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Data from the second year of a proposed four year study of the effects of culvert construction on three streams to be crossed by the Mackenzie Highway, Northwest Territories are presented.

Preconstruction data was collected on selected water quality parameters, stream hydraulics, the diversity and standing crop of benthic invertebrates and the species composition of fish and their utilization of stream habitat in 1976.

This study was terminated at the end of the 1976 field season as a result of the discontinuation of Mackenzie Highway construction.

Key words: Arctic zone, highway construction; environmental impact; aquatic environment; fishery resources; fishery biology; benthos; stream flow; chemical analysis; monitoring.

## RESUME

MCKINNON, G.A., B.G. SUTHERLAND, and P.R. ROBINSON. 1982. The aquatic resources of three Mackenzie River tributaries to be crossed during highway construction, 1976 Data. Can. Data Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 323: v + 104 p .

L'ouvrage présente les données recueillies durant la deuxième année (d'une étude proposée de quatre ans) sur les répercussions de la construction, sur trois ruisseaux, de ponceaux sur lesquels l'autoroute Mackenzie doit passer dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest.

Avant le début des travaux de construction, on a recueilli diverses données: les paramètres de la qualité des eaux, 1 'hydraulique des ruisseaux, la diversité et la biomasse des invertébrés benthiques, l'énumération des espèces de poissons qui ont choisi les ruisseaux conme habitat, et $1^{\prime}$ utilisation qu'ils en font en 1976.

L'étude s'est terminée à la fin de la campagne d'exploration de 1976, ètant donné que la construction de l'autoroute Mackenzie a été discontinuēe.

Mots-clés: Zone arctique; construction d'autoroute; rēpercussions écologiques; environnement aquatique; ressources halieutiques; limnologie; benthos; écoulement fluviatile; analyse chimique; observation.

## INTRODUCTION

Road construction in or near streams and rivers can affect aquatic resources in several ways including disruption of fish migrations, destruction or siltation of vital habitats and alteration of water quality parameters. Increased suspended or deposited sediments in streams can reduce light penetration, cause mechanical abrasion of fish gills and produce changes in substrate. A review of 1 iterature on the effects of increased sedimentation on aquatic biota is presented in Brunskill et a1. (1973) and Rosenberg and Snow (1975). The long-term effects of culvert stream crossings are of particular concern. Studies have shown that small northern tributaries can provide important spawning, nursery and overwintering areas for indigenous fish (Jessop et al. 1974; Slaney and Co. 1974). Brunskill et al. (1975) have suggested that small streams and rivers will be more affected by terrain disturbance than larger streams since construction will affect a larger proportion of drainage area.

The present report deals with the second year of a proposed four-year study on the effects of culvert construction on streams crossed by the Mackenzie Highway, Northwest Territories. Based on construction schedules available in the spring of 1975, three streams along a section of the highway route were chosen for study: Creek Mile 422.7, Creek Mile 426.5 and Smith Creek (Mile 430). Pre1 iminary data were collected in 1975 and as a result, these three streams were considered to be suitable for further study (McKinnon et al. 1978).

The objectives of the study, as set out in 1975, were to obtain data on the diversity and standing crop of benthic invertebrate communities, to determine the species composition of fish and their utilization of the stream systems and to identify changes in selected water quality parameters and stream hydraulics. As highway construction proceeded past each stream, the short-tenm effects of construction on stream water quality and other ecosystem parameters were to be investigated. The field program was to continue after completion of construction in order to study long-term effects, if any. However, in 1977 construction of the Mackenzie Highway was discontinued indefinitely and this study was terminated at the end of the 1976 field season.

## DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

Three streams were chosen for study along the proposed Mackenzie Highway south of Wrigley, NWT (Figs. 1 and 2). These streams (Mile 422.7, Mile 426.5 and Smjth Creek (Mile 430)) provide drainage for a $225 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ area comprised of both mountain and lowland terrain. The lowland area is covered with a continuous mantle of glacial and post-glacial deposits overlaying Devonian shale and limestone. Smith Creek forms a boundary between a glacial outwash plain to the north and a glaciolacustrine plain to the south. The mountain areas (McConnell Range) are composed of thrust masses of SilurianOrdovician dolomites, limestones and shales overlain for the most part by a shallow veneer of glacial drift deposits.

The climate of the region is semi-arid and subarctic to cold temperate in type. The mean annual precipitation is close to $33 \mathrm{~cm}, 18$ to 20 cm of which falls as rain in the summer months. Mean annual temperature is approximately $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

The study area is located in the Boreal forest region; vegetation is mainly white and black spruce, balsam poplar, pine and aspen on degraded eutric brunisal soil. Undergrowth ranges from grasses, sedges and Sphagnum moss on low-lying areas to lichen and rock flora on mountain terrain. The area is one of discontinuous permafrost.

Creek Mile $422.7\left(63^{\circ} 06^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 123^{\circ} 16^{\prime} \mathrm{W}\right)$ is a cobble bottom, clear stream with alternating riffles and pools draining a generally low relief spruce forest. It is well contained within a deep gorge from the highway right-of-way to its confluence with the Mackenzie River, a distance of 2.9 km . The drainage area is approximately $75 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of which one-third is mountainous terrain.

Creek Mile $426.5\left(63^{\circ} 09^{\prime} N, 123^{\circ} 18^{\prime} W\right)$ has a boulder and gravel bottom, clear water and flows through a gully between sloping moss-covered hills. The channel is not well defined above the highway right-of-way and is overgrown with stands of black spruce and tamarack. The drainage area is approximately $20 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ of generally 10 wl and area and the highway right-of-way is located 3.1 km upstream from the confluence with the Mackenzie River. This creek drains a number of small lakes, the largest being approximately 22 hectares in area.

Smith Creek (Mile 430) (63 $\left.{ }^{\circ} 10^{\prime}, 123^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \mathrm{W}\right)$ drains an area of approximately $130 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$, one-half of which is mountainous terrain and one-half glaciolacustrine plain with bogs and lakes. The channel is generally well defined with large riffle areas of rock and gravel. A series of waterfalls is located approximately 5 km upstream from the mouth. Groundwater flow into Smith Creek is substantial throughout the year and is responsible for keeping portions of the stream open during the winter. The highway right-of-way is located 0.76 km from the confluence with the Mackenzie River and is characterized by a very large ancient bi-modal land flow on the south bank of the creek. This landslide is now inactive and the head scarp is heavily vegetated (McRoberts and Morgenstern 1973).

METHODS AND MATERIALS

## PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL STUDIES

## Physical characteristics and hydraulics

Metric staff gauges were reinstalled at all stations established in 1975, i.e. $1,2,3,4,5$, $6,7,8$ and 11 . Additional staff gauge locations were established near the mouth of Creek Mile 426.5 (10c. 9) and at the proposed highway crossing of Creek Mile 426.5 ()oc. 10). Staff gauges consisted of 1 m enamelled plates which were screwed into $5.08 \mathrm{~cm} \times 10.16 \mathrm{~cm}\left(2^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime}\right)$ wooden studs. Approximately $1 / 2$ of the staff gauges used were driven into the ground using $1.83 \mathrm{~cm}(6 \mathrm{ft})$ steel posts. other gauges were cemented in concrete blocks and set upright on the stream bottom. Levels were run
to bench marks using Helger Watt Aritoset and Kern GX1 levels. Gauges were read three times dajly during high water periods and twice daily thereafter until July 18,1976 . From this point on, they were read biweekly until 0ctober 14, 1976. In addition long-term stage recorders were established on Creek Mile 422.7 and Smith Creek in conjunction with the Glaciology Division of Fisheries and Environment Canada.

Current metering was conducted at all locations across established cross-sections throughout the 1976 field season. Water velocity measurements were made using a full sized ott current meter hand-held on a wading rod. For water depths greater than $0.3 \mathrm{~m}(1 \mathrm{ft})$ the $0.2-0.8$ method was used to estimate the mean velocity through a stream section. For depths less than 0.3 m , the 0.6 method was used (U.S. Dep. of the Interior 1967). Thirty-second readings were taken. Discharge was calculated using the mid section method (U.S. Dep. of the interior 1967). Most data were collected in English units and were later converted into metric equivalents. An effort was made to measure the flow over as wide a range as possible.

Stage discharge relationships were developed by plotting log stage versus log discharge and deriving the line of best fit for the points and the correlation coefficient. This same procedure was used to develop stage-mean velocity and stagehydraulic radius relationships.

Stream bed profiles were run from the Mackenzie River at Creek Mile 422.7, Creek Mile 426.5 and Smith Creek up to locations 4,11 and 8 respectively in June, 1976. Water depths, water surface slopes, stream channel sizes and slopes and bank characteristics were noted. A detailed description was made of the bed material at each discharge station was conducted and bed material samples were taken using a shovel. Distances were measured by tape and stadia.

Stream bed material samples were analysed for grain size by sieving. The sieve stack consisted of the following sieves; $3^{\prime \prime}(7.52 \mathrm{~cm}), 1^{\prime \prime}(2.54$ $\mathrm{cm}), .5^{\prime \prime}(1.27 \mathrm{~cm}), \# 4, \# 10, \# 20, \# 40, \# 60, \# 100$, and \#200. Cobbles were removed from the bed material sample prior to sieve shaking, their weight was determined and their dimensions and general shape recorded. The sieve stack was then shaken for 8 minutes on a sieve shaker. The total weight of soil retained on sieves (including any cobbles) was used in the calculation of the "percent finer than" for each sieve. This "percent finer than" calculation was subsequently plotted against sieve opening size with any cobbles being included as being retained on the largest sieve in the stack.

## Water chemistry

Water temperature and conductivity measurements were made on site at each location. Water temperatures $\left( \pm 1.0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ were determined with a handheld pocket thermometer and conductivity was measured by means of a YSI Model 33 conductivity meter. Dissolved oxygen and pH measurements were made on site at each stream location. Dissolved oxygen was measured directly by means of a YSI Model S4 Oxygen meter. Most pH determinations were made by using a Hach water analysis kit (Model AL36WR); however in some cases a Fisher Accumet 150
pH meter was utilized, Continuous recording Ryan submersible thermographs Model Gl5 were located in each stream and read approximately biweekly.

Water samples were collected approximately biweekly throughout the study period for analysis of ions, nutrients and suspended sediments by means of a USDH 48 integrated water sampler in midstream. Water from the sampler unit was then transferred to pre-washed 1 L Nalgene brand bottles and samples were then shipped (refrigerated) to the Freshwater Institute, Water Chemistry Laboratory, Analytical Unit in Winnipeg. Analytical methods were according to Stainton et al. (1974).

## BIOLOGICAL STUDIES

## Benthos

Benthic invertebrate communities were sampled by means of a Surber sampler on Creek Mile 422.7 and Smith Creek. No sampling of invertebrate communities was attempted on Creek Mile 426.5.

A permanent benthic sampling transect was established at each sampling location on the two creeks sampled. Six Surber samples were collected at equal distances across each transect. Four complete sets of Surber samples were collected at approximately monthly intervals until late August.

The Surber sampler consisted of a one-foot square metal frame to which was attached a Nitex net, also one foot square at the open end. All samples were taken using a fine mesh ( 200 micron) net. In using the sampler, the open frame was placed on the stream bottom with the net extending downstream. All larger rocks enclosed within the frame were picked up by hand, washed in front of the net and discarded. The remaining fine material was stirred to a depth of 5 to 10 cm to dislodge any organisms. The organisms were then collected from the net and preserved in $70 \%$ ethyl alcohol solution. After sampling the area was returned to its natural state by replacing substrate materials.

Preserved benthic samples were stained with a solution of rose bengal $(100 \mathrm{mg}$ rose bengal per litre of $95 \%$ ethyl alcohol diluted to $70 \%$ then sorted, identified to family and enumerated. Sorting was accomplished with the aid of a $3 x$ magnifying illuminator and binocular microscope.

Standing crops were calculated as mean number of organisms $m^{-2}$ for each location on each date. Ninety-five percent confidence limits for these means were then calculated. Two way analyses of variance between locations and over time were performed on the standing crop data followed by selected comparisons of location means. All statistical tests were according to Snedecor and Cochran (1967). Fish

Trap and fence: Fish fences and traps were installed at the proposed highway crossing of creek Mile 422.7 and Smith Creek in the spring of 1976. in both cases the traps consisted of a frame 1.5 m ( 5 ft ) long, $1.22 \mathrm{~m}(4 \mathrm{ft})$ deep and $1.22 \mathrm{~m}(4 \mathrm{ft})$ wide, constructed of $5.1 \mathrm{~cm} \times 10.2 \mathrm{~cm}$ ( $2 \mathrm{in} \times 4 \mathrm{in}$ ) lumber. A plywood bottom was attached and the
sides, back and funnel were covered with wire mesh fabric ( $2.54 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}\left(1 \mathrm{in}^{2}\right)$ mesh size) stapled to the frame. The fences leading to the traps were 1.5 m ( 5 ft ) high and made of mesh fabric ( $2.54 \mathrm{~cm}, 1 \mathrm{in}$ ) with a $0.3 \mathrm{~m}(1 \mathrm{ft})$ mesh skirting attached to the bottom at a right angle. The fence was installed in the channet using $1.83 \mathrm{~m}(6 \mathrm{ft})$ steel posts spaced approximately $1.2 \mathrm{~m}(4 \mathrm{ft})$ apart and embedded in the stream bottom to a depth of $0.6 \mathrm{~m}(2 \mathrm{ft})$. The wire mesh fence was attached to these posts with wound wire and weighted down by placing rockfilled burlap bags on the fence skirting. A fish holding pen of similar dimensions and material as the traps were placed alongside the upstream traps.

Both an upstream and a downstream trap were utilized in Smith Creek and Creek Mile 422.7. Fences were then constructed joining the traps and extending to the banks in such a way as to block fish movement completely and at the same time to act as leads for the capture of both upstream and downstream moving fish.

Traps were checked two or three times daily at which time fish were removed and data collected from each specimen. Each trap check was performed by two persons, one working inside the trap and the other serving as recorder. Handling of fish was minimized by using a scoop constructed of PVC pipe and rochelle netting. Fish were passed through the fence in the direction in which they were moving.

The fence was examined daily for holes and cleaned as required.

The traps and fences were installed in Smith Creek on April 21, 1976 and became operational on April 22. High flood waters washed out the fence on April 25 and the upstream trap and fence did not operate again until May 7. The downstream trap became functional again on May 10 . The fence again washed out on May 28 and subsequently was not operational until June 3.

The traps and fences were installed in Creek Mile 422.7 on May 9, 1976, and were operational without interruption until May 31.

Sampling consisted of floy tagging, finclipping, dead sampling or simply counting and releasing fish captured. Generally fish with fork lengths greater than 300 mm were tagged by means of inserting sequentially numbered floy tags. These were inserted into the left side of the fish near the base of the dorsal fin by means of a tagging gun. No anaesthetic was used, and the risk of infection was minimized by rinsing the tagging gun in disinfectant and in fresh water before insertion. For each fish tagged, fork or total length was recorded according to species and a small sample of scales was taken where possible. Weights of some fish were recorded. Arctic grayling and northern pike captured were squeezed anterior to the vent to determine the degree of ripeness of sexual products and to determine sex.

For those fish which had a fork length less than 300 mm fin-clipping was utilized as a tagging method. Each day of fin-clipping was assigned a clipping code. The structures utilized included the pectoral fins, pelvic fins, anal fin, dorsal fin, and both the upper and lower lobe of the caudal fin. Single fin-clipping or combinations of the clipping of two fins were performed. As was
the case with floy tagging, fork nr total length was subsequently recorded, scales were removed and the fish were released in their intended direction of travel. If a fish showed signs of stress subsequent to handling it was placed in a holding pen protected from the current of the river for a period of six hours.

Small numbers of fish were sacrificed for life history analysis. Fork or total length was measured to the nearest 1 mm and weight ( $\pm 25 \mathrm{~g}$ ) were recorded for each fish. Sex and state of maturity were determined by examination of the gonads. A fish was considered to be mature if it appeared that it would spawn or had already spawned in the year of capture. A ripe fish was a mature fish whose gonads were close to spawning condition and from which sexual products could be expressed by application of pressure to the abdomen. A spent or spawned out fish was a mature fish which had obviously spawned shortly before it was captured.

Stomachs were removed and most were preserved in $10 \%$ formalin for a detailed assessment of food habits. In the laboratory stomach content organisms were enumerated and identified to family where possible. Some stomach contents were field identified, mainly those of northern pike.

Scales were removed from the appropriate body location (Hatfield et al. 1972) for ageing of Arctic grayling and northern pike. Otoliths were removed from burbot for aging purposes. No attempt was made to age longnose suckers. Prior to analyses, otoliths were transferred to a benzylbenzoate methyl salicylate clearing medium. 0toliths were read under reflected light using a 20 to $40 x$ magnification of a binocular dissecting microscope. Scales were read utilizing a $50 x$ microprojector.

General: In addition to the counting fence on Creek Mile 422.7 and Sinith Creek, and exclusively on Creek Mile 426.5, fish were collected by various methods depending on the nature of the stream at each location. A 9.2 m beach sieve of 3.2 mm mesh as well as fry traps were utilized at all sampling locations. The fry traps consisted of fry drift nets ( 1 m long cone of 0.6 cm mesh) attached at one end to a $20 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}(7.8 \times 19.7 \mathrm{in})$ wooden frame and at the other end to a fry holding box similar to Porter's (1973) design. The traps were set in riffle areas with the funnel facing upstream. Angling was utilized as a capture technique on Smith Creek. Spin-casting rods and reels and a variety of Mepp's brand lures were used. Electroshocking with a Coffelt brand backpack electroshocker was utilized on a limited basis in Smith Creek.

Seining and fry-trapping were employed weekly at sampling locations while crews manned the fence operations and thereafter were employed biweekly. Electrofishing, angling, and gillnetting were utilized on an irregular basis throughout the period of study.

After capture, fish were generally divided into two groups (ie. those with fork or total length greater than 100 mm and those with fork or total length less than 100 mm ). This was necessary due to difficulties in preserving large fish for subsequent laboratory examination.

