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## ABSTRACT

NRDC-143 applied by aircraft to small lakes at emitted dosages of $35 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $140 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ affected zooplankton and bottom fauna populations and led to changes in the type and quantity of food ingested by native fish. Effects at the lower dosage were relatively short lasting and much less severe than effects at the higher dosage, which included some fish mortality, heavy mortality of shallow dwelling arthropods, and supression of zooplankton and bottom fauna populations over several months. NRDC-143 applied to a creek at the rate of 70 g AI/ha caused dramatic but short lasting increases in the drift of aquatic insects but did not significantly affect bottom fauna populations. Substantial impact on terrestrial arthropods was revealed by knockdown onto the creek's surface.

RESUME

Du NRDC-143 appliqué par avion sur de petits lacs à des doses de 35 et de 140 grames d'ingrédient actif (IA) par hectare a eu un effet marqué sur le zooplancton et la faune des fonds et provoqué des changements quantitatifs et qualitatifs sur la nourriture ingérée par les poissons indigènes. Les effets des faibles doses ont été relativenent de courte durée et beaucoup moins graves que ceux des fortes doses (mortalité des poissons, mortalité nombreuse des arthropodes d'eau peu profonde et suppression du zooplancton et de la faune du fond pour plusieurs mois). Le NRDC-143 appliqué sur un ruisseau à une dose de 70 granmes IA/hectare a provoqué une augmentation brusque, mais de courte durée, du comportement de dérive des insectes aquatiques mais n'a pas influe de façon significative sur la faune du fond. L'effet de choc sur les arthropodes terrestres a été assez marqué, conme l'a révélé le nombre de ces derniers flottant à la surface du ruisseau.
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## INTRODUCTION

For many years large scale insecticide spraying has been canducted over Eastern Canadian forest regions in order to reduce the damage caused by the spruce budworm, Choristoneura fumiferana Clem. Over the years, many insecticides have been tested for their suitability for controlling this pest species with minimum disruption to non-target organisms of the forest habitat. Recently, interest has been focused on newly developed synthetic pyrethroids as promising new tools for spruce budworm cantrol operations. These compounds are structurally similar to the natural pyrethrins which have been used for controlling insects for years, but they are more suitable for use in forest pest control operations because they are more stable, more toxic to insects and less hazardous to manmals and birds than natural pyrethrins (Abernathy and Casida 1973, Nishizawa 1971). Unfortunately, the synthetic pyrethroids are similar to natural pyrethrins in that they are highly toxic to fish (Mauck et al, 1976). Natural pyrethrins have also been found to be highly toxic to some aquatic insects (Bridges and Cope, 1965) and as synthetic pyrethroids display greater toxicity to insects in general, they can be expected to be highly toxic to aquatic insects as well as to fish.

During May and June of 1976 personnel of the Chemical Control Research Institute (CCRI) conducted field trials to test the synthetic pyrethroid NRDC-143 (Permethrin) against the spruce budworm. In conjunction with the efficacy trials, field trials to determine the effects of several dosage rates of NRDC-143 on aquatic fauna were carried out. The purpose of these trials was to determine if NPDC-143 presents too great a hazard to
aquatic ecosystems to be used in forest pest control operations and if not, what dosage rates of this chemical would be reasonably safe in terms of hazard to aquatic orquanisms.

## SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Petawawa Forest Experimental Station: One treatment lake, the treatment stream and the untreated control lake and stream were located within the Petawawa Forest Experimental Station (PFES) near Chalk River, Ontario (Fig. 1).

The treatment lake, Thomas Lake, is a small (approx. 10 ha ), shallow (max, depth 3 m ) circular bog lake. The lake has been used for many years as a holding pond for logs for a research sawmill located on its shore, and as a result the bottan is covered with a thick layer of bark and wood debris and the lake water is highly coloured (Secchi disc reading of only 0.75 m$)$. Much of the shoreline of the lake consists of a floating layer of sphagnum moss, Sphagnum sp., supporting thick growths of heaths, primarily laborador tea, Ledum sp., and sheep laurel, Kalmia angustifolia Linnaeus. The outlet stream flows out the north end of the lake through an alder, Alnus sp., swamp and had little flow throughout the study period. The surrounding forest is primarily a mixture of tamarack, Larix laricina (Du Roi) K. Koch, and black spruce, Picea mariana (Mill.) B.S.P., with occasional large white pine, Pinus strobis Linnaeus. Aquatic vegetation in the lake is limited to sparse growth of spatterdock (yellow water lily), Nuphar Tuteum, because the floating masses of sphagnum moss cover the true shoreline and the bottom drops off very rapidly from the shore leaving almost no shallow areas suitable for rooted aquatic plants.

The untreated control lake, Youngs Lake, is located about 6 km vest of Thamas Lake and is twice as large and deep (approx. 20 ha in area with max. depth about 6 m ). It is a bog lake with a bottom of organic debris and silt but has somewhat clearer water (Secchi disc readings of 1.5 to 2 m )

than Thomas Lake. It also has a more gradual sloping bottom which supports a 15 to 30 m wide compact band of white water lily, Nymphaea odorata, along the shallow margin of the lake. The shoreline vegetation consists primarily of alders in front of a forest of black spruce, white pine and white birch,Betela papyrifera Marsh.

A stretch of Youngs Creek about 5 km in length, between Race Horse Road and Meridian Road, was treated to study effects on stream fauna. Youngs Creek flows out of Youngs Lake about 6 km above the treated portion of the creek and flows into the Ottawa River about 8 km downstream from the treated section. The creek flows at a moderate pace through an open valley approximately 50 to 100 m wide. The creek varies from about 3 to 10 m in width and from about 30 cm to 1.5 m in depth. The creek bed is primarily fine sand which is covered with silt and aquatic plant growth (mostly wildcelery, Vallisneria americana) in some sections. Alders and grasses grow along the banks but there is no overhead forest canopy. Maunsell Creek, the untreated control stream, flows into Youngs Creek abcut 1.25 km above the treated portion and was sampled just upstream from where it enters Youngs Creek as it passes under Baseline Road. It is similar to Youngs Creek but smaller and shallower with lessflow.

Lac Tassel, Quebec: Lac Tassel is a fairly small (approx. 30 ha ), relatively deep (max. depth 14 m ) oligotrophic lake located in Perche Township, Pontiac County, Quebec about 120 km north of Ottawa and 42 km west of Maniwaki, Quebec (Fig. 2). It has clear waters (average Secchi disc reading of about 3.5 m ) and a wide variety of bottom types ranging from areas of sand, stones, rooted aquatic vegetation (primarily pipewort, Eriocaulon septangutare), large rocks, wood debris or thick silt alang the shoreline to the thick,
cozy silt found in deeper portions of the lake. A small outlet stream flows from the south side of the lake (Fig. 3) and a shallow sandy area at its mouth is utilized in the spring as a spawning area bv white suckers, Catastomus commersoni (Lacépède). There are three beaver lodges with adjacent submerged wood piles along the shore of the lake where large numbers of fish were observed on many occasions. A shallow silt bottomed bay at the west end of the lake is the only area where large schools of minnows can be found in the lake. Smallmouth bass, Microterus dolomieu Lacépède, nest along the shoreline of all but the west shore of the lake.

The shoreline of Lac Tassel is forested primarily with stands of balsam fir, Abies balsamea (L.) Mill., interspersed with poplars, Populus $s p$.


Fig. 2. Location of study site at Lac Tassel, Quebec.


Fig. 3. Depth contours (in metres) and features mentioned in the text, Lac Tassel, Quebec.

## MEIHODS

Treatment Procedures and Deposit Measurement: Three application rates of NRDC143 were applied directly over study areas to determine their effects on aquatic fauna (Table 1). All spray formulations were dyed with Automate B dye to facilitate measurement of insecticide deposit.

Table 1
NRDC-143 formulations applied to aquatic study areas, 1976


* Chipman Chemicals Ltd., $50 \%$ oil concentrate
+ FMC Canada Ltd., $80 \%$ oil concentrate

All applications were made by CCRI's Cessna 185 aircraft fitted with a Micronair ${ }^{R}$ spray emission system. Wind speed and direction, temperature and relative hmidity were measured during treatments at PFES by the forest meteorology unit of CCRI. A portable anemometer was used to determine wind conditions at the time of treatment at Lac Tassel. Insecticide deposit in the treated areas was estimated by two methods: colorimetric measurement of dye deposited on aluminum pans, and counting of spray droplets landing on Kramekote cands. Deposit samplers consisting of two aluminum pans $13 \times 17 \mathrm{~cm}$ and a $10 \times 10 \mathrm{~cm}$ Kromekote card were put out immediately before spraying began. On the treated lakes a line of ten deposit samplers on styrofoam floats was anchored across the lake perpendicular to the direction in which the lake was sprayed. At the treated steam, three lines of four deposit samplers were placed on the shore across the creek bed at each end and the middle of the treated section of stream. Insecticide deposit on the aluminum pans was determined by washing the dye off the pans with toluene and determining the amount of dye deposited on the pans with a colorimeter. This was compared with the amount of dye in a reference standard taken from the original spray formulation to determine the actual deposit.

The Kromekote cards were sent to the National Aeronautical Establishment where insecticide deposit on them was determined by a computerized spot-counting system (Slack, 1973).
Water Chemistry and Temperature Profiles: Phvsical and chernical parameters of the aquatic systems studied were monitored throughout the study period. Temperature profiles of the lakes were taken using a portable thermistor*.

[^0]Dissolved axygen, pH, alkalinity and hardness at various depths were determined by the use of Kemmerer water samplers ** and Hack water chemistry kits***. Temperature and water chemistry of the study streams were also monitored as well as changes in their water level.

Zooplankton: Zooplankton populations in the treatment and control lakes were sampled throughout the study period. Zooplankton populations in Thomas and Youngs Lake were sampled by towing a silk bolting cloth (49 meshes to the centimetre) tow net with a $500 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ opening along the surface near the centre of the lake for anproximately a ten-metre stretch between two marker buoys. Zooplankton in Lac Tassel was sampled with a Schindler-Patalas plankton trap (Schindler, 1969) with a 154 mesh to the centimetre straining net, which captured all the zooplankton present in 12-1itre water sarmles. These samples were taken from the surface at the shoreline of the lake and from the surface, 4 m and 8 m at a buoy anchored near the centre of the lake. All zooplankton samples were preserved with formaldehyde and later counted and identified in the laboratory by placing them in a gridded dish under a dissecting microscope. Zooplankton numbers from tow net samples were obtained by extrapolating from the numbers counted in appropriately sized subsamples, but plankton trap samples were counted in their entirety.

Benthic Invertebrates: Bottom fauna populations in the lakes were sampled with an Ekman grab which sampled a $232 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ ( $36 \mathrm{in}^{2}$ ) area of the bottom. Five samples were collected on each sampling date at Thomas and Youngs Lakes and ten samples on each date at Lac Tassel. Samples were collected from the same area

[^1]of bottom on each occasion and from a relatively narrow range of depths. Bottom samples from the creeks were collected from shallow ( 10 to 60 cm ) areas using a $0.093 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (foot square) Surber sampler (Surber, 1936). Two stations were sampled in the treatment stream: Station 1 (Fig. 4) was located on a gravel bottom immediately downstream from Meridian Road and Station 2 (Fig. 5) was situated along a silt covered, sand bottoned stretch of stream near the centre of the treated stretch of Youngs Creek. The control station on Maunsell Creek was located immediately downstream from Baseline Road on a silt covered, gravel bottomed portion of streambed (Fig. 6). All bottom samples were preserved in their entirety in the field with formaldehyde and the organisms in them were later separated from the substrate in the lab with the aid of a "bubbler" (Kingsbury and Beveridge, in press). Benthic organisms were then counted and identified to order or family.

Aquatic insects emerging as adults from the surface of Thomas and Youngs lakes were sampled with submerged emergence traps (Flannagan and Lawler, 1972) suspended from styrofoam floats. Ten traps were set along the shoreline of Thomas Lake while five were used in Youngs Lake. Adult insects which had emerged into the traps were removed daily and counted.

Drifting aquatic invertebrates were sampled in Youngs Creek by placing a drift net in the creek for thirty minute periods each morning and evening (Fig. 7). The net sampled a 46 cm ( 18 in ) wide portion of the creek's flow from surface to bottom, including the surface film. Two additional one hour drift net sets were made imediately prior to and following the insecticide application to document immediate effects on aquatic invertebrates and to sample terrestrial arthropods knocked into the creek. Drifting aquatic and terrestrial organisms were also captured in ablocking seine set across the entire width of the creek (Fig. 8) and emptied each morning and evening.


Fig. 4 Youngs Creek, PFES Treatment Station 1.

Fig. 5 Youngs Creek, PFES Surber sarpling at treatment Station 2.



Fig. 6. Maunsell Creek, PFES. Surber sampling at the untreated control stream.




Fish: Fish mortality related to NPDC-143 treatment was studied by trapping fish and caging them in the study lakes and creek. In Thomas and Youngs lakes, small fish of a number of families were placed in cages which were attached at various depths on a line running from the surface to the bottom anchored near the centre of the lake. Cages were held at the surface, $1 \mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{~m}$, and 3 m (bottom) in Thomas Lake and at the surface, 2 m and 4 m (bottom) in Youngs Lake. Each day all cages were raised to the surface and examined for mortality among their contents. A single cage of cyprinids (Cyprinidae) and mudminnows (Umbridae) was held in Youngs Creek at the downstream end of the treated area and checked twice daily for mortality.

At lac Tassel, hatchery raised brook trout, Salvelinus fontinalis Mitchill, and native white suckers and yellow perch, Perca flavescens (Mitchill), were caged in the lake prior to treatment. Six brook trout and ten suckers were held in cages right along the shoreline. Cages of brook trout, suckers and perch were anchored at various depths near the centre of the lake. Brook trout were held at the surface (Fig. 9) and 4 m , white suckers at the surface and 2 m and a single small cage containing two perch was held at 6 m . These cages were not brought to the surface to examine their contents but were checked for mortality by snorkeling down to where they were held.

Five minnow traps baited with bread were set in each of the study lakes and the catch removed, counted and retumed to the lake daily. Two minnow traps were set in Youngs Creek and checked twice daily in the moming and evening. In each case, the traps were emptied prior to treatment on the treatment date. In addition, a large trap net was set in Lac Tassel and its catch renoved, counted and returned to the lake daily.

