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This memorandum report is intended to provide information on management activities pertaining to stock assessment and harvest of Hood Canal summer chum for the year 2004. This interim report is relatively brief, providing information currently available. A more detailed and complete presentation, including artificial production, will be made available as part of the Summer Chum Salmon Conservation Initiative (SCSCI) 5-year review report to be distributed in 2005.

## Stock Assessment

Escapement: Spawning ground surveys were conducted throughout the summer chum return period to estimate the abundance of summer chum spawners for all known stocks in the Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum regions during 2004. Results of the surveys are summarized in Table 1 and regional escapement estimates for the period 1974 through 2004 are described in Table 2.

The escapements of summer chum in 2004 were exceptional. A total of 79,336 summer chum escaped to the region's streams (including fish collected for hatchery broodstock); 69,995 spawners to Hood Canal streams and 9,341 spawners to Strait of Juan de Fuca streams (Table 2). The 2004 escapements were the highest recorded during the period that total spawner numbers have been estimated (19742004), including the years prior to the decline in summer chum abundance.

Table 1. Preliminary estimates of summer chum salmon spawner escapement for Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca streams, 2004.

|  | Natural |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| spawner Brood- Total |  |  |
| Stream | escapement stock escapement | Comments |

## Hood Canal

| Anderson Cr. | 1 |  | 1 | Peak count |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Big Beef Cr. | 1,852 | 64 | 1,916 | Trap + AUC downstream of trap |
| Dewatto R. | 23 |  | 23 | AUC |
| Tahuya R. | 8 |  | 8 | Peak count |
| Union R. | 5,876 | 100 | 5,976 | Trap |
| Skokomish R. | 24 |  | 24 | AUC; probably minimum estimate |
| Lilliwaup R. | 922 | 95 | 1,017 | AUC adjusted for broodstock (includes 5 broodstock morts) |
| Hamma Hamma R. | 2,493 | 63 | 2,556 | AUC adjusted for broodstock |
| John Cr. | 135 |  | 135 | AUC |
| Fulton Cr. | 6 |  | 6 | Peak count |
| Duckabush R. | 8,631 |  | 8,631 | AUC |
| Dosewallips R. | 11,549 |  | 11,549 | AUC |
| Big Quilcene R. | 35,000 | 108 | 35,108 | AUC; broodstock for NMFS research study in Big Beef Cr. |
| Little Quilcene R. | 3,045 |  | 3,045 | AUC |

## Strait of Juan de Fuca

| Chimacum Cr. | 1,139 |  | 1,139 | AUC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Snow Cr. | 396 |  | 396 | Trap + AUC downstream of trap |
| Salmon Cr. | 6,021 |  | 6,021 | Trap + redds downstream of trap; includes 52 morts in trap |
| JCL Cr. | 1,601 | 61 | 1,662 | Trap + dead ds of trap; incl. 1 brdstock mort; not incl. 36 pre-esc. loss |
| Dungeness R. | 123 |  | 123 | AUC |


| Hood Canal total | 69,565 | 430 | 69,995 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SJF total | 9,280 | 61 | 9,341 |
| total | $\mathbf{7 8 , 8 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 , 3 3 6}$ |

Table 2. Escapement (including hatchery broodstock) for Hood Canal and the Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon stocks, 1974-2004.

