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Study History: This study originated as part of Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fish/Shellfish Study \#3 (F/S 3), entitled "Coded Wire Tag Studies on Prince William Sound Salmon, 1989-1991." The study was concerned with the estimation of contributions and survival rates of hatchery-reared fish in the commercial fisheries of Prince William Sound, and with the estimation of survival rates of wild populations of pink and sockeye salmon in contaminated and uncontaminated areas. Work on pink salmon continued under Restoration Projects 60A, 93067, 94320B, respectively entitled "Coded Wire Tag Studies on Prince William Sound Salmon, 1992," "Coded Wire Tag Recoveries from Pink Salmon in Prince William Sound Salmon Fisheries, 1993," and "Coded Wire Tag Recoveries from Pink Salmon in Prince William Sound Salmon Fisheries, 1994". Studies on sockeye, chum, coho, and chinook salmon were continued under studies 93068, 94137 and 95137 (closeout funding), and were a continuation of the work conducted under F/S 3. This document reports the findings of the latter studies and for the sake of completeness includes the pertinent results of F/S 3.


#### Abstract

Coded wire tags were applied to sockeye, chum, coho, and chinook salmon at three hatcheries in Prince William Sound, and also to three populations of wild sockeye salmon. Two of these populations were situated in contaminated areas of the Sound, while the other was located in an area distant from the trajectory of the oil plume. Contributions of different hatchery and wild release groups to specific harvest-district-week strata were estimated from recoveries of tags in the commercial fishery, and in the escapements of the wild sockeye populations. Tag-specific survival rates were also estimated where possible. As expected, the proportion of fish from wild populations in the commercial catches decreased with increasing releases of hatchery fish. Efforts to enhance natural sockeye salmon populations through remote releases largely failed. Significant relationships between release size and survival rates were detected for sockeye salmon. The comparison between survival rates of sockeye salmon from oiled and unoiled areas was compromised by incomplete scanning of escapements due to lack of funding and problems with enumeration of the sockeye salmon smolt outmigration at Coghill River.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document fulfills the requirements for Restoration Studies 93068, 94137 and 95137 designed to restore the sockeye Oncorhyncus nerka, chum $O$. keta, coho $O$. kisutch and chinook salmon $O$. tshawytscha resource of Prince William Sound to its pre-spill status. Coded wire tags applied at the W. Noerenberg, Solomon Gulch and Main Bay facilities and to wild sockeye populations in Prince William Sound were recovered in commercial catches and escapements. Tagging rates were sufficiently high to allow adequate numbers of marks to be recovered in the fishery catches, brood stock, and streams. Coded wire tags were recovered from the commercial and costrecovery fisheries, from brood stock at the four hatcheries, and from salmon carcasses examined at the streams at which coded wire tags were applied. All tags were decoded at the Coded Wire Tag Processing Laboratory in Juneau.

Postseason analysis of recovered tags from sockeye salmon reared and released at the Main Bay facility revealed that the percentage of the common property catch attributable to the facility increased from $1.8 \%$ in 1989 to between $39 \%$ in 1993 and $91 \%$ in 1991. Survival rates of hatchery-reared and released sockeye salmon were found to be significantly related to release weights. While tagged remote-released sockeye salmon, designed to augment natural populations, returned to the Eshamy and Coghill Rivers, they were late and in poor condition. The ability of these fish to spawn effectively is debatable, and the program was not considered successful. A comparison of adult survival rates for fry stocked at Pass and Esther Pass Lakes showed the latter to be the more suitable disposal site for excess fry production at the Main Bay facility. Survival rates for both lakes were low, however. The ability of the coded wire tag program to estimate the total wild component in the returns of 1991 through 1993 was compromised by the presence of untagged hatchery-reared fish from remote releases at Davis, Esther Pass and Pass Lakes, although specific contributions by the Eshamy system were estimable in certain years. Problems with the enumeration of the outmigration at Coghill River prevented estimation of returns to this system. This was unfortunate given the severe shortfalls in the escapements in 1993 and 1994. The marine survival rates of fish from the Coghill system were substantially lower than those of fish from the Eshamy system. No estimation of the survival rates of fish from the Jackpot system was possible. With respect to chum salmon returns, some evidence was collected to suggest an influence of release size on survival rates, but the relationship was weak. No such relationship was found for coho and chinook salmon.

## INTRODUCTION

In the early 1970's, failures of wild runs of pink salmon Oncorhynchus gorbuscha in Prince William Sound led to an aggressive enhancement program during which numerous hatcheries were built. By 1986 five facilities were operating (Figure 1): the Solomon Gulch hatchery, producing pink salmon, and later, chum $O$. keta, coho $O$. kisutch and chinook salmon $O$. tschawytscha, the A. F. Koernig hatchery, producing pink salmon, the W. Noerenberg hatchery, producing pink salmon, and later, chum, coho and chinook salmon, the Cannery Creek hatchery, producing pink salmon, and the Main Bay hatchery which produced chum and presently raises sockeye salmon $O$. nerka.

Parent stocks for Prince William Sound hatchery production were selected from native populations in the Sound with the consequence that the migratory timings of adult hatchery and wild returns coincide. Furthermore, virtually all these salmon stocks migrate to their natal streams or hatcheries through corridors in the southwestern and western areas of the Sound. The coincident timing and location of the large hatchery return and the considerably smaller wild returns lead to the danger of over-exploitation of the latter by the commercial fishery. A serious example of this occurs in the Eshamy district (Statistical District 225), which includes a hatchery releasing more than four million smolts annually and a major wild sockeye salmon run in the Eshamy River/Lake system. The district also lies directly in the migration path of wild sockeye salmon returning to the Coghill system. Recent declines in the productivity of the Coghill population, possibly due to overescapement in 1987, latent problems associated with saltwater lenses formed as a result of the 1964 earthquake or to problems associated with fertility of the lake, make commercial interception of fish en route to this system all the more undesirable. The sustainability of the wild salmon runs such as those from the Coghill and Eshamy systems must suffer if it is subjected to harvest rates appropriate for returning hatchery fish.

To protect wild stocks in a hatchery-dominated fishery, managers needed information pertaining to the temporal and spatial distributions of hatchery and wild fish. To meet this requirement, a coded wire tagging (CWT) program was initiated in the late 1980's for all five species of salmon released from hatcheries in the Sound. Tag recoveries made in the commercial and cost-recovery fisheries enabled managers to estimate hatchery and wild contributions to catches from different temporal and spatial strata within the fishery. The tagging program was developed for use in Prince William Sound by Peltz and Geiger (1990) and Geiger and Sharr (1990).

The March 24, 1989, Exxon Valdez oil spill (Figure 2) exacerbated the problems faced by fishery managers. The spill contaminated intertidal portions of streams in western Prince William Sound where up to $75 \%$ of wild chum and pink salmon spawn, and also the marine waters traversed by juvenile salmon on their migration seaward through the Sound. Work by Sharr et al. (1994) indicates that for pink salmon, at least, spawning success has been adversely affected by the oil spill, and Willette and Carpenter (1993) found that marine survival of juvenile pink salmon was reduced in areas influenced by the spill. The decisions made by fishery managers suddenly became more critical in as far as they affected the sustainability of wild populations, as did the need for the


Figure 1. Fishing districts and hatcheries of Prince William Sound, Alaska.


Figure 2. Trajectory of oil plume across Prince William Sound, Alaska, 1989.

CWT program and the catch-composition estimates it provided. Other key roles of the CWT program in the post-spill era were to monitor the success of various strategies designed to remediate the weakened wild sockeye salmon populations (remote releases, lake fertilizations), and to quantify oil-related damages to wild sockeye salmon runs.

The CWT program was funded under the damage assessment study F/S 3 through 1991 and continued to provide information pertaining to the nature of the commercial salmon catch. Also during this period, wild pink and sockeye salmon were tagged at a number of streams in the western portion of the Sound. The intention was to monitor the effects of oiling on the survival rates of specific wild populations, and for sockeye salmon, to determine the impact of the intercept fisheries upon the escapements of the endangered Eshamy and Coghill runs.

This report documents the activities and results of the CWT program from 1989 through 1994, as it pertains to sockeye, chum, coho, and chinook salmon, with emphasis placed on the 1993 and 1994 recovery years. It focuses primarily upon hatchery contributions to the different fisheries, survival rates of different hatchery release groups, contributions of Eshamy and Coghill sockeye salmon to intercept fisheries, survival rates of wild sockeye salmon, and the efficacy of various remediation measures designed to augment the weakened Coghill and Eshamy runs. Although some hatchery contribution data from 1989 through 1991 were reported in F/S 3, they were often comprised of data aggregated over recovery strata, and no access to the component strata was made available. In the current report, contribution data from all district-period strata from 1989 to 1994 are provided in appendices. Aggregated data is presented in the main body of the document. It is believed that such a reporting policy presents the data in a more universally useful way.

## OBJECTIVES

1. Use CWT data to estimate contributions of sockeye, coho, chum and chinook salmon from three hatcheries in Prince William Sound to the common property and private-nonprofit (cost-recovery) fisheries
2. Use CWT data and release information to estimate survival rates of tagged sockeye, chum, coho and chinook hatchery release groups.
3. Use CWT, smolt outmigration and escapement data to estimate survival rates of tagged groups of wild sockeye salmon originating from the Jackpot, Eshamy (oil-contaminated estuaries) and Coghill systems (uncontaminated estuary).
4. Use CWT data to assess the impact of different intercept fisheries on the weakened Eshamy and Coghill wild sockeye salmon populations, and make such information available to fishery managers on a real-time basis.
5. Use CWT data to determine the efficacy of different strategies designed to remediate the weakened sockeye salmon runs of the Eshamy and Coghill systems. These strategies include remote releases of hatchery fry or smolt into Eshamy Lake and the Coghill and Eshamy River estuaries, and a lake fertilization program at Coghill Lake.

## METHODS

## Tagging

## Hatchery Tagging

Tagging of chum salmon fry occurred at the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation (PWSAC) W. Noerenberg facility and at the Valdez Fisheries Development Association (VFDA) Solomon Gulch facility. Tagging and recovery efforts were such that contribution estimates were sufficiently precise to allow fishery managers to make meaningful inseason decisions and to allow detection of oil-induced effects. Tagging rates were often dependent on available effort, timing of releases, and other hatchery-related factors. They were, however, kept at levels which would allow equal or greater precision than that obtained for the pink salmon studies of Peltz and Miller 1990, Peltz and Geiger 1990, and Geiger and Sharr 1990, given equal or greater sampling rates. A different tag code was given to each release group, a release group representing a batch of fish subjected to a certain feeding regimen (early feeding, late feeding or no feeding) and release timing.

Chum salmon fry to be tagged were randomly selected as they emerged from incubators. Fry were anesthetized in a 1 ppm solution of MS-222 prior to removal of adipose fins and application of tags. Half-length CWTs were applied with a Northwest Marine Technology tag injector (model MKI). Adipose fin-clipped and tagged fish were passed through an electronic quality control device to test for tag retention. Rejected fish were held and retested later. If rejected a second time, they were sacrificed to minimize the number of untagged clipped fish in the release. Fry which retained tags were held overnight to determine short-term mortality and tag-loss. Overnight mortality rates were determined by counting the number of dead fish 24 hours after tagging. An overnight tag-loss rate was estimated by randomly selecting 200 fish and testing them with the quality control device before release into saltwater rearing pens. Tag placement was checked periodically, but not quantified.

The number of fry released with tags of tag code $t\left(T r_{t}\right)$ was estimated for each release group by deducting both the overnight tagging and saltwater rearing mortalities from the number of fry initially tagged, and then adjusting the result with an overnight tag-loss estimate:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{T r} r_{t}=\left(T_{t}-M o_{t}-M s w_{t}\right)\left(1-\hat{L} o_{t}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$T_{t}=\quad$ total number of tagged $(t)$ fish,
$M o_{t}=\quad$ number of deaths during overnight holding period among tagged $(t)$ fish, $M s w_{t}=\quad$ number of deaths during saltwater rearing period among tagged $(t)$ fish, and $L o_{t}=\quad$ proportion of tagged $(t)$ fish that lost tags during the overnight holding period.

The inclusion of $M s w_{t}$ is appropriate for those facility/year instances where such a parameter could be estimated/determined. Immediately prior to release, chum salmon fry mortalities were estimated visually, and were applied equally to tagged and untagged fish to obtain final release estimates.

Tagging practices for sockeye, coho and chinook salmon were identical to those of chum salmon except that full length CWTs were used due to the larger size of fish being tagged. After tagging, smolt were returned to freshwater raceways before being transferred to either saltwater pens or remote-release locations.

## Tagging of Wild Sockeye Salmon

Wild sockeye salmon populations residing in the Jackpot, Eshamy and Coghill systems (Figure 3) were tagged over the period 1989 through 1991. The intertidal areas adjacent to the Eshamy and Jackpot watersheds were contaminated with oil spilled from the Exxon Valdez while those adjacent to the Coghill watershed were not contaminated. Wild fish were tagged at a considerably higher rate than hatchery fish. The tagging rate was a function of the rates at which field crews worked.

An incline plane trap was used to trap smolt at Coghill and Jackpot and a $1.22 \mathrm{~m} \times 1.22 \mathrm{~m}$ fyke net was used at Eshamy. Half-length CWTs were used at Coghill during 1989 and Jackpot during 1990 due to the small size of the outmigrating smolt. A quality control device was used to test all smolt for tag presence immediately after tag application; this test was repeated on 200 smolt after a 24 hour holding period. The number of tagged and clipped fish actually released was estimated using Equation 2. Tag codes referred to stream identity.

The number of wild stock smolts released with tag code $t\left(\operatorname{Trw}_{t}\right)$ was estimated as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{T r} w_{t}=\left(T_{t}-M o_{t}\right)\left(1-\hat{L} o_{t}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$T_{t}=\quad$ total number of tagged $(t)$ fish,
$M o_{t}=$ number of overnight deaths among tagged $(t)$ fish, and
$L o_{t} \quad=\quad$ proportion of tagged $(t)$ fish that lost tags during the overnight holding period.


Figure 3. Sockeye (and pink) salmon weir sites, Prince William Sound, Alaska.

## Tag Recovery

## Commercial and Cost-Recovery Harvests

Tag recoveries for all species were stratified by district, week, and processor. This stratification was chosen as a result of the findings of Peltz and Geiger (1990), who detected significant differences between the proportions of some tag codes among such strata. The differences indicate that processors tend to receive catches from only certain parts of a district. These are believed to be the result of traditional tendering patterns.

Recoveries of tags from commercial and cost-recovery harvests were made after each fishery opening as fish were dumped onto processing tables from totes at land-based processors located in Cordova, Valdez, Seward, Anchorage, Whittier, Kenai, Kodiak, and aboard floating processors. Fish were sampled by one or two technicians standing alongside the table. In the case where two technicians scanned the belt, measures were taken to ensure that fish were not sampled twice. Each sampled fish was subjected to a visual and tactile examination for a missing adipose fin. In most cases technicians were unable to census a complete tender load. A complete census of some tenders was possible, however, and when this occurred, a chi-square test of independence was used to compare the rate of occurrence of adipose fin clips in the census with that observed in a random sample from the load. In this way a technician's bias was assessed.

Data recorded for each tender included harvest type (i.e. commercial or cost-recovery catch), fishing district(s) from which the catch was taken, catch date, processor, and the number of fish examined. Catch data associated with each tender were later obtained from fish tickets. Heads of fin-clipped fish were excised, identified with a uniquely-numbered cinch tag, bagged, frozen and shipped along with sample data to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Coded Wire Tag Processing Laboratory (Tag Lab) in Juneau. Tag Lab staff processed the heads and entered tag code and sample data into a database that was accessible to biologists in Cordova.

## Brood-Stock Harvests and Escapements

Tag shedding from release to return and differential mortality between tagged and untagged fish can lead to discrepancies between marking rates at release and recovery. Hatchery salmon brood stocks (and escapements in the case of the tagged wild sockeye releases) were scanned for tags in order to estimate adjustment factors which could be used to adjust marking rates at release and hence to account for the loss of tags from the population. For some brood samples, few fish were scanned and/or age-class data needed to account for the presence of untagged release groups were unavailable so that calculation of annual adjustment factors for each hatchery for each species was impossible. The brood data were consequently pooled over years and different adjustment factors were only calculated for each species, and where possible for each site of origin (specific hatchery or wild location). Attempts to account for the possibility that returning fish of different ages have different tendencies to lose tags were also thwarted by scarcity of ageclass data for the brood stocks.

Inherent in the assumed utility of the adjustment factors developed herein are the assumptions that a) the brood stock consists solely of fish reared at the hatchery, b) the tendency for a tagged fish to lose a tag is not different for fish of different marine residencies released in the same year from the same hatchery, c) the tendency for a fish to lose its tag is constant for fish released in different years from the same hatchery, and d) for a specific tag code, the marking rate in the commercial fishery is the same as that in the brood stock. For a given species, the adjustment factor estimate $a \hat{f}_{h}$ for hatchery $h$ is calculated as the ratio of number of fish sampled from the brood stock which originate from tagged release groups (estimated from age-class data in the event that untagged release groups are present in the brood stock) to the total contribution of tagged release groups in the brood sample, based on tagging rates at release:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{a} f_{h}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{h}} s_{h i} \hat{m}_{h i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{h}} \sum_{j=1}^{T_{h i}} \frac{x_{h i j}}{p_{j}}} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

| $N_{h}$ |  | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{h i}$ |  | Number of fish scanned for tags in the $i^{\text {th }}$ year in hatchery $h$, |
| $m_{h i}$ |  | Proportion of brood stock in $i^{\text {th }}$ year at hatchery $h$ which derives from tagged release groups, |
| $T_{h i}$ | = | Number of uniquely tagged release groups which may return to hatchery $h$ in year $i$, |
| $x_{\text {hij }}$ | $=$ | Number of tags of $j^{\text {th }}$ code found in brood sample of $i^{\text {th }}$ year at hatchery $h$, and |
| $p_{j}$ | $=$ | Tagging rate at release for tag code $j$ (defined as number of tagged fish released with $j^{\text {th }}$ code divided by the total number of fish in the $j^{t h}$ release group). |

The adjustment factor was then used to adjust contribution estimates (Equation 4) if it could be shown that it was significantly greater than 1.0 at the $90 \%$ level. Estimated standard errors of $a \hat{f}_{h}$ were derived through simulation (Appendix A).

Brood-stock samples were taken during hatchery egg-take operations, where possible. Approximately $95 \%$ of the brood stock was examined through visual and tactile means for missing adipose fins. When these were found, the heads of the fish were removed and shipped to the Tag Lab where detected tags were extracted and decoded. The Eshamy, Coghill and Jackpot escapements were scanned for missing adipose fins at the weirs

The contribution of release group $t$ to the sampled common property, cost-recovery, brood stock, escapement and special harvests, $C_{t}$, was estimated as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{C}_{t}=\sum_{i=1}^{L} x_{i t}\left(\frac{N_{i} \hat{a} f_{h(t)}}{s_{i} p_{t}}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{i t} & =\quad \text { number of group } t \text { tags recovered in } i \text { th stratum, } \\
N_{i} & =\text { total number of fish in } i \text { th stratum, } \\
s_{i} & =\text { number of fish sampled from ith stratum, } \\
p_{t} & =\text { proportion of group } t \text { tagged, } \\
a \hat{f}_{h(t)} & =\text { adjustment factor associated with hatchery or watershed } h, \text { and } \\
L & =\begin{array}{l}
\text { number of recovery strata associated with common property, cost-recovery, brood } \\
\text { stock, special harvests and escapement in which tag code } t \text { was found. }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

The contribution of release group $t$ to unsampled strata, $C u_{t}$, was estimated from contribution rates associated with strata which were sampled from the same district-week openings as the unsampled strata:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{C} u_{t}=\sum_{i=1}^{U}\left[N_{i} *\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{s} \hat{C}_{t j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{s} N_{j}}\right)\right] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$U=$ number of unsampled strata,
$N_{i}=\quad$ number of fish in ith unsampled stratum,
$S=\quad$ number of strata sampled in the period in which the $i^{t h}$ unsampled stratum resides,
$C_{i j}=$ contribution of release coded with tag $t$ to the sampled stratum $j$, and
$N_{j}=$ number of fish in the $j$ th sampled stratum.
When a district-week opening was not sampled at all (an infrequent occurrence), the catch from that opening was treated as unsampled catch of the subsequent opening in the same district.

For any given year, hatchery-specific contributions were only estimated when all returns to the hatchery in question were tagged. Furthermore, estimates of wild contributions through
calculation of differences between total catches and hatchery contribution estimates were only made when all returning release groups to all hatcheries were tagged.

A variance approximation for $V\left(\hat{C}_{t}\right)$ derived by Clark and Bernard (1987) and simplified by Geiger (1990) was used:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{V}\left(\hat{C}_{t}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{L} x_{i t}\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a} f_{h(t)}}{s_{i} p_{t}}\right]\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a} f_{h(t)}}{s_{i} p_{t}}-I\right] \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming that covariances between contributions of different release groups to a stratum could be ignored, summation of variance components over all tag codes provided an estimate of the variance of the total hatchery contribution. Inspection of the formula given by Clark and Bernard (1987) for the aforementioned covariances shows them to be negligible for large $N$ and $s$, and to be consistently negative, so that when ignored, conservative estimates of variance are obtained. Variances associated with contribution estimates made for unsampled strata are believed to be small (Sharr et al., 1995a).

The survival rate of the release group coded with $\operatorname{tag} t\left(S_{t}\right)$, was estimated as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{S}_{t}=\frac{\hat{C}_{t}+\hat{C}_{t}}{R} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$C_{t}=\quad$ contribution of release coded with tag $t$ to sampled strata,
$C u_{t}=$ contribution of release group coded with tag $t$ from unsampled strata, and
$R_{t} \quad=\quad$ total number of fish in release group coded with tag $t$ released from hatchery.
Only survival rates of those tagged release groups which had completed their marine residencies were calculated.

Assuming the total release of fish associated with a tag code is known with negligible error, and that the cumulative variance contributions associated with contribution estimation for unsampled strata are small, a suitable variance estimate for $\hat{S}_{t}$ is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{V}\left(\hat{S}_{t}\right)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{L} x_{t t}\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a} f_{h(t)}}{s_{t} p_{t}}\right]\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a} f_{h(t)}}{s_{i} p_{t}}-1\right]}{R^{2}} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

## RESULTS

## Tagging

## Hatchery Tagging Data

Chum salmon fry were released from the W. Noerenberg and Solomon Gulch hatcheries (Table 1). Releases ranged from 1.7 million at the Solomon Gulch facility in 1991 to 108 million at the W. Noerenberg hatchery in 1993, with a median of 17 million. Tagging rates used for chum salmon fry ranged from 0.016 at the Solomon Gulch hatchery in 1992 to 0.002 at the W. Noerenberg hatchery in 1993. The median tagging rate was 0.0023 .

Coho salmon smolt were released from the Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg hatcheries (Table 1). Releases ranged from 787 thousand from Solomon Gulch in 1990 to 4.3 million from the W. Noerenberg hatchery in 1993, with a median release of 1.48 million. Tagging rates ranged from 0.043 to 0.0078 . The median tagging rate was 0.031 .

Sockeye salmon smolt were released only from the Main Bay hatchery with releases ranging from 2.7 million in 1990 to 4.8 million in 1994 (Table 1), with a median of 4.2 million. Tagging rates ranged from 0.05 in 1990 to 0.024 in 1992, with a median of 0.029 .

Chinook salmon smolt were released from the W. Noerenberg hatchery in 1990 through 1994, and from the Solomon Gulch facility in 1991 and 1992 (Table 1). Releases ranged from 95 thousand to 642 thousand fish, with tagging rates ranging from 0.25 to 0.036 . The median tagging rate was 0.053 .

## Wild-Stock Tagging Data

Seaward migrations of sockeye salmon in 1989 ranged from 245 thousand from the Coghill system to 388 thousand from the Eshamy system (Table 2). Tagging rates were 0.179 and 0.12 , respectively. In 1990, the seaward migration from the Eshamy system was 682 thousand, while that from the Jackpot system was 20 thousand. Tagging rates were 0.030 and 0.227, respectively. In 1991, three, one and two tag codes were applied at the Eshamy, Jackpot and Coghill systems, respectively. Tagging rates ranged from 0.37 to 0.066 during 1991.

