# WHICH IS MORE IMPORTANT: NUMBER OF PATCHES OR CONNECTIVITY?

Darin Kalisak, PBS Student

Contact: dlkalisa@unity.ncsu.edu

## INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

Metapopulation conservation efforts with limited resources would benefit from a clear understanding of the effects of different conservation strategies, so that the conservationists can decide how to best spend their resources. In particular, in metapopulations with randomly occurring patch extinction and recolonization, it is desirable to know what conservation strategy is more effective: is it better to spend effort to add new patches to the metapopulation, or is it better to spend that effort to facilitate migration between patches?

As an aid to real-life conservation efforts, this model might be useful in weighing various strategies. For example, if the conservation choices for an endangered species are either to buy land to connect existing habitats (increasing connectivity), or to simply work to preserve multiple habitats (increasing number of patches), the model may avoid a solution which is economically preferable but ecologically ineffective.

I developed a simple metapopulation model to investigate this issue. I ran the model using varying numbers of patches, where each patch is considered to be either extinct or occupied, and where every pair of patches is either connected or disconnected for purposes of migration. The whole metapopulation is considered to be extinct if and only if all of the patches are extinct.

## THE PROGRAM



### ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

•Additional migration pathways were added in a manner which kept the number of pathways for each patch fairly constant. No effort was made to investigate the effects of less symmetric configurations.

•Starting patch habitation was randomly determined, and so the results may not correspond well to specific species metapopulations with known starting conditions.

•All patches were assumed to be either fully occupied or extinct, and of equal value to the metapopulation.

•All migration pathways were equivalent, regardless of spatial distances or other factors involved.

•The model had a low resolution for differing probabilities of extinction and migration.

•The model amalgamated results from differing extinction and migration probabilities within a number of patches. It is possible that for specific parameter values, this amalgamation will hide results contrary to the overall trend reported here.

## THE ISSUE



A metapopulation is a collection of discrete population patches, in which individual patches may typically go extinct and be recolonized. Is the long-term viability of the metapopulation helped more by adding new patches or by increasing the number of migration pathways between existing patches?

Adding patches increases the overall population of the organism, and makes a total extinction less likely by increasing the sheer number of patches which would have to go extinct.

Adding migration pathways increases the likelihood of recolonization of extinct pathways, by giving extinct patches more sources for immigration.



## RESULTS

I tested the model by running simulations which varied over four parameters:

• number of patches (values 4, 5, 6, and 7)
• minimally connected to maximally connected (expressed as the ratio of migration pathways to number of patches, or c/p)
• time-step-extinction probabilities of .2, .4, .6, and .8
• time-step-migration probabilities of .2, .4, .6, and .8

For every combination of these parameters, I ran 100 simulations of 1000 time-steps each, and tracked the number of instances out of those 100 runs that the metapopulation did not go extinct. For each number of patches, I then summed the numbers of surviving metapopulations for each connection ratio to obtain a summary value for each patch/pathway configuration. The results are graphed below. The model showed that increasing the number of patches by only one patch had a far greater effect on metapopulation survival than did increasing the connectivity between patches. A horizontal line intersecting two result curves would, at each intersection, show the ratio of connectivity necessary to achieve the same survival rate for each of the two metapopulations. In every case, the metapopulation with the greater number of patches requires a lower connectivity ratio to maintain the desired survival level. In some cases, as with four patches, no increase in connectivity could have the same effect on metapopulation survival as a adding a single patch.



## CONCLUSIONS

The results of this model indicate that, when possible, adding patches to a metapopulation is far preferable to incremental increases in numbers of migration pathways. There are some cases in which substantial gains in numbers of pathways can improve the long term viability of the metapopulation compared to addition of a patch. When the costs of these additional pathways is relatively low, this may be a good strategy, however in most cases the greatest benefit to the metapopulation will come from adding more patches.

It is worth noting that in our results, the curve for each additional patch is steeper than the last. It may be that the low numbers of patches I tested are an important limit on the effects of connectivity. Simulations using larger numbers of patches may show that increased connectivity can have a greater effect on metapopulation survival than is seen here.