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#### Abstract

Flostrand, L., and Schweigert, J.F. 2007. Pacific herring coded wire tagging study: 2006 recoveries. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2771: viii + 32 p.

The results of searching Pacific herring landings from British Columbia roe fisheries in 2006 to recover coded wire tags are presented. It was estimated that $27 \%$ of the total British Columbia roe herring catch by weight, equivalent to approximately 6,069 metric tonnes, was searched for tags at three fish processing plants. Among the three stock assessment regions which had openings for roe herring, the percentages of regional catches searched for tags varied from 19.5 to 29.9\%. A total of 546 tagged herring from six release years were recovered. With respect to year of release, there was 1 recovery from 1999; 3 recoveries from 2000; 30 from 2001; 86 from 2002; 159 from 2003 and 267 from 2004. A total of 52 inter-regional strays were observed and are described. From 2002 releases, 2 were from the Prince Rupert District and recovered in the Central Coast; 1 was from the Central Coast and recovered in the Prince Rupert District and 1 was from the Central Coast and recovered in the Strait of Georgia. From 2003 releases, 7 were from the Prince Rupert District and recovered in the Central Coast; 1 was from the Prince Rupert District and recovered in the Strait of Georgia; 3 were from the Central Coast and recovered in the Prince Rupert District and 6 were from the Central Coast and recovered in the Strait of Georgia. From the 2004 releases, 3 were from the Central Coast and recovered in the Prince Rupert District; 16 were from the Central Coast and recovered in the Strait of Georgia; 1 was from the west coast of Vancouver Island and recovered in the Prince Rupert District and 11 were from the west coast of Vancouver Island and recovered in the Strait of Georgia. In addition to regional strays, there were approximately 88 inter-area strays (with the same region of release and recovery) and there were 406 recoveries having the same area of release and recovery. Observed tag recovery data were related to roe herring catches by region, area(s) and gear type. Using data from specific recovery and release events, we derived estimates of the number of tagged herring recovered per number released, the number of tagged herring recovered per metric tonne of roe herring searched, the number of tagged herring removed by the 2006 roe herring fisheries and the number of tagged herring removed per number released. An additional experiment was conducted during the 2006 tag recovery season to investigate combined rates of tag detection and recovery efficiency in the fish plants. Trials were done by seeding tagged test specimens into catch lots of thawing fish prior to the processing stages of roe extraction. Adjusted estimates of combined tag detection and recovery efficiency ranged from 0.34 to 0.90 , demonstrating considerable variability between fish plants and fishery catch lots.


## RÉSUMÉ

Flostrand, L., et Schweigert, J.F. 2007. Pacific herring coded wire tagging study: 2006 recoveries. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2771: viii + 32 p.

Nous présentons les résultats de la recherche de harengs du Pacifique portant une micromarque magnétisée codée parmi les prises de harengs rogués réalisées en Colombie-Britannique en 2006. Nous estimons que 27,0 \% (en poids) des prises totales, soit quelque 6069 tonnes, ont été examinées dans trois usines de transformation du poisson, pour trouver celles qui portaient une micromarque. Parmi les trois régions côtières d'évaluation des stocks où la pêche du hareng rogué a été autorisée, le pourcentage des prises régionales soumises à cette recherche a varié de 19,5 à 29,9 \%. Au total, 546 harengs qui ont été marqués en saison au cours des six années différentes ont été récupérés (un de 1999; 3 de 2000; 30 de 2001; 86 de 2002; 159 de 2003 et 267 de 2004). Cinquante-deux (52) de ces poissons ont été recapturés dans une région différente de celle où ils ont été marqués. Des harengs marqués en 2002, deux remis à l'eau dans le district de Prince Rupert ont été recapturés sur la côte centrale; un remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale a été recapturé dans le district de Prince Rupert; un remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale a été recapturé dans le district de Prince Rupert et remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale a été recapturé dans le détroit de Georgia. Des harengs marqués en 2003, 7 remis à l'eau dans le district de Prince Rupert ont été recapturés sur la côte centrale; un remis à l'eau dans le district de Prince Rupert a été recapturé dans le détroit de Georgia; trois remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale ont été recapturés dans le district de Prince Rupert et six remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale ont été recapturés dans le détroit de Georgia. Des harengs marqués en 2004, trois remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale ont été recapturés dans le district de Prince Rupert; 16 remis à l'eau sur la côte centrale ont été recapturés dans le détroit de Georgia; un remis à l'eau sur la côte Ouest de l'île de Vancouver a été recapturé dans le district de Prince Rupert et 11 remis à l'eau sur la côte Ouest de l'île de Vancouver ont été recapturés dans le détroit de Georgia. En plus de ces passages d'une région à l'autre, nous avons également observé environ 88 passages d'un secteur à l'autre (à l'intérieur d'une même région de marquage et de recapture). Quelque 406 harengs ont été recapturés au même endroit où ils avaient été remis à l'eau. Nous avons établi le rapport entre les données de harengs marqués récupérés et les prises de harengs rogués selon la région, le secteur et le type d'engin de pêche. À l'aide des données obtenues pour les marquages et les recaptures spécifiques, nous avons aussi estimé le nombre de harengs marqués récupérés par nombre remis à l'eau, le nombre de harengs marqués récupérés par tonne de harengs examinés, le nombre de harengs marqués capturés lors de la pêche de 2006 et le nombre de harengs marqués capturés par nombre remis à l'eau. Une expérience supplémentaire a été menée lors la saison de récupération des étiquettes en 2006 afin d'étudier les taux combinés de détection des étiquettes et de l'efficacité de la recapture dans les usines de transformation du poisson. Des essais ont été réalisés en introduisant des spécimens marqués dans les lots de
poisson congelé avant les étapes de l'extraction de la rogue. Les estimations ajustées des taux combinés de détection des étiquettes et de l'efficacité de la récupération allaient de 0,34 à 0,90 , ce qui démontre une variation considérable entre les usines de transformation.

## INTRODUCTION

The application of coded wire tags (CWT) in Pacific herring began in 1999 and tag recovery from searching roe herring landings began in 2000. The primary purpose of the multi-year tagging study is to increase understanding of herring stock structure by observing inter-annual fidelity and dispersal patterns to spawning sites. Characterizing spatial and temporal patterns of spawning behaviour is critical to the effective management of the resource.

Pacific Fishery Management Area Regulations of the Canadian Fisheries Act identify 30 statistical (or management) areas along the British Columbia (BC) coast, herein referred to as areas, Figure 1. These areas are used for fishery management, enforcement and catch reporting purposes. Specifically for Pacific herring management and stock assessment purposes, there are five stock assessment regions, numerous area subdivisions, and several subdivisions within each area referred to as herring sections (Midgley 2003). The five Pacific herring stock assessment regions are comprised of: 1) the Queen Charlotte Islands (QCI), south-east portions of Area 2E; 2) the Prince Rupert District (PRD), Areas 3 to 5; 3) the Central Coast (CC), Area 7 and portions of 6 to $8 ; 4$ ) the Strait of Georgia (SG), Areas 14 to 19 and portions of 13 and 29, and 5) the west coast of Vancouver Island (WCVI), Areas 23 to 25. For reporting purposes, all releases from Areas 3 to 5 were grouped with the PRD, all releases from Areas 6 to 9 were grouped with the CC, all releases from Areas 14, 16 and 17 were grouped with the SG and all releases from Areas 23 to 26 were grouped with the WCVI.

Prior to 2006, CWTs were applied in the QCI (1999), the SG (1999 to 2003), the PRD (2001 to 2003), the CC (2002 to 2004) and the WCVI (2004). In total 1,364,729 tags were released from 1999 to 2004. Prior to 2006, the searching of roe herring catches for CWTs occurred from 2000 to 2005 and estimates of roe herring searched for tags vary between fishing season, fishing location and gear type. From the 2000 to 2005 roe herring fisheries and tag recovery efforts, 5,462 inter-annual and 2,747 in-season tags were recovered from fish pieces in fish plants. Herring recovered in a different region from where they were tagged are referred to as inter-regional strays (or regional strays). With respect to year of recovery, 3 regional strays were observed in 2000, 1 regional stray was observed in 2001, 4 regional strays were observed in 2002, 41 regional strays were observed in each of 2003 and 2004 and 66 regional strays were observed in 2005. Herring recovered in the same region from where they were tagged but from a different area are referred to as inter-area strays (or area strays). Detailed information on tag release and tag recovery sampling from 1999 to 2005 can be found in Schweigert and Flostrand (2000) and Flostrand and Schweigert (2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007).

The seeding of catch lots in fish plants prior to roe extraction and tag recovery sampling was done for the first time in 2006 to estimate tag detection and recovery efficiencies associated with processing effects, such as size sorting, roe extraction and product conveyance. During all tag recovery seasons (2000 to 2006), hourly recovery
unit tag detection and deflection tests were conducted by dropping seeded specimens on the conveyor belt immediately upstream of a recovery unit. Although results of the hourly test trials consistently indicate that recovery units detected and deflected seeded specimens, the trials do not provide information on tag retention and recovery sampling efficiency from other effects post capture. This report presents results of the 2006 Pacific herring CWT recovery sampling efforts and of the fish plant tag detection and efficiency experiment.

## METHODS

## RECOVERING TAGS FROM 2006 ROE HERRING LANDINGS

The methods applied to the 2006 tag recovery efforts were the same as previous years, using R9500 CWT detectors and deflector gates along conveyor belts at fish plants (Schweigert and Flostrand 2000; Flostrand and Schweigert 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2007). The three fish plants housing the tag recovery equipment were Delta Pacific Seafoods Inc. (DPS and formerly named Icicle Seafoods Inc.), Canadian Fishing Company (CFC), and Bella Coola Fisheries Ltd. (BCF). In 2006, the QCI and WCVI stock assessment regions were closed for roe herring harvests, therefore CWT recovery efforts were focussed on searching representative portions of PRD, CC and SG landings. As in 2003 and 2004, no seined roe herring from Alaska was searched for tags. Tag recovery equipment operated from March 29 to June 8 and J.O. Thomas and Associates (JOT) were again contracted to: operate recovery units; collect recovered specimens, record results of equipment operation; verify catch information related to fish lot processing records and communicate processing schedules and equipment needs with plant staff. Logbooks were kept to document equipment settings, conveyor speeds and loading rates and test trials were conducted approximately every hour using seeded specimens to ensure that recovery units were in working order. Information pertaining to equipment operation is not presented in this report. Tag recovery field staff also removed gill tissue and rinsed each carcass of a putative tagged fish with water to remove possible sources of metal contamination prior to re-testing each specimen for the presence of a tag. This was done to reduce the number of false positive recoveries brought to the laboratory for CWT dissection. Roe herring catch records and CWT search data were compiled into a Microsoft Access database.

