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#### Abstract

A multiple beam sonar unit was used to enumerate the Chinook salmon escapement to the Big Salmon River in 2018. The sonar was operated on the Big Salmon River for its fourteenth year at the same site used since 2005. Sonar operation began on July 15 and continued without interruption through August 21. A total escapement of 5,159 Chinook salmon was estimated to have passed the sonar site in 2018. The first Chinook salmon passing the Big Salmon sonar station was observed on July 15, the first day of operations. Fifty percent of the run had passed the sonar by August 3 and $90 \%$ by August 15. Based on the 2018 Big Salmon sonar count and above border escapement estimates from the Eagle sonar project, the Big Salmon run comprised approximately $9.5 \%$ of the total above border Chinook Salmon escapement. A total of 201 Chinook carcass samples were collected between Aug 22 and Aug 25 over approximately 145 km of the Big Salmon River system. Age, length and sex data was obtained from the samples.


## INTRODUCTION

The 2018 Big Salmon River sonar project marks the fourteenth year that Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) enumeration has been conducted on this system by Metla Environmental Inc. (MEI). The multiple beam sonar units used by the Big Salmon River Chinook enumeration program, as well as many other salmon escapement enumeration projects, have been found to be reliable and to provide accurate counts of migrating salmon (Enzhofer et al. 2010, Holmes et al. 2006, Key et al. 2016, Mercer \& Wilson 2006-2018). Due to high seasonal flows and wilderness recreation use of the Big Salmon River system, the utilization of traditional salmon weir techniques on this river is not feasible. The use of sonar allows for enumeration of migrating Chinook salmon while minimizing negative impacts on fish behaviour and providing un-restricted recreational use of the river. This report is a summary of the results of the 2018 project.

The overall goal of the Big Salmon Chinook program is to provide stock assessment information that will improve the ability of Canadian and U.S. salmon management agencies to manage Yukon River Chinook salmon. Quantifying Chinook escapement into upper Yukon River index streams allows for an independent (from Eagle sonar project estimates) assessment of total above border Chinook escapements. Using accurate Chinook escapement enumeration of select tributaries combined with genetic stock information (GSI), it is possible to generate upper Yukon River Chinook spawning escapement estimates within quantified statistical parameters.

In addition to the sonar operation, carcass sampling was conducted to obtain age, sex and length data from the 2018 Big Salmon Chinook escapement. This information provides important ongoing biological baseline data on the health of the stock as well as information used in constructing future pre-season run forecasts.

In 2015 a juvenile chinook mark/recapture and outmigration study was initiated by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) on the Big Salmon River system. This study was continued in 2018. The existing Big Salmon sonar camp has been used as a base for the project. In addition, personnel associated with the sonar program have assisted with the juvenile assessment project. Information on juvenile production and life history in conjunction with adult escapement information will assist with interpretation of stock recruitment models and could contribute to the management of Canadian-origin Yukon River Chinook salmon stocks.

Based on the 2005-2017 sonar operations, the Big Salmon River has been shown to be a significant contributor to upper Yukon River Chinook production. The 2005-2017 average Big Salmon sonar count is 5,512 (range 1,329 to 10,078 ). These counts represented an average of $10.2 \%$ of the total average upper Yukon River Chinook spawning escapement estimate for these years (JTC 2017).

## Study Area

The Big Salmon River flows in a north-westerly direction from the headwaters at Quiet and Big Salmon lakes to its confluence with the Yukon River (Figure 1). The river and its tributaries drain an area of approximately $6,760 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, predominantly from the Big Salmon Range of the Pelly Mountains. Major tributaries of the Big Salmon River include the North Big Salmon River
and the South Big Salmon River. The Big Salmon River can be accessed by boat either from Quiet Lake on the South Canol Road, from the Yukon River on the Robert Campbell and Klondike Highways, or from Lake Laberge via the Thirty Mile and Yukon rivers. The sonar site is at a remote location, approximately 130 air kilometers from Whitehorse. It is accessible by either boat or float plane.


Figure 1. Big Salmon River Watershed and location of the 2018 Big Salmon sonar station.

## Objectives

The objectives of the 2018 Big Salmon River sonar project were:

1. Obtain an accurate count of the 2018 Chinook salmon escapement in the Big Salmon River.
2. Obtain age-sex-length (ASL) data from as many post-spawned Chinook as possible with a target goal of $5 \%$ of the total run. In addition document egg retention of female spawners and the principal recovery locations of spawned out fish.

## 3. Support the 2018 Big Salmon River Juvenile Chinook Out-migrant Assessment Study.

## METHODS

## Site selection

Sonar operations were set up at the same site on the lower Big Salmon River used since 2005. This site, located approximately 1.5 km upstream from the confluence with the Yukon River (Figure 1), was initially selected for the following reasons:

- It is a sufficient distance upstream of the mouth to avoid straying or milling Chinook salmon destined for other headwater spawning sites.
- The site is in a relatively straight section of the river and far enough downstream from any bends in the river so that recreational boaters using the river have a clear view of the instream structures.
- The river flow is laminar and swift enough to preclude milling or 'holding' behaviour by migrating fish.
- Bottom substrates consist of gravel and cobble evenly distributed along the width of the river.
- The stream bottom profile allows for complete ensonification of the water column.
- The site is accessible by boat and floatplane.

The physical characteristics of the river at this site have not changed over the 14 years of sonar operation. It is anticipated that this site will continue to be used as long as the sonar program operates.

## Camp and Sonar Station Set-up

Supplies and crew were mobilized from Whitehorse, YT. This entailed driving to a boat launch site on the Yukon River situated 3 km downstream of Little Salmon Village on the Robert Campbell Highway. From the boat launch a riverboat was used to access the sonar station site. Subsequent camp access, crew changes, and delivery of supplies were accomplished by riverboat and floatplane from Whitehorse. Mobilization to the sonar station was initiated on July 14. The sonar apparatus was operational beginning 15:00 on July 15.

## River Profile

A boat mounted Biosonics DTX split beam sonar, aimed $90^{\circ}$ down from the surface, was used to obtain a cross section profile of the river bottom at the sonar site. Data was collected from three bank to bank transects of the river. These transects were located 5 m upstream, at the center and 5 m downstream of the anticipated sonar beam. The bottom profile was similar for all three transects. The cross section profile where the sonar was deployed is presented in Figure 2. The cross section profile of the river bottom at the sonar station has remained relatively unchanged since the project started in 2005. However the sonar location in 2018 was moved 2 m downstream relative to the previous year's location. This site had a bottom profile the most conducive to complete ensonification of the water column.


