

Western Washington University Western CEDAR

Environmental Sciences Faculty and Staff Publications

Environmental Sciences

12-4-2023

Dataset for the Incorporation of Climate Change into a Multiple Stressor Risk Assessment for the Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) Population in the Yakima River, Washington USA

Wayne Landis Western Washington Univ., United States, wayne.landis@wwu.edu

Chelsea J. Mitchell Washington State University, chelsea.mitchell@wsu.edu

John D. Hader Stockholm University, John.Hader@aces.su.se

Rory Nathan University of Melbourne, rory.nathan@unimelb.edu.au

Emma E. Sharpe

Part of the Aquaculture and Fisheries Commons, and the Environmental Indicators and Impact Assessment Commons

Recommended Citation

Landis, Wayne; Mitchell, Chelsea J.; Hader, John D.; Nathan, Rory; and Sharpe, Emma E., "Dataset for the Incorporation of Climate Change into a Multiple Stressor Risk Assessment for the Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) Population in the Yakima River, Washington USA" (2023). *Environmental Sciences Faculty and Staff Publications*. 68. https://cedar.wwu.edu/esci_facpubs/68

This Dataset is brought to you for free and open access by the Environmental Sciences at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Environmental Sciences Faculty and Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

Supplemental Information

Table S1. Descriptions and derivation of conditional probability tables (CPTs). CPTs were generated using equations, case learning, and pegging the corners, defined below.

<u>Equations</u>, such as derived from regressions on exposure-response data, can be used to derive conditional probability tables. The use of equations in Netica is described here (<u>https://www.norsys.com/WebHelp/NETICA/X_Equations.htm</u>).

<u>Case learning</u>: Case learning is a machine learning tool used to derive relationships between variables. In the BN-RRM we are using parameter case learning since the causal relationships have already been identified. Details on the methodology in Netica can be found at (<u>https://www.norsys.com/WebHelp/NETICA/X_Learning_from_Cases.htm</u>).

<u>Pegging the corners</u>. When an interaction is indicated and data do not exist to quantify the interaction a 'pegging the corners" technique can be employed (Marcot et al. 2006, Marcot 2017). Pegging the corners sets the extreme cases to the maximum or minimum response possible and then back interpolates the other entries.

Node	Description	Rank Descriptions	Description	Data Source
Spray scenario	Describes the additional amounts of insecticide added given the scenario	None Decrease Present Low Medium High	None-no spraying of these pesticides in the future, Decrease-60 percent decrease in present concentrations, Present-pesticide concentrations as described in Mitchel et al 2021, Low-20 percent increase in pesticide concentrations, Medium-60 percent increase in pesticide concentrations, High-100 increase in pesticide concentrations	Current pesticide concentrations are derived from Ecology 2016a, Tuttle 2014. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds.
River and Region (Mitchell et al 2021)	Lower Yakima, Upper Yakima, Naches	NA	Study areas	Ecology 2016a, 2016b; Tuttle 2014; WAC 2011a, 2011b. (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)
Season (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Time of year	Spring (months 3-< 6), summer (months 6-< 9), fall (months 9-< 12), winter (months 12-< 3)	Captures seasonal variability in water temperature, DO and chlorpyrifos concentrations.	Ecology 2016a, 2016b; Tuttle 2014; WAC 2011a, 2011b.

