# PREDICTING AND MONITORING ADULT SPRING CHINOOK SALMON MIGRATION ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER IN 2011

Technical Report

Prepared by:

W. Nicholas Beer

James J. Anderson
Columbia Basin Research

School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences
University of Washington

Box 358218

Seattle, WA 98195

Prepared for:

United States Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

Division of Fish and Wildlife

P.O. Box 3621

Portland, OR 97208

Project No. 1989-108-00

Contract No. 00055905

January 2012

## SUMMARY

Preseason predictions of run size and migration timing are modified by inseason conditions and passage observations to monitor the run size and migration timing of spring Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River. As the season progresses, patterns in the arrival of the fish dictate modification of the size and timing parameters. The convergence of predictions for normalized run size, peak arrival day and variance parameters are 0.964, 0.766, and 1.25, respectively over the days 80-150 (March 21 – May 30).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents ..... 2

List of Figures ..... 2

Introduction ..... 3

Methods ..... 3

Results ..... 4

Discussion ..... 10

References ..... 12

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Illustrated convergence over 40 days toward the value shown with the red dot for various hypothetical sequences. The convergence value $C_{1,40}$ depicted in the title is the mean absolute difference between values and target (see text). ..... 4

Figure 2 Postseason run assessment. Note that the spring and summer runs are very difficult to distinguish with either distributions or the calendar-based run date cutoffs. Also in this year, the jack returns are exceptional, breaking all records regardless of counting method ..... 6

Figure 3 Daily arrivals, in-season and postseason predictions (upper left) and normalized convergence for three distribution parameters predicted in-season during 2009. ..... 7

Figure 4 Retrospective convergence of the three parameters for the spring mode of the tri-modal arrival distribution in historic years. The points for 2009 based on the hybrid prediction used in-season, and the postseason targets are marked in red. ..... 8

Figure 5 Ratio of Summer run to Spring run size based on retrospective fits of tri-modal run distributions. Filled points are >1 (6 our of last 7 years). Red line shows smoothed trend. ..... 11

Figure 6 Changes in peak arrival of spring and summer runs. Summer in red above and spring in black below. The smoothed trend runs through the fitted points from the tri-modal distributions ..... 12

## INTRODUCTION

Continuous predictions of the run size, peak arrival and variability in timing for spring Chinook at Bonneville Dam (BON) on the Columbia River begins in mid-March and continues for each day that new fish are reported at BON dam until the end of May.

Before the season begins, estimates of three parameters that define the spring chinook arrival distribution at Bonneville dam (BON) are prepared according to methods described by Anderson and Beer (2009), and CBR (2009). As new observations of passing adult fish are made on a daily basis, these parameters are adjusted according to methods of Beer (2009).

This report is a reivew of the ability of the in-season peak predictor to estimate the true parameters of the spring distribution before the run is completed.

## METHODS

On any particular day, the best prediction of the run size, peak arrival and spread of the arrival distribution of the spring Chinook migration is based on historic conditions, current environmental conditions, observations of passage, and mathematical properties of the assumed gaussian (normal) distribution (Beer 2009). Thus, preseason and early predictions rely on historic and current conditions while later predictions are more strongly influenced by observations. As the arrival information becomes available on a daily basis, several methods are used to modify the current prediction.

The ability of the distribution parameters to converge toward the postseason assessment of the parameters is the measure of interest. This is *not* an evaluation of either the preseason or postseason distributions relative to the actual arrivals, both of which are imprecise assessments of the true state of the fish. Conceptually, it is a measure of the transition from the preseason distribution to the postseason.

The sequence of daily predictions of each of the three parameters are treated as a limited time series. The predicted values and the postseason target value are normalized across their range to create daily normalized values for each day ($x_i$) relative to the target. Convergence on day $i$ is based on the absolute difference between the predicted value and the target: $\Delta x_i = abs(x_i - T)$. The convergence value ($C$) is the average of these daily values over the days of interest from $i$ to $j$: $C_{i,j} = \frac{1}{(j-i+1)} \sum_{i}^{j} \Delta x_i$, where days $i$ & $j$ are chosen to be day 80 (March 21) and day 150 (May 30).

