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#### Abstract

Wild coho salmon juveniles were captured by minnow traps, adipose fin-clipped, fluorescent pigment marked, and released in rearing areas of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers during the summer of 1972. Returning adults were sampled for marks at canneries and cold storage plants throughout Southeastern Alaska during the summer and fall of 1974. Fall spawning ground counts and mark sampling indicated commercial fishery harvest rates of 77 to $95 \%$. Nearly $60 \%$ of tagged cohos were harvested by troll gear, nearly $40 \%$ by gillnet, and less than $2 \%$ by seine gear. Cohos from tagged portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers contributed an estimated ll\% (47, 700 fish) to the northern Southeast Alaska commercial coho catch. Fingerling survival, migration timing, size, and age of tagged adults were determined. Minnow trapping and tagging of wild juvenile coho salmon appears to be an excellent method for obtaining data on migrations, timing, and gear type harvest rates needed for effective fishery management.


## INTRODUCTION

The amount and efficiency of gear used for fishing coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) has greatly increased in Southeastern Alaska in recent years. From 1910 to 1927 the coho catch in Southeastern Alaska generally increased as the fishery developed. From 1928 to 1955 the catch was maintained at a fairly high level (average 1.8 million fish), and between 1956 and 1977 the catch declined (average 1.0 million fish) with a low of 427,357 fish in 1975. Expanding fishing pressure, in conjunction with a slowly decreasing average catch since the mid-1950's, has necessitated research to aid in management of the apparently dwindling stocks.

The technique of marking fish by forcing fluorescent pigment into the dermal tissue with compressed air from a small sandblast gun was introduced by Jackson (1959). The technique was refined, adapted for use with juvenile salmonids, and further described by Phinney (1966), Jaenicke (1967), Phinney et al. (1967), and Phinney and Matthews (1969).

During the summer of 1972 Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF \&G) Coho Research personnel minnow trapped, pigment marked, and released over 21,000 wild coho juveniles from portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers. The objectives of the project were to obtain information on migrations, timing, fishery harvest by gear type, and harvest rates of important wild coho stocks in northern Southeastern Alaska that could be used in management of the fishery. Coho juveniles from each river were adipose fin clipped and marked with a different color of fluorescent pigment, visible only under black light, to identify the river of origin. Only fish large enough to leave as smolts during the spring of 1973 were marked. About 75\% of Southeastern Alaska cohos smoltify at age II+ or older after reaching a threshold size of about 90 mm , spend two summers in saltwater, and return as adults in their fourth year.

A marked fish recovery team was organized to recover returning adults during the summer of 1974. Commercial fishery landings were sampled at strategically located canneries and cold storage plants. There was also a limited effort to monitor the sport fishery by creel census in the Juneau and Haines areas. Spawning ground surveys were conducted for total escapement counts, and sampling with seines was conducted for a marked:unmarked ratio of returning adults during the fall of 1974.

MARKING PHASE

## Methods and Materials

During the summer of 1972 juvenile cohos were captured with baited minnow traps in rearing areas of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers. Nearly all of the rearing areas were remote and transportation in and out was accomplished by fixed wing aircraft, helicopter, or boat. In nearly all cases, it was necessary to fly personnel, camping equipment, food, boats, outboard motors and marking equipment both in and out of the study areas. Tent camps were set up in each area for 4 to 9 day periods. Inflatable boats were used to reach most rearing areas, and juvenile cohos were captured with "Gee" minnow traps baited with strawberry-sized portions of boraxed salmon eggs set in weedy areas of lakes, ponds, beaver ponds, sloughs, and slow, weedy sections of rivers. The traps were usually soaked for 1 to 3 hours before pulling, but sometimes overnight soaks were employed.

Scale samples and lengths were taken in each marking area to determine the maximum size of age 0+fish. Previous sampling of the commercial fishery had demonstrated that nearly $75 \%$ of the cohos in Southeastern Alaska migrate to sea at age II+ or older. For this reason only fish large enough to be age I+ or older were marked to assure that the majority would migrate to sea as age II+ or older smolts during the spring of 1973 , spend two summers feeding in the sea, and return as adults in the fall of 1974.

Cohos usually smoltify at 85 to 90 mm , though there are variations from area to area. The minimum size of juveniles marked was 65 mm in the Taku River and Berners River, 78 mm in Mosquito Lake (Chilkat River system) and 85 mm in Chilkat Lake. Fish below these sizes were determined to be age $0+$. The range in sizes of juveniles marked was 65 to 90 mm in the Taku River and Berners River, about 78 to 120 mm in Mosquito Lake, and 85 to 140 mm in Chilkat Lake.

The rearing fish were usually captured by a two-man crew, transported to a marking area consisting of a screened-in tent (for protection from biting insects and rain), a table, dishpans, aerators, and the spraying equipment. The spray marking equipment (Figure 1, Appendix Table 1), consisted of a SCUBA tank containing compressed air, a pressure regulator,
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Figure 1. Minnow trap and spraying equipment used to capture and pigment mark juvenile coho salmon.
a 10 foot hose, a spray gun, cannister for pigment, and nozzle. The pigment used to mark fish was a dry grannular fluorescent powder that fluoresced under black light (3400-3800 angstroms), was non-soluble in water, was biologically inert, and contained at least $70 \%$ of particles between 50-350 microns in size. Four full SCUBA tanks were sufficient for marking up to 8,000 fish. Fish were marked either in a screened-in tent in bad weather, or on the banks of a stream, pond, lake, or in a boat when insects were absent and the weather good. The fish were held in several 5 gallon plastic buckets with lids and battery powered aerator pumps until they could be marked. They were then adipose fin clipped with surgical clippers and placed in a $12^{\prime \prime} \times 18^{\prime \prime}$ dip net, about 12 to 15 fish at a time, and sprayed with pigment from a distance of approximately 10 to 12 inches. The pressure reading on the gauge was set at 105 lbs . It was not necessary to anesthetize fish to fin clip or spray them and, in fact the thrashing in the net probably ensured that all fish were hit with pigment. Immediately after spraying the fish were placed in a bucket of water and poured back and forth into another bucket several times. This washed off most excess visible pigment that had not penetrated the skin and probably helped somewhat to prevent predation after release. The larger individual pigment grannules embedded in the skin of the fish could only be seen under black light. Marked fish were held in aerated pails until taken by foot or boat back to their capture area for release 1 to 2 hours after marking. The limiting factor in the operation was the difficulty, or slowness, of capturing large numbers of age I+ or older cohos. There seemed to be fair to good numbers of rearing cohos in many scattered places but there were seldom large numbers of fish in any one area. Distances between concentrations of fish and between rivers made marking large numbers of rearing cohos difficult. An average of 473 fish per day were captured and marked over the season. Approximately two-thirds of the rearing cohos were captured and marked by a four-man crew, with two trapping and two marking. The rest of the work was conducted with two-man crews, both capturing and then marking the fish. Up to 1,000 coho juveniles were captured and marked per day in the best areas with a four-man crew.

## Marking Areas

Marking locations and numbers of juvenile coho salmon marked in 1972 are shown in Appendix Table 2.

## Taku River

The Taku River (Figure 2) is a large, glacial river flowing into Alaska from British Columbia about 33 miles northeast of Juneau. It has


Figure 2. Pigment marking locations, 1972.
several tributary streams in Alaska which support coho salmon runs. These include Fish Creek, Moose Creek, Sockeye Creek, Yehring Creek, and Johnson Creek. Previous surveys had located concentrations of rearing cohos in Yehring and Johnson Creeks and these areas were selected for tagging.

## Xehring Creek

Yehring Creek is a small brown colored tributary to the Taku River located about 27 miles northeast of Juneau. It has a coho salmon escapement of between 1,000 to 2,500 fish annually. The main stream has good spawning in the upper area but poor rearing in the main stream. The great majority of cohos rearing in this system utilized beaver ponds that averaged about $18.3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ during July while the main stream averaged $8.9^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $10.0^{\circ}$ $C(6-28$ to $7-6-72)$. Access to several beaver pond rearing areas by coho juveniles was probably only during high water levels in the spring or fall.

All cohos marked in Yehring Creek came from three separate groups of beaver ponds.

## Johnson Creek

Johnson Creek is a small, clear tributary to the Taku River located about 24 miles northeast of Juneau (Figure 2). It has a coho escapement of 150 to 230 fish annually. The main stream has good spawning in the upper area but nearly all the coho rearing area is in the warmer, brown colored slough downstream from beaver ponds in the left fork. The main stream was $11.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while the left fork had a temperature of $15.6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $16.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on $8-5-71$. Access to the left fork by juvenile coho salmon was at all water levels but at least one side pond required high water levels for access. All of the cohos that were marked in Johnson Creek came from the slow moving slough (left fork) below the beaver ponds, the small pond connected to the slough by a high water channel, and in some of the beaver ponds themselves. The beaver ponds on Johnson Creek were clearer, colder, deeper, and, in general, poorer coho habitat than those on Yehring Creek.

## Berners River

The Berners River is a medium sized river about 45 miles northnorthwest of Juneau. The main (west) fork is glacial, but clears after freeze-up in the fall, and has good spawning in the headwaters. Very little spawning appeared to take place in the east fork which was mostly
slow, weedy, and brown colored. Most of the coho rearing appeared to take place in the east fork which was $13.9^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on $7-13-72$ while the west fork was much colder, only $5.0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The best catches were around weeds and logs. Some of the best catches came from a large, shallow, weedy, warm, ( $16.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) brown colored beaver pond halfway up, and connected to, the east fork by a narrow channel. In all of these ponds fish were large, fat, and in excellent condition. Spawning escapements for this river have ranged from 4,200 to 6,000 cohos during recent years. Coho fry resulting from spawning in the east fork appear to drift downstream in the cold glacial water and then ascend the warmer, brown colored waters of the east fork for rearing.

All cohos marked in the Berners River came from the slow and weedy east fork, weed filled side sloughs and ponds, and one large weed-filled beaver pond ( $1.215 \pm \mathrm{Ha}$.), all connected to the east fork. No trapping was conducted in the glacial west fork as few rearing cohos were found there.

## Chilkat River

The Chilkat River is a large, glacial river system about 85 miles northwest of Juneau (Figure 2) . It has numerous, large, tributary rivers, small tributaries, and mainstream spawning areas. Known spawning areas include inlet streams in Chilkat Lake, Takhin River, Little Salmon River, Mosquito Lake inlet stream, Bear Lake inlet stream, $3 / 4$ miles of the main Chilkat River just south of the Kelsall River, the Kelsall River, Nataga Creek, 3 total miles of main Chilkat River above and below Turtle Rock, Tahini River, and a small side tributary starting in Section 36 of T26S, R55E (Skagway C-3, topographic map $1: 63,360$ ). This river system is so large and complex that a total count of adult coho spawners would be nearly impossible to obtain. Known, important, coho rearing areas in the Chilkat River system include Mosquito Lake and many side sloughs and ponds along the main river. Chilkat Lake has a spawning escapement of approximately 1,000 coho adults but contains only scattered rearing populations throughout the lake. Most coho fry probably drift downstream from their respective spawning areas and rear in warmer side sloughs and ponds that connect with, or flow into, the main Chilkat River. Chilkat Lake has several spawning tributaries, the most important located at the south end of the lake. Mosquito Lake has a small spawning stream at the south end but it appears that many of the cohos rearing there enter when the Chilkat River floods and back flows into Mosquito Lake.

Most cohos that were marked in the Chilkat River system came from Mosquito Lake (121.5 $\pm \mathrm{Ha}$.), a medium sized, weedy lake connected by a
$1 / 3 \pm$ mile long channel to the river, about 26 miles upstream from Haines. Chilkat Lake was the next best trapping area, although it had a relatively small amount of shallow, weedy areas for rearing. Important coho rearing areas in Chilkat Lake were weed beds at the south end near the inlet, the narrows, and the north end near the outlet. Trapping was also conducted in several ponds in the upper Chilkat River, off the mouth of the Tahini River and further downstream, but catches were poor and no concentrations of rearing cohos were found.

## RECOVERY PHASE

## Commercial Catch Sampling

Commercial fishery landings were sampled at cold storage plants and canneries at Pelican, Hoonah, Excursion Inlet, Juneau, and Petersburg (Figure 3) between June 15 and October 11, 1974. As coho stocks from the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers were believed to return through Cross Sound and Icy Strait, the majority of sampling effort was concentrated in these areas. Less effort was made in Chatham Strait and the southern areas. Sampling was conducted by six $A D F \& G$ biologists and technicians, who watched for adipose fin clipped cohos during the off-loading and sorting of fish at canneries and cold storage plants. Cohos were most easily examined for adipose fin clips as they moved down conveyor belts or during the sorting or dressing operations. Hand tally counters were used to record the number of fish examined for marks. Fish with missing adipose fins were examined with a portable black light in a dark location. Snout-fork and mideye-fork lengths were measured to the nearest $1 / 8$ inch with a Stanley measuring tape, weighed to the nearest ounce on a hand scale (Chatillon Model IN-30), and recorded as either round or dressed weight. A smear of scales ( 15 to 20) was collected from each adipose fin clipped fish from the preferred area. Sex was determined on all round fish by making a short incision anterior to the vent and examining the gonads. The results of the biological sampling are given as a separate section appended to this report (Appendix A). General comments as to the quality of the adipose clip, location, color, and quantity of pigment (if any), general brightness, kype development, and presence and location of fluorescent fungus was also recorded. An orange, fluorescent fungus was confused with pigment early in the recovery program before any marked fish were found. Once the pigment on marked fish was recognized it was not confused with the fungus. The heads of fish lacking visible pigment were saved for later examination for coded wire tags. The few coded wire tagged cohos (7) and multiple fin clipped cohos (3) obtained were from fish originating to the south of Alaska (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 1974 Wire Tag Recovery Report).

