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#### Abstract

Average fecundities of 1 SW ( 50 cm ) and MSW salmon ( 70 cm ) from the Miramichi River were estimated to be 2,552 and 6,374 eggs, respectively, from 256 female samples collected in 1982 and 1983. Egg deposition requirements for the Miramichi, assuming a deposition rate of 2.4 eggs $\cdot \mathrm{m}^{-2}$, were calculated to be 132 X $10^{6}$ eggs. Numbers of MSW salmon required to produce these eggs were 23,600 ( $\pm 1800$ ), with another $22,600( \pm 1800)$ lSW salmon being required to ensure one male spawner for each MSW female.

Historically, ISW salmon contributed about $30 \%$ to the total egg deposition in the Miramichi River ( 1971 to 1983), which is substantially greater than egg deposition by 1 SW fish in the Restigouche (1\%) or St. John rivers (2\%). However, for estimating target spawners in the Miramichi, relying on MSW salmon for providing eggs has two main advantages: (1) MSW salmon returns can be predicted one year in advance and thus spawning requirements can be taken into account before fishing allocations are made each year, and (2) most MSW salmon are females and their high fecundities mean that less spawning biomass is required to achieve target egg depositions, compared to 1 SW salmon.


## RESUNT

La fértilité moyenne du saumon de la rivière Míramichi a été estimée à 2552 oeufs, pour le saumon ayant passé un an en mer ( 50 cm ), et à 6374 oeufs, pour le saumon ayant passé plusieurs années en mer ( 70 cm ), d'aprè̀s 256 échantillons de femelles recueillis en 1982 et en 1983. On a calculé que la quantité d'oeufs nécessaire serait de $132 \times 10^{6}$ pour la rivière Miramichi, si l'on suppose un taux de ponte de 2,4 oeufs..m ${ }^{-2}$. Pour produire un telle quantité d'oeufs, il fallait 23600 ( $\pm 1800$ ) saumons ayant passé plusieurs années en mer auxquels s'ajoutent $2260 \overline{0}( \pm 1800)$ saumons ayant passé un an en mer pour qu'il y ait un géniteur mâle pour chaque femelle ayant passé plusieurs années en mer.

Depuis longtemps, le saumon ayant passe un an en mer intervient pour environ $30 \%$ de la quantité totale d'oeufs pondus dans la rivière Miramichi (de 1971 à 1983). Cette contribution est nettement plus élevée que celle du saumon de même classe dans les rivières Restigouche ( $1 \%$ ) et Saint-Jean ( $2 \%$ ). Cependant, pour estimer le nombre de géniteurs cible dans la rivière Miramichi, le fait de se fier au saumon ayant passé plusieurs années en mer présente deux avantages principaux : 1) le nombre de saumons ayant passé plusieurs années en mer, qui reviennent dans la rivière, peut être prévu un an d'avance, ce qui permet de tenir compte des besoins de frai avant d'établir les prises admissibles pour chaque année; 2) la plupart des saumons ayant passé plus d'un an en mer sont des femelles et, comme elles sont très fertiles, il faut une biomasse de poissons en phase de frai moins élevée que dans le cas du saumon ayant passé un an en mer pour atteindre le niveau de ponte visé.

## INTRODUCTION

Atlantic salmon of the Miramichi River usually mature after one (lSW salmon) or two (2SW) winters at sea. Relative abundance of $1 S W$ salmon increased dramatically in the mid $1960^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$, from $50 \%$ to over $80 \%$ of the spawning run (Ruggles and Turner 1973); this change was attributed to increased fishing mortality of 2 SW salmon. Because of the change in age composition of spawners, the reproductive capacity of Miramichi salmon was reduced.

