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## ABSTRACT

Farwell, M.K., N.D. Schubert and L.W. Kalnin. 1992. A coded wire tag assessment of Salmon River (Langley) coho salmon: 1990 tag application and 1991-1992 spawner enumeration. Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2153: 42 p.

In 1986, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans implemented a plan to improve the assessment data for coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) through the long term evaluation of key stocks. The Salmon River (Langley) was selected for the evaluation, with known precision, of annual escapement, marine survival, harvest distribution and exploitation rate. An estimated 20,390 (corrected for long term tag loss) coho smolts were released with coded wire tags (CWT) in spring of 1990 at an average size of 94.6 mm and 8.6 g . The adult escapement was estimated in fall and winter 1991-1992 using the Petersen mark-recapture method. Escapement was estimated at 4,321 coho adults of which an estimated 411 had coded wire tags and 37 (8.3\%) had lost the coded wire tag. Survival to escapement was 2.0\%.

Key Words: Coho salmon, Salmon River (Langley), key stream, coded wire tag, escapement, survival.
résumé

Farwell, M.K., N.D. Schubert and L.W. Kalnin. 1992. A coded wire tag assessment of Salmon River (Langley) coho salmon: 1990 tag application and 1991-1992 spawner enumeration. Can. Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2153: 42 p.

En 1986, le ministère des pêches et Oceans 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 Evaluation dans la rivière Salmon (Langley) et d'établir des données précises sur l'echappée annuelle, la survie, la repartition des captures et le taux d'exploitation. Au printemps de 1990, environ 20390 (chiffre ajusté pour tenir compte des pertes a long terme de micromarques magnétisés codées) jeunes saumons mesurant en moyenne $94,6 \mathrm{~mm}$, pesant en moyenne $8,6 \mathrm{~g}$, et pourvus d'une micromarque magnetisée codee ont été reláchés. L'échappée des adultes a été estimée à l'automne et au printemps de 1991-1992 au moyen de la technique Petersen de marquage-recapture. L'echappee a eté estimé à 4321 poissons, dont 411 avaient encore leur micromarque et 37 ( $8,3 \%$ ) l'avaient perdue. La survie à l'échappée des cohos géniteurs de 1988 de la rivière Salmon était de 2,0\%.

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

## INTRODUCTION

In 1986, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans implemented a plan to improve coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) assessment data 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, because recent escapements comprised $4 \%$ of the Fraser River total (Farwell et al. 1987), the status of Salmon River coho is an important measure of the status of the Fraser River coho resource. Second, data collected from the 1976-1978 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 1988 brood, the 1990 coho smolt coded wire tag (CWT) application and 19911992 coho adult escapement estimation studies. Previous reports documented the evaluation of the 1984-1987 brood years (Schubert and Kalnin 1990; Farwell et al. 1991, 1992; Kalnin and schubert 1991). This report describes field methods, 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 study results for the 1984-1987 brood years.

## 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 agricultural and residential land. During the Fraser River spring freshet, the Salmon River passes through a pumphouse located at the river mouth. Because 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 1970-1979 and 1980-1986, respectively (Farwell et al. 1987).

## METHODS

## JUVENILE PROGRAM

## Fish Capture

Fence traps similar to those described by schubert (1982a) operated in the salmon River ( 30 m above the Coghlan Creek confluence) from April 24 to June 4, 1990 and in Coghlan Creek ( 50 m above the Salmon River confluence) from April 20 to June 3, 1990.

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 nose-fork (NF) length greater than 11 cm. Presmolts had distinct parr marks and 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 24 to June 4, 1990 at intervals of one to four days. On each day, smolts were sorted by size (NF length greater or less than 100 mm ) and separate nose moulds and implant depths were used for each group. Implant depth was checked 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 mould was then marked to permit correct placement after nose mould 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.

## Transport

To avoid pump mortality, all coho smolts were transported and released at the Salmon River mouth, either immediately after tagging or in the morning when water temperatures were lower. The smolts were transported in a 180 l plastic container supplied with air from a twelve volt air pump. Transport required less than fifteen minutes.

## Sampling

[^0]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 mm , and mean wet weight $( \pm 0.1 \mathrm{~g})$ was determined in aggregate on a triple beam balance.

## ADULT PROGRAM

## Fish Capture

Coho adults were captured in reaches S 1 to S 5 and C 1 to C 5 (Fig. 1) from November 6 to December 20, 1991. Coho were attracted from log jams and cut banks with an electroshocker using direct current. Voltage ( 600 volts) and frequency ( 15 to 30 milliseconds) 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 marked with Petersen disk tags in a wooden tray ( $10 \mathrm{~cm} x$ $10 \mathrm{~cm} \times 100 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) 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 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 ( $\pm 0.1 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), 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 December 2, 1991 to January 14, 1992. 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 $30 \mathrm{~cm} N F$ 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 postorbit-al-hypural plate ( POH ) length (to the nearest 0.1 cm ), sex, female spawning success ( $0 \%$, $50 \%$ or $100 \%$ spawned), adipose $f$ in and carcass condition, and scale samples. The head of AFC coho was removed posterior to the eye orbit for later CWT identification. Adipose fin condition was recorded as unclipped, complete (flush with dorsal surface), partial (nub present) or questionable (appeared clipped but fungus or decomposition obscured the
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 19911992 escapement of Salmon River coho adults was calculated from the markrecapture 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 ( $N_{t}$ ):

$$
N_{t}=N_{m}+N_{f}
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{m} & =\begin{array}{l}
\text { estimated escapement of } \\
\text { adult males; }
\end{array} \\
& =\frac{\left(M_{m}+1\right)\left(C_{m}+1\right)}{\left(R_{m}+1\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
N_{f}=\text { estimated escapement of }
$$ females, analogous to above.

2) Estimated 95\% confidence limits of $N_{t}$ :

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

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}= & \text { total escapement esti- } \\
& \text { mate; } \\
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{t}}= & \text { variance of the escape- } \\
& \text { ment estimate; } \\
= & V_{m}+V_{f} \\
\mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{m}}= & \text { variance of the adult } \\
& \text { male escapement estimate; } \\
= & \frac{\left(N_{m}^{2}\right)\left(C_{m}-R_{m}\right)}{\left(C_{m}+1\right)\left(R_{m}+2\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{m}}= & \text { adult male escapement } \\
& \text { estimate; } \\
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}= & \text { number of adult male car- } \\
& \text { casses examined for disk } \\
& \text { tags; } \\
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}= & \text { number of disk tagged or } \\
& \text { secondary marked adult } \\
& \text { males recovered; } \\
\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{f}}= & \text { variance of female es- } \\
& \text { capement estimate, analo- } \\
& \text { gous to above. }
\end{aligned}
$$

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 ( $M_{m}$ ):

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

where:

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

4) Estimated true number of females
released with disk tags and secondary marks ( $M_{4}$ ):

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

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 markrecapture estimate. The mathematical relationships are reported below (Cochran 1977):
5) Estimated AFC escapement ( $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{a}}$ ):

$$
N_{a}=p\left(N_{t}\right)
$$

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

$$
p \pm 1.96(8 e+f p c)
$$

where:

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

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. Apparent CWT loss was adjusted for post-mortality loss resulting from carcass decomposition and predator activity, when appropriate.

