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## Preface

This annual progress report provides summary information for Lower Snake River Compensation Plan (LSRCP) spring Chinook salmon programs operated by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins during 2005. Also included in this report are summaries of data collected at adult broodstock collection facilities operated by the Nez Perce Tribe (Lostine River) and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Catherine Creek and upper Grande Ronde River) and funded by the Bonneville Power Administration. These ongoing monitoring and evaluation programs provide technical, logistical, and biological information to managers charged with maintaining viable natural Chinook salmon populations, and managing hatchery programs and recreational and tribal fisheries in northeast Oregon.

The data in this report serve as the basis for assessing the success of meeting our management objectives and were derived from hatchery inventories and standard databases (e.g., PSMFC, coded-wire tag), through standard sampling techniques or provided by other agencies. As such, specific protocols are usually not described. When possible, data obtained from different sources were cross-referenced and verified. In cases where expansions of data or unique methodologies were used, we describe protocols in more detail. Additional descriptions of protocols can be found in the 2005 work statement (Carmichael et al. 2005).

We used coded-wire tag (CWT) data collected from 2005 adult returns to evaluate smolt-to-adult survival rates, harvest, straying, escapement, and specific information on experimental results. In addition, much of the data that we discuss in this report will be used in separate and specific evaluations of ongoing supplementation and research programs for Chinook salmon in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins. We began fish culture evaluations in 1983 and have dramatically improved many practices. Progress for work completed in previous years is presented in annual progress reports (Carmichael and Wagner 1983; Carmichael and Messmer 1985; Carmichael et al. 1986a; 1987; 1988; 1999; 2004; Messmer et al. 1989; 1990; 1991; 1992; 1993; Hoffnagle et al. 2005; Monzyk et al. 2006a; b; c; d; e; 2007) and United States v. Oregon production report (Carmichael et al. 1986b).

In this report, data are organized into salmon culture monitoring for juveniles and adults, CWT recoveries, compensation goals, and estimates for total adult escapement. During the period covered in this report, Chinook salmon smolts from the 2003 brood year were released, Chinook salmon from the 2000-2002 brood years returned to spawn, and some of the returning adult Chinook salmon were used to create the 2005 brood year.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2005, we released 435,186 Chinook salmon smolts from the 2003 brood year into the Imnaha River that were released from the Conventional Broodstock Program. We estimated that $5.2 \%$ of these smolts were not identifiably marked with an adipose fin clip (ad clip) or codedwire tag. In addition, we released 2003 brood year smolts from both the Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program and Conventional Broodstock Program into the Grande Ronde Basin. We released 62,149 Captive Broodstock smolts and 102,557 Conventional Broodstock smolts into the Lostine River, all identifiably marked with ad clips and/or coded-wire tags. We released 68,827 Captive Broodstock smolts and 120,753 Conventional Broodstock smolts into Catherine Creek with $0.3 \%$ having no identifiable mark. We also released 98,023 Catherine Creek Captive Broodstock smolts into Lookingglass Creek with an estimated $2.1 \%$ having no identifiable mark. We released 1,019 Captive Broodstock smolts and 104,350 Conventional Broodstock smolts into the upper Grande Ronde River and estimated that $4.4 \%$ of these smolts had no identifiable mark.

We trapped 984 hatchery- and 237 naturally-produced Chinook salmon at the Imnaha River weir. In the Grande Ronde Basin we captured 631 hatchery- and 193 naturally-produced Chinook salmon on the Lostine River, 166 hatchery- and 60 naturally-produced Chinook salmon on Catherine Creek, and 263 hatchery- and 14 naturally-produced Chinook salmon on the upper Grande Ronde River. At the Lookingglass Creek weir we trapped 45 hatchery-produced Chinook salmon along with 25 naturally-produced Chinook salmon.

We estimated that 1,307 Imnaha River hatchery Chinook salmon returned to the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan compensation area in 2005, achieving $40.7 \%$ of the hatchery adult compensation goal in the Imnaha River Basin. In the Grande Ronde River Basin, we estimated that 734 Lostine River, 174 Catherine Creek, 418 Grande Ronde River, and 59 Lookingglass Creek hatchery adults returned to the basin. Combined, these returns achieved $23.8 \%$ of the compensation goal for the Grande Ronde Basin.

The recruits-per-spawner ratio for naturally spawning (spawned in nature from natural and hatchery parents) Imnaha River salmon for the 2000 brood year was 0.2 . This was the second consecutive year productivity was below replacement after three consecutive years of natural productivity levels above replacement. The recruits per spawner ratio for the hatchery component was 8.7 , better than naturally spawning salmon and well above replacement.

In 2005, we observed 229 carcasses and found 447 redds during spawning ground surveys in the Imnaha River Basin. Only one hatchery stray was recovered in the basin (it was originally released in the Lostine River). In the Grande Ronde Basin, we observed 402 carcasses and found 669 redds. There were 13 known hatchery strays recovered in 2005 within the Grande Ronde Basin. All were strays from the Conventional Broodstock Program that were released into other streams within the Grande Ronde Basin.

## INTRODUCTION

This annual progress report summarizes spring Chinook salmon monitoring data for the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan (LSRCP) facilities in 2005. Also summarized are adult broodstock monitoring data collected in the Grande Ronde Basin by the Nez Perce Tribe (NPT) and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). The main objectives of this report are to document and evaluate spring Chinook salmon culture performance for hatchery programs and achievement of management objectives in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins. These data are used to design culture practices to optimize egg-to-smolt survival rate, smolt quality, smolt-to-adult survival rate, and successful spawning in nature by hatcheryreared adults, as well as to provide information to adapt the programs to most effectively meet management objectives. This report provides information on rearing and release operations for the 2003 brood year of juvenile Chinook salmon smolts, the collection, spawning, and adult characteristics of adult Chinook salmon in the 2005 return year, and the collection of eggs for the 2005 brood year.

## LSRCP Chinook Salmon Program Objectives

1. Prevent extinction of Imnaha River, Lostine River, Catherine Creek, and upper Grande Ronde River Chinook salmon populations and ensure a high probability of population persistence well into the future, once causes of basin-wide declines have been addressed.
2. Establish adequate broodstock to meet annual production goals.
3. Establish a consistent total return of Chinook salmon that meets the LSRCP mitigation goal of 3,210 hatchery adults in the Imnaha Basin and 5,820 hatchery adults in the Grande Ronde Basin.
4. Re-establish historic tribal and recreational fisheries.
5. Minimize impacts of hatchery programs on resident stocks of game fish.
6. Operate the hatchery program so that the genetic and life history characteristics of hatchery fish mimic those of wild fish, while achieving mitigation goals.
7. Maintain genetic and life-history characteristics of natural Chinook salmon populations in the Imnaha River, Lostine River, Catherine Creek, and upper Grande Ronde River.
8. Maintain the genetic and life-history characteristics of the endemic wild populations of Chinook salmon in the Minam and Wenaha rivers.
9. Provide a future basis to reverse the decline in abundance of endemic Chinook salmon populations in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins.
10. 

## Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Objectives

1. Document Chinook salmon rearing and release activities at all LSRCP facilities.
2. Determine optimum rearing and release strategies that will produce maximum survival to adulthood for hatchery-produced Chinook salmon smolts.
3. Document Chinook salmon adult returns to broodstock collection facilities in the Imnaha River, Lostine River, Catherine Creek, upper Grande Ronde River, and Lookingglass Creek.
4. Estimate annual hatchery returns to compensation areas and determine success in meeting mitigation goals.
5. Estimate annual smolt survival to Lower Granite Dam for production and experimental groups.
6. Conduct index, extensive, and supplemental Chinook salmon spawning ground surveys for all populations in northeast Oregon to assess spawn timing and spawning distribution, and estimate natural spawner escapement.
7. Determine the proportion of naturally spawning spring Chinook salmon that are of hatchery origin in all Imnaha and Grande Ronde basin Chinook salmon populations.
8. Determine annual escapement and spawner numbers to estimate and compare productivity (recruits per spawner) for natural- and hatchery-produced Chinook salmon in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins.
9. Compare life history characteristics (age structure, run timing, sex ratio, egg size, and fecundity) of hatchery and natural origin salmon.
10. Coordinate Chinook salmon broodstock marking programs for Lookingglass Fish Hatchery.
11. Participate in planning activities associated with anadromous salmon production and management in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins and participate in ESA permitting, consultation, and recovery planning.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

During 2005, spring Chinook salmon from the 2003 brood year produced from Conventional Broodstock were released as smolts into the Imnaha River. In the Grande Ronde River Basin, smolts from the 2003 brood year produced from the Conventional Broodstock program were released into the Lostine River, Catherine Creek, and the Grande Ronde River. Also released into the Lostine River, Catherine Creek, the Grande Ronde River, and Lookingglass Creek were smolts from the 2003 brood year produced from the Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program (Carmichael 2006). Adult Chinook salmon from the 2000-2002 brood years returned to spawn and were used as broodstock to create the 2005 brood year to be reared at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery (LFH). Coded-wire-tag recoveries from adult hatchery returns were used to assess the success of achieving mitigation goals and management objectives. In addition, much of the data discussed in this report will be used in separate and specific evaluations of ongoing supplementation programs for Chinook salmon in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins.

