F I N A L A G E N D A

1983 MARK MEETING

Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission

February 1, 1983
9:00 am - 4:00 pm

Commission Room
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
506 S.W. Mill Street
Portland, Oregon 97201

I. Preliminary Business

1. Introductions
2. Review of agenda; call for changes, additions, etc.

II. Report on high seas sampling program and PMFC request to INPFC to permit landing of incidental steelhead on motherships for sampling purposes. (Alex Wertheimer, NMFS-AK)

III. Proposed changes to 1982 Regional Agreements

1. Exemption from restriction on Ad clip use without CWT for Puget Sound, coastal Washington, and British Columbia steelhead stocks (see Attachments 1 and 2).
2. Request to accord northwest Indian tribes voting representation on the Mark Committee (note: also recommended by participants of 1982 CWT Recovery Workshop) (see Attachment 3)

IV. Review of RMPC CWT Recovery Report format

1. Usefulness of "Ad - No Tag" data in regional report (see Attachment 4)
2. Proposed escapement report section - structured by tag code rather than by fishery and areas within the fishery (see Attachment 5)
3. Include observed with estimated recoveries in Season Summary report (see Attachment 6)
4. Other suggested changes?

V. Discuss objectives, style, format, etc., of Chapters I and II of the Coded Wire Tagging Manual (see Attachment 7 for summary of reviewers' comments).

- Chapter I. Types of Marks, Regional Agreements, and Reporting Requirements
- Chapter II. Procedures for Stock Assessment Studies

(Copies of these chapters are enclosed)

VI. Discussion of how best to implement a coordinated and comprehensive sampling program for freshwater CWT recoveries.

VII. Alaskan proposal for surcharge on CWT purchases to assist recovery programs and the RMPC (see Attachment 8a and 8b).

VIII. Update on CWT technology

1. Agency reports on NWMT "tube tag detector" and the need to xray "no tag" heads
2. Need for double reading of recovered tags
3. Reseach and development report on binary tags - NW Marine Technology
4. Update on silicon chip tag technology

IX. Fin mark request allocations for 1983

Memorandum • PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

REPRESENTING THE STATES OF
ALASKA, CALIFORNIA, IDAHO, OREGON AND WASHINGTON

528 S.W. Mill Street, Portland, OR 97201
phone: (503) 229-5840

TO : 1983 Mark Meeting Participants **DATE:** January 14, 1983

FROM : John P. Harville, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Agenda and Discussion Documents for Feb. 1, 1983 Mark Meeting Commission Room, ODFW, 506 S.W. Mill Street, Portland, OR 97201

The enclosed agenda outlines a busy workday for us, starting at 9AM, Tuesday, February 1. Please review attachments and enclosures carefully in advance, so that we can move effectively over a considerable breadth of topics. Note particularly the attached letters referenced for Agenda items III.1, III.2, and VII, which we believe can be handled quickly if background documents have been read.

I have particular interest in and need for your advice regarding Agenda items IV and V, since these bear on allocation of funding and manpower resources for RMPC operations and for coordination of our regional service functions. Clearly it is time to re-examine our CWT Recovery report format (Agenda item IV) to determine if any space and time-consuming elements may be superfluous (cf. IV.1), whether significant additions or changes should be made (IV.2.-4.) etc. Ken will review these issues and questions with you.

Agenda item V relates to next steps in followup to our two 1982 CWT workshops--on tagging procedures and experimental design (March 31-April 2), and on tag recovery and data expansion (September 15-17). Summaries of the conclusions of those workshops were mailed some time ago, and you no doubt looked them over.

The goal of those two workshops was to achieve some general agreements on experimental design, project management, and reporting as basis for production of a manual outlining those procedures as guidelines for improved coordination of our CWT operations on a coastwide basis. Doug Neeley, a mathematician/statistician and special consultant to PMFC, undertook a first-cut rewrite of Workshop results into manual form. We have sent those first-cut efforts out to ten reviewers for detailed critiques and suggestions.

Enclosed for your general review as basis for discussion under Agenda item V are the first drafts of the first two chapters of this proposed CWT Manual. Chapter I, titled Types of Marks, Regional Agreements, and Reporting Requirements, is an updated and expanded modification of materials included in an earlier document produced by PMFC in June, 1981. Chapter II is Doug Neeley's draft of March Workshop materials relating to Stock Assessment Tagging and Releases.

Please review these two documents from your perspective as a potential user and and supervisor of other users, and in our discussion period for Agenda item V, advise us on such matter as:

- . potential usefulness to foster regional consistency
- . scope of materials - - any major omissions?
  (note that other chapters not yet provided will address multiple comparison tagging experiments, and recovery and data expansion programs)
- . organization
- . style
- . anything else which would help our next editing cut to produce a document of maximum usefulness

A summary of reviewers' comments on Chapter II is attached (see Attachment 7) for your perusal and assistance as you review and consider this chapter as a major component of the CWT Manual.

cc: Larry Six
Ken Johnson

JPH:dmw

JOHN SPELLMAN
Governor

FRANK LOCKARD
Director

Attachment 1

STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF GAME
600 North Capitol Way, GJ-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504 • (206) 753-5700

October 18, 1982

Dr. John P. Harville, Executive Director
Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission
528 S.W. Mill Street
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear John:

We have a problem and feel you are the best man to help us solve it. As you are aware, the adipose fin mark on salmon and steelhead has been "reserved" for a number of years by both the U.S. and Canada as the visible, external indicator of a coded-wire tagged fish. It is the only fin available on a salmon or steelhead which has a negligible regeneration rate and its removal is not detrimental to survival. However, these same unique characteristics of the adipose fin as a research tool also apply to its potential use as a valuable fishery management tool.

