



1.1

12.00

.

۰.

.

77

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A



ENVIRONMENTAL AND WATER ON OPERATIONAL STUDIES **TECHNICAL REPORT E-84-3** FISH OF TWO DIKE POOLS IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVE by Robert W. Nailon, C. H. Pennington Environmental Laboratory U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station P. O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Miss. 39180 Cherry King March 1984 11.3 Final Report Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited DTIC 0131 84 4 Prepared for Office, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army Washington, D. C. 20314 EWQOS Work Units VA and VIIB 1 miles 07 26 020 84



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER	BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
Technical Report E-84-3 AD-A 43	636
TITLE (and Subtitie)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
FISH OF TWO DIKE POOLS IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI	Final report
RIVER	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
AUTHOR(a)	5. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
Robert W. Nailon, C. H. Pennington	
Nobert w. Marion, o. n. rennington	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station	
Environmental Laboratory P. O. Box 631, Vicksburg, Miss. 39180	EWQOS Work Units VA and VIIB
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
Office, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army	March 1984
Washington, D. C. 20314	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 77
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(It different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
	Unclassified
	15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
Approved for public release; distribution unlimit	ed. 🤤 JUL 3 1 1984
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered in Block 20, If different fi	om Report) A
8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	
	vice. 5285 Port Royal Road.
Available from National Technical Information Ser Springfield, Va. 22161.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Springfield, Va. 22161.	
Springfield, Va. 22161. S. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block numbe	
Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary and identify by block numbe Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC)	e)
Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary and identify by block numbe Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv	e)
Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary and identify by block numbe Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC)	e)
Springfield, Va. 22161. • KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde Il necessary and identify by block numbe Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC)	e)
Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse of the memory and identify by block number) ironmental aspects. (LC)
 Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Dike structures, designed and installed by the structures is the structure of the struc	e) ironmental aspects. (LC)) .he U. S. Army Corps of En-
 Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse of the H mercensery and identify by block number Dike structures, designed and installed by t gineers in the Lower Mississippi River, can modified to the structure of t) ironmental aspects. (LC)) he U. S. Army Corps of En- y river geomorphology, dis-
 Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Dike structures, designed and installed by t gineers in the Lower Mississippi River, can modifi charge rates, and sediment movements within the river's characteristics, plus the presence of the) ironmental aspects. (LC)) he U. S. Army Corps of En- y river geomorphology, dis- iver. These changes in the dikes themselves, result in
 Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse start if necessary and identify by block number Dike structures, designed and installed by t gineers in the Lower Mississippi River, can modifi charge rates, and sediment movements within the river's characteristics, plus the presence of the shifts in types, sizes, and variety of aquatic has) ironmental aspects. (LC)) he U. S. Army Corps of En- y river geomorphology, dis- iver. These changes in the dikes themselves, result in bitats on a yearly basis.
 Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Dike structures, designed and installed by t gineers in the Lower Mississippi River, can modifi charge rates, and sediment movements within the river's characteristics, plus the presence of the shifts in types, sizes, and variety of aquatic has At low water river stages, isolated dike pools box) ironmental aspects. (LC)) the U. S. Army Corps of En- y river geomorphology, dis- iver. These changes in the dikes themselves, result in bitats on a yearly basis. rdered by bars are formed,
 Springfield, Va. 22161. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number Aquatic ecologyLower Mississippi River (LC) CatfishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) Dikes (Engineering)Lower Mississippi RiverEnv FishesEffect of water levels on. (LC) FishesEffect of water quality on. (LC) FishesLower Mississippi RiverEcology. (LC) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse start if necessary and identify by block number Dike structures, designed and installed by t gineers in the Lower Mississippi River, can modifi charge rates, and sediment movements within the river's characteristics, plus the presence of the shifts in types, sizes, and variety of aquatic has) ironmental aspects. (LC)) the U. S. Army Corps of En- y river geomorphology, dis- iver. These changes in the dikes themselves, result in bitats on a yearly basis. rdered by bars are formed,

Ô

¢

Unclassified SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (Continued).

/Fish and water samples collected in two such dike pools as well as from the adjacent river border were used to determine the importance of dike pool habitats to fish communities during a low water period of 1980.

Hydrological results indicate that overall differences in water quality were easily distinguishable once stratification began. Surface readings of dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH were generally higher in the pool habitats than in the main channel. As depth increased, the opposite was true for dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH. Conductivity at the bottom in the pools during isolation was much higher than in the main channel.

Fish population characteristics were similar in the two pools, but were different from those in the river border. Mean catch per effort values were generally greater in pool habitats with all gear types--seines, hoop nets, and electroshocker. Catch in pool habitats was dominated by threadfin shad and gizzard shad in numerical abundance and total biomass, respectively. River border catch was dominated by typical riverine species such as minnows and shiners. The degree of similarity in fish community structure between any pair of habitats was most closely related to their location within the dike field. Condition factors, calculated for blue catfish, were consistently higher in the pool habitats than along the river border. Catch analyses indicated that stone dikes created suitable habitat for the growth and development of many species of fish.

> Unclassified SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

PREFACE

The study described in this report was sponsored by the Office, Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, under the Environmental and Water Quality Operational Studies (EWQOS) Program, Work Units VA, Environmental Impact of Selected Channel Alignment and Bank Revetment Alternatives in Waterways, and VIIB, Waterway Field Studies. The EWQOS Program has been assigned to the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES) under the direction of the Environmental Laboratory (EL). The OCE Technical Monitors for EWQOS were Mr. Earl Eiker, Dr. John Bushman, and Mr. James L. Gottesman.

This report presents results of a study designed to document the distribution and relative abundance of fish associated with dike field habitats found within the main-line levees along the Lower Mississippi River. Fish were collected from the Lower Cracraft dikes during the summer of 1980.

The report was prepared by Mr. Robert W. Nailon and Dr. C. H. Pennington under the supervison of Dr. Thomas D. Wright, Chief, Aquatic Habitat Group; Dr. C. J. Kirby, Chief, Environmental Resources Division; Dr. Jerome L. Mahloch, Program Manager, EWQOS; and Dr. John Harrison, Chief, EL.

Special appreciation is expressed to Messrs. Michael Potter and Michael McCoy, EL, for field support. Dr. Michael P. Farrell, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, is thanked for assistance with data analyses.

Commanders and Directors of WES during the study and the preparation of this report were COL Nelson P. Conover, CE, and COL Tilford C. Creel, CE. Technical Director was Mr. F. R. Brown.

10 300

tty Codes

une -d

1 1 1 1 1 1

This report should be cited as follows:

Nailon, R. W., and Pennington, C. H. 1984. "Fish of Two Dike Pools in the Lower Mississippi River," Technical Report E-84-3, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

CONTENTS

40022 AV

	Page
PREFACE	1
PART I: INTRODUCTION	3
Background	3
Objectives	4
PART II: DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA	5
PART III: METHODS AND MATERIALS	8
Water Quality	8
Fish	8
PART IV: RESULTS	12
Flow Pattern Characteristics	12
Characterization of Individual Habitats	13
Comparison of Fish Populations Among Habitats	18
PART V: DISCUSSION	31
Water Quality	31
Fish	35
PART VI: CONCLUSIONS	39
REFERENCES	41
TABLES 1-7	

FISH OF TWO DIKE POOLS IN THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Background

1. No river has played a greater part in the development and expansion of the United States than the Mississippi River. It has been, and will remain, a vital factor in the economic growth of this country. Billions of dollars have been invested in industrial developments along the river (Anonymous 1977). As the industrial base continues to expand, and as the population continues to grow, the importance of the river as a source for agriculture and industry and as an expressway to markets of the Nation and the world becomes apparent.

2. The Mississippi River and Tributaries Project founded under the auspices of the Mississippi River Commission provides for flood control in the alluvial valley and for navigation improvement of the Lower Mississippi River (Anonymous 1977). The open channel method of navigation control employed on the Lower Mississippi River consists of articulated concrete mattresses for bank revetment to control erosion and eventual channel misalignment, and stone dikes for channel contraction and secondary channel closure. The adoption of a stone dike design to replace the long-used timber pile dike has been a successful effort to build a structure better able to withstand the river's forces.

3. The dike structures, designed and installed by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers in the Lower Mississippi River, can modify river geomorphology, discharge rates, and sediment movements within the river. These changes in the river's characteristics plus the presence of the dikes themselves result in shifts in the types, sizes, and variety of aquatic habitats on a yearly basis. At low water river stages, isolated dike pools bordered by middle bars are formed creating distinct aquatic habitats which are quite variable in size and depth.

4. Presently, there are approximately 400 dikes in the Lower

Mississippi River having a combined length of over 295 lin km (Anonymous 1980). Despite the large numbers of dikes present in the Lower Mississippi River and its tributaries, the ecological effects of these structures are poorly known. Dike fields and individual dikes are distinct habitats within river systems where these structures are numerous. Data on environmental quality characteristics of dikes and methods for designing and modifying present structures are needed to enhance their value as habitat for the fish communities.

Objectives

5. This research was conducted to determine the importance of dike pool habitats to fish communities during a low water period on the Lower Mississippi River. Specific objectives of the study were to:

- <u>a</u>. Determine fish species composition within two dike pools and adjacent river border.
- **b**. Determine biomass and condition of blue catfish within two dike pools.
- c. Document variations in water quality characteristics.

PART II: DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

6. The Mississippi River flows some 3545 km from Lake Itasca in northern Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico below New Orleans, La. It is the third longest river in the world with a drainage basin including all or parts of 31 states and two Canadian provinces. The river is arbitrarily subdivided into the Upper, Middle, and Lower sections. The Lower Mississippi River is defined as that section of the river extending from Head of Passes, Louisiana, upstream 1580 km to the mouth of the Ohio River at Cairo, Ill. Average discharge of the river at Vicksburg, Miss., is approximately 15,900 m³/sec. Mean current flow within the main channel varies from 1 to 2 m/sec with a maximum recorded velocity of 5 m/sec at extremely high river stages. Hydrographs depict the greatest discharges to occur from February through March and the least discharges to occur from July through October.

7. The selected site for the dike pool studies was the Lower Cracraft Dike Field. This dike field consists of three transverse dikes located on the right bank between river mile 506.5-510.4 (Figure 1). These riprap dikes were constructed for the dual purpose of secondary channel closure and point bar stabilization (Anonymous 1978). The dike field has a stepped-down design. Dike 1 (numbered sequentially from upstream to downstream) is 564 m long with elevations of +6.1 m low water reference point (LWRP) and +4.6 m LWRP at the bank and main channel ends, respectively. Dike 2 is 1114 m long with elevations of +5.5 and +4.0 m LWRP at the bank and main channel ends, respectively. Dike 3 is 1329 m long with elevations of +4.6 and +3.0 m LWRP at the bank and main channel ends, respectively. Dikes 1 and 2 were constructed in 1971; Dike 3 was constructed in 1972. Extensive sand and gravel bars occur between succeeding dikes and over a 4-km reach of the river downstream from the third dike. These bars, the main axes of which are parallel to the main channel flows, isolate extensive pools between the riverbank and the bar during low flow stages. This study was conducted during a low water stage in the pools below Dikes 2 and 3 (Figure 1).

8. Each study pool was unique. Pool 2 was isolated from the main



Figure 1. Map of Cracraft Dike Field with water quality and fish sampling stations indicated (USCG = U. S. Coast Guard)

channel and Pool 3 at low water stages, while Pool 3 remained open at the downstream end year-round. The shoreline adjacent to the river in both pools was firm silt and sand and gradually sloped; the opposite shore was a steep bank. Asphalt revetment was present along a portion of the steep bank in Pool 2, and stone riprap revetment was present at the upstream end of Pool 3. No submerged vascular plants were present at any time during the study in Pool 2. Isolated areas of standing timber and stumps were present at the lower end of Pool 3 along the natural bank. Dense stands of willows (*Salix* spp.) occur along the natural bank of Pool 3 and are inundated at higher flows. Pool 2 was approximately 29.8 ha in area during isolation. Pool 3 was approximately 118.9 ha in size. Pool 2 was deep at the upstream end, with depths between 6.5 and 11.0 m, while Pool 3 maintained these depths along its entire length.

9. A grid system was employed for location of all sampling stations. Lettered markers (alphabetic notation) placed along the bank depict imaginary lines in the pools running from the bank toward the main channel (Figure 1). Equidistant stations were placed along these imaginary transects with locations dependent on river stage and geomorphology. Three transects were established below each dike. Four stations were positioned along each transect as follows:

a. Adjacent to the steep natural bank.

b. Adjacent to the inner side of the middle bar.

c. Midway between stations described in a and b.

d. Adjacent to the riverside of the middle bar (river border). These stations were established to investigate both longitudinal and transverse distribution of fish within the dike field. Exact location of stations along each transect fluctuated with river stage, but the relative positions, as described above, remained the same.

PART III: METHODS AND MATERIALS

10. Samples of water and fish were collected from Pools 2 and 3 of the Cracraft Dike Field and from the adjacent river border. Sampling began on 2 July 1980 and continued through 25 September 1980.

Water Quality

11. Surface and bottom water quality data were collected from the nine stations in each dike pool. Water quality measurements were measured at the surface only from a single station on the riverside of the middle bar. A Hydrolab Model 6D was used to make in situ measurements of pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen, and conductivity. Water samples, preserved on ice, were returned to the laboratory for analysis of total hardness, and total alkalinity (American Public Health Association 1975). Measurements of water quality were conducted weekly except during 17 July through 2 August when sampling was conducted on alternate days.

Fish

Collecting methods

12. Fish were collected monthly with seines, gill nets, electroshocking equipment, and hoop nets. Gill nets were not employed in pool habitats during 31 July-10 August. During this time, a mark-recapture study was attempted in Pools 2 and 3, but was later abandoned when recapture numbers were low and river levels rose to reflood the pools. Rotenone, in conjunction with block netting, was used during 30 July-1 August to collect fish from Pools 2 and 3 only.

13. Fish were captured with a 4.6- by 0.9-m "common sense" seine having a square mesh size of 3.2 mm from three stations in each pool along the inner side of the middle bar and from six stations on the riverside of the middle bar. Seine hauls at each station were parallel to shoreline in a downstream direction and 32 m long.

14. Experimental gill nets used were 45.7 m long, 2.4 m deep, and had six panels 7.6 m in length with square mesh sizes of 25, 38, 50, 63, 75, and 89 mm, respectively. They were set at a randomly selected station positioned on each of the three transects in Pools 2 and 3 only. Gill nets were fished for two consecutive 24-hr periods.

15. Electroshocking was done with a commercially built, 230-V, pulsed DC, boat-mounted boom shocker. There were eight electroshocking transects in Pool 2, ten in Pool 3, and five along the riverside of the middle bar (Figure 1).

16. Double-throated hoop nets, 0.9-m mouth diameter with 25.4-mmsquare mesh netting, were set at each of the nine stations in Pools 2 and 3 and at the six stations along the riverside of the middle bar. The nets were set parallel to shoreline and fished unbaited for two consecutive 24-hr periods.

17. A single 0.26-ha plot set in each pool was sampled for fish using rotenone midway through the study (30 July-2 August). Block nets 2.7 m deep, 152 m long, with a square mesh size of 6.4 mm were used to block off each plot. Rotenone was applied to each plot at a concentration of 1 mg/l. Potassium permanganate was applied around the outside perimeter of each plot at a rate of 2.5 to 3.0 mg/l to detoxify any rotenone which might have escaped through the net through wind action or boat activity. Fish were collected for 48 hr following application of rotenone.

18. The larger fishes were identified and processed in the field. Juvenile fishes, minnows, and unusual fishes were preserved in 10-percent formalin for later identification. Total length (millimetres) and weight (grams) were recorded for all specimens in good condition. When large numbers of fish of the same species occurred within any one sample, a subsample of that species was taken. (Nomenclature of fish is given in Table 1).

Sampling dates

19. There were six major sampling efforts plus one rotenone effort during the study period:

- a. 2-5 July
- <u>b</u>. 13-16 July
- c. 30 July-2 August (rotenone samples)
- d. 3-10 August
- e. 24-27 August
- f. 7-10 September
- g. 22-25 September

Each was approximately 4 days in duration and was scheduled to coincide as much as possible with river stages that created flowing and nonflowing (isolated) conditions through Pools 2 and 3.