## TAG RECOVERIES AND RECOVERY RATES

Tag recovery observations were used to calculate tag recovery rates (described as proportions or percentages), which were determined by relating the number of tags recovered from specific fisheries to the number of tags released from defined 1999 to 2004 release events. Each tag recovery rates was determined by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R R=R / T \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$R \mathrm{R}=$ tag recovery rate;
$R$ = number of tags recovered by release year, region, and area and by recovery region, area and gear;
$\mathrm{T}=$ number of tags released by year, region and area.
Estimates of tag recovery densities were determined by relating the number of tag recoveries from specific fisheries to metric tonne (mt) quantities of roe herring searched. Each tag recovery density was determined by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R D=R / S \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$R D=$ tags recovered per metric tonne of roe herring searched;
$S=$ roe herring catch searched by region, area and gear.

## TAG REMOVALS AND REMOVAL RATES

For each tag release event, the number of tagged herring removed from the population by each 2006 roe herring fishery was estimated by incorporating the estimated proportion of landed roe herring searched for tags (S/C) into the number of observed recoveries:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R^{\prime}=R /(S / C)=\left(R^{*} C\right) / S \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$\mathrm{R}^{\prime}=$ estimated number of tags removed;
$C=$ total roe herring catch by region, area, and gear.
For each tag release event, the proportion of tagged fish removed from the population by each 2006 roe herring fishery was estimated as the tag removal rate. Each tag removal rate was estimated by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{RR}^{\prime}=\mathrm{R}^{\prime} / \mathrm{T}=\mathrm{RR} /(\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{C}) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$R^{\prime}$ = estimated tag removal rate.

## FISH PLANT SEEDING EXPERIMENT

A "seeding" experiment was conducted in 2006 at each of the three fish plants housing tag recovery equipment to investigate potential effects on tag detection and recovery efficiency from fish plant activities. The experiment consisted of seeding totes
of thawing herring with tagged and frozen adult herring (from 170 to 195 mm in length) at a storage stage prior to both roe extraction and tag recovery detection. Each tagged fish was placed in a separate tote of thawing herring in batch sizes of 5 to 15 fish and each batch represented a specific combination of fish plant, thaw date, catch lot (specific to offload vessel, fishery location and gear type), catch lot weight and tag code. Tag recovery efficiencies and catch search rates were proportional measurements applied to characterize results.

In total, 295 totes were seeded using 53 batches of fish. At BCF, gillnet and seine fishery lots each received 10 batches ( 50 totes) of seeding events. At CFC, 7 batches ( 55 totes) were seeded into gillnet lots and 11 batches ( 55 totes) were seeded into seine lots. At DPS, 7 batches ( 40 totes) were seeded into gillnet lots and 8 batches (45 totes) were seeded into seine lots. The type of information recorded with the recovery of a seeded fish was the same as for wild recaptures. To determine each unadjusted (raw) tag recovery efficiency (denoted by $d_{R}$ ), the number of seeded tagged fish recovered by seeding batch (denoted by R) was divided by the respective batch size (denoted by N ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{R}=R / N \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Each of the fish plants had multiple automated roe extraction machines (generally from 3 to 10 depending on fish plant) operating simultaneously on different conveyor lines that converged upstream of the CWT recovery equipment. As a result, fish from different lots but from the same fishery (defined by location and gear type) could mix while being searched by tag recovery equipment. Therefore, seeded recoveries could appear to come from more than one catch lot. To adjust for inherent mixing of fish product on the conveyor lines, the thaw and search totals of the incidental catch lots were added to the thaw and search totals of the seeded lot to derive an adjusted search rate. Search rates (denoted by c) were used to correct for bias in measurements of raw tag recovery efficiencies. To estimate a search rate for each catch lot that was seeded, the estimated amount of catch searched by lot and processing date (denoted by $\mathrm{C}_{\text {search }}$ ) was divided by the respective thaw weight (denoted by $\mathrm{C}_{\text {Thaw }}$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{c}=\mathrm{C}_{\text {Search }} / \mathrm{C}_{\text {Thaw }} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Each measurement of tag recovery efficiency by seeding batch $\left(d_{R}\right)$ was then divided by the respective search rate (c) to derive an adjusted estimate of tag detection and recovery efficiency (denoted by $\mathrm{d}_{\text {Adj }}$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{\text {Adj }}=d_{R} / c \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

thus, $\mathrm{d}_{\text {Adj }}$ is also equivalent to $\left(\mathrm{R}^{*} \mathrm{C}_{\text {Thaw }}\right) /\left(\mathrm{N}^{*} \mathrm{C}_{\text {Search }}\right)$. If adjusted estimates were greater than 1.0 (i.e. where 1= 100\% efficiency), they were set to 1.0.

## RESULTS

## RECOVERING TAGS FROM 2006 ROE HERRING LANDINGS

The total BC catch of roe herring in 2006, including charter vessel catches, was $22,274 \mathrm{mt}$. Roe herring fishery landings and tag recoveries by region, area, gear, and search amounts at the three fish plants are summarized in Table 1. Fishery areas, dates and total landings are described below. The PRD gillnet fishery in Area 4 was from March 25 to 29 and 1,661.3 mt was landed. The PRD seine fishery in Area 5 was from March 23 to 24 and 956.7 mt was landed. The CC seine fishery in Area 7 was from March 21 to 28 and 3,071.8 mt was landed. The SG gillnet fishery in Areas 14 and 17 was from March 4 to 14 and $7,276.9$ mt was landed (but only 34.5 mt of this harvest was from Area 17 and none of that was searched for CWT recovery). The SG seine fishery in Area 14 was from March 5 to 10 and $9,307.7$ mt was landed.

An estimated 6,069.1 mt of the total 2006 BC roe herring catch was searched for CWTs, representing approximately $27 \%$ of the total landed catch. Regionally, approximately $19.5 \%$ of the PRD; $19.8 \%$ of the CC and $29.9 \%$ of the SG catches were searched for CWTs. The estimated percentages of landings searched, by region and fishing gear, were 15.8\% of PRD gillnet; 25.7\% of PRD seine; 19.8\% of CC seine; $26.6 \%$ of SG gillnet and $32.4 \%$ of SG seine (Tables 1 to 6 ). From the $8,938.2 \mathrm{mt}$ coast wide total of all gillnet landings, approximately $24.6 \%$ of that was searched for tagged fish. From the $13,336.2 \mathrm{mt}$ coast wide total of all seine landings, approximately $29.0 \%$ of that was searched for tagged fish. The approximate amounts of roe herring searched at each of the fish plants was $2,596.4 \mathrm{mt}$ at BCF, $1,948.7 \mathrm{mt}$ at CFC and $1,525.9 \mathrm{mt}$ at Icicle.

## TAG RECOVERIES AND RECOVERY RATES

A total of 546 tags were recovered from the 2006 roe herring season. Table 1 presents summary information on tags recovered by recovery region, gear, area, fish plant, catch and search amounts and release year. Table 2 presents summary information on tags recovered by recovery region, area, gear, catch and search amounts, release year, release region, release area and number of tags released and Appendix B lists the number of recoveries by tagging set and release batch size. With respect to each year of release, there was 1 recovery from 1999; 3 recoveries from 2000; 30 from 2001; 86 from 2002; 159 from 2003 and 267 from 2004. A total of 52 inter-regional strays were recovered. From 2002 releases, 2 were from the PRD and recovered in the CC; 1 was from the CC and recovered in the PRD and 1 was from the CC and recovered in the SG. From 2003 releases, 7 were from the PRD and recovered in the CC; 1 was from the PRD and recovered in the SG; 3 were from the CC and recovered in the PRD and 6 were from the CC and recovered in the SG. From the 2004 releases, 3 were from the CC and recovered in the PRD; 16 were from the CC and recovered in the SG; 1 was from the WCVI and recovered in the PRD and 11 were from
the WCVI and recovered in the SG. In addition to regional strays, there were approximately 88 inter-area strays (with the same region of release and recovery) and there were approximately 406 recoveries having the same area of release and recovery. In addition to the observed 546 tag recoveries, 81 herring without tags were collected from the fish plants but were found to contain metal contamination (34 BCF, 24 CFC and 23 DPS) and 1 fish was lost prior to reading its tag code.

Many different combinations of inter-annual spawning patterns representing fidelity or straying at different liberty periods were observed from the sets of tag recoveries. The one seven-year at large and the 3 six-year at large recoveries were all released and recaptured in the SG. Out of the 30 five-year at large recoveries from 2001 releases, 21 were caught in the PRD and 9 were caught in the SG and no inter-regional strays were observed. Out of the 86 four-year at large recoveries from 2002 releases, 57 were caught in the PRD, 11 were caught in the CC and 18 were caught in the SG. Four of the four-year at large recoveries were inter-regional strays: 1 was an Area 6 release recaptured by seine in Area 5; 2 were Area 5 releases recaptured by seine in Area 7, and 1 was an Area 8 release recaptured by seine in Area 14. Out of the 159 three-year at large recoveries from 2003 releases, 78 were caught in the PRD, 44 were caught in the CC and 37 were caught in the SG. Seventeen of the three-year at large recoveries were inter-regional strays: 7 were Area 5 releases recaptured by seine in Area 7; 1 was an Area 5 release recaptured by gillnet in Area 14; 3 were Area 7 releases recaptured by seine in Area 5; 2 were Area 7 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 14 and 2 were Area 7 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14; 1 was an Area 9 release recaptured by gillnet in Area 14 and 1 was an Area 9 release recaptured by seine in Area 14. Out of the 267 two-year at large recoveries from 2004 releases, 4 were caught in the PRD, 236 were caught in the CC and 27 were caught in the SG. Thirty-one of the two-year at large recoveries were inter-regional strays: 2 were Area 6 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4; 2 were Area 6 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14; 1 was an Area 7 release recaptured by seine in Area 5; 3 were Area 7 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14; 2 were Area 8 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 14; 6 were Area 8 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14; 3 were Area 9 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14; 3 were Area 23 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 14; 2 were Area 23 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14; 1 was an Area 24 release recaptured by gillnet in Area 14; 1 was an Area 24 release recaptured by seine in Area 14; 1 was an Area 26 release recaptured by seine in Area 5; 3 were Area 26 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 14 and 1 was an Area 26 release recaptured by seine in Area 14.