## Juveniles

Green egg-to-smolt survival rate for the 2003 brood year of Imnaha River Chinook salmon released in 2005 was $87.4 \%$ (green egg-to-eyed egg survival rate, $88.0 \%$; eyed-to-smolt survival rate, 99.3\%) (Table 1). For the Lostine River, green egg-to-smolt survival rates were $31.7 \%$ for Captive Broodstock offspring and $94.3 \%$ for Conventional Broodstock offspring. Green egg-to-smolt survival rates for Catherine Creek salmon were $62.0 \%$ for Captive Broodstock offspring and $90.0 \%$ for Conventional Broodstock offspring. For the Grande Ronde

River, green egg-to-smolt survival rates were $65.8 \%$ for Captive Broodstock offspring and 86.4\% for Conventional Broodstock offspring. Compared to the Conventional Broodstock Program, survival rates for the Captive Broodstock Program were consistently lower, mostly due to large numbers of eyed eggs being culled because of high enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) levels in female broodstock, in an effort to reduce the incidence of bacterial kidney disease (BKD) in their offspring. Co-managers decided to cull eyed eggs produced from females with ELISA levels $\geq 0.8$ for Catherine Creek and Grande Ronde River stocks and $\geq 0.4$ for Lostine River females.

We did not reach mitigation goals for any stock in 2005 release year (Table 1). The release of 435,186 smolts from the 2003 Imnaha River brood year was slightly below the longterm mitigation goal of 490,000 but above the specific annual production goal of 360,000 for this brood year*. The recently modified long-term mitigation goal for the Grande Ronde River Basin was set at 250,000 smolts per year for each of the Lostine River, Catherine Creek, and upper Grande Ronde populations and 150,000 smolts for Lookingglass Creek. In the Lostine River, we released 62,149 smolts produced from Captive Broodstock and 102,557 smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock (164,706 total). In Catherine Creek, we released 68,827 smolts produced from Captive Broodstock and 120,753 smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock (189,580 total). We also released 98,023 smolts produced from the Catherine Creek Captive Broodstock Program into Lookingglass Creek. In the Grande Ronde River, we released only 1,019 smolts produced from Captive Broodstock and 104,350 smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock (105,369 total). Mitigation goals were not achieved for these stocks due to numerous reasons. In the Captive Broodstock Program, low broodstock survival due to bacterial kidney disease and low fecundity due to slow broodstock growth rates have limited smolt production. Also, the poor adult return to the Grande Ronde River in 1999 resulted in no age-4 broodstock for use in the 2003 brood year production. In the Conventional Broodstock Program, low adult returns in 2003 limited the number of broodstock collected and subsequent smolt production.

We marked approximately half of the Imnaha River 2003 brood year smolts released in 2005 with ad clip+CWT. The other half of the 2003 Imnaha River brood year smolts received only ad clips. Fin clip application success was estimated at $97.1 \%$ for the portion receiving ad clip+CWT and $94.9 \%$ for the portion receiving just ad clips (Table 2). CWT application success was $98.8 \%$. We estimated that $4.0 \%$ of the Imnaha River 2003 brood year smolts had no identifiable mark (no CWT or ad clip). We attempted to mark all 2003 Lostine River brood year smolts released in 2005 with ad clip+CWT. We had good ad clip+CWT mark retention for this stock (97.1\%) and estimated all smolts had at least one identifiable mark. We attempted to mark all Catherine Creek smolts with ad clip+CWT, except a small portion of Conventional Broodstock progeny that received just ad clips. Mark retention for the portion that received ad clip+CWT was $95.8 \%$. We estimated that $0.3 \%$ of the smolts released had no identifiable mark. Grande Ronde River smolts produced from the Conventional Broodstock program received just CWTs. We estimated that $95.6 \%$ of these smolts retained their CWT marks so $4.4 \%$ had with no identifiable mark when released. All 2003 brood year smolts released into Lookingglass Creek in 2005 were Captive Broodstock progeny from Catherine Creek stock. We marked only a portion of the smolts with ad clip+CWT, with the remainder receiving only ad clips. Application success was estimated at $95.7 \%$ for the portion receiving just ad clips and $93.3 \%$ for the portion

[^0]receiving ad clip+CWT. We estimated that $2.1 \%$ of all smolts released in Lookingglass Creek had no identifiable mark.

The 2003 brood year of Imnaha River Chinook salmon was reared in six raceways at LFH (Table 3). Smolts in raceways 13 and 17 were direct stream released into the Imnaha River on 29 March 2005. All other Imnaha River Chinook salmon smolts were acclimated at the Imnaha Acclimation Facility starting as early as 9 March 2005. Smolts were volitionally released beginning on 21 March 2005 and the remaining smolts were forced out on 8 April 2005.

Lostine River Chinook salmon smolts produced from Captive Broodstock parents were reared in two raceways and smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock were reared in two raceways at LFH. Smolts from both production groups were transported to and released from the Lostine River acclimation ponds in two stages: early and late acclimation periods (Table 3). Smolts from the early acclimation were transported to the acclimation ponds as early as 28 February 2005. Volitional release of smolts began on 11 March 2005 and remaining smolts were forced out on 20 March 2005. Smolts from the late acclimation period were transported to acclimation ponds on 21 March 2005, were volitionally released beginning on 28 March 2005, and remaining smolts were forced out on 11 April 2005.

Catherine Creek Chinook salmon smolts produced from Captive Broodstock parents were reared in one raceway and smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock were reared in two raceways. Smolts produced from both Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock parents were transported to the Catherine Creek acclimation ponds on 7 March 2005, volitionally released on 14 March 2005, and remaining smolts forced out on 27 March 2005. Another group of smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock parents were transported to the acclimation ponds on 28 March 2005, volitionally released beginning 4 April 2005, and forced out on 7 April 2005.

Grande Ronde River Chinook salmon smolts produced from Captive Broodstock parents were few in number and, therefore, were mixed into a raceway with smolts produced from the Conventional Broodstock Program. A total of two raceways were used to rear smolts (Table 3). Smolts from the combined programs were transported to the Grande Ronde River acclimation ponds on 8 March 2005. Due to low water and freezing conditions, smolts were forced out on 14 March 2005, earlier than planned.

Lookingglass Creek Chinook salmon smolts produced from Catherine Creek Captive Broodstock parents were reared in two raceways at LFH. Smolts were volitionally released from the raceways beginning 18 March 2005 and the remaining smolts were forced out on 29 March 2005.

Smolt migration success was monitored based on first-time PIT-tag detections at mainstem dams. Mean detection rates for smolts released in 2005 were: 50.2\% for Imnaha River stock; 37.8\% for Lostine River stock; 22.0\% for Catherine Creek stock; 13.4\% for Grande Ronde River stock; and 49.5\% for Lookingglass River stock. These detection rates were lower across all stocks than reported in the last several years. Lower than average streamflows in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins in 2005 partially explain the lower detection rates. For the Catherine Creek stock, high levels of hematopoietic necrosis (IHN) of the Captive Broodstock progeny most likely resulted in lower detection rates for this group. Also, a mortality event at a screw trap located on the upper Grande Ronde River contributed to the lower detection rates of smolts for the Grande Ronde River. In general, smolts released during early acclimation periods were detected at lower rates than smolts released during late acclimation periods. In the Lostine

River, detection rates were similar for Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock produced smolts within an acclimation period (Table 3).

## Adults

## Imnaha River

The Imnaha River weir was installed on 20 June 2005 and operated until 14 September 2005 (Table 4). We trapped 984 hatchery- and 237 naturally-produced salmon and 43.1\% (467 hatchery; 60 natural) were retained (Table 5). Most were retained for broodstock or to limit the number of hatchery jacks (age 3 males) on the spawning grounds, but 22 (17 hatchery and five natural) were weir mortalities. The remaining salmon collected at the weir were either outplanted to Big Sheep and Lick creeks (292 hatchery) or released above the weir to spawn naturally ( 225 hatchery, 177 natural). Age structure of salmon captured at the weir was determined from CWT or scale analysis, when available, or from length-at-age relationships developed using fish from previous years with known age information. Age structure of hatchery-produced adults collected at the weir was: $18 \%$ age 3 ; $74 \%$ age 4 ; and $8 \%$ age 5 . This differed from the age structure of naturally-produced adults collected at the weir: $4 \%$ age 3 ; $72 \%$ age 4; and $24 \%$ age 5 (Table 5). We spawned 87 hatchery and 29 natural females with 107 hatchery and 24 natural males (Table 5). We collected 531,706 green eggs from broodstock (Table 6). Eggs were incubated at LFH and survival to shocking was $85.1 \%$.