Treatment of data

20. Mean numerical catch per unit of effort (C/f), mean total weight of fish per unit of effort (C/y), and mean number of species per unit of effort were calculated for each habitat during each sampling period. The C/f for all variables for gill nets and hoop nets was based on each catch per net per 24-hr set. For electroshocking, the unit of effort was a single 600-m transect. The C/f for seining was based on catch per 32-m haul. Catch from the block nets was reported on a per hectare basis. Data were also transformed to log 10 (x + 1) as is generally appropriate for species abundance estimates (Green 1979). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for differences between habitats based on mean C/f , C/y , and number of species. Data were also transformed to log 10 (x + 1) as is generally appropriate for species abundance estimates (Green 1979). The significance level for all catch data was established at $\alpha = 0.05$.

21. Condition factor (K) was determined from length-weight data according to Carlander (1969). Blue catfish K values were treated with ANOVA and log 10 ANOVA to compare by habitat over time. Duncan's multiple range test was applied to K data to facilitate comparisons among habitats.

22. The binary similarity coefficient, Kulczynski First, was also applied to the data to compare fish communities among habitats. The Kulczynski First is a ratio of cojoint presence to the sum of the reciprocal absences (A/B + C). This coefficient is one of the best indicators of change in dike field fish communities when large numbers of species make up the community (Polovino, Farrell, and Pennington 1983). Furthermore, measures based on presence/absence represent a valid alternative method for characterizing compositional change in community structure when dealing with highly variable data, which is the case in most fishery assessment studies.

PART IV: RESULTS

Flow Pattern Characteristics

23. The formation of dike pools is dependent upon river stage. During the sampling period of 2-5 July, river stage was highest than at any other time during the study (Figure 2). Water was flowing over Dike 3 and much of the middle bar (Table 2). By the 13-16 July sampling period, the river had fallen to create a cascading effect over Dike 3 and flow continued over much of the middle bar. From 31 July-10 August, river stage had dropped sufficiently to fully expose the middle bar and Dike 3, forming isolated pool conditions. A rise in river stage on 21 August that continued through approximately 5 September allowed flow through Pool 2 and the cascading effect over Dike 3 was again present. As river stage fell to create isolated conditions during 7-10 September, all of the middle bar was exposed and no flow was present through Pool 2 over Dike 3. River stage dropped even more during 22-25 September to



Figure 2. Daily river stage hydrograph for the Lower Mississippi River, Vicksburg, Miss., gauge, 1980

the lowest during the study. Pools decreased appreciably in size during this time and more of the middle bar became exposed. Flow along the riverside of the middle bar varied little throughout the study.

Characterization of Individual Habitats

Pool 2

24. <u>Water quality.</u> Mean water temperatures ranged from 25.4° to 30.1° C at the bottom and 26.8° to 32.9° C at the surface (Figure 3). Pool 2 was essentially isothermal until river stage had fallen sufficiently for the pool to become isolated from the main channel. When this occurred, the water in the pool thermally stratified and stratification continued until 28 August when river stage had risen sufficiently to reflood Pool 2.

25. Mean dissolved oxygen levels ranged from 1.7 to 7.7 mg/ ℓ at



Figure 3. Mean surface and bottom temperature and dissolved oxygen values for water quality stations at the river border, Pool 2, and Pool 3 from 2 July-25 September 1980. Dark portions of the abscissa represent periods of isolation

the bottom and 6.7 to 13.4 mg/l at the surface (Figure 3). Surface and bottom dissolved oxygen levels were quite uniform during the periods prior to 23 July in Pool 2 when flowing conditions were present. Stratification became apparent in Pool 2 and after 23 July and continued until river levels rose on 28 August.

26. Mean total alkalinity levels in Pool 2 ranged from 108.0 to 140.0 mg/ ℓ CaCO₃ at the surface and 114.0 to 232.0 mg/ ℓ CaCO₃ at the bottom (Figure 4). Surface and bottom alkalinity were similar during all sampling periods except on 17 July when the highest values were measured at the bottom.

27. Mean pH levels in Pool 2 ranged from 7.9 to 9.4 at the surface and 7.1 to 8.7 at the bottom (Figure 4). Stratification was apparent from 27 July-28 August with surface pH greater than at the bottom.

28. Mean conductivity levels in this pool ranged from 347.8 to 538.3 μ mhos/cm at the bottom and 347.2 to 507.8 μ mhos/cm at the surface (Figure 4). Surface and bottom values were similar until 31 July when stratification occurred. During this time, bottom conductivity values were higher than at the surface.

SURFACE



Figure 4. Mean surface and bottom total alkalinity, pH, and conductivity values for water quality stations at the river border, Pool 2, and Pool 3 from 2 July-25 September 1980. Dark portions of the abscissa represent periods of isolation

29. <u>Fish.</u> A total of 42 species and 5344 individual fish were collected from Pool 2. The number of species occurring during any one sampling period ranged from 19 to 25 and the number of individuals from 162 to 2013 (Table 3). Gizzard and threadfin shad dominated the catch in Pool 2 with 35.6 and 33.0 percent of the catch, respectively, using all gears. Their relative abundances fluctuated considerably; for example, threadfin shad comprised 1.0 percent of the catch during 13-16 July and 24-27 August to 54.3 percent of the catch during 31 July-10 August. Other species comprising at least 3.0 percent of the catch were river shiner (4.2 percent), emerald shiner (3.6 percent), and blue catfish (3.1 percent).

30. The abundance of the more typical riverine species, such as the minnows and shiners, was generally low in this pool. The minnows and shiners comprised 11.8 percent of the total catch. Although 11 species of minnows and shiners occurred in Pool 2, only the emerald and river shiner were collected at every sampling date. Four species, quillback carpsucker, mimic shiner, speckled chub, and carp, were unique to this pool.

31. Commercial and sport fishes comprised 11.8 percent of the species collected from Pool 2. Centrarchids collectively comprised only 0.8 percent of the catch. Catfishes and freshwater drum represented 8.2 and 2.1 percent of the catch, respectively.

<u>Pool 3</u>

32. <u>Water quality.</u> Mean temperatures were most variable during the study. Temperatures ranged from 28.7° to 33.9° C at the surface and 27.4 to 30.6° C at the bottom (Figure 3). Thermal stratification first became apparent in this pool on 25 July and continued until river levels rose, on 28 August, flooding the pool. Stratification was again evident in September.

33. Mean dissolved oxygen concentrations were quite variable in Pool 3 prior to 23 July. Surface dissolved oxygen ranged from 7.1 to 13.6 mg/ ℓ and bottom concentrations ranged from 1.2 to 6.9 mg/ ℓ (Figure 3). Stratification became apparent after 23 July and continued until 28 August.

34. Mean total alkalinity at both surface and bottom was usually similar in Pool 3. However, on 19 July surface levels were 123 mg/ ℓ CaCO₃ and bottom levels were 280 mg/ ℓ CaC₃ (Figure 4).

35. Mean pH levels in Pool 3 ranged from 7.8 to 9.5 at the surface and 7.5 to 8.1 at the bottom (Figure 4). Differences between surface and bottom levels were greatest on 6 August and stratification was apparent from 23 July through 28 August.

36. Mean conductivity ranged from 342.2 to 517.2 μ mhos/cm at the surface and 345.0 to 650.0 μ mhos/cm at the bottom (Figure 4). Stratification patterns were evident beginning on 25 July through 28 August.

37. <u>Fish.</u> Thirty-seven species, comprising 15,454 individuals, were collected from Pool 3. The number of species occurring during any one sampling period ranged from 20 to 27 and the number of individuals from 334 to 9,153 (Table 4).

38. Threadfin and gizzard shad dominated the fish community of this pool and comprised 62.1 and 21.6 percent of the total catch, respectively (Table 4). Their relative abundances fluctuated considerably among sampling dates; for example, threadfin shad ranged from 1.3 percent of the catch during 13-16 July to 83.0 percent of the catch during 31 July-10 August. Three additional species, emerald shiner, river carpsucker, and blue catfish, each constituted 3.1, 2.4, and 2.3 percent, respectively, of the overall total catch. Bigmouth buffalo, black buffalo, longear sunfish, and largemouth bass were captured only from Pool 3.

39. The abundance of minnows and shiners comprised 6.1 percent of the total catch from Pool 3 and was lower than in other habitats sampled. Of the seven species of minnows and shiners captured, only the emerald shiner and river shiner were present during every sampling period. The central silvery minnow and silverband shiner were represented by only a single collection during the 31 July-10 August sampling period.

40. Commercial and sport fish abundance was generally low in this pool and comprised only 4.8 percent of the total catch. Catfishes, especially the blue catfish, dominated the commerical and sport fish catch and comprised 3.6 percent of the total.

River border of middle bar

41. <u>Water quality.</u> Water quality measurements along the river border varied only slightly during the study. Temperatures ranged from a high of 31.0° C recorded on 17 and 19 July to a low of 26.9° C measured on 25 September (Figure 3). Dissolved oxygen concentrations ranged from 5.8 to 9.0 mg/ ℓ (Figure 3). The former occurred on 17 July and the latter on 6 August.

42. Total alkalinity levels along the river border were similar throughout the study. Measurements ranged only from 119 to 144 mg/ ℓ CaCO₃ (Figure 4), the former occurring on 25 July and 25 September and the latter occurring on 27 July. River border pH values ranged from 7.7 to 9.0 and both extremes were measured during August. Conductivity ranged from 330 to 540 μ mhos/cm during the study with the higher values being recorded during August when river stages were low (Figure 4).

43. <u>Fish.</u> A total of 415 fish representing 20 species were captured from Bar ? (upstream reach of middle bar). The fauna collected during a sampling period varied only slightly; the number of species ranged from 7 to 12, and the number of individuals ranged from 47 to 134.

44. Emerald shiner comprised 41.7 percent of the total fish captured and dominated the catch from Bar 2 except on two occasions: during 2-5 July, bluegill were most numerous and during 7-10 September, river shiner were greatest in abundance (Table 5). Blue catfish fluctuated in relative abundance from 5.6 to 32.1 percent of the catch during any one sampling period and comprised 18.8 percent of the total. Other species comprising at least 4.0 percent of the catch were river shiner (8.0), inland silversides (4.8), and flathead catfish (4.3).

45. Only five species of minnows and shiners occurred along Bar 2, but comprised 55.4 percent of the total catch. The emerald shiner, river shiner, and silverband shiner were captured consistently throughout the study. The silver chub and blacktail shiner were each collected only during a single sampling period.

46. Sport and commercial fishes, principally the blue catfish, ilathead catfish, and the bluegill, comprised 28.9 percent of the total

number of individuals. Blue catfish dominated and accounted for 85 percent of sport and commerical fish captured.

47. The abundance of gizzard and threadfin shad was relatively low along Bar 2. Both species collectively comprised only 5.8 percent of the catch. One yellow bass caught during 13-16 July was unique to Bar 2.

48. Twenty-seven species, comprising 829 individuals, were collected from Bar 3. The number of species occurring during any one sampling period ranged from 9 to 15 and the number of individuals from 34 to 249 (Table 6). Two species, bullhead minnow and mosquitofish, were unique to Bar 3 during this study.

49. Emerald shiner and gizzard shad were the two most abundant species from Bar 3 and comprised 30.6 and 21.0 percent of the total catch, respectively. Their relative abundances fluctuated considerably among sampling dates; for example, the emerald shiner ranged from 8.4 percent of the catch during 7-10 September to 63.1 percent during 13-16 July and the relative abundance of gizzard shad ranged from a low of 1.1 percent during 7-10 September to a high of 57.0 percent during 22-25 September. Three additional species, river shiner, blue catfish, and inland silverside, each accounted for 13.6, 12.1, and 5.9 percent of the overall catch, respectively.

50. The abundance of minnows and shiners comprised 47.0 percent of the total catch from Bar 3. The emerald and river shiner were the most abundant of the seven species of minnows and shiners captured and accounted for 30.6 and 13.6 percent of the catch, respectively. Five or less individuals of silver chub, weed shiner, blacktail shiner, and bullhead minnow were captured and collectively accounted for only 1.3 percent of the catch.

51. Commercial and sport fish comprised 16.8 percent of the total catch. Catfishes, especially the blue catfish, dominated the commercial and sport fish catch and accounted for 15 percent of the total.

Comparison of Fish Populations Among Habitats

52. A total of 22,042 fish representing 53 species and 16 families

were captured from the Cracraft Dike Field during the study. By far the numerically most abundant species was threadfin shad which comprised 50.7 percent of the total catch. Gizzard shad comprised the greatest percentage (39.3 percent) by weight of the catch.

Abundance

53. Mean C/f , C/y , and number of species were indices used to compare, by gear type, the fishes captured from the four habitats over the six sampling periods. ANOVA was used to statistically compare habitats.

54. Relative abundance and species composition varied depending upon sampling gear. Hoop nets principally sampled gizzard shad, flathead catfish, and freshwater drum. Gill nets were particularly effective on gizzard shad, goldeye, blue catfish, skipjack herring, shortnose gar, river carpsucker, and threadfin shad. Electroshocking catch was principally comprised of gizzard shad, blue catfish, threadfin shad, and flathead catfish. Seining was effective on such shallow-water species as emerald shiner, river shiner, threadfin shad, juvenile river carpsucker, and inland silverside.

Hoop nets. During the first two sampling periods, mean C/f 55. was consistently higher along the river border (Figure 5), but only the value at Bar 3 during 13-16 July was significant. Catch was comprised principally of gizzard shad and freshwater drum in the pools and catfishes in the river. Just prior to the 31 July-10 August sampling period, Pool 2 became isolated from the main channel and Pool 3. The occurrence of isolation had no apparent immediate effect on the catch since mean C/f along the river border continued to be higher than mean C/f in the pools. Catch in the pools was dominated by gizzard shad, river carpsucker, and freshwater drum during this time. River border catch was comprised principally of catfishes. As the river rose to reflood the pools just prior to 24-27 August, a shift occurred in mean C/f and for the remainder of the study mean C/f was greater in the pools than along the river border. Flathead catfish dominated the catch along the river border and gizzard shad, black crappie, and river carpsucker were the principal species collected in the pools during this



time. The greatest contrast in mean C/f occurred during 22-25 September when catch in the pools was significantly higher than those at Bar 2 and Bar 3. Gizzard shad almost exclusively comprised the catch in the pools, while very few fish were collected along the river border during this time.

56. Hoop net catches averaged less than 1.0 kg over all habitats during 2-5 July and mean C/y generally reflected the pattern of mean C/f (Figure 5). During 13-16 July mean C/y was significantly higher along the river border. The high value at Bar 3 was a result of the capture of several large blue suckers at this time. During 31 July-10 August and 24-27 August, mean C/y values were higher along the river border with catch at Bar 3 being significantly higher during the former and at Bar 2 during the latter. Catches remained low in all habitats during 7-10 September and increased slightly during 22-25 September.

57. Mean number of species varied little across all habitats during 2-5 and 13-16 July. As river levels dropped to create pool isolation just prior to 31 July-10 August, mean number of species values were higher at Bar 2 and Bar 3. By 24-27 August the opposite effect became apparent. As river levels rose to reflood the pool habitats, mean number of species values were higher in the pools than along the river border. This trend continued for the remainder of the study. However, only during 22-25 September was the difference significant.

58. <u>Gill nets.</u> During 2-5 July and 13-16 July overall catch was low in the pools (Figure 6). Gizzard shad was the principal species collected during these times. The 2-5 July sampling period was the only occurrence of a higher mean C/f in Pool 2. Falling river levels between 24-27 August and 7-10 September had no apparent effect on the catch since mean C/f continued to be higher in Pool 3, but no significant differences were found. Gizzard shad, blue catfish, and shortnose gar comprised the majority of the catch in the pools during August and September.

59. Mean C/y values were consistently higher in Pool 3 and generally followed the pattern of mean C/y (Figure 6). However,





significant differences in mean C/y between pools occurred only during 7-10 and 22-25 September.

60. Gill net catches during all sampling periods were generally comprised of six or more different species in Pool 2 and Pool 3 (Figure 6). Mean number of species was consistently higher in Pool 3 and demonstrated the overall trends of the mean C/f and mean C/y. However, only during 7-10 September was the difference large enough to be statistically significant.

61. <u>Electroshocking</u>. Overall catch was low across all habitats during 2-5 July and 13-16 July (Figure 7). During the latter, Pool 3 exhibited a significantly higher mean C/f than the other habitats.



