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The first known sample of freshwater jellyfish \([\textit{Craspedacusta sowerbyi}\)](Lankester, 1880 (Cnidaria: Limnomedusae: Olindiiidae)) in Montana came from an artificial pond on an abandoned golf course in Cascade County near the town of Great Falls in 2009 (Fig. 1). The pond is located ~600 m from the Missouri River and is part of a four pond network connected by a dry artificial stream.

\textit{C. sowerbyi} originated in the Yangtze River area of China. Distribution of this species is widespread throughout Europe (Didžiulis 2008) and believed to be caused by transporting ornamental pond plants containing eggs or polyps. The first reported case outside of China was in London England in 1880. As of 2009, freshwater jellyfish have been reported in all of the continental 48 states except Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming (T. Peard, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, personal communication, 2010). Most populations are found in lakes and ponds and only about 8 percent in flowing water (Beckett and Turanchik 1980).

The initial collection occurred on 25 August 2009. Hydromedusa were observed swimming near the surface, collected with a dip net, and then preserved in 10-percent

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure}\caption{Location of freshwater jellyfish pond in Montana and six downstream reservoirs on the Missouri River.}
\end{figure}
Mean diameter of the jellyfish measured 29 mm (17-34; Fig. 2). A second visit occurred on 3 September 2009 to make museum collections and record habitat conditions. The pond surface area was 1.09 ha, maximum depth was 2.04 m and mean depth was 1.25 m (Fig 3). Secchi reading was 31 cm. Surface water temperature was 18.1 °C. The substrate of the pond was primarily coarse sand with a few piles of rock 12-25 cm in diameter. No vegetation was present in the water or along the shoreline. Two plankton tows were made from a small raft with a 30-cm diameter 80-micron Wisconsin net at the deepest part of the pond. Plankton collected were *Bosmina* spp., *Cyclops* spp., Nauplii of Cyclops and trace amounts of rotifers *Kellicottia* spp., *Conochilus* spp., and *Asplanchna* spp. One yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) measuring 49 mm long and several water boatmen (Corixidae) were collected.

The life history, distribution and feeding habits of this species have been adequately described by Stefani et al. (2010) and Smith and Alexander (2008). Field and laboratory studies show when population levels are abundant, *C. sowerbyi* can have significant reductions in plankton abundance (Pérez-Bote et al. 2006, Jankowski et al. 2005) as well as selectivity for plankton species and size (Smith and Alexander 2008, Pérez-Bote et al. 2006).

The location of this population raises concern about possible expansion into the Missouri River. Six hydroelectric dams (Black Eagle, Rainbow, Cochrane, Ryan, Morony) that impound reservoirs on the Missouri River downstream of this pond would provide adequate habitat for this organism to survive (Fig.1). The reservoir effect of the closest dam begins 33 river-km downstream of this pond. Fort Peck Reservoir, the largest earthen dam in the United States, is located on the Missouri River 386 river-km downstream of the
First Report of Freshwater Jellyfish in, Montana

This 206-km long reservoir is vital habitat for the last self-sustaining population of paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*) in the United States, and for Cisco (*Coregonus artedi*), which is an important forage fish for the Fort Peck Reservoir sport fishery. Both of these fish species feed almost exclusively on plankton during all life stages. Given the ability of this organism to select for specific plankton and affect their reduction, the ecological impacts of this species could be far reaching if it becomes established in the Missouri River reservoirs.
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**Figure 3.** Bathymetric map of freshwater jellyfish pond in Montana with plankton sampling location. Map contours are 0.5-m increments.
FISH ENTRAINMENT INVESTIGATIONS AT THE FORT SHAW DIVERSION 2003-2004, SUN RIVER, MONTANA

Juddson D. Sechrist, USDI Bureau of Reclamation, PO Box 25007 (86-68290), Denver, CO 80225-0007, 303-445-2198, jsechrist@usbr.gov
Katherine Potak Zehfuss, USDI Bureau of Reclamation, PO Box 25007 (86-68290), Denver, CO 80225-0007, 303-445-2240, kzehfuss@usbr.gov

ABSTRACT
Fish entrainment associated with irrigation has had long-term consequences for many species in the western United States. Investigation of entrainment and attempts at its prevention through physical or behavioral barrier installation are common management practices. However, the factors affecting entrainment are rarely quantified. The purpose of this study was to quantify fish entrained from the Sun River mainstem into the Fort Shaw diversion canal by species using an entrainment monitoring system; and second, to analyze the factors that contributed to this fish entrainment. These factors included: year, photoperiod, Sun River flow, Fort Shaw Canal diverted flow, Fort Shaw lag flow, ratio of diverted flow to Sun River flow, temperature, and moon phase. There were 6536 fish captured in 2003 and 2004 comprising 13 species and unknowns. We found significant differences in entrainment rates associated with Sun River flow, ratio of diverted flow to Sun River flow, and photoperiod. Our data indicated that at this site, fish entrainment is directly related to volume of water diverted, especially when diverted flows exceed mainstem river flows, and that fish entrainment at this site was highest during dark periods. The fish entrainment netting system used at the Fort Shaw Diversion was considered to be both economical and effective for documenting occurrence and determining the composition and number of fish entrained.
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INTRODUCTION
The practice of irrigation has been practiced in Montana for over 160 yrs. A complete census regarding the number of irrigation diversions in Montana is not currently available; however, historical information regarding increases in irrigated acreage would indicate that the number of irrigation diversions has increased concurrently (Howard 1992). Many of these irrigation diversions lead to unintentional fish entrainment, which can cause long-term detrimental effects on fish populations in Montana (Reiland 1997, Gale et al. 2008) and in the western United States (Prince 1922, Hallock and Van Woert 1959, Cook and Buffaloe 1998, Zydlewski and Johnson 2002, Nobriga et al. 2004, Schrank and Rahel 2004, Moyle and Israel 2005).

