SH153 .Un5471 1989

71

Library Northwest & Alaska Fisheries Center Nonnwest & Alaska Fisheries Center NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Center Stak Manuaka Baudaward E Service 2726 Montiako Boulovard, E. **Continued Studies to Evaluate** the Juvenile Bypass Systems at Bonneville Dam-1989

Library

JUN 2 8 1980

by Michael H. Gessel Dean A. Brege, Bruce H. Monk and John G. Williams

April 1990



CONTINUED STUDIES TO EVALUATE THE JUVENILE BYPASS SYSTEMS AT BONNEVILLE DAM - 1989

by

Michael H. Gessel Dean A. Brege Bruce H. Monk and John G. Williams

Annual Report of Research Funded by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Portland District E8689095

and

Coastal Zone and Estuarine Studies Division Northwest Fisheries Center National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 2725 Montlake Boulevard East Seattle, Washington 98112

April 1990

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
OBJECTIVE 1 - EVALUATION OF MODIFICATIONS TO IMPROVE FISH GUIDANCE EFFICIENCY AT BONNEVILLE II	2
Approach	2
Results and Discussion	7
Yearling Chinook Salmon	7
Subyearling Chinook Salmon	10
OBJECTIVE 2 - FISH GUIDANCE EFFICIENCY AND VERTICAL DISTRIBUTION TESTS AT BONNEVILLE I	11
Approach	11
Results and Discussion	11
Yearling Chinook Salmon	11
Subyearling Chinook Salmon	12
Coho Salmon and Steelhead	15
CONCLUSIONS	17
Bonneville II	17
Bonneville I	17
RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Bonneville II	18
Bonneville I	18
LITERATURE CITED	19
APPENDIX	21

INTRODUCTION

Research at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse (Bonneville II) began in 1983 with the evaluation of the fingerling collection and bypass system. In these studies, fish guiding efficiency (FGE) was between 20 and 25% for yearling chinook salmon, far less than the 70% or greater at Bonneville Dam First Powerhouse (Bonneville I) and much below the 70% guidance standard considered by the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority as the minimum level needed for adequate fish passage. Research in 1985 indicated that streamlined trashracks and lowered submersible traveling screens (STSs) could increase FGE to >40% for yearling chinook salmon. Research in 1986 and 1987 resulted in some FGE estimates >70% when using turbine intake extensions (TIEs) combined with earlier modifications. Tests in 1988 with submerged bar screens (SBSs) resulted in increased FGE; however, descaling of juvenile salmonids during testing was unacceptable. Also in 1988, mercury vapor lights attached to the intake ceiling and STS frame increased FGE, but results were inconsistent.

Initial studies of FGE with prototype STSs at Bonneville I were conducted during the early and late portions of the 1981 juvenile salmonid spring outmigration. Guidance estimates >70% were observed for all species tested (Krcma et al. 1982). Based on these results and information obtained at similar projects, a full complement of STSs was installed at the powerhouse in 1984. Subsequent research on summer migrating subyearling chinook salmon at John Day Dam (Krcma et al. 1986; Brege et al. 1987) and McNary Dam (Brege et al. 1988) indicated guidance ranged from 25 to 45%, varying both during the season and from year to year. Because of these poor results, FGE was measured for the first time during the 1988 summer outmigration at Bonneville I to determine baseline guidance levels prior to installation of a floating guidewall for the new Bonneville Dam navigation lock. Fish guidance was <12% (Gessel et al. 1989), which was much lower than the 70% average for subyearling chinook salmon measured during May 1981 (Krcma et al. 1982).

During the 1989 juvenile salmonid outmigration, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) conducted studies at both Bonneville Dam powerhouses with the following objectives:

- Continue FGE and vertical distribution testing at Bonneville II to evaluate the following modifications or additions for improving FGE and STS effectiveness in conjunction with TIEs (Fig. 1):
 - a. Raised operating gate
 - b. Bar screens
 - c. Perforated plate with bar screens to reduce descaling
 - d. Illuminated guiding device
- 2) Continue FGE and vertical distribution testing at Bonneville I to more accurately assess FGE and STS effectiveness over the spring and summer juvenile salmonid outmigration prior to construction of the navigation lock guidewall.

OBJECTIVE 1 - EVALUATION OF MODIFICATIONS TO IMPROVE FISH GUIDANCE EFFICIENCY AT BONNEVILLE II

Approach

Fish guidance and vertical distribution studies were conducted with existing fyke nets and net frames. Procedures and methodologies were similar to those used at Bonneville II in 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988 (Gessel et al. 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989). A dipbasket collected guided fish from the gatewell and a net frame attached to the guiding device (traveling screen or bar screen) supported nets to collect unguided fish.



Figure 1.--Cross-sectional view of a turbine intake with turbine intake extension, operating gate, and lights tested at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse, 1989.

Fish guidance efficiency is the percentage of fish (by species) entering the turbine intake that are guided by the STS out of the intake and into the gatewell for a specific test condition, as follows:

FGE = GW / (GW + GN + FN + CN) x 100 GW = gatewell catch GN = gap net catch FN = fyke net catch¹ CN = closure net catch

We planned five replicates of each test condition. Each replicate required 250-300 fish of the target species. The desired number of replicates was not always attained because of the variety of test conditions and the relatively short field season. Data for unreplicated tests are presented as possible trend indicators, not for statistical analysis.

Whenever possible, FGE tests were conducted with concurrent vertical distribution tests. Vertical distribution provided estimated depth distribution of fish within the turbine intakes. These data were used to determine theoretical FGE (TFGE) which was the percentage of guidable fish entering the turbine intake during an FGE test. Generally, this included all fish collected from the gatewell down to and including the upper half of the third net on the vertical distribution frame. Dividing FGE by the corresponding TFGE provided an indication of STS or bar screen effectiveness for the various test conditions. This information allowed us to compare test conditions even when TFGE estimates varied.

Vertical distribution was based on an estimate of the total number of fish entering the turbine intake. The sum of the catch at the various net levels plus the gatewell catch gave an estimate of the total number of fish during each test. To minimize the number of fish captured in the nets, only the center portion of each net level collected fish, and the number of fish captured was expanded by a factor of 3.

¹Net catches with only a middle net were expanded by a factor of 3.

The percentage of fish at each net level was determined by dividing the computed figure for each net level by the estimated total intake catch.

Fish guidance and concurrent vertical distribution testing occurred during the spring (22 April to 4 June) and summer (8 to 28 July) smolt migrations targeting on yearling and subyearling chinook salmon, respectively. Data for other species were collected as available. Subyearling chinook salmon were also captured during late May-June. Guidance for these fish is generally higher than that for late summer migrants and can approach FGEs of yearling chinook salmon (Krcma et al. 1982; Gessel et al. 1988, 1989). However, the major portion of the wild subyearling smolt migration passes Bonneville Dam during the late summer. Subyearling chinook salmon passing during the spring are almost entirely from Spring Creek Hatchery just 20 km upstream from the dam. For these reasons and to remain consistent with past Bonneville Dam reports, we will continue to separate and designate yearling chinook and coho salmon as the early phase fish and subyearling chinook salmon as the late phase fish. All tests began at approximately 2000 h and generally lasted from 1 to 2 hours, depending upon fish numbers. Tests during the spring were conducted with a unit discharge of 16,500 to 17,500 cfs. Late summer tests were conducted at 14,000-15,000 cfs due to lower tailwater levels and higher unit heads. Four units (11, 12, 13, and 18) were operated during all tests. The FGE tests were conducted in Slots 12A and 12B (the majority in 12B, which was equipped with a TIE) while vertical distribution was measured in Slot 13A (also equipped with a TIE). Individual test conditions are specified in Table 1. Lights used to modify fish behavior to increase FGEs or decrease descaling were either 250-watt mercury vapor (12,000-13,000 lumens/light) mounted on the frame of the guiding device and positioned near the gatewell entrance or xenon

Table 1.--Submersible traveling screen and bar screen fish guidance efficiency tests conducted at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse during the 1989 field season. All testing occurred with four turbine units operating (11, 12, 13, and 17 or 18).

