

Evidence of declining fecundity in the Central Gulf of Alaska

Elizabeth E. Holmes, NWFSC

Lowell Fritz, NMML

Anne York, YoDA

Kathryn Sweeney, UW





The basic idea

- ▼ Develop models for the population based on data and knowledge about SSL life-history.
- ▼ Fit to time series data 1976 to 2004: pup, non-pup, and juvenile fraction
- ▼ Estimate maximum likelihood fits juvenile survivorship, adult survivorship and fecundity in different time periods
- ▼ Statistically quantify the fits



Data are derived mainly from the aerial survey data

AN AGE-
STRUCTURE
METRIC






NON-PUPS on
TREND
SITES
(Br SEASON)

TOTAL
CGA PUP
COUNT



Basic life history can be estimated from 1970s age and pregnancy data from Marmot Is.






Fitting models to total population trends alone does not rapidly detect change





Changes in age-structure is more sensitive to perturbations

- ▶ Perturbation was a 20% increase in juvenile survivorship
- ▶ Most extreme values occur 4-yr following a change
- ▶ Ratio stabilizes 10 yrs following the change





Changes in juvenile fraction allow us to see perturbations quickly

AN AGE-
STRUCTURE
METRIC



NON-PUPS on
TREND
SITES


TOTAL
CGA PUP
COUNT



We used this approach to estimate demographic perturbations in the CGOA



- ▶ Can you explain the data with only one early 1980s perturbation?
- ▶ How have demographic parameters been changing 1980-2004?
- ▶ What demographic parameter change is most consistent with the recent non-pup increases?

We focused on the CGOA



Is the analysis sensitive to the model?

We compared 3 life-history models, all based on the 1970s Marmot Island data



We allowed demographic rates to change through the 1980's and 1990's

For $t = 1976$ to 1982,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{76} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

For $t = 1983$ to 1987,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{83} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

For $t = 1988$ to 1992,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{88} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$



For $t = 1993$ to 1998,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{93} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

Matrices with period specific juvenile surv., fecundity, adult surv.

14-17 free parameters

Three scaling parameters



14-17 free parameters

We allowed demographic rates to change through the 1980's and 1990's

For $t = 1976$ to 1982,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{76} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

For $t = 1983$ to 1987,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{83} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

For $t = 1988$ to 1992,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{88} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

For $t = 1993$ to 1998,

$$\vec{N}_{t+1} = \mathbf{Y}_{93} \cdot \vec{N}_t$$

Matrices with period specific juvenile surv., fecundity, adult surv.

14-17 free parameters

Distance between the model and the data: negative log-likelihood

$$S(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\ln N}^2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\ln(N_i) - \ln(0.524(\hat{J}_i + \hat{A}_i)))^2$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\ln P}^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\ln(P_i) - \ln(0.95\hat{P}_i))^2$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2\sigma_J^2} \sum_{i=1}^m ((J/T)_i - (0.8\hat{J}_i / (\hat{J}_i + 0.21\hat{A}_i)))^2$$

+ a constant


Model

Data


Relationship between the indices and true value

We had to construct plausible time periods for when demographic rates changed. We did this 2 different ways.

- ▶ Oceanographic



- ▶ Analysis of rookery trends (York 1994)



- ~~▶ Known management actions~~
- ~~▶ Treat each year as a possible change point~~

Methodology overview

- ▼ Location
- ▼ Life-history models
- ▼ Temporal changes
- ▼ Fitting models
- ▼ Historical age-structure proxy

We had to develop a practical proxy for age-structure

- ▼ Use models to explore what are sensitive proxies
 - ▼ Ratio of pups to non-pups
 - ▼ Ratio of rookery to haul-out non-pups
 - ▼ Ratio of juveniles to adults
- ▼ Develop a practical way to measure the proxy: the ratio of small to large individuals
- ▼ Test it



The data



Measurements



11 years



7000-2000 animals per year

15-20 haul-outs

31,000 total measurements



Juvenile fraction has been changing

AN AGE-
STRUCTURE
METRIC



NON-PUPS on
TREND
SITES


TOTAL
CGA PUP
COUNT



We used this approach to estimate demographic perturbations in the CGOA


- ▶ Can you explain the data with only one early 1980s perturbation?
- ▶ How have demographic parameters been changing 1980-2004?
- ▶ What demographic parameter change is most consistent with the recent non-pup increases?

One change in demographic rates or multiple?




From Holmes & York 2003


Data are best fit by 4 demographic changes




Fit of model indicates rising survivorship and declining fecundity




The different models vary in their ability to fit the data



Models agree
on declining
fecundity
and rising
juvenile
survivorship



Agreement among models is driven by declining pup-to-non-pup ratios



It is difficult to explain the sum total of CGOA demographic data available since 1980 without a drastic decline in SSL fecundity

