Larval dispersal underlies demographically important inter-system connectivity in a Great Lakes yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) population

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2015-0161.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Aug-2015
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Brodnik, Reed; Ohio State, EEOB Fraker, Michael; Ohio State University, EEOB Anderson, Eric; National Marine Fisheries Service - NOAA Carreon-Martinez, Lucia; University of Windsor, Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research DeVanna, Kristen; The Ohio State University, Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology Heath, Daniel; University of Windsor Reichert, Julie; University of Windsor, Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research Roseman, Edward; U.S. Geological Survey, Great Lakes Science Center Ludsins, Stuart; The Ohio State University, Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology</p>
Keyword:	MODELS < General, HYDRODYNAMICS < General, DISPERSAL < General, GENETICS < General, FRESHWATER FISHERIES < General

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Larval dispersal underlies demographically important inter-system connectivity in a Great Lakes yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) population

Reed M. Brodnik^{1,*}, Michael E. Fraker^{1,*}, Eric J. Anderson², Lucia Carreon-Martinez³, Kristen M. DeVanna¹, Daniel D. Heath⁴, Julie M. Reichert⁴, Edward F. Roseman⁵, and Stuart A. Ludsin^{1,6}

¹ Aquatic Ecology Laboratory, Department of Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43212, USA

² NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, Ann Arbor, MI, 48108-9719, USA

³ Department of Biology, The University of Texas at Brownsville, Brownsville, TX, 78520, USA

⁴ Great Lakes Institute for Environmental Research, University of Windsor, Windsor, ON, N9B 3P4, Canada

⁵ USGS Great Lakes Science Center, Ann Arbor, MI, 48105, USA

⁶ Corresponding author: Stuart A. Ludsin; E-mail: ludsin.1@osu.edu; Phone: 1-614-292-1613

*These authors contributed equally to the work.

Abstract

Ability to quantify connectivity among spawning subpopulations and their relative contribution of recruits to the broader population is a critical fisheries management need. By combining microsatellite and age information from larval yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) collected in the Lake St. Clair – Detroit River system (SC-DRS) and western Lake Erie with a hydrodynamic backtracking approach, we quantified subpopulation structure, connectivity, and contributions of recruits to the juvenile stage in western Lake Erie during 2006-2007. After finding weak (yet stable) genetic structure between the SC-DRS and two western Lake Erie subpopulations, microsatellites also revealed measurable recruitment of SC-DRS larvae to the juvenile stage in western Lake Erie (17-21% during 2006-2007). Consideration of pre-collection larval dispersal trajectories, using hydrodynamic backtracking, increased estimated contributions to 65% in 2006 and 57% in 2007. Our findings highlight the value of complementing subpopulation discrimination methods with hydrodynamic predictions of larval dispersal by revealing the SC-DRS as a source of recruits to western Lake Erie and also showing that connectivity through larval dispersal can affect the structure and dynamics of large-lake fish populations.

Keywords

Population connectivity; biophysical coupling; population genetics; natural tag; portfolio effect; metapopulation; early life stage

Introduction

Many aquatic species exhibit a metapopulation or subpopulation structure in which semi-independent, spatially-distinct populations are linked by varying degrees through dispersal (Hjort 1926; Levin 2006). These subpopulations often represent breeding or spawning groups, from which individuals disperse to form a “mixed” population. In many marine invertebrate and fish populations, larval dispersal through hydrodynamic advection has been identified as a key driver of such subpopulation connectivity (Caley et al. 1996; Cowen and Sponaugle 2009). Similarly, Ludsin et al. (2014) hypothesized that long-distance dispersal of larvae via hydrodynamic advection would be an important driver of population connectivity and recruitment dynamics in many fishes of the Laurentian Great Lakes (e.g., walleye *Sander vitreus*, yellow perch *Perca flavescens*, alewife *Alosa pseudoharengus*) because 1) their life-history traits (e.g., long pelagic larval stage with weak swimming capabilities) are similar to those found in most marine fishes (Miller et al. 2007; North et al. 2008; Pritt et al. 2014) and 2) the Great Lakes share many of the same physical features (e.g., gyres, long-shore currents, upwelling zones) as marine ecosystems (reviewed by Ludsin et al. 2014). Even so, our understanding of metapopulation dynamics and population connectivity remains scant in these (and most other) large lake ecosystems (Ludsin et al. 2014).

Quantification of subpopulation connectivity, including the relative contribution of each subpopulation to the broader mixed population, can improve our ability to understand the structure and dynamics of the broader population (Turchin 1998; Werner et al. 2007; Kool et al. 2013) and the fisheries that it supports (Begg and Waldman 1999; Hilborn et al. 2003; Cowen and Sponaugle 2009). For example, Schindler et al. (2010), in what they described as a “portfolio effect”, demonstrated how the sockeye salmon (*Oncorhynchus nerka*) population in Bristol Bay,

AK (USA) is stabilized by the existence of multiple breeding subpopulations undergoing different but complementary dynamics.

Unfortunately, delineating the demographic consequences of population connectivity has remained elusive for most fish populations. For example, limited information exists about dispersal rates and trajectories for most populations, as well as how new immigrants into a population (i.e., dispersers from another population) affect the overall recruitment rate of the broader (recipient) population (Lowe and Allendorf 2010). Likewise, inefficient and ineffective techniques for discriminating among individuals from different subpopulations and for tracking survival of their progeny have historically limited the ability to identify subpopulation structure (Begg and Waldman 1999).

Fortunately, several advancements have improved our ability to understand dispersal dynamics and the relative contributions of recruits to the broader population. Improved hydrodynamic models, for example, offer better tracking of larval dispersal trajectories (North et al. 2009). In particular, hydrodynamic models can now be run backward in time to estimate the most likely dispersal paths and origins of passively dispersed larvae (Christensen et al. 2007; Hinrichsen et al. 2011). Likewise, recent technological advances have provided methods for using genetic data (Kochzius 2009; Seeb et al. 2011) and otolith microchemical and growth rate information (Campana 1999; Swearer et al. 1999) as “natural” tags to identify subpopulation structure and the relative contribution of recruits to the broader population (Begg and Waldman 1999; Gillanders 2009), with the greatest success coming when multiple discrimination approaches are used simultaneously (Swearer et al. 1999; Miller et al. 2005). Further, Fraker et al. (2015) showed that combining hydrodynamic backtracking approaches with individual-based

85 or subpopulation-specific natural tags can lead to a more complete description of population
86 connectivity.

87 Herein, we utilize the approach introduced by Fraker et al. (2015) to determine if western
88 Lake Erie's yellow perch population is connected to the Lake St. Clair-Detroit River system (SC-
89 DRS; Fig. 1) through larval exchange, as well as whether this connectivity might be important to
90 understanding recruitment dynamics in Lake Erie. While multiple breeding subpopulations are
91 thought to support western Lake Erie's yellow perch population (e.g., Reichert et al. 2010;
92 Sepulveda-Villet and Stepien 2011; Kokovsky et al. 2013; Sullivan and Stepien 2013; Carreon-
93 Martinez et al. 2015), which is not unlike other exploited fish populations within and outside of
94 the Great Lakes basin, the relative contributions of recruits to Lake Erie's fishable population
95 from potential external sources such as the SC-DRS remains unknown. Understanding the degree
96 to which these systems are connected holds great potential to alter how yellow perch are
97 managed in Lake Erie, given that current catch quotas are based on geographically-defined
98 management units without regard to population structure or recruits from external sources such
99 as the SC-DRS (Yellow Perch Task Group [YPTG] 2013).

100 While never documented in the field or quantified, much circumstantial evidence exists
101 to suggest that demographically important connectivity through larval exchange exists between
102 the SC-DRS and western Lake Erie. For example, during 2006-2009, larval yellow perch were
103 consistently captured in open waters of western Lake Erie near the Detroit River outflow (along
104 the north shore) at densities 5- to 10-fold greater than those captured near the Maumee River
105 outflow (along the south shore) (Reichert et al. 2010; Ludsin et al. 2011). Whether these north-
106 shore larvae originated in Lake Erie or were exported from the SC-DRS remains unknown;
107 however, the likelihood of flow-assisted transport is strong as 1) high densities of larval yellow

perch were found in Detroit River during 2006-2010 (EFR, unpublished data), 2) Detroit River flow rates as measured by the USGS consistently exceed the swimming speed of yellow perch larvae (Houde 1969), and 3) hydrodynamic backtracking modeling that traced dispersal trajectories of yellow perch larvae captured in western Lake Erie during 2006-2007 showed that a substantial portion of these larvae likely originated from the SC-DRS (Fraker et al. 2015). Moreover, recent otolith microchemical and genetic research has demonstrated that 50% to 90% of the yellow perch that survive to the age-0 juvenile stage—which is a strong indicator of future recruitment to the fishery at age-2 (YPTG 2013; Farmer et al. 2015)—spend their larval stages in northern waters located near the Detroit River outflow (Reichert et al. 2010; Ludsins et al. 2011; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2015).