Entrainment is defined as the fluvial transport of fish out of their in-stream environment in waters that are passed through a conduit, penstock, or diversion at power generation facilities, dams and / or irrigation canals (Zydlewski and Johnson 2002). Large losses of fish to irrigation canals in Montana have been documented by Thoreson (1952), Clothier (1954), Spindler (1955), Reiland (1997), Mogen and Kaeding (2002), and Sechrist et al. (2005). In addition, Bakes et al. (1998) examined the effects of diversion location on fish movement. Also, quantitative estimates of entrainment at diversions have been determined by Hiebert et al. (2000) and Gale et al (2008).

The effects of irrigation diversions on fish population demographics and connectivity can be cumulative (Helfrich et al. 1999). Several diversions may be located in a specific river basin and, although individual irrigation diversions may not significantly affect fish populations, collectively they may
entrain considerable numbers of fish (Hallock and Van Woert 1959).

Most research pertaining to fish entrainment caused by diverted flows has been conducted in accordance with physical fish screen installation and efficiency testing at diversions (Neitzel et al. 1991, McMichael et al. 2001). These research studies therefore have focused on issues such as approach velocities for fish encountering a screened diversion (Pearce and Lee 1991), and physical characteristics at diversion sites that influence entrainment (Spindler 1955).

Many factors contributing to fish entrainment have been assessed in varying degree. These include: placement of irrigation withdrawal structures within a river channel or the channel morphology associated with the structures (Spindler 1955, Hiebert et al. 2000), river discharge as a catalyst for movement (Young 1994, Reiland 1997), temperature effects (Clothier 1954), turbidity effects (Bakes et al. 1998), habitat complementation (for example, spawn to post-spawn movements, e.g. Shrank and Rahel 2004), fish movement based on diel patterns (Nobriga et al. 2004), and ambient light (Gale et al. 2008). It has been assumed qualitatively that the number of fish entrained is positively correlated to the volume of diverted flow and concurrent density of fish in the water being diverted (Hiebert et al. 2000, Hanson 2001, and Post et al. 2006). However, the quantitative relationship between diverted flow and fish entrainment remains poorly understood (Moyle and Israel 2005).

The purpose of our research was to focus on this relationship between entrainment and flow by installing and implementing an entrainment monitoring system. The objectives were to first quantify fish entrained from the Sun River mainstem into the Fort Shaw diversion canal by species; and second, to analyze the factors that contributed to this fish entrainment. Factors included year, photoperiod, Sun River flow, Fort Shaw Canal diverted flow, Fort Shaw lag flow, ratio of diverted flow to Sun River flow, temperature, and moon phase.

**Study Area**

The Sun River is a tributary to the Missouri River in north-central Montana, with a watershed of ~ 5700-km² (Fig. 1).

![Figure 1. The Sun River watershed with inset of Fort Shaw Diversion Canal.](image-url)
The Sun River drains from the continental divide via north and south forks to the Missouri River confluence, decreasing in elevation from 2743 m to 914 m along the Rocky Mountain front range for 177 km. Primary water storage on the mainstem Sun River occurs in Gibson Reservoir with a capacity of 122,238,050 m³. Mean annual discharge from Gibson Reservoir in 2003 and 2004 was 15.8 and 14.9 cubic meters/second (m³/s), respectively. The Sun River hydrograph from Gibson Dam to its confluence with the Missouri River is influenced by numerous irrigation diversions. The middle Sun River (from the Sun River Diversion Dam to Fort Shaw, Montana) has three major irrigation diversions and associated districts: Greenfield Irrigation District, Broken ‘O’ Ranch, and the Fort Shaw Irrigation District.

The Fort Shaw Diversion Dam and Canal is located ~ 8 km upstream from Simms, Montana (Fig. 1). The Fort Shaw Canal inlet is on the main channel of the Sun River immediately upstream from, or south of, the Fort Shaw Diversion Dam. A concrete headworks operates with four gates to regulate the flow into the canal. The canal has an approximate capacity of 6.3 m³/s. The canal is 19.5 km long and supplies water to the Fort Shaw Irrigation District through ~ 85 laterals. Fort Shaw Irrigation District water irrigated ~ 4573 ha during the course of this study (Bill Bohmker, Fort Shaw Irrigation District Irrigation Manager, pers. comm.).

METHODS

Fish Sampling Techniques

We designed the entrainment monitoring system implemented at the Fort Shaw Diversion to sample 100 percent of the diverted flow through the diversion’s four gates. It consisted of a steel construction frame-work that enabled fyke-type nets to be raised and lowered at the diversion (Figs. 2 and 3). The system utilized eight – 6.4 m steel net frame guides (SAE measurements: 3/16-in non-radiused stock channel, 3.5-in by 2.5-in inside diameter) to guide four 2.3 m² net frames (2-in by 2-in square tube) into

![Figure 2. Side-view schematic of the Fort Shaw Diversion entrainment netting system.](image-url)
position behind each of the diversion’s four gates. Two pieces of 7.6-m channel were welded into place to form a top-bar (2-in radiused bar channel) over the net frame guides. This allowed four 115 V AC electric winches, each with a 454 kg capacity, to be placed above each gate on a mounting bracket to raise and lower the net frames while sampling. Concrete sleeve anchors (1.3 and 1.6 cm or 1/2 and 5/8 in) were used to anchor all un-welded steel to the diversion. Steel installation occurred prior to water-up in the canal in April 2003.

