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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) adopted 2009 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. For the eleventh consecutive year, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) implemented a monitoring plan to test some of these assumptions through dockside catch and effort sampling and 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 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.

The objectives of the Chinook DNA portion of this project are to estimate the number of legal and sublegal-sized Chinook salmon encountered during the Washington recreational fisheries and, to collect genetic material (DNA tissue samples) from sublegal and legalsized Chinook to estimate the stock composition by age. In 2009, WDFW was funded only for dockside DNA data collection from the spring non-Treaty troll fishery in CRC Areas 2-4. However, as time allowed, DNA data were collected from the CRC Area 1 spring non-Treaty troll fishery, and from the summer non-Treaty troll and sport fisheries in all catch areas as well.

## 3. SEASON DESCRIPTION

### 3.1 Ocean Recreational Fisheries

CRC Area 1: The ocean recreational fishery in Area 1 was open for all salmon species seven days per week from June 28 through August 31 and from September 7 through September 30. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, was in effect through July 30; the bag limit was modified to two salmon on July 31. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The Columbia Control Zone was closed. A total of 89 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 2: The ocean recreational fishery from Leadbetter Point to the Queets River was open for all salmon species Sunday through Thursday from June 28 to July 23, and seven days per week from July 24 to September 20. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, plus one additional pink salmon was in effect through July 30; the bag limit was modified to two salmon plus one additional pink salmon on July 31. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. The Grays Harbor Control Zone was closed beginning August 1. A total of 79 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 3: The ocean recreational fishery from the Queets River to Cape Alava was open for all salmon species Tuesday through Saturday from June 27 through July 17, and seven days per week from July 18 through September 20. From September 26 to October 11 , salmon fishing was restricted to the part of Area 3 north of $47^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ north latitude and south of $48^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ north latitude, seven days per week. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, plus two additional pink salmon was in effect through July 30; the bag limit was modified to two salmon plus two additional pink salmon on July 31. All retained coho were required to have a healed adipose fin clip. A total of 96 fishing days were available in the area.

CRC Area 4: The ocean recreational fishery from Cape Alava to the U.S./Canada border was open for all salmon species Tuesday through Saturday from June 27 through July 17, and seven days per week from July 18 through September 20. A daily bag limit of two salmon, one of which could be a Chinook, plus two additional pink salmon was in effect through July 30; the bag limit was modified to two salmon plus two additional pink salmon on July 31. 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 80 fishing days were available in the area.

### 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 1-5, May 8-12, May 16-19, May 23-26, May 30-June 2, June 6-9, June 13-16, June 20-23, and June 27-30 for all salmon except coho (a total of 38 days). The fishery reopened from Cape Falcon to the U.S./Canada border July 1-7, July 11-14, July 18-21, July 25-28, August 1-4, August 8-11, August 15-18, August 22-25, August 29-September 1 , September 5-8, and September 12-15 for all salmon species except no chum retention north of Cape Alava, WA in August and September. A total of 47 fishing days were available during the summer fishery.

## 4. METHODS

Direct on-water observation of salmon encounters was the primary method used in CRC Areas 1 and 2 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 in the recreational fishery. Observers from WDFW rode along on charter vessels 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). As time allowed, samplers also solicited recreational anglers to complete Voluntary Trip Reports (VTRs) while fishing to record the above information.

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. 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.

Due to the lack of availability of charter vessels fishing in CRC Areas 3 and 4, the primary method used to gather selective fishery encounter statistics from these areas was VTRs. Samplers in Areas 3 and 4 were stationed in port beginning at 5:00 AM four or five days per week. These samplers approached anglers as they prepared to depart for fishing, explained the purpose of the VTR and how to complete it, and encouraged anglers to record all encounters and return the form to a dockside sampler at the end of the day. Drop boxes were also provided in the ports, as was the option for postage-paid mail-in. The VTR was designed to capture information identical to that collected by on-board observers.

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). The recreational fisheries in each port were 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 salmon 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 as time allowed.

The Pacific Salmon Commission's Chinook Technical Committee (CTC) funded dockside DNA data collection from the May-June non-Treaty troll fishery in the area north of Leadbetter Point (CRC Areas 2-4). No funding was available for dockside DNA data collection in CRC Area 1, for summer fishery DNA sampling, or for onboard observers. However, dockside samplers collected DNA samples from landed Chinook in all fisheries and areas as time allowed.

## 5. RESULTS

### 5.1 Recreational Catch and Effort

In CRC Area 1, a total of 54,431 anglers (42,181 Washington, 12,250 Oregon) harvested 83,811 coho ( 64,392 WA, 19,419 OR; 87 percent of the 96,500 revised coho quota) and 5,182 Chinook (4,202 WA, 980 OR). In Area 2, a total of 37,831 anglers harvested 53,868 coho ( 97 percent of the 55,270 revised coho quota) and 5,023 Chinook. In Area 3, a total of 5,077 anglers harvested 6,896 coho ( 85 percent of the 8,080 coho quota) and 680 Chinook. In Area 4, a total of 16,471 anglers harvested 13,336 coho (83 percent of the 16,100 revised coho quota) and 2,447 Chinook. Total catches north of Cape Falcon were 157,912 coho ( $90 \%$ of the revised coastwide quota of 175,950 ) and 13,331 Chinook ( $65 \%$ of the coastwide Chinook quota of 20,500 ). Table 1 shows estimated total recreational effort and landed coho and Chinook catch by month for the catch areas north of Cape Falcon.

### 5.2 Non-Treaty Troll Catch

A total of 2,254 coho and 261 Chinook harvested in Area 1 during the non-Treaty troll fishery were landed in Washington State ports; an additional 12,688 coho and 712 Chinook were landed by Oregon-licensed trollers into Oregon State ports. From Area 2, catches landed in Washington totaled 10,060 coho and 8,132 Chinook. A total of 7,157 coho and 2,722 Chinook were harvested in Area 3 and landed in Washington, while Area 4 catches totaled 584 coho and 1,201 Chinook. Total catches north of Cape Falcon (landed in both Washington and Oregon) were 32,743 coho ( 97 percent of the 33,600 coho quota) and 13,028 Chinook ( 64 percent of the 20,500 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 marked and unmarked Chinook salmon encountered in the ocean recreational fisheries are shown in Table 3.

