Ancestry, population structure, and conservation genetics of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) in the upper Missouri River, USA

Douglas P. Peterson[1]
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Ecological Services
585 Shepard Way, Helena, MT 59601 USA
Ph: 406-449-5225 x221, FAX: 406-449-5339
Doug_Peterson@fws.gov

William R. Ardren[2]
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Conservation Genetics Program
Abernathy Fish Technology Center
1440 Abernathy Creek Road, Longview, WA 98632 USA
William_Ardren@fws.gov

Revision 1: April 23, 2009
Accepted: June 17, 2009

[1] Corresponding author
[2] Current address: Western New England Complex, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 11 Lincoln Street, Essex Junction, VT 05452 USA

Abstract

We genotyped Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) at 10 microsatellite loci in 18 samples (n = 726) from Montana, Wyoming, and Saskatchewan to determine genetic relationships among native, captive, and naturalized populations in the upper Missouri River basin; assess patterns in genetic diversity; and infer recent demographic histories. Substantial genetic subdivision was observed among sample populations (global F_{ST}=0.10). Canadian populations have been isolated from Missouri River populations long enough for mutation to have caused genetic differences between regions (mean pairwise F_{ST} = 0.18, R_{ST} = 0.54). Within the Missouri River basin, most naturalized lacustrine populations traced their ancestry to Red Rock lakes. Two populations in headwater lakes within the Big Hole River watershed appear to be native. We found no evidence for introgression of Canadian-origin grayling, nor any effect of hatchery stocking in native populations. The native fluvial Big Hole River group was genetically distinct and most diverse (H_E = 0.89), whereas native Madison River and Red Rock lakes populations exhibited lower genetic diversity (H_E = 0.74 and 0.80, respectfully) and evidence of recent bottlenecks. The existing Big Hole and Red Rock populations are at low abundance but do not appear to be at immediate risk of inbreeding depression (N_e 207.7-228.2).

Keywords: bottleneck, habitat fragmentation, hatchery stocking, microsatellites, population subdivision

Introduction

Understanding population-level consequences of patterns in neutral genetic variation has become a preliminary step in the development of conservation programs for many commercially-exploited or sensitive species. In addition to helping determine ancestral relationships and phylogeny, these patterns are commonly used to infer genetic connectivity among demes and help define populations (Waples and Gaggiotti 2006), which are the logical focus of conservation and management (Morris and Doak 2002). Microsatellite DNA markers can help identify cryptic population structure (e.g., So et al. 2006), and reconstruct demographic histories for rare species (e.g, Nielsen et al. 1999). Genetic-based methods can both characterize and distinguish between historical and contemporary factors that influence the demographic histories of extant populations (Pearse and Crandall 2004), for example glacial events across tens of thousands of years (Bernatchez and Wilson 1998) versus recent habitat fragmentation, human exploitation, nonnative species invasions, or other impacts over tens or hundreds of years (e.g., Koskinen et al. 2002a; Stamford and Taylor 2005). These properties make microsatellite markers particularly amenable to understanding the conservation status of northern freshwater fishes, like Arctic grayling, (*Thymallus articus*), that have been strongly influenced by both types of factors.

Arctic grayling are stenothermic cold-water, salt-water intolerant salmonids. They are native to Arctic Ocean drainages of Alaska and northwestern Canada, as far east as Hudson's Bay, and westward across northern Eurasia to the Ural mountains (Scott and Crossman 1973; Froufe et al. 2005; Weiss et al. 2006). In North America, they are also native to northern Pacific Ocean drainages as far south as the Stikine River in British Columbia. To the south and east of the main species distribution, two disjunct groups of Arctic grayling are native to the coterminous United States: one in Michigan (extirpated in the late 1930s, Hubbs and Lagler

1949), and one in the upper Missouri River basin in Montana and Wyoming (extant). The Michigan and Missouri River populations were isolated from northern drainages by Wisconsin glaciation (Pielou 1991), but the latter apparently began to diverge genetically before that time (i.e., >70 000 yr ago, Redenbach and Taylor 1999). Glacial history and genetic data suggest the Missouri River population was founded from individuals that survived Pleistocene glacial advance in a refuge in the upper Missouri River system or southwestern Alberta, or in both places (Redenbach and Taylor 1999; Stamford and Taylor 2004).

The historical distribution of Arctic grayling in Wyoming and Montana was thought to encompass approximately 2000 km of lotic habitat in the upper Missouri River system above the Great Falls (Kaya 1992). A migratory, river-dwelling (fluvial) life history presumably predominated based on historical reports of Arctic grayling in the main-stem Missouri River and its major tributaries (e.g., Madison, Jefferson, and Gallatin rivers), and the paucity of lakes accessible for colonization (Vincent 1962; Kaya 1992). The current distribution of native Arctic grayling in the Missouri River system is only a fraction (<5%) the historical estimate (Kaya 1992). The combined effects of overexploitation, dams, stream dewatering, and interaction with nonnative trout species are suspected in this decline (Vincent 1962; Kaya 1992, 2000). Currently, native Arctic grayling occur only in southwestern Montana at three locations: (*i*) the Big Hole River and perhaps two small lakes in that drainage; (*ii*) Red Rock lakes, which are two small natural lakes in the headwaters of the Beaverhead River system; and (*iii*) Ennis Reservoir on the Madison River. The Big Hole River population has received special conservation focus as the single-remaining fluvial Arctic grayling population in the coterminous US (Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks (MFWP) 1995).

Until recently, fluvial Arctic grayling in Montana were considered a candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act (US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 2007), and the decision not to extend US federal protection to this population remains controversial. Nonetheless, conservation efforts continue to focus on improving habitat conditions in the Big Hole River and re-establishing other fluvial populations in historic waters using fish derived from the Big Hole River (MFWP 1995, 2007). Ironically, while native Arctic grayling in the upper Missouri River have declined precipitously in the past 100 yr, culture and stocking of grayling within and beyond the region has been extensive (Kelley 1931; Kaya 1990; MFWP 2005b). Dozens of naturalized Arctic grayling populations have been established in Montana lakes (MFWP 2005b). Through the mid-20th century, millions of hatchery-reared Arctic grayling of uncertain origin were planted in Montana waters containing extant native populations, including the Big Hole River, raising concerns that interbreeding with introduced fish has altered indigenous gene pools (Everett 1986), which potentially disrupts local adaptation (e.g., Allendorf et al. 2001).

Existing genetic data support the long-term geographic isolation of Arctic grayling from the upper Missouri River (Everett 1986; Redenbach and Taylor 1999; Stamford and Taylor 2004). These same data provide less insight into ancestral relationships among the extant native and introduced populations within the Missouri River system. In general, allozymes may exhibit less variation in recently diverged populations (Hedrick 1999), which may explain why protein electrophoresis has proven only moderately informative for distinguishing among Arctic grayling populations in Montana and Wyoming (Everett 1986; R. Leary, University of Montana, unpublished report, 2005; Campton 2006). The existing mtDNA data are uninformative within this region as 24 of 25 individuals from the Big Hole River, Red Rock lakes, and Madison River

populations had the same composite haplotype (Redenbach and Taylor 1999). In contrast, a genetic signature of population structure is often detected at the basin or sub-basin scales for philopatric freshwater fishes like salmonids (e.g., Costello et al. 2003; Hendry et al. 2004). Indeed, Hop and Gharrett (1989) used electrophoresis to determine population structure of Arctic graying in the Chena River, Alaska; and studies of European grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*) have found significant population structuring within a river system (e.g., Weiss et al. 2002; Gum et al. 2003; Meldgaard et al. 2003), or even within the same lake (Koskinen et al. 2001). Fine-scale genetic analyses of North American Arctic grayling using microsatellites are few (see Stamford and Taylor 2005), but may help answer important conservation questions.

Our general objective was to use microsatellite markers to more clearly characterize ancestral relationships and genetic differentiation among native and naturalized Arctic grayling populations in the upper Missouri River. Specifically, we used these markers to infer the genetic origin of introduced populations, to determine if significant admixture between indigenous and introduced fish has resulted from past stocking, and to characterize the population structure among native populations at the basin scale (i.e., upper Missouri River). At the sub-basin scale within the Big Hole River, we sought to establish whether the fluvial population functions genetically as a single, panmictic population or as a set of demes linked by occasional gene flow. For the supported native population groupings, we used genetic data to deduce their demographic histories and identify if, and when, abrupt population declines have occurred. Results are discussed relative to the genetic status and conservation of native populations with special emphasis on the Big Hole River, and continuing efforts to restore fluvial populations in indigenous waters within the upper Missouri River basin.

Materials and methods

Study area and sample collection

We collected samples thought to represent native populations and their derivatives, introduced populations of Montana or Canadian origin, and a reference population in northeast Saskatchewan, Canada (Table 1, Figure 1).

Table 1 near here

Figure 1 near here

Native or putative native populations and derived conservation populations

From the Big Hole River we obtained Arctic grayling samples from five discrete but hydrologically connected locations (populations 1-5, Table 1) thought to represent different demes based on occurrence of young-of-the-year fish (e.g., Liknes and Gould 1987; MFWP 2005a, 2007). Mussigbrod (6) and Miner (7) are samples from small (<50 ha) headwater lakes in the upper Big Hole River system which are now isolated from the main stem by a diversion dam and habitat degradation, respectively. Red Rock lakes (8) includes adfluvial grayling collected during their spawning migration into Red Rock Creek. Madison River-Ennis Reservoir (9) are grayling collected in or upstream from Ennis Reservoir. This reservoir was formed by construction of an impassible dam in 1903 (Figure 1).

Waters containing populations 1-9 were extensively stocked with grayling, primarily from the Washoe Park Hatchery (Table 2). Kelley (1931) reported that the Washoe Park (Anaconda) hatchery and a population in nearby Georgetown Lake were founded with grayling eggs from Red Rock lakes (Elk Springs Creek) and the Madison River (Meadow Creek). The Bozeman hatchery population was founded from Red Rock lakes grayling (Kelley 1931).

Table 2 near here

The Ruby River (10), Axolotl Lake (11), and Bozeman Fish Technology Center (12) samples are derived from Big Hole River grayling taken into captivity for conservation purposes. The Ruby River has been stocked with captive-spawned juvenile graying in an attempt to re-establish a fluvial population (MFWP 2004, 2007). Axolotl Lake is a closed-basin lake that

contains a brood reserve established 20 yr ago (MFWP 2007). Grayling (manually) spawned from Axolotl Lake have been transplanted to the Ruby River and elsewhere in the upper Missouri River system (MFWP 2007). The Bozeman Fish Technology Center was a hatchery genetic reserve established between 1988 and 1992 (M. Toner, USFWS, Bozeman, MT, personal communication).

Introduced and Canadian-origin populations

Odell (13) and Bobcat lakes (16) are a small (<15 ha) headwater lakes in the Wise River system, a major tributary to the Big Hole River (Figure 1). We could not locate any stocking records for these locations (Table 1). Grebe Lake (15) is a headwater lake (<40 ha) in the Madison River system within Yellowstone National Park. Grebe Lake is isolated by a natural geologic barrier, but grayling were introduced in 1921 and the lake became a major source of grayling eggs shipped throughout the western US (Kaya 2000). Sunnyslope Canal (17) contains an introduced population derived from the stocking of its source reservoir between 1937-43 (Barndt and Kaya 2000).

Fuse Lake (14) is in the Columbia River basin and contains a population introduced in 1952 from the Mackenzie River system, Canada (Everett 1986; Kaya 1990). We included this sample to determine if Canadian-origin grayling were further transplanted within the upper Missouri River. The Fond du Lac (18) area in northeastern Saskatchewan is also part of the Mackenzie River system, and Fond du Lac grayling were included as a reference population.

Samples from most locations consisted of finclips collected from adults representing multiple cohorts. Native grayling were so rare in the Big Hole and Madison river that samples were pooled across years (Table 1), and generally included all available individuals, including young-of-the-year when present. Swamp Creek and Wisdom samples were primarily young-of-

the-year from two different cohorts, because adults were not present. Only young-of-the-year were present at the time of sample collection in Steel Creek, so we systematically selected a sub-sample of individuals for genotyping to reduce the probability of including full siblings. Scales were the DNA source for the 1996 Madison River-Ennis Reservoir samples (9) and the entire Fond du Lac sample (18).

DNA extraction and genotyping of microsatellite loci

Genomic DNA was extracted from a 1 mm^2 piece of fin tissue or a single scale by placing it in 200 µL of 5% chelex containing 0.2 mg•mL^{-1} of proteinase K, incubating it for 2 h at 56°C, boiling it for 8 min at 100°C, and vortexing it for 30 sec. We used 2 µL of the supernatant in 15 µL PCR reactions to amplify ten microsatellite loci (Table 3). Conditions for PCR amplification, primer sequences, and methods for determining multilocus genotypes for all loci are reported in Diggs and Ardren (2008).

Data analyses

Within population diversity

Average population gene diversities (H_E, Nei 1987) and allelic richness for each locus were estimated using the program HP-RARE 1.0 (Kalinowski 2005). Allelic richness was estimated using a rarefaction procedure to account for unequal sample sizes (Kalinowski 2004). The allele permution test in FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet 2001) was used to test for differences between groups of populations in the mean values of allelic richness and H_E. Conformance of genotypic frequencies to Hardy-Weinberg expectations (HWE) was evaluated using the methods of Guo and Thompson (1992) via the program GENEPOP 4.0.7 (Raymond and Rousset 1995). Tests for genotypic disequilibrium at all pairs of loci in each sample were also calculated using GENEPOP 4.0.7, with 10 000 dememorizations, 10 000 batches and 10 000 iterations per batch. Statistical

significance levels used to detect deviations from HWE or genotypic equilibrium ratios were adjusted for the number of simultaneous tests by the sequential Bonferroni correction (Rice 1989).

Sample collections containing close relatives have the potential to bias population genetic measures of diversity. Many of the samples for this study were collected from populations that have experienced recent declines thus increasing the chance for the sample containing relatives. In addition, the tendency for juvenile salmonids to remain in close proximity during their juvenile life stage often results in the sampling of family groups (Allendorf and Phelps 1981). We estimated the level of relatedness in each sample by calculating the mean pairwise identity (*I*; Belkhir et al. 2002). The probability that each sample was a random draw from a panmictic population was estimated in IDENTIX (Belkhir et al. 2002) by permutating across genotypes and generating 1000 randomized psedo-samples under the assumption of no relatedness. The proportion of psedo-samples that produced a larger mean pairwise identity than the observed mean pairwise identity was used to calculate the p-value for the null hypothesis that the sample represented a random draw from a panmictic population.

Population structure

We used contingency tests of allele frequency homogeneity to test the null hypothesis of panmixia between any pair of sample collections. Contingency tests were conducted using the methods of Raymond and Rousset (1995) as implemented in GENEPOP 4.0.7. For each locus, we estimated the exact probability that the observed allele frequencies were drawn from the same population using the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods to provide an unbiased estimate of the exact probability for each randomization test, we ran 100 batches of 5000 replicates each, with 10 000 dememorisation steps. For each comparison we used the Fisher's

combined probability test (χ^2_F) as a composite test over all loci and used the false discovery rate (FDR) method of Narum (2006) to set a experiment-wise α at the 0.05 level that accounts for multiple tests.

The level of genetic variation among populations was estimated by F_{ST} using the θ statistic of Weir and Cockerham (1984). Pairwise F_{ST} values were estimated in GENEPOP 4.0.7. Estimates of F_{ST} over all sample locations and associated 95% confidence intervals, generated by bootstrap sampling over loci, were calculated in FSTAT 2.9.3.2 (Goudet 2001). Testing for different ancestral histories between populations was accomplished by comparing global variance in allelic identity (i.e., F_{ST}) and allelic size (i.e., R_{ST}) measures of genetic difference. Under the null hypothesis ($R_{ST} = F_{ST}$) differentiation is caused mainly by drift while under the alternative hypothesis ($R_{ST} > F_{ST}$) stepwise mutations have contributed to differentiation (Hardy et al. 2003). SPAGEDI v1.2 (Hardy and Vekemans 2002) was used to calculate R_{ST} and to test for significant differences between F_{ST} and R_{ST} using the allele size permutation test of Hardy et al. (2003) ($\alpha = 0.05$ with FDR adjustment). We used standard error estimates from SPAGEDI v1.2 to calculate 95% confidence intervals for the average pairwise R_{ST} estimates over all populations. To test for geographic structure and consistency with a stepping-stone model of gene flow among native populations with presumed historical connectivity we examined the correlation between the natural log of pairwise fluvial distances (km) and genetic differentiation using Mantel tests implemented in GENEPOP 3.7 (Rousset 1997).

