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This annual report on the Puget Sound Chinook Comprehensive Harvest Management Plan summarizes harvest information about commercial salmon fisheries occurring between May 1, 2018 and April 30, 2019, and Chinook spawning escapement in 2018. It also includes harvest information relevant to the 2017-2018 non-treaty sport fishing season and a review of the coded wire tag sampling rates in fisheries during calendar year (January-December) 2017.

Commercial Chinook catch in Puget Sound pre-terminal fisheries was substantially lower than projected pre-season. Commercial catches in some terminal areas were above expectations, primarily in fisheries targeting higher than anticipated terminal hatchery runs (i.e. Bernie Kai-Kai, Gorst Creek, and Hoodsport Hatcheries).

Marine and freshwater landed recreational Chinook catch, based on catch record cards, in the 2017-2018 season was estimated at 56,758 and was $36 \%$ higher than the pre-season projection of 41,763. Creel survey-based estimates of catch in 2018-2019 mark-selective recreational fisheries in Areas 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11 are included in this report. Total encounter estimates for the 2018-19 summer marine area selective fisheries are presented and compared to pre-season projections for these areas.

Escapement for summer/fall populations varied between management units with greater than projected escapement for some management units (Snohomish, Green, Puyallup, and Skokomish R. falls) while others were below preseason projections (Skagit R summer/falls, Stillaguamish R. summer/falls, Cedar R fall, Nisqually, and Mid Hood Canal).

Coded-wire tag sampling rates for calendar year 2017 commercial fisheries exceeded 20\% in most areas except for Tulalip Bay, MCA 13, Hood Canal terminal areas, and Strait of JDF troll fishery. Sampling rates for marine recreational fisheries exceeded the 10\% objectives in all areas except marine areas 12 and 13.

## 1 Introduction

The Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Management Plan mandates annual reporting of the performance of Chinook harvest management relative to the standards and guidelines of the plan (PSIT and WDFW 2010). This report partially fulfills that requirement and that of the Terms and Conditions in the 2018 Harvest Biological Opinion (F/WCR-2018-9134) by assessing the performance and effectiveness of treaty and non-treaty commercial fishery management actions adopted for the most recent management year, May 2018 through April 2019. Included in this report are:

- Management objectives for the 2018-2019 management year (May 1, 2018 through April 30, 2019)
- Projected and actual commercial landed catch in Puget Sound and descriptions of fisheries for the 2018-2019 management year
- Projected and actual landed catch for 2018 Puget Sound recreational fisheries where creel surveys were conducted and for all 2017 Puget Sound recreational sport fisheries
- Estimates of total encounters for mark-selective fisheries and non-landed mortality for commercial fisheries with Chinook non-retention where data are available.
- Projected and actual spawning escapement for all Puget Sound Chinook populations in 2018 with details on estimation methods and surveys.
- Summaries of biological sampling of spawning escapement, and estimates of contributions of hatchery- and natural-origin spawners where available.
- Coded-wire tag sampling rates for commercial and recreational fisheries in calendar year 2017 (January to December, 2017).


### 1.1 Management Objectives

General management objectives for Puget Sound Chinook populations, including Exploitation Rate Ceilings (ERCs), Critical Exploitation Rate Ceilings (CERC's), Upper Management Thresholds (UMTs), and Low Abundance Thresholds (LATs) were implemented in 2018 (Table 1-1). The final pre-season FRAM model run (Chin3218) highlighted the rates that were used as the ceilings for each Management Unit (MU) in 2018, and the projected exploitation rates and escapements for each unit (Table 1-2).

Pre-season fishery planning for 2018-2019 fisheries projected that natural spawning escapement would fall below the Low Abundance Thresholds (LAT) for the Nooksack early and Mid-Hood Canal MUs, so CERC's were implemented for those units. Escapement projections for other MUs exceeded their LAT's.

Table 1-1. 2018 Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Management Objectives.

| Management Unit | ER Ceiling | Critical ER Ceiling | Low Abundance Threshold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nooksack |  |  |  |
| North Fork <br> South Fork |  | 10.5\% SUS | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & 1,000 \end{aligned}$ |
| Skagit summer / fall | 47\% | 15\% SUS | 6,500 |
| Upper Skagit summer |  |  | 2,200 |
| Sauk summer |  |  | 400 |
| Lower Skagit fall |  |  | 900 |
| Skagit spring | 38\% | 18\% SUS | 690 |
| Upper Sauk |  |  | 130 |
| Cascade |  |  | 170 |
| Suiattle |  |  | 170 |
| Stillaguamish | 24\% Total/13\% SUS Max. | 8\% SUS Max. | 1,200 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Snohomish | 21\% | 15\% SUS | 3,375 |
| Skykomish |  |  | 2,092 |
| Snoqualmie |  |  | 700 |
| Lake Washington | 13\% PT SUS | 12\% SUS |  |
| Cedar River |  |  | 200 |
| Green | 13\% PTSUS | 12\% SUS | 805 |
| White River spring | 22\% SUS | 15\% SUS | 400 |
| Puyallup fall | 50\% | 15\% SUS | 319 |
| Nisqually | 47\% | 50\% Reduction of SUS ER | 7,000 |
| Skokomish | 48\% | 12\% PTSUS | $\begin{gathered} \text { 1,300 aggregate; } \\ \quad 800 \text { natural } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Mid-Hood Canal | 15\% PTSUS | 12\% PTSUS | 400 |
| Dungeness | 10\% SUS | 6\% SUS | 500 |
| Elwha | 10\% SUS | 6\% SUS | 1,500 |
| Western SJDF | 10\% SUS | 6\% SUS | 500 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Stillaguamish LAT is terminal runsize and does not account for terminal fishery impacts.

Table 1-2. Management guidelines implemented and projected exploitation rates and escapements for Puget Sound Chinook Management Units for 2018-2019 pre-season planning (FRAM Chin3218).

| Management Unit | ERC or CERC implemented | Projected ER | Projected Escapement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nooksack | 10.5\% SUS | 10.5\% SUS | 201 |
| Skagit summer fall | 47\% | 37.2\% | 12,219 |
| Skagit spring | 38\% | 28.4\% | 1,967 |
| Stillaguamish | 24\%Tota/13\% SUS | 20.8\%Total/ 12.2\% SUS | 1,551 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Snohomish | 21\% Total | 19.1\% | 3,382 |
| L. Washington (Cedar) | 13\% PT SUS | 12\% PT SUS | 1,722 |
| Green | $13 \%$ PT SUS | 12\% PT SUS | 5,079 |
| White | 22\% SUS | 18.9\% SUS | 1,945 |
| Puyallup | 50\% | 49.9\% | 1,713 |
| Nisqually | 47\% | 47.0\% | 16,576 |
| Skokomish | 48\% | 47.9\% | 2,432 |
| Mid Hood Canal | 12\% PT SUS | 12\% PT SUS | 365 |
| Dungeness | 10\% SUS | 3.3\% SUS | 810 |
| Elwha | 10\% SUS | 4.0\% SUS | 4,599 |
| Western SJDF | 10\% SUS | 2.2\% SUS | 1,295 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Stillaguamish LAT is forecasted terminal runsize and does not account for terminal fishery impacts.

## 2 Commercial Harvest

This chapter provides post-season estimates of Chinook catch for Puget Sound commercial fisheries, catch from tribal ceremonial and subsistence (C\&S) fisheries, and test or research fisheries. Catch is projected pre-season through modeling of the fishery regime, which is developed and agreed upon in the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) and North of Cape Falcon (NOF) forums, using the Fishery Regulation Assessment Model (FRAM). The 2018-19 List of Agreed Fisheries
(http://s3.amazonaws.com/nwifc-fisheriesservices/wp/wp-content/uploads/20180703102637/2018-19-LOAF-w-errata.pdf) describes all salmon fisheries for all areas of Puget Sound and ocean fisheries off the Washington coast. The final pre-season projections of catch under this regime were made in FRAM run number Chin3218.

Commercial, ceremonial and subsistence, and test fishery catch is accounted for on fish tickets, i.e., receipts from transactions between fishers and buyers. Fish ticket data are stored in joint databases maintained by WDFW and the Puget Sound Tribes. In some commercial fisheries with Chinook non-retention, particularly non-treaty purse seine fisheries, estimates of non-landed mortality are also available for comparison to preseason expectations (Table 2-8 and Table 2-9). WDFW conducts on-the-water observations of by-catch in commercial fisheries, concentrating on areas and gears where Chinook retention is not allowed.

Non-treaty troll, treaty troll, and recreational catches in Washington coastal fisheries north of Cape Falcon were less than their expected quotas (Table 2-1). Comparisons of projected and actual Puget Sound catch are provided for two pre-terminal areas (Strait of Juan de Fuca and San Juan Islands), and six regional terminal fisheries
(Nooksack/Samish, Skagit, Stillaguamish/Snohomish, South Puget Sound, Hood Canal, and Strait of Juan de Fuca). General information is presented for the 2018-19 fisheries, including in-season management actions that deviated from the pre-season plan, and explanations for differences in projected and actual catch.

Table 2-1. Projected and actual Chinook catch in waters of the Washington coast and Puget Sound fisheries in 2018.

| Fishery | Projected | Actual |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Washington ocean non-treaty troll | 27,500 | 23,889 |
| Washington ocean recreational | 27,500 | 11,821 |
| Washington ocean treaty troll | 40,000 | 23,903 |
|  |  |  |
| Puget Sound pre-terminal net \& troll total |  |  |
| Strait of Juan de Fuca troll | 4,035 | 1,946 |
| $\quad$ Strait of Juan de Fuca net | 508 | 2,144 |
| PSC Test Fishery |  | 43 |
| San Juan Islands net a | 7,974 | 4,459 |
|  |  |  |
| Nooksack-Samish terminal net | 17,302 | 10,631 |
| Skagit terminal net | 3,740 | 2,640 |
| Stillaguamish-Snohomish net | 5,699 | 9,868 |
| South Puget Sound terminal net | 41,757 | 44,574 |
|  |  |  |
| Hood Canal terminal net | 43,568 | 43,707 |
| Strait Tributaries terminal net | 5 | 0 |
| includes non-retention mortality in NT purse seine fishery. |  |  |

### 2.1 Strait of Juan de Fuca and San Juan Islands

Treaty net fisheries in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and the San Juan Islands caught 2,144 and 3,346 Chinook, respectively. Catch in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and San Juan Islands areas occurred mostly during the Fraser Sockeye directed fishery in the summer, primarily in August 2018.

Non-treaty fisheries targeting Fraser sockeye in Areas 7 and 7A landed 4 Chinook. Because purse seines are required to release all Chinook, release mortality estimates are calculated using available data from on-water by-catch monitoring. Post-season analysis estimated 1,086 Chinook mortalities in the sockeye fishery and 63 Chinook in the Chum fishery.

The PSC Fraser sockeye Test Fishery in Area 5 caught 43 chinook during July 2018.
The Treaty troll fishery in the Strait of Juan de Fuca (SJD), exclusive of catch in Area 4B when it was managed under PFMC quotas, caught 1,946 Chinook. Eight-hundred three Chinook were caught during the summer SJD troll fishery while 1,143 were caught during the winter SJD troll fishery.

### 2.2 Nooksack/Samish Terminal Area

## Treaty Spring Chinook Ceremonial and Subsistence Fishery

The Lummi Nation conducted fishing with tangle-net gear on 22 days from April 6 to June 29, 2018. Total landed catch was 394 hatchery-origin Chinook with an additional 17 natural-origin and 61 Skookum Creek hatchery-origin Chinook released. Genetic results for the released NORs indicated two of the NORs were assigned to South Fork origin, 14 were North Fork origin NORs, and one fall-run origin NOR. Applying the expected release mortality rate of $30 \%$ to the 16 early-run NOR encounters results in five NOR estimated mortalities and 18 Skookum Creek hatchery-origin release mortalities. The total encounter rate of NORs ( $n=17$ ) was lower than the pre-season projection of 35 fish.

In 2018, the Nooksack Tribe conducted a permit only, subsistence fishery on May $8^{\text {th }}, 18^{\text {th }}, 21^{\text {st }}$, $24^{\text {th }}$, and June $1^{\text {st }}, 2019^{\text {h }}$. A total of 72 Chinook were caught in the traditional C\&S fisheries and all were sampled. Sixty-seven of the 72 chinook were clipped indicating Kendall hatchery origin. Otolith results confirm that of the remaining five fish, two were natural origin with the remaining three fish most likely hatchery-origin fish but are awaiting additional laboratory analysis of biological samples to confirm origin. Genetic results for all NORs are still pending.

The Tribes 2018 total NOR mortality is estimated to be seven early-run NORs, pending additional analysis of remaining biological samples.

Table 2-2. Expected and observed Chinook catches in the Nooksack/Samish terminal area, 2018.

| Area | Management Period | Projected | Actual |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 7B, 7C, 7D, Treaty net ${ }^{1}$ | Chinook, coho, chum | 9,891 | 5,468 |
| 7B, 7C Non-treaty net | Chinook, coho, chum | 4,050 | 3,691 |
| Nooksack River Treaty net | Early Chinook, May-Jun | 1,167 | 489 |
|  | Fall Chinook, Aug-Oct | 2,194 | 983 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes 7A on-reservation catch during coho management.

## Fall Chinook, Coho, and Chum Fisheries

The tribal fall Chinook fishery in Bellingham Bay (Area 7B), and Lummi Bay (7D) operated as planned from August $1^{\text {st }}$ through September $7^{\text {th }}$ and in Samish Bay (7C) from August $1^{\text {st }}$ through September $14^{\text {th }}$, with a catch of 4,030 Chinook. The coho fishery operated as planned from September $9^{\text {th }}$ through October $20^{\text {th }}$, with an incidental harvest of 1,419 Chinook. During the 7 A on-reservation Coho fishery from September $9^{\text {th }}$ through October $3^{\text {rd }}, 19$ Chinook were incidentally harvested. No Chinook were harvested incidentally during the chum fishery. The total fall Chinook catch of 5,468 for Areas 7B, 7C and 7D was less than the preseason projection of 9,891 (Table 2-2).

The non-treaty fishery in Area 7B and 7C landed 3,691 Chinook from July through September, lower than the pre-season projection of 4,031 . Nineteen Chinook were forecasted to be landed during the chum fishery, with zero landed.

Fisheries for fall Chinook, coho, and chum in the Nooksack River occurred as planned from August 1 - September 8, Sept. 9 - October 20, and October 21 - December 12, respectively. The total Chinook catch was 983, less than the projected catch of 2,194 fish; 179 were caught
during the Chinook period and 804 during the coho fishery. No Chinook were harvested during the chum period.

### 2.3 Skagit Bay/Skagit River Terminal Areas

## Skagit Terminal Area Treaty Fisheries - 2018

Spring Chinook Fisheries: Treaty commercial fisheries in the Skagit terminal area directed at hatchery spring Chinook were conducted in 2018 as scheduled preseason, with some adjustments in timing. Incidental catch of spring Chinook also occurred during week 26 and 27 of the directed sockeye fishery, as Skagit River sub-areas 78D-2, 78D-3, 78D-4 were still in the spring management period during some or all of that time. A total of 172 wild and 1,164 hatchery spring Chinook were caught in these fisheries, compared to 286 wild and 856 hatchery spring Chinook expected pre-season based on Chinook FRAM 3218. An additional 18 hatchery spring Chinook were harvested for ceremonial purposes, compared to 30 wild and 45 hatchery expected.

Summer/Fall Chinook Fisheries: No treaty commercial fisheries directed at summer/fall Chinook were scheduled in the Skagit terminal area for 2018. However, as anticipated, incidental catch of summer/fall Chinook occurred in the sockeye and coho fisheries. The sockeye and coho fisheries were adjusted from the preseason schedule as noted in Table 2-3 due to in-season management needs and intertribal sharing agreements. Total summer/fall Chinook mortality in these fisheries was 639 fish, compared to the pre-season expectation of 1,220 based on Chinook FRAM 3218. An additional 214 summer/fall Chinook were harvested for ceremonial purposes, which was less than the pre-season modeled value of 700 .

Terminal Area Test Fisheries: A suite of Skagit terminal area test fisheries targeting steelhead, Chinook, sockeye, coho, and chum were conducted by the Skagit tribes in 2018. Some weeks of these fisheries were adjusted or cancelled, as noted in Table 2-3, in response to weather, flow concerns, or staffing issues. A total of 20 wild spring Chinook, 21 hatchery spring Chinook, and 392 summer/fall Chinook mortalities occurred in these fisheries. The preseason expectation of mortalities in the test fisheries was 52 wild spring Chinook, 44 hatchery spring Chinook, and 516 summer/fall Chinook.

Summary: Overall, a total of 192 wild spring Chinook, 1,203 hatchery spring Chinook, and 1,245 summer/fall Chinook were killed in treaty commercial, C\&S, and test fisheries. The preseason expectation based on FRAM Chin3218 was 368 wild springs, 945 hatchery springs, and 2,436 summer/falls.

Table 2-3. Skagit terminal area projected and actual Chinook catches for treaty fisheries in 2018 . Weekly projections were made by plugging the FRAM Chin3218 run sizes into the Skagit weekly harvest rate model, so totals may differ slightly from FRAM.

|  | Preseason Projected |  |  | Post-season Observed/Estimated |  |  | Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishery | Schedule | Encounters | Mortality | Schedule | Encounters | Mortality | Encounters | Mortality |
| Test: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chinook | 1 site, wks 19-35 | 182 | 182 | No week 19,24,26,27 | 122 | 122 | -60 | -60 |
| Sockeye | 2 sites: Area 3 wks 23-30, Blakes wks 24-29 | 87 | 87 | Area 3 Same; No Blakes weeks $24,27,28$ | 45 | 45 | -42 | -42 |
| Coho | 3 sites: Blakes wks $38-42$, Area 3 wks 34-42, Spudhouse wks 3544 | $340$ | 340 | Blakes no wk 45 but wks 34-37 and 43-44 added; Area 3 no wks $34,40,41$; Spudhouse no wks 40,43,44 but added wk 34 | 266 | 266 | -74 | -74 |
| Chum | 3 sites, wks 44-45 | 0 | 0 | No Jetty/Blakes wk 45, No Bay wks 44-45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steelhead | 2 sites, wks 8-17 | 10 | 2 | 2 sites, wks 8-17 | 1 | 0 | -9 | -2 |
| Area 8/78C Spring Chinook Fishery Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 19 | 3 days | 130 | 130 | None | 0 | 0 | -130 | -130 |
| Week 20 | 3 days | 173 | 173 | 1.292 days | 268 | 268 | 95 | 95 |
| Week 21 | 3 days | 129 | 129 | 2 days | 194 | 194 | 65 | 65 |
| Week 22 | None | 0 | 0 | 2 days | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| Area 78C/78D Spring Chinook Fishery Upper Skagit Tribe: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 19 | 0.833 day | 163 | 163 | 1 day | 348 | 348 | 185 | 185 |
| Week 20 | 0.833 day | 260 | 260 | 1 day | 256 | 256 | -4 | -4 |
| Week 21 | 0.833 day | 208 | 208 | None | 0 | 0 | -208 | -208 |
| Area 8/78C/78D Chinook C\&S Fishery Swinomish, Sauk-Suiattle, Upper Skagit Tribes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sum/Fall-Spring Chin. | As needed | 775 | 775 | As needed | 232 | 232 | -543 | -543 |
| Areas 8/78C Sockeye Fishery Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 26 | 3 days | 40 | 40 | 3 days | 45 | 45 | 5 | 5 |
| Week 27 | 5 days | 58 | 58 | 4.167 days | 73 | 73 | 15 | 15 |
| Week 28 | 5 days | 109 | 109 | 3.333 days | 58 | 58 | -51 | -51 |
| Week 29 | 5 days | 270 | 270 | None | 0 | 0 | -270 | -270 |
| Area 78D/780 Sockeye Fishery Swinomish Tribe: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 29 | 1 day | 4 | 4 | None | 0 | 0 | -4 | -4 |


|  | Preseason Projected |  |  | Post-season Observed/Estimated |  |  | Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Areas 78C/78D/780 Sockeye Fishery Upper Skagit Tribe (wks 27-30 Chinook non-retention): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 26 | . 833 day | 77 | 77 | 1.229 day | 124 | 124 | 47 | 47 |
| Week 27 | 0.542 day | 23 | 23 | 1.229 day | 50 | 50 | 27 | 27 |
| Week 28 | 0.542 day | 31 | 31 | None | 0 | 0 | -31 | -31 |
| Week 29 | 0.542 day | 36 | 36 | None | 0 | 0 | -36 | -36 |
| Areas 8/78C Coho Fishery Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 37 | 1 day | 69 | 69 | 1 day | 96 | 96 | 27 | 27 |
| Week 38 | 1 day | 87 | 87 | 1 day | 41 | 41 | -46 | -46 |
| Week 39 | 2 days | 41 | 41 | 2 days | 41 | 41 | 0 | 0 |
| Week 40 | 2 days | 15 | 15 | None | 0 | 0 | -15 | -15 |
| Week 41 | 1 day | 2 | 2 | 3.667 days | 1 | 1 | -1 | -1 |
| Week 42 | 1 day | 3 | 3 | 3.667 days | 0 | 0 | -3 | -3 |
| Areas 78C/78D Coho Fishery Upper Skagit Tribe: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Week 39 | 1 day | 187 | 187 | None | 0 | 0 | -187 | -187 |
| Week 40 | 1 day | 181 | 181 | 1.417 days | 164 | 164 | -17 | -17 |
| Week 41 | 0.833 day | 69 | 69 | 1 day | 78 | 78 | 9 | 9 |
| Week 42 | None | 0 | 0 | Same | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Week 43 | None | 0 | 0 | 1 day | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Areas 8/78C Chum Fishery Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | None | 0 | 0 | None | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Skagit Terminal Area: |  | 3,759 | 3,751 |  | 2,641 | 2,640 | -1,118 | -1,111 |

### 2.4 Stillaguamish/Snohomish Terminal Area

The tribal net fishery in Area 8A was open for the 2018/2019 fishing season for C\&S fishing and a one-month commercial coho fishery. One Chinook salmon was anticipated to be caught during the coho fishery, and 37 Chinook were harvested in the first two weeks of the fishery. Thirty-two Chinook, of the 100 set aside, were harvested for C\&S purposes (Table 2-4). Nontreaty commercial fishing in Area 8A was closed after less than one week due to higher than anticipated encounters of Chinook.

