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#### Abstract

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, assisted by the Organized Village of Kwethluk, operated a resistance board weir on the Kwethluk River, a tributary to the lower Kuskokwim River, between June 24 and September 10, 2007. Data collected were used for in-season management of the commercial and subsistence fisheries in the Kuskokwim drainage. Counts of 54,913 chum Oncorhynchus keta, 12,927 Chinook O. tshawytscha, 5,148 sockeye O. nerka, 626 pink O. gorbuscha, and 19,473 coho $O$. kisutch salmon were documented through the weir. Peak weekly passage occurred July 8 to 14 for chum and Chinook, July 1 to 7 for sockeye, July 22 to 28 for pink, and August 19 to 25 for coho salmon. Age, sex, and length data were collected for each species except pink salmon. Dominant age classes were 0.3 for chum, 1.4 for female and 1.2 for male Chinook, 1.3 for sockeye, and 2.1 for coho salmon. Over all percentages for female salmon were chum $45 \%$, Chinook $26 \%$, sockeye $49 \%$, and coho $38 \%$.


## Introduction

The Kwethluk River, a lower Kuskokwim River tributary located on the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge), provides important spawning and rearing habitat for chum Oncorhynchus keta, Chinook O. tshawytscha, sockeye O. nerka, pink O. gorbuscha, and coho O. kisutch salmon (Figure 1) (Alt 1977; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1992). Adult salmon returning to the Kwethluk River migrate 130 river kilometers (rkm) through the lower Kuskokwim River and up to an additional 160 rkm in the Kwethluk River before reaching spawning grounds. In the lower Kuskokwim River, salmon pass through one of Alaska's most intensive subsistence fisheries (Burkey et al. 2001; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1988). In general, half of the total Chinook salmon statewide subsistence harvest occurs in the Kuskokwim drainage (Alaska Department Fish and Game 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b).

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) mandates that salmon populations and their habitats be conserved in their natural diversity within federal lands; that international treaty obligations are fulfilled; and subsistence opportunities for local residents be maintained. Salmon escapement studies for the Kuskokwim River tributaries on the Refuge are priorities in the Refuge Fishery Management Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1992). However, management of these mixed species systems of multiple individual stocks is not straight forward. Escapement and run timing, as well as other data, are required to meet these policies, mandates, and regulations and provide for sound management strategies and practices.
Under guidelines established in the State of Alaska's sustainable salmon fisheries policy 5AAC.39.222, the Alaska Board of Fisheries (Board) designated Kuskokwim River chum and Chinook salmon stocks as yield concerns in 2001 and managed the fishery under those guidelines through 2006 (Linderman and Bue 2006). This designation was based upon the continued inability, despite specific management measures, to maintain expected yields, or have stable surplus above the stock's escapement needs. Beginning in January 2001, the salmon fishery in the Kuskokwim

River drainage was managed under the Kuskokwim River Salmon Rebuilding Management Plan (Rebuilding Plan) (5AAC 07.365; Ward et al. 2003; Bergstrom and Whitmore 2004). Those stocks of concern designations were discontinued by the Board in 2007 at the Alaska Yukon Kuskokwim (AYK) Regional meeting based on chum and Chinook salmon runs above or at the historical level since 2002 (John Linderman, personal communication).

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (Department), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), and the Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group (Working Group) work together to manage Kuskokwim River salmon resources. They are guided by the above state policies, federal mandates, and regulations for federal lands and rely upon a strategic array of enumeration studies carried out on tributaries of the Kuskokwim River. The Kwethluk River is an important tributary in the lower Kuskokwim River drainage and the Service and other agencies have funded several fisheries monitoring projects from 1991 to present. The objectives of this project remain consistent: (1) enumerate adult salmon; (2) describe the run timing for chum, Chinook, sockeye, pink, and coho salmon returns; (3) estimate the age, sex, and length composition of adult chum, Chinook, sockeye, and coho salmon populations; and (4) identify and count other fish species passing through the weir.

This weir project remains a high priority for the Office of Subsistence Management (OSM), the Department, and the Refuge, and continues to be supported. The Kenai Fish and Wildlife Field Office (KFWFO) and the Organized Village of Kwethluk (OVK) have cooperatively conducted weir project operations since 2000.

The Kwethluk River weir plays an important role as a platform to collect additional information and data for other research projects. These include: (1) genetic samples for other funded projects; (2) monitoring for sockeye, chum, and coho salmon tagged in Kuskokwim River mark-recapture projects for development of total in-river abundance estimates (Kerkvliet 2004; Pawluk 2006a and 2006b); (3) the Salmonid Rivers Observatory Network (SaRON), a 10 year project focused on pristine salmon rivers in the Bering Sea drainage measuring processes and changes to the shifting habitat mosaic of ecosystems (http://www.umt.edu/flbs/Research/SaRON.htm); and (4) the Arctic Yukon Kuskokwim Sustainable Salmon Initiative program (AYK-SSI) Kwethluk River chum salmon juvenile emigration study (http://www.aykssi.org/Research/index.html).

## Study Area

The Kwethluk River is in the lower Kuskokwim River drainage (Figure 1). The region has a subarctic climate characterized by extremes in temperature. Temperatures range from summer highs near $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to average winter lows near $-12^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Alt 1977). Average yearly precipitation is approximately 50 cm , with the majority falling between June and October. The rivers in this area generally become ice-free in the slow current sections by early-May and freeze up in lateNovember. Break up on the Kwethluk River can occur from early-April to late May. The Kwethluk River originates in the Kilbuck Mountains, flows northwest approximately 222 km , and drains an area of about $3,367 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$. The weir is located in the middle section of the river characterized by braiding and gravel substrates. Below the middle section, the lower 47 km consists of a deeper, muddy-bottomed channel that averages 53 m in width (Alt 1977). Turbid water conditions, the result of active stream cutting on tundra banks, are also characteristic of the lower section and are incompatible with weir operations.


Figure 1.-Location of the Kwethluk River weir, 2007.

## Methods

## Weir Operations

A resistance board weir (Tobin 1994; Stewart 2002; Harper et al. 2007) spanning 56 m was installed in the Kwethluk River (N $60^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 44.68^{\prime \prime}$, W $161^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 54.79^{\prime \prime}$, NAD 83) approximately 88 rkm upstream from the Kuskokwim River and 43 air-km east of Kwethluk, Alaska (Figure 1). This location is approximately 2.4 rkm downstream from the 1992 weir site described by Harper (1998). The weir was relocated in 2000 due to channel morphology changes. A staff gauge was installed upstream of the weir to measure daily water levels and measurements were correlated to correspond with the average water depth across the river channel at the upstream edge of the weir. Water temperatures were collected daily from June 20 through September 9 using a Vemco ${ }^{\circledR}$ temperature data recorder at the SaRON project site ( $\mathrm{N} 60^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 02.30^{\prime \prime}$, W161 06’ 46.20 , NAD 83) approximately 8 rkm upriver of the weir.

One live trap and a counting passageway were installed to facilitate sampling and fish passage during varying river stage heights. Counts began at approximately 0600 hours each day and continued through 2300 hours as daylight permitted. Count periods varied with fish passage intensity and were recorded to the nearest 0.25 hours. All fish were enumerated to species as they migrated through the live trap or passage chute (Harper 1998).

The weir was inspected for holes and cleaned daily. An observer outfitted with a mask and snorkel checked weir integrity and substrate conditions. Debris was cleaned by raking debris from the upstream surface of the weir or walking across each panel until partially submerged, allowing the current to wash accumulated debris downstream.

## Biological Data

A sample week (strata) began on Sunday and ended on Saturday. A weekly quota of 200 chum, 210 Chinook, and 200 sockeye salmon were sampled in as short a period (1-3 days) as possible to approximate a pulse or snapshot sample (Geiger et al. 1990). The sample objective for coho salmon was 210 for the season with samples from the early, middle, and late part of the run. All target species trapped were sampled to prevent bias.

Fish were sampled for length, sex, scales collected for ages, and tissue collected for genetics of targeted species. Fish were released upstream of the weir after sampling. Length was measured from mid-eye to the fork of the caudal fin and rounded to the nearest 5 mm . Sex was determined by external characteristics, and or the presence of ovipositor or gametes. One scale was removed from the preferred area from each chum and sockeye salmon, and four scales from each Chinook and coho salmon for age determination (Koo 1962, Mosher 1968). Scale impressions were made on cellulose acetate cards, using a heated scale press, and examined with a microfiche reader (Molyneaux et al. 2008).

