NPAFC

Doc. No. 158

Rev. No. _____

Influence of the Marine Abundance of Pink (Oncorhynchus gorbuscha) and Sockeye Salmon (O. nerka) on Growth of Ozernaya River Sockeye

by

V. F. Bugaev[1], D.W. Welch[2], M. M. Selifonov[1], and L. E. Grachev[1]

[1] KamchatNIRO, Fisheries Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography
18 Naberezhnaya St., 683602 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Russia
FAX: 011-7-41522-24364

[2] Pacific Biological Station, Dept. of Fisheries and Oceans, Nanaimo, B.C. Canada
e-mail: welchd@pbs.dfo.ca TEL: (604) 756-7218 FAX: (604) 756-7053

submitted to the

NORTH PACIFIC ANADROMOUS FISH COMMISSION

by the

Russian and Canadian Parties

NOVEMBER 1995

This paper may be cited in the following manner:
Bugaev, V. F. , D.W. Welch, M. M. Selifonov, and L. E. Grachev. 1995. Influence of the Marine Abundance of Pink (Oncorhynchus gorbuscha) and Sockeye Salmon (O. nerka) on Growth of Ozernaya River Sockeye (NPAFC Doc. No. 158) 19 p. KamchatNIRO, Fisheries Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography, 18 Naberezhnaya St., 683602 Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky, Russia.

Abstract

The length and weight of mature Ozernaya River sockeye (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) was substantially reduced in years when the marine abundance of pink salmon (*O. gorbuscha*) from western and eastern Kamchatkan populations was high, and slightly reduced when the ocean abundance of Kamchatka sockeye populations was high. The strongest statistical relationships were found for fish from separate age-groups; measured relationships using pooled data from all age-classes combined were statistically insignificant. We estimate that in the absence of pink salmon the most strongly affected age groups would be twice the size at maturity that they would be if both the eastern and western Kamchatkan pink salmon populations were simultaneously at peak observed abundances. Trophic competition in the ocean can therefore have a significant influence on the productivity of salmon populations for the most strongly affected age-groups, and the salmonid carrying capacity of the ocean is sufficiently limited that it should be considered in the management of salmon populations.

Introduction

It is generally assumed that fluctuations in fish growth rate are correlated with stock abundance as well as with the abundance of their competitors (Nikolsky 1974). Birman (1985) suggested that food competition between pink and sockeye salmon at sea results in pink salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*) abundance influencing the growth of sockeye (*O. nerka*). Krogius (1960) showed that the marine growth of sockeye returning to the Ozernaya River and Dalnee Lake was poorer in odd years, when west Kamchatkan pink salmon were abundant, than in even years, when the abundance of west Kamchatkan pink salmon was low. However, the correlation between sockeye growth rate and pink abundance was not statistically significant.

Several other studies have also reported evidence that the marine abundance of Pacific salmon may affect their growth rates, and smaller body size is associated with a number of deleterious impacts on reproductive success in salmon (review by Forbes and Peterman 1994). Most salmon growth occurs in the ocean. To the extent that reduced growth rates and smaller size at maturity are related to competition in the ocean, limits on the carrying capacity of the ocean for salmon may have a negative impact on the productivity of salmon populations.

Rogers (1980) demonstrated that the size at maturity of Bristol Bay sockeye salmon was inversely related to their abundance. More recent studies have found statistical evidence for a reduced marine growth rate for Fraser sockeye when Bristol Bay sockeye salmon were abundant (Peterman 1984; McKinnell 1995), and in asian coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) when pink salmon abundances were high (Ogura et al. 1991). Similar evidence exists that the ocean abundance of asian

chum salmon depresses their own growth in the penultimate year at sea (Ishida et al. 1993). More generally, Bigler et al. (1996) found evidence that mean size declined with time after 1976 in 45 of 47 North American and Asian salmon stocks examined, a period of generally increasing salmon abundance (Beamish 1993).

In this paper, we provide an analysis of the impact of the relative numbers of sockeye and pink from the major spawning populations in Kamchatka on length and weight characteristics of the Ozernaya River sockeye, one of the largest Asian sockeye stocks.

