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Study History: The coded wire tag program in Prince William Sound was initiated in 1986 to partition returns of pink salmon into wild and hatchery stocks. After the Exxon Valdez oil spill, the program was incorporated into Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fish/Shellfish Study 3 (Coded wire tag studies on Prince William Sound salmon), which documented effects of the spill on wild pink salmon by comparing survival rates at oiled and unoiled streams, as well as through estimation of hatchery and wild stock returns. The project effort was continued under Restoration Studies R60A (Coded wire tag studies on Prince William Sound pink salmon, 1992), 93067 (Coded wire tag recoveries from pink salmon in Prince William Sound salmon fisheries, 1993), 94320B (Coded wire tag recoveries from pink salmon in Prince William Sound salmon fisheries, 1994), 95320B (Coded wire tag recoveries from pink salmon in Prince William Sound salmon fisheries, 1995), 96186 (Coded wire tag recoveries from pink salmon in Prince William Sound salmon fisheries, 1996), 97186 and currently, 98186 (Coded Wire Tag Recoveries from Pink Salmon in Prince William Sound Salmon Fisheries, 1994 to 1997).


#### Abstract

From 1993 to 1996, between 0.49 and 0.64 billion pink salmon fry were released annually into Prince William Sound from the A.F. Koernig, W.H. Noerenberg, Cannery Creek, and Solomon Gulch hatcheries, of which 0.940 to 1.07 million were tagged with half length coded wire tags. Tags were recovered in Prince William Sound fisheries the year after their release, and estimates of hatchery contributions based upon detected tags were given to management biologists on an inseason basis. Except for 1995, these preliminary estimates agreed well with postseason estimates derived from fully decoded tags. Preliminary estimates were much higher than postseason estimates in 1995 in certain districts because of extremely high survival rates of experimental release lots that had been tagged at three times the normal rate. Total annual catches of hatchery pink salmon between 1994 to 1997 ranged from 13 million to 30 million adults, while total catches of wild pink salmon ranged from 3 million to 8 million. A historical adjustment factor was used to compensate for differential mortality and tag loss and was calculated as the average of available adjustment factors for W.H. Noerenberg hatchery from 1989 to 1996. Between 1994 and 1996, the pink salmon hatchery survival rates dropped for Solomon Gulch hatchery, rose for A.F. Koernig hatchery, and fluctuated for Cannery Creek and W.H. Noerenberg hatcheries.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes Restoration Studies 94320B, 95320B, 96186, and 97186. The projects provided information to management biologists attempting to restore stocks of wild Prince William Sound pink salmon Oncorhynchus gorbuscha to their pre-spill status. Coded wire tags were applied from 1993 to 1996 at four hatcheries in Prince William Sound, the W.H. Noerenberg, Cannery Creek, A.F. Koernig, and Solomon Gulch facilities. The tags were recovered in the commercial catch from 1994 to 1997 and used to provide inseason estimates of hatchery contributions. These estimates were used by fishery managers to target numerically superior hatchery returns, and thus to reduce the pressure placed upon oil-damaged wild stocks. Inseason estimates were made in two stages. Preliminary estimates were based solely on detected tags (not extracted) and were made available to managers upon completion of sampling. These estimates were updated three to seven days later with coded information obtained from extracted tags.

Postseason analysis revealed that between 1994 and 1997, wild pink salmon comprised between 3.1 million and 8.06 million adults in the commercial harvest. The annual hatchery pink salmon component ranged from 13.8 million to 29.9 million adults. Solomon Gulch released the largest number of pink salmon, and provided the largest portion of the hatchery component. Returns to the A.F.Koernig hatchery were the lowest of all of the hatcheries from 1994 to 1996, increasing to the second largest hatchery component in 1997. The pink salmon returns to Cannery Creek and W.H. Noerenberg hatcheries fluctuated between 3.2 million and 9.4 million adults for Cannery Creek, and 2.4 million and 6.2 million adults for W.H. Noerenberg. Between 1994 and 1996, the pink salmon hatchery survival rates dropped for the Solomon Gulch hatchery, rose for the A.F. Koernig hatchery, and fluctuated for the Cannery Creek and W.H. Noerenberg hatcheries.

## INTRODUCTION

Between 1961 and 1976, prior to the establishment of hatcheries in Prince William Sound, the commercial seine harvest averaged about 3.4 million pink salmon Oncorhynchus gorbuscha. In the early 1970's, run failures led to an aggressive enhancement program that included construction of hatcheries. By 1986, five hatcheries were operating (Figure 1): the Solomon Gulch hatchery produced pink salmon, and later, also chum salmon $O$. keta and coho salmon O. kisutch; the A.F. Koernig hatchery produced pink salmon; the W.H. Noerenberg hatchery produced pink salmon, and later, also chum, coho and chinook salmon $O$. tschawytsch; the Cannery Creek hatchery produced pink salmon; the Main Bay hatchery, which originally produced chum presently raises sockeye salmon $O$. nerka.

Supplemental hatchery salmon production complicated management of commercial salmon fisheries in Prince William Sound. Hatchery salmon stocks can tolerate much higher harvest rates than wild salmon stocks, and different management strategies should be applied to them. Such a management regime requires knowledge of the location of hatchery and wild stocks in time and space. In order to collect information about the spatial and temporal distributions of hatchery and wild pink salmon, a coded wire tagging program was initiated in 1986 for hatchery releases of pink salmon, with recovery of tagged returning adults in commercial and cost recovery fisheries beginning in 1987. Tag recovery data enabled managers to estimate hatchery and wild contributions to catches from strata within the fishery.

The March 24, 1989, Exxon Valdez oil spill exacerbated the many problems faced in management of the Prince William Sound pink salmon fishery. The spill contaminated intertidal portions of streams where most wild pink salmon stocks in western Prince William Sound spawn as well as the marine waters traversed by juvenile pink salmon on their migration seaward through the Sound. Decisions made by fishery managers suddenly became more complicated insofar as they affected wild populations injured by the oil spill. The coded wire tagging program was expanded under the Natural Resource Damage Assessment study F/S 3 (Sharr et al, 1995a) and Restoration Study R60A (Sharr et al, 1995b) to include tagging of wild pink salmon in order to examine survival rates of wild salmon in oiled versus unoiled streams. In recent years, the emphasis of the program has been to provide management biologists with timely data on the relative abundance of wild and hatchery stocks, so that they could target fishing effort on hatchery stocks and protect recovering wild stocks. From 1994 to 1997, the program was supported by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council, along with matching funds from the Prince William Sound Aquaculture Corporation (PWSAC), Valdez Fisheries Development Association (VFDA), and the State of Alaska.

This report documents the activities and results of the coded wire tag program for the recovery years 1994 through 1997. It focuses primarily upon hatchery contributions to the different fisheries, survival rates of different hatchery release groups, and inseason


Figure 1. Fishing districts and hatcheries of Prince William Sound, Alaska. Pink salmon hatcheries: W.H.N. $=$ W.H. Noerenberg, $\mathrm{SG}=$ Solomon Gulch, $\mathrm{CC}=$ Cannery Creek, AFK=A.F. Koernig.
estimates of contributions. Aggregated data are presented in the main body of the document, while more specific data are placed in the appendices

## OBJECTIVES

1. To provide estimates of wild and hatchery components of the pink salmon commercial fisheries from 1994 through 1997 to fishery managers on an inseason basis, so that fishing effort could be directed towards hatchery stocks.
2. To estimate marine survival rates for each uniquely coded hatchery release group returning in years 1994 through 1997.
3. To evaluate the method selected in 1993 for inseason analysis of coded wire tag data, whereby a historical adjustment factor and numbers of detected (undecoded) tags are used to estimate the hatchery and wild contributions.

## METHODS

## Tagging

Technicians hired by the aquaculture associations tagged pink salmon fry at the three PWSAC facilities (W.H. Noerenberg, Cannery Creek, and A.F. Koernig hatcheries) and at the VFDA facility (Solomon Gulch hatchery). Tagging rates and recovery efforts were selected that would yield contribution estimates of sufficient precision to allow fishery managers to make meaningful inseason decisions. Assuming a potential sampling rate of $20 \%$ for commercial and cost recovery harvests, and following an analysis of the performance of previous tagging studies (Peltz and Miller 1990; Peltz and Geiger 1990; Geiger and Sharr 1990), an overall tagging rate of approximately one coded wire tag per 600 pink salmon (a tagging rate of 0.001667 ) was chosen. A different tag code was given to each release group that represented a batch of pink salmon subjected to a certain feeding regimen (early feeding, late feeding or no feeding), and release timing. A portion of the pink salmon fry released between 1993 and 1995 were part of a continuing Sound Ecosystem Assessment (SEA) experiment to ascertain whether juveniles above 60 mm in length experienced greater survival rates than smaller juveniles. The 1993 and 1994 SEA experimental releases were tagged at a much higher rate than other release groups.

Pink salmon fry to be tagged were randomly selected as they emerged from incubators. Fry were anesthetized in a 1 ppm solution of MS-222 prior to removal of adipose fins and application of tags. Half-length coded wire tags were applied with a Northwest Marine Technology (Shaw Island, Washington) tag injector (model MKIV). Adipose finclipped and tagged salmon were passed through an electronic quality control device to test for tag retention. Rejected salmon were held and retested later. If rejected a second time, they were killed to minimize the number of untagged clipped salmon in the release. Fry which retained tags were held in fresh water overnight at the PWSAC hatcheries and for 72 hours at the VFDA hatchery, to determine short-term mortality and tag shedding. Hatchery personnel determined mortality rates by counting the number of pink salmon floating on the surface (floaters) after the holding period. The tag shedding rate was estimated by randomly selecting 200 pink salmon and testing them with the quality control device before release into saltwater rearing pens. Tag placement was checked periodically, but not quantified.

At the PWSAC hatcheries, after the overnight holding period and prior to release, all tagged fry were introduced into small saltwater pens within larger pens holding their unmarked cohorts. This additional separation allowed determination of short-term saltwater mortalities through enumeration of floaters. At VFDA's Solomon Gulch hatchery, tagged fry were transferred to the saltwater net pen holding their unmarked cohorts following a 72 hr . mortality check in freshwater; no saltwater mortality estimate
was made on tagged pink salmon. The number of fry released with tags of tag code $t, T r_{t}$, was estimated for each release group by deducting both short-term tagging and saltwater rearing mortalities (for PWSAC facilities) from the number of fry initially tagged and accounting for tag loss :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{T} r_{t}=\left(T_{t}-M o_{t}-M s w_{t}\right)\left(1-\hat{L} o_{t}\right), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
\(\left.\begin{array}{lll}T_{t} \& = \& total number of tagged(t) salmon <br>
M o_{t} \& = \& number of deaths during holding period among tagged(t) salmon <br>

M s w_{t} \& = \& number of deaths during saltwater rearing period among tagged(t)\end{array}\right]\)\begin{tabular}{l}
salmon (PWSAC only); and, <br>
$L o_{t}=$

$\quad$

proportion of tagged $(t)$ salmon which lost their tags during the <br>
<br>
holding period.
\end{tabular}

At the PWSAC hatcheries, unmarked pink salmon fry entering the large saltwater rearing pens were enumerated with electronic fry counters. Fry mortalities were estimated visually immediately prior to release and were applied equally to tagged and untagged pink salmon to obtain final release estimates. With the exception of experimental release groups, fry releases were timed to coincide with peak plankton abundance near the hatcheries. The VFDA hatchery estimated the number of pink salmon entering the large saltwater pens by estimating the number of fry that emerged from the incubators supplying pink salmon to the pens.

## Tag Recovery

## Commercial and Cost Recovery Harvests

Recoveries were stratified by district, week, and processor. This stratification was chosen as a result of the findings of Peltz and Geiger (1990), who detected significant differences between the proportions of some tag codes among such strata. These differences indicated that processors tend to receive catches from only certain parts of a district, and is believed to be the result of traditional tendering patterns.

Recoveries of pink salmon tags from commercial and cost recovery harvests were made after each fishery opening, as salmon were pumped from tenders onto conveyor belts at land based processors located in Cordova, Valdez, Seward, Whittier, and aboard one or two floating processors in PWS. Technicians sampled pink salmon that were moving down the conveyer belt, and subjected each sampled pink salmon to a visual and tactile examination for a missing adipose fin.

Data recorded for each tender included harvest type (i.e. commercial or cost recovery catch), fishing district(s), catch date, processor, and the number of salmon examined. Catch data were later verified from fish tickets.

Technicians excised the heads of pink salmon marked with an adipose fin clip, identified them with a uniquely numbered cinch strap and placed them in plastic bags. Once sampling was completed, individual heads were passed through a Northwest Marine Technology field sampling tag detector. The detector produced an audible signal upon detection of a metal tag in the head. This procedure yielded actual numbers of tags in the sample, and could be implemented immediately after the sample was taken.

All heads were then frozen, and together with sample data, were shipped twice weekly from each site to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Coded Wire Tag Processing Laboratory in Juneau (Tag Lab). Tag Lab staff located and removed tags from heads, decoded extracted tags, and entered tag code and sample data into a database accessible to biologists in Cordova.

## Brood Stock Harvests

Hatchery brood stocks were scanned for tags in order to estimate adjustment factors that could be used to account for loss of tags from the population. Three assumptions inherent in the use of the brood stock for this purpose are: a) the brood stock consists only of pink salmon reared at the hatchery, b) the tendency for a tagged pink salmon to lose a tag or to die is similar for all pink salmon marked at the same hatchery, and c) for a specific tag code, the marking rate in the commercial fishery is the same as that in the brood stock. Work by Sharr et al. (1995b) indicates that the first of these assumptions is likely violated at all facilities except the W.H. Noerenberg hatchery. Consequently, only the adjustment factor calculated from the brood stock at the W.H. Noerenberg hatchery was used as the basis of adjustments for tag shedding and differential mortality at all hatcheries. A historical average W.H. Noerenberg adjustment factor was used for both inseason and postseason estimations..

The adjustment factor for hatchery $h, a_{h}$, was estimated as the ratio of sampled pink salmon in the brood stock to the expanded number of pink salmon based on tags found in the sample :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{a}_{h}=\frac{s_{h}}{\sum_{i}^{T} \frac{x_{i}}{p_{i}}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
T=\text { number of tag codes released from hatchery } h
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
p_{i}= & \begin{array}{l}
\text { tagging rate at release for the } i \text { th tag code (defined as } \\
\text { number of tagged pink salmon released with the } i \text { th code } \\
\text { divided by the total number of salmon in release group } i \text { ) },
\end{array} \\
x_{i}=\quad \begin{array}{l}
\text { number of tags of the } i \text { th code found in } s_{h} \text { and, }
\end{array} \\
s_{h}=\quad \begin{array}{l}
\text { number of brood stock pink salmon examined in hatchery }
\end{array} \\
h .
\end{array}
$$

The W.H. Noerenberg historical average adjustment factor was then used to adjust contribution estimates (Equation 3), if it was significantly greater than 1.0 at the $90 \%$ level. An appropriate test of the hypothesis : Ho: $a_{h} \leq 1$ is given in Sharr et al. (1995a).

## Estimation of Contributions and Survival Rates

## Postseason Hatchery Contributions and Survival Rates

The contribution of release group $t$ to the sampled common property, cost recovery, brood stock and special harvests, as well as the escapement, $C_{t}$, was estimated as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{C}_{t}=\sum_{i=1}^{L} x_{i t}\left(\frac{N_{i} \hat{a}}{s_{i} p_{t}}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$x_{i t}=\quad$ number of group $t$ tags recovered in the $i$ th stratum,
$N_{i}=$ total number of pink salmon in the $i$ th stratum,
$s_{i} \quad=\quad$ number of pink salmon sampled from the $i$ th stratum,
$p_{t} \quad=\quad$ proportion of group $t$ tagged,
$a=$ historical adjustment factor associated with W.H. Noerenberg facility,
$L \quad=\quad$ number of recovery strata associated with common property, costrecovery, brood stock, special harvests and escapement in which tag code $t$ was found.

The contribution of release group $t$ to unsampled strata, $C u_{t}$, was estimated from contribution rates associated with strata which were sampled from the same district-week openings as the unsampled strata:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{C} u_{t}=\sum_{i=1}^{U}\left[N_{i}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{S} \hat{C}_{t j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{S} N_{j}}\right)\right], \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

| $U$ |  | led strata, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N_{i}$ |  | number of pink salmon in ith unsampled stratum |
| $S$ | $=$ | number of strata sampled in the period in which the unsampled stratum resides, |
| $C_{t j}$ | $=$ | contribution of release coded with $\operatorname{tag} t$ to the sampled stratum $j$, |
| $N_{j}$ | $=$ | number of pink salmon in $j$ th sampled stratum. |

When a district-week opening was not sampled at all (an infrequent occurrence), the catch from that opening was treated as unsampled catch from the subsequent opening in the same district.

An estimate of the contribution of tag group $t$ to the total Prince William Sound return for each year was obtained through summation of contribution estimates for sampled and unsampled strata. An estimate of the total hatchery contribution to the Prince William Sound return was calculated through summation of contributions over all release groups.

