

Fish Survey of Miami Whitewater Lake, Hamilton, Ohio

**Chris Lorentz, Chase Runyan, Sarah Scherder and Marcus Thomas
Center for Ohio River Research and Education
Thomas More College Biology Field Station
Thomas More College**

**Prepared for and funded by
Hamilton County Park District
Winton Road
Cincinnati, Ohio**

**For:
John Klein
Robert Mason
Bret Henninger**

Introduction

On May 28th through June 04th of 2001, samples were taken from Miami Whitewater Lake (MWL) in Hamilton County. This project was designed to study the current conditions in Miami Whitewater with respect to the fish population diversity and relative abundance. This information, along with previous studies of the community interactions, can then aid in the development of an overall fisheries management plan. Furthermore, from the analysis of fish communities, much information concerning the overall health and conditions of this lake ecosystem can be determined. When conducting any type of aquatic assessment, the analysis of fish communities can serve as the most viable approach for doing so (Karr and Dudley 1978, 1981). The relative condition of a fish community acts as a sensitive indicator of the health of the ecosystem (Karr 1987). Other organisms, such as benthic invertebrates (Hilsenoff 1988, 1987; Washington 1984), have previously served as indicators for biological monitoring. However, several investigators (Fausch et al. 1990; Ohio EPA 1987; Karr 1986) have provided numerous advantages for the use of fishes. Fish, as relatively permanent residents and long-lived species, are constant and chronic monitors of the environment and provide a long-term chemical, physical and biological record of environmental stress. Most, if not all, trophic groups are represented in a fish community, and those at the top of the food web, by their dependence on lower levels of both aquatic and terrestrial origin, integrate effects from a variety of components and reflect the entire watershed environment. The relative ease of collection and identification at the field site ensure quick and accurate sampling of a community.

From a management viewpoint, the results obtained from a fish study are much more meaningful to the public in terms of economic, political, and aesthetic value. Fausch et al. (1990) summarize the major advantages of using fish communities in stating that they integrate all of the effects of stress, direct and indirect, on the entire ecosystem and reveal the ecological significance of the perturbation.

The specific objectives of the study are to:

- evaluate the present status of the fish community in the Miami Whitewater Lake and
- characterize the physical macrohabitats within the study area.

Methods & Materials

Fisheries: Collections were made from May 28-June 04, 2001. Fish were gathered using electrofishing methods and hoop nets. Electrofishing was conducted daily for approximately 45 minutes at each site with a 5.0 Smith-Root Electrofisher and Generator that produced 8-12 amps of electricity. The boat moved both parallel and perpendicular to the shoreline, ensuring all available habitat was sampled. The electrofishing crew consisted of the principal investigator and three student researchers: one driver to maneuver the boat, two netters on the bow to collect the stunned fish, and one processor to identify, inspect for DELTS (Deformities, Erosions, Lesions, and Tumors), weigh, measure the fish and record the data. Benthic fish species were targeted using hoop nets at sites near the Strimble and South Creeks. These nets were baited with chicken liver and checked twice daily for fish (early morning and evening just prior to leaving for the day). All fish collected were identified to species, weighed (grams), measured for both standard length and total length (centimeters), and released as soon as possible to avoid unnecessary stress on the fish. Voucher and unusual specimens, along with scales from selected species were kept for verification. Overall abundance and biomass, along with relative percentages, of each species were determined for each site as well as the overall lake.

Analysis of Fisheries Data: Diversity indices provide information about species richness (i.e., the number of species present); but also take the relative abundances of each species into account. The Shannon diversity index (H) was employed for this study. The proportion of species i relative to the total number of species (p_i) is calculated, and then multiplied by the natural logarithm of this proportion ($\ln p_i$). The resulting product is summed across species, and multiplied by -1:

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^S p_i \ln p_i$$

Shannon's equitability (E_H) or Evenness can be calculated by dividing H by H_{\max} (here $H_{\max} = \ln S$). Equitability assumes a value between 0 and 1 with 1 being complete evenness.

$$E_H = H / H_{\max} = H / \ln S$$

Site Selections: The physical characteristics of the Lake can greatly influence its associated community of fishes. Furthermore, natural differences in the macrohabitats of the various study sites exist. To more accurately assess the distribution of fishes in light of these natural differences, the entire shoreline of Miami Whitewater Lake was sampled and structural differences in these sites were examined. The study sites are designated A-L. Site A begins at the boat ramp and moves towards the golf course. Each subsequent site is continuous with the previous one and consists of a segment of near-shore habitat. The sites continue along the entire shoreline and finish with Site L back at the boat ramp. The length of each site was determined by the distance covered during a 45 minute-electroshocking period. Therefore, some sites are longer, in distance, than others; however all represent approximately the same amount of collecting time. Special attention was given to the submerged fish habitat structures (i.e. stake and gravel beds, palettes, and brush piles) that were constructed by the Park managers.

