

1 **The quest for successful Atlantic salmon restoration –**
2 **perspectives, priorities, and maxims**

3
4 *Final accepted version (accepted 8 Sept 2021), published in ICES Journal of Marine Science*
5 *(2021) <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsab201>*

6
7 Robert J. Lennox¹, Carlos M. Alexandre², Pedro R. Almeida^{2,3}, Kevin M. Bailey⁴, Bjørn T.
8 Barlaup¹, Kristin Bøe⁵, André Breukelaar⁶, Jaakko Erkinaro⁸, Torbjørn Forseth⁹, Sven-Erik
9 Gabrielsen¹, Edmund Halfyard⁷, Erlend M. Hanssen¹, Sten Karlsson⁹, Stephanie Koch¹, Anders
10 Koed¹⁰, Roy M. Langåker¹¹, Håvard Lo⁵, Martyn C. Lucas¹², Shad Mahlum¹, Charles Perrier¹³,
11 Ulrich Pulg¹, Timothy Sheehan¹⁴, Helge Skoglund¹, Martin Svenning⁹, Eva B. Thorstad⁹, Gaute
12 Velle^{1,15}, Frederick G. Whoriskey¹⁶, & Knut Wiik Vollset¹

13
14 ¹Laboratory for Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries at NORCE Environment, Nygårdsgaten
15 112, Bergen, Norway

16 ²MARE - Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, University of Évora, Largo dos Colegiais,
17 2, 7004-516 Évora, Portugal.

18 ³Department of Biology, School of Sciences and Technology, University of Évora, Largo dos
19 Colegiais, 2, 7004-516 Évora, Portugal.

20 ⁴Alaska Fisheries Science Centre at NOAA

21 ⁵Norwegian Veterinary Institute, P.O. Box 5695, Torgarden, Trondheim 7485, Norway

22 ⁶Rijkswaterstaat IJsselmeergebied Den Oever, Netherlands

23 ⁷Nova Scotia Salmon Association, 107 Farmers Dairy Lane, Bedford, NS, Canada, B4B 2C9

24 ⁸Natural Resources Institute, Finland (Luke), POB 412, FI-90014 Oulu, Finland

25 ⁹Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Postboks 5685 Torgarden, 7485 Trondheim, Norway

26 ¹⁰Section for Freshwater Fisheries and Ecology, National Institute of Aquatic Resources,
27 Technical University of Denmark, Vejlsøvej 39, 8600 Silkeborg, Denmark

28 ¹¹Norwegian Environmental Agency, Postboks 5672 Torgården, 7485 Trondheim.

29 ¹²Department of Biosciences, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

30 ¹³CBGP, INRAe, CIRAD, IRD, Montpellier SupAgro, Univ. Montpellier, Montpellier, France

31 ¹⁴NOAA Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole,
32 MA USA 02543

33 ¹⁵Department of Biological Sciences, University of Bergen, Thormøhlens gate 53A, 5008
34 Bergen, Norway

35 ¹⁶Ocean Tracking Network, Dalhousie University, 1355 Oxford St, Halifax, NS Canada B3H
36 4R2

37

38

39 **Abstract**

40

41 Atlantic salmon is often a focal species of restoration efforts throughout the north Atlantic and it
42 is therefore an excellent case study for how best to design programs to address and mitigate threats
43 and correct population declines. This perspective is written to promote the work that has been
44 accomplished towards restoration of Atlantic salmon populations and synthesize how we believe
45 the lessons can be used effectively to support efforts by management agencies to restore
46 populations. We reviewed where restoration is needed for Atlantic salmon, agreed on definitions
47 for three levels of successful restoration, and then applied these criteria to 49 published papers
48 focused on Atlantic salmon restoration. We identified 16 successful examples of restoration among
49 49 papers reviewed and discussed what interventions led to success versus failure. We then
50 addressed key questions about when hatchery stocking should be used as part of a restoration
51 measure and whether local restoration efforts are enough when these wide ranging species
52 encounter broad-scale changes in the north Atlantic, specifically related to issues of climate change
53 and to marine survival. We advise to avoid restoration as much as possible by protecting and
54 managing existing populations and when restoration is necessary, problems should be identified
55 and addressed in partnership with river users. With appropriate resources and research to resolve
56 ongoing mysteries, restoration of lost Atlantic salmon populations is absolutely feasible.

57

58 **Keywords-** restoration, salmonidae, remediation, ecosystem services, success

59

60 “Nay, the salmon is not lost; for pray take notice, no man can lose what he never had” - Izaak
61 Walton (1654)

62
63 **Introduction**

64
65 North America and Europe have, together, thousands of rivers that historically had
66 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) populations. Today, only a fraction of the historic strongholds
67 still maintains wild populations and throughout much of its natural distribution, the species is
68 considered to be at risk (WWF 2001; ICES 2020). Archeozoological records and historical
69 market data revealed salmon population declines had been ongoing since the early Middle Ages
70 (450 A.D) and were linked to the rise of water mills, small hydropower, the blocking of
71 spawning tributaries, and later damming, straightening, channelization, and pollution of large
72 rivers (Lenders et al. 2016). These population declines occurred despite the adoption of
73 mitigation measures that were intended to protect the species (Dunfield 1985; Lenders et al
74 2016). Already in 1215, the Magna Carta legislated the removal of weirs and dams that
75 obstructed migrating salmon in English rivers. In North America, the depletion of Atlantic
76 salmon by European colonists triggered treaties to prevent overexploitation of stocks in Quebec
77 (Lower Canada; Nettle 1857) and to halt (unsuccessfully) the extirpation of Lake Ontario’s stock
78 of landlocked salmon (Huntsman 1944).

79 The cumulative decline of salmon has been geographically widespread and is well
80 documented. In Lake Ontario, the bountiful runs of Atlantic salmon that could initially be
81 harvested by the shovelful entirely disappeared by the end of the 19th century (Webster 1982;
82 Bogue 2001). In Portugal, the southern limit of the species distribution in Europe, salmon
83 abundance has declined by an estimated 90% from historic levels over the past 50-60 years

84 (Cabral et al. 2005). In the Rhine River, catches in the lower river during the late 19th century
85 reached over 100,000 individuals, but had dropped to zero within 50 years (Lenders et al. 2016).
86 Further, the southern extent of the North American range of the species shifted northward by 2°
87 latitude by the early to mid-1800's with the extirpation of the southernmost USA populations
88 (Fay et al. 2006).

89 Restoration ecology is replete with efforts to reintroduce, recolonize, and/or replenish
90 native fish stocks in the historic range (Hobbs and Harris 2001; Zimmerman and Kruger 2009) in
91 order to restore ecosystem and related cultural services of substantial value (Butler et al. 2009;
92 Childress et al. 2014). Improvements to the quality and quantity of degraded habitat are generally
93 the first and most critical steps to reestablish indigenous fish stocks (Giller 2005; Einum et al.
94 2008). Many rivers have therefore undergone extensive work to undo damage resulting from
95 habitat modification, pollution, dam building and restriction of movement, siltation,
96 eutrophication, channelization, acidification, and other human impacts that have contributed to
97 the collapse or extirpation of fish stocks (Palmer et al. 2005; Erkinaro et al. 2011; Tummers et al.
98 2016). At some sites, fish and river restoration programs have been ongoing for decades and new
99 programs continue to be implemented, as urgency in preserving or restoring species accelerates
100 while stressors multiply. Stakeholders devote a large amount of limited resources every year to
101 study and restore Atlantic salmon and related habitat, and this species presents an excellent case
102 study for restoration ecology (Birnie-Gauvin et al. 2018).

103 This perspective draws on the experience of an international team of experts that have
104 worked on the restoration of Atlantic salmon in the fields of conservation genetics, ecology,
105 physiology, behavioural sciences, fisheries biology, and ecoepidemiology, throughout most of
106 the north Atlantic and Arctic range of Atlantic salmon. We start by reviewing how different

107 stressors operate in different parts of the salmon’s distribution, continue with a discussion of how
108 to define successful restoration action, and provide examples of success, failure, and unintended
109 consequences of restoration. Finally, we review the controversial use of hatcheries for
110 restoration, which we found to be a polarizing point of discussion when considering restoration
111 issues throughout the range and the relative utility of local efforts in the face of ongoing global
112 environmental change.

113

114 **In what situations is restoration needed?**

115

116 Regional differences exist in the urgency of different threats to salmon, which guide
117 evaluations of what the likely problems are that need to be addressed by a restoration program.
118 Although the ICES Working Group on Effectiveness of Recovery Actions for Atlantic Salmon
119 carried out a ranking-based evaluation of the stressors limiting wild Atlantic salmon restoration,
120 which generated detailed catchment-specific information (ICES 2017a), it had only partial
121 coverage across the species’ natural range. The evaluation was also broad with respect to some
122 stressors. For example, the category ‘pollutants’ (ICES 2017a) can be divided into functional
123 subtypes such as hazardous chemical substances, urban organic pollutants (e.g. sewage),
124 excessive silt and nutrients, and acidification (Champion 2003; Hesthagen et al. 2011). To fill
125 gaps and provide some prior information about the regionality of key challenges, we asked
126 experts from 23 regions to rank the importance of 15 stressors to Atlantic salmon. Instructions
127 were to provide an integer value from zero to three indicating zero, minor, moderate, or major
128 impact of a stressor on salmon populations in a given region. For biogeographic convenience,
129 Portugal and Spain were combined to “Iberia”; Ireland and Northern Ireland were combined; and

130 England and Wales were combined. We were unfortunately unable to receive a response from a
131 Russian representative, so we made an evaluation for this country based on NASCO reports and
132 expert inference from scientists familiar with the situation in Russia (Figure 1).

133 Switzerland and the United States ranked highest among nations for stressor scores, with
134 a total score of 31 and 30 respectively out of a possible total of 45 (fifteen categories multiplied
135 by a maximum score of three). Greenland, The Netherlands, and Iceland scored low at 3, 5, and
136 6, respectively. Migration barriers were the most urgent stressor, ranked everywhere except for
137 Greenland (where there is only one river system with a population of Atlantic salmon) and
138 Iceland. Acidification was regionally important in Norway and Canada. Norway, Canada, and
139 Scotland are the main producers of farmed Atlantic salmon within the species natural range and
140 were the regions that scored high on impacts from farmed escapes and pathogens from salmon
141 aquaculture (Figure 1). Some variation occurred among landlocked countries in how they scored
142 their stressor scores. Switzerland ranked highest whereas Czech Republic was eighth lowest on
143 the ranking. In these countries, particularly urgent threats related to damming and river
144 channelization were identified that, if remedied, could be immensely impactful for salmon
145 restoration. Another interesting contrast was Belgium compared to the Netherlands. These
146 neighbouring nations ranked third worst and second best, respectively, with the experts clearly
147 perceiving the threats to their salmon populations differently. The management directives, river
148 productivity, and other factors may change on small spatial scales, possibly causing such stark
149 contrasts between nations. However, it might also reflect large individual differences in the
150 perception of important impacts between experts. Our question sheet is included as an appendix
151 (Appendix 1) and may be adapted to future efforts to score, rank, and prioritize restoration
152 efforts for Atlantic salmon or other species at different scales.

