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#### Abstract

Knowledge of the inseason stock of origin, age, sex, and length of Chinook salmon early in their travel upriver is important for making well informed management decisions. The objective of this study was to obtain inseason genetic stock identification information and age, sex, and length data from the test fishery at Pilot Station sonar. A total of 650 Chinook salmon were sampled from the test fishery. The age, sex, and length composition of the harvest was $0.3 \%$ age$3,14.1 \%$ age-4, $68.4 \%$ age-5, $16.1 \%$ age- $6,1.1 \%$ age-7, $44.5 \%$ female, and an average of 721 mm in length. The proportion of the sample by strata that was of Canadian-origin ranged from $34 \%$ in strata 2 to $54 \%$ in strata 3; about $43 \%$ of the total Chinook Pilot Station test fishery catch was of Canadian-origin in 2016. The data generated from this project are important to assist managers in meeting treaty obligations. Due to the variability in Chinook salmon runs, management actions, and harvest, annual monitoring of the inseason Chinook salmon run is needed.


## Introduction

Effective management of Yukon River Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) stocks originating from Canada requires an understanding of the stock composition of the run as it enters the river. Canadian-origin Chinook salmon migrate through approximately 1,900 kilometers of fisheries in the Alaska portion of the drainage, and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF\&G) manages those fisheries with the goals of managing for sustainable yields, providing for subsistence uses, and ultimately to meet or exceed the Alaska-Yukon border spawning objective plus the midpoint of the Canadian guideline harvest range as defined in the Yukon River Salmon Agreement. An estimate of the Canadian-origin Chinook salmon run strength and migration timing is vital to ensuring appropriate management actions are taken to meet border escapement objectives. This project improves management of Yukon River Chinook salmon by providing inseason estimates of stock composition of Chinook salmon migrating past the mainstem sonar project near Pilot Station in the lower portion of the Yukon River during distinct pulses and contributes to the estimates of total run abundance post-season. The ADF\&G Gene Conservation Laboratory (GCL) creates inseason stock composition estimates using genotypes of samples from the sonar project test fishery in mixed stock analysis (MSA).

Genetic MSA of samples from the mainstem sonar project near Pilot Station offer fishery managers an important "first look" at the Canadian-origin Chinook salmon run strength and timing before those fish migrate through the majority of Alaska fisheries. No other assessment project along the Alaska portion of the drainage directly assesses the Canadian-origin stock of the Chinook salmon run on the Yukon River except the mainstem sonar project near the border at Eagle. Without genetic MSA at the mainstem sonar project near Pilot Station, fishery managers lack clear indication of Canadian-origin run strength and timing until fish arrive at Eagle, when the majority of the run has already passed through 1,200 miles of fisheries. Knowledge of Canadian-origin Chinook salmon run strength and timing early in the run and lower in the river allows more appropriate and timely management actions to ensure escapement and harvest sharing objectives will be met in a given year.
Genetic MSA has been conducted since 2005 on the Yukon River and has provided essential information to fishery managers inseason. Due to statewide budget reductions for ADF\&G in 2016, there are no funds for further genetic analysis on the Yukon; therefore, this was the first year seeking R\&E funding to continue providing essential data for effective inseason management. While historical data could be used to estimate the stock composition of the run each year, inter-annual shifts in stock composition result in inaccurate inseason estimates of Canadian-origin Chinook salmon run strength and timing when assuming historical stock proportions. It is critical to have an annual inseason tool that assesses the Canadian-origin

Chinook salmon stock lower in the river in order to most effectively manage this complex fishery for escapement objectives.

## Objectives

The objective of this study was as follows:

1) Estimate the inseason pulse stock composition and post season total run stock composition of Yukon River Chinook salmon at Pilot Station such that estimates of 20 percent or greater have a coefficient of variation (CV) of 20 percent or less.

## Study Area

The Yukon River watershed exceeds $855,000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, is the fourth largest drainage basin in North America, and discharges over $200 \mathrm{~km}^{3}$ of water per year into the Bering Sea (Brabets et al. 2000). As the longest river in Alaska, the distance between the mouths of the Yukon River to its headwaters in British Columbia, Canada is more than $3,000 \mathrm{~km}$. All five species of Pacific salmon Oncorhynchus spp. enter the Yukon River to spawn each year. Genetic tissue samples were collected at the sonar project near Pilot Station, approximately 200 river kilometers inland(Figure 1).

