Fishery Data Series No. 09-07

# Age Composition and Spawning Escapement of Chinook Salmon in Karluk, Ayakulik, and Chignik Rivers, Alaska, 1999-2003 

by
Donn A. Tracy,
Julia S. Schmidt,
and
Steve J. Fleischman

March 2009
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Divisions of Sport Fish and Commercial Fisheries


## Symbols and Abbreviations

The following symbols and abbreviations, and others approved for the Système International d'Unités (SI), are used without definition in the following reports by the Divisions of Sport Fish and of Commercial Fisheries: Fishery Manuscripts, Fishery Data Series Reports, Fishery Management Reports, and Special Publications. All others, including deviations from definitions listed below, are noted in the text at first mention, as well as in the titles or footnotes of tables, and in figure or figure captions.
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| day | d | (for example) | e.g. | greater than | > |
| degrees Celsius | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | Federal Information |  | greater than or equal to | $\geq$ |
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| hydrogen ion activity (negative log of) | pH | U.S.C. | United States Code | probability of a type II error (acceptance of the null |  |
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| parts per thousand | ppt, |  |  | second (angular) | " |
|  | \% |  |  | standard deviation | SD |
| volts | V |  |  | standard error | SE |
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|  |  |  |  | population | Var |
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#### Abstract

In 1993 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Sport Fish, initiated a project to monitor the status of the Chinook salmon Oncorhynchus tshawytscha stocks of the Karluk, Ayakulik and Chignik rivers. This report presents data collected between 1999 and 2003. During this time period the inriver returns of Chinook salmon to the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers were censused by counting fish passing through weirs on the rivers, while inriver returns to the Chignik River were estimated from sample weir counts taken at hourly intervals. Age and sex compositions of the Karluk and Ayakulik inriver returns were estimated by sampling Chinook salmon at the weirs. Age and sex composition of the Chignik inriver return was estimated by opportunistic sampling of the commercial harvests in Chignik Lagoon and sport harvests in the Chignik River. Total sport fishing effort, and catch and harvest of Chinook salmon, for the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers were annually estimated through the Statewide Harvest Survey. Spawning escapements to the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers were estimated by subtracting sport harvest from inriver return because most harvest at these rivers occurs above the weirs.

At the Karluk River from 1999-2003, the inriver return ranged from 4,453 to 13,063 Chinook salmon. Sport harvest ranged from 587 to 2,581 Chinook salmon, and anglers released from 1,872 to 8,165 Chinook salmon. Estimated sport fishing effort for the entire year in the Karluk system ranged from 1,858 to 8,301 angler-days. Estimated spawning escapement ranged from 3,149 to 11,297 Chinook salmon.

At the Ayakulik River from 1999-2002, the inriver return ranged from 12,552 to 20,527 Chinook salmon. Estimated sport harvest ranged from 362 to 803 Chinook salmon, and estimates of release ranged from 2,825 to 8,135 Chinook salmon. Estimated sport fishing effort for the entire season ranged from 1,715 to 3,173 angler-days. Estimated spawning escapement ranged from 12,190 to 19,724 Chinook salmon.

In 2003, the inriver return to the Ayakulik River was 17,557 Chinook salmon. Census statistics of sport fishery catch, harvest and total effort were 451 Chinook harvested, 4,768 released and 1,725 days of directed Chinook salmon angler effort. Estimated spawning escapement was 17,106 Chinook salmon.

From 1999-2003, the estimated inriver return to the Chignik River ranged from 2,992 to 6,412 Chinook salmon. Harvest in the commercial purse seine fishery in Chignik Lagoon ranged from 595 to 2,834 Chinook salmon. The estimated average annual harvest of Chignik River Chinook salmon was 112 fish.


Key words: Chinook salmon, Oncorhynchus tshawytscha, escapement, Karluk River, Ayakulik River, Chignik River, age, length, sex composition, sport harvest, sport effort.

## INTRODUCTION

The largest Chinook salmon Oncorhynchus tshawytscha populations in the Kodiak Management Area (the Kodiak Island Archipelago, Alaska Peninsula waters west of Cape Douglas on the Pacific side and Cape Mensikof on the Bering side, and the Aleutian Islands) occur in the Karluk, Ayakulik, and Chignik rivers. All three populations support sport fisheries and are also harvested incidentally by commercial fisheries targeting sockeye salmon Oncorhynchus nerka. Chinook salmon from each of these drainages are also harvested by subsistence fisheries. In order to improve Chinook salmon management for the benefit of users it is essential to establish escapement goals which accurately reflect the production capacities of each stock. The purpose of this study is to estimate the age, sex, and length compositions of Chinook salmon returns, estimate total spawning escapements, and document estimated sport harvests and total incidental commercial catch. These data can be used to construct brood tables and refine escapement goals. Adjusting escapement goals to the most effective level will allow for maximum production and harvest opportunity.

## The Karluk River

The Karluk River, located on the southwest end of Kodiak Island (Figure 1), contains one of only two indigenous populations of Chinook salmon found on the Kodiak Archipelago. From its source at the outlet of Karluk Lake, the Karluk River flows 35.2 km ( 22 mi ) to its terminus at Karluk Lagoon. A large portion of the uplands surrounding the Karluk River are currently held in private ownership. Chinook salmon of Karluk River origin are harvested in sport, commercial, and subsistence fisheries.
The primary commercial harvest of Karluk River Chinook salmon likely occurs in a mixed-stock fishery along the west side of Kodiak Island (Appendix A1). Chinook salmon incidentally harvested in this area probably include stocks from the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers, but also include stocks of unknown origin. This fishery annually opens by regulation as early as 9 June. Because over $97 \%$ of the escapement to Karluk River typically occurs by 15 July, mature Karluk Chinook salmon are considered to be commercially exploited from around 9 June through 15 July. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Division (CFD) documents commercial harvests of Chinook salmon through fish ticket reports received from fish processors.
The subsistence harvest of Karluk River Chinook salmon is principally conducted by residents of Karluk Village. Harvest in this fishery is documented through subsistence permits issued by the CFD. Between 1994 and 2002 reported harvests ranged from 4 to 165 Chinook salmon (Table 1).
Chinook salmon are harvested in the sport fishery throughout the Karluk River and in Karluk Lagoon. Anglers typically gain access to the fishery through air service into the village of Karluk or by float plane into Karluk Lake, Karluk Lagoon, or an area in mid-river known as the Portage. Guided anglers also access the Portage area by an overland trail from the community of Larsen Bay. Fly-in parties accessing the fishery upstream often float the river to its terminus.
Sport harvests of Karluk River Chinook salmon as well as overall fishing effort are estimated by the Statewide Harvest Survey (SWHS; Howe et al. 1995, 1996, 2001 a-d; Walker et al. 2003; Jennings et al. 2004, 2006a-b). In addition, sport fishery catch and effort information is available from creel surveys conducted at the Karluk River in 1993 and 1994 (Schwarz et al. 2002), a census conducted in 2002 (Schwarz et al. 2003), and again during 2003 (Schwarz et al In prep) ${ }^{1}$. Between the late 1980s to the early 1990s the total estimated Karluk River sport fishing effort doubled while the estimated annual harvests of Chinook salmon also increased during this period. During the mid-1990s both effort and harvest remained relatively stable, although between 1999 and 2000 the estimated Chinook salmon harvest increased by more than $40 \%$ (Howe et al. 1995, 1996, 2001 a-d; Walker et al. 2003) (Table 1, Figure 2).
The CFD operates a weir on the Karluk River located approximately one-quarter mile upriver of Karluk Lagoon. Between 1994 and 2003, the inriver return of Chinook salmon migrating through the weir ranged from 4,453 to 13,443 and averaged 10,085 fish (Table 1, Figure 2, Appendix B1). Weir counts prior to 1994 (dating to 1976) averaged 9,003 fish.

[^0]

Figure 1.-Karluk and Ayakulik rivers on Kodiak Island with the general locations of ADF\&G weirs.

Table 1.-Total commercial harvest of Chinook salmon from the Inner and Outer Karluk Section statistical areas, Karluk River inriver Chinook salmon return, and estimated sport harvests, 1994-2003; and reported subsistence harvests, 1994-2003.

| Year | Inner and Outer Karluk Section Statistical Area Harvest ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Karluk River |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Subsistence Harvest ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Inriver <br> Return ${ }^{\text {C }}$ | Sport Fishery ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Harvest | (SE) | Release | Effort ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |
| 1994 | 5,114 | 13 | 12,049 | 1,483 | 208 | 2,174 | 10,948 |
| 1995 | 1,794 | 31 | 12,657 | 1,284 | 230 | 2,613 | 6,928 |
| 1996 | 1,662 | 4 | 10,051 | 1,695 | 353 | 8,641 | 4,665 |
| 1997 | 1,445 | 17 | 13,443 | 1,574 | 285 | 9,119 | 5,043 |
| 1998 | 252 | 4 | 10,239 | 1,173 | 224 | 6,150 | 4,223 |
| 1999 | 1,067 | 7 | 13,063 | 1,766 | 317 | 5,957 | 6,239 |
| 2000 | 693 | 22 | 10,460 | 2,581 | 427 | 8,165 | 8,301 |
| 2001 | 2,588 | 24 | 4,453 | 1,304 | 257 | 3,676 | 5,589 |
| $2002{ }^{\text {f }}$ | 1,262 | 165 | 7,175 | 1,086 | 307 | 3,715 | 3,119 |
| $2003{ }^{\text {g }}$ | 1,336 | 6 | 7,256 | 587 | n/a | 1,872 | 1,858 |
| Mean | 1,721 | 29 | 10,085 | 1,453 |  | 5,208 | 5,691 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Source: ADF\&G, Commercial Fish Division Statewide Harvest Receipt (fish ticket) database. Includes all Chinook harvested annually between Rocky Point and Cape Karluk through 15 July. See Appendix A1 for harvest by inclusive statistical areas.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Based on subsistence harvest records maintained by the Westward Region of CFD; includes all reported harvest in Karluk Section.
c Census of Chinook salmon passing Karluk River weir (K. R. Brennan, Fisheries Biologist, ADF\&G, Commercial Fisheries, Kodiak; personal communication)
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Statewide Harvest Survey (Howe et al. 1995, 1996, 2001 a-d; Walker et al. 2003; Jennings et al. 2004, 2006a-b).
${ }^{\text {e }}$ Units are angler-days. Includes effort directed toward all species.
${ }^{f}$ Sport fishery estimates include census above weir of 601 fish harvested, 2,268 released, and 1,745 angler days (numbers corrected from original reported by Schwarz et al. 2003) and SWHS estimates of 485 fish harvested, 234 released, and 1,374 angler days below the weir (Jennings et al. 2006a).
${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$ Sport fishery estimates include census above weir of 294 fish harvested, 1,513 released, and 831 angler days (Schwarz et al. In prep) ${ }^{1}$ and SWHS estimates of 293 fish harvested, 359 released, and 1,027 angler-days below the weir (Jennings et al. 2006b).

[^1]

Figure 2.-Chinook salmon inriver return, estimated Chinook salmon sport harvest, and spawning escapement 1994-2003, and sport fishing effort (angler-days) for all species at Karluk River, 1994-2003.

The current Karluk River Chinook salmon minimum biological escapement goal (BEG) has been set at 3,600 spawning fish, based on an analysis of age composition and escapement data available through 2001 (Hasbrouck and Clark In prep) ${ }^{2}$. The sport fishery is allowed to proceed without inseason restrictions if interim escapement levels projecting a total spawning escapement at or above the minimum goal are achieved. The current management approach assumes a Chinook salmon sport fishing mortality above the weir within the range of 1,000 to 1,500 fish.

## The Ayakulik River

The Ayakulik River, located about 25 miles south of the Karluk River (Figure 1), contains the only other indigenous population of Chinook salmon occurring on Kodiak Island. With the exception of approximately 1 square mile surrounding the stream terminus, all uplands surrounding the Ayakulik River are currently held in public land ownership as part of the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. Chinook salmon of Ayakulik River origin are harvested in the mixedstock commercial fishery along the west side of Kodiak Island (Table 2). Reported subsistence harvests from the Ayakulik River from 1994-2003 were negligible, averaging approximately 14 fish annually.

[^2]Table 2.-Total commercial harvest of Chinook salmon from the Inner and Outer Ayakulik Section statistical areas, Ayakulik River inriver Chinook salmon return and estimated sport harvest, 1994-2003; and reported subsistence harvests, 1994-2002.

| Year | Inner and Outer Ayakulik Section Statistical Area Harvest ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Ayakulik River |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Subsistence | Inriver |  | Sport Fishery ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Harvest ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Return ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Harvest | (SE) | Release | Effort ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |
| 1994 | 0 | 3 | 9,138 | 948 | n/a | 1,020 | 5,473 |
| 1995 | 2,412 | 4 | 17,701 | 200 | 89 | 883 | 1,299 |
| 1996 | 3,723 | 0 | 10,344 | 419 | 168 | 1,972 | 1,524 |
| 1997 | 812 | 0 | 14,357 | 1,190 | 451 | 5,989 | 3,374 |
| 1998 | 3,795 | 0 | 14,038 | 259 | 93 | 3,245 | 1,314 |
| 1999 | 3,564 | 26 | 13,503 | 609 | 207 | 2,825 | 2,165 |
| 2000 | 3,416 | 38 | 20,527 | 803 | 209 | 7,578 | 1,808 |
| 2001 | 6,727 | 16 | 13,929 | 568 | 182 | 8,135 | 3,173 |
| 2002 | 85 | 37 | 12,552 | 362 | 135 | 5,282 | 1,715 |
| 2003 | 0 | n/a | 17,557 | 451 | 0 | 4,768 | 1,725 |
| Mean | 2,453 | 14 | 14,365 | 581 |  | 4,170 | 2,357 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Source: ADF\&G, Commercial Fish Division Statewide Harvest Receipt (fish ticket) database. Includes all Chinook harvested annually between Cape Ikolik and approximately N57.05.00’ through 15 July. See Appendix A1 for harvest by inclusive statistical areas.
b Based on subsistence harvest records maintained by the Westward Region of ADF\&G's Commercial Fish Division; includes all reported harvest in Red (Ayakulik) River Section.
c Census of Chinook salmon passing Karluk River weir (K. R. Brennan, Fisheries Biologist, ADF\&G, Commercial Fisheries, Kodiak; personal communication).
d 1994-2002 numbers are from Statewide Harvest Survey (Howe et al. 1995, 1996, 2001 a-d; Walker et al. 2003; Jennings et al. 2004, 2006a). 2003 sport fishery figures are from census data (Tracy and Schmidt In prep).
e Units are angler-days; includes effort directed toward all species.

Chinook salmon are also harvested in the sport fishery, which generally occurs between the confluence of the Ayakulik and Red rivers and Ayakulik Lagoon. Anglers typically gain access to the fishery via sea plane, either at the lagoon or upriver near the confluence of the Ayakulik River and Bare Creek. Upriver anglers often travel by raft to exit the fishery from the lagoon. Two commercial sport fishing lodges near the lagoon provide opportunity for anglers seeking this type of accommodation. During some years when aircraft cannot access the lagoon due to low water levels, nearly all visitors exit the fishery from the upriver location. In other years as many as 50 angler parties have floated down river from Bare Creek to exit at the lagoon. Estimated annual sport harvest of Ayakulik River Chinook salmon varied considerably from 1994-2003, ranging between 200 and 1,190 fish (Table 2, Figure 3). Between 1994 and 2003 estimates of overall sport fishing effort for all species averaged 2,357 angler-days.

Annual Chinook salmon inriver escapements are enumerated through a weir operated by the CFD just upstream of the Ayakulik Lagoon. From 1994 through 2003, inriver return of Chinook
salmon averaged 14,365 fish, with a peak inriver return of 20,527 occurring in 2000. Other relatively large inriver returns exceeding 17,000 fish occurred in 1995 and 2003 (Table 2, Figure 3, Appendix B2).
The current Ayakulik River Chinook salmon minimum biological escapement goal has been set at 4,800-9,600 spawning fish, based on an analysis of age composition and escapement data available through 2001 (Hasbrouck and Clark In prep) ${ }^{2}$. Additional assessment of the Chinook salmon stock, conducted in 1989 by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), estimated a maximum available spawning habitat capable of accommodating 10,426 adult fish (Handler and Chatto 1989).
Similar to management of the Karluk River, the sport fishery is allowed to proceed without inseason restrictions if interim escapement levels projecting a total inriver count (minus an average estimated upriver sport harvest) meeting or exceeding the minimum goal are achieved. The current management approach assumes an annual Chinook salmon sport fishing mortality above the weir of less than 1,000 fish.


Figure 3.-Ayakulik River Chinook salmon inriver return, estimated Chinook salmon sport harvest, and spawning escapement, 1994-2003, and sport fishing effort (angler-days) for all species, 1994-2003.

## The Chignik River

The Chignik River, located on the Alaska Peninsula near the village of Chignik (Figure 4), is the largest Chinook salmon-producing system on the southern edge of the Alaska Peninsula. Sport, commercial and subsistence fisheries harvest Chinook salmon of Chignik River origin.
Commercial harvests of Chignik River bound Chinook salmon occur incidentally in the Chignik commercial sockeye salmon fishery which takes place both in Chignik Lagoon and in outside waters. Peak Chinook salmon harvests typically occur during July. Between 1994 and 2003, reported commercial harvests of Chinook salmon from Chignik Lagoon ranged from 595 to


Figure 4.-Chignik River on Alaska Peninsula with the general location of the ADF\&G weir.

3,008 fish and averaged 1,697 (Table 3). Reported subsistence harvests of Chignik River Chinook salmon during the same period ranged between 28 and 243 fish.

The sport fishery occurs primarily in the 2-mile river section between an Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF\&G) weir and the outlet of Chignik Lake. Annual estimates of total sport harvests of Chignik River Chinook salmon have not been published by the SWHS (annual sample sizes have been too small to estimate effort, harvest, and catch). However, a creel survey conducted by ADF\&G in 1998 estimated a harvest of approximately 200 fish (Schwarz et al. 2002), and the (unpublished) mean annual harvest estimated by the SWHS from 1999 through 2003 was 112 ( $\mathrm{SE}=36$ ) Chinook salmon (Figure 5).
The CFD operates the ADF\&G weir on Chignik River located approximately midway between Chignik Lagoon and Chignik Lake. Prior to 1993, Chinook salmon were visually counted through the weir on a daily basis during the first 10-minute interval of each hour between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Total daily passage was then estimated by expanding the hourly counts and summing the results. In 1993 Chinook salmon were counted for the first 30 minutes of daily weir operation and during the first 10 minutes of each hour of operation thereafter (Owen 1993; Owen and Quimby 1997). Additionally, until 1994, weir-based estimates of Chinook salmon escapement did not account for fish less than approximately 650 mm mideye to fork length, counts of which were instead included in estimates of sockeye salmon escapement due to a

Table 3.-Commercial and subsistence harvests, and estimated sport harvest of Chignik River Chinook salmon, along with inriver returns, 1994-2003.

|  | Total Chignik <br> Area Commercial $^{\text {Harvest }^{\mathrm{a}}}$ | Chignik Lagoon <br> Commercial <br> Harvest $^{\mathrm{b}}$ | Inriver <br> Return $^{\mathrm{c}}$ | Subsistence <br> Harvest $^{\mathrm{d}}$ | Sport <br> Harvest $^{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 3,919 | 1,804 | 3,016 | 165 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 1995 | 5,493 | 3,008 | 4,288 | 98 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 1996 | 3,105 | 1,579 | 3,485 | 48 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 1997 | 3,032 | 1,289 | 3,824 | 28 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 1998 | 4,395 | 1,700 | 3,075 | 91 | 168 |
| 1999 | 3,296 | 2,101 | 3,728 | 243 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2000 | 2,592 | 595 | 4,285 | 163 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2001 | 2,849 | 1,142 | 2,992 | 171 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2002 | 1,521 | 920 | 3,028 | 74 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 2003 | 3,059 | 2,834 | 6,412 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean $^{\mathrm{f}}$ | 3,326 | 1,697 | 3,813 | 120 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ Source: ADF\&G, Commercial Fisheries Division Statewide Harvest Receipt (fish ticket) database. Total Chignik Area includes all Chinook harvested during the entire fishing season within salmon statistical areas between Kilokak Rocks and Kupreanof Point on the Alaska Peninsula); Chignik Lagoon includes all Chinook harvested during the entire fishing season within statistical area 271-10.
c Inriver returns based on tallies from replayed video counts recorded daily during all hours of weir operation (Pappas et al. 2003).
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Based on subsistence harvest records maintained by CFD and Subsistence Division; figures given are the sum of expanded community harvest estimates for the Chignik Management Area (Pappas et al. 2003).
e Sport harvest estimates available for 1998 only (Schwarz et al. 2002).
f 1994-2003.
similarity in size. Estimated total Chinook salmon counts incorporated the smaller fish escapement component by using age composition estimates for the run. Beginning in 1994 an underwater video camera was installed at the weir to identify and enumerate inriver return by species. Currently, daily video recordings during all hours of weir operation are replayed to produce an enumeration of the number of all Chinook salmon passing through the weir. Between 1994 and 2003, estimates of total Chinook salmon inriver return ranged from 2,992 to 6,412 fish and averaged 3,813 (Table 3).

In 1993 a Ricker stock-recruit model (Ricker 1975) was constructed using limited available data to develop a Chinook salmon BEG (Len Schwarz, ADF\&G Kodiak, personal communication). The model output estimated maximum sustained yield at an escapement level of 3,000 fish, although a minimum escapement goal of 1,750 fish was selected in order provide escapement sufficient to sustain the return while allowing fisheries to proceed during lower escapement years. Because of an $18 \%$ overestimation error of inriver return discovered in 1993, the BEG range of $1,750-3,000$ fish was subsequently lowered by $18 \%$. The current Chignik River Chinook salmon biological escapement goal range has been set at 1,300-2,700 spawning fish based on an


Figure 5.-Inriver return of Chinook salmon to Chignik River, 1994-1997, and estimated sport harvest and spawning escapement, 1998-2003.
analysis of age composition and escapement data available through 2001 (Hasbrouck and Clark In prep) ${ }^{2}$. The sport fishery is allowed to proceed without inseason restrictions if interim escapement levels projecting to an inriver estimate meeting or exceeding the minimum goal are achieved. The current management approach assumes a Chinook salmon sport fishing mortality above the weir of approximately 200 fish.