Spawning potential of Miramichi salmon in recent years (1971 to 1982) was estimated by Randall and Chadwick (1983), assuming a relative fecundity of 1,764 eggs per kilogram for both $1 S W$ and $2 S W$ salmon. This fecundity was based on studies of salmon from other rivers. However, fecundity of Atlantic salmon has been shown to be stock specific (Pope et al. 1961; Glebe et al. 1979), and extrapolating from one population to another may be misleading. Unfortunately, very little information on fecundity of Miramichi salmon has been published. Belding (1940) counted eggs from 163 salmon collected in 1930 , but his sample included only 2 SW and older salmon, and he did not specify exactly where his fish were collected. Glebe et al. (1979) reported the fecundity of salmon from Rocky Brook, a small tributary of the Southwest Miramichi, but their sample was small (28) and it was also restricted to 2 SW salmon.

This study was undertaken to determine the fecundity of 1 SW and 2SW salmon in the Miramichi River. The relative importance of lSW salmon to spawning is identified and compared to other New Brunswick rivers. Numbers of spawners required to attain adequate egg deposition in the Miramichi River are recalculated from Randall and Chadwick (1983), using the new information on fecundity.

METHODS

## 1. Egg deposition requirements

The required egg deposition rate was assumed to be 2.4 eggs. $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ (Elson 1975). Total area of juvenile salmon rearing habitat was estimated from aerial photographs (Amiro 1983). Egg deposition requirements were calculated as:
(1) Egg requirements $=$ deposition rate $X$ rearing area.
2. Fecundity

Ovaries from 256 salmon were collected from the following locations in 1982 and 1983:
$\underline{1982} \underline{1983}$
Miramichi Bay $53 \quad 4$
Millbank 71 7146
Northwest Miramichi 10 27
Southwest Miramichi 16
TOTAL
150
106

Samples from Miramichi Bay were from commercial drift net fishermen at Escuminac, and Millbank samples were from the estuarial counting trap. Both Miramichi Bay and Millbank salmon were assumed to be random samples of Miramichi salmon. Ovaries collected from the Northwest Miramichi came from angling mortalities from several locations on the main Northwest and Sevogle rivers; samples from the Southwest Miramichi River came from two angling camps close to the mouth of the tributary, and thus represented random samples of salmon entering this river. Sample sizes from the Northwest and Southwest rivers were kept proportional to the rearing area of each tributary.

Ovaries were collected from June to September each year. Egg samples were placed in Gilson's fluid until ovarian tissue broke down, and then transferred to $10 \%$ formalin to harden the eggs. All egg samples were counted in their entirety. Other information recorded for each fish included: fork length ( cm ), weight (nearest 0.1 kg ), sampling location, date, gear and age (from scales).

Fecundity was recorded as total fecundity (total eggs per fish) for each sea-age group. Length-fecundity relationships were calculated after both fork lengths and total fecundity were transformed (natural logarithms); the rationale for using this transformation is discussed by Pope et al. (1961) and Healey and Heard (1984).

## 3. Biological characteristics

Biological characteristics of spawning salmon entering the Miramichi River from 1971 to 1982 were summarized by Randall and Chadwick (1983). These data were re-examined to estimate fork lengths and proportions at sea age for 2 SW and 3 SW salmon separately. Also, sex ratios were re-calculated to include both sacrificed salmon (as in Randall and Chadwick 1983), and external sexing of salmon beginning in early August. Similar data for adults sampled in 1983 were added. Sea-ages of salmon in this report are identified as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \mathrm{SW}=\text { one sea winter } \\
& 2 S W=\text { two sea winter } \\
& 3 \mathrm{SW}=\text { three sea winter and older } \\
& \mathrm{MSW}=\text { two sea winter and older } \\
& \mathrm{PS}=\text { previous spawner }
\end{aligned}
$$

For calculating long-term means of proportions (sex ratios and proportions-at-age), arcsine transformations (Zar 1974) and weighted means were used.

## 4. Eggs per fish

Average eggs per fish each year from 1971 to 1983 were calculated as:
(2) Eggs per fish $=$ fecundity $X$ proportion female $X$ proportion at sea age
where fecundity was calculated from length-fecundity relationships (see pg. 6). Eggs per fish were calculated for each sea-age separately and then summed to determine total eggs per fish, regardless of age.

