Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences

Density independent use of shallow riverine areas in juvenile Atlantic salmon

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2017-0500.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Aug-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Puffer, Michael; NTNU, Dept Biology Berg, Ole; NTNU, Dept Biology Hamnes, Frøydis; NTNU, Dept Biol. Bentsen, Vidar; NTNU, Koch, Wouter; NTNU, Dept Biology Ugedal, Ola; Norwegian Institute for Nature Research NINA, Forseth, Torbjørn; Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Arnekleiv, Jo; NTNU, University Museum Einum, Sigurd; NTNU, Dept Biol.; Dept. Biol.
Keyword:	habitat use, Intercohort competition, intracohort competition, hydropeaking, microhabitat use
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Density independent use of shallow riverine areas in juvenile Atlantic salmon

**Michael Puffer, Ole Kristian Berg, Frøydis Bolme Hamnes, Vidar Bentsen, Wouter Koch,
Ola Ugedal, Torbjørn Forseth, Jo Vegar Arnekleiv, and Sigurd Einum**

Michael Puffer, Ole Kristian Berg, Frøydis Bolme Hamnes, Vidar Bentsen, Wouter Koch.

Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim,
Norway.

Ola Ugedal, Torbjørn Forseth. Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA), Trondheim,
Norway

Jo Vegar Arnekleiv. Department of Natural History, Norwegian University of Science and
Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

Sigurd Einum. Centre for Biodiversity Dynamics, Department of Biology, Norwegian
University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

Corresponding author: Ole K. Berg (email: ole.berg@bio.ntnu.no)

Abstract:

Habitat use of aquatic organisms is essential to evaluate effects of many environmental challenges like effects of hydro-power regulation, where stranding may occur under hydropeaking (rapid dewatering of shallow river areas). Experimental studies as well as observations from nature with juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) show that the proportion of the population that uses shallow depth was both independent of population density and decreasing with fish size. Experiments were conducted both in the presence and in absence of older fish, during day and night, and during all four seasons. Juvenile salmon from deep areas may therefore distribute into the shallow areas even when fish density becomes reduced. Thus, low density does not lead to reduced stranding risk and shallow areas may therefore function as a sink in a within-generation source-sink dynamic under a repeated hydropeaking scenario. The sink effect of rapid dewatering in shallow areas may be mitigated by e.g. seasonal and diurnal regulation of hydropeaking activity, but dewatering may still result in extinction of weak populations.

Keywords: habitat use, hydropeaking, intracohort competition, intercohort competition, microhabitat use, stranding

Introduction

Habitat use (i.e. occurrence of an individual in a specific habitat with specific values of water velocity, substrate etc.) of fishes is crucial to determine their stranding risk in rivers where hydro-regulation activity may induce rapid variation in water level. Hydropower is an energy source with the potential to store energy (reservoirs) and this is believed to become more important in the future in order to balance the variation in wind and solar energy production. This benefit of hydropower comes at a cost for the riverine environment, degrading the physical, biological, recreational and economical values of the affected rivers (e.g. Pang et al. 2015). Hydropower production has considerable negative environmental effects, but due to action to mediate climate gas-emissions, hydropower is often considered as green and environmental friendly energy. Currently, more than 50% of the world's stream and river flow crosses one or more dams before reaching the oceans and this fraction could increase up to 90% by 2030 (Van Cappellen and Maavara 2016).

The results of river regulation are usually large-scale changes affecting biological organization levels from organisms to landscapes and involves changes in a multitude of topics from habitat use to general conservation biology or changes in nutrient load leading to profound community changes (Van Cappellen and Maavara 2016). In systems where rapid changes in water discharge, so-called hydropeaking, frequently occur due to fluctuating hydropower production, the effects of hydro-power production can be more pronounced (Irvine et al. 2015; Hauer et al. 2017). Hydropeaking causes a fraction of the riverbed to be dewatered, commonly referred to as the ramping zone with stranding of organisms and exposure to air in the ramping zone during low flow periods (e.g. Saltveit et al. 2001; Halleraker et al. 2003; Nagrodski et al. 2012). Riverine organisms are adapted to a variable environment, but hydropeaking is

unpredictable, since water level fluctuations and ramping speed exceed those occurring naturally (Poff et al. 1997). The ramping zone may therefore represent a potential hazard for organisms that prefer shallow areas. In the case of rivers, shallow and slow-flowing shorelines may be used and even preferred by certain species and life stages, and individuals are able to respond to natural gradual decreases in flow by moving out to more central areas. Both intra- and interspecific competition and fish predation may be lowered in shallow areas, and enemy-free space may make shallow areas preferable, especially for the smallest fry (e.g. Heggenes & Borgstrøm 1991). However, under hydropeaking, these shallow areas may become of low quality due to high risk of stranding and mortality during rapid declines in flow. Thus, hydropeaking causes a mismatch between the environmental clues they usually use for selecting habitat and the actual habitat quality (Donovan and Thompson 2001; Kokko and Sutherland 2001; Schlaepfer et al. 2002; Hale and Swearer 2016). Increased use of renewable energy, more open energy markets, increased transmission capacities and more variable patterns of energy use, all lead to more demands for market-oriented regulation of hydropower production (Harby & Noack 2013), and hydropeaking has become increasingly common in rivers in Europe and North America. While there are no international overview of the extent of hydropeaking practices, in Austria alone it has been estimated that 800 km of river stretches are affected (Melcher et al. 2016).

The effects of hydropeaking on organisms in regulated rivers can be divided into two different problem areas: habitat-specific parameters, especially depth, which determine the dewatering risk for a given organism and then the factors which determine mortality of stranded organisms (e.g. Bradford 1997; Sauterleute et al. 2016; Puffer et al. 2017). For fish, stranding may result in high mortality. The present paper, however, deals with the first of these processes:

assessing factors which determine the use of shallow areas, which are the areas with higher stranding risk. One fish taxon that has received much attention with regards to the issue of hydropeaking in temperate areas is salmonids, and in particular Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). Habitat use in juvenile Atlantic salmon is influenced by body size, time of day, season, predation risk, food and shelter availability, and is extensively described in the literature (e.g. Heggenes et al. 1999; Armstrong et al. 2003; Berg et al., 2014; Puffer et al. 2015). In general, they may be found over the whole range of available depths, including the shallow shorelines that become dewatered during hydropeaking. However, the “efficiency” of the shallow shorelines as a trap (Hale and Swearer 2016), and hence the population-level effect of hydropeaking induced mortality, will be highly influenced by the extent to which this occupancy is density-dependent. There are three possible scenarios in terms of occupancy of the ramping zone:

- 1) it is negatively density-dependent, i.e. the proportion of fish in the ramping zone increases with decreasing population density
- 2) it is density-independent, i.e. the proportion of the population in the ramping zone is independent of population density
- 3) it is positively density-dependent, i.e. the proportion of fish in the ramping zone increases with increasing population density.