Table 1. Site Locations.

Site	Location
A	Shoreline near the boat ramp and includes parts of the driving range.
B	Shoreline along "Ramsey Bay" where "Golf Stream" enters the Lake.
C	Shoreline from Ramsey Bay to the buoy line near Strimble Creek, along the golf course.
D	Shoreline from the buoy line near Strimble Creek, along the shore, opposite the golf course.
E	Shoreline, opposite the rip-rap across the Lake.
F	Shoreline along the bay across from "Ramsey Bay."
G	Shoreline across from the boat ramp where the Lake is narrowest.
H	Shoreline of the bay where South Creek is located, beyond the buoys.
I	Shoreline from the buoy line near South Creek, to the spillway.
J	Shoreline near the spillway in front of boat house.
K	Shoreline along public area for shoreline fishing.
L	Shoreline across from public fishing area, near the birdhouses and up to the boat ramp.

Results and Discussion

A summary of all the fish collected at all sites can be seen in Table 2. The total number of fish collected within Miami Whitewater Lake from electrofishing was 1337 individuals. Sixteen species from 6 families were collected. There were only seventeen individuals collected from the hoop nets (12 bluegill and 5 white crappie); therefore these numbers are not included in the overall analysis. During electrofishing, over 359,000 grams of fish were collected throughout the lake. A biostatistical summary of the measurements of each fish species at all sites is presented in Appendix Table 2.

In terms of overall and relative abundance of the fish populations, gizzard shad (*Dorosoma cepedianum*) was the only species found at every site and comprised just over 66% of the abundance of the total sample. Bluegill (*Lepomis macrochirus*) were found at eleven of the twelve sites but were a distant second, at just over 14%, in terms of relative abundance. In addition to these two species, carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) and white crappie (*Pomoxis annularis*) were well represented throughout the Lake. However, relatively few individuals of the remaining eleven species were found elsewhere—each having less than fifteen individuals, respectively.

Regarding total biomass, both the shad and bluegill were much less representative of the total sample (12.5% and 2.57% respectively). Rather, the Ictalurids comprised over 41% of the total biomass of the electrofishing sample and in particular the blue catfish (*Ictalurus furcatus*) comprised nearly 26% of the overall biomass. The total biomass for this species (93,150) came from just eleven individuals, averaging 8500 grams each. The largest individual was 20,450 grams, approximately 45 pounds. Both carp (*C. carpio*) and largemouth bass (*M. salmoides*) were also well represented, comprising 23.39% and 13.06% of the total biomass respectively. In contrast to the blue catfish (*I. furcatus*) which was found at Site H only, these latter two species were collected at nearly every site.

Table 2: Electrofishing Collections: Species Abundance (Relative %) and Biomass in grams (Relative %) for the entire Lake.

Family		
Species	Number	Biomass
Clupeidae		
Gizzard Shad (<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>)	887 (66.34%)	44890 (12.50%)
Catostomidae		
Black Buffalo (<i>Ictiobus niger</i>)	1 (0.07%)	3200 (0.89%)
Golden Redhorse (<i>Moxostoma erythrinum</i>)	14 (1.05%)	3885 (1.08%)
Spotted Sucker (<i>Moxostoma melanops</i>)	4 (0.30%)	1420 (0.40%)
White Sucker (<i>Catostomus commersoni</i>)	4 (0.30%)	1090 (0.30%)
Cyprinidae		
Common Carp (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>)	61 (4.56%)	83980 (23.39%)
Ictaluridae		
Blue Catfish (<i>Ictalurus furcatus</i>)	11 (0.82%)	93150 (25.95%)
Channel Catfish (<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>)	12 (0.90%)	12950 (3.61%)
Flathead Catfish (<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i>)	5 (0.37%)	41490 (11.56%)
Centrarchidae		
Bluegill Sunfish (<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>)	188 (14.06%)	9210 (2.57%)
Green Sunfish (<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>)	2 (0.15%)	60 (0.02%)
Largemouth Bass (<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>)	61 (4.56%)	46890 (13.06%)
Longear Sunfish (<i>Lepomis megalotis</i>)	10 (0.75%)	270 (0.08%)
Warmouth (<i>Lepomis gulosus</i>)	10 (0.75%)	460 (0.13%)
White Crappie (<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>)	59 (4.41%)	4395 (1.22%)
Sciaenidae		
Freshwater Drum (<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>)	8 (0.60%)	11660 (3.25%)
Total	1337 individuals	359000 grams

