

Western Alaska Salmon Stock Identification Project Advisory Panel Meeting

4/13/07

Moderator: Jim Seeb

Attendees (in order of sign-in sheet):

Name

Doug Eggers	ADFG
Lisa Seeb	ADFG
Molly Chythlook	BBNA
Becca Robbins Gisclair	YRDFA
Jennifer Hooper	AVCP
Wes Jones	NSEDC (Kawerak)
Loretta Bullard	Kawerak
Steve Klosiewski	UFWS
Chris Habicht	ADFG
Mark Witteveen	ADFG
Tim Baker	ADFG
Pat Martin	CAMP
Michael Link	BBSRI (LGL)
Chuck McCallum	Lake and Pen. Bor.
John Hilsinger	ADFG

Arrived late and not on the sign-in sheet:

Dick Jacobson	Aleut Corp
Karen Gillis	BSFA
Gene Sandone	ADFG
Mike Smith	TCC

Meeting scheduled to start at 8:30am was delayed until 9:00am to allow for late-comers. All MOU parties were represented except AEB. Most panel members stayed the duration; some had to leave early and missed discussions later in the day (Dick Jacobson, Chuck McCallum, Karen Gillis, Mike Smith, Steve Klosiewski). This is important to note because we want all Advisory Panel members to be comfortable with decisions including those made in their absence.

Introductions:

During introductions each signatory took the opportunity to give their impression of WASSIP. Some expressed concern that the program was moving too slowly and was not going to provide information in time for the next BOF meeting. ADFG expressed concern that many had not responded to key emails calling for action during the last year. In general, the participants expressed support for continuing the WASSIP process.

Review of historical timeline:

We reviewed the historical timeline of WASSIP landmarks (file attached). Over the 2½ year period ADFG submitted three requests for federal funds, one request for state funds, and one proposal to AYKSSI. The federal and state requests only obtained funds for sampling in 2006-2007. The AYKSSI request was not funded. Senator Hoffman requested WASSIP information, and an Alaskan senate bill may be under consideration this session. Laboratory analysis needs to start soon to insure complete reporting by fall 2009 for the winter BOF meeting.

The October 2004 WASSIP plan called for substantial start up funds and analysis of 30,000 fishery samples per year for two years (60,000 total) at a total cost of \$5M. ADFG obtained much of the start up from collateral projects, and the WASSIP advisory panel modified the analyses up to 47,300 fish per year for three years (141,900 total) at a currently estimated cost of \$4M.

Review of the AYKSSI proposal:

ADFG submitted a proposal for the entire WASSIP program to AYKSSI for \$4M. The budget was split into chum salmon (\$2.2M) and sockeye salmon (\$1.8M) to enable AYKSSI the option to fund only chum salmon. This large request that included sockeye salmon was outside of the bounds for AYKSSI support.

The Advisory Panel agreed that it is acceptable to split WASSIP into chum salmon and sockeye salmon components in order to seek separate funding for each. The chum salmon proposal will be resubmitted to AYKSSI, and the sockeye salmon proposal will be submitted to sockeye proponents on the Advisory Panel.

Concerns that were discussed by the Advisory Panel:

- The ADFG proposal was based upon SNPs – Technical Committee is not formed and has not reviewed methods.
- WASSIP and AYKSSI are different bodies, yet WASSIP MOU is dictating constraints of AYKSSI project.
- ADFG is asking for WASSIP leadership; WASSIP signatories would have to abstain from SSI vote if they submit proposal.
- Samples should be shared with Canadians and other labs – WASSIP MOU does not encourage sharing.

Responses to concerns by ADFG and by Panel discussion:

- Methods must be included in proposal for evaluation, and ADFG advocates that SNPs are the only practical method to analyze 141,900 fish.
 - ADFG will not do any work until after TC review
 - ADFG will not do any work until AP approves

- Constraints of WASSIP MOU will need to be in the AYKSSI proposal and the AYKSSI will need to judge the proposal with these restrictions.
- WASSIP signatories should still be able to vote on the SSI SC if ADFG takes the lead again, but Maryanne See, Gene Sandone and Eric Volk would be recused.
- Substantial discussion surrounded the desire of some to change the MOU to encourage sample sharing (see below).

