

Table S1: Logistic regression model including individuals that failed to survive the first winter, but excluding individuals whose mortality was unequivocally attributable to gopher activity (for comparison with Table 2). This larger dataset shows a significant *nFT* QTL \times environment interaction, in which the local allele at this QTL is favored in both contrasting environments. Mortality due to gopher activity is very easy to distinguish from mortality due to other sources, owing to the characteristic presence of gopher mounds. As with the analysis presented in Table 2, we conducted logistic regression (Proc Glimmix, SAS ver. 9.3) to determine whether the probability of flowering varied as a function of environment, *nFT* QTL genotype, %CO alleles, cohort, and two-way interactions between environment and *nFT* genotype, environment and %CO and environment and cohort. This model included block and family cross classified with site as random effects.

Using this larger dataset (N= 2329), we uncovered significant *nFT* \times environment interactions ($p < 0.0001$), indicating that the local allele has a fitness advantage in each environment:

In the Colorado garden, local CO homozygotes had 173% higher odds of flowering than foreign MT homozygotes (odds ratio= 2.73 for comparison of local vs. foreign genotypes; 95% CI: 1.2 – 6.18, p-value after Tukey’s adjustment for multiple tests=0.0088).

In the Montana garden, MT homozygotes had 271% higher odds of flowering than the foreign CO homozygotes (odds ratio = 3.71 for comparison of local vs. foreign genotype, 95% CI: 2.15 – 5.28, adjusted p-value < 0.0001).

These results are qualitatively identical, and quantitatively similar, to results presented in the body of the paper.

For comparison with Table 2 in the manuscript, the results of this analysis were:

	PROBABILITY OF FLOWERING	
	$F_{1,1960}$	P-VALUE
<i>nFT</i> QTL GENOTYPE	0.42	0.52
ENVIRONMENT (E)	$F_{1,29}=1.5$	0.23
<i>nFT</i> \times E	24.6	<0.0001
GENOMIC PROPORTION OF COLORADO ALLELES (%CO)	0.46	0.50
%CO \times E	4.74	0.03
COHORT	1.99	0.16
COHORT \times <i>nFT</i>	8.29	0.004
COHORT \times %CO	2.31	0.13
FAMILY \times E	$\chi^2= 91.2$	<0.0001
BLOCK \times E	$\chi^2= 152.1$	<0.0001

Please note that the only qualitative difference between these results and those presented in the paper is that the %CO \times E interaction is only marginally significant in Table 2, but is statistically significant here.