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## RÉSUMÉ

Farwell, M.K., N.D. Schubert and L.W. Kalnin. 1991. A coded wire tag assessment of Salmon River (Langley) coho salmon: 1988 tag application and 1989-90 spawner enumeration. Can. MS Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2079: 32p.

En 1986, le ministère des Pêches et Océans a entrepris une évaluation à long terme des stocks cles pour ameliorer la base de donnees sur le saumon coho (Oncorhynchus kisutch). Il a choisi de faire cette évaluation dans la rivière Salmon (Langley) et d'établir des données précises sur l'échappée annuelle, la survie, la repartition des captures et le taux d'exploitation. Au printemps de 1987, environ 24634 (chiffre ajuste pour tenir compte des pertes a long terme de micromarques magnetisees codees) jeunes saumons mesurant en moyenne $93,7 \mathrm{~mm}$, pesant en moyenne $8,8 \mathrm{~g}$, et pourvus d'une micromarque magnétisée codee ont eté reláchés. L'échappée des adultes a été estimée à l'automne et au printemps de 1988-89 au moyen de la technique Petersen de marquage-recapture. L'echappée a été estimée à 8427 poissons, dont 864 avaient encore leur micromarque et 57 (6,2\%) l'avaient perdue. La survie à l'échappée des cohos géniteurs de 1985 de la rivière Salmon était de 3,5\%.

Mots cles: Saumon coho, rivière Salmon (Langley), cours d'eau important, micromarque magnétisée codée, échappée, survie.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1986, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans began the implementation of a plan to improve the assessment data for coho salmon through the long term evaluation of key stocks. The Salmon River was selected for the evaluation, with known precision, of annual escapement, marine survival, harvest distribution and exploitation rate.

The Salmon River was designated a key stream for three reasons. First, recent escapements of Salmon River coho comprised $4 \%$ of the Fraser River total (Farwell et al. 1987). The status of this stock, therefore, is an important measure of the status of the Fraser River coho resource. Second, similar data collected from the 1976-78 brood years (Schubert 1982a; Schubert and Fleming 1989) provided a time series of comparable data. Third, simplified logistics limited project costs.

This report documents, for the 1986 brood, the 1988 coho smolt coded wire tag (CWT) application and 198990 coho adult escapement estimation studies. Previous reports documented the evaluation of the 1984-85 brood years (Schubert and Kalnin 1990; Kalnin and Schubert 1991). This report describes field methodologies, analytic techniques and study results, including smolt timing, age and size and adult age, length, sex, adipose fin clip (AFC) incidence and estimates of escapement and long term CWT loss. The study did not estimate the escapement of precocious males (jacks). The report concludes with a discussion of data limitations and recommendations for future studies.

## STUDY AREA

The Salmon River flows northwest for 33 km , entering the Fraser

River west of Fort Langley (Fig. 1). Coghlan Creek, the principal tributary, joins the mainstem 14 km upstream from the Fraser River. The system, with an average annual discharge of $1.41 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ (Environment Canada 1986), drains $85 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of lowland agricultural and residential land. During the Fraser River spring freshet, the Salmon River passes through a pumphouse located at the river mouth. No provisions were made for fish passage. Up to $31 \%$ of the coho smolts are killed when they pass through the pumps (Russell MS 1981).

Coho adults enter the river at ages $3_{2}$ and $4_{3}$ and spawn in the middle and upper reaches from November to January (Schubert 1982b; Schubert and Fleming 1989). Coho escapements averaged 3,000 and 2,400 in 1970-79 and 1980-86, respectively (Farwell et al. 1987).

## METHODS

## JUVENILE PROGRAM

## Fish Capture

Fence traps similar to those described by Schubert (1982a) operated in Coghlan Creek ( 50 m above the Salmon River confluence) from April 20 to June 1, 1988 and in the Salmon River ( 30 m above the Coghlan Creek confluence) from April 22 to June 1, 1988.

Captured fish were enumerated at least once daily. Coho smolts were transferred to holding boxes or to the tagging site for tagging and sampling. Coho fry were not enumerated because the 6 mm fence mesh did not fully restrict their passage. The remaining catch was identified to species and released below the fence. Steelhead and cutthroat trout were recorded as smolt or presmolt. Smolts had a silver coloration and a nose-fork (NF) length greater than 11

cm. Presmolts had distinct parr marks and a NF length less than 11 cm.

## Coded Wire Tagging

The CWT equipment and methods were described by Armstrong and Argue (1977). Coded wire tagging occurred from April 25 to June l, 1988 at intervals of one to four days. On each day, the smolts were sorted by size (NF length greater or less than 100 mm ) and separate nose molds and implant depths were used for each group. Implant depth was checked for each group by bisecting the skull of a tagged smolt along the median plane. If the CWT was not in the preferred position in the cartilaginous wedge of the skull, the implant depth was adjusted and the procedure repeated until CWT placement was correct. The nose mold was then marked to permit correct placement after nose mold changes.

The smolts were anaesthetized with Tricaine Methane Sulfonate (TMS), marked by adipose fin removal, coded wire tagged and passed through a quality control device to ensure the CWT was present. Any diseased, damaged or undersize (NF length less than 55 mm ) smolts were released untagged. A representative sample of approximately 200 smolts was removed from the recovery bucket and retained for 24 hours for assessment of AFC quality, delayed mortality and CWT loss. Any coho without a CWT or with a poor AFC was retagged or reclipped. All smolts were then transported and released, or held until morning when water temperatures were more suitable for transport.

## Transport

Coded wire tagged smolts were released at the Salmon River mouth to avoid pump related mortality. The
smolts were transported in five gallon plastic buckets supplied with air from a twelve volt air pump. Transport required less than fifteen minutes.

## Sampling

Fifty coho smolts per site were sampled twice weekly for scales, length and weight. The smolts were anaesthetized with TMS, a scale smear was removed with a scalpel from each preferred region, NF length was measured to the nearest millimeter and mean wet weight ( $\pm 0.1 \mathrm{~g}$ ) was determined in aggregate on an Ohaus triple beam balance.

## ADULT PROGRAM

## Fish Capture

Coho adults were captured in reaches S1 to S4, C1 and C5 (Fig. 1) from October 30 to December 20, 1989. Coho were attracted from log jams and cut banks with an electroshocker using direct current. Voltage (600 volts) and frequency ( 15 to 30 mil liseconds) were adjusted daily to ensure the fish were undamaged, but stunned sufficiently to permit capture. Stunned coho were captured in a dip net, permitted to recover in a 601 container of water, disk tagged and released.

## Disk Tag Application

Coho adults (NF length greater than 30 cm ) were Petersen disk tagged in a wooden tray $(10 \mathrm{~cm} \times 10 \mathrm{~cm} \times 100$ cm) constructed with a flexible plastic bottom and a meter stick recessed in one side. The tags consisted of two 2.2 cm diameter laminated cellulose acetate disks and one 0.7 cm diameter transparent plastic buffer disk threaded through centrally punched holes onto a 7.7 cm long
nickel pin. The pin was inserted with pliers through the musculature and pterygiophore bones approximately 1.2 cm below the anterior portion of the dorsal fin insertion. The disk tags, arranged with one on each side of the fish and with a buffer disk on the pin head side, were secured by twisting the pin into a double knot. One disk per pair was numbered with a unique code. Green disk tags were used to reduce colour contrast, thereby minimizing recovery and predation biases.

