

**Coastal Zone and Estuarine Studies Division** 

**Northwest Fisheries Science Center** 

National Marine **Fisheries Service** 

Seattle, Washington

**Preliminary evaluation** of the new juvenile collection, bypass, and sampling facilities at McNary Dam, 1994

Douglas M.Marsh, Bruce H. Monk, Benjamin P. Sandford, and **Gene M. Matthews** 

November 1996

by

# PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF THE NEW JUVENILE COLLECTION, BYPASS, AND SAMPLING FACILITIES AT MCNARY DAM, 1994

by

Douglas M. Marsh Bruce H. Monk Benjamin P. Sandford and Gene M. Matthews

Research funded by

U. S. Army Corp of Engineers Walla Walla District Contract DACW68-84-H-0034

and

Coastal Zone and Estuarine Studies Division Northwest Fisheries Science Center National Marine Fisheries Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 2725 Montlake Boulevard East . Seattle, Washington 98112-2097

November 1996

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

We conducted research to evaluate the new juvenile fish bypass system at McNary Dam, which was completed and began operating in spring 1994.

Our evaluations at McNary Dam in 1994 were intended to accomplish the following objectives: 1) to determine if mechanical problems existed in the new facility that might affect fish passing though its channels, flumes, and pipes, 2) to determine the accuracy of the facility sampling system, and 3) to determine if the outfall pipe safely passed juvenile fish.

We accomplished part of the first and third objectives and all of the second objective during 1993 evaluations, and in 1994, we completed evaluations for all remaining objectives. Results for the work completed in 1993 were described in a previous report (Marsh et al. 1995). Following is a summary of major findings under Objectives 1,2, and 3 which were accomplished in 1994.

# Objective 1

# Evaluate the condition and survival of yearling and subyearling chinook salmon and yearling and adult steelhead after passage through the collection/transportation facility.

We found that passage through all routes from the new collection channel to exit from the facility through either the barge, truck, or return-to-river was satisfactory for outmigrating spring chinook salmon and steelhead. After their release to the collection channel, the median passage time for the juvenile steelhead tested was 17.8 hours.

Blood analysis of outmigrating yearling spring/summer chinook salmon, juvenile steelhead, and subyearling chinook salmon showed that the fish were not overly stressed or fatigued as they passed through the facility.

To assess the effects of the system on adult fallbacks, we released 21 adult steelhead into gatewells. Adult downstream passage was not as satisfactory as that of juveniles, and we observed adults holding along the sides of the primary dewaterer. Of the 21 fish released, only 14 were observed on the separator, while 4 of the remaining 7 were found in the collection channel more than 2 months after release. The median passage time of the 14 adults recovered on the separator was 17.2 hours.

### Objective 2

#### Evaluate the reliability and efficiency of the collection facility sampling system.

Our initial study design for this objective proved to be unsatisfactory, most likely due to the design of the separator. Utilizing a different method we were able to determine that the

sampling system was effective and reliable in sampling at most sampling rates. The lone exception to this was at a 4% sample rate on the large fish flume.

# Objective 3

### **Evaluate the bypass system outfall pipe.**

Our efforts under this objective were limited to a review of video from inside the outfall pipe and the inspector's confirmation of smooth welds.

# **Conclusions and Recommendations**

We concluded that the new collection channel, separator, flumes leading to the laboratory, and flumes leading to the raceways, barge, truck, and river, as well as the outfall pipe, are safe for migrating juvenile salmonids. Overall, the new bypass facility appears to safely pass fish through the dam. Our only recommendation is to test the PIT -tag detection/diversion system at McNary Dam when it becomes operational in 1995.

# **CONTENTS**



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

## **INTRODUCTION**

The first McNary Dam juvenile collection and bypass facility was constructed in 1979 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to study juvenile salmonid transportation on the Columbia River. In 1981, this facility became part of the smolt transportation program operated by the COE (which includes similar facilities at Lower Granite, Little Goose, and Lower Monumental Dams on the Snake River). To increase fish-holding capacity and improve barge-loading facilities at McNary Dam, construction of an entirely new juvenile collection and transportation facility was initiated in 1993. The new facility was first used during the 1994 juvenile salmonid outmigration.

Because the collection channel for the old juvenile fish facility moved bypassed fish to the north (the old facility was located between the powerhouse and the spillbays), a new collection channel had to be constructed to carry bypassed fish to the new facility located downstream of the dam on the southern shore. The new collection channel was constructed within the existing ice and trash sluiceway. Fish enter this channel through 1-m-long flumes attached to the existing orifices. After entry, they move to the south end of the powerhouse, go through primary and secondary dewaterers, and enter a closed, smooth, iron pipe. This pipe transports fish and water approximately 145 m to a pneumatic switch gate, where the fish either continue on to the wet separator or are bypassed to the river through a closed corrugated pipe. The corrugated pipe transitions to a closed plastic outfall pipe approximately 110 m offshore. The outfall pipe terminates with a drop of approximately 5 m to the water surface (depending on tail-water level) (Fig. 1).



 $\cdot$ 

Figure 1. Schematic of the juvenile bypass system at McNary Dam.

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

Fish entering the wet separator are graded into two sizes; large and small fish then exit the wet separator volitionally into separate flumes. From either of these two flumes, fish may enter 1) the PIT-tag diversion system, 2) the sample holding tanks, 3) the river-return line (flume for small fish only), 4) the direct barge-loading lines or, 5) the raceways. The eight main raceways are 2.4 m wide by 20 m long and hold approximately 72,000 liters (19,000 gal) of water or 4,300 kg (9,500 lbs) of fish (at the maximum operatinglholding capacity of 60g per liter (0.5 lbs per gal) of water). Fish in the raceways can be loaded onto either transport trucks (only from raceways 1-4) or barges (from all eight raceways). All of the river-return lines and barge- and truck-loading lines are made of 25-cm-diameter PVC pipe (Fig. 2).

Since 1990, new collection/bypass facilities have been constructed at Little Goose and Lower Monumental Dams. At both facilities, evaluations prior to operation revealed some areas that caused descaling and injury (Monk et al. 1992, Marsh et al. 1995). Isolating these problems prior to full-time operation of the facilities provided the opportunity to make the structural modifications and procedural changes before the start of the main collection/transport season. Similarly, it was important to conduct evaluations of the new juvenile fish facility at McNary Dam, since this facility was expected to collect and transport over seven million migrating juvenile salmonids during the outmigration. It was critical that the facility be evaluated early in the season so any problems could be corrected before the bulk of the 1994 outmigration arrived at the dam.

