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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 2007. Also included in this report are summaries of data collected at adult broodstock collection facilities operated by our co-managers, 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 2007 work statement (Carmichael et al. 2007).

We used coded-wire tag (CWT) data collected from 2007 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 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; 2008a; b) 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, estimates for total adult escapement, and natural escapement monitoring. During the period covered in this report, Chinook salmon smolts from the 2005 brood year were released, Chinook salmon from the 2002-2004 brood years returned to spawn, and some of the returning adult Chinook salmon were used to create the 2007 brood year.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2007, we released 432,530 Chinook salmon smolts from the 2005 brood year into the Imnaha River. We estimated that $99 \%$ of these smolts were identifiably marked with an adipose fin clip (ad clip) and or coded-wire tag. In addition, we released 2005 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 21,573 Captive Broodstock smolts and 49,696 Conventional Broodstock smolts into Catherine Creek with 100\% identifiably marked. We released 20,620 Captive Broodstock smolts and 118,803 Conventional Broodstock smolts into the upper Grande Ronde River with $97.9 \%$ identifiably marked. We did not release any smolts into Lookingglass Creek in 2007. We released 24,604 Captive Broodstock smolts and 205,406 Conventional Broodstock smolts into the Lostine River with 99.9\% identifiably marked.

There was no difference in mean egg weight between age 4 hatchery and natural origin salmon. Age 5 natural returns had a greater mean egg weight than age 5 hatchery returns. The mean egg weight of salmon from the Imnaha River was greater than for salmon from the Grande Ronde Basin. Between stocks, we found significant differences in mean egg weight for age 4 hatchery and natural salmon, and for age 5 salmon, but not age 5 hatchery salmon.

We trapped 1,178 hatchery- and 153 naturally-produced Chinook salmon at the Imnaha River weir. In the Grande Ronde Basin we captured 165 hatchery- and 77 naturally-produced Chinook salmon in Catherine Creek, 40 hatchery- and 33 naturally-produced Chinook salmon in the upper Grande Ronde River, 197 hatchery- and 20 naturally-produced Chinook salmon in Lookingglass Creek. The Nez Perce Tribe reported that some members of their hatchery production staff had falsified weir data from 2001-2008, so some Lostine River data in this report are estimates. Approximately 382 hatchery- and 196 naturally-produced Chinook salmon were captured in the Lostine River.

We estimated that 1,595 Imnaha River hatchery Chinook salmon returned to the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan compensation area in 2007, achieving 49.7\% of the hatchery adult compensation goal in the Imnaha River Basin. In the Grande Ronde River Basin, an estimated 196 Catherine Creek, 78 Grande Ronde River, 216 Lookingglass Creek, and approximately 390 hatchery adults returned to the Lostine River. These returns achieved $15.1 \%$ of the compensation goal for the Grande Ronde Basin.

The recruits-per-spawner ratio for naturally spawning Imnaha River salmon for the 2002 brood year was 0.07 . This was the fourth consecutive year productivity was below replacement after three consecutive years of natural productivity levels above replacement. The recruits-perspawner (R:S) ratio for the hatchery component was 4.3 , better than naturally spawning salmon and above replacement. In the Grande Ronde Basin, the 2002 brood year R:S for the hatchery component was 4.7 in Catherine Creek, and 3.9 in the upper Grande Ronde River. The natural component R:S for the 2002 brood year was 0.3 in Catherine Creek and 1.1 in the upper Grande Ronde River. An R:S was not calculated for Lookingglass because no smolts were released in 2002. We did not calculate an R:S for the Lostine River.

In 2007, we observed 126 carcasses and found 277 redds during spawning ground surveys in the Imnaha River Basin, and one stray from the Umatilla River was recovered. In the Grande Ronde Basin, we observed 230 carcasses and found 442 redds. We recovered five known in-basin hatchery strays and one out-of-basin stray within the Grande Ronde Basin in 2007.

To monitor bacterial kidney disease (BKD), we collected 288 kidney samples from salmon from Grande Ronde Basin streams and 180 kidney samples from Imnaha River Chinook salmon in 2007. We found no difference in mean ELISA OD levels between hatchery-reared and natural Chinook salmon adults. Returning Captive broodstock $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ generation adults had higher mean ELISA OD levels than Conventional Hatchery program offspring. We found no evidence that release of hatchery salmon is causing an increase in BKD prevalence in the monitored streams.

## INTRODUCTION

This annual progress report summarizes spring Chinook salmon monitoring data for the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan (LSRCP) facilities in 2007. Also summarized are adult broodstock monitoring data collected in the Grande Ronde Basin by our co-managers 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, successful spawning in nature by hatchery-reared adults, and to provide information to adapt programs to most effectively meet management objectives. This report provides information on rearing and release operations for the 2005 brood year of juvenile Chinook salmon smolts, the collection of eggs for the 2007 brood year, Chinook spawning in nature, adult characteristics of adult Chinook salmon in the 2007 return year, and Bacterial Kidney Disease (BKD) monitoring.

## 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.

## 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 (LGD) 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 the 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 fish in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basin Chinook 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 2007, spring Chinook salmon from the 2005 brood year were released as smolts into the Imnaha River. In the Grande Ronde Basin, smolts from the 2005 brood year produced from the Conventional Broodstock program were released into Catherine Creek, the Grande Ronde River, and the Lostine River. Also released into Catherine Creek, the Grande Ronde River, and the Lostine River were smolts from the 2005 brood year produced from the Grande Ronde Basin Spring Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program (Carmichael 2008). There were no smolts from the 2005 brood year released into Lookingglass Creek. Adult Chinook salmon from the 2002-2005 brood years, for all supplemental streams, that returned to spawn were used as broodstock to create the 2007 brood year and were 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 2005 brood year of Imnaha River Chinook salmon released in 2007 was $81.4 \%$ (green egg-to-eyed egg survival rate, $85.2 \%$; eyed egg-tosmolt survival rate, $98.0 \%$ ) (Table 1). Green egg-to-smolt survival rates for Catherine Creek salmon were $69.5 \%$ for Captive Broodstock offspring and $92.8 \%$ for Conventional Broodstock offspring. For the Grande Ronde River, green egg-to-smolt survival rates were $56.9 \%$ for Captive Broodstock offspring and $76.6 \%$ for Conventional Broodstock offspring. For the Lostine River, green egg-to-smolt survival rates were $67.2 \%$ for Captive Broodstock offspring
and $87.7 \%$ 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.

Without accounting for age or stock, we found a significant $(\mathrm{P}=0.0004)$ difference in mean egg weight $(\mathrm{g})$ between hatchery $(0.240 \mathrm{~g})$ and natural $(0.259 \mathrm{~g})$ origin Chinook salmon. Incorporating the age of returning salmon, we found no difference ( $\mathrm{P}=0.2335$ ) in mean egg weight between age 4 hatchery $(0.236 \mathrm{~g})$ and natural ( 0.223 g ) returns. Mean egg weight of age 5 hatchery females $(0.258 \mathrm{~g})$ was significantly lower $(\mathrm{P}=0.0045)$ than natural origin age 5 females $(0.288 \mathrm{~g})$. In general, the mean egg weight of Chinook salmon from the Imnaha River was greater than for salmon from the Grande Ronde Basin (Table 2). There was a significant difference in mean egg weight between stocks for age 4 hatchery ( $\mathrm{P}<0.0001$ ) and natural ( $\mathrm{P}=$ 0.0284 ) origin returns. For age 5 returns, we found no difference ( $\mathrm{P}=0.2937$ ) in mean egg weight between stocks for returning hatchery salmon. There was a significant difference $(\mathrm{P}=$ 0.0001 ) in mean egg weight between stocks for age 5 natural origin returns.

The release of 432,530 smolts from the Imnaha River 2005brood year was below the long-term mitigation goal of 490,000 , but above the specific annual production goal of $360,000^{*}$ for this brood year (Table 1). The recently modified long-term mitigation goal for the Grande Ronde River Basin was set at 150,000 smolts for Catherine Creek and 250,000 smolts per year for each of the Lookingglass Creek, upper Grande Ronde River, and Lostine River populations. In Catherine Creek, we released 21,573 smolts produced from Captive Broodstock and 49,696 smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock (71,269 total). In the Grande Ronde River, we released 20,620 smolts produced from Captive Broodstock and 118,803 smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock (139,423 total). In Lookingglass Creek, we did not release any smolts. In the Lostine River, the release of 24,604 smolts produced from Captive Broodstock and 205,406 smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock (230,010 total) nearly achieved the mitigation goal. Mitigation goals were not achieved from the 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 have limited smolt production. In the Conventional Broodstock Program, low adult returns in 2005 limited the number of broodstock collected and subsequent smolt production (Monzyk et al. 2008). Also, in Lookingglass Creek, no returning adults from the 2005 brood year were spawned (Monzyk et al. 2008).

We evaluated the 2005 brood year smolts released in 2007 for mark application success from 6-8 February 2007, a few weeks prior to their release. We sampled at least 500 smolts from each raceway at LFH and checked for the presence of a coded-wire tag (CWT) and adipose fin clip quality (Table 3). We attempted to mark (ad clip+CWT) approximately 43\% (three of seven raceways) of the Imnaha River. The remaining 57\% of the Imnaha River smolts received only ad clips. For the portion of smolts receiving ad clip+CWT, we estimated that $95.5 \%$ were successfully marked with both marks. Fin clip application success was estimated at $98.3 \%$ for the portion receiving just ad clips. We estimated that $1.0 \%$ of the Imnaha River smolts had no identifiable mark (neither ad clip nor CWT). We attempted to mark all Catherine Creek smolts with ad clip+CWT and achieved an application rate of $96.4 \%$. We estimated that $3.1 \%$ had an ad

[^0]clip but no CWT, $0.5 \%$ had a CWT but no ad clip, and none of the smolts released had no identifiable mark. Grande Ronde River smolts produced from the Conventional Broodstock Program received just CWTs. We estimated that $97.9 \%$ of these smolts retained their CWT marks so $2.1 \%$ had no identifiable mark when released. The smolts produced from the Grande Ronde River Captive Broodstock Program received an ad clip and CWT. We estimated 95.8\% had an ad clip and a CWT, $1.9 \%$ had an ad clip but no CWT, $2.3 \%$ had a CWT but no ad clip, and none of smolts had no identifiable mark. We attempted to mark all Lostine River smolts released in 2007 with ad clip+CWT and achieved a $95.1 \%$ application success rate. We estimated $3.8 \%$ had an ad clip but no CWT, $1.0 \%$ had a CWT but no ad clip, and less than $0.1 \%$ of smolts had no identifiable mark.

