Genetic diversity and population structure of the size-selectively harvested owl limpet, *Lottia gigantea*
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Abstract
Size-selective harvesting can elicit a genetic response in target species through changes in population genetic subdivision, genetic diversity and selective regimes. While harvest-induced genetic change has been documented in some commercially important species through the use of historic samples, many commonly harvested species, such as coastal molluscs, lack historic samples and information on potential harvest induced genetic change. In this study, we have genotyped six microsatellite markers from populations across much of the California mainland range of the size-selectively harvested owl limpet (*Lottia gigantea*) to explore the genetic structure and diversity of this species. We found no significant genetic structure or differences in genetic diversity among populations of *L. gigantea*. Our results suggest high gene flow among populations and that differences in life history, demography, and body size previously observed between protected and exploited populations is largely due to phenotypic plasticity. From a conservation perspective, if proper actions are taken to curb harvesting, then exploited populations should be able to return to their pre-impact state given sufficient time.

Problem
Size-selective harvesting is one of the most widespread anthropogenic impacts on marine species. The loss of larger (older) individuals due to such harvesting has numerous cascading effects on the biology of affected species and populations, including changes in life history, demography, reproductive output, and even ecological interactions (Fenberg & Roy 2008). Size-selective harvesting has been shown to elicit rapid microevolutionary responses in some wild populations (Cotman *et al.* 2003; Grift *et al.* 2003; Olsen *et al.* 2004; Kuparinen & Merila 2007; Nusse *et al.* 2009) and intense harvest-induced mortality (regardless of selectivity) over multiple generations should result in genetic changes (Allendorf *et al.* 2008). However, for the vast majority of affected species, we do not know whether observed changes have a genetic basis, represent phenotypic plasticity, or result from a combination of both (Kuparinen & Merila 2007; Allendorf *et al.* 2008; Fenberg & Roy 2008).

The most powerful way to detect harvest-induced genetic changes is to analyze samples collected over an extended period of time as a species is exploited (Cotman *et al.* 2003; Kuparinen & Merila 2007; Allendorf *et al.* 2008). This approach has produced mixed results for harvested fish species, with some such studies showing a change in genetic diversity or structure over time (Smith *et al.* 1991; Hauser *et al.* 2002; Heath *et al.* 2002; Hutchinson *et al.* 2003) while others reveal no significant trends (Nielsen *et al.* 1999; Ruzzante *et al.* 2001; Chevolot
et al. 2008). Such historical analyses are, however, not possible for the majority of harvested species due to the lack of archived samples from the past.

A comparison of genetic variation between populations of a target species from well-protected marine reserves with those from exploited areas is a valuable alternative to detecting harvest-induced genetic change when historic samples are not available. However, a prerequisite for such studies is the proper establishment of population genetic substructure of the target species (Coltman et al. 2003; Allendorf et al. 2008). Comparisons between protected and exploited populations of a panmictic species will provide little evidence of harvest-induced genetic change without historical data. On the other hand, if genetic differences exist, then comparisons of protected and exploited sites can provide information about an intended function of protection, the preservation of intraspecific genetic diversity (Trexler & Travis 2000). For example, allelic richness for a harvested fish species (Diplodus sargus) is significantly higher at protected areas compared with non-protected areas (Perez-Ruzafa et al. 2006). Interestingly, depleted populations of the Tasmanian black-lip abalone (Haliotis rubra) have higher levels of genetic diversity than do healthy populations (Miller et al. 2009). This is hypothesized to be due to a higher ratio of migrants to self-recruiting larvae at depleted populations relative to healthy populations (Miller et al. 2009). Thus information about patterns of gene flow and population connectivity of harvested species is necessary for better understanding the long-term consequences of harvest-induced mortality.

Intertidal and subtidal species of molluscs represent a large portion of species currently known to be affected by size-selective harvesting (Fenberg & Roy 2008). Humans have exploited coastal molluscs (clams, limpets, abalone, and other gastropods) as a food source since prehistoric times (Jerardino et al. 1992; Siegfried 1994; Mannino & Thomas 2002), and for many species subsistence harvesting in the past has given way to widespread commercial harvesting. However, there is a general lack of data on the effects of harvesting (commercial, recreational or subsistence) on the genetic population structures of shallow-water molluscan species. Even along the coast of California, where many species of molluscs are routinely harvested (Murray et al. 1999), information about genetic structure is only available for a few species (Gruenthal et al. 2007; Addison et al. 2008; Gruenthal & Burton 2008).

