

# NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS



JULY 2007

## VIABILITY CRITERIA FOR STEELHEAD OF THE SOUTH-CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COAST

David A. Boughton  
Peter B. Adams  
Eric Anderson  
Craig Fusaro  
Edward Keller  
Elise Kelley  
Leo Lentsch  
Jennifer Nielsen  
Katie Perry  
Helen Regan  
Jerry Smith  
Camm Swift  
Lisa Thompson  
Fred Watson

NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-407

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Southwest Fisheries Science Center

**The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), organized in 1970, has evolved into an agency which establishes national policies and manages and conserves our oceanic, coastal, and atmospheric resources. An organizational element within NOAA, the Office of Fisheries is responsible for fisheries policy and the direction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).**

**In addition to its formal publications, the NMFS uses the NOAA Technical Memorandum series to issue informal scientific and technical publications when complete formal review and editorial processing are not appropriate or feasible. Documents within this series, however, reflect sound professional work and may be referenced in the formal scientific and technical literature.**



## **NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS**

This TM series is used for documentation and timely communication of preliminary results, interim reports, or special purpose information. The TMs have not received complete formal review, editorial control, or detailed editing.

**JULY 2007**

# **VIABILITY CRITERIA FOR STEELHEAD OF THE SOUTH-CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COAST**

David A. Boughton<sup>1</sup>, Peter B. Adams<sup>1</sup>, Eric Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Craig Fusaro<sup>2</sup>,  
Edward Keller<sup>3</sup>, Elise Kelley<sup>4</sup>, Leo Lentsch<sup>5</sup>, Jennifer Nielsen<sup>6</sup>, Katie Perry<sup>7</sup>,  
Helen Regan<sup>8</sup>, Jerry Smith<sup>9</sup>, Camm Swift<sup>10</sup>, Lisa Thompson<sup>11</sup>, Fred Watson<sup>12</sup>

(See reverse for author affiliation)

National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA  
Southwest Fisheries Science Center  
110 Shaffer Road  
Santa Cruz, California 95060

**NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-407**

### **U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

VADM Conrad C. Lautenbacher, Jr., Undersecretary for Oceans and Atmosphere

**National Marine Fisheries Service**

William T. Hogarth, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

David A. Boughton<sup>1</sup>, Peter B. Adams<sup>1</sup>, Eric Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Craig Fusaro<sup>2</sup>,  
Edward Keller<sup>3</sup>, Elise Kelley<sup>4</sup>, Leo Lentsch<sup>5</sup>, Jennifer Nielsen<sup>6</sup>, Katie Perry<sup>7</sup>,  
Helen Regan<sup>8</sup>, Jerry Smith<sup>9</sup>, Camm Swift<sup>10</sup>, Lisa Thompson<sup>11</sup>, Fred Watson<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>NOAA Fisheries, SWFSC, Fisheries Ecology Division,  
110 Shaffer Rd., Santa Cruz, CA 95060

<sup>2</sup>Consultant in Marine & Environmental Sciences,  
435 El Sueno Rd., Santa Barbara, CA 93110

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Studies Program, University of California Santa Barbara,  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

<sup>4</sup>Department of Geography, University of California Santa Barbara,  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

<sup>5</sup>ENTRIX Incorporated,  
8010 W Sahara Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89117-7927

<sup>6</sup>U.S. Geological Survey, Alaska Science Center,  
1011 E Tudor Rd., Anchorage, AK 99503

<sup>7</sup>Native and Anadromous Fish and Watershed Branch,  
California Department of Fish & Game, 830 S Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

<sup>8</sup>San Diego State University,  
5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182

<sup>9</sup>Biological Sciences, San Jose State University,  
One Washington Square, San Jose, CA 95192

<sup>10</sup>ENTRIX Incorporated,  
2140 Eastman, Suite 200, Ventura, CA 93003

<sup>11</sup>University of California Davis,  
1 Shields Ave., Davis, CA 95616

<sup>12</sup>The Watershed Institute, California State University Monterey Bay,  
100 Campus Center, Seaside, CA 93955

---

## Abstract

Recovery planning for threatened and endangered steelhead requires measurable, objective criteria for determining an acceptably low risk of extinction. Here we propose viability criteria for two levels of biological organization: individual populations, and groups of populations within the South-Central/Southern California Coast Steelhead Recovery Planning Domain. For populations, we adapt criteria commonly used by the IUCN (The World Conservation Union) for identifying at-risk species. For groups of populations we implement a diversity-based "representation and redundancy rule," in which diversity includes both life-history diversity and biogeographic groupings of populations. The resulting criteria have the potential for straightforward assessment of the risks posed by evolutionary, demographic, environmental, and catastrophic factors; and are designed to use data that are readily collected. However, our prescriptive approach led to one criterion whose threshold could not yet be specified due to inadequate data, and others in which the simplicity of the criteria may render them inefficient for populations with stable run sizes or stable life-history polymorphisms. Both of these problems could likely be solved by directed programs of research and monitoring aimed at developing more efficient (but equally risk-averse) "performance-based criteria." Of particular utility would be data on the natural fluctuations of populations, research into the stabilizing influence of life-history polymorphisms, and research on the implications of drought, wildfires, and fluvial sediment regimes. Research on estuarine habitat could also yield useful information on the generality and reliability of its role as nursery habitat. Currently, risk assessment at the population level is not possible due to data deficiency, highlighting the need to implement a comprehensive effort to monitor run sizes, anadromous fractions, spawner densities and perhaps marine survival. Assessment at the group level indicates a priority for securing inland populations in the southern Coast Ranges and Transverse Ranges, and a need to maintain not just the fluvial-anadromous life-history form, but also lagoon-anadromous and freshwater-resident forms in each population.



## Introduction

Steelhead (anadromous *Oncorhynchus mykiss*) occur in coastal stream systems throughout southern and south-central California (Swift *et al.* 1993, Boughton *et al.* 2005), but are currently on the US Endangered Species List due to population declines. Such listings require Federal agencies to develop recovery plans that, “to the maximum extent practicable,” incorporate “objective, measurable criteria” for species recovery.<sup>1</sup> Recovery in this context means a return to viability, a scientific concept defined as the conditions for long-term persistence and adaptation of a species or population in a given place (Soulé 1987). If viability can be assessed via objective, measurable criteria, it provides a scientific standard by which to set recovery goals, judge the progress of recovery, and ultimately, remove the species from the US Endangered Species List.

The purpose of this report is to propose viability criteria for steelhead inhabiting the California coast from the Pajaro River south to the Mexican Border. Busby *et al.* (1996) described these fish in a coast-wide status review of steelhead Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs). The ESU concept was proposed by Waples (1991, 1995) to comprise a group of conspecific populations that are substantially reproductively-isolated from other conspecific populations, and that jointly possess an important component of the evolutionary legacy of the species, understood in genetic and adaptive terms (Waples 1991, 1995).

McElhany *et al.* (2000) argued that recovery planning for *Oncorhynchus* would be more effective if each ESU were treated as a collection of demographically independent populations, where the time-extent for assessing independence was 100 yr. Boughton *et al.* (2006) later used this concept of demographic independence to propose a population-delineation scheme within the two ESUs of *O. mykiss* addressed in this report. There were four central theses of Boughton *et al.* (2006). First, direct empirical data on independence were not available, but the generally-recognized hom-

ing ability of the species suggests that each coastal basin generally supports a discrete population. Second, one especially large basin (of the Salinas River) probably supports three discrete populations. Third, the population delineation scheme was uncertain and might require significant revision if better information became available. Fourth, anadromous populations may have a co-existing non-migratory component (also *O. mykiss*), though the biological details of this co-existence are not well understood. In addition, a simple habitat model was used to approximately rank populations in terms of their potential viability and independence under unimpaired conditions.

The effort by Boughton *et al.* (2006) to delineate populations was intended to specify the fundamental components—demographically independent populations—on which to base a recovery strategy for securing the viability of anadromous populations. Currently, the anadromous populations within each ESU are listed on the US Endangered Species List as a threatened or endangered “Distinct Population Segment,” or DPS<sup>2</sup>, whereas the non-migratory, freshwater populations are not listed. The anthropogenic reasons for the decline of the anadromous populations are summarized in NMFS (1996).

The purpose of this report is to propose viability criteria for populations with anadromy, and for the ESUs of which they are part, that would ensure persistence of the anadromous form of the species over the long term. Viability criteria at the ESU level can be directly defined in the sense of Soulé (1987) described above, namely criteria ensuring the long-term (1000+ yr) persistence of the ESU and retention of its evolutionary potential in natural ecosystems. However, viability criteria at the population level often cannot meet this standard, mostly for two reasons. First, in natural ecosystems populations are sometimes extirpated by environmental catastrophes (Lande 1993), as when the eruption of Mount Saint Helens extirpated the salmonid populations in the Toutle River in Washington (Jones and Salo 1986) (In this case steelhead later recolonized; Bisson *et al.* 1988). Second, indi-

<sup>1</sup> Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S. Code § 1533(f)(1)(B)(ii); see also SELS (2001)

<sup>2</sup> Federal Register 70: 67130 [2005] & 71: 834 [2006].

vidual populations generally do not contain the full evolutionary potential of a higher level of organization, such as an ESU, subspecies, or species, because different populations may harbor different collections of genes.

To reflect these differences, viability for populations is generally defined less stringently than for higher levels of organization, and groups of viable populations are considered necessary for protecting an ESU or species. Here we define viability at the population level as a negligible risk of extinction due to threats from demographic variation, non-catastrophic environmental variation, and genetic diversity changes over a 100-year time frame, following McElhany *et al.* (2000). A viable ESU is thus a set of populations with enough of them viable and sufficiently well connected to maintain long-term (1,000-year) persistence and evolutionary potential of the ESU. In considering viability, we focus on protection from risks that are inherent to the ecosystems inhabited by the ESUs. Anthropogenic effects pose additional risks, but are beyond the scope of this report.

### Uncertainty and Types of Criteria

Assessments of viability must account for uncertainty due to the prevalence of stochastic processes in birth, death, and migration (Lande 1993, Burgman *et al.* 1993, Hanski 1991). Assessments of viability must also account for the complexity of estimating these vital rates, along with their functional relationships with population density and habitat (Williams *et al.* 2002, Borchers *et al.* 2002, Amstrup *et al.* 2005, Thompson *et al.* 1998, Buckland *et al.* 1993). Harwood (2000) reviewed techniques for coping with large uncertainties in ecological risk assessment, and identified two general approaches. The first derives from the precautionary principle, which states that irreversible harm (such as a permanent population extirpation) should be actively prevented even if there is significant uncertainty about its magnitude, likelihood or cost. Criteria developed according to the precautionary principle are purposely set high and include a large margin of safety to account for uncertainties. This general approach to uncertainty has precedence elsewhere, for example in numer-

ous engineering applications where it is known as a prescriptive criterion.

The advantages of prescriptive criteria derived from the precautionary principle are that they are readily derived using existing general information. The disadvantages are that they can be unscientific or biologically infeasible (Harwood 2000; Foster *et al.* 2000). They are unscientific if they favor subjective pessimism over a rigorous evaluation of relevant evidence. They are biologically infeasible if the precautionary “solution” is inherently unachievable—for example, fish productivity requirements that exceed the unimpaired capacity of a watershed.

Adopting prescriptive criteria would lead logically to one of the three following outcomes: 1) Efficient recovery, in which the cost (in either expense or time) of achieving the prescriptive criterion is easier or less than the cost of obtaining additional information to produce a less stringent criterion. 2) Inefficient recovery, in which the cost of achieving the prescriptive criterion is harder or higher than the cost of obtaining data to refine the criterion and then achieving the refined criterion. 3) Biologically infeasible recovery, in which the criterion is impossible to achieve. A more scientific approach is unwarranted for case (1), but advisable for case (2) and necessary for case (3).

The second framework for dealing with uncertainty is formal quantitative risk assessment and decision analysis (Harwood 2000). This approach differs from the prescriptive approach in two key ways: first, the criteria involve direct estimates of risk, and second, the guess at a margin of safety is replaced by a full quantitative accounting of uncertainty and its implications for decision-making. In engineering design, such criteria are called “performance-based” because they define standards for the final performance of the product, rather than standards describing how the product is constructed. Often performance standards are met by analytic techniques. For example, classic population viability analysis (*e.g.* Burgman *et al.* 1993) is a special case of an analytic performance-based criterion (*i.e.* “model prediction of less than 5% risk of extinction in 100 yr given business-as-usual”). The general approach of risk assessment plus decision analysis is broader, with conserva-



tion- and fishery-oriented introductions in Harwood and Stokes (2003) and Punt and Hilborn (1997).

The advantages of performance-based criteria are scientific rigor, quantitative estimates of risk, greater scope for innovative solutions, and especially the potential for efficient management strategies that avoid a bias towards unwarranted or unachievable precaution. The principle disadvantage is the stringent requirement for data-gathering and analysis (which can be expensive and time-consuming). In situations where data are scarce and uncertainty is high—which appears to be the case for the steelhead populations in our study area (Busby *et al.* 1996, Boughton 2005)—the approach more or less collapses to prescriptive criteria. It should also be noted that even when the relevant data are available and rigorously analyzed, viability models retain inherent limits on the accurate forecasting of absolute risk (Beissinger and Westphal 1998).

Here, based on existing information, we propose a set of simple prescriptive criteria for viability at the level of population and ESU. Some of the criteria derived for the population level may be excessively stringent, and thus biologically infeasible for some populations and probably inefficient for many others. Therefore, for these criteria we also provide an alternate set of performance standards for deriving more refined criteria. It should be noted however that the performance-based criteria cannot be characterized given existing information, but instead require an investment in research and monitoring. Therefore, we provide general recommendations about the types of data that, if collected in the future, would have high utility for assessing viability using a performance-based approach (Figure 1).