The fish populations of the study lakes were sampled periodically by leaving gill nets set in the lakes overnight. Gangs of gill nets with 30 m sections of various mesh size ranging from 1.3 to 5.1 cm square were run out in the late afternoon from points of attachment along the shoreline towards the centre of the lake, and pulled the following morning (Fig. 10). Fish caught in the net were removed and preserved whole with formaldehyde. A cut was made into the abdominal cavity of the larger fish to facilitate penetration of the preservative and stop digestive processes within the stomach and intestine. Preserved gill net catches were returned to the laboratory where a number of fish of each species were selected for measuring, weighing, sexing and analysis of stomach contents. Ideally, for each sampling period twenty fish of each species were selected from the treatment lakes and ten fish of each species from the control lake. It was not always possible to capture the desired number of fish of each species for each sample. On some occasions fish sampled by gill netting were supplemented with fish caught angling to increase the sample size. After recording the total length, fork length, preserved weight and sex of each fish, the stomach and intestine was removed and preserved until a later date when the contents of the digestive tract were removed, their volume recorded and their composition determined under a dissecting microscope. The contents of only the stomach were analyzed for fish with distinct stomachs (smallmouth bass, pumpkinseed, Lepomis gibbosus (Linnaeus), yellow perch, brown bullheads, Ictalurus nebulosus (Iesueur)) but the contents of the entire digestive tract were analyzed for fish without a distinct stomach (white sucker, fallfish, Semotilus corporalis (Mitchill)). In measuring the volume of the digestive tract contents, the amount of indigestible material present (ingested substrate etc.) was estimated and the
measured volume corrected accordingly so as to only represent actual volume of food items.

The effects of the insecticide application on smallmouth bass reproduction in Lac Tassel was studied by conducting surveys of nesting bass using scuba and snorkeling equipment. The entire shoreline of the lake was surveyed initially and the stretches of shoreline suitable for bass nesting were subsequently surveyed repeatedly and individual bass nests marked. A numbered aluminum marker was placed beside each bass nest and on each visit to the nest the presence or absence of the guarding male, eggs and frywere recorded. Repeated observations were also made on aggregations of fish around the mouth of the outlet stream and near several submerged beaver food piles along the shoreline. During these underwater surveys, observations were also made on aquatic invertebrate, minnow, spotted newt (Triturus viridescens), and tadpole populations.


Fig. 9. Caged brook trout anchored near the centre of Lac Tassel, Quebec. This cage is held at the surface, while other cages are attached at various depths along the line rumning to the bottom of the lake.

Fig. 10. Pemoving a gill
net from Thomas Lake, PFES, after an overnite set.


RESULTS

Thomas Lake - PFES - $35 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}:$ Thomas Lake was treated from 1912 to 1920 hours on 25 May (Fig. 11). The lake was treated in a north-south direction beginning at the west side and progressing east. Meteorological conditions over a 45 minute period from the beginning of treatment were:

| Mean wind speed | $1.51 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\triangle \mathrm{T}$ | $-0.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| Turbulence factor | 1.6 |
| Stability ratio | -2.19 |
| Dry bulb temperature | $22 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $13.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Range $(14.0-12.9)$ |
| Relative humidity | $6 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $14.0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Range $(14.6-13.4)$ |
|  | $22 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $68.9 \%$, Range $(67.1-72.2)$ |
|  | $6 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $62.7 \%$, Range $(61.2-64.8)$ |

Spray deposit on Thamas Lake is presented in Table II. Although the spray was applied under neutral to slightly unstable conditions (stability ratio -2.19$)$, a very good mean deposit of the emitted dosage was achieved. Spray deposit was fairly uniform over the whole lake's surface but a slight increase in the wind from the east towards the end of the application caused a somewhat lighter deposit of spray materials on the east side of the lake (El, E2, E3) and a heavier deposit near the centre of the lake (E4, E5, W5).


Fig. 11. CCRI's Cessna 185 treating Thomas Iake, PFES, with NRDC-143.

Table II
Deposit of the fomulation of $\mathrm{NRDC}-143(7.48 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \ell)$ applied at $4.68 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{ha}$ to Thomas Lake, PFES.

| Deposit sampler | Colorimetric Assessment |  | NAE Spot Counting Assessment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average deposit in two pans (l/ha) | Percentage of emitted rate | Deposit on Kramekote card Pe (l/ha) | Percentage of emitted rate |
| WI (west side of lake) | 2.37 | 50.7 | * | - |
| W2 | 2.18 | 46.6 | 3.59 | 76.7 |
| W3 | 2.22 | 47.5 | 3.62 | 77.4 |
| W4 | 1.97 | 42.1 | 2.16 | 46.2 |
| W5 | 2.93 | 62.6 | * | - |
| E5 | 2.46 | 52.6 | 4.60 | 98.3 |
| E4 | 2.58 | 55.2 | * | - |
| E3 | 1.86 | 39.8 | 2.71 | 57.9 |
| E2 | 1.27 | 27.2 | 2.14 | 45.7 |
| El (east side of lake) | 1.13 | 24.2 | * | - |
| Average | 2.09 (15.6g AL/ha) | 44.7 | 3.13 (23.4 g AI/ha) | a) 67.0 |

* No estimate of deposit given by the computer because of the large area covered by overlapping droplets relative to the total area covered by droplets.

At the time of treatment Thamas Lake was essentially unstratified but stratified rapidly over the next few days of warm weather (Fig. 12). Water chemistry parameters in Thomas Lake showed little variation over the study period until early in July when same oxygen depletion in the bottom waters of the lake became noticeable (Table III). Similar oxygen depletion in the bottam waters of Youngs Lake was evident in July (Table IV). Temperature stratification in Youngs Lake developed much the same over the study period as in Thomas Lake (Fig. 13).

The heavy deposit of emitted spray on the surface of Thomas Lake was apparent immediately following treatment. The carrier oil was easily seen on the suface of the lake and strands of dye were clumped along the windward shoreline. Adult blackflies showed an immediate reaction and could be seen to fall distressed into the lake minutes after the plane passed over. No other distressed organisms were observed the evening the lake was treated but over the next two days one distressed minnow and several dead and distressed aquatic insects were found (Table V).

Survival of caged fish in Thomas and Youngs lakes was excellent during the period from caging until treatment ( 8 to 12 days in duration) but all the darters caged escaped due to their small size. Mortality among caged fish in both lakes after the treatment date is recorded in Table VI. Mortality was heaviest in the surface cage in Thanas Lake where the caged cyprinids, bullheads and sunfish suffered almost complete mortality between the third and ninth day after treatment. Less extensive mortality occurred among cyprinids, bullheads, sunfish and sticklebacks held one meter below the surface. Little to no mortality occurred among
other groups of caged fish held deeper in Thamas Lake or in Youngs Lake. Minnow trap catches in Thomas and Youngs lakes before and after treatment are recorded in Table VII and total minnow catch from both lakes is presented grapically in Fig. 14. Minnow trap catches in Thomas Lake consisted mainly of the cyprinids, Chrosomus eos Cope (northern redbelly dace), Notropis comutus (Mitchill) (common shiner), Pimephales promelas Rafinesque (fathead minnow) and Notemigonus crysolencas (Mitchill) (golden shiner) along with small pumpkinseeds. Small brown bullheads, Johnny darters, Etheostoma nigrum Rafinesque, Iowa darters, Etheostoma exile (Girard), and brook sticklebacks, CuIaea inconstans (Kirtland), were also caught in Thomas Lake. The minnow fauna in Youngs Lake was very similar but also included many small yellow perch.

The daily catch of minnows in the treatment lake was consistently high throughout the study period but dropped off somewhat for a short time immediately after treatment due to a sharp decrease in the numbers of cyprinids caught. Minnow trap catches in the control lake were much smaller than in the treatment lake throughout the study period, particularily after the catch of perch fell off in response to warming of the lake's surface waters. No noticeable decrease in catches occurred in the control lake on the two days after treatment when catches were depressed in the treatment lake.

Plankton tow net catches in Thomas and Youngs lakes throughout the treatment period are recorded in Tables VIII and IX. The composition of the plankton fauna in these two lakes was similar with four genera of cladocerans (Bosmina, Daphnia, Diapanosoma, and Holopedium) and a mixture of calanoid and cyclopoid copepods represented in the catches. No downward trends in plankton numbers in the treatment lake were seen until
the sample taken on the ninth day after treatment when numbers of all four genera of cladocerans were found to have dropped dramatically and numbers of copepods also showed a substantial decrease. All groups except for Holopedium were present again in large numbers when the lake was sampled forty days after treatment. Plankton numbers in Youngs Lake were increasing during the period of decrease in Thomas Lake, but numbers of cladocerans were much reduced in the early July sample.

Emerging insects were trapped from Thomas and Youngs lakes over a three week period around the treatment date. The catch from both lakes consisted almost entirely of emerging midges (Diptera:Chironomidae). Very few emerging insects were trapped from the treatment lake except for one day, ten days before treatment (Table X). Aside from the catch on this day, the numbers of emerging insects trapped before and after treatment in Thamas lake were fairly similar. Far larger numbers of emerging insects were trapped fran Youngs Lake even though only half the number of emergence traps were used there. A very high number of insects were also caught in Youngs Lake on the tenth day preceeding treatment of Thamas Lake.

All Ekman grab samples taken fram Thomas Lake sampled a very similar bottan type consisting of a thick layer of fibrous wood debris covered with silt. The bottom fauna present consisted almost entirely of chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) and "glassworms", larvae of non-biting mosquitoes (Diptera:Culicidae) of the genus Chaoborus (Table XI). A somewhat greater variety of bottom types were sampled in Youngs Lake ranging from areas of wood debris and silt similar to Thomas Lake to areas of hard packed silt and aquatic plant roots and hard bottoms of
small stones covered with sticks and silt. Renthic populations sampled also showed a qreater variety of organisms present but somewhat similar total numbers as in Thomas Lake (Table XII). Following treatment, bottom fauna populations in Thomas Lake decreased substantially due to a large drop in the number of Chaoborus larvae present and a somewhat smaller decline in chironomid larvae populations (Fig. 15). Chaoborus larvae populations gradually increased back to about two-thirds their pretreatment level by early July but chironamid larvae populations were quite low again in July after showing same recovery by the eleventh day after treatment. Total bottom fauna, Chaobomus larvae and chironomid larvae populations in Youngs Lake were all quite stable over the study period. Fish stomach samples from Thomas Lake showed large changes in the volume and composition of their contents following treatment of the lake. Both white suckers (Appendix, Table I) and brown bullheads (Appendix, Table II) had much larger volumes of food material in their stomachs four days after treatment than at any other time, primarily due to the presence of hundreds of Chaoborus larvae in almost all the stomachs sampled. White suckers showed an almost complete switch to Chaoborus larvae (an average of 94.5\% of the volume of each stomach) from a varied pre-spray diet of chironomid pupae (31.7\%), copepods (28.9\%), chironomid larvae (21.9\%) and Chaoborus larvae (13.6\%). Later sampling periods showed large decreases in the number of Chaoborus found in each stomach and smaller decreases in the contribution of Chaoborus to the volume of food in the stomachs while the numbers and contribution to volume of chironamid larvae and copepods increased. Brown bullhead stomachs before treatment contained primarily chironomid larvae (35.0\%), Chaoborus larvae (27.5\%), minnow remains (23.8\%)
and chironomid pupae (12.5\%). Four days after treatment c\%ulormi: larvae predominated in the stomachs (67.9\%) but sizeable contributions to the average percent volume of each stomach were still being made by minnow remains (20.5\%) and chironomid larvae (7.6\%). By twelve days after treatment only small numbers of Chaoborus were found in bullhead stomachs and their diet consisted almost entirely of minnows (48.3\%) and chironomid larvae (46.7\%). In early July minnows (35.0\%) and terrestrial insects (32.5\%) predaminated with small numbers of Chaoborus larvae and pupae contributing fairly large percentages to the volume of each stomach (12.5\% and $9.6 \%$ respectively). Larger aquatic insects were very scarce in Thamas Lake and were not found in any of the fish stomachs except for four days after treatment when one caddisfly larva and two dragonfly nymphs were found in sucker stomachs and one aquatic beetle, one dobsonfly larva and one dragonfly nymph were found in bullhead stomachs.

Stomach samples of four fish species from Youngs Lake generally showed a decrease in the average volume of food per stomach over the study period with no evidence of a large increase in the volume of stomach contents around the treatment date. White sucker stomachs did, however, show a similar change in diet in late Mav towards Chaoborus larvae as seen in the treatment lake (Appendix, Table III). Stomach contents changed from a mixture composed primarily of chironomid larvae ( $45.9 \%$ volume of each stamach), Chaoborus larvae (14.0\%), caddisfly larvae (10.5\%) and dragonfly nymphs (8.0\%) in the pre-spray sample to mainly Chaoborus larvae (57.8\%) and chironomid larvae (26.7\%) four days after treatment. Twelve days after treatment the diet was almost exclusively Chaoborus larvae ( $64.0 \%$ ) and chironomid larvae (31.5\%). By early July only small numbers of

Chaoborus larvae and pupae appeared in sucker stamachs and chironomid larvae (35.7\%) and cladocerans (24.3\%) dominated their diet. Brown Bullheads in Youngs Lake were never found to feed on Chaoborus to any extent. Their diet in May consisted of a wide variety of aquatic insects, minnows and crayfish but became more limited by early June when it consisted almost entirely of fingernail clams, dragonfly nymphs, unknown aquatic larvae of some dipteran and chironomid pupae (Appendix, Table IV). Pumpkinseed diets in Youngs Lake changed from a wide range of aquatic insects in early May to a fairly equal mixture of snails, terrestrial beetles and a samewhat narrower range of aquatic insects by early June (Appendix, Table V). The majority of the yellow perch taken from Youngs Lake had empty stomachs with minnows, chironomid larvae, crayfish, chironomid pupae and caddisfly larvae making up the contents of the rest of the stomachs sampled (Appendix, Table VI).

Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$


Fig. 12. Temperature profiles in Thamas Lake, PFES, 1976.

Table III
Water chemistry parameters in Thomas Lake, PFES, 1976.

| Date | Depth | Temperature <br> $(0 \mathrm{C})$ | Dissolved oxygen <br> $(\mathrm{ppm})$ | pH | Alkalinity <br> $\left(\mathrm{gpg} \mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right) *$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Hardness } \\ (\mathrm{gpg} \mathrm{CaCO}\end{array}\right)$ * |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

* grains per gallon calcium carbonate.

Table IV
Water chemistry parameters in Youngs Lake, PFES, 1976.

| Date | Depth Te | Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | Dissolved oxygen (ppm) | pH | Alkalinity (gpg CaCO3)* | Hardness $\left(\mathrm{gpg} \mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May 13 | Surface | 13.5 | 11 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Bottom (4 m) | 12.5 | 10 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | + |
| May 28 | Surface | 17.5 | 10 | 7.0 | 2 | 2 |
| June 4 | Surface | 22.5 | 9 | 7.5 | 1.5 | 2 |
|  | Bottom ( 5 m ) | 11.5 | 7 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 2 |
| July 6 | Surface | 25.0 | 9 | 6.8 | 1 | 3 |
|  | 3 meters | 16.0 | 6 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | Bottom ( 4.5 m ) | m) 11.5 | 0 | 6.0 | 2 | 2 |

* grains per gallon calcium carbonate.
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Fig. 13. Temperature profiles in Youngs Lake, PFES, 1976.

