

Coquitlam-Buntzen Project Water Use Plan

Lower Coquitlam River Fish Productivity Index

Implementation Year 13

Reference: COQMON-7

Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program

Study Period: 2000-2018

Jody Schick
529 Gower Point Road, Gibsons, BC., V0N 1V0
jodschick@gmail.com

February 2021

Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program:
2000-2018 Results

Prepared for:

BC Hydro

Prepared by:

Jody Schick^{1*}, Jason Macnair, Jennifer Buchanan and Dani Ramos

February 2021

¹ 529 Gower Point Road, Gibsons, BC., V0N 1V0, jodschick@gmail.com

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed

Executive Summary

As part of the Coquitlam River Water Use Plan (LB1 WUP), a long-term adaptive management study is being conducted in the Coquitlam River to compare anadromous fish production under two experimental flow regimes. Fish population monitoring under the first flow regime (Treatment 1, dam release flows from 0.8-1.4 m³/s) occurred from 2000 until the completion of the Coquitlam Dam seismic upgrade in October 2008, with the exception of 2001(8 years). Fish production under Treatment 2 (release flows from 1.1-6.1 m³/s) was initially proposed to be monitored until 2017 (9 years). This has since been extended for an additional 3 years (ending 2020) to increase the level of confidence in the inferences drawn from the study in the lead-up to the Water Use Plan Order Review. The overall objective of the Lower Coquitlam River Fish Productivity Index Monitoring Program (COQMON-07) is to provide the information necessary to better understand the trade-offs between fisheries, domestic water and power generation. To do this, COQMON-07 was designed to evaluate the fisheries benefits of each flow regime by monitoring adult escapement, and smolt and fry outmigration of four anadromous species including Steelhead Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), Chum Salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) and Pink Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*). Higher returns during 2007-2016 allowed Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) escapements to be estimated as well. Since 2006, night snorkeling surveys have also been included in the monitoring program to provide estimates of late summer standing stocks of juvenile Coho and Steelhead. This report summarizes monitoring results for the 8 years during Treatment 1 (2000-2008) and the 10 years of Treatment 2 (2009-2018) for the four major components of the COQMON-07: adult salmon escapement surveys, Steelhead redd counts, juvenile standing stock surveys, and smolt and fry outmigration trapping. For Coho and Steelhead, the primary metrics for evaluating the fisheries benefits of each flow regime are smolt production. For Chum and Pink, it is the number of outmigrating fry produced per adult spawner. The evaluation also includes survival between various freshwater life-stages, fish size and habitat use. Adult abundance is given limited importance because of the large role that ocean survival plays in the number of salmon and Steelhead Trout returning to the Coquitlam River.

The primary emphasis of this report is on fall standing stock, smolt and fry outmigration and Steelhead escapement in 2018. Due to a transition in the monitoring program, no fall adult salmon monitoring occurred in 2017, which would typically be included in this report. The absence of this information meant that links between 2018 outmigrating fry and adult spawner counts could not be made. Summaries of all data years for each species and life stage are presented and discussed as well. Estimates of adult escapement, late summer juvenile standing stocks and egg-to-smolt survival estimates should be considered preliminary and will change as additional observer efficiency data are accumulated in future years.

Coho

The 2018 late summer standing stock fry estimate was 43,740 (95%CI \pm 30%) based on night snorkel surveys, which was well within the range of previous years (18,405-91,367 fry) though lower than the mean for Treatment 2 (55,940 fry). During the spring of 2018, 7,886 (95%CI \pm

1,654) Coho smolts originating from mainstem habitats outmigrated past the lowermost trapping site and an additional 1,560 smolts outmigrated from the four off-channel habitats above RST2.

Coho escapement to the Coquitlam River in 2002-2016 (880-13,290 adults) likely exceeded that necessary to seed available juvenile habitat based on our preliminary stock-recruitment analysis. As with the Pink, Chum and Chinook, there was insufficient survey life and observer efficiency information to calculate the uncertainty of Coho escapement estimates.

Using the combined Coho smolt yield from mainstem and off-channel habitat as the primary measure of freshwater carrying capacity, there was no significant difference in mean smolt freshwater production between Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 (mean: 12,949 and 12,507 smolts, respectively; 2-tailed t-test $p = 0.53$). When using only smolt production from the mainstem, which we consider a better indicator of treatment effects, there was also no significant difference in smolt yield between Treatment 1 and 2 (mean: 6,173 and 7,793, respectively; 2-tailed t-test $p=0.18$), even though there was a 26% increase in mean abundance. The probability of a 10% or greater increase in smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 is moderate (prob = 0.76), moderate for a 20% increase (prob = 0.61) and low for a 50% or greater increase (prob = 0.16). In the 2016 and 2017 summary reports, we reported that smolt yield was significantly higher during Treatment 2 than Treatment 1 (2-tailed t-test $p = 0.04$), whereas we have reported it as not statistically different in this report. This difference stems from earlier reports excluding the 2000 smolt estimate. However, 2000 shouldn't have been excluded for Coho since Treatment 1 was implemented in 1997, thus, the 2000 smolt cohort reared under Treatment 1 conditions.

We are uncertain whether a change in Coho smolt yield was due to Treatment 2 flows or other regional factors that occurred over a similar time. Note that MON-7 uses a Before-After (BA) study design, which relies on the assumption the BA change in smolt abundance was primarily the result of the flow treatments. To help confirm this assumption, we used a Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) analysis to compare how abundance changed in the Coquitlam relative to three other coastal BC streams that estimate smolt yield. No change in the control streams would support the assumption of the BA comparison, whereas a similar or greater change would not support the assumption. For inclusion, streams had to have at least moderately similar abundance trends for cohorts reared prior to Treatment 2 (correlation coefficient > 0.5). We use these streams to represent the changes in productivity in the Coquitlam River that would have occurred without the change to flows during Treatment 2. Results from the BACI analysis provide no support that the increased smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 was the result of the flow treatment or that the BA comparison was relatively unaffected by other factors. The mean change in productivity between Treatment 1 and 2 in the Coquitlam River ranged from near zero or negative, depending on if the Alouette River was included as a control. This is contrary to the expectation if the BA assumption was satisfied. This is a product of the mean smolt yield in the control streams increasing a similar or greater amount as the Coquitlam, instead of a greater increase for the Coquitlam than the control streams if the BA assumption was satisfied.

Steelhead

In 2018, 161 unique redds were counted, which we used to estimate the total escapement of 268 Steelhead. This reflects a relatively low escapement compared to the range since redd surveys began in 2005 (range: 230-870 Steelhead). Redd counts suggests that Steelhead escapements during 2005-2018 (24 to 80 adults/km, or 39,000-149,000 eggs/km,) were above that necessary to seed available juvenile habitat based on stock and recruitment data for the Keogh River (Ward et al. 1993), a well-studied coastal stream, and based on our preliminary stock-recruitment analysis from the Coquitlam River. The 2018 estimate was minimally influenced by modeling redd loss since the period between surveys was sufficiently short that virtually all redds constructed after one survey remained visible during the subsequent survey. The late summer standing stocks and 95%CI of Steelhead fry, age 1+ and 2+ parr for 2018 was $47,565 \pm 26\%$, $9,836 \pm 27\%$ and $2,127 \pm 52\%$, respectively. Smolt yield for the mainstem upstream of the lowermost trap (RST2) was $3,696 \pm 16\%$ in 2018.

Mean Steelhead smolt yield for the Coquitlam River mainstem increased 30% between Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 (mean: 3,701 and 4,811 smolts, respectively) and was significantly different (2-tailed t-test, $p=0.045$). This was almost entirely a product of increased smolt yield from reach 4, which increased 144% between Treatment 1 and 2 (mean: 925 and 2,253 smolts, respectively; 2-tailed t-test, $p<0.01$). As well, abundance in reach 4 has been at least two-fold higher than during Treatment 1 in all but one year since 2009. This continues the trend of generally increasing abundance in reach 4 from less than 400 smolts in 1996 (prior to the start of Treatment 1) to over 2,800 smolts in recent years. Mean smolt production from reaches 2 and 3 was lower between Treatment 1 and 2 (-6% and -8% change, respectively).

Similar to Coho, we are uncertain whether a change in Steelhead smolt yield was due to Treatment 2 flows or other regional factors that occurred over a similar time. We used the BACI analysis to compare the change in the smolt abundance between Treatment 1 and 2 for the Coquitlam relative to other coastal BC streams that estimate smolt yield. After excluding streams that underwent changes in flow regulation and those with poorly correlated abundance trends prior to Treatment 2, we were limited to using only the Alouette River as the control for non-treatment effects. If smolt yield from the Alouette River is a reliable control, the BACI analysis does not support that the increased smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 was the result of the flow treatment or that the BA comparison was relatively unaffected by other factors. This is because while smolt yield for the Coquitlam River increased 30% from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2, the increase was 78% between the two time periods for the Alouette River. However, we are uncertain about the reliability of the Alouette River as a control primarily due to the uncertainty about the amount that pre-2008 estimates were biased low, but also due to the low precision of the estimated change in abundance between treatments (95% CI: 10%-132%) and small Treatment 2 sample size (3 years). As a consequence, we will be investigating other coastal rivers to be used as control streams.

Chum

No Chum spawner surveys and escapement monitoring occurred in 2017. As such, there are no 2017 estimates reported in Table 6.1a. In 2018, 4.0 million (95% CI $\pm 7\%$) Chum fry outmigrated past the lowermost trap. This is well within the range for Treatment 2 (range: 1.9-12.7 million fry) and is high compared to Treatment 1 (0.8-3.4 million fry). Egg-to-fry survival ranged from 3.7%-26.8%, and averaged 10.0% during Treatment 1. Egg-to-fry survival during

Treatment 2 averaged 24.7% and ranged from 12%-40%. Some or all our survival estimates could be biased high as they exceed the published values for Pacific Northwest streams (Bradford 1995). Survival estimates may be better interpreted as an index, only comparable within the Coquitlam River Monitoring Program. Mean survival was significantly higher during Treatment 2 than during Treatment 1 (2-tailed t-test $p=0.01$). Preliminary stock-recruitment analysis also suggests that Treatment 2 likely increased fry production compared with Treatment 1. These findings could change as we further refine the Chum escapement model as well as with further comparisons with other rivers. Chum salmon returns to Coquitlam River were greatly improved in 2002-2016 compared to escapements in years prior to the implementation of the Treatment 1 flow regime in 1997.

Pink

No Pink spawner surveys and escapement monitoring occurred in 2017. As such, there are no 2017 estimates reported in Table 6.1a. Escapement during the most recent run year, 2015 was comparable to the 2009 and 2011 runs and less than 1/3 of 2013 returns. The 2018 estimate of fry yield of $114,846 \pm 40\%$ was the lowest during Treatment 2 (range: 150,000-6.7 million fry). It also had the lowest precision due to the inability to trap during the 27 days flows exceeded the safe limit for trapping out of the 87 day monitoring period. Fry yields during Treatment 2 have been up to 20-fold higher than Treatment 1 and mirrors the significant changes in fry yield in the Cheakamus River since 2006. Egg-to-fry survival ranged from 5.1%-9.7% up to 2009, which was comparable to reported values for other streams and potentially biased high survival rates of 24%-48% for the 2011-2015 broods. With only two run-years under Treatment 2 conditions, between-treatment comparisons are weak and inconclusive. Future evaluations of the fisheries benefits of test flows may be complicated by non-comparable escapements during Treatment 1 and 2 if the current abundance trends continue and will likely rely on comparisons with other rivers.

Chinook

Chinook escapement was not monitored in 2017. Escapement 2007-2016 ranged from 360-8,000 adults, and was likely less than 300 adults prior to this period. The highest Chinook escapement occurred in 2010 (8,018 adults). Too few Chinook smolts (0) or fry (84) were captured in downstream trapping to estimate the number outmigrating out of the Coquitlam River.

COQMON-07 Status of Objectives, Management Questions and Hypothesis after Year 19

| Primary Objective | Management Question | Management Hypothesis | Year 18 (2018) status |
|---|---|--|--|
| To determine the fisheries benefits associated with the two test flows : Treatment 1 – 2FVC Treatment2 – STP6 | Has juvenile rearing capacity of the Coquitlam river changed as a result of flow treatments for Steelhead and Coho? | H ₀ –Steelhead smolt production does not differ between Treatment 1 and 2 | H ₀ –status unclear. Possibly reject if based only on change in Coquitlam River smolt production. High probability (90%) that production increase 10% or more. Do not reject if based on the change in the Coquitlam relative to the Alouette River as the control river. Low probability (19%) of a 10% or greater change than what occurred in the control river. Section 6.2 |
| | | H ₀₁ – Coho smolt production does not differ between Treatment 1 and 2 | H ₀₁ – status unclear. Possibly reject if based only on change in Coquitlam River smolt production. Moderate probability (76%) that production increase 10% or more. Do not reject if based on the change relative to the Alouette River as the control river. High probability (86%) of a 10% or greater <u>decrease</u> in Coquitlam River production. Possibly reject if based on the change relative to five Georgia Basin rivers as the controls. Moderate probability (72%) of a 10% or greater increase in production. Section 6.1 |
| | Has Chum and Pink juvenile productivity changed as a result of flow treatments in the Coquitlam River? | H ₀₃ –Each adult Chum produced the same fry yield during Treatment 1 and 2. Stock-recruitment relationships have: | H ₀₃ – possibly rejected. Results do not incorporation year-specific uncertainty or account for possibly biased adult escapement estimates. Uncertain about treatment versus regional effects. Section 6.3 |
| | | H ₀₄ –Each adult Pink produced the same fry yield during Treatment 1 and 2. Stock-recruitment relationships have increased. | H _{04a} – not rejected H _{04b} – not rejected Insufficient data for analysis. Awaiting larger Treatment 2 sample size and incorporation of year-specific uncertainty. Section 6.4 |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | ii |
| Table of Contents | ii |
| List of Tables | v |
| List of Figures | i |
| List of Appendices | i |
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Study design | 2 |
| 1.2.1 Adult salmon escapement..... | 5 |
| 1.2.2 Adult Steelhead escapement..... | 5 |
| 1.2.3 Juvenile Coho and Steelhead standing stock..... | 6 |
| 1.2.4 Smolt outmigrant trapping..... | 6 |
| 2 Adult Salmon Escapement..... | 8 |
| 2.1 Methods..... | 8 |
| 2.1.1 Stratified index survey design | 8 |
| 2.1.2 Partial surveys, observer efficiency, and survey life | 10 |
| 2.1.3 Escapement model structure and parameter estimation | 12 |
| 2.1.3.1 Process model | 12 |
| 2.1.3.2 Observation model..... | 13 |
| 2.1.3.3 Parameter Estimation and assessing model fit..... | 15 |
| 2.2 Results and Discussion..... | 15 |
| 2.2.1 Survey conditions and run timing..... | 15 |
| 2.2.2 Observer efficiency and survey life..... | 16 |
| 2.2.2.1 Observer efficiency | 16 |
| 2.2.2.2 Survey life..... | 17 |
| 2.2.2.3 Modeling observer efficiency and survey life | 18 |
| 2.2.3 Escapement model..... | 19 |
| 2.2.4 Escapement estimates | 20 |
| 2.2.5 Alternative approach to monitoring changes in escapement..... | 21 |
| 2.2.6 Adult habitat distribution and access to off-channel sites | 21 |
| 2.2.7 Temperature..... | 22 |
| 2.3 Implication for hypothesis testing..... | 23 |
| 3 Adult Steelhead Escapement..... | 24 |
| 3.1 Methods..... | 24 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.1.1 Description of study area and survey methods..... | 24 |
| 3.1.2 Redd Identification | 25 |
| 3.1.3 Redd survey life..... | 26 |
| 3.1.4 Female escapement and egg deposition..... | 26 |
| 3.2 Results and Discussion..... | 27 |
| 3.2.1 Redd survey life..... | 28 |
| 3.2.2 Female escapement and egg deposition..... | 29 |
| 3.3 Implications for hypothesis testing | 30 |
| 4 Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock..... | 31 |
| 4.1 Methods..... | 31 |
| 4.1.1 Study area | 31 |
| 4.1.2 Sampling design | 31 |
| 4.1.3 Night snorkeling | 32 |
| 4.1.4 Mark-recapture experiments to estimate snorkeling detection probability | 33 |
| 4.1.5 Estimation of fish standing stocks and mean densities..... | 34 |
| 4.1.6 Day electrofishing survey | 37 |
| 4.1.7 Physical characteristics of snorkeling and electrofishing sites..... | 38 |
| 4.2 Results | 38 |
| 4.2.1 Night snorkeling | 38 |
| 4.2.1.1 Mark-recapture experiments to estimate snorkeling detection probability..... | 38 |
| 4.2.1.2 Juvenile fish distribution and abundance..... | 39 |
| 4.2.2 Assumptions of estimates based on snorkeling counts..... | 40 |
| 4.2.3 Stream-wide fish abundance estimates based on snorkeling counts | 41 |
| 4.2.4 Fish densities in ‘optimal’ habitats based on electrofishing..... | 42 |
| 4.3 Implications for hypothesis testing | 43 |
| 5 Smolt and Fry Outmigration | 44 |
| 5.1 Methods..... | 44 |
| 5.1.1 Coho and Steelhead smolt enumeration | 44 |
| 5.1.1.1 Location and description of downstream traps | 44 |
| 5.1.1.2 Downstream trap operation..... | 46 |
| 5.1.1.3 Differential marking by period and initial capture location..... | 47 |
| 5.1.1.4 Population estimates | 49 |
| 5.1.1.5 Mark-recapture assumptions..... | 52 |
| 5.1.2 Chum and Pink fry enumeration..... | 53 |
| 5.1.2.1 Downstream trapping..... | 53 |
| 5.1.2.2 Differential marking over time | 53 |
| 5.1.2.3 Population estimates | 54 |
| 5.2 Results | 54 |
| 5.2.1 Off-channel sites..... | 54 |
| 5.2.2 Coquitlam River mainstem..... | 55 |
| 5.2.2.1 Discharge and trap operations..... | 55 |
| 5.2.2.2 Coho | 56 |
| 5.2.2.3 Steelhead | 57 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 5.2.2.4 Chum and Pink..... | 60 |
| 5.2.2.5 Sockeye/Kokanee..... | 60 |
| 5.2.2.6 Chinook..... | 61 |
| 5.2.2.7 Coho Fry | 61 |
| 5.3 Discussion | 61 |
| 5.3.1 Assumptions of the study design..... | 61 |
| 5.3.2 Reliability of estimates and implications for the flow experiment..... | 62 |
| 6 Fish Productivity during Treatment 1 and 2 | 64 |
| 6.1 Treatment 1 and 2 flows..... | 65 |
| 6.2 Coho | 66 |
| 6.2.1 Off-channel smolt abundance..... | 66 |
| 6.2.2 Mainstem smolt abundance | 66 |
| 6.2.3 Mainstem fall fry abundance | 70 |
| 6.2.4 Evaluating season-specific flow effects on survival and abundance..... | 70 |
| 6.3 Steelhead | 71 |
| 6.3.1 Off-channel smolt abundance..... | 71 |
| 6.3.2 Mainstem smolt abundance | 72 |
| 6.3.3 Mainstem fry and parr abundance | 73 |
| 6.3.4 Evaluating season-specific flow effects on survival and abundance..... | 74 |
| 6.4 Chum | 75 |
| 6.4.1 River-wide abundance and survival | 75 |
| 6.4.2 Evaluating season-specific flow effects on survival and abundance..... | 76 |
| 6.5 Pink | 77 |
| 7 Conclusions..... | 79 |
| 8 Recommendations..... | 81 |
| 8.1 Adult Salmon escapement..... | 81 |
| 8.2 Adult Steelhead escapement..... | 81 |
| 8.3 Juvenile salmonid standing stock..... | 81 |
| 8.4 Smolt and fry outmigration | 82 |
| 9 References..... | 83 |
| 10 Figures, Tables and Appendices | 91 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 1.1 Scheduled monthly flow releases from Coquitlam Dam under Treatment 1 and 2 of the Coquitlam River Water Use Plan (BC Hydro 2003a)..... | 91 |
| Table 2.1 Water column visibility (m) at permanent measurement points at index sites A-E and surveyor ‘guesstimates’ of observer efficiency for Chum salmon (see Section 2.1.2) during surveys of the Coquitlam River for the 2016 brood year..... | 99 |
| Table 2.2 Averages and absolute ranges for observer efficiency estimates (proportion of live salmon present that are visually detected) derived from mark-recapture experiments, and subjective ‘guesstimates’ of observer efficiency made by the survey crew for the same surveys during which the mark-recapture experiments occurred (see Section 2.1.2)..... | 100 |
| Table 2.3 Estimated average proportion of Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook salmon spawning populations present at each index site (A-E) and at non-index (NI) sites during 2002-2016..... | 101 |
| Table 2.4 Annual escapement estimates for Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook salmon for the years 2002-2016. | 102 |
| Table 2.5 Adult spawning distribution by habitat type during Treatment 1 and 2, and the 2008 transition year. Treatment 2 flows were initiated October 22, 2008. Proportions shown are calculated based on counts of actively spawning fish only, during surveys when all five index sites were completed. M/S = mainstem, NOC = natural off-channel, OCR = off-channel restoration site, and OC = off-channel sites combined. | 102 |
| Table 3.1 Mean, minimum and Maximum discharge (m ³ /s) in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during Steelhead redd surveys during 2005 – 2018 (Water Survey of Canada station 08MH002). | 123 |
| Table 3.2 Survey dates with raw counts of Steelhead redds, estimated new redds, and live adult counts for all surveys during 2005-2018. Estimated new redds includes the sum of the raw count and the estimated number of redds that were constructed and then obscured by substrate movement prior to a scheduled survey, based on a redd survey life model. | 124 |
| Table 3.3 Summary statistics for Steelhead escapement to Coquitlam River during 2005-2018 based on redd counts. Minimum and maximum range in escapement reflects uncertainty about the number of redds constructed by each female, and about sex ratio (see Section 3.1.4)..... | 127 |
| Table 4.1 Summary of habitat data for night snorkeling and day electrofishing sites in Coquitlam River in 2018..... | 133 |
| Table 4.2 Summary of mark-recapture results and snorkeling detection probability estimates for 16 sites in Coquitlam River collected 2007-2013..... | 134 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 4.3 Estimates of juvenile fish density, standing stock, and 95% confidence intervals by species and age class in Coquitlam River during 2006-2018. Estimates were derived from night snorkeling counts with the exception of 2011 Steelhead (0+). | 135 |
| Table 4.4 Summary of day electrofishing results at four one-shoreline sites in the Coquitlam River in 2018. Mean fish density estimates are also shown for 2006-2018. The electrofishing survey was conducted at the same four sites during 2007-2018, whereas in 2006 electrofishing was conducted at 10 shoreline sites located within the annual snorkeling index sites (Decker et al. 2007). | 137 |
| Table 4.5 Average monthly discharge (m ³ /s) in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during Steelhead spawning period in 2006 – 2018 (Water Survey of Canada station 08MH002). | 138 |
| Table 4.6 Comparison of backpack electroshocking and night snorkeling fish density estimates (fish/km) for juvenile Coho and Steelhead in the Coquitlam River including: r ² and the mean, minimum and maximum ratio of estimates based on electroshocking to snorkeling 2006-2018. | 138 |
| Table 5.1 Description of the stratification of fish marking by location and period for Coho and Steelhead smolts in the Coquitlam River in 2018. The start date for each temporal marking period at each RST trap site is also shown. Removal dates are also given. | 153 |
| Table 5.2 Summary of estimated smolt numbers and densities by species in 2018 for four off-channel sites, for reaches 2-4 of the Coquitlam River mainstem, and for the total Coquitlam River mainstem including and excluding the off-channel sites. | 154 |
| Table 5.3 Differences in capture efficiency (proportion of marked smolts that were recaptured) for Coho and Steelhead from off-channel sites and the Coquitlam River mainstem at three rotary screw traps (RSTs) sites in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. Stratified marking periods were pooled prior to testing (see Equation 5.1). Equal capture efficiency for mark groups was tested using Fisher's exact test. P < 0.05 indicates a significant difference in capture efficiency. | 155 |
| Table 5.4 Mean monthly flows during Treatment 1 (2000-2008), Treatment 2 (2009-2017) and 2018 in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during the smolt and fry trapping period. (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141). | 155 |
| Table 5.5 Percent of all juvenile Steelhead captures that were less than 120mm fork length at RST 2-4 in the Coquitlam River. 120mm fork length has been the minimum length to be considers smolts since 2012. | 155 |
| Table 5.6 Estimated of the number of Coho and Steelhead smolts outmigrating from reaches 2-4 of the Coquitlam River 1996-2018. Individual estimates for four constructed off-channel habitats and mainstem reaches 2-4, both individually and combined, which extends 7.5 km downstream from the Coquitlam Dam. | 156 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 5.7 Captures of Chinook and Coho fry, Steelhead parr and Sockeye/Kokanee during 2018 at RST 2-4. | 157 |
| Table 6.1a Summary of all population estimates for all life stages and species in Coquitlam River, 2000-2018. Values shown for the different life stages for a given year do not correspond in most cases (i.e., columns do not line up), as values are shown for the year in which they occurred rather than the brood year. Abundances for the different life stage are also not strictly comparable because study areas differ somewhat for the different components of the monitoring program. | 180 |
| Table 6.1b Summary of survival estimates across all life stages and species for 2000-2016 brood escapements for Coho, Chum and Pink Salmon and 2005-2018 brood escapement for Steelhead in the Coquitlam River. Egg-to-smolt survival estimates are based on adult escapement upstream of the lowermost smolt trapping site (RST2). Unlike Table 6.1a, year corresponds to the adult return year (brood year), as opposed to the year when the juvenile life stage was present. For survival rates among the juvenile life stages of Steelhead (e.g., fry to age 1+ parr), year corresponds to the younger life stage. Biased-high survival rate estimates (i.e., >100%) are shown in red (see Section 6.2). | 181 |
| Table 6.2 Comparison of mean smolt yield during Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 in the Coquitlam River including the p-values for the two-tailed t tests and percent change in mean abundance between from Treatment 1 to 2. Only annual estimates for cohorts that reared exclusively under either Treatment 1 or Treatment 2 conditions were included. For Coho, this includes 2000-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. For Steelhead, this includes 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 for Treatment 2..... | 182 |
| Table 6.3 Estimates of the probability Coquitlam River mainstem Coho and Steelhead smolt production increased by at least 10%, 20% and 50% from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2. | 182 |
| Table 6.4 Mean annual Coho smolt abundance estimates 1998-2018 for the Coquitlam River mainstem and watersheds considered for use as controls for regional changes in freshwater productivity. | 183 |
| Table 6.5 The Pearson correlation coefficient and the sample size (N) for the comparison between Coho smolt abundance in the Coquitlam River mainstem and the streams considered as controls for regional changes in freshwater productivity in the Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) analysis. The comparison included the years 2000-2009, which represents cohorts reared entirely or mostly under Treatment 1. We used correlation coefficient value of 0.5 as the minimum value to include a stream in the BACI analysis..... | 183 |
| Table 6.6 Estimates of the probability Coquitlam River mainstem Coho smolt production increased 10%, 20% or 50% from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 base on comparison with the estimated mean change for either three control streams (Keogh River, Sakinaw Creek and Alouette River) or two control streams(Keogh River and Sakinaw Creek). | 184 |

Table 6.7 Estimates of the probability for at least a 0%, 10%, 20% or 50% increase in the Coquitlam River mainstem Coho smolt production from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 when compared to the change when using only the Alouette River as a control for regional changes in freshwater productivity. 184

Table 6.8 Model performance of Coho smolt abundance 2002-2018 using linear regression including one or more explanatory variables and evaluated using, the amount of variation explained by the model (R^2), Akaike information criterion (AIC_c), and the distance from the lowest AIC value (ΔAIC). AIC_c include the penalty for the number of parameters at each sample size. Shading marks the model(s) with strong support based on $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ 184

Table 6.9 Annual Steelhead smolt abundance during the Treatment 1 and 2 flow period in the Coquitlam River mainstem and the Alouette River. The Alouette River was used as control for regional changes in freshwater productivity. 185

Table 6.10 The Pearson correlation coefficient and the sample size (N) for the comparison between Steelhead smolt abundance in the Coquitlam River mainstem and the streams considered as controls for regional changes in freshwater productivity in the Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) analysis. The comparison included the years 2000-2009, which represents cohorts reared entirely or mostly under pre-Treatment 2 conditions. We used correlation coefficient value of 0.5 as the minimum value to include a stream in the BACI analysis. 186

Table 6.11 Estimates of the probability Coquitlam River mainstem Steelhead smolt production increased by at least 0%, 10%, 20% and 50% in relation to estimated change in smolt abundance in the Alouette River. 186

Table 6.12 Model performance of Steelhead egg-to-fry survival 2006-2018 using linear regression including one or more explanatory variables and evaluated using, the amount of variation explained by the model (R^2), Akaike information criterion (AIC_c), and the distance from the lowest AIC value (ΔAIC). AIC_c include the penalty for the number of parameters at each sample size. Shading marks the model(s) with strong support based on $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$ 187

Table 6.13 Preliminary ANCOVA results for Chum 2003-2016 brood years to examine the significance of flow treatment on fry yield during Treatment 1 (2000-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2017) in the Coquitlam River including the significance of F values. The null hypothesis in all cases is that the predictive variable is not a significant predictor of fry yield. Escapement x Treatment represents the interaction effect that would produce different slopes of the stock-recruitment relationships for Treatment 1 and 2. 187

Table 6.14 Model performance of Chum egg-to-fry survival for 2002-2016 brood years by each of the explanatory variables evaluated using, linear (r^2), Akaike information criterion (AIC), and the distance from the lowest AIC value (ΔAIC). AIC include the penalty for the number of parameters at each sample size. Shading marks the model(s) with the most support based on ΔAIC_c 188

List of Figures

| | |
|---|-----|
| Figure 1.1 Life stage periodicity chart for some anadromous salmonids in the Coquitlam River. | 92 |
| Figure 1.2 Map of lower Coquitlam River study area with stream reaches defined by the Coquitlam-Buntzen Water Use Plan Consultative Committee. | 93 |
| Figure 2.1 Map showing adult spawning index sites A-C in the lower portion of Coquitlam River study area (reaches 1, 2a)..... | 94 |
| Figure 2.2 Map showing adult spawning index sites D and E, in the upper portion of Coquitlam River study area (reaches 2b, 3 and 4). | 95 |
| Figure 2.3 Spawning run timing base on survey counts for Chinook, Chum, Coho and Pink Salmon in the Coquitlam River during 2016 (red line) and 2002-2015 (teal). | 96 |
| Figure 2.4 Modeled relationship between mean survey life and day of arrival in the study area for Chum, Pink, Coho, and Chinook salmon in the Coquitlam River based on empirical data from other streams. | 97 |
| Figure 2.5 Relationship between the surveyor's 'guesstimate' of observer efficiency and observer efficiency estimated from mark recapture experiments for Chum, Pink and all species combined conducted opportunistically since 2006 in the Coquitlam River. | 98 |
| Figure 2.6 Estimated numbers of Coho spawning in mainstem and side-channel habitat in the Coquitlam River 2003-2016. | 98 |
| Figure 3.1 Steelhead redd locations in reaches 2b-4 in Coquitlam River in 2006, which was the highest escapement year during 2005-2018. Coquitlam Dam is the upstream boundary of the survey area. See Figure 3.2 for redd symbol legend. | 119 |
| Figure 3.2 Steelhead redd locations in reaches 2a-2b in Coquitlam River in 2006. The downstream boundary of reach 2a is also the survey area boundary. | 120 |
| Figure 3.3 Discharge (m ³ /s) in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during Steelhead spawning period in 2005 – 2018 (Water Survey of Canada station 08MH002). | 121 |
| Figure 3.4 Cumulative proportion of the total Steelhead redd count observed over time during 2018 (teal) and 2005 -2017 (red). | 122 |
| Figure 3.5 Relationship between Adult Steelhead escapement estimates based on redd counts and peak counts of live adults during surveys 2005-2018 in the Coquitlam River. | 122 |
| Figure 4.1 Map of Coquitlam River showing juvenile standing stock study area, reach breaks and original 12 sampling sites..... | 130 |
| Figure 4.2 Maximum likelihood estimates of mean snorkeling detection probability for juvenile Coho and Steelhead by forklength class (Steelhead only) at 16 sites in the Coquitlam River | |

during 2007-2013. Errors bars represent ± 1 standard deviation of the mean. Values above bars are total numbers of marked fish for each category..... 131

Figure 4.3 Linear distribution of juvenile salmonids in the Coquitlam River during Treatment 1(2006-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2018) Bars represent mean abundance estimates and 95% confidence intervals for years under flow Treatment 1 and 2. Estimates are based on calibrated snorkeling counts at 10-12 sampling sites 2006-2013 and 24 sites 2014-2016..... 132

Figure 5.1 Map of the Coquitlam River showing constructed off-channel habitat sites, mainstem reach breaks and the locations of mainstem rotary screw traps (RSTs). 144

Figure 5.2 Mean daily flows in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during the smolt trapping period in 2018. (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH002). Approximate start times of Chum fry and Steelhead and Coho smolt migration based on captures at all trapping locations. 145

Figure 5.3 Daily catches of Coho smolts at downstream weirs in three off-channel sites (pooled data) and at three rotary screw trapping locations in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. See Table 5.1 for start and end dates for individual trapping sites..... 146

Figure 5.4 Daily catches of Steelhead smolts at downstream weirs in three off-channel sites (pooled data) and at three rotary screw trapping locations in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. See Table 5.1 for start and end dates for individual trapping sites. 147

Figure 5.5a Areal density of Coho smolts (smolts/100m²) in four constructed off-channel habitats along the Coquitlam River and for all four combined (Total) previous to Treatment 1 (1996-2000), Treatment 1 (2002-2008), when smolt cohorts reared under both treatments (2009) and Treatment 2 (2010-2018). Years with zero fish represent those when the off-channel habitats were not in operation or were not monitored..... 148

Figure 5.5b Areal density of Steelhead smolts (smolts/100m²) in four constructed off-channel habitats along the Coquitlam River and for all four combined (Total) previous to Treatment 1 (1996-2000), Treatment 1 (2002-2008), when smolt cohorts reared under both treatments (2009) and Treatment 2 (2010-2018). Years with zero fish represent those when the off-channel habitats were not in operation or were not monitored. 149

Figure 5.6 Length-frequency histogram for Steelhead captured in the Coquitlam River in 2018 (data pooled for all trap sites). 150

Figure 5.7 Daily catches of Chinook fry, Chum fry, Coho fry, Pink fry and Steelhead parr at the RST2 trapping site in Reach 2 in the Coquitlam River in 2018. See Table 5.1 for start and end dates of downstream trapping. 151

Figure 5.8 Estimated capture efficiencies (across six marking periods) at three rotary screw traps (RSTs) in the Coquitlam River for mark groups of Coho and Steelhead smolts from off-channel (dotted lines) and mainstem (solid lines) habitats in 2018. Dates on the horizontal axis indicate the start point for each marking period. 152

Figure 6.1 Monthly discharge statistics for the Coquitlam River during Flow Treatment 1 (2000-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2018) measured at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141) including monthly mean and minimum discharge as well as the coefficient of variation in monthly mean discharge. 162

Figure 6.2 Annual Coho smolts density for four constructed off-channel habitats connected to the Coquitlam River. The colours of the bars reflect the flow treatment period of the cohort outmigrating during that year: red – Treatment 1, blue – both treatment conditions(2009), green – Treatment 2. 163

Figure 6.3 Annual Coho smolts yield and 95% confidence intervals for the 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem as well from individual reaches 2-4. The colours of the bars reflect the flow treatment period that cohorts were reared under: Treatment 1(red), both treatment conditions 2009 (blue), Treatment 2 (green). 164

Figure 6.4 Annual Steelhead smolts yield and 95% confidence intervals for 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem as well from individual reaches 2-4. The colours of the bars reflect the flow treatment period that cohorts were reared under: Treatment 1(red), both treatment conditions (blue), Treatment 2 (green). 165

Figure 6.5 Mean Coho and Steelhead smolt yield and 95% confidence intervals for Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 for the 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem and in reaches 2-4. Only annual estimates for cohorts that reared exclusively under either Treatment 1 or Treatment 2 conditions were included. For Coho, this includes 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. For Steelhead, this includes 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 for Treatment 2. 166

Figure 6.6 Average effect size and 95% confidence intervals of the change in smolt yield from Treatment 1 to 2 for Coho and Steelhead for the 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem (red) and for individual reaches 2-4 (blue). For Coho, this includes smolt estimates from 2000-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. For Steelhead, this includes smolt estimates from 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 for Treatment 2. 167

Figure 6.7 Average effect size and 95% confidence intervals for Coho smolt yield between Treatment 1 and 2 based on the BACI analysis with the Alouette River (Alouette), using the Alouette, Keogh and Sakinaw as controls (Controls) and using only the Keogh and Sakinaw as controls (Controls_no_Alouette). The BACI effect represents the change in Coquitlam mainstem smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 that is attributed to flow treatment. Effect size greater than 0 represents an increased productivity as a result of Treatment 2 whereas negative values indicates a decrease. This includes cohorts that reared entirely during Treatment 1 (2000-2008) or Treatment 2 (2010-2018). Note that the Alouette and Sakinaw data did not included all years. 167

Figure 6.8 Mean percent change in Coho smolt yield and 95% confidence intervals from Treatment 1 (2000-2008) to Treatment 2 (2010-2018) in mainstem habitats in the Coquitlam River and control streams (Alouette and Keogh rivers, and Sakinaw Creek) with including all

streams (Controls) or excluding the Alouette River (Controls_no_Allouette). This includes smolts estimates for cohorts that reared entirely under only Treatment 1 or 2, including 2000-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. Note that Alouette and Sakinaw data sets did not included all years. 168

Figure 6.9 Annual numbers of Coho and Steelhead smolts in reach 4 of Coquitlam River during 1997-2018. 169

Figure 6.10 Preliminary linear and Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship between Coho escapement and fall fry yield (2006-2018 fry years) and Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship between Coho escapement (upstream of RST2) and total smolt yield in the Coquitlam River during Treatment 1 (2004-2008 smolt years), and Treatment 2 (2009-2018 smolt years). 169

Figure 6.11 The count of Coho fry salvage in relation to the discharge (m^3/s) at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141) for rampdowns that began on June 1st and were completed over 1, 3 or 14 days during 2010-2018. Colours indicates the number of days for rampdown to occur. Even though all rampdowns decreased dam discharge to $1.1 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$, discharge measured downstream at the Port Coquitlam WSC gauge station varied depending on the inflows entering the Coquitlam River downstream of the dam. 170

Figure 6.12 Coho egg-to-fall fry survival in relation to A) adult escapement; B) count of Coho fry stranded following the early June rampdown; C) post June rampdown discharge, and D) number of days the June rampdown occurred over; E) mean discharge during spawning; F) incubation; G) emergence, and H) summer rearing for the escapement years 2010-2016. Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141). 171

Figure 6.13 Coho egg-to-smolt survival in relation to A) adult escapement; B) count of Coho fry stranded following the early June rampdown; C) post June rampdown discharge, and D) number of days the June rampdown occurred over; E) mean discharge during spawning; F) incubation; G) emergence, and H) summer rearing for the escapement years 2010-2016. Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141). 172

Figure 6.14 Coho smolt abundance in relation to A) mean discharge during spawning, B) incubation, C) emergence, D) summer rearing, E) winter rearing and F) days with discharge above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ separately for Treatment 1 and 2 for the smolt years 2002-2018. Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141). 173

Figure 6.15 Average percent change in Steelhead smolt yield and 95% confidence intervals from Treatment 1 (2000-2008) to Treatment 2 (2010-2018) in mainstem habitats in the Coquitlam River and Alouette River. This includes 2002-2008 during Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 during Treatment 2. Note that for the Alouette River, estimates were only available during Treatment 2 up to 2014. 174

Figure 6.16 Steelhead egg-to-fall fry survival in relation to A) mean discharge during spawning, B) incubation, C) difference discharge between spawning and incubation, D) adult escapement

for the fry years 2006-2018 and E) % of August with discharge $> 5.4\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ (20% of MAD).
Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141)..... 175

Figure 6.17 Preliminary escapement-to-fry stock-recruitment relationships of Chum and Pink Salmon during flow Treatment 1 (2002-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2017) from 7.5 km of the Coquitlam River. The best-fit lines intercept the x and y axis at 0 as is typical of stock-recruitment relationships. Note that because Pink Salmon spawn every other year in the lower Fraser River watershed, the number of datapoints is half as for Chum. R^2 values reflect the fit of stock-recruitment. 176

Figure 6.18 Adult-to- $\ln(\text{fry}/\text{adult})$ stock-recruitment relationships of Chum during flow Treatment 1 (red 2002-2008) and Treatment 2 (teal 2009-2016) from 7.5 km of the Coquitlam River used for the ANCOVA tests as to whether flow treatment had a significant effect of productivity. 176

Figure 6.19a Annual escapement and smolt yield in the Coquitlam River study area versus that in the Alouette River during 2002-2014. Values for the Coquitlam are given on the right-hand axis, and values for the Alouette are given on the left-hand axis..... 177

Figure 6.19b Annual escapement, fry and smolt yield in the Coquitlam River versus that in the Cheakamus River during 2002-2017. Values for the Coquitlam are given on the right-hand axis, and values for the Cheakamus are given on the left-hand axis..... 178

Figure 6.20 Chum egg-to-fry survival in relation to A) count of days that average flows were greater $70\text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ during A) winter, B) spawning, C) incubation and the mean discharge during E) winter, F) spawning, and G) incubation separately for Treatment 1 and 2 for the fry years 2003-2018 (excluding 2004). Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141). 179

List of Appendices

| | |
|---|-----|
| Appendix 2.1 The number of hatchery Chinook smolts released in the Coquitlam River 2004-2018 (Scott Ducharme, DFO)..... | 103 |
| Appendix 2.2 Results of the 2006-2016 mark-recapture study to estimate observer efficiency and survey life for Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook salmon in the Coquitlam River. Only shaded values provide estimates of mean observer efficiency, as they represent cases where the proportion of tagged fish detected was based on a complete survey of the study area within two days of tagging..... | 104 |
| Appendix 2.3 Unadjusted live counts of Pink salmon during 2003-2015..... | 106 |
| Appendix 2.4 Unadjusted live counts of Chum salmon during 2002-2016..... | 108 |
| Appendix 2.5 Unadjusted live counts of Coho salmon during 2002-2016..... | 112 |
| Appendix 2.6 Unadjusted live counts of Chinook salmon during 2007-2016..... | 116 |
| Appendix 2.7 An example of diagnostic graphs used to evaluate model fit to the observed data (Coho 2008). Top-left graph shows fit of predicted run timing curve (line) to unadjusted counts of spawners over time. Top-right shows relationship of predicted to observed counts with 95% credible intervals for predicted counts. Lower-left graph shows variation in predicted observer efficiency across surveys. Lower-right graph shows the regression relationship between surveyor guesstimates of observer efficiency (horizontal axis) and mark-recapture derived estimates of observer efficiency (vertical axis), with 95% credible intervals shown for the estimated regression slope. | 118 |
| Appendix 3.1 An example of how raw survey counts were expanded to account for redds that were completed and subsequently became undetectable between surveys (see section 3.2.1). . | 129 |
| Appendix 4.1 Definition of variables of the hierarchical Bayesian model used to estimate juvenile Coho and Steelhead abundance in the Coquitlam River system. Index sites refer to the 12 sites in the Coquitlam River where fish abundance is sampled each year by night snorkeling. Fish size strata (subscript g) apply only to Steelhead (see Section 4.1.5). | 139 |
| Appendix 4.2 Equations of the hierarchical Bayesian model used to estimate juvenile Steelhead abundance in the Coquitlam River. See Appendix 4.1 for definitions of model parameters, constants, and subscripts. Lower case Arabic letters denote data or indices (if subscripts). Capital Arabic letters denoted derived variables, which are computed as a function of estimated parameters. Greek letters denote estimated parameters. Parameters with Greek letter subscripts are hyper-parameters..... | 140 |
| Appendix 4.3 Summary of data deficiencies and alternate approaches taken with respect to estimation of parameters and hyper-distributions in the Hierarchical Bayesian Model (HBM) used to estimate juvenile Steelhead and Coho standing stocks in the Coquitlam River during 2006-2012. | 142 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Appendix 4.4 Length-frequency histogram (proportion of total catch less <80mm forklength) for Steelhead fry captured by electrofishing and counted during snorkeling in the Coquitlam River averaged for 2008-2010,2012-2017 and 2018 (data pooled for all sites). 2011 is also shown for electroshocking as an example of a year with considerable shift towards small sized fry..... | 143 |
| Appendix 5.1 Summary of estimated numbers of Coho, Steelhead and Chum smolts passing the three RST trapping locations (not reach estimates) in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. Mark group indicates the location where fish were initially captured and marked. Also shown are numbers of marked (M), recaptured (R) smolts, unmarked captures (U), estimated capture efficiencies (R/M), 95% confidence intervals, and relative percent errors..... | 157 |
| Appendix 5.2 Mark-recapture data used for the BTSPAS estimates for Coho, Steelhead, Chum and Pink at three rotary screw trap sites (RST2, RST3, RST4) in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. Tables include numbers of fish marked in strata i , numbers recaptured within the release strata ($i+0$) and in subsequent strata ($i+n$), and proportion of each strata in which sampling occurred..... | 158 |
| Appendix 5.3 Age-fork length relationships for Steelhead parr and smolts in the Coquitlam River during 2005-2018 derived from scale-aging analysis..... | 161 |
| Appendix 5.4 Mark-recapture data used to test whether the capture efficiency differed between smolts marked using VIE or fin clips for Coho and Steelhead captures at RST 2 during strata 8 and 9. Proportions recaptured are considered unaffected by marking method with p values greater than 0.05..... | 161 |
| Appendix 6.1 References for annual smolt estimates considered for use as controls steams in the BACI analysis for treatment effects for Coho and Steelhead. | 189 |

1. Introduction

The development of the Coquitlam-Buntzen facilities Water Use Plan (LB1 WUP) was initiated in September 1999 and completed in March 2003. As part of the LB1 WUP, the LB1 WUP Consultative Committee (CC) made recommendations on dam releases in the Coquitlam River based on trade-offs between power, drinking water and fisheries values (BC Hydro 2003). The LB1 WUP was also designed as a long-term adaptive management experiment to compare different flow regimes for the Coquitlam River below the Coquitlam Lake Reservoir. The effect of different flows and other types of enhancements on the productivity of anadromous salmonid populations are often difficult to detect because of the high degree of natural variation in both freshwater and ocean survival (Keeley and Walters 1994; Bradford 1995). Relying on a study by Higgins *et al.* (2002) that looked at the statistical power to detect changes in fish production in the Coquitlam River under different flow regimes, the CC selected two flow regimes for comparison: the regime of two fish valves fully open (2FV, Treatment 1), and the Share the Pain#6 flow regime (STP#6, Treatment 2) prescribed by the CC (Table 1.1) that attempts to improve spawning and rearing habitat conditions in the Coquitlam River relative to Treatment 1.

1.1 Background

The lower Coquitlam River flows 17 km from the base of the Coquitlam Dam to its confluence with the Fraser River. The stream was first dammed in 1903. The present dam dates back to 1914. As part of LB1 WUP (BC Hydro 2003a), flows in the lower Coquitlam River are regulated through the Coquitlam Dam's low-level outlets, which release flows from the Coquitlam Reservoir. The Coquitlam Reservoir supplies drinking water for the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) and water for power via a diversion tunnel to Buntzen Lake.

Typical of lotic habitats downstream of dams, spawning and rearing habitat in the lower Coquitlam River (hereafter referred to as the Coquitlam River) has been impacted over the last hundred years by reduced gravel recruitment from upstream sources and increased sedimentation due to reduced peak flows (NHC, 2001). Several gravel pit operations adjacent to Coquitlam River have also affected habitats by contributing large amounts of fine sediment directly to the system. Other impacts are typical of urban streams, and include extensive channelization and dyke construction, road and bridge crossings, alteration of natural drainage patterns and tributary inflows, and the increased discharge of pollutants. Peak, post-dam flows in Coquitlam River can exceed 200 cubic metres per second (m^3/s , Water Survey of Canada, Station 08MH141). Prior to June 1997, flow releases from the dam ranged from 0.06 to 0.5 m^3/s (not including occasional spill events). From 1997 to October 2008, minimum flow releases were increased to a range of 0.8 to 1.4 m^3/s , depending on the time of year. This represents the Treatment 1 regime of two fish valves fully open (2FV), and is the baseline for this adaptive management study.

The Treatment 2 flow regime, Share the Pain#6 (STP#6) was initiated on October 22, 2008, with seasonal target flow releases from Coquitlam Dam ranging from 1.1 to 6.1 m^3/s (Table 1.1). After the knife gate was put into operation, BC Hydro personnel conducted measurements of actual flows during the spring and summer of 2009, and these were compared

to modeled flows to verify the theoretical discharge rating curve through the various flow ranges. These measurements indicated that actual flows were consistently higher than predicted (2 m³/s higher on average than seasonal target releases, Table 1.1). During August and early September, 2009, BC Hydro's Engineering Group worked on updating the flow rating curve for the new gate facility. Once sufficient data was collected, the discharge rating curve was adjusted and brought into service on September 15, 2009. As a consequence, with respect to the flow experiment, 2009 was not strictly representative of Treatment 2. However, given the planned 9 year duration of Treatment 2, this was not considered to have a significant impact on the comparison of the two treatment periods.

The Coquitlam River historically supported all six Pacific salmon, as well as Cutthroat Trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki*), which are still present in low numbers, and Dolly Varden (*Salvelinus malma*) char, which appear to have been extirpated. Dam construction also resulted in the extirpation of an anadromous stock of summer Sockeye Salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*), but this species still exists in the Coquitlam Reservoir in its resident form (Kokanee). Other species inhabiting the Coquitlam River below the dam include Longnose Dace (*Rhinichthys cataractae*), Prickly Sculpin (*Cottus asper*), Redside Shiner (*Richardsonius balteatus*) Pacific Lamprey (*Entosphenus tridentatus*), and Three-Spine Stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*).

1.2 Study design

Prior to the implementation of the monitoring program, the CC evaluated several potential flow regimes using flow-habitat models for target species and life histories, with habitat treated as a surrogate for fish productivity (BC Hydro 2003b). Habitat modelling suggested that increased base flows in late summer under Treatment 2 could increase the quantity and quality of juvenile rearing habitat for species with longer freshwater residency periods including Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and Steelhead Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), and that increased fall and spring base flows could improve spawning success for all anadromous salmonids.

The LB1 WUP was developed as an adaptive management study with the objective of ensuring sufficient information is in place to determine the fisheries benefits of the two test flows and to enable a better understanding of the trade-offs between fisheries, domestic water and power generation. From this a primary management question was developed:

What are the fisheries benefits of flow Treatment 1 (2FV) and Treatment 2 (STP6)?

To answer this, a Before – After (BA) experimental design was developed that included juvenile outmigration as well as adult escapement monitoring with six years of monitoring Treatment 1 flow conditions followed by nine years of monitoring under Treatment 2 conditions. While Steelhead Trout and Chinook Salmon were identified as the key species of interest, lower Chinook abundance necessitated the use of Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), Chum Salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) and Pink Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) as surrogates for monitoring.

An expected effect size (increased freshwater productivity) from the Treatment 2 flow regime was not defined in the TOR, however the Fisheries Technical Committee (FTC) predictions ranged from a 0% - 100% increase in productivity from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2. Higgins *et al.* (2002) summarized that this uncertainty in the fish benefits from alternative flow regimes, including STP#6, were mainly due to: 1) the fundamental uncertainty about the functional relationships between flow-habitat-fish for the Coquitlam River, 2) the poor contrast in available hydrometric data needed to calibrate hydraulic models which necessitated extrapolation of habitat predictions to flow levels above that observed but under consideration by the WUP Consultative Committee, and 3) the unknown influence of spawning substrate quality issues from gravel mining operations and the practical extent to which that impact could be mitigated by implementing deliberate flushing flows from the Coquitlam Dam.

The Terms of Reference (BC Hydro 2006) anticipated this experimental design to have a probability of 0.51-0.59 (power) to detect a 50% increase in abundance (effect size) and characterizes this level of statistical power as ‘moderate’. However, moderate power typically reflects a probability of 0.8, whereas a probability of 0.5 is more typically considered ‘low’. Power levels of 0.51-0.59 reflect the odds of detecting a given change only slightly better than flipping a coin. This review will use 0.8 as the benchmark for acceptable power, which is consistent with the approach used in the power analysis of the Coquitlam WUP Monitoring Program (Higgins *et al.* 2002).

COQMON-07 focuses on four species: Steelhead Trout, and Coho, Chum, and Pink Salmon. Other fish species in the Coquitlam River are either of too low abundance to effectively monitor, although this appears to be changing for Chinook (see Section 1.2.1), or are not considered to be as high in economic, recreational, or cultural importance. Adult escapement and smolt/fry outmigration are monitored for all four target species. In addition, beginning in 2006, fall juvenile standing stock was assessed for Coho and Steelhead. Coho and Steelhead smolt production is the primary performance measure for the flow experiment. Coho and Steelhead have lengthy freshwater residencies relative to other target species, and smolt production for these species was judged to be the best indicator of the effects of flow management and dam operation on freshwater production. There is much research (e.g., Bradford and Taylor 1996; Ward and Slaney 1993) suggesting that Coho and Steelhead smolt production is limited primarily by habitat carrying capacity at all but very low levels of adult escapement. If adult returns are insufficient to seed available juvenile habitat, then recruitment effects may confound the relationship between smolt production and habitat. Monitoring escapement in addition to smolt production for Coho and Steelhead allows freshwater production to be evaluated under a scenario of recruitment-limited smolt production by substituting smolts per spawner or egg-to-smolt survival for absolute smolt production, but only if enough years of data are available to reliably define the stock-recruitment relationships. At the least, monitoring escapement provides a means of assessing whether escapement was adequate to seed available habitat based on comparisons with other systems for which reliable stock-recruitment data are available. Monitoring the fall standing stock of juvenile Coho and Steelhead, together with smolt production, is potentially useful in addressing questions about freshwater production bottlenecks in the Coquitlam River. Such as, is overwintering habitat more important than summer rearing habitat in limiting juvenile carrying capacity?

1. Introduction

For Chum and Pink, which migrate to saltwater shortly after emergence, habitat conditions in the Coquitlam River determine the quantity and quality of available spawning substrate and incubation conditions for eggs. For these species, fry production and egg-to-fry survival are the most important indicators of freshwater production. Figure 1.1 provides a periodicity chart for different life stages of numerous anadromous salmonids in the Coquitlam River.