Figure 3. Commercial fishery regulatory districts in Southeastern Alaska where marked coho salmon were recovered.


Fluorescent pigment colors used were red for Taku River, green for Berners River, and orange for Chilkat River fish. Under examination with black light the pigment glowed as tiny pin points of fluorescent color of varying densities, depending on how much pigment was embedded in the skin of the flesh. Common locations for pigment on the marked fish were in the eyes, eye sockets, operculum, sides, bases of pectoral, ventral, and anal fins, and in the adipose scar area. About halfway through the recovery program we learned that by slicing skin off the scar from the adipose fin clip with a scalpel and checking the white meat for pigment with a black light we could nearly always find pigment, even in fish that otherwise displayed none.

During commercial landings of cohos the skippers of fishing vessels and tenders were interviewed to determine their fishing areas and dates of catch. All data computation was delineated by the statistical week (Appendix Table 3) in which the landing date of a catch occurred. Marked fish were recovered in many statistical catch areas. In order to simplify analysis of the data and make it more meaningful, catches from adjacent statistical fishing areas were grouped into eleven larger composite areas (Table 1 and Figure 3) so that migration routes and timing could be more easily followed. The groupings consisted of fishing districts (circled numbers on Figure 3), sections of districts (i.e., 14A, 14B, 14C), and a few individual statistical areas (i.e., 112-13, 112-14, 112-15, and 11216) which were the smallest parts of districts.

The Sport Fish Division estimated that Juneau area sports fishermen took 5,622 cohos in 1974. Four pigment marked cohos were recovered from the sports fishery but the majority of the marks came from the commercial fishery.

## Sampling Schedule

Sampling of the commercial fishery was conducted at the following locations and times:

Pelican: June 15 to September 19, 1974 (statistical weeks 24-38).
Hoonah: July 15 to 19; July 29 to August 23, 1974 (statistical weeks 29, 31 to 34 ).

Excursion Inlet: July 8 to 22; August 28 to September 26, 1974 (statistical weeks 28 to 30,35 to 39 ).

Juneau: June 26 to October 11, 1974 (statistical weeks 26 to 41).

Table 1. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch by area, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.


Table 1. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch by area, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered (continued).

Total expanded estimate of adipose clipped cohos in the commercial catch.

| TAKU | - | 450 | - | 26.8\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BERNERS | - | 367 | - | 21.9\% |
| CHILKAT | - | 385 | - | 23.0\% |
| AD ONLY | - | $461 \frac{1}{6}$ | - | 27.5\% |
| OTHER | - | 14/ | - | .8\% |
| (CWT \& fin marks) |  |  |  |  |
| Total Tags |  | ,677 |  | 100.0\% |

a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., 39.68\% for Berners R., 7.14\% for Chilkat R.)
b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
C/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.
d/ Major recovery areas.
e/ Includes adjustment for missed pigment marked fish at Pelican.
f/ No correction over observed numbers in areas $1,2,3,4,6,7$, \& 8 due to small sample sizes.

Petersburg: July 2 to October 3, 1974 (statistical weeks 27 to 40).
The coho fishery in Southeastern Alaska legally opens on June 15 with trollers along the outside coast taking the first fish. Later, cohos begin migrating through Icy Strait and upper Chatham Strait where they are available to both troll and purse seine gear, and, after moving up into Lynn Canal and off the Taku River, they are taken by drift gillnet and troll gear. The troll fishery for cohos closes on September 20 and the gillnet fishery for cohos usually closes during the first or second week in October.

Spawning Ground Escapement Counts and Marked:Unmarked Sampling 1974
The objectives of the spawning ground surveys were to obtain total escapement counts of adult coho salmon for each study stream and to net, or otherwise capture, a sample of the escapement for a marked:unmarked ratio. From this information we were able to calculate the total number of marked fish escaping to spawn. By knowing the total number of marked cohos from a given river system that were taken by the commercial fishery and the total escapement we were able to calculate the harvest rate for that stock of fish.

## Taku River

## Yehring Creek

The Yehring Creek spawning ground surveys (Appendix Table 4) took place from 10-21 to 11-3-74. The creek was reached by fixed wing aircraft and then ascended with an inflatable Avon boat with an outboard motor. Fish in the lower reaches of the stream were counted from the boat while running slowly upstream and fish in the upper reaches of the stream were counted while walking streambanks. At the time of the spawning ground surveys record rainfall and flood conditions lowered stream visibility and made seining in the main stream nearly impossible. A total escapement count of 746 fish was obtained, though a determination of the marked: unmarked ratio was not possible. A second trip was made to Yehring Creek at a later date; 128 fish were captured, of which three (2.34\%) had adipose clips.

## Iohnson Creek

The Johnson Creek survey was a continuation of the first Yehring Creek trip. A foot count showed a total escapement of 217 cohos. Seining
was impossible in Johnson Creek due to flood conditions but a careful visual examination of 36 cohos in a side channel showed one (2.78\%) to be adipose fin clipped.

Fish examined for marks from Yehring and Johnson Creeks were combined for an overall marked:unmarked ratio of $4: 160$ (2.44\%). Fish from these two streams were not separable in the commercial fishery as they were marked with the same pigment color.

## Berners River

Berners River was reached by helicopter drop off in the headwaters of the west fork. Tent camps were made as we proceeded downstream by inflatable boat and pickup by helicopter was made at the river mouth when the survey was completed. The upper stream areas were reached by foot and a 50 foot seine was used to capture fish for examination in the upper areas in small, brushy, confined places. After the headwaters areas were foot surveyed, and samples of cohos examined for marks, the survey was continued by drifting downstream. A total escapement of 4,124 cohos was obtained for the Berners River. Of the 733 cohos examined, 19 (2.59\%) were adipose fin clipped. Captured fish were given a partial dorsal fin-clip prior to release. This prevented counting a previously examined fish twice in the marked:unmarked ratio determination.

## Chilkat River

No extensive escapement survey was conducted on the Chilkat River due to a lack of visibility in the glacial water, the impossibility of obtaining an escapement count, and flood conditions during the fall of 1974. A Sport Fish Division creel census on the Chilkat River near Haines estimated that sport fishermen caught 138 cohos. Twenty-three cohos were examined for marks but none were found. Sport fishing success was much below that observed in the previous 2 years and coho escapement to the Chilkat River was believed to be very poor.

It is quite interesting that the percentage of marked cohos in the escapement was similar ( $2.34 \%$ Yehring Creek, $2.78 \%$ Johnson Creek and 2.59\% Berners River) for the three different streams. This was a much lower percentage than had been expected.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

## Method of Data Analysis

To determine a harvest rate for each study river it was first necessary to know the total commercial catch of coho salmon by statistical week by area. This was obtained from fish tickets filled out by fish buyers when the catches were landed. This data is summarized annually by the ADF \&G Statistics Section. The number of marked fish found by area and statistical week and the percent of the catch that was sampled was then determined. The number of marked fish found in a sample was then expanded to an estimate of the number of marked fish in the total catch. The same method was employed for the spawning ground surveys. A total escapement count was made for each river, a sample of the escapement examined for marks, and the number of marks found in the sample expanded to the estimated number of marks in the total escapement. The ratio of marked cohos in the commercial catch to marked cohos in the escapement gave the harvest rate for each river.

## Sampling Percentage

Of the 428,817 coho salmon caught in major recovery areas (fishing areas 11A and B, 12 (north of Pt. Hepburn), 13A, 14, 15A and C, and 16) 291,283 or $67.9 \%$ were sampled by recovery personnel (Table land Figure 3). Approximately $28 \%$ of all the cohos commercially caught in Southeastern Alaska were sampled for fluorescent pigment marks. Table l shows the commercial catch of cohos, the sample size, the sampling percentage by area, and the number and catch location of marked fish. Commercial landings of cohos as reported on fish tickets for several statistical weeks were less than the number of fish examined for marks. This was probably due in a few cases to catches on the fish tickets being reported from erroneous catch areas. Because a few sample sizes were as high as $125 \%$ of reported landings the catch and sampling data were all grouped into two-week periods before expanding them. This tended to average out minor errors in the fish ticket catch reporting (Appendix Tables 5A-K).

## Fluorescent Pigment Loss

Due to a wide variation in the amount of pigment found on returning adults, a correction factor was necessary for pigment loss. Pigment loss percentages were calculated for each river by examining adipose fin clipped cohos taken by the commercial fishery in near river-of-origin recovery
areas (fishing areas $11 \mathrm{~B}, 15 \mathrm{~A}$ and 15 C ). There were no other tagging projects anywhere near fishing areas llB (Taku River mouth) or 15A and C (Lynn Canal) and no coded wire tagged or multiple fin clipped cohos found in these areas. Thus all adipose fin clipped cohos recovered in these areas were considered to be pigment marked fish. Pigment loss percentages were calculated by dividing the number of non-pigment marked adipose fin clipped fish by the total number of adipose fin clipped cohos (marked plus unmarked) found in the area.

## Taku River (area 11B)

The Taku River pigment loss percentage was calculated using area 11B data where Berners and Chilkat River fish were not present. The total number of adipose fin clipped cohos caught in this area was 72 of which 49 had red (Taku River) pigment and 23 had no pigment.
$\frac{23}{72}=31.94 \%$ Pigment loss estimate for Taku River fish

## Chilkat River (area 15A)

The Chilkat River pigment loss calculation was more difficult as some Berners River cohos were mixed with Chilkat River cohos in area 15A. The ratio of Chilkat River cohos to Berners River cohos in the catch times the number of non-pigmented adipose fin clips gave the percentage pigment loss for the Chilkat River fish. The total number of adipose fin clipped cohos caught in this area was 126 of which 108 had orange (Chilkat River) pigment ( $85.71 \%$ ), 9 had green (Berners River) pigment (7.14\%), and 9 had no pigment (7.14\%).

Ratio of orange to green clips $=108: 9$

| $9 / 117$ | $=7.69 \%$ of clips $=$ green $X 9$ unknowns $=0.69$ fish |
| ---: | :--- |
| $108 / 117$ | $=92.31 \%$ of clips $=$ orange X 9 unknowns $=8.31$ fish |
| $\frac{8.31}{116.31}=\underline{7.19 \%}$ pigment loss estimate for Chilkat River fish |  |

## Berners River (area 15C)

The Berners River pigment loss calculation was difficult as both Chilkat River and Taku River cohos mixed with the Berners River cohos in
area 15 C . The numbers of possible pigment marked Chilkat and Taku cohos were corrected by multiplying their percentage contribution to the catch in area 15 C times the number of non-pigmented adipose fin clips in this area times their pigment loss estimate. The total number of adipose fin clipped cohos caught in this area was 78 of which 38 (48.72\%) were green (Berners River), 10 (12.82\%) were orange (Chilkat River), 4 (5.13\%) were red (Taku River), and 26 ( $33.33 \%$ ) had no pigment.

Ratio of marks in the catch in area $15 \mathrm{C}=38=73.08 \%$ green (Berners River)

$$
\begin{aligned}
10 & =19.23 \% \text { orange (Chilkat River) } \\
\frac{4}{52} & =7.69 \% \text { red (Taku River) }
\end{aligned}
$$

|  | ratio in catch | unknowns in this area |  | pigment loss percentage |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| orange $=10$ fish | 19.23\% | X | 26 | X | 7.14\% | $=$ | . 36 fish |
| $\mathrm{red}=4 \mathrm{fish}$ | 7.69\% | X | 26 | X | 31.94\% | $=$ | . 64 fish |

26 unknown

- 1 orange and red due to pigment loss

25 unknowns = green
25 green without pigment $\quad \underline{5}=39.68 \%$ pigment loss
$+\underline{38}$ green with pigment 63 for Berners River cohos

The pigment loss percentages for each river were used to correct (add to) the numbers of pigment marked cohos found in other areas. For areas 11A and 112-15, 15A and C, and 11B, all the "adipose only" fin marks were assumed to be pigment marks and were corrected on the basis of the ratio of marked fish from each river in the catch in that area and the pigment loss percentage. Pigment loss corrections for all other areas were made on the basis of pigment marked fish recovered in that area and time period, up to the number of "adipose only" clips found.

