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#### Abstract

We hypothesized that fishes in short-hydroperiod wetlands display pulses in activity tied to seasonal flooding and drying, with relatively low activity during intervening periods. To evaluate this hypothesis, sampling devices that funnel fish into traps (drift fences) were used to investigate fish movement across the Everglades, U.S.A. Samples were collected at six sites in the Rocky Glades, a seasonally flooded karstic habitat located on the southeastern edge of the Everglades. Four species that display distinct recovery patterns following drought in longhydroperiod wetlands were studied: eastern mosquitofish (Gambusia holbrooki) and flagfish (Jordanella floridae) (rapid recovery); and bluefin killifish (Lucania goodei) and least killifish (Heterandria formosa) (slow recovery). Consistent with our hypothesized conceptual model, fishes increased movement soon after flooding (immigration period) and just before drying (emigration period), but decreased activity in the intervening foraging period. We also found that eastern mosquitofish and flagfish arrived earlier and showed stronger responses to hydrological variation than either least killifish or bluefin killifish. We concluded that these fishes actively colonize and escape ephemeral wetlands in response to flooding and drying, and display species-specific differences related to flooding and drying that reflect differences in dispersal ability. These results have important implications for Everglades fish metacommunity dynamics.


Changes in habitat use, activity level, and movement strategies of animals may be adaptive responses to environmental fluctuation (Armsworth and Roughgarden 2005, Nams 2006). For example, as habitat patch quality deteriorates, optimal foraging theory suggests individuals should increase exploratory behavior and the frequency of long-distance displacements to gain better information about other habitat patches. These behavioral changes can decrease the odds of time wasted in low-quality sites and reduce the risk of being stranded in a dangerous site (Fretwell and Lucas 1970, Fretwell 1972). In aquatic ecosystems, fluctuations in habitat quality favoring dispersal include changes in oxygen availability, predation risk and water depth and temperature (Cucherousset et el. 2007, Correa et al. 2008, Rayner et al. 2008, Mosepele et al. 2009, Schofield et al. 2009), as well as food availability and sites for reproduction (Lowe-McConnell 1987). In wetlands, floodplains, arid-zone rivers, and littoral zones, seasonal fluctuations in water depth may be so severe as to strand aquatic animals (Chapman et al. 1991, Perry and Bond 2009). Environmental fluctuation also may provide temporary access to previously unavailable high-quality habitats that provide food resources and reproductive sites free from predators for species able to colonize transient environments. In such variable environments, behaviors sensitive to the changing risk of stranding by habitat loss and that enable exploitation of newly available habitat should be favored (Resetarits 2001, Segev et al. 2011).

Though ecologists have always been aware of the limitations of assuming closed populations and communities, increased attention during the past two decades has been paid to spatial ecology, and metapopulation and metacommunity dynamics. Much of metapopulation and metacommunity ecology has been spatially implicit, but recently efforts have focused on using behavioral rules of movement to integrate spatial dynamics into theory (Jacobson and

Peres-Neto 2010). Fisher (1937) and Skellam (1951) proposed ecological analysis of movement by establishing a null model of diffusion based on three behaviors: movement speed, time dispersing in a direction, and turning angle. The speed, time moving in a particular direction, and turning angle determine individual displacement and, collectively, population spread across a landscape. Despite their historical significance, simple diffusion models tend to predict spreading that is too slow to respond to environmental fluctuation (DeAngelis et al. 2010 and citations therein). Thus, bias in turning angle and speed that affect directedness of spread may be common. At the population level, changes in the speed and directionality of movement in response to cues of habitat change determine the ability of a species to persist in a spatially complex and temporally fluctuating environment (Armsworth and Roughgarden 2005, Abrams et al. 2007, Jacobson and Peres-Neto 2010). In aquatic systems, change in water chemistry, presence of desiccated conspecifics, and elevated intra and interspecific density may act as cues that indicate changing habitat quality (Magoulick and Kobza 2003, Davey and Kelly 2007, Sadeh et al. 2011). Spatial complexity and temporal fluctuation are ubiquitous features of wetlands, and fish movement dynamics in these systems likely play an important role in metapopulation and metacommunity persistence.

