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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to provide baseline data that can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of two kokanee salmon hatcheries that will produce 8 million kokanee salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) fry (3.2 million adults) for stocking into Lake Roosevelt, the reservoir created by construction of Grand Coulee Dam. The hatcheries will also produce 500,000 rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) fingerlings to support the Lake Roosevelt net pen program. At the present time, the principle sport fish in the reservoir are walleye (Stizostedion vitreum) and net pen rainbow trout. The project includes the following components:
(1) A year-round creel census survey to determine angler use, catch rates and composition, growth rates of fish and economic value of the fishery. Comparisons will be made before and after hatcheries are on line, to determine hatchery effectiveness;
(2) Assessment of kokanee, rainbow trout and walleye feeding habits, and densities of their preferred prey, at different locations in the reservoir; and how reservoir operations affect population dynamics of prey organisms. This information will be useful for planning long-term hatchery and net pen operations, including stocking levels, time when kokanee and rainbow are stocked, and locations of stocking; and
(3) A mark-recapture study designed to assess the effectiveness of the time and location where hatchery-raised kokanee and rainbow trout are released in terms of minimizing loss over Grand Coulee Dam, increased harvest to anglers, and homing to egg collection sites.

The first years study objectives were to determine:
(1) Angling pressure, catch-per-unit effort, total harvest and economic value of the fishery by conducting a year-round, reservoir-wide creel survey;
(2) Relative abundance of fish species in the reservoir by conducting gill net and electrofishing surveys at nine index stations, six on the Columbia mainstem, two on the Spokane Arm and one on the San Poil Arm:
(3) Feeding habits of rainbow trout, kokanee and walleye;
(4) Growth rates of rainbow trout, kokanee and walleye;
(5) Densities, biomass, and sizes of different categories of zooplankton and how reservoir operations affect zooplankton population dynamics, and;
(6) Migration patterns of net-pen raised rainbow trout and walleye.

From August to December 1988, total harvest ( $\pm 95 \%$ confidence intervals) was estimated at $125,891 \pm 74,629$ fish, comprised of $86,107 \pm$ 31,940 rainbow trout, $9,362 \pm 3,873$ kokanee, $23,005 \pm 8,731$ walleye $1,210 \pm 312$ yellow perch, and $6,207 \pm 2,773$ smallmouth bass.

From January to December 1989, the annual total harvest ( $\pm 95 \%$ confidence intervals) was estimated at $164,227 \pm 63,035$ fish, comprised of $65,515 \pm 25,373$ rainbow trout, $11,906 \pm 3,597$ kokanee, $248 \pm 54$ chinook salmon, $83 \pm 18$ lake whitefish, $80,626 \pm 33,513$ walleye, $3,600 \pm$ 1,631 yellow perch, $8 \pm 3$ largemouth bass, $1,538 \pm 578$ smallmouth bass, $691 \pm 323$ black crappie, and $12 \pm 5$ burbot.

In 1988, the mean lengths of fish harvested were: rainbow trout ( 391 mm ), kokanee ( 432 mm ), walleye ( 436 mm ), yellow perch ( 222 mm ), and smallmouth bass ( 309 mm ). In 1988, mean weights of fish harvested were: rainbow ( 767 g ), kokanee ( 739 g ), walleye ( 508 g ), yellow perch ( 154 g ). and smallmouth bass ( 489 g ).

In 1989, the mean lengths of fish harvested were: rainbow trout ( 403 mm ), kokanee ( 411 mm ), walleye ( 447 mm ), chinook salmon ( 694 mm ), Lake whitefish ( 559 mm ), yellow perch ( 212 mm ), largemouth bass ( 326 mm ), smallmouth bass ( 313 mm ). black crappie ( 209 mm ), sturgeon ( $1,390 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) , and burbot ( 680 mm ). In 1989. mean weights of fish harvested were: rainbow ( 710 g ), kokanee ( 580 g ), walleye ( 723 g ), chinook salmon $(2,450 \mathrm{~g})$. lake whitefish ( $1,420 \mathrm{~g}$ ), yellow perch ( 190 g ), smallmouth bass ( 359 g ), largemouth bass ( 605 g ). and black crappie (146 g).

Angling pressure was estimated at 261,913 angler hours from August through December 1988 and 756,397 angler hours from January through December 1989.

The number of angler trips was estimated at 70,308 from August to December 1988 and 173,871 from January to December 1989. Economic
value of the Lake Rocsevelt sport fishery was calculated at $\$ 2,031,901$ from August to December 1988 and $\$ 5,198,271$ from January to December 1989, based on a figure of $\$ 28.90$ spent per angler trip. The $\$ 28.90$ figure was based on statistics compiled in a national survey conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1985, which estimated that anglers in inland waters of Washington State spent an average of $\$ 26.00$ /angler trip in 1985. The 1985 figure was adjusted for inflation through 1988 using the regional consumer price index.

From August 1988 to December 1989, 10,894 fish (26 species) were collected during gill net and electrofishing surveys. Total number (and relative abundance) of each species captured in descending order of relative abundance was:
Yellow perch
Walleye
Largescale sucker
Sucker fry
Rainbow trout
Squawfish
Kokanee salmon
Lake whitefish
Smallmouth bass
Piute sculpin
Carp
Bridgelip sucker
Black crappie
Brown trout
Largemouth bass
Peamouth
Burbot
Longnose sucker
Mountain whitefish
Chinook salmon
Pumpkinseed
Yellow bullhead
Tench
Brook trout
Chiselmouth
Cutthroat trout
Bull trout

| (Perca flavescens) | 3,947 | $(36.2)$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (Stizostedion vitreum) | 2,017 | $(18.5)$ |
| (Catostomus macrocheilus) | 1,309 | $(12.0)$ |
| (Catostomus spp.) | 724 | $(6.6)$ |
| (Oncorhynchus mykiss) | 714 | $(6.6)$ |
| (Ptychocheilus oregonensis) | 449 | $(4.1)$ |
| (Oncorhynchus nerka) | 310 | $(2.8)$ |
| (Coregonus clupeaformis) | 296 | $(2.7)$ |
| (Micropterus dolomieu) | 205 | $(1.9)$ |
| (Cottus beldingi) | 190 | $(1.7)$ |
| (Cyprinus carpio) | 160 | $(1.5)$ |
| (Catostomus columbianus! | 146 | $(1.4)$ |
| (Pomoxis nigromacula tus) | 116 | $(1.1)$ |
| (Salmo trutta) | 49 | $(0.5)$ |
| (Micropterus salmoides) | 96 | $(0.9)$ |
| (Mylocheilus caurinus) | 46 | $(0.4)$ |
| (Lota lota) | 36 | $(0.2)$ |
| (Catostomus catostomus) | 26 | $(0.2)$ |
| (Prosopium williamsoni) | 16 | $(0.1)$ |
| (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) | 12 | $(0.1)$ |
| (Lepomis gibbosus) | 9 | $(0.1)$ |
| (Ictalurus na talis) | 7 | $(0.1)$ |
| (Tinca tinca) | 5 | $(>0.1)$ |
| (Salvelinus fontinalis) | 4 | $(>0.1)$ |
| (Acrocheilus alutaceus) | 2 | $(>0.1)$ |
| (Oncorhynchus clarki) | 1 | $(>0.1)$ |
| (Salvelinus confluentus) | 1 | $(>0.1)$ |

Kokanee comprised only 2.8 percent ( 310 fish) in relative abundance surveys. In creel surveys conducted in 1988 (August to December) and 1989 (January to December). total kokanee harvest was estimated at $9,362 \pm 3,873$ and $11.906 \pm 3,597$ fish. respectively. In summary, both fisheries survey and creel survey data indicated that kokanee were not
abundant in Lake Roosevelt during the baseline period before the Lake Roosevelt kokanee hatcheries come on line.

Growth rates of rainbow trout, based on back-calculation from scales, were greater than th.e average of 20 other lakes and river systems in the western United States used for comparison. In 1988, the average length and weight of adult trout in Lake Roosevelt were: age $1+(325 \mathrm{~mm}$, $464 \mathrm{~g})$, age $2+(447 \mathrm{~mm}, 1,038 \mathrm{~g})$, age $3+(473 \mathrm{~mm}, 1,096 \mathrm{~g})$, and age 4+ $(508 \mathrm{~mm}, 1,096 \mathrm{~g})$. In 1989, the average length and weight of adult trout in Lake Roosevelt were: age $1+(256 \mathrm{~mm}, 218 \mathrm{~g})$, age $2+(394 \mathrm{~mm}, 572 \mathrm{~g})$, age $3+(429 \mathrm{~mm}, 902 \mathrm{~g})$, and age $4+(483 \mathrm{~mm}, 1,058 \mathrm{~g})$.

Growth rates of walleye in 1988 and 1989 were about average for walleye lakes in the midwestern United States, but lower than those reported for John Day Pool on the Columbia River.

Back-calculated growth rates of kokanee were greater than 19 other kokanee producing lakes in Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Montana and British Columbia. In 1988, the average total length and weight of adult kokanee collected during electrofishing and gill net surveys were: age $2+(368$ $\mathrm{mm}, 494 \mathrm{~g}$ ), age $3+(463 \mathrm{~mm}, 1,052 \mathrm{~g})$, and age $4+(525 \mathrm{~mm}, 1,576 \mathrm{~g})$. In 1989, the average length and weight of adult kokanee were: age 2+ (385 $\mathrm{mm}, 590 \mathrm{~g})$, age $3+(413 \mathrm{~mm}, 813 \mathrm{~g})$ and age $4+(425 \mathrm{~mm}, 905 \mathrm{~g})$.

Comparison of kokanee caught by anglers also indicated that kokanee growth in Lake Roosevelt is superior to that from other locations. The average size of kokanee harvested in Lake Roosevelt was 432 mm in 1988 and 411 mm in 1989, compared to ranges of $240-395 \mathrm{~mm}$ from 1954 to 1988 in Lake Coeur d'Alene, ID; 235-305 mm from 1980-1981 in Spirit Lake, ID; 220-304 mm from 1965-1975 in Odell Lake, OR; 292-369 mm from 1967-1985 in Flathead Lake, MT; 237-343 mm from 1954 to 1987 in Pend Oreille Lake, ID, 231-411 mm from 1941-1985 in Loon Lake, WA and $328-411 \mathrm{~mm}$ from 1940-I 985 in Deer Lake, WA.

Mean densities of microcrustacean zooplankton collected at nine index stations in August and October 1988 were 6,589 cladocerans $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$, 8,929 adult copepods $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and 2,920 naupli/m3. Daphnia spp. accounted for $92.6 \%$ of the cladocera density at 6,108 Daphnia/m³. Mean densities of microcrustacean zooplankton collected at nine index stations in May, August and October 1989 were 4,378 cladocerans $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}, 6,540$ adult copepods $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and 8,595 naupli/m³. Daphnia spp. accounted for $90.4 \%$ of the cladoceran density at 3,957 Daphnia/m ${ }^{3}$.

Mean annual densities of microcrustacean zooplankton collected at Porcupine Bay (on the Spokane Arm) from January to December 1989 were 6,246 cladoceran $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}, 12,214$ adult copepods $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and 7,590 naupli $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Daphnia spp. accounted for $94.9 \%$ of the cladoceran density at 5,926 Daphnia/m ${ }^{3}$. Mean annual densities of microcrustacean zooplankton collected at Seven Bays (on the Columbia River) from January to December 1989 were 5,381 cladocerans $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}, 6,194$ adult copepods $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and 2,264 naupli/m ${ }^{3}$. Daphnia spp. accounted for $96.1 \%$ of the cladoceran density at 5,171 Daphnia/m ${ }^{3}$.

Lake Roosevelt zooplankton samples contained numerous large-sized species of cladocerans (e.g., Daphnia schødleri, Leptodora kindtii) and copepoda (e.g., Epischura nevadensis) that are important to the diet of planktivorous fish.

In May, August and October 1989, microcrustacean zooplankton (excluding naupli) densities were highest in the lower mainstem Columbia stations. Mean annual values were: Spring Canyon $\left(7,914 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Keller Ferry ( $11,527 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Seven Bays $\left(9,274 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Hunters $\left(8,608 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Gifford $\left(5,632 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and Kettle Falls $\left(2,482 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Distance upstream from Grand Coulee Dam to each site was: Spring Canyon (4.8 km), Keller Ferry (24 km), Seven Bays ( 59 km ), Hunters ( 102 km ), Gifford ( 126 km ) and Kettle Falls ( 160 km ). Highest recorded mean microcrustacean densities were on the Spokane Arm stations, including Porcupine Bay ( $27,325 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Little Falls $\left(12,613 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Microcrustacean density was also higher on the San Poil Arm ( $11,527 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) than at mainstem stations. Daphnia biomass was highest in the Spokane Arm and central portion of the reservoir at Hunters and Seven Bays.

In both 1988 and 1989, zooplankton densities and biomass were reiatively high compared to other kokanee producing lakes and comparable to those previously reported for Lake Roosevelt. Beckman et al. (1985) calculated that, at zooplankton levels observed in 1980 and 1982, the forage base in Lake Roosevelt could support about 16 million kokanee fingerlings and 5.9 million adult kokanee ( 0.5 kg body weight), so results of the present study were compared to those collected in 1980 and 1982 to determine if zooplankton levels had changed significantly.

Only one station (Porcupine Bay) was directly comparable in all three years. Mean cladocera densities reported for samples collected from May through September was 1,081 in 1980, 3,578 in 1982 and 9,521 in 1989. Mean copepod density was 2,407 in 1980, 7,437 in 1982 and 15,450 in 1989. At other stations cladoceran density was slightly higher
and copepod density was slightly lower in 1989 than 1980 or 1982. From these data, it appears that microcrustacean abundance in Lake Roosevelt was higher in 1989 than previous years.

Microcrustacean biomtss in Lake Roosevelt was considerably higher than reported for other local productive kokanee lakes: Lake Pend Oreille ( 5 year mean $=38.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Lake Coeur d'Alene ( 3 year mean $=36.8$ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Priest Lake ( $27.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Upper Priest Lake ( $25.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and Spirit Lake ( $39.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Values were reported as growing season means. In comparison, mean Daphnia biomass recorded for nine index stations in Lake Roosevelt in May, August and October 1989 was $128.6 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean annual (January to December 1989) Daphnia biomass at Porcupine Bay (Index Station 4) was $184.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean annual (January to December 1989) Daphnia biomass at Seven Bays (index Station 6) was $153.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Daphnia was tue prey item with the highest relative importance in Lake Roosevelt kokanee diets in both 1988 (70\%) and 1989 (58.4\%). Thus, the present study confirms previous investigations that zooplankton biomass in Lake Roosevelt is sufficient to support the proposed 3.2 million adult kokanee produced by the Lake Roosevelt kokanee hatcheries.

Zooplankton densities and biomass were high when water retention time in the reservoir was high, and low when water retention time was low. Water retention time of about 30-35 days appeared to be of critical importance in the timing of the establishment of microcrustacean standing crops during the summer growing season. In terms of supporting the operation of the Lake Roosevelt kokanee hatcheries, water retention times and microcrustacean densities should be monitored weekly from May to July to ensure that kokanee fry are stocked in the reservoir coinciding with peak standing crops of microcrustaceans.

Feeding habits of kokanee, rainbow trout and walleye were different. Kokanee were principally planktivorous, walleye picivorous and rainbow omnivorous, feeding on zooplankton, fish, benthic macroinvertebrates and terrestrial insects. Feeding habits were assessed by combining numerical percentages, weight percentages and frequency of occurence for particular prey items into an index of relative importance.

In 1988, the predominant prey items in the diet of kokanee, based on relative importance index values, were three species of Daphnia ( $70.0 \%$ ), organic detritus (8.2\%) and Leptodora kindtii (6.0\%). In 1989, the predominant prey items of kokanee were Daphnia schodleri (58.4\%), L. kindtii (6.7\%) larval and pupal chironomids (11.5\%) and walleye eggs (9.4\%).

In 1988, the predominant prey items in the diet of rainbow trout, based on index of relative importance, were Daphnia schodleri ( $34.0 \%$ ), Osteichthyes (12.1\%) and L. kindtii (8.1\%). In 1989, predominant prey in rainbow trout diets included fish eggs ( $34.5 \%$ ), organic detritus ( $28.1 \%$ ) and terrestrial insects (12.0\%). Identifiable fish remains in trout stomachs included sculpins and cyprinids. Trout stomachs contained relatively few Daphnia (3.3\%) in 1989.

In 1988, the predominant prey items consumed by walleye were: Osteichthyes (46.2\%), Daphnia (12.8\%) and chironomid larvae and pupae ( $9.1 \%$ ). In 1989, prey included: Osteichthyes (56.2\%) chironomid larvae and pupae ( $13.6 \%$ ) and Daphnia ( $8.45 \%$ ). Daphnia were consumed principally by younger age classes of walleye while older walleye preferred a fish diet. Types of fish eaten by walleye in 1988 included: Percidae (yellow perch 13.4\%), Cottidae (sculpin 10.4\%), unidentifiable fish remains ( $10.0 \%$ ), Cyprinidae ( $5.4 \%$ ) and Salmonidae ( $5.0 \%$ ). Types of fish eaten by walleye in 1989 included: unidentifiable fish remains (21 .0\%), Percidae (16.3\%) sculpins (10.2\%), and Salmonidae (6.7\%). Walleye did not appear to be preying on kokanee in significant amounts, in part because they occupy benthic habitats whereas kokanee were found in pelagic habitats.

Diet overlaps between kokanee, rainbow and walleye were relatively minor. These data suggest that it may be feasible to successfully manage all three species in Lake Roosevelt. Lack of forage fish in the reservoir precludes expansion of walleye. The abundance of large zooplankton make it feasible to enhance populations of planktivorous species such as kokanee.

Results of net-pen rainbow trout tagging studies conducted at Seven Bays in 1988 indicated that most of the fish were recaptured within six months ( $58.1 \%$ of total recaptures) to one year ( $88.1 \%$ of total recaptures) of release. Angler harvest rate of tagged fish was $9.9 \%$, including all recoveries for two years after release. The majority (57.2\%) of the tagged fish recovered were recaptured within 20 km of the Seven Bays net pen site. Fewer than 1\% (one fish) of the recaptured fish were recovered below Coulee Dam.

In contrast, in 1989, fish released at both Seven Bays and Hunters evidenced much lower harvest rates compared to 1988, respectively 3.0\% and $1.9 \%$, which included all recaptures made within one year of release. For comparison, if just the first year after release data are used for fish
released in 1988, harvest was $8.7 \%$. Fewer fish released in 1989 were recovered near the net-pen site (only $38.2 \%$ at Seven Bays and $27.2 \%$ at Hunters). More fish were recovered below Grand Coulee Dam (26.4\% from Seven Bays and $33.3 \%$ from Hunters). Six fish from Seven Bays (21.4\% of total recoveries) and five fish from Hunters (17.6\% of total recoveries) were collected at the fish counting facility at Rock Island Dam between May 10 and June 6, 1989. Three fish ( $8.8 \%$ of total recoveries) from Seven Bays and two fish ( $9.5 \%$ of total recoveries) from Hunters were recovered in Rufus Woods Reservoir during the following year. These data suggest that large numbers of net-pen fish were lost over Grand Coulee Dam in 1989 but not in 1988.

Reservoir operations were markedly different in 1988 and 1989. Drawdown was prolonged and more pronounced in 1989 than in 1988. Part of the reason that drawdown occurred earlier than normal was because of extreme cold weather in February that severely taxed the energy supply of the Columbia Basin. This caused Lake Roosevelt to be lowered by about 0.5 $\mathrm{m} /$ day ( $1.5 \mathrm{ft} /$ day ) for a period of several weeks in February and March. At the start of this period the reservoir was already at a lower level than normal owing to three consecutive years of drought conditions. Net-pen operators were worried that rapidly declining water levels would ground their net pens, so they released their fish earlier than normal -- in March (at Hunters) and April (at Seven Bays) instead of in May or June. At Seven Bays, although fish could have been held longer, lower reservoir elevations reduced boat mooring space, so a decision was made to release the fish early to free up boat dock space.

Therefore, we recommend that net pen operators retain their fish until May or June to allow trout to become residualized and site imprinted. This should increase the percentage harvested by anglers in Lake Roosevelt. Management agencies providing fish for Lake Roosevelt netpens should have a mutually agreeable contract with the net-pen operators that specifies a release date ranging from about May 10 to June 10.

In 1988, a total of 841 walleye were marked and eight were recaptured for a $1 \%$ recovery rate. Walleye tagged in the Spokane Arm during the spawning season on May 4, 1988 were recovered at Keller Ferry and the San Poil River in September 1988 and at Gifford in July 1989. One fish tagged at Kettle Falls on October 20, 1988 was recaptured at Grand Coulee Dam on July 5, 1989.

In 1989, a total of 1,158 walleye were marked and 43 were recaptured for a $3.7 \%$ recovery rate. A total of 602 walleye were marked
during their spawning migration in the Spokane Arm in May 1989 and 26 of these fish were subsequently recaptured by anglers for a $4.3 \%$ recovery rate. Of the 26 Spokane Arm fish recaptured, 3 (11.5\%) were recovered in Canada, 6 (23\%) near Kettle Falls, 1 (3.8\%) near Gifford, 1 (3.8\%) near Hunters, $10(38.5 \%)$ near the release location at Porcupine Bay in the Spokane Arm, 2 ( $7.6 \%$ ) near Seven Bays/Hawk Creek, and 3 (115\%) near Grand Coulee Dam.

Five walleye tagged at Porcupine Bay in the Spokane Arm during spawning season on May 5-6, 1989 were recovered in the vicinity of Kettle Falls, a distance of 153 km upstream in June and July 1989 (29, 34, 67, 70 and 71 days after release). Three walleye tagged at Porcupine Bay on May 5-6, 1989 were recaptured in British Columbia, two in the vicinity of Waneta Dam and one in the tailrace of Keenleyside Dam, respectively distances of 201 km and 224 km upstream, in July 1989. Four walleye marked at Porcupine Bay on May 5-6, 1989 were recovered in the vicinity of Grand Coulee Dam, a distance of 89 km downstream, in June 1989 (35, 42 and 43 days after release).

Other long distance walleye migrations recorded in 1989 included: (1) A walleye tagged at Kettle Falls on August 7, 1989 was recovered near Seven Bays on May 4, 1990; and (2) A walleye tagged in the San Poil River on May 9, 1989 was recovered in Canada on September 28, 1989. Collectively, these data indicate that walleye migrate extensively throughout Lake Roosevelt.

In 1988, 50 sets of egg skein samples were collected from female kokanee salmon to determine fecundity. Sexually mature 2+ kokanee averaged 399 mm in total length, 588 g in weight and contained a mean number of 1,303 eggs. Sexually mature $3+$ kokanee averaged 472 mm in length, $1,092 \mathrm{~g}$ in weight and contained a mean number of 1,728 eggs. In 1989, 51 sets of egg skein samples were collected from kokanee salmon. Sexually mature $2+$ kokanee averaged 348 mm in length, 419 g in weight and contained a mean number of 1,390 eggs. Sexually mature $3+$ kokanee averaged 460 mm in length, 954 g in weight and contained a mean number of 1,615 eggs.

Lake Roosevelt kokanee total length and fecundity was compared to other lakes in Idaho, Washington, Oregon and Montana. Egg production in Lake Roosevelt kokanee was the highest reported for any of the lakes in the Inland Northwest. This observation is encouraging from the standpoint of collecting a sufficient number of eggs to support hatchery operations. Assuming an $83 \%$ survival rate from egg to release, 9.6 million eggs will
be required to raise 8 million fry for release. Assuming 1,615 eggs/female, 5,968 females would be required to support hatchery operations. Assuming a ratio of 1 male:1 female, 11,936 individuals would be needed. If 1.5 million kokanee are stocked at the Sherman Creek imprinting facility, 11,936 individuals represent an adult return rate of $0.8 \%$ required to support hatchery operations.
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the Northwest Power Planning Council's 1987 Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (NPPC 1987), the Council directed the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to construct two kokanee salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) hatcheries as partial mitigation for the loss of anadromous salmon and steelhead incurred by construction of Grand Coulee Dam [Section 903 (g)(I)(C)]. The hatcheries will produce kokanee salmon for outplanting into Lake Roosevelt as well as rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) for the Lake Roosevelt net-pen program. In section 903 (g)(I)(E), the Council also directed BPA to fund a monitoring program to evaluate the effectiveness of the kokanee hatcheries. The monitoring program included the following components: 1) a year-round, reservoirwide, creel survey to determine angler use, catch rates and composition, and growth and condition of fish; 2) assessment of kokanee, rainbow, and walleye (Stizostedion vitreum) feeding habits and densities of their preferred prey, and; 3) a mark and recapture study designed to assess the effectiveness of different locations where hatchery-raised kokanee and net pen reared rainbow trout are released. The above measures were adopted by the Council based on a management plan, developed by the Upper Columbia United Tribes Fisheries Center, Spokane Indian Tribe, Colville Confederated Tribes, Washington Department of Wildlife, and National Park Service, that examined the feasibility of restoring and enhancing Lake Roosevelt fisheries (Scholz et al. 1986). In July 1988, BPA entered into a contract with the Spokane Indian Tribe to initiate the monitoring program. The projected duration of the monitoring program is through 1995. This report contains the results of the monitoring program from August 1988 to December 1989.

### 1.1 MANAGEMENT HISTORY OF LAKE ROOSEVELT

Relatively little information exists on the fisheries resources of Lake Roosevelt (reviewed by Bennett and White 1977, and Scholz et al. 1986). Before impoundment by Grand Coulee Dam in 1939, the Columbia and Spokane Rivers, in the region now occupied by Lake Roosevelt, produced large numbers of salmon, steelhead and resident rainbow and cutthroat trout (Gangmark and Fulton 1949; Bryant and Parkhurst 1950; Fulton 1968, 1970; Fulton and Laird 1967; Scholz et al. 1985). Earnest et a/. (1966) reported that carp, introduced into the watershed during the 19th century, became abundant immediately after the river was impounded. By 1949-- eight years after Grand Coulee Dam became operational-- carp, squawfish, and other species of cyprinids were the
dominant fish in the reservoir (Gangmark and Fulton 1949; Earnest et a/. 1966).

A fisheries survey to evaluate the feasibility of developing a sport fishery in Lake Roosevelt was conducted by the Washington Department of Wildlife from December 1962 through November 1963 (Earnest et al. 1966). Relative abundance of rough fish was $98 \%$. These results, combined with an unfavorable impression of the amount of food resources available for sport fish, caused the authors to conclude that, "it is unlikely that any game fishes with which we now work will or can develop suitable populations to support sportfishing in Roosevelt Lake."

However, more recent investigations conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from 1980-1983 (Beckman et al. 1985) provided a different picture. In a reservoir-wide creel survey conducted from April 15 to September 15, 1981, they estimated that 56,496 anglers fished 256,491 hours on Lake Roosevelt. Anglers harvested an estimated 126,174 fish at a catch rate of 0.49 sportfish per hour, including: 121,143 walleye, 2,568 yellow perch, 1,517 rainbow, 284 kokanee, 284 whitefish, 190 smallmouth bass and a combined total of 47 cutthroat trout, sturgeon, crappie and largemouth bass. The total amount of biomass harvested was $63,352 \mathrm{~kg}$. Catch rates (number harvested per hour) of walleye in Lake Roosevelt ranged from 0.35 (in 1983) to 0.53 (in 1980), compared to 0.32 for productive Minnesota Walleye Lakes (Beckman et al. 1985). Beckman et al. (1985) also reported that the Spokane Arm was the primary spawning area for walleye in Lake Roosevelt. From these more recent studies it is apparent that the conclusions formulated by Earnest et al. (1966) were premature. It is clear that Lake Roosevelt is reasonably productive and can support a viable fishery. However, by 1980 the walleye fishery was beginning to decline owing to over harvest and relatively poor growth rate caused by lack of forage fish in the reservoir (Beckman et al. 1985).

Kokanee salmon were abundant in Lake Roosevelt prior to the construction of the third power house at Grand Coulee Dam, as evidenced by the capture of 24,940 kokanee by purse seine ( 30 sets) and 3,465 by gill net in the forebay at Grand Coulee Dam in 1966 (Snyder 1969, cited in Bennett and White 1977, and Stober et al. 1977). These observations indicate that ecological conditions during the early to mid-1960's were favorable for successful reproduction and survival of kokanee. Kokanee abundance declined in 1968, after the reservoir was drawn down for the construction of the third powerhouse. Stober et al. (1977) believed the
reason kokanee declined after 1968 was because lower reservoir elevations reduced egg and fry survival.

Since completion of the third powerhouse, the magnitude and duration of reservoir level fluctuations has been altered. Analysis of the annual reservoir drawdown record from 1941 to 1976 showed a trend of increasing drawdown over time. Three periods were identified: 19411951, when drawdown did not exceed 30 feet; 1952-1965, when drawdown was relatively constant at 40 feet; and 1966-1976, when drawdown reached extremes of 130 and 133 feet in 1969 and 1974 respectively, but ranged from 64 to 88 feet during the remaining years (Stober et al. 1977).

Stober et al. (1977) evaluated the historical drawdown patterns of Lake Roosevelt in relation to spawning and incubation timing of kokanee and walleye, and concluded that the decline in kokanee and increase in walleye abundance during the 1960's and 1970's could be explained by the differential impact of the annual drawdown regime on the reproductive success of these two species. Because the timing of walleye spawning and incubation in Lake Roosevelt occurs primarily at low pool or during rising water levels, reservoir drawdown has less severely affected walleye reproduction. This factor was considered to be the primary reason for the survival and expansion of walleye populations in Lake Roosevelt (Stober et a/. 1977). In contrast, since kokanee spawn in late fall when water levels are high, maintenance of reservoir levels in the winter and spring are of critical importance to the normal development of eggs and the early life history stages. Currently, reservoir elevations decline earlier and to lower levels than before 1968 in order to produce more power during the winter. Eggs and alevins of kokanee have extended incubation periods in lakeshore spawning gravels, which are directly affected by this early reservoir drawdown (Stober et al. 1977). Thus, given current reservoir operations, any type of natural production would be nearly impossible.

Comparison of zooplankton standing crops in Lake Roosevelt to those of other good kokanee producing lakes indicated that zooplankton densities in Lake Roosevelt were greater than, or comparable to, other kokanee lakes (Jagielo 1984, Beckman et al. 1985). Jagielo (1984) pointed out that many people had considered Lake Roosevelt relatively unproductive for raising resident fish, yet when he quantitatively compared zooplankton standing crops in Lake Roosevelt with other local productive kokanee lakes, e.g., Lake Pend Oreille which supports a population of 16 million, $0.1-0.2 \mathrm{~kg}$ kokanee, he found that Daphnia were higher in density, larger in size, and higher in biomass in Lake Roosevelt. Jagielo stated, "though
drawdown currently limits the expansion of a reservoir spawning kokanee population in Lake Roosevelt, the abundance of crustacean zooplankton [e.g., Daphnia sp.] in the reservoir indicated a forage base comparable to other productive kokanee lakes." Beckman et al. (1985) also reported an average total benthic macroinvertebrate density of 6,198 organisms $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$, of which 1,189 were chironomids, a favorite prey item in fish diets. Beckman et al. (1985) estimated that the forage base in Lake Roosevelt could support about 16 million fingerling and 5.9 million adult kokanee (mean wt. 0.5 kg ) or 180 adults/hectare.

Nigro et al. (1983) determined that $27,200 \mathrm{~m}$ of suitable natural spawning habitat was available for kokanee in Lake Roosevelt and tributaries, and calculated that 181,000 adult fish or 5.4 fish/hectare could be produced by natural spawning if the habitat was fully utilized. Thus, the ability of naturally spawned kokanee to populate the reservoir was far less than the number that could be produced given the food availability in the reservoir. The primary (phytoplankton) and secondary (zooplankton) biological productivity of the reservoir can support 5.9 million adults, whereas the maximum number that can be produced, if all natural spawning habitat is used, is 0.18 million adults. Based on these estimates, Scholz et al. (1986) proposed that hatchery production would be necessary to take maximum advantage of the biological productivity of the reservoir and increase angler harvest.

Jagielo (1984) suggested that naturally spawned kokanee entering the reservoir in March to May are faced with low food availability because densities of large zooplankton, e.g., Daphnia, do not begin to increase in Lake Roosevelt until July. This factor may limit kokanee population due to increased competition during this critical life history stage. Beckman et
al. (1985) concluded that zooplankton densities in Lake Roosevelt are related to water retention time. Increased discharge, combined with drafting of the reservoir during the spring drawdown, impacted nutrient levels. Beckman et al. (1985) reported that, "the length of time nutrients are available in the reservoir affects the densities of [phytoplankton, which are grazed by zooplankton] -- longer retention times are associated with increased numbers of plankton while shorter times are associated with lower plankton densities, " and, "the threshold retention time that starts to effect zooplankton densities [in Lake Roosevelt] is about 30 days." The principle reason why zooplankton do not increase in lake Roosevelt until July is that the period from March to June coincides with spring drawdown, which is correlated with minimum water retention times -- frequently less than 30 days. Relatively cool floodwaters entering the reservoir during this period may also contribute to reduced
zooplankton densities. The spring drawdown is related to flood control, a lucrative market for non-firm energy sales from power generated by Grand Coulee Dam, and the water budget. The "water budget" refers to water stored in Grand Coulee Reservoir that is released in the spring to provide flushing flows that aid in the downstream passage of salmon and steelhead smolts to the ocean (NPPC 1987).

Taking these observations into account, Scholz et al. (1986) formulated a management plan for Lake Roosevelt, centered around artificial propagation of kokanee salmon. The principle advantage of hatchery production is that it would complement power production, flood control and "water budget" functions of the reservoir, since artificially propagated kokanee could be retained in the hatchery during the period of low food abundance, then stocked into the reservoir in July to coincide with peak food resources after zooplankton levels increase. In 1987, the NPPC included the two kokanee hatcheries proposed for Lake Roosevelt in its 1987 Fish and Wildlife Program. BPA is now implementing this measure.

The principle aim of the Lake Roosevelt fisheries restoration plan is to provide a dual kokanee/walleye fishery that would attract different types of anglers and promote the regional economy (Scholz et al. 1986). In Lake Roosevelt, walleye and kokanee occupy different biological zones and feed on different prey organisms. Walleye are predominantly piscivorous whereas kokanee are planktivorous (Beckman et al. 1985).

Net-pen rearing of rainbow trout in Lake Roosevelt was initiated in 1985 by Mr. Winn Self, owner of Seven Bays Marina, who released 5,000 trout from one net pen that year. By 1989, five net-pen sites -- at Keller Ferry, Seven Bays, Hunters, Kettle Falls and Northport -- with a combined total of 15 net pens, at a rearing capacity of $15,000-20,000$ fish per pen, were operating in support of the Lake Roosevelt Sport fishery. Trout hatched and raised in Washington Department of Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service hatcheries are transferred into net-pens in October at approximately 17 to 34 g individual body weight. In the net-pens individual trout grow to 141 to 247 g in weight and 221 to 262 mm in total length before release into Lake Roosevelt during the following May or June (8-9 months later).

Tagging studies conducted by the Upper Columbia United Tribes Fisheries Center at the Seven Bays and Kettle Falls net-pen sites in 1986 and 1987 indicated that angler harvest rates for individual groups of tagged fish ranged from $12.9 \%$ to $23.3 \%$ (UCUT, unpublished data). After
release in the reservoir, tag returns from anglers indicated that trout grew in length at rates ranging from 22 to $36 \mathrm{~mm} /$ month, so that by October (6-7 months after release) total lengths ranged from 386 to 418 mm . Individual body weights reported by anglers in October ranged from 673 to 840 g . By the following summer individual fish had attained total lengths ranging from 457 to 508 mm and weights ranging from 1,073 to $1,205 \mathrm{~g}$. Most of the fish harvested by anglers were caught within 14 months after release. However, fish were occasionally caught two years after release. These fish measured 527 to 579 mm in total length and weighed 1.5 to 2.0 kg . Only three fish were caught three years after release, ranging from 608 to 657 mm in total length and 2.3 to 2.7 kg in weight.

Prompted by excellent harvest returns and growth rates of net-pen reared rainbow trout, the Spokane Indian Tribe installed two net-pen sites on the Spokane River in 1990, bringing current total net-pen rearing capacity on Lake Roosevelt to approximately 500,000 trout per year. One ongoing problem with the net pen program is that trout production levels at state and federal hatcheries is insufficient to provide 500,000 fish for Lake Roosevelt. Consequently, sufficient space was incorporated in the design of the BPA kokanee hatcheries to rear the 500,000 rainbow trout needed for the Lake Roosevelt net-pen program.

### 1.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the monitoring program for Lake Roosevelt is to evaluate the effectiveness of two kokanee salmon (Oncorhynchus nerka) hatcheries, one at Galbraith Springs on the Spokane Indian Reservation, and the second at Sherman Creek near Kettle Falls, that will produce fish for stocking into Lake Roosevelt. The two hatcheries are complimentary, with the Sherman Creek hatchery being used predominantly as an egg collection and imprinting site, and the Spokane Indian hatchery used for egg incubation and rearing approximately 8 million kokanee and 500,000 rainbow trout for Lake Roosevelt and 5 million kokanee for Banks Lake. The Washington Department of Wildlife has stocked about one million kokanee per year into Lake Roosevelt since 1988 in an attempt to provide spawners to support hatchery operations. The Spokane Indian hatchery is scheduled for completion in January 1991. The Sherman Creek hatchery is scheduled for completion in 1991. The study objectives of this project include the following components:
(1) A year-round creel census survey to determine angler use, catch rates and composition, growth and condition of fish, and
economic value of the fishery. Comparisons will be made before and after hatcheries are on line, so that hatchery effectiveness can be determined;
(2) Assessment of kokanee, rainbow trout and walleye feeding habits, growth rates, and densities of their preferred prey at different locations in the reservoir; and how reservoir operations affect population dynamics of prey organisms. This data will enable fish managers to determine the potential for inter-and-intra-specific competition, predatory impact on prey organisms, seasonal fluctuations in prey abundance, and geographical distribution of kokanee, rainbow, walleye, and their preferred prey. This information will be useful for planning long-term hatchery and net-pen operations, including stocking levels, time when kokanee and rainbow are stocked, and locations of stocking; and
(3) A mark-recapture study designed to assess the effectiveness of the time and location where hatchery-raised kokanee and net-pen reared rainbow trout are released. This study will focus on kokanee and rainbow migratory tendencies and distribution after their release, to determine release sites and time of release that minimize loss over Grand Coulee Dam and provide increased harvest to anglers, as well as homing to egg collection sites during the spawning migration.

During the initial years of the monitoring program, the principle focus was to collect baseline data that can be used for comparison after the fish hatcheries are on line. The first years study objectives were to determine:

1. Angling pressure, catch per unit effort, total harvest and economic value of the fishery by conducting a year-round, reservoir-wide creel survey;
2. Relative abundance of fish species in the reservoir by conducting gill net and electrofishing surveys at nine index stations;
3. Feeding habits of rainbow trout, kokanee and walleye, and densities of their preferred prey;
4. Growth rates of rainbow trout, kokanee and walleye;
5. Densities, biomass, and sizes of different categories of zooplankton and how reservoir operations affect zooplankton population dynamics, and;
6. Migration patterns of net-pen raised rainbow trout and walleye.

## 2 .O MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

Lake Roosevelt is a mainstem Columbia River impoundment formed by Grand Coulee Dam in 1941 (Fig.5 2.1, 2.2). The reservoir, located in Northeast Washington, inundates 33,490 hectares at a full pool elevation of 393 m above mean sea level. Lake Roosevelt has a maximum width of 3.4 km , and maximum depth of 122 m (Stober et a/ 1981). Reservoir elevations and water retention times during the study period are recorded in Fig. 2.3. To construct these graphs, daily midnight reservoir elevation (ft) and total outflow (KCFS) were obtained from daily summary reports for Grand Coulee Dam prepared each month in 1988 and 1989 by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Reservoir Control Center in Portland, OR (Appendix A). Additionally a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (1981) reservoir storage table that converts reservoir elevation (ft) to volume of water stored (KCSFD) was used to calculate water retention time, using the storage replacement method. The formula was:

$$
\text { Water retention time (days) }=\text { Reservoir volume }(\text { kcfsd })+\text { Outflow(kcfs) }
$$

Daily values for reservoir elevation and water retention time were added and divided by the number of days in each month to obtain average monthly reservoir elevation and water retention times. The graphs indicate a pronounced difference in reservoir operation between 1988 and 1989. In general, reservoir elevations were lower and water retention times were reduced in the winter and spring months of 1989 as compared to 1988. Summer and fall seasons were similar in each year.

### 2.2 CREEL SURVEY DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

To determine annual fishing pressure, catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) and harvest of sport fish on Lake Roosevelt, a two-stage probability sampling scheme (Lambou 1961, 1966; Malvestuto 1983) was used.
Random days and hours were selected to sample weekday and weekend/holiday stratums for angler pressure and catch composition. The mean ( $\pm$ S.D.) boat and shore angler pressure, CPUE of total captured and harvested (by species), and total number of fish captured and harvested for days sampled in each stratum were calculated and then expanded by multiplying these values by the total number of days in the sampling interval.


Fig. 2.1 Lake Roosevelt, (Columbia River), indicating locations of primary ( ) and secondary ( $\mathbf{\Delta}$ ) creel locations.


Fig. 2.2 Lake Roosevelt, (Columbia River), indicating location of nine index stations used for sampling fish and zooplankton.


F gure 2.3. Monthly mean water elevations (feet) and water retention time (days) for Lake Roosevelt in 1988 and 1989.

Three creel clerks were employed to survey Lake Roosevelt year round for an average of 20 days per month. Days of each month were stratified into weekdays and weekend/holidays. Survey dates for week days or weekend/holidays were randomly selected. Days were stratified into a.m. (sunrise to 12 p.m.) and p.m. (12 p.m. to sunset) time periods. The times for sunrise to sunset for Lake Roosevelt were determined from the Nautical Almanac.

During each randomly selected a.m. and p.m. creel period, counts of number of boat trailers and shore anglers were determined. All incoming boaters were surveyed to determine: (1) the percentage of boats that were angling and (2) the number of anglers per boat. These two numbers were employed as correction factors to calculate boat angler fishing pressure, using the formula:

| total number of $=$ <br> boat anglers <br> per stratum | boat trailer <br> countspercentage of boats <br> (corrected <br> making fishing trips |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | by airflight |
|  | observations) |$\quad$| \# of anglers/boat |
| :--- |
| for boats making |

Additional instantaneous pressure counts of the entire reservoir were made four times per month (weekday a.m./p.m. and weekend/holiday a.m./p.m.) using a Cessna 172 aircraft. The number of boat trailers at each boat access launch was also recorded by aircraft. This data was compared to boat trailer counts in order to develop a correction factor that accounted for boats on the lake that could not be estimated by boat trailer counts, e.g., boats moored at marinas or private docks. In this case only boats actually on the reservoir were counted.

Angler interviews on Lake Roosevelt were conducted at every National Park Service (NPS) boat access and campground site, as well as Colville and Spokane tribal boat access points and campgrounds for a total of 50 survey sites (Fig. 2.1). For each angler interviewed creel clerks identified species caught, measured length (mm), and weight ( g ) of each fish, and examined it for identifying marks, such as floy tags, fin clips, and unique marks, such as stubbed dorsal fins and eroded pectoral and pelvic fins, that could be used to determine if rainbow trout were of native or hatchery (net-pen) origin. Additional information was collected on hours fished, target species, zone (river mile) for captured fish. Species number and size of released fish was also recorded. Scale and stomach samples were also collected from representative rainbow trout, kokanee, and walleye examined by creel clerks.

### 2.2.1 Computation of Angler Pressure, CPUE and Harvest

Statistical sampling formulas (Lewis 1975; Wonnacott and Wonnacott 1977; Mendel and Schuck 1987 and Willms et a/. 1989) were used to calculate strata estimates and associated confidence intervals for angling pressure, CPUE, and harvest.

Pressure was estimated for each day type (week day or weekend/holiday) and time interval (a.m. or p.m.) for boat and shore anglers for each month by the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P} E_{\mathbf{S}} & =\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{S}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathbf{S}} \\
\text { where: }: \mathrm{PE}_{\mathbf{S}} & =\text { pressure estimate for stratum; } \\
\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{S}} & =\text { number of hours in stratum; and } \\
\mathrm{X}_{\mathbf{S}} & =\text { mean number of anglers per hour in stratum. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The variance of the pressure estimate for each stratum was calculated by:

$$
V^{V P E}=\frac{(N s)}{n} S_{s}{ }^{2}
$$

where: VPE $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{s}}=$ variance of pressure estimate for each stratum; $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{s}}=$ number of hours in stratum;
$\mathrm{n}=$ number of hours sampled in stratum; and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{s}}=$ standard deviation of mean number of angler hours in stratum.

Ninety-five percent confidence intervals for each stratum were calculated by:

$$
\text { C.I. }=P E \pm \sqrt{V_{P E}} \times 1.96
$$

where: C.I. = 95\% confidence intervals;
PE = pressure estimate;
VPE $=$ variance of the pressure estimate.
Annual angler pressure and 95\% confidence estimates were calculated by summing the monthly pressure estimates and $95 \%$ confidence estimates for each stratum and Lake Roosevelt region.

CPUE for fish species in each stratum and survey location (boat access and campground areas) were determined from complete and incomplete angler trips. Studies by Fletcher (1988) and Malvestuto et a/. (1978) have shown that CPUE values calculated independently from complete and incomplete trip data are not statistically different. CPUE was calculated independently for fish harvested (kept) and fish captured (kept or released) by dividing the number of fish species caught by the total number of hours spent fishing.

Harvest of fish species was determined monthly for each stratum and Lake Roosevelt region (i.e., northern, middle, southern and Spokane Arm). Harvest was calculated by multiplying the harvest CPUE times the pressure estimate. Monthly harvest estimates were combined to present an annual estimate for each fish species. The number of sturgeon harvested was determined independently by isolating all CPUE data for this species since sturgeon were primarily harvested at only one location, between Kettle Falls and Marcus Island.

### 2.2.2 Computation of Economic Value of the Lake Roosevelt Fishery

According to statistics compiled in a national survey conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1980 and 1985, a typical angler spent $\$ 23.00 /$ fishing in 1980 and $\$ 26.00 /$ fishing trip in 1985 inland waters of Washington State (USFWS 1989). The $\$ 26.00$ figure was adjusted to account for the rate of inflation between 1985 and 1988 based on the Consumer Price Index. This value was $\$ 28.90$ in 1988. This value was multiplied by the total number of angler trips in 1988 and 1989 to provide an estimate of the economic value of the fishery. The number of angler trips was determined by dividing the total number of angler hours by the average length of a completed fishing trip for each year.

### 2.3 FISHERIES AND ZOOPLANKTON SURVEYS

Fish and zooplankton samples were collected in August 1988, October 1988, May 1989, August 1989, and October 1989 at nine index stations in the reservoir, including: (1) Kettle Falls (Colville); (2) Gifford; (3) Hunters; (4) Porcupine Bay; (5) Little Falls Dam; (6) Seven Bays; (7) Keller Ferry; (8) San Poil, and; (9) Spring Canyon (Fig. 2.2). The Kettle Falls (Colville), Gifford, Porcupine Bay, and San Poil stations are the same used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in their 1979-1983 study of Lake Roosevelt. Approximately 24-36 hours were spent at each index
station collecting fisheries data at each interval. Fisheries data was collected over a 24 hour period. Principle target species included kokanee, rainbow, and walleye. Other species of interest included lake whitefish, yellow perch, and any other species recovered. Additional zooplankton sampling was conducted at Porcupine Bay (Index Station 4), and Seven Bays (Index Stations 6) each month from August 1988 through December 1989.

### 2.3.1 Fisheries Surveys

Relative abundance surveys were performed in littoral areas and tributaries by making 10 minute transects along 0.5 km of shoreline using and SR 18 and SR 22 electrofishing boats (Smith Root, Inc., Vancouver, WA) according to procedures outlined by Reynolds (1983) and Novotany and Priegel (1974). Voltage was adjusted to produce a pulsating DC current of approximately 5 amperes. Fish attracted to the anodes off the bow of the electrofishing boats were collected using dip nets and put into live wells on the boat for examination and data collection.

Additional relative abundance surveys were performed in pelagic zones using bottom and surface monofilament gill nets following methodologies described by Hubert (1983). The following horizontal and vertical gill nets were used: (1) two horizontal surface set gill nets measuring 61 m in length by 6.1 m deep, with four 15.2 m long panels graded from 1.3 to 7.6 cm stretch mesh; (2) two horizontal bottom set gill nets measuring 61 m in length by 6.1 m deep, with four 15.2 m long panels graded from 1.3 to 8.9 cm stretch mesh, and; (3) one vertical gill net measuring 15.2 m in length by 30.5 m deep, with four 7.6 m long panels graded from 1.3 to 8.9 cm stretch mesh. Gill nets were set from late afternoon (4:00 p.m.) until the following morning (9:00 a.m.) and checked at sunset (about 9:00 p.m.) and 9:00 a.m. On some occasions nets were checked at 2 to 4 hour intervals to collect fresh fish for stomach samples.

Each fish captured by electrofishing and gill netting was identified using the taxonomic key of Wydoski and Whitney (1980). Total length was measured to the nearest millimeter using a metric measuring board and a scale sample was removed from target fish species for age and growth determination. Target fish species were also weighed to the nearest gram using either a triple beam balance or an electronic balance. Sex was determined when possible. Stomach samples were collected from representative sizes of target species. Some of the remaining target species were marked with floy tags and released.

### 2.3.2 Zooplankton Surveys

Duplicate zooplankton samples were collected in mid-channel at each index station in August 1988, October 1988, May 1989, August 1989, and October 1989, and at index stations 4 (Porcupine Bay) and 6 (Seven Bays) every month from August 1988 to December 1989. Water column zooplankton samples were taken by making an oblique tow either using a Clark-Bumpas quantitative sampler with a No. 20 ( $76 \mu \mathrm{mesh}$ ) or a Wisconsin vertical tow plankton net ( $76 \mu$ mesh) with 80 mm silk net bucket. The Clark-Bumpas was used August to October 1988 and May to December 1989, while the Wisconsin vertical tow net was used November 1988 to April 1989. Water column tows using the Clark-Bumpas were made from 33 m to the surface at a constant boat speed of about 5 knots. Vertical tows were made with the Wisconsin net from 33 m to the surface. The organisms were washed into a 253 ml bottle containing 10 ml of $37 \%$ formaldehyde. Organisms were stained with 1.0 ml of five percent Lugol's solution and 1.0 ml of saturated eosin-y ethanol stain.

In the lab, zooplankton were identified to genus and species, using taxonomic keys of Brandlova et al. (1972), Brooks (1957), Edmondson (1959), Pennak (1978), Ruttner-Kolisko (1974) and Stemberger (1979). A Nikon SMZ-10 dissecting microscope with a ring illuminator system and Nikon Optiphot phase contrast microscope were used for identification. A minimum of four subsamples was counted using a modified counting chamber (Ward 1955) until 100 organisms or 25 ml of sample had been counted (Edmondson and Windberg 1971; Downing and Rigler 1984). Volume of sample to be subsampled depended on the density of organisms in the sample.

The counts for each species in each subsample were recorded in Microsoft Excell on a Macintosh SE computer. Densities (\# organisms/l) were calculated in the program using the following equations. First, the volume of the sample was calculated. For samples collected by the Wisconsin plankton sampler, the sample volume was calculated by the following equation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& V=\Pi r^{2} h \\
\text { where: } & \mathrm{v} \\
& \mathrm{r}^{2} \\
& =\text { volume; } \\
& h=\operatorname{depth} \text { of sampler; and } \\
\quad \Pi & =\text { pi }(3.414)
\end{aligned}
$$

The volume of the sample collected by the Clark-Bumpas sampler was determined in a different manner. The Clark-Bumpas sampler was field calibrated as described by Clark and Bumpas (1940). A theoretical volume of 56 liters per unit count was determined. The formula for calculating the theoretical volume sampled by the sampler was:

$$
\mathrm{TV}=\Pi \mathrm{r}^{2} \mathrm{~d} / \mathrm{CF}
$$

where: $\quad$ TV $=$ theoretical volume (liters/unit count); $\mathrm{r}^{2}=$ radius of sampler (m); d $=$ distance of plankton tow (m); $C F=$ calibration factor; and $\Pi=3.414$

Entire sample volume was calculated by multiplying theoretical volume and change in counter reading recorded during plankton tow. The following equation was used:

$$
V=T V(C C)
$$

where: $\quad \mathrm{V}=$ volume of entire sample (liters)
TV = theoretical volume (56 liters/unit count)
$\propto=$ Change in Clark-Bumpass counter reading
Volume of entire sample was used to determine the plankton density. Density (\# organisms/l) was calculated using the number of subsamples taken, volume of subsample, volume of entire sample, dilution factor (if diluted) and total number counted of each species. The following equation was used:

$$
D=\frac{\left(\frac{T c}{S n} \times \frac{S V}{S S V}\right)_{D F}}{V}
$$

```
where: \(D=\) density (\# organisms/I);
    \(\mathrm{Sn}=\) number of subsamples;
    sv = sample volume;
    ssv = subsample volume;
    DF = dilution factor; and
    Tc = total number counted of each species
        of organisms.
    \(\mathrm{V}=\) volume of entire sample
```

The lengths of predominant cladocerans were measured from the top of the head to the base of the carapace, excluding the spine. Cladoceran biomass was determined using the length-weight regression equations summarized by Downing and Rigler (1984). If more than one regression equation was available for an organism then the regression equation with a mean length closest to the mean length of that organism in this study was used. The length-weight regression equation, the equations used for each species, and sources of the equations are listed in Table 2.3.1. After the mean weight of an organisms was calculated with the appropriate equation, the biomass of the organisms in the sample was calculated by multiplying the mean weight of an organism by the total number of those organisms in the sample.

### 2.4 AGE DETERMINATION, BACK CALCULATIONS, AND CONDITION FACTORS

In the field, scales were taken from appropriate locations for each species as described by Jearld (1983) and placed in coin envelopes labeled with fish number, length, weight, location, date, and species for later analysis. In the laboratory, backcalculation measurements and age class of each fish were determined simultaneously. To obtain the data, scales were removed from the envelope and placed between two microscope slides. The slides were then placed in a Realist Vantage 5, Model 3315 microfiche reader. The scale image was then projected onto the screen and a non-regenerated, uniform scale was selected to determine age and backcalculation using the following procedures:

Table 2.3.1 Length weight relationships for crustacean zooplankton (Cladocera) collected from the literature as summarized by Downing and Rigler (1984). The slope (b), intercept (In a), and range of length measurements (mm) are presented for the relationship:

$$
\ln w=\ln a+b \overline{\ln L}
$$

where In $\mathrm{w}=$ the logarithim of the dry weight estimate ( $\mu \mathrm{g}$ ); and
In $\mathrm{L}=$ total length from top of the head to the base of the carapace (natural log).

| Species | In A | b | Range |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Daphnia schodleri | 2.30 | 3.10 | $1.00-2.50$ |
| Daphnia re trocurva | 1.4322 | 3.129 | $0.50-2.00$ |
| Daphnia galeata mendota | 1.51 | 2.56 |  |
| Daphnia thorata | 2.64 | 2.54 | $0.60-2.20$ |
| Daphnia ambigua | 1.54 | 2.29 |  |
| Leotodora kindtii | -0.8220 | 2.670 | $1.00-5.00$ |

1. Age was determined by counting the number of annuli (Jearld 1983).
2. Backcalculation measurements were determined using a $T$ square metric ruler.
a. Scale length was determined by placing the 0 mm mark at the center of the focus with the T perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the scale.
b. Annulus distance was then measured from the same origin to the last circuli of each annulus with the T square in the same position.

Each measurement was made under constant magnification to the nearest millimeter.

Body length, scale length, and length of each annulus of all fish were then entered into StatView 512 (Brainpower 1986) on the Apple Macintosh SE computer for linear regression calculation. Lee's backcalculation method was used to determine the length of the fish at the formation of each annulus. (Carlander 1950,1981; Hile 1970).

Backcalculations were computed by the formula:

$$
L_{i}=a-\left(\frac{L_{c}-a}{S_{c}}\right) S_{i}
$$

where: $\quad L_{i}=$ length of fish (in mm ) at each annulus;
a = intercept of the body-scale regression line;
$L_{c}=$ length of fish (in mm ) at time of capture;
$\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{c}}=$ distance (in mm ) from the focus to the edge of the scale; and
$S_{i}=$ scale measurement to each annulus.

The proportional method of back-calculation was used for some species, e.g., kokanee, when small sample size of certain age classes resulted in poor regressions. This method does not take into account the size of fish at scale formation. The following equation was used:

$$
\mathrm{Li}=\frac{\mathrm{Si}(\mathrm{Lc})}{\mathrm{SC}}
$$

where: $\mathrm{Li}=$ length of fish at each annulus (mm); $\mathrm{Lc}=$ length of fish at time of capture (mm); $\mathrm{Si}=$ scale measurement to each annulus (mm); and SC = distance from the focus to the edge of the scale (mm).

Age, size and measurements used for back-calculations for each target species are listed in Appendix C.

Condition factors were determined for each fish to serve as an indicator of general condition of the fish (Hile 1970, Everhart and Youngs 1981). Condition factors describe how a fish adds weight in relation to incremental changes in length. The relationship is shown by the formula:

$$
K_{T L}=\left(\frac{W}{L^{3}}\right)^{10^{5}}
$$

where: $\quad K_{\mathrm{TL}}=$ condition factor;
$\mathrm{w}=$ weight of fish in grams: and
$\mathrm{L}=$ total length of fish in millimeters.

### 2.5 FISH FEEDING HABITS

### 2.5.1 Field Collection

Fish stomachs were collected from kokanee, rainbow, walleye and lake whitefish at each index station in August and October 1988, and May, August and October 1989. Stomachs from representative sizes of fish were collected by making an incision into the body cavity, cutting the pyloric sphincter and esophagus, while clamping the esophagus to keep prey items from being expelled, and preserving the stomach in 10 percent formalin.

### 2.5.2 Diet Analysis

In the lab stomachs were transferred to a 70\% isopropyl alcohol solution. Contents were identified to family for benthic macroinvertebrates and to species for zooplankton using the taxonomic
keys of Brooks (1957), Ward and Whipple (1966), Borror et al. (1976), Ruttner-Kolisko (1974), Edmonds et. al (1976), Wiggins (1977), Pennak (1978), Merritt and Cummings (1984).

Food organisms were identified using a Nikon SMZ-1B dissecting microscope equipped with fiber optics illumination system and 5 mm ocular micrometer. Identification of particular zooplankton species was made using a Nikon S-Ke phase contrast microscope.

Stomachs containing large numbers of zooplankton were either subsampled or counted, depending on diversity of prey organisms. Subsamples were made by diluting zooplankton contents to 100 ml in a beaker, stirring the contents to uniformity and collecting three 2 ml aliquots with a calibrated pipet. The following formula was used to determine the total number of a particular zooplankton species:

Total No.


$$
\text { where: } \quad \begin{aligned}
\quad \mathrm{DV}= & \text { total diluted volume }(100 \mathrm{ml}) ; \\
\mathrm{sv}= & \text { total subsample volume }(2 \mathrm{ml}) ; \text { and } \\
\mathrm{Tn}= & \text { total number of zooplankton (or dipterans) } \\
& \text { in the subsample. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The above subsample and total diluted volume was determined by comparing actual counts of zooplankton contents in 15 stomach samples with calculated estimates using various subsample volumes and diluted volumes. The above subsample and total diluted volume showed the least variance and therefore was used.

