Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences

Cohort strength and body size in co-occurring salmonids in a small stream network: variation in space and time

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2020-0418.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Apr-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Letcher, Benjamin; Silvio O Conte Anadromous Fish Research Center Nislow, Keith; USDA Forest Service O'Donnell, Matthew; U.S. Geological Survey Whiteley, Andrew; University of Montana Missoula College, Wildlife Biology Program, Department of Ecosystem and Conservation Sciences, College of Forestry and Conservation Coombs, Jason; US Forest Service Dubreuil, Todd; Silvio O Conte Anadromous Fish Research Center
Keyword:	brook trout, brown trout, cohort strength, habitat use, coexistence
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Cohort strength and body size in co-occurring salmonids in a small stream network: variation in space
and time

Benjamin H Letcher^{1,*}

Keith H Nislow²

Matthew J O'Donnell¹

Andrew R Whiteley³

Jason A Coombs⁴

Todd L Dubreuil¹

¹ U. S. Geological Survey, Eastern Ecological Science Center, S. O. Conte Research Laboratory, One
Migratory Way, Turners Falls, MA, USA

²US Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Amherst, MA USA

³Wildlife Biology Program, Department of Ecosystem and Conservation Sciences, Franke College of
Forestry and Conservation, University of Montana, Missoula, MT, USA

⁴Department of Environmental Conservation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, USA

*Corresponding author, bletcher@usgs.gov, 413 522-9417

1 Abstract:

2 Trout and salmon commonly coexist in stream networks. Exploring similarities and differences among
3 species can help explain coexistence and invasive ability. Here, we describe spatial distribution, cohort
4 strengths and size-at-age of three co-occurring species in a small stream network. Spatial distributions
5 varied dramatically among species; native brook trout occupied all stream reaches, naturalized brown
6 trout were found in the mainstem and lower portions of tributaries and fry-stocked Atlantic salmon
7 were limited to the mainstem. Size-at-age also differed among species, Atlantic salmon were
8 consistently the smallest, brook trout were intermediate in size and brown trout were the largest.
9 Despite size differences, mean lengths of brook trout and brown trout were highly correlated among
10 years. Cohort strengths varied considerably across years but were also highly correlated for the two
11 trout species, suggesting strong environmental control on cohort strength and a reduced role for species
12 interactions. At low densities, we observed strong negative effects of density on body sizes and weaker
13 effects otherwise. Overall, these results suggest differences in spatial distribution combined with
14 similarities in response to environmental variation contribute to species coexistence in this small stream
15 network.

16

17 Graphical Abstract: Figure 5

18 Keywords: brook trout, brown trout, cohort strength, spatial segregation, coexistence

19 Introduction

20 Species responses to both extrinsic (environmental) and intrinsic (population dynamics) factors
21 are key to understanding patterns of distribution and abundance. Co-occurring species frequently
22 exhibit differences in habitat use across multiple spatial scales (Leibold and Tessier 1991). These
23 differences can reduce the likelihood and intensity of negative interspecific interactions (Gotelli et al.
24 2010) and may contribute to long-term coexistence. When species show considerable overlap in spatial
25 distribution and directly interact, differences in demographic responses to environmental variation are
26 key to coexistence (Siepielski and McPeck 2010). This is a particularly important consideration for the
27 many species that exhibit high annual variation in recruitment and cohort strength (relative abundance
28 of a cohort). Cohort strength can often be directly attributed to environmental effects and may also
29 influence age-structure and density-dependent population dynamics. Theory suggests that spatial and
30 temporal variation in the availability of recruits can result in species coexistence in the absence of any
31 intrinsic interspecific differences in habitat or resource use (Hubbell 2001; Leibold and McPeck 2006).
32 Results of empirical studies have been mixed however, and generally confined to relatively few systems
33 (see Chave 2004 for a review). For stream fishes, the relative importance of species interactions vs.
34 demographic and environmental variability in structuring assemblages has been a long-standing debate.
35 A substantial body of literature suggests that the highly dynamic nature of stream habitats may reduce
36 the likelihood of competitive exclusion and predictable niche differentiation (Grossman et al. 1982;
37 Jackson et al. 2001). In contrast to this view, where patterns of species co-occurrence are largely
38 determined by historical and stochastic factors and species-specific responses to habitats and
39 disturbance regimes, others have suggested that stream fish species occupy distinct niches resulting in
40 predictable and stable assemblage structure (Yant et al. 1984), with implications for species interactions
41 and vulnerability to invasion from non-native species (Gido et al. 2004).

Stream salmonids (trout, salmon and their relatives) provide a good model for studying the factors involved in species persistence, co-occurrence and coexistence. Many co-occurring species show distinct and consistent patterns in spatial distribution at a range of scales (Armstrong et al. 2003), which has been suggested to mediate long-term coexistence. Most species also exhibit strong annual variation in recruitment (Kanno et al. 2016), which often determines cohort strength (Lobon-Cervia 2007; Bassar et al. 2016). The resultant variation in population size has a strong influence on individual somatic growth rates (Kanno et al. 2015a), which can translate into density-dependent effects on individual body size and population size structure (reviewed in Grant and Imre 2005). In addition to interannual variation, recruitment and cohort strength often vary considerably along stream networks (Vincenzi et al. 2012), with similar effects on body size and size structure. In theory, spatial and temporal variation in cohort strength and body size, given the strong effect of body size on the outcomes of both intra- and interspecific interactions (Young 2004), may foster species coexistence, but this issue has not been directly addressed in previous studies. Specifically, few studies have collected data at sufficient resolution and for adequate duration to follow multiple cohorts for more than one sympatric species across their entire life history.

Understanding the link between population dynamics and coexistence is critical for conservation and management of stream salmonid fishes. Across their entire range, salmonids and the ecosystems they are part of have experienced a very large number of invasions (as both sources and recipients of invaders) (Krueger and May 1991) and extirpations (Katz et al. 2013), along with an increasing number of restoration and reintroduction initiatives (Fraser 2008). Interspecific interactions (competition and predation) between co-occurring salmonid species (native, invasive, and reintroduced) are clearly important in many cases (Dewald and Wilzbach 1992), but we still have challenges in forecasting when these interactions will lead to coexistence or extirpation. For example, brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) have been introduced and are well established as wild populations in many, but not all locations across the

native range of brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) in the northeastern and northcentral United States (Krueger and May 1991). In some cases, brown trout appear to have replaced native brook trout (Waters 1983; Wagner et al. 2013) but in others, relatively long-term coexistence has been maintained (McKenna et al. 2013) or brown trout establishment has not been successful over the long term (Hoxmeier and Dieterman 2019). Conversely, in a small number of cases in Western Europe, brook trout have established and been associated with local extirpation of native brown trout (Korsu et al. 2007, 2010). We currently have limited understanding of the mechanisms underlying alternative outcomes for these two species, which will become increasingly relevant in a non-stationary and in some cases rapidly-changing environment (Wenger et al. 2011; Hitt et al. 2017).

To begin to address the potential roles of differences in spatial distribution, recruitment variation, and body-size responses to variation in cohort strength, we used a long-term intensive study of non-migratory sympatric populations of brook trout and brown trout, with migratory juvenile Atlantic salmon (*S. salar*) present during part of the study period, to answer four fundamental questions:

1. Do these species exhibit distinct and consistent patterns in spatial distribution across the stream network?
2. Are body sizes changing over time? Are changes similar across species and the stream network?
3. What is the extent of variation in cohort strength for these co-occurring species and to what extent is this variation correlated across time and space?
4. What is the effect of cohort strength variation on body size for each species, and does it differ in different parts of the stream network?

Materials and methods

Field site – The study area is a small stream network in western Massachusetts, United States, consisting of a mainstem and three tributaries (Figure 1) embedded in mixed hardwood forest with a dense canopy and light farming and residential areas. The entire watershed is 27.4 km² and contains a municipal reservoir at river km 6.6. Watershed area below the reservoir is 11.8 km² and is 15.7 km² above the downstream end of the reservoir. The study was conducted in a section of the stream network below the reservoir which consisted of four catchments that ranged in area from <1 km² to 12.4 km² (Table 1). The largest catchment was the West Brook, a 3rd order stream with an average width of 7.4 m with a total stream length of 10 km below the reservoir, of which we sampled 1,273 m (15%, Table 1). The West Brook streambed is mainly cobbles with sporadic bedrock and boulders. Stream habitat consists of mostly riffles with occasional glides and pools. A small, but passable waterfall defined the bottom of the study area and a large (4 m) impassable waterfall was located 3.5 km downstream of the study area (Figure 1). The upstream boundary of the study area was open and fish could freely pass in either direction.

