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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted 2013 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 an ocean mark-selective Chinook fishery (MSF) in Marine Areas 1 through 4 for the fourth consecutive year, following state-tribal agreement during the North of Falcon process. The fishery was open for 11 total days in May and June in the northern coastal areas, and for 15 days in CRC Area 2 and 14 days in CRC Area 1 beginning June 8. Consistent with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW) intent of Puget Sound/Strait of Juan de Fuca mark-selective Chinook fisheries as well as the prior ocean mark-selective Chinook pilot fisheries, the primary goal for this 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) continued its 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]), iii) the total number of Chinook salmon released (by size/mark-status), $i v$ ) 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, coho mark-selective fisheries were adopted in 2013 for the fifteenth 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 MSF

Catch Record Card (CRC) Area 1 (from Cape Falcon, OR to Leadbetter Point, WA) was open for all salmon except coho seven days per week from June 8 through June 21. 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 14 fishing days were available during this fishery.

CRC Area 2 (from Leadbetter Point to the Queets River) was open for all salmon except coho seven days per week from June 8 through June 22. 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 15 fishing days were available during this fishery.

CRC Areas 3 (from the Queets River to Cape Alava) and 4 (from Cape Alava to the U.S./Canada border) were open for all salmon except coho May 10 and 11, May 17 and 18, then seven days per week from June 22 through June 28. 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 11 fishing days were available during this fishery.

The fishery was operating under a coastwide landed quota of 8,000 marked Chinook. Figure 1 shows the Washington ocean Catch Record Card areas.

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

CRC Area 1: The ocean recreational fishery in CRC Area 1 was open for all salmon species seven days per week from June 22 through September 30. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect June 22 - August 22; the bag limit was modified inseason to two salmon from August 23 - September 30. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip from June 22 - August 31. The fishery was modified to allow retention of unmarked coho beginning September 1 through the season with a bag limit of two salmon. The Columbia Control Zone was closed. A total of 101 fishing days were available in the area (71 days coho mark-selective, 30 days coho non-selective).

CRC Area 2: The ocean recreational fishery in CRC Area 2 was open for all salmon species Sunday through Thursday June 23 - July 18, and seven days per week thereafter. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect June 23 - August 3; the bag limit was modified in-season to two salmon from August 4 - September 30. From June 23September 5, all retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The fishery was modified to allow retention of unmarked coho beginning September 6 with a bag limit of two salmon. A total of 94 fishing days were available in the area ( 69 days coho mark-selective, 25 days coho non-selective).

CRC Area 3: The ocean recreational fishery in CRC Area 3 was open for all salmon species seven days per week from June 29 through September 22. From September 28 - October 13, salmon fishing was open and 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 plus two additional pink was in effect June 29 - August 9 and from August 23 - October 13; the bag limit was modified in-season to two salmon, only one of which could be chinook, plus two additional pink, from August 10 - August 22. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. A total of 102 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 4: The ocean recreational fishery in CRC Area 4 was open for all salmon species seven days per week from June 29 through September 22. A daily bag limit of two salmon plus two additional pink was in effect June 29 - August 9 and from August 23 - September 22; the bag limit was modified in-season to two salmon, only one of which could be chinook, plus two additional pink, from August 10 - August 22. 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 86 fishing days were available in the area.

The all-species fishery operated under preseason quotas of 40,000 landed Chinook and 74,760 landed marked coho.


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 Queets River May 1June 30 ( 61 days), and from the Queets River to the U.S.-Canada border May 1-20 and May 2428 ( 25 days) for all salmon except coho. The fishery reopened from Cape Falcon to the Queets River July 1-9, 12-16, 19-23, 26-30, August 2-6, 9-13, 16-20, August 30-September 3, September 6-10, and September 13-17 ( 59 days) for all salmon species. The area from the Queets River to the U.S.-Canada border was open July 1-9, 12-16, 19-23, 26-30, August 2-6, and August 9-13 (34 days) for all salmon species except no chum retention north of Cape Alava, WA in August. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip.

## 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], sublegalsize 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 allspecies fishery. DNA from sublegal-sized Chinook was prioritized above that from legal-sized Chinook when Chinook retention was not mark-selective 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 where charter vessel salmon fishing trips are numerous. The Voluntary Trip Report (VTR) system (see Section 3.2 below) was the secondary method used to collect encounter data in these two areas.

In CRC Areas 3 and 4, where few charter vessels take salmon fishing trips, and those who do are very small, the VTR system was the primary method used to collect on-water encounter data; the charter ride-along method was used secondarily in these areas.

### 3.2 Voluntary Trip Reports

Selective fishery encounter statistics were also acquired through Voluntary Trip Reports 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 on-board observers. Anglers complete the information on the form as they fish, minimizing recall error.

Samplers distributed VTRs beginning at 5:00 AM five days per week in La Push (CRC Area 3) and Neah Bay (CRC Area 4) during the Chinook MSF and the all-species fishery. In Ilwaco (CRC Area 1) and Westport (CRC Area 2), samplers were dedicated to distributing VTRs most weekend days and one to two days per week during weekdays. 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. Anglers could also mail these forms to the WDFW Region 6 office postage-paid.

In 2013, a new, simpler VTR form was developed to meet the needs of north coast charter boats that have not had sufficient time while fishing to complete the traditional VTR form. The new forms asks anglers simply to tally encountered salmon in the appropriate species/size class/mark status/result of encounter category, ie for each species, kept legal marked, kept legal unmarked, released legal marked, released legal unmarked, kept sublegal marked, kept sublegal unmarked, released sublegal marked, or released sublegal unmarked. They are also asked to tally drop offs and kept/released pink. The new form was distributed to north coast charter skippers and to a select group of private boat anglers with a history of completing traditional VTRs; traditional VTRs were distributed to all other anglers.

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 holidays) and weekday days (non-holiday Monday through Friday) stratified. Typically, all 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:

| $a$ | $=$ the marine catch area, |
| ---: | :--- |
| $i$ | $=$ trip type, |
| $t$ | $=$ Weekend/holiday or Weekday stratum, |
| $N_{t}$ | $=$ the number of days in stratum $t$, |
| $T_{t}$ | $=$ collection of all days in stratum $t$, |
| $n_{t}$ | $=$ the number of days sampled in stratum $t$, |
| $S_{t}$ | $=$ collection of sampled days in stratum $t$ (when $S=T, n=N)$, |
| $Y_{\text {taik }}$ | $=$ estimated catch (or effort) on day $k$ for stratum $t$ in area $a$ from trip type $i$, |
| $C_{t a i}$ | $=$ catch for stratum $t$ in area $a$ from trip type $i$, |

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 boat-trips 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 $t$, $y_{\text {taij }}=$ 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:

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

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 its 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

The overall impacts of the May - June 2013 recreational mark-selective Chinook fishery in ocean Areas 1-4 are characterized 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., legalmarked [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 Chinook MSF in Areas 1-4. 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 mark-selective 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 legal-size marked Chinook as the preferred method for estimating total Chinook encounters in mark-selective 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 2013 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).

We estimated total Chinook mortality resulting from the 2013 Chinook MSF 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 ocean $s f m$ 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. 1213) for each size and mark status category.

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 Parameter(s) | Secondary Parameter(s) | Sample Unit(s) | Finest Estimation Time Step | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dockside <br> Creel <br> 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 <br> 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.

### 3.6 CWT Impacts

To understand the potential effects of the 2013 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 $14 \%$ in all unmarkedDIT mortality calculations. The sfm value of $14 \%$ did not include unseen drop-off mortality (assumed to be 5\% in FRAM) because drop-off mortality occurs in both selective and nonselective recreational Chinook fisheries.

[^0]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:

$$
\hat{U}_{a}^{M S F}=\lambda^{R E L} \hat{M}_{a}^{M S F} s f m
$$

with associated variance:

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

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

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).

## 4. RESULTS IN 2013 CHINOOK MARK SELECTIVE RECREATIONAL FISHERY

### 4.1 Dockside Sampling Results

WDFW dockside samplers interviewed an estimated $38 \%$ of all anglers fishing in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 during the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery; a total of 3,015 anglers in 950 boats were enumerated in-sample (Table 2). In addition, an estimated $42 \%$ $(1,078)$ of all Chinook harvested in Washington ocean Areas 1 through 4 were sampled, and 269 coded wire tags (CWTs) were collected in Washington's coastal ports. (Table 2).

## Estimates of Fishing Effort and Chinook Catch

An estimated 8,383 angler trips (7,976 from Washington, 407 from Oregon) were completed by private and charter anglers during the 2013 coastwide Chinook MSF. These anglers harvested a total of 2,780 Chinook coastwide (2,586 WA, 194 OR) (Table 3). Landed Chinook catch totaled $35 \%$ of the overall fishery quota of 8,000 .

A total of 9,087 Chinook encounters were estimated in Washington ocean waters during the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery, for CRC Areas 1 through 4 combined (Table 4). This total consisted of an estimated 2,586 retained ( 2,563 marked, 23 unmarked) and 6,501 released (2,467 marked, 4,034 unmarked) Chinook salmon.

## CWT Samples

Of a total of 269 coded-wire tags recovered from Chinook salmon sampled dockside during the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4, a total of 246 proved readable. Observed (unexpanded) stock composition results for these in-sample tag recoveries are presented by area in Tables 5A through 5D for Areas 1 through 4, respectively.

In Area 1, samplers recovered a total of 118 readable CWTs, $48 \%$ of the CWTs recovered in all four areas combined. The majority of these recoveries (56\%) were from California. Columbia River hatcheries made up most of the remaining recoveries, with $19 \%$ from Upper Columbia River hatcheries, $14 \%$ from Snake River hatcheries, $8 \%$ from Lower Columbia River hatcheries and 3\% from Central Columbia River hatcheries. The remaining recoveries were from Oregon (1\%) hatcheries (Table 5A). Four of the CWT recoveries in Area 1 were from double index tag (DIT) release groups.

