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#### Abstract

Hyatt, K. D., Stiff, H. W. and Rankin, D. P. 2019. Observations of Size-at-Age for Sockeye Salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) Smolts from Sproat Lake, British Columbia (19772016). Can. Manu. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 3186: v +77 p.

Personnel from the Salmon in Regional Ecosystems Program (SIRE-P) and its predecessors have conducted annual sampling of juvenile salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) migrating seaward from Sproat Lake in most years between 1977 and 2016. Observations of biological traits of smolts (e.g. size at sea entry) help inform ongoing research into the likely origins of large variations in production exhibited by Sockeye Salmon populations in freshwater and marine ecosystems in Canada's Pacific region. For Sproat Lake, smolts were collected from a fyke net set on one to several dates during the spring migration period (April to early June) at the outlet of the lake (Sproat River). Individual fish from sample collections were processed and measured for fork length and weight, and scales were taken. Fish weight (wet weight in grams) and length (fork length in mm ) were obtained from either fresh, frozen or preserved samples but all observations here are expressed as fresh measure equivalents. Summary statistics of size-at-age of Sockeye Salmon smolts are tabulated in this report by survey date and age. A consistent annual index of Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size was identified for the predominant age-1 class of migrants, based on a subset of the sample observations collected between April $14^{\text {th }}\left(10^{\text {th }}\right.$ percentile) and May $22^{\text {nd }}$ ( $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile) of each year. The all-year averages for fork length and wet weights of age 1.0 Sockeye smolts exiting Sproat Lake were 7.4 cm and 3.7 grams respectively. The allyear averages for fork length and wet weights of age 2.0 Sockeye smolts were 8.7 cm and 5.8 grams respectively. Missing years of mean annual age 1 smolt size (2004, 2005, 2007, 20132016) were estimated based on a multi-variate relationship for average smolt length as a function of the average length of fry from trawl samples obtained in Sproat Lake during the previous fall/winter and the timing of the in-lake surveys.


## RÉSUMÉ

Hyatt, K. D., Stiff, H. W. and Rankin, D. P. 2019. Observations of Size-at-Age for Sockeye Salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) Smolts from Sproat Lake, British Columbia (19772016). Can. Manu. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 3186: v +77 p.

Les employés du Programme du saumon dans les écosystèmes régionaux et leurs prédécesseurs ont effectué des échantillonnages annuels de saumons juvéniles (Oncorhynchus nerka) qui dévalaient du lac Sproat la plupart des années entre 1977 et 2016. L'observation des caractéristiques biologiques des saumoneaux (p. ex. la taille à l'entrée en mer) aide à orienter les recherches en cours sur les origines probables des grandes variations de la production des populations de saumon rouge dans les écosystèmes d'eau douce et marins de la région du Pacifique du Canada. Dans le cas du lac Sproat, les saumoneaux ont été capturés à l'aide d'un verveux à une ou plusieurs dates durant la migration printanière (d'avril à début juin) à la sortie du lac (rivière Sproat). Les poissons individuels ont été traités; on a mesuré leur longueur à la fourche et leur poids, et prélevé des écailles. Le poids (poids humide en grammes) et la longueur (longueur à la fourche en mm ) du poisson ont été obtenus à partir d'échantillons frais, congelés ou conservés, mais toutes les observations sont exprimées ici en équivalents de mesures fraîches. Des statistiques sommaires sur la taille selon l'âge des saumoneaux rouges sont présentées dans le présent rapport par date de relevé et par âge. Un indice annuel uniforme de la taille des saumoneaux rouges du lac Sproat a été établi pour la classe d'âge 1 prédominante des migrateurs, d'après un sous-ensemble des observations des échantillons recueillies entre le 14 avril ( 10 e centile) et le 22 mai ( 90 e centile) de chaque année. Les moyennes sur toute l'année pour la longueur à la fourche et le poids humide des saumoneaux rouges d'âge 1 quittant le lac Sproat étaient de $7,4 \mathrm{~cm}$ et 3,7 grammes respectivement. Les moyennes sur toute l'année pour la longueur à la fourche et le poids humide des saumoneaux rouges d'âge 2 étaient de $8,7 \mathrm{~cm}$ et de 5,8 grammes respectivement. Pour les années où les données étaient manquantes (2004, 2005, 2007, 2013-2016), on a estimé la longueur moyenne annuelle des saumoneaux d'âge 1 à partir d'une relation à plusieurs variables exprimée sous la forme d'une fonction de la longueur moyenne des alevins des échantillons prélevés au chalut dans le lac Sproat l'automne et l'hiver précédents et du moment des relevés dans le lac.

## INTRODUCTION

The Salmon in Regional Ecosystems Program (SIRE-P), and its predecessors, have been involved in a series of short- to medium-term studies spanning a roughly forty-year interval focused on more than thirty Sockeye Salmon conservation units (CUs) in Canada's Pacific region. Funding of short-term studies has been received from a variety of federal, provincial and industry sources with interests in salmon enhancement (Hyatt et al. 1984, 2004, 2005a; Hyatt and Stockner 1985), stock assessment (Hyatt and Steer 1987; Hyatt et al. 1994, 2000; McCreight 1994; Hyatt and Rankin 1999), habitat and stock restoration (Johannes et al. 1999, 2002; Hyatt et al. 2003; Hyatt and Stockwell 2019), climate change (Hyatt et al. 2005b, 2015b, 2016, 2018a; Stiff et al. 2018) and food-web research (McQueen et al. 2007; Hyatt et al. 2005b, 2011, 2018). Although most of these programs, focused on individual Sockeye CUs, have been completed and terminated within less than five years, a few of these Sockeye CUs, associated with each of several distinctive freshwater and marine adaptive zones (Holtby and Ciruna 2007), have been subjects of sufficient interest to permit assembly of longer term (>25 years) data sets on lifestage specific biological traits and abundance. Multidecadal patterns of annual production variations exhibited as total returns of adults (i.e. catch plus escapement) by these CUs have been documented by Hyatt et al. (2005b, 2016a, 2018a) in DFO's State of the Pacific Ocean reports, but assembly and documentation of associated abundance and biological trait observations by life-stage (Hyatt et al. 2015b; Stiff et al. 2018), to make these data more widely available to the scientific community, remains a work in progress.

In this report we summarize observational data collected to assess biological traits (size and age) of Sockeye Salmon smolts sampled during spring seaward migrations from Sproat Lake from 1977-2012. Smolt catch and effort data are analyzed to derive a consistent, representative estimate of mean annual Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size by age class. Estimates of smolt size, based principally on statistical relations with pre-smolt (fry) size biosamples in the rearing lake, were used to infill missing years $(2004,2005,2007)$ and extend the time-series for the years 2013-2016.

This report includes:
(1) a general map of sampling locations;
(2) smolt catch and effort summary tables and plots;
(3) plots of length/weight regressions and frequency distributions; and
(4) plots and tables of observed and "best" estimates of smolt size by year and age.

The results reported here are derived from projects designed to deliver on a variety of objectives but now comprise a sufficiently long time series of obervations to have utility as a basis for analysis of lake carrying capacity (Hyatt et al. 2011) and identification of the factors operating to control salmon production variations in either freshwater (Hyatt and Rankin 1999) or marine ecosystems (Hyatt et al 2015b).

## STUDY AREA

Sproat Lake, located in central Vancouver Island ( $49^{\circ} 14^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ x $126^{\circ} 06^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$; elev. 29 m ), is a moderately deep, oligotrophic waterbody (mean depth 59 m ; max depth 195 m ) with a surface area of approximately 4,000 hectares, draining a 35,000 hectare watershed (Hyatt et al. 2011, 2016; Rutherford et al. 1986; Stockner and Shortreed 1985). The lake drains from the northeast
arm (Klehkoot Arm) via Sproat River, which combines with the Stamp River 13 km downstream to form the Somass River flowing into Alberni Inlet (Figure 1, Figure 2).

Smolt populations were sampled in Sproat River near the lake outlet (Hyatt et al. 1984; Rankin et al. 1994). Smolts captured during these surveys include: large numbers of Sockeye (Oncorhynchus nerka), smaller numbers of Coho (O. kisutch), Chinook ( $O$. tshawytsha), and in some cases, Pink (O. gorbuscha) and Chum (O. keta) fry. The results presented here are limited to Sockeye smolts as samples of other species collected were not processed.

## METHODS

Readers are encouraged to review Hyatt et al. (1984) and Rankin et al. (1994) for details regarding smolt sample acquisition and processing methods. However, the general methodology for the Sproat Lake system is outlined briefly here.
Smolt surveys were conducted during April through June. Survey timing was designed to encompass the period of peak smolt migrations (Rankin et al. 1994). Migrating smolts were captured via a variable mesh fyke net ( $2 \times 2 \times 7 \mathrm{~m}$ length; Gjernes 1979) set at the lake outlet, in Sproat River above Sproat Falls, where the river narrows and flows are restricted. On any given sampling date, the net was set one hour before sunset for a duration of 3 to 4 hours and checked at half-hour intervals as per the guidelines outlined in Hyatt et al. (1984). This period includes the time of peak diel smolt migration activity (Wood et al. 1993).

A sample size of 100-200 Sockeye smolts per sample night was recommended for each date sampled. If fewer than 100 smolts were caught during the first 4 hours of sampling, the net was left for the remainder of the night (about 6 hours) and retrieved in the morning. All fish captured were classified by species and preserved with labels identifying system, date, start and stop time, set number, species counts, initials of collection crew and total number of collections obtained during each survey date.
Sampled fish were generally preserved in buffered $3.7 \%$ formaldehyde for at least five weeks prior to laboratory processing for species, length, weight and scales. Alternatively, fish were preserved in $70 \%$ ethyl alcohol, and, in some cases, frozen prior to chemical preservation. Subsequently, in the laboratory at the Pacific Biological Station (PBS), fish were identified to species, and Sockeye smolts were weighed to 0.01 g and measured to 1 mm .

