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## Salmon, trout, burbot



Rainbow smelt


Deepwater sculpin, slimy sculpin, round goby


Bloater


Ninespine stickleback

"Prey fishes"

## Bottom-up regulation?

## Salmon/trout



> Phytoplankton :ife

Phosphorus


## Since the 1980s, "prey" fishes have trended downward (except W. Erie)



## Since 1985-1990 in Lake Michigan- all groups of fish have declined



- Sport fish supplemented by stocking or migrants
- Commercial fishery faced closures/restrictions
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Alewife crash on Lake Michigan raises concerns for salmon fishing


A Sept． 23 survey conducted off Port Washington that swept across nine sections of lakebed yielded a total of 18 alewives．A few of those sweeps netted no alewives at all．
By Dan Egan of the Journal Sentinel
3 Tweet 42 Share $\quad 746$ G＋1 1
Aboard R／V Arcticus－A decade after an alewife collapse on Lake Huro that has dramatically reduced that lake＇s salmon fishing，a similar alewife crash appears to be underway on Lake Michigan．

The results of the federal government＇s annual trawling survey of the Lake Michigan bottom conducted throughout September revealed a shockingly low number of alewives，which are an Atlantic Ocean native that invaded the Great Lakes in the middle of the last century．
The survey，which involves dragging a 40 －foot－wide net across the lake bottom off seven different ports on Lake Michigan，from Michigan＇s Upper Peninsula down to Waukegan，Ill．，just south of the Wisconsin state line， has been going on every year since 1973 ．

Fisheries in the news：
Are alewife collapsing in Lake Michigan？

## Detroit Jree 年ress



## Trying to avoid 2003-2004 in Lake Huron



Jim Johnson, Michigan DNR USGS bottom trawl data

## Trying to avoid 2003-2004 in Lake Huron



## 2013-current: 50\% stocking reduction in Chinook salmon



For Immediate Release
August 27, 2012

## PROPOSED SALMON STOCKING REDUCTIONS ANNOUNCED FOR LAKE MICHIGAN

ANN ARBOR, MI-Following more than a year of consultation with angler groups and other stakeholders, the Lake Michigan Committee (LMC) has proposed a new management strategy for Lake Michigan salmon. Beginning in spring of 2013, the LMC recommends that Chinook salmon stocking in Lake Michigan be reduced to one-half of current stocking levels. With salmon egg collections to begin in September, 2012, fisheries management agencies are now developing plans to decrease fingerling production targets to levels supporting reduced stocking, for a minimum of three years. The LMC comprises representatives from each of the state fisheries management agencies in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and the Chippewa Ottawa Resource Authority (CORA). The Great Lakes Fishery Commission (GLFC) facilitates the committee's activities.
$\checkmark$ Wild fish > stocked fish.
$\checkmark$ Alewife were nearing record-low levels.

## Today's talk:

1. Ecosystem-level trends across the Great Lakes
2. Effects of lower trophic level changes on fishes.
3. Impacts of climate change
\& Assemble trends across trophic levels"report card".
\& Commonalities across lakes?
\& "Bottom-up" vs. "topdown" regulation?
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## Summary of Lake Michigan trends (since 1998)

|  | Positive | No trend | Negative |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Phosphorus inputs |  |  |  |
| Phosphorus in lake |  |  |  |
| Water clarity |  |  |  |
| Phytoplankton |  |  |  |
| Zooplankton |  |  |  |
| Native benthic invert. |  |  |  |
| Dreissenid mussels |  |  |  |
| Prey fish biomass |  |  |  |
| Piscivore biomass |  |  |  |
| Piscivore stocked |  |  |  |

## Summary of Lake Michigan trends (since 1998)

|  | Positive | No trend | Negative |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phosphorus inputs |  | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |
| Phosphorus in lake |  |  | X |
| Water clarity | X |  |  |
| Phytoplankton |  |  | X |
| Zooplankton |  | X |  |
| Native benthic invert. |  |  | X |
| Dreissenid mussels | X |  |  |
| Prey fish biomass |  |  | X |
| Piscivore biomass | X |  |  |
| Piscivore stocked |  | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |

## Common trends across three or more lakes

|  | Positive | No trend | Negative |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phosphorus inputs |  |  |  |
| Phosphorus in lake |  |  |  |
| Water clarity (3) | X |  |  |
| Phytoplankton (3) |  |  | X |
| Zooplankton |  |  |  |
| Native benthic invert. (3) |  |  | X |
| Dreissenid mussels |  |  |  |
| Prey fish biomass (3) |  |  | X |
| Piscivore biomass |  |  |  |
| Piscivore stocked |  |  |  |

## TOP-DOWN

## Salmon/trout

Prey fish

## Zooplankton/ Benthic inv.

## Phytoplankton

Phosphorus

## BOTTOM-UP

## Salmon/trout

## Prey fish

## Zooplankton/ Benthic inv.

## Phytoplankton

Phosphorus

Bottom-up


## Top-down



## Bottom-up control of phytoplankton

 (Lake Michigan)

## Top-down control of phytoplankton

 (Lake Michigan)

## Bottom-up control of zooplankton (Lake Michigan)



No significant pattern between ZP and prey fish


## Bottom-up effect of benthos on prey fish (Lake Michigan)



Native benthic invert. (ranking)

## Top-down effect of salmon/trout on prey fish

 (Lake Michigan)

## Both drivers influence the Lake Michigan food web

|  | Bottom-up | Top-down |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Phytoplankton | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}^{*}$ |
| Zooplankton | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |
| Prey fish | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ |

Primary producers and secondary consumers are being squeezed in both directions...

## Common trophic interactions across lakes

|  | Superior | Huron | Michigan | Western <br> Erie | Central <br> Erie | Ontario |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phytoplankton |  |  | $\mathbf{B , T}$ |  |  |  |
| Zooplankton |  |  | $\mathbf{B}$ |  |  |  |
| Prey fish |  |  | $\mathbf{B , T}$ |  |  |  |
| Piscivores |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{B}=\text { Bottom-up } \\
& \mathrm{T}=\text { Top-down }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Common trophic interactions across lakes

|  | Superior | Huron | Michigan | Western <br> Erie | Central <br> Erie | Ontario |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phytoplankton |  | $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}^{*}$ | $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| Zooplankton |  | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ |  |  |  |
| Prey fish | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{T}$ |  |  |  |
| Piscivores |  | $\mathbf{B}$ |  | $\mathbf{B}$ |  | $\mathbf{B}$ |

B = Bottom-up
T = Top-down
Suggests pervasiveness of bottom-up regulation in the Great
Lakes. Future mechanistic work required to test this hypothesis.

## Today's talk:

1. An ecosystem view of Lake Michigan (and other Great Lakes)
2. Effects of lower trophic level changes on fishes.

## Bottom-up regulation?

$\checkmark$ Base of the food-web is shrinking (less phosphorus, phytoplankton).

- Long-term declines in phosphorus inputs.
- Accelerated by dreissenid mussels sequestering phosphorus.


## Reduction in pelagic productivity in Lake Michigan since 1970s.



## Bottom-up regulation?

## Salmon/trout

10\% Trophic Transfer
Efficiency
Inverts (zooplankton, mussels, Diporeia)

## Phytoplankton

Phosphorus


## $\geq 30 \%$ reduction in annual primary production since 1998 (Warner et al. 2015)

## Salmon/trout

## Prey fish

Inverts (zooplankton, mussels, Diporeia)

## Phytoplankton

Phosphorus (GLWQA \& Mussels)


## Quagga mussels carpet Lake Michigan

Quagga mussel


Nalepa et al. 2014

## Juicy Diporeia are nearly gone

## Diporeia (amphipod)



Nalepa et al. 2014

What effect have declining nutrients and increasing mussels had on zooplankton?

## Lake Michigan Zooplankton- offshore, lakewide in August



26-54\% reduction in total ZP between 19841992 and 1998-2011.