When examining the collections at each site separately (Table 3 and Table 4), the number of individuals caught at each site ranged from 312 at Site C down to just 68 at Site L. The number of species found at each site ranged from just two at Site K to twelve at Site H. In addition to being the most speciose, Site H also held the most biomass, and although only 70 individuals were collected, it contained nearly five times more biomass than any other site. This is primarily due to the large catfish collected here. The biomass for each site ranged from 5,750 grams at Site K up to 152,765 grams at Site H. This is primarily due to the large catfish collected here. Site H was also the most diverse site ($H' = 2.72$). The average diversity index (H') was 1.74. The lowest diversity was found at Site K ($H' = 0.13$) where only two species were found and nearly all of them (113 out of 115) were gizzard shad (*D. cepedianum*).

When examining the distribution of fishes throughout the Lake, two distinct groups emerge. The first group of seven species (*D. cepedianum*, *Moxostoma erythrumum*, *C. carpio*, *Ictalurus punctatus*, *L. macrochirus*, *M. salmoides* and *P. annularis*) were common throughout the Lake. This assemblage was found at nearly every site. In contrast, the second group of nine species, (*Ictiobus niger*, *Miryztrema melanops*, *Catostomus commersoni*, *I. furcatus*, *Pylodictis olivaris*, *L. cyanellus*, *L. gulosus*, *L. megalotis* and *Aplodinotus grunniens*) were relatively rare and found at three or fewer sites. Revealing a similar pattern, the sites can be grouped into two distinct groups in terms of their diversity values. Six sites, Sites E-J had the highest H' values, averaging 2.29 (Range = 1.98 – 2.72). The other six sites, Sites A-D, Site K and Site L had the lowest H' values, averaging 1.18. Lastly, the Evenness values follow this same pattern. As with the diversity values, Sites E-J typically had the highest Evenness values, averaging 74.27 (Range = 79.9 – 62.3); while the other sites, Sites A-D, Sites K and L, had an average Evenness value of 41.85 (Range = 64 – 12.7).

Table 3: Electrofishing Collections: Species Abundance and Diversity for each Site.

Family Species	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Clupeidae												
Gizzard Shad (<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>)	38	51	265	93	82	69	20	24	61	24	113	47
Catostomidae												
Black Buffalo (<i>Ictiobus niger</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Golden Redhorse (<i>Moxostoma erythrumum</i>)	0	1	1	1	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	1
Spotted Sucker (<i>Minytrema melanops</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
White Sucker (<i>Catostomus commersoni</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
Cyprinidae												
Common Carp (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>)	5	5	7	8	5	8	7	6	0	5	0	5
Ictaluridae												
Blue Catfish (<i>Ictalurus furcatus</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0
Channel Catfish (<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>)	0	4	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1
Flathead Catfish (<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0
Centrarchidae												
Bluegill Sunfish (<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>)	5	12	17	7	23	27	37	15	20	19	0	6
Green Sunfish (<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Largemouth Bass (<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>)	3	2	5	3	4	5	10	3	9	12	0	5
Longear Sunfish (<i>Lepomis megalotis</i>)	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	1
Warmouth (<i>Lepomis gulosus</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
White Crappie (<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>)	2	3	12	0	3	9	9	2	18	0	0	1
Sciaenidae												
Freshwater Drum (<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>)	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
# of Individuals	54	79	312	113	122	128	88	70	113	75	115	68
# of Species	6	8	8	6	7	10	7	12	9	7	2	9
Shannon Diversity (H')	1.80	1.51	0.97	1.01	2.27	2.10	2.24	2.72	1.98	2.42	0.13	1.68
H' Max	2.81	3.00	3.00	2.59	3.00	3.32	2.81	3.46	3.17	2.81	1.00	3.17
Evenness	64.0	50.2	32.1	39.1	75.5	63.1	79.9	78.5	62.3	86.3	12.7	53.0

Underfoot
Shooting

Table 4: Electrofishing Collections: Species Biomass for each Site.

