

Sockeye CU assessment scores

CU Name	Stock	DFO Reports		Cohen Report #3	
		Grant et al.	P & C	Figure 5	Exec Summary
Cultus-L	Cultus	3	5	5	Poor
Bowron-ES	Bowron	3	3	4	Poor
Kamloops-L	South Thompson	3	4	4	Poor
TaklaTrembleur-Estu	Early Stuart	3	4	4	Poor
WidgeonRiver	Widgeon	3	4	4	Poor
Nahatlatch-ES	Nahatatch	3	3	4	Poor
Taseko-ES	Taseko	3	3	3.5	Poor
TaklaTrembleur-S	Late Stuart	2	4	3.5	Poor
Anderson-ES	Gates	2	3	3	Poor
Francois-ES	Nadina	2	3	3	Poor
HarrisonUS-L	Weaver	2	3	3	Poor
Seton-L	Portage	2	3	3	Poor
Shuswap-ES	Upper Adams/Scotch	2	3	3	Poor
Stuart-S	Late Stuart	2	3	3	Poor
Quesnel-S	Quesnel	2	2	2.5	Poor
Lillooet-L	Birkenhead	1	3	2.5	
Shuswap-L	Adams/Seymour	1	3	2.5	
Chilko-S	Chilko	2	2	2	
Lower Fraser River	Misc	1	2	2	
Fraser-S	Stellako	2	1	1.5	
Chilliwack-ES	Chilliwack		1	1.5	
Kamloops-ES	Raft/Fennell	2	1	1	
HarrisonDS-L	HarrisonRapids	1	1	1	
Pitt-ES	Pitt	1	1	1	

For Grant et al. (2010, p36) 3=Poor, 2=Intermediate, 1 =Good
P&C are severity scores in Pestal and Cass (2009, Fig 12 and 13)
For Cohen Report #3 the data are from their Fig 5, and are also found in Table 1.
Last column is the list of poor CUs from the Exec Summary
** Note, Stuart-Estu is deleted as per Grant et al (p. 88).