College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences
University of Alaska Fairbanks
2150 Koyukuk Dr., 245 O'Neill Bldg.
Fairbanks, AK 99775-7220

TELEMETRY AND GENETIC IDENTITY OF CHINOOK SALMON IN ALASKA: PRELIMINARY REPORT OF SATELLITE TAGS DEPLOYED IN 2020–2022

Prepared for and funded by: U.S. Navy, Commander Pacific Fleet
Submitted to: Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command
under Cooperative Agreement #N62473-20-2-0001

Andrew C Seitz
Michael B Courtney
College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences
University of Alaska Fairbanks

January 2023

Cover photo: Chinook salmon tagged and released with a pop-up satellite archival tag near Chignik Bay, Alaska. Research activities were conducted under the University of Alaska Fairbanks Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee assurance 495247 and State of Alaska Aquatic Resource Permits CF-20-039, CF-21-027, CF-21-085, and CF-22-034. Photo credit, Michael Courtney.

Suggested Citation: Seitz, A.C., and M.B. Courtney. 2023. Telemetry and Genetic Identity of Chinook Salmon in Alaska. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, Commander Pacific Fleet. Prepared by: College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, University of Alaska Fairbanks under Cooperative Agreement #N62473-20-2-0001. January 2023. 43 pp.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*
01-2023

2. REPORT TYPE
Monitoring report

3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
2020–2022

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
TELEMETRY AND GENETIC IDENTITY OF CHINOOK SALMON IN ALASKA: PRELIMINARY REPORT OF SATELLITE TAGS DEPLOYED IN 2020–2022

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
N62473-20-2-0001

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)
Andrew C. Seitz
Michael B. Courtney

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, University of Alaska Fairbanks

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Commander, U.S.Pacific Fleet, 250 Makalapa Dr. Pearl Harbor, HI

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

12. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) is an iconic species found throughout the North Pacific Ocean and supports valuable subsistence, commercial and recreational fisheries. In addition to its importance to fisheries, Chinook salmon is an important food source for many apex marine predators, including endangered Southern Resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*). Currently, coast-wide changes in Chinook salmon population demographics and production have been documented from western Alaska to California, including several Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) from the United States (U.S.) Pacific Northwest (PNW) that are protected under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The U.S. Navy (Navy) conducts at-sea training in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA), including the Temporary Maritime Activities Area (TMAA). As part of the Marine Species Monitoring Program, the Navy is interested in understanding the overlap of occurrence between populations of Chinook salmon, particularly the ESUs that are listed under the ESA, and specific Navy training activities. This is challenging, as relatively little is known about the at-sea distribution and behavior of Chinook salmon, despite the fact that most individuals reside in the ocean for the majority of their lives. Therefore, an improved understanding of the distribution and behavior of Chinook salmon in the marine environment is important when addressing potential interactions between this species and specific Navy exercises within portions of the TMAA.

To qualitatively describe the spatial distribution, movement, vertical distribution, occupied habitat, and natural mortality of Chinook salmon in the GOA, we attached pop-up satellite archival tags (PSATs) to individuals near Chignik, AK (n = 20), Kodiak, AK (n = 20), Yakutat, AK (n = 20), Craig, AK (n = 20), and Sitka, AK (n = 20) in 2020–2022, and collected tissue samples for genetically determining stock-of-origin of each tagged fish. Of the 100 PSATs deployed, data were transmitted by 95 tags, providing >4,900 days of data. Reporting locations of tags were widespread across the eastern North Pacific Ocean, ranging as far west as the Bering Sea to as far east as the U.S. PNW (Washington and Oregon). Movement models suggested that the majority of tagged fish remained over the continent shelf within relatively close proximity <500 km) to their tagging location. While occupying waters of the North Pacific Ocean, Chinook salmon occupied depths ranging from 0 to 464 m and experienced a thermal environment ranging from 1.8 to 19.0°C. Sixteen tagged Chinook salmon were inferred to have occupied the TMAA (~254 aggregated days) while at liberty (i.e., the span of time between tag deployment to pop-up date). While occupying waters of the TMAA, Chinook salmon spent the majority of their time (58%) in waters over the continental shelf, and spent a minority of their time over the continental slope (22%) and basin (20%). In addition to providing information on the horizontal and vertical distribution of Chinook salmon, PSATs provided evidence of mortality of tagged fish caused by endothermic fish(s) (n = 20), an ectothermic fish (n = 1), marine mammals (n = 6), and unknown (n = 9) causes. Genetic analyses (2022 results still pending) suggested that all tagged Chinook salmon were from populations originating in southern Southeast Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon.

While this study contained a relatively small sample size, the tagged Chinook salmon were comprised of individuals from many populations extending from Southeast Alaska to the U.S. PNW, making our results pertinent for many populations throughout North America, including stocks of concern and those listed under the ESA. The information about Chinook salmon gained in this study may be used to provide insights into important management issues in the North iv Pacific Ocean, including overlap between Chinook salmon and Navy training exercises in the GOA.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Acoustic monitoring, Chinook Salmon, Gulf of Alaska Temporary Maritime Activities Area, pop-up satelllite tags

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			**17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT**	**18. NUMBER OF PAGES**	**19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON**
			UU	43	Department of the Navy
a. REPORT	**b. ABSTRACT**	**c. THIS PAGE**			**19b. TELEPONE NUMBER (*Include area code)***
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified			808-471-6391

Executive Summary

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) is an iconic species found throughout the North Pacific Ocean and supports valuable subsistence, commercial and recreational fisheries. In addition to its importance to fisheries, Chinook salmon is an important food source for many apex marine predators, including endangered Southern Resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*). Currently, coast-wide changes in Chinook salmon population demographics and production have been documented from western Alaska to California, including several Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs) from the United States (U.S.) Pacific Northwest (PNW) that are protected under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The U.S. Navy (Navy) conducts at-sea training in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA), including the Temporary Maritime Activities Area (TMAA). As part of the Marine Species Monitoring Program, the Navy is interested in understanding the overlap of occurrence between populations of Chinook salmon, particularly the ESUs that are listed under the ESA, and specific Navy training activities. This is challenging, as relatively little is known about the at-sea distribution and behavior of Chinook salmon, despite the fact that most individuals reside in the ocean for the majority of their lives. Therefore, an improved understanding of the distribution and behavior of Chinook salmon in the marine environment is important when addressing potential interactions between this species and specific Navy exercises within portions of the TMAA.

To qualitatively describe the spatial distribution, movement, vertical distribution, occupied habitat, and natural mortality of Chinook salmon in the GOA, we attached pop-up satellite archival tags (PSATs) to individuals near Chignik, AK (n = 20), Kodiak, AK (n = 20), Yakutat, AK (n = 20), Craig, AK (n = 20), and Sitka, AK (n = 20) in 2020–2022, and collected tissue samples for genetically determining stock-of-origin of each tagged fish.

Of the 100 PSATs deployed, data were transmitted by 95 tags, providing >4,900 days of data. Reporting locations of tags were widespread across the eastern North Pacific Ocean, ranging as far west as the Bering Sea to as far east as the U.S. PNW (Washington and Oregon). Movement models suggested that the majority of tagged fish remained over the continent shelf within relatively close proximity (<500 km) to their tagging location. While occupying waters of the North Pacific Ocean, Chinook salmon occupied depths ranging from 0 to 464 m and experienced a thermal environment ranging from 1.8 to 19.0°C. Sixteen tagged Chinook salmon were inferred to have occupied the TMAA (~254 aggregated days) while at liberty (i.e., the span of time between tag deployment to pop-up date). While occupying waters of the TMAA, Chinook salmon spent the majority of their time (58%) in waters over the continental shelf, and spent a minority of their time over the continental slope (22%) and basin (20%). In addition to providing information on the horizontal and vertical distribution of Chinook salmon, PSATs provided evidence of mortality of tagged fish caused by endothermic fish(s) (n = 20), an ectothermic fish (n = 1), marine mammals (n = 6), and unknown (n = 9) causes. Genetic analyses (2022 results still pending) suggested that all tagged Chinook salmon were from populations originating in southern Southeast Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon.

While this study contained a relatively small sample size, the tagged Chinook salmon were comprised of individuals from many populations extending from Southeast Alaska to the U.S. PNW, making our results pertinent for many populations throughout North America, including stocks of concern and those listed under the ESA. The information about Chinook salmon gained in this study may be used to provide insights into important management issues in the North

Pacific Ocean, including overlap between Chinook salmon and Navy training exercises in the GOA.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acronyms and abbreviations

CSSMA	Continental Shelf and Slope Mitigation Area
CWT	Coded Wire Tag
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit
ESA	U.S. Endangered Species Act
FL	Fork Length
GOA	Gulf of Alaska
HMM	Hidden Markov Model
Navy	U.S. Navy
NWFSC	Northwest Fisheries Science Center
PNW	Pacific Northwest
PSAT	Pop-up Satellite Archival Tag
TMAA	Temporary Maritime Activities Area
UAF	University of Alaska Fairbanks

1. Introduction

Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) is an iconic species found throughout the North Pacific Ocean and supports valuable subsistence, commercial and recreational fisheries (Healey 1991; Quinn 2005; Riddell et al. 2018). In addition to fisheries, the Chinook salmon is vital to the well-being of many Indigenous communities throughout Alaska. Furthermore, Chinook salmon is an important food source for many apex marine predators, including endangered Southern Resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) (Ford et al. 1998; Adams et al. 2016; Chasco et al. 2017). Populations of anadromous (i.e., individuals that make marine feeding migrations) Chinook salmon have variable life histories. In general, Chinook salmon rear in freshwater for up to two years before they migrate to the ocean to feed for generally one to five years. After their ocean phase when they grow to adults, Chinook salmon return to their natal river to spawn once and then die.

As part of the Navy's Marine Species Monitoring Program, there is interest in understanding the overlap of occurrence between populations of Chinook salmon, particularly the ESUs that are listed under the ESA, and Navy at-sea training activities that occur in the GOA TMAA. Currently, the Navy conducts at-sea training in the GOA TMAA during the months of April to October (U.S. Navy 2020). Recently, the Navy established the Continental Shelf and Slope Mitigation Area (CSSMA) within the TMAA, in which explosive training activities over shelf and slope (i.e., <4,000 m depth) habitats of the TMAA are prohibited (U.S. Navy 2022). The CSSMA was established to minimize the potential impacts of training exercises on Chinook salmon, based on previous results from satellite telemetry research (Courtney et al. 2019; Seitz et al. 2021).