Family Species	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Clupeidae										
Gizzard Shad (<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>)	1900	3490	13250	4850	4100	3450	1000	1200	3050	1150
Catostomidae										
Black Buffalo (<i>Ictiobus niger</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3200	0	0
Golden Redhorse (<i>Moxostoma erythrumum</i>)	0	185	180	280	1350	220	350	0	510	560
Spotted Sucker (<i>Mimytrema melanops</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	620	0	300	500	0
White Sucker (<i>Catostomus commersoni</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	120	0	0	0	0
Cyprinidae										
Common Carp (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>)	5050	6600	8580	8400	7700	13200	9250	11500	0	8500
Ictaluridae										
Blue Catfish (<i>Ictalurus furcatus</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93150	0	0
Channel Catfish (<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>)	0	4600	1500	650	800	2400	0	1700	500	0
Flathead Catfish (<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39990	1500	0
Centrarchidae										
Bluegill Sunfish (<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>)	245	395	940	455	1480	1285	1435	715	935	1050
Green Sunfish (<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	0	0
Largemouth Bass (<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>)	3150	1100	3750	1670	4100	2940	6080	900	9680	8590
Longear Sunfish (<i>Lepomis megalotis</i>)	10	0	0	0	0	140	90	0	0	0
Warmouth (<i>Lepomis gulosus</i>)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
White Crappie (<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>)	110	420	1040	0	150	810	665	80	1070	0
Sciaenidae										
Freshwater Drum (<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>)	0	2300	2110	0	0	0	0	0	0	7250
Total Biomass	10465	19090	31350	16305	19680	25185	18900	152765	17745	27560

From the electrofishing data, it is clear that this lake is highly productive. During the seven-day sampling period, over 1,300 individuals and 359,000 grams of biomass were collected. Furthermore, much of the biomass (over 50%) was contained in desirable species such as the three catfish species and the largemouth bass. However, the data also revealed two less than desirable trends: 1) the fish populations are not evenly distributed throughout the Lake and 2) several sites yielded very low diversity and evenness levels. In particular, Sites A-D, and Sites K-L had low diversity values. Although there were several species at most of these particular sites, gizzard shad and to a lesser extent the common carp, tended to dominate. On the contrary, the diversity and evenness levels at Sites E-J were much higher. Furthermore, shad were much less dominant at these latter sites. Much of the differences observed in these samples can be attributed primarily to habitat differences along the shoreline. Numerous studies have demonstrated this link between the quality of habitat and diversity of the fish communities (Lehtinen et al. 1997, Plafkin et al. 1989, Clements 1987).

Overall, there is much greater environmental heterogeneity within the lake and positive influence from the riparian vegetation at those sites with higher diversity levels. At most of these sites (Sites E-I), there was a mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks and overhanging branches which provide adequate shade, refuge and food to support a rich assemblage of fishes. The other site with a relatively high diversity value, Site J, primarily contained a rocky substrate providing an ideal breeding habitat for lithophils such as the sunfish (Carlander 1970). In general, at those sites with lower levels, the shoreline was barren, often muddy, with only small patches of gravelly substrate or woody debris. In addition to the lack of epifaunal substrate within these depauperate sites, the riparian zone was either lacking all together (i.e. along the boathouse and picnic area) or very narrow (i.e. along the golf course) and disturbed by human activities. This lack of adequate vegetative protection can lead to increased run-off and subsequent sediment deposition, bank instability and higher erosion rates (Armour et al. 1981) all of which contribute to degraded habitat and poor water quality. Karr et al. (1986) rank an altered habitat as a major stressor of aquatic system and thus likely to result in reduced diversity levels. Despite the addition of woody structures (stake beds, palettes, and brush piles) and gravel along the impacted shorelines, the habitat within these

sites does not support as rich of communities as the natural habitat found along the shore, opposite the golf course and boathouse.