COQMON-07 focuses on the effects of dam releases on the fish productivity of mainstem habitats in reaches 2a, 2b, 3 and 4, of the Coquitlam River (Figure 1.2). This section contains the majority of productive spawning and rearing habitat in the Coquitlam River (Riley *et al.* 1997; Macnair 2005). The actual boundaries of the study area vary somewhat among components of the monitoring program due to sampling constraints or species distribution (see Sections 1.2.1-1.2.4). Within reaches 2-4, spawning and rearing for Steelhead, Chum and Pink is largely confined to the mainstem (Macnair 2005; Decker *et al.* 2006). Or Creek is a high gradient, nutrient-poor stream, with limited accessible length, and is the only significant tributary (Figure 1.2). There are several other tributaries, but they are small, with accessible lengths limited to a few hundred metres. In addition to natural habitat, six large off-channel habitats, totalling about 27,000 m² have been constructed in reaches 2-4 (Decker and Foy 2000). The contribution of tributaries and off-channel sites to the production of Steelhead, Chum and Pink is low, but off-channel sites are used extensively by Coho for spawning and rearing. Constructed off-channel habitat contributes 33%-77% of Coho smolt production in reaches 2-4 (Decker *et al.* 2009).

The principal objective of this report is to summarize the fish productivity in the Coquitlam River during Treatment 1 and the first eight years of Treatment 2 by providing population estimates at each monitored life stage for the four target species. This report also provides a thorough description of the study design and sampling methodologies for each component of COQMON-07, an evaluation of potential limitations or problems with the existing study design, and recommended changes to be applied for future years. The remainder of the report is organized in six parts (Sections 2-7). The first four parts (Sections 2-6) address methods and results for the four monitoring components of the COQMON-07: adult salmon escapement surveys, Steelhead redd surveys, juvenile standing stock surveys, and smolt trapping respectively. A discussion of the technical aspects and issues with each monitoring component is included at the end of each of these sections. The rationale for each of the four components and a summary of work completed to date are provided in Sections 1.2.1-1.2.4 below. In the final section of the report (Section 7), fish production across life stages is synthesized for each species for the study period to date. Where possible, we compare productivity data for the Coquitlam River to that in other regulated and non-regulated control streams within the region in order to assess the relative productivity of the Coquitlam River in its current state, and to examine whether recent trends in the Coquitlam River have followed those observed in other streams.

1. Introduction

1.2.1 Adult salmon escapement

Formal surveys of adult salmon escapement were included as a component of COQMON-07 beginning with Chum and Coho salmon in 2002, and Pink salmon during odd years in 2003. Chinook were also enumerated during surveys in all years, but in monitoring years prior to 2007 Chinook escapements were negligible, and were not estimated as part of the monitoring program. During 2007-2014, Chinook escapement increased substantially, largely as a result of hatchery enhancements (M. Coulter-Boisvert, DFO, pers. comm.), and we were able to generate escapement estimates for these years. It should be noted that because adult salmon monitoring was started after smolt monitoring, estimates of egg-to-smolt survival for Treatment 1 were limited to six, three and five years' of data for Chum, Pink and Coho, respectively (smolt abundance was not estimated for Chinook).

During 2002-2016, weekly total counts of live adults by shore-based observers and area-under-the-curve (AUC) methodology was used to estimate adult salmon abundance. The AUC approach requires accurate information about observer efficiency and average spawner survey life (Perrin and Irvine 1990). In 2006 we began conducting mark-recapture studies to generate observer efficiency and survey life estimates for Chum and Pink salmon in the Coquitlam River. Salmon escapement estimates appearing in this report differ from previous years' estimates due to the incorporation of new observer efficiency and survey life data based on mark-recapture experiments and the integration of subjective estimates of observer efficiency made by survey crews for individual years, surveys and stream sections. Escapement estimates will continue to evolve in future years as more mark-recapture data is collected and the escapement model is refined. This report includes escapement results for returns up to and including the 2016 spawning period. Due to a transition in the monitoring program, no salmon escapement monitoring was completed during the fall of 2017.

1.2.2 Adult Steelhead escapement

The assessment of adult winter Steelhead escapement, in the form of redd surveys, was included as a component of COQMON-07 starting in 2005. Because Steelhead escapement monitoring was not included as part of the flow experiment until 2005, estimates of egg-to-smolt survival were available only for 2007 onward, which limits egg-to-smolt survival estimates to just one year for Treatment 1, which includes the yield of age-2 and age-3 smolts in 2007 and 2008, respectively, from the 2005 escapement year. Prior to 2005, snorkeling crews conducted periodic counts of adult Steelhead in some years (2001-2004) but no attempt was made to relate these counts to actual escapement. With the exception of 1999, when redd counts were conducted in reaches 3 and 4 (see Decker and Lewis 1999), pre-2005 surveys did not include counts of Steelhead redds. Because of the protracted migration and spawning period for winter Steelhead in the Coquitlam River (4-5 months), the high variation in stream residence time among individual fish (Korman *et al.* 2002), and the highly variable survey conditions within the spawning period, reliable information about residence time and observer efficiency would be needed in order to estimate escapement using counts of adult Steelhead and the area-under-the-curve methodology (Korman *et al.* 2002). This was considered unfeasible within the scope and budget of the monitoring program given the considerable cost of collecting such information, and

the difficulty tagging sufficient numbers of individuals each year from this relatively small population.

Alternatively, in streams that are well suited to the method, redd count surveys can provide a more reliable index of inter-annual trends in escapement than the AUC-type adult surveys. Redd counts can be excellent predictors (R^2 values > 0.9) of Steelhead escapement as estimated by direct trap counts (Freeman and Foley 1985), resistivity counters (Korman and Schick 2015), mark-recapture studies (Jacobs *et al.* 2002) or the AUC methodology (Gallagher and Gallagher 2005). A pilot study conducted in reaches 3 and 4 in 1999 (Decker and Lewis 1999) indicated that conditions during the spring Steelhead spawning period in the Coquitlam River were, for the most part, well suited to redd count surveys. Estimating uncertainty (95% confidence bounds) for Steelhead escapement estimates derived from redd counts would require the concurrent use of a second more accurate method (e.g., resistivity counter or mark-recapture program). This is beyond the scope of the current study. Thus, estimates of Steelhead escapement and egg deposition for the Coquitlam River are reported without estimates of precision. Our reliance on literature values for sex ratio and fecundity values could reduce the accuracy of escapement estimates, however, they likely remain reliable as an index of relative change across years.

1.2.3 Juvenile Coho and Steelhead standing stock

In 2006 the CC requested that a juvenile standing stock survey component be added to the Coquitlam River Monitoring Program to provide an index of annual abundance for age-0+ Coho and age-0+ to age-2+ Steelhead. These data, together with adult escapement and smolt abundance estimates, are useful for examining freshwater production bottlenecks at specific juvenile life stages that may relate to specific habitat or flow issues. In September 2006, we conducted a feasibility study to determine the best method for sampling juvenile populations. We compared closed-site three-pass removal electrofishing to open-site night snorkeling counts at 20 m long, one-shoreline sites. We also compared results from shoreline sites and sites that spanned the entire stream channel, using snorkeling counts only. The results suggested that sampling juvenile abundance at full channel sites using night snorkeling counts would be the most effective method for monitoring annual juvenile standing stocks in the Coquitlam River (Decker *et al.* 2007). Juvenile standing stocks were assessed during 2006 onward using this methodology; mark-recapture experiments were conducted during 2007-2013 to estimate snorkeling detection probability (the percentage of fish present that snorkelers detect), so that snorkeling counts could be expanded to population estimates. This report describes in detail the results of the 2018 juvenile standing stock survey, and summarizes preliminary population estimates for 2006-2018.

1.2.4 Smolt outmigrant trapping

Smolt trapping has occurred in the Coquitlam River in various years since 1993 (see Decker and Lewis 2000 for a summary of earlier work). However, earlier studies were intended to compare smolt production at several constructed off-channel habitat sites to that in reach 4 of the Coquitlam River mainstem, as opposed to assessing production in the mainstem as a whole. During 2000-2018, numbers of Coho and Steelhead smolt outmigrants were assessed for a 7.5 km long section of Coquitlam River mainstem that included reaches 3 and 4 and most of reach 2a. Smolt numbers were also assessed for individual mainstem reaches and for the four

off-channel sites. Chum and Pink smolt numbers were monitored for the same section of the mainstem beginning in 2003. Smolt numbers in the mainstem were assessed using mark-recapture methodology and rotary screw or incline plane traps. Full-span downstream weirs were used at the off-channel sites. This report describes in detail the results of the 2018 smolt trapping program and summarizes population estimates for all species and reaches for 2000-2018.

2 Adult Salmon Escapement

2.1 Methods

Salmon escapements are often estimated by obtaining repeat counts of the number of fish present over the spawning migration. The number of live spawners present that are detected by the survey crew (observer efficiency) and the proportion of the total run that is present must both be estimated on each survey to determine the total escapement. The total number of fish present on a survey is simply the difference between the cumulative arrivals and departures on that date. The departure schedule will be determined based on the arrival schedule and the length of time spawners remain in the survey area (survey life). The proportion of the run that is present on any survey date can therefore be estimated from data on at least two of the three run timing components: arrival timing, survey life, and departure timing.

Analytical approaches for estimating escapement from repeat count data have advanced considerably from the original AUC methodology (e.g. English *et al.* 1992). Hilborn *et al.* (1999) used a maximum likelihood approach to estimate escapement and arrival timing parameters by assuming that survey life was constant, and that on average, all fish present in the survey area were counted. Korman *et al.* (2002) estimated escapement from repeat mark-recapture experiments in conjunction with more flexible arrival timing and survey life models. Escapement estimates will be uncertain if there are no post peak counts (Hilborn *et al.* 1999, Adkison and Su 2001), or if peak and post peak surveys occur during periods of low catchability (Korman *et al.* 2002). In these situations, the possibility of a large number of fish entering at the peak or late in the run cannot be discounted in the estimation process because there is little information about arrival timing in the repeat count data.

2.1.1 Stratified index survey design

Returning spawners to the Coquitlam River were enumerated by stream walk surveys conducted on an annual basis during 2002-2016 for Chum and Coho, and during odd years for Pink. Chinook were also counted during this time period, but prior to 2007 peak live counts were only 21 to 87 fish (J. Macnair, Living Resources Environmental Consultants, data on file), suggesting annual escapements of < 100 to 300 fish. During 2008-2013 counts of Chinook were substantially higher, largely as a result of hatchery enhancement (S. Ducharme, DFO, pers. comm.; Appendix 2.1), and we have included estimates of Chinook escapement 2008 onward in this report. In this report, we have included escapement results for all four species for 2002-2016. No escapement monitoring was completed during the fall of 2017.

For adult salmon, the study area extends downstream from Coquitlam Dam to the downstream boundary of Reach 1 at the Maple Creek confluence, encompassing reaches 1-4 in their entirety (Figure 1.2). Reach 0 (Fraser River confluence to Maple Creek) was excluded as it contains little spawning habitat and because fish entering the Hoy/Scott Creek system often hold in this reach and could be confused with fish destined for upper reaches in the Coquitlam River.

Considerable overlap exists for the spawning periods of Pink (early to mid-September – late October), Chinook (mid-September – mid-November), Chum (mid-October – early-December), and Coho (mid-October – mid-January). To address this, we conducted concurrent counts for whichever species were present during a particular survey. Surveys were scheduled to occur weekly throughout the entire spawning period, with the first survey date adjusted to capture the arrival of Pink and/or Chinook, and the last survey date dependent on the end of the spawning period for Coho. However, surveys were often cancelled or postponed due to poor water clarity conditions.

Due to the length of the study area (approximately 12.8 km), and the concentration of spawning activity within specific sections, sampling efficiency was improved by stratifying the survey to focus on five key areas hereafter referred to as index sites A-E (Figures 2.1, 2.2). Irvine *et al.* (1992) demonstrated that using a stratified index design to select areas to conduct visual surveys for adult Coho provided accurate estimates of escapement at a lower cost than more intensive methods such as mark-recapture or operation of counting fences. Coquitlam River index sites were originally developed from spawning distribution maps developed as part of the LB1 WUP. The boundaries of these sites were refined during the first several years of the study under Treatment 1, and will likely be further refined over the first several years of the study under Treatment 2. The five index sites have a collective length of approximately 9 km, or 63% of the total length of the survey area, but account for a higher percentage of the total fish present during any one survey because they encompass the majority of available spawning habitat. All potential holding and spawning habitats were surveyed within each index site, including mainstem areas, natural side-channels and braids, and constructed off-channel habitat.

To account for spawners present in the study area, but not in one of the five index sites, on several occasions each year, the survey was extended to include the entire 12.8 km length of the study area. We attempted to complete three full surveys of the study area during the spawning period for each species, with some dates providing full surveys for more than one species. To address possible temporal variation in the proportion of spawners in non-index sites, surveys were scheduled in an attempt to capture early, peak, and late portions of the spawning period for each species. There were occasions each year when it was not possible to survey all five index sites due to poor water visibility. We used data from complete surveys of the study area to ‘fill-in’ counts for non-surveyed index sites and non-index sites on occasions when not all of the study area was surveyed (see Section 2.1.2).

Spawner surveys were performed by a crew of two people, equipped with chest waders and polarized glasses, who traveled in an upstream direction, with one person on either side of the river. The survey team has been very consistent over the project life (1st Crew member: Jason McNair, 2002-2016; 2nd crew member: Gord Lewis 2002-2006; Kris Kehler 2007, 2015-2016; Thibault Doix 2008-2015). This relative consistency likely reduced between-observer variance. The survey crew minimized the likelihood of making duplicate counts by regularly discussing which portions of the river channel each person was responsible for. Surveyors carried walking sticks that they used to probe under cutbanks and LWD accumulations in order to detect fish that were not in plain view. Total numbers of live and dead adults were recorded during each survey, but only data for live fish were used to estimate escapement. In most cases, stratified counts of

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

the five index sites were completed in one day, while surveys of the entire study area were completed over two days.

With the onset of Treatment 2 in October 2008, dam releases during the spawning period increased, particularly during the latter part when the majority of Coho spawning occurred. In 2009, the survey crew concluded that, shore-based observations were less effective for Coho under the new flow regime because of increased water depths and turbulence in many areas where these fish were found. During the latter part of the survey period in 2009 (December-January), the survey crew opted to modify the survey design by incorporating one crewperson equipped with a dry suit and snorkeling gear, in addition to 1-2 shore-based observers. Comparisons of counts made by snorkelers and shore-based observers suggested that snorkelers detected 4- to 6-fold higher numbers of Coho than shore-based observers under Treatment 2. The effect of this shift in protocol with regard to estimating Coho escapements is discussed in Section 2.2.2. Field crew did not report an obvious difference in the detectability of other salmon species between Treatments 1 and 2, and there was some support for this based on similar mark-recapture derived estimates of observer efficiency for Chum salmon under the two treatments (see Section 2.2.2).

2.1.2 Partial surveys, observer efficiency, and survey life

Frequent high flow events and associated high turbidity during the fall and winter spawning period contribute substantially to the uncertainty of salmon escapement estimates in the Coquitlam River (Decker *et al.* 2008). During 2002-2016 it was common for surveys to be postponed for as long as three weeks, or for some portions of the study area to be excluded from a survey, due to poor water visibility. In some cases, this resulted in poorly defined run timing curves for one or more species. The COQMON-07 Terms of Reference and previous analyses of spawner survey data for Coquitlam River (Macnair 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006) do not explicitly consider negative bias in escapement estimates caused by partial surveys. In computing escapement estimates presented in this report, we corrected for negative bias arising from partial surveys by deterministically ‘infilling’ (i.e., approximating) counts for missed index or non-index sites prior to running the escapement model. Uncertainty from this processes was not incorporated into abundance estimates. We used year-specific ratios of spawner counts in missed sites to spawner counts for the entire study area to infill missing counts for specific sites during specific surveys. First, for each year, we computed the ratio of spawners counted in each index site (and for the non-index sites as a whole) to the total spawner count for all complete surveys. These values were then averaged across complete surveys to obtain an average ratio for each site for each year. These ratios were then used to infill missing counts for each site. For example, if, for Coho salmon, the average ratio of counts at the non-index sites to counts for the entire study area in 2009 was 0.15, and the non-index sites were not surveyed on December 13, the total count for the study area for the December 13 survey would be expanded such that:

$$\text{Expanded total count} = (\text{total count}_{\text{sites A-E}}) / (1 - 0.15). \quad (2.1)$$

Information about observer efficiency and survey life is essential for the accurate estimation of salmon escapement (Irvine *et al.* 1992; Korman *et al.* 2002). During 2006-2016, we

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

conducted 22 mark-recapture experiments to obtain estimates of observer efficiency and survey life for the four salmon species in the Coquitlam River (Table 2.2; Appendix 2.2). Note that no additional mark-recapture experiments were conducted in 2016 due to the frequency of high water events. Mark-recapture experiments did not occur for Coho and Chinook until 2010 because these species are less abundant in the Coquitlam River, and it was decided at the beginning of the mark-recapture program that resources were insufficient to provide for the amount of fieldwork that would be required to capture and tag sufficient numbers of these fish. Due to the greater need for Chum and Pink escapement estimates for addressing the management question, we have discontinued the mark-recapture program for Chinook and Coho, instead shifting these resources to Chum and Pink. We attempted to minimize the length of time from when a fish arrived in the study area to when it was tagged (i.e., minimize negative bias in estimated survey life) by tagging fish near the downstream boundary of the study area, under the assumption that these would be predominately new arrivals. We also concentrated on fish holding in pools rather than those actively spawning, and avoided tagging fish exhibiting the physical characteristics of advanced sexual maturation. However, in some cases it was necessary to capture and tag salmon at locations further upstream in order to deploy an adequate number of tags and could negatively bias survey life estimates (see Section 2.2.2.2). Beach seining was used as the primary method of capturing fish, but monofilament tangle nets were sometimes used as well when turbidity was very low. Standard Petersen disc tags were used to tag fish, with different colours used to distinguish temporal mark groups.

To provide estimates of observer efficiency (i.e., proportion of marked fish seen during a survey); we attempted to conduct a complete survey of the study area within two days of a tagging event so that the number of tags lost to mortality and emigration would be minimized. To estimate survey life, for each tagging group, we attempted to complete as many additional surveys as possible, given the constraints of river conditions and work schedules. Ideally, surveys would be repeated every 3-4 days following a tagging event, but this was not always possible. Perrin and Irvine (1990) describe several methods for estimating survey life from tagging data, two of which are applicable to this study. Both methods underestimate survey life when tagged fish are present in the study area for any length of time prior to tagging. With the first method, numbers of tagged fish from an individual tagging event that are observed on subsequent surveys are plotted against time to produce a tag depletion curve, and survey life is estimated as the area-under-the-tag-depletion curve divided by the total number of tags applied. In the second method, individually numbered tags are recovered from carcasses, and survey life is computed as the average number of days between fish tagging and carcass recovery. We estimated survey life using the area-under-the-tag-depletion curve. Fish tagging efforts during 2006-2008 suggested that the second method was not feasible in the Coquitlam River because once they die, tagged fish are quickly flushed out of the study area, and only a negligible number of tagged carcasses are recovered (a carcass fence would likely be necessary to apply this method).

In addition to causing missed surveys, variable flows and turbidity in the Coquitlam River during the salmon spawning period likely resulted in substantial variability in observer efficiency between surveys within a year, and in some cases, between years as well (see Section 2.2.2). Substantial variation in water visibility (and hence observer efficiency) among index sites during

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

individual surveys was also common. This source of error is important because variation in observer efficiency among years that is unaccounted for will bias comparisons of adult abundance and egg-to-smolt survival among years and therefore, between flow treatments. To address this, during 2002-2016, the survey crew developed a relative index of survey conditions by subjectively ‘guesstimating’ observer efficiency (0%-100%) for each index site during all surveys. It is not feasible to estimate observer efficiency using mark-recapture during each survey. Instead, the guesstimate is used to estimate observer efficiency for a survey based on the predictive relationship between surveyor guesstimates and mark-recapture derived estimates of observer efficiency (see Section 2.1.3.2).

Beginning in 2007, the survey crew also began collecting quantitative water visibility data. To index water visibility for each survey, a 1.5 m wading staff that was clearly marked at 5cm intervals, was placed in the water column, and the depth at which the tip of the staff was no longer visible was recorded. Measurements were taken at permanently marked locations in each index site. However, based on mark-recapture experiments completed to date, estimates of water visibility have proven to be a less useful predictor of variation in observer efficiency compared to surveyor guesstimates (Decker *et al.* 2012).

2.1.3 Escapement model structure and parameter estimation

The escapement model consists of two main elements: i) a simple process model predicts the number of fish present on each day of the run and the departure schedule based on the total escapement and parametric relationships simulating arrival timing and survey life, and ii) an observation model simulates the number of fish counted on each survey based on the predicted numbers present and detection probabilities.

2.1.3.1 Process model

To estimate total escapement from repeat count data, the proportion of the total run present on each survey day must be determined. This can be calculated by estimating run timing parameters that describe the cumulative proportion that has arrived and departed for each model day, which forms the process model. In the description that follows, note that lower case Arabic letters denote either model array indices (subscripts) or data. Upper case Arabic letters denote state variables (variables predicted by the model), and Greek letters denote variables that are estimated (parameters).

The proportion of the total escapement entering the survey area on day ‘t’ (PA_t) of the run is predicted by a beta distribution, where α and β are parameters of the beta distribution and p_t represents the proportional day of the run. The total number of model days for Chum, Pink, Coho, and Chinook were 119 (September 3-December 30), 82 (September 1-November 21), 130 (September 20-January 27), and 99 (September 3-December 10), respectively.

$$PA_t = p_t^{\alpha-1} (1 - p_t)^{\beta-1} \quad (2.2)$$

The beta distribution is reparametrized so that β is calculated based on estimates of the day when the peak arrival rate occurs (μ) and the variance (standard deviation) in the proportion of the run arriving over time (σ), using the transformations:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \mu * \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \\ \beta &= (1 - \mu) * \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\end{aligned}\tag{2.3}$$

For Pacific salmon, survey life, which is the number of days a fish spends in the survey area, is normally longer for fish that arrive earlier in the spawning period (Perrin and Irvine 1990; Su *et al.* 2001). Survey life was modeled such that it varied with the day of entry into the spawning area using a decaying exponential relationship,

$$SL_t = \lambda_c e^{-\lambda_s t}\tag{2.4}$$

where, SL_t is the survey life for a fish entering on day t , λ_c is the maximum survey life, and λ_s is the slope of the relationship. The day that a fish arriving on day t has exceeded its survey life is simply $D_t = t + SL_t$, and the proportion of the run that has departed on day t is,

$$PD_t = \sum_t PA_t | t = D_t\tag{2.5}$$

The total number of fish present in the survey area on each day (N_t) is the product of the total escapement (E) and the proportion present on any survey day, estimated as the difference between the cumulative arrivals and departures on that day.

$$N_t = E \left[\int_1^t PA - \int_1^t PD \right]\tag{2.6}$$

2.1.3.2 Observation model

Escapement (E) and arrival timing parameters (μ , σ), and those defining the observation process are jointly estimated by assuming that the count data arise from an over-dispersed Poisson distribution which accounts for the extra variation associated with the non-random distribution of fish on any survey (i.e., clumping),

$$n_t \sim \text{Poisson}(N_t \theta_t e^{\varepsilon_t})\tag{2.7}$$

where, n_t is the total number of fish counted on day t , θ_t is an estimate of the survey-specific detection probability, and ε_t is a survey-specific deviate used to model over-dispersion in the data (McCarthy 2007; Royle and Dorazio 2008). ε_t is drawn from a normal distribution with a mean

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

of 0 and a precision $\tau.o$ (i.e., $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{dnorm}(0, \tau.o)$, where $\sigma.o = \tau.o^{-0.5}$). The term “ \sim ” denotes that the value to the left of the term is a random variable sampled from the probability distribution defined on the right. This equation is often referred to as the likelihood component of the model because it describes the likelihood of the data, given the parameter values. Note that n_t will be greater than the total fish counted across sites surveyed on day t if the entire survey area was not surveyed. In this case, an adjustment is required to account for areas that were not surveyed (see data description above).

Survey-specific detection probability is predicted based on the relationship between detection probability and estimated detection probability developed from mark-recapture data,

$$\gamma_i = \frac{e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 * v_i}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 * v_i}} \quad (2.8)$$

where γ_i is the predicted detection probability for mark-recapture experiment i , and β_0 and β_1 are the constant and slope of a linear relationship predicting γ_i as a function of the estimated detection probability from visual methods for that experiment (v_i), respectively. We assume that the number of marks detected on these experiments is a binomially-distributed random variable,

$$r_i \sim \text{dbin}(\gamma_i, m_i) \quad (2.9)$$

where r_i and m_i are the number of marks detected and the total marks released for each experiment. Given estimates of β_0 and β_1 , it is then possible to predict survey-specific detection probabilities (θ_t) from equation 2.8 given a visual estimate of detection probability on each survey (v_t).

The escapement model is implemented in a Bayesian framework and therefore requires that prior probability distributions are specified for all estimated parameters. We used uninformative priors in all cases,

$$\begin{aligned} E &\sim \text{dnorm}(2000, 1.0\text{E-}6) \text{ I}(0,) \\ \mu &\sim \text{dunif}(0, 1) \\ \sigma &\sim \text{dunif}(0, 10) \\ \tau.o &\sim \text{dgamma}(5, 5) \\ \beta_0 &\sim \text{dnorm}(0, 1.0\text{E-}6) \\ \beta_1 &\sim \text{dnorm}(0, 1.0\text{E-}6) \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where `dnorm`, `dunif`, and `dgamma` refer to normal, uniform, and gamma distributions respectively. The first and second terms in `dnorm` represent the mean and precision, respectively. The `I(0,)` term associated with the prior for escapement indicates that the normal distribution is truncated at 0 as negative escapement values are not possible. The first and second values for the uniform distributions represent the minimum and maximum values, respectively. The first and second values in the gamma distribution represent the shape and scale

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

parameters, respectively. Values of 5 were used in each case so that model fit, as assessed by Bayesian p -values (see below), was adequate.

2.1.3.3 Parameter Estimation and assessing model fit

Posterior probability distributions of model parameters were estimated using a Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) algorithm as implemented in WinBUGS (Spiegelhalter *et al.* 1999). We called WinBUGS from the R2WinBUGS (Sturtz *et al.* 2005) library from R (R Development Core Team 2009). We used the mean of the posterior to represent the expected value for the parameter, and the ratio of the standard deviation of the posterior to the mean as a measure of relative parameter uncertainty. The 95% credible intervals were determined from the lower 2.5 and upper 97.5 percentiles of the posterior distribution. Posterior distributions were based on a total of 2,000 MCMC samples. These samples were obtained by drawing every 2nd sample from a total of 5,000 simulations after excluding the first 1,000 samples to remove the effects of initial values. This strategy was sufficient to achieve convergence in all cases. Model convergence was evaluated by visually inspecting the MCMC chains for evidence of non-stationarity and poor mixing.

We used posterior predicted p -values, often called Bayesian p -values, to statistically evaluate the fit of the models (Gelman *et al.* 2004). The concept behind this statistic is that data simulated from the model will resemble the real data if and only if the model fits the data well (Brooks *et al.* 2000; Gelman *et al.* 2004). Bayesian p -values are similar to the statistic generated from classical goodness-of-fit tests, but are based on multiple measures of discrepancy determined from the posterior distribution of predictions, rather than the single best-fit prediction determined by maximum likelihood estimation in the latter case. Bayesian p -values are computed by replicating a data set based on the model predictions for each MCMC trial. Measures of discrepancy between the replicated data and model predictions (D'), and observed data and model predictions (D), are then compared. The fraction of MCMC trials where $D' > D$ is the Bayesian p -value. Low p -values indicate the model under-fits the data, that is, there is too much scatter around the curve describing the number of fish observed over the run, either because the run-timing model is not flexible enough (under-parameterized) and/or does not explain enough of the variability in the data given the assumed error model. High p -values indicate that the model over-fits the data, that is, the model explains more variation than expected, either because the run-timing model is too flexible or because the assumed error structure is too complex. Bayesian p -values of approximately 0.5 indicate an ideal fit. We used the Freeman-Tukey statistic as the measure of discrepancy as recommended by Brooks *et al.* (2000) for the analysis of mark-recapture models. This measure assigns less weight to outcomes with small expected counts (similar to Pearson's χ^2), and provides more robust assessments of model fit when outcomes are close to zero as is sometimes the case with count data.

2.2 Results and Discussion

2.2.1 Survey conditions and run timing

Unadjusted survey counts from all surveys during 2002-2016 are shown for Chum, Coho, Pink and Chinook in Appendices 2.2-2.5. The typical period of peak spawning was the last week of October for Chum, the second week of December for Coho, and the last half of October for

Chinook. This resulted in the survey period encompassing nearly the entire migration of all target species (Appendices 2.2-2.4). The reliability of estimates depends on surveys encompassing the entire migration but particularly peak conditions as was the case for the three species present in 2016 (Figure 2.3). In other years, run curve peaks for Chum, Coho and Chinook were poorly defined as a result of missed or partial surveys during high water events (see interim data reports of individual years for more details; Decker and Macnair 2009; Macnair 2004, 2005, 2006). In 2003 and 2005, the run timing curve was poorly defined for Pink Salmon because substantial numbers of Pinks were already present in the spawning area at the time of the first survey, and survey data was sparse in the latter half of the spawning period on account of high flows (Appendix 2.3). For Chum and Chinook (with the exception of 2007 for Chinook), the beginning, peak and end of the spawning period was generally well defined each year, other than in 2012 when surveys missed the peak (Appendices 2.4, 2.6). The beginning of the spawning period was well defined for Coho, but in some years of the study (2002, 2004, 2005, and 2011); significant numbers of Coho were still present during the final survey (Appendix 2.5). For modeling purposes, the maximum length of the spawning period for Chum, Pink, Coho, and Chinook was 119 (September 3-December 30), 82 (September 1-November 21), 130 (September 20-January 27), and 99 (September 3-December 10), days respectively.

2.2.2 Observer efficiency and survey life

2.2.2.1 Observer efficiency

During 2006-2016, 22 estimates of observer efficiency were obtained for all species combined. In some of the 22 cases, the field crew was unable to capture and mark adequate numbers of fish to provide reliable estimates of observer efficiency, while in other cases, salmon were tagged, but no estimates of observer efficiency were obtained because poor visibility conditions prevented a complete survey from being conducting within two days (Appendix 2.2). The opportunity exists in future monitoring years to collect additional mark-recapture data under Treatment 2. This is not possible for Treatment 1; estimates of observer efficiency under Treatment 1 (across all years) are limited to four years for Chum, one for Pink and none for Coho and Chinook (Appendix 2.2).

Observer efficiency for Chum averaged 48% across 10 mark-recapture experiments during 2006-2015 (range: 33%-69%; Table 2.2); with similar means for Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 (50% and 48%, respectively; Appendix 2.2). For Pink, seven mark-recapture experiments yielded an average observer efficiency estimate of 66% (range: 49%-85%; Table 2.2, Appendix 2.2). For Coho, three mark-recapture experiments under Treatment 2 provided average observer efficiency estimates of 70%. The value for Coho is relatively high compared to observer efficiency estimates reported for Coho in other streams (Irvine *et al.* 1992). The addition of an underwater observer to the survey crew, beginning in 2009 (see Section 2.1.1), was presumably a contributing factor. In the absence of an underwater observer, observer efficiency during Treatment 1 for Coho in the Coquiltam River was likely lower than the Treatment 2 average of 70%; and was likely lower than the mean value of 47% for Chum, which spawn earlier in the season, and are less associated with cover and deep pools. For Chinook, two mark-recapture

experiments under Treatment 2 provided average observer efficiency estimates of 60%. Due to the small sample size, we combined Coho and Chinook observer efficiency estimates for generating Coho population estimates. Also, given the absence or near absence of data, the observer efficiency during Treatment 1 can only be approximated for Coho, Chinook and Pink (see Section 2.2.2.3).

Mark-recapture experiments completed to date have been limited to the early or middle (peak) portions of the spawning period for each species, with no tagging events occurring after November 1 for any species except Coho. For Chum and Coho, which spawn later in the fall when poor survey conditions occur more frequently, observer efficiency estimates likely represent the upper range, rather than average values for the Coquitlam River. This is because the same poor river conditions that lead to low observer efficiency also make it difficult to capture fish for the mark-recapture experiments. Without this information, we were unable to confirm observer efficiency through the full range of survey conditions. We consider this source of uncertainty one of the primary reasons the HBM is unable to estimate the precision of escapement estimates. It is important that future efforts be made to conduct mark-recapture experiments as late in the season as possible, and during periods of higher flows and lower visibility, so that the actual range in observer efficiencies can be better represented in the escapement model.

The issue of poor spatial distributions of marked populations of Chum, Pink and Chinook has improved since 2007 when marking occurred in only one location which provided little information about observer efficiency in the remainder of the survey area. During 2006-2016, 13 of 22 mark-recapture experiments included marking at two different sections of the Coquitlam River. This provided more spatially representative estimates of observer efficiency, but rendered the data less reliable for assessing survey life because fish captured in the upper river were less likely to be new arrivals to the study area (see below). See Decker *et al.* 2010 for the rationale for distributing marking sites throughout the entire survey area.

In some cases, marked populations of Chum, Pink and Chinook were skewed to males, and were likely unrepresentative of the sex ratios of the population as a whole (Appendix 2.2). Bias in the sex ratio of marked populations can result in a bias in observer efficiency and survey life, if these parameters differ for male and female spawners (Perrin and Irvine 1990).

2.2.2.2 Survey life

Mark-recapture data for 2006-2016 provided limited information about survey life (number of days fish are in the survey area) for each species. Obtaining estimates of survey life requires conducting multiple consecutive surveys (minimum of three) of the entire study area every few days following a tagging event, and this was frequently impossible due to unsuitable survey conditions. A total of 18 estimates of survey life were obtained, seven for Chum, three for Coho, six for Pink and two for Chinook (Table 2.2). Based on the area-under-the-tag-depletion curve method (Perrin and Irvine 1990), mean survey life values ranged from 7.5 days for Chum, to 16.4 days for Coho. Based on estimates from the Coquitlam River, the maximum survey life (maximum number of days between when a fish was tagged and subsequently detected) ranged from 16 days for Chum to 28 days for Coho (Table 2.2; Appendix 2.2). Survey life estimates for

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

salmon in the Coquitlam River were less than mean values reported for the same species in other streams, but were still within the reported range (see next section), suggesting that survey life is relatively short in the Coquitlam River. However, survey life estimates for the Coquitlam River are biased low to some degree because salmon were present in the study area for an unknown period of time prior to being captured (as opposed to being captured while migrating past a weir). This bias was further exacerbated by the fact that during many of the mark-recapture experiments, fish were captured and tagged in the spawning areas at the upstream index sites in order to better distribute tags for the purpose of estimating observer efficiency (see above). Additionally, in order to compute estimates of survey life it was necessary to assume that observer efficiency remained constant across a series of surveys following a tagging event. Yet, in several of the mark-recapture experiments, the number of tagged fish detected actually increased from one survey to the next, indicating that observer efficiency had increased over time, rather than remaining constant. While it is apparent this assumption isn't satisfied when observer efficiency increases substantially, survey life bias would also occur with a drop in observer efficiency, but would go undetected due to the inability to distinguish between the effects of observer efficiency and survey life under these conditions.

Similar to observer efficiency, survey life experiments were skewed towards the early- to mid-spawning period. For Pacific salmon, survey life tends to be greater for early-run fish compared with those spawning later in the season (Perrin and Irvine, 1990). Without more survey life experiments later in the spawning season, we weren't able to confirm the magnitude of difference between early and late run fish.

With a biased estimate of survey life, escapement estimates can still provide a reliable index of adult abundance as long as the actual survey life was relatively consistent across years. An inaccurate estimate of survey life will bias escapement estimates to a similar degree, yet the relative change between years could still be accurate.

2.2.2.3 Modeling observer efficiency and survey life

For Chum, subjective guesstimates of observer efficiency made by the survey crew for surveys where mark-recapture estimates of observer efficiency were available ranged from 55%-90%, and averaged 74% (Table 2.2). When compared to mark-recapture estimates of observer efficiency, the surveyor guesstimates were biased high, but were moderately useful predictors of observer efficiency for Chum (linear regression, $n=10$; $R^2=0.38$; Figure 2.5). For Pinks, surveyor guesstimates ranged from 55% to 95% for five surveys for which mark-recapture data were available (Table 2.2). Surveyor guesstimates explained less than one quarter of the variation in mark-recapture derived estimates of observer efficiency among surveys for Pinks ($n=7$; $R^2=0.23$; Figure 2.5). However, this relationship is highly uncertain, being based on only seven observations. For Chum and Pink, we used the regression relationships in the escapement model to estimate observer efficiency for individual surveys based on the guesstimates of observer efficiency, and to model error in estimated observer efficiency (see equations 2.8 and 2.9). For Coho, surveyor guesstimates over the three surveys ranged from 67% to 73%, which is a poor reflection of common survey conditions (range for all years, 0.45-1.0). Unfortunately, the guesstimates were negatively related to the mark-recapture data (linear regression, $n=3$; $R^2=0.49$; Figure 2.5), which increases uncertainty in the population estimation model. For Chinook, there

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

were only two mark-recapture estimates of observer efficiency available (Table 2.2), which provides no useful information about the relationship between surveyor guesstimates and actual observer efficiency, or even what the average observer efficiency in the Coquiltam River might be. In light of the poor relationship for Coho and limited information for Chinook, in order to model observer efficiency, we regressed surveyor guesstimates against mark-recapture derived estimates of observer efficiency using pooled data for all four species ($n=22$; $R^2=0.17$; Figure 2.5). Mean observer efficiency (based on mark-recapture) across all species was 60% compared to observed means of 76% and 60% for Coho and Chinook, respectively (Table 2.2). Furthermore, existing information is too sparse and variable to evaluate whether an assumption for pooling (similar relationship between mark-recapture observer efficiency and guesstimates for pooled species) is satisfied.

Given the limited and uncertain survey life data for all four salmon species in the Coquiltam River, we relied on reported values from other studies to inform the parameterization of survey life in the escapement model. Perrin and Irvine (1990) summarized studies of survey life for Pacific salmon. They reported that for Chum, average survey life was 12 days (range=4-21 days, $n=54$), and varied little between early and late portions of the spawning period (14 and 11 days, respectively). Average survey life for Pink was 17 days overall, and 24 and 15 days respectively, for the early and late portions of the spawning period (range=5-41 days, $n=36$). Average survey life for Coho was 11 days (range=3-15 days, $n=22$), with no information available about differences between early and late portions of the spawning period. Average survey life for Chinook was 12 days (range=3-20 days, $n=38$). We adjusted the λ_c and λ_s parameter values for each species to provide early, mean, and late period survey life values for Chum (12, 10, and 9 days, respectively); Pink (18, 13, and 9 days); Coho (18, 12, and 8 days); and Chinook (15, 12, and 11 days) (Figure 2.3). To model error in survey life, the coefficient of variation for survey life (λ_v) was set at 0.65 for each species, based on an intensive study of survey life of Pink salmon by Su *et al.* 2001.

2.2.3 Escapement model

We evaluated the performance of the escapement model using data for each species and for different years within each species that provided contrasts in the amount of information available about run timing and the shape of the run timing curve. We found that, in general, it was not possible to obtain realistic estimates of uncertainty in escapement (i.e., 95% credible intervals), while at the same time obtaining plausible mean estimates of escapement and run timing (i.e., predicted run timing curves that provide a good fit to the observed counts; see Appendices 2.7a-d). If the priors that control the extent of overdispersion were set to allow for sufficient overdispersion in the data, as indicated by Bayesian P values of ~ 0.5 (see Section 2.1.3.3), then the predicted escapement tended to be unrealistically low. Conversely, if the priors were adjusted to reduce the extent of overdispersion, the model provided a good fit to the count data, but the Bayesian p -values were too low (indicating that the error distribution was wrong and the 95% credible interval for the escapement estimate was unrealistically narrow). The underlying problem with the model is that there is no independent data to estimate the extent of overdispersion. A similar model to ours worked very well to estimate the uncertainty in estimates of adult bull trout abundance in the Cheakamus River (Ladell *et al.* 2010), but in that

study radiotelemetry data provided much better information about observer efficiency and run timing than was available for salmon in the Coquiltam River. As a result, the model was able to estimate the extent of overdispersion in escapement estimates in the absence of the confounding effect of uncertainty in the other parameters. Given the model-fitting problems described for the Coquiltam data and the very limited amount of observer efficiency and survey life information collected to date, we concluded that the best approach at this point would be to use a version of the model that assumed no overdispersion in the data, and to compute point estimates of escapement only, without attempting to estimate uncertainty in these estimates.

The “no overdispersion” version of the escapement model provided good fits of predicted numbers of fish present (i.e., predicted run timing survey) to observed weekly counts of Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook, allowing for plausible estimates of escapement and run timing. An example of model fit for 2012 data for Coho is provided in Appendix 2.8. However, because true error in the count data exceeded that assumed by a regular Poisson distribution (as opposed to an overdispersed Poisson distribution; see Section 2.1.3.2), 95% credible intervals for escapement estimates were unrealistically low, and were therefore not reported.

2.2.4 Escapement estimates

Estimates of escapement for all species in all years are summarized in Table 2.4. Among years, estimated escapements ranged from 7,000-78,000 for Chum; 900-13,000 for Coho; 3,000-34,000 for Pink; and 123-8,000 for Chinook. It is important to note that escapement is an insensitive measure for comparing fisheries benefits of Treatment 1 and 2 flows owing to the large role of ocean survival (particularly its variability) on the number of adult returns. Trends reported here are products of freshwater and marine conditions. For all species, escapement has been much higher during Treatment 2 than during Treatment 1 (Table 2.4). Mean escapement has increased four-fold for Pink and Chinook, three-fold for Coho and two-fold for Chum compared with Treatment 1. Escapement estimates for Coho and Chinook during Treatment 1 years should be treated as approximations and are likely not comparable with Treatment 2 (See section 2.2.2.1). Estimates reflected here for Coho and Chinook during Treatment 2 years may also be biased low if the limited species specific mark-recapture information collected to date more accurately reflects observer efficiency than the pooled mark-recapture data for all species, which we used to increase the sample size, and thus precision of escapement estimates (see Section 2.2.2.3).

Escapement estimates for 2002-2016 may differ to some degree in future reports from those reported in Table 2.4, as observer efficiency and survey life is re-estimated with additional trials. Escapement estimates are highly sensitive to estimates of observer efficiency and survey life (e.g., a decrease in estimated observer efficiency from 0.8 to 0.4 results in a doubling of the escapement estimate). Ideally, enough mark-recapture experiments should be conducted during future years to provide reliable estimates of survey life and observer efficiency specific to each of the four salmon species in the Coquiltam River, at least for Treatment 2. We were unable to say how many mark-recapture experiments will be necessary to achieve this since survey life data is too sparse to assess the uncertainty of escapement estimates.

2. Adult Salmon Escapement

2.2.5 Alternative approach to monitoring changes in escapement

The HBM approach to estimating adult escapement still has several shortcomings, which make evaluating their accuracy and precisions challenging; see sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3. While efforts continue to collect more information on survey life and observer efficiency, we also explored alternative approaches to estimate escapement both to corroborate the HBM results and as a possible replacement. Escapement estimates for Pink, Coho and Chinook during 2002-2016 are highly correlated with the mean counts of annual surveys (Pink, $n=7$ $R^2=0.92$; Coho, $n=15$, $R^2=0.96$ and $n=9$, $R^2=0.94$; respectively). Under some conditions, particularly consistent survey methods across years and evenly distributed surveys, mean counts could be an equally or more effective metric for detecting changes in escapement than mark-recapture and AUC (Holt and Cox 2008). Also, since the mean counts depend entirely on raw count data, they aren't affected by the uncertainty of the survey life and observer efficiency estimates. However, mean counts are susceptible to under-estimation when surveys do not include the peak run (Holt and Cox 2008). This was the case in 2012 for Chum when high flows prevented surveys during the peak run. The mean count would have indicated a below average escapement in 2012 whereas the HBM, which accounts for this with run timing priors, estimated the second largest escapement to date.

We previously proposed to use the peak count as an index for escapement rather than continue with the HBM approach for Coho and Chinook as a cost saving measure and since there is a very low chance of collecting sufficient observer efficiency or survey life information during the study period (Schick *et al* 2014). For Coho, we still support this approach since we are more interested knowing that the minimum escapement has been reached to fully seed the Coquitlam River with juveniles and there has been little gained from post-peak surveys. For Chinook, there is no additional cost for surveys using either the HBM or mean count method so there is no advantage of switching methods at this point. Under this approach, Coho surveys would end after the peak count (early December), and for both species, survey life and observer efficiency experiments would no longer continue. The reduced survey effort could then be redirected to Chum and Pink to increase the number of survey life and observer efficiency experiments to a level necessary to estimate the precision of escapement.

2.2.6 Adult habitat distribution and access to off-channel sites

Chum salmon in particular show a preference for mainstem spawning habitat in the Coquitlam River (Table 2.5). This preference has been noted in many studies for Chum salmon in medium-sized rivers (Salo, 1991). In addition, adult Chum show a preference for spawning in the lower reaches of the Coquitlam River, (an average of 63% of adult Chum spawning in index sites A-C during 2002-2016; Table 2.3). Chum salmon have a brief freshwater residency and often spawn exclusively in the lower reaches of river systems (Salo 1991). Spawning gravels are also more abundant in the lower reaches of the Coquitlam River.

Pink Salmon also have a brief freshwater residency period, but unlike Chum, Pink spawners make greater use of spawning areas in upper reaches of the Coquitlam River. Depending on the year, the proportion of Pink spawning in the two uppermost sites (D and E) ranged from 44%-72% (Table 2.3). During Treatment 1 and 2, Pinks made greater use of mainstem sites for spawning than off-channel habitats (Treatment 1: 55%-71%, Treatment: 259-76%; Table 2.5).

For Chum, there was a reduction of approximately 10% in the proportion of Chum spawning in mainstem habitats following the initiation of the Treatment 2 flow regime in 2008 (Treatment : 82%-90%, Treatment 2: 69%-81%,; Table 2.5). It is unclear whether this was an artifact of reduced observer efficiency in the mainstem when flows had increased after October 22; whether it was due to the increased availability of off-channel habitats; or a combination of both. Higher mainstem flows under Treatment 2 gave salmon easier access to off-channel habitats, and increased the amount of available spawning habitat in some constructed off-channel sites, mainstem areas and natural side-channels.

Coho salmon showed a preference for the upper reaches of the Coquitlam River (sites D and E accounted for 59%-99% of Coho spawning during 2002-2016; Table 2.3). The trend of low natural or enhanced off-channel habitat use during Treatment 2 continued in 2016 with usage of 6% (Table 2.5). The combined natural and enhanced off-channel habitat use dropped from 20%-73% during 2002-2007 to 6%-16% during 2009-2016 (Table 2.5). This shift commenced prior to Treatment 2 and coincided with the modifications to the Coquitlam Dam and dewatering of the Grant's Tomb off-channel site in 2005, which accounted for the majority of off-channel use. The change in relative use between mainstem and off-channel habitat may reflect the higher carrying capacity of the mainstem as well as changes in off-channel habitat capacity. In terms of the number of Coho, the maximum off-channel use has remained relevantly consistent across treatment periods but varied considerably across years (Figure 2.6). With the several fold higher escapement levels from 2010 onward, use increased disproportionately in the mainstem habitat.

Evidence of movement barriers for spawning adults was not apparent at any time during Treatment 1. Fish arriving during the late summer low flow period (which in 2006 lasted until the middle of October), were observed at all index sites. However, observations by the survey crew suggest that low flows did impede access to natural and enhanced off-channel sites in some instances. For example, during a low flow period in 2005, Pink did not enter off-channel sites until October 2, and in 2006, Chum avoided off-channel sites until October 13. Delayed migration into off-channel areas was not apparent during 2008 when flows were increased under Treatment 2. Under Treatment 2, all index sites continue to be accessible to spawning adults throughout the entire escapement period.

2.2.7 Temperature

Optimal spawning temperatures range from 4.4-9.4°C for Coho, to 4.4-10°C for Chum, to 7.2-12.8°C for Pink (McCullough 1999). Optimal temperatures during the incubation stage range from between 4.4 and 14°C for all species (McCullough 1999). Stream temperatures in the Coquitlam River have typically fallen within the optimal range for Chum and Coho during their mid-October – late November and November – January spawning periods, respectively. The same was true for Pink spawning in late September-late October, with the exception of higher than optimal temperatures in reach 4 during most of September 2009 (18-20 °C).

2.3 Implication for hypothesis testing

Adult escapement monitoring is providing sufficient information to evaluate the fisheries benefits of Treatment 1 and 2 for Coho but not for Pink or Chum. For Coho, the evaluation of flow treatments depends primarily on smolt production estimates, given that the stock-recruitment relationship to date suggest smolt production is limited by rearing habitat. In this situation escapement estimates only serve the purpose of confirming that escapement was sufficient to reach the juvenile carrying capacity (see Figure 6.1). Beyond this minimum value (~800 fish), smolt production appears insensitive to escapement. Furthermore, we do not recommend using Coho escapement for any between-treatment comparisons since survey methods differed between Treatment 1 and 2, and all Coho mark-recapture experiments occurred during Treatment 2. Given the switch to replacing one of the foot-surveyors with a snorkeler during Treatment 2, it is likely observer efficiency was higher than during Treatment 1. Using the same observer efficiency for Treatment 1 and 2 could lead to underestimates for Treatment 1.

For Chum and Pink, our inability to calculate the precision for escapement estimates reduces the reliability of inferences drawn from this data. Unlike for Coho, the Chum and Pink stock-recruitment relationships to date point to escapement-limited fry production (Figure 6.6), which depends on both juvenile and adult estimates to detect treatment effects. This type of regression based analysis assumes that the adult abundance (x axis) is without error, or at least of much less error than juvenile abundance (Zar 1999). The Coquitlam River data is far from satisfying this assumption. While stock-recruitment analyses rarely satisfy this assumption, knowing the precision of our estimates would allow us to exclude very imprecise estimates, which may increase our ability to detect differences between treatments. Using mean counts as an index of escapement can corroborate HBM results when surveys include peak counts but are still subject to error with sparse data. As mentioned in Section 2.2.3, we think that our inability to calculate credible, precise estimates stems from the lack of Coquitlam-specific survey life information and/or insufficient mark-recapture data.

3 Adult Steelhead Escapement

3.1 Methods

During 2005-2018, we conducted periodic redd surveys to assess the cumulative number of redds constructed during the spawning period. To convert redd counts to indices of adult winter Steelhead abundance and potential egg deposition, we used empirical data from studies of winter Steelhead in other coastal streams to approximate the number of redds constructed by each female, the average sex ratio, and mean fecundity per female (see section 3.1.4). The variation in redd counts among observers was not investigated, but was minimized by having the same crew conduct all surveys. Steelhead redds become increasingly difficult to detect over time as their characteristic features become obscured by algal growth and substrate movement during high flows. In a small number of years it was necessary to use redd survey life data (i.e., the period of time following initial construction during which a redd can be positively identified) to adjust redd counts upwards to account for redds that we failed to detect due to survey intervals exceeding redd survey life (see Section 3.1.3).

3.1.1 Description of study area and survey methods

For Steelhead redds, the study area extended approximately 10.8 km from the Coquitlam Dam downstream to the Patricia Footbridge, and included reaches 2a, 2b, 3, and 4 (Figures 3.1, 3.2). Reach 1 was omitted as minimal Steelhead spawning occurs there. During 2005-2006, it was found that the majority of Steelhead spawning occurred during a seven-week period (mid-March – early May). The analysis of previous years' data indicated that all redds remained visible with a seven day survey interval and that only a very small proportion went undetected with a 14 day survey interval (see Section 3.1.3). As such, our target survey frequency was every two weeks for the entire spawning period. We attempted to conduct surveys just prior to high flow events in order to minimize the number of new redds becoming obscured by substrate movement before they could be detected. Owing to the length of the study area, each survey was completed over a two-day period.

Redd surveys were conducted by two trained technicians who were familiar with Steelhead spawning locations in the Coquitlam River and had considerable experience identifying Steelhead redds. During each survey, one crewmember wore a dry suit and snorkeling gear and searched for redds in deep water, while the other wore chest waders and searched for redds in shallower water along the banks. The shoreline observer marked the location of each redd detected by either crew member with numbered flags and a global positioning system (GPS) to prevent double counting on future surveys, and to provide estimates of redd survey life (see section 3.1.3). Additional data collected for each redd included width and length, specific location within the stream channel, and average substrate size. The crew also recorded the number of live adults observed on each survey, along with their location, and, if possible, their approximate fork length, sex, and the absence of an adipose fin (indicating hatchery origin). The observation data of live adults collected during redd counts was not used to estimate escapement.

3.1.2 Redd Identification

Redds were identified as approximately dish-shaped excavations in the bed material, often of brighter appearance than surrounding substrates, accompanied by a deposit beginning in the excavated pit and spilling out of it in a downstream direction. Disturbances in the bed material caused by fish were discriminated from natural scour by:

- i) the presence of tail stroke marks;
- ii) an over-steepened (as opposed to smooth) pit wall often accompanied by perched substrate that could be easily dislodged down into the pit, and often demarcated by sand deposited in the velocity break caused by the front wall;
- iii) excavation marks alongside the front portion of the deposit demarcating the pit associated with earlier egg laying events, and
- iv) a highly characteristic overall shape that included a ‘backstop’ of gravel deposited onto the unexcavated substrates, a deposit made up of gravels continuous with this backstop and continuing upstream into the pit, and a pit typically broader than the deposit and of a circular shape resulting from the sweeping of gravels from all sides to cover the eggs (in a portion of redds gravels are swept into the pit from only one side, often a shallow gravel bar on the shore side).

A second important determination was whether fish had actually spawned at a location where an excavation had been started. ‘Test digs’ were considered to be pits, often small, accompanied by substrate mounded up on the unexcavated bed material downstream but with no accompanying gravel mound downstream of the pit, which would denote at least one egg deposition event. In the case of a test dig determination, the mound of gravels would typically be short and narrow around the downstream side of a relatively small pit. Potential test digs were tagged and re-examined on subsequent surveys to determine if they had been further developed into actual redds.

Redds constructed by resident cutthroat or rainbow trout, or lamprey were distinguished from Steelhead redds by their considerably smaller size, lack of a large deposit downstream of the pit, and a conical, or bowl shape, rather than a rectangular shape.