## HARVEST SAMPLING

This report summarizes the estimated harvest by CWT group for the 1984-1988 broods; 1989 brood estimates have not been finalized and will be provided in a later report. Harvest data were obtained from the coast-wide harvest sampling program, supported by government management agencies in British Columbia, Alaska, Washington, Oregon and California, conducted to enable estimation of fishery contributions of CWT groups. In British Columbia, commercial harvest statistics were compiled by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for 32 statistical areas and 14 catch regions (statistical area aggregates). Salmon landings by the commercial fishery were sampled for AFCs with the objective of examining $20 \%$ of the harvest by gear type, week and statistical area. The fishery contribution of each CWT group was estimated, by area and time, from the number of observed recoveries and the estimated proportion of the harvest examined for marks.

Harvest estimates by CWT group were obtained by catch region, gear and month from the regional mark recovery program data base (Kuhn et al. 1988). These data were then corrected, when appropriate, for two sampling problems. First, observed recoveries were not expanded for a timearea stratum if the proportion of the catch sampled (C:S) was too small to provide reliable results. Because rigorous statistical procedures were unavailable, we arbitrarily rejected strata where the C:S exceeded 10.0 if the sample totalled less than 10,000
coho and five recoveries of the CWT group of interest. Second, some troll recoveries could not be isolated to a single catch region. In these cases, we combined the sample and harvest data for those regions in that week to compute a new C:S ratio for that recovery.

Salmon River coho salmon were also vulnerable to the sport and native fisheries in the lower Fraser River. Harvest could not be estimated because the fishery was not sampled for AFCs and, in the native fishery, voluntary head returns were unavailable.

## RESULTS

## JUVENILE PROGRAM

## Fish Capture

Catch of coho smolts totalled 23,169 in 1990, 9,904 in Salmon River and 13,265 in Coghlan Creek (Appendix 1). The 50\% migration and the peak daily catch occurred on May 5 and May 4, respectively, in the Salmon River, and on May 7 and May 4, respectively, in Coghlan Creek. Low water flow made the traps inoperable for two days in Coghlan Creek and five days in Salmon River. The reported timing of the 1990 smolt migration, therefore, may be biased.

## Coded Wire Tagging

AFC and CWT releases totalled 22,383 coho smolts in 1990 (Appendix 2). When adjusted for long term CWT loss (8.3\%)(Appendix 9) and short term (24-hour) post tagging mortality (47), the number released with CWTs and identifiable AFCs was $20,390$.

Short term CWT loss averaged $0.9 \%$ (range 0.0\% to 11.8\%). The incidence of disease, damage, or structural anomalies averaged 10.9\% (Appendix 3). The most prevalent condition was "fog eye" (10.5\%), a

Table 1. Disk tag application, carcass examination, and mark recovery, by sex, of Salmon River system coho adults, 1991-1992.

|  | Disk <br> tags <br> applied | Carcasses examined ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Marked carcasses recovered ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Disk tag and secondary mark | $\begin{gathered} \text { Secondary } \\ \text { mark } \\ \text { only } \end{gathered}$ | Disk tag only | Percent Total recovered |
| Male | $213^{\text {a }}$ | 346 | 34 | 1 | 0 | $35 \quad 16.48$ |
| Female | $192^{\text {a }}$ | 350 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 29 15.18 |
| Adipose present | - 318 | 622 | 47 | 1 | 2 | $50 \quad 15.7 \%$ |
| Adipose absent | 87 | 72 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1618.48 |
| Total | 405 | $698{ }^{\text {c,d }}$ | 62 | 1 | $3^{\text {c }}$ | $66^{\text {c }}$ ( $16.3 \%$ |

adjusted for sex identification errors.
b Jacks excluded.
c Includes 2 of unknown sex.
d Includes 4 of unknown AFC status.

Table 2. Disk tag application and recovery of Salmon River system coho adults, by release condition, 1991-1992.

| Release <br> condition | Disk tags <br> applied | Disk tags <br> recovered | Percent <br> recovered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fish swam away <br> without assistance <br> Fish required <br> ventilation | 395 | 65 | $16.5 \%$ |
| Total | 10 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Includes 1 with a secondary mark only. | $66^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $16.3 \%$ |  |

Table 3. Incidence of disk tags or secondary marks in coho adults recovered on the Salmon River system spawning grounds, by period and sex, 1991-1992.

| Recovery period | Recovered with disk tag or secondary mark |  |  | Total recoveries ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Percent with disk tag or secondary mark |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male Female Total |  |  | Male Female Total |  |  | Male F | male | Total |
| 02-Dec to 12-Dec | 8 | 15 | 23 | 79 | 93 | 172 | 10.1\% | 16.1\% | 13.4\% |
| 13-Dec to 22-Dec | 19 | 16 | 37 | 151 | 148 | 301 | 12.6\% | 10.8\% | 12.3\% |
| 23-Dec to 14-Jan | 2 | 4 | 6 | 116 | 109 | 225 | 1.78 | 3.7\% | 2.7\% |
| Total | 29 | 35 | 66 | 346 | 350 | 698 | 8.4\% | 10.0\% | 9.5\% |

Table 4. Proportion of the disk tag application sample recovered on the Salmon River system spawning grounds, by application period, 1991-1992.

| Application <br> period | Disk tags <br> applied | Marked carcasses <br> recovered | Percent <br> recovered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06-Nov to 13-Nov | 137 | 21 | $15.3 \%$ |
| 14-Nov to 28-Nov | 207 | 33 | $15.9 \%$ |
| 29-Nov to 20-Dec | 61 | 11 | $18.0 \%$ |
| Total | 405 | $66^{2}$ | $16.3 \%$ |

[^1]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 ( $p$ $>0.05$; Kolmogorov-Smirnov two sample test).

Recovery bias was examined by partitioning the application sample into recovered and non-recovered 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 non-recovered components and comparing the sex ratio in each (Table 8). No significant difference was noted ( $p>0.05$ ). Furthermore, no significant difference was noted in the proportion of males (16.9\%) and females (14.6\%) 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 97.1\% (Appendix 8). Spawning success of marked (94.8\%) and unmarked (98.2\%) females was significantly different ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$; difference in proportions test).

## Estimation of Spawner Population

Total Escapement: The 19911992 escapement of Salmon River coho
adults, calculated from mark-recapture data, was 4,321 (Table 9). Upper and lower $95 \%$ confidence limits were 5,308 and 3,334, respectively. The escapement of female and male coho adults was 2,258 and 2,063 , respectively.

Adipose Fin Clipped Adults: Based on the coho adult AFC incidence in the spawning ground sample (10.48; Table 1), the 1991-1992 escapement of AFC adults was 448, with upper and lower 95\% confidence limits of 544 and 352 , respectively (Table 9). Of that total, an estimated 299 returned with CWT code 0208 34, 106 with CWT code 020835,6 with CWT code 0208 36 , and 37 (8.38) 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 averaged 2.0\%; however, survival for the three CWT codes, ranging from 0.3\% to 3.1\%, were significantly different (p $<$ 0.05, chi-square)(Table 10). There were significant differences in both the location of recovery and the recovery periods of Coghlan Creek CWTs (codes 020834 and 023836 ) and Salmon River CWTs (code 0208 35) (p > 0.05, chi-square)(Table 10).