Three 2nd order tributaries flowed into the West Brook study area (Figure 1). Drainage areas of the tributaries ranged from 1.06 – 2.46 km² and stream lengths ranged from 1.7 to 3.3 km (Table 1). The smallest tributary, Open Small (average width = 2.0 m), was open to immigration from the West Brook but a perched culvert (prior to 2013) restricted access during very low and high stream flows. Access to the Open Large (average width = 3.4 m) tributary was unrestricted and a 2-m-tall waterfall blocked access to the Isolated Large (average width = 3.0 m) tributary. The study length for each tributary was approximately 300m (Table 1). At the upstream end of the study areas, either small (Isolated Large, 1 m) or very tall (Open Small, Open Large, > 4 m) waterfalls blocked upstream migration. There were no brook trout present above the waterfall in Open Small, but trout were present above the waterfalls in

109 Open Large and Isolated Large, resulting in proportions of occupied habitat sampled in each tributary = 1
110 for Open Small, = 0.09 for Open Large and 0.19 for Isolated large (Table 1).

111 Temperature loggers placed at the bottom of the West Brook and each tributary recorded
112 stream temperature every 15 minutes and we used a flow extension model to relate observed water
113 depths from a pressure transducer (at the bottom of the West Brook study area) and a stage-discharge
114 relationship to a nearby United States Geological Survey stream gage (see Letcher et al. 2015 for
115 details). Although we do not use stream temperature and flow data in our modeling, we provide a brief
116 overview here to characterize the study area. Average stream temperatures (°C) varied across seasons
117 (spring = 10.1, summer = 16.0, autumn = 8.2, winter = 1.6) and were similar across tributaries and the
118 West Brook in the autumn and winter, but Open Small was about 1 degree warmer than the other
119 tributaries in the spring and summer. Stream flow (m³/s) also varied across seasons (spring = 0.42,
120 summer = 0.12, autumn = 0.24, winter = 0.40). All study locations contained naturally-reproducing
121 populations of brook trout, and West Brook, Open Large and Open Small (occasionally) contained
122 naturally-reproducing brown trout, which were introduced to the eastern US in the 1800s and are well
123 established throughout the region. Both trout species spawned in the autumn (peak spawning for brook
124 trout in October, with brown trout several weeks to a month later) and emerged in late winter/early
125 spring. Atlantic salmon, which were native to the Connecticut River basin until their extirpation in the
126 1700s, were stocked as unfed fry (at yolk sac absorption) into the West Brook in spring from 1997
127 through 2004; juveniles were present in the system until 2007. Fry were part of the Connecticut River
128 Atlantic salmon restoration program and were obtained from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, White
129 River hatchery (Bethel, VT). Details about Atlantic salmon stocking and life history can be found in
130 Letcher and Gries (2003) and Sigourney et al. (2013). The only other fish species found consistently in the
131 study area was blacknose dace (*Rhinichthys atratulus*), a common, native spring-spawning minnow, but
132 densities were generally low and variable (West Brook: range 0 – 0.45 per m², mean = 0.068 per m²;

Open Small; range 0 – 0.25 per m², mean = 0.053 per m²; Open Large: range 0 – 0.27 per m², mean = 0.053 per m²; Isolated Large: mean = 0). Trout were not stocked in the study area and fishing pressure was very low.

Fish sampling – The study area was divided into 47, contiguous 20-m long sections in the West Brook and into 14 or 15 contiguous 20-m sections in the tributaries. Each section was sampled consecutively from downstream to upstream. Tributaries were typically sampled before the West Brook. Sampling in the West Brook consisted of isolating the study section with temporary block nets at the top and bottom of the section and conducting two-pass backpack electrofishing (300-400 V unpulsed DC). Owing to high capture rates in the tributaries (Letcher et al. 2015), we did not use block nets and conducted a single pass. Captured fish were anesthetized, measured for length (± 1 mm, fork length), weighed (g, wet weight) and scanned for a tag. If no tag was present and the fish was > 60 mm fork length and > 2 g wet weight, the fish was tagged. We used 12-mm full-duplex passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags for individual fish identification (Biomark and then Digital Angel, St. Paul MN, USA). Tags were inserted through a thin abdominal slit made with a small scalpel (Gries and Letcher 2002). Tagging mortality was rare and tagging has minimal impact on fish growth and survival (Gries and Letcher 2002; Sigourney et al. 2005). Following recovery from anesthesia, fish were returned to the approximate center of the study section. All fish handling followed USGS, Eastern Ecological Science Center, Conte Research Laboratory Animal Care and Use guidelines. Although not reported here, we also took an anal fin clip sample for genetic analysis on first capture of each fish.

Sampling occurred four times per year, corresponding roughly with the winter and summer solstice, and spring and autumn equinox. Depending on the number of fish captured and weather, a sampling occasion took between seven and 12 sampling days. Longer sampling occasions typically resulted from floods causing unsafe and inefficient sampling conditions.

We defined cohort for each fish based on size at first capture and species-specific size distributions. Size distributions for age-0+ fish were typically distinct from distributions for the other age classes (Letcher et al. 2015), but there was substantial overlap in body size among ages for older fish. Most fish (62%) were captured as age-0+ fish, limiting cohort assignment error. Based on the cohort assignments, we estimated cohort strength as the total number of individual fish captured from each cohort for each species. Cohort strength was further subdivided by 'metapopulation', which separated the Isolated large population from the connected West Brook, Open Large, Open Small network. For analysis, we scaled cohort strengths by subtracting mean values and dividing by the standard deviation for each population and species. We also used cohort assignments to estimate age in days from age-0+ January 1, using $\text{day-of-year} + 365 * (\text{year} - \text{cohort})$. Fish older than age-3+ were excluded from analysis to avoid smaller sample sizes of older fish. Finally, observations were coded by the presence of Atlantic salmon in the stream network (1 for cohorts < 2005 and in the West Brook, 0 otherwise).

Field data summary – We present data from 62 sampling occasions from 2000 – 2015. Ice accumulation prevented winter sampling in 2002 in all locations, and additionally in 2005, 2007, 2012 and 2015 in the West Brook. Sampling was also incomplete in the West Brook in 2003 (completed 30 of 47 sections) and in 2004 (completed three of 47 sections).

Overall, we captured and tagged 11,707 brook trout, 5,955 brown trout and 4,219 Atlantic salmon (all captured fish were tagged (see Letcher et al. 2015) but we only use tagging data here for cohort assignment). We captured these individuals multiple times for a total of 23,526 (brook trout) and 11,884 (brown trout) observations for body size modelling.

Data analysis -

Our goal was to explore size-at-age for seasonal data and to relate a measure of cohort strength to trout body size data. We were also interested in whether size trajectories were changing over time.

Growth rate in the system is highly seasonal (Letcher et al. 2015), resulting in non-linear body size trajectories within a year. Sample dates are also somewhat inconsistent within a season across years, suggesting a single categorical descriptor for sample seasonal date would not capture the variation in sample dates across years. Finally, both the non-linear size trajectories and potential for non-linear effects of cohort strengths suggest the need for a flexible modeling approach. For these reasons, we chose to model the size trajectories using general additive models (Wood 2006) which, by using smoothed functions (splines), address the issues outlined above. The splines capture the non-linear size trajectories (size-at-age) and effects on the body sizes. We also included non-smoothed, parametric (categorical) variables in the model.

Our model selection approach was to use AIC to first determine inclusion of the parametric variables and then the inclusion of the smoothed variables. We ran separate models for each trout species (brook, brown) because brown trout were not present in all study catchments. Parametric variables included catchment (West Brook, Open Large, Open Small, Isolated Large) and presence/absence of salmon. Smoothed variables included age in days (ageDays, the number of days since January 1 (age-0⁺)), ageDays grouped by cohort, ageDays grouped by catchment, ageDays grouped by catchment and cohort, cohort grouped by catchment, brook trout cohort strength grouped by metapopulation, and brown trout cohort strength grouped by metapopulation. We used the 'bam' function in the R package mgcv (Wood 2017) for model fitting to accommodate the large sample sizes. For all smoothed variables, we used cubic regression spline as the basis function and set the maximum dimension of the splines to four for all variables except ageDays, which had a maximum dimension of 10.

In addition to the central model described above, we also explored drivers of body sizes for age-0+ fish in the autumn across trout species, cohort and catchment with a simple one-way ANOVA. This analysis helps us understand body size drivers before the fish are big enough to tag in the autumn. We

used the R package relimpo to estimate proportion of body size variance explained by the independent variables. We explored spatial distribution of species by simply counting the number of observations in each study catchment.

