S
595.709
Fayf

YELLOWSTONE RIVER STUDY
FINAL REPORT

U.S. DOCUMENTS COLLECTION
MONTANA STATE LIBRARY
STATE DOCUMENTS

MONTANA STATE LIBRARY
930 East Lyndale Avenue
Helena, Montana 59601

RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY:
MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
AND

INTAKE WATER COMPANY

PLEASE RETURN

PREPARED BY:
ROBERT L. NEWELL
AQUATIC ECOLOGIST

AUGUST 1976

DATE DUE

MSL MAR 30 '77				
MSL AUG 22 '79				
MSL MAR 31 '82				
MSL MAR 26 '82				
JAN 30 1985				
FEB 28 1990				
MAY 6 2004				

DEMCO 38-301

MONTANA STATE LIBRARY

3 0864 0014 8068 3

S
 595.709
 F2yf
 Newell, Robert L
 Yellowstone river study
Final Report, Aug. 1976

MONTANA STATE LIBRARY

930 East Lyndale Avenue
 Helena, MT 59601

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank all biologists and friends who contributed time, effort and specimens for this study. He would also like to thank the Intake Water Company for funding the majority of the work and the Old West Regional Commission which also contributed research funds.

The author also thanks the following experts who helped identify organisms: Trichoptera (D. G. Denning); Plecoptera (R. W. Bauman, B. Stark); Coleoptera-Elmidae (H. P. Brown); Diptera-Chironomidae (L. Curry); Oligochaeta and Mollusca (D. Klemm); Odonata and Hemiptera (G. Roemhild).

A special thanks is given to R. Berg, D. Workman and D. Schwehr for taking bottom samples on the middle and upper Yellowstone River and to A. Elser and R. McFarland for taking samples on the Tongue River. Mr. Burwell Gooch of the Systems Development Bureau, Data Processing Division, Montana State Department of Administration was very helpful in constructing computer programs for species diversity analyses and regression analysis.

STATE LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA	11
METHODS AND MATERIALS	11
RESULTS	19
Macroinvertebrate Distribution	19
Insect Emergence	40
Bottom Fauna Standing Crop	42
Species Diversity	48
CURRENT AND DEPTH REQUIREMENTS FOR INVERTEBRATES	48
Environmental Requirements	67
DISCUSSION	82
Chemical	82
Silt	82
Temperature	84
Food	84
Current and Bottom Habitat	84
SUMMARY	91
LITERATURE CITED	93
APPENDIX A	A- 1
APPENDIX B	A- 4
APPENDIX C	A- 5
APPENDIX D	A-40
APPENDIX E	A-58
APPENDIX F	A-103
APPENDIX G	A-226
APPENDIX H	A-251

LIST OF TABLES

1. Yellowstone River sampling stations	12
2. Checklist of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Tongue River (t) and the Yellowstone River (y)	20
3. Ephemeroptera of the Yellowstone River	25
4. Plecoptera of the Yellowstone River	30
5. Trichoptera of the Yellowstone River	33
6. Aquatic invertebrates of the Yellowstone River	34
7. Macroinvertebrate fauna of the Tongue River, Montana	36
8. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of August 1975	49
9. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of September 1975	49
10. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of October 1975	49
11. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of November 1975	50
12. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers, mean percentages for August-November 1975	50
13. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, August 1975	50
14. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, September 1975	51
15. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, October 1975	51
16. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, November 1975	52
17. Mean and standard deviation for four variables measured in the invertebrate/current investigation in the Yellowstone River at Glendive, 1975	52
18. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 samples from each station taken on August 6 and 7, 1975 (no./m ²)	53
19. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 pooled samples taken September 9, 1975 (no./m ²)	54
20. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 pooled samples taken on October 9 and 15, 1976 (no./m ²)	55
21. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 pooled samples taken on November 7 and 11, 1975 (no./m ²)	56
22. Population estimates and percent composition taken from the invertebrate-current samples. Numbers are expressed in no./m ² and the values in parentheses are percent of monthly pooled totals from the Glendive and Intake samples	63
23. Percent composition of invertebrate orders taken with kick samples at Glendive (17) and Intake (18), 1975	66
24. Synopsis of regression analysis on the current-depth data showing significance for the three models for both sampling stations. Regression of number of taxa and depth (ft.) and current velocity (cfs)	68

25.	Synopsis of the regression analysis on the current-depth data showing significance for the three models for both sampling stations. Regression of number of organisms and depth (ft.) and current (cfs)	69
26.	Discharges at Miles City and Sidney during sampling periods (cfs)	78
27.	Characterization of running water habitats on the basis of narrowly defined typical biotic dominants (after Cummins 1973, 1975a)	85
28.	Invertebrate population estimates utilizing data from Intake station 18, subsections from WSP, regression equation from November kick samples, (no. m ⁻²)	89

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Relationships between detritus and stream consumers (from Cummins 1975)	4
2. Relationships between detritus, producers and consumers in different order streams - stream continuum - (Cummins 1975)	5
3. Invertebrate sampling stations established on the Yellowstone River and their relative position along a longitudinal and elevational gradient and probable fish distribution zones . . .	13
4. Map of the Tongue River showing sampling sections and major tributaries	14
5. Sampling Station 1, Corwin Springs	15
6. Yankee Jim Canyon between sampling Stations 1 and 2	15
7. Near Station 3 above Livingston	16
8. Station 4 at Livingston	16
9. Station 5 at Greybear fishing access	17
10. Aerial view of Yellowstone River above Miles City	17
11. Kick net and other data collecting gear	18
12. Water's round bottom sampler	18
13. Aerial view of the Intake diversion, sampling Station No. 18. .	26
14. Yellowstone River at Intake diversion	26
15. Number of species of the three major orders found at each sampling station in the Yellowstone River	27
16. Mature nymph of of the mayfly <i>Heptagenia elegantula</i>	28
17. Adult mayfly <i>Traverella albertana</i>	28
18. Photo of the Yellowstone River taken about 10 miles upstream from Miles City	29
19. Yellowstone River at Glendive during early winter	31
20. Yellowstone River at Terry during late winter	31
21. Photo of an adult mayfly <i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	32
22. Emergence and flight patterns of mayflies from the Yellowstone River, 1974-76	38
23. Emergence and flight patterns of stoneflies from the Yellowstone River, 1974-76	39
24. Photo of an adult stonefly <i>Isoperla longiseta</i>	40
25. Photo of the larvae of the caddisfly <i>Hydropsyche</i>	41
26. Photo of an adult of the genus <i>Hydropsyche</i>	41
27. Emergence and flight patterns of caddisflies from the Yellowstone River, 1974-76	43
28. Population estimates, August 1975, mean and range of six Water's samples	44
29. Population estimates for September 1975, mean and range of six Water's samples	45
30. Population estimates for October 1975, mean and range of six Water's samples	46
31. Population estimates for November 1975, mean and range of six Water's samples	47
32. Percent composition of invertebrate orders from Water's samplers, mean of samples taken August-November	57
33. Species diversity indices for August 1975 range of six Water's samples and all six pooled	58
34. Species diversity indices for September 1975 range of six Water's samples and all six pooled	59

35. Species diversity indices for October 1975 range of six Water's samples and all six pooled	60
36. Species diversity indices for November 1975, range of six Water's samples and all six pooled	61
37. Seasonal changes in Shannon diversity indices, all points are the result of pooling six Water's samples each month at each station during 1975.	62
38. Comparison of sampling methods, Water's (W) and kick net (K) at Glendive using kick samples taken in depths less than 19.5 inches (no./m ²).	64
39. Comparison of sampling methods, Water's (W) and kick net (K) at Intake using kick samples taken in depths less than 19.5 inches (no./m ²).	65
40. Current/invertebrate relationships, Yellowstone River, Glendive, October 9, 1975	70
41. Current/depth/invertebrate relationships, Yellowstone River, Intake, October 15, 1975	71
42. Current/depth/invertebrate relationships, Yellowstone River, Glendive, November 7, 1975	72
43. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Intake, August, 1975.	73
44. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Intake, October, 1975	74
45. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Intake, November, 1975.	75
46. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Glendive, October, 1975	76
47. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Glendive, November, 1975	77
48. Synopsis of mayfly/current relationships from both stations and for all sampling months	79
49. Distribution of <i>Hydropsyche</i> larvae at various currents during October 1975	80
50. Distribution of <i>Hydropsyche</i> larvae at various currents during November, 1975	81
51. Typical rubble substrate in the lower Yellowstone, low summer flow at Glendive	83
52. Closeup of typical rubble substrate in the lower Yellowstone at Glendive	83
53. Floating ice just prior to freeze-up at Glendive	86
54. Ice jam during late winter at Glendive	86
55. Proposed relationships between invertebrates and the factors that determine their distribution and abundance (from Cummins 1972).	87
56. Upper figure is cross section no. 5 at Intake showing water depth at various flows; lower figure contains invertebrate population estimates at various discharges	90

INTRODUCTION

Objectives of this research task were to gain insights into the environmental requirements of the dominant macroinvertebrate genera and species of the Yellowstone River and to describe the distribution of macroinvertebrates in the Yellowstone and Tongue Rivers. Current velocity and water depth were chosen as the two independent variables that would be examined. Since current affects invertebrate distribution in several ways, e.g., distribution of food, size of substratum and current force, and because current and discharge are closely interrelated, studies of the effects of current on invertebrate distribution would be meaningful and would permit predictions about changes in invertebrate communities if flows were altered. Because of the gently sloping morphometry of the river channel, it was believed depth might be a valuable parameter as well; both current and depth are functions of discharge. Once environmental requirements are established, one may predict how the population could change as the flow environment changes.

Species diversity and river zonation analyses were made in an attempt to understand distributional patterns of invertebrates, provide baseline data and record differences and similarities between populations at different sampling stations.

The classification of river zones is helpful in comparing the results of studies on the ecology of different rivers and is useful in fishery and river management. Most attempts at river classification have been instigated by the needs of fishery management.

With an increasing need for water conservation, both quantitatively and qualitatively, a system of river-zone classification is invaluable in predicting the likely effect on the ecology of the river of projected management policies such as water removal and flow regulation.

River zonation studies began at the end of the last century with German biologists who developed a system of classifying river zones on the basis of the dominant fish species present, by which they named the zones - Trout, Grayling, Barbel and Bream. Similar methods of classification were also developed in other regions. Subsequent studies were carried out throughout the world to establish whether the German zonation scheme was generally applicable. These and further studies on German rivers have attempted to characterize the different zones more precisely in physiological, physio-chemical and biotic terms (Whitton 1975).

Carpenter (1928), an early British researcher, attempted to classify the mountain streams of North Wales and she was obviously influenced by the earlier German workers.

Carpenter described a typical river as arising as several sources at high altitude to give rise to streams characterized by swift current, steep gradient and extensive erosion. Downstream as the gradient decreases the current slows and the stream deepens and widens. With the reduction in current, stones, gravel and sand are successively deposited on the stream-bed. Aquatic macrophytes may take root in silted areas. Still further downstream current is further reduced, the river widens and meanders and the bed is covered with deposited silt.

Carpenter's classification of streams included a taxonomic list of the flora and fauna of each zone. High altitude zones included headstreams, trout beckes and minnow reaches. Lowland stream zones included upper and lower reaches.

Huet (1949, 1954) using stream data in Europe, refined the European system which recognized four zones, each identified by key fish species. The trout zones had a steep gradient, fast currents, cool temperatures and oxygenated water. The grayling zone was deeper, had less gradient, gravel bottom with cool temperatures and oxygenated water. The barbel zone had moderate gradient with an alternating riffle-pool morphometry and a few trout still were present. The bream zone was characterized by slight current, high temperatures and deep, turbid water. The four zones represent two fish faunistic regions - an upper, cool water containing salmonid fish and the lower, warmer waters containing cyprinids.

From longitudinal profiles of many European streams, Huet concluded that the fish fauna was directly related to the gradient of the stream, and in nearly all rivers of comparable size, stretches with similar gradients have similar fish faunas. From these conclusions he formulated his "slope rule." "In a given bio-geographical area, rivers or stretches of rivers of like breadth, depth and slope have nearly identical biological characteristics and very similar fish populations."

Other European researchers have found that the concept of fish-faunal zones is useful in river and fish management; it is necessary to realize its limitations due to historic, geographic and climatic influences, however. Generally the greater the distance from the original streams studied, the more the original scheme of zonation needs to be modified to meet local conditions. Pollution can change zonation in localized areas, also.

The zonal distribution of fish in North American rivers has been demonstrated by a succession of workers. Shelford (1911) studied the distribution of fish in a number of Lake Michigan tributaries and concluded that fishes have definite habitat preferences which cause them to be definitely arranged in streams which have a graded series of conditions from mouth to source. Burton and Odum (1945) and Funk and Campbell (1953) all report fish distributed in zones in North American streams.

From these studies in different parts of the world, it is evident that in general there is a longitudinal distribution of fish species in rivers in which a succession of different fish populations occur from source to mouth. Other generalizations regarding the pattern of this distribution are more difficult to make. Funk and Campbell (1953) report that succession is by gradual transition along the length of a river. Other workers report a zonal distribution in which there is a sharp border between zones.

With this general introduction to fish zonation in mind, the next question is - to what extent do fish zones represent different river biocoenoses?

Numerous studies have been conducted on the longitudinal distribution of different benthic invertebrates in rivers. Again, the earliest research occurred in Europe, but studies have taken place throughout the world

(Beauchamp and Ullyott 1932, Carpenter 1928, Chandler 1966). The longitudinal distribution of several insect orders has been investigated (Dodds and Hisaw 1925; Ide 1935; Hynes 1941, 1948; Macon 1957).

Past studies of the longitudinal distribution of aquatic insects have found them to be distributed zonally along the length of rivers. It appears that each taxon exhibits a zonal distribution of its different species along the length of a river. Within taxa some species have a restricted distribution, especially those in the upper reaches, while others extend over a long stretch of river. Over some distances, there may be little change in species present; their relative abundance changes along the length of river, reflecting a change in the ecological structure of the community (Hynes 1961).

The conclusion is that both fish and benthic invertebrates are longitudinally distributed along rivers, with different species occupying different sections of the river. One would expect, therefore, a correlation between fish species and benthic invertebrates.

Some authors have concluded generally that different biocoenoses, associated with the different fish zones, can be recognized. Thorup (1966) is critical of these studies and suggests that pollution is responsible for the observed zonation of invertebrates and fish. Maitland's (1966) work supports the views expressed by Thorup.

It appears from available evidence that although fish zones can be recognized, the association of benthic biocoenoses with them, does not always exist.

A new theory has recently emerged to explain the distribution of groups of invertebrates on the bottom of streams and rivers. This theory is known as the river continuum theory as proposed by Vannote (1975) in Cummins (1975b). This theory makes use of theoretical relationships between stream order (Leopold et al. 1964, Hynes 1970), size of organic matter and production, respiration (P/R) ratios.

Headwater streams are characteristically heavily dependent upon terrestrial contributions (allochthonous) of particulate organic matter, especially coarse particles (CPOM) such as leaf litter, with little or no photosynthetic production of organic matter. CPOM feeding invertebrates, or shredders and detritivores feeding on fine particulate organic matter, or collectors, are the dominant macroconsumers. Thus headwaters can be described as: CPOM - fungi - shredder - FPOM - bacteria - collector systems (Figures 1 and 2).

Intermediate-sized rivers are less dependent upon allochthonous inputs and more on organic production by producer organisms along with input of FPOM from upstream. The ratio of photosynthetic production to community respiration is often greater than one ($P/R > 1$) in contrast to headwater and large rivers where $P/R < 1$ (Figure 2).

Large rivers tend to be turbid with heavy sediment loads or the culmination of all upstream processes. These systems possess plankton communities. These rivers could be characterized as: FPOM - bacteria - collector systems (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Relationships between detritus and stream consumers (from Cummins 1975).

Figure 2. Relationships between detritus, producers and consumers in different order streams - stream continuum - (Cummins 1975).

Fish populations generally show a transition from cold water invertivores, to warm water invertivores and piscivores, to planktivores.

Many factors regulate the distribution and abundance of stream dwelling invertebrates. Some of these factors include current speed, temperature, the substratum, vegetation and dissolved substances (Hynes 1970). Other factors include competition, zoogeography and food. This is the more autecological approach to distribution of aquatic invertebrates in aquatic ecosystems.

Temperature and water chemistry exert the greatest influence on the composition of living communities considered over large areas, but because of feeding and respiratory requirements, it is largely current that determines how communities actually are composed (Jaag and Ambuhl 1964, Chutter 1969). The ecological niche of many macroinvertebrates which inhabit flowing water is partially determined by current. In fact, some species are confined to fairly narrow ranges of current speed. In the case of certain organisms, namely the net-building caddisflies (e.g., *Hydropsyche*, *Cheumatopsyche*, *Parapsyche*), it has been established that the nets require a definite current in order for them to function properly (Philipson 1954).

Many organisms need the current to be nearby, but cannot tolerate being actually in it. There is often a tremendous difference in current velocity for an insect living on top of a rock to that for one living under that rock, yet both may have current requirements. Because of the impossibility of taking measurements at most points where macroinvertebrates exist, current velocity is usually measured at some reproducible depth; e.g., mid-depth, 0.6 of the total depth, or near the bottom (Hynes 1970).

There are unmistakable current specialists (e.g., *Baetis*, *Simulium* and *Hydropsyche*), while some other organisms find their optimum at low velocities (e.g., *Gammarus*, *Hyalella*, *Tricorythodes*). It seems that each species prefers a certain range of current velocity.

In every turbulent flowing system, marginal effects develop in what are called boundary layers. Close to the substratum, movement of the water gradually slows owing to friction, and a boundary layer is formed in which the flow is strongly retarded, until, close to the substratum, it is stagnant (Jaag and Ambuhl 1964). The thickness of this boundary layer depends, among other things, on the velocity of the current above and the shape and roughness of the substratum. Extremely flattened organisms (e.g., *Epeorus*, *Rhithrogena*) make use of the boundary layer to avoid the current.

Many animals that live in flowing water can be maintained only in such water. These species either possess no ventilating organs or have changed or lost the function of those organs in the course of their evolutionary development. They are extremely sensitive to still water and quickly die in it (e.g., most Plecoptera).

Macrodistribution of aquatic invertebrates can be explained with difficulty as habitat gradually changes moving downstream. Cummins (1975a) described food as the ultimate determinant of macroinvertebrate distribution and abundance in non-disturbed running waters. The current regime, velocity and turbulence set the limits on the range of sediment particle sizes present

as well as controlling such features as the growth of periphyton, macrophytes and accumulation of particulate detritus. The size of particles present decreases in a downstream direction (Macan 1974, Hynes 1970) and this results in community variation in primary producers, macroinvertebrates and fish. These community changes may be generally placed into three categories or habitat subsystems: (1) erosional zone, (2) intermediate zone, and (3) depositional zone. Each zone has a characteristic physical-chemical makeup and a characteristic fauna.

Aggregations or communities of aquatic organisms are subjected to almost continual stress due to environmental changes, some of which are "natural" and others are caused by wastes from our industrialized society. It is stresses of the latter sort that are often operating in streams and lakes throughout the United States. It is a generally accepted axiom in ecology that a gross environmental stress exerted upon a diverse biological community, consisting of a large number of species, results in a reduction of species diversity (i.e., number) or a simplification of the system (Cairns 1969). Slobodkin and Sanders (1969) developed the stability-time hypothesis to suggest the kinds of animals that must live in low and high diversity places. This hypothesis states: that all places of high diversity would have stable or predictable environments and that all places of low diversity would either be places of unpredictable hazard or they would be short-lived. This theory was tested in one widespread, stable environment - the ocean floor, and although the investigation is far from complete, the theory appears to hold.

In unstable areas, or where there is not much time, the dangers of extinction are great. Populations of opportunistic animals must frequently be decreased by weather, and the possibility exists of an entire breeding failure. The loss of several consecutive year-classes means extinction, even for long-lived animals. But such year-class failure is less likely in stable climates, and a series of failures is unlikely. Extinction is thus more likely as environmental stress increases. But the actual number of species present in any place is a product both of the loss of species by extinction and of their replacement with new species. In a few specialized organisms such as birds, a limit to the number of species that can accumulate is set by a restricted number of possible niches. For most other kinds of animals and plants the possible number of niches is much larger than the existing number of species. The actual patterns of diversity presently evident are the products of different environments of the earth (Colinvaux 1973).

The use of species diversity indices to analyze biological communities originates from efforts to apply communications information theory to complex biological problems. Various workers who have explored the theoretical use of diversity indices in biology, suggested refinements, or attempted studies include Brillouin (1960), Cairns and Dickson (1971), Lloyd and Ghelardi (1964), Lloyd, Zar and Karr (1968), Margalef (1968), Pielou (1969), Wilhm (1967, 1970abc, 1972), and Wilhm and Dorris (1966, 1968). Several indices have been generally accepted for uniformity: mean diversity ($\bar{d}$); equitability (E_m); redundancy (R); evenness (J'); and richness (SR).

In general, the fundamental objective of information theory as applied to biology is to provide insight into community structure. The biological

information theorist asks how much new knowledge or "information" about the species composition of a community can be obtained by drawing individuals at random. If the community is composed of only one species, then no new information is obtained after the first drawing. But if the community is composed of numerous species, possibly with each individual being a different species, then much new information is gained with each drawing. Information theory attempts to quantify this "knowledge" or "information" contained in the community in terms of "bits" of information per individual.

Mathematically stated, "information" equals the uncertainty of correctly predicting the identity of an individual randomly chosen from a community. Where uncertainty is high, information per individual is high and conversely. The mean amount of uncertainty of prediction of any individual's identity equals the mean number of bits of information per individual, and this number is referred to as the species diversity index. Mean information per individual is commonly measured using the function developed by and named after Shannon and Weaver (1964). The formula for the Shannon-Weaver function is:

$$\bar{d} = - \sum_{i=1}^S (N_i/N) \log_2 (N_i/N)$$

where $\bar{d}$ = mean number of bits of information per individual or the species diversity index, also written as D

S = number of species

N_i = number of individuals in the i^{th} species

N = total number of individuals

A few of the authors cited earlier in this section, and especially Hurlbert (1971), have criticized the Shannon-Weaver function as improperly used in many studies. However, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (1973) has provisionally accepted and recommended the function for aquatic macrobenthos studies.

The index, $\bar{d}$, possesses features that make it a useful method for summarizing community diversity. The index is dimensionless and expresses the relative importance of each species in the community. As sample size is increased, the $\bar{d}$ of the progressively pooled samples increases rapidly at first and then levels off. Since diversity of progressively pooled samples reaches an asymptote and since diversity of individual samples are highly variable, it is preferable to report asymptotic diversity. Diversity had leveled off the fifth pooled sample in most of the areas sampled (Wilhm 1970abc). The range of $\bar{d}$ varies from zero to any positive number. A value of zero is obtained when all individuals belong to the same species. The maximum value of $\bar{d}$ depends on the number of individuals counted and is obtained when all individuals belong to different species. The $\bar{d}$ usually varies between three and four in clean-water stream areas and is usually less than one in polluted stream areas.

EQUITABILITY (E_m)

As measured by Margalef (1957) and Krebs (1972), equitability (E_m) is a ratio of the observed $\bar{d}$ to a maximum theoretical diversity (d_{max}) computed

as though all individuals were equally distributed among the species. Maximum diversity here is measured simply as $\log_2 S$, therefore:

$$E_m = \bar{d} / \log_2 S$$

As equitability increases the more evenly distributed the species become or the more closely their distributions conform to perfect theoretical distributions. Equitability (E_m) may range from 0 to 1 except in the unusual situation where the distribution in the sample is more than the distribution resulting from the MacArthur model. Such an eventuality will result in values of E_m greater than 1, and this occasionally occurs in samples containing only a few specimens with several taxa represented. The estimates of E_m and $\bar{d}$ improve with increased sample size, and samples containing less than 100 specimens should be evaluated with caution if at all (EPA 1973).

Equitability has been found to be very sensitive to even slight levels of degradation. An improved equitability formula is presented below and must be used with tables presented in Lloyd and Ghelardi (1964) and EPA (1973):

$$E_{m2} = S^1 / S$$

where S = number of taxa in the sample
 S^1 = tabulated value

Because a table is required to calculate E_{m2} , it is not easily applied to computer operations. Equitability levels below 0.5 have not been encountered in southeastern streams known to be unaffected by oxygen-demanding wastes, and in such streams, E_{m2} generally range between 0.6 and 0.8. Even slight levels of degradation have been found to reduce E_{m2} below 0.5 and generally to a range of 0.0 to 0.3.

REDUNDANCY (R)

Redundancy (R) as measured by Wilhm and Dorris (1968) and Cairns and Dickson (1971) gives the relative position of the observed diversity index ($\bar{d}$) between theoretical maximum and minimum diversities ($d_{\max}$ and $d_{\min}$). Calculated as follows:

$$R = \frac{d_{\max} - \bar{d}}{d_{\max} - d_{\min}}$$

Theoretical maximum ($d_{\max}$) and minimum ($d_{\min}$) are calculated as follows:

$$d_{\max} = (1/N) [-\log_2 N! - S \log_2 (N/S)!]$$

$$d_{\min} = (1/N) \{-\log_2 N! - \log_2 [N-(S-1)]!\}$$

Redundancy (R) is a measure of the repetition of information within a community and thereby expresses the dominance of one or more species and is inversely proportional to the wealth of species. Redundancy (R) is maximal when no choice of species exists and minimal when there is more choice of species. A second $d_{\max}$ calculated is $d_{\max} = \log_2 N$ but is not widely used.

EVENNESS (J')

If an investigator is dealing with data consisting of the numbers of individuals, $N_1, N_2, \dots, N_S$, in each of the S species and if the data are portrayed in histogram form, S is the range of data or the width of the histogram. The shape of the histogram is best described in terms of what may be called its "evenness." Thus the distribution has maximum evenness if all the species abundances are equal; and the greater the disparities among the different species abundances, the smaller the evenness. Evenness is calculated as follows (Pielou 1969):

$$\text{EVENNESS} = \frac{\text{diversity}}{\log_2 S}$$

where S = number of species

diversity = Shannon-Weaver diversity index ($\bar{d}$)

Egloff and Brakel (1973) calculated evenness for a population of aquatic macroinvertebrates in a stream receiving large inputs of domestic sewage. Above the outfall evenness values ranged from 0.6 to 0.7 when diversity was 3.0 and greater, while below the outfall evenness dropped to 0.4 and below and diversity decreased to less than one. The number of species and evenness appeared to be reciprocals of one another along the stream except at the outfall where both decrease. The evenness index has not been widely used in aquatic studies.

SPECIES RICHNESS (SR)

A further component of diversity, richness, was calculated in the computer program furnished by Orr et al. (1973), but no reference to it could be found in the literature. It was calculated as follows:

$$SR = \bar{d} - \bar{d} / \log_2 N$$

Species richness is more commonly calculated by summing the total number of species present in a sample.

FORTRAN computer programs for calculating species diversity indices are available from the following sources: Wilhm (1970b), Cairns and Dickson (1971), and Orr et al. (1973).

As commonly used by biologists, species diversity indices provide insight into the structure of natural communities and may suggest qualitative aspects about their surrounding environments. A low diversity index ($\bar{d}$) indicates a largely monotypic community dominated by a few abundant organisms. Often the total number of species is considerably reduced. In addition, a low diversity index often suggests that degradational environmental conditions exist which favor the proliferation of a few tolerant

species and the removal of intolerant forms. A high diversity index indicates a heterogeneous community in which abundance is distributed more evenly among a number of species. The total number of species is generally large.

A modification of the Shannon indices is the Brillouin index (Pielou 1969). In the final stages of this study the Brillouin index was calculated and compared with the Shannon values. Formulas are presented in Appendix A.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

The Yellowstone River originates in Yellowstone National Park as a tributary of Yellowstone Lake. From Yellowstone Lake the river flows northward for about 60 miles before entering Montana near Gardiner. After entering Montana, the Yellowstone River continues a northward route for about 70 miles until near Livingston, where the river turns eastward as it leaves the mountains and flows across the prairie of southern Montana. The Yellowstone River joins the Missouri River just inside North Dakota about 30 miles east of Sidney, Montana. About 570 miles of river are found in Montana and sampling stations included 550 miles of this total.

Table 1 lists the longitudinal and elevational location of the 20 sampling stations and the stations are more graphically shown in Figure 3. The Tongue River was extensively studied also, and the macroinvertebrate fauna there influence the fauna of the lower Yellowstone River and so it is included in this study (Figure 4).

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Many sampling methods were used to collect aquatic macroinvertebrates on the Yellowstone River, including kick nets (Figure 11), Water's Round Sampler (Figure 12) and Hester-Dendy multiple plate artificial substrates.

The kick net was a modified Turtox bottom net with dimensions of 8"x8" and 10" deep (46x20x25.4 cm). A six-foot wooden handle was used to hold the net perpendicular to the current. A wire frame 17"x16" (43.2x40.6 cm) was attached to the bottom lip of the net frame perpendicular to the net opening in such a way that the wire frame rested on the stream bottom. The area within the frame was 272 in.² (0.175 m²) and when the area within the frame was disturbed, the bottom organisms were carried into the number 20 (0.70 mm) mesh net. This sampler is essentially a Surber Sampler on a pole.

Net material was added to each side of the wire frame to minimize side washout of organisms. This technique can be used as long as the water is shallow enough to wade. The bottom outlined by the frame is merely stirred with the foot. This sampler was used at the Glendive and Intake sampling stations during 1975 only. Water depth and current speed at six-tenths the depth were determined in the center of each sampling site. A timed (2-minute) kick sample without the 17"x16" frame was taken at many stations during 1974 in the Yellowstone and Tongue rivers to determine relative abundance of organisms.

Table 1. Yellowstone River sampling stations.

No.	Location	County	Elevation (msl)	River Mile**
1	Corwin Springs	Park	5110 ft.	549
2	Mallard Rest Access	"	4620	515
3	above Livingston	"	4490	501
4	above Shields River	"	4380	497
5	Grey Bear Access	Sweetgrass	4100	468
6	below Greycliff	"	3880	444
7	Columbus	Stillwater	3566	411
8	Laurel	Yellowstone	3294	391
9	Duck Creek Bridge	"	3140	360
10	Huntley	"	3110	349
11	Custer	"	2720	300
12	Bighorn River	Treasure	2700	296
13	Myers	"	2640	279
14	Forsyth	Rosebud	2490	234
15	Miles City	Custer	2335	184
16	Terry	Prairie	2190	138
17	Glendive	Dawson	2045	93
18	Intake	"	1998	71
19	Sidney	Richland	1892	30
20	Cartwright, N.D.	McKenzie	1850	9

**Mouth of the Yellowstone River is river mile 0.0.

Figure 3. Invertebrate sampling stations established on the Yellowstone River and their relative position along a longitudinal and elevational gradient and probable fish distribution zones.

FIGURE 4. Map of the Tongue River, showing sampling sections and major tributaries.

Figure 5. Sampling Station 1, Corwin Springs.

Figure 6. Yankee Jim Canyon between sampling Stations 1 and 2.

Figure 7. Near Station 3 above Livingston.

Figure 8. Station 4 at Livingston.

Figure 9. Station 5 at Greybear fishing access.

Figure 10. Aerial view of Yellowstone River above Miles City.

Figure 11. Kick net and other data collecting gear

A Water's round sampler (Figure 12) was used to take six samples per month at 10 of the 20 sampling stations in the Yellowstone River from August-November 1975.

