

In search of a conservation limit for the Allier A. salmon population: how and what for?

Etienne Prévost

▶ To cite this version:

Etienne Prévost. In search of a conservation limit for the Allier A. salmon population: how and what for?. Scientific Committee for Diadromous Fish of the Loire, Nov 2016, Orléans, France. hal-01603880

HAL Id: hal-01603880

https://hal.science/hal-01603880

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

In search of a Conservation Limit for the Allier A. Salmon population: How and what for?

Etienne Prévost

INRA - UMR Ecobiop Saint-Pée-sur-Nivelle - France







St Pée s/ Nivelle

NASCO Conservation Limit


- Conservation Limit is a Biological Reference Point
 - BRP: Abundance benchmark against which population status can be assessed
- Conservation Limit (CL): abundance level above which population should be maintained
 - If falling below, remedial management action should be taken
- NASCO CL: spawning escapement producing MSY
 - Derived from Stock-Recruitment analysis
- An illustration using the Nivelle R. data series





The Nivelle R.:

the southernmost Index River in Europe





Uxondoa trapping station


Redd counts



Olha trapping station





























































Troubles with NASCO CL definition

- Assume catches (at sea and in rivers) are well known or negligible
 - Generally not true
 - E.g. in the Nivelle: significant but unknown coastal exploitation
- Spawning stock producing MSY: is this relevant to conservation?
 - Rather aims at fisheries exploitation optimization
- What if survival (e.g. at sea) drops?






Evolution of NASCO CL if sea survival drops



Recruitment curve flattens

→ NACSO CL decreases









CL definition: time for a change?

- NASCO CL: based on fisheries optimization principle
 - when times become harder for salmon CL should be revised downward
 - for populations below replacement (i.e. non viable; e.g. Allier): NASCO CL is not defined
- Fisheries optimization ≠ Conservation
- But how can we define Conservation?
- An operational (and partial) proposal: conservation should ensure that wild juvenile recruitment does not fall too low
- Associated CL definition: spawning escapement threshold that ensure wild juvenile recruitment does not fall too low





The Nivelle R.: the southernmost Index River in Europe

Uxondoa trapping station




Spawning



Olha trapping station



escapement




Juvenile (0+ parr in the fall) recruitment



Electrofishing

























CL definition: time for a change?


- Acknowledge recruitment stochasticity (uncertainty)
- Modified CL definition: spawning escapement threshold that ensure a <u>low probability</u> of wild juvenile recruitment falling too low
 - Conservation aims at controlling the risk of low recruitment
- But what is low recruitment?
 - A management decision
 - An operational proposal: set as a proportion of the carrying capacity (Rmax)
- And what is low probability?
 - A management decision
- Scientific advice: produce (risk) plots that help management decision





Risk plot for 3 options of low recruitment level

Risk: Proba(Recruitment < X% of Rmax)








Risk plot: an example of management decision

Risk: Proba(Recruitment < X% of Rmax)




New CL definition adopted by DFO for A. Salmon stocks in Canada (apart from Québec)





Risk plot: being too risk averse is not realistic

Risk: Proba(Recruitment < X% of Rmax)







New CL approach: pros & cons

PROs

- Based on a conservation principle/definition in a risk control context
- Identify the risk of low recruitment level as a management decision
 - Easier to communicate to management stakeholders (?)
- Uses scientific and fisheries independent data only
- Not sensitive to changes in density independent mortality (e.g. at sea)

CONs

- CL estimation sensitive to recruitment rate at low spawning escapement
 - A quantity usually difficult to estimate from SR data
- Do not take into account potential density dependence of survival after the juvenile recruitment stage considered





CL for the Allier A. Salmon population?


- NASCO CL: not an option
 - Population currently below replacement
- Definition of a new CL based based on a low risk of low recruitment: can be done
 - The Allier salmon population model (INRA LOGRAMI) includes a density dependent SR sub-model





A CL for the Allier A. Salmon population?

wild 0+ density dependence relationship







CL for the Allier A. Salmon population?

- NASCO CL: not an option
 - Population currently below replacement
- Definition of a new CL based based on a low risk of low recruitment: can be done
 - The Allier salmon population model (INRA LOGRAMI) includes a density dependent SR sub-model
 - Plots of risk of low recruitment vs number of spawners reaching
 Vichy can be produced
 - Management (stakeholders) should decide on the definition of low recruitment and low risk (probability)





CL for the Allier A. Salmon population: so what?

- CL is a useful benchmark for assessing conservation status of the population
 - Caution: CL is purely demographic → makes no consideration of genetics
 - CL does not "generate" management measures: it helps assessing consequences of management measures
 - Given the model available for the Allier salmon, a CL is not a necessity: we can directly assess conservation achievement (provided we agree on an operational definition of conservation)
- Retrospective (up to present) assessment:
 - What is current conservation status of the population?
 - Have past management measures improve conservation?
- Prospective assessment:
 - Predicted evolution of conservation according to various management options (habitat improvement and/or stocking)
 - Beyond viability → identification of exploitable surplus (if any)





A (fictitious) illustration of the use of CL for the Allier A. Salmon population?