We tested for a relationship between brook trout and brown trout cohort strengths by running a simple linear regression with brown trout cohort strength as the dependent variable and brook trout cohort strength as the independent variable. We also tested for a relationship between brook trout cohort strengths in Isolated Large and the connected stream network with a similar regression.

Results

Body size -We observed wide body size distributions within each age/season combination, with increasing medians and ranges as fish aged (Figure 2). Body sizes of Atlantic salmon were generally smaller than trout body sizes, and brook trout and brown trout body sizes overlapped substantially, except older brown trout tended to be larger than older brook trout (Figure 2). For the first sampling occasion for each cohort, body size frequency distributions varied considerably across cohorts and catchments (Figure 3), with 19.3% of the variation explained by cohort, 4.5% explained by catchment and 0.05% explained by species. Brook trout and brown trout mean lengths for the first sampling occasion for each cohort were positively correlated in the West Brook (Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.83) and Open Large (Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.59) (Figure S1). Correlation coefficients between brook trout and brown trout mean lengths for the remaining sampling occasions were consistently high in the West Brook (0.80 – 0.95, except for Winter age-0+ = 0.6) and more variable in Open Large (-0.11 – 0.75) (Figure S1).

For both trout species, model selection for the fixed effects *catchment* and *presence of salmon* yielded delta AICs of >500 for additive models with both variables (results not shown), so these variables

were retained for all subsequent model selection. Model selection for the spline model variables was also consistent between species, the model with all spline variables had the lowest AIC values (Table 2). The models explained 79.5% of the variation in brook trout and 87.9% of the variation in brown trout body sizes. QQ plots of residuals, histograms of residuals and observed vs. predicted observations all suggested that the model fit the data well (Figures S2, S3), although body sizes of very small and very large fish were predicted less well than intermediate body sizes.

Spatial distribution - The three species were not evenly distributed across the stream network. Brook trout were observed in the mainstem and all three tributaries, brown trout were observed in the mainstem and the Open Large (occasional observations in Open Small) tributary and Atlantic salmon were observed primarily in the mainstem (occasional observations in Open Large) (Figure 4).

Fixed effect parameter estimates (Table 3) indicated that fish were on average 13 to 23 mm smaller in the tributaries compared to the mainstem and that fish were 7 (brook trout) or 9 (brown trout) mm larger early in the study when Atlantic salmon were present. Many of the spline variables were highly significant (Table 4). Notable exceptions include some *age in days:cohort* interactions for both species and the intra-specific effect of brown trout in the West Brook.

Predicted body sizes based on the selected model demonstrate highly seasonal patterns with most growth in the spring/early summer, a trend towards larger sizes for later cohorts and generally larger sizes in the West Brook compared to the tributaries (Figure 5**Error! Reference source not found.**). Plotting the main effects of *cohort* for each species and catchment (Figure 6**Error! Reference source not found.**) identified generally increasing body sizes, with increases of about 30 mm for both species in the West Brook and smaller increases (10-20 mm) in the tributaries.

Comparing predicted size trajectories among study catchments indicated that brook trout in West Brook were consistently largest over time, followed by Open Small, Isolated Large, and Open Large

(Figure 7Error! Reference source not found.). Brown trout in West Brook were slightly larger than brown trout in Open Large (Figure 7Error! Reference source not found.). Sizes were similar among tributaries when brook trout were young and old but diverged in between (Figure 7Error! Reference source not found.). Comparing predicted body sizes between species suggested that brook trout and brown trout sizes were similar when fish were young, but diverged for older fish in West Brook (Figure 8Error! Reference source not found.). In contrast, brown trout in Open Large were consistently larger than brook trout in Open Large, with differences as great as about 25 mm (Figure 8Error! Reference source not found.).

Cohort strength - Cohort strength varied considerably among cohorts with some consistent patterns among species and between brook trout populations (Figure 9). Brook trout and brown trout cohort strengths were positively related (P -value = 0.006, $r = 0.71$, slope = 0.75, Figure 10 above). Brook trout cohort strengths in the two metapopulations were also positively related (P -value = 0.002, $r = 0.82$, slope = 0.75, Figure 10below). We found no evidence for a relationship between cohort strength and body size of age-0+ Autumn fish (Figure S2, but see below for cohort strength effects on size-at-age curves).

Effect of cohort strength on body size - Brook trout cohort strength had a negative effect on body size in most cases, with effect sizes of about 20mm for both species in the West Brook, variable effects in Open Large (equivocal for brook trout, strongly positive for brown trout), and strongly negative effects at low cohort strengths for brook trout in Open Small and Isolated Large (Figure 11). Brown trout cohort strength was related to decreased brook trout body sizes and had no effect on brown trout sizes in the West Brook, and, conversely, had a weak negative effect on brook trout sizes and a strongly negative effect on brown trout sizes in Open Large (Figure 12).

Discussion

In this detailed long-term study encompassing annual and seasonal dynamics we observed distinct patterns in key aspects of spatial distribution, cohort strength, and body size of three co-occurring species of salmonid fishes within a small stream network. Brook trout were broadly distributed throughout the entire network including isolated tributary locations, juvenile Atlantic salmon were restricted to the mainstem, and brown trout occurred in the mainstem and in the large tributary with unrestricted access. Mean size-at-age also differed consistently between the three species (brown trout > brook trout > juvenile Atlantic salmon). However, the two trout species exhibited very similar and correlated patterns of annual variation in cohort strength, showed similar relationships between cohort strength and individual body size (clear increases in body size at low cohort strength, weaker evidence for decreases in strong cohorts, except for the effect of brook trout on brown trout sizes in the tributary), and were consistently larger at age in mainstem vs. tributary locations. Our results are consistent with spatial segregation between mainstem and tributaries as a potential mechanism allowing coexistence of salmonid species in small streams (Korsu et al. 2007). In contrast, while density-dependent effects observed for both trout species may contribute to population resilience, our data were likely insufficient to distinguish intra- vs. interspecific effects of density and cohort strength on individual body size. We conclude that although in many respects, there may be substantial overlap in the ecological roles and responses of brook trout and brown trout in small streams, the ability of both species to recover from low densities and weak cohorts, combined with some degree of spatial segregation at the network scale, may prevent species replacement, at least in the near term. Applying the analytical framework we have developed over longer time series across multiple study systems, potentially coupled with manipulative approaches is likely necessary to elucidate the factors fostering long-term population persistence and species coexistence.

Longitudinal zonation of fish species assemblages is a fundamental characteristic of streams and rivers. This has been observed for stream salmonids in a wide range of studies (Bozek and Hubert 1992;

De La Hoz Franco and Budy 2005; Korsu et al. 2007). As found previously, the two trout species were distributed further upstream and in smaller tributaries than salmon (De La Hoz Franco and Budy 2005), likely associated with both habitat requirements and in some cases restrictions on upstream movement and possibly stocking location (mainstem only). This segregation, along with the potential differences in microhabitat use (Armstrong et al. 2003; Nislow et al. 2010), likely reduces local spatial overlap and direct interaction between juvenile Atlantic salmon and either brook or brown trout in this system. This spatial segregation is also consistent with our failure to detect any compensatory response to the loss of Atlantic salmon from the system (small, positive effect of Atlantic salmon presence in the models), even though juvenile Atlantic salmon accounted for over half the total salmonid biomass in the first five years of the study. Brook trout and brown trout, regularly used tributaries over the course of the study, but this was much more common for brook trout, where nearly half of all individual observations occurred in tributaries, compared to less than 10% for brown trout. Preferential upstream distribution of brook trout relative to other salmonids (including brown trout) has been previously demonstrated in a number of other studies (Bozek and Hubert 1992; Korsu et al. 2007; Öhlund et al. 2008). However much of this work has been at larger spatial scales and encompasses substantial differences in fundamental habitat characteristics such as water temperature, acidity, forest cover, and slope/elevation. Differential distribution of brook and brown trout in our study is not associated with major differences in these factors. It is unclear whether the patterns we observed are due to intrinsically poorer performance of brown trout and/or superior performance of brook trout in small tributaries, but these differences may help mediate long-term coexistence in our study system and perhaps more generally.