Figure 12. Water's round bottom sampler.

The Water's sampler is 19.5 in. in height and encloses an area just slightly less than 1-foot square (143.14 in.²) or 0.093 m². The area to be sampled is approached from downstream and is randomly selected. The sampler is forced into the bottom and the investigator reaches down through the open top and stirs the bottom with his hand. Water current carries the organisms into the trailing net with a 20-mesh net. All organisms were preserved in the field in 70 percent ethyl alcohol (Appendix B).

Hester-Dendy multiple plate artificial samplers were used occasionally during 1974, but proved to be unsatisfactory and were discontinued (Hester and Dendy 1962, Fullner 1971, Parsons and Tatum 1974).

In the laboratory, all organisms were picked from bottom detritus and gravel under a dissecting microscope. In most cases immature invertebrates were identified to genus and species and less commonly to family using appropriate taxonomic keys. Adult insects were used whenever possible to confirm species identifications. Experts were consulted when difficulties were encountered.

Current velocity and depth measurements were made to determine velocity/depth requirements for invertebrates. All measurements were made with a Price model AA type current meter obtained from Scientific Instruments, Inc. of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. All velocity measurements were made at the 0.6 depth.

RESULTS

Macroinvertebrate Distribution

A checklist of the macroinvertebrates found in the Tongue and Yellowstone rivers is presented in Table 2. This list is as complete as possible, and utilizes all published sources available, as well as data gathered during this study. Distributional records were taken from Stadnyk (1971), Gaufin et al. (1972), and Thurston et al. (1975).

When a precise species identification was not possible, the most probable species is listed in parentheses using the most recent available distribution data. In the order Diptera, several genera are listed under the family Chironomidae; this is the only place these genera will appear in this report because of unconfirmed identifications.

This group is difficult to identify and it is difficult to have identifications confirmed. This group is being examined more closely, but this work is incomplete at this time.

The distribution of all mayflies (Ephemeroptera) known to occur in the Yellowstone River is presented in Table 3. The mayfly fauna consists of 37 species variously distributed. In this table and in several others, stations 7-12 are shaded and represent the probable location of the transition zone between salmonid and nonsalmonid fish. It would also correspond to the intermediate zone between the erosional and depositional habitat subsystems

Table 2. Checklist of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Tongue River (t) and the Yellowstone River (y).

Phylum Arthropoda

Order Ephemeroptera

Family Siphonuridae

Ameletus (oregonensis) McD.? y

Isonychia (sicca) campestris McD.? y

Family Baetidae

Baetis (alexanderi) M.S. Edmunds & Jensen y t

Baetis parvus Dodds y t

Baetis (propinquus) Walsh y

Baetis tricaudatus Dodds y

Centroptilum sp. A y

Dactylobaetis cepheus Traver & Edmunds y t

Pseudocloeon sp. A y

Family Oligoneuriidae

Lachlania powelli Edmunds y

Family Heptageniidae

Epeorus (Iron) albertae (McD.) y

" " *longimanus* (Eaton) y

Heptagenia elegantula (Eaton) y t

Rhithrogena undulata (Bks.) y t

Stenonema terminatum (Walsh) y t

Stenonema prob n. sp. y

Family Ametropodidae

Ametropus (neavei) McD.) ? y

Family Leptophlebiidae

Choroterpes albimanulata McD. y t

Leptophlebia gravastella Eaton y t

Paraleptophlebia bicornuta (McD.) y

" *heteronea* (McD.) y

Traverella albertana (McD.) y t

Family Ephemerellidae

Ephemerella (Attenuatella) margarita N. y

" *(Caudatella) h. heterocaudata* McD. y

" " *hystrix* Traver y

" *(Drunella) doddsi* Needham y

" " *g. grandis* Eaton y

" *(Ephemerella) inermis* Eaton y t

" *(Serratella) tibialis* McD. y

" *(Timpanoga) h. hecuba* (Eaton) y

Family Tricorythidae

Tricorythodes minutus Traver y t

" sp. A y

Family Ephemeridae

Ephemerella sp. A y

Family Polymitarcidae

Ephoron album (Say) y

Family Caenidae

Brachyocercus (prudens) McD.? y t

Caenis latipennis y

Family Baetiscidae

Baetisca sp. A y t

Table 2 continued. Checklist of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Tongue River (t) and the Yellowstone River (y).

Order Trichoptera		
Family Rhyacophilidae		
<i>Rhyacophila bifida</i> Bks.	y	
Family Helicopsychidae		
<i>Helicopsyche borealis</i> (Hagen)	y	
Family Glossosomatidae		
<i>Glossosoma</i> sp. A.	y	t
" <i>traviatum</i> Bks.	y	
" <i>velona</i> Ross	y	
Family Psychomyiidae		
<i>Polycentropus cinereus</i> Hagen	y	
<i>Psychomyia flavida</i> Hagen	y	
Family Hydropsychidae		
<i>Arctopsyche grandis</i> Bks.	y	
<i>Chumatopsyche</i> sp. A	y	t
" <i>analis</i> (Bks.)	y	
" <i>campyla</i> Ross	y	
" <i>lasia</i> Ross	y	
" <i>enonis</i> Ross	y	
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp. A	y	t
" <i>near alhedra</i> Ross		t
" <i>cockerelli</i> Bks.	y	
" <i>corbeti</i> Nimmo	y	
" <i>occidentalis</i> Bks.	y	
" <i>oslari</i> Bks.	y	
" <i>separata</i> Bks.	y	
Family Hydroptilidae		
<i>Hydroptila</i> sp. A	y	t
" <i>waubesiana</i> Betten	y	
<i>Agraylea multipunctata</i> Curtis	y	
<i>Ochrotrichia potomas</i> Denning	y	
<i>Neotrichia</i> sp. A	y	
Family Leptoceridae		
<i>Athripsodes</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Leptocella</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Ocetis</i> sp. A	y	t
" <i>avara</i> (Bks.)	y	
" <i>disjuncta</i> (Bks.)	y	
<i>Priacnodos frontalis</i> Bks.	y	
Family Lepidostomatidae		
<i>Lepidostoma</i> n. sp.	y	
" <i>pluvialis</i> Milne	y	
" <i>veleda</i> Denning	y	
Family Brachycentridae		
<i>Amiocentrus aspilus</i> (Ross)	y	
<i>Brachycentrus</i> sp. A	y	t
" <i>americanus</i> (Bks)	y	
" <i>occidentalis</i> Bks.	y	
Family Limnephilidae		
<i>Hesperophylax incisus</i> Bks.	y	
<i>Limnephilus taloga</i> Ross	y	

Table 2 continued (2). Checklist of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Tongue River (t) and the Yellowstone River (y).

Order Plecoptera

Family Nemouridae

<i>Nemoura</i> (<i>Prostoia</i>) <i>besametsa</i> Ricker	y	
" (<i>Zapada</i>) <i>cinetipes</i> Bks.	y	
<i>Paraleuctra</i> <i>sara</i> Claassen	y	
<i>Capnia</i> (<i>Capnia</i>) <i>confusa</i> Claassen	y	
" " <i>gracilaria</i> Claassen	y	
" " <i>limata</i> Frison	y	
" (<i>Utacapnia</i>) <i>distincta</i> Frison	y	
" " <i>poda</i> Nebeker & Gaufin	y	
<i>Eucapnopsis</i> <i>vedderensis</i> Ricker	y	
<i>Iso-capnia</i> <i>missouri</i> Ricker	y	
" <i>vedderensis</i> (Ricker)	y	
<i>Brachyptera</i> (<i>Taenionema</i>) <i>fosketti</i> Ricker	y	t
" " <i>nigripennis</i> Bks.	y	
" " <i>pacifica</i> (Bks)	y	

Family Pteronarcidae

<i>Pteronarcella</i> <i>badia</i> (Hagen)	y	
<i>Pteronareys</i> <i>californica</i> Newport	y	

Family Perlodidae

<i>Arcynopteryx</i> (<i>Skwala</i>) <i>parallela</i> (Frison)	y	
<i>Isogenus</i> (<i>Cultus</i>) <i>aestivalis</i> (N & C)	y	
" " <i>tostonus</i> Ricker	y	
" (<i>Isogenoides</i>) <i>frontalis colubrinus</i> Hagen	y	t
" " <i>elongatus</i> Hagen	y	
<i>Isoperla</i> <i>fulva</i> Claassen	y	
" <i>mormona</i> Bks.	y	
" <i>longiseta</i> Bks.	y	
" <i>patrioia</i> Frison	y	

Family Chloroperlidae

<i>Alloperla</i> (<i>Swallia</i>) <i>pallidula</i> (Bks)	y	
" (<i>Sweltsa</i>) <i>coloradensis</i> (Bks)	y	
" (<i>Alloperla</i>) <i>severa</i> Hagen	y	
" (<i>Triznaka</i>) <i>signata</i> (Bks)	y	

Family Perlidae

<i>Acroneuria</i> <i>abnormis</i>	y	t
" (<i>Hesperoperla</i>) <i>pacifica</i> Bks.	y	
<i>Claassenia</i> <i>sabulosa</i> (Bks)	y	

Order Isopoda

Family Asellidae

<i>Asellus</i> <i>racovitzai racovitzai</i> Williams	y	
--	---	--

Order Lepidoptera

Family Pyralidae

<i>Cataclysta</i> sp. A	y	t
-------------------------	---	---

Table 2 continued (3). Checklist of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Tongue River (t) and the Yellowstone River (y).

Order Hemiptera		
Family Corixidae		
<i>Callicorixa utahensis</i> (Hung.)	y	
<i>Conocorixa audeni</i> (Hung.)	y	
<i>Sigara alternata</i> Say	y	
<i>Trichocorixa borealis</i> Sailer	y	
Family Naucoridae		
<i>Ambrysia mormon</i> Mont.	y	
Family Veliidae		
<i>Rhagovelia distincta</i> Champion	y	t
Family Gerridae		
<i>Gerris remigis</i> Say	y	
Family Nepidae		
<i>Ranatra fusca</i> P.B.	y	
Order Odonata		
Family Gomphidae		
<i>Gomphus</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Ophiogomphus</i> sp. A	y	t
Family Agrionidae		
<i>Calopteryx</i> sp. A		t
Family Coenagrionidae		
<i>Argia</i> sp. A		t
<i>Amphiagrion</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Isallagma</i> sp. A	y	
" <i>ebrium</i> (Hagen)		t
<i>Ischnura</i> sp. A		t
Order Coleoptera		
Family Dytiscidae		
<i>Oreodytes</i> sp. A	y	
Family Dryopidae		
<i>Helichus</i> sp. A	y	
Family Elmidae		
<i>Dubiraphia</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Microcyllolopus pusillus</i> (LeConte)	y	t
<i>Optioservus quadrimaculatus</i> (Horn)	y	
<i>Stenelmis</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Waltzevia parvula</i> (Horn)	y	
Family Gyrinidae		
<i>Cyrinus</i> sp. A	y	
Order Diptera		
Family Blepharoceridae		
<i>Agathon</i> sp. A	y	
Family Ceratopogonidae		
	y	

Table 2 continued (4). Checklist of the aquatic macroinvertebrates of the Tongue River (t) and the Yellowstone River (y).

Family Chironomidae		
Subfamily Tanypodinae		
<i>Ablabesmyia</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Clinotanytus</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Cryptocladius</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Procladius</i> sp. A	y	
Subfamily Chironominae		
<i>Chironomus</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Cryptochironomus</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Microtendipes</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Paralauterborniella</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Rheotanytarsus</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Stictochironomus</i> sp. A	y	
Subfamily Diamesinae		
<i>Diamesa</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Monodiamesa</i> sp. A	y	
Subfamily Orthoclaadiinae		
<i>Brillia</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Cardiocladius</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Cricotopus</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Fukiefferiella</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Metriocnemus</i> sp. A	y	
<i>Orthocladus</i> sp. A	y	t
<i>Trichocladus</i> sp. A	y	
Family Dolichopodidae		
Family Empididae		
<i>Hemerodromia</i> sp. A	y	
Family Muscidae		
<i>Limmophora</i> sp. A	y	

Table 3. EPEMEROPTERA OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER.

-STATIONS-

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<u>Baetis (propinquus ?)</u>																				
<u>Ephemerella hystrix</u>																				
<u>Epeorus longimanus</u>																				
<u>Ephemerella heterocaudat</u>																				
" <u>hecuba</u>																				
<u>Baetis tricaudatus</u>																				
<u>Pseudocloeon</u> sp.																				
<u>Ephemerella tibialis</u>																				
<u>Ephemerella</u> sp.																				
<u>Ephemerella doddsi</u>																				
" <u>grandis</u>																				
<u>Paraleptophlebia</u>																				
<u>heteronea</u>																				
<u>Epeorus albertae</u>																				
<u>Paraleptophlebia</u>																				
<u>bicornuta</u>																				
<u>Ephemerella margarita</u>																				
<u>Stenonema</u> prob. n.sp.																				
<u>Ameletus (oregonensis ?)</u>																				
<u>Ephemerella inermis</u>																				
<u>Baetis</u> sp. A																				
" <u>parvus</u>																				
<u>Heptagenia elegantula</u>																				
<u>Rhithrogena undulata</u>																				
<u>Leptophlebia gravastelle</u>																				
<u>Dactylobaetis cepheus</u>																				
<u>Tricorythodes minutus</u>																				
<u>Tricorythodes</u> sp.A																				
<u>Choroterpes albiannulata</u>																				
<u>Traverella albertana</u>																				
<u>Brachycercus (prudens ?)</u>																				
<u>Stenonema terminatum</u>																				
<u>Caenis latipennis</u>																				
<u>Ephoron album</u>																				
<u>Baetisca</u> sp.																				
<u>Isonychia (campestris ?)</u>																				
<u>Centroptilum</u> sp.																				
<u>Lachlania powelli</u>																				
<u>Ametropus (neavei ?)</u>

Figure 13. Aerial view of the Intake diversion, sampling station No. 18.

Figure 14. Yellowstone River at Intake diversion.

Figure 15 . Number of species of the three major orders found at each sampling station in the Yellowstone River.

Figure 16. Mature nymph of the mayfly *Heptagenia elegantula*.

Figure 17. Adult mayfly *Traverella albertana*.

outlined by Cummins (1975b) for large rivers. Four species were collected throughout the study area and a fifth species (*Ephemerella inermis*) was missing only from the lowermost sampling station. There is some question that the species *Baetis alexanderi* may actually be *B. insignificans*.

The number of mayfly species found at each station is illustrated in Figure 15. Station 5 yielded the largest number of species (19) and stations 19 and 20 the fewest with 10 species. No pattern of mayfly distribution is apparent throughout the transition zone. Along a longitudinal gradient the community exhibits a gradual shift from mountain fauna to prairie fauna or a fauna more adapted to slower flow, warmer temperatures and a silty substratum, but the number of species is quite constant along the entire river.

Figure 18. Photo of the Yellowstone River taken about 10 miles upstream from Miles City.

The longitudinal distribution of the stoneflies (Plecoptera) differs considerably from that of the Ephemeroptera (Table 4). A total of 32 species was identified in the study area. No single species was collected at every station. Data available for this order are probably the most accurate because of the work of Stadnyk (1971) and Gauvin et al. (1972). Most of the fauna are probably adapted to the conditions found in the upper river. A total of 12 species drop out in the transition zone and five species could be classified as prairie stream forms. *Acroneuria abnormis*, probably washed out of the Tongue River where it is very abundant, and was collected only at Station 15. The number of Plecoptera species decreases steadily downstream (Figure 15). Generally the non-prairie stoneflies appear to have habitat requirements similar to those of the salmonid fishes.

Table 4. PLECOPTERA OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER
-STATIONS-

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<u>Capnia distincta</u>																				
<u>Isogenus aestivalis</u>																				
<u>Paraleuctra sara</u>																				
<u>Capnia gracilaria</u>																				
<u>Nemoura besametsa</u>																				
<u>Isoperla fulva</u>																				
<u>Capnia confusa</u>																				
<u>Capnia poda</u>																				
<u>Pteronarcys</u>																				
<u>californica</u>																				
<u>Alloperla coloradensis</u>																				
<u>Isocapnia vedderensis</u>																				
<u>Alloperla severa</u>																				
<u>Eucapnopsis vedderensis</u>																				
<u>Alloperla pallidula</u>																				
<u>Hesperoperla pacifica</u>																				
<u>Nemoura cinctipes</u>																				
<u>Alloperla signata</u>																				
<u>Isoperla mormona</u>																				
<u>Arcynopteryx parallela</u>																				
<u>Brachyptera nigripennis</u>																				
<u>Isogenus tostonus</u>																				
<u>Pteronarcella badia</u>																				
<u>Isogenus elongatus</u>																				
<u>Claassenia sabulosa</u>																				
<u>Alloperla sp.</u>																				
<u>Brachyptera pacifica</u>																				
<u>Isoperla patricia</u>																				
<u>Isocapnia missouri</u>																				
<u>Capnia sp.</u>																				
<u>Capnia limata</u>																				
<u>Acro-neuria abnormis</u>																				
<u>Isoperla longiseta</u>																				
<u>Brachyptera fosketti</u>																				
<u>Isogenus frontalis</u>																				
<u>Brachyptera sp.</u>																				
<u>Isogenus sp.</u>																				
<u>Isoperla sp.</u>

Figure 19. Yellowstone River at Glendive during early winter.

Figure 20. Yellowstone River at Terry during late winter.

Caddisfly (Trichoptera) distribution in the Yellowstone River is presented in Table 5. The present species list contains 36 species and additional species will probably be collected. Distributional patterns are less distinct than with the Ephemeroptera and Plecoptera. In most cases caddisfly larvae cannot be identified to species; adult males are necessary. The present distribution is incomplete because all stations were not sampled with equal frequency. For example, Station 9 had the largest number of species and was sampled most intensively. Generally, caddisfly distribution is similar to that of the Plecoptera with a steady decline in species downstream. The genera *Hydropsyche* and *Cheumatopsyche* are abundant throughout the river, but dominate in the lower 10 stations.

The distribution of the remaining aquatic orders is given in Table 6. The order Diptera is widely distributed throughout the river with the family Chironomidae being the most abundant and diverse. *Procladius margarita*, an interesting species previously unreported from Montana, was captured at several stations. Representatives of the remaining orders did not illustrate any distributional trends and, with the exception of the Oligochaeta, were never abundant.

The distribution of macroinvertebrates found in the Tongue River, shown in Table 7, is very complex and is not easily explained. The fauna is similar to the Yellowstone fauna in many ways, but there are several differences. The stonefly *Acroneuria abnormis*, the elmid beetle *Stenelmis* sp. and the mussel *Lampsilis* sp. are very abundant in the Tongue but are rare in the Yellowstone River. Odonates are more abundant and diverse in the Tongue River.

Figure 21. Photo of an adult mayfly, *Tricoorythodes minutus*.

Table 5. TRICHOPTERA OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER.

-STATIONS-

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<u>Glossosoma traviatum</u>																				
<u>Cheumatopsyche pettiti</u>																				
<u>Amiocentrus aspilus</u>																				
<u>Hesperophylax incisus</u>																				
<u>Lepidostoma pluvialis</u>																				
<u>Rhyacophila bifila</u>																				
<u>Cheumatopsyche campyla</u>																				
<u>Limnephilidae</u>																				
<u>Athripsodes sp.</u>																				
<u>Psychomyia flavida</u>																				
<u>Helicopsyche borealis</u>																				
<u>Arctopsyche inermis</u>																				
<u>Lepidostoma veleda</u>																				
<u>Brachycentrus occidentalis</u>																				
<u>Hydropsyche cockerelli</u>																				
<u>Agraylea multipunctata</u>																				
<u>Cheumatopsyche analis</u>																				
<u>Lepidostoma n. sp.</u>																				
<u>Potomyia flavida</u>																				
<u>Trienodes frontalis</u>																				
<u>Brachycentrus americanus</u>																				
<u>Hydropsyche oslari</u>																				
<u>Polycentropus cinereus</u>																				
<u>Ochrotrichia potomas</u>																				
<u>Glossosoma velona</u>																				
<u>Hydropsyche occidentalis</u>																				
<u>Hydroptila sp.</u>																				
<u>Oecetis avara</u>																				
<u>Oecetis disjuncta</u>																				
<u>Cheumatopsyche enonis</u>																				
<u>Neotrichia sp.</u>																				
<u>Limnephilus taloga</u>																				
<u>Leptocella sp.</u>																				
<u>Hydropsyche corbeti</u>																				
<u>Hydropsyche separata</u>																				
<u>Cheumatopsyche lasia</u>																				

Table 6. AQUATIC INVERTEBRATES OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER.

	-STATIONS-																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
DIPTERA																				
<u>Ceratopogonidae</u>																				
<u>Dolichopodidae</u>																				
<u>Agathon</u> sp.																				
<u>Hemerodromia</u> sp.																				
<u>Procladius</u> sp.																				
<u>Atherix</u> sp.																				
<u>Simulium</u> sp.																				
<u>Dicranota</u> sp.																				
<u>Hexatoma</u> sp.																				
<u>Holorusia</u> sp.																				
<u>Tipula</u> sp.																				
<u>Limnophora</u> sp.																				
<u>Chironomidae</u>																				
ISOPODA																				
<u>Asellus</u> sp.																				
LEPIDOPTERA																				
<u>Cataclysta</u> sp.																				
HEMIPTERA																				
<u>Rhagovelia</u> sp.																				
<u>Ambrysia</u> sp.																				
<u>Callicorixa</u> sp.																				
<u>Cenocorixa</u> sp.																				
<u>Trichocorixa</u> sp.																				
<u>Sigara</u> sp.																				
<u>Gerris</u> sp.																				
<u>Ranatra</u> sp.																				
COLEOPTERA																				
<u>Oreodytes</u> sp.																				
<u>Cyrinus</u> sp.																				
<u>Dubiraphia</u> sp.																				
<u>Microcyllopus</u> sp.																				
<u>Optioservus</u> sp.																				
<u>Stenelmis</u> sp.																				
<u>Zaitzevia</u> sp.																				
<u>Helichus</u> sp.																				

Table 6. AQUATIC INVERTEBRATES OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER.

	-STATIONS-																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
ODONATA																				
<u>Gomphus</u> sp.																				
<u>Ophiogomphus</u> sp.																				
<u>Amphiarrion</u> sp.																				
<u>Libellulidae</u>																				
AMPHIPODA																				
<u>Cammarus</u> sp.																				
<u>Hyalella</u> sp.																				
ACARI																				
<u>Hydracarina</u>																				
MOLLUSCA																				
<u>Ferrissia</u> sp.																				
<u>Gyraulus</u> sp.																				
<u>Lampsilis</u> sp.																				
<u>Lymnaea</u> sp.																				
<u>Physa</u> sp.																				
TURBELLARIA																				
<u>Phagocata</u> sp.																				
OLIGOCHAETA																				
<u>Nais</u> sp.																				
<u>Ophidonais</u> sp.																				

Table 7. Macroinvertebrate fauna of the Tongue River, Montana.

Station No. -	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Taxa	Dam Section	Hosford	Birney	Ashland	Viall	S - H	Orcutt	Keogh
Ephemeroptera								
<i>Baetis</i> spp.	x	x	x		x	x		
<i>Baetisca</i> sp.						x		
<i>Brachycerus</i> sp.					x			
<i>Choroterpes</i> sp.				x		x		
<i>Dactylobaetis</i> sp.						x		
<i>Ephemerella</i> sp.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
<i>Heptagenia</i> sp.			x	x	x	x	x	
<i>Leptophlebia</i> sp.			x	x			x	
<i>Rhythrogena</i> sp.			x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Stenonema</i> sp.		x				x		
<i>Traverella</i> sp.			x	x	x	x	x	
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Trichoptera								
<i>Brachycentrus</i> sp.	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Glossosoma</i> sp.		x	x					
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Hydroptila</i> sp.	x	x	x				x	x
<i>Myzocladus</i> sp.			x	x			x	
<i>Oecetis</i> sp.			x	x		x	x	
Plecoptera								
<i>Acroneuria</i> sp.			x			x	x	x
<i>Brachyptera</i> sp.			x		x	x	x	x
<i>Isogenus</i> sp.			x	x	x	x	x	x
Coleoptera								
<i>Dubiraphia</i> sp.		x	x					
<i>Microcylloepus</i> sp.		x	x	x				
<i>Stenelmis</i> sp.		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Mollusca								
<i>Ferriassia</i> sp.	x	x	x					
<i>Gyrulus</i> sp.		x						
<i>Lymnaea</i> sp.	x	x						
<i>Lamprellia</i> sp.								x
<i>Physa</i> sp.	x	x	x					
<i>Pisidium</i> sp.		x				x		
<i>Sphaerium</i> sp.		x						

Table 7 continued. Macroinvertebrate fauna of the Tongue River, Montana.

Station No. -	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Taxa	Dam Section	Hosford	Birney	Ashland	Viall	S - H	Orcutt	Keogh
Odonata								
<i>Argia</i> sp.		x					x	
<i>Calopteryx</i> sp.		x			x	x		
<i>Enallagma</i> sp.								
<i>Ischnura</i> sp.		x						
<i>Gomphus</i> sp.			x					
<i>Ophiogomphus</i> sp.	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Lepidoptera								
<i>Catocalpa</i> sp.	x	x				x	x	
Turbellaria								
<i>Dugesia</i> sp.	x	x	x	x		x	x	
Hemiptera								
Corixidae	x	x	x				x	x
<i>Rhyogonia</i> sp.				x				
Diptera								
Chironomidae	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Cardiocladius</i> sp.	x		x					
<i>Diamasa</i> sp.	x		x					
<i>Eukiefferiella</i> sp.			x					x
<i>Orthocladus</i> sp.	x					x		
<i>Rhyacolanytarsus</i> sp.			x					
Simuliidae								
<i>Simulium</i> sp.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Tipulidae								
<i>Hexatoma</i> sp.			x	x		x	x	x
Oligochaeta		x	x

Figure 22 . Emergence and flight patterns of mayflies from the Yellowstone River, 1974-75.

Figure 23 . Emergence and flight patterns of stoneflies from the Yellowstone River, 1974-76.

Insect Emergence

Emergence times were determined for only 13 species of mayflies (Figure 22). Generally these species are common in the lower reaches of the Yellowstone River. Most mayfly adults live from a few days to a few hours and most emerge at dawn or dusk and a considerable amount of time is necessary to accumulate a thorough collection of the majority of species. Emergence of mayfly adults in the lower river is concentrated in the June-September period. Adult *Ephoron album* emerged very late in the summer. Their emergence was so late in the year that many adults were influenced by cold morning temperatures and many were observed fluttering on the beaches unable to fly. One of the largest mayfly emergences ever observed by the author was witnessed in late August 1974. It was first observed at Huntley (Station 11) where thousands of adult *Traverella albertana* (Figure 17) were emerging. The adults were so thick on the water surface that carp were surface feeding on the adults. It was a wet day and the adults hovered over the wet highway from Huntley to Miles City and the emergence probably involved hundreds of thousands of insects. The emergence of *Tricoorythodes minutus* (Figure 21) and *Ephoron album* also involved large numbers of individuals and was very conspicuous.

The emergence of adult stoneflies occurs over a longer time span than does that of mayflies. Emergence of stoneflies occurred from March-August (Figure 23). Three species, *Capnia limata*, *Brachyptera fosketti* and *B. pacifica* emerged when the river was still covered with ice. Stoneflies are not as abundant as mayflies, spend less time in flight and are therefore less conspicuous when emerging. The most spectacular stonefly emergence is that of *Pteronarcys californica*, the giant stonefly or the "salmonfly" of fly fishermen. This species is confined to the upper river where adult insect sampling was less intense. A small yellow stonefly, *Isoperla longiseta* (Figure 24) emerges in large numbers in the lower river.

Figure 24. Photo of an adult stonefly *Isoperla longiseta*.

Figure 25. Photo of the larvae of the caddisfly *Hydropsyche*.

Figure 26. Photo of an adult of the genus *Hydropsyche*.

The emergence patterns of caddisflies is presented in Figure 27. Emergence and flight times ranged from May-September. Caddisflies and stoneflies can live for several weeks as adults; therefore the presence of an adult does not necessarily signify recent emergence. In most cases larval caddisflies can be identified only to genus; adult males are necessary for species identification. The number of species presented in Figure 27 is much larger than either the mayfly or stonefly lists because the fauna is very rich and because adult caddisflies are readily attracted to collecting lights and are easily collected.

The family Hydropsychidae dominates the caddisfly fauna of the Yellowstone River. Representatives of this family are all net spinners and include the genera *Cheumatopsyche*, *Hydropsyche* and *Arctopsyche*, and total 13 species (Figures 25 and 26). One species *Hydropsyche corbeti* was not known from the United States until collected in the Yellowstone River.

Bottom Fauna Standing Crop

Bottom samples taken during the fall of 1974 were designed to survey the bottom fauna and to test equipment. The data are, therefore, semi-quantitative and very difficult to compare with later sampling. Results of bottom sampling during 1974 are presented in Appendix C.

Quantitative bottom fauna sampling began in the summer of 1975. No sampling is possible in the lower river during the winter because of ice cover and shortly after the ice is removed, spring runoff begins and bottom samples from this period would be of little value. The data gathered by Schwehr (1976) were added here to compare the density of invertebrates of the mid-river (Stations 5-11) to that of the lower river (Stations 12-20). Field data from these samples are presented in Appendix D.

In August standing crop estimates ranged from about 2000 m^{-2} at Station 5 to about 50 m^{-2} at Station 9 (Figure 28). Station 19 exhibited the lowest mean of 250 m^{-2} . Generally there was a gradual decrease in mean standing crop in a downstream direction.

September standing crop estimates exhibited a greater range, from 8500 (Station 5) to 20 m^{-2} at Station 19. Estimates from the lower river were much lower than from upper river stations (Figure 29).

In October less variation in range was observed (Figure 30). The maximum standing crop estimate was 4000 m^{-2} (Station 11) and the low was 250 m^{-2} at Station 18. The trend again was a gradual decrease in the density of organisms as one moves downstream.

In the November samples data from Stations 1 and 3 were available (Figure 31). Standing crop estimates at Stations 1 and 3 were very similar and much higher than for the remaining sampling stations (range 4500-12,000 m^{-2}). The trend along a longitudinal gradient was a decrease in standing crop downstream.

Figure 27 . Emergence and flight patterns of caddisflies from the Yellowstone River, 1974-76.

Figure 28 . Population estimates, August 1975,
mean and range of six Water's samples.

Fig. 29 Population estimates for September 1975, mean and range of six Water's samples.

Fig. 30 Population estimates for October 1975,
mean and range of six Water's samples.

Figure 31 . Population estimates for November 1975.
mean and range of six Water's samples.

The percent composition of all invertebrate orders collected in 1975 are presented in Tables 8-11. The mean percent composition of each order is found in Table 12. Mayflies dominate the fauna in August and Trichoptera begin to dominate in September and October while the Diptera became dominant in November. Plecoptera are a minor portion of the fauna as are remaining fauna. Figure 32 graphically illustrates the longitudinal changes in percent composition of invertebrate orders.

Species Diversity

Species diversity indices were calculated from Water's samples taken during August-November 1975. The rationale behind species diversity indices was the desire to begin a monitoring study of the Yellowstone River. Mathematical indices are one way of condensing long species lists to a single mathematical value that can be compared and contrasted with other stations and other time periods. Four different diversity indices are graphed and presented in Figures 33-36 (Appendix E-F).