In areas of limited gravel or high redd abundance, or where spawning site selection is highly specific, superimposition of redds can occur (Baxter and McPhail 1996). Owing to the relatively high survey frequency (see below), undercounting of Steelhead redds as a result of redd superimposition is not likely to be a substantial source of negative bias in estimates of Steelhead spawner abundance in the Coquiltam River. Redds are usually detected and their locations recorded before new redds are superimposed. In cases where we do encounter superimposed redds, we count redds based on a subjective evaluation, with the most recent complete redd(s) counted and the disturbed remains of prior redds being estimated in relation to it. A greatly extended deposit length (subjectively evaluated to be at least twice the length of a ‘typical’ deposit length) constitutes grounds to consider whether a second female had made use of the pit created by a first to construct a separate redd.

3.1.3 Redd survey life

In most cases, Steelhead redds can be readily detected upon initial construction, but over time, they become undetectable as they are obscured by scour or deposition, regrowth of periphyton, or superimposition of new redds. Thus, survey frequency is an important consideration in designing redd surveys, particularly for streams like the Coquiltam River, where moderately high flow events can occur during the Steelhead spawning period. If the length of time between surveys exceeds average redd survey life, then undercounting will occur. Freymond and Foley (1985) reported winter Steelhead redds remaining easily identifiable for a period of 14 to 30 days in coastal Washington State streams. Based on five years' of data from several coastal Oregon State streams, Jacobs *et al.* (2002) concluded that, on average, 95% of winter Steelhead redds remain visible one week after completion, while 86% remain visible after two weeks.

Across all years, our target of bi-weekly surveys, had we met them, would likely have resulted in negligible undercounting of redds due to survey intervals exceeding average redd survey life. In 2017, with intervals of 14 days or less, we estimated the number of redds simply as the sum of new redds (x_i) counted during n surveys (Equation 3.1). Only if the case where the interval exceeds 14 days did we use the redd life model to estimate the number of missed redds. See Decker *et al.* 2010 for a description of methods used to estimate redd survey life and how this is used to estimate the number of redds not visible when survey intervals exceed 2 weeks. Numbered flags were used to identify new redds (or groups of redds) during each survey. The visibility of previously flagged redds was evaluated during each survey to further refine the redd survey life model.

$$N = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i) \quad (3.1)$$

3.1.4 Female escapement and egg deposition

The objective of the Steelhead redd survey component is to enable smolt production to be related to spawning effort. Redd numbers are a direct measure of spawning effort and egg deposition. So for our purposes, we considered that estimating the total number of redds is as useful as estimating the total adult escapement. However, the number of recruits per spawner is commonly expressed as the number of smolts per female. Following this convention, we converted our estimates of total redd abundance to total female abundance by relying on empirical estimates of the average number of redds per female for winter Steelhead in Pacific coastal streams. Gallagher and Gallagher (2005) reported redds/female values for winter Steelhead in several streams, but their estimates were based on mark-recapture and AUC estimates that were themselves highly imprecise. Freeman and Foley (1985) reported the average number of redds per adult in Snow Creek, Washington State, but not the average number per female. The most robust estimate we were able to obtain was from a study of winter Steelhead in Oregon State coastal streams by Jacobs *et al.* (2002) that compared total redd counts to accurate estimates of female escapement for four streams over three years using total counts at full-span upstream fences, or at upstream fences coupled with intensive mark-recapture methodology. The number of redds per female derived by Jacobs *et al.* (2002) ranged from 0.75

to 1.63 and averaged 1.2, with relatively little variability among years for individual streams. We used this value (1.2 redds/female) to convert total redd numbers to female escapement.

The total number of adult female Steelhead in the surveyed portion of Coquitlam River (N) was approximated as:

$$N = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i) \div 1.2 \quad (3.2)$$

Where x_i is the cumulative number of new redds summed across n surveys and 1.2 is a constant representing the number of redds per individual female spawner. In the absence of fecundity data for Coquitlam River Steelhead, we substituted average fecundity for winter Steelhead (3,700 eggs/female) in the Keogh River on northern Vancouver Island (Ward and Slaney 1993). We assumed 50% of adult Steelhead in the Coquitlam River were female, which is commonly reported for Pacific coastal winter Steelhead (Jacobs *et al.* 2002). To reflect the uncertainty in the Steelhead escapement estimates arising from uncertainty about the average number of redds per female and sex ratio, the possible minimum and maximum range in escapement in any given year was approximated by arbitrarily varying redds/female by 1.0-2.0, and the proportion of females in the population using sex ratios from five other winter Steelhead streams (0.42-0.63; Jacobs *et al.* 2000, 2002).

3.2 Results and Discussion

During 2005-2018, the dates of the first and last redd survey ranged from February 15 to March 24, and from June 5 to June 13, respectively (Table 3.1). During all years except 2007, periods when discharge exceeded the 20 m³/s limit for ideal surveys were relatively infrequent, based on flows at Port Coquitlam (WSC 08MH002, Figure 3.3). In contrast, during 2007, mean daily flows remained above 20 m³/s for 17 days during March. Surveys during Treatment 1 were completed at lower flows (2-10 m³/s, Table 3.1) than during Treatment 2 (2-26 m³/s). This reflects the higher minimum flows during Treatment 2 as a result of increased releases from the LLO during the March-May spawning period. In 2018, surveys were completed at considerably higher flows than all other years (except 2007), in large part due to increased LLO releases as part of the Kwikwetlem Sockeye Restoration Program (KSRP). LLO releases increased to 8.0 m³/s from the Treatment 2 target flows of 3.5 m³/s in April and 2.9 m³/s in May. Flows during six of the eight surveys were above 10 m³/s and two were above 18 m³/s. While we were confident that all redds would be detected during surveys at flows below 10 m³/s, we were concerned that at higher flows (>18m³/s), redds in deeper sections of the channel may not have always been detected. The higher flows also reduced the regularity of number of days between surveys (McNair 2018).

Poor stream visibility conditions, which occurred at low as well as high flows, limited the frequency of surveys in all years (see Section 3.2.1). The goal of conducting bi-weekly surveys during the major portion of the spawning period was met for 7 of the 8 surveys in 2018; across the entire survey period, the length of time between surveys ranged from 8 - 19 days, and

3. Adult Steelhead Escapement

averaged 12 days (Table 3.2). In previous years, the length of time between surveys has ranged from 6 to 37 days (Table 3.2).

In 2018, the first survey was conducted on March 11. Similar to past years, live adult Steelhead were observed (28 fish, Table 3.2), along with a small amount of spawning activity, with 8 redds counted. Across all years, no or minimal spawning (<5% of annual total) was observed by surveys prior to March 12 and, excluding 2018, 9% - 18% of new redds were constructed by the end of March (Table 3.2). In 2018, there was increased spawning during March (37% of redds formed prior to March 31). The results for 2005 to 2018 suggest that Steelhead typically begin spawning in the Coquitlam River in early March but, with the exception of 2018 that most spawning occurs (80-90%) during a six-week period spanning early April to mid-May (Table 3.2, Figure 3.4).

Spawning Steelhead preferred mainstem habitat as compared to natural side channel and constructed off-channel habitat by a large margin during all survey years (83%-99%). In 2018, 91% of the total number of redds were observed in mainstem sites. Average redd size was about 2 m² during all years. Misidentification of resident trout or lamprey redds as Steelhead redds did not appear to be an issue, as the former were much smaller than Steelhead redds, and, in the case of trout, spawning was largely complete prior to the beginning of Steelhead spawning.

Increased base flows under Treatment 2 in 2009-2018 reduced the ability of the survey crew to spot adult Steelhead compared to previous years under Treatment 1. Several sections of the river had increased turbulence that prevented ideal conditions for the observation of adults, and higher current velocities made it difficult for the snorkeler to slow down enough for careful observation. Nevertheless, the peak number of live adults observed on a single survey during Treatment 2 (37-148) was generally higher than during Treatment 1 (22-95, Table 3.2). During 2001-2004, when snorkel counts of adult Steelhead occurred as part of a larger survey of Steelhead escapement in BC Lower Mainland streams (BCCF, Lower Mainland Branch, data on file), the maximum number of adult Steelhead observed on any one survey ranged from 20-64 (Table 3.2). However, peak counts should be considered a less reliable index of year-to-year differences in total escapement compared to redd counts. Unadjusted live peak counts of winter Steelhead are often poorly correlated with actual escapement due to the lengthy spawning period, and the immigration and emigration of fish into the counting area over the course of the survey period (Korman *et al.* 2002). This is also the case on the Coquitlam River. Peak counts explain only 35% of the variability of escapement based on redd counts largely as a result of far fewer live counts than expected in 2006 (Figure 3.5).

No redds were found during the once-a-year reconnaissance survey of Reach 1. Reach 1 is not included in the annual Steelhead redd survey, and thus redd counts for this section were not included in estimates of adult escapement for the purposes of continuity with past years.

3.2.1 Redd survey life

In 2018, the period between surveys was typically short enough (≤ 14 days) to assume that a negligible number of redds became obscured from one survey to the next, based on the evaluation of redd survey life during 2005-2018. The redd life model estimated less than one

additional redd for the 19 day gap between the first and second survey. Thus, the estimated number of new redds was considered equal to the raw count of new redds (Table 3.1). Between 2005-2018, 2006 was the only year where the number of redds estimated using the redd survey life model was substantially higher (21%) than the unadjusted counts due to redds becoming undetectable over the 37-day gap between surveys that spanned the peak spawning period (Table 3.1). See Decker *et al.* 2010 for further discussion of trends in survey life.

3.2.2 Female escapement and egg deposition

Estimated adult female escapement for 2018 was 134 females (Table 3.3), which was a lower than average value for the 2005-2018 period. The highest and lowest female escapements occurred in 2006 (434 females; Table 3.3) and 2009 (113 females), respectively. Average Steelhead redd density in the study area of the Coquitlam River was 15 redds/km in 2018, and ranged from 13-48 redds/km during 2005-2018 (Table 3.3). Among reaches and years, redd density ranged from 6-71 redds/km (Table 3.3). Spawning distribution during 2018 was less in the lower reaches of the river (2a and 2b) than in the upper reaches (3 and 4; 40% lower to 60% upper, Table 3.3), which differed from the typical trend of equal or more spawning in the lower reaches. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 illustrate the fine-scale distribution of redds in the study area for 2006.

The principal sources of uncertainty in deriving Steelhead escapement estimates for the Coquitlam River from redd counts are the sex ratio and the average number of redds constructed by each female; error in escapement estimates will be directly proportional to error in either of these parameters. We used average values of 1:1 for sex ratio, and 1.2 redds per female (Jacobs *et al.* 2002) to develop escapement estimates. Jacobs *et al.* (2002) reported a 2-fold variation in the number of redds per female among streams, but noted relatively little variation among years within individual streams. Jacobs *et al.* (2002) also observed fairly consistent sex ratios of 1:1. For the purposes of indexing Steelhead escapement in the Coquitlam River during Treatment 1 and 2, this is encouraging, since the accuracy of the estimates is of secondary importance as long as the sex ratio and redds/female ratios remained constant between treatments.

A potential source of uncertainty for the 2018 surveys was the possibility that not all redds were detected. Two surveys were completed at unprecedented high flows (18 and 26 m³/s). At these flows, there was a reduced confidence that redds in deeper sections of the river were reliably detected. If the 8 m³/s Sockeye release from the LLO is continued for future years, the detection probability of redd observations may need to be estimated to avoid underestimating Steelhead escapement.

There was no indication that the higher flows during 2018 led to redds becoming obscured by scour. This would have been apparent if individually marked redds were not detected in subsequent surveys. In 2018, all redds were confirmed during at least one survey after they were initially observed.

3.3 Implications for hypothesis testing

The Coquitlam River is well suited to conducting Steelhead redd surveys and provides useful information for assessing the benefits to Steelhead of Treatment 1 and 2. Estimates of adult Steelhead abundance and egg deposition based on total redd counts may be systematically biased high or low due to uncertainty about the number of redds each females constructs, but can still be expected to provide a sensitive and reliable index of recruitment during 2005-2018.

4 Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock

In 2006, the CC requested that a juvenile standing stock survey component be added to the monitoring program to provide estimates of total abundance in late summer for Coho and Steelhead fry (age-0+), and Steelhead parr (age-1+ and 2+) in the Coquitlam River mainstem. The purpose of this monitoring was that this data together with adult escapement and smolt abundance estimates, could be used to investigate freshwater production bottlenecks at specific juvenile life stages that may be related to specific habitat or flow issues. We conducted a feasibility study in 2006 to determine the best method for collecting annual juvenile standing stock data. The study compared three-pass removal electrofishing at 20 m long enclosed sites along one shoreline with night snorkeling counts at sites that extended across the entire stream channel (Decker *et al.* 2007). During 2007-2018 we proceeded with annual juvenile surveys based on night snorkeling counts, as this method proved to be the most effective for the purpose of estimating juvenile standing stocks (Decker *et al.* 2007). A multi-year mark-recapture study was also initiated in 2007 to provide estimates of snorkeling detection probability (percentage of fish present at a site that snorkelers detect), which is necessary to expand raw snorkeling counts to population estimates. In this report, we present a new Hierarchical Bayesian Model (HBM) that was developed to provide estimates of juvenile standing stocks in the Coquitlam River during 2006-2018 (see *Section 4.1.5*); this model replaces a bootstrap model used in previous years (Decker *et al.* 2012).

During 2007-2018 we also conducted a separate 3-pass electrofishing survey (with input and assistance from Ron Ptolemy, MOE stock assessment). As per the COQMON-07 Terms of Reference, the electrofishing data was collected to provide a comparison of fish densities in specific habitats in the Coquitlam River with fish densities from similar habitats in other streams that were sampled using the same methods (BC MOE juvenile electrofishing database; see Ptolemy 2007). The collected electrofishing data was not used to estimate juvenile standing stocks in the Coquitlam River.

4.1 Methods

4.1.1 Study area

The study area extends 10.3 km from the Coquitlam Dam downstream to the Patricia Footbridge just upstream of the Lougheed highway (i.e., reaches 2a, 2b, 3, and 4; Figure 4.1), and includes all mainstem, braid and side-channel habitat. Natural and man-made off-channel habitats in Coquitlam River were not included, and juvenile fish populations in these habitats were therefore not included in juvenile standing stock values reported in this section or in Section 6.

4.1.2 Sampling design

We employed a two-stage sampling design (Cochrane 1977) to generate juvenile standing stock estimates by species and age-class for the Coquitlam River study area. The first stage consisted of a single-pass snorkeling count at each of the 12 index sites for 2007-2014 that were

sampled each year with another 12 index sites added in 2014 increasing the sites surveyed to 24 for 2014-2018. The second stage consisted of conducting mark-recapture experiments at a subsample of these sites to quantify snorkeling detection probability. Fish abundance at each site was estimated by expanding the observed number of fish by the estimate of detection probability (global mean across all mark-recapture sites in all years for each species/size class). The abundance of fish in the remaining length of the Coquitlam River study area that was not sampled (i.e., total stream length – \sum stream length_{index sites 1-12}) was estimated based on estimates of the mean and variance in fish density for the sampled sites. Total standing stock estimate for the study area was the sum of estimates for sampled and unsampled stream length.

For this type of sampling design, error in the estimation of fish standing stocks is the result of both process error (spatial variation in fish abundance among sampling sites) and measurement error (error in the estimation of fish abundance within an individual site). Measurement error includes variation in detection probability caused by differences in fish behaviour and habitat characteristics among sites, and differences among snorkelers in their ability to spot and identify fish. The HBM was used to estimate posterior distributions of the fish standing stocks, from which expected values (mean and median), and 95% credible intervals (Bayesian equivalent of confidence intervals) could be computed.

4.1.3 Night snorkeling

Snorkeling sites were chosen using a simple (non-stratified) systematic sampling design (SSS). Sampling was not stratified by reach or habitat type due to the limited number of sites sampled. During 2007-2013, the 10 sites originally selected in 2006 were re-sampled, and an additional two sites were added in Reach 4 to maintain a uniform sampling interval of ~ 0.85 km (Figure 4.1). The additional 12 sites added in 2014 (for a total of 24 sites) were distributed equidistance between the existing sites. Initial site selection was accomplished using a hand-held GPS unit to determine the straight-line distance from Patricia Footbridge to Coquitlam Dam, and dividing this distance by the total number of sites to obtain a uniform sampling interval. The downstream boundary of each site was then located according to the appropriate pre-determined distance from Patricia Footbridge. Each site was 25 m in length and spanned the entire stream channel. If the stream was split into two or more wetted channels at the selected site location, the entire wetted width of all channels was surveyed as part of the 25 m site to ensure that the site accurately represented available habitat for a particular channel cross-section. Snorkeling surveys were scheduled for early September when precipitation is normally low and target discharge from Coquitlam Dam was 0.8 m³/s under Treatment 1 (2006-2008) and 2.2 m³/s under Treatment 2 (2009-2018). Snorkeling counts were performed once at each site by a two-person crew. Counts were performed at night because numerous studies have shown that daytime concealment behaviour is common in juvenile salmonids (e.g., Bradford and Higgins 2000 and references therein). We limited snorkeling surveys to a four-hour period beginning 0.5 hours after dusk. We based this on Bradford and Higgins' (2000) finding that, throughout the year, the highest counts of juvenile salmonids during a 24-hour period were consistently recorded during a 3-4 hour period after dusk. To illuminate the sampling sites at night, snorkelers used handheld dive lights that cast diffuse rather than direct beams to minimize the disturbance to fish. Snorkelers surveyed the stream's entire wetted width, with each snorkeler entering the site at its downstream end and systematically sweeping in an upstream direction the area between his bank

4. Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock

and the agreed upon mid-point of the site. Regular communication between snorkelers was essential to avoid duplicating counts, particularly in the instances where fish were present in mid-channel areas.

To address the potential concern that age-0+ salmonids, which occupy shallow, near-shore habitats, would be difficult to survey effectively by snorkeling (Griffith 1981; Campbell and Neuner 1985; Hillman *et al.* 1992), snorkelers delineated areas that were too shallow to view from an underwater position. Following the completion of an underwater search of the remainder of the site, conducted a separate visual survey of these areas on foot with masks removed. During the 2006 pilot study it was evident that small fish along the stream margin remained relatively stationary at night and could be identified to species and size class, and if necessary, could be captured with a small net to confirm observations. At sites where these shallow areas were not well delineated from the rest of the site, and the risk of double counting fish was apparent, the two snorkelers worked parallel to one another, with one person searching shallow near-shore areas, and the other searching adjacent off-shore areas. Each person communicated movements of detected fish to the other. This procedure was then repeated for the other half of the site. Other studies have shown that streamside visual counts can be excellent predictors of juvenile salmonid abundance when calibrated using more accurate methods (Bozek and Rahel 1991; Decker and Hagen 2009). Snorkelers identified to species and visually estimated the fork lengths of all fish observed and recorded their observations in waterproof notebooks. To aid in the estimation of fish lengths, snorkelers drew ruled scales on the cover of their notebooks. Snorkelers were typically able to hold the notebooks within 30 cm of a fish to measure its length without disturbing it. Although there was no attempt to assess the accuracy of fish length estimates made by snorkelers, in two similar studies (Korman *et al.* 2011; Decker and Hagen 2009) in which some of the same snorkelers from this study participated, it was found that snorkelers could estimate juvenile fish lengths relatively precisely with little negative or positive bias (R^2 values for regressions of estimated versus measured fork length ranged from 0.94 to 0.97).

4.1.4 Mark-recapture experiments to estimate snorkeling detection probability

To derive population estimates from snorkeling counts, an estimate of snorkeling detection probability (proportion of total fish at a site that snorkelers detect) is also required. The juvenile standing stock study design calls for 2-4 mark-recapture experiments to be completed during each year until enough data are obtained to provide a reliable model of detection probability. We conducted a total of 23 mark-recapture experiments during 2007-2013 towards this end. By distributing the mark-recapture experiments over several years and equally among the 12 annual sampling sites, bias resulting from differences in detection probability among years or habitat types was minimized. Now with well-defined detection probability information for Coho, age-0 fry and age-1 Steelhead parr, further mark-recapture experiments were suspended in 2014. Further mark-recapture experiments would not increase the precision of the standing stock estimates as much as doubling the number of index sites would, by possibly shifting effort from mark-recapture to index sampling. This prevents further refinements to the age-2 Steelhead parr detection probability estimate but this age-class has minimal use for estimating survival or other productivity metrics because a portion of this year-class undergoes smolting prior to fall surveys.

To estimate detection probability discretely for each target species/age-class at a sampling site, one night prior to conducting the normal snorkeling survey, a single snorkeler captured and marked fish throughout the site using one or two large aquarium nets affixed to handles of ~80 cm in length. The snorkeler searched for and captured fish throughout the site with the goal of marking 10-20 individuals for Coho fry, and for each length class of Steelhead (see below). Minimizing disturbance to marked and unmarked fish was a primary goal of the marking methodology. Captured fish were handed to a second crewmember on shore, who immediately measured the fish (fork length to nearest 5 mm), marked it, and returned it to its original location after the snorkeler had moved on. Anticipating that detection probability would differ for smaller and larger juvenile Steelhead over the size range occurring in the Coquiltam River (Hagen *et al.* 2011; Korman *et al.* 2011), we used colour-coded tags to obtain five discrete mark groups for Steelhead (40-50 mm, 50-69 mm, 70-99 mm, 100-140 mm, and >140 mm). The smaller two length classes represent age-0+ fry, while the larger three represent age-1+ and 2+ parr. Marking consisted of inserting a custom-made tag into the fish's back at the insertion of the dorsal fin. Tags consisted of size 16-20 barbed fish hooks (size 16 for fish > 140 mm fork length, size 18 for fish 70-140 mm, and size 20 for fish < 70 mm), with a length of coloured plastic chenille (8-15 mm depending on fish size) attached at the hook eye with heat shrink tubing (Hagen *et al.* 2011). Tags were sized so that snorkelers could readily detect a mark on a fish, without the mark increasing the likelihood of the fish being seen relative to an unmarked one. Captured fish were not anaesthetized because of the uncertainty associated with behavioural effects from the anaesthetic. During the re-sighting event snorkelers recorded marked and unmarked fish separately.

Snorkeling detection probability was estimated for individual sites, species and length classes by dividing the number of marked fish seen by the number marked (R/M). This type of mark-recapture study assumes a closed population, whereas our sites were not enclosed with nets. However, over sufficiently short time periods, if study animals restrict their movements to a defined area, physically open sites can be treated as closed without introducing significant bias (Pollock 1982; Bohlin *et al.* 1989; Mitro and Zale 2002). We chose to conduct the underwater surveys 24 hours after marking because we considered this to be the shortest time period that would still allow fish to recover from marking and complete a diurnal cycle of movement and redistribution within the site, but would minimize movement from the site. We investigated the assumption of site closure by surveying an additional distance of approximately half the site length adjoining both the upstream and downstream site boundaries, so that the total distance surveyed for marks was approximately two times the length of the original site where fish were marked. Marked fish that had moved beyond the original site boundaries were recorded separately. The number of marked fish that emigrated from the original site was estimated as the number of marks observed in the adjoining sections divided by R/M.

4.1.5 Estimation of fish standing stocks and mean densities

There are predominately three age-classes of juvenile Steelhead (age-0+, 1+ and 2+) in the Coquiltam River during late summer; older fish are relatively uncommon and likely to be resident rainbow trout. We computed separate population statistics for each of the three age-classes, and also pooled age-1+ and age-2+ Steelhead data to compute aggregate population

statistics for Steelhead parr. Steelhead ages were estimated based on an analysis of length frequency histograms generated from both the electrofishing and snorkeling data, as well as from length-age data derived from Steelhead smolts from the Coquiltam River (see *Section 5.2.2*). A small proportion of juvenile Coho salmon spend two winters in the Coquiltam River prior to migrating seaward, but we did not stratify our standing stock estimates for Coho by age.

To estimate juvenile standing stocks for the entire study area, and to quantify uncertainty in these estimates, we relied on a modified version of an HBM originally developed by Korman *et al.* (2010) to estimate juvenile Steelhead abundance in the Cheakamus River. Their model is in turn a derivation of a model originally proposed by Wyatt (2002, 2003). The sampling (night snorkeling) and calibration methods (mark-recapture) employed in the Korman *et al.* (2010) study were similar to those used in this study. The hierarchical structure of the HBM approach is well suited to two-stage sampling designs where it is necessary to combine error sources arising at different levels or hierarchies of the sampling design (Wyatt 2002).

The mark-recapture experiments indicated that the snorkeling detection probability for Steelhead was size-dependant (see *Sections 4.1.4 and 4.2.1.1*). In order to account for this, the HBM incorporates stratification by generating independent standing stock estimates for six Steelhead age-class/size-class strata (0+ < 50 mm; 0+ 50-70 mm; 1+ 70-99 mm; 1+ 100-149; 2+ 100-149 mm; and 2+ > 149 mm). To generate a standing stock estimate for a particular Steelhead age-class, the HBM sums estimates across the appropriate size-class strata.

Descriptions of all parameters, variables, constants, subscripts and equations used in the HBM are provided in Appendices 4.1 and 4.2. For the observation (detection) component of the HBM, the number of marked fish observed at snorkeling mark-recapture site i during the recapture event was assumed to be binomially distributed and to depend on the detection probability and number of marks released during the initial marking event (Appendix 4.2, Equation 4.1). The between-site variation in detection probability at mark-recapture sites was assumed to follow a beta hyper-distribution (Equation 4.2). The number of fish observed at index site j (regular sampling site as opposed to a mark-recapture site) was assumed to be binomially distributed and to depend on abundance at the site and a randomly selected detection probability taken from the hyper-distribution of detection probabilities (Equations 4.3 and 4.4). The process component of the HBM assumes that variation in juvenile abundance across sample sites follows a Poisson/log-normal mixture. That is, abundance within a site is Poisson-distributed with a mean equal to the product of fish density and length of stream that was sampled (Equation 4.5), and the log of fish density across index sites is normally distributed (Equation 4.6).

The total standing stock for the study area (Equation 4.9) was computed as the sum of the standing stock estimates from the 12 sampled index sites (Equation 4.7) and the standing stock estimate for the unsampled stream length within the stratum (Equation 4.8). The latter value was computed as the product of the back-transformed mean density from the lognormal density hyper distribution (μ_λ) with lognormal bias correction ($0.5\tau_\lambda$), and the length of the unsampled portion of the stratum.

4. Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock

Posterior distributions of parameters and standing stock estimates from the HBM were estimated using WinBUGS (Spiegelhalter *et al.* 1999) called from the R2WinBUGS library (Sturtz *et al.* 2005) from the “R” statistical package (R Development Core Team 2009). Uninformative prior distributions for hyper-parameters were used if possible for size-specific strata. As well, an uninformative uniform distribution, and an uninformative half-Cauchy distribution were used as priors for the mean and standard deviation of the hyper-distribution for age-, and size-specific detection probability, respectively (Appendix 4.2, Equations 10 and 11, respectively). An uninformative normal prior was used for the mean of the hyper-distribution for log fish density, and an uninformative half-Cauchy distribution was used as a prior for the standard deviation of log fish density (Equation 4.12). The half-Cauchy prior, also referred to as a ‘folded t distribution’, is useful in cases where it is difficult to estimate the variance of hyper-distributions in hierarchical Bayesian models due to limited information in the data (Gelman 2006).

In a few cases, estimates of the variance in the hyper-distributions of detection probability or log fish density were unstable based on these uninformative priors. This occurred because there were either too few fish of a specific size class marked during the mark-recapture experiments to reliably estimate the standard deviation in detection probability ($\tau_{\theta,g}$, Equation 4.11), or the number of fish of a specific size class present in the index sites was too low and variable to reliably estimate the standard deviation in fish density among the index sites (τ_{λ} , Equation 4.13). In these cases, which are described in Appendix 4.3, rather than estimate $\tau_{\theta,g}$ and τ_{λ} , we used fixed values that were equal to the estimated parameter values for an adjacent size class. The means of the hyper-distributions ($\mu_{\theta,g}$ and $\mu_{\lambda,s}$; Equations 4.10 and 4.11) were still estimated separately for each fish size class.

Posterior distributions were estimated by taking every second sample from a total of 10,000 simulations after excluding the first 1000 ‘burn in’ samples. This sample size and sampling strategy was sufficient to achieve adequate model convergence in all cases. Model parameters were estimated in two stages. In the first stage, the posterior distributions of site-specific detection probabilities and hyper-parameters were estimated (Equations 4.1 and 4.2). In the second stage, posterior distributions for the parameters in the population model were estimated. The $\theta_{j,g}$ values required for the population model were simulated from beta hyper-distributions whose parameters were determined from the median values of the posterior distributions estimated in the first stage. This two-phased estimation approach reflects our two-stage sampling design, and ensures that the hyper-distribution for detection probability is not influenced by data from the regular snorkeling index sites. Ideally, we could have sampled from the full range of detection probability hyper-distributions of detection probability in the second estimation phase. This latter approach, which integrates over the full uncertainty in detection probability hyper-parameters, increases computational time by two to three orders of magnitude. During the initial model development of a similar HBM for the Cheakamus River, Korman *et al.* (2010) compared uncertainty in juvenile Steelhead standing stock estimates based on the median versus fully integrated two-phased estimation approaches and found the increase in uncertainty under the latter approach was relatively modest (a few %). Based on their results, we adopted

4. Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock

the more computationally efficient median approach. Korman *et al.* (2010) also used computer simulations to evaluate the extent of bias in standing stock estimates and hyper-parameters generated from the Cheakamus River HBM and found that bias to be negligible in all cases.

To describe the precision of the standing stock estimates in this report, we have used percent relative error, which we computed as the average half credible interval (upper 95% credible limit minus the lower credible limit divided by two and then divided by the mean and expressed as a percentage Krebs 1999). It is important to note that standing stock estimates and confidence intervals reported here will differ in future years' reports if estimates of size-specific snorkeling detection probability are further refined by additional mark-recapture experiments, or in the case where site-specific habitat or environmental variables (e.g., temperature, mean depth, etc.) are incorporated into the observation component of the HBM models, if they are found to be significant predictors of snorkeling detection probability.

Fish/km was calculated by dividing the standing stock estimate by the total length of the Coquitlam River (10.3 km). Fish/100 m² was calculated as the average density of the sampling sites. This is because the total area of the studied zone of the Coquitlam River is not assessed each year.

4.1.6 Day electrofishing survey

In 2018, we resurveyed four shoreline electrofishing sites previously sampled during 2007-2017. These sites were non-randomly chosen based on MOE protocols to represent fast-water habitats (riffle/cascades with relatively large mean substrate size) that were presumed to be ideal habitats for both Steelhead fry and parr (Ptolemy 2007). Sites were fully enclosed by upstream and downstream stop nets placed perpendicular to the shore, and a third offshore net that was placed parallel to the bank, and attached to the other two nets. Nets were held in place using a system of metal bipods, anchors and ropes, and cobbles and boulders placed along the bottom apron of each net. The offshore net was placed as far from shore as water depth and velocity permitted, usually 5-8 m.

Three-pass depletion electrofishing was conducted during daylight hours. Electrofishing was initiated at the downstream net, and consisted of a thorough search in an upstream direction, followed by a systematic sweep back towards the downstream net. Electrofishing sites were 'rested' for a minimum of one hour between passes to minimize decline in capture efficiency over subsequent passes (Bohlin and Sundstrom 1977). All salmonids captured were anaesthetized, identified to species, measured for fork length (nearest mm), allowed to recover and released back into the site following the completion of sampling.

Population estimates were generated for age 0+, 1+ and 2+ Steelhead (see *Section 4.1.5*, par. 1) and Coho at each site using a maximum likelihood (ML) algorithm (Otis *et al.* 1978).

4. Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock

4.1.7 Physical characteristics of snorkeling and electrofishing sites

We conducted simple habitat surveys to describe the physical characteristics of the sampling sites. At each site, depth was measured at five stations along each of three transects spanning the width of the site. During 2009-2018 we also estimated current velocity at each station using a propeller-type current meter. Stations were uniformly-spaced along transects, and transects were uniformly-spaced along the length of the site. We also recorded maximum depth, substrate composition (boulder, cobble, gravel, and fines as percentages of the site area), D90 and D50 (diameters of substrate particles for which 90% and 50%, respectively, of the site area consist of smaller particles), site length, site width, cover (categories included: overhead vegetation, turbulence, deep water and boulder as percentages of the site area, undercut bank as a percentage of the combined length of the stream banks, and the total area of the site covered by wood debris). Other information collected for each site included location (UTMs), and water quality parameters (water temperature, pH, and total alkalinity).

4.2 Results

4.2.1 Night snorkeling

In 2018, night snorkeling surveys were completed during Aug 30- Sept 6, Sept 11 and 18 at a flow of 2.7-4.14 m³/s (WSC station 08MH002). Previous surveys were conducted at flows of 0.8-2 m³/s during Treatment 1, and 2-7 m³/s during Treatment 2. Water temperatures ranged from 19.6-20.5°C during 2018, similar to previous years. In 2018, horizontal underwater visibility exceeded 4 meters at all sites. In past years, visibility has been adequate to good at all sites (2008, 3-4 metres; all other years, >4 metres). This is more than adequate for conducting snorkeling counts (Hagen *et al.* 2011) and within the range of conditions that detection probability experiments were conducted.

4.2.1.1 Mark-recapture experiments to estimate snorkeling detection probability

No additional mark-recapture experiments were carried out in 2017. This section will remain unchanged in future years until the need arises for additional experiments.

From 2007-2013, we marked totals of 454 Coho fry, 450 Steelhead fry, and 428 Steelhead parr at 23 mark-recapture sites (Table 4.2). Based on detection of marked fish by snorkelers during the survey 24 hours after marking, for Coho, the maximum likelihood estimate of mean snorkeling detection probability was 39% (Table 4.2, Figure 4.2), whereas for Steelhead, detection probability ranged from 26% for the < 50 mm length class of Steelhead, to 66% for the 70-99 mm class. For Steelhead, the results suggest an asymptotic relationship between detection probability and body size (Figure 4.2). Estimated detection probability for larger (> 140 mm) age-2+ parr (45%) remains highly uncertain given the limited number of tagged fish for this size class (24 fish across all sites and years). Steelhead larger than 140 mm at the end of summer are relatively uncommon in the Coquiltam River, representing only about 7% of the total standing stock of age-1+ and older parr.

The numbers of marked fish resighted by snorkelers in upstream and downstream sections adjacent to mark-recapture sites suggests that the assumption of population closure was largely met when mark-recapture sites were expanded to account for small-scale fish movement. Across the 23 mark-recapture sites, 27 marked Coho, 27 marked Steelhead fry, and 32 marked Steelhead parr were detected in adjacent upstream and downstream sections as opposed to the original marking site (Table 4.2). When adjusted for detection probability, these values suggest that 50 of 454 marked Coho (11.1%), 73 of 450 marked Steelhead fry (16.0%), and 52 of 428 marked Steelhead parr (age-1+ and 2+ combined: 14.8%), had moved from the original marking site to one of the adjacent sections during the 24-hour interval between the marking and re-sighting events. However, snorkelers noted that the majority of marked fish detected in the adjacent upstream and downstream sections had moved only a few metres beyond the original marking site.

4.2.1.2 Juvenile fish distribution and abundance

The 2018 Coho fry abundance and 95% confidence intervals for the Coquitlam River mainstem was $43,740 \pm 30\%$, which was slightly below average compared with previous years (mean: 50,126; range: 18,450-91,367 fish, Table 4.3). Precision of estimates has increased substantially with the doubling of the number of sampling sites from $\pm 38-44\%$ for 2006-2013 to $\pm 30-31\%$ for 2014-2016 (Table 4.3). Averaged individually for Treatment 1 and 2, Coho density generally increased with distance upstream during Treatment 2 ($R^2 = 0.76$) whereas during Treatment 1 density was lower between km 8-11 but was variable above this point (Figure 4.3).

The 2018 Steelhead fry abundance of $47,565 \pm 26\%$ was average compared to previous years 2006-2017 (mean: 48,457; range: 21,949-138,132 fish, Table 4.3). We consider the 2018 fry estimate credible (minimally biased) since the assumptions underlying the mark-recapture methodology were largely satisfied. Similar to 2017, there was a higher proportion of fish less than 40mm fork length (12%) compared with the average from past years excluding the 2011 outlier year (5%, Appendix 4.4), which was the minimum size included in mark-recapture experiments ($>40\text{mm}$). This may have biased the fry estimate low since observer efficiency decreases with the size of fry (Korman *et al.* 2011) and yet we used the observer efficiency based on fry with a fork length of 40-49mm for smaller fry as well ($<40\text{ mm}$). However, the underestimation would likely be relatively small considering that the proportion of observations for fry less than 40mm from electroshocking – a more reliable sampling method for Steelhead fry – was far more similar to an average year than to 2011, when the large shift towards smaller sized fry led to a very unreliable snorkeling based estimate (see Schick *et al.* 2012, Appendix 4.4). Relative precision was high in 2018. The precision of fry estimates increased substantially since doubling the number of index site in 2014 ($\pm 28-44\%$) compared to prior years ($\pm 37\%-1790\%$). During Treatment 1, Steelhead fry densities were substantially higher in the middle portion of the study area (km 11-13) compared to upper and lower reaches (Figure 4.3), whereas in during Treatment 2, density was far less variable and with no clear trend.

The 2018 standing stock estimate of age-1+ Steelhead parr of $9,836 \pm 27\%$ was near the average abundance since commencing snorkel surveys (mean: 8,824; range: 5,889-13,456 fish, 2006-2017, Table 4.3). The density of age-1+ parr in 2018 was 895 fish/km or 4.6 fish/100m². The 2018 standing stock estimate for age-2 Steelhead parr was $2,127 \pm 52\%$. Mean density of

4. Juvenile Salmonid Standing Stock

age-2+ Steelhead parr in 2018 was 207 fish/km. This was the lowest abundance during Treatment 2 and breaks the trend of consistently higher densities since 2009 (199-372 fish/km during 2009-2017; Table 4.3) than that during 2006-2008 (112-177 fish/km). On average, this trend corresponds well with the transition between flow treatments for age-2+ parr that have spent one year under Treatment 2 conditions even though 2011 would be the first estimate for age-2+ parr that reared entirely under Treatment 2 conditions. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the impact of flow treatment on productivity from age-2+ parr abundance since it reflects both survival to age and changes in life history. Age 2+ parr in the Coquitlam River can smolt during the spring prior to the fall standing stock surveys or in the following spring. Thus, an increased abundance of age-2+ parr could reflect greater freshwater survival and/or an increase in the proportion of smolting the following spring. There was no strong longitudinal pattern in Steelhead parr density when averaged by treatment period and was also relatively similar between the two treatment periods (Figure 4.3).

4.2.2 Assumptions of estimates based on snorkeling counts

A key assumption of our mark-recapture calibration method was that marked and unmarked fish had equal probabilities of being seen by snorkelers the night following marking. Testing for this type of bias was beyond the scope of this study, but we made considerable effort to minimize the effects of handling and marking on fish behaviour: fish were captured in a relatively low impact manner (hand nets), were not anaesthetized prior to marking, were released into the same location that they had been captured from (or first seen in), and were allowed a 24-hour recovery period prior to the re-sighting event. Snorkelers noted that, after 24 hours, marked fish occupied comparable locations to unmarked ones and behaved in a similar way.

A second assumption of our mark-recapture methodology was that the populations were closed between marking and re-sighting events. While our sites were not enclosed, we treated the fish populations within as being closed over the 24-hour period between marking and the snorkeler survey. Some marked fish did move from the original marking site to adjacent upstream and downstream sections during the 24-hour period, with “movers” representing 11% (Coho fry) to 22% (Steelhead 2+ parr) of the total number marked. We included these movers as part of the re-sighted population to account for small-scale movement, but this would not have accounted for larger-scale movements (i.e., marked fish moving beyond the adjacent sections of each mark-recapture site to areas not surveyed by the snorkelers). While movement beyond the adjacent sections would lead to negative bias in our estimates of snorkeling detection probability, we assumed that larger-scale movements of marked fish were relatively uncommon considering that almost all of the marked fish that were detected by snorkelers beyond the original marking site had remained within a short distance (< 5 m) of the original site boundaries.

Detection probabilities derived from mark recapture estimates always refer to the catchable population. All Coho fry are treated as one population while juvenile Steelhead are partitioned into several sub-populations, based on fish length, to minimize the variability in detection probabilities within each sub-population or size-class. During 2008-2010 and 2012-2016 the size class during mark-recapture experiments matched that during index sampling. However, this was

not the case in 2011 when the smaller-than-usual Steelhead fry were likely less visible than the years upon which the mark-recapture results were based. As mentioned, this was also the case in 2017 and 2018, but to a lesser degree than 2011, leading us to treat this estimate as reliable.

4.2.3 Stream-wide fish abundance estimates based on snorkeling counts

The snorkeling surveys indicate that Coho and Steelhead fry and parr are broadly distributed within the study area of the Coquitlam River mainstem, although Coho production was concentrated in the upper portion of the study area during most years. The majority of adult Coho spawn in the upper river. Steelhead fry densities are low in reach 4 relative to downstream reaches. Whereas the channel is relatively confined and deep in Reach 4, in the remaining reaches downstream, it is much broader, with more frequent braids and side-channel and shallow margin areas, which are preferred fry habitats (Hume and Parkinson 1987).

Riley *et al.* (1997) surveyed juvenile abundance in the Coquitlam River in 1997, prior to the installation of the ‘fish flow’ valves and the implementation of Treatment 1. Although their sampling methodology differed as they used three-pass electrofishing, lower flows enabled them to enclose sample sites across the entire wetted width of the channel, similar to our channel-wide snorkeling sites. Comparing the results of the two studies would suggest that mean densities of Coho fry in the Coquitlam River mainstem during 2006-2018 (13-42 fish/100 m²) ranged from just over two and a half to nine times that in 1997 (5 fish/100 m², Riley *et al.* 1997). Compared to the Steelhead fry density in 1997 (12 fish/100 m²), Steelhead fry densities in 2006-2018 were up to more than 2-fold higher (8-29 fish/100 m²). Steelhead parr densities were 6-19 times higher during 2006-2018 (3.7-8.1 fish/100 m², respectively) compared to 1997 (0.5 fish/100 m²). However, electrofishing removal estimates obtained in 1997 were biased-low, particularly for Steelhead parr, as a result of low conductivity and ineffective electrofishing in deeper mid-channel habitats (Riley *et al.* 1997), thus exaggerating the apparent increases in standing stock from 1997 to 2006-07. Nevertheless, the differences in Coho fry and Steelhead parr densities between 2006-2018 and 1997 are likely too large to be explained by negative bias alone in electrofishing depletion estimates (Bohlin and Sundstrom 1977; Peterson *et al.* 2004). While other factors may have also played a role, increased flow releases from the dam during Treatment 1 and 2 relative to earlier years (0.06 to 0.5 m³/s) likely contributed to increased juvenile Coho and Steelhead production in the Coquitlam River.

Based on the calibrated snorkeling data, Steelhead fry density in the Coquitlam River in 2006- 2018 (98-29 fish/100 m²) was typically low to average compared to published values for other streams. For example, Hume and Parkinson (1987) considered 30 Steelhead fry/100 m² to be about average for BC coastal streams, while Ward and Slaney (1993) reported that Steelhead fry densities in Keogh River averaged 34 fish/100 m² one month after emergence. Higher Steelhead fry densities in the Coquitlam River in 2006, 2011 and 2013 were likely associated with relatively high brood escapements for those years (see Section 3), which is consistent with the positive linear relationship between Steelhead escapement and fry abundance that was observed in the Keogh River (Ward and Slaney, 1993).

Snorkeling-derived estimates of Steelhead parr densities in the Coquitlam River (3.3-8.3 fish/100 m²) were comparable to parr density estimates derived from daytime snorkeling counts in Oregon streams (Satterthwaite 2002), and from night snorkeling counts in tributaries of the Thompson River, BC (Decker *et al.* 2009). However, some of the streams sampled by Satterthwaite (2002) had Steelhead parr densities that were considerably higher (up to 20 fish/100 m²).

4.2.4 Fish densities in ‘optimal’ habitats based on electrofishing

Table 4.4 contains density and river-wide abundance estimates based on electrofishing. There was little agreement between density estimates based on electrofishing and snorkelling across years for all species and age-classes ($R^2 < 0.2$, Table 4.6). Differences in density estimates derived from the two methods are expected, given that snorkeling was conducted at randomly chosen sites that spanned the entire channel width, whereas electrofishing sites were deliberately chosen to represent ‘optimal’ Steelhead habitat and encompassed only a portion of the channel width.

Electrofishing surveys in Coquitlam River during 2007-2018 followed a standardized methodology developed by Ron Ptolemy (BC MOE) to facilitate among-stream comparison of relative Steelhead abundance in ‘optimal’ habitat. Ptolemy (2007) proposed an empirical maximum carrying capacity biomass of 272 g/100m² for individual age-classes of Steelhead (combined age-classes would exceed this value) in suitable habitats in the Coquitlam River. This value represents the 95th percentile of the distribution of observed fish densities versus mean weights (Ptolemy 2007; Allan plot on p. 4). This distribution included electrofishing data from 2007 and from previous MOE electrofishing surveys in the Coquitlam River (pre-1998). The Coquitlam River is located in the Coast and Mountains Ecoprovince, and comparisons within this landscape unit are appropriate. A maximum biomass of 272 g/100m² places the Coquitlam River at about the 65% percentile for this landscape unit, which includes data for 86 streams (R. Ptolemy, MOE Fisheries Branch, pers. comm.). The model suggests that the potential carrying capacity for the Coquitlam River exceeds the average for the Ecoprovince. Using electrofishing and alkalinity data from streams in all provincial landscape units, Ptolemy developed a model to predict maximum salmonid biomass based on total alkalinity, as an index of nutrient status (R. Ptolemy, pers. comm.). The observed maximum biomass of 272 g/100m² exceeded the model prediction for the Coquitlam River of 200 g/100m² (based on very low alkalinity; e.g., 8-13 mg/l in 2006), which suggests above-average carrying capacity for the Coquitlam River relative to streams of comparable nutrient richness as described by this model.

Assuming a mean weight of 14 g for age-1+ Steelhead (R. Ptolemy, pers. comm.), maximum biomass values observed at electrofishing sites in the Coquitlam River were 139-236 g/100m² during Treatment 1 (2006-2008) and 38-94 g/100m² during Treatment 2 (2009-2017). Based on a mean weight of 2.5 g for age-0 fry, maximum biomass values observed at electrofishing sites in the Coquitlam River were 123-342 g/100m² and 64-127 g/100m² during Treatment 1 and 2, respectively. Thus, observed maximum values during 2006-2017 were mostly below or well below the ‘historical’ observed maximum of 272 g/100m². However, given the limited number

of sampling sites each year it is possible that electrofishing surveys in 2006-2017 failed to include ‘optimal’ sites where maximum Steelhead biomass would be expected.

4.3 Implications for hypothesis testing

Standing stock monitoring was designed to provide stock-recruitment information at a shorter timescale than possible using smolt outmigration but also at a lower level of precision. As well, it was meant to inform on the distribution of abundance throughout the lower Coquiltam River. To this end, it is satisfying its objective. However, it was not intended as the primary metric for evaluating the fisheries benefits of Treatment 1 and 2.

Standing stock monitoring data based on snorkel surveys provides accurate abundance estimates for mainstem Coho, Steelhead fry and age-1+ Steelhead along with a consistent index of age-2+ Steelhead abundance. While the precision of 2006-2018 standing stock estimates are lower than the average for smolt and fry outmigration, it does provide useful information for distinguishing at what life-stage abundance may become limited by adult escapement versus rearing habitat availability.

5 Smolt and Fry Outmigration

5.1 Methods

5.1.1 Coho and Steelhead smolt enumeration

In 2018, downstream migrating Coho and Steelhead smolts were captured at three locations in the Coquitlam River mainstem (RST2, RST3, RST4) using rotary screw traps (RST), and at the outlets of four constructed off-channel sites using full span weirs (Figure 5.1). Mark-recapture data collected at RSTs were used to estimate smolt numbers for three mainstem reaches and for the entire Coquitlam River upstream of Port Coquitlam (Figure 5.1).

Our approach assumes all fish passing full span weirs are captured (capture efficiency = 100%) but that only a portion passing each RST site are caught (capture efficiency \neq 100%). We use variations of the Peterson two-sample mark-recapture method (Seber 1982) to estimate the proportion of fish passing each RST that are caught and not caught. This information is then used to adjust the catch from the RST site by the capture efficiency of the trap. For example, if an RST caught 50 of the 100 marked fish released upstream, the trap would have a 50% capture efficiency or that the trap captures half of the fish that pass by. And if a total of 1,000 fish were captured at that same trap, then we would estimate that another 1,000 fish passed without capture for a total estimate of 2,000 fish passing the trap. Our marking approach divides the outmigration period into a number of time periods (strata) that allows for individual estimates of capture efficiency for each stratum.

The Peterson mark-recapture method relies on several assumptions in order to produce unbiased estimates. Arnason *et al.* (1996) lists the three for time stratified mark-recapture as:

Closed population – There is no recruitment, emigration or mortality between sampling events.

No tag loss – Tag loss can take several forms in the context of this study. Tagging can induce mortality. Tags can be lost or go undetected. This includes that marks remain identifiable when marked fish pass the recapture site.

Equal catchability – That the probability of capturing a fish at the recapture sites is independent of whether it was marked or not.

5.1.1.1 Location and description of downstream traps

Ideally, RST trapping would be conducted at the downstream end of Reach 1 at Port Coquitlam (the upper limit of tidal influence), so as to estimate smolt yield for the entire study area of the Coquitlam River. However, because of problems with site security, and given the limited number of sites that possess adequate water depth and velocity, RSTs were not installed at the downstream reach boundaries (Figure 5.1). Until 2005, our lowermost trapping site

(RST2) was located just downstream of the upper boundary of reach 2a, 5.1 km upstream of the Reach 1 downstream boundary (Figure 5.1). The 2.6 km long section between RST2 and RST3 immediately upstream includes most of reach 2b and the upper portion of reach 2a, and is referred to in this report as reach 2. For 2006-2018, the RST2 site was moved 600 m downstream (a high water event infilled the former trapping site), increasing the length of the 'reach 2' section to 3.2 km. In 2018, the RST3 site was moved 300m upstream of its previous location to improve access. We refer to the 2.7 km long section between RST3 and RST4 as reach 3 (Figure 5.1), but it should be noted that this section also includes the upper 900 m portion of Reach 2b. The uppermost trap site (RST4) was installed 1.6 km below the Coquitlam Dam, trapping a section that includes all but 100 m of reach 4 (Figure 5.1)¹.

In annual reports prior to 2009, smolt yield for the entire study area included the 4.5km of reach 1 and 2 downstream of the lowest trapping site. To allow for this, we approximated smolt numbers for reach 1 and the portion of reach 2a downstream of RST2 (4.5 km of habitat) based on extrapolation of smolt densities in reach 2 immediately upstream of RST2 site (i.e., reach 2b and a portion of reach 2a). However, this represents a potentially serious source of bias depending on the degree to which actual smolt densities in the 4.5 km section downstream of RST2 differ from those immediately upstream. For example, extrapolating relatively high Steelhead smolt density in reach 2 in 2008 (3.1 smolts/100m²) to the 4.5 km section downstream, resulted in an estimate of 9,245 Steelhead smolts for the Coquitlam River mainstem based on 5,480 smolts passing RST2 (see Decker *et al.* 2009). This suggests that the unsampled lower 4.5 km section produced 41% of mainstem Steelhead smolts, despite relatively low densities of Steelhead redds (Figure 3.2) and parr (Figure 4.3). With the exception of Chum, spawning occurs primarily upstream of RST2 for the four species included in the monitoring program (Coho: 92%; Chum: 50%; Pink: 74%; Steelhead: 88%; mean values across years). To eliminate potential bias associated with extrapolation of smolt numbers downstream of RST2, estimates of smolt yield for the Coquitlam River in all years reported here are for the 7.5 km long section upstream of RST2 only, rather than for the entire 12.0 km long study area extending from the dam to the downstream boundary of reach 1 (see Figure 5.1). With respect to stock-recruitment relationships, and egg-to-smolt survival estimates, this assumes that all juvenile recruits from spawning upstream of RST2 will remain upstream of RST2 until they emigrate as smolts. However, downstream movement of pre-smolt juveniles occurs in the spring as evidenced by significant catches of age-1 Steelhead parr at the RSTs (and likely occurs during other portions of the years as well). This results in some degree of negative bias in our estimates of egg-to-smolt survival.

There are four large constructed off-channel sites (Or Creek, Grant's Tomb, Overland Channel, and Archery Pond) located between Coquitlam Dam and RST2, totaling about 27,000 m² of habitat (Figure 5.1). The enumeration of smolts from the off-channel sites was necessary for two reasons: 1) to distinguish between smolt production in constructed off-channel habitat that is largely unaffected by flow releases from the dam, and production in natural mainstem

¹ Prior to 2002, a full-span downstream weir was used in place of an RST in reach 4 (see Decker and Lewis 2000).

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

habitat that is directly affected by flow releases; and 2) to provide additional marked smolts to improve the precision of smolt abundance estimates for downstream mainstem reaches.

We relied on total counts at full-span downstream weirs (Conlin and Tutty 1979) to estimate smolt yield from three of the sites (Or Creek, Grant's Tomb, Overland Channel). Overland Channel consists of two ponds that are connected, with each pond also having its own outlet channel. We installed an inclusion fence at the outlet of the upper pond at the Overland Channel sites, forcing all smolts to migrate through a single weir installed in the outlet of the lower pond. Detailed descriptions of these sites and the design of the downstream weirs can be found in previous reports (e.g., Decker 1998).

A full span weir was used to enumerate smolts leaving Archery Pond. This approach was used prior to 2008 and 2014 onward. During 2009-2013, the method switched to use mark-recapture by minnow trapping to estimate pre-smolt abundance. This was to shift resources to the sites that historically produced greater numbers of smolts. However, during 2013, too few Coho pre-smolts were captured in Archery Pond for population estimates (6 fish with 200 "Gee" brand wire mesh minnow traps baited with 2 g of preserved roe and set for 24 hours).