Between 1981 and 2012 smolt samples were processed in the PBS laboratory using a metric measuring board and electronic balance to determine fork lengths and preserved weights. Preserved smolt weights were converted to standardized fresh weights (Rankin et al. 1994) and are reported as such here. Age of fish was determined from scale analysis in the PBS Aging Lab. Scales were obtained for complete samples in some years (1977-1986), or for a subsample of fish $>75 \mathrm{~mm}$ after 1986.

Too few scales were examined ( $\mathrm{N}<25$ ) in some years to assign scale-based ages to mixed-age samples of smolts. In the absence of scale age data for a given year, monthly length-frequency distributions were reviewed for evidence of bi-modality to identify likely forklength threshold values to distinguish age classes. These were used in conjunction with multi-year age proportions by 5 mm forklength size class to assign a corresponding proportion of unaged fish in that size class to age.

Processed smolt data were compiled and analyzed using SAS ${ }^{\circledR}$ statistical software to tabulate summary statistics for fork length, preserved and standardized fresh weights, and smolt condition factor ${ }^{1}$ by year, sample date and age class. Sample dates were converted to Julian day-of-year ${ }^{2}$ for inter-annual comparisons. Univariate statistical procedures were used to detect and correct or exclude erroneous data from summary analyses.

Summary plots include:
(1) Weekly sample size, as an indicator of outmigration run-timing (ages pooled);
(2) Length and weight frequency distributions and regressions (by age class); and
(3) Trends in mean length (cm) and standardized fresh weight (g) over time (by age). ${ }^{3}$

Years for which Sockeye smolt size data were insufficient or unavailable (2004, 2005, 2007, 2013-2016) were infilled with estimates based on multi-year linear regression analysis of smolt length as a function of standardized estimates $\left(\mu \sim 0, \sigma^{2}\right)$ of winter fry size (forklength) and abundance from representative acoustic trawl surveys (ATS) during the previous winter or fall ${ }^{4}$, where available. Within- and between-year temporal effects were assessed by including terms for ocean entry year and week of fall/winter ATS sample date (shifted to increment from the previous July). Ocean entry year was forced into the regression model to address annual autocorrelation in the time-series.

The above analyses were used to identify a defensible and reproducible annual indicator of Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size for covariation analyses (e.g. Hyatt et al. 2011).

Non-parametric test statistics were calculated over the resulting annual 40-year time-series for detection of trends (Mann-Kendall (MK)) and step changes in the mean (rank sum) (Kundzewicz and Robson 2000). Regime shift detection using sequential t-test analysis was applied after prewhitening using a target $\mathrm{P}=0.05$, cutoff length $=10$ years, tuning constant $=2$ and a subsample size $=6$ years (STARS 6.2 software: Rodionov 2004).

## RESULTS

The total annual number of Sockeye smolts sampled, with associated statistics for size are summarized in Table 1 by year and age, and tabulated by sample date and sample location in Appendix I. The annual frequency of fyke-net sampling dates in Sproat River is listed in Table 2. Sample meta-data, including total catch (where available) and total fish sampled by date, sample site, gear type, sampling agency and fish preservative type, are listed in Appendix IX ${ }^{5,6}$. Smolt

[^1]biosample observations were not available for 2004, 2005, or 2007, and were limited to <50 fish in 2003, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2013 (Table 2).

In some years, few ( $0-30$ ) scale-based age observations were available (1988, 2002, 2003, 2006, $2009,2010,2012,2013$ ) to rigorously characterize age composition. To obtain sufficient aged fish for mean size estimation, unaged fish were assigned to age as described above. Most (99\%) of age assignments were to age 1; data changes are listed in Appendix X. Within-year summary statistics of fork length and standardized weight by sample date and age are tabulated in Appendix I.
As an indicator of seasonal smolt catch and relative abundance, sample size (count of Sockeye smolts retained by age) and percent of total annual retained catch are charted by year and sample date in Appendix II. Within-year seasonal trends in mean length and weight at age are presented in Appendix III.

Figure 3 summarizes the annual range of dates sampled (see Table 1 for actual sample sizes), with overlays of mean fork length and standard weight, by age class.
Annual size-at-age frequency distributions for fork length, standard weight, and fish condition (K) are organized in Appendix IV. These indicators are graphically summarized across all years in Figure 4. The annual absolute deviations from the multi-year averages displays significant differences in mean size and fish condition between years (Figure 5).
Statistical relations and corresponding regression and correlation coefficients for Sockeye lengthweight relationships (by year and age) can be found in Appendix V. The multi-year lengthweight at age relationships are presented in Figure 6.

The trend in within-season smolt size at age is plotted for length and weight observations by Julian day-of-year in Figure 7 (all years combined).
The multi-year seasonal distribution of smolt sample catch retained is plotted in Figure 8. Statistical quantiles of migration timing - based on Julian day-of-year - are compared in Table 3 for all available years versus "well-sampled" years where the number of sample dates exceed 3 and 5 days. Note that these observations represent only a coarse-grained indicator of timing because of the practice of retaining a maximum sample size of around two hundred individual fish for a given date. The actual catch on any date-specific sampling trip was often far higher than two hundred fish even though only two hundred were retained. Consequently, the observations here will generally conceal the timing of peak migration which tends to occur over a much shorter period than suggested by the annual plots in Appendix II.
The $10^{\text {th }}$ and $90^{\text {th }}$ day-of-year percentiles (April $14^{\text {th }}$ to May $22^{\text {nd }}$ ), representing $80 \%$ of the smolt sample observations, were used as cutoff dates to subset the sample data to obtain statistical measures associated with a consistent inter-annual indicator for Age 1 smolt size (Table 4).
Estimates of age 1 mean smolt size for missing years (2004, 2005, 2007, 2013-2016) were obtained from a linear regression analysis based on pre-smolt length, as well as ocean entry year, an annual estimate of juvenile abundance, and the time-of-year of pre-smolt sample date (week number) plus interactions (Appendix VI). Step-wise selection retained only pre-smolt length as significant at the $\alpha=0.05$ level ( $\mathrm{r}=0.78, \mathrm{~N}=29, \mathrm{P}<0.001$; Figure 9). However, an interaction term for pre-smolt forklength and week of ATS sample date was weakly significant $(\mathrm{P}=0.07)$. Forcing year into the regression to account for annual temporal dependencies (autocorrelation) did not substantially change the explained variance $\left(r^{2} \sim 0.6\right)$ or regression coefficient $(b \sim 0.6)$.

The model incorporating year, pre-smolt fork length and the interaction term between pre-smolt size and week of year yielded the highest coefficient of variation ( $\mathrm{r}^{2}=0.66$; Appendix VI), and was used to infill missing mean annual forklength. Estimated smolt lengths were converted to estimated standard weight based on the multi-year length/weight relation for age 1 smolts (Figure 6).
Final age 2 smolt size was not correlated with pre-smolt factors for the current or previous year. Best estimates for missing years (1980, 1985, 2003-2005, 2007, 2010, 2012, 2014-2016) ${ }^{7}$ were based on the all-year linear relationship for mean age 2 fork length as a function of mean age 1 fork length ( $\mathrm{r}=0.75, \mathrm{P}<0.001, \mathrm{~N}=28$; Appendix VII, Appendix VIII).
Best estimates of mean annual Sockeye smolt size, including predictive values for missing years, were plotted in Figure 10, by age class (Table 4, Table 5). No linear parametric or nonparametric trends, autocorrelation, or regime step changes were detected in mean annual fork length or standard weight estimates.

## DISCUSSION

## Sampling Effort

Over the 30-plus years of available data for ocean entry (1977-2013), Sproat Lake Sockeye smolts were sampled on average $4.9 \pm 3.0$ dates across the months of April, May and June. The mode and median number of sample dates was 5 . Sampling frequency was highest during the 1990s, when the frequency ranged from 7-12 dates per year. As of 2003, most years were sampled two times or less (Table 2). For years of low sampling frequency, survey dates may not have always occurred at representative periods of smolt outmigration (e.g. 2013, for which the sole biosample survey occurred on April $2^{\text {nd }}$ ).

## Smolt Migration

Tallying the frequency of sample dates (Julian day-of-year) across all ocean entry years, weighted by sample size, yields a coarse indicator of smolt migration abundance (assuming catch is proportional to abundance, and effort is roughly equivalent across dates). This indicator can be restricted to years where the number of sample dates exceeds a certain annual minimum (e.g. 3-5 dates; see Table 2). The resultant "smolt migration timing" statistics indicate that, over the range of well-sampled years (1977-2002), Sproat smolt migration peaks in late April to early May (median date: May $1^{\text {st }}$ ), with $90 \%$ of migrants tallied between April $10^{\text {th }}$ and May $25^{\text {th }}$ (Figure 8). Mean, median and variance statistics did not vary significantly when included years were restricted to those with a minimum of 3,4 or 5 sample dates (Table 3).

Migration timing varied between years, exhibiting - where sampling occurred weekly potentially bimodal abundance patterns in some years (e.g. 1990-1992, 1995, 1998, 2002), characterized by a pulse of smolts migrating in early-to-mid-April, followed by another pulse in late April and May (Appendix I and Appendix II). Overall, age 1 fish represented approximately $96 \%$ of migrants, and age 2 fish comprised $4 \%$ (Table 1). However, age 2's often contributed a higher proportion (5-10 \%) of the early April pulse of migrants, while the migrants in May were predominantly composed of age 1 fish ( $>98 \%$ ).

[^2]
## Smolt Size and Condition

The mean length and standard weight of age 1 fish for all available years (1977-2012 ${ }^{8}$ ) were 7.4 $\pm 0.8 \mathrm{~cm}$ and $3.7 \pm 1.1 \mathrm{~g}$, respectively $(\mathrm{N}=17,027$; Table 1$)$. Ninety-five percent of age 1 fish were less than 8.6 cm in fork length.

Age 2 fish averaged slightly larger, at $8.7 \pm 0.9 \mathrm{~cm}$ and $5.8 \pm 1.8 \mathrm{~g}(\mathrm{~N}=565)$. However, maximum length/weight of age 1's ranged from $9-11 \mathrm{~cm} / 4-9 \mathrm{~g}$, resulting in a wide overlap in the age-specific size distributions which precludes a simple size-based assignment of unaged fish to age class. Laboratory personnel attempted to take this overlap into account by focusing scale collection on the upper end of age 1 fish sizes ( $>75 \mathrm{~mm}$ ).