Upon collection, fish with a fork or total length greater than 100 mm were measured to the
nearest 1 mm using a calibrated measuring board. Weight was measured to 5 g on a 1 kg capacity Chatillon brand hanging brass tubular scale. Otoliths and/or scales were removed for age determination. Stomachs were removed, preserved in $10 \%$ formalin and returned to the $1 a b$ for later analysis.

Small fish were preserved whole in $10 \%$ formalin for later laboratory analyses. In the laboratory, fish were identified to species, fork or total length and weight were measured to the nearest 1 mm and 0.1 g respectively, and sexual maturity as determined by gonadal development was recorded.

Otoliths were removed from Arctic grayling, trout-perch, walleye, round whitefish and mountain whitefish for age determination. They were stored in glycerin-filled vials prior to analysis. Scales were removed from some Arctic grayling and all least cisco for age determination.

## RESULTS

## PHYSICAL ANO CHEMICAL CONDITIONS

The spring flood in the study area (Figs. I and 2) began in earnest around April 20 when minimum daily air temperatures rose to or above the freezing point. Stream flows peaked between April 28 and 30 in response to maximum daily air temperatures of about $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Figs. 3, 4, 5). Peak flows in Simith Creek were approximately one to two weeks earlier than recorded during 1973 to 1975 (Fig. 6). Spring flood recession began when temperatures fell between April 30 and May 5. Cool dry weather conditions prevailed until late May when a major rainstorm produced $20-40 \mathrm{~mm}$ of precipitation in the Wrigley area. Response of stream flow to this storm varied with rapid increases in flow for mountainous catchments such as Smith Creek but only minor response for flatter, more densely vegetated catchments such as Creek Mile 422.7.

## Creek Mile 422.7

Physical characteristics: Extensive icings were present in the stream channel of Creek Mile 422.7 during the freshet period in 1976. Flow occurred over and around iced areas and flow was not confined to the normal channel boundaries until early May. Consequently it was not possible to collect many of the hydraulic measurements desired.

The stream bed profile for Creek Mile 422.7 is presented in Fig. 7. The stream channel downstream of the proposed highway crossing is laden with debris jams in many locations. Bed material analyses of all locations sampled are provided in Appendices $1,2,3$ and 4.

Temperature and conductivity measurements are provided in Table 1. Daily water temperature variation as measured by a continuously recording submersible thermograph situated at loc. 4 is provided in Fig. 12.

Hydraulics: Flow summary tables are provided in Appendices 5, 6, 7 and 8. Because of icing conditions prior to May 6, accurate measurements were difficult; however a discharge of $2.21 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ over ice was recorded on April 29 at loc. 4.

Velocity cross-sections for locs. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are provided in Figs. 8, 9, 10 and 11. Representative high, medium and low flows are plotted. Because of the ice conditions present during the freshet, high flows encountered at this time are not represented, instead the flow caused by a late May rainstorn is provided. This, however, cannot truly be considered as indicative of high flows in the stream.

Water chemistry: Results of field water chemistry analyses for pH and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ are provided in Table 1.

Water chemistry data for fourteen parameters are provided in Appendix 9. A summary of analysis of variance and comparison of location means for these parameters is found in Table 2.

## Creek Mile 426.5

Physical characteristics: lcings, although not as extensive as in Creek Mile 422.7 were present in the stream channel of Creek Mile 426.5 during the spring of 1976.

The stream bed profile for Creek Mile 426.5 is presented in Fig. 13. The stream bed below the proposed highway crossing has many debris laden areas and boulder riffles are common. Bed material analysis of all locations sampled is provided in Appendices 10, 11 and 12.

Temperature and conductivity measurements are provided in Table 3. Daily water temperature fluctuation at loc. 10 is provided in Fig. 12.

Hydraulics: Flow summary tables are provided in Appendices 13,14 and 15 . As was the case with Creek Mile 422.7, accurate measurements were made difficult in the early part of the spring as a result of icing in the channel and consequently measurements of all parameters provided here were not begun until May 5.

Velocity cross-sections for locs. 9, 10 and 11 are presented in Figs. 14 through 16. Again as was the case with Creek Mile 422.7, the true high flow condition in Creek Mile 426.5 is not represented here. However post-freshet high, medium and low flows are plotted.

Water chemistry: Results of field water chemistry analyses for pH and $0_{2}$ are provided in Table 3.

Detailed water chemistry data are provided in Appendix 16. A summary of analysis of variance and comparison of location means for all chemical parameters measured is found in Table 4.

## Smith Creek

Physical characteristics: Some channel ice was present in Smith Creek downstream of 10c. 5 during the freshet of 1976; however for the most part this did not hamper our program.

The stream bed profile for Smith Creek from its mouth to a point just upstream of loc. 3 is provided in Fig. 17. The stream has generally a gravel and cobble substrate with alternating pools and riffles. No probable obstructions to fish movement were noted in the section surveyed. Bed
material analyses of all locations sampled are provided in Appendices 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Temperature and conductivity measurenents are provided in Table 5. Daily water temperature variation at loc. 6 is shown in Fig. 12.

Hydraulics: Flow summary tables are provided in Appendices $25,22,23$ and 24 . Accurate deteminations were made for most locations from April 12 on. The maximum recorded discharge measured was $6.15 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ on May 2 at 1 cc . 8 .

Velocity cross-sections for locs. 5, 6, 7 and 8 are provided in Figs. 18 through 21. Representative high, medium and low flows are plotted.

Water chemistry: Results of field water chemistry analyses for pH and $0_{2}$ are provided in Table 5.

Detailed water chemistry data are provided in Appendix 25. A summary of analysis of variance and comparison of location means for all chemical parameters measured is found in Table 6.

BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS
Creek Mile 422.7
Benthos: The results of Surber samples collected from Creek Mile 422.7 during 1976 are presented in Fig. 22, as percent composition by each of the major invertebrate taxa (i.e. a major taxon occurred as $1 \%$ or more of total abundance).

Standing crop increased steadily at all sampling locations over the period of study. Analysis of variance revealed that location had a significant effect on six of the eleven groups tested (Table 7). These groups are Chironomidae, Copepoda, Dther Diptera, Plecoptera, Trichoptera and Total.

Date produced a significant effect in all groups except Simulidae and other Diptera. Number of organisms $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ for all groups generally tended to increase over time; however, no general statistical spatial trends were evident.

Similar comparisons of location means were performed on the data from Creek Mile 422.7 as were performed on Smith creek. Only two groups of invertebretes showed a sigrificant difference in numbers of invertebrates per $m^{2}$ between loc. 1 and 2. Copepods showed greater abundance at loc. 2 than loc. 1 and Simulidae vice versa.

Three groups showed significant differences between loc. 3 and 4. All three groups (other Diptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera) had a significantly greater abundance at loc. 4 than at loc. 3.

Comparison of loc, 3 and 4 to loc. 1 and 2 revealed a larger number of significant differences between groups. Six of the eleven groups showed significant differences in abundance for locations upstream of the proposed highway crossing as compared to locations downstream (Chironomidae, Copepoda, other Diptera, Plecoptera, Trichoptera and total). In five of the six cases (Copepoda the exception) abundance was greater at upstream locations than at downstream locations. The reason for
greater abundance at upstream locations is probably due to groundwater recharge. The abundance of Copepoda at loc. 2 seems to be a consequence of the nature of the bed material.

Fish: Three species of fish were collected from Cre $\overline{e k}$ Mile 422.7 during the period May to October, 1976. All were caught as a result of fry traps, electrofishing and gillnets at established sampling locations. The trap and fence, operated from May 9 to May 31, caught no migrants of any species moving either upstream or downstream.

SLIMy SCULPIN: A total of 176 slimy sculpin were captured from Creek Mile 422.7 in 1976. Of these, 89 were retained for analysis. Slimy sculpin were caught at all sampling locations. The length-weight relationship for 83 slimy sculpin is described by the linear regression
$\log ($ weight $)=-5.0163+3.0444 \log ($ total length $)$ C.I. $=2.9334-3.1554$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
Length frequency data are presented in Table 8. Otolith ages ranged up to six years with age 3 fish being the most abundant (Table 9). Six specimens which were obviously newly hatched and from which individual total lengths and weights were recorded were automatically aged at $0^{+}$.

Five ripe sculpin (four females and one male) were captured between May 13 and 18 . The females ranged in total length from 58 to 81 mm and ranged in weight from 2.3 to 6.1 g . The male had a fork length of 55 mm and a weight of 1.7 g .

Diptera and Ephemeroptera larvae were important items in the diet over all length classes; however, sculpin became increasingly pisciverous with increasing total length (Table 10).

LAKE CHUB: A total of 95 lake chub were captured from all sampling locations on Creek Mile 422.7, 1976. Eighteen lake chub were retained for subsequent analysis.

The length-weight relationship for 18 lake chub is expressed by the linear regression
$\log ($ weight $)=-3.9619+2.3655 \mathrm{log}$ (fork length) C.I. $=1.9958-2.7352$
where C.I. = 95\% confidence interval of $b$
Length frequency data are provided in Table 11. The majority of specimens ( $83 \%$ ) were young-of-the-year (Table 12).

The stomachs from all 18 lake chub were analysed for content. Ten were found to be empty. The remainder contained 11 Diptera, two Ephemeroptera, and one Hemiptera.

ARCTIC GRAYLING: Four arctic grayling were captured from loc. 1 on Creek Mile 422.7 in 1976 by means of gillnets. One additional specimen was captured at loc. 2.

Fish varied in fork length from 150 to 222 mm , in weight from 43.2 to 119.3 g and in age from 2 to 4 years (Table 13). One ripe male with a fork length of 212 mm and a weight of 100 g was caught on June 1, 1976.

Creek Mile 426.5
Fish:
LAKE CHIJB: Eighteen lake chub were captured in Creek Mile 426.5 in 1976 and all were retained for analysis. The length-weight relationship for 18 lake chub is expressed by the linear regression
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.5974+2.8168 \log$ (fork length)
C.I. $=2.6109-3.0235$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of b
14. Length frequency data are presented in Table 14. Otoliths from 11 of the collected lake chub were read for age determination. Age frequency data are presented in Table 15 . Two-year-old lake chub were most abundant in the catch. Stomach content analysis from 18 lake chub are presented in Table 16. Data are presented for four fork length intervals.

LONGNOSE SUCKER: Nine longnose sucker were collected from Creek Mile 426.5 in 1976 . Length frequency data for these are presented in Table 17. All fish collected ( $n=9$ ) were determined to be $1^{+}$year old. The stomachs of all collected specimens were examined for content. Three were found to be empty and two contained unidentifiable remains. The most abundant food items were Diptera larvae (61.5\%), Trichoptera larvae (15.4\%), Ephemeroptera (8.7\%) and Coleoptera (8.7\%).

SLIMY SCULPIN: Five slimy sculpin were captured from Creek Mile 426.5 in 1976 and all were retained for analysis. Fork length ranged from 18 to 74 mm with a mean of 50.8 mm and weight ranged from 0.1 to 5.1 g with a mean of 2.2 g . Otolith ages of four specimens ranged from one to four years (Table 18).

Stomachs were removed from all specimens and analysed for content. The most abundant food items were Plecoptera (50.0\%) and Diptera (36.4\%). Epheneroptera and Trichoptera were found less frequently.

NORTHERN REDBELLY DACE: Four northern redbelly dace were collected from Creek Mile 426.5 in 1976. Fork length ranged from 33 to 62 mm with a mean of 45.3 mm and weight ranged from 0.5 to 3.3 g witil a mean of 1.5 g . 0tolith ages ranged from one to $t: 0$ years (Table 18). Stomachs were examined and all were found to be empty.

BURBOT: Three burbot were captured from Creek Mile 426.5 in 1976. Fork length ranged from 119 to 134 mm with a mean of 125.0 mm and weight ranged from 11 to 17 g with a mean of 13.3 g (Table 18). Stomach contents included one frog, one lake chub, the remains of one unidentified fish, five plecoptera nymphs and one Ephemeroptera.

ARCTIC GRAYLING: One young-of-the-year Arctic grayling with a fork length of 56 mm and a weight of 2.2 g was taken from Location 9 on August 7, 1976. The stomach was found to be empty.

LAKE WHITEFISH: One young-of-the-year lake whitefish with a fork length of 38 mm and a weight of 0.4 g was taken from loc. 9 on July $18,1976$. The stomach contained two Chironomidae larvae and one Ephemeroptera nymph.

MOUNTAIN WHITEFISH: One young-of-the-year mountain whitefish with a fork length of 28 mm and a weight of 0.2 g was collected from Location 9 on July 18, 1976. The stomach contained five Chironomid larvae and unidentifiable insect remains.

## Smith Creek

Benthos: The results of Surber samples taken in Smith Creek during 1976 are presented in Fig. 23 as percent composition by each of the major invertebrate taxa (ie. a major taxon occured as $1 \%$ or more of total abundance). Mean numbers $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ increased steadily over the period of study.

Analyses of variance revealed that overall numbers of all major taxa of invertebrates except Copepoda, Simulidae, and other Diptera were significantly different by location (Table 19). Date produced a significant effect in all but one major taxa (Copepoda). The number of organisms $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ tended to increase in an upstream direction in Smith Creek and also through time. Simulidae are the major exception to this general rule and results here are inconclusive.

Comparisons of location means were performed on all major taxa of invertebrates regardless of whether location showed a significant effect in the analysis of variance. In all groups there were no significant differences between the mean number of invertebrates $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ collected from loc. 5 and 6 . Six groups namely Chironomidae, Ephemeroptera, Hydracarina, Nematoda, Trichoptera and Total showed a significant difference in abundance between loc. 7 and loc. 8. All taxonomic groups with the exception of Copepoda and Simuliidae showed a significant difference in abundance between the pooled mean of locations upstream of the proposed highway crossing versus the pooled mean of downstream locations.

The greater numbers of organisms at upstream locations relative to those at downstream locations is probably due in large measure to groundwater recharge in the vicinity of loc. 8. Water temperatures were generally warmer in this area than in reaches further downstream.

## Fish:

ARCTIC GRAYLING:
Trap and fence: A total of 143 Arctic grayling were recorded migrating upstream at the fence location of Smith Creek in 1976 (Fig. 24). Ninetysix percent of these migrated during a span of 22 days from the time of fence installation to flooding of the stream which washed out the weir on May 29. Of the Arctic grayling captured in the upstream trap, a total of 115 were subsequently released and 28 were dead sampled. of the grayling released, 94 were fin-clipped and nine tagged.

Breakdown of the upstream migration by fork length and age is given in Fig. 25. The migration was dominated numerically throughout by three-yearold fish. No major temporal segmentation of the Arctic grayling migration according to fork length is apparent.

Growth data for upstream migrants are presented in Table 20. The length weight relationship for 140 Arctic grayling is expressed by the linear regression
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.5466+2.8183 \log ($ fork length $)$. C.I. $=2.5991-3.0375$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$.
Dead sample anaiysis of 28 upstream migrants ( 17 female and 11 male) indicated that the age of first gonadal maturity was age 3 for males and age 4 for females (except for one female age 3). This agrees with results from external analysis of live specimens from which sex products could be expelled during trap checks.

The fence operation appeared to be successful in capturing Arctic grayling over approximately 200 mm in fork length. The migration of small grayling upstream may occur but was not detected.

The downstream migration of Arctic grayling in Smith Creek began on June 4 and continued until July 8 although there were few downstream migrants after June 22. A total of 144 Arctic grayling were captured migrating downstream. of these, there were 46 finclip recaptures recorded and six tag recaptures.

The fork length and age composition of the downstream migrating fish differed little from the upstream migration. This suggests that grayling which may have migrated upstream while the trap was not in operation did not represent any particular segment of the population.

Analysis of the downstream migration by fork length and age over time is given in Fig. 26. As was the case with the upstream migration no temporal trends according to fork length or age are apparent.

Growth data for downstream migrants are presented in Table 20. The length-weight relationship for 135 downstream migrants is expressed by the equation
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.9699+2.9966 \log ($ fork length $)$
C.I. $=2.7996-3.1936$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of b .
Stomach content analysis for upstream and downstream migrants combined is presented in Table 21. By far the largest constituent of the diet for migrating Arctic grayling was comprised of Amphipoda.

An analysis of tag and recapture data revealed that $50.5 \%$ of those tagged and fin clipped moving upstream were subsequently recaptured in the downstream trap. An analysis of the number of days spent upstream is presented in Fig. 27 for these recaptures.

General:
Fork length > 100 mm : A total of ten Arctic grayling with a fork length greater than 100 mm were captured from various locations including established sampling locations on Smith Creek in 1976. All were caught by means of gillnets.

Six specimens were subsequently dead sampled and of these four stomachs were analysed for content (Table 25).

Fork length < 100 mm : A total of 94 juvenile Arctic grayling were captured by means of
seine nets and fry traps set at sampling locations on Smith Creek. Of these 44 were retained for analysis. The length-weight relationship for 44 juvenile Arctic grayling is expressed by the equation
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.8627+2.9741 \log$ (fork length)
C.I. $=2.8052-3.1430$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$.
Length frequency data is presented in Table
22. Age was determined for 43 of the specimens collected. The otoliths from 35 of these were removed and inspected for annuli then cross-checked by scale reading. 0toliths from eight specimens were not obtained and for these scale ages only were determined. A summary of growth in length and weight by age for small Arctic grayling 100 mm fork length) is provided in Table 23. A more detailed summary of growth for young-of-the year grayling in 1976 is provided in Table 24.

Stomach content analysis was performed on all small fish sampled (Table 25). The fish were assigned into four length classes prior to analysis. The most abundant food items were Dipterans which comprised over $52 \%$ of all organisms identified. There were no empty stomachs.

## NORTHERN PIKE:

Trap and fence: A total of 92 northern pike were recorded migrating upstream at the fence location on Smith Creek in 1976 (Fig. 24). Eighty-nine percent of these migrated during a span of 20 days beginning as soon as the fence was operational on May 6. For two days prior to the wash-out of the fence on May 29 there were no upstream migrants. A total of 76 individuals were tagged and subsequently released upstream, 13 were dead sampled and one was counted only and released.