If the use of the ramping zone is negatively density-dependent (scenario 1), it would act as a hazard zone or trap for juvenile Atlantic salmon, with the population-level effect increasing with decreasing population density. Scenario 1 may then efficiently drive populations to extinction, particularly in combination with other negative environmental factors. For scenario 2 there is no feedback between population density and negative effects of hydropeaking, and a more constant population-level effect is predicted. Finally, under scenario 3 the negative effect of hydropeaking

is expected to decrease with decreasing population density, making it of less concern in terms of population persistence.

The present study provides both extensive experimental and observational data on Atlantic salmon habitat use that enables us to distinguish between the three density-dependent scenarios outlined above. The focal habitat dimension investigated was water depth. Experiments were conducted in four artificial outdoor-streams. To increase the generality of our findings these experiments were conducted both in the presence and absence of older fish, during day and night, and during all four seasons. The experimental results were complemented and verified with observational data on wild juvenile Atlantic salmon depth use in three Norwegian rivers.

Materials and methods

Experimental study: Study site and experimental design

Experiments were performed at the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA) Station, Ims (south-western Norway, 58° 54' N, 5° 57' E). Four outdoor arenas (i.e. round, concrete pools) were used in the experiments with water originating from a nearby lake, which entered each arena through an individual adjustable water inlet. Each arena comprised a curved stream divided by mesh screens (Fig. 1; Appendix Fig. A4-A7) into three sections, each about 10 m², and constant water flow (for details about the arenas, see: Berg et al. 2014). About 50% of each section was covered with white plastic foil above the water surface to provide overhead shade. Differences in water depth between the outer and inner walls of the streams were created by a sloped gravel streambed, creating a shallow area on the inner side and a deep area on the outer side of the curved stream. To determine depth use at the end of a trial, the shallow (mean depth 18 cm; range 2–31cm) and deep areas (mean depth 31; range 15–44 cm) of the sections

were separated by remotely lowering/releasing screens (i.e. “trapdoors”) placed longitudinally above the stream. When the trap doors were released, they separated the shallow from the deep area to ensure the correct determination of fish distributed into shallow/deep area (for further details see: Berg et al. 2014). A pilot study was conducted to determine the time required to obtain a stable depth use distribution for each trial. After sampling at different trial durations, a minimum of 20 hours was chosen as no further change in depth use distribution occurred later.

Experimental study: Experimental fish and procedures

The juvenile Atlantic salmon were hatched from eggs originating from the local River Imsa once a year during spring and reared at the research station. Fish used in our experiments were thus hatched in spring and then used throughout the four different seasons, which explains the increase in body size in our figures (spring: min. 22 mm – winter: max. 150 mm). Experiments were repeated in all seasons (spring, summer, autumn, winter). Young-of-the-year (YOY) were stocked at either low (one YOY m⁻²) or high (three YOY m⁻²) density into each section, and this was done both in the presence and absence of two overyearling (i.e. > 1 year old) individuals (for details see: Table 1). Our overyearlings were 1+ salmon, hatched and kept at the same facility under the same conditions, but of course in larger tanks because of their size. The chosen YOY densities were within the range of densities found in wild populations of YOY salmonids (Grant and Imre 2005). Experimental fish were only used once.

For autumn and winter experiments, both day- and night-time trials were performed, whereas only daytime trials were performed during spring and summer as our experimental facility’s northward geographical position precludes dark nights in spring and summer. Thus, the combination of these different factors resulted in different **treatments** in the different seasons,

i.e. the spring experiments comprised only low vs. high density (= two treatments and no overyearling due to the large difference in size between overyearling and YOY with risk of predation (e.g. Kennedy and Strange 1980)), whereas the autumn experiments comprised combinations of low vs. high density, with vs. without overyearling, and day vs. night (= eight treatments). Recapture of fish was done by portable electrofishing gear after lowering (releasing) the screens which separated the shallow and deep part. Electrofishing thus only function as a mean of enumeration of fish. Depth use was determined by counting the number of YOY recovered in shallow versus deep areas in each section, and the body length (fork length, ± 1 mm) of each individual was measured. When performing night trials, the arenas were stocked at 02:00 am, and fished again at 00:00 the next night when it already had been completely dark for about three hours.

The summer experiment lasted from 14. – 29. June 2010, the autumn experiment from 31. August – 17. September 2010, the winter experiment from 8. – 23. February 2011, and the spring experiment from 7. – 13. May 2011. The experimental depth use study was based on a total number of 609 experimental replicates (Table 1), pilot studies excluded.

Experimental study: Statistics

All statistical analyses were done using R, v. 2.15.3 (R Core Team 2012). The influence of body length, density, time of day (for autumn and winter), and the presence of overyearlings (summer, autumn and winter) on the depth use of individual YOY was modelled using a generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) with a binomial distribution and with section and replicate (nested within section) as random effects.

The function *lmer* from the *lme4* package was used (Bates et al. 2015). Model simplification procedures followed Zuur et al. (2009) using log likelihood ratio tests to remove non-significant interaction and covariate terms, while the main effects of experimental factors (i.e. YOY density and overyearling presence) were kept in all final models. Final models were re-fitted using restricted maximum likelihood (REML) and final model residuals were checked for normal distribution, homogeneity and independence. Separate models were fitted for each season because of the differences in the treatments (i.e. combination of factors tested). The autumn and winter models are similar and are the most complex ones since all listed treatments were performed in these seasons. The models from the other two seasons are shorter versions of the autumn/winter models. The latter can be written as:

$$P_{ijk} = \alpha + \beta_1 D_k + \beta_2 L_k + \beta_3 B_i + \beta_4 T_k + \beta_5 T_k D_k + \beta_6 T_k L_k + \beta_7 T_k B_i + \beta_8 D_k L_k + \beta_9 B_i D_k + \beta_{10} B_i L_k + a_j + a_k + \varepsilon_i$$

where P is the probability of an individual YOY being in the shallow depth, D is the YOY density (one or three fish m^{-2}), L is overyearlings (present or absent), B is the body length and T is the time of day (day or night). Indices i , j and k represent individuals, sections and replicates, respectively. α and β are the fixed parameters, a_j and a_k are the random intercepts for section and replicate respectively, and ε_i is the random error structure (binomial). The spring model does not include the term T (time of day) and L (overyearlings), and the summer model does not include the term T .