## 5. Numbers of required spawners

Three methods were used to estimate the number of $1 S W$ and MSW salmon required for spawning in the Miramichi River:

Method 1: This was the method used in previous assessments of Miramichi salmon (Randall and Chadwick 1983), but updated parameter values were used here. Eggs per fish were calculated using equation (2), and fork lengths, sex ratios and proportions at sea age from Millbank ( 1971 to 1983). Required spawners were calculated by dividing the required eggs by the average eggs per fish, and proportioned into 1 SW and MSW salmon based on the average lSW/MSW ratio at Millbank (1971 to 1983).

Method 2: MSW salmon required for spawning were calculated presuming all eggs came from MSW salmon. Eggs per MSW salmon were calculated as the product of fecundity and proportion females. Numbers of 1SW salmon required were calculated assuming that at least one male spawner was needed for each female MSW spawner.

Method 3: This method assumed egg deposition came from both 1 SW and MSW salmon, as in Method 1 , but the overall sex ratio at spawning was set at l:1. Required spawners were calculated using simultaneous equations (see pg. 8) and average (1971 to 1983) biological characteristics as in Method 1.

For all three methods, estimates of required 1 SW and MSW spawners were rounded off to the nearest 100 fish. The utility of each method was assessed by estimating the proportion of years ( 1971 to 1983) that $\geqq 90 \%$ of target egg deposition would be achieved and by comparing the relative impact on available harvest of each method.

## RESULTS

## 1. Rearing area

Amiro (1983) estimated the area of juvenile salmon habitat in the Miramichi River to be about $55 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. Total area is subdivided by major tributary below:

Northwest Miramichi
Area
\%

Southwest Miramichi
16,788,400
31
Main Miramichi (below
confluence) $\quad 1,158,800 \quad 2$
TOTAL
54, 605, 100
Egg deposition requirements were estimated to be $132 \times 10^{6}$ eggs (equation (1) and assuming 2.4 eggs $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ ).

## 2. Fecundity

Sea-age composition and location of female salmon collected for estimating fecundity are indicated below:

|  | Number of fish |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Location | 1SW | 2SW | 3SW | PS | Total |
| 1982 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miramichi Bay | 1 | 51 | 1 | 3 | 53 |
| Millbank | 44 | 24 |  | 1 | 10 |
| Northwest | 9 |  |  | 1 | 16 |
| Southwest | 8 | 7 |  | 1 | 5 |
| Subtotal | 62 | 82 | 1 | 150 |  |


| 1983 |  | 4 |  | 4 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Miramichi Bay | 20 | 24 |  | 2 | 46 |
| Millbank | 10 | 16 | 1 | 27 |  |
| Northwest |  | 26 | 3 | 29 |  |
| Southwest | 30 | 70 | 6 | 106 |  |
| Subtotal | 92 | 152 | 1 | 11 | 256 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |

In both years, the majority of $1 S W$ samples came from Millbank. Fewer samples in 1983 reflected the poor returns of 1 SW salmon to the river in that year, compared to 1982 (Randall and Schofield 1983). During both years, it was difficult to get female 1 SW salmon from the Southwest Miramichi; anglers reported less than $5 \%$ of 1 SW fish were female, compared to 30 to $50 \%$ of 1 SW fish in the Northwest Miramichi. Of the total 152 2SW fish sampled in 1982 and 1983, most came from Miramichi Bay and Millbank ( $68 \%$ ). Of the remainder, 33 and $67 \%$ came from the Northwest and Southwest tributaries, respectively.

Slopes of length-fecundity relationships for ISW and MSW salmon were significantly different ( $\mathrm{P}<0.05$ ). For MSW salmon, there was no difference in the slopes or intercepts between 1982 and 1983. Intercepts of 1 SW salmon were different ( $P<0.01$ ), however, indicating fecundity was greater for a given length in 1983 than in 1982. Slopes of 1 SW salmon length-fecundity relationships between years were not significantly different.