Genetic relationships among populations were inferred by generating an unrooted neighbor-joining tree based on Cavalli-Sforza and Edwards (1967) chord distance. Confidence in the observed topology of the NJ-population tree was assessed using the bootstrap procedure in

PHYLIP v3.6 (Felsenstein 1992) based on 1000 resamples across loci. The consensus NJ-population tree was generated in PHYLIP v3.6.

Effective population size

We estimated the long-term effective population size (N_e) using the heterozygosity-based methods of Ohta and Kimura (1973) and Hartl and Clark (1989). Both methods assume selective neutrality and predict that at mutation-drift equilibrium, N_e is a function of H_E. Ohta and Kimura (1973) assume a step-wise mutation model (SMM), whereas Hartl and Clark (1989) assume an infinite allele mutation model (IAM). We used the most commonly applied microsatellite mutation rate for fishes, $\mu = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ (Estoup and Angers 1998).

(1) $$N_{eSMM} = \frac{\left[\left(\frac{1}{1-H_E}\right)^2 - 1\right]}{8\mu}$$ (Ohta and Kimura 1973)

(2) $$N_{eIAM} = \frac{H_E}{4\mu(1-H_E)}$$ (Hartl and Clark 1989)

The true long-term N_e should be in between N_{eSMM} and N_{eIAM} because these two models represent the extremes of the mutation process for microsatellite loci (Busch et al. 2007).

We estimated contemporary N_e of each population using the single-sample linkage disequilibrium method of Waples (2006) implemented in program LDNe (Waples and Do 2008). This method provides an estimate of the effective number of breeding adults that parented the sampled population. In the analysis we excluded all alleles with frequencies less than 0.02, and used the jackknife procedure to estimate the 95% confidence intervals.

Tests for recent population declines

Heterozygosity excess (Cornuet and Luikart 1996) and low ratios of allelic number to allelic size range (*M*-ratio; Garza and Williamson 2001) were used to screen populations for genetic signatures of recent bottlenecks. The two methods are expected to detect bottlenecks on different timescales allowing us to infer the time period that population decline or recovery occurred (Williamson-Natesan 2005; Spear et al. 2006). The *M*-ratio method remains sensitive to size reductions even up to 500 generations following the event while the heterozygosity-based methods is most powerful at detecting more recent bottlenecks (e.g., 0.2 – 4.0 N_e generations; Luikart and Cornuet 1998). We expected that: (a) native Missouri River populations (1-9) would exhibit bottlenecks detectible by both methods because of major habitat alterations 50-100 yr ago and subsequent demographic declines; (b) derived conservation populations (10-12) would show more recent bottlenecks if hatchery effects were significant; and (c) introduced populations (13-17) founded > 50 years ago may exhibit founder effects (significant *M*-ratio).

Tests for heterozygosity excess were done with the program BOTTLENECK v1.2.02 (Piry et al. 1999) using a two-phase model (TPM) of microsatellite mutation (Di Rienzo et al. 1994) with parameter settings of 95% SMM, 5% IAM and 12% variance in multi-step mutations (i.e., presumed model for microsatellites: Piry et al. 1999; Lippé et al. 2006). Significance of heterozygosity excess observed in a population was evaluated by a one-sided Wilcoxon signed rank test (α=0.05) comparing the level of deviation from the null hypothesis of 50:50 heterozygosity deficiency:excess based on 5000 simulation iterations. *M*-ratios were calculated in M_P_VAL (Garza and Williamson 2001). The *M*-ratio is a measure of the number of alleles (k) to the allele size range (r). The *M*-ratio (k/r) is expected to be small in a recently-bottlenecked population because k is reduced faster than r. Program M_P_VAL implemented a

model of microsatellite evolution assuming 88% one-step mutations (p_g), and 2.8 average size of non one-step mutations (Δ_g) (Garza and Williamson 2001). We explored a range of sizes for the pre-bottlenecked population (N_e = 500 and 5000) and a microsatellite mutation rate of $\mu = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ to estimate θ (= $4 \times N_e \times \mu$). Statistical significance of the observed *M*-ratio was calculated using the program Critical_*M* (Garza and Williamson 2001), with the critical value (M_c) for each sample such that 95% of 10 000 simulations of an equilibrium population had *M*-ratio > M_c.

Results

Within population diversity

We observed moderate to high levels of genetic diversity in Arctic grayling across all 10 microsatellite loci. Expected heterozygosites (H_E) over all loci ranged from 0.63 in Sunnyslope Canal to 0.89 in four Big Hole River samples (Table 3; see also Supplement 1), and averaged 0.80 across all samples The number of alleles per locus (N_A) ranged from 5.0 in Sunnyslope Canal to 16.7 in Swamp Creek (a tributary to the Big Hole River), and averaged 12.7 across all samples. The Big Hole River group exhibited higher allelic richness using a sample of 36 genes (N_A^{36} =13.24) and H_E (0.89) than the other native populations combined (i.e., populations #6-9; N_A^{36} = 9.46 and H_E = 0.79, $p<0.05$ for both comparisons).

Table 3 near here

Genotypic frequencies were in HWE for 175 of 180 tests. Only Axolotol Lake (11), Miner Lake (7), and Bozeman Fish Technology Center (12) were out of HWE for 3 loci, 1 locus, and 1 locus, respectively (Table 3). Significant linkage disequilibrium was observed at only 10 of 801 pairs of loci tested over all populations, and all but one of linked pairs occurred in Axolotl Lake (n = 9 pairs of loci).

Individuals within sample populations did not appear to be highly related to one another, with a few exceptions. None of the populations violated the test assumption of being more

related than expected based on a random draw individuals from a panmictic population (lowest one-sided p-value = 0.053, average p-value = 0.56, SD = 0.32). Most populations had relatedness coefficients (*I*) less than 0.25 (i.e., analogous to half siblings; Table 3). Fish sampled in the Big Hole River were less related on average (mean *I* = 0.14) than fish sampled from the other native Missouri River populations (mean *I* = 0.25). The Sunnyslope Canal was nearly consistent with a population of full siblings (*I* = 0.49).

Population structure

We observed substantial genetic subdivision among grayling populations outside of the connected Big Hole River (Table 4). Pairwise F_{ST} estimates generally mirrored the differences in allele frequencies: genetic differentiation among demes within the connected Big Hole River was minimal ($F_{ST} \leq 0.0055$, homogeneity in allele frequences in 8 of 10 comparisons) whereas differentiation between the Big Hole River group (i.e., #1-5) and all other wild native and naturalized populations was greater ($F_{ST} \geq 0.035$, heterogeneity in allele frequencies in 10 of 10 cases). The greatest differentiation was generally observed between Canadian-origin populations (Fuse Lake, Fond du Lac) and those from the Missouri River system (range F_{ST} = 0.13-0.31). Canadian-origin populations contained many alleles not found in any of the Montana populations, a high frequency of private alleles at six loci, and a very different distribution of allele size ranges (Supplement 2). Pairwise F_{ST} values between the five native grayling populations in Montana (#1-5, 6, 7, 8, and 9) ranged from at least 0.071 between the combined Big Hole River group (#1-5) and all other populations, to 0.174 between the Red Rock lakes (#8) and the Madison River-Ennis Reservoir (#9).

Table 4 near here

The global R_{ST} of 0.25 (95% CI 0.17-0.33; n = 14 populations with #1-5 group and #6-18) was much larger than the corresponding global F_{ST} of 0.10 (95% CI 0.07-0.15) indicating

that F_{ST} underestimates the actual levels of genetic structure in some comparisons. The allele size permutation test identified 41 of 91 pair-wise comparisons of populations in which $R_{ST} > F_{ST}$ (Table 4; the 91 comparisons exclude individual estimates for sample sites within the connected Big Hole River #1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). Pairwise R_{ST} values were largest between Canadian-origin populations (#14, 18) and the upper Missouri River populations (#1-9), with the largest value ($R_{ST} = 0.76$) observed between Mussingbrod Lake (#6) and Fond du Lac (#18). Mussingbrod Lake (#6) was the most genetically distinct among the native Missouri River populations (# 1-9) based on pairwise R_{ST} estimates. The introduced population in Bobcat Lake (#16) had $R_{ST} > F_{ST}$ for all comparisons except for with Red Rock lakes (#8).

The neighbor-joining dendrogram revealed five genetically distinct groups (Figure 2). Distinctiveness of the Canadian-origin populations was highly supported with a 100% bootstrap support for the separation of these two populations from all others. The Big Hole River group was also very distinct with a 96% bootstrap support. Three moderately supported groups consisting of Red Rock Creek, Madison River, and the two isolated lakes in the Big Hole River watershed were also identified, although the relationships of these three groups to one another was not well defined. Affinity of the naturalized populations with their sources was apparent in the topology of dendrogram. Overall levels of genetic differentiation were greater among natural populations than among naturalized populations and their source populations.

Figure 2 near here

Clusters of individuals from native grayling locations in the Missouri River (# 1-9) identified using the Bayesian method of STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al. 2000) were consistent with patterns of population structure observed with genic tests, F_{ST}, R_{ST} and the phylogenetic analysis (Supplement 3). Evaluation of the assignment of individuals to six clusters had a clear biological interpretation based on geography and physical isolation. There was little support for

population structure within the connected Big Hole River (#1-5), however fish from this system did form a cluster that was distinct from the other locations sampled. Fish collected from Mussingbrod Lake (#6), Miner Lake, Red Rock Lakes (#7), Madison River (#8), and Fuse Lake (#14) all formed distinct genetic clusters.

We did not detect a statistically significant isolation-by-distance effect based on based on genetic differentiation that considered mutation (R_{ST}, n = 10, Spearman's $r_s = 0.164$, Mantel p-value = 0.35) among the five presumed native populations in the upper Missouri River system (Supplement 4). Differentiation based on genetic drift (F_{ST}) did indicate isolation-by-distance (Supplement 4), however F_{ST} underestimates differentiation among sample pairs that include Miner and Mussigbrod lakes where differences are due, in part, to mutation (Table 4).

Effective population size

Historical N_e of native Missouri River grayling ranged from ~1800 to 20 000, and was highest for the Big Hole River group (~4000 – 20 000) and derived populations (Table 5). Estimates of contemporary N_e were generally much lower (11 of 15 populations < 500), though precision was low in some cases and six populations had estimates or upper confidence limits that were infinite. Contemporary N_e for most native Missouri River populations were typically between 150 and 300 (range 162.3-286.3), with the exception of Mussigbrod Lake (N_e = 1496.8). Effective size for the Big Hole River group was 207.6, but N_e for two derived populations (Axolotl Lake, Bozeman FTC) was much less (29.5 and 38, respectively).

Table 5 near here

Six populations stood out in a bivariate plot of the mean number of alleles per locus versus the mean number of private alleles per locus (Figure 3). Sunnyslope Canal and Madison River both had low number of alleles and a low level of private alleles suggesting these populations have a small N_e relative to the rest of the populations and they are genetically similar

Figure 3 near here

to the other Montana populations. The Canadian-origin populations had the highest levels of private alleles and an intermediate level of mean number of alleles; indicating long-term genetic isolation relative to Montana populations. Among Montana populations, Miner Lake had the most private alleles per locus suggesting it has had a relatively low level of gene flow with the other native Montana populations. The highest number of alleles was observed in the Big Hole River group which is consistent with this population having a comparatively large N_e.

Population bottlenecks

The Ruby River and Axolotl Lake samples experienced recent bottlenecks based on the heterozygosity excess test. Thirteen of 14 sample populations exhibited bottlenecks by the *M*-ratio test using least one of the presumed θ values. Only the Big Hole River group did not, though its *M*-ratio estimate (0.818) was close to the critical value at $\theta = 1$ ($M_c = 0.813$).

Discussion

Ancestry and population structure in Missouri River Arctic grayling

Microsatellite DNA markers confirm earlier findings that Arctic grayling from the upper Missouri River have been separated from Canadian populations for a long time, perhaps even before the most recent glacial advance (Redenbach and Taylor 1999). Private alleles in the Canadian populations were at high frequency with size distributions distinct from Montana samples, and very high R_{ST} values indicate that mutation, in addition to genetic drift, is responsible for the differentiation.

Arctic grayling from the connected Big Hole River form a genetic group distinct from other native populations in the Madison River-Ennis Reservoir and Red Rock lakes. In turn, there is also moderate support that these latter two populations each form discrete genetic groups. Population groupings based on protein electrophoresis previously found no genetic

distinction between Big Hole and Madison river grayling (Everett 1986; R. Leary, University of Montana, unpublished report, 1990), perhaps because only 2 of 39 allozyme loci were polymorphic.

With the exception of the Canadian-origin Fuse Lake population, naturalized lacustrine Arctic grayling populations in the dataset appear to trace their ancestry to adfluvial grayling from Red Rocks lakes. This differs from the historical interpretation that fish from the Madison River made a significant genetic contribution to naturalized populations derived from the Georgetown Lake and Washoe Park Hatchery populations (Kelley 1931; Everett 1986; Kaya 1990). These now-extinct stocks were a major source of further grayling introductions in Montana (Kaya 2000; MFWP 2005b). We were not able to locate archived tissue from Georgetown and Washoe grayling so the genetic composition of the stocked fish is unknown, but the most direct explanation for genetic similarity among naturalized populations is a common origin. We hypothesize a founder effect from stocking of Red Rock-origin fish is the reason for high R_{ST} in Bobcat Lake relative to all other populations except for Red Rock lakes. The distribution of allele sizes in Bobcat Lake grayling was consistent with other Missouri River samples, and Bobcat Lake grayling also cluster with Missouri River populations (and not those from Canada).

Genetic and biogeographic data suggest that Arctic grayling in Miner and Mussigbrod lakes may be remnant native populations. The level of genetic differentiation in these populations also indicates they have been demographically independent for some time. Mussingbrod Lake had $R_{ST} > F_{ST}$ relative to the connected Big Hole River and Miner Lake, indicating it has been isolated long enough for mutation to have contributed to its genetic distinction. In contrast, Miner Lake had $R_{ST} = F_{ST}$ relative to the connected Big Hole River, indicating genetic drift has caused the observed differentiation and the population has been

isolated for less time than the Mussingbrod Lake population. Stocking of hatchery fish could also account for large R_{ST} values in these lakes, however, both Miner and Mussigbrod lakes were strongly differentiated from the Red Rock lakes population with $R_{ST} > F_{ST}$ for both comparisons (F_{ST} = 0.15-0.16; R_{ST} = 0.32-0.48). In addition, Miner and Mussigbrod lakes did not cluster with other naturalized populations apparently derived from Red Rock lakes. Such differentiation would be unlikely if Red Rocks grayling were stocked in those waters and made a significant genetic contribution to the extant population. Presence of other native fishes in high-elevation lakes in the upper Big Hole River watershed (e.g., Vincent 1963) demonstrates historical connectivity with the main-stem river. Indigenous burbot (*Lota lota*) and longnose sucker (*Catostomus catostomus*) populations in Miner and Mussigbrod lakes (B. Snyder, MFWP, personal communication, 2006) implies natural colonization by grayling was also possible. Consequently, we conclude that grayling populations in Miner and Mussigbrod lakes are not solely derived from stocking. The timing of the initial colonization of these lakes by graying and other native fishes is unknown and warrants further investigation.