While in the ocean, relatively little is known about the migration and behavior of Chinook salmon, despite the fact that individuals frequently reside in the ocean for the majority of their lives (Brodeur et al. 2000; Drenner et al. 2012; Riddell et al. 2018). Currently, based on coded wire tag (CWT) recoveries, genetic analyses, and bycatch in groundfish fisheries, a large spatial overlap exists in the oceanic distributions of many populations of Chinook salmon originating from North America (Trudel et al. 2009; Weitkamp 2010; Larson et al. 2013). For example, Chinook salmon from several ESUs from the U.S. PNW that are protected under the ESA (https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/chinook-salmon-protected#overview) are thought to migrate north to the GOA, extending into the Bering Sea. However, there are many details about the migration of this species that are unknown, as most of what is known about Chinook salmon occurrence in the GOA, particularly outside of State of Alaska waters (>5.6 km), is dependent on incidental captures in groundfish trawl fisheries (Masuda 2019; Guthrie et al. 2020; Balsiger 2021), which are not conducted in a spatially and temporally uniform manner throughout the GOA. Furthermore, because Chinook salmon are designated as prohibited species and are subject to caps that may close groundfish trawl fisheries because they reach their catch quotas, Chinook salmon are actively avoided by trawl fleets. As a result, information about Chinook salmon is spatially and temporally biased and it does not exist throughout the species' entire range, which extends beyond where groundfish fisheries occur. As a result, fine-scale movements and habitat occupancy of Chinook salmon in the GOA are not well understood (Walker et al. 2007; Walker and Myers 2009).

A method that builds upon bycatch records for studying the ocean ecology of Chinook salmon is PSATs (Courtney et al. 2019; Courtney et al. 2021b). While attached to a fish, PSATs measure and record data, including depth, ambient temperature, and light intensity (Arnold and Dewar

2001; Musyl et al. 2011; Thorstad et al. 2013). On a user-defined date, PSATs release from the fish, float to the surface of the water and transmit data to satellites, which are then retrieved by project investigators. Because PSATs do not rely on recapture for data retrieval, they are a fisheries independent method of data collection. Therefore, PSATs are a feasible method to provide an improved understanding of the spatial distribution and behaviors of Chinook salmon, independent of groundfish fisheries, which is important when addressing potential interactions between this species and Navy exercises in the TMAA.

To examine Chinook salmon ocean ecology while occupying waters of the GOA, large (>60 cm), immature Chinook salmon were captured and tagged with PSATs at five sites along the coast of Alaska. The PSATs provided information about the horizontal distribution, movement, vertical distribution, and occupied habitat of tagged Chinook salmon. To understand stock-of-origin of each tagged fish, tissue samples were collected and genetic analyses were conducted. This information can provide a more complete understanding of the biology and ecology of the oceanic phase of large, immature Chinook salmon within the GOA, which may be useful for understanding potential interactions between this species and Navy exercises in the TMAA.

2. Methods

2.1 Fish capture and tagging

During angling field expeditions in 2020–2022, large, immature, Chinook salmon were captured, tagged, and released near Chignik, AK (n = 20; 1–4 August 2020), Kodiak, AK (n = 20; 5–28 October 2020), Yakutat, AK (n = 20; 3–22 March 2021), Craig, AK (n = 20; 25 May to 12 June 2022), and Sitka, AK (n= 20; 14–24 June 2022) (Table 1; Fig. 1). In addition to deploying PSATs during fieldwork, acoustic tags were also deployed in non-PSAT tagged Chinook salmon (i.e., fish were not double-tagged) as part of a collaboration among University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC), and the U.S. Navy (Smith and Huff 2022). Specifically, acoustic tags were deployed near Kodiak, AK (n = 80), Yakutat, AK (n = 32), Craig, AK (n = 21), and Sitka, AK (n = 99) during this studies' fieldwork. Furthermore, fieldwork was conducted a second time near Chignik, AK, in August 2021, during which 36 acoustic tags were deployed on Chinook salmon. Because no satellite tags were deployed on Chinook salmon during this effort, it is not reported on subsequently. After hooking, fish were retrieved quickly, brought onboard the



Figure 1. Study regions near a) Chignik, AK, b) Kodiak, AK, c) Yakutat, AK, d) Craig, AK, and e) Sitka, AK, where Chinook salmon were captured and tagged with pop-up satellite archival tags in 2020, 2021, and 2022. Red boxes in panel f indicate extent of sampling locations within Alaska.

fishing vessel in a padded net, and visually assessed for signs of stress or abnormal behavior, including external injuries, loss of scales, bleeding, loss of equilibrium, pupil dilation, abnormal coloration, frayed fins, and rapid opercular movement. Only Chinook salmon deemed to be healthy according to these metrics and >60 cm fork length (FL) were selected for tagging. Tagging Chinook salmon of this size ensured that the tag is <2% of the body weight of the fish, a commonly accepted minimum size threshold for fish tagging (Brown et al. 2010). Candidate Chinook salmon were placed in a custom-fabricated cradle and blindfolded to reduce visual stimuli that can contribute to stress and struggling (Courtney et al. 2019).

PSATs were attached to Chinook salmon while in the cradle with a tag attachment system used for many salmonids, including Dolly Varden char (*Salvelinus malma*) (Courtney et al. 2016a), Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) (Strøm et al. 2017), Chinook salmon (Courtney et al. 2019) and steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) (Courtney et al. 2022). In short, the tag backpack system, which consists of the tag that is tethered to two padded straps, was secured with surgical-grade wire (0.8 mm) through the dorsal musculature and bony fin-ray supports of Chinook salmon (Courtney et al. 2016b). This tag attachment technique aims to minimize muscle damage and premature rejection of the tether system caused by tearing through muscle tissue due to hydrodynamic drag of the tag. After tagging, the axillary process of each fish's left pelvic fin was removed as a tissue sample for subsequent genetic analysis. After tissue sampling, Chinook salmon were identified by tag number, photographed, and released into the ocean. All fieldwork was conducted under the University of Alaska Fairbanks Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee assurance 495247 and State of Alaska Aquatic Resource Permits CF-20-039, CF-21-027, CF-21-085, and CF-22-034.

2.2 Tag specifications and data acquisition

All PSATs (MiniPAT, Wildlife Computers; Redmond, WA; https://wildlifecomputers.com/our-tags/minipat/) weighed 60 g in air and were slightly buoyant in water. While attached to a Chinook salmon, the PSATs measured and archived temperature, depth, and ambient light intensity data. After releasing from the fish, the tags floated to the surface of the sea and transmitted, via satellite (Argos Satellite System), summarized temperature and depth data (resolution 5.0–10.0 min) and daily dawn and dusk times determined from light data. While transmitting, a highly accurate end location was determined (Keating 1995). If tags were recaptured from a live fish or found on shore, data were retrieved in the tags' native resolution (1–5 sec in this study). PSATs were programmed to release from tagged fish at staggered intervals between 30 and 270 days post-tagging (Table 1). This staggered pop-up scheduled was developed as a compromise between obtaining accurate end locations of tagged fish throughout the calendar year and maximizing duration of tag data records and tag-reporting rates. Additionally, tags were programmed to release and report to satellites before their scheduled pop-up date if they triggered a fail-safe mechanism by remaining at a constant depth (± 2.5 m) for three days. This release criterion was based on the assumption that live Chinook salmon in the ocean change depths frequently (Hinke et al. 2005; Walker and Myers 2009; Courtney et al. 2019; Courtney et al. 2021b) and a lack of change in depth indicates mortality (e.g., tag remaining on sea floor) and/or premature release of tag (e.g., tag detached from fish and floating on sea surface).

Table 1. Deployment information for 100 PSATs attached to Chinook salmon in the GOA in 2020, 2021, and 2022.

Argos ID	Tag SN	Harness ID	Deploy date	Deploy region	Programmed attachment duration (days)	Fork length (cm)	Reporting date	Liberty (days)	Data days	Displacement (km)	Track distance (km)
202585	20P0884	2020-092	08-03-20	Chignik	220	67	09-12-20	39	34	47	278
202586	20P0889	2020-099	08-05-20	Chignik	220	70	10-27-20	82	79	224	846
202587	20P0943	2020-089	08-04-20	Chignik	200	81	12-05-20	122	119	69	1071
202588	20P0944	2020-091	08-02-20	Chignik	270	74	11-27-20	118	113	382	1292
202589	20P0945	2020-031	08-03-20	Chignik	220	67	10-12-20	70	19	22	114
202590	20P0946	2020-084	08-04-20	Chignik	220	70	02-08-21	188	115	685	NA
202591	20P0947	2020-023	08-01-20	Chignik	270	65	10-27-20	87	84	227	678
202592	20P0948	2020-038	08-03-20	Chignik	220	75	09-06-20	33	30	1251	1316
202593	20P0949	2020-040	08-02-20	Chignik	270	65	09-13-20	42	39	63	355
202594	20P0952	2020-041	08-02-20	Chignik	270	92	01-23-21	173	73	53	710
202595	20P0953	2020-086	08-04-20	Chignik	200	69	02-17-21	196	192	338	1865
202596	20P0954	2020-029	08-03-20	Chignik	220	73	11-22-20	111	106	299	789
202597	20P0955	2020-045	08-03-20	Chignik	220	72	09-25-20	53	50	52	648
202598	20P0993	2020-097	08-04-20	Chignik	200	101	09-23-20	50	50	1769	NA
202599	20P0999	2020-093	08-04-20	Chignik	220	69	10-11-20	68	62	75	781
202600	20P1002	2020-080	08-02-20	Chignik	270	83	10-17-20	76	58	1583	1764
202601	20P1029	2020-094	08-03-20	Chignik	220	62	10-08-20	66	60	89	394
202602	20P1053	2020-030	08-03-20	Chignik	220	70	10-04-20	61	56	56	497
202603	20P1055	2020-098	08-04-20	Chignik	200	71	09-07-20	33	30	305	651
202604	20P1056	2020-033	08-02-20	Chignik	270	88	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
205398	20P1552	2020-050	10-06-20	Kodiak	240	67	11-14-20	28	25	68	145
205399	20P1565	2020-049	10-05-20	Kodiak	240	68	10-26-20	21	15	122	206
205400	20P1576	2020-027	10-08-20	Kodiak	240	74	11-26-20	49	44	189	638
205401	20P1584	2020-048	10-06-20	Kodiak	240	68	10-30-20	24	18	39	100
205402	20P1586	2020-047	10-09-20	Kodiak	240	76	10-18-20	9	6	36	36
205403	20P1588	2020-027	10-08-20	Kodiak	210	66	12-08-20	61	54	273	773
205404	20P1589	2020-090	10-11-20	Kodiak	210	69	01-02-21	83	75	246	455
205405	20P1599	2020-028	10-13-20	Kodiak	210	74	04-22-21	190	187	2282	3088
205406	20P1625	2020-043	10-11-20	Kodiak	210	66	12-13-20	63	60	463	584
205407	20P1636	2020-034	10-11-20	Kodiak	210	71	12-25-20	75	72	357	684
205408	20P1637	2020-037	10-06-20	Kodiak	180	77	11-08-20	33	28	95	305
205409	20P1649	2020-036	10-07-20	Kodiak	180	77	10-31-20	19	14	92	139
205410	20P1667	2020-039	10-09-20	Kodiak	180	69	12-05-20	54	50	201	344
205411	20P1668	NA	10-15-20	Kodiak	180	85	12-12-20	57	54	219	336
205412	20P1670	2020-026	10-06-20	Kodiak	180	69	10-24-20	18	12	78	105
205413	20P1671	2020-079	10-06-20	Kodiak	150	75	01-09-21	94	91	267	877
205414	20P1672	2020-046	10-13-20	Kodiak	150	66	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
205415	20P1673	2020-095	10-05-20	Kodiak	150	81	02-20-21	137	135	1573	2199
205416	20P1682	2020-035	10-07-20	Kodiak	150	71	10-27-20	19	16	138	166
205417	20P1691	2020-078	10-07-20	Kodiak	150	64	11-12-20	36	29	142	197
210757	20P2236	2020-320	03-19-21	Yakutat	120	77	03-25-21	6	3	7	NA