Field study: Study sites and experimental design

Our main focus in the field was to study salmon YOY habitat use with respect to depth and distance to shore, density of YOY and density of larger conspecifics. The field data were collected in the three Norwegian rivers Nausta, Stjørdalselva, and Surna by electrofishing transects perpendicular to the shoreline with a portable electrofishing device (for details see: Table 2). Nausta has a natural flow regime, whereas in Surna and Stjørdalselva flow regimes are affected by hydropower regulation. The four fishing stations in Surna were situated from 4.5 to 6.5 km downstream of the power plant outlet, whereas the seven fishing stations in Stjørdalselva were situated from 8.2 to 40.3 km downstream of the power plant outlet. In Surna, there are periods of hydropeaking depending on inflow and market demands. However, no hydropeaking took place during or in the month before our investigation in October 2007. In all three rivers electrofishing took place at gradually declining discharge (Appendix Fig. A1-A3) and at water temperatures between 5 and 9 °C. The rivers were fished in different years (Nausta 2008; Stjørdalselva 2007; Surna 2007), but all fishing took place in October and was finished in less than a week. Since we used electrofishing in our experimental study, it was a natural choice to use electrofishing in our field study as well. Fishing stations were specifically chosen for this study, with emphasis on the ability to electrofish far into the middle of the river, and to have rather homogenous water velocities and bottom substrate over a long stretch so that the transects could be placed into a homogenous habitat in each station. Electrofishing was done by a two person's team using a single, handheld anode and backpack gear without any block nets to fence off the stations nor to separate between shallow and deep habitats. A moveable banner net (1 m²) was used to catch any stunned fish drifting downstream. In addition, the operator of the anode assisted by catching both unstunned and stunned fish with a dip-net. The banner net was emptied after each sweep before being moved to position for the next planned sweep. Fish observed

escaping the fished area were noted and added to the capture if it could be identified to species and age class however, such observations were very few.

Electrofishing was standardized by performing similar straight sweeps of about 1.2 m length with the anode in transects perpendicular to the shore. Each transect was fished from the shoreline to the middle of the river or until it became too deep to fish (~80 cm). The perpendicular distance between sweeps was 1 m. Species (Atlantic salmon, brown trout (*Salmo trutta*)), age class (YOY, overyearlings) and number of caught fish were noted for each sweep and the water depth at the lower end of the sweep was measured to the nearest cm. Only data of Atlantic salmon were used in the analyses. We carried out the sampling with as little disturbance of the sampling location as possible other than the necessary movements of the two-person crew to do the sampling. After completion of the first transect, both the operator and assistant went back to shore on the same way they came in to avoid disturbance of nearby fish, moved upstream for five meters and repeated the same procedure in the new transect (for details see: Table 3). The catch was kept alive in buckets and released back to the river after finishing the sampling of all transects in a station.

Field study: Statistics

The field data was used to calculate the proportion of YOY caught in the shallow and to model whether this proportion was influenced by the density of YOY in the transect, the density of overyearlings in the shallow, or the density of overyearlings in the transect. Therefore, an assumed border between shallow and deep areas had to be classified, which also enabled us to compare the results from the field study with the results from the experimental study. Since the maximum water depth of the shallow area in the experimental study was 31 cm, a division value

of 30 cm was chosen for the field study. This also ensured a relatively equal sampling effort of shallow and deep areas, as 46% of all fishing took place at water depths > 30 cm. The proportion of fishing effort in the deep habitat was 40 % in Nausta, 47% in Stjørdalselva and 48% in Surna. When preparing the original data for the analyses, each individual YOY was assigned to either the deep or shallow area, depending on where it was caught. We calculated how many YOY as well as overyearlings were caught per meter sweep with the electrofishing anode for each habitat type (i.e. deep or shallow area), which we define here as fish density (i.e. fish m⁻¹). Then the relative density in the shallow area was calculated by dividing the density of YOY in the shallow by the density of YOY in the whole transect. Only transects where fish were caught were analysed. Each fishing station was assigned to an individual index number which was used as a random effect in the analysis.

As for the experimental part, the function *lmer* and model selection followed by model validation was used to analyse the data. (Zuur et al. 2009; Pinheiro et al. 2013). The full model can be written as:

$$P_{ij} = \alpha + \beta_1 D_i + \beta_2 E_i + \beta_3 F_i + \beta_6 R_i + a_j + \varepsilon_i$$

where P_{ij} is the relative density of YOY in the shallow habitat in transect i within section j , D_i is the density of YOY in the transect, E_i is the density of overyearlings in the shallow, F_i is the density of overyearlings in the transect, and R_i are the three rivers. α and β are the fixed parameters, and a_j is the random intercepts for the station.

Results

Experimental study

Spring

For the spring data, the interaction between YOY density and fish size (log likelihood ratio test: $X^2 = 2.45$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.118$) could be removed from the full model during model simplification, but fish size remained ($X^2 = 37.0$; $df = 1$; $P < 0.0001$). Based on the final model, YOY density had no effect on the probability of YOY occupying the shallow area ($z = 0.33$; $P = 0.74$). However, this probability decreased significantly with increasing fork length (slope-value $\pm$ SE: -0.09 ± 0.01 ; $z = -6.11$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 2).

Summer

For the summer data, both the interaction between overyearlings presence and fish density ($X^2 = 0.13$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.72$) and the interaction between fish density and fish size ($X^2 = 3.04$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.08$) could be removed from the full model during model simplification, but the interaction between overyearlings presence and fish size remained ($X^2 = 39.59$; $df = 1$; $P < 0.0001$). Based on the final model, YOY density had no significant effect on the probability for YOY to be in the shallow area ($z = 0.62$, $P = 0.54$). Without overyearlings present, an increase in fork length significantly decreased this probability (-0.11 ± 0.02 ; $z = -5.11$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 3), whereas with overyearlings present an increase in fork length significantly increased the probability for a YOY to be in the shallow area (0.13 ± 0.02 ; $t = 0.53$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 3).