Catch during July and August was dominated by gizzard shad and blue catfish in all habitats. The onset of isolation had no marked effect on mean C/f during 31 July-10 August; values were not significantly different. Mean C/f was higher in the pool habitats than along the river border during 24-27 August as river levels rose to reflood the pools, but the differences were not significant. Mean C/f remained low across all habitats during 7-10 September with Pool 3 again exhibiting the highest value. Gizzard shad, river carpsucker, and blue catfish were the dominant species collected in the pools during 7-10 September. The greatest contrast in mean C/f occurred during 22-25 September. The high C/f at Pool 3 was the result of the capture of numerous threadfin shad during this time and was significantly greater than mean C/f at any other habitat.

62. Electroshocking catches averaged less than 2.0 kg over all habitats during 2-5 and 13-16 July (Figure 7). During 31 July-10 August, 24-27 August, and 7-10 September, mean C/y was significantly higher along the river border than in the pools. Mean C/y was consistently higher in all habitats during 22-25 September, but no significant differences were found.

63. During 2-5 July, Pool 2 and Bar 3 exhibited the highest mean number of species. Bar 2 and Pool 3 had significantly higher numbers of species during 13-16 July. As river levels dropped just prior to 31 July-10 August, a higher number of species made up the catch in all habitats. During 24-27 August when river levels rose to reflood the pools, as well as 7-10 September when river levels dropped once again, mean number of species was higher in the pools than along the river border. However, only during 7-10 September were the values significant. An increase in number of species was evident across all habitats during 22-25 September. Generally, more species comprised the catch in all habitats during this time.

64. <u>Seine</u>. During 2-5 July, mean C/f was higher in the pools than along the river border (Figure 8). Catch was principally comprised of threadfin shad, emerald shiners, river shiners, and inland silversides in the pools during this time. The bulk of the catch along the



river border was comprised of emerald and river shiners. Catch was highly variable during 13-16 July, with Pool 3 exhibiting a significantly higher mean C/f than the other habitats. Emerald shiners, river shiners, and river carpsuckers dominated the catch in all habitats during this time. During 31 July-10 August, mean C/f was significantly higher in Pool 2 due to the catch of numerous river shiners. Pool habitats exhibited a significantly higher mean C/f than along the river border during 24-27 August due to the catch of large numbers of emerald and river shiners. Mean C/f was also greater in the pools during 7-10 September, but values were not significantly different. Mean C/f dropped off in each habitat during 22-25 September.

65. Mean C/y was very low at both pool and bar habitats throughout the study (Figure 8). However, Pool 3 had significantly higher values during 13-16 July and 24-27 August. The highest value occurred during 24-27 August at Pool 3.

66. Seine data exhibited a higher mean number of species throughout the study than did data from any other gear type (Figure 8). When isolation occurred just prior to 31 July-10 August, species composition varied among habitats. Pool 2 exhibited the highest value during this time but was not significantly different from other habitats. Higher species numbers were present in the pool habitats during 24-27 August. Pool 3 and Bar 3 exhibited the highest species numbers during 7-10 September, while Bar 2 and Bar 3 had the highest during 22-25 September.

67. <u>Rotenone.</u> During 31 July-10 August, threadfin shad was the dominant species in Pool 2 with 64.0 percent of the catch. Other species comprising at least 3.0 percent of the catch were catfishes (14.7 percent), gizzard shad (10.2 percent), silver chub (4.1 percent), and freshwater drum (4.1 percent). During this time, 19 species were collected in Pool 2 with rotenone compared to 10 or less utilizing any other gear. Species collected only with rotenone during 31 July-10 August include central silvery minnow, silverband shiner, highfin carpsucker, smallmouth buffalo, brook silverside, inland silverside, bluegill, and sauger.

68. Threadfin shad comprised 84.8 percent of the catch in Pool 3.

Another species comprising at least 3.0 percent of the catch included river carpsucker (3.8 percent). A total of 22 species was collected in Pool 3 with rotenone during this time compared to 10 or less utilizing any other gear. Species collected only with rotenone during this time include skipjack herring, central silvery minnow, silver chub, silverband shiner, weed shiner, striped bass, orangespotted sunfish, longear sunfish, and freshwater drum.

Seasonal similarity

69. Kulczynski's Binary Similarity Coefficient, based on pairwise comparison of species presence-absence, was calculated for each pair of habitat locations during each sampling period and for each pair of sampling periods at a particular habitat. This coefficient serves as a means of detecting changes in similarity of fish communities over time. Results indicated that species composition in all habitats fluctuated over the low water period. Habitat type was suggested as important in determining location similarities. Fish communities of Pool 2 and Pool 3 were quite similar over all sampling periods (Figure 9). The similarity of fish communities in Bar 2 and Bar 3 was quite variable throughout the sampling periods. In contrast, the habitat effect for pool-bar combinations likely contributed to a lower degree of similarity over time. Pool 2 and Pool 3 fish communities were expected to be more similar duing sampling periods conducted under flowing conditions. However, no general trend was apparent except during 2-5 July and 24-27 August (Figure 9). Similarity values between Pool 2 and Pool 3 during 24-27 August and 7-10 September indicated that fish community structure did not change as river levels dropped to reiosolate Pool 2 (Figure 9).

70. Pairwise comparisons of sampling periods for each habitat revealed some interesting trends. Although similarity values in all habitats were quite variable, fish species composition over time in Pool 2 and Pool 3 was more similar than that of Bar 2 and Bar 3. Of the four habitats, Pool 3 showed the highest similarity values over time (Figure 10), which indicates that the fish community in Pool 3 was more stable than at any other habitat. Pairwise comparisons of sampling periods



Figure 9. Kulczynski's Binary Similarity Coefficient values for each pairwise habitat comparison from 2 July-25 September 1980

for Bar 3 were generally higher than those of Bar 2 with high degrees of similarity noted in both habitats during 24-27 August versus 7-10 September samples and 24-27 August versus 22-25 September samples (Figure 10).



for each pairwise sampling period comparison from 2 July-25 September 1980

Length-weight relationship and condition

71. An overall length-weight relationship for blue catfish was derived from collections in all pool and bar habitats over the six sampling periods. Blue catfish ranged in length from 42 to 758 mm in total length. The resulting equation was:

$$\ln WT = -12.16 + 3.05 \ln TL$$
(1)

where ANOVA indicated that the regression coefficient (slope) was significantly different from 3 (t = 2.98, df = 564, α = 0.05). Furthermore, the 95-percent confidence level for the slope was 3.05 ± 0.03.

72. Condition factors were calculated for blue catfish from each habitat during each sampling period (Table 7). Mean values for K generally were between 0.66 and 0.80. The range of K factors of individual specimens was usually much larger in the pool habitats than along the river border, but only one significant difference among habitats was found: mean K for blue catfish was significantly greater in Pool 2 during 7-10 September.
PART V: DISCUSSION

Water Quality

73. Slack-water pools created as a result of the construction of stone dikes undergo rapid changes in water quality. Changes exhibited in the pools of this study as river stage dropped and flow through them ceased resembled the characteristic summer stratification seen in southern eutrophic lakes. Overall differences in water quality characteristics between pooled and riverine habitats were easily discernable once stratification in the pools began.

74. The water column in the river border was assumed to be uniform and evidence has been reported to support this assumption (Sabol, Winfield, and Toczydlowski 1984). Temperatures along the river border of the middle bar were less variable than temperatures in Pools 2 and 3. As flow into Pools 2 and 3 ceased, they lost their similarities to main channel habitats and became characteristic of permanent lakes. Temperature measurements ranged from 24.0° to 34.5° C during the study with mean values in Pool 2 being slightly higher than those of Pool 3. Thermal stratification was observed in both pools, with metalimnions in Pool 2 commonly occurring between the surface and 1 m, and between 2 and 4 m in Pool 3 (Figures 3 and 11). Temporary metalimnions developed in Pool 3 between 17 and 23 July, and reformed on 27 July for the length of the study. Temperature stratification of Pool 2 was not detected until 29 July.

75. Dissolved oxygen concentrations along the river border were less variable over time than in pooled habitats. Concentration of dissolved oxygen in pools varied considerably and ranged from a surface high of 16.2 mg/ ℓ to a low of 0.1 mg/ ℓ in the stratified hypolimnion. Dissolved oxygen profiles demonstrated clinograde oxygen curves typical of eutrophic lakes, once thermal stratification had occurred in the pools (Figures 3 and 12). Clinograde distributions were first observed in Pool 3 on 17 July and in Pool 2 ten days later.

76. When water was flowing over the middle bar and Dike 3, total







DISSOLVED OXYGEN, mg/l

Figure 12. Mean dissolved oxygen profile data at Pool 2 and Pool 3 on selected dates during the study

alkalinities in the habitats were similar (Figure 4). For example, on 2 July as water flowed over the middle bar and Dike 3, surface total alkalinity across all habitats averaged 127 mg/ ℓ . From that point on, Pool 2 surface alkalinity fluctuated between 108 mg/ ℓ on 14 August to 140 mg/ ℓ on 29 July. Total alkalinity at the surface in Pool 3 showed similar patterns as Pool 2 with values ranging from 114 to 165 mg/ ℓ on 17 July and 2 August, respectively. Bottom alkalinity of the pooled habitats showed wide differences from riverine conditions (Figure 4). Pool 2 alkalinities at the bottom fluctuated from 115 mg/ ℓ on 28 August to 332 mg/ ℓ on 17 July. A similar trend was observed at the bottom in Pool 3, with a maximum alkalinity of 280 mg/ ℓ being measured on 19 July. Alkalinities along the river border fluctuated only slightly.

77. Measurements of pH ranged from 7.0 to 9.5 during this study and were uniform across habitats when water from the river was flowing through the pools (Figure 4). Increased pH values were observed at the surface during low flow stages in all habitats. Higher pH measurements were taken in the pools than along the river border. Surface pH values were higher than at the bottom in the pools, especially during periods when pools were isolated from main channel flow.

78. Surface conductivity levels in the pools and river border were generally similar to each other during any sampling period that occurred when water was flowing through the dike pools (Figure 4). Only during periods when pools were isolated from main channel waters did differences in conductivity become evident. Conductivities of bottom water in the pools were much greater than those of the surface after thermal stratification occurred. There are two possible explanations for peak conductivities occurring near bottom during periods of pool isolation. First, under anaerobic reducing conditions, iron trapped in the sediments became soluable and went into solution. Direct observation of this was seen in discarded samples, where the iron precipitated out of solution after reoxygenation of the water. Second, groundwater inflow could have contributed ions in significant concentrations to cause the increase in conductivity.

<u>Fish</u>

79. Based on species composition and relative frequency of species collected, there are three generalized fish communities present in the Cracraft Dike Field. The lentic community is typified by fish primarily in the pooled habitats. Shortnose gar, American eel, skipjack herring, carp, gizzard shad, paddlefish, striped bass, sunfishes, sauger, and striped mullet are unique only to pool habitats. The lotic community is typified by fish collected primarily in the main channel habitat. Flathead catfish, blue catfish, and blue sucker make up a high percentage of the catch in the main channel, and thus represent a large portion of the lotic community. The shallow-water fish community is characterized by fish collected in the shallows on either side of the dike field sandbar. Common shallow-water fish species found within the dike field include Notropis sp., inland silverside, brook silverside, threadfin shad, and gizzard shad.

80. Catch per unit of effort data can be used to indicate relative numerical abundance of fish within a habitat. Because there were unequal amounts of effort applied between habitats (pools and bars), amounts of effort were standardized to allow more meaningful relationships of relative abundance and similarity. The high C/f in pooled habitats is largely due to the consistently high numbers of gizzard shad and threadfin shad. Each sampling gear employed during the study was particularly effective on these two species. Other species which frequently had high numbers and thus affected overall C/f were river carpsucker, river shiner, emerald shiner, and blue catfish. During the 4-month study, two species made up 75 percent of the total catch in all habitats. Threadfin shad, by far, was the most abundant species comprising 50.8 percent of the total fish catch. Gizzard shad comprised 24.3 percent of the total catch over all habitats. Emerald shiners and river shiners comprised 5.0 and 3.0 percent, respectively, of the overall catch. Overall, 46 species of fish were collected with hoop nets, gill nets, seining, rotenone application, and electroshocking. Fortytwo different species were captured in Pool 2 compared to 41 different

species in Pool 3. The river border habitat exhibited a lower total species count than that of the pool habitats, having 21 species collected in the former. Four species of fish were caught only in Pool 2, four were unique to Pool 3, and three were unique to the bar habitats.

81. It is recognized that not any one gear adequately samples all sizes of all species of fish (Allen, Delacy, and Gotshall 1960; Bennett 1971). All gears are selective to some degree and the use of a variety of sampling devices gives a better indication of fish population parameters than would any one gear by itself. The diversity of sampling gears used during the course of this study probably represented the fish fauna adequately in all habitats in the dike field. Seines were found to be a very valuable gear in estimating relative abundance and presence of fish in the shallows of the dike field sandbar. However, seining was not usable in other pool sites and abundances could be underestimated. Although catch was low employing hoop nets within the dike field (320 fish over all habitats), deepwater and midwater species were probably adequately represented. Gill nets accounted for only 11.1 percent of the total number of fish caught in pooled habitats, but accounted for over 70 percent of the total biomass for each pool. Rotenone and block netting employed in both pools during the sampling period of 1 August accounted for nearly 50 percent of the total catch over all habitats and sampling periods, but accounted for only 4.6 percent of the total biomass over all habitats and sampling periods. Electroshocking not only adequately represented the fish fauna within the Cracraft Dike Field during the low water period (25 percent of the total catch over all habitats composing 22 species), but can be employed in a wide variety of conditions and with limited manpower.

82. The degree of similarity between any pair of habitats was related to their location within the dike field. Lotic habitats Bar 2 and Bar 3 showed high similarity values during the study as did the lentic habitats of Pools 2 and 3 when compared with each other. Pool versus bar comparisons were generally less similar. Isolation and subsequent reflooding of dike pools apparently had little or no effect on changing the species composition of pool and bar habitats. Although the greatest

similarity between Pool 2 and Pool 3 occurred during 7-10 September when isolated conditions were present, values were quite variable during other sampling periods and no specific trends were apparent. Polovino, Farrell, and Pennington (1983) concluded that binary similarity coefficients, such as the Kulczynski First, are successful indicators of change in fish communities. He found that fish also seem to prefer dike field habitats over riverine habitats because habitat heterogeneity is increased by the dike structures.

83. Mean K was quite variable for blue catfish in all habitats during the study. Mean K for blue catfish was consistently greater in pool habitats than in bar habitats. Mean K factors for blue catfish were consistently lower than those reported by CDM/Limnetics (1976) in the Lower Mississippi River.

-

84. The distribution of fish in a riverine ecosystem is a complex phenomenon complicated by the interaction of many factors such as river stage, current, temperature, turbidity, interspecific competition, and reproduction cycles. Ragland (1974) and Emge et al. (1974) have shown that current influences the distribution and relative abundance of fish in the Middle Mississippi River. Many species of fish appear to use the still waters within unchannelized portions of major river systems as spawning and nursery grounds (Hey and Baldwin 1977; Kallemeyn and Novotny 1977; Ellis, Farabee, and Reynolds 1979; Persons 1979). Starrett (1951) considered spawning period, flooding, and siltation to be the most important factors influencing species composition in the Des Moines River. He concluded that late season spawning species were the most successful reproducers due to their avoidance of the worst flooding and siltation conditions during the critical spawning period. He suggested that excessively high or low river levels, occurring over several consecutive years, could have a major effect in changing the species composition of the river. Mississippi Power and Light (1973) strongly suggested that flooding was the major factor responsible for changing the species composition in the Lower Mississippi River during the spring flood of 1973. Schramm and Lewis (1974) suggested that shallow water and softer substrates in addition to reduced current and water level fluctuations appear to be

important in determining fish production in extra-channel habitats.

85. Because of the ubiquity of dikes on the Lower Mississippi River, there exists a significant amount of riverine habitat influenced by the physical characteristics of these structures. Dikes change the morphological characteristics of the river, creating a variety of aquatic habitats capable of supporting many different species of fish. The slack-water pools, created by the construction of dikes, are quite variable in size and depth. The existence of these slack-water pools is greatly dependent on seasons of the year and river flow stage.