This may have been complicated by significant variation in mean smolt size between years. Ignoring years of limited sampling effort and/or small sample size (2003, 2008, 2010, 2012, 2013), age 1 fish averaged < 3 g in weight in 1977, 1979, 1985, 1998, 2001 and 2002 (Figure 3 (top); Table 1), which was $>1$ standard deviation below the all-year average ( 3.7 g ). Large age 1 smolts, averaging > 4.5 g occurred in 1978, 1981, 1986, 1992, and 1994 (Figure 5, Appendix IV).

The largest smolts were evident in 2008-2009, when age 1 smolt weights averaged $>5 \mathrm{~g}$. Though sampling effort was low (1-2 sample dates per year) and exhibited limited sample size ( $<100$ fish), samples were generally drawn from late-April to mid-May, and are therefore considered to be representative of the typical second pulse of principally age 1 migrants (Appendix II).
Therefore, it appears that Sproat Sockeye smolt size improved $+1-2 \mathrm{~g}$ some time between 2003 and 2006, and persisted at a significantly larger average size for several years (2008-2011) before falling below the long-term average in 2012. The subsequent increase in mean length evident in 2013 (weights were not available) may not be representative due to small sample size ( $\mathrm{N}=17$; Table 1) and early sample timing (Appendix II, Appendix III).

Summary data in Table 4 reasonably replicate previous analyses for ocean entry years 2008-2012 (Hyatt et al. 2016b). The 2013 sample observations ( 17 smolts sampled on April 2, 2013; 10 age 1s, 7 age 2s) were included in Table 1 and Appendix I, but excluded from Best Estimates (Table 4) as outside of the mid- $80^{\text {th }}$ percentile for the migratory date range and characterized by poor smolt preservation condition.

Fulton's fish condition factor (K) - which expresses the relationship between fish length and weight - may provide more insight into fish health and survival than either size factor alone. Mean fish condition for age 1 and age 2 fish was $\mathrm{K}=0.9$ (Figure 4), which is likely typical for freshwater stages of juvenile salmonids. Maximum age 1 fish condition occurred in 1998 and 2011 (Figure 5, Table 1). Fulton's K largely reflected inter-annual length and weight variation, with several exceptions (e.g. 1978, 1981, 1984, 1986, 1992, 2008), where larger weights were not characterized by a high K-factor due to associated large fork lengths; and 1998, where low weights were associated with a high K-factor because mean fork lengths were low as well (Figure 5, Table 1). The K-factor suggests significantly lower mean fish condition for most years between 1977-1986 and 1992-2002, despite significantly positive differences in length and/or weight from the multi-year mean during those years (Figure 5).
It should be noted that Sproat Lake fertilization efforts occurred in 1985 (Hyatt et al. 2016). This appeared to have no beneficial size effect on Sockeye smolts entering the ocean in the year of

[^3]treatment (i.e. the Sockeye smolts actually exhibited below-average mean length and weight at $6.4 \mathrm{~cm} / 2.2 \mathrm{~g}$ respectively; $\mathrm{N}=313$ ). However, in 1986, age $1 \mathrm{~s}(8.3 \mathrm{~cm} / 4.7 \mathrm{~g} ; \mathrm{N}=211)$ and age $2 \mathrm{~s}(10.8 \mathrm{~cm} / 10.5 \mathrm{~g} ; \mathrm{N}=5)$ that had experienced the effects of the 1985 lake treatment were both larger than average (Figure 3, Figure 5, Appendix IV).
The length/weight curves for both age classes of Sproat Lake Sockeye are nearly identical despite the mean size differences: fresh standard weight $(\mathrm{g})$ is approximately equivalent to 0.01 times the fork length (cm) cubed (Figure 6).
Mean annual length and weight statistics were correlated between age classes ( $\mathrm{r}=0.75, \mathrm{P}<$ $0.001, \mathrm{~N}=29$; Appendix VII, VIII).

## Seasonal Trends in Smolt Size

Smolt size in biosamples appeared to decrease in both age 1 and age 2 classes as the season progressed ( $\mathrm{P}<0.01$; Figure 7), as evidenced when sampling effort involved $>3$ dates (e.g. 1979-2002). This multi-year trend is driven, however, by a subset of years of strong withinseason decline in the 1990s (e.g. 1989, 1993, 1995, 1996, 2000: P < 0.001; Appendix III), which may potentially mark an apparent shift from neutral or weakly positive changes in size in-season (perhaps related to spring growth) prior to 1989, to mainly negative trends in within-season fish size through to 2000. Diminishing size at age over the season potentially signifies a tendency towards earlier seaward migration of larger smolts (Wood et al. 2003). Due to lower sampling effort in recent decades, it is not clear if this trend has continued.

## Best Estimates of Annual Smolt Size

Thirty years of data indicate that biosamples collected between mid-April and late May (weeks 14-20) are most representative of the size of fish of the dominant age 1 class. Sproat smolt migration peaks between late April and early May (median date: May ${ }^{1}{ }^{\text {st }}$ ), with $90 \%$ of migrants tallied between April $5^{\text {th }}$ and May $25^{\text {th }}$ (Figure 8). As mean, median and variance statistics did not vary significantly when years were restricted to those with a minimum of 3,4 or 5 sample dates (Table 3), and within-year seasonal trends in size were generally weak for age 1 Sockeye (Appendix III), it may be surmised that one or more sample dates between mid-April and late May are likely sufficient to characterize Sockeye smolt size, at least for the predominant age 1 class, provided it is based on a reasonable aggregate sample size (e.g. 50-100 fish).

As noted above, age 2 smolts make up a larger proportion of early April migrants (Table 1, Appendix III). To reduce the influence of unaged age 2's on the annual smolt size indicator, a later, narrower date-range based on the $10^{\text {th }}$ and $90^{\text {th }}$ percentiles (i.e. April $14^{\text {th }}$ to May $22^{\text {nd }}-$ encompassing $80 \%$ of migration observations) was used to subset the data. These thresholds yield a consistent, representative estimate of annual Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size (age 1), given sufficient sample size (Figure 10, top; Table 4).
For years in which age 1 Sockeye smolt size observations were insufficient or unavailable (2004, 2005, 2007, 2013-2016), mean annual age 1 smolt size estimates were infilled based on the allyear multivariate linear relationship based on winter pre-smolt length, time-of-year (week) and ocean entry year ( $\mathrm{r}^{2}=0.66 ; \mathrm{N}=24$ ). Observed means and predictive estimates (represented by hollow squares) in the length and weight time-series in Figure 10 (top).
Mean annual age 2 smolt sizes are based on all available samples (Figure 10, bottom; Table 5). Age 2 size estimates should be considered highly uncertain, due to low frequency of occurrence in biosamples, especially since 2000. However, mean annual age 2 fork lengths and weights
appear to co-vary reasonably well with age 1 size data, enabling missing annual age 2 fork lengths to be estimated based on the age 1 to age 2 regression relation (Appendix VII). It should be noted that, in some well-sampled years (e.g. 1980, 1985), no age 2 fish were represented in the samples, thus age 2 size estimates are completely hypothetical in those years. In other years, the age 2 size estimate may be based on fewer than 10 fish (Table 1; Appendix VIII). Thus, the age 2 time series should be used with caution.

Given the above qualifications, the resulting time-series represent the best estimates of Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size, and may provide a basis for further analysis and identification of the factors operating to control salmon production variations in freshwater (e.g. Hyatt and Rankin 1999; Hyatt et al. 2011) or marine ecosystems (e.g. Hyatt et al. 2015b).
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## MAPS



Figure 1. Location of Barkley Sound study lakes (including Sproat Lake) on the west coast of Vancouver Island, B.C.


Figure 2. Sproat Lake bathymetric contours (in metres). Adapted from Hyatt et al. (2016b). Vector file from http://www.bcfisheries.gov.bc.ca/fishinv/basemaps-maps.html (Source: Province of B. C., Fisheries Branch, Inventory Operations, April 1985).

## FIGURES

Age 1 Sproat Lk Sockeye Sampling Period, Forklength (cm) and Std Wt (g)


Age 2 Sproat Lk Sockeye Sampling Period, Forklength (cm) and Std Wt (g)


Figure 3. Sproat Lake Sockeye annual smolt sampling range (blue boxes; sample dates indicated by +-symbol), mean fork length $\pm 1$ standard deviation (cm; green), mean standard fresh weight $\pm 1$ standard deviation (grams; red), Top: Age 1; bottom: Age 2.

Sproat Lk Sockeye Smolt Size Distribution


Figure 4. Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size distribution, all years. Standard fork length (cm, top), standard fresh weight (g, middle), Fulford fish condition factor (K, bottom).


Figure 5. Absolute deviation of annual mean length (top), standard weight (middle), and fish condition factor (bottom) from the overall multi-year averages for Age 1 Sproat Lake Sockeye smolts.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  | a | b | Rsq | N | a | b | Rsq | N |
| Stock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sproat Lk | 0.0107 | 2.957 | 0.90 | 514 | 0.6872 | 2.201 | 0.87 | 18 |



Figure 6. Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt length/weight relationship, all years.
Model: Std Weight $=\mathrm{a} \cdot$ Fork Length ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$


Figure 7. Decreasing trends in within-season smolt length (top) and weight (bottom), by age class, all years ( $\mathrm{r}<0$; Adj. $\mathrm{r}^{2}<0.03 ; \mathrm{N}>500$ ).


Figure 8. Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt "abundance distribution" (frequency of sample dates (Julian day of year), weighted by sample size), across all years where the minimum number of sample dates >=5 (see Table 2, Table 3).


Figure 9. Simple linear relationship for age 1 fork length as a function of winter pre-smolt fork length, 1980-2011 ( $\mathrm{r}=0.78 ; \mathrm{N}=29$ ).