A variance approximation for $\hat{C}_{t}$, derived by Clark and Bernard (1987) and simplified by Geiger (1990) was used:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{V}\left(\hat{C}_{t}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{L} x_{i t}\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a}}{s_{i} p_{t}}\right]\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a}}{s_{i} p_{t}}-1\right] . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming that covariances between contributions of different release groups to a stratum could be ignored, summation of variance components over all tag codes provided an estimate of the variance of the total hatchery contribution. Inspection of the formula given by Clark and Bernard (1987) for the aforementioned covariances shows them to be negligible for large $N$ and $s$, and to be consistently negative, so that when ignored, conservative estimates of variance are obtained. Variances associated with unsampled strata are believed to be small (Sharr et al, 1995c).

The survival rate of the release group coded with tag $t\left(S_{t}\right)$, was estimated as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{S}_{t}=\frac{\hat{C}_{t}+\hat{C} u_{t}}{R_{t}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where,

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
C_{t} & = \\
C u_{t} & =\quad \text { contribution of release group coded with tag } t \text { to sampled strata }, \\
R_{t} & =\quad \text { contribution of release group coded with tag } t \text { to unsampled strata }, \\
& \text { total number of pink salmon in release group coded with tag } t \\
& \text { released from hatchery } .
\end{array}
$$

Assuming the total release of pink salmon associated with a tag code is known with negligible error, and that the cumulative variance contributions associated with the unsampled strata are small, a suitable variance estimate for $S_{t}$ is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{V}\left(\hat{S}_{t}\right)=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{L} x_{i t}\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a}}{s_{i} p_{t}}\right]\left[\frac{N_{i} \hat{a}}{s_{i} p_{t}}-1\right]}{R_{t}^{2}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Inseason Hatchery Contributions

Two inseason estimates of hatchery contributions of pink salmon were generated for each opening. The first and most timely estimate was made using the method suggested by Sharr et al. (1995c). This method depended on the number of (unread) detected tags. These are tags revealed by a Northwest Marine Technology field tag detector in heads of adipose-clipped pink salmon recovered during sampling. Estimates using (unread) detected tags required that assumptions be made about adjustment (a) and expansion ( $1 / p_{t}$ ) factors (see Equation 3). For inseason estimation, the average historical factor associated with the W.H. Noerenberg hatchery calculated from previous years data was used in the calculations. For example, in the 1997 season, the 1989 to 1996 W.H. Noerenberg historical adjustment factor was used. For fishery openings in the western and northern portions of Prince William Sound, late run hatchery returns to the PWSAC facilities were assumed to be the only hatchery contributors. For openings in the Southwestern district in 1997, an expansion factor of 599 was used; this is a weighted average of all expansion factors associated with tags released at the A.F. Koernig (593), W.H. Noerenberg (591) and Cannery Creek (626) hatcheries in 1996. The weighting scheme depended upon historical contributions of hatcheries to the Southwestern district. Using a similar weighting scheme for the Coghill and Northern districts, expansion factors of 598 and 619 were calculated and used in the 1997 season. For openings in the Eastern district, the early run hatchery returns to Solomon Gulch were assumed to be the only hatchery contributors, and an expansion factor of 594 was used. This number (594) is the average of all expansion factors associated with releases from the VFDA facility in 1996. The second method, which used fully decoded data, was presented less frequently to the management biologists during the season. Fully decoded data were usually available about one week after heads were collected, and results were not as useful in making management decisions. Calculations of inseason contributions were consistent with those used to generate postseason results (Equation 3). Postseason estimation is a more thorough, but less timely method which uses data from extracted and fully decoded tags, and which allowed tag specific expansion factors to be used.

## RESULTS

## Tagging Rates

Table 1 presents information on the pink salmon fry released from the A.F. Koernig, W.H. Noerenberg, Cannery Creek and Solomon Gulch hatcheries between 1993 and 1996. During this time, the Solomon Gulch hatchery has consistently increased the number of pink salmon released. The size of the releases at the other hatcheries has fluctuated.

Tagging rates for all hatchery releases are set at about 0.0017 , or one pink salmon fry tagged for every 600 released. However, five lots of pink salmon, comprising 1.7 million fry in 1993 and 14.7 million fry in 1994 were tagged at much higher rates. The tagging rate was about 0.007 for the 1993 release, and about 0.005 for the 1994 release. Also, in the 1994 release at the W.H. Noerenberg hatchery, a group of about 20,000 tagged pink salmon fry was inadvertently dumped into the wrong pen. The tag code was voided, so that the individuals tagged with the voided tag code did not represent any untagged cohorts. From 1995 onward, the tagging rate returned to 0.007 for all release lots.

## Sampling Rates

The sampling rates achieved for various Prince William Sound fisheries are presented in Table 2. The coded wire tag estimates for individual strata were sometimes associated with wide confidence intervals, often encompassing $30 \%$ of the harvest. A sampling goal of $20 \%$ was established to partially offset the low tagging rate of 0.0017 . Given the speed at which pink salmon were moved during offloading at the processors, it was physically impossible for one or two samplers to examine more fish during the offloading stage, and virtually every tender load had to be examined to achieve a sampling rate of $20 \%$. During years of large returns, the $20 \%$ sampling rate could not be achieved; however, precision did not necessarily suffer because larger catches were associated with a greater absolute number of recovered tags. Nearly all of the brood stocks were examined for coded wire tags, in part to ensure the calculation of accurate adjustment factors.

Table 1. Pink salmon tagging data for hatchery releases into Prince William Sound, from 1993 to 1996.

| Hatchery | Fry Released <br> (in Millions) | Fry Tagged | Number of Tag <br> Codes | Range of <br> Tagging Rates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Released in 1993, returned in 1994.

| Solomon Gulch | 141.865 | 235,764 | 6 | $0.00162-0.00168$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cannery Creek | 140.030 | 232,526 | 14 | $0.00161-0.00168$ |
| W. H. Noerenberg | 172.087 | 284,957 | 14 | $0.00164-0.00168$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 113.337 | 197,779 | 16 | $0.00163-0.00657$ |
| Total | 567.320 | 951,026 | 50 |  |

Released in 1994, returned in 1995

| Solomon Gulch | 149.474 | 305,578 | 6 | $0.00169-0.00233$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Cannery Creek | 84.617 | 141,104 | 9 | $0.00166-0.00169$ |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 162.407 | 316,171 | 17 | $0.00165-1.000^{1}$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 92.078 | 178,858 | 16 | $0.00159-0.005$ |
| Total | 488.576 | 941,811 | 48 |  |


| Released in 1995, returned in 1996 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Solomon Gulch | 205.371 |  | 337,834 | 8 | $0.00169-0.00168$ |
| Cannery Creek | 130.339 |  | 217,554 | 14 | $0.00164-0.00169$ |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 162.548 |  | 270,481 | 14 | $0.00151-0.00171$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 102.598 | 171,119 | 15 | $0.00167-0.00168$ |  |
| Total | 600.856 | 996,988 | 51 |  |  |

## Released in 1996, returned in 1997

| Solomon Gulch | 223.088 | 376,203 | 4 | $0.00159-0.00169$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cannery Creek | 140.441 | 224,045 | 14 | $0.00148-0.00167$ |
| W.H.Noerenberg | 169.509 | 285,130 | 26 | $0.00163-0.00184$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 108.637 | 183,098 | 13 | $0.00163-0.00175$ |
| Total | 641.675 | $1,068,476$ | 57 |  |

[^0]Table 2. Percent of harvest sampled for coded wire tags in Prince William Sound pink salmon fisheries from 1994 to 1997.

| Year | Common Property | Cost Recovery | Rack |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 16.5 | 19.1 | 88.6 |
| 1995 | 25.4 | 24.3 | 98.7 |
| 1996 | 18.3 | 23.7 | 80.6 |
| 1997 | 16.3 | 17.4 | 86.9 |

## Tag Recoveries

## Overall Contributions

The total annual pink salmon harvest between 1994 and 1997 ranged from 17 to 37 million adults (Table 3). The 1995 harvest of 17 million was slightly below the median catch for 1980 through 1997, when hatchery production comprised an important part of the harvest. The 1994 pink salmon harvest of 37 million was the second highest on record. Of the four hatcheries, the Solomon Gulch facility has been the largest contributor of pink salmon to the catch (Figure 2). Hatchery contribution for the Cannery Creek and W.H. Noerenberg hatcheries were estimated to be either second or third largest for 1994 to 1996. The A.F. Koernig hatchery produced the smallest number of hatchery pink salmon from 1994 to 1996, but rebounded from its slump to become the second largest contributor to the pink salmon catch in 1997.

In general, the inseason estimates calculated from detected tags corresponded closely to postseason estimates using fully decoded tags, provided the pink salmon had been tagged at roughly the same rate. Of all of the districts, the Eastern district inseason estimates agreed most closely with postseason estimates (Figure 3). The inseason estimates for the Southwestern district generally agreed with the postseason estimates, except for 1995 (Figure 4).

## Test Fishery Catches

In order to facilitate decisions regarding the opening of the Southwestern district to commercial fishing, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game developed a test fishery. The utility of the test fishery depends upon temporal differences in the migration of wild and hatchery stocks through the fishery. A successful example of a district-wide test fishery occurred in 1994, when the passage of hatchery pink salmon into Prince William Sound was monitored using detected coded wire tags recovered in the test fishery (Figure 5). The test fishery was terminated after the number of wild pink salmon caught dropped markedly, and the number of hatchery pink salmon increased. The 1995 test fishery data were more difficult to interpret. An overzealous crew on a seine boat made considerably more than three sets at its designated sampling station. Unfortunately, the catch for that boat could not be separated from those from other boats, and the data point for 7/31$8 / 01$ was therefore biased. More in depth data on the test fishery catches can be found in Appendix A.

A test fishery was not conducted during 1996 and 1997. Poor market prices for pink salmon reduced the number of boats fishing, and those that did so clustered around the hatcheries. This situation reduced the interception of pink salmon stocks migrating through the district, thereby reducing the need for temporal and/or spatial closures within the fishing districts.

Table 3. Estimates of hatchery contributions (in millions of fish) to the Prince William Sound pink salmon fisheries from 1994 to 1997.

| Contributor | Common Property | Cost <br> Recovery | Brood Stock | Special or Test Fishery | Total <br> Contribution | 95\% Bounds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 9.647 | 2.658 | 0.256 | 0.006 | 12.568 | 11.89-3.25 |
| Cannery Creek | 6.800 | 2.423 | 0.160 | 0.019 | 9.401 | 8.87-9.94 |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 4.163 | 1.582 | 0.394 | 0.013 | 6.223 | 5.87-6.57 |
| A.F. Koernig | 0.563 | 0.950 | 0.203 | 0.019 | 1.735 | 1.54-1.94 |
| Hatchery | 21.173 | 7.614 | 1.013 | 0.056 | 29.926 | 28.97-30.89 |
| Wild | 5.005 | 2.811 | 0.366 | 0 | 8.060 |  |
| Grand Total | 26.178 | 10.425 | 1.380 | 0.056 | 37.986 |  |
| 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 3.809 | 2.536 | 0.408 | 0.004 | 6.757 | 5.97-7.54 |
| Cannery Creek | 2.621 | 0.411 | 0.123 | 0.017 | 3.173 | 2.94-3.41 |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 1.188 | 0.856 | 0.314 | 0.01 | 2.367 | $2.21-2.53$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 0.199 | 0.449 | 0.131 | 0.002 | 0.782 | 0.67-0.90 |
| Hatchery | 7.818 | 4.252 | 0.976 | 0.034 | 13.081 | 12.24-13.92 |
| Wild | 2.976 | 0.838 | 0.147 | 0.106 | 4.069 |  |
| Grand Total | 10.799 | 5.090 | 1.122 | 0.140 | 17.150 |  |
| 1996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 4.869 | 2.017 | 0.349 |  | 7.234 | 6.71-7.79 |
| Cannery Creek | 3.679 | 0.854 | 0.166 |  | 4.699 | 4.29-5.11 |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 2.991 | 2.264 | 0.477 |  | 5.730 | 5.26-6.20 |
| A.F. Koernig | 1.971 | 0.004 | 0 |  | 1.976 | 1.73-2.22 |
| Hatchery Wild | 13.510 | 5.139 | 0.992 |  | 19.641 | 18.86-20.42 |
|  | 4.199 | 3.144 | 0.276 |  | 7.619 |  |
| Grand Total | 17.709 | 8.283 | 1.267 |  | 27.259 |  |
| 1997 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 4.326 | 2.430 | 0.253 |  | 7.008 | 6.51-7.49 |
| Cannery Creek | 3.140 | 1.144 | 0.231 |  | 4.156 | 3.82-5.21 |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 3.070 | 2.142 | 0.412 |  | 5.624 | 5.05-6.20 |
| A.F. Koernig | 3.418 | 3.188 | 0 |  | 6.606 | 4.94-7.20 |
| Hatchery | 13.954 | 8.904 | 0.896 |  | 23.754 | 22.23-25.28 |
| Wild | 1.926 | 0.911 | 0.191 |  | 3.029 |  |
| Grand Total | 18.880 | 9.815 | 1.087 |  | 26.783 |  |

Figure 2. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound pink salmon commercial catches from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 3. Comparison of inseason and postseason estimates of hatchery contributions to the Eastern district common property fishery from 1994 to 1997.
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Figure 4. Comparison of inseason and postseason estimates of hatchery contributions to the Southwestern district common property fishery from 1994 to 1997.
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Figure 5. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Southwestern district test fishery in 1994 and 1995.
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## Common Property Contributions

Estimates of the hatchery composition of the catch vary considerably between districts. For example, the Eastern district common property pink salmon catch is comprised primarily of Solomon Gulch fish, some wild fish, and a small number of pink salmon from other hatcheries (Figure 6). In contrast, the Southwestern district common property pink salmon catches include large numbers of wild pink salmon as well as hatchery pink salmon bound for other districts (Figure 7). Northern and Coghill district catches are dominated by hatchery stocks from the resident hatchery, with wild pink salmon and hatchery pink salmon originating from adjacent districts present in roughly comparable proportions (Figures 8 and 9 ). Hatchery contribution estimates to the common property catches by district and statistical week for the years 1994 to 1997 are presented in Appendix B.

## Cost Recovery Contributions

The portion of the returns harvested by the hatcheries in their cost recovery fisheries, have a much different stock composition compared to the common property fisheries. Since cost recovery fisheries are conducted near hatcheries, harvests tend to be comprised almost exclusively of returns to that hatchery. From 1994 to 1997, the Eastern district cost recovery fishery contained no pink salmon from other hatcheries, and small numbers of wild pink salmon (Figure 10). Cost recovery catches in the Northern district consistently had more wild pink salmon, relative to the number of pink salmon from the resident hatchery, than seen in cost recovery catches in the other districts (Figure 11). Small numbers of W.H. Noerenberg pink salmon were also found in the Northern district cost recovery catches in 1994 and 1997. In the Coghill district cost recovery catches, the number of wild pink salmon was high in 1994 and 1996, and low in 1995 and 1997 (Figure 12). Between 1994 and 1997, Cannery Creek returns always occurred in the Coghill cost recovery catches, while pink salmon from the other hatcheries appeared sporadically. In the Southwestern district, between 1994 and 1997, A.F. Koernig hatchery returns predominate in the cost recovery catches, followed by wild pink salmon, and small numbers of Cannery Creek and W.H. Noerenberg hatchery pink salmon. No cost recovery fishery was conducted in the Southwestern district during 1996 (Figure 13). In-depth information on cost recovery catches by district and week from 1994 to 1997 is presented in Appendix C.

## Survival Rates

The estimated overall hatchery survival rates for pink salmon ranged from $8.86 \%$ for the Solomon Gulch facility in 1994 to $0.83 \%$ for the A.F. Koernig hatchery in 1995 (Table 4, Figure 14). The overall survival rates for three of the hatcheries, Solomon Gulch, Cannery Creek, and W.H. Noerenberg converged in 1996 and 1997. A.F. Koernig hatchery pink salmon were associated with the lowest survival rates of all the hatcheries until 1997, when it was associated with the highest survival rate. The estimated survival

Figure 6. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Eastern district common property fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 7. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Southwestern district common property fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 8. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Northern district common property fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 9. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Coghill district common property fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 10. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Eastern district cost recovery fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 11. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Northern district cost recovery fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 12. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Coghill district cost recovery fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Figure 13. Estimated hatchery and wild stock contributions to the Southwestern district cost recovery fishery from 1994 to 1997.