Figure 2. Cross section profile of Big Salmon River at sonar site using a Biosonics DTX split beam echo-sounder.
Note: Top of yellow line is river bottom, thalweg $=1.97 \mathrm{~m}$. Transect view looking down river. The near field of the transducer prevents readings at depths less than 1 m as indicated by the white band.

## Diversion Fence Construction

Partial fence structures were placed in the river to divert migrating Chinook salmon into a 36 m migration corridor in the center of the river (Figure 3). The weir was constructed using conduit panels and metal tripods that were stored on site. The fences were constructed as detailed in previous years reports (Mercer \& Wilson 2018).


Figure 3. Aerial view of sonar station camp and partial weirs, (photo from 2010 project). Blue outline denotes ensonified portion of the river.

An ARIS model 1800 sonar, manufactured by Sound Metrics Corporation, was used for the 2018 Big Salmon sonar project. This sonar belongs to MEI and was an in-kind contribution to the 2018 project. Sound Metrics are currently the primary manufacturers of multi-beam sonars employed for enumerating migrating salmon in riverine environments.

The DIDSON sonar was the first sonar developed by Sound Metrics. The ARIS (Adaptive Resolution Imaging Sonar) sonar is considered the second generation of multiple beam sonars manufactured by Sound Metrics Corporation. While the underlying beam-forming techniques involving the use of acoustic lenses are similar for both units, significant refinements to the ARIS hardware and software as well as specialized fish counting and measuring software make it a more versatile and user friendly platform for detecting and counting migrating salmon (Key et al. 2016). With DIDSON the number of image samples (pixels) is fixed at 512. Moreover, the DIDSON window length parameter can only be set at the discrete values ( $2.5 \mathrm{M}, 5 \mathrm{M}, 10 \mathrm{M}$ etc.). ARIS images can attain a finer downrange resolution than DIDSON. With the ARIS sonar, the number of samples in a beam is operator controlled and is variable from 128 to a maximum of 4,000 samples (pixels). In addition the ARIS window length is user selectable. This allows the user to increase the number of samples per beam to compensate for the reduced resolution associated with increased window length. A LR DIDSON sonar was also on-site for the 2018 project as a backup unit.

The sonar unit was placed next to the south bank as depicted in Figures 3 and 4. The sonar unit was mounted on an adjustable stand constructed of 2-inch steel galvanized pipe. The stand consisted of two T-shaped legs 120 cm in height connected by a 90 cm crossbar. The sonar unit was bolted to a steel plate suspended from the cross bar that was connected to the stand with adjustable fittings (Kee Klamps ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ ). The adjustable clamps allowed the sonar unit to be raised or lowered according to fluctuating water levels as well as enabling rotation of the transducer lens to adjust the beam angle.


Figure 4. Sonar transducer unit and mounting stand in position (2011 Photo).
The sonar system was powered by a battery bank of five - 12 volt gel cell batteries connected in parallel to create a 12 volt power source. The battery bank was charged by six 80 watt solar
panels and supplemented by a battery charger powered by a 2.0 kW generator. An 800 watt inverter was used to obtain 110 volt AC from the batteries to supply continuous power for the computers and the sonar unit as well as domestic power for the camp. An uninterruptible power supply (UPS) was used to protect the equipment from power surges and occasional power interruptions. As well, an alarm system was installed on the recording computer to alert personnel to power interruptions.

The ARIS sonar with a standard lens produces an ensonified field $29^{\circ}$ wide in the horizontal plane and $14^{\circ}$ in the vertical plane. An $8^{\circ}$ concentrator lens was used for the 2018 project. This lens reduces the vertical ensonified field from $14^{\circ}$ to $8^{\circ}$, resulting in an increase in the resolution of the target images. The ARIS transducer lens was positioned at a depth of approximately 12 cm below the surface of the river and angled downward approximately $3^{\circ}$ from horizontal resulting in the ensonified field of view remaining parallel to and the surface of the river.

Using an $8^{\circ}$ lens on a sonar unit deployed horizontally results in a beam depth of 1.05 m at a distance of 7.5 m from the sonar. A table, using simple trigonometry formulae, enabled the sonar crew to determine the beam depth for given water depths and sonar window start lengths. Care was taken to insure the sonar beam contacted the river bottom before the end of the deflection fence to insure the entire Chinook migration corridor was ensonified.

For optimal resolution of the ensonified targets within the migration corridor the following ARIS sonar settings were used: a) Low frequency ( 1.1 Mhz ), b) 96 sub-beam array, c) Frame rate of 4 frames $/ \mathrm{sec}$. and d) Samples per beam set at 2000. The computer equipment used to interface with the sonar consisted of two workstation laptop computers and one HDMI 25 inch video monitor. The computers used I-7 processors, 256 GB SSHD plus a 1TB HDD and 16 GB of RAM. This processing capability allowed the technicians to read the files concurrent with continuous uninterrupted recording of the data. A third computer was used as a standby machine and for the internet connection.

## Sonar Data Collection

The sonar data was collected continuously over the course of the project and stored automatically in pre-programmed, 20 minute date stamped files using the ARIScope software. This resulted in the accumulation of 72 files over a 24 hour period. The files were stored on the recording laptop computer and transferred each day to a 5 TB external hard drive. Each 20 minute file required approximately 250 Mb of hard disc space. It is MEI policy to maintain the ARIScope files on the external hard drive for a minimum of 3 years after the project is completed.

The ARISFish software program was used for reading the recorded files and the inputting of data. File reading typically occurred the day following recording. All 72 files from each day were read. Files were read using a combination of the sonar view platform and echogram view of each file. When the examiner identified a target on the echogram the sonar view was used to observe and measure the fish when required. To optimize target detection in both sonar and echogram view, the background subtraction feature was used to remove the static images such as the river bottom and weir structures. ARISFish software inputs the targets selected by the reader into a comma-separated values (CSV) file. Data from the CSV file was inputted into an excel spreadsheet incorporating the counts from each file into hourly and daily counts as well as upstream and downstream movements. Total daily fish counts were derived from the net upstream passage of fish. The target measurement feature of the ARISFish software was used
when required to estimate the size of the observed fish and when required to differentiate Chinook salmon from resident fish species. All fish 50 cm and larger were categorized as Chinook. Fish moving downstream identified as live Chinook were subtracted from each file total. It is assumed Chinook migrating downstream were strays. Straying of migrating salmon is not unusual and temporary ${ }^{1}$ straying has been documented in telemetry studies of Yukon River Chinook (Eiler et al. 2006). The proportion of suspected straying Chinook at the sonar site is typically very low (<2\%).