For steelhead resources in the Washington coastal and Puget Sound regions, we believe that the greatest long-term value of an adipose fin clip lies in its use to selectively manage the harvests of co-mingled hatchery and wild stocks. We have had to face the inevitable conclusion that these stocks simply cannot be fished at the same rate without seriously overfishing wild stocks or deliberately allowing a surplus of hatchery fish. These same stocks can provide valuable additional fishery benefits via a basic regulatory strategy allowing selective retention of fish without an adipose fin plus "catch-and-release" for those having an adipose fin.

This desirable management objective could be achieved with adipose-marked fish having coded-wire tags. However, the costs of marking and associated recovery programs would be about ten times or more than of an adipose clip alone. The adipose only marking can be done by existing hatchery personnel with only nominal local help. In some cases, this would be via volunteer help from interested sportmen's organizations. The added requirement of coded-wire tagging would make the costs prohibitive for use as a regular, line management tool. Thus, we are asking that steelhead runs in Washington coastal and Puget Sound rivers be exempted from the reservation for coded-wire tags. If exempted, we would examine each river system independently and confine the use of adipose marks to those situations offering definite potentials for increased fishery benefits. Research uses with coded-wire tags would not be precluded in this river-by-river planning process. (Note: It is my understanding that this reservation does not apply to resident trout where we have similar problems that can be solved by an adipose-only mark.)

One would not anticipate any significant problems for other Pacific coastal resource management agencies due to this limited geographic exclusion for steelhead only. Straying outside the region in question would be negligible and there are not mixed stock U.S. marine area fisheries where sampling problems would be encountered. Our proposal might add slightly to the number of "untagged" fish which might be recovered at some future date in Canadian marine areas or the Japanese high seas net fishery.

We are well aware of the extensive steelhead research work currently underway in the Columbia River system and are not seeking an exclusion in this region at the present time. Washington is attempting (on an experimental basis) to use the deformed dorsal fin as a management tool in our 1982 regulations for the Snake River steelhead fishery. Depressed wild stocks (returning at less than escapement objectives) are being protected by requiring anglers to release adult steelhead with dorsal fins measuring more than 2-1/4 inches in height. However, we feel that this approach will probably have only limited long-term application (if at all) and is much less desirable than an adipose mark. One major negative is the requirement for measuring a fin, which in itself will cause additional handling mortalities for wild stocks. In addition, the deformed dorsal becomes most usable as a management tool when juvenile fish are crowded and stressed in their rearing environment. The deformed dorsal will not be usable at all for many of our better fish cultural situations, particularly those involving large rearing ponds.

We solicit your advice on how to proceed in this matter. This could include our participation in any forum which you might deem productive such as the PMFC Salmon and Steelhead Committee meetings. Your help is genuinely appreciated.

Sincerely,

THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME

Frank

Frank R. Lockard
Director

FRL:mg

Province of
British Columbia

Ministry of
Environment

Fish and Wildlife Branch
Parliament Buildings
Victoria
British Columbia
V8V 1X4

Attachment 2

File: 1319

December 31, 1982

Dr. John P. Harville,
Executive Director,
Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission,
528 S.W. Mill Street,
Portland, Oregon.
U.S.A. 97201

Dear John:

At the February 1, 1983 Annual Mark Meeting of P.M.F.C. we will be proposing a C.W.T. exemption for winter steelhead similar to that being proposed by Washington Department of Game. I do not know how current you are on our management program in British Columbia, but I believe that we are at the "cutting edge" of steelhead management. Of course we have been in the favorable position of both profiting from the problems encountered by agencies to the south of us and starting a steelhead management program almost from scratch.

At present all 800,000(±) steelhead smolts released in British Columbia are nose-tagged and marked by removal of the adipose fin. We have followed this policy since 1976 to evaluate both the development of our fish culture program and the time and location of stock-specific fishery interceptions. It has become clear that our winter steelhead (currently about 600,000 hatchery smolts) are not impacted significantly by the existing commercial fisheries while many of our summer run stocks are hit hard (especially Skeena, Fraser and Barkley Sound).

You may know that about five years ago we instituted wide-spread catch and release regulations in an effort to rehabilitate rapidly declining wild steelhead stocks (by regulation, a wild steelhead has a complete adipose fin). We presently have just over 100 streams designated catch and release for wild steelhead. Needless to say a substantial sales job was done with our clients! One assurance our anglers received (pertinent in this discussion) was that hatchery steelhead, as they increased in abundance, could be kept by anglers. Currently we have 12 streams with returning hatchery winter steelhead. Our entire management program for these streams, and several others not yet on line, is to maximize the

harvest of hatchery fish while ensuring maintenance of the wild stock by exceptionally conservative regulations. By regulation a hatchery steelhead has a missing adipose fin and healed scar. (As an aside most of our hatchery steelhead are by policy from wild parents native to the recipient stream.).

We will propose at the Annual Mark Meeting of February 1 to:

1. Continue adipose marking all steelhead smolts,

2. Continue nose-tagging with C.W.T. all summer steelhead smolts,

3. Discontinue nose-tagging with C.W.T. all winter steelhead smolts.

Approval of this proposal will:

1. Permit us to continue the intensive management of both summer and winter steelhead sport fisheries by regulating differential harvests of hatchery and wild fish,

2. Save an annual cost of $50,000 (1983) by not nose-tagging winter steelhead smolts from hatcheries,

3. Continue to evaluate the interception of summer steelhead in tidal net fisheries,

4. Retain the option of tagging specific lots of winter steelhead with C.W.T. for hatchery evaluation purposes.

We plan to be represented at the February meeting either by myself or Dr. Art Tautz, head of our research section. I trust we will receive serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

