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#### Abstract

The 2022 Scott River Juvenile Salmonid Outmigrant Study is part of the ongoing work conducted by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Yreka Fisheries Program on the Shasta and Scott Rivers in Siskiyou County, California. The Scott River rotary screw trap project has been in operation since 2000. Two rotary screw traps were operated on the Scott River from January 26 to June 23, 2022 to sample all age classes of emigrating Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), Coho Salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch), and steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Mark and recapture trials were conducted multiple times per week to determine trap efficiencies and weekly population estimates. Established age-length cutoffs for each species were used to determine the age of the fish captured. In-stream conditions such as flow and water temperature were also monitored. Weekly estimates for the smolt class of all target species were compared to previous results to evaluate multi-year population trends. Additionally, using multi-year seasonal production estimates and Coho Salmon adult returns to the Scott River, adult survival and smolt production estimates were calculated. For the period sampled in 2022, we estimated that a total of 493,084 0+, and $3271+$ Chinook Salmon; 10,399 $0+$ and 68,616 1+ Coho Salmon; and 638,577 0+, 45,445 1+, 4,173 2+, and $143+$ steelhead emigrated from the Scott River.


## INTRODUCTION

Monitoring of adult salmonids on the Scott River was initiated as part of the Klamath River Project in 1978 (Knechtle and Chesney 2012). Annual juvenile salmonid monitoring started in 2001, with the installation of the Scott River rotary screw trap (RST). In 2005, Coho Salmon of the Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Evolutionary Significant Unit (SONCC ESU) were listed as a threatened species from the Oregon border to Punta Gorda, California under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). This report includes estimates of the number of Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), Coho Salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch), and steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) emigrating from the Scott River, Siskiyou County, California between January 26 and June 23, 2022. Monitoring juvenile salmonid out migration is not only necessary to assess the status of the species but has implications for current and future efforts to sustain and restore these populations. Monitoring efforts will only become increasingly imperative with future changes in water management and watershed dynamics in the Klamath River Basin.

The specific goals of the 2022 out migration monitoring project were:

- To inform the agencies and stakeholders about the effectiveness of restoration projects that are intended to increase juvenile salmonid production and survival.
- To determine abundance and timing of all age classes of juvenile salmonids emigrating from the Scott River between January 26 and June 23, 2022.
- To estimate the weekly mean fork lengths and ages of salmonids in the catch from a measured sub-sample.
- To estimate weekly rotary trap efficiencies for all age classes of Chinook Salmon, Coho Salmon, and steelhead in the catch and produce weekly production estimates for each age class.
- To monitor stream flow and temperature at the traps.


## METHODS

## Study Area

The Scott River is one of nine major tributaries to the Klamath River and is the second largest below the Iron Gate Dam. The river flows 93 kilometers (km) through Siskiyou County before it enters the Klamath River at river kilometer (RK) 222. The system is predominantly precipitationfed from snowmelt and rain in the valley and surrounding mountains. The basin is approximately $2,103 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. It is bound by the Siskiyou Mountains to the north, Scott Bar Mountains and Scarface Ridge to the east, Marble Mountains to the west, and Scott Mountains to the south. The South Fork and East Fork Scott Rivers converge near the town of Callahan to form the Scott River which then flows north through Scott Valley to RK 34 near United States Geological Survey (USGS) gauging station \#11519500. The lower RK 34 flows west to northeast through a relatively steep mountainous canyon that is primarily under management of US Forest Service, Klamath National Forest, Major tributaries that contribute to the Scott River around Scott Valley include the East Fork Scott River, South Fork Scott River, Sugar Creek, French Creek, Etna Creek, Kidder Creek, Shackleford Creek, Patterson Creek, and Moffett Creek (CDFW 2017).

Aquatic habitat for anadromous fish species in the Scott River watershed has been severely altered due to agricultural practices, groundwater pumping, timber harvest, mining, and rural residential development (Van Kirk and Naman 2008, NOAA 2012). Natural factors such as warm dry weather in the summer and fall, seasonal flooding and erosive soils when combined with anthropogenic impacts results in degraded spawning and rearing habitat for anadromous fish species.

The Scott River RST site is approximately 7 RK upstream of the confluence with the Klamath River and 1.6 km SW from the town of Scott Bar (41.76, -123.01; Figure 1). The USGS station \#11519500 is located about 25 RK upstream from the RST site and has been in operation since 1941, totaling 80 years of data.


Figure 1. General location for Scott 8 ' rotary screw trap, approximately 7 RK from the confluence of the Klamath River.

## Trap Operation

The Scott River was sampled with both an eight-foot and a five-foot RST manufactured by EG Solutions, Corvallis, Oregon. The eight-foot trap was placed on river left, while the five-foot trap was placed upstream on river right. The catch in the trap was processed daily at approximately 0900 and cleared of any remaining debris before departure.

## Water Temperature and Flow Monitoring

Hourly water temperatures were recorded by a HOBO temperature logger attached to the eightfoot RST. Water temperature data were compared to temperature thresholds identified in Stenhouse et al. (2012) to calculate percentages of the season where water temperatures were in the optimal $\left(10-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, suboptimal $\left(15-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, and detrimental $\left(>20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ levels for juvenile
salmonid survival. Weekly average temperature (WAT) and weekly maximum temperature (WMT) were calculated as 7-day moving averages.

Stream flow measurements were obtained from USGS stream gage \#11519500, Scott River, Fort Jones, California. This gage is located approximately 34 RK upstream of the confluence with the Klamath River and records stream flow and gage height 15 minutes. Stream flow data presented in this report are preliminary and subject to revision.

The water velocity entering the cone was measured daily at the beginning and end of each 24hour sampling interval using a model 2030R flow meter manufactured by General Oceanics (Miami, Florida). Velocity measurements were used to calculate the total volume of water sampled for each set, in million cubic feet (MCF).

## Trap Efficiency Determinations, Production Estimates, and Multi-Year Estimates

All target and non-target species were identified and counted. A mark-recapture technique was used to estimate trap efficiency and produce an estimate with a 95\% confidence interval for each week (Carlson 1998). Trap efficiency trials were conducted Friday through Thursday to determine the mean weekly trap efficiency for all species and age classes. A sample of 0+ salmonids were dyed in a solution of $0.6-1.2$ grams of Bismarck Brown Y (Alfa Aesar, Ward Hill, Massachusetts). The number of fish marked in this manner depended on fish size, water temperature, and other stress factors. As these factors increased, the number of fish selected for marking was reduced. $1+, 2+$, and $3+$ aged fish were marked with a caudal fin margin clip. An upper caudal, lower caudal, and upper/lower caudal fin clip were used in a weekly rotation to identify recaptured fish from the week they were marked.

For each trial, the dyed and clipped salmonids were transported 0.5 RK upstream from the trap, and hand released. One of the assumptions of the population-estimate model is that once the marked salmonids are released, they mix freely with the unmarked fish in the population. The number of marked fish in the following day's catch, divided by the total number marked on the day prior, produced the trap efficiency estimates.

In weeks when fish marked and released, but none were recaptured, the average trap efficiency for the season (the seasonal trap efficiency) was used. It is generally assumed that due to the smaller catch totals on the Scott River RST that this method results in an underestimation of the total population (ODFW 2018). For weeks using correlations and/or seasonal trap efficiencies, intervals created from estimates may not represent $95 \%$ confidence. However, intervals for these weeks have been calculated in order to demonstrate the large variance that is associated with low trap efficiencies on the Scott River. Additionally, if the calculated lower confidence limit for the estimate was negative, zero was substituted for the negative limit.

A trap efficiency of approximately $10 \%$ is preferred and allows for weekly estimations of production with an acceptable confidence interval without trapping more fish than necessary. Trap efficiency can be manipulated by changing the volume of water sampled. This can be done by moving the trap out of the thalweg.

Efforts to develop annual estimates of 0+ Chinook Salmon produced in the Scott River began in 2001. Estimates for $1+$ Coho Salmon emigrating started in 2003 and estimates of yearling Coho Salmon produced per adult began in 2003. Annual estimates of $2+$ steelhead were first calculated in 2004. The multi-year production estimates reported here are limited to years in which the methods and the period sampled are comparable. Annual estimates are a summation of weekly trapping data, expanded using trap efficiencies. Additionally, to generate weekly (7-day) population estimates, the original population estimate was multiplied by ratio of number of days in the week to number of days the trap was in operation for that given week.

## Bio-Sampling

Sub-samples of fish were processed daily for bio-data which consisted of fork length, life stage, and age (Appendix 1). Up to 25 individuals of each age class of steelhead and Coho Salmon, as well as $500+$ and $151+$ Chinook Salmon were sampled daily. This task involved anesthetizing the sub-sample of fish in a $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ water bath. The fish were anesthetized within 45 seconds to one minute. All sedated fish were measured, aged, and attributed a life stage. After each fish was sampled, it was placed into a well aerated recovery bucket containing Stress Coat® Water Conditioner by Mars Fishcare North America, Inc. (Chalont, Pennsylvania), to aid quick recovery.

Age-length cutoffs developed in 2007 were used to estimate ages of salmonids in the catches (Appendix 2). These cutoffs were determined by calculating the ages of scales in the 2001-2007 collection. Individual scale samples were visually examined and categorized into brood years using scale age-estimation methods (Van Oosten 1957, Chilton and Beamish 1982, Casselman 1983). Fork length intervals for each age class were determined for appropriate time periods and updated throughout the season to create the age-length cutoffs used. These intervals are not absolutes and because of variable growth, some individuals may be older or younger than the cutoff fork lengths predict. Weekly mean fork lengths with standard deviation were calculated and sample size, as well as minimum and maximum sizes were recorded.

## Data Entry and Analysis

All data from field forms were entered into Microsoft Access database software. Summary tables were created in Access and exported to Microsoft Excel, where data were broken down by species and age class. These data were then exported to Excel for analysis.

## RESULTS

## Trap Operation

The Scott River RSTs were operated from Julian Week (JW) 4 (first set on January 26, 2022) through JW 25 (last day of operation was June 23, 2022; Appendix 3). The traps operated for $5,784.83$ hours. Volume of water fished was an estimated 484.40 million cubic feet of water (Table 1). Low flows occasionally required the cone to be partially raised to prevent the cone from making contact with the bed of the river. Water volume sampled during these times is an estimate because the volume sampling equations assume that half of the cone is submerged.