Each disk tagged fish received a secondary mark to allow the assessment of disk tag loss. One or two 0.7 cm diameter holes were punched through the right operculum of males and females, respectively, using a single hole paper punch. Care was taken to avoid gill tissue damage.

Date and location (reach) of capture, disk tag number, NF length (to the nearest 0.1 cm ), sex and adipose fin status were recorded for each fish released with a disk tag. Release condition was recorded as 1 (swam away vigorously), 2 (swam away sluggishly) or 3 (required ventilation). Recovered disk tagged carcasses were enumerated and sampled (described below) to assess handling mortality.

## Stream Surveys

Weekly stream surveys were conducted from October 30, 1989 to January 12, 1990. Complete surveys, conducted by a two to four person crew walking in an upstream direction, required up to two days.

Live adults were counted and carcasses were recorded by date, reach, sex (confirmed by abdominal incision) and mark type (disk tag, secondary mark or AFC). Each marked carcass and every tenth unmarked carcass was sampled. Carcasses less
than 30 cm NF length were recorded as jacks. All carcasses were then cut in two with a machete and returned to the river. Sample data, recorded by date and reach, included post-orbital-hypural plate ( POH ) length (to the nearest 0.1 cm ), sex, female spawning success (0\%, 50\% or 100\% spawned), adipose fin and carcass condition, and scale samples. For AFC coho, the head was removed posterior to the eye orbit for later CWT identification. Adipose fin condition was recorded as unclipped or as complete (flush with dorsal surface), partial (nub present) or questionable (appeared clipped but fungus or decomposition obscured area). The condition of AFC carcasses was recorded as fresh (gills red or mottled), moderately fresh (gills white, body firm), moderately rotten (body intact, flesh soft) or rotten (skin and bones), and the absence of one or both eyes was noted.

## Escapement Estimation

Total Escapement: The 1989-90 escapement of Salmon River coho adults was calculated from the mark-recapture data using the Petersen formula (Chapman modification) (Ricker 1975). Total escapement was the sum of escapement by sex:

1) Estimated Salmon River system coho escapement ( $N_{t}$ ):

$$
\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{t}}=\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{m}}+\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{t}}
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{m}} & =\begin{array}{l}
\text { estimated escapement of } \\
\text { adult males; }
\end{array} \\
& =\frac{\left(M_{m}+1\right)\left(C_{m}+1\right)}{\left(R_{m}+1\right)} \\
N_{f} & =\begin{array}{l}
\text { estimated escapement of } \\
\text { females, analogous to }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

above.
2) Estimated 95\% confidence limits of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}$ :

$$
N_{t} \pm 1.96 \sqrt{V_{t}}
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& N_{t}=\text { total escapement est- } \\
& \text { imate; } \\
& v_{t}=\text { variance of the escape- } \\
& \text { ment estimate; } \\
& =V_{m}+V_{f} \\
& V_{m}=\text { variance of the adult } \\
& \text { male escapement estimate; } \\
& =\frac{\left(N_{m}{ }^{2}\right)\left(C_{m}-R_{m}\right)}{\left(C_{m}+1\right)\left(R_{m}+2\right)} \\
& N_{m}=\text { adult male escapement } \\
& \text { estimate; } \\
& C_{m}=\text { number of adult male car- } \\
& \text { casses examined for disk } \\
& \text { tags; } \\
& R_{m}=\text { number of disk tagged or } \\
& \text { secondary marked adult } \\
& \text { males recovered; } \\
& V_{f}=\text { variance of female es- } \\
& \text { capement estimate, analo- } \\
& \text { gous to above. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Sex Identification Correction: The disk tag application data were corrected for sex identification error. Error occurred because the development of sexually dimorphic traits was often not advanced and internal examinations could not be made. Correction of recovery data was unnecessary because all carcasses were incised and examined internally. Sex identification error was corrected as described by Staley (1990):
3) Estimated true number of males released with disk tags and secondary marks ( $M_{m}$ ):

$$
M_{m}=\frac{M_{m}^{*}-\left(M_{4} R_{m, f}\right) / R_{f}}{1-\left(R_{m, f} / R_{f}\right)-\left(R_{f, m} / R_{m}\right)}
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{m}^{*}= & \text { field estimate of number } \\
& \text { of males released with } \\
& \text { disk tags and secondary } \\
& \text { marks; } \\
M_{t}= & \text { total number of coho ad- } \\
& \text { ults released with disk } \\
& \text { tags and secondary marks; } \\
R_{m, f}= & \text { number of females recov- } \\
& \text { ered with disk tags which } \\
& \text { were released as males; } \\
R_{f, m}= & \text { number of males recovered } \\
& \text { with disk tags which were } \\
& \text { released as females; } \\
R_{f}= & \text { number of females } \\
& \text { recovered with disk tags; } \\
R_{m}= & \text { number of males recovered } \\
& \text { with disk tags. }
\end{aligned}
$$

4) Estimated true number of females released with disk tags and secondary marks (M):

$$
M_{f}=M_{t}-M_{m}
$$

Adipose Fin Clipped Escapement: The estimated AFC escapement was the product of the AFC incidence in the carcass recovery sample, the largest of the two available samples, and the mark-recapture escapement estimate. Ninety-five percent confidence limits were calculated from the respective upper and lower confidence limits of the AFC incidence and the escapement estimate. For example, the upper 95\% confidence limit of the AFC escapement estimate was the product of the upper limit of the AFC incidence and the upper limit of the total mark-recapture estimate. The mathematical relationships are reported below (Cochran 1977):
5) Estimated AFC escapement ( $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{a}}$ ):

$$
\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{a}}=\mathrm{p}\left(\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)
$$

6) Estimated $95 \%$ confidence limits for $p$ :

$$
p \pm 1.96(s e+f p c)
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{p}=\begin{aligned}
\text { proportion of the sample } \\
\text { with an AFC; }
\end{aligned} \\
& \text { se }=\text { standard error; } \\
&=\sqrt{(1-f) p q /(n-1)} \\
& \text { fpc }=\text { finite population correc- } \\
& \text { tion; } \\
&=\frac{1}{2 n} \\
& n=s a m p l e \text { size; } \\
& q=1-p \\
& f=\frac{n}{N_{t}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Coded Wire Tagged Escapement: Escapement by CWT code and long term CWT loss were calculated by applying the CWT composition in the carcass recovery sample to the estimated escapement of AFC adults. Apparant CWT loss was adjusted for postmortality loss resulting from carcass decomposition and predator activity, when appropriate.

## RESULTS

## JUVENILE PROGRAM

## Fish Capture

Coho smolt catch totaled 27,091 in 1988, 17,142 in Salmon River and 9,949 in Coghlan Creek (Appendix 1). The 50\% migration occurred on May 9, while the peak daily catch occurred on May 9 in the Salmon River and May 11 in Coghlan Creek. The traps were inoperable for six days in May; therefore, the true size and timing
of the 1988 smolt migration were unknown.

## Coded Wire Tagging

AFC and CWT releases totaled 26,380 coho smolts in 1988 (Appendix 2). When adjusted for long term CWT loss and short term (24-hour) stressrelated mortality (116), the number released with CWTs and identifiable AFCs was 24,634.