Length measurements of cladocerans were made from the top of the head to the base of the carapace, excluding the spine. This permitted comparison of the size of cladocerans in fish stomachs versus their size in the water column to determine if size selective predation was occurring.

Dry weights were obtained by drying the sorted stomach contents in an oven at $105^{\circ}$ for 24 hours and weighing them on a Sartorius Model H51
analytical balance to the nearest .0001 g (Weber 1973, APHA 1976). Weight values were combined for each age class for each season to obtain seasonal means and standard deviations. The mean seasonal data was then averaged to obtain unbiased annual means.

### 2.5.3 Number and Weight Indices

For each Seasonal means for numerical frequency and weight frequency of the prey items ( $\pm$ standard deviation) were obtained for each age class of walleye, rainbow, and kokanee collected during each sampling interval. Nonmeasureable trace amounts were given the value of 0.0001 grams for calculating percentages by weight.

Seasonal mean data were combined to obtain unbiased estimates of annual average number and weight percent composition by number and weight, frequency of occurrence and index of relative importance for each age class of walleye, rainbow and kokanee.

### 2.5.4 Index of Relative Importance (IRI)

Index of relative importance was used to compensate for numerical estimate biases that tend to overemphasize small prey groups consumed in large numbers and weight estimate biases that overemphasize large prey items in small numbers (Bowen 1983). The index of relative importance (George and Hadley 1979) was calculated using the formula:

$$
\mathrm{Rla}=\frac{100 \mathrm{Al}_{\mathrm{a}}}{\sum_{\mathrm{a}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{Al}_{\mathrm{a}}}
$$

where: $\quad$ Rla $=$ relative importance of food item a; Ala = absolute importance of food item a (i.e., frequency of occurrence + numerical frequency + weight frequency of food item a); and
$\mathrm{n} \quad=$ number of different food types.
Relative importance values range from zero to $100 \%$ with prey items near zero being relatively less important than those prey item near one hundred.

### 2.5.5 Diet Overlap

Diet overlap was calculated to determine the degree to which intraspecies competition exists in Lake Roosevelt. Fish diet overlaps were computed by using the overlap formula of Morisita (1959) as modified by Horn (1966). Overlap values were based upon the indices obtained from the IRI calculations. The overlap index was expressed in the equation:

$$
C_{x}=\frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(P_{x i} x P y i\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{x i^{2}}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{y i^{2}}}
$$

where: $c x=$ the overlap coefficient,
Pxi $=$ the proportion of food category
(i) in the diet of species $x$,

Pyi = the proportion of food category
(i) in the diet of species $y$, and
$n \quad=$ the number of food categories.
The overlap coefficients were computed by using the IRI values in the equation for the variables Pxi and Pyi. The overlap coefficients range from 0 (no overlap) to 1 (complete overlap). Values of less than 0.3 are considered low and values greater than 0.7 indicate high overlap (Peterson and Martin-Robichaud 1982). High diet overlap indices may indicate competition if the food items utilized by the species are limited (MacArthur 1968). High diet overlap indices may also indicate that there is an abundant food supply and competition does not exist.

### 2.5.6 Electivity Index

The electivity index is a method of measuring the degree of selection that a fish has for a particular size category of prey compared to the availability of the same size category of the prey species in the environment (Ivlev 1961). Data obtained from zooplankton samples and stomach samples were used to compute selectivity for different size ranges of Daphnia by planktivorous fish species (kokanee and rainbow trout). Mean annual number frequencies from the fishes' diet and percentage by number of different size ranges of Daphnia in the water
column were used to calculate the linear index of electivity (Strauss 1979). The electivity index was calculated using the equation:

$$
\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{ri}-\mathrm{pi}
$$

where $L=$ the measure of food selection;
$\mathrm{ri}=$ the relative abundance of prey i in the gut;
$\mathrm{Pi}=$ the relative abundance of same prey i in the environment.

Food selection values ranged from +1 to -1 . Values near zero indicate that the fish is feeding on that size category of Daphnia in relation to its abundance, or randomly. Positive values indicate that the fish are selecting those size categories. Negative values indicate that the fish are either avoiding or can't discern those size categories.

Some advantages of using this index are: (1) it is not biased by unequal sample sizes; and (2) extreme values are obtained only when a prey item is very abundant in the environment and rare in the diet or when a prey item is rare in the environment and very abundant in the diet (Strauss 1979).

### 2.6 TAGGING STUDIES

Tagging studies were conducted with net pen rainbow trout and walleye via inserting individually numbered floy tags into the musculature at the posterior base of the dorsal fin. The floy tags contained a return address. Rainbow trout were marked and released at the Seven Bays net pen in 1988 and at the Seven Bays and Hunters in 1989. The fish at Hunters were marked with the assistance of students from the Hunters High School. Representative samples of about 100 fish from each group were measured and weighed to determine the average length and weight of the group at time of release.

Walleye were marked in the Spokane Arm in May 1988 and May 1989. Large numbers of walleye were marked at this site where they congregated to spawn. Walleye were also marked at other index stations during each month when fisheries samples were collected but relatively fewer fish were caught. Lengths were recorded for each walleye marked.

A poster campaign was conducted by placing posters at marina's, boat launches, public fishing areas, National Park Service campgrounds, fish cleaning stations, and businesses that sold fishing licences or tackle
in the communities surrounding Lake Roosevelt. The poster contained information about the Lake Roosevelt monitoring program project and requested that anglers return tags along with the following information: date of recapture, location of recapture, and length and weight (if possible) of fish at time of recapture. Anger clubs in the vicinity of Grand Coulee Reservoir, as well as groups such as the Lake Roosevelt Development Association and the Lake Roosevelt Forum, were also notified about the project.

Tag return data was compiled and analyzed to determine migration patterns and growth rates. Fish lengths, generally reported by anglers in inches, were converted into mm , to assess growth rates in $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{month}$. Because anglers usually measured fish to the nearest 0.5 inch, whereas at marking they were measured to the nearest mm , fish were occasionally reported with lower total lengths or much higher total lengths than when they were originally marked. Therefore, only walleye which were caught at least 10 months after tagging were used for calculating growth rates.

### 2.7 KOKANEE FECUNDITY ESTIMATES

Egg skeins were removed from female kokanee that were nearly ripe and preserved with $10 \%$ formalin. Fish that appeared to have spawned were discarded. In the laboratory, eggs were carefully dissected from the skein and counted using a tally counter and Nikon SMZ-1B dissecting microscope with fiber optics illuminator. The mean and standard deviation of the number of eggs for each age class and linear regression plots of the total length/fecundity and weigh/fecundity relationships were calculated using Statview 512+ (Brainpower 1986) on a Macintosh SE computer.

### 3.0 RESULTS

### 3.1 CREEL SURVEY

Results of annual cree. survey data, including angler pressure ( $\pm 95 \%$ $\mathrm{Cl})$, CPUE, and harvest estimates ( $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ for each fish species, are summarized in Tables 3.1 . 1 through 3.1.13. Results of all monthly creel survey data for northern, middle, southern, and Spokane Arm designated areas of Lake Roosevelt are listed in Appendix B.

From August through December 1988, surveys were conducted on 97 days and 786 boat and 250 shore anglers were interviewed. In 1989, surveys were conducted on 233 days, and 1,137 boat and 2,131 shore anglers were interviewed. The average trip length from August to December, 1988, was 4.1 hours for boat anglers and 3.7 hours for shore anglers. The annual average trip length in 1989 was 4.5 hours for boat anglers and 3.3 hours for shore anglers (Appendix B).

Angler pressure estimates for August to December 1988, and January to December 1989 are listed in Tables 3.1.2 and 3.1.3. Angling pressure was estimated at 261,913 angler hours from August through December 1988. Angling pressure from January through December 1989 was estimated at 756,397 angler hours. The peak angling pressure in 1989 occurred in August with 182,409 angler hours. The next two highest months were June with 175,812 angler hours and July with 146,641 angler hours.

The mean CPUE for for all species (harvested and released) was 0.19 fish/h from August to December 1988, and 0.05 fish/h in 1989. The mean CPUE for all species (harvested only) was 0.14 fish/h 1988 and 0.03 fish/h in 1989 (Table 3.1.4). Individual fish species CPUE estimates for total catch and harvest are summarized monthly in Tables 3.1.5 through 3.1.8.

From August to December 1988, total harvest ( $\pm 95 \%$ confidence intervals) was estimated at $125,891 \pm 47,629$ fish, comprised of $86,107 \pm$ 31,940 rainbow trout, $9,362 \pm 3,873$ kokanee, $23,005 \pm 8,731$ walleye, $1,210 \pm 312$ yellow perch, and $6,207 \pm 2,773$ smallmouth bass (Table 3.1.9). In 1989, the annual total harvest ( $\pm 95 \%$ confidence intervals) was estimated at $164,227 \pm 63,035$ fish, comprised of $65,515 \pm 25,373$ rainbow trout, $11,906 \pm 3,597$ kokanee, $248 \pm 54$ chinook salmon, $83 \pm 18$ lake whitefish, $80,626 \pm 33,513$ walleye, $3,600 \pm 1,631$ yellow perch, $8 \pm$ 3 largemouth bass, $1,538 \pm 578$ smallmouth bass, $691 \pm 323$ black crappie,

Table 3.1.1. Estimates of number of angler hours and angler trips based on average trip length for Lake Roosevelt August to December, 1988 and January to December, 1989.

| 1988 |  | ANG | SEP | CTT | NON | DEC |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Angler Hours |  | 120,559 | 58,404 | 47,865 | 17,003 | 18,082 |
| Ave. Trip length | 3.2 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.2 |  |
| No.Angling_Trips |  | 37,674 | 12,979 | 11.396 | 3.954 | 4.305 |

AUG-DEC 1988 TOTALS:
ANGLER HOURS 261,913
NO. ANGLING TRIPS 70,308

| 1989 | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Angler Hours | 13,729 | 9,482 | 22,139 | 44.037 | 53,961 | 175,812 |
| Ave. Trip length | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 4.3 |
| No. Angling Trips | 4,576 | 2,789 | 5,826 | 10,241 | 14.989 | 40.887 |


| 1989 | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Angler Hours | 146,641 | 182,409 | 42,012 | 29,425 | 27,524 | 9,226 |
| Ave. Trip length | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.2 |
| No. Angling Trips | 31,878 | 44,490 | 10.003 | 6,261 | 5.734 | 2,197 |

JAN-DEC 1989 TOTALS: ANGLER HOURS 756,397
NO. ANGLING TRIPS 179,871

Table 3．1．2．Angler pressure estimates（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ ）for each stratum on Lake Roosevelt， August to December 1988.

|  | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LAKE ROOSEVELT＇89 | Angler h（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler h（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler h （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler h （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler h （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ |
| Weekday（AM）Boal | 26，505（ $\pm 6,865)$ | 13，388（ $\pm 3,983)$ | 7，834 $\pm 2,171)$ | 5，213（ $\pm 1,509$ ） | $4,394$（ $\pm 1,761)$ |
| Weekday（AM）Shore | 137 （ $\pm 40)$ | 165 （ $\pm 46)$ | 615 （ $\pm 235)$ | 974 （ $\pm 223)$ | 2，519（ $\pm 498)$ |
| Weekday（PM）Boat | 18，563（ $\pm 10,042)$ | 16，999（ $\pm 5,400)$ | 15，382（ $\pm 4,400$ ） | $4,665$（ $\pm 1,458)$ | 1.989 （f816） |
| Weekday（PM）Shore | 396 （ $\pm 130)$ | 286 （ $\pm 57)$ | 989 （ $\pm 371)$ | 595 （f114） | 3，105（f445） |
| Weekend（AM）Boat | 47，264（土23，274） | 13，817（ $\pm 5,144)$ | 9，400（土2，350） | 2，395（f691） | 2，554（ $\pm 909)$ |
| Weekend（AM）Shore | 169 （ $\pm 63)$ | 31 （fll） | 515 （f121） | 811 （f228） | 1，720（f534） |
| Weekend（PM）Boal | 26，777（ $\pm 15,586)$ | 12，628（ $\pm 6,962$ ） | 12，203（f210） | 2.118 （f627） | 779 （f215） |
| Weekend（PM）Shore | 748 （f470） | 92 （ $\pm 37)$ | 921 （ $\pm 210)$ | 232 （ $\pm 42)$ | 1，022（f315） |
| TOTAL | $1120,559( \pm 56,4$ | 0） $588,404( \pm 21,640)$ | ｜47，865（土12，887） | $17,003$（ $\pm 4,892)$ | $18,082( \pm 5,493)$ |

Table 3．1．3．Angler pressure estimates（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ ）for each stratum on Lake Roosevelt，January to December 1989.

|  |  | JAN |  | FE |  | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LAKE ROOSEVELT＇89 | Angler h | （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler h | （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler h （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler $h( \pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler $\mathrm{h}( \pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler h （ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） |
|  | Weekday（AM）Boat | 2，191 | （ $\pm 693)$ | 342 | （ $\pm 70$ ） | 1，528（ $\pm 465$ ） | 1，477（ $\pm 384)$ | 10，218 $( \pm 3,230)$ | 43，486（土21，652） |
|  | Weokday（AM）Shore | 3，034 | （ $\pm 816)$ | 1.672 | （ $\pm 806)$ | 1，241（ $\pm 338$ ） | 1.882 （ $\pm 311)$ | 2，039（ $\pm 432)$ | 801 （ $\pm 168)$ |
|  | Weekday（PM）Boat | 2，467 | （ $\pm 825$ ） | 435 | （ $\pm 41$ ） | $4,823( \pm 2,548)$ | $13.671( \pm 3,991)$ | 12，923（ $\pm 5,490$ ） | 39，953（ $\pm 13.994)$ |
|  | Weekday（PM）Shore | 2，152 | $( \pm 730)$ | 855 | （ $\pm 325)$ | 4，366（ $\pm 1,845)$ | $3.111 \quad( \pm 374)$ | $3,478$（ $\pm 847)$ | 9，145（ $\pm 6,047)$ |
|  | Weokend（AM）Boat | 1，150 | （ $\pm 369$ ） | 504 | （ $\pm 181$ ） | 3，020（ $\pm 1,943)$ | 11，407（ $\pm 3,683)$ | 10，935（ $\pm 7,264$ ） | 3，700（ $\pm 11,651)$ |
|  | Weekend（AM）Shore | 1，613 | （ $\pm 430$ ） | 1，872 | （ $\pm 476$ ） | 2，366（ $\pm 658$ ） | 1，438 $( \pm 416)$ | 2，091（f915） | 497 （1130） |
| $\omega$ | Weekend（PM）Boat | 757 | （ $\pm 312)$ | 789 | （f521） | 2，375（f305） | 5，950（土4，412） | 10，555（土2，811） | 77，577（ $\pm 37,414)$ |
| $\rightarrow$ | Weekend（PM）Shore | 365 | （f87） | 2，469 | （f371） | 2.420 （f556） | $5,100$（ $\pm 870)$ | 1，721（ $\pm 672)$ | 653 （ $\pm 154)$ |
|  | TOTAL | 13．729 | $( \pm 4,262)$ | 9，482 | （土2，791） | 22，139（ $\pm 8,658)$ | 44，037（ $\pm 14,441)$ | 53，961（土21，661） | 175，812（ $\pm 91,210)$ |


|  | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LAKE ROOSEVELT＇89 | Angler h（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler $\mathrm{h}( \pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ | Angler h（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler h（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler h（ $\pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ ） | Angler h $( \pm 95 \% \mathrm{Cl})$ |
| Weekday（AM）Boat | 36，514（土16，532） | 21，860（土10，760） | 4，758（21，256） | 7，249（ $\pm 2,263)$ | 1，746（f651） | 1，706（f693） |
| Weekday（AM）Shore | 103 （ +21 ） | 864 （ $\pm 259)$ | 518 （ $\pm 148)$ | 565 （ $\pm 127)$ | 760 （f189） | 737 （f216） |
| Weekday（PM）Boat | 43，437（ $\pm 19,075)$ | 55，057（土13，042） | 22，745 $( \pm 4,580)$ | 13，647（ $\pm 2,158)$ | $1,172$（ $\pm 342)$ | 552 （ $\pm 178)$ |
| Weekday（PM）Shore | 5.489 （ $\pm 994)$ | 1， 360 （ $\pm 458)$ | 1，751（ $\pm 589)$ | 174 （ $\pm 15)$ | 135 （f40） | 1，014（f246） |
| Weekend（AM）Boat | 35，713（ $\pm 13,105)$ | 52，539（土15，954） | 6，981 $( \pm 1,638)$ | 3，335（ $\pm 1,504)$ | 21，252（土7，989） | 2，283（ $\pm 705$ ） |
| Weekend（AM）Shore | 0 | 838 （f 385 ） | 334 | 206 （f47） | $14 \quad( \pm 3)$ | 529 （ $\pm 120)$ |
| Weekend（PM）Boat | 24，907（ $\pm 2,841)$ | 19，735（土11，694） | 2，217（f476） | 3，873（ $\pm 2,192)$ | 2，286（51，201） | 1，736（ $\pm 866)$ |
| Weekend（PM）Shore | 478 （f113） | 424 （ $\pm 794)$ | 2，709（f370） | 375 （ $\pm 53)$ | 161 （f50） | 669 （f140） |
| TOTAL | $146,641( \pm 52,681)$ | 182，409（＋52，723） | 42，012 $( \pm 9,177)$ | 29，425（ $\pm 8,359)$ | 27，524（土10，465） | 9，226 $( \pm 3,164)$ |

Table 3.1.4. Mean annual CPUE based on total catch (kept and released fish) and harvested fish (kept) for Lake Roosevelt, August to December 1988 and January to December 1989.

| LAKE ROOSEVELT | TOTAL CATCH | HARVESTED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 8}$ (AUG-DEC) | CPUE (fish/h) | CPUE (fish/h) |
| Rainbow trout | 0.37 | 0.36 |
| Kokanee | 0.11 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ |
| Walleye | 0.34 | 0.08 |
| Yellow Perch | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Smallmouth Bass | 0.09 | 0.08 |
| AUG-DEC, $\mathbf{1} 988$ MEAN | $\mathbf{0 . 1 9}(\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{sh} / \mathrm{h})$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 4 ( f i s h / \mathrm { h } )}$ |


| $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ (Jan-Dec) | CPUE (flsh/h) | CPUE (fish/h) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow trout | 0.16 | 0.15 |
| Kokanee | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| Chinook Salmon | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Lake Whitefish | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ |
| Walleye | 0.20 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9}$ |
| Yellow Perch | 0.02 | 0.006 |
| Largemouth Bass | 0.001 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ |
| Smallmouth Bass | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Black Crappie | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Sturgeon | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ |
| Burbot | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 5}$ | 0.005 |
| Brown Bullhead | 0.03 | 0.0 |
| $\mathbf{i i 9 8 9}$ Annual Mean | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5}(\mathrm{flsh} / \mathrm{h})$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 3 ( f / s h / h )}$ |

Table 3.1.5. Monthly mean and total CPUE (fish/hr) of fish harvested (kept) for Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

| Lake Roosevelt '88 | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainhous troul | 0.23 | 0.37 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.59 | 0.47 |
| Kokanee | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.28 |  | 0.06 |
| Walleye | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.06 |
| Yellow Perch |  | 0.13 | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 0.04 | 0.09 |  | 0.20 |  |  |
| CPUE MEAN JUL-DEC 1988 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.34 | 0.20 |

Table 3.1.6. Monthly mean and total CPUE (fish/hr) of total catch (kept and released fish) for Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

| Lake Roosevelt '88 | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow trout | 0.48 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.62 | 0.47 |
| Kokanee | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.28 |  |  |
| Walleye | 0.30 | 0.82 | 0.31 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.14 |
| Yellow Perch |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 0.05 | 0.12 |  |  |
| CPUE MEAN JUL-DEC 1988 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 1}$ |

Table 3.1.7. Monthly mean and total CPUE (fish/hr) of fish harvested (kept) for Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

| LAKE ROOSEVELT '89 | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow Trout | 0.34 | . 24 | . 11 | . 16 | . 16 | . 04 | . 08 | . 05 | . 04 | . 17 | . 17 | 20 |
| Kokanee | . 04 | . 02 | . 06 | . 04 | 02 | . 01 | . 02 | . 01 | 14 | . 07 | . 004 |  |
| Chinook Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 03 |  |  |
| Lake Whitefish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 01 |  |  |
| Walleye | 02 |  | 05 | . 14 | . 16 | 13 | . 07 | . 10 | 05 | . 11 | 05 | 09 |
| Yellow Perch |  |  | 005 | 01 | 01 | 01 |  |  | 001 |  | 003 |  |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  | . 003 | 08 |  | 01 | 002 |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  | . 03 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sturgeon |  |  |  | 02 | 004 | 01 | 003 |  | . 006 | 04 |  |  |
| Burbot |  |  | 005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTHLY MEAN | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.15 |

Table 3.1.8. Monthly mean and total CPUE (fish/hr) of total catch (kept and released fish) for Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

| LAKE ROOSEVELT '89 | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow Trout | 0.34 | .24 | .11 | .16 | .18 | .04 | .06 | .05 | .04 | .21 | .25 | .20 |
| Kokanee | .04 | .02 | .06 | .04 | .02 | .03 | .02 | .01 | .14 | .07 | .004 |  |
| Chinook Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .03 |  |
| Lake Whitefish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walleye | .02 | .03 | .53 | .20 | .27 | .29 | .42 | .16 | .11 | .12 | .07 | .14 |
| Yellow Perch |  |  | .005 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .06 |  | .003 |  | .003 | .07 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  | .003 | .08 | .01 | .01 | .003 |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  | .001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  | .03 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sturgeon |  |  |  | .01 | .01 | .01 | .005 | .003 | .01 | .05 |  |  |
| Burbot |  |  | .005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brown Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  |  | .03 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTHLY MEAN | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.14 |

Table 3.1.9. Monthly and annual estimate of total fish species harvested ( $\pm 95 \%$ C.I.) for Lake Roosevelt August 1988 to December 1988.

|  | TOTAL HARVEST ( $\pm 95 \%$ C.I.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | Rainbow | Kokanee | Walleye | Yellow Perch | Smallmouth Bass | Total |
| August | $\begin{array}{r} 38.957 \\ ( \pm 16,176) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.049 \\ (1503) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11,957 \\ ( \pm 5,092) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\left( \pm 2,1794{ }^{4.54}\right.$ | $\left(223,56,507{ }^{7}\right.$ |
| September | $\left( \pm 7^{13,2842}\right)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,412 \\ ( \pm 2,202) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,702 \\ ( \pm 2,205) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,210 \\ ( \pm 312) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,254 \\ ( \pm 461) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.220 \\ ( \pm 12.467) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| October | ( $\pm 2,683$ ) | $( \pm 1,16 \hat{6}$ ) | $\begin{array}{r} 4,669 \\ ( \pm 1,274) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 409 \\ ( \pm 133) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19,165 \\ ( \pm 5,258) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| November | $\begin{array}{r} 11.863 \\ ( \pm 3,245) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 169 \\ +59) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 12,032 \\ ( \pm 3,304) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| December | $\begin{array}{r} 11,459 \\ (52,549) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 508 \\ + \pm 101) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 11.967 \\ ( \pm 2,650) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| AUG - DEC TOTAL | $( \pm 31,940)$ | ( $\pm 3,873$ ) | $\begin{array}{r} 23,005 \\ ( \pm 8,731) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,210 \\ ( \pm 12) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,207 \\ (22,773) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 125,891 \\ ( \pm 47,629) \end{array}$ |

Table 3.1.10. Monthly and annual estimate of total fish species harvested ( $\pm 95 \%$ C.I.) for Lake Roosevelt, January to December 1989.

|  |  | TOTAL HARVEST ( $\pm 95 \%$ C.l.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 | Ralnbow Trout | Kokanee | Chinook | Lakewhite fish | Walleye | Yellow Perch | Large mouth bass | Small mouth bass | Black crappie | Burbot | TOTAL |
|  | January | $\begin{array}{r} 4.504 \\ ( \pm 1,430) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 429 \\ (f 129) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 121 \\ ( \pm 30) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5,054 \\ ( \pm 1,589) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | February | $\begin{array}{r} 2,426 \\ (\mathrm{f} 782) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94 \\ ( \pm 37) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ ( \pm 5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,532 \\ (\mathrm{f} 824) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | March | $\begin{array}{r} 2,246 \\ +927) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,033 \\ ( \pm 707) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1,363 \\ (\mathrm{f} 476) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ ( \pm 5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5,654 \\ ( \pm 2,115) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | April | $\begin{array}{r} 6,440 \\ ( \pm 2,252) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,201 \\ (\mathrm{f} 428) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 14.287 \\ ( \pm 4.297) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 107 \\ ( \pm 43) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ ( \pm 10) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 22,059 \\ (17.030 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 0 | May | $\begin{array}{r} 7.970 \\ + \pm 2.822) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 656 \\ + \pm 231) \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3.719 \\ ( \pm 1,341) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 406 \\ ( \pm 196) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 952 \\ ( \pm 298) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 13,703 \\ (\sim 4,888) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | June | $\begin{array}{r} 8,936 \\ (\mathrm{k} 3.653) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 585 \\ + \pm 180) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 31,998 \\ ( \pm 15,009) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 312 \\ ( \pm 95) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ ( \pm 3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 289 \\ ( \pm 86) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 42,128 \\ ( \pm 19,026) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | July | $\begin{array}{r} 8,545 \\ (23.933) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,602 \\ (\mathrm{f} 481) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 10.847 \\ (\mathrm{f} 3.924) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,763 \\ ( \pm 1,292) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 230 \\ (\mathrm{f} 108) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 691 \\ ( \pm 323) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 24,678 \\ ( \pm 10,061) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | August | $\begin{array}{r} 12,952 \\ ( \pm 5,426) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.964 \\ (+627) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 12,013 \\ (\mathrm{f} 4.403) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 43 \\ \pm 16 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 26,972 \\ (\sim 10.472) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | September | $\begin{array}{r} 2,031 \\ ( \pm 809) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,422 \\ ( \pm 576) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.341 \\ (\mathrm{f} 368) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5,794 \\ (z 1.753) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | October | $\begin{array}{r} 4.475 \\ ( \pm 1.373) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 909 \\ ( \pm 198) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 248 \\ 1 \pm 54 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 83 \\ ( \pm 18) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,699 \\ (\mathrm{f} 770) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8,414 \\ ( \pm 2,413) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | November | $\begin{array}{r} 3.108 \\ (11.123) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11 \\ ( \pm 3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | I |  | $\begin{gathered} 1,651 \\ ( \pm 656) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4.770 \\ (11.782) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | December | $\begin{array}{r} 1,882 \\ ( \pm 843) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 587 \\ ( \pm 239) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,469 \\ (11.082) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | ANNUAL TOTAL | $\begin{array}{r} 65,515 \\ ( \pm 25,373) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.906 \\ (\mathrm{r} 3.597) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 248 \\ +54 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 83 \\ \pm 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 80.626 \\ ( \pm 31.513) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.600 \\ ( \pm 1.631) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ ( \pm 3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,538 \\ (1518) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 691 \\ ( \pm 323) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ ( \pm 5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 164,227 \\ (163.035) \end{array}$ |

Table 3．1．11．Average（ $\pm$ S．D．）total length（ mm ）and weight（ g ）of fish measured during Lake Roosevelt creel surveys in 1988 （ $n=$ sample size）．

|  | JUL |  | AllG |  | SEP |  | OCT |  | NOV |  | DEC |  | ANNUAL M | EAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 |  |  |  |  |  | Lemgith | （mm）$\pm$ SD $(\mathrm{n}$ | $) \quad$ Length（mm） SD （ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline n \\ \hline 72 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $) \quad$ Length $(\mathrm{mm}) \pm$ | SD＿（ n | Length（mm）$\pm$ SD． | （ n ） |
| Rakanee－ | －483（ $\pm 0)$ |  |  |  |  |  | $372( \pm 24)$ | 23 | $389( \pm 25)$ |  | $432-( \pm 21)$ | 130 | $\frac{391}{430}( \pm 25)$ | 347 |
| Watleye | －418（ $\pm 26)$ | 5 | 496（土40） | $4{ }_{4}$ | 438（土43） | 33 | 496（f34） | 34 | 414 （f24） | 1376 | $61{ }^{397}$ | 2 | $\frac{( \pm 35)}{( \pm 3)}$ | 72 |
| Yollow Porn | －418（126） |  | ＿（ $\pm 15)$ |  | （f13） |  | （f14） | 2 | $438( \pm$ ） | 6 | 438 （ $\pm 6$ ） | 6 | 436 （ $\pm 12)$ | 103 |
| Smallmouthac |  |  | $284( \pm 37)$ |  | $222( \pm 52)$ | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 222 （ $\pm 52)$ | 7 |
|  |  |  |  | 5 | 335 （ $\pm$ 3） | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $309( \pm 36)$ | 8 |


|  | JUL | AUG |  | SEP |  | OCT |  | NOV |  | DEC |  | ANNUAL MEA ${ }^{-}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | Weight（g） SSD （ n ） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） 1 | eight（g） SD S | （n） | eight（g）＊${ }^{\text {a }}$ SD | （ n ） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weiaht＿（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） |
| Roinhnin | $\left.4120{ }^{7} \pm 075\right) / 13$ | 624 （ $\pm 89$ ） | 27 | 473 （ $\pm 153)$ | 18 | 738 ${ }^{7} 1130$ | 10 |  | 23 | 940＿$( \pm 85)$ | 119 | 646 （ $\pm 1 / 7)$ | 210 |
|  | －78 $\pm 0$－ |  | $\mathrm{R}_{3}$ | 728 $( \pm 219)$ | ！ |  |  |  | 2 | 3901＇10） | 1 | 739 （土205） | 22 |
| Walteye | － 10 |  |  | （f15） | 13 | 573 |  | 560 （f78） | 2 | 540 （f54） | 6 | $508( \pm 80)$ | 46 |
| Yethow Perch |  |  |  | $154( \pm 89)$ | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 +89 | ？ |
| Smallmouth Bass | 1 | 389 （ $\pm 49)$ | 4 | 589 （土127） | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | $489( \pm 141)$ | 7 |

Table 3.1.12. Average ( $\pm$ S.D.) total length (mm) of fish measured during Lake Roosevelt creel surveys in 1989 ( $\mathrm{n}=$ sample size).

|  | JAN |  |  | FEB |  | MAR |  |  | APR |  |  | MA.Y |  | JUN |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | Length(mm) $\pm$ SD ( n ) Length(mm) $\pm$ SD ( |  |  |  | - ) | Length(mm) $\pm$ SD ( n ) Length(mm) $\pm$ SD ( |  |  |  |  | 1 ) | Length(mm) $\pm$ SD ( n |  | $) \quad$ Length(mm) $\pm$ SD ( n ) |  |  |
| Rainbow | 428 | $( \pm 73)$ | 62 | 412 ( $\pm 86)$ | 48 | 413 | ( $\pm 55$ ) | 66 | 372 | (f74) | 30 | 368 ( $\pm 176)$ | 17 | 326 | ( $\pm 117$ ) | 25 |
| Kokanee | 388 | $( \pm 80)$ | 2 | 393 ( $\pm 47$ ) | 2 | 397 | ( $\pm 86$ ) | 16 |  |  |  | 412 ( $\pm 54$ ) | 2 | 398 | ( $\pm 29$ ) | 2 |
| Walleye | 615 | $( \pm 296)$ | 2 | 408 ( $\pm 19$ ) | 2 |  | ( $\pm 39$ ) | 6 | 434 | ( $\pm 42$ ) | 4 | 421 ( $\pm 36)$ | 14 | 448 | ( $\pm 124$ ) | 44 |
| Yellow Perch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 293 | $( \pm 37)$ | 4 | 194 ( $\pm 0)$ | 1 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 326 | ( $\pm 0$ ) | 1 |
| Sturgeon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1803 | $( \pm 0)$ | 1 | 1486 ( $\pm 198)$ | 2 | 1009 | ( $\pm 651$ ) | 7 |
| Burbol |  |  |  |  |  | 680 | $1 \pm 226$ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | JUL |  | AUG |  | SEP |  | OCT |  | NOV |  | DEC |  | ANNUAL MEAN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | Length(mm) $\pm$ SD | (n) | Lengith(mm) $\pm$ SD | (n) Le | ngth(mm) I SD ( n ) | Length | (mm)tSD ( n ) |  | (mm) mD ( n |  | ength(mm) $\pm$ SD | n ) | Length(mm) $\pm$ SD | n ) |
| Raınbow | 428 ( $\pm 65$ ) | 28 | 405 ( $\pm 95$ ) | 31 | 404 ( $\pm 34)$ | 17 | 412 ( $\pm 87$ ) | 22 | 427 (f16) | 7 | 442 ( $\pm 47$ ) | 154 | 403 ( $\pm 33)$ | 507 |
| Kokanee | 426 ( $\pm 84$ ) | 4 | 429 (f39) | 2 | 446 ( $\pm 83)$ | 46 | 421 ( $\pm 23)$ | 10 | 395 ( $\pm 0$ ) | 1 |  |  | 411 ( $\pm 29)$ | 87 |
| Chinook Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  | 694 ( $\pm 0)$ | 1 |  |  |  |  | $694( \pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Lake Whitefish |  |  |  |  |  |  | 559 ( $\pm 0)$ | 1 |  |  |  |  | 559 ( $\pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Walleye | 469 ( 147 | 7) 4 | 441(土39) | 44 | 409 ( $\pm 30)$ | 67 | 421 ( $\pm 19)$ | 4 | 414 (土 7) | 4 | 410 ( $\pm 16)$ | 9 | 447 ( $\pm 57)$ | 247 |
| Yellow Perch | 250 ( $\pm 0$ ) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $212( \pm 33)$ | 7 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 326 ( $\pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Smalimouth Bass | 347 ( $\pm 118)$ | 2 | $279( \pm 24)$ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $313( \pm 48)$ | 4 |
| Black Crappie | 209 ( $\pm 23$ ) | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 209 ( $\pm 23$ ) | 3 |
| Sturgeon | 1115 ( $\pm 209$ ) | 3 |  |  | $1439( \pm 194)$ | 6 | $1490( \pm 96)$ | 15 |  |  |  |  | 1390 ( $\pm 287$ ) | 34 |
| Burbot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 680 ( $\pm 226)$ | 2 |

Table 3．1．13．Average（ $\pm$ S．D．）weight（ g ）of fish measured during Lake Roosevelt creel surveys in 1989 （ $\mathrm{n}=$ sample size）．

|  | JAN |  | FEB |  | MAR |  | APR |  | MAY |  | JUN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | Weight $(\mathrm{g}) \pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight $(\mathrm{g}) \pm$ SD | （n） |
| Rainbow | 818 （ $\pm 286\rangle$ | 55 | 877（ $\pm 148)$ | 44 | 876 （ $\pm 314)$ | 24 | $712( \pm 376)$ | 17 | 622 （ $\pm 489$ ） | 11 | 543 （ $\pm 86$ ） | 11 |
| Kokanee | 690 （ $\pm 152)$ | 2 | $454( \pm 26)$ | 2 | 522 （ $\pm 238)$ | 16 | 516（ $\pm$ 0） | 1 | 500（ $\pm 72)$ | 2 | 323 （土 0） | 1 |
| Walleye | 2228 （ $\pm 2660$ ） | 2 | $3761 \pm 0)$ | 1 | 747 （ $\pm 110)$ | 6 |  |  | 405（ $\pm 83$ ） | 5 | 525（ $\pm 106)$ | 23 |
| Yellow Perch |  |  |  |  |  |  | 212（土 4） | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $605( \pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Burbot |  |  |  |  | 1270 （ $\pm 229)$ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | JUL |  | AUG |  | SEP |  | OCT |  | NOV |  | DEC |  | ANNUAL MEAN |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weigm $(\mathrm{g}) \pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（9）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight $(\mathrm{g}) \pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） | Weight（g）$\pm$ SD | （n） |
| Rainbow | 684 （ $\pm 184$ ） | 18 | 643（ $\pm 218$ ） | 26 | 771 （ $\pm 267$ ） | 11 | $621 \quad( \pm 37)$ | 14 | 627 （ $\pm 63$ ） | 5 | 720 （ $\pm 129$ ） | 62 | 710 （ $\pm 107)$ | 300 |
| Kokanee | $793( \pm 388)$ | 3 | $589( \pm 0)$ | 1 | 829 （ $\pm 345)$ | 44 | $680 \quad( \pm 30)$ | 10 | $484( \pm 0)$ | 1 |  |  | $580 \quad( \pm 153)$ | 83 |
| Chinook Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2450（ $\pm 0)$ | 1 |  |  |  |  | $2450( \pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Lake Whitefish |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1420（土0） | 1 |  |  |  |  | $1420( \pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Walleye | 678 （ $=199$ ） | 31 | 841 （ $\pm 332)$ | 27 | 620（ $\pm 355)$ | 49 | 560 （ $\pm 16)$ | 4 | $579( \pm 21)$ | 4 | 399 （土 33） | 5 | 723 （ $\pm 520)$ | 157 |
| Yellow Perch | $168( \pm 0)$ | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 190 （ $\pm 31)$ | 5 |
| Smallmouth Bass | $399( \pm 153)$ |  | 319（ $\pm 63)$ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 359 （ $\pm 57)$ | 4 |
| Black Crappie | 146 （ $\pm 37)$ | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $146( \pm 37)$ | 2 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 605 （ $\pm 0)$ | 1 |
| Burbot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1270（土229） | 2 |

and $12 \pm 5$ burbot (Table 3.1.10). The angling pressure was higher August to December in 1989 (estimated at 290,596 angler hours) than in 1988 (estimated at 211,913 angler hours). However, fish harvest in August to December was comparatively lower in 1989 (estimated at 48,558 fish) than 1988 (estimated at 125,891 fish).

Mean lengths and weights from samples of fish harvested August to December 1988 and January to December, 1989, are listed in Tables 3.1.11 to 3.1.13. In 1988, the mean lengths of fish harvested were: rainbow trout ( 391 mm ), kokanee ( 432 mm ), walleye ( 436 mm ), yellow perch ( 222 mm ), and smallmouth bass ( 309 mm ). In 1988, mean weights of fish harvested were: rainbow ( 676 g ), kokanee ( 739 g ), walleye ( 508 g ), yellow perch ( 154 g ), and smallmouth bass ( 489 g ). In 1989, the mean lengths of fish harvested were: rainbow trout ( 403 mm ), kokanee ( 411 mm ), walleye ( 447 mm ) chinook salmon ( 694 mm ), lake whitefish ( 559 mm ), yellow perch ( 212 mm ) largemouth bass ( 326 mm ), smallmouth bass ( 313 mm ), black crappie ( 209 mm ), sturgeon ( $1,390 \mathrm{~mm}$ ), and burbot ( 680 mm ). In 1989, mean weights of fish harvested were: rainbow ( 710 g ), kokanee ( 580 g ), walleye ( 723 g ), chinook salmon $(2,450 \mathrm{~g})$, lake whitefish ( 1,420 g ), yellow perch ( 190 g ), smallmouth bass ( 359 g ), largemouth bass (605), and black crappie ( 146 g ).

A total of 4,635 anglers were surveyed from August 1988 through December 1989 for sport fish preference. Creel data shows 2,568 (55\%) of the anglers surveyed targeted rainbow trout, 1,311 (28\%) targeted walleye, 464 (10\%) targeted sturgeon, 240 (5\%) targeted kokanee, and 40 (1\%) targeted smallmouth bass. Yellow perch, black crappie, burbot, and lake whitefish were each targeted by less than $1 \%$ of the anglers. (Appendix B).

### 3.2 RELATIVE ABUNDANCE OF FISH

A synoptic list of species captured during electrofishing and gill net surveys on Lake Roosevelt from August 1988 to December 1989 is recorded in Table 3.2.1. Tables 3.2.2 through 3.2.5 list the annual total numbers and relative abundance of fish captured during electrofishing and gillnetting surveys from nine index stations sampled during the 1988 and 1989 study period. Appendix B lists the total numbers and relative abundance of fish captured at each index station during electrofishing and gillnetting surveys from Lake Roosevelt during August 1988, October 1988, May 1989, August 1989, and October 1989.

Table 3.2.1. Synoptic list of fish species and total numbers of fish collected during electrofishing and gillnet surveys on Lake Roosevelt, August 1988 to December 1989.

| FAMILY | COMMON NAME | SCIENTIFIC NAME | TOTAL NO. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ascipenseridae | White sturgeon | Acipenser transmontanus | 1 |
| Salmonidae | Kokanee salmon | Oncorhynchus nerka | 310 |
|  | Chinook salmon | Oncorhynchus tshawytscha | 12 |
|  | Rainbow trout | Oncorhynchus mykiss | 714 |
|  | Cutthroat trout | Oncorhynchus clarki | 1 |
|  | Brown trout | Salmo trutta | 49 |
|  | Bull trout | Salvelinus confluentus | 1 |
|  | Brook trout | Salvelinus fontinalis | 4 |
|  | Lake whitefish | Coreaonus clupeaformis | 296 |
|  | Mountain whitefish | Prosopium williamsoni | 16 |
| Cyprinldae | Carp | Cyprinus carpio | 160 |
|  | Squawfish | Ptychocheilus oregonensis | 449 |
|  | Tench | Tinca tinca | 5 |
|  | Chiselmouth | Acrocheilus alutaceus | 2 |
|  | Peamouth | Mylocheilus caurinus | 46 |
| Catostomidae | Bridgelip sucker | Catostomus columbianus | 146 |
|  | Largescale sucker | Catostomus macrocheilus | 1,309 |
|  | Longnose sucker | Catostomus catostomus | 26 |
|  | Sucker fry | Catostomus spp. | 724 |
| Ictaluridae | Yellow bullhead | Ictalurus na talis | 7 |
| Gadidae | Burbot | Lola lota | 36 |
| Percidae | Walleye | Stizostedion vitreum | 2,017 |
|  | Yellow perch | Perca flavesens | 3,947 |
| Centrarchidae | Largemouth bass | Micropterus salmonides | 96 |
|  | Smallmouth bass | Micropterus dolomieu | 205 |
|  | Black crappie | Pomoxis nigromaculatus | 116 |
|  | Pumpkinseed | Lepormis gibbosus | 9 |
| Cottidae | Piute sculpin | Coltus beldingi | 190 |

Table 3.2.2. Total number and (percent relative abundance) of fish captured during electrofishing surveys at each Lake Roosevelt sample site August and October 1988.


Table 3.2.3. Total number and (percent relative abundance) of fish captured during gillnetting surveys at each Lake Roosevelt sample site for August and October 1988.

| Site Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soak Time (hrs) | 27.5 | 30.0 | 96.5 | 27.0 | 48.3 | 30.5 | 42.3 | 38.5 | 24.0 | 346.6 |
| Kokanee |  |  |  |  | 1 (11.1) |  |  |  |  | 1 (0.3) |
| Rainbow Trout |  |  | 6 (6.0) |  |  |  |  |  | 2 (13.3) | 8 (2.0) |
| Lake Whitefish | 4 (11.0) | 1 (3.0) | 1 (1.0) | $5 \quad$ (10.0) | 1 (11.1) | 2 (50.0) |  | 10 (15.6) |  | 24 (6.1) |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 (3.0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (0.3) |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 1 (1.0) |  |  |  | $23 \quad(28.0)$ | 1 (1.6) |  | $25 \quad 16.3)$ |
| Walleye | $24 \quad$ (65.0) | $18 \quad$ (58.0) | 39 (38.0) | 13 (26.0) | 4 (44.4) | 2 (50.0) | 11 (13.4) | 23 (36.0) | 6 (40.1) | 140 (36.0) |
| Yellow Perch | 2 (5.0) | 5 (16.0) | $3 \quad(3.0)$ | 5 (10.0) |  |  | 4 (4.9) | 9 (14.1) |  | 28 (7.1) |
| Pumpkinseed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (1.6) |  | 1 (0.3) |
| Largescale sucker | 5 (4.0) |  | 45 (44.0) | 24 (48.0) | 3 (33.4) |  | 32 (39.0) | 13 (20.3) | 5 (33.3) | 127 (32.2) |
| Longnose sucker | 1 (3.0) | 3 (10.0) | 1 (1.0) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 (1.3) |
| Bridgelip sucker |  |  | 4 (4.0) | 1 (2.0) |  |  |  |  |  | 5 (1.3) |
| Peamouth |  | 4 (13.0) |  |  |  |  | 1 (1.2) | $2 \quad(3.1)$ |  | 7 (1.8) |
| Northern squawfish |  |  | 2 (2.0) | 2 (4.0) |  |  | 10 (12.2) | 5 (7.8) | 2 (13.3) | $21 \quad(5.3)$ |
| Burbot |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (1.2) |  |  | $1 \quad(0.3)$ |
| TOTAL | 37 | 31 | 102 | 50 | 9 | 4 | 82 | 64 | 15 | 394 |

Table 3.2.4. Total number and (percent relative abundance) of fish captured during electrofishing surveys at each Lake Roosevelt sample site for May, August and October 1989.

| Site Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shock Time (min) | 124.2 | 144.7 | 203.2 | 143.5 | 339.0 | 112.4 | 163.7 | 145.6 | 90.9 | 1467.2 |
| Chinook Salmon |  |  |  |  | 1 (.1) |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Kokanee |  | 1 (.2) | 1 (.2) | 1 | 41 (4.2) | 31 (7.9) | 1 (.2) | 39 (2.5) | 12 (3.0) | 127 (1.9) |
| Rainbow Trout | 24 (4.9) | 23 (5.7) | $32 \quad(5.5)$ | 36 (3.2) | 32 (3.2) | 36 (9.2) | 41 (6.7) | 102 (6.5) | 51 (12.6) | $377 \quad(5.7)$ |
| Brown Trout | 5 (1.0) |  |  |  | 16 (1.6) |  |  |  |  | 21 (.3) |
| Brook Trout |  | 1 (.2) | 1 (.2) |  | 1 (.1) |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Dolly Varden |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Lake Whitetish | $6 \quad$ (1.2) | 2 (.5) | 14 (2.4) | 1 |  | 7 (1.8) |  | 2 (.1) |  | $32 \quad(.5)$ |
| Mnt. Whitetish |  | 2 (.5) | 2 (.3) |  | 1 (.1) |  |  | 9 (.5) |  | 14 (.2) |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  | 1 (.2) | 14 (1.2) | $32 \quad(3.2)$ |  |  | 1 |  | 48 (.7) |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 (.2) | $4 \quad(.7)$ | 13 (1.2) | $7 \quad(.7)$ | 6 (1.5) | 11 (1.8) | 17 (1.1) | 12 (3.0) | 71 (1.1) |
| Walleye | 95 (19.2) | 49 (12.0) | 203 (35.0) | 127(11.3) | 253 (25.7) | 107 (27.2) | 40 (6.5) | 135 (8.6) | 44 (10.9) | 1053 (16.0) |
| Yellow Perch | 73 (14.8) | 41 (10.1) | 127 (21.9) | 743 (65.9) | 193 (19.6) | 75 (19.1) | 389 (63.6) | 1093(69.8) | 128 (31.6) | 2862 (43.6) |
| Black Crappie |  | $2 \quad(.5)$ | 1 (.2) | 18 (1.6) | 17 (1.7) |  |  | 5 (.3) |  | 43 (.7) |
| Pumpkinseed | $4 \quad(.8)$ |  | 1 (.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Largescale Sucker | 89 (18.0) | 53 (13.0) | 102 (17.6) | 62 (5.5) | 175 (17.8) | 69 (17.6) | 49 (8.0) | 113 (7.2) | 72 (17.8) | 784 (11.9) |
| Longnose Sucker | $2 \quad(.4)$ | 2 (.5) | $4 \quad(.7)$ |  | $2 \quad(.2)$ |  |  |  | 1 (.2) | 11 (.2) |
| Bridgelip Sucker | 5 (1.0) | 7 (1.7) | 7 (1.2) | 19 (1.7) | $25 \quad(2.5)$ | 3 (.8) | 9 (1.5) | 3 (.2) | 14 (3.5) | $92 \quad(1.4)$ |
| Sucker Fry | 79 (16.0) | 118 (29.0) | 37 (6.4) | 50 (4.4) | 97 (9.8) | 14 (3.6) | 44 (7.2) | 13 (.8) | 24 (5.9) | 476 (7.2) |
| North. Squawfish | 69 (14.0) | 42 (10.3) | 18 (3.1) | 21 (1.9) | 33 (3.4) | 22 (5.6) | 13 (2.1) | 11 (.7) | $30 \quad$ (7.4) | 259 (3.9) |
| Carp | 23 (4.7) | 37 (9.1) | 8 (1.4) | 11(1.0) | $9 \quad$ (.9) | 13 (3.3) | 6 (1.0) | 8 (.5) | 2 (.5) | 117 (1.8) |
| Tench |  | 1 (.2) | 1 (.2) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Peamouth |  | 8 (2.0) | 1 (2) |  |  |  |  |  | ( 2) | 10 (.2) |
| Yellow Bullhead | 1 (.2) | 1 (.2) |  |  |  |  | 2 ( 3) | 1 |  | 5 |
| Sculpin | 18 (3.6) | $14 \quad$ (3.4) | $8 \quad(1.4)$ | 9 (.8) | $50 \quad(5.1)$ | 4 (1.0) | $5 \quad(.8)$ | $10 \quad$ (.6) | 14 (3.5) | 132 (2.0) |
| Burbot | 1 (.2) | 2 (.5) | 7 (1.2) | 2 (.1) |  | 6 (1.5) | 2 (.3) | 3 (.2) |  | 23 (.3) |
| TOTAL | 1494 | 407 | 580 | 1128 | 1985 | 1393 | 612 | 1566 | 405 | 6570 |

Table 3.2.5. Total number and (percent relative abundance) of fish captured during gillnetting surveys at each Lake Roosevelt sample site for May, August and October 1989.

| Site Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net Soak Time/hrs | 45.3 | 63.9 | 73.5 | 62.3 | 15.5 | 39.3 | 49.0 | 44.5 | 64.5 | 457.8 |
| Chinook Salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kokanee | 4 (3.7) | 1 (1.8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $5 \quad$ (.6) |
| Rainbow Trout | $6 \quad(5.6)$ | 1 (1.8) |  | 3 (2.0) |  | $3 \quad$ (6.5) | 1 (1.4) | $5 \quad$ (2.3) |  | $19 \quad(2.4)$ |
| Lake Whitefish | 49 (45.8) | $9 \quad(16.4)$ | $26 \quad 30$ | 51 (34.5) | 1 (11.1) | 21 (45.7) | 2 (2.9) | $80 \quad$ (36.2) |  | 239 (30.7) |
| Mountain Whitefish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 (.9) |  | 2 (.3) |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  | 5 (3.4) |  |  | $17 \quad(24.6)$ | 8 (3.6) | $14 \quad$ (24.6) | $44 \quad$ (5.7) |
| Walleye | 27 (25.2) | 24 (43.6) | $31 \quad$ (47.0) | $50 \quad(33.8)$ | $7 \quad$ (77.8) | 16 (34.8) | 36 (52.2) | 28 (12.7) | $31 \quad$ (54.4) | 250 (32.1) |
| Yellow Perch | (.9) | (9.1) | (1.5) | 10 (6.8) |  |  | 2 (2.9) | $17 \quad$ (7.7) | 3 (5.3) | $39 \quad(5.0)$ |
| Largescale Sucker | 9 (8.4) | $4 \quad$ (7.3) | 2 (3.0) | 17 (11.5) |  | $6 \quad(13.0)$ | 3 (4.3) | $67 \quad(30.3)$ | $8 \quad(14.0)$ | 116 (14.9) |
| Longnose Sucker | $5 \quad$ (4.7) | 4 (7.3) | 1 (1.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  | $10 \quad 1.3)$ |
| Bridgelip Sucker | 1 (.9) | 2 (3.6) |  | 5 (3.4) |  |  |  |  |  | 8 (1.0) |
| North. Squawfish | 3 (2.8) |  | $4 \quad$ (6.1) | $7 \quad$ (4.7) | 1 (11.1) |  | $7 \quad(10.0)$ | $14 \quad$ (6.3) |  | $36 \quad(4.6)$ |
| Peamouth |  | $4 \quad$ (7.3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 ( .5 ) |
| Yellow Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 (1.8) | 1 (1) |
| Burbot | 1 (.9) | 1 (1.8) | 1 (1.5) |  |  |  | 1 (1.4) |  |  | 4 ( 51 |
| Sturgeon | (.9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1 \quad$ (.1) |
| TOTAL | 107 | 55 | 66 | 148 | 9 | 46 | 69 | 121 | 57 | 778 |

During the 1988 to 1989 study period, 10,907 fish were collected while performing relative abundance surveys along shorelines, tributaries, and in pelagic zones. The majority of the fish were collected by electrofishing littoral areas at night, although equal effort was spent during all hours of the day performing the surveys. Gill nets were set throughout the day and night but were less effective in capturing fish.

During relative abundance surveys performed in 1988, a total of 3,175 fish were captured by electrofishing and 392 by gillnetting (Tables 3.2.2 and 3.2.3). Electroshocking surveys were performed for 862 minutes and gill nets were set for 347 hours for a CPUE of 221 fish/h electroshocking and 1.1 fish $/ \mathrm{h}$ gillnetting. Total number and relative abundance of each species captured during electrofishing surveys included 1,018 yellow perch ( $32.1 \%$ ), 574 walleye ( $18.1 \%$ ), 310 rainbow trout ( $9.8 \%$ ), 282 largescale suckers ( $8.9 \%$ ), 248 sucker fry ( $7.8 \%$ ), 177 kokanee ( $5.6 \%$ ), 153 northern squawfish ( $4.8 \%$ ), 73 black crappie ( $2.3 \%$ ), 65 smallmouth bass (2.0\%), 58 sculpins (1.8\%), 47 largemouth bass (1.5\%). 43 carp (1.4\%), 41 bridgelip suckers (1.3\%), and 28 brown trout, 25 peamouth, 11 chinook salmon, 8 burbot, 4 pumpkinseed, 2 tench, 2 chiselmouth, 1 brook trout, 1 cutthroat trout, 1 lake whitefish, and 1 yellow bullhead (each $<1 \%$ ). Total number and relative abundance of each species captured during gillnetting surveys included 140 walleye (36\%), I27 largescale suckers ( $32.2 \%$ ), 28 yellow perch ( $6.4 \%$ ) 25 smallmouth bass ( $6.3 \%$ ), 24 lake whitefish ( $6.2 \%$ ), 21 northern squawfish (5.3\%), 8 rainbow trout ( $2.1 \%$ ), 7 peamouth ( $1.8 \%$ ), 5 longnose suckers, 5 bridgelip suckers, 1 kokanee, 1 largemouth bass and 1 burbot (each < 1\%).

During relative abundance surveys performed in 1989, a total of 6,570 fish were captured by electrofishing and 778 by gillnetting (Tables 3.2.4 and 3.2.5). Electrofishing surveys were performed for 1,467 minutes and gillnets were set for 458 hours for a CPUE of 269 fish/h electrofishing and $1.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{h}$ gillnetting. Total number and relative abundance of fish captured during electrofishing surveys included 2,862 yellow perch ( $43.6 \%$ ), 1,053 walleye ( $16 \%$ ), 784 largescale suckers ( $11.9 \%$ ), 476 sucker fry ( $7.2 \%$ ), 377 rainbow trout ( $5.7 \%$ ), 259 northern squawfish (3.9\%), 132 sculpins (2\%), 127 kokanee ( $1.9 \%$ ), 117 carp ( $1.8 \%$ ), 92 bridgelip suckers (1.4\%), 71 smallmouth bass (1.1\%), 48 largemouth bass, 43 black crappie, 32 lake whitefish, 23 burbot, 21 brown trout, 14 mountain whitefish, 11 longnose suckers, 10 peamouth, 5 yellow bullhead, 5 pumpkinseed, 3 brook trout, 3 tench, 1 chinook salmon and 1 bull trout (each $<1 \%$ ). Total number and relative abundance of each species captured during gillnetting surveys included 250 walleye ( $32.1 \%$ ), 239 lake whitefish (30.7\%), 116 largescale suckers (14.9\%), 44 smallmouth bass
(5.7\%), 39 yellow perch (5.0\%), 36 northern squawfish (4.6\%), 19 rainbow trout (2.4\%), 10 longnose suckers (1.3\%), 8 bridgelip suckers (1.0\%), 5 kokanee, 4 peamouth, 4 burbot, 2 mountain whitefish, 1 sturgeon and 1 yellow bullhead (each <1\%).

Monthly relative abundance of each species was also determined. During 393 minutes spent electroshocking in August 1988, 1,334 fish were captured for a CPUE of 204 fish/h total number captured (and relative abundance) included: 385 yellow perch (28.9\%), 271 walleye (20.3\%), 147 sucker fry (11\%), 122 largescale sukers ( $9.1 \%$ ), 91 northern squawfish ( $6.8 \%$ ), 59 black crappie ( $4.4 \%$ ), 42 rainbow trout ( $3.1 \%$ ), 33 smallmouth bass ( $2.5 \%$ ), 30 sculpins ( $2.2 \%$ ), 22 carp and bridgelip suckers ( $1.6 \%$ ), 20 peamouth ( 1.5 ), 14 largemouth bass ( $1.0 \%$ ), 13 kokanee ( $0.9 \%$ ), 9 brown trout ( $0.7 \%$ ), 3 longnose suckers ( $0.2 \%$ ) and 1 or 2 ( $0.1 \%$ each) chinook salmon, lake whitefish, pumpkinseed, tench and chiselmouth (Appendix C).

In 204.5 hours of gill net sets in August 1988, a total of 226 fish were captured for a CPUE of 1.1 fish per hour. Number and relative abundance of fish captured in gill nets included: 82 walleye ( $36.3 \%$ ), 81 largescale sucker ( $35.8 \%$ ), 20 smallmouth bass ( $8.8 \%$ ), 15 northern squawfish ( $6.6 \%$ ), 7 lake whitefish ( $3.1 \%$ ), 6 yellow perch (2.7\%), 5 longnose sucker and 5 yellow bullhead ( $2.2 \%$ each), 3 bridgelip sucker ( $1.3 \%$ ), and 1 largemouth bass and 1 burbot ( $0.4 \%$ each) (Appendix C).

During 469 minutes spent electroshocking in October 1988, 1,841 fish were captured for a CPUE of 236 fish per hour. The number captured and relative abundance included: 633 yellow perch (34.4\%), 303 walleye (16.5\%). 268 rainbow trout ( $14.6 \%$ ), 164 kokanee ( $8.9 \%$ ), 160 largescale ( $8.7 \%$ ), 100 sucker fry ( $5.4 \%$ ), 62 northern squawfish ( $3.4 \%$ ), 28 sculpin (1.5\%), 26 largemouth bass (1.4\%), 14 black crappie ( $0.8 \%$ ), 11 carp ( $0.6 \%$ ) 10 chinook salmon ( $0.5 \%$ ) 8 burbot ( $0.4 \%$ ), 5 smallmouth bass and 5 peamouth ( $0.3 \%$ each), 3 pumpkinseed ( $0.2 \%$ ) and 1 yellow bullhead ( $0.1 \%$ ) (Appendix C).

In 160.1 hours of gill net sets during October 1988, 172 fish were captured for a CPUE of 1.07 fish per hour. The number and relative abundance of each species were: 58 walleye ( $33.7 \%$ ), 46 largescale suckers ( $26.7 \%$ ), 22 yellow perch ( $12.8 \%$ ), 17 lake whitefish ( $9.9 \%$ ), 8 rainbow trout ( $4.7 \%$ ) 6 peamouth and 6 northern squawfish ( $3.5 \%$ each), 5 smallmouth bass (2.9\%), 2 bridgelip sucker ( $1.2 \%$ ), and 1 kokanee and 1 pumpkinseed ( $0.6 \%$ each) (Appendix C).