Smolt migration success was monitored for all stocks based on survival to Lower Granite Dam (LGD). We developed release-recapture information for PIT-tagged smolts from each raceway to calculate Cormack-Jolly-Seber survival probabilities to LGD using the PIT Pro 4 Program (Westhagen and Skalski 2009) with a single release recapture model (Skalski et al. 1998). Mean stock survival was calculated as the weighted average of the raceways for each stock with the number of smolts in each raceway as the weight.

The Imnaha River 2005 brood year Chinook salmon were reared in raceways 12-18 at LFH (Table 3) and were acclimated at the Imnaha Acclimation Facility starting as early as 13 March 2007. Smolts in raceways 12-16 were volitionally released from 21-28 March and 31 March - 12 April 2007. Raceways 17 and 18 were added to the acclimation pond from 17-18 March 2007 and volitionally released from 31-March until 12 April 2007. All fish remaining in the acclimation ponds were forced out on 12 April 2007. The mean survival rate to LGD for Imnaha smolts released in 2007 was $66 \%$ (Table 4).

Catherine Creek Chinook salmon smolts produced from Captive Broodstock parents were reared in raceway 2 and smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock were reared in raceway 1 (Table 4). Smolts produced from both Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock parents were transported to the Catherine Creek acclimation ponds on 12 March 2007. Smolts were volitionally released on 26 March 2007, and remaining smolts were forced out on 11 April 2007. The mean survival rate to LGD for Catherine Creek smolts was $32 \%$ and $33 \%$ for Conventional and Captive Broodstock, respectfully.

Grande Ronde River Chinook salmon smolts produced from Captive Broodstock parents were reared in raceway 6 and smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock were reared in raceways 3-5 (Table 4). Smolts from the Captive Broodstock Program were transported to the Grande Ronde River acclimation ponds on 12 March 2007, volitionally released on 19 March 2007 and the remaining smolts were forced out on 25 March 2007. Smolts from the Conventional Program were transported to the Grande Rond River acclimation ponds on 26 March 2007, volitionally released on 2 April 2007, and the remaining smolts forced out on 11 April 2007. Mean survival rates to LGD for Grande Ronde River stock was 48\%. The Captive broodstock smolts survived at a lower rate, $34 \%$, than the Conventional Broodstock (47-59\%).

Lostine River Chinook salmon smolts produced from Captive Broodstock parents were reared in raceway 11 and smolts produced from Conventional Broodstock were reared in raceways 7-10 at LFH. Smolts from the Conventional Broodstock production group were transported to and released from the Lostine River acclimation ponds in two stages: early and late acclimation periods (Table 4). Smolts from the early acclimation were transported to the acclimation ponds as early as 5 March 2007. Smolts from the Captive Broodstock Program were part of the late release group. Volitional release of smolts began on 16 March 2007 and
remaining smolts were forced out on 26 March 2007. Smolts from the late acclimation period were transported to acclimation ponds from 26-27 March 2007, were volitionally released beginning on 7 April 2007, and remaining smolts were forced out on 17 April 2007. The Lostine River Conventional Broodstock released during early acclimation periods had lower survival rates to LGD, 53-54\% (Table 4), than Conventional Broodstock smolts released during the late acclimation period, which had a survival probability of $66 \%$. The Lostine River Captive Broodstock had a survival probability to LGD of $59 \%$, intermediate to the early and late Conventional Broodstock smolts.

## Adults

## Imnaha River

The Imnaha River weir was installed on 1 June 2007 and operated until 19 September 2007 (Table 5). We trapped 1,151-hatchery and 180 naturally-produced salmon. After accounting for estimates of hatchery adults returns that lacked both a fin clips and CWT, we estimated that 1,178 hatchery (clipped and unclipped) and 153 naturally-produced salmon returned. We retained 213 hatchery- and 51 natural Chinook salmon for broodstock. To limit the number of hatchery salmon on spawning grounds, 28 jack hatchery salmon were retained for tribal ceremonial/subsistence, and 618 hatchery salmon were outplanted to Big Sheep and Lick Creeks (Table 6). The remaining salmon collected at the weir were released above the weir to spawn naturally ( 318 hatchery, 102 natural). Age structure of salmon captured at the weir was determined from CWT or scale analysis, when available, or from length-at-age relationships. Age structure of hatchery-produced adults collected at the weir was: $42 \%$ age $3 ; 53 \%$ age 4 ; and $5 \%$ age 5 . This differed from the age structure of naturally-produced adults collected at the weir: $14 \%$ age $3 ; 51 \%$ age 4 ; and $35 \%$ age 5 (Table 6 ). We spawned 72 hatchery and 21 natural females with 82 hatchery and 23 natural males (Table 6). We collected 408,397 green eggs from broodstock (Table 7). Eggs were incubated at LFH and percent mortality to shocking was 25.8\%.

## Catherine Creek

The Catherine Creek weir was operated by personnel from the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) from 1 March to 31 July 2007. The last fish captured at the Catherine Creek weir was on 3 July 2007. Totals of 173 hatchery- and 75 naturally-produced adult Chinook salmon were captured with 104 hatchery and 44 natural salmon release above the weir to spawn naturally (Table 6). Additionally, 10 salmon identified as Catherine Creek stock were captured in the Lookingglass Creek weir. Age structure of hatchery-produced adults collected at the Catherine Creek and Lookingglass weirs were: $17 \%$ age 3; $73 \%$ age 4; and $10 \%$ age 5 . Age structure of naturally-produced adults collected at the weir was: $8 \%$ age $3 ; 52 \%$ age 4 ; and $40 \%$ age 5. Adults used as broodstock to create the Catherine Creek 2007 brood year were from both natural and hatchery origin (Conventional Broodstock progeny only - returning Captive Broodstock progeny are allowed to spawn naturally or are removed but are not collected for Conventional broodstock due to domestication concerns). We spawned 31 hatchery and 14 natural females with 17 hatchery and 17 natural males. We collected 171,065 eggs and percent mortality to shocking was $14.5 \%$ (Table 7).

This is the second year we had a complete brood year return of Catherine Creek hatchery adults from both the Captive and Conventional Broodstock Programs (2001 and 2002 brood years). Returning Captive Broodstock adult Chinook were marked with an Ad clip and Conventional returns were marked with an Ad Clip and a VIE tag. Based on visual identification of returning adult Chinook, CTUIR staff identified 105 Captive and 75 Conventional adult Chinook returns. Three hatchery fish could not be identified as Captive or Conventional Broodstock. Subsequently, the age structure of Captive Broodstock progeny that returned to the Catherine Creek weir, determined from visual identification, was $23 \%$ age $3(\mathrm{~N}=25) ; 61 \%$ age 4 ( $\mathrm{N}=64$ ); and $16 \%$ age $5(\mathrm{~N}=16)$. Age structure of the Conventional Broodstock progeny was $9 \%$ age $3(\mathrm{~N}=6) ; 86 \%$ age $4(\mathrm{~N}=64)$; and $6 \%$ age $5(\mathrm{~N}=5)$. Smolt-to-adult return rates (SAR) for the 2002 brood year, based on visual identification of Captive and Conventional adults, was the same as the 2001 brood year; $0.1 \%$ for Captive Broodstock progeny and $0.2 \%$ Conventional Broodstock progeny. However, we are not confident about the proportion of Captive and Conventional adults because we believe the VIE mark is not permanent; and therefore, unreliable. The loss of the VIE mark on Conventional returns would result in incorrectly identifying a Conventional return as a Captive return.

In 2007, CTUIR identified 79 Captive ( 1 age 3 , 63 age 4 , and 15 age 5), 22 Conventional (20 age 4 and 2 age 5), and an estimated three returning adult Chinook of unknown Broodstock origin were passed above the weir. Based on the number of fish passed above the weir, we would expect $78 \%$ of the carcasses recovered with a CWT would be from Captive Broodstock and $22 \%$ from Convential Broodstock. On spawning ground surveys, we recovered 12 carcasses with a CWT and five carcasses that were only marked with an AD clip. Of the 12 carcasses with a CWT, five were from Captive and seven were from Conventional Broodstock. These 12 CWT recoveries represent $42 \%$ ( 5 CWT 's) of the Captive and $58 \%$ ( 7 CWT 's) of the Conventional Broodstock passed above the weir. The higher than expected recovery of Conventional carcasses suggests VIE marks are not being identified at the weir.

## Grande Ronde River

The upper Grande Ronde River weir was operated by CTUIR personnel from 21 March to 13 July 2007. The last fish captured at the Grande Ronde River weir was on 5 July 2007. Forty hatchery- and 33 naturally-produced adult Chinook salmon were captured. An additional 23 salmon that returned to the Lookingglass Creek weir were identified as Grande Ronde hatchery stock. Sixty hatchery and 16 natural salmon were retained for broodstock (Table 6). The remaining salmon caught at the Grande Ronde River weir were released above the weir to spawn naturally ( 3 hatchery, 16 natural). Age structure of hatchery returns to the weir was 27\% age $3 ; 53 \%$ age 4 ; and $20 \%$ age 5 . Age structure of naturally produced adults returning to the weir was $0 \%$ age $3 ; 61 \%$ age 4 ; and $39 \%$ age 5 . Adults used as broodstock to create the Grande Ronde River 2007 brood year were from both natural and hatchery origin (Conventional Broodstock progeny only - returning Captive Broodstock progeny are allowed to spawn naturally or are removed but are not collected for Conventional broodstock due to domestication concerns). We spawned 25 hatchery and 6 natural females with 25 hatchery and 6 natural males. We collected 122,750 eggs and percent mortality to shocking was $19.2 \%$ (Table 7).