5.1.1.2 Downstream trap operation

In 2018, one 1.8 m diameter RST was operated at the reach 4 trapping site (RST4), one 1.8 m RST was operated in reach 3 (RST3) and two 1.8 m RSTs (RST2; Figure 5.1) were operated in close proximity to one another in reach 2. Using two smolt traps at the RST2 location was intended to increase the capture efficiency, which is key to produce precise mainstem population estimates. A 2.4 m diameter RST was used previously at the reach 4 site. The decision to use a smaller RST was based on the information suggesting the depth and width of the channel at base spring flows was insufficient for the trap to operate without damage. Screening used on all of these RSTs was 12 mm in diameter on rotating drum and 9mm for retention box. An additional 1.3m diameter RST (RST2.2) with 2.5mm mesh size was operated at the RST2 location to capture outmigrating Chum and Pink fry.

The objective is for all off-channel weirs and the mainstem RSTs to operate continuously from early-April until mid-June, with the exception of RST2.2, used for Chum and Pink enumeration, which starts operation in early-March. Table 5.1 lists the dates traps were installed, decommissioned and the start dates of marking strata. During some years, one or more RSTs were installed as early as February to monitor for early outmigration but operation was sporadic and was not designed to produce reliable population estimates for the period prior to full operation. Thus, data from the early monitoring was not used in the outmigration estimates. All juvenile fish captured at the weirs and RSTs were identified to species, counted and measured for fork length (nearest mm). Unmarked Coho and Steelhead smolts and Steelhead parr were injected with Visual Indicator Elastomer (VIE) to apply a unique mark identifying capture period and location (see Section 5.1.1.3). Prior to 2018, only fin clips were used to mark for release period and location. To minimize behavioural effects from handling, every effort was made to reduce the stress on fish during the sampling and marking process, and, once recovered, fish were immediately released.

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

We assumed that all downstream migrating Coho larger than 60 mm fork length were smolts. Steelhead smolts in the Coquitlam River range from two to four years in age. We assumed that all Steelhead 120-230 mm in length were seaward migrating smolts, while fish <120 mm were yearlings and smaller two year olds that would remain in the river for at least one more year (see section 5.3.2 for a discussion of this assumption). Frequency histograms of Steelhead fork length from previous years suggest that most two-year old Steelhead smolts are greater than 120 mm in length during the spring migration. We recorded daily catches of Steelhead parr (< 120 mm) caught at each downstream trapping site, but, because there was no way of knowing what proportion of the total parr population these downstream migrants represented, we did not attempt to estimate parr populations by mark-recapture. Conversely, it was reasonable to assume that all smolts were downstream migrants. However, trapping personnel have noted marks from previous years on captured Steelhead smolts, indicating that at least a small portion of Steelhead >120 mm that are counted as smolts are actually parr that remain in the river for an additional year. This resulted in some degree of positive bias in estimates of annual smolt yield. During 2005 and 2007-2018, we collected scale samples from randomly selected Steelhead captured at the RSTs in order to estimate the proportions of age-2+ and age-3+ fish in the smolt population. This was necessary for estimating egg-to-smolt survival since the progeny from one spawning event will outmigrate after either two or three winters in freshwater.

5.1.1.3 Differential marking by period and initial capture location

As in previous years, we estimated smolt abundance in mainstem reaches of the Coquitlam River using a stratified mark-recapture method (Arnason *et al.* 1996, Schwarz *et al.* 2009). Significant temporal variation in capture efficiency (% of marked smolts recovered) is common when mark-recapture methods are used to estimate the abundance of a migrating population (Seber 1982), and stratifying marking by period allows for unbiased estimates when temporal variation in capture efficiency is expected.

To provide distinct mark groups over time, all unmarked Coho and Steelhead smolts captured at the off-channel weirs and the upstream RSTs (RST3, RST4) were differentially batch-marked according to date and location of initial capture (Table 5.1). In addition, unmarked Steelhead captured at RST2 were uniquely marked so that they could be released upstream (\approx 1 km) rather than downstream in order to increase the size of the marked population available for capture at RST2. Similarly, for the uppermost RST site (RST4; Figure 5.1), marked populations of Coho and Steelhead originating from the Grant's Tomb off-channel site were augmented by marking and releasing captured mainstem smolts at a site about 1 km upstream of RST4.

Prior to 2018, the unique mark types consisted of a small clip at one of several fin locations. In 2018, VIE was introduced based on its long mark-retention, ease of distinguishing mark types and greater number of unique mark types possible than with fin clips. VIE used six colours (green, pink, orange, yellow, red and blue) injected into the caudal fin or a clear tissue deposit posterior to the eye. The duration of each marking period was set at 7 days for the 2018 season. This is a departure from prior years in which the duration was based on achieving a minimum recapture target of 40 Coho and 10 Steelhead smolts from each mark group and trapping

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

location. There were two reasons for this change. First, we planned to use a different model to estimate time-stratified capture data that benefits from set length marking strata as well as a higher number of marking strata. Second, VIE allows for a larger number of marking strata than fin clips. To evaluate that detection rates were similar for VIE and fin clips, we compared recapture rates for each method over two weeks. To do this, half the fish at each trap received the VIE mark and the other half received a combination of caudal clips. Capture efficiency for each species, and trap were then tested whether they were significantly different.

Coho and Steelhead smolts as well as Steelhead fry were also given a unique mark based on where they were initially captured (see Table 5.1 and paragraph below). This mark served two purposes. First, it allowed for separate population estimates for mainstem and off-channel habitats. Since all off-channel fish were marked, all unmarked fish captured at the RSTs were assumed to be of mainstem origin and then could be used to estimate the number of mainstem fish passing each RST. The second purpose was to evaluate whether fish marked at off-channel weirs had similar capture efficiencies at each RST as mainstem fish. If they were similar, both could be used to estimate the number of unmarked smolts (mainstem origin) passing each RST. If they were different, then only mainstem marked fish would be used. This is more of an issue for Coho than Steelhead since very few Steelhead smolts originated from the off-channel sites while a large proportion of marked Coho smolts do. This is a concern for Coho because previous work in the Coquiltam River has shown significant differences in capture efficiencies for smolts originating from these two habitat types (Decker and Lewis 2000; Decker *et al.* 2003), suggesting that estimates based on combined marked populations could be biased. By separately analyzing marking and recovery data for these different mark groups, we were able to evaluate the capture efficiency of smolts marked as originating from mainstem versus off-channel habitat passing the same RST.

Since the precision of mark-recapture estimates generally improves with the number of smolts marked, it is advantageous to generate estimates based on combining data for different mark groups. To decide which spatial mark groups could be included in the final mark-recapture dataset for a particular RST, we used the following rationale and statistical tests:

1. We assumed that capture efficiency for unmarked smolts from the mainstem would be better approximated by observed capture efficiency for marked mainstem smolts than by observed capture efficiency for marked off-channel smolts, although we were not able to test this (see section 5.1.1.5),
2. Using Fisher's exact test, we tested whether overall capture efficiency (pooled data for temporal mark groups) differed ($P < 0.05$) for marked smolts from the off-channel and mainstem areas. For example, capture efficiencies (CE) for off-channel and mainstem smolts at RST2 were computed as:

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

$$\frac{\sum_i^6 R_{\text{off-channel},i}}{\sum_i^6 M_{\text{off-channel},i}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sum_i^6 R_{RST2,RST3,RST4,i}}{\sum_i^6 M_{RST2,RST3,RST4,i}} \quad (5.1)$$

where

$R_{\text{off-channel},i}$ = number of marked off-channel smolts from marking period i that were recaptured at RST2

$M_{\text{off-channel},i}$ = number of off-channel smolts marked during marking period i

$R_{RST1,RST2,RST3}$ = number of marked mainstem smolts (all mainstem trapping locations summed) from marking period i that were recaptured at RST2

$M_{RST2,RST3,RST4,i}$ = number of mainstem smolts that were marked during marking period i

3. If we failed to detect a difference in CE, all mark groups were considered in the dataset used to compute the final mark-recapture estimate. On the other hand, if a difference was detected, the final dataset was limited to data for the mainstem mark groups only.
4. Off-channel mark groups were also rejected if when compared to the estimate using only the mainstem mark group, the estimate using both mainstem and off-channel mark groups was either 1) less precise or 2) differed by more than the standard error of either estimate.

5.1.1.4 Population estimates

For the three off-channel sites where full-span weirs were operated, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we assumed a capture efficiency of 100% for each weir, and used the total number of smolts captured to estimate smolt production.

We estimated the number of smolts passing each RST on the mainstem of the Coquitlam River using one or more analytical approaches that all rely on a two-sample mark-recapture method. In this study, smolts captured and marked at the weirs or upstream RSTs constituted the marking sample and smolts recovered at an RST represent the recovery sample. With stratified mark-recapture methodology, both the marking and recovery samples are stratified.

Darroch Maximum Likelihood Estimator

For 2000-2017, we used the maximum likelihood (ML) model developed by Darroch (1961) and modified by Plante (1990) for stratified mark-recapture data. We refer to this model as the Darroch ML model. Darroch ML population estimates and confidence intervals were computed using a software package that is available to the public (SPAS, <http://www.cs.umanitoba.ca/>)

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

~popan/). A description of the ML estimator and the use of the SPAS software is provided by Arnason *et al.* (1996). In general, we delineated six marking and recovery periods although in some cases, it was necessary to pool strata to avoid small sample and numeric problems that may have prevented the maximum likelihood iterations from converging. When pooling strata, we followed the recommendations of Arnason *et al.* (1996). When there were no recaptures in a recovery stratum, it was dropped rather than pooled (Schwarz and Taylor 1998).

Bayesian Time Stratified Petersen Analysis System

In 2018, we used a Bayesian spline model using the package BTSPAS (Bayesian Time Stratified Petersen Analysis System) developed by Bonner and Schwarz (2014), which was run in the R statistical programming environment (R Core Team 2016). The model was configured for non-diagonal data since marked smolts are often recaptured in the strata they were marked in as well as the next strata. The method has two main components, 1) modeling the general shape of abundance during outmigration using a spline and 2) using a hierarchical Bayesian model that can share capture probabilities (capture efficiency) across strata. BTSPAS is similar to the Darroch ML estimator but can deal with several commonly encountered data problems. First, it helps reduce problems from low numbers of recaptures in some temporal strata by “sharing” capture efficiency information among adjacent strata. Second, the model automatically adjusts the amount it “shares” mark-recapture data between strata based on the amount they vary across periods. It will share capture efficiency data when it is similar (analogous to pooling) but when it isn’t, it estimates realistic precision when variation is high. Third, it can interpolate capture rates for strata with missing or minimal mark-recapture data or for strata with missing unmarked fish data.

The model assumes continuous operation of the recapture trap within a stratum. In cases where the recapture trap operates in only a portion of the stratum, the heterogeneity in capture efficiency within the strata is not properly incorporated into the model, leading to overly optimistic estimates of precision as well as bias. Instead, these strata must be flagged as problematic so the data is treated as missing and abundance imputed based on the spline.

Each of the three MCMC chains was run for 20,000 iterations. The first 10,000 were discarded and the remainder thinned at a ratio of 1:50. This provided 6,000 iterations for each estimate.

Model fit was assessed using Bayesian p-values to quantify the similarity between expected and observed recaptures, unmarked captures and both combined. Values close to 0.5 reflect good fit. Values near 0 or 1 indicate potential problems. These values are based on the discrepancy between observed and expected data using either Freeman-Tukey (Freeman-Tukey 1950) or deviance statistics (Schwarz *et al.* 2009). Second, we checked for model convergence using the Brooks-Rubin-Gelman statistic (BRG, Brooks and Gelman (1998). Values close to 1, or less than 1.2 were considered adequate.

The present version of BTSPAS does not account for incomplete sampling in capture efficiency estimates. This can lead to biased estimates depending on whether a) incomplete sampling occurred at both the marking and recapture site, b) the marked fraction was constant

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

within each strata and c) marking or recapture was impacted by the incomplete sampling (Schwarz pers.com.). It is possible to “adjust” the number of marked, recaptured or unmarked fish under some circumstances to generate unbiased results. However, precision would be biased high in such situations since the uncertainty from any adjustments are not incorporated into the model. Details of when and how this was done are included in section 5.2. Uncertainty is incorporated into the estimate for strata with incomplete sampling only by excluding all recaptured and unmarked fish with the strata, leaving abundance to be imputed based on the spline.

Pooled Peterson Estimator

For years or RST sites with inadequate numbers of marked or recaptured fish to use the Darroch ML model, we used the pooled Peterson Estimator (PPE) for a point estimates of abundance but without confidence intervals. Estimates using the PPE are often biased when capture efficiency varies through the survey period as has often been the case (Arnason *et al.* 1996) and generally overestimates the precision of the estimate (Schwarz *et al.* 2009).

Reach Level Abundance

To estimate smolt abundance originating in each mainstem reach (N_{reach}), we computed an estimate of mainstem smolts passing a RST at the downstream end of that reach, and then subtracted from this the estimate for the next RST upstream:

$$N_{reach\ 2} = N_{RST2} - N_{RST3} \quad (5.5)$$

$$N_{reach\ 3} = N_{RST3} - N_{RST4} \quad (5.6)$$

$$N_{reach\ 4} = N_{RST4} \quad (5.7)$$

where $N_{reach\ i}$ was the estimated abundance from reach i and N_{RSTi} represents the estimated number of mainstem fish passing an RST site. Note the due to the catch data input into the Darroch ML estimator, N_{RSTi} is estimated directly. However, BTSPAS generates estimates of both the total number of smolts (N_{RST}) and unmarked smolts (U_{RSTi}). With BTSPAS, we used the estimated the number of unmarked fish passing each RST (U_{RSTi}) and then added the number of fish marked (M) upstream minus any marked mortalities (m) to estimate the total number of mainstem fish passing the RST (N_{RSTi}). Both approaches result in the same estimate of N but including or not including marked fish in N is simplified with the latter approach. Note that when smolts are marked, transported upstream and released, they are not included in N for the trap where they were marked. Marked fish (M) are added to U for each trapping location as follows:

$$N_{RST2} = U_{RST2} + M_{RST3} + M_{RST4} - (m_{RST3} + m_{RST4}) \quad (5.8)$$

$$N_{RST3} = U_{RST3} + M_{RST4} - m_{RST4} \quad (5.9)$$

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

$$N_{RST4} = U_{RST4} \quad (5.10)$$

The key to estimating the abundance of smolts only originating from the Coquitlam River mainstem was that all off-channel smolts were marked, thus allowing them to be distinguished from mainstem smolts. Therefore, we assume that all unmarked smolts captured at mainstem sites are mainstem origin fish.

To compute 95% confidence intervals for $N_{reach\ 2}$ and $N_{reach\ 3}$, we summed variances for all relevant upstream RST or minnow-trapping mark-recapture estimates. For example, the 95% confidence interval for smolt estimates for reach 2 would be:

$$\pm 95\% CI(N_{reach\ 2}) = \pm 1.96\sqrt{Var(N_{RST2}) + Var(N_{RST3})} \quad (5.11)$$

Since reach 4 is the uppermost reach, the variance of population estimates is not affected by the uncertainty of mark-recapture estimates for trapping sites upstream:

$$\pm 95\% CI(N_{reach\ 4}) = \pm 1.96\sqrt{Var(N_{RST4})} \quad (5.12)$$

Coho and Steelhead smolt production for the Coquitlam River mainstem upstream of RST2 is simply N_{RST2} with a 95% confidence interval of:

$$\pm 95\% CI(N_{mainstem}) = \pm 1.96\sqrt{Var(N_{RST2})} \quad (5.13)$$

The estimate for total smolt numbers for the Coquitlam River study area upstream of RST2 including the four off-channel sites was computed as:

$$N_{total} = N_{RST2} + N_{Off-channel} \quad (5.14)$$

with a 95% confidence interval of:

$$\pm 95\% CI(N_{total}) = \pm 1.96\sqrt{Var(N_{RST2})} \quad (5.15)$$

5.1.1.5 Mark-recapture assumptions

We evaluated the assumption of population closure by plotting a frequency histogram of daily smolt catches for each weir or RST and then comparing the numbers of smolts captured at the beginning and end of the trapping period to captures during the peak of the migration. Very low catches at the tails of the trapping period relative to catches during the peak were taken as an indication that most smolts emigrated during the trapping period. We assumed 100% mark

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

retention and 0% marking-induced mortality based on two earlier studies using similar marking procedures (Decker 1998; Decker and Lewis 1999). With respect to the assumption of equal capture efficiency for marked and unmarked smolts, we assumed marking did not change capture efficiency at the RSTs, but we did not test this directly. To do so would require that there be more than one potential recapture event for individual fish with similar effort for each trapping period (Seber 1982). In our study, individual fish may be recaptured at more than one RST site, but trapping effort is not equal among sites because the efficiency of each RST depends on its location. The steps taken to address potential differences in capture efficiency between marked and unmarked smolts are described in section 5.1.1.3. With respect to the assumptions of constant capture efficiency and proportions of marked to unmarked smolts over time, the use of a stratified mark-recapture design minimizes or avoids violations of these two assumptions by stratifying both the marking and recovery periods. We limited the time period during which capture efficiency and the proportion of marked to unmarked smolts were assumed to be constant to 7 days or less (Table 5.1).

5.1.2 Chum and Pink fry enumeration

5.1.2.1 Downstream trapping

To estimate Chum and Pink fry out-migrant numbers, we relied on similar methodology to that employed by Cope (2002) on the nearby Alouette River. Prior to 2008 we used two incline plane traps (IPTs) to capture Chum and Pink fry. Beginning in 2008, a 1.3 m diameter RST was used in place of the IPTs (two RSTs were used in 2009). The substitution of an RST for the IPTs reduced cleaning and maintenance demands as well as fish mortality. The RST targeting Chum was operated in reach 2 at the same location as the two RSTs used to trap Coho and Steelhead smolts (RST2 site; Figure 5.1). The main difference between fry and smolt traps is that fry trap uses a smaller screening than smolt traps (2.5 mm versus 12 mm, respectively).

5.1.2.2 Differential marking over time

To generate temporally stratified mark-recapture estimates, the trapping season was divided into weekly strata. Each week, catches of fry from 1-2 days were marked and released just downstream of RST3, approximately 3.2 km upstream of the RST2 trapping site. Releases were limited to the first half of the week to allow sufficient time for marked fish to pass the RST2 prior to the end of each week. Thus, all recaptures are assumed to occur within the stratum they are released in. This provided temporally stratified data without the need for different marks. This differed from the approach taken for Coho and Steelhead smolts in that marking was not continuous across all days and recaptures occurred over several subsequent strata.

We mass-marked fry by placing them in a solution of Bismark brown Y, a vital stain (Deacon 1963), and water (1:100,000 concentration) for one hour. Adequate oxygen levels within the solution were maintained using bottled oxygen and a flow meter. Fry were held in a live box and released at dusk to reduce predation. Mortalities prior to release were noted and subtracted from the count for each mark group. Mark loss was not assessed, but Deacon (1963) suggests that fry marked with Bismark brown are readily identifiable for at least 5 days

following staining, which agreed with our own observations. Daily captures of Chum were individually sorted from other species (Coho, Chinook and Steelhead), counted and inspected for marks.

5.1.2.3 Population estimates

The population estimate and 95% confidence interval for Chum passing the RST2 site was computed using the same methodology as that for Coho and Steelhead (i.e., N_{RST2} ; see section 5.1.1.4). This included the Darroch ML estimator for 2000-2018 and BTSPAS for 2018 only (see section 5.1.1.4). The estimation process for Darroch ML and BTSPAS is simplified for Chum and Pink fry since all recaptures occur within the marking strata owing to the typically 1-2 days for marked fry to pass RST2. This is referred to as diagonal captures.

5.2 Results

Monitoring during 2018 was distinct from all other years during both of the flow treatment periods. First, discharge was substantially higher during April and May. Discharge from the Coquitlam Dam's low level outlet gate was increased to 8 m³/s April 1-May 31 as part of the Kwikwetlem Sockeye Restoration Program (KSRP). This represents an over two-fold increase from the Treatment 2 minimum discharge levels for April (3.5 m³/s) and May (2.9 m³/s). The consequence on monitoring was that RSTs operated at higher flow levels during this period compared with other Treatment 2 and Treatment 1 years. As discussed in the following sections, this added complexity to how crews managed the traps, generally decreased the effectiveness of RST operation, and decreased both the precision and reliability for some population estimates.

Second, all aspects of on-river monitoring were completed by a new contractor, Instream Fisheries Research (IFR). However, IFR has extensive experience with similar monitoring projects, and IFR relied on photos and descriptions from prior contract staff to replicate trap and weir installation and sampling methods for consistency with prior years.

5.2.1 Off-channel sites

In 2018, off-channel weirs were operational starting the second week of April. This was approximately two weeks later than usual. The delay was a result of transitioning to a new monitoring contractor. Daily catches of Coho smolts at the off-channel weirs at the beginning and end of the trapping period were very low compared to catches during the peak of the migration (Figure 5.3). Therefore, we assumed that population closure was largely met for Coho. There were no trap breaches and no indications smolts were able to bypass weirs without capture. While IFR crews inspected each of the off-channel areas for alternate exits, their survey was not exhaustive and no tests for closure were completed due to other monitoring priorities. For these reasons, we consider that weir counts likely represent outmigration from off-channel sites but with less certainty than for previous years. For Steelhead, daily captures were too low and sporadic to assess whether off-channel weir operation spanned the entire outmigration period (Figure 5.4). Observed mortality for Coho was 6.5% at Grant's Tomb and 1.1% or less at the other weirs. There were no Steelhead mortalities at the off-channel weir sites.

In 2018, an aggregate total of 1,560 Coho and 18 Steelhead smolts were captured at the downstream weirs as they outmigrated from the Overland, Or Creek, Archery Ponds and Grant's Tomb off-channel sites (Table 5.2). This was the lowest outmigration for each off-channel habitat and for all combined since 2000 (Table 6). Even though this was the first year that traps were installed and operated by Instream Fisheries Research (IFR), it is unlikely that the lower counts were the product of outmigrating smolts evading capture. Staff from the prior contractor that now work with IFR and were familiar with prior off-channel trapping operations checked that stop nets were installed at all alternative exits.

The mean weighted density of Coho smolts in the off-channel sites was 5.8 smolts/100 m² while Steelhead smolt density was 0.1 smolts/100 m² (Table 5.2). In terms of areal density, trends across years and flow treatment periods for Coho were flat for Or Creek Ponds and declining for Archery Ponds, Grant's Tomb, and Overland (Figure 5.5a). The density of Steelhead has been variable at the off-channel sites, with no clear trends across years (Figure 5.5b). The proportion of production for the entire Coquitlam River upstream of RST2 originating from constructed off-channel sites was 17%-68% for Coho and 0.3%-9% for Steelhead.

5.2.2 Coquitlam River mainstem

5.2.2.1 Discharge and trap operations

In 2018, the discharge in the Coquitlam River during the spring trapping period was heavily influenced by the increased releases from the Coquitlam Reservoir dam's low level outlet (LLO). Discharge from the LLO was increased to 8 m³/s April 1-May 31 as part of the Kwikwetlem Sockeye Restoration Program (KSRP). This represents over a 2-fold increase from the Treatment 2 minimum discharge levels for April (3.5 m³/s) and May (2.9 m³/s). As a result, mean daily discharge at Port Coquitlam WSC station was nearly double the Treatment 2 average during April-May, while it was below average for March and near average for June (Table 5.4). Daily mean flows exceeded 20 m³/s on three occasions during Chum and Pink fry migration and once during Steelhead and Coho migration (Figure 5.2). Trap operation was suspended on a number of occasions due to actual or expected flows exceeding the trap capacity. The two downstream trap locations were most affected by the higher flows. Flows exceeded the 15 m³/s limit for the RST2 fry trap a total of 27 days out of the 82 day monitoring period. These were spread over seven occasions that ranged from one to 12 days in duration. The longest of these (April 6-17) occurred just prior to peak outmigration and two short (1-2 day) outages did occur during the peak. Smolt trapping at RST2 and 3 was suspended on seven occasions of 1-4 days each. Four of these outages, totaling 9 days, occurred during a sustained period of high water April 6-17. Steelhead and Coho captures were still low at this early stage of outmigration. Without the additional 5 m³/s released from the LLO as part of the KSRP, outages would likely have been reduced to one day for smolt traps and four days for the fry trap.

Overall, observed mortality at the RSTs was 1.2% for Coho and 1.0% for Steelhead smolts, 10% for Chum fry, and 13% for Pink fry. The relatively high mortality for Chum and Pink reflect that the trap operated at flows near its upper limit for most of the outmigration

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

period. The upper flow limit for each RST is based on crew safety as well as fish health. At higher discharges, fry and smolts are at increased risk of trauma as they are captured in the RST and while being held in the trap box.

Daily catches of all species at the beginning and end of the trapping period were very low compared to catches during the peak of the migration (Figures 5.3, 5.4, and 5.7). This suggests that population closure was largely met, though there was no monitoring for early season downstream movement of Coho in 2018.

Appendix 5.1 provides a summary of mark recapture statistics (all release and recovery strata pooled) for each species and mark group, and estimates of the number of smolts passing each RST (not to be confused with estimates of smolt yield from each reach). Stratified mark-recapture data (catch tables) used to generate estimates of the number of Coho and Steelhead passing each RST site are shown in Appendix 5.2.

5.2.2.2 Coho

Table 5.2 lists estimates of mainstem smolt production for Reach 2-4 individually, as well as for all three reaches combined, with and without off-channel sites. Appendix 5.1 lists summary mark-recapture statistics used for the population estimates as well as mean capture efficiencies, and the mark group used for the population estimates.

At RST4, capture efficiency was significantly different between the off-channel and mainstem mark groups (37% and 25%, respectively, Fisher's exact test, $P=0.01$, Table 5.3, Figure 5.8). For this reason, we used only the mainstem mark group for the estimate of mainstem smolts passing RST4. Using BTSPAS, we estimated that 1,936 Coho smolts (95% CI: ± 412 smolts) passed the reach 4 trapping site (Table 5.2), which also represents the smolt production for this reach. Note precision from BTSPAS is represented by 95% credible intervals, which in this report are considered analogous to 95% confidence intervals from the Darroch ML estimator used in past years. Reduced capture efficiency and consequently lower numbers of recaptured smolts accounts for the lower precision than previous years. It is difficult to interpret if the model fit was good since the Bayesian p-value of 0.29 falls in between good (0.5) and poor (0 or 1). The consequence of a poor fitting model is that the actual precision could be lower than reported values since uncertainty from a poor fitting model is not incorporated into the estimate.

At RST3, capture efficiency using marked off-channel and mainstem Coho smolts were again significantly different (10% and 15%, respectively, Fisher's exact test, $P<0.05$; Table 5.3, Figure 5.8). Therefore, we only used the mainstem mark group to estimate that $4,118 \pm 1,053$ mainstem smolts passed RST3. Once smolts from reach 4 were subtracted, we estimated the production from reach 3 to be $2,183 \pm 1,053$ smolts. Overall model fit was poor (Bayesian p-value = 0.15). We considered the estimate to be unbiased even though trapping was not continuous at RST3 during six of the 12 week marking period because both recaptures and captures of unmarked smolts were similarly affected by the missed trapping days. For this to be the case, the marked fraction at the marking site must be assumed to be constant within each stratum. This largely applies to fish marked at RST4 for two reasons. First, all fish captured

were marked and since the trap is assumed to have constant capture efficiency within each stratum, the marked fraction can be assumed to be constant when the trap is operating. Second, trapping at the marking site was continuous for the strata used by the model to estimate capture efficiency (strata 4-12). Abundance was fit by the spline alone for the first three strata.

At RST2, capture efficiency was significantly different for the mainstem mark and off-channel mark groups (35% and 30%, respectively, $P < 0.01$; Table 5.3, Figure 5.8). Discontinuous RST2 trap operation necessitated using only smolts marked at RST4. This is for the same reason that smolts marked at RST4 allowed for an unbiased RST3 estimate. However these reasons did not hold for the RST3 mark group largely because trapping was not continuous, particularly during several strata when there were relatively large numbers of marked and recaptured fish. Using only the RST4 mark group, we estimated smolt production from reach 2 at $3,767 \pm 1,680$, once the contribution from reaches 3 and 4 were removed. We estimated smolt production for the entire mainstem upstream of RST2 at $7,866 \pm 1,654$ smolts and including off-channel areas was at $9,446 \pm 1,654$. Model fit was good (Bayesian p-value = 0.49) suggesting the reported precision is a good indication of actual uncertainty.

Average estimated Coho smolt density in the Coquitlam River mainstem was 4.9 smolts/100 m² and 5.0 smolts/100 m² including the off-channel sites. Areal Coho density was two-fold higher in reach 4 (10.1 smolts/100m², Table 5.2), than in reach 2 (4.5 smolts /100 m²) and reach 3 (4.7 smolts /100 m²). The precision of estimates for individual reaches ranged from $\pm 21\%$ for the estimate for reach 4, to $\pm 48\%$ for the smolt estimate for reach 3 (Table 5.2). This is considerably lower than many previous years but still in the range to provide useful information for evaluating flow effects. This is partly due to the reduced numbers of marked smolts used to estimate capture efficiency as a result of using only the RST4 mark group. It is also a product of the way BTSPAS includes the uncertainty when abundance for a stratum with missing mark-recapture data is based on fitting the spline.

Abundance estimates across all years and reaches for Coho are reported in Table 5.6. The analysis of abundance estimate trends across all study years and low treatment periods is included in Section 6.

5.2.2.3 Steelhead

At RST4, too few Steelhead smolts were recaptured at RST4 to adequately quantify capture efficiency, which is necessary to estimate abundance using even the pooled Peterson Estimator. Out of the 82 smolts marked at RST4 and released upstream and 16 marked at Grant's Tomb off-channel site, only 2 mainstem and no off-channel marked smolts were recaptured. This equates to a 2% capture efficiency for the mainstem mark group whereas in prior years capture efficiency for the trap 2000-2017 was 30-60%. However, the 2% rate is highly uncertain since small changes in the number of recaptures through sampling error would lead to the very large changes in estimated capture efficiency, and consequently in the abundance estimates as well. For instance, two additional recaptures would double the capture efficiency and drop the abundance estimate by half. There was also no support for substituting capture efficiency rates from past years for 2018. At the mean capture efficiency from 2008-2017, we would expect 25-50 recaptures from the 82 marked, not the two that were recaptured. Doing so would lead to a

substantial underestimate of production from reach 4. There were two likely reasons for the low number of recaptures: 1) the switch to a 1.8m diameter trap from the 2.4 used previously, and 2) a more than doubling of the flow in reach 4. Simply put, the smaller trap combined with much more water meant that much smaller proportion of flow was intercepted by the trap. This had a compounded effect on the number of recaptures. It reduced the number of marked fish available for recapture as well as the proportion of marked fish that were recaptured. For example, for every 100 fish passing RST4, a capture efficiency of 50% would result in 25 recaptures, whereas a rate of 25% would yield only 6 recaptures.

The lower catch at RST4 would also reduce the precision of the RST2 and RST3 estimates by reducing the number of marked fish available for recapture at the downstream traps. Precision is partly related to the number of recaptures. The effect would be largest for RST3, which depends entirely on RST4 for all marked fish, and less so for RST2 since only 25-50 % of marked fish are from RST4.

At RST3, there were also too few Steelhead smolts recaptured to estimate the number of Steelhead smolts passing the trap. Only 4 of the 82 marked at RST4 were recaptured and none of the 16 marked at off-channel sites were recaptured. Capture efficiency is commonly in the 15-20% range for this trap. The lower efficiency in 2018 was due in part to the higher discharge, the switch to a 1.5m diameter trap from the 1.8m trap used previously, and the move to a new location that lacked the well-defined thalweg that concentrates fish within a portion of the channel. The RST3 site was moved approximately 200 m upstream due to changes in site access. The channel width and depth at the new site was considered insufficient for traps larger than 1.5 m.

At RST2, capture efficiency was not significantly different for mainstem and off-channel mark groups (22% off-channel and 14% mainstem, $P = 0.33$; Table 5.3), but as with previous years, this was largely a result of insufficient power to detect a difference. Among the mainstem mark groups, we used only smolts marked at RST2 for the estimate that 5,572 ($\pm 4,220$) Steelhead smolts passed RST2. This also represents the estimate of mainstem production for the Coquitlam River upstream of RST2. When we included Steelhead from off-channel habitats, the estimate for all areas upstream of RST2 was 5,590 ($\pm 4,220$). Average Steelhead density in the Coquitlam River mainstem was 3.7 smolts/100 m² and 3.1 smolts/100 m² in the Coquitlam River including the off-channel sites, Table 5.2.

The lower precision for 2018 was partly the product of estimating capture efficiency with a relatively low number of recaptured smolts compared to prior years (58 in 2018 compared with 116 in 2017) even though capture efficiency at RST2 was similar to past years. In past years, recaptures at RST2 included smolts marked at all three RSTs and off-channel traps in some years whereas in 2018, this was reduced to only the RST2 mark group. This decision was based on balancing the objective of maximizing precision and maintaining low bias given that sampling was discontinuous during six of the 12 strata. As described for the Coho estimates, the RST4 mark group would have allowed for an unbiased estimate however, with only 13 recaptures, no BTSPAS estimate was possible. The RST2 and 3 mark groups can result in biased estimates depending on the degree to which discontinuous trap operation disproportionately affected the

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

number of recaptures compared with the catch of unmarked fish. Reducing the bias relies on adjusting the number of marks and/or recaptures in the effected strata, which depends on the time for marked fish to travel between the release site and RST2 as well as the timing of the trap outages within that stratum. This is complex for non-diagonal data, and even more for mark groups with different travel times. Using only one mark group simplified this rather than using marks from RST2 and 3. The RST2 mark group was easier to adjust, because of its' shorter travel time, and it was a more informative mark group due to its much larger number recaptures than the RST3 mark group. For this mark group, the numbers of marks and recaptures during the first four strata, during which sampling was discontinuous, were set to "missing" as there were no recaptures. For these strata, abundance was estimated by the spline. Minimal adjustments were required for the remaining two strata with discontinuous trap operation. For the sixth strata, no adjustments were made to the number of marks or recaptures since the trap outage occurred before any marking during this period. However, the number of unmarked captures was increased to account for the missed sampling day. For the seventh strata, we increased the number of recaptures by 2 smolts, or 1 for each of the two days the trap didn't operate. This reflected the average recapture rate before and after the trap outage.

We assumed all Steelhead 120-230 mm in fork length to be smolts. As in previous years, 120 mm corresponded to the minima between two defined modes representing age-1+ and age-2+ and older juveniles, respectively (Figure 5.6). This was corroborated by scale samples collected for Steelhead in this size range during 2005-2018 (Appendix 5.3). Scale analysis of 627 individuals indicated a broad overlap (130-188 mm) in the absolute ranges in fork length for age-2 and age-3 smolts, but most smolts greater than 160 mm in length were age-3 (Appendix 5.3). Age-4 smolts were also present in the scale sample, ranging in length from 171 mm to 222 mm. Age-4 smolts comprised 5%-10% of smolts 165-194mm fork length and 30%-60% of smolts 195-220mm. To estimate Steelhead adult-to-smolt survival for the 2005-2015 escapement years (the broods of later escapement have yet to smolt), we used age-2/age-3 length cut-offs of 160-170 mm (depending on the year) to estimate the proportions of age-2 smolts in the 2007-2016 smolt populations. The proportion of age-2 smolts ranged from 50%-67% among years. Fish larger than 230 mm had the general appearance of resident rainbow trout (i.e., cryptic colouring, heavily spotting) as opposed to smolts (bright silver), and some were sexually mature.

We assumed that age-1+ Steelhead (fork length < 120mm) will outmigrate after one or two additional winters in the Coquitlam River. While Steelhead parr (fork length < 120mm) are caught at the RSTs, it has been unclear whether this reflects downstream movement, representing unaccounted for production, or if caught parr were intercepted during local movement confined within a reach. The proportion of captures of Steelhead < 120mm was largest and most variable at RST2 based on captures from the last five years (15%-42% of total captures, Table 5.5). To evaluate this, we marked Steelhead parr at all three mainstem trapping sites. Downstream movement would be indicated by recaptures of parr at traps downstream of their marking location where as recaptures at the marking trap would indicate primarily local movement. Of the 23 parr marked at RST4 and 41 marked at RST3, the single recapture for each group occurred at the marking traps and none at a downstream trap. Since RST2 is the lowest trap in

5. Smolt and Fry Outmigration

the system, recaptures of parr marked there is not a clear indication of net downstream movement since this could also represent local movement.

There was no indication that a switch to marking smolts using VIE from fin clips impacted the capture efficiency. For Coho, capture efficiency estimates were nearly identical for both marking methods (clipped = 0.33, VIE = 0.32; Appendix 5.4). The difference in capture efficiency was also very small for Steelhead (clipped = 0.21, VIE = 0.18). The Chi square test of independence also support the finding that mark type did not impact capture efficiency (Chi square test, Coho $p = 0.63$, Steelhead $p = 0.55$; Appendix 5.4). Comparing capture efficiency between the two marking methods reflects the sum total of all ways that marking methods could impact the number of reported recaptures including: survival between marking and recapture; behavioural changes impacting catchability; mark loss and mark detection.

Abundance across all years and reaches for Steelhead are reported in Table 5.6. Analysis of abundance trends across years or by flow treatment period are included in Section 6.

5.2.2.4 Chum and Pink

Both Chum and Pink salmon fry were present in the Coquitlam River during spring 2018. Chum and Pink were trapped from March 6 to May 11 at the RST2 location in reach 2 (Appendix 5.3). Trap operation was discontinuous during six of the 8 weekly strata for Chum and Pink. For Chum capture efficiency varied from 3%-7.0% (Appendix 5.2), and averaged 5% (all strata pooled Appendix 5.1). Capture efficiency for Pink varied from 3%-12% and averaged 6%. The number of recaptures was likely unaffected by any of the trap outages. For Chum and Pink, marked fish are released during only one or two days during each stratum and typically all recaptures occur on the day follow the release. None of the trap outages occurred within the 1-2 days of any release period. However the number of unmarked fry was greatly impacted by the trap outages. We accounted for this by expanding the total catch for each stratum by average daily catch for the stratum and the number of days that were missed.

During 2018, an estimated 3.9 ± 0.26 million Chum fry and $114,846 \pm 46,330$ Pink fry (Table 5.2) migrated past the RST2 trapping site. Note, that these estimates do not include the uncertainty from expanding the number of unmarked fry to account for missed trapping days. Considering that the fry trap was out of operation for approximately 27 days of the 82 day operating period, the actual precision of these estimates is likely far lower than those reported. Based on abundance estimates, density in the mainstem of the Coquitlam River for Chum of 0.53 million fry/km or 2,214 fry/100 m² and for Pink of 15,313 fry/km or 64 fry/100 m² (Table 5.2).

5.2.2.5 Sockeye/Kokanee

In 2018, catches of Sockeye/Kokanee smolts at RST 2-4 were 11, 2 and 8; respectively (Table 5.7). Mortality rates were 0%-38% across the trapping sites and averaged 20% for all traps combined. Sockeye/Kokanee captured each year at all traps during Treatment 1 and 2 have ranged from 10's of fish to several hundred (2005-2007). Even with the assistance of increased discharge from the LLO during April and May in 2018, catches were at the low end of historic

levels. Given the limited number of fish captured, no attempt was made to mark fish or generate population estimates.

5.2.2.6 Chinook

In 2018, 19 Chinook juveniles were captured by the two smolt traps at the RST2 location and another 196 were captured in the fry trap at RST2. None of the Chinook had a fork length greater than 71 mm, suggesting all were age-0 fish. As in past years, there was no attempt to distinguish between the age-classes and they were not included in the mark-recapture program, which would have been necessary to estimate the number of outmigrants.

5.2.2.7 Coho Fry

In addition to Coho smolt production, an additional 3,419 Coho fry were captured at the RST2 fry trap in 2018. Fry catch has ranged from 2,200-30,000 since 2008. As with previous years, there was no attempt in 2018 to include them in the mark-recapture program or estimate the number of outmigrants.

5.3 Discussion

Tables 6.1a and 6.1b in the next section provide estimates of annual escapement, juvenile standing stocks, and smolt production for the Coquitlam River upstream of RST2, along with survival rates from one life stage to the next.

5.3.1 Assumptions of the study design

We assumed all two year and older Steelhead (120-230 mm in length) were smolts. However, there was probably a smaller proportion of smaller Steelhead in this size range, which were likely parr that were dispersing to downstream habitats, and would ultimately be smolting at age-3, or even age-4 (Withers 1966). As well, some of the larger fish in this size range were likely mature residents. In past years we excluded a small number of fish that the trapping crew identified as being resident rainbow trout based on cryptic colouring and heavy spotting as opposed to the typical silvery colouration of a smolt. A number of these fish were confirmed to be sexually mature males or females as they released milt or eggs when light abdominal pressure was applied. However, the vast majority of Steelhead that were captured and recorded as smolts were silvery in appearance (e.g., >97% in 2002 and 2005 when physical characteristics were categorized for all Steelhead captured). Moreover, the average fork length of Steelhead smolts during 1996-2018 varied from 154 mm to 171 mm, which is in good agreement with the expected mean length at ocean entry for Steelhead stocks in the North Pacific (160 mm; CV = 10%-15%; Burgner *et al.* 1992).

We have assumed that captures of Steelhead parr represent within-river movement rather than outmigration yet this has not been confirmed during this monitoring program. If Steelhead do exit the study reaches as parr, this would represent unaccounted for juvenile production. The low number of parr marked at RST3 and 4 did not provide sufficient information about the validity of this assumption.

For Chum and Pink estimates, the primary assumption was the capture efficiency estimated from the 1-3 days per weekly strata reflects the capture efficiency during the remaining days, when no marked fish passed the trap. To minimize the extent of this assumption, the number of release days was increased in 2018 from one to 2-3 days per weekly strata period.

5.3.2 Reliability of estimates and implications for the flow experiment

Results to date suggest that, for the most part, the downstream trapping program in its current form is adequate for the purposes of generating sufficiently precise and reliable estimates of smolt and fry abundance for all species to meet COQMON-07 objectives.

Higgins *et al.* (2002) demonstrated that the statistical power to detect differences in fish production in the Coquitlam River under different flow regimes was strongly influenced by the precision of annual estimates of smolt abundance. Specifically, they showed that for a simulated 12 year-long experiment, power (β) decreases significantly over a range of increasing observation error ($\sigma_{sm,o}$ in their paper) from a high of β : 0.6-0.7 with no observation error to a low of β : 0.3. While this falls short of the goal of ‘moderate’ power ($\beta > 0.8$), the study suggested that there was relatively little drop in power at smolt observation error levels up to 0.1-0.2, which expressed as a 95% confidence interval are $\pm 20\%$ to $\pm 40\%$ of the estimate.

The precision of the 2018 Coho smolt abundance estimate in the Coquitlam River mainstem was moderate (95% CI: $\pm 22\%$) and was lower compared with estimates for 2000-2017 (95% CI: $\pm 6\%$ -14%), but was still much better than the theoretical optimal value of $\pm 20\%$ predicted by Higgins *et al.* (2002). Precision of the 2018 mainstem Steelhead smolt estimate was low (95% CI: $\pm 76\%$) compared with estimates since 2000 (95% CI: $\pm 11\%$ -37%) and considerably lower than the predicted theoretical optimum. With such low precision, the 2018 estimate has lower value for evaluating flow effects than past years. The difference in the precision reflects the much smaller number of recaptured smolts used for the Steelhead estimate (58 smolts) than used for the Coho estimate (130 smolts). Implications from the discontinuous trapping at RST2 and 3 reduced the number of mark groups used for estimates for both species. With few marks available for recapture, the importance of using two rotary screw traps at the most downstream site (RST2) was likely key to avoiding even larger decreases in precision this year.

The precision of fry population estimates for Chum salmon at the RST2 in 2018 was high (95% CI: $\pm 7\%$) compared with previous years using rotary screw traps (95% CI: 6%-18% during 2008-2017) and far higher compared to years using incline plane traps ($\pm 19\%$ -25%). However, this does not include the uncertainty from expanding the number of unmarked captures to account for the numerous and sometimes lengthy trap outages. The high reported precision was largely the product of the moderate capture efficiency (5%) at RST2 and high fry abundance, which combined to result in adequate numbers of recaptures.

The precision of Pink fry estimates in 2018 (95% CI: $\pm 40\%$) was far lower than past rotary screw trap estimates (95% CI: $\pm 12\%$ -19% during 2008-2017). Considering capture efficiency was similar for both Chum and Pink, the difference was likely the product of lower abundance leading to far lower numbers of recaptures. For Pink, there were only 51 recaptures across all

strata while for Chum there were 1,143. This meant there was far less certainty in the capture efficiency for Pink than Chum.

6 Fish Productivity during Treatment 1 and 2

The COQMON-07 uses a Before-After (BA) experimental design where fish metrics (i.e. abundance, survival, productivity) measured under flow Treatment 1 conditions are compared to those under Treatment 2. The expectation of the Consultative Committee (CC) was that increased base flows (all months except June and July) would benefit spawning and/or juvenile rearing of target species (Table 1.1, Figure 1.1). The CC chose an empirical approach to evaluating the benefits of either flow regime. Thus, the primary objective of monitoring is to address the management question:

What are the fisheries benefits of Flow Treatment 1 (2FV) and Treatment 2 (STP6)?

The analysis approach to evaluate the fisheries benefits for Coho and Steelhead relies upon overall smolt production and to a lesser degree on standing stock estimates and survival from one age-class to another. For Pink and Chum salmon, we use egg-to-smolt survival (productivity) as the main metric for the evaluation. We break the evaluation process into three questions.

1. Did fish production or productivity change between Treatment 1 and 2, and by how much? We used the 2-tailed T-test ($\alpha < 0.05$) to test for a statistically significant change in Steelhead and Coho smolt yield. To estimate the amount that Steelhead and Coho smolt yield changed, we used the mean and standard deviation of abundance during each treatment period to generate a posterior distribution of the mean difference between treatments. From this, we estimated the probability that at least a 10%, 20% or 50% change in abundance occurred. Posterior distributions for mean abundance during each treatment as well as the mean difference between treatments were estimated using JAGS (Plummer 2012) called using the BEST (Kruschke 2013) from the “R” statistical package (R Development Core Team 2009). To evaluate whether Chum and Pink salmon productivity changed between treatments, we used the Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) to test whether the flow treatment was a statistically significant predictor of productivity ($\alpha < 0.05$).
2. How much of a change was the consequence of the flow treatments versus other factors? For this, we compared the amount of change in abundance that occurred in the Coquitlam River compared to the abundance changes that occurred over a similar time period at other comparable rivers that did not undergo flow manipulations. These “control” rivers reflect abundance changes due to factors unrelated to the change from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2.
3. What were the main factors impacting abundance, survival or productivity besides minimum flow, which was the primary difference between Treatment 1 and 2? For this we compared linear models with either one or two explanatory factors using the Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AIC_c). AIC_c is used to compare support for different models (Burnham and Anderson 2002). In this context, models differ in the variable used to explain the fish data and whether one or two variables is included. Models with more variables may fit the data better but variable estimates will be less precise. The most parsimonious model from a group

of models is the one which exhibits the best trade-off between fit and precision, and will have the lowest AIC_c value. Models with $\Delta\text{AIC} > 2$ are considered to have strong support, 2-7 moderate support and > 7 low support. We also evaluated the overall effectiveness of the model by the amount of variation explained by a model (R^2). This is important since the model with most support (lowest AIC value) may not be a useful model if it explains only a small amount of the variation. For example, a model with that explains 80% of the variation is more useful one that explains 10%.

The WUP did not specify the amount of change in fish production or productivity to conclude that a meaningful amount had occurred. The CC predicted increases in abundance ranging from 10%-100% (Higgins *et al.* 2002). The expectation of the study was that it would have an 80% probability of detecting a 50% change in abundance, but this not to say that smaller changes would not be of interest to the CC and in decisions about future flows. In light of this, we report the probabilities that production or productivity increased by at least 10%, 20% and 50%.

6.1 Treatment 1 and 2 flows

Treatment 1 and 2 discharges are based on releases from the low level outlet gates (LLOG) at Coquitlam Dam. The LLOG releases for Treatment 2 were categorized as either targeted or minimum discharge. Releases are based on targeted levels other than during periods of limited reservoir capacity or inflows based on a set of rules set out in the Water Use Plan. Generally, targeted releases were higher throughout the year compared with Treatment 1 with the exception of June and July, which were lowered slightly (Table 1.1). Minimum release levels were still higher than Treatment 1 minimums for October to February but similar to Treatment 1 levels for March to September.

Based on flows measured at the Water Survey of Canada station at Port Coquitlam, the increased release from the LLOG during Treatment 2 resulted in higher minimum flows for all months but June-August (Figure 6.1). The absence of an increase in minimum flows for August reflects the frequency that LLOG releases were based on minimum levels rather than on targeted levels. Mean discharge increases were most pronounced during February-April and September-October. This timing corresponds to periods with increased targeted releases as well as relatively low inflows from tributaries below the dam. The difference between minimum and mean discharge was most pronounced during late fall and winter when the contribution from tributaries and spill events represents a large portion of total flow. For the months with higher minimum flows, flows were also more stable during Treatment 2 (Figure 6.1).

Another notable difference between Treatment 1 and 2 was the increase in rampdown events, which occurred almost entirely as a consequence of the monthly change in releases from the LLOGs. While the number of unscheduled rampdowns following higher flow events was similar for each treatment, there were from three to six scheduled rampdowns each year during Treatment 2 while none of comparable size occurred previously (MacNair 2018).

6.2 Coho

6.2.1 Off-channel smolt abundance

Smolt production from the four constructed off-channel habitats² was not considered one of the primary metrics for evaluating the impact of dam regulated flows on freshwater productivity. This is because 1) flows in off-channel areas are stabilized by groundwater inputs and regulated mainstem intakes and 2) continued maintenance of off-channel areas has a large impact on productive capacity. This is not to say that productivity in these areas is unaffected by mainstem flows, but that effects could be less than in the mainstem and, more importantly, mainstem flow effects could be confounded with other factors impacting the productivity of off-channel areas. Production from the four off-channel habitats is reported here because it represents a considerable portion of smolt production for the Coquitlam River and changes in productivity could have population level consequences.

The four monitored off-channel habitats represent about 10% of available habitat in the Coquitlam River study area and supported from 17% to 77% of the overwintering Coho smolt population during 2000-2018. Since monitoring began in 1995, smolt density has generally declined in all four areas but the decline was most pronounced in Grant's Tomb and Overland Channel (Figure 6.2). Mean off-channel smolt density decreased from 28 smolts/100m² during Treatment 1 to 16 smolts/100m² during Treatment 2 (2-tailed t-test, $p = 0.01$). The annual mean density of Coho smolts in the mainstem portion of the study area ranged from 1.9 to 9.2 smolts/100m², which was several times lower than that the average for all the off-channel sites combined (5.8 to 44.9 smolts/100m²). While constructed off-channel habitat may represent relatively productive Coho habitat in the Coquitlam River, the smolt densities in Coquitlam River off-channel sites were below the average densities reported for constructed side-channels and ponds in other Pacific Northwest streams (67 and 69 smolts/100m², respectively; Koning and Keeley 1997).

6.2.2 Mainstem smolt abundance

During 2000-2018, the Coho smolt yield for the 7.5 km long section of the lower Coquitlam River mainstem upstream of the RST2 trapping site ranged from 2,900 to 13,800, with considerable year-to-year variation across the entire study period (Figure 6.3 Table 6.1a). To compare changes between Treatment 1 and 2, we only compare abundance for cohorts that reared entirely under Treatment 1 or 2. In the 2016 and 2017 reports, this meant we excluded estimates from the years 2000 and 2009. We interpreted that the 2000 outmigration cohort reared under Treatment 1 and pre-Treatment 1 and that the 2009 cohort reared under both Treatment 1 and 2. However, we have recently realized that 2000 shouldn't have been excluded for Coho since Treatment 1 was implemented in 1997, not 2000 as we previously understood. There is also no justification for considering 2000 as an outlier year as it is comparable to both

² There are seven major off-channel habitat sites in Coquitlam River, four in the smolt study area, including Grant's Tomb, which was dewatered during 2005-2008 to facilitate repairs to Coquitlam Dam, and three downstream of the study area.

2003 and 2008. As a consequence, for this report we included Treatment 1 smolt estimates from 2000-2008 and Treatment 2 estimates from 2010-2018. Changes in smolt abundance from mainstem habitats only was a more sensitive measure of the effect of flow treatments than changes that included estimates from constructed off-channel habitats, which are buffered from mainstem flows either by groundwater effects or have independently controlled water intakes. For this reason, we only used the mainstem Coho abundance estimates for evaluating flow treatment effects.

The mean abundance of mainstem smolts was 6,173 during Treatment 1 and 7,793 during Treatment 2 (Figure 6.5) and did not amount to a statistically significant change in abundance (2-tailed t-test, $p = 0.180$; Table 6.2). This is a key difference from results reported in the 2000-2017 data report and is entirely the result of including the smolt estimate from 2000 (excluding 2000: 2-tailed t-test, $p = 0.039$). As Treatment 1 flows began in June 1997, Coho smolts outmigrating in 2000 reared entirely under treatment 1 conditions and not under a combination of Treatment 1 and prior conditions. Including the estimate from 2000, the estimated mean abundance for Treatment 1 increased from 5,479 to 6,173 smolts, which in turn reduced the difference between Treatment 1 and 2 to the point that they were not statistically different. Generally, smolt estimates varied more during Treatment 1 (range: 2,870-11,036) than during Treatment 2 (range: 6,573-10,935; Figure 6.3). This consistency in the year-to-year mainstem smolt yield during Treatment 2 is a potentially important outcome of the flow experiment. Maximum smolt yield was similar during each treatment period but minimum yield was lower during Treatment 1 and occurred more frequently (Figure 6.3). This indicates that freshwater carrying capacity was not increased by the Treatment 2. It suggests that under Treatment 2, poor yields were avoided more than raising the productivity of all years.

The amount that abundance changed between treatments (effect size) is a more useful measure for evaluating fisheries benefits than testing merely whether the means are statistically different. There are several ways to evaluate the effect size. One is to evaluate whether the 95% confidence intervals around the mean change in abundance includes the predicted change and excludes 0%, which would represent no change. The mean increase in abundance estimates between Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 was 26% but with broad confidence intervals that span the null hypothesis from no change to a 50% increase (Figure 6.6). Similar to the t-test above, this is an ambiguous result. This effect size for reaches 2 and 3 individual, were similar as for the mainstem in that we couldn't exclude a no or negative change, but a substantial increase was also possible (Figure 6.6). To provide a less ambiguous statistic about the change that occurred, we calculated the probability smolt abundance increased by at least 10%, 20% and 50%. These are listed in Table 6.3. There was a moderate probability (prob = 0.76) of at least a 10% increase in abundance over Treatment 1 levels and a moderate probability (prob = 0.61) of a 20% or greater increase. However, there was little support for a 50% or greater increase (prob = 0.16). It is important to note that this analysis is based on a Before-After experimental design. This design relies on the assumption that any change is predominantly the result of the applied treatment, which in this case was the change in minimum flows from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2.