Sproat Lk Sockeye Sampling Period, Age 1 - Forklength (cm) and Std Wt (g)



Figure 10. Best estimates of Sproat Lake Sockeye annual mean smolt size (solid lines) based on sampling effort (blue boxes) between April $14^{\text {th }}$ and May $22^{\text {nd }}$ each year for age 1 smolts (top), with predictive estimates for ocean entry years 2004, 2005, 2007, 2013$2016{ }^{9}$ (empty squares). Age 2 (bottom) based on all available samples; age 2 smolt size for missing years estimated based on age 1 to age 2 mean annual fork length.
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## TABLES

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Length (cm) |  |  |  | Fresh Std Wt (g) |  |  | K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Pct} \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | N | Length (cm) |  |  |  | Fresh Std Wt (9) |  |  | K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Pct} \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | AUG | P10 | P95 | MAX | AUG | P95 | SD |  |  |  | AUG | P10 | P95 | MAX | AUG | P95 | SD |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Year } \\ \hline 1977 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 243 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 7.8 | 8.6 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.78 | 95 | 13 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 0.78 | 5 |
| 1978 | 168 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 4.6 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 0.85 | 99 | 2 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 0.4 | 0.81 | 1 |
| 1979 | 638 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 0.81 | 100 | 1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 0.86 | 0 |
| 1980 | 439 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 4.1 | 5.9 | 0.9 | 0.88 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 549 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 4.6 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 0.85 | 98 | 14 | 9.3 | 8.3 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 7.1 | 14.1 | 2.7 | 0.83 | 2 |
| 1982 | 382 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 0.88 | 96 | 16 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 0.7 | 0.83 | 4 |
| 1983 | 394 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 0.84 | 98 | 7 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 5.6 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 0.83 | 2 |
| 1984 | 483 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 8.7 | 9.7 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 0.87 | 97 | 14 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 6.5 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 0.84 | 3 |
| 1985 | 313 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 0.83 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 211 | 8.3 | 7.3 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 4.7 | 7.3 | 1.2 | 0.81 | 98 | 5 | 10.8 | 9.4 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 10.5 | 13.4 | 2.5 | 0.81 | 2 |
| 1987 | 518 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 0.91 | 92 | 48 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 5.9 | 8.9 | 1.4 | 0.92 | 8 |
| 1988 | 1,135 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 9.9 | 3.5 | 4.8 | 0.8 | 0.89 | 99 | 15 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 0.7 | 0.89 | 1 |
| 1989 | 1,099 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 8.3 | 9.1 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 0.7 | 0.89 | 98 | 27 | 9.6 | 8.6 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 7.7 | 10.8 | 2.0 | 0.84 | 2 |
| 1990 | 581 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 4.2 | 5.7 | 0.9 | 0.90 | 95 | 28 | 8.4 | 7.6 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 0.89 | 5 |
| 1991 | 969 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 0.88 | 90 | 106 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 6.0 | 8.4 | 1.3 | 0.87 | 10 |
| 1992 | 412 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 4.8 | 6.8 | 1.1 | 0.86 | 95 | 21 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 0.81 | 5 |
| 1993 | 909 | 7.6 | 6.5 | 8.6 | 9.8 | 3.9 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 0.88 | 98 | 14 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 5.9 | 7.2 | 1.0 | 0.85 | 2 |
| 1994 | 989 | 7.8 | 6.6 | 9.0 | 10.8 | 4.4 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 0.88 | 97 | 34 | 8.9 | 8.0 | 10.1 | 11.2 | 6.4 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 0.89 | 3 |
| 1995 | 1,005 | 7.2 | 6.2 | 8.5 | 9.9 | 3.3 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 0.85 | 97 | 30 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 0.87 | 3 |
| 1996 | 1,293 | 7.4 | 6.3 | 8.5 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 5.5 | 1.1 | 0.88 | 96 | 52 | 8.7 | 8.0 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 5.9 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 0.88 | 4 |
| 1997 | 850 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 8.9 | 10.2 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 1.1 | 0.84 | 98 | 21 | 9.1 | 8.2 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 6.4 | 10.5 | 2.1 | 0.84 | 2 |
| 1998 | 814 | 6.7 | 5.8 | 7.7 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 0.96 | 100 | 1 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 0.97 | 0 |
| 1999 | 988 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.3 | 9.5 | 3.3 | 4.8 | 0.9 | 0.84 | 95 | 54 | 8.4 | 7.4 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 5.1 | 8.7 | 1.6 | 0.84 | 5 |
| 2000 | 320 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 8.2 | 9.0 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 0.87 | 100 | 1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 1.04 | 0 |
| 2001 | 537 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 8.3 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 0.84 | 99 | 6 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 0.7 | 0.84 | 1 |
| 2002 | 230 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 0.83 | 100 | 1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 |  | 1.01 | 0 |
| 2003 | 10 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 3.5 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 0.84 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 83 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 0.91 | 95 | 4 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 0.9 | 1.05 | 5 |
| 2008 | 32 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 0.8 | 0.89 | 91 | 3 | 9.9 | 8.6 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 0.83 | 9 |
| 2009 | 90 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 0.8 | 0.88 | 87 | 14 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 7.4 | 14.1 | 2.1 | 0.92 | 13 |
| 2010 | 12 | 8.1 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 4.8 | 6.8 | 1.0 | 0.87 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 295 | 7.8 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 0.92 | 98 | 7 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 1.0 | 1.05 | 2 |
| 2012 | 24 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 0.6 | 0.76 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 10 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 9.5 | 9.5 |  |  |  |  | 59 | 7 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 11.2 | 11.2 |  |  |  |  | 41 |
| All | 17025 | 7.4 | 6.4 | 8.6 | 10.8 | 3.7 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 0.87 | 3E3 | 566 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 10.3 | 12.0 | 5.8 | 9.1 | 1.8 | 0.87 | 143 |

Table 1. Sproat Lake Sockeye annual smolt size statistics (standard fork length (cm), standard fresh weight (g)), by age.


Table 2. Sproat Lake Sockeye annual smolt sampling frequency (dates per year).

Sproat Lk Smolt Abundance Density (Years 1977-2013)

| Sample Dates (Day of Year, Weighted by \#Fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Mean | Max | Std | P05 | P10 | Med | P90 | P95 | \#Fish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 | 122 | 164 | 14 | 101 | 104 | 121 | 142 | 146 | 17,371 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sproat Lk Smolt Abundance Density (Years 1977-2002)

| Sample Dates (Day of Year, Weighted by \#Fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Mean | Max | Std | P05 | P10 | Med | P90 | P95 | \#Fish |
| 90 | 122 | 164 | 14 | 101 | 104 | 121 | 142 | 146 | 16,779 |

Sproat Lk Smolt Abundance Density (Years Where \#Dates >= 5)

| Sample Dates (Day of Year, Weighted by \#Fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min | Mean | Max | Std | P05 | P10 | Med | P90 | P95 | \#Fish |
| 90 | 122 | 164 | 14 | 100 | 104 | 121 | 142 | 145 | 14,432 |

Table 3. Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt "migration timing" statistics, including minimum, mean, maximum (Julian) day of year, standard deviation (days), and $5^{\text {th }}, 10^{\text {th }}, 50^{\text {th }}$ (median), $90^{\text {th }}$ and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentiles, weighted by sample size. Top: all available years; all years where number of sample dates $>=3$; bottom: all years where number of sample dates $>=5$ dates. (Note: Mar $31^{\text {st }}=90 ;$ May $1^{\text {st }}=121 ;$ May $26^{\text {th }}=146$; Jun $13^{\text {th }}=164$ )

Sproat Lk

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Length (cm) |  |  |  | Fresh Std Wt (g) |  |  | K | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Pct } \\ \% \end{gathered}\right.$ |
|  |  | AUG | P10 | P95 | MAX | AUG | P95 | SD |  |  |
| Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 226 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 7.8 | 8.6 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.78 | 88 |
| 1978 | 168 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 4.6 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 0.85 | 99 |
| 1979 | 526 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 2.8 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 0.80 | 82 |
| 1980 | 368 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 8.6 | 10.1 | 4.1 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 0.88 | 84 |
| 1981 | 397 | 8.1 | 7.2 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 4.4 | 6.4 | 1.1 | 0.83 | 71 |
| 1982 | 191 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 0.6 | 0.77 | 48 |
| 1983 | 359 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 0.84 | 90 |
| 1984 | 384 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 8.7 | 9.7 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 0.86 | 77 |
| 1985 | 313 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 0.83 | 100 |
| 1986 | 211 | 8.3 | 7.3 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 4.7 | 7.3 | 1.2 | 0.81 | 98 |
| 1987 | 518 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 0.91 | 92 |
| 1988 | 891 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 9.5 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 0.89 | 77 |
| 1989 | 958 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 8.2 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 0.89 | 85 |
| 1990 | 493 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 0.9 | 0.91 | 81 |
| 1991 | 823 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 3.4 | 4.6 | 0.8 | 0.88 | 77 |
| 1992 | 409 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 1.1 | 0.86 | 94 |
| 1993 | 821 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 8.6 | 9.8 | 4.0 | 5.6 | 1.0 | 0.88 | 89 |
| 1994 | 792 | 7.9 | 6.7 | 9.0 | 10.8 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 0.88 | 77 |
| 1995 | 737 | 7.3 | 6.4 | 8.5 | 9.9 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 1.1 | 0.86 | 71 |
| 1996 | 899 | 7.4 | 6.2 | 8.5 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 5.6 | 1.2 | 0.89 | 67 |
| 1997 | 596 | 7.7 | 6.7 | 8.9 | 10.2 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 1.2 | 0.85 | 68 |
| 1998 | 738 | 6.6 | 5.8 | 7.8 | 8.7 | 2.9 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 0.96 | 91 |
| 1999 | 888 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 8.4 | 9.5 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 0.83 | 85 |

(Continued)
Table 4. Statistics associated with best estimates of Sproat Lake Sockeye annual (ocean entry year) Age 1 mean smolt size (standard fork length (cm), standard fresh weight (g)), based on sampling effort between April $14^{\text {th }}$ and May $22^{\text {nd }}$ each year. Note: Values for 2004, 2005, 2007, 2013-2016 are estimated (Appendix VI).

