Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences

Temporal Variation in the Niche Partitioning of Lake Michigan Salmonines as it Relates to Alewife Abundance and Size Structure.

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2021-0027.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Aug-2021
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Turschak, Benjamin; Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Charlevoix Fisheries Research Station; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, School of Freshwater Sciences</p> <p>Bronte, Charles; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</p> <p>Czesny, Sergiusz; Illinois Natural History Survey, Lake Michigan Biological Station</p> <p>Gerig, Brandon; Northern Michigan University, Biology Department</p> <p>Happel, Austin; John G Shedd Aquarium, Daniel P. Haerther Center for Conservation and Research</p> <p>Höök, Tomas; Purdue University System, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources; Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant,</p> <p>Kornis, Matthew; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Great Lakes Fish Tag and Recovery Lab</p> <p>Leonhardt, Benjamin; U.S. Geological Survey, Great Lakes Science Center</p> <p>Matthias, Bryan; Michigan State University, Quantitative Fisheries Center; US Fish and Wildlife Service</p> <p>Rinchard, Jacques; SUNY Brockport, Department of Environmental Science and Biology</p> <p>Bootsma, Harvey; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, School of Freshwater Sciences</p>
Keyword:	Stable Isotopes, Salmonines, Great Lakes, Dietary Niche, Lake Michigan
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Temporal Variation in the Niche Partitioning of Lake Michigan Salmonines as it Relates to Alewife Abundance and Size Structure.

Benjamin Turschak*^{1,2}, Charles R. Bronte³, Sergiusz Czesny⁴, Brandon Gerig⁵, Austin Happel⁶, Tomas O. Höök^{7,8}, Matthew S. Kornis³, Benjamin S. Leonhardt⁷, Bryan G. Matthias^{9,10}, Jacques Rinchar¹¹, and Harvey Boostma².

¹*Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Charlevoix Fisheries Research Station, 96 Grant St., Charlevoix, MI 49720, USA*

²*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, School of Freshwater Sciences, 600 E Greenfield Ave., Milwaukee, WI, USA*

³*U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Green Bay Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office, 2661 Scott Tower Dr., New Franken, WI 54229, USA*

⁴*University of Illinois, Illinois Natural History Survey, Lake Michigan Biological Station, Prairie Research Institute, 400 17th St., Zion, IL, USA*

⁵*Northern Michigan University, Biology Department, 1401 Presque Isle Avenue, Marquette, MI 49855, USA*

⁶*John G. Shedd Aquarium, Daniel P. Haerther Center for Conservation and Research, 1200 S. Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, IL, 60605, USA*

⁷*Purdue University, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, 195 Marsteller St., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA*

⁸*Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant, 195 Marsteller St., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA*

22 ⁹*Michigan State University, Quantitative Fisheries Center, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife,*
23 *375 Wilson Road, 101 UPLA Building, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA*

24 ¹⁰*U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 850 South Guild Ave., Suite 105, Lodi, CA 95240, USA*
25 *(current)*

26 ¹¹*State University of New York Brockport, Department of Environmental Science and Biology,*
27 *350 New Campus Dr., Brockport, NY, USA*

28 *Corresponding Author: turschakb1@michigan.gov

29

Draft

30 Abstract

31 Stable isotope analyses offer a useful means for quantifying ecological niche dimensions, though
32 few studies have examined isotopic response of an ecological community with respect to
33 resource gradients such as fluctuations in prey availability. Stable carbon and nitrogen isotopes
34 were measured for Lake Michigan salmonines and their prey collected from 2014 to 2016.
35 Bayesian ellipse and mixing model analyses were used to quantify isotopic niche characteristics
36 and diets, respectively, among species and years. During the three-year study period, abundance
37 and size structure of preferred alewife prey changed substantially and offered an opportunity to
38 explore predator isotopic niche response and diet shifts along a prey resource gradient. Results
39 suggested increased reliance on alewives, especially small alewives, over the study period and
40 were consistent with greater availability of this prey. However, differential use of alewife size
41 classes and alternative prey sources by salmonine predators was apparent, which suggested
42 possible resource partitioning. Characterization of ecological niche overlap using stable isotopes
43 likely requires consideration of shared resource availability as well as specific prey and habitat
44 preferences.

45 Key Words:

46 Stable Isotopes, Dietary Niche, Salmonines, Great Lakes, Lake Michigan

47

Introduction

A growing number of studies have attempted to use stable isotope analyses to quantify multiple dimensions of an organism's ecological niche (e.g. Kornis et al., 2020; Layman et al., 2007; Schmidt et al., 2011; Yuille et al., 2015). Stable isotope ratios (e.g., $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{34}\text{S}$, or δD) of an organism's tissue vary because of differential mixing and fractionation of heavy and light isotopes associated with environmental gradients and physiological processes (e.g., primary production, geology, temperature, hydrology, diet, trophic level, growth, and metabolic activity; Peterson and Fry, 1987). Therefore, biotic resource use as well as the abiotic environment experienced by an organism affect mixing and fractionation processes, with resultant variation in isotopic signature. Quantifying an organism's position along various stable isotope gradients provides a continuous measure of that organism's environment and resource use (Vander Zanden and Vadeboncouer 2002; Bowen et al. 2010; Turschak et al. 2019). In this way, the isotopic range that an organism occupies along various isotopic axes, referred to as its 'isotopic niche', is somewhat analogous to the multidimensional ecological niche of that organism (Layman et al. 2007; Newsome et al. 2007; Jackson et al. 2011; Swanson et al. 2015). Examining intra- and inter-specific species variation in isotopic niche facilitates bivariate or multivariate comparisons of multiple resource overlaps. However, isotopic niche area and position (and realized ecological niche) are likely to vary across multiple environmental or resource gradients. Therefore, quantifying potential for ecological niche overlap or resource switching among a community of organisms likely requires examination of isotopic niche parameters along these various resource gradients (Liem 1980; Robinson and Wilson 1998; Yuille et al. 2015).

Stable carbon and nitrogen (hereafter C and N, respectively) isotopes are among the mostly commonly used isotopes in ecological studies. Stable C isotope ratios (expressed as $\delta^{13}\text{C}$)

71 vary broadly among primary producers but are relatively conserved ($<1\%$) during trophic
72 transfer (Bootsma et al., 1996; France, 1995b; Hecky and Hesslein, 1995). At the base of a food
73 web, stable nitrogen isotope ratios (expressed as $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) can vary according to the form of nitrogen
74 assimilated. Above that base, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ increases incrementally by 3 – 4‰ with each trophic transfer
75 (Minagawa and Wada 1984; Vander Zanden et al. 1997). Enrichment of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ also occurs in
76 profundal organisms in the Great Lakes and oceans due to ^{15}N enrichment in settling
77 phytoplankton (Altabet 1988; Ostrom et al. 1998; Sierszen et al. 2006). Thus, in aquatic systems
78 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ are used to determine primary energetic pathway (i.e., benthic or pelagic) and
79 trophic level and/or depth distribution of consumers, respectively (Vander Zanden et al. 1997;
80 Vander Zanden and Vadeboncouer 2002; Sierszen et al. 2006, 2014).

81 We sought to examine $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ isotopic niche overlap as it relates to the diets of the
82 Lake Michigan salmonines. Lake Michigan, a Laurentian Great Lake, has a salmonine
83 community comprised of native lake trout *Salvelinus namaycush*, as well as introduced Pacific
84 salmonines *Oncorhynchus* spp. (Chinook salmon *O. tshawytscha*, coho salmon *O. kisutch*, pink
85 salmon *O. gorbuscha*, and steelhead *O. mykiss*), and Atlantic/European salmonines *Salmo* spp.
86 (brown trout *S. trutta* and Atlantic salmon *S. salar*). Pink salmon and Atlantic salmon are rarely
87 encountered, and little is known about their feeding ecologies in Lake Michigan. In Lake Huron
88 these species seem to exhibit strong reliance on various fish (rainbow smelt *Osmerus mordax*
89 and sticklebacks *Gasterosteus aculeatus* and *Pungitius pungitius*) and invertebrates
90 (*Bythotrephes longimanus* and terrestrial invertebrates; Roseman et al. 2014). However,
91 numerous diet studies of the five common Lake Michigan salmonines, spanning decades, have
92 yielded unequivocal evidence that the invasive pelagic planktivore alewife *Alosa*
93 *pseudoharengus* is the primary salmonine prey species in Lake Michigan (Jude et al. 1987;

Stewart and Ibarra 1991; Rand et al. 1993; Warner et al. 2008; Savitz 2009; Jacobs et al. 2010, 2013; Happel et al. 2018; Leonhardt et al. 2020). The extent of alternate prey use is lower than observed in systems without alewife prey (e.g. Roseman et al. 2014) but still varies among species. For instance, Chinook salmon appear almost exclusively reliant on alewives, whereas steelhead and coho salmon diets have varied to include larger proportions of invertebrate prey (Jacobs et al. 2013; Leonhardt et al. 2020). Lake trout and brown trout, while still highly dependent on alewives, also obtain large proportions of their diets from round goby *Neogobius melanostomus*, an invasive benthivorous prey species (Kornis et al. 2017; Happel et al. 2018; Leonhardt et al. 2020).

