Bill Bradbury Chair Oregon

Henry Lorenzen Oregon

W. Bill Booth Idaho

James A. Yost Idaho



June 3, 2014

MEMORANDUM

- TO: Council Members
- **FROM:** Stacy Horton, Policy Analyst, Washington
- **SUBJECT:** Final 2012 Hatchery Fin Clip Report

Chris Wheaton of StreamNet will be presenting the results of the Final 2012 Hatchery Fin Clip Report. Language in the Draft Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program calls for hatchery fish to be 'visibly marked' in order to accurately assess the survival of naturally spawning populations, to distinguish naturally spawning fish from hatchery fish, and to provide information on program investments.

Specific Draft Program Language regarding the marking of hatchery fish can be found on the following pages:

- Page 21: "Moreover, the presence of unmarked hatchery fish in the river system makes it difficult to accurately assess survival of naturally spawning populations and distinguish hatchery fish. Without this information, it is difficult to know where and whether program investments are successful."
- Page 77: (One of the Segregated Hatchery Principles): "Fish produced in this type of program must be visibly marked so as to be immediately identifiable at the time of handling (e.g., during harvest and at weirs)."
- Page 77: (One of the General Measures): "Continue and expand terminal fishing opportunities and mark-selective fisheries designed to harvest all returning fish in a fashion that does not impact naturally spawning fish."
- Page 79 (One of the Integrated Hatchery Principles): "Fish produced as part of an integrated program must be visibly marked."

Jennifer Anders Vice Chair Montana

> Pat Smith Montana

Tom Karier Washington

Phil Rockefeller Washington The Council last had a report on fin clipping in 2001, also prepared by StreamNet. At that time, 77.4% of the Spring/summer Chinook were marked, 82.2% of the coho, and 43.0% of the fall Chinook. In the 2012 Hatchery Fin Clip Report, we've learned that 85.19% of Spring/summer Chinook are now fin clipped, 86.86% of the coho, and 84.88% of the fall Chinook.

Species	2001 Fin Clip Report % Marked	2012 Fin Clip Report % Marked		
Spring/summer				
Chinook	77.4	85.19		
Coho	82.2	86.86		
Fall Chinook	43	84.88		

Mr. Wheaton will be presenting the findings from the 2012 analysis in a series of very interesting maps and graphs, and will provide more specific information from the report on fin clipping.

The Final 2012 Hatchery Fin Clip Report is included as an attachment to this memorandum.

enclosure



PACIFIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

205 SE Spokane Street, Suite 100 - Portland, Oregon 97202 PHONE (503) 595-3100 FAX (503) 595-3232 website: www.psmfc.org

March 27, 2014

Member Tom Karier

Northwest Power and Conservation Council 851 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Suite 1100 Portland, OR 97204 Portland, Oregon 97204

Dear Member Karier:

Attached are revised maps with hatchery release and fin clip information for the 2012 calendar year, in response to your request for information about this subject. Since our initial tables we have been in contact with state and federal agencies and tribes to conduct one more quality control check on this information. Now that this check has been completed we have made some revisions to the original maps to reflect the few corrections that we received. The maps depict the total number of each species by run, as released in calendar year 2012. The releases are organized by state, and associated with a "primary hatchery" (more on this below). Also represented is the percentage of each species that were fin clipped.

Agency/State	Chinook # Released	Sp./Summer # Marked	%	Chinook, # Released	Fall # Marked	%	Coho # Released	# Marked	%
USFWS	7,583,420	3,067,967	40.5%	19,736,385	848,217	4.3%	4,509,456	3,061,530	67.9%
Idaho	5,070,147	4,796,491	94.6%	2,604,816	397,339	15.3%	440,348	0	0.0%
Oregon	9,041,487	7,141,942	79.0%	17,161,393	4,486,704	26.1%	7,939,167	6,527,897	82.2%
Washington	8,212,121	8,142,416	99.2%	19,767,341	19,762,023		14,790,518	13,157,255	89.0%
2000 totals	29,907,175	23,148,816		59,269,935	25,494,283		27,679,489	22,746,682	
% Admarked			77.4%			43.0%			82.2%

Table 1. Preliminary summary of total and adipose clipped salmon released in CY2000 in the Columbia River Basin. (Schmidt, B. Overview of Adipose Fin Clipping in the Columbia Basin, 2001)

I have also included a historic table showing the releases and the percentage of hatchery salmon released in 2000 with an adipose fin clip (Table 1). In Table 1 tribal releases are included in the state or federal figures. This information was developed by StreamNet in 2001 in response to a previous Council request.

Agency				Percent	Percent
Туре	Clipped	Unclipped	Total	Clipped	Unclipped
Other	4,491,994	1,986	4,493,980	99.96%	0.04%
State	82,753,191	16,297,770	99,050,961	83.55%	16.45%
Tribal	4,923,223	1,906,194	6,829,417	72.09%	27.91%
USFWS	22,372,625	2,357,801	24,730,426	90.47%	9.53%
Total	114,541,033	20,563,751	135,104,784	84.78%	15.22%

Table 2. Preliminary summary by agency of total and fin-clipped salmon released in CY2012 in the Columbia River Basin.



Figure 1. Preliminary summary by agency of total and fin-clipped salmon released in CY2012 in the Columbia River Basin.