The nets for the entrainment monitoring system consisted of four fyke-type nets from Research Nets (Bothell, WA) used on the net frames. The nets were 6.7 m long and were constructed of 1.3-cm (½-in) knotted mesh running to a 4.8-mm (3/16-in) double-bagged cod-end with a heavy duty zipper to allow contents to be emptied. The nets also had 2.5-cm (1-in) steel rings sewn in to accommodate a 1.6-cm (5/8-in) choker line. The choker line prevented fish and debris from escaping the net during retrieval (Figs. 2 and 3). Ultra-violet resistant industrial zip-ties were used to affix the nets to their respective frames, through grommets near the net mouth. Net installation occurred in May 2003.

In both 2003 and 2004, the four nets were operated for 12-hr “Overall” sampling periods, generally starting at 1500 hrs until 0400 hrs the following day. Nets were pulled every 2 hrs and catch was sorted, measured, and recorded for each sampling period. Sampling periods were further defined as “light” for fish caught before 21:00, and “dark” for fish caught after 21:00. Extended net sets with a 24-hr operational period were also implemented in both years. In 2003, netting occurred on 33 days between 3 June and 25 September. In 2004, netting occurred on 30 days between 25 May and 29 July. Netting coincided with the peak hydrograph for each year. All fish captured in both years were returned to the canal.

Figure 3. Photograph of the deployed Fort Shaw Diversion entrainment netting system. Aspect is from the canal side.
Fish Entrainment Rate Calculation

We obtained diverted flow data from the gauge operated by the Fort Shaw Irrigation District (ARC050 V1.4F 09-Dec-1997: Report For Water Year 2003 and Report For Water Year 2004). The gauging station, with Station Identity “FSDM Fort Shaw Diversion Dam near Simms, Montana,” is directly downstream of the canal gates (Fig. 1) and generates Daily Mean Canal Discharge (ft³/s). Flows for Sun River were obtained from USGS Real-Time Water Data for Montana using gauging station “USGS 06085800 Sun River at Simms Montana” (http://waterdata.usgs.gov/mt/nwis/uv). Although this gauging station is roughly 15 km downstream of the Fort Shaw diversion dam, it provided an approximation of the magnitude of Sun River flow at the dam. These flow data were converted to cubic meters /second (m³/s), and further converted to cubic meters/sampling period using hours sampled/sampling period.

Because sampling periods generally covered two subsequent dates, an average of these two dates’ Daily Mean Discharge were used for volume calculations for overall sampling periods. The first date’s Daily Mean Discharge was used for the day sampling period, and the second date’s Daily Mean Discharge was used for the night sampling period. This generated a volume for diverted flow per each sampling period. Two types of fish entrainment rates were calculated during this study. For the purposes of comparisons of variables related to flow (Q), the first entrainment rate was calculated and presented as fish per hr. Comparisons of other variables not related to flow are reported are fish per m³.

We divided the number of fish captured per sample period by the diverted flow per sampling period. This yielded an entrainment rate for each overall, day, and night sampling period. Composition metrics and entrainment rates were calculated for all fish species combined, and for individual species in both years.

To obtain an estimate of total fish entrainment occurring at the Fort Shaw diversion during periods outside of the standardized collection period, and to estimate fish entrainment occurring at this diversion during the course of the June-September irrigation season, 24-hr continuous sampling periods were implemented. These data were collected in conjunction with the standardized 12-hr sample periods. The two 24-hr entrainment rates were derived from one 60-hr (14-17 Jul 2003) and one 72-hr (26-29 Jul 2004) continuous sampling effort.

Statistical Analyses

The 2003, 2004, and combined 2003/2004 number of fish entrained and entrainment rates at Fort Shaw were statistically analyzed to determine if they were independent of certain factors. These factors were: year, photoperiod, Sun River flow, Fort Shaw Canal diverted flow, Fort Shaw lag flow, ratio of diverted flow to Sun River flow, temperature, and moon phase. Nonparametric statistical procedures were used, which did not require assuming normality or equal variance. For all significance testing, the alpha level was 0.05 using two-tailed tests.

Flow and Temperature Parameters.—

Diverted canal flows were the same data as used for the entrainment rate calculations. The flow being diverted into the Fort Shaw canal in comparison to the concurrent flow in Sun River, or Ratio Flow, was calculated as:

\[
FS/SR \text{ Ratio Flow} = \frac{\text{Fort Shaw canal flow}}{\text{Sun River flow}}
\]

The change in flow being diverted into the canal before each overall sampling period and the preceding day was calculated as:

\[
\text{Fort Shaw Lag Flow} = (\text{Fort Shaw canal flow})_{time\ 2} - (\text{Fort Shaw canal flow})_{time\ 1}
\]

Where: Time 2 is current study day and Time 1 is prior calendar day
Temperature data were obtained from Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks (MFWP) thermograph array at Lowry Bridge, which is approximately 5.5 km downstream of the Fort Shaw Diversion (Fig 1).

The Spearman Rank Order Correlation was used to measure the strength of association, or correlation, between pairs of variables (Sokal and Rohlf 1995). The Spearman Rank Order Correlation coefficient is computed by ranking all values of each variable, then computing the Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient of the ranks. This Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, R, was then used to test study hypotheses regarding a correlation between numbers of fish entrained per hour and flow and temperature factors. It is a dimensionless index that ranges from -1.0 to 1.0 inclusive, and reflected the extent of correlation between entrainment (overall sampling period fish entrainment results) and a factor, e.g., Sun River flow, Fort Shaw flow, Fort Shaw lag flow, ratio flow, and temperature.