## Study Objectives

Due to practical constraints on the means available for gathering data to study the Chignik Chinook salmon population, study objectives established for this stock differ from those for Karluk and Ayakulik river stocks. The current method of enumerating the Chignik River salmon escapement using an underwater video camera has precluded sampling of Chinook salmon to estimate length, age and sex composition of the inriver return. Conversely, the visual escapement enumeration method employed at Karluk and Ayakulik river weirs facilitates capture for sampling of a portion of the inriver Chinook salmon return. Study objectives for Karluk and Ayakulik river Chinook salmon were:

1. Enumerate the inriver return of Chinook salmon through the Karluk and Ayakulik weirs;
2. Census the fishing effort, harvest and catch of Chinook salmon of anglers traveling downstream past the Karluk and Ayakulik weirs from 1 June to 15 July;
3. Estimate the length, age and sex composition of the inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir on the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers; and
4. Estimate the length and sex composition of Chinook salmon harvested by anglers traveling by raft downstream past the weir on the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers from 1 June to 15 July.

Study objectives for Chignik River Chinook salmon were:

1. Enumerate the inriver return of Chinook salmon through the Chignik weir; and
2. Estimate the age and sex composition of the commercial harvest of Chinook salmon in the Chignik River Lagoon.

## METHODS

## Data Collection

## Inriver Return

During the 1999-2003 seasons all species of immigrant and outmigrant anadromous fish passing through weirs on the Karluk, Ayakulik, and Chignik rivers were enumerated during the respective dates of operation according to CFD operational plans for each project. Census counts of Chinook salmon inriver returns were obtained each year for the Karluk and Ayakulik river stocks, while inriver returns to Chignik River were estimated. In 2000 high water conditions on the Chignik River precluded operation of the weir between the dates of 8 June and 11 July. Consequently, Chinook escapement was estimated from historic run data for this period (Pappas et al. 2003).

## Age and Sex Composition of Inriver Return

On the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers, returns of Chinook salmon were sampled from weir traps at each location. Sampling strategies for each system consisted of stratification by seven weekly intervals (see below) with sample goals of 15-60 fish each, proportional to historic abundance by time period. Cumulative Chinook salmon sampling goals for each location totaled 300 fish annually.

On the Chignik River, the commercial purse seine harvest was sampled for age, sex, and length. During 1999-2001, the season was divided in two 2-week strata (1 July-15 July and 16 July31 July) with sample goals of 150 fish for each interval. In 2002 and 2003 the commercial harvest sampling strategy was revised to consist of stratification by six weekly intervals (see below) proportional to historic abundance by time period. The total sample size goal was 150 fish annually.
In 2002 and 2003, beach seining was conducted below the weir to sample the escapement of sockeye salmon. This allowed for age-sex-length sampling of Chinook salmon incidentally captured during these operations. Ultimately, Chignik commercial harvest samples were deemed unreliable (see Results), and the escapement sample sizes too small. Sport-caught samples (see below) were used to estimate age and sex composition.
Length from mideye to fork of tail (MEF) was recorded to the nearest millimeter for each fish sampled. Sex was determined on the basis of external characteristics. Whenever possible, three scales were removed from the left side of the body, at a point on a diagonal line from the
posterior insertion of the dorsal fin to the anterior insertion of the anal fin, two rows above the lateral line (Welander 1940). Sample scales were placed on a gummed card for subsequent analysis. Scales not available from the preferred area were taken from the area bounded dorsally by the fourth row of scales above the lateral line, ventrally by the lateral line, and between lines drawn vertically from the posterior insertion of the dorsal fin and the anterior insertion of the anal fin. Scales not available in the preferred area on the left side of the fish were collected from the preferred area on the opposite side. Ages of sampled Chinook salmon were determined from scales using criteria described in Mosher (1969).

## Sport Harvest and Effort

Total sport fishing effort, and catch and harvest of Chinook salmon at the Karluk River were estimated by the SWHS for 1999-2003 and at the Ayakulik River for 1999-2002. The SWHS total estimate for the Karluk was split into separate components - upstream and downstream of the ADF\&G weir - beginning in 2002. The Karluk River sport fishery upriver of the weir was censused in 2002 and 2003. SWHS estimates were not available for the Chignik River sport fishery due to small sample size. The Chignik sport fishery was censused once, in 1998.

In addition, anglers traveling downstream past or through the Karluk and Ayakulik weirs were individually interviewed to provide inseason indices of fishery performance. The following information was recorded for each interview:

1. Number of days fished;
2. Number of Chinook and sockeye salmon, steelhead, and Dolly Varden harvested;
3. Number of Chinook and sockeye salmon, steelhead, and Dolly Varden released;
4. Residency: (a) non-Alaska resident, (b) non-Kodiak Island Alaska resident, (c) Kodiak Island resident, and (d) non-citizen;
5. Guided or unguided.

On the Ayakulik River, clients from a lodge located on the lagoon walked and boated upriver daily to fish. In order to avoid multiple interviews of the same angler, the lodge manager provided ADF\&G with daily summaries of client fishing activities between 1999 and 2002. The daily summary included the following information:

1. Number of anglers;
2. Number of Chinook and sockeye salmon, steelhead, and Dolly Varden collectively harvested;
3. Number of Chinook and sockeye salmon, steelhead, and Dolly Varden collectively released;
4. Residency.

## Age, Sex, and Length Sampling of Sport Harvest

At the Karluk and Ayakulik weirs, sport-harvested Chinook salmon were sampled for sex and length up to a goal of 12 fish per week between 24 May and 10 July. Filleted or headed fish were not sampled. Length and sex data were collected as described for escapement sampling. Difficulty in achieving sport harvest sample goals at either location is due to a common practice of anglers processing fish shortly after being landed for cooler storage during the remainder of their trip. On the Ayakulik River the sample goal has historically been achievable as a result of
predominantly sampling fish harvested by anglers based from the lower river lodge, which are assumed to be representative of the entire sport fish harvest.

At the Chignik River weir, Chinook salmon harvested by anglers traveling downriver past the weir were sampled for age, sex, and length.

## Data Analysis

## Inriver Return at Karluk and Ayakulik Rivers

The proportion of Chinook salmon in age/sex class $j$ sampled from the inriver return at the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers during temporal stratum $i$ and its variance was estimated as a binomial proportion (Cochran 1977) by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{p}_{i j}=\frac{n_{i j}}{n_{i}}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{p}_{i j}\right)=\left[\frac{N_{i}-n_{i}}{N_{i}}\right] \frac{\hat{p}_{i j}\left(1-\hat{p}_{i j}\right)}{n_{i}-1}, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where:
$n_{i j}=$ the number of Chinook salmon in age/sex class $j$ during stratum $i$,
$n_{i}=$ the total number of Chinook salmon sampled during stratum $i$, and
$N_{i}=$ the inriver return of Chinook salmon counted during stratum i.
The abundance of Chinook salmon by age/sex class was estimated as the product of the inriver return and the proportion:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{N}_{i j}=N_{i} \hat{p}_{i j} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and its variance estimated by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{N}_{i j}\right)=N_{i}^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{p}_{i j}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Chi-square statistics were calculated to test the null hypothesis that the age/sex composition of the inriver return did not differ among temporal strata shown below.

| River and Year | Stratum |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karluk and | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Ayakulik Rivers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999-2002 | Before <br> 31 May | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \text { May - } \\ & 5 \text { June } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 6-12 June | $13-19$ <br> June | $\begin{aligned} & 20-26 \\ & \text { June } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 27 June - <br> 3 July | After 3 <br> July |
| 2003 | Before <br> 31 May | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \text { May - } \\ & 6 \text { June } \end{aligned}$ | 7-13 June | $14-20$ <br> June | $21-27$ <br> June | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \text { June - } \\ & \text { 4 July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | After 4 July |
| Chignik River: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999-2001 | 1-15 July | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16-31 } \\ & \text { July } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | Before 30 June | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \text { June - } \\ & 6 \text { July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7-13 July | $\begin{aligned} & 14-20 \\ & \text { July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21-27 \\ & \text { July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | After 27 <br> July |  |
| 2003 | Before 29 June | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \text { June - } \\ & 5 \text { July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 6-12 July | $\begin{aligned} & 13-19 \\ & \text { July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20-26 \\ & \text { July } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | After 26 July |  |

Data were pooled across adjacent strata when differences were not detected at $\alpha=0.05$, or when sampling fractions were approximately equal between strata. If either of these conditions were true, then the pooled and stratified estimates were essentially equivalent, so the adjacent strata were pooled. If neither condition was true (i.e., if either age proportions or sampling fractions differed), then age composition, and return by age, was estimated separately for each stratum. The total number of Chinook salmon of each age/sex class, and their variances, was the sum of the stratum estimates.

## Spawning Escapement at Karluk and Ayakulik Rivers

During 1999-2001, we believe that nearly all of sport harvest occurred upstream of the Karluk and Ayakulik river weirs, therefore spawning escapement was estimated by subtracting total estimated sport fish harvest. The variance of the estimated spawning escapement was the same as the variance of the estimated sport harvest; the inriver return was a complete census and thus without sampling error.

The proportion of Chinook salmon harvested by anglers who moved downstream past the Karluk or Ayakulik weir that was of sex $j$, and its variance, was estimated using equations (1) and (2). The total number of Chinook salmon of sex $j$ harvested above the weir was estimated by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{H}_{j}=\hat{H} \hat{p}_{j}, \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and its variance estimated by (Goodman 1960):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{H}_{j}\right)=\hat{H}^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{p}_{j}\right)+\hat{p}_{j}^{2} \operatorname{Var}(\hat{H})-\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{p}_{j}\right) \operatorname{Var}(\hat{H}) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where:
$\hat{H}$ and $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{H})=$ harvest and variance of harvest estimated from the SWHS, and
$\hat{p}_{j}$ and $\operatorname{Var}\left(\hat{p}_{j}\right)=$ proportion and variance of the proportion of Chinook salmon of class $j$.

## Chignik River

Chignik River Lagoon commercial harvest data based on fish ticket receipts and daily counts of Chinook salmon through the Chignik River weir were considered census data. Total returns of Chinook salmon to the Chignik River were calculated by summing commercial harvests and inriver returns. Since we had no yearly estimates of Chignik sport harvest, Chignik River Chinook salmon spawning escapement was estimated by subtracting 200 fish from the estimated inriver returns (based on a 1998 creel census estimate of 168 fish harvested (Clapsadl 2002). Uncertainty in the Chignik spawning escapement due to the imputed sport harvest estimate has not been addressed in this report. Age and sex proportions, and returns by age and sex, were estimated from samples of sport-harvested fish using equations (1)-(4). Age and sex composition estimates were not stratified by time.

Age and sex composition of total returns was estimated using equations (1)-(4), based on fish sampled in the commercial harvest.

## RESULTS

## Karluk River

## 1999

The Karluk weir was installed in 1999 on 26 May and remained operational continuously through 23 September.

The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 13,063 fish. Age was determined for 324 of 355 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 12 June and after 12 June (Appendix D1). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=24.0, \mathrm{df}=4, P=0.0001$ ), with older fish arriving early and younger fish late. Most fish were aged 1.3 or 1.4 (Table 4). There were 1.1 males for every female.

In 1999, anglers fishing the Karluk system caught an estimated 7,723 Chinook salmon and harvested $1,766(\mathrm{SE}=317)$ fish, expending 6,239 $(\mathrm{SE}=945)$ angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 1; Howe et al. 2001d). The 1999 Karluk River spawning escapement was estimated at $11,297(\mathrm{SE}=317)$ Chinook salmon (Figure 2), of which 5,310 $(\mathrm{SE}=350)$ were females and $5,987(\mathrm{SE}=358)$ were males.
Angler interviews conducted at the weir during 1999 accounted for 1,944 angler days of effort during which 350 Chinook salmon were harvested and 1,540 released (Appendix G1). Of the 323 anglers interviewed, $78 \%$ were nonresident and $66 \%$ were unguided. Sport caught Chinook salmon were not sampled for age, sex and length during the 1999 fishery.

## 2000

The Karluk weir was installed in 2000 on 25 May and operated through 24 September. Daily Chinook salmon escapement was enumerated during this period, except on 15, 22, 23, 29 June and 11 July when counts were unobtainable due to displacement of the weir structure by bears. An estimated total of 220 Chinook salmon were added to the cumulative overall escapement to account for the passage of fish during these periods.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 10,460 fish. Age was determined for 280 of 305 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 12 June and after 12 June (Appendix D2). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=14.9, \mathrm{df}=4, P=0.005$ ), with older fish arriving early and younger fish late. Over $60 \%$ of the fish were age 1.4 (Table 5). There were 1.8 females for every male.

In 2000, anglers fishing the Karluk system caught an estimated 10,746 Chinook salmon and harvested $2,581(\mathrm{SE}=427)$ fish, expending $8,301(\mathrm{SE}=1,203)$ angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 1; Walker et al. 2003). The 2000 Karluk River spawning escapement was estimated at $7,879(\mathrm{SE}=427)$ Chinook salmon, of which $5,066(\mathrm{SE}=352)$ were females and 2,813 ( $\mathrm{SE}=268$ ) were males.

Angler interviews conducted at the weir during 2000 accounted for 1,903 angler days of effort during which 511 Chinook salmon were harvested and 1,958 released (Appendix G1).

Table 4.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Karluk River Chinook salmon, 1999.


Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix D1) based on samples obtained 28 May-9 July 1999. Female, male, and total statistics include 21, 10, and 31 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 5.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Karluk River Chinook salmon, 2000.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.6 | 19.0 | 43.8 | 0.8 | 64.3 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 2.8 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 66 | 1,992 | 4,583 | 83 | 6,724 |
| SE | 0 | 46 | 247 | 311 | 59 | 298 |
| Number Sampled |  | 2 | 54 | 119 | 2 | 192 |
| Mean Length |  | 590 | 758 | 821 | 831 | 800 |
| Std Dev Length |  | 45 | 56 | 37 | 41 | 56 |
| Minimum Length |  | 558 | 497 | 641 | 802 | 497 |
| Maximum Length |  | 621 | 878 | 920 | 860 | 920 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 1.6 | 3.0 | 13.3 | 17.3 | 0.5 | 35.7 |
| SE | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 2.8 |
| Inriver Return | 164 | 312 | 1,396 | 1,814 | 50 | 3,736 |
| SE | 72 | 102 | 199 | 242 | 49 | 298 |
| Number Sampled | 5 | 9 | 41 | 47 | 1 | 113 |
| Mean Length | 386 | 535 | 768 | 838 | 827 | 766 |
| Std Dev Length | 36 | 41 | 51 | 47 |  | 124 |
| Minimum Length | 359 | 470 | 637 | 717 | 827 | 359 |
| Maximum Length | 448 | 616 | 870 | 955 | 827 | 955 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 1.6 | 3.6 | 32.4 | 61.2 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.7 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 164 | 378 | 3,389 | 6,397 | 132 | 10,460 |
| SE | 72 | 111 | 286 | 297 | 76 | 0 |
| Number Sampled | 5 | 11 | 95 | 166 | 3 | 305 |
| Mean Length | 386 | 545 | 762 | 826 | 830 | 787 |
| Std Dev Length | 36 | 45 | 54 | 41 | 29 | 89 |
| Minimum Length | 359 | 470 | 497 | 641 | 802 | 359 |
| Maximum Length | 448 | 621 | 878 | 955 | 860 | 955 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix D2) based on samples obtained 25 May-5 July 2000. Female, male, and total statistics include 15,10 , and 25 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

## 2001

The Karluk weir was installed in 2001 on 24 May and operated through 18 September.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 4,453 fish. Age was determined for 71 of 81 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were not stratified by time period, since age composition did not change between periods (before and after 12 June, ages 1.3-1.5, $\chi^{2}=1.6, \mathrm{df}=2, P=0.45$ ). Most ( $67.6 \%$ ) fish were age 1.4 (Table 6). There were 1.5 females for every male.

In 2001, anglers fishing the Karluk system caught an estimated 4,980 (SE = 1,221) Chinook salmon and harvested 1,304 ( $\mathrm{SE}=257$ ) fish, expending 5,589 ( $\mathrm{SE}=784$ ) angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 1; Jennings et al. 2004). The 2001 Karluk River spawning escapement was estimated at $3,149(\mathrm{SE}=257)$ Chinook salmon, of which $1,864(\mathrm{SE}=$ 240) were females and 1,285 ( $\mathrm{SE}=213$ ) were males.

Angler interviews conducted at the weir and at Karluk Portage during 2001 accounted for 1,976 angler-days of effort during which 333 Chinook salmon were harvested and 1,230 released (Appendix G1). Of the 526 anglers interviewed, $90 \%$ were nonresident and $70 \%$ were guided. Eight harvested Chinook salmon were measured at the weir, four of which were females. Sampled females averaged $849 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{SE}=17)$, and males $725 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{SE}=46)$ in length (Appendix C1).

## 2002

The Karluk weir was installed in 2002 on 21 May and operated through 20 September.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 7,174 fish. Age was determined for 303 of 347 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 12 June, 13-26 June, 27 June-3 July, and after 3 July (Appendix D3). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=114$, $\mathrm{df}=12, P<0.0001$ ), with older fish arriving early and younger fish late. Most fish were ages $1.2,1.3$, or 1.4 (Table 7 ). There were 1.4 males for every female.

In 2002, anglers fishing the Karluk system caught an estimated 4,801 (SE = 505) Chinook salmon and harvested 1,086 ( $\mathrm{SE}=307$ ) fish, expending 3,119 ( $\mathrm{SE}=592$ ) angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 1; Jennings et al. 2006a). The 2002 Karluk River spawning escapement was 6,573 Chinook salmon, of which $2,721(\mathrm{SE}=184)$ were females and 3,852 (SE = 184) were males.

Angler interviews conducted at the weir and at Karluk Portage during 2002 accounted for 1,745 angler-days of effort during which 601 Chinook salmon were harvested and 2,268 were released (Appendix G1). Of the 831 anglers interviewed, $90 \%$ were nonresident and $77 \%$ were guided. Sport caught Chinook salmon were not sampled for age, sex and length during the 2002 fishery.

## 2003

The Karluk weir was installed in 2003 on 17 May and operated through 27 September. In late August high water conditions interrupted operations for a 3-day period, during which an estimate of the daily Chinook salmon escapement was made based on historic run timing scaled to the magnitude of the 2003 return prior to the high water period.

Table 6.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Karluk River Chinook salmon, 2001.

|  | Age |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.5 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 9.9 | 46.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 59.2 |
| SE | 3.5 | 5.9 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 5.8 |
| Inriver Return | 439 | 2,070 | 125 | 0 | 2,634 |
| SE | 157 | 263 | 87 | 0 | 260 |
| Number Sampled | 7 | 33 | 2 |  | 48 |
| Mean Length | 779 | 827 | 847 |  | 821 |
| Std Dev Length | 67 | 57 | 6 |  | 57 |
| Minimum Length | 686 | 601 | 843 |  | 601 |
| Maximum Length | 852 | 906 | 851 |  | 906 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 12.7 | 21.1 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 40.8 |
| SE | 3.9 | 4.8 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 5.8 |
| Inriver Return | 564 | 941 | 251 | 63 | 1,819 |
| SE | 176 | 216 | 122 | 62 | 260 |
| Number Sampled | 9 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 33 |
| Mean Length | 741 | 821 | 857 | 820 | 803 |
| Std Dev Length | 51 | 51 | 37 |  | 62 |
| Minimum Length | 672 | 694 | 817 | 820 | 672 |
| Maximum Length | 834 | 902 | 905 | 820 | 905 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 22.5 | 67.6 | 8.5 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| SE | 5.0 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 1,003 | 3,010 | 376 | 63 | 4,453 |
| SE | 221 | 247 | 147 | 62 | 0 |
| Number Sampled | 16 | 48 | 6 | 1 | 81 |
| Mean Length | 758 | 826 | 854 | 820 | 813 |
| Std Dev Length | 59 | 55 | 29 |  | 60 |
| Minimum Length | 672 | 601 | 817 | 820 | 601 |
| Maximum Length | 852 | 906 | 905 | 820 | 906 |

Note: Based on samples obtained 28 May-9 July 2001. Female, male, and total statistics include 6,4 , and 10 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 7.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Karluk River Chinook salmon, 2002.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.3 | 15.1 | 23.8 | 2.2 | 41.4 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 2.8 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 20 | 1,085 | 1,704 | 160 | 2,969 |
| SE | 0 | 20 | 163 | 152 | 54 | 201 |
| Number Sampled |  | 1 | 46 | 83 | 8 | 164 |
| Mean Length |  | 750 | 781 | 805 | 858 | 799 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  | 39 | 40 | 32 | 44 |
| Minimum Length |  | 750 | 687 | 676 | 810 | 627 |
| Maximum Length |  | 750 | 898 | 925 | 915 | 925 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 2.5 | 25.0 | 16.8 | 12.2 | 2.1 | 58.6 |
| SE | 1.5 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 2.8 |
| Inriver Return | 180 | 1,794 | 1,205 | 878 | 148 | 4,205 |
| SE | 106 | 193 | 157 | 120 | 54 | 201 |
| Number Sampled | 3 | 58 | 54 | 43 | 7 | 183 |
| Mean Length | 372 | 620 | 764 | 797 | 849 | 722 |
| Std Dev Length | 31 | 44 | 59 | 53 | 33 | 105 |
| Minimum Length | 349 | 508 | 612 | 692 | 818 | 349 |
| Maximum Length | 408 | 718 | 884 | 911 | 909 | 911 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 2.5 | 25.3 | 31.9 | 36.0 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| SE | 1.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 180 | 1,815 | 2,289 | 2,582 | 308 | 7,174 |
| SE | 106 | 194 | 205 | 162 | 76 | 0 |
| Number Sampled | 3 | 59 | 100 | 126 | 15 | 347 |
| Mean Length | 372 | 623 | 772 | 802 | 854 | 758 |
| Std Dev Length | 31 | 46 | 51 | 45 | 32 | 91 |
| Minimum Length | 349 | 508 | 612 | 676 | 810 | 349 |
| Maximum Length | 408 | 750 | 898 | 925 | 915 | 925 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix D3) based on samples obtained 26 May-5 July 2002. Female, male, and total statistics include 26, 16, and 42 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 7,256 fish. Age was determined for 373 of 416 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 30 May, 31 May-13 June, 14-27 June, and after 27 June (Appendix D4). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=31.7, \mathrm{df}=12, P=0.002$ ), with older fish generally arriving early and younger fish late. Most fish were age 1.3 (Table 8). There were 0.8 males for every female.

In 2003, anglers fishing the Karluk system caught an estimated 2,459 Chinook salmon and harvested 587 fish, expending 1,858 angler-days of effort directed at all species during the entire year (Table 1; Jennings et al. 2006b). The 2003 Karluk River spawning escapement was 6,986 Chinook salmon, of which 3,884 ( $\mathrm{SE}=238$ ) were females and 3,102 $(\mathrm{SE}=238)$ were males.

