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#### Abstract

The detailed assessments and forecasts of the Robertson Creek Hatchery/Stamp River (Somass) chinook are undertaken annually for management of ocean and inlet fisheries, and as an indicator of the expected returns to the naturally spawning chinook populations along the west coast of Vancouver Island (WCVI). The following forecasts are based on returns through 1998, assumptions of ocean fishing mortality in Alaska and Canada, and using methods previously approved by PSARC.

The recommended forecast for total pre-fishery abundance of Somass/Stamp River chinook available in Canada is $76,000 \pm 20 \%$ based on averaging the Prod 2 and Prod3 forecasts. This number includes both immature feeder chinook which will not mature in 1999 as well as chinook which will mature and be able to spawn in 1999.

Given internal Fishery Managers' recommendations on allocation to various fisheries, the recommended forecast for Robertson Creek Hatchery and Stamp River chinook (age 3,4, and 5) returning to Barkley Sound in 1999, is $39,000 \pm 20 \%$ based on averaging the Prod 2 and Prod3 forecasts. The age structure of the return is projected to be: $13 \%$ Age 3, $11 \%$ Age 4, and $76 \%$ Age 5 ; with an expected sex ratio of $64 \%$ females. The number of chinook required to meet the minimum spawning escapement goal is 25,000 . This goal is achievable if ocean fishing mortality is equal to or less than those assumed (footnote 1) and terminal catches do not exceed those allocated. "Extensive" surveys of natural spawners in systems along the WCVI indicated improved chinook escapements in 1998, mainly due to strong returns from the 1994 brood. However, as with the Somass return, there was a seriously low number of age 3 chinook ( 1995 brood year) throughout the WCVI. This will result in low numbers of age 4 returns in 1999, which are usually the main age class in the run and the main age class in egg deposition.

In addition, indications of low age-2 male (jacks) returns in 1998 suggest a very low survival rate for the 1996 brood year (although note there can be large error in this estimate). However, two consecutive broods with poor survival could result in extreme conservation concerns in 2000. As a result, there is a continued need for conservative management plans in fisheries impacting these stocks during 1999.


## Résumé

Des évaluations et des prévisions détaillées du saumon quinnat de la pisciculture de Robertson Creek et de la Stamp River (Somass) sont réalisées à chaque année aux fins de la gestion des pêches en mer et en estuaire et à titre d'indicateurs des remontées prévues des populations naturelles le long de la côte ouest de l'île de Vancouver (WCVI). Les prévisions ci-après sont fondées sur les remontées de 1998 et les hypothèses formulées pour la mortalité due à la pêche en mer en Alaska et au Canada. Elles ont été réalisées à l'aide des méthodes déjà approuvées par le CEESP.

La prévision recommandée pour l'abondance totale avant la pêche dans les rivières Somass/Stamp exploitables au Canada est de $76000 \pm 20 \%$ et est fondée sur la moyenne des prévisions de Prod2 et Prod3. Cette valeur comprend les saumons quinnats immatures qui ne seront pas matures en 1999 de même que ceux qui matureront et seront en mesure de frayer en 1999.

En tenant compte des recommandations internes des gestionnaires des pêches sur la répartition entre les diverses pêches, la valeur prévue recommandée pour la les saumons de la pisciculture du ruisseau Robertson et de la rivière Stamp (âges, 3, 4 et 5) retournant dans le détroit Barkley en 1999, est de $39000 \pm 20 \%$, valeur basée sur la moyenne des prévisions de Prod2 et Prod3. La structure des âges des remontées prévues est de : âge $3-13 \%$, âge $4-11 \%$ et âge $5-76 \%$; le rapport des sexes prévu étant de $64 \%$ de femelles. Le nombre de saumons quinnats nécessaire pour atteindre l'objectif de l'échappée de géniteurs minimum est de 25000 . Cet objectif peut être atteint si la mortalité par pêche en mer est égale ou inférieure aux valeurs prévues (note de bas de page 1) et si les captures en estuaires n'excèdent pas les valeurs allouées.
Des relevés «exhaustifs» des géniteurs naturels dans les bassins versants de la WCVI ont montré une amélioration des échappées de saumons quinnats en 1998, qui s'explique surtout par de fortes remontées des poissons produits en 1994. Par ailleurs, comme pour la remontée de la Somass, on a noté un nombre très faible de saumon quinnat d'âge 3 (production de 1995) sur toute la WCVI. Cela donnera lieu à de faibles remontées de poissons d'âge 4 en 1999 et les poissons de cet âge sont généralement ceux de la principale classe d'âge formant la remontée, et cette classe d'âge est celle dont la ponte est la plus importante.

En outre, des indices de faibles remontées de âges de 2 ans (« jacks ») en 1998 portent à croire à un très faible taux de survie des poissons de l'année d'éclosion de 1996 (l'erreur de cette estimation pourrait cependant être importante). Par ailleurs, deux générations consécutives de faible taux de survie pourraient se traduire par des problèmes de conservation extrêmement importants en l'an 2000. Par conséquent, il s'avère nécessaire de maintenir les plans de gestion axés sur la conservation pour les pêches ayant des effets sur ces stocks en 1999.
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## 1 Introduction

This PSARC document uses methods previously reviewed in Riddell et al (PSARC X96-01) to forecast Somass River chinook salmon returns to Barkley Sound. This working paper includes a summary of data collection and accounting procedures used in 1998 and a forecast of the 1999 return. Historic data are not repeated but documented in PSARC X96-01.

Since the development of Robertson Creek Hatchery (RCH) in 1971, the Somass River system has become one of Canada's major producers of chinook salmon, with large contributions to ocean troll and sport fisheries, and stimulating the development of substantial terminal sport, native, and commercial fisheries.

CWT analyses for this stock indicate that during an average year (excluding 1995-1998) about $50 \%$ of the stock was harvested in ocean fisheries, and $50 \%$ returned to Barkley Sound. Over half of the ocean harvest occurred in south east Alaska fisheries (SEAK). In years of high productivity, production of chinook salmon from the Somass River system, including total terminal run plus ocean catch of hatchery fish, was over 400,000 chinook ( 1991 return year). This ocean catch is based on expanded coded-wire tag from the hatchery but does not account for incidental mortality in ocean fisheries, or the ocean catch of natural production from the Somass River system.
The Somass River system is located at the head of Alberni Inlet in Barkley Sound on the west coast Vancouver Island. Within this system, the Stamp River, which drains Great Central Lake, and the Sproat River, which drains Sproat Lake, combines to form the Somass River. Roughly half way up the Stamp River are a set of impassable falls, Stamp Falls. Fishways constructed to circumvent the falls are the basis for counting escapement into the upper Stamp River. Historically, naturally spawning chinook were present in the lower Stamp below Stamp Falls, the Sproat River, and the Somass River mainstem. These areas were generally poorly enumerated. However, since the development of RCH on the upper Stamp River, the majority of the spawners are now located in the upper Stamp River.

An interim spawning escapement goal was established in 1988 based on escapements immediately prior to the 1985 Pacific Salmon Treaty (PST), including:

- 70,000 naturally spawning chinook (or double the estimated 35,000 adult spawners),
- 15,000 chinook for 10 million eggs into RCH , plus a
- $20 \%$ increment to account for prespawn mortality.

Conservation concerns due to poor marine survival brought on by an extreme El Nino event in the 19921995 period required formulation of a minimum escapement level. This level was based on escapement prior to 1985, and included:

- 50 million egg target for natural spawning,
- 9.3 million egg target for RCH , plus the
- $20 \%$ increment to account for prespawn mortality


## 2 Terminal Run Calculation

The Stamp River is a key indicator for exploitation rates and distribution patterns of WCVI chinook rivers. The accounting of the terminal return into Barkley Sound (DFO Statistical Area 23) is formulated in Appendix Table 1 and summarized in Table 1. The conduct of the monitoring programs and results in 1998 are described herein.

### 2.1 Sport Fishery Survey

A creel survey was conducted in Alberni Inlet and Barkley Sound from mid-June to the end of September. As part of the ramp survey, 5,126 interviews ( $15 \%$ of the fishing effort) were conducted in Alberni Inlet and approximately 2,100 interviews ( $8 \%$ of the fishing effort) were conducted in Barkley Sound. For the effort survey, all sub-areas were surveyed approximately twice per week or more. Most chinooks observed during the interview process were also sampled for adipose fin clip, scales, and length, and some had otoliths removed.