## Age, Length and Sex

The age and length of 156 coho salmon recovered on the spawning grounds is summarized by sex in Appendix 11. All males and females were age $3_{2}$. Mean $N F$ length of males and females in the application sample was 52.7 cm and 56.3 cm , respectively (Appendix 11). No significant difference ( $p>0.05$; ANOVA) was noted between those with and without an AFC. Females were significantly longer than males ( $p<0.05$; ANOVA). Mean POH length of males and females in the recovery sample was 43.9 cm and 47.9 cm , respectively (Appendix 11). No significant difference ( $p>$ 0.05 ; ANOVA) was noted between those

Table 5. Incidence of disk tags and secondary marks, by section, in the Salmon River system spawning ground recovery sample, 1991-1992.
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\hline & & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Carcasses recovered } \\ \text { with disk tags or }\end{array} \\ \text { secondary marks }\end{array}\right]$

Table 6. Proportion of the disk tag application sample recovered on the Salmon River system spawning grounds, by application section, 1991-1992.

| Location | Section ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Disk tags applied |  | Disk tags recovered |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent recovered |
| Salmon River | Lower | 97 | 24.0\% | 10 | 10.3\% |
|  | Middle | 47 | 11.6\% | 5 | 10.6\% |
|  | Upper | 87 | 21.5\% | 10 | 11.5\% |
| Coghlan Creek | Lower | 56 | 13.8\% | 10 | 17.9\% |
|  | Upper | 118 | 29.1\% | 30 | 25.4\% |
| Total | - | 405 | 100.0\% | $66^{\text {b }}$ | 16.3\% |

[^2]Table 7. Disk tag application and recovery of Salmon River system coho adults, by nose-fork length, 1991-1992.

| Nose-fork length (cm) | Disk tags applied | Carcasses recovered with disk tags | Percent recovered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30-39 | 9 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| 40-49 | 74 | 8 | 10.8\% |
| 50-59 | 229 | 38 | 16.6\% |
| 60-69 | 88 | 18 | 20.5\% |
| 70-79 | 2 | 1 | 50.0\% |
| Total | $405^{\text {a }}$ | $66^{\text {b }}$ | 16.3\% |

Table 8. Sex composition of Salmon River system coho adults in the disk tag application and spawning ground recovery samples, 1991-1992.

| Sex | Application sample ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Spawning ground recovery sample ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Recovered | Not Recovered ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Total | Disk tag or secondary mark | Unmarked | Total |
| Male | N | 35 | 178 | 213 | 35 | 311 | 346 |
|  | \% | 54.7 | 52.2 | 52.6 | 54.7 | 49.2 | 49.7 |
| Female | N | 29 | 163 | 192 | 29 | 321 | 350 |
|  | \% | 45.3 | 47.8 | 47.4 | 45.3 | 50.8 | 50.3 |
| Total |  | $64^{\text {d }}$ | 341 | 405 | $66^{\text {c }}$ | 632 | $698{ }^{\text {c }}$ |

[^3]Table 9. Escapement estimates, by sex and AFC status, for Salmon River system coho adults, 1991-1992.

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Escapement <br> estimate | 95\% confidence limit |  |
|  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Male | 2,063 | 1,433 | 2,692 |
| Female | 2,258 | 1,498 | 3,018 |
| Total | 4,321 | 3,334 | 5,308 |
| AFC Adult | 448 | 352 | 544 |

Table 10. Smolt release, adult escapement and survival to adult escapement of coded wire tagged 1988 brood Salmon River system coho salmon.

|  | CWT Code |  |  |  | No pin | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 020834 | 020835 | 020836 | Total |  |  |
| Number released ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 9,709 | 8,833 | 1,848 | 20,390 |  | 20,390 |
| Spawning ground recoveries Location |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salmon River | 6 | 15 | 1 | 22 | 1 | 23 |
| Coghlan Creek | 42 | 2 | 0 | 44 | 5 | 49 |
| Recovery Period |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02-Dec to 12-Dec | 34 | 5 | 0 | 39 | 2 | 41 |
| 13-Dec to 22-Dec | 9 | 8 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 21 |
| 23-Dec to 14-Jan | 5 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 10 |
| Total | 48 | 17 | 1 | 66 | 6 | 72 |
| Percent of recovering | 66.7 | 23.6 | 1.4 | 91.7 | 8.3 |  |
| Estimated escapement | 299 | 106 | 6 | 411 | 37 | 448 |
| Survival to escapement | 3.1\% | 1.2\% | 0.3\% | $2.0 \%$ | - | - |

with and without an AFC. Females were significantly longer than males ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$; ANOVA).

Females comprised $47.4 \%$ of the application sample, 53.3\% of the recovery sample (Table 8) and 52.3\% of the Petersen population estimate.

## DISCUSSION

GENERAL

## Juvenile Program

The 1988 brood release of 20,390 coded wire tagged coho smolts was similar to the 1984-1987 brood average release of 19,865 (Table 11). The subsequent AFC incidence in the 1991-1992 adult escapement (10.38) was also similar to the four year average (10.5\%), suggesting that smolt catchability has not varied dramatically over the study period.

Long term CWT loss (8.3\%) was less than the four year average (14.4\%), but within the 1984-87 brood range of $6.2 \%$ to $21.6 \%$ (Table 11).

## Adult Program

The apparent efficiency of the 1991-1992 field activities was similar to that reported in previous years (Table 12). The proportion of the escapement which was marked with disk tags was 1.1 percentage points above average, while the proportion of the escapement censused and the proportion of the marks recovered were 2.7 percentage points and 2.5 percentage points below average, respectively (Table 12). These data reflect the pattern of freshets in 1991-1992, which occurred after during the die-off period after immigration was complete.

## 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; Farwell et al. 1991; Farwell et al. 1992) reported differences in the spawning success of marked and unmarked females in most years, suggesting that exposure to electric current influenced subsequent survival. The present study also showed a small but significant difference in spawning success of marked and unmarked females; however, we were unable to determine if a behavioural change associated with reduced spawning success would also influence subsequent catchability.

## 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). As in previous years, 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. Biases were identified in both the tag application and recovery samples (Table 13). The application sample had a spatial and temporal bias, while the recovery sample had $a$ spatial bias.

The spatial bias in both the application and recovery samples could potentially bias study results; however, because the direction of the biases were dissimilar, estimation error may have been minor. To investigate this assumption, we stratified the data by section and estimated the escapement using Schaefer's modifica-

Table 11. Smolt release, escapement, survival and long term CWT loss in 19841988 brood Salmon River coho salmon.

| Domi- <br> nant <br> brood <br> year | Dominant escapement year | ```Number smolts releas- ed with CWTs``` | Escapement |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CWT } \\ \text { es- } \\ \text { cape- } \\ \text { ment } \end{gathered}$ | Survival to es-capement (\%) | Long term CWT $108 s$ | Percent escapement with AFCs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Female | Total |  |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 1987-88 | 7,891 | 5,197 | 11,947 | 373 | 4.7\% | 21.6\% | 3.48 |
| 1985 | 1988-89 | 20,022 | 5,779 | 9,152 | 1,082 | 5.4\% | 13.5\% | 14.4\% |
| 1986 | 1989-90 | 24,634 | 4,458 | 8,427 | 864 | 3.5\% | 6.2\% | 10.98 |
| 1987 | 1990-91 | 26,911 | 3,037 | 4,986 | 791 | 2.9\% | 18.4\% | 19.4\% |
| Mean | - | 19,865 | 4,618 | 8,628 | 778 | 3.98 | 14.4\% | 10.5\% |
| 1988 | 1991-92 | 20,390 | 2,258 | 4,321 | 409 | 2.0\% | 8.3\% | 10.3\% |

Table 12. Adult study efficiency as indicated by the proportion of the salmon River adult escapement which was disk tagged, censused, and recovered, 1987-88 to 1991-1992.