Test	Date	Test	Load			Operating
no.	testa	unit	kcfs	Guiding device	Light condition	gate
1	25,27,29 April 1,3,6,8 May	12B	17.5	Bar Screen with perforated plate and 26-in solid section	No lights	Standard
2	26,28,30 April 2,4,5,7 May	12B	17.5	Bar screen with perforated plate and 26-in solid section	No lights	Raised 25 ft
3	9,10 May	12B	17.5	Bar screen with 2/3 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
4	11,12,13,14 May	12B	17.5	Bar screen with 4/5 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
5	15,16,17 May	12B	17.5	Bar screen with 4/5 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
	15,16,17 May	12A	17.5	Traveling screen	No lights	Standard
6	26,28,30 May 1,3 June	12B	17.5	Bar screen with 4/5 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
	26,28,30 May 1,3 June	1 2A	17.5	Traveling screen	No lights	Standard
7	27,29,31 May 2.4 June	12B	17.5	Traveling screen	No lights	Standard
	27,29,31 May 2,4 June	12A	17.5	Bar Screen with 4/5 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
8	8,12,14,18 20,24 July	12B	14-15	Bar ecreen with 4/5 perf. plate	Four lights mounted on frame in gateslot	Standard
	8,12,14,18 20,24 July	12A	14-15	Traveling screen	Four lights mounted on frame in gateslot	Standard
9	13,17,19,21 25,26 July	12B	14-15	Bar screen with 4/5 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
	13,17,19,21 25,26 July	12A	14-15	Traveling screen	No lights	Standard
10	27,28 July	12B	14-15	Bar screen with 4/5 perf. plate	No lights	Standard
	27,28	12A	14-15	Bar screen no perforated plate	Flashing lights on trashrack (3)	Standard

strobes mounted behind the guiding device (producing 15 joules with a flash rate of one every 2 seconds and a duration of 2 milliseconds).

Fish condition (descaling) was monitored by examining fish captured in the gatewell. Descaling was determined by dividing the fish into five equal areas per side; if any two areas on a side were estimated to be 50% or more descaled, the fish was classified as descaled.

Results and Discussion

Tests at Bonneville II were conducted from 23 April to 4 June with yearling chinook salmon as the target species and from 8 to 28 July with subyearling chinook salmon as the target species. Table 1 and Appendix Tables 1 and 2 provide detailed recapture information for all species.

Yearling Chinook Salmon

Test Series 1 and 2 were alternated in a cross-over test design to determine whether the raised operating gate would increase guidance at Bonneville II. Similar tests conducted at this powerhouse were inconclusive (Gessel et al. 1985, 1986). In 1989, guidance was 43.6% with the raised gate and 41.0% with the standard gate (Table 2) (data were weighted by number of fish captured). The paired t-test (t = 0.88, P > 0.05) indicated no significant difference between the two tests.

Portions of the perforated plate were removed from the bar screen to determine the optimum porosity of the bar screen to minimize descaling (Test Series 3 and 4). Also, solid plate (26 in) was attached to the downstream end of the bar screen. The STS, bar screen, and bar screen with perforated plate had estimated porosities of 25, 48, and 33%, respectively. Removing a portion of the perforated plate increased the overall porosity somewhat. The use of perforated plate and a solid section on the back of the bar screen reduced descaling rates to approximately the same as the STS (Table 3).

Test [•]	Number	Chinook	Guidance			Guidance	device
series	of reps.	salmon	device	Lights	FGE	Mean	S.E.
1	7	Yearling	BS⁵	OFF	41.0	57.7	5.6
2	7	Yearling	BS⁵	OFF	43.6	61.1	5.1
3	2	Yearling	BS	OFF	63.5	73.9	1.8
4	4	Yearling	BSd	OFF	56.4	76.7	4.5
5	3	Yearling	BS⁴	OFF	65.3	87.0	8.6
	3	Yearling	STS.	OFF	78.4	٤	
6	5	Yearling	BS⁴	OFF	g		
	5	Yearling	STS	OFF	g		
7	5	Yearling	STS	OFF	g		
	5	Yearling	BS⁴	OFF	g		
8	6 6	Subyearling Subyearling	BS⁴ STS	ON ON	25.3 23.4	58.4 54.1	4.4 6.4
9	6	Subyearling	BS⁴	OFF	25.1	59.7	6.8
	6	Subyearling	STS	OFF	21.7	52.2	4.2
10	2	Subyearling	BS⁴	OFF	23.4	57.2	8.5
	2	Subyearling	BSh	ON	27.8	ť	

Table 2.--Results of the fish guidance efficiency (FGE) tests conducted at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse during the 1989 field season.

• Test series numbers correspond to Table 1, this report.

^b Bar screen with perforated plate and 26-in solid section.

^c Bar screen with 2/3 perforated plate and solid section (exact porosity unknown).

^d Bar screen with 4/5 perforated plate and solid section (exact porosity unknown).

* Submersible traveling screen.

^f Test conducted without the turbine intake extension (TIE), no comparable vertical distribution.

⁵ No FGE calculated because small numbers of fish (<100 per replicate) for most replicates.

^h No perforated plate behind bar screen.

Dates	Gateslot 12B (%)	Gateslot 12A (%)	Gateslot 13A [•] (%)	
22 April- 6 May	5.5⁵	12.7°	4.0	
7-8 May	9.5⁵	9.5 ^ª	8.4	
9-10 May	17.0	13.1ª	13.4	
11-17 May	9.5 ^r	10.4 ^d	5.9	

Table 3.--Descaling results for yearling chinook salmon compiled during fish guidance efficiency tests conducted at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse during the 1989 field season.

* Vertical distribution gateslot, no guiding device.

^b Bar screen with perforated plate and 26-in solid section.

[°] Bar screen only, no perforated plate.

^d STS

• Bar screen with 2/3 perforated plate and solid section.

^f Bar screen with 4/5 perforated plate and solid section.

Test Series 5 compared the best bar screen and perforated plate configuration with the STS. A cross-over design was not used at this time because of insufficient test days. Weighted FGE results were 78.4% (STS in 12A) and 65.3% (bar screen in 12B). These results were similar to 1987 tests that compared the STS in 12A and 12B (FGE of 72.1 and 60.0%, respectively) (Gessel et al. 1988).

A cross-over test was conducted under the above conditions in late May early June (Test Series 6 and 7), but yearling chinook salmon numbers were too low for statistical evaluation.

As in past years with TIEs in the alternate configuration, FGEs in Unit 12 were higher in the slot without the TIE. Additionally, the number of fish entering the slot without the TIE was 2-3 times higher than in the adjacent slot with a TIE. Thus the overall FGE for the unit was weighted toward the higher FGE obtained from the non-TIE slots.

Subyearling Chinook Salmon

We conducted six test replicates to determine if there was a difference in guidance between the STS or a bar screen with perforated plate and solid plate (Table 2, Series 8 and 9). We also tested these conditions with addition of mercury vapor lights. Average guidance (weighted for fish numbers) for the bar screen was 25.3 and 25.1% (with and without lights) and for the STS was 23.4 and 21.7% (with and without lights). Effectiveness of the bar screen (tested in 12B) with and without the lights was 58.4 and 59.7%, respectively. Guidance was not increased when flashing lights (xenon strobe) were placed behind the bar screen without perforated plate (Test Series 10); however, descaling rose from 9 to 23%. We believe the lights attracted migrants to the bar screen, and without perforated plate, the screen increased descaling.