The degree of dependence on alewife prey and hence potential for dietary niche overlap likely also varies spatiotemporally for Lake Michigan salmonines (Happel et al. 2018, 2020; Leonhardt et al. 2020). Early diet studies of Lake Michigan salmonines suggested very high degrees of dietary overlap corresponding to an abundant alewife population with multiple ages well represented in the diet (Jude et al. 1987; Stewart and Ibarra 1991; Jacobs et al. 2013). However, alewife and other pelagic forage fish have declined substantially, corresponding with sustained high consumptive demand by salmonine predators, which may have been further exacerbated by major declines in the abundance of the native amphipod *Diporeia* (Madenjian et al. 2002, 2006, 2015; Tschaye et al. 2014b, 2014a). The age structure of the current alewife population is highly truncated with relatively few old fish in any given year. Recruitment has also been variable and observed to be low in most years since 2013 (Vidal et al. 2019; Bunnell et al. 2020). With major long-term declines in pelagic prey fish biomass, some salmonine predators have been able to use alternative nearshore benthic or terrestrial energy pathways, which are decoupled from pelagic energy pathways (Johnson et al. 2005; Dietrich et al. 2006; Rennie et al.

2009; He et al. 2015; Fera et al. 2017). Here and throughout, major energetic pathways in Lake Michigan are defined by the location of carbon fixation. For instance, ‘nearshore benthic’ energetic pathway refers to C fixed in the nearshore benthos (i.e. periphyton) which is subsequently available to higher trophic levels. The degree of species-specific dependence on these alternative pathways seems to correspond to long-term lakewide declines in pelagic alewife, as well as the size structure of locally available alewives among seasons (Roseman et al. 2014; He et al. 2015; Happel et al. 2018; Leonhardt et al. 2020).

Stable C and N isotope data for Lake Michigan salmonines were available for the 3-year period from 2014 to 2016, during which time lakewide alewife density increased markedly, and size structure shifted from larger to smaller individuals (Figure 1; D. Warner personal communication; Bunnell et al., 2020; Legler 2020). Estimates of numeric and biomass density increased substantially from a record low density of primarily larger individuals in 2014 to numerically more abundant but smaller individuals in 2015 and 2016. This transition corresponds to the recruitment of age-0 fish (approximately $< 100\text{mm}$) in both 2015 and 2016 detected by the August lakewide hydroacoustic survey (Figure 1; Bunnell et al. 2020). During this same period, we collected muscle tissue from Lake Michigan salmonines and analyzed them for stable isotopes. This provided the opportunity to 1) characterize salmonine isotopic niche areas and positions as well as intra- and inter-species overlaps across a temporal resource gradient and 2) use stable isotope mixing models to evaluate temporal and regional diet differences as they might relate to alewife density and size structure. Our objectives were to determine whether stable C and N isotopes were able to resolve changes in realized dietary niche area among species and, if so, the degree of niche partitioning and diet flexibility among these species along a dietary resource gradient.

140 Materials and methods

141 Sample Collection

142 Stable isotope samples and biometric data were collected from the five most prevalent
143 species of Lake Michigan salmonine ($n=2,057$) in 2014 – 2016. Most salmonine samples were
144 collected from recreationally harvested fish as part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Great
145 Lakes Mass Marking Program (Bronte et al. 2012). Detailed stable isotope sampling strategy and
146 methodology from the Mass Marking Program are given by Kornis et al. (2020), where tissue
147 samples were collected from angler catches at fish cleaning stations and at recreational fishing
148 tournaments at 28 port cities around Lake Michigan. In 2014, samples were collected from June-
149 September, and in 2015 and 2016 samples were collected from April-September. Supplemental
150 lake trout samples were also collected in 2016 as part of several independent gill net (38 – 152
151 mm stretch mesh) sampling efforts led by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources
152 (Eastern Lake Michigan), Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (Southwestern Lake
153 Michigan), and Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians (Northeastern Lake Michigan). In
154 addition to biometric data (e.g., total length and weight), small (< 10 g) skin-free dorsal muscle
155 tissue plugs for stable isotope analysis, and stomachs, were removed from all salmonines
156 sampled and were stored at -20°C until they could be processed in the laboratory.

157 Forage fishes and invertebrate prey samples ($n = 581$) were collected in 2014 – 2016
158 using a variety of methods. In 2014 and 2015, forage fishes and invertebrates were captured in
159 September bottom trawl surveys conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey at their seven index
160 sites around Lake Michigan (Bunnell et al. 2020). Dorsal muscle tissue plugs were collected
161 from forage fish and stored frozen until samples could be processed in the laboratory. Aquatic
162 invertebrates *Mysis relicta* and *Bythotrephes longimanus* were collected using vertical plankton

net (500 μm) tows and individuals were pooled according to taxa after each tow and stored frozen. In 2016, forage fish samples were collected from May to October using a combination of bottom trawls and micromesh gillnets (6 – 12 mm stretch mesh). Forage fish sampling was performed by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Purdue University, Illinois Natural History Survey, NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, and Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa Indians in 2016. Prey fishes collected in 2016 were frozen whole prior to laboratory analyses. Terrestrial invertebrates, which were an important component of steelhead observed diets in 2016 (Leonhardt et al. 2020), were removed from diets during gut content analyses, subset, and then set aside in desiccators for subsequent stable isotope analysis.

Protocols for sample collection and euthanasia were reviewed and approved by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee following guidelines from the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science.

Sample Processing and Analysis

Laboratory processing and stable isotope analysis were done independently in each year of the study period. Forage fish homogenates, salmonine dorsal muscle plugs, and whole invertebrates were dried in 1.5ml polypropylene microcentrifuge tubes using a drying oven at 60°C for 48 h (2014) or were lyophilized (2015 – 2016) in polystyrene weighing boats. Dried samples were homogenized by grinding with a mortar and pestle (2014) or by chopping into a fine powder using surgical scissors or razor blades (2015 – 2016). Subsamples of dried tissue homogenate (0.8 – 1.2 mg) were then packed into a tin capsule for subsequent stable isotope analyses. In 2014, samples were analyzed for $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ at the UC-Davis Stable Isotope Facility using a PDZ Europa ANCA-GSL elemental analyzer (EA) front-end coupled with a PDZ Europa 20-20 isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS). In 2015, samples were analyzed at

the Center for Environmental Science and Technology, University of Notre Dame using an EA (Costech, Valencia, CA) coupled to a Delta Plus IRMS (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, MA). In 2016, samples were analyzed at the School of Freshwater Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee using an elemental analyzer front end (ECS 4010, Costech Instruments, Valencia, CA) coupled with a Delta V Plus IRMS (Thermo Fisher, Bremen). For each sample year, isotope ratios were adjusted after each sample run using a 3-point standard curve and known NIST laboratory standards. During all sample runs, an acetanilide control sample was analyzed for ^{13}C : ^{12}C and ^{15}N : ^{14}N ratios after every 12th sample to ensure precision of IRMSs used for each sample year ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ SD = 0.20 and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ SD $\leq$ 0.20). All stable isotope results were expressed in per mil (‰) differences between the isotope ratio of the sample and that of the standard (PDB carbonate or atmospheric air for $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, respectively), using the formula: $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ or $\delta^{15}\text{N} = (\text{R}_{\text{sample}}/\text{R}_{\text{Standard}} - 1) \times 1000$, where $\text{R} = ^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$ for $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\text{R} = ^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$ for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$.

Data Processing and Analysis

All $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of salmonine predators and prey were corrected for lipid content, and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values presented hereafter reflect lipid-corrected values. Lipid-correction for most species was done using Lake Michigan species-specific equations and coefficients developed and described in Appendix B of Turschak et al. (2014) and Turschak (2013). Correction coefficients were updated for salmonines and some prey by Kornis et al. (2020) and these updated coefficients were used for all applicable species. However, species-specific correction equations were not developed for several taxa including bloater *Coregonus hoyi*, *Bythotrephes*, and terrestrial invertebrates. For these taxa, the generic correction equations of Post et al. (2007) were used in place of species-specific corrections.

For analysis purposes, salmonine stable isotope samples from each of the various ports were grouped into four major quadrants of the lake (i.e., Northwest-NW, Southwest-SW, Southeast-SE, and Northeast-NE) as described in Turschak et al. (2018). Analysis regions were selected *a priori* based on expected spatial variability observed in previous Lake Michigan stable isotope studies (Happel et al. 2015; Foley et al. 2017; Turschak et al. 2019). However, regional trophic baseline corrections were not made for salmonine predators. Given broad horizontal and/or vertical (profundal/pelagic) movements of salmonine predators in the Laurentian Great Lakes, most are unlikely to reach isotopic equilibrium with regional or depth specific isotopic values (Adlerstein et al., 2008, 2007a, 2007b; Bronte et al., 2007; Clark et al., 2017; Haynes et al., 1986; Schmalz et al., 2002; and Michigan Department of Natural Resources unpublished data). Therefore, imposing regional differences in baseline isotope signatures on predators caught within each region is likely to result in artificial regional differences that obscure true differences in predator isotopic niche (Vander Zanden and Rasmussen 1999; Post 2002; Foley et al. 2014; Turschak et al. 2019).