In Area 2, samplers recovered a total of 96 readable CWTs, $39 \%$ of the total tags recovered in all four ocean areas combined. The majority of these recoveries (58\%) were from Columbia River hatcheries, with $24 \%$ from Upper Columbia River hatcheries, 19\% from Snake River hatcheries, 9\% from Central Columbia River hatcheries, and 6\% from Lower Columbia River hatcheries. The remaining recoveries were from California (34\%), Washington ( $2 \%$ ) and British Columbia (5\%) hatcheries (Table 5B). Fourteen of the CWT recoveries in Area 2 were from double index tag (DIT) release groups.

In Area 3, samplers recovered a total of 9 readable CWTs, $4 \%$ of the total tags recovered in all four ocean areas combined. The majority of these recoveries (44\%) were from California hatcheries, $33 \%$ were from Columbia River hatcheries ( $11 \%$ from Upper Columbia River hatcheries, $22 \%$ from Snake River hatcheries) and $22 \%$ from British Columbia hatcheries (Table 5C). No CWT recoveries in Area 3 were from a double index tag (DIT) release group.

In Area 4, samplers recovered a total of 23 readable CWTs, $9 \%$ of the total tags recovered in all four ocean areas combined. The majority of these recoveries ( $52 \%$ ) were from Columbia River hatcheries ( $17 \%$ from Upper Columbia River hatcheries, $26 \%$ from Central Columbia River hatcheries, $4 \%$ from Lower Columbia River hatcheries, and $4 \%$ from Snake River hatcheries). The remaining recoveries were from Washington (39\%) California (4\%), and British Columbia (4\%) hatcheries (Table 5D). Six of the CWT recoveries in Area 4 were from a double index tag (DIT) release group.

Table 2. Dockside sampling statistics during the 2013 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

|  | Boats |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Anglers <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Landed <br> Chinook <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Coded <br> wire tags <br> collected |
| Area 4 | 217 | $38 \%$ | 604 | $38 \%$ | 180 | $45 \%$ | 29 |
| Area 3 | 51 | $58 \%$ | 134 | $54 \%$ | 31 | $79 \%$ | 11 |
| Area 2 | 541 | $34 \%$ | 1,749 | $32 \%$ | 531 | $31 \%$ | 106 |
| Area 1 | 141 | $71 \%$ | 528 | $75 \%$ | 336 | $76 \%$ | 123 |
| Total WA | $\mathbf{9 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 9}$ |

Table 3. Estimates of total fishing effort and number of Chinook retained during the 2013 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

|  | Total | Total | Estimated Chinook Retained |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Marked | Unmarked | TOTAL |
| Area 4 |  |  | 399 | 0 | 399 |
| Area 3 |  | 247 | 39 | 0 | 39 |
| Area 2 |  | 5,431 | 1,687 | 21 | 1,708 |
| Area 1 | 197 | 703 | 438 | 2 | 441 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{2 , 4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 , 9 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 5 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 5 8 6}$ |
| TOTAL OR | N/A | 407 | 194 | 0 | 194 |
| Season Total: | $\mathbf{2 , 4 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 3 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 8 0}$ |
| Variance: $\mathbf{1 /}$ | 6,170 | 48,275 | 22,684 | 70 | 22,473 |
| WA Standard Error: | 79 | 220 | 151 | 8 | 150 |
| WA CV (\%): | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| WA 95\% CI: | $2,288-2,596$ | $7,545-8,407$ | $2,267-2,858$ | $7-40$ | $2,292-2,880$ |

[^1]Table 4. Total estimates of fishing effort and the number of Chinook retained and released by mark status and by week, during the 2013 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 combined.

| Open Dates | Stat Week | Stratum <br> Start Date | Stratum <br> End Date | Effort |  | Retained Chinook |  | Released Chinook 1/ |  | Chinook Encounters Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Boats | Anglers | AD | UM | AD | UM |  |
| May 10 - June 28, 2013 (See areaspecific regs) | 19 | 10-May | 11-May | 182 | 609 | 67 | 0 | 64 | 105 | 236 |
|  | 20 | 17-May | 18-May | 114 | 341 | 64 | 0 | 62 | 101 | 227 |
|  | 23 | 8-Jun | 9-Jun | 183 | 774 | 189 | 0 | 182 | 300 | 672 |
|  | 24 | 10-Jun | 16-Jun | 1,001 | 3,313 | 1,166 | 6 | 1,122 | 1,840 | 4,134 |
|  | 25 | 17-Jun | 23-Jun | 773 | 2,484 | 976 | 18 | 939 | 1,527 | 3,459 |
|  | 26 | 24-Jun | 28-Jun | 189 | 455 | 101 | 0 | 97 | 160 | 358 |
| Season Total: |  |  |  | 2,442 | 7,976 | 2,563 | 23 | 2,467 | 4,034 | 9,087 |
| Variance: |  |  |  | 6,170 | 48,275 | 22,684 | 70 | 158,942 | 102,165 | 548,827 |
| Standard Error: |  |  |  | 79 | 220 | 151 | 8 | 399 | 320 | 741 |
| CV (\%): |  |  |  | 3.2\% | 2.8\% | 5.9\% | 35.7\% | 16.2\% | 7.9\% | 8.2\% |
| 95\% CI: |  |  |  | 2,288-2,596 | 7,545-8,407 | 2,267-2,858 | 7-40 | 1,686-3,248 | 3,407-4,660 | 7,635-10,539 |

[^2]Table 5. Summary of coded-wire tags recovered from Chinook salmon harvested in Washington coastal areas during the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery. The field "Number 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.

Table 5A. Area 1 CWT recoveries.

| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | Number DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



Table 5B. Area 2 CWT recoveries.

| Release Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | Number DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { B.C. } \\ (5.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Fraser River Thompson River (5.2\%) | Shuswap R Middle | Shuswap River, Middle | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Chilliwack R | Chilliwack River H | 3 (3.1\%) | 3 |
|  |  | Shuswap R Low | Shuswap River, Middle | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { WA } \\ (2.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Hood Canal (2.1\%) | Purdy Cr 16.0005 | George Adams Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 1 |
|  |  | Finch Cr 16.0222 | Hoodsport Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
| Columbia River (58.3\%) | Upper Columbia R (above McNary Dam; excludes Snake River) (24\%) | Chelan R 47.0052 | Chelan River NP | 3 (3.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Col R @ Turtle Rock | Turtle Rock Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Columbia Near Wells | Wells Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Chelan R 47.0052 | Chelan Falls Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Similkameen R 490325 | Similkameen Hatchery | 8 (8.3\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Wenatchee R 45.0030 | Dryden Pond | 6 (6.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Methow R 48.0002 | Carlton Acclimation Pond | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  | Central Columbia River (Bonneville Dam to McNary Dam) (9.4\%) | Ltl White Salmon @ NFH | Ltl White Salmon NFH | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Umatilla R | Bonneville Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 1 |
|  |  | Spring Cr 29.0159 | Spring Cr NFH | 5 (5.2\%) | 5 |
|  |  | Umatilla R | Umatilla Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 1 |
|  | Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) (6.2\%) | Big Cr (Lower Col R) | Big Cr Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 2 |
|  |  | Cedar Cr \#1 (Sandy R) | Sandy Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Fallert Cr 27.0017 | Fallert Cr Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | McKenzie R 1 | McKenzie Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 1 |
|  |  | Cowlitz R 26.0002 | Cowlitz Salmon Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (18.8\%) | Captain Johns Pd | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 3 (3.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Luke's Gulch A F | NPT Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Big Canyon Accl Pond | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Snake L. Mon - Ltt Goos | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 3 (3.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Snake R @ Pitt. Landing | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 3 (3.1\%) | 0 |


|  |  | Snake @ Hells Canyon Dam | Oxbow Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Magrudor Corridor | NPT Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Lyons Ferry Rel. Site | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Couse Cr 35.2147 | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { CA } \\ (34.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Klamath River - Trinity River (1\%) | Iron Gate Hatchery | Iron Gate Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  | Central California Coast (18.8\%) | Wickland Oil Net Pen | Feather R Hatchery | 5 (5.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Wickland Oil Net Pen | Nimbus Fish Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Mare Island Net Pen | Coleman NFH | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | San Pablo Bay Net Pens | Feather R Hatchery | 5 (5.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Santa Cruz Harbor Net Pen | Feather R Hatchery | 4 (4.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Tiburon Net Pens | Petaluma R United Ang Hat | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  | Sacramento River(9.4\%) | Coleman NFH | Coleman NFH | 6 (6.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Feather Boyds Pump Ramp | Feather R Hatchery | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Sac R @ Discovery Park | Nimbus Fish Hatchery | 2 (2.1\%) | 0 |
|  | San Joaquin River$(5.2 \%)$ | San Joaq Shrm Isl Net Pen | Mok R Fish Ins | 4 (4.2\%) | 0 |
|  |  | San Joaq Shrm Isl Op Jrsy | Mok R Fish Ins | 1 (1\%) | 0 |
|  |  |  | Total | 96 | 14 |

Table 5C. Area 3 CWT recoveries.

| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | Number DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { B.C. } \\ & (22.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ | Fraser River Thompson River (22.2\%) | Harrison R | Chehalis River H | 1 (11.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Shuswap R Low | Shuswap River, Middle | 1 (11.1\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Columbia } \\ & \text { River } \\ & (33.3 \%) \end{aligned}$ | Upper Columbia R (above McNary Dam; excludes Snake River) (11.1\%) | Wenatchee R 45.0030 | Dryden Pond | 1 (11.1\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (22.2\%) | Snake R @ Pitt. Landing | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 2 (22.2\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { CA } \\ (44.4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Central California Coast (33.3\%) | Mare Island Net Pen | Nimbus Fish Hatchery | 1 (11.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Wickland Oil Net Pen | Feather R Hatchery | 2 (22.2\%) | 0 |
|  | San Joaquin River (11.1\%) | San Joaq Shrm Isl Net Pen | Mok R Fish Ins | 1 (11.1\%) | 0 |
|  |  |  | Total | 9 | 0 |

