Title:

Influence of water-level variability on fish assemblage and natural reproduction following connectivity enhancement in a Typha dominated coastal wetland, USA

John Paul Leblanc* and John M. Farrell

State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry and Thousand Islands Biological Station

* Corresponding Author: 1 Forestry Drive, 253 Illick Hall, Syracuse NY 13210, johnpaul.leblanc@gmail.com

Funding: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the Fish, Enhancement, Mitigation, and Research Fund, NOAA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative

Abstract:

We evaluated a wetland habitat modification strategy to contrast fish assemblage structure and the production of young-of-the-year (YOY) fish between different engineered habitats (i.e., spawning pool complexes and connectivity channels) relative to unmodified lateral channels in a large drowned river mouth tributary of the St. Lawrence River. Prior to habitat modifications, the coastal wetland was impaired by water level regulations, dominance of invasive hybrid cattail, Typha x glauca, that collectively replaced or created barriers to seasonally flooded spawning habitats important to fish. Connectivity enhancements provided fish access along a wetland habitat gradient from sedge-meadows to the deeper water robust emergent main-channel. Across an eight-year fish emigration dataset (2012, 2013, 2016-2021) more than 90% of all captured fish ($N_{total} = 218,086$ fish) were YOY and modified habitats outperformed the unmodified channels in total fish catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) per year (both YOY and non-YOY). Spawning pool complexes had higher YOY species richness than unmodified channel habitats. Fish assemblage structure differed between the modified habitats, where connectivity channels and unmodified channels shared a more similar fish assemblage than spawning pool complexes. Modified habitats, however, supported warmer water and higher dissolved oxygen than the unmodified channels. Redundancy analysis and linear mixed-effect modeling with abiotic variables (hydrology, temperature and dissolved oxygen) showed significant effects on fish assemblage structure, species richness and CPUE of fish emigrating from the modified and unmodified habitats. Historic flooding in 2017 and 2019 was a primary driver of YOY fish production and fish assemblage structure, but also appeared associated with

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/jfb.15468

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

near anoxic conditions systemwide. YOY fish for several species was inversely affected by floods at spawning pool complexes, however CPUE of YOY fish for these species appeared unaffected at the connectivity channels despite low dissolved oxygen. Diversified habitat structure (i.e., connectivity channels and spawning pool complexes) offers a management option to enhance habitat for fish that allowed compensatory effects on the capture of YOY fish of several species during floods. This multi-faceted outcome from the habitat modifications resulted in unique fish assemblages between the channelized and spawning pool habitat. A connectivity-based habitat enhancement strategy provides adaptability for an uncertain climatic and regulatory future for the Laurentian Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River.

Key Words:

St. Lawrence River, climate, floods, northern pike, largemouth bass, hypoxia, regulated hydrology

Introduction:

Between Canada and the United States of America, water levels in the Laurentian Great Lakes typically follow an intra-annual pattern of rising water levels through the spring, peaking in mid-summer and declining into the winter (Farrell et al., 2010a). The period of rising water levels throughout the spring represents a spring flood pulse where spring flood waters inundate upslope or high-marsh habitats (Junk et al., 1989; Midwood and Chow-Fraser, 2012). Such hydrological patterns create natural disturbances where the timing, magnitude, and duration of water level fluctuations influence nearshore macrophyte assemblages (Keddy and Reznicek, 1986; Wilcox, 2004; Midwood and Chow-Fraser, 2012) and provides ephemeral connectivity pathways between littoral and upslope habitats (Bunn and Arthington, 2002; Carlson et al., 2016; Ward et al., 1999; Wilcox et al., 2008). Moreover, interactions between natural hydrology and geomorphology maintain the variety of coastal wetland types or hydro-geomorphic settings (Albert et al., 2005; Keough et al., 1999) that the majority of Laurentian Great Lakes fish use to complete life-history requirements (Jude and Pappas, 1992; Wie et al., 2004).

The magnitude and duration of the spring flood pulse in the Laurentian Great Lakes varies annually by Lake because of the combined effects of climatic variability and water level regulation. This would include the St. Lawrence River, the natural outlet of the Laurentian Great Lakes towards the Atlantic Ocean and ~21% of the world's surface freshwater, which became regulated following construction of the Robert-Moses Saunders Power Dam in 1959 (Farrell et al., 2010a; IJC, 2014). A consequence of regulated waters in the St. Lawrence River was the suppression of inter- and intra-annual hydrological variation relative to unregulated conditions (Farrell et al., 2010a; IJC, 2014). During regulated water levels, many coastal wetlands in the St. Lawrence River experienced significant increases in cover and density of the invasive cattail

hybrid *Typha* x *glauca* (> 20 stems/m²; Farrell et al., 2010a, Bansal et al., 2019), but its initial invasion is thought to be associated with an earlier period of land conversion and agricultural expansion (Rippke et al. 2010). The expanding *Typha* x *glauca* eventually created barriers to fish passage to lateral upslope habitats or completely replaced native sedge-meadow (*Carex* spp.) habitats used by spawning fish (Farrell, 2001; Farrell et al., 2010a; Wilcox and Bateman, 2018; Wilcox et al., 2008).

In response to degraded conditions and ecosystem function in coastal wetlands in the St. Lawrence River (Farrell et al., 2010a; Wilcox & Bateman, 2018; Wilcox et al., 2008), a multipartner collaboration proposed to evaluate fish habitat enhancement strategies that modified the configuration of coastal wetlands impacted by *Typha* x *glauca* expansion (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019). The modifications were hypothesized to improve access to lateral upslope sedge-meadow habitats disconnected by *Typha* x *glauca* by excavating 'connectivity channels'. 'Spawning pool complexes' that created potholes of open-water spawning/nursery habitats were also excavated within monotypic stands of *Typha* x *glauca* (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019; Figure 1).

The modifications were engineered to accommodate the suppressed spring flood pulse prescribed for the St. Lawrence River (IJC, 2014; IJC, 2017) by maintaining littoral zonation and hydrological connectivity within the modified habitats (Humphries et al., 1999; Junk et al., 1986; King et al., 2003; Tockner, et al., 2000). Because the modified habitats differed in design (i.e., connectivity channels vs. spawning pool complexes), we contrasted fish assemblage structure between the two types of habitat modifications relative to unmodified reference channels. Modified habitats were predicted to function as suitable early-life habitats that were at least equitable in quality to unmodified reference habitats (Dionne et al., 1999; Massa and Farrell, 2019; Moyer et al., 1995; Neveldine et al., 2019; Williams and Zelder, 1999). Evaluating the effectiveness of habitat enhancements in providing high quality fish habitat is essential to the future application of similar engineered habitats in the St. Lawrence River and Laurentian Great Lakes degraded by the spread of invasive emergent vegetation.

Finally, we tested the influence of hydrology, temperature and dissolved oxygen on species diversity and catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) of young-of-the-year (YOY) and non-YOY fish captured emigrating from the modified and unmodified habitats over an eight-year period. Spawning behaviours and nursery habitat condition for many fish are adapted to natural hydrological patterns (Bunn and Arthington, 2002; Junk et al., 1989; Lytle and Poff, 2004; Poff et al., 1997). Across our eight-year dataset, water levels in the upper St. Lawrence experienced all time highs through the spring and summer of 2017 and 2019 (Carter and Steinschneider, 2018; Gronewald and Rood, 2019), and uncharacteristic lows in 2012, 2016 and 2021. Thus, evaluating relationships between hydrology and nearshore fish assemblage structure will help determine the functional sustainability and ecological resilience of engineered modifications as spawning and nursery habitats (Erwin, 2009; Peterson et al., 1998; Poff, 2018), and guide future water level regulation plans.

Methods

Study Site Description:

Our study focused on modified habitats excavated in French Creek, a drowned river mouth tributary in the Thousand Islands Region (Clayton, NY) of the upper St. Lawrence River (USLR) (Figure 1). Most of French Creek's watershed (930-ha) is administered as a 'wildlife management area' by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), but the sub-watershed includes agricultural land use (Massa and Farrell, 2020). The mainstem of French Creek (>12 km long) flows into French Bay that interfaces the USLR proper (Figure 1), and was a priority for habitat enhancement to promote northern pike (*Esox lucius*) YOY production (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019). Northern pike populations in the St. Lawrence River have demonstrated poor year-class strength (Smith et al., 2007), and inaccessibility to seasonally flooded habitats (e.g., sedge-meadows) caused by *Typha* x *glauca* expansion is believed to contribute to reduced recruitment (Farrell, 2001; Farrell et al., 2006)

Modifications/Enhancement

Connectivity channels were completed in French Creek with an aquatic excavator to reconnect the main stem of French Creek to lateral sedge-meadow habitats disconnected by *Typha* x *glauca* expansion (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019; Figure 1). The design of connectivity channels included slight meanders, with a channel width between one and two meters, and 0.5 m depth. The mechanical head of the aquatic excavator side-cased spoil into the riparian and floodplain zones of each connectivity channel, which allowed the newly exposed native seedbank to recolonize the habitat (Neveldine et al., 2019). When more than one connectivity channel reconnected the same patch of sedge-meadow habitat to the main stem of French Creek, the connecting channels were grouped into an ecological complex that were considered independent from other complexes (Figure 1). Between 2008 and 2010, three complexes of connectivity channels were installed at French Creek which renewed access to three sedge-meadow habitats (0.15, 0.32 and 0.85 Ha/sedge-meadow habitat; Neveldine et al., 2019).

In the winter of 2012, spawning pool complexes were installed at French Creek with an amphibious long-arm excavator. Spawning pool complexes consisted of a group of relatively

small pools (mean (\pm SD): 0.04 \pm 0.04 Ha/ individual spawning pool) interconnected by short channels excavated within large monotypic stands of *Typha* x *glauca* (Figure 1). Spoil from the excavated spawning pools was deposited as small mounds adjacent to pools (< 1.0-m height) on the monodominant *Typha* x *glauca*. Depth of spawning pools approximated 0.5-m, and the dimensions of channels that connected adjacent spawning pools were similar in depth and width to the connectivity channels (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al. 2019). Groups of interconnected spawning pools were considered an independent ecological complex when movement between adjacent spawning pools did not require using the mainstem of French Creek (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019; Figure 1). Spawning pool complexes were made up of three to six individual spawning pools, and the number of outlets connecting a spawning pool complex to the mainstem of French Creek varied between two and six. Seven independent spawning pool complexes were installed in French Creek (Figure 1), but, between one and five spawning pool complexes were surveyed for fish, a given year.

Lateral channels that resisted *Typha* x *glauca* expansion in French Creek represented available unmodified habitat for fish (Neveldine et al., 2019; Massa and Farrell, 2020); were considered reference habitats and termed unmodified channels (Keough et al., 1999; Neveldine et al., 2019; Figure 1). The unmodified channels had similar wetted width and depth to the connectivity channels and provided the primary natural connectivity to upslope sedge-meadow habitats prior to excavating the modified habitats. In total, 11 unmodified channels were surveyed over the study. Each year, between three and nine unmodified channels were surveyed for an approximate 1:1 ratio of modified-to-unmodified habitats surveyed. The unmodified channels were considered the best available secondary-lateral habitat for fish and provided an internal standard within French Creek to evaluate differences in fish assemblages among habitat

types that was deemed more appropriate than using reference habitats outside the study site (Keough et al., 1999; Neveldine et al., 2019).

Fish Survey

Surveys for emigrating fish followed the same netting protocol described in Neveldine et al. (2019) and Massa and Farrell (2020). Emigration nets had three 60-cm diameter hoops connected with 2.54-cm throats. Mesh size of the net was 1.6-mm and the net opening attached to a panel 366-cm in length and 122-cm in height that was buoyed by floats and stretched with a lead core line. Three reinforcing rods were used to deploy the net at the channel outlet opening; two rods stretched the wings across the channel outlet opening and the third set the cod end downstream of the channel. Each net spanned the entire channel outlet opening to restrict the catch to out-migrating fish by blocking passage of immigrating fish into the channel. Nets were also set at approximately the same location within the channel outlet channel. In 2017 and 2019, when high water levels exceeded the 122 cm net height, nets were fished at mid-depth in the water column at approximately the same location from other years.

Emigration surveys started most years by mid-June, approximately two months after northern pike completed their tributary spawning run (e.g., by mid-April) as to not to interfere with northern pike spawning. Emigration nets were set between 12 and 31 days depending on the year. The longer surveys corresponded to the earliest years that habitats were netted (2012-2013) and became shorter when survey effort was optimized to encompass peak emigration of YOY northern pike (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019). Within years, consistent survey effort (i.e., net-nights) was used at each habitat-type complex. Emigration nets were checked daily throughout the survey period, and all fish caught were identified to lowest taxonomic level, categorized by life-stage base on species length (YOY or non-YOY) and counted (Table 1). After processing, fish were released in the mainstem of French Creek to continue emigrating, and we assumed that released fish were not recaptured. Fish were never anesthetized because of a short handling time (<30 s). The care and use of experimental animals complied with New York State animal welfare laws, and all fieldwork was conducted under the scientific collectors permit NYSDEC-Scientific-#354 and the IACUC project approval #140202.

At each net check, water temperature (°C) and dissolved oxygen concentration (mg/L) were measured with a YSI ProODO® (Optical sensor) from the surface, mid-depth, and near the substrate of the water column. Temperature and dissolved oxygen were averaged among depth profile measurements to obtain representative daily estimates, which were then averaged over the survey period per year at each independent complex. Measurements for dissolved oxygen and temperature generally occurred between 0830 and 1200 each day.

