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## PREFACE

The chinook annex of the 1999 PSC Agreement mandates that the Chinook Technical Committee (CTC) use estimates of total mortality to assess the impacts of fishery regulations in PSC fisheries. The current methodology uses landed catch for establishing quota values and harvest sharing between the parties. This project is focused on development of information necessary to create a new model for fishery regulation analysis. The objectives of the study reflect the requirement for the CTC to produce new estimates of stock impacts which include all sources of mortality. The goals of this project are to estimate the number of chinook salmon released and stock composition of all encountered chinook salmon in the Washington ocean and Puget Sound troll and sport fisheries.

Principal Investigators:
James Packer, Fish Management Program, Olympia, Washington Doug Milward, Fish Management Program, Olympia, Washington

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted 2006 recreational and commercial troll fisheries for all salmon species in the area between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S./Canada border. Mark-selective fisheries for coho were included in all four Catch Record Card areas (Areas 1, 2, 3, and 4) for both recreational and commercial fisheries.

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 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) implemented a monitoring plan to test some of these assumptions through dockside catch and effort sampling along with on-water observations of the fisheries in progress. Both dockside and on-water sampling included collection of DNA tissue samples from chinook.

## 2. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the CTC-sponsored portion of this project are: first, to estimate the number of legal and sublegal sized chinook salmon encountered during the Washington non-treaty ocean troll and recreational fisheries such that all estimates will fall within $\pm 30 \%$ of the true value $90 \%$ of the time and, second, to collect genetic material (DNA tissue samples) from sublegal and legal sized chinook to estimate the stock composition by age.

The objectives of the mark-selective coho fishery monitoring portion of this project are to test some of the assumptions used during the process of modeling ocean fisheries, specifically to determine coho mark rates by area and month, to determine compliance with selective fishery regulations, to estimate incidental mortality, and to compare release information collected dockside with observed release data.

## 3. SEASON DESCRIPTION

### 3.1 Ocean Recreational Fisheries

Area 1: The ocean recreational fishery from Cape Falcon, Oregon to Leadbetter Point, Washington and west of the Buoy 10 line at the Columbia River mouth was open for all salmon species Sunday through Thursday from July 3 through August 10, and seven days per week from August 11 to September 30, for a total of 80 fishing days. A two salmon daily bag limit only one of which could be a chinook was initially in effect; beginning August 11, the bag limit was two salmon. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The Columbia Control Zone was closed; additionally, the area between Cape Falcon and Tillamook Head was closed between August 1 and August 25.

Area 2: The ocean recreational fishery from Leadbetter Point to the Queets River was open for all salmon species Sunday through Thursday from July 3 to August 10, and seven days per week from August 11 to September 17, for a total of 67 fishing days. A two salmon daily bag limit was initially in effect, only one of which could be a chinook; between August 11 and September 17, the bag limit was two salmon. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The Grays Harbor Control Zone was closed beginning August 1.

Area 3: The ocean recreational fishery from the Queets River to Cape Alava was open for all salmon species Tuesday through Saturday from June 30 through August 10, and seven days per week from August 11 through September 17. From September 23 to October 8, salmon fishing was restricted to the part of Area 3 north of $47^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ north latitude and south of $48^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ north latitude, seven days per week. A total of 84 fishing days were available in Area 3. A two salmon daily bag limit was initially in effect, only one of which could be a chinook; between August 11 and October 8, the bag limit was two salmon. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip.

Area 4: The ocean recreational fishery from Cape Alava to the U.S./Canada border was open for all salmon species Tuesday through Saturday from June 30 through August 10, and seven days per week from August 11 through September 17, for a total of 68 fishing days. A two salmon daily bag limit was initially in effect, only one of which could be a chinook; between August 11 and September 17, the bag limit was two salmon. No chum retention was allowed from August 1 through September 17. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. Chinook retention east of the Bonilla-Tatoosh line was allowed from June 30 through July 31 only.

### 3.2 Non-Treaty Commercial Troll Fisheries

The non-treaty troll fishery was open from Cape Falcon, Oregon to the U.S./Canada border May 1-2, May 6-9, May 13-16, May 20-23, May 27-30, June 3-6, June 10-13 and June 27-30 for all salmon except coho (a total of 30 days). The fishery reopened from Cape Falcon to the U.S./Canada border July 15-18, July 22-25, July 29-August 1, August 5-7, August 12-14, August 19-22, August 26-29, September 2-5, and September 8-15 for all salmon species except no chum retention north of Cape Alava, WA in August and September. A total of 38 fishing days were available.

## 4. METHODS

Direct on-water observation of salmon encounters was the primary method used to estimate the encounter ratios of legal to sublegal sized chinook, marked to unmarked coho, and drop-offs, and to collect DNA samples from sublegal chinook. Observers from WDFW rode along on charter boats, and samplers worked from WDFW test-fishing boats to collect encounter rate data from the recreational fisheries. These observers 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, and size class (legal or sublegal). Recreational anglers were also solicited to use voluntary trip reports while fishing to record the above information.