Table V
Aquatic organisms found dead or distressed following treatment of Thomas Lake with NRDC-143, 25 May 1976.

| May 26 | -- | Pisces | : | One fathead minnow Pimephales promelas (Rafinesque) Total length 72 mm . |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Hemiptera:Belestomatidae | : | One giant waterbug Lethocemus omericanus Leidy ( 70 mm ) |
|  |  | Nepidae | : | Two water scorpions Ranatra sp. |
|  |  | Coleoptera:Dytiscidae | : | Three predaceous diving beetles Dytiscus $s p$. (37, 39 and 43 mm ) One unknown predaceous diving beetle ( 18 mm ) |
|  |  | Hydrophilidae | : | Two water scavenger beetles Hydrophilus $s p$. One unknown hydrophilid larva |
|  |  | Gyrinidae | : | Two whirligig beetles |
| May 27 | -- | Coleoptera:Dytiscidae | : | One predaceous diving beetle Dytiscus $s p$. (42 mm) One unknown predaceous diving beetle ( 11 mm ) |

Mortality among caged fish in Thomas and Youngs Lakes, PFES, May 25 to June, 1976. Each X indicates an individual found dead on the day indicated.

|  | No. in cage on treatment day | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 | +6 | +7 | +8 | +9 | +10 | Total Mortality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| THOMAS LAKE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surface |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprinids | 2 | - | - | X | - | - | X | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Bullheads | 2 | - | - | - | XX | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Sunfish | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | XX | - | 2 |
| 1 meter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprinids | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | X | - | 1 |
| Bullheads | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | X | - | 1 |
| Sunfish | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | X | - | - | 1 |
| Sticklebacks | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | X | 1 |
| 2 meter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprinids | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Bullheads | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Sunfish | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Sticklebacks | 2 | - | - | - | X | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 3 meter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprinids | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | All fish died due |  |  |  |
| Bullheads | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | to cage being |  |  |  |
| Sunfish | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | pulled into oxygen |  |  |  |
| Sticklebacks | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | eted | ilt. |  |
| YOUNGS LAKE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Surface |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprinids | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | All fish escaped |  |  |  |
| Bullheads | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | due to cage |  |  |  |
| Sunfish | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | falling open. |  |  |  |
| Perch | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |

TableVI Cont'd.

| No. in cage on treatment day | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +5 | +6 | +7 | +8 | +9 | +10 | Total Mortality |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

YOUNGS LAKE Cont'd

| Cyprinids | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bullheads | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Perch | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| 4 meter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cyprinids | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Bullheads | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Sunfish | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | X | - | - | - | 1 |
| Perch | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |

Table VII
Minnow trap catches in Thomas and Youngs Lakes, PFES, 15 May to 4 June, 1976.

| ```Number of days before or after treatment``` | Cyprinids |  | Bullheads |  | Sunfish |  | Darters |  | Perch |  | Sticklebacks | Totals |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Thomas | Youngs | Thomas | Youngs | Thomas | Youngs | Thomas | Youngs | Thomas | Youngs | Thomas Youngs | Thomas | Youngs |
| -10 | 171 | 1 |  | 8 | 27 |  |  | 4 |  | 40 |  | 198 | 53 |
| -9 | 104 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 51 | 1 |  |  |  | 22 |  | 156 | 36 |
| -8 | 271 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 54 | 1 | 275 | 59 |
| -7 | 260 | 12 |  | 45 | 15 |  |  |  |  | 49 |  | 275 | 106 |
| -6 | 131 | 10 | 2 | 22 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 29 | 5 | 142 | 61 |
| -5 | 210 |  |  | 22 | 7 |  | $2$ | 1 |  |  | 12 | 220 | 27 |
| -4 |  |  |  |  | TRAPS | NOT | EMPTIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -3 | 291 |  |  | 10 | 5 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 298 | 11 |
| -2 | 288 | 4 |  | 22 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 301 | 32 |
| -1 | 285 | 6 | 1 | 23 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | 289 | 34 |
| -0* | 298 |  |  | 6 | 1 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 304 | 6 |
| +1 | 158 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 6 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |  | 165 | 27 |
| +2 | 83 |  |  | 22 | 8 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 92 | 25 |
| +3 | 197 |  |  | 18 | 43 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 241 | 18 |
| +4 | 220 |  |  | 5 | 45 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 267 | 6 |
| +5 | 264 |  |  | 3 | 24 |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |  | 289 | 7 |
| +6 | 200 |  | 1 | 1 | 22 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 224 | 4 |
| +7 | 235 |  |  | 3 | 22 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 257 | 9 |
| +8 | 280 |  | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 288 | 1 |
| +9 | 185 | 2 |  | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 188 | 11 |
| +10 | 128 | 4 |  | 3. | 52 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 180 | 9 |

* Traps emptied before lake was treated.


Fig. 14. Total mumbers of minnows caught in Thamas and Youngs Lakes, PFES, 15 May to 4 June, 1976.

Table VIII

Plankton tow net catches in Thomas Lake, PFES, 1976.

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 12 \\ (-13) \end{gathered}$ | May 25 <br> (0) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { May } 29 \\ & (+4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June } 3 \\ & (+9) \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{(+40)}{\text { July }} 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bosmina | 890 | 10,650 | 3,180 | 5 | 13,700 |
| Daphnia | - | - | 1,380 | 5 | 1,700 |
| Diaphanosoma | 60 | - | 2,520 | 10 | 7,000 |
| Holopedium | - | - | 18,600 | 10 | - |
| Total cladocerans | 950 | 10,650 | 25,680 | 30 | 22,400 |
| Calanoid copepods | 130 | 4,900 | - | 200 | 1,300 |
| Cyclopoid copepods | 230 | 425 | 10,140 | 2,300 | 15,700 |
| Capepodids | 930 | - | - | - | - |
| Nauplii | 4,720 | 4,075 | 4,260 | 550 | 13,200 |
| Total copepods | 6,010 | 9,400 | 14,400 | 3,050 | 30,200 |

Table IX
Plankton tow net catches in Youngs Lake, PFES, 1976.

|  | May 13 | May 28 | June 4 | July 6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bosmina | 400 | 3,900 | 9,200 | 220 |
| Daphnia | 200 | 450 | 1,200 | - |
| Diaphanosama | - | - | 500 | 30 |
| Holopedium | 300 | 3,000 | 23,200 | 70 |
| Total cladocerans | 900 | 7,350 | 34,100 | 320 |
| Calanoid copepods | 350 | 1,350 | 650 | 980 |
| Cyclopoid copepods | 28,050 | 14,400 | 14,850 | - |
| Copepodids | - | 450 | 9,050 | 5,000 |
| Nauplii | 5,550 | 1,150 | 24,550 | 14,180 |
| Total copepods | 33,950 | 17,350 |  | - |

'rable x

> Numbers of emerging insects caught in ten traps set in Thomas Lake and five traps set in Youngs Lake, PFES, 14 May to 3 June, 1976.
Number of days
before or after $\quad$ Thomas Lake
treatment

| -11 | 1 | 26 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

$-10$
1152
$-9$ 2 ..... 13
-8 0 ..... 23
$-7$ 0 ..... 11
-6 Traps not emptied
2 ..... 9
$-4$ Traps not emptied
$-3$ 1 ..... 11
$-2$ 1 ..... 2
$-1$ ..... 0 ..... 3
-0 * 1 ..... 13
$+1$ ..... 2 ..... 10
$+2$ 1 ..... 5
$+3$ ..... 2 ..... 13
$+4$ ..... 2 ..... 9
$+5$ ..... 2 ..... 22
$+6$ ..... 0 ..... 30
$+7$ 1 ..... 17
$+8$ ..... 1 ..... 16
$+9$116

[^2]Table XI
Mean numbers and standard deviations of benthic organisms collected in Ekman grab samples from Thanas Lake, PFES, 12 May to 6 July, 1976.

| Date | May 12 ( -13 ) | May 25 (0) | May 29 (+4) | June 5 ( +11 ) | July 6 ( +41 ) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average depth samples <br> taken from (meters) | 2.25 | 2.15 | 2.35 | 2.40 | 2.45 |
| Diptera:Chironomidae <br> (midge larvae) | $3.6 \pm 2.7$ | $4.4 \pm 0.9$ | $1.6 \pm 1.1$ | $2.6 \pm 2.3$ | $1.2 \pm 1.3$ |
| Diptera:Culicidae <br> (Chaobomu larvae) | $11.8 \pm 15.0$ | $12.0 \pm 3.8$ | $2.6 \pm 2.7$ | $4.6 \pm 2.2$ | $7.8 \pm 4.7$ |
| Diptera:Heleidae <br> (Culicoides larvae) | - | $0.4 \pm 0.9$ | - | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | - |
| Amphipoda |  |  |  |  |  |

Table XII
Mean numbers and standard deviations of benthic organisms collected in Ekman grab samples from Youngs Lake, PFES, 13 May to 6 July, 1976.

| Date | May 13 | May 28 | June 4 | July 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average depth samples taken from (meters) | 2.15 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 2.15 |
| Ephemeroptera:Baetidae | - | - | $0.4 \pm 0.6$ | - |
| Odonata:Libellulidae | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | - | - |
| Trichoptera | - | - | - | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ |
| Diptera:Chironomidae | $5.8 \pm 2.9$ | $4.4 \pm 2.7$ | $5.6 \pm 5.3$ | $4.6 \pm 4.8$ |
| Diptera:Culicidae | $1.2 \pm 0.8$ | $1.2 \pm 1.8$ | $0.8 \pm 1.1$ | $0.8 \pm 1.3$ |
| Diptera:Heleidae | $0.4 \pm 0.9$ | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | $0.4 \pm 0.6$ | $0.4 \pm 0.9$ |
| Oligochaeta | $1.0 \pm 1.2$ | $0.8 \pm 0.8$ | $0.6 \pm 0.6$ | - |
| Hydracarina | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | - | - | - |
| Gastropoda | $0.4 \pm 0.9$ | $1.8 \pm 3.0$ | $2.6 \pm 2.5$ | $1.8 \pm 2.1$ |
| Pelecypoda:Sphaeridae | $0.6 \pm 0.6$ | $0.4 \pm 0.9$ | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ | $0.8 \pm 0.2$ |
| Pelecypoda:Unionidae | - | - | $0.4 \pm 0.6$ | $0.2 \pm 0.5$ |
| Total | $9.8 \pm 3.0$ | $9.0 \pm 3.6$ | $11.0 \pm 6.1$ | $8.8 \pm 5.3$ |

$5.6 \pm 5.3$
$4.6 \pm 4.8$
$.2 \pm 0.8$
$0.8 \pm 1.1$
$0.4 \pm 0.9$
$1.0 \pm 1.2$
$.6 \pm 0.6$
$1.8 \pm 2.1$
Pelecypoda:Sphaeridae
Pelecypoda:Unionidae
$9.8 \pm 3.0$
$9.0 \pm 3.6$
$11.0 \pm 6.1$
$8.8 \pm 5.3$


Fig. 15. Bottom fauna populations in Thomas and Youngs Lakes, PFES, 1976.

Youngs Creek - PFES - $70 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ : The 5 km stretch of Youngs Creek between Meridian and Racehorse Roads was treated between 1935 and 1945 hours on 2 June. Two identical swaths were flown up the centre of the creek valley from east to west (in an upstream direction) emitting $35 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ on each swath for a combined emitted deposit of $70 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ ( $1.0 \mathrm{oz} \mathrm{AI/acre)}$. Meteorological conditions over a 30 minute period beginning at the start of spraying were:

| Mean wind speed | $0.85 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\Delta \mathrm{T}$ | $+0.9^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| Turbulence factor | 1.8 |
| Stability ratio | +12.45 |
| Dry bulb temperature | $22 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $20.4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Range $20.7-20.0$ |
|  | $6 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $20.3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Range $21.2-19.2$ |
| Relative humidity | $22 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $38.7 \%$, Range $38.2-39.8$ |
|  | $6 \mathrm{~m}:$ Mean $37.1 \%$, Range $36.4-40.0$ |

Deposit of emitted spray at three points along the treated portion of the stream varied considerably (Table XIX), probably due in large part to variations in the amount of screening overstory and general "openness" of the stream valley at each location. Despite the stable conditions under which the spray was applied (stability ratio +12.45 ), the average overall measured deposit at the three stations was only about one fifth of the emitted dosage. Loss of spray products to the atmosphere through evaporation was probably high because of the high temperature and low relative humidity.

## Table XIII

Deposit of the fomulation of NRDC-143 (7.48 g AI/ $)$ ) applied at a total of $9.36 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{ha}$ to Youngs Creek, 2FES.

| Deposit sampler |  | Colorimetric Assessment |  |  | NAE Spot Counting Assessien: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Average | deposit in two pans ( $\ell / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | Percentage of emitted rate | Deposit on Kromekote card (l/ha) | Ferrertage of er:-tec rate |
| Station 1 <br> (Meridian Rd.) | 1 | 3.46 |  | 37.0 | * | - |
|  | 2 | 3.18 |  | 34.0 | * | - |
|  | 3 | 3.40 |  | 36.4 | * | - |
|  | 4 | 4.00 |  | 42.8 | * | - |
| Average | 1-4 | 3.51 | (26.2 g AI/ha) | 37.5 | - | - |
| Station 2 | 5 | 0.94 | - | 10.0 | 0.71 | -. 6 |
|  | 6 | 1.26 |  | 13.4 | 0.83 | 8.8 |
|  | 7 | 1.40 |  | 14.9 | 1.36 | 24.5 |
|  | 8 | 0.91 |  | 9.7 | 0.76 | 8.1 |
| Average | 5-8 | 1.13 | (8.4 g AI/ha) | 12.1 | 0.92 ( $6.9 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | 9.8 |
| Racehorse Rd. | 9 | 0.17 |  | 1.8 | $<0.01$ | <0.1 |
|  | 10 | 0.14 |  | 1.4 | <0.01 | $<0.1$ |
|  | 11 | 1.15 |  | 12.3 | 0.56 | 6.0 |
|  | 12 | 1.63 |  | 17.4 | * | - |
| Average | 9-12 | 0.77 | (5.8 g AI/ha) | 8.2 | - | - |
| All samplers |  | 1.80 | (13.5 g AI/ha) | 19.2 | - | - |

* No estimate of deposit given by the computer because of the large area covered by overlapping drociets relative to the total area covered by droplets.

Water chemistry parameters in Youngs Creek were quite similar to those of the surface waters of Youngs Lake, with a pH of about 6.5 and alkalinity and hardness both equivalent to 2 grains per gallon. Maunsell Creek had a pH of 6.0 and alkalinity of $1 \mathrm{gpg} \mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ while hardness approached $4 \mathrm{gpg} \mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$. Its waters were generally warmer than Youngs Creek due to the presence of lakes and slow flowing boggy areas along its length and they held less dissolved oxygen than Youngs Creek. Water levels in Youngs Creek dropped about 40 cm between 27 May and 6 June, climbed about 15 cm by mid-June and then fell a further 25 cm by the end of the first week in July. During the same period water levels at the station in Maunsell Creek did not vary by more than 10 cm .

