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Life-history diversity

Why is diversity important?

Similar to a diverse portfolio of financial assets, life-history diversity confers stability to salmon and steelhead populations given uncertain future environmental conditions.


General patterns of Chinook salmon life-history diversity

*Subyearling juvenile migrants or ocean-type life-history*

*Yearling juvenile migrants or stream-type life-history*
WDFW smolt trap sites
WDFW smolt trap sites

Skagit River

Green River

Nisqually River

Dungeness River
Subyearling Chinook abundance

- Skagit
- Nisqually
- Green
- Dungeness
Chinook salmon migration timing

Skagit 2005 - 2012

Nisqually 2009 - 2013

Green 2005 - 2013

Dungeness 2005 – 2013
Subyearling Chinook salmon body size

- **Skagit**: Various years (2009-2013) are compared, showing growth trends from January 11 to July 5.
- **Nisqually**: Similar comparison, showing growth trends from January 11 to August 16.
- **Green**: Various years (2009-2013) are compared, showing growth trends from January 11 to July 5.
- **Dungeness**: Similar comparison, showing growth trends from January 11 to August 16.
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Chinook productivity

Which model best describes patterns of productivity for each migrant life-history?

- **Ricker density dependent**
  \[ \log \left( \frac{J}{S} \right) = a - \frac{a}{b} S \]

- **Density independent**
  \[ \log \left( \frac{J}{S} \right) = a \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Migrant life-history</th>
<th>Best model</th>
<th>ΔAICc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Density independent</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Density independent</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chinook productivity

Which model best describes patterns of productivity for each migrant life-history?

Ricker density dependent

\[ \log \left( \frac{J}{S} \right) = a - \frac{a}{b} S \]

Density independent

\[ \log \left( \frac{J}{S} \right) = a \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Migrant life-history</th>
<th>Best model</th>
<th>ΔAICc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Density independent</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Density independent</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>Parr</td>
<td>Ricker density dependent</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Parr</td>
<td>Ricker density dependent</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yearling Chinook migration timing

**Skagit**
Yearling median catch 2005 – 2013 = 148

**Nisqually**
Yearling median catch 2009 – 2013 = 242

**Dungeness**
Yearling median catch 2005 – 2013 = 37
Conclusions

Life history diversity
• Distinct bimodal subyearling Chinook migration: early small fry followed by later larger parr
• Yearling Chinook observed in Skagit, Nisqually and Dungeness, likely related to colder temperatures from snowmelt/glacial influence

Productivity
• In Skagit and Green, fry production increases consistently with spawners, but parr production shows evidence for density dependent capacity limits
• By inference, freshwater productivity limited by rearing not spawning habitat

Restoration implications
• Efforts to create and maintain juvenile rearing habitat will provide the greatest benefit to Chinook freshwater productivity
• Diverse habitats promote diverse life-histories

Unanswered question
• What is the relative marine survival of fry vs parr subyearling migrants?
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