The Florida Everglades is a large landscape of hydrologically dynamic, shallow wetlands, where hydrologic connectivity among permanent and ephemeral habitats facilitates fish persistence throughout this system. Aquatic habitat size of the Everglades fluctuates seasonally, with the spatial extent of drying varying annually in roughly decadal cycles of drought severity (Childers et al. 2006; Gaiser et al. 2012). Annual fluctuation in the spatial area of flooding leads to local variation in the time between drying events. Local drying forces fishes to move to areas that remain inundated; those individuals that fail to respond appropriately die from desiccation or
predation. Regional drying can limit fish communities and drive transitions in community composition as the time since a regional drying event increases (Trexler et al. 2005, Ruetz et al. 2005). Three life-history strategies related to recovery following drought have been identified within the Everglades fish assemblage: rapid recovery and sustained high density (eastern mosquitofish - Gambusia holbrooki); rapid recovery followed by decline in density as time since re-flooding increases (flagfish - Jordanella floridae); and slow recovery over a number of years to an asymptotic density (bluefin killifish - Lucania goodei and least killifish - Heterandria formosa) (Trexler et al. 2005, DeAngelis et al. 2005). The relative contributions of immigration and local reproduction in supporting those recovery patterns are not well understood, but reproduction alone cannot explain the first two patterns, as all age classes appear in samples soon after re-flooding (unpublished data). Furthermore, the magnitude of fish emigration from wetlands prior to drying is uncertain, as is its effect on population and community responses to drought in the Everglades landscape.

In this study, we sought to characterize patterns of fish activity in response to hydrologic variation in the Florida Everglades (Figure 1). To investigate fish immigration and emigration in response to annual flooding and drying, we focused on short-hydroperiod wetlands that dry completely every year. Eastern mosquitofish, flagfish, least killifish and bluefin killifish were monitored because of their documented differences in recovery following hydrologic disturbance (Trexler et al. 2005, DeAngelis et al. 2005). Our primary objectives were to determine whether fish-activity patterns change in predictable ways in response to flooding and drying and whether there are interspecific differences in response to flooding and drying. We hypothesized that there are three distinct periods of fish activity that correspond to hydrologic conditions: 1) immigration period, a response to flooding, 2) emigration period, a response to drying, and 3) an
intervening foraging period (Figure 2). The duration of these periods is expected to be shortest when fish activity is elevated (immigration and emigration periods) and longest when fish activity is depressed (foraging period). We also hypothesized that eastern mosquitofish and flagfish arrive sooner, have stronger responses to both flooding and drying, and are generally more dominant numerically than either least killifish or bluefin killifish.

## Methods

## Study Area and Sampling Method

From 2000 to 2004 fishes were sampled in the Rockland Ridge, aka Rocky Glades, a karstic short-hydroperiod wetland in the eastern portion of the Everglades National Park (ENP) (Fig. 1). Here the water table drops below the ground surface for extended periods of time and supports a substrate of mainly limestone and marl instead of peat (a long-hydroperiod Everglades soil). Vegetation in the Rocky Glades is characterized by semi-aquatic gramminoids and upland shrubs, with bayheads and tree islands on topographic highs and aquatic plants in solution holes (Craighead 1971).

Fishes were sampled by constructing six drift-fences in the Rocky Glades (Loftus et al. 2001). To determine population dynamics and successional patterns in the wetlands, we sampled from 2000 to 2004 at four sites (sites 1-4) located along the ENP main road, and from 2001 to 2004 at two sites (sites 5 and 6) located north of the road (Figure 1). Park policies and logistics limited work to sites that could be reached on foot. The X-shaped structures had 12-m wings of black plastic agricultural ground cloth to direct animals into metal minnow traps (3-mm mesh) at the center (see Obaza et al. 2011). To capture fishes moving across the landscape at sites 1 through 4 the traps faced three directions ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{W}$ ), while sites 5 and 6 had traps facing all four cardinal directions (N, S, E, W). The minnow traps were set overnight and fishes were removed
after approximately 24 hours to yield fish catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE). Following wetland flooding, samples were taken daily for the first two weeks, twice weekly for the next two weeks, and finally weekly for the rest of the wet season until all wetlands dried. We saw no evidence that repeated visits to the sites affected the local habitat because the hard karst limestone substrate and the sparse emergent/submerged vegetation resisted trampling. Therefore, site visits likely resulted in little to no consistent effects on our data.