## Lostine River

The Lostine River weir was installed by Nez Perce Tribe personnel on 9 May 2005 and operated until 30 September 2005 (Table 4). A total of 631 hatchery- and 193 naturallyproduced adult Chinook salmon were captured, with $12.6 \%$ (70 hatchery, 34 natural) retained for broodstock (Table 5). The remaining salmon trapped at the weir were either outplanted to Bear Creek (214 hatchery), returned below the weir (five hatchery, three natural), or released above the weir to spawn naturally ( 342 hatchery, 156 natural). Age 4 adults were the dominant age group returning to the Lostine River weir, comprising $83 \%$ of the hatchery-produced salmon and $84 \%$ of the naturally produced salmon collected (Table 5). Age 3 adults comprised $11 \%$ of hatchery-produced adults and only $6 \%$ of naturally-produced adults returning to the weir. Age 5 adults comprised $6 \%$ of hatchery-produced salmon and $10 \%$ of naturally-produced salmon collected. Adults used as broodstock in the 2005 brood year were both natural and hatchery origin (Conventional Broodstock progeny only - returning Captive Broodstock progeny are allowed to spawn naturally or removed but are not collected for Conventional broodstock due to domestication concerns). We spawned 39 hatchery and 17 natural females with 28 hatchery and 14 natural males. We collected 234,117 eggs (Table 6) and egg survival to shocking was $88.5 \%$.

This is the first year we had a complete brood year return of Lostine River hatchery adults from both the Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock Programs (2000 brood year). Age structure of returning Captive Broodstock progeny from the 2000 brood year was $13 \%$ age 3 ; $82 \%$ age 4 ; and $5 \%$ age 5. Age structure of the Conventional Broodstock progeny from the 2000 brood year was $25 \%$ age $3 ; 73 \%$ age 4 ; and $2 \%$ age 5 . Age structure of natural returns from the 2000 brood year was $6 \%$ age 3; $88 \%$ age 4; and $6 \%$ age 5 . Smolt to adult ratios (SAR) for the 2000 brood year was $0.9 \%$ for Captive Broodstock progeny and $0.8 \%$ Conventional Broodstock progeny.

## Catherine Creek

The Catherine Creek weir was operated by personnel from the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) from 11 February to 3 August 2005. Totals of 166 hatchery- and 60 naturally-produced adult Chinook salmon were captured with $24.8 \%$ ( 46 hatchery and 10 natural) retained (Table 5). Most were retained for broodstock or to limit the number of hatchery jacks (age 3 males) on the spawning grounds, but two hatchery adults were weir mortalities. The remaining salmon collected at the weir were either outplanted to Lookingglass Creek (21 hatchery Captive Broodstock progeny) or released above the weir to spawn naturally ( 99 hatchery, 50 natural). Age structure of hatchery-produced adults collected at the weir was: $18 \%$ age 3 ; $67 \%$ age 4 ; and $14 \%$ age 5 . Age structure of naturally-produced adults collected at the weir was: $7 \%$ age 3; $82 \%$ age 4; and $12 \%$ age 5 (Table 5). All age 5 hatchery returns were progeny of the Captive Broodstock Program. Age 3 and age 4 hatchery returns were both Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock progeny. Adults used as broodstock to create the Catherine Creek 2005 brood year were from both natural and hatchery origin (Conventional Broodstock progeny only - returning Captive Broodstock progeny are allowed to spawn naturally or removed and are not collected for broodstock due to domestication concerns). Pre-spawning mortality of broodstock caught at the weir and held at Lookingglass Hatchery was $0.8 \%$. We spawned nine hatchery females and eight natural females with 15 hatchery males and two natural males. We collected 52,107 eggs (Table 6). Egg survival to shocking was high (95.0\%).

## Grande Ronde River

The upper Grande Ronde River weir was operated by CTUIR personnel from 10 March to 3 August 2005. A total of 263 hatchery- and 14 naturally-produced adult Chinook salmon were captured with $26.0 \%$ ( 65 hatchery and seven natural) retained (Table 5). The remaining salmon caught at the weir were released above the weir to spawn naturally (198 hatchery, seven natural). All age 5 hatchery returns were progeny of the Captive Broodstock Program while age 3 and age 4 hatchery returns were both Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock progeny. Overall age structure of hatchery returns to the weir was $2 \%$ age 3 ; $91 \%$ age 4 ; and $7 \%$ age 5. Age structure of naturally produced adults returning to the weir was as follows: $0 \%$ age $3 ; 57 \%$ age 4; and $43 \%$ age 5. Adults used as broodstock to create the Grande Ronde River 2005 brood year were from both natural and Conventional Broodstock origin. Pre-spawning mortality of the fish held at Lookingglass Hatchery was $11.0 \%$. We spawned 38 hatchery females and two natural females with 22 hatchery and three natural males. We collected 155,070 eggs (Table 6) but egg survival to shocking was low (77.9\%).

## Lookingglass Creek

The Lookingglass Creek weir was operated by CTUIR personnel from 22 February to 9 September 2005. A total of 45 hatchery adults along with 25 natural-origin adults were collected at the weir. The natural-origin adults were likely offspring of Rapid River hatchery adults that spawned naturally and thus were retained for tribal ceremonial/subsistence purposes as part of the management objective to phase out Rapid River stock in Lookingglass Creek and re-establish a stock endemic to the Grande Ronde Basin (Catherine Creek). Of the 45 hatchery adults collected, 37 were progeny of the Captive Broodstock Program (Catherine Creek stock) that were released into Lookingglass Creek. These adults were released above the weir to spawn
naturally. Seven hatchery adults were known strays from within the Grande Ronde River Basin (based on VIE marks) and used as broodstock for their respective Conventional Programs or outplanted (Table 5). One hatchery jack stray from Catherine Creek was retained for tribal ceremonial/subsistence. There were no broodstock collections this year for a Lookingglass Creek Conventional program. In all, 58 hatchery adults that were progeny of the Captive Broodstock Program were released above the weir to spawn naturally ( 37 from weir, 21 outplants from Catherine Creek).

## Coded-Wire Tag Recoveries

Hatchery salmon from most production groups were marked with a coded-wire tag (CWT) to provide basic information on survival, harvest, escapement, straying, and specific information on experimental groups (if any). Coded-wire tag recovery information for each CWT code group was obtained from the Regional Mark Information System (RMIS) CWT recovery database maintained by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission.

The observed and estimated number of hatchery salmon from each CWT code group recovered in ocean and mainstem river fisheries as well as strays collected in and out of the Snake River Basin were summarized from the RMIS database. Estimated CWT recoveries in the RMIS database were based on recoveries and the sampling efficiencies at each recovery location. The RMIS database does not expand for recoveries observed in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins. Therefore, we estimated total CWT marked hatchery adults from each code group (observed from weir collections and spawning ground recoveries) returning to the Imnaha, Lostine, and Grande Ronde rivers, and Lookingglass and Catherine creeks based on total escapement to each stream and the proportion of each cohort marked with CWTs.

In the Imnaha River, CWT marked returns were estimated by first estimating hatchery escapement to the river for each returning brood year (see Monzyk et al. 2006a). The estimated total number of coded-wire tagged returns for each brood year was determined by multiplying the hatchery escapement estimate by the proportion of the brood year tagged at release and the weighted average tag retention rate for each brood year. The estimated total number of CWT returns was partitioned into each CWT code group by multiplying the estimated total number of CWT returns by the relative proportion of each CWT code recovered within a brood year to give the estimated number of CWT returns for each tag group.

In the Grande Ronde River Basin, CWTs from Captive and Conventional Broodstock programs were recovered at different sampling efficiencies. Recovery rates for Conventional Broodstock progeny are usually higher because CWTs are recovered from Conventional Broodstock progeny retained for broodstock as well as from spawning grounds surveys, whereas Captive Broodstock recoveries are typically recovered only on spawning ground surveys, since none are retained for broodstock. This necessitated expanding CWT recoveries for Captive and Conventional hatchery returns separately using the method described above for the Imnaha River.

In both the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins, the exception to the CWT expansion method was when we did not have any CWT recoveries for a particular brood year, but weir data indicated that adults from that brood year returned. In these cases, we estimated total number of coded-wire tagged returns as described above. If the returning adults from the brood year were potentially comprised of more than one tag group, we partitioned the estimated CWT returns into
individual code groups based on the relative proportion of tag group recoveries from the previous year's return.

