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Chapter 1: Introduction

Atlantic sturgeon were of great cultural and economic importance in the late 1800s and early 1900s (Secor 2002). Industrial-scale fisheries, driven by the production and export of caviar, were established on many of the large tributaries along the east coast in New York, Delaware, Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia (Secor 2002). By the early 1900s, the Atlantic sturgeon industry crashed; and failure of the species to recover later led to a coast-moratorium in the mid-1990s. In 2012, Atlantic sturgeon, *Acipenser oxyrinchus*, were listed as Endangered under the Endangered Species Act (77 FR 5914, 77 FR 5880) prompting federal and state programs of recovery.

Although historically overfished; pollution, eutrophied waters, and hypoxia are viewed as extant threats curtailing recovery of this species in the Chesapeake Bay. Atlantic sturgeon populations had been considered non self-sustaining in the Chesapeake Bay (Secor et al. 2000). However, a reproducing population was recently discovered in the James and York Rivers, Virginia (Musick 2005; Balazik et al. 2013) and sexually mature Atlantic sturgeon have been found in freshwater portions of other tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay (Kahn et al. 2014). Although substantial uncertainty exists in what limits recovery of Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon, stressors operating during the first year of life play a dominant role. In general, early life stages of fish (embryos, larvae, early juveniles) are more sensitive than adults to stressors such as water pollutants, and temperature (Bonga 1997) and salinity changes (Potts and Rudy 1972; McEnroe and Cech 1985; Kynard and Horgan
Synergies in stressors are likely. For instance, nitrite, known to cause mortality in fish in aquaculture systems particularly in concert with lower salinity (chloride), is typically found in low concentrations (µM) in natural aquatic habitats (Eddy, 1994). However, in eutrophic systems like the Chesapeake Bay, industrial and sewage effluents can contain high levels of nitrite, which are then concentrated in bottom layers of the water column during seasonal stratification or released into surface waters (Eddy, 1994). Another example is the well-known synergy between hypoxia and thermal conditions (Breitburg et al. 1997, Coutant 1987).

Under the premise that Atlantic sturgeon were extirpated in the Chesapeake Bay, approximately 3,300 juvenile Atlantic sturgeon were released into the Nanticoke River in July 1996 to determine whether juveniles could survive and grow in the Chesapeake Bay (Secor et al. 2000). The relatively high recapture rate and growth rates of released fish suggested that Maryland’s portion of the Chesapeake Bay may provide suitable nursery habitat for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon. However, the summer of 1996 corresponded to the highest volume of total suitable habitat, predicted over a 10-year period (Niklitschek and Secor 2005). Thus, the high growth observed from 1996 fish may have been an anomaly. High inter-annual variation in suitable habitats is predicted to occur in the Chesapeake Bay particularly during summer months (Niklitschek and Secor 2005; Schlenger et al. 2013). Past research has emphasized water quality limitations through rearing experiments on age-0 and age-1 juveniles and through the development of bioenergetics models (Niklitschek and Secor 2009a,b; Schlenger et al. 2013).
In temperate systems, cessation of growth and lethal temperatures during winter months are thought to drive a latitudinal countergradient in juvenile growth, where juveniles of higher latitude populations grow faster during their first growth season (Conover 1990). Winter mortality is thought to select for this growth variation, where smaller or lower conditioned individuals are predicted to experience higher mortality rates owing to thermal stress, starvation, predation, disease, winter hypoxia, and physical disturbance (e.g. ice flows) (Hurst 2007). Atlantic sturgeon span a wide geographical range, yet no research has been conducted to determine if there is a difference between strains in their genetic capacity for growth as evident in other fish species (Conover 1990). With recent evidence for Atlantic sturgeon spawning during two seasons (spring and fall) in some regions (Balazik et al. 2013; Balazik and Musick 2015), one would expect very different sizes at the onset of winter and different sizes at age 1.0 years. Growth-degree-day models, (Neuheimer 2007) have been used to predict length-at-day or length-at-date and can act as a common currency among species and environments to evaluate questions related to growth performance and growth phenology (seasonality of growth).

Length-at-date predictions are also important for assessment of juvenile presence and abundance in nursery systems. Assignment of juveniles to age-0 and age-1 based on length has been uncertain owing to incomplete knowledge of how first year growth occurs across the broad latitudinal range (15 degrees) in which the species occurs (Satilla River, Florida to St. Lawrence River, Canada). Dual seasonal spawning in some portions of the species range would also confound these assignments.
Following this Introduction, I address nitrite toxicity in early juvenile Atlantic sturgeon, in Chapter 2. The objective of this study was to determine the lethality (LC50) of Atlantic sturgeon juveniles exposed to nitrite in concert with varying chloride levels. Mortality responses by age-0 Atlantic sturgeon to elevated nitrite concentrations in combination with mitigating chloride concentrations were evaluated in 24-hr LC50 trials. Chloride concentrations tested represented concentrations found in tidal freshwater tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay. Juveniles (4.8±0.8g) were exposed, in a full factorial experiment, to eight nitrite concentrations, 0 mg L⁻¹, 2 mg L⁻¹, 4 mg L⁻¹, 8 mg L⁻¹, 17 mg L⁻¹, 34 mg L⁻¹, 66 mg L⁻¹ and 132 mg L⁻¹ and three chloride levels, 2 mg L⁻¹, 15 mg L⁻¹, and 60 mg L⁻¹. I found early juvenile Atlantic sturgeon are presently not at risk for nitrite toxicity in Chesapeake Bay tributaries considering nitrite concentration in these areas (<0.6 mg L⁻¹) is less than the 24-hr LC50 determined by this study (4.1 mg L⁻¹, 2 mg L⁻¹ chloride).

In Chapter 3, I conducted 30-day laboratory trials to determine the lethal, growth, and physiological responses of age-0 juvenile Atlantic sturgeon to a range of temperatures and salinities, which they would encounter in natural nursery systems. In a balanced block design, four salinity levels (0, 1, 11 and 21 psu; 3 replicates/treatment; 10 fish per replicate) were crossed with three temperature treatments (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) for a total of 36 trials. Each fish was individually measured for length and whole body lactate concentration. Mortality in the high temperature and high salinity treatments were significant greater than in the lower temperature and salinity treatments. Significant interactive effects also occurred between temperature and salinity on mortality. Specific growth rates did not differ
among or between treatments, perhaps due to the short experimental duration and ranged from 1.3% day$^{-1}$ to 1.9% day$^{-1}$. Lactate concentrations were significantly affected by temperature and salinity. Lactate decreased with increasing temperature and salinity. Overall, it seems as though age-0 Atlantic sturgeon tolerate acclimation from 0 to 11 psu at 13°C and 18°C since no mortality was observed in these treatments. Changes to higher temperatures and salinities resulted in significant mortality and decreases in lactate concentrations. Increases in temperature and salinity intrusion as predicted to occur due to climate change (Najjar 2010) may curtail habitat available and/or result in sub-lethal effects of age-0 Atlantic sturgeon.

In Chapter 4, I tested predictions of Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon habitat suitability obtained through a bioenergetics model against incidence data for the period 1990-2013. Application of bioenergetics models to long term Chesapeake Bay data predicted consistently higher juvenile (age-1) growth in spring and fall seasons and in Eastern Shore and Virginia segments of the Lower Chesapeake Bay. There were no long-term trends in juvenile habitat quality observed over the model period (1990-2013), but juvenile growth was inversely correlated with the Chesapeake Bay’s summertime hypoxic volume. During summer months, juveniles, sub-adult, and adult Atlantic sturgeon (<500-1500 cm TL) were frequently captured in regions that the bioenergetics model predicted nil or negative growth (i.e., <40% dissolved oxygen saturation and > 27°C); sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon may not be as sensitive to these environmental parameters than juveniles (< 500 mm) responses, which have been the focus of past research and bioenergetics models. Results of this study indicate that sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon may not be as sensitive to
summertime conditions of high temperature and low dissolved oxygen as suggested by past research and bioenergetics models. However, the duration spent by sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon in these sub-optimal habitats warrant further investigation to fully understand the impact dissolved oxygen and temperature may impact distribution and habitat utilization in the Chesapeake Bay.

In Chapter 5, I investigated latitudinal countergradient variation in growth between populations of Atlantic sturgeon. I compared growth of Canada- and Altamaha (Georgia, US) strain Atlantic sturgeon juveniles (age-0) in a common garden experiment in which they were exposed to three thermal regimes, which were representative of the species latitudinal range. Results indicated no effect of strain on growth performance; Atlantic sturgeon length and weight were significantly influenced by thermal regime treatment independent of strain. To evaluate possible confounding influences of dual spawning on juvenile growth and size predictions, I applied a growth-degree-day (GDD) model, using water temperature data from seven NOAA National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) sites, over the latitudinal range of Atlantic sturgeon. The annual accumulation of GDDs varied significantly over a latitudinal gradient. The laboratory experiment supported a general species response to thermal conditions during the first year of life, and allowed a predictive equation of juvenile length from GDDs. Predicted sizes of age 1.0 juveniles were smaller north of the Chesapeake Bay than south of the Delaware Bay and reflected differences in sub- and supra-optimal temperatures across the species range. The number of days of surpra-optimal temperatures accumulated resulted in annual bi-modal GDD distribution south of the Chesapeake Bay. The
GDD model may support predictions of growth performance related to future climate change scenarios and thereby forecast climate impacts to Atlantic sturgeon recruitment and recovery throughout the species range.
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Chapter 2: Role of chloride mitigation in nitrite tolerance of age-0 Atlantic sturgeon *Acipenser oxyrinchus*

**Abstract**

Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*) spend the first several months of their early life in tidal freshwater where natural chloride levels are typically low and toxic levels of nitrite can accumulate due to pollution or natural processes. Toxic levels of nitrite can also occur in sturgeon aquaculture owing to high fish densities. Toxicity responses by age-0 Atlantic sturgeon to nitrite were tested in 24-hr LC50 exposures of nitrite in combination with mitigating chloride concentrations, which emulated ambient levels in tidal freshwater estuarine habitats. Atlantic sturgeon (4.8±0.77g; mean±S.D) were exposed to eight nitrite concentrations, 0 mg/L, 2 mg/L, 4 mg/L, 8 mg/L, 17 mg/L 34 mg/L, 66 mg/L and 132 mg/L with mitigating chloride concentrations of 2 mg/L, 15 mg/L, and 60 mg/L. Results indicated an increase in nitrite tolerance from 4.1 to 21.6 mg/L occurred with increasing chloride concentrations from 2 to 60 mg/L.

**Introduction**

Understanding the physiological tolerances of sturgeon to degraded habitats and water quality are important for recovery and artificial propagation of Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*), which is depleted throughout its range (ASSRT 2007). Presently the Chesapeake Bay designated population segment (DPS: a metapopulation unit) of Atlantic sturgeon is federally protected as *Endangered* under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Although historically overfished, pollution,
eutrophied waters, and hypoxia are viewed as extant threats curtailing recovery of this species in the Chesapeake Bay.

Nitrite is an intermediate compound formed in natural nitrogen cycling processes (nitrification and denitrification) and is typically found in low concentrations (µM) in natural aquatic habitats (Eddy, 1994). However, in eutrophic systems like the Chesapeake Bay, industrial and sewage effluents can contain high levels of nitrite, which are then concentrated in bottom layers of the water column during seasonal stratification or released into surface waters (Eddy, 1994). In addition, nitrite may also be problematic in aquaculture and other facilities where fish are stocked at artificially high densities, particularly in closed systems where water is recirculated (Timmons, 2002). Nitrite toxicity in intensive aquaculture systems is relevant to sturgeon research and recovery programs (Mims et al. 2002).

Toxicity of nitrite in age-0 Atlantic sturgeon is not known. The limited data available indicates that sturgeon and other ancestral actinopterygii are sensitive to elevated nitrite (Boudreaux, 2007; Huertas, 2002; Fontenot, 1998), which can result in mortality and sublethal effects. Atlantic sturgeon spend the first couple months in tidal freshwater where natural chloride levels are typically low and nitrite may accumulate due to pollution or natural processes. Climate change (increased precipitation and runoff), coupled with eutrophication will result in increased nitrite loads in Chesapeake Bay tributaries (Najjar et al. 2010), exposure to which could lead to physiological stress or mortality of young sturgeons. In fishes, nitrite binds with hemoglobin to form methemoglobin, which has restricted affinity to oxygen, thereby affecting fish respiration, elevating stress chemistry and potentially leading to

The degree of nitrite sensitivity and toxicity in sturgeons and other fishes is related to the chloride concentration of water as chloride is known to compete with nitrite for absorption through the gills (Lewis and Morris 1986; Fontenot et al. 1998). In tidal freshwater tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay, chloride concentrations range from 5-250 mg/L chloride (Chesapeake Bay Water Quality Program, 2001-2005). Shortnose sturgeon (*A. brevirostrum*) juveniles (9.2 ± 3.4g; mean ± SD) have been shown to tolerate nitrite concentration, 11.3 mg/L during 96-hour LC 50 trials at <1.0 mg/L chloride (Fontenot et al., 1998). At high chloride concentration (130.5 mg/L), the median-lethal concentration of nitrite was ~10-fold higher (130 mg/L) for Siberian sturgeon (*A. baerii*) (yearlings; 172.0±18 g; mean±S.D.) in a 72-hour experiment (Huertas et al. 2002). Still, this nitrite exposure resulted in extracellular hyperkalemia (high potassium), elevated chloride, and decreased sodium levels (Huertas et al. 2002).

The objective of this study was to determine the LC50 for Atlantic sturgeon juveniles when exposed to nitrite. Mortality responses by age-0 Atlantic sturgeon to elevated nitrite concentrations in combination with mitigating chloride concentrations were evaluated in 24-hr LC50 trials. Chloride concentrations tested represented concentrations found in tidal freshwater tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay.
**Materials and Methods**

Atlantic sturgeon fertilized eggs (Acadian Sturgeon and Caviar, Inc., New Brunswick, Canada) were hatched and larvae and juveniles reared in well water (17.8°C, 2 mg L⁻¹ chloride, 0 mg L⁻¹ nitrite, 8.4 pH) until 60-days old. At this age, juveniles (4.8±0.8g) were exposed, in a full factorial experiment, to eight nitrite concentrations, 0 mg L⁻¹, 2 mg L⁻¹, 4 mg L⁻¹, 8 mg L⁻¹, 17 mg L⁻¹ 34 mg L⁻¹, 66 mg L⁻¹ and 132 mg L⁻¹ (sodium nitrite, EMD Chemicals, Gibbstown, NJ, USA) and three chloride levels, 2 mg L⁻¹, 15 mg L⁻¹, and 60 mg L⁻¹ (sodium chloride, J.T. Baker, Phillipsburg, NJ, USA). Each nitrite and chloride combination was tested with 10 fish in triplicate for a total of 72 trials each in 8-L containers. Sodium nitrite was mixed in 72-L reservoir tanks with well water to obtain concentrations. Treatment containers received 6L from the nitrite reservoirs. Measured amounts of sodium chloride were added to each tank to obtain target chloride concentrations. Complete volume water exchanges were performed daily, refilling from the nitrite reservoirs and chloride as needed and temperatures were maintained via water bath (Table 1). Dissolved oxygen remained on average >7.8 mg L⁻¹, temperatures were between 18.3-19.3°C, and pH averaged 8.52 (±0.13) for the first 24-hours of the study (Table 1). There was no significant difference in pH levels between nitrite concentrations (p>0.05). Sturgeon mortalities were recorded at 8 and 24 hours (Tables 2-4). Fish were not fed during the study following OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) guidelines (1992). A trimmed Spearman-Karber (Hamilton et al. 1977) (10% trim) method was used to determine the LC50 occurring for each chloride treatment at 24-hrs post-exposure. An analysis of covariance with
binomial data was conducted to determine statistically significant difference between chloride concentrations on Atlantic sturgeon juvenile mortality controlling for nitrite concentrations (R Core Team 2014; Crawley 2007).

**Results**

Results indicated an increase in nitrite tolerance with increasing chloride concentrations (Fig. 1). For the 2 mg L⁻¹ chloride treatment, the 24-hr LC50 was 4.1 mg L⁻¹ nitrite (3.4-4.8, 95% confidence limits). The 24-hr LC50 for nitrite increased to 8.9 mg L⁻¹ (7.4-10.7, 95% confidence limits) for the 15 mg L⁻¹ chloride treatment and 21.60 mg L⁻¹ nitrite (18.3 – 25.5, 95% confidence limits) for the 60 mg L⁻¹ chloride treatment. There was a clear linear relationship between chloride concentrations and 24hr LC50 nitrite concentration (Fig.2). There was a significant effect (p<0.05) of chloride concentrations on juvenile mortality after controlling for nitrite concentrations. The higher the chloride concentration is in the water, the lower the mortality rates are since chloride buffers the detrimental effects of nitrite uptake by fish. The ANCOVA model for mortality, nitrite, and chloride has significant differences for intercepts (Table 2) which indicates mortality was reduced as chloride concentrations increased. These results are as expected since chloride, not nitrite, is preferentially diffused across fish gills which decreases the amount of nitrite entering the blood, hence reducing mortality. In addition to significant difference in intercepts, slopes were also significantly different between 2mg L⁻¹ chloride and 60 mg L⁻¹ chloride treatments (Table 2). A decrease in slope for the 60 mg L⁻¹ chloride treatments results in a decrease in mortality as nitrite concentrations increase.
Overall, chloride concentrations influence mortality rates when Atlantic sturgeon are exposed to varying nitrite concentrations.

**Discussion**

We used mortality as a marker of nitrite toxicity in this study. Since no mortality was observed in the control treatments (0 mg L\(^{-1}\) nitrite with mitigating concentrations of 0, 15, 60 mg L\(^{-1}\) chloride), we can assume all mortality observed was due to nitrite toxicity. Atlantic sturgeon juvenile were less tolerant (4.1 mg L\(^{-1}\) at 2 mg L\(^{-1}\) Cl) to nitrite concentrations than other sturgeon species, albeit fish were smaller (4.8±0.8g) than those used in other studies. LC50 ranged from 11.3 mg L\(^{-1}\) (<1 mg L\(^{-1}\) Cl; 96-hr LC50) to 130 mg L\(^{-1}\) nitrite (130.5 mg L\(^{-1}\) Cl; 72-hr LC50) for shortnose sturgeon (9.2 ± 3.4g) and Siberian sturgeon (172.0±18 g), respectively (Fontenot et al., 1998, Huertas et al. 2002). However, Matsche et al. (2012) found that larger Atlantic sturgeon juveniles (544±0.13 g; mean±SD) were physiologically affected (hemolytic anaemia, ion imbalances) to nitrite at concentrations as low as 1 mg/L (5 mg/L Cl) which may show a reduced tolerance to nitrite as Atlantic sturgeon grow.

Nitrite toxicity in freshwater fish is well documented and is influenced by water quality (i.e. pH, temperature, oxygen concentration), rate of nitrite uptake which differs between species, and other factors such as length of exposure, fish size, and fish activity; inactive fish have lower oxygen demand (Kroupova, 2005; Lewis, 1986; Jensen, 2003). Influx of environmental nitrite in freshwater fish occurs predominantly through the active chloride uptake mechanism in the gills, and interspecific differences in chloride uptake rates may explain differences in nitrite
sensitivity among fish (Tomasso Jr, 2005). Also, nitrite and chloride competitively inhibit each other in uptake across the gills (Williams, 1986). Therefore nitrite toxicity in fish typically decreases with increasing environmental chloride concentrations (Hilmy, 1987; Fontenot, 1999; Yanbo, 2006; Atwood, 2001).

In tidal freshwater environments in the Chesapeake Bay, nitrite concentration range from 0 mg L\(^{-1}\) to 0.6 mg L\(^{-1}\) (Chesapeake Bay Program Water Quality Program (2010-2014)). These nitrite concentrations are significantly lower than the LC 50 concentration (4.1 mg L\(^{-1}\)) detected for the low chloride (2 mg L\(^{-1}\)) level observed in our experiment. Natural chloride levels in these tidal reaches are typically higher than 2 mg L\(^{-1}\) so we would not expect acute toxicity to occur in tidal freshwater tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay. However, Matsche et al. (2012) did note sublethal effects of 1 mg L\(^{-1}\) nitrite (5 mg L\(^{-1}\) chloride) for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon. The likelihood of these conditions occurring in the Chesapeake Bay tidal freshwater tributaries is slight but possible. Chloride concentrations in these areas can be as low as 5 mg L\(^{-1}\) and nitrite concentrations of 0.6 mg L\(^{-1}\) have been measured in these systems. Also, decreased nitrite tolerance with age/size has been reported (Lewis and Morris 1986; Kroupova et al. 2005) so in the tidal freshwater areas of tributaries, it may be the spawning adult Atlantic sturgeon that are more at risk to experience sub-lethal effects than juvenile Atlantic sturgeon. It is possible that nitrite concentrations in the Chesapeake Bay will increase owing to (1) the long-term prediction of increased precipitation and runoff associated with climate change (Najjar et al. 2010) and (2) increased industrial and sewage effluents (Eddy, 1994).
In aquaculture systems, nitrite concentrations can reach 50mg L\(^{-1}\) or more in recirculating systems, which depend on biological filters, or when imbalances occur in managing nitrogenous wastes (Kroupova et al. 2005). Chloride concentration in water is considered one of the most important factors influencing nitrite toxicity and is easily manipulated in recirculating aquaculture systems. As shown in our studies, and as practiced in intensive aquaculture, additions of sodium chloride or calcium chloride should ameliorate the effect of nitrite toxicity in sturgeon (Fontenot et al. 1999; Matsche et al. 2012) and other fish species (Bowser et al. 1983; Himly et al. 1987; Aggergaard and Jensen 2001; Atwood et al. 2001).