Table 1. Hatchery-stock tagging data by species, facility and year, Prince William Sound, Alaska'.

|  | Relense Year | Released | Number Tagged | Tagging Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SOCKE YE SALMON |  |  |  |  |
| Main Bay | 1989 | 3,925,026 | 100,434 | 0.026 |
|  | 1990 | 2,744,595 | 138,663 | 0.051 |
|  | 1991 | 4,133,421 | 135,621 | 0.033 |
|  | 1992 | 4,370,557 | 107,523 | 0.025 |
|  | 1993 | 4,370,252 | 114.899 | 0.026 |
|  | 1994, | 4,833,612 | 123,170 | 0.025 |
| CHUM SALMON |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 1989 | 2,921,414 | 28,991 | 0.0010 |
|  | 1990 | 3,104,288 | 35,820 | 0.0115 |
|  | 1991 | 1,736,374 | 20,720 | 0.0119 |
|  | 1992 | 2,690,414 | 42,961 | 0.0161 |
|  | 1993 | 17,670,584 | 36,327 | 0.0021 |
|  | $1994$ | 6,088,063 | 19,378 | 0.0032 |
| W. Nocremberg |  |  | 110,543 | 0.0023 |
|  | 1991 | 76,834,313 | 178,392 | 0.0023 |
|  | 1992 | 98,044,672 | 205,807 | 0.0021 |
|  | 1993 | 108,026,724 | 215,474 | 0.0020 |
|  | 1994 | 100,108,198 | 201.900 | 0.0020 |
| COHO SALMON |  |  |  |  |
| Soiomon Gulch | 1989 | 980,000 | 30.561 | 0.031 |
|  | 1990 | 787,137 | 33,957 | 0.043 |
|  | 1991 | 1,006,869 | 36,379 | 0.036 |
|  | 1992 | 1,226,044 | 48,785 | 0.040 |
|  | 1994 | 915,087 | 24,240 | 0.026 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | 2,599,937 | 100,529 | 0.038 |
|  | 1990 | 2.460,620 | 69,783 | 0.029 |
|  | 1991 | 2,223,626 | 72,588 | 0.033 |
|  | $1993$ | 4,303,077 | 33,387 | 0.008 |
|  | 1994 | 1,484,936 | 37,447 | 0.025 |
| CHINOOK SALMON |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 1991 | 192,945 | 10,326 | 0.053 |
|  | 1992 | 94,748 | 5,091 | 0.053 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1990 | 141,939 | 36,84! | 0.259 |
|  | 1991 | 410,897 | 40.780 | 0.100 |
|  | 1992 | 478,894 | 16,975 | 0.036 |
|  | 1993 | 472,431 | 23,609 | 0.050 |
|  | 1994 | 642,560 | 32,155 | 0.050 |

${ }^{2}$ Includes remotely-released fish
${ }^{b}$ Average tagging rate: rates for individual tag codes vary considerably

Table 2. Wild-stock tagging data for sockeye salmon by year and watershed system

| Tagging Year | System | Date of Release | Seaward Migration | Tag Code | Number <br> Tagged | Tagging Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | Eshamy | 5/12-6/01 | 388,512 | 311840 | 46,771 | 0.12 |
|  | Coghill ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 5/13-6/03 | 244,939 | 1301010403 | 43,935 | 0.18 |
| 1990 | Eshamy | 5/12-6/05 | 682,521 | 311910 | 20,794 | 0.03 |
|  | Jackpot | 5/18-5/28 | 20,076 | 1301010911 | 4,601 | 0.23 |
| 1991 | Eshamy | 5/13-7/01 | 460,816 | 311951 | 46,152 | 0.10 |
|  |  |  |  | 311957 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 311956 |  |  |
|  | Jackpot | 5/14-6/15 | 22,311 | 311955 | 8,384 | 0.37 |
|  | Coghill ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5/14-7/16 | 110,941 | 1301020102 | 7,347 | 0.07 |
|  |  |  |  | 1301020101 |  |  |

${ }^{2}$ Outmigration enumeration was problematic

## Tag Recoveries

## Sampling Rates of Common Property and Cost-Recovery Fisheries

Sampling rates associated with the sockeye salmon common property fisheries ranged from 0.19 in 1993 to 0.40 in 1991 and from 0.09 in 1993 to 0.90 in 1990 for the cost-recovery fisheries. The only years in which hatchery contributions of chum salmon were estimable were 1993 (Solomon Gulch) and 1994 (Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg). Common property fisheries targeting chum salmon were sampled at an average rate of 0.40 in 1993 and 0.48 in 1994. The chum salmon cost-recovery fisheries were sampled at rates of 0.31 and 0.41 for 1993 and 1994, respectively. Sampling rates associated with the coho salmon common property fisheries ranged from 0.20 in 1994 to 0.37 in 1991 and from 0.31 in 1991 to 1.0 in 1989 for the cost-recovery fisheries. The only years in which hatchery contributions of chinook salmon were estimable were 1993 and 1994. Common property fisheries targeting chinook salmon were sampled at an average rate of 0.20 in 1993 and 0.37 in 1994. The chinook salmon cost-recovery fisheries were sampled at rates of 0.34 and 0.32 for 1993 and 1994 respectively. Sampling data are presented in Table 3.

Sampling of the Eshamy, Coghill and Jackpot Escapements
Sampling of the Eshamy and Coghill escapements for missing adipose fins began in 1991 and continued through 1994. The Jackpot escapement was only sampled in 1991.

## Adjustment factors

Adjustment factors were estimated for all species and for each facility from which the species originated. For coho salmon, year-specific adjustment factors were generated. Adjustment factors and associated standard errors are presented in Table 4.

Contributions and Survival Rates
Contributions and survival rates of sockeye salmon.
Tags applied at the Main Bay hatchery and at the Eshamy, Coghill and Jackpot Rivers were recovered in the common property, cost-recovery and brood-stock harvests, and also in the escapements of the Eshamy, Coghill and Jackpot systems. Tag recovery data associated with returning tagged wild Coghill fish could only be used for survival estimation, and not contribution estimation due to uncertainties over enumeration of the outmigration at Coghill River. Data pertaining to returning Jackpot tags could not be used because of incomplete sampling of the Jackpot escapement and the short duration of the tagging program (see Discussion). For 1989, 1990 and 1994, all returning sockeye salmon which had been reared at the Main Bay facility belonged to release groups which had been tagged. This permitted an estimation of the

Table 3. Sampling rates of common property and cost-recovery fisheries ${ }^{2}$.

| Year | Species | Common Property | Cost- <br> Recovery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | Sockeye | 0.39 | b |
|  | Coho | 0.27 | 1.00 |
| 1990 | Sockeye | 0.31 | 0.90 |
|  | Coho | 0.35 | 0.68 |
| 1991 | Sockeye | 0.40 | b |
|  | Coho | 0.37 | 0.31 |
| 1992 | Sockeye | 0.33 | 0.27 |
|  | Coho | 0.26 | 0.43 |
| 1993 | Sockeye | 0.19 | 0.09 |
|  | Chum | 0.40 | 0.31 |
|  | Coho | 0.33 | 0.72 |
|  | Chinook | 0.20 | 0.34 |
| 1994 | Sockeye | 0.32 | 0.16 |
|  | Chum | 0.48 | 0.41 |
|  | Coho | 0.20 | 0.36 |
|  | Chinook | 0.37 | 0.32 |

${ }^{2}$ Only those rates associated with year/species combinations for which hatchery contributions were estimable are presented.
${ }^{b}$ No fishery

Table 4. Estimated adjustment factors for sockeye, chum, coho and chinook salmon by origin and year of return (coho only).

| Species | Origin | Adjustment Factor | Standard Error ${ }^{\text {s }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sockeye | Main Bay | 1.20 | 0.028 |
|  | Wild | 1.68 | 0.051 |
| Chum | Solomon Gulch | 2.09 | 0.166 |
|  | W. Noerenberg | 1.70 | 0.146 |
|  | Main Bay ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.90 | 0.111 |
| Chinook | Solomon Gulch ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1.22 |  |
|  | W. Noerenberg | 1.22 | 0.091 |
| Coho | Solomon Gulch ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |
|  | 1989 | 0.58 | c |
|  | 1990 | 1.01 | 0.316 |
|  | 1991 | 0.94 | $c$ |
|  | 1992 | 2.30 | 0.755 |
|  | 1993 | 1.39 | 0.380 |
|  | W. Noerenberg ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |  |  |
|  | 1990 | 1.01 | 0.109 |
|  | 1991 | 0.71 | c |
|  | 1992 | 1.07 | 0.129 |

a Estimated as average of Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg factors (appropriate ageclass data unavailable).
b Estimate from W. Noerenberg used (brood-year 1989 and 1990 fish from Solomon Gulch were released remotely, and no suitable brood stock was available from which to estimate an adjustment factor).
c When the point estimate of the adjustment factor was $<1.0$, no statistical test was required ( $p$-value $>0.5$ ), and a value of 1.0 was used.
d Releases from Solomon Gulch in 1993 were not tagged and therefore no adjustment factor was calculated for 1994.
e The first tagged releases from W. Noerenberg occurred in 1989 (first adjustment factor therefore calculated for 1990). In 1992, an outbreak of bacterial kidney disease prevented tagging and in 1993, only one release group was tagged and thus no adjustment factors were estimable for fish returning in 1993 and 1994.
$f$ See Appendix A.
contributions by wild sockeye salmon populations to the commercial harvests. For 1991 through 1993, untagged returns from five remote releases were likely present, and no estimation of the total wild component of the catches was considered possible. Contributions by wild fish of Eshamy origin were estimated when it was determined that all or some of the Eshamy returns originated from outmigrations which had been tagged. Age-class data collected at the Eshamy weir were used to estimate contributions in instances where some but not all returning fish originated from tagged releases. Contributions of sockeye salmon originating at the Main Bay hatchery to the common property fishery of 1989 through 1994 are presented by release group in Table 5. Wild contributions and specifically, contributions by Eshamy fish, are also estimated where possible. Detailed district-week estimates of contributions by the Main Bay facility and wild populations are given in Appendix C. The majority of the contributions to the common property fishery by sockeye salmon released from the Main Bay facility were made in district 225. Total contributions increased dramatically from about 2,500 in 1989 and 12,000 in 1990 to a maximum of 460,000 in 1991. The contributions for 1992, 1993 and 1994 were all greater than 115,000. In 1993, the first significant Main Bay Eshamy stock returns were observed, which constituted about $11 \%$ of the common property catch, compared to $26 \%$ for Main Bay fish of Coghill stock. In 1994, the contribution of the Main Bay Eshamy stock to the common property catch had increased to about $44 \%$, while that of the Main Bay Coghill stock had decreased to about $15 \%$. While most of the Main Bay releases contributed to the catch in district 225, there were also significant contributions made to the common property catch in district 223. The proportion of the common property catch in district 223 which consisted of sockeye salmon released from the Main Bay facility ranged from 0 in 1989 to $76 \%$ in 1992. Contributions by Eshamy and Coghill stocks reared and released at Main Bay to the common property fisheries of 1989 through 1994 are depicted in Figure 4.

In 1993, the first returns associated with the tagged remote releases were observed. The major contributing remote release group in 1993 was of Eshamy stock which was released into Eshamy River as smolt ( $23 \%$ of the total common property catch). A much smaller contribution was made by the Coghill River remote release group ( $3 \%$ of total common property catch). A similar picture was observed for 1994. About $76 \%$ and $54 \%$, respectively, of the contributions by the Eshamy River releases in 1993 and 1994 were observed in district 225, the remainder occurring in districts 223, 226 and 222. Approximately $77 \%$ and $81 \%$, respectively, of the contributions by the Coghill River releases in 1993 and 1994 were observed in district 223, the remainder occurring in districts 225,222 , and 226 . The geographic distribution of the contributions for the two major remote releases for 1993 and 1994 is depicted in Figure 5. Other tagged remote releases of Eshamy stock sockeye fry into Eshamy, Esther Pass and Pass Lakes contributed only marginally to the common property catches of 1993 and 1994.

Attempts to estimate the total wild contribution to the common property sockeye salmon catch were only made for 1989,1990 and 1994, when all returning hatchery sockeye release groups were tagged. During 1989, it was estimated that about $134,500(98.2 \%)$ of the common property catch of about 137,000 sockeye salmon were of wild origin. In 1990, the number and proportion of wild fish in the common property catch dropped so that only $45,600(79 \%)$ of the common property catch of 57,500 was of wild origin, and in 1994, the proportion had dropped further

Table 5. Estimated contributions of sockeye salmon by release group to the common property fishery of 1989 through 1994.


Table 5. (Continued)

'Additional contributions to district 224: 406 wild fish in 1989, 93 Main Bay (Coghill/Smolt) and 941 wild fish in 1990. Additional contributions to district 228 : 146 wild fish in 1989, 9 wild fish in 1990.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Other contributions may contain wild fish and/or untagged releases at Pass Lake ( 1988 release of 594,210 fry; 1989 release of 603,219 fry), Esther Pass Lake (1999 release of 153,031 fry, 1989 release of $154,644 \mathrm{fry}$ ) ) and Davis Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fry).


Figure 4. Contributions by Coghill and Eshamy sockeye salmon stocks released from the Main Bay hatchery to the 1989 through 1994 common property catches.



Figure 5. Geographical distribution of the contributions of the major remote release groups to the common property fisheries of 1993 and 1994.
still, so that only $20.5 \%(51,600)$ of the common property catch was estimated to be wild. Estimates of wild Eshamy returns were made in 1991, 1992 and 1993, when returns to the Eshamy system were believed to have originated from tagged outmigrations. It was estimated that about $4 \%, 6.5 \%$, and $13 \%$, respectively, of the total common property catches of 1991 through 1993 originated from the wild Eshamy population. In 1991, it was estimated that about $56 \%$ of the Eshamy fish caught in the common property were caught in district 226 , with $40 \%$ being caught in district 225 . In contrast, for 1992 and 1993, only $31 \%$ and $19 \%$, respectively, of the Eshamy fish caught in the common property fishery were landed in district 226 , the majority being caught in district 225 .

A large percentage of the common property catch of 1992 (36\%) cannot be accounted for by tagged release groups. It is likely that this group of fish consists of a mixture of non-Eshamy wild fish, including Coghill River-bound fish, and returns of the untagged remote releases.

There were no cost-recovery fisheries on sockeye salmon at the Main Bay facility for 1989 through 1991. Contributions by the Main Bay facility and wild populations to the cost-recoveries of 1992 through 1994 are given in Table 6. The total catch during the cost-recovery effort of 1992 was about 159,000 fish. It was estimated that almost half of these originated from untagged release lots. The returning fish which originated from the Main Bay hatchery were all deemed to be of Coghill stock. Few fish from the wild Eshamy population were found. The total costrecovery for 1993 was about 109,000 fish. Unlike the situation for 1992, almost all ( $97 \%$ ) was accounted for by sockeye salmon that had been released from the Main Bay hatchery. Of these, $81 \%$ were estimated to be of Coghill stock, the remainder being of Eshamy stock. In 1994, the cost-recovery catch was about 79,000 fish, and it was estimated that about $20,000(25 \%)$ of these fish originated from wild populations. About $59,400(75 \%)$ were estimated to have been released from the Main Bay hatchery. Of the hatchery fish, $52 \%$ were deemed to be of Coghill stock, while $43 \%$ were estimated to be of Eshamy stock, the remainder being of Main Bay and Eyak stocks. For all cost-recoveries, there was little contribution from any of the tagged remote release groups.

Contributions of tagged release groups to the escapements of the Coghill and Eshamy systems are presented in Table 7. The Jackpot system was scanned for tags in 1991 only, and none was found. No tags from sockeye salmon released at the Main Bay hatchery or from tagged wild Eshamy populations were found at the Coghill weir (District 223) in 1991. At the Eshamy weir (district 225) $1 \%$ of the 46,229 escapement of 1991 was estimated to have originated at the Main Bay hatchery. At the Coghill weir in 1992, no tags of Main Bay or Eshamy River origin were found. At the Eshamy weir in 1992, a small number of sockeye salmon of Main Bay origin were found ( $<1 \%$ ). At the Coghill weir in 1993, the majority of sockeye salmon of Main Bay origin ( $9.6 \%$ of escapement) arose from a remote release of smolt in Coghill River. Again, no tags associated with wild Eshamy fish were found at the Coghill weir. At the Eshamy weir in 1993, returns from remote releases of smolt in Eshamy River were evident ( $6.2 \%$ of escapement), as were significant returns of tagged wild Eshamy fish ( $81 \%$ of escapement). In 1994, while small numbers of sockeye salmon released at Main Bay found their way into both the Coghill and Eshamy systems ( 0.9 and $0.05 \%$ of escapement, respectively), the most significant contributions

Table 6. Estimated contributions of sockeye salmon by group to the cost-recovery fishery of 1992 through 1994.

| Year | Contributor(Stock/Type) | Release Site | District 225 | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | Main Bay (Coghill/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 84,925 | 53.4 |
|  | Main Bay (Eshamy/Smoit) | Main Bay Hatchery | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Main Bay |  | 84,925 | 53.4 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghil/Smolt) | Coghill R. Est. | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Smolt) | Eshamy R. Est. | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other* |  | 73,617 | 46.3 |
|  | Wild(Eshamy/Smoht) |  | 349 | 0.2 |
|  | Total Catch |  | 158,891 |  |
| 1993 | Main Bay (Coghil/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 85,386 | 78.5 |
|  | Main Bay (Eshamy/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 20,169 | 18.5 |
|  | Main Bay (Eyak/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Main Bay |  | 105,555 | 97.0 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill/Smolt) | Coghill R. Est. | 63 | 0.1 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Smott) | Eshamy R. Est. | 381 | 0.4 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 444 | 0.5 |
|  | Other ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 1,208 | 1.0 |
|  | Wild(Eshamy/Smolt) |  | 1,610 | 1.5 |
|  | Total catch |  | 108,817 |  |
| 1994 |  | Main Bay Hatchery | $31,106$ | 39.3 |
|  | Main Bay (Eshamy/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 25,681 | 32.5 |
|  | Main Bay (Main Bay/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 2,316 | 2.9 |
|  | Main Bay (Eyak/Fry) | Main Bay Hatchery | 249 | 0.3 |
|  | Total Main Bay |  | 59,352 | 75.0 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghil//Smolt) | Coghill R. Est | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Smott) | Eshamy R. Est. | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 19,779 | 25.0 |
|  | Total Catch |  | 79,131 |  |

${ }^{2}$ Other contributions may contain wild fish and/or untagged releases at Pass Lake ( 1988 release of 594,210 fry; 1989 release of 603,219 fry), Esther Pass Lake (1999 release of 153,031 fry; 1989 release of 154,644 fry)) and Davis Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fry).

Table 7. Estimated contributions of sockeye salmon by group to the escapement of the Eshamy(225) and Coghill(223) systems of 1991 through 1994.

| YEAR | Contributor(Stock/ype) | Release Site | District |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 | \% | 225 | \% |
| 1991 | Main Bay (Coghill/Smolt) | Main Bsy Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 415 | 0.9 |
|  | Other ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 9.752 | 100 | 0 | 5.0 |
|  | Wild(Eshamy/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 45,814 | 94.1 |
|  | Total Escapement |  | 9,752 |  | 46,229 |  |
| 1992 | Main Bay (Coghill/Smoit) | Main Hay Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 113 | 03 |
|  | Main Bay (Eshemy/Smott) | Main Bey Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Main Bay |  | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0.3 |
|  | Remote Release (Cogtill/Smolt) | Coghill R Est. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Smolt) | Eshamy R. Est. | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0.4 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Relesse |  | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0.4 |
|  | Other ${ }^{2}$ |  | 29,641 | 100 | 5,364 | 14.8 |
|  | Wild(Eshamy/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 30,627 | 84.5 |
|  | Total Escapement |  | 29,641 |  | 36.236 |  |
| 1993 | Main Bay (Coghill/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 134 | 1.1 | 102 | 0.23 |
|  | Main Bay (Eshamy/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Main Bay (Eyak/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Main Bay |  | 134 | 1.1 | 102 | 0.23 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill/Smolt) | Coghill R Est. | 1,181 | 9.6 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Smolt) | Eshamy R Est. | 0 | 0 | 2,643 | 6.2 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 1,181 | 9.6 | 2,649 | 6.2 |
|  | Other a |  | 10,937 | 89.3 | 5,485 | 12.8 |
|  | Wild(Eshamy/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 34,657 | 80.8 |
|  | Total Escapement |  | 12,252 |  | 42.893 |  |
| 1994 | Main Bay (Coghill/ ${ }^{\text {molt) }}$ | Main Bay Hatchery | 62 | 0.9 | 26 | 0 |
|  | Main Bay (Eshamy/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0.17 |
|  | Main Bay (Main Bay/Smolt) | Main Bay Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Main Bay (Eyak/Fry) | Main Bay Hatchery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Main Bay |  | 62 | 0.9 | 137 | 0.2 |
|  | Remote Release (CoghillSmolt) | Coghill R Est. | 3,416 | 47.0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Smolt) | Eshamy R. Est | 0 | 0 | 37,293 | 577 |
|  | Remote Release (Esharny/Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 24 | 03 | 3.320 | 5.1 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 3.440 | 47.3 | 40,613 | 62.8 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 3,762 | 51.7 | 23,910 | 37.0 |
|  | Total Escapement |  | 7.264 |  | 64.660 |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Other contributions may contain wild fish and/or untagged releases at Pass Lake ( 1988 release of 594,210 fry; 1989 release of 603,219 fry), Esther Pass Lake (1988 release of 153,031 fry; 1989 release of 154,644 fry)) and Davis Lake (1988 release of 657,287 fry).
by tagged release groups were made by remote releases of smolt into the Coghill ( $47 \%$ of escapement) and Eshamy ( $62.8 \%$ of escapement) rivers, respectively.

Brood-stock harvests were made for 1991 through 1994 at the Main Bay facility. The harvests were $31,961,4,579,8,020$ and 4,951 , respectively.

Survival rates for tagged release groups of sockeye salmon were calculated only for those groups which had completed their marine residencies. The survival rates of the different kinds of hatchery-reared release groups are presented in Table 8. Survival rates were generally highest for groups released directly from the Main Bay facility. The lowest survival rates were associated with sockeye salmon released remotely as fry. Survival rates by tag code are presented in Appendix B. A significant linear relationship was found between survival rate of release group and average weight of fish in the release group at release (Survival rate(\%) $=2.22+0.84$ (Release weight (g)); $\mathrm{p}<0.0001$ ). A significant relationship persisted when the analysis was performed only on data associated with those groups released from the Main Bay facility as smolts and of Coghill stock, i.e. on groups whose release weights were more similar (Survival rate(\%) $=7.44+0.49$ (Release weight (g)); $\mathrm{p}=0.03$ ). Survival rates of tagged wild populations are presented in Table 9. The estimated survival rates of wild Eshamy fish are of a similar magnitude to those of the fish reared and released at the Main Bay facility. The survival rates of the Coghill wild fish, however, are significantly smaller than those of the wild Eshamy fish and those of any of the groups reared at the Main Bay hatchery.

## Contributions and survival rates of chum salmon.

Tags applied at the Main Bay, Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg facilities were recovered in common property, cost-recovery and brood-stock harvests. Hatchery contributions to the common property fishery of 1994 are presented in Table 10. Wild contributions are also presented. Detailed district-week estimates of contributions by the Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg facilities and by wild populations are given in Appendix C. By far the largest catch of chum salmon in 1994 (approximately half a million) occurred in district 223. About $78 \%$ of this catch were estimated to have been reared at the $W$. Noerenberg facility, the remainder being predominantly of wild origin.

The next largest catch was much smaller (about 42,000 ) and was made in district 221, and was estimated to consist of $8 \%$ fish reared at the W. Noerenberg facility and $12 \%$ fish reared at the Solomon Gulch facility, the remainder being of wild origin. Catches of chum salmon were also made in district 225 (about 16,$500 ; 46 \%$ of wild origin), 226 (about 9,$000 ; 74 \%$ of wild origin) and 222 (about $1500 ; 58 \%$ of wild origin). Cost-recovery harvests of chum salmon were made in 1994 in districts 221 ( 2,881 ;estimated $100 \%$ wild and incidental to the pink salmon cost-recovery fishery), 223 ( 374,375 ; estimated $15 \%$ wild), and 225 ( 2,863 ; estimated $64 \%$ wild and incidental to the sockeye salmon cost-recovery fishery). The Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg facilities harvested 2,863 and 111,603 chum salmon as brood stock, respectively.

Significant fully-tagged returns of chum salmon reared at the Main Bay facility were present only in the common property fisheries of 1990 and 1991. Contributions by Main Bay chum salmon to

Table 8. Survival rates of release groups of sockeye salmon reared at the Main Bay hatchery.

| Contributor(Stock/Type) | Brood <br> Year | Release Site | Survival Rate <br> $\%$ | Standard <br> Error |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  |  |  | 5.3 | 0.21 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1986 | Main Bay <br> Main Bay | 16.0 | 0.59 |
|  | 1987 | Main Bay <br> 1988 | Main Bay | 9.9 |

Table 9. Survival rates of wild release groups of sockeye salmon.

| Population | Release Site | Release <br> Year | Tag code | Survival <br> Rate $\%$ | Standard <br> Error |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Eshamy weir | 1989 |  |  |  |  |
| Eshamy Lake | Eshamy weir | 1990 | 311840 | 15.5 | 0.51 |  |
| Eshamy Lake | Eshamy weir | 1991 | 311910 | 11.1 | 0.56 |  |
| Eshamy Lake | Eshamy weir | 1991 | 311951 | 3.2 | 0.36 |  |
| Eshamy Lake | Eshamy weir | 1991 | 311956 | 20.6 | 0.91 |  |
| Eshamy Lake |  |  | 311957 | 12.6 | 0.65 |  |
|  | Coghill weir | 1989 |  |  |  |  |
| Coghill Lake | Coghill weir | 1991 | 1301010403 | 0.65 | 0.08 |  |
| Coghill Lake | Coghill weir | 1991 | 1301020101 | 0.68 | 0.09 | 0.05 |
| Coghill Lake |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 10. Contributions of chum salmon to the common property fisheries of 1994.

| Contributor | 221 | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 222 |  |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 4,990 | 12.0 | 0 | 0 | 335 | 0 | 796 | 4.9 | 854 | 9.1 | 6,975 | 1.1 |
| W. Noerenberg | 3,470 | 8.3 | 609 | 41.7 | 436,005 | 78.2 | 7,992 | 48.7 | 1,600 | 17.1 | 449,676 | 69.0 |
| Total Hatchery | 8,460 | 20.3 | 609 | 41.7 | 436,340 | 78.2 | 8,788 | 53.6 | 2,454 | 26.2 | 456,651 | 70.1 |
| Wild | 33,176 | 79.7 | 853 | 58.3 | 121,446 | 21.8 | 7,619 | 46.4 | 6,921 | 73.8 | 195,196 | 30.0 |
| Total Catch | 41,636 |  | 1,462 |  | 597,786 |  | 16,407 |  | 9,375 |  | 651,847 |  |

the common property fishery of 1990 were restricted to the Coghill (estimated 44,741 to a catch of 312,400 ) and Eshamy (estimated 207,600 to a catch of 359,300 ) districts. Contributions by Main Bay chum salmon to the 1991 common property fishery were restricted to the Eshamy district (estimated 162,960 to a catch of 251,870 ). As a result of discontinuation of chum salmon production at the Main Bay facility, there were no brood-stock harvests of this species over the period covered by the current study.