In Area 1, ride-along samplers on charter boats observed 108 Chinook encountered; of those, 25 were legal-sized and 83 were sublegal-sized, resulting in a sublegal-sized rate of $77 \%$, compared with $45 \%$ in 2008. A total of 43 Chinook were recorded from Area 1 on VTRs; 10 were legalsized and 33 were sublegal-sized, resulting in a sublegal-sized rate of $77 \%$, identical to that observed by WDFW ride-along staff.

In Area 2, ride-along samplers on charter boats observed 159 Chinook encountered; of those, 53 were legal-sized and 106 were sublegal-sized, resulting in a sublegal-sized rate of $67 \%$, compared with $15 \%$ in 2008. A total of 65 Chinook were recorded from Area 2 on VTRs; 35 were legal-sized and 30 were sublegal-sized, resulting in a sublegal-sized rate of $46 \%$.

In Area 3, VTRs recorded 142 total Chinook encounters; 37 were legal-sized and 105 were sublegal-sized. The resulting sublegal-sized rate was $74 \%$.

In Area 4, a total of 496 Chinook were recorded on VTRs; 150 were legal-sized and 346 were sublegal-sized. The resulting sublegal-sized rate was $70 \%$.

### 5.4 Mark Rates of Legal-sized Chinook

Table 4 shows observed mark rates of legal-sized Chinook in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries. The table compares mark rates recorded by on-board observers, in VTRs, and by dockside samplers.

In Area 1, ride-along samplers on charter boats observed 25 legal-sized Chinook and saw a legalsized mark rate of $60 \%$ over the season. Ten legal-sized Chinook were recorded on VTRs, with a mark rate of $40 \%$. Dockside samplers examined 1,802 legal-sized Chinook and observed a mark rate of $67 \%$ through the season.

Ride-along samplers in Area 2 observed 53 legal-sized Chinook and a mark rate of $47 \%$. Encounters of legal-sized Chinook on VTRs totaled 35, with a mark rate of 54\%. Dockside samplers examined 1,628 legal-sized Chinook and observed a mark rate of $60 \%$ through the season.

In Area 3, both VTRs and dockside sampling indicated a legal-sized Chinook mark rate of $49 \%$. A total of 37 legal-sized Chinook encounters were recorded on VTRs, and 447 legal-sized Chinook were examined dockside.

In Area 4, 150 legal-sized Chinook were recorded on VTRs with a mark rate of $57 \%$. Dockside samplers examined a total of 911 Chinook and observed a mark rate of $58 \%$.

### 5.5 Chinook to Coho Ratios

Table 5 shows observed ratios of encountered Chinook to coho by month in the ocean recreational fisheries. The table includes Chinook and coho encounters (retained and released) of all size class and mark status categories, and compares data collected on-board, from VTRs, and through dockside interviews and observation.

On-board observation showed a rate of 0.15 Chinook encountered per coho in Area 1, compared to 0.39 in 2008. VTR data indicated a rate of 0.25 Chinook encountered per coho, while dockside sampling indicated a rate of 0.16 Chinook encountered per coho.

In Area 2, on-board observers saw 0.13 Chinook encountered per coho, compared to 0.56 in 2008. VTR data indicated a rate of 0.17 Chinook encountered per coho, while dockside sampling indicated a rate of 0.10 Chinook encountered per coho.

In Area 3, VTR data indicated a rate of 0.12 Chinook encountered per coho. Dockside sampling showed a similar rate of 0.11 Chinook encountered per coho.

In Area 4, anglers recorded a rate of 0.23 Chinook encountered per coho on VTRs. Dockside sampling showed a similar rate of 0.22 Chinook encountered per coho.

### 5.6 Coho Mark Rates

Table 6 shows the mark rates of legal-sized coho observed in the ocean recreational fisheries by onboard observers and from VTRs, and based on dockside interview data.

In Area 1, a total of 722 coho encounters were observed aboard chartered fishing vessels; of these encounters, 446 coho were marked. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $62 \%$, while the mark rates by month were $63 \%$ in July and $60 \%$ in August. Voluntary trip reports indicated an overall coho mark rate of $59 \%$ through the season.

In Area 2, a total of 1,301 coho encounters were observed aboard chartered fishing vessels; 706 of these were marked. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $54 \%$, while the mark rates by month were $55 \%$ in June, $55 \%$ in July, $56 \%$ in August, and $50 \%$ in September. Voluntary trip reports indicated an overall coho mark rate of $50 \%$ through the season.

In Area 3, a total of 1,101 coho encounters were recorded on VTRs; 525 of these coho were marked. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $48 \%$, while the mark rates by month were $33 \%$ in June, $42 \%$ in July, $55 \%$ in August, and $50 \%$ in September.

In Area 4, a total of 2,129 coho encounters were recorded on VTRs; 834 of these coho were marked. The overall coho mark rate through the season was $39 \%$, while the mark rates by month were $41 \%$ in July, $37 \%$ in August, and $39 \%$ in September.

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

Pre-season projections of 2009 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 0921 was the final pre-season assessment of the PFMC's adopted fishery package for the 2009 ocean fisheries.

Table 7 compares the coho mark rates projected by the FRAM model with those observed through on-water monitoring and through dockside interviews by month and area for the recreational fisheries. The observed coho mark rate for the season in the Area 1 recreational selective fishery was $62 \%$ compared to $72 \%$ projected pre-season. The observed coho mark rate for the season in the Area 2 recreational selective fishery was $54 \%$ compared to $67 \%$ projected pre-season. Based on VTRs, the observed coho mark rate in Area 3 was $48 \%$ compared to $60 \%$ projected pre-season. In Area 4, the observed coho mark rate based on VTRs was $39 \%$ compared to $57 \%$ projected pre-season.

### 5.8 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 and release rates based on angler recollection of released coho. Table 7 compares coho mark rates based on dockside interview data with those seen during on-board observation and reported on VTRs. Table 8 compares coho release rates based on dockside interview data with release rates computed through on-board observation data and VTRs.

Information collected by samplers dockside showed a bias towards lower coho mark rates and higher numbers of salmon released in all areas. This is consistent with results from previous years.