| Year | Escapement | Application Sample |  | Census sample |  | Marks recovered |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | ```Percent of total escape- ment``` | Total | Percent of total escapement | Total | Percent recovered |
| 1987-88 | 11,947 | 1,322 | 11.18 | 3,302 | 27.6\% | 352 | 26.68 |
| 1988-89 | 9,152 | 717 | 7.88 | 1,377 | 15.0\% | 107 | 14.9\% |
| 1989-90 | 8,427 | 495 | 5.98 | 1,327 | 15.7\% | 80 | 16.2\% |
| 1990-91 | 4,986 | 430 | 8.6\% | 864 | 17.3\% | 75 | 17.4\% |
| Mean | 8,628 | 741 | 8.3\% | 1,718 | 18.9\% | 154 | 18.88 |
| 1991-92 | 4,321 | 405 | 9.48 | 698 | 16.2\% | 66 | 16.38 |

Table 13. Results of statistical tests for bias in the 1991-1992 Salmon River escapement estimation study.

| Test | Application Sample | Recovery Sample |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bias in late period | No Bias |
| Period Bias in middle Salmon River <br> Fish size No bias <br> Fish sex No bias | Bias in upper Coghlan Creek |  |

Table 14. Smolt to adult survival and exploitation rate of 1984-1987 brood Salmon River coho salmon.

|  | Dominant Brood Year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 |
| Number released with a CWT a | 7,891 | 20,022 | 24,634 | 26,911 |
| Fishery Harvest b |  |  |  |  |
| Age 2 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 4 |
| Age 3 | 802 | 3,123 | 2,061 | 2,602 |
| Age 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 805 | 3,133 | 2,065 | 2,613 |
| Percent of release | 10.2\% | 15.6\% | 8.4\% | 9.7\% |
| Adult Escapement |  |  |  |  |
| Age 3 | 319 | 1,082 | 864 | 791 |
| Age 4 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 373 | 1,082 | 864 | 791 |
| Survival to harvest and escapement |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 1,178 | 4,215 | 2,929 | 3,404 |
| Percent of release | 14.9\% | 21.1\% | 11.9\% | 12.6\% |
| Exploitation Rate | 68.3\% | 74.3\% | 70.5\% | 76.8\% |

a. Adjusted for long term CWT loss.
b. From Appendix 12.
tion of the Petersen method for use with stratified populations (Ricker 1975). This estimate $(4,228)$ was $2.1 \%$ lower than the Petersen estimate but well above its lower $95 \%$ confidence limit. We concluded, therefore, that the assumption was valid; however, because similar spatial biases have been reported in previous studies (Farwell et al. 1991, 1992), spatial patterns should be assessed before undertaking future studies.

## ESCAPEMENT TREND

The 1991-1992 escapement of 4,321 was the fourth consecutive year of coho escapement declines in the Salmon River (Table 11). Escapement
declined by 13\% from 1990-1991 and by 64\% from 1987-1988, the first year of this study (Table 11). Female escapement declined by $26 \%$ and $57 \%$ during the same periods.

## SURVIVAL AND EXPLOITATION RATE

Exploitation rates and smolt to adult survivals were computed for the 1984-1987 brood years (Table 13); 1988 brood harvest data are preliminary and will be report in a future document. Exploitation rates for the 1984-1987 brood years averaged 72.3\% (range 68.0\% to 76.7\%). This level was slightly above the $65 \%-70 \%$ range believed to be associated with maximum sustained production, but below
the the average $77.1 \%$ reported for lower Fraser River hatchery stocks (DFO MS 1990). Smolt to adult survival averaged 15.18 .

## 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 (CWTs) and adipose fin clips (AFCs) were applied to emigrant smolts from April 20 to June 4, 1990. 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 20,390 coho smolts were release with CWTs and AFCs. Size averaged 94.6 mm NF length and 8.6 g wet weight.
4. Adult spawners were enumerated by a mark-recapture study from November 6, 1991 to January 14, 1992. 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 1991-92 coho adult escapement was estimated from a disk tag application sample of 405, a recovery sample of 698, and a recovery of 66 carcasses with disk tags or secondary marks. The estimated escapement was 4,321 coho adults, of which 2,258 were female, 2,063 were
male, and 448 had AFCs.
6. The estimated return to the spawning grounds of CWT codes 020834,020835 , and 0208 36 were 299,106 , and 6 , respectively. Survival from smolt release to spawning ground recovery for these three CWT codes was 3.1\%, $1.2 \%$, and 0.3\%, respectively, while CWT loss was 8.3\%.
7. All coho adults, as measured from the recovery sample, were age $3_{2}$. Adult POH length averaged 43.9 cm for males and 47.9 cm for females.
8. Biages were identified in both the application and recovery samples. None of the biases were likely to have influenced the accuracy of the escapement estimate.
9. For 1984-1987 brood years, smolt to adult survival averaged 15.1\%, and exploitation rate averaged 72.3\%.
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Appendix la. Daily fence trap catches in the Salmon River, 1990.

| Date | Water temp. <br> (c) a | Water level (m) a | Coho smolt | Cutthroat |  | Rainbow |  | Lamprey Sculpin |  | Stickleback | Crayfish | Sucker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Smolt |  | Smolt |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24-Apr | 7.0 | 0.65 | 293 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-Apr | 7.0 | 0.66 | 592 | 110 | 3 | 187 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26-Apr | 7.0 | 0.85 | 125 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Apr | 6.0 | 0.61 | 58 | 13 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 28-Apr | 6.0 | 0.72 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Apr b | 8.0 | 0.61 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 30-Apr | 5.0 | 0.55 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-May | 7.0 | 0.50 | 826 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 02-May | 7.0 | 0.53 | 1033 | 107 | 1 | 90 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 03-May | 7.0 | 0.52 | 406 | 50 | 3 | 55 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 04-May | 8.0 | 0.49 | 1197 | 83 | 0 | 77 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05-May | 9.0 | 0.48 | 921 | 81 | 5 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06-May | 7.5 | 0.48 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 07-May b | 7.0 | 0.49 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 08-May | 7.0 | 0.48 | 330 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09-May | 7.0 | 0.47 | 338 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10-May | 8.0 | 0.47 | 340 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11-May b | 9.0 | 0.47 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 12-May | 7.0 | 0.48 | 72 | 63 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13-May | 7.0 | 0.49 | 150 | 57 | 2 | 25 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-May | 7.0 | 0.50 | 108 | 84 | 9 | 16 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-May | 7.0 | 0.50 | 126 | 59 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 16-May | 8.0 | 0.49 | 195 | 65 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17-May | 7.5 | 0.48 | 338 | 46 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 18-May | 8.0 | 0.50 | 71 | 24 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19-May b | 9.0 | 0.50 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20-May b | 7.5 | 0.53 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 21-May b | 7.5 | 0.54 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 22-May | 8.5 | 0.53 | 59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23-May | 8.0 | 0.51 | 606 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 24-May | 8.0 | 0.50 | 233 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-May | 8.0 | 0.49 | 218 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26-May | 9.0 | 0.48 | 43 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-May | 8.5 | 0.48 | 108 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28-May | 9.0 | 0.49 | 172 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-May | 9.0 | 0.49 | 212 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 30-May | 9.0 | 0.48 | 86 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 31-May | 9.0 | 0.50 | 131 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-Jun | 8.0 | 0.56 | 202 | 44 | 22 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02-Jun | 10.0 | 0.56 | 153 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-Jun | 8.0 | 0.83 | 119 | 62 | 18 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 1 | , | 0 | 0 |
| 04-Jun c | 9.0 | 2.18 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Total } & - & - & 9,904 & 1,140 & 122 & 605 & 115 & 38 & 26 & 10 & 9 & 1\end{array}$
a. Recorded at approximately 0800 hrs .
b. Trap not fishing due to low water.
c. Trap out due to high water.

