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#### Abstract

Nagtegaal, D.A. ,C.J. Hillier, and E.W. Carter. 1999. A preliminary report on juvenile chinook production in the Cowichan River, 1998. Can Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2471: 32 p.

In 1991, Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), Pacific Biological Station began a study of juvenile chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) productivity in the Cowichan River. The 1998 study is concerned primarily with the enumeration and out-migration timing of naturally-reared chinook juveniles.

The estimated production of naturally-reared chinook juveniles from the 1997 brood year was $1,638,198(95 \%$ Confidence limit $1,376,097-1,900,324)$. There were three distinct peaks in the outmigration of naturally-reared chinook. The first occurred March 15-17, the second and largest occurred March 19-21 and the final peak occurred March 23-28. The release of chinook from the Cowichan River hatchery totalled 262,675 . Of these, 160,924 hatchery-reared chinook were released above the trapping site. Trapping results maintain that most hatchery-reared chinook migrate to the Cowichan estuary within one week of release. Interaction between naturally-reared and hatchery-reared chinook juveniles is therefore believed to be limited.


## RÉSUMÉ

Nagtegaal, D.A. ,C.J. Hillier, and E.W. Carter. 1999. A preliminary report on juvenile chinook production in the Cowichan River, 1998. Can Manuscr. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 2471: 32 p.

En 1991, on a entrepris, à la Station biologique du Pacifique de Pêches et Océans Canada (MPO), une étude sur la productivité du quinnat juvénile (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) dans la rivière Cowichan. L'étude de 1998 est principalement centrée sur le dénombrement et la période de dévalaison des quinnats juvéniles sauvages.

La production estimée de quinnats juvéniles sauvages dans l'année de reproduction 1997 était de 1638198 individus (limite de confiance à $95 \%: 1376097-1900324$ ). On a observé trois pics distincts dans la dévalaison des quinnats sauvages: le premier du 15 au 17 mars; le deuxième, et le plus important, du 19 au 21 mars; et le dernier du 23 au 28 mars. L'écloserie de la Cowichan a lâché en tout 262675 quinnats. De ce nombre, 160924 individus ont été lâchés en amont du site de capture. Les résultats de la capture ont montré que la plupart des quinnats d'écloserie atteignent l'estuaire de la Cowichan dans la semaine qui suit leur lâcher. On pense donc que l'interaction entre les quinnats juvéniles sauvages et les quinnats juvéniles d'écloserie est limitée.

## INTRODUCTION

Situated in southeastern Vancouver Island, the Cowichan watershed is one of the most important salmonid producing systems draining into the Strait of Georgia (Candy et al. 1995). Chinook (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), coho (O. kisutch), chum ( $O$. keta), steelhead ( $O$. mykiss), cutthroat ( $O$. clarki), as well as brown trout (Salmo trutta) and dolly varden (Salmo malma) spend periods of their life cycle or reside in this system. Historically, the chinook in this system have played an important role in the recreational, aboriginal, and commercial fisheries (Neave, 1949). Since 1958 the discharge of the Cowichan River has been controlled by a weir located at the outlet of Lake Cowichan, approximately 50 km upstream from the mouth of Cowichan River (Burns et al. 1988). There have been periods of perceived salmonid population decline that have led to numerous studies (Lister et al. 1971; Candy et al. 1995; Nagtegaal et al. 1994-98).

Recent years have shown a dramatic decrease in the abundance of chinook throughout BC waters. The late 1970's were characterized by peak harvest rates of approximately 750,000 pieces. In the 1980's these rates dropped to numbers less than $25 \%$ of their former abundance (Argue et al. 1983).

For this reason, many stock rebuilding initiatives were implemented. In 1979, the Cowichan River Hatchery initiated a chinook enhancement program. Production began with a modest output of less than 70,000 chinook fry and grew to peak production of $3,000,000$ smolts (Candy et al. 1996). The hatchery's 1997 brood stock collection was not very successful. High water levels made it difficult to obtain adults and, consequently, the hatchery only produced approximately 262,675 chinook smolts (D. Millerd, Cowichan River community economic development hatchery manager, P.O. Box 880, Duncan, B.C., pers. comm.).

As in previous years, a portion of these hatchery produced chinook were coded-wire tagged. Fisheries managers rely heavily on the information provided by the tagged salmonids to evaluate the strategies for each hatchery program. The data from tag recoveries also provides key information regarding stock migration, harvest rates, and a measure of enhanced contribution to the stock (Nagtegaal et al. 1998)

In 1985, a chinook rebuilding strategy in conjunction with the Pacific Salmon Treaty, led to the Cowichan's inclusion into a naturally spawning chinook study. Along with the Nanaimo and Squamish River stocks, the Cowichan chinook stock was chosen as an escapement indicator to stop the perceived decline of Lower Strait of Georgia chinook and monitor the rebuilding of escapement into these systems (Nagtegaal et al. 1998). The accurate enumeration of chinook migrants is also an important resource management tool. For this reason the results of this ongoing study can be used to assess enhancement strategies; harvest management practices; as well as investigate possible interactions between hatcherychinook and naturally-reared chinook.

For the purposes of this study, we refer to hatchery fish as those that were spawned and reared in the hatchery environment regardless of parental origin, and naturally-reared fish as those that spawned and reared in the river environment. The naturally-reared juvenile chinook of Cowichan River are considered to be the "ocean-type". This means that they usually migrate to sea within three months of emergence (Healey 1991). Lister et al. (1971) subdivided the Cowichan chinook migrants into two distinct groups. The 'early group' comprises the majority of the migrants and consists mainly of newly emerged fry with an average length of approximately 42 mm . The 'early group' migrates to the estuary in March and April. The 'late group' as described by Lister are larger with lengths averaging over 55 mm . This group may rear
in the river system for up to 90 days before migrating to the estuary in May and June. This 'late group' may account for approximately $15 \%$ of the total juvenile chinook population (Nagtegaal et al. 1998).