For some stocks each year, excess adult hatchery returns are outplanted to nearby streams. CWTs from these stocks that were recovered in outplant streams were not considered strays, but rather were included in escapement calculations (e.g., SAR).

In 2005, a total of 282 hatchery-reared Imnaha River Chinook salmon were recovered with a CWT from the 2000-2002 brood years. Nearly all of these CWT recoveries occurred in the Snake River Basin. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 1,126 CWT marked adults returning to the Imnaha River with the following age distribution: 103 from the 2000 brood year (age 5); 956 from the 2001 brood year (age 4); and 67 from the 2002 brood year (age 3) (Table 7). In addition, an estimated 11 CWT marked Imnaha River salmon were harvested in ocean fisheries, 69 were harvested in the Columbia River, and two were harvested in the Snake River below Lower Granite Dam. Five were estimated to be strays outside the Snake River Basin.

We recovered 174 hatchery-reared Lostine River Chinook salmon from the 2000-2002 brood years with a CWT in 2005. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 720 CWT returns to the Lostine River with the following age distribution: 38 from the 2000 brood year (age 5); 607 from the 2001 brood year (age 4); and 75 from the 2002 brood year (age 3) (Table 8). An estimated 18 CWT Lostine River Chinook salmon were harvested in ocean fisheries and 14 in the Columbia River. One stray was recovered out of the Snake River basin, (Willamette River). Five CWT salmon were recovered as in-basin strays (two recovered in the South Fork Salmon River, two in the Rapid River, and one in the Imnaha River).

We recovered 107 hatchery-reared Catherine Creek Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 2000-2002 brood years. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 167 CWT marked adults returning to Catherine Creek with the following age distribution: 22 from the 2000 brood year (age 5); 115 from the 2001 brood year (age 4); and 30 from the 2002 brood year (age 3) (Table 9). An estimated 32 CWT marked Catherine Creek salmon were also recovered in the Columbia River. An estimated six adults were recovered as strays in the Snake River Basin (two from the upper Grande Ronde River and four caught at the Lookingglass Creek weir), and one was recovered as an out-of-basin stray (John Day River).

We recovered 157 hatchery-reared Grande Ronde River Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 2000-2002 brood years in 2005. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 400 CWT returns to the Grande Ronde River with the following age distribution: 24 from the 2000 brood year (age 5); 367 from the 2001 brood year (age 4); and nine from the 2002 brood year (age 3) (Table 10). No CWT marked Grande Ronde River salmon were recovered in ocean fisheries but 89 were recovered in the Columbia River. There were no out-of-basin strays recovered but 14 in-basin strays were recovered: one in Catherine Creek and 13 in Lookingglass Creek.

All CWT recoveries of Lookingglass Creek hatchery adults occurred in Lookingglass Creek (Table 11). These adults were Captive Broodstock progeny from the 2000-2002 brood years (Catherine Creek stock released into Lookingglass Creek). We estimated three CWT marked Chinook salmon from the 2000 brood year (age 5), 39 CWT marked Chinook salmon from the 2001 brood year (age 4), and 17 CWT marked Chinook salmon from the 2002 brood year (age 3) returned to Lookingglass Creek (Table 13).

## Compensation Goals

To assess LSRCP success of achieving mitigation goals and management objectives, we determined the total number of hatchery-produced salmon for each stock that were caught in fisheries, escaped to the stream of release, or strayed within or outside the Snake River Basin. The number of hatchery-produced salmon that were caught in fisheries or strayed within or outside the Snake River Basin was based on estimated CWT recoveries from the RMIS database. Because not all of a cohort within a stock were CWT marked (i.e., ad-only), the estimated number recovered in each recovery location was further expanded by dividing it by the proportion of the cohort with CWT marks. The number of hatchery-produced salmon that escaped to the stream of release was determined using the method described in Monzyk et al. (2006a). To determine the return to the LSRCP Compensation Area, defined as the Snake River Basin above Lower Granite Dam, we summed all estimated escapement for the 2005 return year above Lower Granite Dam.

The annual compensation goal for the Imnaha Basin is 3,210 hatchery adults. We estimated that 1,307 Imnaha River hatchery adults returned to the compensation area, $40.7 \%$ of the goal for the Imnaha River stock and all returned to the Imnaha River (Table 12). We estimated that 124 Imnaha River hatchery adults were harvested in fisheries outside the compensation area, mostly in Columbia River sport fisheries (Table 12). In addition, we estimated five out-of-basin strays in the Deschutes River. The primary factors causing hatchery returns below the compensation goal were low adult returns during the 2000-2002 brood years that limited broodstock collections and subsequent smolt production.

The recruit-per-spawner ratio for hatchery- and natural-origin Imnaha River salmon that spawned naturally (including jacks) in 2000 was 0.231 , below replacement, much lower than the previous four years, and below the mean value since 1982 (Figure 1). The recruit-per-spawner ratio for Imnaha River salmon spawned at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery was 8.7, better than naturally spawning salmon and well above replacement. The recruit-per-spawner ratio calculated without jacks was 0.463 for natural spawners and 9.47 for the hatchery component.

In the Grande Ronde Basin, the annual compensation goal for all stocks combined was set at 5,820 hatchery adults. For the Lostine River hatchery stock, we estimated that 734 adults returned to the compensation area, most (99.3\%) to the Lostine River. Outside the compensation area, we estimated 18 Lostine River hatchery Chinook salmon were harvested in ocean fisheries and 14 in the Columbia River (Table 13). We estimated one adult strayed out of the Snake River Basin. For Catherine Creek hatchery Chinook salmon, we estimated 174 adults returned to the compensation area ( $98.9 \%$ to Catherine Creek). We estimated 32 Catherine Creek hatchery salmon were harvested in the Columbia River, mostly from sport fisheries and we also estimated one out-of-basin stray. An estimated 418 Grande Ronde River hatchery Chinook salmon returned to compensation area. We estimated 89 adults were harvested in the Columbia River, mostly from sport fisheries. There were no out-of-basin strays. We estimated 59 Lookingglass Creek adults returned to the basin. The combined return to the compensation area was 1,385 hatchery adults, $23.8 \%$ of the compensation goal. The primary factors causing low hatchery returns in the basin were low numbers of Conventional broodstock collections and subsequent smolt production, and a Captive Broodstock program that has been beleaguered with low broodstock survival due to bacterial kidney disease and low fecundity due to slow broodstock growth rates (Hoffnagle et al. 2003; Carmichael 2006).

## Natural Escapement Monitoring

Stream surveys to enumerate Chinook salmon redds and sample salmon carcasses were conducted as in previous years (see Monzyk et al. 2006a). We surveyed three streams in the Imnaha Basin and nine in the Grande Ronde Basin. In 2005, we counted 447 redds and observed 229 carcasses in the Imnaha Basin (Table 14). Redd counts in the basin were low compared to previous years and represent the fifth year in a row in declining counts since the 2002 return year (Figure 2). All recovered CWTs from marked hatchery salmon on spawning grounds were from Imnaha stock with the exception of one age 4 Lostine River adult (Table 15). The number of natural salmon that returned to the basin to spawn (248) was down considerably from the previous four years (Figure 3). Hatchery salmon comprised the majority (68\%) of adults on the spawning grounds in the Imnaha River.

In the Grande Ronde Basin, we observed 669 redds and recovered 402 carcasses on the spawning grounds (Table 14). Redd counts were down from previous years (Figure 2). We recovered 13 known hatchery strays in the Grande Ronde Basin (Table 15). All were strays from within the Grande Ronde Basin: 11 Grande Ronde River stock recovered in Lookingglass Creek; and two Catherine Creek stock recovered in the Grande Ronde River. Marked salmon comprised $69.4 \%$ of the observed carcasses. In streams with hatchery supplementation programs, the number of natural salmon that returned was down from the previous four years (Figure 4). The proportion of hatchery salmon on the spawning grounds was $70 \%, 67 \%$, and $96 \%$, for the Lostine River, Catherine Creek, and the Grande Ronde River, respectively.
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Figure 1. Recruits-per-spawner ratios for completed brood years (1982-2000) of Imnaha River Chinook salmon with age-3 males included (A) and without age-3 males (B). Note: dotted line indicates recruits-per-spawner ratio=1.


Figure 2. Chinook salmon redd counts in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins, 1994-2005.


Figure 3. Estimated numbers of natural- and hatchery-origin spring/summer Chinook salmon, including age 3 males, that spawned naturally in the Imnaha River, 1984-2005.


Figure 4. Estimated numbers of natural- and hatchery-origin spring Chinook salmon, including age 3 males, that spawned naturally in the Lostine River, Catherine Creek, and Grande Ronde River, 1997-2005.