The total chinook catch in Alberni Inlet was estimated to be 13,453 chinook of all origins from approximately 33,000 boat trips. Based on expanded CWT recoveries, 9223 of these chinook were Robertson Creek Hatchery origin. Another 695 chinook originated from other hatcheries, based on expanded CWT. The remaining 3535 chinook were estimated to originate from Stamp River natural spawners. In Barkley Sound, total chinook catch during the Aug.-Sept. period was 19,500 chinook from approximately 26,000 boat trips.
The terminal run calculation includes all Somass River chinooks caught in the sport fishery in DFO Statistical Areas 123 and 23 (Barkley Sound and Alberni Inlet). For the purpose of this accounting, Alberni Inlet includes waters out as far as Pocahontas Point. In Alberni Inlet, the total catch of 12,758 chinook, not includeing expanded coded wire tag (CWT) recoveries of non-Somass River chinook, was included in the terminal run calculation. In Barkley Sound, the catch of Somass River chinook was estimated as the expanded CWT in Barkley Sound / proportion RCH in the Alberni Inlet catch plus escapement (Appendix Table 1). The total catch of Somass River chinook in Barkley Sound was estimated to be 6,431 chinook.

### 2.2 Native Fishery Monitoring

Under an agreement between DFO and the local First Nations, Pilot Sales fisheries targeting chinook salmon were conducted in the lower Somass River below Papermill Dam (the tidal limit). Gear was limited to hand set gill nets, mainly using 7 -inch mesh size. Fisheries were conducted August 31 and September 1. Total catch was estimated by a census of fishers as they landed at designated landing sites and assumed that all fishers were encountered. The total catch in 1998 was estimated to be 7,172 chinook.

Biological sampling was conducted on a portion of the catch as it was transferred to buyer's totes or as it was unloaded at the processing plant. In all, 1007 chinook ( $14 \%$ of the total catch) were sampled for mark incidence. Scales, sex, and length were taken from 315 chinook.

### 2.3 Stamp Falls Fishway Observations of Total Escapement

Monitoring of salmonid migration through Stamp Falls fishway ran from September 2 until November 10, 1998. A snorkel survey was conducted above Stamp Falls on September 2 to determine the number of chinook already in the system above the counting facility at Stamp Falls.

Observations at Stamp Falls fishway counting facility were conducted for about 14 hours per day from September 2 to 17 from approximately 0.5 hour before sunrise to 0.5 hour after sunset. From September 18 to October 25, observations to take place for 24 hours/day, as part of the Barkley Sound Selective Fishery Program, which required enumeration of Spaghetti tags at the fishway. From October 26 to November 10 observation was reduced to 12 hours/day and the fishway was closed to migration for the night-time period. This ensured no migration could occur unobserved.
Early in the season, before 24 hour counting, a mechanical counter was installed to determine night time migration. This showed limited fish movement during this period. However, this migration was difficult
to quantify in terms of both species and numbers. The daytime migration at that time was primarily sockeye and coho but with some chinook.

Later in September and early October, during the 24 hour observations, up to $50 \%$ of all chinook observed during any 24 hour period were migrating at night. However, this night time migration may not be indicative of natural night time migration. It may be a result of the artificial lights being used in the fishway or because of the high densities of fish in the fishway. It was noted that once the chinook moved into the lit area of the fishway they were reluctant to exit into the darkened river. A build up of fish occurs at the exit of the fishway even during daylight hours but not to the same extent as that observed at night. Nighttime migrants were therefore assumed to be sockeye and coho with a few chinook. However, because migration rates for chinook were so low during this period, even if $50 \%$ of all chinook were migrating at night during this period it would not significantly affect the overall estimate of chinook escapement.
Low flows and high water temperatures in the Stamp River resulted in unusual run timings for salmonids during 1998. A large and very late component of the Great Central Lake sockeye run combined with the largest recorded return of coho into the Stamp River resulted in high densities in the fishway and entrance to the fishway from mid September until around mid October. It appeared from ground level observations, that the majority of the chinook run stayed in the deeper and cooler waters of Stamp Canyon until early October. Chinook were observed in poor condition with fungal infections. Visual estimation using snorkel and dive surveys below Stamp Falls in late October/early November estimated approximately 4,000 chinook in poor shape and unlikely to make it through Stamp Falls fishway. These chinook did not show up in subsequent observations at the fishway. Surveys also indicated that some chinook were digging redds below Stamp Falls.

Significant changes were made to the setup from previous years in an attempt to improve visibility during high water and silty flow conditions. A video camera was mounted vertically above the counting tunnel and above the water. This reduced the column of water through which filming/observations had to be made from about 36 inches to 12 . A mirror was placed beneath the camera and at a $45^{\circ}$ angle behind a sheet of plexiglass which divided the observation box lengthwise. This enabled the fish to be observed from above in half the image and a reflection of the side of the fish in the other half. The viewing box and camera were covered with heavy black plastic to eliminate the reflection of light from above. Underwater lights were placed in the box to provide light for the camera and observers. A number of different lighting setups were tried before a satisfactory one was found. The modified setup worked very well and no time was lost as a result of poor conditions. However, conditions were excellent for most of the migration period so the new setup was not tested under adverse conditions.

Observations were conducted in real time through a 21 inch high-resolution colour monitor. A Super VHS time lapse VCR simultaneously recorded the migration. Observations were entered into a customised MSAccess program on a laptop PC. Time, date, observer, species, direction of migration, maturity (adult or jack) and adipose clip data was recorded for each fish as it passed by, along with any comments. Any chinook of 59 cm or less 'total' length was considered to be a jack and was determined by using reference markings on the base and back of the tunnel. The time lapse VCR provided excellent image quality and left a time/date stamp on the image. Synchronised times between the VCR and the Stamp Falls database enabled comparison of the 'real time' observations entered into the database with subsequent verifications.

Observer error was estimated from verification of 100 randomly chosen hours of tape. Verifications were conducted by experienced observers from the Stamp Falls fishway. They were entered into the same MSAccess database as for the 'real time' events. The video tape was slowed down, paused or replayed where there was any difficulty in determining either the species or the number of fish passing through the observaion box. Results from verifications were considered to be a true reflection of the migration .

Linear regression was used to compare the verification with the 'real time' observations. Results indicated that the best predictor for adult chinook was, as expected, adult chinook. However, the results showed that the best predictor of jack chinook was also 'adult chinook'. This indicates that there is poor recognition of jack chinook by observers at Stamp Falls. Therefore, the ratio of jack chinook to adult chinook in the verifications was applied to the adjusted adult return to estimate the jack chinook return to the Stamp River in 1998.

The total observed counts at Stamp Falls were corrected using the following relationships between verified (V) and real time (RT) counts:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Chinook adults: } \mathrm{CNAD}_{\text {adj }}=\mathrm{RT} \times 1.0492 & \mathrm{r}^{2}=0.889, & \text { d.f. }=93 \\
\text { Chinook jacks: } \mathrm{CNJK}_{\text {adj }}=\mathrm{CNAD}_{\text {adj }} \times\left(\Sigma \mathrm{V}_{\text {cnj }} / \Sigma \mathrm{V}_{\text {cnad }}\right)
\end{array}
$$

Where: $\quad \mathrm{CNAD}_{\text {adj }} \quad=$ adjusted chinook adult count

| $\mathrm{CNJK}_{\text {adj }}$ | $=$ adjusted chinook jack count |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\Sigma \mathrm{V}_{\text {cnj }}$ | $=$ sum of verified chinook jacks |
| $\Sigma \mathrm{V}_{\text {cnad }}$ | $=$ sum of verified chinook adults |

A minor component of the chinook return is not accounted for as a result of any bypass of the fishway (up Stamp Falls) and night time migrants from September 2 to 17. The night time component is probably minor and significantly less than past years as a result of night time observations for much of the migration period and closing the fishway during the end of the run. Bypass is difficult to quantify. Many salmon, mostly coho but some chinook, were observed part way up Stamp Falls, well above the entrance to the fishway. However, very few fish were observed successfully making it past the more difficult upper portion of the falls. It is thought that the majority of fish making it part way up the falls eventually drop back down and enter the fishway.