The Shannon index (D) appears to be the most sensitive to community changes and these data are presented in Figure 37. The Miles City and Sidney stations exhibited the greatest season change. The Glendive and Intake stations were extremely constant and very similar (Tables 13-16).

Species diversity calculations showed that the Shannon index for all stations was near or below 3.0 for most stations. Generally an index above 3.0 illustrates a healthy, unstressed community, while an index below 1.0 is indicative of a monospecific community under stress. The index range of 1.0-3.0 seems to illustrate a community under some stress. Stresses upon certain Yellowstone communities might be due to large amounts of inorganic sediments and non-diverse, uniform substrate types of the riverbottom in some areas.

CURRENT AND DEPTH REQUIREMENTS FOR INVERTEBRATES

Data from the current-depth studies at Glendive and Intake are summarized in Table 17. In general, current and depth means are similar for both stations and all sampling times. Taxa and number of individuals varied greatly, however. At Glendive the mean number of taxa increased from 3.9 in August to 9.0 in November; a similar trend was evident in the Intake samples. The mean number of individuals increased from 9.1 to 149 at Glendive and from 37.9 to 65.8 at Intake. More taxa and more individuals were captured in the October and November samples at both stations than during August and September. December samples would have been valuable, but were unavailable because the lower river froze on November 30, 1975.

Population estimates from 24 samples at each station expressed in numbers per m² are shown in Tables 18-21. In August (Table 18) the fauna was dominated by *Traverella* and *Hydropsyche*. There was a large difference in the total number of individuals collected at Glendive (1222) and Intake (5199).

Table 8. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of August 1975.

Order	Station							
	5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
Ephemeroptera	24.4	40.1	67.4	84.7	52.3	49.7	68.8	75.2
Plecoptera	6.7	25.7	17.4	0.8	2.8		0.6	
Trichoptera	4.3	22.4	5.8	8.6	31.9	48.7	30.1	19.7
Diptera	63.2	11.8	9.5	5.6	9.9	1.6		5.1
Coleoptera	1.4				3.1			
Odonata				0.5				
Oligochaeta							0.6	

Table 9. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of September 1975.

Order	Station							
	5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
Ephemeroptera	18.2	71.1	50.4	50.7	37.4	30.1	37.8	28.8
Plecoptera	3.1	5.0	1.7	0.1	0.2		2.0	
Trichoptera	21.2	1.7	0.9	18.7	48.1	52.1	57.1	46.6
Diptera	56.5	21.8	47.0	30.3	14.2	14.6	3.0	19.2
Coleoptera	0.9	0.2			0.1			
Hemiptera	0.04							
Turbellaria	0.04							
Odonata								1.4
Oligochaeta						3.2		4.1
Acari				0.1				

Table 10. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of October 1975.

Order	Station							
	5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
Ephemeroptera	8.3	35.6	50.8	26.1	35.0	19.8	22.9	21.8
Plecoptera	7.8	13.4	2.9	0.2	0.2			
Trichoptera	12.2	12.0	14.1	29.9	39.7	47.4	17.9	44.8
Diptera	71.2	38.7	32.0	44.0	23.3	12.9	29.3	27.0
Coleoptera	0.1	0.2		0.1			0.2	0.5
Odonata					0.2			
Oligochaeta					1.6	19.8	29.7	6.0
Acari	0.3	0.1	0.2					

Table 11. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samplers for the month of November 1975.

Order	Station									
	1	3	5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
Ephemeroptera	14.5	25.4	33.4	22.9	24.8		12.7	7.4	19.6	4.3
Plecoptera	1.4	1.6	8.3	13.8	4.8		1.7	0.4	4.5	1.0
Trichoptera	62.3	43.5	26.3	20.3	16.5		24.7	24.5	29.4	10.8
Diptera	21.1	29.4	29.6	40.6	53.8		54.2	48.4	35.9	75.4
Coleoptera	0.1		0.7	2.4	0.3		0.4			
Oligochaeta	0.1	0.1	0.8				6.2	19.7	10.6	8.6
Acari	0.5		0.1							

Table 12. Percent composition of benthos from the Yellowstone River using Water's samples, mean percentages for August-November 1975.

Order	Station									
	1	3	5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
Ephemeroptera	14.5	25.4	21.1	42.4	48.4	53.8	34.4	26.8	37.3	32.5
Plecoptera	1.4	1.6	6.5	14.5	6.7	0.4	1.2	0.1	1.8	0.3
Trichoptera	62.3	43.5	16.0	14.1	9.3	19.1	36.1	43.2	33.6	30.5
Diptera	21.1	29.4	55.1	28.2	35.6	26.6	25.4	19.4	17.1	31.7
Coleoptera	0.1		0.8	0.7	0.1		1.0			
Hemiptera			0.01							
Turbellaria			0.01							
Odonata						0.1	<0.1			0.4
Oligochaeta	0.1	0.1					2.0	10.7	10.2	3.7
Acari	0.5		0.1							

Table 13. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, August 1975.

		Station							
		5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
$\bar{D}$	Max	2.79	3.11	2.95	3.17	3.22	2.70	2.27	2.43
	Min	1.24	1.66	2.19	2.58	2.16	1.51	1.59	1.69
	Pooled	2.22	3.43	3.25	3.08	3.19	2.15	2.12	2.49
Redundancy	Max	.72	.22	.94	.36	.50	.65	.52	.49
	Min	.27	.00	.02	.01	.24	.23	.33	.14
	Pooled	.49	.08	.28	.26	.32	.44	.45	.30
Evenness	Max	.78	.96	1.00	.92	.89	.90	.81	.95
	Min	.18	.83	.12	.70	.65	.62	.68	.76
	Pooled	.53	.88	.75	.74	.73	.62	.61	.75
Equitability	Max	.52	.72	1.00	.65	.68	.60	.50	.60
	Min	.18	.52	.45	.36	.31	.27	.29	.39
	Pooled	.24	.47	.43	.36	.38	.29	.28	.35

Table 14. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, September 1975.

		Station							
Index		5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
$\bar{D}$	Max					2.50	1.86	1.85	2.43
	Min					1.84	1.38	0.83	1.69
	Pooled					2.49	2.14	2.09	2.49
Redundancy	Max					.55	.59	1.00	.49
	Min					.33	.25	.43	.14
	Pooled					.39	.43	.48	.30
Evenness	Max					.72	.87	.95	.95
	Min					.55	.61	.53	.76
	Pooled					.62	.62	.63	.75
Equitability	Max					.33	.49	.58	.60
	Min					.26	.30	.20	.39
	Pooled					.25	.27	.32	.35

Table 15. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, October 1975.

		Station							
Index		5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
$\bar{D}$	Max					2.50	1.86	1.85	2.33
	Min					1.84	1.38	0.83	0.99
	Pooled					2.41	2.14	2.09	2.42
Redundancy	Max					.55	.59	1.00	1.00
	Min					.33	.25	0.43	.38
	Pooled					.39	.43	0.48	0.00
Evenness	Max					.72	.87	.95	1.00
	Min					.55	.61	.53	.62
	Pooled					.62	.62	.63	.73
Equitability	Max					.33	.49	.75	1.00
	Min					.26	.30	.20	.31
	Pooled					.25	.29	.32	.39

Table 16. Species diversity, range of six Water's samples and results of pooling all samples, November 1975.

Index		Station									
		1	3	5	7	9	11	15	17	18	19
$\bar{D}$	Max	2.88	2.82					1.96	2.45	2.24	1.97
	Min	2.01	2.18					1.41	0.84	1.06	0.24
	Pooled	2.64	2.81					2.00	2.11	2.46	1.30
Redundancy	Max	.53	.44					.64	.82	1.00	.91
	Min	.31	.32					.26	.33	.36	.32
	Pooled	.43	.39					.50	.51	.33	.56
Evenness	Max	.72	.70					.80	.74	.75	.76
	Min	.49	.59					.54	.32	.61	.15
	Pooled	.58	.62					.54	.53	.71	.46
Equitability	Max	.32	.31					.35	.36	.39	.36
	Min	.28	.25					.29	.13	.28	.03
	Pooled	.23	.25					.23	.23	.33	.14

Table 17. Mean and standard deviation for four variables measured in the invertebrate/current investigation in the Yellowstone River at Glendive, 1975.

Date		Depth (ft.)	Current (f/s.)	Taxa	Indiv.
August 7	Mean	1.8	1.202	3.9	9.1
	S. Dev.	0.9	0.575	1.6	8.2
September 17		1.2	0.744	6.5	21.7
		0.9	0.613	2.4	11.1
October 9		1.4	0.786	10.9	126.9
		1.0	0.570	2.2	86.6
November 7		1.6	1.029	9.0	149.0
		0.9	0.678	3.8	133.9

Data taken at Yellowstone River, Intake

August 6	1.3	1.653	4.8	37.9
	0.6	0.782	1.8	32.4
September 9	1.4	0.970	6.0	28.9
	1.0	0.623	1.7	12.2
October 15	0.8	1.124	8.5	84.0
	0.6	1.031	2.9	53.1
November 11	1.6	1.477	7.0	65.8
	0.9	0.921	3.2	44.8

Table 18. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 samples from each station taken on August 6 and 7, 1975 (no./m²).

Taxa	Glendive	Intake
<i>Baetis alexanderi</i>	17	6
<i>Baetis parvus</i>	34	74
<i>Brachycentrus</i> sp.	80	17
<i>Choroterpes</i> sp.	0	11
<i>Dactylobaetis</i> sp.	11	11
<i>Ephemerella</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Heptagenia</i> sp.	57	28
<i>Isonychia</i> sp.	11	40
<i>Rhythrogena</i> sp.	11	210
<i>Traverella</i> sp.	193	3111
<i>Pteronarkodes minutus</i>	63	734
<i>Hydropsyche</i> spp.	569	751
<i>Leptocella</i> sp.	28	6
<i>Isoperla</i> sp.	6	46
Chironomidae	119	114
Simuliidae	11	23
Dytiscidae	0	6
Oligochaeta	6	11
Totals	1222	5199
Means	51	217

Table 19. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 pooled samples taken September 9, 1975 (no./m²).

Taxa	Glendive	Intake
<i>Baelis alexanderi</i>	28	102
<i>Baelis parvus</i>	28	108
<i>Brachyocerus</i> sp.	34	17
<i>Caenis</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Chorolcerpes</i> sp.	23	57
<i>Dactylobactis</i> sp.	28	97
<i>Ephemerebella</i> sp.	0	0
<i>Ephoron</i> sp.	28	17
<i>Ileplagania</i> sp.	131	14
<i>Isonychia</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Amelropus</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Traverella</i> sp.	74	682
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	279	347
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.	0	57
<i>Stenonema</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.	63	23
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp.	779	1763
<i>Leptocella</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Acroneuria</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Isoperla</i> sp.	6	6
<i>Microcylleopus</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Hanatra</i> sp.	6	0
Ceratopogonidae	6	0
Chironomidae	1314	239
Simuliidae	6	51
Oligochaeta	119	28
Totals	2964	3638
Mean	124	152

Table 20. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 pooled samples taken on October 9 and 15, 1975 (no./m²).

Taxa	Glendive	Intake
<i>Baetis alexanderi</i>	1772	1490
<i>Baetis parvus</i>	142	182
<i>Brachyocerus</i> sp.	28	11
<i>Caenis</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Centropetillum</i> sp.	11	0
<i>Choroterpes</i> sp.	46	11
<i>Dactylobaetis</i> sp.	791	301
<i>Ephemerella</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Heptagenia</i> sp.	1879	943
<i>Isonychia</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Rhithrogena</i> sp.	0	742
<i>Stenonema</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Traverella</i> sp.	165	642
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	267	91
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.	11	0
Unknown	6	0
<i>Gammarus</i> sp.	6	6
<i>Hyalella</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Brachycentrus</i> sp.	11	0
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.	199	51
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp.	9845	4448
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp.	0	6
<i>Oecetis</i> sp.	11	0
Gomphidae	17	0
<i>Isogenus</i> sp.	6	80
<i>Isoperla</i> sp.	6	23
Corixidae	23	0
Dolichopodidae	0	6
Empididae	11	0
Chironomidae	1973	2314
Simuliidae	11	154
<i>Stenelmis</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Ferrissia</i> sp.	23	0
<i>Lymnaea</i> sp.	6	0
Oligochaeta	2776	1104
Totals	20,037	12,640
Mean	835	527

Table 21. Population estimates from the invertebrate-current samples, 24 pooled samples taken on November 7 and 11, 1975 (no./m²).

Taxa	Glendive	Intake
<i>Baetis alexanderi</i>	751	392
<i>Baetis parvus</i>	17	85
<i>Brachyocerus</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Caenis</i> sp.	11	0
<i>Dactylobaetis</i> sp.	63	40
<i>Ephemerella</i> sp.	63	0
<i>Heptagenia</i> sp.	956	427
<i>Leptophlebia</i> sp.	6	6
<i>Rhythrogena</i> sp.	80	330
<i>Stenonema</i> sp.	11	0
<i>Traverella</i> sp.	51	11
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	97	34
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.	6	6
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.	927	114
<i>Hydropsyche</i> sp.	10608	4846
<i>Ilyella</i> sp.	6	0
<i>Brachyptera</i> sp.	256	239
<i>Isogenus</i> sp.	6	142
Corixidae	46	0
Chironomidae	1905	1758
Empididae	6	0
Ceratopogonidae	0	6
Simuliidae	0	6
Dytiscidae	11	6
<i>Ferrissia</i> sp.	17	11
<i>Lymnaea</i> sp.	11	0
Oligochaeta	4374	529
Totals	20,245	8988
Mean	844	375

Figure 32 . Percent composition of invertebrate orders
From Water's Samplers, mean of samples taken Aug.-Nov.

Figure 33 . Species diversity indices for August 1975 range of six Water's samples and all six pooled.

Figure 34 . Species diversity indices for September 1975 range of six Water's samples and all six pooled.

Figure 35 . Species diversity indices for October 1975 range of six Water's samples and all six pooled.

Figure 36 . Species diversity indices for November 1975, range of six Water's samples and all six pooled.

Figure 37 . Seasonal changes in Shannon diversity indices, all points are the result of pooling six Water's samples each month at each station during 1975.

In September (Table 19) *Hydropsyche* again were very abundant as were Chironomidae. Totals were comparable for Glendive (2964) and Intake (3638).

Hydropsyche and Chironomidae again dominated in the October samples (Table 20). Number of taxa and total number of individuals greatly increased at both stations.

November samples again found *Hydropsyche* and Chironomidae dominant (Table 21). Totals were again high at Glendive (20,245) but were considerably reduced at Intake (8988).

All 48 samples taken each month were pooled to illustrate which orders dominate the fauna (Table 22). The fauna was dominated by Ephemeroptera and Trichoptera with Diptera a close third. Ephemeroptera monthly percentages ranged from 11.7 to 73.6 percent while Trichoptera totals varied from 21.1 to 56.3 percent of total. It is obvious that the October and November samples contained more information than the August-September samples. This is probably due to summer emergence losses and presence in August and September of very small larvae and nymphs, most of which passed through the collecting net. Mean population estimates varied from 138 m² (August) to 681 m² (October). Percent composition of orders at each station is available in Table 23).

Table 22. Population estimates and percent composition taken from the invertebrate-current samples. Numbers are expressed in no./m² and the values in parentheses are percent of monthly pooled totals from the Glendive and Intake samples.

Orders	August	September	October	November	Mean
EPEMEROPTERA	2175 (32.9)	4725 (73.6)	9555 (29.2)	3449 (11.7)	(36.9)
TRICHOPTERA	2634 (39.9)	1354 (21.1)	14,571 (44.6)	16,495 (56.3)	(40.5)
PLECOPTERA	18 (0.3)	52 (0.3)	115 (0.4)	643 (2.2)	(0.8)
DIPTERA	1616 (24.5)	267 (4.2)	4469 (13.7)	3681 (12.6)	(13.8)
OLIGOCHAETA	147 (2.2)	17 (0.3)	3880 (11.9)	4903 (16.7)	(8.0)
Others	12 (0.2)	6 (0.1)	87 (0.2)	108 (0.4)	(0.2)
Totals	6602	6421	32,677	29,279	
Means	138	134	681	610	
N	48	48	48	48

Fig. 38 . Comparison of sampling methods, Water's (W) and kick net (K) at Glendive using kick samples taken in depths less than 19.5 in. (no./m²).

Fig. 39 . Comparison of sampling methods, Water's (W) and kick net (K) at Intake using kick samples taken in depths less than 19.5 in. (no./m²).

Table 23. Percent composition of invertebrate orders taken with kick samples at Glendive (17) and Intake (18), 1975.

Order	Month - Station							
	August		September		October		November	
	17	18	17	18	17	18	17	18
Ephemeroptera	39.5	81.6	22.2	41.7	25.6	35.1	10.5	14.8
Trichoptera	48.9	14.6	28.4	49.3	50.2	35.6	57.0	55.2
Plecoptera	0.5	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.05	0.8	1.3	4.2
Diptera	10.6	2.6	44.7	8.0	10.0	19.6	9.4	19.7
Hemiptera	0	0	0.2	0	0.1	0	0.2	-
Coleoptera	0	0.1	0.2	0	0.05	0	0.1	0.1
Odonata	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0	0
Amphipoda	0	0	0	0	-	0.2	0.1	0
Mollusca	0	0	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0.1
Oligochaeta	0.5	0.2	4.0	0.8	13.9	8.7	21.6	5.9

Results obtained with the kick net were compared with results of the Water's sampler. Results were similar, but the number of organisms obtained with the kick net was always lower than numbers obtained with the Water's sampler (Figures 38-39). Several kick samples were taken at the water's edge and in water too shallow to sample with the Water's sampler. This would tend to expand the range and reduce the mean. At both stations both samplers followed the same trend and a line joining the means of both methods is almost parallel. The Water's sampler is 19.5 in. high; thus only kick samples taken in depths less than 19.5 in. were compared.

Environmental Requirements

Multiple regression analyses were performed on the current-depth data with current and depth as independent variables and number of taxa and number of individuals as dependent variables. Three models were applied: I) untransformed; II) semilog transformation (of dependent variables); and III) log-log transformation (Appendix G).

It is obvious from Tables 24 and 25 that depth is less frequently significant than current velocity as a means of predicting the number of taxa or the total number of individuals per sample. Number of taxa and number of individuals are very similar when regressed against current velocity. Figures 40-42 are plots of the regression data showing how these data can be expressed to predict the numbers of individuals at any particular current or depth. The deviation of the data from the regression line is demonstrated in Figure 42, for example, where the regression coefficients (r) are 0.774 for current and 0.808 for depth.

Mayfly diversity was very great in the current-depth samples with as many as 15 species present in some samples. Ephemeroptera nymphs are much easier to identify to the species level and so some information was obtained on current preferences for several abundant species. These data provide some insight into niche separation in the mayfly community and how separation and current preference changes throughout the life cycle of several species.

Densities of *Traverella albertana* and *Tricorythodes minutus* are presented in Figure 43. Peak densities in August at Intake for *Traverella albertana* occurred at about 2.25 feet per second (fps). Nymphs of *T. albertana* were more abundant in August than in any other month. This species emerges in September and October and nymphs do not reappear in any number until November.

At the Intake station during the October samples peak population densities were determined for several species (Figure 44). *Heptagenia elegantula* was more abundant in slower currents and was most abundant at 0.5 fps. *Traverella albertana* was abundant near 2.5 fps as in the August samples. *Baetis alexanderi* was also most abundant at 2.5 - 3.0 fps but there was no way to determine at what velocity this population would reach its peak. A similar situation exists with *Rhithrogena undulata* although the population seems to be reaching its greatest density at about 2.75 fps. In November *H. elegantula* and *B. alexanderi* exhibited low densities at Intake but peak densities appear to have occurred at 1.5 fps and 2.5 fps, respectively (Figure 45).

Some current preferences were apparent for mayflies at the Glendive station (Figure 46). Population extremes were evident for *H. elegantula* (0.5 fps), *B. alexanderi* (1.75 fps) and *Dactylobaetis cepheus* (1.75 fps). In the November samples highest densities were *H. elegantula* (1.75 fps) and *B. alexanderi* (2.0 fps) (Figure 47).

Table 24. Synopsis of regression analysis on the current-depth data showing significance for the three models for both sampling stations. Regression of number of taxa and depth (ft.) and current velocity (cfs).

Model	Depth	Current	Depth & Current	Date	Sta.
I	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	17
II	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	17
III	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	17
I	NS	NS	NS	Sept.	17
II	NS	NS	NS	Sept.	17
III	NS	*	*	Sept.	17
I	NS	NS	*	Oct.	17
II	NS	NS	*	Oct.	17
III	NS	*	**	Oct.	17
I	**	**	**	Nov.	17
II	**	**	**	Nov.	17
III	**	**	**	Nov.	17
I	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	18
II	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	18
III	NS	**	**	Aug.	18
I	NS	NS	NS	Sept.	18
II	NS	NS	NS	Sept.	18
III	NS	NS	NS	Sept.	18
I	**	*	**	Oct.	18
II	**	*	**	Oct.	18
III	**	**	**	Oct.	18
I	*	NS	**	Nov.	18
II	*	NS	**	Nov.	18
III	**	**	**	Nov.	18

NS = not significant at $p \leq .05$

* = significant at $p \leq .05$

** = highly significant at $p \leq .01$

Table 25. Synopsis of the regression analysis on the current-depth data showing significance for the three models for both sampling stations. Regression of number of organisms and depth (ft.) and current (cfs).

Model	Depth	Current	Depth & Current	Date	Sta.
I	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	17
II	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	17
III	NS	NS	NS	Aug.	17
I	*	*	*	Sept.	17
II	NS	NS	NS	Sept.	17
III	*	**	**	Sept.	17
I	**	**	**	Oct.	17
II	**	**	**	Oct.	17
III	**	*	**	Oct.	17
I	**	**	**	Nov.	17
II	**	**	**	Nov.	17
III	**	*	**	Nov.	17
I	**	*	**	Aug.	18
II	**	**	**	Aug.	18
III	**	**	**	Aug.	18
I	*	**	**	Sept.	18
II	**	**	**	Sept.	18
III	*	NS	**	Sept.	18
I	**	**	**	Oct.	18
II	**	**	**	Oct.	18
III	**	**	**	Oct.	18
I	**	NS	**	Nov.	18
II	**	**	**	Nov.	18
III	**	**	**	Nov.	18

NS = not significant at $p \leq .05$

* = significant at $p \leq .05$

** = highly significant at $p \leq .01$

Figure 40 . Current/invertebrate relationships,
Yellowstone River, Glendive, Oct. 9, 1975.

Figure 41. Current/depth/invertebrate relationships, Yellowstone River, Intake, Oct. 15, 1975.

Figure 42 . Current/depth/invertebrate relationships, Yellowstone River, Glendive, Nov. 7, 1975.

Figure 43 . Mayfly distribution at various currents, Intake, Aug.1975.

Figure 44. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Intake, Oct., 1975.

Figure 45. Mayfly distribution at various currents, Intake, Nov.1975.

Figure 46 . Mayfly distribution at various currents, Glendive, Oct.1975.

Figure 47 . Mayfly distribution at various currents, Glendive, Nov. 1975.

All of the data on mayfly current preference were pooled and are presented in Figure 48. Several points are evident. Current preference changes with different periods in the life cycle of a species. Greatest population densities for *Heptagenia elegantula* changed from 0.5 fps in October to 1.5 fps in November. Populations of *Baetis alexanderi* exhibited a similar trend. The two samples of *Traverella albertana*, however, were very similar (2.5 fps).

Figure 48 gives some insight into niche separation of six species of Ephemeroptera. Each of these species had its highest densities at slightly different current velocities thus reducing interspecific competition for food and resting areas. The remaining mayflies species were present in numbers too small to illustrate current preference and made up an insignificant part of the fauna in the lower Yellowstone River.

Plecoptera nymphs were not common in the lower Yellowstone River and little information on current preference was obtained. At Intake, however, Plecoptera were only found at the fastest currents.

Trichoptera larvae, *Hydropsyche* in particular, exhibited a distinct current preference with the greatest number of larvae found at the fastest currents sampled. Larvae could not be identified to species and at least three species of *Hydropsyche* have been collected at Glendive and Intake. Samples taken in August and September were not significant ($p > 0.05$) when relating numbers of individuals to current. Samples taken in October and November at both stations were highly significant. It is interesting to note that regression lines varied little from October to November at Glendive and at Intake (Figures 49-50).

There is some evidence that *Hydropsyche* reached its greatest densities at about 1.5 fps at Intake in October (Figure 49) and 2.0 fps in November (Figure 50) after which densities decreased at greater velocities (Appendix H).

Discharge data above and below the study stations are shown in Table 26 (USGS 1976).

Table 26. Discharges at Miles City and Sidney during sampling periods (cfs).

Date	Miles City	Sidney
August 6, 1975	20,200	21,200
August 7, 1975	18,500	20,300
September 9, 1975	9,890	10,100
September 17, 1975	8,440	8,980
October 9, 1975	8,000	9,730
October 15, 1975	8,850	10,300
November 7, 1975	8,620	10,400
November 11, 1975	10,300	10,100

Figure 48 . Synopsis of mayfly/current relationships from both stations and for all sampling months .

Figure 49 . Distribution of Hydropsyche larvae at various currents during October 1975.

Figure 50 . Distribution of Hydropsyche larvae at various currents during November 1975.

DISCUSSION

It is difficult to predict the effects of flow reduction on the invertebrate fauna of a stream because of the large number of species involved and the inability to discuss the environmental requirements and tolerances of a group as large as the Ephemeroptera or Trichoptera. Even within a genus there are large variations in tolerance. The need to know environmental requirements of a species is complicated in the west because few western species have been intensively examined. Roback (1974) lists the habitat requirements of many aquatic insects in terms of chemical concentrations but few western species are listed. Because of these problems, predictions of effects of reduced flows will be general in scope at least at the present time.

Chemical

Attempts to explain the distribution of species in terms of chemical differences have not had much success except where conditions are extreme (Macan 1974).

At present, dissolved oxygen concentrations are sufficiently high to sustain invertebrates and fish. Dissolved oxygen could influence invertebrate communities if reduced flows are so low that the BOD of domestic sewage or decaying organisms tax the reaeration capacity of the river.

With reduced flows, increased concentrations of nutrients could result in an increase in periphyton growth especially in the present dominant alga *Cladophora*. A large mat of *Cladophora* would increase the diversity of benthic habitats and would probably result in a larger standing crop of benthic organisms although there would probably be a shift in benthic species composition (Percival and Whitehead 1929).

Silt

Currently the Yellowstone River carries large amounts of suspended material mostly inorganic in nature. There appears to be enough current to remove much of this material and silt deposits are not frequent along the river. The high spring runoff is one factor that keeps the river flushed of inorganic sediment. The macroinvertebrate fauna of the lower Yellowstone is predominantly silt tolerant. Genera known to be silt tolerant include: *Isonychia*, *Tricorythodes*, *Caenis*, *Traverella*, *Brachycercus*, *Stenonema*, *Dactylobaetis*, and *Ephoron* ((Bernier 1959, Jensen 1966)). It is not known how much silt the benthic fauna of the lower river can tolerate. Sampling station 20 has the lowest gradient, the greatest silt concentrations, and the lowest benthic diversity of all sampling stations. If station 20 is used as an example of what could happen at other stations if the high development scenario is achieved, the result will be a poorer fauna in numbers and species.

Figure 51. Typical rubble substrate in the lower Yellowstone,
low summer flow at Glendive.

Figure 52. Closeup of typical rubble substrate
in the lower Yellowstone at Glendive.

Temperature

Reduced flows resulting in a shallower river will probably result in higher water temperatures that will have an influence on the benthos. Increased temperatures would affect growth, emergence, egg hatching, dissolved oxygen and metabolism. The net effect would probably be a reduction of the fauna.

Another factor associated with temperature is ice. In the lower Yellowstone River a solid ice cover lasts for several months (Figure 20). Ice cover at Glendive lasted from late December to April during the winter of 1974-75 and late November to mid-March during 1975-76 (Figure 53). Surface ice can act in several ways to kill invertebrates. Brown et al. (1953) found that surface ice killed invertebrates. Low flows would permit thicker ice conditions, freezing of large areas of shallow water, and increased gouging and molar action during the time of ice break-up (Figure 54).

Food

It is interesting to note that Egglisshaw (1964), Macan (1974), and Cummins (1975a) all believe that the microdistribution of a species is more determined by food preferences than any other factor. Current distributes allochthonous detritus and periphyton which in turn determines invertebrate distribution. Cummins (1972) presented a table on how food influences microdistribution of aquatic macroinvertebrates (Figure 55).

In attempting to determine if faunal zonation occurs in the Yellowstone River, aquatic genera found in the Yellowstone River were grouped according to feeding mechanism (Table 27). It becomes immediately evident that a grouping of organisms into zones is very difficult. One can see that it is necessary to go to a lower taxonomic level than family in describing its distribution, e.g. the family Chironomidae is listed under all three categories and this family is found at all 20 stations. Four genera in the shredder category are confined to the upper river and at least in part they define the erosional habitat of Cummins (1975a). Genera found in the collector and scraper category are variously distributed along the entire river thus obscuring the intermediate and depositional zones, if they do exist in the Yellowstone River. It may be necessary to graph the abundance of each genus or each species in order to separate the fauna into habitat zones. More information on feeding habits of individual species is necessary before this can be done.

Current and Bottom Habitat

Bottom samples taken at Glendive and Intake during 1975 revealed that invertebrate densities are directly proportional to current velocity up to velocities of 3.0 fps. No samples were taken at velocities greater than 3.0 fps and, therefore, predictions of standing crop at faster currents would not be appropriate.

Table 27. Characterization of running water habitats on the basis of narrowly defined typical biotic dominants (after Cummins 1973, 1975a).

Feeding Mechanism	Dominant Order	Taxa Family	Genus	Distribution in Yellowstone R. (sta).
Shredders (large particle detritivores)	Trichoptera	Leptoceridae	<i>Leptocella</i>	10-18
			<i>Oecetis</i>	6-17
	Plecoptera	Lepidostomatidae (Filipalpia)	<i>Lepidostoma</i>	1- 9
			<i>Nemoura</i>	1- 8
			<i>Capnia</i>	1-15
			<i>Pteronarcella</i>	1-10
			<i>Pteronarcys</i>	1- 5
	Diptera	Chironomidae		1-20
Collectors (fine particle detritivores)	Trichoptera	Hydropsychidae	<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1-18
			<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	2-18
			<i>Arctopsyche</i>	1- 9
	Ephemeroptera	Leptophlebiidae Baetidae Ephemerellidae Heptageniidae Simuliidae	<i>Leptophlebia</i>	3-18
			<i>Baetis</i>	1-20
			<i>Ephemerella</i>	1-18
			<i>Heptagenia</i>	1-20
			<i>Simulium</i>	1-20
	Diptera	Chironomidae		1-20
Scrapers (grazers)	Ephemeroptera	Heptageniidae Baetidae Ephemerellidae Caenidae	<i>Heptagenia</i>	1-20
			<i>Baetis</i>	1-20
			<i>Ephemerella</i>	1-18
			<i>Caenis</i>	10-20
	Diptera	Chironomidae		1-20
Predators	Odonata Plecoptera	Gomphidae (Setipalpia)	<i>Arcynopteryx</i>	1- 9
			<i>Isogenus</i>	1-19
			<i>Isoperla</i>	1-20
			<i>Alloperla</i>	1-12
	Trichoptera	Rhyacophilidae Hydropsychidae	<i>Rhyacophila</i>	1- 6
			<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1-18
	Diptera	Chironomidae Rhagionidae		1-20
			<i>Atherix</i>	1-11

Figure 53. Floating ice just prior to freeze-up at Glendive.