As soon as treatment of Youngs Creek began, knocked down terrestrial and knocked up aquatic organisms were observed in large numbers on the creek's surface. These included spiders, ants, caterpillars, flies, adult mayflies and caddisflies, hymenopterans, terrestrial bugs and beetles, springtails, water striders, water boatmen and larval and adult aquatic coleoptera. Minnows were observed picking these organisms from the creek's surface. A heavy deposit of oil was noticeable on the surface for about an hour after treatment, two minnows were found swimming belly-up in distress in front of the blocking seine set across the creek below the treatment area. No other affected fish were seen after this time, even though the creek was visited twice daily over the nex three days.

Minnow trap catches from Youngs Creek consisted of Northern redbelly dace, common shiners, brook sticklebacks and central mudminnows Umbra limi (Kirtland). Numbers of minnows caught fluctuated considerably (Table XIV) but catches were relatively low over the first thirty-six hours after treatment of the creek. No mortality occurred up to four days after
treatment among a group of cyprinids and mudminnows held caged in the creek. Drift net catches prior to treatment consisted almost entirely of blackfly and midge larvae (Table XV). Immediately following treatment a large variety of aquatic insects were found to be drifting. Numbers and variety of insects in drift net samples remained high the morning after treatment, dropped somewhat by that evening, and then fell to very low levels. The very small drift net catches three and four days after treatment reflect the large decrease in the creeks flow noted during this period. Only a small increase in the rate of drift of other aquatic invertebrates, primarily amphipods and water mites, was observed. Numbers of fish caught in drift nets before and after treatment were quite similar. Terrestrial insects and spiders occurred in very large numbers and variety in the drift net sample taken immediately after treatment (Table XVI). The knockdown was very short-lived except among some dipterans, lepidoptera, coleoptera, hymenoptera and spiders, where it lasted from twelve hours to several days.

Similar effects of the NRDC-143 treatment were seen in aquatic insect catches in the blocking seine set across Youngs Creek as in drift net catches (Table XVII). Pre-spray catches again consisted mainly of blackfly and midge larvae with larger numbers drifting during the late evening and night and being removed from the seine in morning (am) samples. The sample taken the morning following treatment contained very large numbers of a wide variety of aquatic insects with particularly large numbers of springtails (Collembola), heptagenid mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Heptagenidae), water scavenger beetle larvae (Coleoptera:Hydrophilidae), midge larvae and pupae, water boatmen (Hemiptera: Corixidae), predaceous diving beetles (Coleoptera:Dytiscidae) and caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera). Aside from another large catch of heptagenid mayfly nymphs over the second evening and night after treatment, numbers of aquatic
insects caught in the blocking seine in subsequent periods were relatively low though still quite diverse in variety. Water mites showed up in large numbers in the blockina seine immediately after treatment. Fish were not caught in the blocking seine in large numbers except for fairly substantial numbers of apparently healthy brook sticklebacks captured in the seine between two and four days after treatment. Extremely large numbers of terrestrial insects knocked down into the stream following treatment were captured in the blocking seine (Table XVIII). Knockdown to some extent up to three days after treatment was still apparent among same groups of dipterans, beetles, hymenopterans, lepidoptera larvae, caddisflies and spiders.

Surber samples taken fram Youngs Creek (Tables XIX and XX) and Maunsell Creek (Table XXI) did not differ significantly with respect to changes in aquatic insect populations over the treatment period in the treatment versus the control stream (Fig. 16). The areas sampled yielded fairly low densities of acuatic insect pooulations made uo primarilv of midoe larvae and other diptera larve, hut the few mayfly nymphs, dracronfly nvmohs, stonefly nvmphs, caddisfly larvae and coleoptera larvae sampled generally reveal no distinct adverse effects of the treatment. There were also no significant effect noticeable on populations of the other bottam organisms sampled. Substantial numbers of fish eggs were found in several bottom samples from both streams before treatment. The presence of larger number of fry with and without yolk sacs following treatment indicated that egg development and hatching wasn't noticeably affected by the treatment.

# Table XIV <br> Minnow trap catches in Youngs Creek, PFES, 1 June to 6 June, 1976. 

| Number of days <br> before or after <br> treatment | Cyprinids | Mudminnows | Sticklebacks | Totals |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1 am | 129 | 0 | 1 |  |
| -1 pm | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| -0 am | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| $-0 \mathrm{pm*}$ | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| +1 am | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| +1 pm | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| +2 am | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| +2 pm | 13 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| +3 am | 6 | Traps | not | emptied |

$\qquad$

* Traps emptied before creek was treated.
mable XY
Aquatic insects, other aquatic invertrbrates and fish caught in 30 min . drift net sets in Youngs Creek, PFES, 31 May to 6 June, 1376.

| Number of days before or after treatment | Trmeriately* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -2 | -1 | -1 | -? | -n | Pefore | After | +1 | +1 | +2. | +2 | +3 | $+3$ | +4 |
|  | nm | am | 2m | am | 19 |  |  | am | pm | am | pm | am | Pm. | ar |
| Collembola | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Fphemeroptera: Baetidae | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 15 | -- | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ileptageniidae | - | - | - | - | - | -- | - | 8 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Odonata | - | - | -- | -- | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Plecoptera | -- | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Memiptera: Corixidae | - | - | - | -- | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hebridae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coleoptera:Haliplidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | _ | _ | _ | - | - | - |
| Dytiscidae | - | - | - | - | _ | _ | 3 | - | _ | - | _ | _ | - | - |
| Gyrinidae | -- | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hyçrophilidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Elmidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trichoptera:Hydroptilidae | - | - | _ | - | - | - | 12 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | _ | - | _ | - |
| Diptera:Culicidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | _ | _ | - | - |
| Chironomidae | 12 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 14 | 78 | 60 | 32 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| cimuliidae | 60 | 84 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 31 | 196 | 54 | 43 | 10 | 5 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 10 | - | - | - | - |
| Total aquatic insects | 74 | 86 | 26 | 26 | 19 | 45 | 342 | 138 | 83 | 20 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Oligochaeta | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| ITirundinea | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amphipoda | - | -- | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Acari | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 6 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Total other arruatic invertebrates | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - |
| Fish | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | - |

* 1 hour sets

Table XVI
Terrestrial arthropods caught in 30 min . drift net set in Youngs Creek, PFES, 31 May to 6 June, 1976.

| Number of days before or after treatment | Inmediately * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -2 | -1 | -1 | -0 | -0 | Before | After | +1 | +1 | +2 | +2 | +3 | +3 | +4 |
|  | Pn | am | pm | am | pm |  |  | am | pm | am | pm | am | pm | am |
| Thysanoptera | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hemiptera:Nabidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tingidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lygaeidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coriscidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| Homoptera:Cicadellidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Delphacidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Aphididae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fulgoroidea | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coleoptera:Cicindelidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Carabidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Staphylinidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 1 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Elateridae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Curculionidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Trichoptera (adults) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lepidoptera (larvae) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | 7 | 5 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Diptera:Tipulidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Culicidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chironamidae | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | 125 | 19 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 4 | - | 3 |
| Simuliidae | 6 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Bibionidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | . | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | - | 71 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 3 | - |
| Hymenoptera: Braconidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ichneumonidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Formicidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Arachnida | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 6 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 325 | 39 | 30 | 26 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 3 |

* 1 hour sets.

Table XVII
Aquatic insects, other invertebrates and fish removed from a blocking seine set across Youngs Creek, PFES, 31 May to 6 June, 1976.

| Number of days before or | -2 | -1 | -1 | -0 | -0 | +1 | +1 | +2 | +2 | +3 | +3 | +4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| after treatment | pm | am | pm | am | pm | am | pm | arn | pm | am | pm | am |
| Collembola | - | - | - | - | - | 5872* | 28* | 6 | 8 | - | - | - |
| Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae | - | - | - | - | - | 23 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| :Heptageniidae | - | - | - | - | - | 638 | 3 | 331 | - | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| : Baetidae | - | - | - | 5 | - | 17 | 2 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Odenata:Aeshnidae | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| : Cordulegastridge | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :Libellulidae | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| : Agrionidae | - | - | - | - | - | 15* | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| :Coenagrionidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Hemiptera:Corixidae | - | - | - | - | - | 316* | 16 | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| : Notonectidae | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| : Nepidae | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| : Gerridae | - | - | - | - | 1 | 38 | 11 | 3 | - | - | - | - |
| :Hebridae | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 7* | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Coleoptera:Haliplidae | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :Dytiscidae (larvae) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 16* | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| : Dytiscidae (adults) | - | - | - | - | - | 258* | 58 | - | 3 | - | - | 1 |
| :Gyrinidae | - | - | - | - | - | 18 | 7 | 5 | 1 | - | - | - |
| :Hydrophilidae (larvae) | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 415* | 68 | 15 | 7 | - | 1 | - |
| :Hydrophilidae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (adults) | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| :Elmidae | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| : Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table XVII (Continued)

| Number of days before or after treatment | $\begin{aligned} & -2 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0 \\ & \text { am } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1 \\ & \text { am } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +2 \\ & \text { am } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +2 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +3 \\ & \text { am } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +3 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +4 \\ & \text { am } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trichoptera:larvae | - | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 244 * | 7 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| : pupae | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| Diptera:Tipulidae | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| :Chironomidae (larvae) | 16 | 28 | 13 | 61 | 44 | 328* | 14* | 54 | 4 | 40 | 7 | 57 |
| :Chironomidae (pupae) | - | - | - | - | - | 96 * | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :Simuliidae | 363 | 286 | 19 | 454 | 37 | 5 | - | 4 | 4 | 1 | - | 1 |
| : Unknown | 1 | - | - | - | 2 | - | 6* | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total aquatic insects | 381 | 317 | 36 | 521 | 87 | 8323* | 228* | 440 | 31 | 59 | 11 | 71 |
| Nematoda | - | 1 | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| Oligochaeta | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 2 |
| Hirudinea | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Acari | - | - | - | - | - | 192* | 24 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Gastropoda | 8 | 2 | 22 | 12 | - | 55 | 19 | 58 | 7 | 75 | 9 | 3 |
| Total other aquatic <br> invertebrates | 8 | 5 | 23 | 14 | - | 249* | 43 | 61 | 7 | 76 | 10 | 7 |
| Fish | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 5 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 19 | 2 | 16 |

* Includes numbers extrapolated from subsamples.

Table XVIII

Terrestrial arthropods removed from a blocking seine set across Youngs Creek, PFES, 31 May to 6 June, 1976.

| Number of days before or after treatment | $\begin{aligned} & -2 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & a m \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0 \\ & \mathrm{am} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1 \\ & a m \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +1 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +2 \\ & a m \end{aligned}$ | $+2$ <br> pm | $\begin{aligned} & +3 \\ & \text { am } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +3 \\ & \mathrm{pm} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +4 \\ & a m \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ephemeroptera | - | - | 1 | - | - | 18 | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | - |
| odonata | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Plecoptera | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thysanoptera | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hemiptera | - | - | - | - | - | 102* | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Homoptera:Fulgoroidea | - | - | - | - | - | 1124* | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| : Aphidoidea | - | - | - | - | - | 397* | 2 | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| : Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | 21 | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| Coleoptera:Staphylinidae | - | - | - | - | 1 | 131* | 17 | 4 | 4 | - | - | - |
| : Elateridae | - | - | 1 | - | - | 105* | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | - |
| : Coccinellidae | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | 17 | 31 | 5 | - | 2 | - | - |
| : Chrysomelidae | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |
| : Curculionidae | - | - | - | - | - | 97* | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| : Unknown | 2 | 5 | 2 | - | - | 389* | 76 | 20 | 13 | 2 | - | 1 |
| Trichoptera | 2 | - | - | - | - | 449* | 54 | 27 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Lepidoptera (larvae) | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1023* | 106* | 2 | 33 | 1 | 3 | - |
| (adults) | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Diptera:Tipulidae | - | - | - | $\bar{\square}$ | $\bar{\square}$ | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - |
| : Chironomidae + Culicidae | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 12789* | 196* | 129 | 97 | 11 | - | 1 |
| :Simuliidae | - | - | - | - | 1 | 42 | 362* | 12 | 70 | - | 3 | 2 |
| : Unknown | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 456* | 54 | 61 | 3 | 9 | 2 |
| Hymenoptera:Formicidae | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 96 | 16 | 2 | 35 | - | 14 | - |
| : Unknown | 3 | - | 1 | - | - | 1561* | 79* | 5 | 19 | 1 | - | 2 |
| Unknown Insecta | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | - | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | - |
| Arachnida | - | - | - | - | - | 651* | 29* | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Totals | 10 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 18980* | 1459 * | 287 | $350^{\circ}$ | 30 | 37 | 10 |

* Includes numbers extrapolated from subsamples.

Table XIX
Mean numbers and standard deviations of benthic invertebrates collected in Surber samples from Station l, Youngs Creek, PFES, 27 May to 7 July, 1976.

| Date | May | 27 | (-6) | June | 6 | $(+4)$ | June | 16 | $(+14)$ | July | 7 | $(+35)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of samples |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Ephemeroptera:Heptagenidae | 1. | $\pm$ | 1.0 | 1.2 | $\pm$ | 1.0 | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 0.6 | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  |
| : Baetidae |  | - |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| Odonata:Libellulidae |  | - |  |  | - |  | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  | - |  |  |
| : Cordulagastridae |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  |
| Plecoptera: Unknown |  | - |  | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  | - |  |  | - |  | 1 |
| Coleoptera:Haliplidae | 0. | $\pm$ | 0.6 |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| :Elmidae |  | - |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  | - |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | $\checkmark$ |
| Diptera:Chironomidae | 1. | $\pm$ | 0.0 | 4.5 | $\pm$ | 2.1 | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 1.0 | 8.8 | $\pm$ | 4.3 | 1 |
| : Simuliidae |  | - |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| : Tabanidae | 0. | $\pm$ | 0.6 | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| Nematoda | 0. | $\pm$ | 0.6 | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| Oligochaeta | 1. | $\pm$ | 1.7 | 2.2 | $\pm$ | 2.1 | 9.8 | $\pm$ | 2.6 | 7.5 | $\pm$ | 11.8 |  |
| Hirudinea | 1. | $\pm$ | 2.3 | 1.2 | $\pm$ | 1.5 | 0.8 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | 0.8 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  |
| Amphipoda |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  | 0.8 | $\pm$ | 1.5 |  |
| Decapoda |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  | 0.8 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  |
| Gastropoda | 0.3 | $\pm$ | 0.6 |  | - |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total | 5. | $\pm$ | 4.6 | 11.0 | $\pm$ | 6.3 | 12.0 | $\pm$ | 1.6 | 19.8 | $\pm$ | 15.6 |  |

Table XX
Mean numbers and standard deviations of benthic invertebrates collected in surber samples from Station 2, Youngs Creek, PFES, 30 May to 7 July, 1976.
Date
Number of samples
Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae
:Heptagenidae
: Baetidae
Odonata: Gomphidae
:Aeshnidae
:Cordulegastridae
:Libellulidae
Trichoptera:Unknown
Coleoptera:Elmidae
Diptera:Tipulidae
:Chironomidae
:Heleidae
:Simuliidae
:Tabanidae


