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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted 2010 recreational and commercial troll fisheries for all salmon species in the area between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S./Canada border. Mark-selective recreational fisheries for Chinook and coho and markselective coho commercial fisheries were included in all four Catch Record Card (CRC) areas of coastal Washington (Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4). Council-area fisheries were adopted based on assumptions regarding coho and Chinook abundance, distribution of stocks, Chinook age class distributions, coho mark rates, compliance with selective fishery regulations, and incidental mortality.

The PFMC adopted a pilot ocean mark-selective Chinook fishery (MSF) in Marine Areas 1 through 4 for the first time from June 12 through June 30, 2010, following state-tribal agreement during the North of Falcon process to establish the pilot fishery (e.g., WDFW and NWIFC, 2010). Consistent with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW) intent of Puget Sound/Strait of Juan de Fuca mark-selective Chinook fisheries, the primary goal for this pilot selective fishery was to provide meaningful opportunity to the recreational angling public while minimally impacting ESA-listed Chinook salmon encountered in the mixed-stock ocean fisheries. WDFW‘s Ocean Sampling Program (OSP) implemented an intensive monitoring program in all ocean ports during the season to collect data to estimate key parameters characterizing the fishery and its impacts on unmarked salmon. Sampling activities included dockside creel sampling, on-water observation, and a Voluntary Trip Report (VTR) system. Among other parameters, sampling activities emphasized data collection needs for the estimation of: $i$ ) the mark rate of the targeted Chinook population, $i i$ ) the total number of Chinook salmon harvested (by size [legal or sublegal] and mark-status [marked or unmarked]), $i i i$ ) the total number of Chinook salmon released (by size/mark-status), iv) the coded-wire tag- (CWT) and/or DNA-based stock composition of marked and unmarked Chinook mortalities, and v) the total mortality of marked and unmarked double index tag (DIT) CWT stocks.

Additionally, in 2010 coho mark-selective fisheries were adopted for the twelfth consecutive year, and the OSP continued its intensive monitoring program in all ocean ports. Sampling activities were identical to those employed during the Chinook MSF. Sampling activities during the coho MSF emphasized data collection needs for the estimation of: $i$ ) the mark rate of the targeted coho population, ii) the total number of coho harvested by mark-status, including an estimate of angler compliance rate with coho MSF regulations, iii) the total number of coho released (by size/mark-status), $i v$ ) the coded-wire tag- (CWT) stock composition of landed coho, and $v$ ) the total mortality of marked and unmarked coho.

## 2. SEASON DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 Ocean Recreational Chinook pilot MSF

Catch Record Card (CRC) Areas 1 through 4 (Figure 1) were open for all salmon except coho seven days per week from June 12 through June 30. A daily bag limit of two salmon was in effect. All retained Chinook were required to have a healed adipose fin clip, and the minimum size limit was 24 inches total length for Chinook. A total of 19 fishing days were available during this fishery.

### 2.2 Ocean Recreational All-Species Fisheries (Coho Mark-Selective)

CRC Area 1: The ocean recreational fishery in Area 1 was open for all salmon species seven days per week from July 1 through September 30. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect through July 7; the bag limit was modified to two salmon beginning July 8. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The Columbia Control Zone was closed. A total of 92 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 2: The ocean recreational fishery from Leadbetter Point to the Queets River was open for all salmon species Sunday through Thursday from July 4 to July 22, and seven days per week from July 23 to September 19. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect through July 7; the bag limit was modified to two salmon beginning July 8. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The Grays Harbor Control Zone was closed beginning August 1. A total of 74 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 3: The ocean recreational fishery from the Queets River to Cape Alava was open for all salmon species Tuesday through Saturday from July 1 through July 22, and seven days per week from July 23 to September 19. From September 25 to October 10, salmon fishing was restricted to the part of Area 3 north of $47^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ north latitude and south of $48^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ north latitude, seven days per week. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect through July 7; the bag limit was modified to two salmon beginning July 8. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. A total of 91 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 4: The ocean recreational fishery from Cape Alava to the U.S./Canada border was open for all salmon species Tuesday through Saturday from July 1 through July 22, and seven days per week from July 23 to September 19. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect through July 7; the bag limit was modified to two salmon beginning July 8. Beginning August 1, Chinook retention east of the Bonilla-Tatoosh line and chum retention were prohibited. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. A total of 75 fishing days were available in the area.

## Coastal Washington Sampling Sites



Figure 1. Map of coastal Washington showing the ocean catch record card areas (Areas 1 through 4) and major sampling sites.

### 2.3 Non-Treaty Commercial Troll Fisheries (Coho Mark-Selective)

The non-Treaty troll fishery was open from Cape Falcon, Oregon to the U.S./Canada border May 1-June 12, June 18-22, and June 25-29, for all salmon except coho (a total of 53 days). The fishery reopened from Cape Falcon to the U.S./Canada border July 1-6, July 9-13, July 1620, July 23-27, July 30-August 3, August 6-10, August 13-17, August 20-24, August 27-31, and September 3-7 for all salmon species except no chum retention north of Cape Alava, WA in August and September. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. A total of 51 fishing days were available during the summer fishery.

## 3. METHODS

WDFW‘s Ocean Sampling Program (OSP) implemented a comprehensive monitoring program in all ocean ports during the Chinook and coho selective fishery seasons in Washington ocean Areas 1-4. OSP collected the data needed to estimate key fishery parameters characterizing the ocean mark-selective fisheries and associated impacts on unmarked salmon. Sampling activities included dockside angler interviews (with catch sampling), total boat counts via exit or entrance counts at each major coastal port, direct on-the-water observations of salmon encounters during charter ride-along trips, and voluntary trip reports of completed trips provided by the angling public.

### 3.1 On-Board Observation

WDFW samplers conducted direct on-water observation of salmon encounters onboard charter vessels during both the recreational Chinook MSF and the recreational all-species coho MSF. Data collected onboard the charter boats were used to estimate the encounter rates of Chinook by size class and mark group (legal-size and marked [LM], legal-size and unmarked [LU], sublegal-size and marked [SM], and sublegal-size and unmarked [SU]), as well as encounter rates of marked and unmarked coho, and drop-offs. In addition, samplers collected DNA samples from legal sized and sublegal sized Chinook while onboard the charter vessels.

WDFW observers rode along on charter vessels and recorded all hook-ups aboard the vessel; for each hook-up, the following information was recorded: result of the hook-up (fish kept, released, or dropped off), species, mark status (marked or unmarked), and size class (legal or sublegal). A sampling protocol was established for the charter observers so that the most important information relative to this study was collected first. The first priority for the observers was to record the species, mark status, size category, and result of each hook-up aboard the vessel. Collection of these data enabled estimation of encounter rates for Chinook (by size/mark status) and coho (by mark status), and drop-off numbers. The second priority was to collect DNA samples (a small non-lethal clipping from the tip of the dorsal fin), lengths, and scale samples from all Chinook during the June Chinook MSF and from sublegal-sized Chinook during the all-species fishery. DNA from sublegal-sized Chinook was prioritized above that from legal-sized Chinook since legal-sized fish were available on the dock as well as at sea. The third priority was to collect DNA, lengths, and scale samples from legal-sized Chinook.

Direct on-water observation of salmon encounters was the primary method used in CRC Areas 1 and 2 to determine mark rates, encounter rates, and drop-off rates. In CRC Areas 3 and 4, however, the Voluntary Trip Report system (see Section 3.2 below) was the primary method used to collect on-water encounter data, whereas the charter ride-along method was used secondarily due to the limited availability of charter vessels fishing in Areas 3 and 4.

### 3.2 Voluntary Trip Reports

Selective fishery encounter statistics were also acquired through Voluntary Trip Reports (VTRs) that WDFW samplers distributed and collected from the angling public in Areas 1 through 4. The VTR form is designed to capture information identical to that collected by onboard observers. Anglers complete the information on the form as they fish, minimizing recall error.

Samplers distributed VTRs beginning at 5:00 AM four or five days per week in all ports during the Chinook MSFs. During the all-species fisheries, samplers were also dedicated to distributing VTRs four or five days per week in CRC Areas 3 and 4, and one to two days per week in CRC Areas 1 and 2. These samplers approached anglers as they prepared to depart for fishing, explained the purpose of the VTR and how to complete it, and encouraged anglers to record all encounters and return the form to a dockside sampler at the end of the day. Drop boxes were also provided in some ports, as was the option for postage-paid mail-in.

Collection of VTR data was the primary method used in CRC Areas 3 and 4 to estimate mark rates, encounter rates, and drop-off rates. The VTR method was the secondary method used in CRC Areas 1 and 2.

### 3.3 Dockside Sampling

Dockside samplers were stationed in the four major landing ports for the ocean fisheries: Neah Bay, La Push, Westport, and Ilwaco (including the port of Chinook). The recreational fisheries in each port were sampled a minimum of 4 to 5 days per week, with weekend (Saturday, Sunday) and weekday days (Monday through Friday) stratified. Typically, both weekend days and a randomly-selected 3 of 5 weekdays were sampled. Total-fishery catch and effort estimates were generated by the OSP using three types of data obtained during dockside sampling: effort counts, interview data, and examination of catch. Each is described below.

## Effort Counts

On each sample day, a total recreational boat count was obtained either by counting boats exiting the port or entering the port. A minimum of $20 \%$ of the boats returning to the port within each boat type (charter and private) was sampled. An exit count (a count of boats leaving the port) typically began at 4:30AM and continued through the end of the sampling day (exact time was port-specific). An entrance count (a count of boats entering the port) usually began near 8:00AM and continued through dusk. Whether OSP samplers conducted exit or entrance counts varied based on specific considerations for each port. Regardless of the
method used, this effort count, taken on every sampled day, provided the total counts of charter and private boats to which sample data were expanded.

## Angler Interviews and Catch Sampling

WDFW samplers stationed in coastal ports collected catch and effort information during dockside angler interviews of boats exiting the fishery in Areas 1-4. Information collected during each sample included number of anglers, target species, area fished, landed catch by species, mark status of landed salmon, identification and recovery of coded wire tags, and angler estimates of released salmon by species and mark status and of released groundfish by species. Additionally, dockside samplers collected DNA samples, lengths, and scale samples from landed Chinook as time allowed.

### 3.4 Estimating Catch and Effort

## 3.4.i Estimated Stratum Totals (Primary Stage)

Combined (total) catch estimates are typically stratified by weekend/holiday and weekday. In some strata, every day is sampled. In those strata the combined estimates are simply sums of the daily catches. In other strata, where some days are not sampled, the average catch per day over all sampled days is multiplied by the number of days in the stratum to estimate the total catch.

Let:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
a & =\text { the marine catch area, } \\
i & =\text { trip type, } \\
t & =\text { Weekend/holiday or Weekday stratum, } \\
N_{t} & =\text { the number of days in stratum } t, \\
T_{t} & =\text { collection of all days in stratum } t, \\
n_{t} & =\text { the number of days sampled in stratum } t, \text { (rather than the number of boats } \\
\text { sampled as above), } \\
S_{t} & =\text { collection of sampled days in stratum } t(\text { when } S=T, n=N), \\
Y_{t a i k} & =\text { estimated catch (or effort) on day } k \text { for stratum } t \text { in area } a \text { from trip type } i, \\
C_{t a i} & =\text { catch for stratum } t \text { in area } a \text { from trip type } i,
\end{array}
$$

Then

$$
\hat{C}_{t a i}=N_{t} \frac{\sum_{k \in S_{t}} \hat{Y}_{t a i k}}{n_{t}}
$$

with estimated variance (see Thompson 1992, p. 129):

$$
\hat{V}\left(\hat{C}_{t a i}\right)=\frac{N_{t}\left(N_{t}-n_{t}\right)}{n_{t}} \frac{\sum_{k \in S_{t}}\left(\hat{Y}_{t a i k}-\hat{\bar{Y}}_{t a i}\right)^{2}}{n_{t}-1}+\frac{N_{t}}{n_{t}} \sum_{k \in S_{t}} \hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{t a i k}\right)
$$

where

$$
\hat{\bar{Y}}_{t a i}=\frac{\sum_{k \in S_{t}} \hat{Y}_{t a i k}}{n_{t}}
$$

For strata with all days sampled, $n_{t}=N_{t}$, and the catch and variance estimators reduce to:

$$
\hat{C}_{t a i}=\sum_{k \in T_{t}} \hat{Y}_{t a i k}
$$

and

$$
\hat{V}\left(\hat{C}_{t a i}\right)=\sum_{k \in T_{t}} \hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{t a i k}\right) .
$$

## 3.4.ii Daily Catch and Effort Estimation (Secondary Stage)

Both catch and effort are post-stratified by trip-type and area fished. Effort in terms of boattrips is simply the sample number of boats for each trip-type and area expanded by the appropriate boat-type (charter or private) exit/entrance count. Effort in terms of angler-trips is calculated as the mean number of anglers per boat (indexed by trip-type and area) expanded by the counted total population of boats.