Observers from WDFW also rode aboard commercial vessels participating in the non-treaty troll fishery. This effort was coordinated with the CTC-sponsored study for treaty troll encounters conducted by Makah tribal biologists. Observers aboard non-treaty trollers recorded the same information as recreational fishery observers.

A sampling protocol was established for both the charter and troll 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, and result of each hook-up aboard the vessel. This allows estimation of legal to sublegal chinook encounter ratios, marked to unmarked coho encounter ratios, 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 sublegal sized chinook. DNA from sublegal sized chinook was prioritized above that from legal sized chinook since legal sized fish were available on the dock as well as at sea. The third priority was to collect DNA, lengths, and scale samples from legal sized chinook.

Dockside samplers were placed in the four major landing ports for the ocean fisheries: Neah Bay, La Push, Westport, and Ilwaco (including the port of Chinook). Each port was sampled a minimum of 4 to 5 days per week, with weekend and weekday days stratified. 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, which should provide weekly estimates of catch by species and mark status with CVs no higher than 5\%. 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.

For the genetic stock identification portion of this study, a target of 300 chinook genetic tissue samples per stratum with accompanying scale samples was set. The stratum was defined as week, port, and gear type. This should result in approximately 100 samples per age for the most abundant brood year ages, 3 and 4 . The stratum may be redefined during or after the season depending on the size of the fishery and the success of obtaining samples.

## 5. RESULTS

### 5.1 Recreational Catch and Effort

In Catch Record Card Area 1, a total of 31,270 anglers harvested 24,812 coho (68 percent of the 36,600 coho quota) and 2,274 chinook. In Area 2, a total of 24,541 anglers harvested 8,779 coho ( 34 percent of the 25,603 coho quota) and 5,815 chinook. In Area 3 , a total of 4,143 anglers harvested 1,884 coho ( 61 percent of the 3,079 coho quota) and 1,670 chinook. In Area 4, a total of 13,409 anglers harvested 6,023 coho ( 85 percent of
the 7,058 coho quota) and 1,417 chinook. Table 1 shows estimated total recreational landed coho and chinook catch by month for the catch areas north of Cape Falcon.

### 5.2 Non-Treaty Troll Catch Landed in Washington

A total of 74 coho and 2,124 chinook harvested in Area 1 during the non-treaty troll fishery were landed in Washington State ports. From Area 2, catches landed in Washington totaled 184 coho and 2,557 chinook. A total of 766 coho and 7,877 chinook were harvested in Area 3 and landed in Washington, while Area 4 catches totaled 241 coho and 4,211 chinook. Total catches north of Cape Falcon (landed in both Washington and Oregon) were 2,679 coho ( 39 percent of the 6,800 coho quota) and 27,258 chinook ( 80 percent of the 34,000 chinook quota). Table 2 shows estimated total non-treaty commercial troll landed coho and chinook catch by month for the catch areas north of Cape Falcon.

### 5.3 Legal and Sublegal Sized Chinook Encountered

The numbers of legal and sublegal sized chinook salmon encountered by observers in the ocean fisheries are shown in Table 3.

During the recreational fisheries, in Area 1, ride-along samplers on charter boats observed 94 chinook encountered; of those, 38 were legal sized and 56 were sublegal sized, resulting in a sublegal sized rate of $60 \%$, compared with $27 \%$ in 2005. In Area 2, ride-along samplers on charter boats observed 110 chinook encountered; of those, 101 were legal sized and 9 were sublegal sized, resulting in a sublegal sized rate of $8 \%$, compared with $22 \%$ in 2005. In Areas 3 and 4 (combined for chinook in this report since the FRAM chinook model combines those areas), observers on charter boats and WDFW test fishers encountered 52 chinook, of which 17 were legal sized and 35 were sublegal sized, for a sublegal sized rate of $67 \%$ compared with $14 \%$ in 2005.

During the non-treaty troll fisheries, on-board observers were present on vessels in Areas 2, 3, and 4. In Area 2, ride-along samplers observed 232 chinook; of those, 157 were legal sized and 75 were sublegal sized, resulting in a sublegal sized rate of $32 \%$, compared with $36 \%$ in 2005. In Areas 3 and 4, ride-along samplers observed 1,089 chinook; of those, 431 were legal sized and 658 were sublegal sized, for a sublegal sized rate of $42 \%$, compared with $38 \%$ in 2005 (table 3).

### 5.4 Mark Rates in Selective Fisheries

Tables 4 and 5 show the mark rates of legal sized coho and chinook, respectively, encountered in the ocean recreational fisheries.