Table 1. Scott River combined time fished and water volume fished for the traps in 2022.

| Scott River, 2022 |  | Water Volume <br> Julian Week | Calendar Date Fished <br> (Hished (MCF) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Jan 22-Jan 28 | 2.78 | 72.65 |
| 5 | Jan 29 - Feb 04 | 5.74 | 163.63 |
| 6 | Feb 05 - Feb 11 | 12.33 | 240.72 |
| 7 | Feb 12 - Feb 18 | 24.76 | 334.45 |
| 8 | Feb 19 - Feb 25 | 21.93 | 336.82 |
| 9 | Feb 26 - Mar 04 | 21.94 | 335.63 |
| 10 | Mar 05 - Mar 11 | 17.80 | 335.68 |
| 11 | Mar 12 - Mar 18 | 19.85 | 336.13 |
| 12 | Mar 19 - Mar 25 | 28.22 | 326.40 |
| 13 | Mar 26 - Apr 01 | 38.77 | 274.68 |
| 14 | Apr 02 - Apr 08 | 34.07 | 333.18 |
| 15 | Apr 09 - Apr 15 | 29.98 | 337.68 |
| 16 | Apr 16 - Apr 22 | 23.68 | 336.43 |
| 17 | Apr 23 - Apr 29 | 31.61 | 336.87 |
| 18 | Apr 30 - May 06 | 34.22 | 286.65 |
| 19 | May 07 - May 13 | 16.77 | 145.93 |
| 20 | May 14 - May 20 | 18.86 | 236.75 |
| 21 | May 21 - May 27 | 29.08 | 254.45 |
| 22 | May 28 - Jun 03 | 24.64 | 217.93 |
| 23 | Jun 04 - Jun 10 | 15.06 | 204.92 |
| 24 | Jun 11 - Jun 17 | 22.16 | 192.47 |
| 25 | Jun 18 - Jun 24 | 10.18 | 144.77 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{4 8 4 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 7 8 4 . 8 3}$ |

## Water Temperature and Flow Monitoring

Daily average stream temperatures ranged from $3.40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in January and increased to $22.57^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for portions of June (Figure 2). Minimum stream temperature was $2.40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (recorded on February 24, 2022), and maximum stream temperature was $22.90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (recorded on June 27, 2022). This is consistent with past study years where water temperatures increased from an average daily temperature of $<5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in late winter to $>20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in late spring/early summer. Temperatures $>20.3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are considered detrimental for juvenile salmonid growth and survival (Stenhouse et al. 2012). Temperatures rose above $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 8 days during the trapping season.

Average monthly stream temperatures during the trapping season ranged from $3.78-16.20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Table 2). The maximum weekly average water temperature (MWAT) was $19.85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the maximum weekly maximum temperature (MWMT) was $21.93^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, both occurred on during JW 26 (Table 3).


Figure 2. Scott River, 2022. Maximum, minimum and average daily water temperatures.
Table 2. Monthly average (avg.) water temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) with the maximum and minimum of the daily averages for each month.

|  | Water Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Dates | Days <br> $(\mathrm{n})$ | Max Daily Avg. | Monthly Avg. | Min Daily Avg. |
| Jan | $1 / 26-1 / 31$ | 6 | 4.44 | 3.78 | 3.48 |
| Feb | $2 / 1-2 / 28$ | 28 | 7.38 | 5.04 | 3.10 |
| Mar | $3 / 1-3 / 31$ | 31 | 10.97 | 8.61 | 5.97 |
| Apr | $4 / 1-4 / 30$ | 30 | 12.13 | 9.77 | 7.35 |
| May | $5 / 1-5 / 31$ | 31 | 14.60 | 11.68 | 7.78 |
| Jun | $6 / 1-6 / 29$ | 29 | 20.71 | 16.20 | 13.01 |

Table 3. MWAT, MWMT, annual maximum (Max.), and annual minimum (Min.) were calculated. Hours and percentage of total hours logged to date are given at four different temperature ranges. Number of days with temperatures $>20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and average (Avg.) daily duration in hours (hrs.) of temperatures above $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ are also given.

| Location | Parameter | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | JW | Date | Hours at $0-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1937 | 52.1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scott RST | MWMT | 21.93 | 26 | 6/29 | Hours at $10-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 1350 | 36.3\% |
| Year | MWAT | 19.85 | 26 | 6/29 | Hours at $15-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 343 | 9.2\% |
| 2022 | Annual Max | 22.90 | 26 | 6/27 | Hours $>20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 86 | 2.3\% |
|  | Annual Min | 2.40 | 8 | 2/24 | Days with temps $>20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ <br> Avg duration temps $>20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  | 8 |
|  | Total hours logged to date |  |  | 3716 |  |  | 11 |

Average monthly streamflows for 2022 from January - June were 275, 234, 325, 279, 482 and 252 cubic feet per second (cfs) (Table 4).

Table 4. Scott River 2001-2022 Average Monthly Flow

| YEAR | 2002-2022 Scott River Flow Data During Months Sampled |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |
| 2002 | 1077 | 644 | 570 | 1018 | 707 | 395 |
| 2003 | 2051 | 4406 | 1200 | 1199 | 1502 | 1047 |
| 2004 | 545.7 | 1082 | 1185 | 1050 | 969 | 412 |
| 2005 | 554.2 | 492 | 549 | 649 | 1453 | 656 |
| 2006 | 3236 | 2343 | 1101 | 1360 | 2344 | 1155 |
| 2007 | 696.3 | 524 | 1074 | 634 | 539 | 142 |
| 2008 | 381.8 | 497 | 749 | 657 | 1459 | 568 |
| 2009 | 234.9 | 287 | 613 | 497 | 929 | 309 |
| 2010 | 498.4 | 437 | 529 | 863 | 1123 | 1617 |
| 2011 | 1020 | 529 | 1168 | 1452 | 1204 | 1580 |
| 2012 | 461.6 | 293 | 789 | 1630 | 1134 | 410 |
| 2013 | 341.2 | 365 | 552 | 788 | 500 | 129 |
| 2014 | 59.5 | 488 | 845 | 310 | 131 | 44 |
| 2015 | 509.8 | 2235 | 582 | 253 | 157 | 80 |
| 2016 | 1227 | 1341 | 2331 | 1511 | 937 | 307 |
| 2017 | 1518 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2018 | 292 | 321 | 385 | 918 | 475 | 104 |
| 2019 | 684.1 | 839 | 983 | 1994 | 1311 | 664 |
| 2020 | 294.1 | 273 | 191 | 306 | 423 | 213 |
| 2021 | 374 | 349 | 258 | 367 | 339 | 79 |
| 2022 | 275 | 234 | 325 | 279 | 482 | 252 |
| $\begin{gathered} 2002-2022 \\ \text { Average } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 778 | 899 | 799 | 887 | 906 | 508 |
| 2022 <br> Percent of Average | 35\% | 26\% | 41\% | 31\% | 53\% | 50\% |

Flows peaked during JW 19 at 980 cfs on May $7^{\text {th }}, 2022$. The lowest flow while the trap was installed was during JW 25 with a minimum of 160 cfs on June 23, 2022. Later in the summer, mean base flow have been documented at less than 10 cfs due to decreasing snowpack and precipitation, along with increased water demands (CDFW 2016). The increase in water use along with water temperatures has resulted in the repeated occurrence of fish stranding, reduction of rearing habitat, and mortality (Figure 3; NOAA 2012)

This year the screw trap had to be adjusted frequently by moving it closer or farther away from the bank and tethering in the front and back of the trap to achieve positions that best increased trap efficiency. It also required the cone to be frequently raised and propped up on blocks to avoid hitting the riverbed while operating in low flow conditions.


Figure 3. Average weekly flow and average water temperature from JW 4-25 on the Scott River. Flow measurements were from USGS gage \#11517500. Hourly water temperatures were recorded off the RST.

Trap Efficiency Determinations, Production Estimates, and Bio-sampling

## Chinook Salmon: 0+

A total of 30,461 0+ Chinook Salmon were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $8.35 \%$. Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from $2.45 \%-11.67 \%$ (Figure 4). The population estimate for 0+ Chinook Salmon emigrating out of the system in 2022 was 493,084. Peak emigration occurred during JW 22 (May 28 - June 3, 2022) during which, an estimated 60,291 Chinook Salmon ( $12.23 \%$ of the total population) emigrated (Figure 5). An estimated 110,018 ( $22.31 \%$ of the total population) 0+ Chinook Salmon emigrated out of the system by the end of JW 13 (April 1st), when most diversions start, as allotted by the Scott River Adjudication Decree (No. 30662).