Regression statistics for the length-fecundity relationships of $15 W$ and MSW salmon were (Figure 1):

| Sea age | n | slope | intercept | r | F | P |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| lSW | 92 | 3.1718 | -4.5636 | 0.45 | 23.16 | $<0.001$ |
| MSW | 164 | 1.4132 | 2.7560 | 0.39 | 29.42 | $<0.001$ |

These equations gave total fecundities of 2,552 and 6,374 eggs for 1SW ( 50 cm ) and MSW salmon ( 70 cm ), respectively (Table 1).

## 3. Biological characteristics

During the period 1971 to 1983, 1SW, 2SW and 3SW salmon entering the Miramichi River averaged $52.1,72.8$ and 79.9 cm in length, respectively (Table 2). Proportion of females for each sea-age respectively were 0.25 , 0.88 and 0.64 . Of the total spawning run, 1 SW salmon were usually the most abundant (average $76 \%$ ), followed by 2 SW ( $22 \%$ ) and 3 SW salmon ( $2 \%$ ) (Table 3). For 2 SW and 3 SW salmon combined (i.e. MSW salmon), mean fork length was 73.4 cm , proportion females was 0.86 and proportion at sea-age was 0.24 .

On average ( 1971 to 1983), $1.5 \%$ of 2 SW salmon and $88.3 \%$ of 3 SW were previous spawners. For estimating eggs per fish (Section 4), no distinction was made between virgin or previously spawned fish.
4. Eggs per fish

Average eggs per spawner during 1971 to 1983 (Table 4) was 2,006 ( $\pm 460$ ). Proportional contribution by each sea-age group was as follows:

|  | Proportion of total eggs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Range |
| 1SW | 30 | $(8-67)$ |
| 2SW | 64 | $(30-88)$ |
| 3SW | 6 | $(2-14)$ |

5. Spawning requirements

Method 1:
Average eggs per fish, as given above, indicated the following required spawners:

Required spawners $=132 \times 106 / 2,006 \pm 460$
$=65,803(53,528-85,382)$
Required MSW salmon $=15,800(12,800-20,500)$
Required 1SW salmon $=50,000(40,700-64,900)$
Method 2:
Eggs per fish calculated assuming all eggs came from MSW salmon indicated approximately $23,600( \pm 1800)$ MSW. salmon are required for spawning (Table 5).

Assuming 1 male spawner for each MSW female spawner, the numbers of 1SW salmon required were 22,600 ( $\pm 1800$ )

Of the 22,600 lSW salmon required, 5,650 would be female. Given the average fecundity of 1 SW females of 2,908 eggs (see below), these fish would produce $16.4 \times 10^{6}$ eggs, surplus to the $132 \times 10^{6}$ eggs produced by MSW salmon.

|  | Fork length | Fecundity | Proportion <br> female | Eggs per <br> fish |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSW | 73.4 | 6,816 | 0.86 | 5,862 |
| 1SW | 52.1 | 2,908 | 0.25 | 727 |

Method 3:
If MSW = number of MSW salmon required, given that each has 5,862 eggs on average
$1 \mathrm{SW}=$ number of 1 SW salmon required; each has 727 eggs
(3) then MSW $(5,862)+1$ SW $(727)=132 \times 10^{6}$ eggs

Assuming a $1: 1$ sex ratio at spawning, and given average sex ratios for 1SW and MSW salmon as shown in the previous section
(4)
then males $=$ females

$$
\begin{aligned}
(0.14) \mathrm{MSW}+(0.75) 1 \mathrm{SW} & =(0.86) \mathrm{MSW}+(0.25) \mathrm{LSW} \\
\mathrm{MSW} & =(0.69) \mathrm{LSW}
\end{aligned}
$$

Solving with (4) in (3):
$1 \mathrm{SW}(0.69)(5,862)+1 \mathrm{SW}(727)=132 \times 10^{6}$

$$
1 \mathrm{SW}=27,663
$$

$$
=27,700
$$

$$
M S W=0.69(27,663)
$$

19,100
Results of the three methods are compared in Table 6. Both Methods 2 and 3 significantly increased available harvest to the fishery compared to Method 1 , and Method 2 indicated target deposition would be achieved with $23,600 \mathrm{MSW}$ and $22,600 \mathrm{lSW}$ spawners in most years ( $92 \%$ from 1971 to 1983).