Short interruptions in data collection due to equipment maintenance, power interruptions and other technical difficulties are inevitable. All stoppages or gaps in recording coverage were documented. Potentially missed fish were added to the counts by interpolation based on the mean number of fish per hour counted 12 hours before and after the outage. If complete files were missed the Chinook passage was estimated by interpolation of the average file count over the 12 hour period before and after the missing sample event as follows:

$$
P_{m}=\underline{X_{\mathrm{a}}}+X_{\underline{\mathrm{b}}}
$$

Where $m$ is $m$ th missing value, $X_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the mean file count prior to the missing sample event and $X_{\mathrm{b}}$ is the mean file count of the sample after the missing file(s). The interpolated counts were included in the total daily counts reported over the course of the project.

## Precision of Fish Counts

It is the practice in some salmon enumeration sonar projects, particularly those with high rates of daily passage, to read and count salmon from a sub-set of recorded data files and apply an expansion factor to obtain a total estimate of fish passage. The variance associated with this expansion method can be quantified and incorporated into the total fish passage estimate (Enzenhofer et al., 2010). For the Big Salmon sonar project, all recorded files were reviewed in their entirety so there was no variance associated with the expansion of a sub-set of a file data.

The precision of the Chinook counts was measured by reviewing a sub-set of all the files recorded and read. Precision in this case refers to the repeatability of a count between different individuals for the same data file or aggregate of data files. Files for review were randomly selected from 16 days of sonar operation, over the periods July 25 through July 30 and August 3 through August11, inclusive. The re-count from each reviewed file was recorded for comparison with the original.

The Coefficient of Variation (CV) method was used to quantify the repeatability (precision) of counts, particularly those counts with high fish passage rates (Enzenhofer et. al, 2010). This formula is expressed as:

$$
C V=\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{R}\left(X_{i j}-\bar{X}_{j}\right)^{2}}{\bar{X}_{j}{ }^{2}}} \times 100
$$

[^0]where Xij is the ith count of the jth event and Xj is the average count of the jth event.
Because of the relatively low number of fish counted per hour in most of the Big Salmon sonar files, the CV values could be distorted. For example, if the first counter observed 2 upstream fish and the second counter observed one, the CV would be as high as $50 \%$. This is due to the leverage that small numerical differences in low counts have on the overall calculation of CV. For this reason, the CV for this project was calculated using reviewed files with fish counts $\geq 5$ fish/ file.

As well as calculating CV, a sample variance estimator based on the absolute difference between readers was used to quantify the correlation of the counts and the net variability between readers. To do this the relationship was plotted between counts of 2 different file readers using original daily aggregate file counts (reader 1) and reviewed aggregate file counts (reader 2).

## Range Distribution

The ARISFish software recorded the distance (m) from the sonar for each target selected and marked as a Chinook salmon. This range value was inputted into the CSV file. This provided data to construct a range frequency histogram illustrating the cross sectional distribution of migrating Chinook.

## Carcass Pitch

Access to Chinook spawning areas on the river was via a riverboat powered by a 60 hp outboard jet. Carcass pitch efforts extended from the sonar station to a point approximately 120 river kilometers upstream.

The carcass pitch involved collecting dead and moribund Chinook and sampling each fish for age, length and sex (ASL). Length measurements (fork length, mid-eye to fork and post orbital to hyperal) were recorded to the nearest 0.5 cm . Five scales were taken from each fish and placed on scale cards for age determination. All sampling data and scale cards were submitted to DFO Whitehorse. Scale age analysis was conducted by the sclerochronology lab, Pacific Biological Station, Nanaimo, British Columbia.

## RESULTS

## Chinook Salmon Counts

The 2018 Big Salmon River Chinook run timing was similar to the previous 13 year average for this stock (Figure 5). The first Chinook salmon was observed on July 15, on the first day of operations. The run reached $50 \%$ passage on August 3 and $90 \%$ of the run had passed the station by August 15. Daily and cumulative counts are presented in Appendix 1 and Figure 5.

A total of 5,053 targets identified as Chinook salmon was counted past the sonar station from July 15 through to August 21. The sonar was operated continually and no stoppages were recorded during the 2018 project. Because sonar operation stopped before the run was completely over, an estimate was obtained of the number of Chinook that passed the station after sonar operations were stopped. This was done through regression analysis using the final 18
days of the sonar counts based on the logarithmic regression $y=-110.1 \ln (x)+354.69$. This extrapolation added 106 fish to bring the total count to 5,159 . A total of 8 Chinook salmon ( $0.16 \%$ of the total escapement) was recorded moving downstream during the 2018 project.


Figure 5. Daily counts of Chinook salmon passing the Big Salmon River sonar station in 2018 and average daily counts 2005 through 2017.

The 2018 Big Salmon Chinook sonar count 5,159 was comparable to the $2005-2017$ average of 5,512 (Figure 6, Appendix 2).


Figure 6. Annual sonar counts for Big Salmon sonar project 2005-2018.

## Precision of Counts

Of the 2,655 sonar files recorded and analysed, a total of 96 (3.6\%) was reviewed by a second reader (Table 1). Of the 96 files reviewed, 22 files ( $22.9 \%$ ) exhibited a discrepancy in the total
target count between readers. Of the 22 files that exhibited an inconsistency between readers, additional fish were identified in 14 files and 8 files had the Chinook count reduced (Appendix 3). This yields a net gain of 3 fish for the 96 files that were reviewed representing $0.9 \%$ of the 320 fish counted in the first iteration.

Table 1. Double reviewed files and calculated difference between counts.

|  | Count | \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total files recorded during <br> project | 2,655 |  |
| Total files double reviewed | 96 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Total fish counted first <br> iteration | 320 |  |
| Total fish counted second <br> iteration | 323 |  |
| Total files with + divergence | 14 | $14.6 \%$ |
| Total files with - divergence | 8 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Total Files with divergence | 22 | $22.9 \%$ |
| Net difference in target count | 3 | $0.9 \%$ |

The CV was calculated for reviewed files that had fish counts $\geq 5$ fish/file. The CV for this subset was $6.9 \%$.