Survival rates for tagged release groups of chum salmon were calculated only for those groups which had completed their marine residencies. They are presented by tagcode in Appendix B. Some evidence was found to indicate that survival rates of chum salmon released from the W . Noerenberg facility were related to release weights (Survival Rate $=-0.752+4.2$ (Release Weight (g)); $\mathrm{p}=0.103$ ).

## Contributions and survival rates of coho salmon.

Tags applied at the Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg facilities were recovered in common property, cost-recovery and brood-stock harvests. The three-year life cycle of coho salmon allows estimation of hatchery contributions for most years. Exceptions are those from the W. Noerenberg facility in 1989 (tagging of coho salmon commenced only in 1989 at this facility) and 1993 (bacterial kidney disease in 1992 prevented tagging) and those from the Solomon Gulch facility in 1994 (fish were not tagged in 1993 at Solomon Gulch). Consequently, wild contribution estimates derived from differences between total catches and estimated hatchery contributions were made only for 1990, 1991 and 1992. Estimated contributions of coho salmon originating from the Solomon Gulch and W . Noerenberg facilities to the common property fisheries of 1990, 1991 and 1992 are presented in Table 11. Wild contributions are also presented. Detailed district-week estimates of contributions by the Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg facilities are given in Appendix C. Common property catches of coho salmon ranged from 93,000 in 1991 to 215,000 in 1990. In all years, the vast majority of the catch occurred in district 223 , and of this catch by far the most significant contributor was the W . Noerenberg facility. Over the period 1989 through 1994, cost-recovery harvests of coho salmon were made in districts 221 and 223. The Solomon Gulch harvests ranged from 11,201 (estimated 67\% Solomon Gulch fish; $25 \%$ wild) in 1990 to 55,515 (estimated $60 \%$ Solomon Gulch fish) in 1989. The W. Noerenberg harvests ranged from 13,230 (estimated $100 \%$ W. Noerenberg fish) in 1991 to 46,700 (estimated $98 \%$ W. Noerenberg fish; $2 \%$ wild) in 1992 . The Solomon Gulch facility harvested $12,231,1,465$ and 1,179 coho salmon for brood-stock purposes in 1990 through 1992, respectively. The W. Noerenberg facility harvested $2,287,1,635$ and 2,986 coho salmon for brood-stock purposes in 1990 through 1992, respectively.

Survival rates for tagged release groups of coho salmon are estimable for all codes released from 1989 through 1993. They are presented by tagcode in Appendix B. An analysis of the effect of release size upon survival rate for the W. Noerenberg and Solomon Gulch facilities revealed no significant relationship ( $\mathrm{p}=0.23$ for Solomon Gulch; $\mathrm{p}=0.35$ for W. Noerenberg).

## Contributions and survival rates of chinook salmon

Tags applied at the W. Noerenberg facilities were recovered in the common property, costrecovery and brood-stock harvests. Only in 1993 and 1994 were all returning hatchery release

Table 11. Estimated contributions of coho salmon to the common property fisheries of 1990 through 1992.

| Year | Contributor | 221 | 222 |  |  | 223 | 224 |  |  | 225 | \% 226 |  | \% | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | Solomon Guich | 11,340 | 62.2 | 1,400 | 11.3 | 3,481 | 2.5 | 386 | 19.0 | 0 | 0 | 2,809 | 6.9 | 19,416 | 9.0 |
|  | W. Noerenberg | 0 | 0 | 5,778 | 46.6 | 99,637 | 70.9 | 935 | 46.0 | 0 | 0 | 13,884 | 33.9 | 120,234 | 55.8 |
|  | Total Hatchery* | 11,388 | 62.2 | 7,401 | 59.7 | 107,648 | 76.6 | 1355 | 66.7 | 0 | 0 | 18,222 | 44.6 | 146,014 | 67.8 |
|  | Wild | 6,832 | 37.8 | 4,986 | 40.3 | 32,898 | 23.4 | 677 | 33.3 | 1,278 | 100 | 22,651 | 55.4 | 69,322 | 32.2 |
|  | Total Catch | 18,220 |  | 12,387 |  | 140,546 |  | 2,032 |  | 1,278 |  | 40,873 |  | 215,336 |  |
| 1991 | Solomon Gulch | 1,340 | 29.1 | 0 | 0 | 501 | 0.6 |  |  | 428 | 40.0 | 460 | 5.8 | 2,729 | 2.9 |
|  | W. Noerenberg | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72,722 | 92.1 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1,017 | 12.9 | 73,739 | 79.5 |
|  | Total Hatchery ${ }^{2}$ | 1,417 | 30.8 | 0 | 0 | 74.814 | 94.7 |  |  | 428 | 40.0 | 1,843 | 23.3 | 78,502 | 84.6 |
|  | Wild | 3,187 | 69.2 | 207 | 100 | 4,170 | 5.3 |  |  | 641 | 59.9 | 6,062 | 76.7 | 14,267 | 15.4 |
|  | Total Catch | 4,604 |  | 207 |  | 78,984 |  | 0 |  | 1,069 |  | 7905 |  | 92,769 |  |
| 1992 | Solomon Gulch | 17 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 1,599 | 1.4 |  |  | 12 | 0.5 |  |  | 1628 | 1.4 |
|  | W. Noerenberg | 0 | 0 | 1,744 | 76.3 | 111,712 | 97.8 |  |  | 1,939 | 85.8 |  |  | 115,395 | 96.9 |
|  | Total Hatchery' | 17 | 7.1 | 1,744 | 76.3 | 113,311 | 99.1 |  |  | 1,951 | 86.4 |  |  | 117,023 | 98.3 |
|  | Wild | 222 | 92.9 | 542 | 23.7 | 965 | 0.8 |  |  | 308 | 13.6 |  |  | 2,037 | 1.7 |
|  | Total Catch | 239 |  | 2,286 |  | 114,276 |  | 0 |  | 2,259 |  | 0 |  | I 19,060 |  |

[^0]groups tagged. Consequently, wild contribution estimates derived from differences between total catches and estimated hatchery contributions were made only for 1993 and 1994. Contributions of chinook salmon originating from the W. Noerenberg facility to the common property fishery of 1993 and 1994 are presented in Table 12. Wild contributions are also presented. Detailed district-week estimates of contributions by the W . Noerenberg facilities and by wild populations are given in Appendix C. The only hatchery contributor for 1993 and 1994 was the W. Noerenberg facility. The largest catches of chinook salmon were made in district 223. Of the 727 chinook salmon caught in 1993 in district $223,349(48 \%)$ were estimated to be of hatchery origin, while $137(29 \%)$ of the 478 chinook salmon caught in 1994 were estimated to be of hatchery origin. Cost-recovery harvests of chinook salmon made in 1993 and 1994 in district 223 were 1460 (estimated $30 \%$ wild; incidental to the chum salmon cost-recovery fishery) and 835 (estimated $82 \%$ wild; incidental to the chum salmon cost-recovery fishery), respectively. The W. Noerenberg facility harvested 573 and 284 chinook salmon as brood stock in 1993 and 1994, respectively.

Survival rates for tagged release groups of chinook salmon were calculated only for those groups which had completed their marine residencies and only for those groups which were fully sampled upon their return, i.e. no survival rates were computed for releases designed to provide sport fisheries where much of the return was not sampled for tags. Survival rates by tagcode are presented in Appendix B.

Table 12. Estimated contributions of chinook salmon to the common property fisheries of 1993 and 1994.


## DISCUSSION

## Contributions and Survival Rates

## Sockeye Salmon

## Main Bay Releases

The influence of hatchery production of sockeye salmon on the common property fishery on this species is immediately evident upon inspection of the data in Table 5. In 1989, only three yearold fish from the first hatchery releases in 1988 had returned, and the majority of the catch was consequently of wild origin. In the following years, total catches increased dramatically because of returning hatchery fish. The composition of the returns to the Main Bay facility has also changed over time. When the Main Bay facility began operation, its brood stocks were taken from the Coghill River/Lake system. As the sockeye salmon fishery in district 225 developed, and the first signs that the Coghill sockeye population may be in danger were observed, a conscious effort was made to change the composition of the Main Bay releases. In an attempt to avoid interception of the declining Coghill stocks, the facility began using brood stock from the Eyak and Eshamy systems, whose runs are generally earlier and later, respectively, than that of the Coghill system. The influence of this action on the returns to the Main Bay hatchery was first noticed in 1993, when the first returns of the Eshamy stock were observed (Figure 4). With respect to contributions to the cost-recovery harvests, the lion's share was made by Main Bay releases, although in 1992 and 1994, there were significant other components. Reassuringly, there was little contamination of the escapements of the Eshamy and Coghill systems with sockeye salmon released from the Main Bay facility.

Survival rates of sockeye salmon released from the Main Bay facility were quite variable (Table 8, Appendix B). While year and other experimental factors confounded the analysis to some extent, a regression of survival rate on release weight yielded a significantly positive slope of between 0.49 and 0.84 percentage points per $g$ of release weight The practical significance of this result is unknown.

## Remote Releases

In 1990 and 1991, only $15 \%$ of the escapement goal for sockeye salmon returning to the Coghill Lake system was satisfied. Further, partially enumerated smolt outmigrations in 1989, 1990 and 1991 were well below expected levels, as were hydroacoustic estimates of fry rearing in the lake The reason for this decline is unknown, although some hypotheses have been formulated. It is possible that the system experienced an overescapement in 1985 and 1987, when more than three times the desired number of fish entered the river. Another hypothesis is that the 1964 earthquake caused the formation of a saltwater lens in the lake which disrupted nutrient flow, plankton populations, and ultimately the carrying capacity of the lake. Limnological evidence supports the contention that the nutrient cycle and plankton populations have been disrupted, and a Forest Service project is underway to fertilize the lake and reverse some of the trends in the lake's nutrient status. The development in the mid-1980's by the State of Alaska and PWSAC of new
hatchery sockeye and chum salmon fisheries which coincided both spatially and temporally with returning Coghill sockeye stocks is also probably a contributing factor to the declining run.

The low returns in 1990 and 1991, and the low numbers of smolt detected leaving Coghill river in 1989 through 1991 suggested that few sockeye salmon would return to this system in 1992, 1993 and 1994. A number of measures were taken to improve the chances that wild Coghill sockeye salmon would successfully run the gauntlet of the intensively-fished migratory corridors. In 1992, a scale-pattern discrimination study was conducted in which wild Coghill fish were distinguished from Main Bay hatchery fish in the commercial catch. Fishery managers used this information to decide whether opening certain areas to fishing would likely result in significant numbers of wild fish being caught. In an attempt to bolster the returns of 1993 and 1994, a remote release program was implemented, whereby smolt reared at the Main Bay hatchery were released into the Coghill River Estuary. The idea was that the smolt would imprint on the water at the release site, and would thus manage to navigate back to the river to spawn and contribute to the escapement. While returns to the Eshamy system had been relatively healthy, the newly developed hatchery chum and sockeye fisheries posed an interception threat to the run, and a remote release program was also initiated for this system. Hatchery-reared smolt were released into the Coghill and Eshamy Rivers in 1991, 1992 and 1993. Hatchery-reared fry were also released into Eshamy Lake in 1991, in an attempt to compare different methods of remote releases.

In general, returns of the Coghill remote releases were lower than those of the Eshamy releases. This was because fewer fish were released into the Coghill River as remote releases, and also because the survival rate of the Coghill releases (1989 brood year) was about half that of the Eshamy releases (Table 8). The reason for the large difference in survival rates is unknown. Both remote release groups were reared in the same hatchery and were released on the same day, removing timing and fish-husbandry practices as explanatory factors. Neither can the difference be explained in terms of the size of fish at release. The Eshamy releases were in fact smaller than the Coghill releases. Significant contributions by both Coghill and Eshamy remote release groups were made to the common property fishery in 1993 and 1994 (Fig.5, Table 5).

The contribution of the Eshamy remote release group to the escapement at the Eshamy weir in 1993 was minimal. It became evident during the season that the escapement goal would be met by late August, and the Eshamy Lagoon was opened to harvest late-arriving sockeye salmon. Coded wire tag data indicated that the large majority of the escapement consisted of lake-reared fish (Table 7). The late-arriving sockeye salmon are thought to have originated predominantly from the remote release groups and their harvest by the commercial fleet is reflected in the large remote release contribution to district 225 in 1993 (Table 5). Since most of the remote released fish were caught by the fleet, it is difficult to determine whether these fish would have eventually ventured up the river. The catch was reported to contain large numbers of darkened fish, and it is speculated that even if the remote releases had passed through the weir, they may have been poor substitutes for their (usually) ocean-bright wild counterparts.

The return to the Eshamy system in 1994 was skewed, and was extremely late, with $50 \%$ of the run having passed the weir on September 23, as compared to the historic mean date of August 13. From daily weir counts and CWT tag data obtained from sampling the escapement, it was
apparent that remote-released fish dominated the return after September 22, and were therefore responsible for the late mean return date. While high water temperatures and low stream discharge were believed to have been responsible for slowing entry of lake-reared fish into Eshamy River, the late entry of the remote-released fish was more a consequence of their late arrival into the area. By the time the remote releases had appeared, the commercial fleet had largely ceased to operate, and were unlikely to renew their efforts to harvest fish which were darkened and of poor quality. Consequently, the lateness of the remote releases removed the ability of fishery managers to control the escapement into the river, with the consequence that 66,000 fish escaped, about 25,000 fish over the goal. Whether the remote-release members of the escapement spawned successfully is debatable, however, as many of the fish which passed through the weir were lethargic and in poor condition. Since 40,600 fish in the escapement were estimated to be of remote-release origin, it is possible that in the extreme case where none of the remote release fish spawned successfully, that the effective escapement was 19,400, far short of the 40,000 goal.

The contribution by Coghill remote releases to the Coghill River escapement in 1993 was small ( $13 \%$ of escapement). In 1994, the contribution constituted $47 \%$ of the escapement. As with the Eshamy remote releases, the remote-released fish were late, and displayed an imprecise homing ability.

In summary, the remote release program has not achieved its objectives, i.e. that remotelyreleased slamon would contribute to escapements in a manner akin to wild fish. The delayed runtiming, the darkened nature of the fish, and the imprecise homing seen at both the Eshamy and Coghill Rivers, have conspired to create more problems for management than they have solved. Fisheries managers do not know whether sockeye salmon found in the vicinities of these systems will migrate up the river, and if they do, whether they will be effective spawners. Even if the returning remote releases were known quantities, with respect to their homing and spawning abilities, the late nature of the returns coincidental with cessation of fleet activities, effectively removed the ability of the manager to control escapement levels.

In addition to the program designed to enhance escapements at the Coghill and Eshamy Rivers, another remote release program concerned the assimilation of excess fry and/or pre-smolt production at the Main Bay facility. The idea behind the releases was to use various barriered lakes in the Sound as natural incubators, so that the only consequence of the program was the augmentation of the commercial fishery, and not the establishment or rehabilitation of any populations. A release of fry at Marsha Lake on Knight Island in the South Western district was tagged, but has not yet begun contributing to the commercial fishery. At Pass and Esther Pass Lakes, releases of tagged fry were a part of a study designed to compare the suitability of the lakes as receptors of excess fry production. Adult survival rates associated with both lakes were low (Table 8), with that pertaining to Esther Pass (3.4\%) lake surpassing that of Pass Lake ( $1.1 \%$ ). From growth measurements taken from outmigrating smolts, it appears that some of the difference in adult survival rates, at least, occurred at the pre-smolt to smolt stage (Carpenter, pers. comm.).

## Wild Returns

Total wild contributions are routinely calculated as the difference between estimated hatchery contributions and the total catch. As a result of incomplete tagging of releases of excess production of fry and/or presmolt at Pass, Esther Pass and Davis Lakes, estimation of total wild contributions during 1991 through 1993, in which the untagged releases returned, was not possible. The change in the importance of the wild component to the sockeye salmon fishery can still be seen, however, in that $98 \%$ of the total common property catch in 1989 was of wild origin, whereas in 1990 and 1994, this percentage fell to $79 \%$ and $21 \%$, respectively.

For 1991 through 1993, returns of fish reared in Eshamy Lake to the Eshamy River were estimable from CWT recoveries and the dominance of the hatchery contributions to the common property fishery over those made by the Eshamy system is evident from Table 5. As a result of problems with the enumeration of the outmigration at Coghill River during the tagging process in 1989 and 1991, and the fact that the outmigration was not tagged in 1990, direct estimation of the returns of wild Coghill fish from tag-recovery data was not possible. This was to be unfortunate, given the severe shortfalls in the escapement levels at the Coghill weir in 1993 and 1994. The information would have been useful to fishery managers in determining the impact of the commercial fisheries in the Eshamy and Esther subdistricts upon the Coghill returns. This is especially true when considering the common property fishery in the Esther subdistrict in 1993, when contributions of wild and/or untagged remote releases, were about 25,000 fish. Similarly, the wild component of the common property fishery in 1994 in the same district was about 9,000 fish. These numbers are of sufficient magnitude that were they to represent wild Coghill fish, the Coghill escapement goals could have been achieved had the fishery in the Esther subdistrict not occurred.

Marine survival rates of tagged wild stocks varied widely within a watershed both between and within years. That fish migrating from the Coghill system did not survive as well as those migrating from the Eshamy system is evident, however (Table 9). It therefore appears that Coghill sockeye stock may not only be suffering at the lake-rearing stage, but that they also suffer reduced marine survival.

One of the original objectives of this study was to compare survival rates of sockeye salmon native to watersheds that lay in the path of the Exxon Valdez (Eshamy, Jackpot) to that of one that was distant from the oil trajectory. While the ability to calculate survival rates of fish migrating out of Jackpot River was lost because the escapement at this site was only scanned for tags in 1991, the direction of the Eshamy-Coghill survival rate difference is opposite to that expected under the hypothesis that oiling would reduce marine survival rates. In hindsight, the comparison is not a good one, because of the potential existence of confounding factors, such as the possible problem associated with the fertility of the lake.

## Chum Salmon

Only in 1994 were all returning hatchery release groups tagged. This was a consequence of the relatively late start the W . Noerenberg facility experienced in tagging their chum salmon releases
(first chum salmon releases tagged in 1990) and of a 1988 release from the Solomon Gulch facility which was not tagged. Consequently, wild contribution estimates derived from differences between total catches and estimated hatchery contributions were made only for 1994. For some years data pertaining to the age-class structure of the hatchery brood stock was available and attempts were made to use this information to estimate the contribution of untagged hatchery returns. The variability of the resulting contribution estimates were so large, however, that they were of dubious value, and the practice was terminated. In addition, for unbiased estimation on a stratum by stratum basis, an inherent assumption is that within a certain stratum, the fish returning to a given hatchery have the same age composition as those fish in the brood stock. This is improbable, with the result that such estimates will likely be biased. Another method of calculating wild contributions would have been to obtain an estimate of the overall marking rate in the brood stock of the hatchery in question, and use it for all tags recovered for that hatchery in the given year. This would have allowed estimation of the total wild return for a year in which tags of at least one release group were present in the return. Unbiased estimation on a stratum by stratum basis requires, however, that the within-stratum tag composition of fish returning to a given hatchery is the same as that in the brood stock. This is improbable, and biased estimation would again be the likely result.

The large production by the W . Noerenberg facility is clearly seen from Table 10. Almost half a million chum salmon were harvested in the Esther subdistrict common property fishery in 1994. As noted previously, a significant number of sockeye salmon were caught in this fishery, and it is possible that they were members of the depressed Coghill return. In an attempt to alleviate this potential problem, moves are afoot to relocate at least some of the W. Noerenberg chum salmon return, and hence the chum salmon common property fishery, to Port Chalmers on Montague Island through a remote release program. It is hoped that this will relieve some of the pressure from the migratory corridor of the Coghill sockeye stock. The cost-recovery fishery at W . Noerenberg harvested few wild chum salmon (12\%).

The chum salmon return to the Solomon Gulch facility in 1994 was significantly smaller than that to the W. Noerenberg facility. This difference is mainly a consequence of the much larger releases at the W. Noerenberg facility. The W. Noerenberg hatchery released 124.2 million fry, while the Solomon Gulch facility only released 4.8 million fry from the brood years which contributed to the 1994 common property fishery as four and five year-olds. Another less significant factor is the lower marine survival of chum salmon reared at the Solomon Gulch hatchery (Appendix B). The reason for the latter is unknown.

An analysis of the relationship between release weight and survival rate of chum salmon released from the $W$. Noerenberg hatchery revealed some evidence ( $\mathrm{p}=0.1$ ) that higher survival rates were correlated with higher release weights although it was weaker than those obtained for the sockeye releases. The smaller range in the independent variable (release weight) associated with the chum salmon released from the W. Noerenberg facility in 1990, combined with fewer data points (Appendix B) contrived to make the statistical test of the slope of the regression less powerful.

Coho Salmon
The difference in the sheer capacity of the W . Noerenberg facility to produce fish over that of the Solomon Gulch facility is again reflected by its contribution of coho salmon to the common property fisheries of 1990 through 1992. Survival rates (Appendix B) were variable both within facility and year and between facility and year. There were no obvious differences in rates between facilities, however, and the greater contributions by the W. Noerenberg facility are believed to originate from the greater number of fish released from the hatchery. Unlike the situation for sockeye and chum salmon releases, there was no discernible effect of release size on survival rate ( $\mathrm{p}=0.23$ for Solomon Gulch; $\mathrm{p}=0.35$ for W. Noerenberg). For the analysis of the data pertaining to the Solomon Gulch facility at least, the lack of ability to detect a relationship cannot be attributed to a low sample size, or to a small range of the independent variable. No hypothesis is offered to explain why a relationship between release weight and survival rate appears to exist for sockeye and chum salmon, but not for coho salmon.

## Chinook Salmon

The chinook salmon component of the Prince William Sound salmon fishery is very small, and catches were made incidentally in the fishery which targeted the large $W$. Noerenberg hatchery chum salmon returns. In a manner similar to the returns of chum salmon, the presence of untagged hatchery chinook salmon compromised the ability of the CWT program to estimate contributions for certain years. The chinook salmon caught in 1993 and 1994 were found to consist of significant numbers of wild fish. There is little data at this time for assessment of the effect of release weight on survival rate.

## Adjustment Factors

Estimation of the combined effects of tag loss and differential mortality of tagged fish upon the marking rates in returning fish is difficult even for pink salmon (Sharr et al, 1995b), which have a strict two-year life cycle. The main problem with pink salmon appears to be related to the assumption that the brood stock consists solely of hatchery-reared fish, although only circumstantial evidence exists to support this contention. Another possible problem is the effect of the magnetic steel tag upon homing fidelity, leading to an underepresentation of hatchery fish in the brood stock, and inflated adjustment factors. With multiple age-class species, there is the added question of whether the influence of tag loss and differential mortality is different for fish of different marine residencies. Questions relating to the purity of the pink salmon brood stock and the homing ability of returning tagged pink salmon may be answered with the coincidental operation of the CWT and otolith-marking programs. In the latter program, all hatchery-reared fish will have specifically-marked otoliths so that the wild component in the brood stock will be estimable, and a comparison of the CWT and otolith estimates of hatchery fish in the brood stock will be possible. An assessment of homing ability of CWT-marked fish could be conducted through a comparison of the ratio of tagged to untagged hatchery-released fish (determined through otolith marks) in streams near to the facility in question to that found in the brood stock. While the relevance of these findings to other species may be questionable, the tendency of pink
salmon to stray to a greater extent (Horrall, 1981) could be used to establish an argument that the degree of straying by wild pink salmon into a brood stock is a maximum. Further, since the potential damage to pink salmon fry by a CWT is probably much greater than to a smolt, any taginduced straying could also probably be considered a maximum.

## Recommendations for future studies

Some parts of this program could have been performed more effectively had there been more communication between Divisions within the Department. A major example was the release of untagged sockeye fry at Pass, Esther Pass and Davis Lakes. These fish returned over a period of the study when estimation of the total wild component of the catches and escapements was desirable. In the presence of the untagged hatchery-reared fish, it was impossible to estimate wild fish from the difference between total catches or escapement, and estimates of hatchery contributions from returning tagged hatchery-reared fish. Further, the inability to estimate total wild contributions prevented an indirect estimation of the return to the Coghill system. In the event where an estimate of the Eshamy return was available, the Coghill return could have been estimated as the difference between the total wild return and the estimate of the Eshamy return.

Another factor that contributed to the failure of some experiments was a lack of forward funding. This is required when studies are anticipated to extend over several years. One example is the attempt to estimate the survival rates of fish migrating from the Jackpot watershed. Smolt were tagged at this system in 1990 and 1991, and yet the escapement was only scanned for tags in 1991, thus recovering tags from part of the return associated with the release of 1990, and none from the release of 1991. Consequently, estimation of survival rates for this system was impossible. Another example is the discontinuous nature of the tagging program at the Coghill weir, where the outmigration of 1990 was not tagged. This meant that during those years in which fish from the tagged years returned, fish from the untagged year were also present. Any estimation of the total contribution by the Coghill system to any stratum would then have required use of age-class data. As well as adding variability to the estimate, use of age-class data would have meant that the estimate would not have been available inseason.

Finally, improved co-ordination between tag application and tag recovery personnel would alleviate some of the problems stemming from differential tagging rates among releases, such as that associated with estimation of contributions when untagged release groups of chum and chinook salmon returned with tagged release groups.