An analysis of the upstream migration according to fork length and age is provided in Fig. 28. Males were generally smaller than females for a given age and migrated earlier. The migration was dominated numerically throughout by three-year-old fish.

Growth data for upstream migrants are presented in Table 26 . The length-weight relationship for 87 northern pike is expressed by the linear regression
$\log$ (weight) $=-5.3711+3.0746 \log$ (fork length) C.I. $=2.8793-3.2699$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of b .
Gonadal maturity of upstream migrants was determined by expression of sex products. This was found to be an effective technique when used on migrating pike, the majority of which were close to spawning at the time of capture. Gonadal maturity and sex were determined for 77 specimens overall including dead samples. The age of first gonadal maturity was determined to be age 2 for males and age 3 for females.

[^0]first downstream migrant was recorded on June 11 and pike moved downstream through the trap system sporadically until July 17 . The traps were removed on this date but it is likely that the downstream novement of northern pike continued after this date. Of the 46 fish recorded, 36 were tag recaptures from the upstream trap.

A breakdown of the downstream migration according to fork length and age is presented in Fig. 29.

An analysis of tag and recapture data revealed that $47.4 \%$ of the northern pike tagged at the upstream trap were subsequently recaptured in the downstream trap. A graphic representation of the number of days spent upstream is presented in Fig. 30.

Growth data for downstream migrants are presented in Table 26. The length-weight relationship for 44 northern pike is expressed by the linear regression equation
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.8054+2.8610 \log$ (fork length)
C.I. $=2.4911-3.2309$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$.
General:
Fork length > 100 mm : A total of 17 pike were captured from Smith Creek by means of gillnets set periodically from July 10 to October 14, 1976. Sampling took place at all established sampling locations (i.e. loc. 5 through 8) and as well near the mouth of Smith Creek and upstream of loc. 8. Of the 17 individuals captured, 12 were recaptures from the spring tagging operation. Eleven specimens were dead sampled subsequent to capture; of these five had empty stomachs and six contained fish remains including lake chub and white sucker.

Fork Length < 100 mm : No pike with a fork length less than 100 min were captured from Smith Creek in 1976.

LONGNOSE SUCKER:
Trap and fence: A total of 23 longnose sucker were captured in the upstream trap at Smith Creek in 1976 (Fig. 24). The first migrant was captured on May 6 which was the first day of fence operation. The migration then continued until two days prior to the fence washout on May 29. No further upstream migrants were captured after the fence became operational again on June 3. Of the total captured, 12 were tagged and released, seven fin-clipped and released and four were dead sampled.

Twenty-seven longnose suckers were captured in the downstrean trap from May 10 to July 10. of these 10 were recapture tagged fish and two were recapture fin-clipped fish. Of the remainder seven were counted and released, 10 were tagged and two were dead sampled. Many of the fish captured in the downstream trap were still in a ripe condition and so it appears that the fish captured did not represent a post spawning downstream migration.

Age analysis was not performed on longnose suckers captured in the traps on Smith Creek. Length frequency data is summarized in Table 27 for both upstream and downstream migrants. Breakdown of the upstream and downstream migrations by fork
length is provided in Fig. 31. The length weight relationship for 21 upstream migrants is expressed by the equation
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.8531+2.9741 \log ($ fork length $)$
C.I. $=2.4092-3.5390$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of b
and for 25 downstream migrants by the equation
$\log ($ weight $)=-4.8627+2.9741 \log$ (fork length)

$$
\text { C.I. }=2.1382-3.8100
$$

where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of b .
The sex of 16 individuals caught in the upstream trap was determined by means of expression of sexual products at the time of capture. Nine of these were females and seven were males.

Stomach analysis was not performed on any longnose suckers captured.

General:
Fork length > 100 mm : No longnose suckers with a fork length greater than 100 mem were captured from Smith Creek by means other than the trap and fence operation.

Fork length < 100 mm : A total of 460 juvenile longnose suckers (i.e. fork length<100 mm) were captured from Smith Creek by means of seines, fry traps and electrofishing. Of these 87 were retained for analysis. The length-weight relationship for 69 juvenile longnose sucker is expressed by the equation
$\log ($ weight $)=-5.1006+3.1176 \log$ (fork length) C.I. $=2.9550-3.2802$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of b .
Length frequency data is presented in Table 28.

Stomach content analysis was performed on all small fish sampled (Table 29). The fish were assigned in four length classes prior to analysis. Chironomidae comprised by far the largest constituent of diet for all length classes.

BURBOT:
Trap and fence: Three burbot were captured in the upstream trap on Smith Creek (Fig. 24). One individual was tagged (fork length 300 mm , weight 125 g ), one was fin-clipped (fork length 297 mm , weight 150 g ) and one was dead sampled (fork length 292 mm , weight 100 g$)$. Analysis of the stomach contents of the latter specimen revealed an empty stomach. No burbot were captured in the downstream trap on Smith Creek.

General: Eight burbot were captured in various locations on Smith Creek throughout the summer by gillnets, fry traps and electrofishing.

Fork lengths ranged from 69 to 237 mm with a mean of 151 mm . Weight ranged from 2.1 to 101 g with a mean of 30.6 g . 0tolith ages ranged from 2 to 5 years (Table 30). Eight stomachs were examined for content, all contained food. Slimy sculpins accounted for $47.1 \%$ of identifiable food organisms while the remainder of the contents was comprised of lake chub ( $20.6 \%$ ), Plecoptera (14.7\%), longnose sucker ( $8.9 \%$ ), Ephemeroptera ( $5.9 \%$ ) and
chironomid larvae (2.9\%). Slimy sculpin occurred in three of the stomachs examined and lake chub occurred in four.

SLIMY SCULPIN: A total of 222 slimy sculpin were captured at various locations on Smith Creek in 1976. Of this total, 35 were retained for analysis. The length-weight relationship for 35 slimy sculpin from smith creek is expressed by the equation
$\log$ (weight) $=-4.8414+2.9466 \log$ (total length) C.I. $=2.7089-3.1845$
where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$.
Length frequency data is presented in Table
31. The modal fork length class was from 20 to 29 mm. Age analysis is based on otoliths read from 29 specimens. The numerically dominant age class was age $0+$ (Table 32).

Stomach content analyses were performed on all fish retained above (Table 33 ). The data are presented based on the division of the sample into three fork length categories. Diptera larvae comprised the most abundant food item for all three groups, however Ephemeroptera also occupied an important role in the diet of slimy sculpins with fork length from 51-75 min. Empty stomachs accounted for $14.3 \%$ of all stomachs examined.

LAKE WHITEFISH: A total of 165 lake whitefish were caught with 32 retained for detailed analyses. The length-weight relationship for 32 lake whitefish is described by the regression equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log (\text { weight }) & =-4.9589+3.0180 \log \text { (length) } \\
\text { C.I. } & =2.8793-3.1567
\end{aligned}
$$

where C.I. $=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$.
Length frequency data are presented in Table
34. The dominant class numerically is from 40 to 49.9 mm. Scales from 32 lake whitefish were read for age determination. Age frequency data are presented in Table 35 . The results of stomach content analyses are presented in Table 36 . Data are presented for three length intervals. Diptera were found to be the most abundant food item over all intervals. Empty stomachs accounted for $16.1 \%$ of all stomachs examined.

LAKE CHUB: A total of 64 lake chub were caught at Smith Creek in 1976; of these 34 were retained for analysis. The length-weight relationship for 34 lake chub is expressed by the linear regression
$\begin{aligned} \log (\text { weight }) & =-4.9935+3.0871 \log \text { (length) } \\ \text { C.I. } & =2.9355-3.2387 \\ \text { where C.I. } & =95 \% \text { confidence interval of } b .\end{aligned}$
Length frequency data are presented in Table 37. The modal fork length class is 40 to 49 mm . Otoliths from 29 lake chub were removed and read for age determination. Age frequency data are presented in Table 38. Stomach content analyses from 34 lake chub are presented in Table 39. Data are presented for three fork length intervals. Dipterans comprised 100 F of the diet of the two lake chub which had a fork length greater than 76 min.

LONGNOSE DACE: Thirteen longnose dace were captured fron various locations in Smith creek in
1976. Eight of these were retained for detailed analysis (Table 40). Fork length ranged from 24 to 117 mm with a mean of 45.8 mm . Weight ranged from 0.1 to 18.3 g with a mean of 4.3 g .

Ages of longnose dace were not determined. Eight stomachs were examined for content. Six were found to be empty. Simuliidae larvae accounted for $80 \%$ of the identifiable remains with Ephemeroptera, Trichoptera, Nematoda and Hymenoptera accounting for the remainder.

NORTHERN REDBELLY DACE: A total of five northern redbelly dace were taken from Smith Creek in 1976. Fork length ranged from 26 to 37 mm with a mean of 32.2 mm . Weight ranged from 0.2 to 0.7 g with a mean of 0.48 g . All specimens were found to be age $1+$.

Four of the five northern redbelly dace stomachs examined contained some food. Food items consisted exclusively of Chironomidae larvae ( $63.6 \%$ ) and Simuliidae larvae ( $36.4 \%$ ). One stomach was empty.

MOUNTAIN WHITEFISH: Three mountain whitefish were collected from Smith Creek in 1976.

The ages of two specimens were determined by otolith inspection. Both were one year old.

Stomachs were removed from all three specimens and analysed for content. Ephemeroptera and Simuliidae larvae comprised $50 \%$ and $44.2 \%$ respectively of the diet while Plecoptera, Chironomidae and miscellaneous other Diptera made up the remaining $5.8 \%$ of diet.

YELLOW WALLEYE: One yellow walleye (age 1+) with a fork length of 55 mm and a weight of 20 g was taken from Smith Creek near the mouth on August 17, 1976. The stomach contained the remains of one unidentifiable fish.

LEAST CISCO: One least cisco (age $1+$ ) with a fork length of 73 mm and a weight of 3.8 g was taken from Smith Creek on September 28, 1976. The stomach contained three adult Diptera, two Trichoptera, one Plecoptera and one Chironomidae pupa.

ROUND WHITEFISH: One round whitefish with a fork length of 52 mm and a weight of 1.3 g was taken from Smith Creek on August 17, 1976. The age of the specimen as determined by otolith inspection was age $1+$. Stomach contents consisted of four Chironomidae larvae and one Corixidae.

TROUT PERCH: One trout perch with a fork length of 24 man and a weight of 0.2 g was taken from Smith Creek on August 17, 1976. The specimen was determined to be age $1+$. The stomach contained a Trichoptera larva and four Chironomidae larvae.
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Fig. 1. Map of study area showing proposed Mackenzie highway route.


Fig. 2. Map of study area showing sampling locations.


Fig. 3. Creek Mile 422.7 hydroaraph, 1976.


Fig. 4. Creek Mile 426.5 hydrograph, 1976.


Fig. 5. Smith Creek hydrograph, 1976.


Fig. 6. Smith Creek hydrographs, 1973-1976.


Fig. 7. Stream bed profile for Creek Mile 422.7.


Fig. 8. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location l, Creek Mile 422.7.


Fig. 9. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 2, Creek Mile 422.7.


June 4-12:25h $\mathrm{Q}=0.15 \mathrm{~m}^{3 / \mathrm{s}}$ $\bar{V}=0.24 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$


June 24-12:40 h $\mathrm{Q}=0.05 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ $\bar{V}=0.12 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$

Fig. 10. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 3, Creek Mile 422.7.


Fig. 11. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 4, Creek Mile 422.7.


Fig. 12. Daily water temperature fluctuations for Creek Mile 422.7, Creek Mile 426.5 and Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 13. Stream bed profile for Creek Mile 426.5.

June 2-11:15 h $\mathrm{Q}=0.29 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ $\bar{V}=0.42 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$


June 30-09:25h $\mathrm{Q}=0.07 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ $\nabla=0.16 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$

Fig. 14. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 9, Creek Mile 426.5.


Fig. 15. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 10 , Creek Mile 426.5.


Fig. 16. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 11, Creek Mile 426.5.


Fig. 17. Stream bed profile for Smith Creek.


Fig. 18. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 5, Smith Creek.


May 2-17:10 h $\mathrm{Q}=5.32 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ $\bar{\nabla}=1.09 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$

May $31-11: 15 \mathrm{~h}$ $\mathrm{Q}=3.07 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ $\overline{\mathrm{V}}=0.82 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$

June 28-1I:00h $\mathrm{Q}=0.23 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ $\bar{V}=0.21 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$

Fig. 19. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 6, Smith Creek.


Fig. 20. Stream velocity cross-section profiles for Location 7, Smith Creek.



Fig. 22. Standing crops (number $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ ) and percent occurrence of major taxa of invertebrates in Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.


Fig. 23. Standing crops (number $\mathrm{m}^{-2}$ ) and percent occurrence of major taxa of invertebrates in Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 24. Summary of fish movement past the counting fence on Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 25. Temporal lenath and ane frequency summary for upstream migrating Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 26. Temporal length and age frequency summary for downstream migratina Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 27. Summary of time spent above counting fence for Arctic grayling tagged in upstream trap and subsequently recaptured in the downstream trap (one day recaptures not included).


Fig. 28. Temporal length and age frequency summary for upstream migrating northern pike from Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 29. Temporal length and aqe frequency summary for downstream migrating northern pike from Smith Creek, 1976.


Fig. 30. Summary of time spent above counting fence for northern pike tagged in upstream trap and subsequently recaptured in the downstream trap (one day recaptures not included).


Fig. 31. Temporal length frequency summary for upstream and downstream miaratina longnose sucker from Smith Creek, 1976.

Table 1. Field Water Chemistry Data for Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | April 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | June 23 | July 6 | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| pH | 1 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.8* | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 2 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.4* | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.4* | 85 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 4 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.7* | 8.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
| $0_{2}(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ | 1 | 14.0 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 8.5 | 10.6 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 10.9 | 13.6 |
|  | 2 | 12.0 | 10.8 | 10.8 | 9.6 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 10.4 | 11.2 | 10.8 | 11.2 | 13.4 |
|  | 3 | 12.0 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 12.8 |
|  | 4 | 12.0 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 10.4 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 12.8 |
| Conductivity ( $\mu \mathrm{mho} / \mathrm{cm}$ ) | 1 | 50 | 119 | 150 | 200 | 250 | 269 | 330 | 320 | 280 | 265 | 300 | 260 | 200 |
|  | 2 | 51 | 115 | 149 | 198 | 280 | 269 | 275 | 295 | 256 | 265 | 213 | 248 | 210 |
|  | 3 | 51 | 115 | 149 | 198 | 240 | 260 | 262 | 290 | 269 | 262 | 235 | 248 | 210 |
|  | 4 | 51 | 115 | 143 | 197 | 250 | 260 | 260 | 285 | 251 | 262 | 238 | 250 | 210 |
| Temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 1 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 14.5 | 15.0 | 10.2 | 9.1 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 2 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 7.3 | 9.5 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 9.2 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 |
|  | 3 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 7.3 | 9.5 | 10.5 | 11.8 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 8.9 | 7.9 | 5.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 |
|  | 4 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 7.3 | 10.2 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 8.9 | 7.9 | 5.0 | 6.8 | 0.0 |

NA - no analysis.

* pH determination by Fisher Accumet 150 pH meter.

Table 2. Summary of Analysis of Variance and Comparison of Location Means For Water Chemistry Analyses, Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.
Analysis of Variance
Effect of Location

Table 3. Field Water Chemistry Data for Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | April 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | June 23 | July 6 | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| pH | 9 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 10 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.2* | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 11 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.2* | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | NA | NA | NA |
| $\mathrm{O}_{2}(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ | 9 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 10.8 | 11.3 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 13.6 |
|  | 10 | 13.0 | 11.2 | 9.7 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 9.8 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 9.7 | NA |
|  | 11 | 12.0 | 11.2 | 9.4 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 8.2 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 9.4 | 9.4 | NA |
| Conductivity ( $\mu \mathrm{mho} / \mathrm{cm}$ ) | 9 | 90 | 180 | 220 | 253 | 350 | 452 | 460 | 490 | 500 | 470 | 460 | 520 | 420 |
|  | 10 | 70 | 92 | 130 | 153 | 180 | 190 | 210 | 225 | 230 | 225 | 200 | 220 | NA |
|  | 11 | 70 | 92 | 130 | 153 | 180 | 188 | 195 | 225 | 192 | 215 | 200 | 215 | NA |
| Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 9 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 10.8 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 1.0 |
|  | 10 | 1.5 | 7.0 | 12.3 | 14.7 | 15.0 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 12.5 | 9.5 | 8.0 | 5.2 | 6.8 | NA |
|  | 11 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 12.8 | 15.0 | 15.5 | 11.5 | 10.1 | 11.5 | 9.2 | 7.8 | 5.0 | 6.5 | NA |

NA - no analysis.

* pH determination by Fisher Accumet 150 pH meter.

Table 4. Summary of Analysis of Variance and Comparison of Location Means for Water Chemistry Analyses, Creek Mile 426.5 , 1976.

| Analysis of Variance Effect of Location |  |  | Comparison of Location Means Locations Compared |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | F Value (df) | Significant Effect | Location 9 <br> t Value (df) | to 10 Significant Difference | Locations 9 <br> t value (df) | \& 10 to 11 Significant Difference |
| Suspended N | $1.28(2,16)$ | No | 1.60 (16) | No | 0.06 (16) | No |
| Total Dissolved N | 13.55 (2, 18) | Yes | 4.52 (18) | Yes | 2.58 (18) | Yes |
| Suspended P | 2.85 (2, 18) | No | 2.05 (18) | No | 1.22 (18) | No |
| Total Dissolved P | $0.61(2,18)$ | No | 0.91 (18) | No | 0.62 (18) | No |
| Suspended C | $2.44(2,18)$ | No | 1.91 (18) | No | 1.11 (18) | No |
| Si | $40.18(2,18)$ | Yes | 7.71 (18) | Yes | 4.57 (18) | Yes |
| Cl | $22.08(2,18)$ | Yes | 5.74 (18) | Yes | 3.35 (18) | Yes |
| $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ | $25.30(2,18)$ | Yes | 6.13 (18) | Yes | 3.61 (18) | Yes |
| Total Suspended Solids | 3.11 (2, 18) | No | 2.14 (18) | Yes | 1.28 (18) | No |
| Total Dissolved Solids | 34.80 (2, 18) | Yes | 6.88 (18) | Yes | 4.72 (18) | Yes |
| Na | $25.20(2,18)$ | Yes | 6.12 (18) | Yes | 3.59 (18) | Yes |
| K | 38.69 (2, 18) | Yes | 7.58 (18) | Yes | 4.45 (18) | Yes |
| Ca | 31.14 (2, 18) | Yes | 6.82 (18) | Yes | 3.98 (18) | Yes |
| Mg | $33.94(2,18)$ | Yes | 7.01 (18) | Yes | 4.34 (18) | Yes |

Table 5. Field Water Chemistry Data for Smith Creek, 1976.

