

From: Jantz, Lester <jantzl@dfo.mpo.com> on behalf of Rosenberger, Barry <rosenbergerb@dfo.mpo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2009 7:31 PM
To: Jantz, Lester <Lester.Jantz@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Subject: FW: Early August lower Fraser Rec Methods
Attach: Early August Fraser Rec Angling Method Breakdown (17Aug2009).xls

-----Original Message-----

From: Tadey, Joe
Sent: August 17, 2009 4:20 PM
To: Whitehouse, Timber
Cc: Mahoney, Jason; Rosenberger, Barry; Wilmot, Chris
Subject: RE: Early August lower Fraser Rec Methods

Hi Timber,

I have updated the first sheet in this file with the info I received from Jason this afternoon; I labeled the 2 original figures (as Fig.1a and Fig.2) and then created a 3rd figure (Fig.1b) that I think is a bit more intuitive to look at... it clearly shows the change over time from a fishery dominated by bottom bouncing (regardless of whether the Instantaneous Rod Count (IRC) was weekend or weekday) to a fishery that is more or less equally employing the bar and bottom bouncing methods. One might argue that currently, the fishery is predominately a Bar fishery but only the last sample has gone that way.... additional IRC's will help determine if this is a stable shift. And one could probably assume that the mid-week communication to the rec community and the reg change effective at midnight last night have precipitated this change in overall angler behaviour.

Gang, I did not have the detailed "subsection" info so could not update the second sheet in this file (*August IRC Data*) that breaks down Sections 1 & 2 into subsections. Note: Section 1's downstream boundary is the Mission Bridge it's upstream boundary the Agazzi/Rosdale Bridge; Section 2 covers the area upstream from the Agazzi/Rosdale Bridge to the mouth of the Coquihalla River. Section 1 has ~20 "subsections" (e.g. bars and runs) and Section 2 has ~15 "subsections"; subsections are usually gravel bars or high effort areas or effort around river confluences with the Fraser etc.

I should also point out that for Section 1, we do not *routinely* survey IRC effort in the most downstream subsections (i.e. d/s of the Sumas confluence) as past studies had shown that effort in these subsections is minor compared to the effort elsewhere; budgetary constraints have also dictated this action as we look at ways to provide robust estimates at reduced cost. However, given the area closure currently in place, it may be wise to *routinely* look at these subsections as meaningful effort may shift to these subsections as anglers start to redistribute themselves and look for different ways to get out on the water. As pointed out to me by Chris W., the Fraser canyon upstream of the area closure may be another section to have a look for increased effort as a result of this regulation change.

As requested Timber, I have cc'd Barry. If any interpretation of this file is required please give me (or Jason) a call; I can be reached at 604-812-7273 today and both of us can be reached in the office tomorrow.

Jason, I could not find this file on the mbu drive so I had to update the file attached to your email.... I saved my updated version on the mbu at: Area Data - InSeason\2009\2009 Chum et al\2009 Creel\Data Requests 2009.

Cheers,
Joe

<<...>>

-----Original Message-----

From: Mahoney, Jason

DFO-142494[00-01]

\\\\svbcvafp01\Cohen-Comm\The Cohen Commission-Kaml
oops\Resource Management\Les Jantz\Outlook files\J
antz_email_2004-cohen\Fraser Rec\

CAN199592_0001

Sent: August 13, 2009 12:57 PM
To: Whitehouse, Timber
Cc: Tadey, Joe
Subject: Early August lower Fraser Rec Methods

With today's data. I added Method % by section.

<< File: Early August Fraser Rec Angling Method Breakdown (Aug 13, 2009).xls >>

Jason Mahoney

*Biologist
Chum, Pink and Recreational Fisheries Program
Fraser River Stock Assessment
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Phone: (604) 666-2453
Fax: (604) 666-7112
Email: jason.mahoney@dfo-mpo.gc.ca*

\\svbcvanfp01\Cohen-Comm\The Cohen Commission-Kaml
oops\Resource Management\Les Jantz\Outlook files\J
antz email 2004-cohen\Fraser Rec\