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#### Abstract

A multiple beam sonar unit was used to enumerate the Chinook salmon escapement to the Big Salmon River in 2019. The sonar was operated on the Big Salmon River for its fifteenth year at the same site used since 2005. Sonar operation began on July 14 and continued without interruption through August 21. A total escapement of 3,874 Chinook salmon was estimated to have passed the sonar site in 2019. The first Chinook salmon passing the Big Salmon sonar station was observed on July 14, the first day of operations. Fifty percent of the run had passed the sonar by August 5 and $90 \%$ by August 14. Based on the 2019 Big Salmon sonar count and above border escapement estimates from the Eagle sonar project, the Big Salmon run comprised approximately $9.3 \%$ of the total above border Chinook Salmon escapement. A total of 105 Chinook carcass samples was 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 2019 Big Salmon River sonar project marks the fifteenth year that Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) enumeration has been conducted on this system by Metla Environmental Inc. (MEI). This report is a summary of the results of the 2019 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 2019 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.

A four year juvenile Chinook salmon study was conducted by DFO on the Big Salmon system between 2015 and 2018. The Big Salmon sonar camp belonging to MEI was used as a base for the juvenile Chinook study over those years. The Big Salmon sonar project will continue to provide supportive data quantifying the adult returns from previous years of the juvenile Chinook out-migrant study. The juvenile out-migrant study corroborates the JTC Research objective of developing scientifically-based escapement objectives for Canadian-origin salmon. Continued provision of annual Chinook escapement estimates into the Big Salmon system will be an integral component of the data required to complete the juvenile Chinook study.

Based on the 2005-2019 sonar operations, the Big Salmon River has been shown to be a significant contributor to upper Yukon River Chinook production. The 2005-2018 average Big Salmon sonar count is 5,487 (range 1,329 to 10,078 ). These counts represented an average of $10.2 \%$ (range $8.3 \%-15.8 \%$ ) of the total average upper Yukon River Chinook spawning escapement estimate for these years (JTC 2019).

## 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 2019 Big Salmon sonar station.

## Objectives

The objectives of the 2019 Big Salmon River sonar project were:

1. To provide an accurate count of the total Chinook salmon escapement in the Big Salmon River using a multiple beam sonar unit.
2. To conduct a carcass pitch on the Big Salmon River to obtain age-sex-length (ASL) data from as many post-spawned Chinook as possible with a target goal of $5 \%$ of the total run.

## 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 15 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 13. The sonar apparatus was operational beginning 18:00 on July 14.

## 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. This site had a bottom profile the most conducive to complete ensonification of the water column.

## 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 2019).


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.


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

## ARIS 1800 Sonar, Placement and Software Configuration

An ARIS model 1800 sonar, owned by MEI and manufactured by Sound Metrics Corporation, was used for the 2019 Big Salmon sonar project. Sound Metrics are currently the primary manufacturers of multi-beam sonars employed for enumerating migrating salmon in riverine environments.

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 (Figure 4). 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 ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ ). 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.

The sonar unit was placed in the river 1.5 m upstream of the south bank diversion fence and remained in this position for the duration of the project. 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 2019 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. Daily adjustments to the sonar aiming configuration were performed in response to fluctuating water levels.


Figure 4. Sonar transducer unit and mounting stand.
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 or data transmission interruptions.

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:

$$
P_{m}=\underline{X_{\mathrm{a}}} \underline{2}+X_{\underline{\mathrm{b}}}
$$

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.

[^0]
## 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 14 days of sonar operation, over the periods July 25 through August 6, 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:

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

where Xij is the ith count of the j th event and Xj is the average count of the j th 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 only files that had a total Chinook count of 7 fish or higher were used to determine the precision of counts.

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 accomplish 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 145 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 hypural) were recorded to the nearest 0.5 cm . Five scales were taken from each fish and placed on scale cards for age determination. Information was collected on the egg retention of the sampled females. 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 2019 Big Salmon River Chinook run timing was within the range of the previous 14 year average for this stock (Figure 5). The first Chinook salmon was observed on July 14, on the first day of operations. The run reached $50 \%$ passage on August 5 and $90 \%$ of the run had passed the station by August 14. Daily and cumulative counts are presented in Appendix 1 and Figure 5.