In conclusion, early juvenile Atlantic sturgeon are presently not at risk for nitrite toxicity in Chesapeake Bay tributaries considering nitrite concentration in these areas (<0.6 mg L\(^{-1}\)) is less than the 24-hr LC50 determined by this study (4.1 mg L\(^{-1}\), 2 mg L\(^{-1}\) chloride). However, spawning adult Atlantic sturgeon may be more at risk to experience sub-lethal effects of nitrite toxicity in the freshwater environments. If future restoration efforts include aquaculture to supplement the population, these results are important in order to understand the water criteria needed for rearing Atlantic sturgeon in recirculating systems.
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### Tables

Table 1
Water quality conditions (± standard deviation) experienced by Atlantic sturgeon juveniles during 24-hour study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Chloride</th>
<th>Nitrite</th>
<th>DO (mg/L)</th>
<th>Temp (°C)</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3±0.2</td>
<td>18.9±0.1</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.4±0.1</td>
<td>18.8±0.2</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3±0.4</td>
<td>18.8±0.3</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.6±0.2</td>
<td>18.8±0.3</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5±0.1</td>
<td>19.3±0.5</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.5±0.1</td>
<td>19.3±0.5</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.3±0.3</td>
<td>18.8±0.0</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8.5±0.1</td>
<td>19.0±0.1</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3±0.3</td>
<td>18.4±0.0</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.4±0.1</td>
<td>18.3±0.0</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.4±0.2</td>
<td>18.3±0.1</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4±0.2</td>
<td>18.3±0.1</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.7±0.1</td>
<td>18.5±0.4</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.7±0.1</td>
<td>18.3±0.0</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.5±0.1</td>
<td>18.4±0.1</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8.6±0.0</td>
<td>18.5±0.1</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.8±1.4</td>
<td>18.4±0.1</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0±0.4</td>
<td>18.4±0.0</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2±0.4</td>
<td>18.4±0.1</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2±0.2</td>
<td>18.5±0.0</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3±0.2</td>
<td>19.2±0.4</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.4±0.3</td>
<td>19.1±0.5</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.6±0.2</td>
<td>19.2±0.5</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8.5±0.1</td>
<td>19.3±0.5</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. ANCOVA results of chloride effect on juvenile mortality while controlling for nitrite. * denotes significance at 0.05.

|                          | Estimate | Std. Error | Z value | Pr (>|z|) |
|--------------------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| Intercept                | -1.7     | 0.3        | -5.6    | 0.000*   |
| Nitrite                  | 0.3      | 0.1        | 5.7     | 0.000*   |
| Chloride (15 mg L⁻¹)     | -3.2     | 0.5        | -2.9    | 0.004*   |
| Chloride (60 mg L⁻¹)     | -3.2     | 0.5        | -3.1    | 0.002*   |
| Nitrite:Chloride (15 mg L⁻¹) | 0.3     | 0.1        | 0.1     | 0.922    |
| Nitrite:Chloride (60 mg L⁻¹) | 0.1     | 0.1        | -3.1    | 0.002*   |
Figures

Figure 1. Mortality of Atlantic sturgeon juveniles after 24-hour period exposure to eight nitrite concentrations (mg L\(^{-1}\)) crossed with three chloride concentrations (mg L\(^{-1}\)).
Fig. 2. Relationship between chloride concentrations (mg L$^{-1}$) and LC50 nitrite concentrations (mg L$^{-1}$).
Chapter 3: The effects of acclimation to temperature and salinity on age-0 Atlantic sturgeon *Acipenser oxyrinchus* using lactate as an indicator

**Abstract**

Temperature and salinity are known stressors in aquatic environments and may determine habitat available to larval and juvenile euryhaline species. Atlantic sturgeon are anadromous so spawning occurs in freshwater portions of tidal tributaries. Embryos, larvae, and early juveniles are thought to be salinity intolerant but it is unknown at what salinity physiological stress occurs in this species. I acclimated 40dph Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) to three temperatures (13°C, 18°C, 20°C) and four salinities (0, 1, 11, 21) at 1°C day⁻¹ and 1 psu day⁻¹. Whole body lactate, mortality, and specific growth rates were determined. Results indicate decreases in lactate concentrations with increasing temperature (3-5.10 µmol per gram fish weight) and salinity (2.58-5.16 µmol per gram fish weight). Higher mortality was observed in higher salinity treatments (0-27.8%). Specific growth rates (1.3-1.9 % day⁻¹) were comparable across treatments.

**Introduction**

Hematological values of fishes can be affected by environmental factors which include water quality parameters such as water temperature, salinity, oxygen, pH, etc. (Zarejabad et al. 2010). Environmental factors can act as the “stressor” or “stress factor” which is the stimulus that inflicts stress on the fish (Barton 2000). “Stress” or “stressed state” is the altered state of the fish and “stress response” are the
physiological or behavioral responses that can be measured to indicate the degree of stress experienced (Barton 2000). Stress in fishes can be described by three responses: primary, secondary, and tertiary (Bonga 1997; Barton 2000; Wedemeyer et al. 1990). The primary response (the endocrine system) is the initial neuroendocrine response and involves the activation of the brain center resulting in the release of catecholamines and corticosteroids (Wedemeyer et al. 1990; Bonga 1997; Barton 2000). The secondary response (blood and tissue alterations) includes changes in blood glucose and lactate, electrolytes and osmality, and hematological features that relate to physiological functions such as metabolism and hydromineral balance (Wedemeyer et al. 1990; Bonga 1997; Barton 2000). Secondary physiological changes can take minutes to hours to manifest in circulation and can remain altered for extended periods (Barton 2000). The tertiary response (individuals and populations) is a whole-animal response and is extended to the level of the organism and population (Wedemeyer et al. 1990; Bonga 1997; Barton 2000). Tertiary responses include changes in growth, resistance to disease, behavior, reproduction, and survival (Wedemeyer et al. 1990; Bonga 1997; Barton 2000). Cortisol is the primary stress response in fish (Bonga 1997; Tsui et al. 2012) and most likely the main stress steroid in Acipenseriformes (Singer and Ballantyne 2004) of which sturgeon are members (Bermis et al. 1997; Krayushkina et al. 1995). For the present study, I used lactate as an indicator in age-0 Atlantic sturgeon acclimated to various temperatures and salinities. Plasma glucose and lactate levels are indicators of a secondary stress response in fish (Tsui et al. 2012). When fish are stressed, energy reserves are mobilized and increases in plasma glucose and lactate occur (Barton
Measuring these secondary responses in fish provides physiological information assimilated at a higher biological level within the organism and may characterize the severity of stress and the time needed for recovery (Wedemeyer et al. 1990).

Acute stress caused by capture, handling, hypoxia, osmotic and temperature shock, or exposure to water pollutants has been reported to result in the increase of lactate in muscle and plasma of fish (Bonga 1997). In sturgeon species, glucose and lactate have been used as stress indicators for experiments such as air exposure (Lankford et al. 2003; Zuccarelli et al. 2008; Eslamloo and Falahatkar 2014), handling/exercise (Kieffer et al. 2001; Singer and Ballantyne 2004; Webb et al. 2007), salinity (Potts and Rudy 1972; McEnroe and Cech 1985; Bain 1997; McKenzie et al. 2001; Singer and Ballantyne 2004; Allen and Cech 2007) and temperature (Lankford et al. 2003; Zhang and Kieffer 2014). Exhaustive exercise in sturgeon can stimulate a reduced stress response (i.e. change in lactate) (Wokoma and Johnston 1981; Baker et al. 2005), however, it is more likely that changes in lactate are a result of energy stores not being restored under high metabolic costs (Allen and Cech 2007; Haller et al. 2014). Lack of energy reserves and the ability of an animal to recover from exhaustive exercise can limit performance during exercise (Kieffer 2000). Several biological constraints (i.e. body size and nutrition) as well as environmental constraints (i.e. water temperature and salinity) can influence pre- and post-exercise condition of fish (Kieffer 2000). In addition, the nutritional state can influence a fish’s ability to recover from energetic costs, that is fish with lower energy stores display a lower anaerobic capacity (i.e. production of lactate) (Kieffer et
Temperature can also influence and change physiological processes in sturgeon (Zhang and Kieffer 2014). In white sturgeon ($Acipenser transmontanus$), high temperatures can increase mortality, decrease growth rate, and reduce swimming activity (Zhang and Kieffer 2014). In shortnose sturgeon, thermal stress was shown to increase lactate levels suggesting that increased metabolic rates could not be maintained with aerobic metabolism; therefore anaerobic metabolism was used to generate energy; a response to agitation and burst-swimming as their thermal maximum was approached (Zhang and Kieffer 2014).

In general, early life stages of fish (embryos, larvae, early juveniles) are more sensitive than adults to stressors such as water pollutants and temperature changes (Bonga 1997) and salinity changes (Potts and Rudy 1972; McEnroe and Cech 1985; Kynard and Horgan 2002; Singer and Ballantyne 2004). Sturgeons are described taxonomically as Acipenseriformes and they are similar to teleosts in main features of their osmoregulation (Potts and Rudy 1972; Krayushkina et al. 1995; Bermis et al. 1997; Singer and Ballantyne 2004) and stress response (Eslamloo and Falahatkar 2014). The ability of euryhaline fish to adapt to varying environmental salinities depends on activation of ion transport which impose energetic costs (Singer and Ballantyne 2004; Sinha et al. 2015). Compared to teleosts, sturgeon species are less capable of tolerating rapid seawater exposure and may require more time to adjust to salinity changes (Singer and Ballantyne 2004). Atlantic sturgeon are anadromous, with spawning occurring in freshwater tidal regions of estuaries, with some evidence of spawning in brackish water, and both juveniles and adults forage in the marine environment (Smith 1985; Bain 1997; Singer and Ballantyne 2004). Larvae and
young juveniles of anadromous sturgeon species are initially intolerant to higher salinities but as they grow higher salinities are selected (Cataldi et al. 1999; Bain et al. 2000; Kynard and Horgan 2002; Allen and Cech 2007; Ziegeweid et al. 2008; Allen et al. 2009, 2011). Age-0 Atlantic sturgeon are vulnerable to salinities >20 (Niklitschek & Secor 2005). Thus salinity determines the area available to juveniles as nursery grounds (Schlenger et al. 2013) and may explain why sturgeon are typically confined to major river systems with large estuaries where abrupt salinity changes are less likely to occur (Potts and Rudy 1972; Singer and Ballantyne 2004). Atlantic sturgeon <3 months old may be less tolerant to environmental changes and information is needed to fully understand how temperature and salinity interactions can constrain habitat availability for this age group of Atlantic sturgeon. There is limited data on how long Atlantic sturgeon juveniles remain in freshwater environment or at what age/size they can tolerate higher salinities (Smith 1985; Bain 1997; Lazzari et al. 1986). Over the past 55+ years of the VIMS Trawl Survey (1955-2011), forty-eight Atlantic sturgeon ranging in size from 85-997mm TL (avg. 433mm) have been captured; the smallest of which was captured in freshwater (0.1 salinity) (M. Fabrizio and T. Tuckey, VIMS, un-published data). Given the scarcity and difficulty catching early juvenile Atlantic sturgeon, this research may shed new light on habitat (i.e. temperature and salinity) utilized by early juvenile Atlantic sturgeon and their physiological state (i.e. stress level, survival, growth) while inhabiting these environments. I hypothesized that lactate concentrations can be used as an indicator of thermal and salinity stress in Atlantic sturgeon resulting with increased stress with increasing salinities and higher temperature.


**Materials and Methods**

**Fish Source and Husbandry**

Age-0 juveniles were obtained from US Fish and Wildlife Service, Bears Bluff/Orangeburg National Fish Hatchery Complex, Wadmalaw Island, South Carolina and were progeny of Atlantic sturgeon broodstock collected from the Altamaha River, GA between November 2008 – May 2009. At 27 days post-hatch (dph) fish were shipped to University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science Horn Point Laboratory (UMCES HPL) and reared in freshwater (18.7±0.2°C, 7.8±0.3 mg L⁻¹ dissolved oxygen). Fish were fed brine shrimp (Brine Shrimp Direct, Ogden, UT) using a bellows metering pump (Gorman-Rupp Industries, Bellville, OH) set to feed every twelve minutes for 90 seconds from a reservoir of hatched brine shrimp in order to maintain a density of 1.5 nauplii per 10 mL in the tank (Mohler 2004).

**Experimental Design**

At 40 dph (39±5.5mm TL; 3.5±0.07g (average weight of 10 fish)) fish were stocked in 8-L containers. Juveniles were acclimated to treatment temperatures and salinities at a rate of 1°C and 1 psu day⁻¹. In a balanced block design, four salinity levels (0, 1, 11 and 21 psu; 3 replicates/treatment; 10 fish per replicate) were crossed with three temperature treatments (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) for a total of 36 trials. Reservoirs of well water were heated, chilled, or held at ambient temperature to be used for water exchanges that occurred daily. Instant Ocean® was used in salinity treatments and was added to each individual 8-L container to obtain targeted salinity.
Temperature, dissolved oxygen, and salinity were recorded daily. Mortality was recorded daily and cumulative mortality calculated for each treatment container. Fish were fed artemia nauplii by hand two to three times per day at a density of 1.5 nauplii per 10 mL. When treatments reached the desired temperature and salinity concentrations, survivors were euthanized (300 mg L-1 MS-222 buffered with sodium bicarbonate). Each fish was individually measured for length and stored in a -80 freezer until lactate analysis could be completed. Specific growth rates (SGR(% day\(^{-1}\))=(((\ln(\text{final length})-\ln(\text{initial length}))/\# \text{ days})*100) using length data were calculated for each treatment tank to determine if temperature and/or salinity affected growth rates.

**Lactate and Statistical Analysis**

Whole body lactate concentrations were measured for individual juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the study. Following the protocol in Wokoma and Johnston (1981), individual fish were weighed (g) then homogenized in 5 mL of 0.6 mol L\(^{-1}\) perchloric acid. Homogenates were chilled on ice and centrifuged for ten minutes at 6000 revs min\(^{-1}\). Supernatants were removed, neutralized with 2 M-K\(_2\)HCO\(_3\), and lactate acid concentrations were determined colorimetrically (450nm) using a lactate analysis kit (Lactate Assay Kit II, Sigma-Aldrich, catalog number MAK065). Standard curves were run concurrently with samples. Each sample was run in duplicate. Lactate concentrations were converted to \(\mu\text{mol g}^{-1}\) fish weight for statistical analysis.

Two-way ANOVA (R Core Team 2014) was used to determine the effect of temperature and salinity on mortality, SGR, and lactate concentrations. Tukey’s
honestly significant difference multiple comparison tests of means were used if the overall ANOVA was found to be significant.

**Results**

**Mortality and Specific Growth Rates**

A two-way ANOVA of temperature (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) and salinity (0, 1, 11, 21) on mortality (morts:total) and SGR (% day⁻¹) was conducted. A significant main effect of temperature on mortality was found, F(2,24)=15.90, p<0.05. Mortality (%) was higher in the 26°C treatment (mean=27.5) than in the 13°C (mean=3.3) and 18°C (mean=5.8). There was no significant difference in mortality between 18°C and 13°C treatments. A significant main effect of salinity on mortality was found, F(3,24)=9.056, p<0.05. Mortality was higher in the 21 salinity treatment (mean=27.8) compared to the 0, 1, and 11 salinity treatments (means=8.9, 0, 12.2, respectively). The temperature x salinity interaction was significant, F(6,24)=4.2, p<0.05. Within the 26°C treatment, significant differences in mortality occurred between salinities of 0 (mean=13.3) and 21 (mean=60), 1 (mean=0) and 21 (mean=60), and 1 (mean=0) and 11 (mean=36.7) with higher mortality occurring in the higher salinities (Fig.1). Additionally, significant interactions at 11 and 21 salinities occurred between 26°C and the other temperatures (13°C and 18°C) (Fig. 1). There were no additional significant interactions at other levels.

The main effect of temperature on SGR was not significant, F(2,24)=1.466, p=0.251. The main effect of salinity on SGR was also not significant, F(3,24)=0.371, p=0.775. Additionally, the temperature x salinity interaction was not significant,
F(6,24)=1.048, p=0.42. SGRs ranged from 1.3 % day\(^{-1}\) to 1.9 % day\(^{-1}\) across all treatments (Fig. 2).

**Lactate**

A two-way ANOVA of temperature (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) and salinity (0, 1, 11, 21) on lactate (µmol g\(^{-1}\) fish weight) was conducted. A significant main effect of temperature on lactate was found, F(2,258)=148.26, p<0.05. Lactate concentrations decreased as temperatures increased. The lactate concentrations in the 13°C treatment (mean=5.10) was significantly higher than the lactate concentrations in both the 18°C treatment (mean=3.27) and 26°C treatment (mean=3.02) (Fig. 3). A significant main effect of salinity on lactate was found, F(3,258)=107.57, p<0.05. Lactate concentrations decreased as salinity increased with mean lactate concentrations of 5.16, 4.32, 3.37, and 2.58 in salinity treatments 0, 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Lactate concentrations were significantly different across all salinities (Fig. 4). The temperature x salinity interaction was significant, F(6,258)=8.65, p<0.05. Within the 13°C all salinity levels were significantly different from one another (Fig. 5). Mean (± standard of deviation) lactate concentrations in the 13°C treatment were 6.84 (±0.9), 5.95 (±1.0), 4.54 (±0.8), and 2.98 (±0.7) for 0, 1, 11, and 21 salinity treatments, respectively. Within the 18°C treatment, significant differences were found between 0 salinity (4.48±0.9) and both 11 salinity (2.46±0.8) and 21 salinity (2.00±0.4) (Fig. 5). There was no significant difference between 0 salinity (4.48±0.9) and 1 salinity (3.69±0.6) at 18°C. Significant differences were also found between 1 salinity (3.69±0.6) and both 11 salinity (2.46±0.8) and 21 salinity (2.00±0.4) in the 18°C treatment. In the 26°C, 0 salinity (3.9±1.1) was
significantly higher than 1 (1.79±0.5), 11 (2.75±1.72), and 21 (2.27±0.72) salinities (Fig. 5). There were no significant differences between the other salinity treatments at this temperature.

Lactate concentrations decrease in 0 salinity treatments with increasing temperatures (Fig. 5). Lactate concentrations are significantly higher in the 0 salinity at 13°C (6.84±0.9) compared to both the 18°C and 26°C 0 salinity groups (4.48±0.9, 3.9±1.1, respectively). Additionally, the 1 salinity treatment is significantly different among all temperature treatments with lactate concentration significantly decreasing as temperatures increase (5.95±1.0, 3.69±0.6, 1.79±0.5 for 13°C, 18°C, 26°C, respectively). For the 11 salinity treatment, the 13°C group had significantly higher lactate concentration (4.54±0.8) than both the 18°C and 26°C group (2.46±0.8, 2.75±1.72, respectively) but there was no difference at 11 salinity between the 18°C and 26°C groups. The highest salinity treatment, 21, also showed a decrease in lactate concentrations as temperatures increased. There was significant difference at 13°C (2.98±0.7) and 18°C (2.00±0.4) but no difference between 13°C and 26°C or 18°C and 26°C.

Discussion

Growth and Mortality

Sturgeon maintain plasma ion levels hypoosmotic to seawater and hyperosmotic to freshwater and studies suggest osmoregulatory costs are lowest in freshwater during juvenile development (Singer and Ballantyne 2004). Salinity-
related effects on growth have been studied for other sturgeon species (McKenzie et al. 1999, Altinok & Grizzle 2001; McKenzie et al. 2001b) but growth potential for sturgeon in various salinities may vary depending on life history and age/size (Allen & Cech 2007). In a study by Jarvis et al. (2001), juvenile shortnose sturgeon had higher weight gain in freshwater and lost weight at 20‰. Juvenile Gulf sturgeon (*A. oxyrinchus desotoi*) experienced higher specific growth rates in 3‰ and 9‰ than 0‰ and 1‰ (Altinok and Grizzle 2001). Adriatic sturgeon had lower specific growth rates at 20‰ than 0‰ (McKenzie et al. 1999). I did not see an effect of salinity or temperature on specific growth rates for 40dpf Atlantic sturgeon. The growth rates observed were within the range of growth rates for other sturgeon species observed in other studies (Altinok and Grizzle 2001; Allen and Cech 2007; McKenzie et al. 1999) so acclimation of 1 psu day⁻¹ and 1°C day⁻¹ did not inhibit growth. However, a difference in mortality rates was observed with higher mortality occurring in the higher salinity treatments and also at the higher temperature. McEnroe and Cech (1985) showed white sturgeon ranging in weight from 0.4 g to 56 g survived abrupt transfer to 5 salinity but fish below 1.8g did not survive transfer to 10 salinity and those below 4.9 g did not survive transfer to 15 salinity. No juvenile fish survived transfer to salinities of 25 and above (McEnroe and Cech 1985). Ziegeweid et al. 2008 found 48hr salinity LC50 values increased with increasing size of shortnose sturgeon with 56mm TL fish having a LC50 value of 14.8 salinity. In this study, >50% mortality only occurred at 26°C in 21 salinity but it is possible if fish were exposed for a longer period to higher salinities, I may have seen higher mortality as observed in other studies. For shortnose sturgeon (68mm TL, 70dpf), the 48hr LT50
was 28.2°C (Ziegeweid et al. 2008) so it is possible we were approaching the higher
temperature tolerance of age-0 Atlantic sturgeon. It is also likely that that there is an
interaction between temperature and salinity, as seen by Niklitschek and Secor (2005)
and Schlenger et al. (2013).