Characteristics of fish passing through the weir were estimated using standard stratified random sample estimators (Cochran 1977). Within a given stratum $m$, the proportion of species $i$ passing the weir that are of sex $j$ and age $k\left(p_{i j k m}\right)$ was estimated as
$\hat{P}_{i j k m}=\frac{n_{i j k m}}{n_{i++m}}$
where $\mathrm{n}_{i j k m}$ denotes the number of fish of species $i$, sex $j$, and age $k$ sampled during stratum $m$, and a subscript of "+" represents summation overall possible values of the corresponding variable, e.g., $\mathrm{n}_{j++m}$ denotes the total number of fish of species $i$ sampled in stratum $m$. The variance was estimated as
$\hat{v}\left(\hat{p}_{i j k m}\right)=\left(1-\frac{n_{i++m}}{N_{i++m}}\right) \frac{\hat{p}_{i j k m}\left(1-\hat{p}_{i j k m}\right)}{n_{i++m}-1}$
where $\mathrm{N}_{i++m}$ denotes the total number of species $i$ fish passing the weir in stratum $m$. The estimated number of fish species $i$, sex $j$, age $k$ passing the weir in stratum $m\left(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{ijkm}}\right)$ is
$\hat{N}_{i j k m}=N_{i++m} \hat{P}_{i j k m}$
with estimated variance

$$
\hat{v}\left(\hat{N}_{i j k m}\right)=N_{i++m}^{2} \hat{v}\left(\hat{p}_{i j k m}\right)
$$

Estimates of proportions for the entire period of weir operation were computed as weighted sums of the stratum estimates, i.e.,

$$
\hat{p}_{i j k}=\sum_{m}\left(\frac{N_{i++m}}{N_{i++}}\right) \hat{p}_{i j k m}
$$

with estimated variance

$$
\hat{v}\left(\hat{p}_{i j k}\right)=\sum_{m}\left(\frac{n_{i++m}}{N_{i+++}}\right)^{2} \hat{v}\left(\hat{p}_{i j k m}\right)
$$

The total number of fish in a species, sex, and age category passing the weir during the entire period of operation was estimated as

$$
\hat{N}_{i j k}=\sum_{m} \hat{N}_{i j k m}
$$

with estimated variance

$$
\hat{v}\left(\hat{N}_{i j k}\right)=\sum_{m} \hat{v}\left(\hat{N}_{i j k m}\right)
$$

If the length of the $r^{t h}$ fish of species $i$, sex $j$, and age $k$ sampled in stratum $m$ is denoted $x_{i j k m r}$, the mean length of all such fish ( $\mu_{\mathrm{ijkm}}$ ) was estimated as

$$
\hat{\mu}_{i j k m}=\left(\frac{1}{n_{i j k m}}\right) \sum_{r} x_{i j k m r}
$$

with corresponding variance estimator
$\hat{v}\left(\hat{\mu}_{i j k m}\right)=\left(1-\frac{n_{i j k m}}{\hat{N}_{i j k m}}\right) \frac{\sum_{r}\left(x_{i j k m r}-\hat{\mu}_{i j k m}\right)^{2}}{n_{i j k m}\left(n_{i j k m}-1\right)}$

The mean length of all fish of species $i$, sex $j$, and age $k\left(\mu_{\mathrm{ijk}}\right)$ was estimated as a weighted sum of the stratum means, i.e.,
$\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{ijk}}=\sum_{\mathrm{m}}\left(\frac{\hat{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ijkm}}}{\hat{\mathrm{N}}_{\mathrm{ijk}}}\right) \hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{ijkm}}$
An approximate estimator of the variance of $\hat{\mu}_{\mathrm{ijk}}$ was obtained using the delta method (Seber 1982),

$$
\hat{v}\left(\hat{\mu}_{i j k}\right)=\sum_{m}\left\{\hat{v}\left(\hat{N}_{i j k m}\right)\left[\frac{\hat{\mu}_{i j k m}}{\sum_{x} \hat{N}_{i j k x}}-\sum_{y} \frac{\hat{N}_{i j k y} \hat{\mu}_{i j k y}}{\left(\sum_{x} \hat{N}_{i j k x}\right)^{2}}\right]^{2}+\left(\frac{\hat{N}_{i j k m}}{\sum_{x} \hat{N}_{i j k x}}\right)^{2} \hat{v}\left(\hat{\mu}_{i j k m}\right)\right\}
$$

## Genetics

Tissues and procedures for the various genetics projects were collected according to project specific protocols (Olsen et al. 2004, Crane et al. 2007, Liller et al. 2008). Collections were shipped to the Conservation Genetics Laboratory (CGL) in Anchorage for analysis and storage, or sub-sampled and shipped to other laboratories requesting tissue samples. See http://alaska.fws.gov/fisheries/genetics/reports.htm or http://ADFG/commercial.fisheries/Kusko.region/reports;.htm).

## Post-spawn counts

Technicians counted post-spawn salmon and carcasses of dead salmon that washed up on the weir. Counts were to species and the salmon passed downstream. Carcasses were counted at the start of the first shift, each subsequent crew change, and the end of the last member's shift resulting in counts at least every four hours or as daylight permitted.

## Results

## Weir

Refuge pilots started monitoring water and ice conditions in the Kwethluk River in early March. A helicopter was used to transport crew members, equipment, and supplies to the site on April 15 to complete weir panel installation. Weir personnel returned to the weir site on June 16 to remove debris and mud from the rail and panels and set resistance boards. The trap was installed on June 20 and the weir was fully operational from June 24 to September 10. Water level and temperature data were collected daily (Appendix 1).

## Biological Data

Chum Salmon - A total of 54,913 adult chum salmon passed through the weir. The first adult chum salmon migrated through the weir on June 25 and the last on September 5. Peak weekly passage for chum salmon ( $\mathrm{N}=14,337$ ) occurred July 8 to 14 (Figure 2). Median cumulative passage occurred on July 21 for adult chum salmon (Appendix 2) and August 3 for chum salmon carcasses, a difference of 18 days. The first chum salmon carcass passed downstream over the weir on July 1. Gillnet marks were observed on $2 \%$ of the 1,514 sampled chum salmon.


FIGURE 2.-Weekly passage of chum, Chinook, sockeye, pink, and coho salmon at the Kwethluk River weir, 2007.

Four age groups ( $0.2,0.3,0.4$, and 0.5 ) were identified from chum salmon scale samples. The predominant age group was 0.3 for both male ( $69 \%$ ) and female ( $73 \%$ ) chum salmon (Appendix 3). Females comprised $45 \%$ of the total escapement (Figure 3, Appendix 3). Mean length of males was greater in all age groups than that of females (Appendix 4).

Chinook Salmon - A total of 12,927 Chinook salmon passed through the weir. The first adult Chinook salmon migrated through the weir on June 29 and the last on September 9. Peak weekly passage for Chinook salmon ( $\mathrm{N}=5,114$ ) occurred July 8 to 14 (Figure 2). Median cumulative passage occurred on July 13 for adult Chinook salmon (Appendix 2) and August 15 for Chinook salmon carcasses, a difference of 33 days. The first Chinook salmon carcass passed downstream over the weir on July 29. Gillnet marks were observed on $6 \%$ of the 965 sampled Chinook salmon.

Five age groups (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5) were identified from Chinook salmon scale samples. The predominant age group was 1.2 for males ( $58 \%$ ) and 1.4 ( $59 \%$ ) for females. Age groups 1.2 and 1.3 accounted for $89 \%$ of the male Chinook salmon escapement (Appendix 5). Females comprised $26 \%$ of the Chinook salmon escapement in the five strata sampled (Appendix 5). Age groups 1.3 and 1.4 accounted for $93 \%$ of the female Chinook salmon escapement. The percentage of females increased as the run progressed and made up $35 \%$ and $45 \%$ of the last 2 strata, respectively (Figure 3, Appendix 5). Mean length of females was greater than males in age groups 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 and slightly less for age group 1.2 (Appendix 6).