## Population Viability

### Prescriptive Criteria

Conservation biologists have developed several widely-used sets of prescriptive criteria for identifying species at risk of extinction (Mace & Lande 1991, IUCN 1994, Gardenfors *et al.* 2001). These approaches were adapted to Pacific salmonids by Allendorf *et al.* (1997), and further dis-




Figure 1. Schematic depiction of the relationship between information and stringency of criteria. Critical N is the mean abundance necessary to ensure low risk of extinction. The scatterplot depicts 50 hypothetical populations for which Critical N is known. Curve A depicts their probability distribution. When the Critical N for a particular population is unknown, it must be treated as a random draw from this distribution, leading to a relatively stringent criterion C. Curve B depicts the probability distribution for populations in which a risk correlate has been measured and found to be less than  $z_1$ , leading to a less stringent criterion C'. In terms, C is a prescriptive criterion, whereas the data and modeling standards necessary for estimating C' are a performance-based criterion. Due to the large difference between C and C', the data used to estimate  $z_1$  had high utility.

cussed by Lindley *et al.* (2006), who added a “low risk” category corresponding to viability, and a “data deficient category” for poorly known populations. In general we follow the approach of Allendorf *et al.* (1997) and Lindley *et al.* (2006), but with revisions as described below and summarized in Table 1. In discussing the criteria, it is useful to make a distinction between “criterion type” and “viability threshold,” the former being the

parameter measured and the latter the smallest acceptable measurement.

**Adult population size.**— Lindley *et al.* (2006) proposed a low-risk criterion of 2500 spawners per generation, or 834 spawners per year assuming a 3-year generation time. The basis was genetic, in which 2500 adults contributing to the next generation were, on average, sufficient to maintain an effective genetic population size ( $N_e$ ) of at least 500 (Allendorf *et al.* 1997). However, Allendorf *et al.* (1997) noted that  $N_e = 500$  may in some cases be insufficient, and Lande (1995) suggested a minimum  $N_e$  of 5000 (see Lindley *et al.* 2006 for a brief discussion of issues). On the other hand, small amounts of migration—one or two adults per generation—would be expected to relax the need for an  $N_e$  of even 500 (Wright 1931).

Other risks arising from too-small population size stem from demographic stochasticity and environmental stochasticity. Demographic stochasticity generally poses a significant risk only at very small population sizes. Environmental stochasticity is more complex. Defined as year-to-year variation in a population's mean survival and/or fecundity, it can cause large fluctuations in population growth rate irrespective of population size. Consequently, extinction risk has a non-linear dependency on environmental stochasticity and its relationship with the sizes and mean growth rates of populations (Lande 1993, Foley 1994). Essentially, larger variance causes the number of fish to fluctuate more, increasing the chance of it fluctuating to zero; but a large mean growth rate lowers this risk by shortening the recovery time from downward fluctuations, and a large mean population size keeps the population further away from zero to begin with.

Foley (1994) and Lande (1993) describe what is probably the simplest reasonable extinction model incorporating environmental stochasticity. A numerical analysis of this model (see Appendix A) suggests that, lacking specific information on population variability, it is necessary to maintain a mean run size of at least 4,150 spawners per year ( $S$ ) in order to achieve 95% chance of persistence for 100 yr in the steelhead populations of our study area.

This criterion applies to the generalized situation in which there is no quantitative data on population variability. Alternatively, quantitative data on specific populations, if collected, could be used to determine a more refined criterion that for many populations would be significantly less stringent (*i.e.*, allow smaller mean run sizes), but be equally risk-averse. We discuss this alternative in the section on performance-based criteria.

The “4150 spawner rule” is very sensitive to managerial risk tolerance. For example, a change of  $\pm 1\%$  in the performance standard produces:

For 94% assurance:  $S > 2,000$

For 96% assurance:  $S > 11,000$

In addition, vastly different criteria might result from slightly different estimates of the two key parameters, the mean and variance of log-transformed annual rate of population increase (see Appendix A). This sensitivity suggests that acquiring data on population growth and environmental stochasticity would have high utility for developing a performance-based criterion, where “high utility” is in the sense of Figure 1.

Without such data, we are left with the “4,150 rule,” a precautionary, prescriptive criterion. From one perspective, this rule seems reasonable and intuitive—based on the irregular inter-annual patterns of precipitation in the study area; anecdotal accounts of highly variable spawning runs; the robust theoretical result that large population fluctuations pose high extinction risks; and knowing nothing else about a given population, we would expect that an average of 4,150 spawners  $\text{yr}^{-1}$  is both necessary and adequate to safeguard a population. Achieving this may be biologically feasible in the larger basins. From another perspective, however, the rule seems unnecessary for some relatively small populations that appear to have already proven themselves viable in practice. For example, the Big Sur Coast between Carmel and Cambria has numerous small coastal basins containing *O. mykiss* populations (Boughton *et al.* 2005). These populations appear to have very low background extinction rates, and yet all appear to have average run sizes well below 4,150.

**Table 1. Summary of prescriptive viability criteria.**

<b>Population-level Criteria</b>		
<b>Criterion Type<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Viability Threshold</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Mean Annual Run Size <sup>2</sup>	$S > 4,150$	See Figure 3 for alternatives (requires pop. monitoring).
Ocean Conditions <sup>3</sup>	Size criterion met during poor ocean conditions.	“Poor ocean conditions” determined empirically, or size criterion met for at least 6 decades.
Population Density	<i>Unknown at present</i>	Research needed.
Anadromous Fraction <sup>3</sup>	100% of 4,150	See Figure 3 for alternatives (requires further research).
<b>ESU-level Criteria</b>		
<b>Criterion Type<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Viability Threshold</b>	
Biogeographic diversity	1) Numbers of viable populations as in Table 6, last column. 2) Viable populations inhabit watersheds with drought refugia 3) Viable populations separated from one another by at least 68 km if possible <sup>5</sup> .	
Life-history diversity	Viable populations exhibit all three life-history types (fluvial-anadromous, lagoon anadromous, freshwater resident).	

<sup>1</sup> Population should meet all 4 criteria to be considered viable.

<sup>2</sup> Modified from Allendorf *et al.* (1997), Lindley *et al.* (2006).  $S$  refers to spawning *O. mykiss* per generation, and corresponds to an adult population size of at least 12,500 spawners per generation, assuming a three-year generation time.

<sup>3</sup> Specified in this report; refers to spawning anadromous *O. mykiss* per generation.

<sup>4</sup> ESUs should meet all three criteria for biogeographic diversity and the criteria for life-history diversity

<sup>5</sup> Minimum distance between the boundaries of the pair of watersheds harboring each two populations of interest. If meeting the criteria is geographically impossible within a biogeographic group, then the viable populations should be as widely dispersed spatially as possible.

One compelling possibility is that the steel-head habitat in the Big Sur Coast supports populations with high intrinsic growth, low variability, or both, and this allows smaller populations to persist (Boughton *et al.* 2006). If true, this would justify a less stringent criterion for these populations, but determining how much less stringent would require a period of population monitoring (see the section on performance-based criteria). Alternatively, the population delineation scheme of Boughton *et al.* (2006) may be incorrect. In that document we made the provisional assumption that movement of fish among coastal basins is rare enough that each basin can be regarded as containing an independent population. However, if movement is relatively common, then a single population may span multiple basins, meaning fewer but larger populations in the Big Sur Coast, and possibly other areas such as in the southern Santa Barbara Coast and the Santa Monica Mountains. Information on inter-basin movement (dispersal rates) would therefore have high utility to distinguish these two cases.

**Ocean Conditions.**—Allendorf *et al.* (1997) considered downward trends in abundance to be an indicator of extinction risk. Although this is valid for persistent trends, short-term downward trends are not necessarily risky, provided that population size is well above its viability threshold. Indeed, short-term downward trends appear to be a normal feature of the dynamics of Pacific salmonid populations, due in part to serial correlation in ocean conditions.

Variation in ocean conditions is known to have dramatic impacts on marine survival of Pacific salmonids. For example, Mueter *et al.* (2002) made a detailed study of chum salmon productivity in Alaska and British Columbia, and found strong evidence of positive covariation in spawner-to-recruit survival for wild stocks within regions and between certain adjacent regions. Sea-surface temperature was the strongest predictor of ocean survival, and the correlations were strongest at times of early ocean survival (Mueter *et al.* 2002). Since sea-surface temperature in the northeast Pacific tends to exhibit serial autocorrelation at the scale of decades (Mantua and Hare 2002, Wang and Schimel 2003), this suggests that

ocean mortality of salmon in a given region should likewise be serially-autocorrelated. Ocean catches of Pacific salmon indeed exhibit such patterns, though there are various explanations for the underlying mechanism (Mantua *et al.* 1997, Hare *et al.* 1999, Hilborn *et al.* 2003).

The above findings are relevant to viability because serial auto-correlation of mortality tends to amplify the effects of environmental stochasticity on extinction risk (Foley 1994). Thus, serial autocorrelation implies that the “4,150 rule” described in the previous section is inadequate by some unknown amount. A conservative working assumption is that ocean survival fluctuates widely and is serially correlated, but is otherwise unquantified for our region (studies from elsewhere have found regionally-specific effects; Mueter *et al.* 2002). A population meeting the 4,150 rule during a period of good ocean survival is likely to decline to risky levels when ocean survival deteriorates for long periods.

A simple but effective prescriptive criterion for ocean condition is that the 4,150 rule must be met during a period of poor ocean survival. This criterion could be met via two distinct strategies: 1) monitor population size for at least the duration of the longest-period climate “cycle” (*c.* 60 yr according to Mantua and Hare 2002, though others dispute the notion of predictable cycles), or 2) concurrently monitor population size and ocean survival, so that periods of low ocean survival can be empirically determined. Alternatively, a performance-based approach combined with a comprehensive monitoring program could be applied (described in the next section).

Contrary to Allendorf *et al.* (1997), we do not propose a formal criterion for downward trends *per se*. As argued above, such trends over the short term are a normal occurrence, and only pose a risk if they persist long enough that the population falls below its other viability thresholds (for population size and density). In other words, an ongoing decline may turn out to be short-term in which case it is normal; or it may turn out to be persistent, in which case it provides an early signal that a population may fall below its viability threshold or that there is some unrecognized problem with watershed conditions.

Data on ocean survival (derived from smolt counts combined with adult counts) should in principle be useful for separating the effects of ocean cycles and watershed condition on population growth, the former being a kind of autocorrelated noise that obscures the effects of change in the latter. This is because investment in both smolt counts and adult counts allows one to estimate ocean survival as distinct from freshwater production and survival (with only adult counts, the vital rates in the two habitats are confounded and cannot be estimated separately). In addition, short-term improvements in run size due to watershed restoration could be distinguished from short-term improvement due to ocean cycles. Adaptive management probably would be more efficient with an investment in collecting such data, because the feedback loop between doing and learning would be tighter and quicker.

**Population density.**— A given number of spawners or juveniles may be densely packed into a small section of a watershed, or thinly distributed across its entirety. Both situations have costs and benefits with respect to risk. Dense populations have relatively low risk of depensation (poor population growth rate at low abundance, often caused by scarcity of mates). They have low risk of various genetic problems such as inbreeding depression. However, they are vulnerable to environmental stochasticity since the members of the population all experience similar conditions.

Broadly-dispersed populations benefit from spreading the risk (in the sense of Den Boer 1968) and should be less vulnerable to environmental stochasticity (correlated mortality risks). In addition, they are likely to occupy a broader range of habitats, allowing for the expression and maintenance of phenotypic diversity. In other words, dispersed populations may be less likely to become specialized on, and thus dependent on, a particular environment in a particular part of a watershed. The problem is that, if too-thinly dispersed, the population becomes vulnerable to the risks of depensation and loss of genetic diversity mentioned above.

Allendorf *et al.* (1997) did not propose a density criterion, but our view is that such a criterion is warranted, particularly for populations that

were historically large, but are unlikely to be recovered to those historic levels—there is a risk that a thinly dispersed population in such a watershed could meet the criterion for mean size, and yet not be viable (the 4,150 rule seems adequate to prevent the risk of a population densely packed into a small section of the watershed, because the sustained production of 4,150 spawners per year implies substantial spatial dispersion, even at high spawning densities). We also believe that the viability threshold should be high enough to ensure the fish generally inhabit good-quality habitat, which promotes resilience of the population. A potentially suitable threshold for both these purposes is the density at which intra-specific competition for redd sites becomes observable. For coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) this appears to be on average about 40 spawners per kilometer (one spawning pair per 50 meters of stream length), although individual streams vary considerably around this mean (Bradford *et al.* 2000). We could not find data for deriving a corresponding steelhead criterion. It would be a useful topic for research, but would require study areas with sufficient numbers of spawning adults to address the question.

**Hatchery influence.**— Hatchery fish can have a negative influence on viability if they interbreed with or compete with wild populations (*e.g.* Ford 2002, Goodman 2005), or if their presence masks the decline of a wild population. Currently, hatchery steelhead (anadromous *O. mykiss*) are not being introduced to streams in the study area, and hatchery trout (non-anadromous *O. mykiss*) are (for the most part) only being introduced to stream systems above barriers that are impassable to upstream migrants<sup>3</sup>.

For the trout introduced above barriers, ecological impacts on native trout have not been systematically evaluated. Genetic impacts were recently examined by Girman and Garza (2006), who used microsatellite DNA to construct genetic trees describing the relationships of *O. mykiss* subpopulations above and below barriers. They stated “the lack of [genetic] interspersions of the hatchery strains with the wild populations in the [genetic]

---

<sup>3</sup> An exception is ongoing planting of catchable trout in the lower Nacimiento River by the CDFG.

trees and their separation by long internal branches with high bootstrap support indicates a general lack of contribution of fish planted from Fillmore Hatchery to reproduction in trout populations in streams above or below the dam reservoirs.”