| Return year | Hood Canal <br> escapement | Strait of Juan de Fuca <br> escapement | HC/SJF <br> combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 | 12,281 | 1,768 | 14,049 |
| 1975 | 18,248 | 1,448 | 19,696 |
| 1976 | 27,715 | 1,494 | 29,209 |
| 1977 | 10,711 | 1,644 | 12,355 |
| 1978 | 19,710 | 3,080 | 22,790 |
| 1979 | 6,554 | 761 | 7,315 |
| 1980 | 3,777 | 5,109 | 8,886 |
| 1981 | 2,374 | 884 | 3,258 |
| 1982 | 2,623 | 2,751 | 5,374 |
| 1983 | 899 | 1,139 | 2,038 |
| 1984 | 1,414 | 1,579 | 2,993 |
| 1985 | 1,109 | 232 | 1,341 |
| 1986 | 2,552 | 1,087 | 3,639 |
| 1987 | 757 | 1,991 | 2,748 |
| 1988 | 2,967 | 3,690 | 6,657 |
| 1989 | 598 | 388 | 986 |
| 1990 | 429 | 341 | 770 |
| 1991 | 747 | 309 | 1,056 |
| 1992 | 2,377 | 1,070 | 3,447 |
| 1993 | 756 | 573 | 1,329 |
| 1994 | 2,429 | 178 | 2,607 |
| 1995 | 9,462 | 839 | 10,300 |
| 1996 | 20,490 | 1,084 | 21,574 |
| 1997 | 8,972 | 962 | 9,934 |
| 1998 | 4,001 | 1,269 | 5,270 |
| 1999 | 4,114 | 573 | 4,687 |
| 2000 | 8,649 | 983 | 9,612 |
| 2001 | 12,044 | 11,954 | 18,999 |
| 2002 | 35,696 | 6,955 | 42,655 |
| 2003 | 69,995 | 9,349 | 79,336 |
| 2004 |  |  |  |

Run Size: To determine the total numbers of salmon returning to specific production areas, fish that are harvested in mixed stock and terminal fisheries must be allocated to the streams from which they originated. This allocation is done through a post-season process called "run re-construction," which splits the harvests in each catch area into the numbers of fish that likely were contributed by the individual stocks or management unit thought to be transiting the area. All estimated harvests for each stock or management unit are added to the escapement for that grouping to derive the estimated total return or run size for each year. A discussion of the run re-construction methodology can be found in the SCSCI Appendix Report 1.3 (WDFW and PNPTT 2000). Run size estimates for 2004 along with an updated run size estimate for 2003 are provided in an appendix to this report. Table 3 summarizes the estimates of run sizes with escapements by region for 2004. Table 4 and Figures 1 and 2 show Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca total run sizes from 1974 through 2004.

This year's large return was anticipated, since 2004 is the peak return year in a strong 4-year production cycle, and 2003 also had a remarkable total return of 43,400 summer chum salmon to the region. We expect production levels to fall next year as the run cycles down from the high year. For example, pre-season forecasts for 2005 are about 18,000 total recruits for Hood Canal and about 6,800 total recruits for Strait of Juan de Fuca.

| Table 3. Regional summer chum run sizes for 2004. |  |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| Hood Canal Region | 69,995 |
| Escapement | 86,814 |
| Terminal runsize | 86,995 |
| Hood Canal total runsize |  |
|  | 9,341 |
| Strait of Juan de Fuca Region | 9,341 |
| $\quad$ Escapement | 9,360 |
| Terminal runsize |  |
| Strait of Juan de Fuca total runsize |  |


| Return year | Hood Canal Run size | Strait of Juan de Fuca Run size | HC/SJF <br> combined |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 | 14,222 | 1,985 | 16,207 |
| 1975 | 29,113 | 1,747 | 30,860 |
| 1976 | 74,220 | 1,673 | 75,893 |
| 1977 | 16,688 | 1,810 | 18,498 |
| 1978 | 25,344 | 3,240 | 28,584 |
| 1979 | 9,513 | 900 | 10,413 |
| 1980 | 13,026 | 5,574 | 18,600 |
| 1981 | 5,875 | 1,139 | 7,014 |
| 1982 | 8,331 | 3,540 | 11,871 |
| 1983 | 3,545 | 1,217 | 4,762 |
| 1984 | 3,372 | 1,707 | 5,079 |
| 1985 | 4,424 | 411 | 4,835 |
| 1986 | 7,832 | 1,217 | 9,049 |
| 1987 | 3,971 | 2,181 | 6,152 |
| 1988 | 5,680 | 4,129 | 9,809 |
| 1989 | 4,473 | 795 | 5,268 |
| 1990 | 1,564 | 528 | 2,092 |
| 1991 | 2,199 | 424 | 2,623 |
| 1992 | 3,376 | 1,394 | 4,770 |
| 1993 | 871 | 643 | 1,514 |
| 1994 | 2,959 | 214 | 3,173 |
| 1995 | 9,984 | 882 | 10,866 |
| 1996 | 21,056 | 1,106 | 22,162 |
| 1997 | 9,373 | 985 | 10,358 |
| 1998 | 4,274 | 1,316 | 5,590 |
| 1999 | 4,527 | 577 | 5,104 |
| 2000 | 9,506 | 987 | 10,493 |
| 2001 | 13,375 | 3,982 | 17,357 |
| 2002 | 13,170 | 6,981 | 20,151 |
| 2003 | 36,328 | 7,015 | 43,343 |
| 2004 | 86,995 | 9,360 | 96,335 |