During May 1989, 460.5 minutes were spent electroshocking to capture 1,219 fish for a CPUE of 159 fish per hour. The number and relative abundance of each species were: 482 walleye ( $39.5 \%$ ) 265 largescale sucker ( $21.7 \%$ ), 137 rainbow trout (11.2\%), 83 northern squawfish ( $6.8 \%$ ), 56 yellow perch ( $4.6 \%$ ), 52 sucker fry ( $4.3 \%$ ), 37 bridgelip sucker (3.0\%), 23 carp (1.9\%), 20 smallmouth bass (1.6\%), 18 kokanee ( $1.5 \%$ ), 14 sculpin ( $1.1 \%$ ), 7 peamouth ( $0.6 \%$ ), 6 brown trout ( $0.5 \%$ ), 5 longnose sucker ( $0.4 \%$ ), 4 pumpkinseed ( $0.3 \%$ ), 3 lake whitefish, 3 brook trout and 3 largemouth bass ( $0.2 \%$ each), and; 1 Dolly Varden and 1 burbot ( $0.1 \%$ each) (Appendix C).

Gillnets set for 129.6 hours in May 1989 captured a total of 154 fish for a CPUE of 1.2 fish per hour. Number and relative abundance of each species were: 44 walleye ( $28.6 \%$ ), 31 lake whitefish ( $20.1 \%$ ), 28 largescale sucker (18.2\%), 23 smallmouth bass (14.9\%), 15 northern squawfish ( $9.7 \%$ ) 5 yellow perch (3.2\%) 3 rainbow trout and 3 bridgelip sucker ( $1.9 \%$ each) and 1 burbot and 1 longnose sucker ( $0.6 \%$ ) (Appendix C).

In August 1989, a total of 546.8 minutes were spent electroshocking and a total of 2,814 fish were captured for a CPUE of 309 fish per hour. The number and relative abundance of each species were: 1,191 yellow perch ( $42.3 \%$ ), 399 walleye ( $14.2 \%$ ), 358 sucker fry ( $12.7 \%$ ), 244 largescale sucker ( $8.7 \%$ ) 146 northern squawfish (5.2\%), 119 rainbow trout ( $4.2 \%$ ) 84 carp and 80 sculpin ( $2.9 \%$ ) 46 smallmouth bass ( $1.6 \%$ ), 42 black crappie ( $1.5 \%$ ), 29 bridgelip sucker ( $1.0 \%$ ), 25 largemouth bass ( $0.9 \%$ ), 11 brown trout and 11 burbot ( $0.4 \%$ ), 6 lake whitefish, 6 mountain whitefish and 6 longnose sucker ( $0.2 \%$ ), and 3 or 4 each yellow bullhead, tench, peamouth, and kokanee ( $0.1 \%$ ) (Appendix C).

Gill nets set for 222.3 hours in August 1989 captured 414 fish for a CPUE of 1.9 fish per hour. The number and relative abundance of each species were: 156 lake whitefish ( $37.8 \%$ ), 131 walleye (31.7\%), 64 largescale sucker ( $15.5 \%$ ), 16 smallmouth bass (3.9\%) 14 northern squawfish ( $3.4 \%$ ), 11 rainbow trout ( $2.7 \%$ ), 8 yellow perch (1.9\%), 6 longnose sucker ( $1.4 \%$ ), 3 kokanee ( $0.7 \%$ ), 2 burbot and 2 peamouth ( $0.5 \%$ ), and 1 sturgeon (0.2\%) (Appendix C).

During 459.9 minutes spent electroshocking in October 1989, 2,538 fish were captured for a CPUE of 331 fish per hour. The number and relative abundance of each species were: 1615 yellow perch ( $63.6 \%$ ), 275 largescale suckers ( $10.8 \%$ ), 172 walleye ( $6.8 \%$ ), 121 rainbow trout ( $4.8 \%$ ), 106 kokanee ( $4.2 \%$ ), 66 sucker fry ( $2.6 \%$ ), 38 sculpin ( $1.5 \%$ ), 31 northern squawfish (1.2\%), 26 bridgelip sucker ( $1.0 \%$ ), 23 lake whitefish ( $0.9 \%$ ), 20
largemouth bass ( $0.8 \%$ ), 11 burbot, 10 mountain whitefish, and 9 carp ( $0.4 \%$ ), 5 brown trout and 4 smallmouth bass ( $0.2 \%$ ), and 1 each chinook salmon, brook trout, black crappie, pumpkinseed, peamouth and yellow bullhead (all less than 0.1\%) (Appendix C).

Gill nets set for 111.9 hours during October 1989 captured 210 fish for a CPUE of 1.9 fish per hour. The number and relative abundance of each species captured were: 75 walleye ( $35.7 \%$ ), 52 lake whitefish ( $24.8 \%$ ), 26 yellow perch ( $12.4 \%$ ), 24 largescale sucker ( $11.4 \%$ ), 7 northern squawfish (3.3\%), 5 each rainbow trout, smallmouth bass, and bridgelip sucker (2.4\%), 3 longnose sucker (1.4\%) 2 each kokanee, mountain whitefish, and peamouth ( $1.0 \%$ each), and 1 each yellow bullhead and burbot ( $0.5 \%$ each) (Appendix C).

### 3.3 AGE, GROWTH AND CONDITION

### 3.3.1 Rainbow Trout

Table 3.3.1 lists the mean lengths, weight and condition factors of five age classes of rainbow trout determined from 1988 scale samples. Mean back-calculated lengths estimated at annulus formation are shown in Table 3.3.2. Information on individual fish is contained in Appendix D.

Mean length, weight, and condition factors were determined from 246 rainbow trout captured during August and October 1988 at nine index stations. The mean size and condition for each age class were: $0+(139$ mm total length, 41 g weight, condition factor of 1.12 ); $1+(325 \mathrm{~mm}$ length, 464 g weight, condition factor of 1.33 ); $2+(447 \mathrm{~mm}$ length, 1038 g weight, condition factor of 1.16); 3+ (473 mm length, 1096 g in weight, condition factor of 1.04 ); 4+ ( 508 mm length, $1,245 \mathrm{~g}$ weight, condition factor of 0.95 ) and; $5+(475 \mathrm{~mm}$ length, and $1,131 \mathrm{~g}$ weight, condition factor of 1.06).

The mean back-calculated lengths for all cohorts at the formation of the first annulus ranged from 185 mm to 208 mm with a grand mean of 195 mm . Estimated mean lengths at the formation of the second annulus ranged from 264 to 375 mm with a grand mean of 318 mm . Mean lengths at the formation of the third annulus ranged from 328 to 410 mm with a grand mean of 377 mm . Mean lengths at the formation of the fourth annulus ranged from 387 to 459 mm with a grand mean of 423 mm . The back-calculated length at formation of the fifth annulus was 434 mm .

Table 3.3.1. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factor ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{T} L}$ ) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) of rainbow trout collected during 1988. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

| Age clas | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Weight ( g ) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{TL}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| o+ | 21 | 139.3 | (k42.8) | 41.1 | ( $\pm 38.6)$ | 1.12 | ( $\pm 0.24)$ |
| $1+$ | 89 | 325.4 | (69.9) | 464.4 | ( $\pm 209.0)$ | 1.33 | ( $\pm 0.85)$ |
| $2+$ | 59 | 446.6 | ( $\pm 49.4)$ | 1038.4 | ( $\pm 352.0$ ) | 1.16 | $( \pm 0.32)$ |
| $3+$ | 60 | 472.6 | $( \pm 32.5)$ | 1096.3 | ( $\pm 214.6)$ | 1.04 | $( \pm 0.16)$ |
| 4+ | 16 | 508.3 | (k49.3) | 1245.4 | ( $\pm 358.5)$ | 0.95 | $( \pm 0.11)$ |
| $5+$ | 1 | 475 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 1131 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 1.06 | $( \pm 0.00)$ |
| TOTAL | 246 |  |  |  |  | 1.11 | $( \pm 0.28)$ |

Table 3.3.2. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) $\pm$ standard deviations at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of rainbow trout collected during 1988. $N=$ sample size.

|  |  | Mean $\pm$ S.D. Back-calculated length (mm) at Annulus |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1987 | 89 | $189.3 \pm 21.6$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 58 | $207.9 \pm 22.5$ | $375.0 \pm 40.6$ |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 28 | $190.9 \pm 20.8$ | $327.5 \pm 35.4$ | $409.8 \pm 32.3$ |  |  |
| 1984 | 16 | $184.7 \pm 13.9$ | $306.4 \pm 28.0$ | $393.1 \pm 56.4$ | $459.3 \pm 45.9$ |  |
| 1983 | 1 | $200.0 \pm 00.0$ | $264.4 \pm 00.0$ | $328.7 \pm 00.0$ | $387.2 \pm 00.0$ | $434.0 \pm 0.0$ |
| Grand <br> Mean | 192 | $194.6 \pm 19.7$ | $318.3 \pm 34.7$ | $377.2 \pm 44.4$ | $423.3 \pm 45.9$ | $434.0 \pm 0.0$ |
| Mean <br> Annual <br> Growth |  | 195 | 123 | 59 | 46 | 11 |

In 1989, scale samples were collected with length and weight measurements recorded from 347 rainbow trout for determination of condition, age analysis, and back-calculation of length at annulus formation (Tables 3.3.3 and 3.3.4).

The following mean lengths, weights, and condition factors for six age classes of rainbow trout were recorded from May, August, and October, 1989 samples at nine index stations: $0+(120 \mathrm{~mm}$ length, 31 g weight, condition factor of 1.16 ); 1+ ( 256 mm length, 218 g weight, condition factor of 1.23); $2+$ ( 394 mm length, 572 g weight, condition factor of 1.24); 3+ (429 mm length, 902 g weight, condition factor of 1.12); 4+ (483 mm length, 1058 g weight, condition factor of 0.97 ); $5+$ ( 495 mm length, 1155 g weight, condition factor of 0.96 ); and, $6+$ ( 525 mm length, $1,039 \mathrm{~g}$ weight, condition factor of 0.72 ).

Estimated mean length of rainbow at the formation of the first annulus ranged from 146 to 186 mm with a grand mean of 166 mm . At the formation of the second annulus, mean length ranged from 186 to 291 mm with a grand mean of 235 mm . Mean length at the formation of the third annulus ranged from 313 to 377 mm , with a grand mean of 344 mm . Mean length at the formation of the fourth annulus ranged from $422-434 \mathrm{~mm}$ with a grand mean of 429 mm . Mean length at the formation of the fifth annulus ranged from 470-476 mm with a grand mean of 473 mm .

### 3.3.2 Walleye

Mean lengths, weights and condition factors determined from measurements of walleye collected in 1988 are summarized in Table 3.3.5. A total of 369 scale samples were analyzed for age. Estimated mean back-calculated lengths are shown in Table 3.3.7. Mean lengths, weights, and condition factors determined from measurements of walleye collected in 1989 are summarized in Table 3.3.6. A total of 467 scale samples were analyzed for age. Estimated mean back-calculated lengths of seven walleye cohorts are shown in Table 3.3.8. Information on individual fish is contained in Appendix D.

Mean condition factors of walleye collected in 1988 ranged from 0.84 to 1.05 and the overall mean was 0.92 (Table 3.3.5). In 1989, the mean condition factor ranged from 0.74 to 0.90 and the overall mean was 0.84 (Table 3.3.6). In 1988, $1+$ walleye averaged 206 in length, 82 g in weight and 0.89 for condition factor. In 1989. 1+ walleye averaged 245 mm in length, 142 g in weight and 0.90 for condition factor. In 1988, 2+ walleye averaged 275 mm in length, 182 g in weight and 0.95 for condition

Table 3.3.3. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factor ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{TL}}$ ) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) of rainbow trout collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

| Age clas | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Weight (g) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{K}_{\text {TL }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O+ | 41 | 120.4 | ( $\pm 52.5)$ | 30.7 | ( $\pm 45.2)$ | 1.16 | ( $\pm 0.46)$ |
| 1+ | 57 | 255.5 | $( \pm 90.6)$ | 218 | (f302.4) | 1.23 | $( \pm 0.94)$ |
| $2+$ | 102 | 394.3 | (k482.1) | 572.1 | ( $\pm 368.8)$ | 1.24 | $( \pm 0.46)$ |
| $3+$ | 76 | 429.4 | $( \pm 54.1)$ | 902.1 | ( $\pm 400.8)$ | 1.12 | ( $\pm 0.33)$ |
| $4+$ | 55 | 482.8 | ( $\pm 49.1)$ | 1058.3 | ( $\pm 244.0)$ | 0.97 | $( \pm 0.20)$ |
| $5+$ | 15 | 495.4 | $( \pm 34.9)$ | 1154.9 | ( $\pm 200.5)$ | 0.96 | $( \pm 0.19)$ |
| $6+$ | 1 | 525.0 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 1039.0 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 0.72 | $( \pm 0.00)$ |
| IOTAL | 347 |  |  |  |  | 1.06 | $( \pm 0.37)$ |

Table 3.3.4. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) $\pm$ Standard deviations at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of rainbow trout collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

|  |  | Mean (mm) $\pm$ S.D. Back-calculated length (mm) at Annulus |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1988 | 64 | $\begin{gathered} 185.5 \\ ( \pm 64.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 113 | $\begin{array}{r} 181.4 \\ \pm+34.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 290.7 \\ ( \pm 80.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 83 | $\begin{gathered} 174.5 \\ ( \pm 28.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 277.4 \\ ( \pm 65.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 376.6 \\ ( \pm 28.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 59 | $\begin{array}{r} 157.9 \\ +\quad+23.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 226.2 \\ ( \pm 50.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 358.8 \\ ( \pm 57.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 431.1 \\ +65.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| 1984 | 15 | $\begin{gathered} 145.6 \\ ( \pm 14.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 194.5 \\ + \pm 22.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 327.0 \\ + \pm 24.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 422.5 \\ ( \pm 20.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 476.6 \\ ( \pm 23.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 1983 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 149.6 \\ ( \pm 0.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 185.9 \\ ( \pm 0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 313.1 \\ ( \pm 0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 434.2 \\ + \pm 0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 470.5 \\ & ( \pm 0.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500.8 \\ ( \pm 0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grand } \\ & \text { Mean } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 335 | $\begin{array}{r} 165.8 \\ ( \pm 33.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 234.9 \\ + \pm 54.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 343.9 \\ \pm+36.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 429.3 \\ ( \pm 42.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 473.6 \\ + \pm 23.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 500.8 \\ ( \pm 0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Mean Annual Growth |  | 166 | 68 | 109 | 85 | 45 | 27 |

Table 3.3.5. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factors ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{TL}}$ ) $\pm$ standard deviations of walleye collected during 1988. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size .

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ige class | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Weight $(\mathrm{g})$ | $\overline{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{TL}}$ |  |
| $0+$ | 38 | 117.0 | $( \pm 25.3)$ | $18.0( \pm 13.3)$ | $1.05( \pm 0.42)$ |  |
| $1+$ | 38 | 206.0 | $( \pm 39.8)$ | 81.7 | $( \pm 35.1)$ | $0.89( \pm 0.16)$ |
| $2+$ | 26 | 274.5 | $(549.9)$ | 181.7 | $( \pm 73.3)$ | $0.95( \pm 0.37)$ |
| $3+$ | 103 | 345.3 | $( \pm 24.5)$ | 349.9 | $( \pm 94.0)$ | $0.84( \pm 0.19)$ |
| $4+$ | 133 | 405.5 | $( \pm 25.7)$ | 576.1 | $( \pm 150.1)$ | $0.86( \pm 0.13)$ |
| $5+$ | 17 | 478.1 | $(236.6)$ | 923.2 | $( \pm 177.1)$ | $0.85( \pm 0.12)$ |
| $6+$ | 3 | 532.5 | $( \pm 14.4)$ | 1386.0 | $( \pm 49.5)$ | $0.91( \pm 0.03)$ |
| $7+$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $8+$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $9+$ | 1 | 742 | $( \pm 0)$ | 4050 | $( \pm 0)$ | $0.99( \pm 0)$ |
| $10+$ | 1 | 761 | $( \pm 0)$ | 14250 | $( \pm 0)$ | $0.96( \pm 0)$ |
| Total | 360 |  |  |  |  | $0.92( \pm 0.20)$ |

Table 3.3.6. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factors ( $K_{T L}$ ) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) of walleye collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

| Age class | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Weight (g) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{K}_{\text {TL }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0+ | 71 | 125 | (k21.7) | 3714 | ( $\pm 15.5)$ | 0.81 | $( \pm 0.16)$ |
| 1+ | 74 | 244.7 | (ir31.8) | 142.1 | ( $\pm 50.0)$ | 0.90 | $( \pm 0.50)$ |
| $2+$ | 122 | 300.4 | ( $\pm 58.6$ ) | 261.9 | ( $\pm 109$ ) | 0.89 | ( $\pm 0.29)$ |
| $3+$ | 143 | 394.5 | $( \pm 47.8)$ | 568.5 | (k216.7) | 0.88 | $( \pm 0.18)$ |
| 4+ | 86 | 418.8 | ( $\pm 37.4$ ) | 750.3 | ( $\pm 221.7)$ | 0.87 | $( \pm 0.20)$ |
| $5+$ | 22 | 496.4 | ( $\pm 87.1$ ) | 1036.6 | ( $\pm 442.4)$ | 0.85 | ( $\pm 0.09)$ |
| $6+$ | 2 | 516.7 | $( \pm 38.89)$ | 1467.2 | (k312.5) | 0.74 | $( \pm 0.04)$ |
| 7+ | 1 | 612 | $( \pm 0.01$ | 1821.0 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 0.79 | $( \pm 0.0)$ |
| Total | \| 521 |  |  |  |  | 0.84 | $( \pm 0.21)$ |

Table 3.3.7. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of walleye collected during 1988. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.
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|  |  | Mean (mm) $\pm$ S.D. Back-Calculated lengths (mm) at Annulus Formation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1987 | 41 | $\begin{gathered} 173.9 \\ ( \pm 35.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 34 | $\begin{gathered} 185.3 \\ ( \pm 30.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 241.7 \\ ( \pm 44) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 133 | $\begin{array}{r} 193.2 \\ (\mathrm{k} 18.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 258.3 \\ ( \pm 31.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 313.1 \\ ( \pm 29.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 139 | $\begin{gathered} 208 \\ ( \pm 14.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 274.8 \\ (\mathrm{f} 18.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 337.2 \\ (\mathrm{k} 21.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 390.7 \\ (\mathrm{t} 23.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 | 17 | $\begin{array}{r} 206.6 \\ (\mathrm{k} 18.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 268.4 \\ ( \pm 21.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 340.3 \\ ( \pm 31.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 390.8 \\ (\mathrm{k} 35.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 438.9 \\ ( \pm 35.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 3 | $\begin{array}{r} 213.5 \\ ( \pm 2.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 259.3 \\ ( \pm 3.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 329 \\ ( \pm 5.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 384.3 \\ ( \pm 4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 436 \\ & ( \pm 5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 479.2 \\ & (\mathrm{kO} .6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 226.2 \\ ( \pm 0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 309.8 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 388.8 \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 430.6 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 491.1 \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 574.7 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 588.6 \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 663 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 714.1 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 1980 | 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 224.1 } \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 295.9 \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 379.1 \\ & ( \pm 0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 450.9 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 515.2 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 541.7 \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 590.8 \\ & ( \pm 0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 606 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{6 6 2 . 7} \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 689.2 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Grand Mean | 369 | $\begin{gathered} 203.9 \\ ( \pm 15.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 272.6 \\ ( \pm 17) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 347.9 \\ (\mathrm{f} 14.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 409.5 \\ ( \pm 12.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 470.3 \\ ( \pm 10.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 531.9 \\ & ( \pm 2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 589.7 \\ & ( \pm 0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 634.5 \\ & \text { (LO) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 688.4 \\ ( \pm 0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 689.2 \\ (+0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Mean Annual Grouth |  | 204 | 69 | 75 | 62 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 45 | 53 | . |

Table 3.3.8. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of walleye collected during 1989. $N=$ sample size.

|  |  | Mean $\pm$ S.D. Back-Calculated lengths (mm) at Annulus Formation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1988 | 77 | $\begin{gathered} 190.6 \\ ( \pm 36.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 125 | $\begin{gathered} 184.5 \\ ( \pm 35.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 257.5 \\ ( \pm 54.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 150 | $\begin{gathered} 197.9 \\ ( \pm 30.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 280.7 \\ ( \pm 36.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 348.1 \\ ( \pm 42.0) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 91 | $\begin{gathered} 196.7 \\ ( \pm 25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 277.1 \\ (\mathrm{f} 28.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 341.6 \\ ( \pm 30.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 395.9 \\ ( \pm 37.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 206.7 \\ (\mathrm{k} 14.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 288.7 \\ (\mathrm{f} 40.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 357.0 \\ ( \pm 66.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 415.0 \\ (\mathrm{t} 75.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 461.3 \\ ( \pm 75.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 1983 | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 256.2 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 300.9 \\ ( \pm 0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 363.5 \\ & ( \pm 0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 446.2 \\ & ( \pm 0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 533.4 \\ \text { (LO) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 591.6 \\ ( \pm 0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| 1982 | 1 | $\begin{gathered} 239.8 \\ ( \pm 12.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 289.2 \\ (\mathrm{f} 20.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 346.2 \\ (\mathrm{f} 24.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 413.6 \\ ( \pm 8.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 483.6 \\ ( \pm 5.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 550.6 \\ & \text { (t8.3) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 602.6 \\ ( \pm 4.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Grand | 467 | $\begin{gathered} 210.3 \\ ( \pm 22.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 282.4 \\ ( \pm 30.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 351.3 \\ (\mathrm{k} 32.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 417.7 \\ (\mathrm{f} 30.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 492.8 \\ (\mathrm{k} 26.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 571.1 \\ ( \pm 4.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 602.6 \\ (\mathrm{k} 4.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Mean <br> Annual <br> Grouth |  | 210 | 72 | 69 | 67 | 75 | 78 | 32 |

factor. In 1989, 2+ walleye averaged 300 mm in length, 262 g in weight, and 0.89 for condition factor. In 1988, 3+ walleye averaged 345 mm in length, 350 g in weight and 0.84 for condition factor. In 1989, $3+$ walleye averaged 395 mm in length, 569 g in weight and 0.88 for condition factor. In 1988, 4+ walleye averaged 406 mm in length, 576 g in weight and 0.86 for condition factor. In 1989, 4+ walleye averaged 419 mm in length, 750 g in weight and 0.87 for condition factor. In 1988, $5+$ walleye averaged 478 mm in length, 923 g in weight and 0.85 for condition factor. In 1989, $5+$ walleye averaged 496 mm in length, $1,037 \mathrm{~g}$ in weight and 0.85 for condition factor. In 1988, 6+ walleye averaged 532 mm in length, 1386 g in weight and 0.91 for condition factor. In 1989, 6+ walleye averaged 517 mm in length, $1,467 \mathrm{~g}$ in weight and 0.74 for condition factor. The single 7+ walleye captured in 1989 was 612 mm in length, 1821 g in weight and had a condition factor of 0.79 . No walleye in the $8+$ age class were captured either year. In 1988, the single 9+ walleye captured was 742 mm in length, $4,050 \mathrm{~g}$ in weight and had a condition factor of 0.99 . The single $10+$ walleye was captured in 1988 and was 761 mm in length, 4,250 g in weight and had a condition factor of 0.96 .

In 1988, the mean back-calculated length (Table 3.3.7) estimated for all cohorts at the formation of the first annulus ranged from 174 to 226 mm with a grand mean of 204 mm . Mean length at the formation of the second annulus ranged from 242 to 310 mm with a grand mean of 273 mm . Mean length at the formation of the third annulus ranged from 314 to 389 mm with a grand mean of 348 mm . Mean length at the formation of the fourth annulus ranged from 384 to 451 mm with a grand mean of 410 mm . Mean length at the formation of the fifth annulus ranged from 436 to 515 mm with a grand mean of 470 mm . Mean length at the formation of the sixth annulus ranged from 479 to 575 mm with a grand mean of 532 mm . Mean length at the formation of the seventh annulus ranged from 589 to 591 mm with a grand mean of 590 mm . Mean length at the formation of the eighth annulus ranged from 606 to 663 mm with a grand mean of 635 mm . Mean length at the formation of the ninth annulus ranged from 663 to 714 mm with a grand mean of 688 mm . Length at the formation of the 10th annulus was 689 mm .

In 1989, the mean estimated back-calculated length (Table 3.3.8) for all cohorts at the formation of the first annulus ranged from 184 to 256 mm with a grand mean of 210 mm . Mean length at the second annulus ranged from 258 to 301 mm at the formation to the second annulus with a grand mean of 282 mm . Mean length at formation of the third annulus ranged from 342 to 364 mm with a grand mean of 351 mm . Mean length at the formation of the fourth annulus ranged from 396 to 446 mm with a
grand mean of 418 mm . Mean length at the formation of the fifth annulus ranged from 461 to 533 mm with a grand mean of 493 mm . Mean length at the formation of the sixth annulus ranged from 551 to 592 mm with a grand mean of 572 mm . Mean length at the formation of the seventh annulus was 603 mm .

### 3.3.3 Kokanee Salmon

Mean size, condition, and back-calculated growth was detemined from 49 kokanee collected in 1988. No $0+$ and 1+ age classes were captured (Table 3.3.9). Age 2+ kokanee averaged 368 mm in length, 494 g in weight, and 0.99 for condition factor. The $3+$ age class averaged 463 mm in length, 1052 g in weight, and 1.07 for condition factor. The 4+ age class averaged 525 mm in length, 1576 g in weight and 1.07 for condition factor. Information on individual fish is contained in Appendix D.

The mean back-calculated length estimated at the formation of the first annulus ranged from 115 to 176 mm with a grand mean of 142 mm (Table 3.3.10). Mean length at the formation of the second annulus ranged from 238 to 318 mm with a grand mean of 274 mm . Mean length at formation of the third annulus ranged from 352 to 391 mm with a grand mean of 372 mm . Estimated length at the formation of the fourth annulus was 457 mm .

A total of 42 kokanee were collected for determination of mean size, condition, and back-calculation of growth in 1989 (Table 3.3.11). The single kokanee $0+$ in age was 88 mm in length and 5 g in weight with a condition factor of 0.73 . The $1+$ age class averaged 240 mm in length, 111 g in weight and 0.70 for condition factor. The $2+$ in age class averaged 385 mm in length, 590 g in weight and 1.01 for condition factor. The 3+ age class averaged 413 mm in length, 824 g in weight and 1.02 for condition factor. The single 4+ kokanee was 425 mm in length and 905 g in weight, with a condition factor of 0.92 .

[^0]Table 3.3.9. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factor ( $K_{T L}$ ) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) of kokanee salmon collected during 1988. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

| Age clas | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\bar{X}$ Weight (g) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{K}_{\text {TL }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - + | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2+$ | $\sigma$ | 367.7 | (f15.8) | 493.9 | ( $\pm$ 39.1) | 0.99 ( | 0.12) |
| $3+$ | 42 | 463.1 | ( $\pm 23.3$ ) | 1052.3 | (k155.3) | 1.07 ( $\pm$ | 0.17) |
| 4+ | 2 | 525.0 | ( $\pm 77.8$ ) | 1575.5 | ( $\pm 600.3$ ) | 1.07 ( $\pm$ | 0.06) |
| TOTAL | 49 |  |  |  |  | 1.04 (4 | 0.12) |

Table 3.3.10. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) $\pm$ standard deviations at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of kokanee salmon collected during 1988. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

|  | Mean (mm) $\pm$ S.D. Back-calculated length at Annulus |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1986 | 5 | $176.4( \pm 17.7)$ | $318.1( \pm 18.3)$ |  |  |
| 1985 | 39 | $134.0( \pm 24.7)$ | $265.6( \pm 31.8) 391.0( \pm 38.6)$ |  |  |
| 1984 | 2 | $115.0( \pm 58.2)$ | $237.9( \pm 42.1)$ | $352.7( \pm 4.5)$ | $456.9( \pm 47.9)$ |
| Grand <br> Mean | 46 | $141.8( \pm 33.5)$ | $273.9( \pm 30.7)$ | $371.9( \pm 21.6)$ | $456.9( \pm 47.9)$ |
| Mean Annual <br> Growth |  | 142 | 132 | 98 | 85 |

Table 3.3.11. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factor ( $K_{T L}$ ) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) of kokanee salmon collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

| Age clas | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Weight (g) |  | $\bar{X} K_{T L}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - + | 1 | 88.0 | ( $\pm 0.0$ ) | 5.0 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 0.73 | ( $\pm 0.0)$ |
| $1+$ | 5 | 240.2 | ( $\pm$ 28.6) | 110.8 | ( $\pm$ 43.1) | 0.70 | $( \pm 0.41)$ |
| $2+$ | 10 | 385.1 | $( \pm 35.9)$ | 590.4 | $( \pm$ 164.2) | 1.01 | ( $\pm 0.11$ ) |
| $3+$ | 23 | 413.0 | $( \pm 56.3)$ | 823.5 | $( \pm 173.5)$ | 1.02 | ( $\pm 0.12)$ |
| 4+ | 1 | 425.0 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 905.0 | $( \pm 0.0)$ | 0.92 | ( $\pm 0.0$ ) |
| TOTAL | 40 |  |  |  |  | 0.88 | $( \pm 0.13)$ |

Table 3.3.12. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) $\pm$ standard deviations at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of kokanee salmon collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

|  | Mean $\pm$ S.D. Back-calculated length at Annulus |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1988 | 6 | $130.8( \pm 16.7)$ |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 12 | $116.3( \pm 25.5)$ | $271.9( \pm 40.8)$ |  |  |
| 1986 | 23 | $130.6( \pm 25.5)$ | $281.2( \pm 29.1)$ | $364.8( \pm 41.6)$ |  |
| 1985 | 1 | $118.8( \pm 0.0)$ | $225.0( \pm 0.0)$ | $343.8( \pm 0.0)$ | $406.3( \pm 0.0)$ |
| Grand <br> Mean | 42 | $124.1( \pm 22.6)$ | $259.4( \pm 35.0)$ | $354.3( \pm 41.6)$ | $406.3( \pm 0.0)$ |
| Mean Annual <br> Growth |  | 124 | 135 | 95 | 52 |

### 3.3.4 Lake Whitefish

A total of 168 lake whitefish scale samples were collected for age analysis and back-calculation of growth in 1989. Table 3.3.13 summarizes the mean lengtn, weight, and condition factors by age class for lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt. Table 3.3.14 lists the estimated mean total lengths (mm) of lake whitefish cohorts. Information on individual fish is contained in Appendix D.

Mean condition factor for all age classes of lake whitefish collected in 1989 ranged from 0.94 to 1.15 with an overall mean of 1.10 (Table 3.3.13). Mean capture length averaged 220 mm for age 1+, 282 mm for age $2+, 452 \mathrm{~mm}$ for age $3+, 520 \mathrm{~mm}$ for age $3+, 523 \mathrm{~mm}$ for age $4+$, and 544 mm for age 6+ lake white fish. Mean capture weight averaged 125 g for age $1+, 327 \mathrm{~g}$ for age $2+, 1,099 \mathrm{~g}$ for age $3+, 1,611 \mathrm{~g}$ for age $4+$, 1,857 g for age $5+$,and $1,839 \mathrm{~g}$ for age $6+$ lake whitefish.

Mean length at the formation of the first annulus ranged from 191 to 248 mm with a grand mean of 239 mm (Table 3.3.14). At the formation of the second annulus estimated mean length ranged from 251 to 335 mm , and the overall mean was 326 mm . Estimated length at the formation of the third annulus ranged from 405 to 429 mm with a grand mean of 419 mm . Estimated length ranged from 458 to 487 mm at the formation of the fourth annulus, and the grand mean was 478 mm . At the formation of the fifth annulus, mean length ranged from 494 to 496 mm with an overall mean of 496 mm . The estimated length at the formation of the sixth annulus was 524 mm .

### 3.4 ZOOPLANKTON

### 3.4.1 Zooplankton Density

A total of 58 species from 41 genera of zooplankton was identified in Lake Roosevelt during 1988 and 1989 (Table 3.4.1). Rototoria was the most diverse taxon, comprised of 30 species. Nineteen species of Cladocera and 6 species of Copepoda of were found. Mean density ( $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) of zooplankton families calculated for all index stations sampled during seasonal intervals (August and October 1988, and May, August, and October 1989) are shown in Tables 3.4.2 to 3.4.6. Mean densities for monthly samples collected from Porcupine Bay and Seven Bays (representitive Spokane River and Columbia River sample locations) are shown in Tables 3.4.7 through 3.4.10. Also included are values for Daphnia and Leptodora kindtii which were frequent prey items found in the

Table 3.3.13. Mean lengths (mm), weights (g), and condition factor ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{TL}}$ ) ( $\pm$ standard deviations) of lake whitefish collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

| Age class | N | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Length (mm) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ Weight ( g ) |  | $\overline{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{K}_{T L}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1+$ | 13 | 220 | $( \pm 42)$ | 125 | ( $\pm 72$ ) | 1.15 | ( $\pm 0.39)$ |
| $2+$ | 5 | 282 | ( $\pm 68$ ) | 327 | (fl86) | 0.94 | $( \pm 0.10)$ |
| $3+$ | 23 | 452 | $( \pm 52)$ | 1099 | $( \pm 323)$ | 1.12 | $( \pm 0.20)$ |
| 4+ | 85 | 520 | $( \pm 42)$ | 1611 | $( \pm 349)$ | 1.12 | $( \pm 0.20)$ |
| $5+$ | 33 | 523 | $( \pm 62)$ | 1857 | $( \pm 503)$ | 1.15 | $( \pm 0.15)$ |
| 6+ | 6 | 544 | $( \pm 76)$ | 1839 | $( \pm 655)$ | 1.09 | ( $\pm 0.09)$ |
| TOTAL | 1168 |  |  |  |  | 1.10 | $( \pm 0.19)$ |

Table 3.3.14. Estimated mean total lengths (mm) $\pm$ standard deviations at annulus formation back-calculated for each age class of lake whitefish collected during 1989. $\mathrm{N}=$ sample size.

Mean $\pm$ S.D. Back-calculated length at Annulus

| Cohort | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | 13 | $191( \pm 28)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 5 | $210( \pm 31)$ | $251( \pm 43)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 23 | $238( \pm 40)$ | $324( \pm 53)$ | $406( \pm 56)$ |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 85 | $248( \pm 45)$ | $335( \pm 56)$ | $429( \pm 46)$ | $487( \pm 43)$ |  |  |
| 1984 | 33 | $242( \pm 37)$ | $321( \pm 45)$ | $405( \pm 49)$ | $458( \pm 57)$ | $494( \pm 78)$ |  |
| 1983 | 6 | $222( \pm 16)$ | $293( \pm 36)$ | $397( \pm 78)$ | $460( \pm 82)$ | $496( \pm 62)$ | $524( \pm 78)-$ |
| Grand <br> Mean | $\mathbf{1 6 8}$ | $239( \pm 43)$ | $326( \pm 54)$ | $419( \pm 5)$ | $478( \pm 51)$ | $496( \pm 64)$ | $524( \pm 78)$ |
| Mean <br> Annal <br> Growth |  | 239 |  | 87 | $\mathbf{9 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ |

# Table 3.4.1. Synoptic list of zooplankton taxa identified in Lake Roosevelt during 1988 and 1989 study period. 

Phylum Anthropoda<br>Class Crustacea<br>Subclass Brachipoda<br>Order Cladocera<br>Family Oaphnidae<br>1. Ceriodaphnia quadranquia<br>2. Daphnia ambigua<br>3. Daphnia galeata mendota<br>4. Daphnia retrocurva<br>5. Daphnia schodleri<br>6. Daphnia thorata<br>7. Scapholeberis aurita<br>8. Simocephalus serrulatus<br>9. Alona guttata<br>10. Alona quadrangularis<br>11. Samptocerus rectirostris<br>12. Chydorus sphaericus<br>13 . Eurycerus lamellatus<br>14. Pleuroxus denticulatus<br>Family Sididae<br>15. Diaphanosoma brachyurum<br>16. Diaphanosoma birgei<br>17. Sida crystallina<br>Family Macrothricidao<br>18 . Macrothrix laticornis<br>19. Streblocerus pygmaeus<br>20. Streblocerus semicaudatus<br>Family Bosminidae<br>2 1. Bosmina longirostris<br>Family Leptodoriidae<br>22. Leptodora kindtii<br>Subclass Copspoda<br>Order Eucopepoda<br>Suborder Calanoida Family Diaptomidae<br>23 . Leptodiaptomus ashlandi<br>24. Skistodiaptomus oregonensis<br>Family Temoridae<br>25. Epischura nevadensis<br>Suborder Cyciopoida<br>Family Cyciopoidae<br>26. Diicyciops biwspidatus thomasi<br>27 . Mesocyclop edax<br>Suborder Harpacticoida<br>Family Harpacticoidae<br>26 . Bryocamptus spp.

Phylum Rotifera<br>Class Monogononta<br>Order Flosculariacea<br>Family Conochilidao<br>29. Conoctilus unicomis<br>Family Testudineliidae<br>30. Testudinella patina<br>f. triloba<br>Family Filiniidae<br>31. Filinia terminalis<br>32. Tetramastix opoliensis<br>Order Collothecacea<br>Family Collothecidae<br>33. Collotheca mutabilis<br>Order Plioma<br>Family Synchaetidae<br>34. Pleosoma truncatum<br>35 Polyarthra dolichoptera<br>36. Polyarthra major<br>37 Polyantra vulgaris<br>38. Synchatta pectinata<br>Family Aspianchidae<br>39. Asplanchna herricki<br>40. Asplanchna priodonta<br>Family Brachionidae<br>41. Agnotholca toliacea<br>42. Brachionus quadridentata<br>43. Kellicottia longispina<br>44. Keratella cochlearis cochlearis<br>45. Keratella cochlearis recta<br>46. Keratella crassa<br>47. Keratella hiemalis<br>48 Keratella quadrata<br>49. Notholca spp.<br>Family Notommatidae<br>50 Cephalodella gibba<br>Family Epiphanidae<br>51. Epiphanes spp.<br>Family Euchlanidae<br>52 Euchlanis dila tata<br>53. Euchlanis triquetra<br>Family Trichotridae<br>54. Trichotria tetractis<br>Family Trichocercidae<br>55 . Trichocerca porcellus<br>56. Trichocerca spp.<br>Family Lecanidae<br>57. Lecane spp.<br>58. Monostyla lunaris

|  | INDEX STATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TAXON | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 06 | 09 | MONTHLY AVERAGE MEAN |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daphnia } \\ & \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 6,830 \\ (4,299) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,857 \\ & (2,970) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.399 \\ & (2.391) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.046 \\ & (495) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5,115 \\ & (815) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,897 \\ (403) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.102 \\ & (226) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,904 \\ & (141) \end{aligned}$ | 6.644 |
|  | Mean Daphnia size $\mathrm{mm}( \pm \mathrm{SD})$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1.51 \\ (0.50) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.68 \\ (0.58) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.89 \\ (0.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.48 \\ (0.41) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.84 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.84 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.93 \\ 10.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.84 \\ 10.50) \end{gathered}$ | 1.76 mm |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Leptodora } \\ \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & (6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 12 |
|  | Mean Leptodora size $\mathrm{mm}( \pm S D)$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 4.21 \\ (1.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.85 \\ (1.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.10 \\ (1.93) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.51 \\ (1.41) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.63 \\ (1.99) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.46 \\ (2.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.21 \\ (3.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.91 \\ (1.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 5.43 mm |
|  | Cladocera $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD})$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 6,938 \\ (4,148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13,050 \\ (2,936) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,980 \\ (2,362) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,048 \\ & (466) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.223 \\ & (796) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.058 \\ & (536) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.328 \\ & (330) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,360 \\ & (41) \end{aligned}$ | 7.123 |
|  | Adult Copepoda \#/m3 ( $\pm$ SD) |  | $\begin{gathered} 2,137 \\ (1,814) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,898 \\ (298) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22,713 \\ & (5,137) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.2611 \\ (1.086) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.763 \\ (3,849) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 10.539 \\ (5,273) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.724 \\ & (1,520) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26,161 \\ & (2,100) \end{aligned}$ | 13.068 |
| $\underset{\omega}{\infty}$ | Mean Copepoda size mm ( $\pm$ SD) |  | -- | -. | .- | .. | .- | .- | -- | -- | - |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Naudi } \\ \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \text { SD) }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 105 \\ & (14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 537 \\ (192) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 554 \\ (435) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 463 \\ & (18) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 36 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 235 \\ & (42) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 117 \\ (84) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 257 |
|  | Rotifera $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  | tifers for Au <br> 0 <br> 186.43 .7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { ust '88 not } \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | umerated <br> 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . |
|  | Total Daphnia Biomass $\qquad$ |  | 186.433 .7 | 457.750.5 | 445,964.8 | 85.070 .9 | 198,864.8 | 111.703 .6 | 314.502.9 | 321.253 .8 | 265,193 |
|  | Total Leptodora Bioma $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ |  | 31.5 | 264.8 | 2712.7 | 213.6 | 116.7 | 46.1 | 840.8 | 52.3 | 535 |
|  | Total Zooplankion $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 9,180.2 \\ (5,982.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 17.485 .1 \\ (3,047.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34,246.5 \\ (7,934) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21.122 .0 \\ (1.576 .9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.026 .6 \\ (4.658 .3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,603.2 \\ (5,805.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24,287.2 \\ & (1,817.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32,637.6 \\ & (2,057.7) \end{aligned}$ | 20.449 |

Table 3.4.2. Mean densities ( $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categorles of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtil at nine Index statlons in August 1988.

| INDEX STATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TAXON | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | MONTHLY AVERAGE MEAN |
| Daphria | 53 | 775 | 20,149 | 7.504 | 2,493 | -9,662- | 2,039 | 3,490 |  | 5.771 |
| / $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm$ SD $)$ | (1) | (191) | $(10.578)$ | $(1,706)$ | (21) | $(2,499)$ | (523) | (64) |  |  |
| Mean Daphnia sire | 1.13 | 1.54 | 1.52 | 1.74 | 1.38 | 1.51 | 1.51 | 1.60 |  | 1.50 mm |
| -mm_( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (0.35) | (0.52) | $(0,5,1)$ | $(0,62)$ | (0.36) | (0.57) | (0.46) | (0.42) |  |  |
| Leptodora | 0 | 1 | 52 |  |  |  | 23 | 4 |  | 11 |
| \# $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm$ SD) | (0) | (0) | (5) | (1) |  |  | (7) | (0) |  |  |
| Mean Leptodora size | 9.80 | 4.58 | 7.31 | 4.78 | -- | $\cdots$ | -. | 5.96 |  | 6.21 mm |
| _( $\pm$ SD) | (962) | $\left(49^{58}\right)$ | 11 20,351 | 41.851 | 3.230 | 9,662 |  | (2.96) |  |  |
| Cladocera |  |  |  |  | 3.230 |  | 2,303 | 4,038 |  | 6.056 |
| */m + (cn) | (11) | (243) | $(10,500)$ | $(1,450)$ | (123) | $(2,499)$ | (449) | (197) |  |  |
| Adult Copepoda | 63 | 314 | 4,631 | 19,400 | 10.254 | 13,896 | 3.170 | 8,189 |  | 7.490 |
| \#/ $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ + +SD ) | (1) | (21) | (42) | (1732) | (1773) | (4,011) | (360) | $(2,295)$ |  |  |
| Mean'Copepoda size $\text { mm_( } \pm S D)$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - ${ }^{-}$ | - $\quad$ | $\cdots$ |  | $\cdots$ |  | -- |
| Naupli | 202 | 33 | 938 | 22,563 | -588 | 8,68 | 4,130 | 7.023 |  | 5.582 |
| Naupli $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ | (25) | (101) | (149) | (5415) | (37) | (668) | (263) | (811) |  |  |
| Rotifera | 862 | 1 | 551 | 2.964 | 174 | 432 | 1106 | 4,328 |  | 1,302 |
| $z^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  | $(1,094)$ | (100) | (187) | (190) | (397) |  |  |
| Total'Daphnia Biomass | 292.8 | 24,637.1 | -887,962.2 | -426,425.3 | 29,632.0 | 421,997.43 | 83,282.06 | 154,641 |  | 253.609 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| total Leptodora-Biomass | 36.9 | 22.0 | 4670.2 | 278.8 | - - | - | . | 199.4 |  | 651 |
| Total Zoóm3lankton | 1,388.0 | 1,639.7 | 26,472.4 | 52,741.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 20.431 |
| $4 / m^{3}( \pm$ SD $)$ | (42.4) | (367.7) | (9899.5) | $(6,792.3)$ | (1,838.5) | $(6,991.9)$ | $(1,258.7)$ | $(3,698.2)$ |  | 20.431 |

Table 3.4.3. Mean densities ( $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of tooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtii at nine index stations in October 1988.

IINDEX STATION
$\infty$

| TAXON | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | MONTHLY AVERAGE MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daphnia } \\ & / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45 \\ (64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95 \\ (120) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 127 \\ (36) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & (6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 43 |
| Mean Daphnia size mm ( $\pm$ SD) | $\begin{gathered} 0.61 \\ (0.16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.88 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.77 \\ (0.19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.64 \\ 10.00) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.93 \\ (0.04) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.83 \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.26 \\ (0.00) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.12 \\ (0.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.45 \\ 10.30) \end{gathered}$ | 0.86 mm |
| Leptodora $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ (8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & (3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $1$ (1) | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \\ (3) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (1) \end{aligned}$ | $7$ (1) | 6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean Leptodora size } \\ & \text { mm ( } \mathrm{ISD} \text { ) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.07 \\ (0.55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.70 \\ (1.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ 10.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.88 \\ (1.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.39 \\ (0.59) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.58 \\ (0.62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.57 mm |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cladocera } \\ \quad \# / m^{3}( \pm S D) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86 \\ (24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 189 \\ (110) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68 \\ (33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106 \\ & (31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 135 \\ (163) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 254 \\ & (71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 155 \\ & (7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 86 \\ (11) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 250 \\ & (77) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 147 |
| Adult Copepoda $\quad / \mathrm{m3}$ (ISD) | $\begin{gathered} 79 \\ (35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 184 \\ 190 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 308 \\ (123) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.778 \\ & (158) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 472 \\ (559) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.625 \\ & (949) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,821 \\ & (745) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 898 \\ (87) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,268 \\ (1,725) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.937 |
| Mean Copepoda size $\mathrm{mm}( \pm S D)$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.81 \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | .. | $\begin{gathered} 0.90 \\ (0.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.91 \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.01 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ | 0.94 mm |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Naupli } \\ \left.\quad / \mathrm{m}^{3} \pm \mathrm{SD}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,970 \\ & (765) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,689 \\ (4,014) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,238 \\ (1,899) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.319 \\ (58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 720 \\ (468) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.826 \\ (608) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.508 \\ & (318) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.238 \\ (555) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.151 \\ & (1,403) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.740 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rotifera } \\ \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,358 \\ (1,637) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29,786 \\ (18,521) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,273 \\ & (2,960) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.134 \\ (524) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21,214 \\ (19,151) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 147,476 \\ & (19,777) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 156,937 \\ & (2,944) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 64,178 \\ (1,285) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 240,661 \\ & (20,447) \end{aligned}$ | 80.224 |
| Total Daphnia Biomass $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 7.4 | 308.5 | 67.1 | 19.9 | 36.7 | 549.2 | 407 | 227.4 | 939.2 | 285 |
| Total Leptodora Biomas ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ ) | $\cdots$ | 13.8 | 28.6 | 0.1 | $\cdots$ | 21.1 | - | 48.2 | 9.8 | 14 |
| Total Zooplankton $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.493 .5 \\ & (883.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.846 .9 \\ (22.740 .6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,887.3 \\ & (4,956.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54.335 .8 \\ (771.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.540 .2 \\ (20,343.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 163,181 \\ (20,189.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 167,420.2 \\ (1,873.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 69.400 .0 \\ (1,930.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 272,330.0 \\ & (23,645.7) \end{aligned}$ | 90,048 |

Table 3.4.4. Mean densities (\#/m ${ }^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtii at nine index stations In May 1989.

| INDEX STATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TAXON | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | MONTHLY AVERAGE MEAN |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { Daphnia } \\ \quad: / m^{3}( \pm S D) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7,452 \\ & (919) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.010 \\ (1,499) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.283 \\ (332) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,342 \\ & (2,962) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.320 \\ & (877) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.739 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.508 \\ & (283) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2.952 \\ & (1068) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.443 \\ (85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.894 |
| Mean Daphniasize mm ( $\pm$ SD) | $\begin{gathered} 1.72 \\ (0.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.74 \\ (0.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.49 \\ (0.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.60 \\ (0.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.39 \\ (0.42) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.69 \\ (0.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.85 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.88 \\ (0.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.86 \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.67 mm |
| Leptodora $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,346 \\ & (968) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 338 \\ (179) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \\ & (5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & (5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & (0) \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 308 |
| Mean Leptodora size mm ( $\pm$ SD) $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.59 \\ (3.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.69 \\ (1.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.37 \\ (3.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.07 \\ (2.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.00 \\ (0.91) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.54 \\ (2.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.20 \\ (0.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots \cdot$ | 6.54 mm |
| Cladocera $\geqslant / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,843 \\ (1,892) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.469 \\ & (1,678) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.440 \\ & (286) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.745 \\ (3,005) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,479 \\ (1,183) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,545 \\ (2,482) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,736 \\ & (270) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.077 \\ (1,022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.577 \\ & (109) \end{aligned}$ | 7.657 |
| Adult Copepoda $\text { \%/m3 }( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 244 \\ (29) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 712 \\ (267) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,396 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,328 \\ & (4,324) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,131 \\ & (6,616) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,134 \\ (3,053) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17,986 \\ & (2,456) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,791 \\ & (3,897) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,664 \\ & (2,148) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9.710 |
| Mean Copepode size $\qquad$ $\mathrm{mm}( \pm \mathrm{SD})$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.09 \\ (0.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.88 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.54 \\ (0.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.07 \\ (0.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.89 \\ (0.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.19 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.18 \\ (0.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.35 \\ (0.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.25 \\ (0.45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.16 mm |
| Naupli $1 / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{gathered} 799 \\ (247) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.646 \\ -(390) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,735 \\ (454) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.011 \\ & (7,561) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32,224 \\ (11,249) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.718 \\ (480) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.172 \\ (25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.594 \\ & (892) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,331 \\ & (124) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 12,470 |
| Rotifera $* / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.492 \\ & (1376) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47.005 \\ (164) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45,929 \\ & (4645) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2.114 \\ & (581) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 53,323 \\ & (9695) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.186 \\ & (397) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 972 \\ (141) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 870 \\ & (180) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 420 \\ & (104) \end{aligned}$ | 18.257 |
| Total Daphnia Biomass $\qquad$ <br> $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 220,552.2 | 391,872 | 232,577.6 | 565.545.4 | 45,841.8 | 18.027.65 | 87,639.1 | 267.285.1 | 82,336.4 | 230.436 |
| Total Leptodora Biomass $\qquad$ $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 231, 116.1 | 23,776.1 | 3,161.7 | 1.531 .93 | 105.6 | 1,050.5 | $\cdots$ | 1.7 | $\cdots$ | 28,972 |
| Total Zooplankion $1 \mathrm{~m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD})$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.377 .5 \\ (240.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63.831 .3 \\ (855.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.500 .4 \\ & (4,829.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69.198 .7 \\ (15,470.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 110,158.2 \\ & (28,750.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 28,583.5 \\ (6,411.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 26,867 \\ (2,071.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 23,331.8 \\ (5,996.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 15,991.0 \\ (2,227.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 48.093 |

Table 3.4.5. Mean densities (\#/m ${ }^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtil at nine index stations in August 1989.

| INDEX STATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TAXON | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | MONTHLY AVERAGE MEAN |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daphria } \\ & \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,161 \\ (1,039) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,263 \\ (28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5,463 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $22,185$ <br> (43) | $\begin{aligned} & 2.555 \\ & (346) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.240 \\ & (497) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 830 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3.021 \\ & (198) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.701 \\ (1,188) \end{gathered}$ | 4.935 |
| Mean Ladria size mm ( $\pm$ SD) | $\begin{gathered} . .3 .31 \\ (0.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.43 \\ (0.58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.51 \\ (0.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.72 \\ (0.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.58 \\ (0.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.62 \\ (0.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.65 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.64 \\ (0.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.74 \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.53 mm |
| Leptodora $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (3) \end{aligned}$ | $3$ (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \\ (1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \\ (1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 0.42 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 3 |
| Mean Leptodora size $\mathrm{mm}( \pm \mathrm{SD})$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.48 \\ (2.20) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.65 \\ (2.65) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.66 \\ (2.48) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.71 \\ (3.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.11 \\ (1.73) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | -• | $\begin{gathered} 8.85 \\ (4.37) \end{gathered}$ | * | 5.91 mm |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cladocera } \\ & \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,998 \\ (1,672) \end{array}$ | 2.705 <br> (8) | $\begin{gathered} 5.866 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.530 \\ (99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.280 \\ & (366) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.406 \\ & (442) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 979 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,699 \\ (136) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3,066 \\ (1254) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 5.392 |
| Adutt Copepoda \#/m ${ }^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 236 \\ (255) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 637 \\ (27) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 925 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22,489 \\ (743) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,343 \\ (1114) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,448 \\ & (136) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,144 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.030 \\ (367) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,915 \\ & (307) \end{aligned}$ | 7.018 |
| Mean Copepoda size mm ( $\pm$ SD) | $\begin{array}{r} 1.11 \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{gathered} 1.44 \\ (0.45) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.06 \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.12 \\ (0.12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.09 \\ (0.35) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.09 \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.09 \\ (0.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.13 mm |
| Naupli $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{gathered} 369 \\ (185) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.519 \\ & (143) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 946 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16,101 \\ (724) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,199 \\ (617) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,786 \\ (1,186) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,488 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7,294 \\ & (361) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.466 \\ (989) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5,574 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rotifera } \\ & \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.198 \\ (13,221) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.376 \\ (2,577) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.268 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.491 \\ (1,406) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16,858 \\ (338) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.101 \\ & (504) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.087 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.924 \\ (374) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,501 \\ (1,154) \end{gathered}$ | 6,645 |
| Total Dadria Biomass $\left(\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 11,879.9 | 69,968.8 | 280,858.6 | 358,577.5 | 104,379.2 | 226,254.6 | 39.707.3 | 151,371.3 | 152,602.7 | 155.067 |
| Total Leptodora Biomass (ug/m3) | 60.0 | 151.94 | 570.7 | 353.1 | 214.1 | -• | -- | 62.3 | $\cdots$ | 157 |
| Total Zooplankton $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.799 .7 \\ & (15,330.1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13,236.9 \\ (2,404.2) \end{array}$ | $\underset{0}{9.005 .4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68,610.6 \\ & (1,288.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39,678.7 \\ & (1,209.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.741 .8 \\ & (1,112.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,696.8 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27.947 .5 \\ (961.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,948.1 \\ & (3,691.1) \end{aligned}$ | 24.630 |

Table 3.4.6. Mean densities (\#/m ${ }^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtii at nine index stations In October, 1989.

| TAXON | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | MONTHLY MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paphnia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,398 | 7.072 | 7,504 | 2,550 | 2,105 | 5.926 |
| $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(2,391)$ | (149) | $(1,706)$ | (525) | (0) |  |
| Mean Ladina size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.89 | 1.67 | 1.74 | 1.57 | 1.36 | 1.68 |
| mm( $\pm$ SD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (0.64) | (0.50) | (0.62) | (0.65) | (0.43) |  |
| leptodora |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| \#/m ${ }^{3}( \pm$ SD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (11) | (1) | (1) |  |  |  |
| Mean Leptodora size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.10 | 4.34 | 4.78 | -- | - - | 5.59 |
| mm_( $\pm$ SD) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1.93) | (1.33) | (1.85) |  |  |  |
| pladocera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,980 | 7,294 | 7.815 | 2,884 | 2,257 | 6,246 |
| \#/m ${ }^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(2,362)$ | (46) | (1,450) | (299) | (9) |  |
| Aduli Copepoda |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22,713 | 8,938 | 19,400 | 5,106 | 4,913 | 12.214 |
| $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(5,137)$ | (742) | $(1,732)$ | (379) | (86) |  |
| Mean Copepoda size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | -- | -- | -- | - |  |
| Nauoli |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Naupli $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 554 \\ (435) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 256 \\ & (90) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 22,563 \\ & (5,415) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6,755 \\ (1,827) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7.823 \\ & (590) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.590 |
| Rotitera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2.964 | 458 | 4,205 | 1.525 |
| $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1,094) | (298) | $(1,104)$ |  |  |
| Total Dadria biomass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 445,964.8 | 330,782.2 | 426,425.3 | 30,341.4 | 54,415.3 | 257.586 |
| $\left(\mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Leptodora biomass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2712.7 | 31.3 | 278.8 | - - | - | 605 |
| $\left(u g / m^{3}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TotalZZoplankion $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 34,246.5 \\ (7,934) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.487 .4 \\ (877.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52,741.2 \\ & (6,792.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} \hline 15,202.7 \\ (2,204.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 19,196.7 \\ (1,788.2) \end{array}$ | 27,575 |

Table 3.4.7. Mean monthly densities (\#/m ${ }^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtii at Porcupine Bay (Index Station 4) from August to December 1988.

| TAXON | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JU | - AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | MONTHLY MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Daphria } \\ \\ \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5,115 \\ & (815) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.668 \\ & (738) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9,662 \\ (2,499) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6,219 \\ (2,384) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 190 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 5.171 |
| MeanLadria size <br> mm ( $\pm$ SD) <br> Leprodor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.84 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.64 \\ (0.54) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.51 \\ (0.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.65 \\ (0.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.40 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1.65 |
| Leptodora $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $0$ | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 4.63 \\ (1.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots$ | -- | -• | - | 4.63 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Cladocera } \\ & \\ & \pi / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5,223 \\ & (796) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.811 \\ & (771) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.662 \\ (2,499) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.003 \\ (2,630) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 207 \\ (8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5,381 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Adult Copepoda } \\ \\ \# / \mathrm{m}^{3} \quad( \pm \text { SD }) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 6,763 \\ (3,849) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.306 \\ & (496) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,896 \\ & (4,011) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.337 \\ & (390) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 670 \\ (174) \end{gathered}$ | 6,194 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Mean Copepoda size } \\ \mathrm{mm}( \pm S D) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 36 \\ (13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83 \\ (89) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.681 \\ (668) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.482 \\ & (267) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.039 \\ & (237) \end{aligned}$ | 2.264 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Rotifera } \\ \# / \mathrm{m}^{3} \quad( \pm S D) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 432 \\ (187) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 291 \\ -(41) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.826 \\ (671) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 510 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Total Laphria biomass } \\ \left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 198,864.8 | 237,321.0 | 421,997.4 | 8,349.4 | 4.071 .5 | 174,121 |
| $\begin{array}{cc} \hline \text { Total Leqtodbra biomass } \\ & \left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 116.7 | 24.6 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $3,742.0$ | 28 |
| Total Zooplankton \#/m ${ }^{3}( \pm S D)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12,026.6 \\ & (4,658.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13.199 .8 \\ (1,355.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 32.671 .1 \\ & (6.991 .9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.112 .9 \\ & (3.246 .7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,742.0 \\ & -(268.6) \end{aligned}$ | 14,351 |

Table 3.4.8. Mean monthly densities ( $\# / m^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of tooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtil at Seven Bays (Index Station 6) from August to December 1988.

| TAXON | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | MONTHLY MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daphnia | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | O |  |  | 13,342 | 12.321 | 22.185 | 507 | 79 $(104)$ | 5.618 |
| \%/m ${ }^{3}$ (*SD) | (10) |  |  |  | (11) | (4,735) | (275) | (2.962) | 0 | (43) | 0 <br> 1.33 | $\frac{(104)}{1.58}$ |  |
| Mean Daphnia size $\mathrm{mm}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.67 \\ (0.43) \end{gathered}$ | ${ }^{-}$ | -- | $\cdots$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.64 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.52 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.69 \\ (0.72) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.60 \\ (0.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.52 \\ (0.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.72 \\ (0.53) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.33 \\ (0.58) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.58 \\ (0.54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.59 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Leplodora } \\ & \quad / m^{3}( \pm S D) \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (1) | $\begin{gathered} 4.473 \\ (172) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $337$ <br> (3) | $\frac{28}{28}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ \hline \text { (1) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 71 |
| Mean Leplodora size mm( $\pm$ SD) | ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 400 \\ \hline 4.24) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.43 \\ (3.34) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.07 \\ (2.65) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5.71 \\ (3.40) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.20 \\ 101 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 561 |
| cladocera | $\begin{array}{r} 120 \\ (10) \end{array}$ | 0 |  | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 106 \\ 106 \\ (31) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,060 \\ & (4667) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.605 \\ & (262) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.745 \\ & (3.005) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 13.087 0 | $\begin{gathered} 22.530 \\ (99) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 615 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1, C ? 4 \\ & (24) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 5.992 |
| Aduli Copepoda $1 \mathrm{~m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 543 \\ (89) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 102 \\ (21) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1087 \\ & 387 \\ & (89) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,265 \\ (1,387) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.778 \\ & (158) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12,986 \\ (7.231) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.502) \\ & (316) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.320 \\ (4,324) \end{array}$ | 33.648 0 | $\begin{gathered} 22.489 \\ (743) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 933 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.573 \\ & (211) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9.045 |
| Mean Copepoda size mm ( $\pm S D$ ) | (89) | (21) | .- | -- | .- | (7.231) | $\begin{gathered} 1.31 \\ (0.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{4,024)}{1.07} \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.01 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.06 \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.02 \\ (0.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.15 \\ 10.29) \end{gathered}$ | 103 |
| $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { Naupl } \\ / \mathrm{m}^{3} \quad( \pm \mathrm{SD}) \end{array}\right.$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 20,619 \\ (9.977 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,573 \\ & (2.188) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.011 \\ & (7.561) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.403 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,101 \\ & (724) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.332 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.311 \\ & (444) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11.861 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rotilera } \\ & \pi / \mathrm{m}^{3} \quad( \pm S D) \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{10.489}{10.489}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 5.561 \\ (1.123) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101) \\ & \hline 4.301 \\ & (226) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44.134 \\ (524) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 169.161 \\ (21,217) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{12.000}{42.076} \\ (391) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,114 \\ & (581) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 6.888 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 7.491 \\ & (1406) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.205 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.175 \\ & (618) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 26.164 |
| Told Daphnia Biomass $\left(\mu \mathrm{q} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 4452.5 | (2,46) | -. | $\ldots$ | 19.9 | 169.007 .7 | 245.961 .9 | 565.545 .4 | 446.440 .3 | 358.577 .5 | 15.156 .5 | 31,940.6 | 153,092 |
| Total Leptodora Biomass $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | .- | 0.1 | 8.441 .7 | 21.335 .3 | 1.531 .9 | -- | 353.1 | 80 |  | 2639 |
| Tota Zooplankion $\quad: / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.506 .4 \\ (288.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline 13,2586 \\ (2.340 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6.762 .9 <br> $5) \quad(1.45$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 10,258.2 \\ .5)(1,10\{ \end{array}$ | 54.335 .8 <br> 6) 771 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.845 .5 \\ & \text { 6) } 4.3092 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 81.762 .3 \\ 9)(1,219.6 \\ \hline 9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69.198 .7 \\ (15.470 .6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 85.024 .8 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 68,610.6 \\ & (1,288.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.085 .4 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.083 .7 \\ & (1.296 .3) \end{aligned}$ | 53061 |

Table 3.4.9. Mean monthly densities (\#/m ${ }^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnla spp. and Leptodora kindtll at Porcuplne Bay (Index Station 4) In 1989.

| TAXON | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP | OCT | NOV | DEC | Monthly Meal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Daphnia } \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 127 \\ (36) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 4,388 \\ (1.223) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.877 \\ (33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3,739 | $\begin{gathered} 2,558 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.240 \\ & (497) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.067 \\ (3.728) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7.907 .65 \\ (1.170) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.745 |
| Mean Daphnia size mm $\pm$ SD | $\begin{gathered} 1.56 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | -- | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 0.92 \\ (0.00) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.83 \\ (038) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.51 \\ (0.44) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.89 \\ (0.67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|ccc} \hline 1 . & 6 & 9 \\ (0.63) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 165 \\ (0.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.62 \\ (060) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.77 \\ (0.77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.95 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ | 1.66 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Leplodora } \\ & \quad \# / \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm S D) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 403 \\ (22) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 262 \\ (1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 0.65 \\ 101 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 59 |
| Mean Leptodora sue $m \quad$ m ( $\pm$ SD) | $\cdots$ |  | $\cdots$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1.88 \\ (1.56) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.72 \\ (206) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.41 \\ (2.57) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.54 \\ (2.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.55 \\ (1.20) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\cdots$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.29 \\ 11.41) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.09 \\ (1.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 5.06 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cladocera } \\ \left.\quad \quad / m^{3} \pm S D\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 185 \\ \quad 19) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7 \\ (9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 13 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 254 \\ (71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.270 \\ (1.245) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.258 \\ (78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,545 \\ (2,482) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.701 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.406 \\ (442) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.486 \\ (3.847) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.360 \\ (1.208) \end{gathered}$ | 4.124 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Adult Copepoda } \\ & \\ \hline \text { \%/m3 } & \text { ( } \pm \text { SD) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 152 \\ (65) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 125 \\ (28) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 380 \\ & (80) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 753 \\ (26)^{7} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 3,625 \\ (949) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.361 \\ (1.465) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,373 \\ (134) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.134 \\ (3,053) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.307 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.448 \\ & (136) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.657 \\ (1.875) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.274 \\ & (9621 \end{aligned}$ | 3.882 |
| Mean Copepoda size |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  | . | $\begin{gathered} 1.32 \\ (0.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.19 \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.16 \\ (0.40) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.09 \\ (0.35) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.30 \\ 1.41) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.27 \\ (1.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.22 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { Naupli } \\ \\ & \\ \hline \end{array} \mathrm{m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD})$ | $\begin{gathered} 469 \\ (103) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 660 \\ & (75) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,076 \\ & (169) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.631 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11,826 \\ (608) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8,787 \\ & (819) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.281 \\ & (705) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.718 \\ (480) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.425 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.786 \\ (1.186) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.206 \\ & (120) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2.290} \\ & (840) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 6.513 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Rotilera } \\ \quad \#\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3}( \pm \mathrm{SD})\right. \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,604 \\ & (65) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5,742 \\ (1,120) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,921 \\ & 60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.099 \\ & (291) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 147.476 \\ (19.777) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 260,635 \\ (5,982) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50.195 \\ (2,107) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.186 \\ (397) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1.251 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.101 \\ & (504) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.862 \\ (2,525) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,187 \\ & \hline(246) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 4.094 |
| Total Daphnia Biomass $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 1,294.9 | .- | $\cdots$ | 152 | 549.2 | 68.592.2 | 415.647.t | 180,276 ¢ | 104.664. | 226.254 .6 | 613.836.3 | 606.755.4 | 184.824 |
| $\qquad$ | $\cdots$ |  | $\stackrel{\cdot}{ }$ | $\cdots$ | 21.1 | 59.0 | 16.440 .1 | 1,050.5 | 6.1 |  | 80.9 | 3911 | 1.504 |
| Total Zooplankion $\# / m^{3}( \pm S D)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2.409 .0 \\ (467) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 6.534 .0 \\ 11.026 .7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.376 .7 \\ & (1,49.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}10.495 .4 \\ \text { (316.9) } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 163.181 \\ (20,189.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 281.053 .4 \\ (2.453 .3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 93.103 .7 \\ 1,190.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28.583 .5 \\ (6,411.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.6835 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 20,741.8 \\ & (1,112.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 18.211 .1 \\ & (3,076.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.111 .1 \\ (3,256 \quad 9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 55,457 |

TABLE 3.4.10. Mean monthly densities ( $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3} \pm$ S.D.) of different categories of zooplankton and biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) values of Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtii at Seven Bays (Index Station 6) in 1989.
stomachs of planktivorous fish. Mean densities of individual species of zooplankton are listed in Appendix E.