Sample sizes of prey taxa and size classes of interest (prey sources, hereafter) were variable among years, so these data were pooled together to produce lake-wide, three-year (2014 – 2016) mean and variance estimates of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. For forage fishes, size structure and sample size collected for analyses during opportunistic sampling reflected natural lakewide size structure and abundance ([Appendix A, Fig. A1](#)). Therefore, this study was unable to collect all possible prey sources for all years and required data pooling. Given known ontogenetic variation in stable isotope signatures (Turschak and Bootsma 2015; Mumby et al. 2017) and changes in size structure for certain prey species (e.g. alewife) over the study period (Bunnell et al. 2020), interannual variation among prey source $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ were evaluated. Interannual variation

among prey source $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ was very low for most species, especially those of high dietary importance such as alewife, therefore data aggregation was justifiable. Small interannual differences probably reflected the variable size structure and regional variation among prey sources during various collections ([Appendix A, Fig. A1](#); Mumby et al. 2017; Turschak et al. 2019). To provide equal weight to annual $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ mean and variance estimates despite unbalanced annual collections, a bootstrap resampling procedure was used when prey source data was available for multiple years. Prey $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values were resampled with replacement ($n = 1000$) to produce source specific annual sampling distributions. Bootstrapped annual $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ distributions for each species were combined and the mean and SD was calculated to produce a three-year pooled value wherein mean and variance for each year was given equal weight ([Appendix A, Fig. A1](#)). This procedure incorporated prey source variance observed across all study years and regions and allowed us to minimize biases associated with unbalanced sampling of prey source isotopic data.

Quantitative statistical analyses of stable isotope data were performed in R version 3.5.1 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing). Diet proportions of salmonines were determined using the MixSIAR package (Stock and Semmens, 2016) stable isotope mixing models. MixSIAR models were modified from the standard rjags package to operate using the runjags package in R which better facilitated parallel processing (i.e., 4 cores) and extension of MCMC (Markov chain Monte Carlo) chain length without having to restart model runs. These modified MixSIAR models were structured with collection year as a random factor, region as a nested random factor, and consumer total length as a continuous covariate. Informative prior Dirichlet distributions were used based on wet weight diet proportions observed in salmonine diets in 2015 and 2016 (Leonhardt et al. 2020). Prior distributions varied with species but were held

constant among years and regions included in this study. Apart from round goby, which were included as a nearshore benthic endmember in all models, predator-specific prey sources that made up less than 2% by weight in 2015 – 2016 observed annual lake-wide diet proportions were not included as potential sources in mixing models (Leonhardt et al. 2020). Trophic enrichment factors (mean $\pm$ SD) of 0.4 ± 1.3 and 3.4 ± 1.0 for $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, respectively, were also provided as model inputs (Post 2002). Models were run with 4 parallel MCMC chains of length 50,000. Burn-in length was 20,000 and chains were thinned by 10. Model convergence was evaluated visually using trace plots and quantitatively using the Gelman-Rubin Diagnostic. If the Gelman-Rubin Diagnostic exceed 1.05 for more than 5% of parameter estimates, the model was extended by an additional 50,000 iterations with the same burn-in length and thinning. The model was reevaluated using the Gelman-Rubin Diagnostic and iteratively extended as described above until this diagnostic indicated fewer than 5% of parameter estimates exceeded 1.05.

Isotopic niche area expressed as Bayesian Standard Ellipse Area (SEA_B) and overlap were assessed using the SIBER (Jackson et al. 2011) and nicheROVER (Swanson et al. 2015) packages in R, respectively, by fitting 95% Bayesian ellipses to $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ biplot data. Ellipses were fit to each year-species combination to assess interannual variation in isotopic niche area within a salmonine species among years (e.g. Species A Year 1 x Species A Year 2 x Species A Year 3) and among salmonine species within years (e.g. Species A Year 1 x Species B Year 1 x Species C Year 1). Isotopic niche overlap was also evaluated among species on an interannual basis to better understand potential for ecological interactions from one year to the next (e.g. Species A $\cap$ Species B Year 1 x Species A $\cap$ Species B Year 2 x Species A $\cap$ Species B Year 3).

Results

Isotopic Niche Size and Overlap

Lake Michigan salmonines occupied a broad range in the stable C and N isotope biplot ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$: -26‰ – -20‰; $\delta^{15}\text{N}$: 8‰ – 15‰) with niche area and interspecific overlap variable among species ([Figure 2 lower left panel](#) and [Figure 3](#)). When all data years were combined, non-Pacific salmonines, brown trout and lake trout, occupied the largest isotopic niche areas ([Figure 2 lower left panel](#)). The large isotopic niche of brown trout encompassed much of the area occupied by other salmonines and resulted in a high degree of apparent isotopic niche overlap (60 – 97%, [Figure 2 lower panels](#) and [Figure 3](#)). While lake trout also occupied a large isotopic niche area, they occupied the most unique area, with enriched $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ relative to other salmonines ([Figure 2 lower panels](#)). As a result, lake trout had the least overlap with other salmonines (11 – 55%; [Figure 2 lower panels](#) and [Figure 3](#)). Pacific salmonines occupied smaller isotopic niche areas and there was greater niche overlap among these congeners ([Figure 2 lower panels](#) and [Figure 3](#)). Chinook salmon had the largest niche area of Pacific salmonines, with the smaller niche areas of steelhead and coho salmon mostly contained within the Chinook salmon niche area (coho: 87%; steelhead: 89% overlap with Chinook salmon; [Figure 2 lower panels](#) and [Figure 3](#)). Coho salmon and steelhead occupied the smallest niche areas of all salmonines, which resulted in a very low degree of overlap with lake trout and brown trout, although overlap between coho salmon and steelhead was large (88-90%; [Figure 2 lower panels](#) and [Figure 3](#)).

Within individual years, niche area and degree of overlap among species varied relative to the more general patterns that were observed when all study years were combined ([Figure 2](#) and [Figure 3](#)). Isotopic niche area for all salmonines except coho salmon declined from 2014 to 2015 and then increased again in 2016 with magnitude of interannual shifts variable among

species ([Figure 2 left panels](#)). Coho salmon—the only species to deviate from this pattern—also exhibited the least interannual variation in niche area from 2014 – 2016 (95% CI: 0.824 – 1.672‰²). Conversely, brown trout and steelhead exhibited the largest change in niche area over the study period (95% CI: 1.44 – 3.49‰² and 0.67 – 2.13‰², respectively; [Figure 2 left panels](#)). Species-specific niche areas also shifted downward (lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) from 2014 to 2016. This was especially apparent for brown trout, lake trout, and Chinook salmon and less pronounced for coho salmon and steelhead ([Figure 2 left panels](#)). All species were ¹³C-enriched in 2015 relative to 2014 and 2016 ([Figure 2 left panels](#)). Magnitude and direction of interannual shifts in both niche area and position were different among Lake Michigan salmonines ([Figure 2 left panels](#)). Interannual changes in niche area and position were also asymmetric among salmonine species and resulted in interannual differences in interspecific niche overlap ([Figure 2 lower panels](#)). These changes are depicted in detail in [Figure 3](#).

Isotope Diet Mixing Models

Estimated brown trout diets shifted with increased total length as well as among study years ([Figure 4](#) and [Figure 5](#)). Differences in brown trout diet among years were greater than relatively moderate regional differences within years. Among all years, large alewife ≥ 100 mm increased in dietary importance with increasing brown trout total length. However, large alewives were a larger overall proportion of brown trout diets in 2014 than they were in 2015 and 2016. Small alewives < 100 mm, by comparison increased in dietary importance from 2014 to 2016 despite variable ontogenetic diet patterns among years and regions for this prey item. Large and small alewives were the most important diet component for brown trout in all years with substantial contributions of round goby and terrestrial invertebrates to diets at small sizes, particularly in 2015.

Estimated lake trout diets had the greatest regional diet differences of any Lake Michigan salmonine and also varied ontogenetically and interannually ([Figure 4](#) and [Figure 6](#)). Among all years, large alewives dominated lake trout diets, except for lake trout from northwest Lake Michigan in 2015, which were apparently more reliant on round goby over the relatively smaller range of sizes that were available in that region. With increases in total length, lake trout appeared to transition to greater reliance on profundal prey fish like bloater and became less reliant on large alewife. Small alewives contributed less than other prey types to lake trout diets (< 20%) among years and regions and their contribution to lake trout diets varied little with changes in lake trout total length. Reliance on round goby varied little with length of lake trout but varied both interannually and regionally. For example, in 2015 round goby contributed more to regional diets than in other years. Round goby were apparently also of relatively high importance to lake trout diets in the northwest region, intermediate in the eastern regions, and least important in the southwest region.

Estimated Chinook salmon diets shifted from relatively high reliance on small alewives to large alewives with increasing total length ([Figure 4](#) and [Figure 7](#)). The relative importance of small and large alewives remained similar regionally within a given year but interannual differences were apparent. Greater importance of small alewives across all Chinook salmon sizes was observed in 2016, while all sizes of Chinook salmon were relatively more reliant on large alewives in 2014 and 2015. Round goby contributed relatively little to Chinook salmon diets, with greatest reliance on this prey occurring for small Chinook salmon in 2014.