In addition to distinct patterns of longitudinal distribution, the three species also showed consistent differences in size-at-age with brown trout largest and Atlantic salmon smallest in age-specific body length. Based on our size-at-age modeling, we observed that brook trout were slightly longer than brown trout in their first year, but that brown trout surpassed brook trout with faster age-

1+ and age-2+ growth in spring resulting in a ~15% size advantage for brown trout by age-2+ summer in the West Brook and a ~30% size advantage in the large tributary. This switching of size rank of the two species over time contrasts with the intraspecific maintenance of size rank observed for brook trout in our study system (Letcher et al. 2011) and suggests some intrinsic potential differences between the species. The early size advantage for brook trout could stem from earlier brook trout spawning and emergence (Witzel and Maccrimmon 1983; Essington et al. 1998). The later size advantage for brown trout is consistent with laboratory (Dewald and Wilzbach 1992; Hitt et al. 2017), enclosure (Korsu et al. 2009) and field (Cooper 1953; Zorn and Nuhfer 2007; Öhlund et al. 2008; Hoxmeier and Dieterman 2013) observations that superior brown trout competitive ability can lead to larger body size. It is also possible that the higher temperature for maximum growth of brown trout compared with brook trout (Childress and Letcher 2017) could lead to larger sizes as stream temperatures increase. In addition, competitive ability can reinforce size differences, as competitively dominant individuals have been shown to monopolize favorable foraging locations and access to shelters (Harwood et al. 2003). Consistent with this perspective, the larger body size differential between the species we observed in the tributary compared to the mainstem suggests that brown trout may have dominated the advantageous feeding sites that are likely at a premium in the smaller tributary. Finally, the suggestion that brown trout competition limited brook trout body size in the large tributary is reinforced by the observation that brook trout in the smaller tributaries without brown trout were larger than brook trout in the large tributary that contained brown trout.

In contrast to consistent differences in spatial distribution and size-at-age for the three species, cohort strength of brook trout and brown trout was highly correlated. This pattern was driven by interannual variation in recruitment (as measured by population size in the September age-0 sample), with the same years producing either high recruitment or low recruitment for both trout species. Population size and cohort strength in stream salmonids has been observed to be recruitment-

dependent in a number of species, often determined within the first months after emergence from their redds (Elliott 1994; Armstrong and Nislow 2006; Kanno et al. 2016). In our study system and over most of their geographical range, both brown trout and brook trout spawn in autumn and emerge in spring (Witzel and Maccrimmon 1983; Essington et al. 1998) and are therefore subject to similar environments during the first few months of life. Previous studies have suggested that environmental conditions during this period can drive variation in cohort strength. In particular, high flow events during winter and spring (and in southern European populations of brown trout, low flows during summer) appear to result in low recruitment and weak cohorts for both brook (Kanno et al. 2015b; Blum et al. 2018) and brown trout (Spina 2001; Nicola et al. 2009). In addition, neither brook trout nor brown trout cohort strength was influenced by the presence of juvenile Atlantic salmon, despite the large proportion of salmonid biomass accounted for by Atlantic salmon when they were present. Our results are therefore consistent with a common density-independent early life mechanism similarly affecting abundance of both trout species.

In addition to correlated variation in cohort strength, we observed correlated patterns of seasonal, interannual, and among-cohort variation in individual body size and size-at-age. Brook trout, brown trout and Atlantic salmon all exhibited maximum increases in individual body size during the spring and early summer. Other studies with sufficiently frequent sampling have also demonstrated strong seasonal growth in both brook trout (Cooper 1953, 1961; Whitworth and Strange 1983; Utz and Hartman 2009) and brown trout (Beyerle and Cooper 1960; Egglishaw and Shackley 1977; Mortensen 1982). Although the extent and specific timing of seasonal growth varies among studies, all found that growth in spring and early summer was faster than growth in other seasons and that rapid growth can even be constrained to just two months of the year (Cooper 1961; Utz and Hartman 2009). Slower summer growth, often despite stream temperatures near growth optima, suggests that summer food limitation or seasonal behavioral changes limit summer growth. In the West Brook, food availability

changes dramatically over the year, with relatively high densities of drifting invertebrates in the spring (Grader and Letcher 2006), and lower densities in the summer and winter, a pattern observed in other studies (Sweka and Hartman 2008; Wagner et al. 2014), particularly in streams draining woodlands dominated by deciduous vegetation. Associated with high growth rates, all three species of salmonids in the West Brook feed mainly on aquatic-derived drifting invertebrates in the spring, suggesting a lack of resource limitation during this season. In the summer as the availability of these prey resources decrease, brook trout, and to a lesser degree brown trout shift their foraging to terrestrial-derived surface drift, a diet shift observed in several other studies (Sweka and Hartman 2008; Wagner et al. 2014). It also appears that brook trout may generally adopt a low-risk, low energy use strategy as flows decrease seasonally in small streams (Sotiropoulos et al. 2006), suggesting that a combination of low prey availability, low stream flows and behavioral choices limit growth in summer and autumn. Further, it has been shown that salmonids become more risk averse as they get older and closer to reproductive age (Reinhardt and Healey 1999). This general principle is consistent with seasonality of growth being most pronounced for age-1+ and older stream salmonids, while age-0+ fish often show relatively high growth rates in summer and autumn (Cooper 1961; Mortensen 1982; Letcher et al. 2015).

In common with many other studies (e.g. McFadden 1961; Petty et al. 2005; Hoxmeier and Dieterman 2013), we observed very wide body size distributions for both species that varied among years. Cohort-specific mean size for age-0 autumn occasion was highly correlated between brook trout and brown trout in the West Brook. Correlation was present but weaker between the species in the tributary where the species overlapped (Open Large). This correlation suggests similar mechanisms driving early body size distributions for brook trout and brown trout, which are both autumn spawners. Mechanisms promoting variation in early body size for this population were not examined here, but possibilities include differences in spawn timing among females, temperature-dependent development rates while in the gravel, or early pre-capture growth rates. Observed increasing stream temperatures in

the study area in the spring, summer and autumn, but not the winter (Letcher et al. *in prep*), suggest that changes in spawn timing or early growth rates, but not development rates in gravel, are likely explanations for larger age-0 fish over time in the autumn. While density-dependent size and growth have been frequently observed in stream salmonids (Grant and Imre 2005), it has been suggested that in some situations high early mortality may drive densities to such low levels that growth is driven largely by density-independent factors (Armstrong and Nislow 2006; Lobon-Cervia 2007).

Estimating size-at-age for separate cohorts allowed us to characterize body size variation over time by exploring size-at-age curve differences among cohorts (year classes). We found that both brook and brown trout body sizes-at-age increased over the course of the study. Interestingly, even though cohort body size switching was possible in our flexible GAM model, cohorts generally maintained rank order in estimated body sizes, especially in the mainstem, suggesting that body size differences among cohorts were set when fish were young, i.e., before fish were large enough to capture (autumn, age-0+). An earlier analysis of brook trout tagging data in the study area (Letcher et al. 2011) also suggested that individual body size trajectories were mainly determined early in life, based on the observation that individual fish generally maintain body size rank (repeatability of individual body size = 0.73) and that compensatory growth was weak. Maintenance of individual size ranks likely contributed substantially to the generally observed maintenance of among-cohort size ranks for both trout species.

Our relatively simple body size analysis involved several assumptions that may have varying levels of effect on results. First, size-dependent processes (losses or gains) could influence size-at-age curves by either removing small or large fish (losses, mortality or emigration) or adding small or large fish (gains, immigration). In this analysis we assume that size-dependent losses or gains occur but that the magnitude and direction of effects are consistent across cohorts. We have observed negative size-dependent survival across locations in brook trout (Letcher et al. 2015), but the variation among years is unknown. We also assume that the tributary of capture represents actual fish location in the sampling

interval prior to sampling. We have estimated brook trout movement among tributaries and most movement is out of Open Small to the mainstem (Kanno et al. 2014; Letcher et al. 2015), but timing of movements relative to sampling occasions is unknown as is the extent of variation among years. In addition, we estimated density effects as total cohort strengths. This single number may not represent actual, experienced density at a local spatial scale for individual fish or over the course of time for fish in each cohort, but we assume that the estimated cohort strength characterizes average densities across fish and years.