The total catch for a given species on a sampled day is the product of the population of boats and the estimated catch per boat, again post-stratified by trip-type and area fished. Key assumptions in the current estimation procedures are that:

1) All boats exiting/entering a port are included in the exit/entrance count
2) Exit/entrance counts are made without error
3) The approximate systematic sample of boats can be treated as a simple random sample
4) Anglers answer questions accurately and do not conceal fish

In the following discussion, subscripts referring to port and boat-type are suppressed. Let:
$\mathrm{M}_{t}=$ total exit or entrance count for a given port on day $t$ (assumed known without error),
$\mathrm{m}_{t}=$ total boats sampled on day $t$,
$\mathrm{m}_{t a i}=$ number of boats sampled of trip type $i$ fishing in area $a$ on day $t$,
$\mathrm{a}_{\text {taij }}=$ number of anglers on the $j$ th boat from trip type $i$ fishing in area $a$ on day $t$, $y_{t a i j}=$ number of species specific fish caught on the $j$ th boat from trip type $i$ in area $a$ on day $t$, and
$Y_{t a i}=$ total catch of specific species caught from trip type $i$ in area $a$ on day $t$.
The estimate of the number of boat-trips of trip-type $i$ and area $a$ follows the procedure outlined in Lai et. al. (1991) where the proportion of boats in each category is estimated by:

$$
\hat{p}_{t a i}=\frac{m_{t a i}}{m_{t}}
$$

with estimated variance (see Cochran 1977, p. 52):

$$
V\left(\hat{p}_{t a i}\right)=\frac{\hat{p}_{t a i} \cdot\left(1-\hat{p}_{t a i}\right)}{\left(m_{t}-1\right)} \cdot\left(\frac{M_{t}-m_{t}}{M_{t}}\right)
$$

The estimated total boat-trips is then obtained by:

$$
\hat{M}_{t a i}=M_{t} \cdot \hat{p}_{t a i}
$$

with estimated variance:

$$
\hat{V}\left(\hat{M}_{t a i}\right)=M^{2}{ }_{t} \cdot \hat{V}\left(\hat{p}_{t a i}\right)
$$

Effort expressed in terms of angler-trips is the product of the average anglers per boat-trip times the total number of boat-trips. The mean number of anglers per boat-trip (for trip-type $i$ and fishing area $a$ ) is estimated as:

$$
\hat{\bar{a}}_{t a i}=\frac{\sum_{j} a_{t a i j}}{m_{t}}
$$

with variance:

$$
\hat{V}\left(\hat{\bar{a}}_{t a i}\right)=\frac{\sum_{j}\left(a_{t a i j}-\hat{\bar{a}}_{t a i}\right)^{2}}{m_{t}\left(m_{t}-1\right)} \cdot\left(\frac{M_{t}-m_{t}}{M_{t}}\right)
$$

Thus the estimated total number of angler-trips is:

$$
\hat{a}_{t a i}=M_{t} \cdot \hat{\bar{a}}_{t a i}
$$

with variance:

$$
\hat{V}\left(\hat{a}_{t a i}\right)=M_{t}^{2} \cdot \hat{V}\left(\hat{\bar{a}}_{t a i}\right)
$$

The catch (or number released) for a specific species on sampled day $t$ in area $a$ from trip type $i$ is similarly estimated by:

$$
\hat{Y}_{t a i}=\frac{\sum_{j} y_{t a i j}}{m_{t}} M_{t}
$$

with estimated variance:

$$
\hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{t a i}\right)=\frac{\sum_{j}\left(y_{t a i j}-\hat{\bar{y}}_{t a i}\right)^{2}}{m_{t}\left(m_{t}-1\right)} M_{t}\left(M_{t}-m_{t}\right)
$$

This estimate and it's variance differs somewhat from that described in Lai et al. (1991) since the total count, $\mathrm{M}_{t}$ (assumed to be a known quantity), is used to expand the estimated CPUE (calculated over all sampled boats) rather than the estimated boat-trips by trip-type and area fished.

### 3.5 Estimating Chinook Encounters and Mortalities

We characterized the overall impacts of the June 2010 recreational mark-selective Chinook fishery in ocean Areas 1-4 in terms of grand-total estimates of Chinook encounters and mortalities and by using estimates specific to each of the four size/mark-status groups (i.e., legal-marked [LM], sublegal-marked [SM], legal-unmarked [LU], and sublegal-unmarked [SU]; Table 1). The method described above in section 3.4 was used to generate total estimates of angler effort, retained catch by species, and releases of all fish species except for Chinook salmon released during the June 2010 Chinook MSF in Areas 1-4. However, to estimate Chinook salmon releases (and thus, total encounters) by size/mark group, we applied Conrad and McHugh's (2008) bias-corrected approach, the same method that the Puget Sound Sampling Unit (PSSU) has used since 2008 to estimate Chinook releases in Puget Sound markselective Chinook fisheries (e.g., WDFW 2011).

Prior to summer 2008, PSSU had generated two different Chinook encounters estimates based on two separate estimation methods ("Method 1" and "Method 2"; see WDFW 2011 and Conrad and McHugh 2008 for details). Method 1 estimates of total Chinook encounters were derived from the combination of dockside observations of landed catch and angler interview responses about salmon releases; thus, as Conrad and McHugh explain, the accuracy of Method 1 estimates depended heavily on the ability of anglers to correctly recall and report the number of Chinook they actually encountered and released. Method 2 estimates of Chinook encounters were obtained using the creel survey estimates of the total number of legal-size, marked Chinook harvested in combination with the on-water observation or VTR data to estimate both the total number of Chinook encounters and to apportion the encounters to four size/mark status categories (LM, LU, SM, SU). The Method 2 estimator was derived assuming that anglers retain all LM Chinook encountered; therefore, its accuracy depended on the extent
to which angler behavior deviates from this idealized case. Based on their analyses and practical considerations regarding the most feasible bias correction approaches, Conrad and McHugh ultimately recommended using Method 2 with a correction for the release of legalsize marked Chinook as the preferred method for estimating total Chinook encounters in markselective Chinook fisheries. After a thorough state-tribal technical review of Conrad and McHugh's method in August 2008, state and tribal technical representatives agreed to use this bias-corrected approach to produce a "best estimate" of Chinook encounters.

Thus, we estimated Chinook releases in the June 2010 Chinook MSF as the difference between retained catch (i.e., from the dockside creel survey) and total Chinook encounters (i.e., releases = encounters - retained catch) generated using Conrad and McHugh (2008) approach. We first divided the creel estimate of legal-marked Chinook harvest by the onboard observer-based estimate of the proportion of the fishable Chinook population that was of legal size and marked (i.e., the former "Method 2" approach; WDFW 2011). Given that this approach yields negatively biased estimates if anglers release any of the legal-marked Chinook they encounter, we then applied Conrad and McHugh's bias correction factor to account for this phenomenon (13\%) and incorporated it into the estimator (See Appendix A for complete computational details).

Table 1. Sampling/estimation details on target parameters associated with the overall mark-selective Chinook fishery monitoring program in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Activity | Focal <br> Parameter(s) | Secondary <br> Parameter(s) | Sample Unit(s) | Finest Estimation Time Step | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dockside Creel Sampling | Fishing effort (boat \& angler trips); retained and released fish ${ }^{1}$ | Catch rates (CPUE); length, age, and CWT composition of harvest | Boat trip; kept fish; reported fish release | Week | Within weeks, estimates are also produced by strata (weekday/weekend). |
| Onboard observation and VTRs | Size (legal/sublegal) and mark-status composition (marked, unmarked) of encountered Chinook | Chinook length, age, and DNA-based stock composition; species composition of nonChinook encounters | Fish encounter | Season | Too few encounters occurred to assess mark rates on a finer time scale. |
| Overall <br> Fishery <br> Impacts <br> Estimation | Total Chinook encounters and mortalities, by size/mark-status group | Ratios of encounters and mortalities per kept Chinook | N/A | Season | The temporal resolution of impact estimates is constrained by that of the observer encounters data. |
| Coded-wire tag (CWT) <br> Impacts <br> Estimation | Marked/unmarked double-index tag (DIT) encounters and mortalities | N/A | N/A | Season | The temporal resolution of DIT impacts is constrained by the total number of tags recovered. |

${ }^{1 /}$ Under the "bias-corrected Method-2" approach, Chinook releases can be estimated only as finely as onboard observer data allow.

We estimated total Chinook mortality resulting from the June 2010 selective Chinook fishery by applying assumed mortality rates to the total harvest and release estimates for the four size/mark-status groups (LM, LU, SM, and SU). For retained Chinook, the mortality estimate was equivalent to the total harvest estimate for the applicable size/mark-status group. We applied a selective fishing mortality ( sfm ) rate of $14 \%$ to legal (marked and unmarked) and sublegal (marked and unmarked) release totals, to estimate release mortality in the ocean (the same $s f m$ value used in FRAM). See Appendix A for a complete description of our impact estimation procedure, including formulae for total and variance estimators.

The final step of our overall impacts assessment involved comparing fishery outcomes to preseason expectations. To do this, we compared season-total estimates of Chinook encounters and mortalities to pre-season modeled values (FRAM model run no. 1010) for each size and mark status category.

### 3.6 CWT Impacts

To understand the potential effects of the June 12-30, 2010 recreational mark-selective Chinook fishery in the ocean on the CWT program, we estimated the total number of unmarked-tagged Chinook mortalities that may have occurred during the course of the fishery. To do this, we acquired information for all marked CWT double index tag (DIT) groups present in landed catch from the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission's Regional Mark Information System (RMIS) and then applied the methods described by the Pacific Salmon

Commission's Selective Fisheries Evaluation Committee-Analysis Work Group (SFEC-AWG 2002) to estimate the number of unmarked DIT fish encountered ${ }^{1}$. We subsequently estimated the number of these fish that may have died due to hook-and-release impacts using an sfm analogous to that used in FRAM modeling. Given our interest in characterizing the impacts of mark-selective regulations on the CWT program and not recreational fishing in general, we used an $s f m$ of $10 \%$ in all unmarked-DIT mortality calculations. The $s f m$ value of $10 \%$ did not include unseen drop-off mortality (assumed to be 5\% in FRAM) because drop-off mortality occurs in both selective and non-selective recreational Chinook fisheries.

We estimated Chinook encounters and mortalities for each recovered DIT individually and then summed estimates for each hatchery, brood year, and area based on the methods described by SFEC-AWG 2002. Thus, the estimated number of unmarked mortalities was calculated as:

$$
\hat{U}_{a}{ }^{\text {MSF }}=\lambda^{R E L} \hat{M}_{a}{ }^{\text {MSF }} \text { sfm }
$$

with associated variance:

$$
\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{U}_{a}^{M S F}\right) \approx\left(\lambda^{R E L}\right)^{2} s f m^{2} \hat{M}_{a}^{M S F} \frac{1-s}{s} .
$$

where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s f m=\text { selective fishing mortality rate ( } 10 \% \text {, excludes drop-off mortality }), \\
& U_{a, i}{ }^{\text {MSF }}=\text { aged } a \text { unmarked DIT mortalities from stock } i \text { in the selective fishery, } \\
& M_{a, i}{ }^{M S F}=\text { aged } a \text { marked DIT mortalities from stock } i \text { in the selective fishery, } \\
& \\
& =\text { sampling rate of the catch, } \\
& \lambda^{R E L} \quad=\text { unmarked-to-marked ratio at release for fish in a DIT group } \\
& \operatorname{Var}\left(U_{a, i}{ }^{M S F}\right)=\text { variance of } U_{a, i}{ }^{M S F} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In addition to estimating unmarked-DIT mortalities, we pooled all CWTs (DIT and otherwise) recovered during the fishery and, based on this total, report the proportional contribution (unexpanded recoveries) of different hatcheries to the total Chinook harvest (See CWT Results below).

[^0]
## 4. RESULTS IN JUNE CHINOOK MARK SELECTIVE RECREATIONAL FISHERY

### 4.1 Dockside Sampling Results

WDFW dockside samplers interviewed an estimated $36 \%$ of all anglers fishing in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 during the June 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery; a total of 3,619 anglers in 930 boats were enumerated in-sample (Table 2). In addition, a total of 32\% $(1,589)$ of all marked Chinook harvested in ocean Areas 1 through 4 were sampled, and 229 coded wire tags (CWTs) were collected in Washington's coastal ports (Table 2).

## Estimates of Fishing Effort and Chinook Catch

An estimated 10,347 angler trips (10,004 from Washington, 343 from Oregon) were completed by private and charter anglers during the coastwide Chinook MSF from June 12 through June 30, 2010. These anglers harvested a total of 5,037 Chinook coastwide (5,000 WA, 37 OR) (Table 3). Landed Chinook catch totaled $42 \%$ of the overall fishery quota of 12,000 .

A total of 11,202 Chinook encounters were estimated in Washington ocean waters during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery, for CRC Areas 1 through 4 combined (Table 4). This total consisted of an estimated 5,000 retained (4,981 marked, 19 unmarked) and 6,202 released ( 2,636 marked, 3,566 unmarked) Chinook salmon.

Table 2. Dockside sampling statistics during the June 12-30, 2010 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Area | Boats <br> Sampled | Sample Rate | Anglers Sampled | Sample Rate | Landed Chinook Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Coded wire tags collected |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | 227 | 45\% | 565 | 46\% | 69 | 48\% | 5 |
| Area 3 | 101 | 67\% | 271 | 69\% | 27 | 71\% | 4 |
| Area 2 | 494 | 29\% | 2,399 | 31\% | 1,417 | 30\% | 203 |
| Area 1 | 108 | 68\% | 384 | 69\% | 76 | 71\% | 17 |
| Total WA | 930 | 37\% | 3,619 | 36\% | 1,589 | 32\% | 229 |

Table 3. Estimates of total fishing effort and number of Chinook retained during the June 12-30, 2010 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Area | Total Boat Trips | Total Angler Trips | Estimated Chinook Retained |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Marked | Unmarked | TOTAL |
| Area 4 | 501 | 1,239 | 144 | 0 | 144 |
| Area 3 | 150 | 390 | 38 | 0 | 38 |
| Area 2 | 1,677 | 7,822 | 4,694 | 18 | 4,711 |
| Area 1 | 158 | 553 | 105 | 1 | 106 |
| TOTAL WA | 2,487 | 10,004 | 4,981 | 19 | 5,000 |
| TOTAL OR | N/A | 343 | 37 | 0 | 37 |
| Season Total: | 2,487 | 10,347 | 5,018 | 19 | 5,037 |
| WA Variance: ${ }^{1 /}$ | 8,341 | 147,317 | 170,522 | 2,574 |  |
| WA Standard Error: | 91 | 384 | 413 | 51 |  |
| WA CV (\%): | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 269\% |  |
| WA 95\% CI: | 2,308-2,666 | 9,252-10,756 | 4,172-5,790 | -81-118 |  |

${ }^{1 /}$ Variance estimates are unavailable for Oregon statistics.

## CWT Samples

In total, 229 decoded coded-wire tags were recovered from Chinook salmon sampled dockside during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 combined. Observed (unexpanded) stock composition results for these in-sample tag recoveries are presented by area in Tables 5-1 through 5-4 for Areas 1 through 4, respectively. In Area 1, samplers recovered a total of 17 CWTs, $7 \%$ of the CWTs recovered in all four areas combined. The majority of these recoveries ( $41.2 \%$ ) were from Upper Columbia River (above McNary Dam, excluding Snake River), Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) ( $17.6 \%$ ), and Snake River ( $17.6 \%$ ) hatcheries, while recoveries from the Central Columbia River (Bonneville to McNary Dam) (5.9\%) and Central California coast (5.9\%) hatcheries made up the remaining tags in the sample (Table 5-1). One of the CWT recoveries in Area 1 was from a double index tag (DIT) release group.