This is the second year we had a complete brood year return of Grande Ronde River hatchery adults from both the Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock Programs (2001 and 2002 brood years). No Grande Ronde Captive Broodstock progeny were captured at weirs in 2007. Age structure of the Conventional Broodstock was $27 \%$ age 3; $56 \%$ age 4 ; and $17 \%$ age
5. Age structure of natural returns was $0 \%$ age $3 ; 61 \%$ age 4 ; and $39 \%$ age 5 . Smolt to adult return rates (SAR) for the 2002 brood year Captive Broodstock progeny was 0.001\% (1 age 4 female returned in 2006) and $0.2 \%$ for Conventional Broodstock progeny.

## Lookingglass Creek

The Lookingglass Creek weir was operated by Lookingglass Hatchery (ODFW) personnel from 2 April to 18 September 2007. A total of 197 hatchery adults and 20 natural adults were collected at the weir. Twenty-two of the hatchery adults were strays from the Grande Ronde Conventional Broodstock Program, 10 were strays from Catherine Creek ( 9 Conventional and 1 Captive Broodstock). The Conventional Program strays were used as broodstock for their respective Conventional Programs, and the Captive Broodstock salmon (age 3 male) was sacrificed. Six natural age 3 males classified as Lookingglass Creek progeny were released above the weir. Two male adults identified as Rapid River stock were returned below the weir on 24 and 27 August, 2007. Eleven natural adults, assumed to be offspring of Rapid River hatchery adults that spawned naturally, were sacrificed 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). We spawned 22 hatchery females with 15 hatchery males. We collected 68,055 eggs with percent mortality to shocking at $23.1 \%$ (Table 7).

## Lostine River

In a letter from NPT dated 26 May 2009, co-managers were informed about inaccuracies associated with data collected at the Lostine River weir. The NPT determined that three aspects of data collection protocols were compromised or falsified between 2001 and 2008. The pass:keep criteria was not strictly followed, hatchery origin fish with poor or questionable quality adipose fin clips were recorded as natural origin fish, and genetic tissues were dropped or lost and replaced by a "backup supply of tissue" from previously sampled fish resulting in multiple samples from a single fish being recorded as multiple fish. The NPT created a rule set for evaluating all data collected between 2001 and 2008:

1) Any genetic sample matching two or more fish is defined as a group of replicates.
2) There can only be one real fish within a group of replicates with the exception of hatchery fish shown with a disposition of "kept" or "out-planted." If a hatchery fish has been duplicated as "kept" or "out-planted" assume replicate records represent actual fish.
3) Assume that records with dispositions of "kept" or "out-planted" represent the actual fish within a group of replicates. Eliminate all other records unless Rule 1 applies.
4) If the origin of the fish was not consistently duplicated within a group of replicates as either natural or hatchery, assign an unknown origin type to the fish.
5) Assume a fish was real if a valid PIT tag ID exists.

Using the rule set, an escapement estimate using mark-recapture data from spawning ground surveys and the modified weir records were used to estimate the number of returning hatchery and natural Chinook to the Lostine River between 2001 and 2007 (genetic data were not yet available for 2008). Additionally, there is doubt about the reliability of size data collected for fish handled at the Lostine River weir so we are not able to reliably report age structure for fish
handled at the weir (Table 6). At the time this report was prepared, we were not able to estimate the number of Captive and Conventional hatchery broodstock returns based on weir data.

The Lostine River weir was installed by NPT personnel on 15 May 2007 and operated until 28 September 2007 (Table 5). Adults used as broodstock in the 2007 brood year were both natural and hatchery origin (Conventional Broodstock progeny only - returning Captive Broodstock progeny are allowed to spawn naturally or are removed but are not collected for Conventional broodstock due to domestication concerns). This is the third year we had a complete brood year return of Lostine River hatchery adults from both the Captive Broodstock and Conventional Broodstock Programs (2001 brood year). We spawned 40 hatchery and 20 natural females with 26 hatchery and 15 natural males. We collected 267,350 eggs and percent morality to shocking was $13.3 \%$ (Table 7).

## 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 expanded from observed recoveries based on 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 River, Grande Ronde River, Lookingglass and Catherine creeks, and the Lostine River based on total escapement to each stream, sampling rate, and the proportion of each cohort marked with CWTs.

In the Imnaha River, observed recoveries were expanded for unrecovered CWT adults by first estimating hatchery escapement to the river for each 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 total number of CWT returns by the relative proportion of each CWT code recovered within a brood year to give the expanded 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.

The NPT reported that some members of their hatchery production staff had falsified weir data from 2001-2008. One results of this is that for the Lostine River, we were unable to expand Captive and Conventional Broodstock recoveries in the same way we expanded for Catherine Creek and the upper Grande Ronde River because we are unable to rely on Lostine River weir data to correctly identify Captive and Conventional returns. Subsequently, we did not differentiate between broodstock origin, and simply expanded CWT recoveries as "hatchery" salmon using the method described for the Imnaha River. To estimate total return of hatchery and natural salmon to the Lostine River, we used two sets of non-weir data that was known to be reliable for an adult (age 4-5) estimate of hatchery and natural returns above the weir: 1) a mark recapture estimate was calculated using spawning ground survey carcass recoveries, and 2) weir data for 2007 that was reconciled by NPT research biologists using data known to be reliable. We used the percentage of untrapped adults above the weir to estimate the number of untrapped jacks above the weir. A fish/redd estimate was determined by dividing the total number of Chinook (all ages) above the weir by the number of redds above the weir. This fish/redd estimate was multiplied by the number of redds below the weir to estimate the number of untrapped fish below the weir. The estimate of untrapped fish above and below the weir was added to the number of known origin (i.e., hatchery or natural) Chinook handled at the weir to arrive at an estimate for the total return to the river. The proportions of known origin fish handled at the weir were used to partition the total return to the river into hatchery or natural returns. The hatchery jack estimate was determined to be the difference between the estimated total (age 3-5) return to the river of all hatchery returns and the estimated adult only (age 4-5) hatchery returns to the river. To estimate the number of adult returns, we used the total CWT recoveries for age 4 and 5 returns to estimate the proportion of returning adult hatchery Chinook.

In both the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins, the exception to the CWT expansion method is when we did not have any CWT recoveries for a particular brood year, but weir data indicated adults from that brood year returned. In these cases, we estimated the total number of returning adults by age class. 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 the 2007 return, it was not necessary to partition CWT's in this manner.

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) for the stream to which they returned.

In 2007, 149 hatchery-reared Imnaha River Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 20022004 brood years were recovered. Nearly all of these CWT recoveries occurred in the Snake River Basin. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 729 CWT marked adults returning to the Imnaha River ( $84 \%$ of total recoveries) with the following age distribution: 24 from the 2002 brood year (age 5); 425 from the 2003 brood year (age 4); and 280 from the 2004 brood year (age 3) (Table 8). In addition, we estimated that five CWT Imnaha River salmon were harvested in ocean fisheries, 129 were harvested in the Columbia River, none in the Snake River, and one was recovered as a stray within the Snake River Basin at Lyons Ferry Hatchery. Of the Columbia and Snake rivers recoveries, an estimated 42 were recovered in treaty net fisheries, 6 in non-treaty net fisheries, and 82 were recovered in sport fisheries (Table 9). We estimate, with expansions, that 1,593 hatchery adults returned to the Imnaha River, and two Imnaha strays were
recovered within the Snake Basin. After expanding, we estimate a total of 1,595 Chinook salmon returned to the compensation area.

We recovered 97 hatchery-reared Catherine Creek Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 2002-2004 brood years. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 176 CWT marked adults returning to Catherine Creek with the following age distribution: 22 from the 2002 brood year (age 5); 126 from the 2003 brood year (age 4); and 28 from the 2004 brood year (age 3) (Table 10). Catherine Creek Chinook salmon were not recovered in ocean fisheries, 18 were recovered from the Columbia River, and 8 were recovered in the Snake River (Table 11). Of the Columbia and Snake Rivers recoveries, an estimated three were recovered in non-treaty net fisheries, and 23 were recovered in sport fisheries (Table 11).

We recovered 64 hatchery-reared Grande Ronde River Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 2002-2004 brood years in 2007. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 75 CWT returns to the Grande Ronde River with the following age distribution: 11 from the 2002 brood year (age 5); 35 from the 2003 brood year (age 4); and 29 from the 2004 brood year (age 3) (Table 12). Grande Ronde River salmon were not recovered in ocean fisheries, nor the Columbia or Snake Rivers, and we did not identify any in-basin or out-of-basin strays (Table 11). The lack of identified recoveries outside the Grande Ronde River is probably a result of the fact that $48 \%$ of the 2002 brood year was released without an adipose fin clip, $99 \%$ of the 2003 brood year was released unclipped, and $99.6 \%$ of the 2004 brood year was released unclipped. Therefore, unless a snout is collected for all fish with an intact adipose fin, or a CWT wand is used to check for the presence or absence of a CWT for all fish handled that have an intact adipose fin, there is a chance that upper Grande Ronde Chinook salmon could mistakenly be identified as a natural returns and the CWT would not be recovered. Furthermore, many sport fisheries prohibit harvesting Chinook salmon with an intact adipose fin, further diminishing the chances of recovering a CWT from upper Grande Ronde River hatchery salmon.

We recovered 73 hatchery-reared Lookingglass Creek Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 2002-2004 brood years in 2007. Recoveries were expanded to an estimated 194 CWT returns to Lookingglass Creek with the following age distribution: 14 from the 2002 brood year (age 5); 93 from the 2003 brood year (age 4); and 87 from the 2004 brood year (age 3) (Table 13). Lookingglass Creek salmon marked with a CWT were not recovered in ocean fisheries. An estimated six were recovered in the Columbia/Snake river sport fisheries, five were recovered in non-treaty net fisheries, four were recovered as in-basin strays, and none were recovered as out-of-basin strays (Table 11). Of the in-basin strays, one was recovered on the Upper Grande Ronde River, one on the Lostine River, and two were recovered on the South Fork Salmon River.