Like Chinook salmon, estimated coho salmon diets varied little regionally but ontogenetic and interannual differences were apparent ([Figure 4](#) and [Figure 8](#)). At total lengths <500 mm, terrestrial invertebrates and *Bythotrephes* were the dominate prey sources for coho

salmon but were largely replaced by small alewives as total length increased. Dietary importance of small alewives was high among years with strongest reliance on this prey source occurring in 2016. In contrast, coho salmon had the lowest reliance on small alewives in 2015 and were relatively more reliant on alternate prey including round goby and *Mysis*. Across the range of coho salmon total length and among years, large alewives and *Mysis* generally comprised a relatively small proportion of diets. Much greater uncertainty in mixing model diet proportions was observed for coho salmon than other salmonines.

Like the other Pacific Salmonines, estimated steelhead diets were very similar regionally despite strong ontogenetic and interannual variation ([Figure 4](#) and [Figure 9](#)). In 2014 and 2015, terrestrial invertebrates comprised a major component of steelhead diets, particularly at small total lengths. As steelhead total length increased, diets transitioned from terrestrial invertebrates to strong reliance on large alewives. Unlike 2014 and 2015, steelhead diets in 2016 were almost entirely dominated by small alewives with very little reliance on other prey. From 2014 – 2016, there was a substantial increase in contributions of small alewives to steelhead diets and a subsequent decrease in terrestrial invertebrates and large alewives. Round goby also contributed relatively more to steelhead diets in 2015, as was observed for other salmonines.

Discussion

The magnitude and direction of species-specific interannual changes in isotopic niche area and position, as well as trophic overlap among salmonine species, were consistent with shifts in abundance and size structure of the Lake Michigan alewife population and resulting consumption of potential alternative prey items. This study focused on the effects of changes in alewife density and size structure because this prey is highly preferred by Lake Michigan salmonines and dynamics of alternate prey, such as round goby, are largely unknown at this time (Happel et al. 2020; Leonhardt et al. 2020). However, when preferred alewife prey density is low, it appears that Lake Michigan salmonines, like other species (Robinson and Wilson 1998; Hayden et al. 2014; McMeans et al. 2015), switch from preferential feeding on alewives to alternative prey (e.g. terrestrial invertebrates and round goby). The threshold for prey switching varied among salmonines, with Chinook salmon apparently tolerating very low alewife abundance whereas lake trout may use alternate prey even at relatively higher alewife abundance. Use of alternate prey by Lake Michigan salmonines may offer some evidence for how this community of predators partitions available prey by means of species-specific foraging locations or behaviors (e.g., nearshore benthos, surface, or profundal) when preferred pelagic prey are scarce. However, this also means that consideration must be given to resource gradients when examining potential for competition using stable isotopes.

Over the study period, niche area and position as well as diet mixing model results for brown trout, Chinook salmon, coho salmon and steelhead suggested a shift to greater reliance on small alewives <100 mm and less reliance on large alewives ≥ 100 mm. One probable cause for this change is the increased availability of small alewives from improved recruitment in 2015 following very low recruitment in 2013 and 2014 ([Figure 1](#); Bunnell et al., 2020). That this event

is not immediately reflected in the isotopic composition of predators is likely due to their preference for alewives larger than 50-125 mm (Leonhardt et al., 2020). It is likely that young-of-year (YOY) alewives are poorly selected for by salmonines until late summer in Lake Michigan based on alewife growth rates and possible advection from nursery habitats (Höök et al. 2006, 2007; Höök and Pothoven 2009). Given the seasonally delayed availability of young alewife as potential prey and the relatively slow isotopic turnover rates of large adult salmonines (several months or more; Trueman et al., 2005; Vander Zanden et al., 2015), there may be a substantial temporal lag in the predator isotopic response to changes in small alewife availability. The rate of isotopic response will be dependent on the time/season that YOY alewife become selected for by a given predator, and the rate of isotopic incorporation which varies as a function of predator catabolic turnover and growth (Weidel et al. 2011; Vander Zanden et al. 2015).

Lake trout consistently occupied some of the largest niche areas (surpassed only by brown trout) but were the least closely associated with small alewives in the isotope biplots. Enriched $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of lake trout is likely the result of reliance on the enriched $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ profundal energy pathway and associated deeper dwelling prey such as bloater or sculpins (Turschak and Bootsma 2015; Kornis et al. 2020), as well as round goby and large alewife that were also enriched in $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ relative to small alewife. Small alewives also prefer warmer surface waters where lake trout, which prefer colder water, are unlikely to encounter them as prey (Wismer and Christie 1987; Bergstedt et al. 2012; Negus and Bergstedt 2012). Indeed, mixing model results suggest low importance of small alewife prey for lake trout. Nevertheless, niche area for lake trout did shift toward lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ from 2014 to 2016. Mixing model results suggest that this shift is the result of greater reliance on large alewives, which also increased in abundance in 2016 following

2015 recruitment (Bunnell et al. 2020), and a corresponding reduced reliance on bloater and round goby.

Except for Chinook salmon, which are nearly obligate alewife predators in Lake Michigan (Jacobs et al. 2013; Leonhardt et al. 2020), isotopic mixing models suggested that Lake Michigan salmonines shifted to greater reliance on round goby or isotopically similar nearshore benthic prey in 2015, as indicated by enriched $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ among many individual salmonines in 2015 relative 2014 and 2016. Indeed, recent diets studies have shown substantial reliance on this prey by lake trout and brown trout as well as occasional reliance by some Pacific salmonines (Johnson et al. 2005; Dietrich et al. 2006; Roseman et al. 2014; Happel et al. 2020; Leonhardt et al. 2020). Furthermore, salmonine charter angling effort and harvest of some Lake Michigan salmonines has also shifted to nearshore waters following major food web changes (Simpson et al. 2016). The shift toward nearshore energy sources coincides with the lowest biomass of alewives since forage fish monitoring began in 1962 (Predator-Prey Ratio model results from the Lake Michigan Salmonid Working Group; Bunnell et al. 2020). Given the late season recruitment of alewives in 2015, it is reasonable that salmonines would have been somewhat more reliant on alternate nearshore benthic prey sources for much of that year.

In addition to increased reliance on nearshore benthic prey sources in 2015, mixing model results for brown trout, steelhead and coho salmon (particularly smaller individuals of these species) suggests some reliance on invertebrate prey coincident with low alewife abundance. Terrestrial invertebrates are commonly observed in Lake Michigan salmonine diets, especially steelhead (Rand et al. 1993; Leonhardt et al. 2020) and are often associated with surface feeding in thermal bars which entrain large numbers of terrestrial invertebrates in the spring and early summer (Haynes et al. 1986; Aultman and Haynes 1993; Höök et al. 2004).

Other invertebrates commonly found in salmonine diets include the large predatory cladoceran, *Bythotrephes longimanus* and the larger glacial relict *Mysis relicta* (Leonhardt et al. 2020). Poor growth rates of steelhead and coho salmon during years of low small alewife abundance suggest that diet switching to a lower energy density prey, such as invertebrates, is likely among some small salmonines, and offers further evidence that invertebrates are more common prey at low alewife densities (O’Gorman et al., 1987; Michigan DNR unpublished data).

Spatial patterns in reliance on alternate prey sources were also apparent for lake trout and, to a lesser extent, brown trout whereas little regional variation was apparent among Pacific salmonines. Lake trout typically occupy smaller geographic ranges than Pacific salmonines and prey upon regionally distinct prey sources, such as round goby, thereby increasing regional isotopic variation (Schmalz et al. 2002; Adlerstein et al. 2007a; Bronte et al. 2007; Foley et al. 2017; Turschak et al. 2019). While less information is available regarding the movement patterns of brown trout in Lake Michigan, similarities in observed diets and stable isotope signatures suggest that a similar reliance on locally distinct prey sources may be driving brown trout regional variation (Leonhardt et al. 2020). Conversely, available research for Pacific salmonines in lakes Michigan and Huron suggest much broader spatial movement patterns as well as moderately stronger reliance on regionally indistinguishable pelagic prey sources such as alewives (Haynes et al. 1986; Adlerstein et al. 2007a, 2008; Clark et al. 2017; Turschak et al. 2019).

Species-specific responses to changes in resource availability were dissimilar and subsequently result in changes in potential interspecific interactions as revealed by isotopic niche overlaps among those species. Differential use of alternate prey resource pools (i.e., pelagic, profundal, nearshore/benthic, and terrestrial) is likely to aid sympatry among the Lake Michigan

salmonine community, particularly if dynamics of those resource pools are decoupled from one-another (i.e., asymmetric; Rooney et al. 2006; Rooney and McCann 2012). However, use of alternate resources may also allow this community to sustain itself at levels which are detrimental to the preferred alewife prey population. Compensatory declines in predator abundance resulting from low alewife abundance may be offset by these alternate resource subsidies (Schindler et al. 1996; Polis et al. 1997; Vander Zanden and Vadeboncouer 2002). For example, following the population collapse of alewives in Lake Huron in the early 2000s, high predation pressure by lake trout—facilitated by reliance on alternate round goby prey—has maintained suppression of the alewife population (He et al. 2015).