**Year, Photoperiod, and Moon Phase Parameters.**—The Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test was used to test for differences between sample groups that were greater than what could be attributed to random sampling variation (Sokal and Rohlf 1995). The null hypothesis was that the two samples, such as light and dark period entrainment rates, were not drawn from populations with different medians.

Entrainment rates from 2003 and 2004 were compared to assess a difference between years. Within each year, light sampling period entrainment rates were compared to dark sampling period entrainment rates to assess differences in entrainment rates due to photoperiod. We preferred within year day and night entrainment comparisons to pooled comparisons (by year) because of the uncertainty associated with annual run-off timing, etc. Also, for each dark sampling period, moon phase was recorded and verified using a lunar calendar. Entrainment rates for sampling periods with either full moon or new moon phases using both years’ data were compared to assess lunar effects.

**RESULTS**

**2003 Entrainment Results**

Sampling occurred for 33 days during 3 June 2003 to 25 September 2003 for a total of 395 hours of sampling. There were a total of 2585 fish entrained during this period, comprised of 10 species (Table 1, Fig. 4) with 247 fish of unknown species. Unknown species were attributed to field situations where netting system maintenance required immediate attention so fish identification was hampered or in cases of incomplete specimens. Additionally, 2799 crawfish (Orconectes virilis) were entrained during the netting operations. Mean overall entrainment rates and lengths are given in Table 2.

**Twenty-Four Hour Entrainment Rates.**—On 14 - 17 July 2003, a 60-hr continuous netting effort was performed to obtain the 24-hr entrainment rates. These 24 hr entrainment rates for all pooled species were 0.000134 fish / m$$^3$$ 14 July-15 July, and 0.000124 fish / m$$^3$$ on 15 July-16 July. These were lower than the average overall entrainment rates given in Table 2. Although diverted flows into the canal peaked on 16 July and 17 July at approximately 7 m$$^3$$/s, entrainment rates (qualitatively) appeared to not be affected by the peak (Fig. 4).

By summing seasonal flow data, there were approximately 25,573,828 m$$^3$$ (ARCO50 V1.4F 09-Dec-1997 Report For Water Year 2003) of water diverted from the Sun River into the Fort Shaw Diversion June 2003 – September 2003. We estimated total fish entrainment occurring at this diversion during the course of the June-September irrigation season using the 24-hr entrainment rate and this total diverted flow. Using the 14 July-16 July 24 hour entrainment rate of 0.000134 and 0.000124 fish/m$$^3$$, multiplied by total flow, we estimate between 3171-3427 fish were entrained June through September 2003.

---

*Fish Entrainment Investigations at the Fort Shaw Diversion 2003-2004, Sun River, Montana*
Table 1. Summary of number of fish captured during the three sampling periods in 2003 and 2004 in Fort Shaw Diversion Canal, Sun River, Montana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Trout</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salmo trutta</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathead Minnow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pimephales promelas</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Chub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Couesius plumbeus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longnose Dace</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhinichthys cataractae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longnose Sucker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Catostomus catostomus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mottled Sculpin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cottus bairdi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Sucker</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Catostomus platyrhynchus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Whitefish</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prosopium williamsoni</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North. Redbelly Dace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phoxinus eos</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Trout</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oncorhynchus mykiss</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvery or Brassy Minnow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hybognathus sp.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sucker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Catostomus commersoni</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Perch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Perca flavescens</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk/Unmeas.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2341</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2004 Entrainment Results

Sampling occurred for 30 days during 25 May 2004 to 29 July 2004 for a total of 358 hours of sampling. There were a total of 3951 fish entrained during our sampling effort, comprised of 13 species (Table 1, Fig. 5) with 11 fish of unknown species. Additionally, 2630 crawfish were entrained during the netting operations. Again, longnose dace were the most common species captured (see 2003 vs. 2004, Table 1). Mean overall entrainment rates and lengths are given in Table 2.

Entrainment rates in 2004 appeared to increase as the amount of water being diverted at Fort Shaw approached or became greater than the downstream river flow below the diversion in the summer (Fig. 5).
These inflection points in June and July represented the highest entrainment rates for the sample period.

Twenty-Four Hour Entrainment Rates.— On 26 - 29 July 2004, a 72-hr continuous netting effort was performed to obtain the 24-hr entrainment rates. These 24-hr entrainment rates, 0.000088 (27 Jul) and 0.00012 fish / m³ (28 Jul), were lower than the average overall entrainment rates as shown in Table 2. There were ~ 46,169,269 m³ (ARC050 V1.4F 09-Dec-1997 Report For Water Year 2004) of water diverted from the Sun River into the Fort Shaw Diversion June 2004-September 2004. May flow estimates were not included so that flow during irrigation seasons could be compared between years. Using the 27-28 July 24-hr entrainment rates, multiplied by total flow, we estimate between 4063-5540 fish were entrained June-September 2004.