## Zooplankton community shifted to:

- "deeper" species
- Those associated with less productive waters
- More evasive species (especially for larval fish)

Not to scale

Cyclopoid copepods

Daphnia



## Lake Michigan Zooplankton- offshore, Muskegon monthly



## Reduction in pelagic productivity in Lake Michigan since 1970s.



## Bottom-up regulation?

$\checkmark$ Are documented changes in lower primary production affecting fish?

1. Larval fish could be starving in 2010-2011 (Withers et al. 2015).

- 79-87\% of larval alewife (post yolk-sac absorption) had empty stomachs.


Photo: Eppehimer, USGS

## Bottom-up regulation?

$\checkmark$ Are documented changes in lower primary production affecting fish?

1. Larval fish could be starving in 2010-2011 (withers et al. 2015). - 79-87\% of larval alewife (post yolk-sac absorption) had empty stomachs.

- Those larvae with food were eating quagga mussel veligers or diatoms (not small zooplankton).
- In 2001-2002, 43-87\% of larval alewife had empty stomachs (Höök 2005).
- 54\% of larval yellow perch in 2010-2011 (post yolk-sac absorption) had empty stomachs.
- Could limit larval survival and lead to lower numbers of alewife or yellow perch.


## Bottom-up regulation?

$\checkmark$ Are documented changes in lower primary production affecting fish?

1. Larval fish could be starving in 2010-2011 (Withers et al. 2015).
2. Adult fish are in poorer condition, despite reduced numbers.

- Age-1 alewife energy density declined 33\% between 1998-1999 and 2010-2013 (Pothoven et al. 2014)- Muskegon transect.


Pothoven et al. 2014

○ Alewife (>5 inches) energy density declined 23\% in 2002-2004 relative to 1979-1981 (Madenjian et al. 2006)- lakewide.


Madenjian et al. 2006

○ Alewife (>5 inches) energy density declined 23\% in 2002-2004 relative to 1979-1981 (Madenjian et al. 2006)- lakewide. ......and 2015 similar to 2002-2004


Madenjian et al. 2006, USGS unpublished data

## Alewife biomass is lower in 2015 than in earlier time periods.



## Would expect physiological condition to decline with increasing population size.



## Physiological condition is unrelated to population size.



Madenjian et al. 2006, USGS unpublished
o Deepwater sculpin had 65\% less food in their stomachs in 2010 than in 1994-1995 (Bunnell et al. 2015)


- Deepwater sculpin energy density declined 29\% between 2001 and 2009 (Pothoven et al. 2011)


Pothoven et al. 2011

- Deepwater sculpin energy density declined 29\% between 2001 and 2009 (Pothoven et al. 2011)

- Deepwater sculpin were 80\% more abundant in 2001 than 2009, so not driven by density-dependence.
- Loss of Diporeia as high-calorie prey item is most likely explanation for declining physiological condition.


## Changing Lake Michigan food web (since 1970s)



## Changing Lake Michigan food web (since 1970s)



## Today's talk:

1. Ecosystem-level trends across the Great Lakes
2. Effects of lower trophic level changes on fishes.
3. Impacts of climate change"Synchronize" production of fish (or good and bad years)

## Spatial synchrony occurs within Great Lakes fish populations

$\checkmark$ Bloater- Lakes Superior, Huron, Michigan (~800 km): Bunnell et al. 2010

$\checkmark$ Cisco- Lake Superior and inland lakes ( $\sim 400$ km): Myers et al. 2015

$\checkmark$ Yellow perch- Lakes Erie, Huron, Michigan, Ontario ( $\sim 150 \mathrm{~km}$ ): Honsey et al. in review


## What synchronizes animal populations?

1. Moran effect - spatially autocorrelated climate synchronizes disparate populations that have a similar density-dependent structure
2. Dispersal - locally strong year-classes disperse to synchronize disparate populations
3. Predation - mobile predators synchronize disparate prey populations

## Synchrony across species has been documented

$\checkmark$ Georges Bank groundfish- common "exceptional" years related to North Atlantic Oscillation (Brodziak and O'Brien 2005).
$\checkmark$ Small pelagic fish in eastern Atlantic Ocean related to Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (Alheit et al. 2014).