To determine if and how the SC-DRS and western Lake Erie are connected, with the ultimate intention of improving the ability of agencies to understand and manage western Lake Erie's yellow perch population, we sought to test two hypotheses: 1) the SC-DRS and western Lake Erie are connected through larval dispersal; and 2) this connectivity has demographic consequences for western Lake Erie's fishable (adult) population by contributing larvae that recruit to the age-0 juvenile stage. Towards this end, we described population structure by complementing microsatellite information from larvae captured in both the SC-DRS and northern and southern shores of western Lake Erie during 2006 and 2007 with larval age information (from otoliths) and a hydrodynamic backtracking approach that estimates pre-collection larval dispersal (Fraker et al. 2015). Afterwards, we used this structure to estimate the relative contributions of recruits from the SC-DRS and two western Lake Erie subpopulations to western Lake Erie's age-0 juvenile population, which is when adult recruitment is set in this population (YPTG 2013; Farmer et al. 2015).

Materials and methods

Study system and species

Lake Erie is a part of the Laurentian Great Lakes system, and is highly productive across all trophic levels. It contains several ecologically and economically important fishes, including yellow perch, which supports Lake Erie’s largest commercial fishery, and also a strong recreational fishery (YPTG 2013). Recruitment to these fisheries has fluctuated widely through time for reasons that remain largely unknown (YPTG 2013).

Lake Erie consists of three geomorphologically distinct basins (western, central and eastern) that vary in depth and productivity with a trend of average depth increasing from west to east and productivity decreasing along the same west-to-east trajectory (Ludsin et al. 2001). The western basin, which is the focus of this study (Fig. 1), is the shallowest (mean depth = 7.4 m) and most highly productive of the three basins and is a major producer of yellow perch (Reichert et al. 2010; YPTG 2013). The western basin is a hydrodynamically active system, characterized by inflows from the Detroit and Maumee rivers (Baker 2011), large-scale circulation that is primarily driven by Detroit River inflows from the north and basin-wide winds (Beletsky et al. 2013), and the formation of a turbid river plume driven by Maumee River inflows from the south (Reichert et al. 2010).

While yellow perch spawning locations are poorly described, they are likely numerous (Goodyear et al. 1982; Ludsin et al. 2010), with larval production areas documented in the southern and northern shores of the lake (Ludsin 2000; Ludsin et al. 2006; Reichert et al. 2010). In addition, yellow perch larvae have been recently captured in the Detroit River (EFR unpublished data; see below), although whether they are produced there or drift from Lake St.

Clair is unknown. Lake Erie yellow perch larvae hatch at ~5 mm in total length (TL), have weak swimming abilities until ~9.5 mm TL, and spend about 30-35 d in the water column feeding on zooplankton before becoming demersal as juveniles (Houde 1969; Gopalan et al. 1998; Ludsin 2000).

Field collections

Larvae

Larval yellow perch were used to define unique, group-level, genetic patterns and estimate hatch dates from three disparate areas that could be contributing recruits to western Lake Erie's fishery. Although exact spawning locations are unknown, larvae used in this study were collected during April–May 2006 and 2007 at three locations: 1) in the Detroit River proper (the “DR_c” subpopulation; north of 42.05°); 2) along the north shore of western Lake Erie in and around the outflow of the Detroit River (the “NS” subpopulation; between 42.05° and 41.8°); and 3) along the south shore of western Lake Erie in and around the outflow of the Maumee River (the “SS” subpopulation; south of 41.8°; Fig. 1, Table S1). Weekly collections of larval yellow perch were conducted at up to 12 sites in both the north- and south-shore regions (Reichert et al. 2010) and at up to 11 sites within the southern portion of the Detroit River proper (Fig. 1). All larvae were collected with paired (1 m diameter) bongo nets towed ~1 m from the bottom of the lake to the surface (500 µm mesh). These larvae were preserved in 100% ethanol until identification, and were transferred to 95% ethanol for storage. In total, larvae of varying size and age (Table S1) were collected during 2006 (N = 90 from SS, N = 154 from NS, N = 53 from DR_c) and 2007 (N = 81 from SS, N = 282 from NS, N = 64 from DR_c).

177 Juveniles

178 Age-0 juveniles were collected during late August in both 2006 and 2007 ($n = \sim 70$ sites
179 per year) via annual fisheries-independent bottom-trawls (10 m head rope; 3 km h^{-1} tow speed)
180 surveys conducted across western Lake Erie by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources-
181 Division of Wildlife and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (Reichert et al. 2010). We
182 conducted molecular analyses on 119 (2006) and 167 (2007) juveniles that were randomly
183 chosen from trawl collection sites based on proportional catches (Reichert et al. 2010; Fig. 3).
184 All individuals were stored frozen (-20°C) until processing.

185

186 *Larval age estimation*

187 Daily increment counts from sagittal otoliths were used to estimate the hatch date and age
188 at capture (Campana 1999) of larvae collected in each capture area. Methods for otolith
189 extraction and age analysis followed those of Ludsin et al. (2006) and Reichert et al. (2010).
190 Data for NS and SS larvae were taken from archived collections that had been previously
191 analyzed for a different purpose (Reichert et al. 2010). Sagittal otoliths from larvae collected in
192 the DR_c during 2006 and 2007 ($n = 30$ random individuals per year) were extracted and newly
193 analyzed. Utilizing NIS-Elements imaging software (Media Cybernetics, Inc., Rockville, MD,
194 USA) and a Nikon E200 compound microscope (100x and 50x magnification, oil immersion,
195 Nikon Inc., Melville, NY, USA), post-hatch daily increments were counted and the total otolith
196 radius (core to otolith edge), hatch radius (hatch check to otolith edge), and daily growth
197 increments of each otolith were measured. For all subpopulations, larval age was determined
198 from a single count for larvae estimated to be ≤ 25 d old, as previous research conducted with
199 Lake Erie yellow perch less than this age has shown that single increment counts are reliable

(Ludsin et al. 2001; Table S1). For larvae estimated to be > 25 d of age, at least one additional blind count was conducted, with additional counts being performed as needed (see Reichert et al. 2010 for details). Daily increment count information was used to estimate each larva's hatch date. This information was used in our backtracking procedure to correct hatch locations based on pre-collection dispersal (see below). Because subpopulation- and growth-dependent survival of larvae has been documented in western Lake Erie yellow perch (Reichert et al. 2010; Ludsin et al. 2011; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2015), ageing each larva also allowed us to determine if individuals collected in each region were of the same relative age, thus helping ensure that no bias was introduced in identifying larval recruitment patterns to the juvenile stage because of age-at-collection differences among subpopulations.

Hydrodynamic backtracking of larval dispersal

Model simulations were carried out with hydrodynamic conditions (e.g., currents, temperature) provided by the NOAA Great Lakes Coastal Forecasting System (GLCFS; Schwab and Bedford 1994). The GLCFS is based on the Princeton Ocean Model (Blumberg and Mellor 1987), which solves the hydrostatic, three-dimensional (3-d) primitive equations in a second-order finite difference framework. The GLCFS is operated in a real-time nowcast/forecast framework, with hourly output made available on a 2 km structured grid for Lake Erie (21 vertical sigma layers). Horizontal diffusion in the GLCFS is prescribed by the Smagorinsky parameterization and vertical diffusion is governed by the Mellor-Yamada level 2.5 turbulence closure scheme. Forcing conditions for the hydrodynamic model are prescribed using a natural-neighbor interpolation from land- and buoy-based observations, which have yielded successful prediction of water levels, temperatures, and currents in the lake (Schwab and Bedford 1994;

Chu et al. 2011). Although recent work has shown that the interpolated meteorology can cause errors in the summer circulation in the central basin of Lake Erie (Beletsky et al. 2013), our study focuses on spring transport (April – May) in the western basin, in which wind-field-induced errors are presumed to be reduced due to the influence of hydraulically-driven flow and the density of meteorological stations surrounding the western basin.

Hydrodynamic output from the GLCFS was used to drive a Lagrangian particle transport model to simulate the trajectories of larval perch in western Lake Erie. The particle model used a second-order Lagrangian scheme (Bennett and Clites 1987) to simulate passive, neutrally buoyant particle movement in three dimensions. The Smagorinsky parameterization was used for horizontal diffusion (coefficient of 0.005), based on previous calibrations (Michalak et al. 2013), and a random-walk approach was used for vertical diffusion ($0.0005 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$).

The dispersal pathway of each larvae was tracked from the time of hatch until collection by using otolith age information (per above) in combination with a hydrodynamic particle-backtracking procedure (Fraker et al. 2015). Briefly, we simulated the dispersal of an individual larva by spreading 5 000 particles over a 5 m radius at the location (and time) that larva was collected by our nets. We ran hydrodynamic simulations backward in time, starting from the time of capture until the estimated hatch date (from otoliths). We used the backtracked daily locations of the 5 000 particles to determine the most likely post-hatch dispersal path of that individual from time of collection to its (earlier) time of hatch. To do so, we calculated a grid-based probability of daily larva location using the percentage of the 5 000 particles present within each region (NS, SS, or DR) on each post-hatch day. The region that had the highest percentage of the 5 000 particles on the day of hatching was predicted to be the most likely hatch site for that individual (see Fraker et al. 2015 for further discussion of method). Throughout this process,

water-current uncertainties and variability were accounted for by the calibrated diffusion coefficients/schemes, as described above.