Materials and Methods

This study was based on data collected between 1970-1991 by the Ozernovsky Biological Station, Kamchatka, a branch of the Pacific Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography. The data include the number of pink salmon returning to west and east Kamchatka, the number of sockeye returning to the Ozernaya and Kamchatka rivers, and the length and weight by age-class of mature sockeye (Tables 1-3).

The size of Ozernaya sockeye was measured at the counting fence located at the entrance to Kuril Lake. Only size data for sockeye without evidence of breeding colours were used in the analysis. Age was assessed following criteria described by Selifonov (1975, 1988, 1989).

Data on pink salmon from both regions and sockeye from the Ozernaya River give partial information on the marine abundance of these populations. These estimates were supplemented using data taken from reports on Japanese fisheries in the years of spawning migrations. For Kamchatka River sockeye, population estimates were based only on their numbers counted in the outlet of the river, and do not include catches of this stock by Japanese fisheries in the year of spawning migration.

Results

Size-at-Age

The relative abundance of the main sockeye and pink salmon populations in Kamchatka fluctuated widely over the period 1970-1991 (Fig. 1). Multiple regression analysis by sex and age-class between length or weight of the most abundant age groups of fish (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3)[1]

[1] The first number indicates the number of years of life spent in freshwater, and the second the number of years at sea.

and the abundance of pink and sockeye salmon during 1970-1991 revealed significant differences. In general, the greatest observed effects were primarily related to the abundance of pink salmon, and only secondarily to the abundance of sockeye salmon (Tables 4-7). In most cases, the statistically significant regression coefficients are negative, indicating that an increase in the abundance of sockeye or pink salmon leads to a decrease in the body size of mature Ozernaya River sockeye.

Discussion

The observed relationships between abundance and weight or length of Ozernaya River sockeye are similar, so we focus our discussions on the growth response in terms of weight. The occasional differences in regression coefficients when length and weight characteristics of salmon are both compared with marine abundance are probably a combination of both random statistical error and variations in condition factor. In Fraser River sockeye, variations in length accounted for most of the inter-annual variation in weight, and condition factor played a secondary role (Killick and Clemens 1963).

Overall, the marine growth of Ozernaya sockeye seems to be more strongly influenced by the ocean abundance of Kamchatka pink salmon than by the abundance of either sockeye stock (Fig. 2). Based on the magnitude of the regression coefficients (Tables 4-7), the per-capita effect on growth of both pink and sockeye salmon from 1970-91 has been of the same order of magnitude. However, the predicted overall effect on mean size of *maximum* observed abundance is much larger for pink salmon because of the much larger size of these populations, with the predicted size-at-maturity of Ozernaya sockeye reduced by 50% or more if both east and west pink salmon populations were both simultaneously near their maximum observed abundance (Fig. 2). Such an effect would have a very large impact on sockeye productivity.

The best statistical relationships with body weight are achieved for age-specific data, and the level of correlation is poorer when data from all age-groups are pooled. A plausible interpretation is that feeding areas used at sea by different age groups of the Ozernaya River sockeye are dissimilar (Selifonov 1989), so that different age-groups are exposed to different levels of trophic competition. Rogers (1980) also found different correlation coefficients between abundance and size-weight characteristics of Bristol Bay sockeye of different age and sex groups. In the Gulf of Alaska, older sockeye are distributed farther at sea, and the relationship between size variations and abundance varied for different stocks and age-groups (McKinnell, 1995). There may also be complicated effects relating to the change in distributional overlap of different species over time, since the distribution of marine fish tends to change with their abundance (MacCall 1990). Ogura and Ito (1994) showed that as the abundance of Japanese chum salmon increased, their oceanic range also expanded; thus abundance may not necessarily be a stable proxy for marine density or the degree of overlap in ocean

distribution.