Dockside sampling data from Area 1 showed an overall coho mark rate of $55 \%$ compared with $62 \%$ observed on-water; the release rate reported dockside was $47 \%$ compared to a rate of $42 \%$ observed on the water. In Area 2, an overall coho mark rate of $49 \%$ was reported dockside compared with $54 \%$ observed on-water; the release rate reported dockside was $52 \%$, compared with a release rate of $47 \%$ observed on the water. In Area 3, an overall coho mark rate of $38 \%$ was reported dockside, compared with a mark rate of $48 \%$ indicated by VTR data; the release rate reported dockside was $64 \%$ compared to a rate of $54 \%$ observed on VTRs. In Area 4, dockside sampling data indicated an overall coho mark rate of $33 \%$ compared with $39 \%$ observed on VTRs; the release rate reported dockside was $70 \%$ compared to a rate of $65 \%$ indicted by VTRs.

### 5.9 Comparison of Mark Rates in Recreational Selective Fisheries and Non-Selective Treaty Troll Fisheries

The Chinook and coho mark rates observed dockside in the non-selective 2009 Treaty troll fishery are shown in table 9. While fishing regulations, size limits, and areas fished can differ between the Treaty troll fishery and the selective ocean recreational fishery, comparing mark rates in the two fisheries may offer additional insight into the possibility of comparing mark rates in adjacent non-selective fisheries to mark rate data collected during mark selective fisheries.

The mark rates observed in landed coho from the Treaty troll fishery were $42 \%$ and $43 \%$ in Areas 3 and 4 respectively. This compares to VTR observed mark rates in the recreational fishery of $48 \%$ and $39 \%$ respectively.

The Chinook mark rate observed from dockside sampling in Area 4 in the Treaty troll fishery was $50 \%$, slightly lower than that reported by recreational VTRs (57\%).

### 5.10 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, $44 \%$ of the total estimated coho landed in Washington by the recreational fishery were sampled dockside by the Ocean Sampling Program; the observed compliance rate in this area was $99.7 \%$. In Area 2, 32\% of the total estimated coho landed by the recreational fishery were sampled dockside; a compliance rate of $99.4 \%$ 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 $99.6 \%$. In Area 4, 39\% were sampled dockside; a compliance rate of $97.9 \%$ was observed. Table 10 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 six seasons.

The WDFW Enforcement Program monitored compliance with selective fishery regulations in the recreational fisheries coastwide. The enforcement selective fishery compliance report was not available at print time for this report, but in past years, dockside sampling compliance data and enforcement compliance data have shown close correlation.

During the non-Treaty troll fisheries, a total of 7,338 coho ( $37 \%$ of the total coho landed in Washington) were examined dockside by WDFW sampling staff. These samplers encountered 18 unmarked coho in the landed catch, for a compliance rate of $99.8 \%$.

### 5.11 Drop Off Rates

On-water observers and volunteer anglers were asked to record information on fish that were hooked but lost before being brought to the boat, commonly referred to as drop offs. For this study, the definition of drop off was that the fish was actually hooked but became free before it could be landed. 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 and VTR data ranged from $0.8 \%$ in Area 3 to $4.9 \%$ in Area 1. Estimates of drop off mortality rates from on-water observation and VTR data collected during the recreational fisheries are compared with FRAM projections in Table 11.

### 5.12 Estimated Mortality

Table 12 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 13. This analysis uses estimates of coho mark rates from on-water sampling or VTRs 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 15,358 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 83,811 puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 1 selective fishery at 99,169 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 100,453 coho.

Incidental coho mortality in Area 2 is estimated at 11,860 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 53,868 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 2 fishery at 65,728 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 75,598 coho.

In Area 3, incidental mortality is estimated at 1,673 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 6,896 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 3 selective fishery at 8,403 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 5,455 coho.

Incidental coho mortality in Area 4 is estimated at 4,838 which, when combined with a total coho retention of 13,336 , puts the estimate of total coho mortality in the Area 4 selective fishery at 18,174 . This compares to a pre-season projected total mortality of 22,184 coho.

In-season adjustments in sub-Area coho quotas make comparisons between area-specific pre-season FRAM projections of total mortality with post-season estimates of total mortality difficult. Coho are routinely transferred at an impact-neutral rate on stocks of concern between sub-Area quotas in-season to extend season length for consistency between sub-Areas.

In 2009, a total of 8,300 coho were transferred into the Area 1 quota from Area 2; the resulting impact-neutral reduction to the Area 2 quota was 8,750 coho. Another 1,250 coho were transferred from the Area 2 to Area 3 quota, and a total of 2,250 coho were transferred to the Area 3 quota from Area 4.

Table 14 compares total estimated coho mortality by Area calculated using three methods:

- post-season using actual landed catch plus estimated release mortality based on observed mark rates (table 13),
- pre-season by FRAM, using pre-season sub-Area quota and mark rate assumptions (table 12), and
- post-season using adjusted sub-Area quotas as projected landed catch plus estimated release mortality based on pre-season projected mark rates (what would have been modeled by FRAM pre-season, had adjusted sub-Area quotas been in place).


### 5.13 Volume of On-Water Data Collected

Table 15 compares the number of coho encounters recorded by on-water observers and on VTRs with the total estimated number of handled coho in the Washington portion of
the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries. The number of handled coho is calculated as the total estimated number of marked and unmarked retained fish plus marked and unmarked released fish, based on observed coho mark rates.

Overall, an estimated 2\% of the total number of handled coho in Washington ocean recreational fisheries was documented by on-board observers or volunteer anglers. In Area 1, 1,033 encounters ( $1 \%$ of total handled) were recorded; in Area 2, 1,875 encounters ( $2 \%$ of total handled) were recorded. From Area 3, 1,225 encounters ( $9 \%$ of total handled) were documented, and in Area 4, 2,319 encounters (7\% of total handled) were recorded.

Table 16 compares the number of Chinook encounters recorded by on-water observers and on VTRs with the total estimated number of handled Chinook in the Washington portion of the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries. The number of handled Chinook is estimated from dockside sampling data and represents the total estimated number of retained fish plus released fish.

Overall, an estimated $3 \%$ of the total number of handled Chinook in Washington ocean recreational fisheries was documented by on-board observers or volunteer anglers. In Area 1, 177 encounters ( $1 \%$ of total handled) were recorded; in Area 2, 261 encounters ( $2 \%$ of total handled) were recorded. From Area 3, 151 encounters ( $7 \%$ of total handled) were documented, and in Area 4, 541 encounters ( $5 \%$ of total handled) were recorded.