**Lactate**

Results from this study indicate a clear effect of temperature and salinity on
lactate concentration in age-0 Atlantic sturgeon. Studies on the effect of salinity on
several sturgeon species has shown that salinity tolerance increases with body
size/age (Cataldi et al, 1999; Allen and Cech 2007; Ziegeweid et al. 2008; Amiri et al.
2009; Allen et al. 2011). Age-0 Atlantic sturgeon were 40dph (39±5.5mm TL;
3.5±0.07g (average weight of 10 fish)) which is younger and smaller than sturgeon
used in most previous studies. Allen and Cech (2007) looked at the effect of age and
size of green sturgeon (*A. medirostris*) on osmoregulation and found that plasma
lactate decreased in saltwater (33‰) treatments in the younger age groups tested (100
and 170dph) compared to both freshwater (<3‰) and brackish water (10‰)
treatments. A decreased in lactate concentrations with increasing salinities was also
observed in my study. A possible explanation for the decrease of lactate in the higher
salinities is the reduction in food consumption due to stress which means energy
stores were not replenished but osmoregulatory costs were high in the higher
salinities as observed by Allen and Cech (2007). Haller et al. (2014) observed a trend
toward lower lactate in feed-restricted groups of green sturgeon (214dph) across all
salinity treatments (0, 8, 16, 32) and suggest that lactate was utilized for maintenance
of glucose levels due to increased lactate use as a substrate for hepatic
gluconeogenesis. Food consumption was not observed but given the higher mortality observed in the higher salinities, it is possible sturgeon in these treatments were not feeding well although specific growth rates of survivors did not differ between treatments. Additionally, Allen and Cech (2007) observed less swimming activity in the higher salinity treatments where plasma lactate was also low. Reduced activity by Siberian sturgeon (*A. baerii*) has also been observed following an acute stressor and resulted in lower plasma lactate levels (Eslamloo and Falahatkar 2014) and reduced swimming activity was also observed in Adriatic sturgeon following a salinity challenge (McKenzie et al. 2001a). It has been shown that lactate increases with “burst swimming” or periods of hypoxia will increase lactate concentrations (Kieffer et al. 2001; Jarvis and Ballantyne 2003; Lankford et al. 2003; Baker et al. 2005). Swimming activity was not noted but it is possible that the lower lactate levels observed in the higher salinities and temperatures could be the result of less swimming activity in stressed fish. In a study using 16-month old (274g) shortnose sturgeon (*A. brevirostrum*), a small increase in plasma lactate was observed in the high-salinity (20‰) group indicating an oxygen debt incurred which may have been due to gill shrinkage due to the sturgeon being transferred from freshwater to seawater (Jarvis and Ballantyne 2003). In my study using Atlantic sturgeon, I observed the opposite response of sturgeon in higher salinity with regards to lactate. It is possible in my study that the energy requirement for osmoregulation was greater than the energy stores available since it is believed that the energy requirement of the fish gill is maintained by the oxidation of glucose and lactate (Laiz-Carrion et al. 2002). Allen et al. (2009, 2011) stated that developmental growth and an ontogenetic
change in gills occurs between 3-6 months post-hatch in green sturgeon that may be necessary before fish can acclimate to saltwater and internal and external cues may stimulate osmoregulatory mechanisms. In my study, it is possible that 40 dph Atlantic sturgeon have not developed the osmoregulatory mechanisms needed to tolerate high salinities. Gills of sturgeon contain large numbers of chloride cells which are the primary site for salt secretion and Atlantic sturgeon adapted to brackish and salt water have large and higher numbers of chloride cells compared with freshwater fish (Singer and Ballantyne 2004). In future studies with age-0 Atlantic sturgeon it would be interesting to look at gill structure after exposure to various salinities to determine if the structures for osmoregulation are developed in fish this age or start to develop when exposed to salinity as proposed in other studies (Allen and Cech 2007; McEnroe and Cech 1985).

Temperature also had an effect on lactate levels. Higher lactate concentrations were observed in the 13°C treatment compared to the 18°C and 26°C treatments. It is possible that sturgeon in the 13°C treatment had lower feed needs and less metabolic/respiratory costs so energy stores could be used for osmoregulation resulting in increased lactate at this temperature because a deficit in energy stores would not occur. This deficit was observed in the study by Allen and Cech 2007 where low plasma glucose was found in younger age green sturgeon in saltwater due to energy stores being used up through tissue catabolism. The lower lactate levels observed in the 26°C of my study could also be explained by this since metabolic rates increase in warmer water (Zarejabad et al. 2010) and osmoregulatory costs would be greater in higher salinities. Zhang and Kieffer (2014) found that thermal
stress caused lactate levels to increase in shortnose sturgeon especially when the fish were initially acclimated to lower temperatures (10°C and 15°) compared to 20°C, however lactate levels decreased with increases in acclimation temperature so the 20°C treatment had the lowest lactate levels when the critical thermal maximum was reached. In my study, sturgeon were reared in 18°C water and water temperatures were either lowered to 13°C or raised to 26°C. Although Zhang and Kieffer (2014) found an increase in lactate with thermal stress, my results are similar to what they observed in that my fish were acclimated at 18°C at the start of the experiment and lactate levels decreased in the treatment where water temperature was increased at a rate of 1°C day⁻¹. The explanation made by Zhang and Kieffer (2014) for this observation is increased hematocrit associated with thermal stress may negatively impact hemoglobin-oxygen affinity resulting in higher dependency on anaerobic pathways. I did not measure additional hematological parameters in my study so I cannot make conclusions about hematocrit, but given the similarity in the results, it is possible this occurred in the fish in the 26°C treatment.

In conclusion, specific growth rates did not vary much between treatments but there was a significant effect of temperature and salinity on mortality and lactate levels. I hypothesize that lactate levels decreased at as temperatures and salinities increased due to energy stores being depleted for metabolism and osmoregulation. Given the size of the fish I was using (39mm TL), I was unable to process multiple indices to measure the effect of temperature and salinity since I used whole fish to complete the lactate analysis. In future studies, it would be beneficial to also measure glucose levels to better understand the effect on energy stores. In addition, gill
morphology may also be used to better predict and understand the effect salinity will have on age-0 Atlantic sturgeon since the number and size of chloride cells may determine their salinity tolerance (Singer and Ballantyne 2004; Allen et al. 2009, 2011). Overall, it seems as though age-0 Atlantic sturgeon tolerate acclimation to 11 salinity reasonably well at 13°C and 18°C since no mortality was observed in these treatments. Mortality did increase at this salinity in the 26°C treatment so an interaction of temperature and salinity may be occurring at these treatment levels. It may be age-0 Atlantic sturgeon are more tolerant of higher salinities than initially believed and survival in brackish water is possible, at least for short periods of time. It is also interesting that the sturgeon seemed to be less physiologically stressed (i.e. higher lactate levels, lower mortality, comparable SGR) in the 13°C across all salinities compared to the other two temperature treatments. This study may assist researchers in their attempt to find age-0 Atlantic sturgeon within salinity zones of their nursery habitats and understand potential costs of persisting in high salinity environments.
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Figure 1. Mean (± std dev) juvenile Atlantic sturgeon mortality (%) after acclimation to three different temperatures (13°C, 18°C, 26°) and four different salinities (0, 1, 11, 21). Different letters indicate significant differences (ANOVA, p<0.05).
Figure 2. Mean (±std dev) juvenile Atlantic sturgeon SGR (% day$^{-1}$) after acclimation to three different temperatures (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) and four different salinities (0, 1, 11, 21).
Figure 3. Mean (±std dev) juvenile Atlantic sturgeon lactate concentrations (µmol per g fish wt) after acclimation to three different temperatures (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) regardless of salinity treatment. Different letters denote significant differences (ANOVA, p<0.05).
Figure 4. Mean (±std dev) juvenile Atlantic sturgeon lactate concentrations (µmol per g fish wt) after acclimation to four different salinities (0, 1, 11, 21) regardless of temperature treatment. Different letters denote significant differences (ANOVA, p<0.05).
Figure 5. Mean (± std dev) juvenile Atlantic sturgeon lactate concentrations (µmol per g fish wt) after acclimation to three temperatures (13°C, 18°C, 26°C) and four salinities (0, 1, 11, 21). Different letters denote significant differences (ANOVA, p<0.05).
Chapter 4: Testing the sensitivity of Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon to hypoxia through comparison of modeled and observed habitat distribution

Abstract

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2003 established a DO criterion of 60% (5 mg L⁻¹) at 25°C to protect sturgeon species in the Chesapeake Bay. To determine if these criteria are protective of sturgeon, this study tested predictions of Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon habitat suitability obtained through a bioenergetics model against incidence data for the period 1990-2013. Growth rate was modeled through bioenergetics responses to dissolved oxygen (DO), temperature, salinity, and their interactions. Bottom water data on DO (mg L⁻¹), temperature (°C), and salinity were used to develop values of potential growth rate using Chesapeake Bay Program water quality data (Chesapeake Bay Program 2012) from 1990 – 2013. To compare juvenile potential growth with occurrence data for sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon, capture data from the USFWS reward program was used. Most of the time, sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon were captured at sites predicated to have positive growth potential, however, Atlantic sturgeon captures occurred at DO levels <60% saturation during spring, summer, and fall for the Mid Bay segment and during summer in the Lower Eastern Shore segment. Fifty-four of the 163 captures occurred at DO levels <30% DO saturation. In the Lower Eastern Shore, mean DO levels of occurrence in the summer was higher (64 ± 9%) and ranged between 37% and 75%. During summer months in both these segments, there was a tendency for
captures to occur between 22 and 25°C, although captures were observed between 25 and 27°C during 1997 and 1998 in the Lower Eastern Shore segment and in 1997 in the James River and Mid Bay. Results of this study indicate that sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon may not be as sensitive to these environmental parameters as suggested by past research and bioenergetics models.

**Introduction**

Geospatial models of habitat suitability represent a powerful means to predict current threats and future recovery of endangered species, for which an empirical basis for evaluation is curtailed by their rare incidence. Further, such models can provide a means to evaluate ecosystem management efforts against the species recovery. As an example, a habitat suitability model for satellite-tagged blue whales (*Balaenoptera musculus*), an endangered species, identified areas of high use and provided management with relevant data regarding whale activity within shipping lanes and suggested changes to reduce vessel-whale interactions (Irvine et al. 2014; Hazen et al. 2016). As a management strategy to alleviate by-catch, geospatial modelling using satellite tags tracked critically endangered leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) to better understand the spatial and temporal overlap of turtle habitat use and the fishery (Roe et al. 2014; Howell et al. 2015). Modeling efforts for shortnose sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*) demonstrated that nursery habitat was historically sensitive to improvements in water quality contributing to its likely recovery in the Hudson River (Woodland et al. 2009). Habitat suitability modelling for deep-sea corals and sponges has been used to predict presence outside known areas, yet underscored the limitations of these models when used in data poor
areas where species occurrence data is missing (Anderson et al. 2016). A limitation of habitat suitability models is the lack of absence/presence data for rare species, which is needed to calibrate and validate these models.

Atlantic sturgeon are demersal fish, whose depleted status in many large US estuaries has been tied to ecosystem hypoxia (Secor and Niklitschek 2001; Collins et al. 2002; Niklitschek and Secor 2005). The Chesapeake Bay is subject to persistent hypoxia especially during summer months, and the extent and duration of the hypoxic zone varies annually (Hagy et al. 2004; Batiuk et al. 2009). From 1950-2001, summer hypoxic volume increased and expanded southward towards Virginia (Hagy et al. 2004; Murphy et al. 2011). During this period, Atlantic sturgeon fishery captures were a small fraction of historical levels seen in the late 19th century (Secor 2002). Further, Atlantic sturgeon juveniles and large adults had been absent from fishery independent surveys since 1996 (Grogan and Boreman 1998; Secor et al. 2000), with little evidence of spawning in the Chesapeake Bay for decades. Deterioration of water quality (e.g. dissolved oxygen (DO)) appears to degrade nursery function of systems, creating a recruitment bottleneck (Collins et al. 2000). In the southern range of sturgeon, mortalities related to effects of low DO and high summer temperature may be responsible for extirpations and severe population depressions (Collins et al. 2000). Virginia closed the fishery for sturgeon in 1976 and Maryland in 1996. Fisheries for Atlantic sturgeon in the U.S. were closed by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission in 1998.

Despite strong expectations for sturgeon extirpation in the Chesapeake Bay, a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) reward program resulted in thousands of
sturgeon records from 1996-2010 (Welsh et al. 2002; Mangold et al. 2007). The
reward program targeted commercial watermen reports of Atlantic sturgeon
incidental catches, principally taken in gill nets and pound nets (Table 1).
Quantifying the spatial habitat available within the Chesapeake Bay for Atlantic
sturgeon is a conservation priority given its status as an endangered species under the
U.S. Endangered Species Act (NOAA 2010), yet until recently incidence data was
insufficient to develop an empirical basis for their habitat requirements.

The extensive water quality monitoring program within the Chesapeake Bay
provided past scientists a unique opportunity to apply a bioenergetics model to
advance the understanding of how water quality limits Atlantic sturgeon juvenile
production. The Chesapeake Bay Program Water Quality Database contains data
from 1984-present from fixed stations providing extensive spatial coverage of the
Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. Atlantic sturgeon are sensitive to environmental
hypoxia (Secor and Gunderson 1998; Secor and Niklitschek 2001). Warm conditions
in summer and fall can result in a “habitat squeeze” associated with hypoxia and
elevated water temperatures (Niklitschek and Secor 2005; Schlenger et al. 2013),
providing relevance to a model that can make spatial predictions of habitat suitability
on the basis of the interaction of temperature, DO, and salinity. The bioenergetics
model was developed through a series of laboratory experiments; and predicted
growth rates corroborated through mesocosm trials and behavioral choice
experiments (Niklitschek and Secor 2009a; Niklitschek and Secor 2010). Further,
early analysis of sturgeon incidence data (1997-2001) suggested that Atlantic
sturgeon were routinely captured in areas predicted to have high habitat suitability
(Niklitschek and Secor 2005; Schlenger et al. 2013). However, over the past two decades, Atlantic sturgeon have been captured in the mid-Bay during the summer, an area that routinely experiences below-pycnocline hypoxic conditions and negative production, which disagrees with previous model predictions.

The purpose of this study was to rigorously test predictions of Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon habitat suitability obtained through the bioenergetics model developed by Niklitschek (2001) against incidence data for the period 1990-2013. Modeled growth values are generated by levels of DO, temperature, salinity, and their interactions. During the summertime, growth values in the mid-Bay are likely driven by DO but in shallower tributaries it may be temperature and its interaction with DO that determines habitat suitability. Based on laboratory studies performed by Niklitschek (2001) and others, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2003 established a DO criteria of 60% (5 mg L\(^{-1}\)) at 25°C to protect sturgeon species in the Chesapeake Bay (Batiuk et al. 2009). Further, at higher temperatures (<30° C), a more conservative DO concentration threshold of 3.2 mg L\(^{-1}\) was designated (Batiuk et al. 2009). However, the Chesapeake Bay routinely experiences DO of <60% saturation and temperatures >25°C yet Atlantic sturgeon have been captured throughout much of the Bay. This suggests that sturgeon may not be as sensitive to these environmental parameters as suggested by past research and bioenergetics models.

To test Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon sensitivity to summer-fall conditions of hypoxia, I used capture data to assess seasonal habitat being utilized by Atlantic sturgeon, with the assumption that Atlantic sturgeon will be captured in areas
of high growth potential and within physiological boundaries. The USFWS program yielded a rich database on fish size, location (latitude/longitude) and date of capture. Most of the captures comprised sub-adults (500-1500mm TL; average 2.0-7.7 kg) and adults (>1500mm TL; average 26.0 kg) and occurred in mid-Bay, lower Eastern Shore, and James River (Fig. 1). These systems encompass a wide range of water quality conditions and predicted habitat suitabilities. Although I apply a juvenile bioenergetics model to sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon, the DO criteria are protective of all stages of sturgeons so I investigated whether sub-adults and adults are similarly sensitive to DO as previously determined for juveniles. Niklitschek and Secor (2009b) found that larger juveniles (70-300g) conformed to predictions of the model supporting tests of more general application to sub-adult stages. I made predictions of annual and seasonal growth potential both Bay-wide and across tributaries over a 24-year period (1990-2013) and tested these predictions along with interpolated water quality data against sturgeon capture data. Patterns of habitat selectivity based on DO, temperature, and predicted growth levels were tested through quotient analysis (Overholtz et al. 2011). Specific hypotheses included 1) on an annual basis predicted growth will vary inversely with the spatial extent of the hypoxia; 2) predicted growth will be lowest in summer and fall, corresponding to periods with the greatest level of hypoxia; 3) predicted growth will be higher in Virginia and Eastern Shore tributaries than elsewhere in the Chesapeake Bay as suggested by increased observations of sub-adults and adults in these systems; and 4) Atlantic sturgeon will be captured in areas of positive predicted growth within the Chesapeake Bay and avoid areas of low DO (60%) and high temperatures (>25°C).
Methods

Water Quality

Water quality (DO (mg L⁻¹), temperature (°C), and salinity) from the Chesapeake Bay Program’s (Chesapeake Bay Program 2012) monitoring stations was interpolated on a seasonal basis from 1990 – 2013 (Fig. 2). Dissolved oxygen was converted using the temperature and salinity associated with DO (mg/L) (see Appendix 1 for formula) to percent saturation for analysis and presentation of results. Water quality parameters sampled at sites below the pycnocline and bottom layers at stations located in polyhaline to tidal freshwater areas were used in the interpolation. At stations where a below- pycnocline sample was recorded, only the bottom layer was used in the analysis. Interpolations were conducted using a distance matrix and kriging (see below) to predict values over the spatial extent of the Chesapeake Bay (Fig. 3) (Appendix 1). This was accomplished using a shapefile of the Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake Bay Program Monitoring Segments) (Fig. 1). For all interpolation and spatial analyses, the Chesapeake Bay was gridded into 1x1 km² cells. As a first step, data available for each water quality variable, temperature, salinity, and DO were aggregated to produce median values per each season and sampled cell. Water quality medians corresponding to non-sampled cells were obtained by interpolation through simple linear kriging, considering the effective distance among sampled and non-sampled cells, and Matern’s model of geostatistical covariance (Diggle & Ribeiro 2007). Effective distances among cells “as the water flows” were calculated to avoid interpolations across land by using a transition spatial matrix where conductance was defined as 0.01 for land cells and 0.99 for water cells, and a
minimum cost distance function (Dijkstra 1959) as implemented in the R package “gdistance” (Van Etten 2012). Matern’s model parameters were obtained by fitting variograms for each water quality variable using maximum likelihood and the R package “SpatialTools” (French 2014). Seasonal averages for each station was computed annually for each environmental factor; winter (December – February), spring (March – May), summer (June – August), fall (September – November). Resolution for interpolations was 2 km². Moving sturgeon captured within a 2 km² area may not fully experience the assigned water quality medians. To evaluate this further, I examined whether a larger grid resolution, 10km², would produce similar results. At 1 body length s⁻¹, a 500-1000 mm TL sturgeon would traverse 10 km² in 2.7-5.4 hours (Peake 2008). No substantial differences occurred between 10 km² and 2 km² grids. Still, an important assumption that I could not test was that predicted water quality represented a 1-month period, while sturgeon captures represented a much more abbreviated period of time (<1 d). A 2 km² spatial resolution was used for all analyses in order to keep a fine spatial resolution of all parameters.

Bioenergetics Model

After environmental interpolations were conducted, instantaneous potential growth of a 14 g Atlantic sturgeon juvenile was modeled using the bioenergetics model developed by Niklitschek (2001) (Appendix 2). The components of the bioenergetics model developed by Niklitschek (2001) is G = FC – (RM + SDA + ACT) – (EG + U); G = growth, FC = food consumption, RM = routine metabolism, ACT = activity cost, SDA = postprandial metabolism, EG = egestion, and U = excretion. Temperature, salinity, and DO were found to influence FC, RM, ACT, and
U while SDA and EG depended only on temperature and DO (Niklitschek and Secor 2005). Growth was modeled under maximum consumption (100%) and mortality was minimal since it was only dependent upon abiotic factors (Niklitschek and Secor 2005). Potential growth, defined as the instantaneous amount of biomass per day, was obtained by supplying the bioenergetics model with interpolated environmental values hence potential growth was modeled seasonally for the period of 1990 – 2013.