Growth and size at maturity of Ozernaya River sockeye are determined by a combination of environmental and genetic factors. Some evidence suggests the observed differences in body size of Ozernaya River sockeye in odd- and even-years may also be controlled by genetic factors (Krogius 1960). Killick and Clemens (1963) found no direct relationship between the annual variation in body size of Fraser River sockeye and the abundance of Fraser sockeye and pink salmon populations from 1915-60, although Fraser sockeye were larger in even years, when Fraser pink salmon are virtually absent. They suggested instead that the observed differences might also have been caused by genetic factors (Killick and Clemens, 1963).

Data collected from the Kamchatka River (Konovalov, 1980; Bugaev and Ostroumov, 1990) and Kuril Lake (Krokhin and Krogius, 1937; Bugaev, 1976), which is the main spawning ground of the Ozernaya River sockeye, also support a link between genetic factors and sizes of sockeye spawners in some spawning grounds. However, our study suggests that the variations in growth rate of Ozernaya River sockeye are primarily related to environmental factors (in this case, the marine abundance of pink and sockeye populations). If genetic factors were to play a significant role in the changes in mean size then we would expect to see long-term trends in mean size dominating, which is not the case. Sano (1963) also showed that both the size of sockeye and pink salmon caught in the western north Pacific ocean and the average weight of their stomach contents was smaller in alternating years, when pink salmon abundance was high.

Our analysis indicates that studies of separate age groups are more informative than analyses based on pooled age-groups. Data on the age structure of the Bolshaya River sockeye population do not seem to be reliable (unpublished analysis), so it is not possible to establish the variation in growth for this population by separate age groups. However, the data suggest that the number of west Kamchatkan pink also has an effect on the body sizes of sockeye from the Bolshaya River. No statistically significant correlations between abundance of east Kamchatkan pink and the size of Bolshaya River sockeye was found for the pooled data.

Conclusions

Our results indicate that the final body sizes of mature sockeye in the Ozernaya River are affected more by the marine abundance of pink salmon than by the marine abundance of sockeye from the Ozernaya and Kamchatka rivers. This is probably related to the much higher abundance of pink salmon (Fig. 1) and because pink salmon feed lower down the food chain (Brodeur 1990; Pearcy et al 1988; Welch and Parsons 1993).

The effect of pink salmon abundance should be considered when analyzing the population dynamics of Russian sockeye and when making predictions of commercial sockeye returns to the Ozernaya River. The increase in abundance of the Ozernaya River sockeye, as observed from the mid to late 1980s to the early 1990s (Selifonov, 1988, and current catch statistics), may be associated not only with the fertilization of Kuril Lake and other salmon lakes in Kamchatka (Kurenkov, 1988), but also with the abrupt decrease in the marine abundance of Kamchatkan pink salmon at the same time. Significant increases in the abundance of Kamchatkan pink might therefore reduce the productivity of Ozernaya River sockeye. Future evaluations of management strategies should include not just the possibility of ocean interactions with other stocks of sockeye salmon (e.g. Peterman 1984), but also the possibility of density-dependent interactions with other species of salmon.

References

Beamish, R.J. (1993) Climate and exceptional fish production off the west coast of North America. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 50:2270-2291.

Beamish, R.J. and D.R Bouillon. (1993) Pacific salmon production trends in relation to climate. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 50:1002-1016.

Bigler, B.S., D.W. Welch, and J.H. Helle. (1996) A review of size trends among North Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 53:0000-0000.

Birman, I. B. (1985) Marine Period of Life and Abundance Dynamics of Pacific Salmon Stock. Moscow: Agropromizdat 208 pp. [In Russian].

Brodeur, R.D. (1990) A synthesis of the food habits and feeding ecology of salmonids in marine waters of the north Pacific. Fisheries Research Institute, Univ. of Washington Doc. No. FRI-UW-9016. 38 p.

Bugaev, V. F. (1976) Differentiation of subisolates of sockeye salmon in Kuril Lake basin. In: Research on Fish Biology and Fisheries Oceanography. Vol. 7. Vladivostok: TINRO, pp. 88-101. [In Russian].

Bugaev, V. F., and Ostroumov, A. G. (1990) Types of spawning grounds and body sizes of sockeye spawners in the Kamchatka River basin. J. Geography of Kamchatka 10: 56-66. [In Russian].