Herring CWT recovery rates with respect to release and recovery events are presented in Table 3 and the sums of recovery rates by individual release event are described below. The seven and six-year at large tag recovery rates from 1999 and 2000 releases in Areas 14 and 17 were less than 0.01\%. The five-year at large recovery rate for 2001 releases in Area 4 was 0.03\%. Five-year at large recovery rates for 2001 releases in Areas 5 and 14 were $0.01 \%$ or less. Four-year at large recovery rates for 2002 releases in Areas 4, 5 and 5WI were 0.09, 0.05 and 0.01\%, respectively. Four-year at large recovery rates for 2002 releases in Areas 6, 7, 8 and 14 were all
0.02\%. Three-year at large recovery rates for 2003 releases in Areas 3; 5; 7; 8; 9; 14 and 16 were $0.03 ; 0.08 ; 0.05 ; 0.01 ; 0.03 ; 0.03$ and $0 \%$, respectively. Two-year at large recovery rates for 2002 releases in Areas $6 ; 7 ; 8 ; 9 ; 23 ; 24 ; 25$ and 26 were $0.12 ; 0.17$; $0.02 ; 0.02 ; 0.01 ; 0.01 ; 0$ and $0.02 \%$, respectively.

Recovery rate trends pertaining to intervals within tagging sessions of 2003 and 2004 releases are briefly summarized below (for more information refer to Appendix C). From 6 tagging sessions with only 2 intervals per session, a reduction in recovery rates from the first interval to the second occurred in 4 of the sessions. From 41 sessions with 3 or more intervals, 17 sessions showed no decline in recovery rates with increased interval number, 8 sessions had sequential declines in recovery rates with increased interval number and 16 sessions had non-sequential declines in rates (where the last interval's recovery rate was lower than the first but not lower than all intermediate intervals).

Tag recovery density estimates by each release event and by each 2006 roe herring fishery are presented in Table 4. By period of liberty, the seven-year and sixyear at large SG homing recoveries that were recaptured by gillnet had tag density estimates of 0.001 or less. The tag density estimates for five-year at large recoveries from Area 4 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4 and by seine in Area 5 were 0.073 and 0.004, respectively. The tag density estimates for five-year at large recoveries from Area 5 releases recaptured by seine in Area 5 was 0.004 . The tag density estimates for five-year at large recoveries from Area 14 releases recaptured in Area 14 by gillnet and seine were 0.004 and 0.001, respectively. The tag density estimates for four-year at large recoveries from Area 4 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4 and by seine in Area 5 were 0.156 and 0.012 , respectively. The tag density estimates for four-year at large recoveries from Area 5 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4, by seine in Area 5 and by seine in Area 7 were $0.008,0.037$ and 0.003 , respectively. The tag density estimate for the four-year at large recovery from an Area 5WI release recaptured by seine in Area 5 was 0.004. The tag density estimate for four-year at large recoveries from Area 6 releases recaptured by seine in Area 5 and Area 7 were 0.004 and 0.005 , respectively. The tag density estimate for the four-year at large recoveries recaptured by seine in Area 7 was 0.008 . The tag density estimates for four-year at large recoveries from Area 8 releases recaptured by seine in Area 7 and in Area 14 were 0.002 and less than 0.001, respectively. The tag density estimates for the four-year at large recoveries recaptured by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were 0.006 and 0.002 , respectively. The tag density estimate for three-year at large recoveries from Area 3 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4 was 0.015 . The tag density estimates for threeyear at large recoveries from Area 5 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4, by seine in Area 5, by seine in Area 7 and by gillnet in Area 14 were $0.034,0.252,0.012$ and 0.001 , respectively. The tag density estimates for three-year at large recoveries from Area 7 releases recaptured by seine in Area 5, by seine in Area 7 and by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were $0.012,0.054,0.001$ and 0.001 , respectively. The tag density estimate for three-year at large recoveries from Area 8 releases recaptured by seine in Area 17 was 0.003. The tag density estimates for three-year at large recoveries from Area 9 releases
recaptured by seine in Area 7 and by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were 0.003, 0.001 and less than 0.001, respectively. The tag density estimates for three-year at large recoveries from Area 14 releases recaptured by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were 0.009 and 0.004 , respectively. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 6 releases recaptured by gillnet in Area 4 and by seine in Areas 7 and 14 were $0.008,0.096$ and 0.001, respectively. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 7 releases recaptured by seine in Areas 5, 7 and 14 were 0.004, 0.288 and 0.001 , respectively. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 8 releases recaptured by seine in Area 7 and by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were $0.005,0.001$ and 0.002 , respectively. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 9 releases recaptured by seine in Area 14 was 0.001. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 23 releases recaptured by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were 0.002 and 0.001 , respectively. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 24 releases recaptured by gillnet and seine in Area 14 were 0.001 and less than 0.001, respectively. The tag density estimates for two-year at large recoveries from Area 26 releases recaptured by seine in Area 5 and gillnet and seine in Area 14 were $0.004,0.002$ and less than 0.001 , respectively.

## TAG REMOVALS AND REMOVAL RATES

Estimates of CWT removals and removal rates by release event, area and fishing gear are presented in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. The estimate of the total number of tagged herring removed from the population in the 2006 roe herring fishery is 2,612. Removal estimates for 1999 to 2004 releases are 4; 12; 160; 446; 685 and 1,303, respectively (Table 5). Removal estimates by release and recovery event are given in Table 6. Estimates of tag removal rates ranged from 0 to 0.02\%. Seven-year at large removal rates ranged from 0 to $0.02 \%$ and six-year at large removal rates were 0.01\% or less. Five-year at large removal rates ranged from 0.02 to 0.19\%. Four-year at large removal rates ranged from 0.04 to $0.55 \%$. Three-year at large removal rates ranged from 0.04 to $0.35 \%$. Two-year at large removal rates ranged from 0 to $0.83 \%$.

## FISH PLANT SEEDING EXPERIMENT

Results from the 2006 tag recovery seeding trials show that tag recovery efficiency varied by fish plant and gear type and notably low rates were observed at DPS (Table 7). Raw tag recovery efficiency observations by fish plant and gear type (denoted by $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{R}}$ and derived using Equation 5) ranged from 0.28 to 0.87 and corresponding adjusted estimates of tag recovery efficiency (denoted by $\mathrm{d}_{\text {Adj }}$ and derived using Equation 6) ranged from 0.34 to 0.90 . As a result of the mixing of catch lots during processing conveyance, 26 (13.2\%) of the seeded recoveries were reported as coming from 11 catch lots differing from the ones into which they were seeded. At BCF, raw tag recovery efficiencies were $68 \%(R=34)$ for gillnet catch lots and $74 \%(R=37)$ for
seine catch lots. These results correspond to search rate estimates of $91 \%$ for gillnet catch lots and $94 \%$ for seine catch lots, resulting in adjusted estimates of tag recovery efficiencies of $75 \%$ and $79 \%$, respectively. By seeding batch, adjusted estimates of tag recovery efficiency at BCF varied from 41 to $100 \%$ for gillnet lots and from 20 to $100 \%$ for seine lots. At CFC, raw tag recovery efficiencies were 82\% ( $R=45$ ) for gillnet catch lots and $87 \%(R=48)$ for seine catch lots. These results correspond to search rate estimates of $97 \%$ for both gillnet and seine catch lots, resulting in adjusted estimates of tag recovery efficiencies of $84 \%$ and $90 \%$, respectively. By seeding batch, adjusted estimates of tag recovery efficiency at CFC varied from 72 to $98 \%$ for gillnet lots and from 45 to $100 \%$ for seine lots. At DPS, raw tag recovery efficiencies were $28 \%$ ( $\mathrm{R}=11$ ) for gillnet catch lots and 49\% ( $\mathrm{R}=22$ ) for seine catch lots. These results correspond to search rate estimates of $80 \%$ for gillnet catch lots and $78 \%$ for seine catch lots, resulting in adjusted tag recovery efficiencies of $34 \%$ and $63 \%$, respectively. By seeding batch, adjusted estimates of tag recovery efficiency at DPS varied from 0 to $71 \%$ for gillnet lots and from 47 to $100 \%$ for seine lots.

## DISCUSSION

From the total number of inter-annual tag recoveries collected in 2006, 9.5\% represented inter-regional strays, which is higher than what has been observed in previous CWT recovery years. From the total numbers of inter-annual tag recoveries observed from 2000 to 2005, the percentages which were inter-regional strays were 2.3; $0.23 ; 0.6 ; 3.6 ; 3.3$, and $3.1 \%$, respectively. The relatively high percentage of interregional strays observed in the 2006 tag recovery year could in part be due to sampling bias resulting from the WCVI fishing closure, which eliminated any opportunity of recovering homing fish from 2004 WCVI releases. The percentage of inter-regional strays for all 2004 releases recovered in 2006 was $11.6 \%$ but the percentage of interregional strays for all 2003 releases recovered in 2006 was also notably high (10.7\%) and, unlike the circumstances governing the WCVI, all regions of release in 2003 had roe herring tag recovery sampling in 2006. Furthermore, the percentage of inter-regional strays from 2002 releases was also relatively high (4.7\%). Future work could be done to characterize release and recovery sampling intensities and tag recovery results to try to identify inter-regional movement patterns and intensities between recovery years, liberty periods and release events.