Figure 7 illustrates the relationship between counts of 2 different file readers using daily pooled original (reader 1) and reviewed files (reader 2). The Pearson correlation between the separate file reviewers $=0.98$, $(\mathrm{R}(14) \mathrm{p}<0.001)$.


Figure 7. Linear regression between daily pooled sonar file Chinook counts examined by two separate readers.
Note: Data points are daily pooled initial file counts (y axis) and reviewed file counts (x axis).

## Range Distribution

The cross section pattern of migrating Chinook at the sonar site in 2018 is presented in Figure $8 .{ }^{2}$ As occurred in some previous years there was a bi-modal range distribution. There were peak distributions at approximately 6 meters and 19 meters from the sonar. The higher number observed at 6 meters was likely a function of the deflection weir moving south bank oriented fish around the fence. The peak at 19 m demarks the thalweg of the river. The cross sectional range distribution of Chinook at the sonar site varies inter-annually, likely as a result of prevailing water levels.


Figure 8. 2018 Big Salmon River Chinook range/frequency in cross section profile.
Note: The $0-5 \mathrm{~m}$ range from the sonar has a deflection fence in place.
Table 2. Age, length, and sex of Chinook sampled from the Big Salmon River, 2018.

| SEX | AGE | Mean MEF (mm) | Count | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1.2 | 605 | 1 | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 1.3 | 788 | 28 | $14.4 \%$ |
|  | 1.4 | 821 | 66 | $34.0 \%$ |
|  | 1.5 | 852 | 5 | $2.6 \%$ |
|  | M3 | 779 | 7 | $3.6 \%$ |
|  | M4 | 841 | 17 | $8.8 \%$ |
|  | M5 | 890 | 1 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Female total |  |  | 125 | $64.4 \%$ |
| Male | 1.2 | 622 | 5 | $2.6 \%$ |
|  | 1.3 | 735 | 30 | $15.5 \%$ |
|  | 1.4 | 841 | 18 | $9.3 \%$ |
|  | 1.5 | 980 | 1 | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | M3 | 809 | 5 | $2.6 \%$ |
|  | M4 | 829 | 10 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Male total |  |  | 69 | $35.6 \%$ |
| Total |  |  | 194 | $100.0 \%$ |

[^1]
## Carcass Pitch

A total of 201 dead or moribund Chinook was recovered during the carcass pitch. Mean length and age data is presented in Table 2 above. Of the total, 128 ( $64 \%$ ) fish were female and 73 $(36 \%)$ fish were male. Complete age data was determined from 154 of the Chinook sampled; the remaining 47 samples yielded partial or no ages due to regenerate scales. Females were predominately age-6 (1.4) (34\%) and males predominantly age-5 (1.3) (15\%). Complete age, length and sex data are presented in Appendix 4.

## DISCUSSION

The 2018 Big Salmon sonar project was successful in enumerating the Chinook salmon passing the sonar station throughout the course of the run. No significant technical problems were encountered with the sonar and related equipment. The sonar recorded continuously over the course of the project with no interruptions. Water levels at the sonar station were considered average with no extreme high water events affecting the sonar operation (Appendix 5). A high water event occurred on August 10 through 12 that resulted in significant accumulations of woody debris that could not be safely removed until after the water level subsided.

There was a high degree of precision between file readers for both single file counts and daily aggregate counts. As occurred in past years, the reviewed file aggregate counts resulted in a net gain of fish. This is a result of there being a higher probability a file reader will miss a target rather than mark and count a non-existent target. This would suggest that the 2018 sonar count could be biased low. This low bias could be approximately $0.9 \%$ of the total 2018 sonar count as indicated by the results of the file review precision data.

The ARIS sonar is considered the second generation of multiple beam sonars manufactured by Sound Metrics Corporation. The ARIS 1800 sonar and ARISFish software provides better downrange resolution of the fish targets and increases efficiency when reviewing the data compared to the DIDSON sonar. It is recommended the ARIS sonar continue to be used on this project rather than the LR DIDSON previously used from 2005 through 2015. The ARISfish software also reduces the workload of the file readers which allows one member of the sonar crew to assist with the concurrent DFO juvenile Chinook research project.

The 2018 Eagle sonar project on the Yukon River downstream of the Canada/U.S. border yielded a total count of 57,893 Chinook. The above border spawning escapement ${ }^{3}$ estimate was 54,474 (JTC 2018, preliminary). Based on the Big Salmon and Eagle Chinook sonar counts, the Big Salmon stock contributed $9.5 \%$ of the total above border Chinook escapement in 2018. A comparison of Big Salmon River Chinook sonar counts and the JTC above border Chinook escapement estimates based on Eagle sonar counts, (2005 - 2018) is illustrated in Appendix 6. There is a positive relationship between Eagle sonar escapement estimates and the Big Salmon sonar counts, with a Pearson correlation of 0.82 , (R (14) p<0.001).

Genetic stock identification (GSI) samples were obtained at the Eagle sonar site in 2018 using drift gillnets. The GSI data provides information on the proportional stock composition of the

[^2]total above border Yukon River Chinook escapement, including the Big Salmon River. The 2018 GSI data has not been analyzed at the time of this report preparation.

An ongoing DFO juvenile Chinook salmon research project was again based at the Big Salmon River sonar site in 2018. During the operation of the sonar project one of the MEI sonar technicians assisted on the juvenile Chinook project. This did not unduly affect sonar operations and if both projects are conducted again in 2019 a similar arrangement could be made.
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Appendix 1. 2018 daily and cumulative counts of Chinook salmon at the Big Salmon River sonar site.

