Canadian Journal of Zoology
Revue canadienne de zoologie

**Dietary niche partitioning among black bears, grizzly bears
and wolves in a multi-prey ecosystem**

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Zoology</i>
Manuscript ID	cjz-2016-0258.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Mar-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Merkle, Jerod; University of Wyoming, Wyoming Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit Polfus, Jean; University of Manitoba Derbridge, Jonathan ; University of Arizona, School of Natural Resources and the Environment Heinemeyer, Kimberly; Round River Conservation Studies
Keyword:	Ursus americanus, Ursus arctos, Canis lupus, Rangifer tarandus, PREDATION < Discipline, stable isotope analysis, diet

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Dietary niche partitioning among black bears, grizzly bears and wolves in a multi-prey ecosystem

Jerod A. Merkle^a, Jean L. Polfus^b, Jonathan J. Derbridge^c, and Kimberly S. Heinemeyer^d

^aWyoming Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Department of Zoology and Physiology, University of Wyoming, Dept. 3166, 1000 East University Avenue, Laramie, Wyoming, USA 82071; jmerkle@uwyo.edu

^bNatural Resources Institute, University of Manitoba, 303-70 Dysart Road, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2M6; jeanpolfus@gmail.com

^cSchool of Natural Resources and the Environment, University of Arizona, 1064 East Lowell Street, Tucson, Arizona, USA 85721; derbridge@email.arizona.edu

^dRound River Conservation Studies, 925 E 900 S, Suite 207, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA 84105; kim@roundriver.org

Author responsible for correspondence: Jerod A. Merkle; Wyoming Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Dept. 3166, 1000 East University Avenue, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming 82071; telephone 307-399-1094; fax 307-766-5400; email jmerkle@uwyo.edu.

Dietary niche partitioning among black bears, grizzly bears and wolves in a multi-prey ecosystem

Jerod A. Merkle, Jean L. Polfus, Jonathan J. Derbridge, and Kimberly S. Heinemeyer

Abstract

Identifying mechanisms that promote coexistence of sympatric species is important for predicting ecological effects of anthropogenic change. Many caribou (*Rangifer tarandus* (Linnaeus, 1758)) populations are declining, and it is unclear to what extent sympatric predators consume caribou or how alternative prey affect caribou-predator relationships. We used stable isotope mixing models to estimate diets of black bear (*Ursus americanus* (Pallas, 1780)), grizzly bear (*U. arctos* (Linnaeus, 1758)), and grey wolves (*Canis lupus* (Linnaeus, 1758)) during early, middle, and late summer 2009-2010 in northwestern British Columbia, Canada. Although we expected wolf diet to primarily be comprised of moose (*Alces alces* (Linnaeus, 1758)) – as they exist at twice the density of caribou – wolf diet consisted principally of caribou, and to a lesser extent moose and beaver (*Castor canadensis* (Kuhl, 1820)), with little change occurring throughout summer. Black bear diet consisted mainly of vegetation and moose – shifting from moose to vegetation through summer. Grizzly bear diet consisted primarily of vegetation and moose, and did not change throughout summer. Our results demonstrate the role of dietary niche partitioning in bear and wolf coexistence, and that caribou may be primary prey for wolves in an ecosystem with relatively high moose abundance and low human development.

Key words: black bear, grizzly bear, grey wolf, caribou, *Ursus americanus*, *Ursus arctos*, *Canis lupus*, *Rangifer tarandus*, predation, stable isotope analysis, carbon, nitrogen, niche, diet, trophic relations

INTRODUCTION

Identifying the mechanisms that promote coexistence of sympatric species at the same trophic level is essential to understanding and conserving biodiversity. As anthropogenic influences (including climate change) bring about alternative ecological states (Barnosky et al. 2012), interspecific dynamics will likely play an important role in ecosystem responses including whether a species is resilient or vulnerable to change (Post 2013). Although a number of mechanisms have been purported to explain coexistence among species within a trophic level (Schoener 1974), most research has focused on how species partition resources along axes of diet, space, and time (Brown 1989). In general, coexistence appears to be driven by selection for one or more of the following traits: differential consumption of prey species and prey sizes (Karanth and Sunquist 1995), differential use of habitats and space (Palomares et al. 1996), and different temporal activity patterns (Fedriani et al. 1999).

A number of different methods exist to quantify resource partitioning (e.g., gut content, scat analysis), but non-invasive sampling methods coupled with innovative technologies have resulted in fruitful contributions to understanding trophic interactions. The analysis of carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) stable isotopes based on hair and tissue samples is a robust method for determining the relative contribution of different foods to a consumer's diet (DeNiro and Epstein 1978, 1981). Notably, stable isotope analysis has been extended to assess how multiple species partition dietary resources (Hobson et al. 2000; Caut et al. 2006), as well as to understand predator-prey and other trophic relationships (Post 2002; Urton and Hobson 2005). For example, previous studies have determined grey wolf (*Canis lupus* (Linnaeus, 1758)) diets in multi-prey systems using stable isotope analysis of non-invasively collected guard hairs (Darimont and Reimchen 2002; Derbridge et al. 2012). Stable isotope analyses can also identify the suite of

67 predators preying upon a given species and potentially how such predation is partitioned through
68 time – providing important insight into prey species of conservation concern.

69 Forest-dwelling caribou (*Rangifer tarandus* (Linnaeus, 1758)) that occur in boreal forests
70 and mountainous regions are experiencing significant population declines (Vors and Boyce
71 2009; Festa-Bianchet et al. 2011). Although the ultimate reason for the declines can be attributed
72 to habitat alterations from resource extraction activities (Festa-Bianchet et al. 2011), the
73 proximate mechanisms behind the declines can be indirect and complex. To reduce the risk of
74 detection by predators, forest-dwelling caribou use an isolation strategy to spatially segregate
75 themselves from other prey species and conspecifics (Stuart-Smith et al. 1997; James et al.
76 2004). Yet, evidence suggests that predation can significantly limit caribou populations (Stuart-
77 Smith et al. 1997; Bergerud and Elliott 1998). Resource extraction activities can alter caribou-
78 predator relationships by providing linear features (e.g., logging roads, seismic lines) that aid
79 wolf movement (Wittmer et al. 2007; Peters et al. 2013; Losier et al. 2015). For example, in
80 northeastern Alberta, James and Stuart-Smith (2000) found that caribou have higher risk of
81 predation from wolves near linear features, which may have low human use, but are
82 preferentially used by wolves, resulting in increased travel efficiency and caribou detections.
83 Further, an increase in young seral forests following human habitat alterations can enhance
84 moose (*Alces alces* (Linnaeus, 1758)) and wolf populations and increase caribou vulnerability to
85 predation through the mechanism of apparent competition (Seip 1992; DeCesare et al. 2010).
86 Even a small increase in predation through altered spatial relationships between caribou,
87 alternative prey, and shared predators could lead to population level effects in populations with
88 low growth rates (Seip 1992; James et al. 2004; Hervieux et al. 2014).