Angler interviews conducted at the weir and at Karluk Portage during 2003 accounted for 758 angler-days of effort during which 291 Chinook salmon were harvested and 1,513 released (Appendix G1). Of the 389 anglers interviewed at Karluk weir in 2003, 71\% were non Alaska residents from other parts of the United States (U.S.) and $63 \%$ were guided. Of the 54 harvested Chinook salmon measured at the weir, 21 were females and 33 were males. Sampled females averaged $797 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{SE} \mathrm{=} \mathrm{10)}$, and males $765 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{SE}=19)$ in length (Appendix C2).

## Ayakulik River

## 1999

The Ayakulik weir was installed in 1999 on 25 May and operated through 22 August.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 13,503 fish. Age was determined for 254 of 300 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 19 June, and after 19 June (Appendix E1). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=29.5$, $\mathrm{df}=4, P<0.0001$ ), with older fish generally arriving early and younger fish late. Most fish were age 1.3 or 1.4 (Table 9). There were 2.2 males for every female.
In 1999, anglers fishing the Ayakulik system caught an estimated 3,434 Chinook salmon and harvested 609 (SE = 207) fish, expending 2,165 (SE = 491) angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 2; Howe et al. 2001d). The 1999 Ayakulik River spawning escapement was estimated at $12,894(\mathrm{SE}=207)$ Chinook salmon (Figure 3), of which 3,971 $(\mathrm{SE}=405)$ were females and $8,923(\mathrm{SE}=425)$ were males.

Angler interviews conducted at the weir during 1999 accounted for 343 angler-days of effort during which 237 Chinook salmon were harvested and 971 released (Appendix G2). Of the 63 anglers interviewed, $65 \%$ were non Alaska residents from other parts of the U.S. and $64 \%$ were guided. Sport caught Chinook salmon were not sampled for age, sex and length during the 1999 fishery.

## 2000

The Ayakulik weir was installed in 2000 on 21 May and operated through 26 August. On 2-3 August the weir was removed due to high water and was re-installed on 4 August. During this period an estimated Chinook salmon escapement of 0 fish was based on historic run timing scaled to the magnitude of the 2000 return prior to the high water period.

Table 8.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Karluk River Chinook salmon, 2003.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.4 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 6.0 | 35.0 | 14.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 55.6 |
| SE | 0.0 | 1.1 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 435 | 2,537 | 1,042 | 22 | 0 | 4,036 |
| SE | 0 | 79 | 317 | 275 | 22 | 0 | 247 |
| Number Sampled |  | 28 | 107 | 46 | 1 |  | 197 |
| Mean Length |  | 650 | 764 | 816 | 811 |  | 756 |
| Std Dev Length |  | 75 | 50 | 46 |  |  | 76 |
| Minimum Length |  | 528 | 618 | 692 | 811 |  | 528 |
| Maximum Length |  | 834 | 874 | 903 | 811 |  | 903 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 1.4 | 12.6 | 23.9 | 5.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 44.4 |
| SE | 0.6 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| Inriver Return | 102 | 915 | 1,733 | 429 | 36 | 4 | 3,220 |
| SE | 45 | 112 | 237 | 81 | 25 | 3 | 247 |
| Number Sampled | 5 | 55 | 101 | 28 | 1 | 1 | 219 |
| Mean Length | 443 | 605 | 775 | 811 | 1,009 | 881 | 726 |
| Std Dev Length | 99 | 67 | 64 | 65 |  |  | 118 |
| Minimum Length | 356 | 477 | 596 | 626 | 1,009 | 881 | 356 |
| Maximum Length | 595 | 826 | 906 | 965 | 1,009 | 881 | 1,009 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 1.4 | 18.6 | 58.8 | 20.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.6 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 102 | 1,351 | 4,270 | 1,471 | 58 | 4 | 7,256 |
| SE | 45 | 129 | 297 | 284 | 33 | 3 | 0 |
| Number Sampled | 5 | 83 | 208 | 74 | 2 | 1 | 416 |
| Mean Length | 443 | 620 | 769 | 814 | 910 | 881 | 740 |
| Std Dev Length | 99 | 73 | 57 | 54 | 140 |  | 101 |
| Minimum Length | 356 | 477 | 596 | 626 | 811 | 881 | 356 |
| Maximum Length | 595 | 834 | 906 | 965 | 1,009 | 881 | 1,009 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix D4) based on samples obtained 22 May-11 July 2003. Female, male, and total statistics include 15, 28, and 43 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 9.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Ayakulik River Chinook salmon, 1999.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.5 | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 16.8 | 12.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.8 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.1 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 2,269 | 1,652 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4,155 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 343 | 283 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 414 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 4 | 38 | 34 | 1 |  |  |  | 23 | 100 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 540 | 755 | 818 | 847 |  |  |  | 780 | 774 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 66 | 48 | 48 |  |  |  |  | 78 | 79 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 476 | 638 | 689 | 847 |  |  |  | 582 | 476 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 603 | 898 | 897 | 847 |  |  |  | 982 | 982 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 17.5 | 32.6 | 15.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 69.2 |
| SE | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.1 |
| Inriver Return | 70 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 2,367 | 4,398 | 2,113 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9,348 |
| SE | 69 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 311 | 422 | 326 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 414 |
| Number Sampled | 1 |  |  | 6 | 54 | 74 | 39 | 3 |  |  |  | 23 | 200 |
| Mean Length | 562 |  |  | 431 | 577 | 745 | 812 | 800 |  |  |  | 694 | 697 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 184 | 43 | 76 | 70 | 167 |  |  |  | 117 | 126 |
| Minimum Length | 562 |  |  | 314 | 469 | 458 | 672 | 609 |  |  |  | 486 | 314 |
| Maximum Length | 562 |  |  | 782 | 697 | 924 | 917 | 920 |  |  |  | 876 | 924 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 19.0 | 49.4 | 27.9 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 70 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 2,570 | 6,667 | 3,764 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13,503 |
| SE | 69 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 323 | 436 | 398 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Number Sampled | 1 |  |  | 6 | 58 | 112 | 73 | 4 |  |  |  | 46 | 300 |
| Mean Length | 562 |  |  | 431 | 574 | 749 | 815 | 812 |  |  |  | 737 | 723 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 184 | 45 | 68 | 60 | 139 |  |  |  | 107 | 118 |
| Minimum Length | 562 |  |  | 314 | 469 | 458 | 672 | 609 |  |  |  | 486 | 314 |
| Maximum Length | 562 |  |  | 782 | 697 | 924 | 917 | 920 |  |  |  | 982 | 982 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix E1) based on samples obtained 27 May-4 July 1999. Female, male, and total statistics include 23, 23, and 46 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 20,527 fish (Table 2). Age was determined for 339 of 392 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 30 May, 31 May-12 June, 13-19 June, and after 19 June (Appendix E2). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.2-1.4, $\chi^{2}=30.7, \mathrm{df}=6$, $P<0.0001$ ), with older fish arriving early and younger fish late. Most fish were age 1.3 or 1.4 (Table 10). There were 1.4 males for every female.

In 2000, anglers fishing the Ayakulik system caught an estimated 8,381 Chinook salmon and harvested 803 ( $\mathrm{SE}=209$ ) fish, expending $1,808(\mathrm{SE}=395)$ angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 2; Walker et al. 2003). The 2000 Ayakulik River spawning escapement was estimated at 19,724 (SE = 209) Chinook salmon, of which 8,304 $(\mathrm{SE}=657)$ were females and 11,420 ( $\mathrm{SE}=662$ ) were males.

Angler interviews conducted at the weir during 2000 accounted for 403 angler-days of effort during which 315 Chinook salmon were harvested and 1,567 released (Appendix G2). Of the 60 anglers interviewed, $83 \%$ were non Alaskan residents from other parts of the U.S. and $95 \%$ were guided. Sport caught Chinook salmon were not sampled for age, sex and length during the 2000 fishery.

## 2001

The Ayakulik weir was installed in 2001 on 20 May and operated through 29 August. On 2 June, 19-20 July, and 20-21 August the weir was removed due to high water and on each occasion subsequently re-installed. During this period an estimated cumulative total Chinook salmon escapement of 100 fish was based on historic run timing scaled to the magnitude of the 2001 return prior to the high water periods.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 13,929 fish (Table 2). Age was determined for 232 of 300 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 5 June, 6-19 June, and after 19 June (Appendix E3). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=22.4, \mathrm{df}=8, P=0.004$ ). In general, older fish arrived earlier than younger fish, although the proportion of age-1.1 fish peaked during the second time period. Most fish were age 1.4 (Table 11). There were 0.7 males for every female.

In 2001, anglers fishing the Ayakulik system caught an estimated 8,703 ( $\mathrm{SE}=2,418$ ) Chinook salmon and harvested $568(\mathrm{SE}=182)$ fish, expending $3,173(\mathrm{SE}=1,006)$ angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 2; Jennings et al. 2004). The 2001 Ayakulik River spawning escapement was estimated at 13,361 (SE = 182) Chinook salmon, of which 7,830 ( $\mathrm{SE}=467$ ) were females and $5,531(\mathrm{SE}=460)$ were males.

Angler interviews conducted during 2001 accounted for 981 angler-days of effort during which 298 Chinook salmon were harvested and 4,097 released (Appendix G2). Of the 157 anglers interviewed at the Ayakulik weir in 2001, $58 \%$ were non Alaskan resident from other parts of the U.S. and $34 \%$ were guided. A total of 13 Chinook salmon were measured from the weir census harvest, including 7 females and 6 males. Sampled sport harvested females averaged 856 mm $(\mathrm{SE}=9)$, and males averaged $880 \mathrm{~mm}(\mathrm{SE}=17)$ in length.

Table 10.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Ayakulik River Chinook salmon, 2000.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.5 | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 24.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 42.1 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.3 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,581 | 5,032 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 8,638 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 528 | 544 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 668 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  |  | 64 | 82 | 1 |  |  |  | 21 | 168 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  |  | 755 | 820 | 854 |  |  |  | 801 | 793 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 57 | 54 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  |  | 533 | 734 | 854 |  |  |  | 702 | 533 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  |  | 878 | 891 | 854 |  |  |  | 903 | 903 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 33.9 | 20.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 57.9 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.3 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 627 | 6,961 | 4,251 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 11,889 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 233 | 654 | 553 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 668 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 1 | 13 | 105 | 72 | 1 |  |  |  | 31 | 224 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 425 | 570 | 747 | 844 | 927 |  |  |  | 752 | 768 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 41 | 53 | 50 |  |  |  |  | 95 | 92 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 425 | 518 | 565 | 722 | 927 |  |  |  | 503 | 425 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 425 | 663 | 836 | 985 | 927 |  |  |  | 888 | 985 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 51.4 | 45.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 627 | 10,542 | 9,283 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 20,527 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 233 | 655 | 642 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 1 | 13 | 169 | 154 | 2 |  |  |  | 52 | 392 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 425 | 570 | 750 | 832 | 891 |  |  |  | 772 | 779 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 41 | 52 | 45 | 52 |  |  |  | 85 | 79 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 425 | 518 | 533 | 722 | 854 |  |  |  | 503 | 425 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 425 | 663 | 878 | 985 | 927 |  |  |  | 903 | 985 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix E2) based on samples obtained 25 May-5 July 2000. Female, male, and total statistics include 21, 31, and 52 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 11.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Ayakulik River Chinook salmon, 2001.


Males

| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 6.7 | 7.8 | 17.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 41.4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 3.4 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,142 | 928 | 1,083 | 2,451 | 95 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 5,761 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 216 | 264 | 371 | 95 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 475 |
| Number Sampled |  |  | 21 | 20 | 19 | 44 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 31 | 138 |
| Mean Length |  |  | 355 | 562 | 733 | 857 | 920 | 580 |  | 895 | 719 | 689 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  | 40 | 74 | 142 | 54 |  |  |  |  | 148 | 198 |
| Minimum Length |  |  | 282 | 326 | 299 | 697 | 920 | 580 |  | 895 | 346 | 282 |
| Maximum Length |  |  | 423 | 688 | 932 | 980 | 920 | 580 | 895 | 935 | 980 |  |

Total

| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 18.4 | 62.9 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,142 | 1,054 | 2,563 | 8,757 | 351 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 13,929 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 237 | 391 | 474 | 174 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 21 | 22 | 40 | 143 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 | 68 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 355 | 586 | 777 | 838 | 865 | 580 | 895 | 772 | 762 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 40 | 106 | 109 | 41 | 45 |  |  | 115 | 153 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 282 | 326 | 299 | 697 | 817 | 580 | 895 | 346 | 282 |
| Maximum Length |  |  | 423 | 878 | 932 | 980 | 920 | 580 | 895 | 935 | 980 |  |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix E3) based on samples obtained 24 May-8 July 2001. Female, male, and total statistics include 37, 31, and 68 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

## 2002

The Ayakulik weir was installed in 2002 on 20 May and operated through 24 August.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 12,552 fish (Table 2). Age was determined for 252 of 308 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 30 May, 31 May-12 June, 13-19 June, and after 19 June (Appendix E4). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.1-1.5, $\chi^{2}=39.2, \mathrm{df}=12, P=$ 0.0001).

In general, older fish arrived earlier and younger fish later. Most fish were age 1.2, 1.3 or 1.4 (Table 12). There were 1.3 males for every female.
In 2002, anglers fishing the Ayakulik system caught an estimated 5,644 (SE = 2,079) Chinook salmon and harvested $362(\mathrm{SE}=135)$ fish, expending $1,715(\mathrm{SE}=491)$ angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 2; Jennings et al. 2006a). The 2002 Ayakulik River spawning escapement was $12,189(\mathrm{SE}=135)$ Chinook salmon, of which $5,302(\mathrm{SE}=382)$ were females and 6,887 $(\mathrm{SE}=385)$ were males.
Angler interviews conducted at the weir in 2002 accounted for 1,199 angler-days of effort during which 272 Chinook salmon were harvested and 2,343 were released (Appendix G2). Of the 460 anglers interviewed at the Ayakulik weir in 2002, $86 \%$ were non Alaskan residents from other parts of the U.S. and $76 \%$ were guided. Sport caught Chinook salmon were not sampled for age, sex and length during the 2002 fishery.

## 2003

The Ayakulik weir was installed in 2003 on 21 May and operated until 11 August, when high water conditions resulted in its removal for the year.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 17,557 fish (Table 2). Age was determined for 281 of 327 Chinook salmon sampled at the weir. Estimates of abundance by age were stratified by time period: through 30 May, 31 May-13 June, 14-27 June, and after 27 June (Appendix E5). Age composition changed between periods (ages 1.2-1.4, $\chi^{2}=23.8, \mathrm{df}=6, P=$ 0.0006 ). In general, older fish arrived earlier and younger fish later. See Table 13 for estimates of abundance and length by age and sex. There were 1.4 males for every female.

In 2003, anglers fishing the Ayakulik system caught 5,219 Chinook salmon and harvested 451 fish, expending 1,725 angler-days of effort for all species during the entire year (Table 2; Tracy and Schmidt In prep). The 2003 Ayakulik River spawning escapement was 17,106 Chinook salmon, of which 7,185 $(\mathrm{SE}=513)$ were females and $9,921(\mathrm{SE}=513)$ were males.
Of the 188 anglers interviewed at the Ayakulik weir in 2003, $48 \%$ were non Alaskan residents from other parts of the U.S. and $44 \%$ were guided (Appendix G2). Sport caught Chinook salmon were not sampled for age, sex and length during the 2003 fishery.

## CHIGNIK RIVER

Fish sampled from the commercial purse seine fishery in 2002 and 2003 had extremely high proportions of fish aged 1.1 and 1.2 (Appendices C6-C7). This is inconsistent with sport harvest (Tables 14-18) and escapement (Appendix F1) samples, as well as historical age composition for the Chignik (Schwarz 1996; Motis 1997; Clapsadl 2002). We suspect that the Chignik Lagoon

Table 12.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Ayakulik River Chinook salmon, 2002.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 |  | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 15.3 | 20.9 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.2 |  | 43.5 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.2 |  | 3.1 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477 | 1,921 | 2,627 | 288 | 16 | 103 | 30 |  | 5,463 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 336 | 363 | 112 | 16 | 103 | 29 |  | 394 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 10 | 33 | 44 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 123 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 628 | 775 | 821 | 854 | 762 | 814 | 915 | 756.1 | 782.66 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 36 | 81 | 43 | 51 |  |  |  | 107.4 | 89.894 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 552 | 571 | 679 | 770 | 762 | 814 | 915 | 517 | 517 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 678 | 913 | 906 | 907 | 762 | 814 | 915 | 891 | 938 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 22.8 | 18.0 | 6.7 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |  | 56.5 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |  | 3.1 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 30 | 680 | 2,865 | 2,265 | 841 | 305 | 0 | 0 | 103 |  | 7,088 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 29 | 182 | 346 | 310 | 195 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 103 |  | 394 |
| Number Sampled |  |  | 1 | 13 | 54 | 55 | 18 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 32 | 185 |
| Mean Length |  |  | 348 | 369 | 593 | 669 | 839 | 904 |  |  | 913 | 687 | 656 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 78 | 48 | 124 | 99 | 73 |  |  |  | 159 | 158 |
| Minimum Length |  |  | 348 | 306 | 492 | 319 | 545 | 814 |  |  | 913 | 327 | 306 |
| Maximum Length |  |  | 348 | 591 | 697 | 904 | 952 | 978 |  |  | 913 | 986 | 986 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 5.4 | 26.6 | 33.4 | 27.6 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.1 |  | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.9 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 30 | 680 | 3,342 | 4,186 | 3,469 | 592 | 16 | 103 | 133 |  | 12,552 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 29 | 182 | 366 | 415 | 401 | 176 | 16 | 103 | 107 |  | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  | 1 | 13 | 64 | 88 | 62 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 56 | 308 |
| Mean Length |  |  | 348 | 368.9 | 598 | 709 | 826 | 877 | 762 | 814 | 914 | 717 | 707 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 77.67 | 48 | 120 | 64 | 64 |  |  | 1 | 142 | 148 |
| Minimum Length |  |  | 348 | 306 | 492 | 319 | 545 | 770 | 762 | 814 | 913 | 327 | 306 |
| Maximum Length |  |  | 348 | 591 | 697 | 913 | 952 | 978 | 762 | 814 | 915 | 986 | 986 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix E4) based on samples obtained 28 May-8 July 2002. Female, male, and total statistics include 24, 32, and 56 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 13.-Estimated age and sex composition of inriver return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Ayakulik River Chinook salmon, 2003.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 |  | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 26.6 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 42.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 4,672 | 2,519 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7,371 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 472 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 524 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 3 | 75 | 44 |  |  |  |  | 21 | 143 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 668 | 778 | 813 |  |  |  |  | 797 | 789 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 6 | 50 | 65 |  |  |  |  | 73 | 62 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 661 | 665 | 692 |  |  |  |  | 668 | 661 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 671 | 956 | 935 |  |  |  |  | 948 | 956 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 18.9 | 32.0 | 6.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 58.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 3,320 | 5,620 | 1,107 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 10,186 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 407 | 500 | 263 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 524 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 1 | 53 | 87 | 17 | 1 |  |  |  | 25 | 184 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 321 | 580 | 760 | 801 | 909 |  |  |  | 733 | 707 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 52 | 66 | 63 |  |  |  |  | 117 | 114 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 321 | 476 | 549 | 694 | 909 |  |  |  | 519 | 321 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 321 | 714 | 948 | 896 | 909 |  |  |  | 948 | 948 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 19.9 | 58.6 | 20.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 3,501 | 10,292 | 3,626 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 17,557 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 413 | 527 | 430 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 1 | 56 | 162 | 61 | 1 |  |  |  | 46 | 327 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 321 | 585 | 768 | 810 | 909 |  |  |  | 762 | 743 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 54 | 60 | 64 |  |  |  |  | 103 | 103 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 321 | 476 | 549 | 692 | 909 |  |  |  | 519 | 321 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 321 | 714 | 956 | 935 | 909 |  |  |  | 948 | 956 |

Note: Age and sex compositions were stratified by time period (see Appendix E5) based on samples obtained 28 May-6 July 2003. Female, male, and total statistics include 21, 25, and 46 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 14.-Estimated age and sex composition of total return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Chignik River Chinook salmon, 1999.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 2.4 | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 16.7 | 31.5 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 55.6 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 6.8 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 1,012 | 1,912 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3,373 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 309 | 386 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 413 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 2 | 9 | 17 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 32 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 633 | 818 | 896 | 860 |  |  |  | 837 | 852 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 84 | 95 | 53 | 21 |  |  |  | 68 | 93 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 573 | 680 | 802 | 845 |  |  |  | 789 | 573 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 692 | 944 | 983 | 875 |  |  |  | 885 | 983 |

Males

| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 18.5 | 16.7 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 44.4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.8 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 450 | 1,124 | 1,012 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,699 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 323 | 309 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 413 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 4 | 10 | 9 | 1 |  |  | 24 |  |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 656 | 788 | 912 | 1,019 |  |  | 822 |  |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 30 | 104 | 63 |  |  |  | 126 |  |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 629 | 615 | 800 | 1,019 |  |  | 615 |  |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 690 | 940 | 982 | 1,019 |  |  |  | 1019 |

Total

| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 35.2 | 48.1 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 675 | 2,136 | 2,924 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,072 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 397 | 415 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 6 | 19 | 26 | 3 |  |  | 2 | 56 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 648 | 802 | 902 | 913 |  |  | 837 | 839 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 46 | 98 | 56 | 93 |  |  | 68 | 108 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 573 | 615 | 800 | 845 |  |  | 789 | 573 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 692 | 944 | 983 | 1,019 |  |  | 885 | 1,019 |

Note: Estimates are based on fish sampled from the sport fishery harvest from 30 June-6 August, 1999. Female, male, and total statistics include 2,0 , and 2 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 15.-Estimated age and sex composition of total return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Chignik River Chinook salmon, 2000.