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Length (cm) |  |  |  | Fresh Std Wt (9) |  |  | K | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pct } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | AUG | P10 | P95 | MAX | AUG | P95 | SD |  |  |
| Year | 300 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 8.2 | 9.0 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 0.87 | 93 |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 465 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 0.84 | 86 |
| 2002 | 155 | 6.8 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 2.7 | 3.8 | 0.6 | 0.85 | 67 |
| 2003 | 10 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 3.5 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 0.84 | 100 |
| 2004 | 1 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 1 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 4.6 | 4.6 |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 83 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 0.91 | 95 |
| 2007 | 1 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 32 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 0.8 | 0.89 | 91 |
| 2009 | 90 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 0.8 | 0.88 | 87 |
| 2010 | 12 | 8.1 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 4.8 | 6.8 | 1.0 | 0.87 | 100 |
| 2011 | 295 | 7.8 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 0.8 | 0.92 | 98 |
| 2012 | 24 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 2.9 | 3.8 | 0.6 | 0.76 | 100 |
| 2013 | 1 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 1 | 7.7 |  |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 1 | 7.7 |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 1 | 7.7 |  |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |
| All | 14179 | 7.4 | 6.4 | 8.7 | 10.8 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 1.1 | 0.87 | 3E3 |

Table 4, continued. Statistics associated with best estimates of Sproat Lake Sockeye annual (ocean entry year) Age 1 mean smolt size (standard fork length (cm), standard fresh weight (g)), based on sampling effort between April 14th and May 22nd each year. Note: Values for 2004, 2005, 2007, 2013-2016 are estimated (Appendix VI).

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Length (cm) |  |  |  | Fresh Sta Wt (9) |  |  | K | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Pc} t \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | AUG | P10 | P95 | MAX | AUG | P95 | SD |  |  |
| Year |  | 7.0 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 0.78 | 5 |
| 1977 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 2 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 0.4 | 0.81 | 1 |
| 1979 | 1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |  | 0.86 | 0 |
| 1980 |  | 8.7 | . |  |  | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 14 | 9.3 | 8.3 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 7.1 | 14.1 | 2.7 | 0.83 | 2 |
| 1982 | 16 | 7.9 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 0.7 | 0.83 | 4 |
| 1983 | 7 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 5.6 | 7.1 | 1.4 | 0.83 | 2 |
| 1984 | 14 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 6.5 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 0.84 | 3 |
| 1985 |  | 7.1 | . |  |  | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 5 | 10.8 | 9.4 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 10.5 | 13.4 | 2.5 | 0.81 | 2 |
| 1987 | 48 | 8.6 | 7.8 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 5.9 | 8.9 | 1.4 | 0.92 | 8 |
| 1988 | 15 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 4.6 | 6.0 | 0.7 | 0.89 | 1 |
| 1989 | 27 | 9.6 | 8.6 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 7.7 | 10.8 | 2.0 | 0.84 | 2 |
| 1990 | 28 | 8.4 | 7.6 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 0.89 | 5 |
| 1991 | 106 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 6.0 | 8.4 | 1.3 | 0.87 | 10 |
| 1992 | 21 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 0.81 | 5 |
| 1993 | 14 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 5.9 | 7.2 | 1.0 | 0.85 | 2 |
| 1994 | 34 | 8.9 | 8.0 | 10.1 | 11.2 | 6.4 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 0.89 | 3 |
| 1995 | 30 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 0.87 | 3 |
| 1996 | 52 | 8.7 | 8.0 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 5.9 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 0.88 | 4 |
| 1997 | 21 | 9.1 | 8.2 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 6.4 | 10.5 | 2.1 | 0.84 | 2 |
| 1998 | 1 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 6.6 |  | 0.97 | 0 |
| 1999 | 54 | 8.4 | 7.4 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 5.1 | 8.7 | 1.6 | 0.84 | 5 |
| 2000 | 1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 1.04 | 0 |
| 2001 | 6 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 0.7 | 0.84 | 1 |
| 2002 | 1 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 |  | 1.01 | 0 |
| 2003 |  | 8.3 |  |  | - | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 |  | 8.5 |  |  |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  | 8.8 | . |  |  | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 4 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 0.9 | 1.05 | 5 |
| 2007 |  | 7.5 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 3 | 9.9 | 8.6 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 0.83 | 9 |
| 2009 | 14 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 7.4 | 14.1 | 2.1 | 0.92 | 13 |
| 2010 |  | 8.3 |  |  |  | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 7 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 1.0 | 1.05 | 2 |

(Continued)
Table 5. Statistics associated with best estimates of Sproat Lake Sockeye annual (ocean entry year) Age 2 mean smolt size (standard fork length (cm), standard fresh weight (g)), based on sampling effort between April $14^{\text {th }}$ and May $22^{\text {nd }}$ each year. Note: Values for 1980, 1985, 2003-2005, 2007, 2010, 2013-2016 are estimated (Appendix VI).

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Length (cm) |  |  |  | Fresh Std Wt (9) |  |  | K | Pct |
|  |  | aug | P10 | P95 | Max | aug | P95 | SD |  |  |
| Year |  | 8.1 | . | . |  | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 8 | 10.3 | 8.1 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 9.8 | 9.8 |  |  | 41 |
| 2014 |  | 8.7 |  |  |  | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  | 8.7 |  |  |  | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  | 8.7 |  |  |  | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |
| AII | 578 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 10.3 | 12.0 | 5.8 | 9.1 | 1.8 | 0.87 | 143 |

## APPENDIX I - Size Statistics by Sample Date

Appendix I. Annual Sockeye smolt size statistics by stock (lake), age class, and sample date.

(Continued)

(Continued)

(Continued)

(Continued)

(Continued)

(Continued)

(Continued)


## APPENDIX II - Seasonal Sample Size

Appendix II. Smolt sample size (number of fish) and percent of total retained catch, by sample date (ages 1 and 2).
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## APPENDIX III - Seasonal Trends in Size

Appendix III. Seasonal time-trends in smolt size (Fork Length, left; Std Weight, right) by sample date and age class. Box and whiskers represent quartiles and extrema, joined at median.
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## APPENDIX IV - Annual Size Frequency Distributions

Appendix IV. Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt size frequency distributions (Fork Length (cm), left;
Std Weight (g), middle; Condition Factor (k), right) by year and age class.
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## APPENDIX V - Annual Length/Weight Relations

Appendix V. Sproat Lake Sockeye smolt length-to-weight relationships
(model: Std Weight $=\mathrm{a} \cdot$ ForkLength $^{\mathrm{b}}$ ) by ocean entry year and age class.

## Stock Sproat Lk

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  | a | b | Rsq | N | a | b | Rsq | N |
| Year | 0.0076 | 3.013 | 0.97 | 241 | 0.0089 | 2.935 | 0.95 | 11 |
| 1977 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 0.0091 | 2.967 | 0.96 | 166 | 0.0778 | 1.959 | 1.00 | 0 |
| 1979 | 0.0099 | 2.892 | 0.86 | 636 | 3.2000 | 0.000 |  | 0 |
| 1980 | 0.0096 | 2.958 | 0.92 | 437 |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 0.0086 | 2.991 | 0.84 | 547 | 0.0046 | 3.260 | 0.90 | 11 |
| 1982 | 0.0076 | 3.069 | 0.68 | 380 | 0.0187 | 2.602 | 0.58 | 14 |
| 1983 | 0.0096 | 2.931 | 0.91 | 392 | 0.0025 | 3.549 | 0.99 | 5 |
| 1984 | 0.0097 | 2.944 | 0.88 | 481 | 0.0097 | 2.933 | 0.90 | 12 |
| 1985 | 0.0095 | 2.929 | 0.91 | 311 |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 0.0083 | 2.991 | 0.93 | 209 | 0.0344 | 2.364 | 1.00 | 0 |
| 1987 | 0.0077 | 3.079 | 0.95 | 516 | 0.0179 | 2.690 | 0.96 | 46 |
| 1988 | 0.0098 | 2.947 | 0.93 | 1133 | 0.0218 | 2.568 | 0.96 | 13 |
| 1989 | 0.0132 | 2.801 | 0.91 | 1097 | 0.0121 | 2.838 | 0.95 | 22 |
| 1990 | 0.0082 | 3.046 | 0.93 | 579 | 0.0209 | 2.596 | 0.89 | 26 |
| 1991 | 0.0132 | 2.794 | 0.92 | 967 | 0.0125 | 2.831 | 0.90 | 104 |
| 1992 | 0.0079 | 3.038 | 0.95 | 410 | 0.0550 | 2.140 | 0.51 | 19 |
| 1993 | 0.0078 | 3.062 | 0.95 | 907 | 0.0112 | 2.874 | 0.73 | 12 |
| 1994 | 0.0074 | 3.086 | 0.97 | 986 | 0.0087 | 3.011 | 0.95 | 31 |

(Continued)

Stock Sproat Lk

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
|  | a | b | Rsq | N | a | b | Rsq | N |
| Year | 0.0057 | 3.205 | 0.95 | 1003 | 0.0104 | 2.914 | 0.96 | 28 |
| 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 0.0051 | 3.271 | 0.95 | 1291 | 0.0081 | 3.039 | 0.89 | 50 |
| 1997 | 0.0112 | 2.861 | 0.91 | 847 | 0.0233 | 2.535 | 0.89 | 17 |
| 1998 | 0.0120 | 2.878 | 0.83 | 812 | 6.6182 | 0.000 |  | 0 |
| 1999 | 0.0065 | 3.129 | 0.93 | 986 | 0.0186 | 2.624 | 0.93 | 51 |
| 2000 | 0.0075 | 3.074 | 0.95 | 318 | 4.0624 | 0.000 |  | 0 |
| 2001 | 0.0078 | 3.035 | 0.95 | 534 | 0.0535 | 2.110 | 0.99 | 4 |
| 2002 | 0.0080 | 3.018 | 0.85 | 228 | 3.9151 | 0.000 |  | 0 |
| 2003 | 0.0019 | 3.749 | 0.91 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 0.0072 | 3.109 | 0.82 | 81 | 0.0476 | 2.294 | 0.98 | 2 |
| 2008 | 0.0188 | 2.649 | 0.86 | 30 | 0.6923 | 1.040 | 0.97 | 1 |
| 2009 | 0.0326 | 2.376 | 0.75 | 91 | 0.0342 | 2.417 | 0.89 | 8 |
| 2010 | 0.0140 | 2.773 | 0.91 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 0.0271 | 2.471 | 0.88 | 292 | 0.2410 | 1.508 | 0.28 | 6 |
| 2012 | 0.0228 | 2.439 | 0.88 | 22 |  |  |  |  |
| Auerage | 0.0107 | 2.957 | 0.90 | 514 | 0.6872 | 2.201 | 0.87 | 18 |