However, this finding should not deter the maintenance of existing sites and establishment of new ones. It is likely that additional time is necessary to document any potential improvements from these added structures. Furthermore, the runoff expected from the golf course within the same areas and associated adverse effects such as increased sedimentation, eutrophication and potential oxygen deficits might outweigh the beneficial aspects of the artificial substrate. In order to accurately assess the success of such efforts, the concerns, associated with the runoff, should be addressed in concert with improvements to the physical habitat. Perhaps the implementation of mechanisms to reduce the impacts of the golf course such as those outlined in the previous study of this lake (Miller et al. 1997), along with continued placement of woody debris and stocking efforts, will improve the habitat and increase the diversity of the fish community throughout the lake.

Literature Cited

- Armour, C. L., D.A. Duff, and W. Elmore. 1991. The effects of livestock grazing on riparian and stream ecosystems. *Fisheries*. 16 (1): 7-11.
- Carlander, K. D. 1970. *The Handbook of Freshwater Fishery Biology*, Volume Two. The Iowa State University Press.
- Clements, W.H. 1987. The effect of rock surface area on distribution and abundance of stream insects. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology* 4(1):83-91.
- Fausch, K. D., J. Lyons, J. R. Karr, and P. L. Angermeier. 1990. Fish communities as indicators of environmental degradation. Amer. Fish. Soc. Symposium 8: 123-144.
- Hilsenoff, W. L. 1988. Seasonal correction factors for the biotic index. *Great Lakes Entomologist* 21: 9-13.
- _____. 1987. An improved biotic index of organic stream pollution. *Great Lakes Entomologist* 20: 31-39.
- Karr, J. R. 1981. Assessment of the biotic integrity using fish communities. *Fisheries* 6(6): 21-27.
- _____. 1987. Biological monitoring and environmental assessment: a conceptual framework. *Environmental Management* 11: 249-256.
- _____, K. D. Fausch, P. L. Angermeier, P. R. Yantand, I. J. Schlosser. 1986. Assessing biological integrity in running waters: a method and its rationale. Ill. Nat. Hist. Sur. Spec. Publ. 5. 28 pp.
- _____ and D. R. Dudley. 1978. Biological integrity of headwater stream.
- _____. 1981. Ecological perspective on water quality goals. *Environmental Management* 5(1): 55- 68.
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. 1987. Biological criteria for the protection of aquatic life: Vol. II User's Manual for biological field assessment of Ohio surface waters. Division of Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment, Surface Water Section, Columbus, Ohio.
- Plafkin, J.L., M.T. Barbour, K.D. Porter, S.K. Gross, and R.M. Hughes. 1989. *Rapid bioassessment protocols for use in streams and rivers: Benthic macroinvertebrates and fish*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water Regulations and Standards, Washington, D.C. EPA 440-4-89-001.
- Washington, H. G. 1984. Diversity, biotic, and similarity indices: a review with special relevance to aquatic ecosystems. *Water Research* 18: 653-694.

Appendix Table 1: Key for Abbreviation used in the spreadsheets.

<u>Abbreviation</u>	<u>Species</u>	<u>Common Name</u>
<i>A.gru</i>	<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>	Freshwater Drum
<i>C.car</i>	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	Common Carp
<i>C.com</i>	<i>Catostomus commersoni</i>	White Sucker
<i>D.cep</i>	<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>	Gizzard Shad
<i>I.fur</i>	<i>Ictalurus furcatus</i>	Blue Catfish
<i>I.nig</i>	<i>Ictiobus niger</i>	Black Buffalo
<i>I.pun</i>	<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>	Channel Catfish
<i>L.cya</i>	<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>	Green Sunfish
<i>L.gul</i>	<i>Lepomis gulosus</i>	Warmouth
<i>L.mac</i>	<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>	Bluegill
<i>L.meg</i>	<i>Lepomis megalotis</i>	Longear Sunfish
<i>M.ery</i>	<i>Moxostoma erythrinum</i>	Golden Redhorse
<i>M.mel</i>	<i>Mimytrema melanops</i>	Spotted Sucker
<i>M.sal</i>	<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	Largemouth Bass
<i>P.ann</i>	<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>	White Crappie
<i>P.oli</i>	<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i>	Flathead Catfish

<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	Total = 1900		
<i>L.mac</i>	50	14	11
<i>L.mac</i>	70	16.5	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	13.5	12
<i>L.mac</i>	35	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	14.5	12
	Total = 245		
<i>L.meg</i>	10	8	6.5
	Total = 10		
<i>M.sal</i>	1750	48	40.5
<i>M.sal</i>	500	32	28
<i>M.sal</i>	900	38.5	32
	Total = 3150		
<i>P.arn</i>	70	18	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	40	16.5	13
	Total = 110		