OBJECTIVE 2 - FISH GUIDANCE EFFICIENCY AND VERTICAL DISTRIBUTION TESTS AT BONNEVILLE I

Approach

Vertical distribution and FGE procedures used at Bonneville I were identical to those used at Bonneville II. Dipbaskets collected fish from the gatewell, and net frames collected fish from the turbine intake. Testing occurred during the spring outmigration, targeting yearling chinook salmon and during the summer outmigration, targeting subyearling chinook salmon. Data for other species were collected as available. All testing occurred in Unit 3B, with approximately one vertical distribution test for every three FGE tests. Concurrent FGE and vertical distribution tests were not conducted to minimize the number of fish sacrificed in the nets.

A standard elevation STS was used for all FGE tests; therefore, TFGE was estimated to be all fish from the gatewell down to and including fish in the second net level of the vertical distribution frame.

Standard unit operation prevailed with all available units operating at full load. Unit flows ranged from 14,000 to 14,500 cfs in the spring and from 10,200 to 12,700 cfs in the summer.

Results and Discussion

Tests at Bonneville I were conducted from 8 to 14 May with yearling chinook salmon as the target species and from 27 to 30 May and 12 to 24 July with subyearling chinook salmon as the target species. Appendix Tables 3 and 4 provide detailed recapture information for all species.

Yearling Chinook Salmon

Six replicate tests were conducted, and the total number of yearling chinook salmon recaptured per test ranged from 141 to 236. Guidance for the six replicates ranged from 34.7 to 49.6%, with a weighted mean of 41.7% (S.E. = 2.2). The

corresponding TFGE was 69.6% (S.E. = 3.2), and screen effectiveness was 60.8% (Fig 2). This was the first time since 1981 that FGE and vertical distribution were measured for yearling chinook salmon at Bonneville I. Between 11 and 13 May in 1981, the weighted average FGE was 83.6% (in Unit 4 with a screen angle of 53°), and the concurrent TFGE (in Gatewells 5A and 5B) was 85.0%, with an overall screen effectiveness of 98.0% (Krcma et al. 1982). Therefore, the lower FGE in 1989 was due to a lower vertical distribution of fish as they entered the turbine intake (Fig. 3) and a decrease in screen effectiveness of 37% compared with 1981.

The lowered vertical distribution in 1989 could have resulted from a number of factors. As a result of dredging for the new navigation lock, the upstream tip of Bradford Island was removed and seven rock groins were placed in the upstream approach to the navigation lock. These two actions straightened the flow approaching the north side of the powerhouse, removed some of the larger eddies, and distributed the flow across the entire powerhouse. Possibly increased squawfish populations in the forebay caused fish to move deeper to avoid predation.

The descaling rate on yearling chinook salmon ranged from 2.9 to 10.3% and averaged 6.6%.

Subyearling Chinook Salmon

During the first subyearling chinook salmon FGE and vertical distribution tests (27 to 30 May), only 76 to 111 fish were recovered per test. This was fewer fish than preferred. The results, however, indicated the range of FGEs and TFGEs for late spring migrating subyearling chinook salmon. The FGEs for the four replicates ranged from 31.0 to 50.0% with a weighted mean of 36.8% (S.E. = 4.3) compared with 40.7% FGE in 1988 during the same period (Gessel et al. 1989). The TFGE for the one vertical distribution test was 63.6%.



Figure 2.--Fish guidance efficiency (FGE) and theoretical fish guidance efficiency (TFGE) for yearling chinook salmon at Bonneville First Powerhouse, 1989.



Figure 3.--Cumulative weighted average vertical distribution of chinook salmon at Bonneville Dam First Powerhouse, 1981 and 1989.

During the summer testing (12 and 24 July), the total number of fish ranged from 305 to 613. The weighted average for the corresponding FGEs and TFGEs were 4.4 (S.E. = 1.0) and 11.5% (S.E. = 4.5), respectively (Fig. 4).

The 1989 subyearling chinook salmon tests confirmed that the low FGEs found in 1988 were not an anomaly (Gessel et al. 1989). During both years, FGEs for spring migrating subyearling chinook salmon were about 40% and by the latter part of July had decreased substantially (to 11.4% in 1988 and 4.4% in 1989). A decline in subyearling chinook salmon guidance from late spring through summer has also been noted at other dams on the Columbia River and has been attributed to: 1) changing environmental factors such as water temperature, turbidity, or flow or 2) changing composition of the migrating population (Krcma et al. 1985; Monk et al. 1986; Brege et al. 1988). Based on observations in the immediate forebay at Bonneville I, we also speculate that northern squawfish predation may decrease the number of potentially guidable fish. Migrants may sound to avoid predators or guidable migrants may be eaten by predators.

Descaling varied between spring and summer tests. There were no descaled subyearling chinook salmon collected from the gatewell during the spring testing. However, from 12 to 24 July the descaling rate ranged from 0 to 10.5% with a weighted average of 5.1%. Possibly the summer migrants were more highly smolted than the spring released hatchery fish.

Coho Salmon and Steelhead

Although not the target species, during the first two series of tests (9 May to 14 May and 27 to 30 May), coho salmon and steelhead were also caught. The total number of coho salmon per test ranged from 44 to 205. The weighted average FGE and TFGE for coho salmon for these tests was 63.0 and 80.5%, respectively. During the same period, the FGE and TFGE for steelhead averaged 55.8 and 72.7%.



Figure 4.--Fish guidance efficiency (FGE) and theoretical fish guidance efficiency (TFGE) for subyearling chinook salmon at Bonneville First Powerhouse, 1989.

respectively, with the recovery of fish ranging from 55 to 118 total per test. These results compared with 1981 FGE estimates of 81.3 and 77.6% for coho salmon and steelhead, respectively.

CONCLUSIONS

Bonneville II

1) Raising the operating gate will not significantly increase FGE.

- Addition of perforated plate to the back of the bar screen is necessary to decrease screen porosities below 40% and attain levels of descaling comparable to STSs; however, this will also reduce guidance.
- 3) Mercury vapor lights attached to the frame of the guidance device will not significantly increase guidance or decrease descaling for subyearling chinook salmon.

Bonneville I

- Based on tests conducted in Unit 3, fish guidance efficiency for yearling chinook salmon in 1989 decreased substantially from 1981 (41 versus 81%, respectively).
- 2) The 4.4% guidance during summer 1989 for subyearling chinook salmon was not an anomaly. As in 1988, summer subyearling chinook salmon guided poorly and fish moved deeper as the migration progressed.

Bonneville II

 To provide a configuration that will result in the highest FGEs attainable at this time; install 1) TIEs in an alternate configuration across the face of the powerhouse,
 2) lowered STSs, and 3) streamlined trashracks

Bonneville I

- 1) Additional studies are required to determine if all units at the powerhouse exhibit the low guidance levels found in Unit 3.
- 2) Test a raised operating gate to determine possible benefits for increasing FGEs at the powerhouse.
- 3) Build a hydraulic sectional model to conduct systematic evaluations of potential options for improving FGEs.

LITERATURE CITED

Brege, D. A., D. R. Miller, and R. D. Ledgerwood.

1987. Evaluation of the rehabilitated juvenile salmonid collection and passage system at John Day Dam - 1986. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-86-F-024537, 37 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

Brege, D. A., W. T. Norman, G. A. Swan, and J. G. Williams.

1988. Research at McNary Dam to improve fish guiding efficiency of yearling and subyearling chinook salmon, 1987. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW68-84-H-0034, 34 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

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 DACW57-85-H-0001, 63 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097 .)

Gessel, M. H., L. G. Gilbreath, W. D. Muir, B. H. Monk, and R. F. Krcma.
1987. Evaluation of the juvenile salmonid collection and bypass systems at Bonneville Dam - 1986. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-86-F-0270, 53 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

Gessel, M. H., R. F. Krcma, W. D. Muir, C. S. McCutcheon, L. G. Gilbreath, and B. H. Monk.

1985. Evaluation of the juvenile collection and bypass system at Bonneville Dam,
1984. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-84-F-0181,
48 p. plus Appendixes. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center,
2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

Gessel, M. H., B. H. Monk, D. A. Brege, and J. G. Williams.