Foerster, R. E. (1968) The sockeye salmon, *Oncorhynchus nerka.* Fish. Res. Board Can. Bull. 162: 422 p.

Forbes, L.S., and R.M. Peterman. (1994) Simple age-structured models of recruitment and harvest in Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 51:603-616.

Ishida, Y., S. Ito, M. Kaeriyama, S. McKinnell, and K. Nagasawa. (1993) Recent changes in age and size of chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) in the north Pacific Ocean and possible causes. Canadian J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 50: 290-295.

Killick, S. R., and Clemens, W. A. (1963) The age, sex ratio and size of Fraser River sockeye salmon 1915 to 1960. Intl. Pac. Salmon Fish. Comm. Bull. 14: 140 p.

Konovalov, S. M. (1980) Population Biology of Pacific Salmon. Leningrad: Science Editorial Board. 237 p. [In Russian].

Krogius, F. V. (1960) Growth rate and age groupings of sockeye (*Oncorhynchus nerka* Wall.) at sea. Vopr. Ikhtiol. 16: 67-68. [In Russian]. (Translated by the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Translation No. 413).

Krokhin, E. M., and Krogius, F. V. (1937) Kuril Lake and biology of sockeye salmon *Oncorhynchus nerka* (Walbaum) in the lake basin. Trudy Tikhookeanskogo Komiteta, Moscow/Leningrad: Editorial Board of the USSR. 165 p. [In Russian].

Kurenkov, I. I. (Ed.) (1988) Problems of fertilization of salmon lakes in Kamchatka. Vladivostok: TINRO 142 p. [In Russian].

MacCall, A.D. (1990) Dynamic geography of marine fish populations. Washington Sea Grant

Program. Univ. of Washington Press. Seattle. 153 p.

McKinnell, S. (1995) Age--specific effects of sockeye abundance on adult body size of selected British Columbia sockeye stocks. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 52:1050-1063

Nikolsky, G. V. (1974) Theory of fish stock as a biological basis for rational exploitation and reproduction of fish resources. Moscow: Food Industry Editorial Board. 448 p. [In Russian].

Ogura, M., and S. Ito. (1994) Change in the known ocean distribution of Japanese chum salmon, *Oncorhynchus keta*, in relation to the progress of stock enhancement. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 51:501-505.

Ogura, M., Y. Ishida, and S. Ito. (1991) Growth variation of coho salmon *Oncorhynchus kisutch* in the western North Pacific. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 57:1089-1093.

Pearcy, W.G., R.D. Brodeur, J.M. Shenker, W.W. Smoker, and Y. Endo. (1988) Food habits of Pacific salmon and steelhead trout, midwater trawl catches and oceanographic conditions in the Gulf of Alaska, 1980-1985. Bull. Ocean Res. Inst., Univ. of Tokyo, 26(II):29-78.

Peterman, R.M. (1984) Density-dependent growth in early ocean life of sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 41: 1825-1829.

Ricker, W. E. (1972) Hereditary and environmental factors affecting certain salmonid populations. In: The Stock Concept in Pacific Salmon. Simon, R.C., and Larkin, P. A. [Eds.]. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia, pp. 19-160.

Rogers, D. E. (1980) Density-dependent growth of Bristol Bay sockeye salmon. In: Salmonid Ecosystems of the North Pacific. McNeil, W. J., and Himsworth, D. C. [Eds.]. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State Univ. Press, pp. 267-283.

Sano, O. (1963) Notes on environmental factors affecting the salmon populations in the oceanic life. Bull. J. Soc. Sci. Fish. 29:749-753

Selifonov, M. M. (1975) Fishery and reproduction of sockeye in the Ozernaya River basin. Publ. thesis. Vladivostok: TINRO, 23 p. [In Russian].

Selifonov, M. M. (1988) Some biological characteristics and fluctuations in the abundance of sockeye of the Ozernaya River basin (Kamchatka). In: Problems of fertilization of salmon lakes in Kamchatka. I. I. Kurenko [Ed.]. Vladivostok: TINRO, pp. 114-129. [In Russian].