A total of 3,865 targets identified as Chinook salmon was counted past the sonar station from July 14 through to August 21. Short interruptions in sonar recording due to maintenance or power interruptions resulted in a total of $1 \mathrm{hr}, 45 \mathrm{~min}$ recording loss. 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 12 days of the sonar counts and the polynomial $\mathrm{y}=0.396 \mathrm{x} 2-17.78 \mathrm{x}+$ 172.95. This extrapolation added 9 fish to bring the total count to 3,874 . A total of 24 Chinook salmon ( $0.6 \%$ of the total escapement) was recorded moving downstream during the 2019 project.


Figure 5. Daily counts of Chinook salmon passing the Big Salmon River sonar station in 2019 and average daily counts 2005 through 2018.

The 2019 Big Salmon Chinook sonar count of 3,874 was below (28\%) the 2005 - 2018 average of 5,398 (Figure 6, Appendix 2).


Figure 6. Annual sonar counts for Big Salmon sonar project 2005-2019.

## Precision of Counts

Of the 2,790 sonar files recorded and analysed, a total of 36 was reviewed by a second reader (Table 1). A total of 290 fish was counted in the 36 files by the first reviewer. Of the 36 files reviewed by a second reader, 6 files ( $16 \%$ ) exhibited a discrepancy in the count between readers (Appendix 3). Three files had one additional fish each and 3 files yielded 3 less fish. There was no net difference between the total number of fish counted in the first iteration and the subsequent review.

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

|  | Count | \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total files recorded during project | 2,790 |  |
| Total files double reviewed | 36 | $1.2 \%$ |
| Total fish counted first iteration | 290 |  |
| Total fish counted second iteration | 290 |  |
| Total files with + divergence | 3 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Total files with - divergence | 3 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Total Files with divergence | 6 | $22.9 \%$ |
| Net difference in target count | 0 | $0 \%$ |

The CV was calculated for all reviewed files. The CV for this subset was $9.9 \%$.

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 $=0.96,(\mathrm{R} \mathrm{36;} \mathrm{p}<0.001)$.


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 2019 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.

## Carcass Pitch

The carcass pitch was conducted from August 22 through to August 25. A total of 105 dead or moribund Chinook was recovered. Mean length and age data is presented in Table 2. Of the total, 67 (64\%) fish were female and $38(36 \%)$ fish were male. Complete age data was determined from 84 of the Chinook sampled; the remaining 21 samples yielded partial or no ages due to regenerate scales. Females were predominately age-6 (1.4) (35\%) and males predominantly age-5 (1.3) (14\%). Complete age, length and sex data are presented in Appendix 4.
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Figure 8. 2019 Big Salmon River Chinook range/frequency in cross section profile.
Note: The $0-4 \mathrm{~m}$ range from the sonar has a deflection fence in place.
Table 2. Age, length, and sex of Chinook sampled from the Big Salmon River, 2019.

| SEX | AGE | Mean MEF (mm) | Count | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 1.3 | 811 | 9 | $8 \%$ |
|  | 1.4 | 830 | 42 | $35 \%$ |
|  | 1.5 | 865 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
|  | M2 | 790 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
|  | M3 | 819 | 5 | $4 \%$ |
|  | M4 | 855 | 4 | $3 \%$ |
|  | M5 | 920 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Female total |  |  | 63 | $53 \%$ |
| Male | 1.1 | 510 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
|  | 1.3 | 712 | 17 | $14 \%$ |
|  | 1.4 | 806 | 14 | $12 \%$ |
|  | M2 | 600 | 2 | $2 \%$ |
|  | M3 | 695 | 2 | $2 \%$ |
|  | M4 | 720 | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Male total |  |  | 37 | $31 \%$ |
| Total |  |  | 100 | $84 \%$ |

## DISCUSSION

The 2019 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 significant interruptions. Water levels at the sonar station were considered average with no extreme high water events affecting the sonar operation (Appendix 5).