1989. Fish guidance efficiency studies at Bonneville Dam First and Second Powerhouses - 1988. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-87-F-0322, 36 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

Gessel, M. H., B. H. Monk, and J. G. Williams.

1988. Evaluation of the juvenile fish collection and bypass systems at Bonneville Dam - 1987. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-87-F-0322, 131 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

Krcma, R. F., D. A. Brege, and R. D. Ledgerwood.

1986. Evaluation of the rehabilitated juvenile salmonid collection and passage system at John Day Dam - 1985. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-85-H-0001, 25 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.) Krcma, R. F., D. DeHart, M. Gessel, C. W. Long, and C. W. Sims.

1982. Evaluation of submersible traveling screens, passage of juvenile salmonids through the ice and trash sluiceway, and cycling of gatewell orifice operation at the Bonneville First Powerhouse, 1981. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-81-F-0342, 36 p. plus Appendix. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

Krcma, R. F., G. A. Swan, and F. J. Ossiander.

1985. Fish guiding and orifice passage efficiency tests with subyearling chinook salmon, McNary Dam, 1984. Report to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW68-84-H-0034, 19 p. plus Appendixes. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, Wash 98112-2097.)

Monk, B. H., W. D. Muir, and R. F. Krcma.

1986. Studies to evaluate alternative methods of bypassing juvenile fish at The Dalles Dam - 1985. Report to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Contract DACW57-85-H-0001, 33 p. plus Appendixes. (Available from Northwest Fisheries Center, 2725 Montlake Blvd. E., Seattle, WA 98112-2097.)

and the second s

APPENDIX

Data Tables

						Date (Tea	t Uni	t) and	(series	number)*					
	_	22	April (1	2B) (1)			23 A	oril (12	B) (1)			25_A	pril (1	2B) (1)	_
Location	SC	YC	ST	co	80	SC	YC	ST		SO	SC	YC	ST	co	so
Gatewell	1	89	4	58		1	269	17	87	-	1	108	15	74	0
Gap Net		1.000	**	-			6		2	**			1		
Closure		44	3	5		2	130	2	19			46	4	12	
First	3	6	1	5	**	2	45	2	12		2	18	2	7	
Second	1	96	3	4			230	7	15		6	89	1	10	
Third	5	59		7		3	170	6	11		5	58	3	9	
Fourth	3	18	**			9	84		3		3	45		9	
Fifth	-	3		-			15	-	-	-		6	-		
Totals	13	315	11	79	0	17	949	34	149	0	16	370	26	121	0
	-	26	April (1	<u>2B) (2)</u>		-	A	pril (1	<u>2B) (1)</u>			28 A	pril (1	2B) (2)	_
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	co	SO
Gatewell		74	9	30			94	16	40	-	1	41	7	28	
Gan Net	_	1		-		1		-	1	-		1		20	
Closure	1	31	2	7		1	45	1	18	-	1	7	2	2	
First	2	8	- I.	1		ī	26	2	3	1.1	1	3	1	1	
Second	3	49	3	7		3	82	2	12	-	3	20	2	7	
Third		36	1	ß		5	41	3	2	-	2	20	2	5	1
Fourth	9	21		3		3	36	_	3	1	3	21	4	ß	-
Fiab		41				0	12			-	0	41		0	
		_					14			-	3				
Totals	15	220	15	54	0	14	336	24	80	0	20	120	14	49	1
	_	29	April (1	2B) (1)			A	oril (1)	2 <u>B) (2)</u>			<u>1</u> M	av (12	B) (1)	
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	co	SO
Gatewell		38	12	21			73	30	22	1		101	22	32	
Gap Net						1				-					
Closure	1	18	3	3		2	30	5	7	-	2	23	2	5	
First	2	3	1	3		**	13	4	2	-	1	12		2	
Second	1	32	6	5		4	33	4	4		3	43	4	12	
Third	2	20	1	2	**	1	27	6	4	100	6	23	1	7	
Fourth	6	9		***	**		39					30		3	
Fifth		3		-		12	6	-	3						
Totals	12	123	23	34	0	20	221	49	42	1	12	232	29	61	0
		2 1	Mav (1	2B) (2)			3 M	[av (1)	2B) (1)			4 M	av (12	2B) (2	,
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO
Gatewell		72	22	44	1		149	33	32	1		66	9	25	1
Gap Net	2	2						2	-	-		1		20	
Closure	5	24	3	8		1	31	3	9		5	13		ß	
First	3	10	1	3		5	21	1			3	11	2	3	
Second	7	43	2	7	1	6	52	5	4	1	4	7	1	A	
Third	4	31	3	10		ß	18	4	2	-	2	à	1	1	
Fourth	6	15		12			18	3	3	-	3	6	1	9	3
Fifth	9	6		-		3		3			9	3			
Totals	36	203	31	84	2	21	289	54	50	2	26	116	13	48	4

Appendix Table 1.--Numbers of fish collected in the individual replicates of FGE tests at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse, 1989 (tests conducted in July and August captured only subyearling chinook salmon).

					1	Date (Tes	t Uni	t) and	(series	nomi	er)*					
Location	SC	<u>5</u>] YC	May (1 ST	2 <u>B) (2)</u> CO	SO	SC	<u>6 M</u> YC	<u>lay (1</u> ST	2 <u>B) (1)</u> CO	SO		SC	7 YC	May_ST	(<u>12B)</u> CO	(<u>2)</u> SO
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth		101 22 8 38 15 - 3	17 	55 	10 2 2 4 	1 1 1 2 4 9 3	102 43 18 38 22 3 3	33 - 7 1 7 3 -	69 1 10 5 13 4 6 -	15 		1 - - 4 2 -	157 2 37 11 28 22 15 -	30 1 7 6 6 5 -	120 2 19 3 9 9 	24 1 7 2 9 3 6
Totals	29	187	42	80	18	21	229	51	108	42		8	272	55	162	52
Location	SC	<u>8</u>] YC	May (1 ST	<u>2B) (1)</u> CO	SO	SC	9 M YC	<u>lav (1</u> ST	2 <u>B) (3)</u> CO	SO	3	SC	<u>10</u> YC	May ST	(<u>12B)</u> CO	(<u>3)</u> SO
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth		158 2 30 11 30 12 6 3	60 16 10 9 7 6	150 1 25 5 16 9 6 6	41 2 15 5 16 9		160 1 29 14 22 11 12	111 14 10 19 9 3	256 2 21 12 12 7 3 -	53 		1 1 2 1 2 5 3	158 1 32 6 31 15 9	95 1 14 3 12 3 	187 2 16 9 11 10 9 3	22
Totals	16	252	108	218	88	13	249	167	313	133		15	252	128	247	58
Location	sc	11 YC	May_() ST	2 <u>B) (4)</u> CO	SO	SC	<u>12</u> YC	<u>May_(1</u> ST	<u>2B) (4)</u> CO	SO		SC	<u>13</u> YC	May ST	(<u>12B)</u> CO	(4) SO
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth	3 1 4 1 3 14 -	101 1 20 5 17 12 9 6	41 	107 19 4 9 5 -	9 1 1 1 1 6	2 1 3 2 2 7 6 3	67 	33 5 6 9 4 3	72 1 13 6 7 7 -	10 		4 - - 7 6 12 12	95 1 19 5 24 11 3 3	44 2 9 1 9 1 	111 3 14 8 17 7 	26 2 8 7 7 9 9 3
Totals	26	171	60	144	19	26	120	60	106	29		42	161	66	160	71
Location	SC	14) YC	May (1 ST	2 <u>B) (4)</u> CO	SO	SC	<u>15</u> YC	<u>May (1</u> ST	<u>2B) (5)</u> CO	SO		SC	<u>15</u> YC	May ST	(<u>12A)</u> CO	(<u>5)</u> SO
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth	4 3 6 5 11 7 9 12	33 - 7 3 14 10 3 3	14 	17 	13 8 2 7 6 3	8 2 11 1 6 5 6	182 3 39 6 28 17 6 3	91 1 18 6 14 9 3 3	178 1 21 11 11 11 6 12	110 1 31 16 29 12 6		33 3 4 - 6 6 3 -	633 15 68 12 50 21 3	209 1 18 11 21 9 3 3	635 21 35 14 34 14 6 3	193 8 47 17 43 22 9