Selifonov, M. M. (1989) Contributions of Ozernaya River sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) to ocean catches with special reference to their distribution in space and time. In: Effects of Ocean Variability on Recruitment and Evaluation of Parameters used in Stock Assessment Models. Beamish, R. J., and McFarlane, G. A. [Eds.]. Can. Spec. Publ. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 108: 341-352.

Welch, D. W., and Parsons, T. R. (1993) $\delta^{13}C$ - $\delta^{15}N$ values as indicators of trophic position and competitive overlap for Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.). Fish. Oceanogr. 2(1): 11-23.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Variation in the abundance of pink and sockeye salmon stocks used in the analysis.

230 Figure 2. Regression planes of the estimated effect on Ozernaya river sockeye weight of the marine abundance east and west Kamchatka pink and Ozernaya and Kamchatka River sockeye populations. The abundance of stocks not shown in each panel were set to their 1970-91 averages when calculating predicted body weight.

235

Table 1. Pink and sockeye salmon abundance, in thousands of fish.

Year	East Kamchatka Pink	West Kamchatka Pink	Ozernaya River Sockeye	Kamchatka River Sockeye
1970	16.2	0.3	2301	2668
1971	22.9	8.8	2352	1175
1972	9.1	1.7	1951	673
1973	15.6	7.2	1539	856
1974	15.0	2.2	1687	224
1975	38.3	27.8	2344	732
1976	19.9	11.3	1753	734
1977	51.2	56.5	1440	1696
1978	11.0	13.6	2420	1708
1979	53.6	71.3	2415	1421
1980	4.3	21.1	2773	1570
1981	57.8	41.4	2540	1476
1982	15.1	34.8	1794	1501
1983	38.7	153.2	2752	2317
1984	26.7	78.1	4161	2621
1985	22.8	8.7	5881	1756
1986	3.9	37.5	4320	1069
1987	52.8	1.6	5680	1557
1988	8.6	33.0	3700	1025
1989	65.9	1.6	4972	892
1990	26.3	26.8	10583	594
1991	95.3	2.8	6679	626

Table 2. Lengths-at-age of Ozernaya River sockeye salmon (cms).