Autumn

For the autumn data, both the interactions between overyearlings presence and density ($X^2 = 0.0002$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.99$), time of day and fish size ($X^2 = 1.03$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.31$), density and fish size ($X^2 = 1.46$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.23$), and overyearlings presence and fish size ($X^2 = 2.45$; df

= 1; $P = 0.12$) could be removed during model simplification. Both the interaction between time of day and overyearlings presence ($X^2 = 4.94$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.026$), time of day and density ($X^2 = 5.35$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.021$) and the main effect of fish size ($X^2 = 39.14$; $df = 1$; $P < 0.0001$) remained. Based on the final model, an increase in fish size generally decreased the probability of finding a YOY in the shallow area (-0.03 ± 0.004 ; $z = -6.19$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 4). During daytime (with and without overyearlings present) an increase in density (from one to three YOY m^{-2}) significantly decreased the probability of a YOY to be in the shallow area (-0.66 ± 0.26 ; $z = -2.57$; $P = 0.010$; Fig. 4). The presence of overyearlings during daytime at both densities significantly increased the probability of finding a YOY in the shallow area (1.47 ± 0.28 ; $z = 5.34$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 4). During nighttime (with and without overyearlings present) an increase in density significantly increased the probability of a YOY to be in the shallow area (0.76 ± 0.32 ; $z = 2.35$; $P = 0.019$; Fig. 4). The presence of overyearlings during nighttime at both densities significantly decreased the probability of finding a YOY in the shallow area (-0.74 ± 0.34 ; $z = -2.21$; $P = 0.027$; Fig. 4).

Winter

For the winter data, both the interactions between overyearlings presence and fish size ($X^2 = 0.0062$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.94$), time of day and density ($X^2 = 0.29$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.59$), overyearlings presence and density ($X^2 = 1.51$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.22$), density and fish size ($X^2 = 2.67$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.10$), and time of day and fish size ($X^2 = 2.83$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.09$) could be removed during model simplification. Both the interaction between time of day and overyearlings presence ($X^2 = 4.40$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.036$), and the main effect of fish size ($X^2 = 44.22$; $df = 1$; $P < 0.0001$) remained. Based on the final model, YOY density had no significant effect on the

probability of finding a YOY in the shallow area ($z = -1.17$, $P = 0.24$). In general, an increase in fish size significantly decreased this probability (-0.03 ± 0.004 ; $z = -6.75$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 5). There was a tendency for a decreased probability of finding a YOY in the shallow area during daytime when overyearlings were present (-0.47 ± 0.27 ; $z = -1.77$; $P = 0.078$; Fig. 5). The presence of overyearlings during nighttime significantly increased the probability of finding a YOY in the shallow area (0.75 ± 0.36 ; $z = 2.10$; $P = 0.036$; Fig. 5).

Field study

The field study was performed to test whether the findings from the experiments could be confirmed in natural rivers: The relative density of YOY in the shallow was not significantly affected by the density of YOY in the whole transect ($X^2 = 3.45$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.06$). Furthermore, it was independent both of the density of overyearlings in the whole transect ($X^2 = 0.12$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.73$) and the density of overyearlings in the shallow ($X^2 = 0.78$; $df = 1$; $P = 0.38$). Finally, the relative density of YOY in the shallow was independent of river ($X^2 = 4.35$; $df = 2$; $P = 0.11$).

Discussion

Stranding of riverine organisms is one of the main adverse ecological effects of hydropower development of rivers, particularly when hydropower production entails frequent and rapid changes in water discharge (i.e. hydropeaking) (e.g. Irvine et al. 2015; Hauer et al. 2017; Kelly et al. 2017). Mitigation of adverse effects depends on detailed knowledge about the way the use of “risky” areas is influenced by population density. The experimental results based on reared fish in relatively narrow confinements were confirmed by observations of native fish in rivers to ensure the generality of our results. Density-dependent habitat use in juvenile Atlantic

salmon has been studied previously (e.g. Bult et al. 1999; Gibson et al. 2008), but primarily with a mesohabitat scale focus (e.g. pools, riffles, runs). By focusing on the microhabitat scale, we were able to address the issue of density-dependent depth use in more detail. The effects of hydropeaking on organisms are assessed by a combination of stranding risk and the effects (especially mortality) of stranding on organisms like fish. This latter part has been investigated by e.g. Harby and Noack (2013) and Puffer et al. (2017).

Although the differences between the low (one YOY m⁻²) and high density (three YOY m⁻²) treatment in our experiments were relatively large, none or only very subtle effects of fish density on YOY depth use were observed. Density effects were apparent during autumn, but of small magnitude and thus of low biological importance. Maximum fish densities observed in the field study were not as high as the high density in the experiments, but nonetheless covered a relatively broad and representative range. Neither density of YOY nor density of overyearlings influenced depth use of YOY in the field. Overall, our results suggest that the use of the shallow and hence “risky” areas is **density-independent** (scenario 2 in introduction), i.e. the same proportion of the population will use the shallow area regardless of population density. Nonetheless, juvenile salmon from deep areas may distribute into the shallow areas even when fish density becomes reduced due to stranding mortalities. Thus, low density does not lead to reduced stranding risk and shallow areas may therefore function as a sink in a within-generation source-sink dynamic under a repeated hydropeaking scenario.

Population-level effects of anthropogenically induced mortality will also depend on which individuals are at the highest risk. If mortality is selective and for a given life stage primarily targets individuals with poor future prospects, then the population effects can be expected to be less severe than under the converse situation or if mortality is non-selective. Our

study demonstrates that for a given life stage (i.e. regardless of the season), the smallest juvenile salmon had always the highest probability of being in the shallow area, which suggests that they will face the highest stranding risk. Thus, under strong size-selective mortality (i.e. selection against small individuals) during later life-stages, this will reduce the population-level effects. However, existing data suggests that this may not be the case for Atlantic salmon, as patterns of size-selective mortality may vary both across years and seasons (Hendry et al. 2003). Modelling of the effects of stranding of salmon parr and smolt, emphasises the effect of larger fish (presmolts and smolts) where no compensatory mechanisms operate if large fish die in freshwater (Sauterleute et al. 2016). The experimental conditions ensured identical areas for deep and shallow depths, and if the experimental fish are composed of sedentary, floaters or wanderers (Roy et al. 2013), they have similar areas to disperse into or distribute within the experimental areas. We emphasize that we did not monitor individual behaviour in the experiments and the present investigation focus on density dependent use of shallow areas under a set number of conditions like season, diurnal pattern etc. As the experiment was performed with a balanced replication structure, any increase in experimental parameters would lead to a large increase the number of experiments.