The impacts of hatchery steelhead immigrating from elsewhere are probably very small and do not pose a risk. Should further hatchery inputs below barriers be proposed for the future, their expected effect on wild populations can be evaluated. Entries into the literature on this subject are Bilby *et al.* (2005) and Nickum *et al.* (2004), and a rule-set for assessing hatchery risks to viability is in Lindley *et al.* (2006). Given the current situation, we do not propose a viability criterion for hatchery influence.

**Anadromous fraction.** — Anadromous fraction is the mean fraction of reproductive adults that are anadromous. We believe that juvenile steelhead in our area co-occur with their non-anadromous conspecifics (rainbow trout). Elsewhere, steelhead have been observed to have trout among their progeny, and vice versa (Zimmerman and Reeves 2000). Unfortunately, we do not know how often these transitions occur in south-central or southern California, nor what factors bring them about, though clearly individual populations can be polymorphic for life-history type. Depending on the rate of transition, a group of resident and anadromous fish may function as a single population; two completely distinct populations; or something in between.

Interchange between resident and anadromous fish groups would almost certainly lower the extinction risk of both groups, for the same two reasons that dispersal between separate steelhead populations reduces risk—the existence of a “rescue effect” and the possibility of recolonization (Hanski and Gilpin 1997). The rescue effect would occur at low steelhead abundance, when input from the trout population prevents their complete disappearance. Recolonization occurs when steelhead disappear completely, but are re-generated by the trout population (via “recolonization” of the steelhead niche). These phenomena may have maintained steelhead in the Santa Clara River system in recent times, since modern steel-

**Table 2. General performance-based criteria for population viability.**

---

One or more prescriptive criteria (see Table 1) could be replaced by a quantitative risk assessment satisfying the following:

- 1) Extinction risk < 5% in the next 100 yr.
  - 2) Addresses each risk that is addressed by the prescriptive criteria it replaces.
  - 3) Parameters are either **a)** estimated from data or **b)** precautionary.
  - 4) Quantitative methods must conform to accepted practice in the field of risk assessment, either Bayesian or frequentist.
  - 5) Must pass independent scientific review.
- 

head runs appear far too small to be self-sustaining (Boughton 2005).

Unfortunately, lack of data on the life-history polymorphism prevents a reasonable estimate for the magnitude of the rescue effect, or for a viability threshold for anadromous fraction. Lacking such data, the prescriptive criterion for anadromous fraction must assume that the rescue effect is negligible, and that anadromous fraction must be 100%—that is, when applying the population size criterion discussed previously, 100% of the spawners must be anadromous.

Further research on this topic is likely to have high utility for estimating a viability threshold that is more efficient than the precautionary “100% rule,” using the performance-based approach discussed in the next section. However, in populations where anadromous fish are currently quite rare, it will probably be necessary to recover run sizes somewhat before numbers are sufficient for useful empirical research on life-history plasticity.

#### Performance-Based Criteria

Our proposed framework is in Table 2. Of the various criteria types discussed above, mean annual run size is the one we believe would most benefit from a performance-based approach. The




Figure 2. The population size criterion (mean abundance, or  $E[N]$ ) as a function  $V_r$ , under a variety of assumptions about population growth rates. Based on the diffusion-approximation model of Foley (1994). The condition for non-negligible demographic stochasticity was assumed to be  $V_1^{1/2}/N > 1\% \cdot V_r^{1/2}$ , where  $V_1$  is the demographic stochasticity parameter defined as in Foley (1997); it was computed assuming an annual mortality rate of 33%.

prescriptive criterion ( $S > 4,150$  spawners per yr) is rather stringent due to a lack of population-specific data on variability of run sizes and on influences of non-anadromous *O. mykiss*. It also appears to be biologically infeasible for some basins, particularly small coastal basins of the Santa Lucia, Santa Ynez, and Santa Monica Mountains. Below we identify high-utility data (*sensu* Figure 1) that if collected could be used to estimate a more efficient threshold using a performance-based approach.

**Environmental stochasticity**—One principal reason that the prescriptive criterion is so stringent is the lack of population-specific data on environmental stochasticity (year-to-year variation in mean fecundity and/or survival rate). In general, theory predicts that extinction risk is extremely sensitive to environmental stochasticity (Lande 1993). An example is the diffusion-approximation model of Foley (1994), which predicts a log-linear relationship between the population size criterion

( $E[N]$ ), and the model's environmental stochasticity parameter  $V_r$  (Figure 2). This log-linear relationship implies a high utility of acquiring data on  $V_r$ , which would then be used to refine the population size criterion. These refined criteria would generally be much less stringent, since they would no longer need to assume a “nearly-worst-case scenario” for  $V_r$  (see Appendix A)

Methods now exist for estimating  $r$ ,  $V_r$ , and extinction risk by fitting a density-dependent version of the random-walk-with-drift (RWWD) model to time-series of spawner counts (Holmes 2001, Lindley 2003, Dennis *et al.* 2006). In general, about 20 yrs of data are necessary to obtain reasonable confidence in the estimates (Lindley 2003). A recovery effort that includes regular monitoring of spawners could likely use the resulting data to make a better estimate of  $V_r$  and obtain a more efficient criterion for population size (see Table 3A). However, some populations may currently have run sizes so low that useful data cannot be

collected until they have been recovered somewhat, depending on the field methods used for monitoring.

**Anadromous fraction.** — Another key uncertainty is the pattern of interchange between resident and anadromous subpopulations. We suspect that extinction risk of the steelhead fraction is likely to be highly sensitive to the details of this interchange, but at present we do not understand it beyond knowing that such interchange does occur, perhaps regularly. Certainly, studies of *O. mykiss* in Alaska indicate that at least some non-migratory populations can spontaneously generate anadromous fish if they had an anadromous fraction historically (Thrower *et al.* 2004). A better understanding of life history plasticity in our study area would allow the derivation of performance-based criteria for population size and anadromous fraction.

The increased efficiency of a performance-based approach has a cost, in that time and resources used to collect the necessary data may pose an opportunity cost on other recovery activities. In Figure 3 we offer a simple decision tree that may help clarify the tradeoffs. Table 3 gives a summary of the two performance-based options.

**Examples.** — Run sizes have been continuously monitored in the Carmel River since 1988 and in some tributaries of the Santa Ynez River since 1995 (Figure 4). The resulting time-series data may be long enough to fit a Random-Walk-With-Drift (RWWD) risk model (Table 3A), which would estimate the risks posed by current population size, mean growth rate, and environmental stochasticity.

To estimate risk, we fit two versions of the RWWD model to each of the two datasets. The first model assumes density-independent population growth (Lindley 2003), such that

$$\ln(R_{t+1}) = \ln(R_t) + r + \varepsilon_t,$$

where  $R_t$  is the 4-year running sum of spawners in year  $t$  ( $S_t$ ; see McClure *et al.* 2003 for rationale of  $R_t$ ),  $r$  is a parameter describing mean annual growth rate of the population, and  $\varepsilon_t$  is a normally-distributed deviate representing the effects of environmental stochasticity (mean = 0 and variance =  $V_r$ ).

**Table 3. Recommended approaches for deriving performance-based abundance criteria.**

---

**A. Random-walk-with-drift model (RWWD)**

---

Necessary Data

20+ yrs of annual spawner counts (anadromous).

Risk Model

Random-walk-with-drift (Lindley 2003, Foley 1994, Dennis *et al.* 2006, and others).

Pro and Con

Pro: Estimate of environmental stochasticity may permit less stringent criterion.

Con: possibly 2+ decades before estimates can be made (see examples); assumes negligible rescue effect from freshwater residents, which may be incorrect / inefficient.

Likely Useful For

Establishing viable populations in small coastal watersheds.

---

**B. Standard Population Viability Analysis (PVA)**

---

Necessary Data

- 1) Annual spawner counts (resident and anadromous).
- 2) Fecundity (resident and anadromous).
- 3) Anadromous/resident “crossover” rates.
- 4) Estimates of process error for above quantities.
- 5) Possibly: Habitat-specific and lifestage-specific data on survival.

Risk Model

Standard PVA methods (*e.g.* Burgman *et al.* 1993).

Pro and Con

Pro: By reducing uncertainty, may allow less stringent thresholds than RWWD or prescriptive criterion.

Con: Highly stringent data requirements; 2+ decades before estimates can be made.

Likely Useful For

Establishing viable populations in watersheds with unreliable migration corridors; or populations known to maintain life-history polymorphisms, especially those with consistently small anadromous fractions.

---






Figure 3. Decision tree for establishing a viability criterion for mean population size (spawners per generation). "Biologically feasible" refers to the ecological capacity of an unimpaired stream network to support enough spawners on average to meet the criterion.




Figure 4. Time-series of steelhead runs in the Carmel River and Santa Ynez River. Both datasets are partial counts: The Carmel data exclude steelhead spawning below San Clemente Dam, and the Santa Ynez data are fish trapped in Salsipuedes and Hilton Creeks (*i.e.* they are partial for those creeks, and omit fish from the mainstem and other tributaries). The Carmel data from 1964 – 1977 were collected under a different fisheries management regime, and using different methods than the later data, and are not included in the analysis. Also depicted are counts of non-anadromous trout caught in the same traps as the Santa Ynez steelhead. Data for the Carmel are from the website of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District; data for the Santa Ynez kindly provided by Tim Robinson of the Cachuma Project Biology Staff.

This model is appropriate for upward- or downward-trending populations that are far from carrying capacity. We fit this model to the data in Figure 4 using a Bayesian state-space model implemented in the software packages OpenBugs and R, and then used the estimated distributions of the parameters  $R_{2007}$ ,  $r$  and  $V_r$  to estimate the probability that the number of spawners would decline to 1 or fewer per year, an unconservative estimate of extinction risk (see Dennis *et al.* 1991). We also estimated the probability that spawners decline to 10 or fewer per year, which is an unconservative estimate of the risk of declining to an abundance where demographic stochasticity and depensation become significant risks (see below).

The second model assumes density-dependent population growth, in which

$$\ln(R_{t+1}) = c \cdot \ln(R_t) + r + \varepsilon_t,$$

where the parameter  $c$  ( $-1 < c < 1$ ) describes the strength of density dependence (Dennis *et al.* 2006), and the other parameters are as before. This model is applicable to populations that are fluctuating stochastically around a mean carrying capacity. We estimated cumulative risk (over 100 yr) of declining to 1 spawner per year using the stationary distribution of log-population sizes ( $E[X_\infty]$  and  $V[X_\infty]$  in Dennis *et al.* 2006). For both models, the fitting procedure also estimated observation error for the run sizes, which we denote as  $V_{\text{obs}}$ .

For Carmel River steelhead, the density independent model suggested a mean growth rate  $r$  in the vicinity of 0.105 (= 11% growth per year), but the 95% confidence limit included negative growth as low as  $-0.067$  (= 6.5% decline per year) (see Table 4). This probably seems counterintuitive, given that the population demonstrably grew during the time of observation, but what the model suggests is that this could be due to a few well-timed good years at the beginning of an overall decline. This is consistent with a fluctuating population with a relatively short time of observation. Though decline cannot yet be ruled out, the data suggest that the more likely scenario is a population with a moderately good growth rate and modest fluctuations. If so, and if current conditions hold and the population is not yet density-regulated, there is a good chance it will continue to grow stochastically until density regulation occurs.

The density-dependent model is the more plausible model if the Carmel River population is currently saturating its available freshwater and estuarine habitat. It makes a rather different inference from the independence model: namely a much higher mean growth rate. The confidence interval for  $r$  corresponds to a growth rate somewhere between 2.3-fold and 30-fold per year ( $r = 0.826$  to  $3.425$ ). This is no doubt driven by the sharply rising abundances observed between 1992 and 1998, which probably resulted from a congruence of various changes in the environment (such as the end of a drought and restoration of flows to the mainstem river), and the beginning of intensive recovery efforts on the fish (which included actively reintroducing steelhead to the habitat upstream of the counting station). The estimate of  $r$  incorporates the impacts of these activities, and would not necessarily apply to a situation in which they did not continue. The estimate of the density parameter  $c$  (95% c.i. = 0.548 to 0.898) indicates that the data contain enough information to constrain this parameter.

The stochasticity parameter ( $V_r^{1/2}$ ) is similar to its value in the independence model, but perhaps somewhat smaller since the model is attributing some of the variation in run size to density regulation. As befitting a population with density regu-

lation, large intrinsic growth rate  $r$ , and modest variability  $V_r^{1/2}$ , the population is predicted to have a low probability of extinction (zero) if conditions of the future are similar to the period of observation. However, a similar future is not necessarily expected since ocean survival will probably decline in the coming decades (see discussion below). The relatively modest variability may reflect the effects of intensive management in the basin; the variability during years 1964-1975 appears to have been considerably higher (Figure 4).

In the dataset for the Santa Ynez River, steelhead runs were extremely small (sometimes zero) and in contrast to the Carmel situation, did not change much over the period of observation. In the independence model, the median estimate of  $r$  was about 4.5% yr<sup>-1</sup> ( $r = 0.044$ ), but the confidence intervals include declines as large as 17% yr<sup>-1</sup> and increases as large as 30% yr<sup>-1</sup> ( $r = -0.186$  and  $0.262$ , respectively). The stochasticity parameter is also highly uncertain and the population is currently quite small, so the two measures of extinction risk are both equal to 1, indicating unambiguously high risk. Of course this omits any influence of resident trout, highlighting the need to better understand the role of these fish in maintaining anadromous runs. During the period of observation, non-anadromous trout were also caught in the traps and may have had a modest increase, probably due to fisheries management practices in the basin (Figure 4). It could be useful to discover the ecological conditions that would favor steelhead over trout.