## Table XXI

Mean numbers and standard deviations of benthic invertebrates collected in Surber samples from Maunsell Creek, PFES, 1 June to 7 July, 1976.

| Date | Jun | 1 | Jun |  | 6 | Jul | y 16 | $\mathrm{Jul}_{4} 7$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of samples |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ephemeroptera:Baetidae |  |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | 0.2 | $\pm 0.5$ |  | - |  |  |
| Odonata:Cordulegastridae |  |  |  | - |  | 0.2 | $\pm 0.5$ |  | - |  |  |
| :Libellulidae | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | 0.2 | $\pm 0.5$ | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 0.6 | 1 |
| Coleoptera:Gyrinnidae | 0.3 | 0.6 |  | - |  |  | - | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | u |
| Diptera:Chironomidae | 12.7 | 19.4 | 5.8 | $\pm$ | 3.3 | 2.8 | $\pm 1.5$ | 27.8 | $\pm$ | 22.2 |  |
| :Heleidae | 0.3 | 0.6 |  | - |  | 0.2 | $\pm 0.5$ | 0.8 | $\pm$ | 1.0 | 1 |
| :Simuliidae | 0.3 | 0.6 |  | - |  |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Nematoda | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  | - |  | - |  |  |
| Oligochaeta | 7.3 | 2.3 | 17.5 | $\pm$ | 24.9 | 13.5 | $\pm 10.9$ | 28.2 | $\pm$ | 29.8 |  |
| Hirudinea | 0.7 | 1.2 |  | - |  |  | - | 1.2 | $\pm$ | 1.5 |  |
| Amphipoda |  |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | 1.0 | $\pm 2.0$ | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 |  |
| Gastropoda |  |  | 0.2 | $\pm$ | 0.5 | 2.0 | $\pm 3.4$ | 2.8 | $\pm$ | 5.5 |  |
| Pelcypoda:Sphaeridae | 0.7 | 1.2 |  | - |  | 0.8 | $\pm 0.5$ | 0.5 | $\pm$ | 1.0 |  |
| Total | 23.3 | 18.8 | 24.5 | $\pm$ | 15.5 | 21.0 | $\pm 9.5$ | 62.2 | $\pm$ | 46.4 |  |



Fig. 16. Aquatic insect populations (mean number per Surber sample) from the two NPDC-143 treated and control station, PFES.

Lac Tassel-Quebec-140 g AI/ha: Lac Tassel was treated from 0600 to 0612 hours on 31 May in an east-west direction beginning at the south shore and progressing north (Fig. 17). Portable weather equipment showed zero wind velocity at the time of treatment with the temperature at $10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and relative humidity was $90 \%$. These conditions and the probable presence of a strong temperature inversion immediately over the lake at the time of spraying resulted in an extremely high recovery of emitted spray on the deposit samplers on the lake's surface (Table XXII). The very dense deposit of spray droplets on the Kramekote cards made it impossible to accurately assess the volume deposited by the spot counting method because of the large numbers of overlapping droplets.

At the time of treatment Lac Tassel showed a moderate degree of temperature stratification with a fairly distinct thermocline lying between two and three metres (Fig. 18). The top two metres of the lake's surface contimued to warm rapidly through to mid-June with the themocline continuing to lie between two and three metres and becaming more distinct. Water chemistry parameters during this period remained quite stable (Table XXIII) and continued to be so until late August when same depletion of oxygen in the lake's bottam waters became noticeable.

Some fish mortality (Table XXIV) and heavy aquatic and terrestrial arthropod mortality (Table XXV) were observed following treatment of Lac Tassel. Shortly after the lake was treated large numbers of knocked down terrestrial insects were present on the surface. Most dead insects disappeared from the surface by the next day and some were found on the bottom along the shoreline between six hours and two days after treatment. By six hours after treatment large numbers of aquatic insects and amphipods were found distressed on the bottom. Dragonfly, damselfly and non-burrowing mayfly nymphs were overturned


Fig. 17. CCRI's Cessna 185 treating Lac Tassel, Nuebec, with NPDC-143.

## Table XXII

Deposit of the formulation of NRDC-143 (29.9 g AI/l) applied at 4.68 l/ha to Lac Tassel, Quebec.

| Deposit sampler | Averaqe deposit in two pans <br> $(\ell / \mathrm{ha})$ | o deposited <br> S1 (south side of lake) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| S2 | 3.10 | 66.3 |
| S3 | 5.76 | 123.2 |
| S4 | 5.31 | 113.5 |
| S5 | 6.04 | 129.1 |
| N5 | 4.50 | 96.1 |
| N4 | 4.86 | 103.3 |
| N3 | 4.98 | 106.6 |
| N2 | 2.76 | 59.1 |
| N1 (north side of lake) | 2.20 | 47.1 |
| A11 samplers | 3.50 | 74.7 |

onto their backs and showing weak respiratory movements while burrowing mayfly nymphs, caddisfly larvae and amphipods were either prostrate or writhering on the bottam. Water mites exhibited apparently normal behavior. Large masses of dead Chaoborus larvae and pupae were found along the shoreline the day after treatment. Most of the affected aquatic insects and amphipods had died by the first or second day after treatment although distressed burrowing mayfly nymphs were still found three days post-spray. Fungal growth was apparent on the dead insects by this time and all but the largest dragonfly nymphs had disappeared at the end of a week.

Affected native fish were first seen distressed on the surface about twelve hours after treatment. After the first day post-treatment no more distressed fish were seen but numerous dead fish were found either on the bottom or along the shoreline. Throughout the entire treatment period observations were made of large numbers of apparently unaffected fish of all species present in the lake. No noticeable effect was seen on the large shoals of suckers, perch, fallfish and bass repeatedly observed near submerged beaver food piles. Normal overall dace and darter activity was seen at the same time dead and distressed individuals were being found. White suckers were observed spawning in the shallow mouth of the outlet stream the day after treatment of the lake. Tadpole and spotted newt populations also appeared normal after treatment.

Among the caged fish held in the lake two brook trout in the shoreline cage showed signs of distress twelve hours after treatment of the lake and had died by the next morning. One white sucker was found dead in the shoreline cage a week after treatment but the rest of the brook trout and suckers held in the lake remained healthy until released eighteen days after treatment. The two yellow perch held at 6 metres died the day
after treatment but may have been affected more by handling and temperature change than by exposure to the insecticide.

Minnow trap catches in Lac Tassel consisted mainly of Johnny darters, Iowa darters and Northern redbelly dace, with a few small bass, perch and suckers being caught as well. Many potted newts and tadpoles were also caught in the minnow traps. Minnow trap catches were generally small in Lac Tassel (Table XXVI), particularly following treatment of the lake when only five fish were caught in the first four days after spray compared to fourteen fish the four days before treatment. Trap net catches showed no decline following treatment with large numbers of white suckers being caught throughout the period the net was set.

Plankton samples from along the shoreline (Table XXVII) and near the centre (Table XXVIII) of Lac Tassel indicate a dramatic and relatively long lasting effect of NRDC-143 on zooplankton populations. Cladoceran populations in both locations dropped off immediately after treatment with no cladocerans at all present in samples taken after one week. Cladoceran populations remained at extremely low levels up until mid-July along the shoreline and until August near the centre of the lake. Copepod populations showed less dramatic, more gradual declines in numbers following treatment with populations remaining quite depressed up until August.

Bottom fauna populations in Lac Tassel are given in Table XXIX and presented graphically in Fig. 19. Aquatic insect populations showed a gradual decline following treatment with the numbers of burrowing mayfly nymphs, dragonfly nymphs, and chironomid larvae steadily dropping to very low levels by mid-July. Caddisfly larvae disappeared completely from bottom samples shortly after treatment while numbers of aquatic coleoptera larvae remained at or above pre-spray levels throughout the summer. Oligochaete,
snail and fingernail clam populations increased until mid-June when they declined again. Amphipods and isopods disappeared from bottam samples right after treatment. In late summer populations of almost all benthic invertebrates were very low and showed no signs of increasing.

Analysis of large numbers of white sucker stamachs over the study period revealed changes in diet related to the effects of NRDC-143 on populations of fish food organisms within Lac Tassel (Appendix, Table VII). Pre-spray samples showed that in mid-May suckers were feeding almost exclusively on cladocerans which made up a mean of $78.4 \%$ of the volume of each stomach. Immediately before treatment they showed a more varied diet consisting primarily of Chaoborus larvae (35.0\%), cladocerans (23.1\%) and chironomid larvae ( $15.8 \%$ ) . Following treatment suckers were found to have fed extensively on affected aquatic insects: primarily burrowing mayfly nymphs, alderfly larvae (Megaloptera:Sialidae), caddisfly larvae, Chaoborus pupae and heptagenid mayfly nymphs. As plankton and most aquatic insect populations fell to low levels in mid-June suckers began feeding on chironomid larvae (63.2\%) and snails (12.1\%) . Chironomid larvae and molluscs (snails and fingernail clams) remained prominent in sucker stomachs throughout the remainder of the summer but as plankton populations recovered suckers began to feed heavily on copepods and later on cladocerans. Chaoborus larvae and pupae totally disappeared from sucker stomachs from mid-June on. Smallmouth bass stamach contents reflected even greater changes due to effects of the treatment on fish food organisms (Appendix, Table VIII). Extreme gorging on dragonfly nymphs occurred after treatment of the lake followed by an almost total disappearance of aquatic insects from bass stamachs. By mid-June bass were feeding almost exclusively on terrestrial and flying insects with a small amount of feeding on minnows including one case of predation on bass fry.

Late in the summer the small amounts of food present in bass stamachs consisted primarily of cladocerans, terrestrial insects and minnows. Yellow perch in Lac Tassel fed primarily on Chaoborus larvae and pupae prior to treatment of the lake (Appendix, Table IX). Following treatment, extensive feeding on affected burrowing mayfly nymphs was evident. Shortly after treatment the mean volumes of food present in yellow perch stomachs fell to very low levels with the majority of the fish caught having empty stamachs. Chaoborus completely disappeared from yellow perch stamachs from mid-June on. Fallfish stamachs were only sampled on one occasion in late August when analysis of eleven stamachs showed they were feeding primarily on terrestrial insects (63.3\%), snails (17.8\%), minnows (11.1\%) and cladocerans (5.6\%).

Smallmouth bass in Lac Tassel first began spawning two days before treatment of the lake and by the time the lake was treated eighteen bass nests containing eggs had been located (Figs. 20 and 21, Table XXX ). In the first four days following treatment of the lake guarding males disappeared from ten nests containing eggs and four nests without eggs while eggs were laid in twelve nests which previously had no eggs in them (Table XXXI). Of the forty-seven active nests located, forty-three produced eggs and fry were hatched from twenty of these. Three weeks after the treatment date bass nesting had been completed and large numbers of free swimming bass fry were observed along portions of the shoreline (Fig. 22). Underwater observations in July and August found small numbers of the fry present. During these surveys in mid and late summer an almost complete lack of aquatic insects along the shoreline was evident. A few larval and adult aquatic beetles were found as well as abundant numbers of freshwater sponges, bryozoans, flatworms, water mites, snails and clams.

Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$


Fig. 18. Temperature profiles in Lac Tassel, Quebec, 1976

Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$


Fig. 18 (Continued)

Table XXIII
Water chemistry parameters in Lac Tassel, Quebec, 1976.

| Date | Depth | Temperature ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | Dissolved oxygen (ppm) | pH | Alkalinity <br> (gpg $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ )* | Hardness <br> (gpg CaCO ${ }_{3}$;* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May 17 | Surface | 13.5 | 10 | 6.7 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 9 m | 8.0 | 10 | 6.7 | 1 | 2 |
| June 4 | Surface | 19.0 | 10 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 8 m | 8.0 | 9 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
| June 7 | Surface | 23.5 | 9 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 8m | 8.0 | 10 | 6.0 | 1 | 2 |
| June 16 | Surface | 21.5 | 8 | 6.6 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 9 m | 8.0 | 7 | 6.0 | 1 | 2 |
| July 15 | Surface | 21.5 | 8 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 8 m | 8.2 | 7 | 6.0 | 1 | 2 |
| Aug. 25 | Surface | 23.0 | 9 | 7.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 4 m | 18.0 | 9 | 6.5 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 8 m | 8.5 | 4 | 6.0 | 1 | 2 |

* grains per gallon calcium carbonate.

Table XXIV
Dead and distressed native fish found in Lac Tassel, Quebec following aerial treatment with NRDC-143.

| +12 hours |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| +1 day | ```One brown bullhead (122 mm, gorged with insects) - Distressed on bottom One northern redbelly dace (69 mm) One Johnny darter (49 mm)``` |
|  | Found dead |
| +1 day | Three smallmouth bass (190 mm and 69 mm , both large males gorged with insects). <br> One white sucker ( 230 mm , not gorged with insects). <br> Three yellow perch ( $181 \mathrm{~mm}, 91 \mathrm{~mm}$, and 52 mm ). <br> Two northern redbelly dace ( 69 mm and 50 mm ). <br> One common shiner ( 81 mm ). |
| +2 day | Four smallmouth bass ( $187 \mathrm{~mm}, 184 \mathrm{~mm}, 71 \mathrm{~mm}$ and 70 mm ). Three yellowperch ( $95 \mathrm{~mm}, 81 \mathrm{~mm}$, and 81 mm ). <br> Four northern redbelly dace (mean length 60 mm ). <br> One common shiner ( 135 mm ). <br> One Johnny darter ( 46 mm ). |
| +3 day | Two smallmouth bass ( 340 mm and 192 mm ). Two northern redbelly dace ( 72 mm and 69 mm ). |
| +7 day | Seven minnows seen dead on bottom ( $\sim 4 \mathrm{~m}$ ) in the course of scuba diving observations. |
| +9 day | One yearling smallmouth bass and two minnows seen dead along shoreline during bass nesting surveys. |

## Table XXV

Dead aquatic and terrestrial arthropods found in Lac Tassel, Quebec following aerial treatment with NRDC-143.

Terrestrial "knockdown" - very extensive over entire surface of lake shortly after treatment.
~ 90\% Dipterans (primarily midges and blackflies) Also numerous terrestrial beetles, spiders, hymenopterans, caddisflies and mayflies.

Aquatic "knock up" - very extensive, noticeable effect by six hours after treatment.

Chaoborus (Diptera:Culicidae) - masses of thousands of dead larvae and pupae (about 95\% larvae) found along windward shorelines.

Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata:Anisoptera) - Libellulidae- Didymops sp.very large numbers dead on bottam along shoreline. -Aeshnidae-Aeshna sp.- small numbers dead an bottom -Gomphidae-Gomphus sp.-small numbers dead on bottom.

Mayfly nymphs (Fphemeroptera) - Heptagenidae - Stenonema sp.? extremely large numbers dead on bottam along shoreline. -Ephemeridae (burrowing mayfly nymphs) - Hexagenia sp. very large numbers dead on bottom along shoreline. -Baetidae - Leptophlebia sp. - fairly small numbers dead on bottom.