Argos ID	Tag SN	Harness ID	Deploy date	Deploy region	Programmed attachment duration (days)	Fork length (cm)	Reporting date	Liberty (days)	Data days	Displacement (km)	Track distance (km)
210758	20P2237	2020-315	03-06-21	Yakutat	120	70	06-15-21	101	98	61	953
210759	20P2238	2020-301	03-05-21	Yakutat	120	74	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
210760	20P2239	2020-306	03-05-21	Yakutat	120	73	06-22-21	109	106	776	1493
210761*	20P2240	2020-313	03-07-21	Yakutat	90	78	06-04-21	90	89	1744	2101
210762	20P2241	2020-307	03-14-21	Yakutat	90	79	03-24-21	10	7	46	49
210763	20P2242	2020-300	03-05-21	Yakutat	90	79	06-04-21	90	90	753	1410
210764	20P2244	2020-305	03-05-21	Yakutat	90	89	06-04-21	90	90	584	977
210765	20P2246	2020-302	03-05-21	Yakutat	120	70	07-02-21	119	115	723	2535
210766	20P2247	2020-311	03-07-21	Yakutat	120	80	04-02-21	19	12	122	183
210767	20P2248	2020-308	03-05-21	Yakutat	120	74	05-21-21	77	74	729	1056
210768	20P2249	2020-321	03-20-21	Yakutat	120	82	04-24-21	34	31	93	320
210769	20P2309	2020-312	03-07-21	Yakutat	150	70	06-25-21	106	103	1196	1591
210770	20P2311	2020-322	03-22-21	Yakutat	150	74	06-25-21	94	91	454	1240
210771	20P2312	2020-310	03-07-21	Yakutat	150	72	04-24-21	48	45	429	890
210772	20P2346	2020-318	03-20-21	Yakutat	150	74	05-16-21	56	53	371	432
210773	20P2347	2020-316	03-07-21	Yakutat	180	74	07-02-21	117	108	1655	2065
210774	20P2348	2020-314	03-21-21	Yakutat	120	85	06-19-21	87	87	1800	2128
210775	20P2350	2020-309	03-07-21	Yakutat	180	70	06-05-21	90	87	337	948
210776	20P2351	2020-303	03-05-21	Yakutat	180	72	05-13-21	67	58	183	364
229201	21P1902	2020-345	05-29-22	Craig	30	82	06-17-22	18	1	7	NA
229202	21P1904	2020-335	05-26-22	Craig	90	70	06-28-22	33	30	402	592
229203	21P1905	2020-331	05-29-22	Craig	60	83	07-10-22	41	38	866	911
229204	21P1906	2020-346	05-31-22	Craig	60	75	07-31-22	60	60	561	1207
229205	21P1911	2020-329	05-25-22	Craig	60	74	07-24-22	60	45	383	801
229206	21P1912	2020-368	06-02-22	Craig	30	80	07-02-22	30	27	517	637
229207	21P1913	2020-337	05-26-22	Craig	60	86	07-13-22	47	44	466	630
229208	21P1914	2020-342	05-29-22	Craig	90	81	06-10-22	11	8	29	42
229209	21P1915	2020-343	05-27-22	Craig	90	73	07-17-22	50	46	235	549
229210	21P1916	2020-038	05-28-22	Craig	45	91	06-21-22	23	19	65	236
229211	21P1917	2020-367	06-02-22	Craig	30	78	06-08-22	5	2	33	NA
229212	21P1918	2020-344	05-28-22	Craig	60	81	06-08-22	4	1	1	NA
229213	21P1920	2020-328	05-25-22	Craig	60	69	06-10-22	15	12	122	178
229214	21P1921	NA	05-25-22	Craig	60	76	06-11-22	16	13	181	208
229215	21P1922	2020-336	05-26-22	Craig	90	79	05-27-22	1	0	16	NA
229216	21P1924	2020-330	06-02-22	Craig	30	83	06-13-22	11	8	41	61
229217	21P1928	2020-327	05-27-22	Craig	150	75	06-27-22	30	27	118	307
229218	21P1929	2020-351	06-01-22	Craig	120	73	06-05-22	4	1	17	NA
229219	21P1930	2020-341	05-28-22	Craig	45	89	06-14-22	17	14	44	138
229220	21P1931	2020-339	06-01-22	Craig	180	83	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
229221	21P2089	2020-385	06-19-22	Sitka	60	74	07-01-22	11	8	80	100
229222*	21P2091	2020-384	06-15-22	Sitka	120	71	07-01-22	16	16	15	97
229223*	21P2115	2020-348	06-15-22	Sitka	180	70	08-12-22	30	29	12	254
229224*	21P2118	2020-346	06-17-22	Sitka	60	79	08-05-22	49	46	910	1647

Argos ID	Tag SN	Harness ID	Deploy date	Deploy region	Programmed attachment duration (days)	Fork length (cm)	Reporting date	Liberty (days)	Data days	Displacement (km)	Track distance (km)
229225	21P2120	2020-350	06-14-22	Sitka	90	71	07-15-22	31	26	225	333
229226	21P2121	2020-370	06-16-22	Sitka	60	75	08-16-22	60	60	916	1094
229227	21P2123	2020-390	06-16-22	Sitka	90	75	09-12-22	88	81	1171	1635
229228	21P2124	2020-383	06-21-22	Sitka	45	82	07-20-22	29	24	68	285
229229	21P2159	2020-371	06-18-22	Sitka	60	73	07-31-22	42	39	865	1047
229230	21P2161	2020-391	06-14-22	Sitka	60	78	07-01-22	17	14	83	241
229231	21P2162	2020-389	06-17-22	Sitka	90	81	09-16-22	90	90	1422	1621
229232	21P2164	2020-332	06-15-22	Sitka	90	76	09-14-22	90	90	400	1000
229233	21P2167	2020-375	06-18-22	Sitka	180	70	08-28-22	51	40	350	555
229234	21P2171	2020-369	06-16-22	Sitka	60	76	08-16-22	60	60	759	1049
229235	21P2175	2020-347	06-17-22	Sitka	90	74	08-30-22	74	71	1423	1644
229236	21P2176	2020-395	06-17-22	Sitka	30	78	07-18-22	30	30	577	606
229237	21P2177	2020-380	06-16-22	Sitka	60	76	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
229238	21P2188	2020-387	06-22-22	Sitka	30	84	06-29-22	7	4	177	NA
229239	21P2218	2020-340	06-15-22	Sitka	270	73	08-11-22	56	53	185	691
229240	21P2220	2020-373	06-14-22	Sitka	120	70	09-14-22	92	87	354	1075

a) Argos ID refers to the transmitter identification number in each tag supplied by the Argos Satellite System
b) Tag SN refers to serial number of tag, provided by the tags' manufacturer
c) Harness ID refers to identification number displayed on tag harness system, which remains on the fish after the satellite tag releases
d) Liberty refers to the number of days between tagging and the first day of transmission to satellites
e) Data days refers to the total days of data provided by the tag while attached to a live, free-swimming Chinook salmon (i.e., not in the stomach of a predator)
f) Displacement refers to the minimum great arc circle distance between tagging and end locations
g) Track distance refers to curvilinear distance swam by the fish between tagging and end locations, calculated as the sum of distances between daily position estimates produced by a Hidden Markov Model
*Indicates PSATs that were recaptured in fisheries

2.3 Data analyses

To understand the horizontal movement of tagged Chinook salmon, the minimum distance traveled (referred to as displacement in this study) was calculated as the great arc circle distance of a non-meandering route that did not pass over land between tagging and end locations. End locations were assigned as the location of first transmission to satellites of each PSAT with an Argos location class 1–3, corresponding to an accuracy of <1.5 km and these end locations were plotted in GIS software (ArcMap 10.4; Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc., Redlands, California). In addition, the most likely movement paths of individual tagged fish were estimated by a Hidden Markov Model (HMM) provided by Wildlife Computers (Wildlife Computers 2015), similar to past comparable research (e.g., Strøm et al. 2017; Courtney et al. 2019; Rikardsen et al. 2021). Using the most likely movement paths produced by the HMM, the distance swam by each fish between its tagging and end locations (referred to as track distance) was calculated as the sum of distance between daily position estimates.

To understand the depth and temperatures occupied by tagged Chinook salmon, individual depth and temperature records were visualized through scatterplots and boxplots. Mortality of tagged fish was inferred from PSAT data that departed from depth, temperature and light values typically seen while attached to live Chinook salmon, following established criteria (Lacroix 2014; Seitz et al. 2019; Strøm et al. 2019). In short, PSATs that recorded abrupt changes in temperature and/or depth-based behavior, and low light levels indicating complete darkness, were inferred to be in the stomach of a predator that consumed the tagged Chinook salmon, including the externally attached tag. Genetic stock-of-origin assignments were conducted by the National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center by analyzing Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms.

3. Preliminary Results

3.1 Summary

Chinook salmon tagged in the GOA ranged from 62 to 101 cm FL (75.2 ± 6.8 cm, mean ± SD) (Table 1). Of the 100 tags deployed, 91 reported to satellites and four were recaptured in fisheries before their programmed pop-up date (Table 1). In sum, these tags provided approximately 4,968 days (mean 52.3 days per tag) of depth, temperature, and location data. Analyses of the depth, temperature, and light data from these 95 tags suggest that 58 tags were attached to live fish on or immediately before the programmed pop-up date or at recapture, while the other 36 tagged fish experienced mortality by predation (n = 27) or unknown causes (n = 9). One tag's pressure sensor malfunctioned and the fate of the tagged fish was unknown. The remaining five tags failed to transmit any data to Argos satellites and were unaccounted for (i.e., missing without explanation). All tags that reported to satellites were used in depth, temperature, and HMM analyses, except seven tags that were at liberty for <10 days, or transmitted insufficient data (n = 2) for meaningful interpretation.