In the density-dependent model for the Santa Ynez, the estimate of  $c$  was nearly as uncertain as its prior probability, indicating that this model cannot be parameterized given the information in the dataset. In other words, the parameters  $r$  and  $c$  were confounded.

The analysis thus far omits risks from depensation (positive density dependence), which typically occurs only at very small population sizes due to difficulties in finding mates. This is difficult to quantify without knowing something about spawner densities and ability to find mates; it is part of the reason that we recommend developing a density criterion (Table 1). The analysis thus far also omits risks from demographic stochasticity,

also usually significant only at small population sizes, and risks due to erosion of genetic variation (caused by small size and/or large fluctuations). Some researchers have suggested that mean population size should be at least 2500 (c. 600 - 800 spawners per year) to prevent loss of genetic variation in salmon and steelhead (Allendorf *et al.* 1997). Taking a fairly unconservative approach, we can get a rough idea of these risks by estimating the probability that spawner abundances dip below 10 per year (i.e. 5 spawning pairs), which is given in Table 4.

The contribution of resident *O. mykiss* to the stabilization of steelhead runs—whatever its magnitude—is implicit in the analyses of Table 4, since only (partial) counts of anadromous fish runs were used to estimate risk. This has implications: the model parameters in Table 4 implicitly reflect the putative stabilization effect, but they also assume that if the runs dip low enough, they go extinct and cannot be reconstituted by resident fish. A more explicit treatment of the role of resident *O. mykiss* could address this conservative assumption more quantitatively, but would first require some research to accurately understand the effect and the ecological conditions that bring it about.

So far, our two example analyses have taken the place of the criteria for population size and anadromous fraction in Table 1. Now let us consider the implications of long-term variation in ocean conditions (Table 1). The risk estimates in Table 4 are probably too optimistic because the data come from a time period believed to be especially favorable for California salmonids. The period of observation commences at the end of the California drought in the early 1990s and the beginning of a wet period with El Nino events. During this period, steelhead runs in San Mateo Creek, Topanga Creek and Carmel River, formerly believed to be extirpated, were re-established. In addition, in 1998, the marine system known as the California Current appears to have gone through an abrupt physical change (“regime shift”) that improved survival of salmonids during their ocean phase (Peterson and Schwing 2003, Lehodey *et al.* 2006):

**Table 4. Population extinction risk as forecast by RWD models.**

**Carmel River Population**

Parameters*	Estimates	
	median	95% c.i.
<b>Density-Independent Risk Model</b>		
$V_{\text{obs}}^{1/2}$	0.047	(0.003, 0.20)
$V_r^{1/2}$	0.291	(0.198, 0.480)
$r$	0.105	(-0.067, 0.274)
$\Pr(S_t \leq 1 \text{ yr}^{-1})$	0	(0, 1)
$\Pr(S_t \leq 10 \text{ yr}^{-1})$	0	(0, 1)
<b>Density-Dependent Risk Model</b>		
$V_{\text{obs}}^{1/2}$	0.047	(0.003, 0.198)
$V_r^{1/2}$	0.206	(0.135, 0.350)
$r$	2.067	(0.826, 3.425)
$c$	0.730	(0.548, 0.898)
$\Pr(S_t \leq 1 \text{ yr}^{-1})$	0	(0, 0)
$\Pr(S_t \leq 10 \text{ yr}^{-1})$	0	(0, 0)

**Santa Ynez River Population**

Parameters*	Estimates	
	median	95% c.i.
<b>Density-Independent Risk Model</b>		
$V_{\text{obs}}^{1/2}$	0.161	(0.008, 0.493)
$V_r^{1/2}$	0.276	(0.030, 0.658)
$r$	0.044	(-0.186, 0.262)
$\Pr(S_t \leq 1 \text{ yr}^{-1})$	1	(1, 1)
$\Pr(S_t \leq 10 \text{ yr}^{-1})$	1	(1, 1)
<b>Density-Dependent Risk Model</b>		
No convergence of $c$ †		

\* Parameter  $r$  is ln-transformed mean annual growth rate of  $R_t$  (see text). Growth in percent terms is  $(e^r - 1) \cdot 100\%$ .  $V_{\text{obs}}^{1/2}$  is observation error and  $V_r^{1/2}$  is the environmental stochasticity parameter. The two “Pr” terms are the probability of the population dipping to 1 or 10 spawners per year, and represent two measures of extinction risk.

† Posterior distribution of  $c$  very similar to prior distribution (uniform over  $[-1, 1]$ )

“The number of adult chinook salmon returning to the Columbia River system since 1999 has reached levels not seen since the 1950s. Striking changes have also been seen in the ocean survival rate of coho. From 1960 – 1976, survival ranged from 5 – 12% (Logerwell et al. 2003). During the warm phase (1977 – 1998), survival was much more variable and plummeted to <2% in the 1980s and <1% in the 1990s. In 1999 the coho salmon populations began to rebound. Returns increased five-fold to 2% in 1999, and to 4% in 2000” (Peterson and Schwing 2003, ¶11)

Although this is a beneficial development, the expectation among researchers is that unfavorable climate modes lasting several decades will return again sometime within the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. There is disagreement about whether the transitions follow regular cycles or occur stochastically at decadal intervals, but there is widespread agreement that they do indeed occur.

It is also the case that the earth’s climate system is currently undergoing a re-organization, the scale and magnitude of which is probably beyond anything seen in human history. Perhaps a modest proposal is to examine a hypothetical scenario in which a future decline in ocean condition is of no greater magnitude than what has been documented for the 20<sup>th</sup> Century: let’s say a five-fold drop in ocean survival as a middle-of-the road interpretation of the above quote from Peterson and Schwing (2003). Since density regulation is thought to occur during the freshwater phase (Quinn 2005), the drop in ocean survival can be interpreted simply as a decrease in the  $r$  parameter of the RWWD models:

$$r_{\text{modest proposal}} = r_{\text{now}} - \ln(5) = r_{\text{now}} - 1.609$$

If one assumes that the Carmel River is currently density regulated, than its median estimate for  $r$  is now 2.067 (Table 4), but would decline to 0.458 in the hypothetical scenario (the lower confidence limit would be well into negative territory). The expected run size (the abundance around which the population fluctuates; see  $E[X_{\infty}]$  in Dennis *et al.*

2006), would decline from a median estimate of 550 spawners per year to *c.* 1.6 spawners per year. This is similar to where it appears to have been for many years between 1976 and 1991 (Figure 4). This is also what to expect and plan for sometime in the coming decades if one takes a risk-neutral view of the future and assumes that the reorganization of the climate poses no additional risks.

The modest proposal assumes that patterns of ocean survival for steelhead in the southern California current will be similar to those of coho salmon in the northern California current. This is not necessarily the case because regional patterns occur at spatial scales smaller than this (Logerwell et al. 2003, Koslow et al. 2002). This in part is why recent efforts to develop a coastal monitoring plan for California salmonids include a call to monitor smolt-to-spawner survival at various life-cycle monitoring stations along the entire coast of California.

Finally, the above thought experiment indicates why it is desirable to have an explicit and unambiguous understanding of the way in which resident *O. mykiss* sustain or rehabilitate steelhead runs (and vice versa) during difficult periods such as the next several centuries of climate change.

We hope these two extended examples have clarified the performance-based approach.

## ESU viability

ESU viability depends on sufficient numbers of viable populations to accomplish two ends: preserve the among-population diversity (genetic, phenotypic and ecological) originally present in the ESU, and protect the ESU from catastrophic disturbances. We will assume that recovery planners have a time horizon of at least 500 – 1000 yr in the face of environmental variation that is typical of the study area. The past 200 – 1000 yr offers clues as to what this environmental variation will entail—long-term trends in climate; prolonged drought; large wildfires; and profound anthropogenic disturbance (Gordon 1996, Gumprecht 1999, Haston and Michaelson 1997). For ESUs to be considered viable, they should at a minimum be able to persist under the foreseeable natural disturbance regime of the study area.

For Pacific salmonids elsewhere, ESU viability criteria have followed a straightforward “representation and redundancy” rule (Lindley *et al.* 2006, Ruckelshaus *et al.* 2002, Myers *et al.* 2003), which we adopt here. Under this approach the populations are partitioned into “diversity groups” based on life-history and biogeography. A viable steelhead ESU requires *representation* of all diversity groups, and *redundancy* within groups. The redundancy must be sufficient to protect against foreseeable catastrophes.

### Life-History Groups

Studies of coastal *O. mykiss* populations in central and southern California reveal three principal life-history groups, which we here designate as fluvial-anadromous, freshwater resident, and lagoon-anadromous (Smith 1990, Hayes *et al.* 2004, Bond 2006). Both anadromous groups classify as winter steelhead, in that adults migrate during the winter rainy season. Fluvial-anadromous fish spend one or two summers (occasionally more) in freshwater streams as juveniles, then smolt and migrate to the ocean, using the estuary only for acclimation to saltwater and as a migration corridor (also occasionally for spring-time feeding). Freshwater residents (commonly known as rainbow trout) complete their entire lifecycle in the freshwater stream network. Finally, lagoon-anadromous fish spend either their first or second summer as juveniles in the seasonal lagoon at the mouth of the stream. This last group may be unfamiliar to most steelhead biologists, so we will describe it a bit more fully below.

In the study area, the estuaries at the mouths of rivers and creeks are typically transformed into lagoons during the dry season, when the combination of low streamflow and coastal wave action allows a sandbar barrier to form between the ocean and the stream’s mouth. Several case studies from outside the study area indicate that seasonal lagoons often comprise exceptionally good rearing habitat for juvenile steelhead. Smith (1990) described data collected in 1986 from three creeks between Santa Cruz and San Francisco, in which juvenile steelhead reached high densities and grew extremely fast in the lagoons. Bond (2006) described a more intensive study conducted over

4 years in a fourth creek, with similar conclusions. Fast growth is generally beneficial to fish because large fish have lower mortality rates than small ones, particularly in the marine environment (Sogard 1997; see Ward *et al.* 1989 for a steelhead example). Indeed, of 27 adult steelhead examined by Smith (1990), back-calculation of growth rates (using scale samples) suggested that 60% - 70% had the high juvenile growth rates typically observed in lagoons. Bond (2006) conducted a discriminant-function analysis on scale samples from 406 adults, and concluded that 85% of successfully returning adults had reared in the lagoon. From these and other data, Bond (2006, p. vii) concluded that “estuary-reared steelhead showed a large survival advantage and comprised 85% of the returning adult population despite having been between 8% and 48% of the juvenile population. Although the ... estuary comprised less than 5% of the watershed area, it was critical nursery habitat, as estuary-reared juveniles make a disproportionate contribution to the spawning adult pool.”

Bond’s (2006) work suggests that the lagoon-anadromous life history is very important for the viability of many anadromous populations. However, the other life-history types are also important because lagoons sometimes prematurely breach or become anoxic, with high mortality costs for the lagoon-anadromous component of the population (Smith 1990). In the winter following a lagoon failure the fluvial-anadromous life history would tend to predominate in the outgoing smolt run, and thus it probably contributes to the long-term viability of the population.

Finally, the long history of severe droughts in the study area (Haston and Michaelson 1997) leads one to believe that segments of mainstem migration corridors may dry up for multi-year periods, preventing anadromy of any type. During such events the adults in the ocean and the freshwater residents in the perennial segments of streams are the only buffer against extirpation (in the study area, many stream systems are spatially intermittent during dry periods, with alternating segments of surface and subsurface flows). Of these two groups of fish, only the freshwater residents would be capable of reproduction during an extended drought lasting longer than the lifespan of

the fish. This suggests that the freshwater-resident component is critical for long-term viability of the ESU through multiple droughts. Conversely, the anadromous life-history types are necessary for migratory recolonization of basins from which the species has been extirpated by a catastrophic event. Additionally, the anadromous types probably allow some populations to maintain a larger size (and thus a lower extinction risk) than if they were solely composed of freshwater-resident fish.

The representation and redundancy rule therefore indicates that each of these life-history types should be represented in each biogeographic population group (see below). We note that intermediate life-history types are common—for example, fluvial-anadromous fish sometimes feed for part of a summer or spring in the lagoon—but that intermediate forms probably do not obviate the need for each of the three main groups. Also worth noting is the fact that some basins do not have lagoons, particularly in steep coastal areas such as the Big Sur Coast. Some of these basins have *O. mykiss* populations. It is not clear whether these 1) are viable despite lacking the lagoon-anadromous form; 2) are a sub-component of a more inclusive multi-basin population that possesses the lagoon anadromous form; or 3) are not naturally viable and hence ephemeral at the time-scale of a century.

### Biogeographic Population Groups

To divide the steelhead populations into biogeographic groups, we applied two simple rules. First, we sorted the populations into a coastal super-group and an inland super-group, defined by whether most potential freshwater habitat lay on an ocean-facing watershed subject to marine-based climate inversions and orographic precipitation from off-shore weather systems. The inland populations are not thermally protected by summer climate inversions but instead by the temperature lapse rate which causes montane habitat to be cooler in summer. They have a more seasonal climate, inhabit larger watersheds, and tend to occur in rain shadows of coastal mountains. These differences in climate and topography circumscribe local habitat structure and probably affect the variability, productivity, and resilience of coastal

vs. inland populations. Inland populations may require larger runs on average to achieve viability (see discussion in Boughton *et al.* 2006, part 5).

Second, within the coastal and inland super-groups, we sorted populations into groups defined by contiguous areas with broadly similar physical geography and hydrology (Figure 5). The environmental characteristics of each biogeographic area are summarized in Table 5; and the population membership of each group is in Appendix B, based on a list of identified steelhead populations in Boughton *et al.* (2006).