Males

| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 11.4 | 17.1 | 15.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 576 | 865 | 792 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,522 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 192 | 227 | 219 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 301 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 2 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 2 |  |  |  | 35 |
| Mean Length |  |  | 405 | 639 | 816 | 864 | 988 |  |  |  | 777 |  |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 7 | 79 | 95 | 73 | 18 |  |  |  | 155 |
| Minimum Length |  |  | 400 | 580 | 635 | 775 | 975 |  |  |  | 400 |  |
| Maximum Length |  |  | 410 | 812 | 980 | 1,005 | 1,000 |  |  |  | 1,005 |  |

Total

| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 11.4 | 41.4 | 38.6 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 576 | 2,089 | 1,945 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,043 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 192 | 297 | 293 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 2 | 8 | 29 | 27 | 4 |  |  | 5 | 75 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 405 | 639 | 841 | 868 | 984 |  |  | 784 | 821 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 7 | 79 | 77 | 55 | 46 |  |  | 80 | 123 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 400 | 580 | 635 | 775 | 925 |  |  | 675 | 400 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 410 | 812 | 990 | 1,005 | 1,035 |  |  | 876 | 1,035 |

Note: Estimates are based on fish sampled from the sport fishery harvest from 13-23 June 2000. Female, male, and total statistics include 5,0 , and 5 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Table 16.-Estimated age and sex composition of total return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Chignik River Chinook salmon, 2001.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.4 | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 14.5 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 42.7 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 4.7 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 626 | 1,057 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1,840 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 144 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 201 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  |  | 4 | 16 | 27 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 48 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  |  | 684 | 854 | 901 |  |  |  |  | 843 | 866 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 29 | 50 | 43 |  |  |  |  |  | 74 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  |  | 644 | 776 | 826 |  |  |  |  | 843 | 644 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  |  | 706 | 940 | 1,020 |  |  |  |  | 843 | 1,020 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 3.6 | 17.3 | 14.5 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 57.3 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 1.8 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 4.7 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 861 | 157 | 744 | 626 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2,466 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 76 | 154 | 144 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 201 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 22 | 4 | 19 | 16 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 67 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 428 | 599 | 878 | 901 | 991 |  |  |  | 551 | 703 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 95 | 89 | 79 | 80 | 98 |  |  |  | 250 | 240 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 305 | 510 | 715 | 705 | 921 |  |  |  | 335 | 305 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 695 | 690 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,060 |  |  |  | 890 | 1060 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 7.3 | 31.8 | 39.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 861 | 313 | 1,370 | 1,683 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4,305 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 106 | 190 | 199 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 22 | 8 | 35 | 43 | 2 |  |  |  | 5 | 115 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 428 | 641 | 867 | 901 | 991 |  |  |  | 609 | 771 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 95 | 76 | 67 | 59 | 98 |  |  |  | 253 | 205 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 305 | 510 | 715 | 705 | 921 |  |  |  | 335 | 305 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 695 | 706 | 1,000 | 1,050 | 1,060 |  |  |  | 890 | 1,060 |

Note: Estimates are based on fish sampled from the sport fishery harvest from 26 June-31 July 2001. Female, male, and total statistics include 1, 4, and 5 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.
commercial harvest samples included fish harvested outside the Lagoon, where immature fish from multiple stocks are often present. For this reason, samples from sport-harvested fish were used to estimate age and sex composition of the Chignik River Chinook salmon return for all years covered in this report (1999-2003).
1999
The Chignik weir was installed in 1999 on 31 May and operated through 3 September.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 3,728 fish (Table 3). With the commercial harvest of 2,101 fish in Chignik Lagoon and the reported subsistence harvest of 243 fish, the total Chinook salmon return was 6,072 fish.

Table 17.-Estimated age and sex composition of total return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Chignik River Chinook salmon, 2002.


Note: Estimates are based on fish sampled from the sport fishery harvest from 26 June-30 July 2002. Female, male, and total statistics include 0,2 , and 2 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Age was determined for 54 of 56 Chinook salmon sampled from the Chignik River sport fishery. Ages 1.3 and 1.4 were dominant (Table 14). There were 0.8 males for every female. Age composition and length of Chinook salmon sampled from the commercial harvest are shown in Appendix C4.

## 2000

The Chignik weir was installed in 2000 on 28 May and operated through 4 September. Due to high water conditions the weir was washed out from 20 June through 12 July. During this period an estimate of the Chinook salmon passing through the weir during this time period was derived using the data available before and after the wash out and a recent 10-year average time of entry curve was applied to the Chinook salmon escapement (Pappas et al. 2003).

Table 18.-Estimated age and sex composition of total return, and mideye to fork length by age and sex for Chignik River Chinook salmon, 2003.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.4 | unkn. |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 10.3 | 33.3 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 53.8 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 8.1 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 948 | 3,082 | 474 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4,979 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 454 | 706 | 330 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 746 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 627 | 693 | 893 | 1002 | 887 |  |  |  | 368 | 828 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  |  | 117 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 627 | 623 | 797 | 1002 | 887 |  |  |  | 368 | 368 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 627 | 828 | 970 | 1002 | 887 |  |  |  | 368 | 1002 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 30.8 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 46.2 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 7.5 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 8.1 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 474 | 237 | 2,845 | 711 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4,267 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 330 | 237 | 691 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 746 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 329 | 774 | 845 | 1,073 |  |  |  |  | 755 | 815 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 151 |  | 101 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 240 | 216 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 222 | 774 | 708 | 1,040 |  |  |  |  | 585 | 222 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 435 | 774 | 1,042 | 1,108 |  |  |  |  | 925 | 1,108 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 12.8 | 64.1 | 12.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 100.0 |
| SE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 7.8 | 5.4 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 711 | 1,185 | 5,927 | 1,185 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9,246 |
| SE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 399 | 500 | 718 | 500 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Number Sampled |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 |
| Mean Length |  |  |  | 428 | 714 | 870 | 1,055 | 887 |  |  |  | 626 | 822 |
| Std Dev Length |  |  |  | 203 | 103 | 81 | 45 |  |  |  |  | 281 | 185 |
| Minimum Length |  |  |  | 222 | 623 | 708 | 1,002 | 887 |  |  |  | 368 | 222 |
| Maximum Length |  |  |  | 627 | 828 | 1,042 | 1,108 | 887 |  |  |  | 925 | 1,108 |

Note: Estimates are based on fish sampled from the sport fishery harvest from 6-31 July 2003. Female, male, and total statistics include 1, 2, and 3 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 4,285 fish. With the commercial harvest of 595 fish in Chignik Lagoon and the reported subsistence catch of 163 fish, the total Chinook salmon return was 5,043 fish.
Age was determined for 70 of 75 Chinook salmon sampled from the Chignik River sport fishery. Ages 1.3 and 1.4 were dominant (Table 15). There were 1.0 males for every female.

## 2001

The Chignik weir was installed in 2001 on 25 May and operated through 19 August (Pappas et al. 2005).

The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 2,992 fish (Table 3). With the commercial harvest of 1,142 fish in Chignik Lagoon and the reported subsistence catch of 171 fish, the total Chinook salmon return was 4,305 fish.

Age was determined for 110 of 115 Chinook salmon sampled from the Chignik River sport fishery. Ages 1.3 and 1.4 were dominant, followed by age 1.1 (Table 16). There were 1.3 males for every female. Age composition and length of Chinook salmon sampled from the commercial harvest are shown in Appendix C5.

## 2002

The Chignik weir was installed in 2002 on 2 June and operated through 4 September.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 3,028 fish (Table 3). With the commercial harvest of 920 fish in Chignik Lagoon and the reported subsistence catch of 74 fish, the total Chinook salmon return was 4,022 fish.

Age was determined for 48 of 50 Chinook salmon sampled from the Chignik River sport fishery. Ages 1.2 and 1.4 were dominant (Table 17). There were 1.5 males for every female. Age composition and length of Chinook salmon sampled from the commercial harvest are shown in Appendix C6.

## 2003

The Chignik weir was installed in 2003 on 28 May and operated through 4 September.
The inriver return of Chinook salmon through the weir was 6,412 fish (Table 3). With the commercial harvest of 2,834 fish in Chignik Lagoon, and using the previous 9-year average of 120 fish as a substitute for the 2003 subsistence harvest, the estimated total Chinook salmon return was 9,366 fish.
Age was determined for 39 of 42 Chinook salmon sampled from the Chignik River sport fishery. Age 1.3 was dominant Table 18). There were 0.9 males for every female. Age composition and length of Chinook salmon sampled from the commercial harvest are shown in Appendix C7.

## DISCUSSION

The intent of this report series is to document assessment of sport fishing effort, harvest and catch along with age and sex compositions of Chinook salmon stocks of the Karluk, Ayakulik and Chignik rivers. These assessments are necessary to generate brood tables useful for projecting future returns from brood year escapements, which in turn can be used to evaluate and refine escapement goals. Management of fisheries toward appropriate escapement goals will ensure maximum sustained yields are achieved for each of the three Chinook salmon stocks.

## Karluk and Ayakulik 1999

Inriver returns to the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers of 13,063 and 13,503 Chinook salmon, respectively, were within the ranges of returns observed between 1994 and 2003. The total 1999 Inner and Outer Karluk and Ayakulik sections commercial harvest of 4,631 Chinook salmon on the west side of Kodiak Island (Tables 1 and 2) was nearly equal to the average commercial harvest during the same time period.

The prevalent age component of the Karluk and Ayakulik inriver returns between 1994 and 1998, comprised of age-1.3 and -1.4 fish, also dominated inriver returns in 1999. Approximately $76 \%$ of the Ayakulik inriver return and $85 \%$ of the Karluk inriver return consisted of fish belonging to one of these two age groups.

The male to female ratios in the Karluk and Ayakulik during 1999, at approximately 1:1 and 2:1 respectively, are not anomalous as compared to those documented since the stock assessment project was initiated in 1993.

## Chignik 1999

The inriver return to the Chignik River of 3,728 Chinook salmon was very comparable to the average return of 3,813 observed between 1994 and 2003. The commercial harvest in Chignik lagoon of 2,101 fish was slightly higher than the average harvest of 1,697 during the same time period (Table 3).
The combined commercial and subsistence harvests and inriver return produced an estimate for the total return of 6,072 fish. It is possible that this estimate is conservative due to exclusion of any Chignik-bound Chinook salmon caught in commercial fisheries prosecuted outside of Chignik Lagoon.

## Karluk and Ayakulik 2000

While the inriver return of 10,460 Chinook salmon to the Karluk River was very similar to the average return of 10,085 fish observed between 1994 and 2003, the Ayakulik River return of 20,527 Chinook salmon was the highest on record during the same time period. The total 2000 Inner and Outer Karluk and Ayakulik sections commercial harvest of 4,109 Chinook salmon on the west side of Kodiak Island was somewhat below the average commercial harvest between 1994 and 2003.

Similar to preceding years, in 2000 the prevalent age component of the Karluk and Ayakulik inriver returns was again primarily comprised of age-1.3 and -1.4 fish. Approximately $97 \%$ of the Ayakulik inriver return and $94 \%$ of the Karluk inriver return consisted of fish belonging to one of these two age groups.
The male to female ratios in the Karluk and Ayakulik during 1999, at approximately 1.8:1 and 1.4:1 respectively, are not unusual as compared to those documented since the stock assessment project was initiated in 1993.

## Chignik 2000

The inriver return of Chinook salmon to the Chignik River in 2000 was approximately $15 \%$ larger than the 1999 total return with an extrapolated total of 4,285 fish migrating through the weir. Conversely, the commercial harvest in the lagoon was far less than in 1999 with just 595 fish harvested (Table 3). The estimated total return of 5,043 fish from combined harvest and inriver return was comparable to the average estimated return of 5,631 between 1994 and 2003.

## Karluk and Ayakulik 2001

The 2001 inriver return of 4,453 Chinook salmon to the Karluk River was the lowest on record since 1994. The Ayakulik return of 13,929 Chinook salmon was slightly below the 1994-2003
average. The total 2001 commercial harvest of 9,315 Chinook salmon from the Inner and Outer Karluk and Ayakulik sections was more than 100\% over the average harvest during the same period. Since nearly $75 \%$ of this harvest came from the Inner and Outer Ayakulik sections, it is unlikely that the overall increase was significantly responsible for the poor Chinook salmon return to the Karluk River.

In 2001 age-1.3 and -1.4 fish again dominated returns to the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers (Tables 6 and 11). Approximately $90 \%$ of the Karluk inriver return and $81 \%$ of the Ayakulik inriver return consisted of fish belonging to one of these two age groups.

## Chignik 2001

The inriver return of 2,992 Chinook salmon to Chignik River in 2001 was approximately 25\% smaller the 2000 return of 4,285 fish migrating through the weir (Table 3). The commercial harvest in the lagoon was nearly twice that of 2000 but still the second smallest harvest since 1994. The estimated total return of 4,305 fish from combined harvest and inriver return was somewhat smaller than the average total return fish during the most recent 10-year period.

## Karluk and Ayakulik 2002

The 2002 inriver return of 7,175 Chinook salmon to the Karluk River was the second lowest on record since 1994 (Table 1). The Ayakulik return of 12,552 Chinook salmon was the lowest since 1996 and the third lowest since 1994 (Table 2). The total 2002 commercial harvest of 1,347 Chinook salmon from the Inner and Outer Karluk and Ayakulik sections was also the second lowest since 1994, and possibly illustrative of relatively weak returns to both the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers.

In 2002 age-1.3 and -1.4 fish again dominated returns to the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers, although age-1.2 fish were also prevalent, comprising between 25 to $26 \%$ of the returns (Tables 7 and 12). Approximately $68 \%$ of the Karluk inriver return and $61 \%$ of the Ayakulik inriver return consisted of fish aged 1.3 or 1.4.

## Chignik 2002

The inriver return of 3,028 Chinook salmon to the Chignik River in 2002 is reflective of the average return since 1994 (Table 3). In contrast, the commercial harvest in the lagoon was second lowest on record during the same period. The estimated total return of 4,022 fish from combined harvest and inriver return was $29 \%$ below the estimated average annual return since 1994.

## Karluk and Ayakulik 2003

The 2003 inriver return of 7,256 Chinook salmon to the Karluk was slightly higher than 2002 return and the third lowest on record since 1994 (Table 1). Conversely, the Ayakulik river return of 17,557 fish was the third highest on record during the same time period and substantially larger than the 2002 return (Table 2). The total 2003 Karluk commercial harvest of 1,336 fish was slightly higher than the 2002 harvest but less than the 1994-2003 mean of 1,721 fish.
As in previous years, age-1.3 and -1.4 fish were most prevalent in both Karluk and Ayakulik inriver returns, although similar only to 2002, age-1.2 fish comprised nearly $20 \%$ of returns to
each drainage (Tables 8 and 13). About $80 \%$ of the Ayakulik and Karluk inriver returns consisted of fish aged 1.3 or 1.4.

## Chignik 2003

The extrapolated 2003 inriver return of 6,412 Chinook salmon to the Chignik River was the highest on record (Table 3). Similarly, the commercial harvest in the lagoon of 2,834 fish was more than triple the 2002 harvest and substantially larger than the most recent 10 -year average The estimated total return of 9,366 fish from combined harvest and inriver return was also the highest on record.

## Karluk and Ayakulik Sport Fishing

Between 1999 and 2003 sport fishing effort in the Kodiak Management Area was generally higher than average levels of effort during the preceding 5 years (Walker et al. 2003; Jennings et al. 2004, 2006a-b). In contrast, SWHS estimates of angler effort in the Ayakulik River sport fishery have fluctuated significantly since 1994 with no apparent trend, illustrated by the fact that the highest and lowest effort during this period occurred on consecutive years. Levels of estimated annual angler effort at the Karluk River have also fluctuated substantially since 1994, even though the lowest estimates of total effort occurred consecutively in 2002 and 2003.

Ayakulik River Chinook salmon sport harvests have also been highly variable since 1994, ranging between 200 and 1,190 fish (Table 2), and indicating no apparent trend even though the third lowest estimated harvest on record occurred in 2002. Estimated sport harvests for the Karluk River during the same period have generally been higher than those for the Ayakulik River, averaging 1,453 fish, but also fluctuating significantly between years and ranging as high as 2,581 fish. Annual restrictions on public access to the Karluk River implemented during the 2003 Chinook salmon sport fishery were possibly an important factor affecting angler effort and harvest, the latter of which at 587 fish was not only the lowest on record, but substantially so, totaling less then $50 \%$ of estimated harvests between 1994 and 2002.

## Chignik Sport Fishing

The SWHS has not produced published estimates of sport fishing effort and harvest for any species in the Chignik River during the most recent 10-year period due to an insufficient number of survey respondents. However the unpublished mean annual harvest between 1999-2003 is only 112 Chinook salmon, indicating current levels of activity are low by comparison to the Karluk and Ayakulik river fisheries. Due to recent dynamics in the local commercial salmon fishing-based economy, future interest in Chignik River Chinook salmon by the sport fish guiding industry may increase. Consequently, it is possible that although the upper end of the current Chignik River escapement goal of 2,700 fish has been surpassed every year since 1994, it may be difficult to achieve desired escapements in the future if significant increases in sport fishing effort coincide with below average inriver returns.
Brood tables constructed from Chinook salmon returns since initiation of the stock assessment project in 1993 have provided the basis for evaluating existing escapement goals and reestimating the optimum magnitude of escapements for the Karluk, Ayakulik and Chignik river stocks as necessary (Hasbrouck and Clark In prep) ${ }^{2}$. However, because the historic range of Chinook salmon escapement to the Chignik River prior to 2003 has generally been narrow and
the relative magnitude of those escapements has been high, factors affecting stock productivity in addition to escapement remain poorly understood. Moreover, poor success in attainment of Chignik Chinook salmon annual sampling objectives during recent years has further constrained precise evaluation of productivity parameters. With the exception of relatively weak Chinook salmon returns during 2001-2003, consistently high escapements to the Karluk River during the previous 10-year period have also constrained more precise analysis of stock productivity factors. A continuation of the data collections initiated in 1993 may provide the basis for better understanding the role of these variables across a greater spectrum of adult returns.
Although Ayakulik River Chinook salmon returns since 1994 have been somewhat less variable than those of the Karluk River, inclusion of inriver returns dating back to the late 1970s suggests that the Chinook salmon population has likely also experienced relatively high levels of production in the years during which stock assessment data have been available.

Current levels of sport fishing activity at the Karluk and Ayakulik rivers probably have minimal impacts upon the magnitude of returns generated by a specific brood year. However, development of a trend of increasing harvest and effort at the Karluk River could increase the significance of the sport fishery to achievement of escapement goals, particularly in conjunction with below average inriver returns such as those in 2001-2003. Hooking and release mortality and sex-based harvest selectivity does not appear to be a significant problem of sport fisheries occurring at either location. Assumption of a hooking mortality rate of approximately 7\% (Bendock and Alexandersdottir 1992) suggests the effect from this aspect of the sport fisheries on escapement has been minimal. Likewise, the sex composition of sport caught fish sampled at the Karluk and the Ayakulik weirs has been generally similar to the sex composition of the sampled escapement.

During the most recent 10 -year period both Karluk and Ayakulik rivers have maintained sustained populations of Chinook salmon. During most years these two systems have produced escapement counts that are equal to or greater than the combined incidental commercial, subsistence, and sport harvests of Chinook salmon around Kodiak Island. It appears unlikely that any near term changes in prosecution of these three fisheries will substantially increase current harvest levels.

Although currently stable and abundant, the Chignik River Chinook salmon stock may be more vulnerable to expanding sport, commercial, or subsistence harvests because of its relatively small size. Harvest increases in local fisheries of lesser relative magnitude than those potentially affecting the Karluk and Ayakulik River fisheries could have greater impacts on achievement of the Chinook salmon escapement goal. However, due to past problems with attainment of data collection goals, including ensuring an accurate accounting of the harvest location of samples taken from the commercial catch, the Chignik River component of the Chinook salmon assessment project should be discontinued until such time as direct random systematic sampling of the inriver escapement through the weir can be accomplished. This measure will aid in more precise assessment of the variables influencing stock productivity and, correspondingly, the potential impact of increased fishery removal rates and other sources of adult mortality.
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## APPENDIX A. COMMERCIAL HARVEST OF CHINOOK SALMON FROM THE WEST SIDE OF KODIAK ISLAND, BY STATISTICAL AREA, 1994-2003

Appendix A1.-Numbers of Chinook salmon harvested commercially from the west side of Kodiak Island by statistical area, 1 June through 15 July 1994-2003.

|  | Commercial harvest (no. of Chinook salmon) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
| Statistical Area | 565 | 267 | 122 | 84 | 84 | 28 | 47 | 103 | 220 | 277 |
| 253-11 (Uganik) | 1,767 | 405 | 633 | 326 | 659 | 484 | 296 | 887 | 349 | 1,086 |
| 254-10 (Rocky Point) | 177 | 292 | 76 | 109 | 128 | 132 | 94 | 93 | 264 | 339 |
| 254-20 (Inner Uyak) | 143 | 701 | 48 | 2 | 27 | 21 | 92 | 56 | 44 | 32 |
| 254-30 (Zachar) | 902 | 415 | 441 | 177 | 478 | 161 | 143 | 34 | 292 | 203 |
| 254-40 (Spiridon) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 112 | 10 | 1 | 388 | 43 |
| 254-50 (Spiridon Term. area) | 3,632 | 482 | 487 | 790 | 0 | 380 | 231 | 1,051 | 543 | 634 |
| 255-10 (Inner Karluk) | 1,482 | 1,312 | 1,175 | 655 | 252 | 687 | 462 | 1,537 | 719 | 702 |
| 255-20 (Outer Karluk) | 0 | 45 | 1 | 0 | 73 | 198 | 210 | 12 | 14 | 0 |
| 256-10 (S. Ayakulik) | 0 | 0 | 107 | 4 | 73 | 444 | 824 | 3,414 | 32 | 0 |
| 256-15 (Inner Ayakulik) | 0 | 2,367 | 3,615 | 808 | 3,649 | 2,922 | 2,382 | 3,301 | 39 | 0 |
| 256-20 (N. Ayakulik) | 0 | 65 | 20 | 75 | 323 | 151 | 22 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 256-25 (Gurney Bay) | 0 | 196 | 20 | 364 | 231 | 475 | 168 | 423 | 0 | 0 |
| 256-30 (Halibut Bay) | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 256-40 (Sturgeon) | 43 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 257-10 (Sukhoi) | 1,433 | 612 | 279 | 152 | 1,047 | 73 | 291 | 401 | 0 | 127 |
| 257-20 (Tannerhead) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10,144 | 7,315 | 7,024 | 3,546 | 7,098 | 6,295 | 5,298 | 11,333 | 2,904 | 3,443 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average weight (lb.) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 10 | 11 |

Source: ADF\&G, Division of Commercial Fisheries, statewide electronic fish ticket database.