**Flow and Temperature Effects on Entrainment Results**

During the 2003 study period, diverted flow into the Fort Shaw Canal was highest during June, ranging 3.1-6.7 m³/s, and was lower during July-September staying 0.6 - 3.7 m³/s (Fig. 4, also Table 1 in Appendix A). During the 2004 study period, diverted flow

---

Figure 4. Fish entrained per study hour in 2003 overall sampling period in Fort Shaw Canal with Fort Shaw Canal diverted flow and Sun River flow at Simms, MT.
Table 2. Summary of lengths of fish entrained during all sampling periods and mean entrainment rates for Overall sampling period during 2003 and 2004 in Fort Shaw Diversion Canal, Sun River, Montana. ER is the entrainment rate of fish per 1000 m³ of flow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Mean Study Year</th>
<th>Min Length (mm)</th>
<th>Max Mean Length (mm)</th>
<th>Overall ER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Trout</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathead Minnow</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.4762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Chub</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longnose Dace</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.0493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longnose Sucker</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mottled Sculpin</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Sucker</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.0727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.0626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Whitefish</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North. Redbelly Dace</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Trout</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.7959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.7181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Flow was highest in late July with flows reaching 7.4 m³/s with slightly lower flows earlier in the season (Fig. 5, also Table 2 in Appendix A). In both years, Sun River flows peaked above 39 m³/s early in the season, and then quickly dropped to ~ 1.5 m³/s the remainder of the season.

In assessing effects of flow variables on fish entrained/hour, only the effects of Sun River flow and the FS:SR Ratio Flow appeared significant (Table 3, Fig. 6). Fish entrained/hour was negatively correlated with Sun River flow, with more fish entrained as less flow was discharged in the river. Fish entrainment was positively correlated with the ratio of Fort Shaw Canal flow to Sun River flow, indicating that more fish were entrained as Fort Shaw Canal flow exceeded that of the Sun River. The Sun River temperature was not significantly
correlated with fish entrainment (Table 3, also Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix B).

**Year, Photoperiod, and Moon Phase Effects on Entrainment Results**

A graphical comparison of median entrainment rates is given in Figure 7. There was not a significant difference (Mann-Whitney U Statistic = 517.0 P = 0.767) in median overall entrainment rates for all species between 2003 and 2004.

We detected a significant difference both years (2003: Mann-Whitney U Statistic = 997.0 P ≤ 0.001, 2004: Mann-Whitney U Statistic = 835.0 P ≤ 0.001) when comparing...
Figure 6. Scatter Plot depicting correlation between fish entrained per study hour in Fort Shaw Canal during overall sampling periods and ratio of Fort Shaw Canal diverted flow to Sun River flow at Simms, MT.

Figure 7. Comparison of Entrainment Rates between years and sampling periods, depicting median Entrainment Rate with 25% and 75% quartiles.
median values for light and dark sampling period entrainment rates.

There was not a significant difference (Mann-Whitney U Statistic = 272.0 P = 0.420, Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix B) when comparing the difference in median dark entrainment rates for all species between new moon and full moon periods for both years.

**DISCUSSION**

The Fort Shaw nets captured 10 species previously identified to occur within the Sun River, but 3 species [northern redbelly dace (*Phoxinus eos*), fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*), and yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*)] were captured but were previously unrecorded within the Sun River Mainstem (based on Horton et al. 2006). Brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*), burbot (*Lota lota*), carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), and northern pike (*Esox lucius*) have all been sampled in low numbers in the Sun River, and of these, burbot were the only species sampled in the vicinity of the Fort Shaw Diversion by Horton et al. (2006) that was not captured. Entrainment rates and percentage of larger trout as defined by Horton et al. (2006) > 200 mm total length were similar in both years, i.e., 14.4 percent of brown trout and 4.3 percent of rainbow trout in 2003, and 16.0 percent of brown trout and 2.6 percent of rainbow trout in 2004). Trout population density estimates obtained from MFWP indicated Sun River densities near the Fort Shaw Diversion were low in comparison to other trout population densities in North-Central Montana. Mean trout densities of fish > 200 mm near the Fort Shaw Diversion were the lowest of all reaches sampled by Horton et al. (2006). This could be a result of irrigation withdrawals since our net capture data supports that trout are being entrained. We do not, however, know whether trout of all sizes were entrained disproportionately to their abundance since we did not simultaneously obtain an abundance estimate. Also, the relationship between abundance in Sun River and entrainment rate for all species remains unclear. For example, our estimates for longnose dace entrainment at the Fort Shaw Diversion indicated a potential for very high losses of this species. However, electrofishing-based population estimates for small, non-game species such as longnose dace are not particularly effective (Horton et al. 2006). Thus, application of the hypothesis that entrainment rates are related to main stem population density is one of probability, supported only by evidence that some small-bodied fishes have been found to have swimming performances inversely proportionate to water velocity (Warren and Pardew 1998), and have preferences for shallower shoreline habitat (Gryska et al. 1998), likely making them susceptible to entrainment due to diversion canal structure and velocities.

Although the 2003 sampling period encompassed a longer period of the irrigation season than 2004, the total number of fish entrained during 2004 was higher than 2003 by 1366 fish, which consisted mostly of the species longnose dace. There was a lower volume of water diverted in 2003 than in 2004 (20,595,441 fewer m3/s in 2003). This qualitatively seems to support common assumptions that fish entrainment is directly related to volume of water diverted (Hiebert et al. 2000, Hanson 2001, Post et al. 2006).

In both years there was a significant relationship between diverted flow and entrainment. The significance of the ratio of mainstem flow to diverted flow on fish entrained per hour indicates that fish may follow the cue of the larger flow. The numbers of fish entrained increased as the ratio (FS/SR) became > 1, indicating that the fish were following the larger diverted flow cue.

The 2004 Sun River hydrograph experienced a double peak in early June, yet this did not seem to affect entrainment. We would have expected to see higher entraniments in response to this second peak if Sun River flow was positively instead of negatively affecting entrainment. With one exception (4 June 2003), entrainment in both years appears to be the highest directly after an event where the diverted
flow into the canal exceeded the Sun River flow (Figs. 4 and 5). In addition, there was a statistically significant effect of this ratio between the two flows and entrainment. This would indicate that entrainment is probably affected by the change in flow with fish following the magnitude of the flow, whether it is down river or into the diversion. Our data indicate that when diverted flows exceed mainstem Sun River flows, fish are at greater risk for entrainment.