In Area 1, a total of 688 coho encounters were observed aboard chartered fishing vessels; of these encounters, 425 coho were adipose fin clipped. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $65 \%$, while the mark rates by month were $69 \%$ in July, $63 \%$ in August, and $33 \%$ in September (Table 4). For chinook, a total of 38 encounters were observed; 11 of these were
adipose fin clipped. The overall observed chinook mark rate was $31 \%$ through the season (Table 5). Dockside landings indicated a chinook mark rate of $9 \%$ through the season.

In Area 2, a total of 293 coho encounters were observed aboard chartered fishing vessels; 157 of these were adipose fin clipped. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $55 \%$, while the mark rates by month were $56 \%$ in July, $46 \%$ in August, and $70 \%$ in September (Table 4). For chinook, a total of 100 encounters were observed; 15 of these were adipose fin clipped. The overall observed chinook mark rate was $16 \%$ through the season (Table 5). Dockside landings indicated a chinook mark rate of $8 \%$ through the season.

No onboard observer data were collected from the recreational fishery in Area 3. Dockside interviews indicated a coho mark rate of $43 \%$; dockside examination of landed chinook indicate a chinook mark rate of $7 \%$.

In Area 4, a total of 141 coho were encountered; 55 of these were adipose fin clipped. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $40 \%$. The number of coho encountered in June, July, and September was insufficient to assess mark rate by month (Table 4). For chinook, a total of 17 encounters were observed; 3 were adipose fin clipped (Table 5). Chinook mark rates through the season were $18 \%$ based on observer data and $17 \%$ based on dockside interview data.

Tables 6 and 7 show the mark rates of legal sized coho and chinook, respectively, encountered in the ocean non-treaty troll fisheries. The number of coho encountered during on-board observation was not sufficient to assess monthly mark rates with confidence; however, observed overall coho mark rates through the season were $30 \%$ in Area 3 and $37 \%$ in Area 4.

On-board observation indicated an overall chinook mark rate of 27\% in Area 2 through the season, compared with $26 \%$ seen dockside. In Areas 3 and 4, overall chinook mark rates were calculated at $20 \%$ based on observer data, and $17 \%$ based on dockside data through the season.

### 5.5 Chinook to Coho Ratios

Table 8 shows observed ratios of encountered chinook to coho by month in the ocean recreational fisheries. Based on the on-board observation data, 0.13 chinook were encountered per coho in Area 1, 0.37 chinook were encountered per coho in Area 2, and 0.34 chinook per coho were encountered in Area 4.

Table 9 shows observed ratios of encountered chinook to coho by month in the non-treaty troll fisheries. During the May-June chinook-directed fishery, the chinook to coho ratios were estimated at 1.15, 6.10, and 29.00 chinook per coho in Areas 2, 3, and 4, respectively. During the summer all-species fishery, chinook to coho encounter ratios were 2.18 in Area 2, 1.69 in Area 3, and 2.67 in Area 4.

### 5.6 Comparison of Pre-season and Post-season Estimates of Mark Rates

Pre-season projections of 2006 coho mark rates were estimated using the Fishery Regulation Assessment Model (FRAM). The FRAM uses inputs of pre-season run size projections and historic coded wire tag recovery data to predict the resulting impacts from a proposed fishery. FRAM model run 0619 was the final pre-season assessment of the PFMC's adopted fishery package for the 2006 ocean fisheries.

Table 10 compares the coho mark rates projected by the FRAM model with those observed through on-water monitoring by month and area for the recreational fisheries. In all areas, the observed coho mark rate was very similar to the projected mark rate. The observed coho mark rate for the season in the Area 1 recreational selective fishery was $65 \%$ compared to $69 \%$ projected pre-season. The observed coho mark rate for the season in the Area 2 recreational selective fishery was $55 \%$ compared to $57 \%$ projected pre-season, and the observed coho mark rate in the Area 4 selective fishery was $40 \%$ compared to $45 \%$ projected pre-season.

Table 11 compares the projected and observed coho mark rates for the non-treaty troll fisheries for areas with sufficient numbers of encountered coho observed. Observation data showed actual coho mark rates consistently lower than pre-season projections. The observed coho mark rate in the Area 3 non-treaty troll fishery was $30 \%$ compared to the projected rate of $44 \%$, while in Area 4 , the observed coho mark rate was $37 \%$ compared to $43 \%$ projected preseason.

### 5.7 Comparison of Dockside and Observer Data in Recreational Selective Fisheries

Observation data during recreational selective coho fisheries were collected in part to investigate potential bias in estimates of coho mark rates based on angler recollection of released coho. Table 12 compares coho release rates based on dockside interview data with those release rates computed through on-board observation data.

Relative to estimates of released salmon from observation data, information collected at the dock showed a bias towards higher numbers of salmon released where comparisons are possible (Areas 1 and 2). This is consistent with data from previous years. Dockside sampling data from Area 1 showed an overall coho release rate of $48 \%$ compared to a rate of $36 \%$ observed on the water; in Area 2, the release rate reported dockside was $53 \%$, compared with a release rate of $47 \%$ observed on the water.