Appendix 1b. Daily fence trap catches in Coghlan Creek, 1990.

| Date | Water temp. <br> (C) | Water level <br> (m) | $\begin{array}{ll}  & \text { Coho } \\ \text { a } & \text { smolt } \end{array}$ | Cutthroa |  | Rainbow |  | Lamprey | Sculpin | Stickleback | Crayfish | Sucker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Smolt |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-Apr | 8.0 | 0.85 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21-Apr | 7.0 | 0.89 | 13 | 33 | 0 | 51 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22-Apr | 7.0 | 0.77 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23-Apr | 7.0 | 1.11 | 282 | 65 | 6 | 55 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 24-Apr | 7.0 | 1.03 | 214 | 72 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-Apr | 6.0 | 1.18 | 138 | 29 | 4 | 29 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 26-Apr | 7.0 | 1.00 | 330 | 61 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Apr | 6.0 | 0.97 | 54 | 39 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 28-Apr | 5.0 | 1.05 | 261 | 28 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-Apr | 8.0 | 0.95 | 70 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-Apr | 5.0 | 0.90 | 509 | 116 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-May | 6.0 | 0.88 | 658 | 124 | 7 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02-May | 6.5 | 0.88 | 475 | 89 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-May | 6.0 | 0.88 | 918 | 89 | 2 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 04-May | 7.0 | 0.85 | 1009 | 152 | 6 | 28 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 05-May | 8.0 | 0.82 | 930 | 224 | 12 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 06-May | 6.5 | 0.72 | 627 | 174 | 3 | 17 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07-May | 7.0 | 0.82 | 497 | 35 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08-May | 7.0 | 0.82 | 379 | 56 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09-May | 6.0 | 0.80 | 607 | 114 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10-May | 7.0 | 0.80 | 562 | 114 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11-May | 8.0 | 0.80 | 471 | 111 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 12-May | 7.0 | 0.85 | 410 | 218 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13-May | 6.5 | 0.83 | 595 | 86 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-May | 6.0 | 0.85 | 252 | 101 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15-May | 7.0 | 0.80 | 429 | 116 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-May | 7.0 | 0.82 | 355 | 103 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 17-May | 7.0 | 0.80 | 317 | 103 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18-May | 7.0 | 0.86 | 284 | 97 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19-May b | 8.0 | 0.85 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 20-May b | 7.0 | 0.85 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 21-May | 7.0 | 0.84 | 63 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 22-May | 7.5 | 0.81 | 208 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 23-May | 7.0 | 0.80 | 308 | 106 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24-May | 7.0 | 0.80 | 187 | 46 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25-May | 7.0 | 0.79 | 166 | 35 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26-May | 8.0 | 0.79 | 119 | 47 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-May | 7.5 | 0.80 | 64 | 37 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 28-May | 8.0 | 0.80 | 43 | 41 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29-May | 8.5 | 0.79 | 136 | 54 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-May | 8.0 | 0.80 | 74 | 55 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31-May | 8.0 | 0.82 | 49 | 41 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 01-Jun | 7.5 | 0.95 | 126 | 77 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02-Jun | 9.0 | 0.93 | 49 | 72 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-Jun c | 8.0 | 1.55 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | - | - | 13,265 | 3,231 | 142 | 421 | 132 | 40 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 0 |

a. Recorded at approximately 0800 hrs .
b. Trap not fishing due to low water.
c. Trap out due to high water.

Appendix 2a. Salmon River coded wire tagging results (code 020835 ), 1990.

| Tagging date | Maximum holding time (days) | Pretagging mortality | Total number marked | 24-hour CWT rejection |  | Post tagging mortality |  | Total released with CWT c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Na | (\%) | Immedia | -hour b |  |
| 24-Apr | 1 | 1 | 228 | 193 | 1.6 | 1 | 0 | 208 |
| 25-Apr | 1 | 1 | 576 | 179 | 2.2 |  | 21 | 508 |
| 26-Apr | 1 | 1 | 122 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 112 |
| 30-Apr | 3 | 0 | 63 | 102 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| 01-May | 1 | 40 | 764 | 222 | 1.4 | 17 | 6 | 679 |
| 02-May | 1 | 2 | 1124 | 271 | 1.5 | 7 | 0 | 1,024 |
| 03-May | 1 | 0 | 410 | 183 | 1.1 | 4 | 2 | 370 |
| 04-May | 1 | 12 | 1182 | 295 | 0.0 | 6 | 1 | 1,077 |
| 07-May | 2 | 4 | 922 | 270 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 845 |
| 08-May | 1 | 4 | 325 | 99 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 298 |
| 09-May | 1 | 1 | 337 | 253 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 309 |
| 10-May | 1 | 1 | 338 | 338 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 310 |
| 14-May | 2 | 2 | 325 | 343 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 298 |
| 15-May | 1 | 0 | 121 | 121 | 0.0 | 3 | 0 | 108 |
| 16-May | 1 | 2 | 189 | 188 | 0.5 | 2 | 2 | 170 |
| 17-May | 1 | 0 | 339 | 339 | 2.9 | 1 | 0 | 310 |
| 18-May | 1 | 0 | 79 | 78 | 0.0 | 0 | 1 | 72 |
| 22-May | 1 | 1 | 59 | 59 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| 23-May | 1 | 0 | 605 | 306 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 555 |
| 24-May | 1 | 0 | 233 | 233 | 0.4 | 0 | 1 | 213 |
| 25-May | 1 | 0 | 217 | 212 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| 28-May | 2 | 1 | 260 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 238 |
| 29-May | 1 | 3 | 209 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 192 |
| 30-May | 1 | 1 | 85 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| 01-Jun | 1 | 0 | 331 | 156 | 0.0 | 0 | 3 | 301 |
| 04-Jun | 2 | 0 | 272 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 249 |
| Total (mean) | (1.2) | 77 | 9,715 | 4,440 | (0.7) | 42 | 37 | 8,833 |