## Methods

## Fishery Sampling

Sample collection occurred in District 2 in the test fishery at the mainstem sonar project near Pilot Station (Figure 1). The test fishery was used to apportion sonar counts by species and used a suite of 8 gillnet mesh sizes, ranging from 2.75 inch to 8.5 inch stretch mesh, designed to be representative of the entire run passing through the river. Axillary process tissue samples and age sex length (ASL) data were collected in proportion to Chinook salmon passage as estimated by the sonar. Due to the nature of the test fishery, samples are collected in proportion to passage rate. Samples were self-weighted because as test fish catches increase, passage at the sonar also increases and vice versa. All Chinook salmon caught in the test fishery were sampled and expected to adequately represent the Chinook salmon run passing the sonar during each pulse.

Chinook salmon caught in the test fishery were sampled and axillary processes were collected and stored in individual vials partially filled with silica desiccant beads for drying and preserving the samples. Scales were mounted on gum cards. Data sheets recorded mesh size, date, fish number, scale card number, sampler name, and genetic vial number for each sample. Samples were collected using the following protocol:

- Sex was determined by visual inspection as all fish were released alive whenever possible.
- Length was measured from mid-eye to fork of tail (to the nearest mm) using a rigid meter stick.
- Three scales were collected from the left side of the fish, 2-3 rows of scales above the lateral line, and mounted on pre-printed gum cards.
- One axillary process was clipped from each fish and placed in an individual vial with desiccant beads.
All data and samples were shipped to ADF\&G for processing. ADF\&G staff determined the age of samples from scale pattern analysis using standard methods (Eaton, 2015).

For inseason analyses, samples were grouped in strata to represent distinct pulses of Chinook salmon passing through the test fisheries and analyzed promptly to inform inseason management decisions. Pulses were identified by increases in catch per unit effort (CPUE) for a sustained
period of 3 to 5 days followed by a substantial decrease in CPUE. A stratum was identified when pulses were grouped together or to include samples before, between or after pulses in order to obtain the necessary sample size. Samples were flown to the ADF\&G Gene Conservation Laboratory (GCL) in Anchorage, analyzed and reported to fishery managers within 36 hours of receipt at the GCL.

## Laboratory Analysis

Genetic data was collected from the fishery samples as individual multi-locus genotypes for at least 42 SNPs (Table 1) following a well-established protocol. These markers have been used by ADF\&G for Yukon Chinook projects since 2004 (DeCovich and Templin 2009; DeCovich and Howard 2010, 2011; Templin et al. 2006a, 2006b, 2006c). Genomic DNA was extracted using a NucleoSpin® 96 Tissue Kit by Macherey-Nagel (Düren, Germany). Chinook salmon samples were genotyped for selected SNPs using Taqman chemistry. Genotypic data is stored in an Oracle database (LOKI) on a network drive maintained by ADF\&G computer services.

Genotypic data collected by this study was subject to several quality control checks. Prior to MSA, we conducted two statistical quality control analyses to ensure that only quality genotypic data were included in the estimation of stock compositions. First, we excluded individuals missing genotypes for $20 \%$ or more of loci, because these individuals likely have poor-quality DNA. The inclusion of individuals with poor-quality DNA could introduce genotyping errors and reduce the accuracy and precision of MSA. Second, individuals identified with duplicate genotypes were removed from further analyses. The individual with the most missing data from each duplicate pair was removed. Laboratory quality control measures included postseason reanalysis of $8 \%$ of each collection for all markers to ensure that genotypes were reproducible and to identify laboratory errors and measure rates of inconsistencies during repeated analyses.