### 2.4 Sampling at Robertson Creek Hatchery

In 1998, the hatchery intake was left open, allowing 12,961 chinook to enter Robertson Creek Hatchery, including 5189 females ( $40 \%$ of the total). All fish entering the hatchery were counted, checked for AFC, and recorded by sex. Jacks were separated from larger chinook based on a length of $50-\mathrm{cm}$ post orbital hypural $(\mathrm{POH})$ length. The age composition of the total return to the hatchery was based on two independent samples for each sex, ages from CWT's of adipose clipped fish and random scale samples from unmarked fish. Sample data are summarized in Appendix Table 2. Age composition for each sex was estimated by pooling the number at age in the estimated CWT and scale samples.

### 2.5 Sampling on Spawning Grounds

Sampling of carcasses in the Stamp River was conducted by 4 people working 5 days per week, from October 5 through November 10. Water levels were moderate and no time was lost as a result of high flows/dangerous conditions. The objectives included sampling as many fish as possible for adipose fin clips (AFC), and biological sampling (including scales, otoliths, POH length, sex, egg retention level) of about 500 chinook per sex and all jacks. Samples were collected using a carcass weir and by searching for and gaffing carcasses along river banks/bars using a jet boat. Tails were severed from all fish sampled.

In 1998, 6282 chinook were sampled for AFC, with 197 recoveries. Biological samples were taken from 555 adult males, 17 jacks and 545 females. Sample data are summarized in Appendix Table 2.

The total in-river escapement was determined by subtraction of the hatchery count from the adjusted fishway count. In addition, an estimated 4,000 prespawn mortality chinook were observed by visual snorkel surveys below the Stamp Falls fishway. It was assumed that these chinook did not make it through Stamp Falls as a result of the high temperatures and low flows. Sample sizes of adult males and jacks in the river are unlikely to be representative of their population sizes due to the post spawning behaviour of males and the absence of small males in the dead pitch. The in-river sex ratio was therefore estimated as the unweighted average of the hatchery sex ratio and the sex ratio for dead pitch sampling in the river.

The in-river population was stratified into males, females, and jacks in the following way:

| In-river count | $=$ Adjusted total fishway count + estimate below $S$. Falls - total hatchery count |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total river males (TRM) | $=$ in-river count x unweighted sex ratio |
| River females | $=$ in-river count -TRM |
| River jacks | $=\mathrm{CNAD}$ adj $\mathrm{x}\left(\Sigma \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{cnj}} / \Sigma \mathrm{V}_{\text {cnad }}\right)$ |
| Adult river males | $=\mathrm{TRM}$ - river jacks |

Age composition by sex was estimated in the same way as for the hatchery samples.

### 2.6 Total Estimated Terminal Run

The terminal run was defined as catch in DFO Statistical Area 23, including catch of Somass River and RCH chinook in native, sport, and commercial fisheries, plus spawning escapement to the Stamp River.

Table 1a. Summary of 1997 terminal run of Somass River chinook.

| Fishery | \# Age 2 | \# Age 3 | \# Age 4 | \# Age 5 | \# Age 6 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alberni Inlet Sport | 72 | 388 | 11,523 | 775 | 0 | 12,758 |
| Somass Native | 0 | 79 | 6,268 | 796 | 29 | 7,172 |
| Barkley Sound Sport | 85 | 145 | 5,805 | 389 | 26 | 6,431 |
| Hatchery Returns $_{\text {River Escapement }}{ }^{1}$ | 29 | 653 | 10,883 | 311 | 0 | 11,876 |
| Total Terminal Run $^{2}$ | 219 | 1,071 | 27,993 | 1,895 | 0 | 31,178 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes prespawn mortalities plus river spawners
Overall, the terminal run was within $16 \%$ of the forecast. The age 4 component of the total terminal run was $33 \%$ greater than forecast, while the age 3 return was approximately $50 \%$ less than the low number forecast. Female spawners in the river totalled approximately 8,300 which produced a deposition in the river of approximately 37 to 51 million eggs, or approximately $80 \%$ to $100 \%$ of the predicted number, depending on the level of prespawn mortality included. Another 4,700 females swam into the hatchery and were utilised there. Based on expanded CWT data, the estimated proportion of hatchery fish in the total terminal catch was $65 \%$ and $66 \%$ of the chinook spawners in the Stamp River.

Table 1b. Summary of total return from hatchery production only, based on expanded CWT.

| Fishery | \# Age 2 | \# Age 3 | \# Age 4 | \# Age 5 | \# Age 6 | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alberni Sport | 0 | 153 | 8,342 | 728 | 0 | 9,223 |
| Somass Native | 0 | 154 | 3,052 | 414 | 0 | 3,620 |
| Barkley Sound Sport | 0 | 389 | 3,860 | 0 | 0 | 4,249 |
| Total Terminal Catch | 0 | 696 | 15,254 | 1,142 | 0 | 17,092 |
| Hatchery | 47 | 396 | 7,940 | 240 | 0 | 8,624 |
| River | 0 | 477 | 20,746 | 37 | 0 | 21,261 |
| Total Terminal expCWT | 47 | 1,569 | 43,940 | 1,419 | 0 | 46,977 |

## 3 Analytical Framework

### 3.1 Cohort Analyses

Cohort analysis is conducted using 'estimated' CWT recoveries, in all fisheries and total escapement (including hatchery swim-ins and natural spawners), to determine survival rates and exploitation patterns for Robertson Creek Hatchery chinook. The incorporation of in-river tag recoveries provides estimates of the true total exploitation rates for this stock. The cohort model used is documented in Appendix 2 of Starr and Argue (1991) and as modified by the Chinook Technical Committee (CTC) of the Pacific Salmon Commission (PSC, TCCHINOOK (98)-1). In determining incidental mortality, only the brood year method was used. The cohort model was modified by the CTC to account for the chinook nonretention fisheries implemented in Canada during 1996. Modifications are documented by the CTC in Appendix G of TCCHINOOK (98)-1.

For each brood year, information used from the cohort analyses include:

- annual distribution of catch and total fishing mortalities;
- survival of CWT groups to age 2 recruitment; and
- ocean (catch or total fishing mortality) and total exploitation rates by fishery and age.


### 3.2 Forecasting Models

Sibling regression models have been developed to predict total production from selected tag codes based on production observed from younger age classes in these tag codes (including total ocean fishing mortality plus total terminal run for brood years used in the cohort analyses). Total production was calculated by multiplying the brood releases (for the selected tag codes) by the estimated total fishing mortality exploitation rates derived by the cohort analysis. Tag codes used are listed in Appendix 4.

Two combinations of terminal run and total production data have been used in the sibling regression models. Note that the first model developed in 1995 (i.e., Model 1 - Prod1), based on regressing total terminal return at one age class to total terminal return at a subsequent age class is not used since constant ocean fishing mortality rates must be assumed between years.

- Model 2 (Prod2). This regression model uses total terminal return at a younger age class (independent variable) to predict total production (the surviving cohort in the ocean) of a subsequent age or ages from the same brood year. The dependent variable is the total (total ocean fishing mortality plus terminal run) production at a subsequent age or ages.
- Model 3 (Prod3). This regression model uses estimated total production (total fishing mortality plus
escapement) of an age class(es) to predict total production of subsequent ages (i.e., the surviving cohort) from the same brood year.

Relationships between all possible age class combinations were examined using these two models. The actual models used for the forecast were based on the highest $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ values. In the case where more than one age class is used, such as the total terminal run of age $2+3$, the total terminal runs at age 2 and age 3 were summed. Estimates of surviving cohort include natural mortality factors and are estimated as the prefishery abundance of the youngest age being predicted. All regressions were forced through the origin.

### 3.3 Spreadsheet Model

A spreadsheet model was developed to: 1) expand predicted hatchery production (expanded CWT) to total production; 2) determine the number of mature adults returning to southern B.C.; 3) examine response in terminal runs to changes in ocean harvest rates by fishery and age.