We found no evidence for introgression of Canadian-origin fish in Missouri River grayling samples. Moreover, we did not find any indication that extant native Arctic grayling in the Big Hole River, Madison River-Ennis Reservoir, or Red Rock lakes interbred with stocked fish originating from within the Missouri River basin or that these native populations now represent genetic admixtures. Genetic homogenization could be one consequence of interbreeding with hatchery grayling derived from a single source (e.g., Red Rock lakes). In contrast, all the native Missouri River populations appear to form distinct genetic groups. Everett (1986) also concluded that stocking was not successful or contributed little to the

spawning population in the Big Hole River, and that geographic structuring was the most direct explanation for genetic (allozyme) differences among grayling in Montana and Wyoming.

Thymallus populations influenced by intraspecific stocking sometimes exhibit greater genetic diversity than unaltered native populations because of the introduction of nonnative genes and Wahlund effects (e.g., Gum et al. 2003). The Big Hole group was the most diverse sample population, but to attribute this to admixture from stocking, one would have to discount landscape genetic arguments that greater diversity in the Big Hole population (relative to other native populations) could be a function of multiple spawning locations, and greater habitat extent (e.g., Neville et al. 2006) or habitat connectivity (e.g., Costello et al. 2003; Taylor et al. 2003; Wofford et al. 2005). A direct test of introgression (e.g., Koskinen et al. 2002b; Gum et al. 2006) was not possible for indigenous Missouri River grayling because we did not have any samples collected before stocking. Theoretically, stocking from different sources, or stocking from a single source following by genetic drift, could have affected the genetic characteristics of Big Hole River grayling. This appears unlikely given our data and considering that most attempts to introduce Arctic grayling into riverine habitats generally have not been successful (Northcote 1995; Kaya 2000; MFWP 2004).

Little or no recent gene flow has occurred among grayling populations in the Big Hole, Madison, and Beaverhead river sub-basins; or between Mussigbrod and Miner lakes in the Big Hole River watershed. In contrast, the data suggest recent genetic exchange among spawning sites within the connected Big Hole River, as the demes sampled were largely panmictic. The spatial scale of population structuring for Missouri River grayling (over 100s km) is similar to observation of Arctic grayling from rivers in Alaska (Hop and Gharrett 1989) and British Columbia (Stamford and Taylor 2005). Landscape genetic variation in stream salmonids is

driven by historical and contemporary factors such as glaciation and habitat modification (e.g., Costello et al. 2003; Taylor et al. 2003; Stamford and Taylor 2005); species-specific differences in behavior and life history (e.g., Wenburg et al. 1998; Heggenes et al. 2006; Neville et al. 2006), and ecological context (e.g., Haugen and Vøllestad 2000; Koskinen et al. 2001). Population genetic structure in *Thymallus* has been more frequently detected among sub-basins (Gum et al. 2003; Koskinen et al. 2002a; but see Koskinen et al. 2001) relative to other salmonids that show differentiation at finer scales, such as among or within tributary streams (e.g., Carlsson et al. 1999; Taylor et al. 2003; Young et al. 2004).

We infer the contemporary landscape genetic pattern observed in native Missouri River grayling represents historical population structure, but recognize dams may have fostered some of the observed differentiation among Big Hole, Madison, and Red Rock population. Restricted gene flow promotes genetic drift and habitat fragmentation can strongly influence genetic differentiation and diversity in stream fishes (Costello et al. 2003; Wofford et al. 2005), especially those like Arctic grayling (e.g., Stamford and Taylor 2005) that can move hundreds of km among complementary habitats (Armstrong 1986; Northcote 1995; MFWP 2003). Analysis of museum specimens may help determine whether contemporary factors have altered the genetic architecture that existed among Missouri River grayling populations prior to Euro-American settlement.

Demographic status and population declines inferred from genetic data

Arctic grayling in the Missouri River system were historically very abundant, with long-term N_e ranging from a few thousand to tens of thousands. There is some uncertainty as to the timeframe and demographic scale associated with long-term estimates of effective population size (Waples 1991), but most authors agree that these estimates can be interpreted as the

harmonic mean of the N_e in each generation among populations within a geographic region (Kalinowski and Waples 2002). In this case, the long-term estimates are best interpreted as N_e for Arctic grayling populations in the Missouri basin since the Wisconsin glacier receded approximately 10 000 years ago. Contemporary N_e for individual populations was significantly less than the long-term N_e. Most populations did not exhibit inbreeding (i.e., contemporary $N_e >$ 50), but N_e were low enough to raise concern about maintaining adaptive potential.

Most populations showed genetic signatures of recent population declines, but the approximate timing of these bottlenecks varied. This study was correlative so we cannot directly attribute a bottleneck to a specific causal factor, but the observations were generally consistent with the demographic histories of some populations. The most recent bottlenecks (heterozygosity excess) were detected in Axolotl Lake and Ruby River grayling, so we presume that 20 yr of captivity and hatchery culture are proximate cause. Bottlenecks from declines occurring two or more decades ago (*M*-ratio, e.g., Spear et al. 2006) were detected in every sample except the Big Hole River group.

We expected to find a bottleneck in the Big Hole given the population is at low abundance. Perhaps the genetic signatures of a bottleneck are not apparent despite a demographic decline (e.g., see Busch et al. 2007), or the decline has been more gradual or smaller compared with other native populations. Arctic grayling still spawn in multiple locations in the Big Hole River and the main-stem migratory corridor is largely intact. In contrast, fragmentation of main-stem habitats likely contributed to bottlenecks observed in Red Rock lakes and the Madison River. In the Red Rock River system grayling were extirpated from numerous tributary streams during the last 100 yr, and the remaining adfluvial population in the headwater lakes was isolated by a barrier installed in 1957 (Nelson 1954; Vincent 1962; Mogen

1996). In the Madison River, the construction of impassible Ennis Dam >100 yr ago constrained, if not eliminated, any expression of the fluvial life history for grayling (Vincent 1962; Kaya 1992). The residual (adfluvial) Madison River population may have been further affected by draw downs of Ennis Reservoir in the 1960s-1980s which reduced surface area by up to 15-50% (MFWP 1990).

The Miner and Mussigbrod lake grayling populations have not been extensively monitored, so the causes of abrupt population decline are unknown. Loss of connection to the main-stem Big Hole River, winter oxygen deficits (die offs), or competition with stocked grayling are possible factors. Few demographic data are available for naturalized lake populations, but the timing of bottlenecks suggests possible founder effects. The genetically depauparate and inbred Sunnyslope Canal population has been affected by irrigation management and seasonal dewatering (Barndt and Kaya 2000)

Conservation implications

Arctic grayling within the connected Big Hole River tentatively should be considered a single population because we did not detect biologically significant levels of genetic divergence between putative demes within that system. We are currently investigating whether this panmixia is a very recent development or a consistent pattern over past few decades using genetic material from archived specimens (Ardren and Peterson, unpublished data). The native Big Hole, Madison, Red Rock, Miner, and Mussigbrod, populations in the Missouri River basin are demographically independent from one another. Genetic approaches to defining conservation and management units have been proposed (e.g., Crandall et al. 2000; Palsbøll et al. 2007), but anthropogenic isolation (especially Big Hole, Madison, and Red Rock), and long-term reproductive isolation (e.g., Mussigbrod and Miner) among native populations dictates they be

managed as separate units. We presume the native Missouri River populations were historically linked by occasional gene flow and must have exhibited some metapopulation-like structure (e.g., Rieman and Dunham 2000). In the future, facilitating habitat connectivity among sub-basins occupied by native populations would help reduce genetic and stochastic risks. The challenge in doing this, however, will be considerable given existing fragmentation and habitat alteration, and possible threats from further nonnative trout invasions (Fausch et al. 2009).

The Big Hole River population represents an important genetic reservoir for the species within the Missouri River basin, and is also the last example of the riverine, migratory (fluvial) ecotype in the coterminous US (Kaya 1992). Genetic and life history diversity should help buffer populations against environmental variation, catastrophe, and anthropogenic stressors (e.g., Rieman and McIntyre 1993; Crandall et al. 2000; Fausch et al. 2006). By these criteria, the Big Hole River should be a high conservation priority. State and Federal agencies are working with private landowners in the upper Big Hole River basin to implement a conservation agreement to augment stream flows, restore riparian habitats, remove migration barriers, and reduce entrainment in irrigation ditches (MFWP 2006).

Efforts to use captive populations to re-establish wild fluvial populations in indigenous waters will probably continue to challenge grayling restoration biologists. Drought, nonnative trout, and a lack of imprinting by stocked fish have apparently limited reintroduction success of fluvial Arctic grayling in Montana (MFWP 2003, 2007). A general lack of connected, main-stem river habitats accessible to grayling may further constrain expression of a migratory life history at translocation sites. The genetic data suggest additional factors may warrant investigation. First, genetic effects of captivity and culture may be unavoidable (e.g., Frankham 2008), and a slight reduction in genetic diversity has occurred in the ancestors of the captive population derived from Big Hole River grayling. There are no data to indicate these observations are directly related to translocation success, but an examination of behavioral and physiological differences between wild and captive grayling (e.g., in a common-garden setting) or measurable changes in

fitness (e.g., in captive or hatchery fish released into their indigenous habitats) would provide a more rigorous evaluation. Second, divergence among populations measured by molecular markers can potentially indicate differences in behavior, ecology, life history, and physiology (Stamford and Taylor 2005) that influence survival in specific habitats (Merilä and Crnokrak 2001; e.g., in *Thymallus*, see Koskinen et al. 2001; Salonen 2005). If genetic differentiation in the Big Hole River group is concordant with local adaptation (Taylor 1991), then a lack of ecological exchangeability (sensu Crandall et al. 2000) between sub-basins may in part explain why translocations using Big Hole River grayling have yet to establish a self-sustaining population in another river. Common-garden experiments that test for unique or population-specific traits would provide insight into local adaptation. A systematic evaluation of factors influencing translocation success that also considers downscaled climate projections could generate spatially-explicit decision support models to help guide future translocation efforts.

Although introductions using Big Hole River stock have not yet produced a self-sustaining fluvial population, few alternatives exist for ongoing translocations. Adfluvial Arctic grayling have not been successfully transplanted in to rivers in Montana (Kaya 1992), and heritable behavioral differences exist between adfluvial and fluvial stocks (e.g., Kaya 1991; Kaya and Jeanes 1995). Madison River grayling are extremely rare (MFWP 2007), no brood reserve exists for the population, and the contemporary N_e (162.3) is based mostly on fish captured 1-2 generations ago. Moreover these fish now exhibit an adfluvial life history, and it is unclear whether their descendents would re-express a fluvial life history. In the Missouri River basin, Big Hole River grayling theoretically provide a broader template for adaptation to novel environments or future environmental challenges because of their greater genetic diversity (Franklin and Frankham 1998, Lynch and Lande 1998). On the other hand, genetically depauparate populations can persist (e.g., Sunnyslope Canal). If maintaining diversity in captive populations of Big Hole grayling is important, then supplementation from the wild population is needed to limit genetic erosion. Adult grayling are presently at low abundance in the Big Hole

River (MFWP 2005a, 2007), so genetic augmentation of the captive stocks awaits a demographic recovery of the Big Hole River population.

Acknowledgements

The authors dedicate this manuscript to the memory of Rebecca J. Everett. D. Campton (USFWS) provided a thoughtful literature review and synthesis that framed many of the questions addressed in this study. R. Leary (University of Montana and MFWP) provided a helpful review of the original study proposal. M. Diggs completed the study's lab work. Erik Olsen provided database support. USFWS Region 6 and the US Bureau of Reclamation provided funding. M. Wilson (USFWS) provided administrative guidance during project conception. US Forest Service, MFWP, and numerous volunteers helped collect Arctic grayling finclips in Montana. A. Steed (Montana State University) contributed samples from Grebe Lake, Yellowstone National Park; and J. Merkowsky provided samples from northeastern Saskatchewan, Canada. The findings and conclusions in the article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

References

Allendorf, F.W., and Phelps, S.R. 1981. Use of allelic frequencies to describe population structure. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **38**: 1507–1514.

Allendorf, F.W., Leary, R.F., Spruell, P. and Wenburg, J.K. 2001. The problems with hybrids: setting conservation guidelines. Trends Ecol. Evol. **16**(11): 613–622.

Armstrong, R.H. 1986. A review of Arctic grayling studies in Alaska, 1952-1982. Biol. Papers Univ. Alaska **23**: 3–17.

Barndt, S.A. and Kaya, C.M. 2000. Reproduction, growth, and winter habitat of Arctic grayling in an intermittent canal. Northwest Sci. **74**(4): 294–305.

Behnke, R.J. 2002. Trout and salmon of North America. The Free Press, New York, NY.

Belkhir, K., Castric, V., and Banhomme, F. 2002. IDENTIX, a software to test for relatedness in a population using permutation methods. Mol. Ecol. Notes **2**(4): 611–614.

Bernatchez, L., and Wilson, C.C. 1998. Comparative phylogeography of Nearctic and Palearctic fishes. Mol. Ecol. **7**(4): 431–452.

Blackman, B.G. 2001. A strategic plan for the conservation and restoration of Arctic grayling in the Williston Reservoir Watershed. Peace/Williston Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program, Rept. No. 241, Prince George, B.C. 16 pp.

Busch, J.D., Waser, P.M., and DeWoody, J.A. 2007. Recent demographic bottlenecks are not accompanied by a genetic signature in banner-tailed kangaroo rats (*Dipodomys spectabilis*). Mol. Ecol. **16**(12): 2450–2462.

Campton, D.E. 2006. Should Arctic grayling in the Big Hole River, Montana be considered a Distinct Population Segment (DPS) under the U.S. Endangered Species Act? An Evaluation of Existing Genetic Information. Unpublished report to: Montana Field Office, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Conservation Genetics Laboratory, Abernathy Fish Technology Center, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Longview, WA. 31 pp.

Carlsson, J., Olsén, K.H., Nilsson, J., Øverli, Ø., and Stabell, O.B. 1999. Microsatellites reveal fine-scale genetic structure in stream-living brown trout. J. Fish Biol. **55**(6): 1290–1303.

Cavalli-Sforza, L.L., and Edwards, A.W.F. 1967. Phylogenetic analysis: models and estimation procedures. Evolution **21**(3): 550–570.

Cornuet, J.M., and Luikart, G. 1996. Description and power analysis of two tests for detecting recent population bottlenecks from allele frequency data. Genetics **144**: 2001–2014.

Costello, A.B., Down, T.E., Pollard, S.M., Pacas, C.J., and Taylor, E.B. 2003. The influence of history and contemporary stream hydrology on the evolution of genetic diversity within species: an examination of microsatellite DNA variation in bull trout, *Salvelinus confluentus* (Pisces: Salmonidae). Evolution **57**(2): 328–344.

Crandall K.A., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Mace, G.M., and Wayne, R.K.. 2000. Considering evolutionary processes in conservation biology. Trends. Ecol. Evol. **15**(7): 290–295.

Di Rienzo A., Peterson, A.C., Garza, J.C., Valdes, A.M., Slatkin, M., and Freimer, N.B. 1994. Mutational processes of simple-sequence repeat loci in human populations. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **91**: 3166–3170.

Diggs, M.D., and Ardren, W.R. 2008. Characterization of 12 highly variable tetranucleotide microsatellite loci for Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) and cross amplification in other *Thymallus* species. Mol. Ecol. Resour. **8**(4): 828–830.

Estoup, A., and Angers. B. 1998 Microsatellites and minisatellites for molecular ecology: theoretical and empirical considerations. *In* Advances in Molecular Ecology. *Edited by* G.R. Carvlho. NATO Science Series, IOS Press, Amsterdam. pp. 55-36.

Everett, R.J. 1986. The population genetics of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) of Montana. M.Sc. thesis, Univ. Montana, Missoula, Mont.

Fausch, K.D., Rieman, B.E., Young, M.K, and Dunham, J.B. 2006. Strategies for conserving native salmonid populations at risk from nonnative fish invasions: tradeoffs in using barriers to upstream movement. USDA For. Serv. Rocky Mtn. Res. Stn. RMRS-GTR-

174, Ft. Collins, Colo. Available from www.fs.fed.us/rm/boise/publications/fisheries/rmrs_gtr174.pdf

Fausch, K.D., Rieman, B.E., Dunham, J.B., Young, M.K., and Peterson, D.P. 2009. The invasion versus isolation dilemma: tradeoffs in managing native salmonids with barriers to upstream movement. Cons. Biol. **23**(4): 859–870.