The northern mountain caribou Designatable Unit (COSEWIC 2011) occurs in local populations throughout the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and northwestern British Columbia (BC), and was listed as a species of special concern in 2014 by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC; COSEWIC 2014). Our current knowledge of why northern mountain caribou populations are declining is incomplete, mainly because a lack of information about the complex dynamics of multi-prey, multi-predator ecosystems (COSEWIC 2014). For instance, in east-central Yukon, Hayes et al. (2000) found that moose composed 94% of the biomass of ungulates killed by wolves, and wolves did not prey heavily on caribou even when caribou outnumbered moose. Similarly, in the North Columbia Mountains of southeastern BC, Stotyn (2008) found that the relative proportion of caribou within wolf diet was not related to caribou density. Rather, caribou may use spatial or temporal refuges to avoid wolves, or wolves may preferentially kill moose and other prey items. In northeastern Alberta, Latham et al. (2013) found that during summer wolf selection for areas used by beaver led to an increase in spatial overlap with caribou. Further, understanding predation on caribou is complicated by the presence of other predators (i.e., bears). It is well known that black (*Ursus americanus* (Pallas, 1780)) and grizzly (*U. arctos* (Linnaeus, 1758)) bears can be important predators of neonatal ungulates (Zager and Beecham 2006; Barber-Meyer et al. 2008), including caribou (Ballard 1992, 1994; Adams et al. 1995; Young Jr and McCabe 1997).

In many populations of forest-dwelling caribou it is still unclear which predators influence (or potentially limit) prey populations and how the levels of human development and alternative prey species affect these predator-prey interactions. In this study we used Bayesian stable isotope mixing models to reconstruct the dietary differences and overlap of black bears, grizzly bears, and grey wolves during early, middle, and late summer in northwestern BC – an

area characterized by relatively low levels of human development (including logging and resource extraction). We sampled hair from these predators and their potential prey species, and also plant species important for bears. Based on previous literature, caribou are generally a secondary prey item because they are typically less numerous than moose. Our study area is no exception as there exists an estimated 777 caribou and 1,971 moose (Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2010; Marshall 2015; see study area section for details). Thus, we expected that compared to moose, caribou would comprise relatively low proportions of predator diets. We also expected that bear diet would reflect predation on ungulate neonates in early summer, and then shift to a primarily vegetarian diet during late summer when soft plant mast becomes available (Munro et al. 2006). Our study is unique as it provides a comprehensive analysis of the diets of three sympatric predators (i.e., a multi-predator system) with a specific eye towards predation on caribou during the neonatal stage when bear predation is important.

STUDY AREA

This study took place within the traditional territory of the Taku River Tlingit First Nation in northwestern BC, extending into southern Yukon Territory (Figure 1). The 11,594 km² study area primarily falls within the boreal mountains and plateaus ecoregion (Environment Canada 2005), characterized by high peaks, broad plateaus, and wide valleys with elevations ranging from 660 to 2000m. Human development in the study area consists of the town of Atlin with approximately 350 residents, and a total of approximately 1250 km of roads (including approximately 100 km of paved roads, 400 km of unimproved gravel and dirt roads and an additional 750 km of All-Terrain Vehicle trails; overall road density of 0.11 km/km²). All paved roads and most unimproved roads are disproportionately found at low elevations resulting from a

long history of placer mining and mineral exploration in the region. Current mining activity is focused on stream drainages which has been an important economic driver in the region for over 100 years (Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2011). However, All-Terrain Vehicle trails provide access across the study area into higher elevation subalpine and alpine areas. There is no large-scale commercial logging; however, there is some small-scale local timber operations for home building and mine development (Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2011).

The climate is typified by long, cold winters and short, warm summers. The mean summer temperature is 10°C and the winter mean is -15°C (Environment Canada 2005). Annual precipitation in the study area is approximately 33 cm resulting in an average late winter snow depth of 49.5 cm (Atlin snow station 1964-2003). Low to mid-elevation boreal forests include a mix of lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta* var. *latifolia* Engelm. ex S. Watson), subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa* (Hook.) Nutt.) and white and black spruce (*Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss and *P. mariana* (Mill.) Britton, Sterns and Poggenb.). Deciduous stands of trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.), black cottonwood (*Populus balsamifera trichocarpa* (Torr. and A. Gray) Brayshaw), alder (*Alnus tenuifolia* (Nutt.) Breitung) and willow (*Salix* spp. L.) occupy valley bottoms and riparian areas. The understory commonly consists of low shrubs and lichen species including various reindeer (*Cladonia* spp.), pixie-cup (*Cladonia* spp.), foam (*Stereocaulon* spp.) and Iceland lichens (*Cetraria* spp.) and numerous forbs and mosses. White spruce and subalpine firs dominate the subalpine from 850-1500 m transitioning at mid elevations into krummholz where thick knee-high spreads of willow and dwarf birch (*Betula glandulosa* Michx.) dominate. Alpine zones (above 1500 m) consist of extensive areas of rolling alpine tundra characterized by sedge (*Carex* spp. L.) and alтай fescue (*Festuca altaica* Trin.) dominated meadows. Mountain

heather (*Cassiope* spp. D. Don), crowberry (*Empetrum nigrum* L.), mountain avens (*Dryas* spp. L.) and lichen communities are also common.

The Atlin northern mountain caribou population relies heavily on low-elevation mature lodgepole pine forests in the winter and high elevation alpine and subalpine forest in the summer (Polfus et al. 2011; Polfus et al. 2014). Aerial surveys indicate that although the nearby Yukon caribou populations appear to be increasing in abundance (calf:female ratios for the Carcross and Yukon woodland caribou herds are 27:100 and 26:100, respectively; Hegel 2013), the Atlin population has maintained a stable or decreasing population with a low calf recruitment of 21 ± 3 calves:100 females (Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2010). The adjacent Carcross herd is hunted within its range in British Columbia, but hunting is closed in the Yukon and voluntarily suspended by First Nations. British Columbia currently allows a limited entry hunt and guide-outfitter quota of 10 males/year in the Atlin population. There are an estimated 777 ± 132 caribou in the Atlin population (Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2010), and $1,971 \pm 464$ moose (estimated from a 2015 stratified random block survey of moose in the Atlin region yielding 0.17 ± 0.04 moose/km²; Marshall 2015). Other ungulates in the area include and mountain goats (*Oreamnos americanus* (Blainville, 1816)) and Stone's sheep (*Ovis dalli stonei* (J. A. Allen, 1897)) in alpine zones. Apart from grizzly bears, black bears, and wolves, the predator community relative to ungulates includes wolverines (*Gulo gulo* (Linnaeus, 1758)), and lynx (*Lynx canadensis* (Kerr, 1792)).

METHODS

Sample collection

To estimate dietary differences and overlap between black bears, grizzly bears, and wolves, we collected hair samples using non-invasive hair snares set up throughout the study

area during the summers (June-August) of 2009-2010. Wolves have one annual molt that begins in late spring when the old coat is shed and new hair grows until late fall (Darimont and Reimchen 2002). Bears begin molt in late spring after emerging from the den and continue into the fall (Jacoby et al. 1999; Stotyn et al. 2007). We collected wolf hair with non-invasive rub pads constructed following Ausband et al. (2011). The hair snares were scent lured using Forsyth wolf call, Forsyth wolf gland, Forget's cachotier call (canine), freshwater fish oil, and commercial wolf urine purchased from Halford's (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada). We set up hair snares in areas identified as movement corridors based on field observations (tracks and scat) and on information from local hunters and trappers who had knowledge of animal locations.