## Correction to Pelican Data

In addition to the standard pigment loss corrections mentioned above, a correction was made for missed pigment on adipose fin clipped cohos sampled at Pelican during statistical weeks 26 to 29 . During weeks 27 to 29 the sampler at Pelican Cold Storage looked at 33,204 cohos from fishing areas 13A, 14A, and 16 and found 78 adiposed clipped cohos of which 8 (10\%) had fluorescent pigment. During weeks 27 to 29
samplers at the Juneau Cold Storage examined 18,876 cohos from fishing areas $13 \mathrm{~A}, 14 \mathrm{~A}$, and 16 and found 42 adipose clipped cohos of which 18 $(43 \%)$ had fluorescent pigment. The Pelican sampler was working in a $-40^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ freezer and was not examining fish as closely for pigment as the Juneau samplers. The ratio of adipose fin clipped to unclipped cohos found in the catch for areas 13A, 14A, and 16 by the Pelican sampler was 1:426 and 1:449 by the Juneau sampler. Because of the low percentage of pigment marked fish found by the Pelican sampler it was decided to use the Juneau sampler's pigment recovery percentage for each week and apply them to the adipose clipped cohos found by the Pelican sampler. This added 26 Taku River (red) tags, 1 Berners River (green) tag, and 2 Chilkat River (orange) tags and reduced the "adipose only" recoveries at Pelican by 29 for this time period.

## Unaccountable Adipose Fin Clipped Cohos

Table 1 shows that $27.5 \%$ ( 461 fish) of the total expanded commercial catch of adipose fin clipped cohos could not be accounted for after correcting for pigment loss. This excluded those taken in areas 11 A and 112-15, 11B, and 15A and C which were all assumed to be pigmented fish because they were relatively near the spawning streams. Some of the "adipose only" marked cohos were found in every area but the majority came from area $13 \mathrm{~A}, 14 \mathrm{~A}$, and 16 ( 205 fish , or $31 \%$ of the adipose fin clipped cohos caught in that area), area 5, 9, and 13B, (159 fish or $91 \%$ of the adipose fin clipped cohos caught in that area), and area $14 B$ and $C, 112-13$, 112-14, and 112-16 (48 fish or $23 \%$ of the adipose fin clipped cohos found in that area). Other areas having a few "adipose only" marked cohos were areas $10,11 \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{D}(29 \mathrm{fish})$; areas 6, 7, and 8 ( 6 fish); and areas 3 and 4 (12 fish). The number of marked fish in areas $1,2,3,4,6,7$, and 8 was not expanded because of the small sample size, so more marks were probably present than are shown. The adipose only clips in areas 6, 7, 8 , and 10 were probably unauthorized marks released from the Crystal Lake Hatchery in Petersburg. The large number of "adipose only" marked cohos ( 376 fish) found off the outer coast of Southeast Alaska from Cape Fairweather to Cape Muzon (areas $16,14 \mathrm{~A}, 13,9,5,4$, and 3) cannot be explained.

## Miscellaneous Tag Recoveries

There were 11 tagged cohos recovered whose river of origin and release date could be determined by either the presence of a multiple fin clip or a coded wire tag ( 3 multiple fin clips and 8 coded wire tags). These fish from areas south of Alaska were reported with recoveries from other parts of S.E. Alaska (Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife 1976).

## Escapement of Marked Cohos

The total escapement of marked cohos was expanded from marked: unmarked sampling and escapement counts for each river (Appendix Table 4) as follows:

Taku River:
(Johnson and Yehring Creeks)
$\frac{4}{164}$ adipose clips $=2.44 \% \times 963$ escapement $=23 \underset{\text { total estimated }}{\text { marks in }}$ escapement

Berners River:

$$
\frac{19}{733} \text { examined }=2.59 \% \times 4,124=107 \begin{gathered}
\text { total estimated marks } \\
\text { in escapement }
\end{gathered}
$$

Chilkat River: no escapement count or marked:unmarked sample possible.

## Total Return of Marked Cohos

The total return (catch plus escapement) of marked fish to each of the three river systems was as follows:

Taku (Yehring \& Johnson Creeks): 450 commercial catch estimate (Table 1) +23 escapement estimate
473 total return of marked cohos

Berners River: $=367$ commercial catch estimate +107 escapement estimate 474 total return of marked cohos

Chilkat River: $\quad=385$ commercial catch estimate + ? no escapement estimate $385+$ partial return of marked cohos

## Harvest Rates by Stock

Harvest rates (H) were calculated by dividing the estimated number of marked fish taken in the fishery ( $F$ ) by the sum of ( $F$ ) plus the estimated
number of marked fish in the escapement (E):
Harvest Rate $(H)=\frac{F}{F+E}$

For Yehring and Johnson Creeks of the Taku River system:
Escapement $=$ Yehring Creek (746) and Johnson Creek (217) $=963$
963 X marks in escapement ratio ( $4 / 164=2.44 \%$ ) $=23$ estimated marks in $\mathrm{F}=450 \quad \mathrm{H}=\underline{450} \quad=\underline{95.14 \%} \quad$ escapement $E=23 \quad H=\overline{450+23} \quad=.14 \%$

For Berners River:
Escapement $=4,124$
$4,124 \mathrm{X}$ marks in escapement ratio $(19 / 733=2.59 \%)=107$ estimated marks in escapement

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F=367 \\
& E=107
\end{aligned} \quad H=\frac{367}{367+107}=\underline{77.43 \%}
$$

No harvest rate could be calculated for the Chilkat River due to the difficulty in obtaining an escapement count. Observations made in the Chilkat sport fishery and the late spawning ground survey of the Mosquito Lake inlet indicated an extremely weak coho escapement and a high harvest rate.

## Fingerling to Adult Survival

The juvenile cohos that were marked were mostly age I+ and migrated to sea at age II+. Some of the fish were also age II+ migrating to sea at age III+. The size at time of marking ranged from 65 to 90 mm for Taku and Berners River; 78 to 120 mm for Mosquito Lake and 85 to 140 mm for Chilkat Lake in the Chilkat River system.

Fingerling to adult survival was determined by the equation:

$$
\text { Survival Rate }(S)=\frac{F+E}{T}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Where } F= & \text { estimated number of marked fish taken by the } \\
& \text { commercial fishery } . \\
E= & \text { estimated number of marked fish in the escapement } \\
T= & \text { number of fingerlings marked. }
\end{aligned}
$$

For the Taku River (Yehring and Johnson Creeks):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F=450 \\
& E=23 \\
& T=8,883
\end{aligned} \quad S=\frac{450+23}{8,883}=\underline{5.32 \%}
$$

For the Berners River:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F=367 \\
& E=107 \\
& T=8,066
\end{aligned} \quad S=\frac{367+107}{8,066}=\underline{5.88 \%}
$$

For the Chilkat River:

| $\mathrm{F}=$ | 385 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\mathrm{E}=$ | $?$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}=$ | 4,320 |$\quad \mathrm{~S}=\frac{385+?}{4,320} \quad=\underline{8.91+\%}$

Part of the difference in survival rates between the three rivers was probably due to the time of marking (Appendix Table 2). The Taku River fish were marked earlier in the season, the Berners River fish next, and the Chilkat River fish last. Late in the season fish were larger and had a greater chance for survival. The extra large size of lake fish (Chilkat and Mosquito Lakes), probably as a result of better feeding conditions, allowed them to reach a larger size at age I+ (or II+) and resulted in higher survival. The survival rate for the three rivers was fairly high compared with those reported in the literature. There are no known references on survival rates from wild coho fingerlings to adults. Most studies report survival rates for potential egg deposition to adult, or smolt to adult. Shapovalov and Taft (1954) reported $4.95 \%$ average survival (range $0.98 \%$ to $7.72 \%$ ) for wild coho (smolts to adult) for 4 return years to Wadell Creek, California. Salo and Bayliff (1958) reported $4.18 \%$ average survival (range $0.91 \%$ to $7.15 \%$ ) for wild coho (smolts to adult) for 10 return years to Minter Creek, Washington. To compare the survival rates found in this study ( $5.32 \%, 5.88 \%$ and $8.91+\%$ ) with smolt to adult survival rates from other studies we would have to subtract the unknown mortality from the time of tagging to the time of smoltification. For this reason the smolt to adult survival rates for the three rivers studied would be considerably higher than we found for fingerling to adult.

Survival rates for these wild stocks are considerably higher than attained by most hatchery stocks. High survival of tagged cohos also indicates our tagging methods were easy on the fish. Not anesthetizing fish before marking and immediate release of marked fish in the areas of capture favored survival.

## Estimate of Total Adult Return

An estimate of total adult return to each of the rivers is important in determining their contribution to the commercial fishery. To calculate total adult return a ratio of escapement percentage to escapement count was used.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Total adult return }(A)=\frac{E^{\prime}}{1.0-H} \\
& \text { Where } E^{\prime}=\text { Escapement count (marked + unmarked) } \\
& 1.0-H=\text { Escapement percentage where } H \text { = harvest percentage }
\end{aligned}
$$

Taku River (Yehring and Johnson Creeks):

$$
\frac{\mathrm{E}^{\prime}}{1.0-\mathrm{H}}=\frac{963}{1.0-0.9514}=\mathrm{A}=\frac{963}{.0486}=19,815
$$

## Berners River:

$$
\frac{E^{\prime}}{1.0-H}=\frac{4,124}{1.0-0.7743}=A=\frac{4,124}{.2257}=\underline{18,272}
$$

No estimate of adult return for the Chilkat River could be made by this method.

## Percent of Available Fingerlings That Were Marked

Knowledge of the percentage of coho fingerlings marked is important in evaluating the relative productivity of rearing areas. It also helps in evaluating the effectiveness of minnow trapping as a method of obtaining fish for tagging and stream inventory studies. The percent of fingerlings that were minnow trapped can be calculated by two methods.

1) Estimate of total adult return/percentage fingerling survival = estimated total number of fingerlings.
2) Marked:unmarked ratio of adult escapement.

Both methods give similar values for the Taku and Berners Rivers stocks.

## Taku River (Johnson and Yehring Creeks):

1) $19,815 / 0.0532=372,462=$ estimate of total coho fingerlings

Yehring Creek $=6,711$
Johnson Creek $=\frac{2,172}{8,883}=$ total fingerlings marked
$8,883 / 372,462=\underline{2.38 \%}$
2) $4 / 164=\underline{2.44 \%}$

Berners River:

1) $18,272 / 0.0588=310,748=$ estimate of total coho fingerlings $8,066 / 310,748=\underline{2.60 \%}$
2) $19 / 733=\underline{2.59 \%}$

## Chilkat River:

As no escapement count was possible in the Chilkat River, and no mark:unmark ratio obtained, no fingerling to adult survival, harvest rate, or total adult return calculation could be made. The fingerling to adult survival for the Chilkat River, excluding the unknown contribution from the escapement, was 8.91\%.

The small percentage of fingerlings marked ( $2.4 \%$ to $2.6 \%$ of the estimated rearing cohos available) indicates that our minnow trapping, although intensive, was not effective in capturing a high percentage of the rearing fish. It is possible that other undiscovered rearing areas were
more heavily utilized. It is interesting that the percentage of rearing coho fingerlings that were marked in Johnson and Yehring Creeks of the Taku River ( $2.4 \%$ ) was almost exactly the same as for Berners River ( $2.6 \%$ ). This may indicate that only a low percentage of rearing cohos are available to minnow trapping. Despite the low percentage of available rearing cohos that were captured, the numbers obtained were adequate.

## Migration Timing

Figures 4A-E and Appendix Tables 5A-K show the migration timing and estimated numbers of marked cohos caught in the major recovery areas. Figure $4 A$ shows that in areas $13 A, 14 A$, and 16 , Taku River cohos enter the fishery in largest numbers earlier (weeks 28-35, July 7 to August 31) while the Berners and Chilkat River cohos do not appear in large numbers until several weeks later (weeks 32-37, August 4 to September 14). Taku River cohos began to drop off as the Berners and Chilkat cohos became most abundant.

In areas 14 B and $\mathrm{C}, 112-13,112-14$, and 112-16 (Figure 4B) there was little difference in timing. Taku River and Berners River cohos both appeared in weeks 28-29 (July 7 to July 20). Taku River cohos were most abundant (weeks 34-35, August 18-31) about 2 weeks earlier than the Berners and Chilkat River cohos (weeks 36-37, September l-14).

In areas 11A and 112-15 (Figure 4C) Taku River cohos appeared in greatest numbers several weeks earlier than those of the Berners and Chilkat Rivers. The Taku cohos were most abundant from weeks 30-37, (July 21 to September 14), Berners cohos from weeks 34-39, (August 18 to September 28), and Chilkat cohos from weeks 34-37, (August 18 to September 14).

The overall trend in areas $16,14,13 A, 112-13,112-14,112-15$, 112-16, and 11A where Taku, Berners, and Chilkat River cohos were found together was for the Taku River cohos to appear in largest numbers 2 to 4 weeks before the Berners and Chilkat River cohos. There was considerable overlap in occurrence of cohos from the three rivers in each of these areas, and nearly always a few fish from each river were present at the same time. The Berners and Chilkat cohos were found in largest numbers at about the same time.