DNA extraction procedure

Nine microsatellite loci were genotyped per individual using the following procedure. DNA from tissue samples was extracted using a plate-based extraction protocol (Elphinstone et al. 2003). DNA was dissolved in 50 μL of Tris-EDTA buffer (10 mM Tris, 1.0 mM EDTA, pH 8.0) for larval samples, whereas 100 μL of the buffer was used for juvenile samples. PCR amplification consisted of 25 μL reactions with 1.5 μL of template DNA (20 ng μL^{-1}), 2.5 μL 10x PCR buffer, 2.5 μL of MgCl_2 (25mM), 0.3 μL of dNTPs (50 μM of each), 0.2 μL (0.5 μM) of dye-labeled primer, 0.2 μL (0.5 μM) of the reverse primer, and 0.10 U Taq polymerase. PCR conditions included initial denaturation at 94°C for 2 min, followed by 35 to 40 cycles of denaturing at 94°C for 15 s, various annealing temperatures for 30 s (following Li et al. 2007), extension at 72°C for 30 s, and a final extension at 72°C for 10 min. DNA fragment sizes were determined using the LI-COR 4300 DNA analyzer (LI-COR, Inc., Lincoln, NE, USA) and scored using GeneImage IR 4.05 (LI-COR, Inc.).

Molecular genetics analyses

Subpopulation groupings

We determined yellow perch subpopulation structure in two ways, with each annual cohort (year) analyzed separately. The first way assigned each larva to 1 of 3 initial groups (i.e., the SS, NS, or DR_c subpopulation) based on its original capture location. The second way considered hydrodynamic backtracking results, using the most probable hatch location to assign

each larvae to 1 of 4 possible initial groups of origination (i.e., SS, NS, or DR_c, and DR_h subpopulation). The SS and NS are the same western Lake Erie subpopulations, as described above. The DR_c subpopulation consisted of larvae that were predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS and that also were *captured in the Detroit River*. Because no larvae collected in the Detroit River were predicted to have originated (hatched) in Lake Erie (see Results below), the group of DR_c larvae used in this second set of analyses is identical to the group of larvae used in the first set of analyses (based on collection location only). The DR_h subpopulation consisted of larvae that were predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS, but which were *captured in western Lake Erie proper* (i.e., they were predicted to have dispersed from their original SC-DRS hatch location into western Lake Erie prior to capture). All analyses were conducted using only larvae ≤ 8 mm TL, which appear highly vulnerable to passive dispersal given their weak swimming abilities in relation to the high flow rates associated with the Detroit River (Houde 1969; http://waterdata.usgs.gov/mi/nwis/uv/?site_no=04165710&PARAMeter_cd=00065,00060). Sample sizes for these analyses are reported in Table S2 (subpopulations based on collection location) and Table S3 (subpopulations based on backtracked hatch location).

Subpopulation genetic structure

Multiple approaches were used to explore structure among the SS, NS, DR_c, and DR_h subpopulations, using microsatellite information. Fisher's exact tests for Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE) were conducted using Arlequin (v3.5.1.2, Excoffier et al. 2005) and tests for linkage disequilibrium were run for all pairs of loci in all larval and juvenile groups using Genepop (version 4.0.7; Rousset 2008). Second, pairwise F_{ST} estimates were calculated using Genepop (version 4.0.7; Rousset 2008; following Weir and Cockerham 1984). Third, an analysis

of molecular variance (AMOVA; following Weir and Cockerham 1984; Excoffier et al. 2005) was conducted. Year, subpopulation nested within year, and within subpopulation effects were considered in our AMOVA model. P -values < 0.05 were considered statistically significant, unless otherwise noted because of a Bonferroni correction.

Importantly, in describing genetic structure, we were not concerned with identifying population substructure *per se*. Instead, we sought to determine if enough (i.e., significant) structure existed among larval production areas such that we could develop reliable functions to determine the natal source area of juvenile recruits (e.g., Hogan et al. 2012). Indeed, previous studies have demonstrated that the assignment tests used herein are robust to low differentiation among subpopulations (e.g., low F_{ST}) and violations of assumptions of HWE (Hauser et al. 2006; Bradbury et al. 2008).

Larval genetic self-assignment

A rank-based self-assignment analysis (GENECLASS 2.0; Paetkau et al. 1995; Piry et al. 2004; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2015), using larvae from all subpopulations, was conducted for two purposes. First, it was used to assess the consistency of subpopulation-specific genetic signatures for the subsequent classification of juveniles of unknown origin (see below). This analysis used a bootstrapping approach wherein each individual larva was removed from the data set (one at a time) and subsequently treated as an “unknown” larva that is then assigned to one of the subpopulations, based on the genotypes of all other individuals (Paetkau et al. 1995). By determining the percentage of larvae successfully assigned back to their collection site, as well as exploring posterior probabilities of assignment for each individual, reliability in assignments for each subpopulation could be assessed. Second, this analysis was used to characterize genetic

similarity among subpopulations. Genetic similarity was assessed by considering to which subpopulation each misclassified individual was assigned. Our expectation was that the DR_c and DR_h subpopulations would be misclassified as the NS subpopulation (or *vice versa*) more often than either DR subpopulation would be misclassified as the SS subpopulation, owing to the close geographical proximity of the Detroit River mouth to the north-shore of western Lake Erie (see Fig. 1).

Juvenile genetic classification

A two-step process was used to classify juvenile recruits of unknown origin to a larval source population (Beneteau et al. 2009). First, a Bayesian assignment was conducted (Rannala and Mountain 1997) with Monte Carlo re-sampling, using a simulation algorithm (10 000 simulated individuals at an assignment threshold $P = 0.05$; GENECLASS 2.0; Paetkau et al. 2004). Following Bayesian assignment, juveniles that were unlikely to have originated from any of the larval subpopulations being explored herein (i.e., NS, SS, DR_c, and DR_h) were removed from the analysis. Such a possibility exists, given that enhanced swimming capabilities can allow individuals to actively move between lake basins (e.g., from the central to western basin of Lake Erie) during late larval and juvenile stages (Houde 1969; Beletsky et al. 2007). For this analysis, if a juvenile did not have a probability of assignment to any one of our subpopulations that exceeded 0.3 (i.e., it had a > 70% chance of originating from a different subpopulation outside of the basin), it was excluded from analysis (Rannala and Mountain 1997; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2015). In alternate analyses that included these individuals, all were classified as failed assignments (MEF, unpublished data). Second, each remaining juvenile was assigned to a larval source population with an individual-based posterior probability of assignment. Only individuals

with a posterior probability of assignment ≥ 0.7 were considered reliable (Rannala and Mountain 1997; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2015).

Results

Subpopulation genetic structure

Analysis of microsatellites revealed violation of assumptions of HWE for some loci (Tables S2 and S3). For example, when larvae were grouped based on capture location, 2, 3, and 4 of the 9 microsatellite loci deviated from HWE for larvae collected from the SS, NS, and DR_c, respectively, with similar numbers of loci violating assumptions in 2007 (5, 4, and 1 loci for SS, NS, and DR_c, respectively). Similar numbers of violations (i.e., 1-5 loci) were evident when using backtracked hatch location to group larvae, although no violations were evident for some subpopulations in some years (e.g., DR_c in 2006; SS in 2007). No single locus deviated from HWE consistently among subpopulations between years for either method of grouping larvae (Tables S2 and S3), indicating that these violations of assumptions did not stem from null alleles or scoring errors. Additionally, no evidence existed for linkage disequilibrium between any loci after Bonferroni correction (MEF, unpublished data).

Based on *capture* location, pairwise F_{ST} values indicated some genetic differentiation among subpopulations during both years (Table 1). F_{ST} values were greatest between the geographically most distant subpopulations (SS and DR_c) followed by the NS and DR_c, with the two Lake Erie subpopulations (NS and SS) possibly being slightly differentiated. Near identical results were evident during 2007, with the exception that genetic differentiation between the DR_c and both Lake Erie subpopulations was greater than during 2006 (Table 1). Using predicted *hatch* locations (from backtracking) increased F_{ST} values between the NS and SS subpopulations

during both years by 4.5- to 5.5-fold (Table 1). The DR_c subpopulation (larvae hatched in the SC-DRS and captured in the Detroit River) had greater F_{ST} values than the DR_h subpopulation (larvae hatched in the SC-DRS but captured in western Lake Erie proper) when compared to the SS and NS subpopulations (Table 1). The F_{ST} between the DR_c and DR_h subpopulations generally exceeded those between the DR_c and the NS and SS subpopulations during both years (Table 1).

Fisher exact tests revealed generally consistent differences in allele frequency distributions among subpopulations. Using groups assigned based on *capture* location, allele frequency distributions differed between the DR_c and NS subpopulations, as well as between the DR_c and SS subpopulations, during both 2006 and 2007 (all $P < 0.001$, $df = 18$; Table 1). Allele frequencies also differed (marginally) between the NS and SS subpopulations during 2006 ($P = 0.001$, $df = 18$), although no significant difference was detected between these western Lake Erie subpopulations during 2007 ($P = 0.04$, $df = 18$; Table 1). Results based on *hatch* location were similar, with significant differences found between all subpopulations in both years with the exception of the comparisons between DR_h and NS and SS in 2006 and 2007 (Table 1).

Inter-annual differences in genetic structure among subpopulations was not evident, based on AMOVA results. When *capture* location as used to define subpopulations, differences in genetic structure between years explained none (0.00%) of the overall variation. Differences among subpopulations within years explained a small fraction (0.44%) of the variation ($P = 0.5$). AMOVA results based on *hatch* location were similar, with 0.46% of the overall variation being explained by differences among subpopulation within years ($P = 0.5$) and 0.00% due to year differences.