Sockeye Salmon - A total of 5,148 adult sockeye salmon passed through the weir. The first adult sockeye salmon migrated through the weir on June 25 and the last on September 6. Peak weekly passage for sockeye salmon ( $\mathrm{N}=1,704$ ) occurred July 1 to 7 (Figure 2). Median cumulative passage occurred on July 9 for adult sockeye salmon (Appendix 2) and August 26 for sockeye salmon carcasses, a difference of 48 days. The first sockeye salmon carcass passed downstream over the weir July 20. Gillnet marks were observed on $5 \%$ of the 282 sampled sockeye salmon.

Eight age groups ( $1.1,0.3,1.2,1.3,2.2,1.4,2.3$, and 2.4 ) were identified from scales taken from sockeye salmon. The predominant age group was 1.3 for both males and females and comprised $61 \%$ of the sockeye salmon sample. Females comprised $49 \%$ of the total sockeye salmon escapement (Appendix 7). The mean length of males was greater than females for all age groups (Appendix 8).

Pink Salmon - A total of 626 pink salmon passed through the weir. The first adult pink salmon migrated through the weir on July 7 and the last on September 9. Peak weekly passage of pink salmon ( $\mathrm{N}=205$ ) occurred July 22 to 28 (Figure 2). Median cumulative passage occurred on July 26 for adult pink salmon (Appendix 2) and August 8 for pink salmon carcasses, a difference of 13 days. A total of 325 pink salmon carcasses were passed downstream over the weir with the first on July 24 and the last on September 9. No gillnet marks were observed on pink salmon.

Coho Salmon - A total of 19,473 coho salmon passed through the weir. The first adult coho salmon migrated through the weir on July 15 and low numbers of adult coho salmon continued to migrate past the weir at take out on September 10. Peak weekly passage of coho salmon $(\mathrm{N}=5,563)$ occurred August 19 to 25 (Figure 2). Median cumulative passage occurred on August 21 for adult coho salmon (Appendix 2). The first adult coho salmon carcass to pass downstream over the weir was recorded on August 10. Gillnet marks were observed on $1 \%$ of the 957 sampled coho salmon.


Figure 3.-Cumulative proportion and percent females for chum, Chinook, and coho salmon returning to the Kwethluk River during 2007. Percentage of females in the return was estimated by weekly strata for chum and Chinook salmon and during the early, middle and late portion of the return for coho salmon.

Three age groups (1.1, 2.1, and 3.1) were identified from scales of coho salmon. Age 2.1 was the predominant group for both males ( $84 \%$ ) and females ( $94 \%$ ). Females comprised $38 \%$ of the total escapement and were more prevalent in the early part of the coho salmon migration (Figure 3, Appendix 9). Mean lengths for ages 1.1 and 2.1 were slightly larger for males than females and essentially the same at age 3.1 (Appendix 10).

## Genetics collections

Genetic tissue samples were collected from live migrating chum ( $\mathrm{N}=200$ ), Chinook ( $\mathrm{N}=197$ ), sockeye ( $\mathrm{N}=171$ ), pink ( $\mathrm{N}=5$ ), and coho $(\mathrm{N}=57$ ) salmon. Genetic collections were sent to the CGL in Anchorage; sub-sampled if tissue was needed by the CGL, and collections forwarded to ADF\&G Genetics Conservation Laboratory in Anchorage in September 2007.

## Resident Species

In addition to the salmon, 20 Dolly Varden Salvelinus malma, 88 whitefish Coregoninae spp., 12 Arctic grayling Thymallus arcticus, 66 rainbow trout O. mykiss and one northern pike Esox lucius Linnaeus were counted through the weir. Nine rainbow trout mortalities and one Dolly Varden mortality were counted on the weir between August 10 and August 26.

## Mark-Recapture Tag Recovery

No tagged fish of any species were noted migrating through the weir between June 24 and September 10, 2007.

## Discussion

## Weir Operations

Aerial surveys of the Kwethluk River were flown from late March through April to determine when the weir site was clear of ice and water levels low enough for installation of the weir. Weir installation during April avoids the annual high water event, which normally begins in May and often continues until August. High water events are controlled by air temperature, snow pack, and rainfall. Weir panels were installed in late April and the weir was operational from June 24 to September 10, 2007.

Picket spacing on the Kwethluk River weir is such that smaller pink salmon and resident species are able to pass uncounted between pickets while other salmon species are effectively monitored. Thus, counts of pink salmon and resident species are not representative of actual passage.

The Hobo ${ }^{\circledR}$ temperature recorder located at the weir was damaged sometime during the 2007 season and that data was unrecoverable. However, the SaRON project had a Vemco ${ }^{\circledR}$ temperature recorder in the Kwethluk River mainstem approximately 8 rkm above the weir site and that data was used in this report.

## Biological Data

Chum Salmon - Chum salmon weir counts $(\mathrm{N}=54,913)$ were the highest on record and well above the 6 -year average (years with complete counts) (Appendix 11). The median cumulative passage for chum salmon was July 21 which was about 3 to 6 days later than observed in prior years (Appendix 12). The proportion of female chum salmon (45\%) was higher than 2003, 2004, and 2006, reversing a downward trend seen in past years (Appendix 12).

Chinook Salmon - The Chinook salmon weir count $(\mathrm{N}=12,927)$ was a decrease from the record escapement of 2004 and below the 6 -year average (years with complete counts) (Appendix 11). The median cumulative passage for Chinook salmon was July 13, which was very similar to median passage dates, observed during 2000, 2003, and 2006 (Appendix 12). Female Chinook salmon comprised only ( $26 \%$ ) of the run, which was much lower than 2006 but still higher than percentages observed from 1992 through 2004 (Appendix 12).

Sockeye Salmon - The Kwethluk River is not known for a large run of sockeye salmon. The observed count $(\mathrm{N}=5,148)$ of sockeye salmon in 2007 was the second highest recorded to date and well above a 6 -year average (years with complete counts) (Appendix 11). The median cumulative passage date of July 9 was similar to that observed in 2002 and 2006 but 8 days later than 2000 and 2004 (Appendix 12). High numbers of sockeye salmon were also observed at other enumeration projects on the Kuskokwim River in 2007.

Pink Salmon - The observed passage of pink salmon ( $\mathrm{N}=626$ ) is a $60 \%$ decrease over 2003, which was the largest count for odd years since the weir with wider picket spacing came into use in 2000 (Harper 1998) (Appendix 11). Pink salmon counts were below a 5-year average (only even years used) (Appendix 11) and the median cumulative passage for pink salmon occurred five days earlier than in 2003 (Appendix 12). Age, sex, and length data were not collected for pink salmon.

Harper (1998) assumed that the wider spacing of the pickets would allow most pink salmon to pass upstream uncounted and expected that the ratio of carcasses washed up on the weir to total count to increase because 'mortalities' would have approximately the same odds of washing on to the weir while the migrating pink salmon would have a reduced chance of being counted. That ratio shift was not observed until 2006 (Miller et al. 2007). In 2007, the total number of pink salmon carcasses ( $\mathrm{N}=325$ ) counted back across the weir was $>50 \%$ of the pink salmon escapement $(\mathrm{N}=626)$ which indicates that the wider picket spacing accomplished its intent.

Coho Salmon - The coho salmon count $(\mathrm{N}=19,473)$ was less than previous years. The 2007 coho salmon escapement is below the 7-year average (years with complete counts) and substantially below escapements observed in 1992, 2003 and 2004 (Appendix 11). The medium cumulative passage date, August 21, was similar to 2000 and 2006, but earlier than other years for coho salmon (Appendix 12). Female coho salmon comprised only ( $38 \%$ ) of the run and was the second lowest on record at the Kwethluk River weir (Appendix 12).

## Recommendations

The Kwethluk River weir continues to be an important project to monitor Kuskokwim River salmon stocks that originate on the Refuge and for providing information to the Department and Federal InSeason Subsistence Fishery Manager of the Kuskokwim River fisheries. We recommend annual operation of the weir to gather a long-term data set and operations into September to monitor coho salmon escapements. Early installation is essential to insure a successful weir installation, though more costly due to ice and debris damage to panels and increased cost for personnel and helicopter use.