Emigration surveys in French Creek occurred at all three habitat-types (i.e., connectivity channels, spawning pool complexes and unmodified channels) in 2012, 2013, and between 2016 and 2021. Connectivity channels were not surveyed in 2014 and 2015, and those years were excluded from the dataset. At minimum, each year included in the dataset had fish capture and environmental information from complexes of all three habitat-types; however, data from the 2012, 2013 and 2020 surveys were represented by a single spawning pool complex.

For each spawning pool complex surveyed, between two and four emigration net locations were randomly selected and nets were placed at the outlets connecting spawning pools to the mainstem of French Creek. The number of nets used per spawning pool complex was proportional to the number of available outlets. In contrast, at connectivity channels and unmodified channels, emigration nets covered all outlets. To account for fish that emigrated through unnetted outlets at spawning pool complexes, we assumed that fish only used outlets for movements and were equally distributed among all spawning pool outlets. The total number of fish caught at a spawning pool complex for each year was divided by the number of outlets netted. The quotient was multiplied by the total number of outlets available to be netted to estimate the total abundance of fish emigrating from the entire spawning pool complex (Massa and Farrell, 2020).

Habitat digitization

Orthoimagery of French Creek was downloaded from the New York State Interactive Mapping Gateway (https://orthos.dhses.ny.gov//). Orthoimagery represented spring conditions (April/May; source 4-band at resolutions of 30.5 or 15.2 cm) and were available for the years 2015 and 2020. The open-water habitat (Ha) observed at each habitat-type (spawning pool, connectivity channel or unmodified, maximum scale of 1:1000) was digitized visually in QGIS (version 3.16.11-Hannover) for both years. Areas of open-water at each habitat-type was considered representative of available fish habitat. The high density of *Typha* x *glauca* stem (> 20 stems/m²; Farrell et al., 2010a; Neveldine et al. 2019) that delineates the habitat-types was assumed a barrier to fish movement into the *Typha* x *glauca* matrix (Farrell, 2001; Farrell et al., 2006).

Locations where emigration nets were set delineated the outlet boundary of each habitattype and was assumed to represent available fish habitat surveyable. The mainstem-distance of each habitat-type was also measured from the centroid of a habitat-type to the outlet of French Creek into French Bay (at the Rte. 12E bridge; Figure 1) to examine longitudinal effects (i.e., distance) on fish capture.

Between the 2015 and 2020 orthoimagery of French Creek, large mats of *Typha* x *glauca* became dislodged from the riparian habitat that borders the mainstem of French Creek. At three spawning pool complexes, a dislodged Typha mat altered the border with the original excavation. As a result, individual spawning pools exposed to the mainstem of French Creek were functionally separated from the complex due to loss of hydrologic connectivity (Figure 2). The most extreme example involved a spawning pool complex that lost up to 66% of its openwater habitat between 2015 and 2020 (Figure 2). Spawning pool complexes that remained intact, however, had near identical area measurements between the two years measured (2015 and 2020). Connectivity channels and unmodified channels showed a slight increase in open-water habitat in 2020 relative to 2015 due to water level variation. Netting crews adapted to changes in habitat reconfiguration and modified netting locations to ensure remnant outlets were sampled at the impacted spawning pool complexes.

Data handling

Fish capture data was first expressed as a CPUE by taking the number of fish captured at a complex and dividing it by the duration of the netting survey (i.e., net-nights) each year. CPUE data were then corrected to account for differences in open-water area available to fish among the habitat-types by dividing the CPUE by the open-water area (Ha) measured per complex. Hereafter we refer to our area corrected CPUE as simply $CPUE_{area}$. Estimates of open-water area were measured from the 2015 orthoimagery and considered representative of available fish habitat during the 2012, 2013, 2016 and 2017 surveys, whereas open-water area measured from the 2020 orthoimagery represented available fish habitat from 2018 to 2021.

Prior to analysis, fish data were divided by size into putative age-classes representing YOY and non-YOY fishes (Table 1). The YOY fish assemblage was assumed representative of the quality and suitability of early-life habitats (Mapes et al., 2015; Pritt et al., 2015), while non-YOY fish were assumed to be representative of the adult resident or post-spawn fish community that occupy the habitat-types for purposes other than reproduction.

Within the YOY and non-YOY fish assemblages, fish that were identified to species were used to estimate species diversity metrics. Cumulative fish species diversity was assessed among the habitat-types using rarefaction curves (Chao et la., 2014) with "iNEXT Online" (<u>https://chao.shinyapps.io/iNEXTOnline/;</u> Chao et al., 2016), whereas yearly mean fish species richness was evaluated among the habitat-types using linear mixed-effect modeling to determine which of environmental variables best explained patterns in species richness.

Prior to evaluating fish assemblage structure, taxa that were not identified to species were assigned to categories (Table 1). All larval Cyprinidae were combined into a YOY Cyprinidae category. A *Lepomis* category combined abundances of YOY pumpkinseed *Lepomis gibbosus* and YOY bluegill *Lepomis macrochirus*. When YOY taxa were infrequently encountered among all habitat-types (< 10% occurrence; Infante et al., 2009; Schilling et al., 2009) they were grouped into an 'other' category (Table 1).

A similar approach was taken with the non-YOY fish assemblage. Taxa with the potential to reach 300 mm total length were considered to be 'large-bodied adults' (L.B.A.), which were caught by nets with a capture efficiency targeting smaller sized fish (net throat diameter = 25.4-mm). Cyprinidae species encountered at > 10% of all habitat-types were left as standalone species (n = 5), whereas all other Cyprinidae (n = 11) were combined into an 'other Cyprinidae' (CYP) category. Iowa darter *Etheostoma exile* and tessellated darter *E. olmstedi* were grouped

into a 'Darter' category, while round goby *Neogobius melanostomus*, tubenose goby *Proterorhinus semilunaris*, and rudd *Scardinius erythrophthalmus* were categorized as 'Exotics' to the Laurentian Great Lakes. Finally, a non-YOY 'Other' category combined the remaining non-YOY taxa that were infrequently encountered ($\leq 10\%$ of all habitat-types; Table 1).

Environmental variables used to explore patterns in fish assemblage structure included mean-daily water column dissolved oxygen and water temperature which were averaged across the survey period for each habitat-type complex per year. The mainstem distance of each habitat type to French Bay was included to account for spatial differences in the location of modified habitats (Figure 1). Connectivity channels were clustered within at 1.5 km reach of French Creek located between 7.0 and 8.5 km upstream of French Bay. Spawning pool complexes were excavated downstream of the connectivity channels between 1.5 and 5.6 km upstream of French Bay. Locations of unmodified channels occurred between 0.6 to 9.2 km upstream of French Bay and provided spatial overlap with all the modified habitats (Figure 1). Habitat-type was included as a categorical factor to examine differences in assemblage structure between the modified habitats relative to unmodified reference channels.

Daily water level measurements (meters above International Great Lakes Datum; mIGLD) were downloaded from the NOAA monitoring station located in Alexandria Bay, NY (ABAN6–8311062; <u>https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/waterlevels.html?id=8311062</u>). Seasonal and annual water level fluctuations recorded from Alexandria Bay were assumed representative of the hydrological conditions in the USLR that includes French Creek (Alexandria Bay is located approximately 20-km downstream of French Creek). For each year, daily water levels were averaged between 15-March and 15-April to represent water levels during the spawning period for northern pike to access sedge-meadows habitats (Massa and Farrell, 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019); hereafter referred to as WLSpring (Figure 3a). The change in water level between WLSpring and when emigration surveys were run in mid-June (i.e., mean June water levels) was assumed to represent the strength of each year's flood pulse (Δ WL). Δ WL was calculated as the difference between mean June water levels and WLSpring, where values for Δ WL indicate relative rates of change in water levels between spring water levels and the emigration period. Negative values for Δ WL suggest habitat contraction because of water level drawdown (Neveldine et al., 2019), whereas positive values for Δ WL suggest an expansion of the wetted area (Figure 3b). No relationship was found between WLSpring (15-March to 15-April) and Δ WL (Pearson R = -0.021, *p* = 0.939, df = 14), and were treated as independent continuous variables to describe interannual hydrology for the USLR (Figure 3).

Statistical Analysis

Redundancy Analysis (RDA) was used to model assemblage structure of YOY and non-YOY fish against environmental predictors. RDA is a direct gradient ordination technique that can accommodate qualitative factors (Legendre and Legendre, 1998). All continuous environmental variables were centered to 0 mean and standardized to 1 standard deviation prior to analysis. Dissolved oxygen and Δ WL showed the strongest collinearity among environmental predictors (-0.53), but both were included in the analysis. Fish community data was Hellinger transformed prior to analysis, and the forward stepwise procedure in the R package "Vegan" (R version 4.1.3) was used to identify which linear combination of explanatory variables best described fish assemblage structure. Permutation tests (1000 permutations) were used to evaluate the significance of the forward-selected model, and the significance of marginal terms effects. The RDA analysis assumed a linear additive model to explain variation between the environmental predictors and fish community structure.

Potential interactions between environmental variables and habitat-type on overall mean fish CPUE_{area} and yearly species richness were examined with linear-mixed effect models (LMM) in lmerTest (version 3.0–1; Kuznetsova et al., 2017) (R package lme4 version 1.1–17; Bates et al., 2015). Habitat-types were set as a random intercept to account for repeatedmeasures, and year was set as a random slope to account for interannual variability. Environmental predictors (dissolved oxygen, temperature, WLSpring, Δ WL and mainstem distance), which were also centered to zero mean and one standard deviation, were set as fixed factors. Akaike information criterion (AIC) was used to evaluate the strength of candidate models against a null model with only random slope and intercept. Models within 2 units of the lowest AIC score were considered equal in the models' ability to describe the data, but the model with the fewest terms was considered parsimonious with the least bias. Fish CPUE_{area} data were log₁₀ (n+1) transformed to normalize the data prior to analysis. Species richness data were not transformed. In addition, we used the same LMM structure to model the influence of hydrology and habitat-type on patterns of untransformed dissolved oxygen and temperature data.

Results

We caught 218,086 fish emigrating from lateral habitats (modified, n = 8; unmodified, n = 11) over eight-years at French Creek. Non-YOY fish were represented by 19,468 individuals among 40 species, whereas YOY fish accounted for more than 90% of the cumulative catch (198,616 fish) and were represented by 23 species.

Rarefaction curves demonstrated that cumulative non-YOY species richness was similar among the three habitat-types with similar inflection points and overlapping 95% confidence intervals (Figure 4a). A total of 33 species were identified at the unmodified channels, 29 species from connectivity channels and 28 non-YOY species at spawning pool complexes over the eightyears. Rarefaction curves for YOY fish indicated that a larger number of YOY species (n = 19) emigrated from spawning pool complexes, relative to the connectivity (n = 14) and unmodified channels (n = 13) over eight-years. Confidence intervals (95% CI) around species richness rarefaction curves overlapped between the connectivity channels and unmodified channels, but curves for the channelized habitats were below the 95% CI observed for spawning pool complexes (Figure 4b).

Based on the cumulative catch across years, the relative abundance of non-YOY fish appeared more similar between the connectivity channels and unmodified channels relative to spawning pool complexes (Figure 5a). Central mudminnow, *Umbra limi*, was the most commonly encountered non-YOY fish at both the connectivity channels and unmodified channels and accounted for 41% and 37% of the total catch across years, respectively. Central mudminnow at spawning pool complexes represented only 4% of the total catch (Figure 5a). In contrast, spawning pool complexes were dominated by Tadpole Madtom, *Noturus gyrinus*, representing 75% of all non-YOY fish caught at spawning pool complexes. Tadpole Madtom accounted for approximately 1% of the total catch at connectivity channels and unmodified channels (Figure 5a).

YOY largemouth bass, *Micropterus salmoides*, made up 81% of all captured YOY across all habitat-types and years in French Creek (Figure 5b). YOY largemouth bass were consistently dominant among the habitat-types, making up 88% of the total catch at connectivity channels, 79% at spawning pools and 70% at unmodified channels. When YOY largemouth bass were removed to examine relative abundance among the remaining species (with 37,419 individuals; Figure 5c), YOY brown bullhead, *Ameiurus nebulosus*, made up a larger proportion of the catch at spawning pool complexes (42%) relative to connectivity channels (12%) and unmodified

habitats (4%). Bowfin, *Amia calva*, was the most common YOY fish captured at connectivity channels (51%) and unmodified channels (54%) but accounted for 19% of the catch at spawning pool complexes, after excluding YOY largemouth bass (Figure 5c).

The influence of environmental variables on the non-YOY and YOY fish assemblage structure were evaluated with redundancy analysis. Forward stepwise selection found that a linear combination of habitat-type, WLSpring, Δ WL, and mainstem distance of the habitat-types was a significant model (F_{5,92} = 7.509, *p* = 0.001, adj.r² = 0.251) that explained 29% of the variation in the non-YOY data (Figure 6a). Effects of the selected variables were all significant (p < 0.02). The first RDA axis explained 21.8% of the variation and was interpreted to describe fish associated with spawning pool complexes and positive association with spring water levels and Δ WL. Distance of each habitat-type to the mainstem was negatively associated with the first RDA axis and was considered a proxy for the upstream location of the connectivity channels. Non-YOY central mudminnow and tadpole madtom had the strongest species scores on the first RDA axis (-0.929 and 0.534, respectively) and generally aligned with the group centroids for the channelized habitats and spawning pool complexes, respectively (Figure 6a). The second RDA axis accounted for only 4% of the variation in the non-YOY data and was not explored further.