Similar to observations made from 2004 and 2005 tag recoveries, the 2006 tag recoveries which related to 2003 and 2004 batch releases with varying pre-tagging holding interval duration also showed some relatively low recovery rates from longer tag release holding periods. But trends from 2006 recoveries were less apparent than previous recovery years, somewhat due to several release sessions having zero recoveries for all intervals (Appendix C).

The variability in tag recovery efficiencies from the fish plant seeding trials is cause for concern. Although each tag recovery unit was consistently tested (hourly)
over the duration of the study to ensure that its operation was reliable, the 2006 catch lot seeding trials showed that combined effects from the processing stages caused tag detection and recovery to vary between 0.34 and 0.90 . If the results of the 2006 test trials accurately depict undetected recovery efficiency variability on recaptured tagged herring from past tag recovery years, then confounding error of considerable magnitude would adhere to all sets of tag recovery results, thus biasing interpretations that stem from them.

We are uncertain as to why the maximum tag recovery efficiency did not exceed 0.90 (i.e. from seine landings at CFC). One attributing factor could be that seeded specimens were prepared using dead herring, therefore, no tissue healing could occur at the tag insertion site and thus seeded specimens would have been more prone to tag loss than wild releases. Additionally, unlike true product, seeded specimens were not stored in brine prior to roe extraction so their tissue would have been relatively fragile, which could also have contributed to tag loss. Unfortunately, the quality of specimens used in the 2006 seeding trials was not identical to the quality of fish undergoing all processing stages. It is also unfortunate that similar seeding trials were not conducted in previous tag recovery years in order to improve test trial methodology and the interpretation of test trial results.

Compared to the results from the other two fish plants, the lower tag recovery efficiencies at DPS were expected because this plant always had an additional processing stage called pre-sorting. Pre-sorting is the manual removal of male and small fish from conveyor loads prior to roe extraction and it is done to improve plant production by reducing processing loads through the automated roe extraction machines. For all tag recovery years and for all pertinent fisheries, reported estimates of DPS pre-sorted product by JOT staff were mostly in the range of 10 to $20 \%$ (based on tote weight and volume observations). However, differentials between DPS tag recovery test trial efficiencies and those of the other two plants were found to be 0.27 and 0.42 for gillnet catch lots and 0.16 and 0.27 for seine catch lots. One explanation for the discrepancies in tag recovery efficiencies between fish plants is that staff conducting tag recovery sampling at DPS missed or misinterpreted amounts of presorted fish. They likely did misinterpret amounts because small fish have greater densities (numbers of fish per tote) than large fish and JOT estimates were based on tote volume and weight measurements rather than conversions that account for fish numbers or fish densities.

Due to the prevalence of roe herring fishery closures in some BC regions and the high operational costs associated with CWT release and recovery sampling, there are no plans to continue CWT sampling of Pacific herring in the near future. Future work will focus on analyzing results and developing analytical models. Future field observations into herring dispersal and stock structure will likely require applications of new technologies for marking or characterizing herring samples.
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Table 1. Summary of 2006 CWT recoveries by stock assessment region, fishing gear, statistical area, fish plant of recovery, catch searched for tags, total roe fishery catch, percent of total catch searched and tag release year.

| Region | Gear | Area | Fish <br> Plant | Catch (mt) Searched | Total (mt) Catch | \% Catch Searched | CWT Recoveries by Release Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | All |
| PRD | GN | 4 | BCF | 264.0 | 1,661.3 | 15.9 | - | - | 19 | 43 | 13 | 2 | 77 |
|  | SN | 5 | BCF | 178.7 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 10 | 44 |  | 56 |
|  |  |  | CFC | 67.1 | - | - | - |  | - | 4 | 21 | 2 | 27 |
|  |  |  | All | 245.9 | 956.7 | 25.7 | - | - | 2 | 14 | 65 | 2 | 83 |
|  | Both | 4,5 | All | 509.8 | 2,618.0 | 19.5 | - | - | 21 | 57 | 78 | 4 | 160 |
| CC | SN | 7 | BCF | 322.1 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 24 | 105 | 135 |
|  |  |  | CFC | 45.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 24 | 25 |
|  |  |  | DPS | 239.5 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 19 | 107 | 131 |
|  |  |  | All | 606.9 | 3,071.8 | 19.8 | - | - | - | 11 | 44 | 236 | 291 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| SG | GN | 14,17 | BCF | 820.1 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 21 |
|  |  |  | CFC | 706.7 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 23 |
|  |  |  | DPS | 407.3 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  | 8 |
|  |  |  | All | 1,934.2 | 7,276.9 | 26.6 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 21 | 9 | 52 |
|  | SN | 14 | BCF | 1,011.5 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 |
|  |  |  | CFC | 1,129.5 | - | - | - | - |  | 4 | 10 | 9 | 23 |
|  |  |  | DPS | 879.1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 11 |
|  |  |  | All | 3,020.1 | 9,307.7 | 32.4 | - | - | 2 | 7 | 16 | 18 | 43 |
|  | Both | 14,17 | All | 4,954.2 | 16,584.6 | 29.9 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 18 | 37 | 27 | 95 |

Table 1 (continued).

| Region | Gear | Area | Fish <br> Plant | Catch (mt) Searched | Total (mt) Catch | \% Catch Searched | CWT Recoveries by Release Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | All |
| BC | Both | All | BCF | 2,596.4 | - | - | - | - | 25 | 63 | 92 | 118 | 298 |
|  |  |  | CFC | 1,948.7 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 41 | 39 | 98 |
|  |  |  | DPS | 1,525.9 | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | 11 | 26 | 110 | 150 |
| BC | GN | All | All | 2,198.0 | 8,938.2 | 24.6 | 1 | 3 | 26 | 54 | 34 | 11 | 129 |
|  | SN | All | All | 3,872.0 | 13,336.2 | 29.0 | - | - | 4 | 32 | 125 | 256 | 417 |
|  | Both | All | All | 6,069.1 | 22,274.4 | 27.2 | 1 | 3 | 30 | 86 | 159 | 267 | 546 |

Table 2. Summary of 2006 CWT recoveries by assessment region, statistical area and fishing gear.

| RECOVERY | $Y$ Region |  |  | PRD | PRD | CC | SG | SG | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area |  |  | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14,17 | 14 |  |
|  | Gear |  |  | GN | SN | SN | GN | SN |  |
|  | Total C | atch (mt) |  | 1,661.3 | 956.7 | 3,071.8 | 7,276.9 | 9,307.7 | 22,274.4 |
|  | Catch | earched |  | 264.0 | 245.9 | 606.9 | 1,934.2 | 3,020.1 | 6,069.1 |
|  | Catch | earched |  | 15.9 | 25.7 | 19.8 | 26.6 | 32.4 | 27.2 |
| RELEASE   <br> Year Region  <br>    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | QCI | 2E | 6,175 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG | 14 | 23,187 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
|  | SG | 17 | 14,266 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 5,815 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1999/00 | SG ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 14, 17 | 7,141 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | SG | 14 | 180,229 | - | - | - | 2 | - | 2 |
|  | SG | 17 | 58,994 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 6,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2001 | PRD | 4 | 65,809 | 19 | 1 | - | - | - | 20 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 22,387 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
|  | SG | 14 | 60,558 | - | - | - | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| 2002 | PRD | 4 | 48,960 | 41 | 3 | - | - | - | 44 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 25,701 | 2 | 9 | 2 | - | - | 13 |
|  | PRD | 5 WI | 11,081 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
|  | CC | 6 | 18,168 | - | 1 | 3 | - | - | 4 |
|  | CC | 7 | 31,027 | - | - | 5 | - | - | 5 |
|  | CC | 8 | 9,463 | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 |
|  | SG | 14 | 83,528 | - | - | - | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| 2003 | PRD | 3 | 15,066 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 4 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 96,434 | 9 | 62 | 7 | 1 | - | 79 |
|  | CC | 7 | 79,920 | - | 3 | 33 | 2 | 2 | 40 |
|  | CC | 8 | 27,453 | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 |
|  | CC | 9 | 13,660 | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
|  | SG | 14 | 89,247 | - | - | - | 17 | 13 | 30 |
|  | SG | 16 | 6,643 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2004 | CC | 6 | 52,049 | 2 | - | 58 | - | 2 | 62 |
|  | CC | 7 | 107,843 | - | 1 | 175 | - | 3 | 179 |
|  | CC | 8 | 44,614 | - | - | 3 | 2 | 6 | 11 |
|  | CC | 9 | 17,770 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 3 |
|  | WCVI | 23 | 33,608 | - | - | - | 3 | 2 | 5 |
|  | WCVI | 24 | 32,421 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | WCVI | 25 | 38,601 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | WCVI | 26 | 27,181 | - | 1 |  | 3 | 1 | 5 |
|  | WCVI, CC ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 8, 25 | 3,259 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All | All |  | 1,364,729 | 77 | 83 | 291 | 52 | 43 | 546 |

5 WI refers to Wilson Inlet release event (southern PRD).
${ }^{\mathrm{w}}$ within year discrepancy (WYD); ${ }^{\text {b }}$ between year discrepancy (BYD).