Short term CWT loss averaged 1\% (range 0\% to 3.1\%). The incidence of poor AFCs and delayed mortality averaged $0 \%$ and $0.4 \%$, respectively. The incidence of disease, damage, or structural anomalies averaged 13.6\% (3.477)(Appendix 3). The most prevalent condition was fog eye (13.4\%), a reversible condition associated with capture stress. No smolts with naturally missing adipose fins were observed.

## Coho Smolt Age and Size

Coho smolts emigrated from the Salmon River system entirely as yearling (age $1+$ ) smolts. Smolt size averaged 94.5 mm and 8.9 g in the Salmon River and 92.4 mm and 8.6 g in Coghlan Creek (Appendix 4). Weighted mean smolt size was 93.7 mm and 8.8 g. Salmon River smolt size increased to a peak in mid May and decreased through the remainder of the migration. Coghlan Creek smolt size showed no consistent trend in size over the study period.

## ADULT PROGRAM

## Mark-Recapture

Disk Tag Application: Four hundred and ninety-five coho adults were released with disk tags and secondary marks from October 30 to December 20, 1989 (Table 1). Of that total, 96 had AFC's. Condition at

Table 1. Disk tag application, carcass examination and mark recovery by sex of Salmon River system coho adults, 1989-90.

|  | Disk <br> tags applied | Carcasses examined ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Marked carcasses recovered ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ```Disk tag and secondary mark``` | Secondary mark only | Disk tag only | Total | Percent recovered |
| Male | $264{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 613 | 39 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 15.2\% |
| Female | $231{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 710 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 36 | 15.6\% |
| Adipose present | 399 | 1,182 | 66 | 0 | 5 | 71 | 17.8\% |
| Adipose absent | 96 | 145 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 9.4\% |
| Total | 495 | 1,327 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | $74^{\text {d }}$ | 0 | $6^{\text {e }}$ | $80^{\text {c }}$ | 16.2\% |
| a Adjusted for sex identification errors. <br> b Jacks excluded. <br> c Includes 4 disk tagged carcasses of unknown sex. <br> d Includes 1 disk tagged and secondary marked carcass of unknown sex. <br> e Includes 3 disk tagged carcasses of unknown sex. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Disk tag application and recovery of Salmon River system coho adults, by release condition, 1989-90.

| Release <br> condition | Disk tags <br> applied | Disk tags <br> recovered | Percent <br> recovered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fish swam away <br> without assistance | 478 | 76 | $15.9 \%$ |
| Fish required <br> ventilation | 17 | 4 | $23.5 \%$ |
| Total | 495 | 80 | $16.2 \%$ |

release was good, except 17 (3.48) required ventilation (Table 2). No difference (p > 0.05; chi-square) was noted in the proportion of this group recovered on the spawning grounds.

An estimated 7.5\% of the males and $2.8 \%$ of the females were misidentified at the time of tagging (Appendix 6). When adjusted for sex identification error, an estimated 264 (53.3\%) males and 231 (46.7\%) females were released with disk tags and secondary marks.

Spawning Ground Recovery: One thousand, three hundred and twentyseven adults and 47 jacks were recovered on the spawning grounds from October 30, 1989 to January 12, 1990 (Table 1; Appendix 7). Of the adults, 613 (46.3\%) were male and 710 (53.7\%) were female ( 4 were of unknown sex), 80 (6.0\%) had disk tags and 145 (10.9\%) had an AFC. None had lost the disk tag; however, 6 (7.5\%) had no secondary mark. Eight of the AFC coho were disk tagged. The proportion of the disk tagged AFC coho which were recovered (9.4\%) was significantly lower (p < 0.05; chi square) than for disk tagged coho with no AFC (17.8\%).

## Sampling Selectivity

Periods Temporal bias in the application sample was examined by comparing between periods the mark incidence in the recovery sample (Table 3). A significant difference ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$; chi square) was noted in females, with a higher incidence earlier in the study.

Recovery bias was examined by stratifying the application sample by period and comparing the proportions recovered (Table 4). A significant difference ( $p<0.05$ ) was noted, with coho tagged later in the study recovered at higher rates.

Location: Spatial bias in the application sample was examined by comparing between sections the mark incidence in the recovery sample (Table 5). Mark incidence, which ranged from $0.7 \%$ to $14.9 \%$, was significantly different from that expected ( p < 0.05; G-test). Mark incidence was lowest in the upper sections of Salmon River and Coghlan Creek.

Recovery bias was examined by stratifying the application sample by section and comparing the proportions recovered (Table 6). A significant difference ( $p<0.05$ ) was noted, with a higher recovery of coho tagged in upper Coghlan Creek.

Fish size: Size related bias in the application sample was examined by comparing the continuous POH length frequency distributions of marked and unmarked spawning ground recoveries. No significant difference was noted in males or females ( $\mathrm{p}>0.05$; Kolmogorov-Smirnov two sample test).

Recovery bias was examined by partitioning the application sample into recovered and nonrecovered components and comparing the continuous NF length frequency distributions of each. Although the proportion recovered increased with NF length (Table 7), the difference was not significant (p > 0.05).

Fish Sex: Sex related bias in the application sample was examined by comparing the sex ratio of the marked and unmarked spawning ground recoveries (Table 8). No significant difference was noted ( $\mathrm{p}>0.05$; chisquare).

Recovery bias was examined by partitioning the application sample into recovered and nonrecovered components and comparing the sex ratio in each (Table 8). No significant difference was noted ( $p>0.05$ ).

Table 3. Incidence of disk tags or secondary marks in coho adults recovered on the Salmon River system spawning grounds, by period and sex, 1989-90.

| Recovery period | Recovered with disk tag or secondary mark |  |  | Total recoveries ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Percent with disk tag or secondary mark |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Femal | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Male | Female | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Male | Female | Total |
| 30-Oct to 01-Dec | 6 | 7 | 13 | 67 | 48 | 115 | 9.0\% | 14.6\% | 11.3\% |
| 02-Dec to 15-Dec | 18 | 15 | 34 | 321 | 344 | 666 | 5.6\% | 4.4\% | 5.1\% |
| 16-Dec to 12-Jan | 16 | 14 | 33 | 225 | 318 | 546 | 7.18 | 4.4\% | 6.0\% |
| Total | 40 | 36 | 80 | 613 | 710 | 1,327 | 6.5\% | 5.18 | 6.0\% |

[^0]Table 4. Proportion of the disk tag application sample recovered on the Salmon River system spawning grounds, by application period, 1989-90.

| Application <br> period | Disk tags <br> applied | Disk tags or <br> secondary marks <br> recovered | Percent <br> recovered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30-Oct to 06-Nov | 105 | 10 | $9.5 \%$ |
| 07-Nov to 20-Nov | 195 | 23 | $11.8 \%$ |
| 21-Nov to 04-Dec | 148 | 35 | $23.7 \%$ |
| 05-Dec to 18-Dec | 47 | 12 | $25.5 \%$ |
| Total | 495 | 80 | $16.2 \%$ |

Table 5. Incidence of disk tags and secondary marks, by section, in the Salmon River system spawning ground recovery sample, 1989-90.