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | April 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | June 23 | July 7 | July 21 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 10 |
| pH | 5 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.0 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 6 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 7 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
|  | 8 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | NA | NA | NA |
| $0_{2}(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L})$ | 5 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 11.5 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 8.6 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 10.7 | 13.3 |
|  | 6 | 14.0 | 13.2 | 11.0 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 10.2 | 8.0 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 12.9 |
|  | 7 | 14.0 | 12.9 | 11.9 | 9.5 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 11.1 | 8.2 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 12.4 |
|  | 8 | 13.0 | 12.8 | 11.3 | 9.7 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 7.6 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 12.7 |
|  | *Spring | NA | NA | NA | NA | 8.3 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Conductivity (umho/cm) | 5 | 71 | 180 | 178 | 325 | 580 | 680 | 850 | 1100 | 870 | 900 | 950 | 690 | 780 |
|  | 6 | 71 | 180 | 180 | 325 | 550 | 680 | 850 | 1100 | 840 | 900 | 920 | 980 | 750 |
|  | 7 | 61 | 170 | 175 | 310 | 550 | 650 | 810 | 1100 | 810 | 870 | 890 | 900 | 700 |
|  | 8 | 61 | 145 | 165 | 263 | 500 | 590 | 710 | 860 | 690 | 640 | 720 | 760 | 610 |
|  | *Spring | NA | NA | NA | NA | 800 | 3420 | 3200 | NA | 3610 | 3150 | 3320 | 3300 | 2375 |
| Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  |  | 4.5 |  | 10.3 | 14.5 | 13.0 | 12.5 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 11.7 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 2.0 |
|  | 6 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 14.0 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 16.0 | 13.0 | 11.9 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 2.0 |
|  | 7 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 16.5 | 13.0 | 9.9 | 15.5 | 12.8 | 11.5 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 2.0 |
|  | 8 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 10.6 | 16.5 | 13.0 | 11.5 | 15.0 | 12.5 | 11.2 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 2.0 |
|  | *Spring | NA | NA | NA | NA | 16.5 | NA | NA | NA | 14.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 14.5 | 7.5 |

*Spring - Groundwater inflow between Loc. 7 and Loc. 8.
NA - no analysis.
**pH determination by Fisher Accumet pH meter.

Table 6. Summary of Analysis of Variance and Comparison of Location Means For Water Chemistry Analyses, Smith Creek, 1976.

| Analysis of Variance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Effect of Location |

Table 7. Summary of Analysis of Variance and Comparison of Location Means for Benthic Invertebrates, Creek Mile 422.7 1976.

| Benthic Group |  | Analysis of Variance |  |  | Comparison of Location Means |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sour } \\ \text { Location }(3.80) \end{array}$ | ce of Variati <br> Date ( 3,80 ) | on (df) <br> Interaction $(9,80)$ |  | Location 1-2(80) | Locations Compared Location 3-4(80) | (df) <br> Location | 182 and | $384(80$ |
| Chironomidae | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{array}{r} 8.29 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.99 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.99 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | t Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{cc}  & 0.49 \\ \text { e? } & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.36 \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4.95 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ |  |
| Copepoda | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{array}{r} 10.30 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.88 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.25 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $t$ Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{rr}  & 5.08 \\ ? & \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.77 \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.08 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Simuliidae | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{gathered} 1.65 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.87 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.98 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | t value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{lr}  & 2.07 \\ ? & \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.81 \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Other Diptera | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{array}{r} 7.64 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.93 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ \text { NO } \end{gathered}$ | t Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 1.12 \\ \mathrm{e} ? & \mathrm{No} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.98 \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3.76 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ |  |
| Ephemeroptera | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{gathered} 1.19 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.79 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.12 \\ \text { Yes } \end{gathered}$ | $t$ Value Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 0.26 \\ \text { ? } & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.79 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.54 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Acarina | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{gathered} 2.46 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.17 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.61 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $t$ Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{cc}  & 0.24 \\ \text { ? } & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.85 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.98 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\infty}$ |
| Ostracoda | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{gathered} 1.08 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.27 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.83 \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $t$ Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{ll} 1.78 \\ \text { ? } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Plecoptera | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{array}{r} 9.74 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 23.74 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.79 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $t$ Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{ll} 1.13 \\ ? & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.08 \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 4.19 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ |  |
| Trichoptera | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{array}{r} 10.26 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.35 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.32 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | t Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{cc} 0.51 \\ ? & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.32 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5.01 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ |  |
| Other | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{gathered} 1.10 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.17 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.88 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | $t$ Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 0.12 \\ ? & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.70 \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.67 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Total | F. Value Sig. Effect? | $\begin{gathered} 8.92 \\ \text { Yes } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 13.05 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.17 \\ \text { Yes } \end{array}$ | $t$ Value <br> Sig. Difference? | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 0.44 \\ ? & \text { No } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.78 \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.10 \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ |  |

[^1]Table 8. Summary of length-weight data for slimy sculpin from Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Total Length Interval | N | Total Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 0-9.9 | 7 | 9.3* | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10-19.9 | 6 | 10.7 | 0.52 | 0.21 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| 20-29.9 | 9 | 25.8 | 3.67 | 1.22 | 0.23 | 0.11 | 0.04 |
| 30-39.9 | 17 | 32.9 | 2.59 | 0.63 | 0.38 | 0.12 | 0.03 |
| 40-49.9 | 13 | 43.3 | 2.69 | 0.75 | 0.90 | 0.24 | 0.07 |
| 50-59.9 | 16 | 53.9 | 2.59 | 0.65 | 1.83 | 0.33 | 0.08 |
| 60-69.9 | 6 | 63.8 | 2.48 | 1.01 | 3.11 | 0.44 | 0.18 |
| 70-79.9 | 10 | 73.3 | 3.34 | 1.05 | 5.01 | 0.96 | 0.30 |
| 80-89.9 | 5 | 81.4 | 1.67 | 0.75 | 6.78 | 1.26 | 0.56 |
| 90-99.9 | 1 | 98.0 | - | - | 9.20 | - | - |

* Total fork length of 7 individuals measured together $=65 \mathrm{~mm}$

Table 9 . Summary of length and weight by age for slimy sculpin from Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Otolith Age | $N$ | Total Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 0 | 6 | 10.7 | 0.52 | 10-11 | 0.02 | 0.02 | . $01-.06$ |
| 1 | 7 | 29.3 | 2.29 | 27-33 | 0.34 | 0.10 | 0.2-0.5 |
| 2 | 5 | 41.0 | 1.87 | 38-43 | 0.82 | 0.19 | 0.6-1.1 |
| 3 | 11 | 54.5 | 3.78 | 49-62 | 1.87 | 0.45 | 1.3-2.7 |
| 4 | 8 | 69.3 | 3.62 | 64-74 | 4.21 | 0.77 | 3.0-5.2 |
| 5 | 5 | 79.4 | 4.98 | 71-82 | 6.62 | 1.41 | 5.3-8.8 |
| 6 | 2 | 77.5 | 2.12 | 76-79 | 6.20 | 0.14 | 6.1-6.3 |

Table 10. Food items as percent by number, of diet in slimy sculpin from Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 3 | 38 | 28 | 8 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 1 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| Mean number of organisms/stomach | 1.7 | 2.9 | 9.8 | 1.8 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |  |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |  |
| Araneida | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 |
| Acarina | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Insecta |  |  |  |  |
| Diptera |  |  |  |  |
| Larvae |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 0 | 18.0 | 18.9 | 14.3 |
| Simuliidae | 0 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 0 |
| 0ther | 20.0 | 18.9 | 9.5 | 7.1 |
| Plecoptera | 20.0 | 5.4 | 13.5 | 14.3 |
| Ephemeroptera | 40.0 | 34.2 | 21.6 | 14.3 |
| Trichoptera | 0 | 4.5 | 17.6 | 7.1 |
| Collembola | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 |
| Crustacea |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 20.0 | 11.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Nematoda | 0 | 0.1 | 5.4 | 0 |
| Fish Remains | 0 | 0.1 | 8.1 | 35.7 |

Table 11. Summary of length-weight data for lake chub from Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

|  |  | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval | N | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 20-29.9 | 12 | 27.4 | 1.08 | 0.31 | 0.28 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| 30-39.9 | 3 | 32.0 | 1.73 | 1.00 | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.06 |
| 40-49.9 | 2 | 48.0 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.14 | 0.10 |
| 50-59.9 | 1 | 50.0 | - | - | 1.20 | - | - |

Table 12. Summary of length and weight by age for lake chub from Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Otolith Age | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 0 | 10 | 27.7 | 1.34 | 27-30 | 0.29 | 0.06 | 0.2-0.4 |
| 1 | 2 | 48.0 | 1.41 | 47-49 | 1.00 | 0.14 | 0.9-1.1 |

Table 13. Compendium of fork length, weight and age data for arctic grayling captured from Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Age | Fork Length $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Weight $(\mathrm{g})$ | Sex and Maturity |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 150 | 43.2 | - |
| 2 | 166 | - | maturing male |
| 2 | 168 | - | maturing female |
| 3 | 212 | 100.0 | ripe male |
| 4 | 222 | 119.3 | maturing male |

Table 14. Summary of length-weight data for lake chub from Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

| Fork Length Interva 1 | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 20-29.9 | 1 | 27.0 | - | - | 0.30 | - | - |
| $30-39.9$ | 2 | 37.0 | 1.41 | 1.00 | 0.55 | 0.21 | 0.15 |
| 40-49.9 | 3 | 45.7 | 1.53 | 0.88 | 1.20 | 0.10 | 0.06 |
| $50-59.9$ | 3 | 54.3 | 2.89 | 1.67 | 2.20 | 0.36 | 0.21 |
| $60-69.9$ | 3 | 63.0 | 1.73 | 1.00 | 3.10 | 0.10 | 0.06 |
| $70-79.9$ | 2 | 74.0 | 2.83 | 2.00 | 4.95 | 0.07 | 0.05 |
| $80-89.9$ | 2 | 84.0 | 5.66 | 4.00 | 6.50 | 1.27 | 0.90 |
| $90-99.9$ | 1 | 97.0 | - | - | 8.70 | - | - |
| 100-109.9 | 1 | 102.0 | - | - | 10.60 | - | - |

Table 15. Summary of length and weight by age for lake chub from Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

| 0tolith Age | N | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 1 | 2 | 51.0 | 7.07 | 46-56 | 1.60 | 0.71 | 1.1-2.1 |
| 2 | 6 | 58.3 | 8.96 | 47-72 | 2.80 | 1.24 | 1.3-4.9 |
| 3 | 2 | 78.0 | 2.83 | 76-80 | 5.30 | 0.42 | 5.0-5.6 |
| 4 | 1 | 102.0 | - | - | 10.60 | - | - |

Table 16. Food items as percent by number, of diet in lake chub from Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 | 100+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 6 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Mean number of organisms/stomach | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |  |
| Insecta |  |  |  |  |
| Diptera |  |  |  |  |
| Adult | 14.3 | 12.5 | 0 |  |
| Larvae |  |  |  |  |
| Simuliidae | 42.9 | 12.5 | 0 |  |
| Other | 0 | 12.5 | 0 |  |
| Plecoptera |  |  | 25.0 |  |
| Ephemeroptera | 7.1 | 25.0 |  |  |
| Trichoptera | 7.1 | 37.5 | 50.0 |  |
| Coleoptera | 7.1 | 0 | 25.0 |  |
| Crustacea |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 14.3 |  | 0 |  |
| Nematoda | 7.1 |  | 0 |  |

Table 17. Summary of length-weight data for longnose sucker from Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 30-39.9 | 2 | 38.5 | 0.71 | 0.50 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 40-49.9 | 1 | 46.0 | - | - | 1.20 | - | - |
| 50-59.9 | 3 | 54.3 | 4.04 | 2.33 | 1.87 | 0.59 | 0.34 |
| 60-69.9 | 1 | 65.0 | - | - | 3.90 | - | - |
| 70-79.9 | 2 | 72.5 | 0.71 | 0.50 | 4.25 | 0.21 | 0.15 |

Table 18. Compendium of age, fork length, and weight data for slimy sculpin, northern redbelly dace and burbot captured from Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

|  | Otolith <br> Age | Fork Length <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Weight <br> $(\mathrm{g})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Slimy Sculpin | 1 | 41 | 0.7 |
|  | 3 | 56 | 2.0 |
| Northern Redbelly Dace | 4 | 65 | 3.2 |
|  | 4 | 74 | 5.1 |
|  |  | 33 | 0.5 |
| Burbot | 1 | 48 | 1.4 |
|  | 2 | 62 | 3.3 |
|  | 2 | 38 | 0.9 |
|  | N.D. | 119 | 11.0 |
|  | 1 | 122 | 11.6 |
|  | 2 | 134 | 17.3 |

N.D. - Not determined.

Table 19. Summary of Analysis of Variance and Comparison of Location Means for Benthic Invertebrates, Smith Creek 1976.

*Sig. Effect and Sig. Difference Calculated at $95 \%$ confidence level.

Table 20. Summary of length and weight for migrant Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Age | $N$ | Upstream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | Downstream |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fork Length (mm) |  |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  |  | Fork Length (mm) |  |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Range | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Range | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |  | Kange | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Range | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 186-194 | 190.0 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 50-100 | 75.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |  |
| 3 | 10 | 198-238 | 220.0 | 13.2 | 4.2 | 100-150 | 120.0 | 25.8 | 8.2 | 7 | 185-231 | 210.4 | 15.7 | 5.9 | 50-125 | 100.0 | 25.0 | 9.4 |  |
| 4 | 2 | 274-276 | 275.0 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 150-250 | 200.0 | 70.7 | 50.0 | 4 | 223-291 | 248.5 | 29.7 | 14.9 | 100-250 | 165.0 | 62.5 | 31.2 |  |
| 5 | 3 | 258-336 | 296.7 | 39.0 | 22.5 | 155-300 | 251.7 | 83.7 | 48.3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 3 | 315-344 | 326.3 | 15.6 | 8.9 | 350-400 | 366.7 | 28.9 | 16.7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | - | 170.0 | - | - | - | 50.0 | - | - | 2 | 172-180 | 176.0 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 50-90 | 70.0 | 28.3 | 20.0 |  |
| 3 | 9 | 189-265 | 211.4 | 22.5 | 7.5 | 50-150 | 91.7 | 30.6 | 10.2 | 5 | 184-226 | 206.4 | 18.2 | 8.2 | 50-100 | 90.0 | 22.4 | 10.0 |  |
| 4 | 2 | 261-272 | 266.5 | 7.8 | 5.5 | - | 200.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1 | - | 282.0 | - | - | - | 220.0 | - | . |  |
| 5 | 4 | 239-281 | 266.8 | 19.6 | 9.8 | 150-250 | 212.5 | 47.9 | 23.9 | 2 | 208-323 | 265.5 | 81.3 | 57.5 | 100-400 | 250.0 | 212.1 | 150.0 | $\cdots$ |
| 6 | 3 | 278-294 | 285.0 | 8.2 | 4.7 |  | 250.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 1 | - | 340.0 |  | . | - | 650.0 | . | . | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 1 | - | 305.0 | - | - | - | 300.0 | - | - | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 6 | 170-222 | 189.3 | 19.1 | 7.8 | 50-150 | 80.8 | 40.1 | 16.4 | 15 | 172-226 | 189.3 | 13.4 | 3.5 | 50-150 | 77.7 | 27.7 | 7.2 |  |
| 3 | 74 | 184-280 | 218.1 | 19.7 | 2.3 | 50-210 | 114.5 | 33.2 | 3.9 | 62 | 180-284 | 226.8 | 22.7 | 2.9 | 30-250 | 126.4 | 44.7 | 5.7 |  |
| 4 | 31 | 188-290 | 242.7 | 24.6 | 4.4 | 95-300 | 154.1 | 52.3 | 9.4 | 20 | 196-327 | 256.3 | 28.2 | 6.3 | 50-330 | 189.8 | 64.4 | 14.4 |  |
| 5 | 15 | 236-336 | 273.9 | 24.7 | 6.4 | 150-300 | 207.0 | 55.0 | 14.2 | 13 | 208-336 | 286.2 | 37.2 | 10.3 | 100-400 | 256.2 | 87.8 | 24.3 |  |
| 6 | 7 | 278-344 | 303.1 | 24.0 | 9.1 | 250-400 | 300.0 | 64.5 | 24.4 | 2 | 208 | 292.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 225-275 | 250.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |  |
| 7 | 2 | 340-349 | 344.5 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 450-650 | 550.0 | 141.4 | 100.0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 1 | - 34 | 305.0 | . | 4 | - 650 | 300.0 | 11.4 | 100.0 | 2 | 303-307 | 305.0 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 250-300 | 275.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |  |