The South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU has 4 biogeographic groups. The Southern California Steelhead ESU has 5 groups, although it is not clear if all groups are capable of supporting viable populations. In particular, the Santa Monica Mountains and the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast may have originally had so-called ephemeral populations that naturally fail and later get recolonized from neighboring watersheds (*i.e.* metapopulation dynamics). Originally, the Mojave Rim populations probably had quite unreliable migration access and may have consisted mostly of freshwater-resident fish (Boughton *et al.* 2006). This may also be true for headwaters areas in the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast.

Representation and redundancy means each group must possess a sufficient number of viable populations that a worst-case catastrophe will leave at least one viable population in its aftermath. The assumption is that this population would then serve as a source of colonists to the vacant areas after the habitat has recovered.

### Catastrophic Risks

The three most prominent natural disturbances that appear to pose a risk to entire populations are wildfires, droughts, and debris flows, discussed below.

**Wildfire.**—Although wildfires have long-term benefits for fish habitat (such as producing influxes of spawning gravels to the stream), in the short-term they can be catastrophic. For example, Shapovalov (1944, cited in Titus *et al.* 2003) reported that a wildfire in the Cuyama and Sisquoc watersheds (near Santa Maria) increased the wet-season run-off, with the consequence that dry-

**Table 5. Biogeographic population groups.**

<b>South-Central California Coast Steelhead ESU</b>					
<b>Population Group</b>	<b>Ecological Characteristics</b>				
	<b>Migration Corridor</b>	<b>Migration reliability<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Summer Climate Refugia</b>	<b>Intermittent Streams</b>	<b>Winter Precipitation</b>
Interior Coast Range <sup>2</sup>	Long alluvial valleys	Moderate/Low	Montane	Many	mostly < 75 cm <sup>3</sup>
Carmel Basin	Medium valley	Moderate	Marine + Montane	Some	30 - 90 cm
Big Sur Coast	Short, steep	High	Marine	Few	75 – 135 cm
San Luis Obispo Terrace	Coastal terrace	Moderate	Marine	Some	60 – 90 cm
<b>Southern California Steelhead ESU</b>					
<b>Population Group</b>	<b>Ecological Characteristics</b>				
	<b>Migration Corridor</b>	<b>Migration reliability</b>	<b>Summer Climate Refugia</b>	<b>Intermittent Streams</b>	<b>Winter Precipitation</b>
Monte Arido Highlands	Long alluvial valleys	Moderate/Low	Montane	Many	60 – 75 cm (highlands)
Conception Coast	Coastal terrace	Moderate	Marine + Spring-fed Pools	Many	30 – 60 cm
Santa Monica Mountains	Short, steep	Low	Marine + Spring-fed Pools	Many	30 – 60 cm
Mojave Rim	Long alluvial valleys	Very Low	Montane	Many	75 – 135 cm (highlands)
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	Coastal terrace & mesas	Low	Marine	Many	mostly <75 cm

<sup>1</sup> Inferred reliability under an un-managed flow regime.<sup>2</sup> The inclusion of the Pajaro River population in this group is debatable, since much of its best freshwater habitat occurs in the red-wood forests at the southern end of the Santa Cruz Mountains—quite ecologically distinct from the chaparral watersheds of the other east-slope populations.<sup>3</sup> Except in the Santa Cruz Mountains of the Pajaro system, which are wetter.






Figure 5. Schematic depiction areas inhabited by biogeographic population groups of steelhead in the study area.

season baseflow was decreased. In addition, fine sediment input to the stream buried spawning gravels, filled rearing pools, and absorbed the dry-season baseflow that remained. “As of 1950, there appeared to have been no steelhead fishery for 10-15 years in the Santa Maria River, and very few steelhead were reported to have entered the Cuyama River for a decade,” according to Titus *et al.* (2003). In other parts of the southwest, wildfires have been implicated in the extinction of trout populations (Rinne 1996, Brown *et al.* 2001).

To determine a level of redundancy sufficient to withstand catastrophic wildfires, we estimated the expected geographic extent of a thousand-year burn, based on wildfire data from 1910 through 2003 (acquired from the California Department of Forestry<sup>4</sup>). Wildfires in the study area tend to be aggregated in time due to climate forcing (for example, forcing by the hot dry Santa Ana winds out of the Mojave Desert in the southern area; Moritz 1997), so our analysis used total area burned in a year rather than the area of the single largest fire.

Fire return-times were estimated using standard methods: An exponential distribution was found to fit the data (parameter  $\lambda = 0.0025084$ . Fit:  $\chi^2 = 2.32$  [ $df = 3$ ];  $p = 0.51$ ), which predicts a thousand-year burned-area of about 2,750 km<sup>2</sup> (parametric curve in Figure 6). Interestingly, the severe fire season of 2003 burned nearly this much area (empirical curve in Figure 6). Note that “thousand year” refers to the median return time expected for an event; actual waiting times are distributed around this median; so the parametric and empirical results are not inconsistent. Since we have a recent example of a thousand-year event, we can examine it in detail to get some insight.

In 2003, the study area had 31 fires larger than 1.0 km<sup>2</sup>, including some massive conflagrations such as the Simi Fire (435 km<sup>2</sup>), the contiguous Padua, Grand Prix, and Old Fires (combined area 617 km<sup>2</sup>), and the truly colossal Cedar Fire in San Diego County (1095 km<sup>2</sup>). The maximum width of any individual fire at its widest point was 68 km for the Cedar Fire (the combined Padua/Grand Prix/Old Fire was nearly as wide at 63 km), suggesting that two watersheds containing steelhead




Figure 6. Return-times for wildfire seasons in the study area. Based on a 94-year record as of 2003 (inclusive). The last datapoint on the empirical curve is the 2003 fire season.

populations must be separated by at least 68 km of intervening space if they are not to both be affected by the same fire.

If a similar fire season occurred in the future, how many fires might be expected to affect each population group? To make a rough estimate, we noted that the study area as a whole is 56,800 km<sup>2</sup>, translating to 0.0005457 fire-starts per km<sup>2</sup>. For each biogeographic population group, we calculated the total watershed area lying within the species’ thermal limits (described in terms of August air temperature in Boughton and Goslin 2006), and multiplied it by the rate of fire-starts to get an expected number of fires in the area inhabited by each population group (Table 6). However, the expectation is not as useful a number as the upper confidence limit—that is, the maximum number of fires that is not unlikely. We estimated this number using the Poisson distribution at 95% and 99% levels of confidence.

A prescriptive criterion for ESU viability is derived as follows: On the face of it, the minimum number of populations would have to be one greater than the maximum number of wildfires in a 1000-year event to ensure sufficient redundancy

<sup>4</sup> [http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/projects/fire\\_data/fire\\_perimeters/](http://frap.cdf.ca.gov/projects/fire_data/fire_perimeters/)

for a given biogeographic group.<sup>5</sup> However, in some cases this prescription exceeds the number of historic populations (which were sufficient to withstand the aboriginal fire regime). Thus, a reasonable prescription for sufficient population redundancy is: at least 1 + the maximum number of wildfires expected for the biogeographic group, or the number of historic viable populations in the group, whichever is less (see Table 6, last column). Sufficient redundancy also requires that the populations each meet the criteria for population viability; each exhibit all 3 life history types; and each have geographic boundaries separated from other such populations by the long dimension of the largest potential fire (assumed to be 68 km). In cases where such separation is not possible due to geographic constraints, then populations should be as widely dispersed as spatially feasible.

The sufficiency criteria in Table 6 may seem overly conservative, since they maintain a risk of <1% in 1000 yr (*i.e.* well beyond the timescale of a single human life), and assume that all wildfires down to 1 km<sup>2</sup> in size have catastrophic effects on steelhead populations. In principle, a small wildfire can have a widespread effect on stream habitat, due to sediment-transport processes, but in practice only some fraction of them will have catastrophic impacts on steelhead. In fact, to have a catastrophic effect it must occur in the right location and be followed by a wet season sufficient to initiate those sediment processes.

From another perspective, the criteria may not be conservative enough, because for simplicity they assume a stationary fire regime—*i.e.* that the size distribution and frequency of wildfires is not changing over time. In fact, for the western USA as a whole wildfires are becoming larger and more frequent, probably driven by a climate trend (Westerling *et al.* 2006) that is expected to continue intensifying the worldwide situation beyond the foreseeable future (Scholze *et al.* 2006). Another general expectation from climate change studies is that winter storms will become more extreme. This could increase the impact of wildfires on stream habitats, since wildfires and winter storms

interact to mobilize sediment inputs into streams. Additionally, the growing human population in these watersheds is expected to increase the ignition rate of wildfires, believed by Keeley *et al.* (1999) to be the primary control on wildfire frequency.

**Drought.**—Drought is likely to have catastrophic effects on fish by causing lack of migratory access during the winter and lack of perennial flow during the summer (the latter is necessary to support rearing to the smolt stage, or in the case of the freshwater residents, completion of their reproductive cycle). In the present day, drought effects may be exacerbated by the lowering of the water table due to groundwater pumping and stream diversions. Drought has a long history in the North American Southwest, according to Cook *et al.* (2004) who used tree-ring data to reconstruct Palmer Drought Indices for the entire western USA back to the year 800 (see also Haston and Michaelson 1997).

Lindley *et al.* (2006) used the spatially-explicit reconstructions of Cook *et al.* (2004) to estimate a drought “correlation distance,” defined as the minimum geographic distance between two points at which drought conditions are no longer positively correlated. In other words, it is the minimum distance that must separate two steelhead populations if they are to be assured of not both being impacted by the same drought.

The correlation distance they found (640 km) is much longer than the longest dimension of each geographic area occupied by the two ESUs (280 km and 485 km). Thus, redundancy cannot be achieved via spatial separation of populations. It is worth noting, however, that the tree-ring data described by Cook *et al.* (2004) go back to the year 800 A.D., and record at least 4 multi-decade droughts prior to 1300 A.D. These events had far greater magnitudes than anything observed during the historical period. The aboriginal steelhead populations must have either survived in drought-resilient refugia, or have been regionally extirpated prior to 1300 A.D. and recolonized in the subsequent centuries. If the refugium hypothesis is correct, ESU viability is probably contingent on forecasting the location of refugia under future climate regimes. If the recolonization hypothesis is

---

<sup>5</sup> This assumes that all fire-starts have the potential for catastrophic effects on populations.

**Table 6. The number of wildfires in each population group during a thousand-year fire event similar to the events of 2003, and the number of viable populations necessary for ESU viability.**

Population Group	Expected Number of Wildfires	Maximum Number of Wildfires		Sufficient Number of Populations*
		95% confidence	99% confidence	
Interior Coast Range	2.567	5	7	4 <sup>†</sup>
Carmel Basin	0.359	1	2	1
Big Sur	0.406	2	2	3
San Luis Obispo Terrace	0.873	3	4	5
Monte Arido Highlands	5.624	10	12	4
Conception Coast	0.327	1	2	3
Mojave Rim	3.209	6	8	3 <sup>‡</sup>
Santa Monica Mountains	0.210	1	2	3 <sup>‡</sup>
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	2.563	5	7	8 <sup>‡</sup>

\* Viable and spatially separated from other viable populations by > 68 km. Estimated as 1 + the number of wildfires at 99% confidence, or the number of historic populations, whichever is less.

† The number of historically viable populations may be smaller than the table entry, since some historical populations may have been ephemeral and required recurrent colonization.

‡ Evidence is unclear whether anadromy was a consistent feature of *O. mykiss* populations in these groups. Clearly the freshwater-resident form has always been a regular feature of these populations, and anadromous life histories were at least occasionally expressed.

correct, ESU boundaries are currently mis-specified. Evaluation of the refugium hypothesis, particularly as it relates to future climate, is an obvious research priority.

**Debris Flows.**—Flooding can cause debris flows that would be expected to have catastrophic effects on steelhead populations. According to Keller *et al.* (1997), debris flows are the most severe of three types of fluvial transport, moving large amounts of debris of all sizes from fine sediments to large boulders. Keller *et al.* (1997) proposed that debris flows in the study area are usually produced by the convergence of three unusual factors: 1) a pre-existing large geomorphic instability somewhere in the stream network; 2) a large wildfire that removes vegetation, 3) followed within one or two years by an exceptionally large winter storm. This suggests that if a ESU has sufficient redundancy to protect against wildfire risk (discussed earlier), it will also have sufficient redundancy to protect against debris flows.

### Structural Uncertainty in the Coastal Supergroup

Many coastal basins are relatively small, and may be capable of supporting only small steelhead runs. Elsewhere we have noted uncertainty about the population structure and the basis for persistence of steelhead in these small basins (Boughton *et al.* 2006). This uncertainty boils down to three scenarios (not necessarily mutually exclusive):

1) Some of the coastal populations, though small, may be exceptionally stable and thus viable, and sustain the continued presence of steelhead in the neighboring watersheds via the mechanism of dispersal between basins. Possible mechanisms for such stability include stable stream flows (even in dry periods), reliable migration corridors, and/or a persistent resident population of *O. mykiss* that stabilizes anadromous runs.

2) Dispersal may in fact be common enough to knit together the steelhead in individual basins into a small number of “trans-basin” populations,

and these trans-basin populations may be large enough to be viable.

3) The coastal populations may not be generally viable, and instead rely on occasional or frequent dispersal pulses from larger inland populations.

Resolution of the above uncertainties may not be scientifically tractable in the near term. This suggests that recovery planning should proceed with the assumption that any of these scenarios may apply to any of the coastal biogeographic groups. Thus, in planning for a sufficient number of populations in a coastal group, it is prudent to identify basins with stable runs to address scenario (1), group with them enough neighboring basins to address scenario (2), and then develop a monitoring effort to evaluate persistence (scenario 3) as well as to refine viability goals over time.