Felsenstein, J. 1992. PHYLIP (Phylogeny Inference Package) Version 3.5C. Department of Genetics. SK-50, Univ. Washington, Seattle, Wash., USA.

Frankham, R. 2008. Genetic adaptation to captivity in species conservation programs. Mol. Ecol. **17**(1): 325–333.

Franklin, I.R., and Frankham, R. 1998. How large must populations be to retain evolutionary potential? Anim. Cons. **1**(1): 69–70.

Froufe, E., Knizhin, I., and Weiss, S. 2005. Phylogenetic analysis of the genus *Thymallus* (grayling) based on mtDNA control region and ATPase 6 genes, with inferences on control region constraints and broad-scale Eurasian phylogeography. Mol. Phylogen. Evol. **34**(1): 106–117.

Garza, J.C., and Williamson, E.G. 2001. Detection of reduction in population size using data from microsatellite loci. Mol. Ecol. **10**(2): 305–318.

Goudet, J. 2001. FSTAT, a program to estimate and test gene diversities and fixation indices (version 2.9.3) [updated from Goudet 1995]. Available from www2.unil.ch/popgen/softwares/ fstat.html [updated 23 August 2005].

Gum, B., Gross, R., Rottmann, O., Schröder, W., and Kühn, R. 2003. Microsatellite variation in Bavarian populations of European grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*): implications for conservation. Cons. Genet. **4**(6): 659–672.

Gum, B., Gross, R., and Kuehn, R. 2006. Discriminating the impact of recent human mediated stock transfer from historical gene flow on genetic structure of European grayling *Thymallus thymallus* L. J. Fish Biol. **69**(Supplement C):115–135.

Guo, S.W., and Thompson, E.A. 1992. Performing the exact test of Hardy–Weinberg proportion for multiple alleles. Biometrics **48**(2): 361–372.

Hardy, O.J., and Vekemans, X. 2002. SPAGeDi: a versatile computer program to analyze spatial genetic structure at the individual or population levels. Mol. Ecol. Notes **2**;618–620.

Hardy, O.J., Charbonnel, N., Freville, H., and Heuertz, M. 2003. Microsatellite allele size: a simple test to assess their significance. Genetics **163**:1467–1482.

Hartl, D.L., and Clark, A.G. 1989. Principles of Population Genetics, 2nd ed. Sinauer & Associates, Sunderland, Mass.

Haugen, T.O., and Vøllestad, L.A. 2000. Population differences in early life-history traits in grayling. J. Evol. Biol. **13**(6): 897–905.

Haugen, T.O., and Vøllestad, L.A. 2001. A century of life-history evolution in grayling. Genetica **112–113**(1): 475–491.

Hedrick, P.W. 1999. Perspective: highly variable loci and their interpretation in evolution and conservation. Evolution **53**(2): 313–318.

Heggenes, J., Qvenild, T., Stamford, M.D., and Taylor, E.B. 2006. Genetic structure in relation to movements in wild European grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*) in three Norwegian rivers. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **63**(6): 1309–1319.

Hendry, A.P., and Stearns, S.C. 2004 (*Editors*). Evolution illuminated - salmon and their relatives, Oxford University Press, New York.

Hendry, A.P., Castric, V., Kinnison, M.T., and Quinn, T.P. 2004. The evolution of philopatry and dispersal: homing and straying in salmonids. *In* Evolution illuminated - salmon and their relatives. *Edited by* A.P. Hendry and S.C. Stearns. Oxford University Press, New York. pp. 52–91

Hindar, K., Ryman, N., and Utter, F. 1991. Genetic effects of cultured fish on natural fish populations. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **48**(5): 945–957.

Hop, H., and Gharrett, A.J. 1989. Genetic relationships of Arctic grayling in the Koyukuk and Tanana Rivers, Alaska. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **118**(3): 290–295.

Hubbs, C.L., and Lagler, K.F. 1949. Fishes of the Great Lakes Region. Cranbrook Institute of Science. Bulletin No. 26, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.

Jeanes, E.D. 1995. Behavioral responses to water current of age-0 Arctic grayling from the Madison River, and their use of stream habitat. M.Sc. thesis, Montana St. Univ., Bozeman, Mont.

Kalinowski, S.T. 2004. Counting alleles with rarefaction: private alleles and hierarchical sampling designs. Cons. Genet. **5**(4): 539–543

Kalinowski, S.T. 2005. HP-RARE 1.0: a computer program for performing rarefaction on measures of allelic diversity. Mol. Ecol. Notes **5**(1): 187–189.

Kalinowski, S.T. and R.S. Waples. 2002. The ratio of effective to census size in fluctuating populations. Cons. Biol. **16**(1): 129–136.

Kaya, C.M. 1990. Status report on fluvial Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) in Montana. Unpublished report to Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 1420 E. 6th Ave., P.O. Box 200701, Helena, Mont. 59620.

Kaya, C.M. 1991. Rheotactic differentiation between fluvial and lacustrine populations of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*), and implications for the only remaining indigenous population of fluvial Montana grayling. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **48**(1): 53–59.

Kaya, C.M. 1992. Review of the decline and status of fluvial Arctic grayling, *Thymallus arcticus*, in Montana. Proc. Mont. Acad. Sci. **1992**: 43–70.

Kaya, C.M. 2000. Arctic grayling in Yellowstone: status, management and recent restoration efforts. Yellowstone Sci. **8**(3): 12–17. Available from www.nps.gov/yell/planyourvisit/yellsci-issues.htm

Kaya, C.M., and Jeanes, E.D. 1995. Retention of adaptive rheotactic behavior by F1 fluvial Arctic grayling. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **124**(3): 453–457.

Kelly, J.L. 1931. Nation watches Montana grayling. Montana Wildl. **3**(8): 9–11.

Koskinen, M.T., Piironen, J., and Primmer, C.R. 2001. Interpopulation genetic divergence in European grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*, Salmonidae) at a microgeographic scale: implications for conservation. Conserv. Genet. **2**(2): 133–143.

Koskinen, M.T., Knizhin, I., Primmer, C.R., Schoetterer, C., and Weiss, S. 2002a. Mitochondrial and nuclear DNA phylogeography of *Thymallus* spp. (grayling) provides evidence of ice age mediated environmental perturbations in the world's oldest body of fresh water, Lake Baikal. Mol. Ecol. **11**(12): 2599–2611.

Koskinen, M.T., Piironen, J., and Primmer, C.R. 2002b. Genetic assessment of spatiotemporal evoluationary relationships and stocking effects in grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*, Salmonidae). Ecol. Lett. **5**(2): 193–205.

Liknes, G.A., and Gould, W.R. 1987. The distribution, habitat and population characteristics of fluvial Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) in Montana. Northwest Sci. **61**(2): 122–129.

Lippé, C., Dumont, P., and Bernatchez, L. 2006. High genetic diversity and no inbreeding in the endangered copper redhorse, *Moxostoma hubbsi* (Catostomidae, Pices): the positive sides of a long generation time. Mol. Ecol. **15**(7): 1769–1780.

Luikart, G., and Cornuet, J-M. 1998. Empirical evaluation of a test for identifying recently bottlenecked populations from allele frequency data. Cons. Biol. **12**(1): 228–237.

Luikart G., Allendorf, F.W., Cornuet, J-M., and Sherwin, W.B. 1998. Distortion of allele frequency distributions provides a test for recent population bottlenecks. J. Heredity **89**(3): 238–247.

Lynch, J.C., and Vyse, E.R. 1979. Genetic variability and divergence in grayling, *Thymallus arcticus*. Genetics **92**(1): 263–278.

Lynch, M., and Lande, R. 1998. The critical effective size for a genetically secure population. Anim. Cons. **1**(1): 70–72.

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 1990. Ennis Reservoir/Madison River fisheries investigation: draft final report 1990. Unpublished report to Montana Power Company, Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, 1400 S. 19th Ave., Bozeman, Mont. 59718.

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 1995. Montana fluvial Arctic grayling recovery plan. Unpublished report to the Montana Fluvial Arctic Grayling Workgroup. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 1420 E. 6th Ave., P.O. Box 200701, Helena, Mont. 59620.

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 2003. Movement and habitat selection of Arctic grayling, brook trout, and mountain whitefish during drought conditions in the Big Hole River, MT. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 1400 S. 19th Ave., Bozeman, Mont. 59718.

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 2004. Reintroducing fluvial Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) to the upper Ruby River, MT – a progress report. Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, 730 N. Montana St., Dillon, Mont. 59725. Available from fwp.mt.gov/content/getItem.aspx?id=17931

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 2005a. Fluvial Arctic grayling monitoring report 2004. Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, 730 N. Montana St., Dillon, Mont. 59725. Available from http://fwp.mt.gov/content/getItem.aspx?id=10698

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 2005b. Montana Fish Plants. Electronic database, Version VB6-A2K-CR85-01262005. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 1400 S. 19th Ave., Bozeman, Mont. 59718.

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 2006. Candidate conservation agreement with assurances for fluvial Arctic grayling in the upper Big Hole River. Montana, Fish, Wildlife and Parks, 1420 E. 6th Ave., P.O. Box 200701, Helena, Mont. 59620. Available from fwp.mt.gov/content/getItem.aspx?id=11428

MFWP (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks). 2007. Arctic grayling recovery program – Montana Arctic grayling monitoring report 2006. Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, 730 N. Montana St., Dillon, Mont. 59725. Available from fwp.mt.gov/content/getItem.aspx?id=28962

Meldgaard, T., Nielsen, E.E., and Loeschcke, V. 2003. Fragmentation by weirs in a riverine system; a study of genetic variation in time and space among populations of European grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*) in a Danish river system. Cons. Genet. **4**(6): 735–747.

Merilä, J., and Crnokrak, P. 2001. Comparison of genetic differentiation at marker loci and quantitative traits. J. Evol. Biol. **14**(6): 892–903.

Michalakis, Y., and Excoffier, L. 1996. A genetic estimation of population subdivision using distances between alleles with special reference for microsatellite loci. Genetics **142**: 1061–1064.

Mogen, J.T. 1996. Status and biology of the spawning population of Red Rock Lakes Arctic grayling. M.Sc. thesis. Montana St. Univ., Bozeman, Mont.

Morris, W.F., and Doak, D.F. 2002. Quantitative conservation biology: theory and practice of population viability analysis. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Mass.

Narum, S.R. 2006. Beyond Bonferroni: Less conservative analyses for conservation genetics. Cons. Genet. **7**:783–787.

Nei, M. 1987. Molecular evolutionary genetics. Columbia University Press, New York.

Nelson, P.H. 1954. Life history and management of the American grayling (*Thymallus signifer tricolor*) in Montana. J. Wildl. Manage. **18**(3): 324–342.

Neville, H.M., Dunham, J.B., and Peacock, M.M. 2006. Landscape attributes and life history variability shape genetic structure of trout populations in a stream network. Landscape Ecology **21**(6): 901–916.

Nielsen, E.E., Hansen, M.M., and Loeschcke, V. 1999. Genetic variation in time and space: microsatellite analysis of extinct and extant populations of Atlantic salmon. Evolution **53**(1): 261–268.

Northcote, T.G. 1995. Comparative biology and management of Arctic and European grayling (Salmonidae, *Thymallus*). Rev. Fish Biol. Fish. **5**(2): 141–194.

Ohta T., and Kimura, M. 1973. The model of mutation appropriate to estimate the number of electrophoretically detectable alleles in a genetic population. Genet. Res. **22**(2): 201–204.

Palm S., Laikre, L., Jorde, P.E., and Ryman, N. 2003. Effective population size and temporal genetic change in stream resident brown trout (*Salmo trutta*, L.). Cons. Genet. **4**(3):249–264.

Palsbøll, P.J., Bérubé, M., and Allendorf, F.W. 2007. Identification of management units using population genetic data. Trends Ecol. Evol. **22**(1): 16–20.

Pearse, D.E., and Crandall, K.A. 2004. Beyond F_{ST}: Analysis of population genetic data for conservation. Cons. Genet. **5**(5): 585–602.

Pielou, E.C. 1991. After the Ice Age: the return of life to glaciated North America. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Piry, S., Luikart, G., and Cornuet, J-M. 1999. BOTTLENECK: a computer program for detecting recent reductions in the effective population size using allele frequency data. J. Hered. **90**(4): 502–503.

Pritchard, J.K., Stephens, M., and Donnelly, P. 2000. Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data. Genetics **155**: 945–959.

Randall, L.C. 1978. Red Rock Lakes National Wildlife Refuge: an aquatic history 1988-1977. US Fish and Wildlife Service, 780 Creston Hatchery Rd., Kalispell, Mont 59901.

Raymond, M., and Rousset, F. 1995. GENEPOP (version 1.2): population genetics software for exact tests and ecumenicism. J. Hered. **86**(3): 248–249.

Redenbach, Z., and Taylor, E.B. 1999. Zoogeographical implications of variation in mitochondrial DNA of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*). Mol. Ecol. **8**(1): 23–35.

Rice W. 1989. Analyzing tables of statistical tests. Evolution **43**(1): 223–225.

Rieman, B.E., and J.D. McIntyre. 1993. Demographic and habitat requirements for conservation of bull trout. USDA. For. Serv. GTR-INT-302, Boise, Idaho.

Rieman, B.E., and Dunham, J.B. 2000. Metapopulations and salmonids: a synthesis of life history patterns and empirical observations. Ecol. Freshw. Fish **9**(1-2): 51–64.

Rousset, F. 1997. Genetic differentiation and estimation of gene flow from *F*-statistics under isolation by distance. Genetics **145**(4): 1219–1228.

Salonen, A. 2005. Behavioural and morphological variation in European grayling, *Thymallus thymallus*, populations. Ph.D. thesis, University of Helsinki, Finland. Available from ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/bio/bioja/vk/salonen/behaviou.pdf

Schlosser, I.J., and Angermeier, P.L. 1995. Spatial variation in demographic processes in lotic fishes: conceptual models, empirical evidence, and implications for conservation. Am. Fish. Soc. Symp. **17**: 360–370.

Scott, W.B., and Crossman, E.J. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Bull. Fish. Res. Board Can. No. 184.

Skalski, G.T., Landis, J.B., Grose, M.J., and Hudman, S.P. 2008. Genetic structure of creek chub, a headwater minnow, in an impounded river system. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **137**(4): 962–975.

So, N., Maes, G.E., and Volckaert, F.A.M. 2006. High genetic diversity in cryptic populations of the highly migratory sutchi catfish *Pangasianodon hypophthalmus* in the Mekong River. Heredity **96** (2):166–174.

Spear, S.F., Peterson, C.R., Matocq, M.D., and Storfer, A. 2006. Molecular evidence for historical and recent population size reductions of tiger salamanders (*Ambystoma tigrinum*) in Yellowstone National Park. Cons. Genet. **7**(4): 605–611.

Stamford, M.D., and Taylor, E.B. 2004. Phylogeographical lineages of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) in North America: divergence, origins and affinities with Eurasian *Thymallus*. Mol. Ecol. **13**(6): 1533–1549.

Stamford, M.D., and Taylor, E.B. 2005. Population subdivision and genetic signatures of demographic changes in Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) from an impounded watershed. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **62**(11): 2548–2559

Tallmon, D.A., Koyuk, A., Luikart, G., and Beaumont, M.A. 2008. ONeSAMP: a program to estimate effective population size using approximate Bayesian computation. Mol. Ecol. Resour. **8**(2): 299–301.

Taylor, E.B. 1991. A review of local adaptation in Salmonidae, with particular reference to Pacific and Atlantic salmon. Aquaculture **98**:185–207.

Taylor, E.B., Stamford, M.D., and Baxter, J.S. 2003. Population subdivision in westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*) at the northern periphery of its range: evolutionary inferences and conservation implications. Mol. Ecol. **12**(10):2609–2622.