Table 5D. Area 4 CWT recoveries.

| Release <br> Domain | Release Region | Release Site | Rearing Location | CWTs <br> Recovered | Number DITs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { B.C. } \\ (4.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Fraser River Thompson River (4.3\%) | Harrison R | Chehalis River H | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { WA } \\ (39.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Northern Washington (8.7\%) | Nooksack R NF 01.0120 | Kendall Creek Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 1 |
|  |  | East Sound Bay (SAN) | Glenwood Springs | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Hood Canal (13\%) | John Cr 16.0253 | RFEG 6 Hood Canal | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Purdy Cr 16.0005 | George Adams Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 1 |
|  |  | Finch Cr 16.0222 | Hoodsport Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Mid Puget Sound (17.4\%) | Gorst Cr 15.0216 | Gorst Cr Rearing Pond | 2 (8.7\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Grovers Cr Hatchery | Grovers Cr Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 1 |
|  |  | VoightCr Tr 10.0428 | Voights Cr Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Columbia } \\ & \text { River } \\ & (52.2 \%) \end{aligned}$ | Upper Columbia R (above McNary Dam; excludes Snake River) (17.4\%) | Columbia Near Wells | Wells Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Col R @ Turtle Rock | Turtle Rock Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Chelan R 47.0052 | Chelan Falls Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  |  | Wenatchee R 45.0030 | Dryden Pond | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Central Columbia River (Bonneville Dam to McNary Dam) (26.1\%) | Spring Cr 29.0159 | Spring Cr NFH | 1 (4.3\%) | 1 |
|  |  | Lt White Salmon @ NFH | Ltl White Salmon NFH | 5 (21.7\%) | 2 |
|  | Lower Columbia River (mouth to Bonneville Dam) (4.3\%) | Tanner Cr (Bonneville) | Bonneville Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  | Snake River (4.3\%) | Couse Cr 35.2147 | Lyons Ferry Hatchery | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { CA } \\ (4.3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Central California Coast (4.3\%) | Mare Island Net Pen | Colemans NFH | 1 (4.3\%) | 0 |
|  |  |  | Total | 23 | 6 |

### 4.2 On-water Observations of Chinook Encounters

WDFW's observer staff conducted 15 on-the-water catch surveys onboard charter boats during the 2013 selective Chinook fishery. Observers recorded a total of 257 encountered Chinook salmon in all four ocean areas combined. The size/mark status composition of these Chinook encounters is presented in Table 6. The following size/mark group composition was estimated from the 257 encounters: $26 \%$ LM, $31 \%$ LU, $25 \%$ SM, and $18 \%$ SU.

These estimated size/mark group proportions based on onboard observer data were combined with those estimated from our VTR data and 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). The decision to combine these data was based on $i$ ) the short duration of the fishery and the limited numbers of fish encountered during on-water observer trips, $i i$ ) the potential for differences in fishing patterns between charter and private vessels and the desire to represent both patterns, and iii) the lack of representation of catch in Areas 3 and 4 in the observer data.

## DNA Results

Chinook DNA samples were collected only by onboard observers who had access to both marked and unmarked Chinook encounters during the 2013 Chinook MSF. A total of 127 DNA samples were collected from legal sized Chinook and 108 from sublegal sized Chinook during the fishery (Table 7).

## VTR Data

Additional on-the-water encounters data was provided via angler-completed voluntary trip reports (VTRs). Dockside samplers collected 125 completed and useable VTRs containing 445 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 397 Chinook encounters for Areas 1-4 combined. The following size/mark group composition was estimated from these 397 useable encounters: $37 \%$ LM, $28 \% \mathrm{LU}, 21 \% \mathrm{SM}$, and $14 \% \mathrm{SU}$. The VTR data were used in conjunction with observer data in subsequent fishery-wide impacts estimation steps (i.e., Appendix A).

We also combined the onboard observer- and VTR-based encounters data to compare observed (field-estimated) mark rates in each area with preseason FRAM-predicted values. The combined onboard observer and VTR data indicated mark rates of $53 \%$ for legal sized Chinook and $60 \%$ 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 2013 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

|  | Total Observer Trips | LEGAL SIZED |  |  | OBSERVER DATA SUBLEGAL SIZED |  |  | UNKNOWN SIZE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |
| Area 4 | 3 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Area 3 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Area 2 | 7 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Area 1 | 5 | 28 | 37 | 0 | 39 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 15 | 66 | 79 | 0 | 65 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Size/Mark | Comp 1/ | 25.7\% | 30.7\% | - | 25.3\% | 18.3\% | - | - | - | - |

${ }^{\text {I/ }}$ Chinook encounters of unknown size and/or unknown mark status were excluded in determining the overall size/mark status composition.
Table 7. Number of Chinook DNA samples collected by WDFW observers onboard charter vessels during the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1-4.

|  | LEGAL SIZED |  |  |  | SUBLEGAL SIZED |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Marked | Unmarked | Total |  | Marked | Unmarked | Total |
| Area 4 | 14 | 18 | 32 |  | 9 | 12 | 21 |
| Area 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Area 2 | 19 | 19 | 38 |  | 13 | 6 | 19 |
| Area 1 | 22 | 35 | 57 |  | 39 | 28 | 67 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ |  | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ |

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 2013 recreational Chinook mark-selective fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.


[^3]Table 9. Estimated mark rates for legal- and sublegal-sized Chinook during 2013 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.

|  | LEGAL SIZED |  |  | SUBLEGAL SIZED |  |  | FRAM preseason projected mark rate (legal sized) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate |  |
| Area 4 | 41 | 33 | 55\% | 16 | 25 | 39\% | 89\% |
| Area 3 | 9 | 5 | 64\% | 3 | 1 | - | 89\% |
| Area 2 | 103 | 73 | 59\% | 68 | 32 | 68\% | 55\% |
| Area 1 | 59 | 79 | 43\% | 63 | 44 | 59\% | 79\% |
| TOTAL | 212 | 190 | 53\% | 150 | 102 | 60\% |  |

### 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 and VTR based size/mark-status composition data (Tables 6 and 8; see Appendix A for computational details). In total, we estimated that anglers fishing in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4 (combined) encountered 2,946 LM, 2,640 LU, 2,084 SM, and 1,417 SU Chinook during the 2013 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 sublegal-sized Chinook, these encounters translated into a total of 3,496 estimated Chinook mortalities ( 2,586 retained and 910 released; 2,616 LM, 390 LU, 292 SM, and 198 SU ) in ocean Areas 1 through 4 combined (Table 10). Of the total estimated mortalities, $73 \%$ were attributed to retention of legal-size marked Chinook.

## FRAM versus Creel Comparison

Field estimated Chinook encounters and mortalities are compared with those projected in the final preseason FRAM model run (FRAM number 1213) in Tables 11 and 12. These comparisons are illustrated in Figure 2. FRAM projections include encounters and mortalities in Oregon waters; however, field estimated total encounters and mortalities are not available for Oregon waters. Oregon landed catch comprised $7 \%$ of the total landed catch in the ocean Chinook MSF. Both field estimates of encounters and mortalities were less than those projected in preseason FRAM model run 1213 for both legal and sublegal marked and unmarked Chinook (Tables 11 and 12, Figure 2).

## Estimated CWT-DIT Impacts

Of the 246 decoded coded-wire tags recovered during the 2013 ocean mark-selective Chinook fishery in Areas 1-4 combined, a total of 24 belonged to double-index tag (DIT) release groups (Table 13). 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 2013 selective Chinook fishery in the four areas. In total, we estimated that 51 unmarked-DIT Chinook were encountered during the fishery. Given an
assumed sfim rate of 0.14 for the estimated unmarked DIT fish that were encountered and released, we estimate that 7 unmarked DIT fish may have died as a result of the 2013 ocean selective Chinook fishery (Table 13).

Table 10. Summary of the fishery impact estimates for the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Size/Mark Group | Encounters | Number <br> Retained | Number <br> Released | Release Mortality Rate | Release <br> Mortality | Total Mortality | Variance | SE | 95\% CI | CV (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Legal Marked | 2,946 | 2,563 | 383 | 0.14 | 54 | 2,616 | 24,798 | 157 | 2,308-2,925 | 6\% |
| Legal Unmarked | 2,640 | 23 | 2,616 | 0.14 | 366 | 390 | 1,487 | 39 | 314-465 | 10\% |
| Sublegal Marked | 2,084 | 0 | 2,084 | 0.14 | 292 | 292 | 1,001 | 32 | 230-354 | 11\% |
| Sublegal Unmarked | 1,417 | 0 | 1,417 | 0.14 | 198 | 198 | 586 | 24 | 151-246 | 12\% |
| TOTAL ALL GROUPS | 9,087 | 2,586 | 6,501 | 0.14 | 910 | 3,496 | 27,871 | 167 | 3,169-3,823 | 5\% |

Table 11. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1213) and estimated total Chinook encounters in the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

|  | Group | Total <br> Encounters 1/ | Legal | Sublegal | Landed Only <br> (WA + OR) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM Encounters | Unmarked | 9,122 | 6,293 | 2,829 | 126 |
|  | Marked | 13,321 | 9,050 | 4,271 | 7,874 |
|  | Total | 22,443 | 15,343 | 7,100 | 8,000 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | $59 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Estimated (Creel) | Unmarked | 4,057 | 2,640 | 1,417 | 23 |
|  | Marked | 5,030 | 2,946 | 2,084 | 2,757 |
| only) | Total | 9,087 | 5,585 | 3,501 | 2,780 |
|  | $\%$ Marked | $55 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $99 \%$ |

${ }^{1 /}$ Field estimates of 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 \#1213) and estimated total Chinook mortalities in the 2013 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) | 1,385 | 8,637 | 10,022 | 588 | 3,102 | 3,690 |
| Released Legal | 863 | 165 | 1,028 | 366 | 54 | 420 |
| Released Sublegal | 396 | 598 | 994 | 198 | 292 | 490 |
| Landed Only (WA + OR) | 126 | 7,874 | 8,000 | 23 | 2,757 | 2,780 |

${ }^{1 /}$ Field estimates of Chinook mortalities by size class and mark status are not available for Oregon waters; landed catch includes Oregon.