Figure 1. Hood Canal summer chum salmon escapement and harvest, 1974-2004.


Figure 2. Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum escapement and harvest, 1974-2004.


Genetic Stock Identification: During 2004, the Co-managers continued DNA collections for summer chum spawners throughout the region. Table 5 shows the number of DNA samples collected in 2004 as well as the number of samples collected for otoliths and scales. The sampling locations and collection methods are also shown in the table. No funding is currently identified for the processing and analysis of these or other archived DNA samples.

| Table 5. Genetic, otolith, and scale collections made from adult summer chum salmon in Hood Canal and eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca streams, 2004. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stream | WRIA | $\begin{gathered} \text { GSI } \\ \text { code } \end{gathered}$ | Sample size |  |  |  | Collection method |
|  |  |  | Allozyme | DNA | Otolith | Scales |  |
| Dungeness River | 18.0018 | 04GR | 0 | 4 | 8 | 8 | Foot survey |
| Jimmycomelately Cr. ${ }^{1}$ | 17.0825 | 04GS | 0 | 61 | 299 | 283 | Trap, foot survey |
| Salmon Cr. ${ }^{1}$ | 17.0245 | 04GT | 0 | 46 | 400 | 400 | Trap, foot survey |
| Snow Cr. | 17.0219 | 04GU | 0 | 11 | 100 | 97 | Foot survey |
| Chimacum Cr. ${ }^{1}$ | 17.0203 | 04HM | 0 | 0 | 228 | 229 | Foot survey |
| Thorndyke Cr. | 17.017 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Foot survey |
| Little Quilcene R. | 17.0076 | 04GV | 0 | 47 | 157 | 298 | Foot survey |
| Big Quilcene R. ${ }^{1}$ | 17.0012 | -- | 0 | 123 | 77 | 357 | Foot survey, seine (Quil. Bay) |
| Dosewallips R. | 16.0442 | 04GW | 0 | 0 | 487 | 550 | Foot survey |
| Duckabush R. | 16.0351 | 04GX | 0 | 0 | 556 | 625 | Foot survey |
| Fulton Cr. | 16.0332 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Foot survey |
| Hamma Hamma R. ${ }^{1}$ | 16.0251 | 04GY | 0 | 64 | 409 | 445 | Seine, foot survey |
| Lilliwaup R. ${ }^{1}$ | 16.023 | 04GZ | 0 | 95 | 321 | 305 | Trap, foot survey |
| Little Lilliwaup | 16.0228 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Foot survey |
| Union R. ${ }^{1}$ | 15.0503 | 04HA | 0 | 359 | 336 | 341 | Trap, foot survey |
| Stavis Cr. | 15.0404 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Foot survey |
| Dewatto R. | 15.042 | -- | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | Foot survey |
| Big Beef Cr. ${ }^{1}$ | 15.0389 | 04HD | 0 | 64 | 230 | 233 | Trap, foot survey |
| Little Anderson | 15.0377 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Foot survey |
| Totals |  |  | 0 | 874 | 3,616 | 4,179 |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Stream has supplementation or reintroduction program. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Biological Data (Age): Age composition determined from scale collections for summer chum salmon in eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Hood Canal streams during 2004 are presented in Tables 6a, 6b, and 6c. Of particular interest is the high proportion of age-4 fish from the 2000 brood in the 2004 return; estimated to be about $75 \%$ overall (Table 6c). The strong 2000 brood also contributed a high proportion (about 77\%) to the 2003 return as age- 3 fish.