RDA on the YOY fish assemblage included largemouth bass. Forward stepwise selection found that the linear combination of habitat-type, dissolved oxygen, WLSpring and Δ WL were a significant fit (F_{5,92} = 5.661, *p* = 0.001, adj.r² = 0.235) and explained 23.5% of the variation in the YOY data (Figure 6b). Main-effects of the selected variables were all significant (*p* ≤ 0.048). The first RDA axis explained 14.5% of variation and was associated with habitat-type and hydrological variability. Spawning pool complexes and dissolved oxygen were negatively associated with the first RDA axis, whereas Δ WL and WLSpring had positive associations. YOY

largemouth bass and YOY northern pike oriented on opposite ends of the first RDA axis. YOY northern pike and Lepomis showed a positive association with the hydrologic variables, whereas YOY largemouth bass and YOY brown bullhead were associated with the spawning pool complexes, higher dissolved oxygen and low Δ WL (Figure 6). The second RDA axis explained only 5% of the variation and was not explored further.

Linear mixed-effect modeling (LMM) and AIC model selection identified that habitattype and both hydrological variables (WLSpring and Δ WL) were among the most important predictors of CPUE_{area} and yearly species richness for the non-YOY and YOY fish assemblages (Table 2), while temperature, DO and distance to the mainstem did not contribute significantly to the model. CPUE_{area} of non-YOY fish was best described (lowest AIC and fewest terms) by a model with a significant effect of habitat-type (F_{2,17} = 11.218, *p* < 0.0008) and weak interaction between habitat-type and Δ WL (F_{2,81} = 2.708, *p* = 0.07; Table 2). Pairwise comparisons using the Tukey method found higher CPUE_{area} of non-YOY fish at connectivity channels and spawning pool complexes than unmodified channels (*p* < 0.02) (Figure 7a).

The best model describing CPUE_{area} of YOY fish included a significant effect of habitattype (F_{2,16} = 23.076, p < 0.0001) and significant interaction between WLSpring and Δ WL (F_{1,81} = 7.584, p = 0.007; Table 2). Higher CPUE_{area} of YOY fish occurred from connectivity channels and spawning pools relative to unmodified channels (Tukey: p < 0.005; Figure 7b). Effects of WLSpring and Δ WL were not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (p > 0.06) but had positive coefficients. Their interaction, however, carried a significant negative coefficient (-0.364; Figure 7b). The negative coefficient from the WLSpring and Δ WL interaction appeared driven by lower CPUE_{area} of YOY fish from the modified habitats when the product between the hydrological variables was maximized (Figure 7b). We interpret the YOY fish CPUE_{area} response to the WLSpring and Δ WL interaction to describe years where water levels peaked in early-spring (WLSpring) and declined afterwards (i.e., negative Δ WL value). Spring water level itself had no apparent effect on CPUE_{area} of YOY largemouth bass. CPUE_{area} of YOY largemouth bass were best described by a significant habitat-type and Δ WL interaction (F_{2,79} = 8.015, *p* = 0.0007; Figure 7c). CPUE_{area} of YOY largemouth bass emigrating from spawning pool complexes were negatively impacted during years of rising Δ WL compared to the unmodified channels, whereas densities of YOY largemouth bass increased in response to higher Δ WL at the connectivity channels (Figure 7c; Figure 6b).

Non-YOY species richness was described by significant effects of habitat-type ($F_{2,20} = 6.731, p = 0.006$), a negative association with WLSpring ($F_{1,82} = 6.040, p = 0.02$), a positive association with Δ WL ($F_{1,79} = 21.418, p < 0.0001$), and a negative interaction coefficient between WLSpring and Δ WL ($F_{1,81} = 13.784, p = 0.0004$; Figure 8a; Table 2). Non-YOY species richness was higher at spawning pool complexes relative to unmodified habitats (Tukey: p = 0.015) across years. Non-YOY species richness did not differ between the connectivity channels and either the unmodified channels (Tukey: p = 0.106) and spawning pool complexes (Tukey: p = 0.811; Figure 8a).

YOY species richness was described by significant effects of dissolved oxygen ($F_{1,89} = 5.148, p = 0.03$), habitat-type ($F_{2,61} = 13.012, p < 0.0001$), and a significant interaction between WLSpring and Δ WL ($F_{1,86} = 17.737, p < 0.0001$; Figure 8b; Table 2). YOY species richness was positively associated with dissolved oxygen, and negatively associated with the WLSpring x Δ WL interaction term. Tukey pairwise comparison indicated higher YOY species richness at spawning pool complexes relative to unmodified channels (p < 0.001) across years. Yearly YOY

species richness did not differ between connectivity channels and spawning pool complexes (p = 0.124), or between connectivity channels and unmodified channels (p = 0.096; Figure 8b).

Although dissolved oxygen and water temperature were rarely identified in the RDA models describing fish assemblage structure, each variable showed significant effects of hydrological variability and habitat-types. Patterns in temperatures were best described by an interaction between habitat-type and Δ WL (F_{2,73} = 5.833, *p* = 0.004) and a positive main-effect of WLSpring (F_{1,80} = 9.702, *p* = 0.003; Figure 9a). Across years, similar temperatures were observed between the modified habitats (Tukey; *p* = 0.181) which were significantly warmer than temperatures in the unmodified channels (*p* < 0.02; Figure 9a). Differences in temperature among the habitat-types, however, were most pronounced at low Δ WL values and converged towards a uniform thermal regime (~ 20°C) at peak Δ WL (Figure 9a).

Dissolved oxygen was described by a simple additive model with effects of habitat-type $(F_{2,19} = 6.612, p = 0.006)$ and Δ WL $(F_{1,80} = 56.426, p < 0.0001)$. Among habitat-types, higher concentrations of dissolved oxygen (mg/L) were found at spawning pool complexes relative to unmodified channels (Tukey: p = 0.008; Figure 9b). Dissolved oxygen was however similar between connectivity channels and unmodified channels (Tukey: p = 0.559) and between connectivity channels and spawning pool complexes (Tukey: p = 0.164). Across habitat-types, dissolved oxygen declined with increasing Δ WL, and during peak Δ WL dissolved oxygen ranged between mild-hypoxia (< 4.0 mg/L) and anoxia (< 1.0 mg/L) among habitat-types (Figure 9b).

Discussion

The habitat modifications applied in the USLR increased the extent of and renewed connectivity to suitable early-life habitat for fish impacted by *Typha* x *glauca* expansion. The modified habitats outperformed the unmodified habitats in CPUE_{area} of fish per year (YOY and non-YOY) and spawning pool complexes supported higher YOY species richness (yearly and rarefaction curve estimates) than the unmodified channel habitat. Spawning pool complexes and connectivity channels tended to be warmer and have higher dissolved oxygen than the unmodified channels. Ground water infiltration at the unmodified channels from the Frontenac Spring Aquifer (Neveldine et al., 2019) likely caused the cooler temperatures and lower dissolved oxygen (i.e., lower quality fish habitat; Mapes et al., 2015; Pritt et al., 2015) relative to the modified habitats, and may maintain channel morphology.

Despite these environmental differences between the modified (spawning pool complex and connectivity channel) and unmodified habitats, the physical attributes of the habitat (i.e., open-water pools vs. channelized habitats) had an overriding influence on the fish assemblage composition (Meadore and Carlisle, 2007). Connectivity channels complemented the fish assemblage associated with the unmodified channels (e.g., non-YOY central mudminnow and YOY bowfin). Despite similar fish assemblages, the warmer water temperatures and slightly higher dissolved oxygen at the connectivity channels corresponded with higher CPUE_{area} of emigrating fish than the unmodified channels (Mapes et al., 2015; Massa and Farrell, 2020; Pritt et al., 2015). The spawning pool complexes in contrast supported high-quality early-life habitats (higher dissolved oxygen and warmer temperatures) that were used by taxa underrepresented in the channelized habitats (e.g., non-YOY tadpole madtom, YOY brown bullhead).

Although the modified habitats supported conducive environmental conditions for higher CPUE_{area} of YOY fish, patterns in dissolved oxygen, temperature and fish assemblage structure

were inextricably linked, often interactively, with Δ WL and interannual spring water levels (Carlson et al., 2016; Gathman and Burton, 2011; Linhoss et al., 2012). At peak Δ WLs, which corresponded with historic flooding in the USLR and Lake Ontario in 2017 and 2019 (Carter and Steinschneider, 2018; Gronewald and Rood, 2019), temperature differences among habitat-types were lost. Along the Δ WL gradient, temperatures at unmodified channels increased slightly relative to lower Δ WL years. Temperatures at connectivity channels declined slightly, while temperatures at spawning pool complexes declined with higher Δ WL to create a uniform thermal regime (~20°C) among habitat-types that ranged from mild-hypoxia (< 4.0 mg/L) to anoxia (< 1.0 mg/L).

The cause for the negative relationship between Δ WL and dissolved oxygen is contrary to established relationships between other abiotic factors (e.g., flow and temperature) and dissolved oxygen (He et al., 2011). Temperature had no apparent influence on patterns in dissolved oxygen. Spawning pool complexes supported higher temperatures and dissolved oxygen relative to unmodified channels during low Δ WL years. During high Δ WL years, temperatures and dissolved oxygen declined in tandem at spawning pool complexes. The lack of relationship between temperature and dissolved oxygen suggested that respiration exceeded primary productivity, but the mechanism regulating this effect requires more detailed investigation (Post et al., 2018). The extreme flood waters may facilitate increased transport of dissolved organic carbon and other nutrients from newly inundated upslope habitats, or from the Typha litter itself, into coastal areas resulting in elevated microbial respiration (Williamson et al. 1999; Brothers et al. 2014; Su et al., 2007; Han et al., 2018). Although not measured in the current study, water clarity was also notably lower in 2017 and 2019 than the other years, presumably from added runoff related to the floods (J.P. Leblanc, Pers. obs.). The elevated turbidity during the floodyears may have reduced the photosynthetic capacity of the system by limiting light exposure to algae and macrophytes. The precise mechanism(s) responsible for the low dissolved oxygen in French Creek during the floods is uncertain, but could result from heterotrophic-biogeochemical interactions. We suspect, however, that the extreme flood waters precipitated the subsequent biogeochemical process resulting in low dissolved oxygen in 2017 and 2019.

Similar patterns of dissolved oxygen deficits with elevated water levels were observed at other coastal habitats in the USLR surveyed over the same time period as the present study (unpublished data), and in Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, following uncharacteristically high waterlevels (P. Chow-Fraser, Pers. Comm.). High flow rates in Savanah River (southeastern U.S.A) during a flood caused by 1000-year rainstorm also resulted lower dissolved oxygen relative to normal flow rates (Post et al., 2018). Hypoxia associated with extreme hydrological events (Post et al., 2018, this study) may be a novel climate induced stressor on freshwater systems. The frequency of extreme hydrological events (floods and droughts) is expected to increase with climate change (Marengo and Espinoza, 2016; Trenberth, 2011). Coupled with an overall deoxygenation of temperate freshwater lakes because of rising water temperatures (Jane et al., 2021) and eutrophication (Bhagowati and Ahamad, 2019), the severity of dissolved oxygen depletion caused by extreme hydrological events could be magnified. Our results suggest that dissolved oxygen in nearshore coastal habitats was influenced more by extreme hydrological events than temperature and was consistent with patterns in dissolved oxygen and temperature observed by Post et al. (2018) in the Savanah River in response to significant flooding.

Exposure to hypoxic conditions during high Δ WL years undoubtedly created a stressful environment for fish (Breitburg et al., 1999; Wu, 2009). However, based on fish CPUE_{area}

estimates, certain YOY species (e.g., northern pike) showed a positive response to high WLSpring and Δ WL despite near anoxic conditions. CPUE_{area} of YOY largemouth bass suggested limited production of YOY at spawning pool complexes during high Δ WL years, but CPUE_{area} of YOY largemouth bass were positively related to Δ WL at the channelized habitats that also experienced low dissolved oxygen. Thus, it is difficult to attribute patterns in catches of YOY fish solely to reduced concentrations of dissolved oxygen, but rather as an interaction between the habitat-types, hydrodynamics, and adaptations to low oxygen environments.

Because spawning pool complexes were bordered by dense *Typha* x *glauca*, access to inundated riparian habitat during years with high WLSpring and Δ WL may be limited for nest building species (e.g., largemouth bass; Schrank and Lishawa, 2019). Spawning pools may be considered analogous to a series of deep ponds when water levels were at historic highs in the USLR, and may be avoided by species that prefer shallower nesting habitat (Havens et al., 2005; Maceina and Bettoli, 1998; Stuber et al., 1982), but was suitable for broadcast spawning species (e.g., northern pike) that use a wide range of spawning depths (up to 6-m; Farrell et al., 2006). The connectivity channels and unmodified channels, in contrast, maintained a shallower depth gradient relative to spawning pool complexes as flood waters inundated the riparian sedge-meadow habitat. The channelized habitats, which provided connectivity to sedge-meadow habitats, likely maintained sufficiently shallow habitat used by both nest building (largemouth bass; Garvey et al., 2000; Havens et al., 2005) and broadcast spawning species (northern pike; Cottrell et al., 2021; Foubert et al., 2020; Neveldine et al., 2019; Oele et al., 2018) during high and low water level years.