Figure 2. Comparison of modeled (i.e., using FRAM, model run 1213) and estimated total Chinook encounters (top panel) and mortalities (bottom panel) for the 2013 mark-selective Chinook fisheries in Washington coastal Areas 1-4.

Table 13. 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 2013 mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Area | Hatchery | Brood <br> Year | DITs <br> Obs | AD DIT Harvest |  | UM <br> DIT <br> Enc | UM DIT Mortality |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Est | var(Est) |  | Est | var(Est) | SE(Est) |
| 1 | Bonneville Hatchery | 2009 | 1 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.015 | 0.1 |
|  | McKenzie Hatchery | 2009 | 1 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
|  | Priest Rapids Hatchery | 2010 | 2 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.016 | 0.2 |
|  | Total |  | 4 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 0.031 | 0.3 |
| 2 | Big Creek Hatchery | 2010 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 3.2 | 0.5 | 0.140 | 0.4 |
|  | Big Creek Hatchery | 2011 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.016 | 0.1 |
|  | Bonneville Hatchery | 2008 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 0.7 | 0.384 | 0.6 |
|  | George Adams Hatchery | 2010 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 0.145 | 0.4 |
|  | Chilliwack River Hatchery | 2010 | 3 | 9.6 | 21.4 | 4.7 | 0.7 | 0.100 | 0.5 |
|  | McKenzie Hatchery | 2009 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
|  | Spring Creek NFH | 2010 | 4 | 12.9 | 28.5 | 12.8 | 1.8 | 0.556 | 1.5 |
|  | Spring Creek NFH | 2011 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 0.134 | 0.4 |
|  | Umatilla Hatchery | 2010 | 1 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.000 | 0.0 |
|  | Total |  | 14 | 45.0 | $99.8$ | 33.7 | 4.7 | 1.475 | 3.9 |
| 4 | George Adams Hatchery | 2010 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 0.055 | 0.2 |
|  | Grovers Creek Hatchery | 2009 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 0.049 | 0.2 |
|  | Kendall Creek Hatchery | 2010 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 0.050 | 0.2 |
|  | Ltl White Salmon NFH | 2009 | 2 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 0.108 | 0.5 |
|  | Spring Creek NFH | 2009 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 0.053 | 0.2 |
|  | Total |  | 6 | 13.3 | 16.2 | 13.2 | 1.9 | 0.314 | 1.4 |
| Grand Total (All WA Ocean Areas) |  |  | 24 | 63.5 | 117.6 | 51.3 | 7.2 | 1.820 | 5.6 |

Table 14. Season-total estimates of Chinook encounters by size/mark status, and total estimates of angler effort, summarized for all seasons to date in the Spring mark-selective Chinook fisheries in Washington coastal Areas 1 through 4.

| Year | Effort <br> (Angler-trips) | Retained Chinook |  |  |  | LU | SM | SU | LM | LU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SM | SU | Encounters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 10,004 | 4,981 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 744 | 2,620 | 1,892 | 946 | 11,202 |
| 2011 | 4,895 | 2,301 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 344 | 1,247 | 2,759 | 1,462 | 8,146 |
| 2012 | 7,853 | 7,339 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 1,097 | 3,531 | 1,771 | 1,453 | 15,234 |
| 2013 | 7,976 | 2,563 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 383 | 2,616 | 2,084 | 1,417 | 9,087 |

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

### 5.1 Dockside Sampling Results

An estimated 70,284 angler trips (64,888 from Washington, 5,396 from Oregon) were completed by private and charter anglers during the 2013 coastwide all-species coho MSF. These anglers harvested a total of 26,551 Chinook coastwide ( 24,896 WA, 1,655 OR) and 44,612 coho ( 40,763 WA, 3,849 OR). Table 15 shows effort and catch by month and area during the 2013 coho MSF. Note that effort and catch from the non-mark-selective fishery in September in Areas 1 and 2 are not included in this analysis.

WDFW dockside samplers interviewed an estimated $37 \%$ of all anglers fishing from WA coastwide during the coho MSF. A total of $38 \%$ of all Chinook and $39 \%$ of all coho harvested in WA were sampled; 1,493 coded wire tags (CWTs) were collected from sampled Chinook and 1,931 were collected from sampled coho in WA ports (Table 16).

### 5.2 On-water Observation and VTR Results

OSP observer staff conducted a total of 38 on-the-water catch surveys during the all-species coho mark-selective fishery and encountered a total of 136 legal sized Chinook, 208 sublegal sized Chinook, 943 legal sized coho, and 36 sublegal sized coho. Dockside samplers also collected 469 completed and useable VTRs containing 1,184 legal sized Chinook encounters, 1,087 sublegal sized Chinook encounters, 3,458 legal sized coho encounters, and 159 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.

### 5.3 Overall Fishery Impacts

## Estimated Total Coho Encounters and Mortalities

FRAM pre-season projections of coho encounters (Washington and Oregon) in the 2013 ocean recreational all-species coho mark-selective fisheries are compared with field estimated encounters (Washington only) in Table 20. Table 21 compares total coho mortality projected pre-season by FRAM (Washington and Oregon) with field estimated coho mortality (Washington only).

The overall impacts of the 2013 recreational mark-selective coho fishery in ocean Areas 1-4 are characterized in terms of grand-total estimates of coho encounters and mortalities and by using estimates specific to mark group (i.e., marked and unmarked). The method described in section 3.4 was used to generate total estimates of retained catch by mark group. To estimate coho salmon encounters and releases by mark group, we applied Conrad's (2012) proposed alternative method for estimating coho encounters and release mortalities in ocean mark-selective fisheries, which independently calculates charter and private vessel totals based on observer and VTR data. This method differs from that used prior to 2012.

Field estimated 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. Encounters are calculated by boat type and area based on landed catch of legal sized marked coho, the proportion of observed encounters that were legal sized marked coho, and the proportion of observed encounters that were legal sized marked coho retained. Mortality was estimated for each mark group based on calculated encounters and the proportion of the legal sized coho of that mark status that were released multiplied by the PFMC ocean $s f m$ rate of $14 \%$ (Conrad, 2012).

Figure 3 summarizes the projected and field estimated coho encounters and mortality by area in the all-species fishery. Note that projected encounters and mortality includes the Oregon portion of the fishery while estimated statistics do not.

Field estimates of both coho encounters and total mortality were lower than projected preseason in Catch Areas 1, 2 and 4. Estimated coho encounters and total mortality were higher than projected preseason in Catch Area 3, as in-season quota transfers allowed total catch in Area 3 greater than preseason expectations. Total coastwide estimates of encounters and mortality were less than those projected preseason.

## Compliance

Table 22 reports compliance rates observed by dockside samplers for the recreational fisheries by area and month. Coastwide, compliance with selective fishery regulations averaged over $99 \%$, similar to that observed in the last nine seasons.

### 5.4 DNA Data Collection

A total of 2,365 DNA samples were collected from Chinook by onboard and dockside samplers during the summer all-species recreational fishery. Table 23 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 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho markselective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | TOTAL ANGLER TRIPS |  |  |  |  |  | CHINOOK RETAINED |  |  |  |  |  | COHO RETAINED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June | July | August | Sept | Oct | TOTAL | June | July | August | Sept | Oct | TOTAL | June | July | August | Sept | Oct | TOTAL |
| Area 4 | 934 | 7,399 | 5,044 | 391 | - | 13,768 | 364 | 3,267 | 2,142 | 74 |  | 5,846 | 257 | 3,082 | 2,934 | 233 |  | 6,506 |
| Area 3 | 123 | 971 | 2,267 | 420 | 236 | 4,016 | 64 | 693 | 1,288 | 152 | 119 | 2,316 | 57 | 439 | 2,015 | 269 | 18 | 2,798 |
| Area 2 | 1,589 | 7,641 | 16,639 | 881 | - | 26,750 | 484 | 3,403 | 7,021 | 326 |  | 11,234 | 379 | 3,097 | 12,233 | 856 |  | 16,566 |
| Area 1 | 2,140 | 4,833 | 13,381 | - | - | 20,355 | 859 | 1,356 | 3,284 | - | - | 5,499 | 2,287 | 4,007 | 8,599 | - | - | 14,893 |
| TOTAL WA | 4,786 | 20,844 | 37,332 | 1,691 | 236 | 64,888 | 1,771 | 8,719 | 13,734 | 553 | 119 | 24,896 | 2,980 | 10,626 | 25,782 | 1,358 | 18 | 40,763 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 1,178 | 1,338 | 2,880 | - | - | 5,396 | 538 | 323 | 794 | 0 | - | 1,655 | 1,141 | 991 | 1,717 | - | - | 3,849 |
| TOTAL NOF | 5,964 | 22,182 | 40,212 | 1,691 | 236 | 70,284 | 2,309 | 9,042 | 14,528 | 553 | 119 | 26,551 | 4,121 | 11,617 | 27,499 | 1,358 | 18 | 44,612 |
| WA Variance: $1 /$ |  |  |  |  |  | 637,172 |  |  |  |  |  | 366,518 |  |  |  |  |  | 467,714 |
| WA SE: |  |  |  |  |  | 798 |  |  |  |  |  | 605 |  |  |  |  |  | 684 |
| WA CV (\%): |  |  |  |  |  | 1\% |  |  |  |  |  | $2 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2\% |
| WA 95\% CI: |  |  |  |  | 63,3 | 4-66,453 |  |  |  |  | 23,70 | 09-26,082 |  |  |  |  | 39,4 | 22-42,103 |