Table 21. Food items as percent by number, of diet in migrant Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 171-255 | 256-340 | 171-340 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 32 | 12 | 44 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean number of organisms/ stomach | 32.6 | 62.1 | 40.6 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |
| Araneida | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Insecta |  |  |  |
| Hymenoptera |  |  |  |
| Formicidae | 2.2 | 10.1 | 5.5 |
| Other | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.8 |
| Diptera |  |  |  |
| Adult | 0 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Larvae |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 0.4 | 0 | 0.2 |
| Other | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Hemiptera |  |  |  |
| Corixidae | 3.4 | 0.5 | 2.2 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| Plecoptera | 0.8 | 3.8 | 2.0 |
| Ephemeroptera | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.3 |
| Trichoptera | 13.1 | 23.6 | 17.5 |
| Coleoptera | 13.4 | 6.9 | 3.6 |
| Odonata | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Crustacea |  |  |  |
| Amphipoda | 75.8 | 50.6 | 65.3 |
| Nematoda | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Nematomorpha | 0 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Fish Remains | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Table 22. Summary of length-weight data for juvenile Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | $N$ | Fork Length |  |  | Weight |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 20-29.9 | 9 | 27.2 | 1.64 | 0.55 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| 30-39.9 | 11 | 35.5 | 2.58 | 0.78 | 0.58 | 0.16 | 0.05 |
| 40-49.9 | 7 | 44.6 | 2.94 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 0.24 | 0.09 |
| 50-59.9 | 5 | 54.0 | 3.24 | 1.45 | 2.02 | 0.35 | 0.16 |
| 60-69.9 | 4 | 67.0 | 1.41 | 0.71 | 4.00 | 0.22 | 0.11 |
| 70-79.9 | 5 | 73.4 | 2.07 | 0.93 | 5.04 | 0.70 | 0.31 |
| 80-89.9 | 1 | 82.0 | - | - | 5.50 | - | - |
| 90-99.9 | 2 | 94.5 | 2.12 | 1.50 | 10.35 | 0.07 | 0.05 |

Table 23. Summary of length and weight by age for juvenile Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Age | N | Fork Length |  |  | Weight |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 0 | 39 | 43.8 | 15.34 | 24-75 | 1.5 | 1.60 | 0.1-6.2 |
| 1 | 2 | 71.5 | 2.12 | 70-73 | 4.7 | 0.50 | 4.3-5.0 |
| 2 | 2 | 94.5 | 2.12 | 93-96 | 10.4 | 0.07 | 10.3-10.4 |

Table 24. Summary of young-of-the year Arctic grayling from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Date | $N$ | Fork Length |  |  | Weight |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| June 29 | 3 | 25.3 | 1.15 | 24-26 | 0.2 | 0.00 | - |
| July 4 | 5 | 28.8 | 0.84 | 28-30 | 0.2 | 0.04 | 0.1-0.2 |
| July 6 | 4 | 33.8 | 8.30 | 27-45 | 0.5 | 0.42 | 0.2-1.1 |
| July 11 | 2 | 48.0 | 0.00 | - | 1.4 | 0.00 | - |
| July 12 | 5 | 39.4 | 7.86 | 33-52 | 1.0 | 0.70 | 0.5-2.2 |
| July 14 | 7 | 37.7 | 1.98 | 35-41 | 0.7 | 0.11 | 0.5-0.8 |
| Aug. 17 | 11 | 59.5 | 11.11 | 42-75 | 3.0 | 1.68 | 0.9-6.2 |
| Sept. 28 | 1 | 75.0 | - | - | 4.8 | - | - |
| Dec. 9 | 1 | 68.0 | - | - | 4.3 | - | - |

Table 25. Food items as percent by number, of diet in Arctic grayling collected from sampling locations on Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 | 0-100 | 158-263 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of empty stomachs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean number of organisms/stomach | 12.0 | 15.1 | 12.4 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 49.8 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Araneida | 0 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 |
| Acarina | 0 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 | 1.0 |
| Insecta |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hymenoptera |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Formicidae | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.1 |
| Other | 0 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0 | 1.0 | 7.5 |
| Diptera |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adult | 0 | 10.9 | 37.6 | 0 | 16.2 | 1.5 |
| Larvae |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 50.0 | 29.8 | 16.8 | 0 | 25.0 | 1.0 |
| Simuliidae | 41.7 | 7.3 | 0 | 0 | 5.7 | 1.5 |
| Other | 0 | 7.6 | 0.7 | 0 | 5.2 | 0 |
| Hemiptera | 0 | 0.7 | 6.7 | 0 | 2.1 | 7.5 |
| Colembola | 0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.6 | 0 |
| Plecoptera | 0 | 0.7 | 4.7 | 8.9 | 2.2 | 0 |
| Ephemeroptera | 8.3 | 19.9 | 6.7 | 42.2 | 18.1 | 39.7 |
| Trichoptera | 0 | 15.1 | 19.5 | 20.0 | 16.2 | 13.6 |
| Coleoptera | 0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.3 | 6.0 |
| Crustacea |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amphipoda | 0 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 26.7 | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| Nema toda | 0 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0 |

Table 26. Summary of length and weight for migrant northern pike from Smith Creek, 1076.

| Age | N | Length (mm) Upst |  |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  | N | Length (mm) Downs |  |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Range | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Range | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |  | Range | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Range |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 3 | 322-371 | 239.7 | 27.2 | 15.7 | 250-350 | 283.3 | 57.7 | 33.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 29 | 326-491 | 414.6 | 38.7 | 7.2 | 250-800 | 482.5 | 142.5 | 26.5 | 11 | 407-505 | 442.0 | 31.7 | 9.5 | 390 | - 950 | 600.0 | 190.4 | 57.4 |
| 4 | 12 | 385-513 | 439.8 | 37.9 | 10.9 | 325-1000 | 598.8 | 180.4 | 52.1 | 7 | 438-531 | 469.0 | 37.9 | 14.3 | 610 | - 960 | 750.7 | 140.8 | 53.2 |
| 5 | 5 | 415-553 | 487.0 | 53.1 | 23.7 | 450-1250 | 816.0 | 306.6 | 137.1 | 3 | 464-537 | 506.7 | 38.0 | 21.9 | 725 | - 1000 | 841.7 | 142.2 | 82.1 |
| 6 | 1 | - | 430.0 | - | - | - | 550.0 | - | - | 1 | - | 436.0 | - | - |  | - | 650.0 | - | - |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | - | 332.0 | - | - | - | 250.0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 14 | 361-507 | 441.3 | 49.0 | 13.1 | 200-850 | 590.4 | 184.3 | 49.2 | 5 | 470-508 | 487.6 | 14.4 | 6.4 |  | - 775 | 685.0 | 84.0 | 37.6 |
| 4 | 7 | 475-600 | 523.8 | 44.9 | 18.3 | 700-1350 | 992.7 | 212.9 | 86.9 | 3 | 490-531 | 507.0 | 21.4 | 12.3 |  | - 910 | 840.0 | 121.2 | 70.0 |
| 5 | 3 | 513-628 | 575.7 | 58.2 | 33.6 | 1000-1900 | 1500.0 | 458.3 | 264.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 5 | 322-371 | 339.6 | 19.9 | 8.9 | 250-350 | 270.0 | 44.7 | 20.0 | 1 | - | 428.0 | - | - |  | - | 400.0 | - | - |
| 3 | 50 | 326-572 | 425.5 | 47.1 | 6.7 | 200-960 | 520.5 | 171.6 | 24.3 | 23 | 403-516 | 452.3 | 35.9 | 7.5 | 300 | - 950 | 619.6 | 169.5 | 35.3 |
| 4 | 23 | 385-600 | 468.8 | 55.6 | 11.6 | 325-1400 | 748.7 | 279.5 | 58.3 | 15 | 436-570 | 489.0 | 43.3 | 11.2 | 610 | - 1240 | 831.7 | 191.8 | 49.5 |
| 5 | 8 | 415-628 | 520.3 | 68.4 | 24.2 | 450-1900 | 1072.5 | 488.9 | 172.9 | 3 | 464-537 | 506.7 | 38.0 | 22.0 | 725 | - 1000 | 841.7 | 142.2 | 82.1 |
| 6 | 1 |  | 430.0 |  |  | - | 550.0 |  | - | 1 |  | 436.0 |  |  |  | - | 650.0 | - | - |

Table 27. Summary of growth in length and weight for migrant longnose sucker from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | Upstream |  |  |  |  |  |  | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) Dow |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | N | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250-274.9 | 2 | 259.5 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 199.0 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2 | 271.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 275.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |
| 275-299.9 | 4 | 285.5 | 7.3 | 3.7 | 262.5 | 47.9 | 23.9 | 5 | 280.0 | 4.2 | 1.9 | 265.0 | 48.7 | 21.8 |
| 300-324.9 | 1 | 315.0 | - | - | 380.0 | - | - | 2 | 315.0 | 7.1 | 5.0 | 337.5 | 17.7 | 12.5 |
| 325-349.9 | 1 | 326.0 | - | - | 400.0 | - | - | 2 | 328.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 425.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |
| 350-374.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 375-399.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250-274.9 | 1 | 271.0 | - | - | 250.0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 275-299.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300-324.9 | 4 | 308.8 | 9.1 | 4.5 | 375.0 | 28.9 | 14.4 | 4 | 316.8 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 412.5 | 25.0 | 12.5 |
| 325-349.9 | 3 | 341.0 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 466.7 | 76.4 | 44.1 | 2 | 342.5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 525.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |
| 350-374.9 | 1 | 350.0 | - | - | 500.0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 375-399.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250-274.9 | 5 | 262.4 | 6.1 | 2.7 | 223.6 | 25.6 | 11.4 | 2 | 271.0 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 275.0 | 35.4 | 25.0 |
| 275-299.9 | 4 | 285.5 | 7.3 | 3.7 | 262.5 | 47.9 | 23.9 | 8 | 282.3 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 263.1 | 56.2 | 19.9 |
| 300-324.9 | 6 | 310.8 | 7.7 | 3.2 | 388.3 | 37.6 | 15.4 | 10 | 316.3 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 369.0 | 51.4 | 16.2 |
| 325-349.9 | 5 | 337.8 | 7.6 | 3.4 | 460.0 | 65.2 | 29.2 | 5 | 334.4 | 7.8 | 3.5 | 460.0 | 65.2 | 29.2 |
| 350-374.9 | 1 | 350.0 | - | - | 500.0 | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 375-399.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 28. Summary of length-weight data for juvenile longnose suckers from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| May - June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-19.9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20-29.9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30-39.9 | 1 | 34.0 | - | - | 0.5 | - | - |
| 40-49.9 | 6 | 47.0 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.13 | 0.23 | 0.10 |
| 50-59.9 | 7 | 52.6 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 1.64 | 0.34 | 0.13 |
| 60-69.9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70-79.9 | 1 | 72.0 | - | - | 4.2 | - | - |

July - August

| $10-19.9$ | 18 | $16.2^{\star}$ |  |  | $0.08^{\star}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $20-29.9$ | 2 | 26.5 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| $30-39.9$ | 5 | 37.0 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 0.72 | 0.27 | 0.12 |
| $40-49.9$ | 13 | 44.9 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 1.27 | 0.41 | 0.11 |
| $50-59.9$ | 16 | 53.4 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 2.05 | 0.47 | 0.12 |
| $60-69.9$ | 9 | 65.3 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 3.57 | 0.57 | 0.19 |
| $70-79.9$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

September - October
10-19.9

| $20-29.9$ | 1 | 22.0 | - | - | 0.10 | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $30-39.9$ | 1 | 38.0 | - | - | 0.70 | - | - |
| $40-49.9$ | 4 | 43.8 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 1.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| $50-59.9$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $60-69.9$ | 2 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| $70-79.9$ | 1 | 76.0 | - | - | 5.70 | - | - |

## Overall

| $10-19.9$ | 18 | $16.2^{*}$ |  |  | $0.08^{*}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $20-29.9$ | 3 | 25.0 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| $30-39.9$ | 7 | 36.7 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 0.69 | 0.23 | 0.09 |
| $40-49.9$ | 23 | 45.3 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 1.20 | 0.33 | 0.07 |
| $50-59.9$ | 23 | 53.1 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 1.93 | 0.47 | 0.10 |
| $60-69.9$ | 11 | 64.9 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 3.52 | 0.53 | 0.16 |
| $70-79.9$ | 2 | 74.0 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 5.00 | 1.06 | 0.75 |

[^2]Table 29. Food items as percent by number, of diet in juvenile longnose sucker from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 2 | 36 | 32 | 1 |
| Number of stomachs with unidentifiable contents | 2 | 10 | - 9 | 0 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Mean number of organisms/ stomach | N/A | 18.5 | 44.8 | 22.0 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |  |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |  |
| Acarina | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |
| Insecta |  |  |  |  |
| Diptera |  |  |  |  |
| Adult | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Larvae |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 0 | 94.5 | 96.7 | 90.9 |
| Simuliidae | 0 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Plecoptera | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.1 |
| Ephemeroptera | 0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0 |
| Trichoptera | 0 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0 |
| Coleoptera | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 |
| Crustacea |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0 |
| Copepoda | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 |
| Nematoda | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0 |

Table 30. Compendium of fork length, weight and age data for burbot captured from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Age | Fork Length (mm) | Weight $(\mathrm{g})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 131 | 17.8 |
| 3 | 106 | 7.5 |
| 3 | 134 | 18.8 |
| 4 | 160 | 21.6 |
| 4 | 198 | 39.9 |
| 5 | 237 | 100.7 |
| - | 69 | 2.1 |
| - | 171 | 36.3 |

Table 31. Summary of length-weight data for slimy sculpin from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | N | Total Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 10-19.9 | 4 | 18.3 | 1.50 | 0.75 | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 20-29.9 | 13 | 25.2 | 2.95 | 0.82 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.02 |
| 30-39.9 | 6 | 34.7 | 2.58 | 1.05 | 0.50 | 0.15 | 0.06 |
| 40-49.9 | 6 | 45.8 | 3.37 | 1.38 | 1.27 | 0.42 | 0.17 |
| 50-59.9 | 2 | 53.5 | 2.12 | 1.50 | 1.85 | 0.49 | 0.35 |
| 60-69.9 | 3 | 65.0 | 2.00 | 1.15 | 3.17 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| 70-79.9 | 1 | 72.0 | - | - | 5.20 | - | - |

Table 32. Summary of length and weight by aṇe for slimy sculpin from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Age | N | Total Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 0 | 13 | 22.5 | 3.82 | 16-29 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.1-0.3 |
| 1 | 9 | 38.3 | 6.50 | 29-48 | 0.74 | 0.33 | 0.3-1.3 |
| 2 | 3 | 52.0 | 3.00 | 49-55 | 1.80 | 0.36 | 1.5-2.2 |
| 4 | 4 | 66.8 | 3.86 | 63-72 | 3.68 | 1.02 | 3.1-5.2 |

Table 33. Food items as percent by number, of diet in slimy sculpin from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 0-25 | 26-50 | 51-76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 12 | 17 | 6 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| Mean number of organisms/ stomach | 3.9 | 13.5 | 10.2 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |
| Insecta |  |  |  |
| Diptera |  |  |  |
| Larvae |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 93.6 | 88.3 | 34.4 |
| Simuliidae | 0 | 0.9 | 26.2 |
| Plecoptera | 0 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Ephemeroptera | 0 | 7.0 | 29.5 |
| Trichoptera | 2.1 | 2.6 | 4.9 |
| Crustacea |  |  |  |
| Amphipoda | 4.3 | 0.9 | 0 |
| Nematoda | 0 | 0.4 | 0 |

Table 34. Summary of length and weight data for lake whitefish from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 30-39.9 | 8 | 35.4 | 1.77 | 0.63 | 0.54 | 0.13 | 0.05 |
| 40-49.9 | 12 | 43.9 | 2.57 | 0.74 | 1.02 | 0.25 | 0.07 |
| 50-59.9 | 3 | 50.3 | 0.58 | 0.33 | 1.53 | 0.06 | 0.03 |
| 60-69.9 | 3 | 65.3 | 3.51 | 2.03 | 3.27 | 0.71 | 0.41 |
| 70-79.9 | 5 | 73.8 | 2.77 | 1.24 | 4.78 | 0.71 | 0.32 |
| 130-139.9 | 1 | 138.0 | - | - | 31.6 | - | - |

Table 35. Summary of length and weinht by age for lake whitefish from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Age | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 0 | 31 | 49.2 | 13.93 | 33-76 | 1.77 | 1.58 | 0.3-5.9 |
| 2 | 1 | 138.0 | - | - | 31.60 | - | - |

Table 36 . Food items as percent by number, of diet in lake whitefish from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 | 101+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 22 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Mean number of organisms/ stomach | 8.4 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 0 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |  |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |  |
| Acarina | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Insecta |  |  |  |  |
| Hymenoptera | 0 | 12.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diptera |  |  |  |  |
| Adult | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Larvae |  |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 22.8 | 8.0 | 88.9 | 0 |
| Simuliidae | 49.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 6.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Plecoptera | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ephemeroptera | 4.3 | 16.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trichoptera | 2.7 | 8.0 | 11.1 | 0 |
| Coleoptera | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 37. Summary of length-weight data for lake chub from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Interval | $N$ | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | S.E. | Mean | S.D. | S.E. |
| 30-39.9 | 9 | 36.4 | 2.65 | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.18 | 0.06 |
| 40-49.9 | 12 | 45.0 | 2.83 | 0.82 | 1.28 | 0.24 | 0.07 |
| 50-59.9 | 8 | 53.4 | 3.46 | 1.22 | 2.35 | 0.54 | 0.19 |
| 60-69.9 | 2 | 66.5 | 3.54 | 2.50 | 4.40 | 0.42 | 0.30 |
| 70-79.9 | 1 | 71.0 | - | - | 5.30 | - | - |
| 80-89.9 | 1 | 89.0 | - | - | 9.20 | - | - |
| 90-99.9 | 1 | 97.0 | - | - | 13.4 | - | - |

Table 38. Summary of lenath and weight by age for lake chub from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Age | N | Fork Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | S.D. | Range | Mean | S.D. | Range |
| 1 | 27 | 43.7 | 6.39 | 32-56 | 1.26 | 0.58 | 0.4-2.6 |
| 2 | 3 | 74.7 | 12.90 | 64-89 | 6.20 | 2.67 | 4.1-9.2 |
| 3 | 1 | 69.0 | - | - | 4.70 | - | - |

Table 39. Food items as percent by number, of diet in lake chub from Smith Creek, 1976.

| Fork Length Range (mm) | 26-50 | 51-75 | 76-100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of stomachs analysed | 23 | 9 | 2 |
| Number of empty stomachs | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Mean number of organisms/stomach | 23.9 | 11.1 | 2.5 |
| Food Item \% of Diet |  |  |  |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |
| Acarina | 0.4 | 0 | 0 |
| Insecta |  |  |  |
| Hymenoptera | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0 |
| Diptera |  |  |  |
| Larvae |  |  |  |
| Chironomidae | 3.3 | 2.0 | 0 |
| Simuli idae | 91.8 | 86.0 | 0 |
| Other | 1.3 | 0 | 0 |
| Ephemeroptera | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0 |
| Trichoptera | 1.3 | 7.0 | 100.0 |
| Coleoptera | 0.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Nematoda | 0 | 2.0 | 0 |

Table 40. Compendium of length and weight data for longnose dace from Smith
Creek, 1976.
Fork Length (mm) Weight (g)

| 22 | 0.1 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 24 | 0.1 |
| 24 | 0.2 |
| 25 | 0.2 |
| 26 | 0.2 |
| 27 | 0.3 |
| 101 | 14.6 |
| 117 | 18.3 |

Appendix 1. Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 1.
VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE
Visually described as a cobble and coarse gravel section. Approximately $50 \%$ of the area is occupied by large cobbles. Six (6) large cobbles were measured in situ along the long, short and intermediate axes (Table 1-1). The other $50 \%$ of bed was comprised of smaller stones and gravel. A total of 3772 g (dry wt) of the surface material was collected and analysed for size (Table 1-2, Figure 1-1).