<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
<i>D.cep</i>	70	16.5	12
	Total = 3490		
<i>I.pun</i>	750	47	41
<i>I.pun</i>	1750	53	46
<i>I.pun</i>	1500	56	49
<i>I.pun</i>	600	38	32
	Total = 4600		
<i>L.mac</i>	70	13.5	10
<i>L.mac</i>	10	7	5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	13.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	70	16	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	10	7	5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	11	9
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	12.5	10
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	12	10
<i>L.mac</i>	25	11.5	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	10.5	9
	Total = 395		
<i>M.ery</i>	185	25	20
	Total = 185		

<i>M. sal</i>	700	39	30
<i>M. sal</i>	400	27	22
	Total = 1100		
<i>P. arm</i>	60	18.5	14.5
<i>P. arm</i>	40	17	15
<i>P. arm</i>	320	32	25
	Total = 420		

<i>L.mac</i>	85	17	14
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15	12
<i>L.mac</i>	70	14.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	40	12	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	70	14.5	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	35	13.5	11
<i>L.mac</i>	40	12	10
<i>L.mac</i>	70	16	13
<i>L.mac</i>	30	11.5	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	17	14
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15	12
<i>L.mac</i>	30	11	9
	Total = 940		
<i>M.ery</i>	180	22	20
	Total = 180		
<i>M.sal</i>	1050	43	38
<i>M.sal</i>	1600	49	41
<i>M.sal</i>	700	36	30
<i>M.sal</i>	200	25	21
<i>M.sal</i>	200	27	22
	Total = 3750		
<i>P.arn</i>	80	21	16
<i>P.arn</i>	75	19	15
<i>P.arn</i>	60	20	15.5
<i>P.arn</i>	80	21	16
<i>P.arn</i>	370	32.5	25.5
<i>P.arn</i>	50	15.5	12.5
<i>P.arn</i>	60	16	13
<i>P.arn</i>	40	15.5	13
<i>P.arn</i>	50	17	13
<i>P.arn</i>	55	17.5	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	60	19	15
<i>P.arn</i>	60	17	13
	Total = 1040		

<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12

Total = 4100

<i>L.pun</i>	800	45	37
--------------	-----	----	----

Total = 800

<i>L.mac</i>	80	16.5	14
<i>L.mac</i>	80	15	13
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15	12
<i>L.mac</i>	50	13.5	11
<i>L.mac</i>	80	17	13
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	100	17	13
<i>L.mac</i>	60	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	90	16	13
<i>L.mac</i>	40	12.5	10
<i>L.mac</i>	40	11.5	9
<i>L.mac</i>	80	16	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	80	12.5	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	70	11.5	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	110	16	14
<i>L.mac</i>	40	15.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	140	15	15.5
<i>L.mac</i>	45	17.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	35	13	11
<i>L.mac</i>	25	17.5	9
<i>L.mac</i>	30	12	10
<i>L.mac</i>	35	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	11.5	9.5

Total = 1480

<i>M.ery</i>	500	32	27
<i>M.ery</i>	300	28	22
<i>M.ery</i>	250	29	24
<i>M.ery</i>	300	29.5	23

Total = 1350

<i>M.sal</i>	1200	47	44
<i>M.sal</i>	1500	45.5	39
<i>M.sal</i>	700	35.5	29
<i>M.sal</i>	700	36.5	30
	Total = 4100		
<i>P.arm</i>	40	15	12
<i>P.arm</i>	50	16	12.5
<i>P.arm</i>	60	17.5	14
	Total = 150		

<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	Total = 3450		
<i>I.pun</i>	2400	26	48
	Total = 2400		
<i>L.mac</i>	60	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	50	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	60	12.5	10
<i>L.mac</i>	40	15	13
<i>L.mac</i>	30	11.5	9
<i>L.mac</i>	70	16	13
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	80	15.5	14
<i>L.mac</i>	60	14	11
<i>L.mac</i>	60	15	13
<i>L.mac</i>	70	14.5	12
<i>L.mac</i>	45	14	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	35	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	15	11	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	70	14	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	20	17.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	14.5	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	55	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	35	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	14	11
<i>L.mac</i>	25	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	45	15.5	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	11	9.5
	Total = 1285		
<i>L.meg</i>	40	13	11
<i>L.meg</i>	40	13	11
<i>L.meg</i>	15	10	8.5
<i>L.meg</i>	30	12	10
<i>L.meg</i>	15	9.5	8
	Total = 140		
<i>M.ery</i>	220	26.5	22
	Total = 220		
<i>M.mel</i>	300	31	26.5