Our data, as well as other studies (e.g., Obaza et al. 2011), indicate that CPUE obtained from drift-fence minnow traps are indicative of fish activity rates. In cases where both driftfence CPUE and throw-trap samples of fish density are available, little or no correlation has been found (Hoch et al., unpublished manuscript). Following Obaza et al. (2011), we use the term "encounter rate" to refer to drift-fence CPUE because the traps are stationary and fish must encounter and enter the trap to be captured, implying fish are moving; stationary fish will not be caught.

Depth measurements obtained at permanent staff gauges at each drift fence were adjusted to reflect local variation in elevation. Measurements were taken frequently to capture hydrological variation [on average approx. every 11 days; less frequently when the wetland was dry $($ depth $=0)$ and more frequently when the wetland was wet $($ depth $>0)]$. To estimate hydrologic parameters, we interpolated data among days by retaining the previous measurement until the next recorded measurement. The hydrologic parameters we estimated from the data were: 1) Hydroperiod - the number of days the wetland was flooded (depth $>0$ ) within a given water year; 2) Flooding Event - the intervening time between dry periods when the wetland is inundated with water; 3) Days Since Flooding (DSF) - at the time of sampling, the number of continuous days that a marsh has been flooded (this value resets each time the water depth
reaches zero). Because the study sites are only inundated for a portion of each year and rainfall that floods them is variable annually, we defined a "water year" to correspond to a period that begins near the onset of the rainy season (April) and ends at the termination of the dry season the following year (March). In instances when there was an early pulse of rain indicating the onset of the wet season, we pushed back the date to include March; we also pushed up the date of the beginning of the water year if a site dried later.

## Data Analysis

The response variable in our analysis was the mean number of fishes caught in all minnow traps at each drift fence (3-4 traps/fence). When one or more of the traps was compromised (e.g., fell out of drift fence), or if the wetland was dry, the sample was treated as missing. In some instances, traps were set in anticipation of flooding to capture fish immediately after they moved into a wetland. This sometimes resulted in heterogeneity among traps (i.e., some traps were submerged longer than others) and less than 24 hours of total "soak time". Because those samples were important to capture pulses of movement, we included them in the analyses and treated them as equal to periods when all traps are completely submerged for the entire 24 -h period.

To capture variation in fish movement throughout the year, we used a change-point analysis (reviewed in Andersen et al. 2009). In the present study the purpose of using a changepoint analysis was to determine where there are statistically detectable shifts in fish encounter rate as a flooding event progresses. Fish encounter-rate data were analyzed using the changepoint package (Killick and Eckly 2012) in R (R Core Team 2012), which can be used to identify breaks in a time series based on changes in the mean and variance. We used the Schwartz Information Criterion (SIC) and the binary segmentation search algorithm to detect
changes in the mean and variance of fish encounter rate within a given flooding event (assuming a normal distribution). In this analysis, the number of change points is determined by the fit statistics (e.g., SIC) and by specifying a maximum number of change points to be fit. The maximum number of change points was set to three (to yield at most four temporal segments), which enabled us to capture variation in the data related to our conceptual model of three discrete periods (Figure 2), and to accommodate "extra" periods of movement such as if there was low fish movement prior to an immigration pulse (for an example of an extra period see least killifish graph in Figure 5). We were interested in flooding events where enough samples were collected to be able to detect at least one transition between periods (e.g., immigration to foraging period). Because a minimum of four observations are needed to obtain two separate estimates for the mean and variance, we did not analyze flooding events where less than four samples were collected. Although the change-point analysis assumes equally spaced data points, we found that it adequately detected trends in our unequally spaced observations. As an estimate of model fit, we calculated a mean $r^{2}$ value across sites and years using estimates from change-point models with the equation: $\mathrm{r}^{2}=1-$ (residual sums of squares/total sums of squares).