Date (Test Unit) and (series number)*

	-	16_]	May (1	2B) (5)	2		16	May	(12A) (5)		12	May	(12B)	(5)
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO
Gatewell	5	70	129	186	67	15	214	280	849	106	4	125	98	242	190
Gap Net	-		1	2	3	4	1	2	53	9	2		1	3	3
Closure	5	8	16	29	19		12	29	61	38	4	31	24	35	79
First	2	3	11	7	8	2	5	10	32	5	1	6	12	10	27
Second	3	7	22	10	25	5	12	21	40	32	9	20	23	29	66
Third	1	4	6	2	3	1	2	14	5	7	6	10	9	7	41
Fourth	3		6	-				9	6	9	15	9	6	6	15
FILL	-	-					-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	3
Totals	19	92	191	236	125	27	246	365	1048	206	47	201	173	332	424
		17.1	May (1	2A) (5))		26	May (12B) (6)			26	6 May	(12A)	(6)
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO
	-	-	-	_					-	-	-	-	_	-	
Gatewell	11	306	169	721	372	19	41	50	57	130	65	85	73	124	107
Gap Net	2	4	4	23	21	3	11	10	7	27	5	3	6	12	7
Closure	1	34	29	47	101	7	4	7	10	29	12	19	25	19	54
First	11	11	10	27	02	Z	3 15	11	-	21	2	12	10	14	40
Third	11	39	18	32	30	4	10	18	G	28	11	12	25	19	61
Fourth	0	20	8	14	27	3	-	10	0	9		15	12	6	21
Fifth	3	-	3	3	3		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
Totals	37	422	266	868	717	43	79	123	88	305	104	163	189	202	379
		27.1		2B) (7)			27	May_(12A)_(7)		28	May	(12B)	(6)
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO
Gatewell	34	97	26	55	91	67	171	55	153	145	41	75	42	59	66
Gap Net	1	4		4	4	2	1		6	8	6	-	3	2	1
Closure	16	30	10	17	67	14	69	27	23	116	20	23	15	25	89
First	4	15	3	12	18	6	21	12	7	37	5	9	10	5	20
Second	3	21	14	12	72	18	63	29	16	87	5	15	21	11	53
Third	3	14	9	1	58	7	23	16	8	55	5	7	9	13	42
Fourth	-			3	21	3		3	6	33	3	-	9	3	24
Fifth	3	3		-	3			-	3	9				J	
Totals	64	184	62	104	394	117	348	142	222	490	85	129	109	124	295
		28 1	Mav (1	2A) (6)			29	May_(<u>12B)_(7</u>)		29	May	(12A)	(7)
Location	SC	YC	ŜT	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	co	30
Gatewell	89	109	69	112	66	23	38	24	55	108	39	79	57	158	238
Gap Net	6	2	1	8	3	1		1	1	5	3	1		9	9
Closure	14	25	17	26	39	4	8	9	8	74	10	13	15	20	87
First	7	14	10	12	23	4	7	5	4	30	3	6	3	9	100
-						10	31	12	14	99	14	29	12	10	128
Second	13	38	31	28	74	13	01	13		E 1	0	0		15	70
Second	13 13	38 14	31 26	28 24	74 58	13 3	12	7	8	51	3	8	5	15	72
Second Third Fourth	13 13 6	38 14 15	31 26 21	28 24 21	74 58 36	13 3 	12	13 7 3	8	51 12	33	8 9	5	15 9	72 27 9
Second Third Fourth Fifth	13 13 6 3	38 14 15	31 26 21	28 24 21 6	74 58 36 3	13 3 -	12 3 6	13 7 3 -	8 6 -	51 12 3	3 3 -	8 9 -	5	15 9	72 27 9