In this study, we examine the genetic diversity and population structure of one of the most widely exploited molluscs in California, the owl limpet Lottia gigantea. Lottia gigantea is an intertidal gastropod that can reach a maximum length greater than 100 mm, making it the largest patellogastropod (limpet) in North America. The geographic range of this species extends from Baja California (26.1 °N) to northern California (39.4 °N). Individuals undergo a single spawning event in the winter months, typically in January or February (Daly 1975). Larvae are pelagic and although the exact larval duration of this species remains unknown, laboratory studies of other Northeastern Pacific Lottia species (Lottia digitalis and Lottia asmi) suggest that metamorphic competence (at 13 °C) occurs around 5 days after fertilization (Kay & Emlet 2002). However, even with a short pelagic phase, larvae within the north-flowing coastal Davidson Current during the winter could potentially be transported long distances, upwards of 350 km (Glickman 1999; Gruenthal et al. 2007). The potential for high rates of dispersal between L. gigantea populations is thus substantial. On the other hand, there are physical and biological reasons to think that local retention of larvae is also possible. For example, rocky intertidal habitats in the middle portion of the geographic range of L. gigantea (Southern California) are often separated by long stretches of unsuitable sandy habitats and provincial and phylogeographic boundaries (e.g. Point Conception and Monterey Bay), as well as topographical headlands, which can also limit larval dispersal (Burton 1998; Dawson 2001; Wares et al. 2001; Banks et al. 2007). Perhaps more importantly, human exploitation of this species has the potential to affect the genetic makeup of local populations.

Decades of size-selective harvesting have reduced the body sizes of most California mainland populations of L. gigantea, with the exception of those living in well protected reserves and along isolated stretches of coastline (Pombo & Escofet 1996; Lindberg et al. 1998; Roy et al. 2003; Sagarin et al. 2007). Exploited and protected populations of this species differ in several ways. On average, individuals of L. gigantea from protected populations are larger, grow faster, change sex at a larger size (L. gigantea is a protandric hermaphrodite), are less abundant, and have different ecological interactions with the surrounding community compared with those from exploited populations (Pombo & Escofet 1996; Lindberg et al. 1998; Roy et al. 2003; Sagarin et al. 2007; Fenberg 2008). Besides humans, American black oystercatchers (Haematopus bachmani) also eat L. gigantea, yet they do not hunt for the large individuals, are sensitive to human encroachment, and do not regularly occur at sites frequented by humans (Lindberg et al. 1998).

Exploited populations have significantly lower biomass and total reproductive output compared to protected areas (Fenberg 2008). Such reductions in reproductive output can decrease the number of migrants among local populations and potentially result in a loss of genetic variation (Allendorf et al. 2008). The primary goal of this study is to quantify patterns of genetic connectivity among L. gigantea populations along the California coast using...
microsatellite polymorphisms. In addition, we explore whether populations from exploited areas have significantly different levels of genetic diversity compared to those from protected marine reserves.

**Material and Methods**

**Sample sites**

We collected 218 *Lottia gigantea* individuals between 2004 and 2006 at eight rocky intertidal field sites spanning most of the California mainland portion of the geographic range of this species, from 32.66 °N to 38.18 °N (Fig. 1). We stored individuals in 95% ethanol (at 4 °C) and extracted DNA using a commercially available genomic DNA extraction kit (Bioneer Inc.).