- Ephemerella sp. - small numbers dead on bottom.

Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) - various families - moderately large numbers of larvae and a few pupae representing a number of species dead on bottom.

Arphipods (Amphipoda:Gammaridae) - Crangonyx sp.? - moderately large numbers dead on bottorn.

Damselfly nymphs (Odonata:Zygoptera) - Coenagrionidae-Enallagma sp. ? - a few dead on bottam.

Aquatic lepidoptera larva (Lepidoptera:Pyralidae) - one individual found dead on bottom.

Giant water bug (Hemiptera:Belestomatidae) - Lethocemus americanus (Ieidy) - one very large individual found dead on surface along shoreline.

Table XXVI

Daily minnow trap and trap net catches in Lac Tassel, Quebec, before and after treatment with NRDC-143.

| Number of days before or after treatment | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | -0* | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 | +7 | +8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minnow traps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Darters | 16 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Cyrinids | - | - | - | 2 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Smallmouth bass | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| White suckers | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Perch | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| Newts | 1 | - | 2 | 3 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 | - |
| Tadpoles | 4 | 6 | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | - | 1 | - |
| Trap net |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White suckers | Net | 60 | 79 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 97 | 82 | 43 |  | Net |
| Brown bullheads | not | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | - |  | not |
| Perch | set | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | set |
| Smallmouth bass |  | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |  |  |

* Traps emptied before lake was treated.

Table XXVII
Plankton catches from the surface at the shoreline of Lac Tassel, Quebec, 17 May to 25 August, 1976.


Table XXVIII
Total plankton catch from surface, 4 m and 8 m samples taken from near the centre of Lac Tassel, Quebec, 17 May to 25 August, 1976.

|  | May 17 (-14) | May 31 (0) | June $4(+4)$ | June | $7(+7)$ | June | 16 | (+16) July | 15 | $(+45)$ | Aug. 25 | $(+86)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bosmina | 1 | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1 |  |
| Daphnia | 96 | 87 | 2 |  | - |  | 1 |  | - |  | - |  |
| Diaphanosoma | 1 | - | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 100 |  |
| Holopedium | 106 | 317 | 3 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 3 |  |
| Polyphemus | - | 3 | -. |  | - |  | - |  | 3 |  | - |  |
| Immature | 23 | 4 | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1 |  |
| Unknown | - | 1 | 1 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 1 |  |
| Total cladocerans | 227 | 412 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 3 |  | 106 |  |
| Calanoid copepods | 169 | 177 | 19 |  | 14 |  | - |  | 34 |  | 291 |  |
| Cyclopoid copepods | 126 | 37 | 24 |  | 22 |  | 5 |  | 17 |  | 226 |  |
| Copepodids | 1 | 1 | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | 15 |  |
| Nauplii | 230 | 159 | 187 |  | 15 |  | 7 |  | 23 |  | 85 |  |
| Unknown | 1 | - | - |  | 1 |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Total copepods | 527 | 374 | 230 |  | 52 |  | 12 |  | 74 |  | 617 |  |

Table XXIX
Mean numbers and standard deviations of benthic organisms collected in Ekman grab samples from Lac Tassel, Quebec, 17 May to 26 August, 1976.

|  | May 17 (-14) | June $4(+4)$ | June $8(+8)$ | June $17(+17)$ | July 15 (+45) | Aug. 26 (+86) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean depth ( $m$ ) | 2.05 | 2.25 | 2.00 | 1.78 | 2.05 | 1.95 |
| Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae | $1.5 \pm 1.8$ | $1.3 \pm 2.5$ | $0.7 \pm 1.5$ | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - |
| Odonata: Gomphidae | $0.2 \pm 0.4$ | - | - | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - |
| :Tibellulidae | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ |
| :Coenagrionidae | - | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - | - | - |
| Iepidoptera:Pyralidae | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trichoptera:Unknown | $1.1 \pm 1.7$ | $0.5 \pm 0.7$ | - | - | - | - |
| Coleoptera:Elmidae | $0.3 \pm 0.7$ | $1.1 \pm 2.2$ | $1.9 \pm 4.3$ | $0.3 \pm 0.5$ | $0.5 \pm 1.1$ | $0.7 \pm 1.3$ |
| Diptera:Chirancmidae | $18.1 \pm 6.8$ | $13.3 \pm 8.0$ | $14.2 \pm 12.2$ | $7.0 \pm 6.0$ | $1.0 \pm 0.8$ | $1.4 \pm 1.4$ |
| :Heleidae | $0.9 \pm 1.1$ | $0.2 \pm 0.6$ | $0.8 \pm 1.3$ | $0.2 \pm 0.4$ | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ |
| :Simuliidae | $0.2 \pm 0.6$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| :Tipulidae | - | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - | - | - |
| :Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ |
| Turbellaria | - | - | - | $0.2 \pm 0.4$ | - | $0.3 \pm 0.7$ |
| Oligochaeta | $0.7 \pm 1.5$ | $1.2 \pm 1.9$ | $0.5 \pm 0.5$ | $3.6 \pm 2.9$ | $1.9 \pm 2.2$ | $2.3 \pm 1.4$ |
| Amphipoda | $0.6 \pm 0.8$ | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | , | - | - | . |
| Isopoda | $0.1 \pm 0.3$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gastropoda | $0.4 \pm 0.7$ | $0.4 \pm 0.7$ | $2.2 \pm 2.6$ | $3.7 \pm 4.6$ | $0.5 \pm 1.1$ | $0.5 \pm 0.9$ |
| Pelecypoda:Sphaeridae | $0.2 \pm 0.4$ | $1.4 \pm 2.2$ | $1.3 \pm 2.8$ | $2.8 \pm 2.6$ | - | - |
| Total | $24.5 \pm 6.9$ | $19.8 \pm 12.7$ | $21.7 \pm 14.9$ | $18.0 \pm 8.3$ | $4.0 \pm 3.0$ | $5.5 \pm 3.7$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |



Fig. 19. Bottam fauna populations in Lac Tassel, Quebec, 1976.


Fig. 20. Male smallmouth bass guarding his nest, Lac Tassel, Quebec.


Table XXX
Condition of forty-seven marked bass nests in Lac Tasse1, Quebec, from 30 May to 17 June, 1976.

| Number of days before or after treatment | Number of nests with : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ```No male, eggs or fry``` | Male <br> but no eggs <br> or fry | Male <br> with <br> eggs | No male or eggs on nest which previously had male | Eggs only on nest which previously had male and eggs | Male <br> with <br> fry | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Male only } \\ & \text { on nest } \\ & \text { which } \\ & \text { previously } \\ & \text { had male } \\ & \text { and fry } \end{aligned}$ | Fry on1y on nest which previously had male and fry | No male or fry on nest which previously had male and fry |
| -1 | 22 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $+\frac{1}{2}$ | 16 | 1 | 25 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $+1$ | 14 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| +2 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| +3 | 13 | 0 | 20 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| +9 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 19 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| +17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 8 |

## Table XXXI

Numbers of bass nests in Lac Tassel on which spawning activity was terminated or initiated following treatment with NRDC-143.

| Number of days <br> after treatment | Male disappearing <br> from nest without <br> eggs | Male disappearing <br> from nest with <br> eggs | Eggs being laid in <br> nest previously <br> occupied by a male | Eggs being laid in <br> previously unoccupied <br> nest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $+\frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |



Fig. 22. Smallmouth bass fry swimming in front of a bryozoan covered stick in Lac Tassel three weeks after the NRDC-143 treatment.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Thomas Lake, PFES: The measured deposit on Thomas Lake of between 15.6 and $23.4 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NRDC}-143 / \mathrm{ha}$ of the $35 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$ emitted can be considered representative of a high level of contamination likely to occur only occasionally in aquatic systems in areas treated with this dosage of NRDC-143 under operational conditions. The effects of this deposit on the fauna of Thomas Lake were moderate and short-lived. Mortality occurred among caged fish held right at the surface of the lake with rapidly diminishing effects on fish held progressively deeper. Native fish suffered essentially no mortality but a short lasting drop in minnow trap catches may indicate a slight behavioral effect. There were indications of a delayed effect on zooplankton, particularly cladocerans, but recovery appeared to be rapid and complete. Same mortality occurred among surface breathing aquatic coleoptera and hemiptera. An immediate and substantial impact occurred on bottom fauna due to the lake's shallow nature. The effect on Chaobomus larvae populations was partial and recovery was evident and well advanced within six weeks of treatment. A smaller but apparently longer lasting effect occurred on chironomid larvae populations. No effect on emerging insects was apparent, reflecting the generally greater resistance of pupal stages of insects to insecticides than shown by larval stages.

Following treatment of the lake, white suckers and to a lesser extent brown bullheads gorged themselves on Chaoborus larvae. Very heavy feeding of white suckers on Chaoborns larvae also occurred in the control lake at this time but did not result in the kind of large increases in mean volume of stamach contents seen in fish from the treatment lake. Chaobomus larvae contimed to contribute significantly
to fish stomach contents throughout June and into July in Thomas Lake indicating that they remained available as important fish food items despite the adverse effects of treatment on their populations. Similarly, chironomid larvae continued to be available to fish in fairly large numbers after treatment. This indicates that the effects of the treatment on fish food organisms were not severe enough to seriously deprive the lake's fish populations of food organisms. The presence of larger aquatic insects in fish stomachs immediately after treatment suggests they were affected by the treatment and made susceptible to predation because of lethal or sublethal effects of it.

Youngs Creek, PFES: The measured deposit of $13.5 \mathrm{~g} /$ ha of NRDC-143 on Youngs Creek represents light contamination of an aquatic system treated at the dosage of $70 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{AI} / \mathrm{ha}$, and cannot be considered representative of the greatest impact likely to occur in streams treated operationally at this dosage. It had minimal effects on caged or native fish in Youngs Creek but caused dramatic, short-lived increases in the drift of aquatic insects, particularly springtails, heptagenid mayfly nymphs, some larval and adult aquatic beetles, waterboatmen and chironomid larvae. Bottam fauna samples showed that despite this increased drift, aquatic insect populations did not decrease significantly when compared to population changes in the control creek. Knockdown of terrestrial insects and spiders into the creek was very heavy and lasted up to two days despite the small area actually treated with NRDC-143. Heavy and relatively long lasting impact was particularly noticeable of flies, beetles, wasps, caterpillars, caddisflies and spiders.

Lac Tassel, Quebec: The measured deposit of $128.6 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NRDC}-143 / \mathrm{ha}$ on Lac Tassel represents a level of contamination unlikely to occur under operational conditions except at extreme dosage rates or in the event of accidental multiple swathing. It resulted in heavy impact on aquatic organisms. Within hours of treatment extremely heavy mortality of shallow dwelling aquatic insects and amphipods occurred. Substantial numbers of individual fish representing most of the species present in the lake were killed by the treatment, however overall mortality was not significant in terms of total fish populations and the majority of native and caged fish did not appear to be directly affected by toxic effects of the spray. Zooplankton populations were severely reduced after treatment with copepods sanewhat less affected and recovering faster than cladocerans. Substantial recovery of the total zooplankton community was not evident until three months after treatment. Bottam fauna populations sampled from depths between 1 and 3 meters decreased relatively slowly after treatment and were not severely depleted until July. This suggests that they were affected primarily by the overall ecological disruption within the lake rather than by mortality related to direct toxic effects. The severe effects on aquatic invertebrate populations resulted in dramatic changes in the volume and composition of food found in fish stamachs. In particular, the severe effects on plankton and larger aquatic insects eliminated these food items from the available prey of fish over most or all of the summer. Suckers utilized available chironamid larvae and molluscs for food in the absence of other items while smallmouth bass fed primarily on available terrestrial insects and to a small extent on minnows. It is not yet clear what
effects these changes in diet could have on fish growth but attempts to evaluate this will be made after the completion of the growing season. Overall smallmouth bass reproduction in the lake was not noticeably affected by the treatment but the question remains as to the survival and growth of the 1976 year class of bass because of effects on its food supply, particularly the zooplankton on which the newly hatched fry feed.

In summary, it is concluded that heavy deposits of NRDC-143 applied at $140 \mathrm{gm} /$ hectare ( 2 oz ./acre) present a substantial hazard to aquatic envirorments in terms of potential effects on zooplankton, aquatic insects, fish and the ecological relationships between these and other components of aquatic systems. The effects of application rates of $70 \mathrm{gm} /$ hectare or less do not appear at first appraisal to be overly hazardous to the integrity of aquatic systems, but require further evaluation before they can be fairly compared to the environmental hazards posed by chemical insecticides currently in use.
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## APPENDIX

Stomach contents of native fish from
lakes treated with MRDC-143 and an untreated control lake.

Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stamach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in white sucker stomachs from Thomas Lake, PFES, 11 May to 6 July, 1976.

| Date | May 11 (-14) | May 29 (+4) | June $6(+12)$ | July 6 (+41) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 20 | 20 | 20 | 6 |
| Mean total length (mm) | 262.4 | 280.1 | 273.0 | 294.3 |
| Mean fork length | 244.0 | 262.6 | 254.6 | 278.3 |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | 208.9 | 260.0 | 230.9 | 299.3 |
| Sex ratio (males:females) | 4:16 | 3:17 | 8:12 | 1:5 |
| Mean volume food present/stamach (ml) | 0.80 | 2.77 | 0.83 | 0.50 |

Percent occurance of food items:

| Empty stomachs | 10 | - | 5 | - |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) | - | 5 | - |  |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | 30 | 95 | 70 |  |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 75 | 15 | 80 | 67 |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 70 | - | 10 | 83 |
| Copepods (Copepoda) | 45 | - | 35 | - |
| Culicoides larvae (Diptera:Heleidae) | 25 | 5 | 5 | - |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata) | - | 5 | - | - |
| Snails (Gastropoda) | 5 | - | - |  |



## Table II

Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stomach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in brown bullhead stomachs from Thomas Lake PFES, 11 May to 6 July, 1976.