Date (Test Unit) and (series number)*

		30 1	May_(]	2B) (6)	<u> </u>		30	<u>May (1</u>	2A) (6)				31	May	(12B)	(7)
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO		SC	YC	ST	co	so
Gatewell	16	36	22	35	52	58	57	53	83	87		22	25	10	23	57
Gap Net	3			1	2	2	4		9	8		4		1	3	4
Closure	8	13	12	13	26	22	20	17	21	29		11	7	10	3	23
First	7	4	1	3	18	4	4	4	5	12		3	4	2	4	11
Second	13	11	3	6	39	21	12	23	14	46		13	15	9	10	38
Third	8	6	7	9	20	14	10	19	14	34		14	12	7	5	30
Fourth	6		3	3	1 2		3		6	24		3	3	3	6	27
Fifth	-	-		-	-		3	-		3			3	3		
Totals	61	70	48	70	169	121	113	116	152	243		70	69	45	54	190
		31	Mav (1	2A) (7)			1 J	une (12	(6)				1.	June (12A) (6)
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO		SC	YC	ST	CO	SO
Gatewell	76	43	38	110	107	48	25	15	34	94		72	33	23	74	83
Gap Net	8	2		1	2	12	1	1	3	4		6			7	9
Closure	12	14	12	11	34	19	11	8	12	44		18	18	9	16	53
First	6	8	8	6	17	6	1	3	3	22		10	4	2	6	38
Second	17	15	10	6	38	14	8	8	10	51		30	19	9	16	75
Third	23	14	9	9	51	11	1	2	1	23		12	7	9	10	37
Fourth	15	-	6	15	24	3	2.77	3		21			3	3	12	30
Fifth	3		**	6	**	-	· ++)			**		6		-		6
Totals	160	96	63	164	273	113	47	40	63	259		154	84	55	141	331
	-	<u>2 Ju</u>	<u>me_(1</u> ;	2 <u>B)_(7)</u>			<u>2 Ju</u>	<u>ne (12</u>	A) (7)	_		-	<u> </u>	<u>une (1</u>	<u>2B) (</u>	<u>i)</u>
Location	SC	2 Ju YC	ST	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO	SO	SC	<u>2</u> Jy YC	<u>ne (12</u> ST	<u>A) (7)</u> CO	SO		SC	3 J YC	<u>une (1</u> ST	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO	SO
Gatewell	SC 56	2 Jr YC 26	11	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26	S O 39	SC 113	<u>2 Jv</u> YC 49	<u>ine (12</u> ST 47	<u>A) (7)</u> CO 94	SO 64		SC 94	3 J YC 30	<u>une (1</u> ST 12	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67	5) SO 27
Location Gatewell Gap Net	SC 56 5	2 Jr YC 26	11	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3	SO 39	SC 113 6	<u>2 Jv</u> YC 49 2	<u>une (12.</u> ST 47 2	A) (7) CO 94 4	SO 64 1		SC 94 5	3 J YC 30	une (1 ST 12	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67	5) 50 27 1
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure	SC 56 5 28	2 Jr YC 26 10	11 11	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4	39 23	SC 113 6 26	<u>2 Jr</u> YC 49 2 18	47 2 12	A) (7) CO 94 4 14	SO 64 1 45		SC 94 5 32	3 J YC 30 7	<u>une (1</u> ST 12 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 4	5)
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First	SC 56 5 28 4	2 Jr YC 26 	11 11 4 4	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3	39 23 11	SC 113 6 26 7	2 Jv YC 49 2 18 3	47 2 12 3	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5	SO 64 1 45 22		SC 94 5 32 8	3 J YC 30 7 4	<u>une (1</u> ST 12 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 	5) SO 27 1 21 7
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second	SC 56 5 28 4 20	2 Jy YC 26 	11 ST 11 - 4 4 11	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7	39 23 11 38	SC 113 6 26 7 19	2 Jy YC 49 2 18 3 15	47 2 12 3 14	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15	SO 64 1 45 22 40		94 5 32 8 23	3 J YC 30 7 4 8	12 5 5 5	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7	5) SO 27 1 21 7 22
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third	56 5 28 4 20 10	2 Jy YC 26 - 10 4 8 8	11 ST 11 4 4 11 6	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4	39 23 11 38 23	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21	2 Jy YC 49 2 18 3 15 7	47 2 12 3 14 8	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6	50 64 1 45 22 40 19		94 5 32 8 23 14	3 J YC 30 - 7 4 8 3	12 6 5 5	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7 3	5) SO 27 1 21 7 22 14
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth	56 5 28 4 20 10 3	2 Ju YC 26 	11 ST 11 4 4 11 6	2B) (7) CO 26 3 4 3 7 4	39 	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12	2 Jy YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 -	47 2 12 3 14 8 9	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6	50 64 1 45 22 40 19 21		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3	3 J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3	12 5 6 5 5 3	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 4 1 7 3 -	5) SO 27 1 21 7 22 14 6
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth	56 5 28 4 20 10 3	2 Ju YC 26 - 10 4 8 8 - -	111 5T 111 4 4 111 6 3	2B) (7) CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 	39 23 11 38 23 3	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 -	2 Jy YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 - 6	47 2 12 3 14 8 9	94 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 -		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6	3 J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 -	12 6 5 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 -	27 1 21 7 22 14 6
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 	2 Ju YC 26 - 10 4 8 8 8 - - 56	11 5T 11 4 4 11 6 3 39	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47	39 23 11 38 23 3 137	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 	2 Jy YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 - 6 100	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3 3 147	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212	-	SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185	3 J YC 30 - 7 4 8 3 3 - 55	12 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totale	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 	2 Jy YC 26 - 10 4 8 8 - 56	111 	2B) (7) CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - 47 47	39 23 11 38 23 3 137	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 22 -	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 - 6 100	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 - 95	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3 147 B) (7)	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185	3. J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 55	12 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 -4 1 7 3 82 82	5) SO 27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totale Location	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 	2 Jy YC 26 	11 11 4 4 11 6 3 39 <u>st</u>	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO	39 23 11 38 23 3 - 137	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 - 204 SC	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95 95 55	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3 3 147 B) (7) CO	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 212 SO		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC	3. J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 85 85 YC	12 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 82 2 <u>A) (7</u> CO	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals Location	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 126 SC	2 Jy YC 26 	11 11 	2B) (7) CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 47 2A) (6) CO	39 23 11 38 23 3 137 50	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 204 SC	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95 95	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 212 SO		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC	3.J YC 30 - 7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 4.J YC	12 6 5 	2 <u>B) (6</u> 67 - 4 1 7 3 - 82 2 <u>A) (7</u> CO	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 - 98
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals Location Gatewell	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 126 SC 88	2 Jy YC 26 	111 4 4 11 6 3 39 5T 14	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 - 137 SO 30	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 204 SC 62	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC 11	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95 95 55 57 6	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO 16	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 SO 12		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225	3.J YC 30 - 7 4 8 3 3 - 55 5 4.J YC 24	12 	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 CO 65	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 0 SO 35
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals Location Gatewell Gap Net	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 126 SC 88 11	2 Jy YC 26 - 10 4 8 8 - 56 56 3 Jy YC 25 1	111 	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51 2	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 - 137 SO 30 3 3	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 204 SC 62 4	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95 95 95 57 6 	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 6 3 3 147 B) (7) CO 16	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 SO 12 1		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14	3.J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 4.J YC 24	une (1 ST 12 - 6 5 5 - 3 - 31 ST 22 -	2B) (6 CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 82 2A) (7 CO 65 2	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 0
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totale Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 126 SC 88 11 28	2 Jy YC 26 - 10 4 8 8 - - 56 56 56 25 1 10	11 11 4 4 11 6 3 39 11 6 39 11 4 4 11 6 3 39 11 4 4 4 4 11 6 3 11 4 4 4 11 6 3 3 9 14 4 4 4 4 -	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51 2 16	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 137 SO 30 3 24	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 - 204 SC 62 4 10	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC 11 2	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95 95 95 55 6 6	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO 16 2	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 212 SO 12 1 6		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14 26	3.J YC 30 - 7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 4.J YC 24 - 4	une (1 ST 12 6 5 5 3 3 31 31 22 4	2B) (6 CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 82 2A) (7 CO 65 2 6 6	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 20 35 1 14
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totale Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 - 126 SC 88 11 28 9	2 Jy YC 26 	111 	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51 2 16 3	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 - 137 SO 30 3 24 12	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 - 204 SC 62 4 10 4	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC 11 2 2	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 95 95 95 95 87 6 6 	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO 16 2 1	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 212 SO 12 1 6 2		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14 26 11	3.J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 4.J YC 24 - 4 1	une (1 ST 12 6 5 5 3 3 31 222 4 3	2 <u>B) (6</u> CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 82 2 <u>A) (7</u> CO 65 2 6 1	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 98 7) SO 35 1 14 8
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 - 126 SC 88 811 28 9 25	2 Jy YC 26 	111 	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51 2 16 3 7	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 137 SO 30 3 24 12 29	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 - 204 SC 62 4 10 4 18	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC 11 2 5	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 - 95 95 95 95 6 	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO 16 2 1 2	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 212 212 SO 12 1 6 2 8 8		94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14 26 11 29	3.J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 YC 24 - 4 1 4	<u>une (1</u> ST 12 - 6 5 - 3 - 31 <u>une (1</u> ST 22 - 4 3 4	2B) (6 CO 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 82 2A) (7 CO 65 2 6 1 1	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 1 1 21 1 7 22 14 6 98 0 14 90 90 90 90 90 90 14 90 - 90 90 90 9 90 90 90 90 90 90
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 - 126 SC 88 11 28 9 25 7	2 Jy YC 26 	11 11 4 4 11 6 3 39 14 14 4 4 4 4 4 	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - 47 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51 2 16 3 7 2	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 137 SO 30 3 24 12 29 9	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 - 6 100 4 Jr YC 11 - 2 - 5 -	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 - 95 95 95 95 6 - - 4 3	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO 16 2 1 2 4	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 212 212 SO 12 1 6 2 8 6		94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14 26 11 29 15	3.J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 YC 24 - 4 1 4 1	une (1 ST 12 - 6 5 5 - 3 3 - 31 Une (1 ST 22 - 4 3 4 1	2 <u>B) (6</u> <u>67</u> <u>4</u> 1 7 3 <u>-</u> 82 2 <u>A) (7</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>6</u> 1 1 1	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 98 0 1 1 21 1 7 22 14 6 98 0 14 9 0 14 9 1 1 7 1 22 1 7 7 22 1 4 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 7 7 22 1 1 4 9 8 9 9 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Totals Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 - 126 SC 88 11 28 9 25 7 6	2 Jy YC 26 	11 	2B) (7) CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - 47 47 2A) (6) CO 51 2 16 3 7 2 -	SO 39 23 11 38 23 3 137 SO 30 30 324 12 29 9 9 9	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 - 204 SC 62 4 10 4 18 12 3	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC 11 - 2 5 -	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 - 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 3 147 CO 16 -2 1 2 4 3	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 SO 12 1 6 2 8 6 - -		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14 26 11 29 15	3.J YC 30 - 7 4 8 3 3 - 55 YC 24 - 4 1 4 1 3 0	une (1 ST 12 6 5 5 - 3 - 31 ST 22 - 4 3 4 1 6	2 <u>B) (6</u> 67 - 4 1 7 3 - - 82 2 <u>A) (7</u> CO 65 2 6 1 1 3	5) SO 27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 0 SO 35 1 14 8 10 3 9
Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth Location Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth First	SC 56 5 28 4 20 10 3 - - 126 SC 88 11 28 9 25 7 6 -	2 Jy YC 26 - 10 4 8 8 - - 56 56 56 3 Jy YC 25 1 10 - 12 4 9 -	111 	2 <u>B) (7)</u> CO 26 3 4 3 7 4 - - 47 2 <u>A) (6)</u> CO 51 2 16 3 7 2 - -	SO 39 23 11 38 23 11 38 23 3 137 SO 30 32 24 12 29 9 6	SC 113 6 26 7 19 21 12 - 204 SC 62 4 10 4 18 12 3 	2 Jr YC 49 2 18 3 15 7 6 100 4 Jr YC 11 2 5 -	47 2 12 3 14 8 9 - 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 - - - - - 4 3 -	A) (7) CO 94 4 14 5 15 6 6 6 3 147 B) (7) CO 16 -2 1 2 4 3 -	SO 64 1 45 22 40 19 21 - 212 212 SO 12 1 6 2 8 6 - 3		SC 94 5 32 8 23 14 3 6 185 SC 225 14 26 11 29 15 5 9	3.J YC 30 -7 4 8 3 3 - 55 55 55 4.J YC 24 - 4 1 4 1 3 6	une (1 ST 12 - 6 5 5 - 3 - 31 22 - 4 3 4 1 6 -	2 <u>B) (6</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>4</u> 1 7 <u>3</u> <u>-</u> 82 <u>82</u> <u>82</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>6</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>82</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>82</u> <u>82</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>67</u> <u>-</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>66</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>66</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>66</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>66</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>66</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>65</u> <u>2</u> <u>66</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>1</u> <u>3</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u>	27 1 21 7 22 14 6 98 7 22 14 6 98 7 22 14 8 30 35 1 14 8 10 3 9