## Mixed Stock Analysis

Stock compositions of fishery mixtures was estimated using the program BAYES (Pella and Masuda 2001). The Bayesian method of MSA estimates the proportion of stocks caught within each fishery using four pieces of information: 1) a baseline of allele frequencies for each population, 2) the grouping of populations into the reporting groups desired for MSA, 3) prior information about the stock proportions of the fishery, and 4) the genotypes of fish sampled from the fishery.
The baseline of allele frequencies for Chinook salmon populations has evolved over the past several years to include 36 populations (Table 2) genotyped at the 42 SNPs used by this study. This baseline allows 5 reporting groups to be identified in mixture samples when sample sizes are at least 200 fish. The baseline has been tested using proof tests. In these tests, the genotype data from 200 fish are removed from the baseline, and the stock composition of this test mixture sample is estimated using the baseline of remaining fish. We repeated this test five times using a random set of individuals drawn from five reporting groups in proportion to what has been historically observed in Pilot Station test fisheries.

For each fishery mixture, we ran five independent Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains of 40,000 iterations with different starting values and discarded the first 20,000 iterations to remove the influence of the initial start values. In order to assess among-chain convergence, we examined the Gelman-Rubin shrink factors computed for all stock groups in BAYES (Gelman and Rubin 1992). If a shrink factor for any stock group in a mixture is greater than 1.2, we reanalyzed the mixture with 80,000 iterations. We combined the last 20,000 iterations of each of the five chains to form the posterior distribution and tabulated means, $90 \%$ credibility intervals, and standard deviations from a total of 100,000 iterations.

Stock composition estimates were reported for 3 hierarchical levels when sample sizes were larger than 200 as follows: 1) country of origin (U.S and Canada), 2) broad scale (Lower Yukon, Middle Yukon, and Canada), and 3) fine scale (Lower Yukon, Koyukuk, Tanana, Upper U.S. Yukon, and Canada). When sample sizes were smaller than 200, only the first 2 levels of the hierarchy were reported. Primarily, this study focused on the country-of-origin reporting group, as this is most crucial for obtaining treaty objectives. The broad-scale and fine-scale estimates were given when sample sizes were sufficient. We incorporated each sample in post-season estimates of run reconstruction by weighting each set of stock composition estimates by the passage estimate for that pulse.
Assumptions

1. Samples collected at Pilot station are representative of all of the mixed stocks passing the sonar.
2. The ASL and stock compositions of samples were a function of the passage rate, gear, and time.

## Results

A total of 650 Chinook salmon were sampled from various gillnet mesh sizes over three strata starting May 30 through July 6 (Table 3). The number of samples obtained per stratum ranged from 126 in stratum three to 331 in stratum two.

Age, sex, and length were successfully determined for 580 (89\%) of the Chinook salmon sampled. The ASL composition of the Pilot Station sonar Chinook salmon in the test fishery varied among strata and gear (Tables 4 and 5). Overall ASL composition of the sampled fish was $0.3 \%$ age-3, $14.1 \%$ age- $4,68.4 \%$ age- $5,16.0 \%$ age- $6,1.0 \%$ age- $7,44.5 \%$ female, and an average of 721 mm in length (Table 4). Age by mesh size ranged from an average of 4.3 years old in the 2.75-inch stretch mesh gillnets to 5.3 years old in the 8.5 -inch stretch mesh gillnets and fish length tended to increase with mesh size (Table 5).

Genetic MSA was successfully completed using 577 (89\%) of the samples collected in 2016 Table 3). Genetic MSA on the first stratum (including early fish and the first pulse) of Chinook salmon, based on 178 samples (May 30 to June 14), estimated $52 \%$ of the sampled fish were of Canadian-origin (Table 6, Figures 2 and 3). Genetic MSA on the second stratum (including most of the second and third pulse) of Chinook salmon (June 15-25), based on a sample size of 288 fish, estimated $34 \%$ of the sampled fish were of Canadian-origin. Genetic MSA on the third strata (fourth pulse and late fish) of Chinook salmon (June 26-July 6), based on a sample size of 111 fish, estimated $54 \%$ of the sampled fish were of Canadian-origin. Across all strata, roughly $43 \%$ of the Chinook salmon sampled in the test fishery were of Canadian-origin.
The weighted estimate of Canadian-origin Chinook salmon based on genetic MSA of fish sampled in the test fishery and passage by strata at the sonar project near Pilot Station was approximately 76,700 fish (Table 7). Stratum one estimated passage at the sonar was 37,511 Chinook and the weighted Canadian-origin passage was estimated to be 19,356 fish. Stratum two estimated passage was 86,622 Chinook and the weighted Canadian-origin passage was estimated to be 29,105 fish. Stratum 3 estimated passage was 52,765 Chinook and the weighted Canadianorigin passage was estimated to be 28,282 fish.