Inputs to the spreadsheet include: estimated hatchery production (expanded CWT all tagcodes) in terminal runs by age and year, observed total terminal runs by age and year, and the forecasted age 3,4 , and 5 hatchery cohort abundance. Each regression forecast is expanded for total Somass system production to account for hatchery production not associated with the tag codes selected, as well as production from naturally spawning chinook. Expansion scalars are estimated within brood years and by age. These scalars are the ratio of total terminal run (hatchery plus natural) divided by the terminal run of tagged hatchery releases (expanded CWT). This expansion assumes that natural production from the Stamp River exhibits similar behaviour and encounters similar fishing pressure as the hatchery stock.
Other components of the spreadsheet include average total mortality exploitation rates by age and fishery, maturity rates and natural mortality rates by age; and matrices of 'fishery management scalars'. These scalars are used to simulate management actions in the fisheries, and allow examination of alternative actions. Cohorts are harvested in ocean and terminal fisheries and/or allowed to become spawners. Predicted spawning escapement is compared to target reference points.

The surviving immature cohort is passed on to the next age in year $\mathrm{i}+2$. Age 3 cohorts for year $\mathrm{i}+2$ were estimated from average or recent average age 3 survival values (derived from the cohort analysis) times the smolts released in year i-3, and then expanded by average brood year scalars to account for natural production.

### 3.4 Forecast Error

A retrospective assessment of the forecasting methodology was presented in PSARC S96-01, for years 1988 through 1995. Including the information up to and including the current forecast in this assessment, produces an updated estimate of the prediction error. The assessment uses a "leave-one-out" methodology. Each regression model is re-calculated while omitting each data point (one year) once. The omitted data point is then used as the observed value and the predicted value compared to the observed. Average absolute deviations are used as the forecast error expected for each model.

## 4 Results and Forecast for 1999

### 4.1 Cohort Analyses

Cohort analyses for the 1983 through 1996 brood releases from Robertson Creek Hatchery were completed using the total escapement of coded-wire tags to the hatchery and the natural spawning grounds in the upper Stamp River. Returns from the latter 3 broods are incomplete through 1998 and are
estimated using average maturation rates from the completed brood returns. Recoveries from the 1992 brood year are very limited (estimated number of recoveries $=10$ ) and the cohort analysis is not reliable. However, for the nine brood years (1983 through 1991) for which total escapement recoveries are available, the total exploitation rates (expressed as adult equivalents to account for changes in size limits over time) have averaged:

> ocean total mortality exploitation rates $=44.6 \%(C V=13 \%)$
> (ocean implies non-terminal fisheries, outside Barkley Sound $)$, and
> brood total mortality exploitation rates $=65.7 \%(C V=6 \%)$.

Returns from the 1993 brood year indicate significant reduction in exploitation rates (estimated ocean exploitation rate $=37 \%$ and total exploitation rate $=51 \%$ ) as expected due to the conservation actions taken during 1995 through 1998.
Estimates of marine survival continue to demonstrate highly variable survival and very poor survival for the most recent brood years, 1995 and 1996 (Table 2).
Annual distribution of the total fishing mortality on the Robertson Creek stock has been up-dated through 1998. Conservation actions taken in recent years are again evident in distribution changes (Table 3) and the continued reduction in total fishing mortality.

Table 2. Estimated survival rates (smolts released to Age 2 chinook) of coded-wire tagged (CWT) groups released from Robertson Creek Hatchery by brood years. Survival to Age-2 cohort include all recoveries, estimated incidental fishing mortality, and annual rates of natural mortality for all ages (Ages 2 through 5). Survival rates of Age-2 chinook only include recoveries of Age-2 chinook.

| Brood <br> Year | Estimated \% Survival Rate for CWT groups: |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Age-2 cohort |  |
| 1983 | 0.10 | Age-2 chinook |
| 1984 | 4.42 | 0.0114 |
| 1985 | 4.32 | 0.1314 |
| 1986 | 12.05 | 0.1443 |
| 1987 | 10.30 | 0.4161 |
| 1988 | 13.09 | 0.4909 |
| 1989 | 9.21 | 0.6012 |
| 1990 | 5.56 | 0.4096 |
| 1991 | 0.99 | 0.2000 |
| 1992 | 0.01 | 0.0460 |
| 1993 | 2.22 | 0.0002 |
| 1994 | $5.26^{*}$ | 0.0770 |
| 1995 | $0.31^{*}$ | 0.0756 |
| 1996 | $0.18^{*}$ | 0.0043 |

Notes: * these broods have incomplete recoveries but are estimated based on observations to-date and assuming average maturation rates from completed brood years.

### 4.2 Production-based Forecast Models

Table 4 summarizes the results of Prod2 (terminal run vs. total production) and Prod3 regression models. The upper portion of these tables identify each sibling model, the x -value used in the 1998 forecast, the predicted value and its upper and lower $90 \%$ confidence bounds, the co-efficient of the regression (intercept is zero), the r -squared value, and sigma (residual standard deviation of the
regression). Asterisks identify regressions used in the 1998 forecast. Results of the retrospective assessment of each forecasting equation are also presented in the lower portion of tables. For each brood year, the observed and predicted values are presented. The mean absolute deviation (estimated prediction error) varied between $42 \%$ and $86 \%$ of the known data value for the Prod 2 , and $25 \%$ to $50 \%$ for the Prod3 model.

Table 3. Distribution of total fishing mortality for Robertson Creek Hatchery chinook stock; distributions based on cohort analysis through 1997 and using the brood year method to estimate incidental fishing mortality. Some fisheries with very few recoveries have been combined, e.g. Southern nets and other sport include southern BC and Washington recoveries.

|  | Fishing Mortalities by Major Fishery, as a proportion of Total Fishing Mortalities plus Escapement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total <br> Ocean <br> Fishing <br> Mortality | Total <br> Fishing <br> Mortalities | Escapement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catch Year | Alaska Troll | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { north } \\ \mathrm{BC} \\ \text { troll } \end{array}$ | central BC troll | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \mathrm{WCVI} \\ \text { troll } \end{array}$ | Alaska Net | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NCBC } \\ \text { net } \end{array}$ | south BC net | $\begin{aligned} & \text { south } \\ & \text { US net } \end{aligned}$ | Alaska sport | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{NCBC} \\ \text { sport } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { WCVI } \\ \text { sport } \end{array}$ | Other sport | Terminal net | Terminal sport |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 5.1\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 3.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 21.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | 34.3\% | 35.2\% | 64.8\% |
| 1986 | 14.0\% | 8.2\% | 1.9\% | 6.7\% | 6.4\% | 5.3\% | 1.9\% | 0.6\% | 1.5\% | 1.4\% | 4.3\% | 2.9\% | 0.8\% | 15.2\% | 55.0\% | 71.0\% | 29.0\% |
| 1987 | 10.6\% | 7.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.1\% | 3.6\% | 2.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 19.9\% | 34.3\% | 54.5\% | 45.5\% |
| 1988 | 12.9\% | 8.8\% | 1.6\% | 4.7\% | 4.3\% | 1.8\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 1.1\% | 1.2\% | 4.5\% | 0.8\% | 7.0\% | 12.8\% | 42.1\% | 61.9\% | 38.1\% |
| 1989 | 14.3\% | 9.0\% | 1.4\% | 3.3\% | 5.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% | 1.3\% | 1.0\% | 1.6\% | 0.8\% | 15.8\% | 14.6\% | 40.3\% | 70.6\% | 29.4\% |
| 1990 | 19.4\% | 8.8\% | 2.5\% | 7.6\% | 4.4\% | 1.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 1.0\% | 1.9\% | 0.4\% | 8.2\% | 7.8\% | 49.3\% | 65.3\% | 34.7\% |
| 1991 | 19.7\% | 9.5\% | 2.8\% | 6.0\% | 2.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 2.2\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.4\% | 12.8\% | 12.1\% | 46.2\% | 71.1\% | 28.9\% |
| 1992 | 17.1\% | 7.4\% | 2.8\% | 17.9\% | 7.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 1.3\% | 1.4\% | 2.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 5.4\% | 59.1\% | 64.9\% | 35.1\% |
| 1993 | 16.3\% | 7.3\% | 2.0\% | 13.6\% | 2.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 1.4\% | 2.5\% | 0.6\% | 6.9\% | 12.9\% | 49.7\% | 69.5\% | 30.5\% |
| 1994 | 18.3\% | 9.4\% | 1.1\% | 5.4\% | 4.8\% | 1.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 1.2\% | 7.5\% | 0.5\% | 3.1\% | 19.2\% | 53.0\% | 75.4\% | 24.6\% |
| 1995 | 16.8\% | 3.4\% | 0.4\% | 1.6\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 4.2\% | 1.3\% | 5.8\% | 1.3\% | 6.3\% | 11.8\% | 35.6\% | 53.7\% | 46.3\% |
| 1996 | 14.7\% | 3.2\% | 0.7\% | 1.9\% | 1.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 2.4\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 0.2\% | 2.9\% | 29.3\% | 32.4\% | 67.6\% |
| 1997 | 13.7\% | 5.0\% | 1.8\% | 0.1\% | 7.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 2.5\% | 2.0\% | 0.6\% | 5.8\% | 16.9\% | 37.4\% | 60.1\% | 39.9\% |
| 1998 | 18.7\% | 5.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 4.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 4.8\% | 0.5\% | 4.0\% | 17.2\% | 35.9\% | 57.0\% | 43.0\% |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1985-94 | 14.8\% | 7.6\% | 2.0\% | 7.1\% | 4.1\% | 1.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 1.6\% | 1.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.9\% | 5.5\% | 12.1\% | 46.3\% | 63.9\% | 36.1\% |
| 1995-98 | 15.9\% | 4.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.9\% | 3.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.0\% | 3.5\% | 1.0\% | 4.1\% | 12.2\% | 34.5\% | 50.8\% | 49.2\% |