3.2 Horizontal distribution

Reporting locations of tags (n = 95) attached to Chinook salmon were spread throughout the eastern North Pacific Ocean, extending from the eastern Bering Sea to the U.S. PNW (Figs. 2–7). Overall, reporting locations and most likely movement paths (n = 86) suggested that, regardless of time at liberty, even with tag durations up to 192 days, the majority (n = 70) of tagged Chinook salmon remained near (<500 km displacement) their tagging sites (Fig. 8). In contrast to the majority of tags that were inferred to have remained near the tagging regions, 25 tagged Chinook salmon demonstrated extensive (>500 km) easterly movements across the GOA, while at times occupying offshore basin waters (Fig. 8). The most likely movement paths suggested non-directed or net westerly movements for the majority of fish tagged near Chignik, AK (Fig. 3; Fig. 9), net easterly movements of fish tagged near Kodiak, AK (Fig. 4; Fig. 10) and net southeasterly movement of fish tagged near Yakutat (Fig. 5; Fig. 11); Craig, AK (Fig. 6; Fig. 12) and Sitka, AK (Fig. 7; Fig. 13).

Displacement ranged from 22 to 1,769 km (399 ± 538 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Chignik, AK, from 36 to 2,282 km (362 ± 575 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Kodiak, AK, from 7 to 1,800 km (635 ± 580 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Yakutat, AK, from 1 to 866 km (216 ± 247 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Craig, AK, and from 12 to 1,423 km (526 ± 473 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Sitka, AK (Table 1). Track distance ranged from 114 to 1,865 km (826 ± 494 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Chignik, AK, from 36 to 3,088 km (599 ± 776 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Kodiak, AK, from 49 to 2,535 km (1,152 ± 734 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Yakutat, AK, from 42 to 1,207 km (464 ± 353 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Craig, AK, and from 97 to 1,647 km (832 ± 558 km, mean ± SD) for fish tagged near Sitka, AK (Table 1). While occupying waters of the North Pacific Ocean, tagged Chinook salmon spent the majority of their time in waters over the continental shelf (65%), and spent a minority of their time over the continental slope (22%) and basin (13%; Fig. 2).



Figure 2. All end locations (n = 95; white crosses) and most likely movement paths of Chinook salmon (n = 86) tagged in the Gulf of Alaska. Estimated daily locations (circles) produced by a HMM are color coded by month. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.



Figure 3. End locations (n = 19; white crosses) and most likely movement paths of Chinook salmon (n = 17) tagged near Chignik, AK (star). Estimated daily locations (circles) produced by a HMM are color coded by month. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.



Figure 4. End locations (n = 19; white crosses) and most likely movement paths of Chinook salmon (n = 19) tagged near Kodiak, AK (star). Estimated daily locations (circles) produced by a HMM are color coded by month. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.



Figure 5. End locations (n = 19; white crosses) and most likely movement paths of Chinook salmon (n = 18) tagged near Yakutat, AK (star). Estimated daily locations (circles) produced by a HMM are color coded by month. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.



Figure 6. End locations (n = 19; white crosses) and most likely movement paths of Chinook salmon (n = 14) tagged near Craig, AK (star). Estimated daily locations (circles) produced by a HMM are color coded by month. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.



Figure 7. End locations (n = 19; white crosses) and most likely movement paths of Chinook salmon (n = 18) tagged near Sitka, AK (star). Estimated daily locations (circles) produced by a HMM are color coded by month. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.



Figure 8. Relationship between the a) daily cumulative horizontal displacement, b) daily cumulative track distance and data days of tagged Chinook salmon in the GOA, based on HMM results. Colors denote regions where fish were tagged.

3.3 Depth and temperature

While at liberty, tagged Chinook salmon occupied depths ranging from 0 to 464 m, with mean depths of individual fish ranging from 7 to 117 m (44 ± 23 m, grand mean ± SD) (Table 2; Fig. 15). Depth distributions of individual tagged Chinook salmon were highly variable and dives to 100 m were common among most tagged fish (n = 83). Many tagged fish (n = 49) demonstrated dives to >200 m (Fig. 9–13). In general, regardless of habitat occupied (e.g., slope, shelf, basin), tagged fish occupied shallower depths during summer months (June–September; grand mean depth = 31 m), compared to fall (September–November; grand mean depth = 53 m), winter (December–March; aggregated mean depth = 64 m), and spring (March–May; grand mean depth = 47 m) months (Fig. 15b). While at liberty, tagged Chinook salmon experienced a thermal environment ranging from 1.8 to 19.0°C with mean temperatures experienced by individual tagged fish ranging from 4.6 to 11.2°C (8.6 ± 1.7°C, grand mean ± SD) (Table 2; Fig.15c).

Table 2. Summary of depth and temperatures occupied by Chinook salmon (n = 86) tagged in the GOA in 2020, 2021, and 2022.

Argos ID	Region	Mean (±SD) depth (m)	Depth range (m)	Mean (±SD) temperature (°C)	Temperature range (°C)	Data days
202585	Chignik	39.5±33.2	0–168	9.9±2.5	4.7–13.4	34
202586	Chignik	33.1±28.4	0–164	10.0±1.2	5.3–13.9	79
202587	Chignik	35.1±28.8	0–153	9.9±1.3	5.9–13.6	119
202588	Chignik	52.9±40.1	0–242	9.2±1.7	4.8–13.7	113
202589	Chignik	29.3±21.9	0–116	10.4±1.5	6.7–12.9	19
202591	Chignik	26.2±31.4	0–247	10.7±1.5	5.1–13.8	84
202592	Chignik	48.9±45.3	0–206	10.1±2.7	5.6–14.6	30
202593	Chignik	21.5±18.8	0–116	11.2±1.3	6.8–14.1	39
202594	Chignik	40.1±23.0	0–86	10.2±0.9	6.5–13.8	73
202595	Chignik	26.9±27.7	0–157	8.3±2.8	3.7–14.4	192
202596	Chignik	39.1±32.7	0–270	9.6±1.7	5.1–13.4	106
202597	Chignik	28.7±24.8	0–179	10.6±1.2	7.0–13.6	50
202599	Chignik	22.9±25.3	0–184	10.9±0.9	7.1–13.8	62
202600	Chignik	52.6±41.1	0–228	9.7±2.3	4.6–14.7	58
202601	Chignik	31.5±28.4	0–112	10.3±1.7	5.9–13.9	60
202602	Chignik	31.9±24.3	0–138	10.3±1.3	5.3–14.1	56
202603	Chignik	34.0±33.7	0–157	10.0±1.8	5.8–13.6	30
205398	Kodiak	60.4±46.1	0–204	7.7±0.4	6.6–9.5	25
205399	Kodiak	86.8±59.9	0–206	7.8±1.5	6.0–10.6	15
205400	Kodiak	89.8±57.0	0–420	7.4±0.9	4.6–9.7	44
205401	Kodiak	76.8±42.1	0–188	7.7±0.6	6.6–9.9	18
205402	Kodiak	49.9±28.0	0–172	7.6±0.6	6.4–9.7	6
205403	Kodiak	105.6±37.3	0–242	7.5±1.4	5.6–11.0	54
205404	Kodiak	59.9±50.3	0–202	7.3±1.0	5.4–10.9	75
205405	Kodiak	75.9±55.4	0–294	6.6±1.2	3.6–11.0	187
205406	Kodiak	50.0±38.4	0–202	7.5±0.8	5.5–9.3	60
205407	Kodiak	46.6±43.1	0–206	7.8±0.7	5.4–9.5	72
205408	Kodiak	73.6±45.1	0–202	8.0±1.1	5.6–10.0	28
205409	Kodiak	43.9±41.7	0–187	8.0±0.7	6.2–9.7	15
205410	Kodiak	63.0±44.0	0–209	7.5±1.1	4.4–9.8	50
205411	Kodiak	92.1±43.3	0–242	7.0±0.6	5.1–9.0	54
205412	Kodiak	55.3±39.3	0–194	8.0±0.9	6.4–9.6	12
205413	Kodiak	69.4±46.2	0–254	7.2±0.7	5.2–10.0	91
205415	Kodiak	117.3±65.0	0–336	7.5±0.8	4.9–10.3	135
205416	Kodiak	50.4±41.6	0–187	8.9±1.1	5.9–10.8	16
205417	Kodiak	60.2±42.1	0–190	8.0±0.8	6.1–10.1	29
210758	Yakutat	82.0±78.1	0–262	6.3±1.1	4.1–10.8	98
210760	Yakutat	34.6±44.8	0–224	6.7±2.2	2.9–13.9	106
210761*	Yakutat	70.5±67.7	0–464	6.6±2.0	3.1–19.0	89
210762	Yakutat	86.3±40.1	0–161	6.0±0.6	3.9–6.6	7
210763	Yakutat	56.5±50.2	0–238	5.8±1.5	2.3–9.5	90
210764	Yakutat	22.9±19.7	0–317	6.1±1.4	3.8–9.5	90