To compare juvenile potential growth with occurrence data for sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon, capture data from the USFWS reward program was used (Table 1). Here, as opposed to the analysis of long term potential growth, which focused on smaller juvenile production, I modeled predicted growth on the basis of a 300 g sub-adult. Incidences of sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay occur in the Chesapeake Bay and the majority of these captures have occurred in the Lower Eastern Shore, Mid Bay, and James River. Atlantic sturgeon captures (n=1562) were recorded with latitude and longitude coordinates from 1997-1998, 2005-2006, representing over half of the captures that occurred in the Chesapeake Bay from 1993-2010 (Table 1), affording me the opportunity to use the results of the juvenile bioenergetics model to understand habitat utilized by sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon. Gillnets and pound nets were the most common gear type associated with captures in the Lower Eastern Shore and Mid Bay. In the Mid Bay there was an even distribution of captures between the gear types. In the Lower Eastern Shore, pound nets accounted for approximately two times the gillnet captures. In the James River, gillnets were responsible for all captures used in these analyses.
**Chesapeake Bay and Tributary Production**

Annual and seasonal changes in potential growth of juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay were analyzed for normality (Shapiro-Wilk test). Data was normally distributed so was further analyzed using two-way analysis of variance in R (R Core Team 2014). Summer and fall growth predictions were evaluated for the influence of summertime and fall hypoxic volume (km³) (Murphy et al. 2011) through regression analysis. I also compared tributaries across years and seasons using two-way analysis of variance. Tukey Honest Significant Difference (HSD) was used for post-hoc comparisons of main effects and interactions.

**Sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon habitat utilization**

To better understand habitat utilized by sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon, I matched dates and coordinates of captured sturgeon with monthly growth estimates and interpolated environmental values for each individual capture. My goals were to determine if 1) sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon were captured in habitats supporting higher potential growth than that which was available to them; 2) sub-adult and adult sturgeon were captured within environments falling within the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) DO criteria of 60% at 25°C; and 3) sub-adult and adult sturgeon were preferentially selecting specific habitats associated with DO, temperature, salinity, and potential growth. For the first goal, I used a Wilcoxon’s signed-rank test to compare median potential growth, DO, temperature, and salinity between sites of capture and available habitat. This analysis was completed seasonally, combining months in which captures occurred, for the Mid Bay, Lower Eastern Shore, and James River for years 1997, 1998, 2005 and 2006;
these years comprised the highest number of captures. Segments were separately analyzed since these systems environments are inherently different. To address EPA DO thresholds, I first plotted captures by their associated temperature (°C) and DO (%) data creating a bivariate convex hull which encompassed all available combinations of these variables. I then overlaid temperature x DO coordinates where sturgeon were captured. I evaluated whether these incidences of capture occurred above the 60% DO saturation threshold and below the 25°C threshold.

To quantify habitat selection in the Mid Bay and Lower Eastern Shore, I used a quotient analysis (Overholtz et al. 2011) to determine preferential selection of habitat variables seasonally, again combining monthly data for years 1997, 1998, 2005, and 2006. Frequency was computed for intervals of each environmental parameter. Environmental parameters were divided into intervals based on what sturgeon may be able to detect in the environment (Niklitschek and Secor 2010). Dissolved oxygen (%) values were broken into 5% intervals, and salinity and temperature (°C) were divided into intervals of 2 salinity or °C. In general potential growth ranged between 0.01 to 0.05 g day⁻¹, so I used an interval of 0.01. Still in some cases, the range of potential growth was too narrow to divide into 0.01 intervals, and was not analyzed further. Quotient analysis calculated the proportion (p) of stations (station = 2 km² grid) in each environmental interval (pSₑ) by dividing the number of stations within each interval by the total number of stations. I then calculated the proportion of stations positive for Atlantic sturgeon (M) in each environmental interval (pMₑ) by dividing the number of stations in the environmental interval with Atlantic sturgeon by the total number of stations with Atlantic sturgeon.
The quotient value ($Q_E$) is calculated as $p_{ME} / p_{SE}$ with quotient values greater than 1 indicating positive selection. Using the protocol described by Bernal et al. (2007), a resampling procedure (R package “boot”) (Davison and Hinkley 1997; Canty and Ripley 2014) was used to compile confidence intervals against which to test for the significance of single quotient estimates. The number of incidences of Atlantic sturgeon in each interval (with original explanatory variables unchanged – DO saturation, temperature, salinity, and potential growth) was randomly selected from a vector of original sturgeon incidences, with replacement. A new pseudo-survey was created and the quotient value for each bin of the explanatory variable retained. I repeated this 999 times and the 0.025 and 0.975 percentiles of the observed quotient values within each interval were used as the confidence intervals for that bin. Quotient values greater than one and above the 0.975 confidence interval were assigned to be areas that Atlantic sturgeon positively selected. Quotient values less than one and below the 0.025 confidence interval were assigned to be areas that Atlantic sturgeon would avoid.

**Results**

*Inter-annual and seasonal variation within Chesapeake Bay potential growth*

Mean potential growth rates ranged between 0.026 - 0.034 g day$^{-1}$, and showed no discernable trend over the 24 years (Fig. 4; Table 3). Highest estimated production occurred in 2012, which was ~30% higher than the lowest production in 2003. Some apparent oscillation in potential growth rates occurred with lower growth periods during 1993-1996 and 2007-2011 and higher growth periods during
1991-1992 and 1997-2000; peak years occurred in 2006 and 2012 (ANOVA; p<0.05; see posthoc contrasts in Figure 4). Multiple regression analysis showed significant effects of water temperature (p<0.01) but not DO (p>0.05) effect on annual growth rate (Appendix 3).

Potential growth rates predicted for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay showed strong seasonality ordered as fall > spring > summer > winter (Fig. 5). This held true for all years except in 1992 when summer growth was greater than spring growth (Fig. 6). There was a significant interaction (ANOVA; p<0.05) between year*season. Within all years, winter was lower than spring, summer, and fall growth; and fall growth was significantly different than spring and summer growth. Spring growth was typically higher than summer growth but not significantly so in years 1992, 1996, and 2007 (Fig. 6). Among years, predicted growth rates were more variable in winter (coefficient of variation CV=0.57) and summer (CV=0.70) than for spring (CV=0.34) and fall (CV=0.32) (Fig. 7 a-d).

A separate analysis investigated seasons of greatest hypoxic extent: summer and fall. The hypoxic volume (km³) in the summer ranged approximately 4.5-11 km³ from 1990 to 2013. The highest hypoxic volume (~11 km³) occurred in 2003 and the lowest hypoxic volume (4.5 km³) occurred in 2012 (Fig. 8). Summer hypoxic volume was significantly and negatively correlated to summer potential growth (n=24; p=<0.05; R²=0.35) (Fig. 9). Predicted daily production rates declined from 0.028 g day⁻¹ at 4.5 km³ hypoxic volume to 0.023 g day⁻¹ at 11 km³ hypoxic volume. Fall hypoxic volumes were substantially reduced in comparison to summer and ranged
approximately 0-4.2 km$^3$ (Fig. 10). Estimated fall potential growth of juveniles was not significantly correlated with hypoxic volume ($p=0.33$).

**Tributary Potential Growth**

Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon potential growth varied significantly between tributaries (ANOVA; $p<0.05$) (Fig. 11). I hypothesized that Virginia tributaries and the Lower Eastern Shore would have higher potential growth compared to other Chesapeake Bay segments and indeed, highest estimated potential growth occurred in the York River, Lower Eastern Shore, and James River. Lowest predicted growth occurred in the Mid Bay, Potomac River, and Lower Bay. Tributaries were differently ranked between years (ANOVA; interaction term; $p<0.05$).

The ranking of tributary potential growth also varied seasonally (ANOVA; interaction term; $p<0.05$) (Fig. 12). In the winter, Elizabeth River had the highest potential growth rates ($\text{mean}=0.14 \text{ g day}^{-1}$), likely driven by warmer temperatures there, and was significantly different than all other tributaries except the James River and York River (Table 4). In the spring, York River had the highest potential growth rates ($\text{mean}=0.043 \text{ g day}^{-1}$) and was significantly different than all tributaries except Elizabeth River (Table 5). In the summer, Lower Eastern Shore had the highest potential growth rates ($\text{mean}=0.044 \text{ g day}^{-1}$) and was significantly higher than all other tributaries (Table 6). The Patuxent River had the highest fall growth rates ($\text{mean}=0.058 \text{ g day}^{-1}$) while the Lower Bay had the lowest fall growth rates ($\text{mean}=0.034 \text{ g day}^{-1}$) and was significantly lower than all tributaries (Table 7).
\textit{Sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon habitat utilization}

Sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon were captured at sites predicated to have positive growth potential, except for two captures that occurred in the James River in the summertime (Fig. 13). In the Wilcoxon’s signed-rank tests of growth potential (Table 8), statistical significance references those seasons and segments where sturgeon were captured in areas of higher/lower growth potential compared to the overall Chesapeake segment in which they were captured (Fig. 14 a-c). Within the Mid Bay segment, Atlantic sturgeon were captured in areas of higher growth compared to the median growth value of the Mid Bay segment during winter, spring and summer. Within the Lower Eastern Shore, Atlantic sturgeon were captured in areas of higher growth in the spring and summer compared to the median growth value of the entire Lower Eastern Shore. In the James River, winter and fall resulted in captures occurring in areas of higher growth compared to the James River growth potential. Individual environmental parameters (DO, temp, and salinity) were also tested between captures sites and segments. No consistent patterns were observed for selection of DO or salinity. However, when significant differences in temperature occurred between capture sites and the segment, temperature at capture sites were significantly lower in the summertime (Fig. 15 a-c).

Bivariate depictions of the temperature and DO levels where sturgeon were captured showed that occurrences at DO levels $<60\%$ saturation were observed during spring, summer, and fall for the Mid Bay segment (Fig. 16 a, b) and during summer in the Lower Eastern Shore segment (Fig. 17 a, b). The James River had very few captures in the summer months, limiting inference within that system (Fig. 15 a-c).
Captured Mid Bay sturgeon in the summer occurred between 23% and 63% DO saturation (mean: 38 ± 8%) (Fig. 16 b). Fifty-four of the 163 captures occurred at DO levels <30% DO saturation. In the Lower Eastern Shore, mean DO levels of occurrence in the summer was higher (64 ± 9%) and ranged between 37% and 75% (Fig. 17 b). During summer months in both these segments, there was a tendency for captures to occur between 22 and 25°C, although captures were observed between 25 and 27°C during 1997 and 1998 in the Lower Eastern Shore segment and in 1997 in the James River and Mid Bay.

The quotient analysis (Qe) using summer captures in the Mid Bay segment showed no evidence for preferential selection of habitats but contrary to expectations, there was significant avoidance of the highest growth interval (0.015-0.025 g day⁻¹; (Fig. 19 a)). For environmental parameters, significant positive deviations in expected captures occurred at 24.9-34.9% and 44.9-49.9% DO, 16.1-18.1°C, and 10.5-12.5 salinity (Fig. 19 b-d). The Lower Eastern Shore summer captures were preferentially caught at sites predicted to yield high growth rates (0.013-0.023 g day⁻¹; (Fig. 20 a)). Significant positive deviations in expected captures occurred at 66.5-76.5% DO, 19.1-21.1 and 23.1-25.1°C and 10-16 salinity (Fig. 20 b-d). Winter captures resulted in selection for higher temperatures in the Mid Bay segment (5.9-7.9°C) and James River (6.7-8.7°C) but no apparent selection for higher temperatures in the Lower Eastern Shore segment (Fig. 21 a-c). Winter captures, however, did not select for the highest available temperatures (7.9-9.9 °C) (Fig. 21a).
Discussion

The bioenergetics model’s predictions for juvenile growth supported past literature indicating that seasonal and regional habitat suitability rankings were ordered by the severity of hypoxia (Collins et al. 2002; Niklitschek and Secor 2005; Schlenger et al. 2013). Summertime hypoxia in particular caused predicted growth to decline to low levels in certain years and in certain regions, especially the Mid Bay and Upper Eastern Shore segments, as well as the Choptank River. But this prediction of growth sensitivity to hypoxia during warm summer months did not conform well to sub-adult and adult incidence data. Although these stages avoided temperatures predicted to be super-optimal, they frequently occurred in hypoxic conditions (<60% saturation) during summer months. Habitat electivity analysis indicated that during summer, Atlantic sturgeon tended to occupy sub-optimal habitat, even though higher predicted quality habitats were available to them. Although I could only compare juvenile (age-2) production predictions against sub-adult and adult incidence data, my results indicate that Atlantic sturgeon may be more tolerant to summertime hypoxia than laboratory-derived bioenergetics responses would predict.

Chesapeake Bay hypoxia

The extent of hypoxia in the Chesapeake Bay can cause significant ecological harm (Breitburg 1990; Hagy et al. 2004; Davidson et al. 2016) and encompasses an additional constraint on available habitat for estuarine species (Breitburg et al. 2009; Tyler et al. 2009; Schlenger et al. 2013). The seasonal cycle of bottom hypoxia is initiated with increasing thermal stratification and algal blooms in the spring, which
intensify in the summer and dissipate with reduced stratification in the fall and winter (Breitburg et al. 1997; Keister et al. 2000; Testa and Kemp 2014). Seasonally persistent hypoxia occurs in below-pycnocline water, which encompasses 25% of the total volume of the Chesapeake Bay and may last hours to weeks (Keister et al. 2000; Hagy et al. 2004). Maximum hypoxic volume typically occurs in July and August (Murphy et al. 2011; Testa and Kemp 2014). From 1950 – 2001, summer hypoxia (DO <2.0 mg L⁻¹) in the Chesapeake Bay increased significantly from 3.4 x 10⁹ m³ to 9.2 x 10⁹ m³; a 2.7-fold increase (Hagy et al. 2004). Most of this increase occurred in the in the mesohaline and is coincident with an expansion southward to polyhaline portions in Virginia (Hagy et al. 2004; Testa and Kemp 2014).

The spatial and temporal extent of hypoxic zones in the Chesapeake Bay is dependent on factors such as season, water column depth, wind conditions, and proximity to freshwater inflows and the influence of the Atlantic Ocean (Breitburg et al. 1997). The Eastern Shore and Virginia tributaries consistently exhibited higher DO levels and potential growth rates compared to other tributaries and segments when ranked annually. In the Mid Bay, seasonal hypoxia occurs most frequently from mid-May to mid-September and newly affected areas include the high-mesohaline and polyhaline regions of the Chesapeake Bay (Hagy et al. 2004; Murphy et al. 2011). Lower predicted growth rates in the Lower Bay where hypoxia was less prevalent relates to super-optimal salinities, which occur there. Niklitschek and Secor (2009) found that juvenile Atlantic sturgeon maximum growth rates shift from salinity 15 to 22 between age-0 and age-1. Although temperatures were warmer in the Lower Bay, they were not super-optimal. Salinity conditions masked the
otherwise acceptable conditions, i.e. adequate DO concentrations and temperatures, for age-0 Atlantic sturgeon growth. In contrast in portions of the Eastern Shore and Virginia tributaries, temperatures may become super-optimal in freshwater reaches but down-tributary brackish bottom waters can be moderately hypoxic (Niklitschek and Secor 2009). Still, these joint temperature-DO conditions are better than most other segments within the Chesapeake Bay where DO can be less than 30%. On the other hand, even in these low DO conditions, Atlantic sturgeon were captured.

**Sturgeon responses to hypoxia**

Low DO conditions occur at greater frequency in demersal habitats particularly during summer and fall, when sturgeons and other fishes are abundant in the Chesapeake Bay (Table 2; Jung and Houde 2003; Buchheister et al. 2013). These conditions have been associated with lower fish abundance (Tyler and Targett 2007; Stierhoff et al. 2009), spatial distribution (Breitburg 2009; Altenritter et al. 2013), and behavioral changes (Breitburg 1992; Sullivan et al. 2003; Brady et al. 2009; Brady and Targett 2010). Examples include, (1) a positive correlation between DO and the number of juvenile weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*) collected in Pepper Creek, Delaware, with no collections at DO levels <2 mg L\(^{-1}\) (Tyler and Targett 2007); (2) in the Patuxent River, Maryland, densities of bay anchovy (*Anchoa mitchilli*) eggs and larvae, *Chrysaora quinquecirrha* (jellyfish), and zooplankton was lower in bottom water DO <2 mg L\(^{-1}\) in comparison to >2 mg L\(^{-1}\) (Keister et al. 2000); and (3) low DO has also been shown to cause evacuation behaviors from affected oyster reefs by naked gobies *Gobiosoma bosc* (Breitburg 1992), and summer and winter flounder (Stierhoff et al. 2006; Davidson et al. 2016).
The lack of observed avoidance of hypoxic habitat by sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay was inconsistent with past research showing lower growth and survival by sturgeons in general (Jenkins et al. 1993; Secor and Niklitschek 2001; Cech and Doroschov 2004; Niklitschek and Secor, 2009; Niklitschek and Secor 2010). Field work also provided some support for avoidance behaviors by sturgeons. Electronically-tagged white sturgeon (*A. transmontanus*) in the Snake River moved laterally when they encountered low DO levels (<6 mg L\(^{-1}\)) (Sullivan et al. 2003). Seasonal distribution of juvenile lake sturgeon (*A. fulvescens*) in Muskegon Lake, Michigan and shortnose sturgeon (*A. brevirostrum*) in Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, were affected by periodic hypoxia in these systems (Collins et al. 2002; Altenritter et al. 2013). In an earlier analysis of juvenile sturgeon captured during the 1997-2001 USFWS reward program, Niklitschek and Secor (2005) observed that these fish avoided persistently hypoxic channel waters. Further, behavioral responses by juvenile (21-30cm) observed in the laboratory, showed avoidance of hypoxia (40% DO) (Niklitschek and Secor 2010).

Sturgeon are an ancient family (Bemis et al. 1997) and their ancestral morphological and physiological traits (less efficient gill ventilation, low cardiac performance, lower affinity of hemoglobin to oxygen) cause them to be less efficient in respiration than other fish species (Klyashtorin 1982; Secor and Niklitschek 2001). Oxyregulation in sturgeons exposed to hypoxia can result in increased ventilation and routine metabolism, aquatic surface respiration (movement to the upper water column; Breitburg 1992), and decreased swimming (Secor and Gunderson 1998). Critical DO concentrations (i.e. the point of inflection of a metabolic response curve
where below that point metabolism and other functions will be constrained) for some Eurasian sturgeon species ranged between 25-60% saturation but these values increased as temperature increased (Secor and Niklitschek 2001).

Despite existing laboratory and field evidence for sturgeon sensitivity to hypoxia, I found that sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon were routinely captured in DO concentrations <<60%. Indeed, in many instances normoxic bottom habitats were within several hours travel (c. 10km). Field studies suggest that sub-adult and adult sturgeon do not exclusively select habitats on the basis of DO conditions. Sub-adult and adult green sturgeon (A. medirostris) in the San Francisco Bay estuary, California, experienced mean DO concentrations (range 6.5 - 8.75 mg L\(^{-1}\)) lower than the mean value of the environment in which they inhabited (Kelly et al. 2007), indicating, in this case, that sturgeon did not select for the highest DO levels. Lake sturgeon during the summer in Manistee Lake, Michigan, were observed in areas with widely ranging DO levels, 1.1 – 13.3 mg L\(^{-1}\), and in some cases were observed in areas of lower DO even though higher DO levels occurred in adjacent habitats (Damstra and Galarowicz 2013).

**Limiting assumptions of the bioenergetics model**

Bioenergetics models provide a framework to determine habitat suitability for rare species and draw broad inferences on the spatial and temporal distributions of potential habitats. Still, these models can show biases in their parameterization owing to experimental design limits, including the size of study organisms, the manner in which fish are experimentally exposed to water quality conditions, and the measured responses. Principal limiting assumptions in my analysis include (1) extrapolation of
the bioenergetics model to large sub-adults and adults, (2) exclusive demersal behavior, (3) long-term (weeks) stationarity to assessed water quality conditions measured in Bay segments, and (4) lack of consideration of other physiological or ecological endpoints beyond growth. Still, it should be noted that the bioenergetics model developed by Niklitschek and Secor (2009a) was tested against growth rates observed in microcosms (Niklitschek and Secor 2009b) and the field (Niklitschek and Secor 2005) and in behavioral trials (Niklitschek and Secor 2010).