Figure 54. Ice jam during late winter at Glendive.

Figure 55 . Proposed relationships between invertebrates and the factors that determine their distribution and abundance (from Cummins 1972).

Flow reductions in the Yellowstone would result in reduction in current velocities across the entire river channel because of its "U" shaped configuration. A general reduction in flow would result in a faunal reduction because of reduced preference for slow currents for most species. Minshall and Winger (1968) found that a reduction in flow caused a large increase in the number of drifting organisms. Increases in drift expose a greater number of invertebrates to predation by fish and may remove them from a section of stream.

It is possible to relate invertebrate densities to discharge if mean current velocities across the river at several points are known. The Bureau of Reclamation Water Surface Profile (WSP) Computer Program (U.S. Department of Interior 1968) does this. It utilizes current and depth measurements from several transects to compute area and mean current velocity in several subsections of all transects at any desired discharge. This technique was used at the Intake station, the WSP Program was used to predict mean current velocities in 15 subsections at three discharges (Table 28). After the width of each subsection was calculated, the mean current velocity was placed in the regression equation obtained from kick samples in November 1975 (Appendix D). November was selected because this was the last month bottom samples were obtained.

The standing crop in each subsection was summed. At a discharge of 9000 cfs (about mean low summer discharge) the standing crop estimate is 208,847 for a one meter wide strip of river bottom at Intake. This number decreases to 189,895 at 8000 cfs and 171,602 at 7000 cfs, or about a ten percent reduction in standing crop with each 1000 cfs reduction in discharge. The mean current velocities and standing crop in each subsection at Intake are presented in Table 28.

Standing crop estimates at 7000, 8000 and 9000 cfs are graphed in Figure 56 along with a diagrammatic representation of loss of habitat due to water withdrawal. Stage height at 9000 cfs is 1985.30 feet at cross section 5; this cross section was taken opposite the boat launch at Intake. Stage height decreases to 1985.15 at 8000 cfs and 1984.90 at 7000 cfs. Thus the river drops only a few inches as discharges decrease by 1000 cfs and only a few square feet of river bottom are exposed. All of these calculations apply to transect 5 at Intake and river bottom figuration will change at other locations as will current and standing crop.

When standing crop estimates derived at 7000, 8000 and 9000 cfs are plotted against discharge the following regression equation results (Figure 56):

$$\log \text{ Standing Crop} = 4.9384 + 0.000042 \text{ Discharge (cfs)}$$

This equation permits a prediction of standing crop of invertebrates at any discharge. One should remember that a regression equation is a mathematical tool that may or may not predict a future biological event. Therefore, standing crop estimates may continue decreasing

Table 28. Invertebrate population estimates utilizing data from Intake station 18, subsections from WSP, regression equation from Nov. kick samples, (no. m⁻²).

Sub Section	at 9000 cfs		at 8000 cfs		at 7000 cfs	
	Mean Velocity (fps)	Population Estimate	Mean Velocity (fps)	Population Estimate	Mean Velocity (fps)	Population Estimate
1	0	-	0	-	0	-
2	1.02	-	0.91	-	0.81	-
3	2.53	20,819	2.32	18,640	2.15	16,704
4	3.42	39,563	3.17	34,306	2.96	30,433
5	2.94	30,156	2.72	26,560	2.54	24,070
6	2.09	25,868	1.90	22,825	1.73	20,923
7	1.88	16,600	1.70	14,940	1.58	14,110
8	2.13	11,931	1.94	10,721	1.77	9,683
9	2.56	15,217	2.35	13,487	2.18	12,277
10	2.39	16,600	2.66	19,297	2.49	17,430
11	2.85	17,983	2.68	16,254	2.45	14,352
12	1.97	10,894	1.79	9,856	1.62	8,819
13	0.72	3,216	0.62	3,009	0.50	2,801
14	0	-	0	-	0	-
15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals		208,847		189,895		171,602

linearly as the regression equation states. In this case the regression line is probably roughly accurate. Because of the channel morphometry in the Intake area, decreases in discharge result in decreasing currents across the entire channel and little bottom (habitat) is exposed in the process. However, at some low discharge large amounts of riverbottom would be exposed with resultant loss of habitat and a dramatic decrease in fauna. The effects of reduced current velocity and loss of bottom habitat are separable in their effect on fauna. Reduced current velocities (due to lowered streamflow) could adversely affect bottom fauna before a significant loss in bottom habitat occurred.

If the regression equation (Figure 56) is utilized, standing crop estimates can be calculated for various discharges in a 1-meter wide strip at Intake:

6000 cfs	155,800 organisms
5000 cfs	141,300 organisms
4000 cfs	128,200 organisms
3000 cfs	116,300 organisms
2000 cfs	105,400 organisms
1000 cfs	95,600 organisms

Figure 56. Upper figure is cross section no. 5 at Intake showing water depth at various flows; lower figure contains invertebrate population estimates at various discharges.

These standing crop estimates are based on data gathered in November and are higher than estimates would be later in the winter or spring because of natural mortality and drift out of the study area. As flows decrease, several other events would undoubtedly result in a higher than normal mortality of invertebrates - these are ice and silt. With decreased discharges, ice cover would tend to be thicker than normal thus freezing larger than normal areas of river bottom. The additional ice and shallow areas would result in a greater amount of molar action during spring ice break up.

Low discharges and reduced currents would permit greater amounts of silt to accumulate which is very detrimental to bottom dwelling organisms.

Evidence confirming the "stream continuum" theory is apparent although not in large quantities. One major problem with implementing this theory in the west involves stream order. With the multitude of tributaries to every stream a large creek might be an order 10-15 by the time it reaches a larger river. The Yellowstone River could conceivably be an order 20 or more although this has never been calculated. Some of the basic tenants of the theory are evident. The invertebrate fauna in stations 1-8 is dominated by shredder-type organisms. The fauna in the middle and lower river is dominated by organisms that are collectors, i.e. the Trichoptera family Hydropsychidae, which build small nets to collect small food particles and small organisms carried along by the current. Scraper or grazing organisms are found throughout the river and silt tolerant organisms become abundant in the low gradient portions.

Faunal zones are broad and not distinctly defined. This is true for fish and bottom dwelling organisms. Throughout the upper half of the river the salmonid community gradually decreases as does the Plecoptera fauna. Mayflies, however, exhibit a gradual shift from one community to another with the exception of several species that are very adaptable and are present throughout the entire river.

SUMMARY

The invertebrate fauna of the Yellowstone River is rich in numbers and species. The number of species and standing crop is greatest in the upper river, stations 1-5, and both decrease downstream.

The invertebrate fauna is dominated by mayflies, caddisflies and true flies. The stonefly fauna is diverse but not abundant and there is a steady decrease in number of species downstream. The mayfly fauna is composed of a mountain fauna, a prairie fauna and several species found throughout the river. In the lower five sampling stations, mayflies are the most diverse order. Caddisflies are very abundant and diverse throughout the Yellowstone River. The family Hydropsychidae dominates the invertebrate fauna in the lower half of the river. True flies (Diptera) and in particular the midge family, Chironomidae, are abundant and diverse throughout the river.

The invertebrate fauna of the Tongue River is somewhat similar to the fauna of the lower Yellowstone River.

Baseline species diversity calculations showed that the Shannon index for all stations was near or below 3.0 for most stations. Generally an index above 3.0 illustrates a healthy unstressed community while an index below 1.0 is indicative of a monospecific community under stress. The index range of 3.0-1.0 seems to illustrate a community under some stress.

The current preference for many species and genera was examined. For most species increasing current (to 3 fps) means a larger standing crop.

The standing crop of invertebrates for a one meter wide piece of river bottom at intake was calculated and a regression equation was formulated to calculate standing crop at various discharges.

LITERATURE CITED

- Beauchamp, R.S.A. and P. Ulliyott. 1932. Competitive relationships between certain species of freshwater triclads. *J. Ecol.* 20:200-208.
- Bergersen, E.P. and W. J. McConnell. 1973. Pollution investigations on the Yellowstone River, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming. Colorado Coop. Fish. Unit, 140 pp.
- Berner, L. 1959. A tabular summary of the biology of North American mayfly nymphs (Ephemeroptera). *Bull. Florida St. Mus. Biol. Sci.* 4:1-58.
- Brillouin, L. 1960. Science and information theory. Academic Press, New York. 351 pp.
- Brown, C.J.D., W.D. Clothier, and W. Alvord. 1953. Observations on ice conditions in the West Gallatin River, Montana. *Proc. Mont. Acad. Sci.* 13:21-27.
- Burton, G.W. and E.P. Odum. 1945. The distribution of stream fish in the vicinity of Mountain Lake, Virginia. *Ecology* 26:182-194.
- Cairns, J., Jr. 1969. Rate of species diversity restoration following stress in freshwater protozoan communities. *University of Kansas Sci. Bull.*, 48:209-224.
- _____, D.W. Albaugh, F. Busey, and M.D. Chanay. 1968. The sequential comparison index - a simplified method for non-biologists to estimate relative differences in biological diversity in stream pollution studies. *J. Water Pollut. Contr. Fed.* 40:1607-1613.
- _____, and K. L. Dickson. 1971. A simple method for the biological assessment of the effects of waste discharge on aquatic bottom-dwelling organisms. *J. Water Pollut. Contr. Fed.* 43:755-772.
- Carpenter, K.E. 1928. Life in inland waters. Sidgwick and Jackson, London. 267 pp.
- Chandler, C.M. 1966. Environmental factors affecting the local distribution and abundance of four species of stream dwelling triclads. *Invest. Indiana Lakes Streams.* 7:1-56.
- Chutter, F.M. 1969. The distribution of some stream invertebrates in relation to current speed. *Int. Rev. Ges. Hydrobiol.* 54:413-422.
- Colinvaux, P.A. 1973. Introduction to ecology. John Wiley and Sons. N.Y. 621 pp.
- Cummins, K.W. 1972. What is a river? - Zoological description. In: *River Ecology and Man.* R.T. Oglesby, C.A. Carlson, and J.A. McCann, eds. Academic Press, New York. pp. 33-52.
- _____, 1973. Trophic relations of aquatic insects. *Ann. Rev. Ent.* 18:183-206.

- Cummins, K.W. 1975a. Macroinvertebrates. In: River Ecology. B.A. Whitton, ed. Univ. of Calif. Press, Berkeley. pp. 170-198.
- . 1975b. The ecology of running waters; theory and practice, Proc. Sandusky River Basin Symp. Tiffin, Ohio. pp. 277-293.
- Dodds, G.S. and F.L. Hisaw. 1925. Ecological studies of aquatic insects. IV. Altitudinal range and zonation of mayflies, stoneflies and caddisflies in the Colorado Rockies. Ecology 6:380-390.
- Egglishow, H.J. 1964. The distributional relationship between the bottom fauna and plant detritus in streams. J. Animal Ecology 33:463-476.
- Egloff, D.A. and W.H. Brakel. 1973. Stream pollution and a simplified diversity index. J. Water Pollut. Contr. Fed. 45:2269-2275.
- Fullner, R.W. 1971. A comparison of macroinvertebrates collected by basket and modified multiple-plate samplers. J. Water Pollut. Contr. Fed. 43:494-499.
- Funk, J.L. and R.S. Campbell. 1953. The population of large fishes in Black River, Missouri. Univ. Mo. stud. 26:69-82.
- Gauvin, A.R., W.E. Ricker, M. Miner, P. Milam, and R.A. Hays. 1972. The stoneflies (Plecoptera) of Montana. Trans. Amer. Ent. Soc. 98:1-161.
- Harima, H., and P.R. Mundy. 1974. Diversity indices applied to the fish biofacies of a small stream. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 105:457-461.
- Harrel, R.C. and T.C. Dorris. 1968. Stream order, morphometry, physico-chemical conditions, and community structure of benthic macroinvertebrates in an intermittent stream system. Amer. Mid. Nat. 80:220-251.
- Hester, F.E. and J.S. Dendy. 1962. A multiple-plate sampler for aquatic macroinvertebrates. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 91:420-421.
- Huet, M. 1949. Aperçu, des relations entre la pente et les populations des eaux courantes. Schweiz, Z. Hydrol. 11:333-351.
- . 1954. Biologie, profils en long et en travers des eaux courantes. Bull. fr. Piscic. 175:41-53.
- Hurlbert, S.H. 1971. The nonconcept of species diversity: a critique and alternative parameters. Ecol. 52:577-586.
- Hynes, H.B.N. 1941. The taxonomy and ecology of the nymphs of British Plecoptera with notes on the adults and eggs. Trans. R. Ent. Soc., London. 91:459-557.

- Hynes, H.B.N. 1948. Notes on the aquatic Hemiptera-Heteroptera of Trinidad and Tobago, B.W.I., with a description of a new species of *Martarego* B. White (Notonectidae). Trans. R. Ent. Soc., London. 99:341-360.
- _____. 1961. The invertebrate fauna of a Welsh mountain stream. Arch. Hydrobiol. 57:344-388.
- _____. 1970. The ecology of running waters. Univ. of Toronto Press. Toronto, Canada 555 pp.
- Ide, F.P. 1935. The effect of temperature on the distribution of the mayfly fauna of a stream. Publs. Ont. Fish Res. Lab. 50:1-76.
- Jaag, O. and H. Ambuhl. 1964. The effect of the current on the composition of biocoenoses in flowing water streams. Adv. in Water Pol. Res., Proc. Internat. Conf. 1962. pp. 31-49.
- Jensen, S.L. 1966. The mayflies of Idaho. Unpublished m.s. thesis. Univ. of Utah. Salt Lake City.
- Jones, J.R., D.M. Coon, and R.W. Bachmann. 1974. Limnological and fisheries survey of the upper Skunk River, Iowa. Iowa St. J. Res. 48:255-266.
- Krebs, C.J. 1972. Ecology: the experimental analysis of distribution and abundance. Harper and Row, N.Y. 696 pp.
- Leopold, L.B., M.G. Gordon and J.P. Miller. 1964. Fluvial processes in geomorphology. W.H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco. 522 pp.
- Lloyd, M., and R.J. Ghelardi. 1964. A table for calculating the "equitability" component of species diversity. J. Anim. Ecol. 33:217-225.
- Lloyd, M., J.H. Zar, and J.R. Karr. 1968. On the calculation of information theoretical measures of diversity. Am. Mid. Nat. 79:257-272.
- Macan, T.T. 1957. The Ephemeroptera of a stony stream. J. Anim. Ecol. 26:317-342.
- _____. 1974. Freshwater ecology. Longman, London.
- Maitland, P.S. 1966. The fauna of the River Endrick. Studies on Loch Lomond 2. Univ. of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland. 194 pp.
- Margalef, D.R. 1957. Information theory in ecology. Gen Syst. 3:36-71.
- _____. 1968. Perspectives in ecological theory. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 112 pp.

- Mathis, B.J. 1968. Species diversity of benthic macroinvertebrates in three mountain streams. *Trans. Ill. Acad. Sci.* 61:171-176.
- _____ and T.C. Dorris. 1968. Community structure of benthic macroinvertebrates in an intermittent stream receiving oil field brines. *Am. Mid. Nat.* 80:428-439.
- Minshall, G.W. and P.V. Winger. 1968. The effect of reduction in stream flow on invertebrate drift. *Ecology.* 49:580-582.
- Orr, H., J.C. Marshall, T.L. Isenhour, and P.C. Jurs. 1973. Introduction to computer programming for biological sciences. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston. 396 pp.
- Parsons, D.S. and J.W. Tatum. 1974. A new shallow water multiple-plate sampler. *Prog. Fish Cult.* 36:179-180.
- Percival, E. and H. Whitehead. 1929. A quantitative study of some types of streambed. *J. Ecol.* 17:282-314.
- Philipson, G.N. 1954. The effect of water flow and oxygen concentration on six species of caddisfly (Trichoptera) larvae. *Proc. Zool. Soc. London (U.K.)* 124:547-564.
- Pielou, E.C. 1966a. Shannon's formula as a measurement of specific diversity: its use and misuse. *Am. Natur.* 100:463-465.
- _____. 1966b. Species-diversity and pattern-diversity in the study of ecological succession. *J. Theoret. Biol.* 10:370-383.
- _____. 1969. An introduction to mathematical ecology. Wiley-Interscience, John Wiley and Sons, N.Y. 286 pp.
- Poole, R.W. 1970. Temporal variation in the species diversity of a woodland caddisfly fauna from Central Illinois. *Trans. Ill. Acad. Sci.* 63:383-385.
- Ransom, J.D. and T.C. Dorris. 1972. Analyses of benthic community structure in a reservoir by use of diversity indices. *Am. Mid. Nat.* 87:434-447.
- Roback, S.S. 1974. Insects (Arthropoda: Insecta). *In*: Pollution Ecology of freshwater invertebrates. C.W. Hart, Jr., and S.L.H. Fuller, eds. Academic Press, New York. pp. 313-376.
- Shannon, C.E. and W. Weaver. 1964. The mathematical theory of communication. Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana. 125 pp.
- Shelford, V.E. 1911. Ecological succession I. Stream fishes and the method of physiographic analysis. *Biol. Bull.* 21:9-35.
- Slobodkin, L.B. and H.L. Sanders. 1969. On the contribution of environmental predictability to species diversity. Diversity and stability in ecological systems, Brookhaven Symposium in Biology No. 22:82-95.

- Stadnyk, L. 1971. Factors affecting the distribution of stoneflies in the Yellowstone River, Montana. Unpubl. Ph. D. Dissertation. Montana State Univ., Bozeman. 36 pp.
- Thorup, J. 1966. Substrate type and its value as a basis for the delimitation of bottom fauna communities in running waters. Spec. Publs. Pymatuning Lab. Fld. Biol. 4:59-74.
- Thurston, R.V., R.J. Luedtke, and R.C. Russo. 1975. Upper Yellowstone River water quality. August 1973-August 1974. Montana Univ. Joint Water Resources Research Center. Bozeman, Mt.
- U.S. Dept. Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. 1968. The Bureau of Reclamation's Water Surface Profile Computation Method B. Engineering Research Center, Denver, Colo. 17 pp.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1973. Biological field and laboratory methods for measuring the quality of surface waters and effluents. Nat. Environ. Res. Center, Cincinnati, Ohio. EPA-670/4-73-001, 176pp.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 1976. Personal communication with Water Resources Division Personnel. Helena, Mt.
- Whitton, B.A. (ed.) 1975. River ecology studies in Ecol., Vol. 2, Univ. of Calif. press. 725 pp.
- Wilhm, J.L. 1967. Comparison of some diversity indices applied to populations of benthic macroinvertebrates in a stream receiving organic wastes. J. Water Pollut. Control. Fed. 39:1673-1683.
- _____. 1968. Biomass units versus numbers of individuals in species diversity indices. Ecol. 49:153-156.
- _____. 1970a. Effect of sample size on Shannons formula. South-western Natur. 14:441-445.
- _____. 1970b. Range of diversity index in benthic macroinvertebrate populations. J. Water Pollut. Control Fed. 42:R221-R224.
- _____. 1970c. Some aspects of structure and function of benthic macroinvertebrate populations in a spring. Am. Mid. Nat. 84:20-35.
- _____. 1972. Graphic and mathematical analyses of biotic communities in polluted streams. Am. Rev. Entomol. 17:223-252.
- Wilhm, J.L. and T.C. Dorris. 1966. Species diversity of benthic macroinvertebrates in a stream receiving domestic and oil refinery effluents. Am. Midl. Nat. 76:427-449.
- _____. 1968. Biological parameters for water quality criteria. Bioscience. 18:477-481.

SHANNON DIVERSITY INDEXES

$$D = -\sum_i^S (N_i/N) \log(N_i/N) = \log(N) - \sum_i^S (N_i/N) \log(N_i)$$

$$D_{MAX} = \log(S)$$

$$D_{MIN} = \log(N) - \left(\frac{N-S+1}{N}\right) \log(N-S+1)$$

$$RD = \frac{D_{MAX} - D}{D_{MAX} - D_{MIN}}$$

$$EV = D/D_{MAX} = D/\log S$$

$$EQ = D/\log(N)$$

$$SR = D - EQ$$

BRILLOUIN DIVERSITY INDEXES

$$D = \frac{1}{N} \log \left\{ \frac{N!}{\prod_i^s N_i!} \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \log(N!) - \sum_i^s \log(N_i!) \right\}$$

$$D_{MAX} = \frac{1}{N} \log \left\{ \frac{N!}{(X!)^{s-R} (Y!)^R} \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \log(N!) - (s-R) \log(X!) - R \log(Y!) \right\}$$

$$D_{MIN} = \frac{1}{N} \log \left\{ \frac{N!}{(N-s+1)!} \right\} = \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \log(N!) - \log[(N-s+1)!] \right\}$$

$$RD = \frac{D_{MAX} - D}{D_{MAX} - D_{MIN}}$$

$$EV = D/D_{MAX}$$

$$EQ = D / \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \log(N!) \right\}$$

$$SR = D - EQ$$

NOTATION

D = DIVERSITY

D_{MAX} = MAXIMUM DIVERSITY

D_{MIN} = MINIMUM DIVERSITY

RD = REDUNDANCY

EV = EVENNESS

EQ = EQUITABILITY

SR = SPECIES RICHNESS

S = NUMBER OF TAXA IN SAMPLE

N_i = NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS IN TAXON i

$$N = \sum_i N_i$$

X = LARGEST INTEGER $\leq N/S$

$$Y = X + 1$$

$$R = N - S * X$$

APPENDIX B

CONVERSION FACTORS

1 inch = 2.54 cm
1 cm = 0.393 in. or 0.032 ft
1 foot = 0.304 m
1 m = 3.28 feet
1 square foot = 0.093 sq. m
1 square m = 10.744 sq. ft. = 1547.136 sq. in.

Sampler Areas

Water's Round Sampler

Diameter = 13.5 in. (34.3 cm) (143.139 in^2) or 0.093 m^2
Height = 19.75 in., 50.5 cm
Mesh = #20 (20 apertures/inch)
to convert area to m^2 multiply by 10.808

Quantitative Kick Net

Area $17" \times 16" = 43.18 \text{ cm} \times 40.64 \text{ cm}$
 272 in^2 or 0.176 m^2
Mesh = #20
to convert to m^2 multiply by 5.688

Appendix C. Bottom fauna analyses, Yellowstone River station 17
(Glendive), April 17, 1975. Sampled by: kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	13
<i>Ephemerella</i>	7
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	1
<i>Heptagenia</i>	37
<i>Stenonema</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	33
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	4
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	29
<i>Isogenus</i>	2
Coleoptera	
<i>Stenelmis</i>	1
<i>Hydroporus</i>	3
Unknown	1
Diptera	
Ceratopogonidae	1
<i>Orthocladus</i>	145
<i>Abalatesmyia</i>	5
<i>Eukiefferiella</i>	9
<i>Trichocladus</i>	2
Oligochaeta	36

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
15-Miles City (Yellowstone River), April 18, 1975,
sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	498
<i>Ephemerella</i>	40
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	7
<i>Heptagenia</i>	13
<i>Stenonema</i>	5
<i>Baetisca</i>	4
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	11
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	1
<i>Isoperla</i>	12
<i>Acroneuria</i>	1
Odonata	
<i>Ophiogomphus</i>	1
Coleoptera	
<i>Stenelmis</i>	7
Oligochaeta	11
Diptera	
<i>Hemerodromia</i>	1
<i>Orthocladus</i>	53
<i>Chironomus</i>	4
<i>Microtendipes</i>	1
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	1
Unknown	1

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
14-Forsyth (Yellowstone River), April 18, 1975,
sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	516
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	140
<i>Ephemerella</i>	13
<i>Heptagenia</i>	2
<i>Tricorythodes</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	5
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	44
<i>Isogenus</i>	6
Diptera	
<i>Orthocladius</i>	13
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	3
<i>Eukiefferiella</i>	1
<i>Parlauerbormiella</i>	1
Hemiptera	
<i>Hesperocorixa</i>	1

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
13-Myers (Yellowstone River), April 18, 1975, sampled
by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	207
<i>Ephemerella</i>	13
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	4
<i>Heptagenia</i>	7
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	9
<i>Isogenus</i>	2
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	5
Hemiptera	
<i>Hesperocorixa</i>	59
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	2
<i>Tribelos</i>	2
<i>Eukiefferiella</i>	2
<i>Orthocladius</i>	35
<i>Paralauterborniella</i>	3

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
12-Bighorn River (Yellowstone River), April 18,
1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	6
<i>Ephemerella</i>	4
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	1
<i>Heptagenia</i>	4
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	2
Hemiptera	
<i>Hesperocorixa</i>	9
Diptera	
<i>Orthocladius</i>	5
Oligochaeta	6

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1-Corwin Springs (Yellowstone River), April 7, 1975,
sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	274
<i>Ephemerella</i>	423
<i>Rhythrogena</i>	65
<i>Epeorus</i>	2
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	473
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	5
<i>Psychomyia</i>	6
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	16
<i>Hydroptila</i>	33
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Acroneturia</i>	14
<i>Pteronarcys</i>	16
<i>Alloperla</i>	26
<i>Isoperla</i>	70
<i>Nemoura</i>	3
<i>Isogenus</i>	8
Diptera	
<i>Agathon</i>	1
<i>Atherix</i>	14
<i>Hexatoma</i>	1
<i>Hemerodromia</i>	1
<i>Rhectanytarsus</i>	40
<i>Orthocladius</i>	349
<i>Diaamesa</i>	40
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	120
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>	2
<i>Microtendipes</i>	80
Hydracarina	6

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
15 (Miles City), March 19, 1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	~
<i>Baetis</i>	67
<i>Ephemerella</i>	14
<i>Heptagenia</i>	4
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	5
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	16
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	7
<i>Hydroptila</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Capnia</i>	1
<i>Brachyptera</i>	3
<i>Isoperla</i>	15
Coleoptera	
Dytiscidae	1
<i>Dubiraphia</i>	1
<i>Stenelmis</i>	1
Diptera	
<i>Dicranota</i>	4
<i>Orthocladius</i>	328
<i>Eukiefferiella</i>	8

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
14 (Forsyth), March 19, 1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Amelatus</i>	2
<i>Baetis</i>	20
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	6
<i>Heptagenia</i>	10
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	5
<i>Ephemerella</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Capnia</i>	1
<i>Isoperla</i>	40
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1
Hemiptera	
<i>Hesperocorixa</i>	90
<i>Gyrinus</i>	1
Oligochaeta	28
Turbellaria	1
Diptera	
Ceratopogonidae	1
<i>Simulium</i>	1
Unknown	1
<i>Orthocladius</i>	36
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	1
<i>Rheotanytarsus</i>	1
<i>Cryptochironomus</i>	2
Unknown	3

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
13 (Myers), March 19, 1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	118
<i>Rhythrogena</i>	7
<i>Ephemerella</i>	11
<i>Heptagenia</i>	9
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	3
<i>Ameletus</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	4
<i>Isoperla</i>	2
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	4
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	26
<i>Hydroptila</i>	1
Hemiptera	
<i>Hesperocorixa</i>	170
Coleoptera	
Dytiscidae	1
Lepidoptera	
<i>Cataclysta</i>	1
Oligochaeta	
<i>Nais</i>	4
Unknown A	15
Diptera	
<i>Dicranota</i>	3
<i>Simulium</i>	4
Ceratopogonidae	1
<i>Orthocladius</i>	1,350
<i>Candicladus</i>	60
Unknown	17

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
12 (Bighorn River), March 19, 1975, sampled by
Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	5
<i>Ephemerella</i>	5
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1
<i>Stenonema</i>	1
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	2
Trichoptera	
<i>Chewmatopsyche</i>	2
<i>Hydroptila</i>	2
Diptera	
<i>Orthocladus</i>	30
<i>Eukiefferiella</i>	1
Oligochaeta	6
Hemiptera	
<i>Hesperocorixa</i>	2

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
4-above Shields River (Yellowstone River), March 10,
1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1,276
<i>Baetis</i>	232
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	4
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	80
<i>Alloperla</i>	60
<i>Nemoura</i>	4
<i>Isogenus</i>	20
Trichoptera	
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	36
<i>Hydroptila</i>	12
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	80
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	364
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	4
<i>Athripsodes</i>	4
Hemiptera	
Corixidae	4
Diptera	
<i>Atherix</i>	16
<i>Hexatoma</i>	8
Dolichopodidae	4
<i>Orthocladius</i>	520
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	192

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Tenneco Station Mallard Rest,
March 10, 1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>EphemereUa</i>	2,459
<i>Baetis</i>	23
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	100
Trichoptera	
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	6
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	420
<i>Glossosoma</i>	11
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	606
<i>Hydroptila</i>	48
<i>Psychomyia</i>	1
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	5
<i>Rhyacophila</i>	1
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	209
<i>Alloperla</i>	198
<i>Nemoura</i>	12
<i>Isogenus</i>	5
<i>Pteronarcella</i>	3
<i>Pternarcys</i>	4
Diptera	
<i>Atherix</i>	5
<i>Hexatoma</i>	6
<i>Agathon</i>	2
<i>Simulium</i>	3
<i>Diamasa</i>	61
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	208
<i>Orthocladius</i>	110
<i>Rheotanytarsus</i>	10
Coleoptera	
Dytiscidae	15
<i>Optioservus</i>	1
Acari	10

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Tenneco Station Corwin Springs,
March 10, 1975, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	294
<i>Ephemereella</i>	389
<i>Heptagenia</i>	4
<i>Ameletus</i>	2
<i>Paraleptophlebia</i>	1
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	60
<i>Epeorus</i>	2
Diptera	
<i>Diamesa</i>	60
<i>Orthocladius</i>	51
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	61
<i>Microtendipes</i>	20
<i>Rheotanytarsus</i>	51
<i>Agathon</i>	3
<i>Atheris</i>	2
<i>Hexatoma</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	5
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	310
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	43
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	1
<i>Hydroptila</i>	18
<i>Athripsodes</i>	1
<i>Glossosoma</i>	2
<i>Rhyacophila</i>	1
<i>Psychomyia</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Pteronarcys</i>	18
<i>Acroneuria</i>	7
<i>Alloperla</i>	24
<i>Isoperla</i>	63
<i>Nemoura</i>	7
Acari	3
Coleoptera	
<i>Optioservus</i>	1

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
4 (above Shields River), February 14, 1975, sampled
by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	440
<i>Baetis</i>	7
<i>Rhythrogena</i>	4
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	512
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	3
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	5
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	35
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	42
<i>Hydroptila</i>	5
Plecoptera	
<i>Alloperla</i>	28
<i>Isoperla</i>	3
<i>Nemoura</i>	1
<i>Capnia</i>	2
<i>Pteronarcella</i>	5
Diptera	
<i>Atherix</i>	29
<i>Hexatoma</i>	7
Empididae	3
<i>Orthocladius</i>	648
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	20
<i>Dicamesa</i>	3
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>	2
Unknown	1
Coleoptera	
<i>Hydroporus</i>	3