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

Table 16. WA dockside sampling statistics during the 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | Anglers <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Landed <br> Chinook <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Landed <br> Coho <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | Chinook <br> CWTs <br> collected | Coho <br> CWTs <br> collected |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | 4,937 | $36 \%$ | 2,137 | $37 \%$ | 2,483 | $38 \%$ | 254 | 258 |
| Area 3 | 2,680 | $67 \%$ | 1,579 | $68 \%$ | 1,830 | $65 \%$ | 179 | 190 |
| Area 2 | 9,117 | $34 \%$ | 3,510 | $31 \%$ | 4,824 | $29 \%$ | 574 | 615 |
| Area 1 | 7,500 | $37 \%$ | 2,286 | $42 \%$ | 6,943 | $47 \%$ | 486 | 868 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{2 4 , 2 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 , 5 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 , 0 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 3 1}$ |

Table 17. On-board and VTR Chinook encounters by size class and mark status in the 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  |  |  | LEGAL-SIZED |  |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED |  | On-board observation | VTRs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Total <br> VTRs <br> Collected | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |
| Area 4 | June |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 1 |
|  | July | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 177 | 47 | 2 | 131 | 106 | 12 |
|  | August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 130 | 128 | 2 | 58 | 2 | 2 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 319 | 195 | 4 | 213 | 127 | 15 |
| Area 3 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | July | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 80 | 82 | 0 | 58 | 53 | 0 |
|  | August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 38 | 74 | 0 | 21 | 15 | 1 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 124 | 171 | 0 | 90 | 81 | 1 |
| Area 2 | June | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 20 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | July | 10 | 30 | 27 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 65 | 25 | 51 | 6 | 14 | 25 | 3 |
|  | August | 9 | 17 | 24 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 59 | 33 | 44 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 5 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 1 |
|  | TOTAL | 20 | 48 | 52 | 0 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 149 | 84 | 112 | 7 | 37 | 43 | 9 |
| Area 1 | June | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 36 | 37 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 3 |
|  | July | 9 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 39 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 2 | 65 | 107 | 10 |
|  | August | 7 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 41 | 22 | 1 | 11 | 31 | 25 | 5 | 98 | 122 | 27 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 16 | 20 | 0 | 82 | 66 | 1 | 61 | 82 | 78 | 8 | 178 | 253 | 40 |

Table 18. On-board and VTR coho encounters by size class and mark status in the 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  |  | On-board observation |  |  |  |  |  |  | VTRs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Observer Trips | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Total <br> VTRs <br> Collected | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |
| Area 4 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 252 | 390 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 0 |
|  | August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 197 | 353 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 465 | 779 | 3 | 14 | 15 | 1 |
| Area 3 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | July | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 118 | 216 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 |
|  | August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 156 | 271 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 56 | 104 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 340 | 606 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 0 |
| Area 2 | June | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | 10 | 100 | 134 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 65 | 75 | 101 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  | August | 9 | 128 | 161 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 140 | 247 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 20 | 232 | 296 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 149 | 241 | 382 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 3 |
| Area 1 | June | 2 | 36 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 84 | 34 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 4 |
|  | July | 9 | 108 | 81 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 120 | 94 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
|  | August | 7 | 83 | 93 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 164 | 143 | 1 | 32 | 13 | 1 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 227 | 188 | 0 | 22 | 3 | 2 | 61 | 368 | 271 | 1 | 50 | 21 | 7 |

Table 19. Estimated Chinook and coho mark rates during the 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective) by size class using onboard observer and VTR encounters.

|  |  | 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 | June | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | July | - | 79\% | 79\% | - | 55\% | 55\% | - | 39\% | 39\% | 44\% |
|  | August | - | 50\% | 50\% | - | 97\% | 97\% | - | 36\% | 36\% | 41\% |
|  | September | - | 100\% | 100\% | - | 62\% | 62\% | - | 19\% | 19\% | 41\% |
|  | TOTAL | - | 62\% | 62\% | - | 63\% | 63\% | - | 37\% | 37\% | 42\% |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  | July | - | 49\% | 49\% | - | 52\% | 52\% | - | 35\% | 35\% | 47\% |
|  | August | - | 34\% | 34\% | - | 58\% | 58\% | - | 37\% | 37\% | 48\% |
|  | September | - | 17\% | 17\% | - | 50\% | 50\% | - | 35\% | 35\% | 38\% |
|  | TOTAL | - | 42\% | 42\% | - | 53\% | 53\% | - | 36\% | 36\% | 46\% |
| Area 2 | June | 50\% | 69\% | 68\% | 33\% | 0\% | 25\% | 80\% | 43\% | 53\% | 52\% |
|  | July | 53\% | 33\% | 41\% | 68\% | 36\% | 50\% | 43\% | 43\% | 43\% | 51\% |
|  | August | 41\% | 43\% | 42\% | 50\% | 42\% | 46\% | 44\% | 36\% | 40\% | 47\% |
|  | September | - | 43\% | 43\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | 40\% |
|  | TOTAL | 48\% | 43\% | 45\% | 58\% | 46\% | 51\% | 44\% | 39\% | 41\% | 46\% |
| Area 1 | June |  | 49\% | 49\% | 44\% | 38\% | 40\% | 72\% | - | 71\% | 58\% |
|  | July | 43\% | 48\% | 46\% | 49\% | 38\% | 41\% | 57\% | 56\% | 57\% | 56\% |
|  | August | 50\% | 55\% | 54\% | 65\% | 45\% | 49\% | 47\% | 53\% | 51\% | 52\% |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 51\% |
|  | TOTAL | 44\% | 51\% | 50\% | 55\% | 41\% | 45\% | 55\% | 58\% | 56\% | 53\% |

Table 20. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1323, includes Washington and Oregon) and estimated (Washington only) total coho encounters in the 2013 ocean coho mark-selective fishery.

| Data Source | Area | Marked | Unmarked | Total Encounters | Landed Catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRAM (WA and OR) | Area 4 | 8,021 | 10,867 | 18,888 | 7,781 |
|  | Area 3 | 2,008 | 2,329 | 4,337 | 1,940 |
|  | Area 2 | 28,616 | 33,475 | 62,091 | 27,660 |
|  | Area 1 | 38,883 | 34,331 | 73,214 | 37,380 |
|  | TOTAL | 77,528 | 81,002 | 158,530 | 74,761 |
| Estimated Actual Encounters (WA only) | Area 4 | 6,731 | 10,774 | 17,505 | 6,506 |
|  | Area 3 | 3,088 | 6,370 | 9,458 | 2,798 |
|  | Area 2 | 17,477 | 25,080 | 42,557 | 16,566 |
|  | Area 1 | 14,946 | 11,641 | 26,587 | 14,893 |
|  | TOTAL | 42,242 | 53,865 | 96,107 | 40,763 |
| Variance: |  | 1,349,048 | 2,657,604 | 7,676,488 | 467,714 |
| Standard Error: |  | 1,161 | 1,630 | 2,771 | 684 |
| CV (\%): |  | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% |
| 95\% CI: |  | 39,965-44,518 | 50,670-57,060 | 90,677-101,538 | 39,422-42,103 |

Table 21. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1323, includes Washington and Oregon) and estimated (Washington only) total coho mortalities in the 2013 ocean coho mark-selective fishery.

| Data Source | Area | Release Mortality |  | Drop Off Mortality a/ |  | Landed Catch |  | Total Mortality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | Unmarked |  |
| FRAM (WA and OR) | Area 4 | 67 | 1,550 | 403 | 564 | 7,555 | 226 | 10,365 |
|  | Area 3 | 17 | 331 | 101 | 120 | 1,893 | 47 | 2,509 |
|  | Area 2 | 241 | 4,754 | 1,435 | 1,732 | 26,966 | 694 | 35,822 |
|  | Area 1 | 328 | 4,923 | 1,950 | 1,794 | 36,661 | 719 | 46,375 |
|  | TOTAL | 653 | 11,558 | 3,889 | 4,210 | 73,075 | 1,686 | 95,071 |
| Estimated Actual Mortality (WA only) | Area 4 | 64 | 1,507 | 337 | 539 | 6,274 | 232 | 8,952 |
|  | Area 3 | 43 | 892 | 154 | 318 | 2,783 | 15 | 4,205 |
|  | Area 2 | 151 | 3,496 | 874 | 1,254 | 16,396 | 170 | 22,341 |
|  | Area 1 | 20 | 1,627 | 747 | 582 | 14,819 | 74 | 17,869 |
|  | TOTAL | 278 | 7,521 | 2,112 | 2,693 | 40,272 | 490 | 53,367 |
| Variance: |  | 1,311 | 66,696 | 3,373 | 6,644 | 464,036 | 3,678 | - |
| Standard Error: |  | 36 | 258 | 58 | 82 | 681 | 61 | - |
| CV (\%): |  | 13\% | 3\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 12\% | - |
| 95\% CI: |  | 207-349 | 7,014-8,027 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,998- \\ & 2,226 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2,533-2,853 | 38,937-41,608 | 372-609 | - |

a/ Observed drop off mortality calculated as 5\% of observed encounters.