As sturgeon grow larger and older their tolerance to low DO conditions increase. Jenkins et al. (1995) found age-specific mortality young juvenile shortnose sturgeon: mortality at 2.5 mg L\(^{-1}\) was 100%, 96%, and 86% for ages 25, 32, and 64 days post-hatch. At ages 104 and 310 days, mortality was only 12%. Campbell and Goodman (2004) had similar results of Jenkins (1995) where shortnose sturgeon aged (77-134 day-old) showed increased tolerance to low DO conditions as they aged with a LC50 of 2.7mg L\(^{-1}\) for 77 day-old sturgeon compared to 2.2 mg L\(^{-1}\) for 104 and 134 day-old sturgeon. White sturgeon showed a trend of reduced metabolic response with hypoxia as sturgeon grew larger (0.2g – 63.1g) (Crocker and Cech 1997). Higher susceptibility by small juveniles in comparison to larger juveniles and adults have been observed in other estuarine species (bay anchovy, MacGregor and Houde 1996; Rilling and Houde 1999; largemouth bass, Spoor 1977; striped bass, Brandt et al. 2009) and supports more stringent water quality criteria for nursery habitats than other habitat types (Batuik et al. 2009). In adult fish, exposure to hypoxia results in an initial response to counteract the effects of hypoxia (i.e. increase blood flow) and later responses commence counteractive measure to encourage mechanisms to reduce
oxygen update (i.e. reduce activity) (Hughes 1973). One mechanism fish use when exposed to hypoxia is anaerobic ATP production for survival and in this instance larger fish have advantage over smaller fish since their energy stores are greater (Nilsson and Östlund-Nilsson 2008). The bioenergetics model was calibrated using several sizes of juvenile sturgeon in a series of laboratory studies (Niklitschek 2009b). The largest juvenile sturgeon group was 300g whereas the recaptured sturgeon in my sample ranged 2.0-26kg. Niklitschek and Secor (2009b) found that larger juveniles (70-300g) conformed to predictions of the model. Our assumption was this model could also be applied more generally to sub-adult and adult stages. However, the application of the model for sub-adult and adult habitat utilization does not seem be appropriate. The sub-adult and adult sturgeon did not avoid areas of hypoxia within the Chesapeake Bay as observed in laboratory behavior responses and field observations conducted by Niklitschek and Secor (2005; 2010), most likely due to the fact that hypoxia tolerance increases with age in sturgeon and behavioral adaptations.

I further assumed that sturgeon as a demersal fish would spend the majority of the time at the bottom of the water column (Brown and Murphy 2010) and within the segments where water quality measures were taken. Thus, bottom water quality conditions used in the bioenergetics model may not fully represent sturgeon incidence data. It is possible, especially for sturgeon captured in gill nets, that they were captured higher in the water column, possibly above the hypoxic zone. It has been shown that juvenile sturgeon exhibit increased surfacing under hypoxic conditions (Secor and Gunderson 1998). In freshwater environments, Gulf sturgeon are believed
to jump as a form of communication that maintains group structure on summer holding grounds (Sulak et al. 2002). Other research has shown that when sturgeon are making directed movements, they do so farther up in the water column (Balazik et al. 2012). Still, their dependence on benthic substrates and bottom water for spawning, feeding, migration, and refuge from stressful environments (Secor and Niklitschek 2001), makes it plausible that these sturgeon were captured in hypoxic environments within the Chesapeake Bay. At 1 body length s\(^{-1}\), a 500-1000 mm TL sturgeon would traverse 10 km\(^2\) in 2.7-5.4 hours (Peake 2008). The mid-Bay segment is approximately 128 km north to south. A 1000 mm TL sturgeon traversing this segment if entering from the lower Bay would take approximately 35 hours to reach the upper Bay. Hence, Atlantic sturgeon captured within this segment are very likely to have been exposed to sub-optimal conditions when captured, yet Atlantic sturgeon were routinely captured in the mid-Bay during all seasons, including the summer when hypoxia was present throughout this segment. Behavioral adaptations, such as surficial respiration, may be displayed when sturgeon encounter hypoxic areas.

The sturgeon occurrence data I used to determine habitat utilization of sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay did not include the depth at which individual sturgeon were captured. Depth information is a missing component of this study and would provide valuable insight in the behavior of sturgeon when hypoxic areas are encountered. In addition to depth information for sturgeon, water quality data collected at a finer temporal and spatial scale, corresponding to the resolution of capture data would have reduced uncertainty in my inferences. Kraus et al. 2015 demonstrated that striped bass avoided areas of hypoxia but inhabited areas of super-
optimal temperatures when these were the only areas where normoxia occurred. Sufficient tracking or observation data is also necessary to fully utilize models predicting habitat utilization (Hazen et al. 2016). However, even when large data sets are used, ongoing validation of the models are necessary, especially if climate changes beyond the scope of the study (Hazen et al. 2016), which may change species distribution, both spatially and temporally.

The bioenergetics model was based on an ecophysiological construct on the limiting (curtailing) effect of DO on growth, but controlling influences of temperature, particularly super-optimal thermal habitats could over-ride avoidance of hypoxic habitats. Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay were occasionally captured in temperatures >25°C, however most summertime captures occurred between 22-25°C and temperature at capture sites was significantly lower than the average water temperature within those areas. However, avoidance of higher temperatures by Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay may have caused them to occur in habitats with sub-optimal DO. This was evident in the Mid Bay where sturgeon showed significant positive deviations in expected captures at 24.9-34.9% and 44.9-49.9% DO. In choice studies, Niklitschek and Secor (2010) showed juvenile Atlantic sturgeon (21-30cm) avoided 28°C and displayed a preference for 12°C and 20°C. Fish in general have an upper and lower avoidance temperature where within these extremes is their preferred temperature (Coutant 1977). Preferred temperatures as determined in a laboratory setting can be offset by several factors such as food availability, competition, and DO requirements (Coutant 1987). While the distribution of Acipenseriformes in North America extends over an area with
temperature variation of up to 30°C, this taxonomic order prefers and performs optimally at temperatures <25°C (Cech and Doroshov 2004), typically between 16-24°C for Atlantic sturgeon (Schlenger et al. 2013). Many studies focus on early (Cech et al. 1984; Zhang and Kieffer 2014) and juvenile (Hung et al. 1993; Lankford et al. 2003; Kieffer et al. 2014) life stages of sturgeon to determine temperature preference and tolerance. Using incidence data for sub-adult and adult sturgeon is one method to understand habitat preferences of these life stages but it is difficult to determine all the factors that may be influencing their presence in temperature ranges. In this study, captures denote a specific period in time when sturgeon were utilizing the area. Interpolating data on a larger temporal and spatial scale can not capture daily changes in water quality (i.e. DO, temperature, salinity) and inaccurately portray sturgeon as being captured under sub-optimal DO or temperature conditions. Additionally, bioenergetics models account for physiological effects from specific water quality criteria but these models do not account for behavioral adaptations that sturgeon may possess for foraging, spawning, and migration.

Rather than responding immediately to stressful dissolved and oxygen conditions, adult Atlantic sturgeon may be enduring such conditions to accommodate a fall spawning behavior. Adults may be tolerating sub-optimal DO and super-optimal temperatures to time the production of their progeny when environmental parameters are in a suitable range to increase survival and growth of their young (Bonga 1997). Fall spawning may be the dominant spawning behavior in Chesapeake Bay and South Atlantic Bight spawning tributaries (Balazik et al. 2012; Balazik and Musick 2015; Smith et al. 2015; Ingram and Peterson 2016). In the James River, fish were routinely
captured in temperature >25°C in the lower portion of the James River where Atlantic sturgeon were staging during summer months prior to spawning between August and early October (Balazik and Musick 2015). Pacific salmon life cycle depends on appropriately timing spawning events so mismatch between the needs of the progeny does not occur but this may put adults in less than favorable conditions (i.e., higher energetic costs, higher predation risk, thermal stress) (Crozier et al. 2008). Northern populations of American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*) spawn in environments that have harsher temperatures and more environmental variability compared to those populations that spawn in their southern geographic range and as a result have different life history strategies (Leggett and Carscadden 1978). Fish time their spawning to take place when conditions would be favorable for their offspring (Cushing 1990).

Offspring survival and growth potential may not be the only reason Atlantic sturgeon are present in sub-optimal habitats; optimal foraging opportunities may occur in these areas. I modelled growth of Atlantic sturgeon under the assumption that prey was not limited, however benthic prey densities would vary seasonally (Long and Seitz 2008; Diaz and Rosenberg 2008). In the Chesapeake Bay, changes in predator-prey interactions may depend on the DO tolerance of both the predator (i.e. swimming and feeding behavior) and prey (i.e. escape behavior), influencing prey-predator relationships (Breitburg et al. 1997; Keister et al. 2000). Sufficient prey abundance and density may compensate for the negative effects DO and temperature have on growth (Costantini et al. 2008; Thompson and Rice 2013; Kraus 2015). Benthic invertebrates may respond to hypoxia by moving up in the sediment
column creating an opportunity for predators to increase foraging opportunities (Pihl et al. 1992; Baustian et al. 2009; Craig 2012). Baird and Ulanowicz (1989) found predators of macrobenthos remove 40% of the summer and 45% of the fall production of their prey, corresponding to peak benthic production in the Chesapeake Bay. The closer proximity of prey to the surface would reduce search time need for predators and may result in a shift where predation rates are higher during periods of episodic hypoxia (Seitz et al. 2003; Long and Seitz 2008). However, there may be a narrow range of hypoxic conditions where predators can take advantage of prey as their tolerance to low dissolved oxygen is usually less than that of benthic organisms (Diaz and Rosenberg 2008). Yet, areas affected by hypoxia typically recover afterwards and increases in benthic populations are related to recruitment events timed to increase in input of organic matter (i.e. spring and fall blooms) (Diaz and Rosenberg 2008). Sturgeon growth was highest in the spring and fall due to optimal water quality parameters associated with these seasons. The addition of increased foraging opportunities may increase growth potential of Atlantic sturgeon. In addition, sturgeon are demersal fish and may take advantage of increased foraging opportunities by accessing hypoxic habitats. Future studies should evaluate prey availability against Atlantic sturgeon occurrence to better understand sub-optimal habitat utilization by Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay.

**Sturgeon recovery implications**

The EPA established an instantaneous minimum of 5 mg L$^{-1}$ DO to be protective of survival and growth of juveniles and spawning adults of fish species inhabiting the Chesapeake Bay, including shortnose and Atlantic sturgeon (Batuik et
al. 2009). At temperatures >25°C this translates to DO levels > 60%. Results from this study show Atlantic sturgeon are routinely captured in Bay segments, which do not meet these thresholds. Although various studies have shown that juvenile Atlantic sturgeon are sensitive to low DO in terms of survival, growth and avoidance; this study shows sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon are capable of utilizing these environments. One piece of critical information is missing – duration of time spent in these conditions. The capture information used in this study provided a snapshot of habitat utilized by Atlantic sturgeon and assumed long-term (days-weeks) stationarity in assessed habitats. Telemetry, especially mobile telemetry data, would provide a more complete picture of the habitat utilized by Atlantic sturgeon, especially if multiple sizes/age classes could be tagged within the Chesapeake Bay. Small juvenile growth and survival is more sensitive to hypoxia than sub-adult and adult responses, which was the focus of my study. Unfortunately, because only a handful of age-0 juveniles have ever been captured in the Chesapeake Bay, I was unable to test bioenergetics predictions for this critical life history stage. Thus, it may be precautionary to retain current water quality standards, which are specific to the nursery function of juveniles, until we can evaluate juvenile growth responses in the field.

Specific to juvenile production, improvements to water quality through limits to nutrient inputs could have benefits to sturgeon recovery. During the time period I studied (1990-2013), I found summer hypoxic volume (km³) was negatively correlated to modelled age-0 juvenile Atlantic sturgeon growth rates. This suggests that increases in overall DO levels could increase habitats to Atlantic sturgeon. The
severity of late summer hypoxic volume has been decreasing when compared to previous decades (Murphy et al. 2011). If these conditions dissipate early, the Chesapeake Bay may higher starting point for DO concentrations in the fall creating a longer time period for Atlantic sturgeon growth before the onset of winter. Similar assumptions could be made for summer hypoxic volume; higher initial concentrations of DO at the beginning of June could decrease summer hypoxic volume (Murphy et al. 2011) creating more Atlantic sturgeon habitat.

**Summary and future studies**

In conclusion, the bioenergetics model predicted key seasonal and regional patterns of sub-adult and adult distribution data: incidences were higher in spring and fall than in summer and winter when hypoxia and temperatures were predicted to limit growth rates; and captures were greater in regions with less severe summertime hypoxia (Lower Eastern Shore and the James River) than those with higher bottom hypoxia (Mid-Bay). On the other hand, sturgeon in summer and fall months frequently occurred in hypoxic warm conditions where poor juvenile growth was predicted. This mismatch has significant management implications as current water quality criteria in the Chesapeake Bay and elsewhere have been enacted at DO and temperature levels, which are intended to be protective of sturgeon but may be overly conservative for sub-adult and adult stage Atlantic sturgeon. Still, there remain key uncertainties in principal assumptions related to how laboratory studies and the bioenergetics model have been applied. In this study, I applied the bioenergetics model, calibrated for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon (<300mm TL) to incidences of sub-adult and adult sturgeon (>500mm TL). Future research should focus on applying the
results of the bioenergetics model to incidences of juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay. Additionally, I made the assumption that Atlantic sturgeon were captured below-pycnocline in these hypoxic areas and remained in assessed regions for days to weeks. Future telemetry studies should utilize depth-transponding tags to determine what parts of the water column are utilized by Atlantic sturgeon within the Chesapeake Bay, especially during the summer season when much of the mainstem of the Chesapeake Bay contains unsuitable habitat. Telemetry data can also provide behavioral patterns associated with these sub-optimal habitats such as time spent in sub-optimal conditions, movement within the water column, and avoidance of specific areas. This information would provide valuable information to management to determine if the water quality criteria established for the Chesapeake Bay to be protective of sturgeon species is protective of these critical life stages or if the criteria overly conservative. The moderately high incidence of larger sturgeon during summer months suggests compensating factors for their occurrence. New discoveries on their broad summer distribution and fall spawning behaviors emphasize the need to understand if reproductive staging and feeding are offsetting direct physiological responses to DO, temperature, and salinity that drive incidences of sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon in presumed sub-optimal environments.
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### Tables

Table 1. Sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon captures in the Chesapeake Bay (north-south orientation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Upper Bay</th>
<th>Upper Western Shore</th>
<th>Upper Eastern Shore</th>
<th>Patapsco and Back</th>
<th>Lower Western Shore</th>
<th>Choptank</th>
<th>Patuxent</th>
<th>Potomac</th>
<th>Lower Eastern Shore</th>
<th>Mid Bay</th>
<th>Rappahannock</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Elizabeth</th>
<th>Lower Bay</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>James River</th>
<th>Lower Eastern Shore</th>
<th>Mid Bay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Ranking of potential growth average (±SE) of juvenile Atlantic sturgeon growth by year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0.02922(±0.00019)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.03020(±0.00016)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.02923(±0.00017)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0.02714(±0.00017)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0.02713(±0.00017)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.02701(±0.00016)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.02687(±0.00019)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.02921(±0.00016)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.03013(±0.00017)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.02920(±0.00016)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.02923(±0.00017)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.02706(±0.00018)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.02850(±0.00016)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.02600(±0.00018)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.03072(±0.00018)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.02696(±0.00017)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.03308(±0.00018)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.02751(±0.00015)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.02913(±0.00016)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.02814(±0.00018)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.02644(±0.00017)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.02756(±0.00020)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.03363(±0.00016)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.02964(±0.00016)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon growth in individual tributaries in the winter. ANOVA and pairwise contrasts using Tukey’s honest significant difference pairwise contrasts between tributaries are shown as S=significant, NS=not significant. Average growth for each tributary is reported. North-south orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bay</td>
<td>0.00846</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Western Shore</td>
<td>0.00609</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Eastern Shore</td>
<td>0.00789</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patapsco and Back Rivers</td>
<td>0.00961</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Western Shore (MD)</td>
<td>0.00983</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>0.00898</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patuxent River</td>
<td>0.01050</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>0.00882</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eastern Shore (Tangier)</td>
<td>0.00922</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Bay</td>
<td>0.01065</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappahannock River</td>
<td>0.01020</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York River</td>
<td>0.01253</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James River</td>
<td>0.01211</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth River</td>
<td>0.01405</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bay</td>
<td>0.00768</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon growth in individual tributaries in the summer. ANOVA and pairwise contrasts using Tukey’s honest significant difference pairwise contrasts between tributaries are shown as S=significant, NS=not significant. Average growth for each tributary is reported. North-south orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bay</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.02563</td>
<td>0.03577</td>
<td>0.02074</td>
<td>0.01954</td>
<td>0.01117</td>
<td>0.02330</td>
<td>0.01873</td>
<td>0.01555</td>
<td>0.04386</td>
<td>0.01281</td>
<td>0.02608</td>
<td>0.04179</td>
<td>0.03966</td>
<td>0.03969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Western Shore</td>
<td>0.02563</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Eastern Shore</td>
<td>0.03577</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patapsco and Back Rivers</td>
<td>0.02074</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Western Shore (MD)</td>
<td>0.01954</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>0.01117</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patuxent River</td>
<td>0.02330</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>0.01873</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eastern Shore (Tangier)</td>
<td>0.01555</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Bay</td>
<td>0.04386</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappahannock River</td>
<td>0.01281</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York River</td>
<td>0.02608</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James River</td>
<td>0.04179</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth River</td>
<td>0.03966</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bay</td>
<td>0.03969</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bay</td>
<td>0.02586</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon growth in individual tributaries in the fall. ANOVA and pairwise contrasts using Tukey’s honest significant difference pairwise contrasts between tributaries are shown as S=significant, NS=not significant. Average growth for each tributary is reported. North-south orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bay</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.05313</td>
<td>0.05144</td>
<td>0.05315</td>
<td>0.05554</td>
<td>0.05699</td>
<td>0.05711</td>
<td>0.05842</td>
<td>0.05012</td>
<td>0.05239</td>
<td>0.05193</td>
<td>0.04949</td>
<td>0.05273</td>
<td>0.04962</td>
<td>0.04515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Western Shore</td>
<td>0.05313</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Eastern Shore</td>
<td>0.05144</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patapsco and Back Rivers</td>
<td>0.05315</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Western Shore (MD)</td>
<td>0.05554</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>0.05699</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patuxent River</td>
<td>0.05711</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac River</td>
<td>0.05842</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eastern Shore (Tangier)</td>
<td>0.05012</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Bay</td>
<td>0.05239</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rappahannock River</td>
<td>0.05193</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York River</td>
<td>0.04949</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James River</td>
<td>0.05273</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth River</td>
<td>0.04962</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bay</td>
<td>0.04515</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03383</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Wilcoxon-signed rank results of greater incidence than expected for sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon for conditions of higher growth, higher dissolved oxygen, lower temperature and higher salinity. Years (1997, 1998, 2005, 2006) have been combined for analysis. S=significant, NS=not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Production (g day⁻¹)</th>
<th>Dissolved Oxygen (%)</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Salinity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James River</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Eastern Shore</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Bay</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figures**

Figure 2. Locations of fixed stations in the Chesapeake Bay
Figure 3. Interpolated spatial maps of water quality and predicted Atlantic sturgeon growth in the Chesapeake Bay. Examples are from summer 1998: a) dissolved oxygen (% saturation); b) temperature (°C); c) salinity and d) growth (g day$^{-1}$).
c. Chesapeake Bay Summer 1998


d. Chesapeake Bay Summer 1998 Potential
Figure 4. Predicted mean annual growth for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay. Error bars are standard error. Different letters denote significant differences (ANOVA, Tukey honest significant difference; p<0.05).
Figure 5. Predicted mean seasonal growth for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay. Different letters denote significant differences (ANOVA, Tukey honest significant difference; p<0.05).
Figure 6. Predicted mean seasonal growth by year for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay.
Figure 7. Predicted mean seasonal growth by year for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay. a. winter, b. spring, c. summer, d. fall
Figure 8. Comparison of predicted mean summertime growth (bars) for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon and summertime hypoxic volume (km$^3$) (line) (1990-2013) for entire Chesapeake Bay.
Figure 9. Regression of predicted mean summertime growth for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon and summertime hypoxic volume (km³) (1990-2013) for the entire Chesapeake Bay.