| Location | Section ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Carcasses examined |  | Carcasses recovered with disk tags or secondary marks |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Percent of total | Number | Mark <br> Incidence |
| Salmon River | Lower | 87 | 6.6\% | 13 | 14.9\% |
|  | Middle | 163 | 12.3\% | 23 | 14.1\% |
|  | Upper | 455 | 34.3\% | 3 | 0.7\% |
| Coghlan Creek | Lower | 211 | 15.9\% | 21 | 10.0\% |
|  | Upper | 411 | 31.0\% | 20 | 4.9\% |
| Total | - | 1,327 | 100.0\% | 80 | 6.0\% |
| a Salmon River: lower - S1 and S2; middle - s3; upper - S4 and S5. Coghlan Creek: lower - C1; upper - C2, C3, C4 and C5. Excludes jacks. |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6. Proportion of the disk tag application sample recovered on the Salmon River system spawning grounds, by application section, 1989-90.

| Location | Section ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Disk tags applied |  | Disk tags recovered |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent recovered |
| Salmon River | Lower | 197 | 39.8\% | 15 | 7.6\% |
|  | Middle | 85 | 17.2\% | 13 | 15.3\% |
|  | Upper | 87 | 17.6\% | 14 | 16.1\% |
| Coghlan Creek | Lower | 94 | 19.0\% | 21 | 22.3\% |
|  | Upper | 32 | 6.5\% | 17 | 53.18 |
| Total | - | 495 | 100.0\% | 80 | 16.2\% |

[^1]Table 7. Disk tag application and recovery of Salmon River system coho adults, by nose-fork length, 1989-90.

| Nose-fork length (cm) | Disk tags applied | Carcasses recovered with disk tags | Percent recovered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30-39 | 11 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 40-49 | 78 | 3 | 3.98 |
| 50-59 | 319 | 54 | 16.9\% |
| 60-69 | 85 | 23 | 27.1\% |
| Total | $495^{\text {a }}$ | 80 | 16.2\% |

Table 8. Sex composition of Salmon River system coho adults in the disk tag application and spawning ground recovery samples, 1989-90.

| Sex | Application sample ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Spawning ground recovery sample ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Recovered | Not Recovered | Total | Disk tag and secondary mark | Unmarked | Total |
| Male | N | 40 | 224 | 264 | 40 | 573 | 613 |
|  | \% | 52.6 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 52.6 | 46.0 | 46.3 |
| Female | N | 36 | 195 | 231 | 36 | 674 | 710 |
|  | $\%$ | 47.4 | 46.5 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 54.0 | 53.7 |
| Total |  | 76 | 419 | 495 | $80^{\text {c }}$ | 1,247 | 1,327 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Corrected for sex identification error. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Excludes jacks. <br> ${ }^{c}$ Includes 4 of unknown sex. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Furthermore, no significant difference was noted in the proportion of males (15.2\%) and females (15.6\%) released with disk tags and recovered on the spawning grounds (Table 1).

Spawning Success: Spawning success, estimated from the internal examination of female spawning ground recoveries, was estimated at $92.1 \%$ (Appendix 8). Spawning success of marked (81.3\%) and unmarked (95.7\%) females was significantly different ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$; difference in proportions teat).

## Estimation of Spawner Population

Total Escapement: The 1989-90 escapement of Salmon River coho adults, calculated from mark-recapture data, was 8,427 (Table 9). Upper and lower $95 \%$ confidence limits were 10,230 and 6,624, respectively. The escapement of female and male coho adults was 4,458 and 3,969 , respectively.

Adipose Fin Clipped Adults: Based on the coho adult AFC incidence in the spawning ground sample (10.9\%; Table 1), the 1989-90 escapement of AFC adults was 921, with upper and lower $95 \%$ confidence limits of 1,283 and 617, respectively (Table 9). Of that total, an estimated 864 returned with a CWT (02 49 38) and 57 (6.2\%) had lost the CWT (Appendix 9). CWT loss was not influenced by carcass condition or predators ( $p$ > 0.05; chi-square) (Appendix 10). Survival from smolt release to adult escapement was $3.5 \%$.

## Age, Length and Sex

The age and length of 247 coho salmon recovered on the spawning grounds is summarized by sex in Appendix 11. All sampled females were age $3_{2}$. The males were $94.2 \%$ age $3_{2}$ and $5.8 \%$ age 2 .

Mean NF length of male adults and females in the application sample was 52.2 cm and 55.6 cm , respectively (Appendix 11). No significant difference ( $p$ > 0.05; single class ANOVA) was noted between those with and without an AFC. Females were significantly longer than males ( $p<$ 0.05 ; single class ANOVA). Mean POH length of male adults and females in the recovery sample was 43.5 cm and 46.2 cm , respectively (Appendix 11). No significant difference ( $p>0.05$; single class ANOVA) was noted between those with and without an AFC. Females were significantly longer than males ( $p<0.05$; single class ANOVA).

Females comprised $46.7 \%$ of the application sample, $53.7 \%$ of the recovery sample (Table 8) and 52.9\% of the Petersen population estimate.

## DISCUSSION

## ADULT CAPTURE TECHNIQUE

A basic assumption underlying Petersen mark-recapture studies is that capture and tagging must not influence the subsequent catchability of the fish. Previous studies in the Salmon River (Schubert and Kalnin 1990; Kalnin and Schubert 1991) identified a potential concern with stress resulting from the use of electric current. Since the inception of this study in 1987, there has been a consistent significant difference in the spawning success of marked and unmarked females. This suggests that capture stress influenced subsequent survival; however, we were unable to determine if a behavioral change associated with reduced spawning success would also influence catchability. We reiterate, therefore, that this factor should be evaluated in future studies.

Table 9. Escapement estimates, by sex and AFC status, for Salmon River system coho adults, 1989-90.

|  | Escapement estimates | 95\% confidence limit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Male | 3,969 | 2,809 | 5,129 |
| Female | 4,458 | 3,078 | 5,838 |
| Total | 8,427 | 6,624 | 10,230 |
| AFC ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Adult | 921 | 617 | 1,283 |

Table 10. Smolt release, adult escapement and survival to adult escapement of coded wire tagged 1986 brood Salmon River system coho salmon.

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { CWT } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Brood year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { released } \end{aligned}$ | Spawning ground recoveries |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \text { AFC } \\ \text { escapement } \end{gathered}$ | Percent survival to escapement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number | \% |  |  |
| 024938 | 1986 | 24,634 | 136 | 93.7\% | 864 | 3.5\% |
| No pin | - | - | 9 | 6.2\% | 57 | - |

a Adjusted for long term CWT loss.

Table 11. Results of statistical tests for bias in the 1989-90 Salmon River escapement estimation study.

| Test | Application Sample | Recovery Sample |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Period | Bias towards earlier period | Bias towards later period |
| Location | Bias in upper Salmon River | Bias in upper Coghlan Creek |
| Fish size | No bias | No bias |
| Fish sex | No bias | No bias |

## SAMPLING SELECTIVITY

A second assumption underlying Petersen mark-recapture studies is that the population is sampled in a random or representative manner (Ricker 1975). In studies when nonrepresentative sampling occurs, accurate results may still be achieved if one sample is representative (Robson 1969). In the present study, it was not possible to test for representativeness because the true population parameters were not known. Instead, we examined the samples for four biases, temporal, spatial, fish size and fish sex, as indicators of weaknesses in the study design. Significant biases were identified in both the tag application and recovery samples (Table 11). The application sample was biased with respect to period and location and unbiased with respect to fish size and sex. The recovery sample was biased with respect to period and location and unbiased with respect to fish size and sex.