384 *Larval genetic self-assignment*

385 Rank-based self-assignment tests demonstrated high variation in the potential to
386 accurately assign larvae to a source subpopulation (SS, NS, or SC-DRS) during both years when
387 initial assignment was based upon *capture* location (Table 2). During 2006, assignment
388 accuracies of 68% and 72% were found for the DR_c and SS subpopulations, respectively. Larvae
389 collected in the Detroit River were misassigned to the geographically closer NS subpopulation
390 more often than to the SS subpopulation during 2006 (Table 2). Likewise, misassigned larvae
391 from the SS subpopulation were assigned to the geographically closer NS subpopulation than the
392 DR_c subpopulation. Assignment accuracy for the NS subpopulation was the lowest at 52%, with
393 larvae being misassigned to the SS and DR_c subpopulations about evenly (Table 2). During
394 2007, nearly identical results were produced, with the highest self-assignment accuracies being
395 found in the DR_c (80%) and SS (68%) subpopulations (Table 2). Similar to 2006, larvae
396 collected in the Detroit River were misassigned more often to the NS subpopulation than to the
397 SS subpopulation and larvae collected in the SS were more often misassigned to the NS
398 subpopulation than to the DR_c subpopulation. Larvae collected in the NS had a low (49%) self-
399 assignment accuracy, with these larvae being misclassified to the SS subpopulation more often
400 than DR_c (Table 2).

401 Using *hatch* location (i.e., after backtracking revision; Figs. 2A and 2B) produced a
402 similar pattern as using capture location, but with improved self-assignment accuracies for at
403 least two of the subpopulations. While little improvement in self-assignment accuracy ($\leq 3\%$)
404 was found for the NS subpopulation during both years, self-assignment accuracies for the SS
405 subpopulation increased from 72% to 83% during 2006 and from 68% to 75% during 2007
406 (Table 2). Correction for pre-capture dispersal also improved the self-assignment accuracy of

larvae predicted to have originated in the SC-DRS (Table 2). For example, the self-assignment accuracies for larvae captured in western Lake Erie proper but that were predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS (DR_h subpopulation) were higher (83-87% for 2006-2007, respectively) when compared to larvae whose capture location was *assumed* to be their hatch location (i.e., non-backtrack corrected DR_c larvae; 68-80% for 2006-2007, respectively).

Juvenile genetic classification

Classification juveniles of unknown origin to a source subpopulation indicated that the SC-DRS contributed recruits to western Lake Erie's population during both years. Based on analyses using larval yellow perch *capture* location, during 2006 and 2007, three and 27 individuals were excluded from analysis (Table 3), respectively, owing to a Bayesian probability value of < 0.3 (i.e., these individuals had less than a 30% chance of originating from one of the three western basin subpopulations; Rannala and Mountain 1997; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2015). Of the remaining juveniles that were classified to a source subpopulation (SS, NS, or DR_c), 98 were considered failed assignments in each year, owing to a posterior probability of assignment of < 0.70 (Table 3). Of the remaining 18 juveniles classified during 2006, six, nine, and three (33%, 50%, and 17%) of them were typed back to the SS, NS, and DR_c , respectively (Table 3). During 2007, of the 42 juveniles classified to a source population with high confidence (posterior probability > 0.70), seven, 26, and nine (17%, 62%, and 21%) were assigned to the SS, NS, and DR_c , respectively (Table 3).

When juvenile assignments were based on *hatch* location instead of capture location (i.e., after backtracking revision), the number of failed assignments decreased slightly ($N = 79$) during 2006, but remained similar during 2007 (Table 3). Backtracking greatly increased the number of

juveniles assigned to one of the SC-DRS subpopulations (DR_c or DR_h) during both years, with 65% (24 of 37) and 57% (25 of 44) of the juvenile recruits predicted to have originated in the SC-DRS during 2006 and 2007, respectively (Figs. 3A and 3B; Table 3).

Discussion

Our study revealed that connectivity with the SC-DRS appears to be influencing the yellow perch population in western Lake Erie through the export of larvae that recruit to the age-0 juvenile stage. Our study also showed how complementing natural tagging approaches (e.g., microsatellites) with physical (e.g., hydrodynamics) models that consider spatiotemporal processes operating during dispersive early life stages can improve our ability to identify population connectivity and the relative contribution of subpopulations to the broader population. More specifically, revision of hatch locations using hydrodynamic backtracking improved our ability to identify genetic structure in our weakly differentiated subpopulations and increased the estimated contribution of juvenile recruits from the SC-DRS system to western Lake Erie's open-lake population by 3- to 4-fold. Below, we discuss our findings more fully, including how they can be used to guide research and management within the Lake Erie basin. Finally, we discuss the general implications of our research for addressing questions related to population connectivity and recruitment dynamics in large lake and marine ecosystems.

Lake Erie yellow perch

Population connectivity and demographics

Our study indicated that larval yellow perch are being advected from the SC-DRS into western Lake Erie and that some are recruiting to the juvenile population. In support of this

notion, our hydrodynamic modeling showed that a substantial percentage of larvae collected in western Lake Erie proper actually hatched in the SC-DRS (25% in 2006, 64% in 2007), assuming passive transport (Houde 1969). In addition, a conspicuous percentage (17% in 2006, 10% in 2007) of age-0 juveniles—the life stage at which recruitment to the fishery at age-2 is set (YPTG 2013; Farmer et al. 2015)—captured in Lake Erie during 2006 and 2007 assigned back with high confidence to the SC-DRS after using backtracking to revise (and seemingly improve) initial larval hatch locations. These findings support our hypothesis that potentially demographically important population connectivity exists between these systems, with the mechanism of connectivity being larval dispersal from the SC-DRS to western Lake Erie.

While finding evidence for connectivity between the SC-DRS and western Lake Erie, we also documented weak genetic structure between systems. Given the apparent gene flow, the weak structure is not surprising. Fisher's exact tests showed that larvae collected in the lower Detroit River (DR_c) proper had significant genetic differentiation from larvae originating in western Lake Erie's north shore (NS) or south shore (SS) during both 2006 and 2007. Likewise, genetic differentiation was evident between NS and SS larvae during 2006 (and in 2007, but only based on hatch location), although this difference was not as great as found between the DR_c and either the NS or SS subpopulations. The F_{ST} values calculated for DR_c and Lake Erie (NS, SS) yellow perch population pairs in our study (0.013 – 0.025) are lower than those measured for some freshwater fish populations (e.g., landlocked Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* in Lac-Saint Jean, Canada, $F_{ST} = 0.109$; Fraser et al. 2007), but they are within the range of values for other species that exhibit homing with some degree of straying (e.g., brown trout *S. trutta*; $F_{ST} = 0.018$ to 0.063; Carlsson et al. 1999; Fraser et al. 2007) and similar to the total F_{ST} measured for 15 microsatellite loci in 15 spawning groups of yellow perch from lakes St. Clair, Erie, and Ontario

($F_{ST} = 0.034$; Sepulveda-Villet and Stepien 2011). Further, these values are relatively high when compared to the mean global F_{ST} values found among populations of adult fish within coral reef systems known to exhibit high dispersal rates (e.g., 0.003: Christie et al. 2010; 0.001: Saenz-Agudelo et al. 2011; 0.005: Hogan et al. 2012). Our F_{ST} values for NS-SS population pairs (~0.002), however, were close to these values.

The relatively large F_{ST} values between the DR_c and DR_h (2006: 0.017; 2007: 0.024) were surprising to us, given that both groups were predicted to have originated from the SC-DRS. However, while both the DR_c and DR_h larvae emanate from the SC-DRS, it is important to recognize that this system is large and includes different types of spawning habitats, including both lotic and lentic. As such, larvae from one of these SC-DRS subpopulations could have potentially spawned in Lake St. Clair proper (or even above it) and the other below it (in the Detroit River proper, perhaps even just above the entrance to Lake Erie). In this way, both subpopulations could remain genetically separated even though their larvae share an identical dispersal pathway into Lake Erie. In support of this general idea, Sullivan and Stepien (2013) documented some genetically disparate yellow perch spawning groups across Lake Erie and the SC-DRS, including a genetically distinct subpopulation that spawns at restored habitat at Belle Isle within the Detroit River. Another possibility is that our hydrodynamic backtracking is inaccurately assigning larvae from the western basin to the DR_h subpopulation, which leads to the large F_{ST} values between the DR_c and DR_h subpopulations. Given the consistent strong outflow of the Detroit River, we have relatively high confidence in the DR_h larval assignments. However, the possibility exists that these or other assignment errors may account for the unexpected F_{ST} values. Regardless of the potential explanation, further data are needed to satisfactorily resolve this issue.