D.W. Narver
Acting Chief of Fisheries Management

DWN/jl

cc/ K. Johnson
R.A.H. Sparrow
A. Tautz
D. Bailey
D.J. Robinson
E. Anthony
S. Wright

Attachment 3

Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Represent 20 tribes
release over 30 million
Sal & St.
of which nearly
1 million Fraser
Sthead have been represented
by FWS.
But tribes now
have their own technicians

January 5, 1983

Mr. John Harville
Executive Director
Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission
528 S.W. Mill Street
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Mr. ~~Harville~~ John:

The Treaty Tribes of Puget Sound and the Washington Coast are actively involved in the management and enhancement of the Northwest salmon and steelhead resources. Tribal hatcheries now account for a significant percentage of the total hatchery contribution from Washington State. They have also become involved in the marking and tagging of a significant number of salmon and steelhead originating from these facilities.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USF&WS) provides technical assistance to the Tribes to conduct their tagging operations, and we understand they have been representing tribal interests on the Committee on Anadromous Fish Marking and Tagging. We feel it is more appropriate for the Tribes to be directly represented on this committee, and request that an additional voting position be established for a representative of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission.

This request for tribal representation is consistent with recommendations of the PFMC workshop on CWT Recovery and Estimation Procedures, and is a necessity if tagging and recovery coordination is to be effective on a coastwide basis.

We trust you will give this request serious consideration at your upcoming committee meeting.

Sincerely,

Jim

JAMES L. HECKMAN
Executive Director

JLH:cm

cc: Ken Johnson/USF&WS
Tribes/Commissioners

2625 parkmont lane s.w., olympia, washington 98502 phone (206) 352-8030

BI-WEEKLY WITH WINTER POOLING

CODE	AGCY	BRD	TOTAL	Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Period Ending Dates:				Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Week Numbers:				1-5	6-9	10-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25	26-27	28-29	30-31	32-33	34-35	36-37	38-39	40-41	42-43	44-45	46-48	49-53
AREA - 7 SAN JUAN ISLANDS																								
63 17 12	WDF	76	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)															(1)						
TOTAL ESTIMATED			296	42	-	56	-	-	-	10	10	10	-	19	19	18	18	10	29	11	11	23	12	-
TOTAL OBSERVED			(34)	(4)		(10)				(1)	(1)	(1)		(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)	
AREA - 8 SKAGIT BAY																								
Ad - no tag			12	-	4	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-
			(2)		(1)															(1)				
11 01 18	UW	76	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)										(1)											
11 16 01	UW	77	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)																(1)					
13 09 07	WDF	75	4	-	4	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)		(1)																			
63 16 06	WDF	76	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)											(1)										
63 16 10	WDF	76	104	9	11	-	-	-	-	11	-	15	-	-	16	16	-	9	9	-	9	-	-	-
			(14)	(1)	(3)					(1)		(2)			(2)	(2)		(1)	(1)		(1)			
63 16 29	WDF	76	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)								(1)													
63 16 44	WDF	76	62	-	-	-	10	-	-	11	18	8	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
			(7)				(1)			(1)	(2)	(1)					(1)						(1)	
63 17 01	WDF	76	151	9	14	8	10	10	-	11	-	8	-	16	16	8	-	9	-	9	9	-	15	-
			(20)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(1)	(1)		(1)		(1)		(2)	(2)	(1)		(1)		(1)	(1)		(2)	
63 17 10	WDF	76	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(2)								(1)	(1)												
63 17 12	WDF	76	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)										(1)											
TOTAL ESTIMATED			388	19	32	8	19	10	-	32	33	38	16	24	32	24	8	18	18	17	17	-	23	-
TOTAL OBSERVED			(51)	(2)	(9)	(1)	(2)	(1)		(3)	(4)	(5)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(3)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)		(3)	
AREA - 9 ADMIRALTY INLET																								
Ad - no tag			12	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-
			(2)	(1)																	(1)			
01 14 03	WDF	74	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)											(1)										
01 14 12	COOP	74	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)	(1)																				
01 14 15	WDF	74	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)													(1)								
05 01 30	FWS	77	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			(1)														(1)							
05 01 31	FWS	77	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-
			(1)																	(1)				

Attachment 4

Washington - 1980 ESCAPEMENT TO FRESHWATER - CHINOOK

STATISTICAL MONTHS

TAGCODE / AREA		Period Ending Dates: Week Numbers:	Jan31 1-5	Feb29 6-9	Mar31 10-14	Apr30 15-18	May31 19-22	Jun30 23-27	Jul31 28-31	Aug31 32-35	Sep30 36-40	Oct31 41-44	Nov30 45-48	Dec31 49-53	Jan31 54-57	Feb28 58-61	Mar31 62-66	Apr30 67-70
13 09 10 WDF 75 Brood Summ Run																		
WELLS DAM	HATCHERY	FISHERY										9	1					
		TOTAL										(8)	(1)					
13 09 11 WDF 75 Brood Spr Run																		
COWLITZ RIVER	HATCHERY	FISHERY					17	20	15	23	97							
		TOTAL					(16)	(18)	(14)	(21)	(89)							
KALAMA FALLS	HATCHERY	FISHERY									1							
		TOTAL									(1)							
COWLITZ RIVER	SPORT	FISHERY			11	28	12	8	8	9								
		TOTAL			(5)	(7)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(1)								
TOTAL ESTIMATED:					11	28	29	27	23	32	98							
TOTAL OBSERVED :					(5)	(7)	(19)	(20)	(15)	(22)	(90)							
13 09 12 WDF 75 Brood Spr Run																		
COWLITZ RIVER	HATCHERY	FISHERY					31	38	21	38	90							
		TOTAL					(28)	(34)	(19)	(34)	(83)							
COWLITZ RIVER	SPORT	FISHERY		9	48		24	12		9								
		TOTAL		(4)	(12)		(6)	(3)		(1)								
TOTAL ESTIMATED:				9	48		54	49	21	46	90							
TOTAL OBSERVED :				(4)	(12)		(34)	(37)	(19)	(35)	(83)							
13 09 14 WDF 75 Brood Spr Run																		
COWLITZ RIVER	HATCHERY	FISHERY					17	36	16	22	112							
		TOTAL					(16)	(33)	(15)	(20)	(103)							
KALAMA FALLS	HATCHERY	FISHERY									1							
		TOTAL									(1)							
COWLITZ RIVER	SPORT	FISHERY		9	32		12	8	16									
		TOTAL		(4)	(8)		(3)	(2)	(2)									
LEWIS RIVER	SPORT	FISHERY			4													
		TOTAL			(1)													
TOTAL ESTIMATED:				9	36		29	44	32	22	113							
TOTAL OBSERVED :				(4)	(9)		(19)	(35)	(17)	(20)	(104)							
13 11 01 WDF 75 Brood Fall Run																		
PRIEST RAPIDS	HATCHERY	FISHERY										2	66	1				
		TOTAL										(2)	(62)	(1)				
WELLS DAM	HATCHERY	FISHERY										3						
		TOTAL										(3)						
PRIEST RAPIDS	SPAWN GD	FISHERY											179	16				
		TOTAL											(11)	(1)				