Spring water levels and the magnitude of the flood pulse interact to influence accessibility to spawning habitats and to connect spawning and nursery areas (Cooper et al.,

2008; Mingelbier et al., 2008; Neveldine et al., 2019). Low water levels during the spawning period not only limits access to spawning habitat but reduces the extent of available habitat for spawning fish (Farrell, 2001). If Δ WL declines after the spawning period, as was the case in 2012 and 2016, water connections between spawning and nursery areas may be reduced or lost, potentially stranding eggs or newly hatched larvae in upslope habitats leading to poor natural reproduction (Mingelbier et al., 2008; Neveldine et al., 2019; Massa and Farrell, 2020). When WLSpring and Δ WL were both high, fish could access inundated spawning habitats and YOY could exploit resources within an expanding habitat afforded by rising water levels which maintain reliable emigration routes (Casselman and Lewis, 1996; Cottrell et al., 2021; Farrell et al., 2006; Mingelbier et al., 2008, Foubert et al. 2019). However, during peak Δ WL years, the benefits of sustained hydrological connectivity may be offset by hydrologically induced hypoxia.

Fish condition was not evaluated in the study. Exposure to low dissolved oxygen during the nursery period can have consequential physiological impacts on fish that reduces postnursery survival and recruitment (Wu, 2009). Duration of fish exposure to hypoxic conditions will also influence their physiological stress. Because we measured temperature and dissolved oxygen at the channel outlets of the habitat-types, we assumed a uniform distribution in environmental conditions throughout the habitat-types. However, refugia of dissolved oxygen may exist within the modified and unmodified habitats, and the presence of dissolved oxygen refugia could alleviate the severity of hypoxia induced stress experienced by fish.

We also observed a high prevalence of fish species that are known for tolerance of low dissolved oxygen conditions including air breathing fishes (e.g., bowfin and central mudminnow). Bowfin were the third most common YOY fish captured emigrating among all habitat types, whereas central mudminnow were among the most common non-YOY fish

encountered at the connectivity channels and unmodified habitats in French Creek. The strong representation of fishes adapted to low dissolved oxygen in French Creek would be expected in habitats influenced by frequent bouts of hypoxia or anoxia.

Many of these fish species tolerant to low dissolved oxygen also appeared to use the secondary lateral habitats (i.e., modified and unmodified habitats) in French Creek differently. Non-YOY central mudminnow and YOY bowfin were consistently overrepresented at the channelized habitats (i.e., connectivity channels and unmodified habitats). In contrast, non-YOY tadpole madtom, *Noturus gyrinus*, which are meso-tolerant to low dissolved oxygen (Tang et al., 2020), were captured near-exclusively at spawning pools. These observations may suggest that the structural properties of the habitat (channels vs. pools) was a stronger selective force than the environmental conditions (e.g., dissolved oxygen) lateral to the mainstem of French Creek (Meador and Carlisle, 2007).

Central mudminnow and tadpole madtom are strongly associated with high densities of macrophytes in the water column (Henning et al., 2014). However, the channelized habitats had similar representation of central mudminnow despite significant differences in the cover of submersed aquatic vegetation between the connectivity channels and unmodified habitats (Neveldine et al., 2019). Tadpole madtom, which were encountered almost exclusively at spawning pools, also prefer heavily-vegetated slow-moving backwater habitats similar to oxbow wetlands (Henning et al., 2014; Wilson et al., 1999) and un-channelized reaches of tributaries (Meneks et al., 2003). The spawning pool complexes in French Creek shared analogous characteristics with oxbow wetlands (e.g., relatively large sections of open-water lateral of the mainstem of the tributary) favoured by tadpole madtom (Wilson et al., 1999). Consistent with our results from French Creek, tadpole madtom were also encountered less frequently at

channelized reaches within the Red River basin, Minnesota, USA than at un-channelized reaches (Meneks et al., 2003), suggesting tadpole madtom were selecting against the channelized habitats in French Creek.

Interspecific competition between fishes tolerant of low dissolved oxygen may also contribute to fish assemblage differences between the channelized habitats and spawning pools. The strong chemical defenses of tadpole madtom indicates its potential to defend against predators and competitors (Wright, 2012). However, insufficient information exists to evaluate the magnitude that competitive interactions that may influence fish assemblage structure among the habitat-types in French Creek (Jackson et al., 2001).

The habitat enhancement strategy applied to French Creek incorporated functionally diverse habitat modifications (connectivity channels and spawning pool complexes) that showed marked differences in how the production of YOY of fish responded to novel hydrological events. During years with high Δ WL, CPUE_{area} at spawning pool complexes was limited for largemouth bass and brown bullhead, but low Δ WL years had a positive effect on both taxa in spawning pool complexes. CPUE_{area} at the connectivity channels remained relatively consistent regardless of water level scenario, highlighting the importance of a shallow zonation gradient in maintaining suitable fish habitat impacted by variable water levels (Casselman and Lewis, 1996). Having two types of habitat modifications excavated in French Creek appeared better able to buffer the effects of extreme hydrological variability on the production of some YOY fish than if only spawning pool complexes were used. We interpret our results to indicate that a diversified habitat enhancement strategy (e.g., tandem application of connectivity channels and spawning pool complexes) improved ecological resilience of this drowned river mouth wetland (Peterson

et al., 1998) to extreme hydrological variability on the production of YOY fish (Carlson et al., 2016; Erwin, 2009; Poff, 2018).

Acknowledgements

This project was funded through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the Fish, Enhancement, Mitigation, and Research Fund administered by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, the NOAA Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and in part contribution from Ducks Unlimited. Habitat modification projects were completed by Partners for Fish and Wildlife at the Cortland, NY field office and Ducks Unlimited. We thank Scott Schlueter of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and Sarah Fleming of Ducks Unlimited for logistical and collaborative support. Additional support was provided by the New York State Department of Conservation (NYSDEC) and Thousand Islands Land Trust (TILT). We also thank the anonymous reviewers for comments and suggestions that improved the quality of the manuscript, and the many people from the Thousand Islands Biological Station including staff, students, and technicians for their dedication and commitment to the project.

Literature Cited:

- Albert, A. A., Wilcox, D. A., Ingram, J. W., & Thompson, T. A. (2005). Hydrogeomorphic classification for Great Lakes coastal wetlands. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 31, 129-146.
- Avlijaš, S., Ricciardi, A., & Mandrak, N. E. (2018). Eurasian tench (*Tinca tinca*): the next Great Lakes invader. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 75, 169-179.
- Balon E. K. (1975). Reproductive guilds of fishes: A proposal and definition. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada*, 32 (6), 821-864.
- Bansal, S., Lishawa, S. C., Newman, S., Tangen, B. A., Wilcox, D., Albert, D., ... Windham-Myers, L. (2019). Typha (cattail) invasion in Northern American wetlands: biology, regional problems, impacts, ecosystem services and management. *Wetlands*, 39, 645-684.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67, 1-48.
- Beesley, L. S., Gwinn, D. C., Price, A., King, A. J., Gawne, B., Koehn, J. J., & Nielsen, D. L. (2014). Juvenile fish response to wetland inundation: how antecedent conditions can inform environmental flow policies for native fish. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51, 1613-1621.
- Bhagowati, B., and & Ahamad, K., U. (2019). A review on lake eutrophication dynamics and recent developments in lake modeling. *Ecohydrology & Hydrobiology*, 19:, 155-166.
- Bosworth, A., & Farrell, J. M. (2006). Genetic divergence among Northern Pike from locations in the Upper St. Lawrence River. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 26, 676-684.
- Bunn, S. E., & Arthington, A. H. (2002). Basic principles and ecological consequences of altered flow regimes for aquatic biodiversity. *Environmental Management*, 30, 492-507.
- Carlson, A. K., Fincel, M. J., Longhenry, C. M., & Graeb, B. D. S. (2016). Effects of historic flooding on fishes and aquatic habitats in a Missouri River delta. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology*, 31, 271-288.
- Carter, E., & Steinschneider, S. (2018). Hydroclimatological drivers and extreme floods on Lake Ontario. *Water Resources Research*, 54, 4461-4478.
- Casselman, J.M., & Lewis, C. A. (1996). Habitat requirements of northern pike (*Esox lucius*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 53, 161-174.
- Chao, A., Gotelli, N. J., Hsieh, T. C., Sander, E. L., Ma, K. H., Colwell, R. K., & Ellison, A. M. (2014). Rarefaction and extrapolation with Hill numbers: a framework for sampling and estimation in species diversity studies. *Ecological Monographs*, 84, 45-67.

- Author Manuscript
- Chao, A., Ma, K. H., & Hsieh, T. C. (2016). iNEXT (iNterpolation and EXTrapolation) Online: Software for Interpolation and Extrapolation of Species Diversity. <u>http://chao.stat.nthu.edu.tw/wordpress/software_download/inext-online/</u>.
- Cooper, J. E., Mead, J. V., Farrell, J. M., & Werner, R. G. (2008). Potential effects of spawning habitat changes on the segregation of northern pike (Esox lucius) and muskellunge (E. masquinongy) in the upper St. Lawrence River. *Hydrobiologia*, 601, 41-53.
- Cooper, M. J., Ruetz III, C. R., Uzarski, D. G., & Burton, T. M. (2007). Distribution of round gobies in coastal areas of Lake Michigan: are wetlands resistant to invasion? *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 33, 303-313.
- Cooper, M. J., Ruetz III, C. R., Uzarski, D. G., & Shafter, B. M. (2009). Habitat use and diet of the round goby (Neogobius melanostomus) in coastal areas of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology*, 24, 477-488.
- Core Team, R., 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/.
- Cottrell, A. M., David, S. R., & Forsythe, P. S. (2021). Production and outmigration of young-ofyear northern pike *Esox lucis* from natural and modified waterways connected to Lower Green Bay, Wisconsin. *Journal of Fish Biology*, Early View. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14724</u>.
- Coulter, D. P., Murry, B. A., & Uzarski, D. G. (2012). Use of wetland verus open habitats by round gobies in lakes Michigan and Huron: patterns of cpue, length, and maturity. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 38, 439-444.
- De Lima, F. T., Reynalte-Tataje, D. A., & Zaniboni-Filho, E. (2017). Effects of reservoirs water level variation on fish recruitment. *Neotropical Ichthyology*, 15:e160084. DOI: 10.1590/1982-0224-20160084.
- Dionne, M., Short, F., & Burdick, D. (1999). Fish utilization of enhanced, created, and reference salt-marsh habitat in the Gulf of Maine. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, 22, 384-404.
- Erwin, K. L. (2009). Wetlands and global climate change: the role of wetland restoration in a changing world. *Wetlands Ecology and Management*, 17, 71-84.
- Farrell, J. M. (2001). Reproductive success of sympatric northern pike and muskellunge in an Upper St. Lawrence River bay. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 130, 796-808.
- Farrell, J. M., & Augustyn, E. A. (2016). Northern pike research, monitoring and management in the Thousand Islands Section of the St. Lawrence River. In: Section 22, New York State

Department of Environmental Conservation 2015 Annual Report, Bureau of Fisheries, Lake Ontario Unit and St. Lawrence River Unit. Albany, New York.

- Farrell, J. M., Holeck, K. T., Mills, E. L., Hoffman, C. E., & Patil, V. J. (2010b). Recent ecological trends in lower trophic levels of the international section of the St. Lawrence River: a comparison of the 1970s and 2000s. *Hydrobiologia*, 647, 21-33.
- Farrell, J. M., Mead, J. V., & Murry, B. A. (2006). Protracted spawning of St. Lawrence River northern pike (Esox lucius): simulated effects on survival, growth, and production. *Ecology* of Freshwater Fish, 15, 169-179.
- Farrell, J. M., Murry, B. A., Leopold, D. J., Halpern, A., Rippke, M. B., Godwin, K. S., & Hafner, S. D. (2010a). Water-level regulation and coastal wetland vegetation in the upper St. Lawrence River: inferences from historical aerial imagery, seed banks, and *Typha* dynamics. *Hydrobiologia*, 647, 127-144.
- Feyrer, F., Sommer, T., & Harrell, W. (2006). Importance of flood dynamics versus intrinsic physical habitat in structuring fish communities: evidence from two adjacent engineered floodplains on the Sacramento River, California. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 26, 408-417.
- Filgueira, R., Chapman, J. M., Suski, C. D., & Cooke, S. J. (2016). The influence of watershed land use cover on stream fish diversity and size-at-age of a generalist fish. *Ecological Indicators*, 60, 248-257.
- Foubert, A., Le Pichon, C., Mingelbier, M., Farrell, J. M., Morin, J., & Lecomte, F. (2019). Modeling the effective spawning and nursery habitats of northern pike within a large spatiotemporally variable river landscape (St. Lawrence River, Canada). *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 64, 803-819.
- Foubert, A., Lecomte, F., Brodeur, P., Le Pichon, C., & Mingelbeier, M. (2020). How intensive agricultural practices and flow regulation are threatening fish spawning habitat and their connectivity in the St. Lawrence River floodplain, Canada. *Landscape Ecology*, 35, 1229-1247.
- Garvey, J. E., Wright, R. A., Stein, R. A., & Ferry, K. H. (2000). Evaluating how local- and regional-scale processes interact to regulate growth of age-0 largemouth bass. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 129: 1044-1059.
- Goretzke, J. A., Windle, M. J. S., & Farrell, J. M. (2019). Range expansion of the western tubnose goby (*Proterorhinus semilunaris* Heckel, 1837) in eastern Lake Ontario and the upper St. Lawrence River. *BioInvasion Records*, 8, 684-698.
- Gronewold, A. D., & Rood, R. B. (2019). Recent water level changes across Earth's largest lake system and implications for future variability. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 45, 1-3.