We collected bear hair from rub trees and barbed wire corral stations with a non-reward scent lure following Boulanger and McLellan (2001). We placed corral stations near rub trees and along movement corridors that allowed repeated access over the course of the summer. Our lure was a mixture of salmon oil, beaver castor and Forget's cachotier call (canine). We also opportunistically collected bear hair from rub trees that were encountered in the field. We set up rub pads and corral stations at the end of June and early July, and checked and re-lured the sites approximately every ten days until mid-August.

During summers 2009-2010, we also opportunistically collected hair from prey species at predator kill sites found in the field, from the ground near hunting camps, and from local hunters and trappers. We collected guard hairs with tweezers and placed them in manila envelopes, which we then placed in plastic bags with desiccant beads to prevent moisture build-up. The Kluane Ecological Monitoring Project in the Yukon provided snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus* (Erxleben, 1777)) hair samples collected during annual monitoring efforts. The Museum of Southwestern Biology at the University of New Mexico provided small mammal hair samples

from least chipmunk (*Tamias minimus* (Bachman, 1839)) and northern red backed voles (*Myodes rutilus* (Pallas, 1779)) collected within or immediately adjacent to our study area.

We also collected samples from 15 plant species known to be important to bear diet (Fuhr and Demarchii 1990; Nielsen et al. 2004). We collected above-ground foliage from horsetail (*Equisetum* spp. L.), dandelion (*Taraxacum* spp. F.H. Wigg.), clover (*Trifolium* spp. L.), sedges (*Carex* spp.), fescue (*Festuca* spp.), cow parsnip (*Heracleum lanatum* Michx.), lupine (*Lupinus* spp. L.), rose (*Rosa* spp. L.), arrowleaf (*Senecio triangularis* Hook.), and berries from kinnikinnick (*Arctostaphylos uva-ursi* (L.) Spreng.), soapberry (*Shepherdia Canadensis* (L.) Nutt.), blueberry (*Vaccinium caespitosum* Michx.), and crowberry (*Empetrum nigrum* L.). Vegetation samples were desiccated in a drying oven and ground into a fine powder for stable isotope analysis.

Stable isotope analysis

We cleaned all hair samples of surface oils in a 2:1 chloroform:methanol solution for 24 hours and dried them at low heat for 24 hours. Predator guard hairs were cut into three sections (root, middle, and tip sections) representative of different seasons during hair growth (Milakovic and Parker 2011): root section reflects most recent growth (hereafter termed late summer), the middle section reflects earlier growth (mid-summer) and the tip section reflects earliest hair growth (early summer). The rate and timing of hair growth is expected to differ between individual bears (B. Milakovic pers. comm.). Thus, we split bear and wolf hairs into three equal sections based on each guard hair length so that each section was representative of a specific time period relative to each individual.

Hair and vegetation samples were sent to the Stable Isotope Facility at the University of California Davis where stable isotope ratios of carbon and nitrogen were measured on a

continuous flow isotope-ratio mass spectrometer. When enough hair was available, replicates were included approximately every 8-12 samples to check instrument precision. Stable isotopes are expressed in delta notation (δ) in parts per thousand (‰) following standard methods (Post 2002). Based on repeated internal standards, precision was better than ± 0.10 for $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and ± 0.2 for $\delta^{15}\text{N}$.

DNA analysis

Prior to stable isotope analyses, a sub-sample of hairs from each predator sample was sent to the USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station (Missoula, Montana) to identify species (mtDNA) and individuals (microsatellites). We used a previously developed panel of nine variable loci for bears and eight variable loci for wolves. To avoid pseudoreplication within our sample, subsequent stable isotope analyses were only conducted on a single sample from each unique individual sampled during the study. When individuals were identified more than once during the study we randomly selected one of the samples for analysis.

Stable isotope mixing models

We used a Bayesian mixing model approach (Phillips 2012) to determine the proportions of prey in the diets of black bears, grizzly bears, and wolves for each of the three seasons (early, middle, and late summer). Mixing models estimate the proportion p of each food source s (from 1 to k different sources) in the diet of each consumer X (from 1 to i individual consumers), based on fractionation values c for each isotope of interest (from 1 to j different isotopes). As formulated by Jackson et al. (2009), the form of the mixing model was:

$$X_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^k p_k (s_{jk} + c_{jk}) + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

where X_{ij} was the observed isotope value j of individual consumer i based on k sources. The residual error ε_{ij} described additional inter-observation variance not described by the model (Jackson et al. 2009). The model distributions were: $s_{jk} \sim \text{Normal}(\mu_{jk}, \omega_{jk}^2)$, $c_{jk} \sim \text{Normal}(\lambda_{jk}, \tau_{jk}^2)$, $\varepsilon_{ij} \sim \text{Normal}(0, \sigma_j^2)$. Because there was no previous literature documenting diets of all three predator species within the same predator-prey complex as in our study area, we specified uninformative priors (i.e., a Dirichlet distribution with all α_k in each analysis equal to 1) for all analyses.

We estimated proportions of each food source p_k using standard Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations with a burn-in of 50,000 iterations. We generated posterior samples using 15,000 iterations of the model and a thinning rate of 15. We chose the number of iterations by calculating the Gelman and Rubin convergence diagnostic (Brooks and Gelman 1998) and increasing the number of iterations until the statistic was <1.1 . Parameterization of the mixing model was conducted in R 3.2 (R Core Team 2014) and JAGS (Plummer 2003).

For wolves we used fractionation values developed by Derbirdge et al. (2015) on captive wolves that were fed a known diet (mean $\pm$ SD, $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰) = 1.972 ± 0.705 , $\Delta^{15}\text{N}$ (‰) = 3.04 ± 0.313). For bears, we used fractionation values for nitrogen ($\Delta^{15}\text{N}$ (‰) = 4.76 ± 0.45 for vegetation and 4.5 ± 0.45 for meat) from Hilderbrand et al. (1996), and for carbon ($\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰) = 2 ± 1) from Mowat and Heard (2006) and Ben-David et al. (2004), as used on other stable isotope diet studies of bears (e.g., Merkle et al. 2011).

Prior to fitting mixing models, we reduced our suite of prey in the models to 1) focus on prey species that we were interested in making inference about, and 2) because each prey item must have isotopically distinct stable isotope values when reconstructing animal diets (Phillips 2012). We tested for isotopically distinct stable isotope values among our prey items using

Welch's two sided t -tests and two-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction for carbon and nitrogen isotopes separately, and a multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) for carbon and nitrogen isotopes simultaneously (See Supplementary Table S1 for results).

Our intent was to identify the main components of bear and wolf diets, while also being able to compare across the three predators. Thus, we only focused on large mammals, and did not include any potential prey smaller than beaver (*Castor canadensis* (Kuhl, 1820)). Indeed, little to no mammals smaller than beaver were found in wolf scats in a near-by study area (Milakovic and Parker 2011), and wolf diet is known to be mainly composed of large mammals (Merkle et al. 2009; Derbridge et al. 2012). Additionally, when bear diet during summer includes meat it is often from neonatal ungulates (Mowat and Heard 2006).