## METHODS

## STUDY SITE DESCRIPTION

The Cowichan River begins at the Lake Cowichan weir and drains the mountainous slopes of the Vancouver Island range with a watershed area of $840 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ (Candy et al. 1995). Approximately 40 km north of Victoria, the Cowichan River flows eastward through the City of Duncan, and carries a mean annual discharge of $55 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ (Nagtegaal et al. 1995). Skutz Falls, located 18 km downstream of Lake Cowichan, is a partial obstruction to the upstream migration of chinook spawners. In 1956 a fishway was built to help alleviate this problem (Lister et al. 1971). The Cowichan chinook spawn primarily in the mainstem, above Skutz Falls (Nagtegaal et al. 1997).

The rotary trap was placed at the City of Duncan old pumphouse site (Fig. 1). It was assumed that virtually all chinook spawning occurred above this point. Sites 7B and 7F were used exclusively for this study. Site 7B is a wider section of Cowichan River with canyon walls on one side. Site 7F is located in a narrower portion of the river just upstream of 7B and was used only when low discharge and flow rates interfered with the ability of the trap to catch fish.

## FISH CAPTURE

An auger or rotary screw trap, 2.4 m in diameter was used to trap juveniles migrating downstream to the Cowichan Estuary. Fish passing through the cone were collected in a live box. In operation from February 26 to May 15, the trap was held in place by a galvanized steel cable which secured the trap at site 7B (the lower pumphouse site). When flows became too low (May 1), the trap was moved upstream to site 7F (the upper pumphouse site). On Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday evenings, the trap was set at 1900 hrs and fished continuously until 0700 hrs the following morning at which time the trapped fish were removed. During trap efficiency tests, trapping occurred continuously over 24 hour periods. When this occurred the trap was checked at both 0700 and 1900 hours.

All fish captured were enumerated by species and recorded by time period and capture date. Chinook migrants were identified as hatchery or naturally-reared, based on identifiable physical characteristics (size, absence or presence of an adipose fin). Coho were recorded as either fry, one or two year old smolts. Biophysical conditions (water temperature, flow rates, clarity, and weather conditions) were also recorded.

## ABUNDANCE ESTIMATES

Trap efficiency information, using the mark - recapture of Bismarck brown stained juvenile fish (Ward and Verhoeven 1963), was used to expand the trap catch to estimate total numbers migrating past the trap site. Juvenile chinook and chum were stained, and then released approximately 500 m upstream
from the trap site. The number of stained fish recaptured from continuous trapping over the next three to four days was recorded.

The proportion of marked fish recaptured was used to expand the unmarked fish catch and estimate the total number of fish. Mark - recapture estimates were done on a biweekly basis using chinook until captured fish became too few to complete the process. At this point chum were used in the mark recapture estimates.

Trap efficiency was estimated using:

$$
E i j=R i j / M i j
$$

where:
$E$ is the estimated trap efficiency at site $i$ and sampling week $j$
$R$ is the number of marked fish recaptured. M is the number of marked fish released.

Inherent in these efficiency tests were the following assumptions:
i. marking of the fish does not affect short term survival of these fish,
ii. all marked fish released above the traps site migrate downstream past the trap,
iii. marked fish behave the same as unmarked fish, and
$i v$. all recaptured fish were counted.
The total number of fish was estimated by:

$$
N_{i}=U_{i j} \quad E_{i j}
$$

where:
N is the estimated number of marked fish.
U is the catch of unmarked fish in the trap.

Estimates of daily fish migration were obtained by taking the mean of the days when the trap was in operation to fill in the non-fishing days. For example, when the trap was fishing on Monday and Wednesday, but not on Tuesday the mean catch for the fishing days was inserted for the non-fishing days. Twenty-four hour estimates were extrapolated for the parts of the day when the trap was not in operation. The total abundance estimate was taken from the sum of the daily catch estimates for the duration of the study (Nagtegaal et al. 1997).

The adjusted Petersen estimate (Ricker 1975) was used to obtain confidence limits of trap efficiency. Since there is added uncertainty from using biweekly trap efficiencies, interpolation of unsampled days, and extrapolation for unsampled parts of the day, the confidence limits were considered to be minimum (Nagtegaal et al. 1995; Candy et al. 1996).

## GROWTH

Observations on growth for naturally-reared chinook were obtained by collecting samples from each catch of the rotary trap. Thirty chinook migrants were measured to the nearest mm fork length, and weight was recorded to the nearest one hundredth of a gram.

At the Cowichan River hatchery between 30 to 50 chinook were sampled for each rearing strategy prior to release. Due to the hatchery's lower broodstock captures, and subsequent low fry production, sampling the hatchery component of this study was greatly reduced.

## RESULTS

## BIOPHYSICAL CONDITIONS

During the study period the discharge of the Cowichan River decreased steadily from $110 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ on February 26 (with a February mean discharge of $128 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ ) to $9.51 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ on May 19. The mean discharge for March was $69.6 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$; for April $26.4 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$; and for May $11.1 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$. Flow rates decreased from a high of $1.64 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ to a low of $0.39 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. Water temperatures increased from $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $14^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Fig. 2).

On one occasion, large organic debris accumulated in front of the trap (March 10). The total catch on this day was much lower than trap catch prior to or following this date. Therefore, it is believed that the build up of organic materials on this day interfered with the ability of the trap to catch fish. On a regular basis, there was a build up of small organic debris in the trap. However, when this occurred there was no noticeable difference in the fishing efficiency of the rotary trap.

Water clarity at the trapping site was recorded as clear or cloudy. For the first three weeks of the study it was recorded as cloudy. From March 18 until the end of the study the water was consistently clear with only three exceptions (two in mid March and one in mid April). During the time of the study there were only three days where rain was recorded (Table 1).

## MIGRATION TIMING

At the pumphouse 25,983 naturally-reared and 1,911 hatchery chinook juveniles were caught in the auger trap (Table 1). Downstream movement of naturally-reared chinook was observed from February 26 (983) to May 19 (10). The downstream movement of hatchery chinook was observed from April 10 (124) to May 19 (420). It was assumed that the hatchery fish released in the upper river would have reached the trapping site within approximately one week of their release date (Nagtegaal et al. 1998). Naturally-reared chinook migration peaked in mid - March (Fig. 3). It must be noted, however, the first catch of naturallyreared chinook in the rotary trap was substantial (983) relative to previous years and indicated that downstream migration had begun earlier.

