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Many field workers
Chinook salmon and estuary habitat loss

ESA listing affects natural resources management:
• Critical habitat issues in US
• Potential to shut down fisheries
• Orca food – proposal to increase hatchery production to boost prey
• PSP Vital Sign – road to recovery by 2020

Extensive use of estuaries by juveniles

Current area = 1-55% of historical (PSNERP Change Analysis 2011)
Chinook in estuaries: Which life history types benefit?

**Subyearling hatchery (marked) populations**
- emergent fry
  - Rear in hatchery (months)
  - migrate through (days)
  - Tidal Delta
  - migrate through (days)
  - Salish Sea Nearshore
  - Hatchery migrant

**Wild (unmarked) populations**
- emergent fry
  - rear in freshwater
  - several months
  - > 1 year
  - Tidal Delta
  - migrate downstream as fry
  - rear in natal estuary (wks to months)
  - migrate through (days)
  - Salish Sea Nearshore
  - Rear migrant
  - Nearshore Refuge Rearing Fry migrant
  - Tidal Delta Rearing migrant
  - Parr migrant
  - Yearling migrant
Questions

What landscape features influence distribution and abundance of fish?
- Estuary system
- Landscape connectivity
- Habitat types
- Channel types

Does estuary habitat limit population recovery?
- Evaluating density dependence among populations
- Possible hatchery interactions in estuaries
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- Estuarine emergent marsh (EEM)
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Hatchery vs natural origin fish

**Migrant fry**

**Hatchery releases**

Outmigrants/ha of estuary channel

Outmigration year

- Nisqually
- Nooksack
- Skagit
- Snohomish
System differences
Landscape connectivity

![Landscape Connectivity Graphs](image)
Channel & habitat types

FRT = Forested riverine tidal
EFT = Estuarine forest transition
EEM = Estuarine emergent marsh
Density-dependent relationships

UM Chinook density (fish/ha)

Fry outmigrants/channel area (fish/ha)
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- Nooksack
Testing for density dependence

Estuary productivity = **Average annual estuary density**
\[ \text{Migrant fry/channel area} \]

\[ \log_e(d/f) = \log_e(a) + bf \]

\[ \text{Density-dependent} \]

\[ \text{Density-independent} \]

Migrant fry/estuary channel area (fish/ha)
Density-dependent relationships

Outmigrant fry / channel area (ha)

$log_e(\text{Estuary productivity})$

Other population traits exhibiting density dependence in the Skagit:

- Estuary growth and size
- Residence time in estuary
- Proportion of migrants entering Puget Sound as fry
- Smolt-adult return rate
Potential interactions with hatchery fish

Additional analyses indicate:
- Bioenergetic models – high consumption demand by hatchery fish in 3 estuaries
- Seasonal declines in unmarked fish after hatchery releases
Conclusions

What landscape features influence distribution and abundance of fish?
• Estuary system
• Landscape connectivity
• Habitat types
• Channel types
• Context-dependent effects

Does estuary habitat limit population recovery?
• Evidence for density-dependent interactions at large outmigrations
• These levels were not observed in 2 populations

• Densities of unmarked fish negatively tracked hatchery releases
• Hatchery releases regularly surpass estimated maximum densities
Thanks!
Question:
What landscape features influence annual densities of unmarked salmon?

Four main effects:
- Estuary System (Nooksack, Skagit, Snohomish, Nisqually)
- Landscape connectivity (covariate)
- Habitat type (Forested riverine tidal, estuarine forest transition, estuarine emergent marsh)
- Channel type (Off-channel, distributary)

Interactions of main effects:
- System * connectivity
- System * habitat type
- System * channel type
- Connectivity * habitat type
- Connectivity * channel type
Statistical analysis

Question:
Does estuary habitat limit population recovery?

Remove landscape effects:
  - Landscape connectivity (covariate)
  - Channel type (off-channel, distributary)
  - Connectivity * channel type

Retain system and habitat-dependent variation to test for annual effects of:
  - Migrant fry
  - Hatchery releases
Density-dependent relationships

\[ \log_e(\text{Estuary productivity}) \]

\[ \text{Outmigrant fry / channel area (ha)} \]
Competition for food?

Prediction: if there is competition, fish should become less selective at higher fish densities

Test: Similarity of diet composition and prey availability

David et al. 2016
Potential interactions with hatchery fish

Possible causes

- “Pied-piper effect”: fish follow large migrations
- Pulsed competition for food during hatchery releases induces early migration
- Introgression of genotypes for rapid outmigration
- Down-river transmission of pathogens from hatcheries

Additional research needed
Consumption demand of hatchery fish
Is estuary habitat limited during large migrations?

- Reconnect off-channel sites
- Improve landscape connectivity
- Increase FRT or EFT habitat conditions

Do hatchery releases dominate migrations?

- Prioritize increasing capacity in multiple habitat types

Consider hatchery management and habitat restoration objectives jointly
- Later releases
- Releases from out-of-system hatcheries

Possible Decision Framework

Are migrations dominated by fry?

- Reduce mortality of adults
- Improve FW habitat conditions

Skagit

Nisqually