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Figure S1 depicts the study area and shows data locations for fish tissue mercury, water column mercury, and pH . Tables S1 and S3 summarize the data used in the study. Table S2 describes the estimation scenarios. Figures S 2 and S 3 show scatterplots of the regression between pH and fish mercury and surface water mercury and fish mercury, respectively, along with plots of the residuals. Figure S 4 shows the model residuals as a function of river distance, and Figure S5 shows the distribution of fish species in the study. Figure S6 shows a map of the estimation variance. Movie S1 depicts the spatiotemporal trends in fish tissue at 180-day intervals.

## Study Area and Data Locations



Figure S1: Lumber (Left) and Cape Fear (Right) Basins in North Carolina, with locations for Fish Hg (circles), pH (squares), and $W C H g$ (triangles).

Table S1: Data summary for mercury and pH in the Cape Fear and Lumber Basins, 1990-2004

| Data Type | \# of Locations | \# of Independent <br> Samples | \# of Samples <br> collocated with Fish <br> Hg Samples |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fish Hg | 75 | 1663 | - |
| pH | 33 | 356 | 143 |
| Surface Water <br> Hg* | 7 | 80 | 35 |
| *starts 1995 |  |  |  |

## Estimation Scenarios

Table S2: Cross-validation scenarios for FishHg estimations using river-BME and Euclidean-BME

| Scenario | Metric Used | Hard Data Used | Soft Data Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Euclidean | Measured <br> $\log$-FishHg | - |
| II | River | Measured <br> log-FishHg | - |
| III | River | Measured <br> log-FishHg | Gaussian from <br> log-pH |
| IV | River | Measured <br> $\log$-FishHg | Gaussian from <br> $\log -W C H g$ |

## Regression Analysis



Figure S2: (top) Regression scatter plot of pH vs. log-FishHg used to derive FishHg soft data. Dashed lines represent the $95 \%$ prediction bounds for new observations; (bottom) scatter plot of the residuals; p -values for the model coefficients were $<0.001$.


Figure S3: (top) Regression scatter plot of log-SWHg vs. log-FishHg used to generate FishHg soft data; Dashed lines represent the $95 \%$ prediction bounds for new observations; (bottom) scatter plot of the residuals; intercept p-value: 0.035 ; variable coefficient p-value: 0.37 .


Figure S4: Scatter plot of model residuals for collocated data as a function of river distance from the farthest downstream point of the combined river network. The ' + ' represents the residuals from the pH model (Equation 1), while the 'o' represents the residuals from the WCHg model (Equation 2).

Table S3: Summary statistics for fish tissue mercury, pH , and surface water mercury used in the study.

| Parameter / <br> Statistics | FishHg (ppm) | log- FishHg | pH | $\log$-pH | SWHg (ppm) | log-SWHg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 0.62 | -0.69 | 6.62 | 1.88 | 0.31 | 5.62 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.54 | 0.69 | 0.13 | 0.54 |
| Skewness | 2.30 | -0.31 | -2.25 | -3.19 | 0.20 | -1.21 |
| Kurtosis | 11.5 | 2.79 | 12.5 | 18.1 | 3.48 | 3.72 |
| Distribution |  |  |  | $\because$ 1 | 11 | 4 |

## Estimation Variance



Figure S5: Distribution of fish species with measurements of fish tissue mercury between 19902004 in the Cape Fear and Lumber River Basins, NC.


Figure S6: river-BME estimation variance $\left(\mathrm{ppm}^{2}\right)$ in the Cape Fear and Lumber Basins on July 23, 1995 (Top); and June 11, 2003 (Bottom).

## Movie of Spatiotemporal Trend

Movie S1 can be viewed as an animated GIF at the following online location:
http://www.unc.edu/depts/case/BMElab/studies/HgFish_NC/CapefearLumber_HgFish_1991_2004.GIF
Movie S1: Space/time distribution of FishHg in the Cape Fear and Lumber Basins, every 180 days, between 1991-2004.