There was a high degree of precision between file readers for all files reviewed. The total count of the fish in the double reviewed files (290) was identical between reviewers

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 2019 Eagle sonar project on the Yukon River downstream of the Canada/U.S. border yielded a total count of 45,560 Chinook. The above border spawning escapement ${ }^{3}$ estimate was 41,786 (DFO Whitehorse, unpublished data). Based on the Big Salmon and Eagle Chinook sonar counts, the Big Salmon stock contributed $9.3 \%$ of the total above border Chinook escapement in 2019. A comparison of Big Salmon River Chinook sonar counts and the JTC above border Chinook escapement estimates based on Eagle sonar counts (2005-2019) 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).

A DFO juvenile Chinook salmon research project was conducted on the Big Salmon River from 2014 through 2018. The adult salmon returns from this period are expected to occur through to 2023. Annual Big Salmon sonar Chinook escapement estimates would continue to contribute to this juvenile Chinook research project.
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Appendix 1. 2019 daily and cumulative counts of Chinook salmon at the Big Salmon River sonar site.

| DATE | DAILY COUNT | CUMULATIVE | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14-Jul | 2 | 2 | Weir complete at 18:00 hrs. Partial Daily Count |
| 15-Jul | 20 | 22 |  |
| 16-Jul | 24 | 46 |  |
| 17-Jul | 41 | 87 |  |
| 18-Jul | 20 | 107 |  |
| 19-Jul | 38 | 145 |  |
| 20-Jul | 46 | 191 |  |
| 21-Jul | 47 | 238 |  |
| 22-Jul | 48 | 286 |  |
| 23-Jul | 54 | 340 |  |
| 24-Jul | 45 | 385 |  |
| 25-Jul | 66 | 451 |  |
| 26-Jul | 66 | 517 |  |
| 27-Jul | 106 | 623 |  |
| 28-Jul | 113 | 736 |  |
| 29-Jul | 164 | 900 |  |
| 30-Jul | 159 | 1059 |  |
| 31-Jul | 168 | 1227 |  |
| 01-Aug | 183 | 1410 |  |
| 02-Aug | 164 | 1574 |  |
| 03-Aug | 170 | 1744 |  |
| 04-Aug | 159 | 1903 |  |
| 05-Aug | 230 | 2133 |  |
| 06-Aug | 184 | 2317 |  |
| 07-Aug | 230 | 2547 |  |
| 08-Aug | 198 | 2745 |  |
| 09-Aug | 174 | 2919 |  |
| 10-Aug | 158 | 3077 |  |
| 11-Aug | 134 | 3211 |  |
| 12-Aug | 115 | 3326 |  |
| 13-Aug | 106 | 3432 |  |
| 14-Aug | 126 | 3558 |  |
| 15-Aug | 75 | 3633 |  |
| 16-Aug | 60 | 3693 |  |
| 17-Aug | 44 | 3737 |  |
| 18-Aug | 46 | 3783 |  |
| 19-Aug | 37 | 3820 |  |
| 20-Aug | 28 | 3848 |  |
| 21-Aug | 17 | 3865 |  |
| 22-Aug | 8 | 3874 |  |
| 23-Aug | 1 |  |  |
|  |  | Feas daily count estimate based on extrapolation |  |

Yellow cells denote daily extrapolated counts based on the previous 12 days of sonar counts using the polynomial equation: $y=0.396 x^{2}-17.78 x+172.95$