Figure 3. Comparison of modeled (FRAM model run \#1323, includes Washington and Oregon) and estimated (Washington only) total coho encounters and mortality in the 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective).

Table 22. Compliance with coho selective fishery regulations observed during dockside sampling interviews in the 2013 all-species recreational fishery (coho mark-selective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  |  | Total Coho Sampled | Marked Coho Sampled | Unmarked Coho Sampled | \% Sampled Coho Marked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 4 | June | 91 | 79 | 12 | 86.8\% |
|  | July | 1,201 | 1,164 | 37 | 96.9\% |
|  | August | 1,050 | 1,025 | 25 | 97.6\% |
|  | September | 141 | 135 | 6 | 95.7\% |
|  | Total | 2,483 | 2,403 | 80 | 96.8\% |
| Area 3 | June | 46 | 46 | - | - |
|  | July | 357 | 354 | 3 | 99.2\% |
|  | August | 1,146 | 1,142 | 4 | 99.7\% |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 281 | 278 | 3 | 98.9\% |
|  | Total | 1,830 | 1,820 | 10 | 99.5\% |
| Area 2 | June | 113 | 112 | 1 | 99.1\% |
|  | July | 1,134 | 1,126 | 8 | 99.3\% |
|  | August | 3,084 | 3,060 | 24 | 99.2\% |
|  | September | 493 | 490 | - | - |
|  | Total | 4,824 | 4,788 | 36 | 99.3\% |
| Area 1 | June | 1,377 | 1,374 | 3 | 99.8\% |
|  | July | 2,846 | 2,830 | 16 | 99.4\% |
|  | August | 2,720 | 2,710 | 10 | 99.6\% |
|  | September | - | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 6,943 | 6,914 | 29 | 99.6\% |

Table 23. Number of Chinook DNA samples collected by onboard and dockside samplers from the 2013 ocean recreational all-species fishery, by size class, mark status, and sample type.

|  |  | On-Board Sampling |  |  |  |  |  | Dockside Sampling Legal-Sized |  |  | Total <br> Number of <br> DNA <br> Samples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Legal Sized |  |  | Sublegal Sized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |  |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 5 | 0 | 14 |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | - | - | 138 | 98 | 3 | 239 |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | - | 48 | 57 | 1 | 106 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 5 | 0 | 13 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 165 | 4 | 358 |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | - | - | 54 | 55 | 0 | 109 |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | - | 31 | 115 | 0 | 146 |
|  | Sept./Oct. |  | - | - | - | - | - | 10 |  | 0 | 35 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 198 | 0 | 290 |
| Area 2 | June | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 32 | 1 | 97 |
|  | July | 30 | 27 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 181 | 119 | 0 | 386 |
|  | August | 12 | 23 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 142 | 132 | 1 | 329 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | 41 | 52 | 0 | 93 |
|  | Total | 43 | 50 | 0 | 34 | 18 | 0 | 423 | 335 | 2 | 905 |
| Area 1 | June | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 81 |
|  | July | 13 | 14 | 0 | 51 | 49 | 0 | 108 | 115 | 0 | 350 |
|  | August | 5 | 5 | 0 | 40 | 23 | 0 | 114 | 100 | 0 | 287 |
|  | September | - | - | - |  | - | - | 30 | 45 | 0 | 75 |
|  | Total | 19 | 21 | 0 | 94 | 77 | 0 | 287 | 295 | 0 | 793 |

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

The non-Treaty commercial troll fishery harvested a total of 17,968 Chinook ( $17,295 \mathrm{WA}, 673$ OR) and 6,467 coho ( 6,041 WA, 426 OR) during the 2013 coastwide all-species coho MSF operating July through September. Table 24 shows catch by month and area.

WDFW dockside samplers sampled a total of $33 \%$ of all Chinook and $34 \%$ of all coho harvested and landed in WA. Coded wire tag collections totaled 696 from Chinook and 217 from coho in WA ports (Table 25).

Table 26 details numbers of Chinook DNA samples collected in WA by month and area, including during the non mark-selective spring Chinook fishery. A total of 1,846 DNA samples were collected from Chinook by dockside samplers throughout the May - September non-Treaty troll fishery (1,104 in May-June, 742 in July-September).

Table 24. Total Chinook and coho retained during the 2013 all-species non-Treaty commercial troll fishery (coho mark-selective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | Chinook |  |  |  | Coho |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | July | August | September | TOTAL | July | August | September | TOTAL |
| Area 4 | 1,900 | 87 | - | 1,987 | 279 | 30 | - | 309 |
| Area 3 | 2,396 | 1,806 | - | 4,202 | 1,054 | 792 | - | 1,846 |
| Area 2 | 3,520 | 6,796 | 690 | 11,006 | 559 | 2,942 | 258 | 3,759 |
| Area 1 | 42 | 19 | 39 | 100 | 28 | 80 | 19 | 127 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{7 , 8 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 7 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 2 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 8 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 0 4 1}$ |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 136 | 224 | 313 | 673 | 39 | 269 | 118 | 426 |
| TOTAL NOF | $\mathbf{7 , 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 , 9 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 , 9 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 4 6 7}$ |

Table 25. Chinook and coho sampled in WA during the 2013 all-species non-Treaty commercial troll fishery (coho mark-selective only) between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | Chinook |  |  | Coho <br> Total <br> Sampled |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample <br> Rate | CWTs <br> Collected | Total <br> Sampled | Sample <br> Rate | CWTs <br> Collected |  |  |
| Area 4 | 698 | $35 \%$ | 93 | 92 | $30 \%$ | 9 |
| Area 3 | 1,051 | $25 \%$ | 103 | 583 | $32 \%$ | 65 |
| Area 2 | 3,812 | $35 \%$ | 493 | 1,362 | $36 \%$ | 141 |
| Area 1 | 67 | $67 \%$ | 7 | 29 | $23 \%$ | 2 |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{5 , 6 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 7}$ |

Table 26. Number of chinook DNA samples collected from the 2013 non-treaty troll fishery by size class, mark status.

| AREA | MONTH | Dockside Sampling |  |  | Total Number of DNA Samples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Legal-Sized |  |  |  |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown |  |
| Area 4 | May | 85 | 136 | 0 | 221 |
|  | June | - | - | - | 0 |
|  | July | 30 | 105 | 0 | 135 |
|  | August | 2 | 18 | 0 | 20 |
|  | September | - | - | - | 0 |
|  | Total | 117 | 259 | 0 | 376 |
| Area 3 | May | 82 | 123 | 0 | 205 |
|  | June | - | - | - | 0 |
|  | July | 43 | 110 | 0 | 153 |
|  | August | 8 | 24 | 0 | 32 |
|  | September | - | - | - | 0 |
|  | Total | 133 | 257 | 0 | 390 |
| Area 2 | May | 27 | 32 | 0 | 59 |
|  | June | 168 | 164 | 0 | 332 |
|  | July | 75 | 74 | 0 | 149 |
|  | August | 48 | 127 | 0 | 175 |
|  | September | 3 | 16 | 0 | 19 |
|  | Total | 321 | 413 | 0 | 734 |
| Area 1 | May | 29 | 28 | 0 | 57 |
|  | June | 103 | 127 | 0 | 230 |
|  | July | 19 | 13 | 0 | 32 |
|  | August | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
|  | September | 6 | 15 | 0 | 21 |
|  | Total | 162 | 184 | 0 | 346 |
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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 ${ }^{2}$ 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) ${ }^{3} . \hat{E}_{i}$ and its variance are estimated as:

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

[^4]
## Estimating Chinook Encounter Composition

$\hat{p}_{L M i}=$ 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 $U$ ), $\hat{p}_{X Y}$ and its variance is estimated as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \hat{p}_{X Y i}=n_{X Y_{i}} / n_{i}, \text { and }  \tag{3}\\
& \operatorname{var}\left(\hat{p}_{X Y_{i}}\right)=\left[\hat{p}_{X Y_{i}}\left(1-\hat{p}_{X Y i}\right)\right] /\left(n_{i}-1\right), \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

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:

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

## 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 ${ }^{4}$ 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 $n_{\text {МК }}$ and $n_{\text {Хмк }}$ 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:
(9) $\quad \hat{K}_{X M i}=\hat{d}_{X M K} * \hat{N}_{M K i}$

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

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 $i$

[^5]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.