Table 6a-c. Preliminary 2004 Summer chum age composition data (based on scale data only).

Table 6a. Scale samples (numbers)

|  | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Beef Cr. | 0 | 174 | 58 | 1 | 233 |
| Dewatto Cr. | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 8 |
| Union River | 1 | 138 | 201 | 1 | 341 |
| Lilliwaup | 0 | 230 | 75 | 0 | 305 |
| Hamma Hamma R. | 0 | 95 | 350 | 0 | 445 |
| Duckabush R. | 0 | 51 | 574 | 0 | 625 |
| Dosewallips R. | 0 | 40 | 508 | 2 | 550 |
| B. Quilcene R. | 0 | 82 | 273 | 2 | 357 |
| L. Quilcene R. | 0 | 13 | 284 | 1 | 298 |
| Chimacum Cr. | 0 | 140 | 88 | 1 | 229 |
| Snow Cr. | 0 | 32 | 64 | 1 | 97 |
| Salmon Cr. | 1 | 143 | 250 | 6 | 400 |
| Jimmycomelately Cr. | 0 | 243 | 40 | 0 | 283 |
| Dungeness R. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 7 8}$ |

Table 6b. Scale samples (\%'s)

|  | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Beef Cr. | $0.0 \%$ | $74.7 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Dewatto Cr. | $0.0 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $37.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Union River | $0.3 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $58.9 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Lilliwaup | $0.0 \%$ | $75.4 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Hamma Hamma R. | $0.0 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ | $78.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Duckabush R. | $0.0 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $91.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Dosewallips R. | $0.0 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $92.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| B. Quilcene R. | $0.0 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ | $76.5 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| L. Quilcene R. | $0.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $95.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Chimacum Cr. | $0.0 \%$ | $61.1 \%$ | $38.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Snow Cr. | $0.0 \%$ | $33.0 \%$ | $66.0 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Salmon Cr. | $0.3 \%$ | $35.8 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Jimmycomelately Cr. | $0.0 \%$ | $85.9 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Dungeness R. | $0.0 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $71.4 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |

Table 6c. Escapement estimates by age class

|  | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Beef Cr. | 0 | 1,431 | 477 | 8 | 1,916 |
| Dewatto Cr. | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 23 |
| Union River | 18 | 2,418 | 3,523 | 18 | 5,976 |
| Lilliwaup | 0 | 767 | 250 | 0 | 1,017 |
| Hamma Hamma R. | 0 | 574 | 2,117 | 0 | 2,691 |
| Duckabush R. | 0 | 704 | 7,927 | 0 | 8,631 |
| Dosewallips R. | 0 | 840 | 10,667 | 42 | 11,549 |
| B. Quilcene R. | 0 | 8,064 | 26,847 | 197 | 35,108 |
| L. Quilcene R. | 0 | 133 | 2,902 | 10 | 3,045 |
| Chimacum Cr. | 0 | 696 | 438 | 5 | 1,139 |
| Snow Cr. | 0 | 131 | 261 | 4 | 396 |
| Salmon Cr. | 15 | 2,153 | 3,763 | 90 | 6,021 |
| Jimmycomelately Cr. | 0 | 1,427 | 235 | 0 | 1,662 |
| Dungeness R. | 0 | 18 | 88 | 18 | 123 |
| Total | 33 | 19,370 | 59,503 | 392 | $79,297^{1}$ |
| L. Totar |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Total escapement = 79,336; no scales for Anderson Cr., Tahuya
R., Skokomish R., or Fulton Cr.