Table 5. Catch Table for $0+$ Chinook Salmon, Scott River 2022

| Julian week | Live <br> fish trapped ${ }^{1}$ | Mortalities | Adjusted total trapped ${ }^{2}$ | Volume sampled, MCF | Adjusted marked \& released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | Trap efficiency ${ }^{4}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | Lower CI | Upper CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.78 | 0 | 0 | 8.35\%** | 4* | 2" | $7 "$ |
| 5 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 5.74 | 0 | 0 | 8.35\%** | 15* | $0 "$ | $34 "$ |
| 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12.33 | 0 | 0 | 8.35\%** | 5* | $0 "$ | 12" |
| 7 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 24.75 | 0 | 0 | 8.35\%** | 51* | $0 "$ | 112" |
| 8 | 57 | 1 | 58 | 21.93 | 0 | 0 | 8.35\%** | 586* | 149" | 1,023" |
| 9 | 256 | 1 | 257 | 21.94 | 90 | 3 | 3.33\% | 5,847 | 797 | 10,897 |
| 10 | 176 | 0 | 176 | 17.80 | 57 | 3 | 5.26\% | 2,552 | 369 | 4,735 |
| 11 | 158 | 3 | 161 | 19.85 | 29 | 0 | 8.35\%** | 1,412* | 160" | 2,663" |
| 12 | 1347 | 12 | 1359 | 28.22 | 779 | 20 | 2.57\% | 50,477 | 29,510 | 71,444 |
| 13 | 2859 | 7 | 2866 | 32.78 | 2122 | 123 | 5.80\% | 49,069 | 40,543 | 57,594 |
| 14 | 3615 | 19 | 3634 | 34.98 | 3001 | 187 | 6.23\% | 58,028 | 49,814 | 66,242 |
| 15 | 1975 | 4 | 1979 | 33.44 | 1687 | 193 | 11.44\% | 17,219 | 14,837 | 19,602 |
| 16 | 2749 | 0 | 2749 | 28.94 | 1434 | 140 | 9.76\% | 27,977 | 23,497 | 32,458 |
| 17 | 2046 | 11 | 2057 | 25.14 | 1678 | 189 | 11.26\% | 18,177 | 15,640 | 20,715 |
| 18 | 2838 | 8 | 2846 | 31.48 | 2244 | 204 | 9.09\% | 36,362 | 32,161 | 40,562 |
| 19 | 1471 | 2 | 1473 | 29.49 | 1151 | 113 | 9.82\% | 26,049 | 23,368 | 28,729 |
| 20 | 1659 | 3 | 1662 | 18.86 | 1286 | 119 | 9.25\% | 17,825 | 14,693 | 20,957 |
| 21 | 2803 | 8 | 2811 | 29.08 | 1603 | 187 | 11.67\% | 23,983 | 20,665 | 27,302 |
| 22 | 3568 | 4 | 3572 | 24.64 | 1113 | 76 | 6.83\% | 60,291 | 49,107 | 71,475 |
| 23 | 998 | 4 | 1002 | 15.05 | 518 | 25 | 4.83\% | 20,001 | 12,553 | 27,449 |
| 24 | 1092 | 10 | 1102 | 22.16 | 331 | 27 | 8.16\% | 22,867 | 18,258 | 27,475 |
| 25 | 671 | 10 | 681 | 10.18 | 204 | 5 | 2.45\% | 54,291 | 37,233 | 71,348 |
| Totals | 30,354 | 107 | 30,461 | 491.54 | 19,327 | 1,614 | 8.35\% | 493,084 | 458,702 | 527,474 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked during the week minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency equals \# recaptured fish/\# marked released.
${ }^{5}$ Weekly population estimate multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week.

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the seasonal trap efficiency.
**Seasonal trap efficiency was used for weekly totals when fish were not recaptured.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 4. Total 0+ Chinook Salmon sampled on Scott River from JW 4 - JW 25 was 30,461 with weekly trapping efficiencies ranging from $2.45 \%-11.67 \%$. Seasonal trapping efficiency was $8.35 \%$ and used for JW 4-8 and 11.


Figure 5. Population estimates with 95\% confidence interval* for 0+ Chinook Salmon on Scott River. Total population estimate was 493,084.
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## Chinook Salmon: 1+

A total of 68 1+ Chinook Salmon were sampled on the Scott River (Table 6). Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from 4.26-33.33\%. Seasonal trap efficiency was $4.26 \%$ and was used for JW $5-7,9-11,13,15$ and 21 (Figure 6). The population estimate for 1+ Chinook emigrating out of the watershed in 2022 was 327 . Peak emigration was JW 8 (February 19 - February 25, 2022), with an estimated 84 ( $25.69 \%$ of the estimated population) emigrating out of the Scott River during that week (Figure 7). An estimated 312 ( $95.41 \%$ of the total population) emigrated out of the system by the end of JW 13.

Table 6. Catch Table 1+ Chinook Salmon, Scott River 2022

| Julian week | Live fish trapped $^{1}$ | Mortalities | Adjusted total <br> trapped $^{2}$ | Volume sampled, MCF |  <br> released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | Trap efficiency ${ }^{4}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | Lower CI | Upper CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.78 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5.74 | 2 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 8* | $0 "$ | 19" |
| 6 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 12.33 | 5 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 40* | $0 "$ | $90 "$ |
| 7 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 24.75 | 7 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 43* | $0 "$ | 99" |
| 8 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 21.93 | 11 | 1 | 9.09\% | 84 | -9 | 177 |
| 9 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 21.94 | 7 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 49* | 0 " | 112" |
| 10 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 17.80 | 5 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 54* | 0 " | 122" |
| 11 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 19.85 | 1 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 8* | 0 " | 16" |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.22 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 32.78 | 4 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 26* | $0 "$ | 58" |
| 14 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 34.98 | 3 | 1 | 33.33\% | 8 | 0 | 16 |
| 15 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 33.44 | 2 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 6* | 0 " | 13" |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.94 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.14 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31.48 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.49 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.86 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 21 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 29.08 | 0 | 0 | 4.26\%** | 2* | $0 "$ | 5" |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.64 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15.05 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.16 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.18 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | 68 | 0 | 68 | 491.54 | 47 | 2 | 4.26\% | 327 | 172 | 483 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency equals \# recaptured fish/\# marked released.
${ }^{5}$ Weekly population estimate multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the seasonal trap efficiency.
**Seasonal trap efficiency was used for weekly totals when fish were not recaptured.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 6. Total age 1+ Chinook Salmon sampled on Scott River from JW 4 - JW 25 was 68. Seasonal trap efficiency was $4.26 \%$ and was used for JW 5-7, 9-11, 13, 15 and 21.


Figure 7. Population estimate with 95\% confidence interval* for age 1+ Chinook Salmon on Scott River. Total population estimate was 327 .

* Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 5-7, 9-11, 13, 15 and 21 based on seasonal trap efficiency.


## Bio-Sampling: 0+ and 1+ Chinook Salmon

A total of 1,527 $0+$ and $611+$ Chinook Salmon were measured and aged for bio-sampling (Figure 8, Appendix 4-6). Average fork lengths (FL) for the approximate 10th, 50th and 90th cumulative catch percentiles for $0+$ Chinook Salmon were 38,63 , and 90 mm , respectively.


Figure 8. 0+ and 1+ Chinook Salmon weekly mean fork lengths, Scott River, with one standard deviation.

## Coho Salmon: 0+

A total of 586 0+ Coho Salmon were sampled on the Scott River (Table 7). Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from $2.50-5.84 \%$. Seasonal trap efficiency was $4.52 \%$ and was used for JW 16-22 and 25 (Figure 9). The population estimate for $0+$ Coho emigrating out of the watershed in 2022 was 10,399. Peak emigration was JW 23 (June 4 - June 10, 2022), with an estimated 3,333 ( $32.05 \%$ of the estimated population) emigrating out of the Scott River during that week (Figure 10). An estimated $0 \%$ emigrated out of the system by the end of JW 13.

Table 7. Catch Table 0+ Coho Salmon, Scott River, 2022

| Julian week | Live fish trapped $^{1}$ | Mortalities | Adjusted total trapped ${ }^{2}$ | Volume sampled, MCF | Adjusted marked \& released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | $\underset{\text { efficiency }^{4}}{\text { Trap }}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | $\underset{\text { CI }}{\text { Lower }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Upper } \\ & \text { CI } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.78 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.74 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.33 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.76 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.93 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.94 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17.80 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.85 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.22 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.78 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.98 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.44 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 16 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 28.94 | 0 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 64* | $0 "$ | 145" |
| 17 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 25.14 | 0 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 6* | 0 " | 13" |
| 18 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 31.48 | 0 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 29* | 0 " | 61 " |
| 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 29.49 | 0 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 3* | $1 "$ | $6 "$ |
| 20 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 18.86 | 0 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 623* | 5" | 1,241" |
| 21 | 77 | 0 | 77 | 29.08 | 0 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 1,341* | 220 " | 2,461" |
| 22 | 108 | 0 | 108 | 24.64 | 10 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 955* | 0 " | 1,915" |
| 23 | 215 | 0 | 215 | 15.05 | 154 | 9 | 5.84\% | 3,333 | 1,384 | 5,281 |
| 24 | 85 | 0 | 85 | 22.16 | 40 | 1 | 2.50\% | 3,049 | 1,104 | 4,995 |
| 25 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 10.18 | 17 | 0 | 4.52\%** | 998* | 509 " | 1,486" |
| Total | 586 | 0 | 586 | 491.55 | 221 | 10 | 4.52\% | 10,399 | 7,176 | 13,622 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency equals \# recaptured fish/\# marked released.
${ }^{\text {s }}$ Weekly population estimate multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the seasonal trap efficiency.
**Seasonal trap efficiency was used for weekly totals when fish were not recaptured.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 9. Total 0+ Coho Salmon sampled on Scott River from JW 4 - JW 25 was 586. Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from $2.50-5.84 \%$. Seasonal trap efficiency was $4.52 \%$ and was used for JW 16-22 and 25.


Figure 10. Population estimate with $95 \%$ confidence interval* for 0+ Coho Salmon on Scott River. Total population estimate was 10,399 .

* Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 16-22 and 25 based on seasonal trap efficiency.


## Coho Salmon: $1+$

A total of 1,784 1+ Coho Salmon were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $2.67 \%$, which was used for JW 4, 5, 7, 10-13, 16 and 24-25 (Table 8). Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from 1.39-18.75\% (Figure 11). The population estimate for 1+ Coho Salmon emigrating out of the system in 2022 was 68,616. Peak emigration occurred during JW 14 (April 2 - April 8, 2022) with an estimated 9,454 ( $13.78 \%$ of the total population) emigrating out of the Scott River during that week (Figure 12). An estimated 10,107 ( $14.73 \%$ of the total population) emigrated out of the system by the end of JW 13. Three Coho Salmon sampled in the RST were identified as being tagged with a passive integrated transponder. PIT tagging efforts were carried out by the Scott River Watershed Council.