The most serious bias was the non-random distribution of tags among the spawner population. Temporal bias was noted in both the application and recovery samples; however, because the direction of the biases was dissimilar, estimation error was probably minor. To investigate this assumption, we stratified the data by period and estimated the escapement using Schaefer's modification of the Petersen method for use with stratified populations (Ricker 1975). The resulting estimate was within 6\% of the Petersen estimate and well within it's 95\% confidence limits. We concluded, therefore, that the assumption was valid.

Spatial bias was also noted in both the application and recovery samples, the former with a positive bias in upper Coghlan Creek and the latter with a negative bias in upper Salmon River. When the data were
stratified spatially, the resulting escapement estimate was $14.8 \%$ below the Petersen estimate but within the lower 95\% confidence limit. This suggests that spatial bias may have introduced an positive bias in the Petersen estimate; however, because the Schaefer estimate was subject to the same biases (Ricker 1975), the magnitude of the potential estimation error could not be determined from the present data. Because the Schaefer estimate was within the 95\% confidence estimate of the Petersen estimate we concluded that, although suspect, the latter provided the best estimate of the 1989-90 escapement. We note, however, that spatial and temporal distribution patterns should be assessed before undertaking future sampling studies.

## SUMMARY

1. The Salmon River (Langley) coho stock is one of a group of British Columbia stocks being monitored to evaluate responses to management actions by measuring, with known precision, annual escapement, marine survival, harvest distribution and exploitation rate.
2. Coded wire tags (CWT) and adipose fin clips (AFC) were applied to emigrant smolts from April 20 to June 1, 1988. Smolts were captured at fence traps in the Salmon River and Coghlan Creek, the principal tributary. Tagged smolts were transported and released downstream of a pumphouse at the river mouth.
3. A total of 24,634 coho smolts were release with CWTs and AFCs. Size averaged 93.7 mm NF length and 8.8 g wet weight.
4. Adult spawners were enumerated
by a mark-recapture study from October 30, 1989 to January 12, 1990. Coho adults were captured using an electroshocker and marked with Petersen disk tags and opercular punches. The escapement was censused by the recovery of carcasses following spawning.
5. The 1989-90 coho adult escapement was estimated from a disk tag application sample of 495, a recovery sample of 1,327 , and a recovery of 80 carcasses with disk tags. The estimated escapement was 8,427 coho adults, of which 4,458 were female, 3,969 were male, and 921 had adipose fin clips.
6. The estimated return to the spawning grounds of code 0249 38 was 864. Survival from smolt release to spawning ground recovery was $3.5 \%$ while CWT loss was 6.2\%.
7. The age composition of coho adults, measured from the recovery sample, was entirely age $3_{2}$. Adult POH length averaged 43.5 cm for males and 46.2 cm for females.
8. Biases were identified in both the application and recovery samples. The spatial bias may have been sufficiently severe to make the accuracy of the escapement estimate suspect.
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Appendix 1a. Daily fence trap catches in the Salmon River, 1988.

| Date | Water temp. (C) | Water level <br> (m) | Coho smolt | Cutthroat |  | Rainbow |  | Lamprey | Sculpin | Stickleback | Crayfish | Sucker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Smolt | Parr | Smolt | Parr |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22-Apr | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23-Apr | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24-Apr | 10.0 | - | 182 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-Apr | - | - | 268 | 37 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26-Apr | 10.0 | - | 250 | 50 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Apr | 9.5 | - | 538 | 37 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28-Apr | 11.0 | - | 864 | 70 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Apr | 11.0 | 0.16 | 976 | 138 | 32 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-Apr | 9.0 | 0.24 | 1,004 | 324 | 80 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-May | 9.0 | - | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02-May | 9.0 | 0.23 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-May | 9.0 | 0.31 | 114 | 92 | 27 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04-May | 11.0 | 0.24 | 20 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 05-May | 10.0 | 0.20 | 326 | 25 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06-May | 11.0 | 0.19 | 207 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 07-May | 11.0 | 0.18 | 751 | 13 | 24 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08-May | - | - | 207 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 09-May | 12.0 | 0.16 | 4,231 | 202 | 25 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10-May | 12.0 | 0.14 | 544 | 70 | 30 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 11-May | 13.0 | 0.14 | 1,595 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12-May | 14.0 | 0.14 | 1,369 | 36 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 13-May | 12.0 | 0.22 | 587 | 34 | 32 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-May | 12.0 | 0.24 | 1,814 | 130 | 34 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-May | 15.0 | 0.20 | 596 | 208 | 30 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-May b | 13.0 | 0.24 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 17-May b | 12.0 | 0.49 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 18-May b | 11.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 19-May b | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20-May b | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 21-May b | 12.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22-May | 14.0 | 0.24 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23-May | 11.0 | 0.26 | 161 | 49 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24-May | 11.0 | 0.25 | 147 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-May | 12.0 | 0.24 | 37 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 26-May | 12.0 | 0.23 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-May | 12.5 | 0.23 | 53 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28-May | 12.5 | 0.24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-May | 10.5 | 0.26 | 47 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-May | 11.0 | 0.24 | 136 | 29 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 31-May | 12.0 | 0.24 | 37 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-Jun | 11.0 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | - | - | 17,142 | 1,722 | 460 | 197 | 0 | 49 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 |

a. Recorded at approximately 0830 hrs .
b. Trap out due to high water.

Appendix 1b. Daily fence trap catches in Coghlan Creek, 1988.

a. Recorded at approximately 0830 hrs .
b. Trap out due to high water.

Appendix 2a. Salmon River coded wire tagging results (code 0249 38), 1988.

| Tagging date | Maximum holding time (days) | Pretagging mortality | Total number marked | 24 hour CWT rejection |  | Post tagging mortality |  | Total released with CWTs c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Na |  | Imnediate | 24-hour b |  |
| 25-Apr | 2 | 1 | 442 | 169 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 415 |
| 26-Apr | 0 | 2 | 248 | 248 | 1.2 | 0 | 13 | 220 |
| 27-Apr | 0 | 0 | 538 | 239 | 1.7 | 1 | 0 | 504 |
| 28-Apr | 0 | 0 | 864 | 170 | 1.8 | 1 | 0 | 809 |
| 29-Apr | 0 | 0 | 974 | 201 | 0.0 | 2 | 0 | 912 |
| 30-Apr | 0 | 13 | 991 | 173 | 0.6 | 9 | 8 | 914 |
| 02-May | 2 | 0 | 14 | 159 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 03-May | 0 | 0 | 114 | 114 | 0.9 | 0 | , | 105 |
| 04-May | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 06-May | 0 | 2 | 531 | 210 | 1.0 | 6 | 0 | 492 |
| 09-May | 2 | 0 | 3,356 | 263 | 0.4 | 21 | 0 | 3,128 |
| 10-May | 0 | 1 | 2,037 | 234 | 2.6 | 11 | 1 | 1,899 |
| 11-May | 0 | 1 | 1,476 | 253 | 0.4 | 2 | 0 | 1,383 |
| 12-May | 0 | 0 | 1,369 | 192 | 3.1 | 1 | 0 | 1,283 |
| 16-May | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-May | 0 | 0 | 2,493 | 209 | 1.0 | 5 | 0 | 2,334 |
| 18-May | 0 | 0 | 468 | 176 | 0.6 | 3 | 1 | 435 |
| 24-May | 3 | 0 | 321 | 163 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 301 |
| 25-May | 0 | 0 | 37 | 37 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 26-May | 0 | 0 | 76 | 76 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 71 |
| 27-May | 0 | 0 | 49 | 49 | 2.0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 30-May | 2 | 0 | 199 | 199 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| 01-Jun | 1 | 0 | 37 | 37 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Total | (Mean) | 20 | 16,654 | 3,591 | 1.12 | 62 | 25 | 15.539 |

a. Sample size held to assess tag loss.
b. Based on mortality rate observed in QCD subsample expanded to entire tag lot.
c. Adjusted for long term CWT loss (see text).