We recovered 230 hatchery-reared Lostine River Chinook salmon with a CWT from the 2002-2004 brood years in 2007. These recoveries include 86 CWT's ( 85 Lostine River salmon and one Lookingglass Creek salmon) recovered at the Lostine River weir from fish collected for ceremonial/subsistence purposes by NPT that are not reported in RMIS. A total of 90 snouts were collected from fish at the weir in 2007 where the dates of capture, sex, and length were not recorded. Of the 90 recovered snouts, we recovered 86 CWT's, three CWT's were lost (lost CWT's are not counted in the total of recovered CWT's), and one snout did not have a CWT. Without the appropriate biological data, these data were not accepted by either the Oregon or RMIS CWT databases. The 2007 hatchery escapement estimate to the Lostine River, using weir data reconciled by NPT research staff, was 390 hatchery Chinook (age 3-5): Based on CWT recoveries and the estimated total return to the river of 252 hatchery adults (age 4-5), we
estimated that $87.1 \%$ of returning hatchery adults were Age 4, and $12.9 \%$ were age 5 for an approximate age structure of 138 age 3, 219 age 4, and 33 age 5 . We recovered 15 CWT's from the 2002 brood year (Age 5), 101 from the 2003 brood year (age 4), and 88 from the 2004 brood year (age 3). This expanded to an estimated 387 CWT returns to the Lostine River with the following age distribution: 31 from the 2002 brood year; 219 from the 2003 brood year; and 137 from the 2004 brood year (Table 14). No Lostine River Chinook salmon were harvested in ocean fisheries, 61 were harvested in the Columbia River migration corridor, and four were recovered in the Snake River migration corridor (Table 11). Two strays were recovered outside the Snake River basin, one from the Deschutes River, and one from the Umatilla River. A total of 10 CWT salmon were recovered as in-basin strays, one at Lyons Ferry Hatchery, two at the Pahsimeroi trap, four at the Rapid River trap, one on the South Fork Salmon River, one on the Wallow River, and one returned to Lookingglass Hatchery.

## 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 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, failed CWT application), 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 2007 return year above Lower Granite Dam.

## Imnaha River

The annual compensation goal for the Imnaha Basin is 3,210 hatchery adults. We estimated that 1,595 Imnaha River hatchery adults returned to the compensation area, $49.7 \%$ of the goal for the Imnaha River stock (Table 9). The primary factors causing hatchery returns below the compensation goal were low natural adult returns during the 2003 and 2004 brood years that limited broodstock collections and subsequent smolt production, as well as limited rearing capacity at Lookingglass Hatchery.

The recruits-per-spawner ratio for hatchery- and natural-origin Imnaha River salmon that spawned naturally in 2002 was 0.07 , much lower than the 1997-2000 brood years, slightly higher than the 2001 brood year ( 0.05 ) and below replacement (Figure 1). The recruits-per-spawner ( $\mathrm{R}: \mathrm{S}$ ) ratio for the hatchery component was 4.3 , better than naturally spawning salmon, above replacement, but lower than the last seven years. The R:S ratios reported here include jacks and are not adjusted for estimates of pre-spawn mortality.

## Grande Ronde Basin

In the Grande Ronde Basin, the annual compensation goal for all stocks combined was set at 5,820 hatchery adults. We estimated that 196 Catherine Creek, 78 Grande Ronde River, and 216 Lookingglass Creek, and 390 Lostine River, hatchery adults returned to the basin. The
combined return to the compensation area was 880 hatchery adults, $15.1 \%$ of the compensation goal. Several factors have caused these low hatchery returns to the basin. Low numbers of Conventional Broodstock collections and limited rearing space at LFH have resulted in low smolt production. Also, in many years, the Captive Broodstock Program 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 et al. 2007).

For Catherine Creek and the upper Grande Ronde River, the 2002 brood year is only the second brood year where we were able to calculate R:S for hatchery salmon. The R:S rations include jacks and are not adjusted for estimates of pre-spawn mortality. In Catherine Creek, the 2001 brood year R:S was 2.6 and the 2002 brood year $\mathrm{R}: \mathrm{S}$ was 4.7. In the upper Grande Ronde River, the R:S for the hatchery component from the 2001 and 2002 brood year were 6.6 and 3.9, respectfully. The R:S for the natural component from 2002 brood year in Catherine Creek was 0.31 , and 1.1 in the upper Grande Ronde. An R:S was not calculated for Lookingglass Creek because no smolts were released in 2002. The NPT reported that some members of their hatchery production staff falsified weir data from 2001-2008. Therefore, we were unable to calculate an R:S for the Lostine River hatchery salmon because of uncertainty in actual hatchery and natural returns.

## 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 2007, we counted 277 redds and observed 126 carcasses in the Imnaha Basin (Table 15). Redd counts in the basin were low compared to previous years and represent the fifth year in a row of declining counts since the 2002 return year (Figure 2). We recovered one Umatilla River hatchery Chinook on the Imnaha River (Table 16). All remaining CWTs from marked hatchery salmon on spawning grounds were from Imnaha stock (Table 16). The number of natural salmon that returned to the basin to spawn (149) was down considerably from the previous five years (Figure 3). Hatchery salmon comprised the majority ( $68.2 \%$ ) of adults on the spawning grounds in the Imnaha River. On two tributary streams to the Imnaha River, Big Sheep Creek and Lick Creek, $100 \%$ of salmon carcasses recovered were hatchery origin, and were a result of hatchery outplants from the Imnaha River. For the entire Imnaha Basin, hatchery fish represented $70.8 \%$ of carcasses recovered in the Imnaha Basin (Table 15).

In the Grande Ronde Basin, we observed 442 redds and recovered 230 carcasses on the spawning grounds (Table 15). This is the third consecutive year of declining redd counts and is lower than the 502 redds counted in 2000 (Figure 2). We recovered five known in-basin strays. Three Catherine Creek and one Lostine River salmon were recovered in Lookingglass Creek. One Lostine River salmon, and one out-of-basin stray from the Hood River was recovered on the Wallowa River (Table 16). Hatchery salmon comprised 57.1\% of the observed carcasses in the Grande Ronde Basin. In streams with hatchery supplementation programs, the number of natural salmon that returned was down slightly from the previous year and lower than the average since 1997 (Figure 4). The percentage of hatchery salmon on the spawning grounds was $77 \%, 79 \%$ and $67 \%$, for Catherine Creek, the Upper Grande Ronde River and the Lostine River respectively (Table 15, Figures 6-8). On the Upper Grande Ronde River, high stream temperature in early

July resulted in high pre-spawn mortality. On 5 July, CTUIR recovered 15 hatchery and three natural origin Chinook carcasses below the weir (Figure 7).

We collected 180 kidney samples from Imnaha River Chinook salmon in 2007 (Table 17). Of those, 134 came from hatchery-reared salmon and 46 from natural salmon. We collected 136 samples at LFH and 44 from carcasses recovered on spawning ground surveys. Individual ELISA OD levels ranged from 0.056-1.189 and 98\% were from salmon with ELISA OD level <0.2 (Table 18).

We collected 288 kidney samples from salmon from Grande Ronde Basin streams in 2007 (Table 17): 214 from hatchery-reared salmon and 74 from natural salmon. We collected 185 kidney samples from salmon spawned at LFH and 103 from salmon that spawned in nature and were recovered as carcasses during spawning ground surveys. Individual ELISA OD levels ranged from 0.055-2.392 but were generally low, with $98 \%$ of the samples being $<0.2$ OD units (Table 18). Mean ELISA OD levels for each Grande Ronde Basin stream in 2007 ranged from 0.0679-0.410.

Mean ELISA OD in the two wilderness streams (Minam and Wenaha rivers) were the highest ( 0.4097 and 0.2927 , respectively), with both streams having a higher mean ELISA OD level than all of the supplemented streams. This was due to one fish in each stream with an ELISA OD level in the high category ( 2.392 and 1.362, respectfully) and low sample sizes from each stream (7 and 6).

We found no difference $(\mathrm{P}=0.3358)$ in mean ELISA OD levels between hatchery-reared and natural Chinook salmon adults, nor within any of the sampled streams ( P 40.1538 ).
Returning adults from the Captive Broodstock $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ generation had a higher ( $\mathrm{P}=0.0403$ ) mean ELISA OD level ( 0.1168 ; range: 0.063-0.897) than those of the Conventional Hatchery Program ( $0.0735 ; 0.056-0.154$ ). Annual mean ELISA OD level has not changed for any of the monitored streams ( P 40.1802 ), except for the Lostine River, where mean ELISA OD level has decreased over time from 1997-2007 ( $\mathrm{P}=0.0302$ ). The change in the Lostine River mean ELISA OD levels was due to a decrease in the natural salmon ( $\mathrm{P}=0.0213$ ) from 1997-2008 - the mean ELISA OD level of the hatchery salmon did not change from 2001-2008 ( $\mathrm{P}=0.7164$ ).

We found no evidence that the release of hatchery salmon is causing an increase in BKD prevalence in the monitored streams. The only change that we saw was a decrease in mean ELISA OD level in natural salmon and at the levels that we measured, it was probably biologically meaningless. Even in the Grande Ronde River, where we have released smolts that were offspring of females with very high ELISA OD levels and from raceways in which there were BKD outbreaks, we saw no change in mean ELISA OD level. The Captive Broodstock Program has released offspring of females with ELISA OD levels $>1.0$, particularly into the Upper Grande Ronde River. Both natural and Conventional Hatchery Program females returning to Grande Ronde Basin streams tend to have low ELISA OD levels and those $>0.2$ are culled if they are spawned at LFH. Therefore, smolts released from the Conventional Hatchery Program are always from females with ELISA OD levels $<0.2$. It seems likely that any sick salmon that we may have released were either unable to survive in nature, leaving only the healthy fish to survive to maturation, or they were able to fight off the infection and return to spawn.
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Figure 1. Recruits-per-spawner ratios (including jacks) for completed brood years (1982-2002) of Imnaha River Chinook salmon. Note: dotted line indicates recruits-per-spawner ratio=1.


Figure 2. Redd counts in the Imnaha and Grande Ronde basins, 1994-2007.


Figure 3. Estimated numbers of natural- and hatchery-origin spring/summer Chinook salmon (including jacks) that spawned naturally in the Imnaha River, 1985-2007.


## Return year

Figure 4. Estimated numbers of natural- and hatchery-origin Chinook salmon (including jacks) that spawned naturally in Catherine Creek, and the Grande Ronde and Lostine rivers, 1997-2007. The Nez Perce Tribe reported that some members of the hatchery production staff falsified weir data from 2001-208, therefore data for the Lostine River between 2001 and 2007 may not be reliable.