In Area 2, samplers recovered a total of 203 CWTs, $89 \%$ of the total tags recovered in all four ocean areas combined. The majority of these recoveries were from Snake River (44.3\%), Upper Columbia River (above McNary Dam) (14.8\%), and Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) ( $12.3 \%$ ) hatcheries. The remaining Area 2 tag recoveries represented hatcheries from the Central Columbia River (Bonneville to McNary Dam) (7.4\%), general Columbia River (3.4\%), Puget Sound Washington (1.5\%), coastal Oregon (1.5\%), California (10.9\%), and the Lower Fraser River in British Columbia (3.9\%) (Table 5-2). In addition, 33 of the CWT recoveries in Area 2 were from double index tag (DIT) release groups.

In Area 3, samplers recovered a total of 4 CWTs, $2 \%$ of the total tags recovered in all four ocean areas combined. Two of these CWT recoveries (50\%) were from the Lyons Ferry Hatchery on the Snake River; one ( $25 \%$ ) was from the Upper Columbia River (above McNary Dam); and one ( $25 \%$ ) was from Trinity River Hatchery on the Klamath River, California (Table 5-3). None of these CWT recoveries from Area 3 belonged to DIT groups.

In Area 4, samplers recovered a total of $5 \mathrm{CWTs}, 2 \%$ of the total tags recovered in all four ocean areas combined. Three of these CWT recoveries were from the Columbia River -- one each from the Lower Columbia River (Cowlitz Salmon Hatchery), Central Columbia River (Klickitat Hatchery), and Snake River (NPT Hatchery). Another tag was from mid-Puget Sound (Grovers Creek Hatchery), while one was from a Central California coastal hatchery facility (Table 5-4). One of the CWT recoveries in Area 4 was from a double index tag (DIT) release group (Grovers Creek Hatchery in Mid-Puget Sound).

Table 4. Total estimates of fishing effort and the number of Chinook retained and released by mark status and by week, during the June 12-30, 2010 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 combined.

| Chinook MSF Season | Stat Week | Stratum Start Date | Stratum End Date | Est. Effort |  | Est. Retained Chinook |  | Est. Released Chinook ${ }^{1 /}$ |  | Est. Total Chinook Encounters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Boats | Anglers | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | Unmarked |  |
| June 12 - <br> June 30, 2010 | 24 | 12-Jun | 13-Jun | 421 | 1,617 | 605 | 2 | 320 | 433 | 1,360 |
|  | 25 | 14-Jun | 20-Jun | 897 | 3,649 | 2,135 | 12 | 1,130 | 1,524 | 4,801 |
|  | 26 | 21-Jun | 27-Jun | 945 | 3,738 | 1,801 | 1 | 953 | 1,295 | 4,051 |
|  | 27 | 28-Jun | 30-Jun | 223 | 1,001 | 440 | 3 | 233 | 314 | 990 |
| Season Total: |  |  |  | 2,487 | 10,004 | 4,981 | 19 | 2,636 | 3,566 | 11,202 |
| Variance: <br> Standard Error: <br> CV (\%): 95\% CI: |  |  |  | 8,341 | 147,317 | 170,522 | 2,574 | 374,573 | 177,319 | 539,213 |
|  |  |  |  | 91 | 384 | 413 | 51 | 612 | 421 | 734 |
|  |  |  |  | 4\% | 4\% | 8\% | 269\% | 23.2\% | 11.8\% | 6.6\% |
|  |  |  |  | 2,308-2,666 | 9,252-10,756 | 4,172-5,790 | -81-118 | 1,437-3,836 | 2,740-4,391 | 9,762-12,641 |

[^1]Table 5-1. Summary of coded-wire tags recovered from Chinook salmon harvested in Washington coastal Area 1 during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery. The field "No. DITs" corresponds to the number of tags that belonged to double--index tag groups. Percentages in parentheses indicate the proportional contribution (unexpanded recoveries) of different hatcheries to the total Chinook harvest in Area 1.

| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | No. DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Columbia River | Columbia River General Region (11.8\%) | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
|  | Upper Columbia R (above McNary Dam; excludes Snake River) (41.2\%) | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | 2 (11.8\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | 2 (11.8\%) | 0 |
|  |  | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | 3 (17.6\%) | 0 |
|  | Central Columbia River (Bonneville Dam to McNary Dam) (5.9\%) | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | 1 (5.9\%) | 1 |
|  | Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) (17.6\%) | MOLALLA R | WILLAMETTE HATCHERY | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  | MCKENZIE R 1 | MCKENZIE HATCHERY | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SANTIAM R \& N FK-1 | MARION FORKS HATCH | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (17.6\%) | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 2 (11.8\%) | 0 |
|  |  | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
| California | Central California Coast (5.9\%) | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | MOKELUMNE R FISH INS | 1 (5.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  |  | Total, Area 1: | 17 | 1 |

Table 5-2. Summary of coded-wire tags recovered from Chinook salmon harvested in Washington coastal Area 2 during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery. The field "No. DITs" corresponds to the number of tags that belonged to double-index tag groups. Percentages in parentheses indicate the proportional contribution (unexpanded recoveries) of different hatcheries to the total Chinook harvest in Area 2.

| Release Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs Recovered | No. DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Washington | Northern Washington (0.5\%) | FRIDAY CR 03.0017 | SAMISH HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 1 |
|  | Mid Puget Sound (0.5\%) | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 1 |
|  | Southern Puget Sound (0.5\%) | CLEAR CR 11.0013C | CLEAR CREEK HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 1 |
| Columbia River | Columbia River General Region (3.4\%) | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | 5 (2.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL | WELLS HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Upper Columbia R (above McNary Dam; excludes Snake River) (14.8\%) | LK CHELAN + COLUMBIA R |  | 4 (2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | 5 (2.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | 8 (3.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | 8 (3.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | CHELAN R 47.0052 |  | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Central Columbia River (Bonneville Dam to McNary Dam) (7.4\%) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | UMATILLA R | UMATILLA HATCHERY | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | 12 (5.9\%) | 12 |
|  | Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) (12.3\%) | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | 7 (3.4\%) | 0 |
|  |  | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | 11 (5.4\%) | 11 |
|  |  | FALLERT CR 27.0017 | FALLERT CR HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | MCKENZIE R 1 | MCKENZIE HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | ELOCHOMAN R 25.0236 | ELOCHOMAN HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |


| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs Recovered | No. DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TANNER CR (BNVILLE) | BONNEVILLE HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | WASHOUGAL R 28.0159 | WASHOUGAL HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | 7 (3.4\%) | 0 |
|  |  | NPT HATCHERY | NPT HATCHERY | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 11 (5.4\%) | 0 |
|  |  | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 7 (3.4\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (44.3\%) | SNAKE R@PITT. LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 3 (1.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (44.3\%) | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | 10 (4.9\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SNAKE R-UPPR 35.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 4 (2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | CLWTR @ LAPWAI CRK | NPT HATCHERY | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 39 (19.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SNAKE R @ ASOTIN | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | 5 (2.5\%) | 0 |
| Oregon | Northern Oregon Coast (0.5\%) | THREE RIVERS (NESTUC | CEDAR CR HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Southern Oregon Coast (1\%) | ELK R | ELK R HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | ROCK CR (N UMPQUA R) | ROCK CR HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
| California | Northern California Coast (0.5\%) | SMITH RIVER | ROWDY CREEK HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Central California Coast (7.9\%) | SAN PABLO BAY | COLEMAN NFH | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | 2 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | 4 (2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | 4 (2\%) | 0 |


| Release Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | No. DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | MOKELUMNE R FISH INS | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | WICKLAND OIL TERMINAL | FEATHER R HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  | Sacramento River (2.5\%) | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | SAC R COLUSA TO RBDD | COLEMAN NFH | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | 3 (1.5\%) | 0 |
| British Columbia | Lower Fraser River (3.9\%) | R-HARRISON R | H-CHEHALIS R | 1 (0.5\%) | 0 |
|  |  | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | 7 (3.4\%) | 7 |
| Total, Area 2: |  |  |  | 203 | 33 |

Table 5-3. Summary of coded-wire tags recovered from Chinook salmon harvested in Washington coastal Area 3 during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery. The field "No. DITs" corresponds to the number of tags that belonged to double-index tag groups. Percentages in parentheses indicate the proportional contribution (unexpanded recoveries) of different hatcheries to the total Chinook harvest in Area 3.

| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | No. DITs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Columbia <br> River | Upper Columbia R (above McNary Dam; <br> excludes Snake River) (25\%) | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | $1(25 \%)$ | 0 |
|  | Snake River (50\%) | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | $1(25 \%)$ | 0 |
|  | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | $1(25 \%)$ | 0 |  |
|  | Klamath River - Trinity River (25\%) | TRINITY R HATCHERY | TRINITY R HATCHERY | $1(25 \%)$ | 0 |

Table 5-4. Summary of coded-wire tags recovered from Chinook salmon harvested in Washington coastal Area 4 during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery. The field "No. DITs" corresponds to the number of tags that belonged to double-index tag groups. Percentages in parentheses indicate the proportional contribution (unexpanded recoveries) of different hatcheries to the total Chinook harvest in Area 4.

| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | No. DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Washington | Mid Puget Sound (20\%) | GROVERS CR 15.0299 | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | 1 (20\%) | 1 |
| Columbia <br> River | Central Columbia River (Bonneville Dam to McNary Dam) (20\%) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | 1 (20\%) | 0 |
|  | Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) (20\%) | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | 1 (20\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (20\%) | CLWTR @ LAPWAI CRK | NPT HATCHERY | 1 (20\%) | 0 |
| California | Central California Coast (20\%) | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | 1 (20\%) | 0 |
| Total, Area 4: |  |  |  | 5 | 1 |

### 4.2 On-water Observations of Chinook Encounters

## On-Board Observer Data

WDFW's observer staff conducted 22 on-the-water catch surveys onboard charter boats during the 19-day June 2010 selective Chinook fishery. Observers recorded a total of 253 encountered Chinook salmon in all four ocean areas combined; $88 \%$ of these encounters were in Area 2. The size/mark status composition of these Chinook encounters is presented in Table 6. Chinook encounters of unknown size and/or unknown mark status were excluded in determining the overall size/mark status composition (legal-marked [LM], legal-unmarked [LU], sublegal-marked [SM], and sublegal-unmarked [SU]), yielding a useable sample size of 225 Chinook encounters based on onboard observer data for Areas 1-4 combined. The following size/mark group composition was estimated from the 225 useable encounters: $51.1 \% \mathrm{LM}, 23.6 \% \mathrm{LU}$, $16.9 \%$ SM, and $8.4 \%$ SU. These estimated size/mark group proportions based on onboard observer data were used in subsequent impact estimation steps, as discussed further in the section below titled Estimated Chinook Encounters and Mortalities (see Table 10 and Appendix A).

## DNA Results

Chinook DNA samples were collected only by onboard observers who had access to both marked and unmarked Chinook encounters during the June 2010 Chinook MSF. A total of 154 DNA samples were collected from legal sized Chinook and 47 from sublegal sized Chinook during the 19 -day season (Table 7).

## VTR Data

Additional on-the-water encounters data was provided via angler-completed voluntary trip reports (VTRs). Dockside samplers collected 101 completed and useable VTRs containing 444 Chinook encounters (Table 8). Chinook encounters of unknown size and/or unknown mark status were excluded in determining the size/mark status composition results based on VTR data, yielding a useable sample size of 407 Chinook encounters for Areas 1-4 combined. The following size/mark group composition was estimated from these 407 useable encounters: $50.6 \% \mathrm{LM}, 22.9 \% \mathrm{LU}, 15.2 \% \mathrm{SM}$, and $11.3 \%$ SU. Although the VTR data were not used in subsequent fishery-wide impacts estimation steps (i.e., Appendix A), the overall size/mark group composition from VTRs was similar to that from onboard observer data (Table 6) when pooling the Chinook encounters data across all four ocean areas for each data source.

To compare observed (field-estimated) mark rates in each area with preseason FRAMpredicted values, we combined the onboard observer- and VTR-based encounters data. The combined onboard observer and VTR data indicated mark rates of $69 \%$ for legal sized Chinook and $61 \%$ for sublegal sized Chinook coast-wide (Table 9).

Table 6. Summary of on-water Chinook encounters data by size and mark group, collected by WDFW observers sampling onboard charter boats during the June 12-30, 2010 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

"Chinook encounters of unknown size and/or unknown mark status were excluded in determining the overall size/mark status composition based on onboard observer data, as indicated by the dash (--).

Table 7. Number of Chinook DNA samples collected by WDFW observers onboard charter vessels during the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1-4.

|  | LEGAL SIZED |  |  |  | SUBLEGAL SIZED |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Marked | Unmarked | Total |  | Marked | Unmarked | Total |
| Area 4 | 3 | 3 | 6 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Area 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Area 2 | 96 | 42 | 138 |  | 33 | 10 | 43 |
| Area 1 | 9 | 1 | 10 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 4}$ |  | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |  |

Table 8. Summary of on-water Chinook encounters by size class and mark status, as reported on angler-completed voluntary trip reports (VTRs) during the June 12-30, 2010 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

${ }^{4}$ Chinook encounters of unknown size and/or unknown mark status were excluded in determining the overall size/mark status composition based on VTR data, as indicated by the dash (--).