Table 8. Catch Table 1+ Coho Salmon, Scott River 2022

| Julian week | Live fish trapped $^{1}$ | Mortalities | Adjusted total trapped ${ }^{2}$ | Volume sampled, MCF | Adjusted marked \& released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | Trap efficiency ${ }^{4}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | Lower <br> CI | Upper <br> CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2.78 | 3 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 350* | 330 " | 369" |
| 5 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 5.74 | 7 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 375* | 287" | 462" |
| 6 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 12.33 | 24 | 1 | 4.17\% | 888 | 373 | 1,403 |
| 7 | 29 | 1 | 30 | 24.75 | 25 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 1,124* | $566 "$ | 1,682" |
| 8 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 21.93 | 16 | 3 | 18.75\% | 149 | 52 | 247 |
| 9 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 21.94 | 36 | 2 | 5.56\% | 666 | 220 | 1,112 |
| 10 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 17.80 | 15 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 787* | 487" | 1,086" |
| 11 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 19.85 | 16 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 974* | 591" | 1,357" |
| 12 | 41 | 0 | 41 | 28.22 | 21 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 1,536* | 840" | 2,231" |
| 13 | 87 | 0 | 87 | 32.78 | 64 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 3,258* | 1,146" | 5,371" |
| 14 | 232 | 0 | 232 | 34.98 | 163 | 4 | 2.45\% | 9,454 | 3,394 | 15,514 |
| 15 | 272 | 1 | 273 | 33.44 | 177 | 7 | 3.95\% | 6,903 | 2,968 | 10,838 |
| 16 | 245 | 0 | 245 | 28.94 | 131 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 9,176* | 3,215" | 15,137" |
| 17 | 115 | 0 | 115 | 25.14 | 92 | 5 | 5.43\% | 2,116 | 806 | 3,426 |
| 18 | 101 | 1 | 102 | 31.48 | 72 | 2 | 2.78\% | 4,284 | 1,867 | 6,701 |
| 19 | 69 | 0 | 69 | 29.49 | 54 | 3 | 5.56\% | 2,174 | 1,350 | 2,997 |
| 20 | 113 | 2 | 115 | 18.86 | 60 | 1 | 1.67\% | 6,900 | 2,963 | 10,837 |
| 21 | 107 | 1 | 108 | 29.08 | 63 | 1 | 1.59\% | 6,804 | 2,919 | 10,689 |
| 22 | 104 | 0 | 104 | 24.64 | 72 | 1 | 1.39\% | 8,736 | 4,459 | 13,013 |
| 23 | 54 | 0 | 54 | 15.05 | 23 | 1 | 4.35\% | 1,242 | 527 | 1,957 |
| 24 | 39 | 0 | 39 | 22.16 | 24 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 1,040* | 333 " | 1,747" |
| 25 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 10.18 | 1 | 0 | 2.67\%** | 32* | 18" | 46" |
| Totals | 1,778 | 6 | 1,784 | 491.54 | 1,159 | 31 | 2.67\% | 68,616 | 56,643 | 81,288 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked during the week minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency equals \# recaptured fish/\# marked released.
${ }^{5}$ Weekly population estimates multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week.

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the seasonal trap efficiency.
**Seasonal trap efficiency was used for weekly totals when fish were not recaptured.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 11. A total of $1,7841+$ Coho Salmon were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $2.67 \%$, which was used for JW 4, 5, 7, 10-13, 16 and 24-25.


Figure 12. Population estimate with $95 \%$ confidence interval* for $1+$ Coho Salmon on the Scott River. Total population estimate was 68,616 .
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## Bio-Sampling: 0+ and 1+ Coho Salmon

$340+$ and 312 1+ Coho Salmon were measured and aged for bio-sampling (Figure 13, Appendix 6-7). Average fork lengths for the approximate 10th, 50th and 90th cumulative catch percentiles for $1+$ Coho Salmon were 94,115 and 129 mm respectively.


Figure 13. Scott River 0+ and $1+$ Coho Salmon weekly mean fork lengths, Scott River.

## Steelhead: 0+

A total of 11,671 0+ steelhead were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $4.54 \%$, which was used for JW 14-20 (Table 8). Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from 0.48$8.28 \%$ (Figure 14). The population estimate for $0+$ steelhead emigrating out of the system in 2022 was 638,577. Peak emigration occurred during JW 25 (June 18 - June 24, 2022) with an estimated 371,846 ( $58.23 \%$ of the total population) emigrating out of the Scott River during that week (Figure 15). An estimated 0\% emigrated out of the system by the end of JW 13.

Table 9. Catch Table 0+ steelhead, Scott River 2022

| Julian week | Live fish trapped ${ }^{1}$ | Mortalities | $\begin{gathered} \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { trapped }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | Volume sampled, MCF | Adjusted <br> marked \& released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | Trap efficiency ${ }^{4}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | Lower | Upper CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.78 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.74 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.33 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.75 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.93 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21.94 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17.80 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.85 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.22 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.78 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34.98 | 0 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 33.44 | 0 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 2 | -1 | 5 |
| 16 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 28.94 | 0 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 101 | -23 | 225 |
| 17 | 90 | 1 | 91 | 25.14 | 0 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 1,632 | 342 | 2,921 |
| 18 | 232 | 2 | 234 | 31.48 | 0 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 5,519 | 2,913 | 8,126 |
| 19 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 29.49 | 5 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 522 | 169 | 875 |
| 20 | 256 | 7 | 263 | 18.86 | 47 | 0 | 4.54\%** | 4,028 | 252 | 7,805 |
| 21 | 1,886 | 23 | 1,909 | 29.08 | 616 | 51 | 8.28\% | 22,651 | 16,736 | 28,566 |
| 22 | 3,039 | 24 | 3,063 | 24.64 | 542 | 26 | 4.80\% | 71,867 | 49,527 | 94,207 |
| 23 | 3,654 | 22 | 3,676 | 15.05 | 696 | 22 | 3.16\% | 111,399 | 67,435 | 155,363 |
| 24 | 834 | 2 | 836 | 22.16 | 200 | 5 | 2.50\% | 49,011 | 28,502 | 69,519 |
| 25 | 1,515 | 10 | 1,525 | 10.18 | 208 | 1 | 0.48\% | 371,846 | 192,257 | 551,434 |
| Totals | 11,581 | 91 | 11,671 | 491.54 | 2,314 | 105 | 4.54\% | 638,577 | 451,061 | 826,094 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked during the week minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency was calculated using the equation $\mathrm{y}=0.4906 \mathrm{x}+0.03$, where y is steelhead $0+$ efficiency and x is
Chinook $0+$ efficiency.
${ }^{5}$ Weekly population estimate multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week.

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the Chinook 0+ seasonal trap efficiency.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 14. A total of $11,6710+$ steelhead were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $4.54 \%$, which was used for JW 14-20.


Figure 15. Population estimate with $95 \%$ confidence interval* for 0+ steelhead on the Scott River. Total population estimate was 638,577 .
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## Steelhead: 1+

A total of $1,4601+$ steelhead were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $1.70 \%$ (Table 10), which was used for JW 4, 5, 7, 9-12, 17, and 20-25. Weekly trap efficiencies ranged from $1.05 \%-5.88 \%$ (Figure 16). The population estimate for $1+$ steelhead emigrating out of the Scott River watershed in 2022 was 45,455 . Peak emigration was JW 13 (March 26 - April 1, 2022), with an estimated 15,177 ( $33.39 \%$ of the total population) emigrating out of the Scott River during that period (Figure 17). An estimated 23,946 ( $52.68 \%$ of the total population) emigrated out of the system by April $1^{\text {st }}$.

Table 10. Catch Table 1+ Steelhead, Scott River 2022

| Julian week | Live fish trapped ${ }^{1}$ | Mortalities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Adjusted } \\ & \text { total } \\ & \text { trapped }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | Volume sampled, MCF | Adjusted <br> marked \& released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | Trap efficiency ${ }^{4}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | Lower CI | Upper CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 2.78 | 3 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 71* | 0 " | 109" |
| 5 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 5.74 | 6 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 57* | 0 " | 132" |
| 6 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 12.33 | 17 | 1 | 5.88\% | 162 | 0 | 344 |
| 7 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 24.75 | 15 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 217* | 0 " | 498" |
| 8 | 32 | 0 | 32 | 21.93 | 28 | 1 | 3.57\% | 464 | 0 | 986 |
| 9 | 48 | 0 | 48 | 21.94 | 42 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 1,204* | 0 " | 2,633" |
| 10 | 39 | 0 | 39 | 17.80 | 26 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 730* | 0 " | 1,638" |
| 11 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 19.85 | 31 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 1,257* | $0 "$ | 2,789" |
| 12 | 143 | 0 | 143 | 28.22 | 69 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 4,607* | 0 " | 9,634" |
| 13 | 288 | 2 | 290 | 32.78 | 156 | 2 | 1.28\% | 15,177 | 370 | 29,983 |
| 14 | 157 | 0 | 157 | 34.98 | 122 | 7 | 5.74\% | 2,414 | 851 | 3,977 |
| 15 | 113 | 1 | 114 | 33.44 | 95 | 1 | 1.05\% | 5,472 | 0 | 11,653 |
| 16 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 28.94 | 26 | 1 | 3.85\% | 662 | 0 | 1,396 |
| 17 | 128 | 0 | 128 | 25.14 | 103 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 4,839* | 0 " | 9,722" |
| 18 | 87 | 3 | 90 | 31.48 | 68 | 1 | 1.47\% | 3,623 | 122 | 7,123 |
| 19 | 42 | 1 | 43 | 29.49 | 36 | 2 | 5.56\% | 928 | 413 | 1,443 |
| 20 | 54 | 0 | 54 | 18.86 | 30 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 1,109* | 0 " | 2,465" |
| 21 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 29.08 | 25 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 785* | 0 " | 1,760" |
| 22 | 51 | 2 | 53 | 24.64 | 24 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 1,098* | $0 \times$ | 2,268" |
| 23 | 28 | 3 | 31 | 15.05 | 8 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 246* | 0 " | 559" |
| 24 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 22.16 | 5 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 126* | 34" | 218" |
| 25 | 19 | 2 | 21 | 10.18 | 5 | 0 | 1.70\%** | 271* | 125" | 417" |
| Totals | 1,446 | 14 | 1,460 | 491.54 | 940 | 16 | 1.70\% | 45,445 | 27,297 | 63,736 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked during the week minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency equals \# recaptured fish/\# marked released.
${ }^{5}$ Weekly population estimates multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week.

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the seasonal trap efficiency.
**Seasonal trap efficiency was used for weekly totals when fish were not recaptured.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 16. A total of $1,4601+$ steelhead were sampled on the Scott River with a seasonal trap efficiency of $1.70 \%$, which was used for JW 4, 5, 7, 9-12, 17, and 20-25.


Figure 17. Population estimate with $95 \%$ confidence interval* for $1+$ steelhead on the Scott River. Total population estimate was 45,455 .

* Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 4, 5, 7, 9-12, 17, and 20-25 are based on seasonal trap efficiency.