Appendix 2．Daily and average Chinook counts in the Big Salmon River，2005－2019．

| DATE | Daily <br> Count $2005$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Count } \\ & \hline 2006 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Count } \\ & \hline 2007 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Daily <br> Count <br> 2008 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Count } \\ & \hline 2009 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Daily <br> Count <br> 2010 | Daily <br> Count <br> 2011 | Daily <br> Count <br> 2012 | Daily <br> Count <br> 2013 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Count } \\ & \hline 2014 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \\ \hline 2015 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Daily <br> Count <br> 2016 | Daily <br> Count $2017$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Daily } \\ \text { Count } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Count } \\ & \hline 2019 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Daily Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11－Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 12－Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |  | 11 |  |  |  | 15 |
| 13－Jul | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |  | 27 |  |  |  | 26 |
| 14－Jul | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |  | 36 |  |  | 2 | 23 |
| 15－Jul | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | 5 | 57 |  | 1 | 20 | 21 |
| 16－Jul | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 90 | 17 | 56 | 11 | 4 | 24 | 20 |
| 17－Jul | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 2 |  | 0 | 115 | 25 | 56 | 22 | 2 | 41 | 23 |
| 18－Jul | 23 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 39 | 82 | 19 | 2 | 20 | 26 |
| 19－Jul | 13 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 11 |  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 72 | 113 | 32 | 13 | 38 | 36 |
| 20－Jul | 23 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 81 | 126 | 58 | 23 | 46 | 42 |
| 21－Jul | 36 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 47 | 7 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 229 | 117 | 171 | 82 | 38 | 47 | 54 |
| 22－Jul | 58 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 68 | 14 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 284 | 148 | 226 | 144 | 51 | 48 | 72 |
| 23－Jul | 92 | 11 | 18 | 1 | 85 | 12 | 43 | 0 | 2 | 345 | 217 | 174 | 197 | 71 | 54 | 88 |
| 24－Jul | 130 | 21 | 26 | 2 | 135 | 7 | 44 | 0 | 4 | 343 | 312 | 271 | 235 | 91 | 45 | 111 |
| 25－Jul | 158 | 20 | 52 | 1 | 201 | 12 | 50 | 1 | 3 | 356 | 411 | 240 | 211 | 118 | 66 | 127 |
| 26－Jul | 204 | 53 | 88 | 3 | 226 | 14 | 56 | 1 | 11 | 372 | 538 | 292 | 212 | 136 | 66 | 151 |
| 27－Jul | 219 | 95 | 153 | 5 | 346 | 27 | 105 | 1 | 25 | 421 | 494 | 428 | 281 | 168 | 106 | 192 |
| 28－Jul | 287 | 146 | 237 | 9 | 498 | 46 | 160 | 3 | 44 | 307 | 531 | 430 | 243 | 242 | 113 | 220 |
| 29－Jul | 290 | 230 | 287 | 9 | 532 | 83 | 192 | 15 | 86 | 380 | 588 | 394 | 192 | 273 | 164 | 248 |
| 30－Jul | 299 | 321 | 337 | 29 | 594 | 123 | 218 | 12 | 83 | 330 | 586 | 409 | 317 | 326 | 159 | 276 |
| 31－Jul | 279 | 368 | 400 | 21 | 808 | 141 | 218 | 23 | 150 | 256 | 492 | 377 | 432 | 310 | 168 | 296 |