Within a flooding event, we defined the immigration period as the first pulse (i.e., elevated mean estimate relative to adjacent temporal segments) in movement after flooding of a wetland (1 per flooding event); the emigration corresponded to the last pulse in movement prior to wetland drying (1 per flooding event). If the first pulse in movement continued until the end of the time series, we defined it as the emigration period. All other periods were defined as the foraging period, and as a result there were some flooding events with more than one foragingperiod estimate (see Figures 2 and 5 for examples of different periods).

After we determined the different temporal segments from the change-point analysis, we estimated $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the means of three different response variables during each period for each species to characterize responses to hydrologic variation: 1) timing of each period (the time point at which one segment changed to another, or the end of a flooding event); 2) the duration of each period; and, 3) the fish encounter-rate estimates for each period. The timing and duration of each period was estimated by calculating proportion DSF variables that measure when a particular period ended relative to the duration of the entire flooding event (period timing = maximum DSF within a period/maximum DSF for entire flooding event) and the total duration of a period relative to the duration of the entire flooding event (period duration = total \# of days within a period/maximum DSF for entire flooding event). These variables provide a comparable measure of response among flooding events of varying duration. Because of variation movement patterns among flooding events (e.g., an event with an immigration, but no emigration period), we detected unequal numbers of movement periods over the course of the study: 35, 28, 24, 26 immigration periods were detected for eastern mosquitofish, flagfish, least killifish and bluefin killifish, respectively; 19, 19, 15, 18 emigration periods; and 58, 59, 43, and 51 foraging periods. Data from each period were aggregated by estimating the mean within water years and then among water years to yield one mean estimate for each of the three response variables (timing, duration and encounter rate) at each site, and these mean estimates were used to generate period specific $95 \%$ confidence interval estimates for each response variable (six total observations for each confidence interval estimate). Only five observations were used for the least killifish emigration pulse estimate because this species did not exhibit an emigration pulse at Site 2. Although aggregating the data across years within sites homogenizes some of the variation in the data, we were interested in extracting general patterns that were
detectable regardless of site-level idiosyncrasies. In some instances there was more than one estimate for the foraging period within a flooding event; in those instances we estimated the mean encounter rate within a flooding event and then aggregated the data as we did the other periods. For these analyses we focused on the effects, given that there was at least one change point observed within a given flooding event. Therefore, if there were no change points for a given event (i.e., a constant value was fit for the entire time series) then it was not used to estimate confidence intervals. We interpreted mean estimates as different (i.e., significant) if the $95 \%$ confidence intervals did not overlap.

## Results

## Site Hydrology

Though our study sites encompassed a range of hydroperiods, all sites completely dried during each year of the study (Figure 3). Sites 1 and 2 had the shortest mean hydroperiod estimates ( 96.8 and 97.5 days, respectively), followed by sites 3 and 6 (178 and 168.7 days, respectively), with sites 4 and 5 having the longest mean hydroperiod estimates ( 273 and 238.3 days, respectively). The mean and maximum number of days since flooding were positively related to hydroperiod, with means ranging from approximately 6 to 104 days and 76 to 332 days for the maximum (Table 1). The total number of flooding events ranged from 6 events at Site 4 to 19 events at Site 2, with all other estimates in between (Table 1). Although there were exceptions, sites generally flooded $($ depth $>0)$ between May and August and dried $($ depth $=0)$ between November and March, with longer hydroperiod sites flooding earlier and drying out later than the shorter hydroperiod sites (Figure 3).