Argos ID	Region	Mean (±SD) depth (m)	Depth range (m)	Mean (±SD) temperature (°C)	Temperature range (°C)	Data days
210765	Yakutat	43.3±54.3	0–263	7.3±1.9	3.3–17.4	115
210766	Yakutat	19.7±21.2	0–138	4.8±0.4	2.9–6.3	12
210767	Yakutat	23.5±28.8	0–254	5.6±1.4	1.9–9.1	74
210768	Yakutat	44.9±21.8	0–132	4.6±0.3	2.2–6.3	31
210769	Yakutat	55.9±56.8	0–286	7.1±1.8	2.9–13.1	103
210770	Yakutat	21.9±31.0	0–260	6.8±1.9	3.2–13.3	91
210771	Yakutat	56.1±57.7	0–262	5.3±0.7	3.7–7.7	45
210772	Yakutat	57.9±42.0	0–426	6.1±0.9	4.0–9.8	53
210773	Yakutat	45.6±48.3	0–232	7.3±2.2	3.4–14.9	108
210774	Yakutat	29.5±34.2	0–269	7.5±3.1	3.2–16.8	87
210775	Yakutat	52.9±54.4	0–254	6.3±1.1	3.8–10.9	87
210776	Yakutat	93.8±63.4	0–269	6.1±0.5	4.6–7.9	58
229202	Craig	21.0±21.6	0–150	9.8±1.2	6.5–15.8	30
229203	Craig	21.3±22.7	0–142	10.2±1.7	6.1–16.8	38
229204	Craig	18.0±25.5	0–322	11.1±2.1	5.3–18.4	60
229205	Craig	25.1±40.9	0–228	9.9±1.6	5.7–14.9	45
229206	Craig	25.1±25.0	0–202	10.2±1.4	6.0–14.8	28
229207	Craig	39.3±39.0	0–284	9.8±2.7	6.0–17.9	45
229208	Craig	6.9±14.8	0–102	10.5±1.1	7.0–13.4	8
229209	Craig	12.6±16.5	0–138	11.0±1.9	6.0–15.6	46
229210	Craig	21.8±18.4	0–91	9.7±1.3	6.9–14.3	19
229213	Craig	19.6±23.8	0–134	9.4±1.2	6.7–11.8	13
229214	Craig	16.4±26.4	0–134	9.6±1.2	6.5–11.3	13
229216	Craig	16.7±18.2	0–176	9.6±1.9	5.7–15.7	8
229217	Craig	13.9±22.9	0–158	9.9±1.0	6.2–13.4	27
229219	Craig	18.5±18.8	0–124	9.2±0.8	6.4–12.2	14
229221	Sitka	36.6±24.4	0–124	9.0±1.5	6.4–12.1	8
229222*	Sitka	21.6±28.5	0–140	10.3±1.8	6.3–15.4	16
229223*	Sitka	56.1±41.7	0–215	8.4±1.8	5.8–13.6	29
229224*	Sitka	37.8±46.9	0–256	10.3±2.3	5.5–17.1	46
229225	Sitka	31.3±42.2	0–225	9.7±1.7	5.6–13.1	26
229226	Sitka	32.1±28.3	0–202	10.3±1.9	5.5–15.1	61
229227	Sitka	51.0±48.5	0–248	9.7±2.5	5.7–17.0	81
229228	Sitka	13.2±14.3	0–82	10.5±1.9	6.5–17.4	24
229229	Sitka	29.2±36.0	0–228	10.4±1.9	6.0–14.8	39
229230	Sitka	36.2±30.8	0–150	8.9±1.5	6.1–12.7	14
229231	Sitka	57.6±49.2	0–209	9.8±2.8	5.6–19.3	90
229232	Sitka	53.6±35.3	0–198	9.3±2.3	5.7–15.3	90
229233	Sitka	47.0±48.1	0–229	9.5±2.2	5.6–15.1	40
229234	Sitka	66.0±47.3	0–278	8.4±2.3	5.5–14.8	60
229235	Sitka	47.2±45.8	0–218	9.5±2.6	5.9–18.8	71
229236	Sitka	24.4±27.0	0–173	10.4±1.6	5.8–13.7	30
229239	Sitka	30.6±38.1	0–284	10.4±2.1	5.4–14.0	53
229240	Sitka	38.4±36.6	0–210	10.1±2.1	6.0–16.1	87

a) Argos ID refers to the transmitter identification number of each tag supplied by the Argos Satellite System
b) Data days refers to the total days of data provided by the tag while attached to a live, free-swimming Chinook salmon (i.e., not in the stomach of a predator)
*Indicates PSATs which were recaptured in fisheries.



Figure 9. Most likely movement paths (left) and temperature at depth (right) of three representative Chinook salmon tagged with pop-up satellite archival tags near Chignik, AK (star) in August of 2020. Estimated daily locations (circles in left panels) produced by a HMM are color coded by month and crosses denote each tags' end location. Argos IDs are noted in respective panels and correspond to those given in Table 1.



Figure 10. Most likely movement paths (left) and temperature at depth (right) of three representative Chinook salmon tagged with pop-up satellite archival tags near Kodiak, AK (star) in October of 2020. Estimated daily locations (circles in left panels) produced by a HMM are color coded by month and crosses denote each tags' end location. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted. Argos IDs are noted in respective panels and correspond to those given in Table 1.



Figure 11. Most likely movement paths (left) and temperature at depth (right) of three representative Chinook salmon tagged with pop-up satellite archival tags near Yakutat, AK (star) in March 2021. Estimated daily locations (circles in left panels) produced by a HMM are color coded by month and crosses denote each tags' end location. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted. Argos IDs are noted in respective panels and correspond to those given in Table 1.



Figure 12. Most likely movement paths (left) and temperature at depth (right) of three representative Chinook salmon tagged with pop-up satellite archival tags near Craig, AK (star) in May 2022. Estimated daily locations (circles in left panels) produced by a HMM are color coded by month and crosses denote each tags' end location. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted. Argos IDs are noted in respective panels and correspond to those given in Table 1.



Figure 13. Most likely movement paths (left) and temperature at depth (right) of three representative Chinook salmon tagged with pop-up satellite archival tags near Sitka, AK (star) in June 2022. Estimated daily locations (circles in left panels) produced by a HMM are color coded by month and crosses denote each tags' end location. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted. Argos IDs are noted in respective panels and correspond to those given in Table 1.



Figure 14. a) Grand mean proportion (±SD) of time spent at depth b) distribution of mean monthly depth and c) temperature experienced by tagged Chinook salmon. For boxplots, median diving depths are solid lines, and boxes represent the first and third quartiles. Whiskers represent the largest observation less than or equal to the box, plus or minus 1.5 times the interquartile range, and black dots represent outliers.

3.4 Mortality

Thirty-six tags provided evidence that Chinook salmon (72.7 ± 5.9 cm, mean ± SD) experienced mortality (Table 3; Fig. 15). Reporting locations of tags suggest that mortality of tagged Chinook salmon was geographically widespread, from the western extent of the Alaska Peninsula to the U.S. PNW (Fig. 16). Of these 36 tags, 20 provided evidence of predation on Chinook salmon (70.0 ± 4.1 cm, mean ± SD) by endothermic fish(es) with internal temperatures of ~25ºC, 12–192 days after tagging (Table 3; Figure 15a). These predation events were mostly concentrated in the western GOA near the Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak Island; however, three endothermic fish predation events occurred off the coast of Southeast Alaska and northern British Columbia (Fig. 16). Based on known visceral temperatures and species distribution, these endothermic fish predation events are likely attributed to salmon sharks (*Lamna ditropis*) (Anderson and Goldman 2001; Goldman et al. 2004).

Six other tags provided evidence of predation on tagged Chinook salmon (78.2 ± 7.8 cm, mean ± SD) by marine mammals with stomach temperatures of ~36–38ºC, 3–81 days after tagging (Fig. 15b). These predation events were wide spread, occurring near southcentral Alaska (n = 1), south east Alaska (n = 2), British Columbia/U.S. PNW (n = 3). Another tag provided evidence of predation on a Chinook salmon (83 cm FL) by an unknown species of ectothermic fish approximately 58 days after tagging (Fig. 15c). In addition to predation of tagged Chinook salmon, nine tagged fish were inferred to have succumbed to unknown mortality and died and sank to the seafloor 1–115 days after release (Fig. 15d).

Table 3. Information on inferred Chinook salmon mortality events.

Inferred fate of tagged fish	Sample size (n)	Fork Length cm (mean±SD, range)	Chinook salmon data days
Pelagic ectothermic fish predation	1	83	58
Endothermic fish predation	20	70.0±4.1 (62–77)	52.8±45.0 (11.6–192)
Marine mammal predation	6	78.2±7.8 (69–91)	44.0±30.5 (2.6–80.7)
Unknown mortality	9	73.8±4.4 (70–82)	58.6±41.5 (1–114.9)
Total	36	72.7±5.9 (62–91)	52.9±40.6 (1–192)

a) Chinook salmon data days refers to the total days of data provided by the tag while attached to a live, free-swimming Chinook salmon (i.e., not in the stomach of a predator).



Figure 15. Examples of inferred predation of tagged Chinook salmon, by a) salmon shark, b) marine mammal, c) ectothermic fish, and d) unknown mortality. Black circles and lines denote depth (m) while blue circles and lines denote temperature (°C). Red dashed lines in panels a, b, and c, denote estimated times of consumption of tagged Chinook salmon, and subsequent expulsion of the satellite tag. The blue dashed line in panel d denotes the estimated time of unknown mortality. Argos IDs are denoted in upper left hand corner of each figure for reference purposes, and correspond to those given in Table 1.



Figure 16. End locations (crosses) of pop-up satellite archival tags attached to Chinook salmon that experienced mortality, color coded by inferred predators or unknown causes. The Navy GOA TMAA and CSSMA are denoted.

3.5 TMAA occupancy

Based on end locations and estimated daily locations, a subset of tagged fish (n =16) occupied the TMAA for an aggregated total of 254 days (Fig.17a). While occupying waters of the TMAA, Chinook salmon mostly occupied the northern portion of the TMAA while over the continental shelf (Fig. 2; Fig. 17a). Specifically, 58% of the aggregated days (148/254 days) occurred over the continental shelf, compared to 22% (56/252 days) over the continental slope and 20% (50/252 days) over the basin. Mean individual occupied depths in the TMAA ranged from 19 to 110 m (70 ± 27 m; grand mean ± SD) (Fig. 17b). While the data on the timing and duration of occupation of the TMAA are biased by the timing and locations of tag deployment, tagged Chinook salmon were documented to occupy waters of the TMAA across the calendar year (Fig. 17a). While occupying basin waters of the TMAA, fish occupied waters ranging from 0 to 293 m, with individual mean depths ranging from 20 to 137 m (73 ± 31 m; grand mean ± SD). During the months when the U.S. Navy conducts at-sea training in the GOA TMMA (April to October), a subset of tagged Chinook salmon (n = 11) occupied the TMAA for an aggregated total of 94 days. Of these 94 days, 35 were inferred to occur over the basin, whereas 59 days were inferred to occur in the CSSMA of the TMAA.



Figure 17. a) The aggregated number of days the TMAA was occupied by habitat and month of year for the subset of tagged fish that occupied the TMAA, and b) depth distributions of for the subset of tagged Chinook salmon while occupying the TMAA when estimated to be occupying the Navy GOA TMAA. The number of tagged fish for each month is noted in panel a. The gray transparent box in panel a denotes months in which the U.S. Navy conducts at-sea training in the TMAA. Continental shelf and slope habitats in panel a and b comprise the CSSMA of the TMAA. For boxplots, median diving depths are solid lines, and boxes represent the first and third quartiles. Whiskers represent the largest observation less than or equal to the box, plus or minus 1.5 times the interquartile range, and black dots represent outliers.

3.6 Stock-origin

Stock-origin estimates for Chinook salmon tagged in 2022 are currently being processed and are not available at this time. Stock origin could be determined for 47 of the 60 fish tagged in 2020–2021 (Table 4). Of these 47 fish, 11 originated from Southeast Alaska, 23 from western Vancouver Island, two from the Thompson River, British Columbia, two from east Vancouver Island, British Columbia, four from the Columbia River in Washington, one from the Oregon coast, and four from the Willamette River, Oregon (Table 4). The stock-origins of tagged fish that occupied the TMAA (that could be determined) were from North/Mid Oregon Coast (n = 1), Willamette River spring run (n = 1), Upper Columbia River summer/fall run (n = 1), West Vancouver Island (n = 7), South Thompson River (n = 1), and South Southeast Alaska (n = 2).