		1.1		*1.2*		*1.3*		*2.1*	*2.2*		*2.3*		*2.4*		*2.4*	*3.1*		*3.2*		*3.3*		*3.4*	
	Year																						
265	*1970*	-	-	-	-	-		41.1	58.0	55.2	62.5	60.2	-	63.0	-	58.1	56.0	61.5	60.8	-	-	60.0	59.0
	1971	-	-	-	-	-		40.8	56.9	55.6	63.5	61.0	64.7	61.0	-	57.2	55.6	64.8	62.0	-	-	60.4	58.5
	1972	-	-	-	-	-		41.8	57.9	56.4	64.2	61.7	68.0	63.0	-	60.0	57.4	64.6	62.0	-	-	62.0	59.1
	1973	-	-	-	-	-		43.5	56.1	55.4	63.7	61.0	67.0	62.8	46.4	58.3	55.8	64.2	63.0	-	-	61.8	59.9
	1974	-	-	-	-	-		42.8	58.0	56.0	63.0	61.1	62.0	60.8	-	60.7	56.1	64.2	62.4	-	-	61.7	59.0
270	*1975*	-	-	-	-	-		41.2	60.6	56.0	64.3	61.0	66.7	60.5	-	58.8	57.0	65.0	61.8	-	-	61.9	59.0
	1976	-	-	-	-	-		42.7	57.7	56.6	64.0	61.0	64.5	62.8	-	57.5	56.7	-	-	-	-	61.1	59.5
	1977	-	-	-	71.0	-		39.9	57.4	54.8	65.7	62.2	63.6	62.6	-	58.5	55.1	64.2	62.6	-	-	63.3	59.8
	1978	40.0	54.7	53.0	-	58.0		40.2	56.8	55.9	64.6	61.2	-	-	45.3	58.6	56.7	63.9	60.7	-	-	59.5	59.5
	1979	36.5	-	60.5	62.1	59.0		38.9	54.7	53.5	63.4	59.6	64.5	64.0	40.9	57.5	54.8	63.6	60.1	-	64.5	55.2	56.8
275	*1980*	-	57.0	53.8	62.0	-		39.8	55.7	53.9	62.4	60.6	-	62.8	38.5	57.0	54.9	-	62.0	-	64.0	58.9	57.5
	1981	-	-	-	64.1	59.4		37.3	55.8	54.1	63.3	60.0	62.2	61.6	-	60.0	53.6	63.0	59.6	-	-	60.0	58.0
	1982	-	-	-	-	-		39.2	54.7	53.3	63.6	60.3	62.4	61.8	40.1	56.8	54.1	63.5	60.9	-	62.0	57.6	57.4
	1983	-	-	-	-	57.0		34.0	52.1	51.3	61.6	58.1	62.6	-	35.9	52.7	50.7	61.0	58.6	57.0	-	58.6	57.0
	1984	-	-	-	-	-		37.0	53.4	53.6	62.0	58.8	62.5	-	41.0	54.9	53.4	62.0	59.3	66.0	-	59.9	58.3
280	*1985*	-	-	-	58.0	62.0		41.0	55.2	55.2	62.9	59.7	69.5	61.8	-	56.1	55.1	62.4	59.5	63.8	-	60.6	58.8
	1986	37.8	53.3	-	57.5	62.5		40.6	56.0	55.0	63.0	59.8	62.5	60.0	44.5	53.3	53.5	67.3	60.6	65.0	63.6	59.1	58.4
	1987	-	50.5	47.2	60.8	56.6		38.8	54.4	52.3	62.6	59.3	62.1	58.3	-	55.9	53.6	60.3	57.1	-	-	58.6	57.4
	1988	-	49.5	-	62.7	58.8		37.6	55.1	54.5	62.3	59.6	62.8	-	38.5	54.5	54.2	63.4	60.7	-	-	58.8	58.4
	1989	-	-	-	-	-		40.0	53.2	52.8	62.9	59.6	64.9	61.5	39.0	54.4	54.6	62.8	60.2	-	-	57.8	57.8
285	*1990*	38.5	47.5	-	-	63.6		41.3	55.6	54.3	63.8	60.8	64.8	61.9	-	57.3	54.3	64.6	61.8	69.0	-	63.0	59.0
	1991	-	46.7	49.0	64.0	61.6		38.7	53.3	53.3	61.6	58.2	62.5	60.8	44.1	54.5	52.5	62.6	58.4	62.0	-	57.4	56.0
	Avg	38.2	51.3	52.7	62.5	59.9		39.9	55.8	54.5	63.2	60.2	64.2	61.7	41.3	56.9	54.8	63.4	60.7	63.8	63.5	59.9	58.4

Table 3. Weight-at-age of Ozernaya River sockeye salmon (kgs).