## Acknowledgements

Special appreciation is extended to the crew that staffed the weir: Chad Whaley and Chris Berry from KFWFO; Wilson Berlin, Adam Fisher, John Fisher, George Maxie, Paul Michael, Tim Michael, and Brian Spein from OVK. Refuge staff provided support for this project. Special
thanks to Frank Harris and Darryl Sipary of the KFWFO for their knowledge of the process, problem solving abilities and extra effort in making things 'work'.

Also greatly appreciated was the assistance of Dave Folletti and Doug Molyneaux of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Arctic Yukon Kuskokwim Region. Analysis of Kuskokwim River scale samples is supported by a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management Cooperative Agreement with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game under Project FIS 07-303.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management provided funds for this project through the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, Project OSM 07-306. As a partner, OVK hired local residents to staff the weir, provided administrative support, purchased supplies, and performed equipment maintenance.

## References

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2001. Alaska subsistence fisheries 1999 annual report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Juneau, Alaska.
Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Alaska subsistence fisheries 2000 annual report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Juneau, Alaska.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2003a. Alaska subsistence fisheries 2001 annual report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Juneau, Alaska.

Alaska Department of Fish and Game. 2003b. Alaska subsistence fisheries 2002 annual report. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Juneau, Alaska.

Alt, K. 1977. Inventory and cataloging in Western Alaska waters. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Completion Report, Study G-I-P, Volume 18, Juneau, Alaska.

Bergstrom, D.J., and C. Whitmore. 2004. Kuskokwim River Chinook and chum salmon stock status and action plan, a report to the Alaska Board of Fisheries. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Division, Regional Information Report 3A04-02, Anchorage, Alaska.

Burkey, C., M. Coffing, J. Menard, D. Molyneaux, P. Salomone, and C. Utermohle. 2001. Annual management report for the subsistence and commercial fisheries of the Kuskokwim area, 2000. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, AYK Region, Regional Information Report Number 3A01-34, Anchorage, Alaska.

Cochran, W.G. 1977. Sampling techniques, 3rd edition. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
Crane P., D. Molyneaux, C. Lewis, and J. Wenburg. 2007. Genetic variation among coho salmon populations from the Kuskokwim region and application to stock-specific harvest estimation. Alaska Fisheries Technical Report Number 96, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska.

Geiger, J.H., J.E. Clark., B. Cross, and S. McPherson. 1990. Report from the work group on sampling. Pages 3-12 in H.J. Geiger, and R.L. Wilbur, editors. Proceedings of the 1990 Alaska stock separation workshop. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Special Fisheries Report Number 2, Juneau, Alaska.

Harper, K.C. 1998. Run timing and abundance of adult salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 1992. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kenai Fishery Resource Office, Alaska Fisheries Technical Report Number 44, Kenai, Alaska.
Harper, K.C. and C.B. Watry. 2001. Abundance and run timing of adult salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2000. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Alaska Fisheries Data Series Report 2001-4, Kenai, Alaska.
Harper, K.C., F. Harris, and S.J. Miller. 2007. Abundance and run timing of adult Pacific salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2005: Weir Rebuild. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management Annual Report 04-301.

Kerkvliet, C., J. Pawluk, T. Hamazaki, K. Hyer, and D. Cannon. 2004. A mark-recapture experiment to estimate abundance of Kuskokwim River sockeye, chum, and coho salmon, 2003. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries Regional Information Report 3A04-14, Anchorage, Alaska.

Koo, T.S.Y. 1962. Age determination in salmon. Pages $37-48$ in T.S.Y. Koo, editor. Studies of Alaskan red salmon. University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington.
Liller, Z. W., D. J. Costello, and D. B. Molyneaux. 2008. Kogrukluk River salmon studies, 2006. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Data Series Number 08-26, Anchorage, Alaska.

Linderman, J.C. and D. Bue. 2006. Kuskokwim Bay Salmon Fishery News Release \#29, Preliminary 2006 Kuskokwim Area Salmon Fishery Summary. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Kuskokwim Area Office, Bethel, Alaska. http://csfish.adfg.state.ak.us/newsrelease/view.php?year=2006\&dist=KUB\&species=400\&num $=29$

Miller, S.J., K.C. Harper, and D.G. Spencer. 2007. Abundance and run timing of adult salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2006. Alaska Fisheries Data Series Report 2007-9, Kenai, Alaska.
Molyneaux, D.B. and D.L. Folletti. 2008. Salmon age, sex, and length catalog for the Kuskokwim Area, 2007. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Regional Information Report Number 3A070-09, Anchorage, Alaska.

Mosher, K.H. 1968. Photographic atlas of sockeye salmon scales. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fishery Bulletin Number 2: 243-274.
Olsen J.B., S.J. Miller, K. Harper, J.J. Nagler, K. Van Hatten, K. Whitton, and J.K. Wenburg. 2004. Sex ratios of juvenile and adult Chinook salmon in the Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers. Final Report for Study 02-097, Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska.

Pawluk, J., C.M. Kerkvliet, T. Hamazaki, K. Hyer, and D. Cannon. 2006a. A mark-recapture study of Kuskokwim River sockeye, chum, and coho salmon, 2004. Fishery Data Series Number 0652. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Data Series Number 06-52, Anchorage, Alaska.

Pawluk, J., J. Baumer, T. Hamazaki, and D. Orabutt. 2006b. A mark-recapture study of Kuskokwim River Chinook, sockeye, chum and coho salmon, 2005. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Fishery Data Series Number 06-54, Anchorage, Alaska.

Roettiger, T.G., K.C. Harper, and A. Chikowsky. 2002. Abundance and run timing of adult salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2001. Alaska Fisheries Data Series Report 2002-8, Kenai, Alaska.

Roettiger, T.G., K.C. Harper, and D. Nolfi. 2003. Abundance and run timing of adult salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2002. Alaska Fisheries Data Series Report 2003-6, Kenai, Alaska.
Roettiger, T.G., F. Harris, and K.C. Harper. 2004. Abundance and run timing of adult salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2003. Alaska Fisheries Data Series Report 2004-8, Kenai, Alaska.
Roettiger, T.G., F. Harris, and K.C. Harper. 2005. Abundance and run timing of adult Pacific salmon in the Kwethluk River, Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, 2004. Alaska Fisheries Data Series Report 2005-7, Kenai, Alaska.
Seber, G.A.F. 1982. The estimation of animal abundance and related parameters, $2^{\text {nd }}$ edition. Maxmillan, New York.
Stewart, R. 2002. Resistance board weir panel construction manual, 2002. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Regional Information Report 3A02-21, Anchorage, Alaska.

Tobin, J.H. 1994. Construction and performance of a portable resistance board weir for counting migrating adult salmon in rivers. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Kenai Fishery Resource Office, Alaska Fisheries Technical Report Number 22, Kenai, Alaska.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1988. Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge comprehensive conservation plan, environmental impact statement, wilderness review, and wild river plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1992. Fishery Management Plan for the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska.
Ward, T.C., M. Coffing, J. Estenson, R. Fisher, and D. Molyneaux. 2003. Annual management report for the subsistence and commercial fisheries of the Kuskokwim Area, 2002. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Regional Information Report 3A03-27, Anchorage, Alaska.


APPENDIX 1.-Water stage heights at the Kwethluk River weir and water temperatures taken $8 \mathbf{r k m}$ upriver of the weir, Alaska, 2007.