### 5.8 Compliance

Information on compliance with selective regulations was collected through both dockside sampling by the WDFW sampling program and enforcement activities conducted by WDFW Enforcement staff.

Compliance with the selective fishery regulations in the recreational fisheries was high for both private and charter vessels. In Area 1, $48 \%$ of the total estimated coho landed by the recreational fishery were sampled dockside by the Ocean Sampling Program; the observed compliance rate in this area was $99.8 \%$. In Area 2, $44 \%$ of the total estimated
coho landed by the recreational fishery were sampled dockside; a compliance rate of $98.9 \%$ was observed during the selective coho fishery. In Area 3, 66\% of the total estimated coho landed by the recreational fishery were sampled; the observed compliance rate was $98.3 \%$. In Area 4, 36\% were sampled dockside; a compliance rate of $98.2 \%$ was observed. Table 13 reports compliance rates observed by dockside samplers for the recreational fisheries by area and month. These rates are similar to the compliance rates observed in the last three seasons.

The WDFW Enforcement Program monitored compliance with selective fishery regulations in the recreational fisheries coastwide. Enforcement staff estimated compliance regarding the possession of unmarked coho at $99.5 \%$ in Area 1, 99.6\% in Area 2, 100\% in Area 3, and 98.2\% in Area 4.

During the non-treaty troll fisheries, a total of 614 coho ( $49 \%$ of the total coho landed in Washington) were examined dockside by WDFW sampling staff. These samplers encountered 1 unmarked coho in the landed catch, for a compliance rate of $99.8 \%$.

### 5.9 Drop Off Rates

On-water observers were asked to record information on fish that were hooked but lost before being brought to the boat, commonly referred to as drop offs. For this study, the definition of drop off was that the fish was actually hooked but became free before it could be landed. This definition calls for some judgment on the part of the observers recording the data, resulting in potential bias.

Current Council methodology for estimating mortality due to drop off uses a rate of 5\% of the total number of fish handled (retention plus release). Drop-off mortality rates for the recreational fisheries throughout the season estimated from on-water observation data were $1 \%$ in all areas. Estimates of drop off mortality rates from on-water observation data collected during the recreational fisheries are compared with FRAM projections in Table 14.

### 5.10 Estimated Mortality

Table 15 shows the FRAM pre-season projections of total coho mortality in the ocean recreational fisheries. Estimates of actual coho mortality in these fisheries are shown in Table 16. This analysis uses estimates of coho mark rates from on-water sampling where available to estimate total coho released. Estimates of incidental mortality are calculated using rates adopted by the Council for recreational fisheries (5\% drop off mortality and $14 \%$ hooking mortality).

In Area 1, incidental mortality is estimated at 4,053 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 24,812 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 1 selective fishery at 28,865 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 42,420 coho.

Incidental coho mortality in Area 2 is estimated at 2,071 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 8,779 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 2 fishery at 10,850 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 33,660 coho.

In Area 3, incidental mortality is estimated at 499 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 1,884 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 3 selective fishery at 2,382 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 2,553 coho.

Incidental coho mortality in Area 4 is estimated at 1,683 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 6,023 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 4 selective fishery at 7,706 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 13,281 coho.

### 5.11 DNA Samples

Table 17 shows the number of chinook DNA samples collected by month, area, size class, and sampling type (on-board or dockside) from the ocean recreational fisheries. A total of 43 sublegal and 291 legal sized chinook were DNA sampled in Area 1. In Area 2, 9 DNA samples were collected from sublegal sized chinook and 534 samples were collected from legal sized chinook. From Area 3, no DNA samples were collected from sublegal sized chinook, and 291 samples were collected from legal sized chinook. In Area 4, 5 DNA samples were collected from sublegal sized chinook, and 218 samples were collected from legal sized chinook.

The number of chinook DNA samples collected by month, area, size class, and sampling type from the non-treaty troll fisheries is shown in Table 18. Onboard observers in Area 2 collected DNA from a total of 75 sublegal sized chinook, while a total of 608 legal sized chinook were sampled. From Area 3, a total of 388 DNA samples from sublegal sized chinook and 1,005 from legal sized chinook were collected. In Area 4, DNA samples were collected from 135 sublegal sized chinook and from 743 legal sized chinook. In most areas for both the recreational and non-treaty troll fisheries, the number of DNA samples was reduced from 2005 due to significantly lower availability of chinook.

Baseline data for stock composition estimates are currently being collected and analyzed. The DNA samples collected in this project will be archived and held for future analysis when the baseline database is complete.