We included moose and beaver as a potential dietary sources as moose are common in the study area and beaver can be an important diet component for wolves (Potvin et al. 1988). Because we were interested in quantifying the proportion of caribou in predator diet, caribou was also included as a prey item in our mixing models for all three predator species. The isotope signature of caribou was significantly different from all other species, except for Stone's sheep. We assumed that Stone's sheep were rarely depredated by wolves and bears given the low density of the local population (approx. 80 in the study area; Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2010), and Stone's sheep generally avoid areas where wolves and bears are found during summer and fall (Walker et al. 2007). Thus, we did not include Stone's sheep, nor combine their isotope values with caribou, in the stable isotope analysis. Nonetheless, we note that it does appear that wolf predation is a leading cause of mortality in some Stone's sheep populations (Bergerud and Elliott 1998), and by excluding Stone's sheep, a small proportion of predator diet attributed to caribou may be due to predation on the isotopically

similar Stone's sheep. We also excluded mountain goats from the analysis because of their relatively low density in our study area (Environment Yukon 2011) and because no study to our knowledge has suggested that mountain goats are an important dietary component of wolves or bears. Finally, for black bear and grizzly bear diets we also included vegetation (Hobson et al. 2000; Mowat and Heard 2006). There was considerable overlap in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of the 13 plant species we sampled, so we sub-sampled four random plant isotope values from each plant type and estimated a general vegetation baseline for the study area by calculating the mean and SD of all of the combined vegetation isotope values.

RESULTS

DNA analysis

During summers 2009-2010 we collected 127 bear and 41 wolf hair samples. Due to sample quantity and quality only the largest samples of complete wolf and bear hairs were sent to the lab for genetic analysis. DNA extractions were performed on 42 bear hair samples and 18 wolf hair samples from 2009, and 22 bear hair samples and 13 wolf hair samples from 2010. We obtained mtDNA for species identification from 47 of the 64 suspected bear samples (73%); 30 samples were from grizzly bear, 16 samples were from black bear, and one sample was a mix of grizzly and black bear. We obtained mtDNA for species identification from 29 of the 31 wolf samples (94%); all were identified as *C. lupus*.

After obtaining high quality DNA that allowed for individual identification using the microsatellite panel, we identified 13 individual grizzly bears in 2009, and four in 2010. One grizzly bear was identified in both 2009 and 2010. We identified six individual black bears in 2009, and seven in 2010. One black bear was identified in both 2009 and 2010. We identified 10

individual wolves in 2009, and five in 2010. Three individual wolves were identified in both 2009 and 2010.

Stable isotope mixing models

We obtained $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ estimates for the 12 known black bear samples, 16 known grizzly bear samples, and 12 known grey wolf samples (sample sizes do not include individuals captured in both 2009 and 2010). For prey species, stable isotope estimates were derived from moose, caribou, mountain goat, Stone's sheep, beaver, snowshoe hare, least chipmunks, northern red-backed voles, and 13 plant species (Figure 2, Supplementary Table S2). Our replicate analysis ($n = 7$) suggested that instrument precision at the stable isotope facility was relatively high, and that there was little to no measurement/calculation error associated with estimating $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (Supplementary Fig. S1).

In general, compared to both bear species, the diet of wolves was more enriched in both nitrogen and carbon. Black bear and grizzly bear $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ were relatively similar to each other. Further, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ for all predators were similar across early, middle, and late summer, except for the root section of black bear hair (representing late summer diet) which was more depleted in nitrogen compared to other periods of black bear and grizzly bear diet (Figure 3).

Based on Bayesian stable isotope mixture models, wolf diet consisted principally of caribou (mean of $50\% \pm 0.10$ SD of diet), and to a lesser extent beaver ($21\% \pm 0.12$) and moose ($29\% \pm 0.09$), with little change occurring over the course of the summer (Figure 4). Black bear diet consisted mainly of vegetation ($43\% \pm 0.10$) and moose ($31\% \pm 0.16$), and to a lesser extent beaver ($14\% \pm 0.10$) and caribou ($12\% \pm 0.09$), with a clear shift from a diet of moose and vegetation in early summer, to a diet of mostly vegetation in late summer (Figure 4). Similar to

black bear, grizzly bear diet consisted mainly of vegetation ($42\% \pm 0.08$) and moose ($28\% \pm 0.16$) and to a lesser extent beaver ($16\% \pm 0.11$) and caribou ($15\% \pm 0.10$); however, we observed little change in diet occurring over the course of the summer (Figure 4).

DISCUSSION

We quantified diet of three sympatric predators in a multi-prey ecosystem over the course of summer. As expected, both bear species primarily consumed vegetation and moose (the most abundant large mammalian prey in our study area), and to a lesser extent caribou and beaver. As expected, over the course of the summer, black bears shifted from a diet comprised of meat and vegetation to a diet mainly comprised of vegetation. This was not the case for grizzly bears, where moose and vegetation were consistently consumed throughout the summer. Unexpectedly, our results suggest that wolves primarily consumed caribou, and to a lesser extent beaver and moose, even though caribou density is approximately half that of moose density in our study area (Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia 2010). Our results demonstrate that black bear, grizzly bear, and wolf coexistence is driven in part by strong dietary niche partitioning, and that wolves may be consuming more caribou than expected based on availability of prey.

The partitioning of diet among black bears, grizzly bears, and wolves may not be solely driven by diet selection, but also by spatial separation (Hobson et al. 2000). During summer, caribou select for high elevation, broad mountain plateaus (Polfus et al. 2011; Polfus et al. 2014), whereas moose select valley bottoms consisting of deciduous and riparian vegetation (Peters et al. 2013). It is plausible that the underlying diet differences between bears and wolves that we observed was that wolves spent significant time in high elevation areas, and bears spent significant time in low elevation areas. Indeed, Whittington et al. (2011) found that in Banff and

Jasper National Parks wolves spend the most time at high elevations resulting in the highest encounter risk for caribou. Further, in Quebec, caribou that avoid areas that wolves use tend to select areas where black bears occur, consequently exposing themselves to higher predation by bears (Leblond et al. 2016). Whether driven by space use or not, diet partitioning appears to allow these sympatric predators to minimize competition and coexist in a multi-predator, multi-prey ecosystem.

Our results confirm that ungulates are an important component of bear diet in early summer. As summer progresses, however, both bear species typically consume relatively large amounts of vegetation, especially as soft mass becomes available in late summer (Raine and Kansas 1990; McLellan and Hovey 1995; Munro et al. 2006). We observed this typical shift from meat to vegetation in the diet of black bears, which matched high relative availability of soft mast later in summer in our study area. However, our results indicated that grizzly bears foraged on both meat and vegetation throughout the summer. Milakovic and Parker (2013) reported that meat was a significant part of grizzly bear diet in northern BC throughout the summer, and even noted a relative increase in meat consumption compared to vegetation from early to late summer. They attributed the result to increased consumption of elk – a species that does not exist in our study area (Milakovic and Parker 2013). In accordance with our results, Fortin et al. (2013) found that black bears indeed consumed less meat than grizzly bears in Yellowstone National Park. Decreased black bear predation on moose likely occurs as moose calves become too large and fast to capture as summer progresses. Further, grizzly bears may be more effective than black bears at obtaining and competing for ungulate carcasses killed by wolves over the course of the summer (Smith et al. 2003). Both reasons suggest mechanisms behind dietary niche partitioning among the three predators.