Our study objectives in 1994 were: 1) to determine if mechanical problems existed that might affect both juvenile and adult salmonids during passage, and to determine how juveniles



Figure 2. Schematic of the juvenile fish collection system at McNary Dam.

 $\sim$ 

responded physiologically to different parts of the system; 2) to determine the accuracy of the facility sampling system; and 3) to determine if the outfall pipe safely passed juvenile salmonids.

## **OBJECTIVE 1**

Evaluate the condition and survival of yearling and subyearling chinook salmon and yearling and adult steelhead after passage through the collection/transportation facility.

#### Approach

#### Descaling, Injury, and Mortality Evaluation

To determine whether mechanical problems existed within the bypass and collection facilities, hatchery fish were released into different sections of the facilities (Table 1). Fish were recaptured downstream, and the effects of each section were determined by examining the released fish for descaling, injuries, and mortalities. All test groups except Release Group 1 consisted of a test and a control group of fish marked by either an upper or lower caudal clip. Control fish for paired replicates were released directly into the collection device to isolate descaling or injury caused by the recapture or handling procedures.

All test groups consisted of yearling chinook salmon *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha)* and steelhead *(0. mykiss)* trucked from Dworshak National Fish Hatchery. Yearling chinook salmon arrived at the dam on 9 March, and steelhead arrived in three separate loads on 9, 16, and 23 March. All fish were immediately fin-clipped upon arrival. However, because of mechanical problems and construction delays at the McNary facility, fish were held at the facility for 16 to 30 days before being released for evaluation purposes into the various sections of the facility. During the delay, fish were fed a minimum-subsistence diet. Nevertheless, when testing started,



 $\sim$ 

Table 1. Release groups, species, area evaluated, and release and collection sites for each test under Objective 1. All fish were of hatchery origin.

the fish, especially the yearling chinook salmon, were heavily smolted with very deciduous scales, which made them as susceptible to descaling as river-run smolts.

Release Group 1 (released 8-9 April) was used to evaluate the components of the collection system from the collection channel into the sampling room (Table 1). Since this evaluation area terminated at the sample room, no capture nets were needed to recapture fish for examination; therefore, a control group to assess recapture injuries was not used. To isolate effects of passing through the collection channel, separate releases were made in the north (Unit 14), middle (Unit 7), and south (Unit 1) sections of the channel. The facility sample gate was opened (100% sample) for 5 days, so that fish holding in the separator would not avoid collection. After the release, fish were collected in the holding tank every 24 hours, crowded and flushed into the sample facility, anesthetized with tricane methanesulfonate (MS-222), and examined for descaling and injuries.

Release Group 2 (release made on 26 March) was used to test the flumes leading from the separator to the raceways, and the discharges into the raceways. Fish were released into both the large- and small-fish flumes just below the wet separator and collected in a raceway. The area within the raceway was reduced by moving the raceway crowder just beyond the turbulence zone at the head of the raceway. After fish had entered the raceway, the water level was dropped, and fish were dip-netted from the raceway, anesthetized (MS-222), and examined for descaling and injuries.

Release Group 3 (release made on 30 March) was used to test the raceway exits and the truck-loading lines. In order to approach the maximum raceway-loading condition of 60g of fish per liter (0.5 pounds per gallon) of water, fish were crowded into the tail section of each raceway

under a full head of water. Also, by being at the tail of the raceway, the fish were exposed to the higher flows and turbulance associated with a full head of water exiting the raceway, increasing the likelihood of descaling and injury if any physical problems with the exit oriface or exit pipes existed. A large fyke net, with a sanctuary bag in the cod end, was used to line the rear compartment of a COE transport truck. Controls were released directly into this compartment prior to release of test fish from a raceway. A sanctuary dip-net was then used to capture and transport the control and test fish to a tank where they were anesthetized (MS-222) and examined for descaling and injury.

Release Group 4 (releases made on 6-7 April, 10 April and 17 April) was used to test the raceway exits and barge-loading lines from all eight raceways. The same net used to capture fish I in the transport truck was draped into a compartment on the barge, and the release pipe was centered over the net approximately 1.5 m above the water surface. After capture, the procedures were the same as previously described for the other test groups.

Release Group 5 (release made on 28 April) was used to evaluate the direct barge-loading system, which included both the small- and large-fish flumes (from the separator) and the bargeloading pipes. Recapture and examination procedures used for the test and control fish were similar to those used for Release Group 4.

To evaluate the river-return lines, Release Group 6 (release made on 27 April) was divided into two releases: one to the raceway river-return line, and the other to the river- return line from the separator flume that passed small fish. The procedure for the raceway release was similar to that used for other raceway release groups. For the river-return line from the small-fish flume, fish were released into the flume just below the separator with all gates adjusted so that



Figure 3. The floating recovery-net system used under Objective 1. The floating frame was constructed of 30-em foam-filled polyethylene pipe. Saddles were welded onto the pipe to hold the 7.6 m x 7.6 m stainless steel net frame. The net was attached to both the top of the net frame and the legs and tapered to a sanctuary bag at the bottom.

fish continued on to the river-return line. The floating net described by Marsh et al. (1995) was used to recapture these fish at the exit of the river-return pipe (Fig. 3). The net was towed into position below the river-return pipe by skiffs, and control fish were placed into the net just prior to release of the test fish. After all fish were recaptured, the net was hauled to the tailrace of the dam, lifted by crane, and emptied into tanks on the tailrace deck. The fish were then anesthetized (MS-222) and examined for descaling and injury.

We conducted adult steelhead testing during fall 1994. Adults used were fallbacks; fish that entered a turbine intake and were guided into the juvenile collection system after they had ascended the adult ladder to the forebay. The adults were collected as they crossed the separator. Each adult steelhead was anesthetized with MS-222 and marked below the dorsal fin on the left side of its body with a uniquely numbered Floy Tag<sup>1</sup>. For each fish, any body marks (e.g., gillnet marks, open wounds, etc.), length, and sex were noted during tagging. After allowing recovery, groups of 2-4 fish were transported to the upper deck of the dam and released into a gatewell, with date and time of release noted for each fish. A total of 21 adult steelhead were released on 19 October, with 7 adults released into Gatewells 2B, 7B, and 14B.