Table 4. Genetic stock-origin of Chinook salmon tagged in the Gulf of Alaska in 2020 and 2021. Stock-origin estimates for Chinook salmon tagged in 2022 are currently being processed and are not available at this time.

Argos ID	Tagging region	Stock origin region	Stock origin best reporting group
202585	Chignik	NA	NA
202586	Chignik	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
202587	Chignik	NA	NA
202588	Chignik	NA	NA
202589	Chignik	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
202590	Chignik	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
202591	Chignik	NA	NA
202592	Chignik	NA	NA
202593	Chignik	NA	NA
202594	Chignik	NA	NA
202595	Chignik	Northern	East Vancouver Island
202596	Chignik	NA	NA
202597	Chignik	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
202598	Chignik	NA	NA
202599	Chignik	Northern	West Vancouver Island
202600	Chignik	NA	NA
202601	Chignik	Northern	West Vancouver Island
202602	Chignik	NA	NA
202603	Chignik	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
202604	Chignik	NA	NA
205398	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205399	Kodiak	Northern	South Thompson River
205400	Kodiak	Southern	North / Mid Oregon Coast
205401	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205402	Kodiak	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
205403	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205404	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205405†	Kodiak	Columbia	Willamette River spring run
205406	Kodiak	Columbia	Upper Columbia River summer/fall run
205407	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205408	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205409	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205410	Kodiak	Northern	South Thompson River
205411	Kodiak	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
205412	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205413	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205414	Kodiak	NA	NA
205415	Kodiak	Columbia	Upper Columbia River summer/fall run
205416	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
205417	Kodiak	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210757	Yakutat	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
210758	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210759	Yakutat	Columbia	West Cascade fall run
210760	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
21076*†1	Yakutat	Columbia	Willamette River spring run
210762	Yakutat	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
210763	Yakutat	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
210764	Yakutat	Northern	East Vancouver Island
210765	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210766	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210767	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210768	Yakutat	Columbia	Upper Columbia River summer/fall run
210769	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210770	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210771	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210772	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island
210773†	Yakutat	Columbia	Willamette River spring run
210774†	Yakutat	Columbia	Willamette River spring run
210775	Yakutat	Northern	West Vancouver Island

Argos ID	Tagging region	Stock origin region	Stock origin best reporting group
210776	Yakutat	Northern	South Southeast Alaska
229201	Craig	In progress	In progress
229202	Craig	In progress	In progress
229203	Craig	In progress	In progress
229204	Craig	In progress	In progress
229205	Craig	In progress	In progress
229206	Craig	In progress	In progress
229207	Craig	In progress	In progress
229208	Craig	In progress	In progress
229209	Craig	In progress	In progress
229210	Craig	In progress	In progress
229211	Craig	In progress	In progress
229212	Craig	In progress	In progress
229213	Craig	In progress	In progress
229214	Craig	In progress	In progress
229215	Craig	In progress	In progress
229216	Craig	In progress	In progress
229217	Craig	In progress	In progress
229218	Craig	In progress	In progress
229219	Craig	In progress	In progress
229220	Craig	In progress	In progress
229221	Sitka	In progress	In progress
*229222	Sitka	In progress	In progress
*229223	Sitka	In progress	In progress
*229224	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229225	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229226	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229227	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229228	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229229	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229230	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229231	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229232	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229233	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229234	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229235	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229236	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229237	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229238	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229239	Sitka	In progress	In progress
229240	Sitka	In progress	In progress

a) "NA" denotes tagged fish from which no stock-origin could be determined due to insufficient DNA.
*Indicates PSATs which were recaptured in commercial fisheries
† ESA-listed Threatened ESU

4. Discussion

Satellite tags provided detailed insights into the movements, behaviors, and thermal environment of individual Chinook salmon originating from many populations, including Southeast Alaska, British Columbia, and the U.S. PNW, while occupying waters of the GOA and beyond. Insights into the spatial and vertical distribution of tagged Chinook salmon provide valuable information that may be used to address important conservation issues in the North Pacific Ocean including understanding interactions of Chinook salmon and Navy training exercises conducted in the GOA. Furthermore, this study provides valuable information on the location and timing of natural mortality of Chinook salmon caused by apex predators throughout the North Pacific Ocean.

Stock-origins of tagged fish in this study (2022 estimates still pending) were all from populations south of central Alaska, similar to stock composition estimates of Chinook salmon incidentally captured in groundfish fisheries in the GOA, which are predominately comprised of British Columbia, U.S. PNW, and coastal Southeast Alaska populations (Masuda 2019; Guthrie et al. 2020; Balsiger 2021). Capturing Chinook salmon exclusively from these populations, which have both hatchery and natural origins relatively far from their respective tagging locations, is not surprising as these populations have much higher abundances than Chinook salmon with natural origins in the GOA closer to the tagging sites (Healey 1991; Riddell et al. 2018).

Differences in dispersal and behaviors of tagged fish in this study are likely due to many factors including the stock-origin of tagged fish (Weitkamp 2010; Tucker et al. 2011; Shelton et al. 2019), and the variable range of age-at-maturity in Chinook salmon populations (Healey 1991; Riddell et al. 2018). The tendency of many tagged fish to demonstrate fidelity to the region in which they were tagged is likely representative of tagging immature Chinook salmon that still have an additional year or more of feeding at sea before swimming back to their natal origins to spawn. In contrast, based on the direction of travel and genetic assignments, Chinook salmon that were observed to make extensive southeasterly migrations to the PNW were likely maturing fish returning to their natal rivers to spawn.

During this study there was a tendency for tagged fish to occupy the continental shelf from roughly 165–130°W during all months for which we have data. These results highlight the importance of this coastal shelf region in the GOA for Chinook salmon growth. Occupation of this region by tagged Chinook salmon corroborates past research that suggests that this species is more coastally-oriented than other species of Pacific salmon such as pink salmon (*O. gorbuscha*), sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*), and chum salmon (*O. keta*), and are largely concentrated on the continental shelf while inhabiting the GOA (Healey 1991; Quinn 2018; Riddell et al. 2018). The importance of continental shelf habitat for Chinook salmon populations throughout North America is reinforced by incidental catches of this species in many large commercial fisheries that occur in this area (Fissel et al. 2016; Turner et al. 2017; Masuda 2019; Guthrie et al. 2020). The biological importance of the continental shelf is additionally supported by the high abundances of zooplankton, forage fishes, marine mammals and sea birds (Byrd et al. 2005; Heifetz et al. 2005; Logerwell et al. 2005), based on productivity arising from westerly transport of well-mixed nutrient-rich waters (Hunt and Stabeno 2005; Stabeno et al. 2005).

Insights into the horizontal distribution of Chinook salmon from this study may be used to address important management issues in the North Pacific Ocean, including understanding this species' potential exposure to Navy training exercises conducted in the GOA. Although the end locations and movement patterns observed in this study are biased by the locations of capture/tagging, these results do suggest that tagged Chinook salmon primarily reside over the continental shelf while occupying the GOA, including while in the TMAA. These findings are corroborated by previous CWT recoveries and satellite tagging research in the GOA, all of which suggest that Navy training activities that occur over basin waters of the TMAA are less likely to co-occur with this species, compared to other areas of the TMAA (e.g., shelf). This information was used recently to assist the Navy in developing the CSSMA that moved specific Navy training activities with the potential to impact Chinook salmon to TMAA basin waters >4,000 m depth, thereby minimizing overlap between this species and specific training activities (U.S. Navy 2020).

In addition to providing information on the horizontal distribution, satellite tags provided valuable information about the vertical distribution and diving behavior of Chinook salmon, while occupying the GOA and the TMAA. Chinook salmon occupied a broad range of depths, with a tendency to occupy deeper and more isothermal waters during the fall and winter, compared to the shallower and more stratified waters during the spring and summer months. These seasonal patterns in depth and temperature occupancy are corroborated by previous electronic tagging studies in the Bering Sea, GOA, Puget Sound, and off the coast of Oregon and California. These depth and temperature occupation patterns are thought to arise from seasonal changes in stratification of the water column, and the distribution and abundance of prey that occur throughout each region (Hinke et al. 2005; Walker and Myers 2009; Smith et al. 2015; Courtney et al. 2019). Changes in the stratification of the water column have also been suggested to shape the foraging behavior of other pelagic fish species, such as Atlantic salmon (Hedger et al. 2017a; Strøm et al. 2017; Strøm et al. 2018) and Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) (Walli et al. 2009).

While occupying the TMAA, tagged Chinook salmon occupied a wide range of depths, similar to past electronic tagging research in the GOA, which documented Chinook salmon occupying depths from 0 to 538 m (Courtney et al. 2019; Courtney et al. 2021b). The results from this study, combined with additional deployments of PSATs on Chinook salmon would likely lead to a better understanding of trends in daily depth occupation of individual Chinook salmon, and may further aid management strategies to minimize interactions between Navy training exercises and Chinook salmon in the GOA.

Predation of tagged Chinook salmon in this study suggests that consumption by salmon sharks is common across the western and central GOA throughout the calendar year. These results corroborate previous research that documented intense late-stage mortality of Chinook salmon by salmon sharks near the Aleutian Islands and Bering Sea (Seitz et al. 2019). Furthermore, the common occurrence of salmon shark predation on Chinook salmon is supported by previous estimates that salmon sharks have the capacity to consume a considerable proportion of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) residing in the North Pacific Ocean each year (Nagasawa 1998), and have the ability to alter their population demographics through top-down control (Manishin et al. 2021).

Furthermore, during this study, we document natural mortality of tagged Chinook salmon by marine mammal predator(s). Unlike predation by salmon sharks which have unique internal temperatures, species identification of marine mammal predator(s), is much more difficult. However, in five marine mammal predation events, based on frequent dives 10–50 m, it is probable that predation occurred by a large marine mammal such as a resident killer whale

(Whittow et al. 1974; Kasting et al. 1989; Ford and Ellis 2006). Interestingly, two of these events, occurred off the coast of Vancouver Island, near the Swiftsure Bank, known foraging areas for Northern and Southern Resident killer whales (Ford et al. 2017; Riera et al. 2019; Thornton et al. 2022). In the other case of inferred marine mammal predation, based on the location of the event near land and the predator's occupation of 0 m for the entire ingestion period, we speculate that this event was likely caused by a species of pinniped, such as a Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*) (Trites and Porter 2002; Call et al. 2007; Lander et al. 2011).