## HATCHERY RELEASES

Cowichan River Hatchery had two releases 30 km above the trapping site during the study. There was overlap in the size range between the hatchery fish and the naturally-reared fish during the first release.

Prior to the second hatchery release, the sampled size of naturally-reared fish was still less than the hatchery fish. However, with the migration of the ' 90 -day' chinook smolts (Lister et al. 1971) there may have been some overlap in size making it difficult to distinguish larger naturally-reared fish from smaller hatchery-reared chinook, especially in the absence of adipose clips.

A total of approximately 160,924 hatchery-reared chinook were released above the trapping site (Table 2). Of these fish 150,747 received coded wire tags (CWT). The early release group (approximately 76,117 fish) was released in the upper Cowichan River on April 9 at the Road pool site. The late release $(84,807)$ occurred on May 12, also at the Road Pool site. In total the rotary trap caught 885 adipose-clipped hatchery-reared fish. The lake pen release strategy was not used this year.

## TRAP EFFICIENCIES AND ABUNDANCE

At the lower pumphouse site (7B), the mean trap efficiency (Table 3) for naturally-reared chinook was calculated to be $3.34 \%$ (Fig. 4). After April 9, 1998, capture numbers for naturally-reared chinook were so low that chum were used for the two subsequent efficiency tests. The mean efficiency for all tests was determined to be $3.21 \%$. At the upper pumphouse site efficiency tests were not conducted. For this reason efficiency data obtained from this site in the 1996 study were used.

We estimated the total number of naturally-reared chinook migrants in Cowichan River to be $1,638,211(95 \%$ CL: 1,376,097-1,900,324) and the number of hatchery-reared chinook to be 170,057 ( $95 \%$ CL: $99,289-271,155$ ). Reports from the Cowichan River Hatchery indicated that a total of 160,924 were released above the trapping site. It should be noted that the hatchery estimate was incomplete as a release occurred only seven days prior to the end of our study, and the last sampling day recorded 420 hatchery smolts.

## DIEL MIGRATION

This year's study did not include a continuous 24-hour trapping component to determine diel migration. For this reason all assumptions of diel movement were obtained from previous studies. The only daytime trapping occurred in conjunction with the trap efficiency tests. These scanty results indicated that the majority of chinook migrants were caught in the over night sampling, rather than the daytime hours. Nagtegaal et al. (1997) indicated that more extensive 24 -hour trapping sessions must be completed in order to obtain a more confident estimation of diel migration patterns.

## GROWTH

During the study period, growth rates (mean length and weight) of naturally-reared chinook juveniles changed little until May (Appendix 1). Mean length was consistently recorded at approximately 40 mm and mean weight at $.50-.55 \mathrm{gm}$. The early release hatchery fish were much larger, with a mean
length of 69.7 mm and weight of 3.7 gm (Appendix 2). This size difference should have made them easily distinguishable from the naturally-reared chinook.

Toward the end of the study, the size of naturally-reared fish showed a slight length and weight increase, however, subsample sizes were much smaller than in previous sampling ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ to 15 ). The late hatchery release fish had a mean length of 82.3 mm and a weight of 6.3 gm (Fig. 5). The lack of an experienced crew may have led to some chinook juveniles being incorrectly identified.

## CODED WIRE TAG RECOVERIES

During the study, 885 hatchery chinook juveniles out of the total hatchery capture (1911) were identified as being adipose-clipped (coded wire tagged). This number represents $46 \%$ of the total number of hatchery chinook caught in the trap, or $.59 \%$ of the total number of coded-wire tagged hatchery releases.

## DISCUSSION

## ABUNDANCE ESTIMATES

Approximately 1.64 million naturally-reared chinook migrated from Cowichan River in 1998 (95\% CL: 1,376,097-1,900,324). This estimate did not take into consideration the migration of chinook prior to the installation of the rotary trap. Nor did this study take into consideration any migration of chinook smolts after the study ended. It has been reported (Lister et al. 1971) that there is a later migration of juveniles that peaks after May.

This late migration of chinook may have been observed in the Cowichan Lake coho study conducted on the Cowichan River during May/June. Two kilometers downstream of the road pool a large number of chinook smolts were captured in a modified fyke net (Table 4). These fish were larger and may represent the later migratory run or they may be stragglers from the late hatchery release on May 13.

It is interesting to note that these larger chinook smolts were also spotted in Meade Creek, an intermittent Cowichan Lake tributary, during fry salvage efforts by members of the Lake Cowichan Salmonid Enhancement Society in June. In May/June, chinook fry were also identified in Nixon Creek, another intermittent Cowichan Lake tributary. Since the lake pen hatchery release strategy was not used this year it is unlikely that these fish were of hatchery origin. This could not be confirmed since adiposeclipped or coded-wire tagged juveniles were not recovered.

Neave (1949) in his report on the Cowichan River discusses a spring run of chinook that spawned primarily around the Cowichan Lake tributaries. He postulated that these spring run fish were near extinct in his time. Whether these populations of chinook are remnants of a spring run or directly related to the lake pen release strategy is unknown.

Chinook abundance estimates using the Bismarck Brown stain to calculate trap efficiency may be biased low. The assumption that stained fish have the same capture rate as unmarked migrant chinook may be untrue. The stained fish have endured more handling and stress associated with the marking process. Therefore, swimming ability and behavior of these fish may be affected and translate into lower recapture
rates (Nagtegaal et al. 1997). According to Frith et al. (1995), not all released marked fish are available for recapture. Some fish are lost to predation, disease or residualization.

Water turbidity or clarity would likely affect trap avoidance by migrating chinook. Increased turbidity may decrease the ability of the migrants to avoid capture. Clarity combined with lower flow rates may have the opposite effect, increasing the ability of migrants to avoid capture. Excluding the first three weeks of the study, the water was consistently clear. Water temperatures rose from $6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $14^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ during the course of the study.