Table 4. Regression equations and results for Robertson Creek forecast models.
PART A: TERMINAL RUN vs. TOTAL PRODUCTION REGRESSIONS (PROD2 MODELS)

| 90\% confidence interval |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model \# and description | Predictor x -value | Prediction | lower | upper | para.value (slope) | r-square | sigma |
| \#3, Age 2 vs. Ages(3+4+5) | 257 | 6688.75 | -121576.09 | 134953.59 | 26.03 | . 92 | 70765.56 |
| \#5, Age (2+3) vs. Ages (4+5) | 1655 | 5611.63 | -33166.94 | 44390.20 | 3.39 | . 98 | 21393.93 |
| \#6, Ages ( $2+3+4$ ) vs. Age 5 | 63680 | 27447.19 | 13587.03 | 41307.35 | 0.43 | . 97 | 7476.29 |
| \#7, Age 3 vs. Ages (4+5) | 1580 | 6453.56 | -42643.62 | 55550.74 | 4.08 | . 96 | 27085.79 |
| \#8, Ages (3+4) vs. Age 5 | 62735 | 29843.12 | 16302.14 | 43384.10 | 0.48 | . 97 | 7275.23 |

Mean absolute deviations by model:

| Age 2 vs. Ages $(3+4+5)$ | Sum of Square erro |
| :--- | :---: |
| Age $(2+3)$ vs. Ages $(4+5)$ | .8020 |
| Ages $(2+3+4)$ vs. Age 5 | .70165 |
| Age 3 vs. Ages $(4+5)$ | .4958 |
| Ages $(3+4)$ vs. Age 5 | .6176 |

Leave-one-out Assessment (one forecast for each brood year by model type)

|  | MODEL \#3 |  | MODEL \#5 |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | OBS. | PRED. | OBS. | PRED. |
| 1983 | 2604 | 15752 | 1300 | 3255 |
| 1984 | 147862 | 92903 | 79592 | 117905 |
| 1985 | 141639 | 132076 | 85832 | 87747 |
| 1986 | 405832 | 241632 | 243990 | 226347 |
| 1987 | 321910 | 426517 | 187480 | 175086 |
| 1988 | 463603 | 490500 | 269082 | 294968 |
| 1989 | 240936 | 294218 | 145636 | 111266 |
| 1990 | 186542 | 53249 | 111329 | 84161 |
| 1991 | 32540 | 46457 | 17752 | 15456 |
| 1992 | 524 | 0 | 263 | 661 |
| 1993 | 59270 | 48390 | 30880 | 63213 |
| 1994 | 2604 | 15752 | 1300 | 3255 |
| 1995 | 147862 | 92903 | 79592 | 117905 |


| MODEL \#6 | MODEL \#7 |  |  |  | MODEL \#8 |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| OBS. | PRED. | OBS. | PRED. | OBS. | PRED. |
| 211 | 778 | 1277 | 1450 | 211 | 571 |
| 18777 | 30134 | 77527 | 128435 | 18777 | 31625 |
| 22257 | 28159 | 83384 | 84900 | 22257 | 28664 |
| 80671 | 61074 | 235116 | 237807 | 80671 | 63565 |
| 53152 | 49827 | 181633 | 146657 | 53152 | 47486 |
| 65853 | 77761 | 261838 | 271652 | 65853 | 75920 |
| 35580 | 36800 | 141722 | 89330 | 35580 | 35240 |
| 32270 | 25982 | 107779 | 93391 | 32270 | 27768 |
| 3404 | 5805 | 17378 | 11335 | 3404 | 5557 |
| 195 | 101 | 242 | 796 | 195 | 111 |
| 4243 | 14001 | 30413 | 68726 | 4243 | 14572 |
| 211 | 778 | 1277 | 1450 | 211 | 571 |
| 18777 | 30134 | 77527 | 128435 | 18777 | 31625 |

## Table 4 (continued)

PART B: TOTAL PRODUCTION vs. TOTAL PRODUCTION REGRESSIONS (PROD3 MODELS)

| Model \# and description | 90\% confidence interval |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Predictor x -value | Prediction | lower | upper | para.value (slope) | r-square | sigma |
| \#3, Age 2 vs. Ages(3+4+5) | 257 | 2332.03 | -68955.70 | 73619.76 | 9.07 | . 97 | 39331.83 |
| \#5, Age ( $2+3$ ) vs. Ages ( $4+5$ ) | 3401 | 5340.60 | -20232.37 | 30913.57 | 1.57 | . 99 | 14108.59 |
| \#6, Ages ( $2+3+4$ ) vs. Age 5 | 105225 | 21706.95 | 6398.42 | 37015.49 | 0.21 | . 96 | 8325.77 |
| \#7, Age 3 vs. Ages (4+5) | 3053 | 6539.25 | -17711.57 | 30790.08 | 2.14 | . 99 | 13378.63 |
| \#8, Ages (3+4) vs. Age 5 | 99720 | 23907.48 | 9120.41 | 38694.56 | 0.24 | . 96 | 8018.43 |

Mean absolute deviations by model:

| Age 2 vs. Ages $(3+4+5)$ | Sum of square errors |
| :--- | :---: |
| Age $(2+3)$ vs. Ages $(4+5)$ | .4690 |
| Ages $(2+3+4)$ vs. Age 5 | .2865 |
| Age 3 vs. Ages $(4+5)$ | .5685 |
| Ages $(3+4)$ vs. Age 5 | .2702 |
|  | .5140 |

Leave-one-out Assessment (one forecast for each brood year by model type)

|  | MODEL \#3 |  | MODEL \#5 |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | OBS. | PRED. | OBS. | PRED. |
| 1983 | 2604 | 9674 | 1300 | 3211 |
| 1984 | 147862 | 102038 | 79592 | 94361 |
| 1985 | 141639 | 108630 | 85832 | 72519 |
| 1986 | 405832 | 302758 | 243990 | 205540 |
| 1987 | 321910 | 369271 | 187480 | 202451 |
| 1988 | 463603 | 524848 | 269082 | 297001 |
| 1989 | 240936 | 279974 | 145636 | 139524 |
| 1990 | 186542 | 153230 | 111329 | 100634 |
| 1991 | 32540 | 36832 | 17752 | 22635 |
| 1992 | 524 | 145 | 263 | 331 |
| 1993 | 59270 | 49023 | 30880 | 41028 |
| 1994 | 2604 | 9674 | 1300 | 3211 |
| 1995 | 147862 | 102038 | 79592 | 94361 |


| MODEL \#6 |  | MODEL\#7 |  | MODEL \#8 |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| OBS. | PRED. | OBS. | PRED. | OBS. | PRED. |
| 211 | 642 | 1277 | 2097 | 211 | 490 |
| 18777 | 24653 | 77527 | 105078 | 18777 | 25975 |
| 22257 | 22178 | 83384 | 73301 | 22257 | 22911 |
| 80671 | 54016 | 235116 | 210220 | 80671 | 55355 |
| 53152 | 52646 | 181633 | 188800 | 53152 | 51526 |
| 65853 | 85410 | 261838 | 278850 | 65853 | 84345 |
| 35580 | 40826 | 141722 | 124799 | 35580 | 39992 |
| 32270 | 28679 | 107779 | 101146 | 32270 | 29304 |
| 3404 | 5860 | 17378 | 22178 | 3404 | 5836 |
| 195 | 53 | 242 | 418 | 195 | 58 |
| 4243 | 10825 | 30413 | 44410 | 4243 | 11284 |
| 211 | 642 | 1277 | 2097 | 211 | 490 |
| 18777 | 24653 | 77527 | 105078 | 18777 | 25975 |