These results help inform our understanding of stream salmonid assemblage structure, which in turn has implications for conservation and management. Perhaps most clearly, it appears that the ability of brook trout to use the smallest perennial tributaries in the system may promote persistence with co-occurring species. Effective use by brook trout of these spatially-constrained and relatively unproductive habitats may be associated with a suite of characteristic traits including risk-averse foraging strategies (Sotiropoulos et al. 2006), use of terrestrial derived prey resources (Sweka and Hartman 2008), tolerance of low effective population sizes (Letcher et al. 2007; Whiteley et al. 2017), and early sexual maturation at small body sizes (Wilson et al. 2003; Letcher et al. 2007). Independent of the specific mechanisms, occupancy of small tributaries allows a substantial proportion of the population to occupy 'enemy-free space' (Jeffries and Lawton 1984), potentially balancing the size-advantage possessed by brown trout in this and likely other systems. Not only does the ability to effectively use small tributaries contribute to coexistence, it may be a key attribute in determining vulnerability to invasion by brook trout in small streams outside of the species' native range. In terms of restoration, our results support efforts to maintain and restore connectivity between mainstem and tributary habitats with the goal of maintaining resilient and diverse stream salmonid assemblages. While in some systems (Peterson et al. 2008) maintaining or erecting barriers to stop the upstream spread of non-native species and protect native headwater populations has been suggested or

implemented, our results indicate that these may not be necessary or even helpful for brook trout coexisting with non-native brown trout in small stream networks. Hybridization with invasive species can also affect persistence of native populations (Hitt et al. 2003; Muhlfeld et al. 2009). During our study, we observed fewer than five (phenotypically-based) hybrids between brook trout and brown trout, indicating low risk of introgressive hybridization. Of course, results may be specific to our study area and additional studies will be necessary to evaluate the generality of results. In general, connectivity is particularly relevant given previous studies indicating the importance of network connectivity and access to productive mainstem habitats for native brook trout population resilience and life history diversity (Letcher et al. 2007; Huntsman et al. 2016).

Our results also have implications for our general understanding of the factors structuring stream fish assemblages. In the West Brook, brook trout and brown trout abundances were highly correlated, and the two species appeared to respond as functional equivalents with respect to effects of seasonal and annual variation in environmental conditions on size and growth. This similarity and potential niche overlap should in theory increase the strength of species interactions. However, in a highly stochastic environment which produces substantial interannual variation in abundance and body size, neutral community theory (Hubbell 2001) predicts that subtle interspecific advantages may be too weak to result in species replacement. These considerations could be broadly applicable to stream fish assemblages where highly variable environmental conditions produce strong recruitment-dependence (Peres-Neto 2004). Along these lines, competitive exclusion and species replacement may be more likely in more constant environments that produce less variation in cohort strength and body size (e.g. Hoxmeier and Dieterman 2019; Miller et al. 2019). Testing these and other fundamental hypotheses will require extension of these kinds of analytical approaches across a broad range of conditions. Given the fairly basic data needs of these analyses, the large body of monitoring data on stream salmonid

463 populations may provide a powerful way to assess the importance and the outcomes of species
464 interactions and assemblage structure.

465 Acknowledgements:

466

467 We thank all the students, post-docs and volunteers that have helped with field work. We also thank
468 Robert al-Chokhachy and two anonymous reviewers for providing comments that improved the
469 manuscript. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply
470 endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Draft

471 Reference list

- 472 Armstrong, J.D., Kemp, P.S., Kennedy, G.J.A., Ladle, M., and Milner, N.J. 2003. Habitat requirements of
473 Atlantic salmon and brown trout in rivers and streams. *Fish. Res.* **62**(2): 143–170.
474 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-7836\(02\)00160-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-7836(02)00160-1).
- 475 Armstrong, J.D., and Nislow, K.H. 2006. Critical habitat during the transition from maternal provisioning
476 in freshwater fish, with emphasis on Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*).
477 *J. Zool.* **269**(4): 403–413. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00157.x.
- 478 Bassar, R.D., Letcher, B.H., Nislow, K.H., and Whiteley, A.R. 2016. Changes in seasonal climate outpace
479 compensatory density-dependence in eastern brook trout. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*: 577–593.
480 doi:10.1111/gcb.13135.
- 481 Beyerle, G.B., and Cooper, E.L. 1960. Growth of Brown Trout in Selected Pennsylvania Streams. *Trans.*
482 *Am. Fish. Soc.* **89**(3): 255–262.
- 483 Blum, A.G., Kanno, Y., and Letcher, B.H. 2018. Seasonal streamflow extremes are key drivers of Brook
484 Trout young-of-the-year abundance. *Ecosphere* **9**(8): e02356. doi:10.1002/ecs2.2356.
- 485 Bozek, M.A., and Hubert, W.A. 1992. Segregation of resident trout in streams as predicted by three
486 habitat dimensions. *Can. J. Zool.* **70**(5): 886–890. doi:10.1139/z92-126.
- 487 Chave, J. 2004. Neutral theory and community ecology. *Ecol. Lett.* **7**(3): 241–253. doi:10.1111/j.1461-
488 0248.2003.00566.x.
- 489 Childress, E.S., and Letcher, B.H. 2017. Estimating thermal performance curves from repeated field
490 observations. *Ecology* **98**(5): 1377–1387. doi:10.1002/ecy.1801.
- 491 Cooper, E.L. 1953. Periodicity of Growth and Change of Condition of Brook Trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) in

- 492 Three Michigan Trout Streams. *Copeia* **1953**(2): 107. doi:10.2307/1440136.
- 493 Cooper, E.L. 1961. Growth of Wild and Hatchery Strains of Brook Trout. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **90**(4): 424–
494 438. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1961)90[424:gowahs]2.0.co;2.
- 495 Dewald, L., and Wilzbach, M.A. 1992. Interactions between Native Brook Trout and Hatchery Brown
496 Trout: Effects on Habitat Use, Feeding, and Growth. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **121**(3): 287–296.
497 doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1992)121<0287:ibnbta>2.3.co;2.
- 498 Egglshaw, H.J., and Shackley, P.E. 1977. Growth, survival and production of juvenile salmon and trout in
499 a Scottish stream, 1966–75. *J. Fish Biol.* **11**(6): 647–672. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.1977.tb05722.x.
- 500 Elliott, J. 1994. Quantitative ecology and the brown trout. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 501 Essington, T.E., Sorensen, P.W., and Paron, D.G. 1998. High rate of redd superimposition by brook trout
502 (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) in a Minnesota stream cannot be explained
503 by habitat availability alone. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **55**(10): 2310–2316. doi:10.1139/f98-109.
- 504 Fraser, D.J. 2008. How well can captive breeding programs conserve biodiversity? A review of salmonids.
505 *Evol. Appl.*: 535–586. doi:10.1111/j.1752-4571.2008.00036.x.
- 506 Gido, K.B., Schaefer, J.F., and Pigg, J. 2004. Patterns of fish invasions in the Great Plains of North
507 America. *Biol. Conserv.* **118**(2): 121–131. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2003.07.015.
- 508 Gotelli, N.J., Graves, G.R., and Rahbek, C. 2010. Macroecological signals of species interactions in the
509 Danish avifauna. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **107**(11): 5030–5035. doi:10.1073/pnas.0914089107.
- 510 Grader, M., and Letcher, B. 2006. Diel and seasonal gut fullness and prey composition of Atlantic salmon
511 parr in the west brook. *J. Freshw. Ecol.* **21**(3): 503–517.
- 512 Grant, J.W.A., and Imre, I. 2005. Patterns of density-dependent growth in juvenile stream-dwelling

- 513 salmonids. *J. Fish Biol.* **67**(SUPPL. B): 100–110. doi:10.1111/j.0022-1112.2005.00916.x.
- 514 Gries, G., and Letcher, B.H. 2002. Tag Retention and Survival of Age-0 Atlantic Salmon following Surgical
515 Implantation with Passive Integrated Transponder Tags. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **22**(1): 219–222.
516 doi:10.1577/1548-8675(2002)022<0219:TRASOA>2.0.CO;2.
- 517 Grossman, G.D., Moyle, P.B., and Whitaker, J.O. 1982. Stochasticity in Structural and Functional
518 Characteristics of an Indiana Stream Fish Assemblage: A Test of Community Theory. *Am. Nat.*
519 **120**(4): 423–454. doi:10.1086/284004.
- 520 Harwood, A.J., Armstrong, J.D., Metcalfe, N.B., and Griffiths, S.W. 2003. Does dominance status
521 correlate with growth in wild stream-dwelling Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)? *Behav. Ecol.* **14**(6):
522 902–908. doi:10.1093/beheco/arg080.
- 523 Hitt, N.P., Frissell, C.A., Muhlfeld, C.C., and Altendorf, F.W. 2003. Spread of hybridization between native
524 westslope cutthroat trout, *Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*, and nonnative rainbow trout, *Oncorhynchus*
525 *mykiss*. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **60**(12): 1440–1451. doi:10.1139/f03-125.
- 526 Hitt, N.P., Snook, E.L., and Massie, D.L. 2017. Brook trout use of thermal refugia and foraging habitat
527 influenced by brown trout. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **74**(3): 406–418. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2016-0255.
- 528 Hoxmeier, R.J.H., and Dieterman, D.J. 2013. Seasonal movement, growth and survival of brook trout in
529 sympatry with brown trout in Midwestern US streams. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **22**(4): 530–542.
530 doi:10.1111/eff.12051.
- 531 Hoxmeier, R.J.H., and Dieterman, D.J. 2019. Natural replacement of invasive brown trout by brook charr
532 in an upper Midwestern United States stream. *Hydrobiologia* **840**(1): 309–317. Springer
533 International Publishing. doi:10.1007/s10750-019-3912-0.
- 534 Hubbell, S. 2001. The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography. Princeton University