Table 9. Estimated mark rates for legal- and sublegal-sized Chinook during the June 12-30, 2010 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4, based on onboard observer and VTR data combined, compared with FRAM preseason predicted values.

| Area | LEGAL SIZED |  |  | SUBLEGAL SIZED |  |  | FRAM preseason projected mark rate (legal sized) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Marked | Unmarked | Mark Rate | Marked | Unmarked | Mark Rate |  |
| Area 4 | 17 | 11 | 61\% | 5 | 6 | 45\% | 37\% |
| Area 3 | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 2 | 0\% | 53\% |
| Area 2 | 287 | 131 | 69\% | 93 | 53 | 64\% | 63\% |
| Area 1 | 16 | 2 | 89\% | 2 | 4 | 33\% | 72\% |
| TOTAL | 321 | 146 | 69\% | 100 | 65 | 61\% |  |

### 4.3 Overall Fishery Impacts

## Estimated Total Chinook Encounters and Mortalities

We derived size/mark-status group-specific estimates of Chinook encounters from a combination of the dockside sampling results (i.e., retained harvest estimates presented in Tables 2 and 4) and the on-water observer based size/mark-status composition data (Table 6; see Appendix A for computational details). In total, we estimated that private boat anglers fishing in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 (combined) encountered 5,725 LM, 2,639 LU, 1,892 SM, and 946 SU Chinook during the 19-day June 2010 selective Chinook fishery (Table 10). Given the estimates of harvest and the assumed selective fishing mortality ( sfm ) mortality rate of 0.14 for both legal-sized and sublegalsized Chinook, these encounters translated into a total of 5,868 estimated Chinook mortalities ( 5,000 retained and 868 released; $5,085 \mathrm{LM}, 386 \mathrm{LU}, 265 \mathrm{SM}$, and 132 SU ) in ocean Areas 1 through 4 combined (Table 10). Of the total estimated mortalities, $85 \%$ were attributed to retention of legal-size marked Chinook.

## FRAM versus Creel Comparison

Comparisons of Chinook encounters and mortalities projected in the final preseason FRAM model run (FRAM number 1010) with observed encounters and mortalities are presented in Tables 11 and 12. These comparisons are illustrated in Figure 2. FRAM projections include encounters and mortalities in Oregon waters; however, observed total encounters and mortalities are not available for Oregon waters. Oregon landed catch comprised $1 \%$ of the total landed catch in the ocean Chinook MSF. Both observed encounters and estimated actual mortalities were less than those projected in preseason FRAM model run 1010 for all size/mark group categories. For example, FRAMpredicted total encounters and mortalities were approximately double the field-estimated values of these parameters (Tables 11 and 12, Figure 2).

Table 13 and Figure 3 compare preseason modeled impacts on key Columbia River Chinook stocks with modeled impacts using updated catches and run size estimates. In terms of both catch impacts and exploitation rates, the preseason modeled impacts of the Chinook MSF on Bonneville Pool hatchery (BPH), summer Chinook, and upriver bright (URB) Chinook were higher than what was actually observed.

Table 10. Summary of the fishery impact estimates for the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Size/Mark Group | Total <br> Chinook <br> Encounters | Number <br> Retained | Number <br> Released | Release <br> Mortality Rate | Release <br> Mortality | Total <br> Mortality | Variance | SE | 95\% CI | CV (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Legal Marked | 5,725 | 4,981 | 744 | 0.14 | 104 | 5,085 | 6,180 | 79 | $4,931-5,239$ | $2 \%$ |
| Legal Unmarked | 2,639 | 19 | 2,620 | 0.14 | 367 | 386 | 2,555 | 51 | $287-485$ | $13 \%$ |
| Sublegal Marked | 1,892 | 0 | 1,892 | 0.14 | 265 | 265 | 1,836 | 43 | $181-349$ | $16 \%$ |
| Sublegal Unmarked | 946 | 0 | 946 | 0.14 | 132 | 132 | 921 | 30 | $73-192$ | $23 \%$ |
| TOTAL ALL GROUPS | 11,202 | 5,000 | 6,202 | 0.14 | 868 | 5,868 | 11,492 | 107 | $5,658-6,078$ | $2 \%$ |

Table 11. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run no. 1010) and estimated total Chinook encounters in the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Data Source | Group | Encounters ${ }^{1 /}$ | Legal | Sublegal | Landed Only <br> (WA + OR) |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unmarked | 6,643 | 4,543 | 2,100 | 364 |
|  | Marked | 16,824 | 13,174 | 3,650 | 11,636 |
|  | Total | 23,467 | 17,717 | 5,750 | 12,000 |
|  | \% Marked | $72 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
|  | Unmarked | 3,585 | 2,639 | 946 | 19 |
| Estimated (Creel) | Marked | 7,617 | 5,725 | 1,892 | 5,018 |
| Encounters (WA only) | Total | 11,202 | 8,364 | 2,838 | 5,037 |
|  | \% Marked | $68 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

${ }^{1 /}$ Observed (field-estimated) Chinook encounters by size class and mark status are not available for Oregon waters; landed catch includes Oregon.
Table 12. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run no. 1010) and estimated total Chinook mortalities in the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Mortality Category | FRAM Chinook Mortalities (WA + OR) |  |  | Estimated Chinook Mortalities $1 /$ (WA only) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unmarked | Marked | Total | Unmarked | Marked | Total |
| Total (Landed + Released) | 1,470 | 13,059 | 14,529 | 518 | 5,350 | 5,868 |
| Released Legal | 812 | 912 | 1,724 | 367 | 104 | 471 |
| Released Sublegal | 294 | 511 | 805 | 132 | 265 | 397 |
| Landed Only (WA + OR) | 364 | 11,636 | 12,000 | 19 | 5,018 | 5,037 |

[^2]

Figure 2. Comparison of modeled (i.e., using FRAM, model run 1010) and estimated total Chinook encounters (left panel) and mortalities (right panel) for the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1-4.

Table 13. Comparison of 2010 overall fishery impacts on key Columbia River Chinook stocks modeled pre-season and post-season in an updated ocean model run.

| River Run Sizes |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pre- } \\ & \text { Season } \end{aligned}$ | Ocean Catches |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stock | Updated |  |  | Updated | Updated |  | Pre-Seas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BPH | 124,541 | 162,918 |  |  | May-June | Jul-Sep | May-June | Jul-Sep |  |  |  |  |  |
| URB | 327,102 | 393,719 |  | Area 3/4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seak Troll | 177,613 | 146,976 |  | NT Troll | 7,188 | 2,854 | 15,512 | 8,577 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seak Net | 9,060 | 19,129 |  | T Troll | 14,178 | 15,208 | 25,138 | 25,975 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seak Sport | 31,656 | 35,107 |  | Sport | 182 | 4,249 | 1,404 | 7,900 |  |  |  |  |  |
| NCBC Troll | 90,200 | 100,797 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NBC Outside Sport | 55,000 | 43,055 |  | Area 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WCVI Troll | 79,200 | 71,568 |  | NT Troll | 23,363 | 10,808 | 16,996 | 3,609 |  |  |  |  |  |
| WCVI Sport | 52,700 | 68,900 |  | T Troll | 802 | 1,717 | 2,362 | 1,525 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sport | 4,711 | 22,278 | 9,065 | 28,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Area 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | NT Troll | 7,672 | 4,335 | 9,492 | 1,814 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sport | 143 | 7,077 | 1,531 | 13,100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summary of impacts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Exploitat | ion Rates |  |  |  |  | Catc | hes |  |  |
|  |  | Upda <br> Bonn. Pool Hat. | ated Mode <br> Col R Summer All | Run <br> Col URB All | Bonn. Pool Hat. | Season Mod <br> Col R Summer All | odel <br> Col URB All | Upda <br> Bonn. Pool Hat. | ted Model <br> Col R Summer All | Run <br> Col URB All | Pre <br> Bonn. <br> Pool <br> Hat. | Season Col R Summer All | odel <br> Col URB AII |
| SEAK |  | 0.000 | 0.113 | 0.124 | 0.000 | 0.100 | 0.109 | 0 | 11,681 | 52,536 | 0 | 15,096 | 55,030 |
| CANADA |  | 0.057 | 0.192 | 0.084 | 0.058 | 0.173 | 0.090 | 10,871 | 19,801 | 35,553 | 14,838 | 26,165 | 45,789 |
| PFMC TREATY |  | 0.060 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.088 | 0.001 | 0.004 | 11,353 | 109 | 1,075 | 22,366 | 161 | 1,869 |
| PFMC NON-TREATY | MSF | 0.009 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.017 | 0.003 | 0.001 | 1,670 | 189 | 356 | 4,291 | 469 | 717 |
|  | NON-SEL NoF | 0.190 | 0.000 | 0.0113 | 0.164 | 0.000 | 0.0132 | 36,215 | 10 | 4,782 | 41,698 | 17 | 6,676 |
|  | NON-SEL SoF | 0.018 | 0.003 | 0.0022 | 0.018 | 0.003 | 0.0022 | 3,406 | 348 | 947 | 4,495 | 522 | 1,134 |
| PUGET SOUND |  | 0.011 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.010 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 2,027 | 134 | 907 | 2,611 | 201 | 1,041 |
| COASTAL NET |  | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 640 | 0 | 10 | 838 | 0 | 12 |
| RIVER TREATY |  | 0.307 | 0.008 | 0.178 | 0.301 | 0.008 | 0.179 | 58,534 | 833 | 75,233 | 76,571 | 1,278 | 90,555 |
| RIVER NON-TREATY |  | 0.0718 | 0.0018 | 0.090 | 0.0705 | 0.0019 | 0.090 | 13,700 | 185 | 37,917 | 17,921 | 284 | 45,639 |
| TOTAL |  | 0.726 | 0.323 | 0.495 | 0.731 | 0.293 | 0.491 | 138,416 | 33,291 | 209,316 | 185,629 | 44,193 | 248,462 |
| ESCAPEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52,307 | 69,669 | 213,952 | 68,426 | 106,806 | 257,525 |




Figure 3. Comparison of exploitation rates and catches of key Columbia River Chinook stocks in the June 2010 Chinook MSF modeled preseason (run 1010) and post-season in an updated ocean model run.

## Estimated CWT-DIT Impacts

Of the 229 coded-wire tags recovered during the June 12-30, 2010 ocean mark-selective Chinook fishery in Areas 1-4 combined, a total of 35 belonged to double-index tag (DIT) release groups (Table 14). Based on the release details associated with these tags and their unmarked sister groups, we obtained an estimate of the unmarked-to-marked ratio $(\lambda)$ at juvenile release for each applicable hatchery of origin and brood year, and we used this value to estimate total unmarked DIT encounters for the entirety of the June 2010 selective Chinook fishery the four areas. In total, we estimated that 114 unmarked-DIT Chinook were encountered during the fishery. Given an assumed sfm rate of 0.10 for the estimated unmarked DIT fish that were encountered and released, we estimate that 11 unmarked DIT fish may have died as a result of the June 2010 ocean selective Chinook fishery (Table 14).

Table 14. Summary of double-index tagged (DIT) Chinook kept by anglers, and estimated total mortality of unmarked DIT Chinook due to hook-and-release impacts resulting from the June 12-30, 2010 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Marine Area ${ }^{1 /}$ | Hatchery | Brood Year | DITs Obs. | AD DIT Harvest |  | UM DIT Enc | UM DIT Mortality |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Est. AD | var (Est. AD) |  | Est. UM | var (Est. UM) | SE (Est. UM) |
| 1 | SPRING CR NFH | 2007 | 1 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.005 | 0.1 |
|  | Total, Area 1 |  | 1 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.005 | 0.1 |
| 2 | BIG CR HATCHERY | 2007 | 11 | 36.4 | 84.3 | 36.6 | 3.7 | 0.800 | 3.1 |
|  | CLEAR CREEK HATCHERY | 2007 | 1 | 3.3 | 7.7 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 0.100 | 0.3 |
|  | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | 2007 | 1 | 3.3 | 7.7 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 0.100 | 0.3 |
|  | H-CHILLIWACK R | 2007 | 7 | 23.2 | 53.6 | 23.2 | 2.3 | 0.500 | 1.9 |
|  | SAMISH HATCHERY | 2007 | 1 | 3.3 | 7.7 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 0.100 | 0.3 |
|  | SPRING CR NFH | 2007 | 11 | 36.4 | 84.3 | 36.4 | 3.6 | 0.800 | 3.0 |
|  | SPRING CR NFH | 2008 | 1 | 3.3 | 7.7 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 0.200 | 0.4 |
|  | Total, Area 2 |  | 33 | 109.3 | 252.8 | 111.0 | 11.1 | 2.600 | 9.3 |
| 4 | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | 2006 | 1 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.023 | 0.2 |
|  | Total, Area 4 |  | 1 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.023 | 0.2 |
| Grand Total (all WA Ocean Areas) |  |  | 35 | 112.8 | 255.6 | 114.5 | 11.4 | 2.628 | 9.6 |

${ }^{1 /}$ In Area 3, dockside samplers did not recover any DIT Chinook in their samples.

## 5. RESULTS IN THE ALL-SPECIES COHO MARK SELECTIVE RECREATIONAL FISHERY

An estimated 80,895 angler trips (70,947 from Washington, 9,948 from Oregon) were completed by private and charter anglers during the coastwide all-species coho MSF operating July 1 through September 30, 2010. These anglers harvested a total of 33,649 Chinook coastwide ( 31,874 WA, 1,775 OR) and 42,339 coho ( 36,231 WA, 6,108 OR). Landed Chinook catch totaled $74 \%$ of the overall adjusted fishery quota of $45,500^{2}$; landed coho catch totaled $57 \%$ of the adjusted fishery quota of $74,200^{3}$. Table 15 shows effort and catch by month and area.

WDFW dockside samplers interviewed an estimated $37 \%$ of all anglers fishing from WA coastwide. A total of $32 \%$ of all Chinook and $40 \%$ of all coho harvested in WA were sampled; 1,460 coded wire tags (CWTs) were collected from sampled Chinook and 1,456 were collected from sampled coho in WA ports (Table 16).

OSP observer staff conducted a total of 51 on-the-water catch surveys during the allspecies fishery and encountered a total of 329 legal sized Chinook, 222 sublegal sized Chinook, 908 legal sized coho, and 19 sublegal sized coho. Dockside samplers also collected 200 completed and useable VTRs containing 342 legal sized Chinook encounters, 326 sublegal sized Chinook encounters, 773 legal sized coho encounters, and 53 sublegal sized coho encounters (Tables 17 and 18). Mark rates calculated from onboard observer and VTR data are shown in Table 19 and compared to preseason FRAM coho mark rate projections.