Tribal Chinook catch in Area 8D occurred from May through late-September, with most of the catch occurring during June. Total 8D catch was 9,766, including 95 for ceremonial or subsistence purposes (Table 2-4). Chinook catch was greater than projected in area 8D, however this terminal fishery primarily harvests hatchery fish.

Non-treaty Chinook catch in Area 8D was zero Chinook during the Coho fishery.
The Stillaguamish Tribes harvested 19 Chinook for ceremonial and subsistence purposes from the Stillaguamish River in 2018, and one Chinook incidentally harvested during the Coho fishery (Table 2-4).

Table 2-4. Projected (FRAM Chin3218) and actual Chinook net fishery harvest in the Stillaguamish - Snohomish terminal area in 2018.

| Area |  | Projected | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8A Commercial | Treaty | 1 | 37 |
|  | Treaty C\&S | Up to 100 | 32 |
|  | Ntrty | 2 | $13^{*}$ |
| 8A Test |  | 0 | 0 |
| 8D Commercial | Treaty | 5,490 | 9,671 |
|  | Treaty C\&S |  | 95 |
|  | Ntrty | 1 | 0 |
| Stillaguamish R. Net | Treaty C\&S | 105 | 20 |
| ${ }^{*}$ No landed chinook, composed entirely of release mortalities |  |  |  |

### 2.5 South Puget Sound Terminal Areas

Table 2-5. Projected and actual Chinook catch in 2018 South Puget Sound net fisheries.

| Area | Management Period | Projected | Actual |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Area 9/10/11 | Coho (A10 - Test) | 21 | 0 |
|  | Chum (A9 - Test) | 225 | 38 |
|  | A9 (Trty. C\&S + chum) | 511 | 18 |
|  | Trty coho/chum (A10/11) | 99 | 9 |
|  | NT chum (A10/11) | $203^{b}$ | $53^{\text {b }}$ |
| Area 10E | Treaty Chinook/coho/chum | 5,968 | 7,150 |
| Area 10A | Chinook (test/C\&S) | 511 | 175 |
|  | Chinook/Coho/chum | 1,249 | 424 |
| Duwamish River | Chinook/Coho/chum | 6,675 | 10,469 |
|  | Coho (Test/C\&S) |  | 36 |
| L Washington/Ship Canal | Sockeye/coho/ C\&S | 550 | 153 |
|  | Test/Research | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | -- |
| Lake Sammamish | Chinook | 0 | 0 |
| Puyallup River | Spring/Fall C\&S | 794 | 358 |
|  | Chinook/Coho | 3,754 | 6,225 |
| White River | Spring C\&S | --c | 560 |
| Areas 13, 13D-K | Chinook/Coho/Chum | 6,350 | 7,812 |
| Area 13A | Chinook/Coho/Chum | 5,140 | 2,182 |
| Areas 13C/Chambers | Chinook | 1,148 | 135 |
| Nisqually River | Chinook/coho | 8,568 | 8,298 |
| McCallister Cr. | Chinook |  | 479 |

a Fishery was non-retention for chinook and values reported as elease mortalities
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Values include landed catch and release mortalities
${ }^{\text {c }}$ White River C\&S Projected harvest is incorporated in the Puyallup River Spring/Fall C\&S catch of 455 fish.

## Marine Areas 9, 10 \& 11

The coho test fishery in area 10 was not implemented in 2018. The chum test fishery at Apple Cove Point (Area 9) incidentally caught a total of 38 Chinook (Table 2-5), well below the estimated 225.

The non-treaty chum-directed fishery in Area 10 and 11 incidentally harvested 22 Chinook along with 31 estimated release mortalities. The treaty coho fishery in Area 10 harvested nine Chinook, while harvesting zero Chinook during the chum fishery. Fisheries directed at Chinook and coho in Area 10E harvested 7,150 Chinook (Table 2-5). No Chinook were harvested during the chum fishery in area 10E.

Eighteen Chinook were harvested in Area 9 for C\&S purposes, while no Chinook were harvested during the chum fishery.

## Lake Washington

There were no Chinook directed fisheries in Lake Washington, the Ship Canal, or North Lake Washington. Sockeye returns to Lake Washington were insufficient to allow any directed fisheries. The Suquamish tribe conducted C\&S fisheries in the Lake Ship Canal targeting sockeye, with a total by-catch of 20 Chinook. Neither, the Muckleshoot Tribe nor Suquamish Tribe conducted any C\&S fishery on Chinook in the ship canal (fish ladder). Incidental Chinook catch during the coho fishery in Lake Union, and the upper and lower Ship Canal harvested 132 Chinook, which was less than expected. The Muckleshoot Tribe conducted a coho directed commercial fishery in North Lake Washington with a total by-catch of one Chinook. There were no coho directed fisheries in Lake Sammamish.

## Elliott Bay/Duwamish River

The Muckleshoot Tribe harvested 20 Chinook as C\&S in the Duwamish River in 2018. The Chinook test fishery in Area 10A harvested 175 Chinook in 2018. A Chinook-directed commercial fishery occurred in Area 10A and the Duwamish River, harvesting 378 and 9,259 Chinook salmon, respectively. In 10A, there were 46 Chinook caught in September during the coho directed fishery. In the Duwamish River, 16 Chinook were caught during the coho test fishery to determine Chinook clearance. During the coho directed fishery in the Duwamish River, 1,208 Chinook were caught incidentally and none during the chum fishery.

## Puyallup River and White Rivers

Ceremonial and subsistence fisheries in the Puyallup River caught 349 adult Chinook salmon along with nine jacks during management weeks $20-28$. Based on fisheries sampling data, approximately 53 of the adult and none of the jacks are assumed to be fall-run based on ad-clip marks. The Muckleshoot Tribe had an additional C\&S fishery in the White River which caught 560 Chinook. The pre-season projected C\&S catch was 794.

Fall Chinook catch was 3,667 during the Chinook fishery. The coho fishery occurred from management week 36 (September $2^{\text {nd }}$ ) to management week 42 (October $14^{\text {th }}$ ) and incidentally harvested 2,558 Chinook salmon, mostly during early September. Except for the estimated 53 fall Chinook captured during the spring Chinook C\&S fishery, no directed fall Chinook C\&S fisheries occurred (Table 2-5).

## Marine area 13 \& sub areas (Deep South Sound)

The Chinook fishery in Carr Inlet (13A) caught 2,180 Chinook (Table 2-5), in August and early September (weeks $32-36$ ). Pre-season projected catch was 5,075 . This fishery targets Minter Creek Hatchery Chinook returns where no natural origin fish are returning to spawn. The coho fishery in 13A incidentally harvested two Chinook in late-September, with a preseason expectation of 65 .

The Chinook fishery at Chambers Bay (13C) occurred between July 29 through October 13 with 135 Chinook harvested (Table 2-5). The preseason catch projection was 1,148.

Chinook directed fisheries in 13D and Budd Inlet (13F) occurred from early-August through early-September; total catch was 7,132 . Chinook caught incidentally during the coho fishery in (Week 37-44) 13D totaled 680 fish. Zero Chinook were caught during the Fox Island (Area 13) coho fishery. The total preseason catch projection for both areas was 6,350 .

## Nisqually River

The treaty commercial fishery in the Nisqually River harvested an estimated 8,298 Chinook, excluding jacks, but including fish for Ceremonial and Subsistence purposes, with a preseason projected commercial catch, excluding jacks, of 8,568 (Table 2-5).

### 2.6 Hood Canal

Tribal Chinook directed fishing in 12C occurred as planned from July 22 thru August 31 (weeks 30 $-35)$ with a catch of 5,853 . Three Chinook were landed in 12C in early-October during the coho directed fishery. In marine catch area 12B, one Chinook was harvested during the tribal coho directed fishery and one Chinook during the chum directed fishery. Catch exceeded pre-season expectations despite the returns consistent with expected levels for the Skokomish River.

Chinook harvest in the Hoodsport Hatchery Zone (12H) was 17,838 and occurred as planned from July 9 through September 13. Catch was less than the preseason expectation of 19,983.

Chinook harvest in the Skokomish River occurred as planned from August 6 through August 30 landing 9,971 fish with one additional Chinook caught during the first week of October in the Coho fishery. Chinook harvest also occurred in Purdy Creek (tributary of Skokomish River that feeds the George Adams Hatchery) to access Chinook returning to George Adams Hatchery each Saturday from July 7 through August 18 landing 1,666 fish.

In Port Gamble (Area 9A), 60 Chinook were harvested, primarily in mid-August to mid-September during coho fisheries.

Non-treaty commercial fisheries in the Hoodsport Zone (12C) harvested 9,978 Chinook salmon (Table 2-6). There were no Chinook landed in other non-treaty fisheries in Hood Canal in 2018 (Table 2-6 and Table 2-9).

Table 2-6. Pre-season projected and observed catch of Chinook in Hood Canal terminal area net fisheries in 2018.

| Area | Target Species | Projected | Actual |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| $(12,12 \mathrm{~B}-12 \mathrm{D}, 9 \mathrm{~A})(\mathrm{T})$ | Chin, coho, chum | 5,045 | 5,918 |
| $(12-12 \mathrm{C}, 9 \mathrm{~A})(\mathrm{NT})$ | chum, coho | 71 | $0^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| 12A Net (T) | Coho | 76 | 1 |
| 12H Net (T) | Chinook, chum | 19,983 | 17,838 |
| 12C Hoodsport Zone Net (NT) | Chinook, chum | 10,000 | 9,978 |
| Skokomish River (82G) (T) | Chin, coho, chum | 8,483 | 9,972 |
|  | (82J) (T) | Chinook |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Values reported are release mortalities.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Total does not include catch from area 82J.

### 2.7 Strait of Juan de Fuca

Due to the continued depressed status of Chinook populations, terminal fisheries in the Elwha River and Dungeness River were closed or provided very limited fishing opportunity, with no Chinook harvested in either terminal area in 2018.

Table 2-7. Projected and actual catches of Chinook in Strait of Juan de Fuca terminal net fisheries in 2018.

| Terminal Area | Projected | Actual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Area 6D \& Dungeness River Treaty | 0 | 0 |
| Area 6D Non-Treaty | 1 | 0 |
| Elwha River Treaty (C\&S) | 4 | 0 |
| Hoko River Treaty | 0 | 0 |

### 2.8 Non-Treaty Commercial Monitoring and Total Mortality

Because non-treaty vessels are required to release non-target species in many fisheries, WDFW conducts on-water monitoring to provide data on encounters of non-target species. Summaries of observer data for 2018 are presented in Table 2-8. Expanded estimates of total mortality, where available, were presented above in the summaries for individual fisheries, and are summarized and compared to pre-season expectations below in Table 2-9.

Table 2-8. Commercial fishery observation data for 2018 Puget Sound non-treaty salmon net fisheries.

| Area | Gear type | \# sets observed | Chinook | Coho | Sockeye | Pink | Chum | Steelhead |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | PS | 42 | 86 | 28 | 18,311 | 4 | 168 | 1 |
| 7A | PS | 41 | 73 | 53 | 3,115 | 1 | 328 | 0 |
| 8A | PS | 16 | 40 | 308 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 10 | PS | 24 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,883 | 0 |
| 11 | PS | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,566 | 0 |
| 12 | PS | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 877 | 0 |
| 12B | PS | 35 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 8,260 | 0 |
| 7 | GN | 10 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 1 | 25 | 1 |
| 7A | GN | 21 | 2 | 1 | 949 | 2 | 9 | 0 |
| 12 | GN | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 0 |
| 12B | GN | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 |

Table 2-9. Total pre-season projected and post-season estimated Chinook mortality (landed + released) in Puget Sound non-treaty commercial salmon fisheries in 2018.

|  | Total Mortality |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Projected | Actual |
| 6 D | 1 | 0 |
| $7 / 7 \mathrm{~A}$ | 3,123 | 1,149 |
| 8 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | Closed |
| 8 A | 2 | 13 |
| $10 / 11$ | 326 | 53 |
| $12 / 12 \mathrm{~B}$ | 67 | 0 |
| 12 C Hoodsport | 10,000 | 9,978 |
| 9A/12A | 8 | 0 |

## 3 Recreational Harvest

This chapter summarizes expected recreational catch in Puget Sound marine waters and freshwater tributaries for the 2018-2019 management year, and presents catch estimates available from creel studies for that period. Due to the cycle of recovery and analysis of Catch Record Cards (CRCs) used by recreational anglers, complete catch estimates for all areas are not yet available. Since complete catch estimates were not available for all areas in the annual report covering the previous management cycle, projected and actual recreational catches for the 2017-2018 management year are also included here.

### 3.1 2017-2018 Recreational Catch

Total Recreational Chinook harvest in 2017-2018, estimated from preliminary Catch Record Card (CRC) data and creel estimates where available, was 56,758 , compared to a preseason projection of 41,763 . The CRC estimates are preliminary and subject to revision. Projected and actual catches for individual fisheries are shown in Table 3-1. Updated estimates of total mortality in mark-selective fisheries, for those fisheries where estimates are available, are presented in final reports available at https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications.

Table 3-1. Projected (FRAM 2017) and actual (preliminary, where available) Chinook catches in Puget Sound recreational fisheries during the 2017-2018 season.

| Area/Fishery | Projected | Actual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 5-6 |  |  |
| Area 5 Summer MSF | 4,427 | 2,316 |
| Area 5 Winter MSF | 365 | 342 |
| Area 6 Summer MSF | 3,445 | 4,335 |
| Area 6 Winter MSF | 871 | 1,118 |
| Other |  |  |
| Strait Tributaries |  |  |
| Area 7 |  |  |
| Non MSF | 950 | 3,637 |
| MSF (December-April) | 3,512 | 2,227 |
| Nooksack/Samish FW | 3,276 | 7,406 |
| Area 8-1 \& 8-2 |  |  |
| MSF | 966 | 1,135 |
| Skagit River |  |  |
| Spring MSF | 328 | 260 |
| Area 8D SAF | 219 | 269 |
| Stillaguamish River | 0 | 0 |
| Snohomish River |  |  |
| Skyokomish MSF | 556 | 500 |
| Area 9 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 5,599 | 5,458 |
| Winter MSF | 2,625 | 2,884 |
| Area 10 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 2,166 | 2,226 |
| Winter MSF | 415 | 317 |
| Area 11 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 5,325 | 3,597 |
| Winter MSF | 350 | 997 |
| Area 10E SAF ${ }^{1}$ | 104 | 200 |
| Lake Sammamish | 21 | 0 |
| Area 10A SAF | 414 | 626 |
| Green River | 234 | 295 |
| Puyallup River |  |  |
| Carbon R MSF | 138 | 392 |
| Puyallup R MSF | 597 | 921 |
| Area 13 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 952 | 3,805 |
| Winter MSF | 50 | 219* |
| Chambers Cr | 57 | 0 |
| Nisqually | 2,440 | 8,473 |
| Deschutes | 103 | 10 |
| Area 12 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 1,013 | 2,459 |
| Winter MSF | 246 | 334* |
| Skokomish River | 0 | NA |

* All CRC estimates of catch through 3/31/2018
${ }^{1} 10 \mathrm{E}$ SAF catch could not be estimated using traditional methods. Using 2016 as a conservative surrogate for 2017.


### 3.2 2017-2018 Recreational Catch

Projected Chinook catches for 2018-2019 recreational fisheries are listed in Table 3-2. The recreational fishing regime included mark selective fisheries (MSF) for portions of the year in Marine Areas 5 through 13 and in a number of rivers. WDFW conducted intensive sampling and monitoring of MSFs in Marine Areas 5, 7, 9, 10 and 11, which provided the estimates in Table 3-2. Brief summaries of Chinook catch and encounters resulting from these sampling programs are included below. The analysis of 2018 winter fisheries is still in draft. When complete, this analysis will be made available on the WDFW website:

## https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications

For fisheries without intensive sampling and/or creel data available, catch will be estimated using CRC data and data from baseline dockside sampling of marine fisheries. Baseline sampling provides data on catch per unit effort (CPUE), species composition, as well as CWT and biological sampling data. For freshwater fisheries, catch estimates are made using CRC data, unless creel studies were conducted and harvest estimates are available. For marine fisheries, species-specific catch estimates are made using CRC estimates of total catch, combined with species composition data obtained from the baseline sampling program. These estimates will be included in the 2019 annual report.

Table 3-2. Projected (FRAM 2318) and actual (preliminary, where available) Chinook catches in Puget Sound recreational fisheries during the 2018-2019 season.

| Area/Fishery | Projected | Actual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 5-6 |  |  |
| Area 5 Summer MSF | 3,527 | 3,839 |
| Area 5 Winter MSF | 568 |  |
| Area 6 Summer MSF | 4,241 |  |
| Area 6 Winter MSF | 2,003 | 2,047* |
| Other |  |  |
| Strait Tributaries |  |  |
| Area 7 |  |  |
| Summer (July MSF) | 1,727 | 2,295 |
| Winter MSF | 3,739 | 3,855* |
| Nooksack/Samish FW | 4,572 |  |
| Area 8-1 \& 8-2 |  |  |
| Winter MSF | 975 | 1,284* |
| Skagit River |  |  |
| Spring MSF | 456 |  |
| Area 8D SAF | 256 |  |
| Stillaguamish River | 0 |  |
| Snohomish River |  |  |
| Skyokomish MSF | 757 |  |
| Area 9 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 5,587 | 6,031 |
| Winter MSF | 2,090 | 3,754* |
| Area 10 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 4,743 | 4,886 |
| Winter MSF | 227 | 792* |
| Area 11 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 5,344 | 5,673 |
| Winter MSF | 552 |  |
| Area 10E SAF | 135 |  |
| Lake Sammamish | 1 |  |
| Area 10A SAF | 0 |  |
| Green River | 386 |  |
| Puyallup River |  |  |
| Carbon R MSF | 500 |  |
| Puyallup R MSF | 1,831 |  |
| Area 13 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 1,269 |  |
| Winter MSF | 83 |  |
| Chambers Cr | 34 |  |
| Nisqually | 3,218 |  |
| Deschutes | 6 |  |
| Area 12 |  |  |
| Summer MSF | 1,127 |  |
| Winter MSF | 390 |  |
| Skokomish River |  |  |
| *Preliminary MSF catch es |  |  |

### 3.2.1 Marine Area 5 Summer MSF

2018 was the $16^{\text {th }}$ year of summer mark-selective Chinook fishing in Marine Area 5. The 2018 fishery was open for a set season, from July 1 through August 15.

WDFW conducted comprehensive fishery monitoring activities during the Area 5 MSF. Sampling activities included dockside creel sampling and intensive efforts to distribute and collect voluntary trip reports (VTRs) from the angling public. An enhanced Salmon Trip Report (STR) program was used to obtain estimates of Chinook encounter rates by size class (legal or sub-legal) and mark status (ad-marked or unmarked), similar to the approach used successfully during summer 2009. Detailed descriptions of the sampling program and results are available in WDFW (2018).

For Area 5, WDFW estimates that 3,839 Chinook were landed, compared to preseason projections of 3,527 (Table 3-3).

Table 3-3. Comparison of modeled (FRAM 3218) and estimated total Chinook encounters for the 2018 Area 5 summer Chinook MSF.

| Data Source | Group | Total <br> Encounters | Legal | Sublegal | Landed <br> Only |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM Encounters | UM | 5,042 | 1,724 | 3,318 | 17 |
|  | AD | 12,720 | 4,034 | 8,686 | 3,510 |
|  | Total | 17,762 | 5,758 | 12,004 | 3,527 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | 72 | 70 | 72 | 100 |
| Estimated (Creel) | UM | 6,827 | 2,562 | 4,264 | 0 |
| Encounters | AD | 13,818 | 4,173 | 9,645 | 3,839 |
|  | Total | 20,645 | 6,735 | 13,910 | 3,839 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | 67 | 62 | 69 | 100 |

### 3.2.2 Marine Area 7 Summer MSF

2018 was the third year of summer mark-selective Chinook fishing in Marine Area 7. The 2018 fishery was open from July 1 through July 30, 2018.

WDFW conducted comprehensive fishery monitoring activities during the Area 7 MSF. Sampling activities included intensive dockside creel sampling, on-the-water effort surveys, test fishing and collection of voluntary trip reports (VTRs) from the angling public. Detailed descriptions of the sampling program and results are available in WDFW (2018).

For Area 7, WDFW estimates that 2,295 Chinook were landed, compared to preseason projections of 1,727 (Table 3-4).

Table 3-4. Comparison of modeled (FRAM 3218) and estimated total Chinook encounters for the 2018 Area 7 summer Chinook MSF.

| Data Source | Group | Total <br> Encounters | Legal | Sublegal | Landed <br> Only |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM Encounters | UM | 3177 | 1,813 | 1,364 | 18 |
|  | AD | 3,950 | 1,964 | 1,986 | 1,709 |
|  | Total | 7,127 | 3,777 | 3,350 | 1,727 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | 55 | 52 | 59 | 99 |
| Estimated (Creel) | UM | 1,392 | 1,033 | 359 | 4 |
| Encounters | AD | 3,440 | 2,552 | 888 | 2,291 |
|  | Total | 4,832 | 3,584 | 1,248 | 2,295 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | 71 | 71 | 71 | 100 |

### 3.2.3 Marine Area 9 Summer MSF

In 2018, a recreational MSF occurred for the twelfth consecutive summer in Marine Area 9. This fishery was scheduled to open from July 16 through August 15, 2018, but due to achieving the harvest quota early, in-season action was taken and the fishery was closed July 29, 2018. As in previous years, WDFW's Puget Sound Sampling Unit (PSSU) implemented an intensive monitoring program in Area 9 during the summer season to collect the data needed to provide in-season catch estimates and to estimate key parameters characterizing the fishery and its impacts on unmarked salmon. Detailed descriptions of the sampling program and results are available in WDFW (2018).

An estimated 6,031 Chinook were landed in Area 9, compared to preseason projections of 5,587 (Table 3-5).