In areas 15A and C (Figure 4D), where Berners and Chilkat River cohos were found in greatest numbers, they both peaked at about the same time (between weeks 32 and 41 , August 4 to October 12). There would'be no way to separate these two stocks in the commercial fishery, particularly


Figure 4A. Number of nigment marked coho salmon caught by statistical weeks in fishing areas 13A, 14A, and 16 .
a/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.


Figure 4 B . Number of pigment marked coho salmon caught by statistical weeks in fishing areas 14 B and C , 112-13, 112-14, and 112-16.
a/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.


Figure 4C. Number of pigment marked coho salmon caught by statistical weeks in fishing areas 11A and 112-15.
a/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.


Figure 4D. Number of pigment marked coho salmon caught by statistical weeks in fishing areas 15 A and C .
a/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
in area 15C. A few Taku River cohos were taken in area 15C, probably near the northern boundary of area 11A.

Taku River cohos first appeared in area llB (Figure 4E) during weeks 26-27 (June 23 to July 6) and were present in largest numbers from weeks 32-39 (August 4 to September 28).

## Gear Type Harvest Rates

Marked coho salmon from the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers were harvested by the commercial fishery from June 15, when the troll fishery opened, until the gillnet fishery closed October 11. The troll fishery harvested marked cohos along the outside coast of Southeastern Alaska beginning June 15 when the season opened and followed them in through Icy Strait, upper Chatham Strait, Lynn Canal, Stephens Passage, and up to the river mouths when the season closed on September 20. Drift gillnet gear harvested marked cohos in Lynn Canal and Stephens Passage during open fishing periods between June 16 and October 11 when the gillnet season closed. Purse seine gear harvested marked cohos in Icy Strait and upper Chatham Strait during open fishing periods between July 7 and September 26. The harvest rates by different gear types are related to length of season, areas open to each type of gear, and effectiveness of each gear type.

Nearly three quarters (72\%) of the marked Taku River cohos were taken by troll gear (Table 2). Over one quarter were taken by drift gillnets, and less than $1 \%$ by purse seine gear. Almost two-thirds of the Berners River cohos were taken by troll gear, one-third by drift gillnet and less than $3 \%$ by seine gear. By contrast, nearly two-thirds of Chilkat River cohos were taken by gillnet, over one-third by troll, and less than $2 \%$ by seine gear. It appeared that the Taku River cohos had either a shorter period of milling off the river mouth or there was a smaller area available to gillnet gear than off the Berners or Chilkat Rivers. While some $27 \%$ of Taku River cohos were taken by gillnet, gillnet gear harvested $32 \%$ of Berners River cohos, and nearly $62 \%$ of Chilkat River cohos. This reflects the size of the area and the amount of time each of these stocks is available to gillnet gear. Chilkat River cohos are available to gillnet gear nearly the full length of Lynn Canal (area 15A and C).

The overall gear type harvest rate for cohos from all three rivers was nearly $60 \%$ by troll gear, nearly $40 \%$ by drift gillnet and less than $2 \%$ by purse seine. The high overall troll harvest of cohos reflects the large area (from open ocean to river mouths) open to troll, the long season, and the effectiveness of the gear on this species.


Figure $4 E$. Number of pigment marked coho salmon caught by statistical weeks in fishing area llB.
a/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.

Table 2. 1974 total harvest of marked coho salmon by gear type and river of origin a/.

a/ Corrected for pigment loss.

The gear type harvest by fishing area (Table 3) shows that the major harvest area for Taku River cohos was outside waters north and south of and including Cross Sound (areas 13A, 14A, and 16) where $55 \%$ of the catch was taken by troll gear. The second most important catch area for Taku River cohos was the Taku River mouth and upper Stephens Passage (area llB) where drift gillnet gear took $25 \%$ of the catch. Most of the rest of the Taku River cohos (17\%) were taken by troll gear, 4.5\% in Icy Strait and upper Chatham Strait (areas 14B and C, 112-13, 112-14, and 112-16) and $12.5 \%$ in lower Lynn Canal and upper Stephens Passage (areas 11A and 112-15).

The major harvest area for Berners River cohos was also outside waters (areas 13A, 14A, and 16) where $56 \%$ of the catch was taken by troll gear. The second most important catch area for Berners River cohos was Lynn Canal (area 15A and C) where drift gillnet took $32 \%$ of the catch. Most of the rest of Berners River cohos (nearly $8 \%$ ) were taken by troll gear, $1.6 \%$ in areas 14 B and $\mathrm{C}, 112-13,112-14$, and $112-16$, and $6.1 \%$ in 11A and 112-15).

By contrast, the major harvest area for Chilkat River cohos was Lynn Canal (area 15A and C), where nearly $62 \%$ of the catch was taken by drift gillnet gear. The second most important catch area for Chilkat River cohos was outside waters (areas 13A, 14A, and 16) where $33 \%$ of the catch was taken by troll gear.

The major recovery area for marked cohos from the three rivers combined was outside waters (13A, 14A, and 16) where $48 \%$ of the total catch was taken, all by troll gear. The second most important recovery area for marked cohos was Lynn Canal (area 15A and C) where nearly $31 \%$ of the catch was taken, all by drift gillnet (nearly all Chilkat and Berners River cohos). The third most important catch area for marked cohos was the Taku River mouth (area 11B) where $9 \%$ of the catch was taken, all by drift gillnet (all Taku River cohos).

Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers Contribution to Northern Southeastern Alaska Coho Production

The percentage contribution of Taku River (Yehring and Johnson Creeks), Berners River, and Chilkat Rivers (all mainland systems) to total coho production in northem Southeast Alaska is important when assigning priorities for future coho management. No absolute numbers can be assigned for the contribution from these rivers, although several calculations can be made to show their relative importance.

Table 3. 1974 harvest of marked coho salmon by fishing area, river of origin and gear type $\underline{a} /$.

a/ Corrected for pigment loss.

## Ratio of Pigment Marked Cohos in the Commercial Catch

The proportion of pigment marked:unmarked coho salmon in the commercial catch increased as the fish moved closer to their stream of origin (Table 4). From 1:535 for areas 13A, 14A, and 16 to 1:300 for areas 14B and C, 112-13, 112-14, and 112-16 it increased to 1:244 for areas $11 A$ and $112-15,15 A$ and $C$, and 11B combined. The overall ratio of pigment marked to unmarked cohos in the commercial catch in major recovery areas was 1:361. These figures include only marked fish, about $2.52 \%$ of cohos produced from trapping areas of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers.

## Percent Contribution of Marked Populations to the Commercial Catch by Area

Table 5 shows the percentage of total contribution (marked plus unmarked cohos) from the three river systems to the northern Southeast Alaska commercial coho catch by area. The estimated commercial coho catch produced from fingerling trapped portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers was estimated by dividing the total number of marked cohos taken by the fishery by the average percent of fingerlings marked. The average percentage of coho marked, determined from a marked:unmarked ratio of spawners, was 2.52\% (2.44\% from the Taku River, Yehring, and Johnson Creeks and $2.59 \%$ from Berners River).

An overall estimate of $11 \%$ of the commercial coho catch from major recovery areas (13A,14, 16, 112-13, 112-14, 112-15, and 112-16, 11A and $B$, and $15 A$ and $C$ ) in northern Southeastern Alaska came from fingerling trapped portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers. Over 7\% of outside and Cross Sound coho catches (areas 13A, 14A, and 16), over 13\% of the coho catch from Icy Strait and upper Chatham Strait (areas 14B and C, 112-13, 112-14, and 112-16), and $10 \%$ of the coho catch from lower Lynn Canal and upper Stephens Passage (areas 11A and 112-15) came from fingerling trapped portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers. Nearly onequarter ( $23 \%$ ) of the coho catch in Lynn Canal (area 15A and C) came from fingerling trapped portions of the Chilkat and Berners Rivers (minus a few Taku River cohos). Although Yehring and Johnson Creeks are fairly small tributaries of the Taku River, they contributed an estimated $10.6 \%$ of the coho catch in area 11B. These high percentages indicate that the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers are very important contributors of coho salmon to the northern Southeast Alaska commercial fishery.

Table 4. Ratios of pigment marked cohos in the commercial catch.

a/ Corrected and expanded to $100 \%$ sample.

Table 5. Contribution of fingerling trapped portions of Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers to northern Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch.

a/ Average of Taku 2.44\% and Berners 2.59\% $=2.52 \%$.
b/ Marked plus unmarked cohos from all three rivers combined.

## Total Contribution Estimate for the Marked Populations (Catch Plus Escapement)

An estimated 52,817 total adult cohos were produced from fingerling trapped portions of the three rivers. To calculate this estimate, a weighted average survival rate from fingerling to adult for the three rivers was first obtained (Table 6).

Table 6. Weighted average survival from fingerling to adult for Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers.

|  |  | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fingerlings | Percent of | Survival |
| Marked | Total Marked | to Adults |


| Taku (Yehring <br> \& Johnson Creeks) | 8,883 | $41.77 \%$ | X | $5.32 \%$ | $=$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berners | 8,066 | $37.92 \%$ | X | $5.88 \%$ | $=2.22 \%$ |
| Chilkat | 4,320 | $20.31 \%$ | X | $8.91 \%$ | $=1.81 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 21,269 | $100.00 \%$ |  | $6.26 \%$ |  |

The weighted average fingerling to adult survival rate (6.26\%) times the total number of fingerlings marked $(21,269)$ gave an estimated total return of marked coho adults from fingerling trapped portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers of 1,331 fish. With an average marked:unmarked ratio of $2.52 \%$ on Taku and Berners River spawning grounds being equal to 1,331 marked cohos, then the total return from $100 \%$ (marked plus unmarked) of coho salmon from fingerling trapped portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers was equal to 52,817 fish.

$$
\begin{aligned}
1,331: 2.52 \% & =X: 100 \% \\
2.52 X & =133,100 \\
X & =52,817
\end{aligned}
$$

## Combined Harvest Rate Estimate for Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers

Using the estimated total of these stocks commercially landed only from areas $13 A, 14,16,112-13,112-14,112-15,112-16,11 A$ and $B, 15 A$
and C of 47,143 cohos (Table 5), an overall estimate of the harvest rate percentage can be obtained.

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\frac{47,143}{52,817}=\frac{89.3 \%}{} \begin{array}{l}
\text { combined harvest rate for Taku, Berners, and } \\
\text { Chilkat Rivers for major recovery areas. }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

If the estimated 555 marked fish (Table 7) from the two minor recovery areas (area 12 south of Pt. Hepburn and 5, 9, and 13B) are added to the total 47,698 cohos were taken.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{47,698}{52,817}=\underline{90.3} \% \begin{array}{c}
\text { combined harvest rate for Taku, Berners, and } \\
\text { Chilkat Rivers for all recovery areas. }
\end{array}
\end{gathered}
$$

The harvest rates of $77 \%$ for Berners River, $95 \%$ for Taku River (Yehring and Johnson Creeks), and an overall estimated combined harvest rate of $90 \%$ for all three rivers is very high, leaving only 5 to $13 \%$ (combined average of $10 \%$ ) of the fish to spawn.

## Estimate of Adult Return to the Chilkat River

An estimate of the adult coho return to the Chilkat River can also be made from the total return estimate of 52,817 by subtracting the estimated adult returns to the Taku (Yehring and Johnson Creeks) and Berners Rivers.

| Estimated total adult return | $=52,817$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Estimated adult return from Taku River  <br> $\quad$ (Yehring and Johnson Creeks) $-19,815$ <br> Estimated adult return from Berners River $\mathbf{- 1 8 , 2 7 2}$ <br> Estimated adult return from Chilkat River $=14,730$ <br>   <br> Area Harvest Rate Estimates for Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers  <br> Combined  |  |

Area harvest rates of returning marked cohos can also be estimated from the total return estimate (Table 7) . A majority (33.6\%) of cohos from the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers were taken in outside waters including Cross Sound (areas 13A, 14A, and 16). The second highest catch area was in Lynn Canal (areas 15A and C) where $28.8 \%$ were taken. This area

Table 7. Combined harvest rates for Taku, Berners and Chilkat cohos by fishing area.

| Fishing Areas | Estimated total catch from marked populations |  | Estimated tota return from marked populations | Percent of return taken |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13A, 14A and 16 | 17,738 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 33.6\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14 B \text { and } C, 112-13,112-14, \\ & \text { and } 112-16 \end{aligned}$ | 6,270 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 11.9\% |
| 11A and 112-15 | 3,413 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 6.5\% |
| 15A and C | 15,198 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 28.8\% |
| 11B | 4,524 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 8.6\% |
| 12 (south of Pt. Hepburn) | 79 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 0.2\% |
| 5, 9 and 13B | 476 | $\div$ | 52,817 | 0.9\% |
| TOTALS | 47,698 |  | 52,817 | 90.3\% |

included almost entirely Chilkat and Berners River cohos. Icy Strait and upper Chatham Strait (areas 14B and C, 112-13, 112-14, and 112-16) were the third most important catch areas where $11.9 \%$ of the marked populations of cohos were harvested. The Taku River mouth (area 11B) was the fourth most important harvest area where $8.6 \%$ of the catch was taken. This included only Taku River cohos. Lower Lynn Canal and upper Stephens Passage (areas 11A and 112-15) were the fifth most important harvest areas where $6.5 \%$ of the cohos were taken. Small numbers of cohos ( $0.2 \%$ ) from the marked populations were taken in Chatham Strait (area 12 South of Pt. Hepburn) and outside waters near Sitka (areas 5, 9, and 13B) had $0.9 \%$.

## DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This study was the first attempt in Alaska to obtain harvest rates by gear type, migration, and timing data by trapping and tagging wild coho salmon juveniles. The minnow trapping technique proved adequate for capturing sufficient numbers of age I+ and older coho juveniles over a wide range of habitat types.

It was possible to sample a high percentage of commercially landed coho salmon for marks in northern Southeastern Alaska with relatively few personnel.

The pigment spray-marking technique proved adequate in this study but had some drawbacks; the most serious being a high pigment loss rate ( $7 \%$ to $40 \%$ of the fingerlings marked). Other drawbacks were having to examine each fish in a darkened area and the possibility of an inexperienced observer missing pigment or confusing fluorescent fungus for pigment. Since this mark study was conducted in 1972, coded wire tagging of juvenile salmonids has developed as a more reliable method. In 1976 and 1977 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game repeated this study with coded wire tags. Better tag retention will result and better separation of coho stocks within each river system will be possible when tagged cohos begin returning in 1978 and 1979. The recent studies using coded wire tags will also provide two additional years of harvest data on the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat Rivers to compare with the 1974 study.

Taku River cohos appear to enter the fishery several weeks before the Chilkat and Berners River cohos.

Nearly $60 \%$ of the tagged cohos were harvested by troll gear, nearly $40 \%$ by gillnet, and less than $2 \%$ by seine gear.

The major recovery area for marked cohos from the three rivers combined was outside waters (13A, 14A, and 16) where $48 \%$ of the total catch was taken, all by troll gear. The second most important recovery area for marked cohos was Lynn Canal (area 15A and C) where nearly $31 \%$ of the catch was taken, all by drift gillnets (nearly all Chilkat and Berners River cohos). The third most important catch area for marked cohos was the Taku River mouth (area 11B) where $9 \%$ of the catch was taken, all by drift gillnet (all Taku River cohos).

Cohos from tagged portions of the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat: Rivers contributed an estimated $11 \%$ ( 47,700 fish) to the northern Southeast Alaska commercial coho catch.

Harvest rates of wild marked coho stocks in this study were found to range from 77 to $95 \%$ with an overall average of $90 \%$. It is doubtful that wild stock coho salmon can maintain themselves at harvest levels this high. The Washington State Department of Fisheries is presently using a catch:escapement ratio of $3: 1$ ( $75 \%$ harvest, $25 \%$ escapement) for Puget Sound wild stock coho salmon where no hatchery fish occur (personal communication, Gordon Zillges, Wash. Dept. of Fisheries). In Puget Sound, where both wild stock and hatchery cohos are mixed in the catch, the Washington State Dept. of Fisheries uses a catch:escapement ratio of $4: 1$ ( $80 \%$ harvest and $20 \%$ escapement). It is felt that a harvest rate of this magnitude is probably too high for the wild stocks to maintain themselves. In areas where only hatchery cohos are present, however, a catch to escapement ratio of up to $9: 1$ has been allowed.

It is difficult to determine a safe harvest:escapement ratio for wild stock coho salmon. Southeastern Alaska cohos spend an average of two years in freshwater before reaching smolt size compared to only one year in Washington State, hence higher escapement levels may be necessary here as a greater number of spawners might be necessary to offset the higher mortality during the additional year of freshwater rearing.

A conservative estimate of a safe catch:escapement ratio required to maintain wild stock coho salmon runs in Southeastern Alaska may even be in the range of $1: 1$ ( $50 \%$ catch and $50 \%$ escapement). A catch:escapement ratio greater than $3: 2$ ( $60 \%$ catch and $40 \%$ escapement) may prove detrimental to our wild coho stocks. If this is true, then these stocks based on the current study, at least the Taku, Berners, and Chilkat River cohos, are being over-harvested. Tagging projects now in progress will provide more detailed information on harvest levels on these northern Southeastern river systems. Expansion of the tagging program to stream systems in southern Southeastern Alaska was also initiated in 1978.

Minnow trapping and tagging of wild juvenile coho salmon appears to be an excellent method for obtaining data on migrations, timing, and gear type harvest rates needed for effective fishery management.
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## APPENDIX

Appendix Table 1. List of equipment used in fluorescent pigment marking (1972).

| QUANT | ITY MARKING EQUIPMENT | USE | SOURCE | COST (1972) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (6) | Fin Clipping Scissors (Lawton \#19L305 5-1/2" Straight Edge Nail Nippers) | Clipping adipose fins | Biddle \& Crowther Co. 910 North 137th 365-9900 Seattle, WA 98133 | \$8.00 each |
|  | Grannular Fluorescent Pigment fluoresces under black light (3400-3800 angstroms) non-soluble in water, biologically inert, at least $70 \%$ between $50-350$ microns size. Red, green, orange, 12 lbs. each color. | Marking fish with spray gun | Scientific Marking Materials P.0. Box 24122 <br> Seattle, WA 98124 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 6.00 / 1 \mathrm{~b} . \text { red } \\ & \$ 6.50 / 1 \mathrm{~b} . \text { green } \\ & \$ 7.00 / 1 \mathrm{~b} . \text { orange } \end{aligned}$ |
| (2) | \#SG100 Spray Guns (with nozzles) | Marking fish | Scientific Marking Materials P.0. Box 24122 <br> Seattle, WA 98124 | \$32.50 each |
| (2) | \#SG100A Canisters | Attach to spray gun and hold granular pigment | Scientific Marking Materials P.0. Box 24122 <br> Seattle, WA 98124 | \$ 4.98 each |
| (2) | \#SH 101-10 ft. Hoses | Connect spray gun to pressure regulator on tank | Scientific Marking Materials P.0. Box 24122 <br> Seattle, WA 98124 | \$ 9.45 each |
| (2) | \#R-101 2-Stage SCUBA Regulator (0-200 psi) | Regulates pressure from tank to spray gun 0-200 psi adjustable with hex wrench | Scientific Marking Materials P.O. Box 24122 <br> Seattle, WA 98124 | \$66.50 each |
| (4) | $71.2 \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{ft}$. SCUBA Tank with K Valve (no reserve). Complete with neoprene rubber tank boot. U.S. Divers \#651 | Hold compressed air for spray marking | Jafco <br> 520 Westlake No. <br> Seattle, WA 98134 | \$90.00 each tank |
| (2) | \#700345D Pressure Gauges | To check amount of air in SCUBA tank | Jafco <br> 520 Westlake No. <br> Seattle, WA 98134 | \$11.47 each |

Appendix Table 1. List of equipment use in fluorescent pigment marking (1972) - continued.
QUANTITY

MARKING EQUIPMENT
USE
SOURCE
COST (1972)
(3) \#UVC303 Safety Goggles
(8) \#ML-49 BLAK RAY Lamp (operates on two six-volt lantern batteries)
(2) Painter's Face Masks
(2) \#BN-36-8 Nylon Bait Net (15" $\times 14^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime \prime}-3 / 16$ nylon mesh)

合 (1) \#81-1512K Screened Marking Tent
(1) Collapsible Table ( $8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime} \times 5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ plywood w/screw on pipe legs)
(20) Gee Minnow Traps
(6) Lew's Live Bait Bucket with Aerator Pump (operates on flashlight batteries)
(6) Rubbermaid Dishpans (dark green, $14-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime} \times 5-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ )

BOATS
(1) Avon \#S550 14'6" - Mercury 20 hp

To protect eyes from pig- Ultra Violet Products, Inc. \$ 5.00 pair ment while spraying 5114 Walnut Grove Ave. San Gabrie1, CA 91778

Portable UV lamp for Ultra Violet Products, Inc. \$39.75 detecting pigment mark 5114 Walnut Grove Ave. on juveniles and return- San Gabriel, CA 91778 ing adults

To protect lungs from
Local hardware store pigment when spray marking fish
Holding fish for spraying Nylon Net Company
$\$ 5.00$ each
7 Vance Ave., P.O. Box 592
Memphis, TN 38101
For protection from Gander Mountain, Inc. $\$ 74.95$
biting insects and rain
while marking fish
Wilmot, WI 53192
Hold pans of fish for Home-made $\$ 20.00$
clipping
Trapping juvenile cohos for marking

Nylon Net Company
$\$ 3.00$ each
7 Vance Ave., Box 592
Memphis, TN 38101
To keep juvenile cohos Gander Mountain, Inc.
$\$ 12.00$ each
alive while transporting
to and from marking site
and while marking
Sorting fish
Local hardware store
$\$ 2.00$ each

Transportation of gear
and personnel to marking sites

Appendix Table 1. List of equipment use in fluorescent pigment marking (1972) - continued.
(1) Avon \#Redshank 12' - Evinrude 5-1/2 Capture fish in main river hp outboard and lakes
(2) Avon \#Redcrest 9' oars or Johnson Capture fish in beaver ponds 1.5 hp outboard and sloughs

Appendix Table 2. Marking locations and numbers of juvenile cohos pigment marked in 1972.


Appendix Table 3. 1974 statistical weeks.
The numbered calendar weeks to be used for the 1974 catch statistics are as follows:

| WEEK | FROM | THRU |  | WEEK | FROM |  | THRU |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Jan 1 | Jan | 5 | 28 | Jul | 7 | Ju1 | 13 |
| 2 | Jan 6 | Jan | 12 | 29 | Jul | 14 | Jul | 20 |
| 3 | Jan 13 | Jan | 19 | 30 | Ju1 | 21 | Jul | 27 |
| 4 | Jan 20 | Jan | 26 | 31 | Jul | 28 | Aug | 3 |
| 5 | Jan 27 | Feb | 2 | 32 | Aug | 4 | Aug | 10 |
| 6 | Feb 3 | Feb | 9 | 33 | Aug | 11 | Aug | 17 |
| 7 | Feb 10 | Feb | 16 | 34 | Aug | 18 | Aug | 24 |
| 8 | Feb 17 | Feb | 23 | 35 | Aug | 25 | Aug | 31 |
| 9 | Feb 24 | Mar | 2 | 36 | Sept | 1 | Sept | 7 |
| 10 | Mar 3 | Mar | 9 | 37 | Sept | 8 | Sept | 14 |
| 11 | Mar 10 | Mar | 16 | 38 | Sept | 15 | Sept | 21 |
| 12 | Mar 17 | Mar | 23 | 39 | Sept | 22 | Sept | 28 |
| 13 | Mar 24 | Mar | 30 | 40 | Sept | 29 | Oct | 5 |
| 14 | Mar 31 | Apr | 6 | 41 | Oct | 6 | Oct | 12 |
| 15 | Apr 7 | Apr | 13 | 42 | Oct | 13 | Oct | 19 |
| 16 | Apr 14 | Apr | 20 | 43 | Oct | 20 | Oct | 26 |
| 17 | Apr 21 | Apr | 27 | 44 | Oct | 27 | Nov | 2 |
| 18 | Apr 28 | May | 4 | 45 | Nov | 3 | Nov | 9 |
| 19 | May 5 | May | 11 | 46 | Nov | 10 | Nov | 16 |
| 20 | May 12 | May | 18 | 47 | Nov | 17 | Nov | 23 |
| 21 | May 19 | May | 25 | 48 | Nov | 24 | Nov | 30 |
| 22 | May 26 | Jun | 1 | 49 | Dec | 1 | Dec | 7 |
| 23 | Jun 2 | Jun | 8 | 50 | Dec | 8 | Dec | 14 |
| 24 | Jun 9 | Jun | 15 | 51 | Dec | 15 | Dec | 21 |
| 25 | Jun 16 | Jun | 22 | 52 | Dec | 22 | Dec | 28 |
| 26 | Jun 23 | Jun | 29 | 53 | Dec | 29 | Dec | 31 |
| 27 | Jun 30 | Ju1 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix Table 4. Spawning ground counts and marked:unmarked ratios of cohos (1974).