- 535 Press, Princeton, NJ.
- 536 Huntsman, B.M., Petty, J.T., Sharma, S., and Merriam, E.R. 2016. More than a corridor: use of a main
537 stem stream as supplemental foraging habitat by a brook trout metapopulation. *Oecologia* **182**(2):
538 1–11. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/s00442-016-3676-4.
- 539 Jackson, D.A., Peres-Neto, P.R., and Olden, J.D. 2001. What controls who is where in freshwater fish
540 communities - The roles of biotic, abiotic, and spatial factors. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **58**(1): 157–
541 170. doi:10.1139/cjfas-58-1-157.
- 542 Jeffries, M.J., and Lawton, J.H. 1984. Enemy free space and the structure of ecological communities. *Biol.*
543 *J. Linn. Soc.* **23**(4): 269–286. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.1984.tb00145.x.
- 544 Kanno, Y., Letcher, B.H., Coombs, J. a., Nislow, K.H., and Whiteley, A.R. 2014. Linking movement and
545 reproductive history of brook trout to assess habitat connectivity in a heterogeneous stream
546 network. *Freshw. Biol.* **59**(1): 142–154. doi:10.1111/fwb.12254.
- 547 Kanno, Y., Letcher, B.H., Hitt, N.P., Boughton, D. a., Wofford, J.E.B., and Zipkin, E.F. 2015a. Seasonal
548 weather patterns drive population vital rates and persistence in a stream fish. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*
549 **21**(5): 1856–1870. doi:10.1111/gcb.12837.
- 550 Kanno, Y., Letcher, B.H., Hitt, N.P., Boughton, D. a., Wofford, J.E.B., and Zipkin, E.F. 2015b. Seasonal
551 weather patterns drive population vital rates and persistence in a stream fish. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*
552 **21**(5): 1856–1870. doi:10.1111/gcb.12837.
- 553 Kanno, Y., Pregler, K.C., Hitt, N.P., Letcher, B.H., Hocking, D.J., and Wofford, J.E.B. 2016. Seasonal
554 temperature and precipitation regulate brook trout young-of-the-year abundance and population
555 dynamics. *Freshw. Biol.* **61**(1): 88–99. doi:10.1111/fwb.12682.
- 556 Katz, J., Moyle, P.B., Quiñones, R.M., Israel, J., and Purdy, S. 2013. Impending extinction of salmon,

- 557 steelhead, and trout (Salmonidae) in California. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **96**(10–11): 1169–1186.
558 doi:10.1007/s10641-012-9974-8.
- 559 Korsu, K., Huusko, A., and Muotka, T. 2007. Niche characteristics explain the reciprocal invasion success
560 of stream salmonids in different continents. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **104**(23): 9725–9729.
561 doi:10.1073/pnas.0610719104.
- 562 Korsu, K., Huusko, A., and Muotka, T. 2009. Does the introduced brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) affect
563 growth of the native brown trout (*Salmo trutta*)? *Naturwissenschaften* **96**(3): 347–353.
564 doi:10.1007/s00114-008-0482-9.
- 565 Korsu, K., Huusko, A., and Muotka, T. 2010. Invasion of north European streams by brook trout: Hostile
566 takeover or pre-adapted habitat niche segregation? *Biol. Invasions* **12**(5): 1363–1375.
567 doi:10.1007/s10530-009-9553-x.
- 568 Krueger, C.C., and May, B. 1991. Ecological and genetic effects of salmonid introductions. *Can. J. Fish.*
569 *Aquat. Sci.* **48**(Suppl. 1): 66–77.
- 570 De La Hoz Franco, E.A., and Budy, P. 2005. Effects of biotic and abiotic factors on the distribution of trout
571 and salmon along a longitudinal stream gradient. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **72**(4): 379–391.
572 doi:10.1007/s10641-004-2591-4.
- 573 Leibold, M., and Tessier, A.J. 1991. Contrasting patterns of body size for *Daphnia* species that segregate
574 by habitat. *Oecologia* **86**(3): 342–348. doi:10.1007/BF00317599.
- 575 Leibold, M.A., and McPeck, M.A. 2006. Coexistence of the niche and neutral perspectives in community
576 ecology. *Ecology* **87**(6): 1399–1410. doi:https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-
577 9658(2006)87[1399:COTNAN]2.0.CO;2.
- 578 Letcher, B.H., Coombs, J. a., and Nislow, K.H. 2011. Maintenance of phenotypic variation: repeatability,

- 579 heritability and size-dependent processes in a wild brook trout population. *Evol. Appl.* **4**(4): 602–
580 615. doi:10.1111/j.1752-4571.2011.00184.x.
- 581 Letcher, B.H., and Gries, G. 2003. Effects of life history variation on size and growth in stream-dwelling
582 Atlantic salmon. *J. Fish Biol.* **62**(1): 97–114. doi:10.1046/j.0022-1112.2003.00009.x.
- 583 Letcher, B.H., Nislow, K.H., Coombs, J., O'Donnell, M.J., and Dubreuil, T.L. 2007. Population response to
584 habitat fragmentation in a stream-dwelling brook trout population. *PLoS One* **2**(11): e1139.
585 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001139.
- 586 Letcher, B.H., Schueller, P., Bassar, R.D., Nislow, K.H., Coombs, J. a, Sakrejda, K., Morrissey, M.,
587 Sigourney, D.B., Whiteley, A.R., O'Donnell, M.J., and Dubreuil, T.L. 2015. Robust estimates of
588 environmental effects on population vital rates: an integrated capture-recapture model of seasonal
589 brook trout growth, survival and movement in a stream network. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **84**(2): 337–352.
590 doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12308.
- 591 Lobon-Cervia, J. 2007. Density-dependent growth in stream-living Brown Trout *Salmo trutta* L. *Funct.*
592 *Ecol.* **21**(1): 117–124. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2006.01204.x.
- 593 McFadden, J. 1961. A population study of the brook trout, *Salvelinus fontinalis*. *Wildl. Monogr.* (7): 3–73.
- 594 McKenna, J.E., Slattery, M.T., and Clifford, K.M. 2013. Broad-Scale Patterns of Brook Trout Responses to
595 Introduced Brown Trout in New York. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **33**(6): 1221–1235.
596 doi:10.1080/02755947.2013.830998.
- 597 Miller, L.M., Dieterman, D.J., and Hoxmeier, R.J.H. 2019. Reproductive dynamics of a native brook trout
598 population following removal of non-native brown trout from a stream in Minnesota , north-
599 central USA. *Hydrobiologia* **5**. Springer International Publishing. doi:10.1007/s10750-019-3952-5.
- 600 Mortensen, E. 1982. Production of trout, *Salmo trutta*, in a Danish stream. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **7**(4):

- 601 349–356. doi:10.1007/BF00005569.
- 602 Muhlfeld, C.C., Kalinowski, S.T., McMahon, T.E., Taper, M.L., Painter, S., Leary, R.F., and Allendorf, F.W.
603 2009. Hybridization rapidly reduces fitness of a native trout in the wild. *Biol. Lett.* **5**(3): 328–31.
604 doi:10.1098/rsbl.2009.0033.
- 605 Nicola, G.G., Almodóvar, A., and Elvira, B. 2009. Influence of hydrologic attributes on brown trout
606 recruitment in low-latitude range margins. *Oecologia* **160**(3): 515–524. doi:10.1007/s00442-009-
607 1317-x.
- 608 Nislow, K.H., Armstrong, J.D., and Grant, J.W.A. 2010. The Role of Competition in the Ecology of Juvenile
609 Atlantic Salmon. *In* Atlantic Salmon Ecology. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK. pp. 171–197.
610 doi:10.1002/9781444327755.ch7.
- 611 Öhlund, G., Nordwall, F., Degerman, E., and Eriksson, T. 2008. Life history and large-scale habitat use of
612 brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) and brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) - Implications for species
613 replacement patterns. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **65**(4): 633–644. doi:10.1139/F08-003.
- 614 Peres-Neto, P.R. 2004. Patterns in the co-occurrence of fish species in streams: the role of site
615 suitability, morphology and phylogeny versus species interactions. *Oecologia* **140**(2): 352–360.
616 doi:10.1007/s00442-004-1578-3.
- 617 Petty, J.T., Lamothe, P.J., and Mazik, P.M. 2005. Spatial and Seasonal Dynamics of Brook Trout
618 Populations Inhabiting a Central Appalachian Watershed. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **134**(3): 572–587.
619 doi:10.1577/t03-229.1.
- 620 Reinhardt, U.G., and Healey, M.C. 1999. Season- and size-dependent risk taking in juvenile coho salmon:
621 Experimental evaluation of asset protection. *Anim. Behav.* **57**(4): 923–933.
622 doi:10.1006/anbe.1998.1051.