1977 Sproat Lk Sockeye




1980 Sproat Lk Sockeye






1995 Sproat Lk Sockeye




1998 Sproat Lk Sockeye




2001 Sproat Lk Sockeye




2006 Sproat Lk Sockeye





## APPENDIX VI - Annual Pre-Smolt \& Smolt Statistics

Appendix VI. Annual Sockeye smolt size statistics and pre-smolt size and abundance (K. D. Hyatt and D. P. Rankin unpub. data). Stepwise regression analysis retains only presmolt length $(\mathrm{P}=0.001)$ and an interaction term for pre-smolt forklength x week of ATS sample date $(P=0.07)$.

| Smolt Year | ATS Date | Week Since July | Juvenile Sockeye Abundance | Juvenile <br> Sockeye Density | PreSmolt Forklength | Smolt Forklength | Smolt Weight (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 26FEB80 | 35 | 4,624,000 | 1,220 | 69 | 77 | 4.1 |
| 1981 | 20JAN8 1 | 30 | 5,684,000 | 1,550 | 70 | 81 | 4.6 |
| 1982 | 03DEC8 1 | 23 | 8,336,000 | 2,210 |  | 72 | 3.5 |
| 1983 | 02MAR83 | 36 | $8,427,000$ | 2,230 | 63 | 74 | 3.5 |
| 1984 | 28NOU83 | 23 | 9,639,000 | 2,550 | 64 | 79 | 4.3 |
| 1985 | $010 \mathrm{CT84}$ | 14 | 19,564,000 | 5,180 | 52 | 64 | 2.2 |
| 1986 | 27SEP85 | 13 | 6,970,000 | 1,850 |  | 83 | 4.7 |
| 1987 | 3000 T86 | 18 | 5,037,000 | 1,320 | 64 | 77 | 4.3 |
| 1988 | 27JAN88 | 31 | 8,890,000 | 2,350 | 66 | 72 | 3.5 |
| 1989 | 01 N0U88 | 19 | 9,187,000 | 2,430 | 67 | 75 | 3.8 |
| 1990 | 180CT89 | 16 | 11,183,000 | 2,960 |  | 77 | 4.2 |
| 1991 | 06FEB9 1 | 32 | 8,541,000 | 2,260 |  | 72 | 3.4 |
| 1992 | 160CT91 | 16 | 5,883,000 | 1,560 | 73 | 82 | 4.8 |
| 1993 | 260CT92 | 18 | 3,373,000 | 890 | 68 | 77 | 3.9 |
| 1994 | 27JUL93 | 5 | 5,990,000 | 2,700 |  | 79 | 4.4 |
| 1995 | 31 J AN95 | 31 | 5,895,000 | 1,560 | 67 | 73 | 3.3 |
| 1996 | 30JAN96 | 31 | 9,780,000 | 1,720 | 58 | 74 | 3.7 |
| 1997 | 26FEB97 | 35 | 4,761,000 | 1,270 | 73 | 77 | 4.0 |
| 1998 | 19NOU97 | 21 | 18,123,000 | 4,970 | 51 | 66 | 2.9 |
| 1999 | 01 DEC98 | 23 | 8,233,000 | 2,180 | 64 | 73 | 3.6 |
| 2000 | $30 \mathrm{NOU99}$ | 23 | 8,462,000 | 2,240 | 67 | 73 | 3.4 |
| 2001 | 28NOVOO | 23 | 9,679,000 | 2,560 | 55 | 67 | 2.4 |
| 2002 | 05DEC01 | 23 | 7,478,000 | 2,070 | 68 | 68 | 2.8 |
| 2003 | 16JAN03 | 29 | 4,773,000 | 1,264 | 74 | 74 | 3.5 |
| 2004 | 19JANO4 | 30 | 8,637,000 | 2,290 | 67 | . | . |
| 2005 | 26JAN05 | 31 | 6,703,000 | 1,775 | 74 |  |  |
| 2006 | OYJAN06 | 27 | 3,525,000 | 934 | 74 | 79 | 4.6 |
| 2007 | 07FEB07 | 32 | 3,660,000 | 970 | 67 |  |  |
| 2008 | 09NOUOT | 19 | 5,048,000 | 1,351 | 73 | 84 | 5.4 |
| 2009 | 01 DEC08 | 23 | 6,017,000 | 1,594 | 72 | 83 | 5.3 |
| 2010 | $30 \mathrm{NOVO9}$ | 23 | 4,980,000 | 600 |  | 81 | 5.5 |
| 2011 | $30 \mathrm{NOU10}$ | 23 | 14,526,189 | 3,848 | 66 | 78 | 5.0 |
| 2012 | 21 NOU11 | 22 | 13,444,391 | 3,561 | 62 | 72 | 2.9 |
| 2013 | 26FEB13 | 35 | 14,526,189 | 3,848 | 60 | . | . |
| 2014 | 19NOU13 | 21 | 3,687,000 | 1,000 | 70 |  |  |
| 2015 | 17FEB15 | 34 | 1,210,000 | 321 | 76 | . | . |
| 2016 | 17FEB16 | 34 | 4,150,000 | 1,099 | 75 | . | . |

(Continued)
Annual Smolt and Pre-Smolt Size Data
The REG Procedure
Model MODELI
Dependent Uariable: SmoltForklength SmoltForklength

| Number of Observations Read | 37 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Observations Used | 24 |


| Analysis of Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source |  | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F Ualue | $\operatorname{Pr}>\mathrm{F}$ |
| Model <br> Error Corrected | Total | 1 | 372.50708 | $\begin{array}{r} 372.50708 \\ 11.92960 \end{array}$ | 31.23 | $<.0001$ |
|  |  | 22 | 262.45126 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 23 | 634.95833 |  |  |  |
|  | Root MSE |  | 3.45393 | R-Square | 0.5867 |  |
|  | Dependent | Mean | 74.95833 | Adj R-Sq | 0.5679 |  |
|  | Coeff Var |  | 4.60779 |  |  |  |

Parameter Estimates

| Variable | Label | DF | Parameter Estimate | Standard Error | t Value | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|t\|$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```Intercept PreSmoltForklength``` | ```Intercept PreSmoltForklength``` | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 34.59493 \\ 0.61304 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.25759 \\ & 0.10971 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.77 \\ & 5.59 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <.0001 \\ & <.0001 \end{aligned}$ |

Annual Smolt and Pre-Smolt Size Data
The REG Procedure
Model: MODEL4
Dependent Variable: Smoltforklength Smoltforklength
Number of Observations Read
Number of Observations Used
13
Number of Observations with Missing Ualues

| Analysis of Variance |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | DF | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F Value | Pr > F |
| Model | 3 | 417.91714 | 139.30571 | 12.84 | <. 0001 |
| Error | 20 | 217.04119 | 10.85206 |  |  |
| Corrected Total | 23 | 634.95833 |  |  |  |


| Root MSE | 3.29425 | R-Square | 0.6582 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Dependent Mean | 74.95833 | AdjR-Sq | 0.6069 |
| Coeff Var | 4.39477 |  |  |

Parameter Estimates

| Variable | Label | DF | Parameter Estimate | Standard Error | t Value | $\operatorname{Pr}>\|t\|$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | Intercept | 1 | 181.72125 | 143.86638 | 1.26 | 0.2211 |
| Year | Smolt Year | 1 | -0.05310 | 0.07207 | -0.74 | 0.4698 |
| STD_PreSmoltForklength | PreSmoltForklength | 1 | 3.47 . | 0.75856 | 4.58 | 0.0002 |
| STD_Presmolt_Inter_Time | Presmolt $\times$ Week | 1 | -1.647Ч3 | 0.83956 | -1.96 | 0.0638 |

## APPENDIX VII - Annual Size-at-Age Correlation

Appendix VII. Correlation of mean annual age 2 versus age 1 smolt forklength (cm; top) and standard weight (grams; bottom), 1977-2012. For use in estimating missing mean annual age 2 size (see Appendix VIII).

Sproat Lake Sockeye - Mean Annual Forklength


Regression Equation:
FL_Age2 $=-0.773883+1.241411$ *FL_Age 1


## APPENDIX VIII - Mean Annual Size Statistics by Age Class

Appendix VIII. Observed mean annual smolt forklength (cm; top) and standard weight (grams; bottom), 1977 - 2012, with sample sizes, by age class. For use in estimating missing mean annual age 2 size (see Appendix VII). Note years where $\mathrm{N}<10$ for age 2 fish.