Caribou were the most important prey item for wolves throughout the summer. This result is somewhat surprising as it suggests that wolves are selecting for caribou even though moose density is twice that of caribou in our study area. Previous studies have suggested that in multi-predator prey systems, moose are generally the primary prey of wolves and caribou are more likely to be an opportunistic or alternative prey (Wittmer et al. 2005; Wittmer et al. 2007). However, it has also been shown that availability alone may not determine primary prey of wolves, which sometimes exhibit preference for particular prey species (Huggard 1993; Dale et al. 1995). Prey switching can also occur as prey abundance varies over time (Garrott et al. 2007), and variation in diet among packs within a population has been reported (Kunkel et al. 2004; Derbridge et al. 2012). Regardless of prey species, vulnerability to predation is the most consistent factor determining wolf predation (Mech and Peterson 2003). Since wolves are more likely to be found alone, in pairs, or in small groups during the summer (Fuller et al. 2003), caribou may be a more vulnerable or profitable prey item (in terms of energy/handling time) than moose which are generally 2-3 times larger than caribou. This greater profitability was noted by Dale et al. (1995) who suggested relative vulnerability of caribou explained why they were selected by wolves even when moose were more abundant in Alaska. We also note that our results provide some evidence that five of the 12 individual wolves we sampled likely preyed mainly on caribou (i.e., their isotope signatures fall exactly on top of the isotopic signature of caribou; see Supplementary Fig. S2), whereas isotopic signatures of the other wolves were closer to the signatures of moose and beaver – potentially explaining how the overall average consumption of caribou was so high.

Predation rates, predator preferences, and mortality risks for prey may be strongly impacted by the level of habitat modification in a landscape (Schlaepfer et al. 2002). For

example, in Alberta and Quebec anthropogenic conversion of habitats that favor moose appears to result in larger wolf populations and increased wolf predation risk on caribou via apparent competition (Seip 1992; DeCesare et al. 2010; Losier et al. 2015). Further, as human development increases, the spatial overlap of caribou and moose as well as caribou mortality from wolves tends to increase (Peters et al. 2013). Our study system on the other hand, has not experienced extensive habitat conversion (e.g., no significant logging) that impacts other regions that support caribou-moose-wolf dynamics (Johnson et al. 2015; Losier et al. 2015). The predominant human disturbance in the Atlin area is placer mining along creek bottoms of two drainage systems within the study area. The study area has only one main road (Highway 7) that connects Atlin to the Alaska Highway and the city of Whitehorse in the Yukon Territory. However, because of historical prospecting, our study area does have a rather high density of low use roads. There are approximately 100 km of paved roads, 400 km of unimproved gravel and dirt roads and an additional 750 km of All Terrain Vehicle trails in the study area. These roads likely provide wolves with easy access to alpine plateaus and caribou summer habitats. If wolf predation is enhanced by linear features on the landscape (Whittington et al. 2011), it is likely that wolf predation rates on caribou would be increased by even moderate levels of linear features. Further, caribou have been shown to avoid linear developments (and other human landscape alterations including placer mines and cabin sites) in our study area during the summer, even though human presence on the road network is relatively low (Polfus et al. 2011). Therefore, as others have suggested (e.g., Whittington et al. 2011), decommissioning roads and other habitat restoration projects may be a future management strategy to help minimize declines in woodland caribou populations.

It is important to note that the results of our stable isotope analysis cannot be projected during winter months when bears are inactive, as it is unknown in our study area whether wolves switch to moose as their main prey during winter. Such seasonal variation in predation by wolves on moose and caribou must be taken into account when determining the total influence of multiple predators on prey populations. For example, Metz et al. (2012) found that the species composition of wolf predation events varies by season in Yellowstone National Park, and Peters et al. (2013) found that the strength of resource separation between moose and caribou in Alberta depends on season.

Wolves, grizzly bears, and black bears have coexisted, along with a suite of large ungulate prey (that includes caribou), for thousands of years in North America. Our study sheds light on how these three predators partition resources to coexist, suggesting that bears consume mainly moose and vegetation, whereas wolves consume mainly caribou during summer. Our study also reveals that caribou are the primary prey for wolves during summer in an ecosystem where moose are more abundant than caribou and relatively little human development has occurred compared to the habitat of other forest-dwelling caribou populations across their range. Together these findings suggest that dietary niche partitioning allows for these multi-prey, multi-predator ecosystems to exist, and that these ecosystems are challenging to understand with processes such as apparent competition, prey selectivity, and redundancy among interspecific interactions all at play. No single management strategy (e.g., habitat enhancements, decrease density of a single predator or preferred prey of a predator) will likely result in significant, long-term changes to these communities and it appears successful caribou conservation will require a multi-faceted approach that includes curbing human development and native habitat restoration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Government of Canada Aboriginal Fund for Species at Risk, Taku River Tlingit First Nation (TRTFN), Round River Conservation Studies (RRCS), and a U.S. Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and Agriculture postdoctoral fellowship (grant award # 2014-01928) awarded to JAM. The partnership between the TRTFN and RRCS facilitated the development of funding proposals, project management, reporting and implementation. We appreciate mapping support from Julia Smith and help with field work from Myranda Simpson, Morgane Stehelin-Holland, Jerry Jack, Phillip Tizya and Mark Connor. We also thank Doug Milek, Heidi Larsen, Rick Tingey, Chris Lockhart, Claire Polfus, Susie Dain-Owens, Leah Larsen, Jeff Muntifer, Bryan Evans, Gavin Noyes, Julian Griggs, Kevin Cannaday, Basilia Andoroone Shivute, Drew Chambers, Megan Mitchell, Matt Stone, Maggie Harris, Jake Robert Claro, Rebecca Guiao, Emily Moffitt, Ethan Rubenstein, Leif Olson, Hannah Tannebring and Kate Shlepr for help in the field. Elizabeth Hofer and Frank Doyle provided snowshoe hare hair from the Kulane snowshoe hare project. Small mammal samples were provided by the mammal collection of the Museum of Southwestern Biology at the University of New Mexico by Joseph Cook (MSB:Mamm:12656). Additional samples were provided by Earl Carlson, Sophie van den Bergh, Hans Berg and Norm Graham. Genetic analysis was conducted by Kristine Pilgrim and Michael Schwartz at the USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station. Cara Nelson, Lisa Eby, and Matthew Wilson of University of Montana shared work space and equipment. We thank Rebecca Fletcher for help processing samples for isotope analysis. Advice was provided by Brendan Oates, Brian Milakovic and Justin Yeakel.

LITERATURE CITED

Adams, L.G., Singer, F.J., and Dale, B.W. 1995. Caribou calf mortality in Denali national park, Alaska. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **59**: 584–594. doi: 10.2307/3802467.