Water Quality (WQ)	This node specifies	NA	Selection here	Ficklin et al 2013 is the
Scenario	which water		populates the DO mod	source of the temperature
	quality parameters		and the Temp mod	and DO distributions.
	to use from Ficklin		nodes. When a scenario	
	et al (2013.		is selected the	
	010.(2020)		appropriate distribution	
			nonulates each node	
Malathian	Mossured	0 to 2 6o 5 M	Populates each node.	Ecology 2016a, Tuttle 2014
concentration	concontrations of	2 6e-5 to 2 6e-4 M	concontrations of	Distribution is derived from
(Londic et al 2020		2.6c 5 to 2.6c 4 M,		downloaded data from each
(Lanuis et al 2020,	ton woor noried in	5.4e-4 to 0.001 M.		of the watershed. Then we
witchell et al 2021)	ten-year period in	0.001 to 0.005 M	concentrations are	of the watersned. Then we
	each of the river's		adapted from regulatory	calculated OP concentrations
	major waterways.		in un (1)	versus probability for each
			in µg/L)	river and season.
Malathion	Concentration of	0 to 2.6e-5 M,	Ranks based on molar	The percent increases were
concentration 2	malathion by	2.6e-5 to 2.6e-4 M,	concentrations as above.	derived from Table 1.
	adding the spray	2.6e-4 to 5.4e-4 IVI,	Derived from the	
	scenario amount to	0.001 to 0.005 M	addition of values from	
	that predicted	0.001 10 0.005 10	Spray Scenario and River	
	from the River and		and Region.	
	Region node			
Diazinon	Measured	0 to 3.04e-5 M,	Ranks based on molar .	Ecology 2016a, Tuttle 2014.
concentration	concentrations of	3.04e-6 to 3.04e-5	concentrations of	Distribution is derived from
(Landis et al 2020,	diazinon over a	Μ,	diazinon. Molar	downloaded data from each
Mitchell et al 2021)	ten-year period in	3.04e-5 to 1.52e-4	concentrations are	of the watershed. Then we
	each of the river's	Μ,	adapted from regulatory	calculated OP concentrations
	major waterways.	1.52e-4 to 0.001 M,	criteria for OPs (reported	versus probability for each
		0.001 – 0.005 M	in μg/L)	river and season
Diazinon	Concentration of	0 to 3.04e-5 M,	Ranks based on molar	The percent increases were
concentration 2	malathion by	3.04e-6 to 3.04e-5	concentrations as above.	derived from Table 1.
	adding the spray	Μ,	Derived from the	
	scenario amount to	3.04e-5 to 1.52e-4	addition of values from	
	that predicted	Μ,	Spray Scenario and River	
	from the River and	1.52e-4 to 0.001 M.		
		,	and Region.	
	Region node	0.001 – 0.005 M	and Region.	
Water	Region node Measured water	0.001 – 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16,	and Region. Temperature ranges	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a.
Water Temperature(Landis	Region node Measured water temperature over	0.001 – 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25,	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c)	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways.	0.001 – 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways.	0.001 – 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season.
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, -	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, -	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al 2013)	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q to 13, 13 to 15 (°C)C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod Water Temperature	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al 2013) Describes the	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q to 13, 13 to 15 (°C)C) 0 to 13, 13 to 16,	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013. Distribution of	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013 Derived from the
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod Water Temperature 2	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al 2013) Describes the change in water	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q to 13, 13 to 15 (°C)C) 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25,	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013. Distribution of temperature ranges as	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013 Derived from the Temperatures of Water
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod Water Temperature 2	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al 2013) Describes the change in water temperature with	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q to 13, 13 to 15 (°C)C) 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013. Distribution of temperature ranges as predicted by Ficklin et al	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013 Derived from the Temperatures of Water Temp node to the Temp
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod Water Temperature 2	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al 2013) Describes the change in water temperature with climate change	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q to 13, 13 to 15 (°C)C) 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013. Distribution of temperature ranges as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013 Derived from the Temperatures of Water Temp node to the Temp mod. Nodes.
Water Temperature(Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021) Temp mod Water Temperature 2	Region node Measured water temperature over a ten-year period in each of the river's main waterways. Change of temperature as derived by the climate change model (Ficklin et al 2013) Describes the change in water temperature with climate change introduced.	0.001 - 0.005 M 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C) -13 to-11, -11 to -9, - 9 to -7, to -7 to -5, - 5 to -3, -3 to -1, -1 to 1, 1 to 3, 5 to 5, 5 to 7, 7 to 9, 9 to 11, 1q to 13, 13 to 15 (°C)C) 0 to 13, 13 to 16, 16 to 18, 18 to 25, >25 (°C)	and Region. Temperature ranges specific to salmonids based on Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water and survival data. Change in temperature as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013. Distribution of temperature ranges as predicted by Ficklin et al 2013.	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011a. Distribution is derived from downloaded data for each of the watersheds. We calculated WT value versus probability for each river and season. Ficklin et al 2013 Derived from the Temperatures of Water Temp node to the Temp mod. Nodes.