We should note that if scenarios (1) and (2) both are true, each comprises a distinct mechanism for stabilizing steelhead runs and would thus be complementary to some degree. They may even interact in nonlinear ways that further enhance the reliability and abundance of steelhead runs in the coastal supergroup.

We should also note that scenario (3) implies that the continued persistence of steelhead in a particular biogeographic area depends on robust runs occurring in other areas. For example, in the past decade steelhead have begun to be observed (in very sparse numbers) in parts of the Santa Catalina Gulf Coast area (see Figure 5). If scenario (3) is correct for this area, it implies that the continued appearance of steelhead may depend on robust runs occurring in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

## Summary and Recommendations

Table 1 summarizes the prescriptive criteria we proposed for population viability and ESU viability. At the population level we propose 4 criteria that are objective and measurable, at least in principle. However, one of them (density) is too poorly understood at the moment for us to estimate the minimum threshold necessary for low risk. For two more (population size and anadro-

mous fraction), we have derived a minimum threshold given current information constraints, but feel fairly optimistic that a more efficient threshold could be estimated using a performance-based approach. Table 2 summarizes the standards for the performance-based approach, and Figure 3 gives a simple decision tree for identifying when such an approach is warranted. A performance-based approach would require a long-term investment in obtaining quantitative data on environmental stochasticity and the life-history polymorphism (Table 3).

At the ESU level we have proposed numbers for sufficient representation and redundancy of viable populations (Table 6), a criterion for life-history diversity in each viable population, and a simple criterion for spatial separation of populations (Table 1). However, we identified a critical lack of information on how the ESUs achieve resiliency to severe drought. In addition, the criteria for redundancy are based on a simple assessment of wildfire risk that is precautionary and perhaps inefficient. A performance-based estimate of wildfire risk would probably be more efficient, but at the cost of a significant research effort.

The recovery of these fish is surely a long-term process, but our work on this report suggests some near-term activities that can and should begin as soon as possible. These include:

**Identify and commit to a core set of populations on which to focus recovery efforts.** By “core” we mean populations used to meet the criteria proposed in this report—that is, selected to be the underpinnings of viability. The core set would be selected from the set of all populations composing the two ESUs, previously discussed at length by Boughton *et al.* (2006) and summarized here in Appendix B. The purpose of viability criteria is to provide an objective framework for setting priorities. They become irrelevant if all creeks or basins are given equal emphasis in a recovery plan, or if priorities are based mostly on the ease or popularity of certain recovery activities.

The strategy most likely to achieve recovery and lead to de-listing, in our view, would be to identify how recovery actions and monitoring of the core populations would address the popula-

tion and ESU viability criteria described in this paper. In general, population viability is more likely to be achieved by focusing on larger watersheds capable of sustaining larger populations, and ESU viability is more likely to be achieved by selecting the most widely-dispersed set of such core populations still capable of maintaining dispersal-connectivity (see Boughton *et al.* 2006). This is not to say that non-core populations are unimportant—Dispersal connectivity and genetic diversity may be aided by also including smaller “non-core” populations that serve as stepping stones for dispersal. However, the core populations are fundamental.

**Secure the extant parts of the inland populations.** Inland populations comprise the Interior Coast Range, Monte Arido Highlands, and Mojave Rim groups. The original inland populations were relatively few in number, large in spatial extent, and inhabited challenging environments. Due to low redundancy they are necessarily core populations in the sense described above. Unfortunately the inland populations are frequently the most highly impacted by dams, water diversions, and flood control practices, and our wildfire analysis suggests that they had marginal redundancy even before these impacts. Yet the populations of the Interior Coast Range and the Monte Arido Highlands (also the Carmel River) appear to have produced the largest run sizes in the study area during good water years (Boughton 2005).

The extant habitat of these populations—especially the anadromous waters of the Pajaro River, Arroyo Seco, the southern Salinas Valley, the Sisquoc River, the Santa Ynez River, the Ventura River and the Santa Clara River—merit high priority for immediate protection and recovery so that fish passage does not decline further (and should be improved whenever possible, though this is a longer-term effort). The low level of redundancy in the inland groups indicates that ongoing efforts to restore fish passage in the Ventura River are necessary steps to achieving ESU viability, as are future efforts to restore passage in the Santa Ynez River and the Nacimiento River, both of which have a large majority of their steelhead habitat isolated by complete barriers to passage

from the ocean. Also, additional efforts to restore passage in the Santa Clara River may be necessary to achieve ESU viability, depending on the number of steelhead that can be sustained by the currently accessible parts of the system.

The role of anadromy in the inland trout populations of the Mojave Rim is less clear; steelhead ascended these rivers in the past (see appendix in Boughton *et al.* 2006) but with what regularity and numbers is particularly unclear.

**Identify and maintain sustainable refugia against severe droughts and heat waves.** Large changes in the climate are expected by the end of the century and perhaps even mid-century (Hayhoe *et al.* 2004). A direct effect of climate forcing by greenhouse gasses is higher downwelling of infrared radiation, which would be expected to increase surface temperatures and evapotranspiration (Trenberth 1999), with complex, potentially negative effects on summer habitat of *O. mykiss*. Indirect effects include changes in precipitation and temperature patterns; and attendant changes to disturbance regimes, watershed condition, and stream hydrographs (*e.g.* Snyder *et al.* 2002, Bell *et al.* 2004, Maurer *et al.* 2006). Even a brief description of these effects is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is clear that recovery of steelhead populations will rely on identifying the ecosystem, geomorphological and geologic conditions expected to buffer habitat against the new climatic and hydrologic conditions. Then it will be necessary to adjust recovery efforts according to what has been learned.

**Begin collecting population data.** The Carmel River population and the Santa Ynez River populations are the only ones with ongoing efforts to monitor steelhead run size, and even these are only partial counts. Yet annual estimates of run size are the single most useful dataset for assessing progress toward recovery. In addition, such data would produce basin-specific estimates of environmental stochasticity, which would allow a more refined criterion for population size (as in Figure 3). It is difficult to imagine a scientifically-based recovery effort that does not involve a serious ongoing effort to monitor run-size in many if

not all of the core populations within each of the biogeographic population groups.

**Secure and improve lagoon habitat.** The work by Bond (2006) indicates that restoration activities in lagoon habitat are likely to produce disproportionate benefits for steelhead populations. However, the work of Bond (2006) and Smith (1990) were case studies in Santa Cruz County, and the robustness of their predictions for areas to the south has not yet been tested. The precautionary approach is to protect lagoons, and the lagoon anadromous life form, irregardless of the generality of Bond's (2006) findings, but it would also be useful to evaluate this assumption empirically.

Estuaries are under serious pressure from suburban development and declines in water quality. Smith (1990) provides a useful discussion of lagoon conditions correlating with high juvenile growth and survival, and concludes that two key elements are integrity of the sandbar barrier during the dry season, and sufficient inflow of freshwater from the stream system during the dry season. Another important problem occurs when the freshwater spawning habitat is distant from the lagoon, and the intervening fluvial corridor has become unsuitable for adult or juvenile migration due to watershed management practices. In addition, current climate trends predict a future of warmer oceans and melting glaciers and icecaps, all expected to raise mean sea levels, perhaps leading to the inundation and displacement of lagoons. Medium greenhouse-gas scenarios project a rise of 0.34m – 0.38m by the year 2100 (Raper and Braithwaite 2006).

**Decide on a strategic balance and timeline for investment in better information vs. investment in more recovery activities.** Some of the criteria we have proposed are subject to significant revision if quantitative data were obtained. The criteria for population size could be more efficient with basin-specific data on run-size variation and life-history plasticity; and the criterion for spawner density requires basic research. Each of these constitutes a significant research effort that may pose an opportunity cost on recovery activities, but that should also allow better planning

that makes recovery activities more effective and efficient. Interested parties should commit to a specific strategy for learning and doing.

Two related issues are that certain research questions require "take" of the fish, and that the anadromous fractions of many populations may currently be too small for tractable research. An example of the first issue: at this writing the only practical way to estimate life-history plasticity at broad scales is via otolith microchemistry (Zimmerman and Reeves 2000). This technique allows determination of the marine-vs-freshwater history of individual fish and their mothers, but requires lethal sampling of fish. Thus it constitutes take under the ESA but ultimately has useful application to recovery planning.

The second issue of small anadromous fractions indicates that for some populations, recovery efforts will probably need to be implemented, and run sizes improved somewhat, before some research efforts can have sufficient sample sizes to be conclusive. Of course, irregardless of how viability criteria might be adjusted in the future, it seems to us clear that run sizes must generally be larger than they are now, if the fish are to be recovered. We see no reason to delay proximal recovery activities because of scientific uncertainty about viability. The principal uncertainty is about how far recovery must ultimately go to achieve viability.

**Establish programs for ecosystem-based management of sediment regimes and hydrographic regimes.** Sediment regime is a simple term for a complex set of processes governing sediment transport and sorting in stream networks. These processes include the wildfire regime; mass wasting; and the winter flood regime with attendant fluvial transport processes. All these are important for maintaining a dynamic system of spawning gravels and summer pool habitat while preventing too large a buildup of fine sediments (*e.g.* May and Lee 2004). The hydrographic regime plays a role not just in fluvial transport of sediments, but also in maintaining migration connectivity for the steelhead, and in modulating the quality of oversummering habitat in the tributaries and the lagoons. The sediment and hydrographic regimes of many basins have

been fundamentally altered by human activities in the region, and are likely to undergo further fundamental changes, both in direct response to future climate change and urban development, and as an indirect responses to both these causes via their effect on the wildfire regime. This is a complex topic beyond the scope of this report, but it is clear that the management of sediment and hydrologic regimes is not amenable to short-term or site-based solutions.

—x—

Throughout the world, *O. mykiss* have thrived when introduced to stream systems having suitable temperatures and hydrographs exhibiting winter flooding and summer low-flows (Fausch *et al.* 2001). This fact suggests to us that steelhead populations of the south-central and southern California coast should have excellent prospects for recovery, if given the appropriate recovery effort. Provided that the regional climate does not warm so much that it becomes prohibitive to the species, we believe that recovery of steelhead in these two ESUs is highly feasible from a biological point of view.

## Literature Cited

- Allendorf, F.W., D. Bayles, D.L. Bottom, K.P. Currens, C.A. Frissell, D. Hankin, J.A. Lichatowich, W. Nehlsen, P.C. Trotter, and T.H. Williams. 1997. Prioritizing Pacific salmon stocks for conservation. *Conservation Biology* 11: 140 – 152.
- Armstrup, S.C, T.L. McDonald, and B.F.J. Manly. 2005. *Handbook of capture-recapture analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
- Beissinger, S.R. and M.I. Westphal. 1998. On the use of demographic models of population viability analysis in endangered species management. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62: 821 – 841.
- Bell, J.L., L.C. Sloan and M.A. Snyder. 2004. Regional changes in extreme climatic events: A future climate scenario. *Journal of Climate* 17: 81 – 87.
- Bilby, R., P.A. Bisson, C.C. Coutant, J. Epifanio, D. Goodman, S. Hanna, N. Huntly, E.J. Loudenslager, L. McDonald, D.P. Philipp, B. Riddell, B. Ward, R.R. Whitney, and R. Williams. 2005. Monitoring and evaluation of supplementation projects. Council, Columbia River Basin Indian Tribes and the National Marine Fisheries Service ISAB 2005-15. Available from <http://www.nwcouncil.org>.
- Bisson, P.A., J.L. Nielsen, and J.W. Ward. 1988. Summer production of coho salmon stocked in Mount St. Helens streams 3-6 years after the 1980 eruption. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 117:322-335.
- Bond, M.H. 2006. *Importance of estuarine rearing to central California steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) growth and marine survival*. M.A. Thesis, University of California Santa Cruz.
- Borchers, D.L., S.T. Buckland and W. Zucchini. 2002. *Estimating animal abundance: closed populations*. Springer.
- Boughton, D.A. 2005. Southern California steelhead. Pp. 277- 287 in T.P. Good, R.S. Waples and P. Adams [eds]. Updated status of Federally listed ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-66*.