APPENDIX 2.-Daily counts, cumulative counts, and cumulative proportions of chum, Chinook, sockeye, pink, and coho salmon escapement through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007. Boxed areas represent the second and third quartile and median passage dates.

| Date |  | Chum Salmon |  |  | Chinook Salmon |  |  | Sockeye Salmon |  |  | Pink Salmon |  |  | Coho Salmon |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily Count | Cumulative |  | Daily Count | Cumulative |  | Daily <br> Count | Cumulative |  | Daily <br> Count | Cumulative |  | Daily <br> Count | Cumulative |  |
|  |  | Count | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion |
|  | 6/24 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 6/25 | 14 | 14 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 10 | 10 | 0.002 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 6/26 | 44 | 58 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 60 | 70 | 0.014 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 6/27 | 6 | 64 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 18 | 88 | 0.017 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 6/28 | 4 | 68 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 30 | 118 | 0.023 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 6/29 | 89 | 157 | 0.003 | 2 | 2 | 0.000 | 130 | 248 | 0.048 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 6/30 | 46 | 203 | 0.004 | 6 | 8 | 0.001 | 93 | 341 | 0.066 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/1 | 218 | 421 | 0.008 | 47 | 55 | 0.004 | 142 | 483 | 0.094 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/2 | 144 | 565 | 0.010 | 43 | 98 | 0.008 | 91 | 574 | 0.111 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/3 | 200 | 765 | 0.014 | 72 | 170 | 0.013 | 119 | 693 | 0.135 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/4 | 395 | 1160 | 0.021 | 126 | 296 | 0.023 | 205 | 898 | 0.174 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| の | 7/5 | 859 | 2019 | 0.037 | 856 | 1152 | 0.089 | 516 | 1414 | 0.275 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/6 | 806 | 2825 | 0.051 | 500 | 1652 | 0.128 | 319 | 1733 | 0.337 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/7 | 1269 | 4094 | 0.075 | 603 | 2255 | 0.174 | 312 | 2045 | 0.397 | 6 | 6 | 0.010 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/8 | 2316 | 6410 | 0.117 | 804 | 3059 | 0.237 | 417 | 2462 | 0.478 | 5 | 11 | 0.018 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/9 | 1535 | 7945 | 0.145 | 434 | 3493 | 0.270 | 227 | 2689 | 0.522 | 8 | 19 | 0.030 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/10 | 1550 | 9495 | 0.173 | 934 | 4427 | 0.342 | 344 | 3033 | 0.589 | 8 | 27 | 0.043 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/11 | 1779 | 11274 | 0.205 | 371 | 4798 | 0.371 | 232 | 3265 | 0.634 | 11 | 38 | 0.061 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/12 | 2546 | 13820 | 0.252 | 897 | 5695 | 0.441 | 230 | 3495 | 0.679 | 16 | 54 | 0.086 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/13 | 3337 | 17157 | 0.312 | 1283 | 6978 | 0.540 | 100 | 3595 | 0.698 | 6 | 60 | 0.096 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/14 | 1274 | 18431 | 0.336 | 394 | 7372 | 0.570 | 39 | 3634 | 0.706 | 4 | 64 | 0.102 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/15 | 368 | 18799 | 0.342 | 139 | 7511 | 0.581 | 13 | 3647 | 0.708 | 5 | 69 | 0.110 | 5 | 5 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/16 | 603 | 19402 | 0.353 | 101 | 7612 | 0.589 | 37 | 3684 | 0.716 | 8 | 77 | 0.123 | 0 | 5 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/17 | 2481 | 21883 | 0.399 | 340 | 7952 | 0.615 | 110 | 3794 | 0.737 | 12 | 89 | 0.142 | 2 | 7 | 0.000 |
|  | 7/18 | 3304 | 25187 | 0.459 | 595 | 8547 | 0.661 | 122 | 3916 | 0.761 | 20 | 109 | 0.174 | 4 | 11 | 0.001 |
|  | 7/19 | 834 | 26021 | 0.474 | 572 | 9119 | 0.705 | 87 | 4003 | 0.778 | 23 | 132 | 0.211 | 0 | 11 | 0.001 |
|  | 7/20 | 1147 | 27168 | 0.495 | 379 | 9498 | 0.735 | 64 | 4067 | 0.790 | 25 | 157 | 0.251 | 28 | 39 | 0.002 |
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| Date |  | Chum Salmon |  |  | Chinook Salmon |  |  | Sockeye Salmon |  |  | Pink Salmon |  |  | Coho Salmon |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Daily <br> Count | Cumulative |  | Daily Count | Cumulative |  | Daily Count | Cumulative |  | Daily Count | Cumulative |  | Daily <br> Count | Cumulative |  |
|  |  | Count | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion | Count |  | Proportion |
|  | 7/21 |  | 1581 | 28749 | 0.524 | 265 | 9763 | 0.755 | 36 | 4103 | 0.797 | 28 | 185 | 0.296 | 21 | 60 | 0.003 |
|  | 7/22 | 900 | 29649 | 0.540 | 146 | 9909 | 0.767 | 34 | 4137 | 0.804 | 14 | 199 | 0.318 | 9 | 69 | 0.004 |
|  | 7/23 | 2972 | 32621 | 0.594 | 467 | 10376 | 0.803 | 88 | 4225 | 0.821 | 33 | 232 | 0.371 | 46 | 115 | 0.006 |
|  | 7/24 | 2346 | 34967 | 0.637 | 235 | 10611 | 0.821 | 34 | 4259 | 0.827 | 32 | 264 | 0.422 | 34 | 149 | 0.008 |
|  | 7/25 | 2430 | 37397 | 0.681 | 513 | 11124 | 0.861 | 110 | 4369 | 0.849 | 31 | 295 | 0.471 | 93 | 242 | 0.012 |
|  | 7/26 | 2400 | 39797 | 0.725 | 354 | 11478 | 0.888 | 110 | 4479 | 0.870 | 46 | 341 | 0.545 | 129 | 371 | 0.019 |
|  | 7/27 | 1800 | 41597 | 0.758 | 364 | 11842 | 0.916 | 81 | 4560 | 0.886 | 34 | 375 | 0.599 | 105 | 476 | 0.024 |
|  | 7/28 | 822 | 42419 | 0.772 | 146 | 11988 | 0.927 | 43 | 4603 | 0.894 | 15 | 390 | 0.623 | 41 | 517 | 0.027 |
|  | 7/29 | 1095 | 43514 | 0.792 | 84 | 12072 | 0.934 | 37 | 4640 | 0.901 | 6 | 396 | 0.633 | 44 | 561 | 0.029 |
|  | 7/30 | 975 | 44489 | 0.810 | 79 | 12151 | 0.940 | 47 | 4687 | 0.910 | 27 | 423 | 0.676 | 49 | 610 | 0.031 |
|  | 7/31 | 1578 | 46067 | 0.839 | 99 | 12250 | 0.948 | 52 | 4739 | 0.921 | 17 | 440 | 0.703 | 121 | 731 | 0.038 |
|  | 8/1 | 738 | 46805 | 0.852 | 110 | 12360 | 0.956 | 20 | 4759 | 0.924 | 14 | 454 | 0.725 | 146 | 877 | 0.045 |
|  | 8/2 | 848 | 47653 | 0.868 | 100 | 12460 | 0.964 | 30 | 4789 | 0.930 | 10 | 464 | 0.741 | 155 | 1032 | 0.053 |
|  | 8/3 | 818 | 48471 | 0.883 | 89 | 12549 | 0.971 | 31 | 4820 | 0.936 | 15 | 479 | 0.765 | 244 | 1276 | 0.066 |
| ت | 8/4 | 776 | 49247 | 0.897 | 42 | 12591 | 0.974 | 24 | 4844 | 0.941 | 6 | 485 | 0.775 | 171 | 1447 | 0.074 |
| $\checkmark$ | 8/5 | 1383 | 50630 | 0.922 | 97 | 12688 | 0.982 | 61 | 4905 | 0.953 | 24 | 509 | 0.813 | 1048 | 2495 | 0.128 |
|  | 8/6 | 737 | 51367 | 0.935 | 51 | 12739 | 0.985 | 36 | 4941 | 0.960 | 10 | 519 | 0.829 | 453 | 2948 | 0.151 |
|  | 8/7 | 464 | 51831 | 0.944 | 50 | 12789 | 0.989 | 16 | 4957 | 0.963 | 2 | 521 | 0.832 | 253 | 3201 | 0.164 |
|  | 8/8 | 518 | 52349 | 0.953 | 39 | 12828 | 0.992 | 20 | 4977 | 0.967 | 13 | 534 | 0.853 | 326 | 3527 | 0.181 |
|  | 8/9 | 492 | 52841 | 0.962 | 21 | 12849 | 0.994 | 25 | 5002 | 0.972 | 8 | 542 | 0.866 | 274 | 3801 | 0.195 |
|  | 8/10 | 498 | 53339 | 0.971 | 11 | 12860 | 0.995 | 27 | 5029 | 0.977 | 8 | 550 | 0.879 | 488 | 4289 | 0.220 |
|  | 8/11 | 207 | 53546 | 0.975 | 5 | 12865 | 0.995 | 15 | 5044 | 0.980 | 8 | 558 | 0.891 | 368 | 4657 | 0.239 |
|  | 8/12 | 172 | 53718 | 0.978 | 6 | 12871 | 0.996 | 12 | 5056 | 0.982 | 1 | 559 | 0.893 | 331 | 4988 | 0.256 |
|  | 8/13 | 281 | 53999 | 0.983 | 9 | 12880 | 0.996 | 12 | 5068 | 0.984 | 4 | 563 | 0.899 | 974 | 5962 | 0.306 |
|  | 8/14 | 112 | 54111 | 0.985 | 5 | 12885 | 0.997 | 1 | 5069 | 0.985 | 1 | 564 | 0.901 | 348 | 6310 | 0.324 |
|  | 8/15 | 55 | 54166 | 0.986 | 6 | 12891 | 0.997 | 3 | 5072 | 0.985 | 2 | 566 | 0.904 | 153 | 6463 | 0.332 |
|  | 8/16 | 89 | 54255 | 0.988 | 7 | 12898 | 0.998 | 10 | 5082 | 0.987 | 1 | 567 | 0.906 | 216 | 6679 | 0.343 |
|  | 8/17 | 124 | 54379 | 0.990 | 7 | 12905 | 0.998 | 9 | 5091 | 0.989 | 3 | 570 | 0.911 | 597 | 7276 | 0.374 |
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## APPENDIX 3.-Estimated age and sex composition of weekly chum salmon escapements through the

 Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007, and estimated design effects of the stratified sampling design.|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |  |
| Strata 1-2 | 06/24-07/07 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/02-07/07 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 43 | 51 | 14 | 108 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 24.2 | 28.7 | 7.9 | 61 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 989 | 1173 | 322 | 2,484 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 128.8 | 136.1 | 81.0 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 36 | 31 | 2 | 70 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.6 | 20.2 | 17.4 | 1.1 | 39 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 23 | 828 | 713 | 46 | 1,610 |
|  | Standard Error: | 22.5 | 120.9 | 114.1 | 31.7 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 79 | 82 | 16 | 178 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.6 | 44.4 | 46.1 | 9.0 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 23 | 1817 | 1886 | 368 | 4,094 |
|  | Standard Error: | 22.5 | 149.5 | 150.0 | 86.1 |  |
| Stratum 3: | 07/08-7/14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 63 | 27 | 6 | 96 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 33.5 | 14.4 | 3.2 | 51 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 4804 | 2059 | 458 | 7,321 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 491.6 | 365.3 | 183.1 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 59 | 31 | 2 | 92 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 31.4 | 16.5 | 1.1 | 49 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 4499 | 2364 | 153 | 7,016 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 483.3 | 386.5 | 106.9 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 122 | 58 | 8 | 188 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 64.9 | 30.9 | 4.3 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 9304 | 4423 | 610 | 14,337 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 497.1 | 481.1 | 210.2 |  |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |  |
| Stratum 4: | 07/15-07/21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/15-07/16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 83 | 33 | 4 | 120 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.5 | 43.2 | 17.2 | 2.1 | 63 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 53 | 4460 | 1773 | 215 | 6,449 |
|  | Standard Error: | 52.1 | 366.4 | 279.0 | 105.6 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 3 | 54 | 15 | 3 | 72 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 1.5 | 28.1 | 7.8 | 1.6 | 38 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 158 | 2902 | 806 | 161 | 3,869 |
|  | Standard Error: | 90 | 333 | 198 | 92 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 137 | 48 | 7 | 192 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 71.4 | 25.0 | 3.6 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 7362 | 2580 | 376 | 10,318 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 334.4 | 320.3 | 138.6 |  |
| Stratum 5: | 07/22-07/28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 2 | 80 | 24 | 0 | 106 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 1.1 | 43.0 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 57 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 147 | 5880 | 1764 | 0 | 7,790 |
|  | Standard Error: | 102.9 | 494.2 | 334.6 | 0.0 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 4 | 62 | 11 | 3 | 80 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 2.2 | 33.3 | 5.9 | 1.6 | 43 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 294 | 4557 | 808 | 220 | 5,880 |
|  | Standard Error: | 144.8 | 470.5 | 235.5 | 125.7 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 6 | 142 | 35 | 3 | 186 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 3.2 | 76.3 | 18.8 | 1.6 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 441 | 10436 | 2572 | 220 | 13,670 |
|  | Standard Error: | 176.4 | 424.2 | 390.1 | 125.7 |  |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |  |
| Stratum 6: | 07/29-08/04 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/29 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 82 | 25 | 3 | 110 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 44.1 | 13.4 | 1.6 | 59 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 3010 | 918 | 110 | 4,038 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 245.8 | 168.9 | 62.4 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 3 | 62 | 9 | 2 | 76 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 1.6 | 33.3 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 41 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 110 | 2276 | 330 | 73 | 2,790 |
|  | Standard Error: | 62.4 | 233.4 | 106.2 | 51.1 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 3 | 144 | 34 | 5 | 186 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 1.6 | 77.4 | 18.3 | 2.7 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 110 | 5286 | 1248 | 184 | 6,828 |
|  | Standard Error: | 62.4 | 207.0 | 191.4 | 80.1 |  |
| Stratum 7: | 08/05-08/11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 08/06-08/07 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 53 | 9 | 0 | 62 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 28.2 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 33 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 1212 | 206 | 0 | 1,418 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 138.3 | 65.6 | 0.0 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 5 | 100 | 19 | 2 | 126 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 2.7 | 53.2 | 10.1 | 1.1 | 67 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 114 | 2287 | 434 | 46 | 2,881 |
|  | Standard Error: | 49.5 | 153.4 | 92.7 | 31.5 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 5 | 153 | 28 | 2 | 188 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 2.7 | 81.4 | 14.9 | 1.1 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 114 | 3499 | 640 | 46 | 4,299 |
|  | Standard Error: | 49.5 | 119.7 | 109.5 | 31.5 |  |
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APPENDIX 4.-Estimated length (mm) at age composition of weekly chum salmon escapements through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007.

|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 |
|  |  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Strata 1-2: | 06/24-07/07 |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/01-07/04 |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length |  | 593 | 613 | 620 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 6 | 6 | 10 |
|  | Range |  | 530-725 | 525-715 | 535-680 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 43 | 51 | 14 |
| Female: | Mean Length | 540 | 555 | 569 | 595 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 8 | 8 | 25 |
|  | Range | 540 | 460-700 | 450-645 | 570-620 |
|  | Sample Size | 1 | 36 | 31 | 2 |
| Stratum 3: | 07/08-07/14 |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/08-07/09 |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length |  | 575 | 593 | 598 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 4 | 6 | 18 |
|  | Range |  | 510-630 | 520-670 | 535-650 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 63 | 27 | 6 |
| Female: | Mean Length |  | 539 | 567 | 543 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 3 | 5 | 13 |
|  | Range |  | 485-600 | 520-630 | 530-555 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 59 | 31 | 2 |
| Stratum 4: | 07/15-07/21 |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/15 |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length | 605 | 571 | 581 | 593 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 4 | 7 | 13 |
|  | Range | 605 | 450-640 | 500-655 | 560-620 |
|  | Sample Size | 1 | 83 | 33 | 4 |
| Female: | Mean Length | 528 | 528 | 540 | 555 |
|  | Std. Error | 11 | 5 | 10 | 9 |
|  | Range | 515-550 | 410-600 | 470-605 | 540-570 |
|  | Sample Size | 3 | 54 | 15 | 3 |
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APPENDIX 5.-Estimated age and sex composition of weekly Chinook salmon escapements through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007, and estimated design effects of the stratified sampling design.