Table 1. Rearing summaries for 2003 brood year juvenile Chinook salmon released into the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins in 2005.

| Stock | Broodstock | Number of green eggs taken | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eyed } \\ & \text { eggs } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number culled $^{a}$ | Percent Survival |  |  | Total smolts released |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Green egg -toeyed egg | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Eyed egg } \\ \text {-to- } \\ \text { smolt } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Green egg } \\ \text {-to- } \\ \text { smolt } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Imnaha River | Conventional | 497,969 | 438,050 | 0 | 88.0 | 99.3 | 87.4 | 435,186 |
| Lostine River | Captive | 196,043 | 170,758 | 56,691 | 87.1 | 36.4 | 31.7 | 62,149 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| Lostine River ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Conventional | 108,758 | 108,530 | 0 | 99.8 | 94.5 | 94.3 | 102,557 |
| Catherine Creek | Captive | 268,986 | 207,295 | 30,306 | 77.1 | 80.5 | 62.0 | $166,850{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| Catherine Creek ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Conventional | 134,141 | 133,765 | 0 | 99.7 | 90.3 | 90.0 | 120,753 |
| Grande Ronde River | Captive | 1,548 | 1,133 | 0 | 73.2 | 89.9 | 65.8 | 1,019 |
| Grande Ronde River ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Conventional | 120,959 | 120,770 | 0 | 100.0 | 86.4 | 86.4 | 104,350 |
| ${ }^{a}$ Eggs were culled if enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) levels of female broodstock were $\geq 0.8$ for Catherine Creek and the Grande Ronde River and $\geq 0.4$ for the Lostine River. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{b}$ An additional 27,042 smolts were culled or died before release due to disease issues. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Egg counts reconstructed from smolt numbers plus fry, eyed egg, and green egg losses. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{d}$ Of total, 98,023 Captiv | Broodstock sm | were relea | into Loo | grlass |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Estimates of percent adipose fin clip (Ad) and coded-wire tag application success for 2003 brood year Chinook salmon stocks reared at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery and released as smolts in 2005.


Table 2 continued.

| Stock, CWT code | Raceway | Broodstock | Number checked | Ad clip, with CWT | Ad clip, no CWT | No Ad clip, with CWT | No Ad clip, no CWT | Total released |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grande Ronde River ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094035 | 7 | Conventional | - | - | - | - | - | 49,871 |
| 094036 | 6 | Conventional | 501 | n/a | n/a | 95.6 | 4.4 | 54,479 |
| 094127 | 7 | Captive | - | - | - | - | - | 1,019 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 501 | n/a | n/a | 95.6 | 4.4 | 105,369 |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 093824 | 4 | Captive | 508 | 93.3 | $\underline{2.0}$ | 3.7 | 1.0 | 66,578 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 508 | 93.3 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 66,578 |
| Ad-only | 5 | Captive | 506 | n/a | 95.7 | n/a | 4.3 | 31,445 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 506 | n/a | 95.7 | n/a | 4.3 | 31,445 |

${ }^{\bar{a}}$ Estimated $0.4 \%$ of all fish in raceway 1 had no Ad clip or CWT.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Captive Broodstock mixed with Conventional Broodstock progeny in Raceway 7. Conventional progeny were not fin clipped. No estimate of fin clip application success for Captive progeny.

Table 3. Mean size of 2003 brood year Chinook salmon smolts, total number released into the Imnaha River and Grande Ronde River basins, number PIT-tagged, and percent detected at Snake and Columbia river dams, 2005. Length, weight, and condition factor data collected 8-10 February 2005.

| Stock, CWT code | Raceway | Program | Release date | Fork Length (mm) |  | Weight (g) |  | Condition factor (K) |  | Total released $^{a}$ | Number PITtagged | Percent PIT tags detected ${ }^{b}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094033 | 17 | Conventional | 29 MAR | 111.8 | 7.5 | 17.5 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 72,247 | 3,467 | 45.6 |
| 094033 | 16 | Conventional | 21 MAR-8 APR | 115.5 | 8.1 | 19.5 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 73,839 | 3,502 | 51.8 |
| 094034 | 18 | Conventional | 21 MAR-8 APR | 112.9 | 7.8 | 18.4 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 73,763 | 3,499 | 50.5 |
| Ad-only | 13 | Conventional | 29 MAR | 112.6 | 6.3 | 17.8 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 73,495 | 3,496 | 51.0 |
| Ad-only | 12 | Conventional | 21 MAR-8 APR | 111.1 | 6.6 | 19.0 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 74,031 | 3,498 | 51.5 |
| Ad-only | 15 | Conventional | 21 MAR-8 APR | 114.2 | 7.9 | 18.7 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 67,811 | 3,455 | 50.9 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 435,186 | 20,917 | 50.2 |


| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 094037 | 8 | Conventional | 28 MAR-11 APR | 112.8 | 7.1 | 17.5 | 4.5 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 50,826 | 3,990 | 41.3 |
| 094038 | 9 | Conventional | 11-20 MAR | 112.6 | 9.0 | 18.8 | 6.5 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 51,731 | 4,003 | 36.2 |
| 092348 | 10 | Captive | 11-20 MAR | 119.9 | 9.0 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 43,659 | 2,667 | 30.3 |
| 094041 | 11 | Captive | 28 MAR-11 APR | 122.7 | 11.5 | 23.5 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 18,490 | 2,661 | $\underline{42.7}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 164,706 | 13,321 | 37.8 |

Catherine Creek

| $\underline{070753}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Ad-only } \\ 070754 \\ 094039 \\ 094040\end{array}\right\}$ | 1 | Conventional | 7-27 MAR | 112.9 | 6.4 | 17.3 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 58,444 | 7,004 | 24.6 |
| 2 | Conventional | 28 MAR-7 APR | 114.1 | 6.4 | 18.2 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 59,036 | 6,911 | 25.2 |  |
| Total | Captive | 7-14 MAR | 116.0 | 9.5 | 18.6 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 34,415 | $\underline{34,412}$ | $\underline{6,924}$ | $\underline{16.1}$ |

[^1]Table 3 continued.

| Stock, CWT code | Raceway | Program | Release date | Fork Length (mm) |  | Weight (g) |  | Condition factor (K) |  | Total released $^{a}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { PIT- } \\ \text { tagged } \end{gathered}$ | Percent PIT tags detected ${ }^{b}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Mean | SD | Mean |  | Mean | SD |  |  |  |
| Grande Ronde River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094036 | 6 | Conventional | 8-14 MAR | 119.0 | 8.7 | 20.5 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 54,479 | 499 | 14.6 |
| $\begin{gathered} 094035 \\ 094127 \end{gathered}$ |  | Captive | 8-14 MAR | 118.5 | 6.8 | 22.8 | 5.1 | 1.4 | 0.2 | $\begin{gathered} 49,871 \\ 1,019 \end{gathered}$ | 494 | 12.1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 105,369 | 993 | 13.4 |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 093824 | 4 | Captive | 18-29 MAR | 116.5 | 9.8 | 19.8 | 6.4 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 66,578 | 489 | 44.8 |
| Ad-only | 5 | Captive | 18-29 MAR | 120.6 | 14.5 | 22.1 | 11.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 31,445 | 501 | 54.1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 98,023 | 990 | 49.5 |

Table 4. Recoveries of adult Chinook salmon at northeast Oregon LSRCP facilities, 2005.

|  |  | Imnah | River ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Lostine | River ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Catherin | Creek ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Grande Riv | Ronde $e^{\text {c }}$ | Looki Cr | $\mathrm{ek}^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Week of year | Marked | $\begin{gathered} \text { Un- } \\ \text { marked } \end{gathered}$ | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | $\begin{gathered} \text { Un- } \\ \text { marked } \end{gathered}$ | Marked | $\begin{gathered} \text { Un- } \\ \text { marked } \end{gathered}$ | Marked | $\begin{gathered} \text { Un- } \\ \text { marked } \end{gathered}$ |
| Dates of trap operation: |  | 20 JUN - 14 SEP |  | 9 MAY - 30 SEP |  | 11 FEB - 3 AUG |  | 10 MAR - 3 AUG |  | 22 FEB - 9 SEP |  |
| 30 APR - 6 MAY | 18 |  |  | - | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 7-13 MAY | 19 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-20 MAY | 20 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21-27 MAY | 21 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 MAY - 3 JUN | 22 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 25 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 6 | 7 |
| 4-10 JUN | 23 | - | - | 24 | 3 | 50 | 17 | 111 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
| 11-17 JUN | 24 | - | - | 24 | 6 | 38 | 13 | 93 | 2 | 12 | 4 |
| 18-24 JUN | 25 | 74 | 13 | 51 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 29 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 25 JUN - 1 JUL | 26 | 190 | 26 | 96 | 27 | 30 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 2-8 JUL | 27 | 20 | 3 | 137 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 9-15 JUL | 28 | 114 | 35 | 111 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-22 JUL | 29 | 244 | 54 | 109 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 23-29 JUL | 30 | 104 | 20 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 30 JUL - 5 AUG | 31 | 57 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6-12 AUG | 32 | 45 | 10 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 |
| 13-19 AUG | 33 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0 |
| 20-26 AUG | 34 | 74 | 42 | 11 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0 |
| 27 AUG - 2 SEP | 35 | 45 | 19 | 20 | 7 | - | - | - | - | 4 | 2 |
| 3-9 SEP | 36 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 8 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0 |
| 10-16 SEP | 37 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 17-23 SEP | 38 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 60 | 63 | 14 | - | 5 |
| Total |  | 984 | $\overline{237}$ | $\overline{631}$ | $\overline{193}$ | $\overline{166}$ | 60 | $\overline{263}$ | 14 | $\overline{45}$ | 25 |