Table 3-5. Comparison of modeled (FRAM 3218) and estimated Chinook encounters for the 2018 Area 9 summer Chinook MSF.

| Data Source | Group | Total <br> Encounters | Legal | Sublegal | Landed <br> Only |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM | UM | 1,530 | 1019 | 511 | 10 |
| Encounters | AD | 12,899 | 6,411 | 6,488 | 5,577 |
|  | Total | 14,429 | 7,430 | 6,999 | 5,587 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | 89 | 86 | 93 | 100 |
| Estimated (CreeI) | UM | 1551 | 1085 | 465 | 3 |
| Encounters | AD | 10,543 | 6,822 | 3721 | 6,028 |
|  | Total | 12,094 | 7,908 | 4,186 | 6,031 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | 87 | 86 | 89 | 100 |

### 3.2.4 Marine Area 10 Summer MSF

In 2018, a summer recreational MSF was implemented in Area 10 for the eleventh consecutive year, running from July 16 through August 30, 2018. WDFW's Puget Sound Sampling Unit (PSSU) implemented an intensive monitoring program in Area 10 throughout the season in order
to collect the data needed to estimate key parameters characterizing the fishery and its impacts on unmarked salmon. An estimated total of 4,886 Chinook were landed during this fishery, compared to the pre-season projection of 4,743 (Table 3-6).

Table 3-6. Comparison of modeled (FRAM 3218) and estimated Chinook encounters for the 2018 Area 10 summer Chinook MSF.

| Data Source | Group | Total <br> Encounters | Legal | Sublegal | Landed <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM Encounters | UM | 3,033 | 1,049 | 1,984 | 21 |
|  | AD | 12,400 | 5,428 | 6,972 | 4,722 |
|  | Total | 15,433 | 6,477 | 8,956 | 4,743 |
|  | Marked | 80 | 84 | 78 | 100 |
| Estimated (Creel) | UM | 2,143 | 1,032 | 1,111 | 35 |
|  | AD | 9,285 | 5,396 | 3,889 | 4,850 |
|  | Total | 11,428 | 6,428 | 5,000 | 4,886 |
|  | \% Marked | 81 | 84 | 78 | 99 |

### 3.2.5 Marine Area 11 Summer MSF

In 2018, a summer recreational MSF was implemented in Area 11 for the twelfth consecutive year, running from June 1 through September 30. Due to in-season action, the fishery was closed on August, 252018 when the quota was reached. WDFW's Puget Sound Sampling Unit (PSSU) implemented an intensive monitoring program in Area 11 to collect the data needed to provide in-season catch estimates and to estimate key parameters characterizing the fishery and its impacts on unmarked salmon. An estimated total of 5,673 Chinook were landed during this fishery, compared to the pre-season projection of 5,344 (Table 3-7). Unmarked legal and sublegal encounters were greater than pre-season projections.

Table 3-7. Comparison of modeled (FRAM 3218) and estimated Chinook encounters for the 2018 Area 11 summer Chinook MSF.

| Data Source | Group | Total <br> Encounters | Legal | Sublegal | Landed <br> Only |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM Encounters | UM | 2,526 | 889 | 1637 | 18 |
|  | AD | 12,765 | 6,122 | 6,643 | 5,326 |
|  | Total | 15,291 | 7,011 | 8,280 | 5,344 |
|  | \% Marked | 83 | 87 | 80 | 100 |
| Estimated (Creel) | UM | 4946 | 2248 | 2698 | 33 |
| Encounters | AD | 14,388 | 6,295 | 8,093 | 5,640 |
|  | Total | 19,333 | 8,543 | 10,791 | 5,673 |
|  | \% Marked | 74 | 74 | 75 | 99 |

## 4 Spawning escapement

This section compares natural Chinook escapement estimates for 2018 with pre-season escapement projections, and management thresholds.

In general, FRAM projects natural escapement of unmarked adult (age-3 to age-5) Chinook. For some MUs where hatchery-origin adults contribute to natural spawning, the FRAM projections of escapement include adult natural-origin recruits (NOR) and adult hatchery-origin recruits (HOR) that spawn naturally. This includes projections for the Skagit, Cedar, Green, Puyallup, Skokomish, Mid-Hood Canal, Dungeness, and Elwha. For the White MU, the projection includes adult fish of natural origin and adult fish originating from the acclimation pond program. Natural-origin adults that are used for hatchery broodstock may be included in the projections of natural escapement.

FRAM projects adult natural-origin escapement for the Nooksack, Skagit spring, and Snohomish populations, so hatchery-origin fish must be subtracted from total escapement and the number of natural-origin fish used for broodstock added, to obtain an estimate comparable to the FRAM projections.

Escapements for available spring-run Chinook management units were all above projected estimates.

For summer/fall populations, escapement was greater than projected for some management units, except Skagit River summer/falls, Stillaguamish summer/falls, Cedar River fall, Nisqually, and Mid Hood Canal were below forecasted abundance.

Table 4-1. Preseason projections and estimates of Puget Sound Chinook natural spawning escapement in 2018.

| Management Unit |  | NOR | HOR | Total | Projected (FRAM 3218) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nooksack | NF |  |  | N/A | $178{ }^{1}$ |
|  | SF |  |  | N/A | $23{ }^{1}$ |
| Skagit spring | Suiattle |  |  | 645 | $596{ }^{1}$ |
|  | Cascade |  |  | 128 | $261{ }^{1}$ |
|  | Sauk |  |  | 1,603 | 1,110 ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | Total spring |  |  | 2,376 | 1,967 ${ }^{1}$ |
| Skagit summer/fall | Sauk summer |  |  | 378 | $607{ }^{1}$ |
|  | Upper Skagit summer |  |  | 8,602 | 9,108 ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | Lower Skagit fall |  |  | 1,923 | 2,227 ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | Total summer/fall |  |  | 10,920 | 12,219 ${ }^{2}$ |
| Stillaguamish | NF | 118 | 508 | 626 |  |
|  | SF | 0 | 39 | 39 |  |
|  | Total | 161 | 656 | $817{ }^{3}$ | 1,409 |
| Snohomish | Skykomish | 2,259 | 789 | 3,048 | 2,635 ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | Snoqualmie | 823 | 339 | 1,162 | $747{ }^{1}$ |
|  | Total | 3,082 | 1,128 | 4,210 | 3,382 ${ }^{1}$ |
| Lake <br> Washington | Cedar | 675 | 138 | 813 | 1,722 |
| Green |  | 2,231 | 4,660 | 6,891 | 5,079 |
| Puyallup <br> White |  | 755 | 2,050 | 2,805 | 1,713 |
|  |  | 320 | 3,357 | 3,677 | 1,945 ${ }^{4}$ |
| Nisqually |  | 428 | $168{ }^{5}$ | 10,373 ${ }^{5}$ | 16,576 |
| Skokomish |  | 103 | 2,356 | 2,459 | 2,432 |
| Mid Hood Canal | Dosewallips | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
|  | Duckabush | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |
|  | Hamma Hamma | 0 | 58 | 58 |  |
|  | Total |  |  | 63 | 365 |
| Dungeness |  | 127 | 661 | $905{ }^{6}$ | 810 |
| Elwha |  | 320 | 6,787 | 7,107 ${ }^{7}$ | 4,599 |
| Hoko |  |  |  | 1,943 | 1,295 |

1. Natural-origin only.
2. Skagit $\mathrm{Su} /$ Fa projection total includes NOR and HOR escapement to the spawning grounds.
3. Includes additional 108 HORs and 44 NORs collected for broodstock from the North Fork which are part of the FRAM Projection.
4. Includes only adult NORs and adult vent-clipped acclimation pond fish trucked and released upstream of Mud Mountain; plus 1,837 acclimation pond fish
5. Includes 428 NOR and 168 HOR volitional spawners, as well as 9,781 hatchery rack return of which 1,679 HORs from Clear Creek Hatchery trucked, released upstream, and remained on the spawning grounds. Change-in-ratio (CIR) estimate will be revised with final sport-catch data when available. Total is adult (Age 3-5) escapement. Total fish on the spawning grounds 2,275.
6. Includes 117 fish ( 20 NORs and 97 HORs) removed from the river for use as broodstock.
7. Estimate does not include jacks.

### 4.1 Nooksack River Early Chinook

Currently, 2017 escapement data to inform stock assignments are still being evaluated by co-managers with an expectation to finalize the 2017 escapement estimate, with stock proportions, by early to mid December 2019.

### 4.2 Skagit River

## Background

Six recognized Chinook populations spawn in the tributaries and mainstems of the Skagit River watershed. The Sauk River, Suiattle River, Baker River, and the Cascade River are major tributaries to the Skagit River, but there are also numerous smaller, anadromous fish bearing tributaries flowing both into the major tributaries and also into the Skagit River directly. Five hydroelectric projects are in the basin, two on the Baker River at river miles (RM) 1.6 and 9.3, and three on the Skagit River at RM 96.6, 100.9, and 105.1.

Escapements were calculated using various methodologies dependent on population and based on either total new redd counts, total visible redd counts, linear regression predictions, or a combination of methods. During spawning ground surveys, Chinook carcasses were sampled for fork length, sex, scales, and presence or absence of a hatchery mark. We also electronically sampled Chinook carcasses for coded wire tags (CWT) and collected CWT present snouts.

Surveys were performed on foot, by pontoon boat, jet boat, or by helicopter. Escapements estimates for Skagit hatchery spring Chinook, Upper Cascade spring Chinook, and Suiattle spring Chinook were calculated by multiplying total redd counts by 2.5 fish per redd. Upper Sauk spring Chinook, Skagit summer and Skagit fall Chinook, and Sauk River summer Chinook spawning escapement estimates were calculated by summing total redds observed during ground based surveys with area under the curve (AUC) calculated redds from aerial surveys, and multiplying the sum by 2.5 fish per redd.

Additional personnel from the Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group (SFEG), Skagit River System Cooperative (SRSC, the management body for the Sauk-Suiattle and Swinomish Indian tribes), the Upper Skagit Indian Tribe (USIT), Seattle City Light, and Puget Sound Energy, also performed work and contributed data necessary to complete the escapement estimates and predictions for the Skagit River Basin Chinook salmon runs.

## Methods and Results

## Suiattle River Spring Chinook

Suiattle River spring Chinook spawn in the clear, large tributaries draining into the turbid mainstem of the Suiattle River. Some redds are found at tributary confluences with the mainstem and within the tributary's clear water lens in the mainstem created by unmixed tributary and mainstem water. Redds found within the tributary lenses are included in the tributary counts. Historically, limited spawning activity has been documented in the glacially influenced, high turbidity mainstem with the exception of spawning in the tributary clear water lenses. The only recorded exception to date was in 2011, when an unusual combination of environmental variables reduced turbidity in the mainstem and resulted in conditions the Chinook apparently deemed suitable for spawning.

Suiattle spring Chinook spawning Surveys were conducted from 1 August 2018 through 9 October 2018 by WDFW and USIT surveyors. Surveys of tributary indexes were attempted weekly for new redds to ensure all redds were enumerated. The indexes included all known spawning habitat for each tributary. Tributary spawning surveys were conducted on foot. All new redds were marked with survey flagging to prevent double counting during subsequent surveys. The total redd count was multiplied by 2.5 fish per redd to estimate escapement. All obtainable Chinook carcasses were scale sampled, measured for fork length, and sampled for coded wire tags.

The logjam that had been a passage barrier on Buck Creek in previous years (approximately river mile 1.2) remained in 2018. The logjam continues to be a total passage barrier with no live Chinook or Chinook redds observed upstream of the logjam

A total of 59 Suiattle spring Chinook carcasses were observed in 2018 and 49 were collected and sampled. There were 48 wild unmarked and no CWT Suiattle spring Chinook and one carcass that was adipose clipped but no CWT. The season total redd count was 258 redds. (Table 4-2).

Table 4-2. Suiattle River spring Chinook 2018 spawning ground survey redd counts.

| Stream | WRIA | Survey method | Reach (RM) | Location $^{* 1}$ | Redds |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Big Creek | 3.0723 | Foot | $0.0-0.6$ | 7.8 | 7 |
| Tenas Creek | 3.0761 | Foot | $0.0-0.5$ | 9.6 | 8 |
| Straight Creek | 3.0797 | Foot | $0.0-0.1$ | 15.1 | 3 |
| Buck Creek | 3.0813 | Foot | $0.0-1.7$ | 18.1 | 25 |
| Circle Creek | 3.0892 | Foot | $0.0-0.2$ | 18.4 | 0 |
| Lime Creek | 3.0897 | Foot | $0.0-0.5$ | 20.8 | 5 |
| Downey Creek | 3.0919 | Foot | $0.0-2.1$ | 24.4 | 184 |
| Sulfur Creek | 3.0973 | Foot | $0.0-0.9$ | 26.3 | 13 |
| Milk Creek | 3.1022 | Foot | $0.0-0.1$ | 28.6 | 13 |
|  |  |  |  | Total redds | 258 |

*1 Location refers to river mile location of tributary mouth on a mainstem, or lower river mile terminus of a mainstem index.

The preliminary 2018 Suiattle River Spring Chinook escapement estimate was 645 fish (rounded). All data and estimates of escapement were preliminary at the time of reporting and remained subject to further review and agreement by the Skagit comanagers before finalization.

## Upper Cascade River Spring Chinook

Cascade River spring Chinook spawn in the mainstem Cascade River and accessible tributaries from river mile 8.1 (just upstream of a high gradient canyon) up to and including the forks at RM 18.6. Spawning has also been documented in the North and South Fork Cascade Rivers, from the mouth of each fork upstream at varying distances (less than one river mile) dependent upon stream flow and available spawning habitat.

Cascade River spring Chinook surveys occurred from 7 August 2018 through 27 September 2018. The surveys of all known habitat were performed by WDFW and USIT spawning ground surveyors. Mainstem surveys were conducted by foot or pontoon boat depending on the stream features of the index. Historically the survey protocol has been to survey each index every ten to fourteen days. However, with the additional help provided by the USIT beginning in 2016, the interval goal was shortened to weekly surveys with the goal of collecting more carcasses. Carcasses are notoriously difficult to find from the upper Cascade population and it was hypothesized increasing the frequency of surveys would increase the number of carcasses sampled. All new redds were marked with survey flagging to ensure they were only counted once. The total redd count was multiplied by 2.5
fish per redd to estimate escapement. All recoverable carcasses were scale sampled, measured for fork length, and electronically checked for coded wire tags.

The weekly survey goal was not always met in 2018 due to competing work task priorities. A total of 4 upper Cascade spring Chinook carcasses were observed in 2018. Of the located carcasses, 2 could not be collected and 2 were collected and sampled. Both carcasses were wild adipose present (unmarked) and no coded wire tag (no beep). A total of 51 redds were located and marked in 2018 (Table 4-3).

The 2018 upper Cascade River spring Chinook spawning escapement estimate was 128 fish. All data and estimates of escapement were preliminary at the time of reporting and remain subject to further review and agreement by the Skagit comanagers before finalization.

Table 4-3. 2018 Cascade River spring Chinook redd counts.

| Stream | WRIA | Survey method | Reach (RM) | Location $^{* 1}$ | Redds |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Cascade River | 3.1411 | Foot | $8.1-9.0$ | 8.1 | 7 |
| Marble Creek | 3.1451 | Foot | $0.0-0.3$ | 8.6 | 0 |
| Cascade River | 3.1411 | Foot/Raft | $9.0-12.4$ | 9.0 | 18 |
| Cascade River | 3.1411 | Foot | $12.4-15.8$ | 12.4 | 10 |
| Cascade River | 3.1411 | Foot | $15.8-18.6$ | 15.8 | 15 |
| Kindy Creek | 3.1528 | Foot | $0.0-0.5$ | 16.2 | 1 |
| North Fork Cascade River | 3.1605 | Foot | $0.0-0.1$ | 18.6 | 0 |
| South Fork Cascade River | 3.1411 | Foot | $0.0-0.5$ | 18.6 | 0 |

*1Location refers to river mile location of tributary mouth on mainstem, or lower river mile terminus of a mainstem index.

## Upper Sauk River Spring Chinook

Upper Sauk River spring Chinook spawn in the mainstem Sauk River and in the North and South Fork Sauk Rivers. Mainstem Sauk River spawning has been documented between RM 31.0 to the forks at RM 39.7. Sauk spring Chinook spawn in the North Fork Sauk to the falls at river mile 41.3 and in the South Fork Sauk from the forks upstream as high as river mile 5.0 on a high water year. A high gradient section of the Sauk River beginning 0.9 river miles downstream of the White Chuck River acts as an assumed barrier to Sauk summer Chinook and serves as the lowest point of spawning of upper Sauk River spring Chinook.

Sauk River spring Chinook spawning areas were surveyed from 15 August 2018 through 10 October 2018. Surveys were conducted by foot or pontoon boat on indexes upstream of the White Chuck River at an attempted survey interval goal of every seven days. The survey goal for the index below the White Chuck River was every two weeks by helicopter due to the section being too treacherous to raft or walk. Recovered carcasses were sampled for scales, fork length, and presence of coded wire tags. Redds located during foot or pontoon boat surveys were counted and marked with survey flagging.

A total of 96 Sauk spring Chinook carcasses were observed in 2018 and 85 of the carcasses were able to be recovered and sampled. Of the sampled carcasses 84 were wild unmarked and untagged fish, and one fish was adipose present but the head had been scavenged so no CWT scan could be performed. There were 627 redds located upstream of the White Chuck River by ground based surveys and an estimated 14 redds downstream of the White Chuck River in the section surveyed by helicopter (Table 4-4). Total redds from ground based counts and the flown section were summed and multiplied by 2.5 fish per redd to estimate escapement.

The 2018 upper Sauk River spring Chinook escapement estimate was 1,603 fish. All data and estimates of escapement were preliminary at the time of reporting and remained subject to further review and agreement by the Skagit comanagers before finalization.

Table 4-4. Upper Sauk River spring Chinook redd counts from 2018 spawning ground surveys.

| Stream | WRIA | Survey method | Reach (RM) | Location $^{* 1}$ | Redds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Flight | $31.0-31.9$ | 31.0 | 14 |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Foot/Float | $31.9-34.5$ | 31.9 | 172 |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Foot/Float | $34.5-37.8$ | 34.5 | 307 |
| Falls Creek | 3.1182 | Foot | $0.0-0.2$ | 34.9 | 3 |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Foot/Float | $37.8-39.7$ | 37.8 | 18 |
| South Fork Sauk River | 3.1204 | Foot | $0.0-2.9$ | 0.0 | 62 |
| North Fork Sauk River | 3.0673 | Foot | $39.7-40.1$ | 39.7 | 33 |
| North Fork Sauk River | 3.0673 | Foot | $40.1-41.3$ | 40.1 | 32 |

${ }^{* 1}$ Location refers to river mile location of tributary mouth on mainstem, or lower river mile terminus of a mainstem index.

## Skagit Summer Chinook

Skagit River summer Chinook spawn in the mainstem of the Skagit River from the mouth of the Sauk River at RM 67.2 to the Seattle City Light Powerhouse at Newhalem at RM 94.3. Spawning also occurs in tributary streams with suitable flow and spawning habitat. Tributaries were surveyed by foot or pontoon boat at an interval of every seven days to ensure all redds were enumerated before redd life expired. Tributary surveys covered most of the known spawning area with the exception of some limited spawning known to occur above the tributary index areas in years of high abundance, and in some other tributaries that have infrequent spawning activity. Time constraints due to limited personnel resources prevented us from surveying all known spawning habitat. The mainstem of the Skagit River was surveyed by helicopter.

Carcass recovery and sampling occurred incidentally during tributary surveys, and actively during mainstem carcass recovery surveys conducted on jet boats. Mainstem carcass surveys of approximately 22.3 river miles were attempted weekly. Recovered carcasses were sampled for scales, measured for fork length, and checked for presence of tags and marks. Not all carcasses encountered could be sampled; carcasses were often observed in deep pools beyond the reach of gaff hooks, or were badly decomposed and disintegrated upon disturbance. All new redds located during tributary surveys were counted and marked with survey flagging. The protocol for mainstem aerial redd surveys was to count all visible redds including redds that were recognizable from previous flight surveys.

Skagit summer Chinook tributary spawning surveys occurred regularly from 6 September 2018 through 31 October 2018 (Table 4-5). A total of 610 Skagit summer Chinook carcasses were observed in 2018 and 599 carcasses were recovered and sampled. A total of 531 carcasses were unmarked and untagged wild Skagit summer Chinook, 10 carcasses were adipose clipped only (no cwt), 51 carcasses were adipose clipped and coded wire tagged, 1 carcass was coded wire tagged but the adipose fin status could not be determined, 3 carcasses were CWT only, 2 carcasses were not clipped but the coded
wire tag status could not be determined, and one carcass was unknown adipose clip and unknown coded wire tag due to scavengers and decomposition..

Table 4-5. Skagit summer Chinook redd counts from 2018 spawning ground surveys.

| Stream | WRIA | Survey method | Reach (RM) | Location $^{{ }^{* 1}}$ | Redds |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Goodell Creek | 3.1867 | Foot | $0.0-1.3$ | 92.9 | 5 |
| Falls Creek ${ }^{* 3}$ | 3.1780 | Foot | $0.0-0.4$ | 4.0 | 0 |
| Bacon Creek | 3.1774 | Foot | $0.0-4.2$ | 82.9 | 59 |
| Diobsud Creek | 3.1750 | Foot | $0.0-1.3$ | 80.7 | 44 |
| Cascade River | 3.1411 | Foot/Float | $0.0-4.2$ | 78.1 | 106 |
| Illabot Creek | 3.1346 | Foot | $0.0-2.6$ | 71.6 | 35 |
| Skagit River | 3.0176 | Helicopter | $85.9-94.3$ | 85.9 | 1,464 |
| Skagit River | 3.0176 | Helicopter | $78.1-85.2$ | 78.1 | 1,291 |
| Skagit River | 3.0176 | Helicopter | $67.2-78.1$ | 67.2 | 437 |

${ }^{1}$ LLocation refers to river mile location of tributary mouth on mainstem, or lower river mile terminus of a mainstem index.
" 2 Falls Creek WRIA 03.1780 is a tributary of Bacon Creek. The mouth is located at river mile 4.0 of Bacon Creek on the right bank.
We observed 249 summer Chinook redds in the tributaries and using the AUC estimated 3,192 mainstem redds from four aerial mainstem surveys. Total redds from ground based counts and the flown sections were summed and multiplied by 2.5 fish per redd to estimate escapement. (Table 4-5).