## DISCUSSION

Fecundity of Miramichi River salmon based on ovaries collected in 1982 and 1983 is compared to other salmon populations in Table 1 . Fecundity of both 1 SW (fork length 50 cm ) and 2 SW salmon (fork length of 70 cm ) were within the ranges found elsewhere. Average relative fecundity was 2,035 and 1,636 eggs per kilogram for 1 SW and 2 SW fish, respectively. The assumed relative fecundity of 1,764 eggs per kilogram in previous assessments (Randall and Chadwick 1983) therefore overestimated the reproductive potential of MSW spawners, but underestimated 1 SW spawners.

Contribution to total egg deposition by 1 SW fish in the Miramichi is considerably greater than in the Restigouche and St. John Rivers (Randall 1984; Marshall and Penney 1983); this is primarily because of the greater proportion of female lSW fish in the Miramichi:

|  | fecundity <br> $(50 \mathrm{~cm})$ | proportion <br> female | proportion of <br> total spawners | proportion of total <br> egg deposition |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miramichi | 2,552 | 0.25 | 0.76 | 0.30 |
| Restigouche | 2,913 | 0.02 | 0.39 | 0.01 |
| St. John (be low <br> Mactaguac) | 2,609 | 0.05 | 0.43 | 0.02 |

However, the majority of eggs come from MSW salmon in all three rivers. Age 3SW and older salmon are rare in the Miramichi and contribute only $6 \%$ of the total egg deposition. In contrast, 3 SW salmon contribute $49 \%$ of the egg deposition in the Restigouche River (Randall 1984).

The difference in the reproductive potential of $1 S W$ and MSW salmon in the Miramichi River is considerable: it takes eight $1 S W$ fish to produce as many eggs as one MSW salmon. This difference was apparent when the three methods of estimating spawning requirements were compared (Table 6). Methods 2 and 3 rely more on MSW salmon for egg deposition and thus fewer numbers and biomass of spawners are required to achieve the target egg deposition. Of the three methods, Method 2 is the most desirable because, in addition to requiring less spawning biomass, it also ensures that target deposition will be met in most years (92\%). Method 2 indicates that 23,600 MSW and 22,6001 SW salmon are required for spawning.

In addition to the above advantages, there are other reasons why MSW salmon are more desirable as spawners than lSW salmon:
(1) Paloheimo and Elson (1974) found a significant correlation between MSW salmon at Curventon (Northwest Miramichi) and subsequent small parr densities, but there was no correlation between 1 SW fish and parr during the same period (1951 to 1971). Similar results were found using more recent data on angling landings (as an index of spawners) and parr densities from all tributaries (Chadwick and Randall 1986). These results emphasize the importance of MSW spawners.
(2) As mentioned earlier, MSW salmon were historically proportionally more abundant in the spawning run of the Miramichi River (Ruggles and Turner 1973). The apparent relative importance of 1 SW spawners is probably exceptionally high in recent years because of selective fishing mortality of large salmon. Historically lSW fish were not as important for egg deposition.
(3) MSW salmon can be predicted one year in advance in the Miramichi River, but 1SW salmon cannot (Randall et al. 1985). From a management standpoint, therefore, relying on MSW salmon for egg deposition makes good sense. Given the predicted MSW returns each year, management plans developed before the fishery begins can take into account spawning requirements before fishing allocations are decided.
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Table 1. Comparison of fecundity of Atlantic salmon in the Miramichi River with populations from other rivers in New Brunswick and elsewhere.