| 01－Aug | 333 | 357 | 435 | 23 | 578 | 159 | 260 | 62 | 196 | 207 | 568 | 362 | 390 | 272 | 183 | 292 |
| 02－Aug | 346 | 379 | 331 | 18 | 715 | 182 | 313 | 76 | 220 | 207 | 485 | 329 | 363 | 265 | 164 | 293 |
| 03－Aug | 303 | 358 | 304 | 16 | 725 | 216 | 417 | 138 | 264 | 192 | 441 | 309 | 341 | 270 | 170 | 298 |
| 04－Aug | 292 | 413 | 258 | 31 | 595 | 226 | 426 | 156 | 262 | 190 | 451 | 245 | 309 | 333 | 159 | 290 |
| 05－Aug | 331 | 496 | 210 | 51 | 559 | 215 | 396 | 196 | 261 | 170 | 452 | 235 | 241 | 303 | 230 | 290 |
| 06－Aug | 214 | 490 | 178 | 55 | 452 | 221 | 400 | 228 | 225 | 120 | 469 | 222 | 181 | 264 | 184 | 260 |
| 07－Aug | 188 | 464 | 147 | 78 | 364 | 227 | 317 | 192 | 191 | 114 | 449 | 177 | 181 | 248 | 230 | 238 |
| 08－Aug | 232 | 464 | 59 | 61 | 295 | 242 | 294 | 235 | 195 | 96 | 397 | 161 | 115 | 168 | 198 | 214 |
| 09－Aug | 234 | 360 | 74 | 70 | 270 | 248 | 243 | 183 | 156 | 68 | 348 | 157 | 116 | 100 | 174 | 187 |
| 10－Aug | 203 | 349 | 90 | 98 | 209 | 183 | 160 | 154 | 132 | 61 | 246 | 101 | 84 | 93 | 158 | 155 |
| 11－Aug | 124 | 348 | 82 | 122 | 183 | 207 | 170 | 106 | 134 | 50 | 217 | 77 | 85 | 114 | 134 | 144 |
| 12－Aug | 126 | 324 | 98 | 107 | 146 | 174 | 143 | 130 | 113 | 46 | 187 | 79 | 72 | 99 | 115 | 131 |
| 13－Aug | 125 | 243 | 77 | 109 | 118 | 181 | 100 | 110 | 101 | 25 | 201 | 58 | 80 | 131 | 106 | 118 |
| 14－Aug | 72 | 196 | 74 | 89 | 117 | 134 | 85 | 81 | 77 | 30 | 126 | 63 | 65 | 103 | 126 | 96 |
| 15－Aug | 57 | 180 | 66 | 78 | 65 | 114 | 89 | 80 | 65 | 24 | 113 | 52 | 53 | 72 | 75 | 79 |
| 16－Aug | 40 | 172 | 56 | 70 | 55 | 82 | 63 | 94 | 57 | 24 | 91 | 33 | 51 | 76 | 60 | 68 |
| 17－Aug | 53 | 104 | 40 | 49 | 63 | 80 | 35 | 70 | 34 | 17 | 65 | 26 | 54 | 66 | 44 | 53 |
| 18－Aug | 47 | 69 | 64 | 45 | 55 | 53 | 20 | 50 | 32 | 15 | 54 | 20 | 40 | 65 | 46 | 45 |
| 19－Aug | 35 | 87 | 37 | 17 | 43 | 40 | 18 | 44 | 21 | 14 | 28 | 10 | 32 | 54 | 37 | 34 |
| 20－Aug | 29 | 59 | 47 | 18 | 35 | 24 | 21 | 38 | 28 | S | 10 | 18 | 10 | 52 | 28 | 29 |
| 21－Aug | 26 | 45 | 11 | 15 | 28 | 18 | 11 | 27 | 20 | Q | ＋ | LS | 26. | 36 | 17 | 21 |
| 22－Aug | 19 | 50 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 38 | 2 | 19 | 10 | 6 |  | 12 | 22 | 3 | \％ | 19 |
| 23－Aug | 17 | 12 | 23 | 9 | 4 | 24 | 2 | 19 | 14 | － |  | $\theta$ | ＋1 | 25 | 1 | 13 |
| 24－Aug | － |  | 17 | 2 |  | 20 |  | 14 | 11 | K |  | 6. | 1 G | 20 |  | 12 |
| 25－Aug | 9 |  | 14 | 1 |  | 17 |  | \％ | 6 |  |  | 4 | 13 | 15 |  | 10 |
| 26－Aug | \％ 6 |  | 14 |  |  | 6 |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | \％ | 10 | 10 |  | 7 |
| 27－Aug | －ب |  | ＋3 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 5 |  | 6 |
| 28－Aug | ＜K－ |  | ＋ 4 |  |  |  |  | ＋+ ＋ | K |  |  |  | ＋+ S | － |  | 4 |
| 29－Aug |  |  | 世 |  |  |  |  | 世－ |  |  |  |  | 世＋ |  |  | 5 |
| 30－Aug |  |  | － |  |  |  |  | K |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 31－Aug |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 01－Sep |  |  | －4． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 02－Sep |  |  | －\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| TOTAL： | 5618 | 7308 | 4506 | 1329 | 9261 | 3817 | 5156 | 2584 | 3242 | 6321 | 10078 | 6761 | 5672 | 5159 | 3874 | 5379 |