All locations were sampled in August 1988. Mean density of zooplankton per site was estimated at $20,449 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ in August 1988. Zooplankton composition was $64 \%$ Copepoda ( $13,068 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $35 \%$ Cladocera ( $7,123 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $1 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $257 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) (Table 3.4.2). Rotifers were present but not enumerated this month. Cladocera density was highest at Hunters $\left(13,050 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and Porcupine Bay $\left(10,980 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and lowest at Keller Ferry ( $2,058 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and San Poil $\left(4,328 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Copepoda density was highest at Spring Canyon ( $26,161 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Porcupine Bay $\left(22,713 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and San Poil $\left(19,724 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and lowest at Gifford ( $2,137 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Hunters $\left(3,898 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Daphnia comprised $93 \%\left(6,644 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of the mean Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were present in low abundance, averaging $12 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for all locations. Mean density of Daphnia sp. was highest at Hunters ( $12,857 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Porcupine Bay ( $10,398 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and lowest at Keller Ferry $\left(1,897 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Mean Daphnia size ranged from 1.48 to 1.93 mm with an overall mean of 1.76 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in September 1988 was estimated at $16,487 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.7). Zooplankton density was comprised of $54 \%$ Copepoda ( $8,938 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 44\% Cladocera ( $7,294 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $2 \%$ Copepoda nauplii $\left(256 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Rotifers were present but not enumerated this month. Daphnia comprised $97 \%$ of the Cladocera taxa and $43 \%$ of total zooplankton. Leptodora kindtii comprised less than $1 \%\left(1 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of Cladocera density. The mean Daphnia size was 1.67 mm .

Mean zooplankton for Seven Bays in September 1988 was estimated at $13,200 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$, comprised of $63 \%$ Copepoda ( $8,306 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $36 \%$ Cladocera $\left(4,811 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and $1 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $83 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) (Table 3.4.8). Rotifers were present but not enumerated this month. Daphnia comprised $97 \%$ of the Cladocera and $35 \%$ of the total zooplankton. Leptodora kindtii were not found in samples from this location. Mean Daphnia size was 1.65 mm .

All locations were sampled in October 1988. However, samples were not collected from Spring Canyon because of a malfunction of the sampling apparatus. Mean zooplankton density per site in October 1988, was estimated at $20,431 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.3). Copepoda comprised $37 \%$ $\left(7,490 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of the mean density of zooplankton per site, followed by Cladocera at $30 \%\left(6,056 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Copepoda nauplii at $27 \%\left(5,582 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and rotifers at $6 \%\left(1,302 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. The highest mean density of zooplankton was estimated at $52,741 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ from Porcupine Bay. Copepoda density was also highest at Porcupine Bay estimated at $19,400 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Highest Cladocera
density was at Hunters ( $20,352 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia made up $95 \%\left(5,771 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of mean Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii comprised less than $1 \%$
$\left(11 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of Cladocera density. Mean Daphnia size ranged from 1.13 mm to 1.74 mm with an overall mean of 1.50 mm .

Mean zooplankton density for Porcupine Bay in November 1988 was estimated at $15,203 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.7). Zooplankton abundance included $44 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $6,755 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $34 \%$ Copepoda ( $5,106 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 19\% Cladocera ( $2884 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $3 \%$ rotifers ( $458 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Mean density of Cladocera was comprised of $88 \%\left(2,550 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ Daphnia. Leptodora kindtii were not found in November samples from this location. Mean size of Daphnia size was 1.57 mm .

Mean zooplankton density for Seven Bays in November 1988 was estimated at $10,113 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ comprised of $69 \%$ Cladocera ( $7,003 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $15 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $1,482 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $13 \%$ Copepoda ( $1,337 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $3 \%$ rotifers $\left(291 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ (Table 3.4.8). Daphnia comprised $93 \%\left(6,219 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of mean Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in samples this month. Mean size of Daphnia was 1.65 mm .

Mean zooplankton density for Porcupine Bay in December 1988 was estimated at $19,197 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.7). Zooplankton abundance included $41 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $7,823 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 26\% Copepoda ( $4,913 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 22\% Rotifers (4,205/m3), and 12\% Cladocera ( $2,257 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $93 \%$ $\left(2,105 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of the Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in December samples from this location. Mean Daphnia size was 1.36 mm .

Mean zooplankton density for Seven Bays in December 1988 was estimated at $3,742 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.8). Zooplankton abundance included $49 \%$ rotifers ( $1,826 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $28 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $1,039 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $18 \%$ Copepoda ( $670 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $6 \%$ Cladocera ( $207 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised 93\% ( $190 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) of the Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in December samples from this location. Mean Daphnia size was 1.40 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in January 1989 was estimated at $12,506 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ comprised of $84 \%$ rotifers ( $10,489 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $11 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $1,357 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $4 \%$ Copepoda ( $543 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $1 \%$ Cladocera $\left(120 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ (Table 3.4.9). Daphnia comprised $76 \%$ of the Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in January samples from this location. Mean size of Daphnia was 1.67 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in January 1989 was estimated at $2,409 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.10). Zooplankton abundance included

67\% rotifers ( $1604 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 19 \% Copepoda nauplii ( $469 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 8\% Cladocera ( $185 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $6 \%$ Copepoda ( $152 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). L eptodora kindtii were not found in January samples from this location. Daphnia comprised 18\% of the Cladocera density. Mean Daphnia size was 1.56 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in February 1989 was estimated at $13,259 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included $93 \%$ rotifers ( $12,351 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $6 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $806 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $1 \%$ Copepoda $\left(102 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Cladocera were not found in samples from this location in February 1989 at this location.

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in February 1989 was estimated at $6,534 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ comprised of $88 \%$ rotifers ( $5,742 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $10 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $660 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $2 \%$ Copepoda ( $125 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and less than $1 \%$ Cladocera ( $7 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) (Table 3.4.10). Daphnia and Leptodora kindtii were not found in February 1989 at this location.

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in March 1989 was estimated at $6,763 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included 82\% rotifers ( $5,561 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 12\% Copepoda nauplii ( $808 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $6 \%$ Copepoda $\left(387 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and less than $1 \%$ Cladocera ( $7 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia and Leptodora kindtii were not found in March 1989 at this location.

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in March 1989 was estimated at $6,377 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.10). Zooplankton abundance included $77 \%$ rotifers (4,921/m3), 17\% Copepoda nauplii (1,076/m³), and 6\% Copepoda ( $380 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera were not found in March 1989 at this location.

Mean density of zooplankton at Porcupine Bay in April 1989 was estimated at $10,258 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included $42 \%$ rotifers $\left(4,301 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, $41 \%$ Copepoda ( $4,265 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $17 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $1,693 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera were not found in April 1989 at this location.

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in April 1989 was estimated at $10,495 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ comprised of $77 \%$ rotifers ( $8,099 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $16 \%$ Copepoda nauplii $\left(1,631 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right), 7 \%$ Copepoda ( $753 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and less than $1 \%$ Cladocera ( $13 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) (Table 3.4.10). Daphnia comprised $50 \%$ of the Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in April 1989 at this location. Mean Daphnia size was 0.92 mm .

Mean zooplankton density of all 9 sites sampled in May 1989 was estimated at $90,048 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ per site (Table 3.4.4). Densities were highest near the lower end of the reservoir at Spring Canyon ( $272,330 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Keller Ferry ( $167,420 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and Seven Bays $\left(163,181 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Lowest density occurred in the upper part of the reservoir at Kettle Falls $\left(8,493 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Mean zooplankton density was comprised of $89 \%$ rotifers ( $80,224 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $9 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $7,740 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 2\% Copepoda ( $1,937 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and less than $1 \%$ Cladocera ( $147 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Mean density of Daphnia was highest at Seven Bays $\left(127 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and lowest at Kettle Falls $\left(5 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Leptodora kindtii mean density per site was $6 / \mathrm{m}$ ? Mean Daphnia size ranged from 0.61 to 1.45 mm with an overall mean of 0.86 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in June 1989 was estimated at $212,846 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included $79 \%$ rotifers ( $169,181 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 10\% Copepoda nauplii ( $20,619 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $6 \%$ Copepoda ( $12,986 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $5 \%$ Cladocera ( $10,060 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera densty was comprised of $80 \%\left(8,085 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ Daphnia and $5 \%$ Leptodora kindtii ( $473 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) Mean Daphnia size was 1.52 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in June 1989 was estimated at $281,053 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.10). Zooplankton abundance included $93 \%$ rotifers ( $260,635 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $3 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $8,787 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 2\% Copepoda ( $6,361 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $2 \%$ Cladocera ( $5,270 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera density included $83 \%$ Daphnia ( $4,388 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and $8 \%$ Leptodora kindtii ( $403 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Mean Daphnia size was 1.51 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in July 1989 was estimated at $81,762 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included $51 \%$ rotifers (42,076/m3), 26\% Copepoda nauplii ( $21,573 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 12\% Cladocera ( $10,605 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $9 \%$ Copepoda ( $7,508 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera density was comprised of 96\% Dahpnia and 3\% Leptodora kindtii. Mean Daphnia size was 1.69 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in July 1989 was estimated at $93,104 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.10). Zooplankton abundance included $54 \%$ rotifers ( $50,195 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 21\% Copepoda nauplii ( $19,281 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 16\% Cladocera $\left(15,258 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and $9 \%$ Copepda ( $8,373 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera density was comprised of $97 \%$ Daphnia ( $14,877 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and $2 \%$ Leptodora kindtii ( $262 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Mean Daphnia size was 1.89 mm .

Mean zooplankton density of all sites sampled in August 1989 was estimated at $48,093 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.5). Highest zooplankton density was at Little Falls ( $110,158 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and lowest at Spring Canyon ( $15,991 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ).

Zooplankton abundance included $38 \%$ rotifers ( $18,257 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 25\% Copepoda nauplii ( $12,470 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 20\% Copepoda ( $9,710 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $16 \%$ Cladocera ( $7,657 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Cladocera density was highest at Hunters ( $15,440 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Porcupine Bay ( $13,745 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and lowest at Spring Canyon ( $1,577 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Keller Ferry ( $1,736 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Copepoda density was highest at Porcupine Bay $\left(19,328 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and Little Falls $\left(19,131 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and lowest at Kettle Falls $\left(244 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and Gifford $\left(712 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Daphnia and Leptodora kindtii respectively comprised $90 \%\left(6,894 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and $4 \%\left(308 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of mean Cladocera density. Density of Daphnia was highest at Hunters ( $15,283 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Porcupine Bay ( $13,342 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and lowest at Spring Canyon ( $1,443 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Keller Ferry $\left(1,508 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Mean density of Leptodora kindtii was highest at Kettle Falls $\left(2,346 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and Gifford $\left(2,338 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$; however, they were not found in samples from Spring Canyon and Keller Ferry (lower end of the reservoir). Mean Daphnia size ranged from 1.49 to 1.88 mm , with an overall mean of 1.67 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in September 1989 was estimated at $85,024 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ( Table 3.3.9). Zooplankton abundance included $40 \%$ Copepoda ( $33,648 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $37 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $31,403 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $15 \%$ Cladocera ( $13,087 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $8 \%$ rotifers ( $6,888 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $94 \%\left(12,321 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in samples from this location. Mean Daphnia size was 1.52 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in September 1989 was estimated at $17,683 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.3.10). Zooplankton abundance included $41 \%$ Copepoda ( $7,307 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $36 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $6,425 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $15 \%$ Cladocera ( $2,701 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $7 \%$ rotifers ( $1,251 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $95 \%\left(2,558 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii density was low estimated at 1 per m${ }^{3}$. Mean Daphnia size was 1.65 mm .

Mean zoopiankton density for all sites sampled in October 1989 was estimated at $24,360 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.6). Zooplankton density was highest at Porcupine Bay ( $68,611 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and lowest at Hunters ( $9,005 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Mean zooplankton abundance was comprised of $28 \%$ Copepoda ( $7,018 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $27 \%$ rotifers ( $6,645 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $23 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $5,574 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $22 \%$ Cladocera $\left(5,392 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Cladocera density was highest at Porcupine Bay ( $22,530 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and lowest at Keller Ferry ( $979 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Copepoda density was highest at Porcupine Bay ( $22,489 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and lowest at Kettle Falls ( $236 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $92 \%\left(4,935 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of mean Cladocera density. Daphnia density was highest at Porcupine Bay ( $22,185 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and lowest at Keller Ferry $\left(830 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Leptodora kindtii density was low, averaging $3 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for all sites. Mean Daphnia size ranged from 1.31 to 1.74 mm with an overall mean of 1.53 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in November 1989 was estimated at $9,085 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included 57\% rotifers ( $5,205 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $26 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $2,332 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 10\% Copepoda ( $933 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $7 \%$ Cladocera ( $615 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $82 \%\left(507 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right.$ ) of Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii density was low, estimated at $0.14 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean Daphnia size was 1.33 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in November 1989 was estimated at $18,211 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.10). Zooplankton abundance included $41 \%$ Cladocera ( $7,486 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 21\% rotifers ( $3,862 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 20\% Copepoda $\left(3,657 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, and $18 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $3,206 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $94 \%$ $\left(7,067 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right.$ ) of Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii density was $1 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean Daphnia size was 1.77 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Porcupine Bay in December 1989 was estimated at $13,084 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.9). Zooplankton abundance included $41 \%$ Copepoda nauplii ( $5,311 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), 32\% rotifers ( $4,175 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $20 \%$ Copepoda ( $2.573 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $8 \%$ Cladocera ( $1,024 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $8 \%\left(79 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right.$ ) of Cladocera density. Leptodora kindtii were not found in December 1989 at this location. Mean Daphnia size was 1.58 mm .

Mean zooplankton density at Seven Bays in December 1989 was estimated at $17,111 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.10). Zooplankton abundance included $49 \%$ Cladocera ( $8,360 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), $24 \%$ rotifers ( $4,187 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and $13 \%$ each Copepoda nauplii ( $2,290 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Copepoda ( $2,274 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Daphnia comprised $95 \%\left(7,908 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of Claodcera density. Leptodora kindtii density was $5 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean Daphnia size 1.95 mm .

### 3.4.2 Zooplankton Biomass

Biomass $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ of Daphnia sp. and Leptodora kindtii was calculated at all index stations sampled during seasonal intervals (August and October 1988, and May, August, and October 1989), and also for monthly samples collected from Porcupine Bay and Seven Bays (representitive Spokane and Columbia River sample sites). Seasonal biomass values of Daphnia and Leptodora kindtii for all index station are shown in Tables 3.4.2 through 3.4.6. Monthly biomass for Porcupine Bay and Seven Bays are shown in Tables 3.4.7 through 3.4.10. Biomass of individual Daphnia species are listed in Appendix E.

Mean biomass for all sample sites in August 1988 was 265,193 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Daphnia and $535 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Leptodora kindtii (Table 3.4.2).

Biomass of Daphnia ranged from a high of $457,750 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Hunters to a low of $85,071 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Little Falls. Leptodora kindtii biomass ranged from a high of $2,713 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay to a low of $31 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Gifford.

In September 1988, at Porcupine Bay, Daphnia biomass was 330,782 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$, and Leptodora kindtii biomass was $31 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.7). At Seven Bays, Daphnia biomass was $237,321 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and Leptodora kindtii biomass was $25 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ (Table 3.4.8).

Mean biomass for all sample sites, excluding Spring Canyon, in October, 1988 was $253,609 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Daphnia and $651 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Leptodora kindtii (Table 3.4.3). Biomass for Daphnia ranged from a high of $887,962 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Hunters to a low of $293 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Kettle Falls. Biomass of Daphnia was also high at Porcupine Bay ( $426,425 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Seven Bays ( $421,997 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Biomass of Leptodora kindtii was highest at Hunters $\left(4,670 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Leptodora kindtii were not found at Little Falls, Seven Bays, and Keller Ferry this month.

In November 1988 biomass of Daphnia was $30,341 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $8,349 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays. Daphnia biomass was $54,415 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay, and $4,071 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays in December, 1988 (Tables 3.4.7 and 3.4.8). In January, 1989 Daphnia biomass was $4,453 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay, and $1,295 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays. From February to April, 1989, Daphnia were not found at Porcupine Bay. From February to March, 1989 Daphnia were not found at Seven Bays. In April 1989 Daphnia biomass was $15 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays (Tables 3.4.9 and 3.4.10). Leptodora kindtii were not found in samples from November 1988 to April 1989 at these locations.

Mean biomass for all sample sites in May 1989 was $285 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Daphnia and $14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Leptodora kindtii (Table 3.4.4). Biomass levels of Daphnia ranged from a high of $939 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Spring Canyon to a low of 7 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Kettle Falls. Leptodora kindtii biomass ranged from a high of 48 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at San Poil to a low of $0 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Kettle Falls, Little Falls, and Keller Ferry.

In June 1989 biomass of Daphnia was $169,008 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $68,592 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays. Leptodora kindtii biomass was $8,442 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $59 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays (Tables 3.4.9 and 3.4.10).

In July 1989 biomass of Daphnia was $245,962 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $415,648 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ Seven Bays. Leptodora kindtii biomass was $21,335 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $16,440 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays (Tables 3.4.9 and 3.4.10).

Mean biomass for all sites sampled in August 1989 was 230,436 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Daphnia and $28,972 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Leptodora kindtii (Table 3.4.5). Daphnia biomass levels ranged from a high of $565,545 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay to a low of $45,842 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Little Falls. Leptodora kindtii biomass levels ranged from a high of $231,116 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Kettle Falls to a low of 0 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Keller Ferry and Spring Canyon.

In September 1989 Daphnia biomass was $446,440 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $104,664 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays. Leptodora kindtii biomass was $0 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay (not found in samples) and 1,051 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays (Tables 3.4.9 and 3.4.10).

Mean biomass for all sample sites in October 1989 was 155,067 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Daphnia and $157 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ for Leptodora kindtii (Table 3.4.6). Biomass levels of Daphnia ranged from a high of $358,577 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay to a low of $11,880 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Kettle Falls. Leptodora kindtii biomass ranged from a high of $353 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay to a low of 0 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays, Keller Ferry, and Spring Canyon.

In November 1989 biomass of Daphnia was $15,156 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $613,836 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays. Leptodora kindtii biomass was $8 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $81 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays (Tables 3.4.9 and 3.4.10).

In December 1989 biomass of Daphnia was $31,941 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $606,755 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays. Leptodora kindtii biomass was $0 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Porcupine Bay and $391 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ at Seven Bays (Tables 3.4.9 and 3.4.10).

### 3.5 FISH FEEDING HABITS

### 3.5.1 Annual Feeding Habits of Rainbow Trout for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of all age classes of rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.1. Monthly values for all age classes can be found in Appendix F.

Table 3．5．1 The annual food preferences of Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | FIAINBOW TROUT（ $\mathrm{N}=190$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMB |  | WEIGHT | （ng） | POCURPENCE | ｜RI |
| rey Item | $(X \pm$ S．D．$)$ | （\％） | （ $X \pm$ S．D．） | （\％） | （\％） | \％ |
| TTELCHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catastomidae | 0．08士（0．98） | 1.01 | $0.04 \pm(0.45)$ | 44 | 1.1 | 0.99 |
| Centrachidae | $0005 \pm(0.07)$ | 3.00 | $0.005 \pm(0.05)$ | 0.57 | $0.53$ | 0.02 |
| Cothidae | 2．2土（16） | 3.18 | $021 \pm(2.0)$ | 23.00 | 5.3 | 5.2 |
| Cyprinidae | $023 \pm(1.5)$ | 0.02 | $0.09 \pm(0.78)$ | 9.8 | 26 | 23 |
| Percidae | $0.06 \pm(0.57)$ | 0.01 | $0.07 \pm(0.58)$ | 0.4 | 21 | 1.9 |
| Unidentifiable fish | $0.28 \pm(1.9)$ | 0.02 | $0.06 \pm(0.52)$ | 74 | 47 | 22 |
| IPHIPODA（scuds） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gammerus | 0 005～0．07） | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Hyalella | $0.005 \pm(0.07)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 053 | 0.1 |
| JPODA（sow bugs） Asellus | $0005 \pm(.07)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| ADOCERA（water theas） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphria schadlen | 1045t（2340） | 5.3 | 0．30士（2．2） | 33.00 | 70.00 | 34.00 |
| Daphnia thorata | $5.2 \pm(43)$ | 0.43 | $0.0004 \pm(0.004)$ | 005 | 5.9 | 1.1 |
| Daphnia retrocurva | $0.005 \pm(0.07)$ | 0.00 | 0．0 $\pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Daphnia galeata mendota | $13 \pm(9.8)$ | 0.10 | $0.0002 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.03 | 4.2 | 0.79 |
| $L$ eptodora kinctii | 137 $\pm$（477） | 1.2 | $0.01 \pm(0.05)$ | 1.6 | 32.00 | 9.1 |
| Alona alfins | $0.15 \pm(1.8)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.00 | 1.1 | 0.19 |
| Chydorus sphaericus | $0.15 \pm(1.7)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.00 | 21 | 0.38 |
| Eurycerus lamellatus | $0.26 \pm(2.2)$ | 0.02 | $00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 3.7 | 0.67 |
| Sida crystallina | $0.02 \pm(0.26)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm 10.0002)$ | 0.00 | 1.0 | 0.19 |
| ICOPEPODA（copepods） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyclops spp． | 0．04土（0．35） | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.00 |  | 0.57 |
| D．aptomus sop． | $006 \pm(0.68)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | $1.0$ | 0.19 |
| Edischura spo． | 25土（335） | 200 | $0.0007 \pm(0.008)$ | 0.08 | 6.0 | 1.6 |
| 4SOMMATOPHOAA（snasi） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lymnaidac <br> Planorbidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \pm(0.16) \\ & 002 \pm(0.12) \end{aligned}$ | 0.00 0.00 | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \pm(0.02) \\ 0.0003 \pm(0.003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.36 \\ & 0.04 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \\ & 1.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.54 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| JLLUSKA（clam） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sphaeridae | $0.01 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.00 | 0．001 $+(0.01)$ | 0.14 | 1.00 | 0.21 |
| PTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomudae pupae | 2．34（7．1） | 0.19 | $0.001 \pm(0.009)$ | 0.19 | 36.00 | 6.6 |
| Chironomidae larvae | 1．8土（5．6） | 0.15 | $0.0006 \pm(0.004)$ | 0.07 | 32.00 | 5.8 |
| Tipulidae pupae | $0.005 \pm(0.07)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm 0(0.0)$ | 000 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Tidulidae larvae | 0．01士（．16） | 0.00 | 0．01（．0001） | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.19 |
| Tabanudae | $0.005 \pm(0.07)$ | 0.00 | $0.0002 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.03 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Stuatiomyidae | $001 \pm(.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Sciomyzidae | 0．005土（0．07） | 0.00 | 0．0土 0.0005 ） | 0.01 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Heleormyzidae | $001 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.38 |
| FICOPTERA（cadaisties） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leptoceridae | $0.01 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | 0．0土（0．0001） | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Hydropsychidae | $0.06 \pm 10.45)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0065$ ） | 001 | 26 | 0.48 |
| Hydroptuidae | $0 . \mathrm{Mf}(0.20)$ | 0.00 | $0.0005 \pm(0.006)$ | 0.06 | 21 | 0.39 |
| Psychomyidae | $0.09 \pm(0.90)$ | 0.01 | $0.0001 \pm(0.001)$ | 002 | 1.6 | 0.29 |
| Polycentropidae | 0 Olt（0．16） | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.19 |
| Brachycentridae | 0 005f～0．07） | 0.00 | 0．0ı 40.0$)$ | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capmudae <br> Nemouridae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \pm(0.10) \\ & 0 \quad \text { Olf(0.12) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00 \\ 0.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \pm(0.0001) \\ & 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.19 \\ & 0.29 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EMIPTERA（bugs） Corixidae | 2．1土（10） | 0.17 | $0009 \pm(0.07)$ | 1.00 | 20.0 | 3.9 |
| PHEMEROPTERA（mavtires） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baetidae | $0.05 \pm(0.36)$ | 0.00 | $0.0003 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.04 | 3.7 | 0.67 |
| Ephemerellidae | $0.12 \pm(1.2)$ | 0.01 | 0．0士（0．0004） | 0.00 | 26 | 0.48 |
| Trichoryithidae | $0.01 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | 0．040．0） | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| Hedtagenidae | $0.02 \pm(0.29)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 000 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| DONATA（dragontlies） Zygoptera | 0．03＋（．30） | 0.00 | 0．04．0008） | 0.01 | 1.00 | 0.19 |
| OLEOPTERA（beedes） <br> Elmadae | $0005 \pm(0.07)$ | 0.00 | 0．0土（0．0002） | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.1 |
| LIGOCHEATA（worms） Lumbriculidse | O11＊（1．1） | 0.01 | 0 01～0．12） | 0.13 | 21 | 0.61 |
| IYDRACHNELLLAE（spider） Hydracarina | $027 \pm(1.5)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(0.0006)$ | 0.01 | 1.00 | 1.7 |
| THER |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | $001 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.00 | $0.001 \pm(0.01)$ | 015 | 1.00 | 0.22 |
| Terrestrial | 1．1 $\pm(4.2)$ | 0.09 | $0.008 \pm(0.06)$ | 0.92 | 25.00 | 4.7 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.37 \pm(0.77)$ | 0.03 | $0.04 \pm(0.21)$ | 4.9 | 24.00 | 52 |
| Inorganic Detritus | 0．07土（0．29） | 0.01 | $0.01 \pm(0.07)$ | 1.4 | 6.00 | 1.4 |
| Uridentifiable bodies | $0.26 \pm(0.64)$ | 0.02 | 0．004t（0．02） | 0.52 | 17.00 | 3.1 |

## Table 3．5．2 The annual food preferences of 0＋Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | RAINBOW TROUT（N－190） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { NUMBE } \\ \left(\dot{x}_{ \pm}+\text {S.D. }\right) \end{gathered}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | （mg） <br> （\％） | OCOURPENCE \% | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IRI } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES（fish） <br> Cottidae <br> Cyprinidae <br> Unidentiliable tish | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \pm(0.11) \\ & 0.3 \pm(1.3) \\ & 035 \pm(1.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 \\ & 0.12 \\ & 0.14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \pm(0.008) \\ 0.02 \pm(0.09) \\ 0.02 \pm(0.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.6 \\ 30.0 \\ 23.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.0 \\ 5.0 \\ 10.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 5.6 \\ & 5.3 \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA（water tleas） Daphnia schoderi Daphnia thorata | $\begin{gathered} 230 \pm(395) \\ 1.1 \pm(2.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 93.6 \\ 0.45 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \pm(0.03) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0001) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.9 \\ 0.04 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 55.0 \\ 20.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.7 \\ 3.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { EUCOPEPODA (copepoda) } \\ \text { Cyclops spp. } \\ \text { Epischura spp. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \pm(0.61) \\ & 0.7 \pm(2.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \\ & 0.28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0004) \end{array}\right]$ | 0.12 0.17 | $\begin{array}{r} 10.0 \\ 15.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 2.4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| BASOMMATOPHORA（snarl） Lymnaidae | 0．05土（．22） | 0.02 | 0．0土（．0003） | 01 | 30.0 | 4.7 |
| DIPTERA（midges） <br> Chironomidae pupae <br> Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{array}{r} 5.9 \pm(10) \\ 1.3 \pm(1.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \\ & 0.51 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \pm(0.007) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.001) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 55.0 \\ 55.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.3 \\ 8.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| TRICOPTERA（caddistlies） <br> Hydropsychidae <br> Psycttomyidae <br> Polycentropidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \pm(1.3) \\ 0.9 \pm(2.7) \\ 0.15 \pm(0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.20 \\ & 0.37 \\ & 0.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{c} 0.0004 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.004) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0006) \end{array}\right]$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.51 \\ & 1.8 \\ & 0.20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.0 \\ & 15.0 \\ & 10.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \\ & 2.7 \\ & 1.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| PLECOPTERA（stonefiies） <br> Capriidae <br> Nemouridae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \pm(.22) \\ & 0.1 \pm(.30) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} 0.0 \pm(0.0) \\ 0.0002 \pm(0.0008) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.28 0.01 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.84 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { HEMIPTERA (bugs) } \\ \text { Corixidae } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1．1 $\pm$（2．4） | 0.45 | $0.001 \pm(0.004)$ | 2.2 | 20.0 | 3.5 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（maytlies） <br> Baetidae <br> Ephemerellidae <br> Heptagenidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \pm(0.22) \\ 0.05 \pm(0.22) \\ 0.2 \pm(0.89) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.0 \pm(0.0008)$ <br> $0.0 \pm(0.0006)$ <br> $0.0 \pm(0.0004)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.80 \\ 0.80 \\ 0.81 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| OUGOCHEATA（worms） Lumbricutidae | $0.95 \pm(3.4)$ | 0.39 | $0.01 \pm(0.02)$ | 13.1 | 20.0 | 5.3 |
| HYORACHNELLLAE（spider） Hydracarma | 0．6土（2．2） | 0.24 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.12 | 10.0 | 1.6 |
| OTHER： <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \pm(2.2) \\ 0.1 \mathrm{f}(0.30) \\ 0.55 \pm(0.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.24 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0009 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 2.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.0 \\ 5.0 \\ 30.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 5.1 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.3 The annual food preferences of $1+$ Ralnbow trout from Lake Roosevelt In 1988.
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## Taidie 3．5．4 The annual food preterences of 2＋Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | RAINBOW TROUT（ $\mathrm{N}=32$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT (m } \\ & (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | OCOURRENCE $(\%)$ | ｜RI <br> （\％） |
| OSTEICHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catastomrdae | $0.36 \pm(1.9)$ | 0.03 | $0.16 \pm(0.89)$ | 12.0 | 4.3 | 3.2 |
| Cottidae | $79 \pm(32)$ | 0.56 | 0 69土（3．9） | 52.0 | 8.7 | 12.3 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.21 \pm(1.0)$ | 0.02 | $007 \pm(0.44)$ | 5.9 | 4.3 | 2.0 |
| Percidae | $013 \pm(0.74)$ | 0.01 | $006 \pm(0.38)$ | 5.1 | 4.3 | 1.9 |
| Unidentifiable fish | $0.04 \pm(029)$ | 0.00 | $005 \pm(0.29)$ | 39 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| AMPHIPODA（scuds） Gammerus | $002+(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(00)$ | 0.0 | 21 | 0.43 |
| CLADOCERA（water fleas） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schodieri | $1261 \pm(2750)$ | 88.9 | $0.11 \pm(21)$ | 8.8 | 58.7 | 31.3 |
| Daphnia thorata | $18 \pm$（85） | 1.3 | $00001 \pm(00005)$ | 0.01 | 6.5 | 1.5 |
| Daphnia retrocurva | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.43 |
| Daphnia galeata mendola | $3.0 \pm(18)$ | 0.22 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0006)$ | 0.01 | 4.3 | 0.92 |
| Leptodora kindio | 119士（440） | 8.5 | $0009 \pm(0.03)$ | 0.73 | 23.9 | 6.6 |
| Chydorus sphaencus | $004 \pm$（0．20） | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0006)$ | 0.00 | 43 | 0.87 |
| EUCOPEPODA（copepoda） Epischura spp． | $006 \pm(0.32)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(00007)$ | 000 | 43 | 0.87 |
| BASOMMATOPHORA（snarl） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lymnaidae | $0.04 \pm(0.20)$ | 0.00 | $0.001 \pm(0.008)$ | 0.11 | 4.3 | 0.89 |
| Planorbidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 000 | $0.0 \pm(0.0003)$ | 000 | 21 | 0.43 |
| OIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | $15 \pm(3.6)$ | 0.11 | $0.002 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.22 | 28.0 | 5.7 |
| Chironomidae larvae | 1 Ok （2．3） | 0.08 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.02 | 32.6 | 6.5 |
| Tipulidae larvae | $0.06 \pm(0.32)$ | 000 | $00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 43 | 087 |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisflies） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leptoceridae | $0.04 \pm(0.29)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm($（0002） | 0.00 | 2.1 | 0.43 |
| Hydropsychidae | 0．02土（0．14） | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(.0003)$ | 0.00 | 2.1 | 0.43 |
| Hydroptrlidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | ．002土（．01） | 0.16 | 2.1 | 0.47 |
| Brachycentridae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | 2.1 | 0.43 |
| HEMIPTERA（bugs） Corixidae | $30 \pm(18)$ | 0.21 | $0.003+10.011$ | 0.25 | 130 | 27 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（mayties） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baetidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.0 | $0.001 \pm(0.007)$ | 0.10 | 4.3 | 0.89 |
| Ephemerellidae | $047 \pm(2.3)$ | 003 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0005$ | 0.01 | 6.5 | 1.3 |
| Trichoryrthidae | $0.04 \pm(0.29)$ | 00 | $0.0 \pm 10.0)$ | 0.00 | 2.1 | 043 |
| HYDRACHNELLLAE（spider） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hydracarma | $004 \pm(029)$ | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 2.1 | 043 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $0.26 \pm(0.85)$ | 0.02 | 0．004 $\pm$（0．01） | 0.33 | 10.8 | 2.2 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.58 \pm(1.0)$ | 0.04 | $0.12 \pm(0.40)$ | 9.50 | 30.4 | 8.0 |
| Inorganic Detritus | $0.04 \pm(0.20)$ | 0.0 | $0.006 \pm(0.03)$ | 0.52 | 4.3 | 0.97 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.13 \pm(0.40)$ | 0.01 | $0.0009 \pm(0.004)$ | 0.07 | 10.8 | 22 |

Table 3．5．5 The annual food preferences of $3+$ Rainbow
trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | ZAINBOW TROUT（ $\mathrm{N}=29$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ＇FEY ITEM | NUMBER |  | WEIGHT（mg） |  | OCOURPENCE | IRI |
|  | $(\bar{X} \pm$ S．D．$)$ | \％） | $(\dot{X} \pm$ S．D．$)$ | \％ | （\％） | \％） |
| ISTEICHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cottidae | $0.03 \pm(0.18)$ | 0.0 | $0.0004 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.12 | 34 | 0.59 |
| Unidentifiable fish | $006 \pm(0.37)$ | 0.0 | $0.01 \pm(0.04)$ | 3.1 | 34 | 10 |
| ：LADOCERA（water fleas） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schederi | 1450士（3672） | 87.9 | $0.14 \pm(0.29)$ | 40.6 | 65.5 | 32.2 |
| Daphnia thorata | 0．06土（0．37） | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.57 |
| Leptodora kindti | 184土（742） | 11.2 | $0.02 \pm(0.07)$ | 6.3 | 34.5 | 8.6 |
| Alona alfins | $0.86 \pm(4.6)$ | 0.05 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.01 | 3.4 | 0.58 |
| Chydorus sphaericus | $0.82 \pm(4.4)$ | 0.05 | $0.0 \pm 10.0008$ | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.58 |
| Eurycerus lamella tus | $0.06 \pm(0.37)$ | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.57 |
| ：UCOPEPODA（Oopepoch） Epischura spp． | 0．06士（0．37） | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.57 |
| 3ASOMMATOPHORA（snarl） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lymnaidae | $0.20 \pm(0.94)$ | 0.01 | $0.01 \pm(0.06)$ | 4.2 | 6.9 | 1.8 |
| Planorbidae | $0.37 \pm$（2．0） | 0.02 | 0．0006土（0．002） | 0.18 | 3.4 | 0.61 |
| HOLUSKA（clam） <br> Sphaeriidae | $0.03 \pm(.18)$ | 0.0 | $0.007 \pm(0.03)$ | 2.1 | 3.4 | 0.93 |
| JIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | $1.1 \pm(2.7)$ | 0.07 | $0.0005 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.16 | 27.5 | 4.6 |
| Chironomidae larvae | 4．3土（8．1） | 0.23 | $0.003 \pm(0.01)$ | 1.0 | 55.2 | 9.4 |
| Stratiomyidae | $0.06 \pm(0.37)$ | 0.0 | 0．0土 0 （0002） | 0.02 | 3.4 | 0.58 |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisflies） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hydropsychidae | 0．03土（0．18） | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm$（0．0） | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.57 |
| Hydroptilidae | $0.10 \pm(0.40)$ | 0.01 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0 0： | 6.9 | 1.1 |
| HEMIPTERA（bugs） <br> Corixidae | $3.1 \pm$（8．6） | 0.11 | 0．04士（0．18） | 11.9 | 24.0 | 6.0 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（mayflies） Baetidae | $0.10 \pm(0.40)$ | 0.01 | 0．0001 $\pm$（0．0004） | 0.03 | 6.9 | 1.1 |
| JOONATA（dragonflies） Zyqoptera | $0.17 \pm(0.75)$ | 0.01 | $00004 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.12 | 6.9 | 1.1 |
| OLIGOCHEATA（worms） Lumbriculidae | 0．03 $\pm$（0．18） | 0.0 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.01 | 3.4 | 0.57 |
| HYDRACHNELLLAE（spider） Hydracarina | $0.93 \pm(3.0)$ | 0.06 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.08 | 24.0 | 4.0 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $0.93 \pm(2.6)$ | 0.01 | $0.001 \pm(0.006)$ | 0.48 | 27.5 | 4.6 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.62 \pm(1.0)$ | 0.01 | $0.05 \pm(0.16)$ | 14.5 | 34.0 | 8.1 |
| Inorganic Detritus | $0.10 \pm(0.30)$ | 0.0 ＇ | $0.04 \pm(0.16)$ | 11.0 | 10.0 | 3.6 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $000.55 \pm(0.98)$ | 00 ： | $0008 \pm(0.03)$ | 2.5 | 27.5 | 5.0 |

Table 3.5.6 The annual food preferences of 4+ Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | RAINBOW TROUT ( $\mathrm{N}=16$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBEF } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT (m } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | OCCURRENCE (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) <br> Cottidae <br> Cyprinidae <br> Unidentifiable fish | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \pm(5.8) \\ & 1.7 \pm(4.8) \\ & 2.3 \pm(6.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.52 \\ & 0.42 \\ & 0.58 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.28 \pm(1.0) \\ & 0.55 \pm(2.1) \\ & 0.37 \pm(1.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.5 \\ 18.8 \\ 12.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 125 \\ 12.5 \\ 18.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 5.6 \\ & 5.7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { CLADOCERA (water fleas) } \\ \text { Daphnia schgdieri } \\ \text { Leptodora kindtii } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 315 \pm(688) \\ & 79 \pm(205) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 76.4 <br> 19.3 | $16 \pm(6.4)$ $0.006 \pm(0.01)$ | 57.4 0.24 | 68.8 | 36.4 1.1 |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepoda) <br> Epischura spp. | $33 \pm(13)$ | 0.82 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.0 | 6.2 | 12 |
| BASOMMATOPHORA (snal) <br> Lymnaidae | 0.06 $\pm$ (0.25) | 0.02 | $0.003 \pm(0.01)$ | 013 | 6.2 | 1.1 |
| DIPTERA (midges) <br> Chironomidae pupae <br> Chironomidae larvae <br> Sciomyzidae <br> Heleomyzidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.37 \pm(0.88) \\ 1.5 \pm(4.7) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.25) \\ 0.18 \pm(0.75) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.09 \\ & 0.36 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.0007 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.0002 \pm(0.0008) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 001 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.7 \\ 25.0 \\ 6.2 \\ 6.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \\ & 4.5 \\ & 1.1 \\ & 1.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) <br> Corixidae | $2.8 \pm(8.3)$ | 0.70 | $0.005 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.19 | 31.2 | 5.7 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA (mayflies) <br> Baetidae | $0.06 \pm(0.25)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.0 | 62 | 1.1 |
| ODONATA (dragontlies) Zygoptera | 0.06士(0.25) | 0.02 | 0.01(0.0004) | 0.0 | 62 | 1.1 |
| COLEOPTERA (beeves) <br> EImidae | $006 \pm(0.25)$ | 002 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0006)$ | 001 | 62 | 1.1 |
| HYDRACHNELLLAE (spider) Hydracarina | $006 \pm(0.25)$ | 0.02 | $00 \pm(00003)$ | 00 | 62 | 11 |
| OTHER: Jergestrial Organic ganic Detritus <br> Inorganic Detritus Unidenbfiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 02 \pm(3.3) \\ 5 \pm(0.89) \\ 006 \pm(0.25) \\ 000.31 \pm(079) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.48 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 008 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 00097 \pm(0.01) \\ \pm(0.02) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0007) \\ 001 \pm(0.04) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 0 & 24 \\ 0 & 34 \\ 0 & 01 \\ 0 & 44 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 31.3 \\ 37.5 \\ 62 \\ 187 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \\ & 6.8 \\ & 1.1 \\ & 34 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Tables 3.5.7 The annual food preferences of $5+$ Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | RAINBOW TROUT (N-2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | \% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGH } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | OCOURPAVCE $\%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schodleri Leplodora kindïi Alona alfins | $\begin{gathered} 140 \pm(191) \\ 1 \pm(1.4) \\ 0.5 \pm(.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88.6 \\ 0.63 \\ 0.32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \\ 0.0008 \pm(0.001) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \\ & 0.07 \\ & 1.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 50.0 \\ 50.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 27.6 \\ 7.2 \\ 7.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| BASOMMATOPHORA (snail) Lymnaidae | $0.5 \pm(0.71)$ | 0.32 | $0.0 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.07 | 50.0 | 7.2 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidas pupae Chironomidao larvae | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \pm(0.71) \\ 13 \pm(18) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.32 \\ & 0.82 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0008 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 2.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50.0 \\ 50.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.3 \\ & 8.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) Hydroptilidae | $0.5 \pm(0.71)$ | 0.32 | $0.0 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.07 | 50.0 | 7.2 |
| HYDRACHNELUAE (spider) <br> Hydracarina | 1.5土(2.1) | 0.95 | $0.0 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.07 | 50.0 | 7.2 |
| OTHER: <br> Organic Detritus | $0.5 \pm$ (0.71) | 0.32 | 0.07士(0.09) | 91.0 | 50.0 | 20.2 |

The highest number frequency values were for Daphnia schodleri (water fleas) at $1045 \pm 2340$ per stomach, followed by Leptodora kindtii (water fleas) at $137 \pm 477$ and Epischura (copepod water fleas) at $25 \pm$ 335. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at $85.3 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at 11.2\% and Epischura at 2.0\%. (Table 3.5.1).

The highest weight frequency values were for D. schødleri at $.30 \pm$ 2.2 mg per stomach, followed by Cottidae (sculpins) at $.21 \pm 2.0 \mathrm{mg}$ and Cyprinidae (minnows) at $0.09 \pm 0.78 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schødleri at $33.3 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $23.3 \%$ and Cyprinidae at 9.8\%. (Table 3.5.1).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schodleri at $70.0 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae (midges) at $36.0 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae (midges) at $32.0 \%$. (Table $3.5-1$ ).

The highest index of relative importance (IRI) values were for $D$. schedleri at $34 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $8.1 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at 6.6\%. (Table 3.5.1).

## Annual Feeding Habits of 0+ Rainbow Trout for 1988

Information for feeding habits of 0+ rainbow trout in 1989 (August and October combined) is presented in Table 3.5.2.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schodleri at $230 \pm$ 395 per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $5.9 \pm 10$ and Chironomidae larvae at $1.3 \pm 1.4$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schodleri at $93.6 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $2.4 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $0.51 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Cyprinidae at $.0261 \pm$ 0.09 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.02 \pm$ 0.07 mg and $D$. schødleri at $0.02 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Cyprinidae at $30.6 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $23.2 \%$ and $D$. schadleri at $19.9 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schadleri, Chironomidae pupae and Chironomidae larvae all at 55.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $26.7 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $19.4 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $8.8 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of I+ Rainbow Trout for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of 1+ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.3.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $1150 \pm$ 1903 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $180 \pm 480$ and Epischura at 60 $\pm 526$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at $82.0 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $12.8 \%$ and Epischura at $4.3 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae (perch or walleye) at $0.1756 \pm 0.94 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by $D$. schødleri at $0.13 \pm 0.17 \mathrm{mg}$ and Lumbriculidae (earthworms) at $0.03 \pm 0.20$ mg . The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $39.8 \%$, followed by D. schødleri at $29.8 \%$ and Lumbriculidae at $5.3 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for L. kindtii at $46.8 \%$, followed by D. schødleri at $44.2 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $42.9 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schodleri at $30.3 \%$, followed by $L$. kindtii at $13.0 \%$ and Percidae at $8.2 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 2+ Rainbow Trout for 7988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $2+$ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.4.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schodleri at $1261 \pm$ 2750 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $119 \pm 440$ and D. thorata (water fleas) at $18 \pm 85$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at $88.9 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $8.5 \%$ and $D$. thorata at 1.3\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for Cottidae at $0.69 \pm$ 3.92 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Catastomidae (suckers) at $0.16 \pm 0.89 \mathrm{mg}$ and organic detritus (plant matter) at $0.12 \pm 0.40 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Cottidae at $52.2 \%$, followed by Catastomidae at $12.0 \%$ and organic detritus at $9.5 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $58.7 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $32.6 \%$ and organic detritus at 30.4\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at 31.3\%, followed by Cottidae at $12.3 \%$ and organic detritus at $8.0 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 3+ Rainbow Trout for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.5.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri at $1450 \pm$ 3672 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $184 \pm 742$ and Chironomidae larvae at $4.3 \pm 8.1$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schodleri at $87.9 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $11.2 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $0.3 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schodleri at $0.14 \pm$ 0.29 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by organic detritus at $0.05 \pm$ 0.16 and Corixidae (bugs) at $0.04 \pm 0.18$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schodleri at $40.6 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $14.5 \%$ and Corixidae at $11.9 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schodleri at $65.5 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $55.2 \%$ and L. kindtii and organic detritus both at $34.5 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $32.2 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $9.4 \%$ and L. kindtii at $8.6 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Rainbow Trout for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.6.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schodleri at $315 \pm$ 688 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $79 \pm 205$ and Epischura at $3.3 \pm$ 13. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at $76.4 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $19.3 \%$ and Epischura at $0.82 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for D. schodleri at $1.69 \pm$ 6.45 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Cyprinidae at $0.55 \pm 2.14 \mathrm{mg}$ and unidentifiable fish at $0.37 \pm 1.42$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for D. schodleri at $57.4 \%$, followed by Cyprinidae at $18.8 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $12.7 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $68.8 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $37.5 \%$ and Corixidae and terrestrial insects both at $31.3 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $36.4 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $6.8 \%$ and unidentifiable fish, Corixidae, and terrestrial insects all at 6.0\%.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 5+ Rainbow Trout for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $5+$ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.7.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri at $140 \pm$ 191 per stomach, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $13 \pm 18$ and Hydracarina (aquatic spider) at $1.5 \pm 2.12$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schødleri at $88.6 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $8.2 \%$ and Hydracarina at $1.0 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus at $0.07 \pm 0.09 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by $D$. schadleri at $0.003 \pm$ 0.005 mg and Chironomidae larvae at $0.002 \pm 0.002 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $91.0 \%$, followed by D. schødleri at $4.4 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $2.1 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $100.0 \%$, followed by all other prey items at $50.0 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $27.6 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $20.2 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $8.6 \%$.

### 3.5.2 Annual Feeding Habits of Rainbow Trout for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of all age classes of rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.8. Monthly values for all age classes can be found in Appendix F.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri (water fleas) at $191 \pm 652$ per stomach, followed by walleye eggs (fish eggs) at $148 \pm 818$ and L. kindtii (water fleas) at $46 \pm 204$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schadleri at $43.8 \%$, followed by Walleye eggs at $33.8 \%$ and L. kindtii at $10.6 \%$. (Table 3.5.8).