<i>M. mel</i>	320	31	27
	Total = 620		
<i>M. sal</i>	1100	41	35
<i>M. sal</i>	1300	43	37
<i>M. sal</i>	20	12	10.5
<i>M. sal</i>	120	24	21
<i>M. sal</i>	400	31	27
	Total = 2940		
<i>P. ann</i>	220	28	24
<i>P. ann</i>	65	17.5	13.5
<i>P. ann</i>	60	17.5	14.5
<i>P. ann</i>	100	19	16
<i>P. ann</i>	125	22	19
<i>P. ann</i>	100	21.5	17
<i>P. ann</i>	50	16.5	13
<i>P. ann</i>	50	15.5	12.5
<i>P. ann</i>	40	15.5	13
	Total = 810		

<i>L.mac</i>	90	17	14.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	80	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	50	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	35	14.5	12
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	35	14	12
<i>L.mac</i>	25	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	15.5	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	11	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	15	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	25	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	11.5	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	14.5	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	13	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	25	12.5	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	15	12	9.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	13	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	35	13	11.5
Total = 1435			
<i>L.meg</i>	30	12	10
<i>L.meg</i>	30	12	10.5
<i>L.meg</i>	30	12.5	12.5
Total = 90			
<i>M.ery</i>	350	28	22.5
Total = 350			
<i>M.sal</i>	750	49	33
<i>M.sal</i>	1800	51.5	44.5
<i>M.sal</i>	850	41.5	34.5
<i>M.sal</i>	700	35	31
<i>M.sal</i>	400	30	25
<i>M.sal</i>	200	25.5	22

<i>M.sal</i>	400	31	25
<i>M.sal</i>	350	30	26.5
<i>M.sal</i>	600	36	31.5
<i>M.sal</i>	30	13	11

Total = 6080

<i>P.arn</i>	70	20	15.5
<i>P.arn</i>	80	21	16.5
<i>P.arn</i>	220	25.5	22
<i>P.arn</i>	60	18	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	70	20	16.5
<i>P.arn</i>	40	16	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	50	18	15.5
<i>P.arn</i>	25	15.5	12.5
<i>P.arn</i>	40	19	15.5

Total = 655

SITE H	SPECIES	WEIGHT(gm)	TL (cm)	SL (cm)
	<i>C.car</i>	1500	51.5	41
DATE	<i>C.car</i>	2600	54	45
31-May-01	<i>C.car</i>	2000	55	46.5
	<i>C.car</i>	1000	44	35
	<i>C.car</i>	700	40	34.5
	<i>C.car</i>	3700	61	50.5
	Total = 11500			
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	Total = 1200			
	<i>I.fur</i>	7300	80	64
	<i>I.fur</i>	6800	82.5	68
	<i>I.fur</i>	8200	81	70
	<i>I.fur</i>	5450	77	69
	<i>I.fur</i>	8200	82	69
	<i>I.fur</i>	10000	85	69
	<i>I.fur</i>	7300	86	75

<i>I.fur</i>	3650	69	60
<i>I.fur</i>	3600	64	59
<i>I.fur</i>	12200	87	79
<i>I.fur</i>	20450	102	90
	Total = 93150		
<i>I.niger</i>	3200	75	67
	Total = 3200		
<i>I.pun</i>	700	17.5	39
<i>I.pun</i>	1000	46	40
	Total = 1700		
<i>L.cya</i>	30	13.5	12
	Total = 30		
<i>L.mac</i>	70	17	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	60	16.5	14
<i>L.mac</i>	55	14.5	12
<i>L.mac</i>	30	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	15	13
<i>L.mac</i>	70	16.5	14
<i>L.mac</i>	55	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	90	16	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	14	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	13.5	11
	Total = 715		
<i>M.mel</i>	300	29	26
	Total = 300		
<i>M.sal</i>	500	34	28
<i>M.sal</i>	300	27	23
<i>M.sal</i>	100	23	19.5
	Total = 900		
<i>P.arn</i>	50	18.5	15
<i>P.arn</i>	30	17	14
	Total = 80		
<i>P.oli</i>	15910	105	88
<i>P.oli</i>	5450	70	60
<i>P.oli</i>	7730	89	79
<i>P.oli</i>	10900	81	76
	Total = 39990		