\[ y = -0.0012x + 0.033 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.35 \]
Figure 10. Comparison of predicted mean fall growth (bars) for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon and fall hypoxic volumes (km$^3$) (lines) (1990-2013) for the entire Chesapeake Bay.
Figure 11. Predicted mean growth among tributaries and bay regions for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon (1990-2013). Different letters denote significant differences (ANOVA, Tukey honest significant difference; p<0.05).
Figure 12. Predicted mean growth among tributaries and bay regions by season for juvenile Atlantic sturgeon (1990-2013).
Figure 14. Box-whisker plots of predicted mean growth for sub-adults and adults captured in: a. Mid Bay, b. Lower Eastern Shore, and c. James River. *significant difference within a season between segment and capture environment (p<0.05) according to Wilcoxon’s signed-rank test.
Figure 15. Box-whisker plots of mean temperature (°C) for sub-adults and adults captured in: a. Mid Bay, b. Lower Eastern Shore, and c. James River. *significant difference within a season between segment and capture environment (p<0.05) according to Wilcoxon’s signed-rank test.
Figure 16. Bivariate convex hull plot of Atlantic sturgeon captures occurring in the Mid Bay (1997, 1998, 2005, 2006) as they relate to DO and temperature conditions. Confidence ellipses (dashed lines) represent 90% and 50% inclusion of environmental variables. Black vertical and horizontal lines represent DO saturation and temperature levels for EPA dissolved oxygen criteria. a. seasonal captures, and b. summer captures.
Figure 17. Bivariate convex hull plot of Atlantic sturgeon captures occurring in the Lower Eastern Shore (1997, 1998, 2005, 2006) as they relate to DO and temperature conditions. Confidence ellipses (dashed lines) represent 90% and 50% inclusion of environmental variables. Black vertical and horizontal lines represent DO saturation and temperature levels for EPA dissolved oxygen criteria. a. seasonal captures, and b. summer captures.
Figure 18. Bivariate convex hull plot of Atlantic sturgeon captures in the James River (1997, 1998, 2005, 2006) as they relate to DO and temperature conditions. Confidence ellipses (dashed lines) represent 90% and 50% inclusion of environmental variables. Black vertical and horizontal lines represent DO saturation and temperature parameters for EPA dissolved oxygen criteria.
Figure 19. Quotient analysis for Atlantic sturgeon captures that occurred in the summer in the Mid Bay segment. Red line represents quotient value. Gray dashed lines represent 0.975 and 0.025 confidence intervals. a. modeled growth, b. dissolved oxygen, c. temperature, d. salinity.
Figure 20. Quotient analysis for Atlantic sturgeon captures that occurred in the summer in the Lower Eastern Shore segment. Red line represents quotient value. Gray dashed lines represent 0.975 and 0.025 confidence intervals. a. modeled growth, b. dissolved oxygen, c. temperature, d. salinity.
Figure 21. Quotient analysis of temperature for Atlantic sturgeon captures that occurred in the winter. Red line represents quotient value. Gray dashed lines represent 0.975 and 0.025 confidence intervals. a. Mid Bay, b. Lower Eastern Shore, c. James River.
Appendices

Appendix 1.
require(Hmisc)
require(PBSmapping)
require(geoR)
require(maptools)
library(SpatialTools);
library(raster);
library(gdistance)

###---start script 1----
setwd("folder path")

#1. Read shapefile
chesapeake.km<-importShapefile("reporting_regions_new.shp", proj="utm", zone=18)
chesapeake.km<-importShapefile("shapefiles/reporting_regions_simplified/reporting_regions_new.shp",
    #proj="utm",zone=18)
# Transform units to kilometres instead of meters
chesapeake<-cbind(chesapeake.km[,1:3],chesapeake.km[,4:5]/1000)
x11();plotMap(chesapeake)

#2. Define resolution and create matrices
res<-2 #horizontal resolution (km)
resumen<-data.frame(); vcov.st<-data.frame()

#---1990-----
# create dataframe
CBPWQ<-read.csv("water quality file.csv")
CBPWQ$dosat<-with(CBPWQ,DO/((exp(-173.4292+249.6339*(100/(TEMP+273))+143.3483*log((TEMP+273)/100)-21.8492*((TEMP+273)/100)+SALINITY*(-0.033096+0.014259*((TEMP+273)/100)-0.0017*((TEMP+273)/100)^2)))*1.428)*100)
data1<-
with(CBPWQ,data.frame(lat=LATITUDE,lon=LONGITUDE,temp=TEMP,DO=dosat,SALINITY=SALINITY))
summary(data1)

#------------------------------------------------------------
# Create distance matrix
#------------------------------------------------------------
#add utm coordinates
ll.ini<-data.frame(EID=c(1:dim(data1)[1]),X=data1$lon,Y=data1$lat)
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aux1<-convUL(as.EventData(ll.ini,projection="LL"),km=TRUE)
data1<-cbind(data1[,1:5],aux1[,2:3])
names(data1)[6:7]<-c("easting","northing")

# Average data within resolution
data1$reasting<-res*round(data1$easting/res,0)
data1$rnorthing<-res*round(data1$northing/res,0)

# Create analysis grid
grd0<-
with(data1,expand.grid(seq(min(reasting,na.rm=T),max(reasting,na.rm=T),res),
seq(min(rnorthing,na.rm=T),max(rnorthing,na.rm=T),res)))
grd0$EID<-c(1:dim(grd0)[1])
names(grd0)<-c("X","Y","EID")
# Identify which points are located within the bay (needed to build distance matrix)
test<-as.data.frame(findPolys(grd0,chesapeake))
test<-aggregate(PID~EID,data=test,FUN=min)
grd1<-merge(grd0,test,by="EID",all.x=T)
attr(grd1,"projection")<="UTM"; attr(grd1,"zone")<-18

# Calculate effective distances (as the fish swim)
# Define a differential "conductance" for land and water cells
grd1$cond<-0.01+!is.na(grd1$PID)*0.99
# First we create a global raster
grd2<-
SpatialPixelsDataFrame(points=grd1[,c("X","Y")],data=data.frame(grd1$cond),
tolerance=0.99,proj4string=CRS("+proj=utm +datum=WGS84 +zone=18")
)
# create a RasterLayer with the extent of GPRED
rd<- raster(grd2,layer=1)
plot(rd)

# and create a global transition matrix that represets the pairwise product of
# cells conductance
prod<-function(x){x[1]*x[2]}
trd <- transition(rd,prod,8)
trd<-geoCorrection(trd)

# get median responses by cell for all responses
data.med<-
aggregate(cbind(temp,DO,SALINITY)~reasting+rnorthing,data=data1,FUN=median,na.rm=T)
# Finally we use the transition matrix to calculate corrected distances (as the fish swim)
xy<- as.matrix(data.med[,1:2])
d0<-costDistance(trd,xy)
d<-as.matrix(as.dist(d0, diag = TRUE, upper = TRUE))

#-----------------------------------------------
# Interpolate
#-----------------------------------------------
# Prediction grid
gr.pred<-grd1[!is.na(grd1$PID),]

# Prediction distances
pred.xy<-as.matrix(gr.pred[,2:3]) #define zona
# Use again the transition matrix to calculate corrected distances (as the fish swim)
pred.d0<-costDistance(trd,pred.xy)
pred.d<-as.matrix(as.dist(pred.d0, diag = TRUE, upper = TRUE))

# Calculate distances between observed a predicted values
op.d0<-costDistance(trd,xy,pred.xy)
op.d<-as.matrix(op.d0, diag = TRUE, upper = TRUE)
Xp <- as.matrix(cbind(1, gr.pred[,c(2,3)]))

# ciclo for looping along the three variables
for (v in c("temp","DO","SALINITY")) {

  # Fit geostatistical model for the temp data
  geo.med<-as.geodata(cbind(data.med[,c("reasting","northing",v)]), data.col=v)
  vg<-variog(geo.med, max.dist=600,dists.mat=d)
  # Eyefit
  # x11();eyefit(vg)
  # ML fit
  X <- as.matrix(cbind(1, data.med[,c(1,2)]))
  vpar<-maxlik.cov.sp(X, as.matrix(data.med[,v]), coords =
                      as.matrix(data.med[,c(1,2)]),
                      sp.type = "matern", range.par = 600, error.ratio = 0.5, D=d,
                      reml = TRUE)
  # Define spatial structure of prediction matrix from fitted spatial model
  V0<-cov.sp(coords = as.matrix(data.med[,c(1,2)]), sp.type = "matern",
              sp.par = vpar$sp.par, error.var = vpar$error.var,
              smoothness = vpar$smoothness, finescale.var = 0,
              pcoords = as.matrix(gr.pred[,c(2,3)]),
              D = d, Dp = pred.d, Dop = op.d)
  # Apply spatial structure nd model to predict values
  kriged<-krige.uk(as.vector(data.med[,v]),
                  V = V0$V, Vop=V0$Vop, Vp=V0$Vp,
                  X = X, Xp = Xp, nsim = 0)
  gr.pred[[v]]<-krige$pred
  gr.pred[[paste(v,"se",sep=".")]]<-krige$mspe
}
pred.utm <- as.EventData(gr.pred[,1:3])
attr(pred.utm,"projection") = "UTM"; attr(pred.utm,"zone") <- 18
pred.ll <- convUL(pred.utm)
names(pred.ll)[2:3] <- c("Lon","Lat")
pred <- cbind(gr.pred,pred.ll[,2:3])
head(pred)
write.csv(pred,"Title")
Appendix 2.

# ATLANTIC STURGEON MODEL
# SCRIPT : 20110803
# LAST UPDATE: 20140702
# Programmer: Edwin Niklitschek; edwin.niklitschek@ulagos.cl

### READING DATA ###;
# REPLACE data1 BY YOUR OWN ENVIRONMENTAL DATA SET;
data1<-expand.grid(SAL=1:29,DO=25:100,TEMP=6:29)

# DEFINING FISH WEIGHT AND OBSERVED CONSUMPTION;
GR=14; # REPLACE THIS BY YOUR ACTUAL FISH WEIGHT IF NEEDED;
TL=NA; # REPLACE THIS BY YOUR ACTUAL FISH TOTAL LENGTH OR LEAVE IT AS NA IF YOU DO NOT HAVE IT;
CJ_OBS=0; # IF YOU DECLARE THIS VARIABLE EQUAL TO 0, THE MODEL ASSUMES MAXIMUM CONSUMPTION RATE (CMAX);
RATION=1; # IF YOU DECLARE THIS VARIABLE EQUAL TO 1, THE MODEL ASSUMES p-value=1;

# BIOENERGETICS PARAMETERS

## ROUTINE METABOLISM;
arm = 0.522;
brm = -0.17;
tk1rm = 0.141;
tk4rm = 0.796;
crm = 1.0;
drm = 1.048;
grm = 0.748;
hrm = 0.268;
irm = 0.352;
smin = 9.166;
b1=-.158;

## FOOD CONSUMPTION;
afc = 1.028;
bfc = -0.197;
tk1fc = 0.195;
tk4fc = 0.556;
tl98fc = 26.09;
cfc=1;
dfc = 2.516;
gfc = 0.733;
jfc = 0.359;
kfc = 0.247;

## EGESTION;
aeg = 0.335;
ceg = -0.75;
deg = -0.62;
geg = 0;

## EXCRETION;
aex = 0.055703;
bex = -0.29;
cex = 0.0392;

## SDA;
asda = 0.1657;

## AM;
aact = 0.29;

## Constants
S4 = 29; S1 = 1; do1 = 25;

# MODELING

attach(data1)

# RM MODEL;

## RM Model Constants;
ox = 13.55; rt1 = 6; rt4 = 28;

## FT;
y1 = (1/((rt4 - rt1)))*log(tk4rm*(1-tk1rm)/(tk1rm*(1-tk4rm)));
eyl = exp(y1*(TEMP-rt1));
FTrm = tk1rm*eyl/(1+tk1rm*(eyl-1));

## FS;
FSArm = 1+0.01*exp(hrm*GR**b1*(SAL-smin));
FSBrm = 1+0.01*exp(irm*GR**b1*(smin-SAL));
FSrm = FSArm*FSBrm/(1.0201);

## FO;
DOCrm = 100*(1-crm*exp(-FTrm*FSrm));
KO1rm = 1-drm*exp(FTrm*FSrm-1);
dorel=(DOCrm-DO)/100;
SLrm=(.98-KO1rm)/((.02*(DOCrm-do1))**crm);
FOrm=ifelse(dorel>0,(0.98-SLrm*dorel**crm)/0.98,1)

KRM=FOrm*FSrm*FTrm;
RM=GR*(arm*GR**brm)*KRM*24*ox/1000;

#----------------------------------------------------------------------
# FC MODEL;
#----------------------------------------------------------------------
## FC model constants;
ct1=6; ct4=28;
## FT;
cy1=(1/(tl98fc-ct1))*log(0.98*(1-tk1fc)/(tk1fc*0.02));
ecy1=exp(cy1*(TEMP-ct1));
cka=tk1fc*ecy1/(1+tk1fc*(ecy1-1));

cy2=(1/(ct4-tl98fc))*log(0.98*(1-tk4fc)/(tk4fc*0.02));
ecy2=exp(cy2*(ct4-TEMP));
ckb=tk4fc*ecy2/(1+tk4fc*(ecy2-1));

FTfc=cka*ckb;
## FS;
CKS1=jfc*GR**-b1;
CKS4=kfc*GR**-b1;

YA=(1/(smin-CKS1))*log(0.98*(1-CKS1)/(CKS1*0.02));
EYA=exp(YA*(SAL-CKS1));
KSA=CKS1*EYA/(1+CKS1*(EYA-1));

YB=(1/(S4-smin))*log(0.98*(1-CKS4)/(CKS4*0.02));
EYB=exp(YB*(S4-SAL));
KSB=CKS4*EYB/(1+CKS4*(EYB-1));
FSfc=(KSA*KSB)/(1);
## FO;
DOCfc=100*(1-gfc*exp(-KRM));
KO1fc=1-dfc*exp(KRM-1);
dorel=(DOCfc-DO)/100;
SLfc=(.98-KO1fc)/((.02*(DOCfc-do1))**cfc);
FOfc=ifelse(dorel>0,(0.98-SLfc*dorel**cfc)/0.98,1)

CJG_MAX=(afc*GR**bfc)*FTfc*FSfc*FOfc;
CJ_MAX=GR*CJG_MAX;
CJ_PRED=RATION*CJG_MAX;
CJ_PRED=CJG_PRED*GR;
if (CJ_OBS==0) CJ=CJ_PRED else CJ=CJ_OBS;

# EGESTION MODEL

E=aeg*(TEMP/6)**ceg*(DO/DOCrm)**deg*RATION**geg;  
EG=E*CJ;

# EXCRETION MODEL;

EX=aex*GR**bex*RM+cex*CJ;

# SDA MODEL;

SDA=(CJ-EG)*asda;

# ACTIVE METABOLISM ;

AM=CJ_MAX*aact;

# ENERGY CONTENT;

TL=ifelse(is.na(TL),exp((log(GR)+6.1488)/3.113),TL); 
LNL=log(TL); 
WS=TL/exp((log(GR)+6.1488)/3.113); 
ENEC=exp(-1.0065+1.0336*log(WS)+0.6807*LNL);

# GROWTH

GKJ_PRED=CJ-RM-EG-SDA-EX-AM; 
G_PRED=log((GR+GKJ_PRED/ENEC)/GR);
Appendix 3: Results from generalized linear model regression of production versus DO and temperature.

Formula: production ~ Temp + DO, data= production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum Sq</th>
<th>Mean Sq</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Pr(&gt;F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temp</td>
<td>3.93E-05</td>
<td>3.93E-05</td>
<td>18.104</td>
<td>0.0003532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>2.68E-06</td>
<td>2.68E-06</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>0.279752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Latitudinal Countergradient Variation in the Growth of Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon

Abstract

Atlantic sturgeon populations occur over a very broad latitudinal range (Satilla River, Florida to St. Lawrence River, Canada; 15 degrees), such that size-dependent winter mortality of juveniles could select for countergradient latitudinal variation in juvenile growth rate. Any latitudinal trend in juvenile growth rate could be confounded by dual spring and fall spawning, which has been recently documented for several populations. To investigate latitudinal countergradient variation in growth between populations, growth of Canada- and Altamaha (GA) strain Atlantic sturgeon was compared in a common garden experiment in which they were exposed to three thermal regimes, which were representative of the species latitudinal range. Results indicated no effect of strain on growth performance; Atlantic sturgeon length and weight were significantly influenced by thermal regime treatment independent of strain. To evaluate possible confounding influences of dual spawning on juvenile growth and size predictions, I applied a growth-degree-day (GDD) model, using water temperature data from seven NOAA National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) sites, over the latitudinal range of Atlantic sturgeon to predict growth performance across systems and seasonal spring and fall cohorts. The annual accumulation of GDDs varied significantly over a latitudinal gradient. For the spring cohort, which occurs throughout the species range, accumulation of GDDS diminished rapidly north of the Chesapeake Bay. Interestingly, there was no significant difference for GDDS between fall and spring cohorts throughout the
species range, indicating equivalent annual growth performance in those systems where both spring and fall spawning occurs. Using a regression of length versus GDD estimated from laboratory experiments, total length of age-1.0 fish was estimated across a latitudinal gradient using the accumulated GDD for each system (2008-2012). Predicted lengths of age-1.0 sturgeon (241.8-346.0 mm north of Chesapeake Bay; 354.1-416.0 mm south of the Hudson River) generally fell within the range of age-1 Atlantic sturgeon reported in literature. The GDD model of predicted size should hold promise in assessing recruitment and related recovery in Atlantic sturgeon and evaluating scenarios of warming and dual spawning across throughout the range of the species.

**Introduction**

Conservation of threatened and endangered sturgeon is most sensitive to factors that influence first year survival (Gross et al. 2002). Age-0 and older juveniles (<100 cm total length) of the federally protected Atlantic sturgeon, *Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus* are encountered in spawning tributaries but assignment of juveniles to age-0 and age-1 based on length has been uncertain owing to incomplete knowledge of how first year growth occurs across the broad latitudinal range (15 degrees) in which the species occurs (Satilla River, Florida to St. Lawrence River, Canada). Confounding the identification of age-0,1 juveniles further is that in some portions of their range, Atlantic sturgeon spawn in both the spring and the fall (Smith et al. 1985; Balazik et al. 2013; Smith et al. 2015; Hager et al. 2014; Balazik and Musick 2015), which could result in two size modes associated with age-0,1 juveniles in any given season.
Species for which populations occur over broad latitudinal ranges may experience countergradient juvenile growth, where growth rates are higher at higher latitudes (Conover 1992). Higher latitude areas are distinguished by shorter growing season, earlier onset of winter, and severity of winter (Yamahira and Conover 2002) as well as wintertime scarcity of prey items (Shuter et al. 2012). In North America, the latitudinal gradient of shorter summers and longer winters can result in systematic changes in population characteristics such as spawning time, somatic growth, size and age at reproduction, and lifespan (Shuter et al. 2012). Atlantic silversides (Menidia menidia) occur over a similar latitudinal range as Atlantic sturgeon, and juveniles grow faster at higher latitudes; at the end of the first summer growing season size is independent of latitude even though the growing season declines by a factor of 2.5 with increasing latitude (Conover and Present 1990). Cod (Gadus morhua) from higher latitudes also tended to have greater intrinsic rates of growth (Wijekoon et al. 2009) yet Purchase and Brown (2001) found that growth rates were not due to higher genetic capacities for growth but related to how all tested populations responded to similar thermal regimes. Lake sturgeon (Acipenser fulvescens) demonstrated a relationship between length-at-age and thermal opportunity for growth whereby sturgeon in the northern part of the range were smaller-at-age, but grew at a higher rate, when growth was adjusted for expected thermal conditions (Power and McKinley 1997). There are several theories that relate latitudinal countergradient variation to evolutionary fitness, the main one involving over-winter mortality (Conover 1992; Schultz et al. 1996; Power and McKinley 1997).
In temperate system, cessation of growth and lethal temperatures during winter months are thought to drive latitudinal countergradient trends in juvenile growth. Winter mortality may occur due to thermal stress, starvation, predation, disease, winter hypoxia, and physical disturbance (e.g. ice flows) (Hurst 2007). However, it is thermal stress (e.g., inability to maintain homeostasis) and starvation (e.g., allotment of energy stores) that have been assumed to be the principal culprits for winter mortality of fish (Hurst 2007). At higher latitudes, smaller body size and associated energy stores may increase overwinter mortality (Yamahira and Conover 2002; Garvey and Marschall 2003; Crossman et al. 2009; Pörtner and Peck 2010; Shuter et al. 2012). Brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) along a thirteen-degree latitudinal gradient exhibited increased lipid stores in higher latitudes (30% increase) but growth was approximately 20% lower for higher latitudes indicating a selective allocation of energy stores associated with overwintering (Berg et al. 2011). Regardless of ration allocation, smaller largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) from higher latitudes selectively allocated consumed energy into growth rather than reproduction in order to increase fat storage capacity before the onset of winter to increase survival (Garvey and Marschall 2003). Striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) in the Hudson River displayed a shift from increasing length early in the growing season to increasing energy reserves towards the end of the growing season, presumably to reduce overwinter mortality risk (Hurst and Conover 2003). Atlantic silversides in northern latitudes accumulated energy stores faster than their southern counterparts, providing evidence that risk of winter starvation resulted in selection to accumulate energy during the first growing season (Schultz and Conover 1997). There has been minimal research
on winter mortality of sturgeon species except when evaluating hatchery restoration efforts (Crossman et al. 2009; Falahatker et al. 2013). Crossman et al. 2009 observed only 40% of stocked lake sturgeon (*Acipenser fulvescens*) survived their first winter, indicating that overwinter mortality could be an important agent of natural selection. They observed no relationship between size and winter survival.