## APPENDIX B. KARLUK, AYAKULIK, AND CHIGNIK RIVERS CHINOOK SALMON WEIR COUNTS, 1994-2003

Appendix B1.-Daily cumulative weir counts of Karluk River Chinook salmon, 25 May through 1 August 1994-2003.

|  | 1994 |  | $\underline{1995}$ |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | $\underline{2002}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | 1994-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 25-May | 223 | 2 | 166 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 298 | 2 | 116 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 |
| 26-May | 267 | 2 | 238 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 461 | 3 | 230 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 1 |
| 27-May | 331 | 3 | 260 | 2 | 49 | 0 | 609 | 5 | 396 | 4 | 27 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 105 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 2 |
| 28-May | 405 | 3 | 318 | 3 | 179 | 2 | 848 | 6 | 562 | 5 | 49 | 0 | 118 | 1 | 43 | 1 | 145 | 2 | 41 | 1 | 3 |
| 29-May | 489 | 4 | 328 | 3 | 274 | 3 | 964 | 7 | 595 | 6 | 82 | 1 | 138 | 1 | 141 | 3 | 149 | 2 | 45 | 1 | 3 |
| 30-May | 540 | 4 | 366 | 3 | 399 | 4 | 1,105 | 8 | 728 | 7 | 122 | 1 | 179 | 2 | 211 | 5 | 149 | 2 | 61 | 1 | 4 |
| 31-May | 635 | 5 | 405 | 3 | 502 | 5 | 1,178 | 9 | 813 | 8 | 189 | 1 | 308 | 3 | 340 | 8 | 181 | 3 | 63 | 1 | 5 |
| 1-Jun | 743 | 6 | 529 | 4 | 679 | 7 | 1,421 | 11 | 936 | 9 | 218 | 2 | 464 | 4 | 352 | 8 | 291 | 4 | 67 | 1 | 6 |
| 2-Jun | 855 | 7 | 754 | 6 | 779 | 8 | 1,831 | 14 | 1,112 | 11 | 377 | 3 | 733 | 7 | 666 | 15 | 359 | 5 | 67 | 1 | 8 |
| 3-Jun | 1,204 | 10 | 907 | 7 | 1,006 | 10 | 1,993 | 15 | 1,301 | 13 | 460 | 4 | 886 | 8 | 917 | 21 | 632 | 9 | 360 | 5 | 11 |
| 4-Jun | 1,459 | 12 | 1,094 | 9 | 1,180 | 12 | 2,208 | 16 | 1,458 | 14 | 651 | 5 | 934 | 9 | 1,010 | 23 | 816 | 11 | 586 | 8 | 12 |
| 5-Jun | 1,835 | 15 | 1,290 | 10 | 1,457 | 14 | 2,480 | 18 | 1,687 | 16 | 840 | 6 | 977 | 9 | 1,056 | 24 | 967 | 13 | 739 | 10 | 14 |
| 6-Jun | 2,000 | 17 | 1,491 | 12 | 1,713 | 17 | 2,730 | 20 | 1,903 | 19 | 1,161 | 9 | 1,035 | 10 | 1,268 | 28 | 1,149 | 16 | 803 | 11 | 16 |
| 7-Jun | 2,206 | 18 | 1,587 | 13 | 1,994 | 20 | 3,265 | 24 | 2,138 | 21 | 1,800 | 14 | 1,111 | 11 | 1,436 | 32 | 1,354 | 19 | 909 | 13 | 19 |
| 8-Jun | 2,614 | 22 | 1,966 | 16 | 2,174 | 22 | 3,711 | 28 | 2,395 | 23 | 2,268 | 17 | 2,259 | 22 | 1,573 | 35 | 1,497 | 21 | 1,050 | 14 | 23 |
| 9-Jun | 2,869 | 24 | 2,305 | 18 | 2,402 | 24 | 3,866 | 29 | 2,705 | 26 | 3,125 | 24 | 2,914 | 28 | 1,709 | 38 | 1,561 | 22 | 1,147 | 16 | 26 |
| 10-Jun | 3,114 | 26 | 2,785 | 22 | 2,612 | 26 | 4,155 | 31 | 2,997 | 29 | 4,037 | 31 | 3,394 | 32 | 1,848 | 42 | 1,774 | 25 | 1,447 | 20 | 29 |
| 11-Jun | 3,467 | 29 | 3,091 | 24 | 2,755 | 27 | 4,265 | 32 | 3,265 | 32 | 4,447 | 34 | 3,606 | 34 | 2,156 | 48 | 2,140 | 30 | 1,466 | 20 | 32 |
| 12-Jun | 4,198 | 35 | 3,534 | 28 | 2,985 | 30 | 4,469 | 33 | 3,620 | 35 | 4,562 | 35 | 3,734 | 36 | 2,277 | 51 | 2,417 | 34 | 1,564 | 22 | 35 |
| 13-Jun | 4,709 | 39 | 4,058 | 32 | 3,242 | 32 | 5,030 | 37 | 4,000 | 39 | 5,130 | 39 | 4,517 | 43 | 2,525 | 57 | 2,686 | 37 | 1,640 | 23 | 40 |
| 14-Jun | 5,245 | 44 | 4,339 | 34 | 4,189 | 42 | 5,740 | 43 | 4,468 | 44 | 5,318 | 41 | 4,752 | 45 | 2,690 | 60 | 3,092 | 43 | 1,767 | 24 | 44 |
| 15-Jun | 5,774 | 48 | 4,885 | 39 | 4,419 | 44 | 6,366 | 47 | 4,811 | 47 | 5,509 | 42 | 5,216 | 50 | 2,867 | 64 | 3,250 | 45 | 1,826 | 25 | 47 |
| 16-Jun | 6,304 | 52 | 5,174 | 41 | 4,854 | 48 | 6,861 | 51 | 5,190 | 51 | 5,787 | 44 | 5,528 | 53 | 3,062 | 69 | 3,350 | 47 | 1,832 | 25 | 51 |
| 17-Jun | 6,645 | 55 | 5,662 | 45 | 5,036 | 50 | 7,270 | 54 | 5,432 | 53 | 6,354 | 49 | 6,152 | 59 | 3,243 | 73 | 3,694 | 51 | 1,835 | 25 | 54 |
| 18-Jun | 6,971 | 58 | 6,049 | 48 | 5,191 | 52 | 7,892 | 59 | 5,826 | 57 | 6,952 | 53 | 6,636 | 63 | 3,391 | 76 | 3,839 | 54 | 1,845 | 25 | 58 |
| 19-Jun | 7,143 | 59 | 6,495 | 51 | 5,465 | 54 | 8,510 | 63 | 6,030 | 59 | 7,388 | 57 | 6,813 | 65 | 3,434 | 77 | 3,934 | 55 | 1,971 | 27 | 60 |
| 20-Jun | 7,464 | 62 | 6,970 | 55 | 5,580 | 56 | 9,353 | 70 | 6,828 | 67 | 7,715 | 59 | 7,133 | 68 | 3,528 | 79 | 4,201 | 59 | 2,030 | 28 | 64 |
| 21-Jun | 7,816 | 65 | 7,589 | 60 | 6,024 | 60 | 9,715 | 72 | 6,911 | 67 | 7,876 | 60 | 7,340 | 70 | 3,641 | 82 | 4,464 | 62 | 2,269 | 31 | 67 |
| 22-Jun | 8,194 | 68 | 7,859 | 62 | 6,565 | 65 | 10,027 | 75 | 7,275 | 71 | 8,508 | 65 | 7,429 | 71 | 3,725 | 84 | 4,786 | 67 | 2,774 | 38 | 70 |
| 23-Jun | 8,373 | 69 | 8,303 | 66 | 7,048 | 70 | 10,287 | 77 | 7,380 | 72 | 8,940 | 68 | 7,518 | 72 | 3,861 | 87 | 4,931 | 69 | 2,825 | 39 | 72 |

-continued-
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|  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | $\underline{2002}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | 1994-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 24-Jun | 8,645 | 72 | 8,776 | 69 | 7,374 | 73 | 10,856 | 81 | 7,431 | 73 | 9,145 | 70 | 7,845 | 75 | 3,980 | 89 | 5,013 | 70 | 2,859 | 39 | 75 |
| 25-Jun | 9,014 | 75 | 9,105 | 72 | 7,651 | 76 | 11,309 | 84 | 7,838 | 77 | 9,498 | 73 | 8,220 | 79 | 4,060 | 91 | 5,100 | 71 | 3,074 | 42 | 77 |
| 26-Jun | 9,205 | 76 | 9,432 | 75 | 7,766 | 77 | 11,404 | 85 | 8,117 | 79 | 9,817 | 75 | 8,784 | 84 | 4,067 | 91 | 5,121 | 71 | 3,519 | 48 | 79 |
| 27-Jun | 9,648 | 80 | 9,710 | 77 | 8,031 | 80 | 11,429 | 85 | 8,449 | 83 | 10,149 | 78 | 8,806 | 84 | 4,086 | 92 | 5,183 | 72 | 3,767 | 52 | 81 |
| 28-Jun | 9,835 | 82 | 9,875 | 78 | 8,160 | 81 | 11,505 | 86 | 8,795 | 86 | 10,491 | 80 | 9,069 | 87 | 4,086 | 92 | 5,352 | 75 | 3,795 | 52 | 83 |
| 29-Jun | 10,107 | 84 | 10,092 | 80 | 8,397 | 84 | 11,547 | 86 | 8,856 | 86 | 10,792 | 83 | 9,199 | 88 | 4,104 | 92 | 5,391 | 75 | 3,852 | 53 | 84 |
| 30-Jun | 10,344 | 86 | 10,251 | 81 | 8,671 | 86 | 11,752 | 87 | 8,961 | 88 | 10,984 | 84 | 9,281 | 89 | 4,119 | 92 | 5,436 | 76 | 3,909 | 54 | 85 |
| 1-Jul | 10,427 | 87 | 10,672 | 84 | 8,696 | 87 | 12,189 | 91 | 9,094 | 89 | 11,169 | 86 | 9,435 | 90 | 4,124 | 93 | 5,944 | 83 | 4,008 | 55 | 88 |
| 2-Jul | 10,533 | 87 | 10,920 | 86 | 8,713 | 87 | 12,409 | 92 | 9,239 | 90 | 11,283 | 86 | 9,503 | 91 | 4,133 | 93 | 6,079 | 85 | 4,086 | 56 | 89 |
| 3-Jul | 10,631 | 88 | 11,082 | 88 | 8,735 | 87 | 12,469 | 93 | 9,275 | 91 | 11,452 | 88 | 9,616 | 92 | 4,138 | 93 | 6,109 | 85 | 4,093 | 56 | 89 |
| 4-Jul | 10,767 | 89 | 11,265 | 89 | 8,791 | 87 | 12,531 | 93 | 9,337 | 91 | 11,602 | 89 | 9,673 | 92 | 4,142 | 93 | 6,153 | 86 | 4,108 | 57 | 90 |
| $5-\mathrm{Jul}$ | 10,829 | 90 | 11,350 | 90 | 8,809 | 88 | 12,565 | 93 | 9,438 | 92 | 11,716 | 90 | 9,756 | 93 | 4,175 | 94 | 6,184 | 86 | 4,178 | 58 | 91 |
| 6-Jul | 10,876 | 90 | 11,419 | 90 | 8,817 | 88 | 12,609 | 94 | 9,469 | 92 | 11,758 | 90 | 9,790 | 94 | 4,180 | 94 | 6,216 | 87 | 4,286 | 59 | 91 |
| 7-Jul | 10,923 | 91 | 11,509 | 91 | 8,818 | 88 | 12,844 | 96 | 9,490 | 93 | 12,101 | 93 | 9,862 | 94 | 4,211 | 95 | 6,262 | 87 | 4,310 | 59 | 92 |
| 8-Jul | 11,046 | 92 | 11,643 | 92 | 8,828 | 88 | 12,905 | 96 | 9,588 | 94 | 12,197 | 93 | 9,897 | 95 | 4,220 | 95 | 6,305 | 88 | 4,746 | 65 | 92 |
| 9-Jul | 11,078 | 92 | 11,686 | 92 | 8,836 | 88 | 12,934 | 96 | 9,729 | 95 | 12,283 | 94 | 9,941 | 95 | 4,222 | 95 | 6,333 | 88 | 5,872 | 81 | 93 |
| 10-Jul | 11,138 | 92 | 11,839 | 94 | 8,842 | 88 | 12,962 | 96 | 9,853 | 96 | 12,341 | 94 | 9,957 | 95 | 4,231 | 95 | 6,367 | 89 | 6,407 | 88 | 93 |
| 11-Jul | 11,189 | 93 | 11,915 | 94 | 8,844 | 88 | 13,041 | 97 | 9,901 | 97 | 12,442 | 95 | 9,974 | 95 | 4,235 | 95 | 6,401 | 89 | 6,455 | 89 | 94 |
| 12-Jul | 11,230 | 93 | 11,955 | 94 | 8,859 | 88 | 13,054 | 97 | 9,921 | 97 | 12,459 | 95 | 9,987 | 95 | 4,252 | 95 | 6,502 | 91 | 6,673 | 92 | 94 |
| 13-Jul | 11,276 | 94 | 12,006 | 95 | 8,860 | 88 | 13,058 | 97 | 9,933 | 97 | 12,471 | 95 | 10,008 | 96 | 4,262 | 96 | 6,505 | 91 | 6,703 | 92 | 94 |
| 14-Jul | 11,301 | 94 | 12,072 | 95 | 8,862 | 88 | 13,065 | 97 | 9,942 | 97 | 12,597 | 96 | 10,015 | 96 | 4,279 | 96 | 6,533 | 91 | 6,719 | 93 | 95 |
| 15-Jul | 11,327 | 94 | 12,111 | 96 | 8,864 | 88 | 13,078 | 97 | 9,945 | 97 | 12,637 | 97 | 10,020 | 96 | 4,293 | 96 | 6,591 | 92 | 6,802 | 94 | 95 |
| 16-Jul | 11,347 | 94 | 12,144 | 96 | 8,880 | 88 | 13,108 | 98 | 9,951 | 97 | 12,657 | 97 | 10,061 | 96 | 4,296 | 96 | 6,636 | 92 | 6,811 | 94 | 95 |
| 17-Jul | 11,355 | 94 | 12,183 | 96 | 8,904 | 89 | 13,116 | 98 | 9,953 | 97 | 12,672 | 97 | 10,070 | 96 | 4,296 | 96 | 6,659 | 93 | 6,832 | 94 | 95 |
| 18-Jul | 11,357 | 94 | 12,204 | 96 | 8,930 | 89 | 13,123 | 98 | 9,955 | 97 | 12,700 | 97 | 10,074 | 96 | 4,297 | 96 | 6,704 | 93 | 6,836 | 94 | 95 |
| 19-Jul | 11,365 | 94 | 12,211 | 96 | 8,944 | 89 | 13,137 | 98 | 9,955 | 97 | 12,737 | 98 | 10,099 | 97 | 4,309 | 97 | 6,745 | 94 | 6,840 | 94 | 96 |
| 20-Jul | 11,367 | 94 | 12,239 | 97 | 9,357 | 93 | 13,137 | 98 | 9,956 | 97 | 12,764 | 98 | 10,101 | 97 | 4,320 | 97 | 6,758 | 94 | 6,852 | 94 | 96 |
| 21-Jul | 11,420 | 95 | 12,266 | 97 | 9,383 | 93 | 13,151 | 98 | 9,984 | 98 | 12,786 | 98 | 10,107 | 97 | 4,321 | 97 | 6,784 | 95 | 6,866 | 95 | 96 |
| 22-Jul | 11,472 | 95 | 12,285 | 97 | 9,515 | 95 | 13,152 | 98 | 10,000 | 98 | 12,796 | 98 | 10,123 | 97 | 4,334 | 97 | 6,803 | 95 | 6,869 | 95 | 97 |
| 23-Jul | 11,538 | 96 | 12,298 | 97 | 9,602 | 96 | 13,156 | 98 | 10,014 | 98 | 12,811 | 98 | 10,128 | 97 | 4,339 | 97 | 6,821 | 95 | 6,893 | 95 | 97 |
| 24-Jul | 11,623 | 96 | 12,314 | 97 | 9,608 | 96 | 13,233 | 98 | 10,044 | 98 | 12,835 | 98 | 10,136 | 97 | 4,361 | 98 | 6,897 | 96 | 6,906 | 95 | 97 |

## Appendix B1.-Page 3 of 3.

|  | 1994 |  | $\underline{1995}$ |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | $\underline{1998}$ |  | 1999 |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | $\underline{2002}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | 1994-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 25-Jul | 11,687 | 97 | 12,345 | 98 | 9,638 | 96 | 13,233 | 98 | 10,052 | 98 | 12,841 | 98 | 10,168 | 97 | 4,365 | 98 | 6,912 | 96 | 6,907 | 95 | 97 |
| 26-Jul | 11,697 | 97 | 12,375 | 98 | 9,650 | 96 | 13,233 | 98 | 10,056 | 98 | 12,862 | 98 | 10,170 | 97 | 4,370 | 98 | 6,925 | 97 | 6,913 | 95 | 98 |
| 27-Jul | 11,728 | 97 | 12,393 | 98 | 9,656 | 96 | 13,234 | 98 | 10,059 | 98 | 12,892 | 99 | 10,172 | 97 | 4,372 | 98 | 6,928 | 97 | 6,929 | 95 | 98 |
| 28-Jul | 11,770 | 98 | 12,418 | 98 | 9,755 | 97 | 13,239 | 98 | 10,078 | 98 | 12,894 | 99 | 10,191 | 97 | 4,373 | 98 | 6,944 | 97 | 6,949 | 96 | 98 |
| 29-Jul | 11,777 | 98 | 12,472 | 99 | 9,796 | 97 | 13,242 | 99 | 10,083 | 98 | 12,918 | 99 | 10,220 | 98 | 4,379 | 98 | 6,966 | 97 | 6,952 | 96 | 98 |
| 30-Jul | 11,797 | 98 | 12,481 | 99 | 9,801 | 98 | 13,243 | 99 | 10,094 | 99 | 12,929 | 99 | 10,226 | 98 | 4,385 | 98 | 6,987 | 97 | 6,980 | 96 | 98 |
| 31-Jul | 11,814 | 98 | 12,485 | 99 | 9,850 | 98 | 13,269 | 99 | 10,122 | 99 | 12,930 | 99 | 10,288 | 98 | 4,394 | 99 | 7,006 | 98 | 7,021 | 97 | 98 |
| 1-Aug | 11,823 | 98 | 12,489 | 99 | 9,886 | 98 | 13,295 | 99 | 10,132 | 99 | 13,057 | 100 | 10,458 | 100 | 4,453 | 100 | 7,016 | 98 | 7,035 | 97 | 99 |
| Total count | 12,049 |  | 12,657 |  | 10,051 |  | 13,443 |  | 10,239 |  | 13,063 |  | 10,460 |  | 4,453 |  | 7,175 |  | 7,256 |  |  |

Note: $\mathrm{N}=$ daily cumulative weir count (number of Chinook salmon).

Appendix B2.-Daily cumulative weir counts of Ayakulik River Chinook salmon, 25 May through 1 August 1994-2003.