- 623 Siepielski, A.M., and McPeck, M.A. 2010. On the evidence for species coexistence: a critique of the
624 coexistence program. *Ecology* **91**(11): 3153–3164. doi:10.1890/10-0154.1.
- 625 Sigourney, D.B., Horton, G.E., Dubreuil, T.L., Varaday, A.M., and Letcher, B.H. 2005. Electroshocking and
626 PIT Tagging of Juvenile Atlantic Salmon: Are There Interactive Effects on Growth and Survival?
627 *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **25**(3): 1016–1021. doi:10.1577/M04-075.1.
- 628 Sigourney, D.B., Letcher, B.H., Obedzinski, M., and Cunjak, R. a. 2013. Interactive effects of life history
629 and season on size-dependent growth in juvenile Atlantic salmon. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **22**(4): 495–
630 507. doi:10.1111/eff.12042.
- 631 Sotiropoulos, J.C., Nislow, K.H., and Ross, M.R. 2006. Brook trout, *Salvelinus fontinalis*, microhabitat
632 selection and diet under low summer stream flows. *Fish. Manag. Ecol.* **13**(3): 149–155.
633 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2400.2006.00487.x.
- 634 Spina, A.P. 2001. Incubation Discharge and Aspects of Brown Trout Population Dynamics. *Trans. Am.*
635 *Fish. Soc.* **130**(2): 322–327. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(2001)130<0322:idaaob>2.0.co;2.
- 636 Sweka, J.A., and Hartman, K.J. 2008. Contribution of Terrestrial Invertebrates to Yearly Brook Trout Prey
637 Consumption and Growth. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **137**(1): 224–235. doi:10.1577/T05-034.1.
- 638 U.S. Geological Survey. 2018. National Hydrography Dataset Plus High Resolution (NHDPlus HR) for 4-
639 digit Hydrologic Unit - 0108. Available from [https://prd-](https://prd-tnm.s3.amazonaws.com/StagedProducts/Hydrography/NHDPlusHR/Beta/GDB/NHDPLUS_H_0108_HU4_GDB.zip%0A%0A)
640 [tnm.s3.amazonaws.com/StagedProducts/Hydrography/NHDPlusHR/Beta/GDB/NHDPLUS_H_0108_](https://prd-tnm.s3.amazonaws.com/StagedProducts/Hydrography/NHDPlusHR/Beta/GDB/NHDPLUS_H_0108_HU4_GDB.zip%0A%0A)
641 [HU4_GDB.zip%0A%0A](https://prd-tnm.s3.amazonaws.com/StagedProducts/Hydrography/NHDPlusHR/Beta/GDB/NHDPLUS_H_0108_HU4_GDB.zip%0A%0A).
- 642 U.S. Geological Survey. 2020a. National Hydrography Dataset (24K). Available from
643 <https://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/>.
- 644 U.S. Geological Survey. 2020b. National Elevation Dataset (10M). Available from

- 645 <https://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/>.
- 646 Utz, R.M., and Hartman, K.J. 2009. Density-dependent individual growth and size dynamics of central
647 Appalachian brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **66**(7): 1072–1080.
648 doi:10.1139/F09-063.
- 649 Vincenzi, S., Satterthwaite, W.H., and Mangel, M. 2012. Spatial and temporal scale of density-dependent
650 body growth and its implications for recruitment, population dynamics and management of
651 stream-dwelling salmonid populations. *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish.* **22**(3): 813–825. doi:10.1007/s11160-
652 011-9247-1.
- 653 Wagner, T., Deweber, J.T., Detar, J., Kristine, D., and Sweka, J. a. 2014. Spatial and Temporal Dynamics in
654 Brook Trout Density: Implications for Population Monitoring. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **34**(2): 258–
655 269. doi:10.1080/02755947.2013.847878.
- 656 Wagner, T., Deweber, J.T., Detar, J., and Sweka, J.A. 2013. Landscape-Scale Evaluation of Asymmetric
657 Interactions between Brown Trout and Brook Trout Using Two-Species Occupancy Models. *Trans.*
658 *Am. Fish. Soc.* **142**(2): 353–361. doi:10.1080/00028487.2012.734892.
- 659 Waters, T.F. 1983. Replacement of Brook Trout by Brown Trout over 15 Years in a Minnesota Stream:
660 Production and Abundance. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **112**(2A): 137–146. doi:10.1577/1548-
661 8659(1983)112<137:ROBTBB>2.0.CO;2.
- 662 Wenger, S.J., Isaak, D.J., Luce, C.H., Neville, H.M., Fausch, K.D., Dunham, J.B., Dauwalter, D.C., Young,
663 M.K., Elsner, M.M., Rieman, B.E., Hamlet, a. F., and Williams, J.E. 2011. Flow regime, temperature,
664 and biotic interactions drive differential declines of trout species under climate change. *Proc. Natl.*
665 *Acad. Sci.* **108**(34): 14175–14180. doi:10.1073/pnas.1103097108.
- 666 Whiteley, A.R., Coombs, J.A., O'Donnell, M.J., Nislow, K.H., and Letcher, B.H. 2017. Keeping things local:

- subpopulation N_b and N_e in a stream network with partial barriers to fish migration. *Evol. Appl.* (December 2016): 348–365. doi:10.1111/eva.12454.
- Whitworth, W.E., and Strange, R.J. 1983. Growth and Production of Sympatric Brook and Rainbow Trout in an Appalachian Stream. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **112**(4): 469–475. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1983)112<469:gaposb>2.0.co;2.
- Wilson, A.J., Hutchings, J.A., and Ferguson, M.M. 2003. Selective and genetic constraints on the evolution of body size in a stream-dwelling salmonid fish. *J. Evol. Biol.* **16**(4): 584–94. Available from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14632222>.
- Witzel, L.D., and Maccrimmon, H.R. 1983. Redd-Site Selection by Brook Trout and Brown Trout in Southwestern Ontario Streams. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **112**(6): 760–771. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1983)112<760:rsbbta>2.0.co;2.
- Wood, S.N. 2006. General additive models: an introduction with R. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Wood, S.N. 2017. Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R. *In* 2nd edition. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- Yant, P.R., Karr, J.R., and Angermeier, P.L. 1984. Stochasticity in Stream Fish Communities: An Alternative Interpretation. *Am. Nat.* **124**(4): 573–582. doi:10.1086/284296.
- Young, K.A. 2004. Asymmetric competition, habitat selection, and niche overlap in juvenile salmonids. *Ecology* **85**(1): 134–149. doi:10.1890/02-0402.
- Zorn, T.G., and Nuhfer, A.J. 2007. Influences on Brown Trout and Brook Trout Population Dynamics in a Michigan River. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **136**(3): 691–705. doi:10.1577/t06-032.1.

688 Table 1. Characteristics of the study area catchments and surrounding watershed (Figure 1). West Brook drainage area and stream lengths are
689 calculated from the mouth of the West Brook to the bottom of the reservoir and do not include the tributary areas or lengths.

690

Catchment	Drainage area (km ²)	Average width (m)	Total stream length (km)	Proportion of stream length occupied by salmonids	Sampled study area stream length (m)	Proportion of occupied stream length sampled
West Brook	6.92	7.4	10.08	0.87	1,273	0.15
Open Large	2.46	3.4	3.29	1.00	297	0.09
Open Small	1.06	2.0	2.00	0.16	320	1.00
Isolated Large	1.33	3.0	1.67	1.00	318	0.19

691

692

693 Table 2. Model selection table for the two species. All models include the fixed effects 'catchment' and 'presence of salmon'.