|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Strata 1-2: | 06/24-07/07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/2-07/7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 58 | 32 | 8 | 1 | 99 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 47.9 | 26.4 | 6.6 | 0.8 | 81.8 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 1,081 | 596 | 149 | 19 | 1,845 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 100.0 | 88.3 | 49.8 | 18.1 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 1 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 22 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 0.8 | 13.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 18.2 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 19 | 298 | 93 | 0 | 410 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 18.1 | 67.8 | 39.9 | 0.0 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 59 | 48 | 13 | 1 | 121 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 48.8 | 39.7 | 10.7 | 0.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 1,100 | 895 | 242 | 19 | 2,255 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 100.1 | 98.0 | 62.0 | 18.1 |  |
| Stratum 3: | 07/08-07/14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/8-07/10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 77 | 48 | 19 | 0 | 144 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 41.2 | 25.7 | 10.2 | 0 | 77.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 2,107 | 1,313 | 520 | 0 | 3,940 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 181.2 | 160.9 | 111.3 | 0 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 3 | 43 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 16.0 | 1.6 | 23.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 0 | 274 | 821 | 82 | 1,177 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 82.9 | 135.2 | 46.3 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 77 | 58 | 49 | 3 | 187 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 41.2 | 31.0 | 26.2 | 2 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 2,107 | 1,587 | 1,341 | 82 | 5,117 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 181.2 | 170.3 | 161.9 | 46.3 |  |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Stratum 4: | 07/15-07/21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/15-07/19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 93 | 48 | 14 | 1 | 157 |
|  | Estimated \% of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Escapement: | 0.5 | 46.5 | 24.0 | 7.0 | 1 | 78.5 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 12 | 1,112 | 574 | 167 | 12 | 1,877 |
|  | Standard Error: | 11.4 | 80.9 | 69.3 | 41.4 | 11 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 0 | 14 | 26 | 3 | 43 |
|  | Estimated \% of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Escapement: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 13.0 | 2 | 21.5 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 0 | 167 | 311 | 36 | 514 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 0.0 | 41.4 | 54.6 | 20 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: <br> Estimated \% of | 1 | 93 | 62 | 40 | 4 | 200 |
|  | Escapement: | 0.5 | 46.5 | 31.0 | 20.0 | 2 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 12 | 1,112 | 741 | 478 | 48 | 2,391 |
|  | Standard Error: | 11.4 | 80.9 | 75.0 | 64.9 | 22.7 |  |
| Stratum 5: | 07/22-07/28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/22-07/26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 81 | 28 | 9 | 1 | 119 |
|  | Estimated \% of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Escapement: | 0.0 | 44.0 | 15.2 | 4.9 | 1 | 64.7 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 979 | 339 | 109 | 12 | 1,439 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 78.2 | 56.6 | 34.0 | 12 |  |
| Female: |  | 0 | 3 | 20 | 39 | 3 | 65 |
|  | Estimated \% of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Escapement: | 0.0 | 1.6 | 10.9 | 21.2 | 2 | 35.3 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 36 | 242 | 472 | 36 | 786 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 20.0 | 49.0 | 64.4 | 20 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 84 | 48 | 48 | 4 | 184 |
|  | Estimated \% of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Escapement: | 0.0 | 45.7 | 26.1 | 26.1 | 2 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 1,016 | 580 | 580 | 48 | 2,225 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 78.5 | 69.2 | 69.2 | 23.0 |  |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |  |
| Strata 6-9: 07/29-08/25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/29-08/20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 52 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 79 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 36.4 | 13.3 | 5.6 | 0 | 55.2 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 341 | 125 | 53 | 0 | 519 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 34.9 | 24.6 | 16.7 | 0 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 2 | 22 | 38 | 2 | 64 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 1.4 | 15.4 | 26.6 | 1 | 44.8 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 13 | 144 | 250 | 13 | 420 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 8.5 | 26.2 | 32.0 | 9 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 54 | 41 | 46 | 2 | 143 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.0 | 37.8 | 28.7 | 32.2 | 1 | 100 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 355 | 269 | 302 | 13 | 939 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 35.2 | 32.8 | 33.9 | 8.5 |  |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2004 \\ \hline 1.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2003 \\ \hline 1.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2002 \\ \hline 1.3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2001 \\ \hline 1.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 1.5 |  |  |  | Total |
| Strata 1-9: | 06/24-08/25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/02-08/20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 361 | 175 | 58 | 3 | 598 |
|  | \% Males in Age Group: <br> Estimated \% of | 0.1 | 58.4 | 30.6 | 10.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Escapement: | 0.1 | 43.5 | 22.8 | 7.7 | 0.3 | 74.4 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 12 | 5,621 | 2,947 | 998 | 43 | 9,620 |
|  | Standard Error: | 11.4 | 238.2 | 205.6 | 134.2 | 24.4 |  |
|  | Estimated Design Effects: | 0.772 | 1.217 | 1.263 | 1.326 | 0.965 | 1.148 |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 0 | 6 | 82 | 138 | 11 | 237 |
|  | \% Females in Age Group: Estimated \% of | 0.0 | 2.1 | 34.0 | 58.8 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Escapement: | 0.0 | 0.5 | 8.7 | 15.1 | 1.3 | 25.6 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 0 | 68 | 1,125 | 1,946 | 167 | 3,307 |
|  | Standard Error: | 0.0 | 28.3 | 127.6 | 167.3 | 54.8 |  |
|  | Estimated Design Effects: | 0.000 | 0.826 | 1.085 | 1.156 | 1.236 | 1.148 |
| Total: | Number in Sample: <br> Estimated \% of | 1 | 367 | 257 | 196 | 14 | 835 |
|  | Escapement: | 0.1 | 44.0 | 31.5 | 22.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 12 | 5,689 | 4,073 | 2,944 | 210 | 12,927 |
|  | Standard Error: | 11.4 | 238.4 | 223.8 | 200.5 | 59.9 |  |
|  | Estimated Design Effects: | 0.772 | 1.215 | 1.223 | 1.205 | 1.184 |  |

APPENDIX 6.-Estimated length (mm) at age composition of weekly Chinook salmon escapements through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007.

|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Strata 1-2: <br> Sampling Dates: | $\begin{aligned} & 06 / 24-07 / 07 \\ & 07 / 02-07 / 07 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length |  | 546 | 662 | 837 | 775 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 6 | 7 | 68 |  |
|  | Range |  | 445-650 | 570-775 | 610-1110 | 775-775 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 58 | 32 | 8 | 1 |
| Female: | Mean Length |  | 510 | 741 | 812 |  |
|  | Std. Error |  |  | 7 | 31 |  |
|  | Range |  | 510-510 | 700-795 | 750-910 |  |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 1 | 16 | 5 | 0 |
| Stratum 3: | 07/08-07/14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/08-07/10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length |  | 551 | 684 | 836 |  |
|  | Std. Error |  | 4 | 7 | 23 |  |
|  | Range |  | 460-635 | 570-800 | 640-980 |  |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 77 | 48 | 19 | 0 |
| Female: | Mean Length |  |  | 751 | 828 | 832 |
|  | Std. Error |  |  | 13 | 13 | 11 |
|  | Range |  |  | 705-820 | 700-945 | 810-845 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 3 |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 |
|  |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Stratum 4: <br> Sampling Dates: | $\begin{aligned} & 07 / 15-07 / 21 \\ & 07 / 15-7 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length | 450 | 546 | 664 | 791 | 725 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 5 | 9 | 36 |  |
|  | Range | 450 | 445-650 | 530-775 | 635-1100 | 725 |
|  | Sample Size | 1 | 93 | 48 | 14 | 1 |
| Female: | Mean Length |  |  | 755 | 833 | 855 |
|  | Std. Error |  |  | 11 | 11 | 40 |
|  | Range |  |  | 705-825 | 735-910 | 785-925 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 0 | 14 | 26 | 3 |
| Stratum 5: | 07/22-07/28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | $7 / 22,7 / 24-7 / 26$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length |  | 543 | 686 | 789 | 700 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 5 | 10 | 25 |  |
|  | Range |  | 460-660 | 565-795 | 665-920 | 700 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 81 | 28 | 9 | 1 |
| Female: | Mean Length |  | 545 | 731 | 860 | 863 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 48 | 14 | 9 | 32 |
|  | Range |  | 450-595 | 610-825 | 720-990 | 805-915 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 3 | 20 | 39 | 3 |
| Strata 6-9: | 07/29-08/25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/29-08/20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length |  | 547 | 671 | 803 |  |
|  | Std. Error |  | 7 | 15 | 29 |  |
|  | Range |  | 430-635 | 550-810 | 695-915 |  |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 52 | 19 | 8 | 0 |
| Female: | Mean Length |  | 530 | 768 | 853 | 778 |
|  | Std. Error |  | 10 | 11 | 9 | 8 |
|  | Range |  | 520-540 | 615-835 | 770-960 | 770-785 |
|  | Sample Size | 0 | 2 | 22 | 38 | 2 |
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APPENDIX 7.-Estimated age and sex composition of weekly sockeye salmon escapements through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007, and estimated design effects of the stratified sampling design.