### 5.14 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 20 sublegal and 349 legal-sized Chinook were DNA sampled in Area 1. In Area 2, 40 DNA samples were collected from sublegal-sized Chinook, and 300 samples were collected from legal-sized Chinook. From Area 3, no DNA samples were collected from sublegal-sized Chinook, and 7 samples were collected from legal-sized Chinook. In Area 4, no sublegal DNA samples were collected, but 104 legal-sized Chinook were DNA sampled.

The number of Chinook DNA samples collected by WDFW samplers by month, area, size class, and sampling type from the non-Treaty troll fisheries is shown in Table 18. As there was no onboard observer program for the troll fishery in 2009, no samples were obtained from sublegal-sized Chinook. In Area 1, DNA was collected from 33 Chinook. In Area 2, DNA from was collected from 342 Chinook. From Area 3, 1,159 Chinook were DNA sampled. In Area 4, DNA samples were collected from 345 Chinook.

Table 1. Angler trips, and chinook and coho catch by month from the 2009 recreational fishery between Cape Falcon, Oregon and the U.S.Canada border.

|  | ANGLER TRIPS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June | July | August | September | October | TOTAL |
| Area 1 | 193 | 10,271 | 30,247 | 1,470 | - | 42,181 |
| Area 2 | 777 | 10,217 | 21,238 | 5,599 | - | 37,831 |
| Area 3 | 102 | 1,462 | 2,700 | 601 | 212 | 5,077 |
| Area 4 | 225 | 6,436 | 8,608 | 1,202 | - | 16,471 |
| TOTAL WA | 1,297 | 28,386 | 62,792 | 8,872 | 212 | 101,560 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 85 | 5,698 | 6,097 | 370 | - | 12,250 |
| TOTAL NOF | 1,382 | 34,084 | 68,889 | 8,872 | 212 | 113,810 |
|  | CHINOOK |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | June | July | August | September | October | TOTAL |
| Area 1 | 10 | 925 | 3,239 | 28 | - | 4,202 |
| Area 2 | 124 | 2,080 | 2,594 | 225 | - | 5,023 |
| Area 3 | 7 | 194 | 329 | 53 | 97 | 680 |
| Area 4 | 51 | 1,277 | 1,071 | 47 | - | 2,447 |
| TOTAL WA | 192 | 4,476 | 7,233 | 353 | 97 | 12,351 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 4 | 422 | 543 | 11 | - | 980 |
| TOTAL NOF | 196 | 4,898 | 7,776 | 353 | 97 | 13,331 |
|  | COHO |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | June | July | August | September | October | TOTAL |
| Area 1 | 334 | 17,246 | 45,207 | 1,605 | - | 64,392 |
| Area 2 | 539 | 10,745 | 33,181 | 9,403 | - | 53,868 |
| Area 3 | 165 | 1,944 | 4,317 | 377 | 92 | 6,896 |
| Area 4 | 118 | 4,807 | 7,500 | 912 | - | 13,336 |
| total wa | 1,157 | 34,742 | 90,204 | 12,297 | 92 | 138,493 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 138 | 9,593 | 9,330 | 358 | - | 19,419 |
| TOTAL NOF | 1,295 | 44,335 | 99,534 | 12,297 | 92 | 157,912 |

Table 2. Chinook and coho catch by month from the 2009 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 | 146 | 49 | 20 | 46 | 0 | 261 | 587 | 1,667 | 0 | 2,254 |
| Area 2 | 3,576 | 3,111 | 955 | 405 | 85 | 8,132 | 1,933 | 5,291 | 2,836 | 10,060 |
| Area 3 | 1,372 | 523 | 522 | 272 | 33 | 2,722 | 2,466 | 3,888 | 803 | 7,157 |
| Area 4 | 597 | 461 | 138 | 3 | 2 | 1,201 | 458 | 102 | 24 | 584 |
| TOTAL WA | 5,691 | 4,144 | 1,635 | 726 | 120 | 12,316 | 5,444 | 10,948 | 3,663 | 20,055 |
| OREGON (Area 1) | 119 | 232 | 240 | 117 | 4 | 712 | 9,065 | 3,458 | 165 | 12,688 |
| TOTAL NOF | 5,810 | 4,376 | 1,875 | 843 | 124 | 13,028 | 14,509 | 14,406 | 3,828 | 32,743 |

Table 3: On-board chinook encounters by size class and mark status in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | On-board observation |  |  |  | VTRs |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LEGAL-SIZED |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED |  | LEGAL-SIZED |  | SUBLEGAL-SIZED |  |
|  |  | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | Unmarked | Marked | Unmarked |
| Area 1 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | 3 | 6 | 29 | 32 | 3 | 1 | 20 | 10 |
|  | August | 12 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 15 | 10 | 42 | 41 | 4 | 6 | 22 | 11 |
| Area 2 | June | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | 18 | 16 | 35 | 21 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 11 |
|  | August | 5 | 10 | 30 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
|  | September | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL | 25 | 28 | 73 | 33 | 19 | 16 | 12 | 18 |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | 11 | 13 | 19 | 46 |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | 7 | 5 | 8 | 30 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | TOTAL | - | - | - | - | 18 | 19 | 27 | 78 |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | 63 | 43 | 90 | 180 |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | 19 | 16 | 15 | 40 |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 |
|  | TOTAL | - | - | - | - | 86 | 64 | 119 | 227 |