	1	1	1	1
Dissolved Oxygen	Measured oxygen	0 to 3.5, 3.5 to 5, 5	Ranges specific to	Ecology 2016b, WAC 2011b.
(Landis et al 2020,	concentrations	to 6.5, 6.5 to 8, 8 to	salmonids based on	Distribution is derived from
Mitchell et al 2021)	over a ten-year	9.5,	Table 200 (1)(d) Aquatic	downloaded data from each
	period in each of	9.5 to 11, 11 to 15,	Life Temperature Criteria	of the watersheds calculate
	the river's main	15 to 22.39	in Fresh Water and	DO value versus probability
	waterways.	(mg dissolved	survival data.	for each river and season.
		oxygen/L)	Distribution is based on	
			downloaded data from	
			each of the watersheds	
DO mod	Change of	16to 18 14to 16	Amount of change in DO	Ficklin et al 2013
	temperature as	1 2 to 1 4 1 to 1 2	concentration with	
	derived by the	0.8 to 1.06 to 0.8	climate change	
	climate change	0.0 to 1, 0.0 to 0.0,	introduced	
	model (Eicklin et al	0.4 10 0.0, 0.2 10 0.4,	introduced.	
		0 10 0.2, -0.2 10 0, -		
	2013)	0.4 10 -0.2, -0.6 10 -		
		0.4, -0.8 to -0.6, -0.6		
		to -0.4, -0.8 to -0.6, -		
		1 to -0.8, -1.2 to -1, -		
		1.4 to -1.2,-1.6 to -		
		1.4, -1.8 to -1.6, -2		
		to -1.8		
		(mg dissolved		
		oxygen/L)		
Dissolved Oxygen 2	Describes the	0 to 3.5, 3.5 to 5, 5	Resulting change in DO	Ficklin et al 2013.
	distribution in	to 6.5, 6.5 to 8, 8 to	concentration with	
	dissolved oxygen	9.5,	climate change	
	with predicted	9.5 to 11, 11 to 15,	introduced.	
	changes.	15 to 22.39		
		(mg dissolved		
		oxygen/L)		
o:		X 4 5 40 00 50		
Simulation year	Year of simulation	Years 1, 5, 10, 20, 50	The maximum model	Plots summarized by
(Landis et al 2020,	results.		simulation year is 50.	describing results for years 1,
Mitchell et al 2021)				5, 10, 20 and 50 from the
				metapopulation model
				simulations.
AChE activity	AChE activity in	0 to 25, 25 to 50, 50	This describes the	Laetz et al. 2009. Curve
(Landis et al 2020,	salmonids exposed	to 75, 75 to 100, 100	relationship between the	fitted from the dataset
Mitchell et al 2021)	to OP	to 125, 125 to 200	malathion and diazinon	kindly supplied by NOAA via
	concentrations	milli optical density	concentrations and the	C. Laetz using the drc
	dissolved in water.	(mOD) per minute	change in AChE activity	package in R.
		per gram	as determined by curve	
			fitting.	
Toxicological	Mortality due to	0, 10, 20, 50, 90	AChE values that were 5-	Coppage et al. 1975.
Effects-Percent	AChF activity	-, -0, -0, 50, 50	20% as published by	Duangsawasdi 1977 Weiss
Mortality (Landis et			Fulton and Key (2005)	1961 Wheelock et al 2005
al 2020 Mitchell of			was linked to mortality	Fulton and Key (2001)
			was mined to mortdiny	
ai 2021)	1	1		1

Toxicological Effects- Change in Swimming rate (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Decreased AChE activity in salmonids exposed to OP concentrations dissolved in water. Change is swimming due to AChE activity	0 to 25, 25 to 50, 50 to 75, 75 to 100, 100 to 150, 150 to 250	AChE inhibition affects swimming,	Results based on Sandahl et al. 2005 with Coho salmon as the surrogate. Ranking is set as equal intervals up until 100%. >100% indicates a faster swimming speed. The exposure-response curve is based upon the dataset as kindly supplied by NOAA via C. Laetz using the drc package in R.
Toxicological Effects-Summing mortality and the change in swimming rate (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Summation of toxicological effects due to acute mortality and change in swimming rate.	None, 10, 20, 50, 90 percent change	Conditional probability table based on a "peg the corners" approach Marcot (2017).	The CPT was compiled using an extrapolation (peg the corners) approach for the Yes Mortality. The CPT was constructed using a peg the corners approach due to lack of data in the literature, with the highest (100%) probability of effect set at 270 (the summed maximum percent in each of the three nodes (90+90+90= 270)). to cause a 90% reduction in juvenile survival.
Water Quality Effects - Juvenile Salmonids (Mitchell et al 2021)	Effects specific to juvenile salmonid survivorship due to water quality in the Yakima.	0, 10, 20, 50, 90 percent	Combines the effects of DO and temperature.	Water quality effects was compiled using a case file based the Literature (Brett 1952, Carter 2005, 2008).
Water Quality Effects - Egg to emergence (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Effects specific to eggs and larval salmonids, specifically the decline in survivorship of eggs to hatch due to water quality effects.	0, 10, 20, 50, 90 percent	Combines the effects of DO and temperature.	This CPT was completed using the literature (our expert judgement).References to support current CPT include: Carter 2005, 2008. Geist et al. 2006; Jager 2011; McCullough 1999; McCullough et al. 2001; Richter and Kolmes 2005.
Juvenile % Reduction in Survival (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Reduction in juvenile salmonid survivorship due to all effects.	0, 10, 20, 50, 90 percent	Combines the ecological and toxicological pathways that affect juvenile survival.	A pegging the corners approach was used. The sum of each combination % 10, 20, 50, 90 was calculated. 90+90+90= 270 was the highest probability of risk and was calculated as 100% probability of 90% reduction.
Adult % Reduction in Survival (Landis et al 2020, Mitchell et al 2021)	Reduction in adult salmonid survivorship due to all effects.	0, 10, 20, 5 percent	Combines the ecological and toxicological pathways that affect adult survival.	This CPT was completed using the literature (our expert judgement) and case file learning. Carter 2005, 2008; Jager 2011;