| River | Reference | Total fecundity |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sample } \\ \text { size } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 50 cm | 70 cm | 90 cm |  |
| Miramichi | This paper | 2,552 | 6,374 |  | 256 |
| Restigouche | Randall (1984) |  | 6,406 | 11,541 | 91 |
| St. John | Marshall and Penney (1983) | 2,609 | 5,365 | 11,034 | 121 |
| Big Salmon | Glebe et al. (1979) | 2,473 | 6,722 |  | 28 |
| 2; Maine | Baum and Meister (1971) |  | 6,641 | 12,630 | 164 |
| 6; Scotland | Pope et al. (1961) | 2,422 | 5,314 | 9,554 | 402 |

Table 2. Mean fork lengths (FL, cm) and sex ratios of 1 SW and MSW salmon sampled at Millbank, 1971 to 1983. (Sample sizes given in parenthesis.)

| Year | 1SW |  |  |  | 2SW |  |  |  | 3SW |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FL |  | \% female |  | FL |  | \% | female | FL |  | \% female |  |
| 1971 | 51.1 | ( 250) |  | ( 73) | 70.7 | (298) | (88 | ) ${ }^{(0)}$ | 75.7 | (20) | (64) ${ }^{1}$ | ( 0) |
| 1972 | 52.0 | ( 686) | 22 | (268) | 70.7 | (480) | 73 | (167) | 79.0 | (31) | 69 | (13) |
| 1973 | 53.7 | ( 742) | 17 | (616) | 73.6 | (687) | 84 | (467) | 79.9 | (31) | 40 | (25) |
| 1974 | 52.5 | $(1,390)$ | 30 | (603) | 74.0 | (588) | 88 | (343) | 81.4 | (56) | 54 | (37) |
| 1975 | 51.4 | $(1,026)$ | 27 | (478) | 73.9 | (303) | 90 | (230) | 82.2 | (36) | 70 | (27) |
| 1976 | 51.9 | 988) |  | (435) | 74.2 | (174) | 91 | (117) | 81.9 | (22) | 50 | (14) |
| 1977 | 51.9 | 421) | 23 | (202) | 72.7 | (484) | 93 | (356) | 77.4 | (33) | 71 | (21) |
| 1978 | 51.6 | ( 387) |  | (174) | 73.7 | (246) | 90 | (326) | 80.2 | (42) | 82 | (97) |
| 1979 | 51.8 | ( 728) |  | (402) | 72.5 | ( 75) | 91 | ( 46 ) | 81.2 | (26) | 83 | (12) |
| 1980 | 52.0 | ( 593) |  | (290) | 73.3 | (311) | 95 | (202) | 83.0 | (21) | 38 | (13) |
| 1981 | 51.4 | ( 605) | 25 | (219) |  | ( 40) | 73 | ( 26) | 75.4 | (14) | 20 | ( 5) |
| 1982 | 52.7 | 321) | 30 | (207) | 71.5 | (202) | 84 | (167) | 79.3 | (40) | 37 | (35) |
| 1983 | 52.0 | 214) | 29 | ( 72) | 71.6 | ( 63) | 79 | ( 29) | 77.3 | (12) | 67 | ( 3) |
| Mean | 52.1 cm |  | 25\% |  | 72.8 cm |  | 88\% |  | 79.9 cm |  | 64\% |  |

[^0]Table 3. Sea-age composition of salmon captured at Millbank, 1971 to 1983.

| Year | 1SW |  | 2SW |  |  | 3SW and older |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | (\% of salmon) | Number | \% | (\% of salmon) |
| 1971 | 1,962 | 83 | 375 | 16 | 94 | 24 | 1 | 6 |
| 1972 | 2,543 | 69 | 1,082 | 29 | 94 | 69 | 2 | 6 |
| 1973 | 2,450 | 68 | 1,087 | 30 | 96 | 45 | 1 | 4 |
| 1974 | 4,038 | 69 | 1,630 | 28 | 91 | 161 | 3 | 9 |
| 1975 | 3,548 | 75 | 1,075 | 23 | 89 | 133 | 3 | 11 |
| 1976 | 4,939 | 84 | 839 | 14 | 89 | 104 | 2 | 11 |
| 1977 | 1,505 | 44 | 1,818 | 53 | 94 | 116 | 3 | 6 |
| 1978 | 1,268 | 65 | 589 | 30 | 85 | 104 | 5 | 15 |
| 1979 | 2,500 | 89 | 235 | 8 | 74 | 83 | 3 | 26 |
| 1980 | 2,139 | 66 | 1,027 | 32 | 94 | 66 | 2 | 6 |
| 1981 | 2,174 | 92 | 147 | 6 | 74 | 52 | 2 | 26 |
| 1982 | 2,665 | 87 | 343 | 11 | 84 | 65 | 2 | 16 |
| 1983 | 810 | 77 | 206 | 20 | 84 | 39 | 3 | 16 |
| Mean |  | 76\% |  | 22\% |  |  | 2\% |  |