- Halliwell, D.B., Langdon, R.W., Daniels, R.A., Kurtenbach, J.P., & Jacobson, R.A. (1999). Classification of freshwater fish species of the northeastern United States for use in the development of indices of biological integrity, with regional applications. Assessing the sustainability and biological integrity of water resources using fish communities. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida 301–333.
- Havens, K. E., Fox, D., Gornak, S., & Hanlon, C. (2005). Aquatic vegetation and largemouth bass population responses to water-level variations in Lake Okeechobee, Florida (USA). *Hydrobiologia*, 539, 225-237.
- He, J., Chu, A., Ryan, M. C., Valeo, C., & Zaitlin, B. (2011). Abiotic influences on dissolved oxygen in a riverine environment. Ecological Engineering, 37, 1804–1814.
- Henning, B. F., Kapuscinski, K. L., & Farrell, J. M. (2014). Nearshore fish assemblage structure and habitat relationships in protected and open habitats in the upper St. Lawrence River. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 40, 154-163.
- Humphries, P., King, A. J., & Koehn, J. D. (1999). Fish, flows and flood plains: links between freshwater fishes and their environment in the Murray-Darling River system, Australia. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 56, 129-151.
- IJC (2014) International Joint Commission. Lake Ontario St. Lawrence River Plan 2014: Protecting against extreme water levels, restoring wetlands and preparing for climate change. A Report to the Governments of Canada and the United States by the International Joint Commission. ISBN: E95-2/18-2014E-PDF.
- IJC (2017) International Joint Commission. International Lake Ontario St. Lawrence River Board: Current Conditions website (<u>http://ijc.org/en_/islrbc/Current_Conditions</u>). Accessed 08-22-2017
- Infante, D. M., Allan, J. D., Linke, S., & Norris, R. H. (2009). Relationship of fish and macroinvertebrate assemblages to environmental factors: implications for community concordance. *Hydrobiologia*, 623: 87-103.
- Jackson, D. A., Peres-Neto, P. R., & Olden, J. D. (2001). What controls who is where in freshwater fish communities the roles of biotic, abiotic, and spatial factors. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science*, 58: 157-170.
- Janetski, D. J., & Ruetz III, C. R. (2014). Spatiotemporal patterns of fish community composition in Great Lakes drowned river mouths. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, 24, 493-504.
- Jude, D. J., & Pappas, J. (1992). Fish utilization of Great Lakes coastal wetlands. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 24, 569-581.

- Junk, W., Bayley, P. B., & Sparks, R. E. (1989). The flood pulse concept in river-floodplain systems. Pages 110-127 in D.P. Dodge, ed. Proceedings of the International Large River Symposium (LARS). Canadian Special Publication of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 106.
- Kapuscinski, K. L., & Farrell, J. M. (2012). First report of abundant Rudd populations in North America. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 32, 82-62.
- Kapuscinski, K. L., Farrell, J. M., & Murry, B. A. (2012a). Feeding strategies and diets of young-of-the-year muskellunge from two large river ecosystems. *North American Journal* of Fisheries Management, 32, 635-647.
- Kapuscinski, K. L., Farrell, J. M., & Wilkinson, M. A. (2012b). Feeding patterns and population structure of an invasive cyprinid, the rudd *Scardinius erythrophthalmus* (Cypriniformes, Cyprinidae), Buffalo Harbor (Lake Erie) and the upper Niagara River. *Hydrobiologia*, 693, 169-181.
- Keddy, P. A., & Reznicek, A. A. (1986). Great Lakes vegetation dynamics: the role of fluctuating water levels and buried seed. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 12, 25-36.
- Keough, J. R., Thompson, T. A., Guntenspergen, G. R., & Wilcox, D. A. (1999).Hydrogeomorphic factors and ecosystem responses in coastal wetlands of the Great Lakes. *Wetlands*, 19, 821-834.
- Kiernan, J. D., Moyle, P. B., & Crain, P. K. (2012). Restoring native fish assemblages to a regulated California stream using the natural flow regime concept. *Ecological Applications*, 22, 1472-1482.
- King, A. J., Humphries, P., & Lake, P. S. (2003). Fish recruitment on floodplains: the roles of patterns of flooding and life history characteristics. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science*, 60, 773-786.
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). ImerTest package: tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82, 1-26.
- Langer, T. A., Cooper, M. J., Reisinger, L. S., Reisinger, A. J., & Uzarski, D. G. (2018). Water depth and lake-wide water level fluctuation influence on α- and β-diversity of coastal wetland fish communities. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 44, 70-76.
- Larson, J. H., Trebitz, A. S., Steinman, A. D., Wiley, M. J., Mazur, M. C., Pebbles, V., & ... Seelbach, P. W. (2013). Great Lakes rivermouth ecosystems: scientific synthesis and management implications. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 39, 513-524.
- Larsson, P., Tibblin, P., Koch-Schmidt, Engstedt, O., Nilsson, J., Nordahl, O., & Forsman, A. (2015). Ecology, evolution, and management strategies of northern pike populations in the Baltic Sea. *AMBIO*, 44, 451-461.

- Leblanc, J. P., Killourhy, C. C., & Farrell, J. M. (2020). Round goby (Neogobius melaostomus) and native fishes as potential nest predators of centrarchid species in the upper St. Lawrence River. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 46, 216-244.
- Legendre, P., & Legendre, L. (1998). Numerical ecology, 2nd edn. *Developments in Environmental Modelling*, 20, 870pp.
- Linhoss, A. C., Munoz-Carpena, R., Allen, M. S., Kiker, G., Mosepele, K. (2012). A flood pulse driven fish population model of the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Ecological Modelling*, 228, 27-38.
- Lytle, D. A., & Poff, N. L. (2004). Adaptation to natural flow regimes. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 19, 94-100.
- Maceina, M. J., & Bettoli, P. W. (1998). Variation in largemouth bass recruitment in four mainstream impoundments of the Tennessee River. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 18, 998-1003.
- Mapes, R. L., DuFour, M. R., Pritt, J. J., & Mayer, C. M. (2015). Larval fish assemblage recovery: a reflection of environmental change in a large degraded river. *Restoration Ecology*, 23, 85-93.
- Marengo, J. A., & and Espinoza, J. C., (2016). Extreme seasonal droughts and floods in Amazonia: causes, trends and impacts. *International Journal of Climatology*, 36: (3), pp.1033-1050.
- Martin-Bergmann, K. A., & Gee, J. H. (1985). The central mudminnow, *Umbra limi* (Kirtland), a habitat specialist and resource generalist. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 63, 1753-1764.
- Massa, E. A., & Farrell, J. M. (2019). Improving habitat connectivity in a *Typha*-dominated wetland shows increased larval northern pike survival. *Wetlands*, 40, 273-286.
- Meador, M. R., & Carlisle, D. M. (2007). Quantifying tolerance indicator values for common stream fish species of the United States. *Ecological Indicators*, 7: 329-338.
- Meneks, M. L., Vondracek, B., and Hatch, J. (2003). Larval fish as indicators of reproductive success in unchannelized and channelized tributaries of the Red River basin, Minnesota. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology*, 18: 141-154.
- Midwood, J. D., & Chow-Fraser, P. (2012). Changes in aquatic vegetation and fish communities following 5 years of sustained low water levels in coastal marshes of eastern Georgian Bay, Lake Huron. *Global Change Biology*, 18, 93-105.

- Author Manuscript
- Miller, L. M., Kallemeyn, L., & Senanan, W. (2011). Spawning-site and natal-site fidelity by northern pike in a large lake: mark-recapture and genetic evidence. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 130, 307-316.
- Mingelbier, M., Brodeur, P., & Morin, J. (2008). Spatially explicit model predicting the spawning habitat and early stage mortality of northern pike (Esox lucius) in a large system: the St. Lawrence River between 1960 and 2000. *Hydrobiologia*, 601, 55-69.
- Morissette, O., Lecomte, F., Vachon, N., Drouin, A., & Sirois, P. (2021). Quantifying migratory capacity and dispersal of the invasive tench (*Tinca tinca*) in the St. Lawrence River using otolith chemistry. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2020-0460.
- Moyer, E. J., Hulon, M. W., Sweatman, J. J., Butler, R. S., & Williams, V. P. (1995). Fishery response to habitat restoration in Lake Tohopekaliga, Florida. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 15, 591-595.
- Neveldine, B. L., Leblanc, J. P., & Farrell, J. M. (2019). Vegetation response and juvenile northern pike (Esox lucius) outmigration following connectivity enhancement of a Typha dominated coastal wetland. *Wetlands*, 39, 921–934.
- Oele, D. L., Gaeta, J. W., Rypel, A. L., & McIntyre, P. B. (2018). Growth and recruitment dynamics of young-of-year northern pike: implications for habitat conservation and management. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, 28, 285-301.
- Oele, D. L., Hogan, J. D., & McIntyre, P. B. (2015). Chemical tracking of northern pike migrations: If we restore access to breeding habitat, will they come? *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 41, 853-861.
- Ozen, O., & Noble, R. L. (2002). Relationship between water level fluctuations and largemouth bass spawning in a Puerto Rico Reservoir. *American Fisheries Society Symposium*, 31, 213-220.
- Peterson, G., Allen, C.R., &and Holling, C.S. 1998. Ecological Resilience, Biodiversity, and Scale. Ecosystems, 1: 6-18.
- Poff, N. L. (2018). Beyond the natural flow regime? Broadening the hydro-ecological foundation to meet environmental flows challenges in a non-stationary world. *Freshwater Biology*, 63, 1011-1021.
- Poff, N. L., Allan, J. D., Bain, M. B., Karr, J. R., Prestegaard, K. L., Richter, B. D., ... Stromberg, J. C. (1997). The Natural Flow Regime. *Bioscience*, 47, 769-784.
- Poos, M S., & Jackson, D. A. (2012). Addressing the removal of rare species in multivariate bioassessments: the impact of methodological choices. *Ecological Indicators*, 18, 82-90.

- nesting success in the pumpkinseed (Lepomis gibbosus): a comparison of two populations under different risks of predation. Copeia, 3, 649-656. Pritt, J. J., Roseman, E. F., Ross, J. E., & DeBruyne, R. L. (2015). Using larval fish community structure to guide long-term monitoring of fish spawning activity. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 35, 241-252. Resseguie, L. B., & Gordon, D. J. (2019). Thousand Islands Warmwater Fisheries Assessment. Section 6 of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Lake Ontario Annual Report 2019, Bureau of Fisheries, Lake Ontario Unit and St. Lawrence River Unit. Albany, New York. Rippke, M. B., M. T. Distler, & Farrell, J. M. (2010). Post-glacial vegetation dynamics of an upper St. Lawrence River coastal wetland: Paleoecological evidence for a recent historic increase in cattail (Typha). Wetlands, 30, 805-816. Sammons, S. M., Dorsey, L. G., & Bettoli, P. W. (1999). Effects of reservoir hydrology on reproduction by largemouth bass and spotted bass in Normandy Reservoir, Tennessee. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 19, 78-88. Schilling, E. G., Loftin, C. S., & Huryn, A. D. (2009). Macroinvertebrates as indicators of fish absence in naturally fishless lakes. Freshwater Biology, 54:181-202.
 - Schrank, A. J. & Lishawa, S. C. (2019). Invasive cattail reduces fish diversity and abundance in the emergent marsh of a Great Lakes coastal wetland. Journal of Great Lakes Research, 45, 1251-1259.

Popiel, S. A., Perez-Fuentetaja, A., McQueen, D. J., & Collins, N. C. (1996). Determinants of

- Schummer, M. L., Palframan, J., McNaughton, E., Barney, T., & Petrie, S. A. (2012). Comparisons of bird, aquatic macroinvertebrate, and plant communities among dredged ponds and natural wetland habitats a Long Point, Lake Erie, Ontario. Wetlands, 32, 945-953.
- Scott, W. B., & Crossman, E. J. (1998). Freshwater fishes of Canada. Galt House Publications Ltd., Oakville Ontario.
- Smith, B. M., Farrell, J. M., & Underwood, H. B. (2007). Year-class formation of the upper St. Lawrence River northern pike. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 27, 481-491.
- Stuber, R. J. F., Gebhart, F., & Maughan, O. E. (1982). Habitat suitability index models: largemouth bass. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-82/10.16.