Sproat Lake Sockeye - Mean Annual Forklength


Sproat Lake Sockeye - Mean Annual Std Weight


## APPENDIX IX - Sample Meta-Data

Appendix IX. Sample meta-data, including total catch (where available) and total fish sampled by sample date, sample site, gear type, agency (sampling crews: PBS-DFO, consultants) and fish preservative code and type.

|  |  |  |  | FYKE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Catch | Sampled |
| Year <br> 1977 | Date | Agency | Preservative |  |  |
|  | $05 M A Y T 7$ | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 10 |
|  | 0 OMAYT7 | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 87 |
|  | 11 MAYTT | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 141 |
|  | 25MAY7 | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 8 |
|  | 26MAY77 | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 10 |
| 1978 | 25APR78 | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 99 |
|  | $10 \mathrm{MAY} \mathrm{C}^{1}$ | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 16 |
|  | 17 MAY 78 | PBS | 99 Formalin |  | 55 |
| 1979 | $18 \mathrm{APR79}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 108 |
|  | 25APRT9 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 115 |
|  | 01 MAY79 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | $09 M A Y 79$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | 15 MAY 79 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 104 |
|  | 23MAY79 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 106 |
|  | 30 MAY 9 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 7 |
| 1980 | 21 APR80 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 108 |
|  | 28APR80 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 85 |
|  | 05 MAY 80 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | 15 MAY80 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 75 |
|  | 26MAY80 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 71 |
| 1981 | 28APR81 |  | 01 Formalin |  | 140 |
|  | $05 \mathrm{MAY81}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 58 |
|  | 11 MAY81 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 148 |
|  | $19 \mathrm{MAYB1}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 62 |
|  | 25MAY81 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | O2JUNS 1 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 55 |
| 1982 | $30 \mathrm{APR82}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | $13 \mathrm{MAY8Z}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | $26 \mathrm{MAY82}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 198 |
| 1983 | $19 \mathrm{APR83}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | 26APR83 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 99 |
|  | $10 \mathrm{MAY83}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | $17 \mathrm{MAY83}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 67 |
|  | 25MAY83 | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 35 |
| 1984 | 16APR84 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | 25APR84 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
|  | $07 \mathrm{MAY84}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 99 |
|  | $16 \mathrm{MAY84}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 98 |
|  | 28MAY84 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 100 |
| 1985 | 24 APR85 | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 152 |
|  | 01 MAY85 15 MAY85 | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 13 148 1 |
| 1986 | 15MAY85 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 148 113 |
|  | 13 MAY 86 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 103 |
| 1987 | 14 APRET | PBS | 01 Formalin | 23 | 29 |
|  | 21 APR87 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 180 | 191 |
|  | 29APR87 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 85 | 119 |
|  | $05 \mathrm{MAY87}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 95 | 100 |
| 1987 | $12 \mathrm{MAY87}$ |  | 01 Formalin | 87 | 98 |
|  | $20 \mathrm{MAYB7}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 25 | 27 |
|  | 28MAY87 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 1 | 1 |
|  | $04 J$ UN87 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 1 | 1 |
| 1988 | 05 APR88 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 4 |
|  | $13 \mathrm{APR88}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 20 APR88 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 28APR88 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | $04 \mathrm{MAY88}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 11 MAY88 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 123 |
|  | 18MAY88 | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 168 |
|  | 25MAY88 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 47 |
|  | $02 \mathrm{JUN88}$ | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 8 |
| 1989 | 06APR89 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 20 |
|  | 13 APR89 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 102 |
|  | 19 APR89 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 69 |
|  | 27 APR89 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 288 |
|  | $03 \mathrm{MAY89}$ | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 223 |
|  | $10 \mathrm{MAY89}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 199 |
|  | $17 \mathrm{MAY89}$ | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 179 |
|  | 25MAY89 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 13 |
|  | $04 \mathrm{APR9} 0$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 4 |
| 1990 | $10 \mathrm{APR9} 0$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 69 |
|  | $18 \mathrm{APR90}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 136 |
|  | 25APR90 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 164 |
|  | $02 \mathrm{MAY90}$ | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 15 |
|  | $03 \mathrm{MAY90}$ $10 \mathrm{MAY90}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 145 |
|  | $10 \mathrm{MAY90}$ | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 145 45 |
|  | 24 MAYGO | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 13 |
|  | 31 MAY90 | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 9 |
|  | O6JUN90 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 1 |
|  | 13 JUNG 0 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 3 |
| 1991 | $10 \mathrm{APR9} 1$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 238 | 200 |
|  | $17 \mathrm{APR9} 1$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 108 | 106 |
|  | 24APR91 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 177 | 166 |
|  | 01 MAY91 | PBS | 01 Formal in | 228 | 200 |
|  | 08 MAY 1 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 563 | 200 |
|  | $15 \mathrm{MAY9} 1$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 169 | 170 |
|  | 22MAY91 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 8 | 7 |
| 1992 | 31 MAR92 | PBS | 01 Formal in | 27 | 26 3 |
|  | 07 PrR92 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 4 |
|  | $14 \mathrm{APR92}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 7 |
|  | 21 APR92 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 152 |

(Continued)

|  |  |  |  | FYKE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Catch | Sampled |
| Year 1992 | Date | Agency | Preservative |  |  |
|  | $28 \mathrm{APR92}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 174 |
|  | $05 \mathrm{MAY92}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 86 |
|  | $12 \mathrm{MAY92}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 7 |
| 1993 | $30 \mathrm{MAR93}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 0 |
|  | 06 APR93 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 2 | 2 |
|  | 14 APR93 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 141 | 135 |
|  | 21 APR93 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 428 | 195 |
|  | 28APR93 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 618 | 198 |
|  | $05 \mathrm{MAY93}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 108 | 106 |
|  | $12 \mathrm{MAY93}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 160 | 162 |
|  | $19 \mathrm{MAY93}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 29 | 25 |
|  | $27 \mathrm{MAY93}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 70 | 72 |
|  | 02JUN93 | PBS | 01 Formal in | 11 | 11 |
|  | 08JUN93 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 3 | 3 |
|  | $16 \mathrm{JUN93}$ $31 \mathrm{MAR94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 0 | 0 99 |
| 1994 | $07 \mathrm{APR94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 89 |
|  | $14 \mathrm{APR94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | $20 \mathrm{APR94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 72 |
|  | $27 \mathrm{APR94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 05 MAY 94 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | $12 \mathrm{MAY94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 132 |
|  | $18 \mathrm{MAY94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 12 |
|  | 26MAY94 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 14 |
|  | $02 \mathrm{JUN94}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 5 |
| 1995 | 05 APR95 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 33 |
|  | 12 APR95 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 20 |
|  | $19 \mathrm{APR95}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 27 APR95 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | $04 \mathrm{MAY95}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 214 | 214 |
|  | $10 \mathrm{MAY95}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 33 |
|  | $18 \mathrm{MAY95}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 115 |
|  | $25 \mathrm{MAY95}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 01 JUNS5 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 20 |
| 1996 | 02APR96 | PBS | 01 Formal in |  | 181 |
|  | 11 APR96 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 181 |
|  | 18 APRGG | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | 25APR96 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 125 |
|  | $30 \mathrm{APR96}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 |
|  | $09 \mathrm{MAY96}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 180 |
|  | $16 \mathrm{MAY96}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 217 |
|  | 23MAY96 $30 \mathrm{MAY96}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 200 41 |
|  | $10 \mathrm{APR97}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 364 | 41 260 |
| 1997 | 15APR97 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 60 |
|  | 17 APR97 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 11 | 10 |
| 1997 |  | PBS | 01 Formalin |  |  |
|  | $01 \text { MAY97 }$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 143 | 138 |
|  | $08 \mathrm{MAY97}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 100 | 59 |
|  | $16 \mathrm{MAYg7}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 25 175 | 18 |
|  | 22MAY97 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 175 | 126 |
| 1998 | 16APR98 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 158 |
|  | 23APR98 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 50 |
|  | $30 \mathrm{APR98}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 210 |
|  | $07 \mathrm{MAY98}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 350 |
|  | $13 \mathrm{MAY98}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 85 |
|  | 28MAY98 | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 104 250 |
| 1999 | 14 APR99 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 200 | 200 |
|  | 22APR99 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 160 | 160 |
|  | 28APRg9 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 400 | 230 |
|  | $05 \mathrm{MAY99}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 190 | 190 |
|  | 12 MAYg | PBS | 01 Formalin | 130 | 130 |
|  | $19 \mathrm{MAY99}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin | 183 | 183 104 |
|  | 02JUNS9 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 104 6 | 104 |
| 2000 | 27 APR00 | Consultant | 01 Formalin | 62 | 55 |
|  | 03 MAY 0 | Consultant | 01 Formalin | 340 | 132 |
|  | 10 MAYOO | Consultant | 01 Formalin | 100 | 100 |
|  | 18 MAY00 | Consultant | 01 Formalin | 14 | 14 |
|  | 31 MAY00 | Consultant | 01 Formalin | 20 120 | 20 |
| 2001 | 11 APRO1 18 APRO | PBS | 01 Formalin | 120 400 400 | $\begin{array}{r}75 \\ 200 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  | 26APR01 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 400 | 200 |
|  | 13 MAYO 1 | PBS | 01 Formalin | 100 | 69 |
| 2002 | $02 \mathrm{MAY0Z}$ | PBS | 02 Ethanol |  | 113 |
|  | $07 \mathrm{MAY02}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 38 |
|  | $14 \mathrm{MAY02}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 5 |
|  | 23MAY02 $30 \mathrm{MAY02}$ | PBS | 01 Formalin |  | 22 53 |
|  | 07 MAY 03 | PBS | 12 Frozen |  | 10 |
| 2006 | O8MAY0G | PBS | 12 Ethanol | 87 | 87 |
| 2008 | 28APR08 | PBS | 02 Ethanol |  | 35 |
| 2009 | 15APR09 | PBS | 02 Ethanol | 146 | 92 |
|  | $05 M A Y 09$ | PBS | 02 Ethanol | 10 | 12 |
| 2010 | 19APR10 | PBS | 02 Ethanol | 2 | 2 |
| 2011 | 05MAY10 | PBS | 02 Ethanol |  | 10 204 |
|  | 08 MAY 11 | PBS | 02 Ethanol |  | 99 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2012 \\ & 2013 \\ & \text { A11 } \end{aligned}$ | 23APR12 | PBS | 02 Ethanol |  | 24 |
|  | 02APR13 | PBS | 02 Ethanol |  | 17 |
|  |  |  |  | 8,097 | 18,100 |

## APPENDIX X - Data Issues

Smolt data collected over the years have been managed in a variety of ways, but data storage is divided into two basic formats:

1. SAS Database - For the years 1977-1996, smolt size, age and meta-data were keypunched and uploaded into structured SAS datasets. Subsequently, SAS programming procedures for smolt data management was replaced with unstructured spreadsheet workbook files.
2. Excel Workbooks - As of 1997, smolt size and age data were managed in Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, in different formats and data structures. Field trip meta-data were usually stored in separate Excel spreadsheets (Survey Trip Reports, or STRs) and/or in data spreadsheets specific to stock-year-sample-date. File naming conventions and data structures were not always adhered to.
To collate all datasets into one location for compilation and analysis, a spreadsheet-based inventory was created to track the file locations and contents of the Excel workbook files.
Smolt Data Inventory.xlsx is a meta-data inventory spreadsheet documenting the existence of smolt survey datasets based on information collated from STRs and known smolt sample spreadsheets. The Inventory spreadsheet data is organized by smolt ocean entry year, lake/stock (GCL/Sproat/Henderson only), sample site and sample date. For each record, the following variables are listed (where available): Trip, Sample Number, Sample Type ( $1=$ Smolt, 2=ATS (excluded from smolt analyses)), \#Sets, SoakTime, Total Catch, Total Retained (sample), Crew or Agency, fish Preservation Code and Preservative Type (used to identify appropriate conversion to "standard" fresh weight), Gear Code and Gear Type, Size Data Resolution (individual Fish, or summarized by Date or Year), Comments, and Data Source (filename and location).