- 475 Ausband, D.E., Young, J., Fannin, B., Mitchell, M.S., Stenglein, J.L., Waits, L.P., and Shivik,
476 J.A. 2011. Hair of the dog: obtaining samples from coyotes and wolves noninvasively.
477 Wildl. Soc. Bull. **35**(2): 105–111. doi: 10.1002/wsb.23.
- 478 Ballard, W.B. 1992. Bear predation on moose: a review of recent North American studies and
479 their management implications. *Alces*, **1**: 162–176.
- 480 Ballard, W.B. 1994. Effects of black bear predation on caribou—a review. *Alces*, **30**: 25–35.
- 481 Barber-Meyer, S.M., Mech, L.D., and White, P.J. 2008. Elk Calf Survival and Mortality
482 following Wolf Restoration to Yellowstone National Park. Wildl. Monogr. **169**: 1–30.
483 doi: 10.2193/2008-004.
- 484 Barnosky, A.D., Hadly, E.A., Bascompte, J., Berlow, E.L., Brown, J.H., Fortelius, M., Getz,
485 W.M., Harte, J., Hastings, A., and Marquet, P.A. 2012. Approaching a state shift in
486 Earth's biosphere. *Nature*, **486**: 52–58. doi:10.1038/nature11018.
- 487 Ben-David, M., Titus, K., and Beier, L.R. 2004. Consumption of salmon by Alaskan brown
488 bears: a trade-off between nutritional requirements and the risk of infanticide? *Oecologia*,
489 **138**: 465–474. doi: 10.1007/s00442-003-1442-x.
- 490 Bergerud, A., and Elliott, J. 1998. Wolf predation in a multiple-ungulate system in northern
491 British Columbia. *Can. J. Zool.* **76**: 1551–1569. doi: 10.1139/z98-083.
- 492 Boulanger, J., and McLellan, B. 2001. Closure violation in DNA-based mark-recapture
493 estimation of grizzly bear populations. *Can. J. Zool.* **79**: 642–651. doi: 10.1139/z01-020.
- 494 Brown, J.S. 1989. Coexistence on a seasonal resource. *Am. Nat.* **133**: 168–182. doi:
495 10.1086/284908.

- 496 Caut, S., Roemer, G.W., Donlan, C.J., and Courchamp, F. 2006. Coupling stable isotopes with
497 bioenergetics to estimate interspecific interactions. *Ecol. Appl.* **16**: 1893–1900. doi:
498 10.1890/1051-0761.
- 499 COSEWIC. 2011. Designatable units for caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) in Canada. Committee on
500 the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- 501 COSEWIC. 2014. COSEWIC assessment and status report on the Caribou *Rangifer tarandus*,
502 Northern Mountain population, Central Mountain population and Southern Mountain
503 population in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.
504 Ottawa. xxii + 113 pp.
- 505 Dale, B.W., Adams, L.G., and Boyer, R.T. 1995. Winter wolf predation in a multiple ungulate
506 prey system, Gates of the Arctic National Park, Alaska. *In Ecology and conservation of*
507 *wolves in a changing world. Edited by L.N. Carbyn and S.H. Fritts and D.R. Seip.*
508 *Canadian Circumpolar Institute, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.* pp. 223–230.
- 509 Darimont, C., and Reimchen, T. 2002. Intra-hair stable isotope analysis implies seasonal shift to
510 salmon in gray wolf diet. *Can. J. Zool.* **80**: 1638–1642. doi: 10.1139/z02-149.
- 511 DeCesare, N., Hebblewhite, M., Robinson, H., and Musiani, M. 2010. Endangered, apparently:
512 the role of apparent competition in endangered species conservation. *Anim. Conserv.* **13**:
513 353–362. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-1795.2009.00328.x.
- 514 DeNiro, M.J., and Epstein, S. 1978. Influence of diet on the distribution of carbon isotopes in
515 animals. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, **42**: 495–506. doi: 10.1016/0016-7037(78)90199-0.
- 516 DeNiro, M.J., and Epstein, S. 1981. Influence of diet on the distribution of nitrogen isotopes in
517 animals. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, **45**: 341–351. doi: 10.1016/0016-7037(81)90244-1.

- 518 Derbridge, J.J., Krausman, P.R., and Darimont, C.T. 2012. Using Bayesian stable isotope mixing
519 models to estimate wolf diet in a multi-prey ecosystem. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **76**: 1277–
520 1289. doi: 10.1002/jwmg.359.
- 521 Derbridge, J.J., Merkle, J.A., Bucci, M.E., Callahan, P., Koprowski, J.L., Polfus, J.L., and
522 Krausman, P.R. 2015. Experimentally Derived $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ Discrimination Factors for
523 Gray Wolves and the Impact of Prior Information in Bayesian Mixing Models. *Plos One*,
524 **10**: e0119940. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0119940.
- 525 Environment Canada. 2005. Narrative descriptions of terrestrial ecozones and ecoregions of
526 Canada - boreal cordillera ecozone. Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- 527 Environment Yukon. 2011. Mountain Goat Survey of the Southwest Yukon and Northwest
528 British Columbia, 2007. Yukon Fish and Wildlife Branch Report TR-11-14, Whitehorse,
529 Yukon, Canada.
- 530 Fedriani, J.M., Palomares, F., and Delibes, M. 1999. Niche relations among three sympatric
531 Mediterranean carnivores. *Oecologia*, **121**: 138–148. doi:10.1007/s004420050915.
- 532 Festa-Bianchet, M., Ray, J., Boutin, S., Côté, S., and Gunn, A. 2011. Conservation of caribou
533 (*Rangifer tarandus*) in Canada: an uncertain future. *Can. J. Zool.* **89**: 419–434. doi:
534 10.1139/z11-025.
- 535 Fortin, J.K., Schwartz, C.C., Gunther, K.A., Teisberg, J.E., Haroldson, M.A., Evans, M.A., and
536 Robbins, C.T. 2013. Dietary adjustability of grizzly bears and American black bears in
537 Yellowstone National Park. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **77**: 270–281. doi: 10.1002/jwmg.483.
- 538 Fuhr, B.L., and Demarchii, D.A. 1990. A methodology for grizzly bear habitat assessment in
539 British Columbia. British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Wildlife Branch, Victori,
540 British Columbia.

- 541 Fuller, T.K., Mech, L.D., and Cochrane, J.F. 2003. Wolf population dynamics. *In* Wolves:
542 behavior, ecology, and conservation. *Edited by* L.D. Mech and L. Boitani. University of
543 Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA. pp. 161–191.
- 544 Garrott, R.A., Bruggeman, J.E., Becker, M.S., Kalinowski, S.T., and White, P.J. 2007.
545 Evaluating Prey Switching in Wolf-Ungulate Systems. *Ecol. Appl.* **17**: 1588–1597. doi:
546 10.1890/06-1439.1.
- 547 Hayes, R.D., Baer, A., Wotschikowsky, U., and Harestad, A.S. 2000. Kill rate by wolves on
548 moose in the Yukon. *Can. J. Zool.* **78**: 49–59. doi: 10.1139/z99-187.
- 549 Hegel, T. 2013. Yukon woodland caribou composition surveys, 2012. Yukon Fish and Wildlife
550 Branch Technical Report PR-13-02. Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada.
- 551 Hervieux, D., Hebblewhite, M., Stepnisky, D., Bacon, M., and Boutin, S. 2014. Managing
552 wolves (*Canis lupus*) to recover threatened woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*
553 *caribou*) in Alberta. *Can. J. Zool.* **92**: 1029–1037. doi: 10.1139/cjz-2014-0142.
- 554 Hilderbrand, G.V., Farley, S.D., Robbins, C.T., Hanley, T.A., Titus, K., and Servheen, C. 1996.
555 Use of stable isotopes to determine diets of living and extinct bears. *Can. J. Zool.* **74**:
556 2080–2088. doi: 10.1139/z96-236.
- 557 Hobson, K.A., McLellan, B.N., and Woods, J.G. 2000. Using stable carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and nitrogen
558 ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) isotopes to infer trophic relationships among black and grizzly bears in the upper
559 Columbia River basin, British Columbia. *Can. J. Zool.* **78**(8): 1332–1339. doi:
560 10.1139/z00-069.
- 561 Huggard, D.J. 1993. Prey selectivity of wolves in Banff National Park. I. Prey species. *Can. J.*
562 *Zool.* **71**: 130–139. doi: 10.1139/z93-019.