Date
Number of fish sampled
Mean total length ( mm )
Mean fork length (mm)
Mean preserved weight ( g )
Sex ratio (males:females)
Mean volume food present/stanach (ml)

Percent occurance of food items:

| Empty stomachs | 64 | 5 | 14 | 25 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aquatic beetles (Coleoptera) | - | 5 | - | - |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | 27 | 85 | 28 | 50 |
| Chadorus pupae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | 35 | - | 62 |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 36 | 55 | 57 | 38 |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 18 | 10 | 14 | - |
| Copepods (Copepoda) | 9 | - | - | - |
| Culicoides larvae (Diptera:Heleidae) | - | 15 | 14 | 12 |
| Dobsonfly larvae (Megaloptera:Corydalidae) | - | - | - |  |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata) | - | - | - |  |
| Flying insects | - | - | 25 |  |
| Minnow remains | 9 | - | 43 | 38 |
| Terrestrial beetles (Coleoptera) | - | 5 | - | 38 |


| Date | May 11 (-14) | May 29 (+4) | June 6 (+12) | July 6 (+41) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average percent volume contributed by: |  |  |  |  |
| Aquatic beetles | - | 0.3 | - | - |
| Chaoborus larvae | 27.5 | 67.9 | 4.2 | 12.5 |
| Chaoborus pupae | - | 1.6 | - | 9.6 |
| Chironomid larvae | 35.0 | 7.6 | 46.7 | 3.8 |
| Chiranamid pupae | 12.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 | - |
| Copepods | 1.2 | - | - | - |
| Culicoides larve | - | 0.6 | <0.1 | 6.7 |
| Dobsonfly larvae | - | 0.3 | - | - |
| Dragonfly nymph | - | 0.5 | - | - |
| Flying insects | - | - | - | 21.7 |
| Minnow remains | 23.8 | 20.5 | 48.3 | 35.0 |
| Terrestrial beetles | - | 0.5 | - | 10.8 |
| Average number/stomach present in: |  |  |  |  |
| Aquatic beetles | - | 1 | - | - |
| Chaoborus larvae | 14 | approx. 300 | 9 | 7 |
| Chaoborus pupae | - | 3 | - | 2 |
| Chironomid larvae | 3 | $1 \frac{1}{1}$ | approx. 20 | 3 |
| Chironomid pupae | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Copepods | 1 | - | - | - |
| Culicoides larvae | - | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Dobsonfly larvae | - | 1 | - | - |
| Dragonfly nymphs | - | 1 | - | - |

Table II (Continued)

| Date | May 11 (-14) | May 29 (+4) | June 6 (+12) | July 6 (+41) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flying insects | - | - | - | 2 |
| Minnow remains | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Terrestrial beetles | - | 2 | - | 2 |

Table III
Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stomach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in white sucker stomachs from Youngs Lake, PFES, 12 May to 6 Julv, 1976

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 | July 6 . |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
| Mean total length (mm) | 252.5 | 271.2 | 273.9 | 241.1 |
| Mean fork length (mm) | 238.5 | 256.7 | 257.3 | 226.8 |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | 157.1 | 206.9 | 224.7 | 135.3 |
| Sex ratio (males:females) | $5: 5$ | $2: 8$ | $0: 10$ | $1: 9$ |
| Mean volume food present/stomach (ml) | 2.19 | 1.67 | 1.45 | 0.53 |


| Percent occurance of food items: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Empty stamachs | - | 10 | - | 22 |
| Amphipods (Amphipoda) | 20 | - | - | - |
| Borrowing mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae) | 10 | - | - | - |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) | 40 | 10 | - | - |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | 40 | 70 | 70 | 22 |
| Chaoborus pupae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | - | - | 11 |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 90 | 70 | 80 | 78 |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 60 | 20 | 10 | 44 |
| Cladocerans (Cladocera) | 10 | - | - | 33 |
| Copepods (Copepoda) | 10 | 10 | - | 11 |
| Culicoides larvae (Diptera:Heleidae) | 70 | 30 | 30 | 11 |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata) | 20 | 20 | - | 11 |
| Fingernail clams (Petecypoda:Sphaeridae) | 20 | 10 | - | 11 |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Baetidae) | - | 10 | - | - |
| Snails (Gastropoda) | - | - | 10 | - |

Table III (Continued)

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 | July 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average percent volume contributed by: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amphipods | 2.5 | - | - | - |  |
| Burrowing mayfly nymps | 4.5 | - | - | - |  |
| Caddisfly larvae | 10.5 | 1.1 | - | - |  |
| Chaoborus larvae | 14.0 | 57.8 | 64.0 | 6.4 | 1 |
| Chaoborus pupae | - | - | - | 5.0 | ¢ |
| Chironamid larvae | 45.9 | 26.7 | 31.5 | 35.7 |  |
| Chironomid pupae | 5.6 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 7.8 |  |
| Cladocerans | $<0.1$ | - | - | 24.3 |  |
| Copepods | $<0.1$ | 0.6 | - | 5.7 |  |
| Culicoides larvae | 5.0 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 4.3 |  |
| Dragonfly nymphs | 8.0 | 3.9 | - | 5.0 |  |
| Fingernail clams | 4.0 | 0.6 | - | 5.7 |  |
| Mayfly nymphs | - | 2.2 | - | - |  |
| Snails | - | - | 1.0 | - |  |


| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 | July 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average number/stomach present in: |  |  |  |  |
| Amphipods | 10 | - | - | - |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 1 | - | - | - |
| Caddisfly larvae | 6 | 1 | - | - |
| Chaoborus larvae | approx. 60 | approx. 300 | approx. 200 | 8 |
| Chaoborus pupae | - | - | - | 1 |
| Chironomid larvae | 38 | 18 | 39 | 4 |
| Chironomid pupae | 8 | $1{ }_{1}^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
| Cladocerans | approx. 10 | - | - | approx. 500 |
| Copepods | approx. 10 | approx. 100 | - | approx. 500 |
| Culicoides larvae | 6 | 5 | 12 | 2 |
| Dragonfly nymphs | 9 | 2 | - | 2 |
| Fingernail clams | 6 | 1 | - | 12 |
| Mayfly nymphs | - | 2 | - | - |
| Snails | - |  |  |  |

## Table IV

Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stomach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in brownbullhead stomachs from Youngs Lake, PFES, 12 May to 5 June, 1976

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Mean total length (mm) | 202.3 | 204.0 | 188.6 |
| Mean fork length (mm) | 198.6 | 200.8 | 186.1 |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | 101.8 | 106.5 | 87.7 |
| Sex ratio (males:females) | $8: 2$ | $4: 6$ | $8: 2$ |
| Mean volume food present/stomach (ml) | 1.33 | 0.72 | 0.11 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Percent occurance of food items: | 20 | 10 | -10 |
| Empty stamachs | - | - | - |
| Aquatic beetles (Coleoptera) | 10 | 30 | - |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae) | 20 | - |  |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | 10 | 10 |
| Chironamid larvae (Diptera:Chironamidae | 10 | 10 | - |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 20 | 40 | 10 |
| Crayfish (Decapoda) | 10 | 70 | 10 |
| Culicoides larvae (Diptera:Heleidae) | 10 | 10 | 10 |

Table IV (Continued)

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mayfly nymps (Ephemeroptera:Baetidae) | 10 | - | - |  |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Heptagenidae) | - | 10 | - |  |
| Minnow remains | 20 | 20 | - |  |
| Snails (Gastropoda) | 10 | - | - |  |
| Tabanid larvae (Diptera:Tabanidae) | 10 | 10 | - |  |
| Terrestrial beetles (Coleoptera | - | 10 | - |  |
| Unknown aquatic dipteran larvae (Diptera: ?) | - | - | 10 |  |
| Unknown terrestrial insects | - | 30 | - | 1 |
| Average percent volume contributed by: |  |  |  | 1 |
| Aquatic beetles | - | 3.3 | - |  |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 12.5 | - | - |  |
| Caddisfly larvae | 5.6 | 8.3 | - |  |
| Chaoborus larvae | - | 2.6 | - |  |
| Chironamid larvae | 2.5 | 2.8 | 5.0 |  |
| Chironomid pupae | 1.6 | 1.1 | 20.0 |  |
| Crayfish | 9.4 | 7.2 | - |  |
| Culicoides larvae | 0.2 | 2.1 | 1.2 |  |
| Dragonfly nymphs | 41.9 | 30.6 | 25.0 |  |
| Fingernail clams | - | 0.3 | 25.0 |  |
| Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae) | 0.6 | - | - |  |
| Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae) | - | 8.9 | - |  |
| Minnow remains | 23.8 | 15.6 | - |  |

Table IV (Continued)

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Snails | 0.6 | - | - |
| Tabanid larvae | 1.2 | 6.7 | - |
| Terrestrial beetles | - | 3.3 | - |
| Unknown dipteran larvae | - | - | 23.8 |
| Unknown terrestrial insects | - | 7.2 | - |
| Average number/stamach present in: |  |  |  |
| Aquatic beetles | - | 1 | - |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 1 | - | - |
| Caddisfly larvae | 1 | 1 | - |
| Chaoborus larvae | - | 1 | 1 |
| Chironamid larvae | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Chironamid pupae | 1 | 2 | - |
| Crayfish | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Culicoides larvae | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Dragonfly nymphs | - | 1 | 1 |
| Fingernail clams | 1 | - | 1 |
| Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae) |  | 1 | - |


| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae) | - | 1 | - |
| Minoow remains | 1 | - | - |
| Snails | 1 | - | - |
| Tabanid larvae | 1 | - | - |
| Terrestrial beetles | - | - | - |
| Unknown dipteran larvae | - | - | 6 |
| Unknown terrestrial insects | - | - | - |

Table V
Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stomach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in pumpkinseed stomachs from Youngs Lake, PFES, 12 May to 5 June, 1976.

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Mean total length (mm) | 117.5 | 123.6 | 123.5 |
| Mean fork length (mm) | 113.5 | 118.9 | 117.4 |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | 30.5 | 31.3 | 32.4 |
| Sex ratio (males:females) | $8: 2$ | $6: 4$ | $3: 7$ |
| Mean volume food present/stamach (ml) | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.10 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Percent occurance of food items: | 10 | 30 | - |
| Empty stamachs | 30 | - | - |
| Burrowing mayfly nymps (Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae) | 20 | - |  |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) | 30 | 20 | 10 |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | 20 | - | 20 |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 40 | 20 | - |
| Chironamid pupae (Diptera:Chironamidae) | 30 | 10 | 10 |
| Culicoides larvae (Diptera:Heleidae) | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata) | 20 | 20 | 10 |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Baetidae) | - | - | 30 |
| Snails (Gastropoda) | 20 | - |  |
| Tabanid larvae (Diptera:Tabanidae) | 10 |  |  |

Table V (Continued)

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Terrestrial beetles (Coleoptera) | - | 30 | 30 |
| Unknown terrestrial insects | - | 10 | - |
| Water mites (Acari) | - | - | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Average percent volume contributed by: | 11.1 | - | - |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 11.1 | 14.3 | - |
| Caddisfly larvae | 20.0 | - | 9.3 |
| Chaoborus larvae | 20.2 | 15.7 | 5.7 |
| Chironomid larvae | 6.1 | - | - |
| Chironomid pupae | 1.7 | 3.6 | 0.7 |
| Culicoides larvae | 16.1 | 9.3 | 3.6 |
| Dragonfly nymphs | - | 2.1 | 12.8 |
| Manfly nymphs | 2.6 | 15.7 | 33.6 |
| Snails | 11.1 | - | - |
| Tabanid larvae | - | 27.8 | 33.6 |
| Terrestrial beetles | - | 11.4 | - |
| Unknown terrestrial insects | - | - | 0.7 |
| Water mites |  |  |  |

## Date

Average number/stamach present in: Burrowing mayfly nymphs
Caddisfly larvae
Chaoborus larvae
Chironomid larvae
Chironomid pupae
Culicoides larvae
Dragonfly nymphs
Mayfly nymphs
Snails
Tabanid larvae
Terrestrial beetles
Unknown terrestrial insects
Water mites

Table V (Continued)

|  | Table V (Continued) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 |  |
| Average number/stamach prese |  |  |  |  |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 1 | - | - |  |
| Caddisfly larvae | 1 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Chaoborus larvae | 8 | - | 5 | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |
| Chironomid larvae | 20 | 6 | 1) $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| Chironomid pupae | 2 | - | - |  |
| Culicoides larvae | 8 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Dragonfly nymphs | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Mayfly nymphs | - | 1 | 10 |  |
| Snails | 1 | 2 | 8 |  |
| Tabanid larvae | 1 | - | - |  |
| Terrestrial beetles | - | 1 | 1 |  |
| Unknown terrestrial insects | - | 4 | - |  |
| Water mites | - | - | 1 |  |

Table VI
Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stamach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in yellow perch stomachs
from Youngs Lake, PFES, 12 May to 6 July, 1976.

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 | July 6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 10 | 10 | 10 | 2 |
| Mean total length (mm) | 273.5 | 165.3 | 188.0 | 282.0 |
| Mean fork length (mm) | 265.4 | 159.1 | 180.9 | 272.5 |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | 203.0 | 46.5 | 76.0 | 251.0 |
| Sex ratio (males:females) | $7: 3$ | $9: 1$ | $10: 0$ | $2: 0$ |
| Mean volume food present/stamach (ml) | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.00 |
| Percent occurance of food items: |  |  |  |  |
| Empty stomachs | 60 | 30 | 70 | 100 |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) | - | 10 | - | - |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | - | 30 | 10 | - |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | - | 20 | - | - |
| Crayfish (Decapoda | - | - | 10 | - |
| Minnow remains | 40 | 10 | 10 | - |

Table VI (Continued)

| Date | May 12 | May 28 | June 5 | July 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average percent volume contributed by: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Caddisfly larvae | - | 14.3 | - | - |  |
| Chironomid larvae | - | 42.8 | 33.3 | - |  |
| Chironomid pupae | - | 28.6 | - | - |  |
| Crayfish | - | - | 33.3 | - |  |
| Minnow remains | 100 | 14.3 | 33.3 | - |  |
| Average number/stamach present in: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cuddisfly larvae | - | 1 | - | - | O |
| Chironomid larvae | - | 1 | 10 | - | 1 |
| Chironomid pupae | - | 1 | - | - |  |
| Crayfish | - | - | 1 | - |  |
| Minnow remains | ? | ? | ? | - |  |

Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stamach and average number in each stamach present in of various food items found in white sucker stomachs from Lac Tassell, Quebec, 18 May to 26 August, 1976.