Mark Recovery: As noted in the SCSCI and the SCSCI Supplemental Reports, hatchery supplementation techniques are being applied as a strategy to reduce the short-term extinction risk of summer chum salmon in the Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca regions and to aid in their recovery. Appropriate indigenous broodstocks are also being used to reintroduce summer chum to watersheds where they have recently been extirpated. The summer chum juveniles produced by each supplementation program are uniquely mass-marked prior to release. The supplementation fish were $100 \%$ fin-clipped at Quilcene and fish from all other programs are otolith marked. Examination of otoliths or fin clip ratios from spawned adults provides a method to estimate the number of hatcheryorigin and natural-origin recruits. This analysis assists in determining 1) the contribution of fry released from each rearing strategy within each supplementation program to the target population and 2) the level of straying of supplementation program-origin fish to other (non-target) drainages.

As has been typical in recent years (WDFW and PNPTT 2003, WDFW and PNPTC 2004), the supplemented Quilcene summer chum stock experienced another strong escapement during 2004, with a total of 35,108 spawners. In 2004, $93.6 \%$ of Big Quilcene summer chum were unmarked indicating that over 32,000 of the returning fish were natural-origin recruits (pers. comm. T. Kane, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Nov. 2004).

In 2004, summer chum adults were examined for adipose-clips in 14 streams surveyed by WDFW. Adipose-clipped summer chum were only observed in 5 of the 14 streams surveyed: the Big Quilcene, Little Quilcene, Dosewallips, Duckabush, and Hamma Hamma rivers. In these 5 streams, more than 2,200 summer chum adults were sampled for fin-clips and preliminary analysis indicates that $87 \%$ of fin-clipped recoveries occurred in the Big and Little Quilcene rivers, the streams of origin for the Quilcene supplementation program.

In addition, otolith samples were collected from about 3,600 summer chum adults returning to these and other streams during 2004 (Table 5) and examination of these otolith samples is currently in progress at the WDFW Otolith Lab. Since the 2003 return was comprised of $\sim 75 \%$ wild fish, it is expected that this year's return will also have a high proportion of natural origin recruits (wild fish).

## Harvest Management

The SCSCI established annual fishing regimes beginning in 2000 for Canadian, Washington preterminal, and Washington terminal area fisheries designed to minimize incidental impacts to summer chum salmon. The intent of the Base Conservation Regime (BCR) is to initiate rebuilding by providing incremental increases in escapement over time while providing a limited opportunity for fisheries conducted for the harvest of other species. The BCR has been constructed using a conservative approach that would pass through to spawning escapement, on average, in excess of $95 \%$ of the Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum recruitment in U.S. waters, and nearly $90 \%$ of the total recruitment of the run of each management unit.

The SCSCI established that annual abundance evaluations will be performed for both management units and stocks. Management units (MUs) are made up of one or more stocks that are aggregated in recognition of practical and biological limitations to available data and how fisheries can be effectively managed. In the case of Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum, all of the MUs contain only one stock except the Mainstem Hood Canal MU (which is comprised of the Dosewallips, Duckabush, Hamma Hamma, and Lilliwaup stocks). Critical status thresholds are defined for MUs, for both total
run size and spawning escapement, and minimum escapement flags are defined for the stocks within the Mainstem MU. An MU is considered to be in critical status when its abundance or escapement in the most recent past return year is less, or its forecast run size for the coming return year is projected to be less than the appropriate threshold value. Minimum escapement flags are useful benchmarks to check for poor performance of any one stock's escapement and is necessary for years when the overall MU abundance is sufficiently high that the critical abundance threshold would not be triggered but escapement of one or more individual stocks may be extremely low. Minimum escapement flags within the Mainstem MU are 736, 700, 1042, and 182 summer chum for the Dosewallips, Duckabush, Hamma Hamma, and Lilliwaup stocks, respectively (see SCSCI Section 1.7.3).