Table 4. Comparison of mark rates of legal-sized chinook based on on-board observation, VTRs, and dockside sampling data in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | On-board observation |  |  |  | VTRs |  |  |  | Dockside sampling data |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Chinook Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate | Total Chinook Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate | Total Chinook Encountered | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate |
| Area 1 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 7 | 5 | 2 | 71\% |
|  | July | 9 | 3 | 6 | 33\% | 4 | 3 | 1 | 75\% | 625 | 442 | 183 | 71\% |
|  | August | 16 | 12 | 4 | 75\% | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0\% | 1,157 | 746 | 411 | 64\% |
|  | Sept | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 13 | 7 | 6 | 54\% |
|  | TOTAL | 25 | 15 | 10 | 60\% | 10 | 4 | 6 | 40\% | 1,802 | 1,200 | 602 | 67\% |
| Area 2 | June | 3 | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 71 | 41 | 30 | 58\% |
|  | July | 34 | 18 | 16 | 53\% | 20 | 7 | 13 | 35\% | 925 | 561 | 364 | 61\% |
|  | August | 15 | 5 | 10 | 33\% | 15 | 12 | 3 | 80\% | 631 | 366 | 265 | 58\% |
|  | Sept | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 72 | 44 | 28 | 61\% |
|  | TOTAL | 53 | 25 | 28 | 47\% | 35 | 19 | 16 | 54\% | 1,628 | 1,012 | 687 | 60\% |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0\% | 7 | 1 | 6 | 14\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | 24 | 11 | 13 | 46\% | 177 | 88 | 89 | 50\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | 12 | 7 | 5 | 58\% | 176 | 91 | 85 | 52\% |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 94 | 39 | 55 | 41\% |
|  | TOTAL | - | - | - | - | 37 | 18 | 19 | 49\% | 447 | 218 | 229 | 49\% |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | - | 5 | 3 | 2 | 60\% | 27 | 14 | 13 | 52\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | 106 | 63 | 43 | 59\% | 591 | 349 | 242 | 59\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | 35 | 19 | 16 | 54\% | 266 | 149 | 117 | 56\% |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | - | 4 | 1 | 3 | 25\% | 27 | 18 | 9 | 67\% |
|  | TOTAL | - | - | - | - | 150 | 86 | 64 | 57\% | 911 | 530 | 381 | 58\% |

Table 5. Total numbers of chinook and coho encountered by on-board observers, reported in VTRs, and recorded by dockside samplers during the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Onboard Observer data |  |  | VTRs |  |  | Dockside sampling data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Chinook Encountered | Total Coho Encountered | Chinook per Coho Ratio | Total Chinook Encountered | Total Coho Encountered | Chinook per Coho Ratio | Total Chinook Encountered | Total Coho Encountered | Chinook per <br> Coho Ratio |
| Area 1 | June | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 7 | 0.14 | 105 | 405 | 0.26 |
|  | July | 87 | 476 | 0.18 | 39 | 124 | 0.31 | 4156 | 22994 | 0.18 |
|  | August | 43 | 366 | 0.12 | 8 | 67 | 0.12 | 4317 | 28675 | 0.15 |
|  | Sept | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 25 | 1613 | 0.02 |
|  | TOTAL | 130 | 842 | 0.15 | 47 | 191 | 0.25 | 8,498 | 53,282 | 0.16 |
| Area 2 | June | 8 | 35 | 0.23 | 0 | 0 | - | 147 | 891 | 0.16 |
|  | July | 108 | 603 | 0.18 | 42 | 139 | 0.30 | 1906 | 9611 | 0.20 |
|  | August | 62 | 543 | 0.11 | 27 | 257 | 0.11 | 1696 | 20840 | 0.08 |
|  | Sept | 14 | 298 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | - | 169 | 6151 | 0.03 |
|  | TOTAL | 192 | 1,479 | 0.13 | 69 | 396 | 0.17 | 3,771 | 36,602 | 0.10 |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | 2 | 114 | 0.02 | 18 | 459 | 0.04 |
|  | July | - | - | - | 94 | 533 | 0.18 | 454 | 5287 | 0.09 |
|  | August | - | - | - | 54 | 557 | 0.10 | 645 | 6636 | 0.10 |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | 1 | 21 | 0.05 | 251 | 636 | 0.39 |
|  | TOTAL | - | - | - | 151 | 1,225 | 0.12 | 1,350 | 12,559 | 0.11 |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | 16 | 27 | 0.59 | 97 | 177 | 0.55 |
|  | July | - | - | - | 415 | 1,214 | 0.34 | 2277 | 7723 | 0.29 |
|  | August | - | - | - | 106 | 1,011 | 0.10 | 1215 | 7734 | 0.16 |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | 20 | 94 | 0.21 | 231 | 1790 | 0.13 |
|  | TOTAL | - | - | - | 541 | 2,319 | 0.23 | 3,723 | 17,247 | 0.22 |

Table 6. Mark rates of legal-sized coho encountered by on-board observers and from voluntary trip reports in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries.


Table 7. Mark rates of legal-sized coho encountered during on-board observation and reported by voluntary angler trip reports and during dockside sampling observation in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries compared with the FRAM pre-season projected mark rates.

|  |  | Onboard Observer Data |  |  | VTRs |  | Dockside Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Coho Encountered | Observed Mark Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projected } \\ & \text { Mark } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Total Coho Encountered | Observed Mark Rate | Marked Coho Encountered | Unmarked Coho Reported | Observed <br> Mark Rate |
| Area 1 | June | 0 |  | 76\% | 4 | N/A | 269 | 136 | 66\% |
|  | July | 406 | 63\% | 74\% | 103 | 61\% | 13,080 | 9,914 | 57\% |
|  | Aug. | 316 | 60\% | 71\% | 55 | 53\% | 15,462 | 13,213 | 54\% |
|  | Sept. | 0 | - | 69\% | 0 | - | 811 | 802 | 50\% |
|  | Total | 722 | 62\% | 72\% | 162 | 59\% | 28,542 | 23,127 | 55\% |
| Area 2 | June | 33 | 55\% | 70\% | 0 | - | 388 | 503 | 44\% |
|  | July | 526 | 55\% | 69\% | 122 | 49\% | 4,717 | 4,894 | 49\% |
|  | Aug. | 470 | 56\% | 67\% | 225 | 51\% | 10,081 | 10,759 | 48\% |
|  | Sept. | 272 | 50\% | 61\% | 0 | - | 3,012 | 3,139 | 49\% |
|  | Total | 1,301 | 54\% | 67\% | 347 | 50\% | 17,810 | 18,792 | 49\% |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | 68\% | 78 | 33\% | 151 | 308 | 33\% |
|  | July | - | - | 65\% | 498 | 42\% | 1,773 | 3,514 | 34\% |
|  | Aug. | - | - | 65\% | 505 | 55\% | 2,709 | 3,927 | 41\% |
|  | Sept. | - | - | 37\% | 20 | 50\% | 228 | 408 | 36\% |
|  | Total | - | - | 60\% | 1,101 | 48\% | 4,710 | 7,849 | 38\% |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | 49\% | 8 | N/A | 100 | 77 | 56\% |
|  | July | - | - | 60\% | 1,119 | 41\% | 2,650 | 5,073 | 34\% |
|  | Aug. | - | - | 55\% | 915 | 37\% | 2,485 | 5,249 | 32\% |
|  | Sept. | - | - | 59\% | 87 | 39\% | 513 | 1,277 | 29\% |
|  | Total | - | - | 57\% | 2,129 | 39\% | 5,648 | 11,599 | 33\% |

