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Main conclusions from review

“A key need in this area..... is the development of a strong understanding of the degree to which specific activities pose a risk and whether proposed management approaches are effective at reducing these risks”
Aims

1. Key discussion associated with minimizing risks

2. Examples of outstanding issues

3. Considerations for planning a new program
   • Towards a well designed system that allows research and continual assessment
Release objectives

- Produce surplus fish for fishing opportunity

**Integrated Hatchery Aims:**
- Genetic constitution and fitness as similar as possible to wild population
- Achieved by gene flow:
  - Wild to hatchery > hatchery to wild

**Segregated Hatchery Aims:**
- Direct fishing effort away from wild populations
- Little or no spawning in the wild

Mobrand et al. 2005
Segregation – a viable approach?
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**Founder years and F1**
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*Number of returning adults (96-01)*

*Map of Willapa River area with specific locations marked.*
Does segregation by timing work?

After Seamons et al. 2012, Evolutionary Applications
Integrated hatcheries: number generations?

- Decline in fitness observed in a steelhead hatchery over two generations following captive rearing
  - Araki, Cooper & Blouin, Science 2007
### Integrated: subsequent studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steelhead</strong></td>
<td>• Reduced fitness in H descendants spawning in W reduce W pop size, • Swamping: 40% contributions from W • Domestication selection in one generation</td>
<td>Araki et al. 2008, Christie et al. 2011, Christie et al. 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No changes in genetic diversity or effective size (Adult to parr)</td>
<td>Van Doornick et al. 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Methodology: RRS estimates are upwardly biased</td>
<td>Kitada et al. 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chum</strong></td>
<td>H &amp; W similar fitness after 3 generations of culture (spawning channel)</td>
<td>Berejikian et al. 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Integrated: subsequent studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Coho** | - Rearing environment (natural vs trad) affects fitness  
- No genetic explanation for fitness decrease  
- H fish had lower RRS  
- Fitness of fry release similar to smolt release  
- Absence of sexual selection in H implicated | Chittenden et al. 2010  
Theriault et al. 2011 |
| **Chinook** | - No fitness difference after one generation of H rearing (lab)  
- H fitness lower than W in established supplementation hatchery  
- H fish younger, spawned in different habitat  
- H fish over a single generation provided a demographic boost  
- No significant difference in RRS in H&W spawning in W | Schroder et al. 2010, 2012  
Williamson et al. 2011  
Hess et al. 2012 |
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Integrated: outstanding questions

• What are measures of success in supplementation?
  • Is reduced fitness in descendants of hatchery fish acceptable or even desirable?

• Optimal levels of gene flow between Hatchery and Wild fish? Need for experimental approach

• Effects of broodstock collection on wild fish?

• Does long term integration eventually compromise the genetic diversity of a wild population?

• Are hatcheries at risk of becoming pathogen vectors?
Segregated: outstanding questions

• Are there design strategies that prevent negative interactions between hatchery and wild fishes?

• How much gene flow is acceptable if systems fail?

• Effects of broodstock collection on wild fish?

• Mixed stock fisheries

• Are hatcheries at risk of becoming pathogen vectors?
The importance of release sizes

• May affect ability of wild populations to adapt to change
  • Reduction of genetic diversity: the “Ryman – Laikre” effect

Effective size of hatchery fish = 100

Effective size of wild population
Grey = reduction in effective size of total population compared to unsupplemented population

Proportion of hatchery fish in wild population

Waples & Do 2005

Naish et al. 2008
The importance of release sizes

- May reduce population structure \( (Utter, 2004) \)

### No hatchery releases

- \( F_{RT} \) differentiation between Rivers
  - \( r = -0.42, \) partial Mantel test \( p=0.004 \)

### Hatchery releases

- \( F_{SR} \) Genetic differentiation within rivers
  - \( r = -0.87, \) t-test \( p=0.002 \)

---

**Eldridge and Naish 2007, Molecular Ecology**

**See also Marie et al. 2010, Molecular Ecology**
Release sizes: Ecological effects

“Many hatchery management strategies that may decrease genetic risks, ...., (but they) may not mitigate ecological risk factors, rather they may increase the opportunity for ecological effects to occur.” Kostow 2010

- Competition, exacerbated by physical differences
- Density dependent mortality
- Residualization
- Carrying capacity, especially in freshwater
- Predation

- Series of recommendations to reduce ecological effects
“the traditional hatchery paradigm is to release approximately the same number of fish of the same species every year from the same location(s) regardless of ecological conditions. This paradigm occurs in integrated and segregated hatchery programs and generally ignores ecological feedback mechanisms within the environment that can reduce survival of hatchery and wild fish” Pearsons 2010

Release strategies should consider;
• Risks to non-target taxa
• Carrying capacity
• Ecological feedback mechanisms
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Planning a hatchery program

• Stage I: Initial appraisal and goal setting
  • Release objectives
  • Interactions with wild fish
  • Importance of release sizes

• Stage II: Research and technology development including pilot studies
  • Generating population baselines
  • Designing an experimental system
  • Tagging and tracking hatchery and wild fish

• Stage III: Operational implementation and adaptive management

The responsible approach: after Lorenzen et al. 2010
Knowledge gaps: Baseline data sets

1. Maintaining the “portfolio”
   - (Hilborn et al 2003, Schindler et al. 2010)

2. Evidence for population structure?
3. Evidence for local adaptation?
4. Evidence for life history variation within and between populations?
5. Estimate migration rates between populations
6. Evidence for changes in structure over time
Knowledge gaps: feasibility study

- System that permits effective ongoing research
  - Control streams, free of hatchery influence
  - Continual evaluation
    - “Trigger points”
    - Decide how much change is acceptable
- Willingness to change or end practices
- Economic and social analysis
The role of comprehensive long term data

• Measuring phenotypes and pedigrees

• Pedigree data - beyond RRS:
  • Determine hatchery ancestry and contribution over time (eg Christie et al. 2011)
  • Effective population sizes, rates and impacts of inbreeding (eg Naish et al. Molecular Ecology in press)
  • Estimate selection differentials in hatchery and wild environments (eg Ford et al. 2010, Williamson et al 2011)
  • Estimate stray rates between populations (eg Lin et al. 2011, in prep.)
Thank you!
Summary: balancing risks

Integrated Hatchery Risks:
- Proportion of Hatchery fish breeding in the wild
- Optimal number of generations in program
- Optimal number of wild fish in program (broodstock mining)
- Carrying capacity, competition

Segregated Hatchery Risks:
- Divergent hatchery fish interbreed with wild
- Ecological interactions, carrying capacity
- Mixed stock fisheries and efficacy of mass marking
Summary: Considerations in design

• A research based approach
  • Test principles as well as specifics
  • Continual evaluation
  • “Trigger” points for changing or ending practices

• Comprehensive baselines and monitoring program