Differences in growth rates across a latitudinal gradient is heritable in some fish species. Mummichogs (*Fundulus heteroclitus*) showed a difference in their genetic capacity for growth when fish from northern latitudes were reared in a common garden experiment with fish from southern latitudes; northern latitude strains had a higher capacity for growth (Schultz et al. 1996). This has also been observed in juvenile Atlantic silversides (Conover and Present 1990) and larval (Conover et al. 1997) and juvenile (Secor et al. 2000a) striped bass where fish from high latitudes grew faster than those from lower latitudes in common garden experiments. Many species that exhibit countergradient variation in growth between high and low latitude have large geographic ranges. Atlantic sturgeon span a large geographical range, yet no research has been conducted to determine if there is a difference between strains in their genetic capacity for growth.

Given the latitudinal range of Atlantic sturgeon and evidence of dual-spawning, I investigated countergradient growth variation of Atlantic sturgeon along a latitudinal range. Seasonal changes in temperature that juveniles encounter during their first year of life, referenced here as thermal phenology, plays an integral role in determining their growth and size. To evaluate thermal phenology, a valuable tool is the growth-degree-day (GDD) model, which integrates temperatures that a fish
experiences together with thermal tolerance thresholds. The GDD method allows for
growth to be scaled to expected thermal performance throughout the first year’s
growing season (Neuheimer and Taggart 2007; Humphrey et al. 2014). This thermal
concept should be applicable to most fish species and when GDD is unable to explain
the seasonal and variations in length, it is an indication that other factors may be
contributing to the size-at-age variation (e.g., food availability, genetics) (Neuheimer
and Taggart 2007). The GDD method also allows individual growth calendars to be
tracked for differing hatch dates, regions, and years making this method ideal for
comparing the thermal phenology of Atlantic sturgeon growth along their latitudinal
gradient. Although fish weight can be used as the principal growth variable explained
by GDD, length of the fish is preferred since it has either nil or positive changes on a
seasonal basis (i.e. fish will not shrink in length) (Neuheimer and Taggart 2007;
Humphrey et al. 2014).

Growth rates of Atlantic sturgeon and the better-studied sympatric shortnose
sturgeon (\emph{A. brevirostrum}) tend to be higher in the southern portion of their range
(Murawski and Pacheco 1977; Dadwell et al. 1984; Smith 1985). Shortnose sturgeon
attain lengths of 140-300 mm by the end of the first growing season (age-0 juveniles),
depending on latitude (Dadswell et al. 1984). In the Saint John River, shortnose
sturgeon range from 155-190 mm during their second growing season (age-1
juveniles) but in the Hudson River, shortnose sturgeon may reach 250 mm by the end
of their first growing season (Pekovitch 1979). Growth information for Atlantic
sturgeon after the first growing season is less well documented. In the Altamaha
River, age-1 Atlantic sturgeon, confirmed using ageing techniques, reached a
maximum 600 mm total length (Schuller and Peterson 2010) and in the Hudson River, age-1 Atlantic sturgeon were <550 mm total length (Peterson et al. 2000); both systems were sampled during the summer. Under hatchery conditions in South Carolina, Atlantic sturgeon grew to 177 mm by day 204 (Gilbert 1989) and in a PA hatcher grew to 360 mm at age-1 (Secor et al. 2000b).

To test if northern and southern populations of Atlantic sturgeon express countergradient variation in growth, I used juveniles, representing populations from the Altamaha River, GA and the Saint John River, Canada in a common garden experiment in which they were exposed to three thermal regimes, which were representative of the species latitudinal range. In addition to this laboratory experiment, I applied a GDD model over the latitudinal range of Atlantic sturgeon to determine: 1) the number of GDD accumulated during the first year of life and 2) predicted size of Atlantic sturgeon at the first year of life (age=1.0). Specific hypotheses included: 1) differences in growth between genetic strains will occur when exposed to thermal regimes that represent the range of the species occurrence; 2) the number of GDD accumulated over the first year of life will be inversely related to latitude (i.e. higher latitudes will have less accumulation of GDD); 3) accumulated GDD for age-1 Atlantic sturgeon will be less for northern populations than southern populations; and 4) the accumulated GDD for age-1 Atlantic sturgeon will be similar for spring-spawned and fall-spawned Atlantic sturgeon.
Methods

Laboratory experiment

A comparison of juvenile growth between Saint John River, New Brunswick, Canada ("Canada") and Altamaha River, GA ("Altamaha") strain Atlantic sturgeon was conducted in the laboratory to (1) provide insight into genetic growth differences between strains exposed to the same thermal regimes, which were representative of the species latitudinal range and (2) determine the effect of thermal regime on growth of juvenile Atlantic sturgeon over their first year of life. Canada-strain Atlantic sturgeon were acquired from Dr. Cornel Ceapa (Acadian Sturgeon and Caviar, Inc., Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada) in July 2013 (hatch date: July 21, 2013). Altamaha-strain Atlantic sturgeon were acquired from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Bears Bluff National Fish Hatchery (Warm Springs, Georgia) in August 2013 (hatch date: August 9, 2013). All fish were initially reared in freshwater (~17.8°C) and fed Artemia nauplii before being weaned to commercial diet and acclimated to ambient Choptank River (Maryland, Chesapeake Bay) water until the start of the experiment.

Thermal regimes for the study included those simulating the mean monthly temperatures, using 2013 water quality data for the Edisto River, South Carolina and Saint John River, New Brunswick, Canada (Table 1). Treatments included Saint John River strain juveniles reared in an Edisto River temperature profile and Altamaha River strain reared in a Saint John River temperature profile as well as controls where each strain was reared in its natal thermal regime. Seven fish were stocked in each tank (148-L) prior to the start of the experiment and acclimated to the target
temperature (Δ1°C day⁻¹). Six replicates were used for each strain for both the Saint John River and Edisto River temperature treatments (total = 24 tanks). Additionally, both strains were reared in ambient Choptank River as an intermediate latitudinal temperature profile. Due to the limitation in the number of 148-L tanks available, larger tanks were used for the Choptank River treatment (~1600-L). The experiment was conducted December 2013 – June 2014 for the Choptank River and Edisto River thermal treatments. Unfortunately, due to a mechanical failure, the Saint John River thermal treatment was terminated early during March 2014. Fish were fed 5% body weight day⁻¹ (commercial pellets; Zeigler Bros, Inc., Gardner, PA) during the course of the experiment. Saint John and Edisto thermal regimes were regulated using heat exchangers in a partially recirculating aquaculture system using filtered (2μm) Choptank River water. Salinity was ambient Choptank River water and ranged 8-12 psu. Weights (g) and lengths (mm total length (TL)) were measured for all experimental fish, and recorded within a couple days of the end of each 4-week interval before temperatures was stepped up or down (1°C day⁻¹) for the next corresponding temperature in the Saint John River and Edisto River system profiles. Due to the small initial size of the fish (Altamaha River strain: mean = 178 mm ±8.1 SD; Saint John River strain: mean = 180 mm ±9.2 SD, individual fish were not marked so lengths and weights for each tank were summed for statistical comparisons. There was no statistical difference in the initial lengths of stocked fish among treatment levels (ANOVA: between strains, n= 30; p=0.48; between thermal regimes, n=30; p=0.76). There was also no statistical difference in the initial weights
of stocked fish among treatment levels (ANOVA: between strains, n=30; p=0.06); between thermal regimes, n=30; p=0.84).

Growth-degree-days (GDD) were calculated for each temperature profile during this period to provide a standardized response of growth among thermal regimes. Using the minimum temperature threshold, I used the following equation:

\[ \text{GDD} = \sum (T_i - T_{th}) \cdot \Delta d; \]

where \( T_i \) is the mean daily water temperature, \( T_{th} \) is the minimum (4°C) or maximum (28 °C) thermal threshold of the species, and \( \Delta d \) is the number of days between sampling. When calculating GDD at thermal maximum, \( T_{th} \) and \( T_i \) were switched in the GDD equation. Note, I assumed that fish cannot lose length, therefore GDD was assigned a value of 0 if temperatures were outside the species tolerance limits. Little information was available related to lower temperature thresholds for Atlantic sturgeon. Niklitschek and Secor (2009) found at 6°C (70% dissolved oxygen), Atlantic sturgeon had minimal food consumption (< 0.1 kJ g\(^{-1}\) d\(^{-1}\)) and oxygen consumption (<0.05 mg h\(^{-1}\)). In a hatchery setting, Mohler (2004) similarly observed very low food consumption rates at 6.8 °C and reported weight losses by juveniles at <5 °C. Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon exposed to ambient Patuxent River water temperatures stopped feeding and experienced lost equilibrium at <4°C (Dr. David Secor, personal communication, 2017). Thus for a low temperature threshold I chose 4°C. For the thermal maximum, I chose 28°C based on laboratory experiments of thermal tolerance in Atlantic sturgeon (Dovel and Berggren 1983; Niklitschek and Secor 2005; Niklitschek and Secor 2009).
Repeated measures ANOVA (R Core Team 2016) was used to compare the effects of thermal regime and strain on the repeated tank measurements of mean length, weight, and specific growth rate. Four models were compared to determine the best covariance structure among repeated measures: (1) a baseline model assuming independence (Model 1), (2) a model with dependence between tanks but no correlation between days (Model 2), (3) a model with dependence between tanks and AR1 correlation (an autoregressive lag 1 covariance structure) between days (Model 3), and (4) a model with dependence between tanks and ARMA(1,1) correlation (autoregressive moving average model) between days (Model 4). The best model was determined using the lowest AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) value after which the final model structure was determined using restricted maximum likelihood. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey’s honest significant difference were used to determine which comparisons were significant. In addition, regressions were used to determine the extent GDD could explain overall SGR and length-at-day (LaD).

**Comparison of GDD along a latitudinal gradient**

Water quality data (2008-2013) for estuarine systems from Maine to South Carolina were obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS). Seven NERRS sites were selected to represent the latitudinal distribution of Atlantic sturgeon along the east coast of the United States: (1) Wells, Maine, (2) Great Bay, New Hampshire, (3) Hudson River, New York, (4) Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, (5) North Carolina, (6) North Inlet-Winyah Bay, South Carolina (hereafter “South Carolina”), and (7)
Ashepoo-Combahee-Edisto Basin (ACE Basin), South Carolina (Fig. 1). Within each NERRS, one station was selected to represent the estuarine system for calculating GDD. Selected stations were tidal freshwater areas within the estuary, or the station with the lowest salinity. Water temperature data was averaged on a daily basis for all systems, allowing for daily calculations of GDD. The GDDs for each representative station were calculated using the same formula as described previously. After daily GDD was calculated, GDDs were summed for each month. For stations where winter water temperature data was not recorded, I assumed zero growth occurred during these months since water temperature data recorded before or after the missing period was at or below the temperature threshold for Atlantic sturgeon.

Using an ANOVA, I compared NERRS sites and years to determine if there was a statistical difference in GDD estimates between NERRS sites (i.e., over a latitudinal gradient) and years. Additionally, cumulative GDD was calculated for the first year of life (age 1.0) for each NERRS site for spring-spawned sturgeon and fall-spawned sturgeon, where appropriate, to determine if the number of GDDs experienced by sturgeon were different depending on the season in which they were spawned. I used an ANOVA to make statistical comparisons between NERRS and years. Post-hoc comparisons for all comparisons were completed using Tukey’s honest significant difference.

Length at age-1.0 was predicted from combined experimental data using a von Bertalanffy growth model: 

$$l_{t_{\text{GDD}}} = L_{\infty}(1-e^{-K(GDD-GDD_0)})$$

where the age term t is substituted for GDDs. The model was fitted using an iterative fitting procedure within Excel (Solver ©). In the prediction for all GDDs from hatch to age 1.0,
experimental period GDDs were summed with an estimate of GDDs occurring from hatch to the start of the experiment (122 days 18°C~1708 GDDs).

**Results**

**Laboratory experiment**

Owing to the early termination of the Saint John’s River thermal regime experiment, I did initial thermal regime comparisons for the abbreviated period December 2013 - March 2014. Based on AIC criteria, ANOVA tests of average sturgeon length and weight responses utilized a within-tank autoregressive moving average between days (Table 2). There was no effect of strain on average fish length (p=0.82) or weight (p=0.88). Nor was there a significant interaction between thermal regime and strain on length (p=0.80) or weight (p=0.78), so these factors were dropped in the development of the final model. Both sturgeon length and weight were significantly influenced by thermal regime treatment (p<0.05) (Table 3). Thus regardless of strain, juveniles exposed to the Edisto River thermal regime were significantly larger (mean = 232.0 mm TL; 57.0 g) than from the Saint John’s River thermal regime (mean = 180.6 mm TL; 23.6 g; p<0.001) and the Choptank River thermal regime (mean = 192.8 mm TL; 30.7 g; p<0.03) (Figs 2, 3). Although higher growth was observed for the Choptank River thermal regime, no significant difference was detected in the lengths of fish between the Saint John’s River and the Choptank River thermal regimes (p>0.8) (Figs 2, 3).
Using AIC criteria, predictions of size were compared on the basis of experimental days versus GDDs for single and combined strains (Table 4). In the Saint John River thermal regime, predictions of length was improved for the number of experimental days in comparison to GDDs for individual and combined strains yet AIC criteria were close for the Altamaha-strain and combined strains (Table 4; Figures 4, 6). In the Edisto and Choptank River thermal regimes, predictions of length for individual and combined strains were improved for the number of GDDs in comparison to experimental days, except for Canada-strain in the Edisto River thermal regime which was better predicted by experimental days (Table 4; Figure 5). AIC differences were larger in the Choptank River thermal regime than those for the St. John’s and Edisto thermal regimes, so that for combined regimes, GDD was also selected as providing the best prediction of length (Table 4; Figure 7). Combining strains resulted in a saturation curve. The von-Bertalanffy growth equation was used to develop a non-linear equation to best represent length across GDD. The resulting regressions equation, \( \text{length} = 803.93 \times (1 - \exp(-0.000167 \times (\text{GDD} - 110.3))) \), was used to estimate age-1.0 sturgeon along a latitudinal gradient, as discussed in subsequent sections. For the predictive equation, I had to account for GDDs that accumulated before the start of the experiment so 1708 GDDs were added to the calculated experimental GDDs.

**Comparison of GDD along a latitudinal gradient**

The annual accumulation of GDDs varied significantly over a latitudinal gradient (Table 5; Fig. 8). Annually, Maine accumulated significantly less GDDs than all systems south of New Hampshire (\( p<0.001 \)). New Hampshire accumulated
significantly less GDDs than all systems south of New York (p<0.001). New York accumulated less GDDs annually compared to southern systems but was only significantly different from the Chesapeake Bay and South Carolina (p<0.05). Chesapeake Bay, North Carolina, South Carolina, and ACE Basin were not significantly different from the systems located south of them. Interestingly, systems south of the Chesapeake Bay accumulated less GDDs on an annual basis than the Chesapeake Bay, where the maximum accumulation of GDDs occurred (Fig. 8, Table 6). The Chesapeake Bay also has the least number of days with sub-optimal temperatures (<4°C) compared to systems to the north and the least number of days of supra-optimal temperatures (>28°C) compared to systems to the south (Table 6). Systems from the Chesapeake Bay north to Maine have peak accumulation of GDDs in July (Fig. 12 a-d). However, systems south of the Chesapeake Bay have two peaks annually, one in May and one in September or October (Fig. 9 e-g). The decrease of GDDs during the summer months in these systems is due to supra-optimal temperatures.

**Accumulation of GDD across a latitudinal gradient for age 1.0 sturgeon**

There was a significant difference in the accumulation of GDDs for spring-spawn sturgeon over a latitudinal gradient (n=35, p<0.05) (Fig. 10). Age-1.0 sturgeon in the three most northern systems (Maine, New Hampshire, and New York) accumulated significantly less GDD over the first year of life than the southern latitude systems. Age-1.0 sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay region, accumulated the most GDDs (mean=4295±149) compared to all other systems, particularly those to its north. GDDs were fairly similar between the Chesapeake and systems to its south.
There was no significant difference in the accumulation of GDDs for fall-spawn sturgeon over a latitudinal gradient (n=20; p>0.05) (Fig. 11). Within systems that experience both a spring- and fall-spawn event, there was no significant differences in the accumulation of GDDs between the seasons or systems in which sturgeon spawn after one year of life (n=20; p>0.05) (Fig. 12). Sturgeon in systems where both spring- and fall-spawning are believed to occur accumulate more GDDs during their first year of life than in systems where only spring-spawning occurs (Fig. 13). Under a hypothetical scenario where fall-spawning occurs in all systems, the same pattern holds; there isn’t a significant difference between spring- and fall-spawn accumulation of GDD (n=35; p>0.05) (Fig. 14) and there may be a threshold around 4000 GDD for fall spawning to occur in systems.

**Length of age-1.0 sturgeon over a latitudinal gradient**

Using the model of length versus GDD estimated for my laboratory experiments (Fig. 10), I estimated the total length of age-1.0 fish across a latitudinal gradient using the accumulated GDD for each system (2008-2012) (Figure 15). Spring-spawn age-1.0 Atlantic sturgeon attained the smallest size in Maine (253.2±8.6 mm; range=241.8-267.6 mm) whereas the Chesapeake Bay produced the largest size Atlantic sturgeon (404.2±10.0 mm, range = 386.9-416.0 mm). Age-1.0 Atlantic sturgeon in New Hampshire were estimated to be 307.0 mm (±5.7; range=300.8-315.4 mm) while in New York, age-1.0 sturgeon were estimated to be 335.7 mm (±8.7; range=321.5-346.0 mm). South of the Chesapeake Bay, age-1.0 sturgeon sizes were comparable. In North Carolina, spring-spawned age-1.0 sturgeon were estimated to reach a length of 381.9 mm (±16.1; range=367.1-406.8 mm).
Within the two sites in South Carolina, sizes were estimated to be 382.5 mm (±16.3; range=354.1-403.9 mm) and 374.1 mm (±24.1; range=340.9-409.2 mm). Fall-spawned sturgeon were of comparable size as their spring-spawned counterparts.

**Discussion**

Results from the phenology laboratory experiment showed no strain effect on growth of Atlantic sturgeon reared in a common-garden environment, therefore latitudinal countergradient growth variation does not appear to occur in Atlantic sturgeon. Although countergradient growth variation has been highlighted in other ectotherms exhibiting wide latitudinal ranges (Conover et al. 2009), there are species that do not exhibit this behavior. The California grunion, *Leuresthes tenuis*, does not experience countergradient growth, which may be due to their oceanic life history (Brown et al. 2012). Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) populations responded similarly to a warm thermal regime indicating that observed higher growth rates of southern populations were not due to higher genetic capacities for growth (Purchase and Brown 2001). Species from the salmonid family have also shown a lack of strain effect in their capacity for growth. Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) from five Norwegian rivers reared in common thermal conditions showed no association between their river of origin and maximal or threshold growth rates (Jonsson et al. 2001). Atlantic salmon from British populations also exhibited similar growth performance (Elliot and Hurley 1997). Arctic charr, *Savelinus alpinus*, from waters between 54 and 70°N showed no geographical trend in growth performance (Larsson et al. 2005). In this study, Atlantic sturgeon had higher growth in warmer temperatures, which is expected for ectotherms, but Canada-strain Atlantic sturgeon did not compensate for a
shorter growing season with a greater capacity for growth. If strain does not
influence growth then thermal growth performance should be generalizable across
latitudes and spawning periods and permit predictions of juvenile sizes across the
species range.

Experimental results shown here for Atlantic sturgeon and those for lake
sturgeon (Power and McKinley 1997) indicate that GDDs represent a common
currency for growth performance and length predictions. Because fish are
ectotherms, the thermal integral concept, or GDD, should be applicable to most fish
species and in instances when GDD cannot explain variation in size-at-age, other
factors such as food availability may be contributing to the variation (Neuheimer and
Taggart 2007). Sub-adult and adult lake sturgeon total length was well explained by
GDDs, 76% and 86%, respectively (Power and McKinley 1997). Like Atlantic
sturgeon, lake sturgeon span a large geographical range, spanning approximately 24°
of latitude and like Atlantic sturgeon in my study, individuals with the lowest thermal
opportunity for growth were shorter and weighed less (Power and McKinley 1997).
Similar to Atlantic sturgeon, as lake sturgeon age the rate of increase in length
decreases, yet the significance of GDD as an explanation of length at age for lake
sturgeon persisted (Power and McKinley 1997). Variation in length of other species
is well explained by GDDs. The GDD metric has been used to explain 98% and 93%
of the variation in length-at-day for larval Atlantic herring (*Clupea harengus*) and age
2-4 Atlantic cod, respectively (Neuheimer and Taggart 2007). In the Chesapeake
Bay, the GDD model explained 80% of the variability in length for age-0 Atlantic
menhaden (*Brevoortia tyrannus*) (Humprey et al. 2014). For age-0 walleye (*Sander
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vitreus), a model using GDD described 65% of the variability in annual mean length (Uphoff et al. 2013). In this study, GDD was explained 86% of the variation in length of Atlantic sturgeon, which is within the range of the reviewed literature. This GDD model allows practical estimates of age 1.0 lengths throughout the species range, but also permits exploration of the dual spawning behavior by Atlantic sturgeon, which apparently occurs in only the southern part of its range (Balazik and Musik 2015).