Table 3. Estimates of 2005 CWT recovery rates (percentage of the released tags recovered) by assessment region, statistical area and fishing gear.

| RECOVERY | $Y$ Region |  |  | PRD | PRD | CC | SG | SG | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area |  |  | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14,17 | 14 |  |
|  | Gear |  |  | GN | SN | SN | GN | SN |  |
|  | Total Ca | ( mt ) |  | 1,661.3 | 956.7 | 3,071.8 | 7,276.9 | 9,307.7 | 22,274.4 |
|  | Catch Sear | earched (mt) |  | 264.0 | 245.9 | 606.9 | 1,934.2 | 3,020.1 | 6,069.1 |
|  | Catch Sear | arched (\%) |  | 15.9 | 25.7 | 19.8 | 26.6 | 32.4 | 27.2 |
| RELEASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Region | Area | CWT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | QCI | 2E | 6,175 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG | 14 | 23,187 | - | - | - | <0.01 | - | <0.01 |
|  | SG | 17 | 14,266 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 5,815 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1999/00 | SG ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 14, 17 | 7,141 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | SG | 14 | 180,229 | - | - | - | <0.01 | - | <0.01 |
|  | SG | 17 | 58,994 | - | - | - | <0.01 | - | <0.01 |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 6,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2001 | PRD | 4 | 65,809 | 0.03 | <0.01 | - | - | - | 0.03 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 22,387 | - | <0.01 | - | - | - | <0.01 |
|  | SG | 14 | 60,558 | - | - | - | 0.01 | <0.01 | 0.01 |
| 2002 | PRD | 4 | 48,960 | 0.08 | 0.01 | - | - | - | 0.09 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 25,701 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | - | - | 0.05 |
|  | PRD | 5WI | 11,081 | - | 0.01 | - | - | - | 0.01 |
|  | CC | 6 | 18,168 | - | 0.01 | 0.02 | - | - | 0.02 |
|  | CC | 7 | 31,027 | - | - | 0.02 | - | - | 0.02 |
|  | CC | 8 | 9,463 | - | - | 0.01 | - | 0.01 | 0.02 |
|  | SG | 14 | 83,528 | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| 2003 | PRD | 3 | 15,066 | 0.03 | - | - | - | - | 0.03 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 96,434 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.01 | <0.01 | - | 0.08 |
|  | CC | 7 | 79,920 | - | <0.01 | 0.04 | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.05 |
|  | CC | 8 | 27,453 | - | - | <0.01 | - | - | 0.01 |
|  | CC | 9 | 13,660 | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
|  | SG | 14 | 89,247 | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 |
|  | SG | 16 | 6,643 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2004 | CC | 6 | 52,049 | <0.01 | - | 0.11 | - | <0.01 | 0.12 |
|  | CC | 7 | 107,843 | - | <0.01 | 0.16 | - | <0.01 | 0.17 |
|  | CC | 8 | 44,614 | - | - | 0.01 | <0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
|  | CC | 9 | 17,770 | - | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.02 |
|  | WCVI | 23 | 33,608 | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | WCVI | 24 | 32,421 | - | - | - | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.01 |
|  | WCVI | 25 | 38,601 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | WCVI | 26 | 27,181 | - | <0.01 |  | 0.01 | $<0.01$ | 0.02 |
|  | WCVI, CC ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 8, 25 | 3,259 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

5WI refers to Wilson Inlet release event (southern PRD).
${ }^{\mathrm{w}}$ within year discrepancy (WYD); ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ between year discrepancy (BYD).

Table 4. Estimates of 2006 tag densities (CWTs recovered per tonne of roe herring searched) by assessment region, statistical area and fishing gear.

| RECOVERY | $Y$ Region |  |  | PRD | PRD | CC | SG | SG | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area |  |  | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14,17 | 14 |  |
|  | Gear |  |  | GN | SN | SN | GN | SN |  |
|  | Total Ca | tch (mt) |  | 1,661.3 | 956.7 | 3,071.8 | 7,276.9 | 9,307.7 | 22,274.4 |
|  | Catch Sea | earched |  | 264.0 | 245.9 | 606.9 | 1,934.2 | 3,020.1 | 6,069.1 |
|  | Catch Sear | earched |  | 15.9 | 25.7 | 19.8 | 26.6 | 32.4 | 27.2 |
| RELEASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year |  | Region Area CWT | CWT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | QCI | 2E | 6,175 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG | 14 | 23,187 | - | - | - | 0.001 | - | <0.001 |
|  | SG | 17 | 14,266 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG ${ }^{W}$ | 14, 17 | 5,815 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1999/00 | SG ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 14, 17 | 7,141 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 |  | 14 | 180,229 | - | - | - | 0.001 | - | <0.001 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SG } \\ & \text { SG } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 58,994 | - | - | - | 0.001 | - | <0.001 |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 6,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2001 | PRD | 4 | 65,809 | 0.073 | 0.004 | - | - | - | 0.003 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 22,387 | - | 0.004 | - | - | - | <0.001 |
|  | SG | 14 | 60,558 | - | - | - | 0.004 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| 2002 | PRD | 4 | 48,960 | 0.156 | 0.012 | - | - | - | 0.007 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 25,701 | 0.008 | 0.037 | 0.003 | - | - | 0.002 |
|  | PRD | 5WI | 11,081 | - | 0.004 | , | - | - | <0.001 |
|  | CC | 6 | 18,168 | - | 0.004 | 0.005 | - | - | 0.001 |
|  | CC | 7 | 31,027 | - | - | 0.008 | - | - | 0.001 |
|  | CC | 8 | 9,463 | - | - | 0.002 | - | <0.001 | <0.001 |
|  | SG | 14 | 83,528 | - | - | - | 0.006 | 0.002 | 0.003 |
| 2003 | PRD | 3 | 15,066 | 0.015 | - | - | - | - | 0.001 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 96,434 | 0.034 | 0.252 | 0.012 | 0.001 | - | 0.013 |
|  | CC | 7 | 79,920 | - | 0.012 | 0.054 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.007 |
|  | CC | 8 | 27,453 | - | - | 0.003 | - | - | <0.001 |
|  | CC | 9 | 13,660 | - | - | 0.003 | 0.001 | <0.001 | 0.001 |
|  | SG | 14 | 89,247 | - | - | - | 0.009 | 0.004 | 0.005 |
|  | SG | 16 | 6,643 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2004 | CC | 6 | 52,049 | 0.008 | - | 0.096 | - | 0.001 | 0.010 |
|  | CC | 7 | 107,843 | - | 0.004 | 0.288 | - | 0.001 | 0.029 |
|  | CC | 8 | 44,614 | - | - | 0.005 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.002 |
|  | CC | 9 | 17,770 | - | - | - | - | 0.001 | <0.001 |
|  | WCVI | 23 | 33,608 | - | - | - | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
|  | WCVI | 24 | 32,421 | - | - | - | 0.001 | <0.001 | <0.001 |
|  | WCVI | 25 | 38,601 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | WCVI | 26 | 27,181 | - | 0.004 |  | 0.002 | <0.001 | 0.001 |
|  | $\text { WCVI, CC }{ }^{\text {w }}$ | 8,25 | 3,259 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All | All |  | 1,364,729 | 0.294 | 0.338 | 0.479 | 0.027 | 0.014 | 0.090 |

5 WI refers to Wilson Inlet release event (southern PRD).
${ }^{\mathrm{w}}$ within year discrepancy (WYD); ${ }^{\text {b }}$ between year discrepancy (BYD).

Table 5. Estimates of 2006 CWT removals by assessment region, statistical area and fishing gear.

| RECOVERY | $Y$ Region |  |  | PRD | PRD | CC | SG | SG | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area |  |  | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14,17 | 14 |  |
|  | Gear |  |  | GN | SN | SN | GN | SN |  |
|  | Total C | atch (mt) |  | 1,661.3 | 956.7 | 3,071.8 | 7,276.9 | 9,307.7 | 22,274.4 |
|  | Catch | earched |  | 264.0 | 245.9 | 606.9 | 1,934.2 | 3,020.1 | 6,069.1 |
|  | Catch | earched |  | 15.9 | 25.7 | 19.8 | 26.6 | 32.4 | 27.2 |
| RELEASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Region | Area | CWT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | QCI | 2E | 6,175 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG | 14 | 23,187 | - | - | - | 4 | - | 4 |
|  | SG | 17 | 14,266 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 5,815 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1999/00 | SG ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 14, 17 | 7,141 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | SG | 14 | 180,229 | - | - | - | 8 | - | 8 |
|  | SG | 17 | 58,994 | - | - | - | 4 | - | 4 |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 6,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2001 | PRD | 4 | 65,809 | 120 | 4 | - | - | - | 124 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 22,387 | - | 4 | - | - | - | 4 |
|  | SG | 14 | 60,558 | - | - | - | 26 | 6 | 32 |
| 2002 | PRD | 4 | 48,960 | 260 | 12 | - | - | - | 272 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 25,701 | 13 | 35 | 10 | - | - | 58 |
|  | PRD | 5 WI | 11,081 | - | 4 | - | - | - | 4 |
|  | CC | 6 | 18,168 | - | 4 | 15 | - | - | 19 |
|  | CC | 7 | 31,027 | - | - | 25 | - | - | 25 |
|  | CC | 8 | 9,463 | - | - | 5 | - | 3 | 8 |
|  | SG | 14 | 83,528 | - | - | - | 41 | 18 | 60 |
| 2003 | PRD | 3 | 15,066 | 25 | - | - | - | - | 25 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 96,434 | 57 | 241 | 35 | 4 | - | 337 |
|  | CC | 7 | 79,920 | - | 12 | 167 | 8 | 6 | 192 |
|  | CC | 8 | 27,453 | - | - | 10 | - | - | 10 |
|  | CC | 9 | 13,660 | - | - | 10 | 4 | 3 | 17 |
|  | SG | 14 | 89,247 | - | - | - | 64 | 40 | 104 |
|  | SG | 16 | 6,643 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2004 | CC | 6 | 52,049 | 13 | - | 294 | - | 6 | 312 |
|  | CC | 7 | 107,843 | - | 4 | 886 | - | 9 | 899 |
|  | CC | 8 | 44,614 | - | - | 15 | 8 | 18 | 41 |
|  | CC | 9 | 17,770 | - | - | - | - | 9 | 9 |
|  | WCVI | 23 | 33,608 | - | - | - | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  | WCVI | 24 | 32,421 | - | - | - | 4 | 3 | 7 |
|  | WCVI | 25 | 38,601 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | WCVI | 26 | 27,181 | - | 4 |  | 11 | 3 | 18 |
|  | WCVI, CC ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 8, 25 | 3,259 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All | All |  | 1,364,729 | 488 | 323 | 1,473 | 196 | 133 | 2,612 |

5 WI refers to Wilson Inlet release event (southern PRD).
${ }^{\text {w }}$ within year discrepancy (WYD); ${ }^{\text {b }}$ between year discrepancy (BYD).