## Discussion

This study's sampling design was developed in the context of both the representativeness of samples and the effect of sample size on the accuracy and precision of estimates. Precision and accuracy of stock composition estimates are affected primarily by the representativeness of the genetic baseline and sample sizes. The Yukon River Panel’s Joint Technical Committee's (JTC)

Subcommittee on Stock Identification recommended specific criteria for the precision and accuracy of stock composition estimates used for the management of Yukon River Chinook salmon. The JTC recommended that stock composition estimates of 20 percent or greater have a coefficient of variation of $20 \%$ or less and if estimator performance is to be assessed using simulation techniques, it was recommended that the Relative Root Mean Squared Error (RRMSE) be $20 \%$ or less (JTC 1997). The baseline used by this study met these criteria for Chinook salmon. The ability of a genetic baseline to discriminate stocks in MSA was critical to the success of this project. Similar criteria are also used for GSI studies on trans-boundary rivers in southeast Alaska and British Columbia.

We only achieved the desired sampling goal of 200 fish per stratum once. However, we were able to process samples from over 100 fish in strata one and three which allowed the ability to provide country of origin and broad scale reporting group estimates for all three strata but fine scale estimates for only the second stratum. In addition, samples from stratum two included fish from pulse two and three in order to reach the desired number of samples. The lower than anticipated sample sizes were due to a low return of Chinook salmon and issues with data quality. Quality control screenings occurred throughout the period of data collection and analysis; however, some issues with data quality still arose. The degradation of tissue samples occurred and, as a result, not all tissue samples were included in genetic MSA. While some loss of samples during ASL and tissue collection in the field is expected, steps will be taken to keep the loss at a minimum. In 2017, genetic tissue samples will be stored in ethanol instead of silica beads to prevent tissue degradation.

The genetic MSA results from Pilot station performed well in estimating the abundance of Canadian origin Chinook salmon in 2016. The genetic MSA estimate of Canadian-origin Chinook was approximately 76,700 fish, which was similar to the actual total Canadian-origin estimate of 83,140 based on the Eagle sonar estimate and Canadian harvest above and below the sonar (Table 7, JTC 2017). The Eagle sonar estimate was contained in $90 \%$ credible intervals of the stratified MSA estimates (68,133-85,022).

The main objective of this project is to identify country of origin from samples collected from the test fishery at Pilot Station sonar to inform management decisions. Even though we were able to break results down to broad scale reporting groups, for the purposes of this report, only country of origin was reported

Findings from this study apply directly to improving and implementing the US/Canada Yukon River Salmon Agreement management regime in order to address harvest sharing agreements as outlined in Appendix 2 of Chapter 8 of the Pacific Salmon Treaty. Genetic MSA of samples from the mainstem sonar project near Pilot Station offered fishery managers an important early indication of the Canadian-origin Chinook salmon run strength and timing before those fish migrated through the majority of Alaska fisheries. Knowing the Canadian-origin Chinook salmon run strength and timing early in the run and lower in the river allowed for more appropriate and timely management actions to ensure escapement and harvest sharing objectives were met.
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## Tables and Figures

Table 1. Single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) markers used for this study.

| Locus | Source |
| :---: | :---: |
| GTH2B-550 | GAPs locus |
| NOD1 | GAPs locus |
| Ots_E2-275 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_arf-188 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_AsnRS-60 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_ETIF1A | GAPs locus |
| Ots_FARSLA-220 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_FGF6A | Unpublished |
| Ots_GH2 | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_GPDH-338 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_GPH-318 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_GST-207 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_hnRNPL-533 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_HSP90B-100 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_IGF-I.1-76 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_Ikaros-250 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_il-1racp-166 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_LEI-292 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_MHC1 | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_MHC2 | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_ZNF330-181 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_LWSop-638 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_SWS1op-182 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_P450 | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_P53 | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_Prl2 | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_ins-115 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_SClkF2R2-135 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_SERPC1-209 | Smith et al. 2007 |
| Ots_RFC2-558 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_SL | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_TAPBP | GAPs locus |
| Ots_Tnsf | Smith et al. 2005b |
| Ots_u202-161 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_u211-85 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_U212-158 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_u4-92 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_u6-75 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| Ots_Zp3b-215 | Smith et al. 2005a |
| RAG3 | GAPs locus |
| S7-1 | GAPs locus |
| unkn526 | GAPs locus |