Though the experiment was not designed as a Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI), we used this analytical approach to test the assumption that results from the BA comparison were

6. Fish Productivity during Treatment 1 and 2

primarily due to the flow treatment. To do this, we compared the relative change between Treatment 1 and 2 in the Coquitlam to the change in abundance in other monitored watersheds on the south coast of BC, Vancouver Island and northern Washington State (Table 6.4). This is a common approach when conducting experiments in natural settings where a host of non-treatment factors cannot be controlled. Without controlling for these factors it is very difficult to distinguish between the treatment effects and other factors, such as regional changes in freshwater productivity. With a BACI analysis, the change smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 in the Coquitlam is compared with the change that occurred in the control streams between the same time periods. The change that occurs at the control watersheds would potentially represent what could have happened without any experimental manipulation. For example, if the production increased in the Coquitlam by 50% and there was a 10% increase in the control streams then the effect size of the flow treatment would be 40% and would suggest the assumption of the BA comparison was largely met. For the Coquitlam, the expectation was that Treatment 2 flows would have a neutral to positive affect on smolt production, and thus, the between treatment increase would be similar (neutral) or larger (positive) than the change that happened over a similar time period in the control streams. Control streams were considered based on proximity to the Coquitlam, consistent flow regulation during 2000-2018, and the availability of at least three abundance estimates per treatment period. We then compared abundance trends in the Coquitlam to each of the control streams for the years 2000-2009. We used this time period to test the correlation since the primary expectation is that Coquitlam and control streams are comparable prior to the application of the treatment (Treatment 2 flows) even though trends may continue afterwards. Only those with a correlation coefficient ≥ 0.5 were included from the analysis. Three streams met the criteria: Alouette R. ($R = 0.75$), Keogh R. ($R = 0.62$) and Sakinaw Cr. ($R = 0.60$, Table 6.5). We then completed the BACI analysis using the mean relative change of the three control streams, the Alouette River individually, and the Keogh and Sakinaw combined. We included the Alouette River analysis since we consider this the most similar monitored watershed in terms of watershed size, location, geomorphology, fish assemblage and abundance trends. We included the analysis using the Keogh and Sakinaw due to concerns about the amount of bias between the pre- and post 2008 estimates for the Alouette.

Results from the BACI analysis provide no support that the increase smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 was the result of the flow treatment or that BA comparison was relatively unaffected by other factors. The mean change in productivity between Treatment 1 and 2 in the Coquitlam River ranged from near zero when compared to the control streams excluding the Alouette, to over a 60% decline when compared to the Alouette (Figure 6.7). This is contrary to the expectation if the BA assumption was satisfied. This is a product of the mean smolt yield in the control streams increasing a similar or greater amount as the Coquitlam, depending on whether the Alouette River is included as a control stream, (Figure 6.8) instead of a greater increase for the Coquitlam than the control streams if the BA assumption was satisfied. The probability that productivity in the Coquitlam River increased by a relatively small amount as a result of Treatment 2 is low when compared to the Keogh and Sakinaw, or to all three control streams (prob = 0.22 and 0.39, respectively; Table 6.6). Using only the Alouette River as the control, there is a low probability that productivity increased by any amount during Treatment 2 (prob = 0.10, Table 6.7). Regardless of using one or several control rivers, there is near zero support for a 50% increase in productivity due to the flow treatment (prob ≤ 0.05 ,

Table 6.6-.7). The decision to use a single or several watersheds for the control depends on whether a single watershed better reflects the non-flow treatment factors influencing smolt production in the Coquiltam River than the using multiple control streams. While the Alouette River is possibly the most suitable control stream, based on proximity, watershed similarity and fish assemblage, Cope (2015) concluded that smolt yield estimates for the Alouette River were biased low prior to 2008, when the trapping site was repositioned further upstream to avoid tidal-driven backwatering. Until the amount that the pre-2008 estimates are biased is quantified, we consider the Alouette data unreliable as a control.

In reach 4, where annual downstream smolt trapping has occurred over a longer time period (1997-present), there is a systematic trend of generally decreasing Coho smolt yields from 1997-2007, but from 2008 onwards, abundance has varied widely with no systematic trends (Figure 6.9). Late summer snorkeling surveys conducted for this study suggest that densities of Coho fry in reaches 2 and 3 were up to several-fold higher during 2006-2018 compared to density estimates obtained during an electrofishing survey in 1997 (Riley *et al.* 1997; see Section 4.3.2) when flows from dam releases were considerably lower (see Section 1) and prior to the implementation of Treatment 1 and 2.

The initial steep slope of both the escapement-to-smolt and escapement-to-fall fry Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship suggests the Coquiltam River is productive system that reaches carrying capacity at relatively low escapement levels and that beyond this threshold fry and smolt abundance is relatively insensitive to additional spawning adults (Figure 6.10). The 2009 smolt yield stands as an outlier in this stock-recruitment relationship (Figure 6.10). Estimated Coho spawner densities during 2002-2016 ranged from 70 to 1,038 fish/km (Table 2.4), or 34 to 519 females/km, assuming a 1:1 sex ratio. These values exceeded, by 1.8- to 25-fold, an established theoretical minimum threshold of 19 females/km deemed necessary to achieve the maximum Coho smolt yield in an average coastal stream, as suggested by Bradford and Myers (2000). The average proportion of adults counted in mainstem habitats increased substantially from Treatment 1 (51%) to Treatment 2 (87%, Figure 2.6). This increase coincided with higher escapements from 2009 onward, which may have been a product of the change in survey methods as well as an actual increase in escapement.

Coho egg-to-smolt survival remained consistently low (0.03-0.55%) for the 2002-2018 brood years (Table 6.1b), with the highest values associated with the lowest escapements. These values decreased from Treatment 1 and 2 (mean: 0.3% and 0.1%, respectively; 2-tailed t-test $p=0.01$). We are cautious about any between-treatment evaluations using adult escapement estimates, which are likely not comparable because of the change in survey methods employed during Treatment 2.

The mean size of Coho smolts in Reach 4 was slightly greater during 2000-2018 (mean: 96 mm FL) compared to the period preceding Treatment 1 (1996-1998; mean: 89 mm FL; t-test, $p=0.02$). No size data exist for reaches 2 and 3 prior to 1999. During 2000-2018, Coho smolts were consistently larger in reach 4 (mean: 94mm FL) than in reaches 2 and 3 (mean: 89mm FL; t-test, $p<0.01$), and larger in mainstem versus off-channel habitats. Mean Coho smolt lengths

were not significantly different between Treatment 1 and 2 for reach 4 or for reaches 2 and 3 combined ($p=0.29$ and $p=0.65$, respectively).

6.2.3 Mainstem fall fry abundance

The abundance of Coho fry from the snorkel survey based standing stock assessment has varied from a low of 18,000 in 2007 to 91,000 in 2011 (Table 6.1). Mean abundance estimates during Treatment 1 and 2 were 30,745 and 55,940 fry, respectively. These estimates were close to but not significantly different (2-tailed t-test: $p=0.07$). The high variability in abundance within each treatment period combined with only three monitoring years during Treatment 1 were likely responsible for the lack of a significant difference between Treatment 1 and 2 despite the nearly two-fold increase in abundance. Unfortunately, any change in fry abundance between the treatments could be explained by both the change in flow treatment as well as the change in adult escapements. Adult Coho escapement during the three years of Treatment 1 was far lower than during the years of Treatment 2 (Treatment 1: 940-2400 adults; Treatment 2: 3,200-13,000). Adult escapement explained almost half the variance in fall fry abundance using the Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment model ($R^2 = 0.43$, Figure 6.10) and almost none of the variance with a linear model ($R^2 < 0.01$). Mean estimated egg-to-fall fry survival during Treatment 1 and 2 was 1.3% and 0.9% respectively, though they were not significantly different (2-tailed t-test, $p = 0.3$). We are cautious about any between-treatment evaluations reliant on adult escapement estimates, including egg-to-fall fry. All three years of Treatment 1 survival estimates correspond to very low escapements, which were likely too low for carrying capacity or density dependant mortality effects to take effect, whereas these may have occurred during Treatment 2 (Figure 6.10). Thus, the flow treatment tests may have become confounded with density dependence or carrying capacity effects. We are also not confident that adult escapement estimates are comparable between Treatment 1 and 2 due to the changes in monitoring methods that were implemented for Treatment 2 (see section 2.3).

6.2.4 Evaluating season-specific flow effects on survival and abundance

We investigated whether egg-to-fall fry and egg-to-smolt survival was effected by the early June rampdown that occurred only during Treatment 2. The discharge from the Coquitlam Dam's low level outlet was decreased from 2.9 m³/s to 1.1 for 2008-2016 or 8.0 m³/s to 1.1 m³/s for 2017-2018. This rampdown accounted for 74% of all juvenile Coho salvaged following scheduled or unscheduled rampdowns for 2008-2017 (McNair 2018). The effect of this rampdown downstream of the reach 4 depends on the relative inflows from Or Creek, which discharges at the bottom of reach 4 and from Pritchett Creek in reach 3. Post rampdown discharge at the Port Coquitlam station (WSC Station 08MH141) was negatively related to the count of salvaged fry and explained the large amount of variance in the count of stranded fish ($R^2 = 0.78$, Figure 6.11). This figure also suggests that distributing the rampdown over 1, 3 or 14 days has little effect on the number of fry stranded compared to the effect of post-rampdown discharge. Using egg-to-fall fry survival as a measure of population level effects, post-rampdown flow was positively related to egg-to-fry survival but with a weaker relationship ($R^2 = 0.33$; Figure 6.12c). Mean discharge during Coho spawning (Nov-Jan) was the strongest predictor of egg-to-fry survival ($R^2 = 0.65$, Figure 6.12e). There was no support that the number

of days the rampdown was distributed over had any effect on egg-to-fry survival ($R^2 < 0.01$, Figure 6.12d).

There was no support for any effect from the June rampdown on egg-to-smolt survival based on the similar cohorts. Both the number of fry salvaged during the June rampdown and post rampdown discharge explained almost none of the variation in egg-to-smolt survival ($R^2 > 0.01$ for both, Figure 6.13 b-c). Adult escapement explained the largest variation in egg-to-smolt survival ($R^2 = 0.56$, Figure 6.13a) followed closely by the number of days to complete the rampdown ($R^2 = 0.55$, Figure 6.13d). While it was expected that egg-to-smolt survival would decrease as escapement increased, suggesting potential overwintering carrying capacity effects, it was interesting that the rampdown duration explained as much as it did considering the same had no effect on egg-to-fry survival. The strength of the rampdown duration variable may be a spurious result given the low sample size ($n=8$), the large influence of only two data points on the trend, and there is no strong biological explanation to account for the lack of its effect on egg-to-fry survival.

For Coho smolt abundance during 2002-2018, the mean winter flow during rearing (Oct-Feb) and the count of days during winter rearing (Oct-Feb) with flows above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ were the only covariates that explained a moderate amount of the variance within both flow treatment periods (Figure 6.14). Mean flow during incubation (Feb-Mar) did explain a higher amount but only during Treatment 1 ($R^2 = 0.57$, Figure 6.14c). For these three relevant covariates, higher flows were associated with lower smolt abundance. When comparing support for models including a single flow variable as well as models including flow treatment and each flow variable as a covariate, the model including the count of days with discharge above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (Days Above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) had the strongest support ($\Delta\text{AIC}_c = 0$, Table 6.8) and explained just under half the variance in abundance ($R^2 = 0.45$). The model including Days Above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ in combination with flow treatment (Treatment + Days Above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$) had the next most support but fell just outside of what is considered strong support ($\Delta\text{AIC}_c = 2.3$) even though it was slightly better at explaining the variance in abundance ($R^2=0.50$). It's also noteworthy that flow treatment alone explained considerably less variance ($R^2=0.27$) than Days Above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. Rearing conditions during late summer (August) was raised by the CC as an important factor on Coho and Steelhead production. However, this variable (Days during August $> 20\%$ MAD) had a low level of support and was very limited in its ability to explain the variability in abundance ($\Delta\text{AIC}_c = 9.2$, $R^2 = 0.02$, Table 6.8).

6.3 Steelhead

6.3.1 Off-channel smolt abundance

Steelhead smolt yield from off-channel habitats represents only a small proportion of the total yield (0.3%-9% of total annual yield). Thus, off-channel smolt production is not used to evaluate the fisheries benefits of Treatment 1 and 2 flow regimes.

6.3.2 Mainstem smolt abundance

During 2000-2018 the estimated number of Steelhead smolts outmigrating from the 7.5 km long section of the Coquitlam River mainstem upstream of the RST2 trapping site ranged from 2,200 to 5,500. Mean smolt yields for cohorts that reared exclusively under Treatment 1 or Treatment 2 were statistically different (3,716 smolts and 4,811 smolts; respectively; 2-tailed t-test $p = 0.03$, Table 6.2). This included smolt estimates from the years 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and years 2012-2018 for Treatment 2. This was driven primarily by the increase in smolt abundance in reach 4. Mean abundance increased more than two-fold in reach 4 from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 (mean: 925 and 2,253 smolts, respectively; t-test, $p=0.02$; Table 6.2, Figure 6.3), whereas yields from reaches 2 and 3 were similar during both treatment periods. This result is consistent with the hypothesis that the relatively confined channel in reach 4 combined with the higher Treatment 2 base flows would produce a higher energy flow environment, which would be more favorable to juvenile Steelhead.

The mean increase in abundance from Treatment 1 to 2 was approximately 30% from Treatment 1 levels and with considerably better precision than for Coho (Figure 6.6). The change in means for both reaches 2 and 3 was near zero with very high uncertainty. The mean change was above 100% (or a doubling in abundance) in reach 4 but was also highly uncertain. The high uncertainty for individual reaches isn't surprising given the relatively high variability within each treatment period compared to estimates for the entire mainstem (Figure 6.4). Table 6.3 lists the probability that mainstem smolt abundance increased by at least 10%, 20% and 50% using the same approach as was used for Coho smolts. There was a high probability (prob = 0.90) of a 10% or greater increase in abundance from Treatment 1 to 2 levels and a moderate probability (prob = 0.76) of a 20% or greater increase. There was very little support for a 50% or greater increase (prob = 0.11). As for Coho, these can only be interpreted as the response to the Treatment 2 assuming other productivity parameters remained constant during the flow experiment.

Using the same method as for Coho, we compared the relative increase in smolt yield in the Coquitlam River to comparable watersheds to distinguish between flow treatment effects and regional changes in productivity. The BACI analysis is intended addressed whether the smolt abundance increased more in the Coquitlam River than in the comparison streams over a similar time period. Table 6.9 lists the annual smolt yield for the two Coastal BC streams considered for use as controls. We used only the Alouette River for this comparison since it was the only stream with adequately similar smolt yield trends for cohorts that reared prior to Treatment 2 (correlation coefficient: Keogh $R < 0.01$, Alouette $R = 0.52$, Table 6.10). For the BACI comparison, we only included commonly monitored years during Treatment 1 (2002-2008) and Treatment 2 (2012-2014). The mean percent increase in smolt yield between treatment periods was higher for the Alouette (74%) than for the Coquitlam (30%), with considerable overlap in their confidence intervals (Figure 6.15). The probability that smolt yield increased by 10% or more in the Coquitlam than the Alouette was low and only a slightly high probability that any increase occurred (prob = 0.15 and 0.20, respectively; Table 6.11). Though uncertain, these results do not support the assumption that the increased smolt yield in the Coquitlam River was largely the product of the flow treatment.

The BACI analysis depends on the credibility of the Alouette River smolt data as an index of region wide productivity. As mentioned for Coho, the estimates for the Alouette prior to 2008 may be biased low due to backwatering at the trapping site and shorter monitoring period (Cope 2015). If the bias was large, what we are considering as a non-treatment effects on productivity would instead be an artifact of the changes in monitoring. Support for using the Alouette River relies on its close proximity, consistent flow regulation, and similar geomorphology, fish assemblage and abundance trends to the Coquitlam. On this basis, it is a useful control. Its weakness is the uncertainty of the amount pre-2008 smolt estimates are biased. The possibilities to resolve this rely on accessing additional data from other coastal BC watersheds and further investigating the degree that the Alouette smolt estimates are biased.

During 2000-2018, Steelhead smolt densities for the mainstem study area upstream of RST2 as a whole averaged 2.7 smolts/100m² (range = 1.7-3.7 smolts/100m²), which exceeded the provincial Steelhead biostandard of 2.0 smolts/100m² (Tautz *et al.* 1992). With the exception of 2000, areal smolt densities were highest in Reach 4, particularly in 2009, 2010 and 2017, but this was partly due to greater wetted width in downstream reaches. Differences in linear densities among reaches have become more pronounced since 2009, with markedly higher density in reach 4. In many cases, Steelhead population estimates for individual reaches were highly uncertain due to low numbers of marked and recovered fish, or, in the case of downstream reaches, compounding error (see Section 5.1.1.4).

On average, fork lengths of Steelhead smolts were 6-7 mm less during Treatment 1 than Treatment 2 in reach 4, and reaches 2 and 3 combined (2-tailed t-test $p < 0.01$ for both). Age-1+ spring migrant parr in reach 4 were on average 10mm larger than those in reaches 2 and 3 (t-test $p < 0.01$).

6.3.3 Mainstem fry and parr abundance

Snorkeling surveys indicated that during 2006-2018, Steelhead fry density in the Coquitlam River in late summer averaged 12.7 fish/100m², while parr density averaged 5.5 fish/100m². In general, these values are low for coastal Steelhead streams (see Section 4.3.2). Based on snorkeling surveys alone, average fall abundance of fry was 70,963 for Treatment 1 and 41,555 for Treatment 2 though this difference was not significant (t-test $p = 0.15$). Age 1+ parr abundance was similar between Treatment 1 and 2 (age 1+ parr 8,812 and 8,827; respectively; t-test $p = 0.96$) yet age 2+ parr were only half as abundant during Treatment 1 than during Treatment 2 (age 2+ parr 1,691 and 3,072; respectively; t-test $p < 0.01$). However, the abundance of age 2+ parr is the product of 1) surviving to that age and 2) not smolting during the prior spring. Coquitlam Steelhead smolt after their 2nd or 3rd winter and is size and growth dependent (Kendall *et al.* 2015).

Steelhead egg-to-fry survivals ranged from 2.9% to 8.9% (mean: 6.3%, Table 6.1b) during 2006-2018, similar to the Keogh River (mean: 6.5%, Ward and Slaney 1993) but far lower than the Cheakamus (mean: 22.8%, Korman and Schick 2018). Egg-to-age-1+ parr survival for Coquitlam River Steelhead ranged from 0.6%-2.1% (mean: 1.3%) which was somewhat higher than the average of two years' data for the Keogh River (0.65%, derived from Ward and Slaney 1993). Steelhead egg-to-smolt survival for Coquitlam River Steelhead ranged from 0.4%-1.1%

for 2005-2015 brood-years (Table 6.1b; derived from age-2 and age-3 smolt yields in subsequent years). Ward and Slaney (1993) reported a similar range (0.4%-1.3%) for Steelhead egg-to-smolt survival in the Keogh River. Fry-to-age-1+ parr survival for the 2006-2016 fry cohorts ranged from 10%-37% (Table 6.1b). Age-1+ parr-to-smolt survival averaged 52% (ranged 33%-92%) for the 2006-2015 age-1+ Cohorts (Table 6.1b; derived from age-2 and age-3 smolt yields in subsequent years). This is comparable to parr-to-smolt survival for Steelhead in the Keogh River (48.8%; Tautz *et al.* 1992), and for Atlantic salmon populations in several eastern Canadian streams (\approx 40%; Symons 1979). In two of five cases, survival estimates exceeded 100% for the age-2+ parr to age-3 smolt life stage (range: 59%-148%; Table 6.1b), indicating positive bias. The most likely source of this bias is either underestimation of age-2+ parr abundance in 2007 and 2008, or underestimation of the mean fork-length criteria used to delineate age-2 and age-3 smolts, which leads to overestimation of the proportion of age-3 smolts (see Section 5.2.2.2, last paragraph; Appendix 5.3). Over 500 scale samples have been collected to date. This is sufficient for defining multi-year averages of size-at-age and relative proportions of age-2 and age-3 but is not sufficient for year-specific size-at-age relationships.

Steelhead spawner densities appeared to be well above levels thought to be required for full seeding of juvenile habitat across both Treatment 1 and 2. During 2005-2018, Steelhead spawner densities in the Coquitlam River ranged from 24 to 80 fish/km (mean: 38 fish/km). This translates 39,000-149,000 eggs/km deposited in the Coquitlam River during 2005-2017 (Table 3.2). In the Keogh River 13,300 eggs/km was estimated as the minimum required to achieve optimal smolt yield (derived from Ward and Slaney 1993). This supports the notion that smolt abundance is the best metric for comparing flow treatments considering that using stock-recruitment data would reduce sample size considerably. Moreover, inter-annual variation in Steelhead smolt abundance was relatively low within Treatment 1 and 2 (Table 6.1a), and there was evidence of density-dependent survival at older juvenile life stages (Figures 6.19). These results suggest that the juvenile carrying capacity of the Coquitlam River, as opposed to adult escapement, had a major influence on Coho and Steelhead smolt yield thus far during the flow experiment.

6.3.4 Evaluating season-specific flow effects on survival and abundance

For egg-to-fall fry survival during 2006-2018, we evaluated support for models that included one of several life-stage specific flow metrics and adult escapement both singly and in combination with flow treatment. Results are listed in Table 6.12. Flow treatment (model 1) and Discharge difference between spawning and incubation (model 4) both had strong support ($\Delta AIC_c = 2.1$ and 0.0, respectively), however, Discharge difference explained more than twice the variance in survival as the Treatment model ($R^2 = 0.25$ and 0.11, respectively). Using the Discharge difference variable as a covariate in combination with Treatment (model 9) did not improve the explanatory power ($R^2=0.25$) compared with Discharge difference on its own and had lower model support ($\Delta AIC_c=4.3$). In both models 4 and 9, the difference in mean discharge between spawning (March-May,) and incubation (June-July) was included to reflect the effects of stranding that could result from large discharge decreases. Instead of decreased survival, survival increased as the difference between spawning and incubation increased (Figure 6.16c). However, during Treatment 2, which accounts for the majority of sample years, there were

similar positive effects of both discharge during spawning and the difference between discharge between spawning and incubation ($R^2 = 0.41$ and 0.46 , respectively, Figure 6.16 a, c) yet almost no change in survival across the range of flows during incubation (Figure 6.16 b). This suggests that it wasn't the decrease in discharge between spawning and incubation as much as the increased discharge during spawning that may improve survival. Adult escapement was a poor predictor of egg-to-fall fry survival (model 5: $R^2 = 0.01$). This was also the case for the variable representing the proportion of days during August with discharge greater than $5.4 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$, or 20% of MAD (model 6: $R^2 = 0.00$).

6.4 Chum

6.4.1 River-wide abundance and survival

Similar to that for Coho and Pink, escapement and egg-to-smolt survival estimates for Chum should be considered preliminary and will likely change as adult salmon observer efficiency and survey life data are collected in future years. Adult returns of Chum salmon to Coquitlam River (including Reach 1) have ranged from 12,000-78,000 (Table 6.1a), while fry production upstream of RST2 has ranged from 0.8 to 12.7 million. During Treatment 1 (2002-2007 brood years) Chum egg-to-smolt survival ranged from 3.7% to 14.1% (mean: 10.2%; Table 6.1b); thus far during Treatment 2, egg-to-fry survivals have been significantly higher (t-test $p < 0.01$), ranging from 18.1% to 40.0% (mean: 25.2%, Table 6.1b). Bradford (1995) reported an average egg-to-smolt survival rate of 6.7% (± 1 standard deviation = 3.3%-13.5%) for Chum populations in nine Pacific Northwest streams. The Chum egg-to-fry survival estimates for the 2005, 2008, 2010, 2013 and 2014 brood years in the Coquitlam River exceeds published values for this species, and these, and possibly all, may be biased high. The most plausible source of this bias would be an underestimate of Chum escapement (see Section 2.2) as opposed to an overestimate of Chum fry. The study design for estimating fry yield is robust: sampling was nearly daily over the entire outmigration period; it accounts for changes capture efficiency over the outmigration period by stratifying into 8-10 distinct periods; and used a large number of marked fish (800-2000) to estimate capture efficiency for each strata. Escapement estimates depend on estimating both observer efficiency and survey life. Even with considerable effort, these two parameters remain highly uncertain. For instance, there is only a weak relationship between an observer's guess of their efficiency and the mark-recapture based estimate of their efficiency. This level of uncertainty remains too large for the escapement model to generate both credible escapement estimates and precision estimates (see section 2.2.3). Given the weaknesses of adult salmon escapement estimates we view them as an index of abundance rather than accurate measures of escapement. As well, considering that our survival estimates could be biased and unknown (but likely high) uncertainty of adult escapement, we encourage a conservative approach to interpreting any statistical tests using this metrics.

There was strong support of a linear escapement-to-fry relationship during Treatment 2 ($R^2 = 0.70$, Figure 6.17) but only moderate support of one during Treatment 1 ($R^2 = 0.24$). The lower fit during Treatment 1 was largely the result of 2005, when fry production was

considerably higher than expected. If this was considered an outlier and excluded, there would be a high level of support for a linear relationship during Treatment ($R^2 = 0.79$). A linear relationship confirms that with changes in egg-to-fry survival or fry-per-adult are more appropriate methods for evaluating the fisheries benefits of flow treatments than juvenile production alone.

We used an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to evaluate the Chum fry-per-adult relationship for Treatment 1 and 2 using the package STATS in R (R Development Core Team 2009). The test whether flow treatment had a significant effect on recruitment, we evaluated whether the y-intercepts differed for the $\ln(\text{fry}/\text{adult}) \sim \text{adult}$ relationship between Treatment 1 and 2 (Figure 6.18). Using $\ln(\text{fry}/\text{adult})$ instead of fry in the analysis reduces the violation of the assumption that linear stock-recruitment intercept at 0 adults and 0 juveniles. In effect, it becomes a test of whether adult-to-fry survival changes by flow treatment. Table 6.13 provides outputs of this analysis for Chum 2003-2016 brood years. The results are consistent with the comparison of egg-to-fry survival above. The significant values for Treatment and intercept (both $p < 0.001$) support hypothesis that fry-per-adult recruitment differed between Treatment 1 and 2. However, as previously discussed, unaccounted for bias and uncertainty in the adult escapement data also impacts this test. Thus, results should be interpreted with this in mind.

Overall, Chum salmon returns to Coquitlam River were markedly improved in 2002-2017 compared to previous years. Chum salmon escapement was not rigorously assessed until 2002, but qualitative surveys by DFO field staff over several decades suggest that total escapement was typically less than 1000 adults prior to the implementation of the Treatment 1 flow regime in 1997 (DFO, SEDS).

As for Coho and Steelhead, the only way to distinguish between the effects of the flow treatment and other factors influencing freshwater conditions is by comparison with other watersheds. Chum escapement and juvenile abundance has been monitored in the Alouette and Cheakamus River. During 2002-2014, both Chum escapement and fry yield in the Coquitlam River are only minimally to moderately correlated with that in the Alouette River (escapement: $R = 0.55$, fry yield: $R = 0.03$; Figure 6.19a; Cope 2015), which reduces the viability of using the Alouette River as a control of region-wide factors influencing Chum productivity. With the end of monitoring on the Alouette in 2014, these values will remain unchanged. Chum escapement and fry yield were strongly and moderately correlated with the Cheakamus River ($R = 0.79$ and $R = 0.57$; Figure 6.19b), suggest it has a moderate use as a comparison when evaluating whether changes in productivity in the Coquitlam are the result of flow treatments or region wide factors. However, a drawback in using the Cheakamus is that the switch between IFA and WUP flow regimes occurred at a similar time as the change between Treatment 1 and 2 on the Coquitlam.

6.4.2 Evaluating season-specific flow effects on survival and abundance

For egg-to-fry survival during 2005-2017, we evaluated support for models that included one of several life-stage specific flow metrics (spawning, incubation and winter) both singly and in combination with flow treatment. Results are listed in Table 6.14. Model 10 (Treatment + days above $70\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ Dec-Feb) had strong support ($\Delta\text{AIC}_c < 2$) and the majority of the variance in

survival ($R^2 = 0.80$). Mode 13 (Treatment + mean discharge Dec-Feb) was the second ranked model, had moderate support ($\Delta AIC_c = 6.1$) and had a $R^2 = 0.69$. This flow variable reflected discharge during incubation. Used individually, Treatment and the two flow variables reflecting incubation conditions had the most supported. They were also better predictors of survival than those reflecting either spawning condition or for the entire winter. Survival increased with both mean discharge during incubation (Dec-Feb) and with the number of days during this period that flows were greater than $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (Figure 6.20 c, f). The change in Egg-to-fry survival doubled over the range of flows 2004-2017. We excluded the 2004 escapement year from the analysis largely because flows during the 2004-2005 winter were far higher and high flows more frequent than all other years that led to unique impacts on survival. For instance, during December-February, the number of day above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ was 36 in the 2004-2005 winter compared with 0-5 2003-2017. The low egg-to-fry survival during the winter 2004-2005 suggest that while higher flows during incubation may be benefit survival, there is a point when high flows reduce survival. Results provided no support that flow during spawning had a meaningful impact on survival. Survival varied widely at the same mean discharge or number of days above $70 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ regardless of time period (Figure 6.20 a, b, d, e).

6.5 Pink

All stock-recruitment relationship and egg-to-fry survival estimates for Pink are also preliminary at this stage due to the same reason as for Coho and Chum. Estimated adult Pink salmon returns to Coquitlam River ranged from 2,900-34,280 adults, with significantly increasing abundance starting in 2009 (Table 6.1a). Fry production upstream of RST2 ranged from 148,000-6,030,000 (Table 6.1a), with substantial increases since 2008. The egg-to-fry survival for 2003-2009 Pink broods (4.9%-9.9%, Table 6.1b) was comparable to the range reported for Pink populations in 18 other streams (mean: 7.4%; ± 1 standard deviation: 3.2%-17.0%; Bradford 1995). However, the 2011, 2013 and 2015 brood egg-to-fry survival far exceeded this range (range: 27%-48%), even when incorporating the 95% confidence limits of the 2012, 2014 and 2016 fry estimates, which signals they could be non-credible or at least, biased high. An unrealistically high value would occur if escapement was biased low or if fry production was biased high. There were no indications of high bias in the escapement or fry estimates for these years, making it difficult to isolate the cause of the high survival rate. However, we have generally lower confidence in escapement estimates considering they depend heavily on assumptions about observer efficiency, survey life and fecundity (see section 2.2 on how this relates to bias and precision). We will gain a better understanding of the accuracy and precision of Pink escapement estimates if the escapement model is provided with sufficient observer efficiency and survey life information.

There was weak support for a linear escapement-to-fry stock-recruitment relationship during Treatment 1 ($R^2 = 0.36$) and strong support for one during Treatment 2 ($R^2 = 0.75$, Figure 6.17). However, the fit improved when both treatment periods were included ($R^2 = 0.83$), providing weak support that the stock-recruitment relationship was similar during Treatment 1 and 2. The good fit of the single linear stock-recruitment relationship over a wide range of escapements suggests that fry abundance was minimally effected by the availability of spawning

habitat. Given that all high escapement years were during Treatment 2, this provides no information as to whether high escapement under Treatment 1 flows would have resulted in a similar increase in fry abundance.

Pink escapement was poorly correlated with that in the Alouette River ($R=0.16$, Figure 6.19a). As well, there was little correlation between Pink fry yield in the Coquitlam River and that in the Alouette River ($R^2 = 0.10$) but a strong correlation exists with the Cheakamus River fry production ($R = 0.90$, Figure 6.19b).

Our ability to distinguish treatment effects from region-wide abundance trends remains low given that escapement and flow treatments are confounded and the absence of reliable data from a comparable control stream. So far escapement has been significantly higher under Treatment 2 conditions than during Treatment 1. Given the lack of a reliable control stream, an alternative approach for distinguishing flow effect from the effects of escapement is to either return to Treatment 1 flow conditions or a switch to a third flow treatment. This would apply to the other three target species as well.

Pink salmon were successfully reintroduced to the Coquitlam River in 1995 following their extirpation in the 1960's. Increased minimum flows in Coquitlam River beginning in 1997 likely improved migration and spawning conditions for Pinks. There is some indication that larger dam releases under Treatment 2 have further improved access to spawning habitats for Pink salmon (Macnair 2010b) and may account for the lack of density dependent interactions under higher escapements during this period.

7 Conclusions

Study results suggest that the production of juvenile Coho, Chum and Pink Salmon as well as Steelhead have been higher in the Coquitlam River study area during Treatment 2 compared with Treatment 1, but only statistically higher for Steelhead and Chum. For smolts reared in the Coquitlam River mainstem, the mean increased by 26% for Coho and 30% for Steelhead. For Chum fry, this reflects a doubling of the egg-fry productivity. For Pink fry, it is unclear whether egg-fry productivity increased during Treatment 2, however, there is no indication that spawning habitat limited Pink productivity at high escapement levels during Treatment 2.

We are less certain about whether the increases were a product of the Treatment 2 flows or other factors, such as higher adult escapement or regional environmental changes. If the assumption is correct that these differences were primarily the result of the flow treatment, these results supports a conclusion that Treatment 2 flows caused increased freshwater productivity for some species compared to Treatment 1. However, support for this assumption varies by species and is generally uncertain at this point. For Coho, a rise in smolt yield in other watersheds raises the possibility that the increase was not primarily the result of the flow treatment. This is also the case for Steelhead, but the analysis is weaker due to comparing the Coquitlam to only one other river. For Chum and Pink, the absence of comparable productivity data from other watersheds prevents this analysis. Reducing the uncertainty will depend on finding suitable watersheds with reliable and comparable data to compare with the Coquitlam and/or using alternative analytical approaches to control for some non-treatment effects. We are optimistic that alternative analysis will reduce this uncertainty for some species. There is a possibility that for some decision makers neither approach will successfully address this uncertainty ahead of the order review.

We have a weak understanding of the main drivers of productivity and how flows influence productivity at this time. We are still developing the alternate analysis and expect our preliminary findings to change as flow variables are evaluated while accounting for the influence of adult escapement. The number of abundance estimates is at the minimum to reliably compare the influence of multiple factors.

Current answers to the primary management question:

What are the fisheries benefits associated with each of the proposed test flows evaluated over the review period?

Coho – Mean smolt yield likely increased from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 (mean increase 26%). Maximum smolt capacity was relatively unchanged between treatments but there were a higher number of years with abundance near the maximum carrying capacity during Treatment 2. It remains unclear at this time whether the increased productivity was the result of the Treatment 2. Similar abundance trends in comparable watersheds raises the possibility that the increase was due at least in part to non-treatment factors.

Steelhead – Mean smolt yield very likely increased from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 (mean increase 29%). Maximum smolt capacity was relatively unchanged between treatments but there

were a higher number of years with abundance near the maximum carrying capacity during Treatment 2. It remains unclear at this time whether the increased productivity was the result of Treatment 2. Similar abundance trends in the Alouette raises the possibility that the increase was due at least in part to non-treatment factors.

Chum – Egg-fry recruitment increased significantly from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2, even when accounting for the number of adult spawners. While we lack information to confirm that this change was the result of the flow treatment, there is no information suggesting otherwise.

Pink – Egg-fry recruitment possibly increased from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 but this may be a product of the up to 10-fold higher spawner abundance during Treatment 2. Because of this, we do not consider this a useful indicator of fisheries benefits until Treatment 2 includes years with comparable spawner abundance to Treatment 1.

We have not yet completed the analysis to fully address the secondary management questions:

- What is the relationship between habitat and fish productivity in the lower Coquitlam River?
- What are the main factors driving fish productivity in the lower Coquitlam River?

8 Recommendations

8.1 Adult Salmon escapement

1. Conduct at least four mark-recapture experiments per year for Chum and for Pink during odd years, prioritizing for Chum (see section 6.5). Data derived from these experiments is critical for generating reliable estimates of observer efficiency and survey life. The lack of this information limits our ability to confirm the accuracy of the escapement estimates or to report on the precision of the escapement estimates. With the project nearing its end and unpredictable river conditions from year-to-year, a comprehensive approach to obtaining this information during years with favorable river conditions has the best chance of obtaining sufficient data.
2. Continue reconnaissance surveys at the beginning of the arrival of Pinks during odd years in order to confirm the absence of spawners from the study area prior to the first survey. This is needed to minimize uncertainty in the arrival and departure timing models. Pink assessments for access are normally conducted during the low-flow period in late August– early September period as a separate requirement of the Coquitlam-Buntzen WUP, but could also serve as reconnaissance surveys to determine the start date of the Pink run in odd years.

8.2 Adult Steelhead escapement

3. If flow increases for Sockeye outmigration are continued, increase the frequency of redd surveys to weekly from bi-weekly to reduce the possibility of redds being obscured due to scour.
4. Continue using only one survey crew. While there remains a risk of aborting surveys due to the onset of poor conditions, incomplete or missed redd surveys were not a large source of uncertainty in 2005-2015. A second crew, without the additional resources required to test for consistency with past survey methods, could introduce significant bias and uncertainty into redd counts.

8.3 Juvenile salmonid standing stock

5. As much as possible, continue sampling the original 12 snorkeling sites and the 12 new sites added in 2014 to maintain adequate precision.

6. Mark-recapture experiments no longer need to be conducted for any age-class but for age-2+ Steelhead since the Coquiltam River-specific model of snorkeling detection probability is sufficiently refined for all but this species age-class. If we find that precision would improve from further refining the detection probability, benefits from this would be applied to all previous sampling.

8.4 Smolt and fry outmigration

7. Top priority should continue to be given to maximizing the number of Steelhead recaptures at RST2 by maintaining high capture efficiency at RST2 and smolt marking at all RSTs (2-4). The length of the trapping period and the trap configurations and locations for Coho and Steelhead were appropriate in recent years, but changed somewhat for 2018. A similar approach should be applied for future years.
8. Continue to mark Steelhead parr by capture location to better understand the extent of downstream movement and, in particular, the proportion that are moving downstream of the RST2 trapping site. A systematic downstream movement of parr could represent freshwater production not accounted for in smolt estimates. Continued marking would also provide estimates of the capture efficiency of RST2 for parr.

9 References

- Adkison, M.D. and Z. Su. 2001. A comparison of salmon escapement estimates using a hierarchical Bayesian approach versus separate maximum likelihood estimation of each year's return. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 58:1663-1671.
- Arnason, A.N., C.W. Kirby, C.J. Swartz, J.R. Irvine. 1996. Computer analysis of data from stratified mark-recovery experiments for estimation of salmon escapements and other populations. *Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 2106.
- BC Hydro. 2003a. Addendum to the Coquitlam Dam Water Use Plan Consultative Report. Prepared for the BC Hydro Coquitlam Dam Water Use Plan project, Burnaby, BC.
- BC Hydro. 2003b. Lower Coquitlam River 2003 instream flow needs assessment interim report on transect data collection. Prepared for the BC Hydro Coquitlam Dam Water Use Plan project, Burnaby, BC.
- BC Hydro. 2005. Coquitlam-Buntzen Project Water Use Plan-Revised. Prepared for the BC Hydro Coquitlam Dam Water Use Plan project, Burnaby, BC.
- Bohlin, T., and B. Sundstrom. 1977. Influence of unequal catchability on population estimates using the Lincoln Index and the depletion method applied to electro-fishing. *Oikos* 28:123-129.
- Bozek, M. A., F.J. Rahel. 1991. Comparison of streamside visual counts to electrofishing estimates of Colorado River cutthroat trout fry and adults. *N. Amer. J. Fish. Manage.* 11:38-42.
- Bradford, M. J. 1995. Comparative review of Pacific salmon survival rates. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 52: 1327-1338.
- Bradford, M.J., J. Korman, P. S. Higgins. 2005. Using confidence intervals to estimate the response of salmon populations (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) to experimental habitat alterations. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 2005, 62:2716-2726
- Bradford, M. J., G. C. Taylor, et al. 1996. Empirical review of coho salmon smolt abundance and the prediction of smolt production at the regional level. *Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc.* 126:49-64.
- Bradford, M. J. and P. S. Higgins. 2000. Habitat-, season, and size-specific variation in diel activity patterns of juvenile Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and Steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 58:1-10.
- Bradford, M. J., R. A. Myers, et al. 2000. Reference points for coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) harvest rates and escapement goals based on freshwater production. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 57:677-686.
- Brooks, S.P., E.A. Catchpole, and B.J.T. Morgan. 2000. Bayesian animal survival estimation. *Statistical Science* 15:357-376.

- Burgner, R.L., J.T. Light, L. Margolis, T. Okazaki, A Tautz, and S. Ito. 1992. Distribution and origins of steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in offshore waters of the North Pacific. International North Pacific Fisheries Commission Bulletin Number 51, 92 p.
- Burnham, K.P., and D.R. Anderson. 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference, 2nd ed. Springer. 454 pp.
- Campbell, R. F. and J. H. Neuner. 1985. Seasonal and diurnal shifts in habitat utilized by resident rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*) observed in western Washington Cascade Mountain streams. Pages 39-49 in F. W. Olson, R. G. White, and R. H. Hamre, editors. Symposium on Small Hydropower and Fisheries. American Fisheries Society, Western Division and Engineering Section, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Conlin, K. and B.D. Tutty. 1979. Juvenile field trapping manual. Fish. and Mar. Serv. Man. Rep. No. 1530.
- Cope, S. 2015. Alouette River Salmonid Smolt Migration Enumeration: 2014 Data Report. Unpublished report prepared for the Alouette River Management Committee and BC Hydro by Westslope Fisheries, Cranbrook BC, 90 p.
- Cope, S. 2011. Alouette River salmonid smolt migration enumeration. Unpublished report prepared for the Alouette River Management Committee and BC Hydro by Westslope Fisheries, Cranbrook BC.
- Cope, S. 2002. Alouette River salmonid smolt migration enumeration. Unpublished report prepared for the Alouette River Management Committee and BC Hydro by Westslope Fisheries, Cranbrook BC.
- Darroch, J.N. 1961. The two-sample capture-recapture census when tagging and sampling are stratified. *Biometrika* 48: 241-260.
- Decker, S. 1998. Influence of off-channel habitat restoration and other enhancement on the abundance and distribution of salmonids in the Coquitlam River. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C. 35 p.
- Decker, S., and G. Lewis. 2000. Fish Response to Increased Minimum Flows and Habitat Restoration in the Coquitlam River: a 5 Year Review. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., December 2000. 40 p.
- Decker, A.S., and J. Hagen. 2009. Stock assessment of juvenile Gerrard rainbow trout in the Lardeau/Duncan System: feasibility study 2005-2008. Prepared for Habitat Conservation Trust Fund, Victoria, British Columbia, September 2006. 71 p.
- Decker, A.S., J. Hagen, and R. G. Bison. 2009. Annual distribution and abundance of Steelhead parr in the lower Thompson River basin during 2001-2008 in relation to spawner abundance and habitat characteristics. Consultant Report Prepared for BC Ministry of Environment, Kamloops BC. 78 p.
- Decker, S., and G. Lewis. 1999. Response of salmonids to off-channel habitat restoration and increased minimum flows in the Coquitlam River. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., December 1999. 49 p.

- Decker, S., J. Macnair, G. Lewis, and J. Korman. 2008. Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program: 2000-2007 Results. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., June 2007. 125 p.
- Decker, S., J. Macnair, G. Lewis, and J. Korman. 2007. Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program: 2000-2006 Results. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., June 2007. 116 p.
- Decker, S., J. Schick, and G. Lewis. 2006. Coquitlam River salmonid smolt enumeration program: 2006 results. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., January 2006. 48 p.
- Decker, S., J. Schick, and G. Lewis. 2003. 2002 results for the Coquitlam River salmonid smolt enumeration program. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., April 2003. 32 p.
- Decker, A.S., and M. Foy. 2000. The contribution of restored off-channel habitat to smolt production in the Coquitlam River. British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Watershed Restoration Technical Bulletin 4(3):22-24.
- Decker, A.S., J. Macnair, G. Lewis. 2012. Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program: 2000-2010 Results. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C. March 2012. 147 p.
- English, K.K., Bocking, R.C., and Irvine, J.R. 1992. A robust procedure for estimating salmon escapement based on the area-under-the-curve method. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 59:1982-1989.
- Fell, C., D.J.F McCubbing, L.J. Wilson, and C.C. Melville. 2013. Cheakamus River Chum Salmon Escapement Monitoring and Mainstem Spawning Groundwater Survey 2001-2013. Unpublished report prepared for B.C. Hydro Power Facilities, Burnaby, B.C., January 2013, 63p.
- Fleming, I.A., and M.R. Gross. 1993. Breeding success of hatchery and wild coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) in competition. *Ecological applications* 3:230-245.
- Freymond, B and S. Foley. 1985. Wild Steelhead: Spawning escapement estimates for Bolt Case Area Rivers –1985. Washington State Game Department, Fisheries Management Division. Report No. 86-12. 204 pp.
- Gallagher, S.P., and C.M. Gallagher. 2005. Discrimination of Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and Steelhead redds and evaluation of the use of redd data for estimating escapement in several unregulated streams in northern California. *N. Amer. J. Fish. Manage.* 25:284-300.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J.B. Stern, H.S., and D.B. Rubin. 2004. Bayesian data analysis. Chapman and Hall/CRC. 668 pp.
- Griffith, J. S. 1981. Estimation of the age-frequency distribution of stream-dwelling trout by underwater observation. *Prog. Fish. Cult.* 43:51-52.
- Groot, C., and L. Margolis. 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. UBC Press, Vancouver BC.

- Hagen, J., A. S. Decker, J. Korman, and R. Bison. 2010. Effectiveness of night snorkeling for estimating Steelhead parr abundance in a large river basin. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 30:1280-1302.
- Higgins, P.S., J. Korman, and M.J. Bradford. 2002. Statistical power of monitoring inferences derived from experimental flow comparisons planned for Coquitlam-Buntzen Water Use Plan. B.C. Hydro internal report. Burnaby, B.C. 20 p.
- Hillman, T. W., J. W. Mullan, and J. S. Griffith. 1992. Accuracy of underwater counts of juvenile Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and Steelhead. *N. Amer. J. Fish. Manage.* 12:598-603.
- Hume, J.M.B., and E.A. Parkinson. 1987. Effect of density on the survival, growth, and dispersal of Steelhead trout fry (*Salmo gairdneri*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 44:271-281.
- Irvine, J.R., R.C. Bocking, K.K. English, and M. Labelle. 1992. Estimating coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) spawning escapements by conducting visual surveys in areas surveyed using stratified random and stratified index sampling designs. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 49:1972-1981.
- Jacobs S., J. Firman, G. Susac, D. Stewart and J. Weybright. 2002. Status of Oregon coastal stocks of anadromous salmonids, 2000-2001 and 2001-2002; Monitoring Program Report Number OPSW-ODFW-2002-3, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, Oregon.
- Keeley, E. R. and C. J. Walters 1994. The British Columbia Watershed Restoration Program: summary of the experimental design, monitoring and restoration techniques workshop. Vancouver, B.C., B.C. Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks.
- Koning, C.W., and E.R. Keeley. 1997. Salmonid biostandards for estimating production benefits of fish habitat rehabilitation techniques. In P.A. Slaney and D. Zaldokas. [eds.] Fish habitat rehabilitation procedures. Watershed Restoration Technical Circular No. 9.
- Korman, J., R.N.M. Ahrens, P.S. Higgins, C.J. Walters. 2002. Effects of observer efficiency, arrival timing, and survey life on estimates of escapement for Steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) derived from repeat mark and recapture experiments. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 59:1116-1131.
- Korman, J., J. Schick, and A. Clarke. 2010. Cheakamus River Steelhead Juvenile and Adult Abundance Monitoring: Fall 2008 to Spring 2009. Report prepared for BC Hydro, Burnaby, BC, February 2010.
- Korman, J., A. S. Decker, B. Mossop, and J. Hagen. 2011. A comparison of electrofishing- and snorkeling-based mark-recapture methods for estimating detection probability and abundance of juvenile Steelhead in a medium-sized river. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 30:1303-1314.
- Korman, J. and J. Schick. 2018. Cheakamus Project Water Use Plan: Synthesis of Adult and Juvenile Data to Evaluate Effects of the WUP Flow Regime on Steelhead in the Cheakamus River. Report prepared for BC Hydro, Burnaby, BC. January 2018.

- Koski, K.V. 1975. The survival and fitness of two stocks of chum salmon from egg deposition to emergence in a controlled stream environment at Big Beef Creek. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington, Washington.
- Krebs, C.J. 1999. Ecological Methodology. Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park. 620 pp.
- Kruschke, J. K. 2013. BEST:Bayesian estimation supersedes the *t* test. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 142(2):573-603. doi: 10.1037/a0029146
- Ladell, J., J. Korman, D.J.F. McCubbing. 2010. Cheakamus River bull trout radiotelemetry and enumeration program 2007-2009. Consultant report prepared for Canadian National Railway Company, CN Environment, Surrey, BC, July 2010.
- Leake, A.C. 2005. Coquitlam-Buntzen Water Use Plan Terms of Reference: COQMON#7 - Lower Coquitlam River Fish Productivity Index. BC Hydro, Water Use Plan Monitoring Report, November 28, 2005.
- Macnair, J. 2018. Coquitlam River Fish Stranding Monitoring. Prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services. 52 p.
- Macnair, J. 2003. Coquitlam River water use plan: 2003 chum fry enumeration. Unpublished report prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services.
- Macnair, J. 2004. 2003 Coquitlam River adult salmon escapement survey. Prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services. 21 p.
- Macnair, J. 2005. 2004 Coquitlam River adult salmon escapement survey. Prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services. 29 p.
- Macnair, J. 2006. Progress Report: 2005 Coquitlam River adult salmon escapement survey. Prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services. 36 p.
- Macnair, J. 2010a. Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program 2010 adult Steelhead results summary. Prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services, July 2010. 22 p.
- McNair, J. 2018. Coquitlam River Rampdown Fish Stranding Monitoring: May 1, 2016 – April 30, 2017. Report prepared for BC Hydro, Burnaby, BC by Living Resources Environmental Services, 2018.
- Macnair, J. 2010b. Coquitlam River Fish Monitoring Program: 2009 adult escapement interim data report. Prepared for BC Generation Sustainability and Aboriginal Relations, Burnaby BC by Living Resources Environmental Services. 36 p.
- McCarthy, M.A. 2007. Bayesian methods in ecology. Cambridge University Press, New York. 296 p.

- McCullough, D.A. 1999. A review and synthesis of effects and alterations to the water temperature regime on freshwater life stages of salmonids with special reference to Chinook salmon. Report prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, Seattle, Washington, July 1999. EPA Report No. 910-R-99-010.
- McDonald, T.L., W.P. Erickson, and L.L. McDonald. 2000. Analysis of count data from before-after control-impact studies. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*. 5:262-279.
- Myers, J. 2003. Historical population structure of Willamette and lower Columbia River basin Pacific salmonids. National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. 188 p.
- Nelson, J.R. and C. Wood. 2007. Assessment of the genetic relationship among sockeye salmon and kokanee populations of the lower Mainland of British Columbia: Implications for establishment of an anadromous sockeye run in the Coquitlam watershed. Report prepared for Bridge Coastal Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program by SeaStar Biotech Inc. and Fisheries and Oceans Canada. March 30, 2007
- Otis, D. L., K. P. Burnham, G. C. White, and D. R. Anderson. 1978. Statistical inference from capture data on closed animal populations. *Wild. Monogr.* 62:1-135.
- Perrin C.J., J.R. Irvine. 1990. A review of survey life estimates as they apply to the area-under-the-curve method for estimating the spawning escapement of Pacific salmon. *Can. Tech. Rep. Of Fish and Aquat. Sci.* No.1733.
- Peterson, J.T., R.F. Thurow, and J.W. Guzevich. 2004. An evaluation of multipass electrofishing for estimating the abundance of stream-dwelling salmonids. *Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc.* 113:462-475.
- Plante, N. 1990. Estimation de la taille d'une population animale a l'aide d'un modele de capture-recapture avec stratification. M.Sc. thesis, Universite Laval, Quebec.
- Ptolemy, R. A. 1993. Maximum salmonid densities in fluvial habitats in British Columbia. Pages 223-250 in L. Berg and P. W. Delaney, editors. *Proceedings of the Coho Workshop*, Nanaimo, BC, May 26-28, 1992. Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans.
- Ptolemy, R.A. 2007. Trial electrofishing and training using shore-based units; basic findings and observations for Coquitlam River sampling of riffle/rapid habitats during September 10-11, 2007. Management brief prepared for the Coquitlam-Buntzen Water Use Plan Consultative Committee, November 21, 2007. (included as Appendix 6.1 in this document).
- R Development Core Team. 2009. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL <http://www.R-project.org>.
- Plummer, M. 2003. JAGS: A Program for Analysis of Bayesian Graphical Models Using Gibbs Sampling. URL: <http://mcmc-jags.sourceforge.net/>
- Plummer, M. 2013. rjags: Bayesian Graphical Models using MCMC. R package version 3-10. URL: <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rjags>

- Ricker, W.E. 1975. Computation and interpretation of biological statistics of fish populations. Bulletin of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 191.
- Riley, S.C., J. Korman, S. Decker. 1997. Coquitlam River salmonid stock assessment. Unpublished draft report prepared for B.C. Hydro, Burnaby, B.C. 20 p.
- Royle, J.A., and R.M. Dorazio. 2008. Hierarchical modeling and inference in ecology: the analysis of data from populations, metapopulations and communities. Academic Press, London, UK. 444 p.
- Salo, E.O. 1991. Life history of chum salmon, *Oncorhynchus keta*. In Groot, C., and L. Margolis (eds.), Pacific salmon life histories, p. 231-309. Univ. B. C. Press, Vancouver, B. C., Canada.
- Satterthwaite, T.D. 2002. Population health goals and assessment methods for Steelhead in the Klamath mountains province. Monitoring Program Report Number OPSW-ODFW-2002-08, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Portland, OR.
- Schick, J., J. McNair 2018. Lower Coquitlam River fish productivity index, study period 2000-2017. Report prepared for BC Hydro.
- Schwarz, C. J. and Bonner, S. J. 2011. A spline-based capture-mark-recapture model applied to estimating the number of Steelhead within the Bulkley River passing the Moricetown Canyon in 2001-2010. Prepared for the B.C. Ministry of Environment. 83 pp.
- Schwarz, C.J., D. Pickard, K. Marine and S.J. Bonner. 2009. Juvenile Salmonid Outmigrant Monitoring Evaluation, Phase II– December 2009. Final Technical Memorandum for the Trinity River Restoration Program, Weaverville, CA. 155 pp. + appendices.
- Schwarz, C.J., C.G. Taylor. 1998. Use of the stratified-Petersen estimator in fisheries management: estimating the number of pink salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) spawners in the Fraser River. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 55: 280-296.
- Seber, G.A.F. 1982. The estimation of animal abundance. 2nd ed. Griffin, London.
- Spiegelhalter, D.J., Thomas A., Best, N.G., and Lunn, D. 1999. WinBUGS User Manual: Version 1.4. Cambridge: MRC Biostatistics Unit, 60 pp.
- Stewart-Oaten, A., W.W. Murdoch, and K.R. Parker. 1986. Environmental impact assessment: pseudoreplication in time? Ecology 67:929-940.
- Sturtz, S., Legges U., and Gelman A. 2005. R2WinBGS: a package for running WinBUGS from R. Journal of statistical software 3: 1-16.
- Su, Z., Adkison, M.D., and Van Alen, B.W. 2001. A hierarchical Bayesian model for estimating historical salmon escapement and escapement timing. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 58: 1648-1662.
- Symons, P. E. K. 1979. Estimated escapement of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) for maximum smolt production in rivers of different productivity. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 36:132-140.
- Tautz, A.F., B.R. Ward, and R. A. Ptolemy. 1992. Steelhead trout productivity and stream carrying capacity. PSARC Working Paper S92-68.