When the current results are considered with previous satellite tagging research in the Bering Sea (Seitz et al. 2019) and GOA (Courtney et al. 2021b), along with other research examining removals of Chinook salmon by a variety of marine mammals (Adams et al. 2016; Chasco et al. 2017; Ohlberger et al. 2019), there appear to be regional differences in mortality and its agents. Increases in abundance of Chinook salmon predators throughout the North Pacific Ocean may partly explain recent declines in Chinook salmon production (Okey et al. 2007; Adams et al. 2016; Chasco et al. 2017; Ohlberger et al. 2019; Seitz et al. 2019; Manishin et al. 2021), including some ESUs that are protected under the ESA.

It is important to acknowledge that the methods used in this study likely introduces some bias to the results of this study. For example, PSATs could alter the swimming performance of tagged Chinook salmon (e.g., Methling et al. 2011), and/or increase their susceptibility to predation (e.g., Cosgrove et al. 2015). While the effects of towing PSATs on the swimming performance and survival of Chinook salmon is currently poorly understood, it has been qualitatively examined for adult Atlantic salmon and suggests that PSATs have minimal effects on its marine behavior and survival (Hedger et al. 2017b). Future laboratory studies on Chinook salmon towing PSATs would be valuable to understand the possible changes in behavior or increased metabolic costs associated with this research tool.

The tagged Chinook salmon in this study were comprised of individuals from many populations extending from Southeast Alaska to the U.S. PNW, likely making these results pertinent to other populations throughout North America. Currently, several ESUs from the PNW are listed under the ESA, and coast-wide changes in Chinook salmon population demographics and production has been documented from Western Alaska to California (ADF&G 2013; Schindler et al. 2013; Lewis et al. 2015; Ohlberger et al. 2018; Welch et al. 2021), highlighting the importance of understanding this species' marine ecology. This information has not only basic application for trying to unravel many questions about changing demographics, but it also has applied application for inferring and reducing impacts of human activities on this species, such as Navy training exercises conducted in the GOA TMAA. In the future (2023–2024), results from this study and multiple previous tagging campaigns (Courtney et al. 2019; Seitz et al. 2019; Courtney et al. 2021a) will be integrated to provide a more holistic understanding of this species' ecology in the North Pacific Ocean.

5. Acknowledgments

Thanks to Captains Mallory Purdy and John Rantz of Chignik Bay Adventures, Chignik Bay, AK, Jeff Sanford of Salmoncrazy Adventures in Kodiak, AK, Mark Sappington of Yakutat Charter Boat Company in Yakutat, AK, Cody Loomis of Action Alaska Sportfishing in Sitka, AK, and Dave Flocks and David Creighton of Shelter Cove Lodge in Craig, AK, for tirelessly chasing Chinook salmon. Thanks to Drs. David Huff and Joe Smith of National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center for their logistical support and insights into Chinook salmon. This research was funded by the U.S. Navy, Commander Pacific Fleet, under the Navy’s Marine Species Monitoring Program, through a CESU agreement (Cooperative Agreement #N62473-20-2-0001) administered by Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (NAVFAC) Southwest. Thanks to Andrea Balla-Holden (PACFLT), Chris Hunt (NAVFAC NW), Jessica Curran (NAVFAC SW), Brittany Bartlett (NAVFAC PAC), Dr. Jessica Chen (NAVFAC PAC), Dr. Kate Lomac-MacNair, Dr. Dayv Lowry (NMFS), Daniel Carnley (NAVFAC SW), and Kevin Magennis (NAVFAC SW) for providing invaluable assistance in making this project successful and for insightful comments in previous drafts of this document.

6. References

Adams, J., I. C. Kaplan, B. Chasco, K. N. Marshall, A. Acevedo-Gutiérrez, and E. J. Ward. 2016. A century of Chinook salmon consumption by marine mammal predators in the Northeast Pacific Ocean. Ecological Informatics 34:44-51.

ADF&G. 2013. Chinook salmon stock assessment and research plan, 2013. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Special Publication No. 13-01, Anchorage, Alaska.

Anderson, S. D., and K. J. Goldman. 2001. Temperature measurements from salmon sharks, *Lamna ditropis*, in Alaskan waters. Copeia 2001:794-796.

Arnold, G., and H. Dewar. 2001. Electronic tags in marine fisheries research: a 30-year perspective. Pages 7-64 *in* J. R. Sibert, and J. L. Nielsen, editors. Electronic tagging and tracking in marine fisheries. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Balsiger, J. W. 2021. 2020 Annual report for the Alaska groundfish fisheries Chinook Salmon coded wire tag and recovery data for Endangered Species Act consultation. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Juneau, AK.

Brodeur, R. D., W. T. Peterson, G. W. Boehlert, E. Casillas, M. H. Schiewe, M. B. Eldridge, S. T. Lindley, J. H. Helle, and W. R. Heard. 2000. A coordinated research plan for estuarine and ocean research on Pacific salmon. Fisheries 25:7-16.

Brown, R. S., R. A. Harnish, K. M. Carter, J. W. Boyd, K. A. Deters, and M. B. Eppard. 2010. An evaluation of the maximum tag burden for implantation of acoustic transmitters in juvenile Chinook salmon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 30:499-505.

Byrd, G. V., H. M. Renner, and M. Renner. 2005. Distribution patterns and population trends of breeding seabirds in the Aleutian Islands. Fisheries Oceanography 14:139-159.

Call, K. A., B. S. Fadely, A. Greig, and M. J. Rehberg. 2007. At-sea and on-shore cycles of juvenile Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) derived from satellite dive recorders: a comparison between declining and increasing populations. Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography 54:298-310.

Chasco, B., I. C. Kaplan, A. Thomas, A. Acevedo-Gutiérrez, D. Noren, M. J. Ford, M. B. Hanson, J. Scordino, S. Jeffries, S. Pearson, K. N. Marshall, and E. J. Ward. 2017. Estimates of Chinook salmon consumption in Washington State inland waters by four marine mammal predators from 1970 to 2015. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 74:1173-1194.

Cosgrove, R., I. Arregui, H. Arrizabalaga, N. Goni, and J. D. Neilson. 2015. Predation of pop-up satellite archival tagged albacore (*Thunnus alalunga*). Fisheries Research 162:48-52.

Courtney, M. B., M. Evans, K. R. Shedd, and A. C. Seitz. 2021a. Understanding the behavior and ecology of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) on an important feeding ground in the Gulf of Alaska. Environmental Biology of Fishes 104:357-373.

Courtney, M. B., M. D. Evans, K. R. Shedd, and A. C. Seitz. 2021b. Understanding the behavior and ecology of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) on an important feeding ground in the Gulf of Alaska. Environmental Biology of Fishes 104:357-373.

Courtney, M. B., M. D. Evans, J. F. Strøm, A. H. Rikardsen, and A. C. Seitz. 2019. Behavior and thermal environment of Chinook salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* in the North Pacific Ocean, elucidated from pop-up satellite archival tags. Environmental Biology of Fishes 102:1039-1055.

Courtney, M. B., E. A. Miller, A. M. Boustany, K. S. Van Houtan, M. Catterson, J. Pawluk, J. Nichols, and A. C. Seitz. 2022. Ocean migration and behavior of steelhead *Oncorhynchus* *mykiss* kelts from the Situk River, Alaska. Environmental Biology of Fishes 105:1081-1097.

Courtney, M. B., B. S. Scanlon, A. H. Rikardsen, and A. C. Seitz. 2016a. Marine behavior and dispersal of an important subsistence fish in Arctic Alaska, the Dolly Varden. Environmental Biology of Fishes 99:209-222.

Courtney, M. B., B. S. Scanlon, A. H. Rikardsen, and A. C. Seitz. 2016b. Utility of pop-up satellite archival tags to study the summer dispersal and habitat occupancy of Dolly Varden in Arctic Alaska. Arctic:137-146.

Drenner, S. M., T. D. Clark, C. K. Whitney, E. G. Martins, S. J. Cooke, and S. G. Hinch. 2012. A synthesis of tagging studies examining the behaviour and survival of anadromous salmonids in marine environments. PLoS One 7:e31311.

Fissel, B. E., M. Dalton, R. G. Felthoven, B. E. Garber-Yonts, A. Haynie, A. H. Himes-Cornell, S. Kasperski, J. T. Lee, D. K. Lew, and A. N. Santos. 2016. Stock assessment and fishery evaluation report for the groundfishes fisheries of the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea/Aleutian Island area: economic status of the groundfish fisheries off Alaska, 2015. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle.

Ford, J. K., J. F. Pilkington, M. Otsuki, B. Gisborne, R. Abernethy, E. Stredulinsky, J. Towers, and G. Ellis. 2017. Habitats of special importance to resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) off the West Coast of Canada. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ecosystems and Oceans Science.

Ford, J. K. B., and G. M. Ellis. 2006. Selective foraging by fish-eating killer whales *Orcinus orca* in British Columbia. Marine Ecology Progress Series 316:185-199.

Ford, J. K. B., G. M. Ellis, L. G. Barrett-Lennard, A. B. Morton, R. S. Palm, and K. C. Balcomb III. 1998. Dietary specialization in two sympatric populations of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in coastal British Columbia and adjacent waters. Canadian Journal of Zoology 76:1456-1471.

Goldman, K. J., S. D. Anderson, R. J. Latour, and J. A. Musick. 2004. Homeothermy in adult salmon sharks, *Lamna ditropis*. Environmental Biology of Fishes 71:403-411.

Guthrie, C. M., H. T. Nguyen, M. Marsh, and J. R. Guyon. 2020. Genetic stock composition analysis of Chinook Salmon bycatch samples from the 2018 Gulf of Alaska trawl fisheries. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Science Center, Juneau, AK.

Healey, M. C. 1991. Life history of chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Pages 313-393 *in* C. Groot, and L. Margolis, editors. Pacific salmon life histories. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Hedger, R. D., A. H. Rikardsen, J. F. Strøm, D. A. Righton, E. B. Thorstad, and T. F. Næsje. 2017a. Diving behaviour of Atlantic salmon at sea: effects of light regimes and temperature stratification. Marine Ecology Progress Series 574:127-140.

Hedger, R. D., A. H. Rikardsen, and E. B. Thorstad. 2017b. Pop-up satellite archival tag effects on the diving behaviour, growth and survival of adult Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* at sea. Journal of Fish Biology 90:294-310.

Heifetz, J., B. L. Wing, R. P. Stone, P. W. Malecha, and D. L. Courtney. 2005. Corals of the Aleutian Islands. Fisheries Oceanography 14:131-138.

Hinke, J. T., D. G. Foley, C. Wilson, and G. M. Watters. 2005. Persistent habitat use by Chinook salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* in the coastal ocean. Marine Ecology Progress Series 304:207-220.