## Steelhead: 2+

A total of $2942+$ steelhead were sampled on the Scott River (Table 11). Seasonal trap efficiency was $1.09 \%$ and was used for JW 6-8, 10-17, and 19-25 (Figure 18). Weekly trap efficiency ranged from 1.09-25.00\%. The population estimate for 2+ steelhead emigrating out of the Scott River in 2021 was 4,173 . Peak emigration was JW 15 (April $9-15,2022$ ), with an estimated 1,273 ( $30.51 \%$ of the total population) emigrating during that week (Figure 19). An estimated 1,466 ( $35.13 \%$ of the population) emigrated out of the system by April $1^{\text {st }}$.

Table 11. Catch Table 2+ Steelhead, Scott River 2022

| Julian week | Live fish trapped ${ }^{1}$ | Mortalities | $\begin{gathered} \text { Adjusted } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { trapped }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | Volume sampled, MCF | Adjusted marked \& released ${ }^{3}$ | Recaptured | $\underset{\text { efficiency }}{\text { Trap }}$ | Weekly population estimate ${ }^{5}$ | Lower CI | $\begin{gathered} \text { Upper } \\ \text { CI } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.78 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.74 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 12.33 | 3 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 15* | 0 " | 36" |
| 7 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 24.75 | 5 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 28* | 0 " | 67" |
| 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 21.93 | 3 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 12* | 0 " | 28 " |
| 9 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 21.94 | 8 | 1 | 12.50\% | 50 | 0 | 103 |
| 10 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 17.80 | 9 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 91* | 0 " | 214" |
| 11 | 21 | 1 | 22 | 19.85 | 15 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 303* | 0 " | 701" |
| 12 | 36 | 0 | 36 | 28.22 | 22 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 668* | 0 " | 1,533" |
| 13 | 25 | 1 | 26 | 32.78 | 12 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 299* | 0 " | 691 " |
| 14 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 34.98 | 17 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 349* | 0 " | 808" |
| 15 | 46 | 1 | 47 | 33.44 | 37 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 1,273* | 0 " | 2,875" |
| 16 | 23 | 0 | 23 | 28.94 | 9 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 209* | 0 " | 483" |
| 17 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 25.14 | 4 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 19* | 0 " | $45^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 18 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 31.48 | 4 | 1 | 25.00\% | 12 | 1 | 22 |
| 19 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 29.49 | 1 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 10* | 4" | 17 " |
| 20 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 18.86 | 11 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 214* | 0 " | 497" |
| 21 | 25 | 3 | 28 | 29.08 | 14 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 364* | 0 " | 842" |
| 22 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 24.64 | 10 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 185* | 0 " | 395" |
| 23 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 15.05 | 0 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 66* | 0 " | 156" |
| 24 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22.16 | 0 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 2* | $0 "$ | 5" |
| 25 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10.18 | 0 | 0 | 1.09\%** | 5* | 2 " | $7 "$ |
| Totals | 286 | 9 | 294 | 491.54 | 184 | 2 | 1.09\% | 4,173 | 2,100 | 6,245 |

${ }^{1}$ Does not include recaptured fish.
${ }^{2}$ Adjusted total trapped includes live fish, mortalities and marked fish. Does not include recaptured or marked fish caught after the end of the Julian week.
${ }^{3}$ Adjusted marked \& released includes fish marked during the week minus fish early released due to condition.
${ }^{4}$ Trap efficiency equals \# recaptured fish/\# marked released.
${ }^{5}$ Weekly population estimates multiplied by ratio of days in the week to days trap was operated for that given week.

* Weekly population estimate was calculated using the seasonal trap efficiency.
**Seasonal trap efficiency was used for weekly totals when fish were not recaptured.
" Estimated confidence levels based on seasonal trap efficiency


Figure 18. A total of $2942+$ steelhead were sampled on the Scott River. Seasonal trap efficiency was $1.09 \%$ and was used for JW 6-8, 10-17, and 19-25.


Figure 19. Population estimate with $95 \%$ confidence interval* for $2+$ steelhead on the Scott River. Total population estimate was 4,173 .

[^3]
## Steelhead: 3+

$143+$ steelhead were trapped during the 2022 season. None of these fish were recaptured so no population estimate is available.

## Bio-Sampling: $1+2+$, and 3+ Steelhead

A total of $1,1731+, 2542+$ and six $3+$ steelhead were measured and aged in the sub-sample (Figure 20-21, Appendix 8-11). Average fork lengths for the approximate 10th, 50th and 90th cumulative catch percentiles for $2+$ steelhead were 120,146 , and 204 mm respectively.


Figure 20. 1+ steelhead, weekly mean fork lengths, Scott River, with one standard deviation.


Figure 21. 2+ and 3+ steelhead, weekly mean fork lengths, Scott River, with one standard deviation.

## Non-target species

Thirteen non-salmonids were sampled in the Scott River RSTs and equated to $29.51 \%$ of the total catch (Table 12).

Table 12. Non-salmonid species collected in the Scott River rotary screw traps, 2022.

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Count |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Unknown Lamprey | --- | 10,741 |
| Pacific Lamprey | Entosphenus tridentatus | 5,544 |
| Klamath Small Scale Sucker | Catostomus rimiculus | 2,769 |
| Bull Frog \& Tadpole | Rana catesbeiana | 455 |
| Speckled Dace | Rhinichthys osculus | 325 |
| Brook Stickleback | Culaea inconstans | 100 |
| Fathead Minnow | Pimephales promelas | 90 |
| Klamath River Lamprey | Entosphenus similis | 87 |
| Marbled Sculpin | Cottus klamathensis | 22 |
| Western Toad | Anaxyrus boreas | 13 |
| Green Sunfish | Lepomis cyanellus | 6 |
| Red Swamp Crayfish | Procambarus clarkii | 5 |
| Signal Crayfish | Pacifastacus leniusculus | 5 |

Multi-year Comparison


Figure 22. 2001 - 2022 0+ Chinook Salmon population estimates, Scott River. RST was not in operation in 2017.


Figure 23. 2003-2022 1+ Coho Salmon population estimates, Scott River. Estimate for 2003 was not corrected for a 7-day estimate; 2007 is based on correlation with steelhead trapping efficiencies; and RST was not operated in 2017.

Table 13. Coho Salmon smolt outmigration abundance estimates, age 2 and 3 Coho Salmon abundance estimates, and proportion of outmigrants smolts that returned by brood year for the Scott River, years 2004-2021 (Giudice and Knechtle 2021).

| Brood <br> Year | Smolt <br> Year | Smolt <br> Point <br> Estimate | Age 3 <br> Return <br> Year | Age 2 <br> Return | Age 3 <br> Return <br> Age 2 <br> and 3 <br> Return | Percent <br> smolt <br> Survival |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | 2006 | 95,815 | 2007 | 0 | 1622 | 1622 | 1.69 |
| 2005 | 2007 | 3,931 | 2008 | 0 | 58 | 58 | 1.48 |
| 2006 | 2008 | 1,142 | 2009 | 5 | 75 | 80 | 7.01 |
| 2007 | 2009 | 73,232 | 2010 | 6 | 913 | 919 | 1.25 |
| 2008 | 2010 | 3,257 | 2011 | 14 | 344 | 358 | 10.99 |
| 2009 | 2011 | 353 | 2012 | 11 | 186 | 197 | $* *$ |
| 2010 | 2012 | 63,135 | 2013 | 13 | 2631 | 2644 | 4.19 |
| 2011 | 2013 | 9,283 | 2014 | 121 | 383 | 504 | 5.43 |
| 2012 | 2014 | 6,734 | 2015 | 102 | 188 | 290 | 4.31 |
| 2013 | 2015 | 8,758 | 2016 | 24 | 226 | 250 | 2.85 |
| 2014 | 2016 | 3,372 | 2017 | 0 | 364 | 364 | 10.79 |
| 2015 | 2017 | $* *$ | 2018 | 14 | 712 | 726 | $* *$ |
| 2016 | 2018 | 14,218 | 2019 | 27 | 338 | 365 | 2.50 |
| 2017 | 2019 | 15,707 | 2020 | 8 | 1664 | 1672 | 10.64 |
| 2018 | 2020 | 14,628 | 2021 | 102 | 845 | 947 | 6.47 |
| 2019 | 2021 | 1,762 | 2022 | --- | --- | --- | --- |

${ }^{1}$ Efficiency trials were not conducted in low production years. Estimates were produced from correlation with steelhead efficiencies.
** For 2009 \& 2015: Inherent error in data may be due to underestimating juvenile fish or overestimation or age structure classification of adult Coho Salmon.


Figure 24. 2004 - 2022 2+ steelhead population estimates, Scott River. The Scott RST was not in operation in 2017.

## Discussion

On August 17, 2021 the California State Water Resources Control Board approved emergency curtailment regulations for Shasta and Scott Rivers. This meant that in 2022 curtailments to water diversions would be implemented if Scott River flows fell below the following values (in cubic feet per second):

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | June | July | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200 | 200 | 200 | 150 | 150 | 125 | 50 | 30 | 33 | 40 | 60 | 150 |

Minimum flow in 2021 was 4.14 cfs on July $17^{\text {th }}$ while minimum flow in 2022 so far was 18.9 cfs on July $17^{\text {th }}$ (USGS 2022). Higher summer flows may have an impact on the timing of outmigration, the percentage of salmonids remaining in the Scott watershed, etc. Continued monitoring of outmigrants in future years will shed light on the impacts of the emergency regulations.