Table 4. Estimated percent survival rates by hatchery of origin of pink salmon returning to Prince William Sound from 1994 to 1997.

| Hatchery | Survival Rate | $95 \%$ Bounds |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 8.86 | $8.38-9.34$ |
| Cannery Creek | 6.60 | $6.22-6.98$ |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 3.55 | $3.35-3.75$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 1.53 | $1.36-1.69$ |
|  |  |  |
| 1995 |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 4.52 | $4.0-5.04$ |
| Cannery Creek | 3.75 | $3.48-4.02$ |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 1.42 | $1.33-1.52$ |
| A.F. Koernig | 0.83 | $0.71-0.96$ |
|  |  |  |
| 1996 | 3.50 | $3.33-3.71$ |
| Solomon Gulch | 3.60 | $3.28-3.92$ |
| Cannery Creek | 3.29 | $3.01-3.57$ |
| W.H. Noerenberg | 1.82 | $1.60-2.04$ |
| A.F. Koernig |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1997 | 3.15 | $2.93-3.36$ |
| Solomon Gulch | 3.12 | $2.79-3.45$ |
| Cannery Creek | 6.07 | $2.65-3.30$ |
| W.H. Noerenberg |  | $5.03-7.10$ |
| A.F. Koernig |  |  |

Figure 14. Estimated pink salmon survival rates by hatchery in Prince William Sound from 1994 to 1997.

rates for Cannery Creek pink salmon were the second highest from 1994 through 1997. Survival rates for individual release lots can be found in Appendix E. Of the pink salmon returning to the A.F. Koernig facility in 1995, only the SEA experimental release lots displayed good survival rates. The survival rates for the SEA release lots were $7.5 \%$ and $6.3 \%$, while the median survival rate for all A.F. Koernig release lots was $0.23 \%$. The 1995 W.H. Noerenberg hatchery survival rate was similarly buoyed by high survival rates of the SEA experimental release lots. The SEA release lots had survival rates of $23.5 \%$ and $21.2 \%$, while the median survival rate for the W.H. Noerenberg pink salmon in 1995 was $0.49 \%$. A second set of SEA experimental pink salmon fry was released in 1995, returning in 1996. These 1995 experimental releases exhibited the highest survival rates for release lots from their respective hatcheries, but the rates were not as radically different as in 1995.

## Adjustment Factors

Adjustment factors were calculated to correct for apparent violations of assumptions in the tagging experiment. The calculations were made using tag recoveries from hatchery brood stocks and from some cost recovery fisheries (Table 5). There appears to be an upward trend in the W.H. Noerenberg and A.F. Koernig adjustment factors, between 1989 and 1997 (Figure 15). The four largest adjustment factors during that time were calculated for 1994 through 1997.

## Tag Shedding

Adipose-clipped pink salmon adults recovered from the Northern district (the location of Cannery Creek hatchery) consistently possessed the fewest tags. Between 40\% and 73\% of pink salmon with adipose clips recovered from the Northern district did not possess coded wire tags. By comparison, the percentage of adipose-clipped pink salmon adults without tags recovered from other areas has been as little as $11 \%$, depending on the district, fishery, and year.

Table 5. Adjustment factors estimated from brood and cost recovery harvests by facility for hatchery pink salmon from 1989 through 1997.

| Brood |  |  |  |  | Cost-Recovery |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\mathrm{WHN}^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $\mathrm{AFK}^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $\mathrm{SG}^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{CC}^{\mathrm{d}}$ | $\mathrm{SG}^{\mathrm{c}}$ | $\mathrm{CC}^{\mathrm{d}}$ |
| 1989 | 1.73 | 1.36 | 1.13 | 2.12 | 1.11 | 1.81 |
| 1990 | 1.28 | 1.58 | 1.82 | 1.96 | 1.23 | 1.71 |
| 1991 | 1.82 | 1.45 | 1.94 | 2.28 | 1.55 | 1.97 |
| 1992 | 1.63 | 1.43 | 2.55 | 2.74 | 1.25 | 1.58 |
| 1993 | 1.78 | 2.06 | 3.82 | 2.91 | 2.41 | 2.36 |
| 1994 | 2.05 | 1.75 | 3.15 | 2.38 | 1.89 | 2.64 |
| 1995 | 1.96 | 2.13 | 1.45 | 3.21 | 1.89 | 5.55 |
| 1996 | 2.60 |  | 2.30 | 4.01 | 2.19 | 4.62 |
| 1997 | 2.15 |  | 2.83 | 2.47 | 1.21 | 3.02 |

a W.H. Noerenberg
${ }^{b}$ A.F. Koernig
c Solomon Gulch
d Cannery Creek

Figure 15. Annual hatchery pink salmon adjustment factors for Prince William Sound from 1989 to 1997.


## DISCUSSION

## Factors Affecting Need for Hatchery Contribution Estimates

Mingling of hatchery and wild pink salmon stocks fuels the need for tagging information in making management decisions. Since wild pink salmon from throughout Prince William Sound were used to develop the PWSAC and VFDA brood stocks, there are few temporal distinctions between wild stocks and hatchery stocks. Had the spatial or temporal differences between hatchery and resident wild pink salmon been more distinct, wild and hatchery stocks could have been managed separately, and the need for inseason tagging information would have been reduced.

The need for hatchery contribution information in Prince William Sound is districtdependent. The Eastern district fishery resembles a terminal fishery, in which the fleet concentrates close to the resident hatchery. While a few local wild stocks are impacted, the larger component of the Eastern district wild migration return to areas away from Port Valdez and Valdez Arm and are managed separately. While information on hatchery contributions is necessary to ascertain hatchery production and survival rates, the estimates are generally not required for making inseason management decisions. In contrast, the Southwestern district encompasses the major migration corridor through which both wild and hatchery salmon enter Prince William Sound, and is the location of one of the pink salmon hatcheries. Due to the presence of a hatchery in the district, protection of wild stocks cannot be instigated by a blanket closure. In order to protect wild stocks, as well as allowing for an efficient harvest of hatchery stocks, the management biologist must know the composition of the pink salmon migrating through the district in time to make meaningful decisions. In the event of strong returns to the A.F. Koernig hatchery, the management biologist will likely institute partial area closures, opening only areas adjacent to the hatchery. Poor returns to the A.F. Koernig hatchery in conjunction with poor wild stock returns to Southwestern district can result in an early closure of the district, as happened in 1994 and 1995. During 1996, the fleet was allowed to continue fishing around the A.F. Koernig hatchery despite weak returns of both Southwestern district wild and hatchery pink salmon stocks, because PWSAC dispensed with a cost recovery fishery and brood stock at that hatchery. Strong wild stock returns in combination with poor returns to the A. F. Koernig hatchery could result in an area closure of the major migration route to the hatchery, as well as the areas adjacent to the hatchery. For this scenario to occur, returns to the hatchery would be so low as to as to make attainment of brood stock goals questionable. Coded wire tag information rapidly became invaluable for inseason management of areas such as Southwestern district.

The management biologist must also try to fulfill different harvest goals of the two aquaculture associations by allocating catches between the commercial fleet and the aquaculture associations. Certain harvest goals require more hatchery contribution information than others. VFDA has always operated on a revenue goal. Combining known migratory timing patterns of the pink salmon with actual and projected cost
recovery revenue allows the management biologist to schedule common property fisheries. If the number of returning pink salmon is not sufficient to fulfill the hatchery's revenue goal, the commercial fishing fleet is not allowed to fish. PWSAC's harvest goal in 1994 and 1995 was set at $40 \%$ of the returning hatchery pink salmon. The management biologist had to juggle commercial fishery openings in three separate fishing districts to ensure that a $40 \%$ share of the hatchery return was caught by PWSAC in cost recovery fisheries. This management strategy demanded a constant infusion of the most recent data available. In 1996, PWSAC switched its management strategy from a percentage goal to a revenue goal. The shift simplified the inseason management of Prince William Sound commercial fisheries and reduced the demands upon the coded wire tag project for inseason information.

Market conditions for pink salmon have also reduced the degree to which management biologists needed hatchery contribution information to make inseason decisions. The low price paid for pink salmon in 1996 and 1997 reduced the size of the active fleet. Only $34 \%$ of the seine permit holders fished during 1996, and $43 \%$ fished during 1997. The boats that did fish clustered around the hatcheries, further reducing pressure on wild stocks. Also, a fisherman's strike in 1997 idled the fleet for seven days, from July 28 to August 4. As market conditions for pink salmon improve, and fishing effort increases, management biologists will rely more on hatchery contribution information to make and justify their inseason decisions.

## Tagging and Sampling Rates

In contrast to coded wire tag experiments in sport fisheries, which often involve creel surveys and escapement sampling, the coded wire tagging program in Prince William Sound offers only two points at which the precision of hatchery contribution estimates can be changed. The first occurs at the tagging stage and the second at the catchsampling stage. In Prince William Sound, hatchery-released pink salmon were tagged at a rate of one tag per 600 fry, while the sampling rate goal was approximately $20 \%$ of the commercial catch. The tagging rate of one tag per 600 pink salmon fry may appear low compared to that used in many experiments involving coded wire tags, but the sheer volume of harvested hatchery pink salmon, along with the significant sampling rate means that sufficient tags are usually recovered to make useful estimates of contributions. An informative way of gauging the combined adequacy of tagging and catch-sampling programs is to examine the relative precision ( $\mathrm{RP}_{\alpha}$ ) of estimated contributions. For a $\mathrm{RP}_{0.05}$ of $x \%$, the contribution estimate is within $x \%$ of the true value $95 \%$ of the time. The $\mathrm{RP}_{0.05}$ of estimates of annual hatchery contributions ranged from 3.2 to $6.4 \%$, meaning that the program yielded highly precise estimates of hatchery contributions at this level aggregation. Precision worsens for less aggregated strata, although for important mixed-stock fisheries such as those yielding catches in the Southwestern District, the average $\mathrm{RP}_{0.05}$ for 1994 through 1997 was $29 \%$. Increasing precision through enhanced sampling effort would have been practically impossible. The rapid rate at which tenders unloaded pink salmon, and the lack of physical space at sampling stations would have precluded the use of extra samplers. Tagging was conducted and paid for by
the aquaculture corporations, and considerable effort was expended in the process. It would have been very difficult to persuade the aquaculture corporations to allocate additional resources in this endeavor particularly with new marking technologies being developed, but if greater precision in estimation was to have been achieved, it would have had to occur at this point.

Predictions of the effect of enhanced tagging requires anticipation of certain events in the fishery of interest, specifically, the probabilities that members of a cohort will appear in a sample taken from any given stratum catch. The easiest way to obtain estimates of these probabilities is through historical data, modified by anticipated changes in survival, movement, exploitation, and sampling rates. Such methods have recently been outlined in detail in Bernard et al. (in review). The Prince William Sound coded wire tag program has provided a wealth of data that could be used to ascertain effects of changing tagging rates on the precision of contribution estimates. With the advent of otolith marking, and cessation of the coded wire tag program, such an analysis would, however, be academic at this point.

## Tag Recoveries

## Test Fishery Catches

The purpose of the Prince William Sound pink salmon test fishery is to provide managers with information that enables them to protect wild stocks. The test fishery routinely continues until the proportion of wild pink salmon in test fish catches decreases to an acceptable level. The difference in migratory timing between some (early) wild stocks and the hatchery stocks has allowed for temporary closures of areas through which those wild stocks were migrating. A major problem in executing a successful test fishery is that large numbers of pink salmon must be caught and examined to ensure that useful estimates are obtained. If the catch consisted entirely of hatchery pink salmon, about 1,000 pink salmon had to be examined to recover one tag. Therefore, tens of thousands of pink salmon needed to be inspected during the test fishery. The sample sizes needed for a valid estimate also precluded stratification into separate sampling sites.

## Inseason Estimates

A major bottleneck in the Prince William Sound coded wire tag program proved to be the distance between the sampling sites and the lab where recovered tags are decoded. The flow of data from time of tag recovery and presentation to management biologists was delayed for several days to a week. While it is possible to obtain timely information on test fisheries, data from decoded tags recovered from commercial fisheries was often only available after its utility had expired. The inseason estimation method based only on detected tags was initiated to avoid this delay.

Inseason estimates using detected tags were a reasonable substitute for decoded tags, provided that tagging rates remained relatively uniform for all release lots. The poorest
agreement between inseason estimates and postseason estimates was seen in 1995 for the Southwestern district common property catches. The disagreement was due to the presence of pink salmon in SEA experimental studies, which had been tagged at three times the normal tagging rate, and had survived at rates 10 to 30 times that of nonexperimental groups. The problem was compounded by the presence of a voided tag code. Each recovered voided tag represented only one pink salmon. Pink salmon tagged with the voided tag code also had high survival rates, since they had been inadvertently placed in the same pen as a release lot used in SEA experimental studies. As individual tag codes cannot be distinguished during on-site scanning, all detected tags were assigned the same expansion factor. For the 1995 Southwestern district common property catches, the inseason estimates from detected tags overestimated the actual hatchery values by as much as $30 \%$ when compared with estimates derived from decoded tags.

The discrepancy between detected tag estimates and decoded tag estimates was not discovered until the first decoded information was received, which was after the third fishing period announcement for the Southwestern district. Besides postponing closure of the Southwestern district, the differential tagging rates negated the use of detected coded wire tags in making management decisions for the rest of the season. The 1995 Eastern district estimate based on detected tags was similar to that of fully decoded tags because it occurred early in the season prior to the arrival of the experimental tag groups.

In contrast to the situation for the 1995 return, the experimental lot released in 1993 had no noticeable effect on the inseason estimates of 1994. The proportion of pink salmon fry in SEA experimental studies in 1993 was much smaller than in 1994, and the survival rates between experimental and non-experimental lots were more similar for pink salmon released in 1993.

A major failing of estimates from detected tags is the absence of information concerning contributions from individual hatcheries. In the Southwestern district, which includes a major migration corridor and a hatchery, detected tag estimates that indicate large numbers of pink salmon can falsely suggest strong returns to the resident hatchery. This situation occurred in 1994 and in 1995. The Southwestern common property fishery could have been closed sooner had the decoded tag information been available in a more timely fashion.

## Common Property and Cost Recovery Postseason Estimates

The coded wire tag program yielded valuable estimates of hatchery contributions to the Prince William Sound commercial catches. Pink salmon catches from the Eastern district common property presented the fewest management concerns because of the natural spatial restrictions of the fishery and the near exclusive catch contribution by one hatchery. Complexities in management decisions regarding the Coghill and Southwestern districts were the result of the potential for harvesting pink salmon bound for other districts. Management decisions were further complicated in the Southwestern and Northern districts by the consistently high number of sampled heads that did not contain
tags. The high number of sampled heads not containing tags were thought to be of Cannery Creek origin. No method of compensating for the apparent enhanced tag loss in Cannery Creek pink salmon was found, and management biologists assumed that coded wire tag estimates underestimated actual contributions of Cannery Creek pink salmon to the catches.

## Survival Rates

Hatchery rearing practices and conditions in the marine environment affect pink salmon survival rates. The reductions in the Solomon Gulch survival rates between 1994 and 1997 may be due as much to rearing practices as to marine conditions. Personnel at the hatchery will postpone setting up rearing pens because of weather conditions, and will not feed pink salmon fry until they are in rearing pens. The fry are often emaciated before they are placed in the pens, thereby reducing their fitness (Joyce, pers. comm.). The low survival rates for pink salmon from the A.F. Koernig hatchery are more likely due to the marine environment; between 1994 and 1996, wild pink salmon returns to the Southwestern district were weak, in conjunction with the low A.F. Koernig hatchery returns. SEA project information suggests that concentrations of predators feeding on migrating juvenile pink salmon may have been the causative factor. The actual survival rates for Cannery Creek pink salmon are likely higher than calculated because of an assumed tag loss over and above that corrected for by the adjustment factor.

## Adjustment Factors

Adjustment factors were developed to counter some obvious violations of the assumptions inherent in tagging experiments, namely that individuals do not lose their tags, nor do they die at different rates than their untagged counterparts (Seber 1982). Several studies on tag loss and differential mortality for coded wire tagged salmon indicates a rapid drop in tag loss rates about 4 weeks following tagging (Blankenship 1990, Dunning et al. 1990, Kaill et al. 1990). Tagged Prince William Sound hatchery pink salmon are often released two weeks following tagging, and thus cannot be held until tag loss rates decline. One way to circumvent the tag loss problem is to use rates of tag occurrence at the end of the experiment. In the case of the Prince William Sound coded wire tag program, adjustment factors are calculated from brood stocks. The rates at which tags are found in the brood stock should be comparable to those found in the fishery, given that the fishery takes place immediately preceding examination of brood stocks. The value of the adjustment factor should be greater than or equal to 1 . A value of 1.0 would be appropriate in the event of zero tag shedding and differential mortality. If an adjustment factor is significantly less than 1.0 , it may indicate that the tagged pink salmon survived at higher rates than their untagged cohorts or that biased samples were collected.

Use of adjustment factors assumes that the hatchery brood pond contains only pink salmon originating from that facility. Inclusion of stray pink salmon among those
scanned in the brood stock will artificially inflate the adjustment factor. Given the possibility of wild pink salmon being included in the Cannery Creek, A.F. Koernig and Solomon Gulch hatchery brood stocks, the W.H. Noerenberg pink salmon brood stock was used to calculate a standardized adjustment factor as it was believed to have the most pure brood stock of all of the hatcheries.