We consider three of our field sites to be protected from substantial harvest pressure as a result of either proper law enforcement (Cabrillo National Monument) or from restricted public access (Vandenberg Air Force Base and Pebble Beach Golf Course). Two sites are considered exploited based on our personal observations of harvesting (La Jolla) and communication with reserve managers (Don Canestro at Kenneth S. Norris Rancho Marino Reserve) and another site on the Palos Verdes peninsula (PV) was placed in the exploited category based on observations that individuals collected at this location in the past were significantly larger than they are today (Roy *et al.* 2003). A historical decline in body size in Southern California has been attributed to size-selective harvest pressure (Roy *et al.* 2003; Fenberg 2008). Each site listed above was further confirmed to be either exploited or protected based on a previous study documenting the extent of size-selective harvesting of this species across much of its geographic range (Sagarin *et al.* 2007). The remaining two field sites (Pt. Reyes National Seashore and Bolinas) are near the northern range limit of *L. gigantea*, where factors such as naturally reduced abundances and a lack of small (young) individuals (compared to more southerly populations) make it difficult to assess the impact humans have had on these local populations (Fenberg 2008). We have therefore not placed these two field sites into a vulnerability category (protected or exploited); we do, however, use them for the analysis of overall population structure (see below). *Lottia gigantea* are very rare north of San Francisco CA (37.8 °N) (see Fenberg 2008), therefore our sample sizes at Bolinas (37.89 °N) and Pt. Reyes (38.18 °N) were reduced to limit damage to these populations. Increasing our sample sizes by removing a small piece of foot tissue is not recommended in the case of *L. gigantea* because personal observations suggest a high mortality rate is associated with this practice. In addition, our scientific collecting permits limited sample sizes to no more than 25–30 individuals at the protected sites.

**Genotyping and statistical analyses**

With the help of researchers at the Joint Genome Institute (JGI) (especially Jarrod Chapman), we screened the *Lottia gigantea* genome, which is currently being sequenced by JGI, for tri-nucleotide microsatellite markers with eight or more repeat units. This involved creating a long list of potential tri-nucleotide repeats (e.g. AAC, AAG, AGA, ATG, ATC, etc.) and requesting that JGI screen for their presence in the genome with the inclusion of 250-base-pair flanking regions of the repeat sequence each time it was present in the genome.

In all, we developed primers for 20 loci using PRIMER3 V. 0.4.0 (Rozen & Skaltesky 2000). Our criteria for keeping a locus for further analysis were based on the ease of amplification and our ability consistently to detect no more than two bands per individual. In all, we genotyped six polymorphic loci for each of our sampled field sites. PCR amplification for these six loci was performed using fluorescently labeled primers (Table 1) with an annealing temperature of 50 °C. Product sizes were visualized with an automated sequencer (ABI 3100). An internal size standard (400 HD ROX, Applied Biosystems) allowed for accurate sizing and the electropherograms were analyzed using GENEMAPPER V. X software (Applied Biosystems). Alleles were scored by PCR product size and converted to repeat number by subtracting the

![Fig. 1. Map of California collection sites for *Lottia gigantea*. Protected populations are in bold. PR: Pt. Reyes (38.18 °N); BOL: Bolinas (37.89 °N); PBL: Pebble Beach (36.56 °N); KN: Ken Norris UC Reserve (35.52 °N); VBG: Vandenberg (34.73 °N); PV: Palos Verdes (33.7 °N); LJ: La Jolla (32.82 °N); CNM: Cabrillo National Monument (32.66 °N).](image-url)
size of the flanking regions. We calculated the number of alleles and the expected and observed heterozygosity values across field sites for each locus using the program GENEPOP v. 3.4 (Raymond & Rousset 1995, 2003; Table 2). In addition, we account for reduced sample sizes at northern sites (see above) using a method employed by the program FSTAT (Goudet 1995) that allows us to estimate the mean allelic richness values per locus and field site based on the minimum sample size.

Samples were tested for deviations from Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) across sites (multilocus) and by locus (multisite). Global and pairwise exact tests of genotypic differentiation were performed. In addition, we tested for evidence of linkage disequilibrium across all pairwise comparisons of loci. We performed the above statistical tests using GENEPOP with the following Markov chain parameters: 10,000 dememorization steps, 1000 batches, 10,000 permutations per batch.

Genetic differentiation between populations was further tested using $F_{st}$ (Weir & Cockerham 1984) and the microsatellite analogue $q_{st}$ between all pairwise field site possibilities using GENEPOP. $q_{st}$ takes into account allele size assuming a stepwise mutation model (Michalakis & Excoffier 1996; Rousset 1996). In addition, we also calculated a standardized measure of $F_{st}$ ($F_{ST}^*$), which accounts for low $F_{st}$ values due to high within-population variation often found with microsatellites (Hedrick 2005). Levels of significance were based on sequential Bonferroni corrections at the $z = 0.05$ level. We performed a Mantel’s test using GENALEX software v. 6.1 (Peakall & Smouse 2006) to test for a correlation between genetic distance and geographic distance.