Table 6. Estimates of 2006 CWT removal rates (percentage of the released tag removed) from all roe herring catches by assessment region, statistical area and fishing gear.

| RECOVERY | $Y$ Region |  |  | PRD | PRD | CC | SG | SG | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area |  |  | 4 | 5 | 7 | 14,17 | 14 |  |
|  | Gear |  |  | GN | SN | SN | GN | SN |  |
|  | Total C | tch (mt) |  | 1,661.3 | 956.7 | 3,071.8 | 7,276.9 | 9,307.7 | 22,274.4 |
|  | Catch S | earched |  | 264.0 | 245.9 | 606.9 | 1,934.2 | 3,020.1 | 6,069.1 |
|  | Catch S | earched |  | 15.9 | 25.7 | 19.8 | 26.6 | 32.4 | 27.2 |
| RELEASE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Region | Area | CWT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | QCI | 2E | 6,175 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG | 14 | 23,187 | - | - | - | 0.02 | - | 0.02 |
|  | SG | 17 | 14,266 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 5,815 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1999/00 | SG ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 14, 17 | 7,141 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2000 | SG | 14 | 180,229 | - | - | - | <0.01 | - | <0.01 |
|  | SG | 17 | 58,994 | - | - | - | 0.01 | - | 0.01 |
|  | SG ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 14, 17 | 6,471 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2001 | PRD | 4 | 65,809 | 0.18 | 0.01 | - | - | - | 0.19 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 22,387 | - | 0.02 | - | - | - | 0.02 |
|  | SG | 14 | 60,558 | - | - | - | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| 2002 | PRD | 4 | 48,960 | 0.53 | 0.02 | - | - | - | 0.55 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 25,701 | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.04 | - | - | 0.22 |
|  | PRD | 5 WI | 11,081 | - | 0.04 | - | - | - | 0.04 |
|  | CC | 6 | 18,168 | - | 0.02 | 0.08 | - | - | 0.10 |
|  | CC | 7 | 31,027 | - | - | 0.08 | - | - | 0.08 |
|  | CC | 8 | 9,463 | - | - | 0.05 | - | 0.03 | 0.09 |
|  | SG | 14 | 83,528 | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.07 |
| 2003 | PRD | 3 | 15,066 | 0.17 | - | - | - | - | 0.17 |
|  | PRD | 5 | 96,434 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.04 | <0.01 | - | 0.35 |
|  | CC | 7 | 79,920 | - | 0.01 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.24 |
|  | CC | 8 | 27,453 | - | - | 0.04 | - | - | 0.04 |
|  | CC | 9 | 13,660 | - | - | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.12 |
|  | SG | 14 | 89,247 | - | - | - | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.12 |
|  | SG | 16 | 6,643 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2004 | CC | 6 | 52,049 | 0.02 | - | 0.56 | - | 0.01 | 0.60 |
|  | CC | 7 | 107,843 | - | <0.01 | 0.82 | - | 0.01 | 0.83 |
|  | CC | 8 | 44,614 | - | - | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
|  | CC | 9 | 17,770 | - | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.05 |
|  | WCVI | 23 | 33,608 | - | - | - | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.05 |
|  | WCVI | 24 | 32,421 | - | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
|  | WCVI | 25 | 38,601 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | WCVI | 26 | 27,181 | - | 0.01 |  | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.07 |
|  | WCVI, CC ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 8, 25 | 3,259 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

5WI refers to Wilson Inlet release event (southern PRD).
${ }^{\mathrm{w}}$ within year discrepancy (WYD); ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ between year discrepancy (BYD).

Table 7. Tag recovery efficiencies from seeding batches of tagged fish into totes of thawing fish at fish plants housing tag recovery equipment.

| Plant | Gear | SAR | Date Seeded | N | $\mathrm{C}_{\text {Thaw }}$ | Date Recovered | Lot Identifier | $\mathrm{C}_{\text {Search }}$ | R* | C | $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $\mathrm{d}_{\text {Adj }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BCF | GN | SG | Apr. 28 | 5 | 61 | May 1 | 4023 | 59 | 2 | 0.97 | 0.40 | 0.41 |
| BCF | GN | PRD | May 2 | 5 | 62 | May 5 | 6006 | 60 | 4 | 0.97 | 0.80 | 0.82 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 2 | 5 | 34 | May 5 | 4008A | 34 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 5 | 5 | 37 | May 5 | 4052 | 37 | 5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 5 | 5 | 24 | May 8 | 4011A | 24 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 5 | 5 | 42 | May 8 | 4066 (4052) | 10 | 2 (1) | 0.24 | 0.40 | 1.00 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 9 | 5 | 43 | May 12 | 4070 | 43 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 12 | 5 | 54 | May 12 | 4052A | 54 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 12 | 5 | 31 | May 15 | 4046 | 25 | 2 | 0.81 | 0.40 | 0.49 |
| BCF | GN | SG | May 12 | 5 | 67 | May 15 | 4036 | 66 | 5 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| BCF | GN | ALL | ALL | 50 | 455 | ALL | ALL | 412 | 34 (1) | 0.91 | 0.68 | 0.75 |
| BCF | SN | SG | Apr. 29 | 5 | 50 | May 2 | 4509 | 47 | 3 | 0.94 | 0.60 | 0.64 |
| BCF | SN | SG | Apr. 30 | 5 | 87 | May 3 | 4509A (4511) | 87 | 5 (1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 1 | 5 | 49 | May 4 | 4520A | 49 | 1 | 0.99 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 1 | 5 | 33 | May 4 | 4506A | 20 | 4 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 1.00 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 1 | 5 | 13 | May 4 | 4504 | 13 | 4 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.81 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 6 | 5 | 25 | May 9 | 4502 | 25 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| BCF | SN | PRD | May 6 | 5 | 62 | May 9 | 6509 | 62 | 3 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 10 | 5 | 23 | May 10 | 4513 (4503) | 23 | 5 (1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 7 | 5 | 32 | May 10 | 4503 | 23 | 3 | 0.72 | 0.60 | 0.83 |
| BCF | SN | SG | May 7 | 5 | 31 | May 10, 11 | 4504A | 31 | 5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| BCF | SN | ALL | ALL | 50 | 405 | ALL | ALL | 380 | 37 (2) | 0.94 | 0.74 | 0.79 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 2 | 5 | 28 | May 4 | 10376 | 26 | 4 | 0.93 | 0.80 | 0.86 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 3 | 5 | 58 | May 5 | 10393 (10395) | 57 | 4 (1) | 0.98 | 0.80 | 0.82 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 10 | 10 | 53 | May 12 | 10392 (10205) | 52 | 8 (1) | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.81 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 14 | 5 | 31 | May 16 | 10353 | 30 | 4 | 0.98 | 0.80 | 0.81 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 14 | 5 | 26 | May 16 | 10382 | 25 | 4 | 0.97 | 0.80 | 0.82 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 24 | 15 | 46 | May 26 | 10079 | 44 | 14 | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.98 |
| CFC | GN | SG | May 24 | 10 | 26 | May 24 | 10083 | 25 | 7 | 0.97 | 0.70 | 0.72 |
| CFC | GN | SG | ALL | 55 | 267 | ALL | ALL | 259 | 45 (2) | 0.97 | 0.82 | 0.84 |

Table 7 (continued).

| Plant | Gear | SAR | Date Seeded | N | $\mathrm{C}_{\text {Thaw }}$ | Date Recovered | Lot Identifier | $\mathrm{C}_{\text {Search }}$ | R* | C | $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | $\mathrm{d}_{\text {Adj }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CFC | SN | SG | Apr. 26 | 5 | 75 | Apr. 28 | 10359 | 67 | 2 | 0.89 | 0.40 | 0.45 |
| CFC | SN | SG | Apr. 30 | 5 | 39 | May 2 | 10076 (10080) | 39 | 5 (3) | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 1 | 5 | 30 | May 3 | 10073 (10066) | 30 | 5 (1) | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CFC | SN | PRD | May 7 | 5 | 52 | May 7 | 1992 | 51 | 4 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 0.81 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 8 | 5 | 61 | May 10 | 10068 (10372) | 60 | 5 (1) | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 9 | 5 | 31 | May 11, 12 | 10372 (10392) | 30 | 5 (1) | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 15 | 5 | 53 | May 17 | 10358 | 51 | 4 | 0.96 | 0.80 | 0.83 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 16 | 5 | 33 | May 18 | 10378 (10379) | 33 | 4 (3) | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 17 | 5 | 50 | May 19 | 10385 | 50 | 4 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| CFC | SN | CC | May 22 | 5 | 50 | May 24 | 10087 | 50 | 5 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CFC | SN | SG | May 23 | 5 | 19 | May 25 | 10067 (U3706) | 18 | 5 (5) | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| CFC | SN | ALL | ALL | 55 | 493 | ALL | ALL | 479 | 48 (14) | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.90 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 10 | 10 | 30 | May 12 | 10387 | 24 | 4 | 0.80 | 0.40 | 0.50 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 10 | 5 | 19 | May 12 | 10216 | 16 | 1 | 0.86 | 0.20 | 0.23 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 10 | 5 | 26 | May 12 | 10389 | 22 | 3 | 0.85 | 0.60 | 0.71 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 10 | 5 | 62 | May 23 | 10060 | 55 | 0 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 24 | 5 | 28 | May 26 | 10212 | 22 | 1 | 0.79 | 0.20 | 0.25 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 25 | 5 | 55 | May 27 | 10061 | 45 | 1 | 0.82 | 0.20 | 0.24 |
| DPS | GN | SG | May 25 | 5 | 27 | May 27 | 10078 | 13 | 1 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.42 |
| DPS | GN | SG | ALL | 40 | 247 | ALL | ALL | 197 | 11 | 0.80 | 0.28 | 0.34 |
| DPS | SN | SG | Apr. 27 | 5 | 61 | Apr. 29, May 1 | 10055 | 50 | 2 | 0.82 | 0.40 | 0.49 |
| DPS | SN | SG | May 1 | 5 | 55 | May 3 | 10373 | 46 | 2 | 0.83 | 0.40 | 0.48 |
| DPS | SN | SG | May 3 | 5 | 49 | May 5 | 10367 (10368) | 47 | 1 (1) | 0.96 | 0.20 | 0.21 |
| DPS | SN | SG | May 9 | 5 | 27 | May 11 | 7001 (4507) | 23 | 2 (2) | 0.85 | 0.40 | 0.47 |
| DPS | SN | SG | May 9 | 5 | 16 | May 11 | 10365 | 13 | 4 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.98 |
| DPS | SN | CC | May 13 | 10 | 67 | May 15 | 10089 (10371) | 34 | 6 (4) | 0.51 | 0.60 | 1.00 |
| DPS | SN | SG | May 27 | 5 | 25 | May 29 | 10362 | 20 | 3 | 0.80 | 0.60 | 0.75 |
| DPS | SN | SG | May 27 | 5 | 25 | May 29 | 10207 | 20 | 2 | 0.80 | 0.40 | 0.50 |
| DPS | SN | ALL | ALL | 45 | 325 | ALL | ALL | 253 | 22 (7) | 0.78 | 0.49 | 0.63 |