153

154 **How can we evaluate salmon restoration initiatives?**

155

156 The ultimate goal of restoration is to increase a population size to a biological reference
157 point (Table 1) via natural reproduction, which can be defined in terms of genetic (e.g. effective
158 population size; Horreo et al. 2011a), reproductive (e.g. number of eggs deposited; Forseth et al.
159 2013), demographic (e.g. carrying capacity), or social (e.g. harvestable surplus) conceptions of a
160 sustainable population (Figure 3). Different metrics are used in different places to evaluate the
161 past, present, and future status of a population, and changes to the population after restoration
162 interventions can be used to establish whether efforts were successful. Restoration therefore
163 requires knowledge of how many fish exist compared to how many are needed for a healthy
164 population, which is the biological reference point. For Atlantic salmon, the biological reference
165 point is often derived from the census number of adult spawners (see Ferchaud et al. 2016). The
166 biological reference point for a river is ideally defined by historic abundance data or theoretical
167 maximum suitable spawning area and egg deposition and perhaps adjusted to present
168 environmental conditions, for example if spawning grounds have been lost or water temperatures
169 have changed such that historic baselines are no longer attainable. In the Swedish river Vindel,
170 historic photos helped identify a reference state for the river and guide restoration objectives
171 (Hellström et al. 2019). Progress towards the biological reference point using census numbers
172 can be tracked by counting large (i.e. not mature male parr, which are cryptic and impossible to
173 visually identify) adults based on fishing catches, mark-recapture, counting
174 fences/weirs/cameras, or spawning counts (fish seen breeding at spawning sites; Skoglund et al.

175 2021). Because the definition of success is crucial for the evaluation of restoration, and no single
176 definition meets the expectation of all stakeholders for salmon, we define success at three levels:

177 **i) Level 1 success: self-sustaining wild population** Following restoration intervention
178 (Table 1), the first level of success is achieved if the population is self-sustaining in the absence
179 of stocking. The population may remain small or depleted compared to historic levels, but the
180 number of spawners would be expected to increase in subsequent years assuming that adequate
181 habitat is available for reproduction. Small populations may be vulnerable to unforeseen
182 perturbations and stochastic and changing environmental conditions that can undermine
183 restoration efforts and push the population back below replacement levels (Palstra et al. 2007),
184 particularly due to variability in marine survival.

185 **ii) Level 2 success: Robust self-sustaining population** The second level of success is
186 reaching a population abundance level that reaches the biological reference point and is therefore
187 sufficiently large such that the population remains resilient (self-sustaining) to environmental
188 perturbations and variation. In restoration efforts, this level would presumably occur several
189 years after interventions have finished and follow multiple years of increasing numbers towards
190 or beyond the biological reference point established for the population. This level is often chosen
191 as the objective of restoration projects and is monitored by census number with spawning counts
192 or counting fences. In such populations, biological reference points may be achieved, but the
193 number of breeders could still be suboptimal due to skewed sex ratios (Perrier et al. 2016).

194 **iii) Level 3 success: Harvestable surplus** Robust self-sustaining populations providing
195 harvestable surplus beyond the biological reference point. Populations can be considered to have
196 fully realized their potential following restoration when more spawners are returning than needed
197 for replacement, yielding a harvestable surplus. In Norway and Canada, each salmon river is

198 assigned a carrying capacity for the number of eggs needed to reach river-specific biological
199 reference points, which quantifies the biological reference points targeted for attaining Level II
200 and Level III success (O’Connell et al. 1997; Forseth et al. 2013). At this stage, the population is
201 robust, and managers can set fishing quotas to remove part of the population down to a safe level
202 and still allow to achieve complete replacement.

203

204 **Which restoration actions are successful?**

205

206 To understand the success and evaluate failures of actions taken to restore Atlantic
207 salmon populations, we conducted a focused literature search using the Web of Science search
208 engine. The search covered all years up to the beginning of 2020 for TOPIC=atlantic salmon OR
209 salmo salar AND TOPIC=restor* OR remed* to capture papers focusing on Atlantic salmon
210 restoration. We acknowledge that this search would not capture potentially relevant papers
211 focused on other salmonids or studies that did not include restoration in the topic of the paper
212 (title, abstract, keywords), but we consider that our search yielded sufficient data for our
213 analysis. The search yielded 681 results that were manually screened for relevance. Papers that
214 did not focus on Atlantic salmon or did not attempt any intervention to investigate restoration
215 were excluded. Additional papers were added by expert opinion and through the review of
216 reference lists of the publications our search had missed, this effort resulted in 49 papers.
217 Metadata from each study were extracted including the problem being investigated, the
218 intervention being tested, and an evaluation of whether the intervention was successful or not at
219 the three levels of success defined *a priori*.

220 We present a table of key examples of success and failure to restore Atlantic salmon
221 populations (Table 2). Based on the 49 studies, we identified restoration projects in 95 salmon
222 populations, of which 18 did not reach any level of success as defined above, 39 reached a self-
223 sustaining wild population (Level 1), zero attained a robust self-sustaining wild population
224 (Level 2), 26 reached a population with harvestable surplus (Level 3); success was uncertain due
225 to lacking information in 13 rivers from the 49 papers. The main method used in the rivers where
226 restoration failed was hatchery supplementation (stocking) without addressing the threats that
227 originally contributed to population decline. Methods used in rivers reaching Level 1 (self-
228 sustaining population) were habitat and water quality improvement, reconnection of river
229 segments, and measures to eliminate the parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris*. In rivers reaching Level 3
230 (harvestable surplus), habitat and water quality improvement, dam removal and liming were
231 applied (Table 2; Figure 3). Among 19 papers reporting stocking Atlantic salmon, only two
232 achieved any level of success: Saltveit et al. (2019) reported that catches in Suldalslagen,
233 Norway were enhanced by stocking and Perrier et al. (2014) reported recolonization of upstream
234 reaches by hatchery reared salmon following reconnection of the Adour River, France.

235

236 Success

237

238 Success was elusive in the literature, but we identified several key examples. From the
239 review, seven salmon populations achieved a self-sustaining population (Level 1, Figure 3).
240 Typically, these efforts evaluated success based on juvenile densities surveyed around the treated
241 areas and it was not known whether the action directly enhanced progress towards biological
242 reference points at the population scale. Four studies were successful based on improvements to

243 habitat and connectivity. Marttila et al. (2019) added instream structures and reconnected
244 spawning channels in 28 Finnish rivers, de Jong et al. (1997) added boulders, logs, and V-dams
245 to Newfoundland rivers, and Calles et al. (2005) built nature-like bypass channels for salmon to
246 pass barriers in Sweden. Additionally, Hogg et al. (2015) confirmed that dam removal in a Maine
247 tributary contributed to improved fish abundance by comparing to a reference site not affected by
248 dam removal. When habitat is limiting and resulting in extreme juvenile density dependent
249 mortality, providing access to additional habitat therefore has potential to enhance production.
250 The case of *Gyrodactylus salaris* emergency measures in Norway has been successful so far at
251 achieving Level 1 success (Sandodden et al. 2018). Complete removal of the spawning stock to
252 eliminate the parasite from the river, followed by restocking the population using a gene bank
253 (Table 1) implemented prior to treatment that preserved the native genetic diversity, has so far
254 been successful, and may soon achieve Level 3 success once stocking is ceased. Some successes
255 reported stocking of fish, but in conjunction with other restoration efforts that addressed
256 problems, such as Koed et al. (2020) where integrated efforts were made to improve habitat in
257 Denmark and Perrier et al. (2014) where connectivity with upstream reaches was reestablished in
258 the French river Adour, allowing the cultivated salmon to access previously unavailable habitat
259 to increase production. Romakkaniemi et al. (2003) also suggested that rebounding of Finnish
260 salmon populations, partly addressed by stocking rivers, coincided with a dramatic decline in
261 marine fishing mortality in the Baltic Sea, which catalyzed stronger spawning stocks and a
262 restoration success.

263 Among nine salmon populations where harvestable populations were restored (Level 3
264 success), eight did so by addressing habitat quality issues. Water quality issues that can be
265 identified and remediated, for example, point source pollution, revealed good potential for

266 recovery when spawning habitat and sufficient river connectivity were available but not fully
267 used because of poor recruitment linked to pollution. Champion (2003) presented the case of the
268 Tyne River in England, which is now among the best salmon producing river in the country
269 following improvement of water quality (we note that there is debate about the role of hatcheries
270 in restoring the river as well). Similarly, Hesthagen et al. (2011) presented the case for liming
271 acidified rivers to restore water quality, resulting in level 3 success for 13 Norwegian rivers
272 where fisheries are now active and able to draw from the harvestable surplus. Direct
273 improvements to spawning habitat by addition of gravel were highly successful (Barlaup et al.
274 2008), as were instream enhancements to create shelter for juveniles (MacInnis et al. 2008; Floyd
275 et al. 2009), including de Jong and Cowx (2016) where benefits persisted for at least 20 years
276 following addition of boulders and V-dams in Newfoundland, Canada. In a highly integrated
277 effort, Koed et al. (2020) removed weirs and barriers, enhanced spawning grounds, and regulated
278 fisheries in Denmark and achieved sustained Level 3 success, an example of an approach when
279 the exact stressor could not be isolated resulted in implementation of a thorough suite of
280 interventions implemented simultaneously.

281

282 Failure

283

284 Many studies failed to demonstrate a consistent response to restoration measures in
285 salmon populations. At times, this was an artifact of sampling design and not necessarily an
286 indication that the approach was ill-conceived or unlikely to succeed. Some studies had limited
287 follow up intervals after intervention, making it difficult to evaluate success. There were also
288 studies that described changes to habitat quality but not in salmon populations, making it

289 impossible to evaluate whether a biological response occurred following intervention (e.g.
290 Collins et al. 2010). Alternatively, measurements can be made at too narrow a spatial or temporal
291 scope for an evaluation to be made about success. Local enhancements to pools may increase
292 local fry densities soon after intervention but be ineffective at a larger reach or along a longer
293 timescale at actually enhancing the population. We categorized failures into two bins, for which
294 examples are discussed below: (1) the problem was not addressed; (2) the intervention had
295 unintended consequences.

296

297 *The problem was not addressed*

298

299 In some cases, key drivers of mortality have been identified but interventions do not
300 address them because they are too large in scale or due to a political decision. Climate change is
301 affecting every Atlantic salmon population, especially at the southern range edge, but emissions
302 are not being curbed enough to abate warming and the impacts on salmon populations (see
303 Jonsson and Jonsson 2007; Todd et al. 2011). More proximately, hydropower structures in rivers
304 markedly affect salmon movement, survival, growth, and demography and their impacts are not
305 always directly addressed in restoration efforts (Rivinoja et al. 2001; McCarthy et al. 2009; Izzo
306 et al. 2016). Mitigations, such as fish passage, to damming can be considered restoration, but
307 have provided variable results. Rivinoja et al. (2001) observed only 26 % of wild Baltic salmon,
308 and no hatchery salmon, using a newly installed fish ladder in Sweden. Lundqvist et al. (2008)
309 observed a similar lack of success, with an inefficient fish ladder passing only about 30% of
310 potential spawners upstream across years up a Swedish river.

311 Restoration efforts may also fail when the causes of a decline are misidentified, and
312 interventions do not address the right problem. Though over €600 million were spent in the
313 Rhine drainage to improve habitat conditions, especially connectivity (IKSR 2020), the
314 ecological capability of the Rhine system to support salmon still remains poor or moderate
315 throughout the species' original range in the river. In this case, the loss of connectivity restricting
316 passage of the salmon were not addressed and therefore the interventions were not successful. In
317 Newfoundland, Cote et al. (2021) found that illegal fishing was actually a driving force limiting
318 recovery of the population in the Northwest River and community engagement helped curb
319 illegal fishing and contributed to restoration. In Sweden, gaining trust from river landowners was
320 critical for gaining access to the river and having acceptance from over 4000 rightsholders
321 (Hellström et al. 2019). Poor marine survival of salmon can operate similarly; spawning habitat,
322 juvenile shelter, and smolt abundance can be increased by restoration but to no avail for
323 returning spawners if marine mortality is not addressed (Nicola et al. 2018); this problem exists
324 for many North American rivers where freshwater restoration is insufficient to achieve a Level
325 III success.

