By Species

1. ~~Tables of data for each species~~
2. Controlling for space and time graphs
3. FIX CONFIDENCE INTERVALS…need to use gam\_conf\_int…with VCOV…intervals too wide due to no covariance!!!
4. Hooking mortality by gear type and barb (Try point range with error bars instead of box plot)
5. Main effect of barbs with CI…need to calculate on survival, not mortality scale!
6. ~~Landing Percent….make graph~~
7. Then interpretation

(Leave out Steelhead????)

1. Model with regulation variables
   1. Gear
   2. Barb
   3. Hook size
   4. Hook type
   5. Maybe method???
2. Full model with all variables
3. Associations between best variables in Full Model and Regulation Variables.

Talk Track

1. Review background, objectives, methods
2. How did study go?
   1. Well
   2. But blob
   3. Bad returns
   4. No fall chinook controls and no spring chinook controls in 2/3 years
   5. Steelhead surprise!!!
3. Today I’ll present high level results of study/ focus on barbed vs. barbless
4. Barbed vs. barbless
   1. ~~2 x 2 table; explain management actions…if in “both” corner, then “it depends”, need to determine when marginal benefits of increased landing outweigh marginal costs of increased release mortality~~
   2. Present barbless results
   3. Conclusions—show 2x2 table…were in the the “it depends” corner.
   4. Caveats
      1. Juvenile Fish (cite lit)
      2. Sublethal effects; Semelparous vs. iteroparous
      3. Global Caveats: limited to set of gears, species, conditions evaluated…some ability to predict effects but much more uncertain for fisheries with gear types, environmental conditions, species we did not encounter: examples: 1) saltwater & estuary (where osmoregulatory issues, more predators), 2) very warm water, 3) fisheries using very different gear, particularly gear with large weight “in-line” like plunking, mooching, trolling w/banana weights…barb mortality effects likely similar, but landing rates maybe not