- Thurrow, R. F., J. Peterson, J.W. Guzevich. 2006. Utility and validation of day and night snorkel counts for estimating bull trout abundance in first- to third-order streams. *N. Amer. J. Fish. Manage.* 26:217-232.
- Ward, B. R. and P. A. Slaney. 1993. Egg-to-smolt survival and fry-to-smolt density dependence of Keogh River Steelhead trout. *Can. Spec. Publ. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 118.
- Wyatt, R. J. 2002. Estimating riverine fish population size from single- and multiple-pass removal sampling using a hierarchical model. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 59:695-706.
- Wyatt, R.J. 2003. Mapping the abundance of riverine fish populations: integrating hierarchical Bayesian models with a geographic information system (GIS). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 60: 997-1007.
- Zar, J.H. 1999. *Biostatistical Analysis*. 4th Edition. Pearson Prentice-Hall. 944 pp

10 Figures, Tables and Appendices

10.1 Figures and Tables for Chapter 1

Table 1.1 Scheduled monthly flow releases from Coquitlam Dam under Treatment 1 and 2 of the Coquitlam River Water Use Plan (BC Hydro 2003a).

| Period | Reservoir diversion schedule (m ³ /s) | | | | | Target species and life stage |
|-----------|--|------|------------------------|-------------|-----|-------------------------------|
| | Domestic water | | Coquitlam Dam releases | | | |
| | Target | Min | Treatment 1 | Treatment 2 | | |
| | | | | Target | Min | |
| Jan 1-15 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 1.0 | 5.9 | 3.6 | Chinook spawning |
| Jan 15-31 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | Chinook incubation |
| Feb | 11.9 | 10.7 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 1.8 | Chinook incubation |
| Mar | 11.9 | 10.7 | 0.8 | 4.3 | 1.1 | Steelhead spawning |
| Apr | 12.0 | 10.8 | 0.8 | 3.5 | 1.1 | Steelhead spawning |
| May | 12.0 | 11.0 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 1.1 | Steelhead spawning |
| Jun | 12.0 | 10.9 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 | Steelhead parr |
| Jul | 18.0 | 15.8 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.1 | Steelhead parr |
| Aug | 23.0 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 1.1 | Steelhead parr |
| Sep | 23.0 | 20.9 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 1.1 | Steelhead parr |
| Oct | 12.0 | 10.8 | 0.8 | 6.1 | 3.6 | Chinook spawning |
| Nov | 12.0 | 10.8 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.5 | Chinook spawning |
| Dec | 11.9 | 10.7 | 1.1 | 5.0 | 2.5 | Chinook spawning |




Figure 1.1 Life stage periodicity chart for some anadromous salmonids in the Coquitlam River.




Figure 1.2 Map of lower Coquitlam River study area with stream reaches defined by the Coquitlam-Buntzen Water Use Plan Consultative Committee.

10.2 Figures, Tables and Appendices for Chapter 2




Figure 2.1 Map showing adult spawning index sites A-C in the lower portion of Coquitlam River study area (reaches 1, 2a)




Figure 2.2 Map showing adult spawning index sites D and E, in the upper portion of Coquitlam River study area (reaches 2b, 3 and 4).




Figure 2.3 Spawning run timing base on survey counts for Chinook, Chum, Coho and Pink Salmon in the Coquitlam River during 2016 (red line) and 2002-2015 (teal).




Figure 2.4 Modeled relationship between mean survey life and day of arrival in the study area for Chum, Pink, Coho, and Chinook salmon in the Coquitlam River based on empirical data from other streams.




Figure 2.5 Relationship between the surveyor's 'guesstimate' of observer efficiency and observer efficiency estimated from mark recapture experiments for Chum, Pink and all species combined conducted opportunistically since 2006 in the Coquitlam River.




Figure 2.6 Estimated numbers of Coho spawning in mainstem and side-channel habitat in the Coquitlam River 2003-2016.

Table 2.1 Water column visibility (m) at permanent measurement points at index sites A-E and surveyor 'guesstimates' of observer efficiency for Chum salmon (see Section 2.1.2) during surveys of the Coquitlam River for the 2016 brood year.

| Escapement Year | Date | Estimated water column visibility (m) | | | | | non-index |
|--------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | |
| 2016 | 05-Sep | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | |
| 2016 | 15-Sep | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | |
| 2016 | 21-Sep | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 |
| 2016 | 29-Sep | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 | >3 |
| 2016 | 05-Oct | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 1.10 | 0.85 |
| 2016 | 12-Oct | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1.10 | 1.20 | 0.70 |
| 2016 | 19-Oct | | | | | 1.00 | 0.70 |
| 2016 | 30-Oct | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.9 | 1.10 | 0.75 |
| 2016 | 16-Nov | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.9 | 1.10 | |
| 2016 | 27-Nov | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.20 | |
| 2016 | 04-Dec | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 1.20 | |
| 2016 | 10-Dec | 1.00 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | |
| 2016 | 17-Dec | 1.1 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.30 | 0.70 |
| 2016 | 22-Dec | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.30 | |
| 2016 | 30-Dec | | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.40 | |
| 2016 | 06-Jan | | 1.20 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.40 | |
| 2016 | 14-Jan | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.40 | |
| 2016 | 20-Jan | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.40 | |
| 2016 | 24-Jan | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.30 | |

| Surveyor "guesstimates" of observer efficiency (0.0-1.0): (chum salmon example) | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 2016 | 05-Sep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2016 | 15-Sep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2016 | 21-Sep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 | 29-Sep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2016 | 05-Oct | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.7 | 0.75 | 1.5 |
| 2016 | 12-Oct | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.75 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| 2016 | 19-Oct | | | | | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| 2016 | 30-Oct | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| 2016 | 16-Nov | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2016 | 27-Nov | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2016 | 04-Dec | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2016 | 10-Dec | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | |
| 2016 | 17-Dec | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| 2016 | 22-Dec | | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2016 | 30-Dec | | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2016 | 06-Jan | | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |
| 2016 | 14-Jan | | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | |
| 2016 | 20-Jan | | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | |
| 2016 | 24-Jan | | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | |

Table 2.2 Averages and absolute ranges for observer efficiency estimates (proportion of live salmon present that are visually detected) derived from mark-recapture experiments, and subjective ‘guesstimates’ of observer efficiency made by the survey crew for the same surveys during which the mark-recapture experiments occurred (see Section 2.1.2).

| | Chum | Pink | Coho | Chinook | All species |
|--|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Mark-recapture-derived estimates of observer efficiency | | | | | |
| Number of estimates | 10 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 22 |
| mean | 0.52 | 0.66 | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.59 |
| minimum | 0.33 | 0.49 | 0.67 | 0.53 | 0.33 |
| maximum | 0.69 | 0.85 | 0.73 | 0.67 | 0.85 |
| Surveyor guesstimates of observer efficiency | | | | | |
| mean | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.77 | 0.76 |
| minimum | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.60 | 0.75 | 0.55 |
| maximum | 0.90 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.95 |
| Survey life (days) | | | | | |
| Number of estimates | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | |
| mean of estimates | 8.4 | 10.7 | 16.4 | 7.7 | |
| range of estimates | 6.5 - 9.9 | 6.8 - 15.5 | 11.6 - 15.2 | 7.7 - 8.5 | |
| maximum survey life for individual fish | 16 | 20 | 28 | 25 | |

Table 2.3 Estimated average proportion of Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook salmon spawning populations present at each index site (A-E) and at non-index (NI) sites during 2002-2016.

| Species | Site | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Chum | A | 0.25 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 0.48 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.27 | 0.66 | 0.29 | 0.42 | 0.55 | 0.59 | 0.36 |
| | B | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| | C | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.15 |
| | D | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 0.32 | 0.24 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.21 |
| | E | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.10 |
| | NI | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.08 |
| Pink | A | - | 0.16 | - | 0.17 | - | 0.21 | - | 0.13 | - | 0.17 | - | 0.21 | - | 0.30 | - |
| | B | - | 0.10 | - | 0.05 | - | 0.03 | - | 0.06 | - | 0.02 | - | 0.05 | - | 0.03 | - |
| | C | - | 0.20 | - | 0.11 | - | 0.08 | - | 0.12 | - | 0.06 | - | 0.13 | - | 0.12 | - |
| | D | - | 0.21 | - | 0.20 | - | 0.24 | - | 0.25 | - | 0.19 | - | 0.22 | - | 0.17 | - |
| | E | - | 0.24 | - | 0.42 | - | 0.33 | - | 0.36 | - | 0.53 | - | 0.32 | - | 0.29 | - |
| | NI | - | 0.10 | - | 0.05 | - | 0.11 | - | 0.08 | - | 0.04 | - | 0.07 | - | 0.08 | - |
| Coho | A | 0.00 | <0.001 | 0.02 | 0.09 | <0.01 | 0.01 | 0.05 | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | B | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| | C | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| | D | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.36 | 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.21 | 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.22 |
| | E | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.63 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.56 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.66 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.68 |
| | NI | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.05 | <0.001 | 0.01 | <0.01 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.02 |
| Chinook | A | | | | | | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| | B | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | C | | | | | | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| | D | | | | | | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.04 |
| | E | | | | | | 0.64 | 0.76 | 0.70 | 0.60 | 0.61 | 0.84 | 0.61 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.90 |
| | NI | | | | | | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 |

Table 2.4 Annual escapement estimates for Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook salmon for the years 2002-2016.

| Year | Treatment | Chum | Pink | Coho | Chinook |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| 2002 | 1 | 15,378 | - | 2,648 | - |
| 2003 | 1 | 18,301 | 5,418 | 1,562 | - |
| 2004 | 1 | 27,992 | - | 2,562 | - |
| 2005 | 1 | 24,559 | 4,279 | 1,334 | - |
| 2006 | 1 | 51,860 | - | 939 | - |
| 2007 | 1 | 11,066 | 2,944 | 2,401 | 360 |
| 2008 | 1 | 18,224 | - | 878 | 952 |
| 2009 | 2 | 19,600 | 10,698 | 3,175 | 1,529 |
| 2010 | 2 | 6,931 | - | 12,338 | 8,018 |
| 2011 | 2 | 27,410 | 10,427 | 8,414 | 4,918 |
| 2012 | 2 | 57,300 | - | 11,320 | 1,632 |
| 2013 | 2 | 42,220 | 34,280 | 13,290 | 2,413 |
| 2014 | 2 | 8,491 | - | 4,957 | 572 |
| 2015 | 2 | 23,410 | 9,327 | 4,979 | 123 |
| 2016 | 2 | 78,120 | - | 6,867 | 511 |

Table 2.5 Adult spawning distribution by habitat type during Treatment 1 and 2, and the 2008 transition year. Treatment 2 flows were initiated October 22, 2008. Proportions shown are calculated based on counts of actively spawning fish only, during surveys when all five index sites were completed. M/S = mainstem, NOC = natural off-channel, OCR = off-channel restoration site, and OC = off-channel sites combined.

| | | Treatment 1 | | | | | | Transition | Treatment 2 | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Species | Habitat | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | mean | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | mean |
| Chum | M/S | 0.87 | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.73 | 0.77 | 0.69 | 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.75 | 0.76 |
| | NOC | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| | OCR | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.09 |
| | OC | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.31 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 0.25 | 0.24 |
| Pink | M/S | 0.55 | | 0.65 | | 0.71 | 0.64 | | 0.76 | | 0.59 | | 0.77 | | 0.74 | | 0.72 |
| | NOC | 0.19 | | 0.22 | | 0.20 | 0.20 | | 0.12 | | 0.22 | | 0.12 | | 0.15 | | 0.15 |
| | OCR | 0.26 | | 0.13 | | 0.09 | 0.16 | | 0.12 | | 0.19 | | 0.11 | | 0.11 | | 0.13 |
| | OC | 0.45 | | 0.35 | | 0.29 | 0.36 | | 0.24 | | 0.41 | | 0.23 | | 0.26 | | 0.28 |
| Coho | M/S | 0.32 | 0.27 | 0.46 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.51 | 0.74 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.84 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.89 |
| | NOC | 0.15 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| | OCR | 0.53 | 0.35 | 0.21 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 0.28 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| | OC | 0.68 | 0.73 | 0.51 | 0.20 | 0.29 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.11 |
| Chinook | M/S | 0.82 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 0.99 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.95 |
| | NOC | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| | OCR | 0.12 | 0.26 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| | OCR | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.05 |

Appendix 2.1 The number of hatchery Chinook smolts released in the Coquitlam River 2004-2018 (Scott Ducharme, DFO).

| Release year | Number |
|--------------|---------|
| 2004 | 38,000 |
| 2005 | 142,244 |
| 2006 | 195,000 |
| 2007 | 171,050 |
| 2008 | 300,000 |
| 2009 | 200,456 |
| 2010 | 245,000 |
| 2011 | 122,943 |
| 2012 | 22,800 |
| 2013 | 50,000 |
| 2014 | 50,000 |
| 2015 | 93,116 |
| 2016 | 49,713 |
| 2017 | 50,000 |
| 2018 | 69,070 |

Appendix 2.2 Results of the 2006-2016 mark-recapture study to estimate observer efficiency and survey life for Chum, Pink, Coho and Chinook salmon in the Coquitlam River. Only shaded values provide estimates of mean observer efficiency, as they represent cases where the proportion of tagged fish detected was based on a complete survey of the study area within two days of tagging.

| Species | Treat-ment | | Index site | Tag group | Tagging | | Recovery date | Duration (days) | Marks (M) | Recoveries | | Surveyor guess | % females | Recoveries by section | | | | |
|---------|------------|------|------------|-----------|---------------|---|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|-----|----------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|----|----|
| | Year | | | | date | | | | | (R) | R/M | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| chum | 1 | 2006 | below A | 1 | Oct 17 | ✓ | Oct 21-22 | 4.5 | 11 | 1 | 9% | 0.90 | 18% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 1 | 2006 | below A | 1 | Oct 17 | | Oct 31-Nov 1 | 14.5 | 11 | 0 | 0% | 0.70 | 18% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 1 | 2006 | C | 2 | Oct 19-20 | ✓ | Oct 21-22 | 1-3 | 89 | 61 | 69% | 0.90 | 33% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 12 |
| chum | 1 | 2006 | C | 2 | Oct 19-20 | ✓ | Oct 31-Nov 1 | 11-13 | 89 | 1 | 1% | 0.85 | 33% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| chum | 1 | 2006 | C | 3 | Oct 24, 28-30 | | Oct 31-Nov 1 | 2.5-7.5 | 59 | 27 | 46% | 0.85 | 44% | 0 | 1 | 2 | 71 | 14 |
| chum | 1 | 2006 | C | 3 | Oct 24, 28-30 | | Nov 30 | 31.5-36.5 | 59 | 0 | 0% | 0.70 | 44% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 1 | 2007 | A | 1 | Oct 11 | | Oct 13 | 2 | 33 | 11 | 33% | 0.55 | 45% | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 1 | 2007 | A | 1 | Oct 11 | ✓ | Oct 26-27 | 15-16 | 33 | 3 | 9% | 0.70 | 45% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| chum | 1 | 2007 | A | 2 | Oct-25 | ✓ | Oct 26-27 | 1-2 | 62 | 27 | 44% | 0.60 | 55% | 22 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| chum | 1 | 2007 | A | 2 | Oct-25 | | Oct 31-Nov 1 | 6-7 | 62 | 19 | 31% | 0.60 | 55% | 16 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| chum | 1 | 2008 | A | 1 | Oct 15 | ✓ | Oct 16-17 | 1-2 | 81 | 43 | 53% | 0.80 | 37% | 27 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A | 1 | Oct 15 | ✓ | Oct 23-24 | 7-8 | 81 | 18 | 22% | 0.80 | 37% | 14 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A | 1 | Oct 15 | ✓ | Oct 28-29 | 13-14 | 81 | 2 | 2% | 0.65 | 37% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A | 1 | Oct 15 | ✓ | Nov 4-5 | 20-21 | 81 | 0 | 0% | 0.65 | 37% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A/D | 2 | Oct 21 | ✓ | Oct 23-24 | 1-2 | 93 | 34 | 37% | 0.80 | 35% | 15 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 3 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A/D | 2 | Oct 21 | ✓ | Oct 28-29 | 7-8 | 93 | 37 | 40% | 0.70 | 35% | 10 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 7 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A/D | 2 | Oct 21 | ✓ | Nov 4-5 | 14-15 | 93 | 3 | 3% | 0.50 | 35% | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| chum | 2 | 2008 | A/D | 2 | Oct 21 | | Nov 15 | 24-25 | 93 | 0 | 0% | 0.50 | 35% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | | Oct 20 | 1 | 64 | 32 | 50% | 0.78 | 56% | 14 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | | Oct 23 | 4 | 64 | 22 | 34% | 0.80 | 56% | 8 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 |
| chum | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | | Oct 31 | 12 | 64 | 4 | 6% | 0.80 | 56% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | | Nov 4 | 16 | 64 | 0 | 0% | 0.80 | 56% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2011 | A/D | 1 | Oct 24 | | Oct 25 | 1 | 70 | 40 | 57% | 0.75 | 49% | 28 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2011 | A/D | 1 | Oct 24 | | Nov 1 | 8 | 70 | 12 | 17% | 0.75 | 49% | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2011 | A/D | 1 | Oct 24 | | Nov 7 | 14 | 70 | 0 | 0% | 0.75 | 49% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chum | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 1 | Oct 17 | | Oct 18 | 1 | 88 | 57 | 65% | 0.77 | 50% | 22 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 6 |
| chum | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 1 | Oct 18 | | Oct 23 | 6 | 88 | 31 | 35% | 0.77 | 50% | 14 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 5 |
| chum | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | | Oct 29 | 12 | 88 | 6 | 7% | 0.77 | 50% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| chum | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 2 | Oct 28 | | Oct 29 | 1 | 92 | 60 | 65% | 0.77 | 48% | 33 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 2 |
| chum | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 2 | Oct 29 | | Nov 6 | 9 | 92 | 22 | 24% | 0.77 | 48% | 9 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 |
| chum | 1 | 2015 | A/D | 1 | 19-Oct | | 20-Oct | 1 | 133 | 88 | 66% | 74.2% | 0.579 | 45 | 7 | 7 | 25 | 4 |
| chum | 1 | 2015 | A/D | 1 | 19-Oct | | 25-Oct | 6 | 133 | 73 | 55% | 74.0% | 0.579 | 32 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 7 |
| chum | 1 | 2015 | A/D | 1 | 19-Oct | | 03-Nov | 15 | 133 | 13 | 10% | 65.0% | 0.579 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| pink | 1 | 2007 | A | 1 | Oct 9-11 | ✓ | Oct 13 | 2-4 | 45 | 23 | 51% | 0.55 | 22% | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| pink | 1 | 2007 | A | 1 | Oct 9-11 | ✓ | Oct 26-27 | 17-19 | 45 | 0 | 0% | 0.65 | 22% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/D | 1 | Sept 22 | | Sept 23 | 1 | 32 | 23 | 72% | 0.95 | 59% | 4 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 1 |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/D | 1 | Sept 22 | | Oct 7 | 15 | 32 | 6 | 19% | 0.85 | 59% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/D | 1 | Sept 22 | | Oct 12 | 20 | 32 | 3 | 9% | 0.85 | 59% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/D | 1 | Sept 22 | | Oct 28 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0% | 0.85 | 59% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix 2.2. continued

| Species | Treat- ment | Year | Index site | Tag group | Tagging date | Recovery date | Duration (days) | Marks (M) | Recoveries (R) | R/M | surveyor guess | % females | Recoveries by section | | | | |
|---------|----------------|------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|----|----|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | A | B | C | D | E |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/B | 2 | Oct 6 | Oct 7 | 1 | 79 | 39 | 49% | 0.85 | 65% | 11 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 4 |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/B | 2 | Oct 6 | Oct 12 | 6 | 79 | 41 | 52% | 0.85 | 65% | 17 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 5 |
| pink | 2 | 2009 | A/B | 2 | Oct 6 | Oct 28 | 22 | 79 | 0 | 0% | 0.80 | 65% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| pink | 2 | 2013 | D | 1 | Sept 26 | Sept 27 | 1 | 142 | 120 | 85% | 0.87 | 33% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 76 | 42 |
| pink | 2 | 2013 | D | 1 | Sept 26 | Oct 5 | 8 | 142 | 59 | 42% | 0.70 | 33% | 1 | 2 | 1 | 23 | 32 |
| pink | 2 | 2013 | D | 1 | Sept 26 | Oct 10 | 13 | 142 | 31 | 22% | 0.77 | 33% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 21 |
| pink | 2 | 2013 | D | 1 | Sept 26 | Oct 18 | 21 | 142 | 5 | 4% | 0.77 | 33% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| pink | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 2 | Oct 17 | Oct 18 | 1 | 35 | 25 | 71% | 0.77 | 40% | 7 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 2 |
| pink | 2 | 2013 | A/D | 2 | Oct 18 | Oct 23 | 6 | 35 | 7 | 20% | 0.75 | 40% | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | D | 1 | 22-Sep | 23-Sep | 1 | 77 | 52 | 68% | 1.00 | 51.9% | | | 34 | 18 | 4.1 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | D | 1 | 22-Sep | 30-Sep | 8 | 77 | 27 | 35% | 1.00 | 51.9% | 1 | | 15 | 10 | 3.2 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | D | 1 | 22-Sep | 03-Oct | 12 | 77 | 17 | 22% | 1.00 | 51.9% | | | 8 | 9 | 6.4 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | D | 1 | 22-Sep | 07-Oct | 16 | 77 | 4 | 5% | 0.86 | 51.9% | | | 1 | 3 | 6.1 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | A | 2 | 29-Sep | 30-Sep | 1 | 102 | 66 | 65% | | 34.3% | 2 | | | | 3.2 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | A | 2 | 29-Sep | 03-Oct | 5 | 102 | 63 | 62% | | 34.3% | 4 | | | | 6.4 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | A | 2 | 29-Sep | 07-Oct | 9 | 102 | 23 | 23% | | 34.3% | 3 | 2 | 3 | | 6.1 |
| pink | 2 | 2015 | A | 2 | 29-Sep | 15-Oct | 17 | 102 | 2 | 2% | | 34.3% | | | | | 6.8 |
| chinook | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | Oct 20 | 1 | 17 | 9 | 53% | 0.75 | 41% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| chinook | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | Oct 23 | 4 | 17 | 6 | 35% | 0.80 | 41% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| chinook | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | Oct 31 | 12 | 17 | 3 | 18% | 0.72 | 41% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| chinook | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | Nov 4 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0% | 0.70 | 41% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chinook | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | Nov 13 | 25 | 17 | 1 | 6% | 0.65 | 41% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| chinook | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Oct 19 | Nov 23 | 35 | 17 | 0 | 0% | 0.65 | 41% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| chinook | 2 | 2011 | A/D | 1 | Oct 24 | Oct 25 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 67% | | 25% | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| chinook | 2 | 2011 | A/D | 1 | Oct 24 | Nov 1 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 25% | | 25% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| chinook | 2 | 2011 | A/D | 1 | Oct 24 | Nov 7 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0% | | 25% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| coho | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Dec 4 | Dec 5 | 1 | 20 | 14 | 70% | 0.60 | 60% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| coho | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Dec 4 | Dec 19 | 15 | 20 | 9 | 45% | 0.60 | 60% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| coho | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Dec 4 | Dec 31 | 27 | 20 | 6 | 30% | 0.60 | 60% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| coho | 2 | 2010 | A/D | 1 | Dec 4 | Jan 11 | 38 | 20 | 0 | 0% | | 60% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| coho | 2 | 2011 | E | 1 | Nov 20 | Nov 21 | 1 | 15 | 10 | 67% | | 47% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| coho | 2 | 2011 | E | 1 | Nov 20 | Dec 1 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 33% | | 47% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| coho | 2 | 2011 | E | 1 | Nov 20 | Dec 7 | 16 | 15 | 5 | 33% | | 47% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| coho | 2 | 2011 | E | 1 | Nov 20 | Dec 19 | 28 | 15 | 2 | 13% | | 47% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| coho | 2 | 2012 | D/E | 1 | Nov 24 | Nov 25 | 1 | 30 | 22 | 73% | | 44% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 |
| coho | 2 | 2012 | D/E | 1 | Nov 24 | Nov 29 | 5 | 30 | 19 | 63% | | 44% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 |
| coho | 2 | 2012 | D/E | 1 | Nov 24 | Dec 8 | 14 | 30 | 12 | 40% | | 44% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| coho | 2 | 2012 | D/E | 1 | Nov 24 | Dec 14 | 20 | 30 | 5 | 17% | | 44% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Appendix 2.3 Unadjusted live counts of Pink salmon during 2003-2015.

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Percent of the number of adults present | | | | | non-index |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | |
| 2003 | 16-Sep | 13 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 22-Sep | 19 | 5 | 18 | 0 | 39 | 15 | 9 | - |
| 2003 | 27-Sep | 24 | 5 | 255 | 227 | 266 | 12 | 10 | - |
| 2003 | 04-Oct | 31 | 6 | 378 | 511 | 907 | 642 | 159 | 340 |
| 2003 | 10-Oct | 37 | 5 | 243 | 12 | 135 | 504 | 379 | - |
| 2003 | 14-Oct | 41 | 6 | 270 | 18 | 105 | 350 | 1200 | 77 |
| 2003 | 02-Nov | 60 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003 | 07-Nov | 65 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 13-Nov | 71 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
| 2005 | 23-Sep | 20 | 5 | 93 | 109 | 47 | 54 | 16 | - |
| 2005 | 05-Oct | 32 | 5 | 201 | 37 | 149 | 294 | 403 | - |
| 2005 | 12-Oct | 39 | 4 | 162 | 3 | - | 215 | 656 | - |
| 2005 | 24-Oct | 51 | 6 | 34 | 0 | 13 | 59 | 356 | 29 |
| 2005 | 01-Nov | 59 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 09-Nov | 67 | 2 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| 2005 | 16-Nov | 74 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007 | 04-Sep | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | - |
| 2007 | 14-Sep | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | - |
| 2007 | 20-Sep | 17 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | - |
| 2007 | 27-Sep | 24 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 95 | 31 | 8 |
| 2007 | 03-Oct | 30 | 5 | 128 | 31 | 53 | 222 | 233 | - |
| 2007 | 13-Oct | 40 | 6 | 227 | 21 | 90 | 209 | 475 | 132 |
| 2007 | 17-Oct | 44 | 2 | - | - | - | 152 | 329 | - |
| 2007 | 27-Oct | 54 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 2007 | 31-Oct | 58 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2007 | 06-Nov | 64 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 29-Nov | 87 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2009 | 03-Sep | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 37 | - |
| 2009 | 12-Sep | 12 | 5 | 46 | 24 | 50 | 223 | 56 | - |
| 2009 | 17-Sep | 17 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 32 | 182 | 181 | 64 |
| 2009 | 23-Sep | 23 | 5 | 68 | 181 | 86 | 180 | 435 | 114 |
| 2009 | 07-Oct | 37 | 6 | 440 | 188 | 465 | 971 | 1071 | 283 |
| 2009 | 12-Oct | 42 | 6 | 700 | 136 | 452 | 746 | 1299 | 264 |
| 2009 | 20-Oct | 50 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 784 | - |
| 2009 | 28-Oct | 58 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 88 | 0 |
| 2009 | 04-Nov | 65 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Appendix 2.3 continued (Pink)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Int of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2011 | 04-Sep | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 31 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Sep | 10 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 41 | - |
| 2011 | 17-Sep | 17 | 5 | 27 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 43 | - |
| 2011 | 24-Sep | 24 | 5 | 42 | 22 | 92 | 141 | 101 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Oct | 40 | 6 | 550 | 75 | 89 | 505 | 1753 | 98 |
| 2011 | 17-Oct | 47 | 6 | 590 | 39 | 352 | 794 | 1809 | 122 |
| 2011 | 25-Oct | 55 | 6 | 97 | 2 | 19 | 98 | 311 | 43 |
| 2011 | 01-Nov | 62 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 |
| 2011 | 06-Nov | 67 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2011 | 15-Nov | 76 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2013 | 16-Sep | 16 | 5 | 50 | 223 | 20 | 27 | 26 | - |
| 2013 | 27-Sep | 27 | 6 | 961 | 1074 | 2426 | 2800 | 1762 | 1082 |
| 2013 | 05-Oct | 35 | 6 | 2024 | 773 | 1269 | 2894 | 4520 | 656 |
| 2013 | 11-Oct | 41 | 6 | 4075 | 232 | 1429 | 2396 | 5099 | 782 |
| 2013 | 18-Oct | 48 | 6 | 2679 | 55 | 907 | 1797 | 2681 | 593 |
| 2013 | 23-Oct | 53 | 6 | 243 | 9 | 31 | 274 | 980 | 82 |
| 2013 | 29-Oct | 59 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 1 |
| 2015 | 08-Sep | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | |
| 2015 | 16-Sep | 16 | 5 | 26 | 80 | 219 | 246 | 362 | |
| 2015 | 23-Sep | 23 | 6 | 540 | 333 | 535 | 704 | 939 | 227 |
| 2015 | 30-Sep | 30 | 6 | 1206 | 60 | 598 | 949 | 1300 | 637 |
| 2015 | 03-Oct | 33 | 6 | 2036 | 66 | 566 | 853 | 1404 | 386 |
| 2015 | 07-Oct | 37 | 6 | 1939 | 128 | 685 | 647 | 1539 | 331 |
| 2015 | 15-Oct | 45 | 6 | 145 | 13 | 39 | 126 | 425 | 45 |
| 2015 | 20-Oct | 50 | 6 | 45 | 2 | 15 | 43 | 110 | 0 |
| 2015 | 25-Oct | 55 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 19 | - |

Appendix 2.4 Unadjusted live counts of Chum salmon during 2002-2016.

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2002 | 5-Oct | 26 | 5 | 23 | 1 | 15 | 28 | 6 | - |
| 2002 | 11-Oct | 32 | 5 | 83 | 17 | 48 | 120 | 7 | - |
| 2002 | 18-Oct | 39 | 5 | 530 | 83 | 229 | 432 | 26 | - |
| 2002 | 22-Oct | 43 | 5 | 1209 | 223 | 453 | 577 | 202 | - |
| 2002 | 31-Oct | 52 | 6 | 1808 | 228 | 731 | 1416 | 361 | 330 |
| 2002 | 5-Nov | 57 | 2 | - | - | - | 1294 | 117 | - |
| 2002 | 13-Nov | 65 | 5 | 198 | 123 | 360 | 979 | 198 | - |
| 2002 | 24-Nov | 76 | 5 | 29 | 0 | 98 | 97 | 64 | - |
| 2002 | 28-Nov | 80 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 116 | 13 | 6 | - |
| 2002 | 5-Dec | 87 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 16-Sep | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 22-Sep | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 27-Sep | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 4-Oct | 25 | 5 | 120 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 10-Oct | 31 | 5 | 94 | 9 | 64 | 43 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 14-Oct | 35 | 6 | 231 | 7 | 213 | 594 | 52 | 82 |
| 2003 | 2-Nov | 54 | 6 | 2172 | 422 | 502 | 1076 | 33 | 314 |
| 2003 | 7-Nov | 59 | 5 | 3268 | 483 | 642 | 540 | 20 | - |
| 2003 | 13-Nov | 65 | 3 | 1844 | 327 | 484 | - | - | - |
| 2003 | 22-Nov | 74 | 5 | 177 | 149 | 165 | 115 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 9-Dec | 91 | 5 | 23 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 16-Dec | 98 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 23-Dec | 103 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 30-Dec | 110 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 29-Sep | 20 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 5-Oct | 26 | 5 | 60 | 14 | 6 | 11 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 13-Oct | 34 | 6 | 346 | 35 | 75 | 316 | 20 | 127 |
| 2004 | 20-Oct | 41 | 5 | 928 | 175 | 279 | 766 | 38 | - |
| 2004 | 27-Oct | 48 | 6 | 1727 | 392 | 863 | 1104 | 87 | 556 |
| 2004 | 5-Nov | 57 | 5 | 3313 | 295 | - | 1577 | 239 | 649 |
| 2004 | 12-Nov | 64 | 5 | 1857 | 520 | 1226 | 1502 | 242 | - |
| 2004 | 21-Nov | 73 | 5 | 296 | 62 | 287 | 245 | 17 | - |
| 2004 | 30-Nov | 82 | 5 | 23 | 1 | 16 | 38 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 11-Dec | 93 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 23-Dec | 103 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 29-Dec | 109 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 23-Sep | 14 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 5-Oct | 26 | 5 | 258 | 52 | 79 | 120 | 12 | - |
| 2005 | 12-Oct | 33 | 4 | 719 | 50 | - | 383 | 175 | - |
| 2005 | 24-Oct | 45 | 6 | 2230 | 393 | 1080 | 1059 | 283 | 547 |
| 2005 | 1-Nov | 53 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 290 | - |
| 2005 | 9-Nov | 61 | 2 | - | 95 | - | 472 | - | - |
| 2005 | 16-Nov | 68 | 6 | 505 | 104 | 95 | 280 | 26 | 64 |
| 2005 | 24-Nov | 76 | 5 | 183 | 24 | 104 | 16 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 4-Dec | 86 | 5 | 18 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 9-Dec | 91 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 17-Dec | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 23-Dec | 103 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 28-Dec | 108 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - |

Appendix 2.4 continued (Chum)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2006 | 27-Sep | 18 | 5 | 40 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 4-Oct | 25 | 5 | 187 | 34 | 49 | 97 | 3 | - |
| 2006 | 11-Oct | 32 | 6 | 1544 | 391 | 548 | 1241 | 258 | 1034 |
| 2006 | 22-Oct | 43 | 5 | 3844 | 900 | 1152 | 3137 | 1123 | - |
| 2006 | 31-Oct | 52 | 6 | 3657 | 737 | 1408 | 3180 | 1048 | 1318 |
| 2006 | 30-Nov | 82 | 5 | 48 | 6 | 63 | 47 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 8-Dec | 90 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 15-Dec | 97 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 24-Dec | 106 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 30-Dec | 112 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 14-Sep | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 20-Sep | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 27-Sep | 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 3-Oct | 25 | 24 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 13-Oct | 35 | 34 | 97 | 28 | 31 | 170 | 5 | 48 |
| 2007 | 17-Oct | 39 | 38 | - | - | - | 313 | 39 | - |
| 2007 | 27-Oct | 49 | 48 | 742 | 144 | 363 | 595 | 121 | 155 |
| 2007 | 31-Oct | 53 | 52 | 939 | 220 | 406 | 457 | 141 | 124 |
| 2007 | 6-Nov | 59 | 58 | 603 | 143 | 281 | 373 | 114 | - |
| 2007 | 29-Nov | 82 | 81 | 44 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 5-Dec | 88 | 87 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 21-Dec | 104 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2008 | 29-Sep | 21 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 20 | - |
| 2008 | 6-Oct | 28 | 5 | 40 | 9 | 18 | 102 | 28 | - |
| 2008 | 10-Oct | 32 | 6 | 208 | 20 | 110 | 85 | 49 | 86 |
| 2008 | 17-Oct | 39 | 6 | 841 | 80 | 245 | 438 | 83 | 127 |
| 2008 | 23-Oct | 45 | 6 | 1096 | 95 | 336 | 730 | 246 | 231 |
| 2008 | 29-Oct | 51 | 6 | 1316 | 156 | 393 | 1019 | 455 | 247 |
| 2008 | 5-Nov | 58 | 5 | 959 | 353 | 300 | 828 | 608 | - |
| 2008 | 15-Nov | 68 | 5 | 123 | 106 | 159 | 392 | 148 | - |
| 2008 | 24-Nov | 77 | 5 | 17 | 1 | 26 | 17 | 1 | - |
| 2008 | 4-Dec | 87 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2008 | 9-Dec | 92 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2009 | 12-Sep | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2009 | 17-Sep | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2009 | 23-Sep | 15 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2009 | 7-Oct | 29 | 6 | 57 | 5 | 31 | 82 | 24 | 42 |
| 2009 | 12-Oct | 34 | 6 | 505 | 75 | 108 | 127 | 37 | 95 |
| 2009 | 20-Oct | 42 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 749 | - |
| 2009 | 28-Oct | 50 | 6 | 2585 | 247 | 1131 | 1870 | 1031 | 321 |
| 2009 | 4-Nov | 57 | 5 | 1042 | 279 | 1014 | 1161 | 454 | - |
| 2009 | 12-Nov | 65 | 5 | 180 | 57 | 244 | 276 | 34 | - |
| 2009 | 24-Nov | 77 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 8 | 17 | - |
| 2009 | 5-Dec | 88 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2010 | 3-Sep | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2010 | 10-Sep | 8 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 | 21-Sep | 19 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | - |
| 2010 | 5-Oct | 33 | 5 | 50 | 17 | 54 | 37 | 57 | - |
| 2010 | 12-Oct | 40 | 6 | 311 | 35 | 118 | 283 | 191 | 89 |
| 2010 | 20-Oct | 48 | 6 | 331 | 40 | 102 | 474 | 305 | 165 |
| 2010 | 23-Oct | 51 | 6 | 553 | 33 | 119 | 388 | 288 | 278 |
| 2010 | 31-Oct | 59 | 5 | - | 37 | 119 | 415 | 257 | 57 |
| 2010 | 4-Nov | 63 | 6 | 176 | 42 | 108 | 382 | 139 | 51 |
| 2010 | 13-Nov | 72 | 4 | 61 | - | 53 | 86 | 1 | - |
| 2010 | 23-Nov | 82 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - |
| 2010 | 29-Nov | 88 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Appendix 2.4 continued (Chum)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2011 | 04-Sep | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Sep | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 24-Sep | 22 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Oct | 38 | 6 | 238 | 51 | 63 | 36 | 7 | 9 |
| 2011 | 17-Oct | 45 | 6 | 790 | 66 | 144 | 229 | 32 | 14 |
| 2011 | 25-Oct | 53 | 6 | 3056 | 224 | 557 | 849 | 434 | 495 |
| 2011 | 01-Nov | 60 | 6 | 6757 | 575 | 702 | 794 | 183 | 493 |
| 2011 | 06-Nov | 65 | 6 | 3785 | 240 | 475 | 446 | 162 | 257 |
| 2011 | 15-Nov | 74 | 5 | 692 | 132 | 185 | 230 | 42 | - |
| 2011 | 21-Nov | 80 | 5 | 238 | 21 | 114 | 67 | 6 | - |
| 2011 | 01-Dec | 90 | 6 | 23 | 5 | 33 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 07-Dec | 96 | 5 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 19-Dec | 108 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 10-Sep | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2012 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - |
| 2012 | 24-Sep | 22 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | - |
| 2012 | 30-Sep | 28 | 5 | 81 | 2 | 4 | 20 | 31 | - |
| 2012 | 8-Oct | 36 | 6 | 1349 | 93 | 747 | 1475 | 361 | 477 |
| 2012 | 14-Oct | 42 | 3 | - | - | 928 | 1808 | 403 | - |
| 2012 | 15-Nov | 74 | 6 | 224 | 214 | 108 | 273 | 65 | 27 |
| 2012 | 18-Nov | 77 | 5 | 154 | 72 | 89 | 203 | 35 | - |
| 2012 | 25-Nov | 84 | 6 | 25 | 7 | 25 | 11 | 0 | 13 |
| 2012 | 3-Dec | 92 | 4 | 3 | 0 | - | 6 | 0 | - |
| 2012 | 9-Dec | 98 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 16-Sep | 14 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | - |
| 2013 | 27-Sep | 25 | 6 | 14 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 05-Oct | 33 | 6 | 73 | 41 | 40 | 105 | 66 | 10 |
| 2013 | 11-Oct | 39 | 6 | 570 | 57 | 89 | 207 | 159 | 68 |
| 2013 | 18-Oct | 46 | 6 | 1928 | 127 | 490 | 1003 | 447 | 537 |
| 2013 | 23-Oct | 51 | 6 | 3073 | 527 | 1020 | 1849 | 804 | 693 |
| 2013 | 29-Oct | 57 | 6 | 4273 | 767 | 1288 | 3353 | 1136 | 681 |
| 2013 | 05-Nov | 64 | 6 | 5212 | 534 | 1014 | 2110 | 980 | 605 |
| 2013 | 15-Nov | 74 | 5 | 1682 | 88 | 353 | 885 | 380 | - |
| 2013 | 21-Nov | 80 | 5 | 114 | 45 | 115 | 155 | 9 | - |
| 2013 | 27-Nov | 86 | 5 | 27 | 5 | 33 | 8 | 0 | - |
| 2013 | 04-Dec | 93 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2013 | 11-Dec | 100 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| 2014 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | - |
| 2014 | 26-Sep | 24 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 2014 | 07-Oct | 35 | 5 | 51 | 3 | 15 | 29 | 16 | - |
| 2014 | 14-Oct | 42 | 2 | - | - | - | 27 | 62 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Oct | 46 | 6 | 292 | 0 | 72 | 100 | 112 | 72 |
| 2014 | 23-Oct | 51 | 3 | - | - | 76 | 174 | 148 | - |
| 2014 | 30-Oct | 58 | 3 | - | - | 119 | 477 | 208 | - |
| 2014 | 02-Nov | 61 | 6 | 1656 | 201 | 127 | 513 | 272 | 85 |
| 2014 | 13-Nov | 72 | 5 | 160 | 37 | 43 | 80 | 28 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Nov | 77 | 6 | 52 | 12 | 23 | 16 | 21 | 36 |
| 2014 | 29-Nov | 88 | 3 | - | - | 11 | 1 | 0 | - |

Appendix 2.4 continued (Chum)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2015 | 16-Sep | 14 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2015 | 23-Sep | 21 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2015 | 30-Sep | 28 | 6 | 30 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 16 |
| 2015 | 03-Oct | 31 | 6 | 164 | 11 | 20 | 21 | 14 | 37 |
| 2015 | 07-Oct | 35 | 6 | 453 | 16 | 28 | 13 | 16 | 93 |
| 2015 | 15-Oct | 43 | 6 | 2604 | 186 | 247 | 482 | 113 | 174 |
| 2015 | 20-Oct | 48 | 6 | 2945 | 383 | 672 | 1018 | 289 | 435 |
| 2015 | 25-Oct | 53 | 5 | 3382 | 627 | 902 | 1531 | 447 | - |
| 2015 | 03-Nov | 62 | 5 | 1451 | 755 | 323 | 585 | 309 | - |
| 2015 | 09-Nov | 68 | 5 | 705 | 309 | 156 | 233 | 72 | - |
| 2015 | 20-Nov | 79 | 5 | 40 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 3 | - |
| 2016 | 05-Sep | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2016 | 15-Sep | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| 2016 | 21-Sep | 19 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | - |
| 2016 | 29-Sep | 27 | 6 | 43 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 9 |
| 2016 | 05-Oct | 33 | 5 | 85 | 22 | 41 | 135 | 23 | - |
| 2016 | 12-Oct | 40 | 6 | 1691 | 57 | 178 | 535 | 361 | 187 |
| 2016 | 19-Oct | 47 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 684 | - |
| 2016 | 30-Oct | 58 | 6 | 5331 | 2014 | 2457 | 3384 | 1045 | 1541 |
| 2016 | 16-Nov | 75 | 6 | 1643 | 522 | 1020 | 1196 | 259 | 316 |
| 2016 | 27-Nov | 86 | 5 | 170 | 21 | 68 | 31 | 7 | - |
| 2016 | 04-Dec | 93 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | - |

Appendix 2.5 Unadjusted live counts of Coho salmon during 2002-2016.

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2002 | 5-Oct | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2002 | 11-Oct | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2002 | 18-Oct | 29 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - |
| 2002 | 22-Oct | 33 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - |
| 2002 | 31-Oct | 42 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2002 | 5-Nov | 47 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2002 | 13-Nov | 55 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 97 | - |
| 2002 | 24-Nov | 66 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 192 | - |
| 2002 | 28-Nov | 70 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 231 | - |
| 2002 | 5-Dec | 77 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 189 | - |
| 2002 | 12-Dec | 84 | 2 | - | - | - | 50 | 296 | - |
| 2002 | 18-Dec | 90 | 3 | - | 0 | - | 70 | 268 | - |
| 2002 | 26-Dec | 98 | 3 | - | 11 | - | 22 | 169 | - |
| 2002 | 12-Jan | 115 | 3 | - | 7 | - | 1 | 35 | - |
| 2003 | 27-Sep | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 4-Oct | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 10-Oct | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2003 | 14-Oct | 25 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003 | 2-Nov | 44 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 58 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003 | 9-Nov | 51 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 62 | 81 | - |
| 2003 | 13-Nov | 55 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 48 | - | - | - |
| 2003 | 22-Nov | 64 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 55 | 97 | - |
| 2003 | 9-Dec | 81 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 135 | - |
| 2003 | 16-Dec | 88 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 55 | - |
| 2003 | 23-Dec | 95 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 44 | - |
| 2003 | 30-Dec | 102 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | - |
| 2003 | 5-Jan | 108 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| 2004 | 29-Sep | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 5-Oct | 16 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 14-Oct | 25 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 2004 | 21-Oct | 32 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | - |
| 2004 | 28-Oct | 39 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 0 |
| 2004 | 5-Nov | 47 | 4 | 1 | 2 | - | 25 | 13 | 9 |
| 2004 | 12-Nov | 54 | 5 | 21 | 4 | 19 | 27 | 62 | - |
| 2004 | 21-Nov | 63 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 65 | 50 | 110 | - |
| 2004 | 1-Dec | 73 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 95 | 379 | - |
| 2004 | 11-Dec | 83 | 4 | - | 16 | 0 | 38 | 76 | - |
| 2004 | 23-Dec | 95 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 195 | - |
| 2004 | 29-Dec | 101 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 94 | - |
| 2005 | 23-Sep | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 5-Oct | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 12-Oct | 23 | 4 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 24-Oct | 35 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2005 | 1-Nov | 43 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| 2005 | 9-Nov | 51 | 2 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
| 2005 | 16-Nov | 58 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 54 | 14 | 0 |
| 2005 | 24-Nov | 66 | 5 | 19 | 9 | 50 | 10 | 7 | - |
| 2005 | 4-Dec | 76 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 54 | 42 | 13 | - |

Appendix 2.5 continued (Coho)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2005 | 9-Dec | 81 | 6 | 32 | 0 | 55 | 70 | 7 | 6 |
| 2005 | 17-Dec | 89 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 56 | 49 | 12 | - |
| 2005 | 23-Dec | 95 | 4 | 0 | 4 | - | 33 | 65 | - |
| 2005 | 28-Dec | 100 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 34 | 55 | - |
| 2005 | 5-Jan | 108 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 19 | 2 | - |
| 2006 | 27-Sep | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 4-Oct | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2006 | 11-Oct | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 2006 | 22-Oct | 33 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 18 | 4 | - |
| 2006 | 31-Oct | 42 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 29 | 7 | 0 |
| 2006 | 17-Nov | 59 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 27 | - |
| 2006 | 30-Nov | 72 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 59 | 16 |
| 2006 | 8-Dec | 80 | 2 | - | - | - | 9 | 37 | - |
| 2006 | 15-Dec | 87 | 2 | - | - | - | 32 | 12 | - |
| 2006 | 24-Dec | 96 | 2 | - | - | - | 23 | 18 | - |
| 2006 | 30-Dec | 102 | 3 | - | - | 1 | 8 | 6 | - |
| 2006 | 16-Jan | 119 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | - |
| 2007 | 3-Oct | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 13-Oct | 24 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007 | 31-Oct | 42 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2007 | 6-Nov | 48 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | - |
| 2007 | 29-Nov | 71 | 5 | 7 | 30 | 16 | 130 | 217 | - |
| 2007 | 21-Dec | 93 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 76 | 99 | - |
| 2007 | 29-Dec | 101 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 19 | 60 | - |
| 2007 | 4-Jan | 107 | 2 | - | - | - | 9 | 39 | - |
| 2007 | 16-Jan | 119 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 3 | 6 | - |
| 2007 | 26-Jan | 129 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2008 | 10-Oct | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008 | 17-Oct | 28 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008 | 23-Oct | 34 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 2008 | 29-Oct | 40 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 |
| 2008 | 5-Nov | 47 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 24 | - |
| 2008 | 15-Nov | 57 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 95 | - |
| 2008 | 24-Nov | 66 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 68 | - |
| 2008 | 4-Dec | 76 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 60 | 103 | 2 |
| 2008 | 9-Dec | 81 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 11 | - |
| 2008 | 15-Dec | 87 | 4 | - | 0 | 4 | 25 | 41 | - |
| 2008 | 21-Dec | 93 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 44 | 0 |
| 2008 | 29-Dec | 101 | 3 | - | - | 3 | 7 | 17 | - |
| 2008 | 6-Jan | 109 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 2 | 9 | - |
| 2008 | 14-Jan | 117 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 22-Jan | 125 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2009 | 28-Oct | 39 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2009 | 4-Nov | 46 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 14 | 26 | - |
| 2009 | 12-Nov | 54 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 122 | - |
| 2009 | 24-Nov | 66 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 195 | - |
| 2009 | 5-Dec | 77 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 52 | 431 | - |
| 2009 | 13-Dec | 85 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 39 | 415 | - |
| 2009 | 20-Dec | 92 | 2 | - | - | - | 15 | 161 | - |
| 2009 | 29-Dec | 101 | 3 | - | - | 3 | 33 | 119 | - |
| 2009 | 7-Jan | 110 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 13 | 36 | - |
| 2009 | 14-Jan | 117 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 3 | 10 | - |
| 2009 | 26-Jan | 129 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |

Appendix 2.5 continued (Coho)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2010 | 21-Sep | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2010 | 5-Oct | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 2010 | 12-Oct | 23 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 59 | 29 | 19 |
| 2010 | 20-Oct | 31 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 19 | 60 | 106 | 10 |
| 2010 | 23-Oct | 34 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 26 | 55 | 153 | 19 |
| 2010 | 31-Oct | 42 | 5 | | 3 | 0 | 121 | 237 | 34 |
| 2010 | 4-Nov | 46 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 86 | 139 | 565 | 61 |
| 2010 | 13-Nov | 55 | 4 | 3 | | 137 | 162 | 761 | - |
| 2010 | 23-Nov | 65 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 129 | 329 | 813 | - |
| 2010 | 29-Nov | 71 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 64 | 203 | 863 | 77 |
| 2010 | 6-Dec | 78 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 235 | 866 | - |
| 2010 | 19-Dec | 91 | - | - | 25 | 21 | 181 | 567 | - |
| 2010 | 30-Dec | 102 | - | - | 16 | 7 | 109 | 239 | - |
| 2010 | 11-Jan | 114 | - | - | 3 | 0 | 31 | 64 | - |
| 2010 | 18-Jan | 121 | - | - | 1.4 | 0 | 17 | 21 | - |
| 2011 | 24-Sep | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Oct | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 17-Oct | 28 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 2 |
| 2011 | 25-Oct | 36 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 58 | 1 |
| 2011 | 1-Nov | 43 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 132 | 128 | 4 |
| 2011 | 6-Nov | 48 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 71 | 167 | 242 | 45 |
| 2011 | 15-Nov | 57 | 6 | 20 | 27 | 108 | 218 | 318 | 39 |
| 2011 | 21-Nov | 63 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 235 | 399 | 40 |
| 2011 | 1-Dec | 73 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 40 | 184 | 596 | 38 |
| 2011 | 7-Dec | 79 | 5 | - | 0 | 70 | 167 | 623 | 39 |
| 2011 | 19-Dec | 91 | 5 | - | 0 | 20 | 103 | 426 | 26 |
| 2011 | 27-Dec | 99 | 5 | - | 2 | 0 | 56 | 281 | 20 |
| 2011 | 2-Jan | 105 | 5 | - | 14 | 3 | 38 | 194 | 17 |
| 2011 | 12-Jan | 115 | 5 | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 69 | 8 |
| 2011 | 21-Jan | 124 | 5 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 |
| 2012 | 15-Nov | 57 | 6 | 0 | 29 | 115 | 328 | 526 | 36 |
| 2012 | 18-Nov | 60 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 75 | 357 | 538 | - |
| 2012 | 25-Nov | 67 | 6 | 3 | 24 | 146 | 384 | 633 | 79 |
| 2012 | 3-Dec | 75 | 4 | 4 | 67 | - | 267 | 820 | - |
| 2012 | 9-Dec | 81 | 6 | 0 | 37 | 74 | 260 | 725 | 69 |
| 2012 | 14-Dec | 86 | 4 | - | 35 | 50 | 137 | 800 | - |
| 2012 | 23-Dec | 95 | 4 | - | 11 | 32 | 94 | 520 | - |
| 2012 | 30-Dec | 102 | 5 | - | 1 | 13 | 62 | 290 | 12 |
| 2012 | 3-Jan | 106 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 21 | 188 | - |
| 2012 | 11-Jan | 114 | 4 | - | - | 0 | 7 | 87 | 3 |
| 2012 | 17-Jan | 120 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 3 | 24 | - |
| 2012 | 24-Jan | 127 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 1 | 9 | - |

Appendix 2.5 continued (Coho)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Unadjusted count of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2013 | 11-Oct | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2013 | 18-Oct | 29 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 11 | 0 |
| 2013 | 29-Oct | 40 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 69 | 0 |
| 2013 | 05-Nov | 47 | 6 | 3 | 27 | 144 | 126 | 378 | - |
| 2013 | 15-Nov | 57 | 5 | 19 | 47 | 204 | 148 | 449 | - |
| 2013 | 21-Nov | 63 | 5 | 14 | 48 | 243 | 161 | 619 | - |
| 2013 | 27-Nov | 69 | 5 | 13 | 54 | 265 | 262 | 708 | - |
| 2013 | 04-Dec | 76 | 6 | 4 | 43 | 117 | 268 | 1044 | 131 |
| 2013 | 11-Dec | 83 | 5 | 0 | 30 | 82 | 318 | 1060 | - |
| 2013 | 18-Dec | 90 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 128 | 224 | 919 | 54 |
| 2013 | 29-Dec | 101 | 4 | - | 90 | 54 | 129 | 582 | - |
| 2013 | 5-Jan | 108 | 4 | - | 70 | 42 | 77 | 365 | - |
| 2013 | 14-Jan | 117 | 4 | - | 29 | 10 | 36 | 123 | - |
| 2013 | 25-Jan | 128 | 4 | - | 3 | 2 | 13 | 28 | - |
| 2014 | 07-Oct | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | - |
| 2014 | 14-Oct | 25 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 16 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Oct | 29 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 2 | 21 | 3 |
| 2014 | 23-Oct | 34 | 4 | 4 | - | 9 | 11 | 43 | - |
| 2014 | 30-Oct | 41 | 4 | - | 4 | 11 | 13 | 56 | - |
| 2014 | 02-Nov | 44 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 106 | 31 |
| 2014 | 13-Nov | 55 | 5 | 12 | 36 | 134 | 170 | 482 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Nov | 60 | 6 | 6 | 34 | 105 | 252 | 538 | 94 |
| 2014 | 29-Nov | 71 | 3 | 9 | 23 | 67 | 141 | 495 | - |
| 2014 | 03-Dec | 75 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 47 | 115 | 352 | - |
| 2014 | 08-Dec | 80 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 21 | 89 | 221 | 16 |
| 2014 | 20-Dec | 92 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 32 | 123 | - |
| 2014 | 29-Dec | 101 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 67 | - |
| 2014 | 04-Jan | 107 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 44 | - |
| 2014 | 09-Jan | 112 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 25 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Jan | 121 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | - |
| 2014 | 23-Jan | 126 | 3 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 6 | - |
| 2015 | 25-Oct | 36 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | - |
| 2015 | 03-Nov | 45 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 31 | - |
| 2015 | 09-Nov | 51 | 5 | 0 | 68 | 50 | 142 | 76 | - |
| 2015 | 20-Nov | 62 | 5 | 0 | 51 | 36 | 311 | 388 | - |
| 2015 | 29-Nov | 71 | 6 | 0 | 29 | 53 | 214 | 483 | 102 |
| 2015 | 04-Dec | 76 | 3 | - | - | 35 | 150 | 352 | - |
| 2015 | 21-Dec | 93 | 4 | - | 2 | 15 | 66 | 141 | - |
| 2015 | 29-Dec | 101 | 4 | - | 0 | 13 | 25 | 55 | - |
| 2015 | 07-Jan | 110 | 4 | - | 0 | 14 | 2 | 28 | - |
| 2015 | 13-Jan | 116 | 4 | - | 0 | 5 | 2 | 21 | - |
| 2015 | 20-Jan | 123 | 4 | - | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | - |
| 2016 | 12-Oct | 23 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 16 |
| 2016 | 19-Oct | 30 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 52 | - |
| 2016 | 31-Oct | 42 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 66 | 186 | 19 |
| 2016 | 16-Nov | 58 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 227 | 877 | 33 |
| 2016 | 27-Nov | 69 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 80 | 229 | 665 | - |
| 2016 | 04-Dec | 76 | 4 | 0 | 18 | 70 | 184 | 457 | - |
| 2016 | 10-Dec | 82 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 60 | 144 | 408 | - |
| 2016 | 17-Dec | 89 | 4 | - | 8 | 38 | 100 | 279 | - |
| 2016 | 22-Dec | 94 | 4 | - | 6 | 20 | 59 | 159 | - |
| 2016 | 30-Dec | 102 | 4 | - | 2 | 3 | 32 | 98 | - |
| 2016 | 06-Jan | 109 | 4 | - | 1 | 3 | 15 | 68 | - |
| 2016 | 14-Jan | 117 | 4 | - | 0 | 2 | 11 | 46 | - |
| 2016 | 20-Jan | 123 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | - |
| 2016 | 24-Jan | 127 | 4 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | - |


Appendix 2.6 Unadjusted live counts of Chinook salmon during 2007-2016.