Harvest management results again can be described as very good during 2004, the fifth year in which the BCR was implemented. Table 7 provides a preliminary overview for 2004 of the pre-season estimates that triggered the various management responses, as well as the post-season estimates of results. Table 8 shows the estimated annual harvest of summer chum salmon during 2004, by management unit and fishery. Table 9 provides an overview of exploitation rates, relative to BCR targets, for 2004. As indicated, the information for 2004 is preliminary and subject to revision, once commercial catch data are verified and recreational catch data are included.

The 2004 pre-season forecasts indicated that only the Sequim MU abundance would fall short of its critical threshold. Within the Mainstem Hood Canal MU, only the Hamma Hamma stock’s 2003 escapement fell below its minimum escapement flag (2003 escapement of 854 compared to minimum escapement flag of 1042).

Estimated exploitation rates for fisheries in Canadian and U.S. mixed stock areas during 2004 were well below the target exploitation rates of the Base Conservation Regime. In terminal areas, exploitation rates were also well below the BCR target levels, except for the Quilcene management unit. However, the expected escapements for all management units, including the Quilcene MU, were exceeded in 2004 (Table 7).

In 2004, post-season estimates of recruitment were higher than the pre-season forecasts for all MUs (Table 7). The higher than predicted abundance resulted in the critical threshold being exceeded for all MUs; and the minimum escapement flag was exceeded for the Hamma Hamma stock (2004 escapement of 2691 compared to minimum escapement flag of 1042).

During the 2004 season, no changes were made from the initially adopted plans. Using provisions of the BCR, an in-season projection of escapement to the Quilcene MU was made. The projections indicated that escapement would be significantly above the thresholds provided in the SCSCI for fishery modification. Coho fishery regulations were somewhat relaxed, permitting the continued use of gillnets by the Treaty Indian fishery, and gillnet effort was substantial. Provisions were also made for coho harvest in the Quilcene River, immediately downstream of the hatchery.

With the exception of the Quilcene MU, where separate management provisions apply, the escapement rate was $99.8 \%$ for each MU in 2004 (incomplete results). In the Quilcene MU, the escapement rate was 69.3\%.

| Table 7. Post-season assessment of forecasts, recruitment, and escapement by summer chum salmon |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| harvest management unit in the year 2004 . |  |  | Mainstem | SE Hood |
| Canal |  |  |  |  |$|$| Management category |
| :--- |

Table 8. Summer chum salmon harvest, in 2004, by management unit and fishery. ${ }^{1}$

| Fishery | Sequim | Discovery | Chimacum | Quilcene | Mainstem <br> Hood Canal | SE Hood <br> Canal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canada | 1 | 5 | 1 | 44 | 21 | 5 |
| U.S. Mixed | 2 | 8 | 1 | 70 | 33 | 8 |
| Terminal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 1 |
| Extreme Terminal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,799 | 0 | 0 |

Post-season harvest estimates are preliminary and will be revised upwards when recreational harvest estimates are added.

| Table 9. Post-season assessment of exploitation rates for 2004, relative to <br> Base Conservation Regime (BCR) target levels. |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Exploitation Rates |  |
| Sequim | BCR Target | 2004 Est. ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ |
| Discovery | $8.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Chimacum | $8.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Quilcene | na | $0.2 \%$ |
| Mainstem HC | $15.2 \%$ | $30.7 \%$ |
| Southeast HC | $10.9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| 1. Based on preliminary harvest data; recreational catch not included. Rates <br> rounded to nearest $1 / 10$ th of 1\% | $0.2 \%$ |  |

## Artificial Production

Summer chum supplementation programs continued at Lilliwaup, Hamma Hamma, and Jimmycomelately creeks. Summer chum salmon have been successfully re-introduced into two streams that were previously occupied by summer chum, Big Beef and Chimacum creeks; a third reintroduction program is underway on the Tahuya River. Supplementation or reintroduction programs have been terminated on several streams, because they have met the individual projects' production level goals specified in the SCSCI. Projects that have been terminated include Big Quilcene, Salmon Creek, Chimacum Creek, and Union River; the last fry releases from these programs occurred in 2004 (BY 2003).