A second additional factor influencing population-level effects is the timing (i.e. life-stage) of anthropogenically induced mortality. Different life stages may be targeted to different extents, and this will be of importance if populations are regulated by sequential density dependence (Ratikainen et al. 2008). For example, high induced mortality during early stages will have little effect if the population experiences strong density-dependence later in life (i.e. compensatory mortality). Our study shows a decrease in the use of the shallow areas throughout the first year of their lives. This is consistent with previous studies (Greenberg et al. 1996; Mäki-

Petäys et al. 2004; Hedger et al. 2005; Ayllón et al. 2009; Ayllón et al. 2013), suggesting that the earliest stages following emergence from nests will be most susceptible to stranding during hydropeaking. The population-level effect will then depend on whether increased early mortality will be **compensated for** later in life due to sequential density dependence. This issue has been debated for salmonids, where so-called self-thinning lines have been interpreted as showing continuous density dependence throughout the juvenile stage by some authors (Elliott 1993), but not others (Armstrong 1997). Later empirical studies have demonstrated that the temporal pattern of density dependence, i.e. whether density dependence occurs only early in life or more continuously throughout life, will depend on the relative abundance of habitat types that are suitable for the different life stages (Elliott and Hurley 1998). For example, in rivers where a high proportion of the habitat is suitable for early life stages, low competition and high survival during these stages will cause intense competition for the rarer habitat suitable for later stages, and hence density dependence will occur more continuously throughout the freshwater stage (Teichert et al. 2013). Thus, the population-level effect of hydropeaking will be site-specific. In general, rivers with abundant habitat for older juveniles (particularly structural shelter (Finstad et al. 2009)), which are expected to experience little density dependence for older juvenile stages, are predicted to be most negatively influenced by hydropeaking and associated high mortality during early stages. On the other hand, Bellmore et al. (2015) infers that increased spatial complexity may reduce interactions like predation. We have deliberately held substrate composition in both shallow and deep areas identical in both experiments and field studies, since substrate coarseness is important for hiding, but hiding into substrate increase risk of stranding (Puffer et al. 2015).

The experimental set up had identical areas for shallow and deep areas and trapdoors ensured a precise separation between the two areas. Depth use determination was ensured without knowledge on parameters like feeding and predation protection (e.g. Bellmore et al. 2015) or the existence of hierarchical (dominant/subdominant) and non-hierarchical (floater) strategies (Roy et al. 2013) among juvenile salmonids.

The present study also demonstrates that the effect of hydropeaking may depend on the population structure, because the presence of overyearlings had significant effects on YOY habitat use. Surprisingly, the presence of overyearlings in summer mainly influenced the depth use of the larger YOY, who responded by increased use of the shallow habitat. Visual observations helped to explain this phenomenon, since we were able to observe the arenas from a nearby platform and could distinguish between two reactions of YOY when overyearlings were approaching them: small YOY, who actively swam in the water column, stopped swimming and hid in the substrate, whereas larger YOY actively swam away. The less overt response among the smaller individuals may contribute to the previously reported difference in growth responses to inter-cohort competition, where growth of larger YOY was more strongly influenced by overyearling densities than that of smaller YOY (Einum and Kvingedal 2011). The reaction to overyearlings was more consistent in autumn, since the presence of an overyearling always resulted in an increased use of the shallow areas. Here we observed the classical situation of intercohort competition, where smaller individuals are outcompeted by larger individuals and are forced to use sub-optimal habitats (Mäki-Petäys et al. 2004; Ayllón et al. 2013). The same was true for winter, but the effect size was small and thus biologically less important. Because of the population structure found in natural rivers, YOY are forced to use shallower waters than they would without intercohort competition and thus are more susceptible to stranding. This is

beneficial from a production perspective, as the mortality of larger smolt or presmolt will be less compensated for if they die compared to smaller/younger fish (Sauterleute et al. 2016).

Both during autumn and winter YOY were more often in the shallow area during night-time than during daytime, and this effect was as large as the effect of presence of overyearlings. This behaviour is well documented in the literature (e.g. Schmutz et al. 2015) and may lead to the naïve prediction that discharge reductions will be more damaging during night than during day. Yet, field observations have shown that discharge reductions in winter led to fewer stranding casualties during night than during day (Saltveit et al. 2001). This is most likely due to the diurnal change in activity at low water temperatures (Puffer et al. 2015), as they become sedentary and hide in the substrate during daytime, when water temperatures drop below 5–8 °C (e.g. Heggenes and Dokk 2001; Scruton et al. 2005). Thus, even if a larger proportion of the population inhabits shallow areas at night, they are less susceptible to stranding as they are better able to detect and respond to the decreasing water level when active.

In the present study, we found no or small effects of fish density on the use of shallow shorelines of YOY Atlantic salmon. However, the lack of a density-dependent pattern show that there is a potential for each stranding event to cause a more or less constant mortality rate due to redistribution of fish into shallow areas. Shallow areas may thus function as a sink in a within-generation source-sink system under repeated hydropeaking. Furthermore, our data suggest that the earliest stages following emergence from nests will be most susceptible to stranding during hydropeaking. Depending on the habitat characteristics, such increased early mortality may be compensated by reduced mortality during later stages. Thus, site-specific population-level effects of hydropeaking can be expected. Caution has therefore to be exercised in the hydropeaking activity where water is led into rivers where seasonal and diurnal patterns and ramping rates are

key parameters to be considered in the operating manuals for hydroelectric power plants (e.g. Forseth and Harby 2014; Hauer et al. 2017). These manuals are usually issued by governmental agencies and are under severe public awareness as exemplified with the use of the endangered species act, red lists or EU Water framework directive as examples of management tools.

Acknowledgements

The experiments were approved by the National Committees for Research Ethics in Norway on animal experiments (license to Knut Bergesen) and the staff of the NINA research station Ims is especially acknowledged for logistical help. The work was part of the EnviPEAK-project, financed by Centre for Environmental Design of Renewable Energy (CEDREN), one of the Norwegian Research Council's Research Centres for Environmental Friendly Energy (FME contract-number: 193818). Data associated with this paper are available on request.

References

- Armstrong, J.D. 1997. Self-thinning in juvenile sea trout and other salmonid fishes revisited. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 66(4): 519-526. doi:10.2307/5946.
- Armstrong, J.D., Kemp, P.S., Kennedy, G.J.A., Ladle, M., and Milner, N.J. 2003. Habitat requirements of Atlantic salmon and brown trout in rivers and streams. *Fish. Res.* 62(2): 143-170.
- Ayllón, D., Almodovar, A., Nicola, G.G., and Elvira, B. 2009. Interactive effects of cover and hydraulics on brown trout habitat selection patterns. *River Res. Appl.* 25(8): 1051-1065. doi:10.1002/rra.1215.

