## Skokomish River Chinook salmon data response to NOAA concerns from meeting 02 APRIL 2018 at NOF2

Estimates of NOR escapement have evolved since adipose-clip mass-marking of George Adams Hatchery (GAH) Chinook salmon. Previous estimates of pHOS had been based on expansions on few CWT recoveries. Since 2010 all age classes of Chinook returns came from GAH releases that were mass marked. Consequently, it is possible to more accurately estimate pHOS by dividing the mark rate from Chinook carcass surveys in the Skokomish River basin by the weighted mark rate at GAH. The mean pHOS from 2010 to 2017 was $87.3 \%$ with a standard deviation of $6.6 \%$. These modern pHOS estimates were inconsistent with the previous much more variable pHOS estimates from CWTs. Therefore, the Skokomish Chinook run reconstruction has been re-done using adipose-clip based pHOS estimates (Table 1) and applying the mean pHOS from 2010-2017 to years prior to 2010 (Figure 1). Note the 5 year mean NOR escapement has increased by 123\% from 2008 to 2017 (Table 1).

In 2016 and 2017, several adjustments were made to the treaty fishery schedule and structure to provide greater certainty of meeting the harvest management objectives until improvements can be made with the forecasting/harvest rate methodologies. The treaty net-fishery from the mouth of the Skokomish River to the Hwy 106 Bridge was not scheduled to open during the Chinook management period and the coho fishery opening was scheduled for the week beginning Oct. 9th (Table 2). This schedule lead to zero treaty fisheries for the Skokomish River over a period of six continuous weeks ( $w b^{\sim}$ 8/21- wb 10/6); the last three to four weeks of the Chinook management period through the first three to four weeks of the coho management period(weeks are approximate due to the yearly calendar day shifts). Therefore, Chinook impacts in the Skokomish River are expected to only occur over the nine/twelve days of the Chinook fishery, with zero to minimal impacts (e.g. single digit catch) during the coho fishery starting the second week of October. While this restructure is partially intended to provide escapement of later returning Chinook in support of late-timed recovery efforts, it is also intended to provide increased certainty of meeting harvest objectives. Additional schedule changes in the 12C Chinook fishery could also be utilized to minimize impacts on Skokomish River fish. Taken together, these actions are expected to provide greater certainty of meeting pre-season harvest estimates. Preliminary ER estimates for 2016 to 2017 (using pre-terminal ERs from preseason Chinook FRAM estimates, and terminal ERs taken from co-manager run reconstructions) indicate that the above measure have been effective at keeping total ER below 50\% (Table 3).

The continued inability to accurately forecast Chinook runs and the variability in the annual run timing distribution of adults returning to the Skokomish River hinders the capabilities of any harvest model accuracy. It would be more appropriate to look at the accuracy/performance of the forecasting methodology versus the harvest tool that is generating rates based on that forecast. The recent poor marine survival conditions have also hampered forecast accuracy especially for Hood Canal Chinook stocks, both hatchery and natural origin fish. In 2018, the co-managers will continue to pursue different runsize forecasting methodologies for Skokomish River Chinook in order to improve overall performance accuracy in fishery modeling, reduce risk in overages in the exploitation rate and increase current sampling from an average of $28 \%$ to rates equal to or greater than $45 \%$ in order to properly evaluate fishery impacts on NOR/"Late-Timed" Skokomish River recovery programs.

Table 1. The Skokomish River Chinook run reconstruction has been updated with adipose-clip based pHOS estimates. For years prior to 2010, the 2010-2017 mean pHOS of $87.3 \%$ was applied.