An estimated 68,616 age 1+ coho salmon outmigrated from the Scott River in 2022. This indicates that the 41 smolts were produced per adult coho that returned in the fall of 2020. From 2004 to 2022 the average number smolts produced per adult is 32 , meaning that the smolts per adult from the 2020 brood year is $130 \%$ of average.
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Appendix 1. Life stages of salmonids

| Sac Fry | Young salmon from hatching. Yolk sac not yet absorbed. |
| :---: | :--- |
| Fry | Stage between sac fry and parr. Yolk sac is fully absorbed and parr marks <br> are beginning to become visible. |
| Parr | Parr marks are fully developed. Body is widening. |
| Silvery Parr | Stage between parr and smolt. Parr marks are fading and being replaced <br> by silver scales. |
| Smolt | Silver scales and parr marks are not visible. |
| Adult | A sexually mature fish. |

Appendix 2. Scott River age-length cut-offs for Julian weeks 4-25 based on 2000-2006 scale ageing data.

| Chinook | Julian Week | Age 0+ | Age 1+ | Age 2+ | Age 3+ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1-8$ | $\leq 49$ | $\geq 50$ |  |  |
|  | $9-12$ | $\leq 79$ | $\geq 80$ |  |  |
|  | $13-14$ | $\leq 79$ | $\geq 80$ |  |  |
|  | $15-16$ | $\leq 89$ | $\geq 90$ |  |  |
|  | $17-20$ | $\leq 119$ | $\geq 120$ |  |  |
|  | $21-28$ | $\leq 159$ | $\geq 160$ |  |  |
| Coho | Julian Week | Age 0+ | Age 1+ | Age 2+ | Age 3+ |
|  | $1-8$ | $\leq 39$ | $40-149$ | $\geq 150$ |  |
|  | $9-12$ | $\leq 49$ | $50-189$ | $\geq 190$ |  |
|  | $13-14$ | $\leq 59$ | $60-219$ | $\geq 220$ |  |
|  | $15-16$ | $\leq 99$ | $100-159$ | $\geq 160$ |  |
|  | $17-20$ | $\leq 99$ | $100-169$ | $\geq 170$ |  |
|  | $21-28$ | $\leq 119$ | $120-149$ | $\geq 150$ |  |
| SteeIhead | Julian Week | Age 0+ | Age 1+ | Age 2+ | Age 3+ |
|  | $1-8$ | $\leq 39$ | $40-139$ | $140-229$ | $\geq 230$ |
|  | $9-12$ | $\leq 39$ | $40-139$ | $140-209$ | $\geq 210$ |
|  | $13-14$ | $\leq 89$ | $90-139$ | $140-229$ | $\geq 230$ |
|  | $15-16$ | $\leq 79$ | $80-139$ | $140-219$ | $\geq 220$ |
|  | $17-20$ | $\leq 79$ | $80-159$ | $160-229$ | $\geq 230$ |
|  | $21-28$ | $\leq 109$ | $110-179$ | $180-269$ | $\geq 270$ |

Appendix 3. List of Julian Weeks and Calendar Equivalents

| Julian Week \# | Inclusive Dates |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1/1-1/7 |
| $\underline{2}$ | 1/8-1/14 |
| $\underline{3}$ | 1/15-1/21 |
| 4 | 1/22-1/28 |
| 5 | 1/29-2/4 |
| 6 | 2/5-2/11 |
| 7 | 2/12-2/18 |
| $\underline{8}$ | 2/19-2/25 |
| $\underline{9}$ | 2/26-3/4* |
| $\underline{10}$ | 3/5-3/11 |
| 11 | 3/12-3/18 |
| 12 | 3/19-3/25 |
| 13 | 3/26-4/1 |
| 14 | 4/2-4/8 |
| 15 | 4/9-4/15 |
| $\underline{16}$ | 4/16-4/22 |
| $\underline{17}$ | 4/23-4/29 |
| 18 | 4/30-5/6 |
| $\underline{19}$ | 5/7-5/13 |
| $\underline{20}$ | 5/14-5/20 |
| $\underline{21}$ | 5/21-5/27 |
| 22 | 5/28-6/3 |
| 23 | 6/4-6/10 |
| $\underline{24}$ | 6/11-6/17 |
| 25 | 6/18-6/24 |
| $\underline{26}$ | 6/25-7/1 |


| Julian Week \# | Inclusive Dates |
| :---: | :---: |
| 27 | 7/2-7/8 |
| 28 | 7/9-7/15 |
| 29 | 7/16-7/22 |
| 30 | 7/23-7/29 |
| 31 | 7/30-8/5 |
| 32 | 8/6-8/12 |
| $\underline{33}$ | 8/13-8/19 |
| $\underline{34}$ | 8/20-8/26 |
| $\underline{35}$ | 8/27-9/2 |
| 36 | 9/3-9/9 |
| 37 | 9/10-9/16 |
| $\underline{38}$ | 9/17-9/23 |
| $\underline{\underline{39}}$ | 9/24-9/30 |
| $\underline{40}$ | 10/1-10/7 |
| 41 | 10/8-10/14 |
| 42 | 10/15-10/21 |
| 43 | 10/22-10/28 |
| 44 | 10/29-11/4 |
| $\underline{45}$ | 11/5-11/11 |
| $\underline{46}$ | 11/12-11/18 |
| $\underline{47}$ | 11/19-11/25 |
| $\underline{48}$ | 11/26-12/02 |
| 49 | 12/03-12/09 |
| 50 | 12/10-12/16 |
| 51 | 12/17-12/23 |
| 52 | 12/24-12/31** |

[^4]Appendix 4. 0+ Chinook Salmon weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River.

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | n | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | $\ldots--$ | --- | -- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- |
| 6 | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- |
| 7 | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- |
| 8 | 36.90 | 1.66 | 10 | 34 | 39 |
| 9 | 37.79 | 3.22 | 28 | 30 | 50 |
| 10 | 37.92 | 2.12 | 26 | 32 | 44 |
| 11 | 38.10 | 2.91 | 21 | 36 | 50 |
| 12 | 37.82 | 2.16 | 100 | 33 | 47 |
| 13 | 41.88 | 7.48 | 40 | 31 | 62 |
| 14 | 45.61 | 8.52 | 163 | 31 | 69 |
| 15 | 53.42 | 7.11 | 50 | 38 | 68 |
| 16 | 52.63 | 5.41 | 100 | 37 | 66 |
| 17 | 55.38 | 7.48 | 53 | 37 | 73 |
| 18 | 57.81 | 6.61 | 52 | 45 | 75 |
| 19 | 62.75 | 6.93 | 99 | 50 | 81 |
| 20 | 66.86 | 9.12 | 44 | 51 | 94 |
| 21 | 67.75 | 8.00 | 153 | 44 | 91 |
| 22 | 73.27 | 8.60 | 229 | 52 | 93 |
| 23 | 78.18 | 9.62 | 119 | 56 | 99 |
| 24 | 90.61 | 7.44 | 87 | 73 | 109 |
| 25 | 90.74 | 6.65 | 150 | 74 | 105 |

Appendix 5. 1+ Chinook Salmon weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River.

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | n | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | 85.33 | 4.16 | 3 | 82 | 90 |
| 6 | 95.75 | 13.22 | 8 | 67 | 112 |
| 7 | 103.86 | 10.04 | 7 | 89 | 116 |
| 8 | 102.20 | 8.58 | 15 | 89 | 116 |
| 9 | 105.00 | 11.55 | 8 | 87 | 127 |
| 10 | 106.20 | 10.85 | 5 | 94 | 120 |
| 11 | 113.25 | 17.25 | 4 | 95 | 136 |
| 12 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | 122.17 | 24.04 | 6 | 91 | 148 |
| 14 | 118.33 | 7.02 | 3 | 111 | 125 |
| 15 | 110.50 | 6.36 | 2 | 106 | 115 |
| 16 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 21 | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 23 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 24 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 25 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Appendix 6. 0+ Coho Salmon weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River.

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | n | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- |
| 14 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 15 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 17 | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20 | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- |
| 21 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22 | 73.00 | 8.25 | 25 | 57 | 89 |
| 23 | 69.00 | 6.50 | 9 | 57 | 78 |
| 24 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 25 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 26 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Appendix 7. 1+ Coho Salmon weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River.

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | $\mathbf{n}$ | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 98.75 | 4.57 | 4 | 94 | 105 |
| 5 | 95.20 | 11.90 | 10 | 75 | 109 |
| 6 | 97.30 | 7.46 | 37 | 82 | 111 |
| 7 | 100.23 | 10.15 | 30 | 74 | 115 |
| 8 | 103.71 | 8.00 | 31 | 82 | 117 |
| 9 | 102.13 | 8.87 | 38 | 76 | 114 |
| 10 | 102.76 | 9.43 | 21 | 80 | 115 |
| 11 | 102.46 | 8.35 | 24 | 80 | 114 |
| 12 | 102.24 | 13.57 | 38 | 72 | 125 |
| 13 | 99.31 | 14.68 | 84 | 63 | 129 |
| 14 | 106.26 | 14.68 | 141 | 64 | 161 |
| 15 | 108.39 | 11.03 | 187 | 80 | 140 |
| 16 | 108.45 | 13.50 | 141 | 74 | 188 |
| 17 | 109.16 | 16.68 | 110 | 75 | 207 |
| 18 | 107.82 | 11.36 | 50 | 76 | 133 |
| 19 | 112.90 | 9.95 | 69 | 79 | 132 |
| 20 | 115.96 | 9.44 | 100 | 94 | 150 |
| 21 | 118.58 | 8.09 | 78 | 99 | 135 |
| 22 | 120.44 | 7.70 | 96 | 110 | 144 |
| 23 | 120.55 | 7.05 | 38 | 108 | 146 |
| 24 | 122.47 | 8.72 | 36 | 110 | 141 |
| 25 | 120.57 | 5.09 | 7 | 115 | 129 |
| 26 | --- | -- | --- | --- | -- |

Appendix 8. $0+$ steelhead weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | n | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 7 | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 12 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 16 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 17 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 19 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 20 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 21 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 23 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 24 | --- | --- | - | --- | --- |
| 25 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 26 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Appendix 9. 1+ steelhead weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | $\mathbf{n}$ | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 88.25 | 19.41 | 8 | 60 | 115 |
| 5 | 82.44 | 9.88 | 9 | 69 | 103 |
| 6 | 91.28 | 15.59 | 18 | 65 | 113 |
| 7 | 96.65 | 14.38 | 17 | 78 | 118 |
| 8 | 94.55 | 13.05 | 33 | 72 | 115 |
| 9 | 95.44 | 13.91 | 48 | 65 | 118 |
| 10 | 96.69 | 12.90 | 39 | 68 | 130 |
| 11 | 96.31 | 13.17 | 58 | 57 | 119 |
| 12 | 94.23 | 13.99 | 119 | 56 | 119 |
| 13 | 89.91 | 14.45 | 183 | 55 | 119 |
| 14 | 89.74 | 13.17 | 124 | 64 | 118 |
| 15 | 89.78 | 10.98 | 97 | 70 | 109 |
| 16 | 90.14 | 12.03 | 37 | 63 | 107 |
| 17 | 95.91 | 17.31 | 122 | 62 | 147 |
| 18 | 93.48 | 15.86 | 40 | 73 | 130 |
| 19 | 101.83 | 16.65 | 41 | 75 | 143 |
| 20 | 100.84 | 18.58 | 49 | 69 | 147 |
| 21 | 117.66 | 22.67 | 32 | 81 | 171 |
| 22 | 125.08 | 30.00 | 50 | 86 | 177 |
| 23 | 120.00 | 37.77 | 22 | 16 | 179 |
| 24 | 127.17 | 24.92 | 12 | 98 | 179 |
| 25 | 124.73 | 19.17 | 15 | 98 | 169 |
| 26 | $\cdots--$ | $\cdots--$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- |