				McCullough 1999, McCullough et al. 2001; Richter and Kolmes 2005; Peery 2010.
Metapopulation	CESRF (hatchery),	NA	Specifies the	Based on characterizations
(Mitchell et al 2021)	Upper Yakima,		subpopulation to the	of the Spring Chinook salmon
	Naches, American.		Yakima River	populations in the Yakima
			metapopulation of	River Basin Fast et al. 1991,
			Chinook salmon.	Busack and Marshall 1991).
Chinook Pop. Size	The probability	0 to 1e5, 1e5 to 5e5,	The probability	This CPT compiled from case
(Landis et al 2020,	distribution of	5e5 to 1e6, 1e6 to	distributions were	file learning using the Netica
Mitchell et al 2021)	subpopulation size.	5e6, 5e6 to 1e7, 1e7	derived from the	software to derive the
		to 2.14748e9	metapopulation model	probabilities for each cause
		(# fish in	outputs (subpopulation	and effect combination as
		subpopulation)	abundance) for the	determined by the model
			combinations of inputs	output. The inputs are from
			and 200 simulations of	nodes Adult %Reduction in
			each condition.	survival and Juvenile %
				reduction in survival. The
				nodes simulation year and
				metapopulation specify the
				length of the simulation and
				the segment of the
				metapopulation respectively.
				See Mitchell et al 2021 for
				additional details on the
				population modeling.

SI References

- Akçakaya, H.R. and W.T. Root. 2013. RAMAS GIS: Linking Spatial Data with Population Viability Analysis (version 6). Applied Biomathematics, Setauket, New York.
- Beckman, B.R., Larsen, D.A., Sharpe, C., Lee-Pawlak, B., Schreck, C.B. and Dickhoff, W.W., 2000.
 Physiological status of naturally reared juvenile spring Chinook salmon in the Yakima River: seasonal dynamics and changes associated with smolting. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, *129*(3), pp.727-753.
- Busack C, Marshall A. 1991. Genetic analysis of YFP chinook salmon stocks. Annu Prog Rep to the Bonneville Power Administration.
- Coppage DL, Matthews E, Cook GH, Knight J. 1975. Brain acetylcholinesterase inhibition in fish as a diagnosis of environmental poisoning by malathion, *O,O*-dimethyl *S*-(1,2 dicarbethoxyethyl) phosphorodiyhioate. Pestic Biochem. 5:536-542. DOI: 10.1016/0048-3575(75)90028-0.
- Dittman AH, May D, Larsen DA, Moser ML, Johnston M, Fast D. 2010 Jul 1. Homing and Spawning Site Selection by Supplemented Hatchery- and Natural-Origin Yakima River Spring Chinook Salmon. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. doi:10.1577/T09-159.1. [accessed 2019 Jul 1]. https://ntserver1.wsulibs.wsu.edu:2764/doi/abs/10.1577/T09-159.1.
- Dittman A. 2017. Spawning distributions- Yakima Chinook populations.

Duangsawasdi M. 1977. Organophosphate insecticide toxicity in rainbow trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). Effects of temperature and investigations on the sites of action [Internet]. PhD thesis. University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada, October 1977. Available from

https://mspace.lib.umanitoba.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1993/14496/Duangsawasdi Organoph osphate_Insecticide.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. 150 p. Accessed July 25, 2019.

- Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2016a. Environmental Information Management System, Version 2.0.0.0 [Internet]. Washington Department of Ecology: Lacey, WA, Freshwater Fish Contaminants Chlorpyrifos 2006-2016. Available from <u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/eimreporting/MonitoringProgramDefault.aspx?StudyMonitoring</u> <u>ProgramUserId=WSTMP&StudyMonitoringProgramUserIdSearchType=Equals</u>. Accessed July 25, 2019.
- Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2016b. Environmental Information Management System, Version 2.0.0.0 [Internet]. Washington Department of Ecology: Lacey, WA, Freshwater Fish Contaminants Diazinon 2006-2016. Available from

https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/eimreporting/MonitoringProgramDefault.aspx?StudyMonitoring ProgramUserId=WSTMP&StudyMonitoringProgramUserIdSearchType=Equals. Accessed July 25, 2019.

- Fast DE. 1988. Yakima River Spring Chinook Enhancement Study, 1987 Annual Report. Yakima Indian Nation.
- Fish Passage Center Comparative Survival Study. [accessed 2017a Aug 12]. http://fpc.org/survival/smp_multiyearsurvival_query.html.
- Ficklin, D.L., Stewart, I.T. and Maurer, E.P., 2013. Effects of climate change on stream temperature, dissolved oxygen, and sediment concentration in the Sierra Nevada in California. Water Resources Research, 49(5), pp.2765-2782.
- Fulton MH, Key PB. 2001. Acetylcholinesterase inhibition in estuarine fish and invertebrates as an indicator of organophosphorus insecticide exposure and effects. Environ Toxicol Chem. 20(1):37-45. DOI: 10.1002/etc.5620200104.
- Geist DR, Abernethy CS, Hand KD, Cullinan VI, Chandler JA, Groves PA. 2006. Survival, development, and growth of fall Chinook salmon embryos, alevins, and fry exposed to variable thermal and dissolved oxygen regimes. Trans Am Fish Soc. 135(6):1462-77. DOI: 10.1577/T05-294.1.