The 2018 escapement estimate of Skagit River summer Chinook was 8,602 fish (rounded). All data and estimates of escapement were preliminary at the time of reporting and remained subject to further review and agreement by the Skagit comanagers before finalization. (Table 4-1).

## Lower Sauk River Summer Chinook

Lower Sauk River summer Chinook spawn from the mouth of the Sauk River to approximately RM 31.0 ( 0.9 RM downstream of the White Chuck River). The only documented tributary spawning occurs in Dan Creek (WRIA 3.1079) but due to frequent low flows during spawning, summer Chinook use of Dan Creek has been intermittent. Any carcasses located in Dan Creek were sampled for scales, measured for fork length, and checked for presence of tags and marks. The lower Sauk River is too wide, braided, and spawning too sparsely distributed to be effectively surveyed by foot or pontoon boat, so mainstem Sauk River summer Chinook spawning was surveyed by helicopter.

The Sauk Suiattle Indian Tribe (SSIT) conducted carcass surveys for Sauk summer Chinook carcasses in the mainstem of the Sauk River in 2018. A total of 8 carcasses were located and 7 were able to be sampled. All seven sampled carcasses were wild unmarked, and no CWT fish.

Surveys of Dan Creek began 17 September and continued through 08 November. In 2018, two Sauk summer Chinook redds and zero carcasses were observed within the Dan Creek index (Table 4-6).

Table 4-6. Lower Sauk River summer Chinook redd counts from 2017.

| Stream | WRIA | Survey method | Reach (RM) | Location* ${ }^{* 1}$ | Redds by method |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Foot surveys | AUC | Linear regression |
|  |  |  |  |  | Actual | Estimated | Predicted |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Flight | 0.0-13.2 | 0.0 |  | 31 | N/A |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Flight | 13.2-21.1 | 13.2 |  | 87 |  |
| Dan Creek | 3.1079 | Foot | 0.0-0.8 | 16.8 | 2 |  |  |
| Sauk River | 3.0673 | Flight | 21.1-31.0 | 21.1 |  | 32 |  |
| Grand total redds from all methods (rounded): |  |  |  |  |  | 151 |  |

${ }^{1}$ Location refers to river mile location of tributary mouth on mainstem, or lower river mile terminus of a mainstem index.
Mainstem Sauk summer Chinook spawning is often difficult to monitor due to turbidity inputs from the Suiattle River and the White Chuck River, but conditions throughout most of the Sauk summer Chinook spawning period were favorable this year. From four mainstem flights the AUC method estimated 149 Sauk summer Chinook redds in the indexes. Total redds from ground based counts and flown sections were summed and multiplied by 2.5 fish per redd to estimate escapement.

The 2018 escapement estimate of lower Sauk River summer Chinook was 378 fish (rounded). All data and estimates of escapement were preliminary at the time of reporting and remained subject to further review and agreement by the Skagit comanagers before finalization.

## Lower Skagit River Fall Chinook

Skagit fall Chinook spawn in the mainstem Skagit River from the vicinity of RM 24.5 to the mouth of the Sauk River (RM 67.2). They have also been documented spawning in a variable number of large and small tributary streams depending on flow conditions. Tributary surveys were conducted by foot every seven to fourteen days. Encountered carcasses were sampled for scales, measured for fork length, and checked for coded wire tags. Tributary redds were counted and marked with flagging to prevent repeated counting.

Skagit fall Chinook spawning surveys began 17 September 2018 and continued through 20 November 2018. Four total visible redd aerial surveys were conducted over the two mainstem spawning indexes. The aerial surveys were conducted by helicopter. (Table 4-7).

A total of 16 Skagit fall Chinook carcasses were observed in 2018 and 14 of the carcasses were recovered and sampled. All 14 of the sampled carcasses were wild unmarked and untagged fish.

A total of 96 Skagit fall Chinook redds were observed during tributary surveys. The tributary redds were summed with 673 AUC estimated mainstem redds from the four aerial surveys. Total redds were multiplied by 2.5 fish per redd to estimate escapement

The 2018 escapement estimate of Skagit River fall Chinook was 1,923 fish (rounded). All data and estimates of escapement were preliminary at the time of reporting and remained subject to further review and agreement by the Skagit comanagers before finalization.

Table 4-7. Lower Skagit River fall Chinook redd counts from 2018 spawning ground surveys. The Upper Skagit Indian Tribe surveyed the Grandy Creek and upper Finney Creek indexes. The East Fork Nookachamps Creek index was not surveyed in 2018 due to a landowner access issue. Hansen Creek was not surveyed due to a miscommunication.

| Stream | WRIA | Survey method | Reach (RM) | Redds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Skagit River | 3.0176 | Flight | $24.5-56.5$ | 327 |
| Skagit River | 3.0176 | Flight | $56.5-67.2$ | 346 |
| Hansen Creek | 3.0265 | Foot | $3.0-4.3$ | DNS |
| Day Creek | 3.0299 | Foot | $0.0-2.2$ | 14 |
| Jones Creek | 3.0332 | Foot | $0.0-1.3$ | 5 |
| Grandy Creek | 3.0337 | Foot | $0.0-1.1$ | 14 |
| Alder Creek | 3.0359 | Foot | $0.0-1.6$ | 1 |
| O'Toole Creek | 3.0365 | Foot | $0.0-0.2$ | 2 |
| Pressentin Creek | 3.0385 | Foot | $0.0-0.4$ | 5 |
| Finney Creek | 3.0392 | Foot | $0.0-6.0$ | 55 |
| Jackman Creek | 3.0626 | Foot | $0.0-0.7$ | 0 |
| EF Nookachamps | 3.0230 | Foot | $3.5-5.1$ | DNS |

### 4.3 Stillaguamish River

The Stillaguamish River basin has two populations of Chinook distinguished by genetic characteristics: summers and falls. These two populations overlap in spawn timing and distribution with both populations spawning in both forks of the Stillaguamish River. The summer stock is a composite of natural and hatchery-origin supplemental production with the majority of spawning occurring in the North Fork Stillaguamish and its major tributaries, including Boulder River and Deer, Grant, French, and Squire Creeks. The fall stock is a composite of natural and hatchery-origin supplemental production with the majority of spawning primarily in the mainstem and South Fork Stillaguamish Rivers, in Pilchuck, Jim, and Canyon Creeks, and in the North Fork Stillaguamish River. Escapement is currently estimated for North Fork and South Fork Stillaguamish Rivers rather than summer and fall populations of Chinook.

Escapement estimates for Stillaguamish Chinook were calculated by multiplying the cumulative redd count by 2.5 and by the genetic mark recapture (GMR) correction factor. This is an annual provisional estimate. The GMR correction factor is a multiplier resulting from regression analysis of redd-based escapements compared to GMR-based escapement estimate results from the years 2008 through 2016. GMR based escapement estimates are considered more accurate than redd-based estimates and can be produced with statistical confidence intervals (whereas redd-based estimates cannot), but are not available until the following year. GMR escapement estimates require genetic sampling of adult fish in the Fall and juvenile fish in the following Spring. When the final GMR escapement estimate is completed, it then replaces the initial redd-based GMR corrected (provisional) result.. Since 2008, Chinook redds found in the North and South Forks have been individually counted during periodic foot or raft surveys using the marked redd census method. Previous to 2008, redd counts in the North and South Forks were estimated using area under the curve methodology based on aerial surveys of North and South Fork mainstem reaches as well as
ground-based surveys of tributary streams. Aerial surveys continue to provide redd count data for the Lower Mainstem and upper South Fork. Since 2008, the Stillaguamish Tribe Department of Natural Resources has provided ground coverage of the North Fork Stillaguamish River from its mouth to river mile (RM) 30.0. WDFW staff surveyed the remaining known Chinook spawning areas in the Stillaguamish basin.

Surveys were conducted from mid-August to mid-November to encompass the spawn timing of both stocks. All known spawning habitat was surveyed either by foot or raft on a seven to fourteen day cycle, or by helicopter every fourteen to twenty-one days. All ground-counted redds were flagged, enumerated and recorded with a GPS waypoint. Helicopter surveys counted total visible redds during each flight and total redds were estimated using area-under-the-curve methods. Carcasses encountered were sampled for scales, DNA, CWT, and adipose fin mark status.

## North Fork Stillaguamish summer and fall Chinook

North Fork Stillaguamish Chinook spawning surveys covered the entire known distribution. Surveyed areas were the North Fork from RM 0.0 to 34.4 and North Fork tributaries including Squire, Segelson, French, Brooks, and Grant creeks, and Boulder River. Escapement was estimated using expansion of cumulative redd counts ( 2.5 fish per redd) from raft and foot surveys, and multiplying by the GMR correction factor. Survey conditions for counting Chinook in the North Fork Stillaguamish were generally good during the spawning period until midOctober rains pulsed flows and impeded the survey schedule. The first redds were detected August 28th in the North Fork, and last one was detected October 24 in the North Fork. A total of 211 Chinook redds were counted on the North Fork of the Stillaguamish in 2018 (Table $4-8)$. The redd-based escapement estimate was 529 fish (Table 4-8 and Table 4-10). The GMR adjusted provisional escapement estimate is 626 fish ( 118 NOR, 508 HOR). An additional 152 fish ( 108 NOR, 44 HOR) were taken for hatchery brood stock and were not included in the escapement estimate. Total NOR North Fork Stillaguamish River escapement (natural spawning + broodstock collection) was 702 Chinook.

Table 4-8. North Fork Stillaguamish summer and fall Chinook redd counts in 2018.

| Stream | WRIA | Method | Reach (RM) | Redds | Escapement |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Fork | 5.0135 | Foot/Float | $0.0-14.3$ | 3 | 13 |
| North Fork | 5.0135 | Foot/Float | $14.3-30.0$ | 166 | 415 |
| North Fork | 5.0135 | Foot/Float | $30.0-34.4$ | 12 | 30 |
| Grant Creek | 5.0156 | Foot | $0.0-0.4$ | 0 | 0 |
| Deer Creek | 5.0173 | Foot | $0.0-6.0$ | 1 | 3 |
| Brooks Creek | 5.0215 | Foot | $0.0-0.1$ | 0 | 0 |
| Boulder River | 5.0229 | Foot | $0.0-2.9$ | 12 | 30 |
| French Creek | 5.0246 | Foot | $0.0-3.0$ | 0 | 0 |
| Squire Creek | 5.026 | Foot | $0.0-4.0$ | 15 | 38 |
| Brown Creek | 5.0265 | Foot | $0.0-1.0$ | 0 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Total Redds |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ |
|  | Redd-based Escapement |  |  |  |  |
|  | Estimate |  |  |  |  |
|  | GMR adjusted EE (provisional) |  | $\mathbf{5 2 9}$ |  |  |

## South Fork and Mainstem Stillaguamish summer and fall Chinook

South Fork and Mainstem Stillaguamish summer and fall Chinook escapement in 2017 was estimated using expansion of cumulative redd counts ( 2.5 fish per redd) from aerial, foot, and raft surveys. Areas surveyed were the Mainstem between the juvenile trap (near the town of Sylvana and the confluence at Arlington (river miles 6.0 to 17.8), the South Fork from the confluence to Granite Falls (river miles 17.8 to 34.7), and Canyon, Jim, Siberia, and Pilchuck Creeks. River mile 34.7 to 55.1 include Granite Falls and Robe Canyon and are neither surveyable nor good Chinook spawning habitat.

The mainstem aerial index reach, from the juvenile trap (RM 6.0) to the forks (RM 17.8) was flown twice in 2018, October 5 and 18. Rain generated flow pulses in late October and November reduced visibility and precluded further survey efforts.

A total of 13 Chinook redds were found in the Mainstem Stillaguamish and South Fork Stillaguamish River and tributaries in 2018 (Table 4-9). The red-based escapement estimate was 33 adult fish, which expanded to 39 adult fish with the application of the GMR correction factor (Table 4-10).

Table 4-9. South Fork and Mainstem Stillaguamish summer and fall Chinook redd counts in 2018.

| Stream Reach | WRIA | Method | Reach (RM) | Redds | Escapement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mainstem | 5.0001 | Flight | 6.0-17.8 | 0 | 0 |
| South Fork | 5.0001 | Foot/Float | 17.8-34.7 | 9 | 23 |
| South Fork (upper) | 5.0001 | Foot | 34.7-65.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pilchuck Creek | 5.0062 | Foot/Float | 0.0-6.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Jim Creek | 5.0322 | Foot/Float | 0.0-4.1 | 4 | 10 |
| Siberia Creek | 5.0324 | Foot | 0.0-0.4 | 0 | 0 |
| Canyon Creek | 5.0359 | Foot | 0.0-0.5 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Redds |  |  | 13 |  |
|  |  | Redd-base Estimate | scapement |  | 33 |
|  |  | GMR adus (provisional) | EE |  | 39 |

## Carcass sampling and escapement composition

WDFW and Stillaguamish Tribe Natural Resources staff conducted spawning ground survey work and carcass sampling in the North and South Forks of the Stillaguamish River and their tributaries. Tribal staff focused their Chinook carcass sampling efforts in the North Fork between the mouth and Swede Heaven Bridge (RM 0.0 to 30.0) and WDFW staff focused on the remaining spawning grounds. In total, 65 complete carcasses (status of both adipose fin and CWT was determined) were sampled in the Stillaguamish River; 64 in the North Fork reaches and one in the South Fork reaches (Table 4-10). An additional three sampled carcasses were categorized as "unknown" because either the adipose status or the CWT status was undetermined. The sampling rates of Chinook carcasses, not including those with unknown mark dispositions, were $12.1 \%$ for North Fork reaches, and $3.0 \%$ for South Fork reaches. These rates were calculated by dividing the number of carcasses sampled by the escapement estimate for each population.

Escapement of Chinook by origin (hatchery or natural) was determined by applying ratios of hatchery marked carcasses and unmarked carcasses and marked and unmarked live fish collected for broodstock to the total escapement estimate (Table 4-11).

Table 4-10. Stillaguamish Chinook sample proportions and HOR:NOR composition in 2018

|  | Sampled | Sampled Hatchery | Sampled Natural | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Hatchery } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Natural } \end{gathered}$ | GMR Esc EST | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Sampled } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Fork and Tributaries | 64 | 52 | 12 | 81.3\% | 18.8\% | 626 | 10.2\% |
| South Fork and Tributaries | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 39 | 2.6\% |
| Broodstock (NF) | 152 | 44 | 108 | 28.9\% | 71.1\% | 152 | 100\% |
| Stillaguamish Totals | 217 | 97 | 120 | 44.7\% | 55.3\% |  |  |

Table 4-11. Stillaguamish Chinook escapement estimate (GMR provisional) HOR:NOR composition, 2018.

|  | GMR <br> Escapement <br> Est. | $\%$ <br> Hatchery | $\%$ <br> Natural | Esc Est. <br> HOR | Esc. Est. <br> NOR |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 626 | $81.2 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | 508 | 118 |
| North Fork and Tributaries | 39 | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | 39 | 0 |
| South Fork and Tributaries | 69 |  |  | $\mathbf{5 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 8}$ |
| Stillaguamish Totals | $\mathbf{6 6 5}$ |  |  |  |  |

### 4.4 Snohomish River

There are two populations of Chinook in the Snohomish River basin: Skykomish summer/fall Chinook and Snoqualmie fall Chinook. The Skykomish stock spawns in the mainstem of the Skykomish River and its tributaries, including the Wallace and Sultan Rivers, Bridal Veil Creek, the South Fork Skykomish River (between RM 49.6 and RM 51.1 and above Sunset Falls) and the North Fork Skykomish River (occasionally above Bear Falls at RM 13.1). The Snoqualmie stock spawns in the Snoqualmie River and its tributaries, including the Tolt and Raging Rivers, and Tokul Creek.

Escapement estimates of naturally spawning Chinook salmon returning to the Snohomish watershed are calculated from cumulative redd counts made from physical surveys of their spawning grounds, and from counts of adult fish passed at Sunset Falls. Additionally, redd estimates for unsurveyed reaches on Raging River, North Fork Tolt River and Cherry Creek were expanded based on redds per mile of adjacent surveyed reaches. Survey methods included ground based walking, raft, and jet sled surveys, as well as aerial surveys conducted from a helicopter. Ground counted redds were monitored using marked-redd-census methodology. Ground surveys were done at a frequency of seven to ten days so as to not miss new redds. Redds in ground-surveyed reaches were enumerated, marked with a GPS waypoint, and flagged to prevent re-counting on subsequent surveys. Aerial surveys were conducted on the Snohomish, Skykomish and North Fork Skykomish Rivers at target intervals of two weeks. Aerial surveys provided total visible redd counts per survey flight and were plotted against survey date for the area-under-curve (AUC) method yielding total redd days. Total redd days were then divided by the assumed standard 21-day redd life to yield the estimated cumulative redds from aerial surveyed reaches. The cumulative redd count was then expanded by 2.5 (fish per redd) to estimate escapement. Additionally, a count of Chinook passed above the trap at Sunset Falls on the South Fork of the Skykomish was made. Carcasses encountered were sampled for scales, DNA, CWT, adipose fin mark status, and otoliths.

## Skykomish summer/fall Chinook

Spawning ground surveys were conducted throughout the known spawning distribution of Skykomish summer/fall Chinook. Survey reaches were the mainstem Snohomish and

Skykomish Rivers, Pilchuck, Sultan, and Wallace Rivers, Woods, Elwell, Bridal Veil, Olney, and Proctor Creeks, and in the North and South forks of the Skykomish River.

Survey conditions were good for most of the spawning season. High flows late-October made survey conditions difficult. Survey intervals were kept to seven to ten days except for when rain-fed flow pulses in mid-October and November caused survey delays. Five aerial surveys were flown on the Mainstem Snohomish, Skykomish and North and South Fork Skykomish Rivers at two-week intervals between mid-September and mid-November.

A total of 1,180 Chinook redds were found in the Skykomish River and its tributaries, and Pilchuck River in 2018 (Table 4-12). The spawning escapement estimate (including Sunset Falls trap counts) was 3,048 adult fish (2,259 NOR, 789 HOR; Table 4-14). An additional 4,819 adult hatchery origin fish (including 355 jacks) and four natural origin fish recruited to Wallace Hatchery and were not included in this escapement estimate. Total NOR Skykomish escapement (natural spawning + broodstock collection) was 2,263 Chinook.

Table 4-12. Skykomish summer/fall Chinook redd counts and escapement, 2018.

| Stream Reach | WRIA | Method | Reach (RM) | Redds | Escapement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Snoh-Sky (Mainstems) | 7.0012 | Float/Flight | $20.5-51.5$ | 649 | 1,623 |
| NF Skykomish | 7.0982 | Foot/Flight | $0.0-13.5$ | 110 | 275 |
| SF Sky (Sunset Falls) | 7.0012 | Trap/Haul | $51.5-\mathrm{up}$ | $*$ | 97 |
| Pilchuck River | 7.0125 | Foot/Float | $2.0-26.5$ | 29 | 73 |
| Woods Creek | 7.0826 | Foot/Float | $0.0-3.5$ | 4 | 10 |
| Elwell Creek | 7.0865 | Foot | $0.0-1.0$ | 2 | 5 |
| Sultan River | 7.0881 | Foot/Float | $0.0-9.7$ | 234 | 585 |
| Wallace River (lower) | 7.094 | Foot/Float | $0.0-4.4$ | 121 | 303 |
| Wallace River(upper) | 7.094 | Foot/Float | $4.4-7.3$ | 4 | 10 |
| Olney Creek | 7.0946 | Foot | $0.0-0.6$ | 0 | 0 |
| Proctor Creek | 7.097 | Foot | $0.0-0.4$ | 1 | 3 |
| Bridal Veil Creek | 7.1248 | Foot | $0.0-0.4$ | 26 | 64 |
|  |  |  | Total Redds | 1,180 |  |
|  |  |  | Escapement |  | 3,048 |

## Snoqualmie summer/fall Chinook

The escapement estimates for Snoqualmie summer/fall Chinook were made using cumulative redd counts from boat, foot, and aerial surveys of known spawning habitat. Surveyed reaches were the Snoqualmie River and its tributaries, including the Tolt and Raging Rivers and Cherry and Tokul Creeks. Chinook redds were observed from early September to mid-November.

Survey conditions were good for monitoring chinook spawning until mid-October when Fall rainstorms significantly increased stream flows, delaying or preventing some surveys.

In 2018, 1,162 Chinook are estimated to have escaped to the Snoqualmie Basin, based on a total count of 456.5 redds (Table 4-13). Based on carcass sampling results, the escapement estimate is composed of 823 NORs and 339 HORs (Table 4-14).

Table 4-13. Snoqualmie fall Chinook redd counts and escapement by reach, 2018.

| Stream Reach | WRIA | Method | Reach (RM) | Redds | Escapement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Snoqualmie River (Lower) | 7.0219 | Float | $20.5-24.9$ | 70 | 175 |
| Snoqualmie River (Upper) | 7.0219 | Float | $32.9-39.6$ | 126 | 315 |
| Cherry Creek | 7.0240 | Foot | $1.8-3.5$ | 2 | 5 |
| Tolt River (Lower) | 7.0291 | Foot/Float | $0.0-6.0$ | 95 | 238 |
| Tolt River (Upper) | 7.0291 | Foot/Float | $6.0-8.9$ | 37 | 93 |
| NF Tolt River | 7.0291 | Foot | $8.9-11.3$ | 31 | 78 |
| SF Tolt River | 7.0302 | Foot | $0.0-2.3$ | 7 | 18 |
| Raging River | 7.0384 | Foot | $0.0-4.6$ | 34 | 85 |
| Raging River (Upper) | 7.0384 | Foot | $4.6-13.2$ | 30.5 | 76 |
| Tokul Creek (Lower) | 7.044 | Foot | $0.0-0.3$ | 20 | 69 |
| Tokul Creek (Upper) | 7.044 | Foot | $0.3-0.6$ | 4 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Redds |  |  |  |  |

## Sampling and HOR:NOR summary

Field staff sampled 442 complete Chinook carcasses (status of CWT, otolith mark, and adipose fin mark are known) within the Snohomish basin. Additionally, adipose fin and CWT status was determined for 76 live Chinook passed at Sunset Falls. In total, the Chinook carcass sampling rate on the spawning grounds and at Sunset Falls was 12.3\% (Table 4-14). This was calculated by dividing the number of carcasses and live fish sampled by the escapement estimate.