| Date | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 18 \\ (-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 31 \\ (-0) \end{gathered}$ | June 4 $(+4)$ | June 8 $(+8)$ | June 17 $(+17)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 15 \\ (+45) \end{gathered}$ | Aug. 26 (+86) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 20 | 10 | 10 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Mean total length (mm) | 345.3 | 268.5 | 281.9 | 353.6 | 276.7 | 389.9 | 342.4 |
| Mean fork length | 320.8 | 252.0 | 263.1 | 334.0 | 261.1 | 368.1 | 316.4 |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | - | 304.6 | 289.2 | 553.9 | 284.7 | - | 440.4 |
| Sex ratio (males:females:immatures) | 14:6:0 | 3:4:3 | 5:4:1 | 4:13:0 | 18:2:0 | 5:10:0 | 12:7:1 |
| Mean volume food present/stomach (ml) | 2.62 | 1.25 | 3.45 | 4.27 | 2.15 | 1.11 | 1.62 |
| Percent occurance of food items: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Empty stomachs | 5 | 20 | 10 | 12 | - | 7 | 15 |
| Aquatic beetles (Coleoptera) | - | - | - | - | 10 | 7 | - |
| Aquatic beetle larvae (Coleoptera) | 5 | - | - | 6 | 5 | 7 | - |
| Amphipods (Amphipoda) | 5 | 10 | - | 76 | - | - | - |
| Alderfly larvae (Megaloptera:Sialidae) | - | 20 | 50 | 76 | 10 | 13 | 5 |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae) | 15 | - | 90 | 82 | 20 | 7 | - |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) | 10 | 30 | 20 | 71 | - | 7 | - |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | 10 | 40 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chaobomis pupae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | 20 | - | 65 | - | - | - |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 20 | 40 | 30 | 47 | 100 | 67 | 45 |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 5 | - | - | 6 | 35 | 13 | 30. |
| Cladocerans (Cladocera) | 90 | 40 | - | 6 | - | - | 55 |
| Copepods (Copepoda) | 5 | - | - | - | - | 27 | 20 |
| Culicoides larvae (Diptera:Heleidae) | 10 | 40 | 20 | 18 | 75 | 47 | 10 |
| Damselfly nymphs (Odonata: Zygoptera) | 5 | - | - | 6 | - | - | - |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata:Anisoptera) | $\overline{5}$ | 20 | 10 | 6 | 10 | - | 10 |
| Fish eggs | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Table VII (Continued)

| Date | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 18 \\ (-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 31 \\ (-0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June } 4 \\ (+4) \end{gathered}$ | June 8 $(+8)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June } 17 \\ (+17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 15 \\ (+45) \end{gathered}$ | Aug. 26 (+86) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fingernail clams (Pelecypoda:Sphaeridae) | - | - | - | - | 5 | 33 | 5 |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Baetidae) | 5 | - | - | 18 | - | - | - |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Heptagenidae) | - | - | 60 | 18 | - | - | - |
| Snails (Gastropoda) | 5 | 20 | - | 6 | 45 | 40 | 25 |
| Unidentified aquatic insects | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Water boatmen (Hemiptera:Corixidae) | - | - | - | 6 | - | - | - |
| Water mites (Acari) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| Average percent volume contributed by: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aquatic beetles | - | - | - | - | 1.8 | 1.1 | - |
| Aquatic beetle larvae | 0.5 | - | - | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.4 | - |
| Amphipods | 0.2 | 2.5 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Alderfly larvae | - | 5.0 | 11.2 | 16.3 | 2.8 | 6.4 | 0.9 |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 4.2 | - | 69.9 | 33.9 | 4.9 | 4.3 | - |
| Caddisfly larvae | 1.0 | 7.5 | 2.8 | 20.7 | - | 0.4 | - |
| Chaoborus larvae | 4.7 | 35.0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chaoborus pupae | - | 1.2 | - | 12.1 | - | - | - |
| Chironomid larvae | 4.5 | 15.8 | 3.6 | 11.1 | 63.2 | 27.5 | 20.0 |
| Chironomid pupae | 0.3 | - | - | 0.1 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 5.2 |
| Cladocerans | 78.4 | 23.1 | - | 0.1 | - | - | 45.6 |
| Copepods | 3.9 | - | - | - | - | 21.4 | 12.4 |
| Culicoides larvae | 0.4 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 5.4 | 3.9 | 3.0 |
| Damselfly nymphs | 0.3 | - | - | 0.7 | - | - | - |
| Dragonfly nymphs | - | 6.9 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 4.8 | - | 2.0 |
| Fish eggs | 0.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fingernail clams | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | 13.1 | 0.3 |


| Date | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 18 \\ (-13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 31 \\ (-0) \end{gathered}$ | June 4 $(+4)$ | June 8 $(+8)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { June } 17 \\ (+17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { July } 15 \\ (+45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Aug. } 26 \\ (+86) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae) | 0.5 | - | - | 1.3 | - | - | - |
| Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae) | - | - | 11.7 | 1.3 | - | - | - |
| Snails | 0.5 | 1.2 | - | 0.1 | 12.1 | 18.0 | 10.3 |
| Unidentified aquatic insects | 0.3 | - | - | - | 12.1 | - | - |
| Water boatmen | - | - | - | 0.2 | - | - | - |
| Water mites | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.3 |
| Average number/stomach present in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aquatic beetles | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| Aquatic beetle larvae | 10 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Amphipods | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Alderfly larvae | - | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs | 1 | - | 11 | 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 2 | - |
| Caddisfly larvae | 4 | 3 | 4 | 10 | - | 1 | - |
| Chaobomus larvae | ~250 | ~ 375 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chaoborus pupae | - | 5 | - | 14 | - | - | - |
| Chironomid larvae | 9 | 24 | 7 | 24 | ~80 | 26 | 11 |
| Chironomid pupae | 3 | - | - | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| Cladocerans | $\sim 1100$ | $\sim 600$ | - | 1 | - | - | $\sim 400$ |
| Copepods | ~1000 | - | - | - | - | $\sim 1500$ | ~300 |
| Culicoides larvae | $2 \frac{1}{2}$ | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 1 |
| Damselfly nymphs | 2 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Dragonfly nymphs | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 212 |
| Fish eggs | 10 | - | - | - | $\underline{2}$ | - | - |
| Fingernail clams | - | - | - | - . | 1 | 26 | 1 |
| Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae) | 6 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae) | - | - | 3 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Snails | 1 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 1 | 7 | 5 | 9 |
| Unidentified aquatic insects | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Water boatmen | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| Water mites | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |

## Table VIII

Percent occurrance, average percent contributed to the volume of each stomach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in smallmouth bass stamachs from Lac Tassel, Quebec, 18 May to 26 August, 1976

| Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { May 18-30 } \\ & (-13 \text { to }-1) \end{aligned}$ | June 1-3 <br> $(+1$ to +3$)$ | June 8 (+8) | $\begin{gathered} \text { June } 18-22 \\ (+18 \text { to }+22) \end{gathered}$ | June 14 (+44) | Aug. 26 (+86) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 2 | 8 | 2 | 19 | 2 | , |
| Mean total length ( mm ) | 247.5 | 229.6 | 246.0 | 250.1 | 305.0 | 223.7 |
| Mean fork length | 241.0 | 223.6 | 235.0 | 240.3 | 288.0 | 212.3 |
| Mean preserved weight ( g ) | 196.5 | 206.6 | 252.5 | - | - | 160.6 |
| Sex ratio (males:females:immatures) | 2:0:0 | 5:3:0 | 2:0:0 | 11:4:4 | 0:2:0 | 7:1:1 |
| Mean volume food present/stomach (ml) | 0.1 | 5.21 | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.34 |
| Percent occurance of food items: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Empty stomachs | 50 | - | - | 26 | 100 | 33 |
| Adult dragonfly (Odonata) | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| Adult Midges (Diptera:Chironamidae) | - | - | - | 10 | - | 11 |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae) | - | 75 | 50 | 16 | - | - |
| Cladocerans (Cladocera) | - | - | - | - | - | 44 |
| Chaobomus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | 12 | - | - | - | - |
| Chaobomis pupae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | 38 | - | - | - | 22 |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironmidae) | - | - | 50 | - | - | - |
| Chironamid pupae (Diptera:Chironamidae) | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| Damselfly nymphs (Odonata:Zygoptera) | - | 50 | - | - | - | - |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata:Anisoptera) | - | 62 | - | - | - | - |
| Flying ants (Hymenoptera) | 50 | - | - | 16 | - | - |
| Minnows | - | - | - | 5 | - | 11 |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Baetidae) | - | 25 | - | - | - | - |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Heptagenidae) | - | 62 | - | - | - | - |
| Spiders (Arachnida) | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| Smallmouth bass fry | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| Terrestrial beetles (Coleoptera) | - | - | 50 | 47 | - | - |
| Unidentified flying insects | - | 12 | 50 | 26 | - | - |
| Unidentified terrestrial insects | - | - | 50 | - | - | 22 |
| Water mites (Acari) | - | - | 50 | - | - | - |

Date
May 18-30 June 1-3 June 8 June $18-22$ June 14 Aug, 26 $(-13$ to -1$)(+1$ to +3$)(+8) \quad(+18$ to +22$)(+44) \quad(+86)$

Average percent volume contributed by:
Adult dragonflies
Adult midges
Burrowing mayfly nymphs
Cladocerans
Chaobomus larvae
Chaoborus pupae
Chironamid larvae
Chironomid pupae
Damselfly nymphs
Flying ants
Minnows
Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae)
Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae)
Spiders
Smallmouth bass fry
Terrestrial beetles
Unidentified flying insects
Unidentified terrestrial insects
Water mites

| - | - | - | 2.8 | - | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 4.3 | - | 3.3 |  |
| - | 24.4 | 40.0 | 3.6 | - | - |  |
| - | - | - | - | - | 45.8 |  |
| - | 0.1 | - | - | - | - |  |
| - | 8.1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| - | - | 2.5 | - | - | - |  |
| - | - | - | 2.8 | - | 4.2 | ${ }^{\circ}$ |
| - | 3.4 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 100 | - | - | 12.8 | - | - | 1 |
| - | - | - | 7.1 | - | 16.7 |  |
| - | 2.5 | - | - | - | - |  |
| - | 24.0 | - | - | - | - |  |
| - | - | - | 0.4 | - | - |  |
| - | - | - | 1.4 | - | - |  |
| - | - | 5.0 | 47.1 | - | - |  |
| - | 1.9 | 25.0 | 17.5 | - | - |  |
| - | - | 25.0 | - | - | 30.0 |  |
| - | - | 2.5 | - | - | - |  |

Date

Average number/stomach present in:
Adult dragonflies
Adult midges
Burrowing mayfly nymphs
Cladocerans
Chaoborus larvae
Chaobomi pupae
Chironomid larvae
Chironomid pupae
Damselfly nymphs
Dragonfly nymphs
Flying ants
Minnows
Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae)
Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae)
Spiders
Smallmouth bass fry
Terrestrial beetles
Unidentified flying insects
Unidentified terrestrial insects
Water mites

## Table VIII (Continued)

$\begin{array}{cccccc}\text { May } 18-30 & \text { June } 1-3 & \text { June } 8 & \text { June } 18-22 & \text { July } 14 & \text { Aug. } 26 \\ (-13 \text { to }-1) & (+1 \text { to }+3) & (+8) & (+18 \text { to }+22) & (+44) & (+86)\end{array}$

| - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| - | 11 | ? | 1 | - | - |
| - | - | - | - | - | ~110 |
| - | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| - | $\sim 45$ | 1 | - | - | - |
| - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | 1 | - | 3 |
| - | 6 | - | - | - | - |
| - | 8 | - | - | - | - |
| 1 | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| - | - | - | 1 | - | 3 |
| - | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| - | 18 | - | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| - | - | - | 9 | - | - |
| - | - | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| - | ? | ? | 3 | - | - |
| - | - | ? | - | - | 3 |
| - | - | 1 | - | - | - |

## Table IX

Percent occurance, average percent contribution to the volume of each stamach and average number in each stomach present in of various food items found in yellow perch stomachs from Lac Tassel, Quebec, 18 May to 26 August, 1976.

| Date | $\begin{aligned} & \text { May } 18 \\ & (-13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 31 \\ (-0) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(+4)}{\text { June }} 4$ | $\underset{(+8)}{\substack{\text { June } \\ \hline}}$ | $\underset{(+45)}{\text { July } 15}$ | $\underset{(+86)}{\text { Aug. } 26}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of fish sampled | 7 | 11 | 13 | 23 | 2 | 20 |  |
| Mean total lenath (mm) | 143.3 | 198.4 | 210.5 | 210.7 | 210.0 | 160.0 |  |
| Mean fork length | 138.1 | 191.9 | 201.3 | 203.2 | 200.0 | 153.0 |  |
| Mean preserved weight (g) | 42.3 | 96.1 | 124.2 | 124.2 | 109.0 | 46.0 |  |
| Sex ratio (males:females) | 7:0 | 7:1 | 10:3 | 14:9 | 1:1 | 7:13 |  |
| Mean volume food present/stomach (ml) | 0.68 | 0.51 | 1.21 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.01 |  |
| Percent occurance of food items: |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$ |
| Empty stomachs | 29 | - | 15 | 48 | 50 | 80 |  |
| Burrowing mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Ephemeridae) | 29 | - | 85 | 48 | 50 | - |  |
| Caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera) | - | 18 | 15 | 13 | - | - |  |
| Chaoborus larvae (Diptera:Culicidae) | 43 | 91 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Chaoborus pupae (Diptera:Culicidae) | - | 73 | - | 4 | - | - |  |
| Chironomid larvae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 14 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Chironomid pupae (Diptera:Chironomidae) | 14 | 9 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Cladocerans (Cladocera) | 29 | 36 | - | - | - | 20 |  |
| copepods (Copepoda) | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |  |
| Dragonfly nymphs (Odonata:Anisoptera) | - | 9 | 15 | 4 | - | - |  |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Baetidae) | 14 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera:Heptagenidae) | 29 | - | 8 | - | - | - |  |
| Unidentified flying insects | - | - | - | 4 | - | - |  |


| $\underset{(-1.3)}{\text { May } 18}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { May } 31 \\ (-0) \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{(+4)}{ } \begin{aligned} & \text { June } \end{aligned}$ | June 8 $(+8)$ | $\underset{(+45)}{\text { July } 15}$ | $\underset{(+86)}{\text { Aug. }} 26$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.0 | - | 87.3 | 85.8 | 100 | - |
| - | 3.6 | 2.3 | 2.9 | - | - |
| 54.0 | 50.4 | - | - | - | - |
| - | 27.3 | - | 0.4 | - | - |
| 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1.0 | 0.4 | - | - | - | - |
| 5.0 | 9.1 | - | - | - | 78.8 |
| - | - | - | - | - | 21.2 |
| - | 9.1 | 9.5 | 8.3 | - | - |
| 8.0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10.0 | - | 0.9 | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | 2.5 | - | - |
| 1 | - | 10 | 3 | 1 | - |
| - | 1 | $1 \frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | - | - |
| $\sim 230$ | 37 | - | - | - | - |
| - | 40 | - | 1 | - | - |
| 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| $\sim 250$ | $\sim 270$ | - | - | - | 6 |
| - | - | - | - | - | $\sim 140$ |
| - | 1 | $1{ }_{1}^{1}$ | 1 | - | - |
| 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| $1{ }_{1} \frac{1}{2}$ | - | 1 | - | - | - |
|  | - | - | 1 | - | - |

Average percent volume contributed by:
Burrowing mayfly nymphs
Caddisfly larvae
Chaobomis larvae
Chaoboms pupae
Chironomid larvae
Chironomid pupae
Cladocerans
Copepods
Dragonfly nymphs
Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae)
Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae)
Unidentified flying insects

Average number/stamach present in:
Burrowing mayfly nymphs
Caddisfly larvae
Chaoborus larvae
Chaoborus pupae
Chironomid larvae
Chironomid pupae
Cladocerans
Copepods
Dragonfly nymphs
Mayfly nymphs (Baetidae)
Mayfly nymphs (Heptagenidae)
Unidentified flying insects


[^0]:    * Hydrolab Corporation, Austin, Texas.

[^1]:    ** Wildlife Supply Company, Saginaw, Michigan
    *** Hach Chemical Company, Ames, Iowa.

[^2]:    * Tranc omntiad hoforo lako wao trontod