[^0]

Figure 1. The coast of British Columbia, shown divided into representative inshore fisheries statistical (management) areas.
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Appendix A. Summary of 1999 to 2004 herring releases with binary tag code discrepancies and subsequent 2006 tag recoveries.

| Discrepancy | Release year | Tag code | Set \# | RelStat | Section | CWTs | $2006$ <br> Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Within year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1999 | 18-12-13 | 13 | 14 | 143 | 3,310 | 0 |
|  | 1999 | 18-12-32 | 12 | 17 | 173 | 2,505 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-12-19 | 14, 15 | 14 | 143 | 2,506 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 02-12-12 | 21 | 14 | 143 | 9,108 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-03-34 | 11 | 14 | 142 | 6,356 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-42-17 | 16, 17 | 14 | 143 | 7,030 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-34-42 | 19 | 14 | 142 | 511 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-42-23 | 19 | 14 | 142 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 02-13-12 | 5 | 14 | 142 | 3,017 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-14-43 | 25 | 17 | 173 | 3,454 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-34-35 | 13 | 14 | 143 | 2,024 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-34-45 | 13 | 14 | 143 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-31-11 | 27 | 17 | 172 | 3,312 | 0 |
|  | 2000 | 18-31-10 | 27 | 17 | 172 | 3,060 | 0 |
|  | 2003 | 18-45-61 | 15 | 7 | 076 | 868 | 1 |
|  |  | 18-45-61 | 16 | 7 | 074 | 1,121 |  |
|  | 2004 | 18-45-39 | 9 | 25 | 253 | 2,833 | 0 |
|  |  | 18-45-39 | 12 | 8 | 085 | 426 | 0 |
|  | Total | 14 codes |  |  |  | 46,193 | 1 |
| Between years ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1999 | 18-08-48 | 1 | 14 | 142 | 2,587 |  |
|  | 2000 |  | 30 | 17 | 172 | 952 |  |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | 3,539 | 0 |
|  | 1999 | 18-15-63 | 3 | 14 | 142 | 1,857 |  |
|  | 2000 |  | 23, 24 | 17 | 173 | 1,745 |  |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | 3,602 | 0 |
|  | Total | 2 codes |  |  |  | 7,141 | 0 |

${ }^{a}$ Tag code mislabelling occurred between codes used within the same year and stock region.

Appendix B. Summary of herring CWT releases from 1999 to 2004 and subsequent 2006 tag recoveries by release set identification code (year and set number), release stock assessment region, release statistical area, release location, release date, code discrepancy and release batch size.

| Set Id ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Region | Area | Location | Date | Disc ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Releases | Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999-001 | SG | 14 | Fillongley Park | 02/03/1999 | BYD | 3,539 |  |
| 1999-002 | SG | 14 | Whalebone Point | 04/03/1999 |  | 3,751 |  |
| 1999-003 | SG | 14 | Phipps Point | 04/03/1999 | BYD | 3,602 |  |
| 1999-004 | SG | 14 | Bowser | 05/03/1999 |  | 3,006 |  |
| 1999-005 | SG | 14 | Qualicum Bay | 06/03/1999 |  | 3,590 |  |
| 1999-006 | SG | 14 | Qualicum Bay | 06/03/1999 |  | 3,670 | 1 |
| 1999-007 | SG | 14 | Metcalfe Bay | 07/03/1999 |  | 675 |  |
| 1999-008 | SG | 14 | Chrome Island | 09/03/1999 |  | 1,644 |  |
| 1999-009 | SG | 17 | Link Island | 15/03/1999 |  | 1,964 |  |
| 1999-010 | SG | 17 | Jesse Island | 15/03/1999 |  | 3,597 |  |
| 1999-011 | SG | 17 | McKay Point | 16/03/1999 |  | 3,370 |  |
| 1999-012 | SG | 17 | Link Island | 18/03/1999 |  | 913 |  |
| 1999-012 | SG | 17 | Link Island | 18/03/1999 | WYD | 2,505 |  |
| 1999-013 | SG | 14 | French Creek | 18/03/1999 | WYD | 3,310 |  |
| 1999-014 | SG | 14 | French Creek | 19/03/1999 |  | 3,438 |  |
| 1999-015 | SG | 14 | French Creek | 19/03/1999 |  | 3,413 |  |
| 1999-016 | SG | 17 | Link Island | 20/03/1999 |  | 4,422 |  |
| 1999-017 | QC | 02E | Wanderer Island | 26/03/1999 |  | 1,141 |  |
| 1999-018 | QC | 02E | Wanderer Island | 27/03/1999 |  | 2,002 |  |
| 1999-019 | QC | 02E | Wanderer Island | 28/03/1999 |  | 3,032 |  |
| 2000-001 | SG | 14 | Fillongley Park | 26/02/2000 |  | 18,963 |  |
| 2000-003 | SG | 14 | Fillongley Park | 27/02/2000 |  | 13,472 |  |
| 2000-004 | SG | 14 | Big Qualicum | 29/02/2000 |  | 13,304 |  |
| 2000-005 | SG | 14 | Boyle Point | 03/03/2000 | WYD | 6,471 |  |
| 2000-005 | SG | 14 | Boyle Point | 03/03/2000 |  | 4,809 |  |
| 2000-006 | SG | 14 | Boyle Point | 03/03/2000 |  | 15,489 |  |
| 2000-007 | SG | 14 | Repulse Point | 03/03/2000 |  | 13,180 | 1 |
| 2000-009 | SG | 14 | Tribune Bay | 05/03/2000 |  | 16,100 |  |
| 2000-011 | SG | 14 | Helliwell Park | 06/03/2000 |  | 13,386 |  |
| 2000-012 | SG | 14 | Qualicum Bay | 06/03/2000 |  | 4,750 |  |
| 2000-013 | SG | 14 | Parksville Bay | 07/03/2000 |  | 7,963 |  |
| 2000-014 | SG | 14 | Parksville Bay | 07/03/2000 |  | 18,379 | 1 |
| 2000-015 | SG | 14 | Parksville Bay | 07/03/2000 |  | 5,936 |  |
| 2000-016 | SG | 14 | French Creek | 08/03/2000 |  | 2,109 |  |
| 2000-017 | SG | 14 | French Creek | 08/03/2000 |  | 1,576 |  |
| 2000-018 | SG | 14 | French Creek | 08/03/2000 |  | 9,662 |  |
| 2000-019 | SG | 14 | Longbeak Point | 09/03/2000 | WYD | 511 |  |
| 2000-019 | SG | 14 | Longbeak Point | 09/03/2000 |  | 10,358 |  |
| 2000-020 | SG | 14 | Longbeak Point | 09/03/2000 |  | 8,623 |  |
| 2000-021 | SG | 14 | Northwest Bay | 11/03/2000 |  | 1,659 |  |

Appendix B (continued).

| Set Id $^{\text {a }}$ | Region | Area | Location | Date | Disc $^{\text {b }}$ | Releases |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Recoveries 9

Appendix B (continued).

| Set Id $^{\text {a }}$ | Region | Area | Location | Date | Disc $^{\text {b }}$ | Releases |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | Recoveries 9

Appendix B (continued).

| Set Id ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Region | Area | Location | Date | Disc ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Releases | Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003-015 | CC | 7 | Kildidt Sound | 22/03/2003 |  | 9,132 | 5 |
| 2003-016 | CC | 7 | Lockhart Bay | 23/03/2003 |  | 13,542 | 4 |
| 2003-017 | CC | 7 | SW Spiller Channel | 23/03/2003 |  | 13,594 | 7 |
| 2003-018 | CC | 7 | Neekas Inlet | 24/03/2003 |  | 16,394 | 12 |
| 2003-019 | CC | 7 | Berry Inlet | 24/03/2003 |  | 11,739 | 4 |
| 2003-020 | CC | 7 | East Higgins Pass | 25/03/2003 |  | 15,519 | 8 |
| 2003-021 | PRD | 5 | Gurd Point | 27/03/2003 |  | 14,095 | 17 |
| 2003-022 | PRD | 5 | Gurd Island (Nth) | 27/03/2003 |  | 14,092 | 16 |
| 2003-023 | PRD | 5 | Dries Inlet | 27/03/2003 |  | 9,403 | 9 |
| 2003-024 | PRD | 3 | Cunningham Pass | 31/03/2003 |  | 15,066 | 4 |
| 2003-025 | PRD | 5 | Robert Island | 01/04/2003 |  | 15,291 | 9 |
| 2003-026 | PRD | 5 | Kitkatla Inlet | 01/04/2003 |  | 14,379 | 13 |
| 2003-027 | PRD | 5 | Porcher Peninsula | 02/04/2003 |  | 15,465 | 7 |
| 2003-028 | PRD | 5 | Gurd Point | 02/04/2003 |  | 13,709 | 8 |
| 2004-001 | WCVI | 23 | SE Spilling Islets | 04/03/2004 |  | 10,477 | 1 |
| 2004-002 | WCVI | 23 | Mayne Bay | 06/03/2004 |  | 8,401 |  |
| 2004-003 | WCVI | 23 | Saint Ines Island | 07/03/2004 |  | 14,730 | 4 |
| 2004-004 | WCVI | 24 | Shelter Inlet | 10/03/2004 |  | 15,119 | 2 |
| 2004-005 | WCVI | 24 | Shelter Inlet | 11/03/2004 |  | 17,302 |  |
| 2004-006 | WCVI | 26 | Kyuquot Channel | 13/03/2004 |  | 15,717 | 2 |
| 2004-007 | WCVI | 26 | Crowther Channel | 13/03/2004 |  | 11,464 | 3 |
| 2004-008 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 15/03/2004 |  | 16,576 |  |
| 2004-009 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 16/03/2004 |  | 2,591 |  |
| 2004-009 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 16/03/2004 | WYD | 3,259 |  |
| 2004-010 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 17/03/2004 |  | 6,078 |  |
| 2004-011 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 17/03/2004 |  | 13,356 |  |
| 2004-012 | CC | 8 | Pruth Bay | 21/03/2004 |  | 18,223 | 3 |
| 2004-013 | CC | 8 | Fairmile Passage | 21/03/2004 |  | 12,004 | 3 |
| 2004-014 | CC | 8 | Fairmile Passage | 22/03/2004 |  | 14,387 | 5 |
| 2004-015 | CC | 6 | Kitasu Bay | 24/03/2004 |  | 17,332 | 19 |
| 2004-016 | CC | 6 | Kitasu Bay | 24/03/2004 |  | 18,393 | 20 |
| 2004-017 | CC | 6 | Kitasu Bay | 25/03/2004 |  | 16,324 | 23 |
| 2004-018 | CC | 7 | Berry Inlet | 25/03/2004 |  | 17,011 | 27 |
| 2004-019 | CC | 7 | Berry Inlet | 26/03/2004 |  | 19,228 | 25 |
| 2004-020 | CC | 7 | Dundivan Inlet | 27/03/2004 |  | 18,417 | 28 |
| 2004-021 | CC | 7 | Tankeeah River | 27/03/2004 |  | 13,659 | 17 |
| 2004-022 | CC | 7 | Tankeeah River | 28/03/2004 |  | 17,901 | 27 |
| 2004-023 | CC | 7 | East Higgins Pass | 30/03/2004 |  | 21,627 | 55 |
| 2004-024 | CC | 9 | Goose Bay | 31/03/2004 |  | 17,770 | 3 |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  | 1,364,729 | 546 |

