	Trapping effort				Coded -wire tagging		
			Total		Total	Number	Percen
	Trapping	Trap –	chinook	Season	chinook	effectively	of
Year	site	nights a/	trapped	CPUE b/	CWTed	tagged c/	total d
1989	Junction City	88 e/	24,874	283	22,044	15,704	71.2
1990	Lewiston	120	99239		81,513	66,784	81.9
	Indian Cr.	30	77,142		59,385	45349	76.4
	Totals:	150	176,381 f/	1,176	140,898	112,133	
	(Overall percent)		,	,	,	,	(79.6)
1991	Lewiston	63	848				
	Indian Cr.	23	554				
	Steelbridge	78	20,458		19,777	19,090	96.5
	Sky Ranch	210	67,348		60,310	53,775	89.2
	Totals:	,374	89,208	239	80,087	72,865	
	(Overall percent)	,	,		,	,	(91.0)
1992	Lewiston	18	1,832				
	Ambrose	144	16,102		8,348	8,070	%.7
	Steelbridge	114	38,817		35,043	33,195	94.7
	Sky Ranch	166	25,100		16,580	15345	92.6
	Totals	: 442	81,851	185	59,97 1	56,610	
	(Overall percent)						(94.4)
1993	Lewiston	15	293				
	Ambrose	6	362				
	Hard Hat	132	13,689		10,092	9,817	97.3
	Sky Ranch	174	42,624		38,331	33,643	87.8
	Totals:	327	56,968	174	48,423	43,460	
	(Overall percent)						(89.8)

APPENDIX 6. Summary of naturally produced juvenile chinook salmon trapping effort and coded -wire tagging in the mainstem Trinity River, 1989 through 1993.

a/ One trap night is defined as one net fished for one night.

b/ Catch per unit effort = total trapped /trap-nights.

c/ Effectively-tagged fish = tagged fish minus estimated mortalities and estimated shed tags and poor fin-clips. Estimates were based on quality control checks.

d/ Percent of total = (Number effectively tagged/Total chinook CWT) X 100

e/ In addition to fyke-net traps, a rotary trap was used during the latter portion of the trapping period.

f/ Total catch includes Trinity River Hatchery-produced juvenile chinook salmon.