Fish Summary Statistics

Fish encounter-rate estimates showed marked differences among species. Over this fouryear study we collected 95,236 fish at the six study sites. Eastern mosquitofish (76.1\% of total catch) had a mean encounter rate of 80.2 fish/day, flagfish (19.1\%) a mean encounter rate of 20.1 fish/day, least killifish (3.4\%) a mean encounter rate of 3.6 fish/day, and bluefin killifish (1.4\%) had a mean encounter rate of 1.4 fish/day. This overall ranking of species encounter rates was consistent across sites (Table 2). Eastern mosquitofish had the highest maximum number of individuals captured during a single sampling event at all sites, and flagfish had the second highest single-day capture of individuals at four of the six sites (Table 2). There were also differences among species in the order in which they arrived in the wetland. The confidence interval estimates of the rank order of fish arrival indicated that flagfish and eastern mosquitofish were generally the first to arrive, while least killifish and bluefin killifish took longer to colonize (Figure 4).

## Change-point Analyses

Our change-point analyses indicated considerable variability in model fits and movement dynamics among species. Overall, we fit 164 models ( 41 flooding events for each species over all years and sites) with a mean of approximately 21 observations per model and a range of 4 to 64 per model. The mean $r^{2}$ values across sites and years were higher for eastern mosquitofish and flagfish than for least killifish and bluefin killifish (Table 3). However, regardless of species, the models were able to explain a substantial amount of variation in the data, with maximum $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ values ranging from 0.65 to 0.94 . All species exhibited pulses in activity more frequently when immigrating into a wetland (range of 26 to 36 segments) than when leaving a wetland (range of 13 to 18 segments), with eastern mosquitofish and flagfish having greater numbers of immigration and emigration segments than either least killifish or bluefin killifish.

For all species, the number of flooding events during which fishes responded to both flooding and drying of wetlands was similar to the number of emigration segments, indicating that in periods when fish emigrated in response to drying, they also had immigrated in response to wetland flooding earlier in the event (Table 3). All species exhibited pulses in greater than $60 \%$ of the models with eastern mosquitofish having the highest percentage, followed by flagfish and bluefin killifish, and least killifish had the lowest percentage. The total number of change points estimated for both eastern mosquitofish and flagfish was higher than for the other two species (Table 3).

Of the flooding events that exhibited detectable variation in encounter rate through time (i.e., at least one change point), the change-point analyses indicated that all species exhibited distinct periods of movement (Figure 5). The confidence interval estimates of the timing for each period (immigration, emigration and foraging as measured in proportion DSF) indicated that the study species moved during similar time periods. For all species the immigration period occurred earlier than the emigration and foraging periods, and two of the four species had later emigration periods than foraging periods (Figure 6). Within each period there were no detectable differences in the timing of movement among species. Our estimates of period duration showed that for two of the four species the immigration period was shorter than the foraging period (Figure 7). We found no detectable species-specific differences in duration among any of the other periods. However, when we aggregated the species duration estimates within periods there was a slight trend of lower mean duration for both the immigration and emigration periods relative to the foraging period (see dotted lines on Figure 7). As with the timing of the periods, duration estimates were indistinguishable among species.

In contrast to similarities in the timing and duration of fish activity, the change-point analyses revealed marked differences in the encounter-rate estimates among species. Our estimates of mean encounter rate in each period showed that eastern mosquitofish had higher encounter rates in the immigration and emigration periods than in the foraging period (Figure 8). Flagfish mean encounter rates in both the foraging and emigration periods were lower than the immigration period. The encounter rate in the immigration period for least killifish was higher than the foraging period (difference in means was $<4$ fish/day), but there were no differences among the foraging and emigration period estimates. There were no detectable differences in mean encounter rates among any of the periods for bluefin killifish. Eastern mosquitofish and flagfish had higher encounter rate estimates than least killifish and bluefin killifish in both the immigration period and the foraging period. Eastern mosquitofish had the highest emigrationperiod estimate of any species, while flagfish had a higher emigration estimate than least killifish, but not bluefin killifish (Figure 8).