Table 3.5.8 The annual food preferences of Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW TROUT ( $\mathrm{N}=223$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'RN ITEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMB } \\ (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { WEIGH } \\ (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{gathered}$ | g) $(\%)$ | OCOURPENCE (\%) | \|RI <br> (\%) |
| SSTEICHTHYES (ish) <br> Catastomidae <br> Collidae <br> Percidae <br> Unidentifiable tish <br> Walloye eggs | $\begin{gathered} 0.0004 \pm(0.06) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.06) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.25) \\ 0.04 \pm(0.19) \\ 148 \pm(818) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.18 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 33.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.02) \\ 0.02 \pm(0.24) \\ 0.003 \pm(0.02) \\ 0.28 \pm(1.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ 0.08 \\ 1.7 \\ 0.2 \\ 18.0 \end{gathered}$ | 0.45 0.45 1.8 4.0 70 | $\begin{gathered} \\ 0.06 \\ 0.16 \\ 3.2 \\ 0.44 \\ 34.6 \end{gathered}$ |
| MPHIPODA (scuds) Gammerus | 0.01 $\pm(0.13)$ | 0.0 | $00 \pm 10.0001)$ | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.03 |
| SOPODA (sow bugs) Asellus | $001 \pm(0.20)$ | 00 | $0.0002 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.02 | 045 | 0.04 |
| LADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schadtori Leptodora kindfii | $\begin{aligned} & 191 \pm(652) \\ & 46 \pm(204) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \\ & 106 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \pm(0.03) \\ 0008 \pm(0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.97 \\ & 056 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40.6 \\ 12.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \\ & 1.5 \end{aligned}$ |
| UCOPEPODA (copepoda) Cyclops spp. Edischura sop. | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \pm(1.8) \\ 1.0 \pm(15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 \\ & 0.25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 00 \pm(0.0001) \\ 002 \pm(0.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.0 \\ 1.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.4 \\ 9.4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| IECAPODA (craytish) Pacifiasticus | $0004 \pm(0.06)$ | 0.0 | $0.0008 \pm(0.013)$ | 0.06 | 0.45 | 0.12 |
| LASOMMATOPHORA (Enall) <br> Lymnaidese <br> Planorbidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \pm(0.25) \\ & 001 \pm(0.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 0.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 4OLUUSKA (Clam) <br> Sohaeriidae | $002 \pm(0.17)$ | 0.01 | $00001 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.01 | 18 | 0.05 |
| MPTERA (midges) <br> Chironomidae pupae <br> Chironomidae larvae <br> Smilidae larvae <br> Tipulide pupae <br> Tipulide larvae | $\begin{gathered} 18 \pm(148) \\ 16 \pm(213) \\ 1.3 \pm(14) \\ 0.17 \pm(1.0) \\ 0.28 \pm 10.171 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.0 \\ & 3.6 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 006 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0008 \pm(0.08) \\ 0.006 \pm(0.06) \\ 0.0005 \pm(0.006) \\ 0.0002 \pm(0.001) \\ 00002 \pm(0.001) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.54 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.0 \\ 22.0 \\ 1.4 \\ 5.0 \\ 40 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 1.2 \\ & 0.10 \\ & 0.13 \\ & 0.11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 'RICOPTERA (caddisflies) <br> Ledtoceridae <br> Leptostomolidae <br> Lymnephilidae <br> Hydropsycnidae <br> Brachycentridae <br> Heliophsychide <br> Rhyacoonhlidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \pm(0.33) \\ 0.004 \pm(0.06) \\ 0.008 \pm(.013) \\ 2.2 \pm(9.3) \\ 0.15 \pm(1.3) \\ 0.008 \pm(0.13) \\ 0.02 \pm(0.18) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.51 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.01) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.008) \\ 0.0003 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0004) \\ 00 \pm(0.0001) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.09 \\ & 0.13 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.45 \\ 0.45 \\ 0.45 \\ 12.0 \\ 22 \\ 0.45 \\ 2.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.17 \\ & 0.46 \\ & 0.08 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 004 \end{aligned}$ |
| 'LECOPTERA (stoneties) <br> Perlodidae <br> Pteronarcidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \pm(1.8) \\ & 0.14 \pm(1.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 003 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0002 \pm(0.001) \\ & 0.0008 \pm(0.007) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.50 \\ 450 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10 \\ & 0.19 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| iEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae Notonectidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.40 \pm(2.7) \\ 0.004 \pm .006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.09 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0007 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0004) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 005 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.0 \\ 045 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.29 \\ & 001 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ```{PHEMEROPTERA (mayfles) Baetidae Ephemerellidae Heptagenidae``` | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \pm(1.5) \\ 0.008 \pm(0.09) \\ 0.04 \pm(0.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $00 \pm(0.0009)$ <br> $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ <br> $00 \pm(0.0002)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & 1.4 \\ & 36 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.16 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ |
| FDONATA (dragonilies) Zygoptera Anisoptera | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \pm(0.22) \\ & 0.01 \pm(0.21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \pm(0.0004) \\ & 00 \pm(0.0004) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 090 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 002 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ZOLEOPTERA (beelies) <br> Elmidao | $0.04 \pm(0.40)$ | 0.01 | $0.0009 \pm(0.009)$ | 0.06 | 1.8 | 0.14 |
| LIGOCHEATA (worms) $\qquad$ | $0.08 \pm(0.93)$ | 0.02 | $001 \pm(0.05)$ | 10.27 | 6 | 0.52 |
| TYDRACHNELLLAE (sprder) Hydracarina | $007 \pm(0.56)$ | 0.02 | $00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.0 | 50 | 009 |
| THER Cestoda Terrestrial Organic Detnius Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0008 \pm(0.09) \\ 10 \pm(36) \\ 0.66 \pm(1.0) \\ 0.12 \pm(0.41) \\ 022 \pm(0.68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 2.3 \\ & 0.15 \\ & 0.03 \\ & 0.05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.09 \pm(0.68) \\ 0.23 \pm(1.2) \\ 0.05 \pm(0.49) \\ 0.005 \pm(0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 6.3 \\ 15.0 \\ 3.4 \\ 0.36 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 22 \\ 39.0 \\ 34.1 \\ 9.0 \\ 14.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ 12.4 \\ 28.6 \\ 6.3 \\ 0.92 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Table 3.5.9 The annual food preferences of $0+$ Rainbow from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ |  | OCOURPENCE $\%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) Unidentified fish Walleye eggs | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \pm(0.16) \\ 0.10 \pm(.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 0.0029 \pm(0.0179) \\ 0.0003 \pm(0.002) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.09 \\ & 0.40 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.56 \\ 2.56 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.49 \\ & 0.61 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| AMPHIPODA (scuds) Gammerus | $005 \pm(0.22)$ | 0.04 | $0.0 \pm(.0004)$ | 0.00 | 5.13 | 1.00 |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schaderi Leotodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 109.18 \pm(322.65) \\ 0.90 \pm(5.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 82.15 \\ 0.68 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \pm(0.02) \\ 00 \pm(0.0003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.8 \\ 0.08 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.5 \\ 2.56 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.7 \\ 0.64 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepoda Cyclops spp. | $0.03 \pm(0.16)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.00 | 2.56 | 0.50 |
| BASOMMATOPHORA (snarl) Lymnaidae | 0.05t(0.32) | 0.04 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.06 | 2.56 | 0.52 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae Simulidae larvae | $\begin{aligned} & 6.0 \pm(16.62) \\ & 2.97 \pm(7.98) \\ & 0.08 \pm(0.48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.51 \\ & 2.24 \\ & 0.06 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0032 \pm(0.0162) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0019) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0004) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.60 \\ & 0.08 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41.0 \\ 28.21 \\ 2.56 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.92 \\ & 5.92 \\ & 0.51 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) } \\ \text { Hydropsychidae } \\ \text { Brachycentridae } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.26 \pm(0.82) \\ & 0.44 \pm(1.93) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.19 \\ & 0.33 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 0.0002 \pm(0.0011) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.0016) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.44 \\ & 0.64 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.26 \\ 5.13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.11 \\ & 1.18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | 0.21 $\pm(0.47)$ | 0.15 | 0.0008士(0.0054) | 1.40 | 17.95 | 3.70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EPHEMEROPTERA (mayflies) } \\ & \text { Baetidae } \\ & \text { Ephernerelidae } \\ & \text { Heotagenidas } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 021 \pm(0.83) \\ & 0.03 \pm(0.16) \\ & 018 \pm(1.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.15 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(0.0005) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0007) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.05 \\ & 0.19 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.26 \\ 2.56 \\ 17.95 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.02 \\ & 0.51 \\ & 3.55 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ODONATA (dragonties) Zygoptera | 0.08士(0.48) | 0.06 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.20 | 2.56 | 0.55 |
| HYDRACHNELLLAE (spider) Hydracarina | $0.03 \pm(0.16)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(4.8038)$ | 0.01 | 2.56 | 0.50 |
| OTHER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $11 \mathrm{f}(33)$ | 8.35 | $0.005 \pm(0.02)$ | 8.85 | 56.4 | 14.3 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.44 \pm(0.75)$ | 0.33 | $0.03 \pm(0.08)$ | 45.18 | 28.21 | 14.3 |
| Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \pm(0.16) \\ & 0.54 \pm(1.02) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.41 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0005 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.01 \pm(0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.89 \\ 13.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.56 \\ 30.77 \end{array}$ | 0.67 8.76 |

Table 3.5.10 The annual food preferences of $1+$ Rainbow from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBEF } \\ & (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | OCCURRENCE (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { STEEICHTHYES (fish) } \\ & \text { Percidae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $005 \pm(0.32)$ | 0.01 | $0.06 \pm(0.36)$ | 42.5 | 2.50 | 9.5 |
| AMPHIPODA (scuds) <br> Gammerus | $003 \pm(0.16)$ | 0.01 | $00 \pm(3.16)$ | 000 | 2.50 | 0.53 |
| CLADOCERA (water Heas) Daphnia schgdleri Leptodora kindui | $\begin{gathered} 353 \pm(950) \\ 12 \pm(52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 92.1 \\ 3.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \pm(0.05) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.008) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.2 \\ & 120 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 62.5 \\ 17.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37.0 \\ 4.65 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EUCOPEPODA (copepoda) } \\ & \text { Cyclops spp. } \\ & \text { Epischura spp. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 065 \pm(4.11) \\ & 0.13 \pm(0.79) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.17 \\ 0.03 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(9.49) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.00 003 |  | 0.57 <br> 0.54 |
| DIPTERA (midges) <br> Chironomrdae pupae <br> Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{gathered} 6.8 \pm(22) \\ 0.78 \pm(2.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 0.20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \pm(0.009) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0005) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 185 <br> 0.00 | $\begin{array}{r} 25.0 \\ 15.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.06 \\ 3.22 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) } \\ & \text { Hydropsychidae } \\ & \text { Rhyacophilld } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.43 \pm(4.80) \\ & 0.08 \pm(0.27) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.37 \\ 0.02 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.81 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.5 \\ & 7.50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.90 \\ 1.59 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PLECOPTERA (stonetlies) } \\ & \text { Pleronarcyidae } \\ & \text { Perlodidae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \pm(0.16) \\ 0.2 \pm(1.11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \pm(0.0001) \\ & 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2.50 \\ 5.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.54 <br> 139 |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) <br> Corixidae | $16 \pm(6.18)$ | 0.42 | $0002 \pm(0.01)$ | 1.52 | 12.5 | 2.74 |
| COLEOPTERA (beelles) <br> Elmidae | $0.08 \pm(0.47)$ | 0.02 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.14 | 2.50 | 0.56 |
| ODONATA (dragonflies) Antsoptera | $0.08 \pm(0.47)$ | 0.02 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 012 | 2.50 | 0.56 |
| OLIGOCHEATA (worms) Lumbriculidae | $003 \pm 1016)$ | 0.01 | $00003 \pm(0.002)$ | 024 | 250 | 0.58 |
| HYDRACHNELILAE (spider) Hydracarina | $023 \pm(112)$ | 0.06 | $0.0 \pm 1000011$ | 001 | 150 | 319 |
| OTHER: <br> Cestoda <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \pm(0.16) \\ 5.03 \pm(11.25) \\ 0.23 \pm(0.58) \\ 000.23 \pm(0.62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 1 \\ & 01 \\ & 006 \\ & 006 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.04 \pm(0.09) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.01) \\ 0.003 \pm(0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 27.1 \\ 1.89 \\ 234 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.0 \\ 40.0 \\ 15.0 \\ 15.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.12 \\ 14.5 \\ 3.59 \\ 3.68 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 3.511 The annual food preferences of 2+ Rainbow from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW ( $\mathrm{N}=51$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | NUMBER $(X \pm$ S.D.) | (\%) |  | $(\%)$ | OCOURPENCE (\%) | $\|R\|$ <br> (\%) |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catastomidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.001 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.37 | 1.96 | 0.49 |
| Cotidae | $002 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.005 \pm(0.04)$ | 1.17 | 1.96 | 0.66 |
| Unidentified fish | $006 \pm(0.24)$ | 0.01 | $0.001 \pm(0.006)$ | 0.30 | 5.88 | 1.3 |
| Walleye eggs | 41.53土(296.58) | 7.38 | $0.10 \pm(0.72)$ | 22.4 | 1.96 | 6.65 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schedieri Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 337 \pm(839) \\ 45.24 \pm(198.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60.0 \\ 8.04 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \pm(0.05) \\ 0.0008 \pm(0.009) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.45 \\ & 0.18 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56.9 \\ 9.80 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.7 \\ 3.78 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepoda) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BASOMMATOPHORA (snal) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lymnaidae | $0.06 \pm(0.42)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 1.96 | 0.41 |
| Planorbidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | 1.96 | 0.41 |
| DIPTERA (midges) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | 65士(306) | 11.7 | $0.03 \pm(0.17)$ | 7.05 | 29.4 | 10.1 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $64.65 \pm(447.15)$ | 11.5 | $0.009 \pm(0.06)$ | 2.10 | 29.4 | 9.03 |
| Tipulidae pupae | $0.10 \pm(0.41)$ | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0005)$ | 0.03 | 5.88 | 1.25 |
| Tipulidae larvae | $0.27 \pm(1.96)$ | 0.05 | $0.0003 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.07 | 1.96 | 0.44 |
| Simulidae larvae | $2.08 \pm(14.84)$ | 0.37 | $0.0008 \pm(0.006)$ | 0.19 | 1.96 | 0.53 |
| TRICOPTERA (caddistlies) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leptoceridae | $0.10 \pm(0.70)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.01 | 1.96 | 0.42 |
| Hydropsychidae | $0.57 \pm(3.78)$ | 0.10 | $0.0008 \pm(0.004)$ | 0.18 | 3.92 | 0.88 |
| Leptostomatidae | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(5.60)$ | 0.00 | 1.96 | 0.41 |
| Brachycentridas | $0.06 \pm(0.31)$ | 0.01 | $0.0003 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.07 | 3.92 | 0.84 |
| Rhyacophilidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.01 | 1.96 | 0.41 |
| PLECOPTERA (stoneflies) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EPHEMEPOPTERA (maytios) | $0.22 \pm 0.70)$ | 0.04 | 00003 | 0.07 | 11.7 |  |
| EPHEMEROPTERA (mayties) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ephemerellidae | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.80 \\ & 1.96 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.41$ |
| ODONATA (dragonflies) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anisoptera | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm$ (0.0) | 0.00 | 1.96 | 0.41 |
| Zygoptera | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $0.0 \pm(0.0005)$ | 0.02 | 1.96 | 0.42 |
| COLEOPTERA (beoles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HYDRACHNELLLAE (spider) Hydracarina | $002 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.00 | $00 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | 1.96 | 0.41 |
| OTTER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $2.51 \pm(7.48)$ | 0.45 | $003 \pm(0.12)$ | 6.49 | 25.5 | 6.81 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.55 \pm(0.92)$ | 0.10 | $0.19 \pm(1.04)$ | 42.8 | 31.4 | 15.6 |
| Inorganic Detritus | $0.12 \pm(0.43)$ | 0.02 | $0.04 \pm(0.25)$ | 9.7 | 7.84 | 3.68 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.18 \pm(0.65)$ | 0.03 | $0004 \pm(0.02)$ | 0.97 | 794 | 1.86 |

Table 3．5．12 The annual food preferences of 3＋Rainbow from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW（ $\mathrm{N}=35$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBE } \\ & (\bar{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { WEIGHT } \\ (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { OCOURRENCE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES（ish） Percidae Unidentified fish | $\begin{aligned} & 0.09 \pm(0.51) \\ & 0.11 \pm(0.32) \end{aligned}$ | 0.03 0.04 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \pm(0.49) \\ & 0.01 \pm(0.05) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}14.49 \\ 1.81 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.78 \\ 11.11 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.54 \\ & 2.65 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CLADOCEPA (water fleas) } \\ \text { Daphnia schadieri } \\ \text { Leptodora kindtii } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 191 \pm(680) \\ & 77 \pm(182) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 62.37 \\ 25.19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $0.02 \pm(0.04)$ $0.02 \pm(0.04)$ | 2.66 2.96 | $\begin{aligned} & 27.78 \\ & 22.22 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.02 \\ & 10.30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA（copopoda） Epischura spp． | $0.14 \pm(0.85)$ | 0.05 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.00 | 2.78 | 0.58 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DIPTERA (midges) } \\ & \text { Chironomidae pupae } \\ & \text { Chironomidae larvae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.14 \pm(5.82) \\ & 1.34 \pm(3.58) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.98 \\ & 0.44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.0004 \pm(0.002)$ $0.03 \pm(0.15)$ | 0.08 <br> 4.52 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.70 \\ 22.22 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.41 \\ & 5.56 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisllies） Hydropsychidae Rhyacophilidae | $\begin{gathered} 8 \pm(18.72) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.60 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.007 \pm(0.02) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.27 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19.44 \\ 2.78 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.77 \\ & 0.57 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PLECOPTERA (stoneflies) } \\ & \text { Perlodidae } \\ & \text { Pteronarcyidae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.34 \pm(4.14) \\ & 0.09 \pm(0.28) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.44 \\ & 0.03 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \pm(0.006) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0008) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.89 \\ 8.33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.00 \\ & 1.71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| HEMIPTERA（bugs） Corixidae Notonectidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14 \pm(0.43) \\ & 0.03 \pm(0.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.001 \pm(0.008) \\ 0.0002 \pm(0.001) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 11.11 \\ 2.78 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.32 \\ & 0.58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（mayties） <br> Baetidae | 0．74土（2．65） | 0.24 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0008)$ | 0.03 | 8.33 | 1.76 |
| ODONATA（dragonflies） Zygopiera | $0.03 \pm(0.17)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0005)$ | 0.01 | 2.78 | 0.57 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { COLEOPTERA (beeves) } \\ & \text { EImidae } \end{aligned}$ | 0．14土（0．85） | 0.05 | 0．003 $\pm$（0．02） | 0.51 | 2.78 | 0.68 |
| HYORACHNELLLAE（spider） Hiydracarina | $0.14 \pm(0.69)$ | 0.05 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 5.56 | 1.15 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | $0.03 \pm(0.17)$ | 0.01 | 0．0土（0．0002） | 0.00 | 2.78 | 0.57 |
| Terrestrial | 23土（71） | 7.5 | $0.35 \pm(1.66)$ | 60.29 | 41.67 | 22.38 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.51 \pm(0.92)$ | 0.17 | $0.04 \pm(0.12)$ | 6.86 | 30.56 | 7.69 |
| Inorganic Detritus | $0.17 \pm(0.51)$ | 0.06 | $0.02 \pm(0.05)$ | 3.01 | 11.11 | 2.90 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.03 \pm(0.17)$ | 0.01 | $0.004 \pm(0.02)$ | 0.72 | 5.56 | 1.29 |

Table 3.5.13 The annual food preferences of 4+ Rainbow from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBEF } \\ & (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT (m } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\%$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { IRI } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) <br> Percidas <br> Unidentified fish Walloye eggs | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \pm(0.21) \\ & 0.02 \pm(0.15) \\ & 439 \pm(1226) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.01 \\ 0.00 \\ 82.56 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 001 \mathrm{f}(0.06) \\ 0.005 \pm(0.03) \\ 1.10 \pm(2.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.38 \\ 0.26 \\ 58.20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.65 \\ 2.33 \\ 20.93 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.27 \\ 0.54 \\ 33.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| ISOPODA (sow bugs) Asollus | $0.07 \pm(0.46)$ | 0.01 | $0.002 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.09 | 2.33 | 0.51 |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schoderi Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 6.91 \pm(30.61) \\ 60 \pm(239) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} 1.30 \\ 11.37 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \pm(0.006) \\ 0.01 \pm(0.03) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10 \\ & 0.95 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.63 \\ & 13.95 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.73 \\ 5.51 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| DECAPODA (craylish) Pacifasticus | $002 \pm(0.15)$ | 0.00 | $0.01 \pm(0.03)$ | 0.31 | 2.33 | 0.55 |
| BASOMMATOPHORA(snarl) Lymnaidae | $002 \pm$ (0.15) | 000 | $0.001 \pm(0.006)$ | 0.06 | 2.33 | 0.59 |
| MOLLUSKA (dam) <br> Sphaeriidae | $0.07 \pm(0.34)$ | 0.01 | $0.0005 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.03 | 4.65 | 0.98 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae <br> Tipulidae pupae Tipulidae larvae Simulideae larvae | $\begin{gathered} 0.37 \pm(1.00) \\ 0.56 \pm(2.41) \\ 0.72 \pm(2.20) \\ 0.91 \pm(3.27) \\ 4.16 \pm(27.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.10 \\ & 0.14 \\ & 0.17 \\ & 0.78 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0001 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.003 \pm(0.015) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.08 \\ & 0.06 \\ & 0.14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.60 \\ 9.30 \\ 13.95 \\ 9.30 \\ 2.33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.92 \\ & 1.98 \\ & 2.97 \\ & 2.00 \\ & 0.68 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) Hydropsychidae Brachycentridae | $\begin{gathered} 2.74 \pm(10.30) \\ 0.35 \pm(2.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.52 \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.003 \pm(0.01) \\ & 0.002 \pm(0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.18 \\ & 0.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.95 \\ 2.33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.07 \\ & 0.52 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { PLECOPTERA (stoneflies) } \\ \text { Perlodidae } \\ \text { Pteronarcyidae } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.28 \pm(1.40) \\ & 0.14 \pm(0.56) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \\ & 0.03 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \pm(0.002) \\ 00 \pm(0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.98 \\ & 6.98 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.48 \\ 1.49 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | 0.05 $\pm(0.21)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.00 | 4.65 | 0.98 |
| $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.35 \pm(1.99) \\ & 0.02 \pm(0.15) \\ & 005 \pm(0.30) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0002 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0) \\ 0.0 \pm(0.0002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.98 \\ & 2.33 \\ & 2.33 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.48 \\ & 0.49 \\ & 4.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| OLIGOCHEATA (worms) Lumbriculidae | $0.44 \pm(2.10)$ | 0.08 | $0.03 \pm(0.15)$ | 1.46 | 4.65 | 1.3 |
| COLEOPTERA (beetles) | $0.02 \pm(0.15)$ | 0.00 | $0.003 \pm(0.02)$ | 0.18 | 2.33 | 0.52 |
| OTHER: <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 12 \pm(39) \\ 1.16 \pm(1.34) \\ 0.19 \pm(0.50) \\ 0.12 \pm(0.50) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.36 \\ & 0.22 \\ & 0.03 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \pm(0.52) \\ 0.27 \pm(1.23) \\ 0.23 \pm(1.23) \\ 0.004 \pm(0.02) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.40 \\ 14.58 \\ 12.11 \\ 0.20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34.88 \\ 48.84 \\ 13.95 \\ 6.98 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.78 \\ 13.34 \\ 5.47 \\ 1.51 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Table 3.5.14 The annual food preferences of $5+$ Rainbow from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW ( $\mathrm{N}=14$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE |  | WEIGHT |  | OOCURPENCE |  |
| PREY TEM | $(\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. })$ | (\%) | $(\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. })$ | (\%) | (\%) | (\%) |
| OSTEICHTHYES (bish) Walleye eggs | $858 \pm(2276)$ | 83.21 | $1.52 \pm(3.95)$ | 38.50 | 35.71 | 25.62 |
| AMPHIPODA (scuds) Garmmerus | $0.07 \pm(0.27)$ | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 7.14 | 1.16 |
| CLADOCERA (water fieas) <br> Daphnia schadteri <br> Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 2.79 \pm(10.42) \\ 135 \pm(507) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.27 \\ 13.15 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.04 \pm(0.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 1.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.14 $7.14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.21 \\ & 3.47 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepoda) Epischura spp. | 16土(62) | 1.61 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.00 | 7.14 | 1.43 |
| BASOMMATOPHORA (snail) <br> Lymneidae <br> Planorbidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \pm(0.27) \\ & 0.14 \pm(0.53) \end{aligned}$ | 0.01 <br> 0.01 | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \pm(0.009) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.001) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.14 \\ & 7.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.17 \\ & 1.17 \end{aligned}$ |
| MOLLUSKA (clam) Sphaeriidae | $0.14 \pm(0.36)$ | 0.01 | $0.001 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.03 | 14.29 | 2.33 |
| DIPTERA (midges) <br> Chironomidae pupae Chironomidas larvae <br> Tipulidae pupae Tipulidae larvae | $\begin{gathered} 2.5 \pm(6.3) \\ 0.86 \pm(1.56) \\ 0.21 \pm(0.58) \\ 0.71 \pm(1.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.24 \\ & 0.08 \\ & 0.02 \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ | $0.0 \pm(0.0005)$ <br> $0.0004 \pm(0.001)$ <br> $0.0002 \pm(0.0005)$ <br> $0.001 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.03 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.02 | $\begin{aligned} & 21.43 \\ & 58.57 \\ & 14.29 \\ & 28.57 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2.33 3.53 4.67 2.33 4.66 |
| TRICOPTERA (caddistlies) <br> Limnephilidae <br> Hydropsychidae <br> Heliopsyctidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14 \pm(0.53) \\ & 0.14 \pm(0.36) \\ & 0.14 \pm(0.53) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \pm(0.08) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.0005 \pm(0.002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.53 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.14 14.29 7.14 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.25 \\ & 2.33 \\ & 1.17 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EPHEMEROPTERA (maytlies) <br> Baetidae <br> HYDRACH | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.02 | $0.0004 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.01 | 50.00 | 2.33 |
| HYDRACHNELLLAE (spider) Hydracarina | $0.07 \pm(0.27)$ | 0.01 | -0.0土(0.0003) | 0.00 | 7.14 | 1.16 |
| DTHER: <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 10.14 \pm(22.66) \\ 1.79 \pm(1.25) \\ 0.43 \pm(0.65) \\ 0.36 \pm(0.84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.98 \\ & 0.17 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \pm(0.16) \\ & 2.19 \pm(3.49) \\ & 0.08 \pm(0.21) \\ & 0.02 \pm(0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.76 \\ 55.51 \\ 1.97 \\ 0.53 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.86 \\ & 78.57 \\ & 35.71 \\ & 21.43 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.42 \\ 21.87 \\ 6.14 \\ 3.58 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Table 3.5.15 The annual food preferences of 6+ Rainbow trout from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | RAINBOW TROUT ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | NUMBER |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT (mg) } \\ & (\dot{\mathrm{x}} \pm \text { S.D. }) \quad(\%) \end{aligned}$ |  | DCARRENCE (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schedleri Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{aligned} & 103 \pm(0.0) \\ & 250 \pm(0.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.1 \\ & 70.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.004 \pm(0.0) \\ & 0.081 \pm(0.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.5 \\ 69.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & 100 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.5 \\ 47.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| OTHER: <br> Unidentifiable bodies | $1 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.28 | $0.03 \pm(0.0)$ | 27.2 | 100 | 25.5 |

The highest weight frequency values were for walleye eggs at $0.28 \pm$ 1.5 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by organic detritus (plant matter) at $0.23 \pm 1.2 \mathrm{mg}$ and terrestrial insects at $0.09 \pm 0.68 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for walleye eggs at $18.0 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $15.0 \%$ and terrestrial insects at 6.3\% (Table 3.58).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schodleri at $40.8 \%$, followed by terrestrial insects at $39.0 \%$ and organic detritus at 34.1\% (Table 3.5.8)

The highest IRI values were for walleye eggs at $34.6 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $28.6 \%$ and terrestrial insects at $12.4 \%$ (Table 3.5.8).

## Annual Feeding Habits of 0+ Rainbow Trout for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $0+$ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.9.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri at $109 \pm$ 323 per stomach, followed by terrestrial insects at $11 \pm 33$ and Chironomidae pupae (midges) at $6 \pm 17$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schadleri at $82.2 \%$, followed by terrestrial insects at $8.4 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $4.5 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus at $0.03 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by D. schødleri at $0.01 \pm$ 0.02 mg and unidentifiable body parts at $0.01 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $45.2 \%$, followed by $\boldsymbol{D}$. schndleri at $16.8 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $13.9 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for terrestrial insects at $56.4 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $41.0 \%$ and $D$. schodleri at $38.5 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schødleri at $26.7 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $14.3 \%$ and terrestrial insects at $14.3 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 1+ Rainbow Trout for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of 1+ Rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.10.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schndleri at $353 \pm$ 950 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $12 \pm 52$ and Chironomidae pupae at $6.8 \pm 22$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schedleri at $92.1 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $3.3 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $1.8 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae (perch or walleye) at $0.06 \pm 0.36 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by terrestrial insects at $0.04 \pm 0.09 \mathrm{mg}$ and $D$. schodleri at $0.03 \pm 0.05 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $42.5 \%$, followed by terrestrial insects at $27.1 \%$ and D. schndleri at $20.2 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $62.5 \%$, followed by terrestrial insects at $40.0 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at 25.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schndleri at $37.0 \%$, followed by terrestrial insects at $14.5 \%$ and Percidae at $9.5 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 2+ Rainbow Trout for 1989

information for yearly feeding habits of 2+ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.11.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri at $337 \pm$ 839 per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $65 \pm 306$ and Chironomidae larvae (midges) at $64 \pm 447$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schndleri at $60.0 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $11.7 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $11.5 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus at $0.19 \pm 1.04 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by Walleye eggs at $0.10 \pm$ 0.72 mg and inorganic detritus (rocks) at $0.04 \pm 0.25 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $42.8 \%$, followed by Walleye eggs at $22.4 \%$ and inorganic detritus at $9.7 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schodleri at $56.9 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $31.4 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae and Chironomidae pupae, both at 29.4\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $25.7 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $15.6 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $10.1 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 3+ Rainbow Trout for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.12.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $191 \pm$ 680 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $77 \pm 182$ and terrestrial insects at $23 \pm 71$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at $62.4 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $25.2 \%$ and terrestrial insects at 7.5\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for terrestrial insects at $0.35 \pm 1.66 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by Percidae at $0.08 \pm$ 0.49 mg and organic detritus at $0.04 \pm 0.12 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for terrestrial insects at 60.3\%, followed by Percidae at $14.5 \%$ and organic detritus at $6.9 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for terrestrial insects at $41.7 \%$, followed by organic detritus and Chironomidae larvae at $30.6 \%$ and D. schødleri at 27.8\%.

The highest IRI values were for terrestrial insects at $22.4 \%$, followed by D. schødleri at $19.0 \%$ and L. kindtii at $10.3 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Rainbow Trout for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.513.

The highest number frequency values were for walleye eggs at $439 \pm$ 1226 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $60 \pm 239$ and terrestrial insects at $12 \pm 38$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Walleye eggs at $\mathbf{8 2 . 6 \%}$, followed by L. kindtii at $\mathbf{1 1 . 4 \%}$ and terrestrial insects at 2.4\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for walleye eggs at $\mathbf{1} .10 \pm$ $\mathbf{2 . 4 6} \mathbf{~ m g}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by organic detritus at $0.27 \pm$ 1.23 mg and inorganic detritus at $0.23 \pm 1.23 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for walleye eggs at $58.2 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $\mathbf{1 4 . 6 \%}$ and inorganic detritus at $\mathbf{1 2 . 1 \%}$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for organic detritus at $48.8 \%$, followed by terrestrial insects at $34.9 \%$ and walleye eggs at 20.9\%.

The highest IRI values were for walleye eggs at $33.9 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $13.3 \%$ and terrestrial insects at $9.8 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 5+ Rainbow Trout for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $5+$ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.14.

The highest number frequency values were for walleye eggs at $858 \pm$ 2276 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $135 \pm 507$ and Epischura (copepod water fleas) at $16 \pm 62$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Walleye eggs at $83.2 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $13.2 \%$ and Epischura at 1.6\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus at $2.19 \pm 3.49 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by walleye eggs at $1.52 \pm$ 3.95 mg and L. kindtii at $0.04 \pm 0.15 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $55.6 \%$, followed by Walleye eggs at $38.5 \%$ and inorganic detritus at $2.0 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for organic detritus at $78.6 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $58.6 \%$ and terrestrial insects at 42.9\%.

The highest IRI values were for walleye eggs a? $25.6 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $21.9 \%$ and terrestrial insects at $7.4 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 6+ Rainbow Trout for 7989

Information for yearly feeding habits of 6+ rainbow trout is presented in Table 3.5.15.

The highest number frequency values were for L. kindtii at $250 \pm 0.0$ per stomach, followed by D. schødleri at $103 \pm 0.0$ and unidentifiable body parts at $1 \pm 0.0$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for L. kindtii at $70.6 \%$, followed by $D$. schødleri at $29.1 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $0.3 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for L. kindtii at $0.08 \pm 0.0$ mg dry weight per stomach, followed by unidentifiable body parts at 0.03 $\pm 0.0 \mathrm{mg}$ and $D$. schødleri at $0.004 \pm 0.0 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for L. kindtii at $69.2 \%$, followed by unidentifiable body parts at $27.2 \%$ and D. schadleri at $3.5 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for L. kindtii, unidentifiable body parts, and D. schødleri each at 100.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for L. kindtii at $47.8 \%$, followed by $D$. schodleri at $26.5 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $25.5 \%$.

### 3.5.3 Annual Feeding Habits of Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of walleye is presented in Table 3.5.16. Monthly values can be found in Appendix F.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri (large water fleas) at $5.6 \pm 67$ per stomach, followed by Bosminidae (small water fleas) at $3 \pm 48$ and L. kindtii (large water fleas) at $1.6 \pm 18$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schødleri at $32.5 \%$, followed by Bosminidae at $17.5 \%$ and L. kindtii at $9.3 \%$, (Table 3.5.16).

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae (perch or walleye) at $0.42 \pm 0.99 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach followed by Salmonidae (salmon, trout or whitefish) at $0.18 \pm 0.93 \mathrm{mg}$ and unidentifiable fish at $0.13 \pm 0.32$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $36.0 \%$, followed by Salmonidae at $15.7 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $11.9 \%$, (Table 3.5.16).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable body parts at $29.6 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $24.1 \%$ and Cottidae (sculpins) at 22.6\%, (Table 3.5.16).

The highest IRI values were for Percidae at $13.4 \%$, followed by unidentifiable body parts at $10.6 \%$ and D. schødleri and Cottidae both at 10.4\%, (Table 3.5.16).

## Annual Feeding Habits of 0+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $0+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.17.

## Table 3．5．16 The annual food preferences of Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | WALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=257$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ＇RN TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBEF } \\ & \left(\bar{X}_{ \pm} \text {S.D. }\right) \end{aligned}$ | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | DOCURRENCE <br> \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| ISTEICHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catastomidae | $0.03 \pm(0.29)$ | 0.20 | 0．04土（0．27） | 3.90 | 1.60 | 1.50 |
| Centrachidae | $001 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.07 | $0.01 \pm(0.09)$ | 1.10 | 0.78 | 0.50 |
| cottidae | $1.1 \pm$（3．5） | 6.60 | $0.11 \mathrm{f}(0.60)$ | 10.00 | 22.60 | 10.40 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.15 \pm(0.61)$ | 0.89 | $0.12 \pm(0.49)$ | 10.00 | 9.00 | 5.40 |
| Percidae | $0.25 \pm(1.0)$ | 1.50 | $0.42 \pm(0.99)$ | 36.00 | 1400 | 13.40 |
| Salmonidae | $0.03 \pm(0.19)$ | 0.18 | $0.18 \pm(0.93)$ | 15.70 | 3.00 | 4.90 |
| Unidentilied fish | $058 \pm(1.6)$ | 3.40 | $0.13 \pm(0.32)$ | 11.90 | 24.10 | 10.30 |
| MPHIPODA（sards） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOPODA（sow bugs） Asellus | $0.01 \pm(0.18)$ | 0.07 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.12 |
| ＇LADOCERA（water fleas） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphna schsdleri | $5.6 \pm(67)$ | 32.50 | $0.00 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.01 | 7.00 | 10.40 |
| Daphnia thorata | $0.25 \pm$（3．8） | 1.50 | $0.00 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.00 | 1.20 | 0.70 |
| Daphnia galeata mendota | $0.96 \pm$（12） | 5.60 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.03 | 0.78 | 1.70 |
| Leptodwa kindtii | 1．6土（18） | 9.30 | ．0003 $\pm(0.002)$ | 0.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| Polyphemius pediciulus | $004 \pm(0.52)$ | 0.27 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.30 |
| Eurycerus lamellatus | $0.007 \pm(0.12)$ | 0.04 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.11 |
| Sida crystalline | $0.01 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.07 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.22 |
| Bosmina spo． | $3.0 \pm(48)$ | 17.50 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 0.39 | 4.70 |
| Alona spp． | 0．01士（0．15） | 0.09 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.00 | 1.20 | 0.33 |
| EUCOPEPCOA（copepoda） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyctops spp． | $0.01 \pm(0.13)$ | 0.17 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.22 |
| Diaptornus spp． | $0.07 \pm(0.78)$ | 0.40 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 0.78 | 0.31 |
| Epischura spp． | $0.70 \pm(8.8)$ | 0.41 | $0.00 \pm(0.0005)$ | 0.00 | 2.00 | 1.60 |
| Bryocamplus | $0.003 \pm(0.06)$ | 0.02 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.11 |
| JSTRACODA（seed shrimp） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chiiommidae pupae $0.33 \pm(1.4)$ 1.90 $0.0004 \pm(0.003)$ 0.04 14.00 4.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae larvae | 1．4土（6．7） | 8.10 | 0．0003土（0．002） | 0.03 | 11.00 | 4.90 |
| Tipuiidae larvae | $0.007 \pm(0.12)$ | 0.04 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.03 | 0.39 | 0.10 |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisflies） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HEMIPTERA（bugs） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | 0．007士（0．08） | 0.04 | 0．0005 $\pm(0.005)$ | 0.05 | 0.78 | 0.20 |
| Terrestrial | $012 \pm(0.60)$ | 0.69 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.02 | 5.80 | 1.70 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.3 \pm(0.66)$ | 1.70 | $0.02 \pm(0.12)$ | 1.90 | 21.00 | 6.60 |
| Inorganic Detritus | 0．04士（0．31） | 0.25 | 0．006士（0．04） | 0.57 | 2.30 | 0.80 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.45 \pm(0.85)$ | 2.60 | 0．09土0（ 30 ） | 8.00 | 29.60 | 10.60 |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Table 3．5．17 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The annual food preferences of } 0+\text { Walleye from } \\ \text { Lake Roosevelt In } 1988 .\end{array}\end{array}$

|  | WALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=23$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ＇REY ITEM | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { NUMBER } \\ (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) & \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $$ |  | pocurrence | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & (\% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ISTEICHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cottidae | 0．08土0（．41） | 0.07 | $0.005 \pm(0.02)$ | 24.1 | 4.4 | 6.4 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.34 \pm(1.0)$ | 0.28 | $0.01 \pm(0.05)$ | 56.7 | 13.0 | 15.8 |
| Percidae | $0.08 \pm(0.28)$ | 0.07 | 0．0005 $\pm$（0．002） | 2.6 | 9.0 | 3.0 |
| Unidentified fish | $004 \pm(0.20)$ | 0.03 | $0.0007 \pm(0.002)$ | 3.8 | A A | 1.8 |
| MPHIPODA（scuds） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0．04土（0．20） | 0.03 | $0.00 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.03 | A A | 0.99 |
| ：LADOCERA（water fleas） Daphnia schadleri |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schedleri Daphnia thorata | $\begin{array}{r} 61 \pm(221) \\ 2.8 \pm(12) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48.3 \\ 2.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.001) \end{gathered}$ | 1.6 0.03 | $\begin{aligned} & 47.8 \\ & 13.0 \end{aligned}$ | 22.0 3.4 |
| Daphnia galeata mendota | $1 \mathrm{Of}(40)$ | 8.6 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.88 | 9.0 | 4.0 |
| Leptodora kindöi | $1.6 \pm(18)$ | 0.9 | 0．00士（0．0005） | 0.03 | 9.0 | 2.0 |
| Polyphemius pediciulus | $0.52 \pm(1.7)$ | 0.41 | 0．00士（0．0001） | 0.18 | 8.7 | 2.1 |
| Sida crys tallina | $0.04 \pm(0.20)$ | 0.03 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.03 | 4.4 | 1.0 |
| Bosmina spp． | 34土（ 163） | 26.9 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.03 | 4.4 | 7.1 |
| UCOPEPODA（copepods） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Episctura spp． | $7.8 \pm$（29） | 6.2 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 1.2 | 17.0 | 5.6 |
| Bryocamptus spp． | 0．04土（0．20） | 0.03 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0009)$ | 1.1 | 4.4 | 1.2 |
| IIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | 0．47 $\pm$（1．1） | 0.38 | 0．00（0．0007） | 0.03 | 21.7 | 5.0 |
| Chironornidae larvae | $7 \pm(17)$ | 5.6 | $0.001 \pm(0.004)$ | 4.0 | 8.7 | 4.1 |
| Tipulidae larvae | $0.08 \pm(0.41)$ | 0.07 | 0．00 $\pm(0.0003)$ | 0.03 | A A | 1.0 |
| IEMIPTERA（bugs） <br> Corixidae | $004 \pm$（0．20） | 0.03 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.12 | A A | 1.0 |
| THER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organic Detritus | $0.13 \pm(0.34)$ | 0.10 | $0.0006 \pm(0.003)$ | 3.3 | 13.0 | 3.7 |
| Unidentitiable bodies | $0.39 \pm(0.49)$ | 0.31 | $0.00 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.03 | 39.1 | 8.9 |

Table 3.5.18 The annual food preferences of $1+$ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt In 1988.

|  | WALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=27$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ \left(\dot{x}_{ \pm} \text {S.D. }\right) \end{array}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mg) } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { pOCNRRENCA } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (Fish) COttidae Percidae Unidentifiable fish | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \pm(2.1) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.19) \\ 0.40 \pm(1.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \\ & 0.19 \\ & 2.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \pm(0.15) \\ & 0.07 \pm(0.29) \\ & 0.07 \pm(0.13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.8 \\ 27.0 \\ 27.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.7 \\ 3.7 \\ 22.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.9 \\ 7.3 \\ 12.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schedleri Leptodora kindtii Eurycerus lamellatus Sida crystallina Alona affins | $\begin{gathered} 62 \pm(2.0) \\ 14 \pm(56) \\ 0.07 \pm(.38) \\ 0.07 \pm(.38) \\ 0.07 \pm(0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.2 \\ 72.6 \\ 0.38 \\ 0.38 \\ 0.38 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ <br> $0.002 \pm(0.006)$ <br> $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ <br> $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ <br> $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.04 \\ & 0.91 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.0 \\ & 7.4 \\ & 3.7 \\ & 3.7 \\ & 7.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.4 \\ 19.2 \\ 1.0 \\ 1.0 \\ 1.8 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EUCOPEPODA (oopepods) } \\ & \text { Diaptomus spp. } \\ & \text { Epischura } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.66 \pm(2.4) \\ 0.07 \pm(.38) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \\ & 0.38 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \\ & 3.7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.6 \\ 1.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { OSTRACODA (seed shrimp) } \\ \text { Cyptidae } \end{array}$ | $0.51 \pm(2.5)$ | 2.6 | 0.0土 (.0001) | 0.00 | 7.4 | 2.3 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \pm(0.57) \\ 0.40 \pm(1.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1 \\ 2.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0002 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0007) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.09 \\ & 0.03 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.0 \\ 18.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.6 \\ & 4.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| OTHER <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0.40 \pm(1.3) \\ 0.18 \pm(0.48) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.19) \\ 0.44 \pm(0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \\ & 0.95 \\ & 0.19 \\ & 2.2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0007 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.004 \pm(0.009) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.04 \pm(0.119) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ 1.6 \\ 0.04 \\ 18.0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.0 \\ 14.0 \\ 3.7 \\ 37.0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.2 \\ 4.1 \\ 0.93 \\ 13.5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Table 3.5.19 The annual food preferences of 2+ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt In 1988.

|  | WALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (m) <br> (\%) | DOCURRENCE <br> (\%) | IRI <br> (\%) |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cottidae | $0.61 \pm(1.5)$ | 17.0 | $0.08 \pm(0.27)$ | 16.1 | 28.6 | 16.6 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.04 \pm(0.21)$ | 1.3 | $0.02 \pm(0.10)$ | 52 | 4.8 | 3.1 |
| Percidae | $0.19 \pm(0.67)$ | 5.3 | $0.23 \pm(0.71)$ | 40.9 | 9.5 | 15.0 |
| Salmonidae | $0.09 \pm(0.30)$ | 2.6 | $0.004 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.83 | 9.5 | 3.5 |
| Unidentified fish | $0.57 \pm(1.6)$ | 15.8 | $0.05 \pm(0.12)$ | 10.0 | 38.1 | 17.4 |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schadieri | $0.85 \pm$ (3.9) | 23.6 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.01 | 4.8 | 7.6 |
| Alona affins | $0.09 \pm(0.43)$ | 2.6 | $0.00 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.00 | 4.8 | 20 |
| EUCOPEPOOA (copepods) Cyctops spp. | $0.09 \pm(0.43)$ | 2.6 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 4.8 | 2.0 |
| OIPTERA (midges) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae larvae | $0.23 \pm(0.88)$ | 6.6 | $0.001 \pm(0.004)$ | 0.22 | 9.5 | 4.4 |
| HEMPTERA (bugs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corixidas | 0.04 $\pm$ (0.21) | 1.3 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.02 | 4.8 | 1.6 |
| OTHER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $014 \pm(0.47)$ | 3.9 | $0.0003 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.06 | 9.5 | 3.6 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.57 \pm(0.87)$ | 15.0 | $0.11 \mathrm{f}(0.35)$ | 20.5 | 38.1 | 20.0 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $004 \pm(0.21)$ | 1.3 | $0.03 \pm(0.10)$ | 5.6 | 4.7 | 3.2 |

Table 3．5．20 The annual food preferences of 3＋Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | WALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=83$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $$ |  | $\begin{array}{cr} \text { WEIGHT } & (\mathrm{mg}) \\ (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) & \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { TCOURRENCE } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { IRI } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| JSTEICHTHYES（ish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Calastomidae | $0.01 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.23 | 0．04土（0．21） | 2.3 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Centrachidae | $0.02 \pm(0.15)$ | 0.47 | $0.04 \pm(0.19)$ | 2.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| Cottidae | $1.7 \pm$（3．7） | 33.5 | $0.28 \pm(0.85)$ | 13.7 | 31.0 | 21.5 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.20 \pm(0.80)$ | 3.9 | $0.41 \pm(1.0)$ | 20.0 | 9.6 | 9.2 |
| Percidae | $0.42 \pm(1.6)$ | 8.2 | $0.65 \pm(1.3)$ | 31.4 | 16.8 | 15.0 |
| Salmonidae | $0.02 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.47 | $0.15 \pm(0.70)$ | 7.5 | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| Unidentified fish | 0．57士（1．5） | 11.00 | $0.36 \pm(0.56)$ | 17.5 | 25.0 | 14.0 |
| CLADOCERA（water fleas） Daphnia schedteri | $0.12 \pm(1.0)$ | 2.3 | 0．0007士（0．0003） | 0.00 | 1.2 | 0.97 |
| EUCOPEPODA（oopepocts） Cyctops spp． | $0.01 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.23 | 0．0001 $\pm$（0．0005） | 0.01 | 1.2 | 0.40 |
| DIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | $0.44 \pm(1.6)$ | 8.6 | $0.001 \pm(0.007)$ | 0.07 | 14.0 | 6.3 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $0.68 \pm(4.6)$ | 13.3 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.01 | 6.0 | 5.3 |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisflies） Hydropsychidae | $0.02 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.47 | $0.00 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.00 | 1.2 | 0.46 |
| HEMAPTERA（bugs） Corixidae | $0.01 \pm(1.0)$ | 0.23 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 1.2 | 0.39 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $0.13 \pm(0.53)$ | 2.5 | $0.00 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.02 | 8.4 | 3.0 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.27 \pm(0.66)$ | 5.4 | $0.03 \pm(0.07)$ | 1.5 | 19.0 | 7.1 |
| Inorganic Oetritus | $0.07 \pm(0.40)$ | 1.4 | $0.03 \pm(0.10)$ | 1.6 | 3.6 | 1.8 |
| Unidentifable bodies | $0.36 \pm(0.80)$ | 7.0 | $0.04 \pm(0.15)$ | 1.9 | 21.6 | 8.4 |

Table 3.521 The annual food preferences of 4+ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | WALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=89$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMB } \\ (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { pocurreica } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \|R\| } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catastomidae | $0.02 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.42 | $0.007 \pm(0.04)$ | 0.53 | 1.1 | 0.56 |
| Centrachidae | $0.01 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.21 | 0.01 $\pm$ (0.09) | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.63 |
| Cotridae | $1.2 \pm(4.5)$ | 22.6 | $0.14 \pm(0.81)$ | 10.0 | 15.0 | 13.2 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.12 \pm(0.39)$ | 2.3 | $0.09 \pm(0.32)$ | 6.3 | 10.0 | 5.1 |
| Percidae | $0.20 \pm(0.56)$ | 3.8 | $0.56 \pm(0.98)$ | 38.5 | 15.0 | 15.5 |
| Salrnonidae | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.42 | $0.30 \pm(1.35)$ | 20.9 | 2.2 | 6.4 |
| Unidentified fish | $0.77 \pm(2.1)$ | 14.4 | $0.11 \pm(0.24)$ | 7.6 | 24.7 | 12.7 |
| ISOPODA (sow bugs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asellus | $0.03 \pm(0.31)$ | 0.63 | $0.0007 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.01 | 1.1 | 0.48 |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schodleri | $0.01 \pm(0.10)$ | 0.21 | 0.00 $\pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 1.1 | 0.36 |
| Leptodora kindtii | $0.25 \pm(2.4)$ | 4.8 | $0.0006 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.00 | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| DIPTERA (midges) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | $0.32 \pm(1.1)$ | 6.0 | $0.0006 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.05 | 15.0 | 5.6 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $1.3 \pm(4.8)$ | 24.2 | $0.0001 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.01 | 13.0 | 10.0 |
| OTHER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | $0.02 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.42 | $0.001 \pm(0.009)$ | 0.11 | 2.3 | 0.76 |
| Terrestrial | $0.06 \pm(0.44)$ | 1.2 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.01 | 3.3 | 1.3 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.34 \pm(0.72)$ | 6.5 | $0.01 \pm(0.03)$ | 0.87 | 24.7 | 8.7 |
| Inorganic Detritus | $0.03 \pm(0.31)$ | 0.63 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.02 | 1.1 | 0.48 |
| Unidentifable bodies | $0.60 \pm(1.0)$ | 11.0 | $0.21 \pm(0.47)$ | 141 | 348 | 16.4 |

Table 3.5.22 The annual food preferences of $5+$ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.


Table 3.5.23 The annual food preferences of 6+ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | WALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMB } \\ (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | pOCURRENCE (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) <br> Cyprinidae <br> Percidae | $\begin{array}{r} 0.33 \pm(0.57) \\ 1.6 \pm(2.08) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} 8.3 \\ 41.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.39 \pm(0.67) \\ & 2.71 \pm(2.35) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11.9 83.5 | $33.3$ $66.1$ | 13.4 <br> 48.0 |
| OTHER: Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0.33 \pm(0.57) \\ 1.6 \pm(1.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.3 \\ 41.7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0004 \pm(0.0008) \\ 0.15 \pm(0.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.01 4.5 | 33.3 <br> 66.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 10.4 \\ 28.2 \end{array}$ |

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $61 \pm$ 221 per stomach, followed by Bosminidae at $34 \pm 163$ and Daphnia galeata mendota (large water fleas) at $10 \pm 40$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schødleri at $48.3 \%$, followed by Bosminidae at $26.9 \%$ and D. galeata mendota at $8.6 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Cyprinidae (minnows, carp, squawfish), at $0.01 \pm 0.05 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach followed by Cottidae at $0.005 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{mg}$ and Chironomidae larvae (midges) at $0.001 \pm$ 0.004 mg . The highest percent composition by weight values were for Cyprinidae at $56.7 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $24.1 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at 4.0\%.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $47.8 \%$, followed by unidentifiable body parts at $39.1 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae (midges) at 21.7\%.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schødleri at $22.0 \%$. followed by Cyprinidae at $15.8 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $8.9 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 1+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $1+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.18.

The highest number frequency values were for L. kindtii at $14 \pm 56$ per stomach, followed by Cottidae at $1.1 \pm 2.1$ and Diaptomus (copepod water fleas) at $0.66 \pm 2.41$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for L. kindtii at $72.6 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $5.7 \%$ and Diaptomus at $3.4 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for unidentifiable fish at $0.07 \pm 0.13 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach followed by Percidae at $0.07 \pm 0.29$ mg and Cottidae at $.06 \pm 0.15 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for unidentifiable fish at $27.5 \%$, followed by Percidae at $27.0 \%$ and Cottidae at $24.8 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Cottidae at $40.7 \%$, followed by unidentifiable body parts at $37.0 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $22.2 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for L. kindtii at 19.2\%, followed by Cottidae at $16.9 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $13.5 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 2+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $2+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.19.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schødleri at $0.85 \pm$ 3.9 per stomach, followed by Cottidae at $0.61 \pm 1.5$ and organic detritus at $0.6 \pm 0.9$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at 24\%, followed by Cottidae at 17\%, and organic detritus (plant matter) and unidentifiable fish both at $15.8 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae at $0.23 \pm$ 0.71 mg dry weight per stomach followed by organic detritus at $0.11 \pm$ 0.35 mg and Cottidae at $0.08 \pm 0.27 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $40.9 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $20.5 \%$ and Cottidae at $16.1 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for organic detritus and unidentifiable fish, both at $38.1 \%$, followed by Cottidae at 28.6\%.

The highest IRI values were for organic detritus at $20.0 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $17.4 \%$ and Cottidae at $16.6 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 3+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.20.

The highest number frequency values were for Cottidae at $1.70 \pm 3.7$ per stomach, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $0.68 \pm 4.6$ and unidentifiable fish at $0.57 \pm 1.5$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Cottidae at $34 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $13.3 \%$, and unidentifiable fish at $11 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae at $0.65 \pm 1.3$ mg dry weight per stomach followed by Cyprinidae at $0.41 \pm 1.0 \mathrm{mg}$ and unidentifiable fish at $0.36 \pm 0.56 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $31 \%$, followed by Cyprinidae at $20 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $18 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Cottidae at $31 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $25 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $22 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for Cottidae at $22 \%$, followed by Percidae at $16 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $15 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ walleye is presented in Table 3.521.

The highest number frequency values were for Chironomidae larvae at $1.3 \pm 4.8$ per stomach, followed by Cottidae at $1.2 \pm 4.5$ and unidentifiable fish at $0.8 \pm 2.1$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Chironomidae larvae at $24.2 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $22.6 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $14.4 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae at $0.56 \pm$ 0.98 mg dry weight per stomach followed by Salmonidae at $0.30 \pm 1.35 \mathrm{mg}$ and unidentifiable body parts at $0.21 \pm 0.47 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $38.5 \%$, followed by Salmonidae at $20.9 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $14.1 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable body parts at $34.8 \%$, followed by organic detritus and unidentifiable fish, both at $24.7 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for unidentifiable body parts at $16.4 \%$, followed by Percidae at $15.5 \%$ and Cottidae at $13.2 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 5+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $5+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.22.

The highest number frequency values were for Chironomidae larvae at $1.1 \pm 3.6$ per stomach, followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.9 \pm 1.81$ and Catastomidae (suckers) at $0.54 \pm 1.2$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Chironomidae larvae at $27.3 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $22.7 \%$ and Catastomidae at $13.6 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Salmonidae at $0.73 \pm$ 1.35 mg dry weight per stomach followed by Catastomidae at $0.49 \pm 0.90$ mg and unidentifiable fish at $0.27 \pm 0.45 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Salmonidae at $43.7 \%$, followed by Catastomidae at $29.1 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $16.2 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable body parts at $45.5 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $36.4 \%$, and Catastomidae and Salmonidae, both at 18.2\%.

The highest IRI values were for unidentifiable fish at $19.8 \%$, followed by Salmonidae at $17.4 \%$ and Catastomidae at $16.0 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 6+ Walleye for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $6+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.23.

The highest number frequency values were for unidentifiable body parts at $1.6 \pm 1.52$ per stomach, followed by Percidae at $1.6 \pm 2.08$ and Cyprinidae and organic detritus, both at $0.3 \pm 0.6$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for unidentifiable body parts and Percidae, both at $41.7 \%$, followed by Cyprinidae and organic detritus, both at 8.3\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae at $2.71 \pm$ 2.35 mg dry weight per stomach followed by Cyprinidae at $0.39 \pm 0.67 \mathrm{mg}$ and unidentifiable body parts at $0.15 \pm 0.23$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $83.5 \%$, followed by Cyprinidae at $12.0 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $4.5 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable body parts and Percidae, both at $66.7 \%$, followed by Cyprinidae and organic detritus, both at $33.3 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for Percidae at $48.0 \%$, followed by unidentifiable body parts at $28.2 \%$ and Cyprinidae at $13.4 \%$.

### 3.5.4 Annual Feeding Habits of Walleye for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of walleye is presented in Table 3.5.24. Monthly values can be found in Appendix F.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schødleri (water fleas) at $3.1 \pm 38$ per stomach, followed by L. kindtii (water fleas) at $2.6 \pm$ 24 and Chironomidae pupae (midges) at $1.7 \pm 6.9$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schødleri at $27.2 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $23.1 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at 15.4\% (Table 3.5.24).

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae (yellow perch and walleye) at $0.23 \pm 0.81 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.14 \pm 0.51 \mathrm{mg}$ and Salmonidae (salmon, trout, and white fish) at $\mathrm{G} .12 \pm 0.88 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $40.6 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $25.0 \%$ and Salmonidae at $21.0 \%$ (Table 3.5.24).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish at $44.6 \%$, followed by Cottidae (sculpins) at $24.2 \%$ and organic detritus (plant matter) at 21.1\% (Table 3.5.24).

The highest IRI values were for unidentifible fish at $21.1 \%$, followed by Percidae at $16.3 \%$ and Cottidae at $10.2 \%$ (Table 3.5.24).

## Annual Feeding Habits of 0+ Walleye for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $0+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.25.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schødleri at $23 \pm$ 103 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $20 \pm 64$ and Chironomidae pupae at $1.5 \pm 3.4$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schødleri at $49.5 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $42.1 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $3.3 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Catastomidae (suckers) at $0.02 \pm 0.10 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.02 \pm 0.05 \mathrm{mg}$ and Percidae at $0.02 \pm 0.06 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Catastomidae at $\mathbf{2 8 . 5 \%}$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $27.0 \%$ and Percidae at $24.5 \%$.

