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- Passage rates of Chinook and steelhead smolts have been lower than expected.
- Surface flows have been much more variable than originally planned.
- Acoustic telemetry studies (2012-13) provided limited insights regarding flow effects.
- Look at other data sources…
Background

- “Block flows” during 2013 acoustic study
- Adjacent periods of normal operations
- 291 upstream PIT-tagged Chinook smolts passed
Objective

• Use SWW PIT-tag detections of upstream releases to estimate the effects of surface flows on passage rates of Chinook and steelhead smolts.
Objective

• Use SWW PIT-tag detections of upstream releases to estimate the effects of surface flows on passage rates of Chinook and steelhead smolts.

• Non-conventional approach: not interested in proportion detected; rather, interested in the within-day patterns of timing and flow at detection.

• Features that make the approach possible:
  (1) Surface flows variable across hours/days
  (2) Accurate measure of flow at time of passage
  (3) Detection probabilities very high (> 99%)
Smolt Passage Data

- PIT-tag detections for years 2010-2016
- Hatchery-reared smolts released at mouths of Deschutes, Crooked & Metolius rivers
- Naturally-reared smolts (from fry plants) tagged at rotary screw traps in the tributaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hatchery</th>
<th>Naturally reared</th>
<th>Pooled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3155</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Detections and mean surface flows were tabulated for each hour of each day across a given migration season
Modeling Approach ("Hourly models")

- Detections and mean surface flows were tabulated for each hour of each day across a given migration season
- Fit Poisson regression models:
  \[
  \frac{\text{Detections by hour}}{\text{Total detects by day}} \sim \text{Hour} + \log(\text{Flow})
  \]
- Key assumptions: flow relationship and diel pattern constant across days
Results: Hatchery Chinook in 2013

- Total of 512 detections across 92 days (n = 2082 hrs)
Flow-passage relationship for hatchery Chinook smolts in 2013
Diel pattern for hatchery Chinook smolts in 2013 (without flow)
Diel pattern for hatchery Chinook smolts in 2013
Flow-passage relationships for hatchery Chinook smolts (2010-2015)
Flow-passage relationships (2010-2016)
Mixed-effects models

- Combine years
- Mean relationships plus year-specific differences (random effects)
- Results suggest flow and diel relationships quite consistent across years
Other Analyses

• Results were shown for passage rates as a function of log(flow), however…

• Other forms examined, included raw flow and nonlinear models (broken-stick and spline)

• Overdispersion addressed

• Model selection criteria used (e.g., QAIC)

• Also examined models comparing flow at detection versus flow available across discrete periods (stronger flow effects)

• Simulation analyses
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Conclusions

• Evidence of strong, roughly linear relationships between flow and passage.

• Improved estimates of diel patterns by accounting for flow.

• Flow relationships and diel patterns intuitive, and provide key insight into the relative importance and timing of surface flow.

• However, flow effects on absolute passage rates unclear; depends on forebay mortality rates and SWW encounter rates.
Next steps

• Upstream releases of radio-tagged smolts in 2017 (many fish).
• Examine forebay residency and passage timing using time-to-event analysis.