## Discussion

Consistent with our conceptual model of fish movement, our results indicate that fish alter their activity rates in response to hydrological variation. Pulses in movement soon after flooding and just prior to drying suggest that fish are actively moving into and out of shorthydroperiod wetlands in response to seasonal hydrological fluctuations. Further, there was evidence of species-specific differences in activity levels that correspond to patterns of recovery following disturbance in long-hydroperiod wetlands (Trexler et al. 2005, DeAngelis et al. 2005). Our results are consistent with theoretical work on the importance of behavioral differences in movement for structuring communities (Armsworth and Roughgarden 2005, Abrams et al.
2007), and suggest that the interaction between dispersal and the environment is a key process driving metacommunity dynamics in the Everglades landscape.

Results from this study suggest that eastern mosquitofish and flagfish can move in large groups into short-hydroperiod wetlands, and are generally more abundant in ephemeral aquatic habitats than either least killifish or bluefin killfish. These data add to a growing body of evidence that recovery from hydrological disturbance is a primary driver of fish-community structure in the Everglades. Several studies have illustrated the importance of hydrological disturbance driving successional dynamics of fish communities in long-hydroperiod environments (Trexler et al. 2005, Ruetz et al. 2005, McElroy et al. 2011). The current study expands our inference to include environments that are disturbed annually and border the longhydroperiod sites where past work has focused.

Our analysis of change-point results corroborated the hypothesis that fish can exhibit three distinct movement periods in ephemeral wetlands. Fish exhibited pulses in activity soon after flooding or prior to drying in the majority of flooding events we analyzed: eastern mosquitofish exhibited pulsed activity in almost ninety percent of the models, flagfish and bluefin killifish in about three quarters of the models, and least killifish in greater than sixty percent of the models. When at least one pulse in activity was detected, we found that immigration period occurred earlier than the foraging and emigration periods for all species, and the emigration period occurred later than the foraging period for two out of four species. Similarly, we found general trends in the mean duration of each period with foraging being the longest and emigration and immigration being the shortest; however, these results were more equivocal with only two species exhibiting shorter immigration period than foraging period, and no detectable differences observed for any species between the emigration and the other two
periods. High variance in the estimates of emigration duration possibly reflects the inter-site variability in wetland drying.

In contrast to the relatively consistent timing and duration of periods among species, encounter-rate estimates revealed marked differences among species in response to hydrological variation. Change-point analyses described eastern mosquitofish and flagfish data better and indicated more responsiveness to hydrological variation than bluefin killfish and least killifish. During the immigration period, encounter-rate estimates for eastern mosquitofish and flagfish were higher than the encounter rates of least killifish and bluefin killifish in all other periods. This suggests that eastern mosquitofish and flagfish are able to quickly disperse into newly available habitats in relatively large numbers, while relatively few individuals of least killifish and bluefin killifish are able to respond to flooding. These results may indicate heterogeneity in behavioral adaptations enabling detection and response to environmental cues (Lytle and Poff 2004), and may explain differences in recovery observed in long hydroperiod environments (Trexler et al. 2005, DeAngelis et al. 2005). Immigration and emigration encounter-rate estimates for eastern mosquitofish were not different, and were higher than all other estimates with the exception of the flagfish immigration estimate. Strong responses by eastern mosquitofish to both flooding and drying is not surprising because this species is well documented as a good disperser (Brown 1985, 1987, Capone and Kushlan 1991, Congdon 1994, Rehage and Sih 2004, Ruetz et al. 2005), and has become invasive in many areas (Courtenay and Meffe 1989, Pyke 2008). Our results suggest that its responsiveness to both flooding and drying may contribute to its widespread success. Obaza et al. (2011) indicated that drift fences may be slightly less efficient at capturing eastern mosquitofish than the other study species. Thus, the
results reported here are inconsistent with the species differences expected by this bias, and the high encounter rate estimates for eastern mosquitofish are probably conservative.