Table 1. Chinook and coho catch by month from the 2006 recreational fishery between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | CHINOOK |  |  |  |  |  | COHO |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June | July | August | September | October | TOTAL | June | July | August | September | October | TOTAL |
| Area 1 | - | 478 | 1,148 | 140 | - | 1,765 | - | 6,533 | 12,222 | 646 | - | 19,401 |
| Area 2 | - | 2,293 | 3,125 | 398 | - | 5,815 | - | 2,008 | 5,675 | 1,096 | - | 8,779 |
| Area 3 | 36 | 247 | 955 | 342 | 91 | 1,670 | 36 | 744 | 1,041 | 61 | 2 | 1,884 |
| Area 4 | 166 | 734 | 443 | 73 | - | 1,417 | 380 | 3,763 | 1,570 | 309 | - | 6,023 |
| TOTAL WA | 202 | 3,751 | 5,670 | 953 | 91 | 10,667 | 416 | 13,047 | 20,509 | 2,112 | 2 | 36,087 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | - | 81 | 370 | 58 | - | 509 | - | 1,616 | 3,560 | 235 | - | 5,411 |
| TOTAL NOF | 202 | 3,832 | 6,040 | 1,011 | 91 | 11,176 | 416 | 14,663 | 24,069 | 2,347 | 2 | 41,498 |

Table 2. Chinook and coho catch by month from the 2006 non-treaty troll fishery between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.-Canada border.

|  | CHINOOK |  |  |  |  |  | COHO |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | May | June | July | August | September | TOTAL | July | August | September | TOTAL |
| Area 1 | 1,746 | 364 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 2,124 | 7 | 29 | 38 | 74 |
| Area 2 | 1,578 | 632 | 120 | 138 | 89 | 2,557 | 10 | 59 | 115 | 184 |
| Area 3 | 723 | 2,371 | 844 | 2,658 | 1,281 | 7,877 | 100 | 551 | 115 | 766 |
| Area 4 | 2,434 | 545 | 109 | 662 | 461 | 4,211 | 12 | 206 | 23 | 241 |
| TOTAL WA | 6,481 | 3,912 | 1,073 | 3,459 | 1,844 | 16,769 | 129 | 845 | 291 | 1,265 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 7,167 | 3,168 | 1 | 61 | 92 | 10,489 | 10 | 1,182 | 222 | 1,414 |
| TOTAL NOF | 13,648 | 7,080 | 1,074 | 3,520 | 1,936 | 27,258 | 139 | 2,027 | 513 | 2,679 |

Table 3: On-board chinook encounters by size class in the 2006 ocean recreational and non-treaty troll fisheries.

|  | RECREATIONAL FISHERY |  |  |  |  |  | NON-TREATY TROLL FISHERY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statistical | Area 1 |  | Area 2 |  | Area 3/4 |  | Area 2 |  | Area 3/4 |  |
| Month | Legal | Sublegal | Legal | Sublegal | Legal | Sublegal | Legal | Sublegal | Legal | Sublegal |
| May | - | - | - | - | - | - | 92 | 24 | 97 | 155 |
| June | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | 44 | 48 | 184 | 248 |
| July | 21 | 28 | 36 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 6 |
| August | 12 | 24 | 47 | 4 | 12 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 132 | 249 |
| September | 5 | 4 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 38 | 56 | 101 | 9 | 17 | 35 | 157 | 75 | 431 | 658 |

Table 4. Mark rates of legal-sized coho encountered by on-board observers in the 2006 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Total Coho <br> Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Mark Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 428 | 281 | 126 | 21 | $69 \%$ |
|  | August | 222 | 133 | 78 | 11 | $63 \%$ |
|  | September | 38 | 11 | 22 | 5 | $33 \%$ |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{6 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 2 | July | 86 | 48 | 37 | 1 | $56 \%$ |
|  | August | 146 | 66 | 76 | 4 | $46 \%$ |
|  | September | 61 | 43 | 18 | 0 | $70 \%$ |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{2 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 4 | July | 11 | 5 | 3 | 3 | N/A |
|  | August | 121 | 46 | 74 | 1 | $38 \%$ |
|  | September | 9 | 4 | 5 | 0 | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 2}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 \%}$ |

Table 5. Mark rates of legal-sized chinook encountered by on-board observers in the 2006 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Total Chinook <br> Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Mark Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 21 | 7 | 14 | 0 | $33 \%$ |
|  | August | 14 | 4 | 8 | 2 | $33 \%$ |
|  | September | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 2 | July | 44 | 11 | 29 | 4 | $28 \%$ |
|  | August | 44 | 3 | 38 | 3 | $7 \%$ |
|  | September | 12 | 1 | 11 |  | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 4 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | July | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | $20 \%$ |
|  | August | 12 | 2 | 10 | 0 | $17 \%$ |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8} \%$ |

Table 6. Mark rates of legal-sized coho encountered by on-board observers in the 2006 ocean non-treaty troll fisheries.