- Author Manuscrip
- Tang, R. W. K., Doka, S. E., Gertzen, E. L., & Neigum, L. M. (2020). Dissolved oxygen tolerance guilds of adult and juvenile Great Lakes fish species. *Canadian Manuscript Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 3193: viii + 69 p.
- Tockner, K., Malard, F., & Ward, J. V. (2000). An extension of the flood pulse concept. *Hydrological Processes*, 14, 2861-2883.
- Trenberth, K. E. (, 2011). Changes in precipitation with climate change. *Climate research*, 47(1-2), pp.: 123-138.
- Van der. Valk, A. G. (2005). Water-level fluctuations in North American prairie wetlands. *Hydrobiologia*, 539, 171-188.
- Van Kleef, H., Van der Velde, G., Leuven, R. S. E. W., & Esselink, H. (2008). Pumpkinseed sunfish (Lepomis gibbosus) invasions facilitated by introductions and nature management strongly reduced macroinvertebrate abundance in isolated water bodies. *Biological Invasions*, 10, 1481-1490.
- Ward, J. V., Tockner, K., & Schiemer, F. (1999). Biodiversity of floodplain river ecosystems: ecotones and connectivity. *Regulated Rivers: Research and Management*, 15, 125-139.
- Wei, A. Chow-Fraser, P., & Albert, D. (2004). Influence of shoreline features on fish distribution in the Laurentian Great Lakes. *Canadian Journal of Fish and Aquatic Sciences*, 61, 1113-1123.
- Wilcox D. A., & Bateman, J. A. (2018). Photointerpretation analysis of plant communities in Lake Ontario wetlands following 65 years of lake-level regulation. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 44, 1306-1313
- Wilcox D. A., Buckler, K., & Czayka, A. (2018). Controlling cattail invasion in sedge/grass meadows. Wetlands, 38, 337-347
- Wilcox D. A., Kowalski, K. P., Hoare, H. L., Carlson, M. L., & Morgan, H. N. (2008). Cattail invasion of sedge/grass meadows in Lake Ontario: photointerpretation analysis of sixteen wetlands over five decades. *Journal of Great Lakes Research*, 34, 301-323
- Wilcox, D. A. (2004). Implications of hydrologic variability on the success of plants in Great Lakes wetlands. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health and Management*, 7, 223-231
- Williams, G. D., & Zedler, J. B. (1999). Fish assemblage composition in constructed and natural tidal marshes of San Diego Bay: relative influence of channel morphology and restoration history. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 22, 702-716.
- Wilson, S. K., Fisher, S. J., and Willis, D. W. (1999). Tadpole madtom (*Noturus gyrinus*) biology in an upper Missouri river backwater. *Proceeding of the South Dakota Academy of Science*, 78: 69-77.

Wright, J. J. (2012). Adaptive significance of venom glands in the tadpole madtom *Noturus gyrinus* (Siluriformes: Ictaluridae). *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 215, 1816-1823.

Wu, R. S., (2009). Effects of hypoxia on fish reproduction and development. In *Fish physiology*, 27: (Vol. 27, pp. 79-141). Academic Press.

Table 1. List of species caught during emigration survey across 2012, 2013 and 2016-2021. Taxa category assignment shown for the non-YOY (capitalized abbreviations) and YOY (lowercase abbreviations) fish assemblages. Taxa grouped into Other, CYP, yoy cyprinidae, DARTER, Exotics, and large bodied adults (LBA) categories represents groupings of taxa not used as standalone species. Hyphens represents age-class for that species not recorded in French Creek. Untransformed yearly-mean CPUE (SE) for each standalone species presented by age-class. Untransformed yearly-mean CPUE represent capture per net-night per year. When taxa were grouped into a category, yearly-mean CPUE presented for that category. When individual taxa were grouped in a category, a species specific CPUE was not presented (i.e., n.a.).

Common Name	Latin Name	Non-YOY cat.	Mean CPUE (SE)	YOY cat.	Mean CPUE (SE)	
Bluegill	Lepomis macrochirus	BG	0.8 (0.4)	lepomis	n.a.	
Blackchin shiner	Notropis heterodon	BLCH	1.6 (1.3)	yoy cyprinidae	n.a.	
Bluntnose minnow	Pimephales notatus	BLN	2.7 (2.1)	yoy cyprinidae	n.a.	
Blacknose shiner	Notropis heterolepis	BLNO	0.4 (0.2)	-	n.a.	
Brown bullhead	Ameiurus nebulosus	BBH	18.9 (11.1)	bbh	19.5 (6.5)	
Central mudminnow	Umbra limi	CMM	37.8 (13.5)	cmm	9.8 (4.4)	
Fathead minnow	Pimephales promelas	FATH	2.3 (2.0)	-	n.a.	
Golden shiner	Notemigonus crysoleucas	GOSH	4.1 (1.8)	yoy cyprinidae	n.a.	
Grass pickerel	Esox americanus vermiculatus	GP	1.4 (0.5)	gp	2.0 (1.2)	
Pumpkinseed	Lepomis gibbosus	PS	7.6 (1.4)	lepomis	n.a.	
Tadpole madtom	Noturus gyrinus	TMAD	13.6 (10.5)	tmad	1.8 (1.0)	
Yellow bullhead	Ameiurus natalis	YBH	0.2 (0.1)	-	n.a.	
Yellow perch	Perca flavescens	YP	3.2 (0.6)	ур	0.3 (0.2)	
Bowfin	Amia calva	LBA	n.a.	bf	269.4 (143.8)	
Chain pickerel	Esox niger	LBA	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Common carp	Cyprinus carpio	LBA	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Largemouth bass	Micropterus salmoides	LBA	n.a.	lmb	756.2 (238.4)	
Northern pike	Esox lucius	LBA	n.a.	np	19.7 (11.0)	
Smallmouth bass	Micropterus dolomieu	LBA	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Banded killifish	Fundulus diaphanus	OTHER	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Black crappie	Pomoxis nigromaculatus	OTHER	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Brook silverside	Labidesthes sicculus	OTHER	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Rock bass	Ambloplites rupestris	OTHER	n.a.	other	n.a.	
White sucker	Catostomus commersonii	-	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Bridle shiner	Notropis bifrenatus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Common shiner	Luxilus cornutus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Creek chub	Semotilus atromaculatus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Eastern silvery minnow	Hybognathus regius	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Emerald shiner	Notropis atherinoides	CYP	n.a.	yoy cyprinidae	n.a.	
Mimic shiner	Notropis volucellus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Pugnose shiner	Notropis anogenus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Spotfin shiner	Cyprinella spiloptera	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Spottail shiner	Notropis hudsonius	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Iowa darter	Etheostoma exile	DARTER	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Tessellated darter	Etheostoma olmstedi	DARTER	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Etheostoma spp		DARTER	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Round goby	Neogobius melanostomus	EXOTIC	n.a.	other	n.a.	
Rudd	Scardinus erythropthalmus	EXOTIC	n.a.	-	n.a.	
Tubenose goby	Proterorhinus semilunaris	EXOTIC	n.a.	-	n.a.	

Non-YOY OTHER	0.5 (0.2)	n.a.
LBA	11.1 (6.5)	n.a.
СҮР	4.4 (3.8)	n.a.
DARTER	0.3 (0.3)	n.a.
EXOTIC	0.09 (0.03)	n.a.
yoy lepomis	n.a.	6.9 (3.2)
yoy cyprinidae	n.a.	39.2 (22.0)
yoy other	n.a.	0.13 (0.07)

Table 2. AIC model selection results from linear mixed-effect modeling on fish CPUE_{area} and species richness for the non-YOY and YOY fish assemblages. Top ranked models (within 2 units of the lowest AIC score) are presented relative to the null model. Top ranked models did not differ statistically, and the model with the fewest terms was selected to describe the response (bolded ranked model). Variables separated by a colon in a column header indicate an interaction between the terms. Variables not part of an interaction were treated as an additive main-effect.

Response	Age-Class	Model Rank	Habitat	DeltaWL	WLSpring	DO	TEMP	Distance	WLSpring DeltaWL	Habitat : DeltaWL	Habitat : WLSpring	Habitat : DeltaWL : WLSpring	AIC SCORE
	5	1	•	•	•					•			171.70
	Į0	2	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	171.96
Х	γ-Z	3	•	•						•			172.09
SIT	NON NON	4	•	•	•	•				•			173.68
Ž.		Null											190.63
DI	YOY	1	•	•	•				•				222.5
		2	•	•	•	•			•				224.20
		Null											253.56
70	YOY-NON	1	•	•	•				•				492.94
ESS		2	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	494.74
HN		3	•	•	•			•	•				494.87
SIC		Null											513.71
SPECIES R	YC	1	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	360.08
		2	•	•	•	•	•		•				360.55
	Y	3	•	•	•	•			•				360.78
		Null											392.60



Figure1.revised.tif





Figure3.revised.tif



0.5

0.0



Figure7.revised.tif



Figure8.revised.tif



○ Connectivity □ SpawningPool △ Unmodified





Dissolved oxygen (mg/L)

0

0

 Δ WL

Oconnectivity
□SpawningPool △Unmodified

0

0

Δ

-1.0

0

0.0

ΔWL

R² = 0.2845

1.0

2.0

8

8

60

10

8

6

4

2

0 -2.0

Â



Figure 2.tif















Figure Captions

Figure 1. Map of the location of French Creek within the Laurentian Great Lakes (insets) with the location of the habitat-type complexes along the mainstem of French Creek. Examples of delineated spawning pool complexes, connectivity channel complexes and unmodified habitats shown in outsets.

Figure 2. Example of a dislodged *Typha* x *glauca* mat that exposed spawning pools to the mainstem of French Creek. Imagery taken in 2020, with digitized open-water area remaining (solid white) and lost (white dots) of the spawning pool complex.

Figure 3. Untransformed mean spring water levels (WLSpring) and Δ WL for each survey year. Spring water level (primary y-axis) measured in meter above International Great Lakes Datum (mIGLD) represents mean water levels between 15-March and 15-April of each year. Δ WL (secondary y-axis) represents the rate of change in water levels (m) from mean spring water levels to the emigration survey (mean-June water levels).

Figure 4. Rarefaction curves of species diversity on the cumulative abundance of non-YOY (**a**) and YOY (**b**) fish assemblages. Shadding represents 95% confidence intervals for each habitat-type.

Figure 5. Cumulative proportional abundance of the adult (non-YOY) (**a**) and YOY (**b**) fish assemblages captured at connectivity channels, unmodified channels and spawning pool complexes in French Creek across years (2012, 2013, 2016-2021). Because YOY largemouth bass (lmb) dominated the YOY fish assemblage, relative abundance of the remaining taxa after excluding YOY lmb was explored (**c**). Taxa presented in the figure and legend correspond and are ordered from bottom to top. More common taxa were represented at the bottom of the figure, whereas less common taxa were grouped towards the top of the figure.

Figure 6. RDA biplots for the environmental vectors (left panels) and species scores (right panels) of the non-YOY (adult) (**a**) and YOY (**b**) fish assemblages. Species names are acronyms defined in Table 1. Non-YOY taxa identified by capitalized acronyms and YOY taxa by lowercase acronyms.

Figure 7. Main-effect of habitat-type (left panels) and interaction terms (right panels) on log_{10} (n+1) transformed non-YOY (**a**) and YOY (**b**) fish CPUE_{area}. Habitat-types (left panels) covered by the same line are statistically equivalent based on Tukey post-hoc pairwise comparisons (p > p)

0.05). CUE_{area} of the most abundant fish caught, YOY largemouth bass (LMB), showed a significant habitat-type by Δ WL interaction (c). CPUE_{area} of YOY LMB increased at connectivity channels and decreased at spawning pool complexes with rising Δ WL.

Figure 8. Non-YOY (**a**) and YOY (**b**) yearly species richness. Left panels show differences in yearly species richness among habitat-types. Habitat-types that share the same letter do not differ statistically based on Tukey pairwise comparisons (p > 0.05). Right panel for non-YOY species richness (**a**) and YOY species richness (**b**) visualizes the WLSpring by Δ WL interaction, and the middle panel for (**b**) depicts the significant main-effect of dissolved oxygen on YOY species richness.

Figure 9. Patterns in temperature (**a**) and dissolved oxygen (**b**) among habitat-types (left panels). Habitat-types that share the same letter did not differ statistically based on Tukey pairwise comparisons (p > 0.05). Middle and right panel for temperature (**a**) show the habitat-type by Δ WL interaction and main-effect (black dashed line) of WLSpring on temperature, respectively. Right panel for dissolved oxygen (**b**) shows the main-effect (black dashed line) of Δ WL on dissolved oxygen.

Table 1. List of species caught during emigration survey across 2012, 2013 and 2016-2021. Taxa category assignment shown for the non-YOY (capitalized abbreviations) and YOY (lowercase abbreviations) fish assemblages. Taxa grouped into Other, CYP, yoy cyprinidae, DARTER, Exotics, and large bodied adults (LBA) categories represents groupings of taxa not used as standalone species. Hyphens represents age-class for that species not recorded in French Creek. Untransformed yearly-mean CPUE (SE) for each standalone species presented by age-class. Untransformed yearly-mean CPUE represent capture per net-night per year. When taxa were grouped into a category, yearly-mean CPUE presented for that category. When individual taxa were grouped in a category, a species specific CPUE was not presented (i.e., n.a.).