Adult fish moved volitionally down to the separator, and all adult steelhead observed on the separator were checked for a tag. If a tag was found, the fish was examined for injuries. The tag was then removed and attached to a report form, and the tag number recorded along with the date, observation time, and injuries. Each fish was then released to the river through the adult river-return line. The test continued until 6 December when the collection and transport season

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Use of trade names does not imply endorsement by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

ended. Thereafter, the facility remained in bypass mode until 20 December, when it was dewatered for the year. The COE removed all remaining adults from the north sluiceway on 3 January 1995.

#### Passage time Evaluation

To determine the passage time of juvenile salmonids through the collection channel and separator, we PIT tagged and released 100 river-run juvenile steelhead into the collection channel. Because of Endangered Species Act constraints, we were unable to use chinook salmon for this test. The PIT-tagged steelhead were released into the upper end of the collection channel (Unit 14C), and the release date and time was recorded. Each PIT-tagged fish was recorded by PIT-tag detection units in the flumes exiting the separator. The PIT-tag detection units assigned a date and time to each observation. By comparing the collection channel release time of each steelhead with its flume observation time, we determined the passage time of each steelhead through this part of the facility.

Using the individual passage times, we developed a 95% bootstrap confidence interval (Efron 1982) around the median passage time.

#### Stress Evaluation

To examine the new facility in terms of physiological effects, stress and fatigue indices were measured in naturally migrating yearling chinook salmon and steelhead smolts. Four locations were sampled: 1) gatewell 7B (baseline levels), 2) primary dewaterer, 3) wet separator, and 4) the raceways. To determine the effects of raceway residence, fish were sampled at 0, 2, 4, 6, and 10 hours after raceway collection. For each species, 15 blood samples were collected from

each site and time interval (raceway) on 4 separate nights and later assayed for plasma cortisol, glucose, and lactate. Yearling chinook salmon and steelhead were sampled between 9 May and 19 May, and subyearling chinook salmon were sampled from 27 June and 30 June.

Because chinook and steelhead smolts tend to move through Columbia River hydroelectric projects in the evening (Sims et al. 1981, Gessel et al. 1986), fish were sampled between 1800 and 1900 h from the first three locations. This was done to maximize the probability that fish sampled were primarily from a single population moving through the facility and not primarily from fish that remained overnight or longer in the system.

Normally, the maximum fish loading density is 60g of fish per liter of water (0.5 lb per gal) during fish holding operations at COE juvenile fish facilities. Assuming that maximum stress is more likely at higher densities, we attempted to expose fish in the raceways to higher densities to quantify the maximum stress response. However, we needed to minimize the time during which fish were collected in the raceways (prior to the start of sampling). Therefore, before any fish were collected, the raceway crowder was positioned to reduce the length of the raceway by one-half to three-quarters. Fish were then collected in the shortened raceway for 4 hours. Thus, when the sampling for blood plasma began (denoted as O-hour), an individual fish may have been in the sample population from 0 to 4 hours and raceway densities ranged from 12-24 g of fish per liter of water  $(0.1 \text{ to } 0.2 \text{ lb per gal})$ . The holding densities were estimated using the hourly sample count taken by the COE, and the species composition and average weight by species were attained from the daily index sample collected by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Fish were collected from all test areas with a standard dip net and were immediately placed in a 200-mg/L solution of MS-222. This procedure does not significantly alter any of the blood indices being measured (Black and Connor 1964, Strange and Schreck 1978). Immediately after gilling activity ceased, the caudal peduncle was severed and blood was collected with a O.25-ml ammonium-heparinized capillary tube. Blood samples were then centrifuged, and the plasma decanted and frozen immediately on dry ice. Plasma cortisol, glucose, and lactate were assayed at Oregon State University. Thawed plasma was assayed for cortisol using a radioimmunoassay, for glucose using the  $\sigma$ -toluidine method, and for lactate using a fluorimetric enzyme reaction (Barton et al. 1986, Barton and Schreck 1987).

Mean stress indices were analyzed by Randomized Block Analysis of Variance (RBANOV A). Significant changes between locations and raceway times were then examined with Fisher's Protected Least Significant Differences (FPLSD) multiple comparison techniques (Petersen 1985).

### Results and Discussion

### Descaling, Injury, and Mortality Evaluation

Little or no mortality, descaling, or eye/head injuries were observed in any of the release groups for either yearling chinook salmon or steelhead (Tables 2 and 3 and Appendix Table 1). In nearly all cases, the types of problems that were initially found at Little Goose and Lower Monumental Dams--concrete and construction debris left in flumes and dewatering sections, unsanded concrete edges, and inside edges protruding in pipe joints (Monk 1992, Marsh et al. 1995)--were nonexistent on startup of this facility.



Table 2. Mortality and descaling and injury of hatchery-reared juvenile yearling chinook salmon released into the collection and loading facilities at McNary Dam, 1994.

 $\mathbb{R}^2$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 



Table 3. Mortality and descaling and injury of hatchery-reared juvenile yearling steelhead released *into* the *collection* and loading facilities at McNary Dam, 1994.

 $\sim 10^6$ 

In the first replicates of Release Group 1, some mortalities were found from all three release locations. However, these were fish that were stranded in the fish transfer pipe between the sample holding tank and the sample room (laboratory). All of the new collection/transport facilities seem to have this problem initially, because they are designed to minimize the amount of water used to flush the fish into the lab so as not to dilute the anesthetic water. Since it is impossible to see into the transfer pipes, the amount of water used and the proper timing for flushing must be learned by trial and error. Once the proper procedures were learned for this operation, stranding in the pipe was no longer a problem, as evidenced by the mortality rates of zero for yearling chinook salmon and 0.7% (one of 136) for steelhead during the second replicates for all three locations.

There was a concern about the gates that divert fish from the main flume into the sample tanks or the east raceways because their leading edge protruded into the water flow. During the releases (Release Group 2), personnel were positioned near the gates to record any contact observed between fish and the leading edges of the gates. Neither the visual observations or the results of descaling/injury analyses (Tables 2 and 3), identified a problem with the leading edges of the gates.

The McNary Dam facility raceways are similar to those at Lower Monumental Dam. At both facilities, standard operating procedures are to remove excess water from the fish transportation flumes because if too much water is allowed in the flumes, water exiting the fish transportation flumes arcs across the raceway and contacts the opposite wall before plunging into the raceway. There was concern that fish might contact this wall and become descaled or

injured. However, the water apparently acted as a buffer since no descaling or injuries were observed at this location (Tables 2 and 3).