Escapement of Chinook by origin (hatchery or natural) was determined by applying ratios of hatchery marked carcasses and unmarked carcasses (and live fish sampled at Sunset Falls) to the escapement estimate by reach groupings (Table 4-14). Grouping reaches into subsets of the populations allows the calculation of hatchery origin recruits (HOR) and natural origin recruits (NOR) for escapement reaches where sample sizes were small or no carcasses were sampled.

These escapement by origin (hatchery origin and natural origin) numbers are preliminary pending co-manager agreement.

Table 4-14. Snohomish Chinook carcass sampling and escapement composition in 2018, preliminary.

| Stratum | Escapement | $\begin{array}{r} \text { No. } \\ \text { Hatchery } \end{array}$ | No. Natural | \% <br> Hatchery | \% Natural | Number Sampled | Percent Sampled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Skykomish | 1,641 | 290 | 1,351 | 17.65\% | 82.35\% | 85 | 5.2\% |
| Bridal Veil | 339 | 118 | 221 | 34.67\% | 65.33\% | 75 | 22.1\% |
| SF Sky * | 97 | 13 | 84 | 13.16\% | 86.84\% | 76 | 78.4\% |
| Pilchuck River | 73 | 13 | 60 | 18.18\% | 81.82\% | 3 | 4.1\% |
| Sultan River | 585 | 66 | 519 | 11.36\% | 88.64\% | 44 | 7.5\% |
| Wallace River | 313 | 289 | 24 | 92.19\% | 7.81\% | 64 | 20.4\% |
| Skykomish Population | 3,048 | 789 | 2,259 | 25.89\% | 74.11\% | 347 | 11.4\% |
| Snoqualmie | 1,083 | 282 | 801 | 26.00\% | 74.00\% | 100 | 9.2\% |
| Tokul | 79 | 57 | 22 | 71.83\% | 28.17\% | 71 | 89.9\% |
| Snoqualmie Population | 1,162 | 339 | 823 | 29.17\% | 70.83\% | 171 | 14.7\% |
| Snohomish Total | 4,210 | 1,128 | 3,082 | 26.79\% | 73.21\% | 518 | 12.3\% |

*Sunset Falls sample: A sub-sample of Chinook passed upstream were sampled for cwt wire and adipose mark.
Key for Grouped Stratum and Populations:
Skykomish Population:
Bridal Veil: Bridal Veil Creek, NF Skykomish River, SF Sky (Sunset Falls)
Sultan: Sultan River
Skykomish: Snoh-Sky (Mainstems), Elwell Creek, Olney Creek, Woods Creek, Proctor Creek
Pilchuck: Pilchuck River
Wallace: Wallace River (Upper and Lower)

## Snoqualmie Population:

Snoqalmie: Snoqualmie River (Lower and Upper), Raging River, Tolt River (Lower and Upper), SF Tokul: Tokul Creek (Lower), Tokul Creek (Upper)

### 4.5 Cedar River

Prior to 1999, live counts and Area Under the Curve (AUC) methods were used to estimate Chinook spawning abundance in the Cedar River. Since 1999, Chinook redds have been enumerated and mapped in the Cedar River via floating surveys, and escapement estimated by expanding the redd count by 2.5 . Cedar River redd surveys are considered to be a complete census of the mainstem river, where every Chinook redd in the Cedar system is counted. Redd surveys are conducted between RM 4.2 and RM 21.8 (Landsburg Dam) 2-3 times per week for the duration of the Chinook spawning period. The portion of the river upstream from the Landsburg Dam to the Cedar Falls powerhouse (RM 34.5), and the lower 4.2 miles of the Cedar mainstem are each surveyed once per week. Due to the overlap with sockeye spawning timing, Chinook redds are only included in the count if a female Chinook is present and actively attending to a redd.

In 2018, a total of 325 Chinook redds were observed in the Cedar River during the spawning season (including the surveyed area upstream from Landsburg Dam and including all small tributaries). Of the 325 Chinook redds, 321 were observed in the Cedar River mainstem (294 below Landsburg Dam and 27 above), and 4 were observed in small tributaries to the Cedar River. Expansion by 2.5 fish per redd resulted in the estimated escapement of 813 Chinook
(Table 4-1). Carcass surveys in the Cedar River indicated that $83 \%$ of the naturally spawning adult Chinook were natural origin fish (unclipped) and $17 \%$ were hatchery origin (clipped) fish.

### 4.6 Sammamish River/North Lake Washington Tributaries

The Sammamish Chinook population is composed of naturally spawning Chinook in the Big Bear/Cottage Lake Creek watershed and in the Issaquah Creek watershed downstream of Issaquah Hatchery. Chinook natural escapement to the Sammamish River/ North Lake Washington tributaries in 2018 was estimated at 659 fish (Table 4-1).

## Big Bear/Cottage Lake Creeks

Escapement estimation to Big Bear Creek and Cottage Lake Creek involves weekly surveys of all known Chinook spawning areas to enumerate live Chinook. Total spawning escapement is estimated using the AUC method, where live fish counts and a 10-day stream life estimate are used to calculate escapement.

The Bear Creek/Cottage Creek index area was surveyed weekly during the 2018 spawning season. The escapement estimate was 248 fish. Of these, 75 fish were counted in the Bear Creek mainstem, and 173 fish were counted in the Upper and Lower Cottage Creek Indexes. Carcass surveys in the Big Bear/Cottage Lake system indicated that $23 \%$ of the naturally spawning adult Chinook were natural origin fish (unclipped) and $77 \%$ were hatchery origin fish.

## Issaquah Creek System

Issaquah Creek is surveyed weekly from the Issaquah Hatchery (located at river mile 3.0), downstream to its confluence with Lake Sammamish to count Chinook carcasses. All Chinook carcasses are assumed to have spawned, and the cumulative carcass count is used as the escapement estimate for this reach of Issaquah Creek. East Fork Issaquah Creek is also surveyed weekly from its confluence with the Issaquah Creek mainstem, upstream to the High Point Trail crossing at approximately RM 3.0. Similar to the Issaquah Creek mainstem, the cumulative carcass count is used as the escapement estimate for the East Fork.

The Issaquah Creek system was surveyed weekly during the 2018 spawning season, and total escapement was estimated at 411. This estimate includes 384 fish in the mainstem below the hatchery, and 27 fish from the East Fork. Carcass surveys in the Issaquah Creek system indicated that $11 \%$ of the naturally spawning adult Chinook were natural origin fish (unclipped) and $89 \%$ were hatchery origin fish.

Chinook escapement to Issaquah Hatchery in 2018 was 1,857 (1,786 adults and 71 jacks); of which 33 ( 32 adults and 1 jack) were intentionally released upstream to spawn in upper Issaquah Creek.

### 4.7 Green River

Beginning in 2009, Muckleshoot (MIT) and WDFW Biologists agreed to attempt weekly counts of new Chinook redds in all survey-able reaches of the Green River and Newaukum Creek during Chinook spawning ground surveys, reasoning that so few redds were being dug, it was possible to count all redds in all reaches. This estimation methodology uses season total redd counts, without adjustment, in four of the six sections of the mainstem Green River. At the conclusion of the spawning season, the observed number of redds in these sections of the river is known, and the variance is zero. There may be observational error in these sections or
spawning outside these sections. However these factors operate in all sampling programs and are not included in any variance estimates.

New Chinook redds were counted weekly over three days by boat and twice during the season from aerial surveys in the mainstem river between River Mile (RM) 25.4 to 48.5 (Lower River (aerial only), Middle River, and Lower Gorge) and 59.2 to 61.0 (Headworks). Using two, oneman pontoon boats or two, two-man boats, crews worked in tandem to count redds left and right of the center of the river. Foot surveys of Chinook naturally spawning in Newaukum Creek were conducted weekly by WDFW crews from the creek mouth to river mile 3.9. Redds in the Metzler Side Channel (MSC) were counted opportunistically when adequate water filled the side channel, in a similar manner. Only those redds that could reasonably be presumed to be Chinook redds were counted, based on the presence of a female observed digging or guarding the redd, or when redd size and substrate size were unambiguous.

A rigorous surveying schedule began on September 5 and continued through October 31. Although visibility was sometimes limited, no surveys were suspended because of high flows. Redd counts from Metzler Side Channel were conducted on September 24, October 9, and October 23. These counts were added to the weekly counts for the Middle River. The weekly number of redds counted in each section, was summed, without adjustment, to produce the season total redd count by section.

On October 4 and 17, a count of visible redds in each reach was made by helicopter in all 6 sections, encompassing the entire "spawnable area" of the mainstem river between RM 25.4 and approximately RM 60.4. Pending amenable weather conditions, flights were timed to coincide with the historical peak of natural Chinook spawning activity which typically occurs the first or second week in October. Flight scheduling was limited by availability of the helicopter and weather and river conditions.

Escapement was calculated for the sections of the river not surveyed by boat: "Gorge", RM 48.5 to 56.2 and "Hwy 167 to Transfer Shack", RM 25.4 to 26.7, the lowermost reach in the Lower River. The season total redd count from the section just below the Gorge; Lower Gorge section: RM 44.3 to 48.5 , was divided by the number of redds in the Lower Gorge section counted on the flight, resulting in the "Ground to Air Ratio" (G/A). The G/A was then applied to the number of redds observed in the Gorge on the day of the flight. For the Lower River (274 redds) and Hwy 167 to Transfer Shack ( 6 redds) reaches, the sum of redds observed during five floats (Lower River) and two aerial surveys (Hwy 167 to Transfer Shack) was used to estimate a combined season total of 280 redds.

Season total redd counts from boat and foot surveys of the mainstem Green River and Newaukum Creek and calculated values from the aerial sections of the Green River, were multiplied by 2.5 fish per redd to estimate total Chinook spawning naturally in the Green River basin. This multiplier is intended to account for the number of males and females and is derived from the sex ratio of 1.5 males for every female.

Post season analysis of the season totals indicates that peak spawning activity varied by section, but was generally highest during the first two weeks of October for the mainstem and the last week of September for Newaukum Creek (Table 4-15 and Table 4-16). By the end of surveys the week of October 14, $93.8 \%$ of the redds $(2,259$ of 2,409 ) observed during boat and foot spawning ground surveys were complete.

Table 4-15. Chinook redd counts from foot and boat surveys of the Green River in 2018.

| Section | 2-Sep | 9-Sep | 16-Sep | 23-Sep | Week ${ }^{1}$ | 30-Sep | 7-Oct | 14-Oct | 21-Oct | 28-Oct |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Headworks | 0 | 4 | 77 | 169 | 176 | 180 | 56 | 3 | - | Total |
| Lower Gorge | - | 0 | 1 | 9 | 51 | 72 | 53 | 4 | 0 | 190 |
| Middle River | - | 1 | 11 | 119 | 427 | 303 | 171 | 77 | 7 | 1,116 |
| Lower River ${ }^{1}$ | - | 3 | - | 80 | - | 132 | - | 59 | 0 | 274 |
| Newaukum Creek | 0 | 0 | 33 | 51 | 45 | 26 | 9 | 0 | - | 164 |
| Total | 0 | 8 | 122 | 428 | 699 | 713 | 289 | 143 | 7 | 2,409 |

${ }^{1}$ Aerial surveys on October 4 and 17 were used to estimate 6 redds in the Hwy 167 to transfer shack reach.
Table 4-16. Aerial survey counts of Chinook redds in the Green River, 2018.

| Section | 2-Sep | $9-$ Sep | 16-Sep | 23-Sep | $\frac{\text { Week }}{}=1$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $30-$ Sep | 7-Oct | 14-Oct | 21-Oct | 28-Oct | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headworks | - | - | - | - | 289 | - | - | - | 70 | 359 |
| Gorge | - | - | - | - | 151 | - | - | - | 59 | 210 |
| Lower Gorge | - | - | - | - | 84 | - | - | - | 53 | 137 |
| Middle River | - | - | - | - | 591 | - | - | - | 188 | 779 |
| Lower River | - | - | - | - | 185 | - | - | - | 39 | 224 |
| Hwy 167- <br> Transfer <br> Shack | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | 2 | 6 |
| Total | - | - | - | - | 1,304 | - | - | - | 411 | 1,715 |

${ }^{1}$ Aerial counts can include redds still visible from prior weeks and thus exceed boat counts for the same week.
The season total redds from the Middle River was 2,537 redds plus 56 from MSC, 190 from the Lower Gorge, 665 from the Headworks, and 274 in the Lower River plus 6 in the Hwy 167-Transfer Shack reach. The G/A ratio for the Lower Gorge was 2.26 (190/84) resulting in a calculated 342 redds for the "Gorge". A total of 2,593 redds were counted or calculated in the mainstem Green River, including MSC, by census. In Newaukum Creek, the season total redds for the section "400 th to Whitney Hill Bridge" was 61 and for the section "Whitney Hill Bridge" to mouth" was 103, totaling 164 redds in Newaukum Creek.

Applying the constant 2.5 fish/redd ( 1.5 males:1.0 female), an estimate of 6,891 naturally spawning Chinook was generated for the Green River Basin (Table 4-1).

During the season, 542 adults and 89 jacks that returned to the Soos Creek and Keta Creek hatcheries were tagged by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, hauled upstream, and released in the mainstem. Although duration of survival and spawning success of these fish may be variable, any redds created by these fish would have been counted during surveys, meaning that they are included in the natural spawning escapement estimate.

River flows during the 2018 Chinook spawning season were low to moderate until the final week of surveys (Table 4-17). This resulted in excellent conditions for the survey season without any surveys being suspended due to high water.

Table 4-17. Average weekly discharge (cfs) at three locations on the Green River (Palmer USGS Gage 12106700, Auburn USGS Gage 12113000, and Newaukum Creek USGS Gage 12108500) in 2018. Weekly discharges are 7-day averages of mean daily discharge beginning with the day listed.

|  | Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| USGS Gauge | 2-Sep | 9-Sep | 16-Sep | 23-Sep | 30-Sep | 7-Oct | 14-Oct | 21-Oct | 28-Oct |
| Palmer | 171 | 187 | 194 | 260 | 286 | 289 | 242 | 257 | 1,041 |
| Auburn | 271 | 315 | 320 | 359 | 401 | 417 | 357 | 367 | 1,174 |
| Newaukum Creek | 11 | 15 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 32 |

## Carcass sampling

Naturally spawning Chinook carcasses (clipped and unclipped) were sampled opportunistically during spawning ground surveys in the mainstem and Newaukum Creek. Biological data were collected from these carcasses, and a "Percent Egg Retention" variable was determined. The "Percent Egg Retention" variable was determined by inspection of the gonads of all female carcasses. The proportion of eggs estimated to have been retained was noted for carcasses where eggs remained in the body cavity. A carcass noted as having $25 \%$ egg retention was estimated to have expelled $75 \%$ of her total eggs. Additionally, tagged fish from re-released hatchery returns were noted for all sampled carcasses.

A total of 1,113 carcasses were sampled for standard biological data by Green River crews in 2018; 755 (16 DIT+52 CWT\&AD + 309 AD + 378 thermal marked with no adipose fin and no CWT) or $67.8 \%$ were of hatchery origin as indicated by the presence of an adipose fin, CWT tag, or hatchery thermal mark (Table 4-18).

Table 4-18. Summary of Chinook biological sampling in the Green River, 2018.

| Section | Biological Samples | Adipose Clipped | Thermal Marks | MIT Tags ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Acoustic } \\ \text { MIT } \\ \text { Tags }^{2} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CWT }^{3} \\ \text { \& Ad- } \\ \text { Clipped } \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{DIT}^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Headworks | 477 | 39 | 273 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Lower Gorge | 65 | 17 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 1 |
| Middle River | 388 | 187 | 61 | 54 | 2 | 28 | 9 |
| Lower River | 52 | 44 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Metzler Side Channel | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SubTotal: River | 990 | 294 | 357 | 59 | 5 | 39 | 14 |
| Newaukum: 400th to Whitney Hill Br | 36 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Newaukum: Whitney Hill Br to Mouth | 87 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| SubTotal: Newaukum | 123 | 67 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 2 |
| Grand Total: | 1,113 | 361 | 378 | 62 | 5 | 52 | 16 |

[^0]Table 4-19. Coded wire tag sampling, thermal mark analysis of otoliths ${ }^{1}$, and origin of natural Chinook spawners ${ }^{2}$ in the Green River, 2018.

|  | Sampled |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { NM with no } \\ \text { Thermal Mark } \end{gathered}$ |  | AD or NM with Thermal Mark |  | Unknown Origin ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | NOS | HOS | Unknown Origin ${ }^{3}$ | CWT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{No} \\ \mathrm{CWT} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DIT | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{No} \\ \text { CWT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CWT | No CWT | CWT | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { CWT } \end{gathered}$ |
| Green River | 990 | 316 | 665 | 9 | 53 | 937 | 14 | 316 | 39 | 612 | 0 | 9 |
| Newaukum Creek | 123 | 33 | 90 | 0 | 15 | 108 | 2 | 33 | 13 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Green River Basin Total | 1,113 | 349 | 755 | 9 | 68 | 1,045 | 16 | 349 | 52 | 687 | 0 | 9 |

${ }^{1}$ Since 2014, Chinook released from the Palmer Hatchery have been thermal marked but not adipose fin clipped.
${ }^{2}$ NOS $=$ Natural origin spawner; HOS= Hatchery origin spanwer; NM = Adipose fin present; AD = Adipose fin clipped; CWT = Coded wire tag present (unconfirmed); DIT = Double Index Tag; Adipose fin present, coded wire tag present; TM = Thermal Marked.
${ }^{3}$ Unknown origin = otoliths not analyzed for thermal mark or adipose fin presence unknown

### 4.8 White River

By definition, the escapement estimate for White River Spring Chinook is derived from trap counts at the Army Corps of Engineers' Buckley Diversion Dam fish trap (Buckley Trap) and hatchery returns to the White River Hatchery (WRH). The WRH and Buckley Trap are on opposite sides of a diversion dam on the White River. Off-site propagation of White River Spring Chinook also occurs at the Minter Creek/Hupp Springs Hatchery, and returns to that facility are recorded separately. Under ideal conditions, the Buckley Trap allows sampling and enumeration of all fish transported to the upper White River watershed. During odd years when pink salmon return and during years of relatively high Coho returns (2003-2012), sampling at the Buckley trap is limited, particularly during the latter part of the Chinook run. As a consequence, the proportions of hatchery and natural-origin spring and fall Chinook transported above the dam are uncertain. Records of trap and haul operations conducted in the absence of state or tribal fisheries managers are a subject of ongoing concern In 2018, complete sampling occurred through August $27^{\text {th }}$, but 660 Chinook ( 374 adults and 286 jacks) of unknown origin were transported upstream after this date.

The number of adult fish sampled at the WRH and at the Buckley Trap prior to the termination of sampling was 7,538 . Of these, 3,806 were natural-origin (NOR) and acclimation pond (AP) recruits. NORs are assumed to be primarily spring Chinook although based on DNA analysis, fall-run Chinook and potential hybrids have been passed. NORs made up $9 \%$ and APs made up $37 \%$ of the sampled adult Chinook. At the Buckley Trap, the ratios of coded wire tagged, non-coded wire tagged, and vent clipped fish among sampled adults and jacks, were applied to un-sampled adults and jacks passed upstream after the termination of sampling. In addition, 46 of the adult NORs were collected at, or taken to, the White River Hatchery for use as broodstock.

Table 4-20. Estimated number NOR and Acclimation Pond Chinook salmon hauled upstream of Mud Mountain Dam in 2018. Results are a combination of returns sampled White River Hatchery and sampled and un-sampled fish at Buckley Trap.

| Origin | Adults | Jacks | Totals |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Wild (NOR) | 320 | 251 | 571 |
| Acclimation Pond | 1,837 | 1,594 | 3,431 |
| Totals | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 0 0 2}$ |

There are two hatchery programs for White River spring Chinook: the Minter Creek/Hupp Springs program and the White River Hatchery. The Minter Creek/Hupp Springs program was initiated in the mid-1970's in response to steep declines in population abundance. The spring Chinook program was subsequently expanded following completion of the Muckleshoot Tribe's White River Hatchery in 1989. In 2018, escapement to the Minter Creek/Hupp Springs hatchery was 1,523 adults. None of these fish nor their gametes were taken to the White River Hatchery. Escapement to the White River Hatchery in 2018 was 1,299 adults and 44 jacks. These fish were either collected at the Buckley fish trap on the south side of the diversion dam, or volunteered to the WRH trap on the north side of the diversion dam.

### 4.9 Puyallup River

The Puyallup Tribal Fisheries (PTF) and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) staff agree that the ability to quantify fall Chinook escapement in the Puyallup River during odd years is difficult due to abundant pink salmon spawning in the system simultaneously. Due to these challenges, the co-managers agreed to use an adjusted AUC-based methodology to estimate escapement for Chinook in the Puyallup River basin during odd years.

## South Prairie Creek

Survey coverage of the South Prairie system was very good in 2018. The cumulative redd count of 530 in South Prairie Creek, expanded by 2.5 , yielded an escapement estimate of 1,325 spawners. In Wilkeson Creek, the cumulative redd count of 26 , expanded by 2.5 , yielded an escapement estimate of 65 spawners. The South Prairie Creek (SPC) sub-basin total spawning escapement estimate for 2018 is 1,390 . Based on mark-sampling of carcasses observed, about $84 \%$ of these fish were marked, so the escapement was made up of 265 NORs and 1,125 HORs.

## Carbon River

Because conditions in the Carbon River seldom allow accurate Chinook escapement surveys, estimates are based on the relationship between SPC and Carbon River escapement in 1999, when there was an accurate redd count for the Carbon River. Carbon River reaches with complete data tracked the SPC spawn timing remarkably well. Therefore, reaches with incomplete data were expanded using the SPC spawn timing curve with a high degree of confidence. The 2018 SPC escapement, including Wilkeson Creek, utilized in the Carbon River escapement expansion is an adjusted area under the cure (AUC) escapement estimate accounting for the average even-year (1994-2018) ratio of redd-based escapement and live fish AUC estimate exclusively in SPC multiplied by the 2018 AUC live fish estimate for SPC sub-basin.