Flow rates during recapture periods ranged from a high of $1.25 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ on March 4 to a low of 0.43 $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ on April 15. April 29 showed a slight increase to $0.65 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. Low flow rates and other discharge dynamics, in combination with the cone rotation, may affect the efficiency of the trap (Frith et al. 1995).

For this study it was assumed that trap efficiencies for naturally-reared and hatchery-reared chinook were different. The efficiency information for naturally-reared chinook was obtained through Bismarck Brown efficiency tests conducted through the course of the study. For hatchery-reared chinook, data from the 1995 study were used.

Efficiency tests from other studies (Thedinga et al. 1994, Roper and Scarnecchia 1996) indicate that there are considerable differences in trap efficiencies between species, flow rates and fish size. Biophysical factors such as low flow and clarity along with the use of trap efficiencies for hatchery chinook from previous years may partially account for the low bias in this year's estimate. Wetherall (1970) submitted that higher survival rates of migrants were observed with larger fish and high flows (discharges), while fingerling in stream discharges less than $20 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ had lower survival rates.

Trap efficiencies may be affected by the stream characteristics in which the trap is placed. Site 7B is located in a riffle or run section of the pumphouse site, while site 7 E is located in an upstream pool. Roper and Scarnecchi (1996) stated that hatchery-reared fish were often able to avoid a trap in a low velocity riffle area, however, when the trap was positioned at the head of a pool they were often caught.

According to Seelbach (1985) and Roper and Scarnecchi (1996), key factors that affect hatchery fish migrations are size and time of outplanting and water velocities. Another possible reason for the low bias is the misidentification of hatchery fish as naturally-reared fish. An inexperienced crew may account for this. It is interesting to note that on the last day of trapping, 420 hatchery-reared chinook smolts were captured, indicating that the migration of the late hatchery release was not over.

## EGG TO FRY SURVIVAL

To estimate the egg to fry survival rate, an accurate assessment of adult spawners, the percentage of females in the escapement, the average fecundity, and juvenile outmigration are needed. Adult chinook escapement for 1997 was determined to be 7,525 (Nagtegaal et al. 1998). Natural spawners were estimated at 7,086 . The proportion of females was determined to be $54 \%$, or 4,085 . The average fecundity from broodstock biosample data was determined to be 3,723 . With this information, the total egg production was estimated to be $15,208,455$ (Fig. 6).

The estimated abundance of naturally-reared chinook fry was extrapolated to be $1,638,211$. The egg to fry survival was therefore estimated to be $10.77 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CL}: 9.05 \%-12.50 \%$ ). This estimate is
comparable to survival rates from previous surveys in 1991 and 1995 (Nagtegaal et al. 1997) and is also comparable to Healey (1991) who reported chinook egg to fry survivals ranging from $8 \%$ to $16 \%$.

The differences in survival rates among years may be attributed to many factors ranging from biophysical conditions, chum escapements and spawner distribution (Nagtegaal et al. 1997). Spawner distribution in 1997 was consistent with 1994 and 1995 (most chinook spawning occurred in the middle section of the river) and low chum escapements in recent years seem to have enhanced the egg to fry survival rate (Nagtegaal et al. 1998).

## JUVENILE CHINOOK GROWTH

The length - weight sampling during the study showed little increase in average size of naturallyreared chinook until after April 27. Growth information obtained from May 6 to the end of the study is questionable due to smaller subsample sizes. It is unlikely that subsample sizes ranging from 1 to 15 provided accurate population representations.

According to one participant at the trapping site, the identification of naturally-reared versus hatchery chinook became more difficult after the late hatchery release since the length of naturally-reared fish had increased. It is likely that there was an overlap in fish sizes and the incorrect identification of hatchery fish as naturally-reared chinook may have occurred as a result.

## JUVENILE CHINOOK INTERACTION

The possibility of interactions between the early naturally-reared chinook (Lister et al. 1971) and hatchery-reared chinook in Cowichan River seems to be limited. Approximately $85 \%$ of the naturallyreared chinook head to the estuary upon emergence (Nagtegaal et al. 1997) and the peak migration of these chinook occurred in mid to late March, prior to the first hatchery release on April 9.

The late hatchery release occurred on May 13. By this time the majority of 'early' chinook migrants had already passed the trapping site, and capture rates of these naturally-reared chinook had decreased substantially. Possible interactions between hatchery released chinook and the 'late' larger migrants could occur even if the hatchery fish move quickly to the estuary upon release, as Candy et al. (1996) indicated. The small numbers of hatchery fish released and the assumed small population of 'late' migrants would suggest a very limited possibility of interaction.
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Table 1. Rotary screw trap data at pumphouse location.