The main concerns in both raceway releases (Release Groups 3 and 4) were the raceway exits. The raceway exits at McNary Dam differ from those at the other collection/transportation facilities in that separate exits are used for truck and barge loading. The truck-loading exits are on the raceway sides, while the barge-loading exits are on the raceway bottoms. At the Lower Monumental and Little Goose Dam facilities, descaling and injury levels were high during the initial test releases due to rough edges in the exit itself or in the exit pipe. However, this was not the case at McNary Dam, and minimal descaling was observed in both release groups of yearling chinook salmon and steelhead.

Descaling and injury were also minimal for yearling chinook salmon and steelhead in tests of the river-return line (Release Group 6). These results indicated that no problems existed in either the flumes or the pipes. However, for steelhead, the mortality rate was higher than for any other release group. Because of the handling stress involved in releasing these fish, some mortalities were removed even before the releases were made. We believe this was because they were the last groups released, and, due to construction delays, were held for 43 to 50 days.

Few adult steelhead fallbacks were observed during spring 1994. However, we were able to conduct the test the following fall when adult steelhead fallbacks were more numerous. Since water temperatures remained in the 16-20° C range, we theorized that passage time would not differ between spring and fall. Of the 21 adults released, 14 were subsequently observed on the separator: 5 from the gate well 2B release, 4 from the gatewell 7B release, and 5 from the gatewell 14B release (Table 4 and Appendix Table 3). Of the 14 fish observed, 2 from the

Table 4. Passage time (days), mortality, and descaling and injury for adult steelhead released into the gatewells and recovered on the separator at McNary Dam in 1994.

Location	Number released	Number observed	Median passage time (days)	N	Mortality (3)	Ν	Descaling (%)	N	Injury (3)
Gatewell									
1В $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 7B $-14B$	7 7 $\mathbf{\underline{7}}$	5 4 <u>_5</u>	1.8 0.1 0.8	0 $\Omega$ <u>_0</u>	0.0 0.0 0.0	0 0 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.0 0.0 0.0	$\mathbf{2}$ $\mathbf{1}$ $\overline{\phantom{0}}$	40.0 25.0 <u>20.0</u>
Totals	21	14	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	28.6



Figure 4. Percent passage of 21 adult steelhead released into gatewells 1B, 7B, and 14B (seven per gatewell), and recaptured on the fish/debris separator at McNary Dam, October 1994. (After release, four fish were subsequently observed during system dewatering, and three fish were never observed again.)

gatewell2B release, and 1 each from the gatewell 7B and 14B releases showed signs of minor injuries. Median passage time was 17.2 hours (Fig. 4). During testing at Little Goose Dam in spring 1990, a similar median passage time of approximately 13 hours was observed (Monk et al. 1992). However, testing at Lower Monumental Dam in fall 1994 (Marsh et al. 1996) showed a median passage time of 84 hours, nearly five times longer than the time required at Little Goose or McNary Dams.

The McNary Dam facility was placed in bypass mode on 6 December, ending collection for the year. When the facility was later dewatered on 20 December, three of the tagged adult steelhead were observed in the collection channel. On 3 January 1995, the COE removed the remaining in-river fish from the north sluiceway and found another tagged adult. Three tagged adults were never found. Water temperatures began dropping in November, which probably induced the adults to hold in the collection channel after that time.

#### **Passage Time Evaluation**

The median passage time for juvenile steelhead was 17.8 hours, with a 95% confidence interval between 14.4 and 22.3 hours. This passage time was over seven times longer than that observed for juvenile steelhead at Lower Monumental Dam (Marsh et al. 1996). Although steelhead were released at different times at the two dams (1030 at McNary Dam and 1800 at Lower Monumental Dam), observation of the data indicated that this was probably not the reason for the difference in steelhead passage times between the two dams. At Lower Monumental Dam, 98% of the fish were detected within 24 hours of release, while at McNary dam, only 60% of the fish were detected within the first 24 hours, and 10% remained undetected after 48 hours.

A more likely explanation was the effect of low-water velocity areas within the collection channel and dewaterer at McNary Dam. The collection channel drains 84 orifices. Depending upon orifice operations, eddies develop within the channel, particularly at the upper end. Another low water-velocity area occurs where the dewaterer transitions to the pipe that transfers fish to the collection facility. The water velocity in this area is sufficiently low to allow fish to hold with little effort. During blood sampling for this objective, large numbers of fish were consistently observed holding in this area.

#### **Stress evaluation**

Plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose levels showed no significant changes as yearling spring/summer chinook salmon passed from the gatewell into the raceways (Fig. 5 and Appendix Tables 4,5,6 and 10). In contrast, similar testing at Little Goose (Monk et al. 1992) and Lower Monumental Dams (Marsh et al. 1995) showed significant changes in the levels of these blood indices as the fish moved through each of these facilities. The levels of all three plasma indices were either lower than, or in the mid-range of, the results obtained from Little Goose and Lower Monumental Dams.

For yearling spring/summer chinook salmon, the highest average cortisol level observed (102.4 ng/ml in the separator sample) was below the range measured for this species above and below the wet separator at Lower Granite Dam (160-210 ng/ml) by Congleton et al. (1984). This value was also well below the values measured by Matthews et al. (1987) for yearling chinook salmon after marking at Lower Granite Dam.

Plasma cortisol and lactate showed no significant changes as juvenile steelhead passed from the gatewell into the raceways (Fig. 6 and Appendix Tables 4, 5, 6 and 11). In contrast,



Figure 5. Mean concentrations  $(+ S.E., n = 4, n = 3 for PD)$  of plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose for yearling spring/summer chinook salmon at four locations (fish in the raceway were sampled at five different times) in the collection and transportation facility at McNary Dam, 1994. No significant differences were seen for any of the parameters. Abbreviations used are: **GW** = gatewell.; PD = postdewaterer; and S = separator.

similar testing conducted at Little Goose Dam (Monk et al. 1992) and at Lower Monumental Dam (Marsh et al. 1995) showed significant changes in the levels of these blood parameters as fish moved through each of these facilities.

Plasma glucose showed a significant decrease as juvenile steelhead moved from the gatewell to the dewaterer  $(P < 0.05)$ . This decrease was maintained in the separator sample, but had returned to the gate well level in the O-hour raceway sample. At Little Goose Dam, although no samples were significantly different, plasma glucose levels also decreased successively from the gatewell to the separator samples. However, levels did not return to gatewelllevels until the 2-hour raceway sample (Monk et al. 1992). At Lower Monumental Dam, the plasma glucose levels increased significantly between the gatewell and the O-hour raceway sample (Marsh et al. 1995). Overall at McNary Dam, plasma cortisol levels were lower for steelhead than the levels observed at Little Goose and Lower Monumental Dams, while levels of plasma lactate and glucose were similar at all three dams.