86. Many species of fish appear to use these backwater areas (pools) for reproduction and nursery areas because of the lack of quiet water in the main channel. The still water, coupled with a variety of substrates, provides suitable spawning habitat for many species of fish native to the river. Limestone riprap provides suitable spawning substrates for many species of fish with a dike field. Channel catfish and flathead catfish may be classified as speleophils (Balon 1975). Members of this group construct cavities or holes for spawning. The cracks among the riprap would appear to be suitable substrate for speleophil spawning. Riprap was present in both Pools 2 and 3 in the main channel border, as the dikes extended into the main channel past the dike field bar. The river carpsucker and some shiners are species which spawn over a sandy bottom. Sand substrate was present in both pools and adjacent main channel habitats as a direct result of deposition occurrence from dike structures themselves. Gizzard shad, threadfin shad, emerald shiners, goldeye, and freshwater drum are classified as pelagophils or open-water spawners. Open water was abundant in all habitats during the study. However, the use of these pools as a spawning and/or a nursery habitat is dependent upon juveniles and adults entering the pools. Fish can move freely in and out of Pool 3 year-round because it remains open at the lower end. However, since Pool 2 becomes isolated from the main channel at low river stages, fish movement is restricted to higher flow levels. As the flow levels drop to create pools, turbidity levels decrease. As the overall productivity improves, the habitat becomes suitable for the development and growth of many young-of-the-year fishes.

PART VI: CONCLUSIONS

87. Overall differences in water quality between the pools and the river were easily distinguishable once stratification in the pools began. Surface readings of dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH were generally higher in the pooled habitats. As depth increased, the opposite was true for dissolved oxygen, temperature, and pH. Conductivity at the bottom in the pools during isolation were much higher than in the river.

88. Between-pool differences were less apparent. For example, the lower end of Pool 3 fluctuated between uniformity and heterogeneity with the rise and fall of the river. The upper and middle sections, however, took on the characteristics of a stratified lake. Stratification occurred in Pool 3 prior to its establishment in Pool 2.

89. Results from this study indicated that stone dikes create suitable habitat for the growth and development of many species of fish. Mean C/f values were generally greater in pool habitats with all gear types. Catch in pool habitats was dominated by threadfin shad and gizzard shad in numerical abundance and total biomass, respectively. Catch along the river border habitats was dominated by typical riverine species such as minnows and shinners.

90. Based on species composition and relative frequency of species collected, there were three generalized fish communities present in the Cracraft Dike Field. The lentic community was typified by fish primarily in the pooled habitats. Shortnose gar, American eel, skipjack herring, carp, gizzard shad, paddlefish, striped bass, sunfishes, sauger, and striped mullet were unique only to pooled habitats. The lotic community was typified by fish collected primarily in the main channel habitat. Flathead catfish, blue catfish, and blue sucker made up a high percentage of the catch in the main channel, and thus represented a large portion of the lotic community. The shallow-water fish community was characterized by fish collected in the shallows on either side of the dike field sandbar. Common shallow-water fish species found within the dike field included shiners, inland silverside, brook silverside, threadfin shad, and gizzard shad.

91. Results of Kulczynski's Binary similarity coefficient indicated that the degree of similarity in fish community structure between any pair of habitats was likely related to their location within the dike field. Lotic habitats Bar 2 and Bar 3 showed high similarity values during the study when compared with each other, as did the lentic habitats of Pools 2 and 3. Pool versus bar cominations showed a lower degree of similarity likely due to the habitat effect.

92. Although mean K values were quite variable throughout the study, mean values were consistently higher in pool habitats than in river border habitats for blue catfish.

93. The diversity of sampling gears used during the course of the study probably represented the fish fauna adequately in all habitats in the dike field. Electroshocking not only was a very valuable gear in estimating relative abundance of fish in all habitats, but can be employed in a wide variety of conditions and with limited manpower.

94. Results of this study indicated that dike structures can create desirable habitat necessary to maintain fish populations at various river stages. Cooperation between agencies and professions is essential so that dike modification and placement can be completed to maximize fish habitat and minimize impacts on existing off-channel areas.

REFERENCES

Allen, G. H., Delacy, A. C., and Gotshall, D. W. 1960. "Quantitative Sampling of Marine Fishes--A Problem in Fish Behavior and Sampling Gear," <u>Waste Disposal in the Marine Environment</u>, Pergamon Press, Elmsford, N. Y.

American Public Health Association. 1975. <u>Standard Methods for the</u> <u>Examination of Water and Wastewater</u>, 14th ed., Washington, D. C.

Anonymous. 1977. "Plan of Study for Mississippi River Dike and Revetment Studies," Unpublished report, Environmental and Water Quality Operational Studies, Environmental Laboratory, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Anonymous. 1978. "Cracraft-Kentucky Bend Hydrographic Survey, Survey of 17-19 April 1978," Mississippi River Potomology Studies, Detailed Study Reaches, File No. M-3.1-78-17, U. S. Army Engineer District, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Anonymous. 1980. "Plan of Study for Mississippi River Dike and Revetment Fisheries Studies," Unpublished report, Environmental and Water Quality Operational Studies, Environmental Laboratory, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Balon, E. K. 1975. "Reproductive Guilds of Fishes: A Proposal and Definition," Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, Vol 32, pp 821-864.

Bennett, G. W. 1971. <u>Management of Lakes and Ponds</u>, 2nd ed., Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York.

Carlander, K. D. 1969. <u>Handbook of Freshwater Fishery Biology</u>, Vol 1, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa.

CDM/Limnetics. 1976. "An Ecological Study of the Lower Mississippi River," Report to Middle South Services, Inc., New Orleans, La.

Ellis, J. M., Farabee, G. B., and Reynolds, J. B. 1979. "Fish Communities in Three Successional Stages of Side Channels in the Upper Mississippi River," <u>Transactions of the Missouri Academy of Science</u>, Vol 13, pp 5-20.

Emge, W. P., et al. 1974. "Physical, Biological, and Chemical Inventory of Twenty-Three Side Channels and Four River Border Areas, Middle Mississippi River," Contract Report Y-74-4, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Green, R. H. 1979. <u>Sampling Design and Statistical Methods for En-</u>vironmental Biologists, Wiley, New York.

Hey, J., and Baldwin, K. 1977. "Aquatic Ecology Study of the Mississippi River near the George Neal Station (Post-Operational Survey-Unit III), Sioux City, Iowa, Jan-Dec 1976," Briar Cliff College, Sioux City, Iowa. Kallemeyn, L. W., and Novotny, J. F. 1977. "Fish and Fish Food Organisms in Various Habitats of the Missouri River in South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa," PBS-77/25, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Columbia, Mo.

Mississippi Power and Light. 1973. "Environmental Field Measurements Programs," Final Report, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station Units 1 and 3, Jackson, Miss.

Persons, W. R. 1979. <u>The Use of Open and Closed Backwater Ponds of the</u> <u>Missouri River, Iowa, as Spawning and Nursery Areas for Fish, Master's</u> Thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Polovino, H. N, Farrell, M. P., and Pennington, C. H. 1983. "Evaluating Changes in Dike Field Fishes with Community Information Indices," Technical Report prepared by Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the Environmental Laboratory, Waterways Experiment Station, for the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Ragland, D. V. 1974. "Evaluation of Three Side Channels and the Main Channel Border of the Mississippi River as Fish Habitat," Contract Report Y-74-1, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Robins, C. R., et al. 1980. <u>A List of Common and Scientific Names of</u> <u>Fishes from the United States and Canada</u>, 4th ed., American Fisheries Society Special Publications 12.

Sabol, B. M., Winfield, L. E., and Toczydlowski, D. G. 1984. "Water Quality of Selected Habitats on the Lower Mississippi River" in preparation, U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, CE, Vicksburg, Miss.

Schramm, H. L., Jr., and Lewis, W. M. 1974. "Study of the Importance of Backwater Chutes to a Riverine Fishery," prepared for the U. S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station under Contract DACW 39-73-0015 by the Fishery Research Laboratory, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 111.

Starrett, W. C. 1951. "Some Factors Affecting the Abundance of Minnows in the Des Moines River, Iowa," <u>Ecology</u>, Vol 32, pp 13-27.

Table 1

Species of Fish Collected from the Lower Cracraft Dike Field

from 2 July to 25 September 1980*

rgeon Bg Bg	Scaphirhynchus platorynchus Polyodon spathula Lepisosteus osseus Lepisosteus platostomus Anguilla rostrata Alosa chrysochloris Dorosoma cepedianum		××	>	×
80 Ei	spathula eus osseus eus platostomus rostrata rysochloris cepedianum		×	>	
80 E	eus osseus eus platostomus rostrata rysochloris cepedianum		×	4	×
ខ្មីជ	eus platostomus rostrata rysochloris cepedianum			X	×
Anguil ng Alosa Doroso	rostrata rysochloris cepedianum			×	×
ng Alosa Doroso	rysochloris cepedianum			×	×
	cepedianum		×	×	×
		×	×	×	×
Inreautin Snad	Dorosoma petenense	×	×	×	×
Goldeye Hiodon a	alasoides		×	×	×
Carp Cyprinus carpio	carpio			×	
Central silvery Hybognatl minnow	Hybogmathus nuchalis			×	×
Speckled chub Hybopsis	Hybopsis aestivalis			×	
Silver chub Hybopsis	Hybopsis storeriana	×	×	×	×
Emerald shiner Notropis	Notropis atherinoides	×	×	×	×
River shiner Notropis	Notropis blennius	×	×	×	×
Red shiner Notropis	Notropis lutrensis			×	
	(font i nued)				

"x" denotes the capture of a species in a particular habitat. Nomenclature according to Robins et al. (1980). Note: *

(Sheet 1 of 3)

. .

Common Name	Scientific Name	Bar 2	Bar 3	Pool 2	Pool 3
Silverband shiner	Notropis shumardi	×	×	×	×
Weed shiner	Notropis texanus		×		×
Blacktail shiner	Notropis venustus	×	×	×	×
Mimic shiner	Notropis volucellus			×	
Bullhead minnow	Pimephales vigilax		×		
River carpsucker	Carpiodes carpio	×	×	×	×
Quillback carpsucker	Carpiodes cyprinus			×	
Highfin carpsucker	Carpiodes velifer			×	×
Blue sucker	Cycleptus elongatus	×	×	×	
Smallmouth buffalo	Ictiobus bubalus	×	×	×	×
Bigmouth buffalo	Ictiobus cyprinellus				×
Black buffalo	Ictiobus niger				×
Blue catfish	Ictalurus furcatus	×	×	×	×
Channel catfish	Ictalurus punctatus	×	×	×	×
Flathead catfish	Pylodictis olivaris	×	×	×	×
Mosquitofish	Gambusia affinis		×		
Brook silverside	Labidesthes sicculus		×	×	×
Inland silverside	Menidia beryllina	×	×	×	×
White bass	Morone chrysops		×	×	×
Yellow bass	Morone mississippiensis	×			
Striped bass	Morone saxatilis			×	×

Table 1 (Concluded)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Bar 2	Bar 3	Pool 2	Pool 3
Orangespotted sunfish	Lepomis humilis			×	×
Bluegill	Lepomis macrochirus	×	×	×	×
Longear sunfish	Lepomis megalotis				×
Largemouth bass	Nicropterus salmoides				×
White crappie	Pomoxis annularis		×	×	×
Black crappie	Pomoxis nigromaculatus			×	×
Sauger	Stizostedion canadense			×	×
Freshwater drum	Aplodinotus grunniens	×	×	×	×
Striped mullet	Mugil cephalus			×	×

(Sheet 3 of 3)

Table 2

Description of Pool 2, Pool 3, and River Border

Habitats during Each Sampling Period

		Pool Condition	Water flowing over middle bar and Dike 3	Water cascading over middle bar and Dike 3	Isolated conditions present in pools	Water cascading over middle bar and Dike 3	Isolated conditions present in pools	Isolated conditions present in pools
Mean	Velocity	cm/sec	7.2 13.6 61.0	8.8 6.9 55.3	0.0 5.0 60.3	9.0 7.5 50.6	0.0 8.0 50.0	0.0 4.5 52.6
		Habitat	Pool 2 Pool 3 River border	Pool 2 Pool 3 River border	Pool 2 Pool 3 River border	Pool 2 Pool 3 River border	Pool 2 Pool 3 River border	Pool 2 Pool 3 River border
	River Stage	ft*	17.7-16.1	15.4-13.5	10.6–9.6	13.7-14.9	11.0-9.5	8.8-9.0
		Da te	2-5 Jul	13-16 Jul	31 Jul-10 Aug	24-27 Aug	7-10 Sep	22-25 Sep

To convert feet to metres multiply by 0.3048.

*

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (Rank)
			2-5 Jul	y			
Paddlefish	No.						
	Wt.						
Longnose gar	No. Wt			1 1,604.0			1 (20 1,604.0 (9
Shortnose gar	No.				* -		
	Wt.						
American eel	No. Wt.				2 880.0		2 (14 880.0 (12
Skipjack herring	No.			1			1 (20
Skipjack deiting	Wt.			103.0			103.0 (16
Gizzard shad	No.		5	25	8	10	48 (1
	Wt.		118.0	3,139.0	1,072.0	13.0	4,342.0 (3
Threadfin shad	No. Wt.		2 14.0			43 8.2	45 (2 22.2 (17
Goldeye	No.			20	1		21 (6
lordeje	Wt.			1,835.0	95.0		1,930.0 (7
Common carp	No.			3			3 (11
	Wt.			5,652.0			5,652.0 (1
Central silvery minnow	No. Wt.						
Speckled chub	No.						
speckied chab	Wt.						
Silver chub	No.						
	Wt.						
Imerald shiner	No. Wt.					40 6.9	40 (3 6.9 (18
liver shiner	No.		••			3	3 (11)
liver surder	Wt.					3.0	3.0 (19
Red shiner	No.						
	Wt.						••
ilverband shiner	No. Wt.						
weed shiner	No.					1	1 (20
	Wt.					0.4	0.4 (21
otropis sp.	No.						
	Wt.			***			
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.						
limic shiner	No.						
	Wt.						
liver carpsucker	No.		1	1	1	12	15 (7)
	Wt.		36.0	880.0	848.0	3.8	1,767.8 (8)
uillback carpsucker	No. Wt.						
lighfin carpsucker	No.		1	2			3 (11)
	Wt.		162.0	865.0			1,027.0 (10)
Carpiodes sp.	No.	-•					
	Wt.						
Blue sucker	No. Wt.						
mallmouth buffalo	No.			2			2 (14
	Wt.			2,904.0			2,904.0 (4
llue catfish	No.		19	12	1		32 (5)
N	Wt.		2,291.0	2,704.0	83.0		5,078.0 (2)
Channel catfish	No. Wt.			1 588.0			1 (20) 588.0 (13)
ctalurus sp.	No.						
-	Wt.		-+				

Table 3 Total Numbers and Total Weights (grams) of Fish Collected at Pool 2 by Sampling Period and Gear Type

(Continued)

Note: ES = electroshocking, ROTN = rotenone, EG8 = gill net, HN = hoop net, and SN = seine.

(Sheet 1 of 9)

.

٠.

٠.•

(Sheet 1

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (F	(ank
Flathead catfish	No.		<u>2-5 July (Cor</u> 3	ntinued) 	3		6	(9)
	Wt.		810.0		1,991.0		2,801.0	(5)
Brook silverside	No. Wt.							
Inland silverside	No. Wt.					40 2.8	40 2.8	(3) (20)
white bass	No. Wt.			1 296.0			1 296.0	(20)
Striped bass	No.			1			1	(15) (20)
Norone sp.	WL. No.			2,083.0		1	2,083.0 1	(6) (20)
-	Wt.					2.0	2.0	(21)
Orangespot sunfish	No. Wt.							
Bluegill	No. Wt.					6 0.1	6 0.1	(9) (23)
White crappie	No. Wt.							
Black crappie	WC. No.							
	Wt.							
Sauger	No. Wt.			2 441.0			2 441.0	(14) (14)
Freshwater drum	No.			6	4		10	(8)
	Wt.			539.0	364.0		903.0	(11)
Striped mullet	No. Wt.							
Damaged fish	No. Wt.					2 0.0	2 0.0	(14) (24)
fotal number caught			31	78	20	158	287	
fotal number of specie	25		6	14	7	8	22	
			<u>13-16 Ju</u>	ly				
Paddlefish	No. Wt.							
ongnose gar	No.			1			1	(15)
	Wt			1,411.0			1,411.0	(7)
Shortnose gar	No. Wt.			3 3,156.0			3 3,156.0	(8) (2)
American eel	No. Wt.							
Skipjack herring	No.			8			8	(4)
··	Wt.			762			762.0	(9)
Sizzard shad	No. WL.		3 381.0	62 9,174.9	5 278.0	3 6.5	73 9,840.0	(1) (1)
hreadfin shad	No. Wt.					1 0.5	1 0.5	(15) (17)
Goldeye	No.							
Common carp	Wt. No.							
-	Wt.							
Central silvery minnow	No. Wt.							
peckled chub	No. Wt.							
Gilver chub	No.					1	1	(15)
merald shiner	Wt. No.					0.5 41	0.5 41	(17)
	Wt.	*-				11.5	11.5	(14)
liver shiner	No. Wt.					2 0.4	2 0.4	(9) (18)

(Continued)

(Sheet 2 of 9)

.