| DATE | DAILY COUNT | CUMULATIVE | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-Jul | 1 | 1 | Sonar begins recording at 1500h |
| 16-Jul | 4 | 5 |  |
| 17-Jul | 2 | 7 |  |
| 18-Jul | 2 | 9 |  |
| 19-Jul | 13 | 22 |  |
| 20-Jul | 23 | 45 |  |
| 21-Jul | 38 | 83 |  |
| 22-Jul | 51 | 134 |  |
| 23-Jul | 71 | 205 |  |
| 24-Jul | 91 | 296 |  |
| 25-Jul | 118 | 414 |  |
| 26-Jul | 136 | 550 |  |
| 27-Jul | 168 | 718 |  |
| 28-Jul | 242 | 960 |  |
| 29-Jul | 273 | 1233 |  |
| 30-Jul | 326 | 1559 |  |
| 31-Jul | 310 | 1869 |  |
| 01-Aug | 272 | 2141 |  |
| 02-Aug | 265 | 2406 |  |
| 03-Aug | 270 | 2676 |  |
| 04-Aug | 333 | 3009 | peak daily count |
| 05-Aug | 303 | 3312 |  |
| 06-Aug | 264 | 3576 |  |
| 07-Aug | 248 | 3824 |  |
| 08-Aug | 168 | 3992 |  |
| 09-Aug | 100 | 4092 |  |
| 10-Aug | 93 | 4185 |  |
| 11-Aug | 114 | 4299 |  |
| 12-Aug | 99 | 4398 |  |
| 13-Aug | 131 | 4529 |  |
| 14-Aug | 103 | 4632 |  |
| 15-Aug | 72 | 4704 |  |
| 16-Aug | 76 | 4780 |  |
| 17-Aug | 66 | 4846 |  |
| 18-Aug | 65 | 4911 |  |
| 19-Aug | 54 | 4965 |  |
| 20-Aug | 52 | 5017 |  |
| 21-Aug | 36 | 5053 | Last full day of recording |
| 22-Aug | 31 | 5084 |  |
| 23-Aug | 25 | 5109 |  |
| 24-Aug | 20 | 5129 |  |
| 25-Aug | 15 | 5143 |  |
| 26-Aug | 10 | 5153 |  |
| 27-Aug | 5 | 5158 |  |
| 28-Aug | 1 | 5159 | Final estimate based on extrapolation |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Note: Shaded area denotes extrapolated daily counts.

Appendix 2. Daily and average Chinook counts in the Big Salmon River, 2005-2018.

| DATE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Count } \\ & \hline 2005 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline 2006 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Daily Count 2007 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline 2008 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline 2009 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline 2010 \end{array}$ | Daily <br> Count <br> 2011 | Daily <br> Count <br> 2012 | Daily Count 2013 | Daily Count 2014 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline 2015 \end{array}$ | Daily Count 2016 | Daily Count 2017 | Daily <br> Count <br> 2018 | Daily Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11-Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| 12-Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |  | 11 |  |  | 15 |
| 13-Jul | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |  | 27 |  |  | 26 |
| 14-Jul | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |  | 36 |  |  | 29 |
| $15-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | 5 | 57 |  | 1 | 22 |
| 16-Jul | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 90 | 17 | 56 | 11 | 4 | 19 |
| 17-Jul | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 2 |  | 0 | 115 | 25 | 56 | 22 | 2 | 21 |
| 18 -Jul | 23 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 39 | 82 | 19 | 2 | 26 |
| 19-Jul | 13 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 11 |  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 72 | 113 | 32 | 13 | 36 |
| $20-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 23 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 81 | 126 | 58 | 23 | 42 |
| 21-Jul | 36 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 47 | 7 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 229 | 117 | 171 | 82 | 38 | 54 |
| $22-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 58 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 68 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 284 | 148 | 226 | 144 | 51 | 74 |
| 23 -Jul | 92 | 11 | 18 | 1 | 85 | 12 | 43 | 0 | 2 | 345 | 217 | 174 | 197 | 71 | 91 |
| $24-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 130 | 21 | 26 | 2 | 135 | 7 | 44 | 0 | 4 | 343 | 312 | 271 | 235 | 91 | 116 |
| $25-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 158 | 20 | 52 | 1 | 201 | 12 | 50 | 1 | 3 | 356 | 411 | 240 | 211 | 118 | 131 |
| 26-Jul | 204 | 53 | 88 | 3 | 226 | 14 | 56 | 1 | 11 | 372 | 538 | 292 | 212 | 136 | 158 |
| 27-Jul | 219 | 95 | 153 | 5 | 346 | 27 | 105 | 1 | 25 | 421 | 494 | 428 | 281 | 168 | 198 |
| $28-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 287 | 146 | 237 | 9 | 498 | 46 | 160 | 3 | 44 | 307 | 531 | 430 | 243 | 242 | 227 |
| $29-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 290 | 230 | 287 | 9 | 532 | 83 | 192 | 15 | 86 | 380 | 588 | 394 | 192 | 273 | 254 |
| $30-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 299 | 321 | 337 | 29 | 594 | 123 | 218 | 12 | 83 | 330 | 586 | 409 | 317 | 326 | 285 |
| 31-Jul | 279 | 368 | 400 | 21 | 808 | 141 | 218 | 23 | 150 | 256 | 492 | 377 | 432 | 310 | 305 |
| 01-Aug | 333 | 357 | 435 | 23 | 578 | 159 | 260 | 62 | 196 | 207 | 568 | 362 | 390 | 272 | 300 |
| 02-Aug | 346 | 379 | 331 | 18 | 715 | 182 | 313 | 76 | 220 | 207 | 485 | 329 | 363 | 265 | 302 |
| 03-Aug | 303 | 358 | 304 | 16 | 725 | 216 | 417 | 138 | 264 | 192 | 441 | 309 | 341 | 270 | 307 |
| 04-Aug | 292 | 413 | 258 | 31 | 595 | 226 | 426 | 156 | 262 | 190 | 451 | 245 | 309 | 333 | 299 |
| 05-Aug | 331 | 496 | 210 | 51 | 559 | 215 | 396 | 196 | 261 | 170 | 452 | 235 | 241 | 303 | 294 |
| 06-Aug | 214 | 490 | 178 | 55 | 452 | 221 | 400 | 228 | 225 | 120 | 469 | 222 | 181 | 264 | 266 |
| 07-Aug | 188 | 464 | 147 | 78 | 364 | 227 | 317 | 192 | 191 | 114 | 449 | 177 | 181 | 248 | 238 |
| 08-Aug | 232 | 464 | 59 | 61 | 295 | 242 | 294 | 235 | 195 | 96 | 397 | 161 | 115 | 168 | 215 |
| 09-Aug | 234 | 360 | 74 | 70 | 270 | 248 | 243 | 183 | 156 | 68 | 348 | 157 | 116 | 100 | 188 |
| 10-Aug | 203 | 349 | 90 | 98 | 209 | 183 | 160 | 154 | 132 | 61 | 246 | 101 | 84 | 93 | 155 |
| 11-Aug | 124 | 348 | 82 | 122 | 183 | 207 | 170 | 106 | 134 | 50 | 217 | 77 | 85 | 114 | 144 |
| 12-Aug | 126 | 324 | 98 | 107 | 146 | 174 | 143 | 130 | 113 | 46 | 187 | 79 | 72 | 99 | 132 |
| 13-Aug | 125 | 243 | 77 | 109 | 118 | 181 | 100 | 110 | 101 | 25 | 201 | 58 | 80 | 131 | 119 |
| 14-Aug | 72 | 196 | 74 | 89 | 117 | 134 | 85 | 81 | 77 | 30 | 126 | 63 | 65 | 103 | 94 |
| 15-Aug | 57 | 180 | 66 | 78 | 65 | 114 | 89 | 80 | 65 | 24 | 113 | 52 | 53 | 72 | 79 |
| 16-Aug | 40 | 172 | 56 | 70 | 55 | 82 | 63 | 94 | 57 | 24 | 91 | 33 | 51 | 76 | 69 |
| 17-Aug | 53 | 104 | 40 | 49 | 63 | 80 | 35 | 70 | 34 | 17 | 65 | 26 | 54 | 66 | 54 |
| 18-Aug | 47 | 69 | 64 | 45 | 55 | 53 | 20 | 50 | 32 | 15 | 54 | 20 | 40 | 65 | 45 |
| 19-Aug | 35 | 87 | 37 | 17 | 43 | 40 | 18 | 44 | 21 | 14 | 28 | 10 | 32 | 54 | 34 |
| 20-Aug | 29 | 59 | 47 | 18 | 35 | 24 | 21 | 38 | 28 | , 1 \% | 10 | 18 | 10 | 52 | 29 |
| 21-Aug | 26 | 45 | 11 | 15 | 28 | 18 | 11 | 27 | 20 | \% | , \% | 18 | 26 | 36 | 21 |
| 22-Aug | 19 | 50 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 38 | 2 | 19 | 10 | \% 6 |  | 12. | 22 | \% | 20 |
| 23-Aug | 17 | 12 | 23 | 9 | 4 | 24 | 2 | 19 | 14 | \% |  | \% | 1 | 25 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | < 13 | 0 | 17 | 2 |  | 20 |  | 14 | 11 | , , , \% |  | \%6. | , 16\% | 20. | 12 |
| 25-Aug | ¢ |  | 14 | 1 |  | 17 |  | \% | 6, |  |  | 4 | 13 | 15 | 10 |
| 26-Aug | 6 |  | 14 |  |  | 6 |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | \%2. | 10 | 10 | 7 |
| 27-Aug | 4. |  | 13 |  |  |  |  | \% | \% |  |  |  | \% 8 | + | 6 |
| 28-Aug | , < \% , |  | ,1\% |  |  |  |  | \% | , < 1 , , |  |  |  | + 3 , | , 1 , | 4 |
| 29-Aug |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  | , |  | 5 |
| 30-Aug |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 31-Aug |  |  | 6. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 01-Sep |  |  | 4, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 02-Sep |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| OTAL: | 5618 | 7308 | 4506 | 1329 | 9261 | 3817 | 5156 | 2584 | 3242 | 6321 | 10078 | 6761 | 5672 | 5159 | 5487 |