326

327 *Unintended consequences*

328

329 Efforts to restore salmon populations are often met by unintended consequences that
330 undermine conservation efforts. Reconnecting rivers with fishways around dams can be
331 successful but even slight imperfections in design can be damaging. Fish ladders that have poor
332 attractive flows or are difficult to navigate can delay or stop migration, favour certain phenotypes
333 (e.g. small fish; Sigourney et al. 2015; Maynard et al. 2017), or enhance exposure to predators

334 (Boulêtreau et al. 2018). Removal of natural barriers by adding ladders around natural waterfalls
335 or breaking beaver dams may also favour certain phenotypes or facilitate upstream penetration of
336 escaped farmed salmon (Johnsen et al. 1998). Restoration has also enhanced predation of some
337 populations. Natural restoration of a Danish river created perfect habitat for the recolonization of
338 cormorants and increasing predation pressure on Atlantic salmon smolts that may have offset the
339 benefits of restoration afforded to the salmon (Koed et al. 2006; Pedersen et al. 2007).
340 Restoration efforts may also enhance habitat for invasive species that negatively impact Atlantic
341 salmon populations (Korsu et al. 2010). Control or removal of predators may have similar
342 perverse effects. Predators often select slow, weak, or sick prey such that predation is
343 compensatory and not additive. Predator suppression may not affect survival where mortality is
344 compensatory and in some cases may allow disease to spread, in instances where predation of
345 diseased animals is more frequent (e.g. sockeye salmon *Oncorhynchus nerka* smolts; Miller et al.
346 2014; Furey et al. 2021).

347 Stocking fish reared in hatcheries is frequently reverted to as a solution to compensate for
348 uncertainty and buy time for more decisive action to address the causes of population declines.
349 Unfortunately, stocking is the solution most wrought with failure. Studies revealed that stocking
350 eroded genetic diversity in a major Spanish river (Ayllon et al. 2016) and selected for
351 mismatched phenology (Bailey et al. 2010). Recent studies show that hatchery fish lose their
352 fitness in natural systems over just a few generations, which results in a strain of salmon which
353 are less fit in wild rivers, and which can outbreed with the natural populations (Fleming et al.
354 1997; McGinnity et al. 2009; Hagen et al. 2019). Horreo et al. (2011b) observed null or negative
355 impacts of stocking a Spanish river, which was attributed to importing foreign salmon causing
356 introgression and loss of local adaptation (see also Almodóvar et al. 2020). An extensive

357 evaluation of genetic effects from stocking at five sites revealed a strong reduction of effective
358 population size (Ryman-Laikre effect) in three out of five stocked populations of Atlantic salmon
359 in Norway (Hagen et al. 2020). Hagen et al. (2019) additionally showed that stocking in
360 restoration programs may facilitate introgression of farmed genes into wild populations.

361

362 **When should hatchery stocking be applied?**

363

364 Although documentation of potential negative effects of stocking are well known (Myers
365 et al. 2004), whether situations exist in which the use of hatcheries is the only viable option has
366 not been established. Stocking has been successful at restoring populations when initial threats
367 are addressed. For example, in Finland where stocking may have played a role in kick-starting
368 population recovery combined with reductions in fishing mortality and other enhancements,
369 while maintaining measures of genetic diversity (Miettinen et al. 2021). In the following text we
370 therefore outline our perspectives on when to use hatchery stocking as an emergency measure
371 specifically for restoring (i.e. not enhancing) salmon populations.

372 Despite being widely used, hatcheries can only possibly address a few salmon
373 conservation problems when the scarcity of wild breeders is driving depensation. Why, then, do
374 hatcheries remain such a common approach to addressing salmon restoration troubles? Young
375 (2017) outlined seven reasons (called the “seven Hs”) why stocking persists despite
376 overwhelming evidence against the practice. Many rivers have a **habit** of stocking, local
377 communities get a **high** from working with fish, there is **hubris** believing that humans can
378 improve on natural processes, and there are **honour** and **h-index** rewards for researchers that are
379 involved in hatchery work. There is also **hope** that this may resolve troubling problems and an

380 overall hesitance to accept the science (**heresy**). Per our definitions of success, stocking must end
381 in order for at least Level 1 to be attained in a restoration program and the population should then
382 not decline when stocking ends. Yet, hatcheries are actually more likely to do harm than good for
383 a population owing to domestication selection, which causes a loss of fitness for fish released to
384 the wild (e.g. McGinnity et al. 2009; Bolstad et al. 2017). Stocked rivers consistently undergo a
385 reduction in effective population size (Ryman-Laikre effect; Ryman & Laikre 1991; Hagen et al.
386 2020) due to stocking of a large number of offspring produced from a small number of broodfish
387 (Christie et al. 2012; Hagen et al. 2020). Young (2017) suggests that in populations where there
388 are enough wild spawners to support removal of broodstock for hatcheries, that population is
389 probably not close enough to the conservation limit (Table 2; Figure 2) to justify a hatchery, but
390 perhaps a gene bank should be made available in case of further declines and emergency
391 measures are deemed appropriate.

392 Recommendations

393

394 The following are our collective recommendations for consideration when considering
395 the use of hatcheries as part of restoration programs (Figure 4):

396

- 397 ● Thorough analyses of the extinction probability of a population should be conducted to
398 decide whether hatchery supplementation is needed to preserve the genetic integrity and
399 genetic variation of the population (Figure 3).
- 400 ● Hatchery intervention should only be employed (1) in cases when wild populations are
401 Endangered and when threats cannot be removed in the foreseeable future or (2) when
402 reintroducing an extirpated population.

- 403 ● Biological reference points should be established based on historical baselines and
404 present environmental conditions, along with intermediate objectives and timelines for
405 moving the present population back to that reference point.
- 406 ● Hatcheries should be operated in conjunction with investment in efforts to address threat
407 or threats responsible for the population's decline.
- 408 ● Alternatives to hatcheries should be considered, which might have similar demographic
409 effects without altering genetic integrity. For example, capturing and moving fry around
410 the river to reduce density-dependent thinning (Young 2017) or facilitated kelt
411 reconditioning to improve overwinter survival and repeat spawning rates could be studied
412 as possible alternatives.
- 413 ● If stocking of hatchery fish is initiated, efforts must mitigate the risks of an
414 overrepresentation of a small number of parents in the F1 generation leading to a
415 reduction of the total effective population size in the subsequent generation (Ryman and
416 Laikre 1991). Ryman-Laikre effects can be addressed by finding the correct relationship
417 between the effective number of hatchery broodfish, the proportion of stocked fish in the
418 population, and the effective number of natural breeders (Hagen et al. 2020).
- 419 ● The smallest possible ratio between the number of broodfish and the effective number of
420 broodfish should be sought, i.e. make the highest effective number of broodfish from the
421 available broodfish. Optimisation of the effective number of broodfish starts with an
422 equal number of males and females, by producing an equal number of offspring from
423 each broodfish, and by ensuring the hatchery produced fish are released in a manner that
424 provides each family with an equal opportunity to survive until the act of natural
425 selection;

- 426 ● Hatchery mortality should be minimized to avoid any selective effects.
- 427 ● Rearing in a protected artificial environment postpones natural selection until fish are
- 428 released in the natural environment and this may lead to genetic differences between the
- 429 natural and the hatchery raised fish. Given the lack of natural selection in the hatchery,
- 430 hatchery residence should be as short a period as possible, meaning stocking as eggs or
- 431 fry rather than as parr or smolts when feasible.
- 432 ● Work with locals in a conservation behaviour framework is key to help catalyze a shift
- 433 away from hatcheries while maintaining the local engagement and passion for rivers and
- 434 the salmon populations that motivates many hatcheries to persist.

435

436 *Critical considerations for gene banks*

437

- 438 ● The gene bank (Table 1) should preserve the genetic integrity and as much of the genetic
- 439 variation of the population as possible.
- 440 ● Broodfish should be collected from a variety of phenotypes, including fish of different
- 441 sizes and ages, and at different time periods in the spawning run-year, and over many
- 442 years. With molecular genetic markers, stray fish from foreign populations and in
- 443 particular salmon of escaped farmed origin, should be excluded. Broodfish should be
- 444 selected using analyses of relatedness and a low-kinship criterion to obtain as many
- 445 unrelated individuals as possible and to avoid crossings of closely related fish.
- 446 ● The gene bank should be supplemented with cryopreserved milt.
- 447 ● Complete and accurate records of the pedigree in the gene bank should be established,
- 448 and preferably secured in more than one location.

- 449 ● Strict control of diseases should occur by implementing biosafety measures that minimize
450 the risk of introduction, establishment, and transmission of disease between wild and
451 captive populations. All broodstock fish must be screened for diseases and the only
452 external materials that should be introduced to the hatchery should be disinfected eggs to
453 minimize any possible transfer of pathogens.
- 454 ● For biosecurity reasons, where possible “duplicates” of the offspring of families produced
455 for restoration purposes should be kept at separate sites.
- 456 ● If the gene bank will need to operate over multiple generations, the mating and stocking
457 plans that are developed need to be designed to ensure that as much as possible of the
458 genetic variation is being maintained and used.
- 459 ● The survival of stocked fish from the gene bank should be monitored at different life
460 stages (parr, smolt, returning adult, repeat spawner) and stocking plans adjusted to ensure
461 an appropriate representation of the different families from the gene bank in the
462 developing wild population;

463

464 *When the hatchery production is not stopped*

465

466 Sometimes populations cannot recover to above Critically Endangered levels despite the
467 best attempts to address the threats (e.g., all spawning habitat has been eliminated due to the
468 construction of a hydropower facility and it is not possible to construct artificial spawning sites).
469 In these scenarios, the endpoint for terminating the hatchery production is unclear and may be
470 governed by legal constraints, political considerations, genetic objectives, social pressures, etc.
471 In such cases, the population has not been restored, but rather is a progressively domesticated

472 population and should be managed as such when considering the conservation status of the
473 species in the region.

474

475 **Are local efforts enough?**

476

477 Population sizes of salmon on both sides of the Atlantic have declined since the 1980s,
478 not only because of human impacts in rivers and coastal areas, but in many areas also because of
479 ecosystem effects on marine mortality (Otero et al. 2011, Forseth et al. 2017, ICES 2017b).
480 Broad-scale changes in marine ecosystems are considered prominent contributors to the recent
481 increases in marine mortality. Climate driven changes in marine ecosystems may play a part, and
482 region-specific hypotheses are beginning to be developed describing the causal mechanisms of
483 the increased marine mortality experienced by stocks on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean (Todd
484 et al. 2011; Beaugrand & Reid 2012; Chaput 2012; Mills et al. 2013; Beaugrand et al. 2014;
485 Renkawitz et al. 2015; Jonsson et al. 2016). Management actions to directly counteract declines
486 due to climate and ecosystem changes in the ocean are presently not resolved because we know
487 little about where salmon are exactly and what stressors they may even be encountering at a
488 given time. However, mortality at sea seems to be density-independent for Atlantic salmon
489 (Jonsson et al. 1998). Furthermore, there are no recognized compensatory mechanisms exist for
490 additional mortality at the smolt stage (Milner et al., 2003; Einum and Nislow 2011). Hence, in a
491 situation with a reduced oceanic survival occurs, it is even more important to ensure the number
492 of smolts migrating to the ocean and that their condition is maximized, emphasizing the
493 importance of freshwater restoration efforts that occur in freshwater (see Thorstad et al. 2021).