Changing the MOU and Sample Sharing:

A discussion followed regarding changing the WASSIP MOU to encourage sample sharing

Some proponents wanted to change the MOU to provide opportunities for other investigators to analyze smaller subsets of tissues from specific fisheries.

- The general conclusion was that the MOU was hard won and that we should not underestimate the effort to change it.
- The current MOU allows flexibility and this flexibility is under control of a unanimous vote of the signatories.
- If WASSIP breaks up, then burden on Department to solicit input from signatories regarding sample disposition. NI p.

The consensus was not to change the current MOU.

The Advisory Panel agreed that it was acceptable for ADFG to treat the individual species sets as a whole for the separate chum and sockeye salmon proposals. For example, funding may be available for sockeye salmon before chum salmon is approved by AYKSSI.

Review 2006 field season:

2006 was generally very successful with nearly 70,000 tissues collected from chum and sockeye salmon.

Goals were not met in some strata:

- Three Hills not properly sampled (early samples not taken)
 - lack of escapement so no fishing.
- North Peninsula
 - Bristol Bay chum salmon
 - Perryville – no fish
 -

Some failures to meet goals were because the original strata sets were based on little information. Now we know better.

Some failures will occur if fisheries don't take place because of run timing or weak run strength.

Goals were not met in Bristol Bay because chum salmon were hard to fund (the ratio of chum: sockeye is very low). ADFG has committed an extra \$20,000 to add staff to increase Bristol Bay sampling.

Review of 2007 Sampling Plan:

- Bristol Bay chum salmon – The Advisory Panel was comfortable with the proposed new strategy to combine eastside strata. This will enable larger numbers of samples to be collected at the processors. Nushagak and Togiak will have more staff to increase numbers there.
- Mouth of the Yukon River: Gene Sandone indicated that there will probably be a commercial fishery below Emmonak. Gene will talk with manager to determine if the tenders can be sampled. Plan is to add 800 for fall and 800 for summer chum.
- Norton Bay should be sampled using subsistence catch. Shaktoolik, Golovin, Moses Point. Marine waters.
- Safety Sound discussions--categorized as not marine waters for this project. No additional sampling here.
- Chuck McCallum made a request that sampling be extended through August for the SE District Mainland, Shumagin Islands, and Dolgoi Islands. There was discussion about the consequence of adding a change such as this in year 2 (what about the 3-year rule?). The Advisory Panel agreed that these samples could be collected, but inclusion in WASSIP analyses would require consideration of the whole Advisory Panel.

High definition GSI

Pat Martin led a discussion on high definition GSI: the goal of identifying stock contributions in mixture when stock in question occurs at an exceedingly low frequency.

The ADFG proposal to AYKSSI included an HD GSI component with Steve Kalinowski from Montana State University. When that was not funded, Lisa Seeb redirected Steve to Pacific Salmon Commission funding using HD GSI on Chinook salmon fisheries. That work will be incorporated into WASSIP planning. Pat Martin emphasized that it is important for WASSIP analyses to have a goal of identifying stocks with 99% accuracy with a 1% error.

There was general agreement that detecting small component stocks is a high priority. There was substantial debate about the ability to achieve Pat's criteria, and ADFG expressed concern that including what might appear to be unachievable criteria might offend proposal reviewers. Pat made a motion that was passed unanimously by the AP: Both the sockeye and chum preproposals should include specific language that includes

that ADFG will strive to meet a goal of high resolution GSI with 99% accuracy with 1% error.

Technical Committee Selection:

Those present had no objections to any of the nominees for Technical Committee. We agreed that absent panelists should have the option to veto any nominee for any reason. All discussion of was positive.

Those present felt that the Technical Committee should have expertise in genetics (to address the SNP/microsatellite debate), salmon in saltwater, statistics, and modeling.

Advisory Panel members present voted for four choices (top 4 candidates in **BOLD** below). There was discussion about letting those absent vote absentee. The only possible change would involve Terry, Mike, or Daniel, who received 2-4 votes each. Unless there is strong objection from absentees, the Advisory Panel agreed to accept the top four below.

Nominee	Expertise	votes
Robin Waples	Genetics, Endangered Species	8
Bruce Weir	Genetics, Statistics	8
Tom Quinn	FW and Marine Ecology	7
Terry Quinn	Population Dynamics	4
Mike Ford	Genetics, Endangered Species	3
Daniel Schindler	Ecology and Limnology	2
Bernie May	Genetics	0