Assessing niche overlap and potential for competition using stable isotope analyses has become a common practice in ecological studies, particularly with the growing availability of analytical tools catering to these needs (see Gerig et al., 2018; Kornis et al., 2020; Mumby et al., 2018 as examples from the Laurentian Great Lakes). However, little work has been done to explore how intraspecific niche areas and positions vary along resources gradients such as prey availability (McMeans et al. 2015). The isotopic niche of an organism reflects the discrete set of resource conditions within the spatiotemporal domain of a study. While analyses of niche overlap offer valuable insight into shared or differential resource use within a community, they are probably limited with respect to quantifying the actual potential for competition without also considering availability of shared resources. By decomposing isotopic niche area and position into specific prey proportions along a shared resource gradient using mixing models, changes in resource use and alternate resource subsidies become more apparent. Future work may consider incorporating resource gradients or other environmental gradients as explanatory variables in mixing models. This would aid in understanding and predicting potential for competition among

species under different scenarios. Given the relatively short temporal scope of this study (3 years) and covariation among variables (i.e. alewife abundance increased proportionately with decreasing size), it was not possible to develop a statistically robust mixing model that included these explanatory variables.

Understanding how ecological communities partition available resources along environmental gradients is important as ecosystems cope with continued changes resulting from species invasions, habitat degradation, climate change and other anthropogenic stressors (McMeans et al. 2015). Findings of this study add to literature suggesting that stable isotopes offer a useful means of understanding both species specific and community level response to spatiotemporal environmental gradients (Schmidt et al. 2009, 2011; Turschak et al. 2014, 2019). This work is novel in that it helps to quantify asymmetric diet response of a predator community to changes in a preferred prey resource. Niche area and position as they relate to specific diet proportions can be examined in the context of specific prey resource gradients or other environmental gradients. We focused on resource gradients associated with a single preferred prey source, however, a similar approach might be used to explore multiple environmental gradients including density of other prey and predators. Future work incorporating multiple environmental gradients as explanatory variables into mixing models will aid in understanding how species are able to cope with continued ecological changes and may aid resource managers in making decisions to mitigate loss of ecological function or economic value associated with these changes.

498 Acknowledgements

499 We would like to extend a special thanks to David M. Warner for providing helpful feedback on
500 early drafts of this work as well as the alewife biodata and abundance/biomass estimates vital to
501 the interpretation of results provided herein. We would also like to thank the many
502 biotechnicians of the USFWS and creel staff of the Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana
503 DNR for collecting salmonine samples from Lake Michigan anglers. In addition, we offer our
504 sincere gratitude to those anglers who generously donated samples from their catches and
505 patiently waited while those samples were collected. Finally, we would like to thank to the
506 crews of the R.V. *Arcticus*, R.V. *Coregonus*, R.V. *Sturgeon*, and S.V. *Steelhead*, as well as
507 GLERL staff including Steve Pothoven, and the graduate students and technicians from
508 University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Purdue University, University of Notre Dame, University
509 of Illinois and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who assisted in collecting and processing samples
510 for this project. Financial support for this project came from the Great Lakes Fishery Trust,
511 Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant, U.S. Federal Aid in Fish Restoration, US Environmental Protection
512 Agency, Great Lake Restoration Initiative Fish Habitat Utilization template to the U.S. Fish and
513 Wildlife Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-U.S. Geological Survey Science Support
514 Partnership. The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not
515 necessarily represent those of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

516 Literature Cited

- 517 Adams, J.V. 2018. EchoNet2Fish: estimate fish abundance from acoustic echoes and net catch.
518 R package 0.3.1.9000. Available from <https://github.com/JVAdams/EchoNet2Fish>.
- 519 Adlerstein, S.A., Rutherford, E.S., Clapp, D., Clevenger, J.A., and Johnson, J.E. 2007a. Estimating
520 seasonal movements of Chinook salmon in Lake Huron from efficiency analysis of coded

- 521 wire tag recoveries in recreational fisheries. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **27**(3): 792–803.
522 doi:10.1577/m06-204.1.
- 523 Adlerstein, S.A., Rutherford, E.S., Claramunt, R.M., Clapp, D.F., and Clevenger, J.A. 2008.
524 Seasonal movements of Chinook salmon in Lake Michigan based on tag recoveries from
525 recreational fisheries and catch rates in gill-net assessments. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **137**(3):
526 736–750. doi:10.1577/T07-122.1.
- 527 Adlerstein, S.A., Rutherford, E.S., Clevenger, J.A., Johnson, J.E., Clapp, D.F., and Woldt, A.P.
528 2007b. Lake trout movements in U.S. waters of Lake Huron interpreted from coded wire
529 tag recoveries in recreational fisheries. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **33**(1): 186–201.
530 doi:10.3394/0380-1330(2007)33[186:LTMIUW]2.0.CO;2.
- 531 Altabet, M.A. 1988. Variations in nitrogen isotope composition between sinking and suspended
532 particles-implications for nitrogen cycling and particle transformation in the open ocean.
533 *Deep. Res. Part a-Oceanographic Res. Pap.* **35**(4): 535–554. doi:10.1016/0198-
534 0149(88)90130-6.
- 535 Aultman, D.C., and Haynes, J.M. 1993. Spring thermal fronts and salmonine sport catches in
536 Lake Ontario. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **13**(3): 502–510.
- 537 Bergstedt, R.A., Argyle, R.L., Krueger, C.C., and Taylor, W.W. 2012. Bathythermal habitat use by
538 strains of Great Lakes-and Finger Lakes-origin lake trout in Lake Huron after a change in
539 prey fish abundance and composition. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **141**(2): 263–274.
540 doi:10.1080/00028487.2011.651069.

- 541 Bootsma, H.A., Hecky, R.E., Hesslein, R.H., and Turner, G.F. 1996. Food partitioning among Lake
542 Malawi nearshore fishes as revealed by stable isotope analysis. *Ecology* **77**: 1286–1290.
- 543 Bowen, G.J., West, J.B., and Dawson, T.E. 2010. Isoscapes in a rapidly changing and increasingly
544 interconnected world. *In* *Isoscapes*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht. pp. 425–432.
545 doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3354-3_20.
- 546 Bronte, C.R., Holey, M.E., Madenjian, C.P., Jonas, J.L., Claramunt, R.M., McKee, P.C., Toney, S.,
547 M.L., Ebener, M.P., Breidert, B., Fleischer, G.W., Hess, R., Martell, A.W., and Olsen, E.J.
548 2007. Relative abundance, site fidelity, and survival of adult lake trout in Lake Michigan
549 from 1999 to 2001: Implications for future restoration strategies. *North Am. J. Fish.*
550 *Manag.* **27**(1): 137–155. doi:10.1577/m05-214.2.
- 551 Bronte, C.R., Walch, K.A., Dettmers, J.M., Gaden, M., Connerton, M.J., Daniels, M.E., and
552 Newcomb, T.J. 2012. A coordinated mass marking program for salmonines stocked into the
553 Laurentian Great Lakes. *Am. Fish. Soc. Symp.* **76**: 27–42. Available from
554 [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles_Bronte/publication/298352997_A_Coordin](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles_Bronte/publication/298352997_A_Coordinated_Mass_Marking_Program_for_Salmonines_Stocked_into_the_Laurentian_Great_Lakes/links/56e87a2c08ae9bcb3e1cd3c2.pdf)
555 [ated_Mass_Marking_Program_for_Salmonines_Stocked_into_the_Laurentian_Great_Lake](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles_Bronte/publication/298352997_A_Coordinated_Mass_Marking_Program_for_Salmonines_Stocked_into_the_Laurentian_Great_Lakes/links/56e87a2c08ae9bcb3e1cd3c2.pdf)
556 [s/links/56e87a2c08ae9bcb3e1cd3c2.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles_Bronte/publication/298352997_A_Coordinated_Mass_Marking_Program_for_Salmonines_Stocked_into_the_Laurentian_Great_Lakes/links/56e87a2c08ae9bcb3e1cd3c2.pdf) [accessed 3 January 2018].
- 557 Bunnell, D.B., Warner, D.M., Madenjian, C.P., Turschak, B.A., Armenio, P., and Desorcie, T.J.
558 2020. Status and trends of pelagic and benthic prey fish populations in Lake Michigan,
559 2019. A report to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Lake Michigan Committee, Sault Ste
560 Marie, ON.
- 561 Clark, R.D., Bence, J.R., Claramunt, R.M., Clevenger, J.A., Kornis, M.S., Bronte, C.R., Madenjian,

- 562 C.P., and Roseman, E.F. 2017. Changes in movements of Chinook salmon between Lakes
563 Huron and Michigan after alewife population collapse. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **37**:
564 1311–1331.
565 doi:10.1080/02755947.2017.1378778doi.org/10.1080/02755947.2017.1378778.
- 566 Dietrich, J.P., Morrison, B.J., and Hoyle, J.A. 2006. Alternative ecological pathways in the
567 Eastern Lake Ontario food web--round goby in the diet of lake trout. *J. Gt. Lakes Res.* **32**:
568 395–400.
- 569 Fera, S.A., Rennie, M.D., and Dunlop, E.S. 2017. Broad shifts in the resource use of a
570 commercially harvested fish following the invasion of dreissenid mussels. *Ecology* **98**(6):
571 1681–1692. doi:10.1002/ecy.1836.
- 572 Foley, C.J., Bowen, G.J., Nalepa, T.F., Sepúlveda, M.S., and Höök, T.O. 2014. Stable isotope
573 patterns of benthic organisms from the Great Lakes region indicate variable dietary
574 overlap of *Diporeia spp.* and dreissenid mussels. *Can J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **71**: 1784–1795.
- 575 Foley, C.J., Henebry, M.L., Happel, A., Bootsma, H.A., Czesny, S.J., Janssen, J., Jude, D.J.,
576 Rinchar, J., and Höök, T.O. 2017. Patterns of integration of invasive round goby
577 (*Neogobius melanostomus*) into a nearshore freshwater food web. *Food Webs* **10**: 26–38.
578 Elsevier Inc. doi:10.1016/j.fooweb.2016.10.001.
- 579 France, R.L. 1995. Differentiation between littoral and pelagic food webs in lakes using stable
580 carbon isotopes. *Limnol. Ocean.* **40**: 1310–1313.
- 581 Gerig, B.S., Chaloner, D.T., Cullen, S.A., Greil, R., Kapucinski, K., Moerke, A.H., and Lamberti,