Convergence of various hypothetical sequences are demonstrated in Figure 1. It is possible to begin and end the sequence on arbitary days $i$ and $j$ but for comparative purposes these should be the same within and between seasons. Also, the normalized

values (including the target) have mean = 0 and allow comparison of run size convergence to peak day convergence because the values are independent of the units of measure. Smaller values are better.




Figure 1 Illustrated convergence over 40 days toward the value shown with the red dot for various hypothetical sequences. The convergence value $C_{1,40}$ depicted in the title is the mean absolute difference between values and target (see text). Smaller values are better.

## RESULTS

The postseason distributions of the runs is shown in Figure 2. The tri-modal distributions are necessary in order to obtain the target values for the in-season distribution parameters. As a result of fitting the three peaks of the run for 2011, the target parameters for the

spring adult run were obtained: Run Size = 146551, Peak Day = 125 and Standard Deviation = 7.0 which is the postseason estimate of the passage profile. However, in-season, the final parameter set was: Run Size == 183650, peak day = 126 (May 6) and standard deviation = 8.3. Errors of  25%, 1 day and 1.3 days, respectively. Convergence was 0.85 for run size, 0.77 for run timing, and 2.2 for standard deviation. These results and two previous year's convergence values are in Table 1.

Table 1 Convergence values and final parameters (in-season) by year for Peak predictor

| Year | Run size | Peak Day | Std. | Run error | Peak Day error | Std error |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2011 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 2.2 | +25% | +1 | 1.3 |
| 2010 | 0.96 | 0.77 | 1.25 | -14% | -2 | 2 |
| 2009 | 1.43 | 0.87 | 4.8 | | | |

The preseason prediction, all in-season predictions (made daily) and the postseason prediction are all shown in the upper-left panel of Figure 3. There is also a depiction of the relative convergence (in normalized-value space) of each parameter. They can be compared to each other, so the run timing convergence was better than the run size convergence and these in turn better than the standard deviation convergence.




Figure 2 Postseason run assessment. The spring and summer distributions were more distinct than in many recent years. The spring-summer calendar-based cut-off date was during the peak of the summer arrivals. Overall, the spring adult and jack runs were late with a positive skew.




Figure 3 Daily arrivals, in-season and postseason predictions (upper left) and normalized convergence for three distribution parameters predicted in-season during 2011. There is a single point off the plot in upper left at 15766 on May 1, day 121.




Figure 4 Retrospective convergence of the three parameters for the spring mode of the tri-modal arrival distribution in historic years. The points for 2011 are based on the hybrid prediction used in-season, and the postseason targets are marked in red.

## PRESEASON 2012

For 2012, a single model will be used for spring and fall Chinook Escapement Forecaster predictions along with the spring Peak arrival predictions. Abundances are predicted according to the previous year's arrivals of Jacks and Adults and an interaction term with environmental conditions that affects the Jack-to-Adult conversion rate. The expression is:

$$Adult = LYAdult + LYJacks : LYUpwelling$$

The index of Upwelling used is August at 42°N. Conditions at this location (approximately where the sub-arctic current makes landfall on North America) are representative of conditions along the coast and thus are a good single measure of year to year environmental variability with broad impact. It is fitted with standard regression techniques. The LYJacks and LYUpwelling terms must interact in keeping with the lifehistory theory mechanisms.

The current prediction of runsize is for nearly 300,000 peak spring Chinook due to favorable ocean conditions and good returns of both Jacks and Adults in 2011. This forecasting method is also applied retrospectively by first calibrating the model with historic data and forecasting the next year. All retrospective predictions since 2001 are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Retrospective predictions using current model.