494 Another overarching impact on salmon populations is climate change. Climate change is
495 expected to modify thermal and hydrological regimes of rivers and in the northern hemisphere
496 adding an indiscriminate challenge to restoration efforts in terms of salmon thermal performance
497 (Karcher et al. 2021), behaviour (Baisez et al. 2011; Frechette et al. 2018), and life history
498 (Lennox et al. 2018). Climate models have predicted a warming of air temperature and a
499 decrease in summer precipitation in extensive portions of the wild Atlantic salmon's range
500 (Schneider et al. 2013). Given future climate change scenarios, more extreme weather (higher
501 frequencies of violent storms, or conversely extended droughts) may severely alter natural
502 patterns of river flow in the entire distributional range of Atlantic salmon. In Europe, strong
503 impacts on river flow regimes are expected in the boreal climate zone over the distribution range
504 of Atlantic salmon (Schneider et al. 2013). Impacted rivers, especially smaller ones, will likely
505 undergo extinctions of local populations when waters become too warm. By combining
506 biological, hydrological, and hydraulic models, Sundt-Hansen et al. (2018) simulated how future
507 climate change would impact the River Mandalselva in southern Norway, where discharge
508 during summer was predicted to decline and result in reduced Atlantic salmon abundance. They
509 found that the wetted areas will be strongly reduced during the summer and projected increased
510 density-dependent juvenile mortality and reductions in river carrying capacity, leading to low
511 parr abundances and reduced abundance of smolts that would ultimately shift the spawning
512 targets (Sundt-Hansen et al. 2018). Low river flows, predicted to increase in frequency with
513 climate change, have been shown to reduce smolt migration success in rivers with instream
514 barriers such as weirs (Gauld et al. 2013). Climate change is expected to be accompanied by a
515 loss in biodiversity as rare or specialised species become extinct and new competitors or invasive
516 species begin to dominate (Schneider et al. 2013). River restoration efforts must be mindful of

517 the future needs of local populations as the climate changes; Beechie et al. (2013) suggested that
518 many local restoration efforts focus on small scale rehabilitation but that a focus on connectivity
519 and flow regimes is needed to ensure efforts prepare populations for long-term changes of
520 warming and hydrological variability.

521 **Conclusions and Maxims**

522 When a specific stressor is identified, when political desire to resolve it exists, and where
523 a nucleus of the original population's genetic structure remains intact, successful restoration of
524 Atlantic salmon populations is feasible. Successful restoration of self-sustaining populations
525 (Level 1) and populations with harvestable surplus (Level 3) have been documented and attained.
526 However, many failures have also occurred, especially where multiple stressors have been
527 severe, catastrophic impacts have occurred, or efforts have relied heavily on hatchery production.
528 Broad-scale stressors such as climate change and marine dynamics may be especially
529 challenging to resolve. This paper was written to promote the work that has been accomplished
530 towards the restoration of Atlantic salmon populations and synthesize how we believe these
531 experiences can be used effectively to support future efforts by management agencies to restore
532 populations. In many areas we now know enough to implement effective and evidence-based
533 restoration efforts for salmon. Further research should be focused alongside efforts by managers
534 and politicians to restore populations to test whether plans are working using appropriate
535 controlled comparisons, advance new strategies such as alternatives to hatchery production, and
536 develop evidence-based assessments of success that build on our framework and on the
537 following maxims upon which we conclude:

538

- 539 1. **Avoid the need for restoration in the first place. Preserve wild stocks and manage**
540 **them well.** Restoration of degraded populations is difficult and very expensive and will
541 often fail. It is becoming harder with increasing pressure on this species especially as the
542 climate changes and marine survival becomes more stochastic. It is incredibly
543 challenging to restore extirpated wild populations and restoration should be prevented as
544 much as possible. Prevention is preferred by proactively providing protection to pristine
545 populations as much as possible (Roni et al. 2002).
- 546 2. **Restoration efforts need to be relevant to resource users.** Scientific evaluation and
547 monitoring of restoration actions should take place in collaboration with knowledge
548 users. Depending on the jurisdiction, resource users may be Indigenous nations that are
549 rightsholders on rivers, key land claim holders, and decision makers; public servants (i.e.
550 managers) that make financial allocations to restoration projects based on knowledge; or
551 local communities where rivers form an essential part of the landscape, aesthetic,
552 recreation, and society. Involving river users has been promising to gain acceptance and
553 catalyze positive outcomes from restoration and is a vital part of the process (Hellström et
554 al. 2019; Cote et al. 2021). Conservation behaviour research is needed to better
555 understand how to understand how to better involve and empower river users.
- 556 3. **If the goal is for a population to be restored, we first need to identify the problems,**
557 **and then take action to solve them.** Beechie et al. (2010) emphasize that restoration
558 actions must resolve problems in order to be successful. Identifying the problems is often
559 challenging, but it is apparent from the literature that when problems are identified and
560 resolved, salmon populations can respond well, and sometimes fast. The resolution of
561 freshwater acidification in Norway by liming rivers is a very clear example of this

562 (Hesthagen et al. 2011), as are habitat measures when, for example, spawning gravel
563 availability limits production (Barlaup et al. 2008). Salmon are good colonizers and do
564 not necessarily need help from hatchery sources to re-establish populations if there are
565 sources of wild genetically similar populations nearby, albeit at the expense of local
566 genetic specialization (Perrier et al. 2009). We reiterate the importance of preserving
567 salmon populations' genetic structure, but also emphasize that genetic variability is
568 important to protect in populations as they continue to evolve traits to adapt to a changing
569 hydrosphere. Hatcheries are largely unnecessary and can be hindrances given the plethora
570 of genetic problems that may arise from them (Hagen et al. 2020). Hatcheries should only
571 be used as a last resort to forestall extinction and where efforts are being made to identify
572 and resolve stressors that are affecting the production of the population. All hatchery
573 activities should be of the gene bank type with a focus of preserving the genetic variation
574 and integrity before it is lost. Traditional ecological knowledge can be a valuable
575 resource for identifying the causes of key problems and working towards resolutions with
576 a collaborative approach that considers the role of multiple knowledge systems in
577 restoration.

578 4. **Success is often possible.** Challenging problems have been resolved to restore Atlantic
579 salmon and we can continue to overcome them with appropriate investments into
580 research, intervention, and monitoring (especially follow-up). Roni et al. (2008)
581 emphasized that brief monitoring intervals after restoration generally challenges strong
582 conclusions about restoration success. In Norway, the parasite *Gyrodactylus salaris* has
583 been eradicated from more than 40 salmon rivers that were otherwise doomed to
584 extinction by taking swift, albeit expensive, action to preserve the genetic integrity of the

585 population, eradicate the parasite, and restock the population from the native gene pool.
586 Some populations in rivers that are too heavily degraded may not be salvageable, but
587 many Atlantic salmon populations are within the capacity of managers and river
588 stakeholders to restore with appropriate resources to identify and address underlying
589 causes of mortality.

590 **5. Mysteries remain to be solved.** Although we know a lot about Atlantic salmon, perhaps
591 more than almost any other fish species, there are still mysteries remaining to be resolved
592 about the species and its habitat. Often, we are working to restore populations at
593 exceptional speed compared to the natural processes that support recolonization and
594 evolution required of stocks that have gone through genetic changes due to bottlenecks
595 (e.g. depensation, introgression). Patience and a dedication to evidence-based
596 implementation, scientific evaluation of success, sharing lessons of success and failure,
597 and supporting adaptive approaches to salmon restoration are necessary to maintain a
598 long-term vision of restoration for this iconic fish species.

599

600 **Data availability**

601 Data are available at Zenodo.org for the regional assessments.

602 **Acknowledgments**

603 The workshop on salmon restoration was hosted by NORCE Norwegian Research Centre with
604 support from the Norwegian Environmental Directorate. Input from national representatives was
605 crucial to score the restoration priorities by region, and we are very grateful to each respondent.

606 We thank Michael Ovidio, Ondrej Slavik, Martin Kesler, Jean-Luc Balgliniere, Jan Davidsen,
607 Pablo Caballero, Gudni Gudbergsson, Phil McGinnity, Janis Birzaks, Vytautas Kesminas, Rafal

608 Bernaś, Armin Peter, David Aldvern, and Dan Kircheis for contributions to ranking national
609 threat levels. Lennox was supported by the Research Council of Norway (LaKES Project
610 #320726). Vollset was supported by the Research Council of Norway (PaCE Project #303301).

611

612

613 **References**

614

615 Almodóvar, A., Leal, S., Nicola, G. G., Hórreo, J. L., García-Vázquez, E., & Elvira, B. (2020).
616 Long-term stocking practices threaten the original genetic diversity of the southernmost
617 European populations of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar*. *Endangered Species Research*, 41,
618 303-317.

619 Ayllon, F., Martinez, J. L., & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2006). Loss of regional population structure
620 in Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L., following stocking. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*,
621 63(7), 1269-1273.

622 Bailey, M. M., Lachapelle, K. A., & Kinnison, M. T. (2010). Ontogenetic selection on hatchery
623 salmon in the wild: natural selection on artificial phenotypes. *Evolutionary Applications*,
624 3(4), 340-351.

625 Baisez, A., Bach, J. M., Leon, C., Parouty, T., Terrade, R., Hoffmann, M., & Laffaille, P. (2011).
626 Migration delays and mortality of adult Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar* en route to
627 spawning grounds on the River Allier, France. *Endangered Species Research*, 15(3), 265-
628 270.

629 Barlaup, B. T., Gabrielsen, S. E., Skoglund, H., & Wiers, T. (2008). Addition of spawning
630 gravel—a means to restore spawning habitat of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.), and
631 Anadromous and resident brown trout (*Salmo trutta* L.) in regulated rivers. *River*
632 *Research and Applications*, 24(5), 543-550.

633 Beaugrand, G., Goberville, E., Luczak, C., & Kirby, R. R. (2014). Marine biological shifts and
634 climate. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1783), 20133350.

635 Beaugrand, G., & Reid, P. C. (2012). Relationships between North Atlantic salmon, plankton,
636 and hydroclimatic change in the Northeast Atlantic. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*,
637 69(9), 1549-1562.

638

639 Beechie, T. J., Sear, D. A., Olden, J. D., Pess, G. R., Buffington, J. M., Moir, H., ... & Pollock,
640 M. M. (2010). Process-based principles for restoring river ecosystems. *BioScience*, 60(3),
641 209-222.

642 Beechie, T., Imaki, H., Greene, J., Wade, A., Wu, H., Pess, G., ... & Mantua, N. (2013).
643 Restoring salmon habitat for a changing climate. *River research and applications*, 29(8),
644 939-960.

645 Birnie-Gauvin, K., Candee, M. M., Baktoft, H., Larsen, M. H., Koed, A., & Aarestrup, K.
646 (2018). River connectivity reestablished: Effects and implications of six weir removals on
647 brown trout smolt migration. *River research and applications*, 34(6), 548-554.

648 Bogue, M. B. (2001). *Fishing the Great Lakes: an environmental history, 1783–1933*. Univ of
649 Wisconsin Press.

650 Bolstad, G. H., Hindar, K., Robertsen, G., Jonsson, B., Sægvog, H., Diserud, O. H., ... &
651 Karlsson, S. (2017). Gene flow from domesticated escapes alters the life history of wild
652 Atlantic salmon. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1(5), 1-5.

653 Boulêtreau, S., Gaillagot, A., Carry, L., Tétard, S., De Oliveira, E., & Santoul, F. (2018). Adult
654 Atlantic salmon have a new freshwater predator. *PloS one*, 13(4), e0196046.

655 Butler, J. R., Radford, A., Riddington, G., & Laughton, R. (2009). Evaluating an ecosystem
656 service provided by Atlantic salmon, sea trout and other fish species in the River Spey,

657 Scotland: the economic impact of recreational rod fisheries. *Fisheries Research*, 96(2-3),
658 259-266.

659 Cabral, M.J. (coord.), Almeida, J., Almeida, P.R., Dellinger, T., Ferrand De Almeida, N.,
660 Oliveira, M.E., Palmeirim, J.M., Queiroz, L.M., Rogado, L. & Santos-Reis, M. (eds.)
661 (2005). *Livro Vermelho dos Vertebrados de Portugal*. Instituto da Conservação da
662 Natureza. Lisboa, 586 pp.