|  |  | Total Coho <br> Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Mark Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | July | 7 | 3 | 4 | 0 | N/A |
|  | August | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | N/A |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | N/A |
| Area 3 | July |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | August | 32 | 11 | 21 | 0 | $34 \%$ |
|  | September | 57 | 15 | 41 | 1 | $27 \%$ |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  |  | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ |
|  | July |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | August | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | N/A |
|  | September | 73 | 27 | 46 | 0 | $37 \%$ |
|  | TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  |  | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ |

Table 7. Mark rates of legal-sized chinook encountered by on-board observers in the 2006 ocean non-treaty troll fisheries.

|  |  | Total Chinook <br> Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Unknown | Mark Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | May | 106 | 30 | 72 | 4 | $29 \%$ |
|  | June | 29 | 6 | 23 | 0 | $21 \%$ |
|  | July | 12 | 2 | 10 | 0 | N/A |
|  | August | 9 | 3 | 4 | 2 | N/A |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 3/4 | May | 119 | 15 | 94 | 10 | $14 \%$ |
|  | June | 162 | 35 | 120 | 7 | $23 \%$ |
|  | July | 23 | 6 | 14 | 3 | $30 \%$ |
|  | August | 127 | 22 | 94 | 11 | $19 \%$ |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | TOTAL | $\mathbf{4 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0} \%$ |

Table 8. Numbers of chinook and coho encountered by on-board observers in the 2006 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Total Chinook <br> Encountered | Total Coho <br> Encountered | Chinook per <br> Coho Ratio |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 50 | 465 | 0.11 |
|  | August | 40 | 226 | 0.18 |
|  | September | 5 | 38 | 0.13 |
|  | TOTAL | 95 | $\mathbf{7 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 3}$ |
| Area 2 | July |  |  |  |
|  | August | 46 | 96 | 0.48 |
|  | September | 52 | 155 | 0.34 |
|  | TOTAL | 18 | 65 | 0.28 |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 7}$ |
| Area 4 | July |  |  |  |
|  | August | 8 | 8 | 1.00 |
|  | September | 45 | 136 | 0.33 |
|  | TOTAL | 1 | 16 | 0.06 |
|  |  | $\mathbf{5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 4}$ |

Table 9. Numbers of chinook and coho encountered by on-board observers in the 2006 ocean non-treaty troll fisheries.

|  |  | Total Chinook Encountered | Total Coho Encountered | Chinook per Coho Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 2 | May | 146 | 97 | 1.51 |
|  | June | 62 | 84 | 0.74 |
|  | Spring Total | 208 | 181 | 1.15 |
|  | July | 12 | 8 | 1.50 |
|  | August | 12 | 3 | 4.00 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | Summer Total | 24 | 11 | 2.18 |
| Area 3 | May | 234 | 31 | 7.55 |
|  | June | 394 | 72 | 5.47 |
|  | Spring Total | 628 | 103 | 6.10 |
|  | July | 40 | 38 | 1.05 |
|  | August | 143 | 70 | 2.04 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | Summer Total | 183 | 108 | 1.69 |
| Area 4 | May | 58 | 2 | 29.00 |
|  | June | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | Spring Total | 58 | 2 | 29.00 |
|  | July | 0 | 2 | N/A |
|  | August | 222 | 81 | 2.74 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | N/A |
|  | Summer Total | 222 | 83 | 2.67 |

Table 10. Mark rates of legal sized coho encountered during on-board observation in the 2006 ocean recreational fisheries compared with the FRAM preseason projected mark rates.

|  |  | Total Coho <br> Encountered | Observed Mark <br> Rate | Projected Mark <br> Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 428 | $69 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
|  | Aug. | 222 | $63 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 38 | $33 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
|  | Total | 688 | $65 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 2 | July | 86 | $56 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
|  | Aug. | 146 | $46 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 61 | $70 \%$ | $63 \%$ |
|  | Total | 293 | $55 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 4 | July | 11 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $46 \%$ |
|  | Aug. | 121 | $38 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 9 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $46 \%$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 4 1}$ | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ |

Table 11. Mark rates of legal sized coho encountered during on-board observation in the 2006 ocean non-treaty troll fisheries compared with the FRAM preseason projected mark rates.

|  |  | Total Coho <br> Encountered | Observed Mark <br> Rate | Projected Mark <br> Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 3 | July | 32 | $34 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
|  | Aug. | 57 | $27 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 0 | N/A | $42 \%$ |
|  | Total | 89 | $30 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Area 4 | July |  |  |  |
|  | Aug. | 2 | N/A | $40 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 73 | $37 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
|  | Total | 0 | N/A | $46 \%$ |
|  |  | 75 | $37 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ |

Table 12. Comparison of coho release rates observed on-water and reported through dockside interviews in the 2006 ocean recreation fisheries.