Line Line <thline< th=""> Line Line <thl< th=""><th>Common Name</th><th>Latin Name</th><th>Non-YOY</th><th>Mean CPUE</th><th>YOY cat.</th><th>Mean CPUE</th></thl<></thline<>	Common Name	Latin Name	Non-YOY	Mean CPUE	YOY cat.	Mean CPUE
Budgin Lepons Bidochinus BS US (0,4) implants I.a. Blackhin shiner Notropis heterodon BLCH 16 (1.3) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Bluntnose minnow Primephales notatus BLN 2.7 (2.1) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Brown bullhead Ameiurus nebulosus BBH 18.9 (11.1) bbh 19.5 (6.5) Central mudminnow Umbra limi CMM 37.8 (13.5) cmm 9.8 (4.4) Fathead minnow Primephales promelas FATH 2.3 (2.0) - n.a. Golden shiner Notemipones crysoleucas GOSH 4.1 (1.8) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Grass pickernel Escx americanus vermiculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Vellow bullhead Aneturus remiculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Vellow bullhead Aneturus remiculatus GP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Arria calva IBA n.a. n.a. n.a. n.a.	Dhugaill	Lanamia maaraabirua			lonomio	(32)
BalaxDimins inliner Notropis neterodori BLN 1.5 (1.3) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Blurtnose minow Pimephales notatus BLN 2.7 (2.1) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Blacknose shiner Notropis heterolepis BLN 0.4 (0.2) - n.a. Brown bulknead Ameirurs nebulosus BBH 189 (11.1) bbh 195 (6.5) Central mudminnow Umbra limi CMM 37.8 (13.5) cmm 9.8 (4.4) Fathead minnow Pimephales promelas FATH 2.3 (2.0) - n.a. Grass pickerel Esox americanus vermiculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) gp 2.0 (12.) Pumpkinesed Leponis gibbosus PS 7.6 (1.4) leponis n.a. Tadpole mattom Noturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Yellow parto Perce flavescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Amie arais YBH 0.2 (0.1) - n.a. Chain pickers and the second se	Bluegili Blackshin shinar	Leponis macrochirus	BG	0.6 (0.4)		n.a.
Builtinus Primpinales Indiaus DLN 2.1 (2.1) yot opinidade in.a. Brown builthead Ameirurs nebuliosus BLN 0.4 (0.2) - n.a. Brown builthead Ameirurs nebuliosus BH 18.9 (11.1) bbh 19.5 (6.5) Central mudminnow Umbra limi CMM 37.8 (13.5) cmm 9.8 (4.4) Fathead minnow Pimephales promelas FATH 2.3 (2.0) - n.a. Golden shiner Notemigonus crysoleucas GOSH 4.1 (1.8) yoy opinidae n.a. Tadpole madtom Noturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Yellow builthead Ameirurs natalis YBH 0.2 (0.1) - n.a. Yellow perch Perca flavescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowlin Amia cahra LBA n.a. - n.a. Chain pickerel Esox inger LBA n.a. - n.a. Chain pickerel Esox inger LBA n.a. - n.a. Chain pickerel Esox inger LBA n.a. - n.a. Chain pickerel Esox lucius LBA n.a. - n.a.	Blackchin Shinei	Notropis neterodon		1.0 (1.3)	yoy cyprinidae	n.a.
Data Knobel Smithel Inductors intervious basice BBH 18.8 (11.1) bbh bbh 19.5 (6.5) Central mudminnow Umbra limi CMM 37.8 (13.5) cmm 9.8 (4.4) Fathead minnow Pimephales promelas FATH 2.3 (2.0) - n.a. Golden shiner Notemigonus crysoleucas GOSH 4.1 (1.8) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Grass pickerel Esox americanus verniculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) gp 2.0 (1.2) Pumpkinseed Lepornis gibbosus PS 7.6 (1.4) lepornis n.a. Tadpole madtom Noturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Yellow perch Perca favescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Amia caha LBA n.a. - n.a. Chain pickerel Esox incire LBA n.a. - n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. n.p 19.7 (11.0) Smallmouth bass Micropterus dolomieu LBA n.a. other n.a. <td>Diuntriose minnow</td> <td>Pimephales notatus</td> <td></td> <td>2.7 (2.1)</td> <td>yoy cyphhiae</td> <td>n.a.</td>	Diuntriose minnow	Pimephales notatus		2.7 (2.1)	yoy cyphhiae	n.a.
Brown bullinead Arrieurus neublosus Behr 15.9 (1.1) Doh 19.8 (6.3) Central mudminnow Pimephales promelas FATH 2.3 (2.0) - n.a. Grass pickerel Esox americanus vermiculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) gp 2.0 (1.2) Pumphinseed Lepomis gibbosus PS 7.6 (1.4) lepomis n.a. Tadpole madtom Noturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (1.0.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0.0) Yellow perch Perce flavescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowlin Arnia calva LBA n.a. - n.a. Common carp Cyprinus carpio LBA n.a. - n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. - n.a. Bande killifish Funduus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Bande killifish Funduus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Bande killifish Funduus diaphanus OTHER	Diacknose sninei		BLINU	0.4 (0.2)	-	11.a.
Central mutual	Brown builnead	Ameiurus nebulosus	BBH	18.9 (11.1)	naa	19.5 (6.5)
Parties prometers FATH 2.3 (2.0) - Ind. Golden shiner Noternigonus crysoleucas GOSH 4.1 (1.8) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Grass pickerel Esox americanus vermiculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) gp 2.0 (1.2) Pumpkinseed Lepomis gibbosus PS 7.6 (1.4) lepomis n.a. Tadpoie madtom Naturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Yellow perch Perca flavescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowlin Amia caiva LBA n.a. bf 269.4 (143.8) Chain pickerel Esox inger LBA n.a. n.a. n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. ina. n.a. Smallmouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. other n.a. Banded killfish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Banded killfish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER <	Central mudminnow	Ombra IImi Dimonholog promolog		37.8 (13.5)	Cmm	9.8 (4.4)
Content similer Notering/orus crysoleuzas GOSH 4.1 (1.6) yoy cyprinidae n.a. Carsas pickerel Esox americanus vermiculatus GP 14.(0.5) gp 2.0.(1.2) Pumpkinseed Lepomis gibbosus PS 7.6 (1.4) lepomis n.a. Tadpole madtom Noturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Yellow bullhead Ameiurus natalis YB 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Amic calva LBA n.a. bf 269.4 (143.8) Common carp Cyprinus carpio LBA n.a. in.a. n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. in.m. 7.6 (1.4) Sanded Killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brook silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brook silverside Labidesthes	Fathead minnow	Pimephales prometas	FAIH	2.3 (2.0)	-	n.a.
Grass picketer Esson americantus vermiculatus GP 1.4 (0.5) gp 2.0 (1.2) Pumpkinseed Leponis gibbosus PS 7.6 (1.4) leponis in a. Tadpole madtom Noturus ayrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 1.8 (1.0) Yellow perch Perca flavescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Amia calva LBA n.a. bf 269.4 (143.8) Chain pickerel Esson riger LBA n.a. - n.a. Common carp Cyprinus carpio LBA n.a. - n.a. Common carp Cyprinus carpio LBA n.a. other n.a. Smalimouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. other n.a. Banded killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Bande killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Back crappie Pomoxis nigromaculatus CYP n.a. <	Golden shiner	Noternigonus crysoleucas	GOSH	4.1 (1.8)	yoy cyprinidae	n.a.
Putnphinseed Lepoints glabosus PS 7.6 (1.4) lepoints f.a. Tadpole madtom Noturus gyrinus TMAD 13.6 (10.5) tmad 13.8 (1.0) Yellow bullhead Ameiurus natalis YBH 0.2 (0.1) - n.a. Yellow perch Perca flavescens YP 3.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Amia calva LBA n.a. n.a. n.a. Common carp Cyprinus carpio LBA n.a. - n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmiodes LBA n.a. nmb 756.2 (238.4) Northern pike Esox lucius LBA n.a. other n.a. Banded killish Funduus dipahanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Banded killish Funduus dipahanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brok silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brok silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a.<			GP	1.4 (0.5)	gp Ianamia	2.0 (1.2)
Tabbie Mation Notitize gyrinus IMAD 13.6 (10.5) tinde 1.8 (10.0) Yellow bellhead Ameiurus natalis YBH 0.2 (0.6) yp 0.3 (0.2) Bowfin Amia calva LBA n.a. bf 269.4 (143.8) Chain pickerel Esox niger LBA n.a. - n.a. Common carp Cyprinus carpio LBA n.a. - n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. - n.a. Northern pike Esox lucius LBA n.a. - n.a. Banded killifish Fundukus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Black crappie Pomoxis nigromaculatus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Broke silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Broke silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Broke silverside Labidesthes sincrulus OTYP n.a.				7.6 (1.4)	iepomis	n.a.
Tellow pourchAmericalisTellU.2 (0.1)-n.a.Vellow perchPerca flavescensYP3.2 (0.6)yp0.3 (0.2)BowfinAmia calvaLBAn.a.bf269.4 (143.8)Chain pickerelEsox nigerLBAn.an.a.Largemouth bassMicropterus salmoidesLBAn.an.a.Largemouth bassMicropterus salmoidesLBAn.a.nmb756.2 (238.4)Northern pikeEsox luciusLBAn.a.othern.a.Banded killifishFundulus diaphanusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Banded killifishFundulus diaphanusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus comutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis angenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis angenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis angenusCYPn.an.a.Spottin shinerNotropis angenusCYPn.a		Noturus gyrinus		13.6 (10.5)	tmad	1.8 (1.0)
Yellow perchPerce invesseersYP3.2 (0.5)yp0.3 (0.2)BowfinAmia calvaLBAn.a.bf269.4 (143.8)Chain pickerelEsox nigerLBAn.an.a.Common carpCyprinus carpioLBAn.an.a.Largemouth bassMicropterus salmoidesLBAn.a.Imb756.2 (238.4)Northern pikeEsox luciusLBAn.a.np19.7 (11.0)Smallmouth bassMicropterus dolornieuLBAn.a.othern.a.Banded killifishFundulus diaphanusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Black crappiePomoxis nigromaculatusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbopiltes rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbopiltes rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbopiltes rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbopiltes rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Creek chubSemotilus atomaculatusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atomaculatusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinelia spilopteraC	Yellow builnead	Amelurus natalis	т вн	0.2 (0.1)	-	n.a.
BOWINArma CarvaLBAIntu- torDr2094. (14.3.6)Chain pickerelEsox nigerLBAn.an.a.Common carpCyprinus carpioLBAn.an.a.Largemouth bassMicropterus salmoidesLBAn.a.Imb756.2 (238.4)Northern pikeEsox luciusLBAn.a.np19.7 (11.0)Smallmouth bassMicropterus dolomieuLBAn.a.othern.a.Banded killfishFundulus diaphanusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Black crappiePomoxis nigromaculatusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Black scappieLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbopites rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbopites rupestrisCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus commersonii-n.a.n.aCreek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis advegrausCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.a	Yellow perch	Perca navescens	1P	3.2 (0.0) n a	ур	0.3 (0.2)
Chain picketielExon MigerExon MigerExonI.a.I.a.I.a.Common carpCyprinus carpioLBAn.a.n.p19.7 (11.0)Smallmouth bassMicropterus salmoidesLBAn.a.np19.7 (11.0)Smallmouth bassMicropterus dolomieuLBAn.a.np19.7 (11.0)Smallmouth bassMicropterus dolomieuLBAn.a.othern.a.Banded killifishFundulus diaphanusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Black crappiePomoxis nigromaculatusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brok silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbiopites rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus comutusCYPn.an.a.Corek chubSemotlius atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Castern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis adherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis adherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis nogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis adhesinuisCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis nogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shiner <td>Bowtin Chain nickers!</td> <td>Amia calva</td> <td>LBA I BA</td> <td>n.a.</td> <td>DT</td> <td>269.4 (143.8)</td>	Bowtin Chain nickers!	Amia calva	LBA I BA	n.a.	DT	269.4 (143.8)
Lommon carp Copinius carpio LDA in.a n.a. Largemouth bass Micropterus salmoides LBA n.a. Imb 756.2 (238.4) Northern pike Esox lucius LBA n.a. other n.a. Banded killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Banded killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brook silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Common shiner Luxilus commersonii - n.a. other n.a. Common shiner Luxilus comutus CYP n.a n.a. Creek chub Semotilus atromaculatus CYP n.a n.a. Eastern silvery minnow Hybognathus regius CYP n.a n.a. Eastern silvery minnow Hybognathus regius CYP n.a n.a. Pugnose shiner Notropis atherinoides CYP n.a n.a. Spottil shiner Notropis atherinoides CYP n.a n.a. Isona Spottil shiner Notropis hudsonius CYP n.a n.a. Iowa darter Etheostoma oimstedi DARTER n.a. other n.a. Exotric n.a. other n.a. Etheostoma spp DARTER n.a n.a. Rudd Scardinus erythropthalmus EXOTIC n.a. other n.a. Rudd Scardinus erythropthalmus EXOTIC n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. BARTER n.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. CYP 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.a n.a. BARTER 1.		Esox niger		n.a.	-	n.a.
Largemouth bass Micropterus saimoldes Lon int. imp 756.2 (236.4) Northern pike Esox lucius LBA n.a. np 19.7 (11.0) Smallmouth bass Micropterus dolomieu LBA n.a. other n.a. Banded killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Black crappie Pomoxis nigromaculatus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Black strappie Pomoxis nigromaculatus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brook silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Rock bass Amblopites rupestris OTHER n.a. other n.a. Bridle shiner Notropis bifrenatus CYP n.a n.a. Common shiner Luxilus comutus CYP n.a n.a. Common shiner Luxilus comutus CYP n.a n.a. Creek chub Semotilus atromaculatus CYP n.a n.a. Eastern silvery minnow Hybognathus regius CYP n.a n.a. Emerald shiner Notropis volucellus CYP n.a n.a. Mimic shiner Notropis volucellus CYP n.a n.a. Spottil shiner Notropis underlass CYP n.a n.a. Spottil shiner Notropis underlass CYP n.a n.a. Spottil shiner Notropis underlass CYP n.a n.a. Fuensal shiner Notropis underlass CYP n.a n.a. Nervis volucellus CYP n.a n.a. Nervis volucellus CYP n.a n.a. Nervis volucellus CYP n.a n.a. Spottil shiner Notropis angenus CYP n.a n.a. Ilowa darter Etheostoma exile DARTER n.a n.a. Ilowa darter Etheostoma exile DARTER n.a n.a. Spottil shiner Notropis melanostomus EXOTIC n.a n.a. Etheostoma spp Proterorhinus semilunaris EXOTIC n.a n.a. Ruud Scardinus erythropthalmus EXOTIC n.a n.a. Spottil Shiner Notropis selluster DARTER n.a n.a. CYP 4.4 (3.8) n.a. Non-YOY OTHER - 0.3 (0.03) n.a. Non-YOY OTHER - 0.3 (0.3) n.a. Yoy lepomis n.a. (59 (3.2) Yoy cyprinidae - 0.3 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae - 0.3 (3.2) Yoy cyprinidae - 0.4 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae - 0.3 (3.2) Yoy cyprinidae - 0.4 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae - 0.4 (3.2) Yoy cyprinidae - 0.4 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae - 0.4 (3.2		Cyprinus carpio		n.a.	-	n.a.
NotifierESX luciusLDAn.a.np19. / (11.0)Banded killifishFundulus diaphanusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Black crappiePomoxis nigromaculatusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbiopites rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.White suckerCatostomus commersonii-n.a.othern.a.Common shinerLuxilus cornutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerNotropis nudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Ibug datus regiusCYPn.an.aSpotfin shinerNotropis nudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Ibug datus regiusCYPn.an.aSpotfin shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Ibug datusCYPn.an.an.a.Ibug datusDaRTERn.an.an.a. <t< td=""><td>Largemouth bass</td><td>Micropterus saimoides</td><td></td><td>n.a.</td><td>dmi</td><td>756.2 (238.4)</td></t<>	Largemouth bass	Micropterus saimoides		n.a.	dmi	756.2 (238.4)
Shriaimouti bass Micropierus obornieu Lux Inta. other Inta. Banded killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Banded killifish Fundulus diaphanus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brook silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Brook silverside Labidesthes sicculus OTHER n.a. other n.a. Rock bass Amblopites rupestris OTHER n.a. other n.a. Bridle shiner Natropis bifrenatus CYP n.a. other n.a. Common shiner Luxilus comutus CYP n.a. n.a. n.a. Creek chub Semotilus atromaculatus CYP n.a. n.a. n.a. Eastern silvery minnow Hybognathus regius CYP n.a. n.a. n.a. Emerald shiner Natropis valucellus CYP n.a. n.a. n.a. Pugnose shiner Natropis anogenus CYP n.a. n.a. n.a. Spottil shiner Natropis hudsonius CYP n.a. n.a. n.a. Ibowa darter Ethoestoma oimstedi DARTER n.a. <		ESOX IUCIUS	LBA	n.a.	np	19.7 (11.0)
Banded KillinshFundulus diapnanusOTHERInterInterOthern.a.Black crappiePomoxis nigromaculatusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brock silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmblopiltes rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus cornutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Mimic shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis nodgonusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Etheostoma sppDaRTERn.an.aRuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.a. <td>Smallmouth bass</td> <td>Micropterus dolomieu</td> <td></td> <td>n.a.</td> <td>other</td> <td>n.a.</td>	Smallmouth bass	Micropterus dolomieu		n.a.	other	n.a.
bildc GrappiePomoxs nigromaculatusOTHERInd.otherInd.Brook silversideLabidesthes sicculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Brook sassAmbiopiltes rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.White suckerCatostomus commersonii-n.a.othern.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus cornutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Iminic shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spottal shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma olistediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Sottal shinerO.3 (0.3)n.an.aRuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.a. <td>Banded Killifish</td> <td>Fundulus diapnanus</td> <td>OTHER</td> <td>n.a.</td> <td>other</td> <td>n.a.</td>	Banded Killifish	Fundulus diapnanus	OTHER	n.a.	other	n.a.
Brook silversideLabidestriesSilculusOTHERn.a.othern.a.Rock bassAmbloplites rupestrisOTHERn.a.othern.a.White suckerCatostomus commersonii-n.a.othern.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus cornutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Mimic shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis angenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.CYPn.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHERn.a.LBAn.a. <t< td=""><td>Black crapple</td><td>Pomoxis nigromaculatus</td><td>OTHER</td><td>n.a.</td><td>other</td><td>n.a.</td></t<>	Black crapple	Pomoxis nigromaculatus	OTHER	n.a.	other	n.a.
Rock DassAntropolites rupestrisOTHERInd.OtherInd.White suckerCatostomus commersonii-n.a.othern.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus cornutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Mimic shinerNotropis volucellusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis angenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProteorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.aCYP.4.4 (3.8)n.an.a.Iowa darterExotric0.09 (0.03)n.aRuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythro	Brook silverside		OTHER	n.a.	other	n a
Write suckerCatostomus commersonii-I.a.otherI.a.Bridle shinerNotropis bifrenatusCYPn.an.a.Common shinerLuxilus cornutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Mimic shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis nogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spottail shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.a.n.an.a.Lowa darter0.3 (0.3)n.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.a. <t< td=""><td>ROCK Dass</td><td></td><td>OTHER</td><td>n a</td><td>other</td><td>n.a.</td></t<>	ROCK Dass		OTHER	n a	other	n.a.
Bridie ShinerNotropis pirenatusCYPIndInd.Common shinerLuxilus comutusCYPn.an.a.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.a.yoy cyprinidaen.a.Mimic shinerNotropis volucellusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma oimstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Ibenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.aCYPJop oppinisJop oppinidaeRudd<	White sucker		-	n.a.	otner	n.a.
Common shinerLuxius condutusCYPI.uI.u.Creek chubSemotilus atromaculatusCYPn.an.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Mimic shinerNotropis volucellusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfail shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma oimstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHERIba-n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.an.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)n.a.yoy cyprinidaen.an.a.Upper theren.an.a.Spotfail shinern.an.a.Ibas atterExotricn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma semilunarisEXOTICn.aRuddScardinus erythroptha	Bridle sniner	Notropis bifrenatus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.
Creek chubSemotitus atromaculatusCYPIn.aIn.a.Eastern silvery minnowHybognathus regiusCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.a.yoy cyprinidaen.a.Mimic shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfail shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.aCYP4.4 (3.8)n.an.a.yoy lepomisn.a.0.3 (0.3)n.ayoy cyprinidaen.an.aNon-YOY Orthern.an.aLBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.yoy cyprinidaen.an.ayoy cyprinidaen.a0.3 (0.3)n.a.yoy cyprinidaen.a1.a.	Common sniner	Luxilus cornutus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.
Eastern Silvery MinnowHybognathus regulsCYPn.an.a.Emerald shinerNotropis atherinoidesCYPn.an.a.Mimic shinerNotropis volucellusCYPn.an.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP.0.3 (0.3)n.aJoy lepomisn.an.ayoy cyprinidaen.aNon-YOY Orther.0.3 (0.3)n.a.LBAyoy cyprinidaen.ayoy cyprinidaeYou cyberActor<		Semotilus atromaculatus	CYP	n.a.	-	n.a.
Enterland sininerNotropis anienholdesCYPn.a.yoy cypinidaen.a.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYPDARTER0.3 (0.3)n.aDARTERNon-YOY OTHERJoy lepomisYoy cyprinidaeNon-YOY OTHERJoy lepomis <td>Eastern silvery minnow</td> <td>Hybognathus regius</td> <td>CYP</td> <td>n.a.</td> <td>-</td> <td>n a</td>	Eastern silvery minnow	Hybognathus regius	CYP	n.a.	-	n a
Minic similarNotropis volucenusCYPInaIna.Pugnose shinerNotropis anogenusCYPn.an.a.Spotfin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spotfail shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.ayoy lepomisn.a0.99 (0.03)n.a.yoy cyprinidaen.a1.ayoy cyprinidaen.a0.3 (0.2)n.a.	Emerald shiner	Notropis atherinoides	CYP	n.a.	yoy cyprinidae	n a
Pupilose similerNotropis anogenosCTPIndia-IndiaSpottin shinerCyprinella spilopteraCYPn.an.a.Spottail shinerNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.an.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.OARTER0.3 (0.3)n.aEXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.aNon-YOY Othern.aCYP4.4 (3.6)0.42 (0.27)	Numic Shinei	Notropis volucenus	CYP	n a	-	n a
Spotial sinierNotropis hudsoniusCYPn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Iowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.a.othern.a.Etheostoma sppDARTERn.an.a.n.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.a.othern.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.an.a.DARTER0.3 (0.3)n.aEXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a0.4 (20.07)	Pugnose sniner		CYP	n.a.	-	n a
Spotial shifterNotropis housenidsCTPIndia-IndiaIowa darterEtheostoma exileDARTERn.an.a.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.a.othern.a.Etheostoma sppDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.a.othern.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.a.n.a.n.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.a.n.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.a.DARTER0.3 (0.3)n.a.EXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a.10.2 (22.0)	Spottini shiner	Cyprinella Spiloptera	CYP	n a	-	n a
Idwa danterEtheostoma ekineDARTERIndInd.Tessellated darterEtheostoma olmstediDARTERn.a.othern.a.Etheostoma sppDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.a.othern.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.a.n.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.a.DARTER0.3 (0.3)n.a.EXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a.39.2 (22.0)	Spottali Shiriei	Ethooptomo ovilo		na	-	na
Tessenated darterEtheostoria offisitedDARTERInd.OtherInd.Etheostoma sppDARTERn.an.a.Round gobyNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.a.othern.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.aDARTER0.3 (0.3)n.a.EXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a.39.2 (22.0)		Etheostoma ethe	DARTER	n a	- othor	n a
Entrestoring sppNeogobius melanostomusEXOTICn.a.othern.a.RuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.a.DARTER0.3 (0.3)n.a.EXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a.39.2 (22.0)Non cypen.a.0.412 (0.07)		Elleosiona omstea	DARTER	n a	ouner	n a
Roding gobyNeedgobilds metallostomusEXCTICInitialOtherRuddScardinus erythropthalmusEXOTICn.an.a.Tubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.an.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.an.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.an.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.a.DARTER0.3 (0.3)n.a.EXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a.39.2 (22.0)Non ethern.a.0.412 (0.07)	Etheostoma spp	Noogobius malanastamus		n a	- othor	n a
KuduScardinus eryinopinalinusEXOTICInalInalTubenose gobyProterorhinus semilunarisEXOTICn.a.n.a.Non-YOY OTHER0.5 (0.2)n.a.LBA11.1 (6.5)n.a.CYP4.4 (3.8)n.a.DARTER0.3 (0.3)n.a.EXOTIC0.09 (0.03)n.a.yoy lepomisn.a.6.9 (3.2)yoy cyprinidaen.a.39.2 (22.0)Nov othern.a.0.42 (0.07)	Round goby	Neogobius melanosiomus	EXOTIC	n a	other	n a
Non-YOY OTHER 0.5 (0.2) n.a. LBA 11.1 (6.5) n.a. CYP 4.4 (3.8) n.a. DARTER 0.3 (0.3) n.a. EXOTIC 0.09 (0.03) n.a. yoy lepomis n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0)		Bretererbinus englinoplinamus	EXOTIC	na	-	na
LBA 11.1 (6.5) n.a. CYP 4.4 (3.8) n.a. DARTER 0.3 (0.3) n.a. EXOTIC 0.09 (0.03) n.a. yoy lepomis n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0)		Proteronninus semiiunans	EXOTIC	0 5 (0 2)	-	n a
CYP 4.4 (3.8) n.a. DARTER 0.3 (0.3) n.a. EXOTIC 0.09 (0.03) n.a. yoy lepomis n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0)				0.5(0.2)		n a
DARTER 0.3 (0.3) n.a. EXOTIC 0.09 (0.03) n.a. yoy lepomis n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0)				11.1 (0.5)		n a
EXOTIC 0.09 (0.03) n.a. yoy lepomis n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0)				4.4 (3.0) 0 3 (0 3)		na
yoy lepomis n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0)				0.3 (0.3)		n a
yoy reponds n.a. 6.9 (3.2) yoy cyprinidae n.a. 39.2 (22.0) yoy other n.a. 0.42 (0.07)				0.0 9 (0.03) n a		60(2.2)
yoy cyprinidae 39.2 (22.0)	yoy reponns			na		30.2 (J.2) 30.2 (J2.0)
	yoy other			n.a.		0 13 (0 07)