The use of a standardized adjustment factor assumes that rates of tag loss and differential mortality are roughly equal and stable at all hatcheries. However, there were strong indications that Cannery Creek pink salmon shed their tags at higher rates. In any district or fishery, a certain percentage of the heads excised from pink salmon that were missing adipose fins did not contain coded wire tags. Heads collected from pink salmon missing an adipose fin and a tag in the Cannery Creek brood stock exceeded $50 \%$ of the total heads recovered in seven of ten years. A similar situation existed for the Northern district common property and cost recovery fisheries. Over the years, tagging crews and tagging machinery have been changed at Cannery Creek, with no resultant change in the percentage of sampled heads missing tags. Based on this anecdotal evidence, research and management biologists assumed the coded wire tag protocol underestimated the Cannery Creek contributions to the catch. Rearing practices at the Solomon Gulch hatchery also occasionally caused concerns over bias. During 1995, a portion of the tagged pink salmon fry were held separately from their untagged counterparts, and were not fed for a longer period of time (Joyce, pers. Comm.). Consequently, additional fry had to be tagged to compensate for high initial mortalities. Such practices violate the assumptions that tagged individuals are selected randomly from the population of interest, and that tagged and untagged individuals are treated similarly.

Another concern was the upward trend in annual W.H. Noerenberg adjustment factors, which also occurred to a lesser degree with A.F. Koernig adjustment factors. The reason for this trend is unknown. A possible explanation is increased tag loss due to improper tag placement. Tagging crews will often increase their tagging speed as they gain experience, but at the cost of care in proper tag placement. Another possible reason for the trend may be increasing numbers of wild pink salmon in the W.H. Noerenberg brood stock, although that is believed unlikely. The Cannery Creek and Solomon Gulch hatchery adjustment factors fluctuate too much to discern trends. The adjustment factors for those hatcheries do not appear to correlate with percentages of wild pink salmon in the catch.

To thoroughly investigate adjustment factors, methods are needed which allow separation of the effects of tag loss, differential mortality and the presence of wild pink salmon in brood ponds. The latter is currently under investigation through recoveries of otolith thermal marks from the brood ponds of the W.H. Noerenberg, Cannery Creek and Solomon Gulch facilities.

## Monitoring

In order to maintain the integrity of the coded wire tagging program, research biologists must monitor tagging and sampling operations to ensure assumptions are met. Subsampling newly tagged pink salmon once or twice a week is necessary to check for proper tag placement. Hatchery tagging operations should be monitored to ensure efforts are made to randomly select juvenile pink salmon to be tagged, to increase the likelihood of identical treatment of tagged and untagged individuals, and to minimize tag loss. Monitoring of sampling programs should include checking for random and independent sampling, recognition of all pink salmon missing adipose fins in the sample, assessment of head and tag loss after recovery, correct identification of tag codes, and accurate recording of catch and sample data (Clark and Bernard 1987). Novice sampling technicians must be encouraged to maintain a comfortable speed in checking for adipose fin clips, and not to attempt to achieve sampling speeds of more experienced technicians. Individual fishery samples should be checked for equal rates of tag recovery between samplers; tag recovery from samples from the same fishing period at the same processor should be similar if samplers are behaving similarly.

## CONCLUSIONS

The pink salmon coded wire tag program in Prince William Sound has been large and complex, involving 16 to 24 tagging personnel at four separate hatcheries, and upwards of 20 samplers located in four to seven separate ports to sample the catch. The biggest problems involved the differential tagging rates between experimental and normal release lots, the probable different rates of tag loss between hatcheries, and the time lag between sampling and decoding the tags. The best information will be obtained if rearing and tagging procedures, as well as brood sampling protocols are kept as uniform as possible between hatcheries.

The major objective of this study was to provide fishery managers with time and location specific data relating to the occurrence of wild pink salmon stocks in the commercial fishery. These data were to be provided in a timely fashion for inseason management using a technique based upon detected (undecoded) tags. With the exception of 1995, inseason estimates generally agreed with postseason estimates. Hatchery survival rates between 1994 and 1997 decreased for the Solomon Gulch and Cannery Creek hatcheries, fluctuated for W.H. Noerenberg hatchery, and rose for the A.F. Koernig facility. Apparent tag retention problems in Cannery Creek pink salmon continued throughout the study, and suggests underestimation of Cannery Creek pink salmon production over the history of the coded wire tag program.
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Appendix A.1. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound test fisheries by district and week during 1994.

Southwestern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 | 2,192 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,075 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 4,267 | $4.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 10,306 | 14,573 | 3 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 | 11,149 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 7,433 | $4.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 11,149 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 3,716 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 33,447 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 33,447 | 9 |
| Subtotals |  | 13,341 | 7.1E+07 | 9,508 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 11,149 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 3,716 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 37,714 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 10,306 | 48,020 | 12 |

Appendix A.2. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound test fisheries by district and week during 1995.

Southwestern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total <br> Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/29/95 | 30 | 707 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 4,958 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,127 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 4,896 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 12,685 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 27,644 | 40,329 | ${ }^{8}$ |
| 8/05/95 | 31 | 1,966 | 1.5E+06 | 4,545 | $6.7 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 14,354 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+04$ |  |  | 20,865 | $8.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 86,701 | 107,566 | 11 |
| Grand Totals |  | 2,673 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 9,503 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 16,481 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 4,896 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 33,550 | 3.6E+07 | 114,345 | 147,895 | 19 |

Appendix B: Pink Salmon Hatchery and Wild Stock Contributions to Prince William Sound Common Property
Fisheries by District and week for 1994 to 1997.

## Appendix B.1. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound common property fisheries by district and week during 1994.

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/25/94 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/02/94 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 205,028 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 205,028 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 32,995 | 238,023 | 101 |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,228,423 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,228,423 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 133,072 | 2,361,495 | 346 |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,300,085 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,300,085 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 363,149 | 2,663,234 | 353 |
| 7/23/94 | 30 | 11,964 | $7.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 3,684,426 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 3,693,390 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 947,864 | 4,641,254 | 586 |
| 7/30/94 | 31 | 2,255 | $4.7 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 11,457 | $8.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 33,656 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,024,575 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,071,943 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 255,309 | 1,327,252 | 231 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  |  |  | 33,385 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 15,422 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 48,807 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 155,609 | 204,416 | 11 |
| 8/13/94 |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | $9.4 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 39 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 124 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 307 | 521 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 14,219 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,457 | $8.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 67,126 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 9,547,800 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 9,547,800 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 1,888,395 | 11,436,195 | 1,628 |

1/ Proportions from week 32 were used to allocate the catch for week 33.

Northern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29,108 | 1.2E+08 | 29,108 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 9,065 | 38,173 | 7 |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  | 11,516 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 209,868 | 1.1E+09 |  |  | 221,384 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 78,880 | 300,264 | 28 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  | 48,958 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 913,846 | 4.8E+09 | 5,321 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 968,125 | $5.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 335,210 | 1,303,335 | 199 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 | 2,210 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 504,333 | $3.7 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,719,998 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  |  | 3,226,541 | 4.2E+10 | 250,518 | 3,477,059 | 333 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 | 5,882 | 7.3E+06 | 300,517 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 779,684 | $3.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 1,086,083 | 5.5E+09 | 164,502 | 1,250,585 | 212 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  | 23,907 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 176,043 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 199,950 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 212,462 | 412,412 | 31 |
| Subtotals |  | 8,092 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 889,231 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,799,439 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 34,429 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 5,731,191 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,050,637 | 6,781,828 | 810 |
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Coghill District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/11/94 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6/18/94 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 7.3E+02 | 45 | $7.3 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 0 | 45 | 1 |
| 6/25/94 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 35 | 0 |
| 7/02/94 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 294 | 294 | 0 |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 72 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 72 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 315 | 387 | 1 |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 171 | $7.3 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 171 | $7.3 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 525 | 696 | 1 |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,067 | $4.7 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 3,067 | 4.7E+06 | 336 | 3,403 | 2 |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  |  |  | 2,149 | 4.6E+06 | 1,051 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 3,200 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 1,768 | 4,968 | 2 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/13/94 | 33 | 5,648 | 3.8E+06 | 902,178 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 356,126 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,272 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,266,044 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 121,394 | 1,387,438 | 290 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 | 5,527 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 618,294 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 193,698 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 817,519 | $3.5 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 307,704 | 1,125,223 | 180 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 | 5,591 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 448,756 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 180,122 | $9.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 634,469 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 149,633 | 784,102 | 103 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 |  |  | 216,572 | $8.7 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 31,987 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 248,559 | $9.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 26,946 | 275,505 | 84 |
| 9/10/94 | 37 |  |  | 13,439 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,180 | 348,520 |  |  | 14,619 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 365 | 14,984 | 6 |
| Subtotals |  | 16,586 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 2,199,239 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 765,262 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 6,678 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,987,765 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 609,315 | 3,597,080 | 670 |

## Eshamy District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/02/94 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 676 | 676 | 0 |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,777 | 7,444 | 0 |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13,080 | 13,080 | 0 |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,731 | 9,731 | 0 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 | 2,720 | 5,034,087 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20,249 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 28,972 | 49,221 | 6 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 | 21,847 | $8.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 176,644 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 24,888 | 201,532 | 12 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 | 10,734 | 3.8E+07 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89,750 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 50,027 | 139,777 | 02 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 | 25,668 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 125,912 | 3.1E+08 | 7,950 | 133,862 | . 2 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 10,338 | 10,338 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 60,969 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 412,555 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 153,106 | 565,661 | 114 |
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Southwestern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 | 101,886 | $6.7 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 237,595 | 1.7E+09 | 192,618 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 118,796 | $7.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 650,895 | 4.5E+09 | 254,789 | 905,684 | 97 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 | 361,340 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 499,800 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 685,829 | 4.2E+09 | 32,253 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,579,222 | $9.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 923,183 | 2,502,405 | 266 |
| Subtotals |  | 463,226 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 737,395 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 878,447 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 151,049 | $9.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 2,230,117 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,177,972 | 3,408,089 | 363 |

Unakwik District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/18/94 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6/25/94 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 7/02/94 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7 / 16 / 94$ $7 / 23 / 94$ | 29 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/13/94 | $331 /$ |  |  |  |  | 63,184 | 7.5E+07 |  |  | 63,184 | $7.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 44,205 | 107,389 | 0 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 103,682 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 103,682 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 72,536 | 176,218 | 11 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 91,459 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 91,459 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 8,123 | 99,582 | 11 |
| 9/03/94 |  |  |  |  |  | 5,520 | 2,187,580 |  |  | 5,520 | 2,187,580 | 490 | 6,010 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263,845 | 8.8E+08 | 0 | 0 | 263,845 | $8.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 125,355 | 389,200 | 22 |
|  |  | 563,092 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,162,803 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 6,800,224 | $5.9 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 9,647,154 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 21,173,273 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 5,004,780 | 26,178,053 | 3,607 |

1/ Proportions from week 34 were used to allocate catch in week 33.
2/ Proportions from week 35 were used to allocate catch in week 36.

## Appendix B.2. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound common property fisheries by district and week during 1995.

Eastern District

| Week | Stat | AFK H | tchery | WN H | chery | CC H | chery | SG Ha | chery | Total | tchery | Total | Total | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Wild | Catch | of Tags |
| 7/08/95 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,048,084 | $3.76 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,048,084 | $3.76 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 2,048,084 | 884 |
| 7/15/95 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,312,439 | $1.68 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,312,439 | $1.68 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 1,312,439 | 648 |
| 7/22/95 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 1,228 | $3.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 401,677 | $2.29 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 402,905 | $2.29 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 1,160 | 404,065 | 334 |
| 7/29/95 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 96,105 | 96,105 | 0 |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  | 2,344 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 35,681 | $2.23 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 16,353 | $9.49 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 54,378 | $3.21 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 241,176 | 295,554 | 10 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 | 1,091 | $4.6 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 8,867 | $1.45 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 24,960 | $1.05 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 34,918 | $1.20 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 44,161 | 79,079 | 9 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/09/95 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,778,553 $5.69 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  | 0 |  | 312 | 312 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | $1,091-4.6 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  | $11,211 \quad 1.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  | 61,869 3.3E+08 |  |  |  | 3,852,724 | $5.72 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 382,914 | 4,235,638 | 1,885 |

## Northern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  | 36,318 | $1.57 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 793,870 | $3.63 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 830,188 | $3.78 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 469,885 | 1,300,073 | 194 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  | 91,223 | $3.89 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,069,141 | $5.20 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,204 | $1.48 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,164,568 | $5.60 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 825,853 | 1,990,421 | 229 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  | 36,041 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 114,392 | $3.29 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 150,433 | $3.78 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 156,929 | 307,362 | 28 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 28,913 | 21630000 |  |  | 28,913 | 21630000 | 29,349 | 58,262 | 11 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 163,582 | $5.95 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 2,006,316 | $9.18 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,204 | $1.48 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 2,174,102 | $9.79 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 1,482,016 | 3,656,118 | 462 |
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Coghill District

| Week | Stat | AFK H | tchery | WN H | chery | CC H | chery | SG H | chery | Total | tchery | Total | Total | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Wild | Catch | of Tags |
| 6/17/95 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 6/24/95 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 | 27 | 0 |
| 7/01/95 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| 7/08/95 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 7/15/95 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 103 | 103 | 0 |
| 7/22/95 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 304 | 304 | 0 |
| 7/29/95 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,619 | 5,619 | 0 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 | 1,680 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 213,997 | $7.69 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 78,772 | $1.39 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 294,449 | $9.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 31,729 | 326,178 | 183 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  | 403,334 | $2.21 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 151,969 | $3.13 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 555,303 | $2.53 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 28,730 | 584,033 | 281 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  | 38,691 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 38,691 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 7,496 | 46,187 | 15 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 // |  |  | 32,599 | $9.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 4,253 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 36,852 | $1.07 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 70,844 | 107,696 | 15 |
| 9/09/95 | 36 |  |  | 2,558 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 334 | $9.6 \mathrm{E}+04$ |  |  | 2,892 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 5,560 | 8,452 | 0 |
| 9/16/95 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 1,680 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 691,179 | $3.09 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 235,328 | $4.67 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 |  | 928,187 | $3.57 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 150,506 | 1,078,693 | 494 |

1/ Proportions from week 34 were used to allocate the catch.

## Eshamy District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total <br> Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/08/95 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 271 | 271 | 0 |
| 7/15/95 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1,656 | 1,656 | 0 |
| 7/22/95 | 29 2/ | 34 | 484 | 1,292 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 327 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+04$ |  |  | 1,653 | $3.1 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 2,900 | 4,553 | 0 |
| 8/29/95 | 30 2/ | 18 | 148 | 713 | $9.3 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 180 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+03$ |  |  | 911 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 1,604 | 2,515 | 0 |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/12/95 | 32 | 594 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 22,649 | $9.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 5,736 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 28,979 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 50,856 | 79,835 | 15 |
| Subtotals |  | 646 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 24,654 | $9.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 6,243 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0 |  | 31,543 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 57,287 | 88,830 | 15 |

2/ Proportions from week 32 were used to allocate the catch.
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## Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number Of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/05/95 | 31 | 73,269 | $1.68 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 118,077 | $2.75 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 212,231 | $1.04 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 10,051 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 413,628 | $1.53 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 465,052 | 878,680 | 149 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 | 122,602 | $3.56 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 179,440 | $4.23 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 99,770 | $4.59 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 16,442 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 418,254 | $1.33 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 410,811 | 829,065 | 188 |
| Subtotals |  | 195,871 | $5.23 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 297,517 | $6.98 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 312,001 | $1.50 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 26,494 | $1.44 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 831,882 | $2.86 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 875,863 | 1,707,745 | 337 |

## Montague District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 12292 | 12292 | 0 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 5947 | 5947 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 18,239 | 18,239 | 0 |

## Southeastern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 11418 | 11418 | 0 |
| Grand Totals |  | 199,288 | $5.26 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,188,143 | $4.49 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,621,757 | $1.15 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 3,809,250 | $5.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 7,818,438 | $7.4 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,978,243 | 10,796,681 | 3,193 |

Appendix B.3. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound common property fisheries by district and week during 1996.

Eastern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/06 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,700,412 | $1.23 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,700,412 | $1.23 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 445,823 | 2,146,235 | 295 |
| 7/13 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,711,825 | $1.04 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,711,825 | $1.04 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 295,818 | 2,007,643 | 392 |
| 7/20 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 3,733 | $1.39 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,153,736 | $1.08 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,157,469 | $1.08 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 324,667 | 1,482,136 | 225 |
| 7/27 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 183,796 | $1.26 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 183,796 | $1.26 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 102,595 | 286,391 | 30 |
| 8/03 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37,550 | $1.41 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 37,550 | $1.41 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 25,600 | 63,150 | 13 |
| 8/10 | 32 // |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12,848 | $1.65 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 12,848 | $1.65 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 8,760 | 21,608 | 0 |
| 8/17 | 33 |  |  | 22,163 | $2.46 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 11,087 | $1.23 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 33,250 | $3.69 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 17,116 | 50,366 | 3 |
| 8/24 | $34 \quad 2 /$ |  |  | 659 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 330 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 989 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 508 | 1,497 | 0 |
| 8/31 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 9/07 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 | 37 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 22,822 | $2.46 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 15,150 | $1.37 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 4,800,167 | $3.49 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 4,838,139 | $3.53 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,220,924 | 6,059,063 | 958 |

1/ Proportions from week 31 were used to allocate the catch.
2/ Proportions from week 33 were used to allocate the catch.