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
3 (Livingston), February 14, 1975, sampled by
Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	432
<i>Baetis</i>	209
<i>Rhythrogena</i>	227
Trichoptera	
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	103
<i>Hydroptila</i>	42
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	7
<i>Psychomyia</i>	18
<i>Athripsodes</i>	3
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	57
Plecoptera	
<i>Pteronarcella</i>	2
<i>Isogenus</i>	5
<i>Isoperla</i>	93
<i>Alloperla</i>	38
<i>Nemoura</i>	1
Diptera	
<i>Holorusia</i>	1
<i>Hexatoma</i>	4
Empididae	1
<i>Simulium</i>	4
<i>Atherix</i>	4
<i>Diamesa</i>	10
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	130
<i>Orthocladius</i>	80
<i>Microtendipes</i>	88
Hydracarina	2

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
2-Mallard Rest (Yellowstone River), February 14, 1975,
sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	141
<i>Baetis</i>	5
<i>Rhythrogena</i>	17
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	3
<i>Isoperla</i>	42
<i>Alloperla</i>	5
Trichoptera	
<i>Glossosoma</i>	6
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	46
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	13
<i>Amiocentrus</i>	2
<i>Athripsodes</i>	1
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	264
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	16
Diptera	
<i>Hexatoma</i>	4
<i>Simulium</i>	2
<i>Diamesa</i>	91
<i>Orthocladius</i>	40
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	273

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1 (Corwin Springs), February 14, 1975, sampled by
Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemorella</i>	640
<i>Baetis</i>	83
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	30
<i>Heptagenia</i>	4
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1,184
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	30
<i>Hydroptila</i>	12
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	94
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	17
<i>Glossosoma</i>	8
<i>Athripsodes</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Pteronarcys</i>	107
<i>Pteronarcella</i>	1
<i>Hesperoperla</i>	43
<i>Alloperla</i>	25
<i>Isoperla</i>	103
<i>Isogenus</i>	4
<i>Nemoura</i>	5
Coleoptera	
<i>Hydroporus</i>	2
<i>Heterlimnius</i>	3
Diptera	
<i>Agathon</i>	2
<i>Hexatoma</i>	8
Empididae	2
<i>Simulium</i>	2
<i>Atherix</i>	32
<i>Diamesa</i>	150
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	170
<i>Orthocladius</i>	54
Hydracarina	1

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
12 (Bighorn River), January 13, 1975, sampled by
Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	1
<i>Ephemerella</i>	11
<i>Stenonema</i>	36
<i>Tricorythodes</i>	8
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	12
<i>Hydroptila</i>	36
<i>Polycentropus</i>	7
Plecoptera	
<i>Capnia</i>	1
<i>Alloperla</i>	4
<i>Isoperla</i>	1
Hemiptera	
<i>Ambrysia</i>	1
Diptera	
<i>Brillia</i>	4
<i>Clinotanypus</i>	4
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>	36
<i>Microtendipes</i>	100
<i>Orthocladus</i>	220
Unknown	9
Oligochaeta	
<i>Tubificidae</i>	20

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
4 (below Livingston), January 13, 1975, sampled by
Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	8
<i>Baetis</i>	17
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	15
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	2
<i>Hydroptila</i>	1
<i>Psychomyia</i>	1
<i>Glossosoma</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Capnia</i>	2
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	4
<i>Damesa</i>	20
<i>Cardiodadius</i>	160
<i>Orthocladus</i>	47
Hydracarina	1

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
3 (Livingston), January 13, 1975, sampled by Hester-
Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	48
<i>Baetis</i>	4
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	1
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	157
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	4
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	8
<i>Hydroptila</i>	1
Genus A	15
<i>Athripsodes</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	3
Diptera	
<i>Atherix</i>	1
<i>Orthocladius</i>	271
<i>Cardiodadius</i>	173
Hydracarina	2

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
2 (Mallard's Rest), January 13, 1975, sampled by
Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	28
<i>Baetis</i>	2
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	6
Trichoptera	
<i>Athripsodes</i>	2
<i>Micrasema</i>	4
Genus A	7
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	90
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	1
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	4
<i>Hydroptila</i>	80
<i>Glossosoma</i>	3
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	34
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	2
<i>Alloperla</i>	1
Diptera	
<i>Diamesa</i>	15
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>	1
Unknown A	1
<i>Microtendipes</i>	40
Unknown B	5
<i>Orthocladius</i>	10

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
19 (Sidney), December 17, 1974, sampled by Hester-
Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Heptagenia</i>	16
<i>Baetis</i>	2
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	27
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	5
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	2
<i>Orthocladius</i>	17
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>	2

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
18 (Intake), December 17, 1974, sampled by Hester-
Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Heptagenia</i>	29
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1
<i>Baetis</i>	5
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	1
<i>Stenonema</i>	1
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	2
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	2
Plecoptera	
<i>Brachyptera</i>	9
<i>Isoperla</i>	3
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	63
<i>Orthocladius</i>	13
<i>Brillia</i>	2
<i>Clinotanytus</i>	1
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>	7
Oligochaeta	17
Mollusca	
<i>Ferriisia</i>	1

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
4 (below Livingston), December 16, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	227
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	8
<i>Baetis</i>	65
<i>Ameletus</i>	2
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	30
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	6
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	18
<i>Isoperla</i>	65
<i>Alloperla</i>	14
Diptera	
<i>Diamasa</i>	10
<i>Orthocladius</i>	130
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	50

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
3 (above Livingston), December 16, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>EphemereUla</i>	167
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	64
<i>Baetis</i>	467
<i>Leptophlebia</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	3
<i>Hydroptila</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	5
<i>Isoperla</i>	9
<i>Alloperla</i>	9
<i>Capnia</i>	2
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	13
<i>Orthocladus</i>	920
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	100
<i>Ptarmia</i>	200
Podonominae	10

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
2 (Mallard's Rest), December 16, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	726
<i>Rhythrogena</i>	175
<i>Baetis</i>	95
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	7
<i>Isoperla</i>	222
<i>Alloperla</i>	58
<i>Capnia</i>	5
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	38
<i>Rhyacophila</i>	1
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	12
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	1
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	4
Genus A	9
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	12
<i>Damesa</i>	140
<i>Orthocladius</i>	30
<i>Metriocnemus</i>	10
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	120

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1 (Corwin Springs), December 16, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	223
<i>Ephemerella</i>	20
<i>Ameletus</i>	6
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	34
<i>Brachycercus</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1
Plecoptera	
<i>Capnia</i>	13
<i>Isoperla</i>	11
<i>Alloperla</i>	1
<i>Nemoura</i>	3
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	1
<i>Damesa</i>	347
<i>Orthocladius</i>	11
<i>Cardiocladius</i>	24
<i>Rheotanytarsus</i>	12

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F (Glendive), September 3, 1974, sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Traverella</i>	37
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	5
<i>Centroptilum</i>	2
<i>Baetis</i>	43
Diptera	
<i>Simulium</i>	14
Chironomidae	1

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
20 (Cartwright, North Dakota), September 11, 1974,
sampled by Kick.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Brachyocerus</i>	1
<i>Ametropus</i>	1
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	8
<i>Ephoron album</i>	3
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	18
<i>Traverella</i>	11
<i>Choroterpes</i>	7
<i>Baetis</i>	20
<i>Isonychia</i>	1
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	9
Hemiptera	
Corixidae	3
Diptera	
Chironomidae	3
<i>Simulium</i>	4
Oligochaeta	1
Odonata	
<i>Gomphus</i>	2
Coleoptera	
<i>Gyraulus</i>	1

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F-6 (Glendive), September 25, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	11
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	65
Plecoptera	
<i>Isogenus</i>	2
<i>Isoperla</i>	9
<i>Brachyptera</i>	4
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	20
<i>Heptagenia</i>	6
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	1
Diptera	
Chironomidae	52
<i>Simulium</i>	4
Oligochaeta	2
Coleoptera	1

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F-5 (Glendive), September 25, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	15
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	27
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	3
<i>Brachyptera</i>	1
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	3
<i>Baetis</i>	14
<i>Heptagenia</i>	13
Diptera	
Chironomidae	34
<i>Simulium</i>	16
Oligochaeta	3

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F-4 (Glendive), September 25, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Trichoptera	
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	55
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	2
<i>Brachyptera</i>	5
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	2
<i>Baetis</i>	11
<i>Heptagenia</i>	10
<i>Traverella</i>	1
<i>Tricorythodes</i>	1
Diptera	
Chironomidae	7
<i>Simulium</i>	2

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F-3 (Glendive), September 25, 1974, sampled by
Hester Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	3
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	35
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	28
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	27
<i>Heptagenia</i>	27
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	2
<i>Traverella</i>	1
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1
Diptera	
Chironomidae	6
<i>Simulium</i>	24

Appendix C. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F-2 (Glendive), September 25, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	20
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	19
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	6
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	32
<i>Heptagenia</i>	7
<i>Traverella</i>	1
Diptera	
Chironomidae	2
<i>Simulium</i>	10
Oligochaeta	1

Appendix C . Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River Station
1F-1 (Glendive), September 25, 1974, sampled by
Hester-Dendy.

<u>Taxa</u>	<u>Number</u>
Trichoptera	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	13
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	18
Plecoptera	
<i>Isoperla</i>	11
Ephemeroptera	
<i>Baetis</i>	38
<i>Heptagenia</i>	5
Diptera	
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	4
Chironomidae	5

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Miles City November 10, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	22	2	2	5	2	5
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1	3		2		4
<i>Tricorythodes</i>		1				
<i>Heptagenia</i>	2	1	1			
Plecoptera						
<i>Isoperla</i>		1				
<i>Brachyptera</i>	1				1	4
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	15	20	4	40	2	17
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>				4		
<i>Brachycentrus</i>				1		
Diptera						
Chironomidae	49	45	23	47	32	29
<i>Hexatoma</i>				1		
Coleoptera						
<i>Microcyllopus</i>	1				1	
Oligochaeta	3		3	9	7	4
Total Number =	94	73	33	109	45	63
						$\bar{X} = 70$
Total Number/m ² =	1016	789	357	1178	486	681
						$\bar{X} = 751$
						$\sigma = 311$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Glendive
November 10, 1975

Organism	Number in Waters ¹ Sampler					6
	1	2	3	4	5	
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Choroterpes</i>	1	1				
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1		4			10
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	2		5	3	1	6
<i>Tricorythodes</i>		1			1	1
<i>Ephemerella</i>			1	1		
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>				1		
<i>Brachycercus</i>						1
<i>Ameletus</i>						1
Plecoptera						
<i>Isogenus</i>					1	
<i>Isoperla</i>			1			
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1		33	2	2	78
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>		1	12			7
Diptera						
Chironomidae	36	39	32	50	73	41
Ceratopogonidae			1			
<i>Simulium</i>			1			
Oligochaeta	14	16	16	15	7	43
Total Number =	55	58	106	72	85	188
Total Number/m ² =	594	627	1146	778	919	1924
						$\bar{X} = 92$
						$\bar{X} = 998$
						$\sigma = 497$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Miles City
September 8, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Ephemeroptera							
<i>Traverella</i>	24	3	16	6	1	6	
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	2	10	5	5		12	
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	44	52	38	49	18	18	
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	1	3	5	4	5	1	
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail	16	10	10	17	1	6	
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1	1				4	
<i>Ephoron</i>		4	1	2			
<i>Rhithrogena</i>		1	2	3	1	1	
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.x			2	1	1		
<i>Choroterpes</i>						2	
Trichoptera							
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	87	75	130	81	80	57	
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	3		10	7	3		
Diptera							
Simuliidae	13	2	1	3	6		
Chironomidae	12	25	31	15	9	40	
Coleoptera							
<i>Microcylloepus</i>	1	1					
Plecoptera							
<i>Isoperla</i>			1				
<hr/>							
Total Number =	204	187	252	193	125	147	
							$\bar{X} = 184.7$
Total Number/m ² =	2205	2021	2724	2086	1351	1589	
							$\bar{X} = 1996.0$
							$\sigma = 482.5$
<hr/>							

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Intake
September 9, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Ephemeroptera							
<i>Traverella</i>	7	6			1	4	
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	1	1	1			1	
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1		2		2		
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail	1	3	1				
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail		1					
<i>Datylobaetis</i>					1	3	
Trichoptera							
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	8	17	4	14		13	
Diptera							
Chironomidae		2					
Simuliidae				1			
Plecoptera							
<i>Isoperla</i>				2			
Total Number =	18	30	8	17	4	21	$\bar{X} = 16.3$
Total Number/m ² =	195	324	86	184	43	227	$\bar{X} = 176.5$
							$\sigma = 100.7$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Sidney
September 9, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Brachyocerus</i>		2		2		
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>		3		1		1
<i>Ephoron alburn</i>		1	1			1
<i>Ephemerella</i>		1				
<i>Heptagenia</i>			1		1	5
<i>Choroterpes</i>						1
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	4	5	7	7	1	10
Odonata						
<i>Gomphus</i>						1
Oligochaeta	3					
Diptera						
Chironomidae	2	5		2		5
Total Number =	9	17	9	12	2	24
Total Number/m ² =	97	184	97	130	21	259
						$\bar{X} = 12.2$
						$\bar{X} = 131.3$
						$\sigma = 82.0$

Organism	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Traverella</i>	2	3	5	7	7	38
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	5	4	6	3	5	9
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1		1		6	
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1				34	
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	1					
<i>Rhythrogena</i>		2		2	2	3
<i>Baetis three-tail</i>		1			6	
<i>Isonychia</i>			1			6
<i>Baetis two-tail</i>			1			2
				2	2	1
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	1	8	13	6	16	57
<i>Leptocella</i>			1			
<i>Brachycentrus</i>					1	
Plecoptera						
<i>Isogenus</i>					2	
<i>Isoperla</i>					6	
<i>Acroneuria</i>						1
Diptera						
Chironomidae	2	1		1	2	1
Simuliidae		2	6	1	7	8
<i>Tipula</i> sp					1	
Coleoptera						
<i>Stenelmis</i>				2		
<i>Microcylloepus</i>					8	
Total Number =	13	21	34	24	105	126
Total Number/m ² =	141	227	367	259	1135	1362

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Glendive
August 7, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Traverella</i>	22	4	16	5	3	3
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	2	3	2	3	1	1
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail	2		1		3	2
<i>Brachyocerus</i>	1				1	
<i>Heptagenia</i>		1				1
<i>Ephemerella</i>		5			1	
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail		1			1	
<i>Dutyllobaetis</i>		1	1	1	4	
<i>Isonychia</i>						1
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	24	6	19	6	26	10
Diptera						
Chironomidae		2			1	
Total Number =	51	23	39	15	41	18
Total Number/m ² =	551	249	422	162	443	195
						$\bar{X} = 31$
						$\bar{X} = 337$
						$\sigma = 156.7$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Intake
August 7, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Traverella</i>	7	10	17	15	16	18
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	2			2	1	
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	2	6	1		3	
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1	1				
<i>Brachyarcus</i>		1				
<i>Rhithrogena</i>		1				1
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail		2		3	1	
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail			4	2		4
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	10	3	4	6	8	22
Plecoptera						
<i>Isoperla</i>			1			
Oligochaeta						1
Total Number =	22	24	27	28	29	46
Total Number/m ² =	238	259	292	303	313	497
						$\bar{X} = 29$
						$\bar{X} = 317$
						$\sigma = 92.6$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Sidney
August 7, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Ephemeroptera							
<i>Traverella</i>	11	11	16	5	4		
<i>Brachyercus</i>	4	6	2	3	2	3	
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	5	4	9	1	7	3	
<i>Baetis three-tail</i>		1				1	
<i>Heptagenia</i>				1		2	
<i>Isonychia</i>					2		
Trichoptera							
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	7	8	5		5		
<i>Leptocella</i>		1	1				
Diptera							
Simuliidae	1						
Chironomidae		3	1		2		
<hr/>							
Total Number =	28	34	34	10	22	9	$\bar{X} = 23$
Total Number/m ² =	303	367	367	108	238	97	$\bar{X} = 247$
							$\sigma = 121.5$
<hr/>							

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Miles City
October 8, 1975.

Organism	Numbers in Waters' Sampler						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Ephemeroptera							
<i>Heptagenia</i>	4	8	4	8	27	1	
<i>Traverella</i>	1		1		1		
<i>Ephemerella</i>	1			3	1		
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>				1			
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	21	8	40	13	12	12	
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail	1	4	2		3		
<i>Choroterpes</i>	1				1		
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>	2	2	3	2		2	
<i>Rhythrogena</i>					1		
Plecoptera							
<i>Isoperla</i>					1		
Trichoptera							
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	31	38	78	28	6	34	
<i>Brachycentrus</i>		1	1				
Diptera							
Chironomidae	13	46	5	24	14	19	
Empididae	2				1	1	
Simuliidae					3		
Oligochaeta		2		2		4	
Odonata							
<i>Gomphus</i>		1					
Total Number =	77	110	134	81	70	74	$\bar{X} = 91$
Total Number/m ² =	832	1189	1448	875	757	780	$\bar{X} = 980$
							$\sigma = 277.62$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Glendive
October 9, 1976.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Heptagenia</i>	8	3	1	4	1	1
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	2		2	2	1	
<i>Dietylohaetis</i>	2	2		4		
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	15		8	7	2	1
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail	2		4		2	1
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.x	1					
<i>Traverella</i>		1				
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	74	6	38	46	15	5
Oligochaeta	8	11	22	5	12	19
Diptera						
Chironomidae	4	22	11	7	3	3
Total Number =	116	45	86	75	36	30
Total Number/m ² =	1254	486	929	811	389	324
					$\bar{X} = 65$	
					$\bar{X} = 698.8$	
					$\sigma = 362.09$	

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Traverella</i>	1					
<i>Heptagenia</i>	25	2	8	2	9	22
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	6	1	1			4
<i>Stenonema</i>	1					
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	9	1				2
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail		1			1	
<i>Brachycercus</i>	1					
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>				2	1	
<i>Choroterpes</i>					1	
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	45	9	10	3	5	7
Diptera						
Chironomidae	29	3	15	26	11	45
Oligochaeta	38	6	30	5	4	48
Coleoptera						
<i>Microcylloepus</i>	1					
<hr/>						
Total Number =	156	23	64	38	32	128
Total Number/m ² =	1686	249	692	411	346	1383

$\bar{X} = 74$
 $\bar{X} = 794$
 $\sigma = 599$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Sidney
October 9, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Pactylobaetis</i>	4	2	3	10	11	6
<i>Heptagenia</i>	1		7	3	14	4
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail	1	1	2	1	2	2
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail			1	3	2	2
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>					2	1
<i>Traverella</i>					1	1
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	16	11	28	17	84	19
<i>Chumatopsyche</i>					4	
Diptera						
Chironomidae	7	13	21	25	24	16
Ceratopogonidae	1		1			
Oligochaeta	2	6	5	8	2	1
Coleoptera						
<i>Dubiraphia</i>					1	
<i>Microcylloepus</i>					1	
Total Number =	32	33	68	67	148	52
Total Number/m ² =	346	357	735	724	1600	562
						$\bar{X} = 67$
						$\bar{X} = 720.6$
						$\sigma = 462.87$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Livingston
November 7, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters ¹				Sampler	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Ephemereilla inermis</i>	83	77	53	221		
<i>Ephemereilla doddsi</i>		1		2		
<i>Ephemereilla grandis</i>	9	2	4	24		
<i>Baetis three-tail</i>	1	2				
<i>Ameletus</i>						
<i>Rhithrogena</i>	18	15	61	60		
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	90	125	96	421		
<i>Cheumatopsyche</i>	7	15	8	30		
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	2		1	7		
<i>Psychomyia</i>	3	1	3	2		
<i>Glossosoma</i>			1	14		
<i>Hydroptila</i>	30		7	5		
<i>Brachycentrus</i>	28	11	4	42		
<i>Lepidostoma</i>	74	5	14	37		
<i>Athripsodes</i>	1		1	1		
Plecoptera						
<i>Alloperla</i>	6	6	5	13		
<i>Isogenus</i>	2		1	2		
<i>Acroneuria</i>			2			
<i>Pteronarcys</i>				3		
Diptera						
Chironomidae	201	212	157	113		
<i>Atherix</i>	10		11	29		
<i>Huxatoma</i>			1			
<i>Simulium</i>			1			
Oligochaeta		2				
<hr/>						
Total Number =	565	474	431	1026	$\bar{X}$ =	624
Total Number/m ² =	6107	5123	4658	11089	$\bar{X}$ =	6744
					σ =	2958
<hr/>						

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Corwin Springs
November 7, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters ¹					Sampler 6
	1	2	3	4	5	
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Ephemerella inermis</i>	83	48	59	91		
<i>Ephemerella doddsi</i>	1		1	2		
<i>Baetis</i>	2	5	2			
<i>Ephemerella grandis</i>		2	2			
<i>Ameletus</i>		1				
<i>Rhithrogena</i>		16	21	24		
Plecoptera						
<i>Pteronarcys</i>	8	1	4	4		
<i>Acroneuria</i>	2		2	9		
<i>Isogenus</i>	1					
<i>Alloperla</i>		1		2		
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	190	30	125	653		
<i>Psychomyia</i>	35	56	75	10		
<i>Glossosoma</i>	4	2	20	48		
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	2		5	4		
<i>Hydroptila</i>	49	133	47	21		
<i>Lepidostoma</i>			4			
<i>Chumatopsyche</i>				30		
Diptera						
Chironomidae	112	91	118	186		
<i>Atherix</i>	6	2	1	1		
<i>Hexatoma</i>		2		1		
<i>Simulium</i>		1				
Coleoptera						
<i>Optioservus</i>	3					
Acari-Hydracarina	2	7	3			
Oligochaeta				2		
<hr/>						
Total Number =	500	393	492	1090		$\bar{X} = 619$
Total Number/m ² =	5404	4248	5318	11781		$\bar{X} = 6688$
						$\sigma = 3435$

Appendix D. Botton Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Intake,
November 11, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Tricorythodes</i>	1	1		1		
<i>Baetis</i>	6	4	1	3		6
<i>Heptagenia</i>	4	1	3	12		1
<i>Ephemerella</i>		2				1
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>		1				
Plecoptera						
<i>Brachyptera</i>	3			1		1
<i>Isoperla</i>		2		1	1	2
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	21	39				12
Diptera						
Chironomidae	1	13	20	23	6	24
<i>Simulium</i>		1				
Oligochaeta	2	3	7	5	1	8
Total Number =	38	67	31	46	8	55
Total Number/m ² =	411	724	335	497	86	594
						$\bar{X} = 41$
						$\bar{X} = 441$
						$\sigma = 221$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Sidney
November 11, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Baetis</i>		5	3	4		2
<i>Heptagenia</i>		6		1		
Plecoptera						
<i>Brachyptera</i>		2		2		1
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>		11	4	17	4	17
Diptera						
Chironomidae	167	43	80	17	37	24
Ceratopogonidae	1	1				
Oligochaeta	5	3	10	3	14	7
Total Number =	173	71	97	44	55	51
						$\bar{X} = 82$
Total Number/m ² =	1870	767	1048	476	594	551
						$\bar{X} = 884$
						$\sigma = 524$

Appendix D. Bottom Fauna Analyses, Yellowstone River at Glendive
September 9, 1975.

Organism	Number in Waters' Sampler					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ephemeroptera						
<i>Tricorythodes minutus</i>	1		1		2	
<i>Baetis</i> two-tail	4		1		1	1
<i>Dactylobaetis</i>		2			1	
<i>Traverella</i>			1	7	9	24
<i>Tricorythodes</i> sp.x				1		
<i>Heptagenia</i>				2	4	2
<i>Brachycercus</i>						1
<i>Baetis</i> three-tail						1
Trichoptera						
<i>Hydropsyche</i>	8	4	9	20	38	35
Diptera						
Chironomidae	4	1	14	5	5	3
Oligochaeta			1	1	1	4
Total Number =	17	7	27	36	61	71
Total Number/m ² =	184	76	292	389	659	767
						$\bar{X} = 36.5$
						$\bar{X} = 394.5$
						$\sigma = 270.2$

APPENDIX E

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200-1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17-1 Hester-Dendy

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 25, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	38	40.4
2	18	19.1
3	13	13.6
4	11	11.7
5	5	5.3
6	5	5.3
7	4	4.3
TOTAL	94	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.39
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	6.55
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	2.74
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.42
REDUNDANCY	=	0.15
EVENNESS	=	0.85
EQUITABILITY	=	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.02

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17-2 Hester-Dendy

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 25, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	32	32.7
2	20	20.4
3	19	19.4
4	10	10.2
5	7	7.1
6	6	6.1
7	2	2.0
8	1	1.0
9	1	1.0
TOTAL	98	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.56
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	6.61
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.22
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.54
REDUNDANCY	=	0.25
EVENNESS	=	0.81
EQUITABILITY	=	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.17

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17-3 Hester-Dendy

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 25, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	35	22.7
2	28	18.2
3	27	17.5
4	27	17.5
5	24	15.6
6	6	3.9
7	3	1.9
8	2	1.3
9	1	0.6
10	1	0.6
TOTAL	154	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.70
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	7.27
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.24
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.42
REDUNDANCY	=	0.19
EVENNESS	=	0.61
EQUITABILITY	=	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.33

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17-4

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 25, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	55	57.3
2	11	11.5
3	10	10.4
4	7	7.3
5	5	5.2
6	2	2.1
7	2	2.1
8	2	2.1
9	1	1.0
10	1	1.0
TOTAL	96	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.14
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	6.58
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.27
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.61
REDUNDANCY	=	0.42
EVENNESS	=	0.64
EQUITABILITY	=	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.82

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 RPT 2200.1 SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS
 MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17-C

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 25, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	34	26.4
2	27	20.9
3	16	12.4
4	15	11.6
5	14	10.9
6	13	10.1
7	3	2.3
8	3	2.3
9	3	2.3
10	1	0.8
TOTAL	129	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.83
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	7.01
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.37
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.49
REDUNDANCY	=	0.19
EVENNESS	=	0.85
EQUITABILITY	=	0.40
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.42

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17-6

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 25, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	65	36.5
2	52	29.2
3	20	11.2
4	11	6.2
5	6	3.4
6	5	2.8
7	4	2.2
8	4	2.2
9	2	1.1
10	2	1.1
11	1	0.6
12	1	0.6
13	1	0.6
TOTAL	178	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.55
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	7.48
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.69
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.50
REDUNDANCY	=	0.36
EVENNESS	=	0.69
EGUITY	=	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.21

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 20

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 11, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	20	21.6
2	18	19.4
3	11	11.8
4	9	9.7
5	8	8.6
6	7	7.5
7	4	4.3
8	3	3.2
9	3	3.2
10	3	3.2
11	2	2.2
12	1	1.1
13	1	1.1
14	1	1.1
15	1	1.1
16	1	1.1
TOTAL	93	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	3.36
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	6.54
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.96
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	1.04
REDUNDANCY	=	0.21
EVENNESS	=	0.84
EQUITABILITY	=	0.51
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.64

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT. 3, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	43	41.7
2	37	35.9
3	14	13.6
4	5	4.9
5	2	1.9
6	1	1.0
7	1	1.0
TOTAL	103	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.90
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	6.69
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	2.82
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.39
REDUNDANCY	=	0.38
EVENNESS	=	0.68
EGUITABILITY	=	0.28
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.62

STATION: 1 Yellowstone River
 NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy
 SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	347	49.0
2	223	31.5
3	34	4.8
4	24	3.4
5	20	2.8
6	13	1.8
7	12	1.7
8	11	1.6
9	11	1.6
10	6	0.8
11	3	0.4
12	1	0.1
13	1	0.1
14	1	0.1
15	1	0.1
TOTAL	708	100.0

DIVERSITY = 2.09
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1) = 5.47
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2) = 3.65
 MINIMUM DIVERSITY = 0.19
 REDUNDANCY = 0.48
 EVENNESS = 0.53
 EQUITABILITY = 0.22
 SPECIES RICHNESS = 1.67

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 2 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	726	43.6
2	222	13.3
3	175	10.5
4	140	8.4
5	120	7.2
6	95	5.7
7	58	3.5
8	38	2.3
9	30	1.8
10	12	0.7
11	12	0.7
12	10	0.6
13	9	0.5
14	7	0.4
15	5	0.3
16	4	0.2
17	1	0.1
18	1	0.1
TOTAL	1665	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.74
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.70
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.16
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.11
REDUNDANCY	=	0.35
EVENNESS	=	0.66
EQUITABILITY	=	0.26
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.46

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 R-1 2200.1 SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS
 FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 3 Yellowstone River
 NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy
 SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

BANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	920	46.7
2	467	23.7
3	200	10.1
4	167	8.5
5	100	5.1
6	64	3.2
7	13	0.7
8	10	0.5
9	9	0.5
10	9	0.5
11	5	0.3
12	3	0.2
13	2	0.1
14	1	0.1
15	1	0.1
TOTAL	1971	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.24
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.94
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.89
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.08
REDUNDANCY	=	0.43
EVENNESS	=	0.57
EQUITABILITY	=	0.20
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.03

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 RPT 2200.1 SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS
 FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 4 Yellowstone River
 NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 6004 Hester-Dendy
 SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	227	36.3
2	130	20.8
3	65	10.4
4	65	10.4
5	50	8.0
6	30	4.8
7	18	2.9
8	14	2.2
9	10	1.6
10	8	1.3
11	6	1.0
12	2	0.3
TOTAL	625	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.72
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.29
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.92
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.16
REDUNDANCY	=	0.24
EVENNESS	=	0.76
EQUITABILITY	=	0.29
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.43

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 RPT 2200.1 SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS
 FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 4 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	227	36.3
2	130	20.8
3	65	10.4
4	65	10.4
5	50	8.0
6	30	4.8
7	18	2.9
8	14	2.2
9	10	1.6
10	8	1.3
11	6	1.0
12	2	0.3
TOTAL	625	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.72
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.29
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.52
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.16
REDUNDANCY	=	0.24
EVENNESS	=	0.76
EQUITABILITY	=	0.29
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.43

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 3 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	920	46.7
2	467	23.7
3	200	10.1
4	167	8.5
5	100	5.1
6	64	3.2
7	13	0.7
8	10	0.5
9	9	0.5
10	9	0.5
11	5	0.3
12	3	0.2
13	2	0.1
14	1	0.1
15	1	0.1
TOTAL	1971	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.24
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.94
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.89
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.08
REDUNDANCY	=	0.43
EVENNESS	=	0.57
EQUITABILITY	=	0.20
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.03

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 2 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	726	43.6
2	222	13.3
3	175	10.5
4	140	8.4
5	120	7.2
6	95	5.7
7	58	3.5
8	38	2.3
9	30	1.8
10	12	0.7
11	12	0.7
12	10	0.6
13	9	0.5
14	7	0.4
15	5	0.3
16	4	0.2
17	1	0.1
18	1	0.1
TOTAL	1665	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.74
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.70
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.16
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.11
REDUNDANCY	=	0.35
EVENNESS	=	0.66
EQUITABILITY	=	0.26
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.48

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 1 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 16, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	347	49.0
2	223	31.5
3	34	4.8
4	24	3.4
5	20	2.8
6	13	1.8
7	12	1.7
8	11	1.6
9	11	1.6
10	6	0.8
11	3	0.4
12	1	0.1
13	1	0.1
14	1	0.1
15	1	0.1
TOTAL	708	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.09
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.47
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.85
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.19
REDUNDANCY	=	0.48
EVENNESS	=	0.53
EQUITABILITY	=	0.22
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.67

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 18 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 17, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	63	39.9
2	29	18.4
3	17	10.8
4	13	8.2
5	9	5.7
6	7	4.4
7	5	3.2
8	3	1.9
9	2	1.3
10	2	1.3
11	2	1.3
12	1	0.6
13	1	0.6
14	1	0.6
15	1	0.6
16	1	0.6
17	1	0.6
TOTAL	158	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.84
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	7.30
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.91
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.73
REDUNDANCY	=	0.34
EVENNESS	=	0.69
EQUITABILITY	=	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.45