Table 2. AIC model selection results from linear mixed-effect modeling on fish CPUE_{area} and species richness for the non-YOY and YOY fish assemblages. Top ranked models (within 2 units of the lowest AIC score) are presented relative to the null model. Top ranked models did not differ statistically, and the model with the fewest terms was selected to describe the response (bolded ranked model). Variables separated by a colon in a column header indicate an interaction between the terms. Variables not part of an interaction were treated as an additive main-effect.

Response	Age-Class	Model Rank	Habitat	DeltaWL	WLSpring	DO	TEMP	Distance	WLSpring : DeltaWL	Habitat : DeltaWL	Habitat : WLSpring	Habitat : DeltaWL : WLSpring	AIC SCORE
	ŕ	1	•	•	•					•			171.70
	ĺ0	2	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	171.96
Х	ζ-z	3	•	•						•			172.09
IT	ĨŎ,	4	•	•	•	•				•			173.68
Ž.		Null											190.63
DI	YOY	1	•	•	•				•				222.5
		2	•	•	•	•			•				224.20
	F .	Null											253.56
	YOY-NO	1	٠	•	•				•				492.94
ESS		2	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	494.74
H		3	•	•	•			•	•				494.87
SIC	Z	Null											513.71
SPECIES F	үоү	1	•	•	•				•	•	•	•	360.08
		2	•	•	•	•	•		•				360.55
		3	•	•	•	•			•				360.78
		Null											392.60