Table 8. Comparison of coho release rates observed on-water, from voluntary trip reports, and reported through dockside interviews in the 2009 ocean recreation fisheries.

|  |  | On-Board Observation |  |  | VTRs |  |  | Dockside Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Coho Retained | Coho Released | Release Rate | Coho Retained | Coho Released | Release Rate | Coho Retained | Coho Released | Release Rate |
| Area 1 | June | - | - | - | 3 | 2 | N/A | 252 | 153 | 38\% |
|  | July | 247 | 170 | 41\% | 62 | 41 | 40\% | 12,309 | 10,685 | 46\% |
|  | August | 184 | 142 | 44\% | 28 | 28 | 50\% | 14,963 | 13,712 | 48\% |
|  | September | - | - | - | - | - | - | 796 | 817 | 51\% |
|  | Total | 431 | 312 | 42\% | 90 | 69 | 43\% | 28,068 | 25,214 | 47\% |
| Area 2 | June | 18 | 15 | 45\% | - | - | - | 328 | 563 | 63\% |
|  | July | 286 | 248 | 46\% | 53 | 70 | 57\% | 4,597 | 5,014 | 52\% |
|  | August | 257 | 220 | 46\% | 112 | 114 | 50\% | 9,897 | 10,943 | 53\% |
|  | September | 136 | 137 | 50\% | - | - | - | 2,975 | 3,176 | 52\% |
|  | Total | 679 | 605 | 47\% | 165 | 184 | 53\% | 17,469 | 19,133 | 52\% |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | 36 | 70 | 66\% | 146 | 313 | 68\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | 209 | 299 | 59\% | 1,690 | 3,597 | 68\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | 266 | 255 | 49\% | 2,602 | 4,034 | 61\% |
|  | September | - | - | - | 10 | 11 | 52\% | 227 | 409 | 64\% |
|  | Total | - | - | - | 485 | 565 | 54\% | 4,519 | 8,040 | 64\% |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | 5 | 19 | 79\% | 67 | 110 | 62\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | 408 | 734 | 64\% | 2,288 | 5,435 | 70\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | 326 | 605 | 65\% | 2,439 | 5,295 | 68\% |
|  | September | - | - | - | 33 | 60 | 65\% | 513 | 1,277 | 71\% |
|  | Total | - | - | - | 767 | 1,399 | 65\% | 5,240 | 12,007 | 70\% |

Table 9. Mark rates of landed chinook and coho encountered by dockside Tribal samplers in the 2009 ocean Treaty troll (non-selective) fisheries.

|  |  | Chinook |  |  |  | Coho |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Chinook Examined | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate | Total Coho Examined | Marked | Unmarked | Mark <br> Rate |
| Area 3 | May | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | July | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  | August | 17 | 5 | 12 | 29\% | 524 | 219 | 305 | 42\% |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  | TOTAL | 17 | 5 | 12 | 29\% | 524 | 219 | 305 | 42\% |
| Area 4 | May | 653 | 284 | 369 | 43\% | - | - | - | - |
|  | June | 2,643 | 1,538 | 1,105 | 58\% | - | - | - | - |
|  | July | 619 | 241 | 378 | 39\% | 7,488 | 3,383 | 4,105 | 45\% |
|  | August | 1,005 | 374 | 631 | 37\% | 12,451 | 5,252 | 7,199 | 42\% |
|  | September | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  | TOTAL | 4,920 | 2,437 | 2,483 | 50\% | 19,939 | 8,635 | 11,304 | 43\% |

Table 10. Compliance with coho selective fishery regulations observed during dockside port sampling interviews in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Coho } \\ \text { Sampled } \end{gathered}$ | Marked Coho Sampled | Unmarked Coho Sampled | \% Sampled Coho Marked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | June | 252 | 251 | 1 | 99.6\% |
|  | July | 12,309 | 12,273 | 36 | 99.7\% |
|  | August | 14,963 | 14,913 | 50 | 99.7\% |
|  | September | 796 | 796 | 0 | 100.0\% |
|  | Total | 28,068 | 27,982 | 86 | 99.7\% |
| Area 2 | June | 328 | 328 | 0 | 100.0\% |
|  | July | 4,597 | 4,560 | 37 | 99.2\% |
|  | August | 9,897 | 9,846 | 51 | 99.5\% |
|  | September | 2,975 | 2,963 | 12 | 99.6\% |
|  | Total | 17,469 | 17,369 | 100 | 99.4\% |
| Area 3 | June | 146 | 145 | 1 | 99.3\% |
|  | July | 1,690 | 1,679 | 11 | 99.3\% |
|  | August | 2,602 | 2,597 | 5 | 99.8\% |
|  | September | 227 | 225 | 2 | 99.1\% |
|  | Total | 4,519 | 4,501 | 18 | 99.6\% |
| Area 4 | June | 67 | 67 | 0 | 100.0\% |
|  | July | 2,288 | 2,237 | 51 | 97.8\% |
|  | August | 2,439 | 2,387 | 52 | 97.9\% |
|  | September | 513 | 507 | 6 | 98.8\% |
|  | Total | 5,240 | 5,131 | 109 | 97.9\% |

Table 11. Estimated drop off mortality rate in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries using on-water observation data and voluntary trip reports.