Northern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/20 | 29 1/ |  |  |  |  | 708 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 708 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 2,501 | 3,209 | 0 |
| 7/27 | 30 |  |  |  |  | 30,562 | $2.78 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 30,562 | $2.78 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 107,867 | 138,429 | 4 |
| 8/03 | 31 |  |  | 3,744 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 187,971 | $3.96 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 7,318 | $2.68 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 199,033 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 244,405 | 443,438 | 39 |
| $8 / 10$ | 32 |  |  | 83,802 | $9.14 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,154,894 | $1.21 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  |  | 1,238,696 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 485,945 | 1,724,642 | 185 |
| 8/17 | 33 | 19,902 | $1.65 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 460,841 | $6.66 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 747,092 | $6.43 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 10,994 | $1.32 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,238,829 | $1.34 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 337,811 | 1,576,640 | 196 |
| 8/24 | 34 | 19,105 | $7.75 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 134,587 | $8.95 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 552,056 | $6.44 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 705,748 | $7.41 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 270,288 | 976,036 | 137 |
| 8/31 | $35 \quad 2 /$ | 3,476 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 24,535 | $2.96 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 100,439 | $2.13 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 128,450 | $2.45 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 49,127 | 177,577 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 42,483 | $2.45 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 707,509 | $8.52 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,773,722 | $2.94 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 18,312 | $1.59 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 3,542,026 | $3.84 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,497,945 | 5,039,971 | 561 |

1/ Proportions from week 30 were used to allocate the catch.
$2 /$ Proportions from week 34 were used to allocate the catch.
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Coghill District

| Week | Stat | AFK H | tchery | WN H | chery | CC H | chery | SG H | chery | Total | tchery | Total | Total | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Wild | Catch | of Tags |
| 6/15 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $6 / 22$ | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 13 | 0 |
| $6 / 29$ | 26 1/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 556 | 556 | 0 |
| 7/06 | 27 1/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,120 | 1,120 | 0 |
| 7/13 | 28 1/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,176 | 2,176 | 0 |
| 7/20 | 29 1/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,152 | 10,152 | 0 |
| 7/27 | $30 \quad 2 /$ | 96 | $9.1 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 10,579 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,837 | 2.2E+05 |  |  | 12,512 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,129 | 13,641 | 0 |
| 8/03 | $312 /$ | 13 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 1,491 | $3.1 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 259 | 4,302 |  |  | 1,763 | 35,272 | 160 | 1,923 | 0 |
| 8/10 | 32 | 5,492 | $3.02 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 607,728 | $5.11 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 105,547 | $7.14 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 718,767 | $5.86 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 64,859 | 783,626 | 138 |
| 8/17 | 33 |  |  | 483,554 | $7.51 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 48,327 | $7.79 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 531,881 | $8.29 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 109,599 | 641,480 | 38 |
| $8 / 24$ | 34 |  |  | 51,971 | $9.83 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 10,364 | $1.95 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 62,335 | 1.18E+09 | 0 | 62,335 | 6 |
| 8/31 | 35 3/ |  |  | 5,441 | $1.07 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,085 | 2,141,731 |  |  | 6,526 | $1.29 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 | 6,526 | 0 |
| $9 / 07$ | 36 3/ |  |  | 16,120 | $9.45 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 3,215 | $1.88 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 19,335 | $1.13 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 19,335 | 0 |
| 9/14 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 986 | 986 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 5,601 | $3.02 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,176,884 | $1.37 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 170,634 | $1.71 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 |  | 1,353,119 | $1.54 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 190,750 | 1,543,869 | 182 |

1/ Proportions from week 25 were used to allocate the catch.
2/ Proportions from week 32 were used to allocate the catch.
3/ Proportions from week 34 were used to allocate the catch.

## Eshamy District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| $7 / 06$ | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,578 | 4,578 | 0 |
| 7/13 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,943 | 2,943 | 0 |
| 7/20 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,521 | 4,521 | 0 |
| 7/27 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,429 | 1,429 | 0 |
| 8/03 | 31 1/ | 31 | 943 | 3,398 | 159,869 | 590 | 22,340 |  |  | 4,019 | 183,152 | 363 | 4,382 | 0 |
| 8/10 | $32 \quad 21$ |  |  | 897 | 25,833 | 90 | 2,679 |  |  | 987 | 28,512 | 203 | 1,190 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 31 | 943 | 4,295 | 185,702 | 680 | 25,019 | 0 |  | 5,006 | 211,664 | 14,037 | 19,043 | 0 |

1/Proportions from week 32 of the Coghill district common property catch were used to allocate catch $2 /$ Proportions from week 33 of the Coghill district common property catch were used to allocate catch
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Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ \text { Tags } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/27 | 30 | 15,415 | $5.94 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 17,589 | $9.78 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 32,658 | $1.51 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 65,662 | $3.08 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 42,230 | 107,892 | 16 |
| 8/03 | 31 | 222,406 | $9.36 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 205,405 | 2.32E+09 | 289,467 | $3.45 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 37,374 | $2.08 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 754,652 | $6.91 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 145,737 | 900,389 | 156 |
| 8/10 | 32 | 501,678 | 3. $55 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 324,486 | $2.37 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 210,736 | $1.64 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 12,788 | $1.64 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,049,688 | $7.63 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 428,304 | 1,477,992 | 187 |
| 8/17 | 33 | 698,391 | 7.68E+09 | 503,628 | $7.39 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 138,826 | $2.19 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 1,340,845 | $1.73 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 316,970 | 1,657,815 | 174 |
| 8/24 | 34 | 364,367 | $2.32 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 20,342 | $1.04 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 47,240 | $2.98 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 431,949 | $2.72 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 255,483 | 687,432 | 74 |
| 8/31 | 35 | 121,080 | $4.73 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 7,789 | $3.03 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 128,869 | $5.03 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 86,530 | 215,399 | 33 |
| Subtotals |  | 1,923,337 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,079,239 | $1.23 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 718,927 | $7.64 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 50,162 | $3.71 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 3,771,665 | $3.53 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,275,254 | 5,046,919 | 640 |
| Grand Totals |  | 1,971,452 | $1.53 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,990,749 | $3.48 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 3,679,113 | $3.89 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 4,868,641 | $3.51 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 13,509,955 | $1.24 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 4,198,910 | 17,708,865 | 2,341 |

## Appendix B.4. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound common property fisheries by district and week during 1997.

Eastern District


1/ Proportions from week 35 were used to allocate the catch for week 36

## Northern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/26/98 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  |  |  | 194,237 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 9,198 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 203,435 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 50,456 | 253,891 | 40 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  | 71,278 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 989,443 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  |  | 1,060,721 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 116,187 | 1,176,908 | 167 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 |  |  | 302,395 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 138,154 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 440,549 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,796 | 445,345 | 72 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  | 146,013 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 523,658 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 669,671 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 192,269 | 861,940 | 81 |
| 8/30/98 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 288,626 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 288,626 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 61,673 | 350,299 | 36 |
| 9/06/98 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 9/13/98 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 9/20/98 | $38 \quad 2 /$ |  |  | 1,631 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 48,361 | $8.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 49,992 | $8.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 24,448 | 74,440 |  |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 521,317 | $8.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,182,479 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 9,198 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 2,712,994 | $8.4 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 449,829 | 3,162,823 | 396 |

2/ Proportions from week 38 of brood stock were used to allocate the catch
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Coghill District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total <br> Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/07/98 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6/14/98 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 6/21/98 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 6/28/98 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | 60 | 0 |
| 7/05/98 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 267 | 267 | 0 |
| 7/12/98 | 28 1/ |  |  | 5,230 | 1.9E+06 |  |  |  |  | 5,230 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,942 | 7,172 | 0 |
| 7/19/98 | 29 1/ |  |  | 19,546 | 2.7E+07 |  |  |  |  | 19,546 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 7,260 | 26,806 | 0 |
| 7/26/98 | 30 |  |  | 151,670 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  |  |  | 151,670 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 56,333 | 208,003 | 16 |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  | 46,054 | 1.9E+09 |  |  |  |  | 46,054 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,179 | 48,233 | 2 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  | 218,299 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 23,886 | $3.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 242,185 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 35,308 | 277,493 | 39 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 |  |  | 84,043 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 89,425 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 173,468 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,222 | 177,690 | 49 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  | 261,684 | 4.6E+09 | 54,832 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 316,516 | $537 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 102,604 | 419,120 | 38 |
| 8/30/98 | 35 |  |  | 221,706 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 65,672 | 8.2E+08 |  |  | 287,378 | 3.6E+09 | 142,311 | 429,689 | 41 |
| 9/06/98 | 36 |  |  | 346,054 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 23,189 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 369,243 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 154 | 369,243 | 85 |
| 9/13/98 | 37 |  |  | 42,738 | 3.7E+08 | 8,632 | $7.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 51,370 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 15,437 | 66,807 | 6 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 1,397,024 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 265,636 | 3.0E+09 | 0 | 0 | 1,662,660 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 367,926 | 2,030,586 | 276 |

1/ Proportions from week 30 were used to allocate the catch

## Eshamy District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/28/98 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/05/98 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 328 | 328 | 0 |
| 7/12/98 | 28 2/ |  |  | 2,250 | $5.1 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 2,250 | 5.1E+06 | 2,300 | 4,550 | 0 |
| 7/19/98 | 29 2/ |  |  | 710 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 710 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 727 | 1,437 | 0 |
| 7/26/98 | 30 |  |  | 8,150 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 8,150 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 8,334 | 16,484 | 1 |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  | 11,454 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 23,074 | $5.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 34,528 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 16,132 | 50,660 | 3 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  | 17,191 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 17,191 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 11,500 | 28,691 | 2 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 |  |  | 22,532 | $7.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 22,532 | $7.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 22,532 | 8 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 | 9,912 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 52,591 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 62,503 | $8.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ | , | 62,503 | 7 |
| 8/30/98 | 35 | 10,481 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 20,746 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 31,227 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 4,522 | 35,749 | 3 |
| Subtotals |  | 20,393 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 135,624 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 0 | 23,074 | $5.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 179,091 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 43,843 | 222,934 | 24 |

2/ Proportions from week 30 were used to allocate the catch
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Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/26/98 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/02/98 | 31 | 11,443 | $4.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 22,452 | $8.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 7,358 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 3,626 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 44,879 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 35,368 | 80,247 | 12 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 | 1,040,915 | $7.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 121,203 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 114,654 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 9,001 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,285,773 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 29,791 | 1,315,564 | 226 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 | 966,448 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 197,405 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 115,798 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 26,220 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,305,871 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 308,192 | 1,614,063 | 275 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 | 653,581 | $7.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 263,607 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 145,971 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 13,668 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,076,827 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 292,438 | 1,369,265 | 136 |
| 8/30/98 | 35 | 364,164 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 381,702 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 180,366 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  |  | 926,232 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 83,570 | 1,009,802 | 25 |
| 9/06/98 | 36 | 316,910 | 2.1E+09 | 13,443 | $9.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 13,866 | $9.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 344,219 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 130,220 | 474,439 | 51 |
| 9/13/98 | 33 1/ | 44,195 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,875 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,934 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 48,004 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 18,160 | 66,164 |  |
| Subtotals |  | 3,397,656 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 1,001,687 | $4.1 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 579,947 | $3.1 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 52,515 | $6.7 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 5,031,805 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 897,739 | 5,929,544 | 725 |
| Grand Totals |  | 3,418,049 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 3,069,701 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 3,140,428 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 4,325,620 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 13,953,798 | $3.5 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 1,926,455 | 15,880,253 | 2,563 |

1/ Proportions from week 36 were used to allocate the catch

Appendix C:
Pink Salmon Hatchery and Wild Stock Contributions to Prince William Sound Cost Recovery Fisheries by District and Week for 1994 to 1997

Appendix C.1. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound cost recovery fisheries by district and week during 1994.

Eastern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/18/94 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6/25/94 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 265,139 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 265,139 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 265,139 | 120 |
| 7/02/94 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,081,582 | $5.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 1,081,582 | 5.2E+09 | 16,732 | 1,098,314 | 225 |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 480,299 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 480,299 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 42,518 | 522,817 | 141 |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 637,373 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 637,373 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 293,613 | 930,986 | 195 |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 193,328 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 193,328 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 20,841 | 214,169 | 70 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,657,721 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,657,721 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 373,704 | 3,031,425 | 751 |

## Northern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  |  |  | 36,503 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 36,503 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 32,737 | 69,240 | 16 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  | 3,316 | 5.1E+06 | 316,863 | $5.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 316,863 | $5.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 354,363 | 674,542 | 88 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 |  |  |  |  | 1,508,758 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  |  | 1,508,758 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 532,410 | 2,041,168 | 208 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 317,031 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 317,031 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 229,434 | 546,465 | 51 |
| 8/27/94 | $351 /$ |  |  |  |  | 98,054 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 98,054 | 1.9E+08 | 70,961 | 169,015 | 0 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 1/ |  |  |  |  | 33,650 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 33,650 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 24,353 | 58,003 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 3,316 | $5.1 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,310,859 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+10$ |  |  | 2,310,859 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,244,258 | 3,558,433 | 363 |

1/ Proportions from week 34 were used to allocate the catch.
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Coghill District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/25/94 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/02/94 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 34 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 17 | 51 | 1 |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  | 9,505 | $56 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 9,505 | 5,596,253 | 555 | 10,060 | 8 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  | 263,745 | 1.1E+09 | 5,069 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 268,814 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 51,760 | 320,574 | 66 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 |  |  | 576,842 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 27,084 | 2.1E+08 |  |  | 603,926 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 251,531 | 855,457 | 95 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  | 459,012 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 6,024 | $3.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 465,036 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 399,456 | 864,495 | 67 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  | 124,381 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 30,511 | $7.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 154,892 | $3.9 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 200,005 | 354,897 | 15 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/10/94 | 37 2/ |  |  | 25 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+01$ | 6 | 3 |  |  | 31 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+01$ | 41 | 72 | 0 |
| 9/17/94 | $38 \quad 2 /$ |  |  | 689 | $9.8 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 169 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+03$ |  |  | 858 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 1,109 | 1,967 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 1,434,199 | $9.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 68,863 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 34 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 1,503,096 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 904,474 | 2,407,570 | 252 |

1/ Proportions from week 35 were used to allocate the catch.

Eshamy District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/09/94 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 330 | 330 | 0 |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 2,654 | 2,654 | 0 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 12,517 | 12,517 | 0 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 2/ | 1,736 | $8.7 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 12,231 | $6.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 13,966 | $7.1 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 19,513 | 33,479 | 0 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 2/ | 4,365 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 30,769 | $3.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 35,134 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 49,086 | 84,220 | 0 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 | 10,829 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 76,337 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 87,166 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 34,613 | 121,779 | 8 |
| 9/03/94 | $36 \quad 2 /$ | 657 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 4,632 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 5,289 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 7,389 | 12,678 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 17,586 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 123,969 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 141,555 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 126,102 | 267,657 | 8 |

2/ Proportions from week 35 were used to allocate the catch.
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Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total <br> Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/30/94 | 31 | 61,492 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61,492 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 12,095 | 73,587 | 15 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 | 110,742 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 5,479 | $7.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 13,751 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 129,972 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 42,564 | 172,536 | 43 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 | 228,371 | 1.5E+09 | 14,158 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 14,156 | 1.7E+07 |  |  | 256,685 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 12,190 | 268,875 | 51 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 | 333,052 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 333,052 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 75,251 | 408,303 | 65 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 | 173,035 | 1.0E+09 | 1,359 | $4.6 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 15,225 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 189,619 | 1.2E +09 | 21,217 | 210,836 | 58 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 | 26,215 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26,215 | 4.3E+07 | 0 | 26,215 | 4 |
| Subtotals |  | 932,907 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 20,996 | $3.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 43,132 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 997,035 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 163,317 | 1,160,352 | 236 |
| Grand Totals |  | 950,493 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 1,582,480 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,422,854 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,657,755 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 7,613,582 | $4.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,811,855 | 10,425,437 | 1,610 |

Appendix C.2. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound cost recovery fisheries by district and week during 1995.