190402 19 🖤



r

No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt.		<u>13-16 July (Co</u> 		 		
WE. No. WE. No. WE. No. WE.	 		 			
No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No.	 					
No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt.	 					
Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt.	 					
Wt. No. Wt.						
No. Wt.						
Wt.						
N7						
No. Wt.		1 50.0	2 1,168.0		6 0.8	9 (1,216.8 (
No.						
Wt.						
No. Wt.						
No.					1	1 (1 0.5 (1
			3			3 (
Wt.			513.0			513.0 (1
No. Wt.						2 (2,249.0 (
No.			5			5 (
Wt.						2,035.0 (
NO. Wt.			1,567.0			1,567.0 (
No.						
Wt.						
No. Wt.					1 0.8	1 (1 0.8 (1
No.						
Wt.						••
NO. Wt.						
No.			1			1 (1 1,865.0 (
			1,863.0		1	1,005.0 (
Wt.					1.3	1.3 (1
No. Wt.						
No.					ı	1 (1
Wt.						0.1 (1
No. Wt.				310.0		310.0 (1
No.						
Wt.						
No. Wt.			1 58.0	4 647.0		5 (705.0 (1
No.			1			1 (1
₩٤.						239.0 (1
No. Wt.						
		4	90	10	58	162
		2	12	3	8	19
		31 July-10	August			
No. Wr						
	Wt. No. No. Wt. No. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No	Wt. No. Wt. Wt. Wt. Wt. Wt. No. Wt. No. No. No. No. Wt. No. No. Wt. No. No. No. No. No. -	Wt. No. Wt. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. No.	Wt. No. 3 Wt. 2 Wt. 2,249.0 No. 2,249.0 No. 5 Wt. 2,035.0 No. 1 No. 1,567.0 No. No. No. No. Wt. No. No. No	Wt. No. No. 3 No. 2 No. 2,249.0 No. 2,249.0 No. 1 No. 1.57.0 No. 2,249.0 No. 1.567.0 No. 1.567.0 No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No.	Wt. 10.1 No. 1.1 1.0 1.1 <td< td=""></td<>

.

Species		ROTN	ES July-10 August	EG8 (Continued)	<u>HN</u>	SN	Total (F	(ank)
Longnose gar	No.			(continued)				
•	Wt							
Shortnose gar	No. Wt.							
American eel	No. Wt.							
Skipjack herring	No.		3		1		4	(19)
Gizzard shad	Wt. No.	170	88		76.0 4		262	(13)
Threadfin shad	Wt. No.	16,468.0 1,070	*		904.0	 13	17,372.0 1,094	(1)
	Wt.	1,491.8	*			10.1	1,501.9	(4
Goldeye	No. Wt.							
Common carp	No. Wt.							
Central silvery	No.	1 2.0					1	(26)
minnow Speckled chub	Wt. No.					1	2.0 1	(23) (26)
-	Wt.					0.2	0.2	(28
Silver chub	No. Wt.	69 129.1				18 4.9	87 134.0	(5) (11)
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.					23 4.2	23 4.2	(10) (19)
River shiner	No. Wt.	6 8.8				99 19.1	105 27.9	(4) (17)
Red shiner	No.							(17)
	Wt.							
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.	5 2.4					5 2.4	(15) (22)
weed shiner	No. Wt.							
Notropis spp.	No. Wt.							
Blacktail shiner	No.					2	2	(22)
11mic shiner	WL. No.					0.2	0.2	(28)
nur sunci	Wt.							
River carpsucker	No. Wt.	6 317.0	1 *		11 7,418.0	4 39.0	22 7,774.0	(11) (2)
Juillback carpsucker	No. Wt.							
lighfin carpsucker	No.	1					1	(26)
	Wt.	1.3					1.3	(25)
Carpiodes sp.	No. Wt.	1 2.7					1 2.7	(26) (21)
31ue sucker	No. Wt.							
Smallmouth buffalo	No.	4					4	(17)
Blue catfish	Wt. No.	804.0 23	 14		1	1	804.0 39	(7) (8)
Channel catfish	Wt.	15.1	1,091.0		144.0	0.9 2	1,251.0 83	(5) (6)
	No. Wt.	81 209.2				1.2	210.4	(9)
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.	141 92.0					141 92.0	(3) (12)
Flathmad catfish	No. Wt.	1 0.5	4 1,071.0		1 605.0		6 1,676.0	(17) (3)
Brook silverside	No.	3					3	(20)
	Wt.	3.7 1					3.7 1	(20)
Inland silverside	No. Wt.	1.4					1.4	(24)

* Weights not taken.

÷t.

(Sheet 4 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	<u>HN</u>	SN	Total (F	Rank)
				st (Continued)				
White bass	No. Wt.	1 122.7			1 224.0		3 347.0	(20 (8
Striped bass	No.							
	WL.							
Morone sp.	No. Wt.	6 34.2					6 34.2	(13)
)rangespot_sunfish	No.	6				1	7	(12
Plussill	Wt.	37.5 5				1.2	38.7 5	(14
Bluegill	No. Wt.	5.5					5.5	(18
White crappie	No. Wt.				3 160.0		3 160.0	(20 (10
Black crappie	wc. No.							(10
	Wt.							
Sauger	No. Wt.	1 8.8					1 8.8	(26
Freshwater drum	No.	68			1	1	70	(7
	Wt.	585.7			222.0	0.8	808.5	(6
Striped mullet	No. Wt.							
Damaged fish	No.					33	33	(9
	Wt.					0.8	0.8	(26
Fotal number caught Fotal number of species		1,671 19	121 6	0	23 8	198 10	2,013	
ocar number of species	5	19			٥	10	24	
)	No.		24-27 Aug	<u>ust</u>				
Paddlefish	Wt.							
ongnose gar	No.			2			2	(17
hortnose gar	Wt No.			1,746.0			1,746.0	(5 (12
northost gat	Wt.			6,581.0			6,581.0	()
American eel	No. Wt.							
Skipjack herring	No.		3	4			7	(10
	Wt.		*	1,154.0				(8
lizzard shad	No. Wt.		207	189 21,959.0	7 615.0		403	() ()
Chreadfin shad	No.		261			32	293	(2
	Wt.		*			10.1	2	(16
foldeye	No. Wt.			3 336.0			3 336.0	(15 (11
Common carp	No.			1			1	(20
	Wt. No.			1,562.0			1,562.0	(7
entral silvery minnow	Wt.							
peckled chub	No.	* -				••		
ulver chub	Wt. No.							
	Wt.	••						
merald shiner	No. Wt.					76 48.5	76 48.5	(1.1
liver shiner	No.	-•				61	61	(4
	Wt.					22.6	22.6	(15
led shiner	No. Wt.							
ilverband shiner	No.							
	₩٤.							
leed shiner	No. Wt.							
Notropis sp.	No.					7	7	(10
	Wt.					0.8	0.8	(19

* Weights not taken.

(Sheet 5 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HDN	SN	Total (R	lank)
			24-27 August (0	Continued)				
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.					14 1.6	14 1.6	(8 (18
Mimic shiner	No.							(10
	Wt.							
River carpsucker	No. Wt.			7 5,225.0	3 *	16 13.7	26 5,239.0	(7
Quillback carpsucker	No.							
11: - b 6 / -	Wt.							
Highfin carpsucker	No. Wt.							
Carpiodes sp.	No. Wt.							
Blue sucker	No.							
	Wt.							
Smallmouth buffalo	No.		1 *				1 *	(20
Blue catfish	Wt. No.		15	19			34	(6
	Wt.		1,656.0	5,512.0			7,168.0	(2
Channel catfish	No. Wt.			3 1,624.0	1		4 1,624.0	(13 (6
Ictalurus sp.	WE. No.			1,624.0			1,624.0	(0
······································	Wt.							
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.		3 426.0				3 426.0	(15 (10
Brook silverside	No.		428.0			6	420.0	(12
	Wt.					8.4	8.4	(17
Inland silverside	No. Wt.		 			39 45.1	39 45.1	(5 (14
white bass	WC. No.		1			4J.1 	45.1	(20
	Wt.		*				*	*
Striped bass	No. Wt.							
Morone sp.	No.							
	Wt.		~-					
Drangespot sunfish	No. Wt.							
Bluegill	No,		1	1			2	(17
•	Wt.		*	132.0			•	(12
White crappie	No. Wt.				2 *		2 *	(17 *
Black crappie	No.				1		1	(20
•	Wt.				*		*	×
Sauger	No. Wt.							
Freshwater drum	No.			3			3	(15
Stringd mullet	Wt.			521.0			521.0	(9
Striped mullet	No. Wt.							
Damaged fish	No.							
fotal number caught	Wt.		492	238	14	251	995	
fotal number of specie	s		8	11	5	-31	22	
•			7~10 Septe					
Paddlefish	No.		<u>7-10 Septe</u>					
	Wt.							
ongnose gar	No. Wt							
Shortnose gar	WC No.			1			1	(23)
	Wt.			733.0			733.0	(9

Weights not taken.

(Sheet 6 of 9)

			<u> </u>					
Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (F	lank)
			7-10 September					
American eel	No. Wt.				1 703.0		1 703.0	(23) (10)
Skipjack herring	No.		1 *	1			2	(18) (14)
Gizzard shad	Wt. No.		120	143.0 297	17		434	(14)
	Wt.		*	30,258.0	1,886.0		_	(1)
Threadfin shad	No. Wt.		2 *				2 *	(18)
Goldeye	No. Wt.			28 3,026.0			28 3,026.0	(6) (5)
Common carp	No. Wt.			2 4,337.0			2 4,337.0	(18) (4)
Central silvery minnow	No. Wt.							
Speckled chub	WC, No.							
· · · · ·	Wt.							
Silver chub	No. Wt.							
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.					14 13.3	14 13.3	(10) (16)
River shiner	No.					59	59	(10)
	Wt.					29.5	29.5	(15)
Red shiner	No. Wt.					8 1.8	8 1.8	(11) (20)
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.					1 0.6	1 0.6	(23) (21)
Weed shiner	No. Wt.							
Notropis spp.	No.					37	37	(4)
Blacktail shiner	Wt. No.					2.7 37	2.7 37	(19) (4)
limic shiner	Wt. No.					6.2	6.2	(18)
	Wt.							
River carpsucker	No. Wt.			10 6,264.0	2 *	3 9.4	15 6,273.8	(9) (2)
Quillback carpsucker	No. Wt.							
Highfin carpsucker	No. Wt.							
Carpiodes sp.	No. Wt.							
Blue sucker	WC. No.							
	Wt.			•-				<i></i>
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.		2 *	1 497.0			3 497.0	(15) (12)
Blue catfish	No. Wt.		17 1,687.0	13 4,182.0			30 5,869.0	(5) (3)
Channel catfish	No. Wt.			4 1,632.0			4 1,632.0	(13) (7)
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.							
Flathead catfish	No.		2				2	(23)
Brook silverside	Wt. No.		447.0 				447.0 	(13)
Inland silverside	Wt. No.				••	 23	 23	(7)
Inland silverside	NO. Wt.					7.1	7.1	(17)
White bass	No. Wt.				1 *		1 *	(23) *
Striped bass	No. Wt.			1 770.0			1 770.0	(23) (8)
			(Cont in					

• Weights not taken.

(Sheet 7 of 9)

Table 3 (Continued)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (R	ank)	Overall Total and Rank	Relative Abundance percent
	<u> </u>			eptember (Continued)				
Norone sp.	No.									
	Wt.									
Orangespot sunfish	No.									
	Wt.				3		3	(15)		
Bluegill	No. Wt.				*		*	*		
White crappie	No.			~-	3		3	(15)		
	Wt.				*		*	*		
Black crappie	No.				6 *		6 *	(12)		
.	Wt.			1			1	(23)		
Sauger	No. Wt.			571.0			571.0	(11)		
Freshwater drum	No.			15			15	(9)		
	Wt.			2,364.0	•		2,364.0	(6)		
Striped mullet	No. Wt.									
Democrad figh	No.									
Damaged fish	Wt.									
Total number caught			144	374	33	182	733			
Total number of species			6	12	7	7	25			
				22-25 Sept	ember					
Paddlefish	No.			1			1	(18)	1 (28)	**
raddferrau	Wt.			98.0			98.0	(14)		
Longnose gar	No.				•-				4 (25)	0.1
	Wt								10 (19)	0.2
Shortnose gar	No. Wt.									
American eel	No.								3 (26)	0.1
American cer	Wt.									
Skipjack herring	No.		8	3			11 659.0	(7) (10)	33 (15)	0.6
	Wt.		56.0	603.0			681	(10)	1,901 (1)	35.6
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.		386 18,470.0	230 27,174.0	64 6,318.0	1 10.3	51,972.0	(i)		
Threadfin shad	No.		326	1	1		328	(2)	1,763 (2)	33.0
	Wt.		2,093.0	5.0	36.0		2,134.0	(6)		
Goldeye	No.		2 127.8	25 2,899.0			27 3,027	(4) (4)	79 (12)	1.5
	Wt. No.		127.0	2,099.0				()	6 (23)	0.1
Common carp	WE.									
Central silvery	No.								1 (28)	**
minnow	Wt.								1 (28)	**
Speckled chub	No. Wt.									
Cilman shub	No.								88 (11)	1.7
Silver chub	Wt.									
Emerald shiner	No.					1	1	(18)	195 (4)	3.7
	Wt.					0.1	0.1	(20)	232 (3)	4.2
River shiner	No. Wt.					2 1.0	2 1.0	(14) (17)		
Red shiner	No.								8 (21)	0.2
Nea Shinei	Wt.									••
Silverband shiner	No.								6 (23)	0.1
	Wt.								1 (23)	***
Weed shiner	No. Wt.									
Notropis sp.	No.					2	2	(14)		0.9
noceopia ap.	WL.					0.2	0.2			

(Continued)

Weights not taken. Values of less than 0.5 g. **

(Sheet 8 of 9)

Table 3 (Concluded)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (Rank)	Overall Total and Rank	Relative Abundance percent
				25 Septembe					
Blacktail shiner	No.							53 (13)	1.0
	Wt.			•-					
limic shiner	No. Wt.					3 0.6	3 (11) 0.6 (18)	3 (26)	0.1
liver carpsucker	No. Wt.		3	22	4		29 (3)	116 (7)	2.2
			1,559.0	12,246.0	2,463.0		16,268.0 (2)	••	
uillback carpsucker	No. Wt.			1 253.0			1 (18) 253.0 (12)	1 (28)	**
lighfin carpsucker	No.			2			2 (11)	6 (23)	0.1
•	Wt.			636.0			636.0 (11)		
arpiodes sp.	No.			••				2 (27)	**
	Wt.							••	
lue sucker	No.							3 (26)	0.1
	Wt.		••			••			
mallmouth buffalo	No.							12 (18)	0.2
	Wt.								
lue catfish	No. Wt.		25 1,233.0	2 127.0			27 (4) 1,360.0 (8)	167 (5)	3.1
							•	/->	
hannel catfish	No. Wt.		6 26.8	4 3,394.0	1 63.0	4 4.2	15 (6) 3,488.0 (3)	108 (9)	2.0
ctalurus sp.	No.					••		141 (6)	2.6
······································	Wt.			••					
lathead catfish	No.		6				6 (11)	23 (16)	0.4
	Wt.		1,945.0				1,945.0 (7)		
rook silverside	No.							10 (19)	0.2
	Wt.						••	•-	
nland silverside	No.				•-		••	103 (10)	1.9
	Wt.		**						
hite bass	No.		1				1 (18)	7 (22)	0.1
	Wt.		12.5				12.5 (16)		
triped bass	No.			2			2 (14)	5 (24)	0.1
	Wt.			213.0			213.0 (13)		
lorone sp.	No.			••				8 (21)	0.2
	Wt.								
rangespot sunfish	No.							7 (22)	0.1
	Wt.								••
luegill	No. Wt.		1				1 (18) 37.0 (15)	18 (17)	0.3
			37.0						
hite crappie	No. Wt.							9 (20)	0.2
								7 (00)	
lack crappie	No. Wt.							7 (22)	0.1
				4			5 (9)	9 (20)	0.2
auger	No. Wt.		1 128.0	1,109.0			1,237.0 (8)	···	
reshwater drum	No.			9			9 (8)	112 (8)	2.1
tesnwater urum	Wt.			2,421.0			2,421.0 (5)	(0)	
triped mullet	No.						••	1 (28)	**
erspen morree	Wt.	••							••
amaged fish	No.							35 (15)	0.7
	Wt.			••					
otal number caught			765	306	70	13	1,154	5,344	
-		**	11	13	4	5	19	42	
otal number of species		•-	11	13	4	J	17	44	

😽 Values of less than 0.5 g.