| Set date | Site | W | Temp | Clarity | Sampling <br> Date | Start Time | CNW | CNH CNC | CM | COF | $\mathrm{CO1} \mathrm{CO2}$ | BB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25-02 | 7B | 2 | 6C | 2 | 26-02 | 13:00 | 983 |  |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| 01-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 2 | 02-03 | 8:00 | 810 |  | 148 | 6 | 14 |  |
| 03-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 2 | 04-03 | 7:00 | 941 |  | 282 | 1 | 13 |  |
| 04-03 | 7B | 1 | 5C | 2 | 05-03 | 8:00 | 828 |  | 411 | 51 | 18 | 5 CNW |
| 05-03 | 7 B | 1 | 6 C | 2 | 05-03 | 19:00 | 37 |  | 20 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 05-03 | 7B | 1 | 5C | 2 | 06-03 | 7:00 | 842 |  | 291 | 23 | 27 |  |
| 06-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 2 | 06-03 | 19:00 | 57 |  | 26 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 07-03 | 7B | 1 | 5C | 2 | 07-03 | 7:00 | 504 |  | 240 | 14 | 16 |  |
| 08-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 2 | 09-03 | 7:00 | 533 |  | 434 | 34 | 12 |  |
| 10-03 | 7B | 2 | 6C | 2 | 11-03 | 7:00 | 53 |  | 112 | 2 | 3 |  |
| 12-03 | 7B | 2 | 6C | 2 | 13-03 | 7:00 | 496 |  | 650 | 11 | 6 |  |
| 15-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 2 | 16-03 | 7:00 | 1838 |  | 1753 | 32 | 32 |  |
| $17-03$ | 7B |  | 7C | 2 | 18-03 | 7:00 | 1348 |  | 951 | 49 | 26 |  |
| 18-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C |  | 19-03 | 7:00 | 2830 |  | 2390 | 47 | 25 |  |
| 18-03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 1 | 19-03 | 7:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 13 CNW |
| 19-03 | 7B | 2 | 7C | 1 | 19-03 | 19:00 | 93 |  | 26 | 2 | 5 |  |
| $19-03$ | 7B | 1 | 7C | 1 | 20-03 | 7:00 | 3737 |  | 3326 | 91 | 13 | 1 |
| 20-03 | 7B | 1 | 8C | 1 | 20-03 | 19:00 | 109 |  | 248 | 3 | 1 |  |
| 21-03 | 7B | 2 | 7C | 1 | 21-03 | 7:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 CNW |
| 20-03 | 7B | 1 | 7C | 1 | 21-03 | 7:00 | 1509 |  | 2821 | 103 | 12 |  |
| 22-03 | 7B | 3 | 7C | 1 | 23-03 | 7:00 | 1370 |  | 3533 | 113 | 26 |  |
| 24-03 | 7B | 1 | 7 C | 2 | 25-03 | 7:00 | 2241 |  | 3758 | 134 | 42 |  |
| 26.03 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 2 | 27-03 | 7:00 | 2527 |  | 3255 | 247 | 36 |  |
| 28-03 | 7B | 2 | 8C | 1 | 30-03 | 7:00 | 768 |  | 4834 | 184 | 18 |  |
| 31-03 | 7B | 1 | 7C | 1 | 01-05 | 7:00 | 600 |  | 7932 | 278 | 13 |  |
| 01-04 | 7B | 2 | 7C | 1 | 02-04 | 7:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 CNW |
| 01-04 | 7B | 2 | 8C | 1 | 02-04 | 7:00 | 11 |  | 57 | 3 |  |  |
| 02-04 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 1 | 02-04 | 19:00 | 403 |  | 6355 | 192 | 12 |  |
| 02-04 | 7B | , | 7C | 1 | 03-04 | 19:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 CNW |
| 02-04 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 1 | 03-04 | 7:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 CNW |
| 02-04 | 7B | 1 | 6C | 1 | 03-04 | 19:00 | 215 |  | 7506 | 94 | 9 |  |
| 03-04 | 7B | 1 | 7C | 1 | 03-04 | 19:00 | 24 |  | 94 | 3 | 1 |  |
| 03-04 | 7B | 1 | 7 C | 1 | 04-04 | 7:00 | 337 |  | 6900 | 125 | 27 |  |
| 05-04 | 7B | 1 | 8C | 1 | 06-04 | 7:00 | 201 |  | 10775 | 62 | 4 |  |
| 07-04 | 7B |  | 7 C | 1 | 08-04 | 7:00 | 261 |  | 11941 | 26 | 5 |  |
| 09-04 | 7B | 2 | 8C | 1 | 10-04 | 7:00 | 12 | 124 | 1108 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 12-04 | 7 B | 2 | 8C | 2 | 13-04 | 7:00 | 32 | 29 | 7105 | 81 | 5 |  |
| 14-04 | 7B | 1 | 7C | 1 | 15-04 | 7:00 | 21 | 4 | 1715 | 26 | 1 |  |
| 15-04 | 7B | 1 | 8C | 1 | 16-04 | 6:30 | 42 | 6 | 5390 | 133 | 4 |  |
| 15-04 | 7B | , | 8C | 1 | 16-04 | 6:30 |  |  |  |  |  | 13 CM |
| 16-04 | 7B | 1 | 10C | 1 | 16-01 | 19:00 |  |  | 16 |  | 1 |  |
| 16-04 | 7B | 1 | 8C | 1 | 17-04 | 6:30 | 45 | 9 | 4696 | 122 | 6 |  |
| 17-04 | 7B | 1 | 11 C | 1 | 17-04 | 18:30 | 3 |  | 29 |  | 3 |  |
| 17-04 | 7B | 3 | 10C | 1 | 18-04 | 7:00 | 18 | 1 | 1695 | 27 | 2 |  |
| 19-04 | 7B | 1 | 8C | 1 | 20-04 | 7:30 | 58 | 2 | 2699 | 124 | 1 |  |
| 21-04 | 7B | 2 | 10 C | 1 | 22-04 | 7:00 | 27 |  | 3860 | 80 | 4 |  |
| 23-04 | 7B | 1 | 9C | 1 | 24-04 | 7:30 | 46 |  | 1669 | 43 | 4 |  |
| 26-04 | 7B | 1 | 10C | 1 | 27-04 | 7:00 | 29 |  | 1801 | 93 | 12 |  |
| 28-04 | 7B | 1 | 11 C | 1 | 29-04 | 7:00 | 9 |  | 685 | 27 | 10 |  |
| 29-04 | 7B | 1 | 11 C | 1 | 30-04 | 7:00 | 8 |  | 474 | 24 | 2 |  |
| 29-04 | 7B | 1 | 11 C | 1 | 30-04 | 7:00 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 CM |
| 30-04 | 7B | 1 | 14C | 1 | 30-04 | 19:00 |  |  | 33 | 2 |  |  |
| 30-04 | 7B | 1 | 11 C | 1 | 01-05 | 7:00 | 4 |  | 398 | 9 | 6 |  |
| 01-05 | 7 E | 2 | 11 C | 1 | 02-05 | 13:30 | 64 |  | 465 | 53 | 51 |  |
| 03-05 | 7E | 1 | 13C | 1 | 04-05 | 7:30 | 17 |  | 516 | 48 | 37 |  |
| 05-05 | 7E | 2 | 14C | 1 | 06-05 | 7:30 | 3 |  | 158 |  | 60 |  |