499 We propose three possible mechanisms that can explain how weak genetic structure can
500 be maintained between the SC-DRS and western Lake Erie subpopulations in the face of
501 connected populations via larval dispersal, as well as contributions of SC-DRS individuals to the
502 recruited juvenile population in western Lake Erie. First, homing behavior to natal spawning
503 sites may exist for SC-DRS yellow perch, which can lead to reproductive isolation despite
504 mixing during early life stages. Such homing behavior has been demonstrated in yellow perch in
505 other systems (Kipling and Le Cren 1984; Hodgson et al. 1998; Leung et al. 2011) and other
506 fishes, both freshwater (Neville et al. 2006; Stepien et al. 2009) and marine (Ruzzante et al.
507 2006; Walther et al. 2008). Second, although remote, the possibility exists that SC-DRS fish
508 transported into Lake Erie remain there in small numbers (perhaps in a different lake basin) and
509 do not subsequently interbreed with grown NS or SS larvae. Such reproductive isolation among
510 sympatric subpopulations may arise via kin recognition, as has been found in Lake Constance,
511 Germany for European perch (*Perca fluviatilis*), a congener of yellow perch (Gerlach et al.
512 2001). This mechanism also has been suggested as a possible explanation of similar kin groups
513 found in Lake Erie yellow perch (Kocovsky et al. 2013), but has not yet been studied. Growth-
514 dependent survival may offer a third mechanism. Ludsin et al. (2011) and Carreon-Martinez et
515 al. (2014) provide a wealth of evidence to demonstrate that both predation risk and predation
516 mortality were higher in Lake Erie's north shore than south shore during our study years (2006-
517 2007). This disparity was due to formation of turbid, open-lake plumes by Maumee River (see
518 Fig. 1) inflows in the south shore during the larval yellow perch production period, which
519 provided a refuge from predation for larvae (Ludsin et al. 2011; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2014). In
520 turn, larvae that resided in this south-shore plume recruited disproportionately better to the
521 juvenile stage than those living outside of it during both of our study years (Reichert et al. 2010;

Ludsin et al. 2011; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2005). While the Maumee River plume may indeed be crucial to the recruitment success of larval yellow perch in western Lake Erie, we hypothesize that the initial source of the larvae may be the SC-DRS (via larval dispersal) in addition to the Maumee River (south-shore) region.

Because our juvenile classifications require larval subpopulations to be genetically distinct from one another, the connectivity between the SC-DRS and western Lake Erie and within western Lake Erie may reduce our ability to discriminate among larval subpopulations and successfully classify juveniles back to a breeding subpopulation. Reduced discrimination among subpopulations in our study also may emanate from imperfect sampling, owing to river-flow or wind-driven circulation that transports larvae from their natal location into the natal location of another subpopulation prior to collection for development of a subpopulation-specific genetic signature (Fraker et al. 2015). In this way, the suite of larvae collected to characterize the north shore, for example, might actually have consisted of a mix of larvae produced locally and individuals that were physically transported there from another location (e.g., the Detroit River or south shore). Indeed, geographically close subpopulations in this study were less genetically distinct than those farther apart. Specifically, the DR_c and SS subpopulations were more differentiated than were the DR_c and NS or NS and SS during both of our study years. Our hydrodynamic simulations of larval yellow perch advection suggest that transport of larvae from the SC-DRS into western Lake Erie is fairly common, although revising initial assignments based on the backtracking results tended to have small effects on F_{ST} values in this study. Similar long-distance transport of larvae via river flow and wind-driven circulation has been documented both in the Great Lakes (Mion et al. 1998; Hook et al. 2006; Beletsky et al. 2007) and marine ecosystems (Cowen et al. 2003; Hogan et al. 2012).

545

546 Future Lake Erie research and management

547 We encourage continued research that is focused on quantifying contributions of the SC-
548 DRS to the western basin yellow perch population, as this source may have been important
549 historically. While the degree to which the SC-DRS contributes juvenile recruits to western Lake
550 Erie is only known for 2006 and 2007, which were years of below average and average
551 recruitment (YPTG 2103), the possibility exists that contributions from this subpopulation might
552 be higher under different ecosystem conditions. Such conditions might arise owing to high
553 Detroit River inflows that transport more larvae into western Lake Erie or possibly higher
554 Maumee River inflows that cause a greater proportion of the western basin to be encompassed by
555 the “protective” turbid Maumee River plume during the springtime larval production period
556 (Ludsin et al. 2010, 2011; Reichert et al. 2010; Carreon-Martinez et al. 2014). Hydrodynamic
557 modeling (both forward and backward in time) in conjunction with genetic analyses or other
558 natural tagging approaches (e.g., otolith microchemistry) that are being used to discriminate
559 yellow perch spawning subpopulations in Lake Erie (Ludsin et al. 2006; Fraker et al. 2015) also
560 could assist in evaluating annual contributions of larvae from a donor population (e.g. SC-DRS)
561 to its recipient population (Lake Erie). We also see a strong need to better understand yellow
562 perch subpopulation structure within the SC-DRS, including identifying where spawning occurs
563 in this system.

564 Our findings also have implications for the management of western Lake Erie’s yellow
565 perch population. We presented strong evidence for the contribution of age-0 juvenile recruits to
566 the western Lake Erie yellow perch population from at least one external subpopulation (a
567 subpopulation located within the SC-DRS). Thus, modification of Lake Erie’s current yellow

perch management plan (YPTG 2013) to consider contributions of recruits from the SC-DRS to western Lake Erie seems warranted (but see Sullivan and Stepien 2013 for a landscape genetic analysis that found evidence for historical genetic isolation among these groups, although not always related to distance). The need to better understand how contributions from the SC-DRS to western Lake Erie's population vary temporally seems especially important given that maintaining a diverse "portfolio" of spawning stocks (sensu Schindler et al. 2010) has been shown to stabilize fisheries production in other ecosystems during large-scale ecosystem change (Griffiths et al. 2014). Because human-induced ecosystem change has been prominent in the Laurentian Great Lakes basin during the past century (Bunnell et al. 2014), including Lake Erie (Ludsin et al. 2001; Jones et al. 2006; Scavia et al. 2014), the need to understand subpopulation (stock) structure and maintain stock diversity seems as important as ever in the Great Lakes basin.

Implications for quantifying connectivity & recruitment

While the importance of larval dispersal to fish recruitment dynamics has long been recognized in marine ecosystems (Caley et al. 1996; Cowen and Sponaugle 2009), larval dispersal has historically been neglected in large freshwater systems. For example, only within recent decades have researchers begun to consider the role of larval dispersal in the fish recruitment process in freshwater ecosystems, including the world's Great Lakes (reviewed by Ludsin et al. 2014). Further, we only know of one other study (Hatcher et al. 1991) that has considered the role of larval dispersal as a mechanism for inter-system population connectivity in the Great Lakes basin. Given that many of the Laurentian Great Lakes' ecologically and economically important fishes (e.g., walleye, yellow perch, alewife) have a prolonged pelagic

egg or larval stage that is similar to that of their marine counterparts (Ludsin et al. 2014; Pritt et al. 2014), these species also are highly suited to hydrodynamic transport during early life stages (Ludsin et al. 2014). In turn, demographically important intra- and inter-system connectivity—via dispersal during early life stages—may be as widespread a mechanism of population connectivity in the world’s large lakes as it is in marine ecosystems.

Finally, our work points to the need to continue to break down the barriers that exist between freshwater and marine researchers (also see Pritt et al. 2014; Ludsin et al. 2014). Our findings clearly show that population connectivity via larval dispersal, which has historically been considered a marine phenomenon (see review by Cowen and Sponaugle 2009), may play a critical role in structuring fish populations in large lake ecosystems such as Lake Erie. For this reason, we support Ludsin et al.’s (2014) call for the expanded use of coupled biological-physical models in large freshwater ecosystems that are focused on larval fish dispersal and recruitment (e.g., Beletsky et al. 2007; Fraker et al. in press). Such models are quite common in marine ecosystems (Christensen et al. 2007; Miller 2007; North et al. 2009; Hinrichsen et al. 2011) and most certainly could help address the current gap in knowledge regarding the demographic consequences of connectivity in fish and other aquatic animal populations in large lake ecosystems (Lowe and Allendorf 2010). The continued joint application of marine approaches (e.g., coupling physical-biological models) and concepts (e.g., population connectivity through larval dispersal) to the world’s large lake ecosystems would help maximize our ability to identify general processes that explain why metapopulations fluctuate and how they are structured.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by multiple sources and supported by multiple partners, including the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Program (F-69-P, Fish Management in Ohio), administered jointly by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources-Division of Wildlife (ODNR-DOW). Monetary support for genetic analyses and processing of Detroit River fish was provided by The Ohio State University's Chapter of Sigma Xi (to RMB), Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology (to SAL), and College of Arts and Sciences (to RMB), as well as the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (to DDH). Monetary support for collections of yellow perch larvae and juveniles was provided by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission Fisheries Research Program (to SAL and DDH), with in-kind support provided by the ODNR-DOW, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, NOAA's Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, and the USGS Great Lakes Science Center. We also thank W. Stott and the anonymous reviewers for comments that improved this manuscript. This GLERL contribution 1776 and contribution number 1964 of the USGS Great Lakes Science Center. Any use of trade, product, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