|  |  | On-Board Observation |  |  |  |  | VTRs |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Salmon Handled | Observed Drop Offs | Estimated Observed Drop Off Mortality a/ | FRAM Total Drop Off Mortality b/ | Observed <br> Drop Off <br> Mortality <br> Rate c/ | Total Salmon Handled | Observed <br> Drop Offs | Estimated Observed Drop Off Mortality a/ | FRAM Total Drop Off Mortality b/ | Observed <br> Drop Off Mortality Rate c |
| Area 1 | June | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4.7\% |
|  | July | 486 | 196 | 27 | 24 | 5.6\% | 134 | 29 | 4 | 7 | 3.0\% |
|  | August | 362 | 100 | 14 | 18 | 3.9\% | 63 | 12 | 2 | 3 | 2.7\% |
|  | Sept | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 848 | 296 | 41 | 42 | 4.9\% | 197 | 41 | 6 | 10 | 2.9\% |
| Area 2 | June | 39 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | July | 620 | 91 | 13 | 31 | 2.1\% | 162 | 25 | 4 | 8 | 2.2\% |
|  | August | 528 | 77 | 11 | 26 | 2.0\% | 252 | 33 | 5 | 13 | 1.8\% |
|  | Sept | 282 | 30 | 4 | 14 | 1.5\% | 0 | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 1,430 | 198 | 28 | 72 | 1.9\% | 414 | 58 | 8 | 21 | 2.0\% |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | - | - | - | 108 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 1.0\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | - | 600 | 29 | 4 | 30 | 0.7\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | 574 | 39 | 5 | 29 | 1.0\% |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | - | - | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% |
|  | Total | - | - | - | - | - | 1,196 | 68 | 10 | 60 | 0.8\% |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | - | - | - | 40 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2.8\% |
|  | July | - | - | - | - | - | 1,530 | 114 | 16 | 77 | 1.0\% |
|  | August | - | - | - | - | - | 1,027 | 110 | 15 | 51 | 1.5\% |
|  | Sept | - | - | - | - | - | 113 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0.1\% |
|  | Total | - | - | - | - | - | 2,670 | 225 | 32 | 134 | 1.2\% |

a/ Assume 14\% 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 12. Pre-season FRAM (model run 0921) projected coho mortality in the $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Total Retention | Marked Retention | Marked Release Mortality | Unmarked Retention | Unmarked <br> Release Mortality | Total Handled a/ | Predicted Mark Rate | Drop Off Mortality b/ | Release Mortality c/ | Incidental Mortality d/ | Total Mortality e/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | June | 569 | 565 | 5 | 4 | 27 | 794 | 76\% | 40 | 32 | 72 | 641 |
|  | July | 20,659 | 20,506 | 183 | 153 | 1,049 | 29,457 | 74\% | 1,473 | 1,232 | 2,705 | 23,364 |
|  | August | 59,956 | 59,452 | 531 | 504 | 3,460 | 88,467 | 71\% | 4,423 | 3,991 | 8,414 | 68,370 |
|  | Sept. | 7,016 | 6,949 | 62 | 67 | 462 | 10,760 | 69\% | 538 | 524 | 1,062 | 8,078 |
|  | Total | 88,200 | 87,472 | 781 | 728 | 4,998 | 129,478 | 72\% | 6,474 | 5,779 | 12,253 | 100,453 |
| Area <br> 2 | June | 750 | 743 | 7 | 7 | 47 | 1,132 | 70\% | 57 | 54 | 111 | 861 |
|  | July | 21,351 | 21,152 | 189 | 199 | 1,362 | 32,432 | 69\% | 1,622 | 1,551 | 3,173 | 24,524 |
|  | August | 38,169 | 37,766 | 337 | 403 | 2,765 | 60,331 | 67\% | 3,017 | 3,102 | 6,119 | 44,288 |
|  | Sept. | 5,000 | 4,934 | 44 | 66 | 454 | 8,557 | 61\% | 428 | 498 | 926 | 5,926 |
|  | Total | 65,270 | 64,595 | 577 | 675 | 4,628 | 102,452 | 67\% | 5,123 | 5,205 | 10,328 | 75,598 |
| Area$3$ | June | 42 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 65 | 68\% | 3 | 3 | 6 | 48 |
|  | July | 1,488 | 1,471 | 13 | 17 | 118 | 2,424 | 65\% | 121 | 131 | 252 | 1,740 |
|  | August | 2,550 | 2,521 | 23 | 29 | 196 | 4,110 | 65\% | 206 | 219 | 425 | 2,975 |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 500 | 483 | 4 | 17 | 119 | 1,379 | 37\% | 69 | 123 | 192 | 692 |
|  | Total | 4,580 | 4,517 | 40 | 63 | 436 | 7,978 | 60\% | 399 | 476 | 875 | 5,455 |
| Area 4 | June | 284 | 278 | 2 | 6 | 42 | 604 | 49\% | 30 | 44 | 74 | 358 |
|  | July | 7,131 | 7,029 | 63 | 102 | 697 | 12,555 | 60\% | 628 | 760 | 1,388 | 8,519 |
|  | August | 8,936 | 8,783 | 78 | 153 | 1,047 | 16,976 | 55\% | 849 | 1,125 | 1,974 | 10,910 |
|  | Sept. | 2,000 | 1,971 | 18 | 29 | 201 | 3,563 | 59\% | 178 | 219 | 397 | 2,397 |
|  | Total | 18,351 | 18,061 | 161 | 290 | 1,987 | 33,698 | 57\% | 1,685 | 2,148 | 3,833 | 22,184 |

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 13. Estimated actual coho mortality in the 2009 ocean recreational fisheries.

|  |  | Total Retention | Marked Retention | Marked Released Mortality a/ | Unmarked Retention | Unmarked Released Mortality b/ | Total Handled c/ | Observed Mark Rate d/ | Drop Off Mortality e/ | Release Mortality f/ | Incidental Mortality g/ | Total Mortality h/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | June | 472 | 471 | 4 | 2 | 33 | 739 | 66\% | 37 | 37 | 74 | 547 |
|  | July | 26,839 | 26,761 | 225 | 78 | 2,225 | 44,338 | 63\% | 2,217 | 2,450 | 4,667 | 31,506 |
|  | August | 54,537 | 54,354 | 457 | 182 | 4,997 | 93,489 | 60\% | 4,674 | 5,453 | 10,128 | 64,664 |
|  | Sept. | 1,963 | 1,963 | 16 | 0 | 272 | 4,022 | 50\% | 201 | 288 | 489 | 2,452 |
|  | Total | 83,811 | 83,548 | 702 | 263 | 7,527 | 142,588 | 62\% | 7,129 | 8,229 | 15,358 | 99,169 |
| Area 2 | June | 539 | 539 | 5 | 0 | 63 | 1,021 | 55\% | 51 | 67 | 119 | 658 |
|  | July | 10,745 | 10,658 | 90 | 86 | 1,224 | 20,128 | 55\% | 1,006 | 1,314 | 2,320 | 13,065 |
|  | August | 33,181 | 33,010 | 277 | 171 | 3,720 | 61,733 | 56\% | 3,087 | 3,997 | 7,084 | 40,265 |
|  | Sept. | 9,403 | 9,365 | 79 | 38 | 1,297 | 19,230 | 50\% | 962 | 1,376 | 2,337 | 11,740 |
|  | Total | 53,868 | 53,573 | 450 | 295 | 6,304 | 102,112 | 54\% | 5,106 | 6,754 | 11,860 | 65,728 |
| Area 3 | June | 165 | 164 | 1 | 1 | 46 | 505 | 33\% | 25 | 48 |  |  |
|  | July | 1,944 | 1,931 | 16 | 13 | 369 | 4,695 | 42\% | 235 | 385 | 620 | 2,564 |
|  | August | 4,317 | 4,309 | 36 | 8 | 493 | 8,100 | 55\% | 405 | 530 | 935 | 5,252 |
|  | Sept./Oct. | 470 | 466 | 4 | 4 | 66 | 968 | 50\% | 48 | 70 | 118 | 588 |
|  | Total | 6,896 | 6,870 | 58 | 26 | 974 | 14,268 | 48\% | 713 | 1,032 | 1,673 | 8,403 |
| Area 4 | June | 118 | 118 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 216 | 56\% | 11 | 14 | 25 | 143 |
|  | July | 4,807 | 4,700 | 39 | 107 | 954 | 11,904 | 41\% | 595 | 994 | 1,589 | 6,396 |
|  | August | 7,500 | 7,340 | 62 | 160 | 1,798 | 20,780 | 37\% | 1,039 | 1,859 | 2,898 | 10,398 |
|  | Sept. | 912 | 901 | 8 | 11 | 199 | 2,388 | 39\% | 119 | 207 | 326 | 1,238 |
|  | Total | 13,336 | 13,059 | 110 | 278 | 2,964 | 35,288 | 39\% | 1,764 | 3,073 | 4,838 | 18,174 |