## CONCLUSIONS

As expected, the proportion of fish from wild populations in the commercial catches decreased with increasing releases of hatchery fish. Postseason analysis of recovered tags from sockeye salmon reared and released at the Main Bay facility revealed that the percentage of the common property catch attributable to the facility increased from $1.8 \%$ in 1989 to between $39 \%$ in 1993 and $91 \%$ in 1991. Significant relationships between release size and survival rates were detected for sockeye salmon. Efforts to enhance natural sockeye salmon populations through remote releases largely failed. While tagged remote-released sockeye salmon, designed to augment natural populations, returned to the Eshamy and Coghill Rivers, they were late and in poor condition. The ability of these fish to spawn effectively is debatable, and the program was not considered successful. A comparison of adult survival rates for fry stocked at Pass and Esther Pass Lakes showed the latter to be the more suitable disposal site for excess fry production at the Main Bay facility. The comparison between survival rates of sockeye salmon from oiled and unoiled areas was compromised by incomplete scanning of escapements due to lack of funding and problems with enumeration of the sockeye salmon smolt outmigration at Coghill River. The ability of the coded wire tag program to estimate the total wild component in the sockeye salmon returns of 1991 through 1993 was compromised by the presence of untagged hatchery-reared fish from remote releases at Davis, Esther Pass and Pass Lakes, although specific contributions by the Eshamy system were estimable in certain years. The marine survival rates of fish from the Coghill system were substantially lower than those of fish from the Eshamy system. With respect to chum salmon returns, some evidence was collected to suggest an influence of release size on survival rates. No such relationship was detected for coho and chinook salmon

## LITERATURE CITED

Bailey, J.E. 1966. Effects of salinity on intertidal pink salmon survival In Proceedings of the 1966 Northeast Pacific Pink Salmon Workshop Oct. 3, 1966 pp. 12-15.

Clark, J.E. and D.R. Bernard. 1987. A compound multivariate binomial-hypergeometric distribution describing microwire tag recovery from commercial salmon catches in southeast Alaska. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Information Leaflet 261 Juneau.

GAUSS System, Version 3.0, 1992. Aptech Systems, Inc., 23804 S.E. Kent-Kangley Road, Maple Valley, WA 98038.

Geiger, H, J. 1990. Parametric bootstrap confidence intervals for estimating contributions to fisheries from marked salmon populations. American Fisheries Society Symposium 7:667676.

Geiger, H.J. and Sharr, S. 1990. The 1988 tag study of pink salmon from the Solomon Gulch Hatchery in Prince William Sound, Alaska, In Pilot studies in tagging Prince William Sound hatchery pink salmon with coded-wire tags. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Fishery Research Bulletin No. 90-02 Juneau.

Horrall, R.M. 1981. Behavioural stock-isolating mechanisms in Great Lakes fishes with special reference to homing and site imprinting. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences38:1481-1496.

Kirkwood, J.B. 1962. Inshore marine and freshwater life history phases of pink salmon (Oncorhynchus gorbuscha) and chum salmon (O. keta) in Prince William Sound, Alaska. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Louisville, 300 pp . Louisville, Kentucky.

McCurdy, M.L. 1979. Prince William Sound general districts 1979 pink and chum salmon forecasts, background, methods, and thoughts. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Prince William Sound Management Area Data Report No. 14-1979.

Morrison J, and Zajac, D. 1987. Histologic effect of coded-wire tagging in chum salmon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 7:439-441.

Munk, K.M. and W.W. Smoker. 1990. Temperature-induced marks in otoliths of pink salmon embryos. Juneau School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences Report 90-01. University of Alaska, Juneau, Alaska.

Peltz, L. and Geiger, H.J. 1990. A tagging study of the effects of hatcheries on the 1987 pink salmon fishery in Prince William Sound, Alaska, In Pilot studies in tagging Prince William

Sound hatchery pink salmon with coded wire tags. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Fishery Research Bulletin No. 90-02 Juneau.

Peltz, L. and Miller, J. 1990. Performance of half-length coded wire tags in a pink salmon hatchery marking program. American Fisheries Society Symposium 7:244-252.

Rbase Version 4.0a, 1992. Microrim, Inc., 15395 S.E. 30th Place, Bellevue, WA 98007.
Sharr, S., B.G. Bue, S.D. Moffit, A.K. Craig, and D.G. Evans. 1994. Injury to salmon eggs and preemergent fry in Prince William Sound, Exxon Valdez Oil Spill State/Federal Natural Resource Damage Assessment Final Report (Fish/Shellfish Study Number 2), Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division, Cordova, Alaska.

Sharr, S., C.J. Peckham, D.G. Sharp, J.L. Smith, D.G. Evans and B.G. Bue. 1995a. Coded wire tag studies on Prince William Sound salmon. Exxon Valdez Oil Spill State/Federal Resource Damage Assessment Final Report (Restoration Study R60A), Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division, Cordova, Alaska.

Sharr, S., R. Riffe, S. Gehlbach, D.G. Evans and B.G. Bue. 1995b. Coded wire tag recoveries from pink salmon in Prince William Sound salmon.fisheries. Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Project Annual Report (Restoration Project 94320B), Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division, Cordova, Alaska

Willete, T.M., G. Carpenter, P.Shields, and S.R. Carlson. 1994. Early marine salmon injury assessment in Prince William Sound, Exxon Valdez Oil Spill State/Federal Natural Resource Damage Assessment Final Report (Fish/Shellfish Study Number 4A), Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division, Cordova, Alaska

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A. Derivation of standard errors of adjustment factor estimates

The adjustment factor for hatchery $h$ for a given species is calculated by (Equation 3, Methods):

$$
\hat{a} f_{h}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{h}} s_{h i} \hat{m}_{h i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{h}} \sum_{j=1}^{T_{h i}} \frac{x_{h i j}}{p_{j}}}
$$

where
$N_{h} \quad=\quad$ Number of years for which brood samples were collected from hatchery $h$, $s_{h i} \quad=\quad$ Number of fish scanned for tags in the $i^{t h}$ year in hatchery $h$,
$m_{h i} \quad=\quad$ Proportion of brood stock in $i^{\text {th }}$ year at hatchery $h$ which derives from tagged release groups,
$T_{h i}=\quad$ Number of uniquely tagged release groups which may return to hatchery $h$ in year
$i$,
$x_{h j} \quad=\quad$ Number of tags of $j^{\text {th }}$ code found in brood sample of $i^{t h}$ year at hatchery $h$, and
$p_{j} \quad=\quad$ Tagging rate at release for tag code $j$ (defined as number of tagged fish released with $j^{\text {th }}$ code divided by the total number of fish in the $j^{\text {th }}$ release group).

The derivation of an approximate standard error for the adjustment factor estimate for chum salmon released from the W . Noerenberg facility is described to demonstrate general methods. Data from the 1993 and 1994 brood stock sampling program at the W . Noerenberg facility were available to estimate the adjustment factor ( $N_{\text {GN }}=2, s_{W N 1}=107030, s_{W N 2}=106383$, $\sum_{j=1}^{T_{\text {NN1 }}} \frac{x_{\text {KN1 } 1 j}}{p_{i}}=22091, \sum_{j=1}^{T_{\text {WN2 } 2}} \frac{x_{\text {WN } 2 j}}{p_{j}}=45814$ ). Chum salmon have been released from the W . Noerenberg facility since 1984, but have only been tagged since 1990 (1989 brood year). Since chum salmon return to the facility as three, four, five and six year-olds, only three and four year-olds in the 1993 brood stock and only three, four and five year-olds in the 1994 brood stock originate from tagged release groups. Data pertaining to the age-class composition of the brood stock were therefore required to partition the sampled fish into those arising from the tagged and untagged release ( $m_{\text {WNI }}=0.165, m_{\text {WN } 2}=0.92$ ).

The adjustment factor estimate for chum salmon originating at the W . Noerenberg facility ( $\hat{a}_{w N}$ ) is then:


In order to derive an approximate standard error for $a \hat{f}_{W N}$ through simulation, the nature of the four random components A, B, C and D must be specified. Once this has been done, an appropriate algorithm can be formulated which will mimic the processes involved in the generation of $a \hat{f}_{W N}$. By examining the variation of many estimates generated by the algorithm, an approximate standard error can be obtained.

For component A, the estimated proportion of 3 and 4 year-olds in the 1993 W. Noerenberg brood stock is calculated from a realization of a hypergeometric random process, i.e. the number of 3 and 4 year-old fish found in an age-class sample taken without replacement from the brood stock. The sample taken was small compared to the size of the brood stock, and a binomial approximation to the hypergeometric is considered valid. The random nature of component $B$ is similar to that of $A$.

Component C, the estimated contribution of three and four year-olds to the 1993 W. Noerenberg brood stock, is calculated from a realization of a compound multinomial-hypergeometric random process. The realization consists of the numbers of tags of different tag codes found in a sample taken without replacement from the brood stock. There is a hypergeometric quality in that there is sampling without replacement from the brood stock. The multinomial nature derives from the fact that the total number of tags of different codes in the brood stock is the result of a multinomial process, whereby the brood stock is seen as a random sample (taken effectively with replacement) from all the fish returning to the W . Noerenberg hatchery, with the multinomial parameters being the proportions of the various codes in the returning fish. Greater than $95 \%$ of the brood stock is routinely scanned for tags, and for the purposes of this simulation, it is assumed that all of the brood stock is sampled, so removing the hypergeometric sampling component. The tags in the brood stock are therefore assumed to be generated by a multinomial process. The origin of the random nature of component $D$ is similar to that of $C$.

To simulate $a \hat{f}_{B N}$, values for the parameters of the above distributions are required. For the binomial approximations associated with components A and B, the proportions calculated from the age-class samples are taken as the binomial parameters. For the multinomial distributions associated with components C and D , the parameters are taken as the proportions of different tagcodes found in the scanned brood stock. The simulation is described below.

For each of 1000 iterations, the following was performed:

1) A simulated component-A, $A^{\prime}$, was generated according to :
where
$x_{A} \quad=\quad$ Simulated number of three and four year-old fish in age-class sample $\sim \operatorname{Binomial}\left(407, p_{34}\right)$, where $p_{34}=0.165$ is the estimated proportion of three and four year-old fish in the age-class sample from the 1993 brood stock.
2) A simulated component-B, B', was generated according to:

$$
B^{\prime}=106383_{\substack{\text { \# scarmod in ' } 94 \\
\text { brood for tags }}} * \frac{x_{B}}{796_{\begin{array}{c}
\text { \# sampled in age-classs } \\
\text { det or min ation of '94 }
\end{array}}}
$$

where
$x_{B} \quad=\quad$ Simulated number of three and four year-old fish in age-class sample $\sim$ Binomial $\left(796, p_{345}\right)$, where $p_{345}=0.92$ is the estimated proportion of three, four and five year-old fish in the age-class sample from the 1994 brood stock.
3) A simulated component-C, $C^{\prime}$, was generated according to:

$$
C^{\prime}=\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_{C i} t_{C i}
$$

where
$x_{C i}=$ The $i^{\text {th }}$ element of the vector $\underline{x}$ which is generated from a multinomial $\left(107030, p_{c}\right)$. The parameter vector $p_{c}$ consists of the proportions of the different tag codes found in the scanned brood sample codes (four in 1993), concatenated by the compliment: $\left[0.196 \times 10^{-3}, 0.224 \times 10^{-3}, 0.0187 \times 10^{-3}, 0.037 \times 10^{-3}, 1-\left(0.475 \times 10^{-3}\right)\right]$.
$t_{C i}=T h e i^{t^{h}}$ element of the vector $t_{C}$, which contains the expansion factors corresponding to the four found tag codes [444, 436,387,385].
4) A simulated component-D, $D^{\prime}$, was generated according to:

$$
D^{\prime}=\sum_{i=1}^{10} x_{D i} t_{D i}
$$

where
$x_{D i}=\quad$ The $i^{\text {th }}$ element of the vector $\underline{x}$ which is generated from a multinomial $\left(107030, p_{c}\right)$. The parameter vector $p_{c}$ consists of the proportions of the different tag codes found in the scanned brood sample (ten in 1994), concatenated by the compliment: $\left[0.27 \times 10^{-3}, 0.32 \times 10^{-3}, 0.094 \times 10^{-3}, 0.085 \times 10^{-3}, 0.047 \times 10^{-3}, 0.038 \times 10^{-3}\right.$, $\left.0.019 \times 10^{-3}, 0.056 \times 10^{-3}, 0.038 \times 10^{-3}, 0.009 \times 10^{-3}, 1-\left(0.976 \times 10^{-3}\right)\right]$.
$t_{D i} \quad=\quad$ The $i^{\text {th }}$ element of the vector $t_{D}$, which contains the expansion factors corresponding to the ten found tag codes: $[444,436,387,385,679,438,411$, 424, 447, 487].
5) A simulated $a \hat{f} c_{\text {WN }}, a \hat{f} \mathcal{C}_{W_{N}}{ }^{\prime}$ was calculated:

$$
a \hat{f}_{w N}^{\prime}=\frac{A^{\prime}+B^{\prime}}{C^{\prime}+D^{\prime}}
$$

6) A simulated standard error, $\operatorname{se}\left(a \hat{f}_{W_{N}}\right)$ ' was calculated:

$$
\operatorname{se}\left(a \hat{f}_{w N}\right)^{\prime}=\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{1000}\left(a \hat{f}_{w N_{i}} '-a \overline{\hat{f}}_{W N}\right)^{2} * \frac{1}{999}}
$$

## Appendix B. Tagcode-specific survival rates

Survival rates by tagcode of sockeye salmon reared at the Main bay facility.

| Contributor(Stock/Type) | Brood Year | Release <br> Year | Release Site | Tag code | Release Weight(g) | Survival Rate \% | Standard <br> Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1986 | 1988 | MainBay | 311763 | NA | 2.9 | 0.33 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1986 | 1988 | MaínBay | 311801 | NA | 7.5 | 0.49 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1986 | 1988 | MainBay | 311802 | NA | 3.0 | 0.30 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1986 | 1988 | MainBay | 311803 | NA | 10.7 | 0.66 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1987 | 1989 | MainBay | 311812 | 13.84 | 16.4 | 1.34 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1987 | 1989 | MainBay | 311813 | 10.13 | 16.8 | 1.17 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1987 | 1989 | MainBay | 311814 | 9.80 | 15.9 | 1.15 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1987 | 1989 | MainBay | 311815 | 7.85 | 15.4 | 1.13 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311841 | 13.35 | 14.4 | 0.80 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311842 | 15.60 | 15.9 | 0.88 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smott) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311843 | 13.50 | 12.8 | 0.88 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311844 | 16.96 | 12.3 | 0.80 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311845 | 15.05 | 13.0 | 0.87 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311846 | 16.85 | 16.1 | 0.93 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311847 | 16.50 | 16.1 | 0.89 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1988 | 1990 | MainBay | 311848 | 16.10 | 16.9 | 1.01 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | MainBay | 311922 | 7.80 | 6.6 | 0.47 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | MainBay | 311923 | 6.10 | 6.0 | 0.43 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | MainBay | 311924 | 11.30 | 13.4 | 0.73 |
| Main Bay(Coghill/Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | MainBay | 311925 | 14.30 | 12.9 | 0.87 |
| Main Bay(Eshamy/Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | MainBay | 311920 | 7.54 | 6.8 | 0.57 |
| Remote Release(Coghill L. /Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | Coghill River | 311921 | 10.30 | 3.7 | 0.24 |
| Remote Release(Eshamy L./Smolt) | 1989 | 1991 | Eshamy River | 311919 | 7.20 | 7.9 | 0.91 |
| Remote Release(Eshamy L./Fry) | 1989 | 1990 | Esther Pass Lake | 311927 | 1.99 | 3.4 | 0.45 |
| Remote Release(Eshamy L./Fry) | 1989 | 1990 | Pass Lake | 311926 | 1.99 | 1.1 | 0.19 |

## Appendix B (Continued)

Survival rates by tagcode of chum salmon reared at the Main Bay, Solomon Gulch and W. Noerenberg facilities.

| Contributor | Brood Year | Release Site | Tag code | Release Weight | Survival Rate \% | Standard Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Bay | 1986 | Main Bay | B31503 | NA | 0.87 | 0.076 |
| Main Bay | 1986 | Main Bay | B31504 | NA | 0.21 | 0.033 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1986 | Port Valdez | B30107*2 | 1.60 | 0 |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 1986 | Port Valdez | B30200 | 1.60 | 0.12 |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 1988 | Solomon Gulch | 1301010401 | 1.04 | 1.26 | 0.111 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1989 | Solomon Gulch | 1301010505 | 2.00 | 0.14 | 0.0154 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | Lake Bay | 1301010703 | 0.77 | 3.83 | 0.224 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | Lake Bay | 1301010704 | 1.23 | 4.04 | 0.237 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | Lake Bay | 1301010705 | 0.56 | 1.14 | 0.143 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | Lake Bay | 1301010706 | 0.62 | 1.05 | 0.118 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | Lake Bay | 1301010910 | 0.64 | 2.26 | 0.273 |

## Appendix B (Continued)

Survival rates by tag code of chinook salmon reared at the W . Noerenberg facility.

| Contributor | Brood Year | Tag code | Survival Rate \% | Standard <br> .Error |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| W. Noerenberg | 1988 | 311905 | 1.44 | 0.127 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | 311947 | 0.04 | 0.023 |

## Appendix B (Continued)

Survival rates by tag code of coho salmon reared at the W. Noerenberg and Solomon Gulch facilities.

| Contributor | Brood Year | Release <br> Year | Release Site | Tag code | Release Weight | Survival Rate \% | Standard <br> Ertor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Solomon Gulch | 1986 | 1987 | Solomon Gulch | 311750 | 5.20 | 0 | - |
| Solomon Gulch | 1986 | 1988 | Solomon Gulch | 311809 | 15.40 | 5.66 | 0.46 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1986 | 1988 | Solomon Gulch | 311810 | 15.40 | 6.64 | 0.39 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1987 | 1989 | Solomon Gulch | 311833 | 23.18 | 3.19 | 0.16 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1987 | 1989 | Solomon Gulch | 311835 | 23.20 | 2.55 | 0.36 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1988 | 1990 | Solomon Gulch | 311908 | 18.37 | 5.17 | 0.75 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1989 | 1991 | Solomon Gulch | 311949 | 18.76 | 4.54 | 1.06 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1989 | 1991 | Solomon Gulch | 311950 | 15.51 | 0.84 | 0.24 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1990 | 1992 | Solomon Gulch | 312054 | 14.50 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| Solomon Gulch | 1990 | 1992 | Solomon Gulch | 312055 | 19.30 | 1.69 | 1.01 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1987 | 1989 | Lake Bay | 311839 | 13.90 | 4.79 | 0.23 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1988 | 1990 | Lake Bay | 311903 | 7.40 | 1.28 | 0.24 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1988 | 1990 | Lake Bay | 311906 | 13.00 | 4.56 | 0.65 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | 1991 | Lake Bay | 311961 | 10.16 | 0.67 | 0.08 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | 1991 | Lake Bay | 311945 | 11.80 | 9.09 | 0.69 |
| W. Noerenberg | 1989 | 1991 | Lake Bay | 311946 | 11.80 | 4.98 | 0.34 |

Appendix C. Contributions to the sockeye, chum, coho and chinook salmon common property and cost-recovery harvests of 1989 through 1994

Appendix C 1.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the rockeye ralmon common property fiahery of 1989 by period and district



At \% of total catch over aill divtricts.

Appendix C 1.2 .1 Estimates of hatchery contributions (Contrib.)to the coho salmon common propety fishery of 1989 by period and district.

| Week | Contributor | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\%{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 224 |  | 228 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Yar. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | V ¢ | Contrib. | V ¢. | Contrib. | Vr. |  |  |
| 18-24 Jun | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sumpled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Casch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | is |  |
| 25 Jun -01 Jul | Solomion G. | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 54 |
|  | Sempled Catch | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 15 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 23 |  |
| 02-08 Jul | Solomon G. | 43 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 15 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 60 |  | 0 |  | 183 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Totul Catch | 60 |  | 36 |  | 183 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 279 |  |
| 09-15 Jul | Solomon G. | 28 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 67 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 42 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 42 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 42 |  |
| 16-22 Jul | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 23-29 Jul | Solomion G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2475 | 47961 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 2475 | 81 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 497 |  | 2475 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 497 |  | 2475 |  | 78 |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 3065 |  |
| $30 \mathrm{Ju-05}$ Aug | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | is |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  |
| 06-12 Aug | Solomon G. | 1695 | 97422 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1695 | 56 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 2576 |  | 128 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 2576 |  | 128 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 307 |  | 7 |  | 3018 |  |

Appendix C 1.2.1 Estimates of hatchery contributions (Contrib.)to the cobo salmon common property fishery of 1989 by period and district (Continued)

|  |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Totas | $\%{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 224 |  | 228 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
| Week | Contributor | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | V H. | Contrib. | Ver. | Conluib. | V . | Conlub. | Vr . |  |  |

Appendix C 1.2.1 Continued.

| Week Contributor |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \%* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Var | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Yar. | Contrib. | Vat. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 13-19 Aug | Solornon G. | 4369 | 552854 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4369 | 21 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 5768 |  | 0 |  | 10495 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | , |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 5768 |  | 4529 |  | 10495 |  | 24 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  | 20836 |  |
| 20-26 Aug | Solomon G. | 777 | 796487 | 649 | 24866 | 2092 | 2872007 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 10512 | 18 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 12342 |  | 1837 |  | 43336 |  | 1582 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 12342 |  | 1837 |  | 43336 |  | 1582 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 59097 |  |
| 27Aug-02 Sept | ept Solomon G . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 99 |  | 0 |  | 26317 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Cutch | 99 |  | 0 |  | 26317 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 26116 |  |
| 03-09 Sept | Solomon C . |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sempled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 23178 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 23178 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 23178 |  |
| 10-16 Sept | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Semplod Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 13424 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 13424 |  |
| 17-23 Sept | Solomon G . |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 761 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 761 |  |
| 24-30 Sept | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sumpled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 100 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 100 |  |
| TOTAL SOLOMON G. TOTAL CATCH |  | 13918 |  | 649 |  | 4567 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | , |  | 19134 | 13 |
|  |  | 20902 |  | 7044 |  | 120290 |  | 1684 |  | 322 |  | 27 |  | 150269 |  |

Appendix C 1.2.2 Estimates of hatchery contribution (Contrib.) to the coho

| Week | Contributor |  |  | \% ${ }^{\text { }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Var. |  |
| 13-19 Aug | Solomon G. | 187 | 11488 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 265 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 265 |  | 0 |
| 20-26 Aug | Solomon G. | 1595 | 76578 | 3 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 1595 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 1595 |  | 3 |
| 27Aug-02 Sept | Solomon G. | 1130 | 55090 | 2 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 2322 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 2322 |  | 4 |
| 03-09 Sept | Solomon G. | 2801 | 173474 | 5 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 9718 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 9718 |  | 18 |
| 10-16 Sept | Solomon G. | 11694 | 950547 | 21 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 16211 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 16211 |  | 29 |
| 17-23 Sept | Solomon G. | 11293 | 769849 | 20 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 16520 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 16520 |  | 30 |
| 24-30 Sept | Solomon G. | 4325 | 264630 | 8 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 8884 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 8884 |  | 16 |
| TOTAL SOLOMON G. TOTAL CATCH |  | 33025 |  |  |
|  |  | 55515 |  |  |

${ }^{6}$ As \% of total catch over all districts.