Clustering analysis

We used the program STRUCTURE (Pritchard et al. 2000) to further examine levels of genetic population structure across all sampled localities. STRUCTURE assigns individuals to subpopulations ($k$) independent of sampling sites and uses a Bayesian clustering method to assign individuals with similar multilocus genotypes to

| Table 1. Primer sequences and product sizes for six Lottia gigantea microsatellite loci. |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Locus   | Left primer | Right primer | ~Size (bp) |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Lg1 (ATC) | tgttcttggcatcataaact | gcatacacaaggtcaagaaga | 263 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Lg2 (AAC) | ttacacaagcaagctcagg | gttggtcttggttgttggg | 354 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Lg3 (AAC) | caaagctacgcctcattt | ctgggtgatggatctctct | 299 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Lg4 (TGAT) | aacatggtttaaggggaag | gctgttgtcttttttaagctgtgg | 212 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Lg5 (AAC) | gctggtttggttcttacta | atgcgtggtgtgcttgg | 223 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Lg6 (GTT) | aclcaacgcttcttttaagctg | gggatagccggttggta | 259 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for six Lottia gigantea microsatellite loci across eight sampled field localities. Given are the number of samples (N), the observed ($H_o$) and expected heterozygosities ($H_e$) and the number of alleles (A) found per loci and locality. No significant evidence of heterozygote deficit was found for a multilocus test across localities. However, Lg6 was found to deviate significantly from HWE using an exact test for each locus (multilocality; see text for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$H_e$</th>
<th>$H_o$</th>
<th>Het. def.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo N.M. (32.66)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.81 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla (32.87)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.62 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes (33.71)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.87 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandenberg (34.73)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Norris (35.52)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebble Beach (36.56)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.78 (0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolinas (37.89)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.87 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Reyes (38.88)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.87 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

probable subpopulations of origin. We used two default models that are considered to be the most biologically realistic: (i) the admixture model, which assumes that individuals have mixed ancestry (i.e. individual i has inherited some proportion of its genome from its ancestors in population k); and (ii) the uncorrelated allele frequency model, which assumes that allele frequencies are independent draws from a distribution specified by the parameter $\lambda$. We performed 10 runs for each k (1–10) with a burnin of 30,000 steps followed by 100,000 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) iterations to estimate the mean and variance of log likelihoods and posterior probabilities of the number of assumed populations. For each run, we inspected the time series plots to confirm that they reached a stable stationary distribution. We did not provide the program with a priori information about the population of origin for each individual. The best estimate of k that maximized the posterior probability of the data was determined by averaging the maximum likelihood scores for each k value. STRUCTURE also provides an estimate of the probability of the mean proportion of membership (q) for each individual within the assigned subpopulation. Individuals with q values = 0.90 or greater are considered to be confidently placed into their subpopulation of origin (Pritchard et al. 2000).

**Results**

We found no evidence of linkage disequilibrium between any of the loci across all populations after sequential Bonferroni corrections (at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level). In addition, we found no evidence of deviation from HWE across sites (multilocus test) as indicated by the non-significant P-values for heterozygote deficit in Table 2. However, we did find evidence of significant deviation from HWE for the Lg6 locus (multisite test; $P = 0.0005$) after sequential
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**Fig. 2.** Mean allelic richness (based on minimum sample size) (A) and mean expected heterozygosity (B) for sampled populations. Error bars represent the standard error. Protected populations are marked with asterisks. Numbers (1–8) refer to the sampled localities in Fig. 1. Pairwise comparisons reveal no significant differences in allelic richness or expected heterozygosity across all populations.
significant differences in genetic diversity (Fig. 2). The mean number of alleles per population ranged from 0.80 to 0.85. Based on the minimum sample size at Pt. Reyes. Mean expected heterozygosity (He) values ranged from 0.8 to 0.85. The mean number of alleles per locus within a population ranged from 8.6 to 13.0, with the lowest value belonging to the northernmost population. The five remaining tri-nucleotide repeat loci each contained 10–22 alleles (Table 2). The mean number of alleles per locus within a population ranged from 8.6 to 13.0, with the lowest value belonging to the northernmost population. The mean number of alleles per population ranged from 0.80 to 0.85. Based on the minimum sample size at Pt. Reyes. Mean expected heterozygosity (He) values ranged from 0.8 to 0.85.