### 4.3 Spreadsheet Model

The predicted abundances shown in Table 4 are based on CWT, so represent hatchery production only. The "total" production of Stamp River chinook is determined by expanding the predicted hatchery return in Table 4 to account for hatchery production not associated with the CWT used in the regression analyses and "natural" production from the Stamp River. The expansion factors used in this forecast were 8.51, 1.63, and 1.51 respectively for the age $3+4+5$ cohort, age $4+5$ cohort, and the age $5+$ cohort. The total cohort size available to ocean fisheries is presented in Table 5 as "Pre-fishery Abundance".

Next, fishery management scalars are applied to fisheries in Alaska based on fishing patterns expected (based on the Pacific Salmon Treaty rules or other discussions and negotiations). The remaining cohort is identified as the expected abundance into Canada (see Table 5). While all these fish are available to northern fisheries, only the mature migrating component of this total is available to southern B.C. fisheries.

Table 5. Summary of forecasted abundance and terminal run size of Somass/Stamp River chinook salmon. Expected abundance into Canada assumes fishing patterns in Alaska similar to 1998. Expected terminal run size (into Statistical Area 23) and expected escapement assumes catch and allocation patterns outlined by fisheries managers.

|  | Pre-Fishery <br> Abundance | Expected <br> Abundance into <br> Canada | Expected <br> Terminal Run <br> Size | Expected <br> Escapement |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. Model Prod 2 (Terminal vs Total Production) |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 brood | 55,000 | 52,100 | 8,200 | 4,800 |
| 1995 brood | 9,100 | 7,800 | 4,200 | 2,800 |
| 1994 brood | 45,100 | 36,700 | 32,700 | 21,900 |
| Total | 109,200 | 96,700 | 45,000 | 29,500 |
| 2. Model Prod 3 (Total vs Total Production) |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 brood | 19,200 | 18,200 | 2,800 | 1,700 |
| 1995 brood | 8,700 | 7,400 | 4,000 | 2,600 |
| 1994 brood | 36,100 | 29,400 | 26,200 | 17,500 |
| Total | 64,000 | 55,000 | 33,000 | 21,800 |
| 3. Average of Prod2, Prod3 |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 brood | 37,000 | 35,100 | 5,500 | 3,200 |
| 1995 brood | 8,900 | 7,600 | 4,100 | 2,700 |
| 1994 brood | 40,600 | 33,000 | 29,500 | 19,800 |
| Total | 86,600 | 75,700 | 39,000 | 25,700 |

Next, management scalars (i.e., proxy for management actions) are applied to average exploitation rates in Canadian fisheries. These scalars are determined in consultation with Fisheries Managers and reflect conservation and allocation requirements for Stamp/Somass River chinook. The resulting terminal run forecast
can vary depending on the model used, the scalars used to expand the hatchery production to total Somass production, and management actions in ocean fisheries. Forecasts of total terminal run to Barkley Sound are presented for both Prod2 and Prod3 models in Table 5. Expected Stamp River escapement, after allocation to terminal area fisheries using management scalars, is also presented in Table 5.

Forecasts for the 1999 terminal run to Statistical Area 23, range from 33,000 to 45,000 (average is 39,000 ), based on 1999 expected ocean exploitation rates from planned fisheries in Alaska and British Columbia ${ }^{1}$ and final estimates of the stock composition in fisheries (Chinook Technical Committee model calibration 9902).

When the age-specific forecasts are combined to predict the total terminal run to Barkley Sound, the forecasting error is, on average, less than for the individual regression models. Figure 1 compares the annual deviations from observed total terminal runs for the Prod2 and Prod3 models. Over the period 1988 to 1998, the models average 1 to $2 \%$ error in the forecast. However, when the forecast error is expressed as the average absolute deviation from annual forecasts, the average error increases to $25 \%$ for Prod2 and $20 \%$ for Prod3. On an annual basis, the forecasted terminal runs can be expected to vary by $\pm 20 \%$ to $\pm 25 \%$ of the forecast value.

### 4.4 Escapement Goal

The escapement goal for 1999 is consistent with the minimum target accepted by PSARC in 1994 (PSARC Advisory Doc. S94-1). The minimum egg requirement for hatchery and natural spawners in the Stamp River is 50 million eggs from natural spawners plus 9.3 million eggs required for Robertson Creek Hatchery. The escapement required to provide 60 million eggs is determined using Excel solver, given the age composition, fecundity, proportion females, and prespawn mortality parameters outlined in Table 6. The required escapement is estimated to be 25,000 chinook.

Table 6. Derivation of the number of spawners needed to meet the minimum egg requirements in the 1998 chinook return.

|  | Age <br> composition | Fecundity | Proportion <br> Female | Prespawn <br> Mortality | Eggs | Spawners |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1996 brood | $13 \%$ | 4000 | $5 \%$ | $20 \%$ | 0.5 million | 3,375 |
| 1995 brood | $11 \%$ | 4400 | $50 \%$ | $20 \%$ | 4.8 million | 2,725 |
| 1994 brood | $76 \%$ | 4800 | $75 \%$ | $20 \%$ | 54.7 million | 18,980 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 60 million | 25,000 |

### 4.5 Recommended Forecast

The recommended forecast for abundance of Somass/Stamp River chinook available in Canada is $76,000 \pm 20 \%$ based on averaging the Prod 2 and Prod 3 forecasts. This number includes both immature feeder chinook which will not mature in 1999 as well as chinook which will mature and be able to spawn in 1999.

Assuming the fishery allocation scenario outlined in the July 23 memo to P.S. Chamut ${ }^{1}$, the recommended

[^0]forecast for the total terminal run of Robertson Creek Hatchery and Stamp River chinook (age 3,4, and 5) to Barkley Sound in 1999, is $39,000 \pm 20 \%$ based on averaging the Prod2 and Prod3 forecasts. The age structure of the return is projected to be: $13 \%$ Age 3, $11 \%$ Age 4, and $76 \%$ Age 5; with an expected sex ratio of $64 \%$ females. The number of chinook required to meet the minimum spawning escapement goal is 25,000 . This goal is achievable if ocean fishing mortality is equal to or less than those assumed (footnote 1 ) and terminal catches do not exceed those allocated.

## 5 Extensive escapement indicators for WCVI chinook

### 5.1 Survey Methods for "Extensive" Escapement Indicators

The detailed assessments and forecasts of the Somass system ( $\mathrm{RCH} / \mathrm{Stamp}$ ) chinook are undertaken annually for management of that major stock plus as an indicator of the expected returns to the naturally spawning chinook populations along the west coast of Vancouver Island (WCVI). Seven populations on the north-west of Vancouver Island (NWVI), Areas 25 to 27, are, in aggregate, used by the Pacific Salmon Commission (PSC) to indicate trends in escapement to naturally spawning chinook along the WCVI. These are termed "extensive" escapement indicators based on the consistent effort and methodology used. Additionally, since 1995 an additional 15 "extensive" WCVI indicator streams have been surveyed for naturally spawning chinook (Table 7).

Since 1995, the snorkel method has been used to survey escapement to the "extensive" PSC indicators and the additional indicator streams. Surveys are scheduled approximately every 7 days on these systems, although weather and water flows often affect this scheduling. The counts from the snorkel surveys are used to calculate an escapement estimate by the Area-Under-the-Curve method. Age compositions were determined by analysis of scales sampled during broodstock collection, test-fishing and in-river sampling. There are two exceptions in the methodology. On the San Juan River partial fence counts are conducted. And in 1998, on the Gold River, a mark-recapture / radio tagging study was also conducted to determine chinook escapement.