Table 1 (cont'd)

| Set date | Site | $\mathbf{W}$ | Temp | Clarity | Sampling <br> Date | Start Time | CNW | CNH | CNC | CM | COF | CO1 | CO2 | BB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $07-05$ | 7 E | 2 | 14 C | 1 | $08-05$ | $7: 00$ | 4 |  |  | 101 |  | 107 |  |  |
| $09-05$ | 7 E | 2 | 14 C | 1 | $10-05$ | $7: 00$ | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 112 |  |  |
| $12-05$ | 7 E | 2 | 14 C | 1 | $13-05$ | $7: 00$ | 21 | 13 |  | 84 | 1 | 55 |  |  |
| $13-05$ | 7 E | 2 | 14 C | 1 | $13-05$ | $20: 00$ |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | 2 |  |  |
| $13-05$ | 7 E | 3 | 13 C | 1 | $14-05$ | $8: 00$ |  | 71 | 115 | 18 | 88 |  |  |  |
| $13-05$ | 7 E | 1 | 14 C | 1 | $14-05$ | $19: 00$ |  | 2 | 3 | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |
| $14-05$ | 7 E | 2 |  | 1 | $15-05$ | $7: 00$ | 3 | 453 | 658 | 337 | 16 | 169 |  |  |
| $19-05$ | 7 E | 1 | 14 C | 1 | $20-05$ | $8: 00$ | 10 | 311 | 109 | 69 | 34 | 207 |  |  |


Table 2. Cowichan hatchery chinook release data, 1998.


Table 3. Expanded daily catch estimates for the Cowichan River pumphouse site, 1998.

Naturally-reared:

| Date | Observed | Missing cells Interpolated | 24-hour <br> Estimates | Extrapolated Estimates | Cumulative Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25-Feb | 983 |  | 1101 | 32963 | 32963 |
| 26-Feb |  | 896 | 1004 | 30045 | 63008 |
| 27-Feb |  | 896 | 1004 | 30045 | 93054 |
| 28-Feb |  | 896 | 1004 | 30045 | 123099 |
| 29-Feb |  | 896 | 1004 | 30045 | 153144 |
| 01-Mar | 810 |  | 907 | 27162 | 180306 |
| 02-Mar |  | 875 | 980 | 29341 | 209647 |
| 03-Mar | 941 |  | 1054 | 31554 | 241201 |
| 04-Mar | 833 |  | 933 | 27933 | 269134 |
| 05-Mar |  | 866 | 970 | 29039 | 298174 |
| 06-Mar | 899 |  | 1007 | 30146 | 328320 |
| 07-Mar | 504 |  | 564 | 16901 | 345220 |
| 08-Mar |  | 518 | 580 | 17370 | 362590 |
| 09-Mar | 533 |  | 597 | 17873 | 380463 |
| 10-Mar |  | 514 | 576 | 17236 | 397699 |
| 11-Mar |  | 514 | 576 | 17236 | 414935 |
| 12-Mar |  | 514 | 576 | 17236 | 432171 |
| 13-Mar | 496 |  | 556 | 16632 | 448803 |
| 14-Mar |  | 1157 | 1296 | 38797 | 487600 |
| 15-Mar |  | 1157 | 1296 | 38797 | 526398 |
| 16-Mar | 1838 |  | 2059 | 61633 | 588031 |
| 17-Mar |  | 1593 | 1784 | 53418 | 641449 |
| 18-Mar | 1348 |  | 1510 | 45202 | 686651 |
| 19-Mar | 2936 |  | 3288 | 98452 | 785103 |
| 20-Mar | 3846 |  | 4308 | 128967 | 914071 |
| 21-Mar | 1510 |  | 1691 | 50635 | 964705 |
| 22-Mar |  | 1440 | 1613 | 48287 | 1012992 |
| 23-Mar | 1370 |  | 1534 | 45940 | 1058932 |
| 24-Mar |  | 1805 | 2022 | 60527 | 1119459 |
| 25-Mar | 2241 |  | 2510 | 75147 | 1194606 |
| 26-Mar |  | 2384 | 2670 | 79942 | 1274548 |
| 27-Mar | 2527 |  | 2830 | 84737 | 1359286 |
| 28-Mar |  | 1647 | 1845 | 55229 | 1414514 |
| 29-Mar |  | 1647 | 1845 | 55229 | 1469743 |
| 30-Mar | 768 |  | 860 | 25753 | 1495496 |
| 31-Mar |  | 684 | 766 | 22936 | 1518432 |
| 01-Apr | 600 |  | 672 | 20120 | 1538552 |
| 02-Apr | 419 |  | 469 | 14050 | 1552602 |
| 03-Apr | 242 |  | 271 | 8115 | 1560717 |
| 04-Apr | 337 |  | 377 | 11301 | 1572018 |
| 05-Apr |  | 269 | 301 | 9020 | 1581038 |
| 06-Apr | 201 |  | 225 | 6740 | 1587778 |
| 07-Apr |  | 235 | 263 | 7880 | 1595658 |
| 08-Apr | 261 |  | 292 | 8752 | 1604410 |
| 09-Apr |  | 136 | 152 | 4560 | 1608971 |
| 10-Apr | 12 |  | 13 | 402 | 1609373 |