663 Calles, E. O., & Greenberg, L. A. (2005). Evaluation of nature-like fishways for re-establishing
664 connectivity in fragmented salmonid populations in the river Emån. *River Research and*
665 *Applications*, 21(9), 951-960.

666 Champion, A. (2003) The Tyne fishery. In: Archer, D. (2003) *Tyne and Tide*, pp. 73-89. Daryan
667 Press, England.

668 Chaput, G. (2012). Overview of the status of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the North Atlantic
669 and trends in marine mortality. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 69, 1538-1548.

670 Childress, E. S., Allan, J. D., & McIntyre, P. B. (2014). Nutrient subsidies from iteroparous fish
671 migrations can enhance stream productivity. *Ecosystems*, 17(3), 522-534.

672 Christie, M. R., Marine, M. L., French, R. A., Waples, R. S., and Blouin, M. S. 2012. Effective
673 size of a wild salmonid population is greatly reduced by hatchery supplementation.
674 *Heredity*, 109: 254–260

675 Collins, A. L., Walling, D. E., McMellin, G. K., Zhang, Y., Gray, J., McGonigle, D., &
676 Cherrington, R. (2010). A preliminary investigation of the efficacy of riparian fencing
677 schemes for reducing contributions from eroding channel banks to the siltation of
678 salmonid spawning gravels across the south west UK. *Journal of Environmental*
679 *Management*, 91(6), 1341-1349.

680 Cote, D., Van Leeuwen, T. E., Bath, A. J., Gonzales, E. K., & Cote, A. L. (2021). Social-
681 ecological management results in sustained recovery of an imperiled salmon population.
682 Restoration Ecology, e13401.

683 de Jong, M. V. Z., & Cowx, I. G. (2016). Long-term response of salmonid populations to habitat
684 restoration in a boreal forest stream. Ecological Engineering, 91, 148-157.

685 de Jong M. V. Z., Cowx, I. G., & Scruton, D. A. (1997). An evaluation of instream habitat
686 restoration techniques on salmonid populations in a Newfoundland stream. Regulated
687 Rivers: Research & Management: An International Journal Devoted to River Research
688 and Management, 13(6), 603-614.

689 Dunfield R. W. (1985). The Atlantic salmon in the history of North America. Canadian Special
690 Publication of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 80pg. 181 pp

691 Einum, S. & K. H. Nislow, 2011. Variation in population size through time and space: theory
692 and recent empirical advances from Atlantic salmon. In Aas, Ø., S. Einum, A. Klemetsen
693 & J. Skurdal (eds), Atlantic Salmon Ecology. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford: 277–298.

694 Einum, S., Nislow, K. H., Reynolds, J. D., & Sutherland, W. J. (2008). Predicting population
695 responses to restoration of breeding habitat in Atlantic salmon. Journal of Applied
696 Ecology, 45(3), 930-938.

697 Erkinaro, J., Laine, A., Mäki-Petäys, A., Karjalainen, T., Laajala, E., Hirvonen, A., Orell, P., &
698 Yrjänä, T. 2011. Restoring migratory salmonid populations in regulated rivers in the
699 northernmost Baltic Sea area, Northern Finland – biological, technical and social
700 challenges. Journal of Applied Ichthyology 27 (Suppl 3): 45–52.

701 Fay, C., M. Bartron, S. Craig, A. Hecht, J. Pruden, R. Saunders, T. Sheehan, and J. Trial. 2006.
702 Status Review for Anadromous Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the United States.

703 Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 294
704 pages.

705 Ferchaud, A. L., Perrier, C., April, J., Hernandez, C., Dionne, M., & Bernatchez, L. (2016).
706 Making sense of the relationships between Ne, Nb and Nc towards defining conservation
707 thresholds in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Heredity*, 117(4), 268-278.

708 Fleming, I.A., Lamberg, A. & Jonsson, B. 1997. Effects of early experience on the reproductive
709 performance of Atlantic salmon. *Behavioural Ecology* 8:470-480.

710 Floyd, T. A., MacInnis, C., & Taylor, B. R. (2009). Effects of artificial woody structures on
711 Atlantic salmon habitat and populations in a Nova Scotia stream. *River Research and*
712 *Applications*, 25(3), 272-282.

713 Forseth, T., Barlaup, B. T., Finstad, B., Fiske, P., Gjørseter, H., Falkegård, M., ... & Wennevik,
714 V. (2017). The major threats to Atlantic salmon in Norway. *ICES Journal of Marine*
715 *Science*, 74(6), 1496-1513.

716 Forseth, T., Fiske, P., Barlaup, B., Gjørseter, H., Hindar, K., & Diserud, O. H. (2013). Reference
717 point based management of Norwegian Atlantic salmon populations. *Environmental*
718 *conservation*, 40(4), 356-366.

719 Furey, N. B., Bass, A. L., Miller, K. M., Li, S., Lotto, A. G., Healy, S. J., ... & Hinch, S. G.
720 (2021). Infected juvenile salmon can experience increased predation during freshwater
721 migration. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(3), 201522.

722 Gauld, N.R., Campbell, R. & Lucas, M.C. (2013) Reduced flows impact salmonid smolt
723 emigration in a river with low-head weirs. *Science of the Total Environment* 458-460,
724 435-443. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.04.063.

725 Giller, P. S. (2005). River restoration: seeking ecological standards. Editor's introduction. Journal
726 of Applied Ecology, 42(2), 201-207.

727 Hagen, I.J., Jensen, A.J., Bolstad, G.H. et al. Supplementary stocking selects for domesticated
728 genotypes. Nat Commun 10, 199 (2019).

729 Hagen, IJ, Ugedal, O., Jensen, AJ, Lo, H., Holthe, E., Bjørn, B., ... & Karlsson, S. (2020).
730 Evaluation of genetic effects on wild salmon populations from stock enhancement. ICES
731 Journal of Marine Science.

732 Hellström, G., C. Nilsson, S. Westbergh, D. Palm, K. Leonardsson, D. Holmqvist, S. Agren, J.
733 Gardstrom, A. Alanara, and H. Lundqvist. (2019). Restoring the Vindel River, Sweden
734 for Atlantic salmon and brown trout. Pages 125-156 in C.C. Krueger, W.W. Taylor, and
735 S. Youn, editors. From Catastrophe to recovery: stories of fishery management success.
736 American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

737 Hesthagen, T., Larsen, B. M., & Fiske, P. (2011). Liming restores Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)
738 populations in acidified Norwegian rivers. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic
739 Sciences, 68(2), 224-231.

740 Hobbs, R. J., & Harris, J. A. (2001). Restoration ecology: repairing the earth's ecosystems in the
741 new millennium. Restoration ecology, 9(2), 239-246.

742 Hogg, R. S., Coghlan Jr, S. M., Zydlewski, J., & Gardner, C. (2015). Fish community response
743 to a small-stream dam removal in a maine coastal river tributary. Transactions of the
744 American Fisheries Society, 144(3), 467-479.

745 Horreo, J. L., De La Hoz, J., Machado-Schiaffino, G., Pola, I. G., & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2011a).
746 Restoration and enhancement of Atlantic salmon populations: what we have learned from
747 North Iberian rivers. Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems, (402), 23.

748 Horreo, J. L., Machado-Schiaffino, G., Griffiths, A. M., Bright, D., Stevens, J. R., & Garcia-
749 Vazquez, E. (2011a). Atlantic salmon at risk: apparent rapid declines in effective
750 population size in southern European populations. *Transactions of the American*
751 *Fisheries Society*, 140(3), 605-610.

752 Huntsman, A. G. (1944). Why did Ontario salmon disappear. *Transactions of the Royal Society*
753 *of Canada*, 68, 82-102.

754 ICES. (2017b). Report of the Working Group on North Atlantic Salmon (WGNAS). 29 Mars -7
755 April 2017. Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2017/ACOM:20. 296 pp.

756 ICES. (2017a). Report of the Working Group on Effectiveness of Recovery Actions for Atlantic
757 Salmon (WGERAAS), 9–13 November 2015, ICES Headquarters, Copenhagen,
758 Denmark. ICES CM 2015/SSGEPD:03. 115 pp.

759 ICES. (2020). Working Group on North Atlantic Salmon (WGNAS). ICES Scientific Reports.
760 2:21. 358 pp. <http://doi.org/10.17895/ices.pub.5973>

761 IKSR. (2020). Bericht über die Ergebnisse der IKSR-Projektgruppe „Oberrhein“ 2015-2019.
762 Bericht Nr. 262. Internationale Kommission zum Schutz des Rheins (IKSR), Koblenz. 33
763 p.

764 Johnsen, B. O., A. J. Jensen, F. Økland, A. Lamberg and E. B. Thorstad. 1998. The use of radio
765 telemetry for identifying migratory behavior in wild and farmed Atlantic salmon

766 Jonsson, B., Jonsson, N., & Albretsen, J. (2016). Environmental change influences the life
767 history of salmon *Salmo salar* in the North Atlantic Ocean. *Journal of Fish Biology*,
768 88(2), 618-637.

769 Jonsson, N., Jonsson, B., & Hansen, L. P. (1998). The relative role of density-dependent and
770 density-independent survival in the life cycle of Atlantic salmon *Salmo salar*. Journal of
771 Animal Ecology, 67(5), 751-762.

772 Jutila, E. & Pruuki, V. (1988). The enhancement of the salmon stocks in the Simojoki and
773 Tornionjoki rivers by stocking parr in the rapids. Aqua Fennica, 18, 93-99.

774 Koed, A., Birnie-Gauvin, K., Sivebæk, F., & Aarestrup, K. (2020). From endangered to
775 sustainable: Multi-faceted management in rivers and coasts improves Atlantic salmon
776 (*Salmo salar*) populations in Denmark. Fisheries Management and Ecology, 27(1), 64-76.

777 Koed, A., Baktoft, H., & Bak, B. D. (2006). Causes of mortality of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo*
778 *salar*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) smolts in a restored river and its estuary. River
779 research and applications, 22(1), 69-78.

780 Korsu, K., Huusko, A., Korhonen, P. K., & Yrjänä, T. (2010). The potential role of stream
781 habitat restoration in facilitating salmonid invasions: a habitat-hydraulic modeling
782 approach. Restoration Ecology, 18, 158-165.

783 Lenders, H. J. R., Chamuleau, T. P. M., Hendriks, A. J., Lauwerier, R. C. G. M., Leuven, R. S.
784 E. W., & Verberk, W. C. E. P. (2016). Historical rise of waterpower initiated the collapse
785 of salmon stocks. Scientific Reports, 6(1), 1-9.

786 Lennox, R. J., Eliason, E. J., Havn, T. B., Johansen, M. R., Thorstad, E. B., Cooke, S. J., ... &
787 Uglem, I. (2018). Bioenergetic consequences of warming rivers to adult Atlantic salmon
788 *Salmo salar* during their spawning migration. Freshwater Biology, 63(11), 1381-1393.

789 Lundqvist, H., Rivinoja, P., Leonardsson, K., & McKinnell, S. (2008). Upstream passage
790 problems for wild Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) in a regulated river and its effect on

791 the population. In *Fish and Diadromy in Europe (ecology, management, conservation)*
792 (pp. 111-127). Springer, Dordrecht.

793 MacInnis, C., Floyd, T. A., & Taylor, B. R. (2008). Large woody debris structures and their
794 influence on Atlantic salmon spawning in a stream in Nova Scotia, Canada. *North*
795 *American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 28(3), 781-791.

796 Marttila, M., Louhi, P., Huusko, A., Vehanen, T., Mäki-Petäys, A., Erkinaro, J., ... & Muotka, T.
797 (2019). Synthesis of habitat restoration impacts on young-of-the-year salmonids in boreal
798 rivers. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 29(3), 513-527.