(Sheet 9 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	<u>HN</u>	SN	Total (R	ank)
			<u>2-5 July</u>					
hovelnose sturgeon	No. Wt.			1 807.0			1 807.0	(20 (14
addlefish	No. Wt			7 6,077.0			7 6,077.0	(11 (5
ongnose gar	No.			8 19,496.0			8 19,496.0	(9 (1
hortnose gar	Wt. No.			3			3	(15
-	WC.			5,203.0			5,203.0	(6
merican eel	No. Wt.							(2)
kipjack herring	No. Wt.			1 184.0			1 184.0	(2) (16
izzard shad	No. Wt.		4 193.0	11 1,474.0	5 555.0	13 60.6	33 228.0	() (1(
hreadfin shad	No.					159 45.1	159 45.1	() (19
oldeye	Wt. No.		••	6			6	(1
	Wt.			460.0			460.0	(1
entral silvery minnow	No. Wt.							
ilver chub	No. Wt.							
merald shiner	No.					12 1.3	12 1.3	(2 (2
and abiner	WL. No.					1.5	1.5	(
ver shiner	WL.	· -				12.3	12.3	C
lverband shiner	No. Wt.							
ed shiner	No.					1 0.5	1 0.5	(2
otropis sp.	Wt. No		•-					
-	Wt.							
lacktail shiner	No. Wt.							
iver carpsucker	No. Wt.			4 2,245.0	2 I,648.0	3 2.9	9 3,896.0	
ighfin carpsucker	No.							
-	Wt.			 8			 8	
mallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.			8,801.0	••		8,801.0	
igmouth buffalo	No. Wt.							
lack buffalo	No.			1			1 3,257.0	(
1 . C L	Wt.		 26	3,257.0 9			36	
lue catfish	No. Wt.		2,702.0	6,019.0	188.0		8,909.0	
nannel catfish	No. Wt.				1 73.0		1 73.0	(
ctalurus sp.	No.							
lathead catfish	Wt. No.		5		4		9	
	Wt.		7,207.0		1,654.0		8,861.0	I
rook silverside	No. Wt.						••	
nland silverside	No.			••		5 0.9	5 0.9	(
Ait- hage	WL. No.		••	4			4	(
white bass	NO. Wt.		••	2,296.0			2,296.0	

Table 4 Total Numbers and Total Weights (grams) of Fish Collected at Pool 3 by Sampling Period and Gear Type

(Continued)

. . .

Note: ES = electroshocking, ROTN = rotenone, EG8 = gill net, HN = hoop net, and SN = seine.

(Sheet 1 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (Rank)
			2-5 July (Con	ntinued)			Total (Kalik)
Striped bass	No.		••			-	
Morone sp.	Wt.			• •			
norone sp.	No. Wt.						
Orangespot sunfish	No.						
	Wt.						
Bluegill	No. Wt.					1	1 (20
Longear sunfish	No.					0.3	0.3 (24
	Wt.						
Lepomis sp.	No.						
Terreserves a	Wt.	*-					
Largemouth bass	No. Wt.			• -			
White crappie	No.	~ -					
	Wt.	~-			1 134.0		1 (20)
Black crappie	No.						134.0 (17)
Sauger	Wt.						
	No. Wt.			1 1,013.0			1 (20)
Freshwater drum	No.			1,013.0			1,013.0 (13)
	Wt.			605.0	5 576.0		8 (9) 1,181.0 (11)
Striped mullet	No. Wt,		1				1 (20)
fotal number caught	WĽ,		1,074.0				1,074.0 (12)
fotal number of speci-	o <i>r</i>		36	67	19	212	334
ment of specif			7	14	7	8	24
			13-16 Jul	v			
Shovelnose sturgeon	No.	~ =					
addlefish	Wt.						
addleiish	No. Wt			1) (20)
ongnose gar	No.			897.0			897.0 (12)
	Wt.			5 3,819.0			5 (11) 3,819.0 (6)
hortnose gar	No.			3			3 (14)
merican eel	Wt.			2,316.0			2,316.0 (7)
mettean eel	No. Wt.						
kipjack herring	No.			12			
	Wt.			1,025.0			12 (6) 1,025.0 (11)
izzard shad	No. Wt.		33	76	6		115 (2)
hreadfin shad	No.		1,314.0	9,221.0	554.0		11,119.0 (1)
	Wt.		8 57.0				8 (10)
ldeye	No.						57.0 (15)
	Wt.						
ntral silvery minnow	No. Wt.				+-		
lver chub	No.						
	Wt.						
erald shiner	No.					82	82 (3)
ver shiner	Wt.					20.7	20.7 (17)
ver sarner	No. Wt.					3	3 (14)
lverband shiner	No.					1.0	1.0 (21)
	Wt.						
ed shiner	No. Let						
tropis sp.	Wt. No.			**		•-	
ap.	NO. Wt.						
acktail shiner	No.						
	Wt.			••		••	

(Continued)

(Sheet 2 of 9)

Species		ROTN	<u>ES</u>	EG8	HN	SN	Total (R	ank)
liver carpsucker	No.	<u>1</u> 	<u>3-16 July (Con</u> 1	tinued) 18		156	275	()
	Wt.		61.0	10,754.0		30.7	10,846.0	(2
lighfin carpsucker	No. Wt.							
mallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.			9 8,949.0			9 8,949.0	(8 (4
ligmouth buffalo	No.		1				1	(20
Black buffalo	Wt. No.		1,860.0				1,860.0	(9
	Wt.							
Blue catfish	No. Wt.		10 6,048.0	16 3,573.0	1 409.0		27 10,030.0	(4 (3
hannel catfish	No. Wt.							
ctalurus sp.	No.							
	Wt.							
'lathead catfish	No. Wt.		7 3,833.0	1 2,295.0	2 524.0		10 6,652.0	(10 (5
Brook silverside	No. Wt.							
nland silverside	No.					23	23	(5
	Wt.					8.6	8.6	(20
hite bass	No. Wt.							
striped bass	No. Wt.			3 2,104.0			3 2,104.0	(14 (8
lorone sp.	No.					9	9	(8
	Wt.					17.4	17.4	(19
rangespot sunfish	No. Wt.							
luegill	No. Wt.				1 26.0	1 0.7	2 26.7	(17 (16
ongear sunfish	No.				1		1	(20
<i>apomis</i> sp.	Wt. No.				19.0		19.0	(18
apomis sp .	Wt.							
argemouth bass	No. Wt.							
hite crappie	No.							
lack crappie	Wt. No.							
ince crappic	Wt.							
auger	No. Wt.			1 357.0			1 357.0	(20 (13
reshwater drum	No.		1	2	1 183.0		4 1,067.0	(12 (10
Striped mullet	Wt. No.		320.0	564.0 2			2	(17
	Wt.			307.0			307.0	
'otal number caught			61	149	12	374	596	
otal number of species			7	13	6	6	20	
hoveloose sturgeon	No.		31 July-10 A	ugust				
hovelnose sturgeon	Wt.		••					
Paddlefish	No. Wt.							
ongnose gar	No.	1			1		2	(25
ihortnose gar	Wt. No.	0.9	2		495.0 2		495.9 4	(9 (20
november Ber	Wt.		*		2,534.0		2,534	(4
merican eel	No.							

Weights not taken.

(Sheet 3 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total	(Rank)
		31	July-10 Augus	t (Continued)				(INGIN)
Skipjack herring	No. Wt.	1 56.0					1	(29
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.	231 4,878.7	11		5		56. 247	(3
Threadfin shad	No. Wt	7,595	1 *		993.0 	2	5,872. 7,598	0 (2
Goldeye	No.	12,539.7				0.8	12,540.	0 (1
Central silvery minnow	Wt. No.	 3					 3	(22
Silver chub	Wt. No.	20.9 82					20.9 82	
Emerald shiner	Wt. No.	109.1 153				 76	109.	1 (13
River shiner	Wt. No.	61.1 105				49.7	229 111.0	
Silverband shiner	Wt.	127.4				8 1.3	113 128.1	6) 7 (11
	No. Wt.	29 34.0					29 34.0	(13)) (17)
Weed shiner	No. Wt.	1 0.9					1 0.9	(29)
Notropis sp.	No. Wt.	59 8.7				3 0.2	62	(10)
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.						8.9) (21)
River carpsucker	No. Wt.	344 1,219.4	2		2	16	6	(2)
Highfin carpsucker	No. Wt.				1,967.0	24.6	1,992.0	(5)
Smallmouth buffalo	No.	2	 3				 5	(18)
ligmouth buffalo	Wt. No.	9.3 	*				9.3 1	
lack buffalo	Wt. No.		*				*	*
lue catfish	Wt. No.	 107	 24					
hannel catfish	Wt. No.	465.5	2,655.0		1 1,026.0		132 4,147.0	(5) (3)
	Wt.	486.1			1 365.0		110 851.0	(7) (8)
ctalurus sp.	No. Wt.	33 21.1					33 21.1	(11) (18)
lathead catfish	No. Wt.		5 1,143.0				5 1,143.0	(18) (6)
rook silverside	No. Wt.	1 0.6				1 0,7	2	(20) (26)
nland silverside	No. Wt.	42 24.6				22 18.9	64	(9)
hite bass	No. Wt.	4 223.7			5		43.5 9	(15) (14)
triped bass	No. Wt.	3 188.7			711.0		935.0 3	(7) (22)
prone sp.	No.	3					188.7 3	(10) (22)
rangespot sunfish	Wt. No.	6.6 7					6.6 7	(23) (16)
uegill	Wt. No.	6.8 6				 1	6.8	(22)
ongear sunfish	Wt. No.	2.7 1				0.9	7 3.6	(10) (24)
pomis sp.	Wt.	0.7					1 0.7	(29) (28)
-	Νο. ₩ε.	5 2.0					5 2.0	(18) (25)
rgemouth bass	No. Wt.							

Weights not taken.

(Sheet 4 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (F	(ank
		<u>31 J</u>	uly-10 August	(Continued)				
White crappie	No. Wt.							
Black crappie	No.							
_	Wt.							
Sauger	No. Wt.		1 *				1 *	(29)
reshwater drum	No. Wt.	29 42.1					29 42.1	(13) (16)
triped mullet	No. Wt.		1 *				1 *	(29
'otal number caught		8,956	51	0	17	129	9,153	•-
otal number of specie	s	22	10	0	7	7	27	
			24-27 Augu	ist				
hovelnose sturgeon	No. Wt.							
addlefish	WL. No.			2			2	(15)
	Wt.			875.0			875.0	(10)
ongnos e gar	No. Wt.			1 2,635.0			1 2,635.0	(19) (7)
hortnose gar	No.			8	1		9	(9)
	Wt.			10,054.0	*		10,054.0	(2)
merican eel	No. Wt.							
kipjack herring	No.		21	14			35	(6)
izzard shad	Wt. No.		172	3,821.0 352	 9	6	3,821.0 539	(4)
	Wt.		*	39,903.0	1,294.0	436.0	41,633.0	(1)
hreadfin shad	No. Wt.		458 *	1 4.0			459 4.0	(2) (18)
oldeye	No.			2			2	(15)
	Wt.			538.0			538.0	(12)
entral silvery minnow	No. Wt							
ilver chub	No.						•-	
merald shiner	Wt. No.					71	 71	(4)
	Wt.					37.0	37.0	(15)
iver shiner	No. Wt.					81 17.7	81 17.7	(3) (16)
ilverband shiner	No.							(,
	Wt.							
eed shiner	No. Wt.							
otropis sp.	No.							
lacktail shiner	Wt. No.					 8	 8	(10)
ADEREGIT SATUEL	Wt.					1.1		(19)
iver carpsucker	No. Wt.			7 3,017.0	2	40 29.0	49 3,040.0	(5) (6)
ighfin carpsucker	No.			1			1	(19)
	Wt.			211.0			211.0	(13)
sallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.			2 3,720.0			2 3,720.0	(15) (5)
igmouth buffalo	No.							
lack buffalo	Wt. No.	••						
	Wt.							
lue catfish	No. Wt.		17 1,562.0	12 7,153.0	1 156.0		30 8,871.0	(7) (3)
hannel catfish	No.			2	2		4	(12)
	Wt.			1,081.0	172.0		1,253.0	(8)

* Weights not taken.

Ì

(Sheet 5 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	<u> </u>	SN	_Total (Rank)
.		2	4-27 August (Continued)			(Kalik)
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.						
Flathead catfish	No.			•-			
	Wt.		4 1,011.0				4 (12
Brook silverside	No.						1,011.0 (9
Inland silverside	Wt. No.						
	Wt.					12	12 (8)
White bass	No.					8.2	8.2 (17)
Striped bass	Wt.				• *		1 (19) * *
settped bass	No. Wt.						
forone sp.	No.						
	Wt.						
)rangespot sunfish	No. Wt.						
luegill	No.						
	Wt.						
ongear sunfish	No.						
epomis sp.	Wt. No.						
-F	Wt.						
argemouth bass	No.						
L-L .	Wt.						
hite crappie	No. Wt.				1		1 (19)
lack crappie	No.				*		* *
	Wt.		~-	1 143.0	5 *		6 (12) 143.0 (14)
suzer	No. Wt.					••	
eshwater drum	WC. No.						
	Wt.			1 667.0			1 (19)
riped mullet	No.						667.0 (11)
tal number caught	Wt.						
tal number caught tal number of speci-			672	406	22	218	1,318
cal number of speci-	es		5	14	8	6	21
			7-10 Septem	ber			
ovelnose sturgeon	No. Wt.						
ddlefish	WC. No.					~•	
	Wt.			3 3,113.0			3 (16)
ngnose gar	No.						3,113.0 (7)
ortnose gar	Wt.						
sicuose gar	No. Wt.			13	1		14 (11)
				11,111.0	942.0		12,053.0 (3)
erican eel	No.						
	No. Wt.						
erican eel .pjack herring	Wt. No.	 	1	 14			
	Wt. No. Wt.		1 *	 14 3.191.0			
pjack herring	Wt. No.		1	 14 3.191.0 373	 22	 4	 15 (9) 3,191.0 (5) 682 (1)
pjack herring	Wt. No <i>.</i> Wt. No. No.		1 * 283 * 67	 14 3.191.0			 15 (9) 3,191.0 (5) 682 (1) 45,794.0 (1)
pjack herring Zard shad Teadfin shad	Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. Wt.	 	1 * 283 * 67 *	14 3.191.0 373 44,636.0 	 22 1,128.0	 4 34.7	 15 (9) 3,191.0 (5) 682 (1)
pjack herring Zard shad	Wt. No <i>.</i> Wt. No. No.		1 * 283 * 67	 14 3.191.0 373 44,636.0 9	 22 1,128.0 	4 34.7	$\begin{array}{c} \\ 15 & (9) \\ 3, 191.0 & (5) \\ 682 & (1) \\ 45, 794.0 & (1) \\ 67 & (3) \\ * & * \\ 9 & (14) \end{array}$
pjack herring zard shad eadfin shad deye tral silvery	Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No.	 	1 * 283 * 67 *	14 3.191.0 373 44,636.0 	 22 1,128.0 	4 34.7	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ 15 & (9) \\ 3, 191.0 & (5) \\ 682 & (1) \\ 45, 794.0 & (1) \\ 67 & (3) \\ & * & * \\ 9 & (14) \\ 1,008.0 & (12) \end{array}$
pjack herring zard shad eadfin shad deye tral silvery innow	Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No.	 	1 * 283 * 67 *	 14 3.191.0 373 44,636.0 9 1,008.0	 22 1,128.0 	4 34.7	$\begin{array}{c} \\ 15 & (9) \\ 3, 191.0 & (5) \\ 682 & (1) \\ 45, 794.0 & (1) \\ 67 & (3) \\ * & * \\ 9 & (14) \end{array}$
pjack herring zard shad eadfin shad deye tral silvery	Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No.	 	1 * 283 * 67 * 	 14 3.191.0 373 44,636.0 9 1,008.0 	22 1,128.0 	4 34.7 	$\begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & \\ & & & & 15 & (9) \\ & & & & & 3, 191.0 & (5) \\ & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & & & & & 682 & (1) \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & &$
pjack herring zard shad eadfin shad deye tral silvery innow	Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No.	 	1 * 283 * 67 * 	14 3.191.0 373 44,636.0 9 1,008.0	22 1,128.0 	4 34.7	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ 15 & (9) \\ 3, 191.0 & (5) \\ 682 & (1) \\ 45, 794.0 & (1) \\ 67 & (3) \\ * & * \\ 9 & (14) \\ 1,008.0 & (12) \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ & & \\ \end{array}$

• Weights not taken.