Table 1-1 Large Cobbles

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 6 | 24.1 | 7.32 | 2.99 |
| Short | 6 | 12.3 | 1.88 | 0.77 |
| Intermediate | 6 | 17.4 | 4.39 | 1.79 |

Table 1-2 Small Cobbles
Wt Cobbles + Tare 2791.0 g Wt Tare 154.0 g Wt Cobbles 2637.0 g

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 10 | 7.8 | 1.68 | 0.53 |
| Short | 10 | 3.2 | 0.92 | 0.29 |
| Intermediate | 10 | 5.5 | 0.85 | 0.27 |

Figure 1-1.Grain Size Distribution Sample Wt $=1135 \mathrm{~g}$


## Appendix 2. Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 2.

VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE
Visually described as a cobble riffle. Approximately $85 \%$ of the bed area was composed of cobbles and $14 \%$ of coarse gravel. A composite sample of this material was taken. Results of analyses are presented in Table $2-1$ and Table 2-2. Approximately $1 \%$ of the bed area was composed of sand. A sample of this material was analyzed for grain size distribution (Figure $2 \div 1)$.

Table 2-1. Cobbles
Wt Cobbles and Tare 5024.0 g Wt Tare 200.0 g Wt Cobbles 4824.0 g

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{\chi}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 9 | 9.8 | 2.44 | 0.81 |
| Short | 9 | 4.3 | 1.50 | 0.50 |
| Intermediate | 9 | 7.0 | 1.41 | 0.47 |

Table 2-2. Coarse Grave1
Wt Gravel and Tare 1435.0 g Wt Tare 584.0 g Wt Gravel 851.0 g


Appendix 3. Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 3.
VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Visually described as a boulder-cobble riffle. Approximately $40 \%$ of the stream bed consisted of boulders. A sample of these ( $n=7$ ) were measured in situ along 3 axes (Table 3-1). A sample of the material making up the other $60 \%$ of bed was taken. This sample was made up entirely of small cobbles. Their dimensions are given in Table 3-2).

Table 3-1. Boulders

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 7 | 30.5 | 7.75 | 2.93 |
| Short | 7 | 20.3 | 7.02 | 2.65 |
| Intermediate | 7 | 23.2 | 6.95 | 2.63 |

Table 3-2.Small Cobbles

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 16 | 6.9 | 1.85 | 0.46 |
| Short | 16 | 3.0 | 1.10 | 0.27 |
| Intermediate | 16 | 5.1 | 1.48 | 0.37 |

Appendix 4. Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 4.
VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE
Visually described as boulders and cobbles between sand banks. Sand is visible between the rocks on the stream bed. Approximately 50\% of the bed was covered by boulders. Six (6) of these were measured in situ along 3 axes (Table $4-1$ ). Approximately $40 \%$ of the bed area was comprised of cobbles. A sample of these was obtained and measured (Table 4 $-2)$. Approximately $10 \%$ of the bed area was composed of sand. A sample of this material was collected and analyzed for grain size distribution (Figure 4-1).

Table 4-1. Boulders

| AXIS (cm) | $\underline{N}$ | X | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 6 | 27.0 | 7.70 | 3.14 |
| Short | 6 | 20.3 | 6.41 | 2.62 |
| Intermediate | 6 | 16.1 | 4.45 | 1.82 |

Table 4-2. Cobbles
Wt Cobbles and Tare 5570.0 g Wt Tare 200.0 g Wt Cobbles 5370.0 g


Appendix 5. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 1.

| Date | Stage (m) |  | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Velocity (m/mc) |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Slope } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| May 15 | 141.730 | . 38 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.92 | 0.20 |  | 0.17 |  |  | Discharge Station 36.5 m U/S from Staff Gauge |
| May 21 | 141.686 | . 336 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 0.55 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.17 | 0.20 |  | Discharge Station 45.7 m D/S from Staff Gauge |
| May 28 | 141.682 | . 332 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.62 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.19 |  | Discharge Station 45.7 m D/S from Staff Gauge |
| May 29 | 141.710 | . 36 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.87 | 0.31 | 0.28 | 0.24 | 0.22 |  | Discharge Station 45.7 m D/S from Staff Gauge |
| June 4 | 141.670 | . 32 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.68 | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.18 |  | Discharge Station 45.7 m D/S from Staff Gauge |
| June 10 | 141.631 | . 281 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.52 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 1.44 | SLOPE-June $11,15.24 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U/S}$ and D/S from Discharge Station |
| June 17 | 141.606 | . 256 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.39 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.13 |  | Discharge Station 45.7 m D/S from Staff Gauge |
| June 24 | 141.604 | . 254 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 1.92 | Discharge Station 45.7m D/S from Staff Gauge |
| June 24 | 141.604 | . 254 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.33 | 0.15 |  | 0.06 |  | 3.12 | Discharge Station $8.8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{S}$ from Staff Gauge |

Equations:

where $\mathrm{Q}=$ discharge

$$
\begin{aligned}
S & =\text { stage } \\
V & =\text { Mean cross-sectional velocity } \\
R & =\text { hydraulic radius } \\
C I & =95 \% \text { confidence interval of } b \\
r & =\text { correlation }
\end{aligned}
$$

Appendix 6. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 2.

|  | Stage (m) |  | Discharge$\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}\right)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & (\text { Area }) \\ & \left(m^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Velocity (m/mc) |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | $\underset{\%}{\text { Slope }}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| April 29 |  |  | 2.84 |  | 2.37 | 1.20 |  | 0.20 |  |  | Flow on ice |
| May 1 |  |  | 1.94 |  | 1.96 | 0.99 |  | 0.26 |  |  | Flow on ice |
| May 21 | 168.027 | . 287 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.39 | 0.26 | 0.33 | 0.14 | 0.17 |  | Permanent discharge station 30.5 m D/S of staff gauge |
| May 28 | 168.014 | . 274 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.46 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.16 | 0.16 |  |  |
| May 29 | 168.040 | . 300 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.55 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.18 |  |  |
| June 4 | 167.984 | . 244 | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.46 | 0.32 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.14 |  |  |
| June 10 | 167.934 | . 194 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 1.72 | SLOPE June 11 - 15.24m U/S and D/S from Discharge Station |
| June 17 | 167.924 | . 184 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.28 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.11 |  | $\bigcirc$ |
| June 24 | 167.911 | . 171 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.25 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 1.77 | SLOPE June $25-15.24 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and D/S from Discharge Station |

Equations:

```
1) \(\log _{10} \mathrm{Q}=0.6958+2.7532\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right) \quad \mathrm{CI}=1.3809-4.1254\)
2) \(\log _{10} V=0.3823+1.5868\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad C I=0.7635-2.4102\)
    \(r=.912\)
3) \(\begin{aligned} \log _{10} \mathrm{R}=0.2629+.9408\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right) \quad \mathrm{CI} & =0.4288-1.4528 \\ r & =.904\end{aligned}\)
where \(\mathrm{Q}=\) Discharge
    \(S=\) stage
    \(\bar{V}=\) Mean cross-sectional velocity
    \(R=\) hydraulic radius
    \(C I=95 \%\) confidence interval of \(b\)
    \(r=\) correlation
```

Appendix 7. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 3.

|  | Stage (m) |  | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | $\begin{aligned} & (\text { Area) } \\ & \left(m^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Velocity$(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{mc})$ |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | $\underset{\%}{\text { Slope }}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| May 15 | 171.110 | . 420 | 0.19 | 0.24 | 0.64 | 0.30 | 0.32 | 0.21 | 0.23 |  |  |
| May 21 | 171.062 | . 372 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.20 |  |  |
| May 28 | 171.062 | . 372 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.62 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.20 |  |  |
| May 29 | 171.111 | . 421 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.80 | 0.34 | 0.32 | 0.23 | 0.23 |  |  |
| June 4 | 171.064 | . 374 | 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.68 | 0.29 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.20 |  |  |
| June 10 | 171.002 | . 312 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.53 | 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 1.41 | SLOPE - June 11 - $15.24 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and D/S from Discharge Station |
| June 17 | 170.973 | . 283 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.38 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 |  |  |
| June 24 | 170.968 | . 278 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.35 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 1.56 | SLOPE - June 25 - 15.24 m U/S arid D/S from Discharge Station |

Equations:

| 1) $\log _{10} \mathrm{Q}=0.8302+3.8658\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right) \quad \mathrm{CI}$ | $=2.6003-5.1312$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| $r$ | $=.950$ |
| 2) $\log _{10} \overline{\mathrm{~V}}=0.3747+2.3104\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right) \quad \mathrm{CI}$ | $=1.5344-3.0863$ |
| r | $=.948$ |
| 3) $\log _{10} \mathrm{R}=0.2496+1.0383\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right) \quad \mathrm{CI}$ | $=0.3792-1.6974$ |
| $r$ | $=.844$ |

where $Q=$ Discharge
$S=s$ tage
$\mathrm{S}=$ Stage
$\mathrm{V}=$ Mean cross-sectional velocity
$\mathrm{R}=$ hydraulic radius
$C I=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
$r=$ correlation

Appendix E. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 422.7, Location 4.

|  | Stage (m) |  | Discharge$\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}\right)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Area) } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Velocity (m/mc) |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | Slope |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  | Comments |
| April 29 |  |  | 2.21 |  | 2.94 | 0.75 |  | 0.13 |  |  | Flow over ice |
| Hay 6 | 173.53 | . 50 | 0.71 | 0.51 | 1.08 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.26 | 0.23 |  |  |
| May 15 | 173.41 | . 38 | 0.23 | 0.33 | 0.58 | 0.40 | 0.48 | 0.20 | 0.21 |  |  |
| May 21 | 173.30 | . 27 | 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.46 | 0.24 | 0.32 | 0.19 | 0.20 |  |  |
| May 28 | 173.25 | . 22 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.45 | 0.29 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 0.19 |  |  |
| May 29 | 173.29 | . 26 | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.62 | 0.37 | 0.31 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  |
| June 4 | 173.20 | . 17 | 0.18 | 0.09 | 0.62 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.18 |  |  |
| June 10 | 173.14 | . 11 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.47 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 2.32 | SLOPE - June 11-15.24m U/S and D/S from Discharge Station |
| June 17 | 173.12 | . 09 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.16 |  |  |
| June 24 | 173.124 | . 094 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.40 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 2.17 | SLOPE - June 25 - 15.24 m U/S and D/S from Discharge Station |

Equations:

| 1 | $\log _{10} \mathrm{Q}=0.1788+1.5618\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} C I & =1.0051-2.1185 \\ r & =.929 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2) | $\log _{10} \bar{V}=0.1692+1.1579\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} C I & =0.7969-1.5190 \\ r & =.944 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3) | $\log _{10} \mathrm{R}=0.5861+0.1953\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} C I & =0.0633-0.3272 \\ r & =.798 \end{aligned}$ |

where $Q=$ discharge
$\frac{S}{V}=$ stage
$\bar{V}=$ Mean cross-sectional velocity
$R=$ hydraulic radius
$\mathrm{CI}=95 \%$ confidence interval of b
$r=$ correlation

Appendix 9 . Water Chemistry Data For Creek Mile 422.7, 1976.

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | April 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 6 | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| Suspended $N$ ug/L | 1 | 142 | 50 | 47 | 3 | 20 | 84 | 87 | 18 | N/S | $<1$ | N/S | 15 |
|  | 2 | 149 | 83 | 43 | 15 | 63 | 22 | 1 | 11 | 73 | <1 | $<1$ | 16 |
|  | 3 | 151 | 156 | 37 | 4 | <1 | 17 | 30 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 26 | 47 |
|  | 4 | 99 | 85 | 53 | 19 | 6 | 41 | 7 | 4 | 11 | $<1$ | 17 | 36 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Dissolved } N \\ & \quad \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 670 | 420 | 460 | 320 | 310 | 370 | 260 | 340 | N/S | 290 | 350 | 350 |
|  | 2 | 660 | 420 | 460 | 330 | 330 | 360 | 300 | 320 | 270 | 280 | 320 | 340 |
|  | 3 | 670 | 390 | 480 | 330 | 360 | 410 | 280 | 320 | 270 | 300 | 280 | 290 |
|  | 4 | 670 | 410 | 460 | 340 | 350 | 430 | 290 | 320 | 260 | 290 | 280 | 320 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Suspended } P \\ \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L} \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 44 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | <1 | N/S | 1 | <1 | 1 |
|  | 2 | 32 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | <1 | 2 | <1 | 2 | 1 | <1 | 1 |
|  | 3 | 29 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | <1 | 2 | <1 | <1 | $<1$ | <1 | 1 |
|  | 4 | 20 | <1 | 3 | 1 | $<1$ | $<1$ | 2 | <1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 1 |
| Total Dissolved P $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 | N/S | 4 | 8 | 13 |
|  | 2 | 17 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 14 |
|  | 3 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 9 |
|  | 4 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Suspended C } \\ & \mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2350 | 910 | 310 | 220 | 340 | 400 | 270 | 200 | N/S | 100 | N/S | 220 |
|  | 2 | 2910 | 530 | 260 | 240 | 290 | 190 | 450 | 130 | 250 | 140 | 170 | 330 |
|  | 3 | 2240 | 490 | 380 | 420 | 370 | 80 | 510 | 170 | 480 | 130 | 250 | 160 |
|  | 4 | 1600 | 460 | 340 | 240 | 190 | 130 | 230 | 190 | 230 | 150 | 300 | 530 |

Aopendix
9. Continued

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | April 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 6 | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| Si mg/L | 1 | 1.47 | 1.77 | 1.96 | 2.12 | 2.56 | 2.70 | 2.80 | 2.82 | N/S | 2.71 | 2.71 | 2.75 |
|  | 2 | 1.48 | 1.76 | 1.93 | 2.12 | 2.60 | 2.68 | 2.80 | 2.83 | 2.77 | 2.70 | 2.68 | 2.74 |
|  | 3 | 1.48 | 1.75 | 1.93 | 2.14 | 2.62 | 2.67 | 2.77 | 2.84 | 2.71 | 2.68 | 2.70 | 2.74 |
|  | 4 | 1.47 | 1.75 | 1.92 | 2.12 | 2.59 | 2.68 | 2.76 | 2.83 | 2.70 | 2.67 | 2.68 | 2.78 |
| $\mathrm{Cl}$ <br> mg/L | 1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 1.8 | N/S | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
|  | 2 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
|  | 3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.8 |
|  | 4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ mg/L | 1 | 5.4 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 4.6 | N/S | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6.8 |
|  | 2 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 5.2 |
|  | 3 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 5.0 |
|  | 4 | 5.6 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 5.0 |
| Total <br> Suspended <br> Solids mg/L | 1 | 51 | 40 | 5 | 2 | 2 | $<1$ | 1 | $<1$ | N/S | <1 | 1 | 15 |
|  | 2 | 43 | 11 | 5 | 1 | <1 | 1 | 4 | <1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 12 |
|  | 3 | 42 | 5 | 6 | 5 | <1 | $<1$ | 4 | $<1$ | 7 | 1 | $<1$ | 4 |
|  | 4 | 22 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 1 | $<1$ | 1 | <1 | 1 | 1 | $<1$ | 10 |
| Total <br> Dissolved <br> Solids mg/L | 1 | 120 | 160 | 160 | 210 | 240 | 300 | 290 | 290 | N/S | 250 | 250 | 240 |
|  | 2 | 120 | 160 | 160 | 210 | 520 | 300 | 260 | 250 | 260 | 260 | 290 | 260 |
|  | 3 | 130 | 160 | 160 | 210 | 240 | 260 | 280 | 250 | 250 | 260 | 250 | 230 |
|  | 4 | 130 | 160 | 170 | 210 | 240 | 280 | 260 | 240 | 260 | 260 | 260 | 270 |