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | unt of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2007 | 27-Sep | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2007 | 3-Oct | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2007 | 13-Oct | 26 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 44 | - |
| 2007 | 17-Oct | 30 | 2 | - | - | - | 0 | 27 | - |
| 2007 | 27-Oct | 40 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 34 | 7 | 134 | 5 |
| 2007 | 31-Oct | 44 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 49 | 0 |
| 2007 | 6-Nov | 50 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | - |
| 2007 | 29-Nov | 73 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2008 | 23-Sep | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2008 | 29-Sep | 12 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 90 | - |
| 2008 | 6-Oct | 19 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 166 | - |
| 2008 | 10-Oct | 23 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 242 | 23 |
| 2008 | 17-Oct | 30 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 24 | 36 | 190 | 10 |
| 2008 | 23-Oct | 36 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 36 | 107 | 3 |
| 2008 | 29-Oct | 42 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 68 | 0 |
| 2008 | 5-Nov | 49 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | - |
| 2008 | 15-Nov | 59 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | - |
| 2008 | 24-Nov | 68 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2009 | 3-Sep | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2009 | 12-Sep | 10 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 2 | - |
| 2009 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 12 | - |
| 2009 | 23-Sep | 21 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 107 | 16 |
| 2009 | 7-Oct | 35 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 81 | 250 | 35 |
| 2009 | 12-Oct | 40 | 6 | 89 | 29 | 40 | 84 | 495 | 6 |
| 2009 | 20-Oct | 48 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 263 | - |
| 2009 | 28-Oct | 56 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 41 | 19 | 126 | 0 |
| 2009 | 4-Nov | 63 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | - |
| 2009 | 12-Nov | 71 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - |
| 2009 | 24-Nov | 83 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 2009 | 5-Dec | 94 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2010 | 3-Sep | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2010 | 10-Sep | 8 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 2010 | 21-Sep | 19 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | - |
| 2010 | 5-Oct | 33 | 5 | 56 | 49 | 159 | 86 | 1025 | - |
| 2010 | 12-Oct | 40 | 6 | 52 | 18 | 150 | 250 | 1036 | 292 |
| 2010 | 20-Oct | 48 | 6 | 52 | 22 | 97 | 281 | 915 | 114 |
| 2010 | 23-Oct | 51 | 6 | 69 | 4 | 86 | 343 | 911 | 105 |
| 2010 | 31-Oct | 59 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 213 | 625 | 69 |
| 2010 | 4-Nov | 63 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 30 | 101 | 331 | 34 |
| 2010 | 13-Nov | 72 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 30 | 58 | - |
| 2010 | 23-Nov | 82 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | - |
| 2010 | 29-Nov | 88 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Sep | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2011 | 24-Sep | 22 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 31 | 38 | 32 | - |
| 2011 | 10-Oct | 38 | 6 | 17 | 20 | 75 | 268 | 800 | 74 |
| 2011 | 17-Oct | 45 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 95 | 246 | 730 | 66 |
| 2011 | 25-Oct | 53 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 38 | 181 | 505 | 33 |
| 2011 | 1-Nov | 60 | 6 | 53 | 21 | 44 | 103 | 167 | 36 |
| 2011 | 6-Nov | 65 | 6 | 23 | 7 | 10 | 62 | 159 | 19 |
| 2011 | 15-Nov | 74 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 16 | 22 | - |
| 2011 | 21-Nov | 80 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | - |
| 2011 | 1-Dec | 90 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2011 | 7-Dec | 96 | 5 | - | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix 2.6 continued (Chinook)

| Year | Date | Run day | No. sites surveyed | Number of the number of adults present | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|--------------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | | | | site A | site B | site C | site D | site E | non-index |
| 2012 | 10-Sep | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2012 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2012 | 24-Sep | 22 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | - |
| 2012 | 30-Sep | 28 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 137 | - |
| 2012 | 08-Oct | 36 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 246 | 18 |
| 2012 | 14-Oct | 42 | 3 | - | - | 0 | 23 | 239 | - |
| 2012 | 15-Nov | 99 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 2012 | 18-Nov | 77 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | - |
| 2012 | 25-Nov | 84 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2012 | 03-Dec | 92 | 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | - |
| 2012 | 09-Dec | 98 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 09-Sep | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2013 | 16-Sep | 14 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2013 | 27-Sep | 25 | 6 | 3 | 21 | 4 | 35 | 563 | 8 |
| 2013 | 05-Oct | 33 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 22 | 53 | 533 | 49 |
| 2013 | 11-Oct | 39 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 19 | 28 | 549 | 22 |
| 2013 | 18-Oct | 46 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 32 | 42 | 345 | 24 |
| 2013 | 23-Oct | 51 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 14 | 24 | 230 | 17 |
| 2013 | 29-Oct | 57 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 146 | 0 |
| 2013 | 05-Nov | 64 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 0 |
| 2013 | 15-Nov | 74 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | - |
| 2014 | 09-Sep | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 2014 | 17-Sep | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | - |
| 2014 | 26-Sep | 24 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 2014 | 07-Oct | 35 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 103 | - |
| 2014 | 14-Oct | 42 | 2 | - | - | - | 17 | 130 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Oct | 46 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 113 | 0 |
| 2014 | 23-Oct | 51 | 3 | - | - | 2 | 7 | 96 | - |
| 2014 | 30-Oct | 58 | 3 | - | - | 11 | 5 | 36 | - |
| 2014 | 02-Nov | 61 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 29 | 0 |
| 2014 | 13-Nov | 72 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | - |
| 2014 | 18-Nov | 77 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2015 | 16-Sep | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - |
| 2015 | 23-Sep | 21 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2015 | 30-Sep | 28 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| 2015 | 03-Oct | 31 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 2015 | 07-Oct | 35 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 0 |
| 2015 | 15-Oct | 43 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| 2015 | 20-Oct | 48 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 23 | 0 |
| 2015 | 25-Oct | 53 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 31 | - |
| 2015 | 03-Nov | 62 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| 2015 | 09-Nov | 68 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |
| 2016 | 15-Sep | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - |
| 2016 | 21-Sep | 19 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - |
| 2016 | 29-Sep | 27 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| 2016 | 05-Oct | 33 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | - |
| 2016 | 12-Oct | 40 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 89 | 7 |
| 2016 | 19-Oct | 47 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 78 | - |
| 2016 | 30-Oct | 58 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 2 |
| 2016 | 16-Nov | 75 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 0 |
| 2016 | 27-Nov | 86 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | - |
| 2016 | 04-Dec | 93 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - |

Appendix 2.7 An example of diagnostic graphs used to evaluate model fit to the observed data (Coho 2008). Top-left graph shows fit of predicted run timing curve (line) to unadjusted counts of spawners over time. Top-right shows relationship of predicted to observed counts with 95% credible intervals for predicted counts. Lower-left graph shows variation in predicted observer efficiency across surveys. Lower-right graph shows the regression relationship between surveyor guesstimates of observer efficiency (horizontal axis) and mark-recapture derived estimates of observer efficiency (vertical axis), with 95% credible intervals shown for the estimated regression slope.



10.3 Figures, Tables and Appendices for Chapter 3




Figure 3.1 Steelhead redd locations in reaches 2b-4 in Coquitlam River in 2006, which was the highest escapement year during 2005-2018. Coquitlam Dam is the upstream boundary of the survey area. See Figure 3.2 for redd symbol legend.




Figure 3.2 Steelhead redd locations in reaches 2a-2b in Coquitlam River in 2006. The downstream boundary of reach 2a is also the survey area boundary.




Figure 3.3 Discharge (m^3/s) in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during Steelhead spawning period in 2005 – 2018 (Water Survey of Canada station 08MH002).




Figure 3.4 Cumulative proportion of the total Steelhead redd count observed over time during 2018 (teal) and 2005 - 2017 (red).




Figure 3.5 Relationship between Adult Steelhead escapement estimates based on redd counts and peak counts of live adults during surveys 2005-2018 in the Coquitlam River.

Table 3.1 Mean, minimum and Maximum discharge (m^3/s) in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during Steelhead redd surveys during 2005 – 2018 (Water Survey of Canada station 08MH002).

| Year | Discharge (m^3/s) | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | Mean | Minimum | Maximum |
| 2005 | 4.9 | 2.7 | 9.6 |
| 2006 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 4.7 |
| 2007 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 5.9 |
| 2008 | 4.2 | 2.0 | 7.9 |
| 2009 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 8.3 |
| 2010 | 6.1 | 4.4 | 7.4 |
| 2011 | 8.3 | 5.2 | 10.6 |
| 2012 | 7.0 | 5.5 | 8.4 |
| 2013 | 6.8 | 4.0 | 10.3 |
| 2014 | 6.3 | 2.2 | 13.5 |
| 2015 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 9.1 |
| 2016 | 6.7 | 3.7 | 10.8 |
| 2017 | 9.3 | 7.3 | 12.4 |
| 2018 | 13.2 | 4.0 | 26.5 |

Table 3.2 Survey dates with raw counts of Steelhead redds, estimated new redds, and live adult counts for all surveys during 2005-2018. Estimated new redds includes the sum of the raw count and the estimated number of redds that were constructed and then obscured by substrate movement prior to a scheduled survey, based on a redd survey life model.

| Year | Survey date | Days since previous survey | Raw count of new redds | Estimated # new redds | # Live adults observed |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2005 | 24-Mar | - | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 2005 | 13-Apr | 20 | 81 | 84 | 2 ² |
| 2005 | 28-Apr | 15 | 45 | 45 | 11 ² |
| 2005 | 07-May | 9 | 71 | 71 | 22 ² |
| 2005 | 05-Jun | 28 | 17 | 20 | 4 |
| 2005 | Total | | 218 | 224 | peak = 22 |
| 2006 | 15-Feb | - | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 2006 | 13-Mar | 27 | 32 ¹ | 32 | 11 |
| 2006 | 19-Apr | 37 | 285 ³ | 368 | 95 |
| 2006 | 13-May | 24 | 82 | 86 | 37 |
| 2006 | 12-Jun | 29 | 31 | 35 | 3 |
| 2006 | Total | | 430 | 521 | peak = 95 |
| 2007 | 02-Mar | - | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 2007 | 04-Apr | 32 | 5 | 9 | 45 |
| 2007 | 19-Apr | 15 | 68 | 71 | 43 |
| 2007 | 30-Apr | 11 | 25 | 25 | 33 |
| 2007 | 09-May | 9 | 30 | 30 | 24 |
| 2007 | 22-May | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| 2007 | 13-Jun | 22 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 2007 | Total | | 149 | 156 | peak = 45 |
| 2008 | 21-Mar | - | 24 | 24 | 17 |
| 2008 | 02-Apr | 12 | 29 | 29 | 37 |
| 2008 | 13-Apr | 11 | 35 | 35 | 24 |
| 2008 | 25-Apr | 12 | 58 | 58 | 45 |
| 2008 | 09-May | 14 | 20 | 20 | 28 |
| 2008 | 27-May | 18 | 12 | 12 | 17 |
| 2008 | 13-Jun | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2008 | Total | | 178 | 178 | peak = 45 |
| 2009 | 11-Mar | - | 9 ¹ | 9 | 11 |
| 2009 | 04-Apr | 24 | 13 | 13 | 25 |
| 2009 | 15-Apr | 11 | 29 | 29 | 23 |
| 2009 | 25-Apr | 10 | 31 | 31 | 37 |
| 2009 | 01-May | 6 | 13 | 13 | 20 |
| 2009 | 15-May | 14 | 37 | 37 | 24 |
| 2009 | 08-Jun | 24 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 2009 | Total | | 135 | 135 | peak = 37 |

Table 3.2 continued

| Year | Survey date | Days since previous survey | Raw count of new redds | Estimated # new redds | # Live adults observed |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2010 | 09-Mar | - | 7 | 7 | 33 |
| 2010 | 27-Mar | 18 | 39 | 39 | 30 |
| 2010 | 13-Apr | 17 | 60 | 60 | 51 |
| 2010 | 23-Apr | 10 | 41 | 41 | 60 |
| 2010 | 05-May | 12 | 28 | 28 | 44 |
| 2010 | 23-May | 18 | 24 | 24 | 12 |
| 2010 | 14-Jun | 22 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2010 | Total | | 200 | 200 | peak = 60 |
| 2011 | 22-Mar | - | 5 | 5 | 43 |
| 2011 | 05-Apr | 14 | 21 | 21 | 61 |
| 2011 | 10-Apr | 5 | 45 | 45 | 97 |
| 2011 | 20-Apr | 10 | 83 | 83 | 103 |
| 2011 | 05-May | 15 | 68 | 68 | 67 |
| 2011 | 21-May | 16 | 24 | 24 | 36 |
| 2011 | 06-Jun | 16 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 2011 | Total | | 247 | 247 | peak = 103 |
| 2012 | 8-Mar | - | 1 | 1 | 38 |
| 2012 | 24-Mar | 16 | 29 | 29 | 68 |
| 2012 | 7-Apr | 14 | 100 | 100 | 95 |
| 2012 | 16-Apr | 9 | 92 | 92 | 148 |
| 2012 | 2-May | 16 | 85 | 87 | 76 |
| 2012 | 14-May | 12 | 25 | 25 | 44 |
| 2012 | 7-Jun | 24 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| 2012 | Total | | 334 | 337 | peak = 148 |
| 2013 | 10-Mar | - | 2 | 2 | 31 |
| 2013 | 28-Mar | 18 | 32 | 34 | 59 ⁴ |
| 2013 | 14-Apr | 17 | 64 | 67 | 70 ⁴ |
| 2013 | 24-Apr | 10 | 94 | 95 | 113 |
| 2013 | 5-May | 11 | 56 | 56 | 88 |
| 2013 | 20-May | 15 | 34 | 35 | 47 |
| 2013 | 8-Jun | 19 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2013 | Total | | 289 | 297 | peak = 113 |
| 2014 | 15-Mar | - | 3 | 3 | 29 |
| 2014 | 2-Apr | 18 | 28 | 30 | 57 |
| 2014 | 13-Apr | 11 | 83 | 83 | 88 |
| 2014 | 26-Apr | 13 | 37 | 37 | 71 |
| 2014 | 7-May | 11 | 11 | 11 | 63 |
| 2014 | 20-May | 13 | 20 | 20 | 22 |
| 2014 | 8-Jun | 19 | 8 | 9 | 6 |
| | Total | | 190 | 193 | peak = 88 |

Table 3.2 continued

| Year | Survey date | Days since previous survey | Raw count of new redds | Estimated # new redds | # Live adults observed |
|------|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2015 | 16-Mar | 0 | 27 | 27 | 41 |
| 2015 | 27-Mar | 11 | 12 | 12 | 57 |
| 2015 | 6-Apr | 10 | 79 | 79 | 91 |
| 2015 | 17-Apr | 11 | 76 | 76 | 117 |
| 2015 | 26-Apr | 9 | 47 | 47 | 80 |
| 2015 | 10-May | 14 | 46 | 46 | 61 |
| 2015 | 24-May | 14 | 14 | 14 | 34 |
| 2015 | 4-Jun | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| | Total | | 301 | 301 | peak = 117 |
| 2016 | 17-Mar | 0 | 8 | 8 | 31 |
| 2016 | 27-Mar | 10 | 31 | 31 | 59 |
| 2016 | 8-Apr | 12 | 74 | 74 | 78 |
| 2016 | 20-Apr | 12 | 51 | 51 | 90 |
| 2016 | 30-Apr | 10 | 33 | 33 | 67 |
| 2016 | 12-May | 12 | 34 | 34 | 48 |
| 2016 | 26-May | 14 | 14 | 14 | 26 |
| 2016 | 8-Jun | 13 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| | Total | | 246 | 246 | peak = 90 |
| 2017 | 20-Mar | 0 | 11 | 11 | 23 |
| 2017 | 31-Mar | 11 | 37 | 37 | 49 |
| 2017 | 14-Apr | 14 | 63 | 63 | 81 |
| 2017 | 22-Apr | 8 | 33 | 33 | 77 |
| 2017 | 6-May | 14 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| 2017 | 17-May | 11 | 17 | 17 | 41 |
| 2017 | 31-May | 14 | 11 | 11 | 19 |
| 2017 | 7-Jun | 7 | 8 | 8 | 6 |
| | Total | | 239 | 239 | peak = 81 |
| 2018 | 11-Mar | 0 | 8 | 8 | 29 |
| 2018 | 30-Mar | 19 | 52 | 52 | 51 |
| 2018 | 8-Apr | 9 | 11 | 11 | 29 |
| 2018 | 16-Apr | 8 | 43 | 43 | 61 |
| 2018 | 26-Apr | 10 | 21 | 21 | 22 |
| 2018 | 11-May | 15 | 14 | 14 | 0 ⁴ |
| 2018 | 26-May | 15 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| 2018 | 7-Jun | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | | 161 | 161 | peak = 61 |

¹Redd survey incomplete due to poor conditions

²Live adult totals incomplete

³Redd totals from aborted April 13 survey added to April 19 survey

⁴Adult count incomplete due to poor survey conditions

Table 3.3 Summary statistics for Steelhead escapement to Coquitlam River during 2005-2018 based on redd counts. Minimum and maximum range in escapement reflects uncertainty about the number of redds constructed by each female, and about sex ratio (see Section 3.1.4).

| Year | Reach | Total number of redds | Redds /km | Total female spawners | Total egg deposition | Eggs /km | Total adult escapement | Range in escapement | Adults /km |
|------|-------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 2005 | 2a | 30 | 7.1 | 25 | 92,000 | 22,000 | 50 | | 12 |
| | 2b | 76 | 23.8 | 63 | 234,000 | 73,000 | 127 | | 40 |
| | 3 | 63 | 36.9 | 52 | 193,000 | 114,000 | 104 | | 61 |
| | 4 | 55 | 32.6 | 46 | 171,000 | 101,000 | 92 | | 54 |
| | Total | 224 | 20.7 | 187 | 691,000 | 64,000 | 373 | (172-640) | 35 |
| 2006 | 2a | 72 | 17.0 | 60 | 220,000 | 52,000 | 119 | | 28 |
| | 2b | 215 | 67.0 | 179 | 661,000 | 207,000 | 358 | | 112 |
| | 3 | 114 | 66.9 | 95 | 350,000 | 206,000 | 189 | | 111 |
| | 4 | 121 | 71.4 | 101 | 374,000 | 220,000 | 202 | | 119 |
| | Total | 521 | 48.2 | 434 | 1,606,000 | 149,000 | 868 | (401-1,489) | 80 |
| 2007 | 2a | 25 | 6.0 | 21 | 77,000 | 18,000 | 42 | | 10 |
| | 2b | 64 | 20.0 | 53 | 197,000 | 62,000 | 106 | | 33 |
| | 3 | 54 | 32.0 | 45 | 168,000 | 99,000 | 91 | | 53 |
| | 4 | 13 | 7.4 | 10 | 39,000 | 23,000 | 21 | | 12 |
| | Total | 156 | 14.4 | 130 | 481,000 | 45,000 | 260 | (120-446) | 24 |
| 2008 | 2a | 42 | 10.0 | 35 | 130,000 | 31,000 | 70 | | 17 |
| | 2b | 84 | 26.3 | 70 | 259,000 | 81,000 | 140 | | 44 |
| | 3 | 41 | 24.1 | 34 | 126,000 | 74,000 | 68 | | 40 |
| | 4 | 11 | 6.5 | 9 | 34,000 | 20,000 | 18 | | 11 |
| | Total | 178 | 16.5 | 148 | 549,000 | 51,000 | 297 | (137-509) | |
| 2009 | 2a | 30 | 7.1 | 25 | 93,000 | 22,000 | 50 | | 12 |
| | 2b | 54 | 16.9 | 45 | 167,000 | 52,000 | 90 | | 28 |
| | 3 | 35 | 20.6 | 29 | 108,000 | 64,000 | 58 | | 34 |
| | 4 | 16 | 9.4 | 13 | 49,000 | 29,000 | 27 | | 16 |
| | Total | 135 | 12.5 | 113 | 416,000 | 39,000 | 225 | (104-386) | 21 |
| 2010 | 2a | 32 | 7.6 | 27 | 99,000 | 24,000 | 53 | | 13 |
| | 2b | 71 | 22.2 | 59 | 219,000 | 68,000 | 118 | | 37 |
| | 3 | 66 | 38.8 | 55 | 204,000 | 120,000 | 110 | | 65 |
| | 4 | 31 | 18.2 | 26 | 96,000 | 56,000 | 52 | | 30 |
| | Total | 200 | 18.5 | 167 | 617,000 | 57,000 | 333 | (154-571) | 31 |
| 2011 | 2a | 42 | 10.0 | 35 | 130,000 | 31,000 | 70 | | 17 |
| | 2b | 58 | 18.1 | 48 | 179,000 | 56,000 | 97 | | 30 |
| | 3 | 84 | 49.4 | 70 | 259,000 | 152,000 | 140 | | 82 |
| | 4 | 63 | 37.1 | 53 | 194,000 | 114,000 | 105 | | 62 |
| | Total | 247 | 22.9 | 206 | 762,000 | 71,000 | 412 | (190-760) | 38 |
| 2012 | 2a | 60 | 14.3 | 50 | 185,000 | 44,000 | 100 | | 24 |
| | 2b | 102 | 31.9 | 85 | 315,000 | 98,000 | 170 | | 53 |
| | 3 | 102 | 60.0 | 85 | 315,000 | 185,000 | 170 | | 100 |
| | 4 | 70 | 41.2 | 58 | 216,000 | 127,000 | 117 | | 69 |
| | Total | 337 | 31.2 | 281 | 1,039,000 | 96,000 | 562 | (257-954) | 52 |

Table 3.3 cont'd

| Year | Reach | Total number of redds | Redds /km | Total female spawners | Total egg deposition | Eggs /km | Total adult escapement | Range in escapement | Adults /km |
|------|-------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 2013 | 2a | 24 | 5.6 | 20 | 73,000 | 17,000 | 39 | | 9 |
| | 2b | 91 | 28.6 | 76 | 282,000 | 88,000 | 152 | | 48 |
| | 3 | 91 | 53.8 | 76 | 282,000 | 166,000 | 152 | | 90 |
| | 4 | 90 | 53.2 | 75 | 279,000 | 164,000 | 151 | | 89 |
| | Total | 297 | 27.5 | 248 | 916,000 | 85,000 | 495 | (222-826) | 46 |
| 2014 | 2a | 30 | 7.1 | 25 | 93,000 | 22,000 | 50 | | 12 |
| | 2b | 60 | 18.8 | 50 | 185,000 | 58,000 | 100 | | 31 |
| | 3 | 53 | 31.2 | 44 | 163,000 | 96,000 | 88 | | 52 |
| | 4 | 47 | 27.6 | 39 | 145,000 | 85,000 | 78 | | 46 |
| | Total | 190 | 17.6 | 158 | 586,000 | 54,000 | 317 | (146-543) | 29 |
| 2015 | 2a | 37 | 8.8 | 31 | 114,000 | 27,000 | 62 | | 15 |
| | 2b | 102 | 31.9 | 85 | 315,000 | 98,000 | 170 | | 53 |
| | 3 | 68 | 40.0 | 57 | 210,000 | 124,000 | 113 | | 67 |
| | 4 | 94 | 55.3 | 78 | 290,000 | 171,000 | 157 | | 92 |
| | Total | 301 | 27.9 | 251 | 928,000 | 86,000 | 502 | (232-860) | 46 |
| 2016 | 2a | 32 | 7.6 | 27 | 99,000 | 24,000 | 53 | | 13 |
| | 2b | 86 | 26.9 | 72 | 265,000 | 83,000 | 143 | | 45 |
| | 3 | 72 | 42.4 | 60 | 222,000 | 131,000 | 120 | | 71 |
| | 4 | 56 | 32.9 | 47 | 173,000 | 102,000 | 93 | | 55 |
| | Total | 246 | 22.8 | 205 | 759,000 | 70,000 | 410 | (189-703) | 38 |
| 2017 | 2a | 27 | 6.4 | 23 | 83,000 | 20,000 | 45 | | 11 |
| | 2b | 97 | 30.3 | 81 | 299,000 | 93,000 | 162 | | 51 |
| | 3 | 70 | 41.2 | 58 | 216,000 | 127,000 | 117 | | 69 |
| | 4 | 45 | 26.5 | 38 | 139,000 | 82,000 | 75 | | 44 |
| | Total | 239 | 22.1 | 199 | 737,000 | 68,000 | 398 | (184-683) | 37 |
| 2018 | 2a | 12 | 2.9 | 10 | 37,000 | 9,000 | 20 | | 5 |
| | 2b | 52 | 16.3 | 43 | 160,000 | 50,000 | 87 | | 27 |
| | 3 | 52 | 30.6 | 43 | 160,000 | 94,000 | 87 | | 51 |
| | 4 | 45 | 26.5 | 38 | 139,000 | 82,000 | 75 | | 44 |
| | Total | 161 | 14.9 | 134 | 496,000 | 46,000 | 268 | (124-460) | 25 |

Appendix 3.1 An example of how raw survey counts were expanded to account for redds that were completed and subsequently became undetectable between surveys (see section 3.2.1).

April 19, 2007 redd survey

| | |
|---|--|
| Total # new redds observed | 68 |
| Number days from previous survey (CSI) | 15 |
| Number of redds constructed per day since previous survey assuming uniform distribution of spawning over time | 4.53 |
| Run day for the spawning period (<i>R</i>) (March 1 = day one) | 50 |
| Redd survey life equation | % redds lost = $0.029\text{CSI} - 0.002R - 0.1572$ |

| Day | Loss rate | Adjusted # redds |
|-----|-----------|------------------|
| 1 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 2 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 3 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 4 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 5 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 6 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 7 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 8 | 0.0000 | 4.53 |
| 9 | 0.0070 | 4.57 |
| 10 | 0.0358 | 4.70 |
| 11 | 0.0646 | 4.85 |
| 12 | 0.0934 | 5.00 |
| 13 | 0.1222 | 5.16 |
| 14 | 0.1510 | 5.34 |
| 15 | 0.1798 | 5.53 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total new redds adjusted for redd survey life | 71.41 |
|--|--------------|

10.4 Figures, Tables and Appendices for Chapter 4




Figure 4.1 Map of Coquitlam River showing juvenile standing stock study area, reach breaks and original 12 sampling sites.




Figure 4.2 Maximum likelihood estimates of mean snorkeling detection probability for juvenile Coho and Steelhead by forklength class (Steelhead only) at 16 sites in the Coquitlam River during 2007-2013. Errors bars represent ± 1 standard deviation of the mean. Values above bars are total numbers of marked fish for each category.




Figure 4.3 Linear distribution of juvenile salmonids in the Coquitlam River during Treatment 1(2006-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2018) Bars represent mean abundance estimates and 95% confidence intervals for years under flow Treatment 1 and 2. Estimates are based on calibrated snorkeling counts at 10-12 sampling sites 2006-2013 and 24 sites 2014-2016.

Table 4.1 Summary of habitat data for night snorkeling and day electrofishing sites in Coquitlam River in 2018.

| | Upstream | Site | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|----------|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|----------|------|---------|--------|--------|-------|
| Sampling | Site | distance | area | length | width | depth | velocity | Dmax | Boulder | Cobble | Gravel | Fines |
| method | no. | (km) | (m ²) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (m) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) |
| snorkeling | 0.55 | 8.25 | 528.3 | 25 | 21 | 0.35 | 0.53 | 1.95 | 50 | 30 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 0.90 | 8.60 | 388.3 | 25 | 16 | 0.55 | 0.44 | 2.10 | 40 | 25 | 20 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 1.25 | 8.95 | 478.3 | 25 | 19 | 0.43 | 0.40 | 1.75 | 45 | 35 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 1.60 | 9.30 | 816.7 | 25 | 33 | 0.33 | 0.35 | 1.80 | 35 | 45 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 1.95 | 9.65 | 540.0 | 25 | 22 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 3.15 | 65 | 20 | 10 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 2.65 | 10.35 | 425.0 | 25 | 17 | 0.67 | 0.21 | 2.20 | 50 | 30 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 3.00 | 10.70 | 778.3 | 25 | 31 | 0.46 | 0.35 | 3.10 | 60 | 25 | 10 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 3.35 | 11.05 | 532.5 | 25 | 21 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.93 | 15 | 38 | 38 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 3.70 | 11.40 | 607.5 | 25 | 24 | 0.55 | 0.26 | 2.05 | 55 | 20 | 15 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 4.05 | 11.75 | 923.3 | 25 | 37 | 0.25 | 0.31 | 1.30 | 25 | 45 | 20 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 4.40 | 12.10 | 760.8 | 25 | 30 | 0.52 | 0.34 | 3.70 | 60 | 25 | 10 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 4.75 | 12.45 | 465.0 | 25 | 19 | 0.42 | 0.33 | 1.70 | 45 | 30 | 15 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 5.00 | 12.70 | 455.0 | 25 | 18 | 0.40 | 0.23 | 1.50 | 35 | 35 | 20 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 5.20 | 12.90 | 654.2 | 25 | 26 | 0.29 | 0.38 | 1.40 | 55 | 25 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 5.45 | 13.15 | 415.0 | 25 | 17 | 0.31 | 0.35 | 1.45 | 45 | 33 | 15 | 8 |
| snorkeling | 5.60 | 13.30 | 471.7 | 25 | 19 | 0.35 | 0.38 | 1.70 | 30 | 40 | 20 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 5.70 | 13.40 | 680.8 | 25 | 27 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 2.55 | 40 | 40 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 5.80 | 13.50 | 463.3 | 25 | 19 | 0.51 | 0.40 | 1.50 | 30 | 35 | 25 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 6.15 | 13.85 | 345.8 | 25 | 14 | 0.40 | 0.45 | 2.30 | 30 | 40 | 20 | 10 |
| snorkeling | 6.85 | 14.55 | 435.0 | 25 | 17 | 0.39 | 0.23 | 1.20 | 45 | 35 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 7.20 | 14.90 | 278.3 | 25 | 11 | 0.59 | 0.53 | 2.35 | 55 | 25 | 15 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 7.55 | 15.25 | 429.2 | 25 | 17 | 0.29 | 0.20 | 1.68 | 60 | 25 | 10 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 7.90 | 15.60 | 384.2 | 25 | 15 | 0.45 | 0.52 | 2.05 | 45 | 30 | 20 | 5 |
| snorkeling | 8.25 | 15.95 | 230.0 | 25 | 9 | 0.32 | 0.46 | 1.50 | 55 | 30 | 10 | 5 |
| electrofishing | 1.95 | 10.2 | 128.4 | 18 | 7 | 0.41 | 0.37 | 2.30 | 50 | 25 | 15 | 10 |
| electrofishing | 2.50 | 10.7 | 130.5 | 19 | 7 | 0.34 | 0.36 | 1.40 | 40 | 40 | 15 | 5 |
| electrofishing | 3.20 | 11.5 | 137.2 | 19 | 7 | 0.21 | 0.18 | 1.90 | 45 | 30 | 20 | 5 |
| electrofishing | 6.00 | 14.5 | 127.9 | 19 | 7 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 1.50 | 30 | 40 | 25 | 5 |

Table 4.2 Summary of mark-recapture results and snorkeling detection probability estimates for 16 sites in Coquitlam River collected 2007-2013.

| Species | Fork length class (mm) | Total marks (M) | Total resighted marks (R) | Mean snorkeling efficiency | SD | No. of marks resighted in sections adjacent to original marking site | Estimated no. marks actually present in sections adjacent to original marking site |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------|--|--|
| Coho | all | 454 | 258 | 0.57 | 0.18 | 27 | 48 |
| Steelhead | 40-49 | 197 | 53 | 0.27 | 0.16 | 8 | 30 |
| Steelhead | 50-69 | 253 | 123 | 0.49 | 0.21 | 19 | 39 |
| Steelhead | 70-99 | 162 | 104 | 0.64 | 0.30 | 9 | 14 |
| Steelhead | 100-140 | 242 | 166 | 0.69 | 0.27 | 21 | 31 |
| Steelhead | >140 | 24 | 9 | 0.38 | 0.45 | 2 | 5 |

Table 4.3 Estimates of juvenile fish density, standing stock, and 95% confidence intervals by species and age class in Coquitlam River during 2006-2018. Estimates were derived from night snorkeling counts with the exception of 2011 Steelhead (0+).

| Species/age class | Year | Density (fish/100m ²) | Density (fish/km) | Standing stock | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | ± 95% CI |
|-----------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| coho (0+) | 2006 | 14.6 | 2,632 | 27,111 | 15,539 | 840,592 | 1522% |
| coho (0+) | 2007 | 13.1 | 1,787 | 18,405 | 12,500 | 52,431 | 108% |
| coho (0+) | 2008 | 22.8 | 4,536 | 46,719 | 32,478 | 89,047 | 61% |
| coho (0+) | 2009 | 20.7 | 5,126 | 52,794 | 39,854 | 95,912 | 53% |
| coho (0+) | 2010 | 24.1 | 6,037 | 62,178 | 41,717 | 130,782 | 72% |
| coho (0+) | 2011 | 42.8 | 8,871 | 91,367 | 61,568 | 1,961,075 | 1039% |
| coho (0+) | 2012 | 42.9 | 7,170 | 73,846 | 52,204 | 128,002 | 51% |
| coho (0+) | 2013 | 39.2 | 6,823 | 70,279 | 53,293 | 127,942 | 53% |
| coho (0+) | 2014 | 22.8 | 4,321 | 44,507 | 36,058 | 65,971 | 31% |
| coho (0+) | 2015 | 19.7 | 3,505 | 36,101 | 28,520 | 45,660 | 31% |
| coho (0+) | 2016 | 14.8 | 2,468 | 25,424 | 20,270 | 35,420 | 30% |
| coho (0+) | 2017 | 37.8 | 5,744 | 59,166 | 45,730 | 79,661 | 29% |
| coho (0+) | 2018 | 22.7 | 4,247 | 43,740 | 32,743 | 57,667 | 30% |
| | | | | | | | |
| steelhead (0+) | 2006 | 28.9 | 13,411 | 138,132 | 108,971 | 257,522 | 54% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2007 | 9.4 | 3,131 | 32,251 | 22,193 | 139,860 | 182% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2008 | 9.4 | 4,127 | 42,506 | 32,185 | 660,106 | 739% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2009 | 8.1 | 3,597 | 37,047 | 29,002 | 1,355,054 | 1790% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2010 | 10.6 | 3,850 | 39,657 | 29,627 | 151,626 | 154% |
| steelhead (0+) ¹ | 2011 | 9.6 | 2,131 | 21,949 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (0+) | 2012 | 14.5 | 5,362 | 55,232 | 40,520 | 81,398 | 37% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2013 | 19.9 | 6,409 | 66,017 | 51,319 | 107,519 | 43% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2014 | 7.9 | 3,179 | 32,746 | 26,499 | 44,724 | 28% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2015 | 10.4 | 3,134 | 32,277 | 26,270 | 44,291 | 28% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2016 | 8.9 | 2,932 | 30,203 | 22,396 | 43,135 | 34% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2017 | 14.8 | 5,277 | 54,358 | 41,408 | 89,120 | 44% |
| steelhead (0+) | 2018 | 11.4 | 4,618 | 47,565 | 37,341 | 62,031 | 26% |
| | | | | | | | |
| steelhead (1+) | 2006 | 2.9 | 580 | 5,976 | 3,532 | 22,859 | 162% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2007 | 6.6 | 994 | 10,237 | 7,036 | 17,771 | 52% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2008 | 4.6 | 992 | 10,222 | 7,446 | 20,770 | 65% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2009 | 3.8 | 1,056 | 10,876 | 8,229 | 16,041 | 36% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2010 | 3.7 | 787 | 8,106 | 6,556 | 10,710 | 26% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2011 | 4.2 | 853 | 8,791 | 6,425 | 14,701 | 47% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2012 | 6.0 | 1,036 | 10,668 | 8,002 | 17,462 | 44% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2013 | 6.9 | 1,306 | 13,456 | 10,129 | 21,470 | 42% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2014 | 3.2 | 618 | 6,369 | 5,115 | 8,669 | 28% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2015 | 2.9 | 572 | 5,889 | 4,869 | 7,546 | 23% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2016 | 2.9 | 506 | 5,216 | 4,321 | 6,416 | 20% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2017 | 4.8 | 880 | 9,064 | 7,287 | 12,360 | 28% |
| steelhead (1+) | 2018 | 4.6 | 955 | 9,836 | 7,623 | 12,800 | 27% |

¹Biased low estimate due to overestimate of age-0+ detection probability (see section 4.3.1 for explanation)

Table 4.3 cont'd

| Species/age class | Year | Density (fish/100m ²) | Density (fish/km) | Standing stock | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | ± 95% CI |
|----------------------|------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| steelhead (2+) | 2006 | 1.1 | 179 | 1,841 | 933 | 3,569 | 72% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2007 | 1.3 | 192 | 1,978 | 1,145 | 3,950 | 71% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2008 | 1.0 | 122 | 1,255 | 694 | 2,598 | 76% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2009 | 1.9 | 310 | 3,196 | 1,963 | 6,402 | 69% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2010 | 1.7 | 261 | 2,690 | 1,630 | 5,331 | 69% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2011 | 1.9 | 375 | 3,862 | 2,443 | 7,266 | 62% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2012 | 1.8 | 307 | 3,160 | 1,961 | 5,666 | 59% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2013 | 1.6 | 255 | 2,625 | 1,582 | 4,713 | 60% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2014 | 2.1 | 372 | 3,831 | 2,756 | 6,634 | 51% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2015 | 1.3 | 249 | 2,561 | 1,822 | 4,181 | 46% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2016 | 1.1 | 257 | 2,642 | 1,835 | 4,807 | 56% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2017 | 1.9 | 311 | 3,207 | 2,177 | 5,371 | 50% |
| steelhead (2+) | 2018 | 1.6 | 207 | 2,127 | 1,293 | 3,330 | 52% |
| steelhead (parr) | 2006 | 3.7 | 759 | 7,817 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2007 | 7.6 | 1,186 | 12,215 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2008 | 5.4 | 1,114 | 11,477 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2009 | 5.3 | 1,366 | 14,072 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2010 | 4.1 | 1,048 | 10,796 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2011 | 5.6 | 1,228 | 12,653 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2012 | 7.3 | 1,343 | 13,828 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2013 | 8.1 | 1,561 | 16,081 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2014 | 4.4 | 990 | 10,200 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2015 | 3.9 | 820 | 8,450 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2016 | 3.7 | 763 | 7,858 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2017 | 6.1 | 1,191 | 12,271 | - | - | - |
| steelhead (parr) | 2018 | 5.8 | 1,161 | 11,963 | - | - | - |

Table 4.4 Summary of day electrofishing results at four one-shoreline sites in the Coquitlam River in 2018. Mean fish density estimates are also shown for 2006-2018. The electrofishing survey was conducted at the same four sites during 2007-2018, whereas in 2006 electrofishing was conducted at 10 shoreline sites located within the annual snorkeling index sites (Decker et al. 2007).

| Sampling index sites (2006 to 2018) | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------|
| Year | Site | Pass 1 | Pass 2 | Pass 3 | Population estimate | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | Mean density | |
| | | | | | | | | (fish/100m ²) | fish/km |
| Coho fry | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 1.95 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 14 | 18 | 13 | 1,702 |
| 2018 | 2.50 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 6 | 22 | 11 | 1,628 |
| 2018 | 3.20 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 11 | 39 | 19 | 3,145 |
| 2018 | 6.00 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 26 | 22 | 30 | 19 | 3,077 |
| 2006 | all sites | | | | | | | 10 | 591 |
| 2007 | all sites | | | | | | | 3 | 211 |
| 2008 | all sites | | | | | | | 1 | 90 |
| 2009 | all sites | | | | | | | 8 | 606 |
| 2010 | all sites | | | | | | | 3 | 200 |
| 2011 | all sites | | | | | | | 13 | 1072 |
| 2012 | all sites | | | | | | | 7 | 1073 |
| 2013 | all sites | | | | | | | 20 | 2759 |
| 2014 | all sites | | | | | | | 28 | 4011 |
| 2015 | all sites | | | | | | | 16 | 2263 |
| 2016 | all sites | | | | | | | 18 | 2862 |
| 2017 | all sites | | | | | | | 24 | 3685 |
| 2018 | all sites | | | | | | | 16 | 2388 |
| Steelhead fry | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 1.95 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 27 | 21 | 33 | 22 | 1,436 |
| 2018 | 2.50 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 23 | 17 | 29 | 18 | 1,337 |
| 2018 | 3.20 | 12 | 7 | 2 | 29 | 17 | 41 | 22 | 1,824 |
| 2018 | 6.00 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 35 | 24 | 46 | 26 | 2,071 |
| 2006 | all sites | | | | | | | 50 | 3,055 |
| 2007 | all sites | | | | | | | 27 | 2,154 |
| 2008 | all sites | | | | | | | 31 | 2,224 |
| 2009 | all sites | | | | | | | 20 | 1,530 |
| 2010 | all sites | | | | | | | 25 | 1,648 |
| 2011 | all sites | | | | | | | 51 | 4,179 |
| 2012 | all sites | | | | | | | 23 | 1,704 |
| 2013 | all sites | | | | | | | 36 | 2,418 |
| 2014 | all sites | | | | | | | 34 | 2,364 |
| 2015 | all sites | | | | | | | 22 | 1,507 |
| 2016 | all sites | | | | | | | 20 | 1,543 |
| 2017 | all sites | | | | | | | 20 | 1,524 |
| 2018 | all sites | | | | | | | 22 | 1,667 |
| Steelhead parr (1+) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2018 | 1.95 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 6.5 | 426 |
| 2018 | 2.50 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 4.6 | 349 |
| 2018 | 3.20 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 6.2 | 503 |
| 2018 | 6.00 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 5.2 | 414 |
| 2006 | all sites | | | | | | | 3.4 | 206 |
| 2007 | all sites | | | | | | | 11.0 | 891 |
| 2008 | all sites | | | | | | | 6.8 | 493 |
| 2009 | all sites | | | | | | | 6.7 | 505 |
| 2010 | all sites | | | | | | | 2.7 | 200 |
| 2011 | all sites | | | | | | | 5.4 | 425 |
| 2012 | all sites | | | | | | | 2.8 | 211 |
| 2013 | all sites | | | | | | | 4.9 | 344 |
| 2014 | all sites | | | | | | | 4.9 | 347 |
| 2015 | all sites | | | | | | | 6.6 | 460 |
| 2016 | all sites | | | | | | | 2.9 | 209 |
| 2017 | all sites | | | | | | | 7.5 | 568 |
| 2018 | all sites | | | | | | | 5.6 | 423 |

Table 4.4 cont'd

| Year | Site | Pass 1 | Pass 2 | Pass 3 | Population estimate | Lower 95% CI | Upper 95% CI | Mean density | |
|---------------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| | | | | | | | | (fish/100m²) | fish/km |
| Steelhead parr (2+) | | | | | | | | | |
| 2006 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.3 | 21 |
| 2007 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2008 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.4 | 30 |
| 2009 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2010 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2011 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2012 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2013 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2014 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2015 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2016 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2017 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2018 | all sites | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0 |

Table 4.5 Average monthly discharge (m³/s) in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during Steelhead spawning period in 2006 – 2018 (Water Survey of Canada station 08MH002).

| Year | Discharge (m ³ /sec) | | |
|------|---------------------------------|------|------|
| | June | July | Aug |
| 2006 | 4.55 | 2.02 | 1.60 |
| 2007 | 5.54 | 6.41 | 2.48 |
| 2008 | 5.40 | 2.94 | 4.15 |
| 2009 | 5.91 | 4.58 | 6.18 |
| 2010 | 12.78 | 2.52 | 3.26 |
| 2011 | 6.58 | 5.43 | 4.14 |
| 2012 | 7.11 | 4.16 | 3.44 |
| 2013 | 4.60 | 1.99 | 3.14 |
| 2014 | 2.85 | 2.20 | 2.75 |
| 2015 | 1.85 | 1.53 | 2.72 |
| 2016 | 3.61 | 2.43 | 2.95 |
| 2017 | 6.22 | 2.64 | 3.20 |
| 2018 | 3.99 | 1.97 | 3.13 |

Table 4.6 Comparison of backpack electroshocking and night snorkeling fish density estimates (fish/km) for juvenile Coho and Steelhead in the Coquitlam River including: r^2 and the mean, minimum and maximum ratio of estimates based on electroshocking to snorkeling 2006-2018.

| Species | Age Class | N | R ² | EF:SN | |
|-----------|-----------|----|----------------|-------|------|
| | | | | Min | Max |
| Coho | 0+ | 13 | 0.04 | 0.9 | 41.4 |
| Steelhead | 0+ | 13 | 0.19 | 0.4 | 2.0 |
| Steelhead | 1+ | 13 | 0.13 | 0.6 | 4.86 |

Appendix 4.1 Definition of variables of the hierarchical Bayesian model used to estimate juvenile Coho and Steelhead abundance in the Coquitlam River system. Index sites refer to the 12 sites in the Coquitlam River where fish abundance is sampled each year by night snorkeling. Fish size strata (subscript g) apply only to Steelhead (see Section 4.1.5).

| Variable | Description |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Data | |
| $r_{i,g}$ | Marks detected at snorkeling mark-recapture site i, fish size strata g |
| $m_{i,g}$ | Marks released at mark-recapture site i, strata g |
| $c_{j,g}$ | Fish detected at index site j for strata g |
| l_j | Stream length for index site j |
| Site-Specific Parameters | |
| $\theta_{i,g}$ | Estimated detection probability at mark-recapture site i for fish size strata g |
| $\theta_{j,g}$ | Simulated detection probability for index site j for strata g |
| λ_j | Estimated density (fish/m) at index site j |
| Hyper-Parameters | |
| $\mu_{\theta,g}$ | Mean of beta hyper-distribution for detection probability for strata g |
| $\tau_{\theta,g}$ | Precision of beta hyper-distribution for detection probability for strata g |
| μ_{λ} | Mean of normal hyper-distribution for log fish density |
| τ_{λ} | Precision of normal hyper-distribution for log fish density |
| Derived Variables | |
| $\alpha_{i,g}$ | Parameter for beta hyper distribution of detection probability for strata g |
| $\beta_{i,g}$ | Parameter for beta hyper distribution of detection probability for strata g |
| $N_{j,g}$ | Abundance at index site j for strata g |
| N_s | Total abundance across all index sites |
| N_{us} | Total abundance in unsampled stream length |
| N_t | Total abundance in the Coquitlam River study area |
| Indices and Constants | |
| i | Index for snorkeling mark-recapture site |
| j | Index for snorkeling index site |
| g | Index for fish size strata |
| l_j | Shoreline length for index site j |
| L | Total shoreline length for the Coquitlam River study area |

Appendix 4.2 Equations of the hierarchical Bayesian model used to estimate juvenile Steelhead abundance in the Coquiltam River. See Appendix 4.1 for definitions of model parameters, constants, and subscripts. Lower case Arabic letters denote data or indices (if subscripts). Capital Arabic letters denoted derived variables, which are computed as a function of estimated parameters. Greek letters denote estimated parameters. Parameters with Greek letter subscripts are hyper-parameters.

Detection Model

$$(4.1) \quad r_{i,g} \sim dbin(\theta_{i,g}, m_{i,g})$$

$$(4.2) \quad d_{i,p,g} \sim dbeta(\theta_{i,g}, n_{i,p-1,g})$$

Population Model

$$(4.3) \quad \theta_{j,g} \sim dbeta(\alpha_g, \beta_g)$$

$$(4.4) \quad c_{j,g} \sim dbin(\theta_{j,g}, N_{j,g})$$

$$(4.4) \quad N_{j,g} \sim dpois(\lambda_j l_j)$$

$$(4.6) \quad \log(\lambda_j) \sim dnorm(\mu_\lambda, \tau_\lambda)$$

$$(4.7) \quad Ns = \sum_g \sum_{j \in r} n_{j,g}$$

$$(4.8) \quad Nus = \exp[\mu_\lambda + 0.5\tau_\lambda^{-1}](h_r - \sum_{j \in s} l_j)$$

$$(4.9) \quad Nt = Ns + Nus$$

Priors and Transformation

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_{\theta,g} &\sim \text{dunif}(0,1) \\ \sigma_{\theta,g} &\sim \text{dhcauchy}(0,0.5) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau_{\theta,g} &= \sigma_{\theta,g}^{-2} \\ \alpha_g &= \mu_{\theta,g} \tau_{\theta,g} \\ \beta_g &= (1 - \mu_{\theta,g}) \tau_{\theta,g} \end{aligned}$$


$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_\lambda &\sim \text{dnorm}(0, 0.10E-6) \\ \sigma_\lambda &\sim \text{dhcauchy}(0,0.5) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.13) \quad \tau_\lambda = \sigma_\lambda^{-2}$$

Appendix 4.3 Summary of data deficiencies and alternate approaches taken with respect to estimation of parameters and hyper-distributions in the Hierarchical Bayesian Model (HBM) used to estimate juvenile Steelhead and Coho standing stocks in the Coquitlam River during 2006-2012.

1. *Large-sized Steelhead parr (>140 mm) and small-sized Steelhead fry (<50 mm).* For these size categories of Steelhead, there were relatively few fish marked and resighted at the mark-recapture sites, and numbers observed by snorkelers in the index sites were low and quite variable. This led to an insufficient amount of data for the HBM to reliably estimate standard deviation in snorkeling detection probability and fish density among index sites. These deficiencies were addressed by substituting parameter estimates for medium-sized Steelhead parr (100-140 mm) in the case of large-sized Steelhead, and parameter estimates for large-sized Steelhead fry (50-69 mm) in the case of small-sized Steelhead fry.
2. *Coho fry in 2006 and large -sized Steelhead fry (50-69 mm) in 2007.* In these cases, numbers observed by snorkelers in the index sites were low and quite variable, leading to an insufficient amount of data for the HBM to reliably estimate standard deviation fish density among index sites. These deficiencies were addressed by substituting the mean of standard deviation estimates for other years for these species/size classes.