FRAM pre-season projections of total coho mortality in the 2010 ocean recreational all-species fisheries are shown in Table 20. Table 21 details observed coho mortality in those fisheries. Both tables include catch from Oregon. An explanation of the calculations and assumptions used in table 21 follows:

Observed marked and unmarked coho retention is calculated from dockside sampling data as described in Section 3.4; note that since catch estimates are stratified by week, monthly total proportions of marked and unmarked retained estimated catch may vary slightly from monthly total proportions of marked and unmarked sampled coho. Marked release mortality is calculated as $6 \%$ of the marked retained coho multiplied by the hooking mortality rate of $14 \%$ adopted by the PFMC for recreational fisheries north of Cape Falcon. Unmarked release mortality is calculated by dividing total retention by the observed mark rate (to get total encounters), subtracting the total retention (to get unmarked released coho), and multiplying by the ocean recreational hooking mortality rate of $14 \%$. Observed mark rates from on-water sampling or VTRs is used in this calculation. Where there is no observed estimate of mark rate (in 2010, this occurred in Area 4 in September), we estimate mark rate from dockside sampling data ([total

[^3]marked retained + marked reported released]/[total retained + total reported released]). Total coho handled is estimated by dividing the total release mortality by the $14 \%$ hooking mortality rate (to get total released coho) and adding that to the total retained. Drop off mortality is calculated as $5 \%$ of the total estimated handled coho, the rate adopted for ocean recreational fisheries by the PFMC. Total incidental mortality is the sum of release mortality and drop off mortality. Total estimated mortality is the sum of total retention and total incidental mortality.

Tables 22 and 23 and Figure 4 summarize the projected and observed coho encounters and mortality in the all-species fishery. Both observed coho encounters and total mortality were lower than projected preseason in all ocean catch areas.

Table 24 reports compliance rates observed by dockside samplers for the recreational fisheries by area and month. Coastwide, compliance with selective fishery regulations averaged $99 \%$, similar to that observed in the last seven seasons.

On-water observers and volunteer anglers were asked to record information on fish that were hooked but lost before being brought to the boat, commonly referred to as drop offs. For this study, the definition of drop off was that the fish was actually hooked but became free before it could be landed. Current PFMC methodology for estimating mortality due to drop off uses a rate of $5 \%$ of the total number of fish handled (retention plus release).

Estimates of drop off mortality rates from on-water observation and VTR data collected during the recreational fisheries are compared with FRAM projections in Table 25.

A total of 1,920 DNA samples were collected from Chinook by onboard and dockside samplers during the summer all-species recreational fishery. Table 26 describes the numbers of samples by size class, mark status, and method of collection.

Table 15. Estimates of total fishing effort and number of Chinook and coho retained during the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho markselective) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

| AREA | TOTAL ANGLER TRIPS |  |  |  |  | CHINOOK RETAINED |  |  |  |  | COHO RETAINED |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | TOTAL | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | TOTAL | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | TOTAL |
| Area 4 | 5,701 | 3,803 | 807 | - | 10,310 | 1,573 | 1,453 | 129 | - | 3,154 | 1,926 | 1,609 | 150 | - | 3,685 |
| Area 3 | 838 | 1,940 | 513 | 154 | 3,445 | 294 | 715 | 86 | 45 | 1,140 | 211 | 709 | 223 | 37 | 1,180 |
| Area 2 | 11,841 | 13,804 | 4,961 | - | 30,607 | 9,948 | 10,586 | 1,744 | - | 22,278 | 3,680 | 3,957 | 4,925 | - | 12,562 |
| Area 1 | 7,165 | 17,349 | 2,070 | - | 26,584 | 1,485 | 3,588 | 229 | - | 5,302 | 6,430 | 11,725 | 650 | - | 18,804 |
| TOTAL WA | 25,546 | 36,896 | 8,351 | 154 | 70,947 | 13,299 | 16,341 | 2,189 | 45 | 31,874 | 12,247 | 17,999 | 5,947 | 37 | 36,231 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 2,211 | 6,996 | 741 | - | 9,948 | 388 | 1,321 | 66 | - | 1,775 | 1,491 | 4,404 | 213 | - | 6,108 |
| TOTAL NOF | 27,757 | 43,892 | 9,092 | 154 | 80,895 | 13,687 | 17,662 | 2,255 | 45 | 33,649 | 13,738 | 22,403 | 6,160 | 37 | 42,339 |
| WA Variance: ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  |  |  | 691,925 |  |  |  |  | 551,302 |  |  |  |  | 481,778 |
| WA Standard Error: |  |  |  |  | 832 |  |  |  |  | 742 |  |  |  |  | 694 |
| WA CV (\%): |  |  |  |  | 1\% |  |  |  |  | 2\% |  |  |  |  | 2\% |
| WA 95\% CI: |  |  |  |  | 316-72,577 |  |  |  | 30,4 | 19-33,330 |  |  |  | 34,8 | --37,591 |

"Variance estimates are unavailable for Oregon statistics.

Table 16. WA dockside sampling statistics during the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  |  |  | Landed |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AREA | Anglers <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Chinook <br> Campled | Landed <br> Sample <br> Rate | Coho <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Chinook <br> CWTs <br> Collected | Coho <br> CWTs <br> Collected |
| Area 4 | 4,188 | $41 \%$ | 1,325 | $42 \%$ | 1,406 | $38 \%$ | 159 | 114 |
| Area 3 | 2,157 | $63 \%$ | 692 | $61 \%$ | 746 | $63 \%$ | 48 | 53 |
| Area 2 | 9,503 | $31 \%$ | 6,269 | $28 \%$ | 4,309 | $34 \%$ | 867 | 407 |
| Area 1 | 10,191 | $38 \%$ | 2,039 | $38 \%$ | 8,099 | $43 \%$ | 386 | 882 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{2 6 , 0 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 3 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 5 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 5 6}$ |

Table 17. On-board Chinook encounters by size class and mark status in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

| Area Month | On-board observation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Observer Trips | LEGAL-SIZED <br> Marked Unmarked Unknown |  |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED |  |  | Total VTRs Collected | LEGAL-SIZED |  |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmark | Unknown |
| Area 4 July | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 36 | 19 | 23 | 3 | 19 | 38 | 13 |
| August | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| September | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| TOTAL | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 50 | 26 | 33 | 3 | 21 | 46 | 13 |
| Area 3 July | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| August | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| September | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Area 2 July | 14 | 97 | 53 | 11 | 26 | 10 | 8 | 40 | 81 | 38 | 3 | 73 | 26 | 4 |
| August | 10 | 47 | 64 | 6 | 57 | 23 | 17 | 22 | 34 | 21 | 5 | 29 | 11 | 1 |
| September | 3 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 27 | 150 | 128 | 0 | 94 | 35 | 0 | 63 | 117 | 61 | 0 | 102 | 38 | 0 |
| Area 1 July | 10 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 15 | 22 | 4 | 24 | 21 | 9 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 1 |
| August | 10 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 50 | 29 | 29 | 4 | 21 | 15 | 36 |
| September | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 21 | 23 | 15 | 5 | 44 | 32 | 7 | 76 | 50 | 38 | 5 | 37 | 30 | 37 |

Table 18. On-board coho encounters by size class and mark status in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) between Cape Falcon,
Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

| Area | Month | On-board observation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Observer Trips | LEGAL-SIZED <br> Marked Unmarked Unknown |  |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED <br> Marked Unmarked Unknown |  |  | Total VTRs Collected | LEGAL-SIZED |  |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED <br> Marked Unmarked Unknown |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |  |  |  |  |
| Area 4 | July | 3 | 18 | 34 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 39 | 65 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 |
|  | August | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 17 | 42 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
|  | September | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 3 | 18 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 56 | 109 | 6 | 3 | 11 | 4 |
| Area 3 | July | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | August | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
|  | September | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 14 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Area 2 | July | 14 | 69 | 80 | 8 |  | 2 | 1 | 40 | 16 | 35 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | August | 10 | 54 | 43 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 22 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
|  | September | 3 | 60 | 55 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 27 | 183 | 178 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 63 | 36 | 50 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| Area 1 | July | 10 | 114 | 114 | 6 | 3 |  |  | 24 | 68 | 54 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | August | 10 | 122 | 122 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 50 | 137 | 169 | 46 | 9 | 9 | 3 |
|  | September | 1 | 6 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 21 | 242 | 241 | 12 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 76 | 207 | 224 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 3 |

Table 19. 2010 estimated Chinook and coho mark rates during the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) by size class using onboard observer and VTR encounters.

| Area | Month | LEGAL SIZED CHINOOK |  |  | SUBLEGAL SIZED CHINOOK |  |  | LEGAL SIZED COHO |  |  | FRAM Projected Coho Mark Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Observer | VTR | Combined | Observer | VTR | Combined | Observer | VTR | Combined |  |
| Area 4 | July | 63\% | 45\% | 48\% | 67\% | 33\% | 38\% | 35\% | 38\% | 37\% | 51\% |
|  | August | - | 41\% | 41\% | - | 20\% | N/A | - | 29\% | 29\% | 50\% |
|  | September | - | N/A | N/A | - | N/A | N/A | - | N/A | N/A | 54\% |
|  | TOTAL | 63\% | 44\% | 46\% | 67\% | 31\% | 36\% | 35\% | 34\% | 34\% | 51\% |
| Area 3 | July | - | 100\% | 100\% | - | N/A | N/A | - | 63\% | 63\% | 54\% |
|  | August | - | 100\% | 100\% | - | N/A | N/A | - | 37\% | 37\% | 57\% |
|  | September | - | 67\% | 67\% | - | N/A | N/A | - | 40\% | 40\% | 41\% |
|  | TOTAL | - | 89\% | 89\% | - | N/A | N/A | - | 44\% | 44\% | 54\% |
| Area 2 | July | 65\% | 68\% | 66\% | 72\% | 74\% | 73\% | 46\% | $31 \%$ | 43\% | 62\% |
|  | August | 42\% | 62\% | 49\% | 71\% | 73\% | 72\% | 56\% | 64\% | 57\% | 60\% |
|  | September | 35\% | 50\% | 38\% | 85\% | 0\% | 79\% | 52\% | 40\% | 51\% | 52\% |
|  | TOTAL | 54\% | 66\% | 59\% | 73\% | 73\% | 73\% | 51\% | 42\% | 49\% | 59\% |
| Area 1 | July | 68\% | 70\% | 69\% | 41\% | 50\% | 45\% | 50\% | 56\% | 52\% | 70\% |
|  | August | 53\% | 50\% | 51\% | 75\% | 58\% | 67\% | 50\% | 45\% | 47\% | 66\% |
|  | September | N/A | N/A | N/A | 67\% | 100\% | 75\% | 55\% | 67\% | 57\% | 64\% |
|  | TOTAL | 61\% | 57\% | 58\% | 58\% | 55\% | 57\% | 50\% | 48\% | 49\% | 67\% |

Table 20. Preseason FRAM (model run 1016) projected coho mortality in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective).

| Area | Month | Total Retention | Marked Retention | Marked Release Mortality | Unmarked Retention | Unmarked Release Mortality | Total Handled a/ | Predicted Mark Rate | Drop Off Mortality b/ | Release Mortality c/ | Incidental Mortality d/ | Total Mortality e/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | July | 3,137 | 3,075 | 27 | 62 | 428 | 6,392 | 51\% | 320 | 455 | 775 | 3,912 |
|  | August | 3,447 | 3,375 | 30 | 72 | 497 | 7,214 | 50\% | 361 | 527 | 888 | 4,335 |
|  | Sept. | 406 | 399 | 4 | 7 | 50 | 785 | 54\% | 39 | 54 | 93 | 499 |
|  | Total | 6,990 | 6,849 | 61 | 141 | 975 | 14,391 | 51\% | 720 | 1,036 | 1,756 | 8,746 |
| Area 3 | July | 546 | 536 | 5 | 10 | 67 | 1,061 | 54\% | 53 | 72 | 125 | 671 |
|  | August | 1,089 | 1,072 | 10 | 17 | 120 | 2,014 | 57\% | 101 | 130 | 231 | 1,320 |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 114 | 111 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 285 | 41\% | 14 | 24 | 38 | 152 |
|  | Total | 1,749 | 1,719 | 16 | 30 | 210 | 3,360 | 54\% | 168 | 226 | 394 | 2,143 |
| Area 2 | July | 6,672 | 6,587 | 59 | 85 | 582 | 11,251 | 62\% | 563 | 641 | 1,204 | 7,876 |
|  | August | 13,029 | 12,843 | 115 | 186 | 1274 | 22,947 | 60\% | 1,147 | 1,389 | 2,536 | 15,565 |
|  | Sept. | 5,158 | 5060 | 45 | 98 | 670 | 10,263 | 52\% | 513 | 715 | 1,228 | 6,386 |
|  | Total | 24,859 | 24,490 | 219 | 369 | 2,526 | 44,461 | 59\% | 2,223 | 2,745 | 4,968 | 29,827 |
| Area 1 | July | 7,934 | 7,862 | 70 | 72 | 494 | 11,964 | 70\% | 598 | 564 | 1,162 | 9,096 |
|  | August | 22,202 | 21,959 | 196 | 243 | 1,669 | 35,527 | 66\% | 1,776 | 1,865 | 3,641 | 25,843 |
|  | Sept. | 3,464 | 3,423 | 31 | 41 | 280 | 5,683 | 64\% | 284 | 311 | 595 | 4,059 |
|  | Total | 33,600 | 33,244 | 297 | 356 | 2,443 | 53,174 | 67\% | 2,659 | 2,740 | 5,399 | 38,999 |

[^4]Table 21. Estimated actual coho mortality in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective).