Eastern District

| Wcek Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/24/95 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,282 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 8,282 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 | 8,282 | 6 |
| 7/01/95 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 878,823 | $4.04 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 878,823 | $4.04 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 878,823 | 497 |
| 7/08/95 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,054,189 | $4.29 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,054,189 | $4.29 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 1,054,189 | 416 |
| 7/15/95 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 494,839 | $1.59 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 494,839 | $1.59 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 494,839 | 212 |
| 7/22/95 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99,445 | $6.86 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 99,445 | $6.86 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 99,445 | 39 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,535,578 | $9.99 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2,535,578 | $9.99 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 2,535,578 | 1170 |

Northern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  |  |  | 5,380 | $9.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 5,380 | $9.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 51,249 | 56,629 | 3 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  |  |  | 305,680 | $2.14 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 305,680 | $2.14 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 417,212 | 722,892 | 57 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  |  |  | 20,003 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 20,003 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 54,650 | 74,653 | 9 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 47,524 | $1.79 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 47,524 | $1.79 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 134,913 | 182,437 | 12 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 378,587 | $2.38 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 |  | 378,587 | $2.38 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 658,024 | 1,036,611 | 81 |

Coghill District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/22/95 | 29 1/ |  |  | 444 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+04$ |  |  |  |  | 444 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0 | 444 | 0 |
| 7/29/95 | 30 1/ |  |  | 4,788 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 4,788 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0 | 4,788 | 0 |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  | 134,385 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  |  |  | 134,385 | $1.02 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 134,385 | 21 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  | 160,433 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 160,433 | $2.29 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 14,504 | 174,937 | 15 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  | 392,949 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 5,784 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 398,733 | $5.06 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 52,232 | 450,965 | 170 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  | 81,176 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 10,611 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 91,788 | $1.18 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 91,788 | 21 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  | 59,036 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 59,036 | 29650000 | 6,256 | 65,292 | 36 |
| 9/09/95 | $36 \quad 2 /$ |  |  | 5,732 | $2.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 5,732 | $2.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 607 | 6,339 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 838,943 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 16,396 | $7.7 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0 |  | 855,339 | $1.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 73,599 | 928,938 | 263 |

1/ Proportions from week 31 were used to allocate the catch.
2/ Proportions from week 35 were used to allocate the catch.
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Eshamy District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 619 | 619 | 0 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1,946 | 1,946 | 0 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/26/95 | 343 | 152 | 9,782 | 5,806 | 6,133,447 | 1,470 | 216,134 |  |  | 7,428 | 6,359,663 | 13,037 | 20,465 | 0 |
| 9/02/95 |  | 152 | 9,782 | 5,779 | 6,077,232 | 1,464 | 214,450 |  |  | 7,395 | 6,301,464 | 12,976 | 20,371 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 304 | 19,564 | 11,585 | 12,210,679 | 2,934 | 430,884 | 0 |  | 14,823 | 12,661,127 | 28,578 | 43,401 | 0 |

3/ Proportions from week 35 of Eshamy district common property fishery were used to allocate the catch.

## Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/29/95 | 30 | 708 | $2.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 708 | 250042 | 1,841 | 2,549 | 2 |
| 8/05/95 | 31 | 34,075 | $1.38 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34,075 | $1.38 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 70,918 | 104,993 | 8 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 | 95,739 | $5.83 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 10,170 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 105,910 | $6.09 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 105,910 | 21 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 | 187,585 | $1.97 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 5,644 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 193,503 | $1.97 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 193,503 | 103 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 | 116,543 | $2.01 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 2,938 | $8.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 119,481 | $2.10 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 4,507 | 123,988 | 90 |
| 9/02/95 | $354 /$ | 13,799 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 348 | 4.6E04 |  |  | 14,147 | 3.0E+06 | 534 | 14,681 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 448,728 | $2.89 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 5,644 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 13,456 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 |  | 467,824 | $2.93 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 77,800 | 545,624 | 224 |
| Grand Totals |  | 449,028 | $2.89 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 856,172 | $1.91 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 411,373 | $2.42 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,53,5578 | $9.99 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 4,252,151 | $1.01 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 838,001 | 5,090,152 | 1,738 |

4/ Proportions from week 34 were used to allocate the catch

Appendix C.3. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound cost recovery fisheries by district and week during 1996.

Eastern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/22 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,688 | $5.37 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 10,688 | $5.37 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 | 10,688 | 5 |
| $6 / 29$ | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 533,839 | $1.89 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 533,839 | $1.89 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 72,041 | 605,880 | 151 |
| $7 / 06$ | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 518,848 | $1.53 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 518,848 | $1.53 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 107,481 | 626,329 | 176 |
| 7/13 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 668,909 | $2.87 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 668,909 | $2.87 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 17,504 | 686,413 | 156 |
| 7/20 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 284,643 | $1.17 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 284,643 | $1.17 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 151,078 | 435,721 | 68 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 2,016,927 | $1.17 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,016,927 | $1.17 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 348,104 | 2,365,031 | 556 |

Northern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/27 | 30 1/ |  |  |  |  | 4,843 | $8.1 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 4,843 | $8.1 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 6,177 | 11,020 | 0 |
| 8/03 | 31 |  |  |  |  | 124,767 | $5.37 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 124,767 | $5.37 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 159,110 | 283,877 | 29 |
| 8/10 | 32 |  |  |  |  | 111,872 | $3.21 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 111,872 | $3.21 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 196,568 | 308,440 | 39 |
| 8/17 | 33 |  |  |  |  | 210,604 | $9.86 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 210,604 | $9.86 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 516,440 | 727,044 | 45 |
| 8/24 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 153,751 | $6.71 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 153,751 | $6.71 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 226,924 | 380,675 | 51 |
| 8/31 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 94,103 | $3.11 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 94,103 | $3.11 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 94,103 | 30 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 699,940 | $2.83 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 |  | 699,940 | $2.83 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 1,105,219 | 1,805,159 | 194 |

1/ Proportions from week 31 were used to allocate the catch.
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## Coghill District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/03 | 31 |  |  | 73,816 | $1.09 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 14,694 | $2.16 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 88,510 | $1.31 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 134,501 | 223,011 | 6 |
| 8/10 | 32 |  |  | 224,318 | $1.03 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  |  |  | 224,318 | $1.03 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 402,605 | 626,923 | 54 |
| 8/17 | 33 |  |  | 754,679 | $1.09 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 123,322 | $8.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 878,001 | $1.17 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 441,588 | 1,319,589 | 114 |
| $8 / 24$ | 34 |  |  | 479,438 | $5.75 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 11,979 | 1.44E+08 |  |  | 491,417 | $5.89 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 694,875 | 1,186,292 | 41 |
| 8/31 | 35 | 4,127 | $2.52 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 469,686 | $2.87 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 4,136 | $2.53 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 477,949 | $2.92 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 477,949 | 116 |
| 9/07 | 36 |  |  | 227,097 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  |  |  | 227,097 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 227,097 | 57 |
| 9/14 | 37 |  |  | 34,987 | $1.75 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 34,987 | $1.75 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 11,301 | 46,288 | 7 |
| Subtotals |  | 4,127 | $2.52 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 2,264,021 | $2.36 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 154,131 | $1.19 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 2,422,279 | $2.48 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 1,684,870 | 4,107,149 | 395 |

## Eshamy District 1/

| Week | Stat | AFK | atchery | WN H | tchery | CCH | chery | SG H | chery | Total | atchery | Total | Total | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Wild | Catch | of Tags |
| $7 / 06$ | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 7/13 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $7 / 20$ | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/27 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 329 | 329 | 0 |
| $8 / 03$ | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 184 | 184 | 0 |
| 8/10 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/17 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,472 | 5,472 | 0 |
| $8 / 24$ | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/31 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/07 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/14 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6,039 | 6,039 | 0 |
| Grand Totals |  | 4,127 | $2.52 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 2,264,021 | $2.36 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 854,071 | $4.01 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 2,016,927 | $3.52 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 5,139,146 | $3.52 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 3,144,232 | 8,283,378 | 1,145 |

1/ Catches were not allocated to hatcheries due to lack of samples taken in Eshamy district.

Appendix C.4. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound cost recovery fisheries by district and week during 1997.

Eastern District

|  |  | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 6/14/98 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6/21/98 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,614 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 8,614 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 | 8,614 | 5 |
| 6/28/98 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 432,329 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 432,329 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 432,329 | 161 |
| 7/05/98 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 908,645 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 908,645 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 908,645 | 281 |
| 7/12/98 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 845,016 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 845,016 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 845,016 | 285 |
| 7/19/98 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 221,321 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 221,321 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 0 | 221,321 | 83 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 1/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,877 | 2.2E+06 | 8,877 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,541 | 10,418 | 0 |
| 8/30/98 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/06/98 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/13/98 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,515 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,515 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,149 | 4,664 | 2 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,427,317 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 2427317 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+11$ | 3,690 | 2,431,007 | 817 |

1/ Proportions from Solomon Gulch hatchery brood stock for week 34 were used to allocate the catch

## Northem District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/26/98 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  |  |  | 166,325 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 166,325 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 184,621 | 350,946 | 20 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  |  |  | 600,741 | $8.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 600,741 | $8.0 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 391,364 | 992,105 | 102 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 2/ |  |  |  |  | 272,694 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 272,694 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 123,939 | 396,633 | 34 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 71,465 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  | 71,465 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 62,177 | 133,642 | 6 |
| 9/27/98 | 39 |  |  | 203 | 4.1E+04 | 6,023 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 6,226 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 3,045 | 9,271 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 203 | $4.1 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 1,117,248 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 0 | 0 | 1,117,451 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 765,146 | 1,882,597 | 162 |

2/ Proportions from Cannery Creek hatchery brood stock for week 38 were used to allocate the catch
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| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/12/98 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/19/98 | 29 1/ |  |  | 3,048 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 22 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 21 | $64 \mathrm{E}+02$ | 3,091 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 1 | 3,092 | 0 |
| 7/26/98 | 30 1/ |  |  | 5,619 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 40 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 39 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+03$ | 5,698 | $6.3 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 2 | 5,700 | 0 |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  | 325,637 | 2.1E+09 | 2,301 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 2,268 | $7.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 330,206 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 93 | 330,299 | 130 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  | 541,035 | 5.1E+09 |  |  |  |  | 541,035 | 5.1E+09 | 0 | 541,035 | 174 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 1/ |  |  | 707,359 | $5.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ |  |  |  |  | 707,359 | $5.2 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 98,376 | 805,735 | 101 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  | 449,219 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 19,275 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 468,494 | $4.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 21,117 | 489,611 |  |
| 8/30/98 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/06/98 | 36 2/ |  |  | 21,871 | $1.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 938 | 4.7E+05 |  |  | 22,809 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,028 | 23,837 | 0 |
| 9/13/98 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9/20/98 | 38 3/ |  |  | 32,553 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 721 | 5.2E+05 |  |  | 33,274 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,953 | 35,227 | 0 |
| 9/27/98 | $393 /$ |  |  | 19,850 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 440 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 20,290 | 1.1E+07 | 1,191 | 21,481 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 2,106,191 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 23,737 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 2,328 | 7,365,147 | 2,132,256 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+10$ | 123,761 | 2,256,017 | 502 |

1/ Proportions from week 30 of Coghill cost recovery catch were used to allocate the catch
2/ Proportions from week 34 of Coghill cost recovery catch were used to allocate the catch
3/ Proportions from W.H. Noerenberg hatchery brood stock for week 38 were used to allocate the catch

## Eshamy District

| Week | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/05/98 | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/12/98 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 23 | 0 |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,779 | 1,779 | 0 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  | 8,320 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  | 8,320 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 5574 | 13,894 | 13 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 |  |  | 11,944 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 11944 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 11,218 | 23,162 | 1 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 20,264 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  |  |  | 20,264 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 18,594 | 38,858 | 14 |

## Appendix C.4. Page 3 of 3 .

## Southwestern District



Appendix D: Pink SaImon Hatchery and Wild Stock Contributions to Prince William Sound Hatchery Brood Stock by District and Week for 1994 to 1997.

## Appendix D.1. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound hatchery brood stock by district and week during 1994.

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/16/94 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/23/94 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,864 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 5,864 | $6.9 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,162 | 7,026 | 5 |
| 7/30/94 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55,325 | $6.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 55,325 | $6.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 62,549 | 117,874 | 48 |
| 8/06/94 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,407 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 50,407 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 37,173 | 87,580 | 44 |
| 8/13/94 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69,348 | $8.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 69,348 | $8.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 20,367 | 89,715 | 56 |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51,585 | $7.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 51,585 | 7.2E+07 | 57,809 | 109,394 | 37 |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,572 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 19,572 | $2.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 28,313 | 47,885 | 13 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,406 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 4,406 | $6.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 12,492 | 16,898 | 3 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 256,507 | 3.2E+08 | 256,507 | 3.2E+08 | 219,865 | 476,372 | 206 |


| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  | 1,069 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 20,052 | $2.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 21,121 | $2.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 2555 | 23,676 | 20 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 |  |  | 1,057 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 70,883 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 71,940 | $7.7 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 19707 | 91,647 | 67 |
| 9/10/94 | 37 |  |  |  |  | 40,357 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 40,357 | $4.9 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 25985 | 66,342 | 33 |
| 9/17/94 | 38 |  |  | 1,236 | 1.6E+06 | 24,458 | $3.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 25,694 | $3.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 10605 | 36,299 | 21 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 3,362 | $3.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 155,750 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 159,112 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 58852 | 217,964 | 141 |


| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65,963 |  |  | 65,963 | 39 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 | 117,601 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 117,601 |  |  | 117,601 | 76 |
| 9/10/94 | 37 | 118,362 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 118,362 |  |  | 118,362 | 97 |
| 9/17/94 | 38 | 79,509 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 79,509 |  |  | 79,509 | 79 |
| 9/24/94 | 39 | 54,024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54,024 |  |  | 54,024 | 26 |
| Subtotals |  | 435,459 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 435,459 |  |  | 435,459 | 317 |
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Eshamy District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/27/94 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 892 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 892 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0 | 892 | 1 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 | 1,119 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 6,834 | $7.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 7,953 | $9.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 9,535 | 17,488 | 7 |
| 9/10/94 | 37 | 971 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 12,481 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 950 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 14,402 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0 | 14,402 | 15 |
| 9/17/94 | 38 | 885 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 4,484 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 5,369 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 0 | 5,369 | 6 |
| 9/24/94 | 39 |  |  | 255 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+04$ |  |  |  |  | 255 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0 | 255 | 1 |
| Subtotals |  | 2,975 | $1.7 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 24,054 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,842 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 28,871 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 9,535 | 38,406 | 30 |

## Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total <br> Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/20/94 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/27/94 | 35 | 14,647 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14,647 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 | 14,647 | 19 |
| 9/03/94 | 36 | 56,159 | $5.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 1,037 | $1.1 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  | 57,196 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 962 | 58,158 | 69 |
| 9/10/94 | 37 | 45,423 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45,423 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 7,629 | 53,052 | 57 |
| 9/17/94 | 38 | 83,549 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,060 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 1,046 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 85,655 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 85,655 | 98 |
| 9/24/94 | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 480 | 480 | 0 |
| Subtotals |  | 199,778 | $5.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 2,097 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,046 | $2.7 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 202,921 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 9,071 | 211,992 | 243 |
| Grand Totals |  | 202,753 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 464,972 | $5.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 158,638 | $1.8 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 256,507 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 1,082,870 | $1.6 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 297,323 | 1,380,193 | 937 |

## Appendix D.2. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound hatchery brood stock by district and week during 1995.

Eastern District

| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total <br> Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
|  | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 38,936 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 38,936 | $3.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 4,145 | 43,801 | 47 |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89,593 | 5.15E+08 | 89,593 | $5.15 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 89,593 | 138 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 106,101 | $7.70 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 106,101 | 7.70E+08 | 0 | 106,101 | 162 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63,287 | $3.28 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 63,287 | $3.28 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 63,287 | 134 |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71,543 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 71,543 | $6.6 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 15,853 | 87,396 | 77 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37,589 | $1.25 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 37,589 | 1.25E+08 | 0 | 37,589 | 75 |
| 9/09/95 | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 551 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 551 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+04$ | 0 | 551 | 1 |
| 9/16/95 | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 427,614 | 634 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 407,600 | $1.84 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 407,600 | $1.84 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 20,014 | 427,614 | 634 |

Northern District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 1,008 | $2.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ |  |  | 1,008 | $2.5 \mathrm{E}+05$ | 0 | 1,008 |  |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 11,702 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 11,702 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 4,459 | 16,161 | 11 |
| 9/09/95 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 49,947 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 49,947 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 40,128 | 90,075 | 47 |
| 9/16/95 | 37 |  |  |  |  | 56,372 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 56,372 | $6.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 50,646 | 107,018 | 53 |
| 9/23/95 | 38 |  |  |  |  | 4,254 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  | 4,254 | $4.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 5,392 | 9,646 | 4 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123,283 | 1.3E+08 | 0 | 0 | 123,283 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 100,625 | 223,908 | 116 |
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Coghill District

| Week <br> Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN H | chery | CC H | chery | SG H | chery | Total H | tchery | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/15/95 | 28 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7/22/95 | 29 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7/29/95 | 30 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 8/05/95 | 31 |  |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |  | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| 8/12/95 | 32 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 8/19/95 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/26/95 | 34 |  |  | 18,920 |  |  |  |  |  | 18,920 |  | 0 | 18,920 58,645 | 38 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 |  |  | 58,645 |  |  |  |  |  | 58,645 |  | 0 | 58,645 | 137 |
| 9/09/95 | 36 |  |  | 102,929 |  |  |  |  |  | 102,929 |  | 0 | 102,929 | 258 |
| 9/16/95 | 37 |  |  | 117,913 |  |  |  |  |  | 117,913 |  | 0 | 117,913 | 282 |
| 9/23/95 | 38 |  |  | 15,576 |  |  |  |  |  | 15,576 |  | 0 | 15,576 | 34 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 |  | 314,019 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 314,019 |  | 0 | 314,019 | 749 |