Survey conditions were not suitable on the Carbon River during the 2018 spawning period. Consistent with the last ten years, the 2018/1999 SPC AUC escapement ratio (1390 / $1422=$ 0.9775 ) was applied to the 1999 Carbon River escapement (250) to estimate the 2018 value. This method estimated 244 Chinook spawning in the Carbon during 2018 (250 * 0.9775 = 244). Based on mark sampling ratios observed in South Prairie Creek, the escapement was made up of 39 NORs and 205 HORs.

## Puyallup River Tributaries

Aggregate escapement to Puyallup River tributaries in 2018 was estimated at 118 (Table 4-21). Based on mark sampling in these tributaries, excluding Clark's Creek, 15 of these fish are NORs and 103 HORs.

Table 4-21. Chinook escapement estimates for Puyallup River tributaries, 2017.

| Tributary | Escapement |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fennel Creek (WRIA 10.0406) | 10 |
| Canyon Falls Creek (10.0410) | 3 |
| Kapowsin Creek (10.0600) | 0 |
| Clear Creek (10.0022) | 105 |
| Clarks Creek (10.0027) | 0 |
| Tributary total | 118 |

## Mainstem Puyallup River

Chinook spawning escapement to the mainstem Puyallup River was estimated to be 675. This escapement comprised 277 NOR and 398 HOR Chinook, based on mark sampling ratios observed in mainstem tributaries.

As with the Carbon River, surveys of Puyallup River were not possible in 2018. WDFW and PTF staff believe that mainstem spawning escapement is closely related to the tributaries (Fennel, Canyon Falls, Clear, Kapowsin, and Clarks creeks). Therefore, the 2018/1999 Puyallup tributary AUC ratio ( $391 / 113=3.4604$ ) was applied to the estimated 1999 Puyallup mainstem escapement (195) to estimate 2018 escapement of 675 Chinook (195 * $3.4604=$ 675). The same even-year (1994-2018) average AUC adjustment used for the Carbon River was applied to the Puyallup tributary AUC live-fish estimate to develop the 2018 Puyallup tributary AUC estimate for this analysis.

## Lower White River

The fall component of Chinook spawning in the lower White River and its tributaries, downstream of the Buckley trap, are included in the 2018 Puyallup River basin fall Chinook escapement estimate. Spawning ground surveys indicate that, in some years, a sizeable number of Chinook spawn in these areas.

Spring and fall Chinook spawn in the White River. The fall component in the lower White River and tributaries was identified by mark sampling during spawning ground surveys and the genetic analysis conducted by Ford et al. (2004). Carcass sampling during spawning ground surveys provides a ratio of hatchery-origin fall Chinook (i.e. fish with a clipped adipose fin), to unmarked fish. Based on previous genetic analysis of samples collected in Boise Creek (Ford et al 2004), $60 \%$ of the unmarked fish are assumed to be fall Chinook.

Fall Chinook spawning escapement into the lower mainstem White River and its tributaries in 2018 was estimated to be 378 fish. This escapement is made up of 159 NORs and 219 HORs based on mark sampling ratios observed during spawning ground surveys.

## Total Puyallup Escapement

The estimated total number of naturally spawning fall Chinook in the Puyallup basin in 2018 was 2,805 . Based on carcass sampling, we estimated that 755 were NORs, and 2,050 were HORs. The estimate of NORs assumes the proportions of hatchery and natural origin spawners is the same in Puyallup River tributaries, the Puyallup River mainstem, South Prairie Creek, and the Carbon River..

### 4.10 Nisqually River

Escapement to the Nisqually River in 2018 was estimated using a change in ratio methodology (Seber 1982). This method uses (1) the proportion of marked fish entering the river (as estimated by sampling tribal gillnet catch), (2) the total removals below the video counting slot in the Yelm Diversion dam and proportion of those removals marked, and (3) the proportion of marked fish passing above the Yelm Diversion Dam video counting slot to estimate the total return to the river.

Escapement to the Nisqually River was estimated to be 2,275 adult Chinook salmon (Table $4-1$ ). This includes 428 natural-origin and 168 hatchery-origin adult fish volitionally escaping to the spawning grounds, as well as an additional 1,679 adult HOR's, which originally returned to Clear Creek and Kalama Creek Hatcheries and were trucked, released, and remained upstream to spawn naturally. The goal of this effort is to supplement natural spawning and increase the number of juvenile outmigrants and corresponding adult returns, which is outlined in the Nisqually Fall Chinook Recovery Plan.

### 4.11 Hood Canal

Natural Chinook escapement to the Skokomish River and Mid-Hood Canal rivers in 2018 were 2,459 and 63, respectively (Table 4-22).

## Mid-Hood Canal

The Mid-Hood Canal population is comprised of Chinook produced in the Dosewallips, Duckabush, and Hamma Hamma watersheds.

In the Dosewallips and Duckabush rivers, the lower reaches surveyed are spawning and transit areas. Upper reaches of the Dosewallips and Duckabush rivers have also been regularly surveyed since 1998, but few adults have been observed. Current escapement estimates are derived from combinations of live Chinook adult counts and Chinook redd expansions, depending on flow conditions and fish distributions.

In the Hamma Hamma River, most of the Chinook spawning area is currently being surveyed. A cooperative supplementation program was initiated in 1995 to rebuild Chinook abundance. Prior to 1998, escapement had been estimated from counts of cumulative new redds and/or from live Chinook using the area-under-the curve (AUC) method. However, since returns increased as the result of supplementation, the AUC method has been employed as the primary method of escapement estimation.

Summer chum salmon and pink salmon (in odd years) spawn at the same time as Chinook in the lower reaches of these three streams. Consequently, it can be difficult to distinguish Chinook redds from summer chum or pink redds unless Chinook are actively spawning and observed on redds. Pink salmon spawn predominately downstream of RM 6.7 on the Dosewallips, downstream of RM 2.6 on the Duckabush and throughout the reaches surveyed
on the Hamma Hamma. Summer chum salmon spawn predominately downstream of RM 3.6 on the Dosewallips, downstream of RM 2.6 on the Duckabush and throughout the reaches surveyed on the Hamma Hamma. It has been possible to count Chinook redds in the upper Dosewallips and Duckabush River reaches (especially in years without pink salmon).

The WDFW conducted spawner surveys on the Dosewallips, Duckabush, and Hamma Hamma rivers every 7 to 10 days from late August or early September through October. The escapement estimate to all three systems combined was 63 adults: 1, 4, and 58 Chinook in Dosewallips, Duckabush, and Hamma Hamma rivers, respectively (Table 4-22). During 2018, it is possible that some Chinook redds were not identifiable on the Dosewallips and Duckabush rivers in areas with summer chum spawning. However, based on the number of Chinook redds and adults observed during surveys and carcasses recovered during intensive weekly surveys, few very Chinook were present and the escapement estimates for Dosewallips and Duckabush rivers are considered in line with the actual order of magnitude for very low numbers.

The Dosewallips River was surveyed from RM 0 to RM 2.3, RM 3.6 to RM 6.7, but not RM 7 to RM 11; Rockybrook Creek, a tributary, was surveyed from RM 0 to RM 0.3. No Chinook redds were observed and the escapement estimate based on peak live/dead with 1 live fish observation in the Dosewallips River during 2018. The Duckabush River was surveyed from RM 0 to RM 2.6, RM 4.8 to RM 6. Although no Chinook redd was conclusively identified, an AUC estimate of 4 individual live adults was made based on observations made in September and October. The Hamma Hamma River was surveyed from RM 0.3 to RM 1.8; John Creek, a tributary, was also accessible to Chinook and was surveyed from RM 0 to RM 1.6. The estimated total escapement to the Hamma Hamma is 58 which is the AUC estimate of natural spawners in the mainstem. Flows were low in John Creek late into the season that the fish counted there had been previously accounted for in several Hamma Hamma mainstem surveys. No Chinook were collected for broodstock. The FRAM preseason escapement projection was 365 for the Mid-Hood Canal (FRAM 3218) while the estimated escapement is 63 Chinook. Escapements to the Dosewallips River and Duckabush River were low as anticipated.

## Skokomish River

Chinook spawning takes place in the mainstem Skokomish River up to the confluence with the South and North Forks at RM 9, in the South Fork (primarily up to RM 5.5), and in the North Fork from RM 9 to 15.7 (where Little Falls once blocked further access). Natural escapement estimates have historically been based on counts of Chinook redds in the principal spawning habitat in the mainstem Skokomish (RM 2.2 to 9.0), North Fork (R.M. 9.0 to 15.6), and South Fork (R.M. 0 to 2.2). Since 2008, surveys have been conducted from RM 0 to RM 5.5 in the South Fork and included in the total escapement estimate. In addition, escapement estimates are made for Vance Creek and Hunter Creek. However, dramatically increasing numbers of summer chum spawning in the mainstem Skokomish since 2014 led the co-managers to reevaluate the redd-based spawning methodology, and ultimately shift to a modified Area under the Curve (AUC) methodology applied elsewhere in Hood Canal. This change was necessary because summer chum spawning has become so prolific and Chinook spawning has become increasingly concentrated in preferred habitat. These conditions lead to widespread superimposition and difficulties in individual redd detection.

Live and dead adults, along with visible redds, were counted in Skokomish River index areas during foot and raft surveys (e.g., see Smith and Castle 1994). Surveys are conducted every seven to ten days. Historically, the fall Chinook survey season extended from late August through October, but with the first returns of North Fork spring Chinook, there is no break between steelhead survey season and Chinook season, now running from May through October or November if flows allow. Weekly instantaneous live fish counts for the entire
mainstem, South Fork and North Fork are used to calculate fish days, which are then divided by a stream life value of 21 days to estimate total Chinook escapement. In addition, foot surveys are made in Hunter and Vance creeks. Escapements to these tributaries are estimated based on redd counts and/or live Chinook observed.

In recent years, low flows at the mouth of the South Fork have prevented Chinook from accessing the lower South Fork early in the season. In 2018, however, Chinook had limited access the South Fork Skokomish after a brief period of increased flow in early September.

The total estimated spawner escapement to the Skokomish River is 2,459 (Table 4-22). This total includes 1,614 in the mainstem Skokomish, 665 Chinook in the North Fork, and 180 Chinook in the lower (RM 0 to RM 5.5) South Fork Skokomish. These numbers were apportioned based on calculating a redd-based escapement estimate for the north and south forks where summer chum spawning was limited, then using those numbers to apportion the total AUC estimate. The preseason escapement prediction was 2,432 (FRAM 3218).

Table 4-22. Summary of Chinook escapement to Hood Canal streams during 2018.

| Area | Stream | Escapement | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $82 \mathrm{G} / \mathrm{J}$ | Skokomish R. | 1,614 | AUC based on live fish (MS+NF), then apportioned using redd-based esc for NF and SF, due to large summer chum return in MS |
|  | N.F. Skokomish R. | 665 |  |
|  | S.F. Skokomish R. | 180 |  |
|  | Total | 2,459 |  |
| 12A | Little Quilcene R. | 0 | No Chinook observed |
|  | Big Quilcene R. | 0 | No Chinook observed |
|  | Total | 0 |  |
| 12B | Dosewallips R. | 1 | Peak live/dead fish |
|  | Duckabush R. | 4 | AUC based on live fish |
|  | Hamma Hamma R. a/ | 58 | AUC Hamma |
|  | Total | 63 |  |
| 12C | Dewatto R. | 45 | AUC |
|  | Eagle Cr. | 449 | AUC |
|  | Lilliwaup Cr. | 2 | AUC |
|  | Total | 496 |  |
| 12D | Tahuya R. | 2 | AUC |
|  | Union R. | 70 | Trap |
|  | Total | 72 |  |
| Hood Canal total |  | 3,090 |  |

a/ Hamma natural escapement $=63$, broodstock $=0$, John $\mathrm{Ck}=0$ (John Creek fish previously counted in Hamma AUC due to late access)

## Mark Sampling

Mass marking has been implemented for releases from George Adams Hatchery, Hoodsport Hatchery, and Endicott Ponds. Double index tag (DIT) groups have been released from George Adams Hatchery since 1998. The proportion of all Hood Canal hatchery Chinook that were either tagged and/or marked has incrementally increased since brood year 2003. In addition, all of the Chinook released from the Hamma Hamma supplementation program were tagged and/or marked. Coded-wire tag (CWT), age, and sex composition data have been routinely collected from Chinook returning to George Adams Hatchery since 1988.

There has been more intensive sampling of Chinook on the spawning grounds since 1998. During 2017, the Skokomish, Dosewallips, Duckabush, and Hamma Hamma rivers were targeted for enhanced mark and CWT sampling and WDFW also sampled Chinook carcasses for marks and CWTs on the Dewatto, Tahuya, and Lilliwaup rivers.

Of the 386 Chinook sampled in Hood Canal rivers during 2018, 303 Chinook were adiposeclipped and, of these, 49 had CWTs. 26 unmarked Chinook were coded-wire tagged. We sampled $10.6 \%$ of the Chinook spawning escapement in the Skokomish River, $6.3 \%$ of the MidHood Canal Chinook escapement (in the Hamma Hamma, Duckabush, and Dosewallips rivers), with an overall sampling rate of $12.5 \%$ in all Hood Canal rivers combined (Table 4-23).

Jacks are not included in Chinook spawning escapement estimates in Hood Canal, but few jacks were sampled during 2018.

Conservative estimates of hatchery contribution to natural the spawning escapement were made based on the total number of CWT tags and marks recovered (CWT's + adipose-clips + otoliths). However, these estimates are subject to correction for clip error and tag detection rates for the returning brood years. Thus, the proportion of hatchery fish on the spawning escapement is most rigorously estimated by expanding adipose-clipped fish based on proportions of clipped fish released from each brood year. Age composition in the escapement, carcass sampling rate, and the proportion of hatchery production releases that were marked and/or tagged from BY 2013 (age 5), BY 2014 (age 4), and BY 2015 (age 3).

In 2018 there was close agreement in the two aforementioned methods, with mark samplingbased pHOS estimated as $96 \%$ and expanded clip pHOS of $93.5 \%$ in the Skokomish River system (Table 4-23 and Table 4-24). Clip rate expansion estimate, the preferred method of the co-managers, does not include Purdy Creek samples because of the likely bias assoiated with hatchery mortality. However, a total of 260 Chinook sampled, 229 were adipose-marked (88.6\%). Spawning escapement in the Skokomish River was comprised of about 93\% hatchery-origin Chinook and 7\% natural-origin Chinook, with a high proportion of NOR returns to the North Fork where they accounted for $25 \%$ (Table 4-23). These estimates may be further refined as CWT data becomes available next fall.

Hatchery releases into the Hamma Hamma River for the purposes of supplementation are $100 \%$ CWT and otolith marked, with the exception of BY 2013, when all broodstock were collected directly from the Hamma Hamma River and therefore only otolith marked. The 2013 BY was $100 \%$ tagged but not otolith marked since the purpose of otolith marking has been primarily to assess differences in the survival of Hamma Hamma origin supplementation fish versus George Adams origin suppliementation fish. All Chinook carcasses were sampled for CWT and otoliths during 2018. Origin for the 2013 BY were determined by CWT, while origin for all other brood years were determined by otolith mark. The CWT rate was then adjusted for tag loss based on a seven-year average of otolith marks without tags from Mid-Hood Canal.

In the Hamma Hamma River, 1 of 3 (33\%) Chinook sampled had a CWT, which was consistent with otolith marks and corrections for tag loss produced final estimates for spawning escapement composition comprised of $50 \%$ supplementation-origin Chinook, $0 \%$ natural-origin Chinook, and $50 \%$ hatchery-origin strays in the Hamma Hamma River, based on combined CWT and otolith analysis. No Chinook carcasses were sampled in the Duckabush or the Dosewallips River in 2018. Because no carcasses were recovered from the Duckabush and Dosewallips rivers, a long term pHOS average (50\%) was applied to the 2018 escapements (Table 4-23). Due to only a single fish returning to the Dosewallips, we chose to classify that fish as an HOR. The low carcass recovery sample size along with the extremely low escapement, highlight the uncertainty in the 2018 Mid Hood Canal HOR/NOR estimates.

Table 4-23. Chinook salmon spawner escapement origin based on carcasses sampled for marks and coded-wire tags (CWTs) in Hood Canal rivers, 2018.

| Management Unit | Escapement | Chinook <br> Sampled |  | Tagged ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  | $\underline{\text { Untagged }{ }^{1 /}}$ |  |  | Unknown Tagged ${ }^{\text {2/ }}$ |  |  | Totals |  | Rate | Escapement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | \% | AD | NM | Unk | AD | NM | Unk | AD | NM | Unk | CWT's Recovered | Ad-clips observed |  | HOR | NOR |
| Skokomish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mainstem River | 1,614 | 237 | 14.7\% | 19 | 24 | 0 | 192 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 211 | 0.99 | 1600 | 14 |
| North Fk. River | 665 | 16 | 2.4\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.75 | 499 | 166 |
| South Fk. River | 180 | 7 | 3.9\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0.86 | 154 | 26 |
| Skokomish River Total | 2,459 | 260 | 10.6\% | 19 | 24 | 0 | 210 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 229 | 0.96 | 2,356 | 103 |
| 12A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biq Quilcene R. | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA |  |  |
| Little Quilcene R. | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NA |  |  |
| 12B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hamma Hamma R. ${ }^{3 /}$ | 58 | 4 | 6.9\% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1.00 | 58 | 0 |
| Duckabush R. | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.50 | 2 | 2 |
| Dosewallips R. | 1 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.50 | 1 | 0 |
| Mid-Hood Canal Total | 63 | 4 | 6.3\% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.96 | 61 | 2 |
| 12C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dewattor R. | $45$ | 3 | $6.7 \%$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1.00 | 45 | 0 |
| Eagle Creek | 449 | 49 | 10.9\% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 43 | 1.00 | 449 | 0 |
| Lilliwaup R. | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 2 |
| 12D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tahuya R. | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.37 | 1 | 1 |
| Union R.-- | 70 | 70 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 44. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0.37 | 26 | 44 |
| Hood Canal Total | 3,090 | 386 | 12.5\% | 23 | 26 | 0 | 274 | 51 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 49 | 303 | 0.95 | 2,937 | 153 |
| ${ }^{1 /} \mathrm{AD}=$ Adipose fin-clipped; $\mathrm{NM}=$ No Mark; Unk = Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2 /}$ Visual detection only life fish at the trap |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3 /}$ Supplementation Origin Fish calculated from otolith recoveries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{4 /}$ SOR for Hamma applied due to low sample size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{5 /}$ Estimates based on mark sampling data only, not yet corrected for clip error or cwt detection rates, resulting in conservative, provisionary estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4-24. Chinook salmon spawner escapement origin based on carcasses sampled for marks and coded-wire tags (CWTs) in Hood Canal rivers, 2018.

|  | Age |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2.1 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 5.1 |  |
| Mark rate | 0.876 | 0.867 | 0.896 | 0.918 |  |
| ADB | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 |  |
| ADNB | 17 | 55 | 34 | 1 |  |
| ADUkn |  |  |  | 8 |  |
| ADNH |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total ad-clipped | 17 | 61 | 39 | 9 | 126 |
| expanded | 19 | 70 | 44 | 10 | 143 |
| UMB | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 |  |
| UMNB | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 |  |
| UMNH | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Total no clip | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 |  |
| Total mark status known | 23 | 69 | 46 | 15 | 153 |
| Proportion Hatchery Origin | wners | OS) |  |  | 0.935 |

*Excluding fish < 49cm in sample
AD = Adipose-clipped (marked)
UM = Unmarked
NB = no CWT detected
$B=C W T$ detected
$\mathrm{NH}=$ No head

### 4.12 Dungeness

Since 1986, surveys by foot have been conducted throughout the spawning season from RM 0.0 to 18.7 in the mainstem Dungeness, and from RM 0 to 5.1 in the Gray Wolf mainstem, to generate a cumulative redd count for the season. The total redd count is multiplied by 2.5 to estimate the total number of adults. In 2018, 303 Chinook redds were counted in the Dungeness River and 12 redds were counted in the Gray Wolf (Table 4-25). The estimated number of natural spawners in the river was 758 and 30 adults, respectively. There were an additional 117 adults either trapped or netted from the river for the hatchery broodstock program including five pond mortalities. The total estimated return to the river was 905 .

Table 4-25. The distribution of Chinook redds in the Dungeness Rivers system, 2018.


Since 1986, the Dungeness River Chinook total returns have ranged from 50 in 1997 to 1,543 in 2006. The decreases in escapement of Dungeness spring Chinook relative to recent years and relative to forecast are partially due to the termination of the captive brood program after the 2002 brood, and resulting decrease in numbers of hatchery juveniles released.

## CWT Recoveries

Each carcass observed on the spawning ground and those collected and used for broodstock were sampled. Information, such as, fork length, post orbital hypural (POH) length, gender, mark status (adipose fin present or absent), scales, otoliths, DNA, gill
condition, and tag presence were collected. If a CWT had been detected, the snout was removed and a label was attached for identification.

We sampled 196 carcasses ( $\mathrm{n}=117$ broodstock collection and mortalities and 79 from natural spawners in the river). Of the total number of carcasses sampled, 160 of 196 ( $81.6 \%$ ) were tagged (Table 4-26). Eight Chinook carcasses with CWT were strays originating from other watersheds. Age-2 Chinook were not used for escapement expansion estimates.