- 563 Jackson, A.L., Inger, R., Bearhop, S., and Parnell, A. 2009. Erroneous behaviour of MixSIR, a
564 recently published Bayesian isotope mixing model: a discussion of Moore & Semmens
565 (2008). *Ecology Letters* **12**: E1–E5. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01233.x.
- 566 Jacoby, M.E., Hilderbrand, G.V., Servheen, C., Schwartz, C.C., Arthur, S.M., Hanley, T.A.,
567 Robbins, C.T., and Michener, R. 1999. Trophic relations of brown and black bears in
568 several western North American ecosystems. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **63**: 921–929. doi:
569 10.2307/3802806.
- 570 James, A.R., Boutin, S., Hebert, D.M., Rippin, A.B., and White, J. 2004. Spatial separation of
571 caribou from moose and its relation to predation by wolves. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **68**: 799–
572 809. doi: 10.2193/0022-541.
- 573 James, A.R., and Stuart-Smith, A.K. 2000. Distribution of caribou and wolves in relation to
574 linear corridors. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **64**: 154–159. doi: 10.2307/3802985.
- 575 Johnson, C.J., Ehlers, L.P., and Seip, D.R. 2015. Witnessing extinction—Cumulative impacts
576 across landscapes and the future loss of an evolutionarily significant unit of woodland
577 caribou in Canada. *Biol. Conserv.* **186**: 176–186. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2015.03.012.
- 578 Karanth, K.U., and Sunquist, M.E. 1995. Prey selection by tiger, leopard and dhole in tropical
579 forests. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **64**: 439–450. doi: 10.2307/5647.
- 580 Kunkel, K.E., Pletscher, D.H., Boyd, D.K., Ream, R.R., and Fairchild, M.W. 2004. Factors
581 correlated with foraging behavior of wolves in and near Glacier National Park, Montana.
582 *J. Wildl. Manage.* **68**: 167–178. Doi: 10.2193/0022-541.
- 583 Latham, A.D.M., Latham, M.C., Knopff, K.H., Hebblewhite, M., and Boutin, S. 2013. Wolves,
584 white-tailed deer, and beaver: implications of seasonal prey switching for woodland
585 caribou declines. *Ecography*, **36**: 1276–1290. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2013.00035.x.

- 586 Leblond, M., Dussault, C., Ouellet, J.P., and St-Laurent, M.H. 2016. Caribou avoiding wolves
587 face increased predation by bears—Caught between Scylla and Charybdis. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
588 **53**: 1078–1087. doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12658.
- 589 Losier, C.L., Couturier, S., St-Laurent, M.H., Drapeau, P., Dussault, C., Rudolph, T., Brodeur,
590 V., Merkle, J.A., and Fortin, D. 2015. Adjustments in habitat selection to changing
591 availability induce fitness costs for a threatened ungulate. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **52**: 496–504.
592 doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12400.
- 593 Marshall, R. 2015. Atlin Stratified Random Block Moose Surveys March 7-11, 2014. British
594 Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, Smithers, British
595 Columbia, Canada.
- 596 McLellan, B.N., and Hovey, F.W. 1995. The diet of grizzly bears in the Flathead River drainage
597 of southeastern British Columbia. *Can. J. Zool.* **73**: 704–712. doi: 10.1139/z95-082.
- 598 Mech, L.D., and Peterson, R.O. 2003. Wolf-prey relations. *In* *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology and*
599 *Conservation. Edited by* L.D. Mech and L. Boitani. The University of Chicago Press,
600 Chicago, Illinois, USA. pp. 131–160.
- 601 Merkle, J.A., Derbridge, J.J., and Krausman, P.R. 2011. Using stable isotope analysis to quantify
602 anthropogenic foraging in black bears. *Human-Wildlife Interactions* **5**: 159–167.
- 603 Merkle, J.A., Krausman, P.R., Stark, D.W., Oakleaf, J.K., and Ballard, W.B. 2009. Summer diet
604 of the Mexican gray wolf (*Canis lupus baileyi*). *Southwest. Nat.* **54**: 480–485. doi:
605 10.1894/CLG-26.1.
- 606 Metz, M.C., Smith, D.W., Vucetich, J.A., Stahler, D.R., and Peterson, R.O. 2012. Seasonal
607 patterns of predation for gray wolves in the multi-prey system of Yellowstone National
608 Park. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **81**: 553–563. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01945.x.

- 609 Milakovic, B., and Parker, K.L. 2011. Using stable isotopes to define diets of wolves in northern
610 British Columbia, Canada. *J. Mammal.* **92**: 295–304. doi: 10.1644/10-MAMM-A-038.1.
- 611 Milakovic, B., and Parker, K.L. 2013. Quantifying carnivory by grizzly bears in a multi-ungulate
612 system. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **77**: 39–47. doi: 10.1002/jwmg.434.
- 613 Mowat, G., and Heard, D.C. 2006. Major components of grizzly bear diet across North America.
614 *Can. J. Zool.* **84**: 473–489. doi: 10.1139/z06-016.
- 615 Munro, R., Nielsen, S., Price, M., Stenhouse, G., and Boyce, M. 2006. Seasonal and diel patterns
616 of grizzly bear diet and activity in west-central Alberta. *J. Mammal.* **87**: 1112–1121. doi:
617 10.1644/05-MAMM-A-410R3.1.
- 618 Nielsen, S., Munro, R., Bainbridge, E., Stenhouse, G., and Boyce, M. 2004. Grizzly bears and
619 forestry: II. Distribution of grizzly bear foods in clearcuts of west-central Alberta,
620 Canada. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **199**: 67–82. doi: 10.1016/j.foreco.2004.04.015.
- 621 Palomares, F., Ferreras, P., Fedriani, J.M., and Delibes, M. 1996. Spatial relationships between
622 Iberian lynx and other carnivores in an area of south-western Spain. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **33**: 5–
623 13. doi: 10.2307/2405010.
- 624 Peters, W., Hebblewhite, M., DeCesare, N., Cagnacci, F., and Musiani, M. 2013. Resource
625 separation analysis with moose indicates threats to caribou in human altered landscapes.
626 *Ecography*, **36**: 487–498. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07733.x.
- 627 Phillips, D.L. 2012. Converting isotope values to diet composition: the use of mixing models. *J.*
628 *Mammal.* **93**: 342–352. doi: 10.1644/11-MAMM-S-158.1.
- 629 Plummer, M. 2003. JAGS: A program for analysis of Bayesian graphical models using Gibbs
630 sampling. *In* Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Distributed Statistical
631 Computing (DSC 2003), Vienna, Austria. pp. 20–22.

