

## **Response to RC 89 and RC 103 Kodiak Salmon Work Group**

### **Limited data fails to support conclusions regarding Cape Igvak stock-specific harvests**

Substitute language for proposal 60 in RC 103 is based upon Table 1 in RC 89. The table references two studies; a sockeye tagging study from 1969 and the recent sockeye genetics study by Shedd et al. 2016.

#### **Tagging study, Simon et al., 1969.**

- 791 fish were tagged and 161 tags were recovered from fisheries and spawning grounds.
  - Results showed 80% were from the Chignik watershed
- Two tagging study assumptions were like violated (see RC 89).
  - Not all final destinations were sampled
  - Sampling was inconsistent across final destinations
  - Samples collected from commercial fisheries were assumed to be bound for nearby local streams

#### **Genetic Study, Shedd et al., 2017**

- Only three temporal strata were sampled over the study period 2014-2016 because Cape Igvak was closed during all of 2014 and during the early stratum (June) of 2015.
- In the middle stratum 2015 (July) only 6,595 fish were harvested; 31% were Chignik bound
- For 2016, early stratum (June) 154,318 sockeye were harvested with 74% bound for Chignik
- For 2016, middle stratum (July), 177,315 sockeye were harvested with 6% bound for Chignik.

**Inferences for Igvak harvests of Chignik bound sockeye are based upon a partially flawed tagging study and a single data point from the recent genetics study. RC 103 is based on very limited and highly variable data.**