1

(Sheet 6 of 9)

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (R	lank)
		7-1	0 September (C	Continued)				
River shiner	No. Wt.					17 12.5	17 12.5	(8 (19
Silverband shiner	No. Wt							
Weed shiner	No.							
Notropis sp.	Wt. No.					19	19	(7
Blacktail shiner	Wt. No.					2.8 12	2.8 12	(20
River carpsucker	Wt. No.			 19		1.8 13	1.8 34	(21
•	Wt.		*	10,988.0	*	46.4	1,103.0	(11
iighfin carpsucker	No. Wt.							
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.		1 *	1 1,281.0			2 1,281.0	(19 (10
Bigmouth buffalo	No. Wt.							
Black buffalo	No. Wt.							
Blue catfish	No.		53	27	2		82	(2
Channel catfish	Wt. No.		3,369.0	9,744.0 13	125.0 1		13,238.0 14	(2 (11
ctalurus sp.	Wt. No.			3,903.0	*		3,903.0	(4
	Wt.							
lathead catfish	No. Wt.		4 2,311.0				4 2,311.0	(19 (9
brook sílverside	No. Wt.					1 1.5	1 1.5	(24 (22
Inland silverside	No. Wt.					49 54.2	49 54.2	(4 (17
Mite bass	No. Wt.			6 3,159.0			6 3,159.0	(15 (6
Striped bass	No.			2			2	(19
forone sp.	Wt. No.			2,573.0			2,573.0	(8
)rangespot sunfish	Wt. No.							
	Wt. No.							(2)
Bluegill	Wt.				1 *		1 *	(24 *
longear sunfish	No. Wt.							
epomis sp.	No. Wt.							
argemouth bass	No. Wt.						1 *	(24
hite crappie	No.			1	1		2	(19
Black crappie	Wt. No.			161.0	1		161.0 1	(16 (24
Sauger	Wt. No.				*		* 1	* (24
	Wt.			460.0 10			460.0	(15
Freshwater drum	No. Wt.			627.0			10 627.0	(13 (14
Striped mullet	No. Wt.			1 694.0			1 694.0	(24 (13
fotal number caught		••	411	493	30	150	1,084	
Total number of specie	- 8		8	15	8	7	25	

(Continued)

• Weights not taken.

(Sheet 7 of 9)

Table 4 (Continued)

• \

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total (F	(ank)	Overall Total and Rank	Relative Abundance percent
				22-25 Sept	ember					
Shovelnose sturgeon	No. Wi.					·			1 (9)	**
Paddlefish	No. Wt								13 (21)	0.1
Longnose gar	No.			2			2	(18)	18 (19)	0.1
Shortnose gar	WL. No.			1,498.0 5	 2		1,498.0 8	(11) (10)	 41 (13)	0.3
-	Wt.		1,222.0	5,615.0	2,624.0		9,461.0	(3)		 **
American eel	No. Wt.				2 1,732.0		2 1,732.0	(18) (10)	2 (28)	
Skipjack herring	No. Wt.		2 11.4	15 3,812.0			17 3,823.4	(7) (7)	81 (11)	0.5
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.		1,254 48,016.0	336 39,403.0	50 6,272.0	4 16.8	1,644 93,708.0	(1) (1)	3,260 (2)	21.6
Threadfin shad	No.		1,075	1		10	1,086	(2)	9,377 (1)	62.1
Goldeye	Wt. No.		5,839.1 2	15.0 2		12.5 	5,867.0 4	(4) (16)	 21 (18)	 0.1
	Wt.		34.2	565.0			599.2	(14)		***
Central silvery minnow	No. Wt.								3 (27)	
Silver chub	No. Wt.					1 0.2	1 0.2	(22) (25)	83 (10)	0.6
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.					34 11.7	34 11.7	(5)	463 (3)	3.1
River shiner	No.					4	4	(16)	236 (6)	1.6
Silverband shiner	Wt. No.					2.2	2.2	(23)	 29 (15)	0.2
	Wt.									 *-*
Weed shiner	No. Wt.								2 (28)	
Notropis spp.	No. Wt.					27 3.1	27 3.1	(6) (22)	108 (9)	0.7
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.					6 1.0	6 1.0	(12) (24)	26 (17)	0.2
River carpsucker	No.			4	1		5	(14)	736 (23)	2.4
Highfin carpsucker	Wt. No.			2,889.0	557.0		3,446.0	(8)	 1 (29)	 **
	Wt.						÷-			
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.				1 591.0		1 591.0	(22) (15)	27 (16)	0.2
Bigmouth buffalo	No. Wt.								2 (28)	***
Black buffalo	No. Wt.								1 (29)	**
Blue catfish	No.		28	15	3		46	(3)	353 (5)	2.3
Channel catfish	Wt. No.		1,867.0 2	9,160.0 2	300.0 1		11,327.0 5	(2) (14)	134 (8)	 0.9
	₩٤.		7.8	706.0	2,281.0		2,995.0	(9)		 0.2
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.								33 (14)	
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.		1 720.0				1 720.0	(22) (13)	33 (14)	0.2
Brook silverside	Na. Wt.								3 (27)	**
Inland silverside	No.					43	43	(4)	196 (7)	1.3
White bass	Wt. No.			10	3	6.3 	6.3 13	(8)	33 (14)	0.2
Striped bass	Wt. No.			4,913.0 6	369.0		5,282.0 6	(6) (12)	 14 (20)	0.1
	Wt.			5,283.0			5,282.0	(5)		
Morone sp.	No. Wt.								12 (22)	0.1

★ Values of less than 0.5 g.

(Sheet 8 of 9)

hu

Species		ROTN	ES	EG8	HN	SN	Total () 	Overall	Relative Abundance
				5 Septembe			<u>Total (I</u>	(ank)	Total and Rank	percent
Orangespot sunfish	No.					·			7 (0/)	
	Wt.								7 (24)	0.1
Bluegill	No.		1				1	(22)	12 (22)	
	Wt.		0.7				0.7	(25)	12 (22)	0.1
ongear sunfish	No.		1				1	(22)	3 (27)	**
	Wt.		28.7				28.7	(19)		
Lepomis sp.	No.								5 (26)	**
	Wt.									
argemouth bass	No.								1 (29)	**
	Wt.									
hite crappie	No.			1			1	(22)	5 (26)	**
	Wt.			383.0			383.0	(16)		
Black crappie	No.				1		1	(22)	8 (23)	0.1
	Wt.				267.0		267.0	(18)		
auger	No.			1			1	(22)	5 (26)	**
	Wt.			363.0			363.0	(17)		••
reshwater drum	No.			7	2		9	(9)	61 (12)	0.4
	Wt.			1,167.0	315.0		1,482.0	(12)		
triped mullet	No.								5 (26)	**
	Wt.									
'otal number caught			2,367	407	66	129	2,969		15,454	
otal number of species			10	14	10	7	25		37	

 \Rightarrow Values of less than 0.5 g.

5

(Sheet 9 of 9)

	ES	HN	SN	Total (Rank)
		2-5 July		
No. Wt.			1 0.6	1 (12) 0.6 (10)
No. Wt.			4 0.9	4 (6) 0.9 (8)
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.			4 0.7	4 (6) 0.7 (9)
No. Wt.			2 3.2	2 (10) 3.2 (6)
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.			3 0.4	3 (8) 0.4 (11)
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.	1 24.0	5 573.0		6 (3) 597.0 (2)
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.		5 2,195.0		5 (4) 2,195.0 (1)
No. Wt.			6 1.4	6 (3) 1.4 (7)
No. Wt.				
No. Wt.			3 5.1	3 (8) 5.1 (4)
No. Wt.			10 3.3	10 (1) 3.3 (5)
No. Wt.		1 32.0		1 (12) 32.0 (3)
No.				
No.			2 0.2	2 (10) 0.2 (12)
	1	11	35	47
	<pre>Wt. No. No. Wt. No. No. Wt. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No</pre>	No. Wt. No. No. Wt. No. -	No. No. No. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. Wt. No. No.	No. $2-5$ July No. 1 Wt. 0.6 No. Wt. 0.9 No. Wt. No. No.

Table 5											
<u>Total</u>	Numbers	and	Total	Weights	(grams)	of	Fish	Collect	ted at	Bar	2
	of the	Rive	er Bor	der by S	ampling	Per	iod a	nd Gear	Туре		

Note: ES = electroshocking, HN = hoop net, and SN = seine.

(Sheet 1 of 6)

Species		ES	HN	SN	Total (Rank)
			13-16 July		
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.				
Threadfin shad	No. Wt.			1 0.1	1 (10) 0.1 (13)
Silver chub	No. Wt.			1 0.4	1 (10) 0.4 (10)
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.			11 2.6	11 (1) 2.6 (6)
River shiner	No. Wt.			1 2.0	1 (10) 2.0 (7)
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.				
Notropis sp.	No. Wt.				
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.				
River carpsucker	No. Wt.			6 0.9	6 (2) 0.9 (9)
Blue sucker	No. Wt.		2 5,776.0		2 (4) 5,776.0 (1)
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.		1 790.0		1 (10) 790.0 (3)
Blue catfish	No. Wt.		2 154.0		2 (4) 154.0 (5)
Channel catfish	No. Wt.			1 1.3	1 (10) 1.3 (8)
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.				
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.		2 1,065.0		2 (4) 1,065.0 (2)
Inland silverside	No. Wt.			1 0.2	1 (10) 0.2 (12)
Yellow bass	No. Wt.	1 685			1 (10) 685.0 (4)
Morone sp.	No. Wt.				
Bluegill	No. Wt.				
Freshwater drum	No. Wt.				
Unidentified larval fish	No. Wt.				
Damaged fish	No. Wt.				
Total number caught		1	7	22	30
Total number of species		1	4	7	12

(Continued)

(Sheet 2 of 6)
Species		ES	HN	SN	<u>Total (Ra</u>	ank)
		<u>31 Ju</u>	ly-10 August			
Gizzard shad	No.	1			1	(6)
	Wt.	231.0			231.0	(5)
Threadfin shad	No.					
	Wt.					
Silver chub	No.					
	Wt.					
Emerald shiner	No.			75	75	(1
	Wt.			52.6	52.6	(7
River shiner	No.					
	Wt.					
Silverband shiner	No.					
	Wt.					
Notropis sp.	No.					
	Wt.					
Blacktail shiner	No.					
	Wt.					
River carpsucker	No. Wt.					
Blue sucker	No.					
	Wt.					
mallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.	1			1	(6)
		450.0			450.0	(3)
Blue catfish	No. Wt.	2 920.0	3 407.0		5 1,327.0	(2) (2)
					-	
Channel catfish	No. Wt.		2 299.0		2 299.0	(4) (4)
						(4)
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.					
						(
flathead catfish	No. Wt.		3 1,419.0		3 1,419.0	(3)
						(1)
Inland silverside	No. Wt.					
7-11 6						
Cellow bass	No. Wt.					
lorone sp.	No. Wt.					
	No.					
Bluegill	Wt.					
reshwater drum	No.		•		1	(6)
resuwater urum	Wt.		1 84.0		84.0	(6)
nidentified larval	No.			2	2	(4)
fish	NO. Wt.			0.0	0.0	(8)
amaged fish	No.					(4)
amaken IISH	Wt.					(4)
'otal number caught		4	9	77	90	
-						
fotal number of spec	ies	3	4	1	7	

Table 5 (Continued)

Ľ

1

F

(Continued)

(Sheet 3 of 6)

Table 5 (Continued)

· · ·

Species		ES	HN	SN	Total (Rank)
		24-	27 August		
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.	7 1,381.0			7 (4) 1,381.0 (2)
Threadfin shad	No. Wt.			2 0.2	2 (7) 0.2 (8)
Silver chub	No. Wt.				
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.			8 2.5	8 (3) 2.5 (5)
River shiner	No. Wt.			14 4.6	14 (2) 4.6 (4)
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.				
Notropis sp.	No. Wt.			6 0.1	6 (5) 0.1 (10)
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.			1 0.2	1 (9) 0.2 (8)
River carpsucker	No. Wt.			1 0.3	1 (9) 0.3 (7)
Blue sucker	No. Wt.				
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.				
Blue catfish	No. Wt.	14 1,055.0	1 58.0		15 (1) 1,113.0 (3)
Channel catfish	No. Wt.				
Ictalurus sp.	No. Wt.				
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.	1 107.0	3 2,543.0		4 (6) 2,650.0 (1)
Inland silverside	No. Wt.			1 1.2	1 (9) 1.2 (6)
Yellow bass	No. Wt.				
Norone sp.	No. Wt.				
Bluegill	No. Wt.				
Freshwater drum	No. Wt.				
Unidentified larval fish	No. Wt.				
Damaged fish	No. Wt.				
Total number caught		22	4	33	59
Total number of spec	ies	3	2	5	9

(Continued)

(Sheet 4 of 6)

Table 5 (Continued)

Species		ĒS	<u>HN</u>	SN	<u>Total (R</u>	ank)
		7-10) September			
Gizzard shad	No.		1		1	(9)
	Wt.		64.0		64.0	(5)
Threadfin shad	No.	1		1	2	(7)
	Wt.	6.0		0.7	6.7	(7)
Silver chub	No.					
	Wt.					
Emerald shiner	No.			66	66	(1)
	Wt.			71.2	71.2	(4)
liver shiner	No. Wt.			6 5.9	6 5.9	(4) (8)
••• ••• •• •• •• •• ••						
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.			3 1.9	3 1.9	(4) (9)
No Amonda						0.
Votropis sp.	No. Wt.					
Blacktail shiner	No.					
DIACKCAII SUIUCI	Wt.					
River carpsucker	No.					
vivel calpsuckel	Wt.					
Blue sucker	No.		1		1	(9)
	Wt.		1,114.0		1,114.0	(3)
Smallmouth buffalo	No.					
	Wt.					
Blue catfish	No.	42	1		43	(2)
	Wt.	4,920.0	12.0		4,932.0	(1)
Channel catfish	No.					
	Wt.					
ictalurus sp.	No.					
	Wt.					
lathead catfish	No.		2		2	(7)
	Wt.		1,279.0		1,279.0	(2)
Inland silverside	No.			10	10	(3)
	Wt.			13.2	13.2	(6)
ellow bass	No.				••	
	Wt.					
torone sp.	No.					
	Wt.					
Sluegill	No.					
	Wt.					
reshwater drum	No. Wt.					
Inidentified larval fish	No. Wt.					
				_	_	
)amaged fish	No. Wt.					
latal number anusta		1.2	E	86	13/	
otal number caught		43	5	00	134	

(Continued)

(Sheet 5 of 6)

Table 5 (Concluded)

