

Ecography

ECOG-02014

Tonra, C. M., Sager-Fradkin, K. and Marra, P. P. 2015. Barriers to salmon migration impact body condition, offspring size, and life history variation in an avian consumer. – Ecography doi: 10.1111/ecog.02014

Supplementary material

Appendix 1. Random effect evaluation.

We compared models with different random effects and determined the best fit (based on AIC) was achieved with a random intercept for each individual in body condition (controlling for individuals sampled on multiple occasions). For models of fledgling body condition and stable isotopes we included a random intercept territory ID (controlling for multiple individuals sampled from the same territory). Further, following Zuur et al. (2009), we tested the need for inclusion of random effects using the “gls” and “lme” functions in the R package “nlme” with a likelihood ratio test. In all cases random effects improved model fit, except in the case of fledgling body size (likelihood ratio = 0.09, $P = 0.78$). Thus, we analyzed fledgling body size with generalized linear models.

Appendix 2. Means and standard errors (SE) of stable-carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and –nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) isotope ratios in American Dipper whole blood above and below obstructions to salmon migration on the northern Olympic Peninsula, WA, USA, sampled during the 2011-2013 breeding seasons.

| position | age | year | n | $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ | | $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ | |
|-------------------|----------|------|----|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|
| | | | | mean | SE | mean | SE |
| above obstruction | juvenile | 2011 | 6 | -26.08 | 0.61 | 5.13 | 0.22 |
| | | 2012 | 22 | -28.89 | 0.28 | 4.99 | 0.20 |
| | | 2013 | 12 | -28.65 | 0.41 | 4.81 | 0.16 |
| | adult | 2011 | 15 | -28.23 | 0.60 | 5.31 | 0.19 |
| | | 2012 | 36 | -29.43 | 0.20 | 5.10 | 0.17 |
| | | 2013 | 21 | -28.01 | 0.35 | 4.56 | 0.14 |
| below obstruction | juvenile | 2011 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | | 2012 | 16 | -24.92 | 0.43 | 7.60 | 0.53 |
| | | 2013 | 10 | -25.41 | 0.53 | 5.99 | 0.35 |
| | adult | 2011 | 13 | -26.38 | 0.58 | 5.75 | 0.37 |
| | | 2012 | 31 | -26.11 | 0.27 | 5.90 | 0.23 |
| | | 2013 | 12 | -25.72 | 0.48 | 4.79 | 0.27 |

Appendix 3. Post hoc analysis of paternal effects on fledgling body size.

We explored the possibility of paternal effects on offspring body size, but found no effect on this result (Appendix A) by regressing mother's and/or father's tarsus size with fledgling tarsus size, for a subset of fledglings for which this data was available. We found weak positive trends between fledgling tarsus and mother's tarsus size for both males (adjusted $R^2 = 0.07$, $n = 16$, $P = 0.17$) and females (adjusted $R^2 = 0.11$, $n = 17$, $P = 0.11$). Thus we re-ran the analysis of fledgling body size including mothers tarsus as a covariate and including this covariate did result in a stronger effect of salmon status by sex interaction (above/below obstruction*sex: $t_{29} = -3.08$, $P = 0.005$).

Appendix 4. Estimates and standard errors (SE) for all parameters in the full Kaplan-Meier known fate model of American dipper adult annual survival.

| Parameter | stream | above/below barrier | sex | year interval | survival estimate | SE |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------------|-----|---------------|-------------------|------|
| 1 | Barnes Creek | above | F | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 2 | Barnes Creek | above | F | 2012-2013 | 0.46 | 0.35 |
| 3 | Barnes Creek | above | F | 2013-2014 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4 | Barnes Creek | above | M | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 5 | Barnes Creek | above | M | 2012-2013 | 0.52 | 0.35 |
| 6 | Barnes Creek | above | M | 2013-2014 | 0.45 | 0.23 |
| 7 | Dungeness River | below | F | 2011-2012 | 0.45 | 0.35 |
| 8 | Dungeness River | below | F | 2012-2013 | 0.61 | 0.22 |
| 9 | Dungeness River | below | F | 2013-2014 | 0.70 | 0.26 |
| 10 | Dungeness River | below | M | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 11 | Dungeness River | below | M | 2012-2013 | 0.61 | 0.22 |
| 12 | Dungeness River | below | M | 2013-2014 | 0.68 | 0.27 |
| 13 | Elwha River | above | F | 2011-2012 | 0.59 | 0.22 |
| 14 | Elwha River | above | F | 2012-2013 | 0.88 | 0.11 |
| 15 | Elwha River | above | F | 2013-2014 | 0.54 | 0.21 |
| 16 | Elwha River | below | F | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 17 | Elwha River | below | F | 2012-2013 | 1 | 0.00 |
| 18 | Elwha River | below | F | 2013-2014 | 1 | 0.00 |
| 19 | Elwha River | above | M | 2011-2012 | 0.32 | 0.17 |
| 20 | Elwha River | above | M | 2012-2013 | 0.50 | 0.16 |
| 21 | Elwha River | above | M | 2013-2014 | 0.48 | 0.20 |
| 22 | Elwha River | below | M | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 23 | Elwha River | below | M | 2012-2013 | NA | NA |
| 24 | Elwha River | below | M | 2013-2014 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 25 | Sol Duc River | above | F | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 26 | Sol Duc River | above | F | 2012-2013 | 0.55 | 0.25 |
| 27 | Sol Duc River | above | F | 2013-2014 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Sol Duc River | below | F | 2011-2012 | 0.53 | 0.33 |
| 29 | Sol Duc River | below | F | 2012-2013 | 0.37 | 0.16 |
| 30 | Sol Duc River | below | F | 2013-2014 | 0.61 | 0.18 |
| 31 | Sol Duc River | above | M | 2011-2012 | NA | NA |
| 32 | Sol Duc River | above | M | 2012-2013 | 0.49 | 0.36 |
| 33 | Sol Duc River | above | M | 2013-2014 | 0.52 | 0.25 |
| 34 | Sol Duc River | below | M | 2011-2012 | 1 | 0.00 |
| 35 | Sol Duc River | below | M | 2012-2013 | 0.66 | 0.14 |
| 36 | Sol Duc River | below | M | 2013-2014 | 0.60 | 0.14 |