| Prediction year | Input data through… | $R^2$ | N | Prediction | Std. Error | Observed | pre/obs | Avg |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2002 | 2001 | 0.761 | 21 | 153335 | 45852 | 214259 | 0.7 | |
| 2003 | 2002 | 0.804 | 22 | 164687 | 17923 | 155074 | 1.1 | |
| 2004 | 2003 | 0.815 | 23 | 203551 | 14520 | 121289 | 1.7 | |
| 2005 | 2004 | 0.757 | 24 | 82626 | 9860 | 49968 | 1.7 | |
| 2006 | 2005 | 0.749 | 25 | 78110 | 8051 | 87471 | 0.9 | |
| 2007 | 2006 | 0.748 | 26 | 75093 | 6556 | 55510 | 1.4 | |
| 2008 | 2007 | 0.746 | 27 | 91838 | 8223 | 113837 | 0.8 | |
| 2009 | 2008 | 0.744 | 28 | 110536 | 6702 | 80890 | 1.4 | |
| 2010 | 2009 | 0.735 | 29 | 228142 | 26374 | 221997 | 1.0 | |
| 2011 | 2010 | 0.779 | 30 | 146365 | 15339 | 146551 | 1.0 | 1.17 |
| 2012 | 2011 | 0.786 | 31 | 299654 | 24217 | NA | NA | |

## DISCUSSION

The convergence values of run time and size are better (i.e. lower) than last year (Figure 4), and all three parameters converged about as well as any previous year. The measure of convergence is not the same as the accuracy of the point estimates of the parameters, but rather the ability of the model to determine the true parameters as the data becomes available.

This year, as in previous years, there was some difficulty in defining the spring distribution in-season, and the distinction between the end of the spring run and the beginning of the summer run was unclear both mathematically and phenomenologically (see Figure 2), so the "truth" of the target as the actual state of the population is not guaranteed. However, the post-season assessment of the peak arrival day was less than 2 days away from the in-season, final assessment and thus the convergence was good and the final prediction for peak arrival was good.

The challenge of the prediction algorithms to detect these parameters in-season are formidable for several reasons. The daily arrival noise can be quite significant, and leads to un-smooth transitions between daily predictions. But more importantly, the runs themselves seem to be changing in fundamental ways. First, the summer run is becoming more significant as evidenced by the ratio of the summer to spring run (Figure 5). Second, the spring mode of the run is moving later (Figure 6) which means that the late arriving spring fish are confounded with the early summer fish. Finally, the precocious male "jack" returns, which are the harbingers of the next year's run, have increased dramatically in recent years with record breaking numbers in 2009 that were on par with the adult run itself. While not directly affecting our ability to quickly converge on the distribution parameters for the year, this does suggest that fundamental processes controlling the populations in the ocean are changing in ways that we have yet to understand.

In 2010, we began using a modified model for estimating the pre-season abundance which included cohort relations and environmental indices. See http://www.cbr.washington.edu/crisprt/adult_preseason.html. This refinement was required after the unprecedented return of Jack Chinook in 2009. Current methods to assist the model in converging quickly involve deciding when an appropriate estimation method should be applied. Small refinements in the methods (Beer 2009) are only implemented at season-outset when weighting schemes are pre-determined for blending of results from the different assessements. For example, testing for the zero-slope point at peak passage is unnecessary and inappropriate in the early weeks of the run.




Figure 5 Ratio of Summer run to Spring run size based on retrospective fits of tri-modal run distributions. Filled points are >1 (6 out of last 9 years). Red line shows smoothed trend. There is an increasing "summer" Chinook population in the system.




Figure 6 Changes in peak arrival of spring and summer runs. Spring and summer runs are in black (bottom and top respectively). The weighted average arrival day for all adult Chinook between March 15 and August 1 is between (in blue). The smoothed trend lines run through time trends.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, JJ, and WN Beer. 2009. Oceanic, riverine and genetic influences on spring chinook salmon migration timing. [sic] Ecological Applications. 19(8):1989-2003.

Beer WN, Anderson JJ. 2009. Predicting and Monitoring Spring Chinook Salmon Migrations on the Columbia River. CBR. School of Aquatic and Fishery Science,

UW, Box 358218, Seattle, WA 98195. Available March 30 2010 at: http://www.cbr.washington.edu/papers/AdultPredictor2.html

CBR. 2009. Columbia Basin Research. Preseason adult spring Chinook peak arrival timing and run size prediction for Bonneville Dam. Available Dec. 30, 2009. at: http://www.cbr.washington.edu/crisprt/adult_preseason.html