USFWS (US Fish and Wildlife Service). 2007. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: revised 12-month finding for Upper Missouri River Distinct Population Segment of Fluvial Arctic Grayling. Federal Register **72**(78): 20305-20314.

Varley, J.D. 1981. A history of fish stocking activities in Yellowstone National Park between 1881 and 1980. Info. Paper No. 35. Yellowstone National Park, WY.

Vincent, R.E. 1962. Biogeographical and ecological factors contributing to the decline of Arctic grayling, (*Thymallus arcticus*), in Michigan and Montana. Ph.D. thesis. Univ. Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Vincent, R.E. 1963. The native range of lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) in Montana. Copeia **1963**(1): 188–189.

Waples, R.S. 1991. Genetic methods for estimating the effective size of cetacean populations. *In* Genetic Ecology of Whales and Dolphins, Special Issue 13. Edited by A.R. Hoelzel.. International Whale Commission, London. UK. pp 279–300

Waples, R.S. 2006. A bias correction for estimates of effective population size based on linkage disequilibrium at unlinked gene loci. Cons. Genet. **7**(2): 167–184.

Waples, R.S., and Gagiotti, O. 2006. What is a population? An empirical evaluation of some genetic methods for identifying the number of gene pools and their degree of connectivity. Mol. Ecol. **15**(6): 1419–1439.

Waples, R. S., and C. Do. 2008. LDNe: A program for estimating effective population size from data on linkage disequilibrium. Mol. Ecol. Resour. **8**(4):753–756.

Weir, B.S., and Cockerham, C.C. 1984. Estimating *F*-statistics for the analysis of population structure. Evolution **38**(6): 1358–1370.

Weiss, S., Persat, H., Eppe, R., Schlötterer, C., and Uiblein, F. 2002. Complex patterns of colonization and refugia revealed for European grayling *Thymallus thymallus*, based on complete sequencing of the mitochondrial DNA control region. Mol. Ecol. **11**(8): 1393–1407.

Weiss, S., Knizhin, I., Kirillov, A., and Froufe, E. 2006. Phenotypic and genetic differentiation of two major phylogeographical lineages of Arctic grayling *Thymallus arcticus* in the Lena River, and surrounding Arctic drainages. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. **88**(4): 511–526.

Wenburg, J.K., Bentzen, P., and Foote, C.J. 1998. Microsatellite analysis of genetic population structure in an endangered salmonid: the coastal cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki clarki*). Mol. Ecol. **7**(6): 733–749.

Williamson-Natesan, E.G. 2005. Comparison of methods for detecting bottlenecks from microsatellite loci. Cons. Genet. **6**(4): 551–562.

Wofford, J.E., Gresswell, R.E., and Banks, M.A. 2005. Influence of barriers to movement on within-watershed genetic variation of coastal cutthroat trout. Ecol. App. **15**(2): 628–637.

Young, S.F., McLellan, J.G., and Shaklee, J.B. 2004. Genetic integrity and microgeographic population structure of westslope cutthroat trout, *Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*, in the Pend Oreille Basin in Washington. Env. Biol. Fish. **69**(1-4): 127–142.

Table 1. Presumed origin, location, sample size (N), and sample collection years for 18 native and introduced Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) populations in the upper Missouri River and one from the Mackenzie River system, Canada.

No.	Sample population	Latitude (°N)	Longitude (°W)	Elevation (m)	N	Years
Native – upper Missouri River basin						
	Connected Big Hole River					
1	Steel Creek [a]	45.66682	-113.46601	1826	27	2006
2	Swamp Creek [a]	45.64978	-113.44271	1823	38	2005, 2006
3	Big Hole River near Wisdom, MT [a]	45.61755	-113.45758	1844	22	2006
4	Fishtrap Creek [a]	45.8697	-113.22847	1779	28	2005, 2006
5	Lamarche Creek [a]	45.8834	-113.20211	1780	29	2005, 2006
	Upper Big Hole River watershed					
6	Mussigbrod Lake [b]	45.79078	-113.61149	1979	48	2006
7	Miner Lake [b]	45.3248	-113.56747	2125	37	2006
	Red Rock lakes, Beaverhead River					

8	Red Rock Creek	44.61359	-111.68807	2016	48	2005
	Madison River					
9	Madison River-Ennis Reservoir	45.40931	-111.69449	1469	27	1996 (n=23), 1999 (1), 2004 (1), 2006 (2)
Captive reserve or conservation – derived from Big Hole River						
10	Ruby River	45.00863	-111.96207	1880	48	2006
11	Axolotl Lake	45.2258	-111.8713	2229	55	2006
12	Bozeman Fish Technology Center (BFTC)	45.70802	-110.9774	1497	48	2005
Introduced – other sources (source)						
13	Odell Lake (unknown)	45.57523	-113.23231	2543	46	2006
14	Fuse Lake (Canada)	46.24785	-113.72297	2347	47	2006
15	Grebe Lake (upper Missouri River)	44.75083	-110.55778	2447	47	2002, 2005
16	Bobcat Lake (unknown)	45.6219	-113.2206	2569	47	2006
17	Sunnyslope Canal (unknown)	47.60490	-112.09710	1293	50	2006
Native population – Saskatchewan, Canada						
18	Fond du Lac, Athabaska River system	59.24341	-106.41357	202	34	1987

[a] Putative demes for fluvial Arctic grayling within the Big Hole River and connected tributaries.

[b] Putative remnant populations isolated by habitat degradation and water development.

Table 2. Documented stocking of hatchery-cultured Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) into waters containing indigenous or presumed indigenous populations.

	Population	Years stocked	Total number stocked	Hatchery source
1-5	Big Hole River (group)	1937-1957	14 732 193 [a]	Washoe Park Hatchery (MFWP 2005b) [b]
6	Mussigbrod Lake	1934-1955	5 951 847	Washoe Park Hatchery (MFWP 2005b) [b]
7	Miner Lake	1933-1952	3 220 776	Washoe Park Hatchery (MFWP 2005b) [b]
8	Red Rock	1899-1938, 1946-1962	Unknown, 103 704	Bozeman National Fish Hatchery (Randall 1978), Ennis National Fish Hatchery (Randall 1978, MFWP 2005b)
9	Madison River-Ennis Reservoir	1928-1961	2 690 725 [c]	Washoe Park during 1928-1934, Ennis National Fish Hatchery during 1946-1962 (MFWP 2005b)

[a] Number includes records for Arctic grayling planted into the Big Hole River and its tributaries. Number excludes 1080 Arctic grayling from Somers Hatchery (also known as Flathead Lake Salmon Hatchery) planted in 1962, and 622 Arctic grayling from the Bozeman Fish Technology Center planted in 1992 and 1993.

[b] The Washoe Park Hatchery is operated by the state of Montana, and was historically referred to as the "Anaconda Hatchery".

[c] Numbers for the Madison River includes records for Arctic grayling planted into Odell Creek; Ennis Reservoir; the lower, middle, and upper segments of the Madison River; and the South Fork Madison River (MFWP 2005b).

Table 3. Population genetic characteristics for 18 Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) sample populations across 10 microsatellite loci.

	Sample population	N	N_A	N_A^{36}	N_P	H_O	H_E	HWE	LD	Relatedness (*I*)
Native – upper Missouri River basin										
	Connected Big Hole River									
1	Steel Creel	27	14.5	12.9	-	0.89	0.88	0	0	0.1569
2	Swamp Creek	38	16.7	13.5	-	0.87	0.89	0	0	0.1503
3	Big Hole River	22	14.7	13.7	-	0.86	0.89	0	0	0.1365
4	Fishtrap Creek	28	14.3	12.8	-	0.90	0.89	0	0	0.1480
5	Lamarche Creek	29	15.4	13.2	-	0.88	0.89	0	0	0.1532
1-5	Big Hole River (group) [a]	144	19.3	13.3[b]	5	0.88	0.89	0	0	0.1438
	Upper Big Hole River watershed									
6	Mussigbrod Lake	48	10.9	9.1	1	0.78	0.78	0	0	0.2437
7	Miner Lake	37	13.1	10.7	3	0.79	0.82	1	0	0.2101

	Red Rock lakes, Beaverhead River									
8	Red Rock Creek	48	13.3	10.4	2	0.79	0.80	0	0	0.2181
	Madison River									
9	Madison River-Ennis Reservoir	27	8.4	7.7	0	0.73	0.74	0	0	0.3285
Captive reserve and conservation – derived from Big Hole River										
10	Ruby River	48	14.3	11.7	0	0.90	0.88	0	0	0.1777
11	Axolotl Lake	55	15.0	11.8	0	0.87	0.88	4	9	0.1750
12	BFTC	48	13.7	10.8	1	0.85	0.85	1	1	0.2095
Introduced – other sources										
13	Odell Lake	46	14.0	11.0	2	0.84	0.83	0	0	0.1989
14	Fuse Lake	47	10.8	8.5	6	0.74	0.75	0	0	0.2675
15	Grebe Lake	47	13.7	10.6	2	0.84	0.85	0	0	0.2053
16	Bobcat Lake	47	9.9	8.3	3	0.78	0.80	0	0	0.2713
17	Sunnyslope Canal	50	5	4.5	0	0.62	0.63	0	0	0.4922
Native – Saskatchewan, Canada										
18	Fond du Lac	34	11.7	10.4	7	0.68	0.76	0	0	0.2753

Note: N = sample size, N_A = numbers of alleles, N_A^{36} = rarefaction measure of allelic richness using a sample of 36 genes, N_P = number of private alleles, H_O = observed heterozygosity, H_E = expected heterozygosity, HWE = number of loci not in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium, LD = pairs of loci with significant linkage disequilibrium, *I* = mean pairwise relatedness estimates for multi-locus genotypes (after Belkhir et al. 2002) where values range from 0 for unrelated individuals to 0.5 for full siblings.

[a] The Big Hole River group (1-5) is the amalgamation of samples populations 1 through 5 (i.e., Steel Creek, Swamp Creek, Big Hole River near Wisdom, Fishtrap Creek, and Lamarche Creek).

[b] Table value for allelic richness estimated using HP-RARE 1.0 (see Methods). Allelic richness estimated using FSTAT 2.9.3.2 slightly lower (N_A^{36} = 13.24; see Results, Within population diversity)

Table 4. Pairwise F_{ST} (below diagonal) and R_{ST} estimates (above diagonal) for Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) at 10 microsatellite loci.

	Population number									
Population	1	2	3	4	5	1-5	6	7	8	9
1-Steel	-	*-0.0096*	*-0.0083*	*-0.0047*	*-0.0063*	NA	**0.3536**	0.0859	**0.1364**	0.0628
2-Swamp	*0.0036*[a]	-	*0.0004*	*-0.0031*	*-0.0106*	NA	0.2905	0.0694	**0.1326**	0.0638
3-Wisdom	*-0.0027*[a]	*0.0019*[a]	-	*-0.0125*	*-0.0054*	NA	**0.381**	0.1167	0.0897	0.0547
4-Fishtrap	*0.0052*	*0.0019*[a]	*-0.0052*[a]	-	*-0.0118*	NA	0.3488	0.0995	0.0861	0.0509
5-Lamarche	*0.0053*	*0.0055*[a]	*-0.0019*[a]	*-0.003*[a]	-	NA	**0.291**	0.0755	0.116	0.0586
1-5-BigHole (group)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	**0.2756**	0.086	0.1112	0.0506
6-Mussigbrod	0.0789	0.0805	0.0772	0.0743	0.0719	0.0719	-	**0.3075**	**0.4784**	0.4246
7-Miner	0.0789	0.072	0.072	0.0728	0.0777	0.072	0.1199	-	**0.3172**	0.1975
8-Red Rock	0.0808	0.0747	0.0699	0.0694	0.0782	0.0708	0.1604	0.1501	-	0.1442
9-Madison-Ennis	0.0725	0.0789	0.0806	0.076	0.0835	0.0726	0.1441	0.1496	0.1739	-
10-Ruby	0.023	0.0202	0.0128	0.0142	0.0191	0.0171	0.0937	0.075	0.0828	0.0987
11-Axolotl	0.0232	0.0155	0.0134	0.0138	0.0182	0.0162	0.0981	0.0758	0.0734	0.0938

12-BFTC	0.0318	0.0233	0.024	0.0237	0.0293	0.025	0.1044	0.086	0.0929	0.1023
13-Odell	0.0537	0.0579	0.0492	0.0464	0.0568	0.0508	0.1389	0.1329	0.0222	0.1246
14-Fuse	0.1375	0.1362	0.1399	0.1404	0.1414	0.1301	0.1962	0.1862	0.2021	0.1876
15-Grebe	0.035	0.0372	0.033	0.0348	0.0392	0.0346	0.1084	0.1144	0.0377	0.0772
16-Bobcat	0.0577	0.0638	0.0528	0.0557	0.0598	0.0552	0.133	0.1349	0.0739	0.1106
17-Sunnyslope	0.1551	0.1493	0.1538	0.1484	0.1585	0.135	0.2414	0.2346	0.129	0.2262
18-FondDuLac	0.1446	0.1446	0.1454	0.1505	0.1486	0.142	0.206	0.1835	0.2092	0.1974

Table 4 (concluded)

	Population number								
Population	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1-Steel	0.0058	0.0043	0.0089	0.1088	**0.4796**	0.065	**0.2461**	0.1111	**0.5147**
2-Swamp	0.0096	0.0032	-0.008	0.1059	**0.476**	0.0669	**0.2541**	0.1188	**0.5037**
3-Wisdom	0.0128	0.0069	0.0015	0.0664	**0.4335**	0.0373	**0.2**	0.0674	**0.4738**
4-Fishtrap	0.0097	0.0026	0.0038	0.0657	**0.4336**	0.038	**0.1944**	0.0728	**0.4677**
5-Lamarche	0.0102	-0.0006	0.0087	0.0902	**0.4713**	0.0583	**0.2429**	0.1174	**0.5039**
1-5-BigHole (group)	0.0129	0.0066	0.0037	0.086	**0.4416**	0.0498	**0.2259**	0.0842	**0.466**

6-Mussigbrod	**0.3291**	0.2894	0.2896	0.4484	**0.7275**	**0.4499**	**0.6208**	0.5513	**0.7661**
7-Miner	0.0921	0.071	0.0895	**0.288**	**0.5945**	**0.2497**	**0.4081**	0.3224	**0.6104**
8-Red Rock	**0.1315**	**0.1299**	0.113	-0.0015	**0.3536**	0.0264	0.1077	0.0348	**0.4075**
9-Madison-Ennis	0.078	0.0618	0.0597	0.0956	**0.5021**	0.0868	**0.2964**	0.1448	**0.5521**
10-Ruby	-	-0.0044	0.0059	0.102	**0.4923**	0.0546	**0.2197**	0.1212	**0.5153**
11-Axolotl	0.0013[a]	-	0.0037	0.0993	**0.4767**	0.06	**0.2319**	0.1242	**0.4953**
12-BFTC	0.0089	0.0107	-	0.0877	**0.4627**	0.0489	**0.2319**	0.0996	**0.4902**
13-Odell	0.0675	0.0579	0.0805	-	**0.3916**	0.0062	**0.1365**	0.0387	**0.4405**
14-Fuse	0.1578	0.1525	0.1624	0.1827	-	**0.4582**	**0.3486**	0.3814	0.0395
15-Grebe	0.0512	0.0448	0.0662	0.0162	0.1608	-	**0.1527**	0.045	**0.5132**
16-Bobcat	0.0682	0.0663	0.0783	0.045	0.191	0.037	-	0.1306	**0.4139**
17-Sunnyslope	0.1513	0.1497	0.1705	0.1234	0.2894	0.1261	0.1704	-	0.4547
18-FondDuLac	0.1624	0.156	0.166	0.1883	0.0196	0.1669	0.2022	0.3046	-

Note: See Table 1 for complete population names. Italics denote comparisons made among demes from within the Big Hole River (sample populations 1 through 5) that were consolidated into a single Big Hole River population ("1-5-BigHole").