- 472 Ayllón, D., Nicola, G.G., Parra, I., Elvira, B., and Almodovar, A. 2013. Intercohort density
473 dependence drives brown trout habitat selection. *Acta Oecol.-Int. J. Ecol.* 46: 1-9.
474 doi:10.1016/j.actao.2012.10.007.
- 475 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker S. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models
476 Using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* 67(1): 1-48.
- 477 Berg, O.K., Bremset, G., Puffer, M., and Hanssen, K. 2014. Selective segregation in intraspecific
478 competition between juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*).
479 *Ecol. Freshw. Fish.* 23(4): 544-555. doi:10.1111/eff.12107.
- 480 Bellmore, J.R., Baxter, C. V., and Connolly, P. J. 2015. Spatial complexity reduces interaction
481 strengths in the meta-food web of a river floodplain mosaic. *Ecology* 96 (1): 274-283.
- 482 Bradford, M.J. 1997. An experimental study of stranding of juvenile salmonids on gravel bars
483 and in side channels during rapid flow decreases. *Regul. Rivers: Res. Manage.* 13(5): 395-401.
484 doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-1646(199709/10)13:5<395::aid-rrr464>3.0.co;2-l.
- 485 Bult, T.P., Riley, S.C., Haedrich, R.L., Gibson, R.J., and Heggenes, J. 1999. Density-dependent
486 habitat selection by juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in experimental riverine habitats.
487 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 56(7): 1298-1306. doi:10.1139/f99-074.
- 488 Donovan, T.M., and Thompson, F.R. 2001. Modeling the ecological trap hypothesis: A habitat
489 and demographic analysis for migrant songbirds. *Ecol. Appl.* 11(3): 871-882. doi:10.1890/1051-
490 0761(2001)011[0871:MTETHA]2.0.CO;2.
- 491 Einum, S., and Kvingedal, E. 2011. Relative importance of size-based competitive ability and
492 degree of niche overlap in inter-cohort competition of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) juveniles.
493 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 68(6): 969-976. doi:10.1139/f2011-042.

- 494 Elliott, J.M. 1993. The self-thinning rule applied to juvenile sea-trout, *Salmo trutta*. *J. Anim.*
495 *Ecol.* 62(2): 371-379. doi:10.2307/5368.
- 496 Elliott, J.M., and Hurley, M.A. 1998. Population regulation in adult, but not juvenile, resident
497 trout (*Salmo trutta*) in a lake district stream. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 67(2): 280-286. doi:10.1046/j.1365-
498 2656.1998.00185.x.
- 499 Finstad, A.G., Einum, S., Ugedal, O., and Forseth, T. 2009. Spatial distribution of limited
500 resources and local density regulation in juvenile Atlantic salmon. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 78(1): 226-235.
501 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01476.x.
- 502 Forseth, T., and Harby, A. 2014. Handbook for environmental design of regulated salmon rivers.
503 Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, Trondheim.
- 504 Gibson, A.J.F., Bowby, H.D., and Amiro, P.G. 2008. Are wild populations ideally distributed?
505 Variations in density-dependent habitat use by age class in juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo*
506 *salar*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 65(8): 1667-1680. doi:10.1139/f09-087.
- 507 Grant, J.W.A., and Imre, I. 2005. Patterns of density-dependent growth in juvenile stream-
508 dwelling salmonids. *J. Fish Biol.* 67: 100-110. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2005.00916.x.
- 509 Greenberg, L., Svendsen, P., and Harby, A. 1996. Availability of microhabitats and their use by
510 brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) and grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*) in the River Vojman, Sweden.
511 *Regul. Rivers: Res. Manage.* 12(2-3): 287-303. doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-
512 1646(199603)12:2/3<287::aid-rrr396>3.3.co;2-v.
- 513 Hale, R., and Swearer, S.E. 2016. Ecological traps: current evidence and future directions. *Proc.*
514 *R. Soc. Lond. [Biol]* 283(1824). doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2647.
- 515 Halleraker, J.H., Saltveit, S.J., Harby, A., Arnekleiv, J.V., Fjeldstad, H.P., and Kohler, B. 2003.
516 Factors influencing stranding of wild juvenile brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) during rapid and

- 517 frequent flow decreases in an artificial stream. *River Res. Appl.* 19(5-6): 589-603.
518 doi:10.1002/rr.752.
- 519 Harby, A., and Noack, M. 2013. Rapid Flow Fluctuations and Impacts on Fish and the Aquatic
520 Ecosystem. In *Ecohydraulics: an integrated approach*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. pp. 323-335.
- 521 Hauer, C., Siviglia, A., and Zolezzi, G. 2017. Hydropeaking in regulated rivers – From process
522 understanding to design of mitigation measures. *Sci. Total Environ.* 579: 22-26.
523 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.11.028.
- 524 Hedger, R.D., Dodson, J.J., Bergeron, N.E., and Caron, F. 2005. Habitat selection by juvenile
525 Atlantic salmon: the interaction between physical habitat and abundance. *J. Fish Biol.* 67(4):
526 1054-1071. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2005.00808.x.
- 527 Heggenes, J., Bagliniere, J.L., and Cunjak, R.A. 1999. Spatial niche variability for young
528 Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) in heterogeneous streams. *Ecol.*
529 *Freshwat. Fish* 8(1): 1-21. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0633.1999.tb00048.x.
- 530 Heggenes, J., and Dokk, J.G. 2001. Contrasting temperatures, waterflows, and light: Seasonal
531 habitat selection by young Atlantic salmon and brown trout in a boreonemoral river. *Regul.*
532 *Rivers: Res. Manage.* 17(6): 623-635. doi:10.1002/rrr.620.
- 533 Hendry, A.P., Letcher, B.H., and Gries, G. 2003. Estimating natural selection acting on stream-
534 dwelling Atlantic salmon: Implications for the restoration of extirpated populations. *Conserv.*
535 *Biol.* 17(3): 795-805. doi:10.1046/j.1523-1739.2003.02075.x.
- 536 Irvine, R.L., Thorley, J.L., Westcott, R., Schmidt, D., and DeRosa, D. 2015. Why do fish strand?
537 An analysis of ten years of flow reduction monitoring data from the Columbia and Kootenay
538 rivers, Canada. *River Res. Appl.* 31(10): 1242-1250. doi:10.1002/rra.2823.