|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 |  | 2002 |  | 2001 |  | 2000 |  |
|  |  | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 |  |
| Strata 1-12 | 06/2-09/10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 7/01-8/26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 1 | 30 | 73 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 108 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.5 | 0.5 | 13.7 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 49.3 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 24 | 24 | 705 | 1,716 | 0 | 47 | 24 | 0 | 2,539 |
|  | Standard Error: | 23.0 | 23.0 | 117.3 | 160.8 | 0.0 | 32.5 | 23.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 0 | 41 | 61 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 111 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.5 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 27.9 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 50.7 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 24 | 0 | 964 | 1,434 | 71 | 24 | 71 | 24 | 2,609 |
|  | Standard Error: | 23.0 | 0.0 | 133.1 | 152.9 | 39.7 | 23.0 | 39.7 | 23.0 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 2 | 1 | 71 | 134 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 219 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 0.9 | 0.5 | 32.4 | 61.2 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 47 | 24 | 1,669 | 3,150 | 71 | 71 | 94 | 24 | 5,148 |
|  | Standard Error: | 32.5 | 23.0 | 159.7 | 166.3 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 45.7 | 23.0 |  |
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APPENDIX 8.-Estimated length (mm) at age composition of weekly sockeye salmon escapements through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007.


APPENDIX 9.-Estimated age and sex composition of weekly coho salmon escapements through the
Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007, and estimated design effects of the stratified sampling design. Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007, and estimated design effects of the stratified sampling design.


## Appendix 9.-(Page 2 of 2)

|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |  |
|  |  | 1.1 | 2.1 | 3.1 |  |
| Strata 9-12: | 08/19-09/10 |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 08/19, 08/20, 08/26, 09/02 |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 9 | 52 | 0 | 61 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 10.1 | 58.4 | 0.0 | 68.5 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 1,173 | 6,779 | 0 | 7,953 |
|  | Standard Error: | 371.5 | 607.3 | 0.0 |  |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 1 | 27 | 0 | 28 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 1.1 | 30.3 | 0.0 | 31.5 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 130 | 3,520 | 0 | 3,650 |
|  | Standard Error: | 129.9 | 566.4 | 0.0 |  |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 10 | 79 | 0 | 89 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 11.2 | 88.8 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 1,304 | 10,299 | 0 | 11,603 |
|  | Standard Error: | 389.1 | 389.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Strata 1-12: | 06/24-09/10 |  |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/29-09/02 |  |  |  |  |
| Male: | Number in Sample: | 30 | 189 | 3 | 222 |
|  | \% Males in Age Group: | 14.2 | 85.2 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 8.8 | 52.9 | 0.4 | 62.1 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 1,713 | 10,292 | 78 | 12,083 |
|  | Standard Error: | 388.0 | 645.8 | 44.4 |  |
|  | Estimated Design Effects: | 1.965 | 1.755 | 0.529 | 1.675 |
| Female: | Number in Sample: | 9 | 158 | 5 | 172 |
|  | \% Females in Age Group: | 4.6 | 93.6 | 1.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 1.7 | 35.5 | 0.7 | 37.9 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 338 | 6,918 | 133 | 7,390 |
|  | Standard Error: | 148.3 | 607.5 | 58.0 |  |
|  | Estimated Design Effects: | 1.354 | 1.690 | 0.533 | 1.675 |
| Total: | Number in Sample: | 39 | 347 | 8 | 394 |
|  | Estimated \% of Escapement: | 10.5 | 88.4 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
|  | Estimated Escapement: | 2,051 | 17,210 | 211 | 19,473 |
|  | Standard Error: | 410.3 | 415.4 | 72.5 |  |
|  | Estimated Design Effects: | 1.872 | 1.762 | 0.527 |  |

## APPENDIX 10.-Estimated length (mm) at age composition of weekly coho salmon escapements through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 2007.

|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
|  |  | 1.1 | 2.1 | 3.1 |
| No Samples Collected |  |  |  |  |
| Strata 6-7: | 07/29-08/11 |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/29-0808 |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length | 544 | 559 | 545 |
|  | Std. Error | 15 | 4 | 15 |
|  | Range | 440-590 | 490-630 | 530-560 |
|  | Sample Size | 11 | 70 | 2 |
| Female: | Mean Length | 559 | 531 | 565 |
|  | Std. Error | 14 | 6 |  |
|  | Range | 515-585 | 445-640 | 485-615 |
|  | Sample Size | 5 | 79 | 4 |
| Stratum 8: | 08/12-08/18 |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 08/12-08/13 |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length | 562 | 576 | 560 |
|  | Std. Error | 5 | 4 |  |
|  | Range | 540-585 | 445-660 | 560 |
|  | Sample Size | 10 | 67 | 1 |
| Female: | Mean Length | 535 | 547 | 570 |
|  | Std. Error | 5 | 6 |  |
|  | Range | 530-545 | 420-655 | 570 |
|  | Sample Size | 3 | 52 | 1 |
| Strata 9-12: | 08/19-09/10 |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 08/19-08/20, 08/26, 09/02 |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length | 585 | 573 |  |
|  | Std. Error | 14 | 4 |  |
|  | Range | 520-630 | 490-625 |  |
|  | Sample Size | 9 | 52 | 0 |
| Female: | Mean Length | 535 | 556 |  |
|  | Std. Error | . | 6 |  |
|  | Range | 535-535 | 490-615 |  |
|  | Sample Size | 1 | 27 | 0 |
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|  |  | Brood Year and Age Group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
|  |  | 1.1 | 2.1 | 3.1 |
| Strata 1-12: | 06/24-09/10 |  |  |  |
| Sampling Dates: | 07/17-09/02 |  |  |  |
| Male: | Mean Length | 575 | 571 | 550 |
|  | Std. Error | 10 | 3 | 15 |
|  | Range | 440-630 | 445-660 | 530-560 |
|  | Sample Size | 30 | 189 | 3 |
| Female: | Mean Length | 545 | 553 | 556 |
|  | Std. Error | 9 | 3 | 30 |
|  | Range | 515-585 | 420-655 | 485-615 |
|  | Sample Size | 9 | 158 | 5 |



APPENDIX 11.-Estimates of salmon escapement through the Kwethluk River weir, Alaska, 1992, 20002004, 2006 and 2007. Enumeration for 2001 commenced on $8 / 12$ and resulted in counts for coho salmon giving data for a 7 -year average verses a 6-year average for Chinook, chum and sockeye salmon. Pink salmon averages are based on even years only. Averages do not include the current year.

APPENDIX 12.-Median cumulative passage dates and percent female for chum, Chinook, sockeye, pink and coho salmon at the Kwethluk river weir in 1992, 2000-2004, 2006 and 2007 (Harper 1998; Harper and Watry 20001; Roettiger at al. 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005; Miller et al. 2007).

|  | Chum |  | Chinook |  | Sockeye |  | Pink |  | Coho |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Date | Percent Female | Date | Percent Female | Date | Percent Female | Date | Percent <br> Female | Date | Percent Female |
| 1992 | 7/18 | 54 | 7/9 | 25 | 7/18 | 60 | 8/13 | - | 8/26 | 43 |
| 2000 | 7/16 | 50 | 7/13 | 21 | 7/1 | 49 | 8/4 | - | 8/21 | 45 |
| 2001 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8/25 | 51 |
| 2002 | 7/17 | 47 | 7/10 | 22 | 7/11 | 60 | 7/25 | - | 8/28 | 45 |
| 2003 | 7/22 | 44 | 7/11 | 19 | 7/7 | 55 | 8/1 | - | 8/29 | 51 |
| 2004 | 7/14 | 43 | 7/8 | 17 | 7/1 | 48 | 8/6 | - | 8/29 | 43 |
| 2006 | 7/15 | 41 | 7/12 | 40 | 7/10 | 43 | 7/22 | - | 8/19 | 37 |
| 2007 | 7/21 | 45 | 7/13 | 26 | 7/9 | 49 | 7/26 | - | 8/21 | 38 |