Consequently, "NA" indicates estimates or tests that are not applicable because Big Hole group contains sample populations 1-5. Bold indicates sample pairs where the allele size permutation test identified $R_{ST} > F_{ST}$ (see text for details).

[a] Allele frequency tests were based on Fisher's combined probability with a modified false discovery rate (FDR) (n = 166 total pairwise tests, table-wide $\alpha = 0.05$) were conducted for all sample pairs. Statistical heterogeneity in allele frequencies was detected in all pairs below the diagonal except those denoted by subscript "[a]", which indicates tests where the table-wide p-values for the null hypothesis of panmixia was not rejected.

Table 5. Effective population sizes and genetic signatures of population bottlenecks in 14 populations of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*).

		Effective population size			*M*-ratio bottleneck test		
		Long-term		Contemporary		M_C	
	Population	$N_{e\ IAM}$	$N_{e\ SMM}$	N_e (95% CI)	*M*-ratio	θ=1	θ=10
Native – upper Missouri River basin							
	Upper Big Hole River watershed						
1-5	Big Hole River group	4045	20 411	207.6 (175.6-250.9)	0.818	0.813	0.796
6	Mussigbrod Lake	1773	4915	1496.8 (262.3-infinite)	0.747	0.802**	0.752*
7	Miner Lake	2278	7466	286.3 (142.8-4692.6)	0.787	0.801*	0.738
	Red Rock lakes, Beaverhead River						
8	Red Rock Creek	2000	6000	228.2 (140.7-546.7)	0.772	0.802*	0.754
	Madison River						
9	Madison River-Ennis Reservoir	1423	3448	162.3 (75.5-infinite)	0.653	0.795***	0.718**

Captive reserve and conservation – derived from Big Hole River							
10	Ruby River	3667	17 111	166.5 (119.4-265.6)	0.670 [a]	0.805***	0.754***
11	Axolotl Lake	3667	17 111	29.5 (26.3-33.3)	0.695 [a]	0.805***	0.760**
12	Bozeman FTC	2833	10 861	38.0 (32.8-44.5)	0.660	0.804***	0.753***
Introduced – other sources							
13	Odell Lake	2441	8400	576.9 (222.8-infinite)	0.794	0.804*	0.752
14	Fuse Lake	1500	3750	163.8 (88-694.1)	0.694	0.805**	0.752**
15	Grebe Lake	2833	10 861	-1013.7 [b] (1011.1-infinite)	0.753	0.803**	0.752*
16	Bobcat Lake	2000	6000	252 (114.3-infinite)	0.694	0.803***	0.752**
17	Sunnyslope Canal	851	1576	32.5 (22.9-49.3)	0.575	0.805***	0.756***
Native – Saskatchewan, Canada							
18	Fond du Lac	1583	4090	131.8 (42.8-infinite) [c]	0.676	0.801**	0.735**

Notes: Long-term effective population sizes were estimated with heterozygosity-based methods assuming either a step-wise (N_{eSMM}) or infinite allele mutation model (N_{eIAM}), which are presumed to bound the true long-term N_e. Contemporary Ne was based on the linkage disequilibrium estimator of Waples (2006). An estimated *M*-ratio < the critical value (M_C) indicates a population

bottleneck. Theta (θ) values of 1 and 10 correspond to pre-bottleneck effective population sizes of 500 and 5 000, respectively, assuming a microsatellite mutation rate of 5×10^{-4}. Symbols for statistical significance: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, and *** $p \leq 0.001$

[a] Sample populations that also exhibited genetic signatures of a population bottleneck based on heterozygosity excess included Ruby River ($p \leq 0.001$) and Axolotl Lake ($p \leq 0.01$).

[b] A negative point estimate for effective population size using program LDNe (Waples and Do 2008) means there is no evidence for any disequilibrium caused by genetic drift due to a finite number of parents, i.e., N_e is infinite.

[c] Contemporary effective size estimate based on 7 loci. Three loci (Tar110, Tar114, and Tar115) were removed for analysis because of missing data.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Location of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) sample populations. The species historical distribution in western North America (a) is shaded, and includes a disjunct set of populations that occur in the upper Missouri River basin. In the upper Missouri River (b, shaded area), grayling were native to the main stem Missouri River and most of its major tributaries (dark lines). The present range of native grayling that express a fluvial life history is restricted to the upper Big Hole River (b, dark bold line). Major dams are denoted by white bars. In the Big Hole River drainage (c), samples were collected from a number of discrete locations. In all panels, triangles indicate presumed native populations, squares denote introduced (naturalized) populations, and circles are the location of captive or introduced conservation populations derived from Arctic grayling native to the Big Hole River.

Figure 2. Genetic differentiation of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) populations from Canada, Montana, and Wyoming. Un-rooted neighbor-joining dendrogram based on Cavalli-Sforza & Edwards (1967) chord distance (CSE) calculated from allele frequencies at 10 microsatellite loci. Bootstrap probabilities, based on 1000 replicates, provide a measure of statistical confidence for each of the indicated clusters; the numbers leading to each cluster represent the percentage of times the indicated samples clustered together in the simulated, random sampling replicates. Population symbols and numbers as are in Figure 1, but with native Missouri River populations emphasized by filled triangles. Groups of populations inferred to share a common origin are indicated by hand-drawn dashed ellipses.

Figure 3. Mean number of alleles and mean number of private alleles per locus over 10 loci for Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) populations in Canada, Montana, and Wyoming.

Error bars represent the standard error of the mean across loci. The location of a population on the mean number of alleles per locus axis is an indirect measure of the relative N_e among the sampled populations and its location on the mean number of private alleles per locus axis is directly related to the degree of genetic distinction that population has relative to the other sampled populations. Both measures of genetic diversity were computed according to the rarefaction method of (Kalinowsiki 2004) and a subsample of 36 chromosomes. See Table 1 for population numbers.


(a)
50°N
Latitude
40°N
120°W
100°W
Longitude
Canada
USA
18
(b)
Longitude
114°W
113°W
112°W
111°W
48°N
47°N
46°N
45°N
Latitude
MT
ID
WY
Sunnyslope Canal
17
The Great Falls
Sun River
Missouri River
Smith River
Continental Divide
14 Fuse Lake
Big Hole River
Jefferson River
Gallatin River
12
Bozeman Fish Tech Center
Ennis Dam
9
Axolotl Lake
11
Madison River
Ruby River
10
Beaverhead River
Grebe Lake
15
Red Rock lakes
8
0 20 40 80
Kilometers
(c)
Lamarche
5
Fishtrap
4
6
Mussigbrod Lake
Steel
Bobcat Lake
1
2
Swamp
16
3
Wisdom
13
Odell Lake
Miner Lake
7
km
0 10 20 30 40 50
N

Fig 1.


Madison River-
Ennis Reservoir
9
Big Hole River
and derivatives
12
1-5
10
11
100
96
15
17
70
69
62
63
16
13
8
6
Red Rock lakes
7
100
0.01
CSE distance
18
14
Canadian-origin

Fig 2.


Greater relative N_e
Genetic distinction
Mean number of private alleles per locus
Mean number of alleles per locus
1.2
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
-0.2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
14
7
16
6
1-5
8
15
13
11
10
12
17
9

Fig. 3

Supplemental Table S1. Population genetics statistics summarizing variation at 10 microsatellite loci of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) sampled from Montana, Wyoming, and Canada.

Population	**Locus**									
	TAR100	**TAR101**	**TAR104**	**TAR105**	**TAR106**	**TAR109**	**TAR110**	**TAR112**	**TAR114**	**TAR115**
Native - upper Missouri River basin										
Connected Big Hole River										
1 - Steel Creek										
N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
H_O	0.89	0.89	0.93	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.93	0.56	0.93	0.89
H_E	0.93	0.92	0.87	0.95	0.90	0.84	0.94	0.61	0.95	0.92
N_A	14	14	8	21	17	10	17	6	20	18
N_A^{36}	13.24	12.96	7.95	18.35	14.00	9.13	15.16	5.53	17.61	15.21
2 - Swamp Creek										
N	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38
H_O	0.87	0.82	0.84	0.92	0.97	0.71	1.00	0.53	1.00	1.00
H_E	0.91	0.93	0.85	0.95	0.94	0.82	0.95	0.67	0.95	0.93
N_A	13	16	12	22	18	12	22	6	25	21
N_R^{36}	11.74	14.03	9.91	17.47	15.51	9.80	17.26	5.06	18.74	15.62
3 – Big Hole River near Wisdom, MT										
N	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	21
H_O	0.86	0.77	0.91	0.86	0.95	0.68	0.95	0.77	0.91	0.90
H_E	0.93	0.93	0.87	0.94	0.93	0.80	0.95	0.66	0.96	0.94
N_A	15	16	8	19	15	9	21	5	21	18
N_R^{36}	14.17	14.69	7.99	17.26	14.29	8.57	19.32	4.64	19.44	16.91
4 – Fishtrap Creek										
N	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
H_O	0.93	0.89	0.93	0.93	0.96	0.71	0.93	0.75	0.96	0.96
H_E	0.92	0.93	0.89	0.94	0.91	0.83	0.95	0.66	0.94	0.95
N_A	14	16	10	16	14	9	19	5	22	18
N_R^{36}	12.77	14.54	9.49	14.73	12.77	8.34	17.15	4.29	18.27	16.00
5 - Lamarche Creek										
N	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
H_O	0.97	0.97	0.86	0.90	0.90	0.76	0.93	0.62	0.93	0.97
H_E	0.92	0.93	0.90	0.93	0.91	0.83	0.95	0.64	0.95	0.93

Population	**Locus**									
	TAR100	**TAR101**	**TAR104**	**TAR105**	**TAR106**	**TAR109**	**TAR110**	**TAR112**	**TAR114**	**TAR115**
N_A	18	15	11	19	15	10	21	5	20	20
N_R^{36}	15.02	13.86	10.36	15.50	13.08	9.01	17.30	4.81	16.92	16.54
1-5 Big Hole River (group)										
N	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	144	143
H_O	0.90	0.87	0.89	0.92	0.95	0.76	0.95	0.63	0.95	0.95
H_E	0.92	0.92	0.88	0.94	0.93	0.83	0.95	0.64	0.95	0.94
N_A	20	16	13	24	18	13	27	8	29	25
N_R^{36}	13.45	13.40	9.75	16.36	14.31	9.03	17.40	4.90	18.09	16.51
Upper Big Hole River watershed										
6 - Mussigbrod Lake										
N	48	48	47	48	48	48	48	48	47	48
H_O	0.94	0.81	0.85	0.85	0.79	0.77	0.90	0.44	0.53	0.90
H_E	0.91	0.81	0.88	0.89	0.89	0.72	0.93	0.42	0.49	0.89
N_A	13	8	13	15	14	6	17	4	8	11
N_R^{36}	11.67	6.95	10.18	11.93	10.91	5.21	13.79	3.58	6.27	10.25
7 - Miner Lake										
N	36	37	37	37	36	37	36	37	37	35
H_O	0.81	0.86	0.89	0.84	0.89	0.65	0.83	0.35	0.81	0.97
H_E	0.93	0.89	0.91	0.89	0.89	0.69	0.82	0.39	0.88	0.93
N_A	14	13	15	14	13	9	13	2	18	20
N_R^{36}	12.85	10.33	12.85	11.22	10.97	7.13	10.54	2.00	13.66	15.44
Red Rock Lakes system, Beaverhead River										
8 - Red Rock Creek										
N	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	47	48
H_O	0.92	0.83	0.88	0.88	0.92	0.71	0.90	0.13	0.83	0.90
H_E	0.90	0.80	0.88	0.89	0.90	0.74	0.91	0.12	0.92	0.91
N_A	16	8	10	14	14	6	19	2	26	18
N_R^{36}	12.65	7.58	9.07	10.88	11.37	5.13	14.32	1.95	17.19	13.80
Madison River system										
9 - Madison River-Ennis Reservoir										
N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
H_O	0.78	0.78	0.67	0.89	0.70	0.74	0.70	0.30	0.85	0.89
H_E	0.87	0.68	0.75	0.87	0.70	0.72	0.82	0.26	0.85	0.87
N_A	10	6	9	9	10	5	9	2	15	9

Population	**Locus**									
	TAR100	**TAR101**	**TAR104**	**TAR105**	**TAR106**	**TAR109**	**TAR110**	**TAR112**	**TAR114**	**TAR115**
N_R^{36}	9.41	5.30	7.75	8.68	8.53	4.89	8.73	2.00	13.15	8.30
Introduced Populations										
Captive and reserve conservation – derived from Big Hole River										
10 - Ruby River										
N	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
H_O	0.85	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.94	0.81	0.96	0.81	0.96	0.88
H_E	0.91	0.90	0.88	0.93	0.92	0.73	0.93	0.71	0.92	0.94
N_A	15	14	12	18	16	6	19	5	20	18
N_R^{36}	12.55	11.59	10.38	14.45	13.13	5.67	14.74	4.60	14.97	14.89
11 - Axolotl Lake										
N	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	52
H_O	0.84	0.91	0.80	0.95	0.95	0.71	0.89	0.73	0.95	0.94
H_E	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.93	0.90	0.77	0.92	0.75	0.93	0.93
N_A	16	15	11	18	12	8	20	6	23	21
N_R^{36}	12.38	12.19	9.67	14.56	10.83	7.34	14.68	5.46	15.66	15.19
12 - Bozeman Fish Technology Center										
N	48	48	48	47	47	48	48	48	47	48
H_O	0.85	0.79	0.83	0.85	0.94	0.69	0.98	0.69	0.89	1.00
H_E	0.91	0.85	0.81	0.89	0.91	0.71	0.93	0.71	0.91	0.91
N_A	16	14	11	17	15	6	17	5	18	18
N_R^{36}	11.96	10.01	9.04	13.17	12.70	5.20	14.42	4.37	13.80	13.03
Introduced - other sources										
13 - Odell Lake										
N	46	46	46	46	46	46	45	46	46	46
H_O	0.96	0.80	0.91	0.91	0.96	0.67	0.96	0.37	0.93	0.89
H_E	0.86	0.84	0.86	0.93	0.88	0.74	0.94	0.36	0.92	0.94
N_A	16	10	12	18	13	6	20	2	22	21
N_R^{36}	11.60	8.76	9.72	13.98	11.08	5.54	15.86	2.00	15.66	15.46
14 - Fuse Lake										
N	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
H_O	0.74	0.87	0.64	0.66	0.79	0.57	0.85	0.55	0.83	0.91
H_E	0.77	0.86	0.67	0.62	0.85	0.56	0.93	0.45	0.93	0.89
N_A	7	11	8	8	17	3	22	3	16	13
N_R^{36}	5.76	9.26	5.92	6.85	11.24	2.99	15.82	2.38	14.07	10.72

Population	**Locus**									
	TAR100	**TAR101**	**TAR104**	**TAR105**	**TAR106**	**TAR109**	**TAR110**	**TAR112**	**TAR114**	**TAR115**
15 - Grebe Lake										
N	46	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	46	47
H_O	0.91	0.87	0.85	0.91	0.89	0.79	0.98	0.38	0.89	0.94
H_E	0.90	0.86	0.86	0.90	0.91	0.83	0.91	0.51	0.92	0.93
N_A	17	8	9	16	16	9	16	3	22	21
N_R^{36}	12.40	7.56	8.16	12.26	12.51	7.53	12.05	2.62	15.78	15.22
16 - Bobcat Lake										
N	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47	47
H_O	0.74	0.77	0.66	0.85	0.89	0.68	0.74	0.62	0.87	0.98
H_E	0.83	0.79	0.75	0.86	0.86	0.69	0.81	0.56	0.94	0.88
N_A	10	7	6	10	11	5	11	3	21	15
N_R^{36}	8.23	6.62	5.36	9.28	9.35	4.90	8.87	2.95	15.51	11.50
17 - Sunnyslope Canal										
N	50	50	50	50	49	50	50	50	49	50
H_O	0.46	0.62	0.68	0.76	0.69	0.60	0.66	0.26	0.78	0.68
H_E	0.50	0.54	0.76	0.78	0.69	0.55	0.68	0.34	0.75	0.72
N_A	6	5	5	6	6	3	5	2	6	6
N_R^{36}	4.44	4.63	4.94	5.86	5.29	2.94	4.43	2.00	5.21	5.29
Native – Saskatchewan, Canada										
MacKenzie River Basin, Athabasca River system										
18 - Fond du Lac										
N	33	34	34	34	32	32	18	34	25	28
H_O	0.76	0.88	0.85	0.53	0.88	0.41	0.83	0.21	0.84	0.64
H_E	0.74	0.90	0.80	0.58	0.88	0.61	0.96	0.28	0.94	0.91
N_A	8	12	11	9	16	8	21	3	16	13
N_R^{36}	6.96	11.09	9.65	6.80	12.32	6.56	21.00	2.53	15.01	12.27

Note: N = sample size, H_O = observed heterozygosity, H_E = expected heterozygosity, N_A = numbers of alleles, N_A^{36} = rarefaction measure of allelic richness using a sample of 36 genes.