| Year | Non-selective FW catch | Mark-selective FW catch | GAH escapement | Spawning escapement <br> (HOR +NOR) | NOR escapement | pHOS | HOR ETRS | NOR ETRS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | 9,237 | - | 4,439 | 2,666 | 346 | 87\% | 15,547 | 795 |
| 1989 | 9,938 | - | 2,523 | 1,204 | 156 | 87\% | 13,093 | 572 |
| 1990 | 5,977 | - | 2,186 | 642 | 83 | 87\% | 8,546 | 259 |
| 1991 | 6,458 | - | 3,068 | 1,719 | 223 | 87\% | 10,722 | 523 |
| 1992 | 549 | - | 294 | 825 | 107 | 87\% | 1,509 | 159 |
| 1993 | 521 | - | 612 | 960 | 124 | 87\% | 1,927 | 166 |
| 1994 | 275 | - | 495 | 657 | 85 | 87\% | 1,322 | 105 |
| 1995 | - | - | 5,447 | 1,398 | 181 | 87\% | 6,664 | 181 |
| 1996 | - | - | 3,100 | 995 | 129 | 87\% | 3,966 | 129 |
| 1997 | 4 | - | 1,885 | 452 | 59 | 87\% | 2,282 | 59 |
| 1998 | 13 | - | 5,584 | 1,177 | 153 | 87\% | 6,621 | 153 |
| 1999 | 2,340 | - | 8,235 | 1,692 | 219 | 87\% | 11,996 | 271 |
| 2000 | 1,081 | - | 4,032 | 926 | 120 | 87\% | 5,893 | 146 |
| 2001 | 6,549 | - | 8,816 | 1,913 | 248 | 87\% | 16,879 | 399 |
| 2002 | 5,674 | - | 9,395 | 1,479 | 192 | 87\% | 16,256 | 292 |
| 2003 | 7,315 | - | 10,034 | 1,125 | 146 | 87\% | 18,233 | 241 |
| 2004 | 6,811 | - | 12,278 | 2,398 | 311 | 87\% | 21,032 | 455 |
| 2005 | 12,259 | - | 16,018 | 2,032 | 263 | 87\% | 29,867 | 442 |
| 2006 | 13,493 | - | 12,356 | 1,209 | 157 | 87\% | 26,745 | 313 |
| 2007 | 15,364 | - | 13,270 | 429 | 56 | 87\% | 28,945 | 118 |
| 2008 | 13,267 | - | 13,695 | 1,134 | 147 | 87\% | 27,817 | 279 |
| 2009 | 12,041 | - | 13,220 | 1,066 | 138 | 87\% | 26,072 | 255 |
| 2010 | 9,654 | 6,336 | 12,891 | 1,214 | 174 | 86\% | 29,802 | 293 |
| 2011 | 11,761 | 5,784 | 24,581 | 1,321 | 55 | 96\% | 43,367 | 80 |
| 2012 | 15,434 | 12,261 | 22,869 | 1,533 | 142 | 91\% | 51,865 | 232 |
| 2013 | 8,894 | 5,458 | 21,452 | 1,722 | 171 | 90\% | 37,290 | 236 |
| 2014 | 3,680 | 2,167 | 6,227 | 849 | 109 | 87\% | 12,758 | 165 |
| 2015 | 6,313 | 3,297 | 6,032 | 432 | 117 | 73\% | 15,843 | 231 |
| 2016 | 10,314 | - | 22,076 | 1,342 | 177 | 87\% | 33,477 | 255 |
| 2017 | 16,515 | - | 35,129 | 8,058 | 886 | 89\% | 58,477 | 1,225 |
| 5 year Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013-2017 | 9,143 | 2,184 | 18,183 | 2,481 | 292 | 85\% | 31,569 | 423 |
| 2008-2012 | 12,431 | 4,876 | 17,451 | 1,254 | 131 | 89\% | 35,785 | 227 |
| \% increase | -26\% | -55\% | 4\% | 98\% | 123\% | -5\% | -12\% | 86\% |

Figure 1. Skokomish River Chinook PHOS, Spawning escapement (HOR + NOR), and NOR contribution to Spawning escapement updated using adipose-clip based estimates of pHOS.




Table 2. Summary of the tribal commercial Chinook fishery schedule in the Skokomish River, 2010-2017.

| Number of Days Open/Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ******* | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  | 2015 |  | 2016 |  | 2017 |  | 2018 (Proposed) |  | MGMT PERIOD |
|  |  |  |  |  | Hwy 106Hwyl01 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Mouth - Hwy } \\ 106 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Hwy 106- <br> Hwyl01 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Mouth - Hwy } \\ 106 \end{array}$ | Hwy 106- <br> Hwyl01 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Mouth - Hwy } \\ 106 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Hwy 106Hwyl01 | Mouth - Hwy <br> 106 | Hwy 106Hwyl01 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Mouth - Hwy } \\ 106 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| 7/13-7/19 |  |  |  |  | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | CHINOOK |
| 7/20-7/26 |  |  |  |  | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | CHINOOK |
| 7/27-8/2 |  | 3 | 2 |  | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | CHINOOK |
| 8/3-8/9 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed |  | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | CHINOOK |
| 8/10-8/16 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  | Closed |  | Closed |  | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | CHINOOK |
| 8/17-8/23 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  | Closed |  | Closed |  | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | CHINOOK |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 8 / 24-8 / 30 \\ \text { (Peak Run) } \end{array}$ | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | 3 | Closed | 3 | Closed | CHINOOK |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 8 / 31-9 / 6 \\ \text { (Peak Run) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | CHINOOK |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 9 / 7-9 / 13 \\ \text { (Peak Run) } \end{array}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | CHINOOK |
| 9/14-9/20 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Closed | 2 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | СОНО |
| 9/21-9/27 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Closed | 2 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | СОНО |
| 9/28-10/4 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | Closed | СОНО |
| 10/5-10/11 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |  | COHO |
| 10/12-10/18 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |  | COHO |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total Days } \\ \text { Open } \end{array}$ | 56 | 54 | 51 | 35 |  | 35 |  | 33 |  | 23 |  | 26 |  | 26 |  |
| ********* WEEK APPROXIMATE DUE TO YEARLY CALENDAR DAY Shifts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. ER estimates for 2016 to 2017 used pre-terminal ERs from preseason Chinook FRAM estimates, and terminal ERs were taken from co-manager run reconstructions.

| Year | ER estimate |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2016 | $49.8 \%$ |
| 2017 | $49.1 \%$ |