Table 3．5．24 The annual food preferences of Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | WALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=289$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3REY ITEM | NUMB |  | WEIGHT |  | OCOURPENCE | IRI |
|  | （ $\dot{X}+$ S．D．） | \％ | （ X $^{+}$S．D．） | （\％） | （\％） | \％ |
| JSTEICHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Catastomidae | $0.006 \pm(0.08)$ | 0.06 | $0.002 \pm(0.03)$ | 0.45 | 0.69 | 0.33 |
| Cotudae | 0．67 $\pm$（1．76） | 6.0 | 0．04士（0．12） | 7.7 | 24.2 | 10.2 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.09 \pm(0.76)$ | 0.83 | O．OIf（0．10） | 1.9 | 3.1 | 1.6 |
| Percidae | $0.28 \pm(0.87)$ | 2.5 | $0.23 \pm(0.81)$ | 40.6 | 17.0 | 16.3 |
| Salmonidae | ．003 $\pm$（0．20） | 30 | $0.12 \pm(0.88)$ | 21.0 | 3.4 | 6.7 |
| Unidentified fish | $0.91 \pm(1.6)$ | 7.9 | $0.14 \pm(0.51)$ | 25.0 | 44.6 | 21.1 |
| QMPHIPODA（scuds） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gammerus | $0.003 \pm(0.05)$ | 0.03 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.0 | 0.35 | 0.10 |
| Hyalella | $0.006 \pm(0.08)$ | 0.06 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.0 | 0.69 | 0.20 |
| SOPODA（sow bugs） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| こLADOCERA（water fleas） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schadleri | $3.1 \pm(38.0)$ | 27.2 | $0.0002 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.04 | 2.0 | 8.0 |
| Daphnia thorata | 0．09（ 1．6） | 0.83 | 0．0土（0．0） | 0.0 | 0.35 | 0.32 |
| Daphnia galeata mendotz | $0.01 \pm(0.18)$ | 0.12 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.0 | 0.35 | 0.13 |
| Leptodora kindtii | $1.6 \pm(24.0)$ | 23.0 | $0.0002 \pm(0.002)$ | 005 | 2.4 | 7.0 |
| EUCOPEPOOA（copepods） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BASOMMATOPHORA（snail） |  |  |  |  |  | 0.18 |
| MOLIUSKA（dam） <br> Sphaeriidae | $0.40 \pm(6.7)$ | 3.5 | $0.0005 \pm(0.009)$ | 0.10 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| DIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironornidae pupae | $1.7 \pm$（6．9） | 15.4 | $0.0003 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.07 | 19.0 | 9.3 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $0.70 \pm(4.4)$ | 6.0 | $0.0001 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.03 | 11.0 | 4.6 |
| Simulidae pupae | $0.01 \pm(0.13)$ | 0.09 | 0．0土 0.0001 ） | 0.0 | 0.69 | 0.21 |
| Simulidae larvae | $0.03 \pm(0.50)$ | 0.33 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.0 | 0.35 | 0.28 |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisflies） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leptoceridae | $0.003 \pm(0.05)$ | 0.03 | 0．0土（0．0） | 0.0 | 0.35 | 0.10 |
| Hydropsychidae | $0.02 \pm(0.29)$ | 0.18 | $0.0 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.0 | 0.69 | 0.24 |
| PLECOPTERA（stonetios） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perkdidae | 0．03士（0．05） | 0.03 | 0．0土（0．0002） | 0.0 | 0.35 | 0.10 |
| Pteronarcyidae | $0.08 \pm(0.83)$ | 0.74 | $0.0 \pm(0.0008)$ | 0.02 | 2.0 | 0.77 |
|        <br> EPHEMEROPTERA（maytlies） $0.07 \pm(0.83)$ 0.62 $0.0 \pm 10.0002)$ 0.0 2.0 0.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baetidae | $0.07 \pm(0.83)$ | 0.62 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.73 |
| Heptagenidae | 0．05 $\pm$（0．88） | 0.45 | 0．0土 $\pm 0.0002)$ | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.69 |
| ODONATA（Dragonflies） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | $0.02 \pm(0.18)$ | 0.18 | 0．0006 $\pm$（0．008） | 0.12 | 1.0 | 0.36 |
| Terrestrial | $0.08 \pm(0.73)$ | 0.71 | 0．0土（0．0006） | 0.01 | 3.0 | 1.1 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.24 \pm(0.52)$ | 02.1 | $0.01 \pm(0.05)$ | 2.0 | 21.1 | 6.8 |
| Inorganic Detritus | $0.02 \pm(0.16)$ | 0.18 | $0.004 \pm(0.04)$ | 0.85 | 1.7 | 0.75 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.01 \pm(0.14)$ | 0.12 | $0.0 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.01 | 0.69 | 0.22 |

Table 3.5.25 The annual food preferences of $0+$ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | INALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{gathered}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mg) } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | pOCIPRENCE $\%$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { IRI } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) Catastomidae Cottidae Percidae Unidentified fish | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \pm(0.22) \\ 0.25 \pm(0.84) \\ 0.07 \pm(0.26) \\ 0.53 \pm(0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.11 \\ & 0.54 \\ & 0.16 \\ & 1.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \pm(0.10) \\ 0.009 \pm(0.04) \\ 0.02 \pm(0.06) \\ 002 \pm(0.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.5 \\ & 13.0 \\ & 24.5 \\ & 27.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.13 \\ 15.0 \\ 7.7 \\ 38.5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.71 \\ 89 \\ 9.7 \\ 20.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schederi Daphnia thorata Daphnia galeata Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 23.0 \pm(103.0) \\ 0.71 \pm(4.4) \\ 0.10 \pm(0.50) \\ 20.0 \pm(64.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.5 \\ & 1.52 \\ & 0.22 \\ & 42.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \pm(0.008) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.10) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.6 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 3.2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.0 \\ 2.6 \\ 2.6 \\ 18.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.5 \\ 1.2 \\ 0.83 \\ 19.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepoda) Bryocamptus spp. | $0.02 \pm(0.16)$ | 0.05 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 2.6 | 0.70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DIPTERA (midges) } \\ & \text { Chironomidae pupae } \\ & \text { Chironomidae larvae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \pm(3.4) \\ 0.23 \pm(0.77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \\ & 0.49 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0001 \pm(0.0009) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.20 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.6 \\ 10.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.7 \\ & 3.2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) Hydropsychidae | $0.07 \pm(0.48)$ | 0.16 | 0.00 $\pm(0.0002)$ | 0.06 | 2.6 | 0.83 |
| PLECOPTERA (stoneflies) Pteronarcyidae | $0.15 \pm(0.81)$ | 0.32 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.03 | 5.1 | 1.6 |
| OTHER: <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10 \pm(0.38) \\ & 0.02 \pm(0.16) \\ & 0.02 \pm(0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.22 \\ & 0.05 \\ & 0.05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.11 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.7 \\ & 2.6 \\ & 2.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \\ & 0.78 \\ & 0.80 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3．5．26 The annual food preferences of $1+$ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

| PREY TTEM | NALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=44$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER |  | WEIGHT（mg） |  | OCOURRENCE IRI |  |
|  | （ $\mathrm{X} \pm$ S．D．） | \％ | （ $\mathrm{X} \pm$ S．D．） | \％ | \％ | \％ |
| OSTEICHTHYES（ish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cottidae | $0.93 \pm$（2．42） | 22.7 | 0．054（0．13） | 10.5 | 29.6 | 17.7 |
| cyprinidae | 0．0W（0．36） | 2.2 | 0．04土 0.24 ） | 8.6 | 9.0 | 5.6 |
| Percidae | $0.27 \pm(0.58)$ | 6.6 | $0.26 \pm(0.65)$ | 54.2 | 27.3 | 24.9 |
| S a I－e | 0．04土（0．21） | 1.1 | 0．04土 0.27$)$ | 9.4 | 4.5 | 4.2 |
| Unidentifiable fish | $1.2 \pm(2.5)$ | 29.8 | $0.07 \pm(0.15)$ | 15.7 | 38.5 | 23.7 |
| CLADOCERA（water fleas） Daphnia schedleri | $0.02 \pm(0.15)$ | 0.55 | $000 \pm(00001)$ | 0.00 | 2.2 | 0.8 |
| DIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | 0．75 $\pm$（2．7） | 18.2 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0008)$ | 0.05 | 11.0 | 8.4 |
| Chironomidae larvae | 0．04土（0．21） | 1.1 | 0．00士（0．0007） | 0.02 | 4.5 | 1.6 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（maytlies） <br> Baetidas | $0.04 \pm(21)$ | 11.6 |  |  | 6.8 | 5 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | 0．04土（0．21） | 1.1 | 0．00 $\pm(0.0005)$ | 0.00 | 4.5 | 1.6 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.20 \pm(0.50)$ | 4.9 | $0.007 \pm(0.02)$ | 1.5 | 15.9 | 6.3 |

Table 3．5．27 The annual food preferences of $2+$ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt In 1989.

|  | WALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=69$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUM |  | WEIGHT |  | POCURRENCE | $\|R\|$ |
| PREY TTEM | （ X $^{+}$S．D．） | （\％） | （ $\bar{X}+$ S．D．） | （\％） | （\％） | （\％） |
| OSTEICHTHYES（fish） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coltidae | $0.60 \pm(1.8)$ | 8.9 | $0.54 \pm(0.16)$ | 11.7 | 22.5 | 11.1 |
| Percidae | $0.31 \pm(.73)$ | 4.7 | $0.28 \pm(0.79)$ | 60.9 | 18.0 | 21.7 |
| Salmonidae | 0．01 $\pm$（0．12） | 0.21 | 0．02士（0．22） | 5.7 | 1.4 | 1.9 |
| Unidentified fish | $0.86 \pm(1.7)$ | 12.8 | $0.08 \pm(0.29)$ | 18.1 | 38.0 | 17.8 |
| AMPHIPODA（scuds） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hyalella | 0．01士（0．12） | 0.21 | 0．00 $\pm 0.00)$ | 0.00 | 1.4 | 0.42 |
| ISOPODA（sow bugs） Asellus | $0.01 \pm(0.12)$ | 0.21 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 1.4 | 0.42 |
| MOLLUSKA（clam） Sphaeriidae | $0.02 \pm(0.16)$ | 0.43 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 2.8 | 0.84 |
| DIPTERA（midges） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae pupae | $3.3 \pm$（8．7） | 48.8 | $0.0007 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.16 | 29.6 | 20.3 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $0.59 \pm(1.5)$ | 8.7 | $0.0002 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.05 | 19.0 | 7.3 |
| Simulidao pupao | $0.04 \pm(0.26)$ | 0.64 | 0．00 ${ }^{(0.0003)}$ | 0.01 | 2.8 | 1.0 |
| Simulidae larvae | $0.04 \pm(0.36)$ | 0.64 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| PLECOPTERA（stoneflies） <br> Pleronarcyidae | $0.30 \pm(1.6)$ | 4.5 | 0．0003土（0．001） | 0.07 | 5.6 | 2.6 |
| ODONATA（dragonflies） Anisoptera | 0．02士（0．16） | 0.43 | 0．00土（．0002） | 0.01 | 2.3 | 0.84 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | 0．04士（0．26） | 0.64 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 1.4 | 0.53 |
| Terrestrial | $0.17 \pm(1.4)$ | 2.6 | $0.0001 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.03 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.33 \pm(0.53)$ | 4.9 | 0．01 $\pm(0.04)$ | 2.4 | 29.6 | 9.5 |
| norganic Detritus | $0.01 \pm(0.12)$ | 0.21 | $0.002 \pm(0.02)$ | 0.64 | 1.4 | 0.58 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.02 \pm(0.24)$ | 0.43 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0008)$ | 0.03 | 1.4 | 0.48 |

Table 3．5．28 The annual food preferences of $3+$ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

| PREY TTEM | WALLEYE（ $\mathrm{N}=82$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER |  | WEIGHT（mg） |  | DOCURRENCE <br> （\％） | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | （ $\mathrm{X} \pm$ S．D．） | （\％） | （ $\mathrm{X}+$ S．D．） | （\％） |  |  |
| OSTEICHTHYES（6sh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cotidae | $0.80 \pm(1.7)$ | 10.0 | 0．04 $\pm(0.12)$ | 8.0 | 27.2 | 12.9 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.20 \pm(1.1)$ | 2.8 | $0.01 \pm(0.06)$ | 2.3 | 4.5 | 0.28 |
| Percidae | $0.38 \pm(1.3)$ | 5.1 | 0．25士（1．05） | 41.2 | 14.0 | 16.8 |
| Salmondae | $0.03 \pm(0.24)$ | 0.50 | $0.13 \pm(0.98)$ | 21.2 | 3.7 | 7.1 |
| Unidentified fish | $0.93 \pm(1.5)$ | 12.5 | $0.13 \pm(0.38)$ | 22.2 | 51.9 | 24.3 |
| AMPHIPODA（scuds） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hyalella | $0.01 \pm(0.11)$ | 0.17 | 0．00士（0．0002） | 0.00 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| ISOPODA（sow bugs） Asollus | 0．01士（0．11） | 0.17 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 001 |  |  |
| BASOMMATOPHORA（snail） |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Planortidae | 0．09土（0．88） | 1.3 | 0．001 $\pm(0.01)$ | 0.20 | 1.2 | 0.75 |
| MOLLUSKA（clam） <br> Sphaeriidae | $14 \pm(12)$ | 18.9 |  |  |  |  |
| DIPTERA（midges） |  |  | 0．001 $\pm 0.01)$ | 0.32 | 1.2 | 5.7 |
| Chironomidas pupae | $1.7 \pm(9.18)$ | 23.9 | $0.0003 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.06 | 13.6 | 10.6 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $1.2 \pm$（6．3） | 16.8 | $0.0001 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.02 | 8.6 | 7.0 |
| Simuliidae larvas | $0.1 \pm(0.89)$ | 1.3 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 1.2 |  |
| TRICOPTERA（caddisties） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leptoceridas | $0.01 \pm(0.11)$ | 0.17 | $0.00 \pm(0.00)$ | 0.00 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| PLECOPTERA（stonefities） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perlodidae | $0.01 \pm(0.11)$ | 0.17 | 0．00士（0．0003） | 0.01 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Pleronarcyidae | $0.01 \pm(0.11)$ | 0.17 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.01 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| COLEOPTERA（beotos） Elmidae | $0.01 \pm(0.11)$ | 0.17 | 0．00士（0．0001） | 0.00 | 12 |  |
| ODONATA（dragonflies） |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Anisootera | 0．06士（0．33） | 0.83 | 0．00 $\pm(0.0003)$ | 0.00 | 3.7 | 1.2 |
| OTHER： |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | 0．01 $\pm$（0．11） | 0.17 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.01 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.23 \pm(0.50)$ | 3.1 | $0.01 \pm(0.05)$ | 2.0 | 20.9 | 7.3 |
| Inorganic Detritus | 0．06士（0．28） | 0.83 | $0.01 \pm(0.07)$ | 2.3 | 5.0 | 2.3 |

Table 3.5.29 The annual food preferences of $4+$ Walleye from
Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | WALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=53$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ |  | POCURRENCE $\%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cottidae | $0.71 \pm(1.5)$ | 15.0 | 0.04土(0.11) | 4.4 | 24.5 | 12.2 |
| Cyprinidae | $0.13 \pm(0.96)$ | 2.8 | $0.003 \pm(0.02)$ | 03 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| Percidae | $0.28 \pm(0.71)$ | 6.0 | $0.29 \pm(0.87)$ | 27.3 | 19.0 | 14.5 |
| Salmonidae | $0.07 \pm(0.26)$ | 1.6 | $0.39 \pm(1.63)$ | 37.0 | 7.5 | 12.8 |
| Unidentified fish | $0.94 \pm(1.3)$ | 199 | $0.31 \pm(0.91)$ | 29.0 | 49.1 | 27.2 |
| AMPHIPODA (scuds) Gammerus | $001 \pm(0.13)$ | 0.40 | 0.00士(0.0003) | 0.00 | 1.9 | 0.83 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae | $086 \pm(4.3)$ | 18.3 | 0.0002 $\pm$ (0.001) | 0.02 | 11.0 | 8.3 |
| Chironomidae larvae | $0.90 \pm(6.4)$ | 19.1 | $0.0003 \pm(0.002)$ | 003 | 3.7 | 6.4 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA (maytlies) Heptagenidae | $0.28 \pm(2.0)$ | 6.0 | $0.00 \pm(0.0005)$ | 0.01 | 1.9 | 2.1 |
| OTHER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cestoda | $0.01 \pm(0.13)$ | 0.40 | $0.001 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.00 | 1.9 | 0.64 |
| Terrestrial | $0.09 \pm(0.29)$ | 1.9 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.14 | 9.4 | 3.2 |
| Organic Detritus | $0.35 \pm(0.65)$ | 7.5 | $0.01 \pm(0.07)$ | 1.7 | 26.4 | 9.9 |
| Unidentifiable bodies | $0.01 \pm(0.13)$ | 0.40 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 1.9 | 0.64 |

Table 3.5.30 The annual food preferences of 5+ Walleye from Lake Roosevelt In 1989.

|  | WALLEYE ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBI } \\ (\bar{X}+S . D .) \end{array}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | DOCURRENCE (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) Unidentufied fish | $1.1 \pm$ (1.0) | 27.3 | $1.5 \pm(1.8)$ | 92.1 | 66.67 | 39.9 |
| DIPTERA (midges) <br> Chironomidae pupae <br> Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0 \pm(1.7) \\ 0.67 \pm(1.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 27.3 \\ 18.2 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \pm(0.002) \\ & 0.001 \pm(0.001) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.10 \\ 0.07 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 66.67 66.67 | $\begin{array}{r} 20.2 \\ 18.2 \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 0.67 \pm(1.1) \\ 033 \pm(0.58) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.2 \\ 9.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $0.04 \pm(0.07)$ $0.08 \pm(0.15)$ | 2.4 5.33 | 33.33 33.33 | 11.0 10.0 |

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish at $38.5 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $25.6 \%$ and L. kindtii at 18.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for unidentifiable fish at $20.0 \%$, followed by D. schødleri at $19.5 \%$ and L. kindtii at 19.0\%.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 1+ Walleye for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $1+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.26.

The highest number frequency values were for unidentifiable fish at $1.2 \pm 2.5$ per stomach, followed by Cottidae at $0.9 \pm 2.42$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.75=2.7$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for unidentifiable fish at $29.8 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $22.7 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $18.2 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae at $0.26 \pm$ 0.65 mg dry weight per stomach followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.07 \pm$ 0.15 mg and Cottidae at $0.05 \pm 0.13 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $54.2 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $15.7 \%$ and Cottidae at $10.5 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish at $38.5 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $29.6 \%$ and Percidae at $27.3 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for Percidae at $24.9 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $23.7 \%$ and Cottidae at $17.7 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 2+ Walleye for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $2+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.27.

The highest number frequency values were for Chironomidae pupae at $3.3 \pm 8.7$ per stomach, followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.86 \pm 1.7$ and Cottidae at $0.6 \pm 1.8$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Chironomidae pupae at $48.8 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $12.8 \%$ and Cottidae at $8.9 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Cottidae at $0.54 \pm$ 0.16 mg dry weight per stomach followed by Percidae at $0.28 \pm 0.79 \mathrm{mg}$
and unidentifiable fish at $0.08 \pm 0.29 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $60.9 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $18.1 \%$ and Cottidae at $11.7 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish at $38.0 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae and organic detritus, both at $29.6 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for Percidae at 21.7 followed by Chironomidae pupae at $20.3 \%$ and unidentifiable fish at $17.8 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 3+ Walleye for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.28.

The highest number frequency values were for Chironomidae pupae at $1.7 \pm 9.2$ per stomach, followed by Sphaeridae (clams) at $\mathbf{1 . 4} \pm 12.8$ and Chironomidae larvae (midges) at $1.2 \pm 6.3$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Chironomid pupae at $23.9 \%$, followed by Sphaeriidae at $18.9 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $16.8 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Percidae at $0.25 \pm$ 1.05 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.13 \pm$ 0.38 mg and Salmonidae at $0.13 \pm 0.98 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Percidae at $41.2 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $22.2 \%$ and Salmonidae at $21.2 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish at $51.9 \%$, followed by Cottidae at $27.2 \%$ and organic detritus at $20.9 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for unidentifiable fish at $24.3 \%$, followed by Percidae at $16.8 \%$ and Cottidae at 13.0\%.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Walleye for 7989

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.29.

The highest number frequency values were for unidentifiable fish at $0.94 \pm 1.3$ per stomach, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $0.90 \pm 6.4$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.86 \pm 4.3$. The highest percent compostition by
number values were for unidentifiable fish at $19.9 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $19.1 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $18.3 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for Salmonidae at $0.39 \pm$ 1.63 mg dry weight per stcmach followed by unidentifiable fish at $0.31 \pm$ 0.91 mg and Percidae at $0.29 \pm 0.87 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for Salmonidae at $37.0 \%$, followed by unidentifiable fish at $29.0 \%$ and Percidae at $27.3 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish at $49.1 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $26.4 \%$ and Cottidae at $24.5 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for unidentifiable fish at $27.2 \%$, followed by Percidae at $14.5 \%$ and Salmonidae and Cottidae both at $12.2 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 5+ Walleye for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $5+$ walleye is presented in Table 3.5.30.

The highest number frequency values were for unidentifiable fish at $1.0 \pm 1.0$ per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $1.0 \pm 1.7$ and Chironomidae larvae and Cestoda both at $0.67 \pm 1.1$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for unidentifiable fish and Chironomidae pupae, both at $\mathbf{2 7 . 3}$ \%, followed by Chironomidae larvae and Cestoda (nematoda), both at 18.2\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for unidentifiable fish at $1.5 \pm 1.8$ per stomach followed by organic detritus at $0.1 \pm 0.15$ and Cestoda at $0.04 \pm 0.07$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for unidentifiable fish at $92.1 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $5.3 \%$ and Cestoda at 2.4\%.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for unidentifiable fish, Chironomidae pupae and Chironomidae larvae all at $66.7 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for unidentifiable fish at $39.9 \%$. followed by Chironomidae pupae at $20.2 \%$ and Chironomidae larvae at $18.2 \%$.

### 3.5.5 Annual Feeding Habits of Kokanee for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.31. Monthly values can be found in Appendix F.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schodleri (water fleas) at $2,002 \pm 3,898$ per stomach, followed by Cladocera ephippia (water flea eggs) at $38 \pm 204$ and L. kindtii (water fleas) at $27 \pm 122$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schødleri at $96.8 \%$, followed by Cladocera ephippia at $1.9 \%$ and L. kindtii at $1.3 \%$ (Table 3.531).

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schodleri at $0.09 \pm$ 0.17 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by inorganic detritus (rocks) and Cladocera ephippia both at $0.002 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for D. schodleri at $92.8 \%$, followed by inorganic detritus at 2.2\% and Cladocera ephippia at 2.1\% (Table 3.5.31).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $46.4 \%$, followed by organic detritus (plant matter) at $28.6 \%$ and L. kindtii and Cladocera ephippium both at 17.9\% (Table 3.5.31).

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schødleri at $67.0 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $8.2 \%$ and Cladocera ephippia at $6.1 \%$ (Table 3.5.31).

## Annual Feeding Habits of 2+ Kokanee for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of 2+ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.32.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schodleri at $6817 \pm$ 6362 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $11 \pm 19$ and D. retrocurva (water fleas) at $2.6 \pm 4.6$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schødleri at $99.8 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $0.2 \%$ and $D$. retrocurva at $>0.1 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for D. schødleri at $0.32 \pm$ 0.30 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by organic detritus and L . kindtii both at $0.001 \pm 0.0001 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schødleri at $99.5 \%$, followed by organic detritus and L. kindtii both at $0.2 \%$.

Table 3.5.31 The annual food preferences of Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt for the year 1988.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBE } \\ & (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { POCYRRENCA } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) <br> Daphnia schederi <br> Daphnia retrocurva <br> Leptodora kindtii <br> Cladocera ephippia | $\begin{gathered} 2002 \pm(3898) \\ 0.39 \pm(1.5) \\ 27 \pm(122) \\ 38 \pm(204) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 96.8 \\ 0.02 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \pm(0.17) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.009) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.01) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92.8 \\ 0.01 \\ 2.0 \\ 2.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.4 \\ & 11.0 \\ & 17.9 \\ & 17.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 67.0 \\ 3.0 \\ 6.0 \\ 6.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copopoda) Diaptomus spp. Epischura spp. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \pm(0.18) \\ & 0.03 \pm(0.18) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00 \\ 0.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.5 \\ 3.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 1.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae | 0.03土(0.18) | 0.00 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 3.5 | 1.0 |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | $0.14 \pm(0.75)$ | 0.01 | 0.00 $\pm 0.00)$ | 0.02 | 3.5 | 1.0 |
| COLEOPTERA (beoles) Elmidae | 0.03土(0.18) | 0.00 | $0.00 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.08 | 3.5 | 1.0 |
| OTHER: <br> Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies Other | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \pm(0.54) \\ 0.4 \pm(0.5) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.18) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.18) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0006 \pm(0.001) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.01) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.64 \\ & 2.20 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28.6 \\ 7.2 \\ 3.5 \\ 3.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \\ & 2.6 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 1.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.32 The annual food preferences of 2+ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ \left(\dot{x}_{ \pm} \text {S.D. }\right) \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & \left(\bar{X}_{\mathrm{X}}+\text { S.D. }\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { POCURRGNCE } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { IRI } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) <br> Daphnia schedleri <br> Daphnia retrocurva Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 6817 \pm(6362) \\ 2.67 \pm(4.62) \\ 11 \pm(19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 99.77 \\ 0.04 \\ 0.17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3238 \pm(0.2986) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.0007 \pm(0.0012) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.5 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.22 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.00 \\ 33.33 \\ 33.33 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 59.86 \\ 6.60 \\ 6.74 \end{array}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepods) $\qquad$ | $0.33 \pm(0.58)$ | 0.00 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.02 | 33.33 | 6.67 |
| OTHER: Organic Detritus | $1.0 \pm(1.0)$ | 0.01 | 0.0007 $\pm 0.0009)$ | 0.23 | 66.67 | 13.36 |

Table 3.5.33 The annual food preferences of 3+ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMB } \\ (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & \left(\dot{X}_{ \pm} \text {S.D. }\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | PCOURENCE $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schedleri Daphnia retrocurva Leptodora kindbi Cladocera ephippia | $\begin{gathered} 1242 \pm(2863) \\ 0.15 \pm(0.67) \\ 3.6 \pm(10.94) \\ 54 \pm(241) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95.51 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.28 \\ 4.15 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \pm(0.14) \\ 0.00 \pm(2.24) \\ 0.0002 \pm(0.0005) \\ 0.0029 \pm(0.013) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94.13 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.27 \\ 4.42 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 65.0 \\ 10.0 \\ 15.0 \\ 25.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 69.76 \\ 2.75 \\ 4.26 \\ 8.03 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepods) Epischura spp. | $0.05 \pm(0.22)$ | 0.00 | 0.00 $\pm 0.0001)$ | 0.04 | 5.0 | 1.38 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae | 0.05 $\pm$ (0.22) | 0.00 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.08 | 5.0 | 1.39 |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | $0.2 \pm(0.89)$ | 0.02 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.04 | 5.0 | 2.59 |
| COLEOPTERA (beelles) EImidae | $005 \pm(0.22)$ | 0.00 | 0.0001士(0.0005) | 0.17 | 5.0 | 1.38 |
| OTHER: Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25 \pm(0.44) \\ & 0.05 \pm(0.22) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0006 \pm(0.0012) \\ 0.00 \pm(6.708) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.83 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.0 \\ 5.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.08 \\ & 1.38 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.34 The annual food preferences of 4+ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1988.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=5$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBE } \\ & (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PCORRENCE } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schedleri Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 2155 \pm(4804) \\ 130 \pm(291) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94.28 \\ 5.69 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.071 \pm(0.157) \\ 0.01 \pm(0.023) \end{gathered}$ | 75.11 <br> 10.89 | 80.0 20.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 69.27 \\ & 10.16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| OTHER: <br> Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \pm(0.45) \\ & 0.4 \pm(0.55) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0009 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.012 \pm(0.028) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.95 \\ 13.06 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20.0 \\ 40.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.82 \\ 14.74 \end{array}$ |

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schodleri at $100.0 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $66.7 \%$ and all other prey items in stomach at $33.3 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $59.9 \%$, followed by organic detritus at $13.4 \%$ and L. kindtii at $6.7 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 3+ Kokanee for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.33.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schødleri at 1,242 $\pm 2,863$ per stomach, followed by Cladoceran ephippia at $54 \pm 241$ and $L$. kindtii at $3.6 \pm 10.9$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schødleri at $95.5 \%$, followed by Cladoceran ephippia at $4.2 \%$ and L. kindtii at $0.3 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schadleri at $0.06 \pm$ 0.14 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Cladoceran ephippia at 0.003 $\pm 0.01 \mathrm{mg}$ and organic detritus at $0.001 \pm 0.001 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for D. schødleri at $94.1 \%$, followed by Cladoceran ephippia at 4.4\% and organic detritus at 0.8\%.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schadleri at $65.0 \%$, followed by organic detritus and Cladoceran ephippia both at $25.0 \%$ and L. kindtii at 15.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schodleri at $69.8 \%$, followed by Cladoceran ephippia at $8.0 \%$ and organic detritus at $7.0 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Kokanee for 1988

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.34.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schødleri at 2,155 $\pm 4,804$ per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $130 \pm 291$ and inorganic detritus at $0.4 \pm 0.6$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schodleri at $94.3 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $5.7 \%$ and inorganic detritus at $>0.1 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.07 \pm$ 0.16 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by inorganic detritus at $0.01 \pm$ 0.03 mg and $L$. kindtii at $0.01 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schodleri at $75.1 \%$, followed by inorganic detritus at $13.1 \%$ and L. kindtii at 10.9\%.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schodleri at $80.0 \%$, followed by inorganic detritus at $40.0 \%$ and organic detritus and $L$. kindtii both at 20.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $69.3 \%$, followed by inorganic detritus at $14.7 \%$ and L. kindtii at 10.2\%.

### 3.5.6 Annual Feeding Habits of Kokanee for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.35. Monthly values can be found in Appendix F.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schodleri (water fleas) at $1,184 \pm 2,338$ per stomach, followed by Walleye eggs at $64 \pm 368$ and Chironomid pupae (midges) at $28 \pm 82$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schodleri at $91.2 \%$, followed by Walleye eggs at $4.9 \%$ and Chironomid pupae at 2.2\% (Table 3.5.35).

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.08 \pm$ 0.15 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Walleye eggs at $0.03 \pm 0.18$ mg dry weight and L. kindtii (water fleas) at $0.003 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{mg}$ The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schedleri at $66.4 \%$, followed by Walleye eggs at $27.7 \%$ and L. kindtii at 2.4\% (Table 3.5.35).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schodleri at $63.4 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $32.0 \%$ and Chironomid pupae at $30.0 \%$ (Table 3.5.35).

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schodleri at $58.4 \%$, followed by Walleye eggs at $9.4 \%$ and Chironomid pupae at $9.1 \%$ (Table 3.5.35).

Annual Feeding Habits of 0+ Kokanee for 1989
Information for yearly feeding habits of $0+$ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.36.

## Table 3.5.35 The annual food preferences of Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=33$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBE } \\ & (\overline{\mathrm{X}} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | pocurRENCA $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) Walleye eggs | 64土 (368) | 4.9 | $0.03 \pm(0.18)$ | 27.7 | 3.0 | 9.4 |
| ISOPODA (sow bugs) Asellus | $0.06 \pm(0.34)$ | 0 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.03 | 3.0 | 0.81 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { CLADOCERA (water fleas) } \\ \text { Oaphnia schodleri } \\ \text { Leptodora kindtii } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1184 \pm(2338) \\ 20 \pm(84) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.2 \\ 1.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \pm(0.15) \\ 0.003 \pm(0.01) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 66.4 \\ 2.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 63.4 \\ 32.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58.4 \\ 8.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (oopepods) Bryocampus spp. Diaptormus spp. | $\begin{gathered} 0.33 \pm(2.0) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.0 \\ & 6.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.82 \\ & 1.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DIPTERA (midges) } \\ & \text { Chironomidae pupae } \\ & \text { Chironomidae larvae } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \pm(82) \\ 0.72 \pm(2.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.2 \\ & 0.06 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \pm(0.006) \\ & 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30.0 \\ 9.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.1 \\ & 2.4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| HEMPPTERA (bugs) <br> Corixidae | $0.27 \pm(0.8)$ | 0.02 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.01 | 15.0 | 4.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OTER: } \\ & \text { Terrestrial } \\ & \text { Organic Detritus } \\ & \text { Unidentifiable bodies } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \pm(0.8) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.24) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.0009 \pm(0.003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.36 \\ & 0.83 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.0 \\ 6.0 \\ 3.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \\ & 1.7 \\ & 1.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.36 The annual food preferences of $0+$ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{array}{cr} \hline & \text { WEIGHT } \\ (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) & \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | OCOURENCE <br> \% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fieas) Daphnra_schodioni | 217土(306.0) | 98.19 | $\underline{0.0078 \pm(0.011)}$ | 88.57 | 50.0 | 67.65 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae | $0.5 \pm(0.71)$ $35 \pm(4.9)$ | 0.23 1.58 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0013)$ $0.0001 \pm(0.0002)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.71 \\ & 5.71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.0 \\ & 50.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.98 \\ & 16.37 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.37 The annual food preferences of $1+$ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & (\dot{x} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & \left(\overline{X_{ \pm}} \text {S.D. }\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { pOCURRENCE } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schodleri Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 2612.0 \pm(3977.0) \\ 86.0 \pm(188.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96.78 \\ 3.20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.20 \pm(0.29) \\ 0.01 \pm(0.03) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 94.52 \\ 5.45 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 66.67 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.99 \\ & 19.65 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae | 0.66士(1.63) | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.02 | 16.67 | 4.36 |

Table 3.538 The annual food preferences of $2+$ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

| KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=11$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | NUMBER$(\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \quad(\%)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT (mg) } \\ & \text { ( } \bar{x}_{ \pm} \text {S.D.) } \quad(\%) \end{aligned}$ |  | PCOURRENCE <br> (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water Heas) Daphria schodteri Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 1394.0 \pm(1836.0) \\ 13.0 \pm(44.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.34 \\ 0.95 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \pm(0.07) \\ 0.0026 \pm(0.0087) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92.89 \\ 4.32 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81.82 \\ 9.09 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $73.26$ $3.85$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepods) Diaptomus spp. | 0.09 $\pm$ (0.30) | 0.01 | $0.0 \pm(0.0)$ | 0.15 | 9.09 | 2.48 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomıdae pupae Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{array}{r} 7.9 \pm(17.0) \\ 1.54 \pm(4.23) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.56 \\ & 0.11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0014 \pm(.0036) \\ 0.0 \pm(.0003) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.30 \\ & 0.12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.18 \\ 18.18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.65 \\ & 4.94 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | $0.27 \pm(0.65)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.07 | 18.18 | 4.90 |
| OTHER: <br> Terrestrial | $0.27 \pm(0.65)$ | 0.02 | $0.0 \pm(0.0005)$ | 0.15 | 18.18 | 4.92 |

Table 3.5.39 The annual food preferences of $3+$ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=11$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | g) (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { POCURRENCE } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| ISOPODA (sow bugs) Asellus | $0.1818 \pm(0.603)$ | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0004)$ | 0.19 | 9.09 | 2.38 |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schodlen Leptodora kindtii | $\begin{gathered} 693.0 \pm(2015.0) \\ 1.54 \pm(4.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.10 \\ 0.20 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.049 \pm(0.10) \\ 0.05 \pm(9.04) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84.70 \\ 0.05 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 36.36 \\ 18.18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54.28 \\ 4.72 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA (copepods) Diaptornus spp. Bryocampus spp. | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \pm(0.3015) \\ 1 \pm(3.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \pm(0.0006) \\ 0.0 \pm(9.045) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.15 \\ & 0.15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.09 \\ & 9.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.37 \\ 2.40 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae | $63.0 \pm(132.0)$ | 8.36 | $0.0046 \pm(0.0092)$ | 7.87 | 45.46 | 15.78 |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | $0.45 \pm(1.21)$ | 0.06 | $0.0 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.15 | 18.18 | 4.71 |
| OTHER: <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0.55 \pm(1.29) \\ 0.091 \pm(0.3015) \\ 0.182 \pm(0.4045) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.0 \pm(0.0002)$ $0.0012 \pm(0.0039)$ $0.0027 \pm(0.006)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.15 \\ & 2.01 \\ & 4.56 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.18 \\ 9.09 \\ 18.18 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 4.71 2.84 5.82 |

Table 3.5.40 The annual food preferences of 4+ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | g) (\%) | pocurrence <br> (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia Schodten | $13.0 \pm(19.0)$ | 16.36 | $0.0009 \pm(0.001)$ | 3.48 | 50.00 | 17.46 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae | $68.0 \pm(96.0)$ | 82.42 | 0039土(.0055) | 15.09 | 50.00 | 36.88 |
| HEMIPTERA (bugs) Corixidae | $0.5 \pm(0.70)$ | 0.61 | $0.0 \pm 10.0)$ | 0.19 | 50.00 | 12.7 |
| OTHER: <br> Inorganic Detritus | $0.5 \pm(0.70)$ | 061 | $0021 \pm(0.029)$ | 81.24 | 50.00 | 32.96 |

Table 3.541 The annual food preferences of $5+$ Kokanee from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | KOKANEE ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{x}+S . D .) \end{aligned}$ | mg) <br> (\%) | DOCURRENCE <br> (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TRI } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Osteichthyes (fish) Walleye eggs | 2119.0土(0.0) | 100.0 | $0.9883 \pm(0.0)$ | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.00 |

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schadleri at $217 \pm$ 306 per stomach, followed by Chironomidae larvae (midges) at $3.5 \pm 4.9$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.5 \pm 0.7$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schødleri at $98.2 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $1.6 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.2 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schodleri at $0.01 \pm$ 0.01 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $0.0001 \pm 0.001 \mathrm{mg}$ and Chironomidae larvae at $0.0001 \pm 0.0002 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schødleri at $88.6 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae and Chironomidae pupae both at 5.7\% .

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schodleri, Chironomidae larvae and Chironomidae pupae all at 50.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schodleri at $67.7 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae at $16.4 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $16.0 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 1+ Kokanee for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $1+$ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.37.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schødleri at 2,612 $\pm 3,977$ per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $86 \pm 188$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.7 \pm 1.6$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schodleri at $96.8 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $3.2 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $>0.1 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schodleri at $0.20 \pm$ 0.29 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by $L$. kindtii at $0.01 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mg}$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.0001 \pm 0.0001 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schodleri at $94.5 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $5.5 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $>0.1 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schodleri at 100.0\%, followed by L. kindtii at $66.7 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $16.7 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schødleri at $76.0 \%$, followed by $L$. kindtii at $19.7 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $4.4 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 2+ Kokanee for 7989

Information for yearly feeding habits of 2+ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.38.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schodleri at 1,394 $\pm 1,836$ per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $13 \pm 44$ and Chironomidae pupae at $7.9 \pm 17$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schodleri at $98.3 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $0.9 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $0.6 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.06 \pm$ 0.07 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $0.003 \pm 0.009$ mg and Chironomidae pupae at $0.001 \pm 0.004 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schødleri at $92.9 \%$, followed by L. kindtii at $4.3 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $2.3 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for D. schødleri at $81.8 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae, Chironomidae larvae, Corixidae (bugs), and terrestrial insects all at $18.2 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $73.3 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $5.7 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae and terrestrial insects both at 4.9\%.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 3+ Kokanee for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.39.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $693 \pm$ 2,015 per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $63 \pm 132$ and $L$. kindtii at $1.5 \pm 4.5$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for $D$. schodleri at $91.1 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $8.4 \%$ and L. kindtii at $0.2 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.05 \pm$ 0.10 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at 0.005 $\pm 0.009 \mathrm{mg}$ and unidentifiable body parts at $0.003 \pm 0.006 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schødleri at $84.7 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $7.9 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at 4.6\%.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Chironomidae pupae at $45.5 \%$, followed by D. schødleri at $36.4 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schødleri at $54.3 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $15.8 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $5.8 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Kokanee for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.40.

The highest number frequency values were for Chironomidae pupae at $68 \pm 96$ per stomach, followed by D. schødleri at $13 \pm 19$ and Corixidae and inorganic detritus (rocks), both at $0.5 \pm 0.7$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for Chironomidae pupae at $82.4 \%$, followed by D. schedleri at $16.4 \%$ and Corixidae and inorganic detritus, both at $0.6 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for inorganic detritus at $0.02 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $0.004 \pm 0.006 \mathrm{mg}$ and $D$. schodleri at $.001 \pm 0.001 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for inorganic detritus at $81.2 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $15.1 \%$ and D. schødleri at $3.5 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for inorganic detritus, Chironomidae pupae and D. schødleri all at $50.0 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for Chironomidae pupae at $36.9 \%$, followed by inorganic detritus at $33.0 \%$ and $D$. schedleri at $17.5 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 5+ Kokanee for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of $5+$ kokanee is presented in Table 3.5.41.

The highest number frequency values were for walleye eggs at 2,119 $\pm 0.0$ per stomach. The highest percent compostition by number values were for walleye eggs at $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$.

The highest weight frequency values were for walleye eggs at $0.99 \pm$ 0.0 mg dry weight per stomach. The highest percent composition by weight values were for walleye eggs at 100.0\%.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for walleye eggs at 100.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for walleye eggs at $100.0 \%$.

### 3.5.7 Annual Feeding Habits of Lake Whitefish for 1989

Information for yearly feeding habits of lake whitefish is presented in Table 3.5.42. Monthly values can be found in Appendix F.

The highest number frequency values were for $D$. schadleri (water fleas) at $453 \pm 1,574$ per stomach, followed by $D$. thorata (water fleas) at $42 \pm 349$ and L. kindtii (water fleas) at $29 \pm 212$. The highest percent compostition by number values were for D. schødleri at $76.7 \%$, followed by D. thorata at $7.2 \%$ and L. kindtii at $5.0 \%$ (Table 3.5.42).

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus (plant matter) at $0.03 \pm 0.10 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by $D$. schedleri at $0.02 \pm 0.07$ and inorganic detritus (rocks) at $0.01 \pm 0.12 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $25.7 \%$, followed by $D$. schedleri at $17.4 \%$ and inorganic detritus at $12.6 \%$. (Table 3.5.42).

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Chironomidae pupae (midge) at $59.0 \%$, followed by Chironomidae larvae (midge) at $46.1 \%$ and D. schødleri at $41.0 \%$. (Table 3.5.42).

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $23.6 \%$, followed by Chironomidae pupae at $11.6 \%$ and organic detritus at $9.1 \%$ (Table 3.5.42).

## Annual Feeding Habits of 1+ Lake Whitefish

Information for yearly feeding habits of 1+ lake whitefish is presented in Table 3.5.43.

The highest number frequency values were for D. schødleri at $2200 \pm$ 1625 per stomach, followed by L. kindtii at $14.7 \pm 14.9$ and Lepidostomatidae (caddisflies) at $5.9 \pm 20.4$. The highest percent composition by number values were for D. schodleri at $98.6 \%$ followed by L. kindtii at $0.66 \%$ and Lepidostomatidae at $0.27 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.11 \pm$ 0.10 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by Lepidostomatidae at $0.002 \pm$

Table 3．5．42 The annual food preferences of Lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH（ $\mathbf{N}=118$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {＇R N TTEM }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | （\％） | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & \left(\bar{X}_{ \pm} \text {S.D. }\right) \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{mg})}$ <br> （\％） | $\begin{gathered} \text { pocurianct } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | IRI <br> （\％） |
| XSTEICHTHYES（fish） Fish eggs | 1．1412．5） | 0.20 | $0.001 \pm(0.01)$ | 0.86 | （0．85 | 0.33 |
| SOPODA（sow bugs） Asellus | $0.13 \pm(.88)$ | 0.02 | $0.002 \pm(0.001)$ | 0.14 | 4.27 | 0.77 |
| ：LADOCERA（water fleas） <br> Daphnia schaderi <br> Daphria thorata <br> Daphnia retrocurva <br> Daphnia galeata mendota <br> L eptodora kindtii <br> Sida crystallina <br> Alona affins | $\begin{gathered} 453 \pm(1574) \\ 42 \pm(349) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.36) \\ 0.11 \pm(0.59) \\ 29 \pm(212) \\ 0.008 \pm(0.09) \\ 003 \pm(0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 76.67 \\ 7.22 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.02 \\ 5.00 \\ 0.00 \\ 0.01 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0．02010（．068） $0.0007 \pm(0.005)$ $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ $0.002 \pm(0.01)$ $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.40 \\ 0.62 \\ 0.03 \\ 0.04 \\ 1.63 \\ 0.00 \\ 0.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 41.03 \\ 4.27 \\ 8.55 \\ 4.27 \\ 32.48 \\ 0.85 \\ 2.56 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.58 \\ 2.11 \\ 1.50 \\ 0.75 \\ 6.78 \\ 0.15 \\ 0.44 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { UCOPEPOOA (copepocs) } \\ \text { Diaptomus spp. } \\ \text { Epischura spp. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \pm(0.13) \\ 0.008 \pm(0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00 \\ 0.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.71 \\ & 1.85 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.31 \\ & 0.32 \end{aligned}$ |
| JSTRACODA（seed shrimp） Cypridae | 0．008土（0．09） | 0.00 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.00 | 1.85 | 0.32 |
| IASOMMATOPHOPA（5nad） <br> Lymmaidae <br> Planorbidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \pm(0.61) \\ 0.73 \pm(5.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.01 \\ 0.12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \pm(0.008) \\ & 0.003 \pm(0.026) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.88 \\ 2.92 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.71 \\ 5.13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45 \\ & 1.42 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| KOULUSKA（ctarn） <br> Sphaeriidae | 8．8427 | 1.49 | 0．011 0.04 ） | 10.11 | 23.08 | 6.01 |
| JPTERA（midges） Chironomidee pupae Chironomidae larvae Sirmuliidae larvao | $\begin{gathered} 14 \pm(40) \\ 10 \pm(51) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.38 \\ & 1.85 \\ & 0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $0.006 \pm(0.015)$ <br> $0.001 \pm(0.008)$ <br> $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.74 \\ & 1.56 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58.97 \\ 46.15 \\ 0.85 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.62 \\ 8.60 \\ 0.15 \end{array}$ |
| ＇RICOPTERA（caddisfies） <br> Leptoceridae <br> Hydropsychidae <br> Hydroptilidse <br> Lepidostomatidae <br> Brachycentridae | $\begin{gathered} 0.41 \pm(3.2) \\ 0.52 \pm(3.05) \\ 0.008 \pm(0.09) \\ 0.60 \pm(6.56) \\ 3.5 \pm(36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.09 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.10 \\ & 0.60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.0001 \pm(0.001)$ <br> $0.0005 \pm(0.0032)$ <br> $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ <br> $0.0002 \pm(0.003)$ <br> $0.008 \pm(0.084)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \\ & 0.38 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.21 \\ & 6.7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.42 \\ & 7.69 \\ & 0.85 \\ & 0.85 \\ & 2.56 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.61 \\ & 1.41 \\ & 0.15 \\ & 0.20 \\ & 1.71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| LLECOPTERA（stonefines） Pteronarcyidae | 0．02士（0．20） | 0.00 | 0．00014（0．0005） | 0.04 | 1.71 | 0.30 |
| TEMWTERA（bugs） Corixidae | 0．008＊（0．09） | 0.00 | $0.0001 \pm 0.0006)$ | 0.04 | 0.85 | 0.15 |
| ：PHEMEROPTERA（maymes） <br> Baetidae <br> Ephemerellidae <br> Heptagenidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.17 \pm(1.24) \\ & 0.17 \pm(1.94) \\ & 0.75 \pm(4.03) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.03 \\ & 0.03 \\ & 0.13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & .0001 \pm(0.002) \\ & .0003 \pm(0.004) \\ & 0006 \pm 10.004) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.11 \\ & 0.29 \\ & 0.53 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.84 \\ & 0.85 \\ & 5.13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.21 \\ & 0.20 \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ZLIGOCHEATA（worms） Lumbricoidies | 0．008土（0．092） | 0.00 | 0．00 $\pm 0.0001$ ） | 0.00 | 0.85 | 0.15 |
| ZOLEOPTERA（beodes） EImidae | 0．01土（0．13） | 0.00 | 0．00ı 0.0002 | 0.02 | 1.71 | 0.30 |
| TYDRACHNELLAE（spider） Hydracarina | 21．78 $\pm$（135） | 3.68 | $0.0051 \pm 10.037$ | 4.4 | 38.46 | 8.06 |
| YRALIDAE（catepilars） <br> Pyralidae | 0．41t（4．3） | 0.07 | $0.0004 \pm(0.004)$ | 0.33 | 1.71 | 0.37 |
| $\qquad$ <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentriable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \pm(0.23) \\ & 0.40 \pm(0.73) \\ & 0.22 \pm(0.87) \\ & 0.28 \pm(0.55) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.07 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.03 \pm(0.10) \\ 0.01 \pm(0.12) \\ 0.007 \pm(0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ 25.7 \\ 12.6 \\ 6.57 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.13 \\ 26.50 \\ 10.26 \\ 22.22 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.89 \\ & 9.06 \\ & 3.97 \\ & 5.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.43 The annual food preferences of 1+ Lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH ( $\mathrm{N}=12$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBE } \\ & (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | PCOMPRENCE $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| ISOPODA (sow bugs) Aseilus | $0.16 \pm(0.57)$ | 0.01 | $0.0006 \pm(0.002)$ | 0.52 | 8.33 | 1.48 |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) Daphnia schedleri Leptodora kindti | $\begin{array}{r} 2200 \pm(1625) \\ 14.7 \pm(14.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 98.63 \\ 0.66 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \pm(0.096) \\ 0.0007 \pm(0.0021 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 95.02 \\ 0.61 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 83.33 \\ 66.67 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.16 \\ & 11.32 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| BASOMMATOPHORA (snail) <br> Planorbidae | $0.16 \pm(0.38)$ | 0.01 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.08 | 16.67 | 2.79 |
| MOLLUSKA (clam) Sphaeriidae | 2.0土(6.32) | 0.09 | $0.0005 \pm(0.002)$ | 038 | 16.67 | 2.86 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DIPTERA (midges) } \\ & \text { Chironomidae pupae } \\ & \text { Chironomidae tarvae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \pm(1.8) \\ & 1.9 \pm(4.5) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \\ & 0.09 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0001 \pm(0.0008) \\ & 0.0001 \pm(0.0005) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \\ & 0.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.00 \\ & 41.67 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.35 \\ 6.97 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| TRICOPTERA (caddisfies) Leptoceridae Lepidosiomatidae Brachycentridae | $\begin{gathered} 3.1 \pm(9.4) \\ 5.9 \pm(20.4) \\ .41 \pm(1.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14 \\ & 0.27 \\ & 0.02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0008 \pm(0.004) \\ 0.0024 \pm(0.008) \\ 0.003 \pm(0.001) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.64 \\ & 2.03 \\ & 0.23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.00 \\ 8.33 \\ 8.33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.30 \\ & 1.77 \\ & 1.43 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EPHEMEROPTERA (mayflies) Baetidae | $0.5 \pm(0.90)$ | 0.02 | 0.0001士(0.0005) | 0.08 | 33.33 | 5.57 |
| HYDRACHNELLAE (spider) Hydracarina | $0.25 \pm(0.62)$ | 0.01 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.08 | 16.67 | 2.79 |
| OTHER: <br> Terrestrial Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \pm(0.28) \\ & 0.08 \pm(0.28) \\ & 0.08 \pm(0.28) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ & 0.00 \pm(0.0006) \\ & 0.00 \pm(0.0012) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \\ & 0.08 \\ & 0.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.33 \\ & 8.33 \\ & 8.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.40 \\ & 1.40 \\ & 1.40 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.44 The annual food preferences of 2+ Lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{gathered}$ | (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{mg}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { POCURRENCE } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \|R\| \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| MOLLUSKA (clam) <br> Sphaeriidae | $0.67 \pm(1.15)$ | 1.20 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.17 | 33.33 | 6.51 |
| DIPTERA (midges) Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{gathered} 15.3 \pm(24.0) \\ 5.7 \pm(8.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.54 \\ & 10.18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.014 \pm(0.025) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.001) \end{gathered}$ | 17.84 0.13 | 33.33 100.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.28 \\ & 20.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| TRICOPTERA (caddistlies) Hydropsychidae | $5.7 \pm(9.8)$ | 10.18 | $0.009 \pm(0.015)$ | 10.95 | 33.33 | 9.88 |
| HYORACHNELLLAE (spider) Hydracarina | $113 \pm(19.6)$ | 20.36 | $0.0005 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.64 | 33.33 | 9.86 |
| PYRALIDAE (catepillars) Pyralidae | $15.7 \pm(27.1)$ | 28.14 | $0.015 \pm(0.026)$ | 19.50 | 16.67 | 11.67 |
| OTHER: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial | $0.33 \pm(0.57)$ | 0.60 | $0.0009 \pm(0.002)$ | 1.11 | 33.33 | 6.36 |
| Organic Detritus <br> Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.66 \pm(1.15) \\ & 0.33 \pm(0.57) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.20 \\ & 0.60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.038 \pm(0.067) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0008) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 49.53 \\ 0.13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.33 \\ & 33.33 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.25 \\ 6.18 \end{array}$ |

Table 3.545 The annısal food preferences of 3＋lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH（ $\mathrm{N}=10$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY ITEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBE } \\ & (\dot{x}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | mg） (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { pOCURRENCA } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { IRI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| CLADOCERA（water fleas） Daphnia schedteri Daphnia retrocurva Leptodora kindai | $\begin{gathered} 1765 \pm(4429) \\ 0.1 \pm(0.32) \\ 0.5 \pm(.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.23 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.03 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \pm(0.169) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0009) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 66.09 \\ 0.09 \\ 0.09 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.00 \\ & 10.00 \\ & 30.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40.06 \\ 1.98 \\ 5.91 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| MOLLUSKA（ciam） Sphaeriidae | 14．1 $\pm$（45） | 0.78 | $0.01 \pm(0.03)$ | 9.26 | 10.00 | 3.93 |
| DIPTERA（midges） Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae Simulidae pupae | $\begin{array}{r} 4.7 \pm(5.8) \\ 7.2 \pm(19) \\ 0.4 \pm(1.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.26 \\ & 0.40 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \pm(0.004) \\ 0.002 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.03 \\ 1.88 \\ 0.09 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.00 \\ & 30.00 \\ & 10.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.40 \\ 6.33 \\ 1.96 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| TRICOPTERA（caddistlies） Hydropsychidae | $0.2 \pm(0.63)$ | 0.01 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0006)$ | 0.17 | 10.00 | 2.00 |
| HEMIPTERA（bugs） Corixidae | $0.1 \pm(0.32)$ | 0.01 | 0．0006土（0．002） | 0.58 | 10.00 | 20.8 |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（mayties） Baotidae | 1．3土（4．11） | 0.07 | 0．0003 $\pm$（0．0009） | 0.26 | 10.00 | 2.03 |
| HYDRACHNELLAE（spider） Hydracarina | 2．5土（3．1） | 0.14 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.05 | 50.00 | 9.84 |
| OTHER： <br> Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \pm(0.67) \\ & 0.1 \pm(0.31) \\ & 0.3 \pm(0.48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.01 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $0.019 \pm(0.059)$ <br> $0.0005 \pm(0.002)$ <br> $0.0002 \pm(0.0005)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.74 \\ & 0.43 \\ & 0.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.00 \\ & 10.00 \\ & 20.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.40 \\ & 2.05 \\ & 3.98 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table $3.5 .46^{-}$The annual food preferences of 4＋Lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH（ $\mathrm{N}=65$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| गREY I TEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMB } \\ (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{ng}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRI } \\ & (\% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| JSTEICHTHYES（fish） Fish eggs | 2土（16） | 0.74 | $0.002 \pm(0.015)$ | t． 63 | 1.54 | 0.70 |
| SOPODA（sow bugs） Asellus | $0.06 \pm(0.35)$ | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0009)$ | 0.12 | 3.08 | 0.58 |
| JLADOCERA（water fleas） <br> Daphnia schedteri <br> Daphnia thorata <br> Daphnia retrocurva <br> Daphnia galeata mendota <br> Leptodora kindtii <br> Alona affins <br> Sida crystallina | $\begin{gathered} 109 \pm(470) \\ 68 \pm(466) \\ 0.06 \pm(0.30) \\ 0.09 \pm(0.63) \\ 47 \pm(284) \\ 0.04 \pm(.0 .28) \\ 0.02 \pm(0.12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38.58 \\ 24.21 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.03 \\ 16.82 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.01 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.005 \pm(0.022) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.007) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0004) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.003 \pm(0.016) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.17 \\ & 0.98 \\ & 0.05 \\ & 0.05 \\ & 2.81 \\ & 001 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32.31 \\ 1.54 \\ 4.62 \\ 3.08 \\ 27.69 \\ 3.08 \\ 1.54 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.40 \\ 4.77 \\ 0.84 \\ 0.56 \\ 8.45 \\ 0.56 \\ 0.28 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| ：UCOPEPODA（copepods） <br> Diaplomus spp． <br> Epischura sop． | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \pm(0.12) \\ & 0.02 \pm(0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0001) \\ 000 \pm(0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.54 \\ & 1.54 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.28 \\ & 0.28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| JSTRACODA（seed shnmp） Cypridae | $0.02 \pm(0.12)$ | 0.01 | $0.00 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.00 | 1.54 | 0.28 |
| 3ASOMMATOPHORA（snail） <br> Lymnaidae <br> Planorbidae | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \pm(0.37) \\ & 0.45 \pm(2.65) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0013 \pm(0.011) \\ 0002 \pm(0.012) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.19 \\ & 1.77 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.54 \\ & 3.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.49 \\ & 089 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| HOLLUSKA（clam） Sphaeriidae | $8.0 \pm(25)$ | 2.81 | $0.012 \pm(0.037)$ | 11.02 | 24.62 | 6.86 |
| JIPTERA（midges） Chironomidae pupae Chironomidae larvae | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \pm(30) \\ & 16 \pm(69) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.54 \\ & 5.71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \pm(0.014) \\ & 0.003 \pm(0.012) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.98 \\ & 2.71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63.08 \\ & 47.69 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.14 \\ & 10.02 \end{aligned}$ |
| 「RICOPTERA（caddisflies） <br> Hydroosychidae Lepidostomatidae | $\begin{gathered} 0.63 \pm(3.51) \\ 6.3 \pm(49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.22 \\ & 2.23 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0004 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.014 \pm(0.113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.36 \\ 12.65 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.23 \\ & 3.08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.75 \\ & 3.20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| PLECOPTERA（stoneflies） Pteronarcyidae | $0.04 \pm(0.28)$ | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0007)$ | 009 | 3.08 | 0.57 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \pm(0.17) \\ 0.32 \pm(2.60) \\ 1.3 \pm(5.35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01 \\ & 0.11 \\ & 0.47 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \pm(0.0003) \\ 0.0006 \pm(0.005) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.005) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.55 \\ & 1.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.08 \\ & 1.54 \\ & 7.69 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.55 \\ & 0.39 \\ & 1.64 \end{aligned}$ |
| COLEOPTERA（beetles） Elmidae | $0.02 \pm(0.12)$ | 0.01 | 0．00士（0．0002） | 0.02 | 154 | 0.28 |
| HYDRACHNELLAE（spider） Hydracarina | $8.1 \pm(23.7)$ | 2.87 | $00005 \pm(0.003)$ | 0.48 | 43.08 | 8.29 |
| OTHER <br> Terrestrial <br> Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \pm(0.21) \\ 0.4 \pm(0.77) \\ 0.32 \pm(1.12) \\ 0.29 \pm(0.58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.14 \\ & 0.11 \\ & 0.10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \pm(0.0002) \\ & 0.044 \pm(0.134) \\ & 0.007 \pm(0.032) \\ & 0.008 \pm(0.064) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.01 \\ 39.10 \\ 5.85 \\ 7.51 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.62 \\ 24.62 \\ 12.31 \\ 23.08 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.83 \\ 11.40 \\ 3.26 \\ 5.48 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Table 3．5．47 The annual food preferences of 5＋Lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt In 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH（ $\mathrm{N}=22$ ） |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMBE } \\ (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\dot{X} \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | mg） $(\%)$ | PCOURRBNCA $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \|RI } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ISOPODA (sow bugs) } \\ & \text { Asellus } \end{aligned}$ | $000.45 \pm(1.392)$ | 0.23 | $0.0002 \pm(0.0007)$ | 0.10 | 9.09 | 1.48 |
| CLADOCERA（water fleas） <br> Daphnia schederi <br> Daphnia thorata <br> Daphnia retrocurva <br> Daphnia gateata mendota <br> Leplodora kindti <br> Alona affins | $\begin{gathered} 17 \pm(63) \\ 24 \pm(68) \\ 0.13 \pm(0.34) \\ 0.32 \pm(0.84) \\ 8 \pm(20) \\ 0.05 \pm(0.21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.63 \\ 12.37 \\ 0.07 \\ 0.16 \\ 4.11 \\ 0.02 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0008 \pm(0.004) \\ 0.0007 \pm(0.002) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0004) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0004) \\ 0.0007 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45 \\ & 0.42 \\ & 0.04 \\ & 0.05 \\ & 0.40 \\ & 0.06 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50.00 \\ 13.64 \\ 4.55 \\ 13.64 \\ 31.82 \\ 4.55 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.29 \\ & 4.15 \\ & 0.73 \\ & 2.18 \\ & 5.71 \\ & 0.73 \end{aligned}$ |
| EUCOPEPODA（copepods） Diaptanus spp | 0．05士（0．21） | 0.02 | $00001 \mathrm{f}(0.003)$ | 0.06 | 4.55 | 0.73 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { BASOMMATOPHORA (snal) } \\ & \text { Lymnaidae } \\ & \text { Planorbidae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \pm(1.28) \\ 2.5 \pm(11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14 \\ & 1.27 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.002 \pm(0.007) \\ & 0.013 \pm(0.058) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.91 \\ & 7.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.55 \\ & 9.09 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.88 \\ & 2.76 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| MOLUSKA（dam） Sphaeriidae | 16さ（35） | 8.06 | $0.022 \pm(0.066)$ | 12.79 | 31.82 | 8.28 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { DIPTERA (midges) } \\ \text { Chironomidae pupae } \\ \text { Chironomidae larvae } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32 \pm(77) \\ 5 \pm(10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.09 \\ 2.68 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.013 \pm(0.025) \\ 0.0002 \pm(0.002) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.60 \\ & 0.12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63.64 \\ & 50.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.73 \\ 8.30 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) } \\ & \text { Leptoceridae } \\ & \text { Hydroptilidae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \pm(2.3) \\ 0.05 \pm(0.21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25 \\ & 0.02 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \\ & 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.76 \\ & 0.73 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| EPHEMEROPTERA（mayflies） Heptagenidae | $0.04 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.02 | $0.00 \pm(0.0002)$ | 0.02 | 4.55 | 0.72 |
| OLIGOCHEATA（worms） Lumbriwlidae | 0．04士（0．21） | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.06 | 4.55 | 0.73 |
| COLEOPTERA（beetes） <br> Elmidae | $0.04 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.02 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0003)$ | 0.04 | 4.55 | 0.73 |
| HYDRACHNELUAE（spider） Hydracarina | 89土（306） | 45.20 | $0026 \pm(0.085)$ | 14.90 | 40.91 | 15.88 |
| PYRALIDAE（caterpillars） Pyralidae | $0.05 \pm(0.21)$ | 0.02 | $0.00 \pm(0.0001)$ | 0.00 | 4.55 | 0.72 |
| OTHER： <br> Terrestrial <br> Organic Detritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.05 \pm(0.21) \\ & 0.60 \pm(0.80) \\ & 0.18 \pm(0.50) \\ & 0.32 \pm(0.65) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02 \\ & 0.30 \\ & 0.09 \\ & 0.16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \pm(0.00) \\ & 0.02 \pm(.0 .06) \\ & 0.06 \pm(0.26) \\ & 002 \pm(0.06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ \mathrm{t} 0.44 \\ 34.31 \\ 9.44 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ 40.91 \\ 13.64 \\ 22.73 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 8.12 \\ & 7.55 \\ & 5.08 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Table 3.5.48 The annual food preferences of 6+ Lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989.

|  | LAKE WHITEFISH ( $\mathrm{N}=5$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PREY TTEM | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NUMB } \\ (\bar{X}+\text { S.D. }) \end{array}$ | $(\%)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WEIGHT } \\ & (\bar{x}+\text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | ( mg ) <br> (\%) | pocurrance (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \|R\| \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| CLADOCERA (water fleas) <br> Daphnia schedieri <br> Daphnia thorata Leptodora kinduii | $\begin{aligned} & 301 \pm(514) \\ & 0.2 \pm(0.44) \\ & 08 \pm(1.10) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.75 \\ 0.07 \\ 0.26 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \pm(0.004) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0008) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53.76 \\ 1.88 \\ 1.88 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.00 \\ & 20.00 \end{aligned}$ $40.00$ | 40.14 <br> 4.58 <br> 8.79 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DIPTERA (midges) } \\ & \text { Chironomidae pupae } \\ & \text { Chironomidae larvae } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \pm(1.73) \\ & 0.6 \pm(1.34) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33 \\ & 0.20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0001 \pm(0.0004) \\ 0.0001 \pm(0.0005) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.88 \\ 1.88 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.00 \\ & 20.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.80 \\ & 4.60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| TRICOPTERA (caddisflies) <br> Hydroptilidae | $0.2 \pm(0.44)$ | 0.07 | $0.0001 \pm(0.0004)$ | 1.88 | 20.00 | 4.58 |
| Terrestrial Organic Detritus Unidentifiable bodies | $\begin{aligned} & 0.20 \pm(0.45) \\ & 0.40 \pm(0.55) \\ & 0.40 \pm(0.55) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \\ & 0.13 \\ & 0.13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0001 \pm(0.0004) \\ 0.001 \pm(0.003) \\ 0.0004 \pm(0.0006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.88 \\ 27.07 \\ 7.89 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.00 \\ & 40.00 \\ & 40.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.58 \\ 14.01 \\ 10.01 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

0.008 mg and Leptoceridae (caddisflies) at $0.001 \pm 0.004 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for D. schadleri at $95 \%$ followed by Lepidostomatidae at $2 \%$ and Leptoceridae at $0.60 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for $D$. schødleri at $83 \%$,followed by L. kindtii at $66.7 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $50 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for $D$. schødleri at $46 \%$ followed by $L$. kindtii at $11 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $8.4 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits for 2+ Lake Whitefish

Information for yearly feeding habits of 2+ lake whitefish is presented in Table 3.5.44.