Species	Age in days	Age in days by cohort	Age in days by catchment	Age in days by cohort and catchment	Cohort by catchment	Brook trout cohort strength by catchment	Brown trout cohort strength by catchment	df	AIC	Delta AIC
Brook Trout	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	153.9	188634	-
	x	x	x		x	x	x	92.2	189181	547
	x	x	x		x	x		82.0	189329	696
	x	x	x		x			72.0	191540	2907
	x	x	x					55.6	193270	4636
	x	x						48.4	194682	6048
	x							15.0	196672	8038
								6.0	225245	36612

Brown Trout	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	84.5	94948	-
	x	x	x		x	x	x	69.5	95022	74
	x	x	x		x	x		63.3	95076	128
	x	x	x		x			57.4	95681	733
	x	x	x					50.4	96400	1451
	x	x						45.1	96512	1563
	x							13.0	98180	3232
								4.0	119776	24827

694

695

696 Table 3. Fixed effect parameter estimates for both species. The intercept contained the mainstem (West
 697 Brook) and salmon presence = 0. Catchment estimates indicate average deviations from mainstem sizes.

Species	Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err.	t-value	P-value
Brook Trout	Intercept	104.91	1.55	67.89	< 2e-16
	Catchment: OL	-13.68	1.89	-7.25	4.26E-13
	Catchment: OS	-22.86	5.91	-3.87	0.000111
	Catchment: IL	-13.01	1.61	-8.09	6.2E-16
	Salmon presence	6.53	0.94	6.96	3.5E-12
Brown Trout	Intercept	103.05	0.52	198.11	< 2e-16
	Catchment: OL	-18.13	3.00	-6.04	1.62E-09
	Salmon presence	9.20	1.21	7.59	3.53E-14

Table 4. Degrees of freedom, F values and p-values for the spline effects. The large number of cohort:catchment interactions were omitted for brevity. P-values < 0.05 are in bold and number of stars indicate relative strength of the P-values. Catchment abbreviations: WB = West Brook, OS = Open Small, OL = Open large, IL = Isolated Large

Species	Effect	edf	d.f.	F	P-value	
Brook Trout	Age in days	7.95	8.00	502.74	< 2e-16	***
	Age in days: cohort 2000	0.89	0.98	0.05	8.18E-01	
	Age in days: cohort 2001	1.98	2.00	3.76	2.16E-02	*
	Age in days: cohort 2002	2.84	2.94	7.77	5.83E-04	***
	Age in days: cohort 2003	1.00	1.01	0.13	7.17E-01	
	Age in days: cohort 2004	2.60	2.86	10.81	1.18E-06	***
	Age in days: cohort 2005	1.01	1.01	8.67	3.14E-03	**
	Age in days: cohort 2006	2.88	2.98	14.56	1.33E-09	***
	Age in days: cohort 2007	1.01	1.02	3.64	5.51E-02	.
	Age in days: cohort 2008	2.96	3.00	24.96	6.92E-16	***
	Age in days: cohort 2009	2.98	3.00	44.36	< 2e-16	***
	Age in days: cohort 2010	2.94	2.99	19.63	1.71E-12	***
	Age in days: cohort 2011	1.83	1.95	19.17	1.20E-07	***
	Age in days: cohort 2012	1.00	1.00	0.00	9.92E-01	
	Age in days: cohort 2013	1.00	1.01	0.00	9.52E-01	
	Age in days: catchment WB	1.01	1.01	274.37	< 2e-16	***
	Age in days: catchment OL	2.56	2.82	15.83	1.80E-08	***

	Age in days: catchment OS	1.01	1.02	40.88	1.34E-10	***
	Age in days: catchment IL	2.84	2.95	39.50	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort: catchment WB	2.99	3.00	238.95	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort: catchment OL	2.79	2.95	85.52	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort: catchment OS	2.95	3.00	184.56	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort: catchment IL	2.17	2.58	14.59	2.08E-08	***
	Cohort strength Brook Trout: catchment					
	WB	2.99	3.00	217.52	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort strength Brook Trout: catchment					
	OL	2.99	3.00	73.17	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort strength Brook Trout: catchment					
	OS	2.98	3.00	50.05	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort strength Brook Trout: catchment					
	IL	2.95	2.99	158.51	< 2e-16	***
	Cohort strength Brown Trout:					
	catchment WB	2.38	2.64	38.24	9.69E-10	***
	Cohort strength Brown Trout:					
	catchment OS	2.88	2.98	25.17	4.11E-15	***
Brown Trout	Age in days	7.94	8.00	436.58	< 2e-16	***
	Age in days: cohort 2000	0.95	0.99	0.02	9.00E-01	
	Age in days: cohort 2001	0.01	0.02	0.03	9.84E-01	
	Age in days: cohort 2002	0.01	0.01	0.12	9.71E-01	
	Age in days: cohort 2003	2.59	2.86	2.14	5.89E-02	.

Age in days: cohort 2004	1.01	1.02	0.87	3.52E-01	
Age in days: cohort 2005	1.01	1.03	0.09	7.66E-01	
Age in days: cohort 2006	2.26	2.58	1.09	3.48E-01	
Age in days: cohort 2007	2.84	2.97	4.38	3.38E-03	**
Age in days: cohort 2008	2.49	2.76	3.92	8.45E-03	**
Age in days: cohort 2009	1.02	1.03	0.62	4.35E-01	
Age in days: cohort 2010	2.97	3.00	28.05	< 2e-16	***
Age in days: cohort 2011	2.90	2.99	9.09	1.31E-05	***
Age in days: cohort 2012	1.01	1.01	0.05	8.31E-01	
Age in days: cohort 2013	1.02	1.03	1.89	1.68E-01	
Age in days: catchment WB	1.00	1.00	32.35	1.31E-08	***
Age in days: catchment OL	1.99	2.35	21.47	5.75E-11	***
Cohort: catchment WB	2.98	3.00	237.10	< 2e-16	***
Cohort: catchment OL	2.84	2.95	37.07	< 2e-16	***
Cohort strength Brook Trout: catchment					
WB	2.89	2.99	155.62	< 2e-16	***
Cohort strength Brook Trout: catchment					
OL	1.66	1.91	24.50	6.10E-11	***
Cohort strength Brown Trout:					
catchment WB	1.86	2.10	1.08	2.75E-01	
Cohort strength Brown Trout:					
catchment OL	2.23	2.48	25.79	1.71E-13	***

Figure legends

Figure 1. Map of the study area in Massachusetts, USA. The mainstem (West Brook) and tributary watersheds are color-shaded and the tagging study area is shown with black and white dashes. Impassible (square) and passable (circle) waterfalls are indicated on the stream network (blue lines). The map was made using ArcMap v10.8.1 and datasets included the National Hydrography Dataset (U.S. Geological Survey 2020a), the National Elevation Dataset (U.S. Geological Survey 2020b) and the National Hydrography Dataset Plus High Resolution Dataset for flow lines (U.S. Geological Survey 2018).

Figure 2. Observed lengths of individual fish as a function of age in days for three species of salmonids.

Figure 3. Frequency distributions for cohort-specific body sizes of fish at first possible capture (age-0⁺, Autumn). Minimum length of collected fish was 60 mm. Cohorts (2000 - 2012) are indicated by color (darker = earlier, lighter = later).

Figure 4. Number of individual observations by catchment for each species.

Figure 5. Predicted sizes for cohorts (lines), catchments (columns) and species (rows). Dashed vertical lines represent January 1.

Figure 6. Cohort main effects on size-at-age curves for each catchment (panels) and species (brook trout: solid line, brown trout: dashed line).

Figure 7. Predicted body sizes across catchments (line colors) and species (rows). Predictions are for the 2006 cohort and values of salmon presence/absence, and brook trout and brown trout cohort strengths were set to 0

Figure 8. Predicted body sizes for brook trout (solid lines) and brown trout (dashed lines) and catchments (panels) where the species coexist. Predictions are for the 2006 cohort and values of salmon presence/absence, and brook trout and brown trout cohort strengths were set to 0

Figure 9. Scaled cohort strength across cohorts, for Isolated Small (IL, above) and the metapopulation (West Brook, Open Large, Open Small). Lines and symbols depict species (brook trout: black circles, brown trout: grey triangles, Atlantic Salmon: light grey squares).

Figure 10. Brook trout cohort strength vs. brown trout cohort strength for the connected metapopulation (above) and connected metapopulation vs. isolated population for brook trout (below).

Figure 11. Brook trout cohort strength effects on size-at-age-curves for each catchment (panels) and species (brook trout: solid line, brown trout: dashed line).

Figure 12. Brown trout cohort strength effects on size-at-age curves for each catchment (panels) and species (brook trout: solid line, brown trout: dashed line).

Draft

738 Figure 1

739

740 Figure 2

741

742

743 Figure 3

744

745 Figure 4

746

747 Figure 5Error! Reference source not found.

748

749 Figure 6Error! Reference source not found.

750
751

752 Figure 7Error! Reference source not found.

753

754 Figure 8Error! Reference source not found.

755

756

757 Figure 9

758

759 Figure 10

763 Figure 11

764

765 Figure 12

766