

From: Kristine Petersen <kristine.petersen@noaa.gov>
To: <Drohr5@aol.com>
Date: 5/15/2006 11:56:25 AM
Subject: Re: CONFERENCE CALL: Re: Tagging proposal for BY05 White River spring-run Chinook.

Denny,

Unfortunately something has come up that may prevent me from participating in tomorrow's call to discuss marking/tagging of the 2005 brood White River spring Chinook salmon. At this time NMFS believes that there is sufficient detection locations currently in place and more anticipated within the next few years to warrant consideration of using PIT tags rather than CWTs in the ad-fin for the White River smolts. The additional handling of spring Chinook salmon adults necessary to detect CWTs in the ad-fin or other body location compared to the passive detection of PIT tags, and the multiple monitoring locations further supports the use of PIT tags. I look forward to hearing what others think concerning PIT tags vs CWT for this brood group.

Cheers!

Kris

Drohr5@aol.com wrote:

> *CONFERENCE CALL*
> **
> *PRCC Hatchery Subcommittee*
> *Tuesday, May 16, 2006*
> *Call In Numbers to Follow *
>
> *InRe: Tagging Proposal for BY05 White River Spring-run Chinook*
> **
> *Denny*
>
>
> In a message dated 5/12/2006 9:53:13 A.M. Pacific Standard Time,
> rlangsh@gcpud.org writes:
>
> Good morning. I apologize for the delayed proposal. We spent
> some additional time considering risks and benefits of PIT-tagging
> these fish. Below is a brief proposal for discussion on our
> conference call next Tuesday (May 16th).
>
> The draft HGMP requires that all hatchery White River spring-run
> Chinook be marked in a way that they can be non-lethally
> interrogated and recognized as White River origin (e.g. PIT-tag or
> unique CWT location). There are currently 83,856 BY05 White River
> spring-run Chinook on station at the AquaSeed facilities. We
> propose that all fish released from BY05 be CWTed in a unique
> location (e.g. adipose fin). PIT-tags are likely more useful for
> evaluation purposes, however there are currently no formal plans
> for evaluations requiring PIT-tags. Basic M&E parameters (e.g.
> migration timing, survival, etc.) can be sufficiently estimated
> with existing collection techniques (screw traps) and unique CWT

> locations. Evaluations of release strategies or other studies
> requiring differential marking may be developed and proposed to or
> by the committee in the future. Although there are no studies in
> place, differential CWT marking may provide useful survival
> information in the future. Currently juveniles are segregated and
> reared in four ELISA level groups. Marking each group with a
> different tag lot may provide useful survival information when/if
> tags are recovered.

>
> Approximately 56,000 fish will be transferred to the Little White
> Salmon National Fish Hatchery in late May. The hatchery manager
> would like to mark those fish in June using the USFWS marking
> crews. The fish remaining at AquaSeed would be marked at a later
> date using the same crew and protocols. The exact date of the
> AquaSeed marking is yet to be determined but will likely occur
> after October 1, 2006.

>
> In summary Grant PUD proposes that all BY05 White River spring-run
> Chinook be CWTed in a unique location (e.g. adipose fin). Each
> ELISA group will be marked with a different tag lot. A subset of
> the population may be PIT-tagged at a later date if a study is
> developed and approved by the PRCC HSC.

> Please call if you have any questions. Cheers- Russell

>
>
>
>
>
>
> Russell Langshaw
> Fisheries Scientist
> Grant County PUD
> Office: 509-754-5088x2170
> Cell: 509-989-7305

>
>
CC: <rlangsh@gcpud.org>, <Jerry.Marco@colvilletribes.com>,
<CarlMerkle@ctuir.com>, <trusckdt@dfw.wa.gov>, <scribner@easystreet.com>,
<david_carie@fws.gov>, <CCARLSO@gcpud.org>, <Slowry@gcpud.org>,
<cathomas@fs.fed.us>, <tdresse@gcpud.org>