*Note: Recovery date represents time of sampling and not date of return to the hatchery.

Attachment 5a
Option 1

BI-WEEKLY WITH WINTER POOLING

CODE	AGCY	BRD	TOTAL		Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Week Numbers:					1-5	6-9	10-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25	26-27	28-29	30-31	32-33	34-35	36-37	38-39	40-41	42-43	44-45	46-48	49-53
AREA - SPEELYAI																									
63 17 19	WDF	76	1	-																		1			
			(1)																			(1)			
63 17 48	WDF	77	1	-																		1			
			(1)																			(1)			
TOTAL ESTIMATED			26	-															3	1	7	6	9		
TOTAL OBSERVED			(23)																(3)	(1)	(6)	(5)	(8)		
AREA - WASHOUGAL																									
Ad - no tag			1	-																		1			
			(1)																			(1)			
63 16 09	WDF	76	2	-																		2			
			(2)																			(2)			
63 16 41	WDF	76	24	-																	11	12			
			(23)																		(11)	(12)			
63 18 03	WDF	77	3	-																1		1	1		
			(3)																	(1)		(1)	(1)		
TOTAL ESTIMATED			30	-																1	11	17	1		
TOTAL OBSERVED			(29)																	(1)	(11)	(16)	(1)		
AREA - KLICKITAT																									
Ad - no tag			39	-												1		9	14	1	5	7	1		
			(38)													(1)		(9)	(14)	(1)	(5)	(7)	(1)		
13 06 01	WDF	75	3	-																	2	1			
			(3)																		(2)	(1)			
13 09 11	WDF	75	1	-									1												
			(1)										(1)												
13 11 02	WDF	75	114	-																	18	82	14		
			(111)																		(17)	(80)	(14)		
13 11 03	WDF	75	150	-									1	3		1	1	36	82	26					
			(146)										(1)	(3)		(1)	(1)	(35)	(80)	(25)					
63 16 01	WDF	76	28	-														8	7	9	2	1			
			(27)															(8)	(7)	(9)	(2)	(1)			
63 16 02	WDF	76	41	-										1				8	15	11	5				
			(40)											(1)				(8)	(15)	(11)	(5)				
63 16 05	WDF	76	14	-															2	3	4	5			
			(14)																(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
63 16 08	WDF	76	43	-															1		15	26	1		
			(42)																(1)		(15)	(25)	(1)		
63 16 63	WDF	77	43	-														2	7		29	4	1		
			(42)															(2)	(7)		(28)	(4)	(1)		
63 17 18	WDF	76	3	-																		3			
			(3)																			(3)			
63 17 32	WDF	77	244	-													2	170	71		1				
			(237)														(2)	(165)	(69)		(1)				

*Note: The recovery date is the period when the fish were killed rather than date of return to the hatchery.

BI-WEEKLY WITH WINTER POOLING

CODE	AGCY	BRD	TOTAL	Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Period Ending Dates:				Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Week Numbers:				1-5	6-9	10-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25	26-27	28-29	30-31	32-33	34-35	36-37	38-39	40-41	42-43	44-45	46-48	49-53
AREA - 537 SNOHOMISH RIVER																								
63 16 10	WDF	76	4																				4	
			(1)																				(1)	
TOTAL ESTIMATED			4																				4	
TOTAL OBSERVED			(1)																				(1)	
AREA - 535 SKAGIT RIVER																								
13 03 08	WDF	74	4										4											
			(0)										(0)											
TOTAL ESTIMATED			4										4											
TOTAL OBSERVED			(0)										(0)											
AREA - ELOKOMIN																								
63 16 04	WDF	76	3															3						
			(1)															(1)						
TOTAL ESTIMATED			3															3						
TOTAL OBSERVED			(1)															(1)						
AREA - COWLITZ																								
Ad - no tag			12	.	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(2)					(1)	(1)															
10 01 02	IDFG	74	7	.	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(1)		(1)																			
13 04 03	WDF	74	7	.	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(1)		(1)																			
13 04 05	WDF	74	13	.	7	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(2)		(1)				(1)															
13 04 06	WDF	74	35	.	-	-	-	12	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	10						
			(5)					(2)			(2)							(1)						
13 04 07	WDF	74	13	.	7	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(2)		(1)				(1)															
13 04 08	WDF	74	30	.	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19							
			(4)						(2)								(2)							
13 04 09	WDF	74	12	.	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(2)				(2)																	
13 04 10	WDF	74	12	.	-	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(2)			(1)	(1)																	
13 09 11	WDF	75	181	.	-	12	35	41	46	12	7	-	9	-	-	-	-				19			
			(29)			(2)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(2)	(1)		(1)								(2)			
13 09 12	WDF	75	233	.	21	29	46	58	29	28	21	-	-	-	-	-	-							
			(38)		(3)	(5)	(8)	(10)	(5)	(4)	(3)													
13 09 14	WDF	75	229	.	20	29	29	52	23	43	14	-	-	-	9	-		10						
			(36)		(3)	(5)	(5)	(9)	(4)	(6)	(2)				(1)			(1)						