799 Maynard, G. A., Kinnison, M. T., & Zydlewski, J. D. (2017). Size selection from fishways and
800 potential evolutionary responses in a threatened Atlantic salmon population. *River*
801 *Research and Applications*, 33(7), 1004-1015.

802 McGinnity, P., Jennings, E., DeEyto, E., Allott, N., Samuelsson, P., Rogan, G., ... & Cross, T.
803 (2009). Impact of naturally spawning captive-bred Atlantic salmon on wild populations:
804 depressed recruitment and increased risk of climate-mediated extinction. *Proceedings of*
805 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* , 276 (1673), 3601-3610.

806 Miettinen, A., Palm, S., Dannewitz, J., Lind, E., Primmer, C. R., Romakkaniemi, A., ... &
807 Pritchard, V. L. (2021). A large wild salmon stock shows genetic and life history
808 differentiation within, but not between, rivers. *Conservation Genetics*, 22(1), 35-51.

809 Miller, K. M., Teffer, A., Tucker, S., Li, S., Schulze, A. D., Trudel, M., ... & Hinch, S. G. (2014).
810 Infectious disease, shifting climates, and opportunistic predators: cumulative factors
811 potentially impacting wild salmon declines. *Evolutionary Applications*, 7(7), 812-855.

812 Mills, K.E., Pershing, A., Sheehan, T.F. and Mountain, D. 2013. Climate and ecosystem linkages
813 explain widespread declines in North American Atlantic salmon populations. *Global*
814 *Change Biology*. 19: 3046-3061.

815 Milner, N. J., J. M. Elliott, J. D. Armstrong, R. Gardiner, J. S. Welton & M. Ladle, 2003. The
816 natural control of salmon and trout populations in streams. *Fisheries Research* 62: 111–
817 125.

818 Myers, R. A., Levin, S. A., Lande, R., James, F. C., Murdoch, W. W., & Paine, R. T. (2004).
819 Hatcheries and endangered salmon. *Science*, 303: 5666, 1980-1980.

820 Nettle, R. (1857). *The Salmon Fisheries of the St. Lawrence and its Tributaries*. Printed by J.
821 Lovell (1857), p. 144

822 Nicola, G. G., Elvira, B., Jonsson, B., Ayllón, D., & Almodóvar, A. (2018). Local and global
823 climatic drivers of Atlantic salmon decline in southern Europe. *Fisheries Research*, 198,
824 78-85.

825 O’Connell, M. F., Reddin, D. G., Amiro, P. G., Caron, F., Marshall, T. L., Chaput, G., ... &
826 Cairns, D. K. (1997). Estimates of conservation spawner requirements for Atlantic
827 salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) for Canada. *DFO Can. Stock. Assess. Sec. Res. Doc*, 97, 100.

828 Otero, J., Jensen, A. J., L'Abée-Lund, J. H., Stenseth, N. C., Storvik, G. O., & Vøllestad, L. A.
829 (2011). Quantifying the ocean, freshwater and human effects on year-to-year variability
830 of one-sea-winter Atlantic salmon angled in multiple Norwegian rivers. *PLoS One*, 6(8),
831 e24005.

832 Palmer, M. A., Bernhardt, E. S., Allan, J. D., Lake, P. S., Alexander, G., Brooks, S., ... & Galat,
833 D. L. (2005). Standards for ecologically successful river restoration. *Journal of Applied*
834 *Ecology*, 42(2), 208-217.

835 Palstra, F. P., O'Connell, M. F., & Ruzzante, D. E. (2007). Population structure and gene flow
836 reversals in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) over contemporary and long-term temporal
837 scales: Effects of population size and life history. *Molecular Ecology*, 16, 4504–4522.

838 Pedersen, M. L., Andersen, J. M., Nielsen, K., & Linnemann, M. (2007). Restoration of Skjern
839 River and its valley: project description and general ecological changes in the project
840 area. *Ecological Engineering*, 30(2), 131-144.

841 Perrier, C., April, J., Cote, G., Bernatchez, L., & Dionne, M. (2016). Effective number of
842 breeders in relation to census size as management tools for Atlantic salmon conservation
843 in a context of stocked populations. *Conservation genetics*, 17(1), 31-44.

844 Perrier, C., Evanno, G., Belliard, J., Guyomard, R., & Bagliniere, J. L. (2009). Natural
845 recolonization of the Seine River by Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) of multiple origins.
846 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 67(1), 1-4.

847 Perrier, C., Le Gentil, J., Ravigne, V., Gaudin, P., & Salvado, J. C. (2014). Origins and genetic
848 diversity among Atlantic salmon recolonizing upstream areas of a large South European
849 river following restoration of connectivity and stocking. *Conservation Genetics*, 15(5),
850 1095-1109.

851 Renkawitz, M. D., Sheehan, T. F., Dixon, H. J., & Nygaard, R. (2015). Changing trophic
852 structure and energy dynamics in the Northwest Atlantic: implications for Atlantic
853 salmon feeding at West Greenland. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 538, 197-211.

854 Rivinoja, P., McKinnell, S., & Lundqvist, H. (2001). Hindrances to upstream migration of
855 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in a northern Swedish river caused by a hydroelectric
856 power-station. *Regulated Rivers: Research & Management: An International Journal*
857 *Devoted to River Research and Management*, 17(2), 101-115.

858 Romakkaniemi, A., Perä, I., Karlsson, L., Jutila, E., Carlsson, U., & Pakarinen, T. (2003).
859 Development of wild Atlantic salmon stocks in the rivers of the northern Baltic Sea in
860 response to management measures. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 60(2), 329-342.

861 Roni, P., Beechie, T. J., Bilby, R. E., Leonetti, F. E., Pollock, M. M., & Pess, G. R. (2002). A
862 review of stream restoration techniques and a hierarchical strategy for prioritizing
863 restoration in Pacific Northwest watersheds. *North American Journal of Fisheries*
864 *Management*, 22(1), 1-20.

865 Roni, P., Hanson, K., & Beechie, T. (2008). Global review of the physical and biological
866 effectiveness of stream habitat rehabilitation techniques. *North American Journal of*
867 *Fisheries Management*, 28(3), 856-890.

868 Ryman, N., & Laikre, L. (1991). Effects of supportive breeding on the genetically effective
869 population size. *Conservation Biology*, 5(3), 325-329.

870 Saltveit, S. J., Brabrand, Å., & Brittain, J. E. (2019). Rivers need floods: Management lessons
871 learnt from the regulation of the Norwegian salmon river, Suldalslågen. *River Research*
872 *and Applications*, 35(8), 1181-1191.

873 Sandodden, R., Brazier, M., Sandvik, M., Moen, A., Wist, A. N., & Adolfsen, P. (2018).
874 Eradication of *Gyrodactylus salaris* infested Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the Rauma
875 River, Norway, using rotenone. *Management of Biological Invasions*, 9(1), 67.

876 Schneider, C., Laizé, C. L. R., Acreman, M. C., & Florke, M. (2013). How will climate change
877 modify river flow regimes in Europe? *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17(1), 325-
878 339.

879 Sigourney, D. B., Zydlewski, J. D., Hughes, E., & Cox, O. (2015). Transport, dam passage, and
880 size selection of adult Atlantic Salmon in the Penobscot River, Maine. *North American*
881 *Journal of Fisheries Management*, 35(6), 1164-1176.

882 Skoglund, H., Vollset, K. W., Lennox, R., Skaala, Ø., & Barlaup, B. T. (2021). Drift diving: A
883 quick and accurate method for assessment of anadromous salmonid spawning
884 populations. *Fisheries Management and Ecology*.

885 Sundt-Hansen, L. E., Hedger, R. D., Ugedal, O., Diserud, O. H., Finstad, A. G., Sauterleute, J.
886 F., ... & Forseth, T. (2018). Modelling climate change effects on Atlantic salmon:
887 Implications for mitigation in regulated rivers. *Science of the total environment*, 631,
888 1005-1017.

889 Thorstad, E.B., Bliss, D., Breau, C., Damon-Randall, K., Sundt-Hansen, L.E., Hatfield, E.M.,
890 Horsburgh, G., Hansen, H., Maoiléidigh, N.Ó., Sheehan, T. and Sutton, S.G. (2021).
891 Atlantic salmon in a rapidly changing environment—Facing the challenges of reduced
892 marine survival and climate change. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater*
893 *Ecosystems*.

894 Kärcher, O., Flörke, M., & Markovic, D. (2021). Different life stage, different risks: Thermal
895 performance across the life cycle of *Salmo trutta* and *Salmo salar* in the face of climate
896 change. *Ecology and Evolution*.

897 Todd, C. D., Friedland, K. D., MacLean, J. C., Hazon, N., & Jensen, A. J. (2011). Getting into
898 hot water? Atlantic salmon responses to climate change in freshwater and marine
899 environments. In *Atlantic Salmon Ecology* (Aas Ø et al. eds.), pp. 409-443. Wiley-
900 Blackwell.

901 Tummers, J.S., Hudson, S. & Lucas, M.C. (2016). Evaluating the effectiveness of restoring
902 longitudinal connectivity for stream fish communities: towards a more holistic approach.
903 Science of the Total Environment, 569-570, 850-860.

904 Webster, D.W. (1982). Early history of Atlantic salmon in New York. New York Fish and Game
905 Journal, 29, 26-44.

906 WWF (2001). The Status of Wild Atlantic Salmon: A River by River Assessment. (28 October
907 2009; <http://assets.panda.org/downloads/salmon2.pdf>)

908 Young, K. A. (2017). Approaches to minimising unintended negative consequences to wild
909 Atlantic salmon populations from hatchery and stocking activities. In: Report of a
910 Theme-based Special Session of the Council of NASCO, edited by Chaput, G., Knight,
911 P., Russell, I., Sivertsen, A., Hutchinson, P. and Forero Segovia, S. L. NASCO Council
912 document CNL(17)61. 116pp

913 Zimmerman, M. S., & Krueger, C. C. (2009). An ecosystem perspective on re-establishing native
914 deepwater fishes in the Laurentian Great Lakes. North American Journal of Fisheries
915 Management, 29(5), 1352-1371.

916

918 Table 1. Glossary of key terms
 919

Term	Definition	Example
Intervention	Any action taken as part of a restoration program that is intended to have a positive effect on the salmon biological reference point. Synonymous with a treatment, manipulation, or management action in a river.	Addition of spawning gravel is an intervention that may be used by managers to improve conditions for salmon spawning in a river.
Biological reference point	A quantitative measure of a salmon population, against which success of a restoration intervention is to be measured, relative to a baseline established prior to intervention. A biological reference point may be the number of spawners, the number of eggs deposited by females, or the effective population size.	Before and after addition of spawning gravel to a river, the census number of adult salmon is determined by spawning count to evaluate whether the intervention could be related to an increase in the census number, relative to a biological reference point
Hatchery	A facility for controlled mating of broodstock salmon taken from the river (or sometimes a foreign stock) where eggs are planted in the gravel or reared to fry, parr, or smolt before release.	Broodstock male and female salmon are stored in hatchery tanks until gonads are ripe and then stripped of gametes to produce F1 offspring.
Gene bank	A specialized genetic repository and reproductive facility for evolutionarily enlightened artificial rearing of salmon. Gene banks harvest and store genetic material from salmon and supplement it annually to maintain genetic diversity. Offspring are produced from carefully selected genetic combinations of eggs and sperm to limit inbreeding depression and maximize genetic diversity. Gene banks may never be used but maintained if needed for replenishing threatened stocks.	During a concerning decline in a salmon population, genetic material is stored in a gene bank in case the population falls below a conservation limit. Gene banks are prudent to have in case of emergency and can be used to resupply a struggling population.
Conservation limit	A threshold used to establish whether a population is threatened with extinction. There are many possible conservation limits that may be used based on metrics such as spawning stock, eggs deposited, effective population size, etc. The limits may be conservative or liberal depending on the management risk tolerance level. The conservation limit lies somewhere below the biological reference point.	When a salmon population falls below the biological reference point, continued declines will eventually surpass the conservation limit that is used to trigger some action. The conservation limit should be conservative enough not to overreact to stochasticity, but not too conservative such that the

		population has approached extinction too rapidly to intervene.
Harvestable surplus	A harvestable surplus is a number or biomass of salmon beyond the biological reference point that can be harvested while allowing the population to still achieve replacement.	Level 3 success is achieved when the population exceeds the biological reference point and there is a harvestable surplus available to fisheries.