Figure 5. Number of natural and hatchery origin Chinook salmon carcasses recovered during the 2007 spawning ground surveys on the Imnaha River. Reach 1-Gorge to Freezeout Creek.Reach, Reach 2-Grouse Creek to the gorge, Reach 3-Crazyman Creek to Grouse Creek, Reach 4-Weir to Crazyman Creek, Reach 5-Mac's Mine to the weir, Reach 6-Mile post five (i.e. log) to Mac's Mine, Reach 7-Indian Crossing to mile post five (i.e., log), and Reach 8-Blue Hole to Indian Crossing.


Figure 6. Number of natural and hatchery origin Chinook salmon carcasses recovered during the spawning ground surveys on Catherine Creek, 2007. Reach 1-Weir to $2^{\text {nd }}$ Union Bridge, Reach 2-Bottom of Southern Cross Ranch to the Weir, Reach 3-Mile post five to top of Southern Cross Ranch, Reach 4-Badger Flat to mile post five, Reach 5Highway Bridge to Badger Flat, Reach 6-7735 Bridge to Highway Bridge, Reach 7-Forks to 7735 Bridge, Reach 8South Fork Catherine Creek, and Reach 9-North Fork Catherine Creek.


Figure 7. Number of natural and hatchery origin Chinook salmon carcasses recovered during spawning ground surveys on the Upper Grande Ronde River, 2007. Reach 1-Weir to Starkey Store Reach, Reach 2-Spoolcart Campground to the Weir, Reach 3-Time and a Half Campground to Spoolcart Campground, Reach 4-Forest Service Boundary below Vey Meadows to Time and a Half Campground, Reach 5-Carson Campground Bridge to Forest Service Boundary below acclimation facility, and Reach 6- Three Penny Claim to Carson Campground Bridge.


Figure 8. Number of natural and hatchery origin Chinook salmon carcasses recovered during the 2007 spawning ground surveys on the Lostine River. Reach 1-Weir to the Mouth, Reach 2-McLain's Ranch to the Weir, Reach 3Highway 82 Bridge in Lostine to McLain's Ranch, Reach 4-Westside Ditch to the trout farm, Reach 5-Lostine River Ranch Bridge to Westside Ditch, Reach 6-Acclimation Facility to Lostine River Ranch Bridge, Reach 7-Six Mile Bridge to Acclimation Facility, Reach 8-Pole Bridge to Six Mile Bridge, Reach 9-Above Walla Walla Campground to Williamson Campground, Reach 10-Lapover Meadows to Bowman Trailhead, Reach 11-Turkey Flat to Lapover Meadows, Reach 12- Arrow Campground to French Campground.

Table 1. Rearing summaries for 2005 brood year juvenile spring Chinook salmon released into the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins in 2007.

| Stock | Broodstock | Number of green eggs taken | Eyed eggs | Number culled ${ }^{a}$ | Percent Survival |  |  | Total smolts released |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Green egg -toeyed egg | Eyed egg -tosmolt ${ }^{b}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Green egg } \\ & \text {-to- } \\ & \text { smolt }^{b} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Imnaha River | Conventional | 531,244 | 452,755 | 11,486 | 85.2 | 98.0 | 83.2 | 432,530 |
| Catherine Creek | Captive | 41,882 | 36,825 | 10,837 | 87.9 | 83.0 | 69.5 | 21,573 |
| Catherine Creek | Conventional | 53,530 | 50,668 | 0 | 94.7 | 98.1 | 92.8 | 49,696 |
| Grande Ronde River | Captive | 62,188 | 51,332 | 25,978 | 82.5 | 81.3 | 56.9 | 20,620 |
| Grande Ronde River | Conventional | 155,070 | 120,731 | 0 | 77.9 | 98.4 | 76.6 | 118,803 |
| Lostine River | Captive | 51,080 | 44,478 | 14,451 | 87.1 | 81.9 | 67.2 | 24,604 |
| Lostine River | Conventional | 234,218 | 207,291 | 0 | 88.5 | 99.1 | 87.7 | 205,406 |
| ${ }^{a}$ Eggs were culled if enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) levels of female broodstock were $\geq 0.8$ for Catherine Creek and the Grand Ronde River and $\geq 0.4$ for the Lostine River. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Embryos culled from $p$ | oduction were s | tracted from | e calcula | n of eyed | g-to-smolt | d green egg | to-smolt s | vival. |

Table 2. Number of female spring/summer Chinook salmon ( $N$ ) and mean egg weight (g) by stock, origin (hatchery or natural), and age. Within an age class, shared letters are not significantly different (Tukey-kramer; $\mathrm{P}>0.05$ ) between stocks.

| Stock |  | Hatchery |  |  | Natural |  |  | Grand total/ mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Age 4 | Age 5 | Total/ mean | Age 4 | Age 5 | Total/ mean |  |
| Imnaha River | $N$ | 56 | 14 | 70 | 8 | 13 | 21 | 91 |
|  | Mean | $0.250{ }^{\text {A }}$ | $0.270^{\text {A }}$ | 0.254 | $0.238{ }^{\text {A }}$ | $0.310^{\text {A }}$ | 0.274 | 0.261 |
| Catherine Creek | $N$ | 31 | -- | 31 | 6 | 8 | 14 | 45 |
|  | Mean | $0.230^{\text {A,B,C }}$ | -- | 0.230 | $0.205^{\text {B }}$ | $0.268{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 0.237 | 0.233 |
| Grande Ronde River | $N$ | 17 | 8 | 25 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 31 |
|  | Mean | $0.223^{\text {B,C }}$ | $0.238{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 0.228 | $0.234^{\text {A,B }}$ | $0.206^{\text {A }}$ | 0.220 | 0.226 |
| Lookingglass Creek | $N$ | 20 | 3 | 23 | -- | -- | -- | 23 |
|  | Mean | $0.211^{\text {C }}$ | $0.250^{\text {A }}$ | . 217 | -- | -- | -- | 0.217 |
| Lostine River | $N$ | 31 | 8 | 39 | 12 | 7 | 19 | 58 |
|  | Mean | $0.239^{\text {A,B }}$ | $0.262^{\text {A }}$ | 0.243 | $0.233{ }^{\text {A,B }}$ | $0.306^{\text {A }}$ | 0.270 | 0.249 |

Table 3. Estimates of percent adipose (Ad) fin clip and coded-wire tag application success for 2005 brood year spring Chinook salmon stocks reared at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery and released as smolts in 2007.

| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 093825 | 12 | Conventional | 521 | 95.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 61,648 |
| 093826 | 13 | Conventional | 514 | 94.8 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 61,805 |
| 094350 | 14 | Conventional | 504 | $\underline{96.6}$ | $\underline{2.2}$ | $\underline{1.2}$ | $\underline{0.0}$ | 61,741 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 1,539 | 95.5 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 185,194 |
| Ad-only | 15 | Conventional | 514 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 98.4 | n/a | 1.6 | 61,799 |
| Ad-only | 16 | Conventional | 515 | n/a | 97.1 | n/a | 2.9 | 61,805 |
| Ad-only | 17 | Conventional | 501 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 98.8 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 1.2 | 61,011 |
| Ad-only | 18 | Conventional | 529 | n/a | $\underline{98.7}$ | n/a | 1.3 | 62,721 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 2,059 | n/a | 98.3 | n/a | 1.7 | 247,336 |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094357 | 1 | Conventional | 525 | 95.6 | 4.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 49,696 |
| 094361 | 2 | Captive | 519 | $\underline{97.1}$ | 2.3 | 0.6 | $\underline{0.0}$ | 21,573 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 1,044 | 96.4 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 71,269 |

Table 3 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094358 | 3 | Conventional | 500 | n/a | n/a | 98.2 | 1.8 | 39,366 |
| 094359 | 4 | Conventional | 513 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | 99.6 | 0.4 | 39,290 |
| 093162 | 5 | Conventional | 522 | n/a | n/a | $\underline{95.8}$ | 4.2 | 40,147 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 1,535 | n/a | n/a | 97.9 | 2.1 | 118,803 |
| 094362 | 6 | Captive | 522 | 95.8 | 1.9 | 2.3 | $\underline{0.0}$ | 20,620 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 522 | 95.8 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 20,620 |
| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094355 | 7 | Conventional | 504 | 90.7 | 7.7 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 50,604 |
| 094353 | 8 | Conventional | 487 | 95.3 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 53,313 |
| 094354 | 9 | Conventional | 500 | 96.8 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 49,693 |
| 094356 | 10 | Conventional | 507 | 94.7 | 4.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 51,796 |
| 094360 | 11 | Captive | 496 | $\underline{98.0}$ | $\underline{0.8}$ | 1.2 | $\underline{0.0}$ | 24,604 |
| Total/mean |  |  | 2,494 | 95.1 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 230,010 |

Table 4. Mean size of 2005 brood year spring Chinook salmon smolts, total number released into the Imnaha and Grande Ronde river basins, number PIT-tagged, and survival to Lower Granite Dam, 2007. Length, weight, and condition factor data collected 6-8 February 2007.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 4 continued.

| Stock, CWT code | Raceway | Program | Release date | Fork Length (mm) |  | Weight (g) |  | Condition <br> factor (K) |  | Total released | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { PIT- } \\ \text { tagged } \end{gathered}$ | Survival to Lower Granite Dam |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |  |  |  |
| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 094355 | 7 | Conventional | 07-17 APR | 115.6 | 13.4 | 22.6 | 7.2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 50,604 | 1,297 | 0.66 |
| 094353 | 8 | Conventional | 16-26 MAR | 116.4 | 13.6 | 16.1 | 6.5 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 53,313 | 1,249 | 0.53 |
| 094354 | 9 | Conventional | 07-17 APR | 114.4 |  | 19.2 | 9.0 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 49,693 | 1,249 | 0.66 |
| 094356 | 10 | Conventional | 16-26 MAR | 111.5 |  | 17.9 | 6.0 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 51,796 | 1,183 | 0.54 |
| 094360 | 11 | Captive | 17-17 APR | 112.8 |  | 15.9 | 5.1 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 24,604 | 1,465 | $\underline{0.59}$ |
| Total/mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 230,010 | 6,443 | 0.60 |

Table 5. Number of adult spring Chinook salmon handled each week at northeast Oregon LSRCP facilities, 2007. The total for the Imnaha River excludes recaptures of fish releasedd below the weir. The total for Lookingglass Creek includes stray hatchery fish from Catherine Creek and Grande Ronde River stock.