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.

| File \# | Reviewer \#1 | Reviewer \#2 | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 7 | 8 | 1 |
| 2 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 3 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 4 | 7 | 8 | 1 |
| 5 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 6 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 7 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 8 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 10 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 11 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 12 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 13 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 14 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 15 | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| 16 | 13 | 12 | -1 |
| 17 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 18 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 19 | 8 | 7 | -1 |
| 20 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 21 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 22 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 23 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 24 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| 25 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 26 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 27 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 28 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 29 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 30 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 31 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 32 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 33 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 34 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 35 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 36 | 7 | 6 | -1 |
| Total | 290 | 290 | 0 |

Appendix 4. Age, sex, and length of sampled Chinook on the Big Salmon River, 2019.

| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { SPAWNED } \end{gathered}$ | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22-Aug | 1 | M |  | 1015 | 880 | 780 | 1.4 |
| 22-Aug | 2 | F | 100\% | 800 | 740 | 660 | 1.4 |
| 22-Aug | 3 | F | 100\% | 950 | 870 | 765 | 1.3 |
| 22-Aug | 4 | M |  | 685 | 620 | 540 | 1.3 |
| 22-Aug | 5 | M |  | 875 | 775 | 685 | 1.3 |
| 22-Aug | 6 | F | N/A | 910 | 830 | 745 | 1.3 |
| 22-Aug | 7 | F | 0\% | 870 | 790 | 700 | M2 |
| 22-Aug | 8 | M |  | 770 | 690 | 610 | 1.3 |
| 22-Aug | 9 | F | N/A | 920 | 840 | 750 | 1.4 |
| 22-Aug | 10 | F | 100\% | 970 | 885 | 790 | 1.4 |
| 22-Aug | 11 | F | 100\% | 925 | 850 | 750 | 1.4 |
| 22-Aug | 12 | F | 100\% | 940 | 850 | 760 | M4 |
| 22-Aug | 13 | M |  | 560 | 510 | 445 | 1.1 |
| 22-Aug | 14 | F | N/A | 875 | 800 | 710 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 15 | M |  | 870 | 770 | 670 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 16 | M |  | 1050 | 930 | 815 | no age |
| 23-Aug | 17 | M |  | 760 | 675 | 590 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 18 | F | 100\% | 930 | 860 | 770 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 19 | F | 100\% | 920 | 830 | 735 | no age |
| 23-Aug | 20 | M |  | 640 | 585 | 530 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 21 | M |  | 775 | 690 | 600 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 22 | M |  | 780 | 700 | 620 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 23 | M |  | 750 | 660 | 585 | M2 |
| 23-Aug | 24 | F | 10\% | 830 | 760 | 670 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 25 | M |  | 830 | 740 | 650 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 26 | M |  | 800 | 720 | 635 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 27 | F | 100\% | 850 | 770 | 680 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 28 | M |  | 680 | 620 | 550 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 29 | M |  | 760 | 680 | 600 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 30 | F | 100\% | 930 | 830 | 750 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 31 | F | 100\% | 990 | 890 | 810 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 32 | F | 100\% | 890 | 820 | 730 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 33 | F | 100\% | 950 | 865 | 770 | 1.5 |
| 23-Aug | 34 | F | 100\% | 920 | 840 | 750 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 35 | F | 100\% | 960 | 880 | 780 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 36 | F | 10\% | 915 | 820 | 745 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 37 | F | 100\% | 950 | 865 | 775 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 38 | F | 100\% | 880 | 810 | 720 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 39 | M |  | 940 | 835 | 730 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 40 | F | 100\% | 880 | 815 | 720 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 41 | F | N/A | 895 | 815 | 700 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 42 | M |  | 910 | 810 | 710 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 43 | M |  | 730 | 660 | 570 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 44 | M |  | 1010 | 895 | 790 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 45 | M |  | 830 | 750 | 660 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 46 | M |  | 590 | 540 | 470 | M2 |
| 23-Aug | 47 | F | 100\% | 895 | 815 | 730 | no age |
| 23-Aug | 48 | M |  | 1000 | 870 | 760 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 49 | F | 100\% | 910 | 830 | 755 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 50 | M |  | 920 | 830 | 735 | 1.4 |


| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { SPAWNED } \end{gathered}$ | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23-Aug | 51 | F | 100\% | 945 | 860 | 775 | M4 |
| 23-Aug | 52 | F | 100\% | 900 | 815 | 740 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 53 | M |  | 780 | 700 | 630 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 54 | F | 100\% | 890 | 810 | 715 | M3 |
| 23-Aug | 55 | F | 100\% | 1015 | 920 | 840 | M5 |
| 23-Aug | 56 | F | 100\% | 895 | 810 | 720 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 57 | M |  | 795 | 710 | 620 | 1.3 |
| 23-Aug | 58 | F | 100\% | 950 | 865 | 775 | 1.4 |
| 23-Aug | 59 | M |  | 1015 | 905 | 795 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 60 | F | N/A | 950 | 870 | 770 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 61 | F | 100\% | 955 | 880 | 785 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 62 | F | 100\% | 980 | 900 | 810 | M4 |
| 24-Aug | 63 | F | 100\% | 915 | 840 | 750 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 64 | F | 10\% | 820 | 755 | 665 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 65 | F | 100\% | 940 | 860 | 775 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 66 | M |  | 940 | 830 | 710 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 67 | M |  | 760 | 670 | 590 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 68 | M |  | 650 | 590 | 515 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 69 | F | 100\% | 865 | 800 | 720 | M3 |
| 24-Aug | 70 | M |  | 805 | 725 | 620 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 71 | F | N/A | 1010 | 930 | 830 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 72 | M |  | 755 | 665 | 580 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 73 | F | 10\% | 860 | 795 | 705 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 74 | F | 100\% | 980 | 890 | 800 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 75 | F | N/A | 850 | 800 | 710 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 76 | F | 100\% | 870 | 790 | 710 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 77 | F | 100\% | 900 | 820 | 720 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 78 | M |  | 880 | 780 | 690 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 79 | M |  | 960 | 840 | 740 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 80 | M |  | 1050 | 910 | 815 | 1.3 |
| 24-Aug | 81 | F | N/A | 920 | 845 | 750 | 1.4 |
| 24-Aug | 82 | F | N/A | 970 | 905 | 810 | 1F |
| 25-Aug | 83 | M |  | 830 | 740 | 650 | 1.3 |
| 25-Aug | 84 | F | 100\% | 870 | 790 | 705 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 85 | F | 50\% | 850 | 780 | 690 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 86 | F | 0\% | 900 | 820 | 730 | 1F |
| 25-Aug | 87 | F | 100\% | 920 | 840 | 740 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 88 | F | 10\% | 940 | 860 | 775 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 89 | F | 100\% | 950 | 860 | 760 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 90 | F | 100\% | 900 | 820 | 730 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 91 | F | 100\% | 910 | 830 | 730 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 92 | F | 100\% | 900 | 820 | 740 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 93 | F | N/A | 880 | 800 | 715 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 94 | F | 100\% | 880 | 800 | 710 | 1.3 |
| 25-Aug | 95 | F | 100\% | 900 | 825 | 730 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 96 | M |  | 925 | 820 | 720 | 1.3 |
| 25-Aug | 97 | F | 100\% | 890 | 815 | 740 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 98 | F | 100\% | 930 | 850 | 755 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 99 | F | 100\% | 890 | 810 | 730 | M4 |
| 25-Aug | 100 | F | 80\% | 825 | 750 | 680 | 1.4 |


| DATE | FISH \# | SEX | \% <br> SPAWNED | FL (mm) | MEF (mm) | POHL (mm) | AGE * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25-Aug | 101 | F | $100 \%$ | 890 | 810 | 720 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 102 | F | $100 \%$ | 835 | 760 | 680 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 103 | F | $50 \%$ | 860 | 790 | 700 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 104 | F | $100 \%$ | 950 | 860 | 765 | 1.4 |
| 25-Aug | 105 | M |  | 930 | 820 | 720 | 1.4 |

*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
N/A = Partially decomposed or consumed, no assessment.