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 (codes 020834 and 020836 ), 1990.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \end{aligned}$ | Tagging date | Maximum holding time (days) | Pretagging mortality | Total <br> number marked | 24-hour CWT rejection |  | Post tagging mortality |  | Total released with CWT c |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Na | (\%) | Immedi | 4-hour b |  |
| 020834 | 24-Apr | 4 | 0 | 500 | 213 | 0.5 | 12 | 0 | 447 |
|  | 26-Apr | 1 | 3 | 359 | 100 | 2.0 | 3 | 0 | 326 |
|  | 30-Apr | 3 | 5 | 895 | 239 | 0.4 | 3 | 0 | 818 |
|  | 01-May | 1 | 1 | 653 | 219 | 0.0 | 3 | 1 | 595 |
|  | 02-May | 1 | 3 | 471 | 204 | 11.8 | 1 | 0 | 431 |
|  | 03-May | 1 | 1 | 917 | 263 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 841 |
|  | 04-May | 1 | 11 | 878 | 193 | 0.0 | 16 | 0 | 790 |
|  | 07-May | 2 | 19 | 1754 | 274 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1,608 |
|  | 08-May | 1 | 0 | 377 | 129 | 1.6 | 1 | 0 | 345 |
|  | 09-May | 1 | 1 | 607 | 238 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 556 |
|  | 10-May | 1 | 3 | 555 | 129 | 0.0 | 3 | 0 | 506 |
|  | 11-May | 1 | 3 | 461 | 150 | 0.0 | 7 | 0 | 416 |
|  | 14-May | 2 | 9 | 1260 | 345 | 1.2 | 0 | 1 | 1,154 |
|  | 15-May | 1 | 0 | 426 | 362 | 0.6 | 1 | 0 | 390 |
|  | 16-May | 1 | 1 | 354 | 213 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 325 |
|  | 17-May | 1 | 0 | 178 | 175 | 0.0 | 0 | 1 | 162 |
|  | Total (mean) | (1.4) | 60 | 10.645 | 3,446 | (1.3) | 50 | 3 | 9.709 |
| 020836 | 22-May | 4 | 3 | 679 | 268 | 0.0 | 0 | 1 | 622 |
|  | 23-May | 1 | 0 | 305 | 222 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 280 |
|  | 24-May | 1 | 0 | 187 | 186 | 2.7 | 0 | 1 | 171 |
|  | 25-May | 1 | 0 | 154 | 152 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
|  | 28-May | 2 | 0 | 270 | 254 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
|  | 29-May | 1 | 0 | 135 | 135 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
|  | 30-May | 1 | 0 | 74 | - | - | 0 | 2 | 66 |
|  | 01-Jun | 1 | 0 | 169 | 129 | 0.8 | 0 | 3 | 152 |
|  | 04-Jun | 2 | 0 | 50 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 46 |
|  | Total (mean) | (1.6) | 3 | 2,023 | 1.346 | 0.8 | 0 | 7 | 1.848 |
| Total (mean) |  | (1.5) | 63 | 12,668 | 4.792 | 1.1 | 50 | 10 | 11.557 |

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 Salmon River system coho salmon smolts, 1990.

| Location | Number inspected | Fog eye | Neascus | Crinkleback | General damage | Natural AFC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salmon River | 9,977 | 1.040 | 22 | 2 | 18 | 0 |
|  | \% | 10.4 | 0.2 | 0.02 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Coghlan Creek | 12,402 | 1.301 | 31 | 3 | 23 | 0 |
|  | \% | 10.5 | 0.2 | 0.02 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Total | 22.379 | 2,341 | 53 | 5 | 41 | 0 |
|  | \% | 10.5 | 0.2 | 0.02 | 0.2 | 0.0 |

Appendix 4. Mean length and weight of coho salmon smolts in the Salmon River System, 1990.

| Location | Sample date | Sample <br> size | Nose-fork length (mm) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean | Standard deviation | weight <br> (g) |
| Salmon River | 24-Apr | 50 | 99.8 | 14.1 | 10.5 |
|  | 27-Apr | 50 | 99.6 | 15.1 | 10.5 |
|  | 01-May | 50 | 94.8 | 10.0 | 8.5 |
|  | 04-May | 50 | 94.8 | 10.3 | 8.9 |
|  | 08-May | 50 | 92.5 | 8.6 | 8.0 |
|  | 11-May | 50 | 89.6 | 7.2 | 7.4 |
|  | 15-May | 50 | 90.3 | 8.6 | 7.8 |
|  | 18-May | 50 | 91.0 | 7.6 | 7.9 |
|  | 22-May | 50 | 90.5 | 9.9 | 7.3 |
|  | 25-May | 50 | 88.9 | 7.3 | 7.0 |
|  | 29-May | 50 | 87.9 | 5.7 | 7.1 |
|  | 01-Jun | 50 | 89.4 | 6.1 | 6.9 |
|  | Total a | 600 | 92.9 | - | 8.3 a |
| Coghlan Creek | 24-Apr | 50 | 103.6 | 11.4 | 11.6 |
|  | 27-Apr | 50 | 105.4 | 12.1 | 11.8 |
|  | 01-May | 50 | 99.7 | 8.7 | 10.1 |
|  | 04-May | 50 | 97.0 | 6.8 | 9.0 |
|  | 08-May | 50 | 96.5 | 7.4 | 9.1 |
|  | 11-May | 50 | 93.2 | 6.5 | 7.8 |
|  | 15-May | 50 | 93.2 | 7.0 | 8.0 |
|  | 18-May | 50 | 92.8 | 7.3 | 8.0 |
|  | 22-May | 50 | 89.5 | 5.7 | 7.5 |
|  | 25-May | 50 | 90.7 | 6.3 | 7.3 |
|  | 29-May | 50 | 91.8 | 5.9 | 7.6 |
|  | 01-Jun | 50 | 91.7 | 7.6 | 7.8 |
|  | Total a | 600 | 95.8 | - | 8.8 a |
| Total | - | 1,200 | 94.6 | - | 8.6 a |

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

Appendix 5a. Coho adult disk tag application results in the Salmon River, 1991. a

| Date | Reach b | Adipose present |  |  | Adipose absent |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 06-Nov | S1 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 22 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| O8-Nov | S2 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 9 |
|  | S3 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 6 | 21 |
|  | S4 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 13 |
| 13-Nov | S5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 15-Nov | S1 | 13 | 12 | 25 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 18 | 34 |
|  | S3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 14 |
|  | S4 | 10 | 11 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 12 | 23 |
| 22-Nov | S1 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
|  | S3 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
|  | S4 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 15 |
|  | S5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 29-Nov | S1 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 16 |
|  | S5 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 13 |
| 20-Dec | S1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
|  | S4 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 11 |
| Total | S1 | 27 | 45 | 72 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 31 | 55 | 86 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 11 |
|  | S3 | 25 | 14 | 39 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 29 | 18 | 47 |
|  | S4 | 34 | 20 | 54 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 36 | 26 | 62 |
|  | S5 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 25 |
|  | Total | 98 | 97 | 195 | 11 | 25 | 36 | 109 | 122 | 231 |

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, 1991. a

| Date | Reach b | Adipose present |  |  | Adipose absent |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| 06-Nov | C1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 08-Nov | C1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| 13-Nov | Cl | 7 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
|  | C2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  | C3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 11 |
|  | C4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
|  | C5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| 15-Nov | Cl | 9 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 11 |
| 18-Nov | C2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
|  | C3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
|  | C5 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| 25-Nov | C1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
|  | C2 | 12 | 5 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 20 |
|  | C4 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
|  | C5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| 06-Dec | Cl | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
|  | C3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
|  | C4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 12-Dec | C3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | Cl | 26 | 21 | 47 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 34 | 22 | 56 |
|  | C2 | 17 | 8 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 22 | 10 | 32 |
|  | C3 | 11 | 10 | 21 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 26 |
|  | C4 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 15 |
|  | C5 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 28 | 25 | 20 | 45 |
|  | Total | 66 | 57 | 123 | 32 | 19 | 51 | 98 | 76 | 174 |

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, 1991-1992.