Appendix 2b. Coghlan Creek coded wire tagging results (code 0249 38), 1988.

a. Sample size held to assess tag loss.
b. Based on mortality rate observed in QCD subsample expanded to entire tag lot.
c. Adjusted for long term CWT loss (see text).

Appendix 3. Incidence of anomalies encountered while coded wire tagging wild Salmon River system coho salmon smolts, 1988.

| Location | Number Inspected | Fog eye | Neascus | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fin } \\ & \text { rot } \end{aligned}$ | General damage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salmon River | 16,109 | 2.158 | 16 | 13 | 6 |
|  | \% | 13.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | <0.1 |
| Coghlan Creek | 9,462 | 1,259 | 9 | 14 | 2 |
|  | \% | 13.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | <0.1 |
| Total | 25,571 | 3,417 | 25 | 27 | 8 |
|  | \% total | 13.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | <0.1 |

Appendix 4. Mean length and weight of coho salmon smolts in the Salmon River system, 1988.

| Location | Sample date | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sample } \\ \text { size } \end{array}$ | Nose-Fork length (mm) |  | Mean wet weight (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean | Standard deviation |  |
| Salmon River | 26-Apr | 50 | 87.9 | 9.7 | 7.3 |
|  | 29-Apr | 50 | 88.9 | 7.9 | 7.4 |
|  | 06-May | 50 | 96.3 | 9.9 | 9.5 |
|  | 10-May | 50 | 97.1 | 8.6 | 9.6 |
|  | 24-May | 50 | 94.5 | 7.2 | 8.9 |
|  | 27-May | 50 | 93.7 | 7.1 | 8.7 |
|  | 31-May | 37 | 92.6 | 7.3 | 7.9 |
|  | Total | 337 | 94.5 a | - | 8.9 a |
| Coghlan Creek | 26-Apr | 50 | 95.4 | 14.3 | 9.7 |
|  | 29-Apr | 50 | 88.5 | 9.6 | 8.4 |
|  | 04-May | 50 | 92.6 | 10.1 | 8.4 |
|  | 06-May | 50 | 94.6 | 8.9 | 8.9 |
|  | 10-May | 50 | 95.3 | 9.0 | 9.3 |
|  | 24-May | 50 | 90.9 | 7.3 | 8.1 |
|  | 27-May | 50 | 91.1 | 5.7 | 8.1 |
|  | 31-May | 14 | 89.0 | 3.5 | 8.1 |
|  | Total | 364 | 92.4 a | - | 8.6 a |
| Total | - | 701 | 93.7 a | - | 8.8 a |

a. Weighted by proportion of smolt migration in time periods.

Appendix 5a. Coho adult disk tag application results in the Salmon River, 1989-90. a

| Date | Reach b | Adipose present |  |  | Adipose absent |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 30-0ct | S1 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 19 |
| 01-Nov | S1 | 16 | 9 | 25 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 20 | 12 | 32 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 03-Nov | S1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
|  | S4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 11 | 16 | 27 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 19 | 32 |
|  | S4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| 08-Nov | S1 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 13 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  | S4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 21 |
| 15-Nov | S1 | 7 | 16 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 19 | 26 |
|  | S2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | S4 | 9 | 8 | 17 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| 17-Nov | S1 | 11 | 20 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 20 | 32 |
|  | S3 | 16 | 15 | 31 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 17 | 37 |
| 20-Nov | S3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| 22-Nov | S1 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 19 |
|  | S3 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
|  | S4 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 24-Nov | S1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 11 |
|  | S4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 27-Nov | S1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | S3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 29-Nov | S1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | S3 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 11-Dec | S2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | S3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 20-Dec | S1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | S1 | 69 | 93 | 162 | 11 | 15 | 26 | 80 | 108 | 188 |
|  | S2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
|  | S3 | 39 | 33 | 72 | 6 | 7 | 13 | 45 | 40 | 85 |
|  | S4 | 33 | 21 | 54 | 20 | 13 | 33 | 53 | 34 | 87 |
|  | Total | 145 | 152 | 297 | 37 | 35 | 72 | 182 | 187 | 369 |

a. Not corrected for sex identification error.
b. Salmon River reaches: S1 - below Coghlan Creek.

S2 - Coghlan Creek to 64 Ave.
S3-64 Ave. to 56 Ave.
S4 - 56 Ave. to 248 St .
S5 - 248 St. to 256 St.

Appendix 5b. Coho adult disk tag application results in Coghlan Creek, 1989-90. a

| Date | Reach b | Adipose present |  |  | Adipose absent |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 15-Nov | Cl | 9 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 9 | 22 |
| 17-Nov | C1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 22-Nov | Cl | 5 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| 24-Nov | Cl | 6 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 12 |
|  | C5 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 12 | 32 |
| 27-Nov | Cl | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| $29-\mathrm{Nov}$ | Cl | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 13 | 16 | 29 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 17 | 32 |
| 20-Dec | C1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | C1 | 40 | 42 | 82 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 49 | 45 | 94 |
|  | C5 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 12 | 32 |
|  | Total | 55 | 47 | 102 | 14 | 10 | 24 | 69 | 57 | 126 |

a. Not corrected for sex identification error
b. Coghlan Creek reaches: Cl - Salmon River to Hwy. 1.

C2 - Hwy. 1 to 248 St .
C3 - 248 St. to 64 Ave.
C4 - 64 Ave. to 256 St.
C5 - Above 256 St.

Appendix 6. Disk tag recoveries in the Salmon River system, by application and recovery date and location, 1989-90.

