



## Supplement of

## Large wood as a confounding factor in interpreting the width of spring-fed streams

Dana Ariel Lapides and Michael Manga

Correspondence to: Dana Ariel Lapides (danalapides@gmail.com)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.



**Figure S1.** Individual histograms of wood orientation for spring-fed streams included in the histogram analysis. All histograms demonstrate preferential orientation of wood away from the flow direction, with most wood oriented  $50-90^{\circ}$ .



**Figure S2.** Individual histograms of wood orientation for runoff-fed streams included in the histogram analysis. Histograms in (a), (d), and (e) demonstrate wood orientation with flow.



Figure S3. We test the utility of five power law models shown in the legend in panel (a). The best fit is shown for (a) spring-fed streams and (b) runoff-fed streams for each model. The models are very similar to one another for runoff-fed streams, with the model  $w = aQ^b$  based only on discharge performing the best. For spring-fed streams, the model based only on discharge performs worst, while the other models are similar to one another with the model  $w = lQ^b$  performing best for the full set of streams, but the model  $w = al^b$  based only on wood length performs best on streams narrower than 30 m.