			Date (Test U	nit) and (series num	ber)*	
Location	SC	<u>8 July (12B) (8)</u> YC ST CO SO	SC YC	<u>July (12A) (8)</u> ST CO SO	<u>12 Ju</u> SC YC	<u>v (12B) (8)</u> ST CO SO
Gatewell	119		157		45	
Gap Net	12		24		23	
First	21		33		10	
Second	67		92		41	
Third	63		76		18	
Fourth	36		24		6	
Total	978		485		169	
Total	370		100			
	-	<u>12 July (12A) (8)</u>	13	July (12B) (9)	13 Ju	<u>ly (12A) (9)</u>
Location	SC	YC ST CO SO	SC YC	c sr co so	SC IC	5100 50
Gatewell	53		91		64	
Gap Net	11		-		6	
Closure	29		35		19	
First	13		57		81	
Third	28		53		34	
Fourth	9		21		36	
Fifth	-		6		0	
Total	169		277		273	
Location	SC	<u>14 July (12B) (8)</u> YC ST CO SO	SC Y	<u>July (12A) (8)</u> C ST CO SO	SC YC	<u>dy (12B) (9)</u> ST CO SO
					155	
Gatewell	80		16		4	
Closure	34		23		57	
First	14		20		23	
Second	52		64		166	
Third	39		27		87	
Fifth	33		6		21	
Total	258		281		673	
					10.1	-1- (194) (9)
Location	SC	<u>17 July (12A) (9)</u> YC ST CO SO	SC Y	<u>July (12B) (8)</u> C ST CO SO	SC YC	ST CO SO
Gatemall	100		51		52	
Gap Net	4		4		3	
Closure	64		41		26	
First	32		17		88	
Second	161		63		88	
Fourth	99		114		117	
Fifth	24		15		00	
Total	. 633		383		489	

		D	ate (Tea	t Unit) and (series numb	er)*	
Location	SC	<u>19 July (12B) (9)</u> YC ST CO SO	SC	<u>19 July (12A) (9)</u> YC ST CO SO	SC	20 July (12B) (8) YC ST CO SO
Gatewell	36		57		32	
Gap Net	2		1		3	
Closure	29		40		21	
First	23		21		10	
Second	88		101		40	
Third	104		110		19	
Fourth	84		90		8	
Fifth	18		21		0	
Total	384		447		146	
		<u>20 July (12A) (8)</u>		21 July (12B) (9)		21 July (12A) (9)
Location	SC	YC ST CO SO	SC	YC ST CO SO	sc	YC SICO SO
Gatewell	25		94		121	
Gap Net	3		5		4	
Closure	24		59		58	
First	15		23		23	
Second	46		77		SO BA	
Third	20		00		33	
Fourth	12		24		3	
Fifth	3		-		· ·	
Total	148		340		403	
		24 July (12B) (8)		24 July (12A) (8)	_	25 July (12B) (9)
Location	SC	YC ST CO SO	SC	YC ST CO SO	SC	YC STCO SO
Gatewell	69		61		129	
Gan Net	1		6		2	
Closure	54		55		00	
First	14		17		23	
Second	43		55		50	
Third	34		28		18	
Fourth	12		10		6	
FIICH	0				384	
Total	233		237			
		25 July (12A) (9)	_	26 July (12B) (9)	90	<u>26 July (12A) (9)</u> VC ST CO SO
Location	SC	YC ST CO SO	SC	YC ST CO SO		10 0100 01
Gatawall	74		65		51	
Gap Net	3		2		27	
Closure	58		34		16	
First	23		15		56	
Second	76		50		23	
Third	20		27		24	
Fourth	30		10		3	
Fifth	15		3			
			211		201	

Totals 299

					Date (Tea	t Unit) a	nd (series	number)*			
Location	90	27 J	<u>ılv (12</u> ST	<u>B) (10)</u>	90	27 July	(12A) (10)	20	<u>28 J</u>	uly (12B)	(10)
	50	IC	51		30			.0	SC YC	STCC	9 80
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth Fifth	72 2 35 10 60 36 24 3				89 25 46 30 49 40 15 9				61 2 53 14 75 68 45 9		
Totals	242				303				327		
Location	SC	28 Ju YC	<u>uly (12</u> ST	<u>A) (10)</u> CO SO							
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third	67 13 18 15 40 54			5.4		1					
Fifth	42 9										
Totals	268										

				YEA	RLING CI	HINOOK S	ALMON			
Test Unit	13A	13A	13A	13A	13A	13 A	13A	13A	13A	13A
Test Date 2	2 April	23 April	25 April	26 April	27 April	28 April	29 April	30 April	1 May	2 May
Gatewell	95	259	89	82	179	121	64	66	91	123
First Net	138	282	138	132	138	84	96	84	90	144
Second Net	126	231	96	72	99	114	42	63	144	114
Third Net	93	150	72	24	75	102	36	36	60	69
Fourth Net	87	108	81	39	39	48	30	39	75	51
Fifth Net	42	138	81	27	33	48	36	54	48	51
Sixth Net	63	78	48	18	30	27	18	15	42	39
Seventh Net	24	39	15	6	12	9	-	9	12	24
Totals	668	1285	620	400	605	553	322	366	562	615
Test Unit	13A	13 A	13 A	13A	13A	1 3A	13 A	13A	13A	13 A
Test Date	3 May	4 May	5 May	6 May	7 May	8 May	9 May	10 May	11 May	12 May
Gatewell	273	74	141	140	127	100	75	132	58	53
First Net	183	60	219	198	84	153	168	165	54	54
Second Net	156	51	45	123	87	72	78	63	36	27
Third Net	96	36	54	54	54	18	30	36	15	15
Fourth Net	75	30	33	39	33	42	18	24	-	15
Fifth Net	48	15	33	36	30	15	15	12	6	21
Sixth Net	36	9	18	12	21	9	9	3	6	6
Seventh Net	6	3	9	3	3	9	3	-		6
		079	552	005	439	418	396	435	175	197

Appendix Table 2.--Vertical distribution data for yearling and subyearling chinook and coho salmon, collected at Bonneville Dam Second Powerhouse, 1989.