|  |  | On-Board Observation |  |  | Dockside Interview |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Coho Retained | Coho Released | Release Rate a/ | Coho Retained | Coho Released | Release Rate |
| Area 1 | July | 276 | 136 | 33\% | 5,283 | 4,434 | 46\% |
|  | August | 130 | 73 | 36\% | 5,523 | 5,287 | 49\% |
|  | September | 10 | 20 | 67\% | 1,123 | 1,126 | 50\% |
|  | Total | 416 | 229 | 36\% | 11,929 | 10,847 | 48\% |
| Area 2 | July | 46 | 41 | 47\% | 1,142 | 1,228 | 52\% |
|  | August | 66 | 79 | 54\% | 1,938 | 2,258 | 54\% |
|  | September | 45 | 18 | 29\% | 776 | 908 | 54\% |
|  | Total | 157 | 138 | 47\% | 3,856 | 4,394 | 53\% |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | 33 | 59 | 64\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | 568 | 1,098 | 66\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | 592 | 1,401 | 70\% |
|  | September | - | - | - | 54 | 109 | 67\% |
|  | October | - | - | - | 2 | 29 | 94\% |
|  | Total | - | - | - | 1,249 | 2,696 | 68\% |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | 80 | 130 | 62\% |
|  | July | 5 | 3 | N/A | 1,373 | 2,323 | 63\% |
|  | August | 45 | 81 | N/A | 461 | 1,013 | 69\% |
|  | September | 4 | 12 | N/A | 261 | 781 | 75\% |
|  | Total | 54 | 96 | N/A | 2,175 | 4,247 | 66\% |

a/ A release rate for Area 4 is unavailable from on-board observer data since much of the data was collected from test fishers who were required to release all catch.

Table 13. Compliance with coho selective fishery regulations observed through dockside port sampling interviews in the 2006 ocean recreation fisheries.

|  |  | Total Coho <br> Sampled | Marked Coho <br> Sampled | Unmarked Coho <br> Sampled | \% Sampled <br> Coho Marked |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 5,283 | 5,271 | 12 | $99.8 \%$ |
|  | August | 5,523 | 5,515 | 8 | $99.9 \%$ |
|  | September | 1,123 | 1,115 | 8 | $99.3 \%$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 1 , 9 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 9 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 8 \%}$ |
| Area 2 | July |  |  |  |  |
|  | August | 1,142 | 1,127 | 15 | $98.7 \%$ |
|  | September | 1,938 | 1,920 | 18 | $99.1 \%$ |
|  | Total | 776 | 768 | 8 | $99.0 \%$ |
|  |  | $\mathbf{3 , 8 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 8 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 . 9 \%}$ |
| Area 3 | June |  |  |  |  |
|  | July | 33 | 32 | 1 | $97.0 \%$ |
|  | August | 568 | 562 | 6 | $98.9 \%$ |
|  | September | 592 | 585 | 7 | $98.8 \%$ |
|  | October | 54 | 47 | 7 | $87.0 \%$ |
|  | Total | 2 | 2 | 0 | $100.0 \%$ |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1 , 2 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 . 3 \%}$ |
| Area 4 | June |  |  |  |  |
|  | July | 80 | 77 | 3 | $96.3 \%$ |
|  | August | 1373 | 1,367 | 6 | $99.6 \%$ |
|  | September | 461 | 439 | 22 | $95.2 \%$ |
|  | Total | 261 | 253 | 8 | $96.9 \%$ |
|  |  | $\mathbf{2 , 1 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 . 2 \%}$ |

Table 14. Estimated drop off mortality in the 2006 ocean recreational fisheries using on-water observation data.

|  |  | Total <br> Salmon <br> Handled | Observed <br> Drop Offs | Estimated <br> Observed Drop <br> Off Mortality a/ | FRAM Total <br> Drop Off <br> Mortality b/ | Observed Drop <br> Off Mortality <br> Rate c/ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 457 | 58 | 5 | 23 | $1.0 \%$ |
|  | August | 236 | 30 | 2 | 12 | $1.0 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 34 | 9 | 1 | 2 | $2.1 \%$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{7 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 \%}$ |
| Area 2 | July | 129 | 33 | 3 |  |  |
|  | August | 191 | 23 | 2 | 6 | $2.0 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 78 | 5 | 0 | 10 | $1.0 \%$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | 4 | $0.5 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2 \%}$ |
| Area 4 | June | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |
|  | July | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | $16.0 \%$ |
|  | August | 166 | 15 | 1 | 1 | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | Sept. | 17 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{8}$ | $0.7 \%$ |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 1 | $0.0 \%$ |

a/ Assume 8\% hooking mortality rate on observed drop offs.
b/ Total drop off mortality calculated using FRAM methodology ( $5 \%$ of handled fish).
c/ Estimated drop off mortality/Total salmon handled; 5\% used by FRAM pre-season.