Appendix 5. 2019 Big Salmon River Environmental Conditions - Recorded at 0900h Daily

| DATE | AIR TEMP. <br> $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathbf{C}\right)$ | WATER <br> TEMP. $\left({ }^{\circ}\right.$ C $)$ | WATER <br> LEVEL (cm) | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14-Jul | 10.0 | 14.0 |  | Sunny in am, cloudy and showers after 16:00 |
| 15-Jul | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | Sunny in am. |
| 16-Jul | 10.0 | 14.0 |  | partial clouds |
| 17-Jul | 10.0 | 14.0 |  | partial clouds |
| 18-Jul | 12.0 | 14.0 |  | warm, partial clouds, threatening thunder in eve |
| 19-Jul | 14.0 | 14.0 | 36 | light drizzle turning to rain in the evening |
| 20-Jul | 12.0 | 14.0 | 38 | cloudy morning |
| 21-Jul | 12.0 | 14.0 | 41 | heavy rain in the morning until late afternoon |
| 22-Jul | 12.0 | 14.0 | 45 | cloudy morning, no rain |
| 23-Jul | 12.0 | 14.0 | 50 | cloudy morning, series of short rains |
| 24-Jul | 8.0 | 13.5 | 52 | Cloudy morning, no rain |
| 25-Jul | 10.0 | 13.5 | 50 | Sunny, partial clouds |
| 26-Jul | 13.0 | 13.5 | 48 | Sunny, partial clouds |
| 27-Jul | 13.0 | 13.0 | 46 | Sunny, partial clouds |
| 28-Jul | 12.0 | 13.0 | 44 | Cloudy |
| 29-Jul | 10.5 | 12.0 | 44 | cloudy |
| 30-Jul | 12.0 | 12.0 | 50 | sunny with some clouds, light rain in evening |
| 31-Jul | 9.0 | 12.0 | 50 | Sunny, partial clouds |
| 01-Aug | 9.0 | 12.5 | 46 | Sunny, partial clouds, light rain in eve |
| 02-Aug | 9.0 | 12.5 | 44 | cloudy |
| 03-Aug | 14.0 | 13.0 | 42 | sunny and hot |
| 04-Aug | 10.0 | 14.5 | 38 | overcast with some clouds |
| 05-Aug | 15.0 | 14.5 | 38 | overcast light rain |
| 06-Aug | 10.0 | 13.5 | 37 | overcast, rain |
| 07-Aug | 11.5 | 13.5 | 37 | partial sun and cloud |
| 08-Aug | 5.0 | 12.0 | 38 | sunny and cool |
| 09-Aug | 4.0 | 11.0 | 37 | sunny and cool |
| 10-Aug | 7.0 | 11.0 | 36 | partial clouds, light rain |
| 11-Aug | 7.0 | 11.0 | 34 | rainy, windy and cool |
| 12-Aug | 7.0 | 11.0 | 33 | partial cloud, cool |
| 13-Aug | 7.0 | 11.0 | 32 | light rain, cool |
| 14-Aug | 12.0 | 12.0 | 32 | rain and cool |
| 15-Aug | 10.0 | 11.5 | 35 | rain and cool |
| 16-Aug | 7.0 | 11.0 | 39 | rain |
| 17-Aug | 5.0 | 10.5 | 45 | sunny and cool |
| 18-Aug | 4.0 | 9.0 | 73 | sunny and cool |
| 19-Aug | 4.0 | 8.0 | 65 | sunny and cool |
| 20-Aug | 1.0 | 8.0 | 65 | sunny and cool |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix 6. Comparison of Big Salmon River Chinook sonar counts and the JTC above border Chinook escapement estimates based on Eagle sonar counts, 2005-2019.


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.