The highest number frequency values were for Pyralidae (aquatic caterpillars) at $15.7 \pm 27.1$ per stomach, followed by Chironomid pupae at $15.3 \pm 24$ and Hydracarina (aquatic spiders) at $11.3 \pm$ 19.6. The highest percent composition by number values were for Pyralidae at $28.1 \%$ followed by Chironomid pupae at $27.5 \%$ and Hydracarina at 20.4\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus at $0.04 \pm 0.07 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by Pyralidae at $0.01 \pm$ 0.03 mg and Chironomid pupae at $0.01 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $49.5 \%$ followed by Pyralidae at $19.5 \%$ and Chironomid pupae at $17.8 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Chironomid larvae at $100.0 \%$, followed by Sphaeriidae, (clams) Chironomid pupae, Hydropsychidae (caddisflies), Hydracarina, terrestrial insects, organic detritus, and unidentifiable body parts all at $33.33 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for Chironomidae larvae at $20 \%$ followed by organic detritus at $15.3 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $14.3 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits for 3+ Lake Whitefish

Information for yearly feeding habits of $3+$ lake whitefish is presented in Table 35.45.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schadleri at 1,765 $\pm 4,429$ per stomach, followed by Sphaeriidae at $14.1 \pm 45$ and Chironomid larvae at $7.2 \pm 19$. The highest percent composition by number values
were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schodleri at $98.2 \%$ followed by Sphaeriidae at $0.8 \%$ and Chironomid larvae at $0.4 \%$.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.07 \pm$ 0.17 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by organic detritus at $0.02 \pm$ 0.06 mg and Sphaeriidae at $0.01 \pm 0.03 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schedleri at $66.1 \%$ followed by organic detritus at $17.7 \%$ and Sphaeriidae at $9.3 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Chironomid pupae and Hydracarina which had equal values of $50.0 \%$ followed by $D$. schodleri at 40.00\%.

The highest IRI values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schodleri at $40.1 \%$ followed by Corixidae (bugs) at $20.8 \%$ and Chironomidae pupae at $10.4 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 4+ Lake Whitefish

Information for yearly feeding habits of 4+ lake whitefish is presented in Table 3.5.46.

The highest number frequency values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schodleri at $109 \pm$ 470 per stomach, followed by D. thorata (water fleas) at $68 \pm 466$ and L. kindtii at $47 \pm 284$. The highest percent composition by number values were for $\boldsymbol{D}$. schødleri at $38.6 \%$ followed by $\boldsymbol{D}$. thorata at $24.2 \%$ and $\boldsymbol{L}$. kindtii at 16.8\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for organic detritus at $0.049 \pm 0.13 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by Lepidostomatidae at $0.014 \pm 0.11 \mathrm{mg}$ and Sphaeriidae at $0.012 \pm 0.04 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for organic detritus at $39.1 \%$ followed by Lepidostomatidae at $12.6 \%$ and Sphaeriidae at $11.0 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Chironomidae pupae at $63.1 \%$ followed by Chironomid larvae at $47.7 \%$ and Hydracarina at 43.1\%.

The highest IRI values were for D. schodleri at $13.4 \%$ followed by Chironomid pupae at $13.1 \%$ and organic detritus at $11.4 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits of 5+ Lake Whitefish

Information for yearly feeding habits of $5+$ lake whitefish is presented in Table 3.5.47.

The highest number frequency values were for Hydracarina at $89 \pm$ 306 per stomach, followed by Chironomid pupae at $32 \pm 77$ and D. thorata at $24 \pm 68$. The highest percent composition by number values were for Hydracarina at $45.2 \%$ followed by Chironomid pupae at $16.1 \%$ and $D$. thofata at 12.4\%.

The highest weight frequency values were for inorganic detritus at $0.06 \pm 0.26 \mathrm{mg}$ dry weight per stomach, followed by Hydracarina at $0.03 \pm$ 0.09 mg and Sphaeriidae at $0.022 \pm 0.07 \mathrm{mg}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for inorganic detritus at $34.3 \%$ followed by Hydracarina at $14.9 \%$ and Chironomid pupae at $12.8 \%$.

The highest frequency of occurrence values were for Chironomidae pupae at $63.6 \%$ followed by Chironomid larvae and D. schodleri both at 50.0\%.

The highest IRI values were for Hydracarina at $15.9 \%$ followed by Chironomid pupae at $13.7 \%$ and D. thorata at $9.3 \%$.

## Annual Feeding Habits for 6+ Lake Whitefish

Information for yearly feeding habits of 6+ lake whitefish is presented in Table 3.5.48.

The highest IRI values were for D. schødleri at $301 \pm 514$ per stomach, followed by Chironomid pupae at $1.0 \pm 1.7$ and L. kindtii at $0.8 \pm$ 1 .1. The highest percent composition by number values were for $D$. schədleri at $98.7 \%$ followed by Chironomid pupae at $0.33 \%$ and L. kindtii at 0.3.

The highest weight frequency values were for $D$. schødleri at $0.003 \pm$ 0.004 mg dry weight per stomach, followed by organic detritus at $0.001 \pm$ $0.003 \mathbf{~ m g}$ and unidentifiable body parts at $0.0004 \pm 0.0006 \mathbf{~ m g}$. The highest percent composition by weight values were for $D$. schødleri at $53.8 \%$ followed by organic detritus at $27.1 \%$ and unidentifiable body parts at $7.9 \%$.

The highest frequencies of occurrence values were for D. schødleri, L. kindtii, Chironomidae pupae, organic detritus and unidentifiable body parts all at $40.00 \%$.

The highest IRI values were for D. schodleri at $40.1 \%$ followed by organic detritus at $14.0 \%$, and unidentifiable body parts at $10.0 \%$.

### 3.5.0 Diet Overlap between Species for 1988

The diet overlap between rainbow trout and walleye in 1988 was 0.569 . The overlap between rainbow trout and kokanee was 0.786 . The overlap between walleye and kokanee was 0.289 (Table 3.5.49).

### 3.5.9 Diet Overlap between Species for 1989

The diet overlap between rainbow trout and walleye in 1989 was 0.199 . The overlap between rainbow trout and kokanee was 0.216 . The overlap between rainbow trout and lake whitefish was 0.262 . The overlap between walleye and kokanee was 0.259 . The overlap between walleye and lake whitefish was 0.421 . The overlap between kokanee and lake whitefish was 0.669 . (Table 3.5.49).

### 3.5.10 Electivity Indices

Electivities of kokanee and rainbow trout for different size categories of Daphnia were calculated for all age classes captured at each index station in August 1988, October 1988, May 1989, August 1989 and October 1989. Daphnia sizes in fish stomachs from a particular station were compared to Daphnia sizes observed in the water column at the same station on the same dates that the fish were collected. The mean electivity value and standard deviation were calculated for all stations in each month (Appendix F). The resulting electivities are presented in Table 3.5.50 (kokanee) and Table 3.5.51 (rainbow trout).

In August 1988, kokanee had positive electivities $(+0.03$ to +0.33$)$ for Daphnia sizes ranging from 1.6 to 2.4 mm and negative electivities for Daphnia $<1.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ or $>2.5 \mathrm{~mm}$ (Table 3.5.50). Similar results occured in October 1988, and May, August and October 1989. Positive electivity values were indicative of size-selective predation. However, positive electivity values in the range observed ( +0.01 to +0.35 ) suggest that the intensity of size-selective predation by kokanee on Daphnia was not high in either 1988 or 1989.

Table 3.5.49 Annual diet overlaps between fish species, analyzed from stomach contents, in Lake Roosevelt, WA. Overlaps based on relative importance values for 1988 and 1989 separately.

SPECIES OVERLAPS FOR 1988

|  | Rainbow trout | Walleye | Kokanee |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow trout | 1.0 | .569 | .786 |
| Walleye |  | 1.0 | .289 |
| Kokanee |  |  | 1.0 |

SPECIES OVERLAPS FOR 1989

|  | Rainbow trout | Walleye | Kokanee | Lake Whitefish |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow trout | 1.0 | .199 | .216 | .262 |
| Walleye |  | 1.0 | .259 | .421 |
| Kokanee |  |  | 1.0 | .669 |
| Lake Whitefish |  |  |  | 1.0 |

Table 3.5.50. Mean electivities of kokanee salmon for different size ranges of Daphnia in 1988 and 1989. (Data presented as mean $\pm$ S.D. for nine index stations).

|  | Electivity ( $\mathrm{X} \pm$ S.D.) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daphnia size <br> Range (mm) | 191 |  |  | 1989 |  |
|  | AUG | OCT | MAY | AUG | OCT |
| 0.1-0.3 | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ |
| 0-4-0.6 | $-0.005 \pm 0.007$ | -0.09 $\pm 0.05$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.02 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.005 \pm 0.01$ |
| 0.7-0.9 | $-0.08 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.25 \pm 0.05$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.15 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.14 \pm 0.08$ |
| 1.0-1.2 | $-0.24 \pm 0.007$ | -0.19 $\pm 0.10$ | -0.21 $\pm 0.30$ | -0.14 $\pm 0.0$ | -0.14 $\pm 0.03$ |
| 1.3-1.5 | -0.08 $\pm 0.04$ | $0.32 \pm 0.32$ | -0.23 $\pm 0.51$ | $0.04 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.05 \pm 0.15$ |
| 1.6-1.8 | $0.10 \pm 0.06$ | $0.04 \pm 0.18$ | $0.35 \pm 0.26$ | $0.03 \pm 0.0$ | $0.08 \pm 0.21$ |
| 1.9-2.1 | $0.33 \pm 0.16$ | $0.15 \pm 0.23$ | $0.24 \pm 0.25$ | $0.29 \pm 0.0$ | $0.23 \pm 0.16$ |
| 2.2-2.4 | $0.03 \pm 0.09$ | $0.01 \pm 0.06$ | $0.06 \pm 0.08$ | $-0.06 \pm 0.0$ | $0.04 \pm 0.12$ |
| 2.5-2.7 | -0.03 $\pm 0.04$ | $0.003 \pm 0.04$ | $0.03 \pm 0.04$ | $0.02 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.008 \pm 0.06$ |
| 2.8-3.0 | $-0.005 \pm 0.007$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.01 \pm 0.0$ | $-0.003 \pm 0.03$ |
| 3.1-3.3 | $-0.005 \pm 0.00 i$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ |
| 3.4-3.6 | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ |

Table 3.5.51. Mean electivities of rainbow trout for different size range of Daphnia in 1988 and 1989. (Data presented as mean $\pm$ S.D. for nine index stations).

|  | Electivitv ( $X \pm$ S.D.) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Daphnia size' Range (mm) | 19 | 88 |  | 1989 |  |
|  | AUG | OCT | MAY | AUG | OCT |
| 0.1-0.3 | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ |
| 0.4-0.6 | $-0.01 \pm 0$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $-0.06 \pm 0.05$ | $0.0 \pm 0.01$ | $0.07 \pm 0.08$ |
| 0.7-0.9 | $-0.08 \pm 0.05$ | $-0.25 \pm 0.05$ | $-0.18 \pm 0.25$ | $\cdot 0.07 \pm 0.07$ | -0.15 $\pm 0.04$ |
| 1.0-1.2 | $-0.03 \pm 0.18$ | $-0.19 \pm 0.10$ | -0.24k0.18 | - 0.10 fO .10 | -0.14 $\pm 0.05$ |
| 1.3-1.5 | -0.03 f0.28 | $-0.02 \pm 0.11$ | $-0.20 \pm 0.47$ | $0.05 \pm 0.07$ | $-0.50 \pm 0.10$ |
| 1.6-1.8 | $-0.00 \pm 0.10$ | $0.11 \pm 0.13$ | $0.37 \pm 0.09$ | $0.06 \pm 0.01$ | $0.13 \pm 0.16$ |
| 1.9-2.1 | $0.03 \pm 0.18$ | 0.19 f0.07 | 0.43 f 0.09 | $0.10 \pm 0.03$ | $0.16 \pm 0.19$ |
| 2.2-2.4 | $0.02 \pm 0.19$ | $0.17 \pm 0.11$ | $0.07 \pm 0.11$ | $0.06 \pm 0.01$ | $0.03 \pm 0.12$ |
| 2.5-2.7 | $0.04 \pm 0.09$ | $0.03 \pm 0.07$ | $0.01 \pm 0.02$ | -0.01 $\pm 0.10$ | $0.03 \pm 0.09$ |
| 2.8-3.0 | $0.00 \pm 0.04$ | $0.01 \pm 0.02$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $0.01 \pm 0.03$ | $0.00 \pm 0.02$ |
| 3.1-3.3 | $-0.01 \pm 0.02$ | $0.01 \pm 0.01$ | $0.0 \pm 0$ | $-0.01 \pm 0.01$ | $0.01 \pm 0.01$ |

In August 1988, rainbow trout electivity for all size categories were near zero, indicating that trout preyed on different sizes of Daphnia in relative proportion to their abundance in the reservoir (Table 3.551). In October 1981, rainbow trout had positive electivities ( +0.11 to +0.19 ) for Daphnia in sizes ranging from 1.6 to 2.4 mm , negative electivities (. 0.20 to -0.18 ) for Daphnia $<1.5 \mathrm{~mm}$, and neutral electivity for Daphnia >2.5 mm . In 1989, electivities were similar to those observed in October 1988. Again, positive electivities in the range observed ( +0.07 to +0.43 ) suggest that the intensity of size-selective predation by rainbow trout on Daphnia was not high in either 1988 or 1989. Only one month was marginally high, May 1989, when electivity for Daphnia 1.6 to 2.1 mm ranged from +0.37 to +0.43 . For all other months the maximum positive electivity observed was +0.19 .

### 3.6 TAGGING STUDIES

### 3.6.1 Net-Pen Rainbow Trout Tagging

On May 4, 1988, 1 ,111 marked rainbow trout were released at the Seven Bays net-pen site and a total of 110 were subsequently recaptured by anglers between May 1988 and April 1990, for a $9.9 \%$ recovery rate. Of the 110 fish recaptured, $58.1 \%$ ( 64 individuals) were recaptured within 6 months and $88.1 \%$ ( 97 individuals) were recaptured within one year after release (Table 3.6.1). The majority ( $57.2 \% 63$ individuals) of the recaptured fish were recovered in the vicinity ( $\pm 20 \mathrm{~km}$ ) of the Seven Bays net-pen site, $10 \%$ ( 11 fish) were recaptured further upstream as far as Gifford ( 64 km ), and 32.7\% ( 36 fish ) were recaptured further downstream as far as Grand Coulee Dam ( 40 km ) (Table 3.6.1). Only one ( $0.9 \%$ ) of the 110 fish recovered was recaptured outside of Lake Roosevelt in Rufus Wood Reservoir, the impoundment of Chief Joseph Dam.

Individual trout weighed 28 g when put into the net-pens on 29 October 1987 and grew to a mean length of $229 \pm 16 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weight of $167 \pm 41 \mathrm{~g}$ by the time they were released from the net pens on May 4, 1988. After release into the reservoir, growth rates of recaptured fish reported by anglers indicated that the fish attained lengths of $418 \pm 17$ mm and weights of $764 \pm 70 \mathrm{~g}$ by October 1988. Fish growth slowed over the winter months: mean lengths and weights reported in April 1989 were respectively $469 \pm 27 \mathrm{~mm}$ and $885 \pm 59 \mathrm{~g}$. By October 1989, length was $542 \pm 20 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weight was $1,547 \pm 121 \mathrm{~g}$. In March 1989, the single fish recaptured was 609 mm in total length and $2,239 \mathrm{~g}$ in weight. This individual was released at a length of 268 mm in May 1988.

Table 3.6.1. Dates and locations of recaptures of rainbow trout stocked in Seven Bays Net-Pen (Location 6) on 29 October 1987 and released into Lake Roosevelt on 4 May 1988. Mean total lengths ( mm ) and weights ( g ) at time of stocking, release and recapture are also presented. Recapture lengths and weights are for fish captured in April or October only. Number tagged $=1,111$.


Total \# tagged: 1,111
Total \# recovered by anglers: 110 [ $\mathbf{+ 0}$ fish collected at Rock Island Dam fish passage faclity] \% Recovered by anglers: 9.9\%

Table 3.6.2. Dates and locations of recaptures of rainbow trout stocked in Seven Bays Net Pen (Location 6) on 18 October 1988 and released into Lake Roosevelt on 12 April 1989. Mean total lengths ( mm ) and weights ( g ) at time of stocking, release and recapture are also presented. Recapture lengths and weights are for fish captured in April or October only. Number tagged $=918$.


Total \# tagged: 918
Total \# recovered by anglers: 28 [+6 fish collected at Rock Island Dam fish passage facility]
\% Recovered by anglers: 3.0\%

Table 3.6.3. Dates and locations of recaptures of rainbow trout stocked in Hunters Net-Pen (Location 3) on 26 October 1988 and released into Lake Roosevelt on 10 March 1989. Mean total lengths ( mm ) and weights ( g ) at time of stocking, release and recapture are also presented. Recapture lengths and weights are for fish captured in April or October only. Number tagged $=845$.


Total \# tagged: 845
Total \# recovered by anglers: 16 [ +5 fish collected at Rock Island Dam fish passage facility]
\% Recovered by anglers: 1.9\%

On April 12, 1989, 918 marked rainbow trout were released at the Seven Bays net pen site and a total of 28 were subsequently recaptured by anglers between April 1989 and April 1990, for a recovery rate of 3.0\% (Table 3.6.2). Additionally, six fish were collected at the Rock Island Dam fish counting facility in May and June 1989. Of the 34 fish recovered, $38.2 \%$ ( 13 fish) were recaptured in the vicinity ( $\pm 20 \mathrm{~km}$ ) of the Seven Bays net pen site; 2.9\% ( 1 fish) was recovered upstream at Hunters (40 km ) and $58.8 \%$ ( 20 fish ) were recovered downstream at Grand Coulee Dam, Rufus Woods Reservoir and Rock Island Dam. Nine (26.4\%) of the 34 fish recaptured were recaptured below Grand Coulee Dam.

Individual trout weighed 17 g when put into the net pen on 18 October 1988 and grew to a mean length of $202 \pm 15 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weight of 87 $\pm 27 \mathrm{~g}$ by the time they were released from the net pens on April 12, 1989. By October 1989 they had reached lengths of $401 \pm 13 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weights of $681 \pm 98 \mathrm{~g}$. One fish released at 189 mm in total length in April 1989 had attained a length of 432 mm and a weight of 995 g at the time of recovery in March 1990.

On March 10, 1989, 845 marked rainbow trout were released at the Hunters net pen site and a total of 16 were subsequently recaptured by anglers between March 1989 and April 1990, for a recovery rate of $1.9 \%$ (Table 3.6.3). Also, five fish were collected at the Rock Island Dam fish counting facility in May 1989. Of the 21 fish recovered, $27.2 \%$ ( 6 fish) were recovered in the vicinity ( $\pm 20 \mathrm{~km}$ ) of the Hunters net pen site, $0 \%$ were recovered upstream from Hunters, and 72.8\% (15 fish) were recovered downstream at Seven Bays, Grand Coulee Dam, Rufus Woods Reservoir and Rock island Dam. Seven (33.3\%) of the 21 fish recaptured were recovered below Grand Coulee Dam.

Individual trout weighed 30 g when put into the Hunters net pen on October 26, 1988 and grew to a mean length of $209 \pm 16 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weight of $89 \pm 16 \mathrm{~g}$ by the time they were released from the net pens on March 10, 1989. By October 1989, mean length was $390 \pm 58 \mathrm{~mm}$ and mean weight was $817 \pm 296 \mathrm{~g}$. One individual released at a length of 191 mm in March 1989 and recovered in October 1989 reportedly grew to a total length of 431 mm and weight of 1026 g .

### 3.6.2 Walleye Tagging

Table 3.6.4 summarizes the number of walleye marked at each index station in 1988 and 1989, as well as number of tagged fish recovered from each marking.

Table 3.6.4. Summary of walleye marked with floy tags and released into Lake Roosevelt in 1988 and 1989.

| YEAR | DATE | Capture and Release Location | \# Tagged | \# Recovered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | May | 4 | 521 | 3 |
| 1988 | May | 5 | 91 |  |
| 1988 | Aug | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| 1988 | Aug | 4 | 43 |  |
| 1988 | Aug | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 1988 | Aug | 6 | 4 |  |
| 1988 | Oct | 1 | 40 | 1 |
| 1988 | Oat | 2 | 10 |  |
| 1988 | Oat | 3 | 19 |  |
| 1988 | Oat | 5 | 102 | 2 |
| 1988 | Oat | 7 | 1 |  |
| 1988 | Oat | 8 | 2 |  |
| 1989 | May | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| 1989 | May | 2 | 7 |  |
| 1989 | May | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1989 | May | 4 | 602 | 25 |
| 1989 | May | 5 | 83 |  |
| 1989 | May | 6 | 3 | 3 |
| 1989 | May | 7 | 10 |  |
| 1989 | May | 8 | 99 | 5 |
| 1989 | Jun | 5 | 11 |  |
| 1989 | Aug | 1 | 53 | 1 |
| 1989 | Aug | 2 | 20 |  |
| 1989 | Aug | 3 | 62 | 1 |
| 1989 | Aug | 4 | 15 |  |
| 1989 | Aug | 5 | 25 | 2 |
| 1989 | Aug | 6 | 4 |  |
| 1989 | Alug | 7 | 11 |  |
| 1989 | Aug | 8 | 5 |  |
| 1989 | Oat | 1 | 3 |  |
| 1989 | Ot | 2 | 8 |  |
| 1989 | Oat | 3 | 18 | 4 |
| 1989 | Oct | 5 | 14 | 1 |
| 1989 | Ot | 6 | 7 |  |
| 1989 | Od | 8 | 10 |  |
| 1989 | Ot | 9 | 3 |  |

LOCATION CODES:
(1) Kettle Falls
(4) Porcupine Bay
(7) Keller
(2) Gifford
(5) Little Falls Dam
(6) San Poil
(3) Hunters
(6) Seven Bays
(9) Spring Canyon

Table 3.6.5. Summary of walleye tag recoveries in Lake Roosevelt for fish marked in 1988.

| Release Data |  |  |  | Recapture Data |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tag No. | Loc | Date | Length $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Loc | Date | Length (mm) | Increase <br> (mm) |
| 24029 | 1 | $10 / 88$ | 395 | 9 | 7189 | 533 | 138 |
| 08053 | 4 | 5188 | 392 | 8 | $6 / 89$ | 432 | 40 |
| 10764 |  | $5 / 88$ | 247 | 7 | 9/88 |  |  |
| 08803 |  | 5/88 | 296 | 3 | 7189 | 393 | 97 |
| 10505 | 5 | 8188 | 290 | 5 | $6 / 89$ | 314 | 24 |
| 22120 |  | $10 / 88$ | 400 | 5 | $10 / 88$ | 399 |  |
| 21129 |  | 10/88 | 345 | 4 | 5/89 | 346 | 8 |

LOCATION CODES:
(1) Kettle Falls
(4) Porcupine Bay
(7) Keller
(2) Gifford
(5) Little Falls Dam
(8) San Poil
(3) Hunters
(6) Seven Bays
(9) Spring Canyon
BC British Columbia

| lag No. | Months between <br> capture and <br> recapture | Growth between <br> capture and <br> recapture $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Growth Increment <br> $(\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{mo})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24029 | 10 | 138 | 13.8 |
| 08803 | 14 | 97 | 6.9 |
| 10505 | 10 | 34 | 2.4 |
| Average |  |  | 7.7 |

Table 3.6.6. Summary of walleye tag recoveries in Lake Roosevelt for fish marked in 1989.


Tabie 3.6.T. Distribution of walleye recaptures marked at nine index stationsin in a-y, August and October 1989. The majority of the fish marked in the Spokane Arm at Porcupine Bay (Index Station \#4) were captured during their spawning migration in May 1989. Recapture locations indicate their subsequent dispersal throughout Lake Roosevelt.

| Recapture Location (Index Station \#) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ndex Station | Capture Location | narked | Canada | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 |
|  | Canada |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01 | Kettle Falls | 60 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 02 | G fford | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03 | Hunters | 82 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04 | Porcupi ne Bay | 617 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 10 |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |
| 05 | Little Falls | 122 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 06 | Seven Bays | 78 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 07 | Keller Ferry | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08 | San Poil | 114 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 09 | Spring Canyon (Grand Coulee) | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

In 1988, a total of 841 walleye were marked and seven were recaptured for a $1 \%$ recovery rate (Table 3.6.4). Walleye tagged in the Spokane Arm during the spawning season on May 4, 1988 were recovered at Keller Ferry and the San Poil River in September 1988 and at Gifford in July 1989 (Table 3.6.5). One fish tagged at Kettle Falls on October 20, 1988 was recaptured at Grand Coulee Dam on July 5, 1989 (Table 3.6.5). Growth increments calculated for walleye captured at least 10 months after release ranged from 2.4 to $13.8 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mo}$ with a mean value of 7.7 $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{mo}$ (Table 3.65).

In 1989, a total of 1,158 walleye were marked and 44 were recaptured for a $3.7 \%$ recovery rate (Tables 3.6.4 and 3.6.6). A total of 602 walleye were marked during their spawning migration in the Spokane Arm in May 1989 and 26 of these fish were subsequently recaptured by anglers for a $4.3 \%$ recovery rate (Table 3.6.7). Of the 26 Spokane Arm fish recaptured 3 ( $11.5 \%$ ) were recovered in Canada, 6 (23\%) near Kettle Falls, 1 (3.8\%) near Gifford, 1 (3.8\%) near Hunters, 10 (38.5\%) near the release location at Porcupine Bay in the Spokane Arm, 2 (7.6\%) near Seven Bays/Hawk Creek, and 3 (11.5\%) near Grand Coulee Dam (Table 3.6.7).

Five walleye tagged at Porcupine Bay in the Spokane Arm during the spawning season on May 5-6, 1989, were recovered in the vicinity of Kettle Falls, a distance of 153 km ( 95 miles), upstream in June and July 1989 (29, 34, 67, 70 and 71 days after release) (Table 3.6.7)). Travel time for the fish making the trip in 29 days computed to $5.3 \mathrm{~km} /$ day or 0.22 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$. Average travel time for the five fish was $3.3 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{day}$. Four walleye marked at Porcupine Bay on May 5-6, 1989 were recovered in the vicinity of Grand Coulee Dam, a distance of 89 km ( 55 miles) downstream, in June 1989 (35, 42 and 43 days after release) (Table 3.6.7). Three walleye tagged at Porcupine Bay on May 5-6, 1988 were recaptured in British Columbia, two in the vicinity of Waneta Dam and one in the tailrace of Keenleyside Dam, respectively distances of 201 km ( 125 miles) and 224 km (140 miles) upstream, in July 1989 (Table 3.6.7).

Other long distance walleye migrations recorded in 1989 included:
(1) One walleye tagged at Kettle Falls on August 7, 1989 was recovered near Seven Bays on May 4, 1990;
(2) One walleye tagged at Seven Bays on May 16, 1989 was recaptured near Grand Coulee Dam on July 3, 1989;
(3) Two walleye tagged in the San Poil River on May 9, 1989 were recovered at Hunters on July 28, 1989 and in Canada on September 28, 1989.

Growth increments for walleye collected at least 10 months after release ranged from 1.6 to $7.7 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mo}$ with a mean of $4.8 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mo}$ (Table 3.6.6). Growth increments for walleye captured in October 1989 and recaptured before April 1990 ranged from 0.4 mm to $3 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mo}$ and averaged $1.7 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mo}$.

### 3.7 Kokanee Fecundity

Tables 3.7.1 and 3.7.2 lists lengths, weights, and fecundity estimates for kokanee collected in 1988 and 1989. Regression plots of kokanee fecundity versus length and weight are presented in Appendix G.

In 1988, 50 sets of egg skein samples were collected from female kokanee salmon. Sexually mature 2+ kokanee averaged 399 mm in total length, 588 g in weight and contained a mean number of 1,303 eggs. Sexually mature $3+$ kokanee averaged 472 mm in length, $1,092 \mathrm{~g}$ in weight and contained a mean number of 1,728 eggs. In 1989, 51 sets of egg skein samples were collected from kokanee salmon. Sexually mature $2+$ kokanee averaged 348 mm in length, 419 g in weight and contained a mean number of 1,390 eggs. Sexually mature $3+$ kokanee averaged 460 mm in length, 954 g in weight and contained a mean number of 1,615 eggs.

Table 3.7.1. Length, weight, and fecundity of kokanee salmon collected in Lake Roosevelt, August to October 1988.

| Fish No. | Age | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Length } \\ \text { (mm) } \end{gathered}$ | Weight (g) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fecundity } \\ & \text { (eggs) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $2+$ | 389 | 548 | 1332 |
| 2 | 2+ | 470 | 849 | 1592 |
| 3 | 2+ | 338 | 366 | 984 |
| 4 | 3+ | 481 | 1246 | 1955 |
| 5 | $3+$ | 485 | 1200 | 1191 |
| 6 | $3+$ | 465 | 1107 | 2204 |
| 7 | $3+$ | 432 | 1210 | 1402 |
| 8 | $3+$ | 495 | 1046 | 1786 |
| 9 | 3 + | 485 | 998 | 951 |
| 10 | $3+$ | 460 | 958 | 1134 |
| 11 | 3 + | 451 | 1020 | 1282 |
| 12 | $3+$ | 487 | 1151 | 1249 |
| 13 | $3+$ | 478 | 1110 | 1855 |
| 14 | $3+$ | 464 | 1086 | 1619 |
| 15 | $3+$ | 480 | 1064 | 1830 |
| 16 | 3 + | 500 | 1378 | 2351 |
| 17 | 3. | 475 | 1145 | 1324 |
| 18 | $3+$ | 465 | 998 | 2225 |
| 19 | $3+$ | 502 | 1168 | 2366 |
| 20 | $3+$ | 481 | 1042 | 2064 |
| 21 | $3+$ | 502 | 1168 | 1963 |
| 22 | 3. | 486 | 1027 | 1620 |
| 23 | $3+$ | 465 | 963 | 1249 |
| 24 | $3+$ | 457 | 1149 | 2065 |
| 25 | $3+$ | 448 | 1000 | 1521 |
| 26 | $3+$ | 463 | 1108 | 2039 |
| 27 | $3+$ | 443 | 1145 | 1883 |
| 28 | $3+$ | 486 | 1027 | 1454 |
| 29 | $3+$ | 425 | 833 | 1608 |
| 30 | $3+$ | 443 | 1169 | 1952 |
| 31 | $3+$ | 470 | 1048 | 1567 |
| 32 | $3+$ | 481 |  | 1810 |
| 33 | $3+$ | 482 |  | 1716 |
| 34 | $3+$ | 452 |  | 919 |
| 35 | $3+$ | 462 |  | 1428 |
| 36 | $3+$ | 481 |  | 2567 |
| 37 | $3+$ | 439 |  | 1216 |
| 38 | $3+$ | 475 |  | 2054 |
| 39 | $3+$ | 481 |  | 1386 |
| 40 | $3+$ | 491 |  | 1591 |
| 41 | $3+$ | 457 |  | 1996 |
| 42 | $3+$ | 495 |  | 1770 |
| 43 | $3+$ | 431 |  | 1643 |
| 44 | $3+$ | 446 |  | 1761 |
| 45 | $3+$ | 455 |  | 1826 |
| 46 | $3+$ | 490 |  | 2020 |
| 47 | $3+$ | 525 |  | 1733 |
| 48 | $3+$ | 465 |  | 2720 |
| 49 50 | $3+$ $3+$ | $\begin{array}{r} 473 \\ 528 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1632 \\ & 1700 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $2+$ |  |  |  |
| ( $\pm$ S.O.) |  | $( \pm 67)$ | $( \pm 244)$ | $( \pm 305)$ |
| Mean | $3+$ | 472 | 1092 | 1728 |
| ( $\pm$ S.D.) |  |  |  | $( \pm 398)$ |

Table 3.7.2. Length, weight, and fecundity of kokanee salmon collected in Lake Roosevelt, May to December 1989.

| Fish No. | Age | Total Lenglh (mm) | Weight (g) | Fecundily <br> (in oggs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $1+$ | 245 | 141 | 987 |
| 2 | $1+$ | 250 | 154 | 956 |
| 3 | $1+$ | 280 | 169 | 1004 |
| 4 | $1+$ | 206 | 80 | 920 |
| 5 | 1 + | 346 | 455 | 1131 |
| 6 | 2+ | 262 | 138 | 1034 |
| 7 | $2+$ | 280 | 200 | 1148 |
| 8 | 2+ | 348 | 586 | 2119 |
| 9 | 2+ | 335 | 470 | 1228 |
| 10 | $2+$ | 370 | 476 | 1385 |
| 11 | $2+$ | 385 | 500 | 1332 |
| 12 | $2+$ | 380 | 555 | 1402 |
| 13 | $2+$ | 369 | 365 | 1624 |
| 14 | $2+$ | 381 | 480 | 1137 |
| 15 | 2+ | 361 | 420 | 1043 |
| 16 | $2+$ | 379 | 540 | 1644 |
| 17 | $2+$ | 380 | 493 | 1830 |
| 18 | $2+$ | 339 | 405 | 1889 |
| 19 | 2+ | 354 | 447 | 1343 |
| 20 | 2+ | 244 | 119 | 1107 |
| 21 | $2+$ | 393 | 505 | 979 |
| 22 | $3+$ | 420 | 705 | 1211 |
| 23 | $3+$ | 375 | 491 | 1102 |
| 24 | $3+$ | 363 | 492 | 1636 |
| 25 | $3+$ | 395 | 580 | 1522 |
| 26 | $3+$ | 425 | 698 | 1781 |
| 27 | $3+$ | 512 | 1150 | 2201 |
| 28 | $3+$ | 412 | 978 | 1674 |
| 29 | 3 + | 402 | 560 | 1576 |
| 30 | $3+$ | 503 | 1245 | 1850 |
| 31 | $3+$ | 535 | 1340 | 2133 |
| 32 | $3+$ | 380 | 565 | 1567 |
| 33 | 3. | 490 | 1020 | 2026 |
| 34 | 3. | 506 | 1120 | 1654 |
| 35 | 3. | 502 | 1160 | 1876 |
| 36 | $3+$ | 465 | 900 | 1376 |
| 37 | $3+$ | 512 | 1145 | 2054 |
| 38 | $3+$ | 510 | 1140 | 2165 |
| 39 | $3+$ | 487 | 960 | 1811 |
| 40 | 3. | 510 | 1240 | 1407 |
| 41 | 3. | 496 | 850 | 1590 |
| 42 | $3+$ | 550 | 1550 | 2334 |
| 43 | $3+$ | 463 | 945 | 1861 |
| 44 | $3+$ | 446 | 916 | 1122 |
| 45 | $3+$ | 445 | 1010 | 1242 |
| 46 | $3+$ | 482 | 1139 | 1227 |
| 47 | $3+$ | 455 | 406 | 1656 |
| 48 | $3+$ | 395 | 531 | 1419 |
| 49 | $3+$ | 416 | 954 | 1963 |
| 50 | $3+$ | 435 | 1225 | 1250 |
| 51 | $3+$ | 481 | 1226 | 1434 |
| 52 | $3+$ | 493 | 1346 | 1357 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ ( \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{gathered}$ | 1 + | $\begin{gathered} 265 \\ ( \pm 47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 200 \\ ( \pm 131) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1000 \\ & ( \pm 72) \end{aligned}$ |
| Mean | $2+$ | $348$ | $\begin{array}{r} 419 \\ \hline+1701 \end{array}$ | $1390$ |
| ( $\pm$ S.D.) |  | $( \pm 45)$ | $( \pm 139)$ | ( $\pm 330$ ) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & ( \pm \text { S.D. }) \end{aligned}$ | 3 + | $\begin{gathered} 460 \\ ( \pm 50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 954 \\ ( \pm 295) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1615 \\ ( \pm 422) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

### 4.0 DISCUSSION

### 4.1 CREEL SURVEYS

### 4.1.1 Trends in Angling Pressure, CPUE and harvest estimates

A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) creel survey (Harper et al. 1981) estimated that, from April 15 to September 15, 1981, approximately 56,496 anglers fished 256,491 hours on Lake Roosevelt. In contrast, results of the 1989 creel survey during the same period (April 15 to September 15, 1989) indicated a 1.7 fold increase in the number of anglers $(95,919)$ and 2.5 fold increase in angler hours $(644,872)$. Angling pressure also increased from 1988 to 1989. From August to December, 1988, an estimated 31,672 anglers fished 261,913 hours on Lake Roosevelt. Fro,n August to December 1989 an estimated 49,706 anglers fished 290,596 hours on Lake Roosevelt, respectively a 1.6 and 1.1 fold increase over 1988 angler trips and angler hours.

Although the angling pressure has increased significantly, catch rates (CPUE) and harvest numbers have fluctuated erratically. Before 1985, walleye were the primary sport fish in Lake Roosevelt. A Washington Department of Wildlife (WDW) survey conducted in 1973 determined that Lake Roosevelt anglers were catching walleye at a rate of 0.40 fish/h (Nielsen 1974a, b). Walleye CPUE increased to a rate of 0.53 fish/h in 1980, which was the highest recorded catch rate on the reservoir, and then decreased to 0.43 fish $/ \mathrm{h}$ in 1982 and 0.38 fish per hour in 1983 (Beckman et al. 1985). In the present creel survey, walleye CPUE was estimated at 0.34 fish/h from August to December, 1988 and 0.20 fish/h from January to December 1989.

Walleye harvest rates over the past decade have also fluctuated. WDW estimated a total catch of 2,797 walleye from June 1 to September 30, 1973 (Nielsen 1974a, b; Fletcher 1985). USFWS creel surveys estimated the walleye harvest at 128,156 from April 15 to September 15, 1981 and 108,532 from April 15 to September 15, 1982 (Harper et al. 1981; Beckman et al. 1985). Results of creel survey data collected in the present study from January to December 1989 show a further decrease to only 80,626 walleye harvested. In part, this decrease was related to minimum size regulations ( 16 inch minimum length) established by WDW. Total catch (harvest + released) of walleye was $151,794 \pm 37,676$ fish in 1989.

From August to December 1988, anglers caught rainbow trout at a rate of 0.37 fish/h and harvested 86,107 fish. In 1989, the rainbow trout catch rate was 0.15 fish $/ \mathrm{h}$ and 65,515 fish were harvested. In comparison, from April 15 to September 15, 1981, anglers harvested only 1,517 rainbow (Harper et al. 1981). This large increase in rainbow trout harvest was attributed to the Lake Roosevelt rainbow trout net pen program. This assumption is supported by net pen raised (i.e., hatchery origin) rainbow outnumbering native rainbow observed in angler creels by a ratio of 3:1. In 1985, net pen operations commenced and anglers began catching net pen reared rainbow trout at a rate of about two fish per day, or a catch rate of 0.25 fish/h (Jackson 1985).

Little information exists on catch rates and harvest numbers of kokanee salmon in Lake Roosevelt. Catch rates are currently extremely low at 0.08 fish $/ \mathrm{h}$ from August to December, 1988 and 0.04 fish $/ \mathrm{h}$ in 1989, which is probably a direct correlation with the low population size. The catch rates are also erratic as shown by catch rates as high as 0.28 fish/h in October 1988 and 0.14 fish/h in September 1989, months when sexually mature adults congregate for spawning.

In terms of kokanee harvest, an estimated 126,174 fish harvested in 1981 included only 284 kokanee (Harper et al. 1981). From August to December, 1988, an estimated 125,891 fish were harvested comprised of 9,362 kokanee; while in 1989, an estimated 164,598 fish were harvested comprised of 11,906 kokanee. In both 1988 and 1989, kokanee comprised $7 \%$ of the total harvest compared to 1981 when kokanee was less than $1 \%$ of the total harvest. The greater percent seen in the current harvest size is partly related to the difference in creel survey techniques. The 1981 USFWS creel survey was conducted for a six month period from April 15 to September 15. As mentioned, the highest catch rate recorded August to December, 1988, was 0.28 fish per hour in October. The 1989 annual creel survey indicated that the high catch rate season occurred in late winter and the low catch rates season occurred in the summer. However, in 1989 an estimated 7,229 kokanee were harvested from April through September. This indicates that kokanee abundance in the reservoir has increased (See Section 4.2.4 for details about factors contributing to this increase).

Sturgeon fishing on Lake Roosevelt was predominantly confined to the upper reaches of the lake above the Kettle Falls area, although there have been recorded catches near Gifford Ferry and Fort Spokane. Sturgeon angling in 1989 was compared to results of surveys performed by the National Park Service from 1985 to 1987 (Chilcoat and Appling 1985, Appling 1986, and NPS 1987) (Table 4.1.1). Creel surveys were conducted

Table 4.1.1. Summary of sturgeon fishery survey data for Lake Roosevelt from 1985-I 989. Data from 1985 to 1987 collected by National Park Service.

|  | NPS Survey |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | Present study |
|  |  | 1989 |  |  |
| No. days surveyed | 67 | 145 | 163 | 233 |
| No. anglers surveyed | 424 | 894 | 956 | 447 |
| No. hours fished | 3293 | 10,181 | 8463 | 5,671 |
| No. harvested | 39 | 34 | 71 | 34 |
| No. released | 20 | 21 | 31 | 17 |
| Total catch | 59 | 55 | 102 | 51 |
| CPUE (Total Catch) | 55.8 | 188.5 | 83 | 111.2 |
| (\# hr to catch one sturgeon) | 84.4 | 299.4 | 119.2 | 166.8 |
| CPUE (Harvest only) | 84 |  |  |  |
| (\# hr to harvest one sturgeon) |  |  |  |  |

for 8 months by the NPS in 1985 and 1986, and ten months in 1987, while our 1989 survey was performed for twelve months. The NPS surveys showed that an angler spent 55.8 hours in 1985, 188.5 hours in 1986, and 82.9 hours in 1987 to catch one sturgeon and 88.4 hours in 1985, 299.4 hours in 1986, and 119.2 hours in 1987 to harvest one sturgeon. Results of the 1989 survey indicate that an angler spent 111.2 hours to catch and 166.8 hours to harvest one sturgeon. The number of sturgeon examined during surveys was also lower in 1989 at 51 fish compared to 59 in 1985, 55 in 1986 and 102 fish in 1987. The increasing time to catch one sturgeon and the fewer fish harvested may be an indication of a decline in the sturgeon population of Lake Roosevelt.

### 4.1.2 Economic Value of the Lake Roosevelt Fishery

Past and present economic values of the Lake Roosevelt sport fishery were estimated by multiplying the number of angler trips by the dollar amount spent per angler trip for inland waters of the Pacific Northwest (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1989). Data on angler trips from 1980 and 1982 was obtained from Beckman et $a /$. (1985) who estimated that about 75,000 angler trips were made from April 15 to September 15 each year. Results of the present creel survey estimated the number of angler trips at 70,308 from August to December 1988, and 179,871 from January to December 1989 (Table 4.1.2).

The estimated revenue generated in 1980, 1982, 1988 and 1989 is recorded in Table 4.1.2. In 1980 and 1981 the fishery produced about $\$ 1.73$ million for the regional economy. This represents a minimum estimate because the fishery was surveyed only between April and September. A larger amount ( $\$ 2.03$ million) was estimated for the period August to December 1988. The net economic value of the 1989 fishery (January-December) was estimated at $\$ 5.20$ million. Thus, the Lake Roosevelt fishery contributes significantly to the regional economy.

### 4.2 RELATIVE ABUNDANCE OF LAKE ROOSEVELT FISH POPULATIONS

After impoundment by Grand Coulee Dam in 1939, composition and populations of fish species in the Columbia, Spokane. and San Poil river systems that form Lake Roosevelt have simultaneously changed as biological characteristics of the reservoir have changed. These river systems, that once produced large quantities of anadromous salmon and steelhead, as well as resident rainbow, cutthroat and bull trout, mountain whitefish, and kokanee salmon, were immediately overrun by carp and

Table 4.1.2. Estimates of the economic value of the Lake Roosevelt sport fishery.

| Date | \# Angler Trips | Net Value of <br> Sport Fishery |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Apr-Ott, 1980 | $\mathbf{7 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ 1,725,500$ |
| Apr-Ott, 1982 | $\mathbf{7 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 2 5 , 5 0 0}$ |
| Aug-Dee, 1988 | $\mathbf{7 0 , 3 0 8}$ | $2,031,901$ |
| Jan-Dee, 1989 | $\mathbf{1 7 9 , 8 7 1}$ | $5,198,271$ |

other undesirable species. By 1949, eight years after Grand Coulee Dam became operational, a USFWS gill net survey of Lake Roosevelt determined that carp, squawfish and other species of cyprinids and catastomids were the dominant fish in the reservoir (Gangmark and Fulton 1949). Similar observations were reported in a gill net survey conducted by WDW from December 1962 to November 1963 (Earnest et al. 1963).

Table 4.2.1 presents the relative abundance of different families of fish captured in Lake Roosevelt from 1949 to 1989. The results indicate two major alterations in the fish community of Lake Roosevelt since construction of Grand Coulee Dam.

First, walleye, illegally introduced into Lake Roosevelt probably around 1962, became abundant, and, as population levels increased, a viable sport fishery developed by 1973 (Beckman et al. 1985; Fletcher 1985). Results of gill net surveys performed on the Spokane Arm of Lake Roosevelt by the Washington Water Power Company in 1973 showed that walleye comprised $11 \%$ of the relative abundance. A gill net survey conducted by USFWS from 1980-1982 estimated that walleye comprised $29 \%$ and yellow perch comprised $8 \%$ of the relative abundance (Beckman et al. 1985). According to their creel survey the walleye sport fishery increased markedly. Anglers caught walleye at a rate of 0.53 fish/h and harvested 128,156 walleye in 1980 (Beckman et al. 1985), indicating that a large population of walleye existed. Cyprinids and catostomids were still abundant in the USFWS survey at $23 \%$ and $34 \%$ respectively. In the present 1988 gill net survey, relative abundance was $36.3 \%$ walleye, $2.7 \%$ yellow perch, $38 \%$ catostomids and $8.8 \%$ cyprinids. In the 1989 gill net survey, relative abundance was $33.7 \%$ walleye, $12.8 \%$ yellow perch, $27.9 \%$ catostomid and 7\% cyprinids.

Second, in all of the studies reported above through 1983, salmonids accounted for less than $1 \%$ of the relative abundance. In contrast, in the present survey, salmonids accounted for $25.6 \%$ of the relative abundance. This increased abundance of salmonids was also noted in creel surveys. The USFWS survey conducted in 1980 and 1982 reported that salmonids comprised about $4 \%$ of the harvest each year (5,126 fish in 1980 and 4,341 fish in 1982), whereas, in the present study, salmonids comprised $60 \%$ (172,890 fish) of the harvest from August 1988 to December 1989. In part, this difference is owing to different techniques used in the surveys. For example, the USFWS survey was conducted from April 15 to September 15 each year, whereas the present survey was conducted from January 1 to December 31.

Table 4.2.1. Summary of relative abundance of families of fish captured in Lake Roosevelt from 1949 to 1989. Percentage of total numbers are presented for USFWS (1980-1 982) and present study (1988-1 989).

| $\infty$ | FAM LY | PERCENT RELATI VE ABUNDANCE FOR EACH TYF' E OF SURVEY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | USFVS (1949) <br> gill net | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UDW ( 1963) } \\ & \text { gill net } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { WPP ( 1973) } \\ \text { gill net } \end{gathered}$ | USFWS (1980-1982) |  | Present Studv (1988-1 989) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | gillnet | creel | gillnet | electrofishing | creel |
|  | SALMONIDAE | $<1$ | $<1$ | cl | <1 | 4 | 25. 6 | 11.3 | 60 |
|  | PERCIDAE | 3 | 4 | 32 | 37 | 94 | 39.9 | 56.5 | 37 |
|  | CENTRARCHIDAE | 1 | >1 |  | 1 | $<1$ | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3 \% |
|  | CATASTOMIDAE | 10 | 20 | 44 | 34 |  | 23.3 | 19.9 |  |
|  | CYPRINIDAE | 83 | 72 | 22 | 23 |  | 5.9 | 6.3 |  |
|  | ICTALURIDAE |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |
|  | ACIPENSERIDAE |  |  |  |  | $<1$ | 0.1 | 0 | cl |
|  | GADIDAE |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | 0.3 |  |

However, we believe that the results reflect a true increase of salmonid populations in the reservoir, resulting from the rainbow trout net pen program, which was initiated in 1985. From August 1988 to December 1989, a total of 151,622 rainbow were harvested, composed of $65 \%$ net pen fish, $14 \%$ wild fish and $21 \%$ whose origin could not be determined. Creel clerks determined origin in the field by observing if fish had characteristic hatchery marks, e.g., stubbed dorsal fin, and eroded pectoral and pelvic fins.

### 4.2.1 Yellow Perch Abundance

In 1949 and 1963, yellow perch relative abundance was 3\% and 4\% respectively (Gangmark and Fulton 1949, Earnest et al. 1966). In 1973, yellow perch relative abundance was 20\% (WWP 1973). In 1980 to 1983, yellow perch relative abundance had declined to $8 \%$ of the total catch (Beckman et al. 1985). The decline in relative abundance of yellow perch in the 1980 to 1983 surveys was attributed to increased reservoir fluctuations owing to construction and operation of the third power house at Grand Coulee Dam,

Beckman et al. (1985) reported that, in Lake Roosevelt, peak yellow perch spawning occurred during late April to mid-May with eggs hatching from mid-May to early June. Beckman et al. were able to demonstrate a correlation between water level fluctuations during the spawning season with larval catch. In 1980, water levels increased steadily after reaching a low of 373.3 m on 10 April. Larval catch was 94.5 perch/ $/ 00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. In 1981, reservoir level was higher, but after reaching a minimum of 383.3 m on 22 April, and increasing to 385.6 m on 3 May, reservoir elevation declined to 383.8 m on 17 May before beginning to increase to full pool. Larval catch was reduced to 8.4 perch/ $/ 00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$. Reservoir levels were lowest in 1982 ( 369.1 m ) and did not begin to increase until 20 April but rose steadily. Larval catch was 73.2 perch1100 $\mathrm{m}^{3}$. Beckman et al. (1985) concluded that, "Spawning success of yellow perch was better in years when the minimum water elevation was achieved earlier, and the increase was consistent once begun, than in years when water levels fluctuated of did not begin to rise until later in the spring."

In the present study, yellow perch was the overall most abundant species captured, comprising $36 \%$ in relative abundance of the total catch from August 1988 to December 1989. In 1988, the majority of the yellow perch were young-of-the-year (YOY) fry. Our studies were conducted after three consecutive years (1986-1988) of drought. During this period relatively minimal drawdowns for flood control occurred on Lake

Roosevelt and once refill was initiated, water levels steadily increased (Fig. 2.3).

In 1989, a more pronounced and earlier drawdown occurred, but after refill was initiated water levels steadily increased and YOY yellow perch fry were again abundant (Fig. 2.3). Thus, results of the present study are consistent with those reported by Beckman et al. (1985). Adult perch were rarely encountered in the present survey. Virtually all adult (>2+) yellow perch were captured in pelagic zones or near mouths of embayments and tributaries, while the dominant younger fish were found in littoral areas associated with woody debris. Yellow perch were an important forage species for walleye. In 1988 and 1989, the ratio of yellow perch to walleye captured in gillnet and electrofishing surveys was 1.96:1 ( 3,947 yellow perch and 2,017 walleye). This is better than the $1: 3$ ratio reported in 1980 to 1982, but less than the $3: 1$ ratio needed for good walleye growth (Beckman et al. 1985). If just 1989 gillnet survey data, which is more comparable to Beckman et al. (1985), is used the ratio of yellow perch to walleye was 1:2.6 (relative abundance $=33.7 \%$ walleye and $12.8 \%$ yellow perch). This result is uniform with those of Beckman et al. (1985). These data suggest that lack of forage fish currently limits walleye production in Lake Roosevelt.

### 4.2.2 Walleye Abundance

Although walleye were the second most abundant species collected in the present electrofishing and gill net surveys, their populations appear to be on the decline in Lake Roosevelt. Evidence stems from comparisons of gill net catch-per-effort (CPE) statistics reported by USFWS (Beckman et al. 1985) and the present study. The mean CPE for four stations (San Poil, Porcupine Bay, Gifford and Kettle Falls) was 9.8 fish/net in 1980, 4.9 fish/net in 1981, 4.5 fish/net in 1988 and 3.9 fish/net in 1989.

The rapid decline of walleye during the early 1980's was attributed to over harvest by anglers, poor recruitment and a declining prey (yellow perch) base (Beckman et a/ 1985). In 1985, WDW enacted stricter harvest regulations, including establishment of both catch and minimum size limits, as well as closure of the Spokane Arm -- the principle spawning and rearing area in the reservoir -- during the spawning season (April 1 May 31). This action appears to have stabilized the decline in walleye abundance. The slight reduction in CPE between 1988 and 1989 may be related to a difference in reservoir operations between the two years (Fig. 2.3). The reservoir was drawn down for an extended period and to a lower reservoir elevation in 1989 as compared to 1988. This could have
increased entrainment of walleye through Grand Coulee Dam. Additionally, gill net surveys were conducted in May 1989 but not May 1988, so the data are not strictly comparable.

### 4.2.3 Rainbow Trout Abundance

Rainbow trout populations have increased to their highest level since the impoundment by Grand Coulee Dam. The majority of rainbow were captured near pet pen locations, although considerable numbers were also captured at the mouths of tributaries. The present abundance is attributed to fish from two different origins: artificial production of net-pen reared rainbow and native production in tributary streams.

Examination for native or hatchery origin (i.e., stubbed dorsal and eroded pectoral fins) showed that hatchery (net-pen reared) trout outnumbered native rainbow trout by a ratio of 3:1 in gill net and electrofishing surveys. This was also seen in the creel surveys, which estimated $65 \%$ hatchery, $14 \%$ native, and $21 \%$ of unknown origin rainbow trout. The majority of net-pen trout were found in the southern portion of Lake Roosevelt, excluding the San Poil Arm, while the majority of native trout were found in the San Poil and Spokane Arms of Lake Roosevelt, and at the mouths of several tributaries.

Results of past fishery surveys on Lake Roosevelt indicated the scarcity of rainbow trout. In 1949, the USFWS sampled six locations throughout Lake Roosevelt with gill nets which resulted in the total absence of any salmonid species (Gangmark and Fulton 1949). Fishery surveys performed over the following three decades showed similar results; rainbow trout comprised less than $1 \%$ of the total abundance. The small population of rainbow trout that existed in Lake Roosevelt has been limited by the amount of spawning habitat and possibly the over harvest of spring spawners in tributaries. Beckman et al. (1985) determined that naturally produced rainbow trout sustained a relatively small population of harvestable size rainbow trout. Beak Consultants (1980) operated a trap in the San Poil river and caught 51 migratory adult rainbow trout 3 to 4 years old, averaging 412 mm and 0.8 kg , on their upstream spawning migration (March 21 - June 1, 1979). They also captured 312 juvenile ( $1+$ age class) rainbow which moved downstream in large numbers between June 15 and July 15, 1979. Subsequent tag recoveries indicated that these fish scattered through the lower reservoir (Beak Consultants, 1980).

The limited spawning habitat (Stober et al. 1977, Beckman et al. 1985) is a result of natural barriers on most tributary streams which
make them inaccessible to reservoir fish populations. There is a considerable amount of spawning and rearing habitat in many Lake Roosevelt tributaries, but natural barriers (i.e., waterfalls at the mouth, dead falls and log jams) impedes access to migratory fish. Also, rainbow trout seeking access to spawning tributaries during the spring find ascent difficult because of drawdown effects. These observations suggest that manipulations to improve spawning and rearing habitat and access to spawning tributaries would substantially increase the population levels of wild rainbow trout in the reservoir (Scholz et al. 1986).