| Area | Month | Total Retention | Marked Retention | Marked <br> Released Mortality a/ | Unmarked Retention | Unmarked Released Mortality b/ | Total Handled c/ | Observed Mark Rate d/ | Drop Off Mortality e/ | Release Mortality f/ | Incidental Mortality g/ | Total Mortality h/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | July | 1,926 | 1,903 | 16 | 23 | 468 | 5,385 | 37\% | 269 | 484 | 754 | 2,679 |
|  | August | 1,609 | 1,545 | 13 | 64 | 557 | 5,678 | 29\% | 284 | 570 | 853 | 2,463 |
|  | Sept. | 150 | 141 | 1 | 9 | 79 | 724 | 21\% | 36 | 80 | 116 | 267 |
|  | Total | 3,685 | 3,589 | 30 | 96 | 1,104 | 11,786 | 34\% | 589 | 1,134 | 1,723 | 5,409 |
| Area 3 | July | 211 | 207 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 350 | 63\% | 18 | 19 | 37 | 248 |
|  | August | 709 | 703 | 6 | 6 | 170 | 1,966 | 37\% | 98 | 176 | 274 | 983 |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 259 | 258 | 2 | 1 | 54 | 664 | 40\% | 33 | 57 | 90 | 349 |
|  | Total | 1,180 | 1,168 | 10 | 12 | 242 | 2,981 | 44\% | 149 | 252 | 401 | 1,581 |
| Area 2 | July | 3,680 | 3,676 | 31 | 4 | 697 | 8,880 | 43\% | 444 | 728 | 1,172 | 4,852 |
|  | August | 3,957 | 3,942 | 33 | 15 | 412 | 7,133 | 57\% | 357 | 445 | 801 | 4,758 |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 4,925 | 4,892 | 41 | 33 | 657 | 9,912 | 51\% | 496 | 698 | 1,194 | 6,118 |
|  | Total | 12,562 | 12,510 | 105 | 52 | 1,766 | 25,925 | 49\% | 1,296 | 1,871 | 3,167 | 15,729 |
| Area 1 | July | 7,921 | 7,914 | 66 | 7 | 1,024 | 15,708 | 52\% | 785 | 1,090 | 1,875 | 9,796 |
|  | August | 16,129 | 16,079 | 135 | 50 | 2,537 | 35,214 | 47\% | 1,761 | 2,672 | 4,433 | 20,561 |
|  | Sept. | 863 | 848 | 7 | 15 | 91 | 1,561 | 57\% | 78 | 98 | 176 | 1,039 |
|  | Total | 24,912 | 24,841 | 209 | 72 | 3,651 | 52,483 | 49\% | 2,624 | 3,860 | 6,484 | 31,396 |

a/ $6 \%$ of marked retention multiplied by 0.14 hooking mortality
b/ Total retention divided by observed mark rate less total retention multiplied by 0.14 hooking mortality
c/ Total retention + (Total released mortality divided by 0.14 mooking mortality).
d/ Observed mark rates assumed from dockside sampling data where observer data and VTR data are unavailable (Area 4 September).
e/ $5 \%$ of total handled.
$\mathrm{f} /$ Unmarked released mortality + marked released mortality.
g/ Drop off + release mortality.
h/ Total retention + incidental mortality.

Table 22. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1016) and estimated total coho encountersa/ in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective).

| Area | Projected | Observed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | 14,390 | 11,786 |
| Area 3 | 3,363 | 2,981 |
| Area 2 | 44,466 | 25,925 |
| Area 1 | 53,171 | 52,483 |
| Coastwide Total | $\mathbf{1 1 5 , 3 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 , 1 7 4}$ |

${ }^{a}$ Total retention + (Total released mortality divided by 0.14 hooking mortality).

Table 23. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1016) and estimated total coho mortalities in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective).

|  | Projected | Observed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | 8,746 | 5,409 |
| Area 3 | 2,143 | 1,581 |
| Area 2 | 29,827 | 15,729 |
| Area 1 | 38,999 | 31,396 |
| Coastwide Total | $\mathbf{7 9 , 7 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 , 1 1 5}$ |



Figure 4. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1016) and estimated total coho encounters and mortality in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective).

Table 24. Compliance with coho selective fishery regulations observed during dockside sampling interviews in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

| Area | Month | Total Coho Sampled | Marked Coho Sampled | Unmarked Coho Sampled | \% Sampled Coho Marked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | July | 689 | 679 | 10 | 98.5\% |
|  | August | 661 | 640 | 21 | 96.8\% |
|  | September | 48 | 45 | 3 | 93.8\% |
|  | Total | 1,398 | 1,364 | 34 | 97.6\% |
| Area 3 | July | 124 | 123 | 1 | 99.2\% |
|  | August | 491 | 487 | 4 | 99.2\% |
|  | September | 148 | 147 | 1 | 99.3\% |
|  | Total | 763 | 757 | 6 | 99.2\% |
| Area 2 | July | 1,125 | 1,110 | 15 | 98.7\% |
|  | August | 1,310 | 1,305 | 5 | 99.6\% |
|  | September | 1,918 | 1,909 | 9 | 99.5\% |
|  | Total | 4,353 | 4,324 | 29 | 99.3\% |
| Area 1 | July | 3,335 | 3,332 | 3 | 99.9\% |
|  | August | 4,523 | 4,509 | 14 | 99.7\% |
|  | September | 238 | 234 | 4 | 98.3\% |
|  | Total | 8,096 | 8,075 | 21 | 99.7\% |

Table 25. Estimated drop off mortality rate in the 2010 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) using on-water observation data and voluntary trip reports.

| Area | Month | On-Board Observation |  |  |  |  | VTRs |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Salmon Handled | Observed <br> Drop Offs | Estimated Observed Drop Off Mortality a/ | FRAM Total Drop Off Mortality b/ | Observed <br> Drop Off <br> Mortality Rate c/ | Total Salmon Handled | Observed <br> Drop Offs | Estimated Observed Drop Off Mortality a/ | FRAM Total Drop Off Mortality b/ | Observed <br> Drop Off <br> Mortality <br> Rate c/ |
| Area 4 | July | 72 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0.2\% | 241 | 20 | 3 | 12 | 1.2\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | 96 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1.0\% |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.7\% |
|  | Total | 72 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0.2\% | 340 | 28 | 4 | 17 | 1.2\% |
| Area 3 | July | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5.1\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | 31 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2.3\% |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  | Total | - | - | - | - | - | 50 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 2.5\% |
| Area 2 | July | 368 | 37 | 5 | 18 | 1.4\% | 283 | 55 | 8 | 14 | 2.7\% |
|  | August | 313 | 29 | 4 | 16 | 1.3\% | 147 | 27 | 4 | 7 | 2.6\% |
|  | Sept | 157 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 1.4\% | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% |
|  | Total | 838 | 82 | 11 | 42 | 1.4\% | 445 | 82 | 11 | 22 | 2.6\% |
| Area 1 | July | 301 | 198 | 28 | 15 | 9.2\% | 197 | 28 | 4 | 10 | 2.0\% |
|  | August | 328 | 133 | 19 | 16 | 5.7\% | 567 | 161 | 23 | 28 | 4.0\% |
|  | Sept | 14 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.0\% | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.5\% |
|  | Total | 643 | 334 | 47 | 32 | 7.3\% | 768 | 190 | 27 | 38 | 3.5\% |

[^5]Table 26. Number of Chinook DNA samples collected by onboard and dockside samplers from the ocean recreational all-species fishery, by size class, mark status, and sample type.

| Area | Month | On-Board Sampling |  |  |  |  |  | Dockside Sampling |  |  | Total Number of DNA Samples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Legal Sized |  |  | Sublegal Sized |  |  | Legal-Sized |  |  |  |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |  |
| Area 4 | July | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 66 | 106 | 35 | 220 |
|  | August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 51 | 3 | 104 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
|  | Total | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 121 | 160 | 39 | 333 |
| Area 3 | July | - | - | - | - | - | - | 21 | 21 | 0 | 42 |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 | 43 | 0 | 93 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 20 | 0 | 27 |
|  | Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | 78 | 84 | 0 | 162 |
| Area 2 | July | 101 | 59 | 0 | 29 | 14 | 0 | 236 | 106 | 0 | 545 |
|  | August | 31 | 54 | 0 | 46 | 17 | 0 | 63 | 49 | 0 | 260 |
|  | September | 4 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 49 |
|  | Total | 136 | 123 | 0 | 87 | 33 | 0 | 308 | 167 | 0 | 854 |
| Area 1 | July | 9 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 1 | 127 | 80 | 8 | 259 |
|  | August | 10 | 8 | 0 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 120 | 119 | 1 | 291 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 21 |
|  | Total | 19 | 14 | 0 | 39 | 25 | 1 | 253 | 211 | 9 | 571 |

## 6. RESULTS IN THE ALL-SPECIES COHO MARK SELECTIVE NON-TREATY COMMERCIAL TROLL FISHERY

The non-Treaty commercial troll fishery harvested a total of 17,997 Chinook (14,108 WA, 3,889 OR) and 3,142 coho ( $2,104 \mathrm{WA}, 1,038 \mathrm{OR}$ ) during the coastwide all-species coho MSF operating July 1 through September 7, 2010. Landed Chinook catch totaled $98 \%$ of the overall adjusted fishery quota of $18,350^{4}$; landed coho catch totaled $52 \%$ of the adjusted fishery quota of $6,100^{5}$. Table 27 shows catch by month and area.

WDFW dockside samplers sampled a total of $44 \%$ of all Chinook and $44 \%$ of all coho harvested in WA. Coded wire tag collections totaled 637 from Chinook and 88 from coho in WA ports (Table 28).

Table 29 details numbers of Chinook DNA samples collected in WA by month and area. A total of 2,295 DNA samples were collected from Chinook by dockside samplers throughout the May September non-Treaty troll fishery (1,313 in May-June, 982 in July-September).

Table 27. Total Chinook and coho retained during the 2010 all-species non-Treaty commercial troll fishery (coho mark-selective) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | Chinook |  |  |  | Coho |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AREA | July | August | September TOTAL | July | August | September | TOTAL |  |
| Area 4 | 368 | 332 | 0 | 700 | 69 | 18 | 0 | 87 |
| Area 3 | 984 | 1,147 | 23 | 2,154 | 121 | 87 | 1 | 209 |
| Area 2 | 4,761 | 5,788 | 259 | 10,808 | 895 | 639 | 123 | 1,657 |
| Area 1 | 168 | 237 | 41 | 446 | 99 | 38 | 14 | 151 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{6 , 2 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 5 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 , 1 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 4}$ |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 2,121 | 1,657 | 111 | 3,889 | 636 | 367 | 35 | 1,038 |
| TOTAL NOF | $\mathbf{8 , 4 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 1 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 1 4 2}$ |

Table 28. Chinook and coho sampled in WA during the 2010 all-species non-Treaty commercial troll fishery (coho mark-selective) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

| AREA | Chinook |  |  | Coho <br> Total <br> Sampled |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sample <br> Rate | CWTs <br> Collected | Total <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | CWTs <br> Collected |  |
| Area 4 | 507 | $72 \%$ | 43 | 70 | $80 \%$ | 8 |
| Area 3 | 1,237 | $57 \%$ | 90 | 160 | $77 \%$ | 7 |
| Area 2 | 4,249 | $39 \%$ | 460 | 596 | $36 \%$ | 59 |
| Area 1 | 281 | $63 \%$ | 44 | 90 | $60 \%$ | 14 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{6 , 2 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 8}$ |

[^6]Table 29. Number of chinook DNA samples collected from the non-treaty troll fishery by size class, mark status.

| Area | Month | Dockside Sampling |  |  | Total Number of DNA Samples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Legal-Sized  <br> Marked Unmarked Unknown  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 4 | May | 94 | 164 | 0 | 258 |
|  | June | 28 | 62 | 0 | 90 |
|  | July | 34 | 86 | 0 | 120 |
|  | August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 156 | 312 | 0 | 468 |
| Area 3 | May | 68 | 113 | 0 | 181 |
|  | June | 112 | 149 | 0 | 261 |
|  | July | 22 | 93 | 0 | 115 |
|  | August | 50 | 190 | 0 | 240 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | Total | 252 | 545 | 0 | 797 |
| Area 2 | May | 183 | 59 | 1 | 243 |
|  | June | 162 | 64 | 0 | 226 |
|  | July | 71 | 35 | 1 | 107 |
|  | August | 98 | 63 | 0 | 161 |
|  | September | 11 | 5 | 0 | 16 |
|  | Total | 525 | 226 | 2 | 753 |
| Area 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | May | 20 | 14 | 0 | 34 |
|  | June | 6 | 14 | 0 | 20 |
|  | July | 34 | 40 | 0 | 74 |
|  | August | 83 | 66 | 0 | 149 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 143 | 134 | 0 | 277 |
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## APPENDICES

Appendix A. Mark-selective fishery impact estimation details for the pilot recreational selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

Below are definitions and equations for all quantities used in estimating mark-selective fishery impacts from the combination of dockside creel survey information, on-water observer data, and/or voluntary trip report (VTR) results as applicable. The estimation sequence builds from monthly ${ }^{6}$ estimators of encounters-by-class (i.e., the four size [legal, sublegal] $\times$ mark-status [marked, unmarked] groups) to season-wide impact estimates.

## A. Total and Class-specific Encounters Estimation

The first step towards quantifying mark-selective fishery impacts by size/mark-status class is to estimate total Chinook encounters ( $\hat{E}_{i}$, includes retained + released Chinook; See Monthly Encounters below) for each month of the fishery. Secondarily, encounters are apportioned to the appropriate size/mark-status group using encounters-composition data collected from onboard sampling on charter boats (See Estimating Chinook Encounter Composition on following page).