Supplemental Table S2. Allele frequencies at 10 microsatellite loci of Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) sampled from Montana, Wyoming, and Canada.

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
TAR100	**251**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.015**
	255	0.076	0.000	0.069	0.000	0.000	0.042	0.009	0.104	0.000	0.170	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.046
	259	0.052	0.000	0.125	0.000	0.000	0.083	0.109	0.073	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.030
	263	0.094	0.052	0.056	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.064	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.046
	267	0.028	0.115	0.069	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.011	0.170	0.000	0.117	0.000	0.227
	271	0.076	0.031	0.069	0.073	0.222	0.052	0.064	0.146	0.033	0.383	0.022	0.032	0.000	0.424
	275	0.042	0.125	0.028	0.000	0.019	0.031	0.009	0.073	0.000	0.149	0.044	0.000	0.000	0.182
	279	0.056	0.063	0.125	0.010	0.111	0.208	0.146	0.063	0.076	0.106	0.044	0.000	0.670	0.030
	283	0.090	0.094	0.125	0.042	0.056	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.098	0.000	0.000	0.000
	287	0.017	0.125	0.069	0.042	0.037	0.125	0.109	0.063	0.022	0.000	0.130	0.000	0.000	0.000
	291	0.052	0.115	0.042	0.115	0.130	0.021	0.018	0.010	0.152	0.011	0.109	0.085	0.230	0.000
	295	0.135	0.063	0.097	0.135	0.204	0.063	0.055	0.125	0.294	0.000	0.196	0.298	0.020	0.000
	299	0.115	0.052	0.056	0.115	0.111	0.063	0.091	0.083	0.076	0.000	0.065	0.213	0.010	0.000
	303	0.094	0.021	0.000	0.219	0.037	0.083	0.091	0.052	0.120	0.000	0.152	0.138	0.000	0.000
	307	0.031	0.000	0.014	0.010	0.074	0.000	0.036	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	311	0.007	0.021	0.056	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	317	0.004	0.125	0.000	0.031	0.000	0.094	0.100	0.156	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	321	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.022	0.011	0.000	0.000
	325	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	329	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.050	0.000
	333	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.031	0.000	0.073	0.082	0.010	0.054	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	337	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.042	0.009	0.010	0.065	0.000	0.044	0.032	0.020	0.000
	341	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.011	0.064	0.000	0.000
	345	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000
	349	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	353	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000
	361	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
TAR101	203	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.063	0.064	0.063	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	215	0.000	0.000	0.068	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	219	0.052	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.031	0.109	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	223	0.000	0.229	0.095	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	227	0.052	0.000	0.176	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.036	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	231	0.076	0.104	0.108	0.000	0.482	0.167	0.146	0.115	0.022	0.021	0.138	0.043	0.000	0.059
	235	0.076	0.323	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.083	0.055	0.021	0.044	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	239	0.014	0.115	0.014	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.018	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	243	0.066	0.083	0.054	0.000	0.000	0.146	0.064	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	247	0.035	0.115	0.149	0.052	0.000	0.021	0.018	0.000	0.087	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000
	251	0.073	0.021	0.149	0.031	0.241	0.073	0.027	0.010	0.163	0.000	0.192	0.351	0.100	0.000
	255	0.101	0.010	0.000	0.260	0.185	0.083	0.182	0.229	0.250	0.000	0.160	0.138	0.050	0.000
	259	0.122	0.000	0.014	0.094	0.056	0.031	0.100	0.010	0.109	0.000	0.117	0.000	0.000	0.000
	263	0.052	0.000	0.135	0.323	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.228	0.000	0.213	0.202	0.650	0.000
	267	0.146	0.000	0.014	0.073	0.019	0.156	0.064	0.229	0.044	0.085	0.064	0.138	0.170	0.044
	271	0.042	0.000	0.014	0.094	0.000	0.094	0.091	0.156	0.022	0.000	0.096	0.096	0.030	0.000
	275	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.021	0.009	0.021	0.033	0.138	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044
	279	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.103
	283	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.202**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.132**
	287	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.255	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.088
	292	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.011**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.147**
	296	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.032**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.029**
	300	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.106**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.103**
	304	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.075**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.191**
	308	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.021**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.029**
	312	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.029**
TAR104	151	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.059
	155	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.059
	159	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.031	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	163	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	167	0.000	0.000	0.176	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044
	171	0.014	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044	0.021	0.096	0.000	0.000	0.074
	175	0.146	0.011	0.027	0.073	0.019	0.052	0.082	0.083	0.044	0.511	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.397

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	179	0.101	0.011	0.081	0.000	0.037	0.042	0.091	0.052	0.022	0.245	0.053	0.085	0.000	0.162
	183	0.122	0.032	0.081	0.115	0.370	0.167	0.227	0.198	0.239	0.128	0.149	0.404	0.000	0.088
	187	0.198	0.096	0.054	0.156	0.315	0.219	0.218	0.354	0.130	0.000	0.202	0.223	0.180	0.044
	191	0.146	0.128	0.068	0.188	0.130	0.115	0.055	0.052	0.130	0.000	0.192	0.117	0.320	0.015
	194	0.108	0.170	0.081	0.125	0.000	0.115	0.109	0.083	0.196	0.011	0.181	0.160	0.310	0.000
	198	0.063	0.021	0.108	0.167	0.056	0.083	0.055	0.083	0.087	0.000	0.064	0.011	0.130	0.000
	202	0.024	0.149	0.054	0.052	0.037	0.094	0.091	0.052	0.022	0.021	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.044
	206	0.049	0.213	0.027	0.073	0.019	0.021	0.000	0.010	0.065	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.060	0.015
	210	0.010	0.075	0.149	0.010	0.019	0.010	0.018	0.010	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	214	0.010	0.032	0.041	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	218	0.010	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.036	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	222	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
TAR105	**148**	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.103**
	172	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.596**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.632**
	176	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.075**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.132**
	180	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.021**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.015**
	188	0.000	0.104	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	192	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	196	0.000	0.010	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	200	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	204	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.042	0.064	0.021	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	208	0.035	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.010	0.018	0.075	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	212	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.036	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	216	0.087	0.000	0.000	0.031	0.000	0.042	0.018	0.021	0.033	0.064	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	220	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.111	0.000	0.046	0.032	0.033	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.190	0.000
	224	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.021	0.009	0.000	0.109	0.000	0.043	0.032	0.000	0.000
	228	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.094	0.167	0.063	0.064	0.053	0.087	0.000	0.043	0.117	0.000	0.000
	232	0.028	0.000	0.014	0.052	0.204	0.115	0.073	0.138	0.087	0.000	0.202	0.181	0.190	0.000
	236	0.049	0.010	0.216	0.135	0.111	0.063	0.046	0.011	0.065	0.000	0.149	0.085	0.000	0.015
	240	0.014	0.010	0.041	0.146	0.204	0.031	0.046	0.011	0.087	0.000	0.138	0.255	0.000	0.000
	244	0.024	0.042	0.000	0.156	0.093	0.031	0.082	0.021	0.130	0.021	0.096	0.053	0.140	0.000
	248	0.021	0.063	0.054	0.188	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.087	0.032	0.075	0.117	0.360	0.029

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	252	0.007	0.135	0.108	0.052	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.138	0.000	0.000	0.070	0.015
	256	0.038	0.083	0.122	0.021	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.015
	260	0.059	0.031	0.108	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.046	0.064	0.033	0.053	0.011	0.000	0.050	0.044
	264	0.066	0.000	0.135	0.021	0.000	0.094	0.100	0.053	0.022	0.000	0.032	0.032	0.000	0.000
	268	0.045	0.021	0.108	0.000	0.000	0.104	0.127	0.096	0.120	0.000	0.011	0.043	0.000	0.000
	272	0.108	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.042	0.036	0.043	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.085	0.000	0.000
	276	0.066	0.094	0.027	0.000	0.037	0.146	0.146	0.255	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000
	280	0.083	0.052	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.063	0.027	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	284	0.045	0.052	0.000	0.000	0.037	0.042	0.018	0.043	0.011	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000
	288	0.014	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	292	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.037	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.075	0.000	0.000	0.000
	296	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
TAR106	220	0.024	0.000	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.046	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	224	0.038	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.125	0.118	0.075	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.020	0.000
	228	0.017	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.074	0.021	0.000	0.043	0.022	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	232	0.101	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.519	0.073	0.046	0.053	0.065	0.011	0.149	0.032	0.347	0.000
	236	0.069	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.148	0.073	0.036	0.053	0.250	0.000	0.117	0.021	0.112	0.016
	240	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.135	0.000	0.146	0.127	0.021	0.044	0.032	0.149	0.138	0.000	0.000
	244	0.073	0.010	0.111	0.104	0.019	0.052	0.073	0.149	0.087	0.021	0.053	0.043	0.000	0.203
	248	0.028	0.073	0.014	0.063	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.266	0.064	0.192	0.000	0.125
	252	0.059	0.156	0.125	0.052	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.202	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.234
	256	0.028	0.094	0.194	0.052	0.000	0.042	0.118	0.064	0.033	0.021	0.021	0.106	0.031	0.094
	260	0.021	0.167	0.083	0.104	0.019	0.052	0.018	0.106	0.098	0.000	0.128	0.138	0.000	0.063
	264	0.042	0.198	0.042	0.021	0.000	0.021	0.036	0.032	0.011	0.021	0.117	0.000	0.000	0.031
	268	0.146	0.021	0.111	0.177	0.074	0.094	0.136	0.202	0.130	0.000	0.032	0.043	0.429	0.016
	272	0.066	0.042	0.042	0.073	0.037	0.094	0.100	0.075	0.098	0.021	0.043	0.234	0.000	0.000
	276	0.059	0.000	0.069	0.010	0.019	0.094	0.146	0.064	0.044	0.011	0.032	0.000	0.061	0.031
	280	0.108	0.052	0.153	0.135	0.074	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.098	0.011	0.043	0.043	0.000	0.016
	284	0.028	0.104	0.014	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.128	0.021	0.011	0.000	0.078
	288	0.021	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.138	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.016
	292	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	296	0.000	0.042	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	304	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.011**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.016**
	308	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.032**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.016**
	312	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.053**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.016**
	316	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.011**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**
	320	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.011**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.031**
TAR109	283	0.010	0.000	0.432	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	285	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.444	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.087	0.575	0.192	0.000	0.000	0.594
	287	0.000	0.000	0.041	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.063
	289	0.066	0.000	0.351	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.082	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.078
	294	0.087	0.260	0.027	0.010	0.185	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000
	297	0.104	0.021	0.014	0.167	0.222	0.156	0.091	0.188	0.239	0.000	0.138	0.372	0.060	0.000
	302	0.288	0.188	0.041	0.156	0.111	0.396	0.373	0.438	0.033	0.000	0.096	0.064	0.530	0.000
	305	0.250	0.094	0.027	0.385	0.000	0.302	0.273	0.250	0.391	0.000	0.255	0.404	0.410	0.016
	310	0.069	0.417	0.054	0.250	0.000	0.052	0.027	0.000	0.217	0.000	0.223	0.085	0.000	0.000
	312	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	314	0.056	0.021	0.014	0.031	0.037	0.042	0.046	0.073	0.033	0.000	0.032	0.075	0.000	0.000
	316	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.046	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	318	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000
	322	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.064	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	330	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.016**
	344	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.330**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.172**
	348	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.096**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.047**
	352	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.016**
TAR110	220	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	224	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.063	0.027	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	228	0.066	0.000	0.069	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.046	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	232	0.042	0.000	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.064	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	236	0.004	0.000	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	252	0.014	0.104	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.042	0.046	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	256	0.042	0.052	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.156	0.155	0.083	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	258	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.028**

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	260	0.014	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	264	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	268	0.042	0.010	0.056	0.010	0.000	0.073	0.146	0.115	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	270	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.011**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**
	272	0.080	0.000	0.097	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	274	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.096**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.028**
	277	0.028	0.094	0.042	0.031	0.000	0.063	0.027	0.083	0.033	0.106	0.043	0.053	0.000	0.056
	281	0.035	0.083	0.153	0.208	0.167	0.000	0.027	0.104	0.044	0.011	0.106	0.064	0.000	0.000
	285	0.063	0.115	0.083	0.021	0.037	0.094	0.073	0.031	0.078	0.011	0.149	0.351	0.000	0.000
	289	0.080	0.052	0.000	0.000	0.056	0.052	0.064	0.042	0.089	0.000	0.138	0.000	0.250	0.028
	293	0.080	0.042	0.000	0.094	0.093	0.021	0.027	0.021	0.100	0.000	0.096	0.000	0.040	0.056
	297	0.024	0.115	0.014	0.063	0.074	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.089	0.000	0.085	0.011	0.000	0.139
	301	0.076	0.104	0.000	0.031	0.370	0.042	0.055	0.031	0.067	0.000	0.149	0.128	0.450	0.000
	303	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	305	0.066	0.073	0.000	0.010	0.037	0.125	0.091	0.042	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.083
	308	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	310	0.021	0.031	0.028	0.031	0.093	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044	0.021	0.075	0.202	0.240	0.111
	314	0.038	0.010	0.000	0.052	0.074	0.010	0.009	0.063	0.056	0.032	0.021	0.011	0.000	0.000
	318	0.052	0.042	0.000	0.146	0.000	0.010	0.036	0.125	0.011	0.170	0.043	0.043	0.000	0.056
	322	0.042	0.021	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.031	0.009	0.031	0.056	0.011	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.028
	326	0.031	0.042	0.028	0.063	0.000	0.073	0.073	0.073	0.056	0.085	0.011	0.085	0.020	0.056
	330	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.111	0.032	0.043	0.032	0.000	0.056
	334	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.085	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.028
	338	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.063	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.044	0.043	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.028
	342	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.028
	346	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.043	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.028
	350	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.028**
	354	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.028
	358	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	366	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.021**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**
	370	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.043**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.028**
	374	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.011**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.028**
	378	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.064**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	382	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.032**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.056**
	386	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.043**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**
TAR112	227	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	254	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.681**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.838**
	258	0.205	0.021	0.000	0.938	0.000	0.177	0.264	0.146	0.772	0.011	0.575	0.447	0.790	0.000
	262	0.524	0.740	0.257	0.063	0.852	0.313	0.309	0.313	0.228	0.309	0.404	0.489	0.210	0.147
	266	0.198	0.167	0.743	0.000	0.148	0.396	0.291	0.406	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.064	0.000	0.015
	270	0.024	0.073	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	286	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	290	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000
	294	0.031	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.094	0.073	0.125	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	298	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.036	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	302	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
TAR114	124	0.066	0.032	0.027	0.000	0.037	0.042	0.100	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	128	0.052	0.702	0.243	0.000	0.019	0.042	0.036	0.117	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	132	0.049	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.037	0.052	0.018	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	145	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	149	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.021	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.075	0.000	0.000
	154	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.010	0.018	0.000	0.174	0.000	0.022	0.011	0.041	0.000
	158	0.104	0.011	0.230	0.096	0.333	0.073	0.118	0.096	0.152	0.000	0.185	0.106	0.306	0.000
	162	0.042	0.000	0.027	0.223	0.037	0.125	0.164	0.170	0.076	0.000	0.141	0.032	0.000	0.000
	166	0.080	0.075	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.063	0.018	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000
	170	0.021	0.096	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.042	0.018	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	174	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	194	0.000	0.032	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	202	0.028	0.032	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
	206	0.000	0.000	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.020
	210	0.000	0.000	0.041	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	214	0.004	0.000	0.041	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.040
	218	0.052	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.056	0.000	0.018	0.053	0.000	0.032	0.011	0.021	0.000	0.100
	222	0.031	0.000	0.027	0.021	0.185	0.021	0.046	0.000	0.011	0.053	0.109	0.000	0.000	0.080