|  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | $\underline{2002}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | 1994-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 25-May | 100 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 1 | 24 | 0 | 177 | 1 |  | 0 | 155 | 1 | 101 | 1 | 72 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 26-May | 129 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 1 | 34 | 0 | 236 | 2 |  | 0 | 197 | 1 | 152 | 1 | 92 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 27-May | 158 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 75 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 422 | 3 | 46 | 0 | 210 | 1 | 177 | 1 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 28-May | 204 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 91 | 1 | 68 | 0 | 604 | 4 | 48 | 0 | 215 | 1 | 399 | 3 | 173 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| 29-May | 210 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 111 | 1 | 70 | 0 | 732 | 5 | 55 | 0 | 216 | 1 | 797 | 6 | 179 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 2 |
| 30-May | 265 | 3 | 29 | 0 | 123 | 1 | 123 | 1 | 848 | 6 | 55 | 0 | 262 | 1 | 1,079 | 8 | 230 | 2 | 53 | 0 | 2 |
| 31-May | 294 | 3 | 41 | 0 | 318 | 3 | 132 | 1 | 1,049 | 7 | 55 | 0 | 282 | 1 | 1,227 | 9 | 295 | 2 | 147 | 1 | 3 |
| 1-Jun | 328 | 4 | 127 | 1 | 622 | 6 | 151 | 1 | 1,413 | 10 | 55 | 0 | 437 | 2 | 1,476 | 11 | 607 | 5 | 275 | 2 | 4 |
| 2-Jun | 568 | 6 | 349 | 2 | 961 | 9 | 215 | 1 | 1,858 | 13 | 71 | 1 | 464 | 2 | 1,760 | 13 | 786 | 6 | 541 | 3 | 6 |
| 3-Jun | 694 | 8 | 532 | 3 | 1642 | 16 | 316 | 2 | 2,170 | 15 | 405 | 3 | 581 | 3 | 3,277 | 24 | 825 | 7 | 947 | 5 | 9 |
| 4-Jun | 1304 | 14 | 2818 | 16 | 1822 | 18 | 483 | 3 | 2,536 | 18 | 537 | 4 | 2,047 | 10 | 3,657 | 26 | 1,242 | 10 | 1,742 | 10 | 13 |
| 5-Jun | 1,565 | 17 | 3,602 | 20 | 2,020 | 20 | 706 | 5 | 2,941 | 21 | 610 | 5 | 3,434 | 17 | 5,325 | 38 | 1,280 | 10 | 2,183 | 12 | 17 |
| 6-Jun | 1,636 | 18 | 4,111 | 23 | 2,988 | 29 | 920 | 6 | 3,477 | 25 | 634 | 5 | 4,810 | 23 | 6,952 | 50 | 1,511 | 12 | 2,596 | 15 | 21 |
| 7-Jun | 1,860 | 20 | 4,397 | 25 | 3,317 | 32 | 1,344 | 9 | 3,940 | 28 | 1,089 | 8 | 5,050 | 25 | 8,179 | 59 | 1,749 | 14 | 3,865 | 22 | 24 |
| 8-Jun | 2,731 | 30 | 5,167 | 29 | 3,404 | 33 | 1,429 | 10 | 4,347 | 31 | 1,298 | 10 | 5,129 | 25 | 9,115 | 65 | 2,011 | 16 | 4,128 | 24 | 28 |
| 9-Jun | 3,257 | 36 | 5,466 | 31 | 3,413 | 33 | 1,741 | 12 | 4,825 | 34 | 1,857 | 14 | 5,312 | 26 | 9,605 | 69 | 2,316 | 18 | 4,334 | 25 | 30 |
| 10-Jun | 3,641 | 40 | 5,671 | 32 | 3,473 | 34 | 3,019 | 21 | 5,328 | 38 | 2,447 | 18 | 6,561 | 32 | 9,889 | 71 | 2,483 | 20 | 5,095 | 29 | 34 |
| 11-Jun | 3,797 | 42 | 5,936 | 34 | 3,511 | 34 | 3,978 | 28 | 5,799 | 41 | 3,405 | 25 | 6,981 | 34 | 10,204 | 73 | 2,651 | 21 | 6,689 | 38 | 37 |
| 12-Jun | 4,293 | 47 | 6,245 | 35 | 3,585 | 35 | 4,553 | 32 | 6,147 | 44 | 6,148 | 46 | 8,204 | 40 | 10,450 | 75 | 2,713 | 22 | 6,889 | 39 | 42 |
| 13-Jun | 4,321 | 47 | 7,213 | 41 | 3,740 | 36 | 4,782 | 33 | 6,612 | 47 | 8,135 | 60 | 9,545 | 46 | 10,592 | 76 | 2,848 | 23 | 6,999 | 40 | 46 |
| 14-Jun | 4,544 | 50 | 7,470 | 42 | 4,080 | 39 | 4,905 | 34 | 6,840 | 49 | 8,863 | 66 | 10,379 | 51 | 10,669 | 77 | 3,229 | 26 | 7,831 | 45 | 48 |
| 15-Jun | 4,825 | 53 | 7,800 | 44 | 4,773 | 46 | 5,547 | 39 | 7,150 | 51 | 9,190 | 68 | 10,994 | 54 | 10,721 | 77 | 3,338 | 27 | 8,563 | 49 | 51 |
| 16-Jun | 4,933 | 54 | 8,160 | 46 | 5,579 | 54 | 6,038 | 42 | 7,575 | 54 | 9,256 | 69 | 13,324 | 65 | 10,818 | 78 | 3,728 | 30 | 9,151 | 52 | 55 |
| 17-Jun | 5,155 | 56 | 8,633 | 49 | 6,015 | 58 | 6,723 | 47 | 7,972 | 57 | 9,329 | 69 | 15,467 | 75 | 10,948 | 79 | 4,869 | 39 | 9,874 | 56 | 59 |
| 18-Jun | 5,347 | 59 | 9,021 | 51 | 6,113 | 59 | 7,095 | 49 | 8,225 | 59 | 9,586 | 71 | 15,913 | 78 | 11,003 | 79 | 5,533 | 44 | 10,046 | 57 | 61 |
| 19-Jun | 5,461 | 60 | 9,368 | 53 | 6,161 | 60 | 7,428 | 52 | 8,585 | 61 | 9,953 | 74 | 16,077 | 78 | 11,283 | 81 | 6,119 | 49 | 10,760 | 61 | 63 |
| 20-Jun | 5,536 | 61 | 9,781 | 55 | 6,428 | 62 | 7,814 | 54 | 8,779 | 63 | 10,050 | 74 | 16,425 | 80 | 11,421 | 82 | 7,490 | 60 | 10,864 | 62 | 66 |
| 21-Jun | 5,771 | 63 | 11,126 | 63 | 7,144 | 69 | 8,213 | 57 | 9,327 | 66 | 10,113 | 75 | 16,663 | 81 | 11,504 | 83 | 7,693 | 61 | 10,984 | 63 | 69 |
| 22-Jun | 5,931 | 65 | 11,797 | 67 | 7,583 | 73 | 8,530 | 59 | 9,717 | 69 | 10,257 | 76 | 17,347 | 85 | 11,963 | 86 | 7,855 | 63 | 11,343 | 65 | 71 |
| 23-Jun | 6,190 | 68 | 12,269 | 69 | 8,746 | 85 | 10,077 | 70 | 10,360 | 74 | 10,414 | 77 | 17,389 | 85 | 12,147 | 87 | 8,672 | 69 | 11,515 | 66 | 76 |
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|  | $\underline{1994}$ |  | $\underline{1995}$ |  | $\underline{1996}$ |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | $\underline{2002}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ | 1994-2003 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 24-Jun | 6,789 | 74 | 13,292 | 75 | 8,819 | 85 | 12,048 | 84 | 10,938 | 78 | 10,460 | 77 | 18,189 | 89 | 12,335 | 89 | 9,353 | 75 | 11,608 | 66 | 81 |
| 25-Jun | 7,229 | 79 | 14,207 | 80 | 8,915 | 86 | 12,560 | 87 | 11,380 | 81 | 10,559 | 78 | 18,582 | 91 | 12,376 | 89 | 10,249 | 82 | 11,845 | 67 | 84 |
| 26-Jun | 7,724 | 85 | 14,618 | 83 | 9,010 | 87 | 12,626 | 88 | 11,645 | 83 | 10,926 | 81 | 18,724 | 91 | 12,436 | 89 | 10,484 | 84 | 11,868 | 68 | 86 |
| 27-Jun | 7,906 | 87 | 15,177 | 86 | 9,083 | 88 | 12,778 | 89 | 11,984 | 85 | 11,438 | 85 | 19,087 | 93 | 12,553 | 90 | 10,668 | 85 | 12,127 | 69 | 87 |
| 28-Jun | 7,990 | 87 | 15,557 | 88 | 9,269 | 90 | 12,839 | 89 | 12,247 | 87 | 11,631 | 86 | 19,195 | 94 | 12,671 | 91 | 10,884 | 87 | 12,962 | 74 | 89 |
| 29-Jun | 8,093 | 89 | 15,702 | 89 | 9,434 | 91 | 12,881 | 90 | 12,453 | 89 | 11,862 | 88 | 19,462 | 95 | 12,899 | 93 | 11,088 | 88 | 13,693 | 78 | 90 |
| 30-Jun | 8,261 | 90 | 16,291 | 92 | 9,557 | 92 | 12,964 | 90 | 12,664 | 90 | 12,000 | 89 | 19,583 | 95 | 12,971 | 93 | 11,172 | 89 | 13,897 | 79 | 91 |
| 1-Jul | 8,443 | 92 | 16,446 | 93 | 9,582 | 93 | 13,177 | 92 | 12,816 | 91 | 12,116 | 90 | 19,620 | 96 | 13,128 | 94 | 11,259 | 90 | 14,222 | 81 | 92 |
| 2-Jul | 8,522 | 93 | 16,676 | 94 | 9,642 | 93 | 13,418 | 93 | 13,035 | 93 | 12,226 | 91 | 19,722 | 96 | 13,286 | 95 | 11,495 | 92 | 14,623 | 83 | 93 |
| 3-Jul | 8,619 | 94 | 16,771 | 95 | 9,750 | 94 | 13,577 | 95 | 13,212 | 94 | 12,230 | 91 | 19,772 | 96 | 13,325 | 96 | 11,546 | 92 | 14,783 | 84 | 94 |
| 4-Jul | 8,661 | 95 | 16,810 | 95 | 9,809 | 95 | 13,701 | 95 | 13,348 | 95 | 12,266 | 91 | 19,795 | 96 | 13,397 | 96 | 11,728 | 93 | 15,122 | 86 | 95 |
| 5-Jul | 8,691 | 95 | 16,850 | 95 | 9,858 | 95 | 13,766 | 96 | 13,408 | 96 | 12,366 | 92 | 19,888 | 97 | 13,397 | 96 | 11,917 | 95 | 15,317 | 87 | 95 |
| 6-Jul | 8,740 | 96 | 16,914 | 96 | 9,988 | 97 | 13,852 | 96 | 13,511 | 96 | 12,392 | 92 | 19,990 | 97 | 13,496 | 97 | 11,942 | 95 | 15,547 | 89 | 96 |
| 7-Jul | 8,806 | 96 | 17,155 | 97 | 10,087 | 98 | 13,928 | 97 | 13,601 | 97 | 12,465 | 92 | 19,992 | 97 | 13,541 | 97 | 11,978 | 95 | 15,719 | 90 | 96 |
| 8-Jul | 8,832 | 97 | 17,182 | 97 | 10,132 | 98 | 13,980 | 97 | 13,690 | 98 | 12,522 | 93 | 19,992 | 97 | 13,549 | 97 | 12,012 | 96 | 15,882 | 90 | 97 |
| 9-Jul | 8,873 | 97 | 17,220 | 97 | 10,153 | 98 | 14,035 | 98 | 13,731 | 98 | 12,757 | 94 | 20,046 | 98 | 13,598 | 98 | 12,036 | 96 | 16,021 | 91 | 97 |
| 10-Jul | 8,942 | 98 | 17,315 | 98 | 10,153 | 98 | 14,094 | 98 | 13,779 | 98 | 12,884 | 95 | 20,116 | 98 | 13,650 | 98 | 12,174 | 97 | 16,301 | 93 | 98 |
| 11-Jul | 8,973 | 98 | 17,359 | 98 | 10,172 | 98 | 14,120 | 98 | 13,825 | 98 | 12,965 | 96 | 20,140 | 98 | 13,678 | 98 | 12,189 | 97 | 16,724 | 95 | 98 |
| 12-Jul | 8,990 | 98 | 17,376 | 98 | 10,194 | 99 | 14,153 | 99 | 13,862 | 99 | 13,089 | 97 | 20,200 | 98 | 13,700 | 98 | 12,208 | 97 | 16,754 | 95 | 98 |
| 13-Jul | 9,008 | 99 | 17,414 | 98 | 10,194 | 99 | 14,165 | 99 | 13,872 | 99 | 13,129 | 97 | 20,253 | 99 | 13,755 | 99 | 12,252 | 98 | 16,762 | 95 | 98 |
| 14-Jul | 9,025 | 99 | 17,420 | 98 | 10,202 | 99 | 14,177 | 99 | 13,904 | 99 | 13,165 | 97 | 20,287 | 99 | 13,765 | 99 | 12,306 | 98 | 16,823 | 96 | 99 |
| 15-Jul | 9,036 | 99 | 17,459 | 99 | 10,211 | 99 | 14,181 | 99 | 13,916 | 99 | 13,188 | 98 | 20,292 | 99 | 13,791 | 99 | 12,307 | 98 | 16,840 | 96 | 99 |
| 16-Jul | 9,054 | 99 | 17,490 | 99 | 10,227 | 99 | 14,191 | 99 | 13,924 | 99 | 13,188 | 98 | 20,325 | 99 | 13,803 | 99 | 12,335 | 98 | 16,929 | 96 | 99 |
| 17-Jul | 9,069 | 99 | 17,512 | 99 | 10,234 | 99 | 14,212 | 99 | 13,933 | 99 | 13,195 | 98 | 20,329 | 99 | 13,825 | 99 | 12,367 | 99 | 16,934 | 96 | 99 |
| 18-Jul | 9,082 | 99 | 17,516 | 99 | 10,249 | 99 | 14,216 | 99 | 13,946 | 99 | 13,203 | 98 | 20,334 | 99 | 13,836 | 99 | 12,373 | 99 | 16,980 | 97 | 99 |
| 19-Jul | 9,088 | 99 | 17,549 | 99 | 10,256 | 99 | 14,248 | 99 | 13,969 | 99 | 13,203 | 98 | 20,365 | 99 | 13,843 | 99 | 12,386 | 99 | 17,078 | 97 | 99 |
| 20-Jul | 9,094 | 99 | 17,577 | 99 | 10,260 | 99 | 14,274 | 99 | 13,973 | 99 | 13,287 | 98 | 20,378 | 99 | 13,843 | 99 | 12,397 | 99 | 17,368 | 99 | 99 |
| 21-Jul | 9,099 | 99 | 17,581 | 99 | 10,266 | 99 | 14,280 | 99 | 13,977 | 99 | 13,297 | 98 | 20,396 | 99 | 13,844 | 99 | 12,401 | 99 | 17,384 | 99 | 99 |
| 22-Jul | 9,104 | 99 | 17,585 | 99 | 10,289 | 99 | 14,293 | 99 | 13,978 | 99 | 13,347 | 99 | 20,407 | 99 | 13,846 | 99 | 12,406 | 99 | 17,485 | 100 | 99 |
| 23-Jul | 9,105 | 99 | 17,599 | 99 | 10,291 | 99 | 14,299 | 99 | 13,981 | 99 | 13,371 | 99 | 20,421 | 99 | 13,849 | 99 | 12,415 | 99 | 17,488 | 100 | 99 |
| 24-Jul | 9,108 | 99 | 17,610 | 99 | 10,293 | 99 | 14,302 | 99 | 13,984 | 99 | 13,376 | 99 | 20,437 | 100 | 13,856 | 99 | 12,416 | 99 | 17,492 | 100 | 99 |
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|  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | $\underline{2000}$ |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | $\underline{2002}$ |  | $\underline{2003}$ |  | 1994-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 25-Jul | 9,111 | 99 | 17,618 | 99 | 10,298 | 99 | 14,303 | 99 | 13,986 | 99 | 13,386 | 99 | 20,445 | 100 | 13,877 | 100 | 12,416 | 99 | 17,527 | 100 | 99 |
| 26-Jul | 9,111 | 99 | 17,620 | 99 | 10,301 | 99 | 14,308 | 99 | 13,992 | 99 | 13,404 | 99 | 20,452 | 100 | 13,885 | 100 | 12,416 | 99 | 17,528 | 100 | 99 |
| 27-Jul | 9,113 | 99 | 17,628 | 99 | 10,305 | 99 | 14,314 | 99 | 13,993 | 99 | 13,435 | 99 | 20,463 | 100 | 13,891 | 100 | 12,416 | 99 | 17,530 | 100 | 99 |
| 28-Jul | 9,115 | 99 | 17,637 | 99 | 10,307 | 99 | 14,322 | 99 | 14,004 | 99 | 13,446 | 100 | 20,477 | 100 | 13,892 | 100 | 12,416 | 99 | 17,537 | 100 | 99 |
| 29-Jul | 9,116 | 99 | 17,649 | 99 | 10,308 | 99 | 14,323 | 99 | 14,005 | 99 | 13,449 | 100 | 20,479 | 100 | 13,893 | 100 | 12,429 | 99 | 17,537 | 100 | 99 |
| 30-Jul | 9,118 | 99 | 17,651 | 99 | 10,314 | 99 | 14,325 | 99 | 14,009 | 99 | 13,467 | 100 | 20,479 | 100 | 13,900 | 100 | 12,429 | 99 | 17,544 | 100 | 99 |
| 31-Jul | 9,118 | 99 | 17,659 | 99 | 10,316 | 99 | 14,325 | 99 | 14,013 | 99 | 13,474 | 100 | 20,483 | 100 | 13,901 | 100 | 12,429 | 99 | 17,544 | 100 | 99 |
| 1-Aug | 9,120 | 99 | 17,664 | 99 | 10,321 | 99 | 14,326 | 99 | 14,017 | 99 | 13,475 | 100 | 20,487 | 100 | 13,902 | 100 | 12,429 | 99 | 17,545 | 100 | 99 |
| Total count | 9,138 |  | 17,701 |  | 10,344 |  | 14,357 |  | 14,038 |  | 13,503 |  | 20,527 |  | 13,929 |  | 12,552 |  | 17,557 |  |  |

Note: N = daily cumulative weir count (number of Chinook salmon).

Appendix B3.-Daily cumulative weir counts of Chignik River Chinook salmon 16 June through 15 August 1994-2003.

|  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | $\underline{2001}$ |  | 2002 |  | 2003 |  | 1994-2003 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | Avg \% |
| 16-Jun | 4 | 0 |  |  | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 0 | 26 | 0 |  |
| 17-Jun | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0 | 27 | 0 |  |
| 18-Jun | 5 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 0 | 33 | 1 |  |
| 19-Jun | 6 | 0 | 36 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 36 | 1 | 69 | 1 |  |
| 20-Jun | 24 | 1 | 36 | 1 | 62 | 2 | 55 | 1 | 58 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 39 | 1 |  |  | 42 | 1 | 69 | 1 |  |
| 21-Jun | 30 | 1 | 36 | 1 | 74 | 2 | 73 | 2 | 95 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 47 | 1 |  |  | 42 | 1 | 105 | 2 |  |
| 22-Jun | 50 | 2 | 36 | 1 | 80 | 2 | 106 | 3 | 108 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 60 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 67 | 2 | 135 | 2 | 2 |
| 23-Jun | 56 | 2 | 38 | 1 | 94 | 3 | 124 | 3 | 114 | 4 | 38 | 1 | 73 | 2 | 18 | 1 | 79 | 2 | 159 | 2 | 2 |
| 24-Jun | 74 | 2 | 45 | 1 | 124 | 4 | 130 | 3 | 150 | 5 | 63 | 2 | 94 | 2 | 18 | 1 | 85 | 2 | 183 | 3 | 2 |
| 25-Jun | 88 | 3 | 49 | 1 | 136 | 4 | 160 | 4 | 198 | 6 | 85 | 2 | 124 | 3 | 18 | 1 | 122 | 3 | 219 | 3 | 3 |
| 26-Jun | 88 | 3 | 53 | 1 | 142 | 4 | 218 | 6 | 222 | 7 | 97 | 3 | 163 | 4 | 18 | 1 | 226 | 6 | 279 | 4 | 4 |
| 27-Jun | 94 | 3 | 53 | 1 | 250 | 7 | 280 | 7 | 276 | 9 | 109 | 3 | 219 | 5 | 18 | 1 | 256 | 7 | 388 | 6 | 5 |
| 28-Jun | 108 | 4 | 74 | 2 | 394 | 11 | 358 | 9 | 369 | 12 | 111 | 3 | 300 | 7 | 54 | 2 | 305 | 9 | 448 | 7 | 6 |
| 29-Jun | 140 | 5 | 77 | 2 | 532 | 15 | 382 | 10 | 441 | 14 | 135 | 4 | 399 | 9 | 85 | 3 | 389 | 11 | 485 | 8 | 8 |
| 30-Jun | 147 | 5 | 77 | 2 | 574 | 16 | 462 | 12 | 495 | 16 | 184 | 5 | 467 | 11 | 128 | 4 | 551 | 16 | 534 | 8 | 10 |
| 1-Jul | 167 | 6 | 77 | 2 | 691 | 20 | 528 | 14 | 525 | 17 | 214 | 6 | 557 | 13 | 257 | 9 | 599 | 17 | 552 | 9 | 11 |
| 2-Jul | 167 | 6 | 85 | 2 | 725 | 21 | 582 | 15 | 561 | 18 | 280 | 8 | 643 | 15 | 485 | 16 | 659 | 19 | 612 | 10 | 13 |
| 3-Jul | 205 | 7 | 104 | 2 | 798 | 23 | 624 | 16 | 621 | 20 | 354 | 9 | 763 | 18 | 647 | 22 | 678 | 19 | 668 | 10 | 15 |
| 4-Jul | 318 | 11 | 140 | 3 | 822 | 24 | 693 | 18 | 665 | 22 | 390 | 10 | 887 | 21 | 731 | 24 | 843 | 24 | 848 | 13 | 17 |
| 5-Jul | 444 | 15 | 212 | 5 | 912 | 26 | 778 | 20 | 755 | 25 | 459 | 12 | 1,033 | 24 | 779 | 26 | 891 | 25 | 1,071 | 17 | 20 |
| 6-Jul | 514 | 17 | 266 | 6 | 946 | 27 | 848 | 22 | 794 | 26 | 495 | 13 | 1,234 | 29 | 857 | 29 | 958 | 27 | 1,254 | 20 | 22 |
| 7-Jul | 583 | 19 | 284 | 7 | 946 | 27 | 990 | 26 | 942 | 31 | 647 | 17 | 1,384 | 32 | 965 | 32 | 1,060 | 30 | 1,296 | 20 | 25 |
| 8-Jul | 752 | 25 | 383 | 9 | 964 | 28 | 1,137 | 30 | 1,092 | 36 | 695 | 19 | 1,581 | 37 | 1,088 | 36 | 1,144 | 32 | 1,602 | 25 | 28 |
| 9-Jul | 863 | 29 | 503 | 12 | 976 | 28 | 1,398 | 37 | 1,110 | 36 | 761 | 20 | 1,753 | 41 | 1,158 | 39 | 1,228 | 35 | 1,932 | 30 | 31 |
| 10-Jul | 1,025 | 34 | 603 | 14 | 1,246 | 36 | 1,533 | 40 | 1,221 | 40 | 828 | 22 | 1,954 | 46 | 1,218 | 41 | 1,324 | 37 | 2,161 | 34 | 34 |
| 11-Jul | 1,096 | 36 | 633 | 15 | 1,288 | 37 | 1,664 | 44 | 1,305 | 42 | 967 | 26 | 2,103 | 49 | 1,280 | 43 | 1,408 | 40 | 2,564 | 40 | 37 |
| 12-Jul | 1,212 | 40 | 982 | 23 | 1,402 | 40 | 1,793 | 47 | 1,383 | 45 | 1,111 | 30 | 2,343 | 55 | 1,304 | 44 | 1,579 | 45 | 3,081 | 48 | 41 |
| 13-Jul | 1,315 | 44 | 1,625 | 38 | 1,527 | 44 | 1,890 | 49 | 1,440 | 47 | 1,292 | 35 | 2,512 | 59 | 1,328 | 44 | 1,675 | 47 | 3,408 | 53 | 45 |
| 14-Jul | 1,330 | 44 | 2,030 | 47 | 1,599 | 46 | 1,921 | 50 | 1,521 | 49 | 1,463 | 39 | 2,608 | 61 | 1,436 | 48 | 1,729 | 49 | 3,649 | 57 | 48 |
| 15-Jul | 1,435 | 48 | 2,358 | 55 | 1,709 | 49 | 1,975 | 52 | 1,635 | 53 | 1,702 | 46 | 2,728 | 64 | 1,496 | 50 | 1,867 | 53 | 3,921 | 61 | 52 |
| 16-Jul | 1,703 | 56 | 2,413 | 56 | 1,819 | 52 | 2,131 | 56 | 1,659 | 54 | 1,790 | 48 | 2,836 | 66 | 1,656 | 55 | 1,935 | 55 | 4,085 | 64 | 55 |