Table 2. Chinook salmon collections from the Yukon River drainage organized hierarchically into reporting groups for genetic mixed stock analysis.

| Country | Broad scale Fine scale | Population | Year(s) | Sample size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lower Yukon |  |  |  |
|  | Lower Yukon |  |  |  |
|  |  | Andreafsky River | 2003 | 202 |
|  |  | Anvik River | 2007 | 58 |
|  |  | Nulato River | 2012 | 51 |
|  |  | Kateel River | 2002, 2008, 2012 | 174 |
|  |  | Gisasa River | 2001 | 78 |
|  |  | Tozitna River | 2002, 2003 | 278 |
|  | Middle Yukon |  |  |  |
|  | Middle Yukon |  |  |  |
|  |  | S. Fork Koyukuk River | 2003 | 49 |
|  |  | Henshaw Creek | 2001, 2007 | 180 |
|  |  | Kantishna River | 2005 | 187 |
|  |  | Chatanika River | 2001, 2007 | 43 |
|  |  | Chena River | 2001 | 176 |
|  |  | Salcha River | 2005 | 188 |
|  |  | Goodpaster River | 2006, 2007, 2011 | 79 |
|  | Upper U.S. Yukon |  |  |  |
|  |  | Beaver Creek | 1997 | 91 |
|  |  | Chandalar River | 2002, 2003, 2004 | 162 |
|  |  | Sheenjek River | 2002, 2004, 2006, 2011 | 69 |
| Canada |  | Colleen River | 2011 | 24 |
|  | Canada |  |  |  |
|  | Canada |  |  |  |
|  |  | Kandik River | 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 | 56 |
|  |  | Chandindu River | 2001 | 146 |
|  |  | Klondike River | 2001, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2011 | 144 |
|  |  | Porcupine River - Old Crow | $2007$ | 127 |
|  |  | Stewart River | $\text { 1997, } 2007$ | 102 |
|  |  | Mayo River | 1997, 2003, 2011 | 72 |
|  |  | Pelly River | 1996, 1997 | 107 |
|  |  | Blind Creek | 2003, 2007, 2008 | 218 |
|  |  | Tin Cup Creek | 2003, 2009, 2010, 2011 | 132 |
|  |  | Mainstem at Minto | 2007 | 97 |
|  |  | Tatchun Creek | 1987, 1997, 2002, 2003 | 160 |
|  |  | Nordenskiold River | 2003 | 55 |
|  |  | Little Salmon | 1987, 1997, 2007, 2010 | 237 |
|  |  | Big Salmon | 1987, 1997, 2007 | 176 |
|  |  | Nisutlin River | 1987, 1997 | 55 |
|  |  | Teslin River | 2007, 2009, 2010, 2011 | 198 |
|  |  | Morley River | 1997, 2002, 2003, 2009, 2010 | 46 |
|  |  | Takhini River | 1997, 2003 | 96 |
|  |  | Whitehorse Hatchery | 1985, 1987, 1997, 2010 | 303 |
|  |  |  |  | 4616 |

Table 3. Number of Chinook salmon sampled (N) by strata and the number and percent (\%) of those samples that were successfully used for genetics and ASL composition estimation, 2016.

| Stratum | Dates | N | Genetics |  | ASL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Processed | Percent | Processed | Percent |
| 1 | 5/31-6/14 | 193 | 178 | 92.2 | 173 | 89.6 |
| 2 | 6/15-6/25 | 331 | 288 | 87.0 | 290 | 87.6 |
| 3 | 6/26-7/06 | 126 | 111 | 88.1 | 117 | 92.9 |
| Total | 5/31-7/06 | 650 | 577 | 88.8 | 580 | 89.2 |

Table 4. Age, sex, and length (mm) composition of Yukon River Chinook salmon sampled in the Pilot Station sonar test fishery, 2016.