[^0]Table 14. Comparison of total projected coho mortality in 2009 ocean recreational fisheries calculated post-season using observed mark rates and actual catch, pre-season by FRAM (model run 0921), and post-season using sub-Area quotas resulting from in-season transfers combined with realease mortality based on projected mark rates.

|  | Total mortality based on <br> actual landed catch plus <br> release mortality calculated <br> from observed mark rates | Total <br> mortality <br> projected by <br> FRAM run <br> 0921 | Total projected mortality based <br> on adjusted sub-Area quotas <br> and projected release mortalities <br> using pre-season projected mark <br> rates |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | 99,169 | 100,453 | 109,336 |
| Area 2 | 65,728 | 75,598 | 64,015 |
| Area 3 | 8,403 | 5,455 | 9,623 |
| Area 4 | 18,174 | 22,184 | 19,463 |
| Coastwide Total |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 1 , 4 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 , 6 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 , 4 3 8}$ |

Table 15. Number of coho encounters recorded by WDFW on-board samplers and on VTRs from the 2009 ocean recreational fishery compared with the estimated total handled coho (Washington only).

Area 1
Area 2
Area 3

| On-board <br> observation | VTRs | Estimated <br> total <br> handled a/ | Percent of <br> estimated total <br> handled sampled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 842 | 191 | 109,551 | $1 \%$ |
| 1,479 | 396 | 102,112 | $2 \%$ |
| - | 1,225 | 14,268 | $9 \%$ |
| - | 2,319 | 35,288 | $7 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 , 3 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1 , 2 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ |

a/ Total retention + (Total released mortality divided by 0.14 mooking mortality); WA only.

Table 16. Number of Chinook encounters recorded by WDFW on-board samplers and on VTRs from the 2009 ocean recreational fishery compared with the estimated total handled Chinook (Washington only).

|  | On-board <br> observation | VTRs | Estimated <br> total <br> handled a/ | Percent of <br> estimated total <br> handled sampled |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | 130 | 47 | 19,158 | $1 \%$ |
| Area 2 | 192 | 69 | 11,602 | $2 \%$ |
| Area 3 | - | 151 | 2,018 | $7 \%$ |
| Area 4 | - | 541 | 10,261 | $5 \%$ |
| TOTAL WA | $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 , 0 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ |

[^1]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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area 1 | June | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | 8 | 58 | 144 | 210 |
|  | August | 12 | 26 | 120 | 158 |
|  | September |  |  | 1 | 1 |
|  | Total | 20 | 84 | 265 | 369 |
| Area 2 | June | 3 | 3 |  | 6 |
|  | July | 27 | 54 | 100 | 181 |
|  | August | 12 | 33 | 96 | 141 |
|  | September | 1 | 8 | 9 | 18 |
|  | Total | 40 | 95 | 205 | 340 |
| Area 3 | June | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | - | - | 3 | 3 |
|  | August | - | - | 4 | 4 |
|  | September | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | - | 7 | 7 |
| Area 4 | June | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | - | - | 71 | 71 |
|  | August | - | - | 33 | 33 |
|  | September | - | - | 0 | - |
|  | Total | - | - | 104 | 104 |

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

|  |  | On-Boar <br> Sublegal- <br> Sized | pling <br> Legal- <br> Sized | Dockside Sampling Legal-Sized | Total Number of DNA Samples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area <br> 1 | May | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  | June | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | July | - | - | 20 | 20 |
|  | August | - | - | 12 | 12 |
|  | September | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | - | 33 | 33 |
| Area <br> 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | May | - | - | 172 | 172 |
|  | June | - | - | 105 | 105 |
|  | July | - | - | 23 | 23 |
|  | August | - | - | 42 | 42 |
|  | September | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | - | 342 | 342 |
| Area$3$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | May | - | - | 661 | 661 |
|  | June | - | - | 315 | 315 |
|  | July | - | - | 126 | 126 |
|  | August | - | - | 55 | 55 |
|  | September | - | - | 2 | 2 |
|  | Total | - | - | 1,159 | 1,159 |
| Area |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | May | - | - | 132 | 132 |
|  | June | - | - | 213 | 213 |
|  | July | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | August | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | September | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | - | - | 345 | 345 |


[^0]:    a/ $6 \%$ of marked retention multiplied by 0.14 hooking mortality
    b/ Total retention divided by observed mark rate less total retention multiplied by 0.14 hooking mortality
    c/ Total retention + (Total released mortality divided by 0.14 mooking mortality).
    d/ Observed mark rates assumed from dockside sampling data where observer data and VTR data are unavailable
    e/ 5\% of total handled.
    f/ Unmarked released mortality + marked released mortality.
    g/ Drop off + release mortality.
    h/ Total retention + incidental mortality

[^1]:    a/ Total retention + Total released; WA only; estimated from dockside sampling.