Hanski I. 1998. Metapopulation dynamics. Nature. 396(6706):41.

- Johnson, C.L., Pearsons, T.N. and Temple, G.M., 2009. Spring Chinook Salmon Interactions Indices and Residual/Precocious Male Monitoring in the Upper Yakima Basin.
- Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP), Upper Yakima Spring Chinook / Cle Elum Supplementation and Research Facility. 2010. Yakama Nation In cooperation with WDFW and BPA. [http://ykfp.org/Yakima_HGMPs/Yakima_FaChHGMP_May2010.pdf].
- Hines EE, Landis WG. 2014. Regional risk assessment of the Puyallup River watershed and the evaluation of low impact development in meeting management goals. Integr Environ Assess Manag. 10:269-278.

Jager HI. 2011. Quantifying temperature effects on fall Chinook salmon [Internet]. ORNL/TM-2011/456. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2011, pages 14-19. Available from http://info.ornl.gov/sites/publications/files/Pub33206.pdf.

Kareiva P, Marvier M, McClure M. 2000. Recovery and management options for spring/summer chinook salmon in the Columbia River Basin. Science. 290(5493):977–979.

- Knudsen CM, Schroder SL, Busack CA, Johnston MV, Pearsons TN, Bosch WJ, Fast DE. 2006. Comparison of life history traits between first-generation hatchery and wild upper Yakima River spring Chinook salmon. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 135(4):1130–1144.
- Laetz CA, Baldwin DH, Collier TK, Hebert V, Stark JD, Scholz NL. 2009. The synergistic toxicity of pesticide mixtures: implications for risk assessment and the conservation of endangered pacific salmon. Envirn. Health. Perspect. 117: 348-353. DOI: 10.1289/ehp.0800096.
- Landis WG, Chu VR, Graham SE, Harris MJ, Markiewicz AJ, Mitchell CJ, Stackelberg KE, Stark JD. 2020. Integration of Chlorpyrifos Acetylcholinesterase Inhibition, Water Temperature, and Dissolved Oxygen Concentration into a Regional Scale Multiple Stressor Risk Assessment Estimating Risk to Chinook Salmon. Integr Environ Assess Manag. 16(1):28–42. doi:10.1002/ieam.4199. [accessed 2020 Apr 30]. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ieam.4199.
- Marcot BG, Steventon JD, Sutherland GD, McCann RK. 2006. Guidelines for development and updating Bayesian belief networks applied to ecological modeling and conservation. Can J Forest Res. 36:3063–3074.
- Marcot BG. 2012. Metrics for evaluating performance and uncertainty of Bayesian network models. Ecol. Model. 230:50-62.
- Marcot BG. 2017. Common quandaries and their practical solutions in Bayesian network modeling. Ecol Model. 358:1–9.
- McCullough DA. 1999. A review and synthesis of effects of alterations to the water temperature regime on freshwater life stages of salmonids, with special reference to Chinook salmon [Internet].
 Report # EPA 910-R-99-010. United States Environmental Protection Agency Water Division.
 Region 10. Seattle, WA. July 1999. Available from http://www.critfc.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/EPAreport_2.pdf?x78172. Accessed July 25, 2019.
- McCullough DA, Spalding S, Sturdevant D, Hicks M. 2001. Summary of technical literature examining the physiological effects of temperature on salmonids [Internet]. Report # EPA 910-D-01-005. United States Environmental Protection Agency. Water Division. Region 10. Seattle, WA May 2001.
 Available from https://www.critfc.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/epareport_dale.pdf?x78172.
 Accessed July 25, 2019.
- Mitchell CJ, Lawrence E, Chu VR, Harris MJ, Landis WG, von Stackelberg KE, Stark JD. 2021. Integrating Metapopulation Dynamics into a Bayesian Network Relative Risk Model: Assessing Risk of Pesticides to Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) in an Ecological Context. *Integr Environ Assess Manag*.17:95-109.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2008. Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation, draft biological opinion: Environmental Protection Agency registration of pesticides containing chlorpyrifos, diazinon, and malathion. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/16997. Viewed 16 Feb 2018.

- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2017. National Marine Fisheries Service Endangered Species Act Section 7. Biological Opinion on the Environmental Protection Agency's Registration of Pesticides containing Chlorpyrifos, Diazinon, and Malathion [Internet]. Available from <u>https://doi.org/10.7289/V5CJ8BQM</u>, <u>https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/16997</u>. Accessed July 25, 2019.
- Norsys Software Corp. 2014. Netica[™] Bayesian network development software [Internet]. Norsys Software Corp., Vancouver, B.C., Canada. Copyright 2014. Available from <u>http://www.norsys.com/netica.html</u>. Accessed July 25, 2019.
- Pearson, T. N., C. L. Johnson, B. B. James, and G. M. Temple. 2007. Spring Chinook salmon interactions indices and residual/precocious male monitoring in the upper Yakima basin. Annual Report FY 2007 submitted to Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon. DOE/BP-106760.
- Peery CA. 2010. Temperature and handling of adult salmon and steelhead at Bonneville Dam [Internet]. Idaho Fisheries Resource Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, DOI. Ahsaka, Idaho. January 2010. Available from

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=OahUKEwi394X2g 6fcAhVKilQKHXsXDelQFggoMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fpweb.crohms.org%2Ftmt%2Fdocuments% 2FFPOM%2F2010%2FTask%2520Groups%2FTask%2520Group%2520BON%2520AFF%2FAppG%25 20Temperature%2520and%2520handling%2520of%2520adult%2520salmon%2520and%2520stee lhead.doc&usg=AOvVaw0H5Rg3UK i6fjiO0upq9Fu. Accessed July 25, 2019.

- Pollino CA, Woodberry O, Nicholson A, Korb K, Hart BT. 2007. Parameterisation and evaluation of a Bayesian network for use in an ecological risk assessment. Environ Model Software 22:1140-1152.
- R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.
- Ratner, S., Lande, R. and Roper, B.B., 1997. Population Viability Analysis of Spring Chinook Salmon in the South Umpqua River, Oregon: Análisis de Viabilidad Poblacional del Salmón Chinook de Primavera en el río South Umpqua, Oregon. *Conservation Biology*, *11*(4), pp.879-889.
- Rechisky, E.L., Welch, D.W., Porter, A.D., Jacobs-Scott, M.C. and Winchell, P.M., 2013. Influence of multiple dam passage on survival of juvenile Chinook salmon in the Columbia River estuary and coastal ocean. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *110*(17), pp.6883-6888.
- Rechisky, E.L., Welch, D.W., Porter, A.D., Hess, J.E. and Narum, S.R., 2014. Testing for delayed mortality effects in the early marine life history of Columbia River Basin yearling Chinook salmon. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 496, pp.159-180.
- Richter A, Kolmes SA. 2005. Maximum temperature limits for Chinook, Coho, and chum salmon, and steelhead trout in the Pacific Northwest. Rev Fish Sci. 13(1):23-49. DOI: 10.1080/10641260590885861.
- Roni, P., Johnson, C., De Boer, T., Pess, G., Dittman, A. and Sear, D., 2015. Interannual variability in the effects of physical habitat and parentage on Chinook salmon egg-to-fry survival. *Canadian journal of fisheries and aquatic sciences*, 73(7), pp.1047-1059.
- Sampson, M.R., D.E. Fast, and W.J. Bosch (editors). Yakima-Klickitat Fisheries Project Monitoring and Evaluation – Yakima Subbasin, Final Report for the performance period May/2015-April/2016, Project number 1995-063-25, 265 electronic pages.

- Sandahl JF, Baldwin DH, Jenkins JJ, Scholz NL. 2005. Comparative thresholds for acetylcholinesterase inhibition and behavioral impairment in coho salmon exposed to chlorpyrifos. Environ Toxicol Chem 24:136–145.
- Schtickzelle, N. and Quinn, T.P., 2007. A metapopulation perspective for salmon and other anadromous fish. *Fish and Fisheries*, 8(4), pp.297-314.
- Tuttle G.2014. Surface water monitoring program for pesticides in salmonid-bearing streams, 2013 data summary. A cooperative study by the Washington state departments of agriculture and ecology [Internet]. Report # AGR PUB 103-411 (N/8/14). Washington State Department of Agriculture. Olympia, WA. Available from https://agr.wa.gov/FP/Pubs/docs/411-SWM2013Report.pdf.
- WAC (Washington Administrative Code). 2011a. WAC 173-201A-200: Fresh water designated uses and criteria Table 200 (1)(c) Aquatic Life Temperature Criteria in Fresh Water [Internet]. 2011a.
 Available from http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-201A-200. Accessed July 25, 2019.
- WAC (Washington Administrative Code). 2011b. WAC 173-201A-200: Fresh water designated uses and criteria Table 200 (1)(d) Dissolved oxygen Criteria in Fresh Water [Internet]. Available from http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=173-201A-200. Accessed July 25, 2019.
- Weiss CM. 1961 Physiological effect of organic phosphorus insecticides on several species of fish. Trans Am Fish Soc. 90:143-152.
- Wheelock CE, Shan G, Ottea J. 2005. Overview of carboxyl-esterases and their role in the metabolism of insecticides. J Pest Sci. 30(2):75–83.
- Zabel RW, Scheuerell MD, McClure MM, Williams JG. 2006. The Interplay between Climate Variability and Density Dependence in the Population Viability of Chinook Salmon: Population Viability of Chinook Salmon. Conservation Biology. 20(1):190–200. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00300.x.
- Zabel et al. 2007. Assessing the Impact of Environmental Conditions and Hydropower on Population Productivity for Interior Columbia River Stream-type Chinook and Steelhead Populations. Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team).