Appendix C 2.1. Estimatem of hatchery contributions (Contrib. ) to the wockoyo allnon common property fishery of 1990 by period and diatrict.

| Weck | Corraibutor | Distric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toud | 90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 224 |  | 275 |  | 226 |  | 128 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Conerib. | Vr. | Cortrib. | Vx. | Comarib. | Vr. | Coxrrib. | Vr . | Conarib. | Vs. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | $\mathbf{V}$. | Contrib. | Vr . |  |  |
| 10.16 km | MB Hetchery (Cogbill Lekersmoly) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  | 312 | 0 |  |  | 651 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 96 | 100 |
| 17.23 km | Sumpled Cruch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 651 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Totu Cuth | 0 |  | 0 |  | 312 |  | 0 |  | 651 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 963 |  |
|  | MB Hechery (Cogaill Lakesmant) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 129 | 880 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 129 | 3 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  | 1118 | 0 |  |  | 2330 | 280 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4148 | 97 |
| 24-30 ma | Sumpled Cuch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1818 |  | 0 |  | 2159 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Toun Cult | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1818 |  | 0 |  | 2459 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4277 |  |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 115 | 7640 |  |  | 469 | 6025 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ser | * |
|  | Wild | 167 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 3314 | 7640 |  |  | 2995 | 6025 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 658 | 92 |
| 01-07 30l | Sempled Csuch | 167 |  | 110 |  | 3429 |  | 0 |  | 3464 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | Toual Cuch | 167 |  | 110 |  | 3429 |  | 0 |  | 3464 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 770 |  |
|  | MB Huchery (Cophill Late/Smok) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 109 | 246 |  |  | 895 | 52115 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1003 | 23 |
|  | wild | 286 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 1201 | 246 |  |  | 1896 | 5215 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3138 | 7 |
|  | Sempled Cuch | 286 |  | 0 |  | 1309 |  | 0 |  | 2791 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | Total Cuch | 286 |  | 55 |  | 1309 |  | 0 |  | 2791 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 0 |  | 444 |  |
| 09.14 14 | MB Hzucrey (Cogtill 1-2ke/Smok) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1363 | 95401 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1363 | 24 |
|  | Wild | 294 | 0 | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3839 | 95401 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4221 | 76 |
| $15-21 \mathrm{ml}$ | Sempled Cuch | 294 |  | 8 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5202 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | Toal Cench | 294 |  | 88 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5202 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  | ssu |  |
|  | MB Hatcrery (Cogill Lake/Smok) | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 447 | 3784 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 447 | 0 |
|  | wid | 100 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3784 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 18 |
| 22-28 3us | Smpled Cath | 100 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 44 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Cath | 100 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 447 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | $\bullet$ |  | S47 |  |
|  | MB Hechery (Cogtill LakeSmok) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1060 | 39564 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1060 | 35 |
|  | Wud | 80 | - | 532 | 0 | 1010 | 39564 |  |  |  |  | 280 | 0 |  |  | 74 | - | 1976 | 65 |
| 29 kut 04 A A88 | Sempled Cuth | 80 |  | 532 |  | 2070 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 280 |  | - |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Tound Cuch | 0 |  | 532 |  | 2070 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 280 |  | 0 |  | 74 |  | 3036 |  |
|  | MB Hechery (Cogtill Leke/Smok) | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 481 | 4556 | 40 | 0 | 3954 | 0 | 385 | 789 |  |  | - | 0 | 4860 | 36 |
|  | Wild | 119 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 1347 | 4556 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6058 | 7990 |  |  | 34 | - | 8754 | 6 |
|  | Sumpled Cuch | 119 |  | 21 |  | 1828 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 643 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | Toat Cach | 119 |  | 21. |  | 1828 |  | 395 |  | 3954 |  | 6443 |  | 0 |  | 34 |  | 13614 |  |

Appendix C 2.1. Estimates of hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon comman property fishery of 1990 by period and district (Continued)




## 



## 

| Weat | Corrsituor | Paxility | Dixtria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toun | ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 224 |  | 223 |  | 226 |  | 227 |  | 278 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrik | VFIF | Contrib. | VE. | Cortrib | V . | Corter | VE. | Cortrib. | $\mathrm{vr}$. | Corrint | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{w} .}$ | Comerib. | va. | Corarit. | ve. | Camit. | VE. |  |  |
| 65.11 Aus | Hexthay | Waly | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 0 | 222 | 13992 | 1918 | 43372 | 249 | 11490 | 。 | 0 | 927 | 60286 | 10 | 0 |  |  | , | 0 | 3131 | 21 |
|  |  | Solamon 0. | 574 | 29107 | 886 | 73207 | 566 | 12994 | f | 123) | 0 | 0 | 60 | ${ }^{7177}$ | 7 | - |  |  | 21 | - | 2780 | 17 |
|  |  | F. Richurdorn * | 0 | 0 | 13 | 134 | 47 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  | 0 | 0 | 62 | - |
|  |  | Toul | 574 | 29107 | 1123 | 26933 | 2311 | ssass | 330 | 12775 | 0 | 0 | 1392 | 147463 | 17 | - |  |  | 27 | - | 6174 | 39 |
|  | Widd |  | 15ss | 29107 | 2501 | 86933 | 2031 | s84s | 39 | 1277 | 238 | - | 3028 | 147463 | 33 | 0 |  |  | 59 | - | 924 | 61 |
|  |  | Serpiod Cuch | 2129 |  | 3624 |  | 442 |  | 726 |  | 0 |  | 4620 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Town Cuch | 2129 |  | 3624 |  | $44^{2}$ |  | 726 |  | 238 |  | 4620 |  | 50 |  | 0 |  | 66 |  | 16015 |  |
| 12-18 Aus | Hectary | Walis N . | 0 | 0 | 3166 | 34294 | 4867 | 404251 | 401 | 22650 | 0 | 0 | 248 | 200056 |  |  | 1 | - | 22 | 0 | 13305 | 43 |
|  |  | Solemen 0 . | 2651 | 107010 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1064 | 73416 |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | - | 3715 | 14 |
|  |  | F. Ridurstona ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 11 | 4 | 174 | 194 | 109 | 1132 | , | 12 | - | 0 | 698 | 181331 |  |  | - | 0 | , | 0 | 1000 | , |
|  |  | Toel | 2662 | 107074 | 3340 | 343188 | 4976 | 405403 | 408 | 22662 | 0 | 0 | 4610 | 456803 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 23 | - | 16022 | 62 |
|  | Wid |  | 1078 | 107074 | 7 | 343188 | 248 | 405403 | 60 | 22662 | 328 | 0 | 6048 | 456803 |  |  | 2 | 0 | - | - | 997 | 31 |
|  |  | Smupled Cuch | 3740 |  | 3347 |  | 7424 |  | 468 |  | 0 |  | 10651 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Cach | 3740 |  | 3347 |  | 7424 |  | 468 |  | 328 |  | 10658 |  | - |  | 4 |  | 23 |  | 25992 |  |
| 19.23 Aus | Hextay | Wallys. | 0 | 0 | 2357 | 12449 | 14161 | 2110873 | 217 | 17661 | 0 | 0 | 10595 | 5127651 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 0 | 27339 | 39 |
|  |  | Sotarcoa C . | 7640 | 1115ss: | 471 | 6578 | $746$ | 48376 | 293 | 2989 | 0 | 0 | 1647 | 19994 |  |  |  |  | 2 | - | 10829 | 16 |
|  |  | F. Richumon * | 37 | 562 | 30 | 30 | 519 | 3686 | 27 | 269 | 0 | - | 757 | 31318 |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | 1370 |  |
|  |  | Town | 767 | 1116120 | 2388 | 131057 | 15426 | 2162935 | 327 | 47819 | 0 | - | 13039 | s359152 |  |  |  |  | 11 | - | 39338 | 57 |
|  | wise |  | 2897 | 1116120 | 1724 | 133087 | 1079 | 2162935 | 133 | 4389 | 214 | $\bigcirc$ | 14158 | 5359152 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 0 | 29902 | 43 |
|  |  | Smplod Cuch | 10364 |  | 4582 |  | 26225 |  | 640 |  | 0 |  | 27197 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Cuch | 10564 |  | 4382 |  | 2625 |  | 640 |  | 214 |  | 27197 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  | 6940 |  |
| 26 Aus-01 sax himetry |  | Walb N . |  |  |  |  | 20634 | 6623433 |  |  | 68 | 136\% | 346 | 9395 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21048 |  |
|  |  | Solamon 0. |  |  |  |  | 837 | 53878 |  |  | 0 | 0 | . | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{8} 137$ | 2 |
|  |  | F. Ricturdion - |  |  |  |  | 1388 | 10598 |  |  | 0 | 24 | 24 | 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1382 | 4 |
|  |  | Tow |  |  |  |  | 22829 | 6689929 |  |  | 68 | 4392 | 370 | 946 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23267 | 68 |
| Wild |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10561 | 6699929 |  |  | 61 | 4592 | 324 | 946 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10946 | 32 |
|  |  | Smpled Crach | 0 |  | $\stackrel{0}{ }$ |  | 33390 |  | 0 |  | 129 |  | 69 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Town Cuch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 33390 |  | 0 |  | 129 |  | 69. |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 34213 |  |

[^1]




| Weak | Contributer Fxiliy |  | Dixict |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toun | ** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 224 |  | 223 |  | 226 |  | 227 |  | 228 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | cantrin. | V⿷匚. | Costric. | $\mathrm{V}_{\text {re }}$ | Connerib. | V . | Corsib. | Vr. | Coxtrib. | V | Corstib. | Vr | Contic. | $\mathrm{Vr}$. | Coatrin. | Vm. | Cansib. | Vr. |  |  |
| 30 Spp .06 Ot | Hethary | Wally N |  |  |  |  | 151 | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 131 | 1 |
|  |  | Sotamon 0 . |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |
|  |  | F. Ricturdent |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 |
|  |  | Toud |  |  |  |  | 138 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 158 | 85 |
|  | Widd |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 15 |
|  |  | Smpled Cuch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toull Cach | 0 |  | 0 |  | 186 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 0 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 186 |  |
|  |  | total hatchery | 11388 |  | 7401 |  | 107648 |  | 1335 |  | 64 |  | 19764 |  | 17 |  | 2 |  | 61 |  | 147704 | 67 |
|  |  | total wid | 6632 |  | 4986 |  | 32894 |  | 677 |  | 1223 |  | 23729 |  | 33 |  | 2 |  | 66 |  | 7246 | 33 |
|  |  | total catch | 119220 |  | 12387 |  | 140546 |  | 2032 |  | 129 |  | 45493 |  | so |  | 4 |  | 127 |  | 220150 |  |




Appendix C 2.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1990
by period and district.

| Week | Contributor | Facility | Dislrict |  |  |  | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 05-11 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 19 | 90 | 19 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 19 | 90 | 19 | 100 |
|  | Wisd |  |  |  | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 19 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 19 |  | 19 |  |
| 12-18 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 7 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 8 | 16 | 8 | 7 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 107 | 16 | 107 | 93 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 115 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 115 |  | 115 |  |
| 19-25 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N. |  |  | 70 | 775 | 70 | 76 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 70 | 775 | 70 | 76 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 22 | 775 | 22 | 24 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 92 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 92 |  | 92 |  |

- As \% of total catch over all districte.
${ }^{6}$ Sport-fish releases at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour.

Appendix C 2.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1990

> by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 26 Aus-01 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 1202 | 110 | 1202 | 64 |
|  |  | Sotomon G. | 371 | 20715 | 0 | 0 | 371 | 20 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 371 | 20715 | 1202 | 110 | 1573 | 83 |
|  | Widd |  | 315 | 20715 | 0 | 110 | 315 | 17 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 686 |  | 1202 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 686 |  | 1202 |  | 1888 |  |
| 02-08 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 104 | 2620 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 2 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 2380 | 78162 | 0 | 0 | 2380 | 43 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 13 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 2497 | 80812 | 0 | 0 | 2497 | 45 |
|  | Widd |  | 1635 | 80812 | 1385 | 0 | 3020 | Ss |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 4132 |  | 1385 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 4132 |  | 1385 |  | 5517 |  |
| 09.15 Sept | Hatchery | Waly N. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 1508 | 56599 |  |  | 1508 | 71 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 1508 | 56599 |  |  | 1508 | 71 |
|  | Wild |  | 630 | 56599 |  |  | 630 | 29 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 2138 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 2138 |  | 0 |  | 2138 |  |

- As \% of total calch over all districts.
- Sport-fish reclesces at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour.

Appendix C 2.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1990
by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Conlributor | Facility | District |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 16-22 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 2955 | 136372 |  |  | 2955 | 77 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 2955 | 136372 |  |  | 2955 | 77 |
|  | Wild |  | 878 | 136372 |  |  | 878 | 23 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3833 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 3833 |  | 0 |  | 3833 |  |
| 23-29 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 198 | 12906 |  |  | 198 | 85 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 198 | 12906 |  |  | 198 | 85 |
|  | Wild |  | 34 | 12906 |  |  | 34 | 15 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 232 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 232 |  | 0 |  | 232 |  |
| 30 Sept-06 Oct | Hatchery | Wally N . | 5 | 0 |  |  | 5 | 3 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 104 | 0 |  |  | 104 | 58 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 109 | 0 |  |  | 109 | 60 |
|  | Wild |  | 71 | 0 |  |  | 71 | 40 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 180 |  | 0 |  | 180 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 7638 |  | 1299 |  | 8937 | 64 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 3563 |  | 1514 |  | 5077 | 36 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 11201 |  | 2813 |  | 14014 |  |

*Sport-fish releases at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour


[^2]- Other contrib. may contuin wild fish and/or fish from untagged remote releases at Pass Lake ( 1988 rolease of 594,210 fry; 1989 reloase of 603,219 fyy). Eather Pass Lake (1988 rolosse of 153,031 fy, 1989 roleare of 154,644 fry) and Davis Lako ( 1988 releane of 657,287 fy).

Appendix C 3.1 Estimated hatchory contributions (Contrib.) Ko tho sockeye salmon cornmon property fishory of 1991 by pariod and district (Continued)

| Woek | Contributor (StockType) | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\%^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 21-27 Jut | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smot) | 0 | 0 |  |  | 2002 | 115751 | 57212 | $6.911+\mathrm{E} 7$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 59214 | 94 |
|  | Other * | 128 | 0 |  |  | 1065 | 115751 | 2627 | $6.911+E 7$ |  |  | 97 | 0 | 3917 | 6 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 128 |  | 0 |  | 3067 |  | 59839 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 128 |  | 0 |  | 3067 |  | 59839 |  | 0 |  | 97 |  | 63131 |  |
| 28 Jul-03 Aug | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smott) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21690 | $1.258+E 7$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21690 | 95 |
|  | Other ${ }^{\text {• }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1176 | $1.258+E 7$ |  |  | 21 | 0 | 1197 | 5 |
|  | Samplod Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 22866 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Cotch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 22866 |  | 0 |  | 21 |  | 22887 |  |
| 04-10 Aug | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  |  | 131 | 784 | 313 | 5212 | 3225 | 378582 | 558 | 5019 | 0 | 0 | 4227 | 48 |
|  | Other ' |  |  | 663 | 784 | 399 | 5212 | 1842 | 378582 | 1097 | 5019 | 538 | 0 | 4539 | 52 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 794 |  | 712 |  | 5067 |  | 1655 |  | 538 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 794 |  | 712 |  | 5067 |  | 1655 |  | 538 |  | 8766 |  |
| 11-17 Aug | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 54 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 607 | 36055 | 0 | 0 | 661 | 7 |
|  | Other * |  |  | 140 | 0 | 555 | 273 | 2506 | 0 | 6004 | 36055 | 24 | 0 | 9229 | 93 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 140 |  | 609 |  | 2506 |  | 6611 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 140 |  | 609 |  | 2506 |  | 6611 |  | 24 |  | 9890 |  |
| 18-24 Aug |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Othor ${ }^{-}$ |  |  | 43 | 0 | 187 | 0 |  |  | 4977 | 0 |  |  | 5207 | 100 |
|  | Samplod Catch | 0 |  | 43 |  | 187 |  | 0 |  | 4977 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 43 |  | 187 |  | 0 |  | 4977 |  | 0 |  | 5207 |  |
| 25-31 Aug | MB Hatchary (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Oher * |  |  | 1 | 0 | 192 | 0 |  |  | 1176 | 0 |  |  | 1369 | 100 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 192 |  | 0 |  | 1176 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 1 |  | 192 |  | 0 |  | 1176 |  | 0 |  | 1369 |  |

- As \% of total catch over all diatricta.

and Davis Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fy ).

Appendix C 3.1 Estimatod hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye malmon common property fishery of 1991 by period and district (Continued)

| Weak Contributor (Stock/Typo) |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\%^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 01-07 Sept | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  |  | 284 | 0 | 381 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 665 | 100 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 284 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 284 |  | 381 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 665 |  |
| 08-14 Sept | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  |  | 20 | 0 | 107 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 127 | 100 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  | 107 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 127 |  |
| 15-21 Sept | MB Hatchery (Coghill LakdSmolt) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | 63 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 66 | 100 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  | 63 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 66 |  |
| 22-28 Sopt | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |
|  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 227 |  | 131 |  | 2369 |  | 459844 |  | 1165 |  | 0 |  | 463736 | 91 |
|  | TOTAL OTHER | 694 |  | 847 |  | 3081 |  | 20531 |  | 13254 |  | 5388 |  | 43795 | 9 |
|  | TOTALCATCH | 921 |  | 978 |  | 5450 |  | 480375 |  | 14419 |  | 5388 |  | 507531 |  |

- As a \% of total catch ower all districts.
 and Davia Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fry).



## Appendix C 3.2.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon common property fishery of 1991 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toul | $\%$ * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 07-13 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson - | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 137 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 143 | 100 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 137 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 137 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 143 |  |
| $14-20 \mathrm{Jul}$ | Hatchery | Wully N . | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solormon G. | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson - | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  | 39 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 353 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 392 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 39 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 353 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 39 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 353 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 392 |  |
| 21-27 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sotomon G. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 136 | 8679 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 136 | 34 |
|  |  | F. Richurdson - | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 136 | 8679 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 136 | 34 |
|  | Wid |  | 26 | 0 |  |  | 219 | 8679 | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 259 | 66 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 26 |  | 0 |  | 355 |  | 14 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 26 |  | 0 |  | 355 |  | 14 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 395 |  |
| 28 JuL-03 Au8 | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richadison - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 100 |
|  |  | Surupled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 14 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 14 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 14 |  |

Appendix C 3.2.1 Rstimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho saltrion common property fishery of 1991 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\%$ \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var | Contib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | $\mathrm{V}_{\underline{\text { r }}}$ | Contrib. | Vur. |  |  |
| 0410 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 289 | 826 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 29 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 289 | 826 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 29 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 116 | 0 | 315 | 826 | 14 | 0 | 258 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 705 | 7 |
|  |  | Sumpled Calch | 0 |  | 116 |  | 604 |  | 14 |  | 258 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 116 |  | 604 |  | 14 |  | 258 |  | 2 |  | 994 |  |
| 11-17 Aus | Hatchery | Waily N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomion G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 4970 | 292 | 13745 | 0 | 0 | 466 | 18 |
|  |  | F. Richardson - |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 19820 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 8 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 4970 | 487 | 33565 | 0 | 0 | 661 | 26 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  | 63 | 0 | 572 | 0 | 0 | 4970 | 1244 | 33565 | 12 | 0 | 1891 | 74 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 63 |  | 572 |  | 174 |  | 1731 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 63 |  | 572 |  | 174 |  | 1731 |  | 12 |  | 2552 |  |
| 18-24 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 536 | 78458 |  |  | 240 | 10425 |  |  | 776 | 14 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 76 | 1122 |  |  | 168 | 5893 |  |  | 244 | 5 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * |  |  | 0 | 0 | 24 | 125 |  |  | 136 | 844 |  |  | 160 | 3 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 636 | 79705 |  |  | 544 | 17163 |  |  | 1180 | 22 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 28 | 0 | 466 | 79705 |  |  | 3709 | 17163 |  |  | 4203 | 78 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1102 |  | 0 |  | 4253 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 28 |  | 3102 |  | 0 |  | 4253 |  | 0 |  | 5383 |  |
| 25-31 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 8926 | 5484507 |  |  | $m$ | 101939 |  |  | 9703 | 79 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 0 | 0 |  |  | 145 | 3673 |  |  | 35 | 797 |  |  | 180 | 1 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 9071 | 5488180 |  |  | 812 | 102716 |  |  | 9883 | 81 |
|  | Wid |  | 1472 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5488180 |  |  | 851 | 102716 |  |  | 2324 | 19 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 9072 |  | 0 |  | 1663 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 1472 |  | 0 |  | 907 |  | 0 |  | 1663 |  | 0 |  | 12207 |  |

As \% of total calch over all districts.

- Sport-fish releases at Fleming Spit and Whitier Harbour

Appendix C 3.2.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho almon common property fishery of 1991 by period and district (Continued)


Appendix C 3.2.1 Estimeted hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salnon common property fishery of 1991 by period end district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor Facility |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tow | \% ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vra. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. | Contib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Vr. |  |  |
| 29 Sept-05 Oct | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | F. Richardson - |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  |  | 393 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 393 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 393 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 393 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 1417 |  | 0 |  | 74814 |  | 428 |  | 1843 |  | 0 |  | 78502 | BS |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 3187 |  | 207 |  | 4170 |  | 641 |  | 6062 |  | 18 |  | 14285 | 15 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 4604 |  | 207 |  | 78984 |  | 1069 |  | 7905 |  | 18 |  | 92787 |  |

- As \% of totel cutch over all districts.
- Sport-ish releases at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour

'As \% total catch over all districts.
- Sport-fish releases at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour.

Appendix C 3.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1991 by period and district (Continued)

| Weck | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 18-24 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 10017 | $2.49+\mathrm{E} 7$ |  |  | 10017 | 100 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 10017 | 0 |  |  | 10017 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 10017 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 10017 |  | 0 |  | 10017 |  |
| 25-31 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 724 | 0 | 724 | 7 |
|  |  | Solomon G . | 9806 | 8580685 | 0 |  | 9806 | 93 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 9806 | 8580685 | 741 | 0 | 10547 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  | 0 | 8580685 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 9806 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 9806 |  | 741 |  | 10547 |  |
| 01-07 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N. | 0 | 0 | 6621 | 4906335 | 6621 | 40 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 9527 | 602655 | 0 |  | 9527 | 57 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 0 | 0 | 153 | 3969 | 153 | 1 |
|  |  | Total | 9527 | 602655 | 6774 | 4910304 | 16301 | 98 |
|  | Wild |  | 411 | 602655 | 1 | 4910304 | 412 | 2 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 9938 |  | 6775 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 9938 |  | 6775 |  | 16713 |  |

' As \% total catch over all districts.
${ }^{*}$ Sport-fish releases at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour.

Appendix C 3.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1991 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\text {- }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 08-14 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 5339 | 1446619 | 5339 | 41 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 5882 | 280717 | 0 |  | 5882 | 45 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 | 74 | 347 | 74 | 1 |
|  |  | Total | 5882 | 280717 | 5413 | 1446966 | 11295 | 87 |
|  | Wild |  | 1746 | 280717 | 1 | 1446966 | 1747 | 13 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 7628 |  | 5414 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 7628 |  | 5414 |  | 13042 |  |
| 15-21 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 300 | 14665 | 300 | 19 |
|  |  | Solomon G . | 993 | 12294 | 0 |  | 993 | 62 |
|  |  | F. Richardson * | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 993 | 12294 | 300 | 14665 | 1293 | 81 |
|  | Wild |  | 308 | 12294 | 0 | 14665 | 308 | 19 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 1301 |  | 300 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 1301 |  | 300 |  | 1601 |  |
| 22-28 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 211 | 3085 |  |  | 211 | 100 |
|  |  | F. Richardson ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 211 | 3085 |  |  | 211 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  | 0 | 3085 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 211 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 211 |  | 0 |  | 211 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 36631 |  | 13228 |  | 49859 | 95 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 2766 |  | 2 |  | 2768 | 5 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 39397 |  | 13230 |  | 52627 |  |

[^3]




| Weak | Conaributor (SLCNETYyo) | Remota Raleme Sine | Dixria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Towl | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 22 |  | 22 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 29 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | VN. | Conuib. | VE. | Contrib. | Ve. | Contrib. | va. | $c_{\text {Onfrib. }}$ | v . | Contuib. | Vm. |  |  |
| 24.1 man -0 / ful | MB Hathery (Coyhill Lete/Smok) |  |  |  |  |  | 16781 | \$205325 | 10544 | 3.956+E7 |  |  | 19 | 0 | 12213 | ${ }^{6}$ |
|  | MB Hewhery (Elhmy Lake/smok) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - | * | - |
|  | Taull liwchery |  |  |  |  |  | 16481 | 5205325 | losss | 3.936+E7 |  |  | 19 | 0 | 122131 | 12 |
|  | Remodo Releme (Coghill Lata/Smolk) | Coghill remuary |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | 1 | - |
|  | Remoln Releme(Ehemy LakdSmol) | Eshany R EEstury |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Remoce Rutemon(Ethemy Lakefry) | Erchar Pras lake |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Toul Remoter Reless |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | 9 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  |  |  | 9287 | 5205325 | 15301 | 106619 |  |  | 998 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wid (Exhmy Lata/Smok) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 6.7 | 106619 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 697 | - |
|  | Sempled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 25768 |  | 121402 |  | 0 |  | 1194 |  |  |  |
|  | Toull cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 25768 |  | 121402 |  | - |  | 119 |  | 148364 |  |
| OS. 11 Iul | MB Henchery (Coshill Lakesmol) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 13775 | 296374 | 64206 | 2.269467 |  |  |  |  | 7741 | 4 |
|  | MB fecthery (Exhmmy Lake/Smok) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |  |  |  | - | - |
|  | Toul ferchery |  | 0 | - |  |  | 13275 | 296374 | 65206 | $2.269+E 7$ |  |  |  |  | 7481 | 4 |
|  | Remote Reiome (Coghill Latersmolu) | Coghill R Examy | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | - | 0 |
|  | Rernoth Relemen(Ehtumy Lemedsmoll) | Eshmny R.Estury | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | - | 0 |
|  | Resiole Rabus(Ememy Leve/Fy) | Exher Pass Lake | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  |  |  | - | 0 |
|  | Town Remota Rolemo |  | 0 | - |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | - | - |
|  | Other * |  | 69 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 296374 | 95632 | 259228 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Wild (Eahmuy Lake/Smolk) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - | 1597 | 259228 |  |  |  |  | 1597 | 1 |
|  | semplod Cach |  | 69 |  | 0 |  | 13275 |  | 161485 |  | 0 |  | * |  |  |  |
|  | Toundexch |  | 69 |  | 0 |  | 13275 |  | 161485 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 17482 |  |

- A1 \% of colle cutch over all distridt.




| Woet | Contributior (SlockiThpe) | Remote Releme Sita | Divtrict |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Town | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 272 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vкs. | Connrib. | VE. | Contrib. | Ve. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Vm. |  |  |
| 12-18 Jul | Mes Hinchary (Coghill Latusmol) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 10735 | 113370 | 53231 | $2.568+$ E7 |  |  | 24 | - | 63990 | 61 |
|  | MB Hechery (Exhany Late/Smol) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 |
|  | Totel limechery |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 10735 | 113370 | \$3231 | $2.568+$ E7 |  |  | 24 | 0 | 63990 | 61 |
|  | Rentele Releme (Cophill LakdSmol) | Coghill R. Estury | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remole Rolemon(Exhemy LaxdSmol) | Eahmany R Extury | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remiot Ralemo(Exturay LeteFry) | Ewhar Pmon lake | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | $\cdots$ |
|  | Tour Rerioce Relemo |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | $\bullet$ | - | * |
|  | Oher * |  | 313 | 0 |  |  | 839 | 113370 | 39351 | 93514 |  |  | 123 | - |  |  |
|  | Wid (Ehrany Lakersmok) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - | 774 | 93514 |  |  | - | 0 | 774 | 1 |
|  | Smpled Catch |  | 313 |  | 0 |  | 11574 |  | 93356 |  | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |  | 147 |  |  |  |
|  | Toun Cuch |  | 313 |  | 0 |  | 11574 |  | 93356 |  | - |  | 147 |  | 105390 |  |
| $19-25 \mathrm{Jul}$ | MB Hathary (Coghill Leta/Smolk) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 524 | 23846 |  |  | 7 | - | 5322 | 3 |
|  | MB Hechery (Ethemy Lakesmok) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | 0 | $\cdots$ | $\bullet$ |
|  | Toull Hachary |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 524 | 233646 |  |  | 78 | - | 5322 | 73 |
|  | Remoto Releno (Coghill Leke/Smok) | Cothill R Exumg | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | - | 0 |  |  | - | - | * | - |
|  | Remota Releme(Eatheny Leta/Smok) | Eshmy R.Exumy | - | 0 |  |  |  |  | - | 0 |  |  | - | 0 | - | - |
|  | Remole Relemo(Edheny LakelFry) | Exher Pman Lake | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - | * | - |
|  | Totel Remote Relews |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | 0 | - | - |
|  | Other * |  | 180 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 927 | 256701 |  |  | 396 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Widd (Ethmy Lata/Smok) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 43 | 23055 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 44 | 6 |
|  | Sumpled Cach |  | 180 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | 6614 |  | 0 |  | 474 |  |  |  |
|  | Touterech |  | 180 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6614 |  | 0 |  | 474 |  | 7261 |  |