|  | Brood Year | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strata | Age | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 |  |
| $\text { May } 30 \text { - June } 14$ | Male n | 0 | 17 | 70 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 99 |
|  | Female $n$ | 0 | 5 | 49 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 74 |
|  | Total $n$ | 0 | 22 | 119 | 26 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 173 |
|  | Male \% | 0.0 | 9.8 | 40.5 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 57.2 |
|  | Female \% | 0.0 | 2.9 | 28.3 | 9.8 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 42.8 |
|  | Total \% | 0.0 | 12.7 | 68.8 | 15.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Male Mean Length |  | 612 | 723 | 743 | 708 | 932 |  | 707 |
|  | Min of Length |  | 495 | 570 | 660 | 697 | 932 |  | 495 |
|  | Max of Length |  | 670 | 837 | 868 | 718 | 932 |  | 932 |
|  | SD |  | 37 | 60 | 61 | 15 |  |  | 74 |
|  | n | 0 | 17 | 70 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 99 |
|  | Female Mean Length |  | 657 | 731 | 822 | 710 | 875 |  | 750 |
|  | Min of Length |  | 601 | 590 | 713 | 710 | 857 |  | 590 |
|  | Max of Length |  | 798 | 894 | 900 | 710 | 892 |  | 900 |
|  | SD |  | 81 | 53 | 54 |  | 25 |  | 73 |
|  | n | 0 | 5 | 49 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 74 |
|  | Brood Year | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | Total |
| June 15 - June 25 | Age | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 |  |
|  | Male n | 0 | 46 | 101 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 157 |
|  | Female $n$ | 0 | 6 | 94 | 27 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 133 |
|  | Total n | 0 | 52 | 195 | 35 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 290 |
|  | Male \% | 0.0 | 15.9 | 34.8 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 54.1 |
|  | Female \% | 0.0 | 2.1 | 32.4 | 9.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 45.9 |
|  | Total \% | 0.0 | 17.9 | 67.2 | 12.1 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
|  | Male Mean Length |  | 619 | 698 | 730 | 663 |  | 678 | 676 |
|  | Min of Length |  | 430 | 364 | 575 | 663 |  | 678 | 364 |
|  | Max of Length |  | 903 | 875 | 841 | 663 |  | 678 | 903 |
|  | SD |  | 77 | 77 | 84 |  |  |  | 85 |
|  | n | 0 | 46 | 101 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 157 |
|  | Female Mean Length |  | 723 | 746 | 810 | 783 | 841 |  | 760 |
|  | Min of Length |  | 550 | 638 | 649 | 698 | 781 |  | 550 |
|  | Max of Length |  | 864 | 906 | 915 | 852 | 900 |  | 915 |
|  | SD |  | 121 | 55 | 64 | 76 | 84 |  | 67 |
|  | n | 0 | 6 | 94 | 27 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 133 |

Table 4. Page 2 of 2.

|  | Brood Year | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strata | Age | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 |  |
| June 26 - July 6 | Male n | 2 | 8 | 44 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
|  | Female n | 0 | 0 | 39 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
|  | Total n | 2 | 8 | 83 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 |
|  | Male \% | 1.7 | 6.8 | 37.6 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.4 |
|  | Female \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 43.6 |
|  | Total \% | 1.7 | 6.8 | 70.9 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Male Mean Length | 348 | 564 | 722 | 788 |  |  |  | 703 |
|  | Min of Length | 320 | 482 | 632 | 692 |  |  |  | 320 |
|  | Max of Length | 376 | 604 | 857 | 960 |  |  |  | 960 |
|  | SD | 40 | 43 | 51 | 80 |  |  |  | 104 |
|  | n | 2 | 8 | 44 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
|  | Female Mean Length |  |  | 757 | 807 |  |  |  | 769 |
|  | Min of Length |  |  | 628 | 725 |  |  |  | 628 |
|  | Max of Length |  |  | 843 | 890 |  |  |  | 890 |
|  | SD |  |  | 49 | 52 |  |  |  | 54 |
|  | n | 0 | 0 | 39 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Strata | Brood Year | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | Total |
|  | Age | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 |  |
| Total | Male n | 2 | 71 | 215 | 29 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 322 |
|  | Female n |  | 11 | 182 | 56 | 5 | 4 |  | 258 |
|  | Total n | 2 | 82 | 397 | 85 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 580 |
|  | Male \% | 0.3 | 12.2 | 37.1 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 55.5 |
|  | Female \% | 0.0 | 1.9 | 31.4 | 9.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 44.5 |
|  | Total \% | 0.3 | 14.1 | 68.4 | 14.7 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
|  | Male Mean Length | 348 | 611 | 711 | 758 | 693 | 932 | 678 | 691 |
|  | Min of Length | 320 | 430 | 364 | 575 | 663 | 932 | 678 | 320 |
|  | Max of Length | 376 | 903 | 875 | 960 | 718 | 932 | 678 | 960 |
|  | SD | 40 | 68 | 68 | 77 | 28 |  |  | 87 |
|  | n | 2 | 71 | 215 | 29 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 322 |
|  | Female Mean Length |  | 693 | 744 | 813 | 768 | 813 |  | 759 |
|  | Min of Length |  | 550 | 590 | 649 | 698 | 649 |  | 550 |
|  | Max of Length |  | 864 | 906 | 915 | 852 | 915 |  | 915 |
|  | SD |  | 106 | 54 | 58 | 73 | 58 |  | 67 |
|  | n | 0 | 11 | 182 | 56 | 5 | 56 | 0 | 258 |