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

FPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 18 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 0004 Hester-Dendy

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 17, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	63	39.9
2	29	18.4
3	17	10.8
4	13	8.2
5	9	5.7
6	7	4.4
7	5	3.2
8	3	1.9
9	2	1.3
10	2	1.3
11	2	1.3
12	1	0.6
13	1	0.6
14	1	0.6
15	1	0.6
16	1	0.6
17	1	0.6
TOTAL	158	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.84
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	7.30
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.91
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.73
REDUNDANCY	=	0.34
EVERNESS	=	0.69
EQUITABILITY	=	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.45

SOUTHERN DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ST. 2250.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 9, 1975

STATION: 15

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 17, 1974

WALK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	27	36.5
2	17	23.0
3	16	21.6
4	5	6.8
5	2	2.7
6	2	2.7
7	2	2.7
8	2	2.7
9	1	1.4
TOTAL	74	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.41
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	6.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	2.97
MARGINAL DIVERSITY	=	0.65
REDUNDANCY	=	0.24
EVENNESS	=	0.76
EQUALITY	=	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.02

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 1

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: JAN. 13, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	343	69.0
2	33	6.6
3	33	6.6
4	20	4.0
5	15	3.0
6	15	3.0
7	12	2.4
8	11	2.2
9	4	0.8
10	4	0.8
11	2	0.4
12	2	0.4
13	1	0.2
14	1	0.2
15	1	0.2
TOTAL	497	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.86
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.95
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.82
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.25
REDUNDANCY	=	0.55
EVENNESS	=	0.48
EGUITABILITY	=	0.21
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.65

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
RPT 2200.1 SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS
FEBRUARY 14 1975

STATION: 2 Yellowstone River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: JAN. 13, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	90	26.8
2	80	23.8
3	40	11.9
4	34	10.1
5	28	8.3
6	15	4.5
7	10	3.0
8	7	2.1
9	6	1.8
10	5	1.5
11	4	1.2
12	4	1.2
13	3	0.9
14	2	0.6
15	2	0.6
16	2	0.6
17	1	0.3
18	1	0.3
19	1	0.3
20	1	0.3
TOTAL	336	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	3.11
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.39
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.33
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.47
REDUNDANCY	=	0.32
EVENNESS	=	0.72
EQUITABILITY	=	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.74

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

HPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 3

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: JAN. 13, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	271	39.3
2	173	25.1
3	157	22.8
4	48	7.0
5	15	2.2
6	8	1.2
7	4	0.6
8	4	0.6
9	3	0.4
10	2	0.3
11	1	0.1
12	1	0.1
13	1	0.1
14	1	0.1
15	1	0.1
TOTAL	690	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.19
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.43
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.83
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.19
REDUNDANCY	=	0.45
EVENNESS	=	0.56
EQUITABILITY	=	0.23
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.96

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 4

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: JAN. 13, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	160	57.1
2	47	16.8
3	20	7.1
4	17	6.1
5	15	5.4
6	8	2.9
7	4	1.4
8	2	0.7
9	2	0.7
10	2	0.7
11	1	0.4
12	1	0.4
13	1	0.4
TOTAL	280	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.11
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.13
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.67
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.35
REDUNDANCY	=	0.47
EVENNESS	=	0.57
EQUITABILITY	=	0.26
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.85

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 12

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: JAN. 13, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	220	43.1
2	100	19.6
3	36	7.0
4	30	7.0
5	36	7.0
6	20	3.9
7	12	2.3
8	11	2.2
9	9	1.8
10	8	1.6
11	7	1.4
12	4	0.8
13	4	0.8
14	4	0.8
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
17	1	0.2
18	1	0.2
TOTAL	511	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.74
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.00
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.12
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.30
REDUNDANCY	=	0.36
EVENNESS	=	0.66
EQUITABILITY	=	0.30
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.43

NOVA SCOTIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

REF 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

DATE: 5, 1975

STATION: 1

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: FEB. 14, 1975

SPECIES	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	1184	42.0
2	646	22.7
3	170	6.0
4	150	5.3
5	107	3.8
6	103	3.7
7	74	2.6
8	53	1.9
9	54	1.9
10	43	1.5
11	32	1.1
12	31	1.1
13	30	1.1
14	25	0.9
15	17	0.6
16	12	0.4
17	8	0.3
18	8	0.3
19	5	0.2
20	4	0.1
21	4	0.1
22	3	0.1
23	2	0.1
24	2	0.1
25	2	0.1
26	2	0.1
27	1	0.0
28	1	0.0
29	1	0.0
TOTAL	2817	100.0

DIVERSITY = 2.84
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1) = 11.46
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2) = 4.62
 MINIMUM DIVERSITY = 0.11
 REDUNDANCY = 0.42
 EVENNESS = 0.59
 EQUITABILITY = 0.25
 SPECIES RICHNESS = 29.00

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 2-MALLARD REST

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: FEB. 14, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	273	26.1
2	264	27.2
3	141	14.3
4	91	9.4
5	46	4.7
6	42	4.3
7	40	4.1
8	17	1.8
9	15	1.5
10	13	1.3
11	6	0.6
12	5	0.5
13	5	0.5
14	4	0.4
15	3	0.3
16	2	0.2
17	2	0.2
18	1	0.1
TOTAL	971	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.36
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	4.92
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.20
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.17
REDUNDANCY	=	0.53
EVENNESS	=	0.62
EQUITABILITY	=	0.29
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.57

MONTEANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

REF 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 9, 1975

STATION: 3

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: FEB. 14, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	432	27.7
2	227	14.5
3	205	13.4
4	130	8.3
5	103	6.6
6	93	6.0
7	68	4.4
8	36	2.3
9	57	3.7
10	42	2.7
11	36	2.4
12	18	1.2
13	10	0.6
14	7	0.4
15	5	0.3
16	4	0.3
17	4	0.3
18	4	0.3
19	3	0.2
20	2	0.1
21	2	0.1
22	1	0.1
23	1	0.1
24	1	0.1
TOTAL	1561	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	3.32
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.61
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.03
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.16
REDUNDANCY	=	0.28
EVENNESS	=	0.72
EQUITABILITY	=	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	3.00

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

WTF 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 5, 1975

STATION: 4

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: FEB. 14, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	640	35.8
2	512	28.3
3	440	24.3
4	42	2.3
5	35	1.9
6	28	1.6
7	28	1.5
8	20	1.1
9	7	0.4
10	7	0.4
11	5	0.3
12	5	0.3
13	5	0.3
14	4	0.2
15	3	0.2
16	3	0.2
17	3	0.2
18	3	0.2
19	3	0.2
20	2	0.1
21	2	0.1
22	1	0.1
23	1	0.1
TOTAL	1660	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.30
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.82
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.52
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.11
REDUNDANCY	=	0.51
EVENNESS	=	0.51
EQUITABILITY	=	0.21
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.39

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

OCTOBER 27, 1975

STATION: CORWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS:

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 10, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	389	25.8
2	310	20.6
3	294	19.5
4	63	4.2
5	61	4.0
6	60	4.0
7	60	4.0
8	51	3.4
9	51	3.4
10	43	2.9
11	24	1.6
12	20	1.3
13	18	1.2
14	18	1.2
15	7	0.5
16	7	0.5
17	5	0.3
18	4	0.3
19	3	0.2
20	3	0.2
21	2	0.1
22	2	0.1
23	2	0.1
24	2	0.1
25	2	0.1
26	1	0.1
27	1	0.1
28	1	0.1
29	1	0.1
30	1	0.1
31	1	0.1
TOTAL	1507	100.0

DIVERSITY = 3.25
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1) = 10.56
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2) = 4.94
 MINIMUM DIVERSITY = 0.21
 REDUNDANCY = 0.30
 EVENNESS = 0.66

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

OCTOBER 27, 1975

STATION: MALLARD REST

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS:

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 10, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	2459	54.1
2	606	13.3
3	420	9.2
4	209	4.6
5	208	4.6
6	198	4.4
7	110	2.4
8	100	2.2
9	61	1.3
10	48	1.1
11	23	0.5
12	15	0.3
13	12	0.3
14	11	0.2
15	10	0.2
16	10	0.2
17	6	0.1
18	6	0.1
19	5	0.1
20	5	0.1
21	5	0.1
22	4	0.1
23	3	0.1
24	3	0.1
25	2	0.0
26	1	0.0
27	1	0.0
28	1	0.0
29	1	0.0
TOTAL	4543	100.0

DIVERSITY = 2.44
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1) = 12.15
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2) = 4.86
 MINIMUM DIVERSITY = 0.07
 REDUNDANCY = 0.51
 EVENNESS = 0.50
 EQUITABILITY = 0.20
 SPECIES RICHNESS = 2.24

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

OCTOBER 27, 1975

STATION: 4-ABOVE SHIELDS R.

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS:

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 10, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	1276	43.7
2	520	17.8
3	364	12.5
4	232	7.9
5	192	6.6
6	80	2.7
7	80	2.7
8	60	2.1
9	36	1.2
10	20	0.7
11	16	0.5
12	12	0.4
13	8	0.3
14	4	0.1
15	4	0.1
16	4	0.1
17	4	0.1
18	4	0.1
19	4	0.1
TOTAL	2920	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.59
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	11.51
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.25
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.07
REDUNDANCY	=	0.40
EVENNESS	=	0.61
EQUITABILITY	=	0.23
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.37

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

BFF 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 9, 1975

STATION: 13

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 19, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	1350	74.5
2	170	9.4
3	118	6.5
4	60	3.3
5	26	1.4
6	17	0.9
7	15	0.8
8	11	0.6
9	9	0.5
10	7	0.4
11	4	0.2
12	4	0.2
13	4	0.2
14	4	0.2
15	3	0.2
16	3	0.2
17	2	0.1
18	2	0.1
19	1	0.1
20	1	0.1
21	1	0.1
22	1	0.1
TOTAL	1813	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.53
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	10.82
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.44
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.13
REDUNDANCY	=	0.67
EVENNESS	=	0.34
EQUITABILITY	=	0.14
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.39

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

MT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 9, 1975

STATION: 14

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 19, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	90	35.6
2	40	15.8
3	30	14.2
4	28	11.1
5	20	7.9
6	10	4.0
7	8	2.4
8	5	2.0
9	3	1.2
10	2	0.8
11	2	0.8
12	2	0.8
13	1	0.4
14	1	0.4
15	1	0.4
16	1	0.4
17	1	0.4
18	1	0.4
19	1	0.4
20	1	0.4
21	1	0.4
TOTAL	253	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.94
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	7.98
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.17
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.63
REDUNDANCY	=	0.38
EVENNESS	=	0.67
EQUITABILITY	=	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.57

ONTARIO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 9, 1975

STATION: 15

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 19, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	328	68.9
2	67	14.1
3	16	3.4
4	15	3.2
5	14	2.9
6	6	1.7
7	7	1.5
8	5	1.1
9	4	0.8
10	4	0.6
11	3	0.6
12	1	0.2
13	1	0.2
14	1	0.2
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
TOTAL	476	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.75
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.89
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.01
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.28
REDUNDANCY	=	0.60
EVENNESS	=	0.44
EQUITABILITY	=	0.20
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.56

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 1-CORWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: APRIL 7, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	473	22.5
2	423	20.2
3	345	16.7
4	274	13.1
5	120	5.7
6	80	3.8
7	70	3.4
8	65	3.1
9	40	1.9
10	40	1.9
11	33	1.6
12	26	1.2
13	16	0.8
14	16	0.8
15	14	0.7
16	14	0.7
17	8	0.4
18	6	0.3
19	6	0.3
20	5	0.2
21	3	0.1
22	2	0.1
23	2	0.1
24	1	0.0
25	1	0.0
26	1	0.0
27	1	0.0
TOTAL	2089	100.0

DIVERSITY = 3.25
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1) = 11.03
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2) = 4.72
 MINIMUM DIVERSITY = 0.14
 REDUNDANCY = 0.32
 EVENNESS = 0.68
 EQUITABILITY = 0.30
 SPECIES RICHNESS = 2.96

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 12-BIGHORN R

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: APRIL 18, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	9	24.3
2	6	16.2
3	6	16.2
4	5	13.5
5	4	10.8
6	4	10.8
7	2	5.4
8	1	2.7
TOTAL	37	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.80
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	5.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	2.32
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.96
REDUNDANCY	=	0.94
EVENNESS	=	0.93
EQUITABILITY	=	0.54
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.26

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 13-MYERS

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: APRIL 18, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	207	59.1
2	56	16.3
3	35	10.0
4	13	3.7
5	9	2.6
6	7	2.0
7	5	1.4
8	4	1.1
9	3	.9
10	2	.6
11	2	.6
12	2	.6
13	2	.6
TOTAL	350	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.03
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.45
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.74
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.29
REDUNDANCY	=	0.50
EVENNESS	=	0.55
EQUITABILITY	=	0.24
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.79

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 14-FORSYTH

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: APRIL 18, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	516	69.2
2	140	18.8
3	44	5.9
4	13	1.7
5	13	1.7
6	6	0.8
7	5	0.7
8	3	0.4
9	2	0.3
10	1	0.1
11	1	0.1
12	1	0.1
13	1	0.1
TOTAL	746	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.48
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.54
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.67
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.18
REDUNDANCY	=	0.62
EVENNESS	=	0.40
EQUITABILITY	=	0.18
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.32

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 15-MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: APRIL 18, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	498	73.9
2	53	7.9
3	40	5.9
4	13	1.9
5	12	1.8
6	11	1.6
7	11	1.6
8	7	1.0
9	7	1.0
10	5	0.7
11	4	0.6
12	4	0.6
13	2	0.3
14	1	0.1
15	1	0.1
16	1	0.1
17	1	0.1
18	1	0.1
19	1	0.1
20	1	0.1
TOTAL	674	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.66
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	9.40
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.32
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.26
REDUNDANCY	=	0.66
EVENNESS	=	0.38
EQUITABILITY	=	0.18
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.48

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JUNE 25, 1975

STATION: 17-GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: APRIL 17, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	145	43.9
2	37	11.2
3	36	10.9
4	33	10.0
5	29	8.8
6	13	3.9
7	9	2.7
8	7	2.1
9	5	1.5
10	4	1.2
11	3	0.9
12	2	0.6
13	2	0.6
14	1	0.3
15	1	0.3
16	1	0.3
17	1	0.3
18	1	0.3
TOTAL	330	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.75
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.37
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.08
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.42
REDUNDANCY	=	0.36
EVENNESS	=	0.66
EQUITABILITY	=	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.43

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RIT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

APRIL 5, 1975

STATION: 12

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: MARCH 19, 1975

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	30	52.6
2	6	10.5
3	5	8.8
4	5	8.8
5	2	3.5
6	2	3.5
7	2	3.5
8	2	3.5
9	1	1.8
10	1	1.8
11	1	1.8
TOTAL	57	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	2.43
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	5.63
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.13
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	1.60
REDUNDANCY	=	0.33
EVENNESS	=	0.70
EQUITABILITY	=	0.42
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	2.01

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 06 Tongue River

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 3, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	138	34.2
2	39	9.7
3	33	8.2
4	26	6.5
5	16	4.0
6	16	4.0
7	15	3.7
8	14	3.5
9	12	3.0
10	11	2.7
11	10	2.5
12	10	2.5
13	10	2.5
14	7	1.7
15	7	1.7
16	6	1.5
17	5	1.2
18	5	1.2
19	4	1.0
20	4	1.0
21	4	1.0
22	2	0.5
23	2	0.5
24	1	0.2
25	1	0.2
26	1	0.2
27	1	0.2
28	1	0.2
29	1	0.2
30	1	0.2
TOTAL	403	100.0

DIVERSITY = 3.69
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1) = 8.65
 MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2) = 4.80
 MINIMUM DIVERSITY = 0.62
 REDUNDANCY = 0.27
 EVENNESS = 0.75
 EQUITABILITY = 0.43
 SPECIES RICHNESS = 3.26

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200-1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 01 Tongue River-Keogh

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 3, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	60	62.5
2	11	11.5
3	10	10.4
4	4	4.2
5	3	3.1
6	2	2.1
7	2	2.1
8	1	1.0
9	1	1.0
10	1	1.0
11	1	1.0
TOTAL	96	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	1.98
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	0.58
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	3.44
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.68
REDUNDANCY	=	0.53
EVENNESS	=	0.47
EQUITABILITY	=	0.30
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	1.68

MINNAPOTA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 1200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MARCH 17, 1975

STATION: 00 Tongue River-Birney

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1 Kick

SAMPLING PERIOD: DEC. 3, 1974

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	130	34.2
2	39	9.7
3	31	8.2
4	26	6.5
5	16	4.0
6	16	4.0
7	14	3.7
8	14	3.5
9	12	3.0
10	11	2.7
11	10	2.5
12	10	2.5
13	10	2.5
14	7	1.7
15	7	1.7
16	6	1.5
17	5	1.2
18	5	1.2
19	4	1.0
20	4	1.0
21	4	1.0
22	2	0.5
23	2	0.5
24	1	0.2
25	1	0.2
26	1	0.2
27	1	0.2
28	1	0.2
29	1	0.2
30	1	0.2
TOTAL	403	100.0

DIVERSITY	=	3.69	
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (1)	=	8.65	
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY (2)	=	4.80	
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	=	0.62	
REDUNDANCY	=	0.27	
EVENNESS	=	0.75	
EQUITABILITY	=	0.43	A-102
SPECIES RICHNESS	=	3.26	

APPENDIX F

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	5	39.5
2	2	15.4
3	2	15.4
4	1	7.7
5	1	7.7
6	1	7.7
7	1	7.7
TOTAL	13	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.50	1.82
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.04
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	2.19	1.56
REDUNDANCY	0.50	0.46
EVENNESS	0.89	0.89
EQUITABILITY	0.63	0.73
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.82	1.00

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	8	38.1
2	4	19.0
3	3	14.3
4	2	9.5
5	2	9.5
6	1	4.8
7	1	4.8
TOTAL	21	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.45	1.95
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.26
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.67	1.20
REDUNDANCY	0.30	0.29
EVENNESS	0.87	0.87
EQUITABILITY	0.56	0.63
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.89	1.33

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

PRT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILFS CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	13	38.2
2	6	17.6
3	6	17.6
4	5	14.7
5	1	2.9
6	1	2.9
7	1	2.9
8	1	2.9
TOTAL	34	100.0

	SHANNON	PIILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.42	2.04
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.54
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.31	1.02
REDUNDANCY	0.34	0.33
EVENNESS	0.81	0.80
EQUITABILITY	0.48	0.54
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.94	1.50

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	7	29.2
2	6	25.0
3	3	12.5
4	2	8.3
5	2	8.3
6	2	8.3
7	1	4.2
8	1	4.2
TOTAL	24	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.67	2.15
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.43
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.69	1.28
REDUNDANCY	0.25	0.24
EVENNESS	0.89	0.89
EQUITABILITY	0.58	0.65
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.09	1.50

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	34	32.4
2	16	15.2
3	8	7.6
4	7	6.7
5	7	6.7
6	6	5.7
7	6	5.7
8	6	5.7
9	5	4.8
10	2	1.9
11	2	1.9
12	2	1.9
13	2	1.9
14	1	1.0
15	1	1.0
TOTAL	105	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	3.22	2.92
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.91	3.56
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.07	0.88
REUNDANCY	0.24	0.24
EVENNESS	0.83	0.82
EQUITABILITY	0.48	0.55
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.74	2.37

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	57	45.2
2	38	30.2
3	9	7.1
4	8	6.3
5	6	4.8
6	3	2.4
7	2	1.6
8	1	0.8
9	1	0.8
10	1	0.8
TOTAL	126	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.16	2.00
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.11
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.60	0.50
REDUNDANCY	0.47	0.42
EVENNESS	0.65	0.64
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.85	1.64

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-5-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	101	31.3
2	62	19.2
3	35	10.8
4	32	9.9
5	24	7.4
6	9	2.8
7	8	2.5
8	8	2.5
9	7	2.2
10	7	2.2
11	7	2.2
12	6	1.9
13	5	1.5
14	3	0.9
15	2	0.6
16	2	0.6
17	1	0.3
18	1	0.3
19	1	0.3
20	1	0.3
21	1	0.3
TOTAL	323	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	3.19	3.03
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.39	4.19
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.60	0.51
REDUNDANCY	0.32	0.32
EVENNESS	0.73	0.72
EQUITABILITY	0.38	0.44
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.81	2.59

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	24	47.1
2	22	43.1
3	2	3.9
4	2	3.9
5	1	2.0
TOTAL	51	100.0

	SHANNON	PILOTQUIN
DIVERSITY	1.51	1.35
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.11
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.55	0.44
REDUNDANCY	0.46	0.45
EVENNESS	0.65	0.64
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.25	1.04

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	6	26.1
2	5	21.7
3	4	17.4
4	3	13.0
5	2	8.7
6	1	4.3
7	1	4.3
8	1	4.3
TOTAL	23	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.73	2.17
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.41
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.74	1.31
REDUNDANCY	0.24	0.22
EVENNESS	0.90	0.90
EQUITABILITY	0.60	0.67
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.11	1.50

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	19	48.7
2	16	41.0
3	2	5.1
4	1	2.6
5	1	2.6
TOTAL	39	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.52	1.33
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.06
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.68	0.54
REDUNDANCY	0.40	0.48
EVENNESS	0.65	0.65
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.24	0.99

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	6	40.0
2	5	33.3
3	3	20.0
4	1	6.7
TOTAL	15	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.78	1.42
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.59
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.04	0.76
REDUNDANCY	0.23	0.21
EVENNESS	0.89	0.89
EQUITABILITY	0.46	0.53
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.33	0.89

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
911-V

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVF

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	22.1	1.59
2	04.0	0.33
3	05.0	0.33
4	04.0	0.33
5	20.1	1.31
6	22.2	1.31
TOTAL	26.1	1.65
BRILLLOUIN	SHANNON	DIVERSITY
0.001	0.001	0.001
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.59	1.59
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.59	1.59
ABUNDANCE	0.59	0.59
EVENNESS	0.75	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.75	0.75
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.49	1.49
7.3	3	3
9.8	4	4
63.4	26	26
PERCENT OF TOTAL	ABUNDANCE	RANK

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

STATION: GLENDIVF

JULY 2, 1976

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
911-V

RPT 2200.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLFNDIVF

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	91	48.7
2	53	28.3
3	12	6.4
4	8	4.3
5	7	3.7
6	6	3.2
7	3	1.6
8	2	1.1
9	2	1.1
10	2	1.1
11	1	0.5
TOTAL	187	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.15	2.02
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.46	3.29
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.48	0.40
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.44
EVENNESS	0.62	0.62
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.87	1.69

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	10	45.5
2	7	31.8
3	2	9.1
4	2	9.1
5	1	4.5
TOTAL	22	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.87	1.54
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	1.93
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.05	0.70
REDUNDANCY	0.35	0.34
EVENNESS	0.81	0.80
EQUITABILITY	0.42	0.48
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.45	1.05

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	10	41.7
2	6	25.0
3	3	12.5
4	2	8.3
5	1	4.2
6	1	4.2
7	1	4.2
TOTAL	24	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.27	1.84
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.29
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.46	1.11
REDUNDANCY	0.40	0.38
EVENNESS	0.81	0.80
EQUITABILITY	0.50	0.56
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.78	1.28

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	17	63.0
2	4	14.8
3	4	14.8
4	1	3.7
5	1	3.7
TOTAL	27	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.59	1.32
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	1.98
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.90	0.69
REDUNDANCY	0.52	0.51
EVENNESS	0.68	0.67
EQUITABILITY	0.33	0.38
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.25	0.94

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	15	53.6
2	6	21.4
3	3	10.7
4	2	7.1
5	2	7.1
TOTAL	28	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.85	1.56
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	1.99
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.88	0.68
REDUNDANCY	0.33	0.33
EVENNESS	0.80	0.78
EQUITABILITY	0.38	0.45
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.46	1.11

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	16	55.2
2	8	27.6
3	3	10.3
4	1	3.4
5	1	3.4
TOTAL	29	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.66	1.40
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.00
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.85	0.66
REDUNDANCY	0.45	0.44
EVENNESS	0.71	0.70
EQUITABILITY	0.34	0.40
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.32	1.01

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	22	47.8
2	18	39.1
3	4	8.7
4	1	2.2
5	1	2.2
TOTAL	46	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.59	1.41
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.09
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.60	0.48
REDUNDANCY	0.43	0.42
EVENNESS	0.68	0.67
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.30	1.07

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	83	47.2
2	53	30.1
3	12	6.8
4	10	5.7
5	6	3.4
6	5	2.8
7	2	1.1
8	2	1.1
9	1	0.6
10	1	0.6
11	1	0.6
TOTAL	176	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.12	1.99
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.46	3.28
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.50	0.42
REDUNDANCY	0.45	0.45
EVENNESS	0.61	0.61
EQUITABILITY	0.28	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.83	1.66

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	11	39.3
2	7	25.0
3	5	17.9
4	4	14.3
5	1	3.6
TOTAL	28	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.05	1.75
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	1.99
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.88	0.68
REDUNDANCY	0.19	0.18
EVENNESS	0.88	0.88
EQUITABILITY	0.43	0.50
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.62	1.25

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	11	32.4
2	8	23.5
3	6	17.6
4	4	11.8
5	3	8.8
6	1	2.9
7	1	2.9
TOTAL	34	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.43	2.08
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.40
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.13	0.88
REDUNDANCY	0.22	0.22
EVENNESS	0.87	0.86
EQUITABILITY	0.48	0.55
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.95	1.52

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	16	47.1
2	9	26.5
3	5	14.7
4	2	5.9
5	1	2.9
6	1	2.9
TOTAL	34	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.97	1.68
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.24
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.94	0.74
REDUNDANCY	0.38	0.37
EVENNESS	0.76	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.39	0.45
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.53	1.23

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	5	50.0
2	3	30.0
3	1	10.0
4	1	10.0
TOTAL	10	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.69	1.23
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.46
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.36	0.95
REDUNDANCY	0.49	0.45
EVENNESS	0.84	0.84
EQUITABILITY	0.51	0.56
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.18	0.67

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	7	31.8
2	5	22.7
3	4	18.2
4	2	9.1
5	2	9.1
6	2	9.1
TOTAL	22	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLIQUIN
DIVERSITY	2.42	1.96
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.11
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.32	0.98
REDUNDANCY	0.14	0.13
EVENNESS	0.93	0.93
EQUITABILITY	0.54	0.62
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.85	1.34

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RDT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	3	33.3
2	3	33.3
3	2	22.2
4	1	11.1
TOTAL	9	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.89	1.37
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.43
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.45	1.00
REDUNDANCY	0.20	0.15
EVENNESS	0.95	0.95
EQUITABILITY	0.60	0.67
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.29	0.70

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: VIII-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	47	34.3
2	29	21.2
3	25	18.2
4	20	14.6
5	6	4.4
6	3	2.2
7	2	1.5
8	2	1.5
9	2	1.5
10	1	0.7
TOTAL	137	100.0

	SHANNON	BPILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.49	2.33
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.12
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.55	0.46
REDUNDANCY	0.33	0.30
EVENNESS	0.75	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.35	0.41
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.14	1.92

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	87	42.6
2	44	21.6
3	24	11.8
4	16	7.8
5	13	6.4
6	12	5.9
7	3	1.5
8	2	1.0
9	1	0.5
10	1	0.5
11	1	0.5
TOTAL	204	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.41	2.29
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.46	3.30
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.45	0.37
REDUNDANCY	0.35	0.34
EVENNESS	0.70	0.69
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.10	1.92

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	75	40.1
2	52	27.8
3	25	13.4
4	10	5.3
5	10	5.3
6	4	2.1
7	3	1.6
8	3	1.6
9	2	1.1
10	1	0.5
11	1	0.5
12	1	0.5
TOTAL	187	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.33	2.24
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.58	3.40
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.53	0.44
REDUNDANCY	0.39	0.39
EVENNESS	0.66	0.66
EQUITABILITY	0.32	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.07	1.88

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILFS CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	130	51.6
2	38	15.1
3	31	12.3
4	16	6.3
5	10	4.0
6	10	4.0
7	5	2.0
8	5	2.0
9	2	0.8
10	2	0.8
11	1	0.4
12	1	0.4
13	1	0.4
TOTAL	252	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.33	2.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.70	3.54
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.45	0.39
REDUNDANCY	0.42	0.42
EVENNESS	0.63	0.62
POUITABILITY	0.29	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.04	1.87

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	91	42.0
2	49	25.4
3	17	8.8
4	15	7.8
5	7	3.6
6	6	3.1
7	5	2.6
8	4	2.1
9	3	1.6
10	3	1.6
11	2	1.0
12	1	0.5
TOTAL	193	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.50	2.35
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.59	3.40
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.51	0.43
REDUNDANCY	0.35	0.35
EVENNESS	0.70	0.69
EQUITABILITY	0.33	0.38
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.17	1.97

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	80	64.0
2	18	14.4
3	9	7.2
4	6	4.8
5	5	4.0
6	3	2.4
7	1	0.8
8	1	0.8
9	1	0.8
10	1	0.8
TOTAL	125	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.84	1.68
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.11
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.67	0.50
REDUNDANCY	0.55	0.55
EVENNESS	0.55	0.54
EQUITABILITY	0.26	0.30
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.57	1.38

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	57	38.8
2	40	27.2
3	18	12.2
4	12	8.2
5	6	4.1
6	6	4.1
7	4	2.7
8	2	1.4
9	1	0.7
10	1	0.7
TOTAL	147	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.41	2.26
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.13
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.53	0.44
REDUNDANCY	0.33	0.33
EVENNESS	0.72	0.72
EQUITABILITY	0.33	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.07	1.87

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	510	46.0
2	219	19.8
3	132	11.9
4	60	5.4
5	56	5.1
6	34	3.1
7	25	2.3
8	23	2.1
9	10	1.7
10	8	0.7
11	7	0.6
12	6	0.5
13	4	0.4
14	2	0.2
15	2	0.2
16	1	0.1
TOTAL	1108	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.49	2.45
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.00	3.94
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.16	0.14
REDUNDANCY	0.39	0.39
EVENNESS	0.62	0.62
EQUITABILITY	0.25	0.28
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.25	2.17

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	8	47.1
2	4	23.5
3	4	23.5
4	1	5.9
TOTAL	17	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.73	1.40
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.63
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.95	0.71
REDUNDANCY	0.25	0.24
EVENNESS	0.87	0.86
EQUITABILITY	0.42	0.49
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.31	0.91

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	4	57.1
2	2	28.6
3	1	14.3
TOTAL	7	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.38	0.96
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.10
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.15	0.77
REDUNDANCY	0.47	0.43
EVENNESS	0.87	0.87
EQUITABILITY	0.49	0.55
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.89	0.41

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	14	51.9
2	9	33.3
3	1	3.7
4	1	3.7
5	1	3.7
6	1	3.7
TOTAL	27	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.72	1.42
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.59	2.17
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.12	0.86
REDUNDANCY	0.59	0.57
EVENNESS	0.67	0.65
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.41
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.36	1.01

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	20	55.6
2	7	19.4
3	5	13.9
4	2	5.6
5	1	2.8
6	1	2.8
TOTAL	36	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.84	1.58
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.25
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.90	0.71
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.44
EVENNESS	0.71	0.70
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.41
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.49	1.17