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

Table 6. Number and disposition, by origin, age, and sex, of adult spring Chinook salmon returning to northeast Oregon LSRCP facilities in 2007. The numbers of Chinook trapped/passed above the weir were adjusted to account for the estimated number of returning unclipped hatchery fish without a coded wire tag (CWT).

| Stock, Disposition | Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grand total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Age | 3 | 4 |  | 5 |  | Total | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | Total |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  |  |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 496 | 0 | 376 | 243 | 25 | 38 | 1178 | 21 | 0 | 55 | 23 | 15 | 39 | 153 | 1331 |
| Passed above the weir | 10 | 0 | 172 | 108 | 10 | 18 | 318 | 21 | 0 | 34 | 10 | 12 | 25 | 102 | 420 |
| Outplanted | 398 | 0 | 29 | 72 | 7 | 12 | 618 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 618 |
| Ceremonial/Subsistence | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Kept ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 55 | 0 | 75 | 63 | 4 | 16 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 13 | 3 | 14 | 51 | 264 |
| Actual spawned | 20 | 0 | 59 | 58 | 3 | 14 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 4 | 13 | 44 | 198 |
| Killed, not spawned | 11 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 24 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 48 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 570 |  | 773 | 796 | 974 | 860 |  | n/a | - | 748 | 757 | 876 | 895 |  |  |
| (Sample Size) | (20) | - | (44) | (48) | ( 2 ) | (13) |  | n/a | - | (15) | (10) | (2) | (14) |  |  |
| Weir age composition (\%) | 42.1 | 0.0 | 31.9 | 20.6 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 100 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 15.0 | 9.8 | 25.5 | 100 |  |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped at Catherine Creek ${ }^{d}$ | 29 | 0 | 48 | 78 | 11 | 7 | 173 | 6 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 75 | 248 |
| Passed above the weir | 2 | 0 | 38 | 48 | 9 | 7 | 104 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 44 | 148 |
| Returned to Lookingglass | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 10 |
| Kept ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 30 | 0 | 12 | 35 | 2 | 0 | 79 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 29 | 108 |
| Spawned | 4 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 28 | 75 |
| Killed not spawned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ (Sample Size) | $\begin{gathered} 501 \\ (5) \end{gathered}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 774 \\ (11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 734 \\ & (28) \end{aligned}$ | $827$ (2) | $n / a$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 415 \\ (1) \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 727 \\ (8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 718 \\ (6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 883 \\ (4) \end{gathered}$ | 841 <br> (7) |  |  |

Table 6 continued.

| Stock, Disposition | Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grandtotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | Total | 3 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | Total |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  |  |
| Upper Grande Ronde River (UGR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped at UGR ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 5 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 33 | 73 |
| Passed above the weir | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 19 |
| Returned to Lookingglass | 12 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 23 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 23 |
| Kept ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 13 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 4 | 9 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 16 | 76 |
| Spawned | 7 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 3 | 8 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 60 |
| Killed not spawned | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 470 |  | 756 | 729 | 904 | 821 |  |  |  | 728 | 675 | 893 | 755 |  |  |
| (Sample Size) | (12) | - | (15) | (17) | (4) | (8) |  | - | - | (4) | (2) | (2) | (3) |  |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 26.5 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 28.1 | 6.3 | 14.1 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 18.2 | 21.2 | 100 |  |

## Lostine River

Trapped

| The Nez Perce Tribe reported that some members of the hatchery production staff falsified weir data from |
| :--- |
| 2001-2008. Therefore, these data are unreliable. |


| Passed |
| :--- |
| Returned below weir |


|  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Outplanted |

Kept $^{f}$

Table 6 continued.

| Stock, Disposition | Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grandtotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 |  | , |  | 5 |  | Total | $3^{i}$ |  | $4^{i}$ |  | $5^{j}$ |  | Total |  |
|  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  | M | F | M | F | M | F |  |  |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trapped ${ }^{\text {d,g }}$ | 58 | 0 | 36 | 58 | 10 | 3 | 165 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 185 |
| Passed | 0 | 0 | 25 | 36 | 5 | 1 | 67 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 73 |
| Returned below weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Kept ${ }^{\text {e }}$, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 58 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 109 |
| Spawned | 24 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Killed not spawned | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 43 |
| Pre-spawn mortality | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Mean length (mm) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ (Sample Size) | $\begin{gathered} 490 \\ (23) \end{gathered}$ | - | $719$ (6) | $717$ (14) | $\begin{gathered} 865 \\ (4) \end{gathered}$ | $856$ (2) |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Age composition (\%) | 35.1 | 0.0 | 21.8 | 35.2 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 100 | 35.0 | - | 30.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 100 |  |

${ }^{a}$ Number of fish per age class determination based on Imnaha River age-length key ( $<630=$ Age 3; 630-850 $=$ Age 4; $>850=$ Age 5)
${ }^{b}$ Age composition based on CWT data, scale ages, and the Imnaha River age-length key.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Mean length per age class determined from known age fish based on either CWT, or scales.
${ }^{d}$ Number of fish per age class determination based on Catherine Creek/Grande Ronde River age-length key ( $\leq 600=$ Age 3; 601-799 $=$ Age 4; $\geq 800=$ Age 5)
${ }^{e}$ Age composition based on CWT data, scale ages, and the Catherine Creek/Grande Ronde River age-length key.
${ }^{f}$ Age composition based on CWT data, scale ages, and the Lostine River age-length key (<630 $=$ Age 3; 630-850 $=$ Age 4; $>850=$ Age 5).
${ }^{g}$ Total does not include strays from Catherine Creek (10) or the Upper Grande Ronde River (23).
${ }^{h}$ Kept fish were strays from Catherine Creek and Grande Ronde River. The Catherine Creek and Grande Ronde River strays were used as broodstock for those programs.
${ }^{i}$ Assumed to be Lookingglass Creek stock.
${ }^{j}$ Assumed to be Rapid River stock.

Table 7. Spawning summaries for the Conventional Broodstock of spring Chinook salmon at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery, 2007.

| Stock, spawn date | Number of parents |  |  |  | Number of green eggs collected | Average fecundity | Number of eyed eggs | Percent mortality to shocking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hatchery |  | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | F | $\mathrm{M}^{a b}$ | F | $\mathrm{M}^{a}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 AUG | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5,862 | 5,862 | 2,975 | 49.2 |
| 21 AUG | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 31,065 | 4,438 | 12,014 | 61.3 |
| 27 AUG | 13 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 77,663 | 4,568 | 68,644 | 11.6 |
| 4 SEP | 50 | 50 | 10 | 19 | 257,145 | 4,286 | 185,076 | 28.0 |
| 10 SEP | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 31,888 | 4,555 | 29,648 | 7.0 |
| 13 SEP | $\underline{0}$ | 1 | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{1}$ | 4,774 | 4,774 | 4,700 | 1.6 |
| Total | 72 | 67 | 21 | 28 | 408,397 | 4,391 | 303,057 | 25.8 |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 AUG | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8,327 | 4,164 | 5,489 | 34.1 |
| 29 AUG | 15 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 89,136 | 3,714 | 69,433 | 22.1 |
| 6 SEP | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 47,935 | 3,995 | 46,286 | 3.4 |
| 11 SEP | $\underline{7}$ | 5 | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{3}$ | 25,667 | 3,666 | $\underline{24,999}$ | 2.6 |
| Total | 31 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 171,065 | 3,801 | 146,207 | 14.5 |
| Grande Ronde River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 AUG | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4,449 | 4,449 | 1,045 | 76.5 |
| 6 SEP | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 24,685 | 3,526 | 18,018 | 27.0 |
| 11 SEP | 12 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 55,994 | 4,000 | 45,145 | 19.4 |
| 17 SEP | $\underline{8}$ | 7 | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{3}$ | 37,622 | 3,762 | 34,928 | 7.2 |
| Total | 25 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 122,750 | 3,960 | 99,136 | 19.2 |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 AUG | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 24,848 | 3,106 | 16,636 | 33.0 |
| 9 SEP | 14 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 40,285 | 2,878 | 32,891 | 18.4 |
| 11 SEP | $\underline{1}^{\text {c }}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | 2,922 | 2,922 | 2,806 | $\underline{4.0}$ |
| Total | 23 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 68,055 | 2,959 | 52,333 | 23.1 |
| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 SEP | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 50,083 | 5,008 | 38,847 | 22.4 |
| 10 SEP | 12 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 86,813 | 4,569 | 77,378 | 10.9 |
| 13 SEP | 11 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 66,398 | 4,427 | 63,984 | 3.6 |
| 17 SEP | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 49,195 | 4,100 | 47,440 | 3.6 |
| 20 SEP | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9,230 | 4,615 | 4 | 99.9 |
| 24 SEP | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{1}$ | $\underline{2}$ | 5,631 | $\underline{2,815}$ | 4,229 | $\underline{24.9}$ |
| Total | 40 | 26 | 20 | 15 | 267,350 | 4,456 | 231,882 | 13.3 |

${ }^{a}$ The numbers of male parents is greater than the number kept because some males were spawned more than once.
${ }^{b}$ One hatchery male spawned as Catherine Creek stock brought in from the Lostine River weir was determined to be Catherine Creek stock due to presence of green VIE tag.
${ }^{c}$ This female returned to the Grande Ronde River weir and was spawned with Grande Ronde River males. CWT reading determined it to be of Lookingglass Creek stock.

