

**CHUM STOCK ID ASSESSMENT (CANADIAN AREA 3  
COMMERCIAL FISHERY OTOLITHS): ADF&G  
COMPONENT**

by

Bev Agler and Lorna Wilson  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game Division Commercial Fisheries, Juneau

Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Division of Commercial Fisheries, Mark, Tag, and Age Laboratory  
10107 Bentwood Drive, Juneau AK 99801

January 2017

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game Thermal Mark Laboratory, Juneau examined chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) otoliths for the presence of thermal marks as part of a multi-year stock identification assessment of Canadian chum salmon. Chum salmon otoliths recovered from 2015 fisheries were analyzed during winter 2016 to determine the presence of a thermal mark. From 2015 fishery sampling, we received 1,369 samples of which 1,327 were readable. Of these, 946 (71.3%) were thermal marked, and the most common mark found was from fish released in Nakat Inlet, Alaska. The Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association's Whitman Lake Hatchery utilizes Nakat Inlet as a remote release site.

Key words: Chum salmon, *Oncorhynchus keta*, thermal mark, hatchery, otolith

## INTRODUCTION

Thermal marking of salmonid otoliths is an effective tool for identifying hatchery salmon (Munk and Smoker 1991; Volk et al. 1990), because thermal mark identification is quick and fairly accurate (Hagen et al. 1995). Salmonid otoliths are thermal marked by exposing them to repeated temperature cycles that create patterns of optically-dense bands (Volk et al. 1990). Thermal mark identification is used by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) for in-season management of Alaska's salmon stocks (TTC 1990) and for evaluation of hatchery success rates. Recent studies have used thermal marks to document the presence and distribution of stray hatchery chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) in index streams throughout Southeast Alaska (Piston and Heintz 2011).

The objective of this study was to detect and identify chum salmon thermal marks for the Chum Stock Identification Assessment project in Canadian Area 3 commercial seine and gillnet fisheries.

## METHODS

Chum salmon otoliths were collected from the Canadian Area 3 commercial fishery in 2015, as part of a continuing study. All sample data were entered into specialized applications, and summary results were immediately available online. Individual specimen results were queried from the Southeast Alaska Mark Recovery Oracle database, and results were saved in Microsoft Excel.

The chum salmon otoliths were prepared for thermal mark examination in the ADF&G Thermal Mark Lab. First, the otoliths were cleaned with a chlorine solution (5%), rinsed with a de-chlorine solution (0.7% thiosulfate), and then mounted on 1 by 2 inch glass slides with thermoplastic cement. Otoliths were examined for thermal mark presence by grinding the otolith on a grinder using 800 grit grinding paper until the primordia were visible under 200x magnification on a compound microscope. Fine polishing was performed by hand using 9 µm grinding paper. Readers identified specimens as marked, unmarked, or unreadable. If a specimen was marked, readers described the mark with special codes (known as hatch codes; ADF&G 2015). For quality control, each specimen was independently read a second time, and any conflicts between the two reads were resolved.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the 2015 fishery, ADF&G MTA Lab readers examined 1,369 samples of which 1,327 were readable (Table 1). Of these, 946 (71.3%) were thermal-marked, and 945 (99.9%) were marked by the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association (SSRA) and released in southern southeast Alaska. Only one otolith was found with a mark from northern southeast Alaska. Of the SSRA marks, most (742, 78.4%) recoveries were released in Nakat Inlet. The majority of (617, 83.2%) of Nakat Inlet recoveries were the brood year 2011 summer release. Nakat Inlet is a remote release site used by Whitman Lake Hatchery, part of the Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association.

The 2015 chum salmon results by specimen were delivered to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada Stock Assessment Biologist on 25 March 2016.

We met all required timelines and objectives. We were unable to judge the benefits of this project. We provided the data to the Prince Rupert Department of Fisheries and Oceans office, and they utilized it in their fishery management.

A summary of the financial expenditures will be sent separately by ADF&G Headquarters. There was little deviation from the projected budget.

Table 1. Thermal marks recovered from otoliths collected during the 2015 fishing season in British Columbia's Area 3. SSRAA = Southern Southeast Regional Aquaculture Association; DIPAC = Douglas Island Pink and Chum, Inc.

Affiliation	Mark Name	n	Total Release Site	Overall %
SSRAA	ANITABAY11A	1	1	0.1%
DIPAC	DIPAC10	1	1	0.1%
SSRAA	KENDRICK10	1	146	15.4%
	KENDRICK11	112		
	KENDRICK12	5		
	KENDRICK12LL	1		
	KENDRICKLL11	27		
SSRAA	NAKATINLET10SUM	46	742	78.4%
	NAKATINLET11FALL	14		
	NAKATINLET11FALLB	7		
	NAKATINLET11SUM	617		
	NAKATINLET12SUM	58		
SSRAA	NEETSBAY10SUM	1	56	5.9%
	NEETSBAY11FALL	3		
	NEETSBAY11SUM	40		
	NEETSBAY11SUMB	10		
	NEETSBAY12SUM	2		

## REFERENCES

- ADF&G. 2015. Mark Summary Report. Juneau <http://mtalab.adfg.alaska.gov/OTO/reports/MarkSummary.aspx>
- Hagen, P., K. Munk, B. W. Van Alen, and B. White. 1995. Thermal mark technology for inseason fisheries management: a case study. *Alaska Fishery Research Bulletin* 2(2):143-155.
- Munk, K., and W. W. Smoker 1991. Temperature-induced mass-marking of pink salmon otoliths. Production trial at Gastineau Channel. University of Alaska Fairbanks, Juneau, Alaska
- Piston, A. W., and S. C. Heintz. 2011. Chum Salmon Stock Status and Escapement Goals in Southeast Alaska. TTC (Transboundary Technical Committee). 1990. Long-term research plans for the transboundary rivers. *TCTR* (90)-3.
- Volk, E. C., S. L. Schroder, and K. L. Fresh. 1990. Inducement of unique otolith banding patterns as a practical means to mass-mark juvenile Pacific salmon. *American Fisheries Society Symposium* 7:203-215.