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2. 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMRER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	38	62.3
2	9	14.8
3	5	8.2
4	4	6.6
5	2	3.3
6	1	1.6
7	1	1.6
8	1	1.6
TOTAL	61	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.84	1.62
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.09	2.70
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.84	0.67
REDUNDANCY	0.54	0.53
EVENNESS	0.61	0.60
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.35
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.53	1.26

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	35	49.3
2	24	33.8
3	4	5.6
4	3	4.2
5	2	2.8
6	1	1.4
7	1	1.4
8	1	1.4
TOTAL	71	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.86	1.67
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.07	2.73
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.74	0.60
REDUNDANCY	0.50	0.50
EVENNESS	0.62	0.61
EQUITABILITY	0.30	0.35
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.56	1.32

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	114	52.1
2	41	18.7
3	32	14.6
4	8	3.7
5	7	3.2
6	7	3.2
7	4	1.8
8	3	1.4
9	1	0.5
10	1	0.5
11	1	0.5
TOTAL	219	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.14	2.02
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.46	3.31
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.42	0.35
REDUNDANCY	0.43	0.43
EVENNESS	0.62	0.61
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.32
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.86	1.71

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	8	44.4
2	7	38.9
3	1	5.6
4	1	5.6
5	1	5.6
TOTAL	18	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.74	1.38
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	1.87
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.21	0.90
REDUNDANCY	0.52	0.50
EVENNESS	0.75	0.74
EQUITABILITY	0.42	0.47
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.33	0.91

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	17	56.7
2	6	20.0
3	3	10.0
4	2	6.7
5	1	3.3
6	1	3.3
TOTAL	30	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.85	1.54
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.21
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.04	0.80
REDUNDANCY	0.48	0.47
EVENNESS	0.72	0.70
EQUITABILITY	0.38	0.43
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.47	1.11

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	4	50.0
2	2	25.0
3	1	12.5
4	1	12.5
TOTAL	8	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.75	1.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.41
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.55	1.05
REDUNDANCY	0.55	0.55
EVENNESS	0.87	0.86
EQUITABILITY	0.58	0.63
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.17	0.58

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	14	82.4
2	2	11.8
3	1	5.9
TOTAL	17	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	0.83	0.65
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.32
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.64	0.48
REDUNDANCY	0.79	0.80
EVENNESS	0.53	0.49
EQUITABILITY	0.20	0.23
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.63	0.42

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	2	50.0
2	1	25.0
3	1	25.0
TOTAL	4	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.50	0.90
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	0.90
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.50	0.90
REDUNDANCY	1.00	1.75
EVENNESS	0.95	1.00
EQUITABILITY	0.75	0.78
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.75	0.11

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	13	61.9
2	4	19.0
3	3	14.3
4	1	4.8
TOTAL	21	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.49	1.23
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.68
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.82	0.62
REDUNDANCY	0.43	0.43
EVFNNESS	0.75	0.73
EQUITABILITY	0.34	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.15	0.83

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	56	57.1
2	18	18.4
3	5	5.1
4	5	5.1
5	4	4.1
6	4	4.1
7	2	2.0
8	2	2.0
9	1	1.0
10	1	1.0
TOTAL	98	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.09	1.89
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.06
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.73	0.60
REDUNDANCY	0.48	0.48
EVENNESS	0.63	0.62
EQUITABILITY	0.32	0.76
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.77	1.53

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	4	44.4
2	3	33.3
3	2	22.2
TOTAL	9	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.53	1.14
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.19
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.99	0.69
REDUNDANCY	0.09	0.09
EVENNESS	0.97	0.96
EQUITABILITY	0.48	0.56
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.05	0.59

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	5	29.4
2	5	29.4
3	3	17.6
4	2	11.8
5	1	5.9
6	1	5.9
TOTAL	17	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.32	1.82
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.02
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.56	1.15
REDUNDANCY	0.25	0.23
EVENNESS	0.90	0.90
EQUITABILITY	0.57	0.64
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.76	1.18

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	7	77.8
2	1	11.1
3	1	11.1
TOTAL	9	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	0.99	0.69
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.19
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.99	0.69
REDUNDANCY	1.00	1.00
EVENNESS	0.62	0.58
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.68	0.35

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMRER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	7	58.3
2	2	16.7
3	2	16.7
4	1	8.3
TOTAL	12	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.61	1.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.54
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.21	0.86
REDUNDANCY	0.49	0.49
EVENNESS	0.81	0.79
EQUITABILITY	0.45	0.50
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.16	0.71

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	1	50.0
2	1	50.0
TOTAL	2	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.00	0.50
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.00	0.50
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.00	0.50
REDUNDANCY	1.24 0	1.99 0
EVENNESS	1.00	1.00
EQUITABILITY	1.00	1.00
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.00	-0.50

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	10	41.7
2	5	20.8
3	5	20.8
4	1	4.2
5	1	4.2
6	1	4.2
7	1	4.2
TOTAL	24	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.23	1.81
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.29
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.46	1.11
REDUNDANCY	0.43	0.41
EVENNESS	0.80	0.79
EQUITABILITY	0.49	0.55
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.75	1.26

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: IX-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	34	46.6
2	14	19.2
3	7	9.6
4	5	6.8
5	4	5.5
6	3	4.1
7	3	4.1
8	1	1.4
9	1	1.4
10	1	1.4
TOTAL	73	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.42	2.16
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.00
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.93	0.75
REDUNDANCY	0.38	0.37
EVENNESS	0.73	0.72
EQUITABILITY	0.39	0.45
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.03	1.71

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	31	40.3
2	21	27.3
3	13	16.9
4	4	5.2
5	2	2.6
6	2	2.6
7	1	1.3
8	1	1.3
9	1	1.3
10	1	1.3
TOTAL	77	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.29	2.06
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.01
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.89	0.72
REDUNDANCY	0.42	0.42
EVENNESS	0.69	0.68
EQUITABILITY	0.37	0.42
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.93	1.64

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	46	41.8
2	38	34.5
3	8	7.3
4	8	7.3
5	4	3.6
6	2	1.8
7	2	1.8
8	1	0.9
9	1	0.9
TOTAL	110	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.11	1.95
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.17	2.96
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.59	0.49
REDUNDANCY	0.41	0.41
EVENNESS	0.67	0.66
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.89	1.59

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	78	58.2
2	40	29.9
3	5	3.7
4	4	3.0
5	3	2.2
6	2	1.5
7	1	0.7
8	1	0.7
TOTAL	134	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.62	1.51
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.83
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.44	0.37
REDUNDANCY	0.54	0.54
EVENNESS	0.54	0.53
EQUITABILITY	0.23	0.27
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.39	1.24

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

PANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	28	34.6
2	24	29.6
3	13	16.0
4	8	9.9
5	3	3.7
6	2	2.5
7	2	2.5
8	1	1.2
TOTAL	81	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.32	2.12
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.76
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.67	0.54
REDUNDANCY	0.29	0.29
EVENNESS	0.77	0.77
EQUITABILITY	0.37	0.43
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.96	1.69

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	27	38.6
2	14	20.0
3	12	17.1
4	6	8.6
5	3	4.3
6	3	4.3
7	1	1.4
8	1	1.4
9	1	1.4
10	1	1.4
11	1	1.4
TOTAL	70	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.56	2.28
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.46	3.10
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.07	0.86
REDUNDANCY	0.38	0.37
EVENNESS	0.74	0.74
EQUITABILITY	0.42	0.48
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.14	1.80

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	34	45.9
2	19	25.7
3	12	16.2
4	4	5.4
5	2	2.7
6	1	1.4
7	1	1.4
8	1	1.4
TOTAL	74	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.06	1.87
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.74
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.72	0.58
REDUNDANCY	0.41	0.40
EVENNESS	0.69	0.68
EQUITABILITY	0.33	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.73	1.48

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-8-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	215	39.4
2	121	22.2
3	106	19.4
4	52	9.5
5	11	2.0
6	10	1.8
7	8	1.5
8	5	0.9
9	4	0.7
10	3	0.5
11	3	0.5
12	2	0.4
13	2	0.4
14	1	0.2
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
17	1	0.2
TOTAL	546	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.42	2.35
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.09	3.98
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.31	0.27
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.44
EVENNESS	0.59	0.59
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.16	2.04

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	74	63.8
2	15	12.9
3	8	6.9
4	8	6.9
5	4	3.4
6	2	1.7
7	2	1.7
8	2	1.7
9	1	0.9
TOTAL	116	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.86	1.70
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.17	2.96
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.57	0.47
REDUNDANCY	0.50	0.51
EVENNESS	0.59	0.57
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.59	1.39

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2. 1976

STATION: GLENDIVF

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	22	48.9
2	11	24.4
3	6	13.3
4	3	6.7
5	2	4.4
6	1	2.2
TOTAL	45	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.97	1.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.30
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.76	0.60
REDUNDANCY	0.34	0.33
EVENNESS	0.76	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.42
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.61	1.32

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	38	44.2
2	22	25.6
3	11	12.8
4	8	9.3
5	4	4.7
6	2	2.3
7	1	1.2
TOTAL	86	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.13	1.96
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.60
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.55	0.45
REFOUNDANCY	0.30	0.30
EVENNESS	0.76	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.33	0.39
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.80	1.57

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVF

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: 8-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	46	61.3
2	7	9.3
3	7	9.3
4	5	6.7
5	4	5.3
6	4	5.3
7	2	2.7
TOTAL	75	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.92	1.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.58
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.61	0.49
REDUNDANCY	0.40	0.41
EVENNESS	0.68	0.67
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.61	1.37

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	15	41.7
2	12	33.3
3	3	8.3
4	2	5.6
5	2	5.6
6	1	2.8
7	1	2.8
TOTAL	36	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.10	1.70
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.42
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.08	0.84
REDUNDANCY	0.41	0.40
EVENNESS	0.75	0.74
EQUITABILITY	0.41	0.47
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.70	1.32

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVF

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	10	63.3
2	5	16.7
3	3	10.0
4	1	3.3
5	1	3.3
6	1	3.3
TOTAL	30	100.0

	SHANNON	PRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.67	1.38
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.21
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.04	0.80
REDUNDANCY	0.59	0.59
EVENNESS	0.65	0.63
EQUITABILITY	0.34	0.38
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.33	1.00

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RDT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	184	47.4
2	77	19.8
3	50	12.9
4	33	8.5
5	18	4.6
6	9	2.3
7	8	2.1
8	7	1.8
9	1	0.3
10	1	0.3
TOTAL	388	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILL QUIN
DIVERSITY	2.25	2.18
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.23
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.23	0.20
REDUNDANCY	0.35	0.35
EVENNESS	0.68	0.68
EQUITABILITY	0.26	0.30
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.99	1.88

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	45	28.9
2	38	24.4
3	29	18.6
4	25	16.0
5	9	5.8
6	6	3.8
7	1	0.6
8	1	0.6
9	1	0.6
10	1	0.6
TOTAL	156	100.0

	SHANNON	BPILLLOUTIN
DIVERSITY	2.49	2.35
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.14
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.57	0.42
REDUNDANCY	0.29	0.29
EVENNESS	0.75	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.34	0.40
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.15	1.95

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	9	39.1
2	6	26.1
3	3	13.0
4	2	8.7
5	1	4.3
6	1	4.3
7	1	4.3
TOTAL	23	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.32	1.87
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.28
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.50	1.14
REDUNDANCY	0.38	0.36
EVENNESS	0.82	0.82
EQUITABILITY	0.51	0.58
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.80	1.29

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	30	46.9
2	15	23.4
3	10	15.6
4	8	12.5
5	1	1.6
TOTAL	64	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.89	1.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.14
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.46	0.37
REDUNDANCY	0.23	0.23
EVENNESS	0.81	0.81
EQUITABILITY	0.32	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.58	1.36

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ROT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	26	68.4
2	5	13.2
3	3	7.9
4	2	5.3
5	2	5.3
TOTAL	38	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.50	1.28
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.05
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.70	0.55
REDUNDANCY	0.51	0.51
EVENNESS	0.64	0.62
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.21	0.95

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	11	34.4
2	9	28.1
3	5	15.6
4	4	12.5
5	1	3.1
6	1	3.1
7	1	3.1
TOTAL	32	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.31	1.95
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.38
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.18	0.92
REDUNDANCY	0.31	0.29
EVENNESS	0.82	0.82
EQUITABILITY	0.46	0.53
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.85	1.42

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	48	37.5
2	45	35.2
3	22	17.2
4	7	5.5
5	4	3.1
6	2	1.6
TOTAL	128	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.98	1.87
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.46
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.33	0.27
REDUNDANCY	0.27	0.27
EVENNESS	0.76	0.76
EQUITABILITY	0.28	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.69	1.53

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	131	29.7
2	129	29.3
3	79	17.9
4	68	15.4
5	12	2.7
6	12	2.7
7	3	0.7
8	2	0.5
9	1	0.2
10	1	0.2
11	1	0.2
12	1	0.2
13	1	0.2
TOTAL	441	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.37	2.30
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.70	3.60
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.28	0.24
REDUNDANCY	0.39	0.39
EVENNESS	0.64	0.64
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.10	1.99

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	16	50.0
2	7	21.9
3	4	12.5
4	2	6.3
5	1	3.1
6	1	3.1
7	1	3.1
TOTAL	32	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.07	1.74
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.38
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.18	0.02
REDUNDANCY	0.45	0.44
EVENNESS	0.74	0.73
EQUITABILITY	0.41	0.47
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.66	1.26

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

POT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	13	39.4
2	11	33.3
3	6	18.2
4	2	6.1
5	1	3.0
TOTAL	33	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.90	1.65
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.03
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.78	0.60
REDUNDANCY	0.27	0.26
EVENNESS	0.82	0.81
EQUITABILITY	0.38	0.44
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.53	1.21

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	28	41.2
2	21	30.9
3	7	10.3
4	5	7.4
5	3	4.4
6	2	2.9
7	1	1.5
8	1	1.5
TOTAL	68	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.19	1.97
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.72
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.77	0.62
REDUNDANCY	0.36	0.36
EVENNESS	0.73	0.72
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.42
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.83	1.55

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2220.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	25	37.3
2	17	25.4
3	10	14.9
4	8	11.9
5	3	4.5
6	3	4.5
7	1	1.5
TOTAL	67	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.30	2.09
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.56
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.67	0.54
REDUNDANCY	0.24	0.23
EVENNESS	0.82	0.82
EQUITABILITY	0.38	0.45
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.92	1.64

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	84	56.8
2	24	16.2
3	14	9.5
4	11	7.4
5	4	2.7
6	2	1.4
7	2	1.4
8	2	1.4
9	2	1.4
10	1	0.7
11	1	0.7
12	1	0.7
TOTAL	148	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.11	1.95
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.58	3.36
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.64	0.53
REDUNDANCY	0.57	0.60
EVENNESS	0.59	0.58
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.82	1.62

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	19	36.5
2	16	30.8
3	6	11.5
4	4	7.7
5	2	3.8
6	2	3.8
7	1	1.9
8	1	1.9
9	1	1.9
TOTAL	52	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.39	2.09
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.17	2.79
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.08	0.86
REDUNDANCY	0.37	0.37
EVENNESS	0.75	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.42	0.48
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.97	1.61

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: X-9-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	175	43.8
2	106	26.5
3	36	9.0
4	29	7.2
5	24	6.0
6	9	2.2
7	8	2.0
8	4	1.0
9	3	0.7
10	2	0.5
11	2	0.5
12	1	0.2
13	1	0.2
TOTAL	400	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.34	2.25
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.70	3.59
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.30	0.26
REDUNDANCY	0.40	0.40
EVENNESS	0.63	0.63
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.07	1.94

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: CORWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	190	38.0
2	112	22.4
3	83	16.6
4	49	9.8
5	35	7.0
6	8	1.6
7	6	1.2
8	4	0.8
9	3	0.6
10	2	0.4
11	2	0.4
12	2	0.4
13	2	0.4
14	1	0.2
15	1	0.2
TOTAL	500	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.48	2.40
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.91	3.80
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.29	0.25
REDUNDANCY	0.40	0.39
EVENNESS	0.63	0.63
EQUITABILITY	0.28	0.32
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.20	2.08

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: CORWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	133	33.8
2	91	23.2
3	56	14.2
4	48	12.2
5	30	7.6
6	16	4.1
7	7	1.8
8	2	0.5
9	2	0.5
10	2	0.5
11	2	0.5
12	1	0.3
13	1	0.3
14	1	0.3
15	1	0.3
TOTAL	393	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.61	2.52
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.21	3.78
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.36	0.31
REDUNDANCY	0.37	0.36
EVENNESS	0.67	0.67
EQUITABILITY	0.39	0.35
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.39	2.17

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2202.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: COPWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	125	25.4
2	118	24.0
3	75	15.2
4	59	12.0
5	47	9.6
6	21	4.3
7	20	4.1
8	5	1.0
9	5	1.0
10	4	0.8
11	4	0.8
12	3	0.6
13	2	0.4
14	2	0.4
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
TOTAL	492	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.88	2.79
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.00	3.89
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.32	0.27
REDUNDANCY	0.31	0.30
EVENNESS	0.72	0.72
EQUITABILITY	0.32	0.37
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.55	2.42

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: CORWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	653	59.9
2	186	17.1
3	91	8.3
4	48	4.4
5	30	2.8
6	24	2.2
7	21	1.9
8	10	0.9
9	9	0.8
10	4	0.4
11	4	0.4
12	2	0.2
13	2	0.2
14	2	0.2
15	2	0.2
16	1	0.1
17	1	0.1
TOTAL	1090	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLQUIN
DIVERSITY	2.01	1.97
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.09	4.03
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.17	0.15
REDUNDANCY	0.53	0.53
EVENNESS	0.49	0.49
EQUITABILITY	0.20	0.23
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.81	1.74

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: CORWIN SPRINGS

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	998	40.3
2	507	20.5
3	281	11.4
4	250	10.1
5	176	7.1
6	74	3.0
7	61	2.5
8	30	1.2
9	17	0.7
10	13	0.5
11	12	0.5
12	11	0.4
13	10	0.4
14	9	0.4
15	4	0.2
16	4	0.2
17	4	0.2
18	3	0.1
19	3	0.1
20	3	0.1
21	2	0.1
22	1	0.0
23	1	0.0
24	1	0.0
TOTAL	2475	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.64	2.61
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.58	4.54
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.12	0.10
REDUNDANCY	0.43	0.43
EVENNESS	0.58	0.58
EQUITABILITY	0.23	0.27
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.41	2.35

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: LIVINGSTON

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	201	35.6
2	90	15.9
3	83	14.7
4	74	13.1
5	30	5.3
6	28	5.0
7	18	3.2
8	10	1.8
9	9	1.6
10	7	1.2
11	6	1.1
12	3	0.5
13	2	0.4
14	2	0.4
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
TOTAL	565	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.82	2.74
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.00	3.00
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.28	0.24
REDUNDANCY	0.32	0.32
EVENNESS	0.70	0.70
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.51	2.38

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: LIVINGSTON

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	212	44.7
2	125	26.4
3	77	16.2
4	15	3.2
5	15	3.2
6	11	2.3
7	6	1.3
8	5	1.1
9	2	0.4
10	2	0.4
11	2	0.4
12	1	0.2
13	1	0.2
TOTAL	474	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.13	2.11
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.70	3.60
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.26	0.22
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.44
EVENNESS	0.59	0.59
EQUITABILITY	0.25	0.28
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.93	1.83

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: LIVINGSTON

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	157	36.4
2	96	22.3
3	61	14.2
4	53	12.3
5	14	3.2
6	11	2.6
7	8	1.9
8	7	1.6
9	5	1.2
10	4	0.9
11	4	0.9
12	3	0.7
13	2	0.5
14	1	0.2
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
17	1	0.2
18	1	0.2
19	1	0.2
TOTAL	431	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILL QUIN
DIVERSITY	2.69	2.59
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.25	4.10
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.42	0.36
REDUNDANCY	0.41	0.41
EVENNESS	0.63	0.63
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.35
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.38	2.27

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: LIVINGSTON

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	421	41.0
2	221	21.5
3	113	11.0
4	60	5.8
5	42	4.1
6	37	3.6
7	30	2.9
8	29	2.8
9	24	2.3
10	14	1.4
11	13	1.3
12	7	0.7
13	5	0.5
14	3	0.3
15	2	0.2
16	2	0.2
17	2	0.2
18	1	0.1
TOTAL	1026	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.72	2.66
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.17	4.10
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.19	0.17
REDUNDANCY	0.37	0.37
EVENNESS	0.65	0.65
EQUITABILITY	0.27	0.31
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.44	2.35

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: LIVINGSTON

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-7-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	732	29.3
2	683	27.4
3	434	17.4
4	154	6.2
5	130	5.2
6	85	3.4
7	60	2.4
8	50	2.0
9	42	1.7
10	30	1.6
11	30	1.2
12	15	0.6
13	10	0.4
14	9	0.4
15	5	0.2
16	3	0.1
17	3	0.1
18	3	0.1
19	3	0.1
20	2	0.1
21	2	0.1
22	1	0.0
23	1	0.0
TOTAL	2496	100.0

	SHANNON	PIILLQUIN
DIVERSITY	2.81	2.78
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.52	4.48
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.11	0.10
REDUNDANCY	0.39	0.39
EVENNESS	0.62	0.62
EQUITABILITY	0.25	0.28
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.56	2.50

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	49	52.1
2	22	23.4
3	15	16.0
4	3	3.2
5	2	2.1
6	1	1.1
7	1	1.1
8	1	1.1
TOTAL	94	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.89	1.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.78
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.59	0.48
REDUNDANCY	0.46	0.46
EVENNESS	0.63	0.62
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.60	1.40

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

WBT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	45	61.6
2	20	27.4
3	3	4.1
4	2	2.7
5	1	1.4
6	1	1.4
7	1	1.4
TOTAL	73	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLQUIN
DIVERSITY	1.53	1.37
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.58
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.62	0.50
REDUNDANCY	0.52	0.58
EVENNESS	0.54	0.53
EQUITABILITY	0.25	0.28
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.29	1.09

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	23	69.7
2	4	12.1
3	3	9.1
4	2	6.1
5	1	3.0
TOTAL	33	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.44	1.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.03
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.78	0.60
REDUNDANCY	0.57	0.57
EVENNESS	0.62	0.60
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.16	0.89

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	47	43.1
2	40	36.7
3	9	8.3
4	5	4.6
5	4	3.7
6	2	1.8
7	1	0.9
8	1	0.9
TOTAL	109	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.96	1.81
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.81
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.52	0.43
REDUNDANCY	0.42	0.42
EVENNESS	0.65	0.65
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.74
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.67	1.48

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	32	71.1
2	7	15.6
3	2	4.4
4	2	4.4
5	1	2.2
6	1	2.2
TOTAL	45	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.41	1.21
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.30
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.75	0.60
REDUNDANCY	0.64	0.64
EVENNESS	0.55	0.52
EQUITABILITY	0.26	0.29
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.15	0.92

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	29	46.0
2	17	27.0
3	5	7.9
4	4	6.3
5	4	6.3
6	4	6.3
TOTAL	63	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.07	1.88
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.53	2.36
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.58	0.47
REDUNDANCY	0.26	0.26
EVENNESS	0.80	0.79
EQUITABILITY	0.35	0.41
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.73	1.47

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ROT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: MILES CITY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	225	54.0
2	98	23.5
3	39	9.1
4	26	6.2
5	10	2.4
6	6	1.4
7	4	1.0
8	4	1.0
9	2	0.5
10	1	0.2
11	1	0.2
12	1	0.2
13	1	0.2
TOTAL	417	100.0

	SHANNON	SPILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.00	1.93
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.70	3.59
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.29	0.25
REDUNDANCY	0.50	0.50
EVENNESS	0.54	0.54
EQUITABILITY	0.23	0.27
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.77	1.67

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

WPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	36	65.5
2	14	25.5
3	2	3.6
4	1	1.8
5	1	1.8
6	1	1.8
TOTAL	55	100.0

	SHANNON	PILOTQUIN
DIVERSITY	1.39	1.23
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.34
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.65	0.52
REDUNDANCY	0.62	0.61
EVENNESS	0.54	0.52
EQUITABILITY	0.24	0.28
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.15	0.95

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

DOT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	39	67.2
2	16	27.6
3	1	1.7
4	1	1.7
5	1	1.7
TOTAL	58	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.20	1.07
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.13
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.50	0.40
REDUNDANCY	0.62	0.61
EVENNESS	0.52	0.50
EQUITABILITY	0.20	0.24
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.00	0.83

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	33	31.1
2	32	30.2
3	16	15.1
4	12	11.3
5	5	4.7
6	4	3.8
7	1	0.9
8	1	0.9
9	1	0.9
10	1	0.9
TOTAL	106	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.45	2.26
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	3.08
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.69	0.57
REDUNDANCY	0.33	0.32
EVENNESS	0.74	0.74
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.42
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.09	1.84

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	50	69.4
2	15	20.8
3	3	4.2
4	2	2.8
5	1	1.4
6	1	1.4
TOTAL	72	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.34	1.20
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.39
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.53	0.43
REDUNDANCY	0.60	0.60
EVENNESS	0.52	0.50
EQUITABILITY	0.22	0.25
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.13	0.95

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	73	85.9
2	7	8.2
3	2	2.4
4	1	1.2
5	1	1.2
6	1	1.2
TOTAL	85	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	0.84	0.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.41
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.46	0.37
REDUNDANCY	0.82	0.82
EVENNESS	0.32	0.30
EQUITABILITY	0.13	0.15
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.71	0.59

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	78	41.5
2	43	22.9
3	41	21.8
4	10	5.3
5	7	3.7
6	6	3.2
7	1	0.5
8	1	0.5
9	1	0.5
TOTAL	188	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.17	2.07
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.17	3.03
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.38	0.32
REDUNDANCY	0.36	0.36
EVENNESS	0.69	0.68
EQUITABILITY	0.29	0.34
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.89	1.73

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: GLENDIVE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-10-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	271	48.0
2	116	20.6
3	111	19.7
4	20	3.5
5	17	3.0
6	15	2.7
7	3	0.5
8	2	0.4
9	2	0.4
10	1	0.2
11	1	0.2
12	1	0.2
13	1	0.2
14	1	0.2
15	1	0.2
16	1	0.2
TOTAL	564	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.11	2.05
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	4.00	3.90
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.28	0.24
REDUNDANCY	0.51	0.51
EVENNESS	0.53	0.53
EQUITABILITY	0.23	0.27
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.88	1.78

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	21	55.3
2	6	15.8
3	4	10.5
4	3	7.9
5	2	5.3
6	1	2.6
7	1	2.6
TOTAL	38	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.02	1.72
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.43
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.04	0.81
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.44
EVENNESS	0.72	0.71
EQUITABILITY	0.39	0.44
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.64	1.28

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1975

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	39	58.2
2	13	19.4
3	4	6.0
4	3	4.5
5	2	3.0
6	2	3.0
7	1	1.5
8	1	1.5
9	1	1.5
10	1	1.5
TOTAL	67	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.02	1.77
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.32	2.98
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.00	0.80
REDUNDANCY	0.56	0.56
EVENNESS	0.61	0.69
EQUITABILITY	0.33	0.38
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.69	1.39

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	20	64.5
2	7	22.6
3	3	9.7
4	1	3.2
TOTAL	31	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.38	1.18
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.00	1.76
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.61	0.47
REDUNDANCY	0.45	0.45
EVENNESS	0.69	0.67
EQUITABILITY	0.28	0.33
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.10	0.86

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	23	50.0
2	12	26.1
3	5	10.9
4	3	6.5
5	1	2.2
6	1	2.2
7	1	2.2
TOTAL	46	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.97	1.72
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.48
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.90	0.71
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.43
EVENNESS	0.70	0.69
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.41
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.61	1.31

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

POT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	6	75.0
2	1	12.5
3	1	12.5
TOTAL	8	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.06	0.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.14
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	1.06	0.73
REDUNDANCY	1.00	1.00
EVENNESS	0.67	0.64
EQUITABILITY	0.35	0.38
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.71	0.35

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	24	43.6
2	12	21.8
3	9	14.5
4	6	10.9
5	2	3.6
6	1	1.8
7	1	1.8
8	1	1.8
TOTAL	55	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.24	1.99
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.00	2.68
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.91	0.73
REDUNDANCY	0.36	0.35
EVENNESS	0.75	0.74
EQUITABILITY	0.39	0.45
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.86	1.54

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: INTAKE

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	87	35.5
2	72	29.4
3	26	10.6
4	21	8.6
5	20	8.2
6	6	2.4
7	5	2.0
8	3	1.2
9	3	1.2
10	1	0.4
11	1	0.4
TOTAL	245	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	2.46	2.35
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	3.46	3.32
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.38	0.32
REDUNDANCY	0.33	0.32
EVENNESS	0.71	0.71
EQUITABILITY	0.31	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	2.15	1.99

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 1

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-76

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	167	96.5
2	5	2.9
3	1	0.6
TOTAL	173	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	0.24	0.22
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.54
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.10	0.09
REDUNDANCY	0.91	0.91
EVENNESS	0.15	0.14
EQUITABILITY	0.03	0.04
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.21	0.18

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 2

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	43	60.6
2	11	15.5
3	6	8.5
4	5	7.0
5	3	4.2
6	2	2.8
7	1	1.4
TOTAL	71	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.85	1.66
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.57
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.64	0.52
REDUNDANCY	0.44	0.44
EVENNESS	0.66	0.65
EQUITABILITY	0.30	0.75
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.55	1.31

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 3

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	80	82.5
2	10	10.3
3	4	4.1
4	3	3.1
TOTAL	97	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	0.91	0.84
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.07	1.90
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.25	0.20
REDUNDANCY	0.62	0.63
EVENNESS	0.46	0.44
EQUITABILITY	0.14	0.16
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.77	0.68

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ROT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 4

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	17	38.6
2	17	38.6
3	4	9.1
4	3	6.8
5	2	4.5
6	1	2.3
TOTAL	44	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.97	1.73
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.58	2.30
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.77	0.61
REDUNDANCY	0.34	0.34
EVENNESS	0.76	0.75
EQUITABILITY	0.36	0.42
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.61	1.31

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 5

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	37	67.3
2	14	25.5
3	4	7.3
TOTAL	55	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.16	1.07
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	1.58	1.47
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.26	0.21
REDUNDANCY	0.32	0.32
EVENNESS	0.73	0.72
EQUITABILITY	0.20	0.24
SPECIES RICHNESS	0.96	0.82

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2, 1976

STATION: SIDNEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 6

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	24	47.1
2	17	33.3
3	7	13.7
4	2	3.9
5	1	2.0
TOTAL	51	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.73	1.55
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.32	2.11
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.55	0.44
REDUNDANCY	0.34	0.33
EVENNESS	0.74	0.74
EQUITABILITY	0.39	0.36
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.42	1.19

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2200.1

SPECIES DIVERSITY ANALYSIS

JULY 2. 1976

STATION: STONEY

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 7

SAMPLING PERIOD: XI-11-75

RANK	ABUNDANCE	PERCENT OF TOTAL
1	368	74.9
2	53	10.8
3	42	8.6
4	14	2.9
5	7	1.4
6	5	1.0
7	2	0.4
TOTAL	491	100.0

	SHANNON	BRILLOUIN
DIVERSITY	1.30	1.26
MAXIMUM DIVERSITY	2.81	2.76
MINIMUM DIVERSITY	0.13	0.11
REDUNDANCY	0.56	0.57
EVENNESS	0.46	0.46
EQUITABILITY	0.14	0.17
SPECIES RICHNESS	1.15	1.09