Table 8. Expanded recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Imnaha River spring/summer Chinook salmon for the 2007 return year. Inbasin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake/Columbia rivers migration corridor. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded CWT recoveries.

| Brood year | CWT code | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Imnaha River ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Out-of-basin } \\ & \text { strays }^{b} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $2002{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 093822 | 57,053 | 12 (4) | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
|  | 093823 | 56,992 | 12 (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\underline{15}$ |
|  | Total | 268,426 | 24 (8) | 0 | 1 (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| $2003{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 094032 | 73,839 | 174 (36) | 0 | 39 (5) | 0 | 1 (1) | 1 (1) | 210 |
|  | 094033 | 72,247 | 140 (29) | 1 (1) | 16 (5) | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 163 |
|  | 094034 | 73,763 | $\underline{111}$ (23) | 0 | 17 (4) | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 129 |
|  | Total | 219,849 | 425 (88) | 1 (1) | 72 (14) | 0 | 1 (1) | 3 (3) | 502 |
| $2004{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 094206 | 64,167 | 154 (11) | 4 (2) | 11 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 |
|  | 094207 | 63,864 | 28 (2) | 0 | 26 (4) | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 54 |
|  | 094208 | 64,105 | 98 (7) | 0 | 19 (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |
|  | Total | 192,136 | $\underline{280(20)}$ | 4 (2) | 56 (10) | 0 | 0 | 1 (1) | 341 |
| Grand Total |  | 680,411 | 729 (116) | 5 (3) | 129 (25) | 0 | 1 (1) | 4 (4) | 868 |

${ }^{a}$ 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.
${ }^{\text {c }} 268,426$ juvenile Chinook released from the 2002 brood year marked with an AD clip and no CWT.
${ }^{d}$ 215,337 juvenile Chinook released from the 2003 brood year marked with an AD clip and no CWT.
${ }^{e}$ 249,544 juvenile Chinook released from the 2004 brood year marked with an AD clip and no CWT.

Table 9. Catch and escapement distribution of Imnaha River spring/summer hatchery Chinook salmon by stock and recovery location for the 2007 return year. The estimated CWT recoveries were summarized through 1 June 2009 from the PSMFC database and expanded to account for recoveries of adipose clipped Chinook without a CWT.

| Location, recovery type | Estimated CWT recoveries | Expanded hatchery adults | Percent of total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ocean catch | 5 | 12 | 0.6 |
| Columbia River |  |  |  |
| Ceremonial and subsistence | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Treaty net | 42 | 88 | 4.6 |
| Non-treaty net | 6 | 13 | 0.7 |
| Sport | 81 | 187 | 9.8 |
| Test fishery | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Snake River |  |  |  |
| Sport | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lower Granite Dam ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Deschutes River |  |  |  |
| Trap | 4 | 8 | 0.4 |
| 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 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Recruitment to river ${ }^{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $1,593{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 83.8 |
| Total catch/escapement |  | 1,903 |  |
| Return to compensation area |  | 1,595 |  |
| Percent of compensation goal (3,210 hatchery adults) |  | 49.7 |  |
| ${ }^{a}$ Indicates areas defining the LSRCP <br> ${ }^{b}$ Estimated total return of hatchery <br> CWT loss. This value accounts for a | nsation area. <br> to the Imnaha River te of AD clip only re | The estimate does not ns. | de an adjustment for |

Table 10. Expanded adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Catherine Creek spring Chinook salmon for the 2007 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 recoveries.

| Brood year | Broodstock | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Catherine Creek ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays $^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2002 | Conventional | 093840 | 70,071 | 4 (4) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 |
|  | Captive | 093835 | 45,413 | 9 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 |
|  | Captive | 093836 | 46,384 | 9 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 9 |
|  | Total |  | 161,868 | 22 (6) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 22 |
| 2003 | Conventional | 070753 | 58,444 | 21 (18) | 0 (0) | 9 (3) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 30 |
|  | Conventional | 070754 | 59,036 | 34 (29) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 36 |
|  | Captive | 094039 | 34,415 | 14 (1) | 0 (0) | 8 (2) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 23 |
|  | Captive | 094040 | 34,412 | 57 (4) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 58 |
|  |  |  | 186,307 | 126 (52) | 0 (0) | 18 (6) | 0 (0) | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 147 |
| 2004 | Captive | 93427 | 28,824 | 7 (6) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 7 |
|  | Captive | 94215 | 16,780 | 11 (11) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (1) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 11 |
|  | Conventional | 94218 | 23,216 | 10 (10) | 0 (0) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 10 |
|  |  |  | 688,820 | 28 (27) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | $\underline{8(2)}$ | $\underline{1(1)}$ | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | 28 |
| Grand Total |  |  | 416,995 | 176 (85) | 0 (0) | 18 (6) | 8 (2) | 4 (4) | 0 (0) | 206 |

[^1]Table 11. Catch and escapement distribution of Grande Ronde Basin hatchery adult spring Chinook salmon by stock and recovery location for the 2007 return year. The estimated CWT recoveries were summarized through 1 June 2009 from the PSMFC database and expanded to account for recoveries of adipose clipped Chinook without a CWT.

| Location, recovery type | Catherine Creek |  |  | Grande Ronde River |  |  | Lookingglass Creek |  |  | Lostine River ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est. } \\ & \text { CWT } \end{aligned}$ | 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 | Est. CWT | Expanded adults | Percent of total |
| Ocean catch | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 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 | 85 | 87 | 15.5 |
| Treaty net | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 10 | 1.8 |
| Non-treaty net | 3 | 4 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 8 | 3.4 | 2 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Sport | 15 | 18 | 8.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 7 | 2.6 | 50 | 51 | 9.1 |
| Snake River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sport | 8 | 8 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2 | 0.8 | 4 | 4 | 0.7 |
| Deschutes River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trap | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 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 | 0.0 |
| Other Strays |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outside Snake R. Basin | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1 | 0.2 |
| Within Snake R. Basin ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 4 | 4 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 5 | 2.1 | 9 | 9 | 1.6 |
| Recruitment to stream ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | n/a | $192{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 84.9 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $78^{\text {c }}$ | 100.0 | n/a | $211^{\text {c }}$ | 90.6 | n/a | $390{ }^{\text {c,d }}$ | 70.5 |
| Total estimated return |  | 226 |  |  | 78 |  |  | 233 |  |  | 560 |  |
| Compensation area return |  | 196 |  |  | 78 |  |  | 216 |  |  | 404 |  |

${ }^{\bar{a}} 90$ snouts were recovered from the Lostine River weir for fish sacrificed for ceremonial/subsistence in 2007 that were unable to be associated with biological data or date of capture. CWT codes were recovered from 84 age 3 Chinook and 1 age 4 Chinook and 1 age 3 stray from Lookingglass. These data are not available in RMIS or the Oregon CWT Database.
${ }^{b}$ Indicates areas within LSRCP compensation area.
${ }^{c}$ Expansion factor based on estimated total return to natal stream of hatchery adults. Does not include adjustment for CWT loss.
${ }^{d}$ Escapement estimate based on revised weir data provided by Nez Perce Fisheries Research.

Table 12. Expanded adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Grande Ronde River spring Chinook salmon for the 2007 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/Columbia rivers migration corridor. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded recoveries.

| Brood year | Broodstock | CWT <br> code | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Grande <br> Ronde River ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ |  |
| 2002 | Conventional | 093833 | 69,856 | 11 (10) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 11 |
|  | Captive | 093832 | 15,676 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093834 | 59,387 | $0 \quad 0$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 (0) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 |
|  | Total |  | 144,919 | 11 (10) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 11 |
| 2003 | Conventional | 094035 | 49,871 | 14 (12) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 14 |
|  | Conventional | 094036 | 54,479 | 21 (18) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 21 |
|  | Captive | 094127 | 1,019 | $0 \quad(0)$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 |
|  | Total |  | $\underline{105,369}$ | 35 (30) |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| 2004 | Conventional | 094213 | 18,901 | 29 (24) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 (0) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $0(0)$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{29}$ |
|  | Total |  | 18,901 | $\underline{29(24)}$ | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | 0 (0) | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | $\underline{\underline{29}}$ |
| Grand Total |  |  | 269,189 | 75 (64) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 75 |

${ }^{a}{ }^{a}$ 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.

Table 13. Expanded adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group for the 2007 return year of Lookingglass Creek spring Chinook salmon. 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/Columbia rivers migration corridor. Numbers in parenthesis are unexpanded CWT recoveries.

| Brood year | CWT code | Number released | Recovery location |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lookingglass Creek ${ }^{a}$ | Ocean catch $^{b}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{b}$ | Snake <br> River ${ }^{b}$ | In-basin strays ${ }^{b}$ | Out-of-basin strays $^{b}$ |  |
| 2002 | 093837 | 15,843 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 |
|  | 093838 | 37,352 | 14 (1) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 1 (1) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{15}$ |
|  | Total | 53,195 | 14 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 15 |
| 2003 | 093824 | 66,578 | 79 (13) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 9 (4) | 1(1) | 1(1) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{90}$ |
| 2004 | 094216 | 71,466 | 29 (16) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 29 |
|  | 094217 | 73,769 | 58 (32) | 0 (0) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 O 0 ) | 4 (3) | $0(0)$ | $\underline{62}$ |
|  | Total | $\underline{\underline{145,235}}$ | 87(48) | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | 0(0) | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | 4(3) | $\underline{\underline{0(0)}}$ | 91 |
| Grand Total |  | 265,008 | 180 (62) | 0 (0) | 10 (6) | 1 (1) | 5 (4) | 0 (0) | 196 |

${ }^{a}$ 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.