Appendix 6. Disk tag recoveries in the Salmon River system, by application and recovery date and location, 1991-1992.

| Date | Application sample |  |  |  | Recovery sample |  |  |  | Time out (days) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reach d | $\begin{gathered} N F \\ \text { length } \\ (\mathrm{cm}) \end{gathered}$ | Sex | ipose fin | Date | Reach | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{POH} \\ & \text { length } \\ & (\mathrm{cm}) \end{aligned}$ | Sex |  |
| 25-Nov | C5 | 62.5 | M | A | 02-Dec | C3 | 49.2 | M | 7 |
| 25-Nov | C5 | 53.5 | M | A | 13-Dec | S1 | 57.2 | $M$ c | 18 |
| 25-Nov | C5 | 44.0 | M | A | 13-Dec | C5 | 35.1 | M | 18 |
| 29-Nov | S1 | 53.0 | F | P | 18-Dec | C1 | 43.7 | F | 19 |
| 29-Nov | S1 | 54.0 | F | P | 18-Dec | C1 | 43.5 | F | 19 |
| 29-Nov | S5 | 50.0 | M | P | 18-Dec | S4 | 40.0 | M | 19 |
| 29-Nov | S5 | 59.0 | F | P | 18-Dec | S4 | 50.1 | F | 19 |
| 29-Nov | S5 | 52.0 | M | P | 18-Dec | S4 | 42.6 | M | 19 |
| 29-Nov | S5 | 63.0 | F | P | 16-Dec | S4 | 51.2 | F | 17 |
| 29-Nov | S5 | 62.0 | F | P | 18-Dec | S4 | 51.8 | F | 19 |
| 29-Nov | S5 | 60.0 | M | P | 18-Dec | S4 | 48.2 | M | 19 |
| 06-Dec | Cl | 59.5 | F | P | 13-Dec | S1 | 49.2 | F | 7 |
| 06-Dec | Cl | 50.0 | F | P | 18-Dec | C1 | 41.7 | F | 12 |
| 20-Dec | S1 | 61.0 | F | P | 06-Jan | S1 | 53.7 | F | 17 |

Summary:

| Females initially identified as males: | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | Mean days out $=$ <br> Males initially identified as females: | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

a. Incorrect sex identification during disk tag application
b. No secondary mark on recovery
c. Excluded from POH and NF regressions
d. Salmon River: S1 - below Coghlan Cr; S2 - Coghlan Cr. to 64 Ave; S3-64 Ave to 56 Ave S4-56 Ave to 248 St ; S5-248 St to 256 St . Coghlan Creek: C1 - Salmon R. 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 7a. Summary of live observations and dead counts of coho salmon in the Salmon River, $1991-1992$.

| Date | Reach | Live count | Dead count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Adip $--\cdots$ Male | pose fi Female | pre | sent <br> Adult <br> total | Adipose fin absent <br> Adult <br> Male Female Jack total |  |  |  | Adult total | Disk tag and secondary mark | Secondary mark only | $\begin{gathered} \text { Disk } \\ \text { tag } \\ \text { only } \end{gathered}$ |
| 04-Dec | S4 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06-Dec | S4 |  | 9 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 13-Dec | S1 | 3 | 23 | 18 | 1 | 41 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 46 a | a 8 | 0 | 1 |
|  | S3 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 16-Dec | S4 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | - | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18-Dec | S1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | O | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 2 | 36 | 37 | 3 | 73 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 77 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 23-Dec | S1 | - | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | - | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | 1 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27-Dec | S5 | - | 8 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30-Dec | S5 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-Jan | S1 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | - | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 54 | - | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06-Jan | S1 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 54 | - | 6 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14-Jan | S1 | - | 3 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S3 | - | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | S1 | - | 40 | 48 | 1 | 88 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 97 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
|  | S2 | - | 8 | 7 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
|  | S3 | - | 41 | 28 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 54 | - | 70 | 74 | 7 | 144 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 157 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
|  | S5 | - | 25 | 22 | 1 | 47 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | 184 | 179 | 11 | 363 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 388 | 22 | 1 | 1 |

a. Includes 2 with unkown adipose fin status

Appendix 7b. Summary of live observations and dead counts of coho salmon in Coghlan Creek, 1991-1992.

a. Includes 2 of unknown sex.
b. Includes 2 of unknown adipose fin status.

Appendix 8. Spawning success of female adult coho spawning ground recoveries, 1991-1992.


Appendix 9. Observed and estimated coho adult escapement, by CWT code, in the Salmon River system, 1991-1992.

|  | Total | CWT Code |  |  | No CWT |  | CWT lost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 020834 | 020835 | 020836 | Jack | Adult |  |
| Estimated AFC escapement | 448 a | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| No. AFCs recovered | 72 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Observed CWT codes | 66 | 48 | 17 | 1 | - | 6 | - |
| Estimated escapement by code | - | 299 | 106 | 6 | - | 37 | - |

Appendix 10. Incidence of CWT loss by carcass condition, eye status. and AFC condition in AFC coho adult carcasses in the Salmon River system, 1991-1992.

| Category | Condition | Sample size | CWT <br> absent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { loss } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carcass condition | Fresh | 8 | 1 | 12.5\% |
|  | Moderately fresh | 48 | 5 | 10.4\% |
|  | Moderately rotten | 15 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Rotten | 1 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Eyes a | Present | 62 | 4 | 6.5\% |
|  | Absent | 9 | 1 | 11.1\% |
| Adipose fin clip | aComplete | 69 | 5 | 7.2\% |
|  | Partial | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Questionable | 0 | 0 | - |

a. Condition not recorded on 1 carcass

Appendix 11. Mean length, by sex and age, of Salmon River system coho spawners, 1991-1992.

| Sample | Age | Sex | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sample } \\ \text { size } \end{array}$ | Percent | Length (cm) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mean | Standard deviation | Range |
| Application sample | $a, b, c$ | Male | 205 | 51.0\% | 52.7 | 6.7 | 35.0-73.0 |
|  | - | Female | 197 | 49.0\% | 56.3 | 5.4 | 45.0-68.5 |
|  |  | Total | 402 | - | 54.5 | 6.3 | 35.0-73.0 |
| Recovery sample d | 3/2 | Male | 36 | 46.2\% | 43.9 | 6.6 | 33.9-57.8 |
|  |  | Female | 42 | 53.8\% | 47.9 | 3.8 | 38.3-55.9 |
|  | Total | Male | 73 | 46.8\% | 43.7 | 6.4 | 30.1-59.5 |
|  |  | Female | 83 | 53.2\% | 47.2 | 4.3 | 37.6-56.0 |
|  |  | Total | 156 | - | 45.6 | 5.6 | 30.1-59.5 |

a. Not adjusted for sex identification errors.
b. NF length.
c. Excludes 3 not measured at release.
d. POH length.

Appendix 12a. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 023838 ) a.

| Year | Fishery | Location | Catch by month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep |  | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| 1987 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | 2 | 7 | 6 | 5 |  | - | - | b - | - | 20 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | 15 | 26 | 31 | 30 |  | - | - | - | - | 102 |
|  |  | Central | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | 4 | - | 4 |
|  |  | Freshwater | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 4 d |  | d | - | 8 |
|  |  | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 2 | - |  | - | - | - | - | 3 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | 8 | - |  | - | - | - | - | 12 |
|  | Troll | South Central | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |  | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |  | - | - | - | - | 4 |
|  |  | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 3 |  | - | - | - | - | 7 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 22 | 9 |  | - | - | - | - | 31 |
|  |  | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 6 |  | 1 | - | - | - | 15 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 49 | 17 |  | 2 | - | - | - | 68 |
|  |  | Puget Sound c | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |  | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - |  | - | - | - | - | 3 |
|  | Net | Juan de Fuca | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 5 | - | - | 5 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 11 | - | - | 11 |
|  |  | Puget Sound c | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | - | - | 5 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |  | 9 | 7 | - | - | 21 |
|  |  | Fraser River | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  | Total |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 21 | 17 |  | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 61 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 26 | 113 | 65 | 15 | 5 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 265 |

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Excludes one recovery from Fort Langley (reported under freshwater sport).
c. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission database.
d. Assumed a 0.25 awareness factor for freshwater sport.