Appendix Table 4. Spawning ground counts and marked:unmarked ratios of cohos (1974) - continued.

|  | Dates \& persons making counts | Total escapement count (Live plus carcasses) | Marked:unmarked ratio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berners River | 11-1 to 11-7 (Gray, Laner, Saviko, Staska) | 1,761 (11-1) | Seine | Carcasses | Visual Counts |  |
|  |  | 333 607 $(11-2)$ $(11-5)$ | 5:96 (11-2) | 0:27 (11-1) | 1:84 (11-2) h | headwaters. |
|  |  | 1,078 (11-6) | 4:145 (11-4) | $0: 15$ (11-2) | 2:66 (11-6) s | side pool shallows |
|  |  | 343 (11-7) | 6:134 (11-5) | 0:2 (11-4) |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0:53 (11-6) | 1:28 (11-5) | 3:150 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0:50 (11-6) |  |  |
|  |  | 4,124 TOTAL | 15:428 | 0:14 (11-7) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1:136 |  |  |
|  |  |  | TOTAL $=19: 714$ | $=19 / 733=2$. | adipose fin mar | rks in escapement. |
| Chilkat River |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower Main River | $\begin{aligned} & 9-28 \text { to } 11-2 \\ & \text { (Burleson) } \end{aligned}$ | No escapement count possible | Examination of | Sport Catch |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0:23 |  |  |  |
| Mosquito Lake | $\begin{aligned} & 11-9 \\ & \text { (Marriott) } \end{aligned}$ |  | One adipose fin clipped carcass found. No other cohos seen and run looked over. Signs of recent heavy flooding. |  |  |  |

Appendix Table 5A. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 13A, 14A, and 16 by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.

a/ Corrected for pigment loss ( $31.94 \%$ for Taku R., $39.68 \%$ for Berners R., $7.14 \%$ for Chilkat R.).
b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
Corrected for less adipose oniy marks due to pigment loss correction.

Appendix Table 58. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas $148 \& \mathrm{C}, 112-13,112-14$, and $112-16$ by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.


[^1]Appendix Table 5C． 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 11 \＆\＆112－15 by statistical weeks，sample percentage，and number of marked cohos recovered．

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TAKU } \\ & \text { (red) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | BERNERS （green） |  |  | CHILKAT <br> （orange） |  |  | AD only |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OTHER MARKS } \\ & \text { (wt or } \\ & \text { fin clips) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { MARKS } \\ & \text { (all types) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 気 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ఫ్d } \\ & \pm \\ & \mathbf{U} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 管茳 } \\ & \frac{5}{2} \end{aligned}$ | प्す |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Uiv } \\ & \stackrel{4}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Total found | Total expanded |
| $\begin{gathered} 24-25 \\ \text { (June } 9-22 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 128 | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |
| $\begin{gathered} 26-27 \\ \text { (June 23- } \\ \text { July 6) } \end{gathered}$ | 1，674 | 206 | 12.31 |  | － | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | － |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－ | －－－ | － |
| $\begin{array}{lc} 1 & 28-29 \\ \text { \& } \\ \text { \& } & \text { (July } 7-20) \end{array}$ | 3，681 | 1，795 | 48.76 |  | －－－ | 1 | －－－ | －－－ | 1 | －－－ | －－ | －－－ | 1 | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ | 1 | 2 |
| $\begin{gathered} 30-31 \\ \text { (July 21- } \\ \text { August 3) } \end{gathered}$ | 5，429 | 2，868 | 52.83 | 3 | 5 | 9 | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | 2 | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ | 5 | 9 |
| $\begin{gathered} 32-33 \\ \text { (Aug. 4-17) } \end{gathered}$ | 8，234 | 6，875 | 83.50 | 5 |  | 18 | －－－ | －－－ | － |  | －－－ | －－ | 10 | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | 15 | 18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34-35 \\ & \text { (Aug. } 18-31 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 8，122 | 6，018 | 74.10 |  |  | 16 |  | 6 | 8 |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | －－－ | －－－ | －－ | －－－ | 21 | 28 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 36-37 \\ (5 \mathrm{ept} .1-14) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 5，593 | 2，808 | 50.21 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | － | －－ | －－－ | －－－ | 12 | 25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 38-39 \\ & \text { (Sept. } 15-28 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 1，273 | 546 | 42.89 |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | 2 | 4 | －－－ | －－－ | － | 1 | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | 2 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 34，134 | 21，116 | 61.86 |  | 36 | 53 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 5 | 9 | 20 | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | 56 | 86 |

[^2]Appendix Table 50. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas $15 A$ and $C$ by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.


Appendix Table 50. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 15 A and C by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered (continued).
a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., $39.68 \%$ for Berners R., $7.14 \%$ for Chilkat R.).
b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.

Appendix Table 5E. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing area $11 B$ by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.

|  |  |  |  | TAKU(red) |  |  | BERNERS <br> (green) |  |  | CHILKAT <br> (orange) |  |  | AD only |  |  | OTHER MARKS (cwt or fin clips) |  | TOTAL MARKS (all types) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 힘 } \\ & \stackrel{4}{4} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{4}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 힘 世 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total found | Total expanded |
| $\begin{gathered} 24-25 \\ \text { (June } 9-22 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 249 | --- | --- |  | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | - | --- | -- |
| $\begin{gathered} 26-27 \\ \text { (June 23- } \\ \text { July 6) } \end{gathered}$ | 2,026 | 855 | 42.20 | 1 | 2 | 5 |  | --- | - | --- | --- | -- |  | --- | --- | --- | -- | 2 | 5 |
| $\begin{gathered} 28-29 \\ \text { (July } 7-20 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 3,326 | 1,287 | 38.70 | 1 | 3 | 8 |  | --- | --- |  | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | 3 | 8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30-31 \\ & \text { (July 21- } \\ & \text { August 3) } \end{aligned}$ | 613 | 47 | 7.67 |  | --- | --- |  | --- | --- |  | --- | -- |  | --- | - | --- | - | - | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32-33 \\ \text { (Aug. } 4-17 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 3,942 | 2,092 | 53.07 | 5 | 7 | 13 |  | --- | --- | - | --- | -- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | 7 | 13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34-35 \\ & \text { (Aug. 18-31) } \end{aligned}$ | 5,389 | 3,017 | 55.98 | 5 | 5 | 9 |  | - | --- |  | - | - |  | --- | - | --- | - | 5 | 9 |
| $\left(\begin{array}{l} 36-37 \\ (\text { Sept. } 1-14) \end{array}\right.$ | 16,586 | 12,185 | 73.47 |  | 39 | 53 | --- | - | -- | --- | --- | - |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | 39 | 53 |
| $\stackrel{38-39}{(\text { Sept. } 15-28)}$ | 9,929 | 5,998 | 60.41 |  | 16 | 26 |  | -- | --- | --- | -- | --- |  |  | --- | --- | --- | 16 | 26 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40-41 \\ & (\text { Sept. } 29-1 \\ & \text { Oct. 12) } \end{aligned}$ | 601 | 8 | 1.33 |  | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- |
| TOTAL | 42,661 | 25,489 | 59.75 |  | 72 | 114 | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | 72 | 114 |

Appendix Table 5E. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing area $11 B$ by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered (continued).
a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., 39.68\% for Berners R., 7.14\% for Chilkat R.). b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.

Appendix Table 5F． 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 10 ， 110 and $D$ by statistical weeks，sample percentage，and number of marked cohos recovered．

|  |  |  |  | TAKU <br> （red） |  |  | BERNERS （green） |  |  | CHILKAT <br> （orange） |  |  | AD only |  |  | OTHER MARKS （cwt or fin clips） |  | TOTALMARKS（all types） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \\ & \frac{1}{5} \\ & \frac{1}{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { त⿹丁口㇒ } \\ & \text { H } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { तो } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { U } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \frac{n}{5} \\ & \text { 䯧 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { च्णे } \\ & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \text { U } \\ & \frac{2}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{10}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{5} \\ & \frac{1}{2} \\ & \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | ¢్ত |  |  |  | Total found | Total expanded |
| $\begin{gathered} 24-25 \\ \text { (June 9-22) } \end{gathered}$ | 35 | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ |
| $\begin{gathered} 26-27 \\ \text { (June 23- } \\ \text { July 6) } \end{gathered}$ | 583 | 30 | 5.15 |  | －－－ | － |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－ | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ |
| $\begin{gathered} 28-29 \\ \text { (July } 7-20 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 2，151 | 300 | 13.95 |  | －－ | － |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | 1 | 1 | 7 | －－－ | －－－ | 1 | 7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30-31 \\ & \text { (July } 21- \\ & \text { August 3) } \end{aligned}$ | 3，982 | 117 | 4.45 |  | －－ | －－－ |  | － | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |
| $\begin{gathered} 32-33 \\ \text { (Aug. 4-17) } \end{gathered}$ | 3，842 | 1，606 | 41.80 |  |  | －－－ |  | －－ | － |  | －－－ | －－－ | 2 | 2 | 5 | －－－ | －－－ | 2 | 5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34-35 \\ & \text { (Aug. 18-31) } \end{aligned}$ | 7，375 | 847 | 11.48 |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | － | 2 | 2 | 17 | －－－ | － | 2 | 17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36-37 \\ & (\text { Sept. 1-14) } \end{aligned}$ | 5，125 | 152 | 2.97 | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | － | － | －－ | － | － | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 38-39 \\ & \text { (Sept. 15-28) } \end{aligned}$ | 1，627 | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－ |  | － | －－－ | － | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | － | －－－ |
| total | 24，720 | 3，112 | 12.59 |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | －－－ | －－－ |  | － | －－－ | 5 | 5 |  | －－－ | －－－ | 5 | 29 |

a／Corrected for pigment loss（31．94\％for Taku R．， $39.68 \%$ for Berner R．， $7.14 \%$ for Chilkat R．）．
b／Expanded to 100\％sample size．
c／Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction．

Appendix Table 5G. 1974 Southeastern Alaska conmercial coho catch in fishing area 12 (south of Pt. Hepburn) by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.


[^3]Appendix Table 5H. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 5, 9 and 13B by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.


[^4]Appendix Table 51. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 3 and 4 by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.

a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., $39.68 \%$ for Berners R., $\mathbf{7 . 1 4 \%}$ for Chilkat R.).
b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.
d/ No correction over observed numbers due to small sample sizes.

Appendix Table 5J. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 6,7 and 8 by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.

| Statistical weeks | Comm. catch | Number sampled | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { sampled } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | TAKU (red) |  |  | BERNERS (green) |  |  | CHILKAT (orange) |  |  | AD only |  |  | OTHER MARKS (cwt or fin clips) |  | TOTAL MARKS (all types) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \frac{n}{E} \\ & \text { 品亭 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ָif } \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \stackrel{4}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\frac{\text { n }}{\frac{2}{2}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 힐 } \\ \stackrel{4}{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{2} \\ & \frac{\text { n }}{2} \end{aligned}$ | प्व स् 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  | Total found | Total expanded |
| $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ \text { (June 2-8) } \end{gathered}$ | 1 | --. | --- | --- | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | - | --- |  | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 24-25 \\ \text { (June } 9-22 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 787 | --- | --- |  | --- | --- |  | --- |  | --- | --- | - |  | --- |  | - | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 26-27 \\ \text { (June 23- } \\ \text { July 6) } \end{gathered}$ | 4,337 | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- |  | - | $\cdots$ | -- | --- | --- | --- | - | -- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 28-29 \\ \text { (July } 7-20 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 3,825 | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30-31 \\ & \text { (July 21- } \\ & \text { August 3) } \end{aligned}$ | 8,389 | 13 | 0.15 |  | --- | -- | -- | --- | --- | --- | $\cdots$ | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32-33 \\ \text { (Aug. } 4-17 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 16,658 | 945 | 5.67 | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | --- |  | - | -.- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34-35 \\ & \text { (Aug. 18-31) } \end{aligned}$ | 28,520 | 1,585 | 5.56 |  | - | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | -- | --- |  | 2 | 2 d | --- | --- | 2 | 2d/ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36-37 \\ & \text { (Sept. 1-14) } \end{aligned}$ | 27,769 | 1,613 | 5.81 | --- | - | --- | -- | --- | --- |  | -- | --- |  | 4 | 4 d | --- | --- | 4 | 4 d/ |
| $\left(\begin{array}{l} 38-39 \\ (\text { Sept. } 15-28) \end{array}\right.$ | 4,840 | --- | --- |  | - | -- | -- | - | -- |  | -- | -- |  | --- |  | --- | $\cdots$ | --- | --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40-41 } \\ & \text { (Sept. 29- } \\ & \text { Oct. 12) } \end{aligned}$ | 20 | --- | --- | --- | -- | -- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | $\cdots$ | --- |  | --- | --- | --- | --- |

Appendix Table 5J． 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 6， 7 and 8 by statistical weeks，sample percentage，and number of marked cohos recovered（continued）．

|  |  |  |  | TAKU （red） |  |  | BERNERS （green） |  |  | CHILKAT （orange） |  |  | AD only |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OTHER MARKS } \\ & \text { ( } \mathrm{cwt} \text { or } \\ & \text { fin } \mathrm{cl} \mathrm{ips} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ |  | TOTALMARKS（all types） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statistical weeks |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n 믈 } \\ & \text { 를 } \\ & \text { mi } \end{aligned}$ | ⿹ㅣ $\stackrel{y}{u}$ 0 0 $\vdots$ 0 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\square} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\check{0}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{x} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n n } \\ & \stackrel{y}{\text { max }} \end{aligned}$ | Uٕ <br> \＃ <br> ¢ <br> ¢ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n 믈 } \\ & \text { 空空 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Total found | Total expanded |
| TOTAL | 95，146 | 4，156 | 4.37 | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ | －－－ |  | 6 | 6d／ | －－－ | －－ | 6 | 6d／ |

a／Corrected for pigment loss（31．94\％for Taku R．，39．68\％for Berners R．，7．14\％for Chilkat R．）．
$\frac{a}{b} /$ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size．
c／Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction．
d／No correction over observed numbers due to smalil sample sizes．