Plasma cortisol and glucose showed no significant changes as subyearling chinook salmon passed from the gatewell into the raceways (Fig. 7 and Appendix Tables 7, 8, 9, and 12). Plasma lactate levels decreased significantly between the gatewell and the dewaterer, and remained low through the separator. Levels then rose significantly, back to gatewelllevels, at the O-hour raceway sample. The plasma lactate levels again dropped significantly between the O-hour and the 2-hour raceway samples. Thereafter, levels remained low through the 10-hour raceway sample.

These results suggested that the physiological effects on yearling spring/summer chinook salmon and steelhead smolts, and subyearling chinook salmon passing through the juvenile



Figure 6. Mean concentrations  $(+ S.E., n = 4)$  of plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose for juvenile steelhead at four locations (fish in the raceway were sampled at five different times) in the collection and transportation facility at McNary Dam, 1994. Bars marked (a) are significantly lower than gatewell levels. Abbreviations used are:  $GW = gatewell$ ;  $PD = post-dewaterer$ ; and  $S = separatevector$ .



Figure 7. Mean concentrations  $(+ S.E., n = 4; n = 2 for PD)$  of plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose for subyearling chinook salmon at four locations (fish in the raceway were sampled at five different times) in the collection and transportation facility at McNary Dam, 1994. Bars marked (a) are significantly lower than gatewell levels, and bars marked (b) are significantly lower than the 0 hour raceway sample. Abbreviations used are: GW = gatewell; PD = post-dewaterer; and S = separator.

collection facility at McNary Dam are nominal. For the most part, bloodindicator levels of stress and fatigue did not change significantly during passage through the facility. Overall, plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose levels observed at McNary Dam were low to moderate compared to similar testing at other facilities.

#### OBJECTIVE 2

Evaluate the reliability and efficiency of the collection facility sampling system.

#### Approach

To evaluate the reliability and efficiency of the collection facility sampling system, we released PIT-tagged fish upstream from the separator and monitored their passage through the small- and large-fish distribution flumes. We PIT tagged 8,382 yearling chinook salmon and 21,028 steelhead delivered from Dworshak National Fish Hatchery. The yearling chinook salmon were used to test the small-fish flume sampling system, while the steelhead were used to test the large-fish flume sampling system. Because the fish were not placed directly into the small- or large-fish side of the separator, we anticipated that some hatchery chinook salmon would pass through the large-fish flume and some hatchery steelhead would pass through the small-fish flume. In order to make use of this, the two flumes were tested concurrently.

Two sample rates per flume were tested, and both rates chosen for testing were within the range of sample rates used at McNary Dam under normal fish collection operations. For the small-fish flume, the test sample rates were 10 and 5% of all the fish passing into the collection facility; for the large-fish flume, these rates were set at 5 and 2%. For the 10 and 5% rates, tests

were designed to determine if the measured sample rate was within one percentage point of either side of the set sample rate (i.e., 9 to  $11\%$  for the 10% sample rate). For the 2% rate, the test was designed to determine if the measured sample rate was within one-half a percentage point of either side of the set sample rate (i.e., 1.5 to 2.5%). The small-fish flume 10% sample rate and the large-fish flume 5% sample rate tests were run concurrently, as were tests of the small-fish flume at 5% and the large-fish flume at 2%.

We relied upon the results of similar tests conducted at Lower Monumental Dam in spring 1993 (Marsh et al. 1995) to determine the numbers of fish required for precision. Based upon these results, we used the following formulas to estimate the numbers of tests and fish needed:

# $n = 4S^2/W^2$

#### $x = ny$

where:  $n = number of tests needed$ 

 $S<sup>2</sup>$  = variance of the measured sample rate

 $W = half-width of the confidence interval$ 

 $x =$  number of fish needed

 $y =$  number of fish in system during one test

Before the start of each set of tests, the sample gates in each flume were set at the rates to be tested. Sample rates of 5% on the small-fish flume and 2% on the large-fish flume were tested first, and sample rates of 10% on the small-fish flume and 5% on the large-fish flume were tested last.

The first set of tests began at 1000 hours on 13 April, with the last release being made at 1730 hours on 16 April. We released totals of 4,000 PIT-tagged yearling chinook salmon and 16,000 PIT-tagged steelhead for these tests. Of these totals, 50 yearling chinook salmon and 100 steelhead were released every half-hour during the first 40 hours. During the last 40 hours, 100 steelhead were released every half-hour.

The second set of tests began at 0800 hours on 18 April, with the last release occurring at 2330 hours on 19 April. We released totals of 4,000 PIT-tagged yearling chinook salmon and 4,000 PIT -tagged steelhead for these tests. Of these totals, 50 yearling chinook salmon and 50 steelhead were released every half-hour for 40 hours.

To make a release, test fish were counted into a 114-L plastic container at ground level. The container was then placed into a sling and power hoisted the 14 m up to the flume platform for release into the flume approximately 10 m upstream from the separator. To obtain an accurate measure of the sample rate, the tests required that fish leave the separator randomly over time. Therefore, fish were not released directly into the separator because we believed that this release procedure would affect the behavior of fish already in the separator.

Each flume exiting the separator was equipped with PIT -tag detectors that recorded the date and time of departure for each PIT -tagged fish. Another detector recorded PIT -tagged fish that were captured by the sampling system. The sample rate was measured by comparing detections at each set of detectors (e.g., if 100 PIT-tagged fish were recorded leaving the separator during 1 hour and 9 were recorded by the sample detector, the measured sample rate for that hour was 9%).

# **Results and Discussion**

The tests of the sampling system were compromised by an unexpected development. While visiting the PIT-tag equipment room at the facility, we noticed that whenever fish were released into the flume, an unusually large number of PIT -tag detections occurred immediately, particularly in the large-fish flume. An examination of the observation records at the end of the tests revealed that twice during each hour, large numbers of detections occurred within 1-2 minutes. Based on these observations, and since we were releasing test fish every half-hour on the half-hour, we speculated that introduction of the test fish to the flume was inducing large numbers of fish to exit the separator.