- 539 Kelly, B., Smokorowski, K.E., and Power, M. 2017. Impact of river regulation and hydropеaking
540 on the growth, condition and field metabolism of Brook Trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*). *Ecol.*
541 *Freshw. Fish.* 26(4): 666-675. doi:10.1111/eff.12310.
- 542 Kennedy, G.J.A., and Strange, C.D. 1980. Population-changes after 2 years of salmon (*Salmo*
543 *salar* L.) stocking in upland trout (*Salmo trutta* L.) streams. *J. Fish Biol.* 17(5): 577-586.
544 doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.1980.tb02789.x.
- 545 Kokko, H., and Sutherland, W.J. 2001. Ecological traps in changing environments: Ecological
546 and evolutionary consequences of a behaviourally mediated Allee effect. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* 3(5):
547 603-610.
- 548 Melcher, A.H., Bakken, T.H., Friedrich, T., Greimel, F., Humer, N., Schmutz, B., and Webb, J.A.
549 2016. Drawing together multiple lines of evidence from assessment studies of hydropеaking
550 pressures in impacted rivers. *Freshw. Sci.* 36: 220-230.
- 551 Mäki-Petäys, A., Erkinaro, J., Niemela, E., Huusko, A., and Muotka, T. 2004. Spatial
552 distribution of juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) in a subarctic river: size-specific changes
553 in a strongly seasonal environment. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 61(12): 2329-2338.
554 doi:10.1139/f04-218.
- 555 Nagrodski, A., Raby, G.D., Hasler, C.T., Taylor, M.K., and Cooke, S.J. 2012. Fish stranding in
556 freshwater systems: Sources, consequences, and mitigation. *J. Environ. Manage.* 103: 133-141.
557 doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.03.007.
- 558 Nielsen, J. L. 1992. Microhabitat-specific foraging behavior, diet, and growth of juvenile coho
559 salmon. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **121** (5): 617-634.

- 560 Pang, M., Zhang, L., Ulgiati, S., and Wang, C. 2015. Ecological impacts of small hydropower in
561 China: Insights from an emergy analysis of a case plant. *Energy Policy* 76: 112-122.
562 doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2014.10.009.
- 563 Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., EISPACK, and R-core. 2013. nlme: Linear and
564 Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models. <http://cran.rproject.org/web/packages/nlme/index.html>
- 565 Poff, N.L., Allan, J.D., Bain, M.B., Karr, J.R., Prestegard, K.L., Richter, B.D., Sparks, R.E., and
566 Stromberg, J.C. 1997. The natural flow regime: a paradigm for river conservation and
567 restoration. *Biosci.* 47(11): 769-784. doi:10.2307/1313099.
- 568 Puckett, K.J., and Dill, L.M. 1985. The energetics of feeding territoriality in juvenile coho salmon
569 (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). *Behaviour* 92 (1): 97-111.
- 570 Puffer, M., Berg, O.K., Huusko, A., Vehanen, T., Forseth, T., and Einum, S. 2015. Seasonal
571 effects of hydropeaking on growth, energetics and movement of juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo*
572 *salar*). *River Res. Appl.* 31(9): 1101-1108. doi:10.1002/rra.2801.
- 573 Puffer, M., Berg, O.K., Einum, S., Saltveit, S.J., and Forseth, T. 2017. Energetic Consequences
574 of Stranding of Juvenile Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *J. Wat. Res. Prot.* 9(2): 20.
575 doi:10.4236/jwarp.2017.92012.
- 576 R Core Team. 2012. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation
577 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.r-project.org/>
- 578 Ratikainen, I.I., Gill, J.A., Gunnarsson, T.G., Sutherland, W.J., and Kokko, H. 2008. When
579 density dependence is not instantaneous: theoretical developments and management
580 implications. *Ecol. Lett.* 11(2): 184-198. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01122.x.

- 581 Roy, M. L., Roy, A. G., Grant, J.W.A., and Bergeron, N.E. 2012. Individual variability in the
582 movement behaviour of juvenile Atlantic salmon. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **70** (2):339-347.
- 583 Saltveit, S.J., Halleraker, J.H., Arnekleiv, J.V., and Harby, A. 2001. Field experiments on
584 stranding in juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) during rapid
585 flow decreases caused by hydropedaking. *Regul. Riv.: Res. Manage.* 17(4-5): 609-622.
586 doi:10.1002/rrr.652.
- 587 Sauterleute, J.F., Hedger, R.D., Hauer, C., Pulg, U., Skoglund, H., Sundt-Hansen, L.E., Bakken,
588 T.H., and Ugedal, O. 2016. Modelling the effects of stranding on the Atlantic salmon population
589 in the Dale River, Norway. *Sci. Tot. Env.* 573: 574-584.
590 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.08.080.
- 591 Schlaepfer, M.A., Runge, M.C., and Sherman, P.W. 2002. Ecological and evolutionary traps.
592 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 17(10): 474-480. doi:10.1016/s0169-5347(02)02580-6.
- 593 Heggenes, J., and Borgström, R. 1991. Effect on habitat types on survival, spatial distribution
594 and production of an allopatric cohort of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar* L., under conditions of
595 low competition. *J. Fish Biol.* 38, 267-280.
- 596 Schmutz, S., Bakken, T.H., Friedrich, T., Greimel, F., Harby, A., Jungwirth, M., Melcher, A.,
597 Unfer, G., and Zeiringer, B. 2015. Response of fish communities to hydrological and
598 morphological alterations in hydropedaking rivers of Austria. *River Res. Appl.* 31(8): 919-930.
599 doi:10.1002/rra.2795.
- 600 Scruton, D.A., Pennell, C.J., Robertson, M.J., Ollerhead, L.M.N., Clarke, K.D., Alfredsen, K.,
601 Harby, A., and McKinley, R.S. 2005. Seasonal response of juvenile Atlantic salmon to
602 experimental hydropedaking power generation in Newfoundland, Canada. *N. Am. J. Fish.*
603 *Manage.* 25(3): 964-974. doi:10.1577/m04-133.1.

- 604 Teichert, M.A.K., Einum, S., Finstad, A.G., Ugedal, O., and Forseth, T. 2013. Ontogenetic
605 timing of density dependence: location-specific patterns reflect distribution of a limiting
606 resource. *Popul. Ecol.* 55(4): 575-583. doi:10.1007/s10144-013-0387-0.
- 607 Van Cappellen, P., and Maavara, T. 2016. Rivers in the Anthropocene: Global scale
608 modifications of riverine nutrient fluxes by damming. *Eco. Hydrobiol.* 16(2): 106-111.
609 doi:10.1016/j.ecohyd.2016.04.001.
- 610 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A., and Smith, G.M. 2009. *Mixed Effects*
611 *Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. Springer, New York.

Draft

613 **Tables**

614 Table 1: Overview over the experiments, listing the different treatments and which factor combinations that were tested in the four
615 seasons. YOY are the young-of-the-year Atlantic salmon, overyearlings are the >1 year old fish, size of fish was measured as fork
616 length in mm (mean ± SD), and relative size difference between overyearlings and YOY is the size of overyearlings divided by the size
617 of YOY.