## Monthly Encounters

$\hat{E}_{i}=$ Total Chinook encounters for month $i$, which is estimated by combining creel estimates of legalmarked Chinook harvest ( $\hat{K}_{L M i}$, defined on subsequent page) with an estimate of the proportion of the fishable Chinook population that is of legal size and marked ( $\hat{p}_{L M i}$, defined on subsequent page). Given the potential for negative bias in $\hat{E}_{i}$ if anglers release any of the legal-marked Chinook that they encounter, the $\hat{E}_{i}$ estimator also includes a "correction" to account for this phenomenon (i.e., $1-p_{\mathrm{LM}-\mathrm{R}}$, where $p_{\mathrm{LM}-\mathrm{R}}$ is the estimated legal-marked Chinook release rate) ${ }^{7} . \hat{E}_{i}$ and its variance are estimated as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{E}_{i}=\frac{\hat{K}_{L M}}{\left[\hat{p}_{L M}\left(1-p_{L M-R}\right)\right]}  \tag{1}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{E}_{i}\right)=\frac{1}{\left[\left(1-p_{L M-R}\right)^{2}\right]} *\left[\frac{\hat{K}_{L M i}{ }^{2}}{\hat{p}_{L M i}{ }^{2}} *\left(\frac{\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{K}_{L M i}\right)}{\hat{K}_{L M i}{ }^{2}}+\frac{\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{p}_{L M i}\right)}{\hat{p}_{L M i}{ }^{2}}\right)\right] \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

[^7]$\hat{p}_{L M i}=$ the onboard observer (charter ride-along)-based estimate of the proportion of Chinook encounters that are legal-sized $(L)$ and marked $(M)$ during month $i$
$\hat{p}_{L U i}=$ the estimated proportion of encounters that are legal-sized $(L)$ and unmarked $(U)$
$\hat{p}_{S M_{i}}=$ the estimated proportion of encounters that are sublegal-sized $(S)$ and unmarked $(M)$
$\hat{p}_{L U i}=$ the estimated proportion of encounters that are sublegal-sized $(S)$ and unmarked $(U)$
For each $X Y$ combination (where $X=L$ or $S$ and $Y=M$ or $U$ ), $\hat{p}_{X Y i}$ and its variance is estimated as:
\[

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{p}_{X Y i}=n_{X Y i} / n_{i}, \text { and }  \tag{3}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{p}_{X Y i}\right)=\left[\hat{p}_{X Y i}\left(1-\hat{p}_{X Y i}\right)\right] /\left(n_{i}-1\right),
\end{align*}
$$
\]

Where, $n_{i}=$ the total number of fish encountered by the onboard observers during month $i$.

## Encounters by Size/Mark-status Class

$\hat{E}_{L M i}=$ estimated legal $(L)$, marked ( $M$ ) encounters during month $i$
$\hat{E}_{L U i}=$ estimated legal $(L)$, unmarked $(U)$ encounters during month $i$
$\hat{E}_{S M i}=$ estimated sublegal (S), marked (M) encounters during month $i$
$\hat{E}_{S U_{i}}=$ estimated sublegal $(S)$, marked $(U)$ encounters during month $i$
For each $X Y$ combination (where $X=L$ or $S$ and $Y=M$ or $U$ ) $\hat{E}_{X Y i}$ and an estimate of its variance are obtained from:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{E}_{X Y_{i}}=\hat{E}_{i} * \hat{p}_{X Y_{i}}  \tag{5}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{E}_{X Y_{i}}\right)=\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{E}_{i}\right) * \hat{p}_{X Y}{ }^{2}+\hat{E}_{i}{ }^{2} * \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{p}_{X Y_{i}}\right)-\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{E}_{i}\right) * \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{p}_{X Y_{i}}\right) \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

## B. Estimating Retained and Released Numbers by Size/Mark-status Class

Before total mortality can be estimated for each class (LM, SM, LU, SU), class-specific encounters must be separated into retention and release categories. First, given that harvest is estimated only to markstatus class for creel survey purposes, estimates of marked and unmarked Chinook retention must be assigned to size classes (See Apportioned Estimates of Retention to Size Classes on subsequent page); this is done using mark-status-specific size composition data from dockside sampling (See Dockside Observations for Apportioning Retained Catch to Class on subsequent page). Subsequently, size/markstatus group-specific releases are estimated as the difference between class-specific encounters and retention (See Estimating Release Numbers by Class on subsequent page).

## Dockside Observations for Apportioning Retained Catch to Class

$\hat{d}_{L M K}=$ the estimated proportion of retained (kept, $K$ ), marked ( $M$ ) Chinook salmon that were legal ( $L$ ); based on season-wide ${ }^{8}$ dockside observations of marked Chinook (as is $\hat{d}_{S M K}$ )
$\hat{d}_{S M K}=$ the estimated proportion of retained (kept, $K$ ), marked $(M)$ Chinook that were sublegal $(S)$
The proportion of retained, marked fish in size class $X(X=L$ or $S)$ and its variance are estimated as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{d}_{X M K}=n_{X M K} / n_{M K}  \tag{7}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{d}_{X M K}\right)=\left[\hat{d}_{X M K} *\left(1-\hat{d}_{X M K}\right)\right] /\left(n_{M K}-1\right), \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

where $n_{\mathrm{MK}}$ and $n_{\mathrm{XMK}}$ are season-wide total dockside counts of marked fish and the subset of marked fish in size-class $X$, respectively.
$\hat{d}_{L U K}=$ the estimated proportion of retained (kept, $K$ ), unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook salmon that are legal $(L)$; estimated from season-wide dockside observations of unmarked Chinook (as is $\hat{d}_{\text {SUK }}$ )
$\hat{d}_{S U K}=$ the estimated proportion of retained (kept, $K$ ), unmarked $(U)$ Chinook that are sublegal $(S)$
The proportions of retained, unmarked fish belonging to legal and sublegal size classes and their respective variances are estimated as above (Eqns. 7 and 8) but using season-wide dockside observations on unmarked ( $U$ ), not marked Chinook salmon.

## Apportioned Estimates of Retention to Size Classes

$\hat{K}_{L M i}=$ the estimated number of legal $(L)$, marked (M) Chinook kept in month $i$
$\hat{K}_{L U_{i}}=$ the estimated number of legal $(L)$, unmarked $(U)$ Chinook kept in month $i$
The number of kept, marked encounters, marked fish in size class $X(L$ or $S)$ and its variance is estimated as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{K}_{X M i}=\hat{d}_{X M K} * \hat{N}_{M K i}  \tag{9}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{K}_{X M i}\right)=\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{N}_{M K i}\right) * \hat{d}_{X M K}{ }^{2}+\hat{N}_{M K i}{ }^{2} * \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{d}_{X M K}\right)-\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{N}_{M K i}\right) * \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{d}_{X M K}\right) \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\hat{d}_{X M K}$ and its variance are from 6 and 7 above and $\hat{N}_{M K i}$ is the survey estimate of retained marked fish for month $i$ defined in Eqn. 1.
$\hat{K}_{S M i}=$ estimated number of sublegal $(S)$, marked (M) Chinook kept in month $i$
$\hat{K}_{S U_{i}}=$ estimated number of sublegal $(S)$, unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook kept in month $i$
The number of retained, unmarked fish belonging to legal and sublegal size classes is estimated according to Eqns. 9 and 10 above but using unmarked fish proportions and monthly retention estimates.

[^8]
## Estimating Release Numbers by Class

$\hat{R}_{L M i}=$ the estimated number of legal ( $L$ ), marked ( $M$ ) Chinook released in month $i$
$\hat{R}_{L U_{i}}=$ the estimated number of legal $(L)$, unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook released in month $i$
$\hat{R}_{S M_{i}}=$ the estimated number of sublegal $(S)$, marked $(M)$ Chinook released in month $i$
$\hat{R}_{S U_{i}}=$ the estimated number of sublegal ( $S$ ), unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook released in month $i$
For each size/mark-status class (i.e., $X Y$ combination $[X=L$ or $S$ and $Y=M$ or $U]$ ), the number of fish encountered and released is estimated as the difference between total size/mark-status class encounters ( $\hat{E}_{X Y i}$ ) and retention ( $\hat{K}_{X Y i}$ ) during month $i$. The estimator and its variance are:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{R}_{X Y_{i}}=\hat{E}_{X Y i}-\hat{K}_{X Y i}  \tag{11}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{R}_{X Y_{i}}\right)=\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{E}_{X Y_{i}}\right)+\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{K}_{X Y i}\right) \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

## C. Estimating Total (and Class-specific) Monthly and Season-wide Mortality

The application of assumed mortality rates (See Assumed Mortality Rates for Retained and Released Chinook below) to class-specific estimates of total retention and releases constitutes the final step in quantifying mark-selective fishery impacts.

## Assumed Mortality Rates for Retained and Released Chinook

$m_{K}=$ retention mortality rate, $100 \%$ for all retained Chinook (reincarnation is rare among fishes)
$s f m_{L}=$ release mortality rate for legal ( $L$ ) Chinook, assumed to be a constant of $14 \%$ in ocean fisheries $s f m_{S}=$ release mortality rate for sublegal $(S)$ Chinook, assumed to be a constant of $14 \%$ in ocean fisheries

## Retention-mortality Estimates

$\hat{M}_{L M K i}=$ estimated mortality due to legal $(L)$, marked (M) Chinook harvest in month $i\left(=\hat{K}_{L M i}\right)$.
$\hat{M}_{L U K i}=$ estimated mortality due to harvest of legal (L), unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook in month $i\left(=\hat{K}_{L U U_{i}}\right)$.
$\hat{M}_{S M K_{i}}=$ estimated mortality due to harvest of sublegal (S), marked ( $M$ ) Chinook in month $i\left(=\hat{K}_{S M_{i}}\right)$.
$\hat{M}_{S U K i}=$ estimated mortality due to harvest of sublegal (S), marked ( $M$ ) Chinook in month $i\left(=\hat{K}_{S U_{i}}\right)$.

## Release-mortality Estimates

$\hat{M}_{L M R i}=$ estimated post-release mortality for legal ( $L$ ), marked ( $M$ ) Chinook in month $i$
$\hat{M}_{L U R_{i}}=$ estimated post-release mortality for legal $(L)$, unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook in month $i$
$\hat{M}_{S M R_{i}}=$ estimated post-release mortality for sublegal ( $S$ ), marked ( $M$ ) Chinook in month $i$
$\hat{M}_{S U R i}=$ estimated post-release mortality for sublegal (S), unmarked ( $U$ ) Chinook in month $i$

All class-specific ( $X Y$ [ $X=L$ or $S, Y=M$ or $U]$ ) release mortality estimates are obtained from:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{M}_{X Y R i}=\hat{R}_{X Y i} * s f m_{Y}  \tag{13}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{M}_{X Y R i}\right)=\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{R}_{X Y i}\right) * s m_{Y}^{2} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

## Season-wide Total and Class-specific Mortality Estimation

$\hat{M}_{\text {total }}=$ total season-wide Chinook salmon mortality; this parameter and its variance $\left[\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{M}_{\text {total }}\right)\right]$ are computed as the sum of all monthly retention and release mortality estimates [i.e.,
$\left.\hat{M}_{\text {total }}=\sum_{i=1}^{\max i}\left(\hat{M}_{X Y K i}+\hat{M}_{X Y R i}\right)\right]$ and variances
$\left[\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{M}_{\text {total }}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{\max i}\left[\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{M}_{X Y K i}\right)+\operatorname{var}\left(\hat{M}_{X Y R i}\right)\right]\right]$, respectively, for all four size/mark-status groups ( $X=L$ or $S, Y=M$ or $U$ ). Season total estimates for subgroups of interest (e.g., unmarked, sublegal Chinook, $\hat{M}_{S U-\text { total }}$ ) are obtained by summing monthly estimates (and variances) across the season for just that group.

## D. Characterizing Precision of Estimates

The precision of estimates generated from creel surveys and the preceding fishery impact estimation scheme is characterized using estimates of a parameter's standard error (SE), coefficient of variation (CV or relative standard error), and approximate $95 \%$ confidence interval. For any parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}$ (e.g., $\hat{M}_{\text {total }}, \hat{K}_{L M i}, \hat{E}_{i}$, etc.), these metrics are estimated using:
(15) $S E(\hat{\theta})=\sqrt{\operatorname{var}(\hat{\theta})}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& C V(\hat{\theta})=[S E(\hat{\theta}) / \hat{\theta}] * 100  \tag{16}\\
& C I=\hat{\theta} \pm 1.96 * S E(\hat{\theta}) \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

Figure A1. (On following page) Graphical representation of the approach used to estimate monthly encounters and mortalities by size/mark-status category in mark-selective Chinook fisheries. Boxes depict abundance estimates (encounters, mortalities) whereas the mathematical operations depicted on intermediate connector lines are estimator formulae yielding quantities found in subsequent boxes (moving from left to right). Parameter definitions, complete formulae, and variances are defined in the preceding pages. For short-duration fisheries ( $\sim 1$ month or less), monthly and season-total values are equivalent; for all others, season-total impacts are equivalent to the sum of monthly impact estimates (and variances).