[^4]


| Weok Contibutor (StockTYpos) |  | Remote Rovere Sile | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toud | \%- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 211 | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | V . | Contrib. | VE. | Consrib. | Vr. | Contib. | Ver. |  |  |
| $26 \mathrm{JuT}-0 \mathrm{~A}$ Aus | MB Hechery (Coghill LekeSmoh) |  |  |  |  | 66 | 3138 | 3135 | 248050 | 4730 | 3946: | 5133 | 83396 | 4 | 0 | 13413 | 32 |
|  | MB Hetchery (Edhumy LatedSmol) |  |  |  |  | 58 | 1525 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | - | - | 5 | - |
|  | Tow Hachery |  |  |  | 124 | 4663 | 3435 | 248080 | 4730 | 398468 | 5133 | 833965 | 4 | 0 | 13471 | 32 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lata/Smoli) | Coghill R. Examay |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 1908 | 0 | 0 | 113 | - |
|  | Remow Rateme(Eshmeny LakdSmol) | Eshany R.Exumy |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remola Relome(Estaray Lake/Fry) | Euther Pay Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Tous Remota Releme |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 1908 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  | 278 | 4663 | 125 | 39092 | 20736 | 414033 | 2371 | 221359 | 24 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wid (Echany Luta/Smol) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 876 | 14884 | 174 | 1556 | 3159 | 137586 | - | 0 | 4509 | 14 |
|  | Sempled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 402 |  | 4436 |  | 25640 |  | 11076 |  | 29\% |  |  |  |
|  | Toun Cuch |  | 0 |  | 402 |  | 446 |  | 25640 |  | 11076 |  | 296 |  | 41850 |  |
| 02-08 Ans | MB Hechary (Coshill Lase/Smoll) |  |  |  | 58 | 1525 | 142 | 226 | 3948 | 43964 | 1299 | 43025 | 7 | 4 | 544 | 19 |
|  | MB Hechery (Eahemy Lake/Smol) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 123 | 2664 | 0 | - | - | - | 123 | - |
|  | Totel Hachery |  |  |  | 58 | 1525 | 142 | 226 | 4071 | 442312 | 1299 | 63025 | 7 | 0 | 5567 | 19 |
|  | Remote Releme (Coghill Lataismok) | Coghin remany |  |  | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  | Etheny R.Esuury |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 114 | 6951 | 0 | - | 114 | 0 |
|  | Remota Relemo(Eshmay Lak/Fty) | Exher Peal Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Toul Retwote Relemo |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 114 | 6951 | - | 0 | 114 | 0 |
|  | Other - |  |  |  | 824 | 1523 | 421 | 13217 | 8007 | 901845 | 5125 | 1035063 | 37 | - |  |  |
|  | Whid (Estremy Latersmok) |  |  |  | - | 0 | 1119 | 12991 | 3003 | 459533 | 449 | 965067 | - | - | 2620 | 30 |
|  | Smiplod Cuch |  | 0 |  | 882 |  | 1681 |  | 15006 |  | 11022 |  | 4 |  |  |  |
|  | Toul Cach |  | 0 |  | 882 |  | 1681 |  | 15036 |  | 11022 |  | 4 |  | 27715 |  |

## - As \% of butin cerch over ill diatrica





|  |  |  | Divriat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Town | \% ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 23 |  | 235 |  | 226 |  | 279 |  |  |  |
| week | Contributor (Stock/Type) | Remote Relowe Sive | Conatib. | V. | Comerib. | V. | Contrib. | V* | Contrib. | vec . | Contrib. | Vme. | Contrib. | VE. |  |  |
| 09-15 An5 | MB Hatchery (Cophill Latersmok) |  |  |  | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 0 | 2975 | 316183 | 469 | 41225 | 10 | - | 3393 | 17 |
|  | MB Hechery (Exhumy Latedsmok) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  | Toxal liachery |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 2975 | 51688 | 408 | 4123 | 10 | 0 | 3393 | 17 |
|  | Remote Relemo (Coghill LakdSmol) | Coghill R. Exumy |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | * | $\bullet$ | 0 |
|  | Remota Ralemo(Exheny Latasmok) | Eehmy R.Exumy |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relomen(Eshmay Laterfy) | Esher Pras Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toul Remole Reieaso |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Other - |  |  |  | 193 | 0 | 752 | 0 | 699 | 2530233 | 1687 | 42514 | 33 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wild (Elumy Late/Smoli) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | - | 9591 | 2013750 | 3534 | 384169 | 0 | 0 | 13125 | 66 |
|  | Sumpled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 193 |  | 752 |  | 13265 |  | 5629 |  | 63 |  |  |  |
|  | Toull Cuch |  | 0 |  | 193 |  | 752 |  | 13265 |  | 5629 |  | 63 |  | 19902 |  |
| 16-22 Ang | MB Hechury (Coshin Lake/Smok) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 14 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 |
|  | MB Hechery (Exhemy Lete/Smol) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | $\bullet$ | * |
|  | Tout Hachery |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 171 | - | 0 | 14 | 1 |
|  | Remole Releme (Coshill Late/Smol) | Coghill R. Eraury |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releme(Exheny Late/Smol) | Eahmy R.Exumy |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bullet$ | - | 0 |
|  | Remoter Releme(Exhamy Late/Fr) | Exher Peos Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Towl Remots Relema |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 2050 | 2581334 | 1184 | 2495 | 1 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wild (Elymmy Lata/Smok) |  |  |  | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6052 | 258134 | 733 | 26774 | - | 0 | 6 ET 2 | 65 |
|  | Smpled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 67 |  | 267 |  | 3102 |  | 2081 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Town Cuch |  | 0 |  | 67 |  | 267 |  | 1102 |  | 2081 |  | 1 |  | 10518 |  |

:As\% of loan canch ove all diatricts.



Appendix C 4.1.1 Eatmand hatchary contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye admon soramon property firhory of 1992 by period med dirtrict (Continued)

| Week Conributor (SloctuType) |  | Remole Ralomo Site | Ditriat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 | 22 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Consib. | Ver. | Contrib. | yr. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | VE. | Contrib. | V s. | Coonit. | Vax. | Toun | $\%$ - |
| 23-29 Aus | MB Hachery (Coghill (amosmol) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  |  | * | - |
|  | MB Hemetary (Eahmay Lake/Smol) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - |
|  | Toxil liachery |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Retame (Coghill Late Smok) | Coghill R Exumy |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releementemmy Lakessmok) | Eshmy R.Exumy |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  | - | 0 |
|  | Remote Relomen(Enhmy Lakefry) | Euther Pea Lato |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 18 | 280 | - | 0 |  |  | 18 | 1 |
|  | Toces Remoter Releme |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 18 | 280 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 14 | 1 |
|  | Onher |  |  |  |  |  | 92 | 0 | 1054 | 156350 | 251 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Wise (Exhmay LatalSmol) |  |  |  |  |  | 238 | 0 | 1598 | 156070 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1036 | 56 |
|  | Smplod Cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 330 |  | 2670 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Toen Cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 330 |  | 2670 |  | 231 |  | 0 |  | 3251 |  |
|  | TOTAL HATCHERY |  | 0 |  | 182 |  | 44068 |  | 299392 |  | 6974 |  | 372 |  | 350948 | 57.56 |
|  | total rerelease |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  | 227 |  | - |  | 245 | 0.04 |
|  | TOTAL WILDESHAMY |  | 0 |  | 67 |  | 2232 |  | 24865 |  | 12240 |  | $\bullet$ |  | 33404 | 6.462 |
|  | total catch |  | \$62 |  | 1544 |  | 58083 |  | 513304 |  | 30059 |  | 2266 |  | 60918 |  |

-A $A$ of total cesch over all diatriota.

Appendix C 4.1.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1992 by period and district.

| Weck | Contributor (Stock/Type) | Remote Relcase Site | District |  | \% * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. |  |
| 21-27 Jun | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  | 8427 | 1568268 | 100 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 8427 | 1568268 | 100 |
|  | Remote Retesse (Coghill Lake/Smolt) | Coghill R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smoit) | Eshamy R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  | 0 | 1568268 |  |
|  | Wild (Eshamy Lake/Smol) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 8427 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 8427 |  |  |
| 28 Jun-04 Jul | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smott) |  | 34728 | $2.465+$ E7 | 100 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 34728 | $2.465+$ E7 | 100 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smolt) | Coghill R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smolt) | Eshamy R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relcase(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  | 1 | 4002 |  |
|  | Wild (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 126 | 4002 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 34855 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 34855 |  |  |

- As \% of total catch over all districts.
- Other contrib, may contain wild fish and/or fish from untagged remole releases at Pass Lake ( 1988 release of $\mathbf{5 9 4 , 2 1 0}$ fry; 1989 release of 603,219 fry), Esther Pass Lake (1988 releasc of 153,031 and Davis Lake (1988 release of 657,287 fry). -Continued-

Appendix C 4.1.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1992
by period and district (Continued)


- As \% of total catch over all districts.
- Other contrib. may contain wild fish and/or fish from untagged remote releases at Pass Lake ( 1988 release of $\mathbf{5 9 4 , 2 1 0}$ fry; 1989 release of 603,219 fry), Esther Pass Lake ( 1988 release of 153,031 and Davis Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fry). -Continued-

Appendix C 4.1.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1992
by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor (Stock/Type) | Remote Relezse Site | District |  | \% ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. |  |
| 19-25 Jul | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smoll) |  | 16135 | 2212178 | 63 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 16135 | 2212178 | 63 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smolt) | Coghill R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smolt) | Eshamy R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  | 9481 | 2212178 |  |
|  | Wild (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 25616 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 25616 |  |  |
| 26 Jul-01 Aug | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  | 1109 | 2212178 | 63 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 1109 | 2212178 | 63 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smolt) | Coghill R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smolt) | Eshamy R.Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other * |  | 652 | 2212178 |  |
|  | Wid (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 1761 |  |  |
|  | TOTAL HATCHERY |  | 84925 |  |  |
|  | TOTAL R. RELEASE |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | TOTAL WILD ESHAMY |  | 349 |  |  |
|  | TOTAL CATCH |  | 158891 |  |  |

[^5]- Other contrib. may contain wild fish and/or fish from untagged remote releases at Pass Lake (1988 release of 594,210 fry; 1989 release of 603,219 fiy), Esther Pass Lake ( 1988 release of 153,031 and Davis Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fry)

Appendix C4.2.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon common propesty fishery of 1992 by period and district

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\%{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 228 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vrr. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var . | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 14-20 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon C . |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 |  |
| 21-27 Jus | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 60 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 60 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 40 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 20 |  |
| 28 Jun-04 Jui | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 21 | 54 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Toul |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 21 | 54 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 18 | 46 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 12 |  | 27 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 12 |  | 27 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 39 |  |
| 05-il Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  | 17 | 0 |  |  | 18 | 0 | 110 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 145 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 17 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 110 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cutch | 17 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  | 110 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 145 |  |
| 12-18 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 143 | 930 |  |  |  |  | 143 | 57 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 17 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 7 |
|  |  | Total | 17 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 143 | 930 |  |  |  |  | 160 | 64 |
|  | Wild |  | 10 | 2 |  |  | 69 | 0 | 12 | 930 |  |  |  |  | 91 | 36 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 27 |  | 0 |  | 69 |  | 155 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 27 |  | 0 |  | 69 |  | 155 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 251 |  |

Appendix C 4.2.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon common property fishery of 1992 by period and distict (Continued)


Appendix C4.2.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon commion property fishery of 1992 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Totel | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 228 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib, | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. |  |  |
| 23-29 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 30894 | 35009816 | 394 | 9246 |  |  |  |  | 31288 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 30894 | 35009816 | 394 | 9246 |  |  |  |  | 31288 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 35009816 | 0 | 9246 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 30894 |  | 394 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 30894 |  | 394 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 31288 |  |
| 30 Aug-05 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 45514 | 58850004 | 144 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 45658 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 45514 | 55850004 | 144 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 45658 | 100 |
|  | Wid |  | 122 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 55850004 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 122 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 45514 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 122 |  | 0 |  | 45514 |  | 144 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 45780 |  |
| 06-12 Sept | Hatchery | Waly N . |  |  |  |  | 16900 | 34624 | 30 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 16930 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 16900 | 34624 | 30 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 16930 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 34624 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Serapled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 16900 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 16900 |  | 30 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 16930 |  |
| 13-19 Sept | Hatchery | Wall N . |  |  |  |  | 1687 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1690 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 1687 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1690 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Surapled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1687 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1690 |  |
| 20.26 Sept | Hitchery | Waly N . |  |  |  |  | 372 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 372 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 372 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 372 | 100 |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sarapled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 372 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 372 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 17 |  | 1744 |  | 11334 |  | 1415 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 117023 | 98 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 222 |  | 542 |  | 965 |  | 855 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  | 2063 | 2 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 239 |  | 2286 |  | 114276 |  | 2270 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  | 119086 |  |

Appendix C 4.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1992 by period and district.

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  | Towl | 9. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Conlrib. | ver. | Contrib. | $\mathrm{V}_{5}$ |  |  |
| 21-27 Jum | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wid |  | 18 | 0 |  |  | 18 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 18 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tolal Catch | 18 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  |
| 28 Jun-04 Jul | Hathery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Soiomen G. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Toal | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wid |  | 2 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 2 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cotch | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| 05-11 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Toal | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | wid |  | 4 | 0 |  |  | 4 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 4 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tolal Catch | 4 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |
| 12.18 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wid |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 19.25 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G . |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toual Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |

Appendix C 4.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho selmon cost recovery fishary of 1992 by period and distrixt (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Pacility | District |  |  |  | Total | $\%$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Ver. |  |  |
| 26 Jul-01 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 67 | 0 | 67 | 100 |
|  |  | Solomon G . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 67 | 0 | 67 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 67 |  | 67 |  |
| 02-08 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 3612 | 388519 | 3612 | 100 |
|  |  | Soloman G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 3612 | 388519 | 3612 | 100 |
|  | Wad |  |  |  | 0 | 388519 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 0 |  | 3612 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 3612 |  | 3612 |  |
| 09-15 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 5238 | 279392 | 5238 | 100 |
|  |  | Solamon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 5238 | 279392 | 5238 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 0 | 279392 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 5238 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 5238 |  | 5238 |  |
| 16-22 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 11752 | 5114810 | 11752 | 87 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 1797 | 455389 | 0 | 0 | 1797 | 13 |
|  |  | Total | 1797 | 455389 | 11752 | 5114810 | 13549 | 100 |
|  | Wid |  | 0 | 455389 | 0 | 5148810 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 1797 |  | 11752 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 1797 |  | 11752 |  | 13549 |  |
| 23-29 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 15997 | 4572011 | 15397 | 78 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 4278 | 2760660 | 0 | 0 | 4278 | 22 |
|  |  | Total | 4278 | 2760660 | 15397 | 4572011 | 19675 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  | 0 | 2760660 | 0 | 4572011 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 4278 |  | 15397 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Catch | 4278 |  | 15397 |  | 19675 |  |

Appendix C 4.2 .2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1992 by period end district (Continued)



| Weck | Contributor | Faxility | Distric |  |  |  | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 22! |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 04-100ct | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sumpled Calch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 11-170t | Hetchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solornon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Toul |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 18-240ct | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Soloman G. | 1824 | 0 |  |  | 1824 | 100 |
|  |  | Toun | 1824 | 0 |  |  | 1824 | 100 |
|  | Wild |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 1824 |  | 0 |  | 1824 |  |
|  |  | total hatchery | 27390 |  | 48831 |  | 73221 | 99 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 24 |  | 869 |  | 893 | 1 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 27414 |  | 46700 |  | 74114 |  |

As \% of total catch over all districts.

Appandix C 5.1.1 Eximatiod hatchery coatributions (Coatib) Io the nockeyo salmon commoa property finhery of 1993 by period and dirtrict

| Weak | Contributar (SlockType) | Remote Relena Sita | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Towd | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Yer | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. |  |  |
| O6-12 han | MB Hatchery (Coghill Late/smoll) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hatchriy (Esheny LekeSmoll) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Ilatchery (Eyid/Fry) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchary |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Reriote Relean (Coshill LakeSmoll) | Cogeill R. Estury |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Redenox Eshany LakeSmolt) | Eshamy R. Entury |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Reieum(Ehhury LakoFry) | Erther Pase inke |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remota Ralease(Eahrmy Lake/Fry) | Pus Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remola Relece |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Othes - |  |  |  | 338 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Wild (Emhmy LakeSmolt) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Cruch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Toul Calch |  | 0 |  | 338 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 338 |  |
| 13-19 Jun | MB Hatchery (Coyhill Lekersmolt) |  |  |  | 71 | 1712 | 147 | 607 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 219 | 14 |
|  | MB Hetchery (Ehemy Lake(smoll) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyak/fy) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  |  |  | 71 | 1712 | 147 | 607 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 219 | 14 |
|  | Remote Ratace (Cosphill Laketmolt) | Coghill R Ertusy |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remoto Relene(Eshamy LakelSmoll) | Esheny R Estury |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Renota Releno(Eahamy Late/Fry) | Eother Paoel Lek. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Redeeno(Ehhemy Lakeriy) | Pmontak. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toul Remote Rolese |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Obere ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |  |  |  | 1025 | 1712 | 211 | 607 |  |  | 159 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wild (Eshamy LakeSmoll) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Samplos Carch |  | 0 |  | 1096 |  | 358 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Totul Catch. |  | 0 |  | 1096 |  | 338 |  | 0 |  | 156 |  | 1610 |  |

 and Davie Lake (1988 relezwe of 657,287 fy).

Appendix C 5.1.1 Entimated hutchery conatibutions (Contrib.) to the nockeyo entmon common property finhery of 1993 by pariod and dintrict (Continued)


und Devis Lake (1988 rideun of 657,287 6y)

Appendir C 5.1 .1 Eatimated hatchary contributions (Coastrib.) to the nockeyo malmon commor property finhery of 1993 by period and dintrict (Continued)


As \% of toblal catch over ind diatricts.
 and Devin Lake (1988 releace of 657,287 fyy).

## 



[^6]Appendix C 5.1.1 Entimaled hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the oockoyo walmon common property fishery of 1993 by period and dirtrict (Costinued)

| Week ____Contibutor (StockTYpo) |  | Remoto Releua Sile | Dintice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Towl | \% ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 222 | 223 |  | 223 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Vre. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Ver. | Coatrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 01.07 Aus | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lekedsmolt) |  |  |  |  | 1733 | 42987 | 3831 | 288575 | 26 | 111 | 0 | 0 | \$390 | 20 |
|  | MB Hacchery (Earumy Lakasmoll) |  |  |  |  | 1293 | 89931 | 5641 | 2946118 | 797 | 28170 | 0 | 0 | 7731 | 28 |
|  | MB Hetchery (Eyllfry) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Helchery |  |  |  | 3026 | 132918 | 9472 | 3234693 | 823 | 28281 | 0 | 0 | 13321 | 49 |
|  | Rersote Redeno (Cothill Lake/smolit) | Coghill R Edumary |  |  | 921 | 34839 | 48 | 2246 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 969 | 4 |
|  | Reenoto Ralumentahemy LakeSmolt) | Eshamy R, Esturary |  |  | 2287 | 284448 | 3194 | \$242002 | 269 | 4196 | 0 | 0 | 5750 | 21 |
|  | Remote Releure(Ehhmy LakdFry) | Ether Pan Leke |  |  | 19 | 98 | 29 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 |
|  | Remota Rolease(Edhuray Leke/Fy) | Pues lato |  |  | 40 | 506 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
|  | Total Remotu Relene |  |  |  | 3267 | 319891 | 3271 | 1244417 | 269 | 4196 | 0 | 0 | 6807 | 25 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  | 740 | 462886 | 1754 | 4610078 | 1911 | 33669 | 338 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wid (Eahumy LakwSmott) |  |  |  | 500 | 10077 | 1848 | 130968 | 184 | 992 | 0 | 0 | 2332 | 9 |
|  | Sumplos Catch |  | 0 |  | 7533 |  | 16345 |  | 3187 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 0 |  | 7533 |  | 16345 |  | 3187 |  | 338 |  | 27403 |  |
| 08-14 Ang | MB Hatchery (Coghil LakuSmoli) |  |  |  | 1276 | 57692 | 0 | 0 | 547 | 22768 | 0 | 0 | 1823 | 6 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Emhamy LavuSmoll) |  |  |  | 1801 | 220659 | 829 | 61119 | 1603 | 140684 | 0 | 0 | 4233 | 15 |
|  | MB Hetchery (Eyb/Fiy) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4931 | 2546145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4931 | 17 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  |  |  | 3077 | 278351 | 5760 | 2607264 | 2150 | 163452 | 0 | 0 | 10987 | 38 |
|  | Remote Release (Cophill Lake/smolt) | Cogrill R. Extuary |  |  | 826 | 77216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 826 | 3 |
|  | Remole Relceson(Exhemy Lekelsmok) | Echemy R. Ettuay |  |  | 4018 | 913160 | 2194 | 635839 | 2815 | 270880 | 0 | 0 | 9027 | 31 |
|  | Remotu Releam(Eaheriy LakeFry) | Erther Pase Lake |  |  | 78 | 1271 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releane(Ehhamy Lakefry) | Pane Lako |  |  | 31 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 2433 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 1 |
|  | Toel Remote Relowe |  |  |  | 1953 | 99214 | 2194 | 635839 | 2945 | 273313 | - | 0 | 10092 | 35 |
|  | Ohere - |  |  |  | 703 | 1437553 | 1124 | 3472427 | 285 | 545416 | 214 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wid (Ethmy Lekesmok) |  |  |  | 1578 | 167058 | 2063 | 229324 | 1981 | 108651 | 0 | 0 | 5622 | 19 |
|  | Senaplod Catch |  | d |  | 10311 |  | 11141 |  | 7361 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | -T.T. Total Catch |  | 0 |  | 10311 |  | 11141 |  | 7361 |  | 214 |  | 29027 |  |

 and Davie Lake ( 1988 ruleseo of 657,287 fy).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Whak | Contributor (Elack $/ T_{\text {Ypo }}$ ) | Remole Relemes Site | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Totw | ** |
|  | 15.21 Avs | MB Hetchery (Coshri' Lakedsmoth) |  | 0 | 0 | 355 | 36403 | 119 | 7445 | 282 | 22540 | 0 | 0 | 936 | 2 |
|  |  | MB Hatchery (Eahamy Lakesmoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 179 | 27455 | 7252 | 6419581 | 1804 | 340281 | 0 | 0 | 9235 | 18 |
|  |  | MB Hachery (Eybl/ry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Totel Hatchery |  | 0 | 0 | 734 | 63860 | 3371 | 6427026 | 2086 | 362821 | 0 | 0 | 10191 | 20 |
|  |  | Rumota Relems (Coghill Leke/Smoly) | Coghill R Eatury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Remote Ralease(Eshmay LakuSmoty) | Eshamy R. Retuary | 0 | 0 | 1002 | 91247 | 14994 | 5370407 | 3470 | 605224 | 0 | 0 | 18965 | 38 |
|  |  | Remola Ralewe(Ehamy LekwFry) | Eother Pimutake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 2525 | 52 | 621 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 |
|  |  | Remote Raceno(Ehhany Lake/Fy) | Pam Laks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 7248 | 26 | 437 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 0 |
|  |  | Total Remotor Relens |  | 0 | 0 | 1002 | 91247 | 14780 | $5380180$ | 3548 | 606282 | 0 | 0 | 19330 | 39 |
|  |  | Other - |  | 120 | 0 | 269 | 168370 | 6343 | 13941242 | 2788 | минин | 46 | 0 |  |  |
|  |  | Wid (Eahamy Lakeksmot) |  | 0 | 0 | 337 | 13263 | 7844 | 2134036 | 2818 | 154216 | 0 | 0 | 10999 | 22 |
|  |  | Sumplod Catch |  | 0 |  | 2342 |  | 36338 |  | 11240 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch |  | 120 |  | 2342 |  | 36338 |  | 11240 |  | 46 |  | 50086 |  |
|  | 22-28 Aus | MB Hatchey ( Cophill Lake/smoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | MB Hetchery (Ethenay Latedsmolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 625 | 49238 | 1307 | 254420 | 2081 | 162143 |  |  | 4013 | 10 |
|  |  | MB Hatchery (Eyd/fry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| $\cdots$ |  | Toull hatchery |  | 0 | 0 | 625 | 49238 | 1307 | 254420 | 2081 | 162143 |  |  | 4013 | 10 |
| $\underset{\boldsymbol{\omega}}{\mathbf{O}}$ |  | Remote Retese (Costill Lakesmolk) | Coghill R Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Remote Ralemen(Enheny Lake/Smoli) | Eshamy R. Eetuary | 0 | 0 | 200 | 14845 | 22704 | 50s80000 | 1504 | 79211 |  |  | 24408 | 38 |
|  |  | Renote Relese(Esthmy Lake/Fy) | Erther Pam Lako | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 1287 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 111 |  |
|  |  | Remoto Rolesee(Eshmay LakdFry) | Panctake | 0 | 0 | 73 | 938 | 332 | 20756 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 405 | 1 |
|  |  | Toual Remote Releaso |  | 0 | 0 | 273 | 15783 | 23147 | 50602043 | 1504 | 79211 |  |  | 29924 | 60 |
|  |  | Other * |  | 34 | 0 | 628 | 78121 | 409 | 53335336 | 171 | 308958 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Wid (ECheny Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 498 | 13100 | 9043 | 2478873 | 2066 | 67604 |  |  | 11607 | 28 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch |  | 0 |  | 2024 |  | 33906 |  | 5822 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tooul Catch |  | 34 |  | 2024 |  | 33906 |  | 5822 |  | 0 |  | 41786 |  |