[^1]Appendix C. Summary of 2006 herring CWT recoveries and recovery rates from 2003 and 2004 tag release intervals by release set identification code (year and set number), release stock assessment region, release statistical area, release location and release batch size.

| Set Id | Region | Area | Location | Interval | Releases | Recoveries | RR\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003-001 | SG | 17 | Secret Cove | 1 | 3,821 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 2,822 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-002 | SG | 14 | Madrona Point | 1 | 4,282 | 5 | 0.12 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,236 | 3 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,183 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 2003-003 | SG | 14 | Madrona Point | 1 | 3,903 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 2003-004 | SG | 14 | Mistaken Island | 1 | 3,806 | 2 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 3,711 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,055 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 2003-005 | SG | 14 | Brant Point | 1 | 1,203 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-006 | SG | 14 | Brant Point | 1 | 3,907 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 2003-007 | SG | 14 | Baynes Sound | 1 | 4,166 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,083 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,884 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-008 | SG | 14 | Longbeak Point | 1 | 3,890 | 3 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,375 | 6 | 0.14 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,086 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 2003-009 | SG | 14 | Longbeak Point | 1 | 3,324 | 1 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,013 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 2003-010 | SG | 14 | Chrome Island | 1 | 4,169 | 3 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 3,352 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,851 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-011 | SG | 14 | Repulse Point | 1 | 4,237 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,281 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,250 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-012 | CC | 9 | Goose Bay | 1 | 4,139 | 3 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 3,809 | 1 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,822 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 1,890 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-013 | CC | 8 | Storm Inlet | 1 | 3,916 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,393 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,338 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 2,776 | 1 | 0.04 |
| 2003-014 | CC | 8 | Pruth Bay | 1 | 3,667 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 3,722 | 1 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,641 | 0 | 0.00 |


| Set Id | Region | Area | Location | Interval | Releases | Recoveries | RR\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003-015 | CC | 7 | Kildidt Sound | 1 | 3,654 | 3 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,021 | 2 | 0.05 |
| 2003-016 | CC | 7 | Lockhart Bay | 1 | 3,866 | 1 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,163 | 2 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,309 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 2,661 | 1 | 0.04 |
| 2003-017 | CC | 7 | SW Spiller Channel | 1 | 3,972 | 1 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,347 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,275 | 5 | 0.12 |
| 2003-018 | CC | 7 | Neekas Inlet | 1 | 5,687 | 3 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,433 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,043 | 4 | 0.10 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 1,231 | 4 | 0.32 |
| 2003-019 | CC | 7 | Berry Inlet | 1 | 4,128 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,141 | 2 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 2,470 | 1 | 0.04 |
| 2003-020 | CC | 7 | East Higgins Pass | 1 | 4,786 | 3 | 0.06 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,049 | 2 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,874 | 3 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 1,810 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2003-021 | PRD | 5 | Gurd Point | 1 | 4,062 | 6 | 0.15 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,194 | 8 | 0.13 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,839 | 3 | 0.08 |
| 2003-022 | PRD | 5 | Gurd Point | 1 | 4,389 | 7 | 0.16 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,184 | 5 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,519 | 4 | 0.11 |
| 2003-023 | PRD | 5 | Dries Inlet | 1 | 4,859 | 6 | 0.12 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,544 | 3 | 0.07 |
| 2003-024 | PRD | 3 | Hook Point | 1 | 4,400 | 2 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,727 | 1 | 0.01 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,939 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 2003-025 | PRD | 5 | Robert Island | 1 | 4,614 | 3 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,624 | 4 | 0.06 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,053 | 2 | 0.05 |
| 2003-026 | PRD | 5 | Kitkatla Inlet | 1 | 4,755 | 9 | 0.19 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,222 | 2 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,402 | 2 | 0.06 |


| Set Id | Region | Area | Location | Interval | Releases | Recoveries | RR\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003-027 | PRD | 5 | Porcher Peninsula | 1 | 4,621 | 4 | 0.09 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,310 | 2 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,534 | 1 | 0.02 |
| 2003-028 | PRD | 5 | Gurd Point | 1 | 4,787 | 2 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,569 | 4 | 0.06 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 2,353 | 2 | 0.08 |
| 2004-001 | WCVI | 23 | SE Spilling Islets | 1 | 3,585 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 3,465 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,427 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 2004-002 | WCVI | 23 | Lyall Point | 1 | 3,954 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,447 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-003 | WCVI | 23 | Saint Ines Island | 1 | 4,045 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,832 | 2 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,034 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 819 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-004 | WCVI | 24 | Steamer Cove | 1 | 4,505 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,805 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,015 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 1,794 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-005 | WCVI | 24 | Clio Island | 1 | 4,143 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,064 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,176 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 2,919 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-006 | WCVI | 26 | Kyuquot Channel | 1 | 4,234 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,251 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,232 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-007 | WCVI | 26 | Crowther Channel | 1 | 4,750 | 2 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,714 | 1 | 0.01 |
| 2004-008 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 1 | 4,756 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,391 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,570 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 2,859 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-009 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 1 | 5,424 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-010 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 1 | 6,078 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-011 | WCVI | 25 | Rosa Harbour | 1 | 4,911 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,545 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,900 | 0 | 0.00 |


| Appendix C (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Set Id | Region | Area | Location | Interval | Releases | Recoveries | RR\% |
| 2004-012 | CC | 8 | Pruth Bay | 1 | 4,297 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,106 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,647 | 2 | 0.04 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 4,025 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-013 | CC | 8 | Fairmile Passage | 1 | 5,768 | 2 | 0.03 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,808 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 1,428 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2004-014 | CC | 8 | Fairmile Passage | 1 | 5,171 | 3 | 0.06 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,975 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,241 | 1 | 0.03 |
| 2004-015 | CC | 6 | Kitasu Bay | 1 | 4,226 | 5 | 0.12 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,342 | 7 | 0.13 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,034 | 5 | 0.12 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 3,730 | 2 | 0.05 |
| 2004-016 | CC | 6 | Kitasu Bay | 1 | 5,119 | 12 | 0.23 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 5,953 | 3 | 0.05 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,010 | 3 | 0.06 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 2,311 | 2 | 0.09 |
| 2004-017 | CC | 6 | Kitasu Bay | 1 | 6,068 | 6 | 0.10 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,245 | 9 | 0.21 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 6,011 | 8 | 0.13 |
| 2004-018 | CC | 7 | Berry Inlet | 1 | 4,581 | 10 | 0.22 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,646 | 9 | 0.14 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,091 | 6 | 0.15 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 1,693 | 2 | 0.12 |
| 2004-019 | CC | 7 | Berry Inlet | 1 | 5,439 | 11 | 0.20 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 3,594 | 5 | 0.14 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,987 | 4 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 5,208 | 5 | 0.10 |
| 2004-020 | CC | 7 | Dundivan Inlet | 1 | 6,327 | 12 | 0.19 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,165 | 11 | 0.18 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,925 | 5 | 0.08 |
| 2004-021 | CC | 7 | Tankeeah River | 1 | 5,193 | 4 | 0.08 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,295 | 5 | 0.12 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,171 | 8 | 0.19 |
| 2004-022 | CC | 7 | Tankeeah River | 1 | 4,731 | 7 | 0.15 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,630 | 11 | 0.17 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,092 | 6 | 0.19 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 3,448 | 3 | 0.09 |


| Set Id | Region | Area | Location | Interval | Releases | Recoveries | RR\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004-023 | CC | 7 | East Higgins Pass | 1 | 4,458 | 15 | 0.34 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 6,022 | 17 | 0.28 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,645 | 9 | 0.16 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 5,502 | 14 | 0.25 |
| 2004-024 | CC | 9 | Goose Bay | 1 | 5,675 | 1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 4,240 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 5,576 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 4 | 2,279 | 2 | 0.09 |
| Totals |  |  |  |  | 686,195 | 427 | 0.06 |


[^0]:    * Data in parentheses correspond to lot mixing during processing and tag recovery.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Set Id refers to release year and set number for first use of tag code in cases where multiple use occurred.
    ${ }^{b}$ Disc indicates which sets had discrepant release information from multiple code use; BYD = between year discrepancies; WYD= within year discrepancies (Appendix A).