-continued-
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|  | 1994 |  | 1995 |  | 1996 |  | 1997 |  | 1998 |  | 1999 |  | 2000 |  | 2001 |  | 2002 |  | 2003 |  | $\begin{gathered} \frac{1994-2003}{\text { Avg } \%} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| 17-Jul | 1,846 | 61 | 2,443 | 57 | 2,094 | 60 | 2,263 | 59 | 1,798 | 58 | 1,938 | 52 | 2,938 | 69 | 1,818 | 61 | 2,121 | 60 | 4,281 | 67 | 60 |
| 18-Jul | 2,069 | 69 | 2,587 | 60 | 2,270 | 65 | 2,451 | 64 | 1,879 | 61 | 1,992 | 53 | 3,016 | 70 | 2,016 | 67 | 2,271 | 64 | 4,369 | 68 | 64 |
| 19-Jul | 2,151 | 71 | 2,861 | 67 | 2,384 | 68 | 2,543 | 67 | 2,138 | 70 | 2,214 | 59 | 3,159 | 74 | 2,152 | 72 | 2,362 | 67 | 4,460 | 70 | 68 |
| 20-Jul | 2,340 | 78 | 2,948 | 69 | 2,535 | 73 | 2,587 | 68 | 2,222 | 72 | 2,281 | 61 | 3,244 | 76 | 2,237 | 75 | 2,464 | 70 | 4,600 | 72 | 71 |
| 21-Jul | 2,378 | 79 | 3,104 | 72 | 2,577 | 74 | 2,621 | 69 | 2,312 | 75 | 2,378 | 64 | 3,352 | 78 | 2,325 | 78 | 2,526 | 71 | 4,752 | 74 | 73 |
| 22-Jul | 2,432 | 81 | 3,281 | 77 | 2,626 | 75 | 2,729 | 71 | 2,365 | 77 | 2,458 | 66 | 3,442 | 80 | 2,452 | 82 | 2,640 | 75 | 4,896 | 76 | 76 |
| 23-Jul | 2,494 | 83 | 3,317 | 77 | 2,663 | 76 | 2,858 | 75 | 2,431 | 79 | 2,573 | 69 | 3,650 | 85 | 2,513 | 84 | 2,772 | 78 | 5,005 | 78 | 79 |
| 24-Jul | 2,570 | 85 | 3,360 | 78 | 2,740 | 79 | 2,972 | 78 | 2,505 | 81 | 2,729 | 73 | 3,766 | 88 | 2,609 | 87 | 2,904 | 82 | 5,011 | 78 | 81 |
| 25-Jul | 2,610 | 87 | 3,545 | 83 | 2,855 | 82 | 3,045 | 80 | 2,555 | 83 | 2,777 | 74 | 3,786 | 88 | 2,663 | 89 | 2,982 | 84 | 5,149 | 80 | 83 |
| 26-Jul | 2,663 | 88 | 3,691 | 86 | 2,905 | 83 | 3,057 | 80 | 2,585 | 84 | 2,897 | 78 | 3,788 | 88 | 2,702 | 90 | 3,054 | 86 | 5,203 | 81 | 85 |
| 27-Jul | 2,679 | 89 | 3,775 | 88 | 3,030 | 87 | 3,073 | 80 | 2,603 | 85 | 3,001 | 80 | 3,806 | 89 | 2,714 | 91 | 3,084 | 87 | 5,371 | 84 | 86 |
| 28-Jul | 2,700 | 90 | 3,838 | 90 | 3,078 | 88 | 3,131 | 82 | 2,625 | 85 | 3,031 | 81 | 3,848 | 90 | 2,726 | 91 | 3,108 | 88 | 5,495 | 86 | 87 |
| 29-Jul | 2,707 | 90 | 3,859 | 90 | 3,131 | 90 | 3,215 | 84 | 2,680 | 87 | 3,290 | 88 | 3,885 | 91 | 2,744 | 92 | 3,144 | 89 | 5,610 | 87 | 89 |
| 30-Jul | 2,720 | 90 | 3,895 | 91 | 3,163 | 91 | 3,257 | 85 | 2,696 | 88 | 3,348 | 90 | 3,923 | 92 | 2,756 | 92 | 3,156 | 89 | 5,694 | 89 | 90 |
| 31-Jul | 2,735 | 91 | 3,914 | 91 | 3,171 | 91 | 3,349 | 88 | 2,708 | 88 | 3,384 | 91 | 3,953 | 92 | 2,816 | 94 | 3,180 | 90 | 5,766 | 90 | 91 |
| 1-Aug | 2,747 | 91 | 3,974 | 93 | 3,196 | 92 | 3,387 | 89 | 2,732 | 89 | 3,402 | 91 | 3,973 | 93 | 2,822 | 94 | 3,192 | 90 | 5,808 | 91 | 91 |
| 2-Aug | 2,768 | 92 | 4,008 | 93 | 3,214 | 92 | 3,407 | 89 | 2,753 | 90 | 3,432 | 92 | 4,063 | 95 | 2,858 | 96 | 3,198 | 90 | 5,820 | 91 | 92 |
| 3-Aug | 2,780 | 92 | 4,021 | 94 | 3,227 | 93 | 3,414 | 89 | 2,765 | 90 | 3,462 | 93 | 4,111 | 96 | 2,876 | 96 | 3,234 | 91 | 5,874 | 92 | 93 |
| 4-Aug | 2,792 | 93 | 4,043 | 94 | 3,233 | 93 | 3,420 | 89 | 2,789 | 91 | 3,501 | 94 | 4,135 | 96 | 2,906 | 97 | 3,258 | 92 | 5,880 | 92 | 93 |
| 5-Aug | 2,828 | 94 | 4,050 | 94 | 3,264 | 94 | 3,434 | 90 | 2,825 | 92 | 3,522 | 94 | 4,147 | 97 | 2,924 | 98 | 3,270 | 92 | 5,928 | 92 | 94 |
| 6-Aug | 2,869 | 95 | 4,062 | 95 | 3,300 | 95 | 3,465 | 91 | 2,825 | 92 | 3,528 | 95 | 4,189 | 98 | 2,930 | 98 | 3,294 | 93 | 5,928 | 92 | 94 |
| 7-Aug | 2,879 | 95 | 4,094 | 95 | 3,306 | 95 | 3,564 | 93 | 2,855 | 93 | 3,564 | 96 | 4,189 | 98 | 2,930 | 98 | 3,312 | 94 | 5,934 | 93 | 95 |
| 8-Aug | 2,903 | 96 | 4,110 | 96 | 3,313 | 95 | 3,627 | 95 | 2,882 | 94 | 3,584 | 96 | 4,189 | 98 | 2,943 | 98 | 3,337 | 94 | 5,988 | 93 | 96 |
| 9-Aug | 2,915 | 97 | 4,183 | 98 | 3,331 | 96 | 3,651 | 95 | 2,915 | 95 | 3,602 | 97 | 4,213 | 98 | 2,955 | 99 | 3,373 | 95 | 6,024 | 94 | 97 |
| 10-Aug | 2,915 | 97 | 4,192 | 98 | 3,345 | 96 | 3,696 | 97 | 2,933 | 95 | 3,626 | 97 | 4,219 | 98 | 2,961 | 99 | 3,391 | 96 | 6,102 | 95 | 97 |
| 11-Aug | 2,921 | 97 | 4,229 | 99 | 3,388 | 97 | 3,716 | 97 | 2,933 | 95 | 3,650 | 98 | 4,249 | 99 | 2,967 | 99 | 3,415 | 96 | 6,144 | 96 | 98 |
| 12-Aug | 2,939 | 97 | 4,235 | 99 | 3,412 | 98 | 3,728 | 97 | 2,945 | 96 | 3,662 | 98 | 4,249 | 99 | 2,967 | 99 | 3,421 | 97 | 6,192 | 97 | 98 |
| 13-Aug | 2,957 | 98 | 4,247 | 99 | 3,418 | 98 | 3,729 | 98 | 2,975 | 97 | 3,692 | 99 | 4,255 | 99 | 2,979 | 100 | 3,433 | 97 | 6,207 | 97 | 98 |
| 14-Aug | 2,963 | 98 | 4,253 | 99 | 3,418 | 98 | 3,729 | 98 | 2,981 | 97 | 3,704 | 99 | 4,267 | 100 | 2,979 | 100 | 3,439 | 97 | 6,243 | 97 | 98 |
| 15-Aug | 2,963 | 98 | 4,253 | 99 | 3,438 | 99 | 3,761 | 98 | 2,999 | 98 | 3,704 | 99 | 4,267 | 100 | 2,986 | 100 | 3,445 | 97 | 6,261 | 98 | 99 |
| Total count | 3,016 |  | 4,288 |  | 3,485 |  | 3,824 |  | 3,075 |  | 3,728 |  | 4,285 |  | 2,992 |  | 3,541 |  | 6,412 |  |  |

Note: $\mathrm{N}=$ daily cumulative weir count (number of Chinook salmon).

# APPENDIX C. AGE COMPOSITIONS FROM KARLUK, AND AYAKULIK RIVER CHINOOK SALMON SPORT HARVEST, AND CHIGNIK RIVER COMMERCIAL HARVEST, 1999-2003 

Appendix C1.-Age composition and mean length-at-age for Karluk River Chinook salmon sport harvest, 2001.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | Total $^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.5 | 12.5 | 50.0 |
| SE Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 12.5 | 18.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Length (mm) |  |  | 839 | 819 | 849 |
| SE Mean Length |  |  | 15 |  | 17 |
| Minimum Length (mm) |  |  | 816 | 819 | 816 |
| Maximum Length (mm) |  |  | 868 | 819 | 906 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 50.0 |
| SE Percent | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 18.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Length (mm) |  | 617 |  | 813 | 725 |
| SE Mean Length |  | 13 |  | 29 | 46 |
| Minimum Length (mm) |  | 604 |  | 784 | 604 |
| Maximum Length (mm) |  | 629 |  | 841 | 841 |


| All |  |  |  | 3 | 8 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number sampled | 0 | 2 | 3 | 37.5 | 100.0 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 25.0 | 37.5 | 0.0 |  |
| SE Percent | 0.0 | 16.4 | 18.3 | 18.3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean Length (mm) |  | 617 | 839 | 815 | 787 |
| SE Mean Length |  | 13 | 15 | 17 | 31 |
| Minimum Length (mm) |  | 604 | 816 | 784 | 604 |
| Maximum Length (mm) |  | 629 | 868 | 841 | 906 |

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Estimated from sport fish catch sampled on 11 June 2001.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Female total mean length includes 1 fish for which age was not determined, male total mean length includes 1 fish for which age was not determined, total mean length was not determined for all Chinook salmon includes 1 fish for which age was not determined.

Appendix C2.-Age composition and mean length-at-age of Karluk River Chinook salmon sport harvest, 2003.

| Year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Age |  |  |  | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 21 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 13.0 | 38.9 |
| SE Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 4.6 | 6.7 |
| Mean Length (mm) |  |  | 776 | 830 | 797 |
| SE Mean Length |  |  | 14 | 14 | 10 |
| Minimum Length (mm) |  |  | 627 | 782 | 627 |
| Maximum Length (mm) |  |  | 843 | 880 | 903 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 2 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 33 |
| Percent | 3.7 | 5.6 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 61.1 |
| SE Percent | 2.6 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.7 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 371 | 679 | 787 | 828 | 765 |
| SE Mean Length | 2 | 62 | 9 | 14 | 19 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 369 | 58 | 741 | 724 | 369 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 372 | 798 | 862 | 905 | 905 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 2 | 3 | 28 | 21 | 54 |
| Percent | 3.7 | 5.6 | 51.9 | 38.9 | 100.0 |
| SE Percent | 2.6 | 3.1 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 371 | 679 | 781 | 829 | 778 |
| SE Mean Length | 2 | 62 | 8 | 10 | 2 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 369 | 58 | 327 | 724 | 369 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 372 | 798 | 862 | 905 | 905 |

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Estimated from sport fish catch sampled between 8 June and 6 July 2003.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Female total mean length includes 5 fish for which age was not determined, male total mean length includes 5 fish for which age was not determined, total mean length for all Chinook salmon includes 10 fish for which age was not determined.

Appendix C3.-Age composition and mean length-at-age of Ayakulik River Chinook salmon sport harvest, 2001.

| Year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Age |  | Total ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.3 | 1.4 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| Percent | 7.7 | 46.2 | 53.8 |
| SE Percent | 7.7 | 14.4 | 14.4 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 883 | 844 | 856 |
| SE Mean Length |  | 12 | 9 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 883 | 802 | 802 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 883 | 885 | 896 |
| Males |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Percent | 7.7 | 38.5 | 46.2 |
| SE Percent | 7.7 | 14.0 | 14.4 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 862 | 893 | 880 |
| SE Mean Length |  | 24 | 17 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 862 | 820 | 820 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 862 | 970 | 970 |
| All |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 2 | 11 | 13 |
| Percent | 15.4 | 84.6 | 100.0 |
| SE Percent | 10.4 | 10.4 | 0.0 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 873 | 866 | 867 |
| SE Mean Length | 11 | 14 | 9 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 862 | 802 | 802 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 883 | 970 | 970 |

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
a Estimated from sport catch sampled from 12-26 June 2001.
b Female total mean length includes 3 fish for which age was not determined, male total mean length includes 2 fish for which age was not determined, total mean length for all Chinook salmon includes 5 fish for which age was not determined.

Appendix C4.-Age composition and mideye to fork length of commercial-harvested Chinook salmon, Chignik River, 1999.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.4 |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 10 | 80 | 82 | 61 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 241 |
| Percent | 2.4 | 19.2 | 19.7 | 14.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 57.8 |
| SE Percent | 0.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 |  | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 431 | 604 | 783 | 871 | 865 |  | 910 | 737 |
| Std Dev Length | 115 | 66 | 84 | 71 | 58 |  |  | 147 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 282 | 463 | 408 | 712 | 749 |  | 910 | 282 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 727 | 724 | 902 | 1045 | 934 |  | 910 | 1045 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 4 | 45 | 58 | 62 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 176 |
| Percent | 1.0 | 10.8 | 13.9 | 14.9 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 42.2 |
| SE Percent | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 |  | 2.4 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 417 | 626 | 790 | 913 | 904 | 881 |  | 791 |
| Std Dev Length | 17 | 92 | 91 | 64 | 82 |  |  | 149 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 401 | 491 | 605 | 755 | 757 | 881 |  | 401 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 440 | 964 | 1,043 | 1,075 | 973 | 881 |  | 1,075 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 14 | 125 | 140 | 123 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 417 |
| Percent | 3.4 | 30.0 | 33.6 | 29.5 | 3.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| SE Percent | 0.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Mean Length (mm) | 427 | 612 | 786 | 893 | 883 | 881 | 910 | 760 |
| Std Dev Length | 96 | 77 | 87 | 71 | 70 |  |  | 150 |
| Minimum Length (mm) | 282 | 463 | 408 | 712 | 749 | 881 | 910 | 282 |
| Maximum Length (mm) | 727 | 964 | 1,043 | 1,075 | 973 | 881 | 910 | 1,075 |

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
a Based on samples obtained 25 June-8 August 1999.
b Female, male, and total statistics include 8, 8, and 16 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Appendix C5.-Age composition and mideye to fork length of commercial-harvested Chinook salmon, Chignik River, 2001.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |  | Total

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
a Based on samples obtained 16 June-31 July 2001.
b Female, male, and total statistics include 4, 5, and 9 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Appendix C6.-Age composition and mideye to fork length of commercialharvested Chinook salmon, Chignik River, 2002.

|  |  |  |  | Age |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | Total |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 22 |
|  | Percent | 26.3 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 57.9 |
|  | SE Percent | 7.2 | 7.2 |  | 3.7 |  | 8.1 |
|  | Mean Length | 371 | 604 |  | 872 |  | 526 |
|  | Std Dev Length | 28 | 46 |  | 64 |  | 158 |
|  | Minimum Length | 312 | 512 |  | 826 |  | 312 |
|  | Maximum Length | 406 | 657 |  | 917 |  | 917 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
|  | Percent | 15.8 | 21.1 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 42.1 |
|  | SE Percent | 6.0 | 6.7 | 2.6 | 2.6 |  | 8.1 |
|  | Mean Length | 404 | 662 | 646 | 989 |  | 595 |
|  | Std Dev Length | 17 | 45 |  |  |  | 157 |
|  | Minimum Length | 383 | 581 | 646 | 989 |  | 383 |
|  | Maximum Length | 432 | 721 | 646 | 989 |  | 989 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 16 | 18 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 38 |
|  | Percent | 42.1 | 47.4 | 2.6 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | SE Percent | 8.1 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 4.4 |  | 0.0 |
|  | Mean Length | 383 | 630 | 646 | 911 |  | 556 |
|  | Std Dev Length | 29 | 53 |  | 82 |  | 160 |
|  | Minimum Length | 312 | 512 | 646 | 826 |  | 312 |
|  | Maximum Length | 432 | 721 | 646 | 989 |  | 989 |

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
a Based on samples obtained 26 June-31 July 2002.
b Female, male, and total statistics include 3, 3, and 6 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

Appendix C7.-Age composition and mideye to fork length of commercial-harvested Chinook salmon, Chignik River, 2003.

|  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 2.1 | Total |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 36 |
|  | Percent | 46.7 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 60.0 |
|  | SE Percent | 6.5 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 6.4 |
|  | Mean Length | 427 | 528 | 797 | 341 | 453 |
|  | Std Dev Length | 66 | 137 |  |  | 104 |
|  | Minimum Length | 302 | 357 | 797 | 341 | 302 |
|  | Maximum Length | 682 | 666 | 797 | 341 | 797 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 8 | 12 | 4 |  | 24 |
|  | Percent | 13.3 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
|  | SE Percent | 4.4 | 5.2 | 3.2 |  | 6.4 |
|  | Mean Length | 412 | 627 | 743 |  | 579 |
|  | Std Dev Length | 33 | 84 | 65 |  | 138 |
|  | Minimum Length | 372 | 400 | 662 |  | 372 |
|  | Maximum Length | 449 | 720 | 807 |  | 807 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 36 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 60 |
|  | Percent | 60.0 | 30.0 | 8.3 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
|  | SE Percent | 6.4 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Mean Length | 424 | 594 | 753 | 341 | 505 |
|  | Std Dev Length | 60 | 111 | 61 |  | 133 |
|  | Minimum Length | 302 | 357 | 662 | 341 | 302 |
|  | Maximum Length | 682 | 720 | 807 | 341 | 807 |

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.
a Based on samples obtained 26 June-1 August 2003.
b Female, male, and total statistics include 3, 3, and 6 fish for which age was not determined, respectively.

# APPENDIX D. ESTIMATED INRIVER RETURN OF CHINOOK SALMON BY TIME STRATUM AND AGE, KARLUK RIVER, 1999-2003 

Appendix D1.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Karluk River, 1999.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.4 |  |
| Through 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 8 | 0 | 40 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 26.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 45.5 |
| SE percent |  |  |  |  | 3.2 | 4.7 | 3.1 |  | 5.3 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 467 | 1,192 | 415 | 0 | 2,074 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 213 | 139 | 0 | 241 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 48 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 20.5 | 23.9 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 54.5 |
| SE percent |  |  |  | 2.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 1.9 |  | 5.3 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 311 | 933 | 1,089 | 156 | 0 | 2,488 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 195 | 206 | 88 | 0 | 241 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 44 | 11 | 0 | 88 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 30.7 | 50.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  |  |  | 2.7 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 311 | 1,400 | 2,281 | 570 | 0 | 4,562 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 223 | 242 | 160 | 0 | 0 |
| After 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 45 | 60 | 4 | 1 | 114 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 19.1 | 25.4 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 48.3 |
| SE percent |  | 0.4 |  | 0.7 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 3.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 36 | 0 | 108 | 1,621 | 2,161 | 144 | 36 | 4,106 |
| SE return | 0 | 36 | 0 | 61 | 215 | 238 | 71 | 36 | 273 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 69 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 122 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 8.5 | 29.2 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.7 |
| SE percent |  |  | 0.6 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 2.2 |  |  | 3.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 72 | 720 | 2,485 | 1,117 | 0 | 0 | 4,395 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 50 | 152 | 249 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 273 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 114 | 91 | 4 | 1 | 236 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 9.7 | 48.3 | 38.6 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 36 | 72 | 828 | 4,106 | 3,278 | 144 | 36 | 8,501 |
| SE return | 0 | 36 | 50 | 162 | 273 | 266 | 71 | 36 | 0 |

Appendix D2.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Karluk River, 2000.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Through 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40 | 1 | 54 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 53.3 | 1.3 | 72.0 |
| SE percent |  |  | 4.4 | 5.7 | 1.3 | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 647 | 1,991 | 50 | 2,688 |
| SE Return | 0 | 0 | 163 | 214 | 49 | 193 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 21 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 21.3 | 1.3 | 28.0 |
| SE percent |  | 1.3 | 2.3 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 50 | 149 | 797 | 50 | 1,046 |
| SE Return | 0 | 49 | 84 | 176 | 49 | 193 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 16 | 56 | 2 | 75 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 1.3 | 21.3 | 74.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  | 1.3 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 50 | 797 | 2,788 | 100 | 3,734 |
| SE Return | 0 | 49 | 176 | 187 | 69 | 0 |
| After 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 2 | 41 | 79 | 1 | 123 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 1.0 | 20.0 | 38.5 | 0.5 | 60.0 |
| SE percent |  | 0.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 3.4 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 66 | 1,345 | 2,592 | 33 | 4,036 |
| SE Return | 0 | 46 | 185 | 226 | 32 | 227 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 5 | 8 | 38 | 31 | 0 | 82 |
| Percent | 2.4 | 3.9 | 18.5 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 40.0 |
| SE percent | 1.1 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 |  | 3.4 |
| Inriver return at weir | 164 | 262 | 1,247 | 1,017 | 0 | 2,690 |
| SE Return | 72 | 90 | 180 | 166 | 0 | 227 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 5 | 10 | 79 | 110 | 1 | 205 |
| Percent | 2.4 | 4.9 | 38.5 | 53.7 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 1.1 | 1.5 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 164 | 328 | 2,592 | 3,609 | 33 | 6,726 |
| SE Return | 72 | 100 | 226 | 231 | 32 | 0 |

Appendix D3.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Karluk River, 2002.

|  | Age |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Through 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 11 | 52 | 6 | 69 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 9.0 | 42.6 | 4.9 | 56.6 |
| SE percent |  | 2.5 | 4.4 | 1.9 | 4.4 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 218 | 1,030 | 119 | 1,367 |
| SE Return | 0 | 61 | 106 | 46 | 106 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 4 | 17 | 27 | 5 | 53 |
| Percent | 3.3 | 13.9 | 22.1 | 4.1 | 43.4 |
| SE percent | 1.6 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 4.4 |
| Inriver return at weir | 79 | 337 | 535 | 99 | 1,050 |
| SE Return | 38 | 74 | 89 | 42 | 106 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 4 | 28 | 79 | 11 | 122 |
| Percent | 3.3 | 23.0 | 64.8 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 1.6 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 79 | 555 | 1,565 | 218 | 2,417 |
| SE Return | 38 | 90 | 102 | 61 | 0 |
| 13-26 June |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 28 | 26 | 2 | 57 |
| Percent | 0.8 | 21.2 | 19.7 | 1.5 | 43.2 |
| SE percent | 0.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 4.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 20 | 574 | 533 | 41 | 1,168 |
| SE Return | 20 | 94 | 92 | 28 | 114 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 31 | 29 | 14 | 1 | 75 |
| Percent | 23.5 | 22.0 | 10.6 | 0.8 | 56.8 |
| SE percent | 3.6 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 4.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 635 | 594 | 287 | 20 | 1,536 |
| SE Return | 98 | 95 | 71 | 20 | 114 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 32 | 57 | 40 | 3 | 132 |
| Percent | 24.2 | 43.2 | 30.3 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 656 | 1,168 | 819 | 61 | 2,704 |
| SE Return | 99 | 114 | 106 | 34 | 0 |