Although the exact time of each half-hour release was not recorded, we believed it safe to assume that the majority of the releases occurred within the first fifteen minutes of each halfhour. Using the observation records of the 2% large-fish flume test, we ran a t-test (Table 5) comparing the mean number of fish observed during the first fifteen minutes of each half-hour with the mean number of fish observed during the second fifteen minutes of each half-hour. We found that nearly  $70\%$  (P<0.001) more fish exited the separator during the first than the second fifteen minutes of each half-hour (Table 5).

The experimental design required that test fish exit the separator volitionally, and most importantly, at random over the course of each hour. We concluded that this requirement was not met, thus invalidating the test.

, During the 1994 outmigration, large numbers of fIsh were PIT tagged in the Snake River by various researchers. At each Snake River collector dam, these PIT-tagged fish were diverted



Table 5. Number of PIT tags observed each hour, by 15-minute intervals

 $\bar{z}$ 

back to the river by the PIT -tag diversion system. Subsequently, many of these fish were collected at McNary Dam throughout the spring.

We analyzed the observation records for McNary Dam from 13 April to 1 July 1994, removing records gathered on the days that we conducted our formal tests under this Objective (13-16 and 18-20 April). We also removed records from dates when the facility did not operate for a full 24 hours, and dates when the expected value for fish in the sample was less than one. The daily sample rate for each of the dates in the analysis was provided by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Each day represented one replicate.

Over the course of this period, 18,822 PIT-tagged fish passed through the small-fish flume, and 34,068 PIT-tagged fish passed through the large-fish flume. Based on our analysis, all of the electronic (pre-set) sample rates  $(2\%, 3\%, 4\%, 5\%, \text{and } 16.67\%)$  fell within the 95% confidence interval of the observed sample rate for the small-fish flume (Table 6). For the largefish flume, the pre-set sample rates of 2%, 3%, and 5% fell within the 95% confidence interval of the observed sample rate, while the pre-set sample rate of 4% fell outside of the 95% confidence interval for its observed sample rate. While all but one of the sample rates tested were within the confidence interval of the observed sample rates, the width of some of the confidence intervals indicates the variability of the data.



Table 6. Results from Objective 2, using river-run PIT-tagged fish passing through the McNary Dam bypass/collection facility and recovered in the sampling system, 1994.

\* Indicates that the pre-set sample rate was outside the 95% confidence interval

#### OBJECTIVE 3

Evaluate the bypass system outfall pipe.

#### **Approach**

The outfall pipe design at McNary Dam juvenile fish facility was based on the design used at Lower Monumental Dam. It is a 76-cm-diameter, black PVC pipe that terminates approximately 110m offshore, immediately downstream from the turbine boil near the center of the powerhouse. Flow and plunge conditions at the pipe terminus were similar to conditions at Lower Monumental Dam, and turbulence in the tailrace was greater than at Lower Monumental Dam. Therefore, we ruled out the use of a floating recovery-net similar to the one used at Lower Monumental Dam in 1993 (Marsh et al. 1995): these conditions had previously caused such instability that precise placement of the net was not feasible.

During October 1993, we examined the feasibility of using a purse seine to recapture test fish for this objective. Turbine. units were operated selectively in an attempt to create acceptable conditions for purse-seine deployment. After several failed attempts, we concluded that the only operating conditions that would allow use of the purse seine in this area would be a complete shutdown of all 14 turbine units with no spill. However, it was virtually impossible to operate the dam with total shutdown of all units and spill for the 8-16 hours required to complete the testing.

The fisheries agencies and tribes agreed that a visual inspection of the pipe, combined with further testing of the outfall pipe at Lower Monumental Dam in 1994 (Marsh et al.1996) would suffice as a surrogate evaluation of the McNary Dam outfall pipe. at least for the 1994

outmigration. When we attempted to coordinate a visual inspection of the pipe with the COE, we were advised that under the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's (OSHA) regulations, the pipe was considered an "enclosed space" and was therefore subject to a strict set of safety requirements. Unfortunately, it was impossible to meet all of the safety requirements in the limited amount of time available between completion of the pipe and opening of the facility. Therefore, we were unable to visually inspect the pipe.

During construction, some videos of the internal welds had been made. We obtained these videos (approximately 2-3 minutes in length) along with a statement from the chief inspector of the pipe regarding his inspections of the welds in order to meet this objective. Neither of these two pieces of information indicated any problems with the outfall pipe.

#### **Results and Discussion**

The 1994 evaluation of the Lower Monumental Dam outfall pipe produced no statistically reliable results. However, based on observations from 2 years of evaluation, we are confident that the Lower Monumental Dam outfall pipe safely passes migrating juvenile salmonids (Marsh et al. 1996). These observations, together with information on the McNary Dam outfall pipe, are the extent of the McNary Dam outfall pipe evaluation for 1994.

# **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Based on the tests conducted, the new bypass, collection, and transportation facility at McNary Dam appears to safely pass fish around the dam.

- 2. The sample rates set electronically (2, 3, 4, 5, and 16.67%) for the small-fish flume and most (2, 3, and 5%) set for the large-fish flume provided samples that were relatively accurate.
- 3. The complete PIT-tag detection/diversion system was not operational in 1994. This system should be evaluated when it becomes operational in 1995.

# **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We express our appreciation to COE personnel for their assistance and cooperation during the conduct of these studies. Special thanks to Brad Eby, Project Biologist, and Connie Hampton, Assistant Project Biologist, for their help in coordinating research activities at the dam. Their crew provided much needed help setting up the equipment and facilities required to carry out this work.

Special thanks also go to the WDFW crew, headed by Paul Wagner, Fishery Biologist, for their assistance in all facets of this endeavor, from fish marking to actually conducting parts of the evaluation.

For their ideas, assistance, and encouragement, we also thank COE fishery biologists Rebecca Kalamasz and Teri Barila. Finally, we thank Dr. Carl Schreck and his staff at Oregon State University for analyzing the blood samples.