Table 4-26. The number of CWT recoveries from Dungeness River Chinook salmon collected from broodstock collections and on spawning ground surveys (SGS) in the Dungeness and Gray Wolf rivers in 2018.

|  | Carcass <br> sample <br> size | $\#$ <br> carcasses <br> with CWT | Prop. Snouts <br> detected <br> with CWT | No. carcasses <br> with no tag <br> detected | Prop. no <br> tag <br> detected |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broodstock <br> collection and <br> mortalities | 117 | 92 | 0.7863 | 25 | 0.2136 |
| Spawning Ground <br> Surveys (SGS) | 79 | 68 | 0.8607 | 11 | 0.1392 |
| Total sample size | 196 | $160^{1}$ | 0.8163 | 36 | 0.1837 |

${ }^{1}$ One tag was lost

Of the 159 tagged fish decoded and excluding one tag that was lost, 2 (1.3\%) were age 2 , 65 (40.9\%) age 3, 91 (57.2\%) age 4, and 1 ( $0.6 \%$ ) were age 5. Eight-Elwha Hatchery origin Chinook had strayed into the Dungeness River (Table 4-26).

Based on the CWT results and scale samples analyzed, the preliminary NOR/HOR composition for Return Year (RY) 2018 was 147 (16.2\%) NOR and 758 ( $83.8 \%$ ) HOR. The ages of the NOR Chinook for RY2018 consisted of $44.9 \%$ age-3, $51.7 \%$ age-4, $3.4 \%$ age-5, and $0.0 \%$ age-6. The ages of the HOR Chinook for RY2018 consisted of $0.7 \%$ age-2, 40.5\% age-3, 58.2\% age-4, $0.7 \%$ age- 5 , and $0.0 \%$ age- 6 . The ages of all Chinook for RY2018 combined were $0.6 \%$ age 2, 41.2\%\% age-3, 57.1\% age-4, 1.1\% age-5, and 0.0\% age-6 (Table 4-27).

Table 4-27. Total number and percentages of Age 3, Age 4, and Age 5 HOR and NOR Chinook returns in 2018. Does not include nine age 2 HOR in broodstock collection.

|  | NOR | Percentage | HOR | Percentage | Total | Percentage |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Age-2 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 5 | $0.7 \%$ | 5 | $0.6 \%$ |
| Age-3 | 66 | $44.9 \%$ | 307 | $58.5 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ |  |
| Age-4 | 76 | $51.7 \%$ | 441 | 5 | 517 | $57.1 \%$ |
| Age-5 | 5 | $3.4 \%$ | 0 | $0.7 \%$ | 10 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Age-6 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Total | 147 | $100.0 \%$ | 758 | $100.0 \%$ | 905 | $100.0 \%$ |

From 2006 to 2017, the total Dungeness River Chinook NOR plus HOR returns ranged from 204 to 1,543 (Table 4-28). The number of NOR Chinook returns ranged from 43 to 339 and the number of HOR returns ranged from 90 to 1,204. The thirteen year averages for NOR and HOR were 149 ( $27.1 \%$ ) NOR and 400 ( $72.9 \%$ ) HOR, respectively.

Table 4-28. Total number of NOR and HOR natural spawners and broodstock in the Dungeness River for return years 2006-2018.

| Return <br> year | Natural <br> spawners <br> NOR $^{1}$ | Natural <br> spawners <br> HOR $^{1}$ | Natural <br> spawners <br> NOR+HOR | Broodstock <br> collection <br> NOR $^{2}$ | Broodstock <br> collection <br> HOR $^{2}$ | Broodstock <br> collection <br> NOR+HOR | Natural <br> spawners <br> + <br> Broodstock <br> NOR | Natural <br> spawners <br> Broodstock <br> HOR | Total <br> returns <br> NOR+HOR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 293 | 1,112 | 1,405 | 46 | 92 | 138 | 339 | 1,204 | 1,543 |
| 2007 | 146 | 159 | 305 | 47 | 51 | 98 | 193 | 210 | 403 |
| 2008 | 86 | 54 | 140 | 53 | 36 | 89 | 139 | 90 | 229 |
| 2009 | 71 | 57 | 128 | 42 | 50 | 92 | 113 | 107 | 220 |
| 2010 | 76 | 269 | 345 | 18 | 94 | 112 | 94 | 363 | 457 |
| 2011 | 83 | 452 | 535 | 21 | 109 | 130 | 104 | 561 | 665 |
| 2012 | 212 | 296 | 508 | 38 | 68 | 106 | 250 | 364 | 614 |
| 2013 | 46 | 122 | 168 | 31 | 79 | 110 | 77 | 201 | 278 |
| 2014 | 21 | 87 | 108 | 22 | 74 | 96 | 43 | 161 | 204 |
| 2015 | 65 | 200 | 265 | 37 | 105 | 142 | 102 | 305 | 407 |
| 2016 | 135 | 273 | 408 | 30 | 77 | 107 | 165 | 350 | 515 |
| 2017 | 149 | 456 | 605 | 26 | 74 | 100 | 175 | 530 | 705 |
| 2018 | 127 | 661 | 788 | 20 | 97 | 117 | 147 | 758 | 905 |
| Avg. | 116.2 | 322.9 | 439.1 | 33.2 | 77.4 | 111.2 | 149.3 | 400.3 | 550.2 |

${ }^{1}$ Natural spawners: Chinook that spawned naturally in the river. Natural spawner estimate based on redd surveys.
${ }^{2}$ Broodstock collection: Chinook that were collected in the river or returned to the hatchery and used for broodstock. Total includes pre-spawn mortalities.
3/ NORs and HORs determined by CWT detection, otolith marks, scales, or visible marks (adipose clips) from broodstock and river carcasses sampled.

### 4.13 Elwha River

The Elwha Dam removal project began in September 2011 and was completed by March 2012. The natural river flow was restored through the former Lake Aldwell. Prior to September 2012, Chinook spawning in the Elwha River was limited to the 4.8 miles below the dam with most natural spawning concentrated between RM 2.8 and 4.4. In August 2014, the Glines Canyon Dam was removed. Before dam removal, Chinook surveys were conducted by raft and foot surveys. SONAR technology is being used in the Elwha River as a method to improve enumeration of Chinook passage during the entire run from June through September. This technology will improve Chinook escapement estimates due to the difficulty of observing redds and fish in turbid water conditions caused by the removal of the two dams. Denton et. al. (2018) used an ARIS 1800 and a DIDSON LR (long-range) multi-beam sonar system to enumerate Chinook salmon in the Elwha River on a daily basis from June 6 h to September 18, 2018. For RY 2018, their best total return estimate for Chinook salmon was 7,107 fish with a calculated $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}(6,598-7,821)$.

The 2018 hatchery component of the Elwha Chinook Forecast terminal run size employed the return per spawner rates, with 4,5 , and 6 year old rates adjusted by the brood's previous performance. The adjustment is a multiplier consisting of the previous year's return rate divided by the mean return for that age. The wild (natural origin) return was estimated from 3 years of breakouts using otoliths and CWTs. The wild component of the returns has been rather consistently $5.5 \%$ of the total but otoliths have not been analyzed for 2018.

## Peak Spawning Ground Surveys and Redd Distribution

To determine the 2018 spatial distribution and density of Chinook redds in the Elwha River after dam removal, the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe (LEKT), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and Olympic National Park (ONP) personnel conducted extensive surveys during the peak spawning period (September 19-27) in the upper, middle, and lower watersheds. The Upper Elwha section is from Mills at Rkm 23.4 to Rkm midpoint 43.8, the Middle Elwha from Glines Power (Rkm 20.6) to Aldwell North (Rm 8.8), and the Lower Elwha from Lower Dam (Rkm 7.3) to Hunt Channel (Rkm 2.0). Of 1601 redds observed, 211 (13.2\%) redds were in the Upper Elwha, 909 (56.8\%) in the Middle Elwha, and 481 (30.0\%) in the Lower Elwha. In addition to recording the number of redds, surveyors recorded the number of live and dead Chinook (Table 4-29, McHenry et al. 2018).

Table 4-29. 2017 Elwha River Chinook salmon spawners from Upper Watershed Dam to the mouth (McHenry et al. 2018).

| Survey Reach | Rkm midpoint | Redds | Redds/km | Live Chinook | Dead Chinook | Jacks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upper Elwha |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upper Watershed | 43.8 | 5 | 0.2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Long Creek |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Geyser Valley | 28.8 | 11 | 1.8 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Cat Creek |  | 25 | 25 | 26 | 10 | 0 |
| Boulder Creek |  | 21 | 42 | 91 | 25 | 1 |
| Mills | 23.4 | 149 | 32.4 | 129 | 32 | 1 |
| UE Subtotal |  | 211 |  | 257 | 70 | 2 |
|  |  | 13.2\% |  |  |  |  |
| Middle Elwha |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Glines Power. | 20.6 | 71 | 64.5 | 91 | 26 | 0 |
| Altaire Bridge | 19.5 | 28 | 28 | 112 | 45 | 0 |
| Griff Creek | 18.5 | 42 | 42 | 38 | 55 | 0 |
| Rabbit Hole (Hughes) | 17.3 | 132 | 88 | 133 | 65 | 0 |
| Fisherman's C. | 16.1 | 49 | 61.2 | 18 | 37 | 0 |
| ONP Boundary | 14.7 | 33 | 16.5 | 26 | 18 | 1 |
| McDonald Br . | 12.9 | 43 | 26.9 | 49 | 15 | 0 |
| Little River | 12.2 | 63 | 33.2 | 108 | 52 | 0 |
| Indian Creek | 12.1 | 144 | 75.8 | 97 | 58 | 0 |
| Aldwell South | 11 | 206 | 89.6 | 149 | 115 | 0 |
| Aldwell North | 88 | 98 | 51.6 | 62 | 71 | 0 |
| ME Subtotal | 8.8 | 909 | 51.6 | 883 | 557 | 1 |
|  |  | 56.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| Lower Elwha |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Elwha Dam | 7.3 | 84 | 70 | 151 | 40 | 0 |
| Hwy 112 Bridge | 6.1 | 186 | 97.9 | 182 | 104 | 0 |
| County Bridge | 3.8 | 87 | 43.5 | - | - | - |
| East Channel | 1.4 | 82 | 29.3 | - | - | - |
| Hunt Rd. Chan. | 2 | 42 | 26.3 | 26 | 29 | 0 |
| LE Subtotal |  | 481 |  | 359 | 17 |  |
|  |  | 30.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  | 1,601 |  | 1,499 | 800 | 3 |

Source: McHenry et al. 2018. Spatial distribution of Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) spawning in the Elwha River, Washington State during dam removal and early stages of recolonization (2012-2018).

In addition to SONAR enumeration and peak spawning ground surveys, adult Chinook were collected by various methods for broodstock purposes in the lower river. WDFW hatchery staff collected salmon for broodstock by net, seine, gaff, and trap methods. Hatchery personnel collected 2,320 Chinook (1,420 males, 880 females, 20 jacks) from the traps and river for broodstock for the hatchery program. Due to an excess of males and females, 500 males, 29 females and 16 jacks, hatchery staff trucked the fish upstream and released them into the river to spawn naturally. The number of males, females, and jacks used for broodstock were 794, 744, and 2,
respectively. The terminal run size to the river was based on the SONAR estimate of 7,101 Chinook. Excluding jacks, the total number of Chinook that spawned naturally in the Elwha River and its tributaries was 5,330 adults. This number was calculated by subtracting the number of Chinook that were collected for broodstock from the SONAR estimate (Table 4-30).

Table 4-30. Chinook broodstock collection, estimated total adult return, and estimated number of natural spawning fish Elwha River in 2018.

| Capture method | No. <br> Males | No. <br> Females | Total <br> adults | No. <br> Jacks | Total adults <br> incl jacks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gaff-Hook and line | 52 | 214 | $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ | 0 | 266 |
| Seining-Gill netting | 616 | 438 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 5 4}$ | 2 | 1,056 |
| Elwha Hatchery Trap Volunteers | 731 | 177 | $\mathbf{9 0 8}$ | 18 | 926 |
| Lower Elwha Hatchery transfers | 21 | 51 | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | 0 | 72 |
| Total broodstock collection | 1,420 | 880 | $\mathbf{2 , 3 0 0}$ | 20 | 2,320 |
| Minus Elwha Hatchery Trap Volunteers | -500 | -29 | $\mathbf{- 5 2 9}$ | -16 | -545 |
| Returned back to the river to spawn |  |  | 851 | $\mathbf{1 , 7 7 1}$ | 4 |
| naturally | 920 | 107 | $\mathbf{1 3 3}$ | 2 | 1,775 |
| Total broodstock collection | 126 |  | $\mathbf{7 , 1 0 1}$ |  | 135 |
| Mortalities in raceways |  | $\mathbf{5 , 3 3 0}$ |  |  |  |
| SONAR adult estimate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated natural spawners in rivera |  |  |  |  |  |

Natural spawners $=$ SONAR estimate of 7,101 minus adult broodstock collection of 1,771$)=5,330$ natural escapements. Data source: Hatchery broodstock collection numbers from Troy Tisdale, WDFW Hatchery Manager.

## Sampling Collection

WDFW personnel sampled carcasses using the methods described in Weinheimer et al (2018). Carcasses were sampled in the mainstem river (CS) and from broodstock collected by WDFW hatchery staff using seines and nets (Net) and fish returning to the Lower Elwha Klallam tribal hatchery (LEKT) and WDFW Elwha Rearing Channel (Volunteers). WDFW staff sampled carcasses for fork length (cm), post-orbital hypural length ( POH ), sex, scales, otoliths, presence of CWT tag, checked for clipped adipose fin, and a DNA fin clip if fish gills showed a coloration of better than $50 \%$. During each sampling day and after all samples were collected (sampled group), personnel would tally the remaining spawned fish for sex, marks, and tags (non-sampled group). No scales, otoliths, or DNA were collected from this group. If a tag was detected in a fish, then the snout was removed, labeled, and bagged. Summaries of the sampled and non-sampled groups were given to the hatchery manager for their records. Four hundred and fifty carcasses were sampled in the river and 312 broodstock carcasses were sampled at the WDFW Elwha Hatchery adult raceways for a total of 762. All broodstock and carcass survey results in this report are preliminary until all age, mark, otolith and CWT results are verified.

## Evaluating hatchery mark rates

The primary hatchery marking strategy for brood years of Elwha Chinook salmon expected to return in 2018 was a thermal otolith mark. Avoidance of the adipose clip was intended to reduce vulnerability to mark selective fisheries. Most hatchery Chinook salmon are released
into the Elwha River as sub-yearlings, but there is also a smaller yearling release group (Table 4-31).

In some years, equipment malfunctions limited the capacity to induce thermal otolith marks. Thermal otolith marks require sequentially altering water temperature during embryonic development in a prescribed protocol over the course of approximately 1-3 weeks, and specialized chillers are required to accomplish this task.

Table 4-31. Releases of hatchery Chinook in the Elwha River Basin, brood years 2013-2016.

| Brood <br> Year | Type | Thermal <br> Otolith | Thermal <br> Otolith + CWT | CWT | AD + CWT + <br> Thermal Otolith | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2013 | Subyearling | $2,388,947$ | 0 | 0 | 251,024 | $2,639,971$ |
|  | Yearling | 0 | 177,945 | 0 | 0 | 177,269 |
| 2014 | Subyearling | $2,429,097$ | 0 | 0 | 250,295 | $2,679,392$ |
|  | Yearling | 0 | 158,799 | 0 | 0 | 158,799 |
| 2015 | Subyearling | $2,429,097$ | 0 | 0 | 250,072 | $2,646,442$ |
|  | Yearling | 0 | 155,400 | 0 | 0 | 158,400 |
| 2016 | Subyearling | 585,431 | 0 | 0 | 249,206 | 834,637 |
|  | Yearling | 0 | 154,760 | 0 | 0 | 154,760 |

## River Carcass Recoveries

WDFW, LEKT, and ONP biologists and technicians sampled river carcasses from fish that spawned naturally in the river. Chinook carcasses were sampled between September 12 and October 4, 2018. Based on redd numbers from previous spawning seasons, the period between September 19 and September 26 provided the best opportunity for the peak redd count and sampling carcasses.

Biologist and technicians sampled 450 Chinook river carcasses throughout the spawning season. Of this total, $374(83.1 \%)$ had readable scales. The highest number of river carcass samples collected in a one-week period occurred during the week of Sept 19-26, 389 ( $86.4 \%$ ). Ten percent of the carcasses were sampled after October 1 as spawning declined significantly. Of the 374 carcasses that were successfully aged, 1 ( $0.3 \%$ ) was age 2 , 203 ( $54.3 \%$ ) were age 3,168 ( $44.9 \%$ ) were age 4 , and $0.5 \%$ were age 5 (Table 4-32).

Table 4-32. 2018 readable scale samples taken from Elwha Chinook collected during river carcass surveys.

| Method | Mark | Age $\mathbf{2}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Age 4 $_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Age $\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| CS | ADB | 0 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | $4.55 \%$ |
| CS | ADNB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | $0.53 \%$ |
| CS | UMB | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | $2.67 \%$ |
| CS | UMNB | 0 | 155 | 1 | 138 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 295 | $78.88 \%$ |
| CS | UDNB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $0.27 \%$ |
| CS | Blank | 1 | 28 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | $13.10 \%$ |
| Total |  | 1 | 201 | 2 | 166 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 374 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Percentage |  | $0.27 \%$ | $53.74 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ | $44.39 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

The abbreviations in the Mark column represent the number of fish in each of the following categories: ADB = adipose clipped + Beep (CWT detected); ADNB = adipose clipped + No Beep (no CWT detected); UMB = Unmarked + Beep (CWT detected); UMNB = Unmarked + No Beep (No CWT detected); UDNB=Undetermined mark + No Beep (No CWT detected; BLANK= Unknown marking.

## Broodstock Collection:

We sampled $66 \%$ of the netted fish that were transported from the river to the WDFW Hatchery. One hundred percent of the adults collected at the LEKT Hatchery (29) and the volunteers to the WDFW Hatchery (77) were sampled. We did not sample any river-gaffed fish during the 2018 season.

Biologists and technicians sampled broodstock (BS) carcasses on three different spawning days. The following dates, September 11, 18, and 25, provided an excellent opportunity to collect scale, otolith, DNA, and to check for marked and tagged fish during the prime spawning period. For the three spawning days, 312 of 950 or $32.8 \%$ of the fish were sampled. Of the total sampled and non-sampled fish, 160 of 502 males (31.8\%) and 152 of 448 females (33.9\%) were sampled.

Of the 312 broodstock scale samples collected, 285 ( $86.5 \%$ ) were successfully aged in the laboratory. Of the 285 carcasses that were successfully aged, 129 ( $45.3 \%$ ) were age 3,153 ( $53.6 \%$ ) were age 4 , and $1.1 \%$ were age 5 (Table 4-33).

Table 4-33. Readable scale samples collected from Elwha Chinook broodstock, LEKT transfers to the WDFW Elwha hatchery, and volunteers.

| Method | Mark | Age $\mathbf{2}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Age $\mathbf{4}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{4}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Age $\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEKT, NET, VOL | ADB | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | $5.26 \%$ |
| LEKT, NET, VOL | ADNB | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | $1.05 \%$ |
| LEKT, NET, VOL | UMB | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | $2.81 \%$ |
| LEKT, NET, VOL | UMNB | 0 | 116 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 | $90.88 \%$ |
| LEKT, NET, VOL | UDNB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| LEKT, NET, VOL | Blank | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
| Percentage |  | $0.00 \%$ | $45.26 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $52.98 \%$ | $0.70 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |

Of the 762 scale samples collected, 659 ( $86.5 \%$ ) were successfully aged in the laboratory. Of the 659 carcasses that were successfully aged, 332 ( $50.4 \%$ ) were age 3, 321 ( $48.7 \%$ ) were age 4 , and $0.8 \%$ were age 5 (Table 4-34).

Table 4-34. Redable scales samples from carcass surveys and Elwha chinook transferred and volunteered to WDFW Elwha hatchery.

| Method | Mark | Age $\mathbf{2}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{3}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Age $\mathbf{4}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{4}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Age $\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Age $\mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Total | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CS, LEKT, NET, VOL | ADB | 0 | 23 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | $4.86 \%$ |
| CS, LEKT, NET, VOL | ADNB | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | $0.76 \%$ |
| CS, LEKT, NET, VOL UMB | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 18 | $2.73 \%$ |  |
| CS, LEKT, NET, VOL UMNB | 0 | 271 | 1 | 281 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 554 | $84.07 \%$ |  |
| CS, LEKT, NET, VOL UDNB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $0.15 \%$ |  |
| CS, LEKT, NET, VOL | Blank | 1 | 28 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | $7.44 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
| Percentage |  | $0.15 \%$ | $50.08 \%$ | $0.30 \%$ | $48.10 \%$ | $0.61 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.76 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

## Hatchery mark rates

Four-hundred and forty five and 312 otolith samples were taken during river carcass surveys and hatchery broodstock, respectively. Of the 659 fish that could be aged by scales, 37 were adipose clipped, 572 were unmarked, and 50 fish could not be positively identified for a mark.

Hatchery Origin Returns (HOR) and Natural Origin Returns (NOR) will be finalized after all of the otolith samples have been analyzed and CWTs have been matched with individual fish. False CWT detections can occur and the number of CWT fish in the table could be lower. Fish that could not be aged because of unreadable scale samples may be aged from otolith marked samples or decoded tags.

## CWT Data

We collected CWTs from 55 fish in the Elwha River watershed during fall 2018. In addition, three snouts were submitted to the CWT Lab but they did not have a tag. Thirty of the CWTs were recovered from river carcasses and the remaining 25 from Chinook broodstock (Table 4-35). The majority of the CWTs originated from releases into the Elwha River, but some were derived from releases into the neighboring Morse Creek ( $N=3$ ), Dungeness $(\mathrm{N}=2)$ and Gray Wolf ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) watersheds. The Morse Creek Chinook are Elwha stock origin. We sampled one fish that originated from East Sound Bay ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ). Of the 55 CWTs recovered, 36 were from adipose clipped fish originating from Elwha releases. Of the 36 marked fish, 1 was from brood year 2013, 8 from brood year 2014, and 27 from brood year 2015. The ages of the tagged fish were ( $67.3 \%$ ) age 3, 20.0\% age 4, and $12.7 \%$ age 5 (Table 4-35).