Table 3 (cont'd)

| Date | Observed | Missing cells Interpolated | $\begin{gathered} 24-h o u r \\ \text { Estimates } \end{gathered}$ | Extrapolated Estimates | Cumulative Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11-Apr |  | 22 | 25 | 738 | 1610111 |
| 12-Apr |  | 22 | 25 | 738 | 1610849 |
| 13-Apr | 32 |  | 36 | 1073 | 1611922 |
| 14-Apr |  | 26 | 29 | 872 | 1612794 |
| 15-Apr | 21 |  | 24 | 704 | 1613498 |
| 16-Apr | 42 |  | 47 | 1408 | 1614906 |
| 17-Apr | 48 |  | 54 | 1610 | 1616516 |
| 18-Apr | 18 |  | 20 | 604 | 1617119 |
| 19-Apr |  | 38 | 43 | 1274 | 1618394 |
| 20-Apr | 58 |  | 65 | 1945 | 1620338 |
| 21-Apr |  | 43 | 48 | 1442 | 1621780 |
| 22-Apr | 27 |  | 30 | 905 | 1622686 |
| 23-Apr |  | 36 | 40 | 1207 | 1623893 |
| 24-Apr | 46 |  | 52 | 1543 | 1625435 |
| 25-Apr |  | 37 | 41 | 1241 | 1626676 |
| 26-Apr |  | 37 | 41 | 1241 | 1627917 |
| 27-Apr | 29 |  | 32 | 972 | 1628889 |
| 28-Apr |  | 19 | 21 | 637 | 1629526 |
| 29-Apr | 9 |  | 10 | 302 | 1629828 |
| 30-Apr | 8 |  | 9 | 268 | 1630096 |
| 01-May | 4 |  | 4 | 134 | 1630231 |
| 02-May | 64 |  | 72 | 2146 | 1632377 |
| 03 -May |  | 40 | 45 | 1341 | 1633718 |
| 04-May | 17 |  | 19 | 570 | 1634288 |
| 05-May |  | 10 | 11 | 335 | 1634623 |
| 06-May | 3 |  | 3 | 101 | 1634724 |
| 07-May |  | 3 | 3 | 101 | 1634825 |
| 08-May | 4 |  | 4 | 134 | 1634959 |
| 09-May |  | 3 | 3 | 101 | 1635059 |
| 10-May | 2 |  | 2 | 67 | 1635126 |
| 11-May |  | 11 | 12 | 369 | 1635495 |
| 12-May |  | 11 | 12 | 369 | 1635864 |
| 13-May | 21 |  | 24 | 704 | 1636568 |
| 14-May |  | 12 | 13 | 402 | 1636971 |
| 15-May | 3 |  | 3 | 101 | 1637071 |
| 16-May |  | 6 | 7 | 201 | 1637272 |
| 17-May |  | 6 | 7 | 201 | 1637474 |
| 18-May |  | 6 | 7 | 201 | 1637675 |
| 19-May |  | 6 | 7 | 201 | 1637876 |
| 20-May | 10 |  | 11 | 335 | 1638211 |
| 21-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1638211 |
| 22-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1638211 |
| 23-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1638211 |
| 24-May |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3 (cont'd)
Hatchery reared:

| Date | Observed | Missing cells Interpolated | 24-hour <br> Estimate | Extrapolated Estimates | Cumulative Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 02-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 03-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 04-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 05-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 06-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10-Apr | 124 |  | 131 | 4820 | 4820 |
| 11-Apr |  | 76 | 80 | 2954 | 7774 |
| 12-Apr |  | 76 | 80 | 2954 | 10728 |
| 13-Apr | 29 |  | 30 | 1127 | 11855 |
| 14-Apr |  | 16 | 16 | 622 | 12477 |
| 15-Apr | 4 |  | 4 | 155 | 12633 |
| 16-Apr | 6 |  | 6 | 233 | 12866 |
| 17-Apr | 9 |  | 9 | 350 | 13216 |
| 18-Apr | 1 |  | 1 | 39 | 13255 |
| 19-Apr |  | 1 | 1 | 39 | 13294 |
| 20-Apr | 2 |  | 2 | 78 | 13371 |
| 21-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 22 -Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 23-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 24-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 25-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 26-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 27-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 28-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 29-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 30-Apr |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 01-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 02-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 03-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 04-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 05-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 06-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 07-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 08-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 09-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 10-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 11-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 12-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 13371 |
| 13-May | 14 |  | 14 | 544 | 13916 |
| 14-May | 191 |  | 202 | 7424 | 21340 |
| 15-May | 1111 |  | 1177 | 43185 | 64525 |

Table 3 (cont'd)

| Date | Observed | Missing cells <br> Interpolated | 24-hour <br> Estimate | Extrapolated <br> Estimates | Cumulative <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16-May |  | 765 | 810 | 29736 | 94260 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-May |  | 765 | 810 | 29736 | 123996 |
| 18-May |  | 765 | 810 | 29736 | 153732 |
| 19-May | 420 |  | 445 | 16325 | 170057 |
| 20-May |  | 0 | 0 | 170057 |  |
| 21-May |  | 0 | 0 | 170057 |  |
| 22-May |  |  | 0 | 0 | 170057 |
| 23-May |  |  |  |  | 170057 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4. Fyke trap enumeration data from the Cowichan River coho recapture program, 1998.

| Date | Coho 1yr | Chinook | Coho fry | Trout fry OTHER | Temp (C) |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 23-May-98 | 11 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 24-May-98 | 5 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 25-May-98 |  |  | 6 | 7 |  |  |
| 26-May-98 | 1 | 7 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 27-May-98 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 4 |  |  |
| 28-May-98 | 32 | 144 | 67 | 49 |  | 17 |
| 29-May-98 | 28 | 48 | 30 | 5 |  | 17 |
| 30-May-98 | 25 | 37 | 29 | 38 |  | No temp |
| 31-May-98 | 30 | 33 | 35 | 10 |  | 17 |
| 01-Jun-98 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 17 |
| 02-Jun-98 | 69 | 65 | 51 | 8 |  | 17 |
| 03-Jun-98 | 8 | 30 | 51 | 4 | RB 2 | 17 |
| 04-Jun-98 | 10 | 59 | 69 | 2 |  | 17 |
| 05-Jun-98 | 4 | 34 | 84 | 1 |  | 17 |
| 06-Jun-98 | 5 | 22 | 90 | 3 | RB 1 | 17.5 |
| 07-Jun-98 | 16 | 22 | 94 |  | craytish 1 | 17.5 |
| 08-Jun-98 | 19 | 19 | 137 |  |  | 17 |
| 09-Jun-98 | 12 | 6 | 151 |  |  | 17 |
| 10-Jun-98 | 6 | 3 | 50 | 2 |  | 17 |
| 11-Jun-98 | 14 | 21 | 66 | 3 | lamprey |  |
| 12-Jun-98 | 32 | 4 | 23 |  |  | 17 |
| 13-Jun-98 | 3 | 6 | 132 |  |  | 17 |
| 14-Jun-98 | 1 |  | 27 | 6 |  | 17 |
| 15-Jun-98 | 10 | 2 | 49 |  |  | 17 |
| 16-Jun-98 | 2 | 12 | 57 | 3 | parr 1 | 17 |
| 17-Jun-98 | 26 | 3 | 8 |  |  | 17 |
| 18-Jun-98 | 4 |  | 25 | 1 |  | 18.5 |
| 19-Jun-98 | 18 | 39 | 71 | 7 | crayfish | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 408 | 633 | 1412 | 153 |  |  |