- 582 G.A. 2019. Trophic ecology of salmonine predators in northern Lake Huron with emphasis
583 on Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). J. Great Lakes Res. **45**(1): 160–166. International
584 Association for Great Lakes Research. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2018.11.003.
- 585 Happel, A., Creque, S., Rinchard, J., Höök, T., Bootsma, H., Janssen, J., Jude, D., and Czesny, S.
586 2015. Exploring yellow perch diets in Lake Michigan through stomach content, fatty acids,
587 and stable isotope ratios. J. Great Lakes Res. **41**: 172–178. International Association for
588 Great Lakes Research. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2015.03.025.
- 589 Happel, A., Jonas, J.L., McKenna, P.R., Rinchard, J., He, J.X., and Czesny, S.J. 2018. Spatial
590 variability of lake trout diets in Lakes Huron and Michigan revealed by stomach content
591 and fatty acid profiles. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **75**(1): 95–106. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2016-0202.
- 592 Happel, A., Leonhardt, B.S., Hook, T., Bootsma, H., Bronte, C.R., Kornis, M.S., Czesny, S.,
593 Turschak, B., Maier, C., and Rinchard, J. 2020. Fatty acids reveal salmonine – prey
594 relationships in Lake Michigan. J. Great Lakes Res. **46**(6): 1689–1701. International
595 Association for Great Lakes Research. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2020.08.005.
- 596 Hayden, B., Harrod, C., and Kahilainen, K.K. 2014. Dual fuels : intra-annual variation in the
597 relative importance of benthic and pelagic resources to maintenance , growth and
598 reproduction in a generalist salmonid fish. J. Anim. Ecol. **83**: 1501–1512. doi:10.1111/1365-
599 2656.12233.
- 600 Haynes, J.M., Nettles, D.C., Parnell, K.M., Voiland, M.P., Olson, R.A., and Winter, J.D. 1986.
601 Movements of rainbow steelhead trout (*Salmo Gairdneri*) in Lake Ontario and a hypothesis
602 for the influence of spring thermal structure. J. Great Lakes Res. **12**(4): 304–313.

- doi:10.1016/S0380-1330(86)71730-9.
- He, J.X., Bence, J.R., Madenjian, C.P., Pothoven, S.A., Dobiesz, N.E., Fielder, D.G., Johnson, J.E., Ebener, M.P., Adam Cottrill, R., Mohr, L.C., and Koproski, S.R. 2015. Coupling age-structured stock assessment and fish bioenergetics models: A system of time-varying models for quantifying piscivory patterns during the rapid trophic shift in the main basin of Lake Huron. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **72**(1): 7–23. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2014-0161.
- Hecky, R.E., and Hesslein, R.H. 1995. Contributions of benthic algae to lake food webs as revealed by stable isotope analysis. *J. N. Benthol. Soc.* **14**(4): 631–653. doi:10.2307/1467546.
- Höök, T.O., McCormick, M.J., Rutherford, E.S., Mason, D.M., and Carter, G.S. 2006. Short-term water mass movements in Lake Michigan: Implications for larval fish transport. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **32**(4): 728–737. doi:10.3394/0380-1330(2006)32[728:SWMMIL]2.0.CO;2.
- Höök, T.O., and Pothoven, S.A. 2009. Energy content of young alewives in Eastern Lake Michigan and Muskegon Lake, a connected drowned river mouth lake. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **29**(2): 378–387. doi:10.1577/m08-017.1.
- Höök, T.O., Rutherford, E.S., Brines, S.J., Schwab, D.J., and McCormick, M.J. 2004. Relationship between surface water temperature and steelhead distributions in Lake Michigan. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **24**(1): 211–221. doi:10.1577/M02-159.
- Höök, T.O., Rutherford, E.S., Mason, D.M., and Carter, G.S. 2007. Hatch dates, growth, survival, and overwinter mortality of age-0 alewives in Lake Michigan: Implications for habitat-

- specific recruitment success. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **136**(February 2015): 1298–1312. Taylor & Francis. doi:10.1577/T06-194.1.
- Jackson, A.L., Inger, R., Parnell, A.C., and Bearhop, S. 2011. Comparing isotopic niche widths among and within communities: SIBER - Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses in R. J. Anim. Ecol. **80**(3): 595–602. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01806.x.
- Jacobs, G.R., Madenjian, C.P., Bunnell, D.B., and Holuszko, J.D. 2010. Diet of lake trout and burbot in Northern Lake Michigan during spring: Evidence of ecological interaction. J. Gt. Lakes Res. **36**: 312–317.
- Jacobs, G.R., Madenjian, C.P., Bunnell, D.B., Warner, D.M., and Claramunt, R.M. 2013. Chinook salmon foraging patterns in a changing Lake Michigan. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **142**(2): 362–372.
- Johnson, T.B., Bunnell, D.B., and Knight, C.T. 2005. A potential new energy pathway in Central Lake Erie: the round boby connection. J. Gt. Lakes Res. **31**(Suppl. 2): 238–251.
- Jude, D.J., Tesar, F.J., Deboe, S.F., and Miller, T.J. 1987. Diet and selection of major prey species by Lake Michigan salmonines, 1973-1982. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **116**(5): 677–691.
- Kornis, M.S., Bunnell, D.B., Swanson, H.K., and Bronte, C.R. 2020. Spatiotemporal patterns in trophic niche overlap among five salmonines in Lake Michigan, USA. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **17**(February): 1–17. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2019-0288.
- Kornis, M.S., Weidel, B.C., and Vander Zanden, M.J. 2017. Divergent life histories of invasive round gobies (*Neogobius melanostomus*) in Lake Michigan and its tributaries. Ecol. Freshw.

- 643 Fish **26**(4): 563–574. doi:10.1111/eff.12300.
- 644 Layman, C.A., Arrington, D.A., Montana, C.G., and Post, D.M. 2007. Can stable isotope ratios
645 provide for community-wide measures of trophic structure? *Ecology* **88**: 42–48.
- 646 Legler, N.D., Jonas, J.L., Turschak, B.A., Warner, D.M., Tsehay, I., Dickinson, B., Redman, R.A.,
647 Bronte, C.R., Kornis, M.S., Elliott, R.F., Clark, R.D., Barton, N., Czesny, S.J., and Clark, E.
648 2017. Summary of the predator/prey ratio analysis for Chinook salmon and alewife in Lake
649 Michigan. A report to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Lake Michigan Committee,
650 Sault Ste. Marie, ON. Available from [https://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/Predator-](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/Predator-PreyRatioAnalysis-ChinookAlewife-LakeMI_528613_7.pdf)
651 [PreyRatioAnalysis-ChinookAlewife-LakeMI_528613_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/Predator-PreyRatioAnalysis-ChinookAlewife-LakeMI_528613_7.pdf).
- 652 Leonhardt, B.S., Happel, A., Bootsma, H., Bronte, C.R., Czesny, S., Feiner, Z., Kornis, M.S.,
653 Rinchar, J., Turschak, B., and Höök, T. 2020. Diet complexity of Lake Michigan salmonines:
654 2015–2016. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **46**(4): 1044–1057. International Association for Great Lakes
655 Research. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2020.05.010.
- 656 Liem, K.F. 1980. Adaptive significance of intra- and interspecific differences in the feeding
657 repertoires of cichlid fishes. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **20**(1): 295–314. doi:10.1093/icb/20.1.295.
- 658 Madenjian, C.P., Bunnell, D.B., Warner, D.M., Pothoven, S. a., Fahnenstiel, G.L., Nalepa, T.F.,
659 Vanderploeg, H. a., Tsehay, I., Claramunt, R.M., and Clark, R.D. 2015. Changes in the Lake
660 Michigan food web following dreissenid mussel invasions: A synthesis. *J. Great Lakes Res.*
661 **41**: 217–231. Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2015.08.009.
- 662 Madenjian, C.P., Fahnenstiel, G.L., Johengen, T.H., Nalepa, T.F., Vanderploeg, H. a, Fleischer,

- 663 G.W., Schneeberger, P.J., Benjamin, D.M., Smith, E.B., Bence, J.R., Rutherford, E.S., Lavis,
664 D.S., Robertson, D.M., Jude, D.J., and Ebener, M.P. 2002. Dynamics of the Lake Michigan
665 food web, 1970–2000. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **59**: 736–753. doi:10.1139/f02-044.
- 666 Madenjian, C.P., Pothoven, S.A., Dettmers, J.M., and Holuszko, J.D. 2006. Changes in seasonal
667 energy dynamics of alewife (*Alosa pseudoharengus*) in Lake Michigan after invasion of
668 dreissenid mussels. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **63**: 891–902.
- 669 McMeans, B.C., McCann, K.S., Humphries, M., Rooney, N., and Fisk, A.T. 2015. Food web
670 structure in temporally-forced ecosystems. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **30**(11): 662–672. Elsevier
671 Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.001.
- 672 Minagawa, M., and Wada, E. 1984. Stepwise enrichment of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ along food chains: Further
673 evidence and the relation between $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and animal age. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **48**:
674 1135–1140.
- 675 Mumby, J.A., Johnson, T.B., Stewart, T.J., Halfyard, E.A., Weidel, B.C., Walsh, M.G., Lantry, J.R.,
676 and Fisk, A.T. 2017. Feeding ecology and niche overlap of Lake Ontario offshore forage fish
677 assessed with stable isotopes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **13**(July): 50 pps.
678 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2016-0150>.
- 679 Mumby, J.A., Larocque, S.M., Johnson, T.B., Stewart, T.J., Fitzsimons, J.D., Weidel, B.C., Walsh,
680 M.G., Lantry, J.R., Yuille, M.J., and Fisk, A.T. 2018. Diet and trophic niche space and overlap
681 of Lake Ontario salmonid species using stable isotopes and stomach contents. *J. Great
682 Lakes Res.* **44**(6): 1383–1392. Elsevier. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2018.08.009.