Many species such as salmon (Salmonidae), sturgeon (Acipenseridae), paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*), and blue suckers (*Cycleptus elongates*) have been shown to initiate large scale spawning movements within rivers experiencing discharge peaks (Russell 1986, Young 1994, Holton and Johnson 1996). Movement into the canal could be falsely cued by diversion discharges, which could increase entrainment probabilities for fish species in the Sun River.

In both years, entrainments rates were significantly higher during dark than during light sampling periods. Fish were more prone to entrainment during dark periods because they were likely more active during the dark periods, (e.g., Beers and Culp 1990, Schmetterling and Adams 2004). The 12-hr sample period used in our study appeared to be effective at capturing fish entrained into the canal because it likely incorporates this period of highest activity, which yielded higher capture efficiencies. For example, two 24-hour sampling periods from 2003 are compared in Figure 8. The hours of 2130-0330 appeared to be periods of highest entrainment. Future research studies at this site could consider doing only dark net sets if resources are limited.

There are examples in the literature that both support and refute a corollary for the effect of lunar periodicity. For example, Rooker and Dennis (1991) found that

![Figure 8. Twenty-four hour entrainment rates (14-16 July, 2003), Fort Shaw Diversion, Sun River, MT.](image)
lunar periodicity had no obvious effect on abundance of migratory fish assemblages in a tidal system, whereas Gale (2005) found lunar cycles may have influenced downstream movement young cutthroat trout; however, it did not appear to have an effect on fish entrainment at this diversion. We did not find that in-stream temperature had an effect on entrainment at the Fort Shaw Diversion although increasing stream temperatures likely initiate movement of cool or cold-water fishes (Lessard and Hayes 2003); and this movement presumably would increasing the chance of entrainment as fish encounter diversions while seeking thermal refugia.

We considered the fish entrainment netting system used at the Fort Shaw Diversion to be both economical and effective. This general design has been used on several Bureau of Reclamation entrainment studies in Montana but has not been formally published. For example, the Huntley (Best et al. 2004) and Intake Diversions (Hiebert et al. 2000) on the Yellowstone River, the St. Mary Diversion on the St. Mary River (Mogen and Kaeding 2002), the Frenchtown Diversion on the Clark Fork River (Sechrist et al. 2005), and in other river systems in the Western United States. Larger netting systems of this type have also been used to monitor entrainment from large reservoir turbine outfalls at Shasta and Blue Mesa Reservoirs (California and Colorado respectively, USDI Bureau of Reclamation, Unpub. data). These systems allow for quantification of entrainment timing (diurnal, seasonal) and species composition, yielding daily, seasonal, and species-specific entrainment rates. However, fyke-type netting systems of this design are monitoring intensive because they require frequent checks to clear debris and to prevent fish impingement at the back of the cod-end. The system is not robust to high water volume or velocity because the working ratio of frame opening to net length is assumed to be roughly 1:3/m^2 of frame opening (the net must be 3 times longer) to dissipate flow energy through our chosen mesh size. Thus in some diversion locations, net lengths could become unmanageable. Also, capture efficiency for larval or large, strong swimming fish have not been measured at any of the locations where these systems have been installed.

**CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Losses of Sun River fishes to irrigation diversions have been documented since 1952 (Thoreson 1952). Our study further revealed that many of these fish are entrained when the majority of the instream flow is diverted into irrigation canals. It is apparent that effective screening techniques would decrease entrainment at the Fort Shaw Diversion, and by extension, other large diversions within the Sun River.

In addition to potential screening, other proactive management techniques merit consideration. For example, in 2004, a limited salvage operation at the Fort Shaw canal did return some fish to the Sun River after irrigation deliveries had ceased. Further, in some years, an informal downstream flow agreement has existed to maintain limited flow below the Sun River Diversion Dam. To be effective, and because there are many diversions on the Sun River, any proactive water management that is likely to succeed will rely on consensus and cooperation between suppliers (government) and water users (stakeholders).
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### APPENDIX A.