## 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 $i\left(=\hat{K}_{L U i}\right)$.
$\hat{M}_{S M K_{i}}=$ 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 $(L), \operatorname{marked}(M)$ 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 $i$
$\hat{M}_{\text {SURi }}=$ 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:

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

## 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:

$$
\begin{align*}
& S E(\hat{\theta})=\sqrt{\operatorname{var}(\hat{\theta})}  \tag{15}\\
& C V(\hat{\theta})=[\operatorname{SE}(\hat{\theta}) / \hat{\theta}] * 100  \tag{16}\\
& C I=\hat{\theta} \pm 1.96 * S E(\hat{\theta}) \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

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 (CWT) recovery data collected during dockside sampling activities in the June 2012 recreational mark-selective Chinook fishery in Washington coastal Marine Areas 1, 2, 3 and 4.

| Area | Recovery Date | Tag Code | Brood Year | Release Site | RearingHatchery | Release Agency | DIT codes | $\begin{gathered} \text { FL } \\ (\mathrm{cm}) \end{gathered}$ | Label | Recovery Mark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6/8/2013 | 68768 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 60 | 17590 | AD |
| 1 | 6/9/2013 | 635280 | 2009 | COLUMBIA NEAR WELLS | WELLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 67 | 17001 | AD |
| 1 | 6/9/2013 | 55378 | 2010 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 62 | 17002 | AD |
| 1 | 6/9/2013 | 635087 | 2009 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 73 | 17003 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 635598 | 2010 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 59 | 7703 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 220315 | 2009 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 68 | 7704 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 68769 | 2010 | AMERICAN R @ SUNRISE | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 65 | 7705 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 64 | 7706 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 62 | 7707 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 68752 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 59 | 17005 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 220321 | 2010 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 60 | 17006 | AD |
| 1 | 6/12/2013 | 635579 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 64 | 17007 | AD |
| 1 | 6/13/2013 | 90390 | 2009 | MCKENZIE R 1 | MCKENZIE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 75 | 3335 | AD |
| 1 | 6/13/2013 | 68769 | 2010 | AMERICAN R @ SUNRISE | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 70 | 3336 | AD |
| 1 | 6/13/2013 | 68757 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 61 | 3337 | AD |
| 1 | 6/14/2013 | 68768 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 71 | 3338 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 90324 | 2009 | SPRINGS CR 36.0114 | RINGOLD SPRINGS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 73 | 3339 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635372 | 2009 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON ACCLIMATION POND | WDFW |  | 74 | 3340 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635273 | 2010 | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | WDFW |  | 58 | 3341 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635095 | 2008 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON ACCLIMATION POND | WDFW |  | 86 | 3342 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 72 | 3343 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 70 | 3344 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635088 | 2009 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN RIVER NP | WDFW |  | 76 | 3345 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 90348 | 2009 | CLACKAMAS R | CLACKAMAS HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 77 | 3346 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 55387 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 64 | 3347 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 55394 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 65 | 3348 | AD |


| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68769 | 2010 | AMERICAN R @ SUNRISE | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 3349 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68767 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 65 | 3350 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635097 | 2008 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 74 | 3351 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 3352 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635774 | 2010 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN FALLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 45 | 3353 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 220120 | 2010 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 64 | 3354 | UM |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 3355 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68767 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 66 | 3356 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 55437 | 2011 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 64 | 7022 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635699 | 2010 | COL R @ PRIEST RAPIDS | PRIEST RAPIDS HATCHERY | WDFW | $\begin{gathered} 635764,635766, \\ 635970,635973, \\ 635974 \end{gathered}$ | 69 | 7708 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 70 | 7709 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 75 | 7711 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68747 | 2010 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 7712 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 62 | 7713 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 65 | 7714 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635577 | 2009 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 66 | 17008 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 90475 | 2010 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R) | SANDY HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 56 | 17009 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635979 | 2010 | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | KLICKITAT HATCHERY (YKFP) | YAKA |  | 68 | 17010 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 66 | 17011 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635196 | 2009 | KALAMA R 27.0002 | KALAMA FALLS HATCHRY | WDFW |  | 73 | 17012 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 220322 | 2010 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 55 | 17013 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 634875 | 2008 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 79 | 17014 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 64 | 17015 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635371 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 63 | 17016 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 635694 | 2010 | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | WDFW |  | 60 | 17017 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 63 | 17018 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 68 | 17019 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 55395 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 63 | 17020 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68770 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 68 | 17021 | AD |


| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 220316 | 2009 | SNAKER @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 67 | 17023 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS |  | 74 | 17301 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 90356 | 2009 | UMATILLA R | BONNEVILLE HATCHERY | ODFW | 090355 | 66 | 17302 | AD |
| 1 | 6/15/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 17303 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 220206 | 2010 | MAGRUDOR CORRIDOR | NPT HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 66 | 3357 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 90486 | 2010 | TANNER CR (BNVILLE) | BONNEVILLE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 74 | 3358 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68769 | 2010 | AMERICAN R @ SUNRISE | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 64 | 3359 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 55395 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 72 | 3360 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635999 | 2010 | GRANDE RONDE R 1 | IRRIGON HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 61 | 3361 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 64 | 3362 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635997 | 2010 | COUSE CR 35.2147 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 64 | 3363 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 220322 | 2010 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 56 | 3364 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68674 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 61 | 3365 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 55380 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 64 | 3366 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635179 | 2008 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 85 | 7715 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 55370 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 68 | 7716 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68752 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 66 | 7717 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635578 | 2009 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 68 | 7718 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 70 | 7719 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 55390 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 72 | 7720 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 55371 | 2010 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 61 | 7721 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68763 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 67 | 7722 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68752 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 69 | 7723 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 90441 | 2010 | KLASKANINE R S FK | KLASKANINE S FK POND | ODFW |  | 63 | 7724 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68770 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 70 | 7725 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635087 | 2009 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 63 | 17024 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635699 | 2010 | COL R @ PRIEST RAPIDS | PRIEST RAPIDS HATCHERY | WDFW | $\begin{gathered} \hline 635764,635766, \\ 635970,635973, \\ 635974 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 57 | 17025 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635897 | 2010 | LEWIS R - NF 27.0168 | NA | WDFW |  | 58 | 17026 | AD |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 635375 | 2009 | COLUMBIA NEAR WELLS | WELLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 77 | 17028 | AD |


| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68767 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW | 69 | 17029 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6/16/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 84 | 17308 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 93939 | 2010 | NESTUCCA R | CEDAR CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 61 | 3367 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 61 | 3368 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 58 | 3369 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 55373 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS | 69 | 3370 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 65 | 3371 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 63 | 3372 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 65 | 3373 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 58 | 3374 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 61 | 7727 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 220320 | 2010 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP | 56 | 7728 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 58 | 7729 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 55371 | 2010 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | COLEMAN NFH | FWS | 72 | 17030 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68674 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 65 | 17031 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68752 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 67 | 17032 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68752 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 66 | 17304 | AD |
| 1 | 6/17/2013 | 68763 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW | 68 | 17305 | AD |
| 1 | 6/18/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS | 68 | 17033 | AD |
| 1 | 6/18/2013 | 635579 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW | 75 | 17591 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 220117 | 2010 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP | 63 | 2919 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 220208 | 2010 | LUKE'S GULCH A F | NPT HATCHERY | NEZP | 71 | 2920 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 68763 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW | 67 | 2921 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 636080 | 2010 | LYONS FERRY REL.SITE | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW | 56 | 3375 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 220209 | 2010 | NPT HATCHERY | NPT HATCHERY | NEZP | 60 | 3377 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 635272 | 2009 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW | 76 | 17034 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 68762 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW | 67 | 17035 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 635179 | 2008 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW | 74 | 17036 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 68709 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW | 77 | 17037 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 68693 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL OP JRSY | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW | 72 | 17038 | AD |


| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 17039 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 220117 | 2010 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 64 | 17040 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 636080 | 2010 | LYONS FERRY RELSITE | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 58 | 17041 | AD |
| 1 | 6/21/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 77 | 17043 | AD |
| 2 | 6/8/2013 | 635097 | 2008 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 87 | 3941 | AD |
| 2 | 6/8/2013 | 635510 | 2009 | SNAKE L MON - LTL GOOS | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 57 | 3942 | AD |
| 2 | 6/8/2013 | 635271 | 2009 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 76 | 19201 | AD |
| 2 | 6/8/2013 | 55405 | 2010 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | FWS | 055406 | 71 | 31879 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 635577 | 2009 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 10995 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 55371 | 2010 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 75 | 19202 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 68767 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 71 | 19203 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 68748 | 2010 | FEATHER BOYDS PUMP RAMP | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 66 | 19204 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 55374 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 75 | 19205 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 635578 | 2009 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 63 | 19206 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 66 | 19207 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 68770 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 68 | 31880 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 635767 | 2010 | PURDY CR 16.0005 | GEORGE ADAMS HATCHRY | WDFW | 635768 | 73 | 31881 | AD |
| 2 | 6/9/2013 | 69503 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 62 | 31882 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 635578 | 2009 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 73 | 10996 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 635998 | 2010 | SNAKE L MON - LTL GOOS | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 62 | 10997 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 63 | 10998 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 220321 | 2010 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 56 | 10999 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS |  | 84 | 11000 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 90436 | 2010 | UMATILLA R | UMATILLA HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 61 | 19208 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 635998 | 2010 | SNAKE L MON - LTL GOOS | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 65 | 19209 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 181592 | 2010 | CHILLIWACK R | H-Chilliwack River H | CDFO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 181679,181584, \\ & 181588,181590 \end{aligned}$ | 71 | 19210 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 63 | 19212 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 220121 | 2010 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 56 | 19213 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 634875 | 2008 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 87 | 19214 | AD |


| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 55442 | 2011 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 63 | 31831 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 55372 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 66 | 31832 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 220121 | 2010 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 66 | 31833 | AD |
| 2 | 6/12/2013 | 100153 | 2010 | SNAKE @ HLLS CNYON DM | OXBOW HATCHERY | IDFG |  | 68 | 31835 | AD |
| 2 | 6/13/2013 | 634875 | 2008 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 86 | 19401 | AD |
| 2 | 6/13/2013 | 220119 | 2010 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 60 | 31162 | AD |
| 2 | 6/13/2013 | 55527 | 2011 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | FWS | $\begin{gathered} \hline 055399,055404, \\ 055528 \end{gathered}$ | 54 | 31163 | AD |
| 2 | 6/13/2013 | 220119 | 2010 | CAPTAIN JOHNS PD | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 64 | 31701 | AD |
| 2 | 6/13/2013 | 635579 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 76 | 31837 | AD |
| 2 | 6/14/2013 | 68714 | 2009 | IRON GATE HATCHERY | IRON GATE HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 74 | 19215 | AD |
| 2 | 6/14/2013 | 68755 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 65 | 19216 | AD |
| 2 | 6/14/2013 | 635371 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 73 | 19217 | AD |
| 2 | 6/14/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 83 | 31164 | AD |
| 2 | 6/14/2013 | 635775 | 2010 | COLUMBIA NEAR WELLS | WELLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 62 | 31165 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 63 | 3843 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 220208 | 2010 | LUKE'S GULCH A F | NPT HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 61 | 19220 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 55405 | 2010 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | FWS | 055406 | 78 | 19221 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS |  | 80 | 19402 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 79 | 19403 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 62 | 31166 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 635095 | 2008 | METHOW R 48.0002 | CARLTON ACCLIMATION POND | WDFW |  | 82 | 31167 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 181590 | 2010 | CHILLIWACK R | H-Chilliwack River H | CDFO | $\begin{aligned} & 181679,181584, \\ & 181592,181588 \end{aligned}$ | 73 | 31702 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 71 | 31838 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 68709 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 65 | 31839 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 90245 | 2008 | UMATILLA R | BONNEVILLE HATCHERY | ODFW | 090246 | 85 | 31841 | AD |
| 2 | 6/15/2013 | 68047 | 2010 | TIBURON NET PENS | PETALUMA R UNITED ANG HAT | TYEE |  | 56 | 38140 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 68768 | 2010 | SAC R @ DISCOVERY PARK | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 75 | 16001 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 635273 | 2010 | COWLITZ R 26.0002 | COWLITZ SALMON HATCH | WDFW |  | 57 | 16003 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 635579 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 70 | 16004 | AD |


| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 636080 | 2010 | LYONS FERRY REL SITE | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 60 | 16005 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 68755 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 63 | 16006 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 67 | 16008 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 55392 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 71 | 19222 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 220206 | 2010 | MAGRUDOR CORRIDOR | NPT HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 71 | 19223 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 635371 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 73 | 19404 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 68753 | 2010 | SANTA CRUZ HARBOR NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 73 | 19405 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 90566 | 2011 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | $\begin{gathered} \hline 090583,090582, \\ 090567 \end{gathered}$ | 56 | 19406 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 181588 | 2010 | CHILLIWACK R | H-Chilliwack River H | CDFO | $\begin{aligned} & 181679,181584, \\ & 181592,181590 \end{aligned}$ | 73 | 19407 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 55373 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 68 | 19408 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 68709 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 68 | 31168 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 68770 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 70 | 31169 | AD |
| 2 | 6/16/2013 | 635997 | 2010 | COUSE CR 35.2147 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 65 | 31842 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 635187 | 2009 | FALLERT CR 27.0017 | FALLERT CR HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 69 | 16009 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 181386 | 2010 | SHUSWAP R LOW | H-Shuswap River, Middle, | CDFO |  | 82 | 19409 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 635776 | 2010 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 57 | 19410 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 220316 | 2009 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 75 | 19411 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 635371 | 2009 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 58 | 31703 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 635177 | 2008 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN RIVER NP | WDFW |  | 79 | 31704 | AD |
| 2 | 6/17/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 78 | 31705 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 69505 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL OP JRSY | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 62 | 16010 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 55405 | 2010 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | FWS | 055406 | 71 | 19224 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 90390 | 2009 | MCKENZIE R 1 | MCKENZIE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 79 | 19225 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 635178 | 2008 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN RIVER NP | WDFW |  | 73 | 19226 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 635364 | 2009 | COLUMBIA NEAR WELLS | WELLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 72 | 19227 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 635997 | 2010 | COUSE CR 35.2147 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 74 | 19228 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 635774 | 2010 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN FALLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 55 | 19230 | AD |
| 2 | 6/18/2013 | 635098 | 2008 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 84 | 31708 | AD |
| 2 | 6/20/2013 | 55390 | 2010 | COLEMAN NFH | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 70 | 19231 | AD |


| 2 | 6/20/2013 | 90347 | 2009 | CEDAR CR \#1 (SANDY R) | SANDY HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 73 | 31170 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 6/20/2013 | 634875 | 2008 | SIMILKAMEEN R 490325 | SIMILKAMEEN HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 86 | 31171 | AD |
| 2 | 6/20/2013 | 635088 | 2009 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN RIVER NP | WDFW |  | 74 | 31843 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 220117 | 2010 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 68 | 16501 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 181370 | 2010 | SHUSWAP R MIDDLE | H-Shuswap River, Middle, | CDFO |  | 76 | 16502 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 220208 | 2010 | LUKE'S GULCH A F | NPT HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 69 | 16503 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 90437 | 2010 | BIG CR (LWR COL R) | BIG CR HATCHERY | ODFW | 090366 | 73 | 19232 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 635291 | 2009 | FINCH CR 16.0222 | HOODSPORT HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 74 | 19233 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 55405 | 2010 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | FWS | 055406 | 75 | 19234 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 220117 | 2010 | BIG CANYON ACCL POND | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 64 | 19235 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 68750 | 2010 | SAN PABLO BAY NET PENS | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 62 | 31709 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 68756 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 65 | 31710 | AD |
| 2 | 6/22/2013 | 635774 | 2010 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN FALLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 64 | 31711 | AD |
| 3 | 6/22/2013 | 181585 | 2010 | SHUSWAP R LOW | H-Shuswap River, Middle, | CDFO |  | 70 | 8330 | AD |
| 3 | 6/22/2013 | 68756 | 2010 | SAN JOAQ SHRM ISL NET PEN | MOK R FISH INS | CDFW |  | 74 | 8331 | AD |
| 3 | 6/22/2013 | 220121 | 2010 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 69 | 8332 | AD |
| 3 | 6/23/2013 | 68680 | 2009 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | NIMBUS FISH HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 81 | 8334 | AD |
| 3 | 6/23/2013 | 220122 | 2010 | SNAKE R @ PITT LNDG | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | NEZP |  | 79 | 8335 | AD |
| 3 | 6/23/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 60 | 8336 | AD |
| 3 | 6/23/2013 | 635097 | 2008 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 70 | 8337 | AD |
| 3 | 6/23/2013 | 68751 | 2010 | WICKLAND OIL NET PEN | FEATHER R HATCHERY | CDFW |  | 66 | 8338 | AD |
| 3 | 6/28/2013 | 181473 | 2010 | HARRISON R | H-Chehalis River H | CDFO |  | 66 | 3402 | AD |
| 4 | 5/17/2013 | 635092 | 2008 | COLUMBIA NEAR WELLS | WELLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 89 | 2801 | AD |
| 4 | 5/17/2013 | 635164 | 2008 | COL R @ TURTLE ROCK | TURTLE ROCK HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 83 | 2802 | AD |
| 4 | 5/17/2013 | 54596 | 2009 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS | $\begin{gathered} 053577,054595, \\ 054597 \end{gathered}$ | 68 | 2803 | AD |
| 4 | 5/17/2013 | 210912 | 2009 | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | GROVERS CR HATCHERY | SUQ | 635089 | 61 | 3141 | AD |
| 4 | 5/18/2013 | 635264 | 2009 | JOHN CR 16.0253 | RFEG 6 HOOD CANAL | WREG |  | 75 | 31258 | AD |
| 4 | 6/22/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS |  | 79 | 2751 | AD |
| 4 | 6/22/2013 | 54278 | 2009 | SPRING CR 29.0159 | SPRING CR NFH | FWS | 054283 | 85 | 2804 | AD |


| 4 | 6/22/2013 | 55378 | 2010 | MARE ISLAND NET PEN | COLEMAN NFH | FWS |  | 73 | 2806 | AD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 6/22/2013 | 181470 | 2010 | HARRISON R | H-Chehalis River H | CDFO |  | 57 | 31259 | AD |
| 4 | 6/22/2013 | 635683 | 2010 | NOOKSACK R - NF 01.0120 | KENDALL CR HATCHERY | WDFW | 635682 | 66 | 71874 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS |  | 60 | 3144 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 90486 | 2010 | TANNER CR (BNVILLE) | BONNEVILLE HATCHERY | ODFW |  | 61 | 3145 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 635291 | 2009 | FINCH CR 16.0222 | HOODSPORT HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 69 | 8652 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 635686 | 2010 | CHELAN R 47.0052 | CHELAN FALLS HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 68 | 8653 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 635768 | 2010 | PURDY CR 16.0005 | GEORGE ADAMS HATCHRY | WDFW | 635767 | 61 | 8654 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 635288 | 2009 | VOIGHT CR TR 10.0428 | VOIGHTS CR HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 69 | 8655 | AD |
| 4 | 6/23/2013 | 54595 | 2009 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS | $\begin{gathered} \hline 053577,054596, \\ 054597 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 82 | 19601 | AD |
| 4 | 6/25/2013 | 210973 | 2010 | GORST CR 15.0216 | GORST CR REARING PND | SUQ |  | 59 | 8656 | AD |
| 4 | 6/25/2013 | 635776 | 2010 | WENATCHEE R 45.0030 | DRYDEN POND | WDFW |  | 52 | 9231 | AD |
| 4 | 6/28/2013 | 54590 | 2010 | LTL WHITE SALMON @ NFH | LTL WHITE SALMON NFH | FWS |  | 78 | 3156 | AD |
| 4 | 6/28/2013 | 636069 | 2010 | EAST SOUND BAY (SAN) | GLENWOOD SPRINGS | COOP |  | 58 | 19602 | AD |
| 4 | 6/28/2013 | 210972 | 2010 | GORST CR 15.0216 | GORST CR REARING PND | SUQ |  | 68 | 31260 | AD |
| 4 | 6/28/2013 | 635997 | 2010 | COUSE CR 35.2147 | LYONS FERRY HATCHERY | WDFW |  | 61 | 31261 | AD |


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

[^2]:    ${ }^{1 /}$ 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.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1 /}$ Chinook encounters of unknown size and/or unknown mark status were excluded in determining the overall size/mark status composition based on VTR data.

[^4]:    ${ }^{2}$ 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.
    ${ }^{3}$ 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.

[^5]:    ${ }^{4}$ 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 $\hat{d}_{X Y K}$.