### **REFERENCES**

- Barton, B. A, and C. B. Schreck. 1987. Metabolic costs of acute physical stress on juvenile steelhead. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 116:257-263.
- Barton, B. A., C. B. Schreck, and L. A. Sigismondi. 1986. Multiple acute disturbances evoke cumulative physiological stress responses in juvenile chinook salmon. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 115:245-251.
- Black, E. c., and A. R. Conner. 1964. Effects of MS222 on glycogen and lactate levels in rainbow trout. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 21:1539-1542.
- Congleton, J. L., T. C. Bjornn, C. A Robertson, J. L. Irving, and R. R. Ringe. 1984. Evaluating the effects of stress on the viability of chinook salmon smolts transported from the Snake River to the Columbia River Estuary. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW68-83-C-0029, 67 p. (Available from Idaho Cooperative Fishery Research Unit, Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, College of Forestry, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83843.)
- Efron, B. 1982. The Jackknife, the Bootstrap, and Other Resampling Plans. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA. 92p.
- Gessel. M. H., L. G. Gilbreath, W. D. Muir, and R. F. Krcma. 1986. Evaluation of the juvenile collection and bypass systems at Bonneville Dam--1985. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW75-85-H-0001, 63 p. + Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097.)
- Marsh, D. M., B. P. Sandford, & G. M. Matthews. 1995. Preliminary evaluation of the new juvenile collection, bypass, and sampling facilities at Lower Monumental Dam, 1993. Annual report of research to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW68-84 H-0034 48 p. + Appendices. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097.)
- Marsh, D. M., L. K. Timme, B. P. Sandford, S. Achord, & G. M. Matthews. 1996. Preliminary evaluation of the new juvenile collection, bypass, and sampling facilities at Lower Monumental Dam, 1994. Annual report of research to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW68-84-H-0034. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097.)
- Matthews, G. M., D. L. Park, 1. R. Harmon, C. S. McCutcheon, and A. J. Novotny. 1987. Evaluation of transportation of juvenile salmonids and related research on the Columbia and Snake Rivers--1986. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW68 84-H-0034, 34 p. + Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097.)

Monk, B. H., B. P. Sandford, and 1. G. Williams. 1992. Evaluation of the juvenile fish collection, transportation, and bypass facility at Little Goose Dam, 1990. Annual report of research to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract E86900057, 131 p. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097.)

Petersen, R. G. 1985. Design and analysis of experiments. Marcel Dekker, New York. 429 p.

- Sims, C. W., J. G. Williams, D. A. Faurot, R. C. Johnsen, and D. A. Brege. 1981. Migrational characteristics ofjuvenile salmon and steelhead trout in the Columbia River Basin and related passage research at John Day Dam, Volume 1. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-80-F-0394, 61 p. + Appendices. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097.)
- Strange, R. J., and C. B. Schreck. 1978. Anesthetic and handling stress on survival and cortisol concentration in yearling chinook salmon *(Oncorhynchus tshawytscha).* J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 35:345-349.

# **APPENDIX**

Data Tables

 $\lambda$ 



Appendix Table 1. Recoveries, descaling, injuries, and mortality of hatchery yearling spring chinook salmon released into the collection and loading facilities at McNary Dam, 1993 (Objective 1) .



ж





Appendix Table 2. Passage times for river-run juvenile steelhead marked and released at McNary Dam, 1994.



Appendix Table 2. Continued.



 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$ 

Appendix Table 3. Passage times, descaling, injuries and mortalities for adult steelhead released and recovered at McNary Dam, 1994.

Appendix Table 4. Means of plasma cortisol values (ng/ml), standard errors, RBANOVAs, and Fisher's Protected Least Significant Difference (FPLSD) for yearling chinook salmon and juvenile steelhead sampled at various locations and times at McNary Dam, May 1994.

			Yearling chinook	Steelhead		
Sample	Location/(Time)	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	
$\mathbf{1}$	Gatewell 7B	92.5	8.1	83.2	7.2	
$\overline{a}$	Post-Dewaterer	97.5	9.3	84.4	7.2	
4	Separator	102.4	8.1	90.5	7.2	
5	Raceway (0-hour)	89.5	8.1	101.2	7.2	
6	Raceway (2-hour)	98.4	8.1	108.0	7.2	
7	Raceway (4-hour)	84.7	8.1	86.9	7.2	
8	Raceway (6-hour)	79.8	8.1	75.8	7.2	
9	Raceway (10-hour)	92.3	8.1	100.9	7.2	

Yearling spring/summer chinook salmon (RBANOVA):



 $FPLSD = N/A$ 

Juvenile steelhead (RBANOVA):

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{max}}$ 



 $FPLSD = N/A$ 

Appendix Table 5. Means of plasma lactate values (mg/dl), standard errors, RBANOVAs, and Fisher's Protected Least Significant Difference (FPLSD) for yearling chinook salmon and juvenile steelhead sampled at various locations and times at McNary Dam, May 1994.

		Yearling chinook		Steelhead		
Sample	Location/(Time)	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	
1	Gatewell 7B	62.1	3.7	59.3	4.7	
$\overline{a}$	Post-Dewaterer	74.8	4.2	49.9	4.7	
4	Separator	65.3	3:7	59.9	4.7	
5	Raceway (0-hour)	66.9	3.7	72.4	4.7	
6	Raceway (2-hour)	61.5	3.7	62.4	4.7	
7	Raceway (4-hour)	57.1	3.7	59.6	4.7	
8	Raceway (6-hour)	52.3	3.7	53.4	4.7	
9	Raceway (10-hour)	61.7	3.7	62.6	4.7	

Yearling spring/summer chinook salmon (RBANOVA):



 $FPLSD = N/A$ 

Juvenile steelhead (RBANOVA):



 $FPLSD = N/A$ 

Appendix Table 6. Means of plasma glucose values (mg/dl), standard errors, RBANOVAs, and Fisher's Protected Least Significant Difference (FPLSD) for yearling chinook salmon and juvenile steelhead sampled at various locations and times at McNary Dam, May 1994.

			Yearling chinook Steelhead			
Sample	Location/(Time)	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.	
1	Gatewell 7B	93.9	3.9	153.3	11.5	
2	Post-Dewaterer	97.1	4.5	108.2	11.5	
4	Separator	91.6	3.9	109.7	11.5	
5	Raceway (0-hour)	87.7	3.9	132.7	11.5	
6	Raceway (2-hour)	93.1	3.9	137.3	11.5	
7	Raceway (4-hour)	86.2	3.9	132.7	11.5	
8	Raceway (6-hour)	88.3	3.9	131.2	11.5	
9	Raceway (10-hour)	103.2	3.9	161.5	11.5	

Yearling spring/summer chinook salmon (RBANOVA):



 $FPLSD = N/A$ 

Juvenile steelhead (RBANOVA):



 $FPLSD = 33.8$ 





Subyearling chinook salmon (RBANOVA):



 $FPLSD = N/A$ 



Appendix Table 8. Means of plasma lactate values (mg/dl), standard errors, RBANOVAs, and Fisher's Protected Least Significant Difference (FPLSD) for subyearling chinook salmon sampled at various locations and times at McNary Dam, June 1994.