- 683 Negus, M.T., and Bergstedt, R.A. 2012. Rates of intraperitoneal temperature change in lake
684 trout implanted with archival tags. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **141**(2): 383–391.
685 doi:10.1080/00028487.2012.664600.
- 686 Newsome, S.D., Rio, Martinez del, C., Bearhop, S., and Phillips, D.L. 2007. A niche for isotope
687 ecology. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **5**(8): 429–436. doi:10.1890/060150.01.
- 688 O’Gorman, R., Bergstedt, R.A., and Eckert, T.H. 1987. Prey fish dynamics and salmonine
689 predator growth in Lake Ontario, 1978–84. *Can J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **44**(S2): s390–s403.
- 690 Ostrom, N.E., Long, D.T., Bell, E.M., and Beals, T. 1998. The origin and cycling of particulate and
691 sedimentary organic matter and nitrate in Lake Superior. *Chem. Geol.* **152**(1–2): 13–28.
692 doi:10.1016/s0009-2541(98)00093-x.
- 693 Peterson, B.J., and Fry, B. 1987. Stable isotopes in ecosystem studies. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **18**:
694 293–320.
- 695 Polis, G.A., Anderson, W.B., and Holt, R.D. 1997. Toward an integration of landscape and food
696 web ecology: The dynamics of spatially subsidized food webs. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **28**:
697 289–316.
- 698 Post, D.M. 2002. Using stable isotopes to estimate trophic position: Models, methods, and
699 assumptions. *Ecology* **83**(3): 703–718. doi:10.2307/3071875.
- 700 Rand, P.S., Stewart, D.J., Seelbach, P.W., Jones, M.L., and Wedge, L.R. 1993. Modeling steelhead
701 population energetics in Lakes Michigan and Ontario. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **122**(5): 977–
702 1001. Taylor & Francis Group. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1993)122<0977:MSPEIL>2.3.CO;2.

- 703 Rennie, M.D., Sprules, W.G., and Johnson, T.B. 2009. Resource switching in fish following a
704 major food web disruption. *Oecologia* **159**: 789–802.
- 705 Robinson, B.W., and Wilson, D.S. 1998. Optimal foraging, specialization, and a solution to Liem's
706 paradox. *Am. Nat.* **151**(3): 223–235. doi:10.1086/286113.
- 707 Rooney, N., McCann, K., Gellner, G., and Moore, J.C. 2006. Structural asymmetry and the
708 stability of diverse food webs. *Nature* **442**(July): 265–269. doi:10.1038/nature04887.
- 709 Rooney, N., and McCann, K.S. 2012. Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability.
710 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **27**(1): 40–45. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.09.001.
- 711 Roseman, E.F., Schaeffer, J.S., Bright, E., and Fielder, D.G. 2014. Angler-caught piscivore diets
712 reflect fish community changes in Lake Huron. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **143**(6): 1419–1433.
713 Taylor & Francis. doi:10.1080/00028487.2014.945659.
- 714 Savitz, J. 2009. Diets of Lake Michigan salmon and maximum size of alewife prey. *J. Freshw.*
715 *Ecol.* **24**(4): 563–566. doi:10.1080/02705060.2009.9664333.
- 716 Schindler, D.E., Carpenter, S.R., Cottingham, K.L., He, X., Hodgeson, J.R., Kitchell, J.F., and
717 Soranno, P.A. 1996. Food web structure and littoral zone coupling to pelagic trophic
718 cascades. *In* *Food Webs: Integration of Patterns and Dynamics*. Edited by G.A. Polis and
719 K.O. Winemiller. Chapman & Hall. pp. 96–105.
- 720 Schmalz, P.J., Hansen, M.J., Holey, M.E., McKee, P.C., and Toneys, M.L. 2002. Lake trout
721 movements in Northwestern Lake Michigan. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* **22**(3): 737–749.
722 doi:10.1577/1548-8675(2002)022<0737:ltminl>2.0.co;2.

- 723 Schmidt, S.N., Harvey, C.J., and Vander Zanden, M.J. 2011. Historical and contemporary trophic
724 niche partitioning among the Laurentian Great Lakes coregonines. *Ecol. Appl.* **21**(3): 888–
725 896. doi:Doi 10.1890/09-0906.1.
- 726 Schmidt, S.N., Vander Zanden, M.J., and Kitchell, J.F. 2009. Long-term food web change in Lake
727 Superior. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **66**: 2118–2129.
- 728 Sierszen, M.E., Hrabik, T.R., Stockwell, J.D., Cotter, A.M., Hoffman, J.C., and Yule, D.L. 2014.
729 Depth gradients in food-web processes linking habitats in large lakes: Lake Superior as an
730 exemplar ecosystem. *Freshw. Biol.* **59**(10): 2122–2136. doi:10.1111/fwb.12415.
- 731 Sierszen, M.E., Peterson, G.S., and Scharold, J. V. 2006. Depth-specific patterns in benthic-
732 planktonic food web relationships in Lake Superior. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **63**: 1496–1503.
733 doi:10.1139/f06-057.
- 734 Simpson, N.T., Honsey, A., Rutherford, E.S., and Höök, T.O. 2016. Spatial shifts in salmonine
735 harvest, harvest rate, and effort by charter boat anglers in Lake Michigan, 1992–2012. *J.*
736 *Great Lakes Res.* **42**(5): 1109–1117. Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2016.07.030.
- 737 Stewart, D.J., and Ibarra, M. 1991. Predation and production by salmonine fishes in Lake
738 Michigan. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **48**: 909–922.
- 739 Swanson, H.K., Lysy, M., Power, M., Stasko, A.D., Johnson, J.D., and Reist, J.D. 2015. A new
740 probabilistic method for quantifying n -dimensional ecological niches and niche overlap.
741 *Ecology* **96**(2): 318–324. Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1890/14-0235.1.
- 742 Trueman, C.N., McGill, R.A.R., and Guyard, P.H. 2005. The effect of growth rate on tissue-diet

- 743 isotopic spacing in rapidly growing animals. An experimental study with Atlantic salmon
744 (*Salmo salar*). Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. **19**(22): 3239–3247. doi:10.1002/rcm.2199.
- 745 Tsehay, I., Jones, M.L., Bence, J.R., Brenden, T.O., Madenjian, C.P., and Warner, D.M. 2014a. A
746 multispecies statistical age-structured model to assess predator – prey balance :
747 application to an intensively managed Lake Michigan pelagic fish community. Can. J. Fish.
748 Aquat. Sci. **71**(January): 627–644. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2013-0313.
- 749 Tsehay, I., Jones, M.L., Brenden, T.O., Bence, J.R., Randall, M., and Claramunt, R.M. 2014b.
750 Changes in the salmonine community of Lake Michigan and their implications for predator
751 – prey balance. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **143**(October 2014): 420–437.
752 doi:10.1080/00028487.2013.862176.
- 753 Turschak, B.A. 2013. Changes in the Lake Michigan trophic structure as revealed by stable
754 isotopes. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI.
- 755 Turschak, B.A., and Bootsma, H.A. 2015. Lake Michigan trophic structure as revealed by stable C
756 and N isotopes. J. Great Lakes Res. **41**: 185–196. International Association for Great Lakes
757 Research. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2015.04.004.
- 758 Turschak, B.A., Czesny, S.J., Doll, J.C., Grunert, B.K., Höök, T.O., Janssen, J., Bootsma, H.A.A.,
759 Hook, T.O., Janssen, J., and Bootsma, H.A.A. 2019. Spatial variation in trophic structure of
760 nearshore fishes in Lake Michigan as it relates to water clarity. Can J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.
761 **76**(3): 364–377. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2017-0390.
- 762 Turschak, B.A.A., Bunnell, D.B., Czesny, S.J., Hook, T.O., Janssen, J., Warner, D.M., Bootsma,