- Boughton, D.A., H. Fish, K. Pipal, J. Goin, F. Watson, J. Casagrande, J. Casagrande and M. Stoecker. 2005. Contraction of the southern range limit for anadromous *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-380*.
- Boughton, D.A. and M. Goslin. 2006. Potential steelhead overwintering habitat in the south-central/southern California coast recovery domain: maps based on the envelope method. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-391*.
- Boughton, D.A., P.B. Adams, E. Anderson, C. Fusaro, E.A. Keller, E. Kelley, L. Lentsch, J. Nielsen, K. Perry, H. Regan, J. Smith, C. Swift, L. Thompson, and F. Watson. 2006. Steelhead of the south-central/southern California coast: Population characterization for recovery planning. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC*.
- Bradford, M. J., R. A. Myers, and J. R. Irvine. 2000. Reference points for coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) harvest rates and escapement goals based on freshwater production. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 57: 677 – 686.
- Brown, D.K., A.A. Echelle, D.L. Propst, J.E. Brooks, and W.L. Fisher. 2001. Catastrophic wildfire and number of populations as factors influencing risk of extinction for Gila trout (*Oncorhynchus gilae*). *Western North American Naturalist* 61: 139 – 148.
- Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham and J.L. Laake. 1993. *Distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Burgman, M.A., S. Ferson and H.R. Akcakaya. 1993. *Risk assessment in conservation biology*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Busby, P.J., T.C. Wainwright, G.J. Bryant, L. Lierheimer, R.S. Waples, F.W. Waknitz, and I. V. Lagomarsino. 1996. Status review of west coast steelhead from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-27*, 261p.
- Cook, E.R., C.A. Woodhouse, C.M. Eakin, D.M. Meko, and D.W. Stahle. 2004. Long-term aridity changes in the western United States. *Science* 306: 1015 – 1018.
- Den Boer, P.J. 1968. Spreading of risk and stabilization of animal numbers. *Acta Biotheoretica* 18:165–194.
- Dennis, B., P.L. Munholland, and J.M. Scott. 1991. Estimation of growth and extinction parameters for endangered species. *Ecological Monographs* 61: 261 – 281.
- Dennis, B., J.M. Ponciano, S.R. Lele, M.L. Taper and D.F. Staples. 2006. Estimating density dependence, process noise, and observation error. *Ecological Monographs* 76: 323 – 341.
- Engblom, S.B. 2004. Testimony of Scott B. Engblom, Project Fisheries Biologist, Cachuma Conservation Release Board and Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, Improvement District #1. Prepared for: State Water Resources Control Board, Cachuma Project Hearing – Applications 11331 and 11332.
- Fausch, K.D., Y. Taniguchi, S. Nakano, G.D. Grossman and C.R. Townsend. 2001. Flood disturbance regimes influence rainbow trout invasion success among five holarctic regions. *Ecological Applications* 11: 1438–1455
- Foley, P. 1994. Predicting extinction times from environmental stochasticity and carrying capacity. *Conservation Biology* 8(1): 124 – 137.
- Foley, P. 1997. Extinction models for local populations. Pp. 215 – 246 in I.A. Hanski and M.E. Gilpin [eds], *Metapopulation biology: ecology, genetics, and evolution*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Ford, M.J. 2002. Selection in captivity during supportive breeding may reduce fitness in the wild. *Conservation Biology* 16: 815 – 825.
- Foster, K.R., P. Vecchia and M.H. Repacholi. 2000. Risk management: science and the precautionary principle. *Science* 288: 979 – 981.
- Gardenfors, U., C. Hilton-Taylor, G.M. Mace, & J.P. Rodriguez. 2001. The application of IUCN Red List Criteria at regional levels. *Conservation Biology* 15:1206–1212.
- Girman, D. and J.C. Garza. 2006. *Population structure and ancestry of O. mykiss populations in South-Central California based on genetic analysis of microsatellite data*. Final Report for California Department of Fish and Game Project No.

- P0350021 and Pacific States Marine Fisheries Contract No. AWIP-S-1, September 2006.
- Goodman, D. 2005. Selection equilibrium for hatchery and wild spawning fitness in integrated breeding programs. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 62: 374 – 389.
- Gordon, B.L. 1996. *Monterey Bay Area: Natural history and cultural imprints*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Boxwood Press, Pacific Grove.
- Gumprecht, B. 1999. *The Los Angeles River: Its life, death, and possible rebirth*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Hanski, I.A. 1991. Single-species metapopulation dynamics: concepts, models and observations. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 42: 17-38.
- Hanski, I.A. and M.E. Gilpin [eds]. 1997. *Metapopulation biology; ecology, genetics, and evolution*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Hare, S.R., N.J. Mantua, and R.C. Francis. 1999. Inverse production regimes: Alaska and West Coast Pacific salmon. *Fisheries* 24(1): 6 – 14.
- Harwood, J. 2000. Risk assessment and decision analysis in conservation. *Biological Conservation* 95: 219 – 226.
- Harwood, J. and K. Stokes. 2003. Coping with uncertainty in ecological advice: lessons from fisheries. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 18(12): 617 – 622.
- Haston, L. and J. Michaelsen. 1997. Spatial and temporal variability of southern California precipitation over the last 400 yr and relationships to atmospheric circulation patterns. *Journal of Climate* 10: 1836 – 1852.
- Hayes, S.A., M.H. Bond, C.V. Hanson, and R.B. MacFarlane. 2004. Interactions between endangered wild and hatchery salmonids: can the pitfalls of artificial propagation be avoided in small coastal streams? *Journal of Fish Biology* 65(supp. A):101-121.
- Hayhoe, K., D. Cayan, C.B. Field, P.C. Frumhoff, E.P. Maurer, N.L. Miller, S.C. Moser, S.H. Schneider, K.N. Cahill, E.E. Cleland, L. Dale, R. Drapek, R.M. Hanemann, L.S. Kalkstein, J. Lenihan, C.K. Lunch, R.P. Neilson, S.C. Sheridan, and J.H. Verville. 2004. Emissions pathways, climate change, and impacts on California. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 101: 12422 – 12427.
- Hilborn, R., T.P. Quinn, D.E. Schindler, and D.E. Rogers. 2003. Biocomplexity and fisheries sustainability. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 100: 6564 – 6568.
- Holmes, E.E. 2001. Estimating risks in declining populations with poor data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 98(9): 5072 – 5077.
- IUCN. 1994. *Red List Categories*. International Union for the Conservation of Nature.
- Jones, R.P. and E.O. Salo. 1986. Status of anadromous fish habitat in the north and south fork Toutle River Watersheds, Mount St. Helens, Washington, 1984. Fisheries Research Institute, University of Washington. *Report FRI-UW-8601*. Seattle, WA.
- Keeley, J.E., C.J. Fotheringham, and M. Morais. 1999. Reexamining fire suppression impacts on brushland fire regimes. *Science* 284: 1829 – 1832.
- Keller, E.A., D.W. Valentine and D.R. Gibbs. 1997. Hydrological response of small watershed following the southern California Painted Cave fire of June 1990. *Hydrological Processes* 11: 401 – 414.
- Koslow, J., A. Hobday and G. Boehlert. 2002. Climate variability and marine survival of coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) in the Oregon Production Area. *Fisheries Oceanography* 11: 65 – 77.
- Lande, R. 1993. Risks of population extinction from demographic and environmental stochasticity and random catastrophes. *American Naturalist* 142: 911 – 927.
- Lande, R. 1995. Mutation and conservation. *Conservation Biology* 9:782–791.
- Lehodey, P., J. Alheit, M. Barange, T. Baumbartner, G. Beaugrand, K. Drinkwater, J.-M. Fromentin, S.R. Hare, G. Ottersen, R.I. Perry, C. Roy, C.D. van der Lingen, and F. Werner. 2006. Climate variability, fish, and fisheries. *Journal of Climate* 19: 5009 – 5030.
- Lindley, S.T. 2003. Estimation of population growth and extinction parameters from noisy data. *Ecological Applications* 13: 806 – 813.
- Lindley, S.T., and M.H. Mohr. 2003. Predicting the impact of striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) population manipulations on the persistence of win-

- ter-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). *Fisheries Bulletin* 101: 321 – 331.
- Lindley, S.T., R.S. Schick, E. Mora, P.B. Adams, J.J. Anderson, S. Greene, C. Hanson, B.P. May, D. McEwan, R.B. MacFarlane, C. Swanson and J.G. Williams. In press. Viability of threatened and endangered Chinook salmon and steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin basin. *San Francisco Estuary and Watershed Science*.
- Logerwell, E.A., N. Mantua, P.W. Lawson, R.C. Francis and V.N. Agostini. 2003. Tracking environmental processes in the coastal zone for understanding and predicting Oregon coho (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) marine survival. *Fisheries Oceanography* 12(6): 554 – 568.
- Mace, G.M. and R. Lande. 1991. Assessing extinction threats: toward a reevaluation of IUCN threatened species categories. *Conservation Biology* 5: 148 – 157.
- Mantua, N.J., S.R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J.M. Wallace, and R.C. Francis. 1997. A Pacific interdecadal climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 78: 1069-1079.
- Mantua, N.J. and S.R. Hare. 2002. The Pacific decadal oscillation. *Journal of Oceanography* 58: 35 – 44.
- Maurer, E.P., S. Gibbard and P.B. Duffy. 2006. Amplification of streamflow impacts of El Niño by increased atmospheric greenhouse gases. *Geophysical Research Letters* 33: L02707. doi:10.1029/2005GL025100.
- May, C.L. and D.C. Lee. 2004. The relationships among in-channel sediment storage, pool depth, and summer survival of juvenile salmonids in Oregon Coast Range streams. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 24: 761 – 774.
- McClure, M. M., E.E. Holmes, B.L. Sanderson, and C.E. Jordan. 2003. A large-scale, multispecies status assessment: anadromous salmonids in the Columbia River basin. *Ecological Applications* 13(4): 964 – 989.
- McElhany, P., M.H. Ruckelshaus, M.J. Ford, T.C. Wainwright, and E.P. Bjorkstedt. 2000. Viable salmonid populations and the recovery of evolutionarily significant units. *NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-42*.
- Moritz, M.A. 1997. Analyzing extreme disturbance events: fire in Los Padres National Forest. *Ecological Applications* 7: 1252 – 1262.
- Mueter, F.J., R.M. Peterman, and B.J. Pyper. 2002. Opposite effects of ocean temperature on survival rates of 120 stocks of Pacific salmon (*Oncorhynchus spp.*) in northern and southern areas. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 59: 456 – 463.
- Myers, J., C. Busack, D. Rawding, and A. Marshall. 2003. Historical population structure of Willamette and Lower Columbia River Basin Pacific salmonids. *WLC-TRT Report, NOAA Fisheries NW Fisheries Science Center*. Seattle, WA.
- Nickum, M., P. Mazik, J. Nickum, and D. MacKinlay [eds]. 2004. *Propagated Fish in Resource Management*. Symposium 44, American Fisheries Society.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1996. *Factors for decline. A supplement to the Notice of Determination for West Coast Steelhead under the Endangered Species Act*. NMFS, Protected Species Branch, 525 NE Oregon St. – Suite 500, Portland Oregon 97232 and NMFS, Protected Species Management Division, 501 West Ocean Blvd., Suite 4200, Long Beach, California 90802.
- Peterson, W.T. and F.B. Schwing. 2003. A new climate regime in northeast Pacific ecosystems. *Geophysical Research Letters* 30(17): 1896, doi:10.1029/2003GL017528.
- Punt, A.E. and R. Hilborn. 1997. Fisheries stock assessment and decision analysis: the Bayesian approach. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 7: 35 – 63.
- Quinn, T.P. 2005. The behavior and ecology of Pacific salmon & trout. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda.
- Raper, S.C.B. and R.J. Braithwaite. 2006. Low sea level rise projections from mountain glaciers and icecaps under global warming. *Nature* 439: 311 – 313.
- Rinne, J.N. 1996. Short-term effects of wildfire on fishes and aquatic macroinvertebrates in the southwestern United States. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16: 653 – 658.
- Ruckelshaus, M.H., K. Currens, R. Furstenberg, W. Graeber, K. Rawson, N. Sands, and J. Scott. 2002. Planning ranges and preliminary guide-

- lines for the delisting and recovery of the Puget Sound Chinook salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit. NOAA Fisheries, NW Fisheries Science Center. Seattle, WA.
- Scholze, M., W. Knorr, N.W. Arnell and I.C. Prentice. 2006. A climate-change risk analysis for world ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103 (35): 13116-13120.
- SELS [Stanford Environmental Law Society]. 2001. *The Endangered Species Act*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Shapovalov, L. 1944. Preliminary report on the fisheries of the Santa Maria River system, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Ventura counties, California. *California Department of Fish and Game, Inland Fisheries Administrative Report No. 44-15*. 11 pp.
- Smith, J.J. 1990. *The effects of sandbar formation and inflows on aquatic habitat and fish utilization in Pescadero, San Gregorio, Waddell and Pomponio Creek Estuary/Lagoon systems, 1985 – 1989*. Report prepared under interagency agreement 84-04-324, between Trustees for California State University and the California Department of Parks and Recreation.
- Snyder, M.A., J.L. Bell and L.C. Sloan. 2002. Climate responses to a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide for a climatically vulnerable region. *Geophysical Research Letters* 29(11): 10.1029/2001GL014431.
- Sogard, S. M. 1997. Size-selective mortality in the juvenile stage of teleost fishes: A review. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 60(3): 1129 – 1157.
- Soulé, M.E. Introduction. 1987. Pp. 1 – 11 in M.E. Soulé [ed.], *Viable populations for conservation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Swift, C.C., T.R. Haglund, M. Ruiz, and R.N. Fisher. 1993. The status and distribution of the freshwater fishes of southern California. *Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences* 92: 101 – 167.
- Thompson, W.L., G.C. White and C. Gowan. 1998. *Monitoring vertebrate populations*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Thrower, F.P., J.J. Hard, and J.E. Joyce. 2004. Genetic architecture of growth and early life-history transitions in anadromous and derived freshwater populations of steelhead. *Journal of Fish Biology* 65 (Supp. A): 286 – 307.
- Titus, R.G., D.C. Erman and W.M. Snider. 2003. *History and status of steelhead in California coastal drainages south of San Francisco Bay*. Manuscript dated 19 Feb. 2003, available from the authors.
- Trenberth, K.E. 1999. Conceptual framework for changes of extremes of the hydrological cycle with climate change. *Climatic Change* 42: 327 – 339.
- Wang, G. and D. Schimel. 2003. Climate change, climate modes, and climate impacts. *Annual Review of Environmental Resources* 28:1 – 28.
- Waples, R.S. 1991. Pacific salmon, *Oncorhynchus spp.*, and the definition of “species” under the Endangered Species Act. *Marine Fisheries Review* 53(3): 11 – 21.
- Waples, R.S. 1995. Evolutionarily significant units and the conservation of biological diversity under the Endangered Species Act. Evolution and the aquatic ecosystem: Defining unique units in population conservation. *American Fisheries Society Symposium* 17: 8 – 27.
- Ward, B.R., P.A. Slaney, A.R. Facchin, and R. W. Land. 1989. Size-biased survival in steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*): Back-calculated lengths from adults’ scales compared to migrating smolts at the Keogh River, British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 46: 1853 – 1858.
- Westerling, A.L., H.G. Hidalgo, D.R. Cayan and T.W. Swetnam. 2006. Warming and earlier spring increase western U.S. forest wildfire activity. *Science* 313: 940 – 943.
- Williams, B.K., J.D. Nichols, and M.J. Conroy. 2002. *Analysis and management of animal populations*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Wright, S. 1931. Evolution in Mendelian populations. *Genetics* 16:97–159.
- Zimmerman, C.E. and G.H. Reeves. 2000. Population structure of sympatric anadromous and nonanadromous *Oncorhynchus mykiss*: evidences from spawning surveys and otolith microchemistry. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 57: 2152 – 2162.