${ }^{a}$ Operated by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildife
${ }^{b}$ Operated by Nez Perce Tribe
${ }^{c}$ Operated by Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Table 5. Number and disposition of adult Chinook salmon returning to northeast Oregon LSRCP facilities in 2005 by origin, age, and sex.

| Stock, Disposition | Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grand total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age 3 |  | Age 4 |  | Age 5 |  | Total | Age 3 |  | Age 4 |  | Age 5 |  | Total |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  |  |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped | 178 | 0 | 283 | 444 | 32 | 47 | 984 | 10 | 0 | 112 | 58 | 23 | 34 | 237 | 1,221 |
| Passed | 1 | 0 | 74 | 125 | 10 | 15 | 225 | 10 | 0 | 83 | 38 | 22 | 24 | 177 | 402 |
| Returned below weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outplanted | 0 | 0 | 122 | 151 | 7 | 12 | 292 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 292 |
| Kept | 177 | 0 | 87 | 168 | 15 | 20 | 467 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 60 | 527 |
| Actual spawned | 41 | 0 | 61 | 79 | 5 | 8 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 19 | 1 | 10 | 53 | 247 |
| Killed, not spawned | 133 | 0 | 21 | 78 | 3 | 10 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 3 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 552 | - | 759 | 779 | 875 | 917 |  | n/a | - | 744 | 753 | 862 | 918 |  |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 18.1 | 0.0 | 28.8 | 45.1 | 3.3 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 47.3 | 24.5 | 9.7 | 14.3 | 100.0 |  |
| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped | 70 | 0 | 202 | 324 | 16 | 19 | 631 | 11 | 0 | 95 | 67 | 12 | 8 | 193 | 824 |
| Passed | 12 | 0 | 107 | 196 | 14 | 13 | 342 | 9 | 0 | 80 | 50 | 9 | 8 | 156 | 498 |
| Returned below weir | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Outplanted | 55 | 0 | 67 | 87 | 1 | 4 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Kept | 0 | 0 | 28 | 40 | 0 | 2 | 70 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 34 | 104 |
| Actual spawned | 0 | 0 | 28 | 37 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 98 |
| Killed, not spawned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | n/a | - | 793 | 755 | n/a | 828 |  | 466 | - | 756 | 751 | 956 | n/a |  |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 11.1 | 0.0 | 32.0 | 51.3 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 100.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 49.2 | 34.7 | 6.2 | 4.1 | 100.0 |  |

[^2]Table 5 continued.

| Stock, Disposition | Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grand total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age 3 |  | Age 4 |  | Age 5 |  | Total | Age 3 |  | Age 4 |  | Age 5 |  | Total |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  |  |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped | 30 | 0 | 58 | 54 | 8 | 16 | 166 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 27 | 3 | 4 | 60 | 226 |
| Passed | 6 | 0 | 40 | 31 | 6 | 16 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 3 | 4 | 50 | 149 |
| Returned below weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outplanted | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Kept | 24 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 56 |
| Spawned ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 5 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 35 |
| Killed not spawned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 446 | - | 731 | 721 | n/a | n/a |  | n/a | - | 712 | 677 | n/a | n/a |  |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 18.1 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 32.5 | 4.8 | 9.6 | 100.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 36.7 | 45.0 | 5.0 | 6.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Grande Ronde River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped | 6 | 0 | 106 | 134 | 11 | 6 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 277 |
| Passed | 1 | 0 | 85 | 95 | 11 | 6 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 205 |
| Returned below weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kept | 5 | 0 | 21 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 72 |
| Spawned ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 4 | 0 | 18 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 65 |
| Killed not spawned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{a}$ | 512 | - | 756 | 738 | n/a | n/a |  | - | - | 685 | 782 | 922 | n/a | n/a |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 2.3 | 0.0 | 40.3 | 51.0 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 100.0 |  |

[^3]Table 5 continued.

| Stock, Disposition | Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grand total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age 3 |  | Age 4 |  | Age 5 |  | Total | Age 3 |  | Age 4 |  | Age 5 |  | Total |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  |  |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped | 14 | 0 | 17 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 45 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 70 |
| Passed ${ }^{d}$ | 11 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Returned below weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kept ${ }^{e}$ | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Spawned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Killed not spawned ${ }^{f}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 26 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | n/a | - | n/a | n/a | n/a | - |  | n/a | - | n/a | n/a | - | n/a |  |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 29.5 | 0.0 | 38.6 | 27.3 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 56.0 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |  |

${ }^{d}$ Fish were initially kept but later released above the weir.
${ }^{e}$ Kept fish were strays from Catherine Creek (4), Grande Ronde River (2,) and the Lostine River (1). The Catherine Creek and Grande Ronde River strays were used as broodstock for those programs. The Lostine River 'stray' was re-outplanted to Bear Creek.
${ }^{f}$ All natural returns were assumed to be Rapid River stock and killed not spawned.

Table 6. Timing of spawning and spawning summaries for the Conventional Broodstock of Chinook salmon at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery, 2005. Mixed includes hatchery and natural origin fish.

| Stock, spawn date | Number of parents |  |  |  | Number of green eggs collected | Average fecundity | Number of eyed eggs | Percent mortality to shocking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hatchery |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | F | $\mathrm{M}^{\text {a }}$ | F | $\mathrm{M}^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 AUG | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5,605 | 5,605 | 5,549 | 1.0 |
| 23 AUG | 10 | 15 | 7 | 2 | 82,397 | 4,847 | 54,976 | 33.3 |
| 30 AUG | 19 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 132,533 | 4,418 | 103,274 | 22.1 |
| 6 SEP | 54 | 66 | 9 | 9 | 284,689 | 4,519 | 263,154 | 7.6 |
| 13 SEP | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 26,482 | 4,414 | 25,780 | $\underline{2.7}$ |
| Total | 88 | 100 | 29 | 11 | 531,706 | 4,760 | 452,733 | 14.9 |
| $\underline{\text { Lostine River }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 AUG | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8,658 | 4,329 | 7,310 | 15.6 |
| 24 AUG | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 25,719 | 4,287 | 18,786 | 27 |
| 31 AUG | 16 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 91,778 | 4,172 | 81,915 | 10.7 |
| 7 SEP | 13 | 16 | 5 | 8 | 75,267 | 4,182 | 68,467 | 9.0 |
| 13 SEP | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 21,785 | 4,357 | 20,475 | 6.0 |
| 12 SEP | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ | 1 | 10,910 | 3,637 | 10,338 | 5.2 |
| Total | 39 | 39 | 17 | 18 | 234,117 | 4,160 | 207,291 | 11.5 |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 AUG | $1^{\text {b }}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2,880 | 2,880 | 2,697 | 6.4 |
| 1 SEP | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 11,385 | 2,846 | 10,014 | 12.0 |
| 8 SEP | $\underline{6}$ | $\underline{11}$ | $\underline{6}$ | 1 | 37,842 | 3,154 | 36,765 | $\underline{2.8}$ |
| Total | 10 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 52,107 | 2,960 | 49,476 | 5 |
| Grande Ronde River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 AUG | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4,114 | 4,114 | 1,518 | 63.1 |
| 18 AUG | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6,486 | 3,243 | 3,728 | 42.5 |
| 25 AUG | 11 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 46,983 | 3,614 | 37,678 | 19.8 |
| 1 SEP | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 41,196 | 4,120 | 26,607 | 35.4 |
| 8 SEP | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48,958 | 4,080 | 44,178 | 9.8 |
| 14 SEP | $\underline{0}$ | 1 | $\underline{0}$ | 1 | 7,333 | 3,667 | 7,022 | 4.2 |
| Total | 37 | 21 | 2 | 4 | 155,070 | 3,806 | 120,731 | 22.1 |

[^4]Table 7. Estimated adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Imnaha River spring/summer Chinook salmon for the 2005 return year. In-basin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake River Basin or in the upper Columbia River. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded CWT recoveries.