Appendix 10. $2+$ steelhead weekly mean fork lengths, one standard deviation, sample size, minimum and maximum lengths, Scott River

| Julian week | Average | s.d. | n | Min | Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | ---- | -- | -- | -- |  |
| 6 | 136.25 | 20.37 | 4 | 120 | 166 |
| 7 | 127 | 6.04 | 5 | 121 | 135 |
| 8 | 139.67 | 13.61 | 3 | 129 | 155 |
| 9 | 146.00 | 25.37 | 12 | 123 | 196 |
| 10 | 128.00 | 17.46 | 10 | 100 | 165 |
| 11 | 143.73 | 18.19 | 22 | 120 | 184 |
| 12 | 143.88 | 21.03 | 25 | 121 | 213 |
| 13 | 137.57 | 12.30 | 23 | 120 | 160 |
| 14 | 159.28 | 34.79 | 18 | 120 | 220 |
| 15 | 135.85 | 23.34 | 46 | 106 | 190 |
| 16 | 133.11 | 18.83 | 18 | 112 | 168 |
| 17 | 177.00 | 30.32 | 4 | 152 | 217 |
| 18 | 194.00 | 30.41 | 3 | 159 | 214 |
| 19 | 176.50 | 16.26 | 2 | 165 | 188 |
| 20 | 188.78 | 17.76 | 18 | 157 | 219 |
| 21 | 197.39 | 22.46 | 23 | 122 | 228 |
| 22 | 199.94 | 12.38 | 16 | 182 | 223 |
| 23 | 172.50 | 17.68 | 2 | 160 | 185 |
| 24 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 25 | ------ | --- | --- | --- |  |
| 26 | --- | -- | --- |  |  |

Appendix 11. Multi-year 0+ Chinook Salmon population estimates by Julian week and season total, 2001 - 2022, Scott River.

| Julian Weel | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | $2017{ }^{1}$ | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 4 |
| 5 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ---- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 14 | $\cdots$ | 14 | 15 |
| 6 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ---- | ---- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 168 | 5255 | $\cdots$ | 1012 | 25 | $\cdots$ | 20 | 5 |
| 7 | ---- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 6395 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 530 | 339 | $\cdots$ | 1296 | 31 | 349 | 5080 | 7 | 1105 | 4720 | $\cdots$ | 2713 | 7 | 37 | 110 | 51 |
| 8 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ---- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 1938 | 175 | 532 | 2181 | 3002 | 3508 | 2822 | 140 | 4956 | 7124 | $\cdots$ | 1562 | 50 | 46 | 212 | 586 |
| 9 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ---- | 14862 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 994 | 3477 | $\cdots$ | 15778 | 7816 | 1986 | 27672 | 4292 | 2164 | 4778 | $\cdots$ | 1031 | 196 | 68 | 630 | 5,847 |
| 10 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ---- | 55053 | 2365 | 1092 | 6175 | 37716 | 460 | 20220 | 13384 | 2197 | 22657 | 226 | 8446 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 72716 | 176 | 1992 | 1387 | 2,552 |
| 11 | 7240 | $\cdots$ | ---- | 97416 | 11548 | 63 | 488 | 14888 | 10374 | 85056 | 3990 | 4645 | 33242 | 375 | 26990 | 9618 | $\cdots$ | 15141 | 24093 | 5989 | 4008 | 1,412 |
| 12 | 41535 | $\cdots$ | ---- | 104792 | 14166 | 103 | 15659 | 14433 | 32479 | 47132 | 6539 | 1119 | 27951 | 9038 | 21555 | 14427 | $\cdots$ | 12961 | 38369 | 4568 | 5829 | 50,477 |
| 13 | 8524 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 160406 | 4592 | 61 | 12472 | 35320 | 86779 | 100699 | 18320 | 25480 | 37785 | 43059 | 6960 | 6435 | $\cdots$ | 3598 | 22805 | 12715 | 6403 | 49,069 |
| 14 | 18796 | 49916 | $\cdots$ | 123290 | 24907 | 68 | 12360 | 43904 | 88192 | 46372 | 19220 | 11104 | 2730 | 107632 | 6747 | 10388 | ---- | 11228 | 0 | 5859 | 37932 | 58,028 |
| 15 | 39187 | 20945 | 15164 | 107805 | 17070 | 37 | 30846 | 92904 | 202763 | 81515 | 20265 | 6851 | 24421 | 41813 | 7016 | 13892 | ---- | 24714 | 0 | 17381 | 38567 | 17,219 |
| 16 | 100278 | 29008 | 16113 | 47900 | 8598 | 75 | 68769 | 16687 | 321650 | 133590 | 11781 | 21812 | 32038 | 30818 | 10425 | 11934 | ---- | 17430 | 6222 | 18827 | 40925 | 27,977 |
| 17 | 79772 | 24346 | 3638 | 30427 | 5035 | $\cdots$ | 14320 | 32757 | 96571 | 64864 | 15371 | 196 | 15013 | 66917 | 29156 | 1958 | $\cdots$ | 7425 | 74 | 19314 | 6220 | 18,177 |
| 18 | 57000 | 38295 | ---- | 11503 | 4284 | 7 | 16436 | 41028 | 60656 | 20979 | 9216 | 12009 | 32851 | 29820 | 24982 | 5611 | $\cdots$ | 9742 | 4195 | 21625 | 25622 | 36,362 |
| 19 | 20869 | 4494 | ---- | 19758 | 4652 | 62 | 6013 | 71064 | $\cdots$ | 138698 | 4989 | 10499 | 34685 | 32561 | 24798 | 534 | $\cdots$ | 12417 | 47 | 18751 | 6766 | 26,449 |
| 20 | 14330 | 6057 | $\cdots$ | 9029 | 7299 | $\cdots$ | 14854 | 18190 | 44157 | 64266 | 5719 | 3515 | 28677 | 29609 | 24711 | 267 | $\cdots$ | 3662 | 3219 | 31284 | 2188 | 17,825 |
| 21 | 201288 | 4293 | ---- | 5438 | 3718 | 19 | 17261 | 52194 | 49291 | 34618 | 3020 | 4589 | 16297 | 47712 | 10641 | 88 | $\cdots$ | 2637 | 971 | 10166 | 10613 | 23,983 |
| 22 | 41331 | 3781 | $\cdots$ | 6592 | 7007 | 28 | 4478 | 61290 | 12252 | 22450 | 1582 | 2203 | 50722 | 27725 | 17325 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 43215 | 1024 | 20814 | 10415 | 60,291 |
| 23 | $\cdots$ | 36243 | $\cdots$ | 17533 | 12248 | $\cdots$ | 26041 | 38093 | 8420 | $\cdots$ | 515 | 7550 | 109656 | 10969 | 30423 | --- | $\cdots$ | 125757 | 2084 | 189372 | 27992 | 20,001 |
| 24 | $\cdots$ | 73829 | $\cdots$ | 61740 | 4543 | 19 | 60114 | 38571 | 13033 | 26872 | 25 | 8947 | 219875 | 8679 | 20375 | --- | $\cdots$ | 38531 | 1756 | 12206 | 1696 | 22,867 |
| 25 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 268773 | 2842 | 22 | $\cdots$ | 42726 | 23413 | 33499 | 4390 | 40496 | 37364 | 1810 | 5070 | --- | $\cdots$ | 2630 | 12455 | 1684 | 168 | 54,291 |
| 26 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 14050 | 59270 | 19341 | 3061 | 60877 | 62195 | 19500 | 23310 | 13533 | 50247 | 21268 | 520 | 316 | --- | $\cdots$ | 566 | 21094 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 27 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 34802 | 3625 | 49943 | 5788 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 28 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 42142 | $\cdots$ | 7691 | 2204 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| TOTAL | 630,151 | 291,207 | 125,909 | 1,211,604 | 211,847 | 12,707 | 370,622 | 717,948 | 1,070,520 | 963,392 | 162,706 | 219,303 | 782,804 | 493,721 | 284,329 | 97,027 | NA | 410,688 | 138,947 | 391,643 | 227,716 | 493,084 |

${ }^{1}$ The Scott RST was not in operation in 2017.

Appendix 12. Multi-year 1+ Coho Salmon population estimates by Julian week and season total, 2003 - 2022, Scott River.