Appendix 4.4 Length-frequency histogram (proportion of total catch less <80mm forklength) for Steelhead fry captured by electrofishing and counted during snorkeling in the Coquitlam River averaged for 2008-2010,2012-2017 and 2018 (data pooled for all sites). 2011 is also shown for electroshocking as an example of a year with considerable shift towards small sized fry.



10.5 Figures, Tables and Appendices for Chapter 5




Figure 5.1 Map of the Coquitlam River showing constructed off-channel habitat sites, mainstem reach breaks and the locations of mainstem rotary screw traps (RSTs).




Figure 5.2 Mean daily flows in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during the smolt trapping period in 2018. (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH002). Approximate start times of Chum fry and Steelhead and Coho smolt migration based on captures at all trapping locations.




Figure 5.3 Daily catches of Coho smolts at downstream weirs in three off-channel sites (pooled data) and at three rotary screw trapping locations in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. See Table 5.1 for start and end dates for individual trapping sites.




Figure 5.4 Daily catches of Steelhead smolts at downstream weirs in three off-channel sites (pooled data) and at three rotary screw trapping locations in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. See Table 5.1 for start and end dates for individual trapping sites.




Figure 5.5a Areal density of Coho smolts (smolts/100m²) in four constructed off-channel habitats along the Coquitlam River and for all four combined (Total) previous to Treatment 1 (1996-2000), Treatment 1 (2002-2008), when smolt cohorts reared under both treatments (2009) and Treatment 2 (2010-2018). Years with zero fish represent those when the off-channel habitats were not in operation or were not monitored.




Figure 5.5b Areal density of Steelhead smolts (smolts/100m²) in four constructed off-channel habitats along the Coquitlam River and for all four combined (Total) previous to Treatment 1 (1996-2000), Treatment 1 (2002-2008), when smolt cohorts reared under both treatments (2009) and Treatment 2 (2010-2018). Years with zero fish represent those when the off-channel habitats were not in operation or were not monitored.




Figure 5.6 Length-frequency histogram for Steelhead captured in the Coquitlam River in 2018 (data pooled for all trap sites).




Figure 5.7 Daily catches of Chinook fry, Chum fry, Coho fry, Pink fry and Steelhead parr at the RST2 trapping site in Reach 2 in the Coquitlam River in 2018. See Table 5.1 for start and end dates of downstream trapping.




Figure 5.8 Estimated capture efficiencies (across six marking periods) at three rotary screw traps (RSTs) in the Coquitlam River for mark groups of Coho and Steelhead smolts from off-channel (dotted lines) and mainstem (solid lines) habitats in 2018. Dates on the horizontal axis indicate the start point for each marking period.

Table 5.1 Description of the stratification of fish marking by location and period for Coho and Steelhead smolts in the Coquitlam River in 2018. The start date for each temporal marking period at each RST trap site is also shown. Removal dates are also given.

| Downstream RST trapping site | Mark type by location | Traps installed | Mark stratification by period | | | | | | | | | | | | Traps removed |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|-----|------|------------------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Reach 2 (RST2.2) chum, pink | mark E | 3-6 | 3-13 | 3-20 | 3-29 | 4-3 | 4-18 | 4-24 | 5-1 | 5-11 | | | | | 5-22 |
| Reach 2 (RST2.4) coho, steelhead | mark E | 3-29 | 3-25 | 4-1 | 4-8 | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |
| Reach 2 (RST2.5) coho, steelhead | mark E | 4-5 | 3-25 | 4-1 | 4-8 | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |
| Reach 3 (RST3) coho, steelhead | mark D | 3-29 | 3-25 | 4-1 | 4-8 | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |
| Reach 4 (RST4) coho, steelhead | mark B | 4-5 | - | - | 4-8 | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |
| Archery Pond | mark A | 4-13 | - | - | - | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |
| Grants Tomb Pond | mark A | 4-14 | - | - | - | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |
| Overland Ponds | mark A | 4-18 | - | - | - | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-11 |
| Orr Creek Ponds | mark A | 4-18 | - | - | - | 4-15 | 4-22 | 4-29 | 5-6 | 5-13 | 5-20 | 5-27 | 6-3 | 6-10 | 6-15 |

Table 5.2 Summary of estimated smolt numbers and densities by species in 2018 for four off-channel sites, for reaches 2-4 of the Coquitlam River mainstem, and for the total Coquitlam River mainstem including and excluding the off-channel sites.

| Site | Length (km) | Area (m ²) | N smolts | CI (+/-) | CI (%) | Density | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|--------------------------|----------|
| | | | | | | (no./100m ²) | (no./km) |
| Coho Smolts | | | | | | | |
| Off-channel sites | | | | | | | |
| Grant's Tomb | - | 3,300 | 124 | - | - | 3.8 | - |
| Or Creek | - | 13,336 | 1,010 | - | - | 7.6 | - |
| Archery Pond | - | 4,500 | 251 | - | - | 5.6 | - |
| Overland Channel | - | 8,700 | 175 | - | - | 2.0 | - |
| Total Off-channel | - | 29,836 | 1,560 | - | - | 5.2 | - |
| Mainstem | | | | | | | |
| Reach 2, Coquitlam River | 3.2 | 83,778 | 3,767 | 1,680 | 45% | 4.5 | 1,177 |
| Reach 3, Coquitlam River | 2.7 | 46,920 | 2,183 | 1,053 | 48% | 4.7 | 809 |
| Reach 4, Coquitlam River | 1.6 | 19,200 | 1,936 | 412 | 21.3% | 10.1 | 1,210 |
| Total Mainstem | 7.5 | 149,898 | 7,886 | 1,654 | 21% | 5.3 | 1,051 |
| Coquitlam R.incl. off-channel s | 7.5 | 179,734 | 9,446 | 1,654 | 18% | 5.3 | 1,259 |
| Steelhead Smolts | | | | | | | |
| Off-channel sites | | | | | | | |
| Grant's Tomb | - | 3,300 | 11 | - | - | 0.3 | - |
| Or Creek site | - | 13,336 | 2 | - | - | 0.0 | - |
| Archery Pond | - | 4,500 | 5 | - | - | 0.1 | - |
| Overland Channel | - | 8,700 | 0 | - | - | 0.0 | - |
| Total Off-channel | - | 29,836 | 18 | - | - | 0.1 | - |
| Mainstem | | | | | | | |
| Reach 2, Coquitlam River | 3.2 | 83,778 | 5,572 | 4,220 | 76% | 6.7 | 1,741 |
| Reach 3, Coquitlam River | 2.7 | 46,920 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Reach 4, Coquitlam River | 1.6 | 19,200 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Mainstem | 7.5 | 149,898 | 5,572 | 4,220 | 76% | 3.7 | 743 |
| Coquitlam R.incl. off-channel s | 7.5 | 179,734 | 5,590 | 4,220 | 75% | 3.1 | 745 |
| Chum Fry | | | | | | | |
| Coquitlam R.incl. off-channel s | 7.5 | 179,734 | 3,980,067 | 262,513 | 7% | 2,214 | 530,676 |
| Pink Fry | | | | | | | |
| Coquitlam R.incl. off-channel s | 7.5 | 179,734 | 114,846 | 46,330 | 40% | 64 | 15,313 |

Table 5.3 Differences in capture efficiency (proportion of marked smolts that were recaptured) for Coho and Steelhead from off-channel sites and the Coquitlam River mainstem at three rotary screw traps (RSTs) sites in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. Stratified marking periods were pooled prior to testing (see Equation 5.1). Equal capture efficiency for mark groups was tested using Fisher's exact test. $P < 0.05$ indicates a significant difference in capture efficiency.

| Species | Recapture site | Capture efficiency | | Fisher's exact test (P) |
|-----------|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Mainstem mark group | Off-channel mark group | |
| Coho | RST 2 | 0.30 | 0.35 | 0.01 |
| Coho | RST 3 | 0.14 | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| Coho | RST 4 | 0.25 | 0.37 | 0.01 |
| Steelhead | RST 2 | 0.14 | 0.22 | 0.33 |
| Steelhead | RST 3 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.37 |
| Steelhead | RST 4 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.60 |

Table 5.4 Mean monthly flows during Treatment 1 (2000-2008), Treatment 2 (2009-2017) and 2018 in Coquitlam River at Port Coquitlam during the smolt and fry trapping period. (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141).

| Month | Mean monthly flow ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$) | | |
|-----------|--|-------------|------|
| | Treatment 1 | Treatment 2 | 2018 |
| March | 8.5 | 12.0 | 9.3 |
| April | 6.4 | 8.9 | 16.4 |
| May | 6.5 | 7.9 | 13.2 |
| June 1-15 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 5.0 |

Table 5.5 Percent of all juvenile Steelhead captures that were less than 120mm fork length at RST 2-4 in the Coquitlam River. 120mm fork length has been the minimum length to be considers smolts since 2012.

| Site | Year | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| RST 2 | 31% | 27% | 42% | 33% | 36% | 15% | 32% | 28% |
| RST 3 | 18% | 16% | 26% | 35% | 28% | 23% | 21% | 23% |
| RST 4 | 12% | 11% | 14% | 7% | 10% | 8% | 4% | 23% |

Table 5.6 Estimated of the number of Coho and Steelhead smolts outmigrating from reaches 2-4 of the Coquitlam River 1996-2018. Individual estimates for four constructed off-channel habitats and mainstem reaches 2-4, both individually and combined, which extends 7.5 km downstream from the Coquitlam Dam.

| Site | Year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Coho | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Off-channel sites</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grant's Tomb | 1,220 | 697 | 1,390 | 1,822 | 1,074 | 1,524 | 1,373 | 886 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2193 | 902 | 519 | 804 | 264 | 171 | 344 | 416 | 267 | 124 |
| Or Creek Ponds | 2,814 | 11,281 | - | 1,138 | 2,982 | 2,283 | 2,266 | 2,315 | 2,945 | 2,420 | 2,357 | 2,614 | 3,121 | 1,926 | 2,454 | 3,608 | 1,862 | 868 | 1,735 | 1,608 | 3,437 | 1,010 |
| Archery Pond | 3,016 | 621 | - | 3,422 | 1,292 | 662 | 1,196 | 620 | 799 | 509 | 479 | - | 1,761 | 1,761 | 313 | 392 | - | 279 | 456 | 596 | 274 | 251 |
| Overland Channel | - | - | - | - | - | - | 819 | 5,108 | 6,860 | 4,983 | 2,681 | 3,156 | 3,538 | 2,529 | 700 | 1,846 | 1,796 | 1,747 | 1,085 | 1,788 | 370 | 175 |
| Total | 7,050 | 12,599 | 1,390 | 6,382 | 5,348 | 4,469 | 5,654 | 8,929 | 10,604 | 7,912 | 5,517 | 5,770 | 10,613 | 7,118 | 3,986 | 6,650 | 3,922 | 3,065 | 3,620 | 4,408 | 4,348 | 1,560 |
| <u>Mainstem</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reach 2 | - | - | - | - | 4,368 | 1,196 | 2,570 | 497 | 619 | 1,502 | 815 | 5,380 | 3,591 | 2,748 | 2,629 | 3,124 | 2,037 | 3,510 | 2,821 | 1,788 | 4,148 | 3,767 |
| Reach 3 | - | - | - | 2,405 | 5,285 | 2,231 | 2,471 | 2,201 | 1,141 | 3,458 | 1,086 | 2,452 | 5,071 | 2,257 | 3,037 | 4,167 | 2,523 | 3,538 | 4,265 | 3,058 | 3,218 | 2,183 |
| Reach 4 | 290 ¹ | 2,773 | 2,979 | 1,331 | 3,826 | 2,339 | 2,331 | 1,536 | 1,455 | 1,109 | 969 | 1,188 | 5,182 | 1,568 | 1,420 | 3,644 | 2,255 | 2,247 | 1,148 | 848 | 2,012 | 1,936 |
| Total | - | - | - | - | 11,036 | 4,838 | 8,195 | 4,234 | 3,215 | 5,979 | 2,870 | 9,020 | 13,844 | 6,573 | 7,086 | 10,935 | 6,366 | 8,278 | 8,234 | 5,654 | 9,810 | 7,886 |
| <u>Coquitlam River (incl. off-channel)</u> | - | - | - | - | 16,384 | 9,307 | 13,849 | 13,163 | 13,819 | 13,891 | 8,387 | 14,790 | 24,457 | 13,691 | 11,072 | 17,585 | 10,288 | 11,343 | 11,854 | 10,062 | 14,158 | 9,446 |
| Steelhead | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Off-channel sites</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grant's Tomb | 57 | 11 | - | 42 | 58 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 49 | 13 | 9 | 46 | 27 | 47 | 76 | 19 | 11 |
| Or Creek Ponds | 55 | 411 | - | 91 | 161 | 26 | 19 | 30 | 66 | 44 | 47 | 74 | 53 | 52 | 30 | 13 | 17 | 14 | 47 | 59 | 22 | 2 |
| Archery Pond | - | - | - | - | 148 | 54 | 46 | 25 | 19 | 21 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29 | 18 | 47 | 24 | 5 |
| Overland Channel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 96 | 15 | 4 | 73 | 12 | 37 | 9 | 24 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Total | 112 | 422 | - | 133 | 367 | 92 | 73 | 60 | 181 | 80 | 53 | 147 | 125 | 138 | 52 | 46 | 74 | 75 | 112 | 182 | 83 | 18 |
| <u>Mainstem</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reach 2 | - | - | - | - | 2,756 | 1,317 | 1,598 | 1,974 | 1,984 | 2,262 | 1,085 | 2,567 | 2,529 | 1,146 | 903 | 2,071 | 739 | 2,080 | 1,428 | 2,547 | 1,433 | 5,572 |
| Reach 3 | - | - | - | 1,781 | 1,790 | 391 | 1,318 | 636 | 1,022 | 1,230 | 435 | 1,578 | 417 | 879 | 921 | 243 | 449 | 402 | 1,730 | 1,204 | 1,182 | - |
| Reach 4 | 258 | 207 | 421 | 526 | 711 | 547 | 857 | 1,303 | 779 | 705 | 929 | 1,352 | 2,327 | 2,711 | 1,228 | 2,636 | 2,618 | 2,314 | 1,808 | 1,335 | 2,807 | - |
| Total | - | - | - | - | 3,824 | 2,216 | 3,812 | 3,782 | 3,785 | 4,197 | 2,615 | 5,497 | 5,273 | 4,736 | 3,052 | 4,712 | 3,622 | 4,579 | 4,966 | 5,086 | 5,142 | 5,572 |
| <u>Coquitlam River (incl. off-channel)</u> | - | - | - | - | 4,191 | 2,308 | 3,885 | 3,842 | 3,966 | 4,277 | 2,668 | 5,644 | 5,398 | 4,874 | 3,104 | 4,758 | 3,696 | 4,654 | 5,078 | 5,268 | 5,225 | 5,590 |

Table 5.7 Captures of Chinook and Coho fry, Steelhead parr and Sockeye/Kokanee during 2018 at RST 2-4.

| Site | Chinook | Coho fry | Steelhead | Sockeye / Kokanee |
|-------|---------|----------|-----------|----------------------|
| | fry | | parr | smolts |
| RST 2 | 234 | 3,419 | 219 | 11 |
| RST 3 | 5 | 26 | 45 | 2 |
| RST 4 | 7 | 6 | 26 | 8 |

Appendix 5.1 Summary of estimated numbers of Coho, Steelhead and Chum smolts passing the three RST trapping locations (not reach estimates) in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. Mark group indicates the location where fish were initially captured and marked. Also shown are numbers of marked (M), recaptured (R) smolts, unmarked captures (U), estimated capture efficiencies (R/M), 95% confidence intervals, and relative percent errors.

| Species | Site | Mark | M | R | U | Capture | N smolts | CI (+/-) | CI (%) |
|----------------------|-------|----------|--------|-------|---------|------------|-----------|----------|--------|
| | | group(s) | | | | efficiency | | | |
| Coho | RST 2 | RST 4 | 449 | 130 | 449 | 29% | 7,413 | 1,654 | 22.3% |
| | RST 3 | RST 4 | 449 | 61 | 483 | 14% | 4,118 | 1,053 | 25.6% |
| | RST 4 | mainstem | 449 | 111 | 459 | 25% | 1,936 | 412 | 21.3% |
| Steelhead | RST 2 | RST 2 | 440 | 58 | 448 | 13% | 5,572 | 4,220 | 75.7% |
| | RST 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | RST 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chum Pink | RST 2 | RST 2 | 25,160 | 1,143 | 109,542 | 5% | 3,980,067 | 262,513 | 6.6% |
| | RST 2 | RST 2 | 840 | 51 | 2,903 | 6% | 114,846 | 46,330 | 40.3% |

Appendix 5.2 Mark-recapture data used for the BTSPAS estimates for Coho, Steelhead, Chum and Pink at three rotary screw trap sites (RST2, RST3, RST4) in the Coquitlam River mainstem in 2018. Tables include numbers of fish marked in strata i , numbers recaptured within the release strata ($i+0$) and in subsequent strata ($i+n$), and proportion of each strata in which sampling occurred.

Coho

| Recovery site: RST 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|
| RST 4 Mark Group | | | | | | | | | | |
| Release | | Recoveries in strata post release | | | | | | | | Proportion |
| Strata (i) | Marks | i+0 | i+1 | i+2 | i+3 | i+4 | i+5 | i+6 | Unmarked | strata sampled |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0.71 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0.71 |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0.29 |
| 4 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 0.71 |
| 5 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0.86 |
| 7 | 94 | 14 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 326 | 0.71 |
| 8 | 177 | 23 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 551 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 89 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 430 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0.86 |

| Recovery site: RST 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|
| RST 4 Mark Group | | | | | | | | | | |
| Release | | Recoveries in strata post release | | | | | | | | Proportion |
| Strata (i) | Marks | i+0 | i+1 | i+2 | i+3 | i+4 | i+5 | i+6 | Unmarked | strata sampled |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0.43 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0.71 |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0.29 |
| 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0.71 |
| 5 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0.86 |
| 7 | 94 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0.71 |
| 8 | 177 | 9 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 89 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.71 |

| Recovery site: RST 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|
| RST 4 Mark Group | | | | | | | | | | |
| Release | | Recoveries in strata post release | | | | | | | | Proportion |
| Strata (i) | Marks | i+0 | i+1 | i+2 | i+3 | i+4 | i+5 | i+6 | Unmarked | strata sampled |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.14 |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0.71 |
| 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 1.00 |
| 5 | 26 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 1.00 |
| 7 | 94 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 1.00 |
| 8 | 177 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 89 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.86 |

Appendix 5.2 continued

Steelhead

| Recovery site: RST 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|---------------------------|
| RST 2 mark group | | | | | | | | | | |
| Release | | Recoveries in strata post release | | | | | | | Unmarked | Proportion strata sampled |
| Strata (i) | Marks | i+0 | i+1 | i+2 | i+3 | i+4 | i+5 | i+6 | | |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.71 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.71 |
| 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0.29 |
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.71 |
| 5 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 48 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0.86 |
| 7 | 98 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0.71 |
| 8 | 141 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 79 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0.86 |

| Recovery site: RST 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|---------------------------|
| All mark groups | | | | | | | | | | |
| Release | | Recoveries in strata post release | | | | | | | Unmarked | Proportion strata sampled |
| Strata (i) | Marks | i+0 | i+1 | i+2 | i+3 | i+4 | i+5 | i+6 | | |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.43 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.71 |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.29 |
| 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.71 |
| 5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0.86 |
| 7 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0.71 |
| 8 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.71 |

| Recovery site: RST 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|---------------------------|
| All mark groups | | | | | | | | | | |
| Release | | Recoveries in strata post release | | | | | | | Unmarked | Proportion strata sampled |
| Strata (i) | Marks | i+0 | i+1 | i+2 | i+3 | i+4 | i+5 | i+6 | | |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.14 |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0.71 |
| 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1.00 |
| 5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1.00 |
| 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1.00 |
| 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1.00 |
| 8 | 27 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 1.00 |
| 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 |
| 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.00 |
| 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.00 |
| 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.86 |

Appendix 5.2 continued


Chum**Recovery site: RST 2.2****All mark groups**

| Strata | Marked | Recaptured | Unmarked | Days / Strata | Days sampled | Proportion sampled |
|--------|--------|------------|----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 541 | 25 | 1,977 | 8 | 7 | 0.88 |
| 2 | 1,795 | 122 | 3,731 | 9 | 6 | 0.67 |
| 3 | 811 | 40 | 8,621 | 5 | 5 | 1.00 |
| 4 | 3,465 | 193 | 7,195 | 15 | 3 | 0.20 |
| 5 | 6,000 | 167 | 27,819 | 6 | 5 | 0.83 |
| 6 | 6,046 | 237 | 29,948 | 7 | 5 | 0.71 |
| 7 | 6,000 | 344 | 28,219 | 10 | 7 | 0.70 |
| 8 | 502 | 15 | 2,032 | 11 | 11 | 1.00 |

Pink**Recovery site: RST 2.2****All mark groups**

| Strata | Marked | Recaptured | Unmarked | Days / Strata | Days sampled | Proportion sampled |
|--------|--------|------------|----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 36 | 1 | 171 | 8 | 7 | 0.88 |
| 2 | 63 | 3 | 261 | 9 | 6 | 0.67 |
| 3 | 84 | 3 | 865 | 5 | 5 | 1.00 |
| 4 | 270 | 10 | 623 | 15 | 3 | 0.20 |
| 5 | 190 | 13 | 562 | 6 | 5 | 0.83 |
| 6 | 164 | 20 | 339 | 7 | 5 | 0.71 |
| 7 | 33 | 1 | 77 | 10 | 7 | 0.70 |

Appendix 5.3 Age-fork length relationships for Steelhead parr and smolts in the Coquitlam River during 2005-2018 derived from scale-aging analysis.



Appendix 5.4 Mark-recapture data used to test whether the capture efficiency differed between smolts marked using VIE or fin clips for Coho and Steelhead captures at RST 2 during strata 8 and 9. Proportions recaptured are considered unaffected by marking method with p values greater than 0.05.

| Species | Marking method | Marked | Recaptured | Chi square test | |
|-----------|----------------|--------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| | | | | Capture efficiency | p value |
| Coho | Adipose clip | 278 | 93 | 0.33 | 0.63 |
| | VIE | 276 | 87 | 0.32 | |
| Steelhead | Adipose clip | 159 | 33 | 0.21 | 0.55 |
| | VIE | 160 | 29 | 0.18 | |

10.6 Figures and Tables for Chapter 6




Figure 6.1 Monthly discharge statistics for the Coquitlam River during Flow Treatment 1 (2000-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2018) measured at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141) including monthly mean and minimum discharge as well as the coefficient of variation in monthly mean discharge.




Figure 6.2 Annual Coho smolts density for four constructed off-channel habitats connected to the Coquitlam River. The colours of the bars reflect the flow treatment period of the cohort outmigrating during that year: red – Treatment 1, blue – both treatment conditions(2009), green – Treatment 2.




Figure 6.3 Annual Coho smolts yield and 95% confidence intervals for the 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem as well from individual reaches 2-4. The colours of the bars reflect the flow treatment period that cohorts were reared under: Treatment 1 (red), both treatment conditions 2009 (blue), Treatment 2 (green).




Figure 6.4 Annual Steelhead smolts yield and 95% confidence intervals for 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem as well from individual reaches 2-4. The colours of the bars reflect the flow treatment period that cohorts were reared under: Treatment 1(red), both treatment conditions (blue), Treatment 2 (green).




Figure 6.5 Mean Coho and Steelhead smolt yield and 95% confidence intervals for Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 for the 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem and in reaches 2-4. Only annual estimates for cohorts that reared exclusively under either Treatment 1 or Treatment 2 conditions were included. For Coho, this includes 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. For Steelhead, this includes 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 for Treatment 2.




Figure 6.6 Average effect size and 95% confidence intervals of the change in smolt yield from Treatment 1 to 2 for Coho and Steelhead for the 7.5km study section of the Coquitlam River mainstem (red) and for individual reaches 2-4 (blue). For Coho, this includes smolt estimates from 2000-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. For Steelhead, this includes smolt estimates from 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 for Treatment 2.




Figure 6.7 Average effect size and 95% confidence intervals for Coho smolt yield between Treatment 1 and 2 based on the BACI analysis with the Alouette River (Alouette), using the Alouette, Keogh and Sakinaw as controls (Controls) and using only the Keogh and Sakinaw as controls (Controls_no_Alouette). The BACI effect represents the change in Coquitlam mainstem smolt production between Treatment 1 and 2 that is attributed to flow treatment. Effect size greater than 0 represents an increased productivity as a result of Treatment 2 whereas negative values indicates a decrease. This includes cohorts that reared entirely during Treatment 1 (2000-2008) or Treatment 2 (2010-2018). Note that the Alouette and Sakinaw data did not included all years.




Figure 6.8 Mean percent change in Coho smolt yield and 95% confidence intervals from Treatment 1 (2000-2008) to Treatment 2 (2010-2018) in mainstem habitats in the Coquitlam River and control streams (Alouette and Keogh rivers, and Sakinaw Creek) with including all streams (Controls) or excluding the Alouette River (Controls_no_Allouette). This includes smolts estimates for cohorts that reared entirely under only Treatment 1 or 2, including 2000-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. Note that Alouette and Sakinaw data sets did not included all years.




Figure 6.9 Annual numbers of Coho and Steelhead smolts in reach 4 of Coquitlam River during 1997-2018.




Figure 6.10 Preliminary linear and Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship between Coho escapement and fall fry yield (2006-2018 fry years) and Beverton-Holt stock-recruitment relationship between Coho escapement (upstream of RST2) and total smolt yield in the Coquitlam River during Treatment 1 (2004-2008 smolt years), and Treatment 2 (2009-2018 smolt years).




Figure 6.11 The count of Coho fry salvage in relation to the discharge (m³/s) at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141) for rampdowns that began on June 1st and were completed over 1, 3 or 14 days during 2010-2018. Colours indicates the number of days for rampdown to occur. Even though all rampdowns decreased dam discharge to 1.1 m³/s, discharge measured downstream at the Port Coquitlam WSC gauge station varied depending on the inflows entering the Coquitlam River downstream of the dam.




Figure 6.12 Coho egg-to-fall fry survival in relation to A) adult escapement; B) count of Coho fry stranded following the early June rampdown; C) post June rampdown discharge, and D) number of days the June rampdown occurred over; E) mean discharge during spawning; F) incubation; G) emergence, and H) summer rearing for the escapement years 2010-2016. Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141).




Figure 6.13 Coho egg-to-smolt survival in relation to A) adult escapement; B) count of Coho fry stranded following the early June rampdown; C) post June rampdown discharge, and D) number of days the June rampdown occurred over; E) mean discharge during spawning; F) incubation; G) emergence, and H) summer rearing for the escapement years 2010-2016. Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141).




Figure 6.14 Coho smolt abundance in relation to A) mean discharge during spawning, B) incubation, C) emergence, D) summer rearing, E) winter rearing and F) days with discharge above 70 m³/s separately for Treatment 1 and 2 for the smolt years 2002-2018. Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141).




Figure 6.15 Average percent change in Steelhead smolt yield and 95% confidence intervals from Treatment 1 (2000-2008) to Treatment 2 (2010-2018) in mainstem habitats in the Coquitlam River and Alouette River. This includes 2002-2008 during Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 during Treatment 2. Note that for the Alouette River, estimates were only available during Treatment 2 up to 2014.




Figure 6.16 Steelhead egg-to-fall fry survival in relation to A) mean discharge during spawning, B) incubation, C) difference discharge between spawning and incubation, D) adult escapement for the fry years 2006-2018 and E) % of August with discharge $> 5.4\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ (20% of MAD). Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141).




Figure 6.17 Preliminary escapement-to-fry stock-recruitment relationships of Chum and Pink Salmon during flow Treatment 1 (2002-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2017) from 7.5 km of the Coquitlam River. The best-fit lines intercept the x and y axis at 0 as is typical of stock-recruitment relationships. Note that because Pink Salmon spawn every other year in the lower Fraser River watershed, the number of datapoints is half as for Chum. R^2 values reflect the fit of stock-recruitment.




Figure 6.18 Adult-to- $\ln(\text{fry}/\text{adult})$ stock-recruitment relationships of Chum during flow Treatment 1 (red 2002-2008) and Treatment 2 (teal 2009-2016) from 7.5 km of the Coquitlam River used for the ANCOVA tests as to whether flow treatment had a significant effect of productivity.




Figure 6.19a Annual escapement and smolt yield in the Coquitlam River study area versus that in the Alouette River during 2002-2014. Values for the Coquitlam are given on the right-hand axis, and values for the Alouette are given on the left-hand axis.




Figure 6.19b Annual escapement, fry and smolt yield in the Coquitlam River versus that in the Cheakamus River during 2002-2017. Values for the Coquitlam are given on the right-hand axis, and values for the Cheakamus are given on the left-hand axis.




Figure 6.20 Chum egg-to-fry survival in relation to A) count of days that average flows were greater 70 m³/s during A) winter, B) spawning, C) incubation and the mean discharge during E) winter, F) spawning, and G) incubation separately for Treatment 1 and 2 for the fry years 2003-2018 (excluding 2004). Discharge based on flows at Port Coquitlam (Water Survey of Canada, stn. 08MH141).

Table 6.1a Summary of all population estimates for all life stages and species in Coquitlam River, 2000-2018. Values shown for the different life stages for a given year do not correspond in most cases (i.e., columns do not line up), as values are shown for the year in which they occurred rather than the brood year. Abundances for the different life stage are also not strictly comparable because study areas differ somewhat for the different components of the monitoring program.

| Life stage | Species | 2000 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Adult | chum | - | 15,378 | 18,301 | 27,992 | 24,559 | 51,860 | 11,066 | 18,224 | 19,600 | 6,931 | 27,410 | 57,300 | 42,220 | 8,491 | 23,410 | 78,120 | | |
| | escapement pink | - | - | 5,418 | - | 4,406 | - | 2,876 | - | 10,698 | - | 10,427 | - | 34,280 | | 9,327 | | | |
| | coho | - | 2,648 | 1,562 | 2,562 | 1,334 | 939 | 2,401 | 878 | 3,175 | 12,338 | 8,428 | 11,320 | 13,290 | 4,957 | 4,979 | 6,867 | | |
| | Chinook | - | - | <300 | <100 | <100 | <100 | 438 | 952 | 1,529 | 8,018 | 4,918 | 363 | 2,413 | 572 | 123 | 511 | | |
| | steelhead (female) | - | - | - | - | 187 | 434 | 130 | 148 | 113 | 167 | 206 | 278 | 248 | 158 | 251 | 205 | 199 | 134 |
| | steelhead (total) | - | - | - | - | 373 | 868 | 260 | 297 | 225 | 333 | 412 | 557 | 495 | 317 | 502 | 410 | 398 | 268 |
| Fall standing | coho | - | - | - | - | - | 27,111 | 18,405 | 46,719 | 52,794 | 62,178 | 91,367 | 73,846 | 70,279 | 44,507 | 36,101 | 25,424 | 59,166 | 43,740 |
| stock | 0+ steelhead fry | - | - | - | - | - | 138,132 | 32,251 | 42,506 | 37,047 | 39,657 | 21,949 | 55,232 | 66,017 | 32,746 | 32,277 | 30,203 | 54,358 | 47,565 |
| | 1+ steelhead parr | - | - | - | - | - | 5,976 | 10,237 | 10,222 | 10,876 | 8,106 | 8,791 | 10,668 | 13,456 | 6,369 | 5,889 | 5,216 | 9,064 | 9,836 |
| | 2+ steelhead parr | - | - | - | - | - | 1,841 | 1,978 | 1,255 | 3,196 | 2,690 | 3,862 | 3,160 | 2,625 | 3,831 | 2,561 | 2,642 | 3,207 | 2,127 |
| Smolt yield | chum (total - millions) | - | - | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 6.7 | 8.6 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 12.7 | 4.0 |
| | pink (total - millions) | - | - | | 0.32 | - | 0.15 | - | 0.18 | - | 0.55 | - | 3.56 | - | 6.03 | - | 1.31 | - | 0.11 |
| | coho (total) | 16,384 | 9,307 | 13,849 | 13,163 | 13,819 | 13,891 | 8,387 | 14,790 | 24,457 | 13,691 | 11,072 | 17,585 | 10,288 | 11,343 | 11,854 | 10,062 | 14,158 | 8,973 |
| | coho (mainstem) | 11,036 | 4,838 | 8,195 | 4,234 | 3,215 | 5,979 | 2,870 | 9,020 | 13,844 | 6,573 | 7,086 | 10,935 | 6,351 | 8,080 | 8,234 | 5,654 | 9,810 | 7,413 |
| | steelhead (total) | 4,191 | 2,308 | 3,885 | 3,842 | 3,966 | 4,277 | 2,668 | 5,644 | 5,398 | 4,874 | 3,104 | 4,758 | 3,622 | 4,654 | 5,078 | 5,268 | 5,225 | 5,590 |
| | steelhead (mainstem) | 3,824 | 2,216 | 3,812 | 3,782 | 3,785 | 4,197 | 2,615 | 5,497 | 5,273 | 4,736 | 3,052 | 4,712 | 3,622 | 4,579 | 4,966 | 5,086 | 5,142 | 5,572 |
| | steelhead (2+) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,412 | 2,795 | 2,968 | 2,588 | 1,848 | 2,177 | 1,927 | 3,134 | 3,134 | 4,056 | 3,882 | 3,180 |
| | steelhead (3+) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,849 | 2,430 | 2,286 | 1,256 | 2,581 | 1,695 | 1,520 | 1,944 | 1,212 | 1,343 | 2,410 |
| | steelhead smolts by brood year | | | | | 4,261 | 5,225 | 5,254 | 3,843 | 4,429 | 3,871 | 3,447 | 5,078 | 4,347 | 5,399 | 6,292 | | | |

Table 6.1b Summary of survival estimates across all life stages and species for 2000-2016 brood escapements for Coho, Chum and Pink Salmon and 2005-2018 brood escapement for Steelhead in the Coquitlam River. Egg-to-smolt survival estimates are based on adult escapement upstream of the lowermost smolt trapping site (RST2). Unlike Table 6.1a, year corresponds to the adult return year (brood year), as opposed to the year when the juvenile life stage was present. For survival rates among the juvenile life stages of Steelhead (e.g., fry to age 1+ parr), year corresponds to the younger life stage. Biased-high survival rate estimates (i.e., >100%) are shown in red (see Section 6.2).

| Species | Survival by life stage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------|
| | | 2000 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
| Coho | Egg-to-fall fry ¹ | - | - | - | - | 1.35% | 1.31% | 1.30% | 4.01% | 1.31% | 0.49% | 0.58% | 0.41% | 0.22% | 0.49% | 0.34% | 0.57% | | |
| Coho | Fall fry-to-smolt | - | - | - | - | - | 2.08% | 27.97% | 32.57% | 17.74% | 17.87% | 49.82% | 11.50% | 12.24% | 25.15% | 17.52% | 32.48% | | |
| Coho | Egg-to-smolt | | 0.17% | 0.28% | 0.18% | 0.35% | 0.30% | 0.21% | 0.93% | 0.14% | 0.03% | 0.07% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.08% | 0.07% | 0.07% | | |
| Steelhead | Egg-to-fall fry ¹ | - | - | - | - | - | 8.6% | 6.7% | 7.8% | 8.9% | 6.4% | 2.9% | 5.4% | 7.2% | 5.6% | 3.5% | 4.0% | 7.4% | 9.6% |
| Steelhead | Egg-to-parr ¹ | - | - | - | - | 0.9% | 0.6% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 1.9% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1.3% | 0.7% | 1.0% | 0.6% | 1.2% | 1.3% | |
| Steelhead | Egg-to-smolt ^{1,2} | - | - | - | - | 0.7% | 0.4% | 1.1% | 0.8% | 1.3% | 0.7% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 1.0% | 0.7% | | | |
| Steelhead | Fry to age-1+ parr | - | - | - | - | - | 7.4% | 31.7% | 25.6% | 21.9% | 22.2% | 48.6% | 24.4% | 9.6% | 18.0% | 16.2% | 30.0% | 18.1% | |
| Steelhead | Fry to age-2+ parr | - | - | - | - | - | 0.9% | 9.9% | 6.3% | 10.4% | 8.0% | 12.0% | 6.9% | 3.9% | 8.1% | 9.9% | 7.0% | | |
| Steelhead | Age 1+ parr to smolt ² | - | - | - | - | - | 68.6% | 40.4% | 44.1% | 35% | 55% | 44% | 32% | 38% | 68% | 92% | 121% | | |
| Steelhead | Age 2+ parr to smolt ² | - | - | - | - | - | 68.2% | 144.0% | 193.6% | 71.5% | 46.7% | 66.8% | 53.6% | 57.9% | 50.7% | 47.3% | 50.8% | 75.1% | |
| Chum | Egg-to-fry ¹ | - | 7.9% | 9.5% | 3.8% | 19.0% | 7.2% | 13.5% | 26.8% | 18.1% | 26.1% | 19.9% | 12.1% | 29.7% | 40.0% | 33.5% | 20.4% | | |
| Pink | Egg-to-fry ¹ | - | - | 9.6% | - | 5.1% | - | 9.7% | - | 7.4% | - | 48.0% | - | 27.5% | - | 24.9% | - | | |

¹ Assuming a 1:1 sex ratio for all species and average fecundity values of 3,200, 1,800, 3000, and 3,700 eggs/female for Chum, Pink, Coho, and Steelhead (Groot and Margolis 1991; Ward and Slaney 1993).

² Derived from yield of age-2 and age-3 smolts in subsequent years (see Section 5.2.2.2).

Table 6.2 Comparison of mean smolt yield during Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 in the Coquitlam River including the p-values for the two-tailed t tests and percent change in mean abundance between from Treatment 1 to 2. Only annual estimates for cohorts that reared exclusively under either Treatment 1 or Treatment 2 conditions were included. For Coho, this includes 2000-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2010-2018 for Treatment 2. For Steelhead, this includes 2002-2008 for Treatment 1 and 2012-2018 for Treatment 2.

| Smolt yield | Treatment 1 | | | Treatment 2 | | | t test | | Null Hypothesis of no change (p<0.05) |
|----------------------|-------------|-------|---|-------------|-------|---|---------|----------|--|
| | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | N | p value | % change | |
| Coho (Total) | 12,949 | 2,719 | 8 | 12,114 | 2,963 | 9 | 0.531 | -6% | do not reject |
| Coho (Mainstem) | 6,173 | 2,954 | 8 | 7,793 | 1,872 | 9 | 0.180 | 26% | do not reject |
| Coho (Reach 2) | 2,118 | 1,728 | 8 | 2,900 | 726 | 9 | 0.257 | 37% | do not reject |
| Coho (Reach 3) | 2,541 | 823 | 8 | 3,138 | 757 | 9 | 0.269 | 24% | reject |
| Coho (Reach 4) | 1,844 | 563 | 8 | 1,898 | 815 | 9 | 0.903 | 3% | do not reject |
| Steelhead (Total) | 3,799 | 993 | 7 | 4,885 | 272 | 6 | 0.053 | 29% | do not reject |
| Steelhead (Mainstem) | 3,701 | 978 | 7 | 4,811 | 261 | 6 | 0.045 | 30% | reject |
| Steelhead (Reach 2) | 1,827 | 524 | 7 | 1,716 | 643 | 6 | 0.903 | -6% | do not reject |
| Steelhead (Reach 3) | 944 | 464 | 7 | 868 | 590 | 6 | 0.799 | -8% | do not reject |
| Steelhead (Reach 4) | 925 | 301 | 7 | 2,253 | 571 | 6 | 0.000 | 144% | reject |

Table 6.3 Estimates of the probability Coquitlam River mainstem Coho and Steelhead smolt production increased by at least 10%, 20% and 50% from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2.

| % Change from Treatment 1 | Coho | Steelhead |
|---------------------------|------|-----------|
| 10% | 0.76 | 0.90 |
| 20% | 0.61 | 0.76 |
| 50% | 0.16 | 0.11 |

Table 6.4 Mean annual Coho smolt abundance estimates 1998-2018 for the Coquitlam River mainstem and watersheds considered for use as controls for regional changes in freshwater productivity.

| Year | Flow Treatment | Coquitlam Mainstem | Alouette R | Black Cr | Carnation Cr | Sakinaw Cr | Cherry Cr | Keogh | Green R |
|------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | | South Coast BC | South Coast BC | Vancouver Island | Vancouver Island | South Coast BC | Vancouver Island | Vancouver Island | Northern Washington |
| 1998 | pre | | 16,200 | | 4,865 | | | | |
| 1999 | pre | | 10,200 | | 2,842 | | | | |
| 2000 | 1 | 11,036 | 20,003 | 153,966 | 4,828 | | 16,438 | 74,400 | |
| 2001 | 1 | | | 42,628 | 2,205 | | 9,078 | 59,931 | |
| 2002 | 1 | 4,838 | 12,100 | 89,257 | 4,740 | | 13,853 | 60,044 | 194,393 |
| 2003 | 1 | 8,195 | 19,358 | 81,973 | 4,539 | 30,592 | 5,345 | 93,578 | 207,442 |
| 2004 | 1 | 4,234 | 16,880 | 41,250 | 4,433 | 13,934 | 3,476 | 22,428 | |
| 2005 | 1 | 3,215 | 13,020 | 46,028 | 2,974 | 16,264 | 6,499 | 58,900 | |
| 2006 | 1 | 5,979 | 14,591 | 124,864 | 2,248 | 21,465 | 8,750 | 50,403 | 31,460 |
| 2007 | 1 | 2,870 | 3,040 | 35,370 | 1,100 | 15,986 | 4,708 | 56,187 | 22,671 |
| 2008 | 1 | 9,020 | 6,508 | 34,700 | 682 | 9,197 | 2,017 | 72,064 | |
| 2009 | both | 13,844 | 40,156 | 68,517 | 3,205 | 32,648 | 10,306 | 77,822 | 81,079 |
| 2010 | 2 | 6,573 | 19,885 | 27,750 | 2,617 | | 15,943 | 61,495 | 43,763 |
| 2011 | 2 | 7,086 | 19,240 | 27,975 | 2,757 | 19,830 | 11,662 | 89,788 | 62,280 |
| 2012 | 2 | 10,935 | 39,050 | 32,274 | 2,861 | 33,864 | 11,676 | 108,063 | 48,148 |
| 2013 | 2 | 6,351 | 31,670 | 56,856 | 819 | 26,860 | 15,147 | 111,042 | 50,642 |
| 2014 | 2 | 8,080 | 22,620 | 55,964 | 1,386 | 21,149 | | 66,765 | 106,365 |
| 2015 | 2 | 8,234 | | 19,419 | 1,203 | 4,094 | | 111,718 | 42,564 |
| 2016 | 2 | 5,654 | | 25,424 | | 12,473 | | 91,582 | 62,074 |
| 2017 | 2 | 9,810 | | 34,473 | | 2,966 | | 81,502 | 79,491 |
| 2018 | 2 | 7,413 | | 40,322 | | | | 65,084 | |

Table 6.5 The Pearson correlation coefficient and the sample size (N) for the comparison between Coho smolt abundance in the Coquitlam River mainstem and the streams considered as controls for regional changes in freshwater productivity in the Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) analysis. The comparison included the years 2000-2009, which represents cohorts reared entirely or mostly under Treatment 1. We used correlation coefficient value of 0.5 as the minimum value to include a stream in the BACI analysis.

| Stream | Correlation coefficient (R) | N | Included in BACI analysis |
|--------------|-----------------------------|----|---------------------------|
| Alouette R | 0.75 | 9 | TRUE |
| Keogh | 0.62 | 10 | TRUE |
| Sakinaw Cr | 0.60 | 7 | TRUE |
| Black Cr | 0.38 | 10 | FALSE |
| Cherry Cr | 0.36 | 10 | FALSE |
| Carnation Cr | 0.14 | 10 | FALSE |
| Green River | -0.04 | 7 | FALSE |

Table 6.6 Estimates of the probability Coquitlam River mainstem Coho smolt production increased 10%, 20% or 50% from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 base on comparison with the estimated mean change for either three control streams (Keogh River, Sakinaw Creek and Alouette River) or two control streams(Keogh River and Sakinaw Creek).

| % Change from Treatment 1 | Control | Control |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | Alouette, Keogh, Sakinaw | Keogh, Sakinaw |
| 0% | 33% | 52% |
| 10% | 22% | 39% |
| 20% | 14% | 26% |
| 50% | 2% | 5% |

Table 6.7 Estimates of the probability for at least a 0%, 10%, 20% or 50% increase in the Coquitlam River mainstem Coho smolt production from Treatment 1 to Treatment 2 when compared to the change when using only the Alouette River as a control for regional changes in freshwater productivity.

| % Change from Treatment 1 | Control |
|---------------------------|----------|
| | Alouette |
| 0% | 0.10 |
| 10% | 0.08 |
| 20% | 0.06 |
| 50% | 0.03 |

Table 6.8 Model performance of Coho smolt abundance 2002-2018 using linear regression including one or more explanatory variables and evaluated using, the amount of variation explained by the model (R^2), Akaike information criterion (AIC_c), and the distance from the lowest AIC value (ΔAIC). AIC_c include the penalty for the number of parameters at each sample size. Shading marks the model(s) with strong support based on $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$.

Coho

| Model # | Response variable | Explanatory variables | R^2 | AIC_c | ΔAIC |
|---------|-------------------|---|-------|---------|--------------|
| 1 | Smolt abundance | Treatment | 0.27 | 294.8 | 4.6 |
| 2 | Smolt abundance | Mean discharge-spawning (Nov-Jan) | 0.03 | 299.3 | 9.1 |
| 3 | Smolt abundance | Mean discharge-incubation (Feb-Mar) | 0.04 | 299.1 | 9.0 |
| 4 | Smolt abundance | Mean discharge-emergence (Apr-May) | 0.03 | 299.4 | 9.2 |
| 5 | Smolt abundance | Mean discharge-summer rearing (June-Sept) | 0.17 | 296.9 | 6.7 |
| 6 | Smolt abundance | Mean discharge - winter rearing (Oct-Feb) | 0.22 | 295.8 | 5.7 |
| 7 | Smolt abundance | Days above 70 cms-winter (Oct-Feb) | 0.45 | 290.2 | 0.0 |
| 8 | Smolt abundance | % of August > 5.4cms (20% MAD) | 0.02 | 299.4 | 9.2 |
| 9 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + Mean discharge-spawning (Nov-Jan) | 0.33 | 297.1 | 6.9 |
| 10 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + Mean discharge-incubation (Feb-Mar) | 0.30 | 297.8 | 7.6 |
| 11 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + Mean discharge-emergence (Apr-May) | 0.28 | 298.3 | 8.1 |
| 12 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + Mean discharge-summer rearing (June-Sept) | 0.30 | 297.8 | 7.6 |
| 13 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + Mean discharge - winter rearing (Oct-Feb) | 0.46 | 293.6 | 3.4 |
| 14 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + Days above 70 cms-winter (Oct-Feb) | 0.50 | 292.5 | 2.3 |
| 15 | Smolt abundance | Treatment + % of August > 5.4cms (20% MAD) | 0.28 | 298.2 | 8.0 |

Table 6.9 Annual Steelhead smolt abundance during the Treatment 1 and 2 flow period in the Coquitlam River mainstem and the Alouette River. The Alouette River was used as control for regional changes in freshwater productivity.

| Year | Treatment Period | Coquitlam Mainstem | Alouette R | Keogh R |
|------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | South Coast BC | South Coast BC | Vancouver Island |
| 2000 | pre | 3,824 | 3,392 | 2,344 |
| 2001 | pre | | 2,286 | 2,010 |
| 2002 | pre | 2,216 | 3,768 | 1,892 |
| 2003 | 1 | 3,812 | 2,364 | 4,865 |
| 2004 | 1 | 3,782 | 3,355 | 511 |
| 2005 | 1 | 3,785 | 2,493 | 4,676 |
| 2006 | 1 | 4,197 | 784 | 2,051 |
| 2007 | 1 | 2,615 | | 965 |
| 2008 | 1 | 5,497 | 6,204 | 1,455 |
| 2009 | both | 5,273 | 6,191 | 1,561 |
| 2010 | both | 4,736 | 15,130 | 1,889 |
| 2011 | both | 3,052 | 5,077 | 1,638 |
| 2012 | 2 | 4,712 | 5,778 | 3,193 |
| 2013 | 2 | 3,622 | 5,917 | 2,620 |
| 2014 | 2 | 4,579 | 4,610 | 2,382 |
| 2015 | 2 | 4,966 | | 2,981 |
| 2016 | 2 | 5,086 | | 2,009 |
| 2017 | 2 | 5,142 | | 2,396 |
| 2018 | 2 | 5,572 | | 1,471 |

Table 6.10 The Pearson correlation coefficient and the sample size (N) for the comparison between Steelhead smolt abundance in the Coquitlam River mainstem and the streams considered as controls for regional changes in freshwater productivity in the Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) analysis. The comparison included the years 2000-2009, which represents cohorts reared entirely or mostly under pre-Treatment 2 conditions. We used correlation coefficient value of 0.5 as the minimum value to include a stream in the BACI analysis.

| Stream | Correlation coefficient (R) | N | Included in BACI analysis |
|------------|-----------------------------|----|---------------------------|
| Alouette R | 0.521850241 | 9 | TRUE |
| Keogh R | -0.025447947 | 10 | FALSE |

Table 6.11 Estimates of the probability Coquitlam River mainstem Steelhead smolt production increased by at least 0%, 10%, 20% and 50% in relation to estimated change in smolt abundance in the Alouette River.

| % Increase from Treatment 1 | Control |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| | Alouette |
| 0% | 0.20 |
| 10% | 0.16 |
| 20% | 0.14 |
| 50% | 0.08 |

Table 6.12 Model performance of Steelhead egg-to-fry survival 2006-2018 using linear regression including one or more explanatory variables and evaluated using, the amount of variation explained by the model (R^2), Akaike information criterion (AIC_c), and the distance from the lowest AIC value (ΔAIC). AIC_c include the penalty for the number of parameters at each sample size. Shading marks the model(s) with strong support based on $\Delta AIC_c \leq 2$.

Steelhead

| Model # | Response variable | Explanatory Variable | R^2 | AIC_c | ΔAIC |
|---------|-------------------------|--|-------|---------|--------------|
| 1 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Flow treatment | 0.11 | -57.5 | 2.1 |
| 2 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Mean spawning discharge (Mar-May) | 0.05 | -56.5 | 3.0 |
| 3 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Mean incubation discharge (June-July) | 0.00 | -55.9 | 3.7 |
| 4 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Discharge difference (spawning - incubation) | 0.25 | -59.6 | 0.0 |
| 5 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Adults | 0.01 | -56.0 | 3.6 |
| 6 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | % of August > 5.4cms (20% MAD) | 0.00 | -55.9 | 3.7 |
| 7 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Treatment + Mean spawning discharge | 0.05 | -52.2 | 7.4 |
| 8 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Treatment + Mean incubation discharge | 0.01 | -51.7 | 7.9 |
| 9 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Treatment + Discharge difference | 0.25 | -55.3 | 4.3 |
| 10 | Survival (egg-fall fry) | Treatment + % of August > 5.4cms (20% MAD) | 0.01 | -51.7 | 7.9 |

Table 6.13 Preliminary ANCOVA results for Chum 2003-2016 brood years to examine the significance of flow treatment on fry yield during Treatment 1 (2000-2008) and Treatment 2 (2009-2017) in the Coquitlam River including the significance of F values. The null hypothesis in all cases is that the predictive variable is not a significant predictor of fry yield. Escapement x Treatment represents the interaction effect that would produce different slopes of the stock-recruitment relationships for Treatment 1 and 2.

| Coefficient | F value | Significance level probability (>F) | Null hypothesis prob < 0.05 |
|-------------|---------|--|--------------------------------|
| Intercept | 5.2 | <0.001 | reject |
| Escapement | 27.4 | 0.06 | do not reject |
| Treatment | 9.1 | <0.001 | reject |

Table 6.14 Model performance of Chum egg-to-fry survival for 2002-2016 brood years by each of the explanatory variables evaluated using, linear (r^2), Akaike information criterion (AIC), and the distance from the lowest AIC value (Δ AIC). AIC include the penalty for the number of parameters at each sample size. Shading marks the model(s) with the most support based on Δ AICc.

Chum

| Model # | Response variable | Explanatory Variable | R^2 | AICc | Δ AIC |
|---------|-----------------------|---|-------|-------|--------------|
| 1 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment | 0.47 | -26.4 | 9.6 |
| 2 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Days above 70 cms (Oct-Feb) | 0.01 | -17.6 | 18.4 |
| 3 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Days above 70 cms (Oct-Nov) | 0.23 | -21.1 | 14.9 |
| 4 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Days above 70 cms (Dec-Feb) | 0.20 | -20.6 | 15.4 |
| 5 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Mean discharge (Oct-Feb) | 0.00 | -17.5 | 18.5 |
| 6 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Mean discharge (Oct-Nov) | 0.17 | -20.1 | 15.9 |
| 7 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Mean discharges (Dec-Feb) | 0.38 | -24.2 | 11.8 |
| 8 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment + Days above 70 cms (Oct-Feb) | 0.49 | -22.9 | 13.0 |
| 9 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment + Days above 70 cms (Oct-Nov) | 0.51 | -23.3 | 12.7 |
| 10 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment + Days above 70 cms (Dec-Feb) | 0.80 | -36.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment + Mean discharge (Oct-Feb) | 0.47 | -22.4 | 13.6 |
| 12 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment + Mean discharge (Oct-Nov) | 0.53 | -24.0 | 12.0 |
| 13 | Survival (egg-to-fry) | Treatment + Mean discharges (Dec-Feb) | 0.69 | -29.9 | 6.1 |

Appendix 6.1 References for annual smolt estimates considered for use as controls streams in the BACI analysis for treatment effects for Coho and Steelhead.

Alouette River – Coho and Steelhead

Cope, S. 2015. Alouette River Salmonid Smolt Migration Enumeration: 2014 Data Report.

Unpublished report prepared for the Alouette River Management Committee and BC Hydro by Westslope Fisheries, Cranbrook BC, 90 p.

Black Creek, Carnation Creek, Cherry Creek, Keogh River and Sakinaw Creek – Coho

Wade, J. and Irvine, J.R., 2018. Synthesis of smolt and spawner abundance information for Coho Salmon from South Coast British Columbia streams. Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 3161: vi + 39 p.

Keogh River – Steelhead and Coho (post 2015)

Reports prepared by Instream Fisheries Research

Green River – Coho

Topping, P.C. and J.H. Anderson. 2018. Green River Juvenile Salmonid Production Evaluation: 2017 Annual Report. Report prepared by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fish Program, Science Division