Year	1.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4
1970	- - -	- -	1.02	2.57 2.24	3.22 2.82	- 3.10	-	2.50	2.33 3.20	2.70	- -
1971	- - -	- -	0.85	2.33 2.20	3.32 2.88	3.33 2.95	-	2.44	2.17 3.51	3.10	- -
1972	- - -	- -	0.98	2.56 2.30	3.50 3.04	4.10 3.30	-	2.72	2.30 3.50	3.10	- -
1973	- - -	- -	1.06	2.23 2.12	3.23 2.84	3.78 3.27	1.20	2.46	2.21 3.25	3.27	- -
1974	- - -	- -	1.00	2.50 2.18	3.10 2.82	2.95 3.00	-	2.70	2.26 3.40	3.03	- -
1975	- - -	- -	0.90	2.83 2.23	3.26 2.80	3.52 3.20	-	2.60	2.44 3.27	2.85	- -
1976	- - -	- -	1.00	2.57 2.40	3.22 2.97	3.40 2.98	-	2.46	2.38 -	-	- -
1977	- - -	4.20 -	0.72	2.25 1.89	3.45 2.94	2.86 2.96	-	2.33	1.92 3.21	2.92	- -
1978	0.70 2.11	1.85 -	2.45	0.85	2.35 2.18	3.62 2.96	- -	1.22	2.45 2.25	3.43	3.00 - -
1979	0.60 -	2.60 2.86	2.55	0.77	2.01 1.83	3.24 2.65	3.20 3.55	0.85	2.30 2.00	3.37	2.66 - 3.40
1980	- 2.60	2.35 3.05	-	0.83	2.33 2.09	3.29 2.82	- 3.25	0.70	2.49 2.13	-	3.53 - 3.80
1981	- - -	3.77 2.73	0.70	2.46 2.09	3.48 2.89	2.75 3.07	-	2.85	2.08 3.35	2.75	- -
1982	- - -	- -	0.80	2.24 2.03	3.54 2.93	3.34 3.15	0.85	2.54	2.02 3.46	3.01	- 3.20
1983	- - -	- 2.40	0.55	1.83 1.70	3.06 2.50	3.02 -	0.64	1.86	1.59 3.10	2.54	2.30 -
1984	- - -	- -	0.60	2.08 2.04	3.33 2.77	3.19 -	1.00	2.27	2.01 3.34	2.86	3.60 -
1985	- - -	2.20 2.55	0.97	2.38 2.31	3.38 2.85	4.55 3.27	-	2.51	2.27 3.39	2.84	3.32 -
1986	0.75 2.08	- 2.63	3.30	1.14	2.45 2.22	3.41 2.95	3.37 3.02	1.20	2.14 2.11	4.02	3.11 3.70 3.50
1987	- 1.82	1.40 3.18	2.45	0.85	2.21 1.96	3.38 2.86	3.27 2.78	-	2.40 1.99	3.01	2.45 - -
1988	- 1.70	- 3.56	2.88	0.74	2.67 2.21	3.37 2.91	3.25 -	0.75	2.14 2.15	3.59	3.00 - -
1989	- - -	- -	0.88	2.03 1.92	3.34 2.85	3.74 2.98	0.75	2.11	2.01 3.24	2.81	- -
1990	0.75 1.15	- -	3.34	0.98	2.30 2.15	3.58 3.02	3.78 3.29	-	2.54	2.18 3.82	3.14 4.95 -
1991	- 1.31	1.35 3.65	3.25	0.75	1.99 2.00	3.09 2.64	3.30 2.92	1.15	2.22	1.87 3.22	2.55 3.40 -
Avg	0.70 1.82	1.91 3.23	2.79	0.86	2.32 2.10	3.34 2.85	3.40 3.11	0.94	2.41	2.12 3.38	2.92 3.54 3.47

Table 4. Summary of regression coefficients ($x10^{-3}$) of sockeye and pink salmon abundance on average weight at return (kgs) of Ozernaya sockeye by sex and age.

		Age Group	*W. Pink*	*E. Pink*	*Ozernaya Sockeye*	*Kamchatka Sockeye*	R^2	*p value*
	Male	2.1	-2.1	-2.8	6.6	-53.4	0.66	<0.01
		2.2	-2.5	-4.5	-19.9	-66.4	0.49	0.02
		2.3	-0.9	-2.1	19.9	34.7	0.18	0.46
		2.4	-6.1	-6.7	70.4	155.2	0.42	0.09
		3.2	-3.3	-1.1	-21.6	-20.1	0.35	0.10
		3.3	1.3	-6.8	42.6	-148.6	0.61	<0.01
		Pooled	-0.5	-3.9	16.4	-14.5	0.15	0.56
	Female	2.2	-2.6	-3.9	3.5	-22.9	0.68	<0.01
		2.3	-1.6	-2.5	6.6	-23.7	0.52	0.01
		2.4	4.3	-3	11.1	-20.4	0.31	0.28
		3.2	-3.2	-3.5	-9.7	-27.4	0.68	<0.01
		3.3	-0.3	-7.7	-3.3	-139.1	0.63	<0.01
		Pooled	-0.4	-3.2	19.0	-72.5	0.41	0.05

Table 5. Estimated effect of the mean abundance of different stocks discussed in the text on Ozernaya sockeye weight (kgs). The calculations show the predicted effect on mean weight if the average abundance of each stock dropped to zero. Single and double asterisks indicate results based on regression equations that were statistically significant at probabilities less than 5% and 1%, respectively.