| Date | Application sample |  |  |  | Recovery sample |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reach c | length <br> (cm) | Sex | Adipose fin | Date | Reach | $\begin{gathered} \text { POH } \\ \text { length } \\ (\mathrm{cm}) \end{gathered}$ | Sex |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { (days) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 01-Nov | S1 | 61.0 | F | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 47.8 | F |  | 30 |
| 01-Nov | S1 | 55.5 | F | $p$ | 11-Dec | Cl | 43.4 | F |  | 40 |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 47.9 | F | P | 17-Nov | S1 | 35.8 | M | a | 11 |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 54.5 | F | P | 11-Dec | S1 | 42.2 | F |  | 35 |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 68.5 | M | A | 07-Dec | C4 | 54.0 | M |  | 31 |
| 06-Nov | S1, | 52.8 | M | P | 20-Dec | S1 | - | M |  | 44 |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 58.8 | F | P | 01-Dec | S1 | 45.7 | F |  | 25 |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 54.8 | F | P | 15-Dec | S1 | 45.4 | F |  | 39 |
| 06-Nov | S4 | 57.4 | M | P | 01-Dec | 53 | 45.4 | M |  | 25 |
| 06-Nov | S4 | 57.8 | M | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 42.8 | M |  | 25 |
| 08-Nov | S2 | 62.2 | F | P | 11-Dec | C1 | 49.8 | F |  | 33 |
| 15-Nov | Cl | 53.8 | F | P | 20-Dec | Cl | 42.9 | F |  | 35 |
| 15-Nov | Cl | 55.5 | F | P | 12-Jan | S1 | - | F |  | 58 |
| 15-Nov | Cl | 57.4 | M | P | 11-Dec | C1 | 45.3 | M |  | 26 |
| 15-Nov | Cl | 56.1 | M | P | 07-Dec | C1 | - | M |  | 22 |
| 15-Nov | S1 | 54.4 | F | P | 20-Dec | S1 | - | F | b | 35 |
| 15-Nov | S4 | 58.3 | M | A | 01-Dec | S3 | 44.4 | M |  | 16 |
| 15-Nov | S4 | 57.8 | F | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 46.8 | F |  | 16 |
| 15-Nov | S4 | 55.9 | M | P | 15-Dec | S3 | 44.6 | M |  | 30 |
| 15-Nov | S4 | 56.7 | F | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 48.2 | F |  | 16 |
| 15-Nov | S4 | 66.5 | M | P | 01-Dec | \$3 | 55.4 | M |  | 16 |
| 17-Nov | C1 | 62.1 | F | P | 07-Dec | C5 | 49.5 | F |  | 20 |
| $17-\mathrm{Nov}$ | S1 | 54.0 | F | P | 13-Dec | C3 | 45.2 | F |  | 26 |
| 17-Nov | S1 | 61.9 | F | P | 01-Dec | S1 | 52.4 | F |  | 14 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 56.1 | F | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 45.5 | F |  | 14 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 63.1 | F | P | 13-Dec | S4 | 49.6 | F |  | 26 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 56.7 | F | P | 18-Dec | S4 | 45.6 | F |  | 31 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 59.1 | M | P | 29-Dec | S3 | - | - | b | 42 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 58.7 | M | P | 15-Dec | S3 | 47.6 | M |  | 28 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 61.2 | F | P | 15-Dec | S3 | 43.8 | F |  | 28 |
| 17 -Nov | S3 | 46.2 | F | P | 29-Dec | S3 | - | - |  | 42 |
| 17-Nov | S3 | 63.5 | M | P | 29-Dec | S3 | - | M |  | 42 |
| 20-Nov | S3 | 54.2 | M | P | 15-Dec | C2 | 43.3 | M |  | 25 |
| 22-Nov | Cl | 58.9 | F | P | 20-Dec | Cl | 46.8 | F |  | 28 |
| $22-\mathrm{Nov}$ | S1 | 55.1 | M | P | 11-Dec | C1 | 43.5 | M |  | 19 |
| 22-Nov | S3 | 58.7 | F | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 49.2 | F |  | 9 |
| 22-Nov | S4 | 53.2 | M | P | 01-Dec | S3 | 39.2 | M |  | 9 |
| 22-Nov | S4 | 57.5 | M | P | 29-Dec | S1 | 44.8 | M |  | 37 |
| 22-Nov | S4 | 51.7 | M | P | 20-Dec | S3 | 40.3 | M |  | 28 |
| 22-Nov | S4 | 62.4 | M | P | 15-Dec | S3 | 48.1 | M |  | 23 |
| 22 -Nov | S4 | 50.5 | M | P | 20-Dec | S3 | 40.4 | M |  | 28 |
| 24-Nov | C1 | 63.5 | M | P | 08-Jan | Cl | - | - | b | 45 |

Appendix 6. Disk tag recoveries in the Salmon River system, by application and recovery date and location, 1989-90.

| Date | Application sample |  |  |  | Recovery sample |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reach c | ```NF length (cm)``` | Sex | Adipose fin | Date | Reach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { POH } \\ & \text { length } \\ & (\mathrm{cm}) \end{aligned}$ | Sex |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ \text { out } \\ \text { (days) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 60.9 | F | A | 07-Dec | C4 | 47.7 | F |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 56.0 | F | A | 07-Dec | C4 | 45.5 | F |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 60.1 | F | A | 07-Dec | C4 | 48.4 | F | b | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 60.7 | M | P | 07-Dec | C5 | 46.2 | M |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 66.8 | M | P | 13-Dec | C3 | 51.3 | M |  | 19 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 54.5 | M | P | 18-Dec | C3 | 43.1 | M |  | 24 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 55.7 | M | P | 07-Dec | Cl | 43.3 | M |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 55.2 | M | P | 07-Dec | C4 | - | M |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 59.2 | M | P | 07-Dec | C4 | 45.3 | M |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 64.7 | F | P | 07-Dec | C4 | 51.5 | F |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 61.0 | F | A | 07-Dec | C4 | 48.5 | F |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 54.6 | F | A | 27-Dec | C4 | - | M | a | 33 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 50.0 | M | A | 07-Dec | C4 | 40.4 | M |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 66.3 | M | P | 07-Dec | C4 | 53.3 | F | a | 13 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 54.1 | F | P | 27-Dec | C4 | - | F |  | 33 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 51.8 | M | P | 18-Dec | C5 | 43.3 | M |  | 24 |
| 24-Nov | C5 | 62.0 | M | P | 07-Dec | C4 | 49.5 | M |  | 13 |
| 24-Nov | S3 | 54.0 | M | P | 29-Dec | S3 | 42.1 | M |  | 35 |
| 24-Nov | S3 | 57.4 | F | P | 27-Dec | S4 | 45.1 | F |  | 33 |
| 24-Nov | S4 | 56.4 | F | P | 15-Dec | S3 | - | - | b | 21 |
| 27-Nov | C1 | 59.0 | F | P | 07-Dec | Cl | 45.5 | F |  | 10 |
| 27-Nov | Cl | 48.4 | M | P | 07-Dec | Cl | 36.7 | M |  | 10 |
| 29-Nov | Cl | 53.9 | F | P | 20-Dec | Cl | 43.8 | F |  | 21 |
| 29-Nov | C1 | 63.1 | M | P | 11-Dec | C1 | 51.2 | M |  | 12 |
| 29-Nov | S3 | 57.9 | M | P | 29-Dec | S3 | 45.5 | M |  | 30 |
| 29-Nov | S4 | 51.7 | F | A | 15-Dec | S3 | 40.6 | M | a | 16 |
| 11-Dec | C1 | 51.5 | F | P | 29-Dec | Cl | 39.6 | F |  | 18 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 58.7 | F | P | 08-Jan | Cl | - | F |  | 28 |
| 11-Dec | C1 | 54.2 | M | P | 29-Dec | Cl | 43.1 | M |  | 18 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 50.2 | M | P | 20-Dec | Cl | 39.4 | M |  | 9 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 60.2 | M | P | 12-Jan | S1 | 47.5 | M | b | 32 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 56.6 | M | P | 29-Dec | Cl | 43.6 | M |  | 18 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 53.8 | F | P | 29-Dec | C 1 | 44.6 | F |  | 18 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 53.9 | F | P | 12-Jan | S1 | 41.4 | F |  | 32 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 52.5 | M | P | 08-Jan | Cl | 43.2 | M |  | 28 |
| 20-Dec | Cl | 57.1 | F | P | 29-Dec | Cl | 46.4 | F |  | 9 |
| 20-Dec | S1 | 54.7 | F | P | 12-Jan | S1 | 43.6 | F |  | 23 |
| 20-Dec | S2 | 64.0 | M | P | 29-Dec | S1 | 49.5 | M |  | 9 |

Appendix 6. Disk tag recoveries in the Salmon River system, by application and recovery date and location, 1989-90.

a. Incorrect sex identification during disk tag application
b. No secondary mark on recovery
c. Salmon River: S1 - below Coghlan Cr. S2 - Coghlan Cr. to 64 Ave.
S3 - 64 Ave. to 56 Ave.
Coghlan Creek:
C1 - Salmon R. to Hwy 1.
C2 - Hwy 1 to 248 St.
S4-56 Ave. to 248 St .
C3 - 248 St. to 64 Ave.
S5-248 St. to 256 St .
C4 - 64 Ave. to 256 St.
C5 - Above 256 St.