Attachment 5b
Option 2
Page 2 of 4

BI-WEEKLY WITH WINTER POOLING

CODE	AGCY	BRD	TOTAL	Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Period Ending Dates:				Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Week Numbers:				1-5	6-9	10-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25	26-27	28-29	30-31	32-33	34-35	36-37	38-39	40-41	42-43	44-45	46-48	49-53
AREA - SKYKOMISH																								
63 17 06	WDF	76	1000																293		643		11	53
TOTAL ESTIMATED			1000																293		643		11	53
AREA - DESCHUTES COMPLEX																								
05 34 04	FWS	76	57																		57			
TOTAL ESTIMATED			57																		57			
AREA - 716 BIG BEEF CREEK																								
11 16 17	UW	77	76																		52		24	
63 16 14	WDF	76	895																		518		377	
63 17 28	WDF	76	788																		456		332	
63 19 30	WDF	77	489																		335		154	
TOTAL ESTIMATED			2248																		1361		887	
AREA - 735 LITTLE PILCHUCK CREEK																								
63 16 15	WDF	76	1332																			1332		
63 17 29	WDF	76	503																			503		
TOTAL ESTIMATED			1835																			1835		
AREA - 738 MILL CREEK																								
63 17 30	WDF	76	197																			197		
TOTAL ESTIMATED			197																			197		

Attachment 5b
Option 2
Page 3 of 4

*Note: See Introductory Section for discussion on expansion procedures used for fish trap recoveries.

BI-WEEKLY WITH WINTER POOLING

CODE	AGCY	BRD	TOTAL		Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Period Ending Dates:					Feb 4	Mar 4	Apr 1	Apr15	Apr29	May13	May27	Jun10	Jun24	Jul 8	Jul22	Aug 5	Aug19	Sep 2	Sep16	Sep30	Oct14	Oct28	Nov11	Dec 2	Dec31
Week Numbers:					1-5	6-9	10-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22-23	24-25	26-27	28-29	30-31	32-33	34-35	36-37	38-39	40-41	42-43	44-45	46-48	49-53
AREA - LEWIS RIVER																									
63 16 19	WDF	77	13	-																				13	
			(2)																					(2)	
63 17 19	WDF	76	27	-																		7	20		
			(4)																			(1)	(3)		
63 17 48	WDF	77	7	-																				7	
			(1)																					(1)	
H1 01 01	WDF	77	7	-																				7	
			(1)																					(1)	
TOTAL ESTIMATED			258	-																64		7	114	74	
TOTAL OBSERVED			(32)																	(3)		(1)	(17)	(11)	
AREA - WASHOUGAL																									
63 16 41	WDF	76	33	-																	33				
			(4)																		(4)				
TOTAL ESTIMATED			33	-																	33				
TOTAL OBSERVED			(4)																		(4)				
AREA - KLICKITAT																									
63 16 05	WDF	76	34	-																	34				
			(1)																		(1)				
TOTAL ESTIMATED			34	-																	34				
TOTAL OBSERVED			(1)																		(1)				
AREA - PRIEST RAPIDS																									
Ad - no tag			112																				32	80	
			(7)																				(2)	(5)	
13 07 13	WDF	75	32																					32	
			(2)																					(2)	
13 11 01	WDF	75	32																				16	16	
			(2)																				(1)	(1)	
13 12 02	WDF	75	32																					32	
			(2)																					(2)	
TOTAL ESTIMATED			207																				48	160	
TOTAL OBSERVED			(13)																				(3)	(10)	

Attachment 5b
Option 2
Page 4 of 4

COASTWIDE SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF TAGS IN THE CATCH FOR 1977