Based on the seasonal observations of adult and early life stages in Atlantic sturgeon spawning tributaries, dual-spawning events have been proposed for populations in Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina (Smith et al. 1984; Balazik et al. 2013; Smith et al. 2015; Hager et al. 2014; Balazik and Musick 2015), and in the Altamaha River, Georgia, Atlantic sturgeon spawning may only occur in the fall (Ingram and Peterson 2016). Results from the GDD model indicated that thermal conditions experienced by northern populations (Maine to New York), may be inadequate to support fall spawning. Although GDDs for both fall and spring spawning components were similar for Northern populations, predicted sizes at winter onset would be substantially different between the two seasonal cohorts. For instance, Hudson River spring and fall age-0 juveniles would be expected to be 318±9.0 mm and 102.3±4.3 mm on 1 January. In comparison Chesapeake Bay spring and fall age-0 juveniles would be 351.5±8.7 mm and 148.6±7.4 mm on 1 January. Smaller sizes at the onset of winter would be expected to result in increased mortality owing to thermal stress (e.g., inability to maintain homeostasis) and starvation (e.g., allotment of energy stores) (Hurst 2007). Spring-spawned juveniles from northern
populations, albeit smaller in size than their southern population counterparts, may be sufficiently large at winter onset to weather the longer and more intense winters encountered at higher latitudes. Interestingly, there is a strong threshold difference in days < 4°C between the Hudson River (119.2±13.8 days) and the Chesapeake Bay (4.2±6.0 days) (Table 6) associated with the apparent shift from spring spawning in the north to dual spawning in the south. A supra-optimal thermal threshold may also curtail the incidence of dual spawning. In areas where fall-spawning may exclusively occur, as proposed in the Altamaha River, GA (Ingram and Peterson 2016), supra-optimal temperatures (>28°C) may curtail successful spring-spawning events or at least reduce growth and possibly survival of juveniles. Atlantic sturgeon experienced a sharp increase in the number of supra-optimal days between the Chesapeake Bay (0 days) and North Carolina (58.7±20 days) (Table 5). With regional warming in the Mid- and South-Atlantic (Kennedy et al. 2002; Najjar et al. 2010), increased supra-optimal days experienced could negatively affecting spring-spawned sturgeon. If this results in a reduction of recruitment of spring-spawn individuals, then population stability may become dependent on successful fall-spawning events.

My GDD model predicts that the dual spawning strategy should be most successful in the middle latitudinal range of Atlantic sturgeon. Here the number of sub-optimal and supra-optimal days may not limit juvenile sturgeon growth enough to affect size-dependent survival, allowing recruitment to occur regardless of the season of spawning. A remarkable model outcome is that where dual spawning occurs, fall and spring spawning cohort attain equivalent sizes at age 1.0 regardless of thermal regime. This suggests that over generations, selection for either behavior could lead
to equivalent reproductive success. There is some evidence in systems where spring- and fall-spawn sturgeon are genetically distinct (Balazik and Musick 2015; Hilton et al. 2016; Farrae et al. 2017). Although mixing of juveniles would occur in the nursery before migrating seaward, there is some evidence that fall- and spring-run adults do not mix on the spawning grounds (Balazik and Musick 2015). Atlantic herring from autumn- and winter-spawned fish mix extensively yet spawning aggregations consisted almost exclusively of autumn-spawned fish which suggests the season and location of spawning is imprinted on larvae and not due to genetic differences (Brophy et al. 2006). Similarly, Pacific salmon returning to the same tributaries exhibit genetically discrete seasonal spawning runs (Burgner 1991; Dittman and Quinn 1996). Further work to determine if Atlantic sturgeon that undergo dual spawning is related to genetic differentiation and/or if larval and juvenile sturgeon are able to imprint on specific systems during particular seasons merits additional study.

The cryptic behavior of dual spawning may have conferred resilience to Atlantic sturgeon populations. Historically, Atlantic sturgeon adults were harvested mainly during the spring months, either as a targeted fishery (Brundage and Meadows 1982; Smith et al. 1984; Secor and Waldman 1999; Armstrong and Hightower 2002; Secor 2002) or by-catch (Armstrong and Hightower 2002). The moratorium established in the mid-1990s to protect Atlantic sturgeon from commercial and recreational fishing may have provided the opportunity for sturgeon to mature and the population to have overlapping age classes, allowing for recent stabilization of populations along the east coast. Spawning-condition Atlantic sturgeon have recently
been discovered in smaller tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay in the Nanticoke River, York, Rappahannock Rivers (Musick 2005; Hager et al. 2014). It is unknown if this is a new occurrence or if Atlantic sturgeon historically spawned in these systems. However, if historical spawning occurred in these smaller tributaries, it may have protected sturgeon populations from overfishing that occurred in the early 1900s.

Atlantic sturgeon are long-lived fish that mature late in life and typically spawn every 2-5 years. This strategy may foster Atlantic sturgeon population growth (or at least maintain populations) in times when the environment is not conducive to successful spawns or survival of early life stages and juveniles. After Atlantic sturgeon population plummeted due to overfishing in the early 1900s, the storage effect concept (Secor 2007) may explain how Atlantic sturgeon populations were able to be maintained even with such low biomass in systems. The reproductive potential was “stored” in the many adult year classes. The historical cryptic nature of Atlantic sturgeon is becoming apparent as evidence of large adults and small juveniles has recently occurred in systems where it has not been noted in decades such as the Connecticut River (Savoy et al. 2017) and James River (Hilton et al. 2016).

Thermal performance predictions related laboratory and modeling results are curtailed by important experimental constraints and model assumptions. Two strains of Atlantic sturgeon were acquired for the laboratory growth study – Altamaha River, GA and Saint John River, Canada. Although they represent northern and southern strains of spawning populations, the addition of other strains would have strengthened inferences by providing a continuum of expected growth rates (had strain been a significant factor). The small size of the Atlantic sturgeon at the start of the
experiment was not conducive to marking individual fish hence, length and weight data were pooled for tanks. Individual growth rates can vary substantially within populations investigation into the variability of growth among different population is warranted. Finally, using progeny from one spawning event in a hatchery may not well represent the genetic variability in wild populations. However, hatchery-reared Atlantic sturgeon provide a reliable source for experimental research with known genetic parentage and utilization of these hatchery-reared sturgeon do not impact the wild populations.

Important GDD model assumptions included: 1) the lower and upper threshold temperatures for Atlantic sturgeon are 4 and 28°C; and 2) the exact timing of spawning associated with spring and fall periods, which likely vary with latitude. Thermal tolerances of Atlantic sturgeon have seen limited investigation, primarily focused on the Hudson River population (Mohler 2004; Niklischek and Secor 2009). It is conceivable that populations could vary in these thresholds, which would influence inferences made related to juvenile size predictions. Still, laboratory experiments indicated that both strains experienced nil growth rates for the Saint John’s River at <4°C. In the Edisto River, fish were exposed only briefly to temperatures of 28°C, but this period coincided with a marked decline in growth rate (Figure 16 and 17). Under extreme thermal conditions growth curves saturated indicating nil to very low growth rates. Early termination of the Saint John’s River treatment constrained analysis on growth under this temperature regime, however, results did indicate that the Canada-strain did not perform better than the Altamaha-strain, supporting my results that the strains do not appear to have different capacities
for growth. Still, measurements of growth over an entire year’s thermal regime would improve the model used in determining size at age 1.0. However, age 1.0 sizes across a latitudinal range were well predicted using the model generated from the laboratory study.

The predicted lengths of age-1.0 sturgeon generally fell within the range of age-1 Atlantic sturgeon reported in literature (Table 6). The age-1.0 length predicted for Maine (241.8-267.6 mm) and New Hampshire (300.8-315.4 mm) were larger than the range of reported age-1 Atlantic sturgeon lengths for Saint John River (217 mm) to the north and less variable than those reported for the Connecticut River (225-640 mm) to the south. The predicted length for age-1.0 in New York (321.5-346.0 mm), which would hypothetically be sampled in April, fell below the range of age-1 Atlantic sturgeon (425-525 mm) sampled in the Hudson River between March-July but were approximately the size of those sampled October-May (323 mm). The length of predicted age 1.0 Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay (386.9-416.0 mm) is within the size range of juveniles captured during summer in the James River (406-431 mm). Predicted lengths of fall-collected juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in North Carolina (367.1-406.8 mm) did not have observed samples from North Carolina systems with which to compare, but the upper range was the same for the lower range in the James River but similar in range to those reported for rivers in Georgia (310-550 mm). The predicted lengths of age-1.0 Atlantic sturgeon in South Carolina (340.9-409.2 mm) are smaller than the length of age-1 Atlantic sturgeon reported for coastal rivers in South Carolina (reported mean=550 mm; sampling period unknown). Thus, in a coarse manner, the predictive model developed in this study was
corroborated by observed juvenile lengths. However, a major limitation to such comparisons was lack of knowledge on whether age 1 juveniles were in fact <1.0 or >1.0 owing to time of observation and spawning period. Here, the GDD model – if credible - can be used to evaluate what observed juveniles represent in terms of age and time of spawning.

If researchers have reasonable knowledge of when fish spawn in a system and have access to water temperature data to calculate GDDs, observed Atlantic sturgeon lengths can compared to predicted lengths using the regression equation to predict the age of the fish when sampled. This information provides researchers and managers a way to designate age-1 fish to other attributes such as habitat, abundance, and stresses over a geographical range that does not require use of traditional ageing techniques. Since Atlantic sturgeon do not reach the same length after the first year of growth across a latitudinal gradient (i.e. they do not exhibit countergradient variation in growth), a way to determine the length of an age-1 Atlantic sturgeon within systems is imperative to determine if recruitment is occurring within systems and how long juveniles may spend in their natal estuaries. In addition to gleaning more insight into juvenile life histories, being able to predict length of sturgeon during their first year of growth will help managers and researchers determine: 1) if the sampled sturgeon are < age-1, and thereby provide evidence of successful spawning in a given tributary and 2) the likelihood of juvenile fish sampled in systems are from a spring- or fall-spawn event.

More information on lengths of Atlantic sturgeon between age-1 and age-2, particularly using validated ageing techniques would further validate and refine the
model. Additional research to determine the lower temperature threshold of Atlantic sturgeon would further fine-tune the model. Additionally, fine scale water temperature data within systems in which Atlantic sturgeon spawn could be used to better predict length of age-1 sturgeon on a local scale. The coarse resolution of water quality parameters in many systems, or complete lack of monitoring, currently limits predictions of age-1.0 Atlantic sturgeon in most east-coast systems. The Chesapeake Bay Program as well as Maryland Department of Natural Resources Eye on the Bay contains decades worth of water quality data on a fairly fine scale considering the spatial range of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. However, within-tributary data is still lacking making predictions of age-1.0 sizes between tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay difficult. Data from NERRS sites, as used in this study to calculate GDDs, is also a great source for water temperature data but monitoring sites are intermittently placed within the reserves. Down-scaled climate predictions use regional climate models to better predict climate patterns at a regional scale (Maurer et al. 2007; Tabor and Williams 2010). These finer-scale models may fill in data gaps for systems where monitoring does not occur, however, in-system monitoring would generate more accurate predictive sizes of age-1.0 Atlantic sturgeon.

In conclusion, Atlantic sturgeon strains (Saint John’s River and Altamaha River) did not differ in their capacity for growth in thermal regimes that represented the species latitudinal range. This allowed construction of a general predictive model to determine length of age-1.0 sturgeon based on a common species thermal performance. Using water quality data from NERRS sites, GDDs accumulated
during the first growing season were calculated and used to predict length of Atlantic sturgeon across a latitudinal gradient. These predicted lengths are comparable to lengths reported in literature from the same or nearby systems demonstrating the validity of the model. In addition, comparisons of GDDs among systems validates the theory of dual-spawning in systems from the Chesapeake Bay to South Carolina as well as provides rationale why this behavior may not occur in the more northern and extreme southern systems of their range. I have shown that the number of days of sub-optimal and supra-optimal temperatures may be the constraining factors in systems that have not shown evidence of dual-spawning. In addition, accumulated GDDs can be calculated under different climate change scenarios and predicted length of age-1.0 sturgeon across a latitudinal range can determine the effect of climate change on the size of Atlantic sturgeon in systems, which may alter predation risks, overwinter survival, tolerance to water quality parameters (i.e. dissolved oxygen, temperature and salinity), affecting survival of Atlantic sturgeon juveniles and recruitment in systems.
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### Tables

Table 1. Experimental temperature schedules for Atlantic sturgeon juvenile growth studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Treatment Temp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saint John River, Canada (2013)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>0°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>0°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>5°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>5°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edisto River, SC (2013)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2013</td>
<td>10°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>10°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>15°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>20°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>23°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>27°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>28°C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Comparison of covariance models for repeated measures analysis of length and weight between thermal regimes. Model 1: no covariance; Model 2: dependence between tanks only; Model 3: autoregressive lag 1 covariance structure; Model 4: autoregressive moving average model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Structure</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>ΔAIC</th>
<th>Random</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length~Thermal regime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1136.9</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1128.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1109.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1077.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight~Thermal regime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1051.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1022.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1035.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1016.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. ANOVA and Tukey honest significant difference pairwise comparisons between thermal regime and Atlantic sturgeon length.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Structure</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>lsmean</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>contrasts</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length~Thermal regime</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Choptank-Saint John</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choptank</td>
<td>189.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Choptank-Edisto</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Edisto-Saint John</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight~Thermal regime</td>
<td>Saint John</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Choptank-Saint John</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choptank</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Choptank-Edisto</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edisto</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Edisto-Saint John</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Comparison of experimental days v. GDD in prediction of length for combinations of thermal regime and strain using regressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Thermal Regime</th>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>ΔAIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length~days)</td>
<td>Saint John's River</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>0.00127</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-43.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length~GDD)</td>
<td>Saint John's River</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>0.00148</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-37.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length~days)</td>
<td>Saint John's River</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>176.9</td>
<td>0.00636</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-28.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length~GDD)</td>
<td>Saint John's River</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>177.3</td>
<td>0.00826</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length~days)</td>
<td>Saint John's River</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>178.5</td>
<td>0.00382</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-55.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length~GDD)</td>
<td>Saint John's River</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>178.7</td>
<td>0.00400</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length~days</td>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>162.3</td>
<td>0.74000</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length~GDD</td>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>187.9</td>
<td>0.12700</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length~days</td>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>144.7</td>
<td>0.93700</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length~GDD</td>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>178.2</td>
<td>0.16200</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length~days</td>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>153.5</td>
<td>0.83800</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length~GDD</td>
<td>Choptank River</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>182.7</td>
<td>0.14400</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length)~days</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>0.00394</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length)~GDD</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>195.4</td>
<td>0.00027</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length)~days</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>0.00389</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length)~GDD</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>132.2</td>
<td>0.12205</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length)~days</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>183.4</td>
<td>0.00391</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln(Length)~GDD</td>
<td>Edisto River</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>169.1</td>
<td>0.00026</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Statistical test significance (ANOVA; p-value) in pairwise comparisons of annual GDD between NERRS sites for years 2008-2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maine</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Chesapeake Bay</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>ACE Basin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1253</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>0.1253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3991</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.3991</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Bay</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5912</td>
<td>0.7683</td>
<td>0.4611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>0.5912</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8084</td>
<td>0.8384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.7683</td>
<td>0.8084</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Basin</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.1024</td>
<td>0.4611</td>
<td>0.8384</td>
<td>0.6565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERRS</td>
<td>Average Annual GDD (±std)</td>
<td>Average # days with sub-optimal temperatures (±std)</td>
<td>Average # days with supra-optimal temperatures (±std)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, ME</td>
<td>197.3 (±9.8)</td>
<td>123.8 (±10.9)</td>
<td>0 (±0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bay, NH</td>
<td>249.2 (±9.7)</td>
<td>123.7 (±9.6)</td>
<td>0 (±0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>277.7 (±14.8)</td>
<td>119.2 (±13.8)</td>
<td>0.7 (±1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Bay, MD</td>
<td>358.4 (±14.5)</td>
<td>4.2 (±6.0)</td>
<td>0 (±0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>340.3 (±28.2)</td>
<td>3.5 (±4.8)</td>
<td>58.7 (±20.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Inlet-Winyah Bay, SC</td>
<td>348.5 (±49.9)</td>
<td>2 (±4.0)</td>
<td>62 (±21.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashepoo-Combahee-Edisto Basin, SC</td>
<td>333.4 (±50.2)</td>
<td>1.2 (±2.6)</td>
<td>78 (±22.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Observed size (mm)</td>
<td>Age (yrs)</td>
<td>Predicted size (mm)</td>
<td>Age (yrs)</td>
<td>Reported sampling date</td>
<td>Hypothetical sampling date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
<td>448*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hatin et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John River</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May-October</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart et al. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>241.8-267.6***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June****</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>300.8-315.4***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May****</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut River</td>
<td>225-640</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May-October 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savoy et al. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>321.5-346.0***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April****</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>323*</td>
<td>0+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October-May 1975, 1976, 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dovel 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>502*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October-May 1975-1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dovel 1979; Dovel and Berggren 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>425-525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March-July</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson et al. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>450-550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson et al. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>525-600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson et al. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River, NY</td>
<td>575-625</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October-December</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson et al. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake Bay</td>
<td>386.9-416.0***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April****</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James River, VA</td>
<td>406-431++</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>367.1-406.8***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March****</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Reported and predicted lengths of age-0+ to age 2 Atlantic sturgeon from Canada to Georgia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Observed size (mm)</th>
<th>Age (yrs)</th>
<th>Predicted size (mm)</th>
<th>Reported sampling date</th>
<th>Hypothetical sampling date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina coastal rivers</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td></td>
<td>McCord et al. 2007 as reported in Schueller and Peterson 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River, SC/GA</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>340.9-409.2***</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>March****</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogeechee River, GA</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>May-December</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogeechee River, GA</td>
<td>242-361</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>June-August 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson et al. 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altamaha River, GA</td>
<td>350-550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>various</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schueller and Peterson 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satilla River, GA</td>
<td>340-540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>September-July</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fritts et al. 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*mean lengths reported
**reported 16-17"
***predicted using regression from this study
****hypothetical sampling month
Figures

Figure 1. Locations of National Estuarine Research Reserve Systems used in comparison of growth-degree-days along a latitudinal gradient. 1) Well, ME, 2) Great Bay, NH, 3) Hudson River, NY, 4) Chesapeake Bay, MD/VA, 5) North Carolina, 6) North Inlet-Winyah Bay, SC, and 7) Ashepoo-Combahee-Edisto Basin, SC.
Figure 2. Comparisons of fish lengths (mm) among thermal regimes and between strains within thermal regimes. Different letters denote significant differences according to ANOVA, Tukey's honest significant difference (a,b represents treatment differences; x,y represent strain differences). Error bars represent standard error.
Figure 3. Comparisons of fish weights (g) among thermal regimes and between strains within thermal regimes. Different letters denote significant differences according to ANOVA, Tukey’s honest significant difference (a,b represents treatment differences; x,y represent strain differences). Error bars represent standard error.
Figure 4. Length at experimental day (a) and GDD (b) for the Saint John’s River thermal regime comparing Canada-strain and Altamaha-strain Atlantic sturgeon.
Figure 5. Length at experimental day (a) and GDD (b) for the Choptank River thermal regime comparing Canada-strain and Altamaha-strain Atlantic sturgeon.
Figure 6. Length at experimental day (a) and GDD (b) for the Edisto River thermal regime comparing Canada-strain and Altamaha-strain Atlantic sturgeon.
Figure 7. Regression of Atlantic sturgeon length on GDD for thermal regimes and strains combined using von Bertalanffy equation.
Figure 8. Comparison of annual GDD between NERRS sites (2008-2013). Error bars represent standard of deviation. Different letters denote significant differences according to ANOVA, Tukey’s honest significant difference.
Figure 9. Monthly GDD averages (2008-2013) for a) Maine, b) New Hampshire, c) New York, d) Chesapeake Bay, e) North Carolina, f) South Carolina, g) ACE Basin.
Figure 10. Accumulation of GDD for spring-spawn sturgeon after one year of life. Different letters denote significant difference (p<0.05) according to ANOVA, Tukey’s honest significant difference. Error bars represent standard deviation.
Figure 11. Accumulation of GDD for fall-spawn sturgeon after one year of life. Error bars represent standard deviation.
Figure 12. Comparison of the accumulation of GDD for spring- and fall-spawn sturgeon after one year of life. Error bars represent standard deviation.
Figure 13. Accumulation of GDD in relation to time of spawning across NERRS sites. Error bars represent standard of deviation. Error bars represent standard deviation.
Figure 14. Comparison of the accumulation of GDD for spring- and fall-spawn sturgeon after one year of life, with inclusion of hypothetical fall spawn. Error bars represent standard deviation.
Figure 15. Length of age 1.0 Atlantic sturgeon across a latitudinal gradient. Error bars represent standard deviation.
Figure 16. Temperature profile and growth of Atlantic sturgeon in the Saint John’s River thermal regime.
Figure 17. Temperature profile and growth of Atlantic sturgeon in the Edisto River thermal regime.
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