Table 1. USGS and Hydromet stream flow gage data for Sun River at Simms and Fort Shaw Canal during 2003. Lag proportional flow is percentage change in flow from previous day. Entrainment (Fish/h) is based on 12 h sample periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SR Simms Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>FS Canal Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>Ratio FS/SR</th>
<th>Lag Prop. SR Flow</th>
<th>Lag Prop. FS Flow</th>
<th>Overall Study Fish/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2003</td>
<td>41.9136</td>
<td>6.6000</td>
<td>0.1575</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/2003</td>
<td>48.4272</td>
<td>6.7124</td>
<td>0.1386</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2003</td>
<td>40.7808</td>
<td>6.5586</td>
<td>0.1608</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2003</td>
<td>16.9920</td>
<td>5.8336</td>
<td>0.3433</td>
<td>-0.583</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2003</td>
<td>8.4960</td>
<td>5.7937</td>
<td>0.6819</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2003</td>
<td>11.3280</td>
<td>5.8149</td>
<td>0.5133</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/2003</td>
<td>14.1600</td>
<td>5.6773</td>
<td>0.4009</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/2003</td>
<td>16.9920</td>
<td>5.5485</td>
<td>0.3265</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2003</td>
<td>18.3514</td>
<td>5.3083</td>
<td>0.2893</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/2003</td>
<td>19.2293</td>
<td>5.0500</td>
<td>0.2626</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2003</td>
<td>18.9178</td>
<td>4.5742</td>
<td>0.2418</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2003</td>
<td>15.5194</td>
<td>4.2534</td>
<td>0.2741</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2003</td>
<td>12.4608</td>
<td>4.0387</td>
<td>0.3241</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2003</td>
<td>9.9970</td>
<td>4.0381</td>
<td>0.4039</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/2003</td>
<td>9.4872</td>
<td>4.0577</td>
<td>0.4277</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2003</td>
<td>7.5048</td>
<td>4.0047</td>
<td>0.5336</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/2003</td>
<td>6.6269</td>
<td>3.9031</td>
<td>0.5890</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2003</td>
<td>5.7206</td>
<td>3.8793</td>
<td>0.6781</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2003</td>
<td>7.9013</td>
<td>3.7238</td>
<td>0.4713</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2003</td>
<td>6.9101</td>
<td>3.5341</td>
<td>0.5114</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2003</td>
<td>5.8056</td>
<td>3.5522</td>
<td>0.6119</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2003</td>
<td>5.7206</td>
<td>3.2262</td>
<td>0.5640</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/2003</td>
<td>5.4941</td>
<td>3.1684</td>
<td>0.5767</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2003</td>
<td>5.4658</td>
<td>3.2967</td>
<td>0.6032</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26/2003</td>
<td>4.7294</td>
<td>3.3783</td>
<td>0.7143</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2003</td>
<td>4.0498</td>
<td>3.4808</td>
<td>0.8595</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2003</td>
<td>3.4550</td>
<td>3.5434</td>
<td>1.0256</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/2003</td>
<td>2.9170</td>
<td>3.7026</td>
<td>1.2693</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2003</td>
<td>2.1806</td>
<td>3.4910</td>
<td>1.6009</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2003</td>
<td>1.5859</td>
<td>3.1902</td>
<td>2.0116</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>24.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2003</td>
<td>1.5576</td>
<td>3.2429</td>
<td>2.0820</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2003</td>
<td>1.3310</td>
<td>3.4590</td>
<td>2.5987</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4/2003</td>
<td>1.2178</td>
<td>3.4938</td>
<td>2.8691</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2003</td>
<td>1.1894</td>
<td>3.7300</td>
<td>3.1360</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2003</td>
<td>1.1611</td>
<td>3.7068</td>
<td>3.1924</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/2003</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>3.4420</td>
<td>3.1984</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2003</td>
<td>1.0478</td>
<td>3.1036</td>
<td>2.9619</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2003</td>
<td>1.0478</td>
<td>2.6765</td>
<td>2.5543</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/2003</td>
<td>0.8213</td>
<td>2.2783</td>
<td>2.7741</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2003</td>
<td>0.7646</td>
<td>2.3103</td>
<td>3.0215</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/2003</td>
<td>0.7363</td>
<td>2.3302</td>
<td>3.1646</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/2003</td>
<td>0.7646</td>
<td>2.2775</td>
<td>2.9785</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>SR Simms Canal Q (m³/s)</td>
<td>FS Canal Q (m³/s)</td>
<td>Ratio FS/SR</td>
<td>Lag Prop. SR Flow</td>
<td>Lag Prop. FS Flow</td>
<td>Overall Study Fish/h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2003</td>
<td>1.4443</td>
<td>2.7725</td>
<td>1.9196</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>1.9258</td>
<td>2.4687</td>
<td>1.2819</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>1.6426</td>
<td>2.3503</td>
<td>1.4309</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/2003</td>
<td>1.8408</td>
<td>2.4282</td>
<td>1.3191</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/2003</td>
<td>1.4726</td>
<td>2.2914</td>
<td>1.5560</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2003</td>
<td>1.2461</td>
<td>1.8708</td>
<td>1.5014</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/2003</td>
<td>1.0478</td>
<td>1.6825</td>
<td>1.6057</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/2003</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>1.4721</td>
<td>1.3679</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/2003</td>
<td>1.1611</td>
<td>1.4021</td>
<td>1.2076</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/2003</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>1.2954</td>
<td>1.2037</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2003</td>
<td>1.0478</td>
<td>1.4282</td>
<td>1.3630</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2003</td>
<td>1.1328</td>
<td>1.3684</td>
<td>1.2080</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2003</td>
<td>1.1328</td>
<td>1.4225</td>
<td>1.2558</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27/2003</td>
<td>1.1894</td>
<td>1.5313</td>
<td>1.2874</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/2003</td>
<td>1.3310</td>
<td>1.5703</td>
<td>1.1798</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/2003</td>
<td>1.5859</td>
<td>1.3285</td>
<td>0.8377</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2003</td>
<td>1.6426</td>
<td>1.0311</td>
<td>0.6278</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>1.5576</td>
<td>0.8873</td>
<td>0.5696</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2003</td>
<td>1.5576</td>
<td>0.9858</td>