-continued-

Appendix D3.-Page 2 of 2.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| 27 June - 3 July |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
| SE percent |  |  | 5.9 | 5.9 |  | 7.6 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 141 | 141 | 0 | 282 |
| SE Return | 0 | 0 | 58 | 58 | 0 | 75 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 25 |
| Percent | 2.9 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 5.7 | 2.9 | 71.4 |
| SE percent | 2.8 | 8.3 | 6.7 | 3.9 | 2.8 | 7.6 |
| Inriver return at weir | 28 | 395 | 198 | 56 | 28 | 706 |
| SE Return | 28 | 82 | 67 | 39 | 28 | 75 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 14 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 35 |
| Percent | 2.9 | 40.0 | 34.3 | 20.0 | 2.9 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 2.8 | 8.3 | 8.0 | 6.7 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 28 | 395 | 339 | 198 | 28 | 988 |
| SE Return | 28 | 82 | 79 | 67 | 28 | 0 |
| After 3 July |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| SE percent |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.6 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| SE Return | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 2 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Percent | 14.3 | 64.3 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 85.7 |
| SE percent | 9.6 | 13.2 | 7.1 |  |  | 9.6 |
| Inriver return at weir | 152 | 685 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 913 |
| SE Return | 103 | 141 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Percent | 14.3 | 64.3 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 9.6 | 13.2 | 11.3 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 152 | 685 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 1,065 |
| SE Return | 103 | 141 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix D4.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Karluk River, 2003.

|  | Age |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.4 |  |
| Through 30 May |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| Percent | 12.5 | 31.3 | 0.0 | 43.8 |
| SE percent | 7.3 | 10.3 |  | 11.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 8 | 19 | 0 | 27 |
| SE Return | 4 | 6 | 0 | 7 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 4 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| Percent | 25.0 | 25.0 | 6.3 | 56.3 |
| SE percent | 9.6 | 9.6 | 5.4 | 11.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 15 | 15 | 4 | 34 |
| SE Return | 6 | 6 | 3 | 7 |
| All |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 6 | 9 | 1 | 16 |
| Percent | 37.5 | 56.3 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 10.7 | 11.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 23 | 34 | 4 | 61 |
| SE Return | 7 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| 31 May - 13 June |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| Percent | 62.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 87.5 |
| SE percent | 18.3 | 16.3 |  | 12.5 |
| Inriver return at weir | 987 | 395 | 0 | 1,382 |
| SE Return | 288 | 258 | 0 | 197 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Percent | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| SE percent | 12.5 |  |  | 12.5 |
| Inriver return at weir | 197 | 0 | 0 | 197 |
| SE Return | 197 | 0 | 0 | 197 |
| All |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 6 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| Percent | 75.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 16.3 | 16.3 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 1,184 | 395 | 0 | 1,579 |
| SE Return | 258 | 258 | 0 | 0 |
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|  | Age |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| 14-27 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 6 | 20 | 11 | 1 | 38 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 6.3 | 20.8 | 11.5 | 1.0 | 39.6 |
| SE percent |  | 2.4 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 4.9 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 133 | 443 | 244 | 22 | 842 |
| SE Return | 0 | 52 | 87 | 68 | 22 | 104 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 4 | 19 | 24 | 10 | 1 | 58 |
| Percent | 4.2 | 19.8 | 25.0 | 10.4 | 1.0 | 60.4 |
| SE percent | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 4.9 |
| Inriver return at weir | 89 | 421 | 532 | 222 | 22 | 1,285 |
| SE Return | 43 | 85 | 92 | 65 | 22 | 104 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 4 | 25 | 44 | 21 | 2 | 96 |
| Percent | 4.2 | 26.0 | 45.8 | 21.9 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 2.0 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 89 | 554 | 975 | 465 | 44 | 2,127 |
| SE Return | 43 | 94 | 106 | 88 | 30 | 0 |
| After 27 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 22 | 80 | 28 | 0 | 130 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 8.7 | 31.5 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 51.2 |
| SE percent |  | 1.7 | 2.8 | 1.9 |  | 3.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 302 | 1,099 | 385 | 0 | 1,786 |
| SE Return | 0 | 59 | 98 | 66 | 0 | 106 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 36 | 72 | 14 | 1 | 124 |
| Percent | 0.4 | 14.2 | 28.3 | 5.5 | 0.4 | 48.8 |
| SE percent | 0.4 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 3.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 14 | 495 | 989 | 192 | 14 | 1,703 |
| SE Return | 13 | 74 | 95 | 48 | 13 | 106 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 58 | 152 | 42 | 1 | 254 |
| Percent | 0.4 | 22.8 | 59.8 | 16.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 0.4 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 14 | 797 | 2,088 | 577 | 14 | 3,489 |
| SE Return | 13 | 89 | 104 | 78 | 13 | 0 |

# APPENDIX E. ESTIMATED INRIVER RETURN OF CHINOOK SALMON BY TIME STRATUM AND AGE, AYAKULIK RIVER, 1999-2003 

Appendix E1.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Ayakulik River, 1999.


Appendix E2.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Ayakulik River, 2000.

|  | Age |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Through 30 May |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 14.3 | 42.9 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
| SE percent |  | 9.4 | 13.4 |  | 13.4 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 37 | 112 | 0 | 150 |
| SE return | 0 | 25 | 35 | 0 | 35 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 14.3 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
| SE percent |  | 9.4 | 12.2 |  | 13.4 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 37 | 75 | 0 | 112 |
| SE return | 0 | 25 | 32 | 0 | 35 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 14 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 28.6 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  | 12.2 | 12.2 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 75 | 187 | 0 | 262 |
| SE return | 0 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 May - 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 11 | 38 | 0 | 49 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 11.8 | 40.9 | 0.0 | 52.7 |
| SE percent |  | 3.3 | 5.1 |  | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 939 | 3,245 | 0 | 4,184 |
| SE return | 0 | 266 | 405 | 0 | 411 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 20 | 23 | 0 | 44 |
| Percent | 1.1 | 21.5 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 47.3 |
| SE percent | 1.1 | 4.3 | 4.5 |  | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 85 | 1,708 | 1,964 | 0 | 3,758 |
| SE return | 85 | 338 | 355 | 0 | 411 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 31 | 61 | 0 | 93 |
| Percent | 1.1 | 33.3 | 65.6 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 1.1 | 4.9 | 4.9 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 85 | 2,647 | 5,209 | 0 | 7,942 |
| SE return | 85 | 388 | 391 | 0 | 0 |
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Appendix E3.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Ayakulik River, 2001.

\left.|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | Total |  |  |
| Through 5 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  | 38 |  |  |
|  | Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 8 | 27 | 2 |  |  |$\right)$
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Appendix E4.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Ayakulik River, 2002.

|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.5 |  |
| Through 30 May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 42.9 |
| SE percent |  |  | 9.4 | 11.0 |  |  | 6.9 |  | 13.3 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 33 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 99 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 31 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.1 |
| SE percent |  |  |  | 13.4 | 6.9 |  |  |  | 13.3 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 71.4 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  |  | 9.4 | 12.1 | 6.9 |  | 6.9 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 33 | 164 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 230 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 22 | 28 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 May - 12 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 35 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 10.7 | 22.6 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 41.7 |
| SE percent |  |  | 1.6 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 2.3 |  | 1.2 | 5.3 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 0 | 59 | 266 | 562 | 118 | 0 | 30 | 1,035 |
| SE return | 0 | 0 | 41 | 83 | 112 | 57 | 0 | 29 | 132 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 2 | 12 | 26 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Percent | 1.2 | 2.4 | 14.3 | 31.0 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 |
| SE percent | 1.2 | 1.6 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 2.6 | 2.0 |  |  | 5.3 |
| Inriver return at weir | 30 | 59 | 355 | 769 | 148 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 1,448 |
| SE return | 29 | 41 | 94 | 124 | 63 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 2 | 14 | 35 | 24 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 84 |
| Percent | 1.2 | 2.4 | 16.7 | 41.7 | 28.6 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 1.2 | 1.6 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 3.0 |  | 1.2 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 30 | 59 | 414 | 1,035 | 709 | 207 | 0 | 30 | 2,483 |
| SE return | 29 | 41 | 100 | 132 | 121 | 74 | 0 | 29 | 0 |
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|  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 |  |
| 13-19 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 3.0 | 27.3 | 42.4 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 75.8 |
| SE percent |  | 3.0 | 7.8 | 8.7 |  | 3.0 |  | 7.5 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 103 | 929 | 1,445 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 2,580 |
| SE return | 0 | 103 | 267 | 296 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 257 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 24.2 |
| SE percent |  | 5.1 | 5.1 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 7.5 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 310 | 310 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 103 | 826 |
| SE return | 0 | 172 | 172 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 103 | 257 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 4 | 12 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 33 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 12.1 | 36.4 | 42.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  | 5.7 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 413 | 1,239 | 1,445 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 3,406 |
| SE return | 0 | 196 | 288 | 296 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 0 |
| After 19 June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 4.4 | 10.5 | 9.6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.2 |
| SE percent |  | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 1.5 |  |  | 4.1 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 282 | 677 | 621 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 1,749 |
| SE return | 0 | 123 | 184 | 177 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 267 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 11 | 39 | 19 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Percent | 9.6 | 34.2 | 16.7 | 10.5 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.8 |
| SE percent | 2.8 | 4.4 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 1.2 |  |  | 4.1 |
| Inriver return at weir | 621 | 2,200 | 1,072 | 677 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 4,683 |
| SE return | 177 | 284 | 223 | 184 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 267 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 11 | 44 | 31 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Percent | 9.6 | 38.6 | 27.2 | 20.2 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 2.8 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 1.9 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 621 | 2,483 | 1,749 | 1,298 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 6,432 |
| SE return | 177 | 292 | 267 | 241 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix E5.-Estimated inriver return of Chinook salmon by time stratum and age, Ayakulik River, 2003.

|  | Age |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Through 30 May |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 30.8 | 46.2 | 0.0 | 76.9 |
| SE percent |  | 11.6 | 12.5 |  | 10.6 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 16 | 24 | 0 | 41 |
| SE return | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Percent | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| SE percent | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 |  | 10.6 |
| Inriver return at weir | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 12 |
| SE return | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 13 |
| Percent | 7.7 | 38.5 | 53.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 6.7 | 12.2 | 12.5 |  | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 4 | 20 | 29 | 0 | 53 |
| SE return | 4 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 May - 13 June |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 30 | 17 | 0 | 47 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 30.9 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 48.5 |
| SE percent |  | 4.7 | 3.9 |  | 5.1 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 2,148 | 1,217 | 0 | 3,366 |
| SE return | 0 | 325 | 268 | 0 | 352 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 9 | 29 | 11 | 1 | 50 |
| Percent | 9.3 | 29.9 | 11.3 | 1.0 | 51.5 |
| SE percent | 2.9 | 4.6 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 5.1 |
| Inriver return at weir | 644 | 2,077 | 788 | 72 | 3,580 |
| SE return | 204 | 322 | 223 | 71 | 352 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 9 | 59 | 28 | 1 | 97 |
| Percent | 9.3 | 60.8 | 28.9 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 2.9 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 644 | 4,225 | 2,005 | 72 | 6,946 |
| SE return | 204 | 344 | 319 | 71 | 0 |
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|  | Age |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 |  |
| 14-27 June |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 2 | 24 | 13 | 39 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 2.2 | 26.7 | 14.4 | 43.3 |
| SE percent |  | 1.5 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 114 | 1,367 | 741 | 2,222 |
| SE return | 0 | 79 | 238 | 189 | 267 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 21 | 28 | 2 | 51 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 23.3 | 31.1 | 2.2 | 56.7 |
| SE percent |  | 4.4 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 1,197 | 1,595 | 114 | 2,906 |
| SE return | 0 | 228 | 249 | 79 | 267 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 23 | 52 | 15 | 90 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 25.6 | 57.8 | 16.7 | 100.0 |
| SE percent |  | 4.6 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 1,310 | 2,963 | 855 | 5,128 |
| SE return | 0 | 235 | 266 | 201 | 0 |
| After 27 June |  |  |  |  |  |
| Females |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 0 | 1 | 17 | 8 | 26 |
| Percent | 0.0 | 1.2 | 21.0 | 9.9 | 32.1 |
| SE percent |  | 1.2 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 0 | 67 | 1,140 | 536 | 1,743 |
| SE return | 0 | 67 | 245 | 180 | 281 |
| Males |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 22 | 29 | 3 | 55 |
| Percent | 1.2 | 27.2 | 35.8 | 3.7 | 67.9 |
| SE percent | 1.2 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 2.1 | 5.2 |
| Inriver return at weir | 67 | 1,475 | 1,944 | 201 | 3,687 |
| SE return | 67 | 268 | 289 | 114 | 281 |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number sampled | 1 | 23 | 46 | 11 | 81 |
| Percent | 1.2 | 28.4 | 56.8 | 13.6 | 100.0 |
| SE percent | 1.2 | 5.0 | 5.5 | 3.8 | 0.0 |
| Inriver return at weir | 67 | 1,542 | 3,084 | 737 | 5,430 |
| SE return | 67 | 272 | 298 | 206 | 0 |

# APPENDIX F. AGE COMPOSITION AND MEAN LENGTH AT AGE OF THE CHIGNIK RIVER CHINOOK SALMON ESCAPEMENT, 2003 

Appendix F1.-Estimates of Chinook salmon escapement by age and mean length at age, Chignik River, 2003.

|  |  | Age |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | Total

Note: Length from mideye to fork of tail recorded to the nearest millimeter.

# APPENDIX G. CHINOOK SALMON ANGLER CENSUS DATA FROM KARLUK AND AYAKULIK RIVER WEIRS, 1999-2003 

Appendix G1.-Chinook salmon angler census data from Karluk River weir, 1999-2003.

| Year |  | Angler type |  | Residency ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Alaska resident |  | Non Alaska resident |  |  |
|  |  | Guided | Unguided | Local | Nonlocal | U.S. | Foreign |  |
| 1999 | Anglers | 109 | 214 | 31 | 39 | 110 | 143 | 323 |
|  | Effort ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 451 | 1,493 | 110 | 141 | 457 | 1,236 | 1,944 |
|  | Harvest | 110 | 240 | 21 | 33 | 86 | 210 | 350 |
|  | Release | 223 | 1,317 | 147 | 115 | 430 | 848 | 1,540 |
| 2000 | Anglers | 173 | 214 | 6 | 61 | 150 | 170 | 387 |
|  | Effort ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 530 | 1,373 | 13 | 227 | 441 | 1,222 | 1,903 |
|  | Harvest | 224 | 287 | 2 | 58 | 192 | 259 | 511 |
|  | Release | 383 | 1,575 | 3 | 154 | 853 | 948 | 1,958 |
| 2001 | Anglers | 366 | 160 | 2 | 49 | 323 | 152 | 526 |
|  | Effort ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 934 | 1,042 | 2 | 150 | 670 | 1,154 | 1,976 |
|  | Harvest | 261 | 72 | 0 | 30 | 228 | 75 | 333 |
|  | Release | 743 | 487 | 0 | 176 | 760 | 294 | 1,230 |
| 2002 | Anglers | 637 | 194 | 41 | 46 | 598 | 146 | 831 |
|  | Effort ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1,019 | 726 | 88 | 58 | 882 | 717 | 1,745 |
|  | Harvest | 513 | 88 | 16 | 32 | 463 | 90 | 601 |
|  | Release | 1,622 | 646 | 51 | 107 | 1,369 | 741 | 2,268 |
| 2003 | Anglers | 244 | 145 | 36 | 28 | 277 | 48 | 389 |
|  | Effort ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 418 | 340 | 51 | 53 | 333 | 321 | 758 |
|  | Harvest | 221 | 70 | 17 | 14 | 202 | 58 | 291 |
|  | Release | 1,111 | 402 | 96 | 39 | 977 | 401 | 1,513 |

a Local = Alaska resident who lives on Kodiak Island; Nonlocal = Alaska resident who lives outside of Kodiak Island; U.S. = lives in the U.S. outside of the State of Alaska; Foreign = lives outside the United States. Residency undetermined for some anglers.
b Units of effort = angler days.

Appendix G2.-Chinook salmon angler census data from Ayakulik River weir, 1999-2003.

| Year |  | Angler type |  | Residency ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Alaska resident |  | Non Alaska resident |  |  |
|  |  | Guided | Unguided | Local | Nonlocal | U.S. | Foreign |  |
| 1999 | Anglers | 41 | 22 | ND | 23 | 40 | ND | 63 |
|  | Effort ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 240 | 103 | ND | 93 | 250 | ND | 343 |
|  | Harvest | 212 | 25 | ND | 22 | 215 | ND | 237 |
|  | Release | 796 | 175 | ND | 109 | 862 | ND | 971 |
| 2000 | Anglers | 57 | 3 | ND | 10 | 50 | ND | 60 |
|  | Effort | 391 | 12 | ND | 39 | 364 | ND | 403 |
|  | Harvest | 309 | 6 | ND | 18 | 297 | ND | 315 |
|  | Release | 1,472 | 95 | ND | 36 | 1,531 | ND | 1,567 |
| 2001 | Anglers | 54 | 103 | 27 | 16 | 91 | 23 | 157 |
|  | Effort | 288 | 693 | 158 | 95 | 510 | 218 | 981 |
|  | Harvest | 134 | 164 | 41 | 16 | 231 | 10 | 298 |
|  | Release | 1,306 | 2,791 | 601 | 327 | 2,402 | 767 | 4,097 |
| 2002 | Anglers | 348 | 112 | 24 | 13 | 395 | 28 | 460 |
|  | Effort | 474 | 725 | 104 | 85 | 752 | 258 | 1,199 |
|  | Harvest | 145 | 127 | 25 | 19 | 209 | 19 | 272 |
|  | Release | 1,332 | 1,011 | 243 | 69 | 1,695 | 336 | 2,343 |
| 2003 | Anglers | 83 | 105 | 21 | 20 | 90 | 57 | 188 |
|  | Effort | 420 | 756 | 123 | 120 | 468 | 465 | 1,176 |
|  | Harvest | 149 | 100 | 14 | 29 | 146 | 60 | 249 |
|  | Release | 902 | 1,725 | 298 | 340 | 1,303 | 686 | 2,627 |

Note: ND = no data because no attempts were made to collect it.
a Local = Alaska resident who lives on Kodiak Island; Nonlocal = Alaska resident who lives outside of Kodiak Island; U.S. = lives in the U.S. outside of the State of Alaska; Foreign = lives outside the United States. Residency undetermined for some anglers.
b Units of effort = angler days.

Appendix G3.-Comparison of harvest and release of Chinook salmon estimates from the Statewide Harvest Survey, creel surveys, and censuses at Karluk and Ayakulik rivers, 1994-2003.

| River | Year | SWHS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | Creel survey ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | Angler census at weir ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Harvest | Release | Harvest | Release | Anglers | Effort ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Harvest | Release |
| Karluk | 1994 | 1,483 | 2,174 | $896{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 4,339 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 506 | 1,650 | 493 | 3,385 |
|  | 1995 | 1,284 | 2,613 |  |  | 380 | 1,677 | 492 | 2,411 |
|  | 1996 | 769 | 1,613 |  |  | 329 | 1,727 | 406 | 2,996 |
|  | 1997 | 1,562 | 9,051 |  |  | 322 | 1,632 | 399 | 2,246 |
|  | 1998 | 1,173 | 6,150 |  |  | 289 | 1,738 | 376 | 1,453 |
|  | 1999 | 1,766 | 6,150 |  |  | 323 | 1,944 | 350 | 1,540 |
|  | 2000 | 2,581 | 8,165 |  |  | 385 | 1,903 | 512 | 1,958 |
|  | 2001 | 1,304 | 3,676 |  |  | 526 | 1,976 | 333 | 1,230 |
|  | 2002 | 716 | 753 | $601{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 2,268 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 562 | 2,060 | 425 | 1,811 |
|  | 2003 | 563 | 1,832 | $291{ }^{\text {e }}$ | $1,513{ }^{\text {e }}$ | 265 | 858 | 247 | 1,193 |
| 1994-2003 Mean |  | 1,320 | 4,218 | - | - | 389 | 1,717 | 403 | 2,022 |
| Ayakulik | 1994 | 948 | 1,020 | $739{ }^{\text {f }}$ | 2,752 ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 203 | 926 | 477 | 1,898 |
|  | 1995 | 200 | 883 |  |  | 126 | 606 | 296 | 2,445 |
|  | 1996 | 203 | 591 |  |  | 135 | 446 | 292 | 1,299 |
|  | 1997 | 1,182 | 5,951 |  |  | 75 | 537 | 251 | 1,799 |
|  | 1998 | 259 | 3,245 |  |  | 64 | 440 | 195 | 2,060 |
|  | 1999 | 609 | 2,825 |  |  | 64 | 349 | 237 | 971 |
|  | 2000 | 803 | 7,578 |  |  | 152 | 966 | 404 | 3,114 |
|  | 2001 | 568 | 8,135 |  |  | 157 | 981 | 303 | 4,148 |
|  | 2002 | 362 | 5,302 |  |  | 458 | 1,179 | 255 | 2,276 |
|  | 2003 | 344 | 3,738 | $434{ }^{\text {g }}$ | $4,746{ }^{\text {g }}$ | 188 | 1,176 | 249 | 2,627 |
| 1994-2003 Mean |  | 568 | 3,927 | - | - | 162 | 761 | 296 | 2,264 |

Note: "-" = value can't be computed due to limitations of the data.
a SWHS = Statewide Harvest Survey (Howe et al. 1995 1996, 2001a-d; Walker et al. 2003; Jennings et al 2004, 2006 a, b).
b Schwartz et al. 2002.
c Does not include anglers who fished Karluk Lagoon or anglers who exited at Karluk Portage.
d Units of effort = angler days.
e Does not include anglers who fished downstream of the weir.
f Creel census conducted by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
g Creel census conducted by ADF\&G and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
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