-As $\%$ of tomel catch over ill dirtricto.
 and Devie Lake (1988 ruleano of 657,287 fy).

|  |  | Remole Reloeno Site | Dintrict |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toled | $\kappa^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 223 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Woak }}{29 \text { A } 85-04 \operatorname{sep}}$ | Contribulor (Slock(Typo) |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{L}}$. | Contrib. | Ver. | Connib. | Vr. |  |  |
|  | MB Hatchary (Coghill Lekersmot) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Inatchery (Eahuny Lakesmol)) |  |  |  | 1085 | 292102 | 1832 | 230964 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 2917 | 26 |
|  | MB Hathery (Eyul/ry) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Towl Hatchery |  |  |  | 1085 | 292102 | 1832 | 230964 | 0 | - |  |  | 2917 | 26 |
|  | Remole Ralease (Coghill Lakelsmoli) | Coghill R Etamary |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releme(Exhamy Lake/Smolt) | Eahemy R. Eatuary |  |  | 163 | 19839 | 3459 | 1267680 | 295 | 582 |  |  | 3917 | 35 |
|  | Rentoto Reiesoo(Edhamy Leke/Fry) | Eother Pam Lako |  |  | 34 | 1000 | 49 | 286 | 14 | 3 |  |  | 97 | 1 |
|  |  | Pus Lak |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Totel Reanoter Relens |  |  |  | 197 | 20839 | 3508 | 1267966 | 309 | 585 |  |  | 4014 | 36 |
|  | Other - |  |  |  | 395 | 327950 | 8 | 2094744 | 1 | 771 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Wid (Eakmy Leke(Smolt) |  |  |  | 423 | 15009 | 3369 | 598814 | 172 | 186 |  |  | 394 | 35 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 0 |  | 2100 |  | 8717 |  | 482 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Towl Catch |  | 0 |  | 2100 |  | 8717 |  | 482 |  | 0 |  | 11299 |  |
| 05-11 Sept | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lakersmoll) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hetchery (Eshmmy Lakesmoll) |  |  |  | 86 | 493 | 438 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 524 | 22 |
|  | M ${ }^{\text {Helchery (Eyuf/ry) }}$ |  |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hetchary |  |  |  | 86 | 493 | 438 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 524 | 22 |
|  | Remote Roveree (Cophill lakersmodi) | Coghill R. Eetancy |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releemerehamy Lakersmolt) | Eshumy R. Entuary |  |  | 85 | 493 | 827 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 912 | 38 |
|  | Remotele Releso(Eahany Lekofry) | Esther Pus Lak* |  |  | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 1 |
|  | Remoto Relecer(Enhemy Lekeriry) | Pancoke |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remoto Reloseo |  |  |  | 85 | 493 | 839 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 924 | 39 |
|  | Other * |  |  |  | 126 | 986 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Wild (Eshany LakwSmolt) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 806 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 806 | 34 |
|  | Sumplod Catch |  | 0 |  | 297 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 0 |  | 297 |  | 2085 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2382 |  |

[^7]|  | dix Cs. | imatod hatchery contribution (Coutrib.) 10 | oye mimoa common | perty fincer | 3 by | iod and dir | Contin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Vor. | Contrib. | Vaf. | Contrib. | Vas. | Contrib. | Ver. | Total | $\%^{\circ}$ |
|  | Weak | Contribulor (Slocketypo) | Remote Ralame Sito | Contrib. | Ve. | Conat. | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | 12-18 Sopt | MB Hatchery (Coptill Lakesmoti) |  |  |  | 15 | 0 | 70 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 115 | 24 |
|  |  | MB Hatchery (Eahemy LakeSmol) |  |  |  | S | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | MB Hatchery (Eyll/Fry) |  |  |  | 45 | 0 | 70 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 115 | 24 |
|  |  | Total Hatchery |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Remote Ralease (Coghill LekeNsmoti) |  |  |  | 44 | 0 | 132 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 176 | 36 |
|  |  | Remoto Release(Echany Lukusmolt) | Esherny R Eetury |  |  | 4 | 0 | , | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0 |
|  |  | Remote Relewo(Echamy Lata/Fry) | Eether Prow Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Remote Ralease(Enhemy Lakefry) |  |  |  | 44 | 0 | 134 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 178 | 37 |
|  |  | Total Remoto Relecse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Other * |  |  |  | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 132 | 27 |
|  |  | Wild (Echuny LakuSmoll) |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | 129 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 132 | 27 |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 154 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cutch |  | 0 |  | 154 |  | 333 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 487 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | 19.25 Sopt | MB Hetchery (Coghill Laka/Smoll) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | MB Hetchery (Eahemy Lake/Smoth) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| - |  | MB Hischery (Eymb/Fy) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ |  | Total Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Remote Releno (Coghill LakeSmoll) | Coghill R. Extury |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Remote Rulenes(Eahmy Lake/smoli) | Eshemy R. Ectunsy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Remoth Rolowo (Ethemy Leke/Fry) | Esthet Pual Lake |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Romoto Relewer (Eshemy LekwFry) | Puas Lako |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total Remote Releas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Other * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Wild (Emany Lakedsmolt) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch <br> Total Catch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 29756 |  | 78684 |  | 7140 |  | 45 |  | 115625 | 39 |
|  |  | total hatelery |  | 0 |  | 15373 |  | 53769 |  | 4575 |  | 0 |  | 77717 | 26 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD ESHAMY |  | 0 |  | 3683 |  | 27954 |  | 7221 |  | 0 |  | 38858 | 13 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH |  | 154 |  | 72782 |  | 182469 |  | 28092 |  | 14770 |  | 298267 |  |

- As $\%$ of total catch over an dirtricta.
 and Davis Lake ( 1988 selean of 657,287 fyy).

Appendix C 5.1.2 Estirnted hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1993 by by period and district.

| Week | Contributor (Slock/Type) | Remote Release Site | District |  | $\%$ - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. |  |
| 27 Jun-03 Jul | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smol) |  | 4330 | 0 | 99 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshany Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hetchery (Eyak/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Totel Hachery |  | 4330 | 0 | 99 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smoli) | Coghill R. Esturry | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remole Release(Eshamy Leke/Smolt) | Eshmiy R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshany Lake/Fy) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Renote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other ${ }^{\text {- }}$ |  | 33 | 0 |  |
|  | Wild (Eshmy Leke/Smoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sumpled Catch |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Totul Calch |  | 4363 |  |  |
| 04.10 Jul | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  | 12737 | 1330077 | 99 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshumy Lele/Smoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hutchery (EykN/Fy) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 12737 | 1330077 | 99 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smoil) | Coghill R Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relemse(Eshany Lake/Srooll) | Eshamy R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshumy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Late/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toud Remote Relesse |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Other - |  | 87 | 1330077 |  |
|  | Wild (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch Total Catch |  | 12824 12824 |  |  |

- As \% of totel calch over all districts.
- Other contributions may contuin wild fish and/or fish from unlugged remote releases at Pass Leke (1988 release of 594,210 6y, 1989 release of 603,219 fiy), Esther Pass Lake(1988 release of 153,031 fyy; 1989 release of 154,641 fy)) and Davis Lake ( 1988 release of 657,287 fy). -continued-

- As \% of total catch over all districts.
- Other contributions may contuin wild fish and/oc fish fiom uniagged remote releases at Pass Lake (1988 release of 594,210 fyy, 1989


- As \% of total catch over all districts.
- Oher contributions may contain widd fish and/or fish from untagged remote releasea at Pass Lake (1988 rclease of 594,210 fy; 1989
redese of 603,219 fiy). Esther Pass Lake( 1988 ralense of 153,031 fy, 1989 relesse of 154,644 fy ) ) and Davis Lake ( 9988 release of 657,287 fiy) -Continued.

Appendix C S.1.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contib.) W the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1993 by
by period and district (Continued)


[^8]- Other contributions may contrin widd fish vidior fish from untageed remole relesses at Pass Lake (1988 relense of 594,210 fy, 1989 release of 603,219 fyy), Esther Pass Lake( 1988 release of 153,031 fyy, 1989 recense of 154,644 fyy) and Davis Lake (1988 rekease of 657,287 fy).


[^9]- Ober contributions may connuin wild fish andor fish from untagged renole relewes at Pase Lake ( 1988 release of 594,210 fyy,198s release of 603,219 fy), Esther Pass Lake(1988 release of 153,031 fyy, 1989 recesse of 154,644 fy ) ) and Davis Lake ( 1988 relesse of 657,287 fy ).

Appendix C 5.2.1 Extimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) No the colbo salinon common property fishery of 1993 by period and district.

| Woek | Contributor | Faclity | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contri. | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver: | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 06-12 Sm | Hatchery | Sotomon Gulch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Totul Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 13-19 Jun | Hatchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Cutch | 0 |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  |
| 20-26 Jun | Hetchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sempied Cancix | 0 |  | 32 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Totw Catch | 0 |  | 32 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 32 |  |
| 27 Jun-03 Jul | Hatchery | Solomon Guich |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Samplad Catch | 0 |  | 159 |  | 98 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 159 |  | 98 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 257 |  |
| 04-10 Jul | Hatchary | Soloman Gulch |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 0 |  | 312 |  | 287 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 312 |  | 287 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 599 |  |
| 11-17 Jul | Hotchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Cutch | 0 |  | 91 |  | 12 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 91 |  | 12 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 103 |  |
| 18-24 Jul | Hetchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Calch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 |  | 4 |  |
| 23-31 Jul | Hatchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sumpled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 10 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 10 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 10 |  |

Appendix C S.2.1 Eleimaled halchery conaributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon consurion property finhery of 1993 by pariod and district (Continued)

| Weck | Contribulor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \%* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. |  |  |
| $01-47$ Aug | Hatchary | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 100 | 5265 | 11 | 34 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 111 | 10 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 604 |  | 36 |  | 528 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 604 |  | 36 |  | 528 |  | 0 |  | 1168 |  |
| 08-14 Aug | Hatchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | . 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Semplod Catch | 0 |  | 1194 |  | 134 |  | 1359 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 1194 |  | 134 |  | 1359 |  | 0 |  | 2687 |  |
| 15-21 Aug | Hatchery | Solomon Gulch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Semplod Catch | 17 |  | 441 |  | 117 |  | 1205 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Totel Catch | 17 |  | 441 |  | 117 |  | 1205 |  | 0 |  | 1780 |  |
| 22-28 Aug | Hatchery | Solomon Gulch | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 1 |  | 2605 |  | 634 |  | 515 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 1 |  | 2605 |  | 634 |  | 515 |  | 0 |  | 3755 |  |
| 29 Aug-04 Sep | Heachery | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 69 | 4239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 69 | 1 |
|  |  | Sernpled Calch | 0 |  | 8399 |  | 300 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cutch | 0 |  | 8399 |  | 300 |  | 52 |  | 0 |  | 8751 |  |
| 05-11 Sept | Hatchery | Solormon Guch |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 10536 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 10536 |  | 147 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 10683 |  |
| 12-18 Sept | Hetchery | Solomon Gukch |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Semplod Catich | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 9319 |  | 20 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 9339 |  |
| 19-25 Sept | Hatchery | Solaman Gulch |  |  | 0 | D |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Samplod Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 5876 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5876 |  |

Appendix C 5.2.1 Extimated hatchery contributiona (Contrib.) to the coho salmon common property fishery of 1993 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor Facility |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | $\%^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 222 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Vrr. |  |  |
| 26 Sept-02 Oct | Hatchery | Solomon Gulch |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 484 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 484 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL SOLOMON G. | 0 |  | 169 |  | 11 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 180 | 0 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 18 |  | 40067 |  | 1795 |  | 3659 |  | 4 |  | 45543 |  |

'As \% of total calch over an districts.

|  | Appendix C 5.2.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho almon cost recovery fishery of 1993 by period and district. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Distr |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Week | Contributor | Facility | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Total | \% ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ |
|  | 22-28 Aug | Hatchery | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 193 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 193 |  | 193 |  |
|  | 29 Aug-04 Sept | Hatchery | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 1339 |  | 1339 |  |
|  | 05-11 Sept | Hatchery | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| $\cdots$ |  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 | . |  |  |
| - |  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 12-18 Sept | Hatchery | Solomon G. | 1614 | 58056 |  |  | 1614 | 81 |
|  |  |  | Sampled Catch | 1985 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Catch | 1985 |  | 0 |  | 1985 |  |
|  | 19-25 Sept | Hatchery | Solomon G. | 132 | 4278 |  |  | 132 | 66 |
|  |  |  | Sampled Catch | 201 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Catch | 201 |  | 0 |  | 201 |  |
| - |  | TOTAL | SOLOMON G. | 1746 2186 |  | $\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 1532 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 1746 <br> 3718 | 47 |

Appendix C 5.3.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook salmon common property fishery of 1993 by period and district

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toul |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 06-12 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N . | 156 | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 60 |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 156 | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156 | 60 |
|  | Wid |  | 106 | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 106 | 40 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 262 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 262 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 262 |  |
| 13-19 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N . | 80 | 0 | 15 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 95 | 65 |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 80 | 0 | 15 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 95 | 65 |
|  | Wild |  | 51 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 51 | 35 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 131 |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cutch | $131$ |  | 15 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 146 |  |
| 20-26 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N . | 46 | 154 | 9 | 34 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 55 | 62 |
|  |  | Solomon 0 . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 46 | 154 | 9 | 34 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 55 | 62 |
|  | Wild |  | 25 | 154 | 8 | 34 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 34 | 38 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 71 |  | 17 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 71 |  | 17 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 89 |  |
| 27 Jun-03 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 34 | 368 | 7 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 41 | 53 |
|  |  | Soloman 0 . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 34 | 368 | 7 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 41 | 53 |
|  | Wid |  | 28 | 368 | 6 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 36 | 47 |
|  |  | Smmpled Catch | 62 |  | 13 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Calch | 62 |  | 13 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 77 |  |

*At \% of lotal catch over all districts.

Appendix C S.3.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook salmon common property fishery of 1993 by period and district (Continued)

| Weak | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 04-10 \% | Hatchery | Wally N . | 17 | 50 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 17 | 55 |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 17 | 50 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 17 | 55 |
|  | Wid |  | 3 | 50 | 8 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 0 | 14 | 45 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 20 |  | 8 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  | . |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 20 |  | 8 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  | 31 |  |
| 11-17 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 16 | 45 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 16 | 70 |
|  |  | Solomon 0. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 16 | 45 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 16 | 70 |
|  | Wild |  | 2 | 45 | 3 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 7 | 30 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 18 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 18 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 23 |  |
| 18-24 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon 0. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 0 | 6 | 100 |
|  |  | Sumpled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 |  | 6 |  |
| 25-31 Jul | Hetchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon 0. |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wid |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100 |
|  |  | Smpled Catch | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |

Appendix C 5.3.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook relmon common property fishery of 1993 by pariod and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facility | Districe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tolal | \% ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 01-07 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  | 30 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 |  |  | 32 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 30 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | . |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 30 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 32 |  |
| 08-14 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon C . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  | 120 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 |  |  | 127 | 100 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 120 |  | 1 |  | 6 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 120 |  | 1 |  | 6 |  | 0 |  | 127 |  |
| 15-21 Aug | Hetchary | Waly N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  | 8 | 100 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 3 |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 3 |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 8 |  |
| 22-28 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wid |  | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 7 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 5 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 5 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 7 |  |

Appendix C 5.3.1 Extimated hutchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chirook aalmon common property fishery of 1993 by period and district (Continued)

| Woak | Contributor Facility |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Toual | \%* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 29 Aug-04 Sep | Hastchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon C . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | , |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 3 |  | $s$ |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 8 |  |
| 05-11 Sept | Hatchery | Wasly N . | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon C . | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 100 |
|  |  | Sempled Cotch | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| 12-18 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon O . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild | d |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 349 |  | 31 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 380 | 46 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 378 |  | 36 |  | 11 |  | 14 |  | 439 | 54 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 727 |  | 67 |  | 11 |  | 14 |  | 819 |  |

- As \% of total catch over all districts.

Appendix C 53.2 Estinated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook
satmon cost recovery fishery of 1993 by period and district

| Wesk | Contributer | Facility | District |  | \% ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vv. |  |
| 23-29 May | Hatchery | Wally N. | 11 | 0 | 30 |
|  | Wld |  | 25 | 0 | 70 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 36 |  |  |
| $30 \mathrm{May-05}$ Jun | Hatchery | Wally N. | 78 | 1504 | 30 |
|  | Wid |  | 183 | 1504 | 70 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 261 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 261 |  |  |
| 06-12 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N. | 353 | 13063 | 100 |
|  | WId |  | 0 | 13063 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 353 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 353 |  |  |
| 13-19 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N. | 256 | 2213 | 64 |
|  | Wad |  | 145 | 2213 | 36 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 401 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 401 |  |  |
| 20-26 Jun | Hetchery | Wally N . | 286 | 703 | 79 |
|  | Wid |  | 75 | 703 | 21 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 361 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 361 |  |  |

Appendix C 5.3.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook salimon cost recovery fishery of 1993 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor | Facrity | District |  | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 223 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vat. |  |
| 27 Jun-03 Jul | Hatchery | Wuly N . | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | wid |  | 8 | 0 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 8 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 8 |  |  |
| 04-10 Jul | Hatchery | Waly N . | 3 | 1 | 50 |
|  | Wid |  | 3 | 1 | so |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 6 |  |  |
|  |  | Towl Catch | 6 |  |  |
| 11-17 Jul | Hatchery | Waly N . | 20 | $s$ | 100 |
|  | Wad |  | 0 | 5 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 20 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 20 |  |  |
| 18.24 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Wid |  | 7 | 0 | 175 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 7 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cath | 7 |  |  |
| 25-31 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 4 | 17 | 57 |
|  | WId |  | 3 | 17 | 0 |
|  |  | Sumpled Catch | 7 |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 7 |  |  |
|  |  | TOTAL HATCHERY | 1011 |  |  |
|  |  | total wild | 449 |  |  |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 1460 |  |  |

- As \% of total catch over ill districts.









| WEEX Conaribut (StockThpol |  | Remote Relamer She | Dixtrig |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 | 22 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 224 |  | Town | $\underline{6}$ |
|  |  | Contiti | Vr. | Contrib. | Vm. | Conurib. | Ve. | Contrib, | V . | Connib. |  |  | ves. |
| 07.13 A48 | MR futchary (Coquiris Lakersmok) |  |  |  |  | 1043 | 30374 | 360 | 11536 | 271 | 23994 |  |  | 176 | - |
|  | MB Hachery (Exhemy Late/Smok) |  |  |  |  | 3759 | 119683 | 83 | 117992 | 19548 | 583438 |  |  | 2145 | 57 |
|  | MB Huchery (Main Bay/Smoh) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Toul Hachery |  |  |  | 142 | 1280057 | 1198 | 12957 | 19819 | 5908342 |  |  | 2505\% | 61 |
|  | Remiou Relemen (Coghill Lake/Smok) | Coghill r extury |  |  | 0 | 0 | 415 | 9484 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 415 | 1 |
|  | Remota Recemo(Etheny LekdSmok) | Eheny R Exumy |  |  | 1579 | 30931 | 1635 | 3434 | 7907 | 2601232 |  |  | 11101 | 26 |
|  | Remote Releme (Exhmay Lete/Fis) | Eshemy Lake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 135 | 4954 | 237 | 20023 |  |  | 422 | 1 |
|  | Remole Releem(Exheny Leterfy) | Exher Peralake |  |  | 0 | 0 | 176 | 4157 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 176 | - |
|  | Rexiote Releme(Ethemy Lekefry) | Pan Late |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Town Remote Ralesw |  |  |  | 1579 | 30931 | 231 | 9729 | 819 | 2621305 |  |  | 12114 | 29 |
|  | rowal widd |  |  |  | 366 | 1310989 | 1653 | 227307 | 2133 | 452964 |  |  | 4152 | 10 |
|  | Smpled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 6737 |  | 5192 |  | 30146 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Toun cach |  | - |  | 677 |  | 3192 |  | 30446 |  | 0 |  | 43125 |  |
| 14-20 Ang | MB Hachery (Cozhill Latwsmok) |  |  |  | 50 | 249 | 273 | 3120 | 726 | 221698 |  |  | 149 | 3 |
|  | MB Hecthery (Ealumy Lakw/smok) |  |  |  | 2091 | 751068 | 254 | 37002 | 12031 | 7255553 |  |  | 16659 | 47 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | MP Hatior (Ey $\mathrm{l}_{6} / \mathrm{Fry}$ ) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Toun Hachery |  |  |  | 2131 | 751317 | 2320 | 4012 | 12757 | 747231 |  |  | 17708 | so |
|  | Remole Releme (Coerhill Lake/Smoll) | Coshinl R Exumay |  |  | 0 | 0 | 69 | 14378 | 0 | 0 |  |  | $6 \%$ | 2 |
|  | Remote Relamen(Ehtury Lek 4 Smoll) | Eshmay R. Emumy |  |  | 205 | 3646 | 2150 | 42153 | 757 | 160304s |  |  | 11012 | 3 |
|  | Remole Ralemen (Fehmay Lateory) | Eshemy Lake |  |  | 121 | 1406 | - | - | - | - |  |  | 121 | - |
|  | Remote Releme(Ethmony LateFry) | Ember Pma Lake |  |  | - | 0 | 57 | 38 | - | - |  |  | 37 | - |
|  | Remote Relesee(Exheny Leke/Fry) | Pranlake |  |  | 20 | 39 | 109 | 435 | - | - |  |  | 129 | - |
|  | Toled Remode Releso |  |  |  | 96 | 38091 | 3342 | 53066 | $7 T^{2}$ | 4603085 |  |  | 12005 | 3 |
|  | Toull wid |  |  |  | 4145 | 78908 | 119 | 93164 | 411 | 12080336 |  |  | 5754 | 16 |
|  | Sampled Cach |  | 0 |  | 7 mm |  | 7356 |  | 20925 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Todul Cuch |  | 0 |  | 722 |  | 736 |  | 20925 |  | 0 |  | 35503 |  |


| mepk |  | Remone Relemen Site | Distria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | Toun | $6 \cdot$ |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Yar. | сомй. | Vm. | Conurib. | Ve. | Conmer | $\mathrm{v}_{4}$. | Contrit. | Ve. |  |  |
| 21-71 An8 | MB Hetchery (Coghill lekw ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (mol) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 9 | 124 |  |  | 1 | - |
|  | MB Hechery (Erhma lake/Smoll) |  |  |  | 279 | 3186 | 3226 | 116903 | 16613 | 1911993 |  |  | 20124 | 6 |
|  | MB 1 luchery (Main Bay/Smok) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | * |  |  | - | - |
|  | MB Hanchet (Eyutfry) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | - | - |
|  | Toxal fuchery |  |  |  | 279 | 3486 | 3236 | 116903 | 16704 | 19923182 |  |  | 20213 | 65 |
|  | Remote Releme (Coghill LakdSmol) | Coghill r Exumy |  |  | 0 | - | 705 | 379 | - | 0 |  |  | 705 | 2 |
|  | Remole Releme(Esmay Lekessmok) | Eahamy R Exumy |  |  | 90 | 272 | 1209 | 228s ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | - | 4768 |  |  | 1299 | 4 |
|  | Resnoun Relemen (Eshmay Lake/Fy) | Erhemy Late |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 37 | 1315 |  |  | 37 | - |
|  |  | Exher Puselake |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Remote Raleme(Etheny Leke/Fy) | Paus Lato |  |  | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | - | - |
|  | Toul Remote Relena |  |  |  | 90 | 272 | 1914 | 9144 | 37 | 6083 |  |  | 2041 | 7 |
|  | Toun wild |  |  |  | 181 | 3788 | 1674 | 208351 | 5404 | 191326s |  |  | 2919 | ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | Smapled Cach |  | 0 |  | 2210 |  | 6834 |  | 22145 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Toul Cuch |  | - |  | 2210 |  | 6824 |  | 22145 |  |  |  | 317\% |  |
| 28 Ang-03 Sopt | MB Hechery (Coghill LakdSmol) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | ame Hechery (Fahmy Leka/Smoli) |  |  |  |  |  | 3521 | 1445527 | 13060 | 49137 |  |  | 16s81 | * |
|  | MB Hachary (Main Bey/Smok) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | MB Hemer (EydF/Fy) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Town Hechery |  |  |  |  |  | 3521 | 1445327 | 13050 | 291378 |  |  | 16581 | as |
|  | Ramon Relemo (Coghill LendSmoll) | Cophill R Estory |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | - | - |  |  | 0 | - |
|  | Remoln Releme(Esherny IntuSmol) | Elhemy R Exuay |  |  |  |  | 674 | 10636 | 1726 | - |  |  | 2400 | 12 |
|  | Remoto Rolease (Ethemy LateFiy) | Erhemy Lakt |  |  |  |  | 190 | 3511 | 0 | 271415 |  |  | 150 | 1 |
|  |  | Exher Patial |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Remocs Rutemo(Eshmy Letuefry) | Prosake |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Toul Remode Rolesen |  |  |  |  |  | 864 | 15547 | 1726 | 27145 |  |  | 259 | 13 |
|  | Tout Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 1560574 | 1 | 4762863 |  |  | 46 | 2 |
|  | Sempled Cutch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4030 |  | 14797 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| - | - Toxectich |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4830 |  | 1477 |  |  |  | 19617. |  |