Season	Time of Day	Density YOY (fish m ⁻²)	Overyearlings	Number of replicates	Size YOY (mm)	Number of YOY	Size overyearlings (mm)	Relative size difference
Spring	Day	1	absent	36	33 ± 4	353	–	–
	Day	3	absent	37	34 ± 4	1014	–	–
Summer	Day	1	absent	21	49 ± 10	222	–	–
	Day	3	absent	21	48 ± 10	620	–	–
	Day	1	present	61	47 ± 7	596	167 ± 16	3.6
	Day	3	present	57	46 ± 7	1551	172 ± 15	3.7

Autumn	Day	1	absent	21	80 ± 12	200	—	—
	Day	3	absent	21	80 ± 12	614	—	—
	Day	1	present	24	81 ± 12	244	208 ± 12	2.6
	Day	3	present	24	81 ± 13	660	206 ± 14	2.5
	Night	1	absent	24	83 ± 11	236	—	—
	Night	3	absent	24	82 ± 11	721	—	—
	Night	1	present	24	85 ± 12	243	205 ± 12	2.4
	Night	3	present	24	82 ± 12	664	205 ± 10	2.5
Winter	Day	1	absent	24	102 ± 23	242	—	—
	Day	3	absent	24	106 ± 22	706	—	—
	Day	1	present	24	106 ± 21	244	172 ± 11	1.6
	Day	3	present	22	112 ± 20	647	175 ± 11	1.6
	Night	1	absent	26	110 ± 21	256	—	—
	Night	3	absent	25	114 ± 18	719	—	—
	Night	1	present	23	112 ± 18	229	176 ± 11	1.6

Night	3	present	24	119 ± 14	717	176 ± 10	1.5
-------	---	---------	----	----------	-----	----------	-----

Draft

619 Table 2: Details of the three rivers of the field study. Size of fish was measured as fork length in mm (mean $\pm$ SD).

River	Number of stations	Number of transects	Range max. distance from shore (m)	Range max. depth (cm)	Size YOY (mm)	Size overyearlings (mm)	Relative size difference
Nausta	2	16	10–15	33–63	51 $\pm$ 4	88 $\pm$ 14	1.7
Stjørdalselva	7	71	5–47	45–90	42 $\pm$ 4	65 $\pm$ 6	1.5
Surna	4	43	5–16	25–70	41 $\pm$ 3	79 $\pm$ 17	1.9

621 Table 3: Details of the two year classes of Atlantic salmon caught in the three rivers of the field study. YOY are the young-of-the year
622 and overyearlings are > 1 year old individuals. Fish densities are given as mean ± SD values.

River	Number of caught YOY	YOY density in shallow (fish m ⁻¹)	YOY density in transect (fish m ⁻¹)	Number of caught overyearlings	Overyearlings density in shallow (fish m ⁻¹)	Overyearlings density in transect (fish m ⁻¹)
Nausta	197	0.87 ± 0.47	0.95 ± 0.59	133	0.73 ± 0.64	0.75 ± 0.60
Stjørdalselva	261	0.63 ± 1.08	0.31 ± 0.24	112	0.14 ± 0.23	0.13 ± 0.15
Surna	293	1.14 ± 0.78	0.76 ± 0.39	129	0.18 ± 0.23	0.32 ± 0.23

623

Figure Legends

Fig. 1: Top view and perspective view of an arena used in the experiments. 1: Water inlet, 2: deep area, 3: shallow area, 4: mesh screen separating two sections, 5: trapdoor separating the deep and shallow sections, 6: Water outlet.

Fig. 2: Probability for a YOY Atlantic salmon being in the shallow area in relation to its fork length (in mm) in spring (black solid line). Grey lines indicate posterior calculated 95% confidence intervals.

Fig. 3: Probability for a YOY Atlantic salmon being in the shallow area in relation to its fork length (in mm) in summer, either without (black solid line) or with (black dashed line) overyearlings present. Grey solid and dashed lines indicate the posterior calculated 95% confidence intervals.

Fig. 4: Probability for a YOY Atlantic salmon being in the shallow area in relation to its fork length (in mm) in autumn in either the low (black solid line) or high (black dashed line) density experiments, A) during daytime without overyearlings present, B) during daytime with overyearlings present, C) during night-time without overyearlings present and D) during night-time with overyearlings present. Grey solid and dashed lines indicate the posterior calculated 95% confidence intervals.

Fig. 5: Probability for a YOY Atlantic salmon being in the shallow area in relation to its fork length (in mm) in winter either without (black solid line) or with (black dashed line) overyearlings present, A) during daytime and B) during night-time. Grey solid and dashed lines indicate the posterior calculated 95% confidence intervals.

Draft

651 **FIGURES**

Draft

Fig. 1

654

655 Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

Fig. 5

Appendix:

Fig. A1: Hydrograph for river Nausta depicting the period one month before electrofishing (mean daily discharge in m^3s^{-1}). The actual date of electrofishing is marked with a black dot.

Fig. A2: Hydrograph for river Surna depicting the period one month before electrofishing (mean daily discharge in m^3s^{-1}). The actual date of electrofishing is marked with a black dot.

Draft

Fig. A3: Hydrograph for river Stjørdalselva depicting the period one month before electrofishing (mean daily discharge in m^3s^{-1}). The actual dates of electrofishing are marked with black dots.

Fig. A4: One of the arenas used in the experiments. The water inlet is on the right side, the water outlet on the left. White tarps are providing shade and overhead protection. The photo depicts the 20 hour acclimatisation period when fish could swim freely around in the sections to choose their preferred habitat, i.e. the deep area close to the outer wall or the shallow area close to the inner wall. The mesh screens (“trap doors”) are therefore in the upper position, suspended over the water surface. The ropes that are used to activate the trap doors are leading to the centre of the whole construction, which is the place the operator will be standing when releasing them and thus ending the 20 hour acclimatisation period.

Fig. A5: One of the arenas during the 20 hours acclimatisation period seen from upstream. White tarps cover about 50% of each section. The "trap doors" are locked in place above the water surface and are ready to get dropped by removing the metal bolts that are attached to ropes.

Fig. A6: Arena during fishing: The tarps are removed and the trap doors are lowered to separate the shallow from the deep area.

Fig. A7: Inside of the arena: Detail of the downward slope from the shallow to the deep area. The metal rail in the middle will hold the trap door in place once lowered. Fine plastic mesh is fastened to a wooden construction separating the sections from each other.