[Yesterday 3:04 PM] Hein, Kristopher (he, him / il, lui) (DFO/MPO)

case when ("ESTIMATE MADE" = 'Y' and "3 Mid Week Flights" = 'Y' and "3 Week End Flights" = 'Y' and "15 Day Flight Survey" = 'Y' and ("25 Mid Week Interviews" = 'Y' or "10% Mid Week Coverage" = 'Y') and ("25 Week End Interviews" = 'Y' or "10% Week end Coverage" = 'Y') and "15 Day Interview Survey" = 'Y') then 1 else 0 end as include\_15

like 1

[Yesterday 3:04 PM] Hein, Kristopher (he, him / il, lui) (DFO/MPO)

* ("ESTIMATE MADE" = 'Y'  An estimate was run? When would ESTIMATE MADE = ‘N’?
* and "3 Mid Week Flights" = 'Y' and "3 Week End Flights" = 'Y' Needs to be at least 3 flights for each day type
* and "15 Day Flight Survey" = 'Y' Must be at least a 15 day spread in the flights because irec is monthly
* and ("25 Mid Week Interviews" = 'Y' or "10% Mid Week Coverage" = 'Y') Must be 25 interviews mid week OR …at least 10% of interviews must be from mid-week? With this interpretation the estimate would pass the test based on a single mid-week interview as long as there were only 10 interviews for the weekend.
* and ("25 Week End Interviews" = 'Y' or "10% Week end Coverage" = 'Y') Same as above but for weekends
* and "15 Day Interview Survey" = 'Y') Must be at least a 15 day spread in the interviews because irec is monthly

[Yesterday 3:50 PM] Hein, Kristopher (he, him / il, lui) (DFO/MPO)

So the South Coast creel started estimating Chinook (and Coho) catch by mark status in 2008.  Prior to that, data on the number of ***retained*** fish that were marked/unmarked was collected at the interview level.  That was used to create "mark rates".  These  were not stored anywhere and the level they were grouped didn't necessarily match the same level as the estimates and any analytical borrowing of sub-areas wasn't take into account, etc. etc.  I think, especially for Coho mark selective fisheries started and the Coho mark rate derived from retained didn't make sense, so we moved to the more detailed catch and release by marks leading directly to estimates by marks.

The short answer to the question no one asked, is there is mark (rate) data for retained Chinook prior tp 2008.

[Yesterday 4:38 PM] Houtman, Rob

Thanks Kris, i am digesting. I think this is very germaine but i still don't quite get it. So before 08, releases were estimated but not by mark status (because the mark rate observed in the kepts could appropriately be applied ot the released)?

[Yesterday 5:00 PM] Hein, Kristopher (he, him / il, lui) (DFO/MPO)

Close, Before 08 Chinook and Coho where just kept, released and released sub-legal size.  There being no MSF's the kept mark rate was assumed to be the same as the releases, or close enough.

[8:45 AM] Houtman, Rob

thx. and then a mark rate was estimated for each species but it was estimated from kept fish. The interview didn't ask about releases by mark status.

[8:54 AM] Hein, Kristopher (he, him / il, lui) (DFO/MPO)

That is correct.  Biggest problem was everyone took the data and made their own mark rate which was often different from other interpretations of mark rate.  There was no "official" mark rate made.

like 1

[8:55 AM] Houtman, Rob

THats great detail to inform this work, thx