| week | Contributor (Sxckitypu) | Remote Relemen Sius | Distria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 22 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | Tow | \%. |
|  |  |  | Corurib. | vas. | Conrib. | Ve. | Conkrib. | V | Contrib. | VE. | Contrit. | Ve. |  |  |
| -4-10 Sept |  |  |  |  |  |  | * | * | ${ }^{1}$ | + |  |  | * | - |
|  | MB ILathery (Eahemy LakeSmoll) |  |  |  |  |  | 632 | 5799 | 178 | 429959 |  |  | 2370 | 41 |
|  | MB temchery (Muin Bay/Smolu) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | $\bullet$ | - |
|  | MB Hather (Eyd/Fy) |  |  |  |  |  | - | 0 | $\bullet$ | 0 |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
|  | Towl hatbery |  |  |  |  |  | 632 | 57999 | 173 | 42995 |  |  | 2370 | 4 |
|  | Remole Relemen (Coghill Lak/Smolk) | Corhill r. Emumy |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | - | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Remolu Raleme(Erhmixy LaldSmoll) | Eramy R. Etumy |  |  |  |  | 107 | 2304 | - | 0 |  |  | 107 | 2 |
|  | Ramon Reless (Erhemy Lavofy) | Emhmy Lukt |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Remaco Releme(Etheny LateFry) | Exther Past lake |  |  |  |  | - | 0 | 9 | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Reanole Relemo(Etheny Lateofry) | Pasalake |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Tocal Remote Relemo |  |  |  |  |  | 107 | 2304 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 107 | 2 |
|  | Town wid |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 60303 | 3276 | 429959 |  |  | 3321 | 57 |
|  | Smapled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | m |  | 5044 |  | 4 |  |  |  |
|  | Toun Cach |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 7M |  | 5014 |  | - |  | 5798 |  |
| 11-17 Sept | ma Hacthery (Coyhill LakdSmok) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | MB Humbery (Exhemy LatedSrok) |  |  |  |  |  | 191 | - | 276 | - |  |  | 467 | 45 |
|  | MB Hucchery (Mein Bay/Smol) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | UB Heacher (Eydility |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | , |
|  | Tow Hathery |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 0 | 276 | - |  |  | 467 | 45 |
|  | Remonh Releme (Coghill Lakersmok) | Cophill R Etuary |  |  |  |  | - | - | 6 | 9 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Remole Releme(Erheray Leke/3mok) | Ehtony R. Exumy |  |  |  |  | 32 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  | 32 | , |
|  | Renoct Relomo (Exhmy Leta/Fry) | Erhmy Lake |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |  | - | - |
|  | Reathote Raveme(Eshmay Lekefry) | Eather Paw Lake |  |  |  |  | 0 | - | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Remote Rolemestermany Lekefry) | Pesalate |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Total Ramsole Releme |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 0 | $\bullet$ | 0 |  |  | 32 | 3 |
|  | Touth wid |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | - | 521 | 0 |  |  | 536 | 52 |
|  | Sempled Cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | Toul Cuch |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 239 |  | 797 |  | - |  | 1133 |  |
|  | total hatchery |  | 233 | 11 | 2665 | 46 | 14193 | 42 | 113950 | 71 | 12062 | 31 | 149103 | 39 |
|  | TOTAL R.RELEASE |  | 0 | 0 | 3369 | 18 | 10976 | 32 | 25205 | 16 | 12156 | 32 | 31706 | 20 |
|  | total wild |  | 1938 | 8 | 6816 | 36 | 819 | 26 | 20365 | 13 | 1445 | 37 | 52105 | 3 |
|  | TOTAL CATCH |  | 2171 |  | L8850 |  | 33986 |  | 159549 |  | 38367 |  | 229214 |  |

[^10]Appendix C 6.1.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib), to the sockeye selimon cost tecovery fishery of 1994 by pariod and district

| Week | Contributos (SlockTType) | Reinote Relense Sito | Distict |  | Tow | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 19-25 Jun | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshumy Lake/Smoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hscthery (Main Bay/Smoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eywl/Fy) |  | 220 | 0 | 220 | 66 |
|  | Towas Hatchery |  | 220 | 0 | 220 | 66 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Leke/Smoll) | Cogrill R Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Ranote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smoli) | Eshamy R. Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relecse (Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Eshmy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relense(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesee(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Tolal Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toual Wid |  | 115 | 0 | 115 | 34 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 335 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Calch |  | 335 |  | 335 |  |
| $26 \mathrm{Jun}-02 \mathrm{Jus}$ | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smolt) |  | 2535 | 235434 | 2535 | 79 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshmmy Lake/Smoli) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Bay/Snolt) |  | 131 | 17105 | 131 | 4 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyik/Fry) |  | 29 | 817 | 29 | 1 |
|  | Toual Hatchery |  | 2695 | 253356 | 2695 | 84 |
|  | Remote Release (Cogtinl Lake/Smoli) | Coghill R. Estung | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smoll) | Eshumy R. Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesse (Eshamy Lake/fry) | Eshany Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshmmy Leke/Fyy) | Esther Puss Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesse(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Pass lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 499 | 253356 | 499 | 16 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 3194 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 3194 |  | 3194 |  |

Appendix C 6.1.2 Extirnated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contribulor (StockType) | Reinote Relcase Site | District |  | Tolal | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 03-09 Jul | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smol) |  | 5309 | 2181671 | 5309 | 78 |
|  | M8 Hatchery (Esthamy Lake/Smoll) |  | 783 | 153240 | 783 | 12 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Boy/Smolt) |  | 671 | 11267 | 671 | 10 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyak/Fy) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Towi Hatchery |  | 6763 | 2447588 | 6763 | 100 |
|  | Remole Release (Coghill Leke/Smolt) | Coghill R. Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Rermote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smoll) | Eshumy R. Estarcy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relcase (Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relcase(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esthet Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshumy Lake/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Tound Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 1 | 2447588 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 6764 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 6764 |  | 6764 |  |
| 10-16 Jul | MB Hitchery (Coghill Lake/Smott) |  | 2720 | 1397535 | 2720 | 23 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Esharny LakdSmoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Bay/Smoll) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | MB Halchery (Eyal/Fy) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Totad Halchery |  | 2770 | 1397535 | 2720 | 23 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smoli) | Coghill R Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshumy Lake/Smolt) | Esharny R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remiote Release (Eshamy Luke/Fy) | Eshany Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relese(Eshomy Lake/Fry) | Esthet Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesee(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Relesse | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 8942 | 1397535 | 8942 | 77 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 11662 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Calch |  | 11662 |  | 11662 |  |

Appendix C 6.1 .2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Cortibutor (Stock/rype) | Remole Reloase Silo | District |  | Totel | $\underline{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contuib. | Var. |  |  |
| 24.30 Jul | Mg Helchery (Coghill Lake/Smoll) |  | 10169 | 1560376 | 10169 | 49 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smolt) |  | 5201 | 19072 | 5201 | 25 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Bay/Smoli) |  | 1038 | 133807 | 1038 | 5 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eydi/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 16408 | 1884911 | 16408 | 80 |
|  | Renote Release (Coghill Lake/Smoty) | Coghill R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshany Leke/Smoll) | Eshany R Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remole Release (Eshamy LakeFry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Leke/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releaso(Eshemy Leve/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toul Remote Recense |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toun Wid |  | 4215 | 1884911 | 4215 | 20 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 20623 |  |  |  |
|  | Toul Catch |  | 20623 |  | 20623 |  |
| 31 Jut-06 Aug | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smoll) |  | 4279 | 437446 | 4279 | 28 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshumy Lake/Smoll) |  | 8121 | 1381985 | 8121 | 54 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Bay/Smolt) |  | 196 | 17403 | 19 | 1 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyak/Fy) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | $125 \%$ | 1836834 | 125\% | 84 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smoli) | Cophill R Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Ranote Release(Eshmy Lake/Smolt) | Eshamy R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesse (Eshamy Leke/Fry) | Eshmy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshmmy Lakefry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toul Remote Relesse |  | - | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wid |  | 2479 | 1836834 | 2479 | 16 |
|  | Sumpled Catch |  | 15075 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 15075 |  | 15075 |  |

Appendix C 6.1.2 Estimeted hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor (Stock/1ype) | Rembore Release Site | District |  | Toul | $\% \cdot$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vru. |  |  |
| 07.13 Aus | MB Hetchery (Coghill Lake/Smoil) |  | 988 | 0 | 988 | 28 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshuny Lake/Smoll) |  | 1875 | 0 | 1875 | 54 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Bay/Smoll) |  | 45 | 0 | 45 | 1 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyal/ry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 2908 | 0 | 2908 | 84 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Leke/Smolt) | Coghtill R Estung | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Sunol) | Eshumy R. Estary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshamy Lake\%Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Retrote Relesse(Eshamy LakefFy) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Rernote Release (Eshumy LakeFFy) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 574 | 0 | 574 | 16 |
|  | Sampled Calch |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Calch |  | 3482 |  | 3482 |  |
| 14.20 Aug | MB Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smoll) |  | 1197 | 0 | 1197 | 28 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshumy Lake/Smoll) |  | 2273 | 0 | 2273 | 54 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Mein Bay/Smoly) |  | 35 | 0 | ss | 1 |
|  | M8 Hatchery (Eyal/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 3525 | 0 | 3525 | 84 |
|  | Remote Relense (Coghill Lake/Smoll) | Coghin R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Smoty) | Eshamy R Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesse (Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relesse(Eshamy Lake/Fiy) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshumy Lexe/firy) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Relesse |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Widd |  | 693 | 0 | 693 | 16 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Tolal Catch |  | 4218 |  | 4218 |  |

Apperdix C 6.1 .2 Estimaled hatchery contribuions (Contrib.) Io the sockeye salmon cost recovery fishery of 1994 by peciod and district (Continues)

| Week | Contributor (Stock $/$ Ype) | Remote Release Site | District |  | Total | $\%$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 225 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vr. |  |  |
| 21-27 Aug | MB Halchery (Coghill Lake/Smoli) |  | 3194 | 0 | 3194 | 28 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smoll) |  | 6069 | 0 | 6069 | \$4 |
|  | MB Halchery (Main Bay/Smoll) |  | 147 | 0 | 147 | 1 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyak/Fy) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Tota Hachery |  | 9410 | 0 | 9410 | 84 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smot) | Coghill R. Estuary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Releese(Eshamy Leke/Smoli) | Eshamy R. Estary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release (Eshany Lake/Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Leke/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Toul Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 1847 | 0 | 1847 | 16 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 11257 |  | 11257 |  |
| 28 Aug-03 Sept | M8 Hatchery (Coghill Lake/Smoll) |  | 715 | 0 | 715 | 28 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eshamy Lake/Smoll) |  | 1359 | 0 | 1359 | 54 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Main Bay/Smoll) |  | 33 | 0 | 33 | 1 |
|  | MB Hatchery (Eyal/Fry) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Hatchery |  | 2107 | 0 | 2107 | 84 |
|  | Remote Release (Coghill Lake/Smoll) | Coghill R Estuery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Relcese(Eshamy Lake/Smot) | Eshany R. Estury | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Rernote Release (Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Eshamy Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eshamy Lake/Fry) | Esther Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Remote Release(Eslanny Leke/Fry) | Pass Lake | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Remote Release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total Wild |  | 414 | 0 | 414 | 16 |
|  | Sampled Catch |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch |  | 2521 |  | 2521 |  |
|  | total hatchery |  | 59352 | 75 | 59352 | 75 |
|  | total r release |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL WILD |  | 19779 | 25 | 19779 | 25 |
|  | total Catch |  | 79131 |  | 79131 |  |

- As \% of total calch over all districts.

Appendix C 6.2.1 Estimate hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chum salmon common property fishery of 1994 by period and district


Appendix C 6.2.1 Estimate hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chum salmon common property fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | ntributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tolal | \% ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Yar. |  |  |
| 17-23 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 2740 | 1116491 | 0 | 0 | 17892 | $2.414+E 7$ | 5358 | 2671405 |  |  | 25990 | 35 |
|  |  | Solomon O . | 704 | 82958 | 0 | 0 | 335 | 109774 | 796 | 106799 |  |  | 1835 | 2 |
|  |  | Total | 3444 | 1199449 | 0 | 0 | 18227 | 109774 | 6154 | 2778204 |  |  | 27825 | 38 |
|  | Wild |  | 15118 | 1199449 | 15231 | 0 | 15886 | 109774 | 1 | 2778204 |  |  | 46236 | 62 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 18562 |  | 15231 |  | 34113 |  | 6155 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 18562 |  | 15231 |  | 34113 |  | 6155 |  | 0 |  | 34061 |  |
| 24-30 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7131 | $1.106+E 7$ | 0 | 0 | 1293 | 2550 | 8424 | 30 |
|  |  | Solomon C . | 3615 | 745544 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 854 | 325361 | 4469 | 16 |
|  |  | Total | 3615 | 745544 | 0 | 0 | 7131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2147 | 327911 | 12893 | 45 |
|  | Wild |  | 6546 | 745544 | 2278 | 0 | 3622 | 0 | 647 | 0 | 2381 | 327911 | 15474 | 55 |
|  |  | Sampled Calch | 10161 |  | 2278 |  | 10753 |  | 647 |  | 4528 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 10161 |  | 2278 |  | 10753 |  | 647 |  | 4528 |  | 28367 |  |
| 31 Jul-06 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 307 | 1560 | 307 | 2 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 503 | 105333 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503 | 4 |
|  |  | Total | 503 | 105333 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 307 | 1560 | 810 | 7 |
|  | Wild |  | 2005 | 105333 | 4072 | 0 |  |  | 883 | 0 | 4540 | 1560 | 11500 | 93 |
|  |  | Sampled Calch | 2508 |  | 4072 |  | 0 |  | 883 |  | 4847 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 2508 |  | 4072 |  | 0 |  | 883 |  | 4847 |  | 12310 |  |
| 07-13 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon C . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 3133 | 0 | 1764 | 0 | 447 | 0 |  |  | 5344 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 3133 |  | 1764 |  | 447 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Calch | 0 |  | 3133 |  | 1764 |  | 447 |  | 0 |  | 5344 |  |
| 14-20 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 609 | 37636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 609 | 19 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 609 | 37636 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 609 | 19 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 853 | 37636 | 1527 | 0 | 156 | 0 |  |  | 2536 | 81 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 1462 |  | 1527 |  | 156 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 1462 |  |  |  | 156 |  | 0 |  | 3145 |  |

- As \% of total catch over all districts.

Appendix C 6.2.1 Estimate hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chim salmon common property fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | neributor Facility |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tolal | \% ${ }^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Conurib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Vr. |  |  |
| 21-27 Aug | Hatchery | Waly N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 467 | 0 | 444 | 0 | 83 | 0 |  |  | 994 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 467 |  | 444 |  | 83 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 467 |  | 444 |  | 83 |  | 0 |  | 994 |  |
| 28 Aug-03 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  | 232 | 0 | 43 | 0 |  |  | 275 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 232 |  | 43 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 232 |  | 43 |  | 0 |  | 275 |  |
| 04.10 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 3 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 6 |
|  |  | Total | 3 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 6 |
|  | Wild |  | 11 | 0 |  |  | 30 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  | 45 | 94 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 30 |  | 4 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 14 |  | 0 |  | 30 |  | 4 |  | 0 |  | 48 |  |
| 11-17 Sept | Hatchery | Wally N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Solomon G . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Wild |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | TOT | Al HATCHERY | 8460 |  | 609 |  | 436340 |  | 8788 |  | 2454 |  | 456651 | 70 |
|  |  | TOTAL WILD | 33176 |  | 26034 |  | 121446 |  | 7619 |  | 6921 |  | 195196 | 30 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCH | 41636 |  | 26643 |  | 557786 |  | 16407 |  | 9375 |  | 651847 |  |

*As \% of total catch over all districts.

Appendix C 6.2.2 Extimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chum salmon cost recovery fichery of 1994 by period and districe

-Continued-

Appendix C6.2.2 Erimated hachery conaributions (Contrib.) Do the chum almon coat recovery fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)


- An \% of total catch over all districts.

Appendix C 6.3.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon common property fishery of 1994 by period and district.

| WEEK | Contribulor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | $V_{\text {as. }}$ | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Ves. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var . |  |  |
| 12-18 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 30 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 30 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 30 |  |
| 19-25 Jun | Hatchery | Wally N. |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 18 |  |
| 26 Jun-02 ful | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 91 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 91 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 94 |  |
| 03-09 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N. | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 38 |  | 0 |  | 9 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 38 |  | 0 |  | 9 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 48 |  |
| 10-16 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 29 |  | 16 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 29 |  | 16 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 118 |  |
| 17-23 Jw | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 286 |  | 23 |  | 83 |  | 19 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toun Catch | 286 |  | 23 |  | 83 |  | 19 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 411 |  |
| 24.30 Jul | Hatchery | Wully N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3928 |  | 135 |  | 86 |  | 114 |  | 1348 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 3928 |  | 135 |  | 86 |  | 114 |  | 1348 |  | 0 |  | 5611 |  |
| 31 Jul-06 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | . 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 400 | 139839 |  |  | 400 | 11 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3ss |  | 219 |  | 0 |  | 82 |  | 2753 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | - 535 |  | 219 |  | 0 |  | 82 |  | 2753 |  | 0 |  | 3609 |  |

Appendix C 6.3 .1 Estimated tuthery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon common property fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| WEEK | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tolel | \%* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 222 |  | 223 |  | 225 |  | 226 |  | 229 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Vru. | Contrib. | $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{H} .}$ | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 07.13 An4 | Hachery | Waly c . |  |  | 130 | 1762 | - | $\cdots$ | - | - |  |  |  |  | 138 | $\cdots$ |
|  |  | 8 mplos Cuch | 0 |  | 126 |  | 7 |  | 121 |  | - |  | * |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Cath | - |  | 126 |  | 71 |  | 121 |  | $\bullet$ |  | - |  | 176 |  |
| 14-20 Ans | Hendury | Waly N . |  |  | 197 | 912 | 196 | 3675 | - | - |  |  | 16 | - | 2170 | 6 |
|  |  | smoded Cuct | - |  | 31 |  | 2274 |  | ${ }^{12}$ |  | 1 |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | Towl Cuct | - |  | 191 |  | 2274 |  | 128 |  | - |  | 4 |  | 133 |  |
| 21-27 A48 | Hetchy | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4633 | 233433 | 87 | 1892 |  |  | 13 | - | 473 | 4 |
|  |  | 2mplos Cuch | $\bullet$ |  | 90 |  | 9561 |  | 100 |  | - |  | * |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tomesuch | 0 |  | 40 |  | 9361 |  | 400 |  | $\bullet$ |  | 38 |  | 1079 |  |
| 24 ncseng sept | Henchry | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 11613 | \%**** | 23 | 976 |  |  |  |  | :1046 | c |
|  |  | Smplad cad | - |  | 0 |  | 24117 |  | 233 |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Cuch | - |  | 0 |  | 2317 |  | 233 |  | - |  | - |  | 20350 |  |
| 0-10 seps | Hecher | Wdly N | - | - |  |  | 2036 | munes | * | - |  |  |  |  | 2054 | 71 |
|  |  | Seapled Cend | - |  | 0 |  | ${ }^{2408}$ |  | 141 |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tous Cuch | 4137 |  | 0 |  | 2 man |  | 141 |  | 0 |  | - |  | 3306 |  |
| 11-17 30\% | Henctry | Walys. | - | - |  |  | 93 | - | - | - |  |  |  |  | 239 | ${ }^{1}$ |
|  |  | memplod cat | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | - |  | $\bullet$ |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toun cach | 42 |  | 0 |  | 1192 |  | * |  | - |  | - |  | 11460 |  |
| 18-4 4 mex | Henctury | Walys. |  |  |  |  | 4020 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4020 | 4 |
|  |  | zemplod Cuch | ${ }^{0}$ |  | 0 |  | - |  | 0 |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | Toul Culd | * |  | - |  | 47 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 47 |  |
|  |  | total wallyn. total catch | \% 42 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 347 \\ 274 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3925 \\ & 3141 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 320 \\ 1261 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 400 \\ 4101 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | ${ }^{202}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6033 \\ & 9,171 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 41 |

## Appendix C 6.3.2 Extimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon coat recovery fiahery of 1994 by period and district.

| Week | Contributor | Facility | District |  |  |  | Total | $\%{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 26 Jun-02 Jul | Hatchery | Wully N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| 03-09 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 15 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 15 |  | 0 |  | 15 |  |
| 10.16 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 2 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| 17-23 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 24-30 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Samplod Catch | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| 31 Jul-06 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |

Appendix C 6.3.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the coho salmon cost recovery fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Facility | District |  |  |  | Tolal | $\%{ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 221 |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. |  |  |
| 07-13 Aug | Hatchery Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 10 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  |
| 14-20 Aug | Hatchery Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 21-27 Aus | Hatchery Wally N . |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 4182 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 4182 |  | 4182 |  |
| 28 Aug-03 Sept | Hatchery Wally N . |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
|  | Sempled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 04-10 Sept | Hatchery Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 13019 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Calch | 13019 |  | 874 |  | 13893 |  |
| 11-17 Sept | Hatchery Wally N. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 4374 |  | 4374 |  |
|  | TOTAL WALLYN. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL CATCH | 13038 |  | 9444 |  | 22482 |  |

- As \% of total catch over all districts.


## Appendix C 6.4.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Conlrib.) to the chinook salmon common property fishery of 1994 by period and district

| Week | Contributor | Facility | Districi |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Vr. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 12-18 Jun | Halchery | Wally N . |  |  | 38 | 1243 | 38 | 18 |
|  |  | Solomon 6. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 38 | 1243 | 38 | 18 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 175 | 1243 | 175 | 82 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 213 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 213 |  | 213 |  |
| 19.25 Jan | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon C . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 26 | 0 | 26 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 26 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 26 |  | 26 |  |
| $26 \mathrm{Jun}-02 \mathrm{Jul}$ | Hatchery | Wolly N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  | 15 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 41 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Carch | 15 |  | 26 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 15 |  | 26 |  | 41 |  |
| 03-09 Jul | Hatchery | Waly N . | 0 | 0 | 70 | 343 | 70 | 82 |
|  |  | Solomion C . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 70 | 343 | 70 | 82 |
|  | Wild |  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 343 | 15 | 18 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 15 |  | 70 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 15 |  | 70 |  | 85 |  |

Appendix C 6.4.1 Estimeted hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook salmon common property fishery of 1994
by period and district (Continued)

| Weck | Contributor | Facilily | District |  |  |  | Total | \% ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 221 |  | 223 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Conlrib | Var. | Contrib. | Var. |  |  |
| 10.16 Jul | Halchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 13 | 42 | 13 | 20 |
|  |  | Solomon 0. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 13 | 42 | 13 | 20 |
|  | Wild |  | 10 | 0 | 41 | 42 | 51 | 80 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 10 |  | 54 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 10 |  | 54 |  | 64 |  |
| 17-23 Jul | Helchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 15 | 56 | 15 | 38 |
|  |  | Solomon G . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 15 | 56 | 15 | 38 |
|  | Wild |  | 16 | 0 | 9 | 56 | 25 | 63 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 16 |  | 24 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 16 |  | 24 |  | 40 |  |
| 24-30 Jul | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  | 26 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 32 | 100 |
|  |  | Sempled Catch | 26 |  | 6 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 26 |  | 6 |  | 32 |  |
| 31 Jul-06 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G . | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  | 3 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 3 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  |

Continued-

Appendix C 6.4.1 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook salman common property fishery of 1994 by period and district (Continued)

| Week | Contributor Facility |  | District |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contrib. | Var. | Contrib. | Ver. | Tolat | $\%$ |
| 07-13 Aug | Hatchery | Welly N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomion G . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 17 | 0 | 17 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Tolal Catch | 0 |  | 17 |  | 17 |  |
| 14-20 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomion 0. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 35 | 0 | 35 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 35 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Cetch | 0 |  | 35 |  | 35 |  |
| 21-27 Aug | Hatchery | Wally N . |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Solomon G. |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Wild |  |  |  | 7 | 0 | 7 | 100 |
|  |  | Sampled Catch | 0 |  | 7 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Catch | 0 |  | 7 |  | 7 |  |
|  | TOTAL HATCHERY TOTAL WLD |  | 0 |  | 136 |  | 136 | 24 |
|  |  |  | 85 |  | 342 |  | 427 | 76 |
|  |  | TOTAL CATCI | 85 |  | 478 |  | 563 |  |

- As a \% of total catch over all districts.

Appendix C 6.4.2 Estimated hatchery contributions (Contrib.) to the chinook salmon cost recovery fishery of 1994 by period and district.


As a $\%$ of total catch over all districts.


[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ Includes estimated contributions from the Fort Richardson hatchery

[^1]:    

[^2]:    - As \% of total catch over wll dintrictes.

[^3]:    As \% of total catch over all districts.

    - Sport-fish releases at Fleming Spit and Whittier Harbour.

[^4]:    

[^5]:    - As \% of total catch over all districts.

[^6]:    -AE \% of tookl catch over all divtricta.
     and Davis Lake (1988 releane of 657,287 fy).

[^7]:    - An \% of total catch over all dietrict
    
    and Davis Lake (1988 relene of 657,287 fy).

[^8]:    - As \% of toulal celch over all districts

[^9]:    - As \% of totel calch over all districts.

[^10]:    - As \% of bolal cuch over inl ditricite.