| Julian Week | $2003{ }^{1}$ | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | $2007{ }^{2}$ | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | $2017^{3}$ | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | --- | $\cdots$ | -- | --- | --- | -- | -- | --- | --- | -- | --- | $\cdots$ | -- | -- | --- | --- | -- | ---- | --- | 350 |
| 5 | ---- | --- | --- | --- | ---- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | ---- | --- | 616 | ---- | 2 | 375 |
| 6 | ---- | ---- | $\cdots-$ | ---- | $\cdots$ | ---- | $\cdots-$ | ---- | ---- | --- | ---- | ---- | 14 | 139 | ---- | 72 | 448 | ---- | 6 | 888 |
| 7 | ---- | 0 | 7 | ---- | 2 | 15 | 555 | 28 | 3 | 2,069 | 8 | 49 | 1,792 | 51 | ---- | 1 | 359 | 44 | 6 | 1,124 |
| 8 | $\cdots$ | 95 | 12 | 576 | 0 | 12 | 1,818 | 28 | 2 | 2,764 | 21 | 1,213 | 1,832 | 44 | ---- | 19 | 224 | 165 | 4 | 149 |
| 9 | 489 | 23 | 32 | 651 | 1 | 5 | 6,727 | 99 | 4 | 432 | 30 | 1,419 | 1,617 | 70 | --- | 22 | 821 | 105 | 4 | 666 |
| 10 | 272 | 245 | 50 | 323 | 0 | --- | 15,201 | 83 | 4 | 1,974 | 54 | 63 | 210 | --- | ---- | 4 | 186 | 375 | 6 | 787 |
| 11 | 2,367 | 84 | 189 | 1,435 | 1 | 52 | 15,096 | 115 | 7 | 2,946 | 21 | 168 | 211 | 0 | ---- | 1,121 | 224 | 322 | 10 | 974 |
| 12 | 10,136 | 5 | 71 | 1,199 | 2 | 33 | 7,595 | 55 | 3 | 2,884 | 67 | 1,079 | 120 | 44 | ---- | 454 | 381 | 537 | 39 | 1,536 |
| 13 | 1,677 | 28 | 106 | 3,400 | 9 | 64 | 7,294 | 21 | 2 | 3,197 | 22 | 245 | 341 | 709 | ---- | 340 | 719 | 805 | 210 | 3,258 |
| 14 | 3,600 | 1 | 343 | 2,118 | 21 | 209 | 2,866 | 148 | $\cdots$ | 4,314 | 18 | 84 | 243 | 882 | ---- | 1,934 | ---- | 805 | 240 | 9,454 |
| 15 | 4,068 | 74 | 313 | 2,527 | 48 | 127 | 5,805 | 260 | 2 | 5,250 | 350 | 417 | 561 | 200 | ---- | 933 | ---- | 1,341 | 210 | 6,903 |
| 16 | 1,338 | 212 | 173 | 7,153 | 30 | 175 | 5,121 | 308 | 4 | 8,785 | 436 | 394 | 389 | 177 | ---- | 1,767 | 499 | 1,502 | 132 | 9,176 |
| 17 | 1,261 | 37 | 211 | 7,125 | 20 | 108 | 2,638 | 390 | 44 | 7 | 1,895 | 343 | 531 | 310 | ---- | 2,215 | 308 | 1,609 | 12 | 2,116 |
| 18 | 771 | 11 | 280 | 9,515 | 79 | 184 | 1,812 | 99 | 20 | 631 | 491 | 665 | 347 | 288 | ---- | 1,421 | 1,000 | 4,471 | 55 | 4,284 |
| 19 | 506 | 75 | 56 | 11,591 | 93 | 18 | ---- | 782 | 82 | 9,867 | 3,208 | 334 | 524 | 67 | ---- | 1,524 | 2,909 | 2,414 | 272 | 2,174 |
| 20 | 3,967 | 18 | 175 | 9,679 | 37 | 56 | 510 | 378 | 25 | 1,307 | 904 | 219 | 23 | 111 | ---- | 1,251 | 2,122 | 68 | 72 | 6,900 |
| 21 | 800 | 18 | $\cdots$ | 8,675 | 50 | --- | 56 | 99 | 118 | 3,292 | 1,091 | 36 | 16 | 213 | ---- | 973 | 2,122 | 30 | 595 | 6,804 |
| 22 | 1,613 | 2 | 25 | 19,234 | 11 | 42 | 68 | 363 | 31 | 8,363 | 567 | 6 | 2 | 67 | --- | 575 | 1,531 | 28 | 306 | 8,736 |
| 23 | 961 | 14 | $\cdots$ | 2,973 | 4 | 20 | 66 | $\cdots$ | 3 | 993 | 76 | $\cdots$ | ---- | ---- | $\cdots$ | 0 | 616 | 6 | 6 | 1,242 |
| 24 | 312 | 8 | ---- | 4,128 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 3,593 | 25 | ---- | --- | --- | $\cdots$ | 0 | 411 | 1 | $\cdots$ | 1,040 |
| 25 | 11 | 0 | ---- | 2,188 | $\cdots$ | 2 | ---- | 0 | $\cdots$ | 385 | ---- | ---- | --- | ---- | $\cdots$ | 0 | 171 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 32 |
| 26 | $\cdots$ | 0 | ---- | 1,251 | 0 | ---- | ---- | 0 | $\cdots$ | 84 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- | ---- | 0 | 41 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- |
| 27 | $\cdots$ | 0 | $\cdots$ | 71 | 0 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| 28 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | --- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | -- |
| T0TAL | 34,149 | 949 | 2,042 | 95,815 | 410 | 1,142 | 73,232 | 3,257 | 353 | 63,135 | 9283 | 6734 | 8,758 | 3,372 | ---- | 14,626 | 15,707 | 14,228 | 1,762 | 68,616 |

${ }^{1}$ There was no data on number of days of trap operation. As a result, a 7-day estimate was not produced.
${ }^{2} 2007$ is based on correlation with steelhead trapping efficiencies. Weekly estimate not available.
${ }^{3}$ The Scott RST was not in operation in 2017.

Appendix 13. Multi-year 2+ steelhead population estimates by Julian week and season total, 2004 - 2022, Scott River.

| Julian Week | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | $2015{ }^{1}$ | $2016{ }^{1}$ | $2017{ }^{2}$ | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | --- | ---- | --- | ---- | --- | -- |
| 5 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | --- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | --- | ---- | 0 | ---- | ---- | -- |
| 6 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 2 | ---- | 42 | 23 | ---- | $\cdots$ | 15 |
| 7 | 4 | 96 | ---- | 361 | 95 | 36 | 1 | 59 | 81 | 11 | 21 | 11 | 0 | ---- | 128 | 14 | 385 | ---- | 28 |
| 8 | 5 | 92 | 193 | 121 | 20 | 116 | 4 | 83 | 123 | 11 | 294 | 13 | 0 | ---- | 105 | 11 | 220 | $\cdots$ | 12 |
| 9 | 4 | 868 | 75 | ---- | 560 | 851 | 172 | 231 | 58 | 12 | 1,096 | 13 | 4 | ---- | 11 | 175 | 769 | 6 | 50 |
| 10 | 26 | 1,482 | 116 | 2,352 | 1,107 | 859 | 229 | 832 | 15 | 114 | 250 | 9 | ---- | ---- | 408 | 218 | 616 | 21 | 91 |
| 11 | 14 | 2,086 | 7 | 2,664 | 2,786 | 71 | 1,331 | 546 | 41 | 39 | 57 | 9 | 0 | ---- | 3,220 | 212 | 769 | 120 | 303 |
| 12 | 9 | 1,300 | 295 | 14,749 | 546 | 438 | 2,107 | 199 | 50 | 186 | 282 | 5 | 2 | ---- | 5,460 | 246 | 513 | 432 | 668 |
| 13 | 6 | 1,853 | 595 | 5,770 | 1,415 | 1,190 | 480 | 512 | 47 | 63 | 370 | 4 | 8 | ---- | 1,531 | 25 | 1,847 | 467 | 299 |
| 14 | 12 | 3,500 | 359 | 2,871 | 4,611 | 429 | 113 | 33 | 231 | 18 | 109 | 1 | 21 | ---- | 14,380 | ---- | 3,385 | 1,219 | 349 |
| 15 | 7 | 2,616 | 317 | 5,019 | 4,236 | 2,827 | 452 | 496 | 217 | 687 | 313 | 26 | 11 | ---- | 4,106 | ---- | 5,538 | 280 | 1,273 |
| 16 | 27 | 5,819 | 7 | 1,813 | 719 | 2,938 | 660 | 158 | 1,602 | 1,136 | 212 | 33 | 6 | ---- | 1,292 | 268 | 9,538 | 406 | 209 |
| 17 | 14 | 2,546 | 105 | 501 | 89 | 37 | 4 | 16 | 42 | 247 | 33 | 8 | 5 | ---- | 106 | 0 | 2,001 | 12 | 19 |
| 18 | 8 | 741 | 42 | 299 | 64 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 6 | 36 | 274 | 6 | 1 | ---- | 35 | 7 | 1,027 | ---- | 12 |
| 19 | 13 | 664 | 126 | 630 | 11 | ---- | 18 | 83 | 1 | 327 | 411 | 14 | 0 | ---- | 67 | 14 | 210 | 20 | 10 |
| 20 | 30 | 231 | 1,218 | 12,950 | ---- | ---- | 4 | 67 | 0 | 265 | 519 | 30 | 4 | ---- | 754 | 14 | 2,501 | 15 | 214 |
| 21 | 27 | 60 | 4,106 | 3,354 | 14 | ---- | 6 | 59 | 29 | 870 | 0 | 6 | 1 | ---- | 231 | 14 | 1,538 | 30 | 364 |
| 22 | 25 | 282 | 691 | 912 | 26 | ---- | 85 | 119 | 18 | 457 | 1 | 1 | 2 | ---- | 116 | 41 | 769 | 6 | 185 |
| 23 | 25 | 1,579 | 245 | 100 | 7 | ---- | ---- | 80 | 7 | 410 | 1 | 0 | ---- | ---- | 25 | 5 | 220 | 2 | 66 |
| 24 | 31 | 1,664 | 298 | 71 | 26 | ---- | 3 | ---- | 13 | 5 | ---- | 0 | ---- | ---- | 0 | 5 | ---- | --- | 2 |
| 25 | 12 | 204 | 18 | ---- | 5 | ---- | 16 | ---- | 6 | 0 | ---- | 0 | ---- | ---- | 1 | 5 | ---- | ---- | 5 |
| 26 | 7 | 48 | 131 | 41 | 0 | --- | 7 | 65 | 1 | 0 | ---- | 0 | ---- | ---- | 0 | 0 | ---- | $\cdots$ | --- |
| 27 | 5 | 1,700 | 506 | ---- | ---- | - | --- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| 28 | ---- | 5,859 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | $\cdots$ | --- |
| T0TAL | 308 | 29,428 | 9,448 | 54,578 | 16,336 | 9,796 | 5,690 | 3,653 | 2,587 | 4,892 | 4,242 | 189 | 66 | NA | 32,015 | 1,296 | 31,845 | 3,036 | 4,173 |

${ }^{1}$ Reported numbers are total trapped and not population estimate.
${ }^{2}$ The Scott RST was not in operation in 2017.


[^0]:    * Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 4-8 and 11 based on seasonal trap efficiency.

[^1]:    * Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 4, 5, 7, 10-13, 16 and 24-25 is based on seasonal trap efficiency.

[^2]:    * Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 14-20 is based on seasonal trap efficiency.

[^3]:    * Estimated weekly population and CI for JW 6-8, 10-17, and 19-25 are based on seasonal trap efficiency.

[^4]:    * = eight days only during leap years ** = eight day Julian week