Hunt, G. L., and P. J. Stabeno. 2005. Oceanography and ecology of the Aleutian Archipelago: spatial and temporal variation. Fisheries Oceanography 14:292-306.

Kasting, N. W., S. A. Adderley, T. Safford, and K. G. Hewlett. 1989. Thermoregulation in beluga (*Delphinapterus leucas*) and killer (*Orcinus orca*) whales. Physiological Zoology 62:687-701.

Keating, K. A. 1995. Mitigating elevation-induced errors in satellite telemetry locations. The Journal of Wildlife Management 59:801-808.

Lacroix, G. L. 2014. Large pelagic predators could jeopardize the recovery of endangered Atlantic salmon. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 71:343-350.

Lander, M. E., D. S. Johnson, J. T. Sterling, T. S. Gelatt, and B. S. Fadely. 2011. Diving behaviors and movements of juvenile steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) captured in the central Aleutian Islands, April 2005. Alaska Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service,, NMFS-AFSC-218, Seattle, Washington.

Larson, W. A., F. M. Utter, K. W. Myers, W. D. Templin, J. E. Seeb, C. M. Guthrie III, A. V. Bugaev, and L. W. Seeb. 2013. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms reveal distribution and migration of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in the Bering Sea and North Pacific Ocean. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 70:128-141.

Lewis, B., W. S. Grant, R. E. Brenner, and T. Hamazaki. 2015. Changes in size and age of Chinook salmon Oncorhynchus tshawytscha returning to Alaska. PLoS One 10:e0130184.

Logerwell, E., K. Aydin, S. Barbeaux, E. Brown, M. Conners, S. Lowe, J. Orr, I. Ortiz, R. Reuter, and P. Spencer. 2005. Geographic patterns in the demersal ichthyofauna of the Aleutian Islands. Fisheries Oceanography 14:93-112.

Manishin, K. A., C. J. Cunningham, P. A. Westley, and A. C. Seitz. 2021. Can late stage marine mortality explain observed shifts in age structure of Chinook salmon? PLoS One 16:e0247370.

Masuda, M. 2019. 2018 Coded-Wire Tagged Chinook Salmon Recoveries in the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea-Aleutian Islands (Including 2017 Recoveries from U.S. Research). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Juneau, AK.

Methling, C., C. Tudorache, P. V. Skov, and J. F. Steffensen. 2011. Pop up satellite tags impair swimming performance and energetics of the European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*). PLoS One 6:e20797.

Musyl, M. K., M. L. Domeier, N. Nasby-Lucas, R. W. Brill, L. M. McNaughton, J. Y. Swimmer, M. S. Lutcavage, S. G. Wilson, B. Galuardi, and J. B. Liddle. 2011. Performance of pop-up satellite archival tags. Marine Ecology Progress Series 433:1-28.

Nagasawa, K. 1998. Predation by salmon sharks (*Lamna ditropis*) on Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) in the North Pacific Ocean. North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin 1:419-433.

Ohlberger, J., D. E. Schindler, E. J. Ward, T. E. Walsworth, and T. E. Essington. 2019. Resurgence of an apex marine predator and the decline in prey body size. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116:26682-26689.

Ohlberger, J., E. J. Ward, D. E. Schindler, and B. Lewis. 2018. Demographic changes in Chinook salmon across the Northeast Pacific Ocean. Fish and Fisheries 19:533-546.

Okey, T. A., B. A. Wright, and M. Y. Brubaker. 2007. Salmon shark connections: North Pacific climate change, indirect fisheries effects, or just variability? Fish and Fisheries 8:359-366.

Quinn, T. P. 2005. The behavior and ecology of Pacific salmon and trout. University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington.

Quinn, T. P. 2018. The behavior and ecology of Pacific salmon and trout. Second Edition. University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington.

Riddell, B. E., R. D. Brodeur, A. V. Bugaev, P. Moran, J. M. Murphy, J. A. Orsi, M. Trudel, L. A. Weitkamp, B. K. Wells, and A. C. Wertheimer. 2018. Ocean ecology of Chinook salmon. Pages 555-696 *in* R. J. Beamish, editor. The ocean ecology of Pacific salmon and trout. America Fisheries Society, Bethseda, Maryland.

Riera, A., J. F. Pilkington, J. K. Ford, E. H. Stredulinsky, and N. R. Chapman. 2019. Passive acoustic monitoring off Vancouver Island reveals extensive use by at-risk Resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) populations. Endangered Species Research 39:221-234.

Rikardsen, A. H., D. Righton, J. F. Strøm, E. B. Thorstad, P. Gargan, T. Sheehan, F. Økland, C. M. Chittenden, R. D. Hedger, and T. F. Næsje. 2021. Redefining the oceanic distribution of Atlantic salmon. Scientific reports 11:1-12.

Schindler, D., C. Krueger, P. Bisson, M. Bradford, B. Clark, J. Conitz, K. Howard, M. Jones, J. Murphy, and K. Myers. 2013. Arctic-Yukon-Kuskokwim Chinook Salmon research action plan: Evidence of decline of Chinook Salmon populations and recommendations for future research. Prepared for the AYK Sustainable Salmon Initiative., Anchorage, Alaska.

Seitz, A. C., **M. B. Courtney**, A. Boustany, E. A. Miller, K. S. Van Houtan, M. Catterson, and J. Pawluk. 2021. Ocean migration and behavior of steelhead kelts in Alaska OCS oil and gas lease areas, examined with satellite telemetry. Coastal Marine Institute, Fairbanks, AK.

Seitz, A. C., M. B. Courtney, M. D. Evans, and K. Manishin. 2019. Pop-up satellite archival tags reveal evidence of intense predation on large immature Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in the North Pacific Ocean. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 76:1608-1615.

Shelton, A. O., W. H. Satterthwaite, E. J. Ward, B. E. Feist, and B. Burke. 2019. Using hierarchical models to estimate stock-specific and seasonal variation in ocean distribution, survivorship, and aggregate abundance of fall run Chinook salmon. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 76:95-108.

Smith, J. M., K. L. Fresh, A. N. Kagley, and T. P. Quinn. 2015. Ultrasonic telemetry reveals seasonal variation in depth distribution and diel vertical migrations of sub-adult Chinook and coho salmon in Puget Sound. Marine Ecology Progress Series 532:227-242.

Smith, J. M., and D. D. Huff. 2022. Characterizing the distribution of ESA listed salmonids in the Northwest Training and Testing Area with acoustic and pop-up satellite tags, Prepared for: U.S. Navy, Commander Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-21-MP-0EQ8Q. 11 March 2022.

Stabeno, P., D. Kachel, N. Kachel, and M. Sullivan. 2005. Observations from moorings in the Aleutian Passes: temperature, salinity and transport. Fisheries Oceanography 14:39-54.

Strøm, J. F., A. H. Rikardsen, S. E. Campana, D. Righton, J. Carr, K. Aarestrup, M. J. W. Stokesbury, P. Gargan, P. C. Javierre, and E. B. Thorstad. 2019. Ocean predation and mortality of adult Atlantic salmon. Scientific reports 9:7890.

Strøm, J. F., E. B. Thorstad, G. Chafe, S. H. Sørbye, D. Righton, A. H. Rikardsen, and J. Carr. 2017. Ocean migration of pop-up satellite archival tagged Atlantic salmon from the Miramichi River in Canada. ICES Journal of Marine Science 74:1356-1370.

Strøm, J. F., E. B. Thorstad, R. D. Hedger, and A. H. Rikardsen. 2018. Revealing the full ocean migration of individual Atlantic salmon. Animal Biotelemetry 6:2.

Thornton, S. J., S. Toews, E. Stredulinsky, K. Gavrilchuk, C. Konrad, R. Burnham, D. P. Noren, M. M. Holt, and S. Vagle. 2022. Southern Resident Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) summer distribution and habitat use in the southern Salish Sea and the Swiftsure Bank area (2009 to 2020). Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat, Document 2022/037.

Thorstad, E. B., A. H. Rikardsen, A. Alp, and F. Økland. 2013. The use of electronic tags in fish research–an overview of fish telemetry methods. Turkish Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 13:881-896.

Trites, A. W., and B. T. Porter. 2002. Attendance patterns of Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) and their young during winter. Journal of Zoology 256:547-556.

Trudel, M., J. Fisher, J. A. Orsi, J. F. T. Morris, M. E. Thiess, R. M. Sweeting, S. Hinton, E. A. Fergusson, and D. W. Welch. 2009. Distribution and migration of juvenile Chinook salmon derived from coded wire tag recoveries along the continental shelf of western North America. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 138:1369-1391.

Tucker, S., M. Trudel, D. W. Welch, J. R. Candy, J. F. T. Morris, M. E. Thiess, C. Wallace, and T. D. Beacham. 2011. Life history and seasonal stock-specific ocean migration of juvenile Chinook Salmon. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 140:1101-1119.

Turner, K. A., C. N. Rooper, E. A. Laman, S. C. Rooney, D. W. Cooper, and M. Zimmermann. 2017. Model-based essential fish habitat definitions for Aleutian Island groundfish species. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA Technical Memoradum AFSC-360, Seattle.

U.S. Navy. 2020. Gulf of Alaska Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS Documents. https://goaeis.com/.

U.S. Navy. 2022. Notice of Intent for the Supplement to the GOA Draft Supplemental EIS/OEIS – February 2022. https://goaeis.com/Public-Involvement/Public-Information/Public-Notices#7870183-2022-notice-of-intent.

Walker, R. V., and K. W. Myers. 2009. Behavior of Yukon River Chinook salmon in the Bering Sea as inferred from archival tag data. North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin 5:121-130.

Walker, R. V., V. V. Sviridov, S. Urawa, and T. Azumaya. 2007. Spatio-temporal variation in vertical distributions of Pacific salmon in the ocean. North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin 4:193-201.

Walli, A., S. L. Teo, A. Boustany, C. J. Farwell, T. Williams, H. Dewar, E. Prince, and B. A. Block. 2009. Seasonal movements, aggregations and diving behavior of Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) revealed with archival tags. PLoS One 4:e6151.

Weitkamp, L. A. 2010. Marine distributions of Chinook salmon from the west coast of North America determined by coded wire tag recoveries. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 139:147-170.

Welch, D. W., A. D. Porter, and E. L. Rechisky. 2021. A synthesis of the coast-wide decline in survival of West Coast Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, Salmonidae). Fish and Fisheries 22:194-211.

Whittow, G., I. Hampton, D. Matsuura, C. Ohata, R. Smith, and J. Allen. 1974. Body temperature of three species of whales. Journal of mammalogy 55:653-656.

Wildlife Computers. 2015. Data portal's location processing (GPE3 & FastLoc-GPS) user guide. Wildlife Computers, Inc., Redmond, Washington, accessed from https://wildlifecomputers.com/.