## Southwestern District

| Week Ending | Stat <br> Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/26/95 | 34 | 1,819 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,819 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 1,083 | 2,902 | 3 |
| 9/02/95 | 35 | 41,128 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41,128 | $2.4 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 4,965 | 46,093 | 92 |
| 9/09/95 | 36 | 74,185 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 74,185 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 11,527 | 85,712 | 152 |
| 9/16/95 | 37 | 13,857 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13,857 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 8,793 | 22,650 | 27 |
| Subtotals |  | 130,989 | $8.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 130,989 | $8.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 26,368 | 157,357 | 274 |
| Grand Totals |  | 130,989 | $8.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 314,019 |  | 123,283 | 1.30E+08 | 407,600 | $1.84 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 975,891 | $2.05 \mathrm{E}+09$ | 147,007 | 1,122,898 | 1,773 |

## Appendix D.3. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound hatchery brood stock by

 district and week during 1996.

| Week <br> Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total <br> Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/31 | 35 |  |  | 1,515 | $2.3 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 32,772 | $4.88 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 34,287 | 5.11E+07 | 32,334 | 66,621 | 23 |
| 9/07 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 37,866 | $5.31 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 37,866 | $5.31 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 50,849 | 88,715 | 27 |
| $9 / 14$ | 37 |  |  | 3,346 | $5.6 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 66,569 | $1.11 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 69,915 | $1.16 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 49,182 | 119,097 | 42 |
| 9/21 | 38 |  |  |  |  | 28,534 | 5.43E+07 |  |  | 28,534 | $5.43 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 57,933 | 86,467 | 15 |
| Subtotals |  |  |  | 4,861 | $7.9 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 165,741 | $2.67 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 170,602 | $2.75 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 190,298 | 360,900 | 107 |


| Week Ending | Stat Week | AFK Hatchery |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/24 | 34 |  |  | 14,268 |  |  |  |  |  | 14,268 |  | 0 | 14,268 | 22 |
| 8/31 | 35 |  |  | 67,564 |  |  |  |  |  | 67,564 |  | 0 | 67,564 | 57 |
| 9/07 | 36 |  |  | 107,754 |  |  |  |  |  | 107,754 |  | 0 | 107,754 | 71 |
| 9/14 | 37 |  |  | 108,101 |  |  |  |  |  | 108,101 |  | 0 | 108,101 | 74 |
| 9/21 | 38 |  |  | 130,136 |  |  |  |  |  | 130,136 |  | 0 | 130,136 | 47 |
| 9/28 | 39 |  |  | 44,256 |  |  |  |  |  | 44,256 |  | 0 | 44,256 | 10 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 472,079 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 472,079 | 0 | 0 | 472,079 | 281 |
| Grand Totals |  | 0 | 0 | 476,940 | $7.89 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 165,741 | $2.67 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 348,897 | $5.04 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 991,578 | $7.79 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 275,831 | 1,267,409 | 640 |

## Appendix D.4. Pink salmon hatchery and wild stock contributions to Prince William Sound hatchery brood stock by

 district and week during 1997.| Week Stat AFK Hatchery |  |  |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 7/19/98 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7/26/98 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44,309 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 44,309 | $5.3 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 8,332 | 52,641 | 37 |
| 8/02/98 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48,514 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 48,514 | $5.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 33,703 | 82,217 | 43 |
| 8/09/98 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 82,862 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 82,862 | $9.5 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 35,624 | 118,486 | 72 |
| 8/16/98 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26,716 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 26,716 | $4.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 19,256 | 45,972 | 17 |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50,849 | $7.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 50,849 | $7.2 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 8,824 | 59,673 | 36 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253,250 | $3.2 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 253,250 | 3.2E+08 | 105,739 | 358,989 | 205 |


| Week Stat AFK Hatchery |  |  |  | WN Hatchery |  | CC Hatchery |  | SG Hatchery |  | Total Hatchery |  | Total Wild | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  |  |  |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8/30/98 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 6,114 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ |  |  | 6,114 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}+07$ | 0 | 6,114 | 6 |
| 9/06/98 | 36 |  |  |  |  | 89,193 | $1.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 89,193 | 1.4E+08 | 187 | 89,380 | 57 |
| 9/13/98 | 37 |  |  | 1,655 | $2.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 76,463 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 78,118 | $1.5 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 55,009 | 133,127 | 41 |
| 9/20/98 | 38 |  |  | 2,009 | $4.0 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 59,569 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ |  |  | 61,578 | $1.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 30,114 | 91,692 | 29 |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 3,664 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 231,339 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 0 | 0 | 235,003 | $4.4 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 85,310 | 320,313 | 133 |


| Week | Stat | AFK Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ending | Week | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance | Contrib. | Variance |  | Total Catch | Number of Tags |
| 8/23/98 | 34 |  |  | 6,723 |  |  |  |  |  | 6,723 |  |  | 6,723 | 10 |
| 8/30/98 | 35 |  |  | 33,427 |  |  |  |  |  | 33,427 |  |  | 33,427 | 33 |
| 9/06/98 | 36 |  |  | 134,240 |  |  |  |  |  | 134,240 |  |  | 134,240 | 113 |
| 9/13/98 | 37 |  |  | 159,889 |  |  |  |  |  | 159,889 |  |  | 159,889 | 119 |
| 9/20/98 | 38 |  |  | 44,815 |  |  |  |  |  | 44,815 |  |  | 44,815 | 47 |
| 9/27/98 | 39 |  |  | 29,377 |  |  |  |  |  | 29,377 |  |  | 29,377 |  |
| Subtotals |  | 0 | 0 | 408,471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 408,471 | 0 | 0 | 408,471 | 322 |
| Grand To |  | 0 | 0 | 412,135 | $6.8 \mathrm{E}+06$ | 231,339 | $4.3 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 253,250 | 3.2E+08 | 896,724 | $7.6 \mathrm{E}+08$ | 191,049 | 1,087,773 | 660 |

Appendix E: Percent Survival by Tag Code of Pink Salmon Returning to Prince William Sound from 1994 to 1997.

Appendix E. 1 Percent survival by tag code of pink salmon returning to Prince William Sound in 1994.

| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated Percent Survival | Standard Error | Lower $95 \%$ Conf. Interval | $\begin{gathered} \text { Upper } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Conf. } \\ \text { Interval } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. F. Koernig | 1301020811 | 13,509 | 7,976,770 | 3.145698 | 0.441131 | 2.28108 | 4.010316 |
|  | 1301020812 | 13,371 | 8,178,517 | 1.705346 | 0.283914 | 1.148874 | 2.261818 |
|  | 1301020813 | 13,371 | 7,992,494 | 0.138387 | 0.099071 | 0 | 0.332566 |
|  | 1301020814 | 13,248 | 7,975,690 | 0.438167 | 0.154242 | 0.135851 | 0.740482 |
|  | 1301020815 | 13,385 | 7,975,497 | 0.257798 | 0.096229 | 0.069188 | 0.446408 |
|  | 1301020901 | 13,146 | 7,975,242 | 0.160592 | 0.075795 | 0.012033 | 0.30915 |
|  | 1301020902 | 11,859 | 7,006,119 | 0.590062 | 0.214705 | 0.169239 | 1.010885 |
|  | 1301020903 | 11,813 | 6,981,010 | 0.357228 | 0.149917 | 0.063389 | 0.65107 |
|  | 1301020904 | 11,662 | 6,999,822 | 0.171454 | 0.078777 | 0.01751 | 0.325856 |
|  | 1301020905 | 11,943 | 7,168,239 | 0.372202 | 0.184151 | 0.011266 | 0.733138 |
|  | 1301020906 | 12,373 | 7,363,609 | 0.422415 | 0.148131 | 0.132077 | 0.712752 |
|  | 1301020907 | 11,709 | 7,111,484 | 0.102991 | 0.082256 | 0 | 0.264214 |
|  | 1301020908 | 11,701 | 7,045,612 | 6.993602 | 0.742799 | 5.537715 | 8.449489 |
|  | 1301020909 | 11,860 | 6,975,193 | 0.371924 | 0.156926 | 0.064348 | 0.679499 |
|  | $1301020910$ | 11,538 | 6,916,286 | 7.066813 | 0.767675 | 5.562169 | 8.571458 |
|  | 1301020911 | 11,109 | 1,695,761 | 8.720289 | 0.946697 | 6.864763 | 10.57582 |
| Wally Noerenberg | 1301021012 | 20,757 | 12,688,033 | 5.344273 | 0.510004 | 4.344664 | 6.343881 |
|  | 1301021013 | 19,901 | 12,036,519 | 5.248547 | 0.479511 | 4.308705 | 6.188389 |
|  | 1301021014 | 19,562 | 11,900,957 | 3.4548 | 0.356042 | 2.756957 | 4.152643 |
|  | 1301021015 | 20,087 | 12,105,181 | 3.405236 | 0.341749 | 2.735407 | 4.075065 |
|  | 1301021101 | 19,973 | 12,003,572 | 1.693484 | 0.243266 | 1.216682 | 2.170286 |
|  | 1301021102 | 19,910 | 11,976,571 | 2.204503 | 0.288845 | 1.3914 | 2.769866 |
|  | 1301021103 | 19,819 | 12,016,427 | 1.85995 | 0.243324 | 1.383033 | 2.336866 |
|  | 1301021104 | 21,118 | 12,727,191 | 2.837786 | 0.324476 | 2.201812 | 3.473761 |
|  | 1301021105 | 20,036 | 12,167,539 | 2.265819 | 0.283359 | 1.710434 | 2.821203 |
|  | 1301021106 | 19,690 | 12,003,914 | 3.076506 | 0.335001 | 2.419903 | 3.733109 |
|  | 1301021107 | 19,901 | 12,020,607 | 1.588383 | 0.239975 | 1.118032 | 2.058735 |
|  | 1301021108 | 20,194 | 12,022,492 | 1.532489 | 0.229462 | 1.082742 | 1.982236 |
|  | $1301021109$ | 19,808 | 12,063,272 | 8.870708 | 0.657025 | 7.582938 | 10.15848 |
|  | 1301021110 | 24,201 | 14,352,158 | 6.99958 | 0.509936 | 6.000104 | 7.999056 |
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| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated <br> Percent | Standard <br> Error | Lower <br> S5\% <br> Conf. | Upper <br> $95 \%$ <br> Conf. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cannery Creek | 1301020912 | 16,457 | $9,951,523$ | 8.05868 | 0.764006 | 6.561227 | 9.556131 |
|  | 1301020913 | 16,713 | $9,982,219$ | 5.755855 | 0.658355 | 4.465477 | 7.046233 |
|  | 1301020914 | 16,618 | $9,941,026$ | 5.528337 | 0.617083 | 4.318883 | 6.737852 |
|  | 1301020915 | 16,808 | $10,031,625$ | 7.200574 | 0.706065 | 5.816685 | 8.584463 |
|  | 1301021101 | 16,449 | $9,974,576$ | 7.242904 | 0.766623 | 5.740323 | 8.745486 |
|  | 1301021102 | 16,055 | $9,977,249$ | 5.390296 | 0.668785 | 4.079476 | 6.701115 |
|  | 130102103 | 16,596 | $9,974,215$ | 7.12651 | 0.736764 | 5.682452 | 8.570568 |
|  | 1301021104 | 16,534 | $9,967,084$ | 9.539519 | 0.915365 | 7.745402 | 11.33364 |
|  | 1301021105 | 16,767 | $10,073,965$ | 7.724174 | 0.741958 | 6.269935 | 9.178412 |
|  | 1301021106 | 16,600 | $9,973,185$ | 9.441556 | 0.981971 | 7.516891 | 11.36622 |
|  | 1301021107 | 16,945 | $10,162,835$ | 6.636293 | 0.632046 | 5.397482 | 7.875104 |
|  | 1301021108 | 16,648 | $9,957,657$ | 6.116417 | 0.637359 | 4.867194 | 7.365641 |
|  | 130102109 | 16,802 | $10,066,503$ | 5.692704 | 0.634167 | 4.449375 | 6.935672 |
|  | 1301021110 | 16,534 | $9,996,737$ | 3.644717 | 0.439522 | 2.783253 | 4.506181 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 1301020508 | 51,650 | 31028437 | 7.934947 | 0.508379 | 6.938523 | 8.931373 |
|  | 1301020509 | 50,158 | 29948159 | 11.15499 | 0.600435 | 9.978139 | 12.33185 |
|  | 1301020511 | 30,358 | 18237547 | 9.841 | 0.657663 | 8.551979 | 11.13002 |
|  | 1301021302 | 66,651 | 40031900 | 9.773089 | 0.504779 | 8.78372 | 10.76246 |
|  | 1301021305 | 6,724 | 4161909 | 7.780141 | 1.034944 | 5.751651 | 9.808632 |
|  | 1301021310 | 30,223 | 18457283 | 5.604424 | 0.441809 | 4.738479 | 6.470371 |

Appendix E. 2 Percent survival by tag code of pink salmon returning to Prince William Sound in 1995.

| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated <br> Percent <br> Survival | Standard Error | Lower 95\% Conf. Interval | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Upper } \\ 95 \% \\ \text { Conf. } \\ \text { Interval } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. F. Koernig | 1301030108 | 13,427 | 6,618,697 | 0.049596 | 0.36406 | 0 . | 0.120954 |
|  | 1301030109 | 10,541 | 60324,498 | 0.016791 | 0 |  |  |
|  | 1301030110 | 9,213 | 5,527,509 | 0.019212 | 0 |  |  |
|  | 1301030111 | 9,741 | 5,844,629 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1301030113 | 9,179 | 5,507,274 | 0.095969 | 0.038343 | 0.20816 | 0.171122 |
|  | 1301030114 | 10,208 | 6,125,031 | 0.231033 | 0.095736 | 0.043389 | 0.418677 |
|  | 1301030115 | 8,570 | 5,142,018 | 0.226232 | 0.082136 | 0.065245 | 0.387219 |
|  | 1301030201 | 8,243 | 4,946,477 | 0.197874 | 0.11882 | 0. | 0.430762 |
|  | 1301030202 | 10,577 | 6,345,996 | 0.16298 | 0.05695 | 0.051356 | 0.274603 |
|  | 1301030203 | 10,794 | 6,476,718 | 0.146823 | 0.065212 | 0.019006 | 0.274640 |
|  | 1301030204 | 11,143 | 6,685,569 | 0.650078 | 0.205886 | 0.246541 | 1.053616 |
|  | 1301030205 | 10,450 | 6,270,226 | 0.747400 | 0.15818 | 0.437366 | 1.057433 |
|  | 1301030206 | 11,368 | 6,821,127 | 0.644830 | 0.200624 | 0.251606 | 1.038054 |
|  | 1301030207 | 10,191 | 6,398,894 | 1.303599 | 0.251904 | 0.809865 | 1.797333 |
|  | 1301030303 | 17,732 | 3,547,896 | 7.461411 | 1.119573 | 5.26705 | 9.655774 |
|  | 1301030304 | 17,481 | 3,496,392 | 6.291389 | 0.893904 | 4.539336 | 8.043441 |
| Wally Noerenberg | 1301020401 | 15,977 | 9,371,637 | 0.534149 | 0.099969 | 0.33821 | 0.730089 |
|  | 1301021214 | 2,229 | 1,300,230 | 0.793112 | 0.183494 | 0.433464 | 1.152761 |
|  | 1301021312 | 18,674 | 11,211,336 | 1.113184 | 0.153949 | 0.811441 | 1.414925 |
|  | 1301021313 | 19,208 | 11,540,914 | 0.906253 | 0.137294 | 0.637156 | 1.175351 |
|  | 1301021314 | 19,917 | 12,040,148 | 0.294916 | 0.068438 | 0.160777 | 0.429056 |
|  | 1301021315 | 19,744 | 11,872,060 | 0.324124 | 0.084269 | 0.158955 | 0.489293 |
|  | 1301021401 | 20,181 | 12,163,694 | 0.156990 | 0.0875 | 0. | 0.328491 |
|  | 1301021402 | 19,977 | 19,977 | 1.996349 | 0.133013 | 1.735642 | 2.257056 |
|  | 1301021403 | 20,324 | 12,055,003 | 0.206729 | 0.073913 | 0.061859 | 0.351599 |
|  | 1301021404 | 20,706 | 12,328,148 | 0.179387 | 0.043744 | 0.093648 | 0.265126 |
|  | 1310121405 | 20,214 | 12,126,815 | 0.094160 | 0.046921 | 0.002193 | 0.186127 |
|  | 1301021406 | 20,098 | 12,106,415 | 0.065842 | 0.039793 | 0. | 0.143838 |
|  | 1301021407 | 20,113 | 12,214,122 | 0.315546 | 0.078754 | 0.161187 | 0.469905 |
|  | 1301021408 | 20,385 | 12,336,261 | 0.495401 | 0.10529 | 0.289032 | 0.701770 |
|  | 1301021409 | 19,965 | 12,010,977 | 0.332658 | 0.069442 | 0.196550 | 0.468766 |
|  | 1301030305 | 18,990 | 3,803,426 | 23.53498 | 1.343817 | 20.9011 | 26.16886 |
|  | 1301030306 | 19,469 | 3,905,582 | 21.15258 | 1.247775 | 18.70694 | 23.59822 |
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| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated <br> Percent <br> Survival | Standard <br> Error | Lower <br> $95 \%$ <br> Conf. <br> Interval | Upper <br> $95 \%$ <br> Conf. <br> Interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cannery Creek | 1301021513 | 16,084 | $9,485,711$ | 0.364058 | 0.119929 | 0.128997 | 0.599122 |
|  | 1301021514 | 15,523 | $9,329,671$ | 0.425376 | 0.139545 | 0.151867 | 0.698886 |
|  | 1301021515 | 15,793 | $9,492,115$ | 1.464074 | 0.273948 | 0.927134 | 2.001013 |
|  | 1310130101 | 15,691 | $9,429,516$ | 5.993971 | 0.525123 | 4.964729 | 7.023213 |
|  | 1301030102 | 45,797 | $9,494,035$ | 4.886346 | 0.482306 | 3.941026 | 5.831666 |
|  | 1301030103 | 16,252 | $9,767,701$ | 4.605903 | 0.460585 | 3.703154 | 5.508651 |
|  | 1301030104 | 16,434 | $9,876,333$ | 3.60213 | 0.402492 | 2.813245 | 4.391015 |
|  | 1301030105 | 15,961 | $9,580,712$ | 6.481187 | 0.548845 | 5.405451 | 7.556923 |
|  | 1301030106 | 13,569 | $8,160,820$ | 6.165203 | 0.551855 | 5.083567 | 7.24684 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1301030209 | 49,718 | $28,140,000$ | 1.67472 | 0.303499 | 1.079862 | 2.269578 |
|  | 1301030210 | 49,513 | $29,370,000$ | 1.309377 | 0.223177 | 0.871948 | 1.746805 |
|  | 1301030211 | 50,381 | $24,170,000$ | 2.017086 | 0.269197 | 1.489458 | 2.544713 |
|  | 1301030212 | 53,421 | $23,740,000$ | 8.600124 | 1.023131 | 6.594788 | 10.60546 |
|  | 1301030213 | 68,860 | $29,553,648$ | 8.166784 | 0.899825 | 6.403126 | 9.930443 |
|  | 1301030214 | 33,785 | $14,500,000$ | 7.397067 | 0.735555 | 5.955378 | 8.838755 |