631 **References**

- 632 Baker, D.B. 2011. The sources and transport of bioavailable phosphorus to Lake Erie, Final
633 Report: Part 2. US EPA/GLNPO ID: GL 00E75401-1. United States Environmental
634 Protection Agency, Chicago.
- 635 Begg, G.A., and Waldman, J.R. 1999. A holistic approach to fish stock identification. Fish. Res.
636 **43**: 35-44.
- 637 Beletsky, D., and Schwab, D.J. 2001. Modeling circulation and thermal structure in Lake
638 Michigan: annual cycle and interannual variability. J. Geophys. Res. **106**: 19745-19771.
- 639 Beletsky, D., Mason, D.M., Schwab, D.J., Rutherford, E.S., Janssen, J., Clapp, D.F., and
640 Dettmers, J.M. 2007. Biophysical model of larval yellow perch advection and settlement
641 in Lake Michigan. J. Great Lakes Res. **33**: 842-866.
- 642 Beletsky, D., Hawley, N., and Rao, Y.R. 2013. Modeling summer circulation and thermal
643 structure in Lake Erie. J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans **118**: 6238-6252.
- 644 Beneteau, C.L., Mandrak, N.E., and Heath, D.D. 2009. The effects of river barriers and range
645 expansion of the population genetic structure and stability in Greenside Darter
646 (*Etheostoma blennioides*) populations. Conserv. Biol. **10**: 477-487.
- 647 Bennett, J.R., and Clites, A.H. 1987. Accuracy of trajectory calculation in a finite-difference
648 circulation model. J. Comput. Phys. **68**: 272-282.
- 649 Blumberg, A.F., and Mellor, G.L. 1987. A description of a three-dimensional coastal ocean
650 circulation model. In Three-Dimensional Coastal Ocean Models. Edited by N. Heaps.
651 American Geophysical Union, Washington D.C. pp. 1-16.
- 652 Bradbury, I.R., Campana, S.E., and Bentzen, P. 2008. Estimating contemporary early life-history

- 653 dispersal in an estuarine fish: integrating molecular and otolith elemental approaches.
654 Mol. Ecol. **17**: 1438-1450.
- 655 Bunnell, D.B., Barbiero, R.P., Ludsins, S.A., Madenjian, C.P., Warren, G.J., Dolan, D.M.,
656 Brenden, T.O., Briland, R., Gorman, O.T., He, J.X., Johengen, T.H., Lantry, B.F.,
657 Nalepa, T.F., Riley, S.C., Riseng, C.M. Treska, T.J., Tsehaye, I., Walsh, M.G., Warner,
658 D.M., and Weidel, B.C. 2014. Changing ecosystem dynamics in the Laurentian Great
659 Lakes: bottom-up and top-down regulation. BioScience **64**: 26-39.
- 660 Caley, M.J., Carr, M.H., Hixon, M.A., Hughes, T.P., Jones, G.P., and Menge, B.A. 2007.
661 Recruitment and the local dynamics of open marine populations. Ann. Rev. Ecol. System.
662 **27**: 447-500.
- 663 Campana, S.E. 1999. Chemistry and composition of fish otoliths: pathways, mechanisms and
664 applications. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **188**: 263-297.
- 665 Carlsson, J., Olsen, K., Nilsson, J., Overli, O., and Stabell, O. 1999. Microsatellites reveal fine-
666 scale genetic structure in stream-living brown trout. J. Fish Biol. **55**: 1290-1303.
- 667 Carreon-Martinez, L.B., Wellband, K.W., Johnson, T.B., Ludsins, S.A., and Heath, D.D. 2014.
668 Novel molecular approach demonstrates that turbid river plumes reduce predation
669 mortality on larval fish. Mol. Ecol. **23**: 5366–5377.
- 670 Carreon-Martinez, L.B., R.P. Walter, T.B. Johnson, S.A. Ludsins, and D.D. Heath. 2015. Benefits
671 of turbid river plume habitat for Lake Erie yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) recruitment
672 determined by juvenile to larval genotype assignment. Plos One 10(5): e0125234.
- 673 Christensen, A., Daewel, U., Jensen, H., Mosegaard, H., St. John, M., and Schrum, C. 2007.
674 Hydrodynamic backtracking of fish larvae by individual-based modeling. Mar. Ecol.
675 Prog. Ser. **347**: 221-232.

- 676 Christie, M.R., Johnson, D.W., Stallings, C.D., and Hixon, M.A. 2010. Self-recruitment and
677 sweepstakes reproduction amid extensive gene flow in a coral-reef fish. *Mol. Ecol.* **19**:
678 1042-1057.
- 679 Chu, P.Y., Kelley, J.G.W., Mott, G.V., Zhang, A., and Lang, G.A. 2011. Development,
680 implementation, and skill assessment of the NOAA/NOS Great Lakes Operational
681 Forecast System. *Ocean Dynam.* **61**: 1305-1316.
- 682 Cowen, R.C., and Sponaugle, S. 2009. Larval dispersal and marine population connectivity.
683 *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.* **1**: 443-466.
- 684 Cowen, R.K., Paris, C.B., Olson, D.B., and Fortuna, J.L. 2003. The role of long distance
685 dispersal versus local retention in replenishing marine populations. *Gulf and Caribb. Res.*
686 **14**: 129-137.
- 687 Elphinstone, M.S., Hinten, G.N., Anderson, M.J., and Nock, C.J. 2003. An inexpensive and
688 high-throughput procedure to extract and purify total genomic DNA for population
689 studies. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **3**: 317-320.
- 690 Excoffier, L., Laval, G., and Schneider, S. 2005. Arlequin version 3.0: An integrated software
691 package for population genetics data analysis. *Evol. Bioinform.* **1**:4 7-50.
- 692 Farmer, T.M, E.A. Marschall, K. Dabrowski, and Ludsin, S.A. 2015. Short winters threaten
693 temperate fish populations. *Nature Comm.* **6**: 7724.
- 694 Fraker, M.E., Anderson, E.J., Brodник, R., Carreon-Martinez, L., DeVanna, K.M., Fryer, B.J.,
695 Heath, D.D., Reichert, J.M., and Ludsin, S.A. 2015. Particle backtracking improves
696 breeding subpopulation discrimination and natal-source identification in mixed
697 populations. *PLoS ONE* **10**: e0120752.
- 698 Fraker, M.E., Anderson, E.J., Chen, K.-Y., Davis, J.J., DeVanna, K.M., DuFour, M.R.,

- 699 Marschall, E.A., May, C.J., Mayer, C.M., Miner, J.G., Pangle, K.L., Pritt, J.J., Roseman,
700 E.F., Tyson, J.T., Zhao, Y., and Ludsin, S.A. 2015. Variation in larval advection and
701 early life history of Lake Erie walleye (*Sander vitreus*): insights from an individual-based
702 biophysical model. J. Great Lakes Res. in press. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2015.04.008
- 703 Fraser, D.J., Jones, M.W., McParland, T.L., and Hutchings, J.A. 2007. Loss of historical
704 immigration and the unsuccessful rehabilitation of extirpated salmon populations.
705 Conserv. Genet. **8**: 527-546.
- 706 Gerlach, G., Schardt, U., Eckmann, R., and Meyer, A. 2001. Kin structured subpopulations of
707 Eurasian perch (*Perca fluviatilis*). Heredity, **86**: 213-221.
- 708 Gillanders, B.M. 2009. Tools for studying biological marine ecosystem interactions-natural and
709 artificial tags. In Ecological Connectivity Among Tropical Coastal Ecosystems. Edited by
710 I. Nagelkerken. Springer, New York. pp. 457-492
- 711 Glover, D.C., Dettmers, J.M., Wahl, D.H., and Clapp, D.F. 2008. Yellow perch stock structure in
712 Lake Michigan: an analysis using mark-recapture data. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **65**:
713 1919-1930.
- 714 Goodyear, C.S., Edsall, T.A., Ormsby, D.M.D., Moss, G.D., and Polanski, P.E. 1982. Atlas of
715 the spawning and nursery areas of Great Lakes fishes. Volume 9: Lake Erie. US Fish and
716 Wildlife Service, Washington D.C.
- 717 Gopalan, G., Culver, D.A., Wu, L., and Trauben, B.K. 1998. The effect of recent ecosystem
718 changes on the recruitment of young-of-year fish in western Lake Erie. Can. J. Fish.
719 Aquat. Sci. **55**: 2572-2579.

- 720 Griffiths, J.R., Schindler, D.E., Armstrong, J.B., Scheuerell, D.B., Whited, D.C., Clark, R.A.,
721 Hilborn, R., Holt, C.A., Lindley, S.T., Stanford, J.A., and Volk, E.C. 2014. Performance
722 of salmon fishery portfolios across western North America. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **51**: 1554-1563.
- 723 Hatcher, C.O., Nester, R.T., and Muth, K.M. 1991. Using larval fish abundance in the St. Clair
724 and Detroit Rivers to predict year-class strength of forage fish in lakes Huron and Erie. *J.*
725 *Great Lakes Res.* **17**: 74-84.
- 726 Hauser, L., Seamons, T.R., Dauer, M., Naish, K.A., and Quinn, T.P. 2006. An empirical
727 verification of population assignment methods by marking and parentage data: hatchery
728 and wild steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in Forks Creek, Washington, USA. *Mol. Ecol.*
729 **15**: 3157-3173.
- 730 Hilborn, R., Quinn, T.P., Schindler, D.E., and Rogers, D.E. 2003. Biocomplexity and fisheries
731 sustainability. *PNAS USA* **100**: 6564-6568.
- 732 Hinrichsen, H.H., Dickey-Collas, M., Hurat, M., Peck, M.A., and Vikebo, M.E. 2011. Evaluating
733 the suitability of coupled biophysical models for fishery management. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*
734 **68**: 1478-1487.
- 735 Hjort, J. 1926. Fluctuations in the year classes of important food fishes. *J. du Conseil* **1**: 5-38.
- 736 Hodgson, J.R., Schindler, D. E., and He. X. 1998. Homing tendency of three piscivorous fish in a
737 north temperate lake. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **127**: 1071-1081.
- 738 Hogan, J.D., Thiessen, R.J., Sale P.F., and Heath, D.D. 2012. Local retention, dispersal and
739 fluctuating connectivity among populations of a coral reef fish. *Oecologia* **168**: 61-71.
- 740 Hook, T.O., McCormick, M.J., Rutherford, E.S., Mason, D.M., and Carter, G.S. 2006. Short-
741 term water mass movements in Lake Michigan: Implications for larval fish transport. *J.*
742 *Great Lakes Res.* **32**: 728-737.