920

921 Table 2. A review of Atlantic salmon restoration papers identified by a structured literature search
 922 and expert review revealed 49 relevant studies covering 95 rivers. Papers were graded based on
 923 the levels of success that we derived, from Level 1 to Level 3, or failure (0). Uncertainties are left
 924 blank. Cases are sorted from Level 3 to Level 1, uncertainties, and then failures, with first author
 925 alphabetical organization within success categories.

Article	Category	Problem	Intervention	Result	Explanation	Succe ss	Populati ons (N)
Barlaup et al. 2008	Habitat and water quality	Regulation of rivers impacts spawning habitats and recruitment	Addition of spawning gravel	Level 3 Success; Juvenile production can be enhanced by adding gravel to supply- limited rivers	High spawning success (egg survival >80%), but gravel displacemen ts due to floods	3	3

Champion 2003	Habitat and water quality	Salmon population almost became extinct (negligible catches ~1940 - ~1970) due to poor water quality in estuary and lower river due to untreated human sewage (BOD impact, low O2) and due to intense industrial pollution “cokeworks etc (esp. ammonia, phenols, cyanide)	Industrial decline & cleanup of industrial effluent. Interceptor sewer system and sewage treatment for nearly 1M people in lower Tyne online 1980. Juvenile stocking (160K-360K fry/parr per year) commences due to Kielder dam in 1981.	Level 3 Success; The Tyne is now the best English salmon river with declared rod catch of adult salmon peaking at 5630 in 2011. Adult river stock est. 7000-18000 2004-2016.	Predominant cause of strong recovery is concluded as due to pollution abatement and treatment actions. In early years of stocking, returning hatchery fish contributed 20% spawning, wild 80%. Declined as recolonization occurred.	3	1
de Jong et al. 2017	Habitat and water quality	Salmon habitat complexity lost in a Newfoundland river	Addition of boulder clusters, V-dams, and half-log covers	Level 3 success; Sustained improvement in salmon abundance across 21 years	Increase of salmon density and biomass after structure addition and remaining high levels 20 years thereafter	3	1

Fjeldstad et al. 2012	Connectivity and habitat quality	Habitat fragmentation, siltation, and habitat	Enhanced connectivity and improved sediment conditions after removal of two weirs	Level 3 success. Spawning sites were re-created, pike and cyprinids were displaced, and juvenile density increased		3	1
Floyd et al. 2009	Habitat and water quality	Decreased abundance of salmon and degraded habitats	Addition of artificial woody structures	Level 3 Success; Higher spawning densities in reaches with addition of woody debris	Presumably higher spawning densities improved overall salmon production	3	1
Hesthagen et al. 2011	Habitat and water quality	Acidification of rivers	Liming program	Level 3 Success; Increasing fish density, liming as important restoration factor of formerly acidified Norwegian rivers	more than 20 years of liming suggested for successful restoration of self-sustaining salmon populations in Norway	3	13

Coed et al. 2020	Habitat and water quality	Declining populations of Atlantic salmon in Denmark	Habitat restorations , spawning ground additions, weir removals, fishing regulations/ bans population genetics and barrier removals	Level 3 Success; Rehabilitation of salmon populations with significant increase in population densities	Success through multi-faceted management and focusing on several problems simultaneously	3	4
MacInnis et al. 2008	Habitat and water quality	Habitat degradation seems to be driving poor salmon abundance	Create pools and shelter with woody debris	Level 3 Success; exponential increase in spawning with sustained high levels in subsequent years		3	1
Saltveit et al. 2014	Habitat and water quality	Water pollution and extirpation of Atlantic salmon in Akerselva, Norway	Water quality improvement program via limitation of industrial discharges, pollution, and urban runoff into the river	Level 3 Success; improved water quality and return of Atlantic salmon and sea trout to lower reaches	Further ecological improvement is limited due to several obstacles in urban environment	3	1

Calles et al. 2005	Connectivity and habitat quality	Power plant restricting passability	Construction of nature-like bypass channels	Level 1 Success; salmon ascended the fishway to colonize upstream and descended as kelts to recondition at sea. Recolonization was, however, slower than expected	90-100% passage of fish that entered the fishways	1	1
De Jong et al. 1997	Habitat and water quality	Decline in salmon abundance due to environmental perturbations	Three types of habitat improvements: boulder clusters, V-dams, and half-log covers and evaluation	Level 1 Success; restoration led to increased habitat heterogeneity, habitat complexity, and salmon production and decreased competition	Boulder clusters were most effective as they increased densities of 0+, 1+ and 3+ juveniles, but also V-dams and half-log covers positively affected salmon	1	1
Hogg et al. 2015	Connectivity and habitat quality	River connectivity reduced by dams and salmon population declining	Addition of new habitat following dam removal	Level 1 Success; Increased density, biomass and diversity of fish assemblage upstream of dam removal	Multiple age classes of juvenile salmon abundant at all test sites after dam removal	1	1

Marttila et al. 2019	Habitat and water quality	Channelization and removal of boulders reduced habitat complexity in 28 Finnish rivers	Instream structure added and connectivity to side channels restored	Level 1 success; Young-of-the-year salmon in increasing	Challenging to ascribe change in YOY densities directly to restoration efforts, but a good sign	1	28
Perrier et al. 2014	Stocking/ Fish Passage	Erosion of genetic diversity in French salmon populations caused by fragmentation	Restoration of connectivity and stocking	Level 1 Success; recolonization and reproduction of upstream areas from downstream habitats	majority of genotyped individuals in recolonized sites originated from downstream areas, but also prominent share from more distant sites or hybrids	1	1

Saltveit et al 2019	Fish passage/hydropower/stocking	River Suldalslagen was regulated for hydropower, resulting in flow reduction, sedimentation, and carpet moss	New flow regime implemented to offset changes caused by regulation, stocking based on gene bank method	Level 1 success reached; Increase of catches of salmon >7kg since 2010, but fishing and harvest based on stocking.	No pre regulation data on fish catches known, hatchery fish contributed to increase of large salmon catches, no conclusion possible if goal of sustaining naturally reproducing wild large salmon has been achieved	1	1
Sandodden et al. 2018	Biological invasions	Gyrodactylus parasite	Rotenone to kill salmon stock, eliminate invasive parasite, followed by reintroduction of native stock	Level 1 Success: Gyrodactylus was eliminated and salmon were reintroduced	Reintroduction of native stocks in controlled removal of damaging invasive species is an extreme but effective measure when stocks face catastrophic mortality. Level 3 is supposed to be reached	1	6

Collins et al. 2010	Habitat and water quality	Excessive sedimentation due to eroding channel banks	Evaluation of riparian fencing schemes to reduce siltation of salmon spawning gravel	Uncertain; Riparian fencing schemes are recommended to reduce spawning site siltation, but no measure of effects on salmon production directly	Findings based on limited sample material and sample period, need follow up on how salmon production is affected	NA	1
Guyette et al. 2013	Habitat and water quality	Decline in abundance and condition of juvenile salmon	Carcass analog nutrient addition with optimized timing for juvenile Atlantic salmon in headwater streams	Uncertain; Increased growth of juvenile salmon and potential increased overwinter survival and younger smolt age, but unclear how this influences overall population production	Heavier individual mass and longer standard length in juvenile salmon at treatment sites compared to control reaches for 4 months after treatment	NA	1
Hill et al. 2019	Fish passage/hydropower	Migration of Lake Champlain salmon disconnected by dam	Removal of Willsboro dam in Boquet River, NY	Uncertain; Rapid improvements in habitat quality after dam removal	Habitat improved, remains to be seen whether salmon production improves	NA	1

Hvidsten & Johnsen 1992	Habitat and water quality	River Soya, Norway, was canalized for agricultural purposes which affected the natural dynamic of sediment transport, reduced sediment granulometry and decreased the habitat quality for salmon juveniles.	Several small weirs were built on these rivers, covering the riverbank and entire river bottom with blasted stones.	Uncertain; population effect unclear. Restoration of the river bottom with blasted stones provided salmon with more substrate spaces. Densities of trout increased after the river bank was covered with stones.	Sediments transported downstream from the canalized river stretch decreased the densities of juvenile salmon and trout.	0	1
Izzo et al. 2016	Fish passage/hydropower	River connectivity reduced by dams and salmon population declining	Dam removal and installation of fish lifts	Uncertain; salmon easily passed sites where dams were removed but experienced prolonged delays at the fish lift	Need to investigate why passage was so poor at the fish lift	NA	1

ji	Fish passage/ hydropower/ stocking	Historically renowned major salmon rivers have been harnessed for hydropower for 40-60 years without provisions for fish passage.	Hydropower companies are obliged to compensate for the losses caused by dam construction by annual fish releases. Also, fishways were constructed in two rivers and more are planned to restore river connectivity	Uncertain; Successful first years of the fishway operation with 150-500 salmon and trout annually entering the river provoked public pressure for restoring runs of fish. no actual results of the restoration success are available yet, although background investigations and pilot studies have been carried out or are underway.	Projects have proved successful in bringing together authorities, hydropower companies, local organizations, and expertise from various institutions for a joint effort to tackle these multifaceted and multidisciplinary problems.	NA	1
Jutila and Pruuki 1988	Stocking	Decreasing wild production in Simojoki River	Stocking parr	Uncertain; smolt run increased but population effects not measured	Short-term benefits of stocking could not be extrapolated to restoration success (i.e. without further stocking) from the data presented	1	1

Kennedy et al. 2012	Stocking	Decline of escapement	Stocking of 0+ fry to maintain recruitment near historical levels. Habitat degradation noted but not addressed.	Uncertain; population effects unclear. Stocking of both unfed and fed-fry contributed to smolt production	Differences in the biological characteristics of wild vs. stocked salmon were noted and the fitness of offspring was questioned by authors. The long-term effect was not examined.	0	1
Kennedy et al. 2014	Habitat and water quality	Salmon disappearing in Northern Ireland	Installation of flow deflectors and boulder addition	Uncertain; increased juvenile salmon habitat with greater biomass of salmon on improved sites but fry recruitment unchanged	no change in overall salmon fry recruitment index,, around 30% of boulders got buried by fine sediments and limited the efficacy	NA	1
McCarthy et al. 2009	Habitat and water quality	Loss of spawning habitats due to hydropower development	Construction of a fish habitat compensation channel	Uncertain; population effects unclear. Successful mitigation of habitat loss may lead to improved salmon populations	Survey showed good habitat stability, a typical mean standing stock and verified spawning	NA	1

McLennan et al. 2019	Habitat and water quality	Loss of migratory fish reduced nutrient subsidies and resulted in oligotrophication	Simulation of Atlantic salmon carcasses by deposition at the end of spawning period	Uncertain; Quintupling of macroinvertebrate biomass compared to reference sites, faster growth of juvenile salmon and earlier smolt age	Positive effects on early life stages but does not report effects on spawning production	NA	1
Pedersen et al. 2007	Habitat and water quality	Channelisation, artificial draining, high nutrient loading to sea	Restoration of the river valley into a meandering river with wetlands, meadows and shallow lakes	Uncertain; Enhanced biodiversity attributable to higher quality habitat. Total predation mortality increased due to colonization of birds, but overall salmon population confounded by hatchery release	Cormorants arrived in the newly restored area and increased the predation mortality of smolts	NA	1