Appendix 12b. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 023839 ) a.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Catch | by | onth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Fishery | Location |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| 1987 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | 2 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | - | - b | - | 22 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | 15 | 30 | 42 | 12 | 13 | - | - | - | 112 |
|  |  | Puget Sound c | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | 7 |
|  |  | Freshwater | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 d | - | 4 |
|  | Troll | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 9 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 23 | 16 | - | - | - | - | 39 |
|  |  | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 14 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 62 | 3 | 9 | 2 | - | - | 76 |
|  | Net | Washington/ | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  | Oregon | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  | Juan de Fuca | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | 7 | - | - | 9 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | 16 | - | - | 23 |
|  |  | Puget Sound c | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 3 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 9 | - | - | - | 11 |
|  | Total |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 12 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 60 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 127 | 48 | 31 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 273 |

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Excludes one recovery from below Mission (reported in freshwater sport).
c. Pacific State Marine Fisheries Commission database.
d. Assumed a 0.25 awareness factor for freshwater sport.

Appendix 12c. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 023840 ) a.
 Catch by month

| Year | Fishery | Location |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1987 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - |  | - | 1 | - | 4 | 11 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | 20 |
|  |  | Georgi | Est |  |  |  | 4 |  | 15 | 57 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  | 101 |



| Washington/ | 0bs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Oregon b | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccc}\text { Central } & \text { Obs: } & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & 1 & - & - & - & - & 1 \\ & \text { Est: } & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & 4 & - & - & - & - & 4\end{array}$
Troll West Vancouver Obs: - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - 9 - 14
Island Est: - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - $\quad-\quad 4714$ - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - 61
South Central Obs: - - $\quad$ - $\quad$ - 1 - $-\quad$ -
Est: - $-\quad-\quad-\quad-3 \quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-\quad-3$


1988 Troll South Central Obs: - $\quad$ - $\quad-\quad-1$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllllll}\text { Total } & \text { Obs: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & \text { Est: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrr} & \text { Obs: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 4 & 30 & 12 & 8 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 62 \\ & \text { Est: } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 & 15 & 154 & 42 & 32 & 20 & 0 & 0 & 267\end{array}$
a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission database.

Appendix 12d. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 0243 10) a.


Catch by month

| Year | Fishery | Location |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1987 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - b | b - b | - | 0 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
|  |  | Freshwater | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $4 d$ | 4 d | - | 8 |
|  | Net | Puget Sound c | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 |
|  | Total |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  |  | Est : | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| 1988 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | 15 | 47 | 82 | 57 | 28 | 2 | $3 \mathrm{e}$ | $0 \mathrm{e}$ | $1$ | 235 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | 88 | 312 | 425 | 480 | $281$ | $16$ | $13$ | $0$ | $3$ | 1,618 |
|  |  | Central | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | 4 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 8 | 4 | - | - | - | 16 |
|  |  | Puget Sound c | Obs: | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | 10 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | 6 | 3 | 17 | 7 | - | 13 | - | - | 46 |
|  |  | Washington/ | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  | Oregon c | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
|  |  | Freshwater | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 c | 4 f | - | 7 |
|  |  |  | Est : | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 d | 16 d | - | 28 |
|  | Troll | South Central | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 6 | 2 | - | - | - | 10 |
|  |  |  | Est : | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 18 | 9 | - | - | - | 33 |
|  |  | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 32 | 33 | 15 | - | - | - | 80 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 144 | 144 | 68 | - | - | - | 356 |
|  |  | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 116 | 37 | 27 | - | - | - | 180 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est : | - | - | - | - | - | - | 421 | 166 | 63 | - | - | - | 650 |
|  |  | Washington/ | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
|  |  | Oregon c | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | 10 |

Appendix 12d continued. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 0243 10). a

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Excludes one recovery from Fraser River (reported in freshwater sport).
c. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission database.
d. Assumed a 0.25 awareness factor for freshwater sport.
e. Excludes threee recoveries from Fraser River (reported in freshwater sport).
f. Includes 3 recoveries from Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commision database.

Appendix 12e. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 0249 38) a.
 Catch by month

| Year | Fishery | Location |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | Net | Puget Sound b | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | 4 |
|  | Total |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 1989 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | 5 | 11 | 45 | 44 | 22 | 10 | 2 | 4 | - | 143 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | 44 | 103 | 139 | 262 | 123 | 83 | 11 | 5 | - | 770 |
|  |  | Puget Sound b | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | - | - | 14 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 7 | 18 | 18 | 5 | - | - | 55 |
|  |  | Washington/ | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 7 |
|  |  | Oregon b | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 6 | 2 | - | - | - | 15 |
|  | Troll | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 91 | 17 | - | - | - | - | 108 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 524 | 127 | - | - | - | - | 651 |
|  |  | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 18 | - | 7 | - | - | - | 25 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 80 | - | 20 | - | - | - | 100 |
|  |  | Washington/ | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | 9 |
|  |  | Oregon b | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 23 | - | - | - | - | 23 |
|  | Net | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | 3 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | 1 | - | 7 |
|  |  | Johnstone | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 7 | - | - | - | 10 |
|  |  | Strait | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 21 | - | - | - | 32 |
|  |  | Juan de Fuca | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 16 | 19 | 23 | - | - | - | 58 |
|  |  |  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 62 | 108 | 92 | - | - | - | 262 |
|  |  | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | 9 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36 | - | - | 36 |


| Puget Sound | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 4 | 19 | - | - | - | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 7 | 94 | - | - | - | 105 |
| Fraser River | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 2 |
|  | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2 | - | - | 5 |
|  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 46 | 173 | 82 | 75 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 412 |
|  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 103 | 146 | 946 | 423 | 333 | 60 | 6 | 0 | 2.061 |
|  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 46 | 173 | 82 | 75 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 413 |
|  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 103 | 146 | 946 | 423 | 333 | 64 | 6 | 0 | 2.065 |

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commision database.

Appendix 12f. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 02 57 25) a.

Catch by month


Appendix 12f continued. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 0257 25). a

| Catch by month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Fishery | Location |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| 1991 | Sport | Strait of | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
|  |  | Georgia | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | 4 |
|  | Total |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Total |  |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 53 | 96 | 28 | 25 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 231 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 177 | 354 | 144 | 149 | 60 | 8 | 0 | 939 |

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Assumed a 0.25 awareness factor for freshwater sport.
c. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission database.
d. Used expansion factor of 1.0
e. Used expansion factor of 0.25

Appendix 12g. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 026322 ) a.


Appendix 12 g continued. Observed and estimated recoveries of Salmon River coho salmon (CWT code 0263 22). a

| Catch by month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Fishery | Location |  | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| 1991 | Troll | West Vancouver | Obs: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
|  |  | Island | Est: | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
|  | Total |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Total |  |  | Obs: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 70 | 167 | 60 | 25 | 35 | 9 | 0 | 403 |
|  |  |  | Est: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 133 | 231 | 690 | 334 | 121 | 131 | 17 | 0 | 1,670 |

a. Department of Fisheries and Oceans database.
b. Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission database.


[^0]:    Fifty coho smolts per site were sampled twice weekly for scales,

[^1]:    a Includes 1 with a secondary mark only.

[^2]:    See Table 5 for section descriptions.
    b Includes 1 with a secondary mark only.

[^3]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Corrected for sex identification error.
    ${ }^{b}$ Excludes jacks.
    ${ }^{c}$ Includes 2 recovered with unknown sex.
    ${ }^{d}$ Excludes 2 of unknown sex.