CHINOOK

TAG CODE	AGCY	BROOD YEAR	HATCHERY OR TAGGING SITE	RELEASE SITE	# TAGGED RELEASED	TOTAL	CAL SPRT	CAL TRLL	ORE SPRT	ORE TRLL	COLR SPRT	COLR NET	WASH SPRT	WASH TRLL	P.S. SPRT	P.S. NET	WASH NET	B.C. SPRT	B.C. TRLL	B.C. NET	ALSK TRLL
.1 02 06	UW	74	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	15,771	146	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	77	15	-	NA	35	5	-
.1 02 07	UW	74	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	12,168	35	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	19	5	-	NA	4	3	-
.1 02 08	UW	74	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	10,691	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	9	-	NA	-	-	-
.1 02 09	UW	74	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	16,596	56	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	41	4	-	NA	8	-	-
.1 02 11	UW	75	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	24,397	212	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	161	8	-	NA	-	43	-
L1 02 12	UW	75	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	30,028	268	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	151	61	-	NA	-	56	-
L1 02 13	UW	75	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	27,848	231	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	153	69	-	NA	2	7	-
L1 02 14	UW	75	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	23,797	342	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	265	27	-	NA	-	50	-
L1 03 01	UW	75	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	18,480	175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	104	42	-	NA	-	29	-
L1 03 02	UW	75	COLL FISHERIES	PORTAGE BAY	18,065	283	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	179	67	-	NA	2	35	-
L3 01 01	WDF	73	KALAMA FALLS	KALAMA R	19,396	232	-	-	-	5	-	46	46	64	-	-	12	NA	58	-	1
L3 01 04	WDF	74	SAMISH	FRIDAY CR	72,493	798	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	8	185	247	5	NA	186	151	-
L3 01 08	WDF	73	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	2,258	58	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	5	-	NA	9	5	26
L3 01 09	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	2,011	8	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NA	5	-	-
L3 01 13	WDF	75	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	229	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NA	8	-	-
L3 02 05	WDF	74	DESCHUTES	CAPITOL LK	19,704	603	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	536	44	-	NA	7	12	-
L3 02 06	WDF	74	DESCHUTES	CAPITOL LK	19,801	814	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	772	32	-	NA	2	8	-
L3 02 08	WDF	74	MINTER CREEK	WHITE R	8,285	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59	27	-	NA	10	-	-
L3 02 09	WDF	74	HOOD CANAL	FINCH CR	17,990	194	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	139	32	-	NA	15	8	-
L3 02 15	WDF	74	NOOKSACK	KENDALL CR	75,761	933	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	7	179	361	-	NA	278	101	2
13 03 01	WDF	74	SKAGIT	SAMISH R	76,383	72	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	NA	38	25	-
13 03 02	WDF	75	NOOKSACK	KENDALL CR	72,842	154	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85	17	-	NA	2	50	-
13 03 03	WDF	74	GEORGE ADAMS	PURDY CR	70,315	334	-	-	-	-	-	5	13	3	142	37	-	NA	106	28	-
13 03 04	WDF	75	RINGOLD	SPRINGS CR	72,771	74	-	-	-	-	27	43	4	-	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
13 03 05	WDF	74	SIMPSON	BINGHAM CR	45,568	59	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	3	-	3	NA	28	13	-
13 03 06	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	1,476	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
13 03 07	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	5,391	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NA	10	11	-
13 03 08	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	7,227	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NA	-	11	-
13 03 09	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	5,548	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	NA	-	-	-
13 03 12	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	2,261	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	NA	-	-	-
13 03 13	WDF	74	SKAGIT R (W)	SKAGIT R	2,261	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	NA	-	9	-
13 04 01	WDF	74	DESCHUTES	CAPITOL LK	9,615	347	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	293	25	-	NA	6	10	-
13 04 02	WDF	74	GRAYS R	W FK GRAYS R	5,367	226	-	-	10	37	-	3	76	72	-	-	-	NA	23	5	-
13 04 03	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	17,643	122	-	-	-	-	-	-	99	4	3	3	-	NA	10	3	-
13 04 04	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	15,382	162	-	-	34	-	-	8	91	7	-	-	-	NA	11	11	-
13 04 05	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	18,070	178	-	-	4	-	-	-	133	8	4	-	-	NA	29	-	-
13 04 06	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	17,540	116	-	-	-	3	-	8	81	8	5	-	-	NA	7	4	-
13 04 07	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	17,185	203	-	-	29	2	-	11	120	15	-	-	-	NA	13	13	-
13 04 08	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	15,903	221	-	-	29	-	13	-	127	12	-	-	-	NA	37	3	-
13 04 09	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	21,110	269	-	-	-	5	-	5	163	16	8	10	-	NA	52	10	-
13 04 10	WDF	74	COWLITZ	COWLITZ R	18,149	265	-	-	23	-	-	5	147	12	-	-	-	NA	47	31	-
13 05 05	WDF	74	KALAMA FALLS	KALAMA R	30,060	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	10	-	-	-	NA	3	3	-
13 05 06	WDF	74	KALAMA FALLS	KALAMA R	27,999	128	-	-	26	5	-	-	30	16	-	3	-	NA	44	-	4
13 05 11	WDF	74	WELLS	COLUMBIA R	118,416	60	-	-	11	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	NA	35	10	-

Attachment 6

Attachment 7

SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS' COMMENTS
ON
CHAPTER II. "PROCEDURES FOR STOCK ASSESSMENT STUDIES"

I. Reviewers

Reviews were received from the following persons:

Steve Cramer (ODFW)	- Biostatistician
Frank de Libero (WDF)	- Statistician
Michael Eames (WDF)	- Statistician
Ken Hall (ODFW)	- Biostatistician/Tag Coordinator
Dennis Isaac (ODFW)	- Biologist/Tag Coordinator
Ted Perry (CDFO)	- Biostatistician
Alex Wertheimer (NMFS-AK)	- Biologist

While the following comments are from the review of Chapter II, essentially the same comments and recommendations were advanced for improvement of Chapter III. which deals with Procedures for Multiple Comparison Studies. (Note: this latter Chapter will not be covered during the Mark Meeting because of time restrictions and its large size).

II. Comments on General Content and Format

1. Most reviewers felt that the overall content of Chapter II was quite good and and that the text was generally quite readable.

2. Several reviewers, however, noted that many portions of the text were very awkward and difficult to follow because of poorly defined terms and the use of many multi-syllable words arranged abstractly.

3. One reviewer noted that the chapter appeared written for statistically inclined persons, and recommended that it should be aimed for a more general audience, i.e. administrators, fish culturists, biologists (management and research), as well as statisticians, in order to increase its utility as a regional CWT Manual.

4. Nearly all reviewers found the introductory section to be ambiguous in terms of definitions and experimental objectives. In addition, successive paragraphs are somewhat repetitive in content and should be reworked.

5. Several reviewers commented that the wide range of ideas presented in the present format has resulted in a rather abrupt reading style with little reader sense of an underlying theme. As a result, the reader is confused as to what to expect. It was suggested that this could be corrected by incorporating more summaries at the beginning of each section and adding transition sentences between ideas.