Our results provide empirical support for the importance of dispersal for connecting local fish communities in the Everglades. Species-specific differences in dispersal is a key component of metacommunity models where patterns in community structure are shaped by both local (e.g., competition) and regional scale processes (e.g., dispersal). In particular, patch dynamics models predict species that would normally be inferior competitors in a given patch can persist regionally via superior colonization ability (e.g., a competition-colonization trade-off) (Leibold et al. 2004). Empirical studies of Everglades fish communities where some species exhibit quick recovery to disturbance followed by a decline in density (e.g., flagfish) while others recover slowly but become dominant as time increases following a disturbance (e.g., bluefin and least killifish) indicate that trade-offs between dispersal and competitive ability may be important in explaining species coexistence in this system (Trexler et al. 2005; DeAngelis et al. 2005 ). Eastern mosquitofish recovers quickly and persists at high densities through time, suggesting that other mechanisms may explain its dynamics. In the present study, movement patterns were consistent with previous estimates of interspecific differences in recovery, and reinforced the inference that fish recovery to disturbance is driven by dispersal. Although there are likely other mechanisms determining fish coexistence in this system, strong interspecific differences in dispersal ability suggest that trade-offs operating at regional spatial scales may play a role in mediating species coexistence in this system.

Overall, the results of our study are consistent with a conceptual model in which small fishes in the Everglades display three periods of movement throughout the year: immigration, foraging, and emigration. Although three periods of movement did not occur in every flooding
event, in the majority of flooding events that we analyzed the timing of the periods is relatively consistent across species and there is evidence that the immigration period occurs over a relatively short period of time. There are also interspecific differences in the magnitude of response to flooding and drying that likely reflect differences in dispersal ability that may drive larger scale patterns in response to disturbance. Although the drift-fence sampling methodology also allows estimation of the direction fish are moving, in this study our focus was on differences in overall activity levels in response to hydrological variation. Future research should explore the potential directedness of movement in the immigration and emigration phases of this seasonal cycle which would enhance our understanding of how fishes persist in this fluctuating environment. The results of this study have important implications for predicting the consequences of hydrological management of peripheral wetlands in the Everglades, and for developing models for management assessment and evaluation (Trexler and Goss 2009, Jopp et al. 2010). This study also reinforces the importance of regional scale processes influencing Everglades fish communities and suggests that metacommunity theory may provide insight into the mechanisms shaping fish community structure in this system.
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Table 1. Summary statistics for hydrologic data at each site across all years. DSF corresponds to the number of consecutive days of wetland flooding (depth $>0$ ). Events correspond to the number of flooding events over the course of the study.

| Site | Mean Hydroperiod | Mean DSF | Max DSF | Events |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 96.8 | 7.2 | 77 | 11 |
| 2 | 97.5 | 6.4 | 76 | 19 |
| 3 | 178.0 | 33.0 | 192 | 15 |
| 4 | 273.0 | 104.2 | 332 | 6 |
| 5 | 238.3 | 65.2 | 252 | 11 |
| 6 | 168.7 | 20.2 | 126 | 16 |

Table 2. Encounter-rate (\# of fish collected/24 hrs) summary statistics for all species at each site aggregated across years.

| Site | Species | Mean | Max |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Eastern Mosquitofish | 79.0 | 1998 |
| 1 | Flagfish | 7.3 | 85 |
| 1 | Least Killifish | 5.3 | 138 |
| 1 | Bluefin Killifish | 1.1 | 13 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Eastern Mosquitofish | 60.4 | 1427 |
| 2 | Flagfish | 36.2 | 595 |
| 2 | Least Killifish | 3.0 | 114 |
| 2 | Bluefin Killifish | 1.5 | 44 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Eastern Mosquitofish | 93.1 | 1837 |
| 3 | Flagfish | 12.4 | 364 |
| 3 | Least Killifish | 8.7 | 368 |
| 3 | Bluefin Killifish | 2.1 | 183 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Eastern Mosquitofish | 73.8 | 1714 |
| 4 | Flagfish | 19.5 | 234 |
| 4 | Least Killifish | 1.5 | 79 |
| 4 | Bluefin Killifish | 1.7 | 180 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Eastern Mosquitofish | 101.7 | 1648 |
| 5 | Flagfish | 24.4 | 494 |
| 5 | Least Killifish | 1.6 | 33 |
| 5 | Bluefin Killifish | 1.2 | 94 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Eastern Mosquitofish | 65.1 | 796 |
| 6 | Flagfish | 22.4 | 245 |
| 6 | Least Killifish | 2.0 | 73 |
| 6 | Bluefin Killifish | 0.5 | 25 |