Table 7. Streams (extensive, hatchery extensive) surveyed since 1995, by StAD, for chinook escapement, in addition to main exploitation (intensive) indicator on the Stamp River.

| Stream | Stat. <br> Area | Indicator <br> Type | Survey <br> Method |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Juan River | 20 | Extensive | Fence |
| Nitinat River | 22 | Hatchery | Snorkel |
| Sarita River | 23 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Nahmint River | 23 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Bedwell R / Ursus C | 24 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Moyeha River | 24 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Megin River | 24 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Burman River (PSC) | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Gold River (PSC) | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel/M-R |
| Tlupana River | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Conuma R /Canton C | 25 | Hatchery | Snorkel |


| Stream | Stat. <br> Area | Indicator <br> Type | Survey <br> Method |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sucwoa River | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Deserted Creek | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Tsowwin River | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Leiner River | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Tahsis River (PSC) | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Zeballos River | 25 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Kaouk River (PSC) | 26 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Artlish River (PSC) | 26 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Tahsish River (PSC) | 26 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Klaskish River | 27 | Extensive | Snorkel |
| Marble River (PSC) | 27 | Extensive | Snorkel |

### 5.2 Escapement Levels in "Extensive" Indicator Systems

In 1998, dry weather during September kept river levels low until early October when the rains began. This meant that the migration of chinook into streams was delayed by two to three weeks in comparison to more typical years. This delay likely resulted in a compression of the in-river residence time compared to past years, which is reflected in the AUC calculations.

As a whole, the PSC aggregate indicators exceeded the rebuilding goal of double the 1979-82 average escapement, for the first time since the start of the base period in 1975 (Figure 2). The Area 25 indicator group exceeded the PSC goal (more than double) for the second year. The Area 26 indicator group also exceeded the PSC goal this year; the first time that this has happened since 1985. The Area 27 indicator (Marble River) had the highest escapement since the start of the base period but still failed to meet PSC goal (only $77 \%$ of goal).

In addition to these PSC incdicators, other additional "extensive" escapement indicators along the WCVI also had good chinook returns in 1998. On the south west Vancouver Island most indicator streams showed increased escapements over recent years. For example, the San Juan Enhancement Society operated a fence on the San Juan River (Area 20), primarily for broodstock collection. The 1998 escapement to the San Juan River was the highest since the start of the base period; exceeding the previous maximum by three times. Another example is the Sarita River (Area 23), which had the second highest escapement since the start of the base period (the highest was in 1992). The Nahmint River (also Area 23) had its highest escapement since the start of base period. The exceptions to these observations of high escapements were the Area 24 streams. While the chinook escapement in the Bedwell, Moyeha and Megin rivers was greater than 1997 levels, there was no substantial increase in escapement relative to the 1994-95 period, as exhibited in other areas.

In the north west part of Vancouver Island, the additional "extensive" indicators are situated in close proximity to the PSC indicators. These additional "extensive" indicator streams in the north west Vancouver Island area showed trends similar to the PSC indicators; most systems exhibited high escapements equal to or greater than recent years. There were a few exceptions, including the Klaskish River (Area 27), which had an escapement less than $20 \%$ of the base period average.
Age composition of chinook escapements was estimated for a few the "extensive" indicators (Table 8) where samples could be readily collected. Generally, samples were not obtained from "wild" rivers due to the difficulty in obtaining samples (carcasses are eaten by bears, birds, etc. or flushed out of system). Consequently, sampling was generally associated with broodstock collection in the river or estuary. Where possible samples were collected in the estuary, since low river flow levels and high inriver water temperatures delayed migration of mature chinook into the rivers. The resulting age data indicate that the four and five year-olds predominated the returns, while the age two and three components were weak. This corroborates the 1998 Somass system age distribution.

Table 8. Age Composition data from scale analysis.

| Stream | Age 21 | $\text { Age } 31$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Age } \\ & 32 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Age 41 | Age 51 | Age $52$ | Age <br> 61 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nitinat River/ | 1 | 43 |  | 517 | 150 |  |  | 711 |
| Lake testfish | 0.14\% | 6.05\% | - | 72.71\% | 21.10\% | - | - |  |
| Conuma River |  | 28 |  | 300 | 77 | 1 |  | 406 |
|  | - | 6.90\% | - | 73.89\% | 18.97\% | 0.25\% | - |  |
| Sarita River |  | 3 |  | 137 | 19 |  |  | 159 |
|  | - | 1.89\% | - | 86.16\% | 11.95\% | - | - |  |
| Nahmint River | 4 | 1 |  | 157 | 42 |  | 1 | 205 |
|  | 1.95\% | 0.49\% | - | 76.59\% | 20.49\% | - | 0.49\% |  |
| Marble River |  | 23 |  | 321 | 107 |  | 2 | 453 |
|  | - | 5.08\% | - | 70.86\% | 23.62\% | - | 0.44\% |  |
| Total CountOverall \% | 5 | 98 | 0 | 1432 | 395 | 1 | 3 | 1934 |
|  | 0.26\% | 5.07\% | 0.00\% | 74.04\% | 20.42\% | 0.05\% | 0.16\% |  |

In summary, returns to most areas of the WCVI were generally good in 1998. All Statistical Areas showed escapements greater than in 1997. However, the good returns were due to stronger than expected age 4 returns from the 1994 brood year (out to sea in the spring of 1995). There was a general lack of two and three year-old fish in 1998, suggesting poor returns in 1999 throughout the WCVI.

Based on field staff observations, chinook spawning habitat was not fully utilized in 1998, indicating that the current rebuilding goals may be low. An assessment of these escapement goals will be conducted in 2000.
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Figure 1. Average annual error for Prod2 and Prod3 forecast models when applied to estimating the terminal run size of Somass chinook into Barkley Sound. Terminal denotes Prod2 model and Total denotes Prod3 model. Error expressed as the deviation from the observed terminal run, 1988 through 1998.


Figure 2. Trend in adult chinook escapement of PSC escapement indicator stocks, 1975 to 1998 where; Total escapement includes natural spawners plus broodstock removals, and "base" means the period 1975 to 1982 average escapement (solid line), and "Goal" indicates the PSC rebuilding goal (double the base period average).


Appendix Table 1. 1998 Somass Chinook Terminal Run, Catch and Escapement

|  |  |  | AGE COMPOSITION |  |  |  |  |  |  | obs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISHERY | DATE | CATCH | Aged | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Females | MarkInc |

ALBERNI INLET CATCH


Appendix Table 2. Escapement of Somass Chinook, into Robertson Creek Hatchery and Stamp River, 1998

## STAMP RIVER CHINOOK ESCAPEMENT



0.602 Sex Ratio (Adult Males/Total Adult): 0.004 Ratio of Jacks to Total Males:

| INRIVER POPULATION: <br> Total spawners: <br> River Adults: <br> In-river Jack estimate (a): <br> Number of males(incl jacks): <br> Alternate in-river jack est (b): | $\begin{array}{r} 28,263 \\ 28,044 \\ 219 \\ 14,613 \\ 59 \\ \\ 0.440 \\ 0.521 \end{array}$ | =Escapement <br> =Escapement <br> =Escapement <br> =total inriver * <br> =based on jack <br> =Sex ratio in sa <br> = Unweighted | estimate-hatchery, estimate-estimateunweighted poole /male ratio in <br> ample(Adult male males (pooled Ha | , includes <br> d sex <br>  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total popn. | Sample popn. | No. sampled | Sex | C/S Rate |
| Chosen jack est (a) | 219 | 219 | 17 | J | 12.88 |
| Number of adult males: | 14,394 | 13,782 | 2,758 | M | 5.00 |
| Number of females: | 13,650 | 13,177 | 3,507 | F | 3.76 |

Table 2. Cont'd. Escapement of Somass Chinook, into Robertson Creek Hatchery and Stamp River, 1998