Appendix 7a. Summary of live observations and dead counts of coho salmon in the Salmon River, 1989-90.

| Date | Reach | Live count | Dead count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Adipose fin present |  |  | Adipose fin absent |  |  | Adult <br> total | Disk tag and secondary mark | Second ary mark only | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Disk } \\ \text { tag } \\ \text { only } \end{array}$ |
| 30-0ct | S1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-Nov | S1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-Nov | S1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 22-Nov | S4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24-Nov | S3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Nov | S1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Nov | S1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-Dec | S1 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 8 | 23 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 49 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 04-Dec | S4 | 22 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07-Dec | S4 | 15 | 38 | 44 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 15 | 16 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11-Dec | S1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13-Dec | S4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 69 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-Dec | S1 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 3 | 32 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 57 a | - 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 18-Dec | S4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 13 | 15 | 26 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 49 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20-Dec | S1 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Dec | S4 | 2 | 24 | 27 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 63 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Dec | S1 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 b | b 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 12-Jan | S1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
|  | S2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix 7a. Sumnary of live observations and dead counts of coho salmon in the Salmon River, 1989-90.

|  |  | Dead count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Reach | Live count | Adipose fin present |  |  | Adipose fin absent |  |  | Adult total | Disk tag and secondary mark | Second- <br> ary <br> mark <br> only | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Disk } \\ \text { tag } \\ \text { only } \end{array}$ |
| Total | S1 | - | 32 | 47 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 82 | 12 | 0 | 1 |
|  | S2 | - | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | - | 76 | 68 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 163 | 22 | 0 | 1 |
|  | S4 | - | 127 | 162 | 2 | 30 | 20 | 1 | 339 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | - | 40 | 59 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | 278 | 338 | 9 | 46 | 40 | 3 | 705 | 37 | 0 | 2 |

a. Includes one carcass of unknown sex.
b. Includes two carcasses of unknown sex.

Appendix 7b. Surmary of live observations and dead counts of coho salmon in Coghlan Creek, 1989-90.

| Date | Reach | Live count | Dead count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Adipos | fin pr | $\begin{gathered} \text { esent } \\ \hline \text { Jack } \end{gathered}$ | Adipo <br> -Male | Female | bsent <br> Jack | Adult <br> total | Disk tag and secondary mark | Second- <br> ary <br> mark <br> only | $\begin{gathered} \text { Disk } \\ \text { tag } \\ \text { only } \end{gathered}$ |
| 22-Nov | Cl | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24-Nov | C1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C5 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Nov | C1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Nov | Cl | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07-Dec | Cl | 130 | 37 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 61 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C2 | 32 | 18 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C3 | 22 | 18 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 51 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
|  | C5 | 24 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 11-Dec | Cl | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 13-Dec | C3 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-Dec | Cl | 11 | 11 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C2 | 17 | 11 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18-Dec | Cl | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C2 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C3 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C5 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 20-Dec | C1 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Dec | C3 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 32 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C5 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Dec | Cl | 0 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C2 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-Jan | C3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08-Jan | C1 | 1 | 19 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 a | 2 | 0 | 1 |
|  | C2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | C1 | - | 99 | 102 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 211 | 20 | 0 | 1 |
|  | C2 | - | 49 | 65 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 123 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C3 | - | 46 | 47 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 101 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C4 | - | 56 | 54 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 128 | 12 | 0 | 1 |
|  | C5 | - | 18 | 26 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 59 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | 268 | 294 | 31 | 21 | 38 | 4 | 622 | 39 | 0 | 2 |

[^2]Appendix 8. Spawning success of female adult coho spawning ground recoveries, 1989-90.


Appendix 9. Observed and estimated coho adult escapement, by CWT code, in the Salmon River system, 1989-90.

|  |  | CWT Code |  |  | No CWT |  | CWT lost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 024938 | 025725 | 025725 a | Jack | Adult |  |
| Estimated AFC escapement | 921 b | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| No. AFCs recovered | 152 | - | - | - | - |  | - |
| Observed CWT codes | 142 c | 136 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 9 | - |
| Estimated escapement by code | - | 864 | - | - | - | 57 | - |

a. Recovered from 1987 brood coho jacks.
c. Excludes 10 with no CWT.
b. Adults only.

Appendix 10. Incidence of CWT loss by carcass condition and eye status in AFC coho adults carcasses in the Salmon River system, 1989-90.

| Group | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sample } \\ & \text { size a } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { CWT } \\ \text { absent } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CWT } \\ \text { loss } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition 1 | 28 | 4 | 14.3\% |
| Condition 2 | 91 | 2 | 2.2\% |
| Condition 3 | 21 | 3 | 14.3\% |
| Condition 4 | 3 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Eyes present | 110 | 6 | 5.5\% |
| Eyes absent | 33 | 3 | 9.1\% |
| Complete AFC | 131 | 9 | 6.9\% |
| Partial AFC | 12 | 0 | 0.0\% |

Appendix 11. Mean length, by sex and age, of Salmon River system coho spawners, 1989-90.

| Sample | Age | Sex | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sample } \\ \text { size } \end{array}$ | Percent | Length (cm) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mean | Standard deviation | Range |
| Application sample $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}$ | - | Male | 249 | 50.5\% | 52.2 | 7.0 | 29.3-68.9 |
|  | - | Female | 244 | 49.5\% | 55.6 | 4.6 | 41.0-69.0 |
| Recovery sample c | $3 / 2$ | Male | 114 | 46.2\% | 43.5 | 5.1 | 29.2-56.3 |
|  |  | Female | 126 | 51.0\% | 46.2 | 4.1 | 35.2-56.8 |
|  | $2 / 2$ | Male | 7 | 2.8\% | 26.0 | 2.0 | 24.0-29.5 |
|  | Total | Male | 121 | 49.0\% | 42.5 | 6.4 | 24.0-56.3 |
|  |  | Fenale | 126 | 51.0\% | 46.2 | 4.1 | 35.2-56.8 |

a. Not adjusted for sex identification errors.
b. NF length.
c. POH length.


[^0]:    a Excludes jacks.
    b Includes 4 of unknown sex.

[^1]:    ${ }^{a}$ See Table 5 for section descriptions.

[^2]:    a. includes one carcass of unknown sex