- 763 H.A.A., Höök, T.O., Janssen, J., Warner, D.M., Bootsma, H.A.A., Hook, T.O., Janssen, J.,
764 Warner, D.M., and Bootsma, H.A.A. 2014. Nearshore energy subsidies support Lake
765 Michigan fishes and invertebrates following major changes in food web structure. *Ecology*
766 **95**(5): 1243–1252. doi:10.1890/13-0329.1.
- 767 Vidal, T., Irwin, B.J., Madenjian, C.P., and Wenger, S.J. 2019. Age truncation of alewife in Lake
768 Michigan. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **45**(5): 958–968. Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.jglr.2019.06.006.
- 769 Warner, D.M., Kiley, C.S., Claramunt, R.M., and Clapp, D.F. 2008. The influence of alewife year-
770 class strength on prey selection and abundance of age-1 Chinook salmon in Lake Michigan.
771 *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **137**(6): 1683–1700. doi:10.1577/T07-130.1.
- 772 Warner, D.M., Phillips, K., Turschak, B.A., Hanson, D., and Smith, J. 2019. Status of pelagic prey
773 fishes in Lake Michigan, 2018. A report to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, Lake
774 Michigan Committee, Ypsilanti, MI.
- 775 Weidel, B.C., Carpenter, S.R., Kitchell, J.F., and Vander Zanden, M.J. 2011. Rates and
776 components of carbon turnover in fish muscle: insights from bioenergetics models and a
777 whole-lake ¹³C addition. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **68**: 387–399.
- 778 Wismer, D.A., and Christie, A.E. 1987. Temperature relationships of Great Lakes Fishes: A data
779 compilation. *Gt. Lakes Fish. Comm. Spec. Pub No* **87–3**: 165 p.
- 780 Yuille, M.J., Fisk, A.T., Stewart, T., and Johnson, T.B. 2015. Evaluation of Lake Ontario salmonid
781 niche space overlap using stable isotopes. *J. Great Lakes Res.* **41**(3): 934–940. Elsevier.
782 doi:10.1016/J.JGLR.2015.05.011.

- 783 Vander Zanden, M.J., Cabana, G., and Rasmussen, J.B. 1997. Comparing trophic position of
784 freshwater fish calculated using stable nitrogen isotope ratios ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) and literature dietary
785 data. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **54**: 1142–1158.
- 786 Vander Zanden, M.J., Clayton, M.K., Moody, E.K., Solomon, C.T., and Weidel, B.C. 2015. Stable
787 isotope turnover and half-life in animal tissues: A literature synthesis. *PLoS One* **10**(1): 1–
788 16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0116182.
- 789 Vander Zanden, M.J., and Rasmussen, J.B. 1999. Primary consumer $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and the
790 trophic position of aquatic consumers. *Ecology* **80**: 1395–1404.
- 791 Vander Zanden, M.J., and Vadeboncouer, Y. 2002. Fishes as integrators of benthic and pelagic
792 food webs in lakes. *Ecology* **83**: 2152–2161.
- 793

794 Figure Captions

795 Figure 1. Lake Michigan alewife length density distribution scaled by average lakewide areal
796 density of alewives from 2013 to 2016 (D. Warner personal communication; Data Source: Lake
797 Michigan Hydroacoustic Survey). Cutoff for discrete alewife size classes used in this study are
798 indicated by the vertical dashed lines: small alewives < 100 mm and large alewives ≥ 100 mm, or
799 $\approx$ age 0 and $\approx$ age 1+, respectively, during the August hydroacoustic survey.

800 Figure 2. Median 95% $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ isotopic niche for Lake Michigan salmonines from 2014-
801 2016. Left panels (upper five) depict interannual differences in isotopic niche position and size
802 for individual salmonine species. Lower panels (right three) depict interspecific isotopic niche
803 area and niche overlap among salmonine species within individual study years. Lower-left most
804 panel depicts interspecific isotopic niche area and niche overlap for all study years combined
805 with individual data points shown to illustrate ellipse fitting. Block of panels in the upper right
806 depict individual species-year combinations with trophic-adjusted prey position and standard
807 deviation ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$: $+0.8 \pm 1.3$; $\delta^{15}\text{N}$: $+3.4 \pm 1.0$) overlaid as colored cross bars. Dashed lines
808 indicate the upper and lower 95% credible intervals around the shaded median ellipse and the
809 text indicates median ellipse area (95% credible interval).

810 Figure 3. Pairwise median (95% credible interval) $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ isotopic niche overlap among
811 species expressed as a percentage of overlap in species-specific 95% isotopic niche region shown
812 in [Figure 2](#). Horizontal panels (2014-2016) indicate the year for which the pairwise comparisons
813 are being made and vertical panels indicate the reference species. Pairwise comparisons are
814 directional and are expressed relative to the reference species. For example, an individual from
815 comparison species A (x-axis) has XX% probability of occurring within reference species B's
816 (vertical panels) isotopic niche region.

Figure 4. Estimates (median and 95% credible interval) of small alewife (left panels), large alewife (middle panels), and all other potential prey (right panels) to the lakewide diets of salmonine predators over the study period (Solid lines and light gray or colored shading).

Lakewide biomass (mean and standard error) of alewife size classes as a proportion of total lakewide alewife biomass measured by the August hydroacoustic survey are overlayed for comparison (Dashed lines and dark gray shading; D. Warner personal communication; see methods in Adams 2018 and Warner et al. 2019).

Figure 5. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ mixing model predictions of dietary proportions as a function of total length (mm) for brown trout. Panels separate unique region (NE, NW, SE, and SW study) by prey source (ALE < 100 mm: small alewives; ALE > 100 mm: large alewives; ROG: round goby) combinations. Lines represent the median of the posterior probability distribution, and the shaded areas represent the bounds of the 95% credible interval of the predicted diet proportion. Line colors correspond to specific study years (2014-2016).

Figure 6. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ mixing model predictions of dietary proportions as a function of total length (mm) for Chinook salmon. Panels separate unique region (NE, NW, SE, and SW study) by prey source (ALE < 100 mm: small alewives; ALE > 100 mm: large alewives; ROG: round goby; and TER: terrestrial invertebrates) combinations. Lines represent the median of the posterior probability distribution, and the shaded areas represent the bounds of the 95% credible interval of the predicted diet proportion. Line colors correspond to specific study years (2014-2016).

Figure 7. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ mixing model predictions of dietary proportions as a function of total length (mm) for coho salmon. Panels separate unique region (NE, NW, SE, and SW study) by

839 prey source (ALE < 100 mm: small alewives; ALE > 100 mm: large alewives; BYT:
840 *Bythotrephes*; MYS: *Mysis*; ROG: round goby; and TER: terrestrial invertebrates) combinations.
841 Lines represent the median of the posterior probability distribution, and the shaded areas
842 represent the bounds of the 95% credible interval of the predicted diet proportion. Line colors
843 correspond to specific study years (2014-2016).

844 Figure 8. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ mixing model predictions of dietary proportions as a function of total
845 length (mm) for lake trout. Panels separate unique region (NE, NW, SE, and SW study) by prey
846 source (ALE < 100 mm: small alewives; ALE > 100 mm: large alewives; BLO: bloater; and
847 ROG: round goby combinations. Lines represent the median of the posterior probability
848 distribution, and the shaded areas represent the bounds of the 95% credible interval of the
849 predicted diet proportion. Line colors correspond to specific study years (2014-2016).

850 Figure 9. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ mixing model predictions of dietary proportions as a function of total
851 length (mm) for steelhead. Panels separate unique region (NE, NW, SE, and SW study) by prey
852 source (ALE < 100 mm: small alewives; ALE > 100 mm: large alewives; ROG: round goby; and
853 TER: terrestrial invertebrates) combinations. Lines represent the median of the posterior
854 probability distribution, and the shaded areas represent the bounds of the 95% credible interval
855 of the predicted diet proportion. Line colors correspond to specific study years (2014-2016).

856
857
858
859

860 Figures

861 Figure 1.

862

863

864 Figure 2.

865

866

867 Figure 3.

868

869

Figure 4.

873 Figure 5.

874

875

876 Figure 6.

Figure 7.

884 Figure 8.

885

886

887

888 Figure 9.

889

890

891 Appendix A

892 Turschak, B.A., C.R. Bronte, S. Czesny, B. Gerig, A. Happel, T.O. Höök, M.S. Kornis, B.S.
893 Leonhardt, B.G. Matthias, J. Rinchar, D. Warner, and H. Boostma. XXXX. Temporal Variation
894 in the Niche Partitioning of Lake Michigan Salmonines as it Relates to Alewife Abundance and
895 Size Structure. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 000: 000-000

896 Figure A1.

897 Isotope biplots depicting the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of potential prey sources for Lake Michigan
898 salmonines from 2014-2016. Each panel corresponds to a specific prey source including alewife
899 <100 mm (ALE <100mm), alewife >100 mm (ALE >100mm); bloater >100 mm (BLO
900 >100mm), *Mysis* (MYS), round goby (ROG), and terrestrial invertebrates (TER). Colored points
901 depict the year of collection (2014: yellow circles; 2015: blue triangles; 2016: pink squares) and
902 cross bars indicate the mean and standard deviation (SD) of interannual prey $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$
903 values. Black cross bars indicate the mean and SD of the prey $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ pooled across years.
904 Pooled prey means and SDs were estimated by resampling annual raw prey source data (n =
905 1000 samples per data year with replacement) such that each year was given equal weight in
906 estimating pooled means and SDs.

907 Figure A1

908