## Appendix E.3. Percent survival by tag code of pink salmon returning to Prince William Sound in 1996.

| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated Percent Survival | Standard Error | Lower 95\% Confidence. Interval | Upper 95\% Confidence. Interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. F. Koernig | 1301030112 | 10,805 | 6,482,867 | 0.6273 | 0.2274 | 0.1815 | 1.0731 |
|  | 1301030208 | 5,484 | 3,290,381 | 0.8551 | 0.3639 | 0.1418 | 1.5684 |
|  | 1301030611 | 4,949 | 2,961,191 | 3.8069 | 0.8506 | 2.1340 | 5.4741 |
|  | 1301030612 | 5,056 | 3,024,130 | 3.4228 | 0.8582 | 1.7408 | 5.1049 |
|  | 1301030613 | 12,844 | 7,706,875 | 1.4195 | 0.4634 | 0.5112 | 2.3278 |
|  | 1301030614 | 13,227 | 7,935,957 | 1.8131 | 0.4983 | 0.8365 | 2.7898 |
|  | 1301030615 | 13,150 | 7,890,002 | 2.5186 | 0.5286 | 1.4825 | 3.5547 |
|  | 1301030701 | 13,267 | 7,959,660 | 1.8989 | 0.4217 | 1.0724 | 2.7254 |
|  | 1301030702 | 11,523 | 6,914,076 | 2.9554 | 0.5969 | 1.7854 | 4.1253 |
|  | 1301030703 | 11,489 | 6,896,169 | 1.8450 | 0.3621 | 1.1353 | 2.5547 |
|  | 1301030704 | 11,568 | 6,940,882 | 1.7759 | 0.4081 | 0.9761 | 2.5757 |
|  | 1301030705 | 11,971 | 7,182,752 | 1.8385 | 0.5290 | 0.8017 | 2.8753 |
|  | 1301030706 | 11,497 | 6,898,064 | 1.3965 | 0.3246 | 0.7604 | 2.0326 |
|  | 1301030707 | 11,596 | 6,884,266 | 2.0239 | 0.3855 | 1.2683 | 2.7794 |
|  | 1301030708 | 10,712 | 6,427,763 | 1.9541 | 0.5675 | 0.8419 | 3.0663 |
|  | 1301030709 | 10,362 | 6,217,053 | 1.4790 | 0.3808 | 0.7326 | 2.2253 |
|  | 1301030710 | 11,624 | 6,974,024 | 0.6808 | 0.2419 | 0.2067 | 1.1549 |
| W. H. Noerenberg | 1301030412 | 18,306 | 11,204,511 | 3.7630 | 0.6002 | 2.5866 | 4.9393 |
|  | 1301030413 | 19,685 | 11,784,356 | 4.2798 | 0.6263 | 3.0522 | 5.5074 |
|  | 1301030414 | 19,554 | 11,835,217 | 3.6413 | 0.6085 | 2.4487 | 4.8339 |
|  | 1301030415 | 19,626 | 11,858,128 | 3.8029 | 0.5899 | 2.6466 | 4.9592 |
|  | 1301030501 | 19,655 | 11,965,054 | 2.3725 | 0.4245 | 1.5405 | 3.2044 |
|  | 1301030502 | 19,615 | 11,910,616 | 2.3392 | 0.4835 | 1.3916 | 3.2868 |
|  | 1301030503 | 21,607 | 12,939,147 | 1.8215 | 0.3846 | 1.0678 | 2.5753 |
|  | 1301030504 | 20,170 | 12,045,477 | 2.2398 | 0.4491 | 1.3596 | 3.1199 |
|  | 1301030505 | 20,192 | 12,055,098 | 2.4580 | 0.4506 | 1.5748 | 3.3412 |
|  | 1301030506 | 20,258 | 12,094,688 | 3.0890 | 0.5150 | 2.0796 | 4.0985 |
|  | 1301030507 | 19,983 | 12,032,630 | 3.4294 | 0.5377 | 2.3755 | 4.4833 |
|  | 1301030508 | 20,160 | 12,041,789 | 3.6520 | 0.5534 | 2.5673 | 4.7366 |
|  | 1301030509 | 20,152 | 12,058,282 | 4.0573 | 0.6107 | 2.8603 | 5.2544 |
|  | 1301030510 | 11,518 | 6,723,354 | 2.6206 | 0.5475 | 1.5475 | 3.6936 |
|  | 1301030511 | 5,443 | 3,153,255 | 8.0870 | 1.7299 | 4.6964 | 11.4777 |
|  | 1301030512 | 5,346 | 3,162,934 | 6.9855 | 1.4687 | 4.1069 | 9.8641 |
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| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated <br> Percent <br> Survival | Standard <br> Error | Lower 95\% <br> Confidence. <br> Interval | Upper 95\% <br> Confidence. <br> Interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cannery Creek | 1301030903 | 15,972 | $9,557,693$ | 4.9891 | 0.9055 | 3.2144 | 6.7638 |
|  | 1301030904 | 16,382 | $9,791,611$ | 3.9179 | 0.6266 | 2.6898 | 5.1460 |
|  | 1301030905 | 16,244 | $9,699,256$ | 2.5472 | 0.5084 | 1.5508 | 3.5436 |
|  | 1301030906 | 16,740 | $10,028,649$ | 2.4096 | 0.4786 | 1.4715 | 3.3476 |
|  | 1301030907 | 16,366 | $9,833,723$ | 2.6805 | 0.5191 | 1.6630 | 3.6980 |
|  | 1301030908 | 16,661 | $9,865,363$ | 2.7152 | 0.4314 | 1.8696 | 3.5607 |
|  | 1301030909 | 16,345 | $9,827,507$ | 6.2311 | 0.7479 | 4.7652 | 7.6971 |
|  | 1301030910 | 16,785 | $10,026,368$ | 4.4486 | 0.5800 | 3.3118 | 5.5853 |
|  | 1301030911 | 16,480 | $9,864,051$ | 5.5536 | 0.7644 | 4.0553 | 7.0519 |
|  | 1301030912 | 16,394 | $9,831,138$ | 3.9557 | 0.5473 | 2.8830 | 5.0284 |
|  | 1301030913 | 16,668 | $10,101,033$ | 3.1075 | 0.5214 | 2.0856 | 4.1294 |
|  | 1301030914 | 16,247 | $9,765,141$ | 3.1258 | 0.5488 | 2.0501 | 4.2016 |
|  | 1301030915 | 16,094 | $9,610,718$ | 1.5995 | 0.3718 | 0.8708 | 2.3282 |
|  | 1301031001 | 4,176 | $2,537,200$ | 1.8674 | 0.7923 | 0.3145 | 3.4202 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1301030602 | 38,238 | $24,064,548$ | 3.4483 | 0.3090 | 2.8426 | 4.0540 |
|  | 1301030603 | 41,773 | $25,360,456$ | 4.1628 | 0.2939 | 3.5867 | 4.7389 |
|  | 1301030604 | 42,204 | $25,937,816$ | 3.9351 | 0.3346 | 3.2792 | 4.5909 |
|  | 1301030605 | 44,606 | $26,999,046$ | 2.6309 | 0.2227 | 2.1945 | 3.0674 |
|  | 1301030606 | 45,160 | $27,148,395$ | 3.1727 | 0.2822 | 2.6197 | 3.7258 |
|  | 1301030607 | 40,824 | $24,333,581$ | 2.3821 | 0.2613 | 1.8699 | 2.8943 |
|  | 1301030608 | 52,218 | $31,917,113$ | 5.0820 | 0.3011 | 4.4918 | 5.6722 |
|  | 1301030609 | 32,811 | $19,610,175$ | 2.6692 | 0.2591 | 2.1613 | 3.1771 |

## Appendix E.4. Percent survival by tag code of pink salmon returning to Prince William Sound in 1997.

| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated Percent Survival | Standard Error | Lower 95\% Confidence. Interval | Upper 95\% Confidence. Interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. F. Koernig | 1301031315 | 17,818 | 10,768,841 | 9.200 | 2.138 | 5.009 | 13.390 |
|  | 1301031401 | 16,976 | 10,374,384 | 8.145 | 2.290 | 3.656 | 12.634 |
|  | 1301031402 | 17,090 | 10,325,538 | 7.886 | 1.896 | 4.169 | 11.603 |
|  | 1301031403 | 18,284 | 10,912,648 | 6.464 | 1.602 | 3.324 | 9.604 |
|  | 1301031404 | 18,130 | 10,626,187 | 6.419 | 1.688 | 3.109 | 9.728 |
|  | 1301031405 | 14,476 | 8,312,086 | 5.549 | 1.858 | 1.907 | 9.191 |
|  | 1301031406 | 15,080 | 8,638,583 | 4.660 | 1.538 | 1.645 | 7.675 |
|  | 1301031407 | 14,990 | 8,594,441 | 4.093 | 1.547 | 4.060 | 7.126 |
|  | 1301031408 | 15,855 | 9,745,337 | 5.223 | 4.395 | 2.489 | 7.956 |
|  | 1301031409 | 13,319 | 7,877,679 | 1.956 | 0.758 | 0.471 | 3.441 |
|  | 1301031410 | 6,857 | 4,088,687 | 6.208 | 2.977 | 0.373 | 12.042 |
|  | 1301031411 | 6,955 | 4,150,370 | 4.336 | 2.442 | 0 | 9.123 |
|  | 1301031412 | 7,268 | 4,222,195 | 5.754 | 2.578 | 0.702 | 10.806 |
| W. H. Noerenberg | 1301031202 | 4,957 | 2,851,883 | 4.828 | 2.687 | 0 | 10.095 |
|  | 1301031203 | 5,050 | 2,996,758 | 1.556 | 0.610 | 0.361 | 2.751 |
|  | 1301031204 | 4,731 | 2,850,133 | 4.031 | 1.247 | 1.588 | 6.474 |
|  | 1301031205 | 4,945 | 2,689,583 | 2.729 | 2.181 | 0 | 7.004 |
|  | 1301031206 | 12,273 | 7,146,802 | 3.159 | 1.016 | 1.168 | 5.151 |
|  | 1301031207 | 11,711 | 7,131,155 | 3.180 | 0.703 | 1.803 | 4.558 |
|  | 1301031208 | 12,371 | 6,768,978 | 3.955 | 0.821 | 2.345 | 5.564 |
|  | 1301031209 | 11,649 | 6,958,899 | 3.190 | 0.634 | 1.949 | 4.432 |
|  | 1301031210 | 11,758 | 7,089,362 | 2.716 | 0.652 | 4.438 | 3.994 |
|  | 1301031211 | 11,677 | 7,010,355 | 2.456 | 0.569 | 1.342 | 3.571 |
|  | 1301031212 | 11,247 | 6,737,469 | 3.906 | 1.315 | 1.328 | 6.484 |
|  | 1301031213 | 11,863 | 7,093,496 | 3.492 | 0.743 | 2.034 | 4.949 |
|  | 1301031214 | 10,748 | 6,400,600 | 3.908 | 0.731 | 2.475 | 5.341 |
|  | 1301031215 | 11,674 | 6,922,926 | 3.112 | 0.914 | 1.319 | 4.904 |
|  | 1301031301 | 12,664 | 7,585,848 | 4.078 | 1.267 | 1.595 | 6.562 |
|  | 1301031302 | 12,115 | 7,173,971 | 3.676 | 0.659 | 2.383 | 4.968 |
|  | 1301031303 | 12,266 | 7,227,585 | 3.917 | 0.764 | 2.419 | 5.415 |
|  | 1301031304 | 12,368 | 7,320,089 | 2.954 | 0.623 | 1.733 | 4.174 |
|  | 1301031305 | 12,319 | 7,304,017 | 1.894 | 0.491 | 0.930 | 2.857 |
|  | 1301031306 | 12,309 | 7,310,726 | 2.996 | 0.632 | 1.757 | 4.234 |
|  | 1301031307 | 11,967 | 7,342,976 | 3.105 | 0.697 | 1.738 | 4.471 |
|  | 1301031308 | 12,253 | 7,372,255 | 2.544 | 0.520 | 1.526 | 3.563 |
|  | 1301031309 | 12,138 | 7,288,100 | 3.369 | 1.175 | 1.065 | 5.673 |
|  | 1301031310 | 13,372 | 7,998,210 | 0.732 | 0.303 | 0.137 | 1.326 |
|  | 1301031311 | 12,620 | 7,757,000 | 1.422 | 0.485 | 0.472 | 2.372 |
|  | 1301031312 | 12,085 | 7,179,817 | 1.705 | 0.416 | 0.890 | 2.519 |
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| Origin | Tag Code | \# Tagged | \# Released | Estimated <br> Percent <br> Survival | Standard <br> Error | Lower 95\% <br> Confidence. <br> Interval | Upper 95\% <br> Confidence. <br> Interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cannery Creek | 1301031413 | 16,086 | $9,615,650$ | 4.330 | 0.644 | 3.067 | 5.592 |
|  | 1301031414 | 16,557 | $9,934,444$ | 3.107 | 0.467 | 2.192 | 4.023 |
|  | 1301031415 | 16,632 | $9,971,524$ | 4.349 | 0.788 | 3.105 | 6.192 |
|  | 1301031501 | 16,623 | $9,978,551$ | 3.857 | 0.680 | 2.524 | 5.190 |
|  | 1301031502 | 16,636 | $9,973,804$ | 2.028 | 0.446 | 1.154 | 2.902 |
|  | 1301031503 | 16,628 | $10,291,792$ | 2.958 | 0.495 | 1.989 | 3.928 |
|  | 1301031504 | 16,477 | $10,764,086$ | 4.672 | 0.956 | 2.798 | 3.546 |
|  | 1301031505 | 16,931 | $10,703,108$ | 3.193 | 0.502 | 2.210 | 4.176 |
|  | 1301031506 | 16,637 | $10,979,642$ | 4.387 | 0.723 | 2.970 | 5.803 |
|  | 1301031507 | 16,642 | $11,213,439$ | 2.277 | 0.838 | 0.634 | 3.920 |
|  | 1301031508 | 15,230 | $10,232,285$ | 2.182 | 0.417 | 1.364 | 3.000 |
|  | 1301031509 | 16,732 | $11,018,655$ | 1.872 | 0.394 | 1.100 | 2.645 |
|  | 1301031510 | 16,592 | $9,978,652$ | 1.752 | 0.391 | 0.987 | 2.518 |
|  | 1301031511 | 9,642 | $5,785,499$ | 2.053 | 0.637 | 0.804 | 3.302 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Solomon Gulch | 1301031113 | 53,278 | $31,830,481$ | 2.486 | 0.247 | 2.002 | 2.970 |
|  | 1301031114 | 53,562 | $31,989,818$ | 4.630 | 0.396 | 3.857 | 5.410 |
|  | 1301031115 | 136,086 | $80,464,628$ | 2.574 | 0.163 | 2.254 | 2.895 |
|  | 1301031201 | 133,277 | $78,803,400$ | 3.393 | 0.187 | 3.026 | 3.760 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The tagging rate of 1.00 was due to a group of tagged fish being inadvertently dumped into the wrong pen. The tag code was then voided and the tagged fish represented only themselves, resulting in a tagging rate of 1.0 . The next highest tagging rate was 0.005 .