Table 5. Total number of samples ( N ), mean length ( mm ) with standard deviation (SD), mean age with standard deviation (SD), and percent female (\%) for Chinook salmon caught in test drift gillnets, by mesh size, 2016.

| Mesh | N | Length | SD | Age | SD | Percent Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.75 | 4 | 602 | 192.4 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 50.0 |
| 4.00 | 20 | 649 | 107.2 | 4.9 | 0.6 | 20.0 |
| 5.25 | 39 | 634 | 76.5 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 24.4 |
| 6.50 | 193 | 706 | 82.1 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 42.2 |
| 7.50 | 236 | 734 | 72.1 | 5.1 | 0.5 | 49.4 |
| 8.50 | 88 | 779 | 65.1 | 5.3 | 0.5 | 50.0 |
| Total | 580 | 721 | 86.0 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 44.3 |

Table 6. Results from genetic mixed stock analysis of Yukon River Chinook salmon sampled in the test fishery from the sonar project near Pilot Station, 2016.

|  |  |  | Reporting |  | $90 \%$ Confidence Interval |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strata | Dates | N | Group | Estimate | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | May 30 - June 14 | 178 | U.S. | 48.4 | 40.6 | 56.4 |
|  |  |  | Canada | 51.6 | 43.6 | 59.4 |
| 2 | June 15 - June 25 | 288 | U.S. | 66.4 | 59.5 | 73.8 |
|  |  |  | Canada | 33.6 | 26.2 | 40.5 |
| 3 | June 26 - July 6 | 111 | U.S. | 46.4 | 37.2 | 55.7 |
|  |  |  | Canada | 53.6 | 44.3 | 62.8 |
| Total | May 30 - July 6 | 577 | U.S. | 56.6 | 51.9 | 61.5 |
|  |  |  | Canada | 43.4 | 38.5 | 48.1 |

Table 7. Estimated Canadian-origin Chinook based on genetic Mixed-Stock-Analysis of fish sampled in the test fishery from the sonar project near Pilot Station, 2016.

| Strata <br> Dates | Passage <br> Estimates | Stratum Weight | Canadian Estimate |  | Proportion U.S. | Canadian origin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Proportion | S.E. |  |  |
| 5/30-6/14 | 37,511 | 0.21 | 51.6 | 0.00359 | 48.4 | 19,356 |
| 6/15-6/25 | 86,622 | 0.49 | 33.6 | 0.00256 | 66.4 | 29,105 |
| 6/26-8/24 | 52,765 | 0.30 | 53.6 | 0.00534 | 46.4 | 28,282 |
| Total | 176,898 | 1.00 | 43.4 | 0.00120 | 56.6 | 76,713 |



Figure 1. The Alaska portion of Yukon River with location of assessment projects and fishing districts.


Figure 2. Results of the genetic MSA of Chinook salmon by stratum. Error bars represent 90\% confidence intervals.


Figure 3. Daily Chinook salmon passage estimates at the sonar near Pilot Station, 2016.
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