<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
<i>D.cep</i>	50	15	12
	Total 3050		
<i>I.pum</i>	500	34.5	26
	Total = 500		
<i>L.mac</i>	50	15	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	15.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13.5	11
<i>L.mac</i>	60	14	12
<i>L.mac</i>	35	13	12
<i>L.mac</i>	30	12	10
<i>L.mac</i>	10	8.5	7.5
<i>L.mac</i>	50	15	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	12	10
<i>L.mac</i>	40	14	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	30	13.5	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	60	14.5	12
<i>L.mac</i>	80	17	14
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13.5	11
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13.5	11

<i>L.mac</i>	70	12.5	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	100	17	15
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13.5	11
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13	11
	Total = 935		
<i>Lcya</i>	30	11	9.5
	Total = 30		
<i>M.ery</i>	250	28	23
<i>M.ery</i>	260	27	23
	Total = 510		
<i>M.mel</i>	500	34	29
	Total = 500		
<i>M.sal</i>	2400	53	46.5
<i>M.sal</i>	1400	47	41.5
<i>M.sal</i>	1000	39	34.5
<i>M.sal</i>	420	31.5	26.5
<i>M.sal</i>	400	31	28
<i>M.sal</i>	1700	48	42
<i>M.sal</i>	1600	49	42.5
<i>M.sal</i>	700	36	32
<i>M.sal</i>	60	24	20.5
	Total = 9680		
<i>P.arn</i>	40	17	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	60	18.5	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	65	18.5	15
<i>P.arn</i>	80	20	16
<i>P.arn</i>	100	21.5	16.5
<i>P.arn</i>	60	17	15.5
<i>P.arn</i>	60	19	15.5
<i>P.arn</i>	85	20	17
<i>P.arn</i>	50	17	13.5
<i>P.arn</i>	70	17	15.5
<i>P.arn</i>	50	17.5	15
<i>P.arn</i>	50	17.5	15
<i>P.arn</i>	60	17	14
<i>P.arn</i>	40	17	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	60	17	14
<i>P.arn</i>	50	17.5	15
<i>P.arn</i>	40	17	14.5
<i>P.arn</i>	50	17.5	15
	Total = 1070		

P.oli

1500

50

42

Total = 1500

<i>L.gul</i>	35	12.5	11.5
<i>L.gul</i>	30	11.5	9.5
<i>L.gul</i>	20	10.5	9
<i>L.gul</i>	40	12	10
<i>L.gul</i>	25	11.5	9.5
Total = 460			
<i>L.mac</i>	70	16	13.5
<i>L.mac</i>	90	16.5	14
<i>L.mac</i>	80	15	12.5
<i>L.mac</i>	90	17	15.5
<i>L.mac</i>	60	14.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	70	15	12
<i>L.mac</i>	70	14.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	65	15	13
<i>L.mac</i>	55	14	12
<i>L.mac</i>	50	13.5	12
<i>L.mac</i>	55	14	12
<i>L.mac</i>	40	13	11.5
<i>L.mac</i>	45	14.5	13
<i>L.mac</i>	60	14	12
<i>L.mac</i>	40	12.5	10.5
<i>L.mac</i>	20	11.5	10
<i>L.mac</i>	40	12	11
<i>L.mac</i>	25	12	10.5
Total = 1050			
<i>M.ery</i>	300	29	23.5
<i>M.ery</i>	260	27.5	23
Total = 560			
<i>M.sal</i>	1800	49	43
<i>M.sal</i>	1200	45.5	39
<i>M.sal</i>	600	40	34.5
<i>M.sal</i>	500	34	28
<i>M.sal</i>	320	29.5	24.5
<i>M.sal</i>	770	36.5	32
<i>M.sal</i>	200	24.5	21
<i>M.sal</i>	700	37	31.5
<i>M.sal</i>	1000	40.5	35
<i>M.sal</i>	1200	42.5	35.5
<i>M.sal</i>	150	22	18.5
<i>M.sal</i>	150	22.5	18.5
Total = 8590			