Table 3. Results from change-point analysis across all sites and years. Change points correspond to the total number transitions between immigration, emigration and foraging periods; \% models with pulses is the percentage of models where the change-point analysis detected at least one period with a pulse in activity (i.e., at least one change point within a flooding event); immigration is the total number of segments occurring in the first (immigration) period; emigration refers to the total number of segments in the last (emigration) period; both corresponds to the total number of flooding events during which both immigration and emigration periods occurred; mean and max $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ correspond to the model fits aggregated across years and sites, and the maximum $r^{2}$, respectively.

| Species | Change points | \% Models <br> with pulses | Immigration Emigration Both | Mean $\mathbf{r}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Max $^{\mathbf{2}}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern Mosquitofish | 76 | 88 | 35 | 19 | 18 | 0.33 | 0.94 |
| Flagfish | 75 | 76 | 28 | 19 | 16 | 0.36 | 0.88 |
| Least Killifish | 56 | 63 | 24 | 15 | 13 | 0.20 | 0.65 |
| Bluefin Killifish | 65 | 73 | 26 | 18 | 14 | 0.24 | 0.81 |

Figure Legends
Figure 1. Location of the Rocky Glades region (stippled area) in Everglades National Park, Florida, U.S.A., with study sites indicated by numbers. The Rocky Glades outside of ENP is not stippled because it has been converted to agriculture.

Figure 2. A conceptual model of how fish-movement rate is related to the number of days since wetland flooding. We hypothesized that there are three distinct periods of movement in response to hydrologic variation: an immigration period with increased movement in response to flooding; an emigration period with increased movement that is a response to drying; and a foraging period between those two periods when movement is reduced.

Figure 3. Time-series graph of water depths during the study plotted separately for each site. Sites are grouped by hydroperiod.

Figure 4. Estimates of the rank order of arrival means and $95 \%$ confidence intervals for each species. Rankings were determined by assigning a rank based on the first instance a species was collected during each flooding event (e.g., $1=$ first species to arrive, $2=$ second species to arrive, etc.). Species were ranked equally if they arrived on the same day, and if they did not appear in samples during a flooding event they were given a rank of one higher than the last species to arrive (e.g., if the last species to arrive was ranked 3 then a species that did not appear would be given a rank of 4). Non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate significant differences.

Figure 5. Plots of mean estimates from change-point analyses (colored lines) overlain on observed data. The plots illustrate trends in encounter rates throughout a flooding event, with the highest encounter rates during immigration and emigration periods, and lowest during foraging periods. The graphs show data from Site 4, water years 2001, 2002, and 2003 (eastern mosquitofish, bluefin killifish, and flagfish), and Site 3, water year 2001 (least killifish).

Figure 6. Estimates of the period timing means and $95 \%$ confidence intervals for each species. Period timing corresponds to the ending of a particular period and is measured as a ratio of the number days since flooding (DSF) observed at the change point for each period divided by the maximum DSF observed in a flooding event. Non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate significant differences.

Figure 7. Estimates of the period duration means and $95 \%$ confidence intervals for each species. Period duration is the length of a period measured as a ratio of the total duration of a particular period (measured in days) divided by the maximum number of days since flooding (DSF) observed in a flooding event. Non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate significant differences. Dotted lines correspond to the approximate mean estimate of all species for each period.

Figure 8. Estimates of encounter rate means and $95 \%$ confidence intervals during each period for each species. Non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate significant differences.
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