Bonferroni correction. This may be due to any number of factors, including null-alleles, non-random mating, inbreeding or selection (Lowe et al. 2004). Although including Lg6 did not significantly alter any of our results, we chose to exclude this locus for the remainder of our analyses given the possibility that it is not a neutral Mendelian marker.

The five remaining tri-nucleotide repeat loci each contained 10–22 alleles (Table 2). The mean number of alleles per locus within a population ranged from 8.6 to 13.0, with the lowest value belonging to the northernmost population at Pt. Reyes. Mean expected heterozygosity (He) values ranged from 0.8 to 0.85. Based on the minimum sample size (Table 2), the mean number of alleles per population ranges from 8.3 to 10.0. Pairwise t-tests of mean allelic richness (based on minimum sample size) and mean expected heterozygosity performed across populations revealed no significant differences in genetic diversity (Fig. 2).

Analysis of all loci combined revealed no significant global differentiation among populations (P = 0.284). In addition, no significant pairwise divergence between populations was found (exact tests and through Fst and ρst) after sequential Bonferroni corrections (Table 3). Furthermore, the calculated standardized values for Fst (Fst) revealed non-significant results (overall Fst = 0.012). Similarly, the results from the Mantel test show that there is no significant correlation between geographic distance and genetic distance across populations (P = 0.280).

A lack of significant genetic differentiation between populations is further supported from our clustering analysis using the program STRUCTURE. Regardless of the assumed k, the proportion of membership (q) is equally partitioned into each subpopulation for all individuals. For example, at k = 2, the proportion of membership is equal to 0.50; at k = 1, the proportion of membership is 1.0 (Fig. 3). Individuals with q values greater than 0.90 are considered to be confidently placed into their subpopulation of origin (Pritchard et al. 2000); therefore, our results indicate that all genotyped individuals represent part of a single interbreeding population (k = 1).

Table 3. Global and pairwise comparisons of genotypic differentiation and F-statistics (Fst and ρst).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Genotypic differentiation</th>
<th>F-statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>Fst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOL &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>−0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBL &amp; BOL</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN &amp; BOL</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN &amp; PBL</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>−0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBG &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBG &amp; BOL</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>−0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBG &amp; PBL</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>−0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBG &amp; KN</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV &amp; BOL</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV &amp; PBL</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV &amp; KN</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV &amp; VBG</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ &amp; BOL</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>−0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ &amp; PBL</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>−0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ &amp; KN</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>−0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ &amp; VBG</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ &amp; PV</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; PR</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; BOL</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; PBL</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; KN</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; VBG</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; PV</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNM &amp; LJ</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant P-values existed after sequential Bonferroni correction at the α = 0.05 level. Protected populations are in bold.

Discussion

A prerequisite for assessing the genetic effects of harvesting is the establishment of population genetic substructure of the target species (Coltman et al. 2003; Allendorf et al. 2008). Our analyses reveal no such structure or differences in genetic diversity among local populations of Lottia gigantea from throughout the California mainland portion of its geographic range. These results suggest high gene flow between populations and a lack of long-term geographic barriers to dispersal. This is consistent with the pattern seen in other coastal marine invertebrates with planktonic larvae, where low population differentiation and high gene flow between populations is commonly reported (Hellberg 1996; Dawson 2001; Gruenthal et al. 2007; Kelly & Eernisse 2007; Lee & Boulding 2007; Addison et al. 2008). For harvested species, our results are similar to those found for the California populations of the harvested red abalone, Haliotis rufescenes (Gruenthal et al. 2007). Haliotis rufescenes and L. gigantea have similar geographic ranges, a comparable early life history, and a lack of significant genetic subdivision among populations using the same number (5) of microsatellite markers covering roughly the same geographic area.