Appendix 9. Continued

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Apri1 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 6 | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| Na mg/L | 1 | 0.27 | 0.75 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.25 | 1.52 | 1.50 | 1.62 | N/S | 2.25 | 1.51 | 1.58 |
|  | 2 | 0.27 | 0.70 | 0.94 | 1.26 | 1.06 | 1.31 | 1.22 | 1.34 | 1.52 | 1.95 | 1.17 | 1.20 |
|  | 3 | 0.27 | 0.64 | 0.98 | 1.21 | 1.01 | 1.25 | 1.19 | 1.21 | 1.48 | 1.93 | 1.20 | 1.28 |
|  | 4 | 0.30 | 0.61 | 1.01 | 0.82 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.16 | 1.37 | 1.37 | 1.98 | 1.16 | 1.19 |
| K | 1 | 0.86 | 0.67 | 0.36 | 0.44 | 0.53 | 0.67 | 0.77 | 0.65 | N/S | 0.64 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 2 | 0.83 | 0.61 | 0.30 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.60 | 0.74 | 0.60 | 0.74 | 0.61 | 0.62 | 0.66 |
|  | 3 | 0.84 | 0.66 | 0.30 | 0.50 | 0.41 | 0.60 | 0.67 | 0.58 | 0.65 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.66 |
|  | 4 | 0.82 | 0.64 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.43 | 0.54 | 0.67 | 0.51 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 0.64 | 0.64 |
| Ca | 1 | 17.4 | 32.6 | 37.4 | 48.9 | 69.8 | 62.0 | 47.8 | 63.4 | N/S | 58.2 | 65.5 | 65.5 |
| $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 2 | 17.7 | 33.3 | 36.1 | 46.0 | 64.4 | 63.2 | 62.6 | 64.6 | 64.6 | 61.2 | 66.5 | 65.5 |
|  | 3 | 17.8 | 32.3 | 35.8 | 47.6 | 65.0 | 62.6 | 64.5 | 64.0 | 61.4 | 59.0 | 65.5 | 65.5 |
|  | 4 | 18.1 | 32.5 | 36.6 | 46.5 | 62.6 | 63.2 | 61.3 | 60.8 | 62.1 | 56.7 | 66.0 | 66.0 |
| Mg | 1 | 4.06 | 7.40 | 9.64 | 11.6 | 15.9 | 15.5 | 9.77 | 17.4 | N/S | 16.7 | 15.0 | 15.4 |
| mg/L | 2 | 4.06 | 7.36 | 10.5 | 10.6 | 14.2 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 28.1 | 17.5 | 16.1 | 14.9 | 15.4 |
|  | 3 | 4.16 | 7.45 | 9.17 | 11.2 | 14.0 | 14.8 | 15.2 | 27.6 | 17.4 | 15.3 | 14.2 | 15.3 |
|  | 4 | 3.92 | 7.31 | 7.86 | 10.7 | 14.2 | 14.5 | 15.1 | 26.8 | 17.7 | 15.8 | 15.0 | 14.7 |

$N / S=$ No Sample

Appendix 10. Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 426.5, Location 9. VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Visually described as a boulder-cobble riffle section between steep clay-organic banks. Approximately $75 \%$ bed area was comprised of boulders of which 7 were measured in situ along 3 axes (Table 10-1). The other $25 \%$ of bed area was made up mainly of cobbles and gravel. A sample of this material was taken and analyzed. That portion of the sample retained by a $7.62 \mathrm{~cm}\left(3^{\prime \prime}\right)$ mesh was measured individually along 3 axes (Table 10-2). The grain size distribution for the entire sample is presented in Figure 10-1.

Table 10-1. Boulders

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 7 | 26.7 | 10.24 | 3.87 |
| Short | 7 | 13.8 | 8.53 | 3.23 |
| Intermediate | 7 | 19.9 | 7.69 | 2.91 |

Table 10-2. Cobbles

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\underline{\bar{x}}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 2 | 8.5 | 2.12 | 1.50 |
| Short | 2 | 4.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Intermediate |  | 5.5 | 0.71 | 0.50 |

Figure 10-1. Grain Size Distribution Sample Wt $=3579.5 \mathrm{~g}$


Appendix 11. Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 426.5, Location 10.

VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE
Visually described as a boulder riffle with a small amount of sand between boulders. Well rounded boulders made up approximately $95 \%$ of bed area. Five (5) of these were measured in situ along 3 axes (Table 11 -1). A sample of sand which comprised approximately $5 \%$ of bed area was collected. The grain size distribution for this sample is presented in Figure 11-1).

Table 11-1. Boulders

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{\chi}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 5 | 45.7 | 21.85 | 9.77 |
| Short | 5 | 33.5 | 15.49 | 6.93 |
| Intermediate | 5 | 37.6 | 15.07 | 6.74 |

Figure 11-1, Grain Size Distribution Sample Wt $=832.5 \mathrm{~g}$


Appendix 12 . Bed Material Analysis - Creek Mile 426.5, Location 11. VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Visually described as a boulder riffle with sand interspersed. Boulders comprised approximately $80 \%$ of bed area. Six (6) of these were measured in situ along 3 axes. (Table 12-1). Sand made up the other approximate $20 \%$ of bed area. A sample was taken of coarse sand in mid channel (Figure 12-1a) and another sample was taken of finer sand near the north shore (Figure 12-1b).

Table 12-1. Boulders

| AXPS (cm) | N | $X$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 6 | 26.3 | 11.22 | 4.58 |
| Short | 6 | 19.1 | 9.18 | 3.75 |
| Intermediate | 6 | 22.4 | 10.47 | 4.27 |



Appendix 13. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 426.5, Location 9.


Appendix 14. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 426.5, Location 10.

|  | Stage (m) |  | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}, \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | Area $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | Velocity$(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{mc})$ |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | Slope | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| May 5 | 183.60 | 0.68 | 0.84 | 1.18 | 1.20 | 0.70 | 0.79 | 0.24 | 0.32 |  |  |
| May 13 | 183.37 | 0.45 | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.65 | 0.43 | 0.38 | 0.27 | 0.24 |  |  |
| May 20 | 183.30 | 0.38 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.47 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 0.22 | 0.21 |  |  |
| May 27 | 183.28 | 0.36 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.20 |  |  |
| June 3 | 183.32 | 0.40 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.62 | 0.28 | 0.31 | 0.28 | 0.22 |  |  |
| June 9 | 183.26 | 0.34 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.47 | 0.21 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 4.97 | SLOPE-June 11-15.24m U/S and D/S from Discharge section |
| June 17 | 183.18 | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 5.12 | SLOPE-June 25-15.24m U/S and D/S from Discharge Section |

Equations:

| 1) | $\log _{10} Q=0.6651+3.6668\left(\log _{10} S\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} C I & =2.6297-4.7038 \\ r & =.971 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2) | $\log _{10} \bar{V}=0.1984+1.7859\left(\log _{10} S\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} C I & =1.2293-2.3425 \\ r & =.965 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3) | $\log _{10} R=0.3833+0.6894\left(\log _{10} S\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} C I & =0 \\ r & =.644 \end{aligned}$ |

where $Q=$ discharge
$\underline{S}=$ stage
$\bar{V}=$ mean cross sectional velocity
$\mathrm{R}=$ hydraulic radius
$C I=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
$r=$ correlation

Appendix 15. Flow Summary Table - Creek Mile 426.5, Location 11.

| Date | Stage <br> Datum <br> Elevation | (m) Above Zero Datum | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | Area (m²) <br> Meas. | Velocity <br> (m/mc) |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | $\underset{\%}{\text { Slope }}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Meas. | Calc. |  | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| May 5 | 188.58 | 0.66 | 0.64 | 0.74 | 0.65 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.29 | 0.33 |  |  |
| May 13 | 188.34 | 0.42 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.59 | 0.55 | 0.16 | 0.18 |  |  |
| May 20 | 188.27 | 0.35 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.56 | 0.44 | 0.14 | 0.15 |  |  |
| May 27 | 188.23 | 0.31 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.39 | 0.17 | 0.12 |  |  |
| June 3 | 188.26 | 0.34 | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.33 | 0.45 | 0.43 | 0.17 | 0.14 |  |  |
| Junē 9 | 188.21 | 0.29 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.35 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.11 |  |  |
| June 17 | 188.12 | 0.20 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 3.82 | SLOPE June 11-15.24m U/S and D/S from Discharge Section |
| July 1 | 188.05 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 0.14 | - | 0.04 | 3.89 | SLOPE June 25-15.24m U/S and D/S from Discharge Section |

Equations:

$$
\text { 1) } \begin{aligned}
\log _{10} Q=0.3965+2.8701\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad \begin{aligned}
C I & =2.1521-3.5882 \\
r & =.970 \\
\text { 2) } \log _{10} \bar{V}=0.1743+1.1575\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad C I & =0.4918-1.8231 \\
r & =.867
\end{aligned} & \begin{aligned}
\text { CI } & =0.6748-1.9251 \\
\text { 3) } \log _{10} R=0.2439+1.3000\left(\log _{10} S\right) & =.923
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $Q=$ discharge
$\frac{S}{V}=$ stage
$\bar{V}=$ mean cross sectional velocity
$\mathrm{R}=$ hydraulic radius
$C I=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
$r=$ correlation

Appendix 16. Water Chemistry Data For Creek Mile 426.5, 1976.

| Analysis | Location | April 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 6 | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| Suspended N $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ | 9 | 368 | N/S | 95 | 191 | 67 | 17 | N/S | 7 | 51 | $<1$ | 6 | 27 |
|  | 10 | 76 | N/S | 43 | 36 | $<1$ | 55 | 234 | 22 | 57 | 4 | 46 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 106 | 61 | 181 | 24 | 14 | 51 | 40 | 53 | 118 | 4 | 35 | N/S |
| Total | 9 | 700 | 410 | 460 | 560 | 230 | 220 | N/S | 210 | 150 | 130 | 170 | 140 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Dissolved } N \\ \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L} \end{gathered}$ | 10 | 660 | 410 | 550 | 530 | 550 | 630 | 590 | 500 | 390 | 410 | 480 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 670 | 420 | 600 | 530 | 560 | 530 | 540 | 500 | 400 | 410 | 480 | N/S |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Suspended } P \\ \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L} \end{gathered}$ |  | 283 | 38 | 39 | 95 | 15 | 4 | N/S | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 10 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 9 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | N/S |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Dissolved } P \\ & \quad \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L} \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 17. | 11 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 2 | N/S | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
|  | 10 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 9 | N/S |
| Suspended C $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{L}$ | 9 | 10740 | 1170 | 1760 | 4290 | 810 | 260 | N/S | 290 | 340 | 190 | 380 | 70 |
|  | 10 | 1200 | 130 | 310 | 400 | 380 | 800 | 1630 | 240 | 510 | 290 | 580 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 1020 | 630 | 310 | 380 | 310 | 320 | 380 | 250 | 690 | 480 | 380 | N/S |
| Si $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 9 | 2.03 | 1.70 | 2.00 | 2.42 | 4.07 | 4.61 | N/S | 4.61 | 4.59 | 4.48 | 4.59 | 4.55 |
|  | 10 | 1.97 | 1.08 | 0.866 | 1.01 | 1.84 | 2.06 | 2.06 | 2.40 | 2.32 | 2.38 | 2.53 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 1.97 | 1.08 | 0.862 | 1.02 | 1.79 | 1.96 | 1.97 | 2.37 | 2.32 | 2.36 | 2.51 | N/S |
| C1 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 9 | 5.8 | 9.4 | 17.2 | 23.8 | 62.0 | 81.0 | N/S | 95.0 | 76 | 90.5 | 84.5 | 69.0 |
|  | 10 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 1.4 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 1.2 | N/S |

Appendix 16. Continued

| Analysis | Location | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Apri1 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 6 | July 20 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 |
| $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ mg/L | 9 | 9.4 | 17.4 | 23.2 | 23.8 | 57.0 | 60.0 | N/S | 26.5 | 74.0 | 61.0 | 55.8 | 73.0 |
|  | 10 | 5.2 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 6.4 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.6 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 5.6 | 4.4 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 6.0 | N/S |
| Total | 9 | 460 | 81 | 66 | 149 | 28 | 9 | N/S | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 11 |
| Suspended | 10 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | N/S |
| Solids mg/L | 11 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | N/S |
| Total | 9 | 160 | 230 | 230 | 280 | 440 | 470 | N/S | 450 | 470 | 490 | 450 | 520 |
| Dissolved | 10 | 140 | 130 | 160 | 180 | 210 | 220 | 240 | 220 | 240 | 240 | 230 | N/S |
| Solids mg/L | 11 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 150 | 210 | 130 | 220 | 220 | 240 | 210 | 230 | N/S |
| Na mg/L | 9 | 3.64 | 9.40 | 14.3 | 17.2 | 46.0 | 59.1 | N/S | 56.1 | 59.9 | 57.1 | 54.4 | 56.1 |
|  | 10 | 0.49 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 1.44 | 2.46 | 1.54 | 1.79 | 2.36 | 1.52 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 0.47 | 0.60 | 0.87 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 1.07 | 1.25 | 1.73 | 1.00 | N/S |
| K mg/L | 9 | 1.13 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.81 | 1.53 | 1.68 | N/S | 1.90 | 1.99 | 1.80 | 1.98 | 1.85 |
|  | 10 | 1.02 | 0.44 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.44 | 0.60 | 0.56 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.62 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 0.99 | 0.41 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.31 | 0.47 | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.65 | 0.57 | 0.62 | N/S |
| Ca mg/L | 9 | 24.8 | 32.2 | 41.4 | 46.0 | 77.1 | 80.4 | N/S | 69.1 | 76.8 | 80.7 | 80.0 | 84.1 |
|  | 10 | 24.1 | 24.8 | 29.9 | 33.4 | 47.6 | 46.6 | 55.9 | 55.0 | 56.3 | 54.1 | 59.1 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 23.6 | 24.6 | 29.1 | 33.5 | 52.4 | 49.7 | 54.0 | 51.8 | 56.3 | 51.5 | 57.5 | N/S |
| Mg mg/L | 9 | 5.68 | 7.83 | 11.4 | 13.2 | 22.2 | 25.3 | N/S | 37.3 | 30.1 | 22.8 | 25.3 | 27.0 |
|  | 10 | 4.87 | 4.91 | 5.69 | 6.33 | 9.50 | 11.7 | 11.5 | 24.2 | 14.1 | 13.2 | 12.1 | N/S |
|  | 11 | 4.78 | 4.78 | 5.35 | 6.61 | 9.29 | 11.0 | 11.1 | 23.7 | 13.5 | 12.5 | 11.7 | N/S |

Appendix 17. Bed Material Analysis - Smith Creek, Location 5.

## VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Visually described as having a substrate of coarse gravel with occasional cobbles. Approximately $95 \%$ of the bed area was cobble size or smaller. A surface sample of $1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of bed was collected. The cobbles in this sample (i.e. retained on $7.62 \mathrm{~cm}\left(3^{\prime \prime}\right)$ mesh) were separated and measured (Table 17-1). The grain size distribution for the entire sample is presented in Figure 17-1a. A composite subsurface sample under $1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of bed was taken and analyzed for grain size distribution (Figure 17.-7b). A surface sample of the transitional zone between cobbles in the channel and the vegetated higher bank was also taken and analyzed (Figure 17-1c).

Table 17-1, Cobbles
Wt Cobbles and Tare 2524.0 g Wt Tare 200.0 g Wt Cobbles 2324.0 g

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{x}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 5 | 9.8 | 1.30 | 0.58 |
| Short | 5 | 5.0 | 0.71 | 0.32 |
| Intermediate | 5 | 6.8 | 1.79 | 0.80 |



## Appendix 18. Bed Material Analysis - Smith Creek, Location 6.

## VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

Visually described as a cobble and gravel area. Approximately 75\% of the bed area was covered by large cobbles. Seven (7) of these were measured in situ along 3 axes and the results are presented in Table 18-1. Approximately $25 \%$ of the bed area was made up of gravel. A sample of this material was collected and results of grain size determination are presented in Figure 18-1. Fines from the sample may have been lost when it was collected from the stream bottom.

Table 18-1. Cobbles

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 7 | 30.1 | 11.50 | 4.35 |
| Short | 7 | 14.9 | 8.61 | 3.25 |
| Intermediate | 7 | 21.50 | 5.81 | 2.20 |

Figure 18-1. Grain Size Distribution $\quad$ Sample Wt $=3148.5 \mathrm{~g}$


Appendix 19, Bed Material Analysis - Smịth Creek, Location 7.
VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE
The south side of this section is visually described as consisting of large boulders with cobbles and coarse gravel interspersed. Six (6) boulders on the south side of the section were measured in situ along three axes (Table 19-1). A sample of the cobbles and coarse gravel between the boulders was taken and analyzed (Table 19-2). This sample consisted of $82.4 \%$ cobbles, $17.3 \%$ gravel larger than a 2.54 cm (3") mesh and $0.3 \%$ smaller gravel. The weight of gravel in the sample totaled 1210.5 g . A composite sample of the stream bed near the north side of the section was also taken (Table 19-4, Figure 19-1). This sample is representative of the main channel material. Some fines may have been lost in acquiring the samples but the loss is not considered significant here.
Table 19-1. Boulders

| AXIS (cm) | N | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 6 | 51.6 | 32.87 | 13.42 |
| Short | 6 | 27.1 | 9.46 | 3.86 |
| Intermediate | 6 | 41.5 | 24.13 | 9.85 |

Table 19-2. Cobbles**

| Long. | 12 | 10.0 | 2.45 | 0.71 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Short | 12 | 3.8 | 1.54 | 0.45 |
| Intermediate | 12 | 6.1 | 1.24 | 0.36 |

Table 19-3.Cobbles***

| Long | 4 | 7.5 | 1.29 | 0.65 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Short | 4 | 3.5 | 0.58 | 0.29 |
| Intermediate | 4 | 6.5 | 1.29 | 0.65 |

**Wt Cobbles and Tare 58.50 g Wt Tare 202.5 g Wt Cobbles 5648.0 g $* * * W t$ Cobbles and Tare 1348.0 g Wt Tare 153.0 g Wt Cobbles 1195.0 g Figure 19-1.Grain Size Distribution Sample Wt $=4708 \mathrm{~g}$


Appendix 20. Bed Material Analysis - Smith Creek, Location 8.
VISUAL DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE
Visually described as a cobble and coarse gravel substrate. Approximately $5-10 \%$ of the bed area was covered by boulders. A surface sample of cobble material was collected. That portion of the sample retained by the 7.62 cm ( $3^{\prime \prime}$ ) mesh was measured individually along three (3) axes. This data is presented in Table $20-1$. The grain size distribution for the entire sample is presented in Figure 20-1a. A composite subsurface sample was also taken and the grain size distribution is presented in Figure 20-1b.