Prespawn Mortalities On Route (below Stamp Falls):
Estimate from snorkel and dive surveys. Applied the 'pooled' In-river sex and age compositions to prespawn mortalities in the Lower River (below Stamp Falls): On Route - below S. Falls: Prespawn Mort. Est. 4,000

| Age composition (from scales and cwt's): | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 6 | Total | Total Adults |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Males | 0 | 121 | 1607 | 33 | 0 | 1761 | 1761 |
| Females | 0 | 0 | 2006 | 233 | 0 | 2,239 | 2239 |
| Total | 0 | 121 | 3613 | 266 | 0 | 4000 | 4000 |

TOTAL ESCAPEMENT RUN TO STAMP RIVER ABOVE STAMP FALLS (spawning escapement + prespawn morts + hatchery remo

|  |  | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 6 | Total | Ttl adult |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Males | - | 248 | 1,633 | 19,569 | 323 | - | 21,773 | 21,525 |
| Females | - | - | 27 | 16,692 | 1,647 | - | 18,366 | 18,366 |
| Total | - | 248 | 1,660 | 36,261 | 1,970 | - | 40,139 | 39,891 |
| Total expanded CwT |  | 47 | 786 | 25,369 | 240 | - | 26,442 | 26,395 |
| \% hatchery (exp cwt) |  | $19 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $12 \%$ |  | $68 \%$ |  |

TOTAL ESCAPEMENT RUN TO STAMP RIVER (spawning escapement + prespawn mortalities + hatchery removals).

|  |  | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 6 | Total | Ttl adult |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Males | - | 248 | 1,755 | 21,176 | 356 | - | 23,534 | 23,286 |
| Females | - | - | 27 | 18,698 | 1,881 | - | 20,605 | 20,605 |
| Total | - | 248 | 1,781 | 39,874 | 2,236 | - | 44,139 | 43,891 |

notes:
total fishway count includes swim count Sep 2, fishway sep 2 - nov 10
fishway counts were adjusted for observer error
**total run into hatchery is that killed for broodstock,surplus, etc....all sampled for marks...all others released
assume released chinook are part of river number, but never part of any sample.
${ }^{* * * \%}$ hatchery (exp cwt) No attempt at recoveries from Pre-spawn morts below S. Falls so apply estimate from above S. Falls

Appendix 3. Total Adult Chinook Escapement (river + brood) estimates for selected WCVI systems (no Jack males) (Table entries 'ni' = stream not investigated in that year, or 'no' = indicates that no chinook were observed in that year)

| AREA RIVER | $\mathbf{1 9 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| A. PSC Indicator stocks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 Tahsis River | 60 | 20 | 125 | 500 | 300 | 1400 | 1400 | 500 | 380 | 525 | 771 | 722 | 587 |
| 25 Burman River | 400 | 100 | 400 | 700 | 1100 | 2500 | 2000 | 1750 | 2200 | 594 | 724 | 2354 | 3205 |
| 25 Gold River | 1900 | 600 | 1000 | 1000 | 2000 | 1000 | 2500 | 1700 | 3600 | 805 | 902 | 1874 | 2229 |
| 26 Kaouk River | 100 | 100 | 65 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 150 | 266 | 219 | 558 | 824 |
| 26 Artlish River | 100 | 100 | 70 | 40 | 50 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 99 | 53 | 402 | 300 |
| 26 Tahsish River | 1000 | 500 | 400 | 450 | 200 | 120 | 600 | 250 | 250 | 600 | 288 | 523 | 1430 |
| 27 Marble River | 1100 | 1750 | 3500 | 4500 | 2000 | 1000 | 800 | 2000 | 1000 | 1626 | 3971 | 2638 | 5297 |
| \% Marble River in Index: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

B. Other systems: wild or hatchery supplemented. Intensively surveyed since in 1994 or 1995 but less consistently before that time.

| 25 Leiner River | 190 | 125 | 336 | 500 | 450 | 300 | 445 | 585 | 300 | 412 | 715 | 516 | 380 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 Bedwell/Ursus | 10 | 8 | 10 | 70 | ni | ni | ni | 377 | 691 | 291 | 528 | 275 | 306 |
| 24 Moyeha River | ni | no | no | 80 | ni | ni | ni | 250 | 420 | 89 | 243 | 84 | 155 |
| 24 Megin River | 30 | 25 | 30 | 26 | ni | 10 | 150 | 436 | 841 | 323 | 164 | 266 | 370 |
| 23 Nahmint River | 287 | 400 | 97 | 279 | 596 | 165 | 135 | 158 | 438 | 212 | 246 | 242 | 784 |
| ms for Sections A \& B: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spawning Year | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| PSC indicators | 4660 | 3170 | 5560 | 7220 | 5660 | 6060 | 7330 | 6230 | 7680 | 4515 | 6928 | 9071 | 13872 |
| Other systems. | 517 | 558 | 473 | 955 | 1046 | 475 | 730 | 1806 | 2690 | 1327 | 1896 | 1383 | 1995 |

## Systems with major hatcheries

| 22 Nitinat River | 8000 | 2500 | 21047 | 17000 | 19000 | 12000 | 30000 | 25000 | 11000 | 10538 | 29809 | 34482 | 34854 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 23 Somass River | 36289 | 53478 | 66959 | 63043 | 112061 | 114416 | 141060 | 96254 | 57678 | 27801 | 28500 | 32121 | 43891 |
| 25 Conuma River | 210 | 200 | 3000 | 7000 | 10700 | 15000 | 22000 | 11500 | 20000 | 23071 | 19422 | 20813 | 26311 |

Appendix 4. Coded-wire tag groups utilized in the cohort analyses for this analysis. The format of this listing is by Brood Year followed by the 6 -digit tag code. Tag codes are selected to represent "production" and "both production and experimental" releases from the facility and are reviewed by Stock Assessment Division and the Salmonid Enhancement Program.

| @ 83 (Brood year) | @87(continued) | @ 92 | @96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 022662 | 024960 | 180259 | 182232 |
| 022663 | 024961 | 180260 | 182233 |
| 022708 | 025326 | 180261 | 182234 |
| 022753 | 025327 | 180262 | 182235 |
| 082247 | 025328 | 180624 | 182236 |
| 082248 | 025329 | 180625 | 182237 |
| @ 84 | @ 88 | 180626 | 182541 |
| 023131 | 025014 | 180627 | 182543 |
| 023132 | 025836 | @93 | 182542 |
| 023133 | 025837 | 181539 | 182544 |
| 023134 | 025838 | 181540 | 182545 |
| 023135 | 025839 | 181541 | 182546 |
| 023136 | 026055 | 181542 | 182547 |
| 023142 | 026056 | 181543 |  |
| 023143 | 026057 | 181544 |  |
| 023144 | @ 89 | 181545 |  |
| 023145 | 020645 | 181546 |  |
| 023151 | 020646 | @ 94 |  |
| 023203 | 020950 | 181455 |  |
| 023204 | 020949 | 181456 |  |
| 023206 | 020948 | 181457 |  |
| 023208 | 020648 | 181458 |  |
| 023304 | 020647 | 181459 |  |
| @ 85 | 020153 | 181460 |  |
| 023734 | 020152 | 182220 |  |
| 023735 | 020151 | 182221 |  |
| 023736 | @ 90 | 182222 |  |
| 023737 | 021549 | 182223 |  |
| 023738 | 021550 | 182224 |  |
| 023739 | 021551 | 182225 |  |
| 023740 | 021552 | @95 |  |
| 023741 | 021553 | 182226 |  |
| @ 86 | 021208 | 182227 |  |
| 024256 | 021209 | 182228 |  |
| 024257 | @91 | 182229 |  |
| 024361 | 180620 | 182230 |  |
| 024362 | 180621 | 182231 |  |
| 024363 | 180622 | 182502 |  |
| 024401 | 180623 | 182503 |  |
| @ 87 | 180802 | 182504 |  |
| 024311 | 180803 | 182505 |  |
| 024802 | 180804 | 182506 |  |
| 024809 | 180805 | 182507 |  |
| 024810 |  | 182508 |  |
| 024951 |  |  |  |
| 024952 |  |  |  |
| 024958 |  |  |  |
| 024959 |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Memo from Director-General Pacific Region to P.S.Chamut, Assistant Deputy Minister Fisheries Management, 23 July 1999, "Conservation measures for WCVI chinook and allocation of Somass and North Coast chinook in Canadian fisheries in 1999.