Appendix Table 5k. 1974 Southeastern Alaska comnercial coho catch in fishing areas 1 and 2 by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered.

|  |  |  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { taku } \\ \text { (red) }}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BERNERS } \\ & \text { (green) } \end{aligned}$ | CHILKAT (orange) | AD only |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTALA } \\ & \text { MARK } \\ & \text { Call types } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\substack{\text { Statistical } \\ \text { weeks }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Coam. } \begin{array}{l} \text { Coatch } \\ \text { cat } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Number sampled | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent } \\ & \text { sampled } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \begin{array}{c} \text { Total } \\ \text { found } \\ \text { expanded } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24-25 \\ & \text { (June 9-22) } \end{aligned}$ | 1,429 | --- | --- | --- --- | --- --- --- | --. --- --- | --- --- -- | --- --- | --- --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26-27 \\ & \left(\begin{array}{l} \text { une 27 } \\ \text { July 6 } \end{array}\right. \end{aligned}$ | 11,692 | --- | --- | --- --- --- | --- --- --- | - | --- -- | --- --- | --- --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 28-29 \\ \text { (July } 7-20 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 22,512 | --- | --- | -- | --- --- --- | --- | --- --- --- | --- --- | --- --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30-31 \\ & \left(\begin{array}{c} 30-31-21-2 \\ \text { August } 3) \end{array}\right. \end{aligned}$ | 22,631 | 76 | 0.34 | --- --- --- | --. --- --. | --- -.- --- | --- | --- --- | --- --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32-33 \\ (\mathrm{Avg} .4-7) \end{gathered}$ | 37,439 | 229 | 0.61 | --- --- --- | --- --- --- | --- --- --- | 11919 | --- --- | 1 d |
| $\begin{gathered} 34-35 \\ (\mathrm{Aug} . \\ \hline 8-31) \end{gathered}$ | 49,189 | --- | --- | --- --- --- | --- --. --- | --- --- --- | - | --- --- | --- --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36-37 \\ & \text { (sept. 1-14) } \end{aligned}$ | 21,625 | --- | --- | --. --- --- | --- | --- | --- --- | --- --- | --- --- |
| ${ }_{(\text {Sept. }}{ }^{38-39-28-28)}$ | 11,227 | --- | --- | ---- --- --- | --- --- --- | --- | --- --- - | - | --- --- |
|  | 135 | --- | --- | --- --- --- | --- --- --- | -- | --- | - | --- --- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42-43 \\ & \text { (oct. } 13-26) \end{aligned}$ | 3 | --- | --- | --- --- -- | --- --- | --- --- --- | --- --- --- | --- --- | $\left.\right\|_{\text {(continued) }} ^{---}$ |

Appendix Table 5K. 1974 Southeastern Alaska commercial coho catch in fishing areas 1 and 2 by statistical weeks, sample percentage, and number of marked cohos recovered (continued).

a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., $39.68 \%$ for Berners R., 7.14\% for Chilkat R.).
$\frac{a}{b}$ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
$\frac{b}{c} /$ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.
c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss corre
d/ No correction over observed numbers due to small sample sizes.

APPENDIX A. BIOLOGICAL SAMPLING OF PIGMENT MARKED COHO SALMON

## Length and Weight of Pigment Marked Coho Salmon

Appendix Tables Al-A4 show the number, mean, and range of sizes of coho salmon recovered by statistical week. The tables also show the results of linear regression analysis of fish size by statistical week.

Snout-fork lengths of 551 pigment marked coho salmon ranged from 50.8 to $83.8 \mathrm{~cm}(20.0$ to 33.0 in.$)$ and round weights ( 228 fish) from 2.39 to 8.18 kg ( 4 lbs .14 oz . to 18 lbs .). Taku River cohos had a wide range in fish size for each statistical week. Fish of double the weight were common in the same week. Berners River cohos also had a wide range in sizes and fish up to double the weight were fairly common in the same week. Chilkat River cohos had less range in size and fish up to double the weight in the same week were not common.

Reasons for the wide range in fish size for the same week might be the two different streams on the Taku River (Yehring and Johnson Creek) or time of migration of smolts from each stream. The time of smolt migration may also vary considerably within the same stream. Time of smolt migration could determine both length of time and area of feeding in saltwater. Some cohos migrate out Icy Strait for open ocean feeding while others may remain in inside waters and thus attain a smaller size at maturity.

Large differences in size of cohos at maturity have been found in Washington State where some fish remain inside Puget Sound while others migrate into open ocean areas to feed. Cohos that migrated to outside waters attained a considerably larger size than those remaining inside Puget Sound.

Linear regressions of fish length and weight on statistical week were calculated to show the increase in fish size as the season progressed. These regressions did not yield good correlations, probably because of the wide range in sizes for any given week. The increase in snout-fork length per week was $0.9 \mathrm{~cm}(0.36 \mathrm{in}$.$) for Taku cohos, 1.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ ( 0.40 in .) for Berners cohos, and $0.8 \mathrm{~cm}(0.31 \mathrm{in}$.$) for Chilkat cohos. Round weight$ increases were 0.23 kg ( 0.50 lb.$)$ per week for Taku River cohos, 0.17 kg ( 0.36 lb.$)$ for Berners cohos, and $0.17 \mathrm{~kg}(0.36 \mathrm{lb}$.$) for Chilkat cohos.$

Appendix Table Al. Snout-fork lengths of pigment marked coho salmon by statistical week.

|  | TAKU |  |  | BERNERS |  |  | CHILKAT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statistical <br> Week | Number of Fish | Range in Lengths (cm) | Mean | Number of Fish | Range in Lengths (cm) | Mean | Number of Fish | Range in Lengths (cm) | Mean |
| $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (6 / 30-7 / 6) \end{gathered}$ | 2 | (62.2-66.4) | 64.3 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | (64.8) | 64.8 |
| $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (7 / 7-7 / 13) \end{gathered}$ | 14 | (58.4-68.6) | 64.1 | 3 | (58.4-66.7) | 62.4 | 1 | (55.2) | 55.2 |
| $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (7 / 14-7 / 20) \end{gathered}$ | 9 | (61.6-74.9) | 68.2 | 2 | (64.8-69.9) | 67.3 | 3 | (65.4-69.9) | 67.9 |
| $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (7 / 21-7 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | 3 | (50.8-73.0) | 63.4 | 2 | (55.2-66.0) | 60.6 | 3 | (64.1-67.9) | 66.0 |
| $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (7 / 28-8 / 3) \end{gathered}$ | 8 | (58.7-72.4) | 67.1 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (8 / 4-8 / 10) \end{gathered}$ | 24 | (52.1-76.2) | 67.4 | 4 | (65.1-73.3) | 68.8 | 7 | (63.5-73.7) | 68.0 |
| $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (8 / 17-8 / 17) \end{gathered}$ | 17 | (54.0-74.9) | 69.4 | 4 | (65.4-72.4) | 69.2 | 6 | (63.5-70.2) | 68.3 |
| $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (8 / 18-8 / 24) \end{gathered}$ | 20 | (55.2-81.3 | 69.4 | 21 | (57.8-75.6) | 70.0 | 15 | (55.2-75.2) | 69.6 |
| $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (8 / 25-8 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | 16 | (67.0-83.2) | 73.0 | 28 | (54.6-77.2) | 70.6 | 32 | (64.1-78.4) | 71.9 |
| $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (9 / 1-9 / 7) \end{gathered}$ | 21 | (55.9-83.8) | 71.2 | 37 | (62.2-79.4) | 72.7 | 36 | (64.5-80.0) | 71.8 |
| $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (9 / 8-9 / 14) \end{gathered}$ | 19 | (65.7-78.7) | 73.0 | 18 | (67.9-78.7) | 73.7 | 49 | (60.0-78.7) | 72.0 |
| $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (9 / 15-9 / 21) \end{gathered}$ | 13 | (70.2-83.8) | 73.8 | 23 | (67.6-81.3) | 73.7 | 33 | (66.0-78.1) | 73.3 |
| $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (9 / 22-9 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | (75.6) | 75.6 | 10 | (69.9-83.8) | 75.0 | 25 | (66.7-81.3) | 74.2 |
| $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (9 / 29-10 / 5) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | 3 | (63.5-76.2) | 71.5 | 16 | (66.0-79.1) | 73.3 |
| $\stackrel{41}{(10 / 6-10 / 12)}$ | ${ }^{---}$ | --- | -- | $\overline{155}$ | -- | -- | $\frac{2}{229}$ | (76.2-80.0) | 78.1 |

Linear Regression Analysis - Snout-Fork Length on Statistical Week

| a. 38.7445 | $a_{\text {a }} 35.5677$ | $\mathrm{a}_{0} 43.1207$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{a}_{1} \quad 0.9219$ | $a_{1} \quad 1.0119$ | $\mathrm{a}_{1} 0.7901$ |
| $r^{2} \quad 0.2197$ | $\mathrm{r}^{2} \quad 0.2330$ | $r^{2} \quad 0.2165$ |
| ¢ $383.7445+0.9219 x$ | $\begin{aligned} & \widehat{y} \quad 35.5677+1.0119 x \\ & -68 \end{aligned}$ | 人 ${ }^{\text {y }} 43.1207+0.7901 x$ |

Appendix Table A2. Mideye-fork lengths of pigment marked coho salmon by statistical week.

|  | TAKU |  |  | BERNERS |  |  | CHILKAT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statistical <br> Week | Number of Fish | Range in Lengths (cm) | Mean | Number of Fish | Range in Lengths (cm) | Mean | Number of Fish | Range in Lengths (cm) | Mean |
| $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (6 / 30-7 / 6) \end{gathered}$ | 2 | (57.8-62.2) | 60.0 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | (59.7) | 59.7 |
| $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (7 / 7-7 / 13) \end{gathered}$ | 14 | (54.0-63.5) | 59.4 | 3 | (53.3-62.2) | 58.0 | 1 | (50.8) | 50.8 |
| $\stackrel{29}{(7 / 14-Z / 20)}$ | 9 | (57.2-68.6) | 62.4 | 2 | (59.7-63.5) | 61.6 | 3 | (60.3-64.5) | 62.8 |
| $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (7 / 21-7 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | 3 | (46.4-66.0) | 58.0 | 2 | (50.2-61.0) | 55.6 | 3 | (59.7-64.1) | 61.8 |
| $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (7 / 28-8 / 3) \end{gathered}$ | 8 | (55.9-65.4) | 61.8 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (8 / 4-8 / 10) \end{gathered}$ | 24 | (47.6-68.9) | 61.9 | 4 | (60.3-66.7) | 63.2 | 7 | (59.1-67.3) | 62.8 |
| $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (8 / 11-8 / 17) \end{gathered}$ | 17 | (49.5-69.2) | 64.0 | 4 | (59.7-66.0) | 64.0 | 6 | (59.1-65.1) | 63.5 |
| $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (8 / 18-8 / 24) \end{gathered}$ | 19 | (51.8-72.4) | 64.2 | 21 | (52.7-68.9) | 64.2 | 15 | (50.8-67.9) | 64.1 |
| $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (8 / 25-8 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | 16 | (61.9-73.7) | 66.8 | 28 | (49.5-69.9) | 64.7 | 32 | (57.8-71.8) | 65.8 |
| $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (9 / 1-9 / 7) \end{gathered}$ | 21 | (49.8-73.7) | 64.6 | 37 | (57.5-71.1) | 66.3 | 36 | (58.7-71.4) | 65.5 |
| $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (9 / 8-9 / 14) \end{gathered}$ | 19 | (59.7-70.5) | 66.2 | 18 | (60.3-69.9) | 66.7 | 49 | (55.6-70.5) | 65.5 |
| $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (9 / 15-9 / 21) \end{gathered}$ | 3 | (63.5-73.3) | 66.8 | 23 | (62.2-73.7) | 66.7 | 33 | (60.3-72.1) | 67.3 |
| $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (9 / 22-9 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | (67.9) | 67.9 | 10 | (61.0-73.0) | 66.6 | 25 | (61.6-73.0) | 67.2 |
| $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (9 / 29-10 / 5) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | 3 | (56.2-69.9) | 65.0 | 16 | (59.7-71.1) | 66.4 |
| $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (10 / 6-10 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | $\overline{166}$ | - | --- | $\frac{---}{155}$ | - --- | --- | $\frac{2}{229}$ | (69.9-72.1) | 71.0 |