					Percent	Percent
Species/Run		Clipped	Unclipped	Total	Clipped	Unclipped
Chinook Fall		56,050,050	9,982,165	66,032,215	84.88%	15.12%
Chinook						
Sp./Summer		31,032,364	5,444,541	36,476,905	85.07%	14.93%
Chum		74,893	425,486	500,379	14.97%	85.03%
Coho		14,648,255	2,216,756	16,865,011	86.86%	13.14%
Sockeye		266,732	166,613	433,345	61.55%	38.45%
Steelhead		12,468,739	2,328,190	14,796,929	84.27%	15.73%
Total		114,541,033	20,614,620	135,155,653	84.75%	15.25%

Table 3. Preliminary summary by species by agency of total and fin-clipped salmon released in CY2012 in the Columbia River Basin.



Figure 2. Preliminary summary by species by agency of total and fin-clipped salmon released in CY2012 in the Columbia River Basin.

Data for both the CY 2000 and CY 2012 information are derived from the Regional Mark Information System (RMIS) database. The RMIS system here at PSMFC is a cooperative effort of the many state, federal, private, and tribal entities that rear and release fish in the Pacific Northwest. Even with this second review, it is still possible that errors in the data remain. I would suggest that in use these data be

referred to as "best available estimates" in case some errors or omissions are discovered upon deeper review.

In making these tables, the RMIS database was searched for various fin clips that indicate fish are of hatchery origin. Other marks were ignored, meaning fish that were coded wire tagged but not marked with a fin clip show up in the "unclipped" category. The 2000 information separated only those fish that were adipose clipped. Presumably any other mark types were included in the overall "released" category in 2000.

The policies guiding marking are too complex to discuss here. Suffice it to say that marking is determined by state, tribal, and federal agency policy. The majority of hatchery production released above Bonneville Dam is managed under the jurisdiction of the <u>U.S. vs. Oregon</u> Management Agreement. It is important to recognize that regardless of which entity operates the hatchery facility (state, tribal, or federal), the parties are implementing the Agreement, including specific fish marking strategies.

Another complexity is that large, multi-state programs, such as Snake River fall Chinook, are difficult to depict with graphics that are organized by State. The Snake River Fall Chinook Program has a comprehensive marking strategy, developed by the <u>U.S. vs. Oregon</u> Parties, encompassing 3 states, and these graphics are unable to characterize that complexity of organization and coordination that is associated with this particular type of program.

This summary does not include information or qualification of the purpose of the hatchery programs – harvest, supplementation, conservation/restoration, recovery, or a combination of these purposes. The majority of supplementation hatchery programs, which are used to assist with reintroduction, conservation, and recovery, are located in the Upper Columbia and Snake Basins. Unclipped fish may be released in these areas in order to contribute to spawning populations. Many of the fish that are identified as "unclipped" in this summary may actually be marked with a coded-wire or genetic tag, so that they can be identified as hatchery-origin. The graphic analysis only represents them as "unclipped", and care should be taken to not categorize them as "unmarked".

The release information is organized by "primary hatchery", which is generally the primary rearing facility. The data is not organized by release site, and the term "fish stocked' on the maps does not necessarily mean that the hatchery was the stocking location. In some cases a significant portion of the releases do not occur at the primary facility. For instance, in Oregon, many of the spring Chinook from Lookingglass Hatchery are actually acclimated and released in the Imnaha, Lostine, Catherine Creek and Upper Grande Ronde rivers.

Each release was categorized by agency type, and the release numbers were summed by agency type in the final results. In some cases, groups of fish are moved from one agency type to another during the rearing cycle. The agency type for each release is the manager of the hatchery listed as the "primary hatchery". The "other" category is made up entirely of fish released in the lower river by the Clatsop County Fisheries program (CCF). These fish are generally reared at state facilities in Oregon, and then transported to net pens in the lower river, acclimated, and released.

Excluded from this report are releases by schools. These are not believed to be significant numerically, and include things such as small batches of fish raised in classroom incubators and released into water

bodies by students, generally as fry. Also excluded are releases by fishing clubs and other educational groups. The total number of excluded fish is 632,680 (0.47% of the fish released). Of these excluded fish, 31% were fin clipped.

If you are interested in digging more deeply into this subject, background data containing information on individual facilities and other hatchery production information is available. Thank you for turning to StreamNet for this information. We are happy to be of service.

Sincerely,

Chris Wheaton, StreamNet Program Manager Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Columbia Basin Hatchery Releases and Clipping Rates

CHRIS WHEATON, PSMFC - STREAMNET





Report Completed at the Request of Member Karier

- Replicates a similar report produced in 2001
- Data is from the Regional Mark Information System (RMIS)
- RMIS is a cooperative effort of the many state, federal, tribal, and private entities that rear and release fish in the Pacific Northwest
- The RMIS Database is administered by PSMFC staff at the Regional Mark Processing Center



REGIONAL MARK PROCESSING CENTER

Caveats

- RMIS searched for "fin clips". Other marks (Coded wire tags, genetic marks, etc. would not be included if not combined with a fin clip)
- No attempt made to capture the complex arrangements and agreements surrounding various clipping issues (U.S. v. Oregon, etc.)
- No distinctions made between types of programs (Supplementation, restoration, harvest)
- Releases shown by "primary hatchery". Many fish are moved during rearing and release; not captured in this large scale depiction.

2000 *does not include steelhead, chum, or sockeye







Spring & Summer Chinook





Comparative Clipping Rates * 2000 did not include steelhead, chum, or sockeye









































Questions?