A more detailed and complete presentation of artificial production programs will be made as part of the SCSCI 5 -year review report.

## Summary

The improved summer chum salmon returns and escapements to Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca streams, enhanced by strong returns to various supplementation programs, and combined with the high percentage of natural origin recruits in recent years suggest a substantial reduction of the extinction risk for this Evolutionarily Significant Unit. While all of the above events are very positive results for the summer chum salmon recovery effort, they do not yet constitute full recovery. The comanagers have developed interim recovery goals for summer chum salmon (PNPTT and WDFW 2003), that require strong production performance of natural origin recruits over three generations (12 years), and the recent years of large returns do not at this time meet the recovery goals. The comanagers are just now beginning the development of a 5 -year review of the Summer Chum Salmon Conservation Inititative results, and that document (due in the summer of 2005) will contain a detailed discussion of progress towards full recovery.
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## Appendix

Run Reconstruction Tables, 2003-2004


| 2004 |  | Harvest | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 16,799 |  | 0 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ |  | $124 \quad 76$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mgmt | Prod. Unit | Escape | Brood | ********** |  | Run Abundance by Location |  |  |  | ********** |  | Discov. | Sequim | Term. | Seattle <br> (Area 10) | Admiralty <br> (Area 9) | U.S. <br> Conv | CDN <br> Area 20 |
|  |  |  |  | 82G/J | 12D | 12C | 82F | 12A | 12B | 12 | 9A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Skok | Skokomish | 24 |  | 24 |  | 24 |  |  | 24 | 24 | 24 |  |  | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 12D | Tahuya | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |  | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  | 5,985 | 5,985 | 5,985 | 5,993 | 5,998 |
|  | Union | 5,876 | 100 |  | 5,976 | 5,976 |  |  | 5,976 | 5,977 | 5,977 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12A | L. Quilcene | 3,045 |  |  |  |  |  | 4,386 | 4,386 | 4,387 | 4,387 |  |  | 54,965 | 54,965 | 54,965 | 55,035 | 55,079 |
|  | B. Quilcene | 35,000 | 108 |  |  |  | 35,108 | 50,566 | 50,566 | 50,576 | 50,578 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12-12 \mathrm{~B}- \\ & 12 \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | Big Beef | 1,852 | 64 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,916 | 1,916 | 1,916 |  |  | 25,840 | 25,840 | 25,840 | 25,873 | 25,894 |
|  | Anderson | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dosewallips | 11,549 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,549 | 11,551 | 11,552 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Duckabush | 8,637 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,637 | 8,639 | 8,639 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hamma | 2,628 | 63 |  |  |  |  |  | 2,691 | 2,691 | 2,692 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lilliwaup | 922 | 95 |  |  | 1,017 |  |  | 1,017 | 1,017 | 1,017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dewatto | 23 |  |  |  | 23 |  |  | 23 | 23 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chim. | Chimacum | 1,139 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,139 |  | 1,139 | 1,140 | 1,141 |
| Discov. | Snow | 396 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 396 |  | 6,417 |  | 6,417 | 6,425 | 6,430 |
|  | Salmon | 6,021 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sequim | JCL | 1,601 | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,662 | 1,662 |  | 1,662 | 1,664 | 1,665 |
| Dung. | Dungeness | 123 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123 |  | 123 | 123 | 123 |
| Totals |  | 78,845 | 491 | 24 | 5,984 | 7,048 | 35,108 | 54,952 | 86,794 | 86,810 | 86,814 | 6,417 | 1,662 | 96,155 | 86,814 | 96,155 | 96,279 | 96,355 |
| Hood Canal Portion |  | 69,565 | 430 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86,814 | 86,814 | 86,814 | 86,926 | 86,995 |
| E. Strait Portion |  | 9,280 | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,341 |  | 9,341 | 9,353 | 9,360 |