htt<u>ps://www.nwfsc.noa</u>a.gov/assets/11/8632_02052016_134513_ICTRT.and.Zabel.2007. pdf. [last accessed 09/03/201

Summary of methods used in the BN from Mitchell et al (2021).

Mitchell et al. (2021) constructed four age-based matrix population models representing each spring Chinook subpopulation in the Yakima River Basin, WA. The study focused on direct effects, and not the indirect effects that may be caused by changes to benthic communities and water flows. The transition matrices were based on stream-type Chinook salmon life history graphs and had a maximum age of 5 years. Matrix transition values (survival and reproduction) and dispersal rates were estimated from subpopulation-specific life history information described in detail in the Supplemental Data of Mitchell et al. (2021). The matrices used baseline models representing metapopulation dynamics prior to impact from pesticides and ecological stressors. An equation for diazinon-malathion synergistic mixture toxicity was derived using the drc package in R (Ritz et al. 2015) to model a log logistic 3 parameter model of the pesticide toxicity data from Laetz et al. (2013). Diazinon and malathion concentrations were converted to toxic units (TU) in the equation for this model by normalizing measured concentrations with EC50s calculated from individual diazinon and malathion dose-response curves (Laetz et al. 2009, 2013).

Measured organophosphate concentrations (malathion and diazinon in μ g/L), water temperature 7-day average of the daily maxima (°C), and dissolved oxygen (DO) data (mg/L) were downloaded from the Washington Department of Ecology's Environmental Integrated Management (EIM) database (WDOE 2020) using search filters "Lower Yakima" and "fresh/surface waters" for the monitoring period of 2006 to 2016. The resulting frequency distributions of the data were discretized into bins and incorporated into conditional probability tables (CPTs) dependent on the season. For pesticide data, non-detects ("U" -qualified) and data detected below the reporting limit ("J"-qualified) were captured in the lowest pesticide concentration bins in the Bayesian network. The lowest pesticide concentration bins were parameterized as 0 μ g/L to the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) aquatic life criteria for diazinon (0.17 μ g/L) or malathion (0.1 μ g/L) (USEPA 2020) and were associated with no toxic effect (no effect on AChE activity) in the model. Additional details can be found in Mitchell et al. (2021) and the associated Supplemental Information.

The Puget Sound Partnership's (PSP's) recovery goal for Chinook salmon is "no net loss" of population abundance (PSP 2020). This metric was used to define risk to Chinook in the present study and has previously been used to define risk by Landis et al. (2020) and Mitchell et al. (2021). The initial abundance for all subpopulation models was set to 500 000 fish, which approximates a typical salmon population's spawner abundance under a stable age distribution for the region. Risk was defined as the probability that the resultant metapopulation size is below the initial abundance of 500 000 fish.

The sensitivity of the Bayesian network Chinook population size endpoint to various nodes was calculated using Netica's "Sensitivity to findings" function to calculate percent mutual information (Norsys 2014).

Supplemental Information Tables

SI Table 1. Modifications (additions) to the temperature and dissolved oxygen distributions for seasons and climate change scenarios. All modification (mod) distributions are normal distributions with the mean and standard deviation indicated below. Modifications adapted from Ficklin et al. (2013) percentile and standard deviation ensemble model statistics across the Sierra Nevada for the 2050s and 2080s for spring and summer. Low=25th percentile; medium = 50th percentile; high = 75th percentile of SWAT model simulations forced with 16 general circulation models.

Node	Scenario states	Season	Mean (standard deviation)
Temp mod	Low_2050	Spring	0.9 (0.2)
(25 th	Low_2050	Summer	1.5 (0.5)
percentile)	Low_2050	Fall	1 (1)
	Low_2050	Winter	1 (1)
	Low_2080	Spring	2.1 (0.4)
	Low_2080	Summer	3.1 (0.7)
	Low_2080	Fall	1 (1.4)
	Low_2080	Winter	1 (1.4)
Temp mod	Med_2050	Spring	1.9 (0.3)
(50 th	Med_2050	Summer	2.5 (0.6)
percentile)	Med_2050	Fall	1 (1.2)
	Med_2050	Winter	1 (1.2)
	Med_2080	Spring	3.2 (0.5)
	Med_2080	Summer	4.4 (0.9)
	Med_2080	Fall	1 (1.8)
	Med_2080	Winter	1 (1.8)
Temp mod	High_2050	Spring	2.9 (2.5)
(75 th	High_2050	Summer	3.4 (0.6)
percentile)	High_2050	Fall	1 (5.0)
	High_2050	Winter	1 (5.0)
	High_2080	Spring	4.4 (0.6)
	High_2080	Summer	5.5 (0.8)