Table 4. Estimated numbers of eggs per fish for Miramichi 1SW and MSW salmon, and the variables used to estimate these values, 1971 to 1983. Mean fork lengths (FL), sex ratios and proportions-at-age from Tables 3 and 4; eggs per female calculated from the length-fecundity relationships previously described.

| Year | Agegroup | FL | Eggs/ female | Proportion female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proportion-at- } \\ & \text { age } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eggs/ } \\ & \text { fish } \end{aligned}$ | Percent of total eggs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1971 | 1SW | 51.1 | 2,734 | 0.11 | 0.83 | 250 | 21 |
|  | 2SW | 70.7 | 6,464 | 0.88 | 0.16 | 910 | 75 |
|  | 3SW | 75.7 | 7,120 | 0.64 | 0.01 | 46 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{1,206}$ |  |
| 1972 | 1SW | 52.0 | 2,890 | 0.22 | 0.69 | 439 | 23 |
|  | 2SW | 70.7 | 6,464 | 0.73 | 0.29 | 1,368 | 72 |
|  | 3SW | 79.0 | 7,562 | 0.69 | 0.02 | 104 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{1,911}$ |  |
| 1973 | 1SW | 53.7 | 3,200 | 0.17 | 0.68 | 370 | 17 |
|  | 2SW | 73.6 | 6,842 | 0.84 | 0.30 | 1,724 | 81 |
|  | 3SW | 79.9 | 7,684 | 0.40 | 0.01 | 31 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{2,125}$ |  |

Table 4; Continued

| Year | Agegroup | FL | Eggs/ <br> female | Proportion female | Proportion-atage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eggs/ } \\ & \text { fish } \end{aligned}$ | Percent of total eggs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 | 1SW | 52.5 | 2,979 | 0.30 | 0.69 | 617 | 25 |
|  | 2SW | 74.0 | 6,895 | 0.88 | 0.28 | 1,699 | 70 |
|  | 3SW | 81.4 | 7,889 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 128 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{2,444}$ |  |
| 1975 | 1SW | 51.4 | 2,785 | 0.27 | 0.74 | 556 | 26 |
|  | 2SW | 73.9 | 6,882 | 0.90 | 0.23 | 1,425 | 66 |
|  | 3SW | 82.2 | 7,999 | 0.70 | 0.03 | 168 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{2,149}$ |  |
| 1976 | 1SW | 51.9 | 2,872 | 0.24 | 0.84 | 579 | 38 |
|  | 2SW | 74.2 | 6,921 | 0.91 | 0.14 | 882 | 57 |
|  | 3SW | 81.9 | 7,957 | 0.50 | 0.02 | 80 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{1,541}$ |  |
| 1977 | 1SW | 51.9 | 2,872 | 0.23 | 0.44 | 291 | 8 |
|  | 2SW | 72.7 | 6,724 | 0.93 | 0.53 | 3,314 | 88 |
|  | 3SW | 77.4 | 7,347 | 0.71 | 0.03 | 156 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{3,761}$ |  |
| 1978 | 1SW | 51.6 | 2,820 | 0.37 | 0.65 | 678 | 24 |
|  | 2SW | 73.7 | 6,855 | 0.90 | 0.30 | 1,851 | 65 |
|  | 3SW | 80.2 | 7,725 | 0.82 | 0.05 | 317 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{2,846}$ |  |
| 1979 | 1SW | 51.8 | 2,855 | 0.27 | 0.89 | 686 | 50 |
|  | 2SW | 72.5 | 6,698 | 0.91 | 0.08 | 488 | 36 |
|  | 3SW | 81.2 | 7,861 | 0.83 | 0.03 | -196 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{1,370}$ |  |
| 1980 | 1 SW | 52.0 | 2,890 | 0.19 | 0.66 | 362 | 15 |
|  | 2SW | 73.3 | 6,803 | 0.95 | 0.32 | 2,068 | 83 |
|  | 3SW | 83.0 | 8,109 | 0.38 | 0.02 | 62 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{2,492}$ |  |
| 1981 | 1SW | 51.4 | 2,785 | 0.25 | 0.92 | 641 | 67 |
|  | 2SW | 71.4 | 6,555 | 0.73 | 0.06 | 287 | 30 |
|  | 3SW | 75.4 | 7,080 | 0.20 | 0.02 | 28 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 956 |  |
| 1982 | 1 SW | 52.7 | 3,015 | 0.30 | 0.87 | 787 | 54 |
|  | 2SW | 71.5 | 6,568 | 0.84 | 0.11 | 607 | 42 |
|  | 3SW | 79.3 | 7,603 | 0.37 | 0.02 | 56 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{1,450}$ |  |
| 1983 | 1SW | 52.0 | 2,890 | 0.29 | 0.77 | 645 | 35 |
|  | 2SW | 71.6 | 6,581 | 0.79 | 0.20 | 1,040 | 57 |
|  | 3SW | 77.3 | 7,333 | 0.67 | 0.03 | 147 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{1,832}$ |  |