Table 14. Expanded adult recoveries by coded-wire tag group of Lostine River spring Chinook salmon for the 2007 return year. Inbasin strays were recovered in non-natal streams in the Snake River Basin. Out-of-basin strays were recovered from streams outside the Snake/Columbia rivers migration corridor. 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 $^{c}$ | Columbia River ${ }^{c}$ | Snake River ${ }^{c}$ | In-basin strays ${ }^{c}$ | Out-of-basin strays ${ }^{c}$ |  |
| 2002 | Conventional | 093830 | 58,004 | 21 (10) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 21 |
|  | Conventional | 093831 | 58,366 | 6 (3) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 6 |
|  | Captive | 093821 | 58,030 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 1 |
|  | Captive | 093827 | 12,830 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 |
|  | Captive | 093829 | 27,773 | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 |
|  | Captive | 093839 | 26,727 | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 7 (1) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 9 |
|  | Total |  | 241,730 | 31 (15) | 0 (0) | 7 (1) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 39 |
| 2003 | Conventional | 094037 | 58,004 | 104 (48) | 0 (0) | 18 (3) | 0 (0) | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 125 |
|  | Conventional | 094038 | 58,366 | 82 (38 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) | 0 (0) | 10 (2) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 93 |
|  | Captive | 092348 | 58,030 | 20 (9) | 0 (0) | 20 (2) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 40 |
|  | Captive | 094041 | 12,830 | $13 \quad(6)$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 1 (1) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 1 (1) | 15 |
|  | Total |  | 187,230 | 219 (101) | 0 (0) | 49 (8) | 0 (0) | 4 (4) | 1 (1) | 273 |
| $2004{ }^{\text {c }}$ | Conventional | 094209 | 64,582 | 61 ( $39^{\text {b }}$ ) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (1) | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 67 |
|  | Conventional | 094210 | 65,339 | 25 (16 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 25 |
|  | Conventional | 094211 | 49,052 | 20 (13 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) | 0 (0) | 2 (1) | 0 (0) | 3 (3) | 0 (0) | 25 |
|  | Conventional | 094214 | 18,978 | 25 (16 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ ) | 0 (0) | 3 (1) | 0 (0) | 1 (1) | 0 (0) | 29 |
|  | Captive | 094212 | 15,895 | $3\left(2^{\text {b }}\right.$ ) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 |
|  | Captive | 094248 | $\underline{25,087}$ | $3 \quad\left(2^{\text {b }}\right.$ ) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | $\underline{0(0)}$ | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 3 |
|  | Total |  | 238,933 | 137 (88) | 0 (0) | 5(2) | 4(1) | 6(6) | 0 (0) | $\underline{152}$ |
| Grand Total |  |  | 667,893 | 387 (204) | 0 (0) | 61 (11) | 4 (2) | 10 (10) | 2 (2) | 470 |

[^2]Table 15. Summary of hatchery and natural spring Chinook salmon carcasses recovered and number of redds observed by stream during spawning ground surveys, 2007.

| Basin, stream | Hatchery | Natural | Unknown <br> Origin | Percent <br> hatchery | Number of <br> redds |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Imnaha River Basin |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Big Sheep Creek | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100.0 | 6 |
| Imnaha River | 75 | 35 | 6 | 68.2 | 252 |
| $\quad$ Lick Creek | $\underline{75}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{100.0}$ | $\underline{19}$ |
| Totals | 85 | 6 | 70.8 | 277 |  |

Grande Ronde River Basin

| Bear Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Catherine Creek $_{\text {Grande Ronde River }^{a}}$ | 17 | 5 | 0 | 77.3 | 59 |
| Hurricane Creek | 15 | 4 | 0 | 78.9 | 1 |
| Lookingglass Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 16 |
| Lostine River $_{\text {Minam River }}{ }^{b}$ | 35 | 6 | 0 | 85.4 | 53 |
| Wallowa River | 53 | 26 | 5 | 67.1 | 104 |
| Wenaha River | 1 | 26 | 0 | 3.7 | 101 |
| Totals | 2 | 4 | 0 | 33.3 | 22 |
|  | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{23}$ | $\underline{6}$ | $\underline{8.0}$ | $\underline{86}$ |
| 125 | 94 | 11 | 57.1 | 442 |  |

${ }^{\bar{a}}$ Includes 15 hatchery and 3 natural origin Chinook carcasses collected below the weir on 5 July. Only one natural origin carcasses was recovered during regularly spawning ground surveys in August and September.
${ }^{b}$ Includes the Little Minam River

Table 16. Summary of adipose-clipped Chinook salmon carcasses with coded-wire tags recovered during spawning ground surveys, 2007.

| Recovery location | Brood year | CWT code | Number recovered | Release site |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Imnaha River Basin |  |  |  |  |
| Big Sheep Creek ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2004 | 094206 | 1 | Imnaha River |
| Imnaha River | 2002 | 093823 | 2 | Imnaha River |
|  | 2003 | 094032 | 9 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 094033 | 4 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 094034 | 6 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 094102 | 1 | Umatilla River |
|  | 2004 | 094206 | 1 | Imnaha River |
|  |  | 094208 | 2 | Imnaha River |
| Lick Creek ${ }^{a}$ | 2002 | 093823 | 1 | Imnaha River |
|  | 2003 | 094033 | 1 | Imnaha River |
| Grande Ronde River Basin |  |  |  |  |
| Catherine Creek | 2002 | 093836 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  | 2003 | 070753 | 3 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 070754 | 4 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 094040 | 4 | Catherine Creek |
| Grande Ronde ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 2002 | 093833 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
|  | 2003 | 094035 | 1 | Grande Ronde River |
|  | 2004 | 094213 | 12 | Grande Ronde River |
| Lookingglass Creek | 2002 | 093831 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093838 | 1 | Lookingglass Creek |
|  | 2003 | 070754 | 2 | Catherine Creek |
|  |  | 093824 | 12 | Lookingglass Creek |
|  |  | 094038 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 094039 | 1 | Catherine Creek |
|  | 2004 | 094216 | 1 | Lookingglass Creek |
| Lostine River | 2002 | 093829 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093830 | 3 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093831 | 2 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 093839 | 1 | Lostine River |
|  | 2003 | 092348 | 9 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 094037 | 13 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 094038 | 7 | Lostine River |
|  |  | 094041 | 6 | Lostine River |
|  | 2004 | 094209 | 1 | Lostine River |
| Wallowa River | 2003 | 094047 | 1 | Hood R W FK |
|  | 2004 | 094211 | 1 | Lostine River |

[^3]Table 17. Number sampled and mean, standard deviation (STD), minimum and maximum ELISA OD levels for hatchery-reared [Captive (CBS) and Conventional (CONV) broodstock programs] and natural adult Chinook salmon from streams in the Grande Ronde and Imnaha river basins and sampled at Lookingglass Fish Hatchery (LFH) or as carcasses on spawning ground surveys (SGS), 2007.

| Population, origin | Program | Sampling location | N | ELISA OD |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Mean | STD | Minimum | Maximum |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CONV | LFH | 34 | 0.0796 | 0.0215 | 0.061 | 0.154 |
| Hatchery | CBS | SGS | 8 | 0.0875 | 0.0192 | 0.070 | 0.123 |
| Hatchery | CONV | SGS | 9 | 0.0816 | 0.0083 | 0.067 | 0.092 |
| Natural |  | LFH | 15 | 0.0749 | 0.0085 | 0.065 | 0.092 |
| Natural |  | SGS | 4 | 0.0795 | 0.0121 | 0.064 | 0.093 |
| Grande Ronde River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CBS | LFH | 2 | 0.0645 | 0.0021 | 0.063 | 0.066 |
| Hatchery | CONV | LFH | 29 | 0.0709 | 0.0099 | 0.057 | 0.104 |
| Hatchery |  | SGS | 15 | 0.0619 | 0.0046 | 0.055 | 0.071 |
| Natural |  | LFH | 8 | 0.0700 | 0.0139 | 0.057 | 0.098 |
| Natural |  | SGS | 3 | 0.0653 | 0.0015 | 0.064 | 0.067 |
| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CONV | LFH | 49 | 0.0678 | 0.0107 | 0.056 | 0.103 |
| Hatchery | CBS | SGS | 7 | 0.1091 | 0.0398 | 0.076 | 0.175 |
| Hatchery | CONV | SGS | 8 | 0.0848 | 0.0102 | 0.070 | 0.101 |
| Natural |  | LFH | 23 | 0.0659 | 0.0071 | 0.057 | 0.084 |
| Natural |  | SGS | 5 | 0.0960 | 0.0141 | 0.082 | 0.117 |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CONV | LFH | 25 | 0.1562 | 0.4073 | 0.063 | 2.108 |
| Hatchery | CBS | SGS | 13 | 0.1471 | 0.2257 | 0.070 | 0.897 |
| Hatchery | CONV | SGS | 15 | 0.0815 | 0.0109 | 0.068 | 0.103 |
| Natural |  | SGS | 3 | 0.0813 | 0.0050 | 0.076 | 0.086 |
| Minam River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural |  | SGS | 7 | 0.4097 | 0.8741 | 0.069 | 2.392 |
| Wenaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural |  | SGS | 6 | 0.2927 | 0.5239 | 0.070 | 1.362 |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CONV | LFH | 106 | 0.0849 | 0.1169 | 0.056 | 1.189 |
| Hatchery | CONV | SGS | 28 | 0.0785 | 0.0083 | 0.064 | 0.094 |
| Natural |  | LFH | 30 | 0.0739 | 0.0117 | 0.060 | 0.110 |
| Natural |  | SGS | 16 | 0.0799 | 0.0137 | 0.065 | 0.123 |

Table 18. Number and percent of natural and hatchery-reared [Captive (CBS) and Conventional (CONV) broodstock programs] adult Chinook salmon from streams in the Grande Ronde and Imnaha basins sampled for BKD with ELISA OD levels in each category, 2007.

| Population, origin | Program | ELISA category |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low } \\ (<0.2) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Moderate } \\ (0.2-<0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { High } \\ (\geq 0.8) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| Catherine Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CBS | 8 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Hatchery | CONV | 43 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Natural |  | 19 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Grande Ronde River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CBS | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Hatchery | CONV | 44 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Natural |  | 11 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Lostine River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CBS | 7 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Hatchery | CONV | 57 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| Natural |  | 28 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Lookingglass Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CBS | 12 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 13 |
| Hatchery | CONV | 39 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 40 |
| Natural |  | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Minam River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural |  | 6 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 7 |
| Wenaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural |  | 5 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 6 |
| Imnaha River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hatchery | CONV | 131 | 98 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 |
| Natural |  | 46 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
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[^0]:    * Due to space limitations at LFH, the annual production goal is less than the LSRCP mitigation goal.

[^1]:    ${ }_{b}^{a}$ 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.

[^2]:    ${ }^{a}$ Expansions based on estimated escapement to the Lostine River using revised weir data provided by NPT Fisheries Research
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Recovered from Lostine River weir without biological data and not included in RMIS or ODFW databases. $094038=1$ tag; $094202=2$ tags; $094248=2$ tags; 094209 = 37 tags; $094210=16 ; 094211=13$ tags; 094214 = 14 tags.
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Estimated number of total CWT fish recovered from PSMFC and ODFW databases.

[^3]:    ${ }^{a}$ Recoveries of Imnaha River adults are probably the result of outplanting.
    ${ }^{b}$ Fifteen carcasses recovered on 5 July below the weir. The CWT code for one carcass was lost.