Table 15. Preseason FRAM (model run 0619) projected coho mortality in the 2006 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Total Retention | Marked Retention | Marked <br> Release <br> Mortality | Unmarked Retention | Unmarked Release Mortality | Total handled a/ | Predicted Mark Rate | Drop Off Mortality b/ | Release Mortality c/ | Incidental Mortality d/ | Total Mortality e/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | July | 19,311 | 19,132 | 171 | 179 | 1,228 | 29,300 | 70\% | 1,465 | 1,399 | 2,864 | 22,175 |
|  | August | 17,289 | 17,087 | 153 | 202 | 1,388 | 28,291 | 68\% | 1,415 | 1,541 | 2,956 | 20,245 |
|  | Sept. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 36,600 | 36,219 | 324 | 381 | 2,616 | 57,591 | 69\% | 2,880 | 2,940 | 5,820 | 42,420 |
| Area 2 | July | 7,183 | 7,062 | 63 | 121 | 831 | 13,573 | 55\% | 679 | 894 | 1,573 | 8,756 |
|  | August | 15,000 | 14,742 | 132 | 258 | 1,770 | 28,582 | 58\% | 1,429 | 1,902 | 3,331 | 18,331 |
|  | Sept. | 5,420 | 5,332 | 48 | 88 | 602 | 10,058 | 63\% | 503 | 650 | 1,153 | 6,573 |
|  | Total | 27,603 | 27,136 | 243 | 467 | 3,203 | 52,213 | 57\% | 2,611 | 3,446 | 6,057 | 33,660 |
| Area 3 | June | 87 | 85 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 198 | 47\% | 10 | 16 | 26 | 113 |
|  | July | 692 | 673 | 6 | 19 | 133 | 1,684 | 42\% | 84 | 139 | 223 | 915 |
|  | August | 955 | 934 | 8 | 21 | 142 | 2,032 | 52\% | 102 | 150 | 252 | 1,207 |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 206 | 195 | 2 | 11 | 73 | 743 | 31\% | 37 | 75 | 112 | 318 |
|  | Total | 1,940 | 1,887 | 17 | 53 | 363 | 4,657 | 49\% | 233 | 380 | 613 | 2,553 |
| Area 4 | June | 573 | 547 | 5 | 26 | 175 | 1,861 | 31\% | 93 | 180 | 273 | 846 |
|  | July | 6,464 | 6,304 | 56 | 160 | 1,100 | 14,727 | 46\% | 736 | 1,156 | 1,892 | 8,356 |
|  | August | 3,021 | 2,927 | 26 | 94 | 642 | 7,790 | 42\% | 390 | 668 | 1,058 | 4,079 |
|  | Sept. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 10,058 | 9,778 | 87 | 280 | 1,917 | 24,378 | 45\% | 1,219 | 2,004 | 3,223 | 13,281 |

a/ Marked handled + Unmarked handled.
b/ $5 \%$ of total handled.
c/ Marked release mortality + unmarked release mortality.
d/ Drop off + Release mortality.
e/ Total retention + Incidental mortality.

Table 16. Estimated Actual Coho Mortality in the 2006 Ocean Recreational Fisheries.

a/ Marked handled + Unmarked handled.
b/ Observed mark rates in Area 3 and in Area 4 June, July, and September assumed from preseason projections.
c/ $5 \%$ of total handled.
d/ 14\% of unmarked released.
e/ Drop off + Release mortality.
$\mathrm{f} /$ Total retention + Incidental mortality.

Table 17. Number of chinook DNA samples collected from the ocean recreational fishery by size class and sample type.

|  |  | On-Board Sampling |  | Dockside Sampling Legal Sized | Total Number of DNA Samples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Sublegal Sized | Legal Sized |  |  |
| Area 1 | July | 21 | 21 | 124 | 166 |
|  | August | 21 | 12 | 69 | 102 |
|  | September | 1 | 3 | 62 | 66 |
|  | Total | 43 | 36 | 255 | 334 |
| Area 2 | July | 2 | 35 | 305 | 342 |
|  | August | 4 | 41 | 112 | 157 |
|  | September | 3 | 12 | 29 | 44 |
|  | Total | 9 | 88 | 446 | 543 |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | 4 | 4 |
|  | July | - | - | 88 | 88 |
|  | August | - | - | 97 | 97 |
|  | September | - | - | 56 | 56 |
|  | October | - | - | 46 | 46 |
|  | Total | - | - | 291 | 291 |
| Area 4 | July | 1 | 4 | 8 | 13 |
|  | August | 4 | 11 | 127 | 142 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 68 | 68 |
|  | Total | 5 | 15 | 203 | 223 |

Table 18. Number of chinook DNA samples collected from the non-treaty troll fishery by size class and sample type.

|  | On-Board Sampling |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sublegal Sized |  |  | Legal Sized | Dockside Sampling |
| :---: |
| Legal Sized |$\quad$| Total Number of |
| :---: |
| DNA Samples |