Table 5. Estimated numbers of eggs per salmon (MSW) and the numbers of salmon required for spawning, 1971 to 1983. Required spawners are calculated assuming an egg deposition requirement of $132,000,000$ eggs.

| Year | F.L. | Eggs/female | Proportion Female | Eggs/salmon | Required Spawners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1971 | 71.0 | 6,503 | $(0.86)^{1}$ | 5,593 | 23,601 |
| 1972 | 71.2 | 6,529 | 0.73 | 4,766 | 27,696 |
| 1973 | 73.9 | 6,882 | 0.82 | 5,643 | 23,392 |
| 1974 | 74.6 | 6,974 | 0.85 | 5,928 | 22,267 |
| 1975 | 74.8 | 7,000 | 0.88 | 6,160 | 21,429 |
| 1976 | 75.1 | 7,040 | 0.87 | 6,125 | 21,551 |
| 1977 | 73.0 | 6,763 | 0.92 | 6,222 | 21,215 |
| 1978 | 74.7 | 6,987 | 0.88 | 6,149 | 21,467 |
| 1979 | 74.7 | 6,987 | 0.89 | 6,218 | 21,229 |
| 1980 | 73.9 | 6,882 | 0.92 | 6,331 | 20,850 |
| 1981 | 72.4 | 6,685 | 0.64 | 4,278 | 30,856 |
| 1982 | 72.8 | 6,737 | 0.76 | 5,120 | 25,781 |
| 1983 | 72.5 | 6,698 | 0.78 | 5,224 | 25,268 |
|  |  |  |  | Mean 95\% C.L. | $\begin{array}{r} 23,584 \\ ( \pm 1839) \end{array}$ |

[^1]Table 6. Comparison of three methods for estimating required numbers of 1 SW and MSW spawners in the Miramichi River. The three methods are described in the text. Harvest (kilograms) was calculated assuming a mean weight of 4.5 and 1.6 kg for MSW and 1 SW salmon, respectively.

|  |  | Method |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Required spawners |  | 2 |  |



Figure 1. Length-fecundity relationship for $15 W$ and MSW salmon in the Miramichi River. Regression equations given in text.


[^0]:    1 Sex ratios of MSW salmon in 1971 were assumed to be average (1972 to 1983).

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ proportion of female salmon in 1971 was assumed to be average (1972-1983).