Subyearling chinook salmon (RBANOVA):



FPLSD = 13 .2, = 18.7 for PD

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 





Subyearling chinook salmon (RBANOVA):

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 



 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

 $FPLSD = N/A$ 

Appendix Table 10. Fork lengths, plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose values for migrating yearling spring/summer chinook salmon collected from various locations and times at McNary Dam's collection facility, 1994.



 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sim$ 



 $\bar{z}$ 



 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\sim$ 



Appendix Table *10.* Continued.

Appendix Table 11. Fork lengths, plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose values for migrating juvenile steelhead collected from various locations and times at McNary Dam's collection facility, 1994.

Fork Length	Cortisol	Lact.	Gluc.	Fork Length	Cortisol	Lact.	Gluc.
(mm)	(ng/ml)	(mg/dl)	(mq/dl)	(mm)	(ng/ml)	(mg/d1)	(mg/dl)
Sample date: 05/10/94							
Gatewell 7B				Post Dewaterer			
199	105.2	43.3	210.3	201	136.1	46.5	79.4
232	22.9	39.5	93.1	217	55.6	26.5	64.6
240	160.7	56.3	133.2	183	136.1	66.8	112.1
227	14.2	50.1	167.4	201	$\sim$ $\sim$	30.2	85.7
215	158.4	58.6	99.5	224	92.0	54.7	150.7
231	112.5	62.2	124.0	237	19.7	72.6	105.3
213	13.6	39.9	74.6	220	42.6	37.9	121.8
210	$- -$	54.6	76.9	219	45.6	46.9	83.6
203	46.9	67.2	123.0	231	48.7	59.8	144.9
208	87.6	85.3	125.0	236	130.9	182.1	115.8
221	181.5	75.3	113.2	280	112.5	63.6	83.1
203	118.1	68.5	105.0	214	83.3	62.2	55.8
173	81.5	64.2	106.1	253	42.6	54.4	112.0
196	99.5	72.8	76.2	205	256.0	48.0	64.3
218	32.4	79.1	123.7	234	23.6	58.1	62.2
Separator				Raceway 0-hour			
222	170.5	38.0	105.9	232	155.0	28.0	546.5
206	83.2	37.7	118.5	213	150.8	81.3	518.6
237	92.2	34.4	106.3	234	79.1	85.1	103.0
253	16.1	53.8	127.5	208	116.8	96.5	88.5
247	123.5	39.3	184.8	248	176.6	57.1	117.1
243	126.4	39.4	134.0	227	84.7	48.3	93.1
240	25.2	26.1	87.5	220	200.7	46.6	115.3
248	68.4	48.0	170.3	220	180.1	53.1	90.8
204	21.5	75.5	121.9	241	70.3	106.1	62.5
228	$\overline{a}$	41.1	96.3	228	76.8	69.2	113.6
231	154.0	75.0	88.0	227	111.6	82.7	80.1
223	30.1	52.8	47.3	216	43.9	44.6	106.4
225	158.6	97.0	86.4	200	210.5	75.7	100.2
179	105.3	58.5	90.1	238	46.3	77.6	152.6
221	17.4	99.4	53.3				
Raceway 2-hour				Raceway 4-hour			
216	66.2	38.8	155.2	245	38.1	30.3	106.0
213	89.4	46.3	114.1	252	167.1	78.4	93.0
224	141.2	107.6	64.2	255	250.0	73.7	376.1
232	200.4	42.6	122.9	200	27.7	49.3	171.1
238	34.3	65.0	79.0	231	156.2	41.3	110.8
215	104.4	115.4	190.1	221	39.4	36.1	88.0
253	48.5	73.1	178.4	220	73.8	22.1	83.2
265	89.3	97.2	82.6	256	64.3	77.1	142.3
218	39.6	49.3	93.7	214	16.0	48.4	176.9
236	55.2	44.6	76.7	266	15.0	52.4	101.6
218	94.5	73.1	98.0	226	15.9	81.3	141.3
196	73.2	79.8	83.8	222	40.2	43.3	91.7
195	260.2	91.7	144.0	233	28.3	47.5	93.7
189	77.1	83.7	154.6	250	198.1	52.4	132.2
190	255.0	90.7	383.0	208,195	19.8	$-\,-$	$- -$
Raceway 6-hour				Raceway 10-hour			
194	144.3	32.0	115.3	214	13.5	55.4	146.5
208	55.0	43.4	95.4	240	72.3	51.9	130.7
235	88.6	31.4	386.2	188	196.0	97.1	128.6
205	42.7	65.7	165.6	205	21.2	31.0	90.9
210	71.6	45.2	175.5	196	169.1	75.8	138.5
204	74.3	39.7	123.3	210	19.9	74.6	57.2
222	35.2	58.1	182.7	267	42.2	49.2	115.6
228	107.2	46.9	244.7	223	131.7	79.3	178.9
198	226.1	70.0	151.6	220	28.4	72.6	143.7
235	37.5	40.3	94.8	247	176.4	61.8	128.0
208	92.7	107.4	118.2	231	129.0	64.4	96.0
187	55.3	47.4	138.6	219	117.0	69.3	105.3
205	29.4	52.2	161.6	234	96.2	67.9	83.3
206	120.5	76.4	144.0	223	121.0	54.2	93.0
200	14.9	76.1	127.6	196	108.3	61.8	80.8

 $\bar{z}$ 





 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A}}$ 

Appendix Table 11. Continued.

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2.$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 



 $\sim$ 

 $\bar{z}$ 

Appendix Table 12. Fork lengths, plasma cortisol, lactate, and glucose values for migrating subyearling chinook salmon collected from various locations and times at McNary Dam's collection facility, 1994.





 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$  ,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ 

 $\sim 10^6$ 

 $\sim 10$ 

 $\sim 10^{11}$ 

 $\sim 10$ 



 $\overline{a}$ 



 $\sim 10^{-11}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

Appendix Table 13. The number of PIT-tagged fish passing through the flume, the number caught in the sampling system, the measured sample rate, the facility sample rate, and the expected number of fish caught in the sample for each day at McNary Dam, 1994 (Objective 2).





Appendix Table 13. Continued.

 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ 



Appendix Table 13. Continued.

 $\mathcal{A}$ 

 $\Box$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim 10$