				YEARLI	NG CHIN	OOK SAL	MON			
Test Unit	13A	13 A	13A	13A	13 A	13 A	13 A	13 A	13A	
Test Date	13 May	14 May	15 May	16 May	17 May	1 June	2 June	3 June	4 June	
Gatewell	31	31	191	31	59	15	11	8	10	
First Net	42	48	213	24	66	9	12	15	6	
Second Net	30	24	75	33	21	15	6	12	9	
Third Net	12	18	30	6	15	9	9	6	3	
Fourth Net	24	24	15	3	24	9	3	12	3	
Fifth Net	9	18	6	18	18	9	6	3	-	
Sixth Net	15	18	9	3	12	9	-	-	-	
Seventh Net	-	3	3	-	12	3	3	3	3	
Totale	168	164	543	118	227	78	50	59	34	

SUBYEARLING CHINOOK SALMON

Test Unit	13A	13 A	13A	13A	13 A	1 3A	13 A	13A	13 A	13 A
Test Date	8 July	12 July	13 July	14 July	17 July	18 July	19 July	20 July	21 July	24 July
Gatewell	69	47	47	40	104	28	35	19	35	53
First Net	48	39	33	57	90	33	45	9	33	48
Second Net	42	33	27	51	33	27	54	27	66	48
Third Net	57	30	18	24	96	12	45	36	45	51
Fourth Net	75	51	36	45	123	57	84	15	69	60
Fifth Net	69	30	48	42	168	90	78	27	45	33
Sizth Not	87	24	33	27	171	96	84	21	27	39
Sameth Net	18	15	18	12	45	36	30	3	24	21
Totels	465	269	280	298	830	379	455	157	344	359

Test Unit	13A	1 3A	13 A	13 A									
Test Date	25 July	26 July	27 July	28 July									
Gatewell	54	37	28	37	76	-	- 24	-	-	-	-	100	10
First Net	90	54	24	42									
Second Net	111	9	66	66									
Third Net	60	48	42	51									
Fourth Net	78	42	33	63									
Fifth Net	78	36	48	90									
Sixth Net	21	36	51	27									
Seventh No	et 12	9	15	69									
Totals	504	271	307	445									

31

SUBYEARLING CHINOOK SALMON

							D	ato (T	est U	nit)		30			
		0	Man	20)			10		(0.0)						
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	80	SC	YC	May ST	(<u>3B</u>)	90
1 mil	_					_									00
Gatewell	8	99	38	149	6	5	84	70	69	9	19	87	53	78	7
Gap Net	1	7	0	8	1	7	6	1	3		2	2		2	0
Closure	7	34	5	18	2	5	23	8	4	-	2	26	3	6	3
First	3	27	9	6	3	12	18	6	6		6	15	6	-	3
Second	15	57	3	21		12	60	15	27	6	14	42	13	10	5
Third	12	12		3	6	24	36	18	15		32	15	8	4	2
Fourth	12			-	-	24	15		3	-	18	9	-	3	
Total	5 58	236	55	205	18	89	242	118	127	15	99	196	83	103	13
And in case	-	12	May	(3B)		_	13	May	<u>(3B)</u>		1.1	14	May	<u>(3B</u>	
Location	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO	SC	YC	ST	co	SO	SC	YC	ST	CO	SO
Gatewell	27	70	33	64	8	25	68	60	58	6	35	58	64	26	15
Gan Net	3	5		5	ĭ	8	8	2	4	1	3	7		1	2
Closure	10	17	5	3	7	5	19	9	7	3	7	18	2	5	5
First	0	3	3				15	12		3	12	15		3	-
Second	19	26	15	3	4	19	31	16	11	7	29	34	11	4	11
Third	8	20	4	3	7	24	9	5	2	4	17	18	5	2	1
Fourth	24		3	6	0	24		3		3	18	3	-	3	
Total	91	141	63	84	27	105	150	107	81	27	121	153	82	44	35
		27	May	<u>(3B)</u>			28	May	<u>(3B)</u>			2	9 May	<u>(3B)</u>	
Location	SC	YC	ST	co	SO	SC	YC	ST	co	30	SC	YC	ST	00	30
Gatewell	27	38	50	65	78	29	7	31	36	26	36	5	27	73	26
Gap Net	4	2	1	13	8	2	1	4	6	2	5	2	0	15	2
Closure	19	18	11	13	64	12	7	9	17	26	19	8	9	10	19
First	12	21	12	6	33	9	6	3	12	21	12		3	21	2
Second	20	18	24	14	106	11	12	18	13	31	9	5	10	2	20
Third	5	8	13	8	54	10	2	11	8	24	27	3	6	13	19
Fourth	-	9	3	3	9	6	0	9	3	12	3		1		1
Totals	87	114	114	122	352	79	35	85	95	142	111	23	56	134	89
				(0.7)											
		30	May	(<u>3B)</u>											
Location	sc	YC	ST	00	<u>so</u>										
Gatewell	38	12	31	50	29										
Gap Net	4		2	3	8										
Closure	12	6	6	11	10										
First	3	3	9	15	9										
Second	9	4	11	16	36										
Third	10	1	5	3	13										
Fourth	-				6										

Totals 76

26

64

98 111

Appendix Table 3.--Numbers of fish collected in the individual replicates of FGE tests at Bonneville Dam First Powerhouse, 1989 (tests conducted in July and August captured only subyearling chinook salmon).

								D	ate (T	est U	nit)					
Location	SC	<u>12</u> YC	July ST	(<u>3B)</u> CO	SO		SC	<u>13</u> YC	July (ST	<u>3B)</u> CO	SO	SC	<u>14</u> YC	Julv (ST	<u>3B)</u> CO	SO
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth	18 1 24 12 52 99 99						25 1 25 24 89 82 57					19 53 9 168 142 108				
Total	305					:	303					504				
Location	SC	18 YC	<u>July</u> ST	(<u>3B)</u> CO	SO		SC	19 YC	J <u>uly</u> ST	(3B) CO	SO	SC	20 YC	<u>July</u> ST	(<u>3B)</u> CO	SO
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth	16 3 12 12 177 291 102						30 2 12 9 126 213 105					9 1 22 33 156 129 81				
Total	613						497					431				
Location	SC	21 YC	July ST	(<u>3B)</u> CO	SO		SC	24 YC	Julv ST	(<u>3B)</u> CO	SO					
Gatewell Gap Net Closure First Second Third Fourth	8 3 18 6 129 171 120						29 1 29 18 102 105 69									
Totals	455					:	353									

SC = Subyearling chinook salmon YC = Yearling chinook salmon ST = Steelhead CO = Coho salmon SO = Sockeye salmon

	-								
<u>_</u> <u>x</u>	R. CHI	NOOK		<u>SUB</u>	CHINOO	<u>K</u>		C	OHO
Test Unit	3 B	3B	3 B						
Test Date 8	May	26 May	8 May	26 May	11 July	17 July	25 July	8 May	26 May
Gatewell	15	11	10	13	15	30	15	22	36
First Net	75	84	48	75	18	63	24	48	84
Second Net	54	42	39	48	33	42	27	15	72
Third Net	27	42	21	27	51	123	30	18	27
Fourth Netet	18	18	3	27	102	345	75	9	12
Fifth Net	15	6	-	15	140	444	60	-	6
Sixth Net	3	-	3	9	159	333	33	-	-
Seventh Net					42	96	15	-	
Totals	207	203	124	214	500	1476	279	112	237

Appendix	Table	4Vertical	distribution	data for	r yearling	g and	subyearling	chinook	and	coho
		salmon	collected at	Bonnevi	le Dam	First	Powerhouse,	1989.		

-	SOCK	09,4 0	210 00	HEAD_		
Test Unit	3 B	3 B	3 B	3 B		
Test Date	8 May	26 May	8 May	26 May		
Gateweil	3	5	19	45		
First Net	9	72	27	114		
Second Net	6	39	3	72		
Third Net	6	39	3	30		
Fourth Net	3	39	6	33		
Fifth Net	-	27	6	21		
Sixth Net	3	9	-	3		
Seventh Net	. 0	-	3	-		
Totals	30	811	67	318		