Table 5. Trap Efficiency Data at the Pumphouse Site, 1998

## Pumphouse site:

| Date | Flow | Released |  | Recovered |  | \% Recovered |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Chinook | Chum | Chinook | Chum | Chin/Chum | Expansion factor |
| 04-Mar | 13935 | 292 |  | 5 |  | 1.71\% | 58.48 |
| 18-Mar | 11324 | 300 |  | 14 |  | 4.67\% | 21.41 |
| 01-Apr | 8912 | 306 |  | 11 |  | 3.59\% | 27.86 |
| 15-Apr | 6110 |  | 206 |  | 13 | $6.31 \%$ | 15.85 |
| 29-Apr | 7295 |  | 300 |  | 2 | $0.67 \%$ | 149.25 |
| Total: |  | 898 | 506 | 30 | 15 | 3.218 | 31.15 |
|  |  |  |  | Chinook | only: | $3.34 \%$ | 29.94 |

## Upper Pumphouse Site:

No bismarck tests



Fig. 2. Biophysical conditions recorded at the pumphouse site, Cowichan River.

## Naturally-reared



Hatchery-reared


Fig. 3. Daily abundance estimates of naturally-reared and hatchery chinook fry downstream migration, pumphouse site.


Fig. 4. Rotary trap efficiency vs water flow, pumphouse site, Cowichan River.



Fig. 5. Length and weight of chinook fry sampled by date, pumphouse site, Cowichan River.


Fig. 6. Egg to fry survival estimates (in brackets) relative to adult escapement, Cowichan River.
Appendix 1. Biosampling data from naturally-reared chinook fry from the pumphouse site, 1998.
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Appendix 1 (cont'd.)

| 19-Mar |  | 20-Mar |  | 21-Mar |  | 23-Mar |  | 25-Mar |  | 27-Mar |  | 30-Mar |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\operatorname{Lgth}(\mathrm{mm})$ | Witgm) | Lgth(mm) | Wt(gm) | Lgth(mm) | Wt(gm) | $\operatorname{Lgth}(\mathrm{mm})$ | Wt(gm) | Lgth(mm) | Wt(gm) | Lgth(mm) | Wt(gm) | Lgth(mm) | WI(gm) |
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Appendix 2. Biosampling data of hatchery reared chinook prior to release.

| Date | 09-Apr-98 |  |  |  | 12-May-98 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lgth(mm) | Lgth(mm) | Wt(g) | Wt (g) | Lgth(mm) | $\mathrm{Wt}(\mathrm{g})$ |
|  | 72 | 75 | 3.96 | 4.84 | 87 | 7.43 |
|  | 68 | 70 | 3.42 | 4 | 87 | 7.15 |
|  | 65 | 70 | 3.01 | 3.65 | 99 | 12.47 |
|  | 67 | 71 | 2.98 | 3.77 | 78 | 4.98 |
|  | 72 | 71 | 3.83 | 3.88 | 73 | 6.25 |
|  | 78 | 75 | 5.2 | 4.75 | 81 | 4.01 |
|  | 74 | 66 | 4.2 | 3.08 | 77 | 5.21 |
|  | 62 | 65 | 2.75 | 2.8 | 75 | 4.66 |
|  | 74 | 71 | 4.87 | 3.87 | 86 | 6.82 |
|  | 67 | 66 | 3.39 | 3.36 | 82 | 5.89 |
|  | 75 | 66 | 5.14 | 3.36 | 72 | 3.86 |
|  | 68 | 64 | 3.31 | 2.62 | 87 | 7.14 |
|  | 74 | 67 | 4.38 | 3.22 | 86 | 6.77 |
|  | 75 | 68 | 4.87 | 3.4 | 90 | 8.4 |
|  | 73 | 68 | 4.07 | 3.05 | 75 | 4.8 |
|  | 72 | 68 | 4.34 | 3.14 | 71 | 3.84 |
|  | 68 | 72 | 3.79 | 3.91 | 92 | 7.78 |
|  | 73 | 64 | 4.34 | 2.78 | 90 | 8.26 |
|  | 73 | 75 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 79 | 5.33 |
|  | 64 |  | 2.55 |  | 76 | 4.55 |
|  | 72 |  | 4.1 |  | 84 | 7.11 |
|  | 73 |  | 4.43 |  | 87 | 7.31 |
|  | 69 |  | 3.49 |  | 81 | 5.52 |
|  | 68 |  | 3.25 |  | 80 | 5.5 |
|  | 75 |  | 4.73 |  |  |  |
|  | 63 |  | 2.56 |  |  |  |
|  | 65 |  | 3.04 |  |  |  |
|  | 73 |  | 4.51 |  |  |  |
|  | 68 |  | 2.24 |  |  |  |
|  | 68 |  | 3.19 |  |  |  |
|  | 68 |  | 3.31 |  |  |  |
| Mean length | 69.76 |  |  |  | 82.29 |  |
| min | 62 |  |  |  | 71 |  |
| max | 78 |  |  |  | 99 |  |
| Mean weight |  |  | 3.70 |  |  | 6.29 |
| min |  |  | 2.24 |  |  | 3.84 |
| max |  |  | 5.2 |  |  | 12.47 |
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