## Appendix A

### Derivation of the prescriptive size criterion

**The extinction model.**—Foley (1994) and Lande (1993) discuss an extinction model in which population growth is treated as a diffusion process, capped by a reflecting boundary representing carrying capacity. Specifically, the model assumes that between  $N = 1$  and  $N = K$ , the population changes according to

$$\begin{aligned} n_{t+1} &= r_t + n_t, \text{ where} \\ n_t &= \ln(N_t) \text{ and} \\ r_t &\sim \mathbf{N}(r, V_r) \text{ (}\mathbf{N} = \text{normal distribution)} \end{aligned}$$

The interpretation of the parameters is as follows:  $r$  is the expected change in  $n_t$  (*i.e.* the mean population growth rate, log-transformed) and  $V_r$  is the variance of random variation in  $r_t$  (*i.e.* environmental stochasticity) (Foley 1994). When population size  $N_t = K$ , the population trajectory is reflected, interpreted as carrying capacity  $K$  acting like a ceiling on population size. At  $\ln(N_t) = n_t = 0$  the population is considered extinct.

The expected time to extinction of this system is

$$\text{Eq. 1} \quad T_e(n_o) = \frac{1}{2sr} [e^{2sk} (1 - e^{-2sn_o}) - 2sn_o],$$

in which  $n_o$  is the initial population size,  $k$  is  $\ln(K)$ , and  $s = r/V_r$  (Foley 1994, equation 8). For the purpose of deriving a viability criterion, the pertinent risk is for a population currently in its “restored” state, at or near carrying capacity ( $n_o \approx k$ ).

In order to achieve a 95% assurance that a population will persist 100 yrs, one must achieve a  $T_e$  considerably larger than 100 yrs. Specifically, the target must be

$$\text{Eq. 2} \quad T_e \approx \frac{100 \text{ yr}}{-\ln(p_{crit})}$$

where  $p_{crit}$  would be 0.95 for the risk tolerance given above (Foley 1994, equation 11). Given values of  $r$  and  $V_r$ , and solving for a  $T_e$  that meets the specified risk tolerance, provides an estimate of the minimum carrying capacity that has an acceptably low risk.

However, carrying capacity is difficult to measure and therefore not a useful risk criterion. A better type of criterion is the expected popula-

tion size, which will be some amount smaller than  $K$  due to fluctuations. The equation for expected population size is

$$\text{Eq. 3} \quad E[N] = \frac{e^{2sk} \left[ k - \frac{1}{2s} \right] - \frac{1}{2s} - sk^2}{e^{2sk} - 2sk - 1}$$

as reported by Foley (1994), equation A22. To develop a criterion in terms of  $E[N]$ , it is necessary to derive standards for  $V_r$ ,  $r$ , and  $p_{crit}$  that jointly meet the 95% assurance criterion, and then use them to solve Eq. 1 through Eq. 3.

**A standard for  $r$ .**—The assumed value for  $r$  should reflect mean growth rate in habitat with good or moderately good quality. The only relevant data we have—steelhead counts from San Clemente Dam on the Carmel River—are somewhat problematic for several reasons: 1) the population appears to have leveled off in recent years, suggesting density dependence (which would violate assumptions for calculating  $r$ ); 2) earlier counts may reflect not just population growth but redistribution of adults from below the dam to above the dam; and 3) statistical estimates for  $r$  have wide confidence limits that include population decline, even though the population was clearly growing during the time period.

Specifically, the 95% confidence interval for the estimator  $r = \ln(N_{t+1}/N_t)$  is  $\{-0.20, 0.49\}$  for counts during the years 1992–2004. In percent terms this translates to somewhere between -18% and +63% growth per year. This range of plausible values is so uncertain statistically, and of such doubtful biological validity that it is not useful.

We are left to speculate about a cautiously optimistic standard for  $r$  in habitat of moderately good quality. We suggest the following standard: 10% per year (= 33% per generation if 3-yr generation time is assumed). Thus the standard for  $r = \ln[1 + 0.10] = 0.0953$ .

**A standard for  $V_r$ .**—We have no data on typical values of  $V_r$  in the steelhead populations of our study area. However, S. Lindley (personal communication) has produced estimates of  $V_r$  for 20 salmonid populations in the Central Valley,

Table 7. Estimates of  $V_r$  for 20 salmonid populations from the Central Valley<sup>1</sup>

Population	sqrt( $V_r$ ) {90% c.i.}
Sac. R. winter chinook	0.212 {0.126, 0.344}
Sac. R. spring chinook	0.312 {0.268, 0.354}
Feather R. spring chinook	0.142 {0.100, 0.194}
Butte Cr. spring chinook	0.388 {0.256, 0.588}
Deer Cr. spring chinook	0.192 {0.114, 0.291}
Mill Cr. spring chinook	0.267 {0.141, 0.455}
Sac. R. fall chinook	0.116 {0.087, 0.140}
Sac. R. late fall chinook	0.132 {0.084, 0.214}
Battle Cr. fall chinook	0.170 {0.125, 0.233}
Mill Cr. fall chinook	0.248 {0.153, 0.388}
Deer Cr. fall chinook	0.180 {0.104, 0.319}
Feather R. fall chinook	0.065 {0.032, 0.114}
Yuba R. fall chinook	0.128 {0.086, 0.180}
American R. fall chinook	0.135 {0.087, 0.208}
San Joaquin fall chinook	0.399 {0.331, 0.463}
Mokelumne R. fall chinook	0.383 {0.321, 0.431}
Stanislaus R. fall chinook	0.576 {0.480, 0.656}
Tuolumne R. fall chinook	0.542 {0.404, 0.703}
Merced R. fall chinook	0.418 {0.327, 0.520}
Sac. R. steelhead	0.102 {0.062, 0.174}

<sup>1</sup> Source: S.T. Lindley, NOAA Fisheries. Estimates generated using the state-space method of Lindley (2003)

reproduced above in Table 7. These estimates—mostly from chinook populations—result from a random-walk-with-drift model that was fit to various datasets using a state-space technique described by Lindley (2003) (see also Lindley and Mohr 2003). These estimates for  $V_r$  range over nearly an order of magnitude, from 0.065 to 0.576.

A standard can be derived from these data if the following assumptions are true:

- 1) Each salmonid population can be considered to have a  $V_r$  randomly drawn from an underlying distribution that describes all the populations in the Central Valley (sometimes called a “hyper-distribution” of the parameter  $V_r$ ).

- 2) The steelhead populations in our study area are described by the same distribution.

It then follows that a standard can be derived by estimating the parameters of the distribution (in our case, the gamma), defining a critical value ( $p_{crit}$ ) consistent with the overall risk tolerance, and calculating the corresponding critical value of  $V_r$ .

**Calculations.**—There are two critical p-values: one for the extinction model (Eq. 2) and one for the hyper-distribution of  $V_r$  (above). Since the product of these two p-values must be at least 0.95, it is convenient to set each at

$$p_{crit} = \sqrt{0.95} = 0.9747.$$

A gamma distribution fit to the point estimates of  $V_r$  (from Table 7) has parameter estimates of alpha (shape) = 3.1571455, and beta (scale) = 0.08088002. The critical value for  $V_r$  at  $p_{crit} = 0.9747$  is approximately 0.603.

Likewise, according to Eq. 2 the critical value for  $T_e$  at  $p_{crit} = 0.9747$  is

$$T_e \approx \frac{100yr}{-\ln(0.9747)} = 3902 yr.$$

To get the final size criterion, substitute the standards for  $V_r$ ,  $r$ , and  $p_{crit}$  into Eq. 1 and solve for  $k$ ; then substitute  $V_r$ ,  $r$ , and  $k$  into Eq. 3 and solve for  $E[N]$ . The result is  $E[N] = 4154$  spawners per year. Assuming that the generation time for steelhead is 3 yr (*i.e.* the mean age at spawning is 3 yr), a tolerably low risk would be obtained by a mean population size of  $3 \times 4154$ , which suggests the following criterion:

$$N \geq 12,500 \text{ spawners per generation}$$

It should be noted that slightly different assumptions about the parameters  $V_r$  and  $r$  could yield a vastly more stringent, or less stringent, criterion than the one given here (see Figure 2).

## Appendix B

### Composition of biogeographic population groups.

Names of populations from Boughton *et al.* (2006); names of groups from Table 5 and Figure 5.

Biogeographic Group	Member Populations (ordered north to south)
Interior Coast Range	Pajaro River, Gabilan Creek, Arroyo Seco, Southwest Salinas Basin.
Carmel Basin	Carmel River.
Big Sur Coast <sup>1</sup>	San Jose Creek, Malpaso Creek, Garrapata Creek, Rocky Creek, Bixby Creek, Little Sur River, Big Sur River, Partington Creek, Big Creek, Vicente Creek, Limekiln Creek, Mill Creek, Prewitt Creek, Plaskett Creek, Willow Creek (Monterey Co.), Alder Creek, Villa Creek (Monterey Co.), Salmon Creek.
San Luis Obispo Terrace	San Carpofofo Creek, Arroyo de la Cruz, Little Pico Creek, Pico Creek, San Simeon Creek, Santa Rosa Creek, Villa Creek (SLO Co.), Cayucos Creek, Old Creek, Toro Creek, Morro Creek, Chorro Creek, Los Osos Creek, Islay Creek, Coon Creek, Diablo Canyon, San Luis Obispo Creek, Pismo Creek, Arroyo Grande Creek.
Monte Arido Highlands	Santa Maria River, Santa Ynez River, Ventura River, Santa Clara River.
Conception Coast <sup>1</sup>	Jalama Creek, Canada de Santa Anita, Canada de la Gaviota, Canada San Onofre, Arroyo Hondo, Arroyo Quemado, Tajiguas Creek, Canada del Refugio, Canada del Venadito, Canada del Corral, Canada del Capitan, Gato Canyon, Dos Pueblos Canyon, Eagle Canyon, Tecolote Canyon, Bell Canyon, Goleta Slough Complex, Arroyo Burro, Mission Creek, Montecito Creek, Oak Creek, San Ysidro Creek, Romero Creek, Arroyo Paredon, Carpinteria Salt Marsh Complex, Carpinteria Creek, Rincon Creek.
Santa Monica Mtns <sup>1</sup>	Big Sycamore Canyon, Arroyo Sequit, Malibu Creek, Topanga Canyon.
Mojave Rim	Los Angeles River, San Gabriel River, Santa Ana River (multiple subpopulations).
Santa Catalina Gulf Coast	San Juan Creek, San Mateo Creek, San Onofre Creek, Santa Margarita River, San Luis Rey River, San Diego River, Sweetwater River, Otay River, Tijuana River.

<sup>1</sup> Population delineation in these groups may be split too finely if there is significant dispersal of fish among neighboring coastal basins. For more discussion see Boughton *et al.* (2006).





## RECENT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUMS

Copies of this and other NOAA Technical Memorandums are available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22167. Paper copies vary in price. Microfiche copies cost \$9.00. Recent issues of NOAA Technical Memorandums from the NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center are listed below:

- NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-397 AMLR 2005/2006 field season report: Objectives, Accomplishments, and Tentative Conclusions.  
J.D. LIPSKY, Editor  
(December 2006)
- 398 U.S. Pacific marine mammal stock assessments: 2006.  
J.V. CARRETTA, K.A. FORNEY, M.M. MUTO, J. BARLOW,  
J. BAKER, B. HANSON, and M.S. LOWRY  
(January 2007)
- 399 Monitoring and research needed to manage the recovery of threatened and endangered Chinook and steelhead in the Sacramento-San Joaquin basin.  
J.G. WILLIAMS, J.J. ANDERSON, S. GREENE, C. HANSON,  
S.T. LINDLEY, A. LOW, B.P. MAY, D. McEWAN, M.S. MOHR,  
R.B. MacFARLANE, and S. SWANSON  
(February 2007)
- 400 Extraction of DNA from formalin-fixed cetacean tissues.  
K.M. ROBERTSON, C.A. LeDUC, R.G. LeDUC, and P.A. MORIN  
(February 2007)
- 401 Spawning biomass of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) off U.S. and Canada in 2006.  
N.C.H. LO, B.J. MACEWICZ, D.A. GRIFFITH, and R.L. CHARTER  
(February 2007)
- 402 Data sources: California habitat restoration project cost analysis.  
K.K. HILDNER  
(April 2007)
- 403 Using the California habitat restoration project database to estimate habitat restoration costs for ESA-listed salmonids.  
K.K. HILDNER and C.J. THOMSON  
(April 2007)
- 404 Salmon habitat restoration cost modeling: Results and lessons learned.  
K.K. HILDNER and C.J. THOMSON  
(April 2007)
- 405 Stock assessment model for the shortbelly rockfish, *Sebastes jordani*, in the California current.  
J.C. FIELD, E.J. DICK, and A. MacCALL  
(April 2007)
- 406 Preliminary estimates of cetacean abundance along the U.S. West Coast and within four National Marine Sanctuaries during 2005.  
K.A. FORNEY  
(June 2007)