Given that our analysis indicates extensive contemporary gene flow across most of the geographic range of L. gigantea, the exploited populations of this species do not appear to be genetically differentiated from the protected populations. On the other hand, multiple studies have shown that there are clear and significant non-genetically measured
differences (e.g., body size, individual growth rates, size at sex change, abundance) between exploited and protected populations of this species (Pombo & Escofet 1996; Lindberg et al. 1998; Roy et al. 2003; Sagarin et al. 2007; Fenberg 2008). Thus these differences are likely to represent a largely plastic (non-genetic) response to size-selective harvesting. From a conservation perspective, this is promising because it indicates that if proper actions are taken to reduce illegal harvesting (which constitutes the vast majority of harvest for this species; California Fish and Game personal communication, Brooke McVeigh), then exploited populations should be able to return to their pre-impact state given sufficient time. This hypothesis has been proposed before (Kido & Murray 2003; Roy et al. 2003), but not tested using genetic data.

Alternatively, the absence of contemporary genetic population differentiation may itself be a result of harvesting, compounded by the high-dispersal capabilities of L. gigantea. Harvesting can lead to an increase in gene flow to exploited populations from those less affected. This can occur when harvesting initially reduces the density of local populations, allowing for increased immigration from neighboring populations. This may lead to genetic swamping in which genetic differences between populations are reduced, potentially limiting the ability of local populations to adapt to exploitation (Allendorf et al. 2008). This hypothesis is difficult to test given the lack of information about the genetic population structure of L. gigantea before most of the California populations of this species were affected by harvesting.

Certain aspects of California coastal oceanography combined with the life history of L. gigantea may also contribute to high population connectivity. During the winter spawning season for L. gigantea, currents along this coast generally flow northwards (Winant et al. 2003; Shanks & Eckert 2005; Gruenthal et al. 2007), making the region near the northern geographic range limit of this species a possible larval sink. In such a case, population persistence at the northern end of the range could be sustained by larvae from more southerly populations, even if they arrived only sporadically during favorable years. For long-lived species such as L. gigantea, unidirectional but sporadic recruitment events can have lasting genetic and demographic effects on a local population (Gruenthal et al. 2007; Fenberg 2008). In fact, comparative ecological surveys suggest recruitment is sporadic in northern populations of L. gigantea. Northern populations are characterized by low adult abundances and an almost complete lack of juveniles, in stark contrast to Central and Southern Californian populations (Fenberg 2008). Considering that L. gigantea individuals can reach ages of 20 years (Fenberg 2008), unidirectional and sporadic recruitment events on the decadal scale may be all that is needed to maintain genetic homogeneity and the existence of these ‘populations’. Sampling of specific recruitment events and/or age cohorts can provide better insights into the role of such sporadic recruitment (Flowers et al. 2002; Hellberg et al. 2002) but this remains a challenge for L. gigantea because the larvae of this species are not commonly seen in the field and newly settled individuals can be cryptic, often settling in mussel beds, and are very difficult to distinguish from those of other limpets. We cannot rule out the possibility that the lack of genetic differentiation among populations seen here may be due to
the lack of power in the microsatellite data. Recent analyses of the California red abalone, *Haliotis rufescens*, also failed to find significant differentiation among populations using five microsatellite loci, but did find some evidence for divergence using 142 AFLP markers, which greatly increased the power of the analyses (Gruenthal et al. 2007).

In summary, the lack of significant genetic differences between populations of *L. gigantea* suggests that the response of this species to size-selective harvesting pressure largely represents phenotypic plasticity. Untangling genetic and plastic effects, however, is notoriously difficult (Allendorf et al. 2008; Fenberg & Roy 2008), especially for broadcast spawning marine invertebrates where conventional mitochondrial and/or nuclear markers may not always have enough power to resolve population subdivisions (Gruenthal et al. 2007; Burton 2009). In the future, higher resolution studies using many more loci and/or genome-wide analyses and candidate genes (Hemmer-Hansen et al. 2007; Allendorf et al. 2008; Burton 2009) may provide a more refined insight into this issue.

Finally, the lack of genetic structure seen here should not preclude the adoption of evolutionary sustainable management practices for *L. gigantea*. Effective management of this species needs to take into account not only these genetic data, but also the history, ecology, biogeography, and life history parameters (Pombo & Escofet 1996; Lindberg et al. 1998; Kido & Murray 2003; Roy et al. 2003; Sagarin et al. 2007; Fenberg 2008). Proper enforcement to curb illegal size-selective harvesting is the first and most important step in returning exploited populations to their pre-impact state (Roy et al. 2003). Only then can we know for sure whether size-selective harvest has had a long-term impact on the biology of *Lottia gigantea*.
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