- 743 Houde, E.D. 1969. Sustained swimming ability of larvae of walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum*
744 *vitreum*) and yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*). J. Fish. Res. B. Can. **26**: 1647-1659.
- 745 Jones, M.L., Shuter, B.J., Zhao, Y., and Stockwell, J.D. 2006. Forecasting effects of climate
746 change on Great Lakes fisheries: models that link habitat supply to population dynamics
747 can help. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **63**: 457-468.
- 748 Kipling, C., and Le Cren, E.D. 1984. Mark-recapture experiments on fish in Windermere, 1943-
749 1982. J. Fish Biol. **24**: 395-414.
- 750 Kochzius, M. 2009. Trends in fishery genetics. In The Future of Fisheries Science in North
751 America. Edited by R.J. Beamish and B.J. Rothschild. Springer, New York. pp. 453-493.
- 752 Kocovsky, P.M., Sullivan, T.J., Knight, C.T., and Stepien, C.A. 2013. Genetic and morphometric
753 differences demonstrate fine-scale population substructure of the yellow perch *Perca*
754 *flavescens*: need for redefined management units. J. Fish Biol. **82**: 2015-2030.
- 755 Kool, J.T., Moilanen, A., and Treml, E.A. 2013. Population connectivity: recent advances and
756 new perspectives. Landscape Ecol. **28**: 165-185.
- 757 Kutkuhn, J.H., 1981. Stock definition as a necessary basis for cooperative management of Great
758 Lakes fish resources. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **38**: 1476-1478.
- 759 Levin, L.A., 2006. Recent progress in understanding larval dispersal: new directions and
760 digressions. Integ. Comp. Biol. **46**: 282-297.
- 761 Leung, C., Magnan, P., and Angers, B. 2011. Genetic evidence for sympatric populations of
762 yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) in Lake Saint-Pierre (Canada): the crucial first step in
763 developing a fishery management plan. J. Aquac. Res. Develop. **S6**: 001.

- 764 Li, L., Wang, H.P., Givens, C., Czesny, S., and Brown, B. 2007. Primer note: Isolation and
765 characterization of microsatellites in yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*). Mol. Ecol. Notes, **7**:
766 600–603.
- 767 Lowe, W.H., and Allendorf, F.W. 2010. What can genetics tell us about population connectivity?
768 Mol. Ecol. **19**: 3038-3051.
- 769 Ludsin, S.A. 2000. Exploration of spatiotemporal patterns in recruitment and community
770 organization of Lake Erie fishes: a multiscale, mechanistic approach. PhD dissertation,
771 Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology, The Ohio State University,
772 Columbus, OH, USA.
- 773 Ludsin, S.A., Kershner, M., Blocksom, K., Knight, R., and Stein, R. 2001. Life after death in
774 Lake Erie: nutrient controls drive fish species richness, rehabilitation. Ecol. Appl. **11**:
775 731-746.
- 776 Ludsin, S.A., Fryer, B.J., and Gagnon, J.E. 2006. Comparison of solution-based versus laser-
777 ablation ICPMS for analysis of larval fish otoliths. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. **135**: 218-231.
- 778 Ludsin, S.A., Pangle, K.L., and Tyson, J.T. 2010. Using satellite imagery for fisheries
779 management. Final completion report. Lake Erie Protection Fund, Toledo, OH.
- 780 Ludsin, S.A., Pangle, K., Carreon-Martinez, L., Legler, N., Reichert, J.M., Heath, D.D., 2011.
781 River discharge as a predictor of Lake Erie yellow perch recruitment. Final completion
782 report. Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Fisheries Research Program, Ann Arbor, MI.
- 783 Ludsin, S.A., DeVanna K.M., and Smith, R.E.H. 2014. Physical-biological coupling and the
784 challenge of understanding fish recruitment in freshwater lakes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.
785 **71**: 775-794.
- 786 Michalak, A.M., Anderson, E.J., Beletsky, D., Boland, S., Bosch, N.S., Bridgeman, T.B.,

- 787 Chaffin, J.D., Cho, K., Confesor, R., Daloglu, I., DePinto, J.V., Evans, M.A., Fahnenstiel,
788 G.L., He, L., Ho, J.C., Jenkins, L., Johengen, T.H., Kuo, K.C., Laporte, E., Liu, X.,
789 McWilliams, M., Moore, M.R. Posselt, D.J., Richards, R.P., Scavia, D., Steiner, A.L.,
790 Verhamme, E., Wright, D.M., and Zagorski, M.A. 2013. Record-setting algal bloom in
791 Lake Erie caused by agricultural and meteorological trends consistent with expected
792 future conditions. PNAS USA **110**: 6448-6452.
- 793 Miller, J.A., Banks, M.A., Gomez-Uchida, D., and Shanks, A.L. 2005. A comparison of
794 population structure in black rockfish (*Sebastes melanops*) as determined with otolith
795 microchemistry and microsatellite DNA. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **62**: 2189-2198.
- 796 Miller, T.J. 2007. Contribution of individual-based coupled physical-biological models to
797 understanding recruitment in marine fish populations. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **347**: 127-
798 138.
- 799 Mion, J., Stein, R., and Marschall, E. 1998. River discharge drives survival of larval walleye.
800 Ecol. Appl. **8**: 88-103.
- 801 Neville, H.M., Isaak, D.J., Dunham, J.B., Thurow, R.F., and Rieman, B.E. 2006. Fine-scale natal
802 homing and localized movement as shaped by sex and spawning habitat in Chinook
803 salmon: insights from spatial autocorrelation analysis of individual genotypes. Mol. Ecol.
804 **15**: 4589-4602.
- 805 North, E.W., Schlag, Z., Hood, R.R., Li, M., Zhong, L., Gross, T., Kennedy, V.S. 2008. Vertical
806 swimming behavior influences dispersal of simulated oyster larvae in a coupled particle-
807 tracking and hydrodynamic model of Chesapeake Bay. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **359**: 99-
808 115.

- 809 North, E.W., Gallego, A., and Petigas, P. 2009. Manual of Recommended Practices for Modeling
810 Physical-Biological Interactions During Early Fish Life. ICES Report 295. ICES,
811 Copenhagen.
- 812 Paetkau, D., Calvert, W., Stirling, I., and Strobeck, C. 1995. Microsatellite analysis of population
813 structure in Canadian polar bears. *Mol. Ecol.* **4**: 347-354.
- 814 Paetkau, D., Slade, R., Burden, M., and Estoup, A. 2004. Genetic assignment methods for the
815 direct, real-time estimate of migration rates: a simulation-based exploration of accuracy
816 and power. *Mol. Ecol.* **13**: 55-65.
- 817 Piry, S., Alapetite, A., Cornuet, J.M., Paetkau, D., Baudouin, L., and Estoup, A. 2004.
818 GENECLASS2: A software for genetic assignment and first-generation migrant
819 detection. *J. Hered.* **95**: 536-539.
- 820 Pritt, J.J., Roseman, E.F., O'Brien, T.P. 2014. Mechanisms driving recruitment variability in
821 fish: comparisons between the Laurentian Great Lakes and marine systems. *ICES J. Mar.*
822 *Sci.* **71**: 2252-2267.
- 823 Rannala, B., and Mountain, J.L. 1997. Detecting immigration by using multilocus genotypes.
824 *PNAS USA* **94**: 9197-9221.
- 825 Reichert, J.M., Fryer, B.J., Pangle, K.L., Johnson, T.B., Tyson, J.T., Drelich, A.B., Ludsin, S.A.
826 2010. River-plume use during the pelagic larval stage benefits recruitment of a lentic fish.
827 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **67**: 987-1004.
- 828 Rousset, F. 2008. Genepop'007: A complete reimplementation of the Genepop software for
829 Windows and Linux. *Mol. Ecol. Res.* **8**: 103-106.
- 830 Ruzzante, D.E., Mariani, S., Bekkevold, D., André, C., Mosegaard, H., Clausen, L.A., Dahlgren

