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Large numbers of adult salmon have been tagged in a variety of ways for the purposes of tracing their further actions and destinations; however, little investigational work has been directed toward determination of the effects of the tagging operation itself on the subsequent behavior and condition of the fish. This neglect could be harmful, since the tagging effects influence the accuracy of results obtained from tagging exp periments.

In order to appraise these effects on red salmon spawning in Bristol Bsy streams, an experiment was' proposed for '1949 on a stream of 'such small size that it could be under almost constant surveillance, so that any differences of behavior and condition between tagged and untagged fish could readily be noted. Hidden Creek, a tributary to Brooks Lake on the Naknek River system, was chosen for the purpose. It was accessible, open in character, could be surveyed easily, and was of representative size and length for the Brooks system. Flow was approximately eight cubje feet per second, and length from the mouth to a beaver dam that formed an impassable barrier was two and oneeighth miles.

This stream was first surveyed physically, and later divided into halfmile intervals with station markers. A trap was installed at the mouth, blocking passage of all fish to the stream. Plans included tagging and releasing approximately 200 spawners, simultaneously releasing a like number of untagged fish, one tagged fish accompanied by one untagged, so that distribution would be equal. Tagging was done with Peterson type plastic discs, connected by a nickel pin below the dorsal fin.

On August 17, tagging began at $1: 15 \mathrm{pm}$. on the first group trapped ( 163 fish), of which $8 \hat{6}$ were tagged. Tagging of the group was completed at $2: 00 \mathrm{pm}$. and the trap opened. By $5: 15$ a second group, numbering 231 fish had been handled, of wich 115 were tagged, making a total of 197 each tagged and untagged.

Immediately upon completion of tagging, two men started up the stream on survey. They covered all of the area up to the beaver-dam barrier, arriv-. ing there at $7: 50 \mathrm{pm}$. On the following morning they surveyed back down to the trap, which had been closed to prevent passage of other salmon.

On the first survey, about 80 fish were noted directly above the trap, apparently resting, or undergoing orientation after handling. Between these fish and the halfomile station, the other salmon were observed grouped in schools of from 8 to 20, all of which were moving upstream. Beyond the half-mile station, the salmon were more dispersed, occurring in groups of two and three, but still moving about.

The survey of the following morning revealed a large number of fish paired and beginning nest excavations. A diminished upstream movement was evident, and very few schools were noted.

Five surveys were made in all．By the time of the fourth survey，three days after the tagging，at least 80 percent of the fish were settled and spawning．Between the fourth and fifth surveys flood conditions had damaged the trap．permitting the passage of rore fish from below，and making further observations difficult。 Results are summarized in Table i。

It had been planned to make daily surveys after August i9；however， weather conditions on Brooks Lake made it impossible to return to the creek until the 25 th，at which time the washout of the trap was discovered．The creek was surveyed notwithstanding，the search revealing totals of $95^{\circ}$ tagged and 699 untagged fish．

Results of the four earlier surveys are fairly significant，however． As can be seen from Table $l$ ，there was little disparity in movement or selection of spaming arєz。 In addition，close sorutiny by the observers revealea no noticeable difference in vigor，or inability to find a mate， between the two classes．Selection of mates seemed indiscriminate．

Some of the fish were examined after natural death for degree of spawning．Of four fernale and one maie tagged fish examined，all were totally spamed．Of 14 female and 8 male untagged salmon examined， 10 females and 7 males were totally spawned，and 4 females and 1 male were partially spawned．

A statistical treatment of the survey tabulations yielded Chimsquare values of $2.082,4.928,1.596$ and 0.307 ，with values for $P$ of approximately .70 ． 50 ， 90 ，and .95 for the first through the fourth survey respectively， indicating a high degree of homogeneity in the data。

While the experiment indicates that，on strearns of the character and size，of Hidden Creek，tagging has iittle effect on the subsequent life of the fisin，it should be bome in mind that the same results might not obtain where longer distarces and more time were involved，with possible tag loss， differential orientaむion，and modified physiological reactions induced by tags and the tagging operation．

Table 1.--Numbers of salmon counted in Hidden Creek above point of tagging First Survey--August 17, 1949; afternoon

| Distance | surveyed | Tagged | Untagged |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/2 | mile | 121 | 118 |
| 1 | mile | 38 | 38 |
| $11 / 2$ | miles | 15 | 13 |
| 2 | miles | $\stackrel{1}{\square}$ | 0 |
|  |  | 175 | 175 |
| Second Surrey-august 18, 1949; morning |  |  |  |
| Distance | surveyed | Tagged | Untagged |
| $1 / 2$ | mile | 8 | 13 |
| 1 | mile | 45 | 48 |
| $11 / 2$ | miles | 84 | 76 |
| 2 | miles | 23 | 25 |
|  |  | 160 | 162 |

Third Survey-August 18, 1949; afternoon

| Distance | surveyed | Tagged | Untagged |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/2 | mile | 4 | 4 |
| 1 | mile | 46 | 46 |
| $11 / 2$ | miles | 71 | 79 |
| 2 | miles | 67 | 65 |
|  |  | 188 | $\overline{194}$ |
| Fourth Survey--August 19, 1949; morning |  |  |  |
| Distance | surveyed | Tagged | Untagged |
| 1/2 | mile | 0 | 2 |
| 1 | mile | 41 | 44 |
| 2 | miles* | $\underline{235}$ | 246 |
|  |  | 176 | 192 |

* Station between 1 and 2 mile points was missed by survey crew. Last figure is the aggregate of these.

1. An experiment to determine the effects of tagging with disc tags on the subsequent life of adult red salmon was conducted on a small creek in western Alaska by stopping all migration to the stream except for the simultaneous passage of 197 tagged and 197 untagged salmon, whose further actions were observed on succeeding days.
2. Within three days, 80 percent of the fish were settled and spawning.
3. Movement up the stream was virtually the same for tagged as for untagged fish.
4. No noticeable difference in spawning behavior was detected between the tagged and untagged salmon.
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