${ }^{a}$ Expansion based on estimated number of CWT fish returning (brood year escapement x proportion with CWT x tag retention rate).
${ }^{b}$ Estimated number of total CWT fish recovered from PSMFC and ODFW databases.

Table 8. Estimated adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Lostine River spring Chinook salmon for the 2005 return year. In-basin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin other than outplant streams. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake River Basin or in the upper Columbia River. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded CWT recoveries.

| Brood year | Broodstock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Lostine River ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays $^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2000 | Conventional | 075852 | 31,464 | 4 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Captive | 093419 | 2,363 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093421 | 7,800 | 10 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | Captive | 093422 | 10,514 | 5 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 6 |
|  | Captive | 093423 | 13,178 | 5 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Captive | 093425 | 16,537 | 10 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | Captive | 093426 | 20,265 | 5 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Captive | 093428 | 3,815 | 0 | 0 | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total |  | 105,936 | 38 (10) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 39 |
| 2001 | Conventional | 093539 | 51,795 | 137 (52) | 1 (1) | 2 (1) | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 141 |
|  | Conventional | 093540 | 49,087 | 158 (60) | 6 (2) | 3 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 |
|  | Captive | 093507 | 29,158 | 96 (8) | 0 | 2 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
|  | Captive | 093535 | 50,559 | 60 (5) | 7 (3) | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 68 |
|  | Captive | 093536 | 46,752 | 120 (10) | 4 (2) | 7 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
|  | Captive | 093537 | 7,971 | 36 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 37 |
|  | Captive | 093538 | 7,427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\underline{0}$ | 1 (1) | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total |  | 242,749 | 607 (138) | 18 (8) | 14 (7) | 0 | 3 (3) | 1 (1) | 643 |

${ }^{\bar{a}}$ Expansion based on estimated number of CWT fish returning (brood year escapement x proportion with CWT x tag retention rate).
Includes recoveries from the Wallowa River and Bear Creek that were assumed to be the result of outplanting.
${ }^{b}$ Estimated number of total CWT fish recovered from PSMFC and ODFW databases.

Table 8 continued.

| Brood year | Broodstock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Lostine River ${ }^{a}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ocean } \\ & \text { catch }^{b} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Columbia } \\ \text { River }^{b} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays $^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays $^{b}$ |  |
| 2002 | Conventional | 093830 | 58,004 | 26 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
|  | Conventional | 093831 | 58,366 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093821 | 58,030 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093827 | 12,830 | 16 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
|  | Captive | 093829 | 27,773 | 33 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
|  | Captive | 093839 | 26,727 | 0 | 0 | $\underline{0}$ | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total |  | 241,730 | 75 (5) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 76 |
| Grand Total |  |  | 590,415 | 720 (153) | 18 (8) | 14 (7) | 0 | 5 (5) | 1 (1) | 758 |

Table 9. Estimated adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Catherine Creek spring Chinook salmon for the 2005 return year. In-basin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin other than outplant streams. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake River Basin or in the upper Columbia River. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded recoveries.

| Brood year | Broodstock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Catherine Creek ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { In-basin } \\ \text { strays }^{b} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2000 | Captive | 093420 | 5,553 | 2 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Captive | 093429 | 3,260 | 2 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Captive | 093430 | 6,560 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093431 | 9,404 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 2 |
|  | Captive | 093432 | 10,524 | 2 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Captive | 093433 | 14,490 | 4 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Captive | 093435 | 46,365 | 6 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | Captive | 093436 | 43,986 | 4 (2) | 0 | 6 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | Captive | 093438 | 23,348 | 2 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Total |  | 163,490 | 22 (11) | 0 | 6 (2) | 0 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 30 |
| 2001 | Conventional | 093543 | 24,392 | 27 (26) | 0 | 5 (1) | 0 | 2 (2) | 0 | 34 |
|  | Captive | 093541 | 52,989 | 74 (27) | 0 | 21 (5) | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 96 |
|  | Captive | $093542^{\text {c }}$ | 52,303 | 14 (5) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
|  | Total |  | 129,684 | 115 (58) | 0 | 26 (6) | 0 | 3 (3) | 0 | $\overline{144}$ |
| 2002 | Conventional | 093840 | 70,071 | 21 (17) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (2) | 0 | 23 |
|  | Captive | 093835 | 45,413 | 7 (5) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | Captive | 093836 | 46,384 | $2(1)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Total |  | 161,868 | 30 (23) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (2) | 0 | 32 |
| Grand Total |  |  | 455,042 | 167 (92) | 0 | 32 (8) | 0 | 6 (6) | 1 (1) | 206 |

${ }^{{ }^{a}}$ Expansion based on predicted number of CWT fish returning (brood year escapement x proportion with CWT x tag retention rate).
${ }^{b}$ Estimated number of total CWT fish recovered from PSMFC and ODFW databases.
${ }^{c}$ At time of release, CWT code group 093542 had high ELISA levels for bacterial kidney disease.

Table 10. Estimated adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Grande Ronde River spring Chinook salmon for the 2005 return year. In-basin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin other than outplant streams. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake River Basin or in the upper Columbia River. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded recoveries.

| Brood year | Broodstock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Grande Ronde River ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays $^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2000 | Captive | 070149 | 42,152 | 12 (1) | 0 | 3 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
|  | Captive | 092611 | 2,029 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093416 | 24,669 | 12 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
|  | Captive | 093424 | 13,214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093439 | 30,376 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093440 | 31,824 | 0 | 0 | 5 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | Captive | 093441 | 20,394 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093442 | 4,544 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093444 | 42,200 | 0 | 0 | 2 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | Total |  | 211,402 | 24 (2) | 0 | 10 (5) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| 2001 | Conventional | 092607 | 480 | 4 (3) | 0 | 5 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | Conventional | 093549 | 26,443 | 91 (67) | 0 | 8 (3) | 0 | 3 (3) | 0 | 102 |
|  | Captive | 093544 | 57,750 | 78 (10) | 0 | 40 (12) | 0 | 2 (2) | 0 | 120 |
|  | Captive | 093545 | 57,797 | 86 (11) | 0 | 15 (6) | 0 | 3 (3) | 0 | 104 |
|  | Captive | 093546 | 4,821 | 23 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
|  | Captive | 093547 | 31,881 | 23 (3) | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 25 |
|  | Captive | 093548 | 52,252 | 39 (5) | 0 | 5 (1) | 0 | 4 (4) | 0 | 48 |
|  | Captive | 093649 | 5,612 | 23 (3) | 0 | 5 (1) | 0 | 1 (1) | $\underline{0}$ | 29 |
|  | Total |  | 237,036 | 367 (105) | 0 | 79 (25) | 0 | 14 (14) | 0 | 460 |

[^5]Table 10 continued.

| Brood year | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Broodstock | CWT <br> code | Number released | Grande Ronde River ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake <br> River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2002 | Conventional | 093833 | 69,856 | 9 (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | Captive | 093832 | 15,676 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093834 | 59,387 | 0 | $\underline{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  |  | 144,919 | 9 (6) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Grand Total |  |  | 593,357 | 400 (113) | 0 | 89 (30) | 0 | 14 (14) | 0 | 503 |

Table 11. Estimated adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group for the 2005 return year of Lookingglass Creek spring Chinook salmon. In-basin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin other than outplant streams. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake River Basin or in the upper Columbia River. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded CWT recoveries.

| Brood year | CWT code | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lookingglass Creek ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ocean } \\ & \text { catch }^{b} \end{aligned}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays $^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2000 | 093434 | 24,176 | 2 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 093437 | 23,756 | 1 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total | 47,932 | 3 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| $2001{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 093506 | 17,880 | 39 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 2002 | 093837 | 15,843 | 11 (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
|  | 093838 | 37,352 | 6 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  |  | 53,195 | 17 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Grand Total |  | 119,007 | 59 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

${ }^{a}$ Expansion based on estimated number of CWT fish returning (brood year escapement x proportion with CWT x tag retention rate).
${ }^{b}$ Expanded number of total CWT fish recovered from PSMFC and ODFW databases.
${ }^{c}$ Catherine Creek stock released as parr into Lookingglass Creek.