- 831 T.G., Hutchinson W.F., Hatfield, E.M.C., Torstensen, E., Brigham, J., Simmonds, E.J.,
832 Laikre, L., Larsson, L.C., Stet, R.J.M., Ryman, N., and Carvalho, G. R. 2006.
833 Biocomplexity in a highly migratory pelagic marine fish, Atlantic herring. *Proc. Roy.*
834 *Soc. Lond., B* **273**: 1459-1464.
- 835 Saenz-Agudelo, P., Jones, G.P., Thorrold, S.R., and Planes, S. 2011. Connectivity dominates
836 larval replenishment in a coastal reef fish metapopulation. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond., B* **278**:
837 2954-2961.
- 838 Scavia, D., Allan, J.D., Arend, K.K., Bartell, S., Beletsky, D., Bosch, N.S. Brandt, S.B., Briland,
839 R.D., Daloğlu, I., DePinto, J.V., Dolan, D.M., Evans, M.A. Farmer, T.M., Goto, D., Han,
840 H., Höök, T.O., Knight, R., Ludsın, S.A., Mason, D., Michalak, A.M., Richards, R.P.,
841 Roberts, J.J. Rucinski, D.K., Rutherford, E., Schwab, D.J. Sesterhenn, T., Zhang, H.,
842 Zhou, Y. 2014. Assessing and addressing the re-eutrophication of Lake Erie: Central
843 Basin Hypoxia. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **40**: 226–246.
- 844 Schindler, D.E., Hilborn, R., Chasco, B., Boatright, C.P., Rogers, L.A., Quinn, T.P., Rogers,
845 L.A., Webster, M. S. 2010. Population diversity and the portfolio effect in an exploited
846 species. *Nature*, **465**, 609-612.
- 847 Schwab, D.J., and Bedford, K.W. 1994. Initial implementation of the Great Lakes Forecasting
848 System: a real-time system for predicting lake circulation and thermal structure. *Water*
849 *Poll. Res. J. Can.* **29**: 203-220.
- 850 Seeb, J.E., Carvalho, G., Hauser, L., Naish, K., Roberts, S., and Seeb, L.W. 2011. Single-
851 nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) discovery and applications of SNP genotyping in
852 nonmodel organisms. *Mol. Ecol. Resources* **11**: 1-8.

- 853 Sepulveda-Villet, O.J., and Stepien, C.A. 2011. Fine-scale population genetic structure of the
854 yellow perch *Perca flavescens* in Lake Erie. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **68**: 1435-1453.
- 855 Smith, R.E.H., and Ludsin, S.A. 2009. Physical-biological coupling and the challenge of
856 understanding recruitment in large lakes. New Research Theme White Paper, Great
857 Lakes Fishery Commission, Fisheries Research Program, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 858 Stepien, C.A., Murphy, D.J., Lohner, R.N., Sepulveda-Villet, O.J., and Haponski, A.E. 2009.
859 Signatures of vicariance, postglacial dispersal, and spawning philopatry: population
860 genetics of the walleye, *Sander vitreus*. *Mol. Ecol.* **18**: 3411-3428.
- 861 Sullivan, T.J., and Stepien, C.A. 2013. Genetic diversity and divergence of yellow perch
862 spawning populations across the Huron-Erie corridor, from Lake Huron through western
863 Lake Erie. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **40** (Suppl. 2): 101-109.
- 864 Swearer, S.E., Caselle, J.E., Lea, D.W., and Warner, R.R. 1999. Larval retention and recruitment
865 in an island population of coral-reef fish. *Nature* **402**: 799-802.
- 866 Turchin, P. 1998. Quantitative Analysis of Movement: Measuring and Modeling Population
867 Redistribution in Plants and Animals. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- 868 Walther, B.D., and Thorrold, S.R. 2008. Geochemical signatures in otoliths record natal origins
869 of American shad. *Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc.* **137**: 57-69.
- 870 Weir, B.S., and Cockerham, C.C. 1984. Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of population
871 structure. *Evolution* **38**: 1358-1370.
- 872 Werner, F.E., Cowen, R.K., and Paris, C.B. 2007. Coupled biological and physical models:
873 Present capabilities and necessary developments for future studies of population
874 connectivity. *Oceanogr.* **20**: 54-69.
- 875 Yellow Perch Task Group. 2013. Report of the Lake Erie Yellow Perch Task Group. Report to

876 the Standing Technical Committee, Lake Erie Committee of the Great Lakes Fishery
877 Commission, Ann Arbor, MI.
878

Draft

Table 1. Pairwise F_{ST} values for yellow perch larvae collected in the Lake St. Clair-Detroit River system (SC-DRS) and western Lake Erie during 2006 and 2007. The initial assignment locations of larvae (north shore of western Lake Erie, NS; south shore of western Lake Erie, SS; Detroit River, DR_c) were based on larval collection locations (Capture), whereas the revised (most probable) hatch locations were based on the backtracking results (Hatch). For analyses based on backtracking-modified hatch locations, larvae captured in western Lake Erie proper but that were predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS were designated as DR_h, whereas those captured in the Detroit River and predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS were designated as DR_c. The same individuals were used for the DR_c in both sets of analyses within a year. Only larvae < 8 mm total length were included in these analyses. Asterisks denote significance differences in allele frequency distributions, using Fisher exact tests with a Bonferroni-corrected α level = 0.0167 (Capture) or 0.0083 (Hatch).

Capture			Hatch			
Subpopulation	2006		Subpopulation	2006		
	DR _c	NS		DR _h	NS	SS
NS	0.013*		NS	0.004		
SS	0.017*	0.002*	SS	0.005	0.011*	
			DR _c	0.017*	0.014*	0.016*
2007			2007			
Subpopulation			Subpopulation			
	DR _c	NS		DR _h	NS	SS
NS	0.017*		NS	0.005		
SS	0.025*	0.002	SS	0.006	0.009*	
			DR _c	0.024*	0.017*	0.025*

Table 2. Genetic self-assignment results for larval yellow perch collected in the Lake St. Clair-Detroit River system (SC-DRS) or western Lake Erie during 2006 and 2007. The assignment location of larvae was based on their initial collection location (Capture) or their most probable hatch location based on hydrodynamic backtracking (Hatch). Larvae were collected in the north shore (NS) and south shore (SS) of western Lake Erie, as well as the Detroit River. For analyses based on backtracking-modified hatch locations, larvae captured in western Lake Erie that were predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS were designated as DR_h, whereas those captured in the Detroit River and predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS were designated as DR_c.

2006		Assigned as (%)		
Capture		DR _c	NS	SS
Collection site	DR _c	68	19	13
	NS	12	52	36
	SS	8	20	72
Hatch		Assigned as (%)		
		SC-DRS	NS	SS
Hatch site	DR _h	83	11	6
	DR _c	60	22	18
	NS	17	53	30
	SS	7	10	83
2007		Assigned as (%)		
Capture		DR _c	NS	SS
Collection site	DR _c	80	11	9
	NS	21	49	30
	SS	11	21	68
Hatch		Assigned as (%)		
		SC-DRS	NS	SS
Hatch site	DR _h	87	8	6
	DR _c	70	18	12
	NS	15	52	33
	SS	11	14	75

Table 3. Genetic classification results for age-0 juvenile yellow perch recruits captured in western Lake Erie during 2006 and 2007. Juveniles that had a < 30% likelihood of originating from any of the three larval collection areas (north shore, NS; south shore, SS; Detroit River, DR), following Bayesian correction, were ‘Excluded’ from analyses. Those with probabilities of assignment to a larval production area that ranged 30% to 70% were considered “Failed”. Those juveniles with a > 70% probability were assigned to their respective larval population(s) (i.e., SS, NS, DR_c, or DR_h). The initial assignment of juveniles was based on larval collection locations (Capture). The revised assignment was based on the most probable hatch location, which was based on the backtracking results (Hatch). For analyses based on backtracking-modified hatch locations, larvae captured in western Lake Erie proper but that were predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS were designated as DR_h, whereas those captured in the DR and predicted to have hatched in the SC-DRS were designated as DR_c. The numbers of juveniles assigned to an SC-DRS origin are highlighted with bold font.

Capture						
	SS	NS	DR _c	Failed	Excluded	Total Juveniles
2006	6	9	3	98	3	119
2007	7	26	9	98	27	167

Hatch						
	SS	NS	DR _c	DR _h	Failed	Total Juveniles
2006	3	10	3	21	79	119
2007	1	18	8	17	96	167

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Map of the collection sites of yellow perch larvae during 2006 and 2007 in the western basin of Lake Erie with an inset of Lake Erie (LE) and Lake St. Clair (LSC). The horizontal line at 41.8 °N separates the north shore (NS) and south shore (SS), while the horizontal line at 42.05 °N separates the north shore from the Detroit River (DR).

Fig. 2. Subpopulation assignments of yellow perch larvae collected in western Lake Erie during 2006 (A) and 2007 (B). Larval assignment (SS, NS, or DR_h) reflects revision after a hydrodynamic backtracking correction was applied (i.e., location shows collection location, while symbol shows subpopulation assignment). Larvae collected in the Detroit River and predicted to have hatched in the Lake St. Clair-Detroit River system (i.e., those collected in the Detroit River north of 42.05°, DR_c) are not shown. Note that symbols of larvae collected at the same site and assigned to the same subpopulation overlap. Subpopulation symbols are slightly offset if larvae from a site were assigned to different subpopulations so that the range of subpopulation assignments at a site is visible.

Fig. 3. Subpopulation classification of yellow perch juveniles collected in western Lake Erie during 2006 (A) and 2007 (B). Juvenile genetic classification reflects assignment using backtracking-revised larval groupings. Note that symbols of juveniles collected at the same site and classified to the same subpopulation overlap. Symbols are slightly offset if juveniles from a site were assigned to different subpopulations so that the range of subpopulation classifications at a site is visible.

254x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)