Perrier et al. 2010	Habitat and water quality	Migration barriers, canalization and degrading water quality in River Seine led to extinction of Atlantic salmon in the Seine River, France	No direct interventions to reestablish Atlantic salmon but progressive remediation of water quality	Uncertain; low number of spawners in a big river; Natural recolonization from long-distance straying and nearby stocked Atlantic salmon	Video counting of salmon in 2008 resulted in 162 individuals recolonizing the Seine	NA	1
Philippart et al. 1994	Stocking	Extinction of Atlantic salmon due to pollution, weirs, and overexploitation	Evaluating the potential of salmon restoration via smolt production in tributaries, experimental stocking	Uncertain; Promising results on re-establishment of salmon population, but remaining problems to be solved	Dense colonisation of suitable habitats, promising survival and growth rates, smoltification and migration; but water quality and fish passes need to be improved	NA	1

Raastad et al. 1993	Habitat and water quality	Regulation of rivers impacting survival and growth of young salmon	Habitat adjustment, building of rearing channel system, stocking, introducing dead organic material to enrich benthic fauna	Uncertain; increased density of macrobenthos and promising survival rate of young salmon	Preliminary results given at early stage of project; 30% survival of 1+ salmon	NA	1
Saavedra-Nieves et al. 2020	Stocking/ Fish Passage	Decline of salmon abundances in Ulla river due to fragmentation and low marine survival	Stocking actions, obstacle removal and fishway construction	Uncertain; Based on long-term data set (1992 - 2018) from fish trap, a gradual population increase to the early 1990s was observed, then remained relatively stable until 2007 and increased thereafter due to an increase in the number of wild salmon entering the river	Increase in the number of returning salmon in the Ulla River achieved over this period is due to salmon stocking, the connectivity restoration in the river and to a higher marine survival rate.	0	1

Bacon et al. 2015	Stocking	Decline of adult returns between 1966-1999. Presumed low over-winter ova survival and high within-cohort competition	Stock-recruit modelling of 33-year dataset to investigate whether ova-stocking program led to more smolts being produced	Failure; ova-stocking failed to increase freshwater production	Separated effects of natural production and ova-stocking interventions using native stock fish.	NA	NA
Bailey et al. 2010	Stocking	Density dependent effects on populations	Stocking and tagging of fry and assessment of growth, survival, and movement in relation to density	Failure; Level 1 not reached. Density dependent effects were apparent on growth but not movement or mortality	Additional research needed to understand density effects of stocking	0	1
Barlaup et al. 2009	Stocking	Decline in salmon due to acidification and hydropower development	Roe planting, restoration of spawning habitats, limited fishing for salmon	Failure; Level 1 Not reached Increased natural recruitment, but further measures needed for self maintaining population	Only about 10 % natural recruitment	0	1

Bolscher et al. 2013	Habitat and water quality, stocking	Extinction of Atlantic salmon in river Rhine	Rhine Action Plan for improvement of the Rhine river ecosystem and to reestablish salmon and sea trout	Failure; Level 1 not reached . reintroduction is threatened due to climate change and warming water temperature	Migration of Rhine salmon reduces above 23 °C, projections prognose up to 100 days per year of exceeding this temperature	0	1
Brunsdon et al. 2017	Stocking	Releases of hatchery fish yielding density-dependent mortality	Experimental comparison of growth between two stocking practices-releasing fish in groups or dispersing them along the river	Failure; No clear benefits of spreading out releases of hatchery stockings	Mobility in fish that were clump-stocked was greater than expected	0	1
Carr et al. 2004	Stocking	Decline in abundance of wild salmon	Releasing captive reared adult salmon to spawn	Failure; Level 1 not reached Method not effective, released adults didn't move upwards to spawning sites	Very few salmon fry were found the next year and these didn't seem to be offspring of the released salmons	0	1

Donadi et al. 2019	Habitat and water quality	Loss of exogenous shelter from wood affecting production of Atlantic salmon in rivers	Addition of large woody debris in river	Failure; No correlation between salmon abundance and woody debris in >3000 streams in Sweden	Stream width most important driver for salmon abundance	0	1
Dymond et al. 2019	Stocking	Extinction of Lake Ontario Atlantic salmon in 1800s	Release of hatchery-reared salmon	Failure; Small increase in salmon returns supported by hatchery, level 1 not reached	Failure to reestablish self-sustaining salmon population from hatchery releases	0	1
Glover et al. 2018	Stocking	Conservation stocking ongoing in Girnock Burn, Scotland to compensate for poor production	Conservation stocking	Failure; No overall benefit of stocking	long time monitoring was used for the comparison of natural population regulation and stocking management and showed that conservation stocking was not effective	0	1

Horreo et al. 2011	Habitat and water quality	Decline in abundance of salmon	Foreign stocking, supportive breeding, and restoration of habitat connectivity	Failure; Level 1 not reached . Habitat restoration was promising, but supportive breeding and foreign stocking had null or negative impacts on the population	High abundance increase after barrier removal, lower than 10% abundance increase due to supportive breeding, and adverse effects of foreign stocking on local adaptability	0	1
Koed et al. 2006	Habitat and water quality	Channelization, degraded habitats, forming of lake caused by subsiding soils	Restoration project with removal of dykes and meandering of river, monitoring the mortality of smolt before and after project	Failure; level 1 not reached Naturalization of the river doubled the smolt mortality owing to bird predation. An example of unintended consequences .	Newly formed lake was prime habitat for piscivorous cormorants to settle	0	1
Koljonen et al. 2013	Habitat and water quality	Channelization limiting salmon habitat resulting in low abundance	In-stream restoration project to increase available fish habitat	Failure; Level 1 not reached. Juvenile habitat improved but no response of age-1 salmon	Wintertime discharge was limiting habitat availability	0	1

Larocque et al. 2020	Stocking	Extinction of Lake Ontario Atlantic salmon in 1800s	Compare wild and hatchery smolt survival	Failure; wild smolts were 13.9 times more likely to survive the migration	Mortality for hatchery reared smolt was highest at release site and indicated high pre-migration mortality and stocking related mortality	0	1
Prignon et al. 1999	Stocking	Extinction of Atlantic salmon due to pollution, weirs, and overexploitation	Rearing, stocking, migration study and establishing improvement proposals	Failure; Level 1 not reached Good adaptation of stocked parr in river Ourthe basin, most smolts migrating at age 2, hydropower plants cause mortality	Efficiency of stocking: minimum of 2% for eggs, 3.0% for parr and 19.0% for pre-smolts; new fish passes are required	0	1


<p>Rivinoja et al. 2001</p>	<p>Fish passage/ hydropower/stocking</p>	<p>Baltic salmon rivers (in this case River Umealven in northern Sweden) have lost their natural juvenile production due to human activities blocking or reducing access to their spawning grounds, e.g. damming, power generation, partial hinders</p>	<p>Construction of fish ladders in existing dams and weirs. Stocking with hatchery salmon to reduce population losses.</p>	<p>Failure; Wild and hatchery salmon monitored through radio telemetry. Only 26% of the wild salmon and none of the hatchery salmon found the fish ladder</p>	<p>Salmon followed the main water discharge from the power station outlet and are thus directed away from the entrance to the bypass channel leading to the fish ladder.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>
-----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	----------	----------

Saltveit et al. 2006	Stocking	Stocking is undertaken in the River Suldalsl�gen, western Norway, to compensate for an estimated annual loss of 20�f000 Atlantic salmon smolts, <i>Salmo salar</i> L., caused by regulating the river for hydropower production	Between 160�f000 and 250�f000 one�sum mer old fish were experimentally stocked in the study area	Failure; Level 1 not reached. Only between 6 and 10 (<0.005%) were recaptured as adults in the river. Recaptured stocked fish never exceeded 0.03% by number, despite smolts dominating the stocking material in recent years	The lack of positive response to stocking is possibly due to lesser age, smaller size and later migration of hatchery smolts, and that seawater tolerance of hatchery smolts is poorly developed, all factors increasing mortality at sea.	0	1
----------------------	----------	---	--	---	--	---	---


Wallace and Curry 2017	Stocking	Decreasing wild production in Miramichi River, Canada	Enhancement stocking of 0+ fry	Failure; Level 1 not reached No overall benefit of stocking on site density of parr	Parr densities were lower than predicted (relative to wild parr) at sites previously stocked. Did not account for the population-level effect of brood stock removal.	0	1
------------------------	----------	---	--------------------------------	--	---	---	---

926

927 **Figures**



928



929


930

931 Figure 1. Expert assessments of the risks posed by 15 stressors to salmon populations in salmon-
932 bearing regions. A small number of experts from each country contributed to the assessment and
933 were asked to assign and integers from 0 (no threat) to 3 (major threat) to categorically score rank

934 the threat posed by each stressor. Scores are displayed for each country and each threat (top).
935 Countries are sorted left to right from lowest to highest total score and stressors are sorted from
936 bottom to top from lowest to highest total score. Summed scores are also displayed (bottom).
937

938


939



940

941

942 Figure 2. Conceptual diagram of restoration for Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). The figure provides
943 a guide towards achieving success in restoration. As managers approach small populations with
944 poor status (e.g. threatened, Endangered, Critically Endangered, Extinct), restoration is needed to
945 work towards a self-sustaining population. A usable surplus, defined as a population size with
946 more individuals than are needed to replace the population (i.e. beyond spawning target or carrying
947 capacity), can provide provisioning ecosystem services in the form of valuable fisheries. Numbers
948 correspond to levels of success.




949

950

951 Figure 3. Illustration of successful Atlantic salmon restoration initiatives. Success levels
 952 correspond to our evaluation, with Level 1 indicating a self-sustaining population, Level 2 a robust
 953 self-sustaining population, and Level 3 a population with a harvestable surplus. Figure is based on
 954 data available in Table 2.

955



956

957 Figure 4. A schematic diagram of considerations as to when and if, when, and how to use hatcheries
 958 for conservation. Critically Endangered populations may be defined differently depending on
 959 jurisdiction, but in general should be relative to biological reference points defined for a population
 960 relative to conservation limits (CR; i.e. extinction risk).

961

962

963

964 **Appendix A: Geographical context of salmon restoration pressures**

965 Please grade the following pressures, with regard to the need to solve them in order to restore
966 populations of wild Atlantic salmon in your country (PLEASE NOTE, EVEN IF YOU AWARE
967 OF SOME REGIONALITY FOR A PRESSURE IN YOUR COUNTRY, STILL SCORE THE
968 PRESSURE AS A SINGLE VALUE FOR THE WHOLE COUNTRY).

969 Please score each stressor as 0, no impact; 1, minor impact; 2 moderate impact; 3 major impact -
970 use only integers, give your best estimate FOR EVERY PRESSURE LISTED!

971 The order of listing of stressors does NOT imply any importance of one over another

972

973 **Pressure** **Score**

974 Acidification

975 Migration and dispersal barriers (dams etc)

976 Impacts of hydropower other than barriers (hydropeaking, thermal effects,
977 hydropower-related abstraction and habitat alteration)

978 Other water abstraction (non-hydropower)

979 Overexploitation by fisheries

980 Channelisation, dredging (including gravel extraction) and flood control

981 Sewage and organic pollution from urban sources

982 Excessive nutrients and/or fine sediment from poor land management

983 Hazardous chemical substances (heavy metals, pesticides etc)

984 Excessive predator stress due to human

985 influence (e.g. cormorant, seal, sawbill duck, stocked trout)

986 Farmed salmon escapes

- 987 Salmon pathogens/parasites facilitated by human action (e.g. viruses,
- 988 bacteria, flukes, salmon lice)
- 989 Invasive species
- 990 Climate change
- 991 Stocking of *S. salar*
- 992 Other (please list:)