Table 20-1.Cobbles
Wt Tare and Cobbles 3846.1 g Wt Tare 155.0 g Wt Cobbles 3691.1 g

| AXIS (cm) | $\underline{N}$ | $\bar{X}$ | SD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long | 5 | 12.4 | 3.44 | 1.54 |
| Short | 5 | 3.6 | 1.14 | 0.51 |
| Intermediate | 5 | 8.6 | 1.52 | 0.68 |

Sample Wt = a) 5304.1 g b) 3365.9 g

Figure 20-1, Grain Size Distribution


Appendix 21. Flow Summary Table - Smith Creek, Location 5.

| Date | Stage (m) |  | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | Area (m²) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Velocity } \\ (\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{mc}) \end{gathered}$ |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | Slope \% | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| May 5 | 76.43 | 0.42 | 3.39 | 3.21 | 4.76 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 0.45 | 0.44 |  |  |
| May 10 | 76.28 | 0.27 | 1.86 | 1.84 | 3.67 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.40 |  |  |
| May 17 | 76.19 | 0.18 | 1.01 | 1.10 | 2.95 | 0.34 | 0.36 | 0.39 | 0.37 |  |  |
| May 24 | 76.15 | 0.14 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 2.47 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.34 | 0.35 |  |  |
| May 31 | 76.33 | 0.32 | 2.83 | 2.28 | 4.30 | 0.66 | 0.58 | 0.41 | 0.42 |  |  |
| June 7 | 76.135 | 0.125 | 0.69 | 0.70 | 2.40 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.11 | SLOPE-Juñe 6 - $15.2 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and D/S from Discharge Station |
| June 14 | 76.103 | 0.093 | 0.41 | 0.48 | 2.17 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.19 | SLOPE-June $13-15.2 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and D/S from Discharge Station |
| June 21 | 76.103 | 0.093 | 0.39 | 0.48 | 2.12 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.33 |  |  |
| June 28 | 76.06 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.22 | 1.80 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.30 | 0.29 |  |  |
| Oct 12 | 76.045 | 0.035 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 1.67 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.27 |  |  |
| Equation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
1) }\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{10}{}Q=0.9825+1.2628(\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{10}{}S)\quadCI=1.1150-1.410
        r=.990
2) }\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{10}{}\overline{V}=0.1796+0.8340(\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{10}{}S)\quadCI=0.7470-0.921
        r=.992
3) }\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{10}{}R=0.2850+0.1927(\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{10}{}S)\quadCI=0.1521-0.233
where Q = discharge
    S}=\mathrm{ stage
    S}=\mp@code{V}=\mathrm{ Mean Cross-sectional velocity
    R = hydraulic radius
    CI = 95% confidence interval of b
    r correlation
```

Appendix 22. Flow Summary Table - Smith Creek, Location 6.

| Date |  |  | Discharge |  | Area (m²) Meas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Velocity } \\ & (\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{mc}) \end{aligned}$ |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Slope } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Meas. | Calc. |  | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| April 22 | 78.81 | 0.14 | 1.07 | 0.75 | 2.40 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.30 |  |  |
| April 24 | 79.02 | 0.35 | 2.47 | 2.65 | 3.45 | 0.72 | 0.75 | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |  |
| April 25 | 79.09 | 0.42 | 3.61 | 3.40 | 4.04 | 0.89 | 0.86 | 0.57 | 0.55 |  |  |
| April 26 | 79.25 | 0.58 | 5.08 | 5.32 | 4.82 | 1.05 | 1.09 | 0.64 | 0.65 |  |  |
| May 2 | 79.25 | 0.58 | 5.66 | 5.32 | 5.26 | 1.08 | 1.09 | 0.66 | 0.65 |  |  |
| May 10 | 78.95 | 0.28 | 1.92 | 1.94 | 3.17 | 0.61 | 0.64 | 0.47 | 0.44 |  |  |
| May 17 | 78.85 | 0.18 | 1.01 | 1.06 | 2.14 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.32 | 0.34 |  |  |
| May 24 | 78.81 | 0.14 | 0.78 | 0.75 | 1.88 | 0.42 | 0.39 | 0.29 | 0.30 |  |  |
| May 31 | 79.06 | 0.39 | 2.77 | 3.07 | 3.33 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.47 | 0.52 |  |  |
| June 7 | 78.80 | 0.13 | 0.65 | 0.67 | 1.72 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.26 | 0.28 | 0.66 | SLOPE-June6-15.2m U/S and D/S from discharge section |
| June 14 | 78.77 | 0.10 | 0.44 | 0.47 | 1.52 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.48 | SLOPE-June $13^{\prime} 15.2 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and D/S from discharge section |
| June 21 | 78.77 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.47 | 1.50 | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.24 | 0.24 |  |  |
| June 28 | 78.73 | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 1.10 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.17 | 0.18 |  |  |
| Equations: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) $\log _{10} \mathrm{Q}=$ | $1.0529+1$ | $3826\left(\log _{10} 5\right)$ | $\underset{r}{\mathrm{CI}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.2727 \\ .993 \end{gathered}$ | $1.4925$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) $\log _{10} \bar{V}=$ | $0.2082+0$ | $7252\left(\log _{10} 5\right.$ | CI r | $\begin{gathered} 0.6682 \\ .993 \end{gathered}$ | 0.7822 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) $\log _{10} \mathrm{R}=$ | $0.0526+0$ | $5588\left(\log _{10}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CI} \\ \mathrm{r} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4865 \\ .982 \end{gathered}$ | 0.6310 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SLOPE-June $13^{\prime} 15.2 \mathrm{~m}$ U/S and D/S from discharge section

## where $Q=$ discharge

$S=s$ tage
$\bar{V}=$ Mean cross sectional velocity
$R=$ hydraulic radius
$C I=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
$r=$ correlation

Appendix 23. Flow Summary Table - Smith Creek, Location 7.

| Date | Stage (m) |  | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | Area <br> ( $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Velocity } \\ & (\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{mc}) \end{aligned}$ |  | Hyd. Radius (m) |  | $\underset{\%}{\text { Slope }}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elevation | Datum | Meas. |  |  | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| April 22 | 87.79 | 0.24 | 1.23 | 1.25 | 1.89 | 0.65 | 0.61 | 0.33 | 0.28 |  |  |
| April 27 | 88.49 | 0.92 | * | 7.31 | * | * | 1.33 | - | 0.52 |  | *Incomplete |
| May 2 | 88.35 | 0.80 | 5.98 | 6.08 | 5.74 | 1.04 | 1.23 | 0.57 | 0.49 |  |  |
| May 10 | 87.93 | 0.38 | 1.95 | 2.28 | 2.52 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.29 | 0.35 |  |  |
| May 17 | 87.76 | 0.21 | 0.95 | 1.04 | 1.63 | 0.58 | 0.57 | 0.21 | 0.26 |  |  |
| May 24 | 87.71 | 0.16 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 1.34 | 0.55 | 0.49 | 0.19 | 0.23 |  |  |
| May 31 | 87.95 | 0.40 | 3.00 | 2.44 | 3.21 | 0.93 | 0.82 | 0.36 | 0.35 |  |  |
| June 7 | 87.70 | 0.15 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 1.43 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 1.39 | SLOPE June $6-15.2 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and D/S from Discharge Section |
| June 14 | 87.66 | 0.11 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 1.16 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.20 | 0.19 | 1.81 | SLOPE June 13-15.2m U/S and D/S from Discharge Section |
| June 21 | 87.65 | 0.10 | 0.44 | 0.39 | 1.09 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  |
| June 28 | 87.61 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.84 | 0.23 | 0.28 | 0.16 | 0.15 |  |  |

1) $\log _{10} \mathrm{Q}=0.9116+1.3171\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad C I=1.2089-1.4253$
2) $\begin{aligned} \log _{10} \bar{V}=0.1441+0.5756\left(\log _{10} \mathrm{~S}\right) \quad \mathrm{CI} & =0.4616-0.6895 \\ r & =.972\end{aligned}$
3) $\log _{10} R=0.2665+0.4648\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad C I=0.3182-0.6114$
where $\mathrm{Q}=$ discharge
$\underline{S}=s$ tage
$\bar{V}=$ Mean cross sectional area
$\mathrm{R}=$ hydraulic radius
$C I=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
$r=$ correlation

Appendix 24. Flow Summary Table - Smith Creek, Location 8.

|  | Stage (m) <br> Datum Above 7ero |  | Discharge ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} \mathrm{sec}$ ) |  | Area $\left(m^{2}\right)$ | Velocity (m/mc) |  | Hyd. Radius <br> (m) |  | $\underset{\%}{\text { Slope }}$ | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Elevation | Datum | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Meas. | Calc. | Meas. | Calc. |  |  |
| April 22 | 89.98 | 0.23 | 1.03 | 1.50 | 2.96 | 0.35 | 0.41 | 0.32 | 0.37 |  |  |
| April 26 | 90.25 | 0.50 | 5.34 | 4.86 | 6.06 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.50 | 0.45 |  |  |
| day 2 | 90.24 | 0.49 | 6.15 | 4.72 | 6.16 | 0.93 | 0.86 | 0.53 | 0.45 |  |  |
| May 10 | 90.01 | 0.26 | 2.01 | 1.81 | 3.84 | 0.52 | 0.47 | 0.37 | 0.38 |  |  |
| May 17 | 89.93 | 0.18 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 3.06 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.35 |  |  |
| May 24 | 89.90 | 0.15 | 0.71 | 0.79 | 2.70 | 0.26 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 0.33 |  |  |
| May 31 | 90.07 | 0.32 | 2.59 | 2.48 | 4.37 | 0.59 | 0.57 | 0.37 | 0.40 |  |  |
| June 7 | 89.87 | 0.12 | 0.59 | 0.56 | 2.52 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.30 | 0.31 | 0.26 | SLOPE June 6-15.2m U/S and D/S from Discharge Section |
| June 14 | 89.86 | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.49 | 2.17 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.21 | 0.32 | SLOPE June $13-15.2 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{S}$ from Discharge Section |
| June 21 | 89.86 | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.49 | 2.23 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  |
| June 28 | 89.81 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 1.81 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  |
| Oct 12 | 89.79 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 1.70 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.24 |  |  |

Equations:

1) $\begin{aligned} \log _{10} Q=1.1426+1.5135\left(\log _{10} S\right) & \mathrm{CI}\end{aligned}=1.3237-1.7033$
2) $\log _{10} \bar{V}=0.2347+0.9686\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad C I=0.8735-1.0638$ $r=.990$
3) $\begin{aligned} \log _{10} R=0.2694+0.2539\left(\log _{10} S\right) \quad C I & =0.1692-0.3386 \\ r & =.904\end{aligned}$
where $Q=$ discharge
$\begin{aligned} Q & =\text { stage } \\ V & =\text { mean cross-sectional velocity } \\ R & =\text { hydraulic radius } \\ C I & =95 \% \text { confidence interval of } b\end{aligned}$
$C I=95 \%$ confidence interval of $b$
$r=$ correlation

Appendix 25. Water Chemistry Data For Smith Creek, 1976.


Appendix 25. Continued.

|  |  | Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis | Location | Apri1 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 7 | July 21 | Aug. 3 | Aug. 18 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 | Oct. 14 | Dec. 10 |
| Si | 5 | 1.47 | N/S | 2.00 | 2.15 | 2.94 | 3.68 | 4.01 | 3.88 | 3.71 | 3.73 | 3.75 | 3.84 | 5.15 |
| $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 6 | 1.46 | 1.66 | 1.99 | 2.15 | 2.99 | 3.68 | 4.08 | 3.91 | 3.75 | 3.78 | 3.77 | 3.82 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 1.43 | 1.64 | 1.97 | 2.10 | 2.92 | 3.70 | 4.10 | 3.85 | 3.71 | 3.73 | 3.76 | 3.72 | 5.21 |
|  | 8 | 1.42 | 1.60 | N/S | 2.03 | 2.74 | 3.44 | 3.97 | 3.67 | 3.49 | 3.41 | 3.45 | 3.63 | 5.10 |
| C1 | 5 | 4.4 | 17.4 | 8.4 | 32.8 | 84.0 | 149 | 186 | 162 | 159 | 194 | 191 | 155 | 408 |
| $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 6 | 4.4 | 17.0 | 9.4 | 32.2 | 85.5 | 153 | 185 | 162 | 165 | 198 | 195 | 148 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 4.0 | 16.6 | 8.6 | 29.2 | 77.5 | 143 | 175 | 150 | 148 | 181 | 176 | 128 | 440 |
|  | 8 | 2.6 | 5.2 | N/S | 21.6 | 55.0 | 114 | 158 | 94.0 | 105 | 140 | 132 | 119 | 390 |
| $\mathrm{SO}_{4}$ | 5 | 10.4 | 28.5 | 24.0 | 57.5 | 134 | 204 | 231 | 114 | 214 | 236 | 246 | 241 | 544 |
| $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 6 | 10.6 | 26.5 | 23.2 | 57.8 | 134 | 196 | 215 | 114 | 209 | 236 | 243 | 220 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 10.2 | 24.8 | 22.6 | 54.1 | 128 | 194 | 215 | 108 | 202 | 236 | 233 | 201 | 584 |
|  | 8 | 8.4 | 22.4 | N/S | 46.5 | 98.0 | 164 | 205 | 87.5 | 156 | 187 | 190 | 202 | 592 |
| Total | 5 | 58 | N/S | 72 | 20 | 9 | 13 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 17 |
| Suspended | 6 | 54 | 26 | 68 | 21 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 28 | N/S |
| Solids mg/L | 7 | 32 | 29 | 65 | 21 | 4 | 16 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 25 |
|  | 8 | 35 | 21 | N/S | 8 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 5 |
| Total | 5 | 160 | N/S | 210 | 340 | 600 | 810 | 880 | 740 | 790 | 900 | 920 | 860 | 1650 |
| Dissolved | 6 | 150 | 210 | 210 | 360 | 610 | 790 | 920 | 750 | 790 | 910 | 910 | 890 | N/S |
| Solids mg/L | 7 | 150 | 210 | 160 | 330 | 590 | 780 | 890 | 710 | 740 | 980 | 890 | 820 | 1730 |
|  | 8 | 140 | 190 | N/S | 320 | 460 | 680 | 860 | 580 | 630 | 710 | 7.40 | 820 | 1640 |

Appendix 25. Continued

| Analysis | Location | Apri1 28 | May 12 | May 31 | June 9 | July 7 | - Da | Aug. 3 | Aug. 15 | Aug. 31 | Sept. 15 | Sept. 28 Oct. 14 |  | Dec. 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Na $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 5 | 2.41 | 10.7 | 6.78 | 22.4 | 60.1 | 9.70 | 112 | 91.8 | 99.5 | 113 | 108 | 105 | 246 |
|  | 6 | 2.34 | 10.9 | 7.14 | 22.0 | 59.7 | 95.3 | 112 | 91.8 | 103 | 109 | 109 | 99.6 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 2.09 | 9.4 | 5.30 | 19.1 | 51.2 | 89.0 | 106 | 76.5 | 95.6 | 108 | 97.9 | 84.5 | 246 |
|  | 8 | 1.23 | 5.23 | N/S | 14.5 | 34.4 | 70.4 | 96.0 | 57.4 | 66.3 | 72.8 | 67.8 | 79.5 | 224 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}}$ | 5 | 0.94 | 0.99 | 0.46 | 0.87 | 1.74 | 2.35 | 3.19 | 2.54 | 2.77 | 2.84 | 2.92 | 2.94 | 5.06 |
|  | 6 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 0.48 | 0.89 | 1.68 | 2.48 | 3.05 | 2.59 | 2.72 | 2.78 | 2,94 | 2.85 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.46 | 0.87 | 1.51 | 2.21 | 3.09 | 2.45 | 2.63 | 2.78 | 2.78 | 2.58 | 6.42 |
|  | 8 | 1.01 | 0.82 | N/S | 0.78 | 1.29 | 2.18 | 2.98 | 2.16 | 2.32 | 2.38 | 2.40 | 2.60 | 6.18 |
| Ca $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 5 | 21.4 | 43.1 | 38.0 | 54.4 | 95.7 | 107 | 115 | 102 | 97.9 | 124 | 128 | 219 | 38.8 |
|  | 6 | 21.2 | 38.7 | 38.1 | 53.9 | 96.9 | 107 | 121 | 102 | 110 | 122 | 124 | 119 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 21.0 | 38.4 | 38.4 | 54.6 | 93.9 | 108 | 111 | 97.9 | 105 | 132 | 126 | 120 | 39.5 |
|  | 8 | 20.5 | 35.4 | N/S | 50.7 | 83.7 | 103 | 117 | 94.7 | 102 | 115 | 113 | 118 | 37.6 |
| $\mathrm{Mg}$$\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 5 | 4.68 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 14.6 | 25.4 | 32.3 | 34.6 | 44.4 | 36.4 | 34.3 | 35.6 | 39.5 | 60.1 |
|  | 6 | 4.73 | 9.60 | 10.3 | 15.1 | 25.8 | 33.0 | 36.1 | 44.8 | 37.8 | 33.8 | 37.0 | 36.7 | N/S |
|  | 7 | 4.63 | 9.31 | 10.1 | 13.9 | 24.7 | 32.3 | 35.5 | 45.1 | 37.1 | 34.8 | 36.4 | 36.7 | 58.3 |
|  | 8 | 4.49 | 8.54 | N/S | 13.3 | 22.9 | 30.6 | 36.1 | 41.1 | 33.2 | 30.7 | 30.2 | 36.1 | 55.9 |

[^3]
[^0]:    Stomach content analyses were performed on the 13 dead samples obtained. Eight stomachs were found to be empty, the rest contained fish remains, mainly Arctic grayling.

    A total of 46 northern pike was detected moving downstream during the fence operation. The

[^1]:    *Sig. Effect and Sig. Difference calculated at $95 \%$ confidence level.

[^2]:    * derived from totai length and weight of 18 individuals measured together.

[^3]:    $N / S=$ No Sample