Note: Stippled areas are interpolated counts. Shaded areas denote start and end of sonar recording

Appendix 3. Precision of counts by two ARISfish file reviewers.

| Reviewed File Number | Fish counted by reader \#1 | Fish counted by reader \#2 | Difference | Reviewed File Number | Fish counted by reader \#1 | Fish counted by reader \#2 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 49 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 2 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 50 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 6 | 5 | -1 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 53 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 54 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 0 | -1 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 57 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 10 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 58 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 11 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 59 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 12 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 60 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 13 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 61 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 14 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 62 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 15 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 63 | 3 | 1 | -2 |
| 16 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 64 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 17 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 21 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 24 | 3 | 2 | -1 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 74 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 27 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 76 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 30 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 78 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 31 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 79 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 32 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 33 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 81 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| 35 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 84 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 37 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 85 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 38 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 86 | 6 | 5 | -1 |
| 39 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 87 | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| 40 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 88 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 41 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 89 | 3 | 0 | -3 |
| 42 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 90 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 44 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 92 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 46 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 94 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 47 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 95 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 48 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 96 | 16 | 17 | 1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 320 | 323 | 3 |

Appendix 4. Age, sex, and length of sampled Chinook on the Big Salmon River, 2018.

| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22-Aug | 1 | M | 825 | 735 | 625 |  |
| 22-Aug | 2 | F | 855 | 785 | 670 | 14 |
| 22-Aug | 3 | F | 910 | 830 | 720 | 14 |
| 22-Aug | 4 | M | 965 | 855 | 745 | 14 |
| 22-Aug | 5 | F | 930 | 855 | 750 | 13 |
| 22-Aug | 6 | F | 820 | 740 | 660 | M3 |
| 22-Aug | 7 | F | 890 | 820 | 725 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 8 | M | 1055 | 935 | 820 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 9 | F | 760 | 690 | 630 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 10 | F | 870 | 795 | 715 | no age |
| 23-Aug | 11 | F | 930 | 840 | 770 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 12 | F | 925 | 845 | 755 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 13 | F | 890 | 825 | 730 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 14 | M | 800 | 720 | 640 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 15 | M | 910 | 815 | 710 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 16 | M | 920 | 825 | 720 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 17 | F | 870 | 800 | 700 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 18 | F | 880 | 805 | 705 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 19 | F | 835 | 760 | 670 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 20 | F | 895 | 820 | 720 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 21 | F | 910 | 835 | 725 | 15 |
| 23-Aug | 22 | M | 830 | 745 | 655 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 23 | F | 900 | 820 | 730 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 24 | F | 865 | 795 | 695 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 25 | F | 850 | 765 | 670 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 26 | F | 900 | 820 | 735 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 27 | F | 875 | 790 | 705 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 28 | M | 830 | 755 | 665 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 29 | F | 910 | 830 | 745 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 30 | F | 930 | 845 | 745 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 31 | F | 880 | 800 | 710 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 32 | M | 1010 | 900 | 775 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 33 | M | 890 | 780 | 670 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 34 | F | 930 | 860 | 765 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 35 | F | 940 | 855 | 750 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 36 | F | 660 | 605 | 525 | 12 |
| 23-Aug | 37 | M | 995 | 890 | 785 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 38 | M | 810 | 735 | 650 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 39 | F | 950 | 860 | 755 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 40 | M | 685 | 605 | 535 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 41 | F | 960 | 870 | 770 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 42 | M | 990 | 885 | 770 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 43 | F | 865 | 790 | 690 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 44 | M | 965 | 865 | 765 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 45 | F | 810 | 740 | 670 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 46 | F | 920 | 840 | 740 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 47 | M | 820 | 730 | 635 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 48 | F | 865 | 785 | 685 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 49 | M | 1020 | 890 | 765 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 50 | F | 880 | 805 | 705 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 51 | M | 720 | 650 | 565 | 12 |


| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23-Aug | 52 | M | 750 | 675 | 585 | 12 |
| 23-Aug | 53 | F | 880 | 810 | 710 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 54 | F | 920 | 830 | 710 | 14 |
| 23-Aug | 55 | F | 750 | 685 | 605 | 13 |
| 23-Aug | 56 | F | 910 | 830 | 750 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 57 | M | 955 | 860 | 750 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 58 | F | 980 | 895 | 795 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 59 | F | 910 | 825 | 735 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 60 | M | 940 | 845 | 730 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 61 | F | 880 | 805 | 710 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 62 | M | 875 | 790 | 685 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 63 | M | 940 | 845 | 725 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 64 | F | 980 | 895 | 795 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 65 | M | 800 | 720 | 625 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 66 | F | 890 | 810 | 715 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 67 | F | 890 | 820 | 725 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 68 | M | 910 | 820 | 715 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 69 | F | 960 | 880 | 780 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 70 | M | 1015 | 900 | 780 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 71 | F | 895 | 830 | 720 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 72 | F | 905 | 825 | 735 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 73 | F | 950 | 860 | 770 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 74 | F | 910 | 835 | 725 | no age |
| 24-Aug | 75 | M | 870 | 775 | 695 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 76 | F | 940 | 850 | 760 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 77 | F | 805 | 730 | 650 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 78 | M | 580 | 525 | 460 | 12 |
| 24-Aug | 79 | M | 920 | 805 | 700 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 80 | M | 1000 | 885 | 785 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 81 | F | 930 | 850 | 735 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 82 | F | 905 | 830 | 730 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 83 | F | 960 | 870 | 770 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 84 | F | 940 | 850 | 750 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 85 | M | 855 | 670 | 580 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 86 | M | 785 | 705 | 600 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 87 | F | 960 | 870 | 765 | no age |
| 24-Aug | 88 | F | 900 | 820 | 720 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 89 | F | 890 | 780 | 680 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 90 | F | 930 | 845 | 745 | 15 |
| 24-Aug | 91 | M | 840 | 750 | 655 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 92 | M | 945 | 830 | 705 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 93 | F | 985 | 890 | 780 | M5 |
| 24-Aug | 94 | M | 705 | 630 | 535 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 95 | F | 870 | 790 | 705 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 96 | M | 905 | 820 | 720 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 97 | F | 1030 | 935 | 830 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 98 | F | 915 | 845 | 750 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 99 | F | 760 | 690 | 605 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 100 | F | 880 | 805 | 710 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 101 | M | 800 | 710 | 620 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 102 | F | 930 | 855 | 765 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 103 | F | 900 | 830 | 730 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 104 | F | 790 | 715 | 640 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 105 | M | 830 | 750 | 655 | 12 |
| 24-Aug | 106 | M | 860 | 760 | 675 | M4 |


| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24-Aug | 107 | M | 760 | 690 | 610 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 108 | F | 945 | 860 | 760 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 109 | M | 725 | 660 | 585 | 1F |
| 24-Aug | 110 | M | 1100 | 980 | 850 | 15 |
| 24-Aug | 111 | M | 750 | 680 | 585 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 112 | F | 1000 | 905 | 800 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 113 | F | 870 | 790 | 700 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 114 | M | 920 | 830 | 725 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 115 | F | 1010 | 915 | 810 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 116 | F | 900 | 820 | 720 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 117 | M | 990 | 885 | 760 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 118 | F | 930 | 855 | 750 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 119 | F | 785 | 720 | 630 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 120 | M | 890 | 805 | 705 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 121 | F | 855 | 775 | 680 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 122 | M | 845 | 750 | 655 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 123 | F | 840 | 770 | 685 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 124 | M | 960 | 870 | 750 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 125 | F | 850 | 775 | 690 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 126 | F | 900 | 820 | 725 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 127 | M | 560 | 510 | 440 | 12 |
| 24-Aug | 128 | F | 915 | 835 | 745 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 129 | F | 890 | 815 | 700 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 130 | F | 950 | 875 | 780 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 131 | M | 945 | 835 | 725 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 132 | F | 970 | 870 | 780 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 133 | F | 830 | 770 | 670 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 134 | F | 910 | 820 | 750 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 135 | F | 780 | 715 | 635 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 136 | M | 1045 | 925 | 790 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 137 | F | 850 | 785 | 690 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 138 | F | 880 | 805 | 715 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 139 | F | 865 | 785 | 690 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 140 | F | 925 | 845 | 755 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 141 | M | 890 | 785 | 695 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 142 | F | 970 | 890 | 775 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 143 | M | 800 | 705 | 610 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 144 | M | 1030 | 925 | 800 | no age |
| 24-Aug | 145 | F | 910 | 835 | 745 | 15 |
| 24-Aug | 146 | M | 895 | 795 | 685 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 147 | F | 885 | 800 | 705 | 14 |
| 24-Aug | 148 | M | 780 | 710 | 600 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 149 | F | 875 | 805 | 720 | 13 |
| 24-Aug | 150 | F | 885 | 800 | 720 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 151 | M | 1010 | 890 | 775 | M3 |
| 25-Aug | 152 | F | 930 | 840 | 745 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 153 | F | 850 | 775 | 675 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 154 | F | 810 | 740 | 655 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 155 | M | 1035 | 915 | 810 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 156 | F | 975 | 885 | 785 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 157 | M | 740 | 660 | 575 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 158 | M | 1030 | 905 | 790 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 159 | M | 860 | 775 | 685 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 160 | M | 885 | 795 | 680 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 161 | F | 890 | 810 | 730 | 14 |


| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25-Aug | 162 | F | 980 | 895 | 805 | 15 |
| 25-Aug | 163 | M | 780 | 700 | 600 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 164 | F | 865 | 790 | 700 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 165 | F | 960 | 875 | 780 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 166 | F | 805 | 735 | 650 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 167 | M | 870 | 780 | 680 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 168 | M | 870 | 800 | 700 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 169 | M | 800 | 720 | 620 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 170 | F | 890 | 815 | 720 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 171 | F | 870 | 795 | 690 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 172 | F | 900 | 825 | 710 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 173 | F | 885 | 805 | 715 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 174 | M | 840 | 760 | 675 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 175 | F | 840 | 770 | 685 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 176 | F | 920 | 845 | 740 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 177 | M | 775 | 700 | 610 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 178 | F | 895 | 820 | 725 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 179 | M | 745 | 670 | 570 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 180 | M | 920 | 820 | 710 | No age |
| 25-Aug | 181 | F | 940 | 860 | 750 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 182 | F | 875 | 800 | 705 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 183 | F | 950 | 870 | 760 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 184 | M | 660 | 585 | 515 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 185 | F | 785 | 715 | 635 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 186 | F | 870 | 790 | 690 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 187 | F | 865 | 790 | 700 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 188 | F | 980 | 885 | 770 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 189 | F | 845 | 770 | 690 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 190 | M | 760 | 680 | 585 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 191 | F | 790 | 720 | 630 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 192 | F | 885 | 810 | 720 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 193 | F | 880 | 805 | 695 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 194 | F | 930 | 850 | 725 | 15 |
| 25-Aug | 195 | F | 1020 | 925 | 815 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 196 | F | 920 | 840 | 735 | 14 |
| 25-Aug | 197 | F | 885 | 800 | 715 | M3 |
| 25-Aug | 198 | F | 825 | 745 | 655 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 199 | F | 890 | 820 | 720 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 200 | M | 995 | 880 | 775 | 13 |
| 25-Aug | 201 | F | 880 | 790 | 690 | 14 |

*European age format; e.g. 1.3 denotes a 5 year old fish with $1+$ years freshwater residence and 3 years marine residence
No age $=$ scales regenerate (center is missing from scale) or resorbed (growth at scale margin is missing)
$\mathrm{M}=$ Marine stage
F = Freshwater stage

Appendix 5. 2018 Big Salmon River environmental conditions.

| DATE | AIR TEMP. <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | WATER <br> TEMP. $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | WATER <br> LEVEL $(\mathbf{c m})$ | COMMENTS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 16-Jul | 10.0 | 10.0 | 56 | Foggy AM |
| 17-Jul | 10.0 | 11.0 | 55 | sunny |
| 18-Jul | 9.5 | 10.0 | 57 |  |
| 1-Jul | 5.0 | 10.0 | 56 | cloudy AM, sunny PM |
| 20-Jul | 10.0 | 11.0 | 57 | sunny, hot |
| 21-Jul | 11.0 | 11.5 | 54 | sunny, hazy, hot |
| 22-Jul | 10.0 | 12.0 | 50 | sunny, hazy, hot |
| 23-Jul | 12.0 | 13.0 | 47 | sunny, hot |
| 24-Jul | 11.0 | 14.0 | 44 | sunny, hot |
| 25-Jul | 13.0 | 13.5 | 41 | sunny, hot |
| 26-Jul | 14.0 | 14.0 | 39 | sunny, hot |
| 27-Jul | 15.0 | 14.5 | 37 | sunny, hot |
| 28-Jul | 12.0 | 16.0 | 35 | sunny, hot |
| 29-Jul | 14.0 | 16.0 | 34 | mostly sunny evening shower |
| 30-Jul | 9.0 | 16.0 | 32 | sunny, hot |
| 31-Jul | 13.0 | 15.0 | 31 | sun and cloud mix |
| 01-Aug | 12.0 | 16.0 | 29 | Smoky |
| 02-Aug | 8.0 | 15.0 | 28 | overcast |
| 03-Aug | 13.0 | 14.0 | 27 | Rain |
| 04-Aug | 14.0 | 14.0 | 26 | Rain |
| 05-Aug | 13.0 | 14.0 | 25 | Rain |
| 06-Aug | 12.0 | 14.0 | 25 | Overcast |
| 07-Aug | 11.0 | 12.5 | 29 | Rain |
| 08-Aug | 12.5 | 11.5 | 41 | Overcast |
| 09-Aug | 9.0 | 11.0 | 63 | sunny, below 0 overnight |
| 10-Aug | 7.5 | 10.0 | 88 | sun and cloud mix |
| 11-Aug | 6.0 | 9.0 | 101 | PM rain and wind |
| 12-Aug | 9.0 | 9.5 | 94 |  |
| 13-Aug | 13.0 | 10.5 | 76 | partially cloudy, river very turbid |
| 14-Aug | 10.0 | 11.0 | 70 | partially cloudy, river clearing |
| 15-Aug | 8.5 | 10.0 | 76 | partially cloudy with light rain |
| 16-Aug | 9.0 | 9.5 | 75 | sun with some clouds |
| 17-Aug | 6.5 | 9.0 | 69 | sun with a few clouds |
| 18-Aug | 8.0 | 9.0 | 67 | Overcast with some sunny periods |
| 19-Aug | 4.5 | 8.5 | 65 | Overcast |
| 20-Aug | 6.0 | 9.0 | 59 | Foggy AM |
| 21-Aug | 10.0 | 10.0 | 55 | sunny |

Note: Environmental conditions recorded at 0900h daily

Appendix 6. Comparison of Big Salmon River Chinook sonar counts and the JTC above border Chinook escapement estimates based on Eagle sonar counts, 2005-2018.


Note: The value labels are the yearly Big Salmon Chinook sonar counts.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Radio tagged Chinook were documented entering a tributary and subsequently retreating to the mainstem river and continuing their migration further up the system. Since the sonar station is located 1.5 km upstream from the confluence of the Yukon River the presence of straying Chinook could be expected.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The distribution observed from sonar data may not reflect the natural in-river migration pattern at this location as the weir structures channel the fish from an 80 m wide into a 36 m wide corridor.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Spawning escapement is the Eagle sonar count minus the catches in the U.S. upstream of the sonar station and in the Canadian fisheries.