This assisted in the compilation of the smolt survey observations, i.e. the individual fish meristics, standard weights, and age data. The raw data were organized in Smolt Size Data 1997-2018.xlsx. The individual fish size and age data, where available, have been retrieved from the data sources identified in Smolt Data Inventory.xlsx and consolidated into stock-specific tabs (GCL, SPR, etc) to structure the data by Stock, Sample Date, Sample Number and Fish Number. Meta-data include Species Code, Gear Code, Site Code, Lab Processor, and Notes. Size data include ForkLength (fresh only), and may include either Preserved Wet Weight or Fresh Standard Weight, or both. Age data include (where available) Scale Book Number, Scale Number, Scale Quality and Scale Age. In the absence of scale age data, an Assigned Age may be applied. The Final Age value is set to the Scale Age or Assigned Age, and is used as the fish's age class in analyses.

Age Data - Between 1977 and 1986, all fish captured and retained were scale-sampled for age analysis. After 1986, scale sampling was reduced in scope, and focused on fish in the overlapping age range of $75-90 \mathrm{~mm}$, with few fish $<70 \mathrm{~mm}$ (assumed age 1) or $>90$ mm (assumed age 2) in fork length scale-sampled. In many cases, scale sampling did not occur at all, or was limited by sample size, or did occur but the scales were never aged. In-season analyses by sampling crews often assumed all unaged fish were age 1 (not unreasonable for Henderson Lake Sockeye, or perhaps Sproat Lake Sockeye, but potentially problematic for Great Central Lake Sockeye with its larger proportion of age

2 fish in the population), or assigned to age based on a conventional threshold that varied between years and stocks from $70-90 \mathrm{~mm}$. The misclassification of fish age may lead to directional biases in annual smolt size summaries. If many average-sized fish are left unaged, while all small and big fish are assigned, then the mean size of age 1 s will be biased downward, and age 2 mean size would be biased upward. To reduce the potential bias in age classification, the following procedures were applied to smolt survey data with missing ages (1987-2018):

1. Where Scale Age exists and is not ambiguous or erroneous, the Final Age was set to the Scale Age.
2. An Assigned Age can be used to overrule Scale Age (if erroneous or ambiguous).
3. In the absence of Scale Age or Assigned Age, Final Age is set for very small and very large fish based on unambiguous size rules associated with fork length (e.g. If Forklength $<70 \mathrm{~mm}$, Final Age $=1$; If ForkLength $>100 \mathrm{~mm}$, Final Age $=2$, etc).
4. For mid-range sizes ( $70-100 \mathrm{~mm}$ ), bimodality in the size distributions can be used to classify unaged fish to age in some years. However, high overlap in size distributions between age classes, plus a general trend for larger fish emigrating earlier in the season, required some attention to sample timing and proportions by age at specific size classes. Thus:
a. Year-specific age proportions from scale data by year, month (April versus May/June) and 5 mm length class were used to classify unaged fish to age class. For example, if scale analysis indicated $80 \%$ of aged fish $90-95 \mathrm{~mm}$ in length in April 1999 were age 1, then the smallest (by weight) 8 of 10 unaged fish in that size class in 1999 were assigned age 1, and the largest 2 of 10 fish were assigned age 2. Age proportions for May-June would be applied to classify unaged fish in subsequent months. For very low sample sizes of unaged fish (e.g. <10 fish), the default age assignment was age 1 since age 1 fish are predominant in the population. In the absence of age data from scale samples for a given year, the multi-year age proportions by forklength size class were used to assign age.
b. Fish-specific age assignments were entered into the Assigned Age column in the spreadsheet, and thereby incorporated into the Final Age value.
c. Assigned ages for the Excel spreadsheet data (1997-2018) are recorded and annotated in Smolt Size Data 1997-2018.xlsx.
d. Unassigned age classes in mid-sized length range the SAS database data (1986-1996) were programmatically defaulted to age 1, with individual fish re-assignments to age 2 as tabulated below.

Data Omissions - Outliers and anomalies that were omitted from analyses included:

1. Rare ages - fish aged 0 omitted.

## 2. Outliers

a. 08-May-11 - Fish\# 1, forklength 170 mm , std weight 39 g

Other - In 1992 and 1994, smolt surveys occurred on March 31st. For plotting purposes, the survey date was reassigned to April 1st of the year for these samples.

Age Re-assignments - The following unaged fish were assigned to age 2 programmatically based on forklength, month, and available age proportion data, by sample date and fish number.

|  |  |  |  | Fork Length | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Final } \\ & \text { Age } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year <br> 1987 | Date | Fish | Metric Size Class |  |  |
|  | 21 APR87 | 185 | forklength 76-80 | 78 | 2 |
|  | 29APR87 | 2 | forklength 76-80 | 78 | 2 |
|  | $05 M A Y 87$ | 64 | forklength 76-80 | 79 | 2 |
|  | $12 \mathrm{MAY87}$ | 1 | forklength 76-80 | 79 | 2 |
|  | $20 M A Y 87$ | 14 | forklength 76-80 | 78 | 2 |
|  |  | 26 | forklength 76-80 | 78 | 2 |
|  | 28MAY87 | 1 | forklength 76-80 | 79 | 2 |
|  | $04 J$ UN8 7 | 1 | forklength 76-80 | 78 | 2 |
| 1988 | 13 APR88 | 3 | forklength 81-83 | 83 | 2 |
|  |  | 17 | forklength 76-80 | 80 | 2 |
|  |  | 33 | forklength 84-89 | 89 | 2 |
|  |  | 34 | forklength 76-80 | 80 | 2 |
|  |  | 53 | forklength 70-75 | 75 | 2 |
|  |  | 78 | forklength 70-75 | 75 | 2 |
|  |  | 99 | forklength 81-83 | 83 | 2 |
|  |  | 103 | forklength 76-80 | 80 | 2 |
|  |  | 119 | forklength 70-75 | 75 | 2 |
|  |  | 134 | forklength 84-89 | 86 | 2 |
|  |  | 170 | forklength 76-80 | 80 | 2 |
|  |  | 179 | forklength 81-83 | 83 | 2 |
|  |  | 188 | forklength 70-75 | 75 | 2 |
|  |  | 189 | forklength 70-75 | 75 | 2 |
|  |  | 200 | forklength 76-80 | 80 | 2 |
| 1991 | 10 APR9 1 | 20 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 80 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 90 | forklength 70-75 | 75 | 2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1994 \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $14 \mathrm{APR9} 4$ | 68 | forklength 81-83 | 83 | 2 |
|  | 05APR95 | 22 | forklength 76-83 | 79 | 2 |
|  |  | 27 | forklength 76-83 | 82 | 2 |
|  | $19 \mathrm{APR95}$ | 28 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 31 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 51 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 55 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 56 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 57 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 65 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 67 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 86 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 94 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 96 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 108 | forklength 70-75 | 74 | 2 |
|  |  | 118 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 180 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  | 27 APR95 | 19 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
|  |  | 181 | forklength 70-75 | 73 | 2 |
| 1996 | 11 APR96 | 7 | forklength 76-83 | 92 | 2 |
|  |  | 8 | forklength 76-83 | 87 | 2 |
|  |  | 72 | forklength 76-83 | 80 | 2 |
|  |  | 128 | forklength 76-83 | 81 | 2 |
|  |  | 154 | forklength 76-83 | 80 | 2 |
| 1996 | 11 APR96 | 181 | forklength 76-83 | 81 |  |
|  | $18 \mathrm{APR96}$ | 62 | forklength 87-97 | 92 | 2 |
|  |  | 73 | forklength 87-97 | 89 | 2 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Salmon in Regional Ecosystems Program, and
    ${ }^{2}$ Retired, Science Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans Pacific Biological Station, British Columbia, V9R 5K6

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Fulton fish condition factor $(\mathrm{K})$ is an index of fish 'health' that relates fish weight to length, and is influenced by age of fish, sex, season, maturation stage, fullness of gut, type of food consumed, amount of fat reserve, and degree of muscular development (Fulton 1902; in Barnham and Baxter 1998). $\mathrm{K}=10^{5} \mathrm{x} \mathrm{W} / \mathrm{L}^{3}$, where $\mathrm{W}=$ Standard weight $(\mathrm{g})$ and $\mathrm{L}=$ forklength (cm). K generally ranges from 0.5 ("poor condition") to 2.0 ("good condition"), with $\mathrm{K}<=1$ for long, thin fish such as salmonid fry and smolts.
    ${ }^{2}$ For leap years, day-of-year was advanced by one day beginning in March to account for February 29th.
    ${ }^{3}$ For some figures, the Fulton fish condition factor (K) is multiplied by 10 for plotting purposes.
    ${ }^{4}$ Winter pre-smolt (fry) size and abundance estimates from Hyatt et al. (2016) and K. Hyatt, DFO Pacific Biological Station (unpub. data).
    ${ }^{5}$ Data issues are listed in Appendix X.
    ${ }^{6}$ Smolt data are available upon request. Contact Kim.Hyatt @dfo-mpo.gc.ca.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ Note that in 1980, 1985, 2003, 2010, and 2012, no age 2 smolts were found in sampled fish, therefore the predicted age 2 fork length is hypothetical for those years.

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ Weight data were not available for fish sampled in 2013 due to poor quality of fish preservation.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Smolt size data are insufficient or N/A.

