**Table 1:** Here is shown the AIC table output from a full model set run with respect to *C. clemensi* that includes various summary statistics. This shows that the full model, with all three variables – salmon species, year of sampling, and the region of the sampling site – is the best predictor of the data.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***C. clemensi*  Model** | **Negative Log Likelihood** | **AIC value** | **Delta-AIC value** |
| **Null** | -1509.74 | 3025.5 | 35.2 |
| **Site Region** | -1505.65 | 3019.3 | 29 |
| **Year** | -1502.83 | 3017.7 | 27.3 |
| **Year, Site Region** | -1498.2 | 3010.4 | 20.1 |
| **Species** | -1497.33 | 3004.7 | 14.3 |
| **Species, Site Region** | -1493.2 | 2998.4 | 8.1 |
| **Species, Year** | -1490.78 | 2997.6 | 7.2 |
| **Species, Year, Site Region** | -1486.16 | 2990.3 | 0.0 |

**Table 2:** Here is shown the effects of each significant level in the variables from the full model described in Table 1. That includes the Reverse Transformed Estimate, which represents the coefficient raised to the exponent of *e,* and included is a 95% confidence interval of that Estimate, represented by the coefficient, plus or minus two standard errors, raised to the exponent of *e.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***C. clemensi*  Output** | **Coefficient** | **Standard Error** | **Reverse Trans. Est.** |
| **Chum** | -1.161 | 0.173 | 0.313 (0.222, 0.443) |
| **Pink** | -0.581 | 0.158 | 0.559 (0.408, 0.767) |
| **Sockeye** | -0.686 | 0.153 | 0.504 (0.371, 0.684) |
| **2016** | -0.579 | 0.158 | 0.560 (0.409, 0.769) |
| **2017** | -0.778 | 0.285 | 0.459 (0.260, 0.812) |
| **2018** | -0.516 | 0.177 | 0.597 (0.419, 0.850) |
| **Johnstone Strait** | 0.402 | 0.126 | 1.495 (1.162, 1.923) |

**Table 3:** Here is shown the AIC table output from a full model set run with respect to *L. salmonis*  that includes various summary statistics. This shows that the model including only the salmon species and the year of sampling is the best predictor of the data

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***L. salmonis*  Model** | **Negative Log Likelihood** | **AIC value** | **Delta-AIC value** |
| **Site Region** | -461.316 | 930.6 | 77.8 |
| **Null** | -461.325 | 928.6 | 75.8 |
| **Year, Site Region** | -452.342 | 918.7 | 65.8 |
| **Year** | -452.366 | 916.7 | 63.9 |
| **Species, Site Region** | -427.751 | 867.5 | 14.7 |
| **Species** | -427.833 | 865.7 | 12.8 |
| **Species, Year, Site Region** | -418.292 | 854.6 | 1.7 |
| **Species, Year** | -418.419 | 852.8 | 0.0 |

**Table 4:** Here is shown the effects of each significant level in the variables from the species + year model described in Table 2. That includes the Reverse Transformed Estimate, which represents the coefficient raised to the exponent of *e,* and included is a 95% confidence interval of that Estimate, represented by the coefficient, plus or minus two standard errors, raised to the exponent of *e.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***L. salmonis*  Output** | **Coefficient** | **Standard Error** | **Reverse Trans. Est.** |
| **Chum** | -2.074 | 0.362 | 0.126 (0.061, 0.259) |
| **Pink** | -1.283 | 0.324 | 0.277 (0.145, 0.530) |
| **Sockeye** | -3.572 | 0.403 | 0. 028 (0.013, 0.063) |
| **2016** | -0.662 | 0.392 | 0.516 (0.236,1.130) |
| **2017** | -2.108 | 0.900 | 0.121 (0.020, 0.735) |
| **2018** | -2.138 | 0.518 | 0.118 (0.042, 0.332) |