Appendix B. Coded-wire tag recovery data collected during dockside sampling activities in the June 12-30, 2010 recreational markselective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Marine Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4.

| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | 18-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 74 | 69551 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 20-Jun-10 | 54276 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 54274,54275,54277 | 69 | 69552 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 24-Jun-10 | 94615 | 2006 | MCKENZIE R 1 | MCKENZIE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 66 | 69553 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 27-Jun-10 | 633378 | 2006 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 75 | 69554 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 26-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 75 | 82229 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 12-Jun-10 | 94602 | 2006 | MOLALLA R | WILLAMETTE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 85 | 94851 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 12-Jun-10 | 94609 | 2006 | SANTIAM R \& N FK-1 | MARION FORKS HATCH | ODFW |  | 76 | 94852 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 18-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  |  | 94853 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 18-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 64 | 94854 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 18-Jun-10 | 612511 | 2006 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 82 | 94855 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 27-Jun-10 | 634183 | 2006 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 79 | 95101 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 21-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 76 | 95125 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 19-Jun-10 | 68607 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | MOKELUMNE R FISH INS | CDFG |  | 73 | 95302 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 19-Jun-10 | 633799 | 2006 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | WDFW |  | 80 | 95303 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 23-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 69 | 95304 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 27-Jun-10 | 634183 | 2006 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 84 | 95305 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 1 | 23-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 79 | 95320 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 54274 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 54276,54275,54277 | 77 | 53287 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 72 | 69698 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 69 | 96100 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 94332 | 2005 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 78 | 53296 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 84 | 94501 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 103680 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 66 | 96103 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 210790 | 2007 | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | Suquamish Tribe | 634276 | 78 | 96104 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 612511 | 2006 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 66 | 69699 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 612716 | 2007 | NPT HATCHERY | NPT HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 54 | 53290 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 633592 | 2005 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 78 | 53295 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag <br> Code | Brood <br> Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 633594 | 2005 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 82 | 96101 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 633871 | 2007 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | WDFW |  | 72 | 96102 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634183 | 2006 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 71 | 53291 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 67 | 53286 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 70 | 53292 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 78 | 94087 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634280 | 2007 | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | WDFW |  | 70 | 53293 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 70 | 53294 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 12-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 94502 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 52978 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 53782,53783,53768 | 62 | 53300 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 53767 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 50685,53766,50686 | 77 | 53298 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 53874 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | $53779,53875,53776,53777,53778,53780,53781$ | 79 | 53301 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 94611 | 2006 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 78 | 53299 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 70 | 94505 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 634183 | 2006 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 66 | 94504 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 13-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 77 | 53297 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 68610 | 2007 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 75 | 94506 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 73 | 96108 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 78 | 96106 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 81 | 96107 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 186242 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186241,186240,186243 |  | 96304 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 633799 | 2006 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | WDFW |  | 63 | 96301 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 633872 | 2007 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | WDFW |  | 63 | 96105 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 76 | 94508 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 65 | 96110 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 634370 | 2007 | ELOCHOMAN R 25.0236 | ELOCHOMAN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 79 | 96109 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 67 | 94507 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 17-Jun-10 | 634680 | 2007 | SNAKE R @ ASOTIN | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 60 | 96303 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 53767 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 50685,53766,50686 | 75 | 87416 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 54274 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 54276,54275,54277 | 78 | 87414 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 67005 | 2006 | WICKLAND OIL TERMINAL | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 83 | 96493 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 68603 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 78 | 96121 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 68605 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 70 | 96306 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 68611 | 2007 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 72 | 69530 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 68611 | 2007 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 79 | 80347 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 61 | 69532 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 59 | 83292 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94611 | 2006 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 76 | 96118 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94611 | 2006 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 78 | 96305 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94615 | 2006 | MCKENZIE R 1 | MCKENZIE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 70 | 96117 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 75 | 69531 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 74 | 96113 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 63 | 96307 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 94647 | 2007 | TANNER CR (BNVILLE) | BONNEVILLE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 61 | 69548 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 186240 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186242,186241,186243 | 71 | 96114 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 612511 | 2006 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 80 | 96119 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 612517 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 67 | 69700 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 612517 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 66 | 83293 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 612520 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 69 | 87415 | Unmarked |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633385 | 2006 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL | WELLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 64 | 80348 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633593 | 2005 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 77 | 96111 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633895 | 2006 | LK CHELAN + COLUMBIA R |  | WDFW |  | 71 | 87413 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 69 | 69547 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 77 | 80349 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 73 | 96115 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 77 | 96116 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 71 | 96491 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY | WDFW |  | 75 | 96492 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | HATCHERY |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 96494 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 71 | 96112 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 634272 | 2007 | FRIDAY CR 03.0017 | SAMISH HATCHERY | WDFW | 634273 | 68 | 83294 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 634671 | 2007 | SNAKE R-UPPR 35.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 67 | 96308 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 61 | 80350 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 18-Jun-10 | 634680 | 2007 | SNAKE R @ ASOTIN | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 57 | 96120 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 54274 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 54276,54275,54277 | 70 | 53304 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 54873 | 2008 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | USFWS |  | 56 | 96124 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 94321 | 2006 | THREE RIVERS (NESTUC | CEDAR CR HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 79 | 96123 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 78 | 53307 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 76 | 93760 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 612513 | 2006 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 65 | 53311 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 612517 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 63 | 53302 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 612517 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 64 | 93761 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 612519 | 2007 | SNAKE R@PITT. LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 70 | 96125 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 612750 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 53 | 53303 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 633592 | 2005 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 83 | 53310 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 93762 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 77 | 93763 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 73 | 53308 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 67 | 53309 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 57 | 94509 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 19-Jun-10 | 634680 | 2007 | SNAKE R @ ASOTIN | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 60 | 53305 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 54274 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 54276,54275,54277 | 67 | 69533 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 54395 | 2007 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | USFWS |  | 63 | 69537 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 54397 | 2007 | SAC R COLUSA TO RBDD | COLEMAN NFH | USFWS |  | 77 | 96128 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 68608 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  |  | 69534 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 94332 | 2005 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 84 | 83295 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 94611 | 2006 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 64 | 53312 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 94611 | 2006 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 70 | 69538 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 72 | 83297 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 107502 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 66 | 69536 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 186242 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186241,186240,186243 | 68 | 96127 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 210788 | 2007 | CLEAR CR 11.0013C | CLEAR CREEK <br> HATCHERY | Nisqually Tribe <br> (WA) | 634277 |  | 69535 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 633881 | 2006 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 74 | 83296 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 81 | 94510 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 71 | 96126 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 20-Jun-10 | 634680 | 2007 | SNAKE R @ ASOTIN | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 59 | 94511 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 53874 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 53779,53875,53776,53777,53778,53780,53781 | 79 | 69543 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 54391 | 2007 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | USFWS |  | 75 | 83299 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 68601 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | MOKELUMNE R FISH INS | CDFG |  | 70 | 96486 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 68604 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 79 | 96490 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 68605 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 75 | 96489 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 90134 | 2007 | UMATILLA R | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 68 | 94513 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 70 | 85498 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 103680 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 61 | 85497 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 107502 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 75 | 69540 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 107502 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 71 | 96479 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 612518 | 2007 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 69 | 69549 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 612519 | 2007 | SNAKE R@PITT. LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 62 | 69546 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 633799 | 2006 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | WDFW |  | 65 | 85499 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 78 | 69550 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 72 | 94512 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 634183 | 2006 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 67 | 85496 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 66 | 69542 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 56 | 69544 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 61 | 69545 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 22-Jun-10 | 634680 | 2007 | SNAKE R @ ASOTIN | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 61 | 83298 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 68010 | 2007 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDWR |  | 76 | 94040 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 68022 | 2008 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDWR |  | 58 | 96309 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 75 | 96314 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 186242 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186241,186240,186243 | 68 | 94515 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 612513 | 2006 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 63 | 94516 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 634671 | 2007 | SNAKE R-UPPR 35.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 63 | 96310 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 70 | 94041 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 71 | 94514 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 23-Jun-10 | 634693 | 2007 | CHELAN R 47.0052 |  | WDFW |  | 56 | 94039 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 52978 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 53782,53783,53768 | 78 | 94291 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 68612 | 2007 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 71 | 94292 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 94646 | 2007 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 94662 | 83 | 86929 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 186242 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186241,186240,186243 | 73 | 86930 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 612752 | 2007 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 53 | 86931 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 633593 | 2005 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON REARING POND | WDFW |  | 90 | 94295 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 633895 | 2006 | LK CHELAN + COLUMBIA R |  | WDFW |  | 72 | 94293 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 72 | 86927 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 77 | 94294 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 73 | 86928 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 24-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 71 | 94296 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 54394 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY | COLEMAN NFH | USFWS |  | 83 | 94518 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 68610 | 2007 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 73 | 94517 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 90135 | 2007 | UMATILLA R | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 67 | 86934 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 67 | 96130 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 69 | 96316 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 186242 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186241,186240,186243 | 70 | 96312 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 612694 | 2007 | CLWTR @ LAPWAI CRK | NPT HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 71 | 86935 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 74 | 96129 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 74 | 96313 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 77 | 96132 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 634184 | 2006 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 |  | WDFW |  | 72 | 96131 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 65 | 86933 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 26-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 57 | 96317 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 68612 | 2007 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 71 | 70182 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 68618 | 2007 | SMITH RIVER | ROWDY CREEK HATCHERY | Rowdy Creek <br> Hatchery (CA) |  | 64 | 96321 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 90156 | 2006 | ROCK CR (N UMPQUA R) | ROCK CR HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 63 | 94520 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 94343 | 2005 | ELK R | ELK R HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 73 | 86936 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 103680 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 68 | 94522 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 107502 | 2007 | SNAKE@ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 66 | 70185 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 612513 | 2006 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 77 | 70183 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 612517 | 2007 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 65 | 94521 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 612518 | 2007 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 64 | 96318 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 612716 | 2007 | NPT HATCHERY | NPT HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 68 | 70190 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 612752 | 2007 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  |  | 95135 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 633972 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 69 | 96323 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 633974 | 2007 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | WDFW |  | 59 | 96320 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 72 | 70184 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 71 | 70188 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 67 | 96322 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 76 | 96324 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 69 | 70187 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 67 | 94519 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634269 | 2007 | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | Yakama Nation |  | 70 | 70181 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634371 | 2007 | FALLERT CR 27.0017 | FALLERT CR HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 70189 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634671 | 2007 | SNAKE R-UPPR 35.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 73 | 70186 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634671 | 2007 | SNAKE R-UPPR 35.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 96133 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 27-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 63 | 96319 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 53767 | 2007 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 50685,53766,50686 | 77 | 96329 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 68009 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDWR |  | 70 | 93765 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 68 | 93764 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 90136 | 2007 | SNAKE R-1 (HELLS CAN | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 66 | 96328 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 185612 | 2007 | R-HARRISON R | H-CHEHALIS R | CDFO |  | 74 | 96325 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 186240 | 2007 | R-CHILLIWACK R | H-CHILLIWACK R | CDFO | 186242,186241,186243 | 76 | 93767 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 612511 | 2006 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 72 | 94525 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 633872 | 2007 | COLUMBIA R - GENERAL |  | WDFW |  | 60 | 94528 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 633895 | 2006 | LK CHELAN + COLUMBIA R |  | WDFW |  | 72 | 94529 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 633895 | 2006 | LK CHELAN + COLUMBIA R |  | WDFW |  | 74 | 96326 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 74 | 94527 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 69 | 96327 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 634369 | 2007 | WASHOUGAL R 28.0159 | WASHOUGAL HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 64 | 94526 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 634392 | 2007 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 54 | 94523 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 28-Jun-10 | 634672 | 2007 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 94524 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 29-Jun-10 | 54864 | 2008 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | USFWS | 54865 | 61 | 96135 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 29-Jun-10 | 612513 | 2006 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 78 | 96134 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 29-Jun-10 | 612519 | 2007 | SNAKE R@PITT. LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 74 | 96331 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 2 | 29-Jun-10 | 612694 | 2007 | CLWTR @ LAPWAI CRK | NPT HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 72 | 96136 | AD Fin Clp |


| Area | Recov Date | Tag <br> Code | Brood <br> Year | Release Site | Rearing Hatchery | Rel Agency | DIT codes | FKL cm | Label | Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | 29-Jun-10 | 633987 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 67 | 96330 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 3 | 2010-06-12 | 68804 | 2007 | TRINITY R HATCHERY | TRINITY R HATCHERY | Hoopa Valley Tribe (CA) |  | 66 | 80475 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 3 | 2010-06-18 | 634182 | 2006 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 |  | WDFW |  | 69 | 80476 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 3 | 2010-06-26 | 612518 | 2007 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 66 | 90701 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 3 | 2010-06-26 | 634092 | 2006 | SNAKE R-LOWR 33.0002 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 90700 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 4 | 30-Jun-10 | 68602 | 2007 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFG |  | 65 | 60084 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 4 | 25-Jun-10 | 633579 | 2006 | GROVERS CR 15.0299 | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | Suquamish Tribe | 210737 | 75 | 60755 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 4 | 27-Jun-10 | 612694 | 2007 | CLWTR @ LAPWAI CRK | NPT HATCHERY | Nez Perce Tribe (ID) |  | 69 | 96503 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 4 | 12-Jun-10 | 634280 | 2007 | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | WDFW |  | 61 | 96508 | AD Fin Clp |
| Area 4 | 13-Jun-10 | 634269 | 2007 | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | Yakama Nation |  | 60 | 96906 | AD Fin Clp |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For all unmarked-DIT encounters and mortalities calculations, we relied on the unmarked-to-marked abundance ratio $(\lambda)$ estimated for DIT groups at the time of juvenile release.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1 /}$ Released Chinook were estimated as the difference between total Chinook encounters generated using the bias-corrected "Method 2" estimator (see Conrad and McHugh 2008) and creel-based estimates of retained Chinook.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1 /}$ Observed (field-estimated) Chinook mortalities by size class and mark status are not available for Oregon waters; landed catch includes Oregon.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ In-season adjustments included rollover of remainder from June MSF, transfers to non-Treaty commercial troll fishery. All rollovers and transfers were executed at an impact-neutral rate. Preseason recreational quota was 49,000.
    ${ }^{3}$ In-season adjustments included a transfer from the non-Treaty commercial troll fishery (impact-neutral). Preseason recreational quota was 67,200 .

[^4]:    ${ }^{a}$ Marked handled + Unmarked handled.
    ${ }^{b} / 5 \%$ of total handled.
    ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$ Marked release mortality + unmarked release mortality.
    ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ Drop off + Release mortality.
    ${ }^{e /}$ Total retention + Incidental mortality.

[^5]:    ${ }^{a /}$ Assume $14 \%$ hooking mortality rate on observed drop offs.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b} /}$ Total drop off mortality calculated using FRAM methodology ( $5 \%$ of handled fish).
    ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$ Estimated drop off mortality/Total salmon handled; $5 \%$ used by FRAM pre-season.

[^6]:    ${ }^{4}$ In-season adjustments included rollover of remainder from May-June fishery and transfers from the recreational fishery. All rollovers and transfers were executed at an impact-neutral rate. Preseason summer Chinook quota was 14,000.
    ${ }^{5}$ In-season adjustments included a transfer to the recreational fishery (impact-neutral). Preseason troll coho quota was 11,800 .

[^7]:    ${ }^{6}$ Note: For fisheries characterized by short-duration seasons (i.e., $\sim 1$ month), the "monthly" estimators described in this appendix are synonymous season-total estimators.
    ${ }^{7}$ Equations 1 and 2 were modified based on a 2008 state-tribal evaluation of sources of bias in estimates of total Chinook encounters in mark-selective fisheries. Based on a review of relevant data, the current operational $p_{\mathrm{LM}-\mathrm{R}}$ (combined intentional and unintentional LM Chinook release rate) applied in the bias-corrected $\hat{E}_{i}$ estimator is 0.13. See Conrad and McHugh (2008) for further detail.

[^8]:    ${ }^{8}$ Due to small sample sizes for observed, harvested Chinook-particularly for sublegal and/or unmarked classes-dockside length data are pooled across the season to estimate $\hat{d}_{X Y K}$.