Table 12. Catch and escapement distribution of Imnaha River hatchery adult spring/summer Chinook salmon by recovery location in 2005 (estimated CWT recovery data summarized through December 2006 from the PSMFC and ODFW recovery databases).

| Location, recovery type | Estimated CWT recoveries ${ }^{a}$ | Expanded adults | Percent of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ocean catch | 11 | 11 | 0.8 |
| Columbia River |  |  |  |
| Ceremonial and subsistence | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Treaty net | 12 | 17 | 1.2 |
| Non-treaty net | 10 | 12 | 0.8 |
| Sport | 47 | 82 | 5.7 |
| Test fishery | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Snake River |  |  |  |
| Sport | 2 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Lower Granite Dam ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Deschutes River |  |  |  |
| Trap | 5 | 5 | 0.3 |
| Sport | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Ceremonial and subsistence | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other Strays |  |  |  |
| Outside Snake River Basin | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Within Snake River Basin ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Recruitment to river ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | n/a | $1,307^{\text {c }}$ | 91.0 |
| Total catch/escapement |  | 1,436 |  |
| Return to compensation area |  | 1,307 |  |
| Percent of compensation goal ${ }^{d}$ |  | 40.7 |  |
| ${ }^{a}$ Estimated recoveries in the PSMFC database. <br> ${ }^{b}$ Indicates areas defining the compensation area. |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{c}$ Expansion factor based on estimated total return to Imnaha River of hatchery brood years. <br> ${ }^{d}$ The compensation goal for Imnaha stock is 3,210 hatchery adults. |  |  |  |

Table 13. Catch and escapement distribution of Grande Ronde Basin hatchery adult spring Chinook salmon by stock and recovery location in 2005 (estimated CWT recovery data summarized through April 2007 from the PSMFC and ODFW databases).

| Location, recovery type | Lostine River |  |  | Catherine Creek |  |  | Grande Ronde River |  |  | Lookingglass Creek |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } \\ & \text { CWT } \end{aligned}$ | Expanded adults | Percent of total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } \\ & \text { CWT } \end{aligned}$ | Expanded adults | Percent of total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } \\ & \text { CWT } \end{aligned}$ | Expanded adults | Percent of total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } \\ & \text { CWT } \end{aligned}$ | Expande adults | Percent of total |
| Ocean catch | 8 | 18 | 2.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Columbia River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ceremonial/subsistence | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Treaty net | 1 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Non-treaty net | 2 | 2 | 0.3 | 2 | 2 | 1.0 | 16 | 20 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Sport | 4 | 10 | 1.3 | 6 | 30 | 14.5 | 14 | 69 | 13.6 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Test fishery | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Snake River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sport | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lower Granite Dam ${ }^{a}$ | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Deschutes River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trap | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Sport | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Ceremonial/subsistence | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other Strays |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outside Snake R. Basin | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Within Snake R. Basin ${ }^{a}$ | 5 | 5 | 0.7 | 2 | 6 | 2.9 | 14 | 14 | 2.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Recruitment to stream ${ }^{a}$ | $651{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $729{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 95.0 | $169{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $172^{\text {c }}$ | 83.1 | $311^{\text {b }}$ | $404^{c}$ | 79.7 | $55^{b}$ | 59 | 100.0 |
| Total estimated return |  | 767 |  |  | 207 |  |  | 507 |  |  | 59 |  |
| Compensation area return |  | 734 |  |  | 174 |  |  | 418 |  |  | 59 |  |

${ }^{a}$ Indicates areas within LRSCP compensation area.
${ }^{b}$ Number of hatchery spring Chinook salmon observed at weir and on spawning ground surveys.
${ }^{c}$ Expansion factor based on estimated total return to natal stream of hatchery adults. Does not include adjustment for CWT loss.

Table 14. Summary of marked and unmarked Chinook salmon carcass recoveries and number of redds observed by stream during spawning ground surveys, 2005.

| Basin, stream | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown <br> Mark | Percent <br> marked | Number of <br> redds |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Imnaha River Basin |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Big Sheep Creek | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 25 |
| Imnaha River | 95 | 80 | 10 | 54.3 | 349 |
| Lick Creek | $\underline{36}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{7}$ | $\underline{100.0}$ | $\underline{73}$ |
| Totals | 131 | 80 | 18 | 62.1 | 447 |
| Grande Ronde River Basin |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bear Creek | 7 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 11 |
| Hurricane Creek | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.0 | 14 |
| Lostine River | 87 | 22 | 16 | 79.8 | 148 |
| Wallowa River | 20 | 15 | 3 | 57.1 | 46 |
| Catherine Creek | 35 | 17 | 2 | 67.3 | 74 |
| Grande Ronde River | 74 | 4 | 7 | 94.9 | 90 |
| Lookingglass Creek | 31 | 6 | 3 | 83.8 | 39 |
| Minam River | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0.0 | 100 |
| Wenaha River | 2 | $\underline{33}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{5.7}$ | $\underline{147}$ |
| Totals | 256 | 113 | 33 | 69.4 | 669 |

Table 15. Summary of adipose-clipped Chinook salmon carcass with coded-wire tags recovered during spawning ground surveys, 2005.

| Recovery location | Brood year | CWT code | Number recovered | Release site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Imnaha River Basin |  |  |  |  |
| Imnaha River | 2000 | 075851 | 2 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093414 | 1 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093415 | 1 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093417 | 3 | Imnaha River |
|  | 2001 | 093535 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093642 | 10 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093643 | 16 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093644 | 9 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093659 | 8 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093660 | 15 | Imnaha River |
| Lick Creek ${ }^{a}$ | 2000 | 093417 | 1 | Imnaha River |
|  | 2001 | 093642 | 5 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093643 | 3 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093644 | 8 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093659 | 6 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 093660 | 3 | Imnaha River |
| Grande Ronde River Basin |  |  |  |  |
| Bear Creek ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 2001 | 093537 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093539 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093540 | 5 | Lostine River |
| Catherine Creek | 2000 | 093420 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093429 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093435 | 3 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093436 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093438 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  | 2001 | 093541 | 11 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093542 | 4 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093543 | 8 | Catherine Creek |
|  | 2002 | 093835 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093840 | 4 | Catherine Creek |
| ${ }^{\bar{a}}$ Recoveries of Imnaha River adults in Lick Creek were most likely the result of outplanting. <br> ${ }^{b}$ Recoveries of Lostine River adults in Bear Creek and Wallowa River were most likely the result of outplanting. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 15 continued.

| Recovery location | Brood year | CWT code | Number recovered | Release site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grande Ronde River | 2000 | 070149 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093416 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093431 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  | 2001 | 093541 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093544 | 10 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093545 | 10 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093546 | 3 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093547 | 3 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093548 | 5 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093549 | 15 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093649 | 3 | Grande Ronde River |
|  | 2002 | 093833 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
| Lookingglass Creek ${ }^{c}$ | 2000 | 093433 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093436 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  | 2001 | 093541 | 13 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093542 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093544 | 2 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093545 | 3 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093547 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093548 | 4 | Grande Ronde River |
|  |  | 093649 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
|  | 2002 | 093837 | 2 | Lookingglass Creek |
|  |  | 093838 | 1 | Lookingglass Creek |
| Lostine River | 2000 | 075852 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093421 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093422 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093423 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093425 | 2 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093426 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  | 2001 | 093507 | 8 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093535 | 3 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093536 | 9 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093537 | 2 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093539 | 17 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093540 | 15 | Lostine River |
|  | 2002 | 093829 | 2 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093830 | 1 | Lostine River |

Table 15 continued.

| Recovery location | Brood <br> year | CWT code | Number <br> recovered | Release site |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wallowa River $^{b}$ | 2000 | 093421 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  | 2001 | 093535 | 2 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093536 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093539 | 4 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093540 | 5 | Lostine River |
|  | 2002 | 093827 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093830 | 1 | Lostine River |
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[^0]:    * Due to space limitations at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery, the annual production goal is less than the LSRCP mitigation goal.

[^1]:    ${ }^{a}$ Equals total number released in Table 1 by stock.
    ${ }^{b}$ Percent PIT tag detections are unique first-time detections at dams in the Snake and Columbia rivers.

[^2]:    ${ }^{a}$ Mean length per age class determined from known age fish based on either CWT, scales, or unique VIE mark.

[^3]:    ${ }^{b}$ Additional fish collected at Lookingglass weir were used as Catherine Creek broodstock ( 2 jacks and 2 age- 4 males).
    ${ }^{c}$ Additional fish collected at Lookingglass weir were used as Grande Ronde River broodstock (1 age-4 male and 1 age-4 female).

[^4]:    ${ }^{a}$ The number of males in table are greater than the number kept because some males were recycled.
    ${ }^{b}$ The coded wire tag in this female showed her to be from the Grande Ronde River.

[^5]:    ${ }^{a}$ Expansion based on predicted number of CWT fish returning (brood year escapement x proportion with CWT x tag retention rate).
    ${ }^{b}$ Estimated number of total CWT fish recovered from PSMFC and ODFW databases.