APPENDIX G

4-1 2/16-1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: AUG 7, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.3	0.0	2	4
0.3	0.165	6	9
1.0	0.605	4	11
0.0	0.674	2	2
1.4	0.746	5	8
1.4	0.837	6	21
1.1	0.867	2	3
0.9	0.947	5	6
1.5	0.947	4	37
1.0	1.110	5	20
1.4	1.110	2	4
2.0	1.110	4	11
1.8	1.160	4	9
3.3	1.320	3	7
2.8	1.330	6	13
3.1	1.410	3	5
2.0	1.470	7	20
1.9	1.540	2	2
1.7	1.650	2	7
2.2	1.650	5	7
2.5	1.730	3	3
2.7	1.760	3	3
3.0	2.190	4	5
3.3	2.490	1	2
MEAN	1.6	3.9	9.1
ST DEV	0.9	1.6	8.2

A-227

OPT 2/16-1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: AUG 7, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = 4.3429$$

$$B = -0.2268$$

$$R = -0.1467$$

$$F = 0.4638$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 4.3882$$

$$B = -0.4266$$

$$R = -0.1538$$

$$F = 0.5327$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 4.4106$$

$$B = -0.1044$$

$$C = -0.2885$$

$$R = 0.1570$$

$$F = 0.2655$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 1.4052$$

$$B = -0.0822$$

$$R = -0.1548$$

$$F = 0.5401$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

$$A = 1.4509$$

$$B = -0.1665$$

$$R = -0.1994$$

$$F = 0.9110$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

$$A = 1.4517$$

$$B = -0.0239$$

$$C = -0.1982$$

$$R = 0.2009$$

$$F = 0.4415$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 1.2761$$

$$B = -0.0502$$

$$R = -0.0666$$

$$F = 0.1041$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 1.2657$$

$$B = 0.0355$$

$$R = 0.1794$$

$$F = 0.7518$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 1.3982$$

$$B = -0.2596$$

$$C = 0.0832$$

$$R = 0.3161$$

$$F = 1.1655$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS
FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: AUG 7, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = 11.7768
B = -1.4664
R = -0.1615
F = 0.5894
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 12.5626
B = -2.8599
R = -0.2602
F = 0.9188
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 12.5164
B = 0.2202
C = -3.1517
R = 0.2006
F = 0.4405
DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = 2.1631
B = -0.1483
R = -0.1674
F = 0.6341
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

A = 2.3445
B = -0.3739
R = -0.2689
F = 1.7043
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

A = 2.3062
B = 0.1778
C = -0.6095
R = 0.2892
F = 0.9581
DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

A = 1.9307
B = -0.0637
R = -0.0665
F = 0.1039
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

A = 1.9040
B = 0.0247
R = 0.0746
F = 0.1236
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

A = 2.0384
B = -0.2715
C = 0.0746
R = 0.1793
F = 0.3489
DF = 2, 21

10-1 2710-1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 10, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT 17, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	14	40
0.2	0.0	6	27
0.2	0.0	7	25
0.2	0.0	13	46
0.3	0.0	6	28
0.3	0.0	5	35
0.3	0.060	5	25
0.5	0.100	5	24
0.6	0.200	2	5
0.9	0.687	7	14
0.9	0.537	5	18
1.0	0.947	3	6
1.0	0.947	5	11
1.1	1.010	7	23
1.8	1.010	6	18
1.8	1.030	5	9
1.4	1.060	5	28
1.5	1.110	7	24
1.9	1.160	6	13
1.9	1.320	5	24
2.3	1.350	5	6
2.0	1.380	7	39
2.6	1.760	5	16
3.3	1.880	4	17
MEAN	1.2	0.744	21.7
ST DEV	0.9	0.613	11.1

A-230

WPI 2/18+1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT 17, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$Y = A + B \cdot X_1$
A = 7.5291
B = -0.6954
R = -0.3326
F = 2.7360
DF = 1, 22

$Y = A + B \cdot X_2$
A = 7.4390
B = -1.3187
R = -0.3402
F = 2.6799
DF = 1, 22

$Y = A + L \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$
A = 7.4721
B = -0.1963
C = -1.0443
R = 0.3408
F = 1.3801
DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1$

A = 1.9092
B = -0.0917
R = -0.2110
F = 1.0248
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X_2$

A = 1.9011
B = -0.1367
R = -0.2184
F = 1.1017
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + L \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$

A = 1.9022
B = -0.0864
C = -0.1279
R = 0.2164
F = 0.5260
DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X_1)$

A = 1.7720
B = -0.1401
R = -0.3603
F = 3.3455
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X_2)$

A = 1.6945
B = -0.0381
R = -0.4473
F = 5.5024
DF = 1, 22

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X_1) + C \cdot LN(X_2)$

A = 1.6696
B = 0.0714
C = -0.0467
R = 0.0549
F = 2.7393
DF = 2, 21

MT 4716-1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT 17, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = 26.1597$$

$$B = -5.3549$$

$$R = -0.4307$$

$$F = 5.0109$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 27.5794$$

$$B = -7.6259$$

$$R = -0.4229$$

$$F = 4.7912$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 28.0442$$

$$B = -3.4809$$

$$C = -2.1185$$

$$R = 0.4319$$

$$F = 2.4083$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 3.2138$$

$$B = -0.2421$$

$$R = -0.3501$$

$$F = 3.0726$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

$$A = 3.1735$$

$$B = -0.3352$$

$$R = -0.3369$$

$$F = 2.6127$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

$$A = 3.2136$$

$$B = -0.2396$$

$$C = -0.0037$$

$$R = 0.3501$$

$$F = 1.4665$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 2.6678$$

$$B = -0.2674$$

$$R = -0.4686$$

$$F = 6.1964$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 2.7229$$

$$B = -0.0653$$

$$R = -0.5389$$

$$F = 9.0037$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 2.7084$$

$$B = 0.0418$$

$$C = -0.0727$$

$$R = 0.5398$$

$$F = 4.3166$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 12, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT 9, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	6	32
0.2	0.0	9	44
0.2	0.0	11	55
0.5	0.0	7	57
0.1	0.050	11	41
0.2	0.100	11	66
0.5	0.250	10	102
0.4	0.300	17	205
1.2	0.565	11	66
1.0	0.674	8	27
1.0	0.817	9	23
1.2	0.856	12	101
2.0	0.927	11	110
2.1	1.030	13	45
1.0	1.066	14	115
1.4	1.060	12	167
2.5	1.130	16	151
2.0	1.266	11	304
1.5	1.290	12	141
2.9	1.440	10	268
2.5	1.470	10	193
2.5	1.470	13	253
3.0	1.470	8	147
3.4	1.650	1	290
MEAN	1.4	0.786	10.9
ST DEV	1.0	0.570	2.2

WPI 2/18.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 12, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT 9, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = 10.7426$$

$$B = 0.0928$$

$$R = 0.0429$$

$$F = 0.0406$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 10.1926$$

$$B = 0.8679$$

$$R = 0.2217$$

$$F = 1.1372$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 10.4542$$

$$B = -2.3684$$

$$C = 4.8284$$

$$R = 0.4758$$

$$F = 3.0731$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 2.3462$$

$$B = 0.0143$$

$$R = 0.0725$$

$$F = 0.1164$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

$$A = 2.2926$$

$$B = 0.0928$$

$$R = 0.2594$$

$$F = 1.5815$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

$$A = 2.3163$$

$$B = -0.2233$$

$$C = 0.4662$$

$$R = 0.5061$$

$$F = 3.6160$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 2.3685$$

$$B = 0.0255$$

$$R = 0.1395$$

$$F = 0.4369$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 2.4134$$

$$B = 0.0214$$

$$R = 0.4556$$

$$F = 5.7617$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 2.4407$$

$$B = -0.0798$$

$$C = 0.0365$$

$$R = 0.5420$$

$$F = 4.3670$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

A-234

KENTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT 9, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL 12

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_1$$

A = 49.9123
B = 54.0050

R = 0.6436
F = 15.5768
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_2$$

A = 44.6156
B = 104.6133

R = 0.6657
F = 19.8468
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$$

A = 44.1146
B = 4.5643
C = 96.9823

R = 0.6890
F = 9.4889
DF = 2, 21

MODEL 11: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1$

A = 3.9659
B = 0.4352

R = 0.5864
F = 11.1733
DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X_2$

A = 3.5960
B = 0.8750

R = 0.6444
F = 15.6238
DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$

A = 3.9062
B = -0.0741
C = 0.9989

R = 0.6455
F = 7.5012
DF = 2, 21

MODEL 111: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X_1)$

A = 4.6139
B = 0.3761

R = 0.5417
F = 9.1364
DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X_2)$

A = 4.7597
B = 0.0793

R = 0.4451
F = 5.4306
DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X_1) + C \cdot \ln(X_2)$

A = 4.6484
B = 0.3258
C = 0.0175

R = 0.5457
F = 4.4526
DF = 2, 21

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV 7, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.2	0.0	6	43
0.3	0.0	4	91
0.4	0.0	5	26
0.5	0.0	6	46
1.1	0.397	7	46
0.6	0.440	6	44
1.2	0.465	6	36
0.7	0.661	4	19
1.0	0.701	4	47
1.0	0.755	10	68
1.7	1.080	14	149
1.6	1.110	7	100
1.5	1.200	10	163
1.5	1.230	7	26
2.0	1.260	11	163
1.9	1.500	11	206
2.2	1.560	9	153
2.4	1.560	15	263
2.5	1.546	14	271
2.2	1.610	13	303
2.5	1.720	13	551
3.0	1.800	12	118
3.1	1.850	11	369
3.2	2.380	14	274
MEAN	1.6	1.029	149.6
ST DEV	0.9	0.676	3.8
			133.9

KPI 2/16.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLES: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV 7, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = 3.5921
B = 3.4149

R = 0.8316
F = 49.3168
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 4.3860
B = 4.5220

R = 0.8161
F = 43.8881
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 3.7237
B = 2.5471
C = 1.2178

R = 0.8338
F = 23.9449
DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = 1.4257
B = 0.4251

R = 0.8213
F = 45.0004
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 1.5218
B = 0.5658

R = 0.8103
F = 42.0682
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 1.4463
B = 0.2893
C = 0.1906

R = 0.8248
F = 22.3348
DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

A = 1.9848
B = 0.4926

R = 0.8007
F = 39.2979
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = 2.2262
B = 0.0665

R = 0.6242
F = 14.0445
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = 1.9198
B = 0.5981
C = -0.0215

R = 0.8077
F = 19.7087
DF = 2, 21

KPI < 710.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV 7, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 LN X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = -27.2074$$

$$B = 110.4434$$

$$R = 0.7550$$

$$F = 29.1678$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 1.0625$$

$$B = 143.7915$$

$$R = 0.7266$$

$$F = 24.8863$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = -26.4642$$

$$B = 105.5434$$

$$C = 6.4729$$

$$R = 0.7551$$

$$F = 13.9261$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II:

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = 3.2551$$

$$B = 0.6433$$

$$R = 0.8089$$

$$F = 41.6461$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 3.4799$$

$$B = 1.0892$$

$$R = 0.7744$$

$$F = 32.9497$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 3.2483$$

$$B = 0.8893$$

$$C = -0.0632$$

$$R = 0.8090$$

$$F = 19.8898$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

$$A = 4.3652$$

$$B = 0.8902$$

$$R = 0.7184$$

$$F = 23.4575$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$$

$$A = 4.7736$$

$$B = 0.0941$$

$$R = 0.4363$$

$$F = 5.2308$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$$

$$A = 3.9835$$

$$B = 1.5419$$

$$C = -0.1328$$

$$R = 0.7890$$

$$F = 17.3165$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 1R

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: AUG 6, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.6	0.0	1	2
0.5	0.674	4	6
0.6	0.746	5	13
0.4	0.837	6	15
0.8	0.927	5	11
1.0	1.170	8	27
0.7	1.210	7	35
0.6	1.290	6	37
0.5	1.320	5	84
1.5	1.360	6	53
1.1	1.400	3	7
1.3	1.530	4	15
1.1	1.570	6	23
1.5	1.760	3	18
1.6	1.870	4	33
1.6	1.960	7	41
1.8	2.190	4	36
1.9	2.190	4	49
2.3	2.190	4	131
1.9	2.240	6	68
2.4	2.280	6	110
1.8	2.390	3	26
1.6	3.270	3	24
2.0	3.270	3	46
MEAN	1.3	4.6	37.9
ST DEV	0.6	1.8	32.4

RP1 2/16.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS
FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: AUG 6, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL 1:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_1$$

A = 5.5473
B = -0.5551
R = -0.2017
F = 0.9330
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_2$$

A = 5.4252
B = -0.3632
R = -0.1695
F = 0.6507
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$$

A = 5.5584
B = -0.5465
C = -0.0362
R = 0.2019
F = 0.4463
DF = 2, 21

MODEL 11: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1$

A = 1.5593
B = -0.0571
R = -0.0776
F = 0.1333
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X_2$

A = 1.4869
B = -0.0009
R = -0.0016
F = 0.0001
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$

A = 1.5274
B = -0.1659
C = 0.1046
R = 0.1312
F = 0.1839
DF = 2, 21

MODEL 111: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X_1)$

A = 1.4953
B = -0.0766
R = -0.0931
F = 0.1926
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X_2)$

A = 1.4899
B = 0.1156
R = 0.6385
F = 15.1406
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X_1) + C \cdot \ln(X_2)$

A = 1.5339
B = -0.3303
C = 0.1441
R = 0.7380
F = 12.5589
DF = 2, 21

WPI 2718.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: AUG 6, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = -2.7647$$

$$B = 31.3940$$

$$R = 0.5936$$

$$F = 11.9667$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 6.7776$$

$$B = 17.0227$$

$$R = 0.4261$$

$$F = 4.6800$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = -0.6454$$

$$B = 36.6102$$

$$C = -6.9369$$

$$R = 0.6015$$

$$F = 5.9531$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 2.0241$$

$$B = 0.9603$$

$$R = 0.6113$$

$$F = 13.1296$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

$$A = 2.0063$$

$$B = 0.7621$$

$$R = 0.6205$$

$$F = 13.7704$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

$$A = 1.8874$$

$$B = 0.4952$$

$$C = 0.4472$$

$$R = 0.6470$$

$$F = 7.5593$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 3.1437$$

$$B = 0.9599$$

$$R = 0.5466$$

$$F = 9.3726$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 3.2783$$

$$B = 0.2493$$

$$R = 0.6434$$

$$F = 15.5404$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 3.1965$$

$$B = 0.6136$$

$$C = 0.1967$$

$$R = 0.7195$$

$$F = 11.2687$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT 9, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	4	11
0.2	0.0	6	22
0.2	0.0	9	29
0.2	0.100	8	34
0.3	0.100	3	17
0.7	0.403	6	11
0.8	0.516	5	22
0.9	0.763	4	11
0.6	0.837	4	16
1.1	0.837	5	15
1.2	1.010	7	31
1.3	1.110	5	32
1.3	1.110	5	26
1.4	1.200	7	53
1.6	1.260	4	40
1.9	1.260	6	30
2.0	1.290	7	55
2.5	1.290	7	24
1.8	1.360	9	32
2.3	1.540	9	49
2.3	1.650	6	30
2.7	1.650	7	30
3.0	1.830	5	36
3.5	2.140	6	31
MEAN	1.4	0.970	28.9
ST DEV	1.0	0.623	12.2

RPT 2718.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 16

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT 9, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_1$$

$$A = 5.4523$$

$$B = 0.3877$$

$$R = 0.2208$$

$$F = 1.1278$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_2$$

$$A = 5.5683$$

$$B = 0.4451$$

$$R = 0.1638$$

$$F = 0.6063$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$$

$$A = 5.5987$$

$$B = 1.3196$$

$$C = -1.5081$$

$$R = 0.2740$$

$$F = 0.8522$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1$

$$A = 1.6344$$

$$B = 0.0833$$

$$R = 0.2752$$

$$F = 1.8030$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X_2$

$$A = 1.6528$$

$$B = 0.1024$$

$$R = 0.2185$$

$$F = 1.1025$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X_1 + C \cdot X_2$

$$A = 1.6583$$

$$B = 0.2389$$

$$C = -0.2454$$

$$R = 0.3149$$

$$F = 1.1561$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X_1)$

$$A = 1.7523$$

$$B = 0.0658$$

$$R = 0.2238$$

$$F = 1.1546$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X_2)$

$$A = 1.7523$$

$$B = 0.0002$$

$$R = 0.0021$$

$$F = 0.0001$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X_1) + C \cdot LN(X_2)$

$$A = 1.6862$$

$$B = 0.2077$$

$$C = -0.0433$$

$$R = 0.3961$$

$$F = 1.9538$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

RPT 271b01

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: SEPT 9, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + b \cdot X1$$

$$A = 20.1720$$

$$b = 6.1909$$

$$R = 0.4901$$

$$F = 6.9546$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 19.0913$$

$$B = 10.1310$$

$$R = 0.5182$$

$$F = 8.0746$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + b \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 19.0728$$

$$b = -0.6036$$

$$C = 11.3205$$

$$R = 0.5185$$

$$F = 3.6606$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 2.9099$$

$$B = 0.2547$$

$$R = 0.5291$$

$$F = 8.9542$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

$$A = 2.8726$$

$$B = 0.4094$$

$$R = 0.5496$$

$$F = 9.5218$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + b \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

$$A = 2.8730$$

$$b = 0.0198$$

$$C = 0.3801$$

$$R = 0.5497$$

$$F = 4.5476$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 3.2704$$

$$B = 0.2401$$

$$R = 0.5139$$

$$F = 7.8946$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 3.3300$$

$$B = 0.0393$$

$$R = 0.3327$$

$$F = 2.7369$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$LN(Y) = A + b \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 3.2171$$

$$b = 0.3545$$

$$C = -0.0349$$

$$R = 0.5399$$

$$F = 4.3205$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 1976

STATION: 16

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT 15, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	3	9
0.1	0.0	4	11
0.2	0.0	4	26
0.2	0.0	9	22
0.2	0.100	4	31
0.2	0.150	4	50
0.3	0.250	6	140
0.6	0.330	9	66
0.5	0.400	9	71
0.7	0.550	9	59
0.6	0.649	12	65
1.2	0.637	10	60
1.0	0.850	12	92
1.2	1.110	13	112
1.8	1.110	6	54
1.6	1.440	11	199
0.6	1.650	7	34
1.6	1.790	10	142
0.9	2.140	11	181
0.7	2.490	9	98
1.2	2.550	8	75
1.2	2.730	13	144
1.5	2.660	9	131
1.5	2.960	7	124
MEAN	0.8	8.5	84.0
ST DEV	0.6	2.9	53.1

KPI 271b.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 16

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT 15, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = 5.9696
B = 3.0014

R = 0.5691
F = 10.5400
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 7.0687
B = 1.2150

R = 0.4264
F = 4.6901
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 5.9645
B = 2.0268
C = 0.1320
R = 0.5701
F = 5.0549
DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = 1.6622
B = 0.4566

R = 0.6148
F = 12.6880
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 1.8453
B = 0.1917

R = 0.4686
F = 6.1692
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 1.6809
B = 0.4137
C = 0.0328
R = 0.6078
F = 6.1392
DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

A = 2.2414
B = 0.2581

R = 0.7754
F = 33.1695
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = 2.1643
B = 0.0623

R = 0.6567
F = 16.6845
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = 2.2411
B = 0.3383
C = 0.0049
R = 0.7759
F = 15.8874
DF = 2, 21

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 16

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT 15, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = 34.1316$$

$$B = 60.1426$$

$$R = 0.6329$$

$$F = 14.6983$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 48.1276$$

$$b = 31.9268$$

$$R = 0.6198$$

$$F = 13.7245$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 33.4391$$

$$B = 36.9599$$

$$C = 17.7246$$

$$R = 0.6778$$

$$F = 8.9233$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 3.3354$$

$$B = 1.0058$$

$$R = 0.6764$$

$$F = 18.5538$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 3.5940$$

$$B = 0.5122$$

$$R = 0.6354$$

$$F = 14.8990$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 3.3256$$

$$B = 0.6754$$

$$C = 0.2526$$

$$R = 0.7116$$

$$F = 10.7715$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 4.5390$$

$$B = 0.7327$$

$$R = 0.6055$$

$$F = 40.6402$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$$

$$A = 4.4781$$

$$B = 0.1586$$

$$R = 0.8328$$

$$F = 49.7742$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$$

$$A = 4.5347$$

$$B = 0.3369$$

$$C = 0.0984$$

$$R = 0.6586$$

$$F = 29.4437$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV 11, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	1	2
0.2	0.150	3	15
0.3	0.220	5	23
0.4	0.333	9	29
0.6	0.510	11	67
0.9	0.705	4	15
1.1	0.770	3	19
1.5	0.967	8	102
1.3	1.200	7	64
1.5	1.260	7	95
1.9	1.410	13	167
2.0	1.440	7	74
1.7	1.570	10	66
2.3	1.610	11	129
1.1	1.670	7	22
2.7	1.690	12	92
2.5	2.000	11	164
3.0	2.000	9	58
1.5	2.190	8	51
2.1	2.190	8	102
1.8	2.600	5	70
2.7	2.680	3	51
2.4	2.730	7	59
2.4	3.550	4	51

MEAN	1.6	1.477	7.0	65.8
ST DEV	0.9	0.921	3.2	44.8

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS
 FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV 11, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y1 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

$$A = 4.2757$$

$$B = 1.7469$$

$$R = 0.4653$$

$$F = 6.0795$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

$$A = 6.0950$$

$$B = 0.6410$$

$$R = 0.1831$$

$$F = 0.7632$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

$$A = 4.4430$$

$$B = 3.6926$$

$$C = -2.1992$$

$$R = 0.5853$$

$$F = 5.4726$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

$$A = 1.2809$$

$$B = 0.3386$$

$$R = 0.4918$$

$$F = 7.0169$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

$$A = 1.5520$$

$$B = 0.1795$$

$$R = 0.2795$$

$$F = 1.6646$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

$$A = 1.3001$$

$$B = 0.5628$$

$$C = -0.2535$$

$$R = 0.5400$$

$$F = 4.3225$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

$$A = 1.7322$$

$$B = 0.4237$$

$$R = 0.6406$$

$$F = 15.3277$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 1.8651$$

$$B = 0.1627$$

$$R = 0.6939$$

$$F = 20.4304$$

$$DF = 1, 22$$

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

$$A = 1.8213$$

$$B = 0.1537$$

$$C = 0.1188$$

$$R = 0.7074$$

$$F = 18.5180$$

$$DF = 2, 21$$

WPI 2110.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 18, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV 11, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = 17.6509
B = 30.8100

R = 0.5904
F = 11.7725
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 41.3263
B = 16.5939

R = 0.3410
F = 2.8955
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 18.7420
B = 50.4811
C = -22.2341
R = 0.6444
F = 7.4579
DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = 2.5952
B = 0.6017

R = 0.6977
F = 20.8697
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

A = 3.0285
B = 0.5660

R = 0.5283
F = 6.5146
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

A = 2.6072
B = 0.9618
C = -0.1583
R = 0.7027
F = 10.2427
DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

A = 3.6845
B = 0.8997

R = 0.8150
F = 43.6911
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$

A = 3.9552
B = 0.3072

R = 0.7852
F = 35.3690
DF = 1, 22

$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$

A = 3.7916
B = 0.5752
C = 0.1428
R = 0.8436
F = 25.9200
DF = 2, 21

A-250

APPENDIX H

RPT 2716.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT-9, 1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	0	1
0.2	0.0	0	2
0.2	0.0	0	1
0.5	0.0	0	5
0.1	0.050	0	1
0.2	0.100	0	1
0.5	0.250	0	8
0.4	0.300	0	2
1.2	0.565	0	1
1.8	0.674	0	2
1.0	0.817	0	5
1.2	0.858	0	50
2.0	0.927	0	67
2.1	1.030	0	20
1.0	1.060	0	31
1.4	1.060	0	91
2.5	1.130	0	110
2.0	1.260	0	201
1.5	1.290	0	73
2.0	1.440	0	165
2.5	1.470	0	142
2.5	1.470	0	180
3.0	1.470	0	94
3.4	1.650	0	210
MEAN	1.4	0.786	0.0
ST DEV	1.0	0.570	0.0
			61.3
			71.6

A-252

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS
 MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT.3,1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = -19.5299
 B = 56.7462
 R = 0.8180
 F = 44.5017
 DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = -20.8114
 B = 104.4713
 R = 0.8317
 F = 49.3494
 DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = -23.4170
 B = 23.5951
 C = 65.0236
 R = 0.9419
 F = 25.5500
 DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = 0.3615
 B = 1.6773
 R = 0.8302
 F = 48.7969
 DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 0.1456
 B = 3.3144
 R = 0.9059
 F = 100.6949
 DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = 0.1549
 B = -0.0844
 C = 3.4555
 R = 0.9061
 F = 48.1432
 DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

A = 2.8666
 B = 1.5518
 R = 0.8294
 F = 48.5088
 DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = 3.3897
 B = 0.2913
 R = 0.6058
 F = 12.8189
 DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = 2.8521
 B = 1.5729
 C = -0.0073
 R = 0.8295
 F = 23.1633
 DF = 2, 21

RPT 2718.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV. 7, 1975

K1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.2	0.0	0	0
0.3	0.0	0	0
0.4	0.0	0	0
0.5	0.0	0	0
0.7	0.0	0	2
1.1	0.397	0	2
0.6	0.440	0	2
1.2	0.465	0	1
1.0	0.701	0	0
1.0	0.755	0	23
1.7	1.080	0	70
1.6	1.110	0	13
1.5	1.200	0	58
1.5	1.230	0	1
2.0	1.260	0	110
1.9	1.500	0	80
2.2	1.500	0	89
2.4	1.500	0	140
2.5	1.540	0	201
2.2	1.610	0	135
2.5	1.720	0	390
3.0	1.800	0	80
3.1	1.950	0	301
3.2	2.380	0	170
MEAN	1.6	0.0	77.7
ST DEV	0.9	0.0	103.5

RPT 2718.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS
 MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 17

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV. 7, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = -60.8812
 B = 86.8447

R = 0.7677
 F = 31.5821
 DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = -26.2292
 B = 105.7703

R = 0.7221
 F = 23.9639
 DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = -67.1428
 B = 112.0479

C = -33.9047
 R = 0.7703
 F = 15.3205
 DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = -6.5077
 B = 5.5476

R = 0.7847
 F = 35.2542
 DF = 1, 22

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

A = -6.8370
 B = 7.1714

R = 0.7633
 F = 34.9281
 DF = 1, 22

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

A = -7.8640
 B = 2.9570

C = 3.4854
 R = 0.7914
 F = 17.6035
 DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1)$

A = -1.4100
 B = 7.2499

R = 0.8626
 F = 63.9667
 DF = 1, 22

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X2)$

A = 2.7665
 B = 1.0539

R = 0.7892
 F = 36.3389
 DF = 1, 22

 $LN(Y) = A + B \cdot LN(X1) + C \cdot LN(X2)$

A = -0.4968
 B = 5.0637

C = 0.2533
 R = 0.8682
 F = 32.1323
 DF = 2, 21

RPT 2710.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT.15,1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	0	0
0.1	0.0	0	0
0.2	0.0	0	2
0.2	0.0	0	0
0.2	0.100	0	0
0.2	0.150	0	0
0.3	0.250	0	0
0.6	0.330	0	2
0.5	0.400	0	1
0.7	0.550	0	3
0.5	0.649	0	1
1.2	0.837	0	10
1.0	0.850	0	5
1.2	1.110	0	66
1.6	1.110	0	18
1.6	1.440	0	121
0.6	1.650	0	3
1.6	1.790	0	101
0.9	2.140	0	85
0.7	2.490	0	52
1.2	2.550	0	34
1.2	2.730	0	56
1.5	2.860	0	65
1.5	2.980	0	40
MEAN	0.8	1.124	0.0
ST DEV	0.6	1.031	0.0
			27.7
			36.9

A-256

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
 AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS
 MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: OCT.15,1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL 1:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = -11.2272
 B = 46.9574

R = 0.7117
 F = 22.5856
 DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 1.1668
 B = 23.6223

R = 0.6696
 F = 17.0311
 DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = -11.6655
 B = 32.2691
 C = 11.2148

R = 0.7453
 F = 13.1213
 DF = 2, 21

MODEL 11: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = -8.4027
 B = 9.0644

R = 0.7873
 F = 35.6822
 DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$

A = -5.9088
 B = 4.4697

R = 0.7163
 F = 23.1906
 DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$

A = -8.4802
 B = 6.4702
 C = 1.9835

R = 0.8186
 F = 21.3349
 DF = 2, 21

MODEL 111: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

A = 2.2599
 B = 6.2385

R = 0.8858
 F = 80.1472
 DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$

A = 1.0216
 B = 0.9518

R = 0.6650
 F = 17.4399
 DF = 1, 22

 $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$

A = 2.2732
 B = 7.4536
 C = -0.3020

R = 0.8936
 F = 41.6094
 DF = 2, 21

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

RPT 2718.1

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV-11-1975

X1 WATER DEPTH	X2 CURRENT VELOCITY	Y1 NUMBER OF SPECIES	Y2 NUMBER OF ORGANISMS
0.1	0.0	0	3
0.2	0.150	0	0
0.3	0.220	0	0
0.4	0.333	0	0
0.6	0.510	0	2
0.9	0.705	0	0
1.1	0.770	0	3
1.5	0.967	0	32
1.3	1.200	0	9
1.5	1.260	0	26
1.9	1.410	0	105
2.0	1.440	0	48
1.7	1.570	0	38
2.3	1.610	0	91
1.1	1.670	0	0
2.7	1.690	0	65
2.5	2.000	0	130
3.0	2.000	0	38
1.5	2.190	0	34
2.1	2.190	0	75
1.8	2.600	0	49
2.7	2.680	0	39
2.4	2.730	0	49
2.4	3.550	0	31
MEAN	1.477	0.0	35.5
ST DEV	0.9	0.0	36.4

DOT 2718.1

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

AQUATIC INSECT REGRESSION ANALYSIS

MARCH 12, 1976

STATION: 18

NUMBER OF SAMPLERS: 24

SAMPLING PERIOD: NOV. 11, 1975

REGRESSION OF Y2 ON X1 AND X2

MODEL I:

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1$$

A = -11.8690
B = 29.9173
R = 0.7052
F = 21.8877
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = 7.0011
B = 19.2968
R = 0.4885
F = 6.8963
DF = 1, 22

$$Y = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = -10.9849
B = 40.2026
C = -11.6254
R = 0.7295
F = 11.6705
DF = 2, 21

MODEL II: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1$

A = -11.2785
B = 6.6206
R = 0.8038
F = 40.1620
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X2$$

A = -8.5895
B = 5.2771
R = 0.6871
F = 19.6775
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot X1 + C \cdot X2$$

A = -11.3225
B = 6.1091
C = 0.5783
R = 0.9049
F = 19.3210
DF = 2, 21

MODEL III: $\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1)$

A = -2.0578
B = 6.3077
R = 0.7976
F = 38.4592
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = -0.3576
B = 1.4840
R = 0.5291
F = 8.5528
DF = 1, 22

$$\ln(Y) = A + B \cdot \ln(X1) + C \cdot \ln(X2)$$

A = -2.7423
B = 8.3818
C = -0.9125
R = 0.8205
F = 21.6267
DF = 2, 21