Linear Regression Analysis - Mideye-Fork Length on Statistical Week

| $\mathrm{a}_{\text {。 }} \cdot 40.1324$ | a. 39.7604 | a。 44.3995 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{a}_{1} 0.7058$ | $a_{1} 0.7157$ | $a_{1} 0.5837$ |
| $r^{2} 0.1854$ | $\mathrm{r}^{2} \quad 0.1603$ | $\begin{array}{ll}r^{2} & 0.1567\end{array}$ |
| $\widehat{y} 40.1324+0.7058 x$ | $\widehat{y} 39.7604+0.7157 x$ | $\widehat{y} 44.3995+0.5837 x$ |

Appendix Table A3. Round weights of pigment marked coho salmon by statistical week.

| Statistical Week | TAKU |  |  | BERNERS |  |  | CHILKAT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Fish | Range in Weight $\qquad$ | Mean | Number of Fish | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range in } \\ & \text { Weight } \end{aligned}$ $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Mean | Number of Fish | Range in Weight (kg) | Mean |
| $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (6 / 30-7 / 6) \end{gathered}$ | -- | --- | -- | --- | -- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (7 / 7-7 / 13) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | (2.73) | 2.73 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ (7 / 14-7 / 20) \end{gathered}$ | --- | . --- | --- | 2 | (2.73-3.64) | 3.18 | --- | --- | - |
| $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (7 / 21-7 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | - | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (7 / 28-8 / 3) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | - | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (8 / 4-8 / 10) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | (3.75) | 3.75 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | -- |
| $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (8 / 11-8 / 17) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | - | -- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (8 / 18-8 / 24) \end{gathered}$ | 2 | (2.39-7.73) | 5.06 | --- | -- | - | 1 | (2.22) | 2.22 |
| $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (8 / 25-8 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | 2 | (4.09-4.55) | 4.32 | --- | - | --- | 15 | (3.64-5.68) | 4.73 |
| $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (9 / 1-9 / 7) \end{gathered}$ | 11 | (3.30-7.05) | 5.23 | 6 | (3.07-5.97) | 4.47 | 13 | (3.98-5.57) | 4.75 |
| $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (9 / 8-9 / 14) \end{gathered}$ | 11 | (3.86-6.82) | 5.47 | 9 | (3.75-6.14) | 4.90 | 36 | (3.41-6.14) | 4.85 |
| $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (9 / 15-9 / 21) \end{gathered}$ | 13 | (4.55-8.18) | 5.40 | 19 | (3.75-6.59) | 5.23 | 31 | (3.69-6.39) | 5.31 |
| $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (9 / 22-9 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | (4.43) | 4.43 | 9 | (3.41-6.36) | 4.85 | 24 | (3.64-6.93) | 4.99 |
| $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (9 / 29-10 / 5) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | 3 | (2.73-6.14) | 4.66 | 16 | (3.41-6.70) | 5.17 |
| $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (10 / 6-10 / 12) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | $\overline{48}$ | --- | --- | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ \hline 138 \end{gathered}$ | (5.00-5.91) | 5.46 |

Linear Regression Analysis - Round Weight on Statistical Week

| $a_{0}-3.1269$ | $a_{0}-1.3152$ | $a_{0}$ | 0.1296 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $a_{2}$ | 0.2274 | $a_{1}$ | 0.1652 |
| $r^{2}$ | 0.1238 | $a_{1}$ | 0.1289 |
| $\hat{y}-3.1269+0.2274 x$ | $r^{2}$ | 0.1223 | $r^{2}$ |
| 0.0610 |  |  |  |
|  | $-1.3152+0.1652 x$ | $\hat{y}$ | $0.1296+0.1289 x$ |

Appendix Table A4. Dressed weights of pigment marked coho salmon by statistical week.

| Statistical Week | TAKU |  |  | BERNERS |  |  | CHILKAT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Fish | Range in Weight (kg) | Mean | Number of Fish | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range in } \\ & \text { Weight } \\ & \text { (kg.) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Mean | Number of Fish | Range in Weight (kg) | Mean |
| $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (6 / 30-7 / 6) \end{gathered}$ | 2 | (2.53-3.18) | 2.86 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | (2.53) | 2.53 |
| $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (7 / 7-7 / 13) \end{gathered}$ | 13 | (1.82-3.41) | 2.67 | 3 | (1.70-2.50) | 2.16 | 1 | (1.59) | 1.59 |
| $\stackrel{29}{(7 / 14-7 / 20)}$ | 9 | (2.27-4.89) | 3.42 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | (2.84-3.41) | 3.18 |
| $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (7 / 21-7 / 27) \end{gathered}$ | 3 | (1.11-3.78) | 2.56 | 2 | (1.70-2.87) | 2.29 | 3 | (2.39-3.18) | 2.80 |
| $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (7 / 28-8 / 3) \end{gathered}$ | 8 | (2.13-4.55) | 3.31 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ (8 / 4-8 / 10) \end{gathered}$ | 23 | (1.48-5.11) | 3.44 | 4 | (2.87-4.46) | 3.64 | 7 | (2.39-4.43) | 3.32 |
| $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (8 / 11-8 / 17) \end{gathered}$ | 17 | (1.62-4.43) | 3.59 | 4 | (3.18-4.09) | 3.72 | 6 | (3.10-3.72) | 3.37 |
| $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (8 / 18-8 / 24) \end{gathered}$ | 19 | (1.99-5.45) | 3.76 | 20 | (2.16-4.91) | 3.96 | 13 | (2.98-5.00) | 3.96 |
| $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (8 / 25-8 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | 14 | (3.69-6.36) | 4.68 | 28 | (2.27-5.48) | 3.98 | 17 | (3.32-5.51) | 4.30 |
| $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (9 / 7-9 / 7) \end{gathered}$ | 10 | (3.64-5.11) | 4.29 | 31 | (2.36-6.36) | 4.43 | 23 | (3.10-5.00) | 4.18 |
| $\begin{gathered} 37 \\ (9 / 8-9 / 14) \end{gathered}$ | 8 | (3.07-5.34) | 4.24 | 9 | (3.24-6.02) | 4.45 | 15 | (2.27-5.23) | 3.97 |
| $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (9 / 15-9 / 21) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | 4 | (3.21-5.23) | 3.96 | 2 | (3.38-3.66) | 3.53 |
| $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (9 / 22-9 / 28) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | 1 | (3.52) | 3.52 | 1 | (4.66) | 4.66 |
| $\begin{gathered} 40 \\ (9 / 29-10 / 5) \end{gathered}$ | --- | --- | --- | -- | --- | -- | -- | --- | --- |
| $\stackrel{41}{(10 / 6-10 / 12)}$ | --- | - ${ }^{---}$ | - | $106$ | --- | --- | $92$ | --- | --- |

Linear Regression Analysis - Dressed Weight on Statistical Week

| $\mathrm{a}_{0}$ | -2.5693 | $a_{0}$ | -3.3918 | $\mathrm{a}_{0}-1.8604$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $a_{i}$ | 0.1907 | $a_{1}$ | 0.2125 | $a_{1} \quad 0.1657$ |
| $r^{2}$ | 0.2633 | $r^{2}$ | 0.1965 | $\begin{array}{ll}r^{2} & 0.2643\end{array}$ |
| $\widehat{y}$ | $-2.5693+0.1907 x$ | $\widehat{y}$ | $-3.3918+0.2125 x$ | $\widehat{y}-1.8604+0.1657 x$ |

## Total age of marked cohos

The age composition of pigment marked coho salmon recovered in the commercial fishery consisted of four different age classes and are compared in Appendix Table A5 1/. The 2.1 age class was predominant in all three river systems followed by the 3.1 age class. The 1.1 age class was represented in only $1.8 \%$ of the total scale samples. This is due to the fact that during the pigment marking operations an effort was made to mark only age I+ or older juveniles which migrated to sea as age II+ smolts. The 4.1 age class was present in only the Chilkat and Taku Rivers and consisted of $5.0 \%$ and $0.7 \%$ respectively of the total scale samples from those systems.

Scales from Berners River cohos were easiest to read followed by Taku River cohos which were more difficult and by Chilkat River cohos which were considerably more difficult. This is reflected in the percentage of cohos going to sea in their third year of life (2.1) which was highest in Berners River cohos (89.1\%), second in Taku River cohos (78.9\%), and lowest in Chilkat River cohos ( $60 \%$ ) . The highest percentage of older aged cohos (3.1 and 4.1) was found in Chilkat River cohos followed by Taku River cohos and Berners River cohos. The longer a coho spends in freshwater the more difficult the scales become to read.

## Mean freshwater circuli counts

The mean circuli counts of each year of freshwater life by age class is shown in Appendix Table A6. Marked coho that went to sea in their second year of life (1.1) exhibited the highest mean circuli count for the first year of freshwater growth ranging from 14.5 in the Chilkat River sample to 14.0 in the Taku River sample. Coho that went to sea as smolts in their third year of life (age 2.1) exhibited the most growth in their second year of freshwater residency. As the freshwater age increased the mean circuli counts for each year of freshwater growth decreased, averaging only 4 to 6 circuli per year in age 4.1 coho.

[^5]Appendix Table A5. Comparison of the age structure of pigment marked coho salmonl/

|  | Age 1.1 <br> River System |  | N | $\%$ | Age 2.1 <br> N |  | $\%$ | Age 3.1 <br> N |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taku River | 1 | 0.7 | 120 | 78.9 | 30 | 19.7 | 1 | 0.7 | 152 |
| Berners River | 3 | 2.2 | 123 | 89.1 | 12 | 8.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 138 |
| Chilkat River | 4 | 2.5 | 96 | 60.0 | 52 | 32.5 | 8 | 5.0 | 160 |
| Total | 8 | 1.8 | 339 | 75.3 | 94 | 20.9 | 9 | 2.0 | 450 |

1/ European age designation (the numbers before and after the decimal point refer to the number of winters a fish spent in fresh and saltwater respectively. A $1 . l$ age coho spent one winter in freshwater, one winter in saltwater and returned to spawn in its third year of life.

Appendix Table A6. Mean circuli counts of each year of freshwater growth by age class for pigment marked coho salmon.

|  | Age 1.1 | Age 2.1 |  |  | Age 3.1 |  |  |  | Age 4.1 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| River System | lst | lst | 2nd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th |  |
| Taku River | 14.0 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Berners River | 14.3 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 6.0 | 7.3 | 6.5 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Chilkat River | 14.5 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.5 |  |
| Average | 14.2 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 4.6 |  |

The Chilkat River sample showed the highest mean circuli count for each year of freshwater residency followed by the Berners River sample. The Taku River cohos showed the lowest mean circuli counts averaging 6.9 and 7.7 for the first and second years of growth in age 2.1 coho as compared with 9.1 and 10.3 for the Chilkat River sample and 8.1 and 8.2 for the Berners River sample.

It appears that the fastest growing cohos (as evidenced by higher mean circuli counts) go to sea at an earlier age because they reach smolt size sooner. The difference in mean circuli counts between the three river systems is probably due to the quality of the rearing environment. The Chilkat River cohos from Mosquito and Chilkat Lakes were probably in the richest environment followed by the Berners River's warm, weedy east fork and small lake, and the smaller beaver ponds and sloughs of Yehring and Johnson Creek (Taku River) in last place.

## Mean saltwater circuli counts

The mean circuli counts of the first year of saltwater residency by age class is shown in Appendix Table A7. The mean saltwater counts did not vary significantly by age class in any of the samples. The Berners River sample exhibited the highest mean saltwater circuli count when all age classes were combined. The mean counts ranged from 37.1 in the Berners River sample to 36.6 and 36.0 for the Taku and Chilkat samples.

Appendix Table A7. Mean circuli counts for the first year of saltwater residency by age class for pigment marked coho salmon.

| River system | Age 1.1 | Age 2.1 | Age 3.1 | Age 4.1 | All ages <br> combined |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taku River | 38.0 | 36.6 | 36.7 | 38.0 | 36.6 |
| Berners River | 35.6 | 37.2 | 36.8 | -- | 37.1 |
| Chilkat River | 36.3 | 35.7 | 36.7 | 36.3 | 36.0 |
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[^0]:    1/ Use of trade names is not intended to connote endorsement by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

[^1]:    a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., 39.68\% for Berners R., $7.14 \%$ for Chilkat R.)
    b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
    c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.

[^2]:    a／Corrected for pigment loss（31．94\％for Taku R．， $39.68 \%$ for Berners R．， $7.14 \%$ for Chilkat R．）．
    b）Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size
    c／Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction．

[^3]:    a/ Corrected for pigment loss ( $31.94 \%$ for Taku R., $39.68 \%$ for Berners R., $7.14 \%$ for Chilkat R.).
    b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
    c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.

[^4]:    a/ Corrected for pigment loss (31.94\% for Taku R., 39.68\% for Berners R., 7.14\% for Chilkat R.).
    b/ Expanded to $100 \%$ sample size.
    c/ Corrected for less adipose only marks due to pigment loss correction.

[^5]:    1/ European age designation (the numbers before and after the decimal point refer to the number of winters a fish spent in fresh and saltwater respectively. Al.l age coho spent one winter in freshwater, one winter in saltwater and returned to spawn in its third year of life.)