- 632 Polfus, J., Hebblewhite, M., and Heinemeyer, K. 2011. Identifying indirect habitat loss and
633 avoidance of human infrastructure by northern mountain woodland caribou. *Biol.*
634 *Conserv.* **144**: 2637–2646. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2011.07.023.
- 635 Polfus, J.L., Heinemeyer, K., and Hebblewhite, M. 2014. Comparing traditional ecological
636 knowledge and western science woodland caribou habitat models. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **78**:
637 112–121. doi: 10.1002/jwmg.643.
- 638 Post, D.M. 2002. Using stable isotopes to estimate trophic position: models, methods, and
639 assumptions. *Ecology*, **83**: 703–718. doi: 10.1890/0012-9658.
- 640 Post, E. 2013. *Ecology of climate change: the importance of biotic interactions*. Princeton
641 University Press, Princeton, USA.
- 642 Potvin, F., Jolicoeur, H., and Huot, J. 1988. Wolf diet and prey selectivity during two periods for
643 deer in Quebec: decline versus expansion. *Can. J. Zool.* **66**: 1274–1279. doi:
644 10.1139/z88-186.
- 645 R Core Team. 2014. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for
646 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 647 Raine, R.M., and Kansas, J.L. 1990. Black Bear Seasonal Food Habits and Distribution by
648 Elevation in Banff National Park, Alberta. *Int. Conf. Bear Res. Manage.* **8**: 297–304.
- 649 Schlaepfer, M.A., Runge, M.C., and Sherman, P.W. 2002. Ecological and evolutionary traps.
650 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **17**: 474–480. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02580-6.
- 651 Schoener, T.W. 1974. Resource partitioning in ecological communities. *Science*, **185**: 27–39.
652 doi: 10.1126/science.185.4145.27.

- 653 Seip, D.R. 1992. Factors limiting woodland caribou populations and their interrelationships with
654 wolves and moose in southeastern British Columbia. *Can. J. Zool.* **70**: 1494–1503. doi:
655 10.1139/z92-206.
- 656 Smith, D.W., Peterson, R.O., and Houston, D.B. 2003. Yellowstone after Wolves. *BioScience*,
657 **53**: 330–340. doi: 10.1641/0006-3568.
- 658 Stotyn, S.A. 2008. Ecological interactions of mountain caribou, wolves and moose in the North
659 Columbia Mountains, British Columbia. University of Alberta.
- 660 Stotyn, S.A., McLellan, B.N., and Serrouya, R. 2007. Mortality sources and spatial partitioning
661 among mountain caribou, moose, and wolves in the north Columbia Mountains, British
662 Columbia. Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program, Nelson, British
663 Columbia, Canada.
- 664 Stuart-Smith, A.K., Bradshaw, C.J., Boutin, S., Hebert, D.M., and Rippin, A.B. 1997. Woodland
665 caribou relative to landscape patterns in northeastern Alberta. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **61**: 622–
666 633. doi: 10.2307/3802170.
- 667 Taku River Tlingit First Nation, and Province of British Columbia. 2010. Interim collaborative
668 harvest management plans for Atlin caribou, Atlin east sheep and moose and lower Taku
669 grizzly bear. Taku River Tlingit First Nation and Province of British Columbia, British
670 Columbia, Canada.
- 671 Taku River Tlingit First Nation, and Province of British Columbia. 2011. Wóoshtin wudidáa -
672 Atlin Taku Land Use Plan. British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural
673 Resource Operations, Atlin, British Columbia, Canada.

- 674 Urton, E.J., and Hobson, K.A. 2005. Intrapopulation variation in gray wolf isotope ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and
675 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$) profiles: implications for the ecology of individuals. *Oecologia*, **145**: 316–325. doi:
676 10.1007/s00442-005-0124-2.
- 677 Vors, L.S., and Boyce, M.S. 2009. Global declines of caribou and reindeer. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*
678 **15**: 2626–2633. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01974.x.
- 679 Walker, A.B., Parker, K.L., Gillingham, M.P., Gustine, D.D., and Lay, R.J. 2007. Habitat
680 selection by female Stone's sheep in relation to vegetation, topography, and risk of
681 predation. *Ecoscience*, **14**: 55–70. doi: 10.2980/1195-6860.
- 682 Whittington, J., Hebblewhite, M., DeCesare, N.J., Neufeld, L., Bradley, M., Wilmshurst, J., and
683 Musiani, M. 2011. Caribou encounters with wolves increase near roads and trails: a time-
684 to-event approach. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **48**: 1535–1542. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
685 2664.2011.02043.x.
- 686 Wittmer, H.U., McLellan, B.N., Serrouya, R., and Apps, C.D. 2007. Changes in landscape
687 composition influence the decline of a threatened woodland caribou population. *J. Anim.*
688 *Ecol.* **76**: 568–579. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01220.x.
- 689 Wittmer, H.U., Sinclair, A.R., and McLellan, B.N. 2005. The role of predation in the decline and
690 extirpation of woodland caribou. *Oecologia*, **144**: 257–267. doi: 10.1007/s00442-005-
691 0055-y.
- 692 Young Jr, D.D., and McCabe, T.R. 1997. Grizzly bear predation rates on caribou calves in
693 northeastern Alaska. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **61**: 1056–1066. doi: 10.2307/3802102.
- 694 Zager, P., and Beecham, J. 2006. The role of American black bears and brown bears as predators
695 on ungulates in North America. *Ursus*, **17**: 95–108. doi: 10.2192/1537-6176.
- 696

Figures

Figure 1. General location of the study area along with sampling locations within the traditional territory of the Taku River Tlingit First Nation (TRTFN) territory in northwestern British Columbia, Canada.

Figure 2. Mean (with SD bars in black) prey carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) isotope values from tissue samples (guard hair for mammals and above ground tissue for plants) collected in the traditional territory of the Taku River Tlingit First Nation in northwestern British Columbia, Canada, 2009-2010. See Supplementary Table S1 for statistical tests of differences among the mammalian prey items.

Figure 3. Mean (with SD bars in black) predator carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) isotope values based on samples of grey wolf (*Canis lupus*; a), black bear (*Ursus americanus*; b), and grizzly bear (*U. arctos*; c) guard hairs representing early (tip section), mid (middle section), and late (root section) summer growth. Hair samples were collected in the traditional territory of the Taku River Tlingit First Nation in northwestern British Columbia, Canada, 2009-2010.

Figure 4. Mean posterior distributions (with SD bars in black) of the proportional contribution of caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*), beaver (*Castor canadensis*), moose (*Alces alces*), and vegetation in the diets of grey wolves (*Canis lupus*), black bears (*Ursus americanus*), and grizzly bears (*U. arctos*) in early, middle, and late summer of 2009-2010 in the traditional territory of the Taku River Tlingit First Nation in northwestern British Columbia, Canada. Distributions calculated

719 from a Bayesian n-mixture model of carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) isotope values derived
720 from guard hairs (mammals) and above ground whole tissue (vegetation).

Draft

76x101mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Proportion of diet