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	226	0.014	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.037	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.054	0.021	0.054	0.043	0.000	0.080
	230	0.066	0.000	0.014	0.011	0.037	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.022	0.106	0.054	0.011	0.000	0.080
	234	0.069	0.000	0.054	0.075	0.037	0.156	0.046	0.096	0.022	0.053	0.022	0.075	0.000	0.060
	238	0.056	0.000	0.054	0.085	0.000	0.135	0.091	0.043	0.033	0.053	0.054	0.032	0.000	0.060
	242	0.007	0.000	0.081	0.021	0.000	0.031	0.036	0.032	0.033	0.043	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.040
	246	0.004	0.021	0.000	0.053	0.019	0.010	0.018	0.021	0.033	0.170	0.054	0.000	0.296	0.080
	250	0.024	0.000	0.027	0.011	0.037	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.076	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.245	0.040
	254	0.017	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.056	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.065	0.096	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.120
	258	0.035	0.000	0.054	0.021	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.011	0.011	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.040
	262	0.045	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.056	0.052	0.091	0.149	0.044	0.096	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.100
	266	0.017	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.064	0.033	0.011	0.000	0.040
	270	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.052	0.046	0.021	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	274	0.035	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.031	0.027	0.021	0.033	0.053	0.044	0.128	0.010	0.020
	278	0.010	0.000	0.014	0.053	0.019	0.031	0.046	0.043	0.011	0.000	0.054	0.032	0.000	0.000
	282	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.010	0.009	0.000	0.076	0.000	0.022	0.096	0.102	0.000
	286	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.000	0.022	0.064	0.000	0.000
	291	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000
	295	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	299	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	303	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	309	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000
	312	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.043	0.000	0.000
	320	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000
	326	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000
	330	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.106	0.000	0.000
	334	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000
TAR115	178	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000
	182	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.019	0.021	0.010	0.010	0.065	0.000	0.053	0.000	0.000	0.000
	186	0.014	0.000	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.058	0.010	0.087	0.000	0.085	0.011	0.000	0.000
	190	0.014	0.000	0.057	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.054	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000
	194	0.077	0.052	0.014	0.073	0.000	0.031	0.029	0.021	0.011	0.000	0.043	0.021	0.000	0.000
	198	0.004	0.219	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.031	0.067	0.021	0.022	0.000	0.011	0.181	0.000	0.000

		Population number													
Locus	**Allele (bp)**	**1-5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**
	202	0.000	0.083	0.086	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.010	0.011	0.000	0.011	0.053	0.000	0.000
	206	0.028	0.104	0.029	0.021	0.019	0.094	0.048	0.188	0.011	0.000	0.011	0.106	0.070	0.000
	210	0.039	0.167	0.100	0.135	0.000	0.094	0.048	0.031	0.011	0.000	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.054
	214	0.039	0.052	0.029	0.135	0.000	0.104	0.039	0.063	0.065	0.000	0.032	0.075	0.000	0.000
	218	0.066	0.021	0.029	0.198	0.056	0.104	0.048	0.052	0.087	0.000	0.011	0.021	0.400	0.036
	222	0.112	0.052	0.014	0.052	0.148	0.073	0.125	0.094	0.109	0.011	0.138	0.053	0.000	0.000
	226	0.101	0.104	0.014	0.052	0.148	0.094	0.096	0.115	0.120	0.021	0.160	0.223	0.320	0.018
	230	0.039	0.073	0.029	0.021	0.185	0.031	0.067	0.010	0.054	0.160	0.096	0.000	0.000	0.054
	234	0.059	0.073	0.114	0.052	0.111	0.021	0.010	0.000	0.098	0.160	0.053	0.032	0.000	0.071
	238	0.056	0.000	0.071	0.052	0.167	0.083	0.115	0.104	0.011	0.043	0.043	0.021	0.000	0.054
	242	0.077	0.000	0.157	0.042	0.000	0.052	0.039	0.031	0.000	0.138	0.021	0.128	0.000	0.071
	246	0.021	0.000	0.071	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.010	0.065	0.096	0.043	0.011	0.000	0.196
	250	0.070	0.000	0.014	0.010	0.000	0.031	0.010	0.021	0.022	0.106	0.085	0.000	0.080	0.107
	254	0.007	0.000	0.043	0.010	0.148	0.052	0.096	0.073	0.022	0.043	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.161
	258	0.032	0.000	0.014	0.042	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.033	0.149	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.054
	262	0.042	0.000	0.086	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.058	0.135	0.011	0.032	0.000	0.053	0.120	0.054
	266	0.035	0.000	0.014	0.052	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.033	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.071
	270	0.025	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011	0.000	0.000
	274	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	278	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	282	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.021**	0.000	0.000	0.000	**0.000**

Note: Sample populations numbers are: 1-5-BigHole River (group), 6-Mussigbrod Lake, 7-Miner Lake, 8-Red Rock, 9-Madison River-Ennis Reservoir, 10-Ruby River, 11-Axolotl Lake, 12-Bozeman Fish Technology Center, 13-Odell Lake, 14-Fuse Lake, 15-Grebe Lake, 16-Bobcat Lake, 17-Sunnyslope Canal, and 18-Fond du Lac. Private alleles in the Canadian-origin populations (14-Fuse Lake and 18-Fond du Lac) are indicated by bold type.

Supplement 3 –*Population groupings of Arctic grayling (Thymallus arcticus) based on the Bayesian clustering method of STRUCTURE*

Methods

We also used the Bayesian clustering method of STRUCTURE v2.1 (Pritchard et al. 2000) to investigate population structure of native Arctic grayling in Montana relative to those we defined a priori based on sample location. Program STRUCTURE v2.1 groups individuals into a predefined number of genetic clusters (*K*). We applied the admixture model that assumes gene flow among populations and allows for correlated allele frequency across clusters. This admixture model assigns a proportion of each individual's genome to each of the clusters pursuing solutions that maximize HWE and linkage equilibrium within clusters. Using data from all locations in Montana where native grayling were sampled, 20 replicated unsupervised STRUCTURE runs were performed for each *K* from 1 - 15. All runs had a burn-in of 30 000 iterations followed by 100 000 iterations.

The symmetric similarity coefficient (SSC) was used to determine the similarity of outcomes among the 20 replicate STRUCTURE runs for each *K*. Using the LargeKGreedy algorithm of CLUMPP (Jakobsson and Rosenberg 2007) with 1000 random input sequences we determined the number of distinct modes among the 20 runs at each K by grouping pairs of runs that had a SSC > 0.9. Graphical displays of STRUCTURE results were generated using the DISTRUCT software (Rosenberg 2004) with the membership of each individual representing the mean membership over the replicate runs.

Three methods were used to infer the correct value of *K* for the dataset. Pritchard et al. (2000) showed that the posterior probabilities of *K* and Bayes' Rule can be used to estimate the correct value of *K*. This method simply identifies the *K* with the highest posterior probability for

the dataset as the correct value of *K*. Evanno et al. (2005) suggested that the method of Pritchard et al. (2000) often leads to an over estimate of *K* and recommended using the second order rate of change between *K* and *K*+1 clusters, Delta K (ΔK), as a more effective identifier of the correct *K* for the dataset. Finally, we used informal visualization of the population structure over all *K* values to select a *K* where there is a clear biological interpretation for the assignments and individuals are strongly assigned to clusters (Pritchard and Wen 2004).

Results

Bayesian cluster analysis for samples from ten locations provided strong support for a priori population groupings based on geography and physical isolation. Substantially less support for discrete demes or population substructure was found within the connected Big Hole River which had a different number of clusters based on the method of inference. Mussigbrod Lake, Miner Lake, Red Rock lakes, Madison River-Ennis Reservoir, and Fuse Lake formed distinct genetic clusters (Figure S3-1). In contrast, we could infer one, two, or five genetic clusters within the connected Big Hole River, corresponding to $K = 6$, 7, or 10, respectively. Ten total clusters (i.e., $K = 10$) had the highest mean posterior probability in the STRUCTURE analysis (ln P(D) = -15,861). In contrast, estimates of ΔK (= 26) indicated that a $K = 7$ was the most likely number of grayling population clusters, and $K = 8$ was second-most likely ($\Delta K = 8$). Evaluation of the assignment of individuals to clusters and a clear biological interpretation supported $K = 6$. For example in Figure S3-1 we plotted proportional membership for individuals assuming a $K = 10$, $K = 7$, and $K = 6$. At a $K = 10$ individuals from the five sampling locations in the connected Big Hole River were assigned fairly evenly to the five within-Big Hole clusters, while at a $K = 7$ individuals assigned with a higher confidence to one of the two clusters. However, we did not observe a clear biological interpretation of the clusters in the Big

Hole River at either $K = 10$ or a $K = 7$, so we did not reject the null hypothesis of panmixia among demes within the connected Big Hole River. Population analysis using F_{ST} and allele frequencies also supported this conclusion ((Peterson and Ardren In Review)

References

Evanno G., Regnaut, S., Goudet, J. 2005. Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. Mol. Ecol. **14**(8): 2611–2620.

Jakobsson, M., and Rosenberg, N.A. 2007. CLUMPP: a cluster matching and permutation program for dealing with label switching and multimodality in analysis of population structure. Bioinformatics **23**(14): 1801–1806.

Pritchard, J.K., and Wen, W. 2004. Documentation for structure Software: Version 2. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Rosenberg, N.A. 2004. DISTRICT: a program for the graphical display of population structure. Mol. Ecol. Notes **4**(1): 137–138.

Figure captions

Figure S3-1. Analysis of genetic population structure for 702 Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) sampled from 10 locations in Montana. These three plots correspond to the results from an unsupervised Bayesian clustering method assuming the number of clusters (i.e., K) = 6, 7, or 10. Plots display mean individual membership of all fish into each of the K clusters. Clusters are represented by different colors and each fish is represented as a vertical line fractionally allocated into K genetic clusters. Fish are grouped by sampling location.


Native – upper Missouri River basin
Connected Big Hole River
Isolated Lakes in Big Hole Watershed
Red Rock Lakes
Madison River
Canadian Origin
K=6
K=7
K=10
Swamp Creek
Steel Creek
Main stem (Wisdom, MT)
Fishtrap Creek
Lamarche Creek
Mussigbrood Lake
Miner Lake
Red Rock Creek
Ennis Reservoir
Fuse Lake

Fig S3-1.

Supplement 4 – *Isolation-by-distance among native Arctic grayling populations in the Upper Missouri River system, USA*

Methods

Calculation of fluvial pairwise distances

Pairwise fluvial distances among sample locations (Table S4-1) were calculated in ArcGIS version 9.2 (ESRI, Inc., Redlands, CA) based on the sample locations presented in Peterson and Ardren (In Review). The Big Hole River sample combines Arctic grayling (*Thymallus articus*) collected at five discrete locations: Fishtrap Creek, Lamarche Creek, Steel Creek, Swamp Creek, and the Big Hole River near the town of Wisdom, Montana. We used the midpoint of the fluvial distance between the most upstream (Wisdom) and downstream (Lamarche Creek) sample locations as the point location for the combined Big Hole River sample (25.25 km upstream from the confluence of Lamarche Creek and the Big Hole River).

Pairwise genetic distances

Tests of isolation-by-distance typically use pairwise F_{ST} for values of genetic differentiation. We detected that mutation accounted for some of the genetic differentiation for Arctic grayling in Mussigbrod Lake (Peterson et al. In Review), thus F_{ST} (which estimates differentiation based on genetic drift) likely underestimates the actual differentiation among sample pairs containing that population. Consequently, we considered R_{ST} a less biased estimate of genetic differentiation as this metric considers mutation, but present results of isolation-by-distance for both R_{ST} and F_{ST} (Tables S4-2 and S4-3). We also analyzed whether anthropogenic migration barriers, rather than fluvial distance, could account for genetic differentiation among sample pairs (Table S4-4).

Table S4-1. Pairwise fluvial distances among native Arctic grayling populations.

	Fluvial distance (ln(km))			
	Big Hole River	Mussigbrod Lake	Miner Lake	Red Rock lakes
Mussigbrod Lake	3.5723			
Miner Lake	4.2957	4.6150		
Red Rock lakes	6.1001	6.1769	6.2525	
Madison River	5.8533	5.9506	6.0444	6.1913

Table S4-2. Pairwise genetic differentiation among native Arctic grayling populations based on R_{ST}.

	Genetic differentiation ($R_{ST}/(1-R_{ST})$)			
	Big Hole River	Mussigbrod Lake	Miner Lake	Red Rock lakes
Mussigbrod Lake	0.3805			
Miner Lake	0.0941	0.4440		
Red Rock lakes	0.1251	0.9172	0.46464	
Madison River	0.0533	0.7379	0.2461	0.1685

Table S4-3. Pairwise genetic differentiation among native Arctic grayling populations based on F_{ST}.

	Genetic differentiation ($F_{ST}/(1-F_{ST})$)			
	Big Hole River	Mussigbrod Lake	Miner Lake	Red Rock lakes
Mussigbrod Lake	0.0775			
Miner Lake	0.0776	0.1362		
Red Rock lakes	0.07619	0.1910	0.1766	
Madison River	0.0783	0.1684	0.1759	0.2105

Table S4-3. Migration barriers between pairs of native Arctic grayling populations.

	Migration barriers (no.)			
	Big Hole River	Mussigbrod Lake	Miner Lake	Red Rock lakes
Mussigbrod Lake	1			
Miner Lake	0	1		
Red Rock lakes	3	4	3	
Madison River	1	2	1	4

Figure captions

Figure S4-1. Pairwise estimates of genetic differentiation ($R_{ST}/(1-R_{ST})$) versus fluvial distance in five native Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) populations in Montana. An isolation by distance effect was not detected (Mantel test, n=10, $r_s = 0.164$, $p = 0.35$). Filled points (●) are those pairs including only the Big Hole River (group), Madison River-Ennis Reservoir and Red Rock lakes populations, whereas open points (○) include Miner and Mussigbrod lakes. The inset plot at upper left shows, for the same populations, genetic differentiation versus the number of migration barriers between pairs of populations (note: the inset's *y*-axis scale is equivalent to the larger plot). Fluvial distance was correlated with the number of physical migration barriers between these populations (Mantel test, n = 10, $r_s = 0.850$, $p = 0.0019$), but no correlation was detected between ($R_{ST}/(1-R_{ST})$) the number of migration barriers (Mantel test, n = 10, $r_s = 0.271$, p-value = 0.24).

Figure S4-2. Pairwise estimates of genetic differentiation ($F_{ST}/(1-F_{ST})$) versus fluvial distance values showing significant isolation by distance in five native Arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) populations in Montana (Mantel test, n=10, $r_s = 0.697$, $p = 0.013$). Filled points (●) are those pairs including only the Big Hole River (group), Madison River-Ennis Reservoir and Red Rock lakes populations, whereas open points (○) include Miner and Mussigbrod lakes. The inset plot at upper left shows, for the same populations, genetic differentiation versus the number of migration barriers between pairs of populations (note: the inset's *y*-axis scale is equivalent to the larger plot).


1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
$R_{ST}/(1-R_{ST})$
3
4
5
6
7
Ln(fluvial distance) (km)
0
1
2
3
4
No. barriers

Figure S4-1


0.25
0.20
0.15
0.10
0.05
0.00
$F_{ST}/(1-F_{ST})$
3
4
5
6
7
Ln(fluvial distance) (km)
0
1
2
3
4
No. barriers

Figure S4-2