Species		ES	HN	SN	Total (Rank)	Overall Total and Rank	Relative Abundance percent
	<u> </u>		22-2	25 Septem		<u> </u>	·····	- *
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.	1 313.0		4 13.3	5 326.3	(6) (4)	15 (6)	3.6
Threadfin shad	No. Wt.						9 (9)	2.2
Silver chub	No. Wt.						1 (14)	2
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.			9 3.6	9 3.6	(2) (6)	173 (1)	41.7
River shiner	No. Wt.			10 7.2	10 7.2	(1) (5)	33 (3)	8.0
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.			5 1.0	5 1.0	(6) (8)	8 (10)	1.9
Notropis sp.	No. Wt.						6 (11)	1.5
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.			8 1.7	8 1.7	(3)	9 (9)	2.2
River carpsucker	No. Wt.		1 747.0	3 8.8	4 756.0	(7) (3)	14 (7)	3.4
Blue sucker	No. Wt.						3 (12)	0.7
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.						2 (13)	0.5
Blue catfish	No. Wt.	7 1,597.2			7 1,597.2	(4) (2)	78 (2)	18.8
Channel catfish	No. Wt.	 			, 		3 (12)	0.7
<i>Ictalur</i> us sp.	No. Wt.			3 0.5	3 0.5	(8) (9)	3 (12)	0.7
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.	2 2,620.0			2 2,620.0	(10) (1)	18 (5)	4.3
Inland silverside	No. Wt.			2 0.2	2	(10) (10)	20 (4)	4.8
Yellow bass	No. Wt.			 			1 (14)	0.2
Morone sp.	No. Wt.			 			3 (12)	0.7
Bluegill	No. Wt.						10 (8)	2.4
Freshwater drum	No. Wt.						2 (13)	0.5
Unidentified larval fish	No. Wt.						2 (13)	0.5
Damaged fish	No. Wt.						2 (13)	0.5
Total number caught		10	1	44	55		415	
Total number of spec	ies	3	- 1	7	9		20	

(Sheet 6 of 6)

•

Species	<u> </u>	ES	<u> </u>	SN	Total (Ran
		<u>2</u>	-5 July		
novelnose sturgeon	No.				
	Wt.				
ongnose gar	No. Wt.				
tipjack herring	No.				
cipjack nerring	Wt.		••		
zzard shad	No.		1		1 (1
	Wt.		56.0		56.0 (
readfin shad	No.			1	1 (1
	Wt.			0.2	0.2 (1
ldeye	No.				
	Wt.				
lver chub	No. Wt.				
merald shiner	No.			6	6 (
cruid suinci	Wt.			1.6	1.6
ver shiner	No.			3	3
	Wt.			4.7	4.7
lverband shiner	No.				
	Wt.				
ed shiner	No.			2	2
	Wt.			0.4	0.4 (
acktail shiner	No. Wt.				
llhead minnow					
linead minnow	No. Wt.				
ver carpsucker	No.		2		2
ver curpsucker	Wt.		1,692.0		1,692.0
ue sucker	No.				
	Wt.				
allmouth buffalo	No.			•	
	Wt.				
ue catfish	No.	4	2		6 862.0
	Wt.	724.0	138.0		
annel catfish	No. Wt.				
athead catfish	No.	2	1		3
achead catilan	WE.	458.0	243.0		701.0
squitofish	No.			1	1 (
•	Wt.			0.1	0.1 (
ook silverside	No.				
	Wt.				
land silverside	No.			4 2.2	4 2.2
	Wt.				
ite bass	No. Wt.	1 31.0			1 (31.0 (
rone sp.	No.			1	1 (
tone sp.	Wt.		••	1.5	1.5 (
uegill	No.			3	3
v ===	Wt.			0.5	0.5 (
ite crappie	No.				
	Wt.				
eshwater drum	No.		1		1 (
	Wt.		264.0		264.0
tal number caught		7	7	21	34

Table 6							
Total Numbers	and Total Weights (grams) of Fish Collected at Bar 3						
of the	River Border by Sampling Period and Gear Type						

Note: ES = electroshocking, HN = hoop net, and SN = seine.

(Sheet 1 of 6)

Table	6	(Cont	inued)
-------	---	-------	--------

Species		ES	HN	SN	Total	(Rank
		1	13-16 July			
Shovelnose sturgeon	No.					
_	Wt.			•-		
Longnose gar	No.					
Skipjack herring	No.					
	Wt.					
Gizzard shad	No.	1		4	5	(6)
	Wt.	153.0		5.4	158.4	(4)
Threadfin shad	No. Wt.					
Goldeye	No.				,	(10)
londeye	Wt.	•-		1 1.4	1	(10) (9)
Silver chub	No.					
	Wt.					
Emerald shiner	No.			53	5.3	(1)
21 I.I.	Wt.			9.2	9.2	(5)
River shiner	No. Wt.			2 2.2	2 2.2	(8) (8)
Silverband shiner	No.					(8)
	Wt.					
weed shiner	No.			2	2	(7)
	Wt.			0.4	0.4	(12)
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.					
Bullhead minnow	WC. No.					
Sulliead minnow	Wt.					
liver carpsucker	No.			1	1	(10)
•	Wt.			0.1	0.1	(11)
lue sucker	No.		5		5	(6)
	Wt.		10,469.0		10,469.0	(1)
mallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.					
llue catfish	No.		6			
	Wt.		612.0		6 612.0	(4) (3)
hannel catfish	No.			••		
	Wt.					
lathead catfish	No.	1	7		3	(3)
	Wt.	795.0	2,589.0		3,384.0	(2)
losquitofish	No. Wt.					
rook silverside	No.			1	1	(10)
	Wt.			0.6	0.6	(10)
nland silverside	No.			25	25	(2)
	Wt.			6.4	6.4	(6)
hite bass	No. Wt.					
orone sp.	No.			2		(0)
orone sp.	Wt.			3.7	2 3.7	(8) (7)
luegill	No.					. ,
	Wt.					
hite crappie	No.					
bbb	Wt.					
reshwater drum	No. Wt.		••			
otal number caught		2	18	89	109	
stal number caught		-	10		107	

í,

(Continued)

Table 6 (Continued)

Species		ES	HN	SN	Total (Rank
		<u>31 Ju</u>	ly-10 August			
Shovelnose sturgeon	No. Wt.					
Longnose gar	No. Wt.		1 2,176.0		1 2,176.0	(14 (4
Skipjack herring	No. Wt.					
jizzard shad	No. Wt.	13 1,399.0	4 181.0		17 1,580.0	(2 (6
hreadfin shad	No. Wt.	2 28.0			2 28.0	(10
oldeye	No. Wt.					
ilver chub	No. Wt.					
merald shiner	No. Wt.			101 56.6	101 56.6	() (11
liver shiner	No.			5 1.3	5 1.3	(11 (6 (14
Silverband shiner	Wt. No.					(14
leed shiner	Wt. No.					
Blacktail shiner	Wt. No.				1	(14
ullhead minnow	Wt. No.			0.2	0.2	(15
iver carpsucker	Wt. No.			2	 7 2,846.6	(4
lue sucker	Wt. No.	2,845.0	1	1.6	2	(13
mallmouth buffalo	Wt. No.	133.0 3	1,335.0		1,468.0	(7 (8)
lue catfish	Wt. No.	4,122.0 4			4,122.0	(2 (6
hannel catfish	Wt. No.	1,900.0	43.0		1,943.0	(5
lathead catfish	Wt. No.		 4		 4	(7
losquítofish	Wt. No.		4,777.0		4,777.0	(1
lrook silverside	Wt. No.					
nland silverside	Wt. No.			 8	 8	(3
	Wt.	1		6.6	6.6 1	(13 (14
hite bass	No. Wt.	378.0			378.0	(8
lorone sp.	No. Wt.					
Bluegill	No. Wt.					
hite crappie	No. Wt.		2 263.0		2 263.0	(10)
reshwater drum	No. Wt.		1 269		1 269.0	(14 (9
fotal number caught		29	14	117	160	

(Continued)

Table 6 (Continued)

ないたからいため、たたくたちという

Species		ES	<u> </u>	SN	<u>Total (F</u>	Ran <u>k</u>)
		24-23	August			
Shovelnose sturgeon	No.					
-	Wt.					
Longnose gar	No. Wt.					
Skipjack herring	No.					
sarpjack netring	Wt.					
Gizzard shad	No.	7			7	(6)
	Wt.	634.0			634.0	(2)
Threadfin shad			9	(4)		
	Wt.	33.0		8.4	41.4	(4)
Goldeye	No. Wt.	1 6.0			1 6.0	(9) (8)
Silver chub	No.					
Jiiver Chub	Wt.	••				
Emerald shiner	No.			8	8	(5)
	Wt.			7.3	7.3	(5)
River shiner	No.			30	30	(1)
	Wt.			6.8	6.8	(7)
Silverband shiner	No.					
	Wt.					
Weed shiner	No. Wt.					
Blacktail shiner	No.					
DIACKLAIT Suider	Wt.	••				
Bullhead minnow	No.					
	Wt.					
River carpsucker	No.			17	17	(2)
	Wt.			7.0	7.0	(6)
Blue sucker	No.					
	Wt.					
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.					
Blue catfish	No.	19	1		20	(2)
blue caellan	Wt.	4,292.0	98.0		4,300.0	(1)
Channel catfish	No.					
	Wt.					
Flathead catfish	No.		2		2	(7)
	Wt.		498.0		498.0	(3)
Mosquitofish	No. Wt.					
D						
Brook silverside	No. Wt.					
Inland silverside	No.			1	1	(9)
	Wt.			0.7	0.7	(9)
White bass	No.					
	Wt.					
Morone sp.	No.					
	Wt.					
Bluegill	No. Wt.					
White crappie	No.			~-		
HILL CLOPPIC	Wt.					
Freshwater drum	No.					
Total number caught	Wt.		3	62	95	
		30				

(Continued)

Table 6 (Continued)

Species	.	ES	HN	SN	Total (Rank
		7-10	September		
Shovelnose sturgeon	No. Wt.				
Longnose gar	WC. No.				
Longhose gar	Wt.				
Skipjack herring	No.			1	1 (12
	Wt.			4.0	4.0 (10
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.			2 39.0	2 (8 39.0 (4
Threadfin shad	No.			1	1 (12
	Wt.			5.2	5.2 (9
Goldeye	No. Wt.	2 16.2			2 (8 16.0 (6
Silver chub	No.			1	1 (12
	Wt.			1.0	1.0 (12
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.			55 44.8	55 (1 45.0 (3
River shiner	No.			44.8	49 (2
	Wt.			26.3	26.3 (5
Silverband shiner	No. Wt.			12	12 (4
Weed shiner	WL. No.			7.2	7.2 (7
accu sainer	Wt.				
Blacktail shiner	No.			2	2 (8
D. 115 - 4 - 2	Wt.			0.6	0.6 (13
Bullhead minnow	No. Wt.				
River carpsucker	No.				
	Wt.				
Blue sucker	No. Wt.				
Smallmouth buffalo	No.				
	Wt.				
Blue catfish	No. Wt.	45 11,916.0	1 227.0		46 (3 12,143.0 (1
Channel catfish	No.				
	Wt.				
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.		1 795.0		1 (12 795.0 (2
losquitofish	No.				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Wt.				
Brook silverside	No. Wt.			2	2 (8 2.3 (11
Inland silverside	WL. No.			2.3 7	2.3 (11 7 (5
anany streeside	Wt.			6.7	6.7 (8
white bass	No.				
	Wt.				
forone sp.	No. Wt.				
Bluegill	No.				
_	Wt.				
hite crappie	No. Wt.				
reshwater drum	No.				
	Wt.				* -
fotal number caught		47	2	132	181
lotal number of speci	ies	2	2	10	13

アンシンティ

_

(Continued)

(Sheet 5 of 6)

			Table	6 (Conclud	led)		
Species		ES	<u> </u>	SN	Total (Rank)	Overall Total and Rank	Relative Abundance percent
Shovelnose sturgeon	No.			5 Septembe	-		
Shovernose seargeon	Wt.		2 2,278		2 (11) 2,278.0 (3)	2 (14)	0.2
Longnose gar	No. Wt.			••	~~	1 (15)	0.1
Skipjack herring	No. Wt.	4 132.2			4 (8) 132.0 (6)	5 (11)	0.6
Gizzard shad	No. Wt.	142 7,356.0	4		142 (1) 7,356.0 (1)	174 (2)	21.0
Threadfin shad	No. WL.	12 77.5			12 (5) 77.5 (8)	25 (7)	 3.0
Goldeye	No. Wt.					4 (12)	0.5
Silver chub	No. Wt.					1 (15)	0.1
Emerald shiner	No. Wt.			31 13.0	31 (2) 13.0 (10)	254 (1)	30.6
River shiner	No. Wt.			24 26.8	24 (3) 26.8 (9)	113 (3)	13.6
Silverband shiner	No. ₩t.					12 (9)	1.5
Weed shiner	No. Wt.					2 (14)	0.2
Blacktail shiner	No. Wt.			2 0.3	2 (11) 0.3 (13)	5 (11)	0.6
Bullhead minnow	No. Wt.			3 0,4	3 (9) 0,4 (12)	3 (13)	0.4
River carpsucker	No. Wt.	1 125.0		1 5.4	2 (11) 130.4 (7)	29 (6)	3.5
Blue sucker	No. Wt.				••	7 (10)	0.8
Smallmouth buffalo	No. Wt.					3 (13)	0.4
Blue catfish	No. Wt.	15 4,126.0	1 76.0	1 0.3	17 (4) 4,202.3 (2)	100 (4)	12.1
Channel catfish	No. Wt.	1 161.0			1 (13) 161.0 (5)	1 (15)	0.1
Flathead catfish	No. Wt.	5 1,796.5			5 (6) 1,796.5 (4)	23 (8)	2.8
losquitofish	No. Wt.					1 (15)	0.1
Brook silverside	No. Wt.					3 (13)	0.4
inland silverside	No. Wt.			4 3.7	4 (8) 3.7 (11)	49 (5)	5.9
hite bass	No. Wt.					2 (14)	0.2
lorone sp.	No. Wt.					3 (13)	0.4
lluegill	No. Wt.					3 (13)	0.4
hite crappie	No. Wt.			•••		2 (14)	0.2
reshwater drum	No. Wt.			••		2 (14)	0.2
otal number caught		180	3	66	249	829	••
otal number of speci	es	7	2	7	13	27	

(Sheet 6 of 6)

Date	Habitat	Mean TL, mm	Mean K	Range (K)	N
2-5 Jul	Pool 2	257.8	0.70	0.52 - 1.00	32
	Pool 3	258.6	0.69	0.44 - 1.04	36
	Bar 2	245.2	0.66	0.52 - 0.81	6
	Bar 3	249.7	0.72	0.61 - 0.83	6
13-16 Jul	Pool 2	325.6	0.75	0.62 - 1.05	5
	Pool 3	295.7	0.69	0.38 - 1.04	27
	Bar 2	223.0	0.69	0.68 - 0.70	2
	Bar 3	243.2	0.67	0.55 - 0.80	6
31 Jul-	Pool 2	218.7	0.66	0.47 - 0.90	16
10 Aug	Pool 3	245.2	0.79	0.39 - 1.12	25
	Bar 2	312.8	0.67	0.47 - 1.00	5
	Bar 3	339.4	0.77	0.53 - 0.91	5
24-27 Aug	Pool 2	251.4	0.73	0.36 - 1.13	34
	Pool 3	274.4	0.74	0.57 - 1.22	30
	Bar 2	143.8	0.76	0.57 - 1.00	15
	Bar 3	272.1	0.80	0.57 - 0.93	20
7-10 Sep	Pool 2	247.5	0.87*	0.57 - 1.88	30
	Pool 3	245.8	0.71	0.38 - 1.04	82
	Bar 2	168.0	0.73	0.47 - 0.95	43
	Bar 3	220.6	0.76	0.46 - 1.14	46
22-25 Sep	Pool 2	166.3	0.73	0.61 - 0.89	27
	Pool 3	237.1	0.74	0.60 - 1.23	46
	Bar 2	256.7	0.75	0.67 - 0.99	7
	Bar 3	296.0	0.74	0.63 - 1.09	16

Mean Total Length (TL) and Mean Condition Factor (K) for Blue Catfish by Habitat and Sampling Date

* Significantly different (α = 0.05 level) values among habitats on a given sampling date.

Table 7



9~34