Table 4-35. 2018 CWT's recovered from naturally spawning chinook during carcass surveys and from broodstock collections.

| 2018 CWTs Recovered from Naturally Spawning Chinook during Carcass Surveys and from Broodstock Collections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Brood year | Brood year | Brood year |  |
| Collection Method-Tag Code | Tag Code | Release Site | Mark Status | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Grand Total |
| Carcass Survey | 211109 | GRAY WOLF R 18.0048 | Unmarked |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Carcass Survey | 211112 | DUNGENESS R 18.0018 | Unmarked |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| Carcass Survey | 636614 | MORSE CR 18.0185 | Unmarked | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Carcass Survey | 636624 | MORSE CR 18.0185 | Unmarked | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Carcass Survey | 636671 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | Unknown mark | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Carcass Survey | 636812 | ELWHAR 18.0272 | Unmarked |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Carcass Survey | 636833 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clip |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| Carcass Survey | 636956 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | Unmarked |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Carcass Survey | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clip |  |  | 12 | 12 |
| Carcass Survey | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | Unmarked |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| Carcass Survey | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | Unknown mark |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| Carcass Survey | 637047 | EAST SOUND BAY (SAN) | AD Fin Clip |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Carcass Survey |  |  |  | 3 | 6 | 21 | 30 |
| LEKT | 636812 | ELWHAR 18.0272 | Unmarked |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| LEKT | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clip |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| LEKT |  |  |  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| NET | 636614 | MORSE CR 18.0185 | Unmarked | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| NET | 636671 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clp | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| NET | 636671 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | Unmarked | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| NET | 636833 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clp |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| NET | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clp |  |  | 10 | 10 |
| NET | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | Unmarked |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| NET |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | 11 | 17 |
| VOL | 636833 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clp |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| VOL | 636963 | ELWHA R 18.0272 | AD Fin Clp |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| VOL |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  | 7 | 11 | 37 | 55 |
| Percentage |  |  |  | 12.7\% | 20.0\% | 67.3\% | 100.0\% |

DNA Collection
We collected 460 DNA fin clips, 148 from river carcasses and 312 from the broodstock collection. These samples are stored for future analysis at the WDFW Molecular Genetics Laboratory.

### 4.14 Hoko

WDFW and Makah Fisheries Management staff conducted foot surveys to count live and dead Chinook and Chinook redds in the mainstem between river miles 2.8 to 21.7 and tributaries, which represents all Chinook spawning area in the Hoko basin. There are ten mainstem and13 tributary reaches, which include the Little Hoko River, a tributary to the lower mainstem, and Browne's, Herman, North Fork Herman, Ellis, Bear, and Cub creeks, which are tributaries to the upper mainstem. WDFW conducted surveys from RM 2.8 to 10.1 during the 2018 return year and observed 219 redds (Table 4-36) and Makah Fisheries Management (MFM) counted 22 redds (Table 4-37).

Table 4-36. Chinook redd surveys in mainstem Hoko River from RM 2.8 - RM 10.1 by DFW in 2018.

| Survey Date | End River Mile | Start River Mile | Total Live | Total Dead | New Redds | Visible Redds | Survey visibility | Stream flow | Survey Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2018-10-03 | RM 9.80 | RM 10.10 | 128 | 0 | 47 | 47 | Excellent | Low |  |
| 2018-10-09 | RM 9.80 | RM 10.10 | 330 | F 15 | 20 | 67 | Excellent | Moderate | 240 floy tags observed |
| 2018-10-17 | RM 9.80 | RM 10.10 | 234 | 3 | 36 | 102 | Excellent | Low | 6 green floy tags observed |
| 2018-10-22 | RM 9.80 | RM 10.10 | 141 | 6 | 30 | 115 | Excellent | Low |  |
| Total redds |  |  |  |  | 133 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-10-17 | RM 2.80 | RM 3.40 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
| Total redds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-10-03 | RM 3.40 | RM 4.40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Excellent | Low |  |
| 2018-10-09 | RM 3.40 | RM 4.40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-17 | RM 3.40 | RM 4.40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-24 | RM 3.40 | RM 4.40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Excellent | Low |  |
| Total redds |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-10-03 | RM 4.40 | RM 5.60 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | Excellent | Low |  |
| 2018-10-09 | RM 4.40 | RM 5.60 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | Very good | Moderate |  |
| 2018-10-17 | RM 4.40 | RM 5.60 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-24 | RM 4.40 | RM 5.60 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | Excellent | Low |  |
| Total redds |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-10-03 | RM 5.60 | RM 7.50 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-10 | RM 5.60 | RM 7.50 | 26 | 0 | 19 | 20 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-17 | RM 5.60 | RM 7.50 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 19 | Excellent | Low |  |
| 2018-10-24 | RM 5.60 | RM 7.50 | 9 | 0 | 15 |  | Excellent | Moderately-low |  |
| Total redds |  |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018-10-03 | RM 7.50 | RM 8.70 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 8 | Good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-10 | RM 7.50 | RM 8.70 | 28 | 0 | 5 | 13 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
| 2018-10-17 | RM 7.50 | RM 8.70 | 46 | 1 | 15 | 26 | Excellent | Low |  |
| 2018-10-24 | RM 7.50 | RM 8.70 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 28 | Very good | Moderately-low |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Season total redds |  |  |  |  | 219 |  |  |  |  |

Table 4-37. Summary of Hoko and Sekiu Chinook surveys by Makah Fisheries Management staff in 2018.


In addition to the Hoko River surveys, Makah Fish Management staffed surveyed the NF Sekiu River from RM 5.47 to RM 8.13 and the Sekiu River from RM 1.30 to RM 5.47. No Chinook redds were observed in either section and only two live Chinook were observed, one in each of the two streams.

## Hoko Broodstock Collection

For the 2018 Hoko Chinook broodstock season, 175 females, 15,34 males, and 194 jacks returned to the Hoko Falls Hatchery pond facility. Of the 1,903 total fish that returned to the pond, 122 females, 114 males and 16 jacks were lethally spawned. The remaining 53 females and 1,420 males were released back to the river to spawn naturally (Table 4-38).

Table 4-38. Number of female, male, and jack Chinook that returned to the Hoko Falls Hatchery in 2018 that were spawned, released back to the river to spawn naturally, culled, surplused, and died before spawning.

| Sex | Rack count | Mortality | Surplused | Lethal spawned <br> (Viable) | Returned to stream |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 175 | 0 | 0 | -122 | -53 |
| Male | 1,534 | 0 | 0 | -114 | $-1,420$ |
| Total adults | $\mathbf{1 , 7 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 3 6}$ | $-1,473$ |
| Jack | 194 | 0 | 0 | -16 | -178 |
| Total fish | $\mathbf{1 , 9 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 , 6 5 1}$ |

Source: Joe Hinton, Hoko Falls Hatchery Manager-Makah Tribe.

The 2018 escapement estimate for Hoko Chinook is 1,943 spawning in the river (natural origin and hatchery origin combined) and 236 returning to the hatchery for a terminal runsize (TRS) of 2,179 . To prevent double counting salmon released from the hatchery back to the river to spawn naturally, the following methods were used to calculate the final TRS:

1) Hoko Falls Hatchery adult return 1,709 ( 175 females and 1,534 males).
2) Number of Chinook spawned at hatchery: 122 females and 114 males spawned $=236$ adults broodstock.
3) To get an idea of hatchery returns released back to the river, 53 females and 1,420 males at the hatchery were released back to the river on October 8th. Of this total, 19 females, 740 males, and 130 jacks were floy tagged and released. On October 9,345 live plus dead fish were counted, of which 240 were floy- tagged fish in the section close to the hatchery (RM 9.8-10.1). On October 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, 19 females ( 12 tagged), 103 males ( 53 tagged), and 21 jacks (21 tagged) were recaptured at the hatchery and released back to the river for a second time. Six tags were observed on October 17 and 3 tags on October 23. Since there were only 53 females released back to the river, it was decided to calculate the number of river adult spawners before and after the release date.
4) Before the first release date October 8th, WDFW and Makah Fishery Management field staff (MFM) counted 67 redds ( 67 redds $\times 2.5$ adults per redd $=167.5$ fish). The 2.5 adults per redd is equal to one female and 1.5 males per redd.
5) After the October $8^{\text {th }}$ release date, WDFW and MFM counted 174 redds ( 435 fish). We assumed that the 53 females returned to the river, spawned, and counted as part of the 174 redd count. The corrected redd count would be (174-53 =121 total redds or 302.5 fish).
6) Adding the corrected redd count of 121 to the 67 redds observed before the fish were released yields 188 redds or 470 adults.
7) Of the 1,709 adult Chinook returns to the Hoko Falls Hatchery, 1,473 adult Chinook (53 females and 1,420 males) were released back to the river to spawn naturally. Adding this number to the redd-based estimate of 470 adults from WDFW and MFM surveys, the number of natural spawners (HOR and NOR) in the river equals 1,943 fish. The Terminal Run Size (TRS) equals 2,179 adults when the 236 adult broodstock spawned at the hatchery were added. This total excludes jacks.

The number of hatchery origin and natural origin Chinook returning to either the Hoko falls Hatchery and the Hoko river could not be determined at the time of this report because scales have yet to be processed, however the totals are listed below (Table 4-39).

Table 4-39. Total broodstock and natural Chinook spawners in the Hoko river in 2018.

|  | Returns to <br> Hatchery | In-River <br> Spawners | Total | HOR <br> Proportion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 236 | 1,943 | 2,179 | NA |

Data source: Hap Leon, Makah Fisheries Management.

## 5 Coded-wire Tag Sampling

Commercial and recreational catch is sampled to recover coded-wire tagged Chinook and coho. General objectives are to sample 20\% of commercial catch in each area and week, and $10 \%$ of marine recreational catch in each area and month. Sampling rates for calendar year (January-December) 2017 are summarized below, and were based on catches reported by local biologists, and sample sizes queried from the RMIS database. Sampling rates of commercial fisheries in 2017 generally exceeded the $20 \%$ sampling objective, although 13A, 13C, 12C, and Strait of Juan de Fuca Troll were below 20\% (Table 5-1). Marine area recreational fisheries were sampled at rates between $8.8 \% \%$ and $49 \%$ for the year (Table 5-2). Note that these data were updated just prior to completion of this report, and will be validated and corrected as needed prior to submission to update the RMIS (Regional Mark Information System) database.

Table 5-1. Chinook coded-wire tag sampling rates for commercial fisheries in 2017 (calendar year).

| Catch Area/River | Catch | \# Sampled | Sample Rate |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7-7A | 2,567 | 596 | $23 \%$ |
| 7B-7C-7D-Nooksack River | 19,912 | 6,944 | $35 \%$ |
| Skagit River/Bay | 2,373 | 1,118 | $47 \%$ |
| 8A | 2 | 1 | $50 \%$ |
| 8D | 11,812 | 1,862 | $16 \%$ |
| Stillaguamish River | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | $100 \%$ |
| 10E | 5,798 | 2,677 | $46 \%$ |
| 10F | 297 | 270 | $91 \%$ |
| 10G | 8 | 3 | $37 \%$ |
| 10A | 918 | 898 | $98 \%$ |
| Duwamish River | 5,789 | 3,080 | $53 \%$ |
| Puyallup/White rivers | 3,464 | 2,336 | $67 \%$ |
| Nisqually River | 16,548 | 5,696 | $34 \%$ |
| 13A | 3,741 | 184 | $5 \%$ |
| 13C | 519 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| 13D-F | 9,791 | 1,134 | $12 \%$ |
| 9 | 45 | 15 | $33 \%$ |
| 9A-12-12A-12B | 252 | 34 | $13 \%$ |
| 12C | 16,995 | 1,256 | $7 \%$ |
| 12H | 24,592 | 6,573 | $27 \%$ |
| Skokomish River | 16,640 | 2,119 | $13 \%$ |
| Purdy Creek | 5,908 | 1,389 | $24 \%$ |
| Strait of JDF 4B-5-6 (Net) | 53 | 17 | $32 \%$ |
| Strait of JDF 4B-5-6C (Troll) a | 380 | 5 | $1 \%$ |

[^1]Table 5-2. Chinook coded-wire tag sampling rates for marine recreational fisheries in 2017.

| Catch Area | Catch | \# Sampled | Sample Rate |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Marine Sport Area 5 | 2,658 | 1,110 | $41.8 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 6 | 5,453 | 1,635 | $30.0 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 7 | 5,864 | 1,586 | $27.0 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 8.1/8.2 | 1,135 | 557 | $49.1 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 9 | 8,342 | 2,115 | $25.4 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 10 | 2,543 | 1,114 | $43.8 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 11 | 4,594 | 1,670 | $36.4 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 13 | 4,024 | 353 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Marine Sport Area 12 | 2,793 | 245 | $8.8 \%$ |
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## 7 9-Year Spawning Escapements

Nooksack Early Management Unit. Spawning escapement in the South Fork Nooksack River, are a complex of multiple origin and run-timing Chinook populations. The portion of the complex estimated to be of SF early NOR returns are highlighted for convenience.

| Year | N./Mid. Fork |  | South Fork |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NOR | HOR | SF Native NOR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SF } \\ & \text { HOR } \end{aligned}$ | N. Fk Early NOR | Kendall Cr. HOR | Fall NOR | Fall/other HOR/Unk |
| 2009 | 269 | 1,634 | 45 |  | 58 | 128 | 187 | 38 |
| 2010 | 204 | 1,844 | 21 (0) |  | 43 (0) | 293 | 107 (0) | 29 (0) |
| 2011 | 99 | 766 | 90 (3) |  | 61 (1) | 176 | 96 (1) | 48 (8) |
| 2012 | 281 | 477 | 116 (1) |  | 172 (1) | 79 (17) | 93 (2) | 42 (0) |
| 2013 | 100 | 1,247 | 10 (1) |  | 39 (0) | 162 (39) | 16 (2) | 15 (2) |
| 2014 | 91 | 1,307 | 22 (1) | 10 (0) | 56 (1) | 99 (2) | 11 (0) | 10 (0) |
| 2015 | 401 | 1,316 | 7 (0) | 11 (0) | 39 (0) | 9 (0) | 32 (0) | 37 (0) |
| 2016 | 187 | 735 | 319 (4) | 302 (7) | 179 (3) | 32 (5) | 86 (1) | 39 (0) |

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent additional pre-spawn mortalities encountered.
Skagit Springs Management Unit.

| Year | Upper Sauk | Suiattle | Upper Cascade |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 367 | 273 | 338 |
| 2010 | 768 | 263 | 330 |
| 2011 | 345 | 215 | 265 |
| 2012 | 1,826 | 460 | 488 |
| 2013 | 1,080 | 620 | 310 |
| 2014 | 923 | 460 | 225 |
| 2015 | 743 | 478 | 188 |
| 2016 | 1,502 | 648 | 295 |
| 2017 | 1,630 | 898 | 232 |

Skagit Summer/Falls Management Unit.

| Year | Upper Skagit | Lower Sauk | Lower Skagit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 5,290 | 250 | 1,439 |
| 2010 | 6,644 | 356 | 1,017 |
| 2011 | 4,480 | 210 | 820 |
| 2012 | 9,808 | 715 | 3,295 |
| 2013 | 8,801 | 530 | 1,551 |
| 2014 | 8,308 | 364 | 1,785 |
| 2015 | 10,705 | 406 | 2,203 |
| 2016 | 15,423 | 1,044 | 2,921 |
| 2017 | 7,792 | 1,001 | 3,638 |

Stillaguamish Management Unit. Stillaguamish River escapement estimates for both summer and fall Chinook populations proportioned by HOR/NOR adult returns. Numbers in parentheses from represent additional fish (both HOR and NOR) collected for brood-stock (BS) utilization.

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MU Total |  |  |
| Year | NOR (BS) |  |

Snohomish Management Unit.

|  | Skykomish |  | Snoqualmie |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Year | NOR | HOR | NOR | HOR |
| 2009 | 1,146 | 268 | 649 | 246 |
| 2010 | 1,836 | 676 | 1,585 | 203 |
| 2011 | 881 | 299 | 479 | 221 |
| 2012 | 2,462 | 1,283 | 898 | 481 |
| 2013 | 1,860 | 495 | 770 | 119 |
| 2014 | 1,654 | 1,409 | 698 | 140 |
| 2015 | 1,585 | 1,449 | 694 | 135 |
| 2016 | 2,363 | 1,422 | 1,013 | 355 |
| 2017 | 2,783 | 1,591 | 1,401 | 344 |

Lake Washington Management Unit.

|  | Cedar River |  | Sammamish River |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Year | NOR | HOR | NOR | HOR |
| 2009 | 574 | 139 | 25 | 899 |
| 2010 | 553 | 113 | 43 | 1,788 |
| 2011 | 647 | 163 | 25 | 715 |
| 2012 | 898 | 185 | 60 | 1,979 |
| 2013 | 1,591 | 260 | 93 | 2,240 |
| 2014 | 303 | 277 | 18 | 464 |
| 2015 | 1,176 | 632 | 49 | 939 |
| 2016 | 609 | 436 | 100 | 1,147 |
| 2017 | 1,557 | 491 | N/A | N/A |

Green River Management Unit.

| Year |  | NOR |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2009 | 165 | HOR |
| 2010 | 859 | 1,233 |
| 2011 | 459 | 534 |
| 2012 | 1,638 | 1,452 |
| 2013 | 524 | 1,517 |
| 2014 | 756 | 1,974 |
| 2015 | 864 | 3,223 |
| 2016 | 2,566 | 7,497 |
| 2017 | 2,011 | 6,346 |

Puyallup River Fall Management Unit.

| Year | NOR | HOR |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2009 | 538 | 1,027 |
| 2010 | 550 | 1,080 |
| 2011 | 487 | 1,093 |
| 2012 | 654 | 419 |
| 2013 | 252 | 596 |
| 2014 | 544 | 926 |
| 2015 | 984 | 1,140 |
| 2016 | 737 | 1,963 |
| 2017 | 840 | 1,079 |

White River Spring Management Unit.

| Year |  | NOR | HOR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2009 | 263 | 284 | APP |
| 2010 | 239 | 126 | 362 |
| 2011 | 450 | 369 | 983 |
| 2012 | 808 | 204 | 1,119 |
| 2013 | 795 | 931 | 2,734 |
| 2014 | 218 | 105 | 637 |
| 2015 | 358 | 490 | 736 |
| 2016 | 645 | 501 | 2,851 |
| 2017 | 630 |  | 2,994 |

## Nisqually River Management Unit.

| Year | NOR | HOR |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2009 | 185 | 687 |
| 2010 | 353 | 1,714 |
| 2011 | 302 | 1,962 |
| 2012 | 617 | 1,850 |
| 2013 | 738 | 933 |
| 2014 | 528 | 512 |
| 2015 | 715 | 790 |
| 2016 | 796 | 168 |
| 2017 | 1,049 | 1,991 |

## Skokomish River Management Unit.

| Year | NOR | HOR | Total |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2009 |  |  | 1,066 |
| 2010 | 162 | 1,052 | 1,214 |
| 2011 | 54 | 1,267 | 1,321 |
| 2012 | 142 | 1,391 | 1,533 |
| 2013 | 171 | 1,551 | 1,722 |
| 2014 | 109 | 740 | 849 |
| 2015 | 117 | 315 | 432 |
| 2016 | 179 | 1,163 | 1,342 |
| 2017 |  |  | 8,058 |

Mid-Hood Canal Management Unit.

| Year | Hamma Hamma | Duckabush | Dosewallips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 98 | 9 | 23 |
| 2010 | 91 | 0 | 15 |
| 2011 | 294 | 5 | 11 |
| 2012 | 425 | 6 | 7 |
| 2013 | 707 | 7 | 4 |
| 2014 | 117 | 13 | 11 |
| 2015 | 236 | 20 | 3 |
| 2016 | 268 | 15 | 8 |
| 2017 | 365 | 2 | 7 |

## Dungeness River Management Unit.

|  | Natural Spawners ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  | Broodstock Collection ${ }^{2 /}$ |  |  | Total Returns <br> (Natural Spawners + Broodstock) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Return year | NOR | HOR | Total | NOR | HOR | Total | NOR | HOR | Total |
| 2009 | 71 | 57 | 128 | 42 | 50 | 92 | 113 | 107 | 220 |
| 2010 | 76 | 269 | 345 | 18 | 94 | 112 | 94 | 363 | 457 |
| 2011 | 83 | 452 | 535 | 21 | 109 | 130 | 104 | 561 | 665 |
| 2012 | 212 | 296 | 508 | 38 | 68 | 106 | 250 | 364 | 614 |
| 2013 | 46 | 122 | 168 | 31 | 79 | 110 | 77 | 201 | 278 |
| 2014 | 21 | 87 | 108 | 22 | 74 | 96 | 43 | 161 | 204 |
| 2015 | 65 | 200 | 265 | 37 | 105 | 142 | 102 | 305 | 407 |
| 2016 | 135 | 273 | 408 | 30 | 77 | 115 | 165 | 350 | 523 |
| 2017 | 166 | 439 | 605 | 26 | 74 | 100 | 192 | 513 | 705 |

1/ Natural spawners: Chinook that spawned naturally in the river. Natural spawner estimate based on redd surveys.
2/ Broodstock collection: Chinook that were collected in the river or returned to the hatchery and used for broodstock. Includes pre-spawned mortalities as well.
3/ NORs and HORs determined by CWT, otolith, scales, or visible marks from broodstock and river carcasses sampled.

## Elwha River Management Unit.

| Year |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| HOR/NOR |  |
| 2009 | 2,192 |
| 2010 | 1,278 |
| 2011 | 1,862 |
| 2012 | 2,638 |
| 2013 | 4,243 |
| 2014 | 4,360 |
| 2015 | 4,112 |
| 2016 | 2,628 |
| 2017 | 3,100 |

## Hoko River Management Unit.

| Year | HOR/NOR |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 385 |
| 2010 | 793 |
| 2011 | 1,504 |
| 2012 | 663 |
| 2013 | 1,406 |
| 2014 | 1,760 |
| 2015 | 2,877 |
| 2016 | 1,324 |
| 2017 | 1,225 |


[^0]:    1"MIT tags"; the number of sampled fish with MIT tags, or those otherwise identified as hatchery re-release.
    ${ }^{2}$ Accoustic MIT Tags: the number of carcasses retrieved with MIT acoustic tags (MIT supplemental study)
    ${ }^{3}$ CWT: Coded wire tag present (unconfirmed) DIT = (Double Index Tag) Adipose fin present, coded wire tag present.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Includes 4B Summer Troll catch for 2017.