6. Many sections presented in Chapter II are repeated in Chapter III. While it was generally recognized that these chapters were designed to stand alone, reviewers felt that the redundancy was time consumming and unnecessary if the chapters are to be combined in a single CWT Manual.

7. Most reviewers found the outline scheme used to identify major and minor sections (e.g. Section D.2.a) to be very difficult when trying to find references. Page references would be more practical.

8. Chapter II gives only a very cursory treatment of the fundamental question of how to determine the number of fish that should be tagged to insure success and yet not over-tag (see Section C.2.c). Much more attention is needed here.

III. Comments on Statistical Section D

1. Comments on the statistical material in Section D appeared to depend on the training of the reviewer. Biologists tended to be pleased that the material was provided but felt that it was unnecessarily complex and wordy. Statisticians were likewise pleased to see the inclusion of statistical procedures but generally felt that much of the material was elementary and could be easily obtained from any standard statistical book.

2. There was a general consensus that substantial work is needed on the statistical section to make it more practical, useful, and in particular, readable.

3. One statistician noted that Section D.2.a on "Estimating Covariances Between Components" was particularly valuable because the information was generally not accessible elsewhere for most biologists.

4. It was recommended that the statistical section be treated as either a separate chapter or as an appendix because of the substantial differences in content from the rest of the chapter.

5. Some statisticians reported disagreements with the formulation or application of some of the statistical equations. However, there did not appear to be a consensus of any given issue.

6. One reviewer felt that the discussion on sample size determination (Section D.5.b) was misleading since it gave the impression that only "within sample variance" need to be considered. Between year variance is ignored. The reviewer further noted that the greatest problem with CWT studies to date is that most have been designed with inappropriate determination of sample size. Hence the chapter should treat this subject fully, with several examples given from common situations, to prevent the misunderstanding that only within variance is important.

7. Reviewers found the use of lower case letter constants in the equations to be confusing. This was also true for the use of the lower case "x" as a symbol for multiplication.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Auke Bay Laboratory
P.O. Box 155 Auke Bay, Alaska 99821
907 789-7231

ATTACHMENT 8A

Date : March 5, 1982

Reply to Attn. of: F/NWCx9

To : Dr. John Harville, Executive Director
Dr. Ken Johnson, Regional Mark Coordinator
Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission

From : Alex Wertheimer: NMFS-Alaska Tag Coordinator

Subject: Proposed surcharge on purchase of coded wire tags to be used for ocean/mainstream recoveries.

This proposal is in response to Dr. Harville's memorandum referring to various problems faced by RMPC and the tag recovery programs. A surcharge is not a new idea; Bill Heard, former NMFS-Alaska Tag Coordinator, recalls the concept being discussed at a tag coordinators' meeting several years ago. This is, perhaps, an appropriate time to reconsider a surcharge as a step towards resolving some of the problems faced by the tagging and tag recovery programs.

Benefits of Surcharge

1. Money is allocated for recovery at the time of tagging. Although the money would be used for recovery efforts in the year it is collected, the necessary link between tagging efforts and recovery costs would be established.

2. All groups tagging fish contribute towards recovery costs. Level of contribution is based on level of tagging, and thus potential "load" on recovery agencies. At this time, certain tagging programs such as private hatcheries, universities, NMFS-Alaska, rely on tag recovery programs for ocean recoveries but do not contribute to recovery costs.

3. Provide a stable funding base for RMPC. At a time of shrinking budgets for natural resource agencies, having a "user fee" to fund regional tag coordination and to contribute to tag recovery programs may become essential. At a tagging level of 20 million tags per year, a $.05-.10 per tag surcharge would generate $1-2 million dollars. RMPC current budget is less than $100 thousand. Such a surcharge would easily fund RMPC, and provide considerable dollars to be bounced back to the recovery agencies to assist in funding their programs.

4. Provide a disincentive to unnecessary CWT/adipose clip marking. A constant complaint of recovery agencies has been the swamping of their programs with tags from experiments not requiring ocean or mainstream recoveries. A substantial increase in the cost of tagging (such as $.05-.10 per tag) would discourage unnecessary use of CWT/adipose clip. CWTs could still be provided, free of the surcharge, for use with other fin clips, so that the technology could still be applied where numerous groups are involved but ocean recoveries are not essential.

Problems of Surcharge

1. Equitable allocation of amount of surcharge. Should upriver (e.g., Snake River) releases be taxed the same as a coastal hatchery, when the latter would have significantly higher tag returns? Should half-tags for use on pink salmon be subject to the same rate as tags for coho smolts?

2. Equitable allocation of an agency's "fair share" contribution to RMPC. Of the amount collected, what portion should be allocated to RMPC? How should surplus dollars be allocated to recovery agencies?

3. Distinguishing CWTs not to be used with adipose fin clips (and thus escaping the surcharge).

4. Collection of surcharge. Would Dr. Jefferts be willing to apply such a "sales tax" to tag cost, or would tag purchasing have to go through some other central entity (i.e., RMPC)?

This listing just touches on the problems that could arise from "taxing" tag users. Perhaps there are too many problems, both practical and philosophical, to such an approach; however, I feel this is an appropriate time to seriously discuss funding alternatives.