### 4.2.4 Kokanee Salmon Abundance

The current abundance of kokanee in Lake Roosevelt is lower than it was before construction of the third powerhouse in 1968 (Stober et al. 1977). In 1966 and 1967 large numbers of kokanee were collected in the forebay of Grand Coulee Dam via gill nets and purse seine (Snyder 1967). Snyder (1969) reported that, "Sizeable kokanee populations were present in the lake. In 7966, 35,000 kokanee were captured in Cfesent Bay and transplanted below Chief Joseph Dam."

In contrast, in the fisheries survey performed by USFWS from 1980 1982, kokanee comprised less than $1 \%$ of their total gill net catch (Beckman et a/. 1985). In the present study kokanee comprised about $\mathbf{1 \%}$ of the gillnet catch in both 1988 and 1989, 3.5\% of electrofishing catch in 1988 and $1.9 \%$ of the electrofishing catch in 1989. Stober et al. (1977) concluded that, with increased drawdown after construction of the third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam, redds of shoreline spawning kokanee would be exposed to dessication. This could account for the decline in kokanee abundance observed from the 1960's to the 1980's.

From 1980 to 1982, USFWS collected a total of only 19 kokanee (Beckman et al. 1985) present study 310 kokanee were collected in fisheries surveys from August 1988 to December 1989. In 1981, anglers harvest 284 kokanee from April 15 through September 15 (Harper et al. 1981). In 1989, anglers harvest 7,229 kokanee from April through September. These data indicate that kokanee abundance has increased from 1980 to 1989. In part, this increase is attributed to the difference in resenvoir operation prior to and during the two studies. From 1979 to 1982, the reservoir was drawn down to low levels. In contrast, from 1987 to 1989, the resenvoir was operated to retain as much water as possible because of drought conditions. In 1986 and 1987 the reservoir was operated more like it was during the 1950's and early 1960's.

A second factor contributing to the increased abundance of kokanee in Lake Roosevelt is an influx of kokanee from Lake Coeur d'Alene, ID. Kokanee migrating downstream from Lake Coeur d'Alene into Lake Roosevelt was evidenced from juveniles observed in the forebay of Little Falls Dam by UCUT and Washington Water Power Company personnel in December 1989. No known natural spawning or stocking of kokanee occurs between Little Falls Dam and Lake Coeur d'Alene, so it is likely that the juvenile fish observed in the forebay had migrated downstream from Lake Coeur d'Alene. In 1988 and 1989 mature kokanee were recorded at the base of Little Falls Dam, appearing to be migrating upstream. Lake Coeur d'Alene became overpopulated from 1979 to 1985 when the population increased from 6.04 million to 9.38 million fish (Partridge 1988). The adult spawners observed at Little Falls Dam in 1988 may have been progeny of the 1985 cohort. Age analysis of kokanee scales collected from Little Falls Dam in 1988 revealed that these spawners were predominantly the $3+$ age class.

Never-the-less, kokanee were still not very abundant in 1988 and 1989. Only 310 kokanee were captured in gillnet and electrofishing surveys. In creel surveys conducted in 1988 (August-December) and 1989, (January-December), total kokanee harvest was estimated at only 9,362 $\pm$ 3,873 and $11,906 \pm 3,597$ fish respectively. In summary, both fisheries survey and creel survey data indicated that kokanee were not abundant in Lake Roosevelt during the baseline period before the Lake Roosevelt kokanee hatcheries come on line.

Both USFWS and present surveys found comparable distribution of kokanee with the majority of kokanee captured in the lower reaches of the reservoir except during the autumn when sexually mature adults migrated to spawning grounds and distributed throughout the reservoir. In our surveys, spawning populations were noted at Little Falls Dam, San Poil River, Hawk Creek, Sheep Creek, Nez Perce creek and Hunters Creek. Possible shoal spawning sites were located at Kieffer Point in the mainstem Columbia on the Spokane Indian Reservation and about 1.5 km below Little Falls Dam in the Spokane Arm.

### 4.2.5 Lake Whitefish Abundance

Lake whitefish abundance in Lake Roosevelt appears to be increasing as evidenced by increased relative abundance in gill net surveys from $1 \%$ in 1963 (Earnest et a/. 1966) to 3\% in 1980-I 982 (Beckman et al. 1985), to $6.1 \%$ ( 24 fish) in 1988 and $30.7 \%$ (239 fish) in 1989 (present study). The increased abundance of whitefish may be related to reduced predation
by adult yellow perch and walleye. Whitefish were reported in the diets of adult yellow perch and walleye in Lake Roosevelt (Harper et al. 1981, Nigro et al. 1983). Lake whitefish abundance is of concern to the operation of the kokanee hatcheries because of the high diet overlap between kokanee and lake whitefish.

### 4.2.6 Notes on other Sport Fish Species

Twelve chinook salmon were captured in the present electrofishing and gill net surveys. The majority of these were captured in the late summer and autumn at Little Falls Dam on the Spokane Arm (Index Station 5). In 1982, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) introduced chinook salmon into Lake Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. It seems likely that the chinook we observed emigrated from Lake Coeur d'Alene as juveniles and grew to maturity in Lake Roosevelt. Chinook salmon lengths and weights respectively ranged from 400 to 665 mm and $1,195 \mathrm{~g}$ ( 495 mm fish) to $1,605 \mathrm{~g}$ ( 510 mm fish). See Appendix D (Table D5).

Forty nine brown trout were captured in 1988 and 1989. Nearly all were captured either at the base of Little Falls Dam or in the Colville River near Kettle Falls (Index Station 1). Brown trout lengths and weights ranged from 145 to 732 mm and 106 to $5,783 \mathrm{~g}$, respectively (Appendix D, Table D6).

In 1988 and 1989, 96 largemouth bass and 205 smallmouth bass were captured in electrofishing and gill net surveys. Adult bass of both species were concentrated in the southern portion of the reservoir at Spring Canyon, Keller Ferry, and the Sanpoil River (Index Stations 7, 8, and 9). Some adult bass were collected at Porcupine Bay in the Spokane Arm (Index Station 4). Most young-of-the-year bass were collected in the Spokane Arm, Sanpoil Arm and Hawk Creek (Index Station 4, 6 and 8). Largemouth bass ranged from 116 to 390 mm in total length (Appendix D, Table D7). Smallmouth bass ranged from 130 to 385 mm in total length and $181 \mathrm{~g}(225 \mathrm{~mm})$ to $499 \mathrm{~g}(315 \mathrm{~mm})$ in weight (Appendix D, Table D8).

### 4.3 AGE, GROWTH, AND CONDITION

### 4.3.1 Rainbow Trout

Mean estimated total length at annulus formation of rainbow trout in Lake Roosevelt was compared to that reported from other rainbow producing lakes and rivers in the western United States and Canada (Table 4.3.1). At each annulus, rainbow lengths from Lake Roosevelt trout

Table 4.3.1. Comparisons of estimated total lengths at annulus formation for rainbow trout in Lake Roosevelt -v- rainbow trout waters in the western United States and British Columbia.

|  | Average total length (mm) at annulus formation |  |  |  |  |  | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| Okanogan Lake, B.C. | 114 | 305 | 431 | 571 |  |  | Wydoski 8 Whitney (1979) |
| Moyie River, ID | 96 | 160 | 228 | 297 | - |  | Horner \& Ri enan (1984) |
| Box Canyon, ID | 155 | 277 | 364 | 431 | 493 | 532 | Angradi \& Contour (1989) |
| Spokane Ri ver, ID | 139 | 222 | 306 | 371 |  |  | Bennet \& Under nood ( 1987) |
| Henry Forks, ID | 126 | 243 | 362 | 450 | 493 | 532 | Angradi \& Contour (1989) |
| Whrm River, ID | 113 | 192 | 265 | 313 | 363 | 381 | Bronstrom (1987) |
| Fall River, ID | 103 | 179 | 251 | 307 |  |  | Bronstrom \& Spat ehol ts (1985) |
| Henrys Fork, ID | 129 | 211 | 297 | 369 | 458 | 555 | Bronstrom\& Spateholts (1985) |
| Snake River, ID | 130 | 257 | 353 | 462 | 495 | $\stackrel{-}{7}$ | Wydoski \& Whitney ( 1979) |
| Coeur d'Alene River, ID | 69 | 111 | 171 | 256 | 370 | 433 | Lewynsky ( M5) |
| Pend Oreille Lake, ID | 78 | 161 | 290 | 446 | 562 | 662 | Pratt (1984) |
| Mssouri River, M | 81 | 201 | 282 | 343 | 404 | 421 | Katherin (1951) |
| Mbrtana Lakes, M | 89 | 206 | 323 | 406 | 465 | . | Carl ander (1969) |
| Kootenai Ri ver, M | 97 | 262 | 353 | 406 | - |  | May \& Huston (1983) |
| Firehole Ri ver, VY | 135 | 234 | 328 | 396 | - |  | Carlander (1969) |
| Medi son Ri ver, wr | 127 | 244 | 356 | 417 | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ |  | Carl ander (1969) |
| Ross Lake, MA | 122 | 266 | 345 | 383 | 406 | - | Wydoski \& Whitney ( 1979) |
| Box Canyon Reservoir, WA | 105 | 154 | 233 | 321 | 387 | $\cdots$ | Barber et al. (1989) |
| Spokane Ri ver, WA ${ }^{1}$ | 89 | 196 | 274 | 368 | 419 | 470 | Bail ey \& Saltes (1982) |
| Spokane River, MA* | 123 | 219 | 318 | 397 | 419 | . | Kleist ( 1987) |
| Lake Roosevelt, WA 19773 | 97 | 255 | 322 | - |  |  | Stober et al. (1977) |
| MEAN TOTALS | 110 | 217 | 307 | 386 | 441 | 498 |  |
| Lake Roosevelt, WA 1988 Lake Roosevelt, WA 1989 | 195 166 | 318 235 | 377 344 | $\begin{aligned} & 423 \\ & 429 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 434 \\ & 474 \end{aligned}$ | 501 | Present Study Present Study |

[^1]collected in 1989 were greater than the average of 20 lakes used for comparison: $166-\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{I} 10 \mathrm{~mm}$ at Age I, $235-\mathrm{v}-217 \mathrm{~mm}$ at age II, $344-\mathrm{v}-207$ mm at age III, $429-\mathrm{v}-386 \mathrm{~mm}$ at age IV, 474-v-441 mm at age V , and 501-$\mathrm{v}-498 \mathrm{~mm}$ at age VI.

The excellent growth rates of Lake Roosevelt rainbow is further reflected in creel survey results. Mean length and weight of rainbow harvested from August to December 1988 were respectively 391 mm and 676 g . Mean length and weight of rainbow harvested from January to December 1989 was 403 mm and 710 g . Most of these fish were net pen rainbow harvested during the first six to twelve months after release. Tagging studies indicated that rainbow trout, tagged at the Seven Bays net pen in May 1988 achieved total lengths of $418 \pm 37 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weights of $764 \pm 70 \mathrm{~g}$ by October 1988. Rainbow trout tagged at the Seven Bays net pen in April 1989 attained lengths of $401 \pm 13 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weights of $681 \pm$ 98 g by October 1989. Rainbow trout tagged at Hunters net pen in March 1989 attained lengths of $390 \pm 58 \mathrm{~mm}$ and weights of $817 \pm 296 \mathrm{~g}$ by October 1989.

### 4.3.2 Walleye

Walleye collected during this study were of average size and condition. Growth estimates back-calculated from scale samples collected during the present study were compared to estimates reported for walleye in past surveys of Lake Roosevelt and from other walleye waters in the United States and British Columbia (Table 4.3.2).

From age I to VI, Lake Roosevelt walleye were average in size, whereas from age VII to IX Lake Roosevelt walleye were above average. Lake Roosevelt walleye growth for all ages was lower in comparison to mid-Columbia River and Lake Umatilla estimates, but greater than estimates reported for northern Wisconsin and Minnesota lakes.

Growth estimates reported in studies conducted by the WDW in 1973 (Nielson 1974a, b), and USFWS from 1979-1980 (Harper et al. 1980) and 1981 (Nigro et al. 1983) were greater for all age classes of walleye than found in the present study (Table 4.3.2). However, 1988 to 1989 growth estimates were comparable to those reported by Beckman et al. (1985), which included scale data from 1979 to 1983. Beckman et al. (1985) reported walleye size had declined from 1969 to 1983 but had stabilzed between 1980 and 1983. The decline in walleye size from 1969 to 1983 appeared to be a result of the population overextending its forage base. Mean condition factor of walleye collected from 1980-I 983 was 0.87 ,

Table 4.3.2. Comparisons of estimated total lengths at annulus formation for walleye in Lake Roosevelt -v- other walleye lakes in the western United States and British Columbia.

which is very close to the 1988-I 989 mean of 0.88 . Thus, it appears that walleye growth has been relatively stable from about 1980 to 1989. Further support for this claim stems from growth comparisons of fish collected in 1988 and 1989 fisheries surveys. Mean length, weight and condition factor for a particular age class was similar in both 1988 and 1989, although growth was slightly greater in 1989 (Tables 3.3.5 and 3.3.6).

### 4.3.3 Kokanee Salmon

Back-calculated lengths at annulus formation for kokanee from Lake Roosevelt were compared to estimates from other kokanee lakes in the western United States and British Columbia (Table 4.3.3). Mean total length of Lake Roosevelt kokanee was significantly greater at the end of each year than the mean of 19 other lakes used for comparison: 124-v-121 mm at age I, $259-\mathrm{v}-207 \mathrm{~mm}$ at age II, $354-\mathrm{v}-256 \mathrm{~mm}$ at age III and 406-$v-272$ at age IV. In fact, Lake Roosevelt kokanee exhibited the best growth among the compared lakes for all age classes, with the exception of the first year.

Comparison of kokanee caught by anglers also indicated that kokanee growth in Lake Roosevelt is superior to that from other locations. The average size of kokanee harvested in Lake Roosevelt was 432 mm in 1988 and 411 mm in 1989 compared to ranges of $240-395 \mathrm{~mm}$ from 1954 to 1988 in Lake Coeur d'Alene, ID, 235-305 mm from 1980 to 1981 in Spirit Lake, ID, 220-304 mm from 1965 to 1975 in Odell Lake, OR, 292-369 mm from 1967 to 1985 in Flathead Lake, MT, 237-343 mm from 1954 to 1987 in Pend Oreille Lake, ID, 231-411 mm from 1941 to 1985 in Loon Lake, WA and 328-411 mm from 1940 to 1985 in Deer Lake, WA (Lewis 1975; Rieman and Bowler 1980; Cochnauer 1983, Chisolm and Fraley 1985, Scholz et a/. 1988). Because kokanee are size selective predators of zooplankton, the growth of kokanee is greatly influenced by the relationship between kokanee population density and amount of food resources, i.e., intraspecific competition (Pfeiffer 1978; Scholz et al. 1988).

Cochnauer (1983) reported that the kokanee population in Lake Coeur d'Alene, ID steadily increased from 1954 to 1982. This population increase was accompanied by steadily decreasing individual growth. Mean lengths of kokanee decreased from 394 millimeters in 1954 to 236 millimeters in 1982. Rieman et al. (1980) reported that by 1979 no large zooplankton were left in the lake. In 1972, the cladoceran, Daphnia (1.372.16 mm ), and the copepod, Epischura (1.7-2.3 mm), were present in

Table 4.3.3. Comparisons of estimated total lengths at annulus formation for kokanee salmon in Lake Roosevelt -v-other kokanee lakes in the western United States and British Columbla.

significant numbers, but by 1979, the cladocerans Diaphanosoma (0.6-I .O mm ) and Bosminia ( $0.3-0.4 \mathrm{~mm}$ )-- and copepods, Cyclops ( $0.5-0.7 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and Diapromus ( 0.7 mm ), were the dominant forms and larger zooplankton were absent. From 1979 to 1985, kokanee populations increased from 6.04 million to 9.38 million fish.

In 1985, the average kokanee length in Lake Coeur d'Alene had declined to 188 mm (Partridge 1988). In 1982, chinook salmon predators were introduced into Lake Coeur d'Alene. Introduction of chinook had the following effects on the kokanee: (1) the kokanee population decreased by 2.06 million fish (from 9.38 million fish in 1985 to 7.31 million fish in 1986); and (2) the mean size of kokanee in the fishery increased from 188 millimeters in 1985 to 216 millimeters in 1986 (Horner et al. 1986, 1987; Partridge 1988).

A study of two adjacent lakes, Loon and Deer Lakes, WA, provided similar results. At Loon Lake, WA mean size of kokanee in the creel decreased from $403 \pm 16 \mathrm{~mm}$ in 1947 to $234 \pm 15 \mathrm{~mm}$ in 1985 (Scholz et al. 1988). The mean size of kokanee harvested was relatively constant from 1947 to 1975. In 1975, the mean size was $411 \pm 16 \mathrm{~mm}$. However, after 1975, accelerating eutrophication and hypolimnetic oxygen depletion caused the lake trout population to decline. Accompanying this decline in predator levels, kokanee increased in abundance (as evidenced by a CPUE of 0.3 kokanee/angler hour from 1969-1973 compared to a CPUE of 3.3 kokanee/angler hour from 1980-1983 and 4.4 kokanee/angler hour in 1984-I 985 -- Scholz et a/. 1988). The mean size of kokanee decreased to $333 \pm 13 \mathrm{~mm}$ by 1982 and $244 \pm 28 \mathrm{~mm}$ in 1983 (Scholz et al. 1988). Introduction of picivorous lake trout and brown trout in 1985 caused a reduction in the kokanee population. By 1988, CPUE decreased to approximately 2.0 kokanee/angler hour and size had increased to approximately 368 mm (Scholz et a/. 1988). The decline in growth rate was related to food availability and intraspecific competition. In 1985, in Loon Lake Daphnia biomass was $13.8 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ and mean size was $0.8 \pm 0.1 \mathrm{~mm}$. By comparison, in Deer Lake where the kokanee population was relatively low, kokanee growth was excellent ( 410 mm ), Daphnia biomass was 156.1 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}$ and mean size was $1.4 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ (Scholz et al. 1988). Daphnia was the principle item in the diet of kokanee from both lakes with an index of relative importance of $49.1 \%$ in Loon Lake and $68.3 \%$ in Deer Lake (Scholz et al. 1988).

Collectively, these studies indicate that kokanee growth is profoundly affected by kokanee density relative to selected prey organisms, and that kokanee growth can fluctuate rapidly in response to
changes in these variables. Since natural spawning of kokanee in Lake Roosevelt is limited (Nigro et a/. 1983), population levels are currently low and density of preferred prey is high. We infer that these factors contribute to the relatively high growth rates of kokanee in Lake Roosevelt. One of the objectives of our management plan is to continue to produce kokanee with relatively high growth rates. Stocking of 8 million fingerlings in Lake Roosevelt from the approved hatcheries is anticipated to produce 3.2 million adults or $54 \%$ of the 5.9 million adult population that the. Lake could theoretically support (Beckman et al. 1985). This was an intentional part of the mangement plan, aimed at maintaining good growth rates.

### 4.3.4 Lake Whitefish

Table 4.3.4 presents a comparison of the estimated total lengths at annulus formation for lake whitefish in Lake Roosevelt -v- other Lake whitefish waters in North America. The estimated mean total length at annulus formation for lake whitefish from Lake Roosevelt in 1989 were $239 \pm 43,326 \pm 54,419 \pm 50,478 \pm 51,496 \pm 64$, and $524 \pm 78 \mathrm{~mm}$ for age class I, II, III, IV, V, and VI respectively. The mean values from other Lake whitefish producing lakes were $146 \pm 43,246 \pm 73,326 \pm 81,381 \pm$ $87,423 \pm 93$, and $455 \pm 104$ for age class I, II, III, IV, V, and VI respectively. Thus, Lake whitefish in Lake Roosevelt were larger than average at the formation of each annulus. Our findings for Lake whitefish were similar to those reported by Beckman et a/. (1985). Condition factor of Lake whitefish was 1.17 from 1979 to 1983 (Beckman et al. 1985) and 1.10 in 1989 (present study).

### 4.4 ZOOPLANKTON

### 4.4.1 Zooplankton Abundance and Distribution

Mean microcrustacean zooplankton (excluding nauplii) density was determined for May, August and October 1989 at nine index stations (Table 4.4.1). Microcrustacean zooplankton densities were highest in the lower mainstem Columbia stations (Fig. 4.4.1). Mean annual values were: Spring Canyon ( $7,914 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Keller Ferry $\left(11,527 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right.$ ) Seven Bays $\left(9,274 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Hunters $\left(8,608 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Gifford $\left(5,632 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and Kettle Falls $\left(2,482 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Distance upstream from Grand Coulee Dam to each site was: Spring Canyon (4.8 km), Keller Ferry ( 24 km ), Seven Bays ( 59 km ), Hunter (102 km), Gifford ( 126 km ) and Kettle Falls ( 160 km ). Highest recorded mean microcrustacean densities were on the Spokane Arm stations, including

Table 4.3.4. Comparisons of estimated total lengths at annulus formation for lake whitefish in Lake Roosevelt versus other lake whitefish waters in the western United States and British Columbia.


Table 4.4.1. Density ( $\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) of microcrustacean zooplankton collected in Lake Roosevelt in May, August and October 1989, and mean annual density ( X ), at each index station.



Cig. -4.1 Mean total microcrustacean density (excluding naupli) collected at mainstem Columbia stations and reservbir arm stations in May, August and october 1989.

Porcupine Bay ( $27,325 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Little Falls ( $12,613 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). Microcrustacean density was also higher on the San Poil Arm $\left(11,527 / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ than at mainstem stations.

Zooplankton density distribution observed in the present study was similar to that observed by Beckman et al. (1985), who reported that mean number of cladocera, calanoid copepods and cyclopoid copepods was lower in the upper reservoir and higher in the Spokane and San Poil Arms.

In the present study mean annual Daphnia biomass estimates in 1989 for the Columbia mainstem were highest in the middle portion of the reservoir at Hunters (171,166.1 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Gifford ( $154,049.8 ~ \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Seven Bays ( $135,693.4 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) (Table 4.4.2, Fig. 4.4.2). Biomass was lower at Keller Ferry ( $42,584.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Spring Canyon ( $78,626.1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) and Kettle Falls $\left(77,479.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$. Highest Daphnia biomass reported in the reservoir was in the Spokane Arm at Porcupine Bay ( $308,047.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). In the San Poil Arm mean Daphnia biomass was $139,627.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Annual (May to October) mean Daphnia biomass for all stations was 128,595.7 $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$.

Beckman et al. (1985) calculated that, at zooplankton levels observed in 1980 and 1982, the forage base in Lake Roosevelt could support about 16 million kokanee fingerlings and 5.9 million adult kokanee ( 0.5 kg body weight); so results of the present study were compared to those collected in 1980 and 1982 to determine if zooplankton levels had changed significantly.

Range of densities of cladocera and copepods collected at four stations (San Poil, Porcupine Bay, Gifford and Kettle Falls) were compared from samples collected from May to September 1980 (Stober et al. 1981), May to September 1982 (Beckman et al. 1985), and May, August, and October 1989 (present study) (Table 4.4.3). Ranges were thought to be the most useful measure for comparison because reservoir operations each year influenced zooplankton abundance on a particular date. Mean Cladocera ranges reported for the four stations were 13 to 1,489 in 1980, 80 to 11,612 in 1982 and 117 to 12,135 in 1989. Mean copepod ranges reported were 1,114 to 3,787 in 1980, 1,112 to 18,152 in 1982 and 1,235 to 12,519 in 1989. Thus, microcrustacean abundance in 1989 was comparable to that reported in 1982. Cladocerans were slightly higher and copepods were slightly lower.

Only one station was directly comparable in all three years (Table 4.4.4). At the Porcupine Bay station, mean Cladocera densities reported

Table 4.4.2. Daphnia biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) at nine index stations in May, August and October 1989.



Fig. 4.4.2. Mean Daphnia biomass $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ at nine index stations in Lake Roosevelt. Values reported are mean for May, August and October samples.

Table 4.4.3. Comparisons of range of densities reported for Cladocera and Copepoda at four index stations in Lake Roosevelt in 1980, 1982 and 1989. Range is reported for samples collected from May to September in 1980 and 1982, and May to October in 1989.

| Station |  | $1980^{1}$ | $1982^{2}$ | 19893 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Poil Cladocera Copepoda | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 3.489 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2450 \\ -\quad 9.505 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 110-19,557 \\ 3,580-47,825 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 86 \cdot 3,699 \\ 898 \cdot 14,030 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Porcupine Bay Cladocera Copepoda | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 691 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,777 \\ -\quad 4,275 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56 \cdot 10,258 \\ 341-17,690 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 106-22,530 \\ 3,778-33,648 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Gifford Cladocera Copepoda |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1,557 \\ -\quad 1,268 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $87-15,578$ <br> $482-\quad 5,615$ | $\begin{array}{r} 189-12,469 \\ 184 . \quad 712 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Kettle Falls Cladocera Copepoda | $\begin{array}{r} 25 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 172 \\ -\quad 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65-1,056 \\ & 45-1,477 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 86-9.842 \\ 79-\quad 244 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\bar{x}$ Cladocera Copepoda | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \\ 1,114 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,489 \\ -\quad 3,787 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 80 \cdot 11,612 \\ 1,112 \cdot 18,152 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 117-12.135 \\ 1,235-12,159 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

1 Data from Stober et al. (1980). Data collected May to September 1980.
2 Data from Beckman et al. (1985). Data collected May to September 1982.
3 Data from percent study. Data collected May to October 1989 at Porcupine Bay and May, August and October 1989 at San Poil, Gifford, and Kettle Falls.

Table 4.4.4. Comparison of copepod and cladocera densities reported at Porcupine Bay (Index Station \#4) from May to September 1980, 1982 and 1989.

|  | 1980 Stober et al. (1980) (\#/m ${ }^{3}$ ) | 1982 Beckman et al. (1985) $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1989 \\ \text { Present Study } \\ \left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COPEPODA |  |  |  |
| MAY | 875 | 341 | 3,778 |
| JUN | 691 | 1,131 | 12,986 |
| JUL | 1,742 | 10,752 | 7,508 |
| AUG | 4,451 | 17,690 | 19,328 |
| SEP | 4,275 | 7,000 | 33,648 |
| $\bar{\chi}$ | 2,407 | 7,437 | 15,450 |
| CLADOCERA |  |  |  |
| MAY | 8 | 56 | 106 |
| JUN | 682 | 1,293 | 10,060 |
| JUL | 1,716 | 10,258 | 10,605 |
| AUG | 1,228 | 2,572 | 13,745 |
| SEP | 1,772 | 3,712 | 13,087 |
| $\overline{\text { X }}$ | 1,081 | 3,578 | 9,521 |

for samples collected from May through September was 1,081 in 1980, 3,578 in 1982 and 9,521 in 1989. In each year, the majority of cladocerans were Daphnia spp. Mean copepod density was 2,407 in 1980, 7,437 in 1982 and 15,450 in 1989. From these data it appears that microcrustacean abundance was higher in 1989 than previous years.

In both comparisons, cladocerans were higher in 1989 than 1980 or 1982. This was particularly encouraging from the standpoint of enhancing kokanee populations, because Cladocera (particularly Daphnia spp.) were the prey item with the highest index of relative importance values in kokanee diets ( $76 \%$ in 1988 and $65.1 \%$ in 1989).

Microcrustacean biomass in Lake Roosevelt was considerably higher than reported for other local productive kokanee lakes. Rieman and Bowler (1980) reported that summer mean microcrustacean biomass for five north Idaho kokanee producing lakes was: Lake Pend Oreille (5 year mean = $38.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Lake Coeur d'Alene ( 3 year mean $=36.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), Preist Lake $\left(27.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$, Upper Priest Lake ( $25.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), and Spirit Lake ( 39.7 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). In comparison, mean Daphnia biomass recorded for nine index stations in Lake Roosevelt in May, August and October 1989 was 128.6 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean annual (January to December 1989) Daphnia biomass at Porcupine Bay (Index Station 4) was 184. $8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Mean annual (January to December 1989) Daphnia biomass at Seven Bays (index Station 6) was $153.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. Daphnia was the prey item with the highest relative importance in Lake Roosevelt kokanee diets in both 1988 (70\%) and 1989 (58.4\%) Thus, the present study confirms previous investigations that zooplankton biomass in Lake Roosevelt is sufficient to support the proposed 3.1 million adult kokanee produced by the Lake Roosevelt kokanee hatcheries. The difference in zooplankton biomass between Lake Roosevelt and the above mentioned Idaho Lakes can be attributed to two factors: (1) Lake Roosevelt, being downstream of a major urban center at Spokane, WA and Coeur d'Alene, ID, contains more nutrients and (2) zooplankton in the north Idaho lakes has been affected by size selective predation whereas zooplankton in Lake Roosevelt have not been impacted by size selective predation (See Section 4.3.3).

### 4.4.2 Effect of Reservoir Operation on Zooplankton Dynamics

Zooplankton densities and biomass collected at monthly intervals at index stations 4 (Porcupine Bay) and 6 (Seven Bays) were compared to mean monthly reservoir elevations and water retention times (Tables 4.4.5 and 4.4.6; Fig.'s 4.4 .3 to 4.4.6) to determine the effect of reservoir operations on zooplankton dynamics. In 1988 and 1989, Daphnia densities

Table 4.4.5. Reservoir elevation, water retention time and density or biomass of selected 20 I categories of zooplankton collected at monthly intervals at Porcupine Bay (Index Station 4). Total $=$ total microcrustaceans (Cladocera + Copepoda).

| 1988 | Reservoir <br> Elevation | Water Retention <br> Time (days) | Daphnia <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Cladocera <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Copepoda <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Total | Daphnia <br> Biomass |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88 Jan | 1268.3 | 34.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feb | 1265.4 | 38.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mar | 1253.6 | 38.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apr | 1252.8 | 49.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| May | 1268.3 | 40.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jun | 1273.2 | 44.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| JUI | 1283.8 | 59.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aug | 1284.9 | 56.9 | 10,399 | 10,980 | 22,713 | 33,693 | 445,965 |
| Sep | 1283.5 | 52.0 | 7.072 | 7,294 | 8,938 | 16,232 | 330,782 |
| Oct | 1285.9 | 56.9 | 7,504 | 7,815 | 19,400 | 27,215 | 426,425 |
| Nov | 1283.1 | 46.6 | 2,550 | 2,884 | 5,106 | 7,990 | 30,341 |
| Dec | 1260.1 | 29.0 | 2,105 | 2,257 | 4,913 | 7,170 | 54,415 |


| 1989 | Reservoir Elevation | Water Retention Time (days) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Daphnia } \\ & \left(\# / m^{3}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Cladocera $\left(\# / m^{3}\right)$ | Copepoda (\#/m3) | Total | Daphnia <br> Biomass |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89 Jan | 1245.8 | 25.8 | 91 | $12{ }^{\prime}$ | 541 | 661 | 4453 |
| Feb | 1231.0 | 25.3 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 102 | 0 |
| Mar | 1225.1 | 35.5 | 0 | 7 | 387 | 394 | 0 |
| Apr | 1231.0 | 33.1 | 0 | 0 | 4.265 | 4,265 | 0 |
| May | 1245.5 | 23.2 | 8 | 106 | 3,778 | 3,884 | 20 |
| dun | 12595 | 39.9 | 8.085 | 10,060 | 12,986 | 23,046 | 169,008 |
| Jul | 1278.6 | 64.8 | 10,167 | 10,605 | 7,508 | 18,113 | 245,962 |
| Aug | 1280.8 | 69.8 | 13,342 | 12,7,45 | 19,328 | 33,073 | 565,545 |
| Sep | 1286.7 | 68.3 | 12,321 | 13,087 | 33,648 | 46,735 | 446,440 |
| Oct | 1287.9 | 60.0 | 22,185 | 22,530 | 22,489 | 45,019 | 359,578 |
| Nov | 1287.1 | 48.9 | 507 | 615 | 933 | 1,548 | 151,157 |
| Dec | 1286.7 | 45.5 | 719 | 1,024 | 2,573 | 3,597 | 31,941 |

Table 4.4.6. Reservoir elevation, water retention time and density or biomass of selected categories of zooplankton collected at monthly intervals at Seven Bays (Index Station 6). Total $=$ total microcrustaceans (Cladocera + Copepoda).

|  | Reservoir <br> Elevation | Water Retention <br> Time (days) | Daphnia <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Cladocera <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Copepoda <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Total | Daphnia <br> Biomass |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88 Jan | 1268.3 | 34.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feb | 1265.4 | 38.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mar | 1253.6 | 38.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apr | 1252.8 | 49.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| May | 1268.3 | 40.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jun | 1273.2 | 44.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul | 1283.8 | 59.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aug | 1284.9 | 56.9 | 5,115 | 5,223 | 6,763 | 11,986 | 198,864 |
| Sep | 1283.5 | 52.0 | 4,668 | 4,811 | 8,306 | 13,117 | 237,321 |
| Oct | 1285.9 | 56.9 | 9,662 | 9,662 | 13,896 | 23,558 | 421,997 |
| Nov | 1283.1 | 46.6 | 6,219 | 7,004 | 1,337 | 8,431 | 8,349 |
| Dec | 1260.1 | 29.0 | 190 | 207 | 670 | 877 | 4,072 |


|  | Reservoir <br> Elevation | Vater Retention <br> Time (days) | Daphnia <br> $\left(\# / \mathbf{m}^{3}\right)$ | C ladocera <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Copepoda <br> $\left(\# / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | Total | Daphnia <br> Biomass |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89 Jan | 1245.8 | 25.8 | 33 | 185 | 152 | 337 | 1,295 |
| Feb | 1231.0 | 25.3 | 0 | 7 | 125 | 132 | 0 |
| Mar | 1225.1 | 35.5 | 0 | 0 | 380 | 380 | 0 |
| Apr | 1231.0 | 33.1 | 6 | 13 | 753 | 766 | 15 |
| May | 1245.5 | 23.2 | 127 | 254 | 3625 | 3879 | 549 |
| Jun | 1259.5 | 39.9 | 4,388 | 5,270 | 6,361 | 11,631 | 68,592 |
| Jul | 1278.6 | 64.8 | 14,877 | 15,258 | 8,373 | 23,631 | 415,648 |
| Aug | 1280.8 | 69.8 | 3,739 | 5,545 | 5,134 | 10,679 | 180,276 |
| Sep | 1286.7 | 68.3 | 2,559 | 2,701 | 7,307 | 10,008 | 104,664 |
| Oct | 1287.9 | 60.0 | 4,240 | 4,406 | 8,448 | 12,854 | 226,255 |
| Nov | 1287.1 | 48.9 | 7,067 | 7,486 | 3,657 | 11,143 | 613,836 |
| Dec | 1286.7 | 45.5 | 7,908 | 8,360 | 2,274 | 10,634 | 606,755 |





(b)
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Figure 4.4.6. Plots of mean monthly water retention time (days in 1989 - v (a) Total microcrustacean density (excluding naupli) (\#/m ${ }^{3}$ ), (b) Cyclopoid and calanoid copepod density (\#/m ${ }^{3}$ ), (c) Cladocera density (\#/m³), (d) Daphnia density (\#/m ${ }^{3}$ ) and (e) Daphnia biomass ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) at Seven Bays (Index Station $6)$.

at Seven Bays (Index Station 6) were below 200 individuals/ma and Daphnia biomass was less than $5000 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ during months when water retention time was less than 35 days (Table 4.4.6; Fig. 4.4.6). In contrast, in months when water retention time was greater than 39.9 days Daphnia density ranged from 3,739 to 14,877 individuals/m3 and biomass ranged from 68,592 to $613,836 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. In 1988, Daphnia densities and biomass peaked in August and October, the two months with the highest water retention times. In 1989, Daphnia density and biomass increased between June and July when water retention time increased from 39.9 to 64.8 days and remained high for the remainder of the year. In December 1988, water retention time was 29.0 days, Daphnia density was $190 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and Daphnia biomass was $4,072 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$. In December 1989, water retention time was 45.5 days, Daphnia density was $7,908 / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ and Daphnia biomass was $606,755 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$.

At Porcupine Bay, in 1988, Daphnia density and biomass peaked in August and October, the two months with highest water retention times (Table 4.45; Fig. 4.4.5). In 1989, Daphnia density and biomass peaked in August and September, the two months with highest water retention times. In months when water retention time was over 60 days, Daphnia densities ranged from 10,167 to 22,185 individuals/ma. On months when water retention times were 39.9 to 48.9 days, Daphnia densities ranged from 507 to 8,085 individuals $/ \mathrm{m}$ ? In months when water retention times were 23.2 to 35.5 days, Daphnia densities ranged from 0 to 91 individuals/ma.

In the present study it was not possible to separate seasonal effects (e.g., photoperiod, water temperature, life cycle) from water retention effects on microcrustacean zooplankton. Water retention time was lowest during the winter months when microcrustacean abundance would normally be depressed.

However, we suspect that water retention time is of critical importance in the timing of establishment of the microcrustacean standing crop during the summer growing season.

Our findings are similar to those of Beckman et al. (1985), who compared water retention times and mean number of pelagic microcrustaceans in Lake Roosevelt in May to August, 1981 and 1982. In their study, zooplankton sample were collected at weekly intervals in May and June. Water retention times were higher (>30 days) in each week through mid-June in 1981 than the corresponding weeks in 1982 (18-20 days). At each interval microcrustacean density was higher in 1981 than
1982. By mid-June water retention time was uniform in both years and steadily increased over the remainder of the summer. Microcrustacean abundance then increased at a similar rate in both years.

Beckman et $a /$. (1985) reported than the threshold water retention time that starts to affect microcrustacean densities appeared to be about 30 days. Results of the present study support a threshold retention in the range of 30-35 days. Beckman et al. concluded, "minimal water retention times would have an adverse impact on numbers of zooplankton in Lake Roosevelt, especially during the spring when the primary influx of nutrients enters the reservoir from the watershed."

In terms of supporting the operation of the Lake Roosevelt kokanee hatcheries, water retention times and microcrustacean densities should be monitored weekly from May to July to ensure that kokanee fry are stocked in the reservoir coinciding with peak standing crops of microcrustaceans.

### 4.5 FISH FEEDING HABITS

### 4.5.1 Principle Prey Items in Fish Diets

Tables 4.5.1 and 4.5.2 present a comparison of the feeding habitats of kokanee, rainbow trout, walleye and lake whitefish in 1988 and 1989. Kokanee were primarily planktivorous. In 1988, the predominant prey items in the diet of kokanee, based on relative importance index values, were, Daphnia spp. ( $70.0 \%$ ), organic detritus (8.2\%) and Leptodora kindtii (6.0\%). In 1989, the predominant prey items of kokanee were Daphnia schodleri (58.4\%), L. kindtii (8.0\%), larval and pupal chironomids (11.5\%), and walleye eggs $(9.41 \%)$. Walleye eggs were consumed in large numbers by only one fish, so were not an important prey item.

Daphnia and Leptodora are large species of cladocerans that are frequently found in the diets of planktivorous fish. Density and biomass of Daphnia in Lake Roosevelt were higher than those reports for other productive kokanee lakes in the Pacific Northwest (See Section 4.4.1). Leptodora was also abundant. In terms of prey availability, conditions in Lake Roosevelt appear to be ideal for hatchery introduction of planktivorous kokanee. Kokanee size selectivity preyed on Daphnia. Kokanee evidenced positive electivities ( +0.03 to +0.35 ) for Daphnia ranging from 1.6 to 2.4 mm and negative electivities, ranging from 0 to 0.24 for Daphnia below 1.5 mm . Eleotivity values for Daphnia ranging from

Table 4.5.1. Mean index of relative importance of prey items found in the diets of Lake Roosevelt fish- in 1988 having values of greater than $2 \%$. $\mathrm{n}=$ sample size.

| Prey | Kokanee $(n=28)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rainbow Trout } \\ (\mathrm{n}-190) \end{gathered}$ | Walleye $(n=257)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OSTEICHTHYES (fish) <br> Cottidae <br> Cyprinidae <br> Percidae <br> Salmonidae <br> Unidentified fish |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2 \\ & 2.3 \\ & \\ & 2.2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.4 \\ 5.4 \\ 13.4 \\ 4.9 \\ 10.3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| CLADOCERA <br> Daphnia.schodleri Daphnia retrocurva Leptodora kindtii Bosminidae spp. Cladocera ephippia | $\begin{array}{r} 67.0 \\ 3.0 \\ 6.0 \\ 6.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 34.0 8.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 10.4 \\ 3.0 \\ 4.7 \end{array}$ |
| DIPTERA Chironomid pupa Chironomid larva |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \\ & 5.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.2 \\ & 4.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| HEMIPTERA Corividae |  | 3.8 |  |
| OTHER <br> Terrestrial insects Organic De tritus Inorganic Detritus Unidentified bodv | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \\ & 2.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.7 \\ & 5.2 \\ & 3.1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.6 \\ 10.0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |

Table 4.5.2. Mean index of relative importance of prey items found in the diets of Lake Roosevelt fish in 1989 having values of greater than $2 \%$. $\mathrm{n}=$ sample size.

| Prey | Kokanee $(n=33)$ | Lake Whitefish $(n=118)$ | Rainbow Trout $(n=223)$ | Walleye $(n=289)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JESTICHTHYES (fish) |  |  |  |  |
| Cottidae |  |  |  | 10.2 |
| Percidae |  |  | 3.2 | 16.3 |
| Salmonidae |  |  |  | 6.7 |
| Unidentified fish |  |  |  | 21.1 |
| Walleye eggs | 9.4 |  | 34.6 |  |
| JLADOCERA |  |  |  |  |
| Daphnia schodleri | 58.4 | 23.6 | 3.3 | 8.0 |
| Daphnia thorata |  | 2.1 |  |  |
| Leptodora kindtii | 8.0 | 6.8 |  | 7.0 |
| EUCOPEPODA |  |  |  |  |
| Epischura spp. |  |  | 2.7 |  |
| MOLLUSKA |  |  |  |  |
| Spheariidae |  | 6.0 |  |  |
| DIPTERA |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomid pupa | 9.1 | 11.6 |  | 9.3 |
| Chironomid lana | 2.4 | 8.6 |  | 4.6 |
| HEMIPTERA |  |  |  |  |
| Corixidae | 4.0 |  |  |  |
| HYDRACHNELAE |  |  |  |  |
| Hydracarina |  | 8.0 |  |  |
| OTHER |  |  |  |  |
| Terrestrial insects | 3.2 |  | 12.4 |  |
| Organic Detritus |  | 9.1 | 28.6 | 6.8 |
| Inorganic Detritus |  | 4.0 | 6.3 |  |
| Unidentifiable body |  | 5.0 |  |  |

2.5 to 3.6 mm were near zero, indicating that kokanee consumed these sizes in proportion to their availability in the environment.

The key feature of size-selective predation is that the fish preys upon the largest, most reproductively fit individuals of the selected species and, thereby, can first lower the average size, then lower the reproduction potential and ultimately cause a decline in the population of a particular species of zooplankton (Brooks and Dodson 1965). For example, Taylor (1980) reported that the minimum size for reproduction in Daphnia is 1.3 mm . Fecundity in Daphnia increased geometrically with size: with a 1.3 mm individual containing 2 eggs/clutch, a 1.7 mm individual containing 5 eggs/clutch and a 2.0 mm individual containing 18 eggs/clutch. Hence, a geometric decrease in reproductive potential would occur concomitantly with a decrease in the average size of Daphnia in the water column, ultimately leading to a collapse of the Daphnia population (Taylor and Slatkin 1981, Scholz et al. 1985b). Zooplankton species in competition with Daphnia would then have a competitive advantage, so zooplankton population dynamics would be altered. In typical situations, intensive size-selective predation will cause a shift to greater abundance of smaller-sized zooplankton with less biomass and corresponding reduced growth rates of planktivorous fish (Brooks and Dodson 1965; Kitchell and Kitchell 1980; Scholz et al. 1985).

In Lake Roosevelt, these problems do not appear to be occurring at the present time. The abundance of large-sized Daphnia in the water column was higher than most kokanee producing lakes in northeastern Washington and north Idaho. Growth of all planktivorous fish species -kokanee, rainbow trout, and lake whitefish -- was above average. Kokanee growth rates were higher than those reported for twenty lakes used for growth comparisons.

Additionally, the degree of size selective predation on Daphnia by kokanee in Lake Roosevelt was not particularly intensive, so we do not believe it represents a problem over the short term. However, as additional hatchery produced kokanee are added to the lake, kokanee feeding habits and zooplankton abundance should be carefully monitored to determine the incremental impact on microcrustacean population dynamics.

In 1988, the predominant prey items in the diet of rainbow trout, based on index of relative importance, were Daphnia schodleri (34.0\%), chironomid larvae and pupae ( $12.4 \%$ ), and Osteichthyes ( $9.7 \%$ ), organic and inorganic detritus ( $6.8 \%$ ), and terrestrial insects (4.7\%). In 1989,
predominant prey in rainbow trout diets included organic and inorganic detritus (34.9\%), walleye eggs (34.6\%), terrestrial insects (12.4\%), and Osteichthyes (3.2\%). Identifiable fish remains in trout stomachs included percidae. Trout stomachs contained relatively few Daphnia (relative importance $=3.3 \%$ ) in 1989. Rainbow trout size selectively preyed on Daphnia ranging from 1.6 to 3.0 mm . Electivity values typically ranged from +0.01 to +0.43 . Electivities for Daphnia from 0.1 to 1.5 mm were generally negative (range -0.24 to +0.06 ). For Daphnia above 3 mm electivities were near zero. In some months, electivities of rainbow trout for all size categories of Daphnia were near zero, indicating that trout preyed on different size categories of Daphnia in proportion to their densities in the reservoir. The degree of size selection was not intensive and currently does not present a problem in terms of managing the Lake Roosevelt fishery.

Walleye were mainly piscivorous in their feeding habits. In 1988, the predominant prey items consumed by walleye based on index of relative importance, were; Osteichthyes (46.2\%), Daphnia (12.8\%), and chironomid larvae and pupae (9.1\%). In 1989, prey included: Osteichthyes ( $56.2 \%$ ), chironomid larvae and pupae (13.6\%), and Daphnia (8.45\%). Daphnia were consumed principally by younger age classes of walleye while older walleye preferred a fish diet. Types of fish eaten by walleye in 1988 included: cottidae (sculpin -- 10.4\%), percidae (yellow perch -$13.4 \%$ ), salmonidae ( $4.9 \%$ ), and unidentifiable fish remains (10.3\%). Types of fish eaten by walleye in 1989 included: sculpins (10.2\%), yellow perch (16.3\%), salmonidae (6.7\%) and unidentifiable fish remains (21.1\%). Our findings were similar to those reported by Harper et al. (1981) and Nigro et al. (1983), who determined that the major prey items of walleye in Lake Roosevelt in 1980 and 1982 were yellow perch, sculpins, Catostomids (suckers), and chironomid larvae and pupae. Small numbers of Daphnia were also encountered frequently in walleye stomachs in 1980 and 1982.

Adult lake whitefish fed primarily on zooplankton and benthic organisms. In 1989, the principle prey items in the diets of lake whitefish, based on index of relative importance, were Daphnia schødleri (23.6\%) chironomid larvae and pupae (20.2\%), Hydracarina (8.0\%), and Leptodora kindtii (6.8\%). Nigro et a/. (1982) also reported that Lake whitefish preyed principally on zooplankton and bottom organisms in Lake Roosevelt.

### 4.5.2 Diet Overlap and Potential for Competative Interactions

Diet overlap was between kokanee and rainbow were high in 1988 (0.786) but low in 1989 (0.216). In 1988, the high diet overlap was due principally to consumption of Daphnia schedleri and Leptodora kindtii. Diet overlap between kokanee and walleye was low in both 1988 (0.289) and 1989 (0.259). Diet overlap between rainbow and walleye was marginal in 1988 (0.569) and low in 1989 (0.199). Diet overlap between lake whitefish and kokanee was moderate in 1989 (0.669). Both species preyed mainly on zooplankton and chironomids. However, kokanee and lake whitefish occupied different geographic regions of the lake. Kokanee were captured principally in mid-water or surface set gill nets whereas lake whitefish were captured mainly in bottom set gill nets and also preyed on benthic invertebrates. Therefore, kokanee appeared to be pelagic planktivores whereas lake whitefish were associated with benthic environments. Lake whitefish are normally considered to be primarily benthivorous feeders. However, they are also reported to be opportunistic in their feeding habits, preying on the most abundant organisms available (Scott and Crossman 1973; Becker 1983). In Lake Roosevelt, it appears that Lake whitefish fed on benthic organisms, but also preyed opportunistically on abundant zooplankton. Diet overlaps between Lake whitefish and walleye (0.421) or lake whitefish and rainbow (0.262) were low to moderate in 1989.

The only high diet overlaps observed in 1988 and 1989 were between planktivorous species. These diet overlaps are not of concern at the present time because of the relatively high densities of large-sized species of zooplankton e.g. Daphnia spp. and Leptodora kindtii. Diet overlaps between kokanee, rainbow and walleye were relatively minor. These data suggest that it may be feasible to successfully manage all three species in Lake Roosevelt.

### 4.6 TAGGING STUDIES

### 4.6.1 Net Pen Rainbow Trout

Results of net pen rainbow trout tagging studies conducted at Seven Bays in 1988 were similar to previous results (UCUT, unpublished data). Most of the fish were recaptured within six months ( $58.1 \%$ of total recaptures) to one year ( $88.1 \%$ of total recaptures) of release. Angler harvest rate was $9.9 \%$ including all recoveries for two years after release. The majority of the tagged fish recovered were recaptured within 20 km of the Seven Bays net pen site ( $57.2 \%$ in 1988). In 1986 and 1987, $66.3 \%$
and $72.0 \%$ of the recoveries were within 20 km of the Seven Bays net pen site. In 1988, fewer than $1 \%$ (one fish) of the recaptured fish were recovered below Coulee Dam. None were recovered below Chief Joseph Dam. In previous tagging studies conducted in 1986 and 1987, less than 1\% of the recoveries were made below Grand Coulee Dam and none below Chief Joseph Dam (UCUT, unpublished data; Table 4.6.1).

In contrast, in 1989, fish released at both Seven Bays and Hunters evidenced much lower harvest rates compared to 1988, respectively 3.0\% and $1.9 \%$, which included all recaptures made within one year of release. For comparison, if just the first year after release data are used for fish released in 1988, harvest was $8.7 \%$.

Fewer fish released in 1989 were recovered near the net-pen site (only $38.2 \%$ at Seven Bays and $27.2 \%$ at Hunters). More fish were recovered below Grand Coulee Dam (26.4\% from Seven Bays and 33.3\% from Hunters). Six fish from Seven Bays ( $21.4 \%$ of total recoveries) and five fish from Hunters ( $17.6 \%$ of total recoveries) were collected at the fish counting facility at Rock Island Dam within a few months after release, between May 10 and June 6, 1989. In previous years no tagged fish from Lake Roosevelt had been observed at Rock Island Dam. Three fish (8.8\% of total recoveries) from Seven Bays and two fish ( $9.5 \%$ of total recoveries) from Hunters were recovered in Rufus Woods Reservoir during the following year. These data suggests that large numbers of net pen fish were lost over Grand Coulee Dam in 1989 but not in 1988.

Reservoir operations were markedly different in 1988 and 1989 (Fig. 2.3). Drawdown was prolonged and more pronounced in 1989 than 1988. Part of the reason that drawdown occurred earlier than normal was because of extreme cold weather in February that severely taxed the energy supply of the Columbia Basin. This caused Lake Roosevelt to be lowered by about $0.5 \mathrm{~m} /$ day ( 1.5 ft day) for a period of several weeks in February and March. At the start of this period the reservoir was already at a lower level than normal owing to three consecutive years of drought conditions. Net pen operators were worried that rapidly declining water levels would ground their net pens, so they released their fish earlier than normal -- in March (at Hunters) and April (at Seven Bays) instead of May or June. At Seven Bays, although fish could have been held longer, lower reservoir elevations reduced boat mooring space, so a decision was made to release the fish early to free up boat dock space.

Land-locked rainbow trout go through a distinct smolt stage in April similar to that of their anadromous steelhead counterparts. By undergoing

Table 4.6.1. Effect of release time on net pen rainbow trout site imprinting and percentage of recaptured below Grand Coulee Dam.

| Location | Release Date | Total <br> \# Tagged | \% Harvest | \% Captured within $\pm 20$ km of net pen site | \% Captured below Grand Coulee D a m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seven Bays | JUN 86 | 446 | 21.3 | 66.3 | 0.9 |
| Seven Bays | MAY 87 | 613 | 13.7 | 71.4 | 0.0 |
| Seven Bays | JUN 87 | 199 | 16.6 | 72.0 | 0.0 |
| Seven Bays | MAY 88 | 1.111 | 9.9 | 57.2 | 1.8 |
| Seven Bays | APR 89 | 918 | 3.0 | 38.2 | 26.4 |
| Hunters | MAR 89 | 845 | 1.9 | 27.2 | 33.3 |

this process in the net pens they residualize and remain in the reservoir instead of migrating downstream. We suspect that the fish released in March and April of 1989 underwent morphological, physiological and behavioral transitions associated with smoltification after release into the reservoir, then traveled downstream; whereas fish released in May or June in 1986, 1987 and 1988 residualized in the net pens, which prevented their migration. Additionally, fish which residualize in net pens at a particular location experience a certain amount of "site imprinting". Site imprinted fish will often form a home range and remain near the release location. This would have the effect of concentrating fish for sport harvest -- an important consideration in a reservoir with a large surface area and relatively few anglers, as is the case on Lake Roosevelt. From 1986 to 1988, tag recoveries indicate that fish released in May or June did remain in the vicinity of the net pen site (Table 4.6.1).

Table 4.6.1 summarizes rainbow tagging studies conducted from 1986 to 1989 at Seven Bays and Hunters. In general, later release dates are correlated with greater percentages harvested by anglers, greater percentages captured near the net pen, and fewer fish captured below Grand Coulee Dam. Therefore, we recommend that net pen operators retain their fish until May or June to allow trout to become residualized and site imprinted. This should increase the percentage harvested by anglers. Management agencies providing fish for Lake Roosevelt net pens should have a mutually agreeable contract with the net pen operators that specifies a release date ranging from about May 10 to June 10.

### 4.6.2 Walleye Migration

Results of 1988 and 1989 tagging studies indicated that walleye rapidly dispearsed from their spawning sites on the Spokane Arm throughout the entire reservoir, from Grand Coulee Dam to Canada. Also, fish tagged at Kettle Falls were recaptured as far away as Grand Coulee Dam. About $38.5 \%$ of the fish tagged on their spawning grounds at Porcupine Bay in the Spokane Arm were recovered in the vicinity of the release site, while $61.5 \%$ were recaptured outside the Spokane Arm.

These results are comparable to previous walleye tagging studies conducted in Lake Roosevelt by the USFWS from 1980-1982. About 25\% of the recaptured fish tagged in the Spokane Arm in April 1981 and 49\% tagged in April 1982 were recovered outside the Spokane Arm (Nigro et al. 1983; Beckman et a/. 1985). In all three years -- 1981, 1982 and 1989 -nearly twice as many tagged fish were recovered upstream of the mouth
of the Spokane Arm than downstream. However, angler fishing effort for walleye was much greater upstream than downstream in all three years.

Hall et al. (1985) observed two types of behavior patterns in 10 radio-tagged walleye released in the Spokane Arm of Lake Roosevelt in 1983: (1) summer home range; and (2) excursion activity. Nine fish established home ranges at various locations throughout the reservoir. Mean size of the home range was 10.3 km . Seven walleye established home ranges in the Spokane Arm near their spawning grounds. Five of these fish never left the arm while two fish made excursions to the main reservoir and subsequently returned. Two fish migrated out of the Spokane Arm and established summer home ranges 45 km and 272 km away from their spawning grounds. Mean distance moved for five fish making excursions was 60 km (range 7.2 - 284.8 km ), with a mean movement rate of $2.7 \mathrm{~km} /$ day. One fish displayed a pattern of continuous movement (excursion).

In the present study estimated travel times of five fish migrating from the Spokane Arm to Kettle Falls averaged $3.3 \mathrm{~km} /$ day (and ranged from $2.2-5.3 \mathrm{~km} /$ day) based on the interval recorded between time of capture and recapture. In comparison, radiotracking by USFWS in 1985 indicated that five walleye moved an average of $2.7 \mathrm{~km} /$ day while on excursions (Hall et a/. 1985). One walleye traveled 352 km to Keenleyside Dam in British Columbia, during one 15-day period. This fish moved 173 km or $11.5 \mathrm{~km} /$ day (Hall et al. 1985).

Collectively, these data suggest that walleye migrate extensively throughout Lake Roosevelt.

### 4.7 Kokanee Fecundity Estimates

Lake Roosevelt kokanee total length and fecundity was compared to various lakes in western United States (Table 4.7.1). Fecundity of Lake Roosevelt $3+$ kokanee ( $n=47$ ) collected in 1988 averaged 1,728 eggs/female. In 1989, mean fecundity for 3+ kokanee in Lake Roosevelt was 1,615 eggs/female. The next highest fecundity reported was 1,676 eggs/female ( $\mathrm{n}=7$ ) at Grandby Lake, Colorado. Mean fecundity of 2+ kokanee ( $\mathrm{n}=19$ ) collected in 1988 (1,303 eggs/female) and in 1989 (1,390 eggs/female) was greater than estimates from other lakes with typical fecundity ranges of 301 to 984 eggs/female. Thus, production in Lake Roosevelt kokanee is presently the highest reported for any of the lakes in the Inland Northwest. This observation is encouraging from the standpoint of collecting a sufficient number of eggs to support hatchery operation.

Table 4.7.1. Comparison of total length and fecundity of spawning female kokanee in various lakes in the western United States and Canada.


Previous kokanee egg and fry rearing at Ford Hatchery over a threeyear period (1987-1990), which is supplied by the same aquifer as the proposed Spokane Tribal Hatchery (Bob Johns, WDW hatchery manager, Ford Fish Hatchery pers. comm.), as well as biological testing by Heath tray incubation and live box rearing of kokanee in the Spokane Tribal hatchery water supply in 1988 (UCUT unpublished data), indicated that survival from egg to release was approximately $83 \%$. Eggs were not released until mid July.

Assuming an $83 \%$ survival rate from egg to release, 15.6 million eggs will be required to raise 13 million fry for release. Assuming 1,615 eggs/female, 9,659 females would be required to support hatchery operations. Assuming a ratio of 1 female: 1 male, 19,318 individuals would be needed to support hatchery operations. If 1.5 million kokanee are stocked at the Sherman Creek imprinting facility, 19,318 individuals represent an adult return rate of $1.2 \%$ required to support hatchery operations.
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[^0]:    Back-calculated length estimated at the formation of the first annulus ranged from $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ to $\mathbf{1 3 1} \mathbf{~ m m}$ with a grand mean of $\mathbf{1 2 4} \mathbf{~ m m}$ (Table 3.3.12). Mean length at the formation of the second annulus ranged from 225 to 281 mm with a grand mean of 259 mm . Mean length at formation of the third annulus ranged from 344 to 365 mm with a grand mean of 354 mm . The estimated length at the formation of the fourth annulus was 406 mm .

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Upstream of Lake Roosevelt, river nile 79 to 97
    ${ }^{2}$ Upsiream of Lake Roosevelt, river mile 58 to 74
    3Lake Roosevelt (San Poil Arm) Fork Iength. These fish were wildfish. Trout captured in the present sludywere predominantly(65\%) net pen raised fish.