Sex	Age Group	W. Pink	E. Pink	Ozernaya Sockeye	Kamchatka Sockeye	Net Effect (kgs)
Male	2.1	-0.06	-0.09	0.02	-0.07	-0.19**
	2.2	-0.07	-0.14	-0.07	-0.09	-0.37*
	2.3	-0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.05	0.02
	2.4	-0.18	-0.20	0.24	0.20	0.07
	3.2	-0.10	-0.03	-0.07	-0.03	-0.23
	3.3	0.04	-0.21	0.15	-0.20	-0.22**
	Pooled	-0.01	-0.12	0.06	-0.02	-0.10
Female	2.2	-0.08	-0.12	0.01	-0.03	-0.21**
	2.3	-0.05	-0.08	0.02	-0.03	-0.13**
	2.4	0.13	-0.09	0.04	-0.03	0.05
	3.2	-0.09	-0.11	-0.03	-0.04	-0.27**
	3.3	-0.01	-0.23	-0.01	-0.18	-0.44**
	Pooled	-0.01	-0.10	0.07	-0.10	-0.14*

Table 6. Summary of regression coefficients of sockeye and pink salmon abundance on average length at return (cms) of Ozernaya sockeye by sex and age.

			Regression Coefficient ($x10^{-6}$)					
	Sex	***Age Group***	***W. Pink***	***E. Pink***	***Ozernaya Sockeye***	***Kamchatka Sockeye***	***R^2***	***p value***
	Male	***2.1***	-0.0360**	-0.0261*	-0.127	-1.000	0.73	<0.01
		2.2	-0.020	-0.021	-0.3701*	-0.653	0.49	0.02
		2.3	-0.003	-0.003	-0.157	-0.404	0.21	0.36
		2.4	-0.023	-0.021	0.015	0.371	0.16	0.63
		3.2	-0.023	-0.001	-0.4721*	-0.510	0.40	0.06
		3.3	0.007	-0.0279*	-0.077	-1.6495**	0.55	0.01
		Average	-0.004	-0.029	0.031	-0.654	0.18	0.48
	Female	***2.2***	-0.0158*	-0.0238*	-0.190	-0.550	0.63	<0.01
		2.3	-0.009	-0.015	-0.180	-0.446	0.51	0.01
		2.4	0.017	-0.009	-0.133	0.229	0.22	0.49
		3.2	-0.0258**	-0.018	-0.2878*	-0.306	0.67	<0.01
		3.3	-0.002	-0.0292*	-0.241	-1.1024*	0.57	<0.01
		Average	-0.007	-0.021	-0.075	-0.091	0.39	0.06

Table 7. Estimated effect of mean abundance on Ozernaya Sockeye Lengths (cm)

Sex	Age Group	W. Pink	E. Pink	Ozernaya Sockeye	Kamchatka Sockeye
Male	2.1	-1.0	-0.8	-0.4	-1.3
	2.2	-0.6	-0.6	-1.3	-0.9
	2.3	-0.1	-0.1	-0.5	-0.5
	2.4	-0.7	-0.6	0.1	0.5
	3.2	-0.7	0.0	-1.6	-0.7
	3.3	0.2	-0.8	-0.3	-2.2
Female	2.2	-0.5	-0.7	-0.7	-0.7
	2.3	-0.3	-0.5	-0.6	-0.6
	2.4	0.5	-0.3	-0.5	0.3
	3.2	-0.8	-0.5	-1.0	-0.4
	3.3	-0.1	-0.9	-0.8	-1.4

Fig. 1 p. 18


12
10
8
6
4
2
0
Ozernaya
Kamchatka
1970 1972 1974 1976 1978 1980 1982 1984 1986 1988 1990 1992


175
150
125
100
75
50
25
0
Western Pink
Eastern Pink
1970 1972 1974 1976 1978 1980 1982 1984 1986 1988 1990 1992

Age 2.1 Male Sockeye





Age 2.2 Female Sockeye