ATTACHMENT 8B

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF FISH & GAME

JAY S. HAMMOND, Governor

State of Alaska
Alaska Dept. of Fish & Game
230 S. Franklin St. Rm. 301
Juneau, Alaska 99801

PHONE:

March 10, 1982

Mr. Ken Johnson
Regional Mark Coordinator
Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission
528 Mill Street
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Ken:

A Mark/Tag Coordination Meeting was held in Juneau on February 11, 1982. The participants in the meeting were staff members responsible for the tagging designs and/or the CWT data reporting. They represented the three fisheries divisions of the Department, NMFS, and several private non-profit hatcheries in Southeast Alaska. The particpants and the project or entity they represent were as follows:

Johnny Holland, Regional Biologist, FRED Division, ADF&G
Dan Reed, Biometrician, FRED Division, ADF&G
Steve Schwartz, Research Analyst, FRED Division, ADF&G
Sam Bertoni, Senior Fish Culturist, FRED Division, ADF&G
Ron Smith, Private Non-Profit Office, FRED Division, ADF&G
Gary Sanders, Regional Research Supervisor, Sport Fish Division, ADF&G
Phil Gray, Coho Research Project leader, Commercial Fish, ADF&G
Leon Shaul, Coho Research Project, Commercial Fish, ADF&G
Alex Wertheimer, Tag Coordinator, NMFS - Alaska
Gary Freitag, Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Assocation
Greg Young, Northern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association
Bill Davidson, Sheldon Jackson College Aquaculture Program

All participants expressed the concern that dollars invested in tagging this or any year may be later wasted if funds for sampling and tag recovery are not available when tagged adults return. The need for an assured, stable funding source was discussed. Alex Wertheimer reviewed the concepts of a "proposed surcharge on purchase of coded wire tags to be used for ocean and mainstream recoveries." Important ideas discussed were:

1. Money for recovery of coded wire tags would be allocated at time of tagging.

2. All tagging groups would contribute towards recovery costs.

3. The surcharge would fund the Regional Mark Processing Center and help to fund the sampling programs of recovery agencies.

It was noted that administrative and practical details have not been worked out for this proposal. After some discussion of the merits and the problems, administrative and philosphical, of this proposal, the group came to a concensus that they: 1) agree in concept with the surcharge proposal and 2) recommend that the surcharge, as a potential funding source for CWT recovery, be investigated further by PMFC.

It probably should be noted that the people participating in this meeting are not policy spokesmen for the entities they work for but, are for the most part, tagging project leaders and designers concerned with the success of their individual programs.

Sincerely,

Karen K. Crandall

Karen Crandall
Fisheries Biologist
Division of Fisheries Rehabilitation,
Enhancement and Development

cc: Meeting Participants
Stan Moberly
Bill Hauser

Memorandum

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
REPRESENTING THE STATES OF
ALASKA, CALIFORNIA, IDAHO, OREGON AND WASHINGTON
528 S.W. Mill Street, Portland, OR 97201
phone: (503) 229-5840

TO : Tag Coordinators; Mark Meeting Participants

DATE: April 15, 1983

FROM : Ken Johnson, Regional Mark Coordinator Ken

SUBJECT: 1) Mark Meeting Minutes
2) New Tag Coordinator for Washington Tribes

1) Enclosed are the minutes for the 1983 Mark Meeting. A large number of subjects were covered. Therefore, please review the minutes and forward relevant information if discrepancies are found.

2) Gary Graves, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, will be representing Washington coastal and Puget Sound tribes on the Mark Committee (see Minutes, Item III.B). A welcome is extended to Gary in this new responsibility.

KJ:jc
Enclosure

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

REPRESENTING THE STATES OF
ALASKA, CALIFORNIA, IDAHO, OREGON AND WASHINGTON

528 S.W. Mill Street, Portland, OR 97201
Phone: (503) 229-5840

Memorandum

TO : Committee on Anadromous Fish Marking & Tagging; Personnel involved in Marking & Tagging

DATE: December 8, 1982

FROM : Ken Johnson, Regional Mark Coordinator

SUBJECT: Annual Mark Meeting

I. Meeting Time and Place

On the basis of a phone survey of the tag coordinators, the 1983 Mark Meeting has been scheduled as follows:

1) Time: 9:00am-4:00pm

2) Date: February 1, 1983 (Tuesday)

3) Site: Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife Building
Commissioner's Room
526 S.W. Mill Street
Portland, OR 97201

The meeting date was selected to minimize travel requirements for those who also wish to attend the Oregon Chapter-American Fisheries Society meeting in Corvallis, Oregon on February 2-4. The AFS meeting promises to be excellent and includes a session chaired by Ken Hall (ODFW) on coded wire tagging and related issues (February 4, 8-10am). More information may be obtained by calling Jim Newton (ODFW), President Elect of the Oregon Chapter, at (503) 296-4628.

II. Call for Agenda Items

Please forward matters that you wish placed on the agenda. I will need your input by December 30 in order to distribute the final agenda in early January.

The following items are now on the agenda:

1) Fin mark allocations for 1983.

2) Review of current mark restrictions.

* → 3) Voting representation for northwest Indian tribes on the Mark Committee.

4) Report on the high seas sampling program and PMFC's 1982 request to INPFC to permit landing of incidental steelhead on motherships for sampling purposes.

5) WDF proposal to amend current marking agreements to permit the use of the Ad clip with no CWT on Puget Sound and coastal Washington steelhead stocks. (Tag Coordinators: Further details will be forthcoming shortly).

6) In-depth review of manuals and reports resulting from the 1982 PMFC sponsored workshops on "Coded Wire Tagging Experimental Design" and "Coded Wire Tag Recovery and Estimation Procedures".

7) Update on advances in micro-tagging technology:

   a) Binary Coded Tags - Northwest Marine Technology.

   b) ODFW and WDF reports on use of NWMT's tube tag detector and the question of whether or not "no-tag" snouts should still be x-rayed.

   c) Other? Please Advise.

III. Seasons Greetings

Please accept my best wishes for a happy holiday season with your families and friends! I have enjoyed my association with you during these few past years and especially appreciate your full cooperation and assistance in moving regional tagging concerns forward. A great deal remains to be done in this area and I am confident that with your continued support and enthusiasm, we shall see much progress in 1983.

JKJ:dmw