Reviewer's Appendix: Results from Different GEV Error Specifications[1]
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Parameter[2]	Model 1 (3,4),(1,2)	Model 1a (3,4),(1,2)	Model 2 (3,4), 1,2	Model 3 (1,3),(1,4)	Model 3a (2,3),(1,4)	Model 4 (2,3), 1,4	Model 5 EV errors
δ_0 (Intercept)	-8.43 (0.20)	-8.36 (0.19)	-8.48 (0.20)	-8.42 (0.19)	-8.42 (0.19)	-8.45 (0.19)	-8.53 (0.18)
δ_{lk} (Lake Trout)	-0.70 (1.59)	-0.28 (1.52)	-0.72 (1.63)	-0.03 (1.59)	-0.0079 (1.59)	-0.17 (1.60)	0.10 (1.63)
δ_{ch} (Chinook Salmon)	11.11 (2.19)	10.17 (2.29)	11.38 (2.21)	12.28 (2.11)	12.28 (2.11)	12.44 (2.08)	13.39 (2.05)
δ_{co} (Coho Salmon)	3.70 (1.37)	3.96 (1.29)	3.67 (1.40)	3.44 (1.31)	3.43 (1.31)	3.47 (1.32)	3.12 (1.37)
δ_{rb} (Rainbow Trout)	13.96 (3.46)	13.18 (3.67)	13.94 (3.51)	10.50 (4.09)	10.39 (4.06)	10.58 (4.09)	8.61 (4.06)
δ_E (Effective Toxin Level)	-0.07 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.02)	-0.06 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.02)	-.07 (0.02)	-0.06 (0.02)	-0.06 (0.02)
Ω	1.82 (0.23)	1.84 (0.23)	1.80 (0.23)	1.83 (0.22)	1.83 (0.22)	1.81 (0.22)	1.76 (0.21)
θ_1	0.570 (0.04)	-	-	.84 (0.05)	-	-	-
θ_2	0.91 (0.04)	-	-	.86 (0.05)	-	-	-
θ	-	0.72 (0.04)	0.57 (0.04)	-	0.85 (0.03)	0.84 (0.05)	-
μ	1.30 (0.05)	1.31 (0.06)	1.31 (0.05)	1.29 (0.05)	1.29 (0.05)	1.29 (0.53)	1.29 (0.05)
Log Likelihood	-1890.20	-1902.75	-1893.85	-1925.36	-1925.40	-1930.46	-1935.80

[1] (W,X),(Y,Z) designates nesting structure used, with 1 = Lake Superior, 2 = South Lake Michigan, 3 = North Lake Michigan, and 4 = Green Bay.

[2] θ_1 is dissimilarity coefficient for (W,X), θ_2 is dissimilarity coefficient for (Y,Z), θ is dissimilarity coefficient when $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta$ is imposed.