	High_2080	Fall	1 (1.6)
	High_2080	Winter	1 (1.6)
DO mod	Low_2050	Spring	-0.8 (0.1)
(25 th	Low_2050	Summer	-1.2 (0.3)
percentile)	Low_2050	Fall	-0.1 (0.6)
	Low_2050	Winter	-0.1 (0.6)
	Low_2080	Spring	-1.4 (0.3)
	Low_2080	Summer	-1.6 (0.5)
	Low_2080	Fall	-0.1 (1)
	Low_2080	Winter	-0.1 (1)
DO mod	Med_2050	Spring	-0.6 (0.5)
(50 th	Med_2050	Summer	-0.9 (1.0)
percentile)	Med_2050	Fall	-0.1 (2.0)
	Med_2050	Winter	-0.1 (2.0)
	Med_2080	Spring	-1.3 (0.5)
	Med_2080	Summer	-1.3 (1.0)
	Med_2080	Fall	-0.1 (2.0)
	Med_2080	Winter	-0.1 (2.0)
DO mod	High_2050	Spring	-0.3 (0.1)
(75 th	High_2050	Summer	-0.6 (0.2)
percentile)	High_2050	Fall	-0.1 (0.4)
	High_2050	Winter	-0.1 (0.4)
	High_2080	Spring	-0.6 (0.1)
	High_2080	Summer	-0.9 (0.2)
	High_2080	Fall	-0.1 (0.4)
	High_2080	Winter	-0.1 (0.4)

SI Table 2. Scenarios explored in the amended Bayesian network model from Mitchell et al (2021) for the lower Yakima metapopulation. Present = original distributions from Mitchell et al. (2021) model. See Tables 1 and 2 and text for additional explanation of scenarios.

Scenario #	Spray scenario	Season	WQ Scenario
1a	None	Summer	Present
1b	None	Spring	Present
2a	None	Summer	High 2050
2b	None	Spring	High 2050
3a	None	Summer	High 2080
Зb	None	Spring	High 2080
4a	Present	Summer	Present
4b	Present	Spring	Present
5a	Present	Summer	High 2050
5b	Present	Spring	High 2050
6a	Present	Summer	High 2080
6b	Present	Spring	High 2080
7a	High	Summer	Present
7b	High	Spring	Present
8a	High	Summer	High 2050
8b	High	Spring	High 2050
9a	High	Summer	Hiah 2080
9b	High	Spring	High 2080
10a	High	Summer	Low 2050
10b	High	Spring	Low 2050
11a	Present	Summer	Low 2080
11b	Present	Spring	Low 2080
12a	High	Summer	Low 2080
12b	High	Spring	Low 2080
13a	None	Summer	Low 2080
13b	None	Spring	Low 2080
14a	None	Summer	Low 2050
14b	None	Spring	Low 2050
15a	Present	Summer	Low 2050
15b	Present	Spring	Low 2050

Supplemental Information Figures



SI Figure 1. Conceptual flow for modifying monitoring concentration distribution nodes from Mitchell et al. (2021) for dissolved oxygen. (a) "Present" state selected in *Scenario* with no resulting change to the original *Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)* distribution so both *Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)* nodes contain the same distributions, (b) "Future" state selected in *Scenario* so the distribution in the parent *Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)* is subtracted from the distribution in the modification node to create a modified distribution in the child *Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)*. A similar modification was made for the Water *Temperature 7-DADMax* distribution. Pesticide distributions were modified through percent additions or subtractions.



SI Figure 2. Adjustment network for the malathion, diazinon, water temperature, and dissolved oxygen monitoring nodes. Nodes are grouped into pesticides (green); scenarios (bright blue); and water quality (dark blue). Mod=modification factor; DO= dissolved oxygen; temp = temperature. Pesticide concentration distributions are reduced or increased by percentages based on hypothetical futures in the *Spray scenario* node. Water quality nodes are adjusted by adding their corresponding "mod" nodes based on scenario projections.



SI Figure 3. Scenario example for summertime monitoring data in the Lower Yakima with a high 2080 projected adjustment to water quality (temperature and dissolved oxygen) and a high spray scenario. Note the changes in the values of the nodes compared to SI Figure 2.



SI Figure S4. Sensitivity analysis to population node for the present, 2050, and 2080 year scenarios with none, present, and high pesticide loads using mutual information (%). Note the differences in the contributions as measured by mutual information for the spring (yellow) compared to summer (blue). Note the importance of the metapopulation node is in summer compared to the spring.