## Approach to evaluating synchrony across species in Lake Michigan to detect a climate signal

1. Estimate stock-recruit relationship for each species. Estimate the residual- unexplained variation due to environmental factors or measurement error.


Approach to evaluating synchrony across species in Lake Michigan to detect a climate signal

1. Estimate stock-recruit relationship for each species. Estimate the residual- unexplained variation due to environmental factors or measurement error.
2. Do residuals reveal common patterns between species? If so, use a generalized additive model (GAM) to determine whether the residuals correspond with environmental or climate variables.


## Residual patterns across the four species



## Average residuals across the four species



## Climatic or environmental variables

| Variable | Mechanism |
| :--- | :--- |
| Annual maximum ice cover | Timing and magnitude of plankton <br> blooms <br> April-July lake level <br> Mafect nearshore spawning habitat <br> May-Aug epilimnetic water <br> temperature |
| Transport of fish larvae |  |
| ENSO index (El Niño) | Growth rates of fish larvae |
| North Atlantic Oscillation index | Regional climate indices that may |
| influence regional Great Lakes climate |  |$|$| Effect of water temperature on |
| :--- |
| growth could depend on spawning |
| habitat |

Only lake level, water
temperature, and NAO had temporal autocorrelation.

## But does the

 timing of the "regimes" match with the fish patterns?

## Top-ranked model



Water temperature ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$



Lake level (m)

Higher recruitment in extreme NAO years.

Cold, dry NAO winter index Warm, wet

## Effect of climate on fish recruitment

\& Climate signals are difficult to detect when paired with biotic variables. Factors such as predation or densitydependence can be more important.
\& Some evidence of "regimes" of good and bad recruitment in Lake Michigan fish community. But future research will be required to identify whether some climatic characteristic underlies those regimes.

## Today's talk:

1. Ecosystem-level trends across the Great Lakes -Declining nutrients could be limiting production at higher trophic level.
2. Effects of lower trophic level changes on fishes. -Larval fish could be starving \& juveniles and adults are skinnier.
3. Impacts of climate change
-Climate (lake level, water temperature) is
changing. Difficult to discern effect on fish so far.

## Great Lakes: Learn to expect the unexpected

$\checkmark$ Stocking: After 46 years, native lake trout are just now starting to reproduce in the wild. Non-native chinook salmon are > 50\% of wild origin.
$\checkmark$ Zebra mussels are effectively extirpated.
$\checkmark$ Quagga mussels (far worse) have replaced them.
$\checkmark$ New fisheries in Lake Michigan are causing excitement...


Native cisco caught while trawling for trout and salmon in Grand Traverse Bay.


## World Record Brown Trout

2009: Manistee River, Michigan (41.5 lbs)
http://www.jsonline.com/blogs/sports/586340 57.html

2010: Racine- (41.5 lbs)
http://www.jsonline.com/sports/outdoors/107 105798.html

2012: Milwaukee harbor fish recognized as world record
http://www.jsonline.com/blogs/sports/160297 845.html


Will Chinook salmon collapse in Lake Michigan?

## Will Chinook salmon collapse in Lake Michigan?

$\checkmark$ No strong alewife year-classes in 2013, 2014, 2015.


Will Chinook salmon collapse in Lake Michigan?
$\checkmark$ No strong alewife year-classes in 2013, 2014, 2015.
$\checkmark$ Alewife are not surviving as long as they used to.

## Alewife age truncation since 2007



## Will Chinook salmon collapse in Lake Michigan?

$\checkmark$ No strong alewife year-classes in 2013, 2014, 2015.
$\checkmark$ Alewife are not surviving as long as they used to.
$\checkmark$ The 2015 year-class was critical.

- By 2016, the 2012 year-class will be 4 years old and the 2010 year-class will be gone.
- Strong year-class recipe = relatively low salmon densities, warm spring, sufficient spawning stock size.
$\checkmark$ Lake Huron lesson: if alewife collapse, Chinook salmon diet strategies is inflexible, and Chinook salmon crash will likely follow.
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