<td>0.6329</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2003</td>
<td>1.7842</td>
<td>1.0815</td>
<td>0.6062</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2003</td>
<td>1.9541</td>
<td>0.9314</td>
<td>0.4767</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2003</td>
<td>1.4726</td>
<td>0.8952</td>
<td>0.6079</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/5/2003</td>
<td>1.2744</td>
<td>0.8592</td>
<td>0.6742</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6/2003</td>
<td>1.4160</td>
<td>0.8252</td>
<td>0.5828</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/7/2003</td>
<td>1.9528</td>
<td>0.7952</td>
<td>0.4129</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2003</td>
<td>3.3134</td>
<td>0.5797</td>
<td>0.1750</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9/2003</td>
<td>2.9170</td>
<td>0.7241</td>
<td>0.2483</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2003</td>
<td>2.9170</td>
<td>0.8932</td>
<td>0.3062</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11/2003</td>
<td>2.4638</td>
<td>0.7881</td>
<td>0.3199</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/2003</td>
<td>2.2656</td>
<td>1.0725</td>
<td>0.4734</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2003</td>
<td>1.9541</td>
<td>1.4922</td>
<td>0.7636</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2003</td>
<td>1.9824</td>
<td>1.5140</td>
<td>0.7637</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2003</td>
<td>2.0390</td>
<td>1.5089</td>
<td>0.7400</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/2003</td>
<td>2.1240</td>
<td>1.5171</td>
<td>0.7143</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/2003</td>
<td>2.1240</td>
<td>1.6165</td>
<td>0.7611</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2003</td>
<td>1.4443</td>
<td>1.6848</td>
<td>1.1665</td>
<td>-0.320</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/19/2003</td>
<td>1.1045</td>
<td>1.1960</td>
<td>1.0828</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
<td>-0.290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2003</td>
<td>0.9629</td>
<td>1.0529</td>
<td>1.0935</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2003</td>
<td>0.9346</td>
<td>1.2625</td>
<td>1.3509</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2003</td>
<td>0.9346</td>
<td>1.4973</td>
<td>1.6021</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/23/2003</td>
<td>0.9629</td>
<td>1.5211</td>
<td>1.5797</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2003</td>
<td>0.9346</td>
<td>1.4817</td>
<td>1.5855</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/25/2003</td>
<td>0.8496</td>
<td>1.5086</td>
<td>1.7757</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26/2003</td>
<td>0.9912</td>
<td>1.8618</td>
<td>1.8783</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/2003</td>
<td>1.1045</td>
<td>1.7083</td>
<td>1.5467</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A, TABLE 1 (CONT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SR Simms Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>FS Canal Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>Ratio FS/SR Q</th>
<th>Lag Prop. SR Flow</th>
<th>Lag Prop. FS Flow</th>
<th>Overall Study Fish/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/28/2003</td>
<td>1.0478</td>
<td>1.6822</td>
<td>1.6054</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/2003</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>1.6729</td>
<td>1.5545</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/2003</td>
<td>1.0195</td>
<td>1.4508</td>
<td>1.4231</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/31/2003</td>
<td>0.8496</td>
<td>1.2305</td>
<td>1.4483</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/1/2003</td>
<td>0.9912</td>
<td>1.4007</td>
<td>1.4131</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2003</td>
<td>1.2178</td>
<td>1.4330</td>
<td>1.1767</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/3/2003</td>
<td>1.4443</td>
<td>1.4021</td>
<td>0.9708</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2003</td>
<td>1.2744</td>
<td>1.3214</td>
<td>1.0369</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/2003</td>
<td>1.1045</td>
<td>1.4149</td>
<td>1.2810</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2003</td>
<td>0.9912</td>
<td>1.3704</td>
<td>1.3826</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/2003</td>
<td>0.9346</td>
<td>1.3087</td>
<td>1.4003</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/2003</td>
<td>0.9629</td>
<td>2.0073</td>
<td>2.0847</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2003</td>
<td>1.5859</td>
<td>2.1070</td>
<td>1.3286</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2003</td>
<td>1.7842</td>
<td>2.0218</td>
<td>1.1332</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2003</td>
<td>1.9541</td>
<td>1.9920</td>
<td>1.0194</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2003</td>
<td>2.1523</td>
<td>1.9600</td>
<td>0.9107</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2003</td>
<td>2.3506</td>
<td>1.9317</td>
<td>0.8218</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/2003</td>
<td>3.1152</td>
<td>1.8841</td>
<td>0.6048</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2003</td>
<td>3.2002</td>
<td>1.9059</td>
<td>0.5956</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/2003</td>
<td>4.1914</td>
<td>1.9314</td>
<td>0.4608</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/17/2003</td>
<td>4.3896</td>
<td>1.8872</td>
<td>0.4299</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2003</td>
<td>3.5117</td>
<td>1.5941</td>
<td>0.4540</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2003</td>
<td>3.3418</td>
<td>1.5364</td>
<td>0.4597</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/2003</td>
<td>3.3418</td>
<td>1.5556</td>
<td>0.4655</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2003</td>
<td>3.3134</td>
<td>1.5616</td>
<td>0.4713</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2003</td>
<td>3.4550</td>
<td>1.5502</td>
<td>0.4487</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/2003</td>
<td>3.3418</td>
<td>1.5310</td>
<td>0.4581</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2003</td>
<td>3.0019</td>
<td>1.9422</td>
<td>0.6470</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2003</td>
<td>2.9170</td>
<td>1.9442</td>
<td>0.6665</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/26/2003</td>
<td>2.8037</td>
<td>1.8589</td>
<td>0.6630</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. USGS and Hydromet stream flow gage data for Sun River at Simms and Fort Shaw Canal during 2004. Lag proportional flow is percentage change in flow from previous day. Entrainment (Fish/h) is based on 12 h sample periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SR Simms Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>FS Canal Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>SR/FS Ratio</th>
<th>Lag Prop. SR Flow</th>
<th>Lag Prop. FS Flow</th>
<th>Overall Study Fish/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2004</td>
<td>7.3349</td>
<td>3.6655</td>
<td>0.4997</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2004</td>
<td>11.2430</td>
<td>3.5975</td>
<td>0.3200</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/2004</td>
<td>16.2840</td>
<td>3.5397</td>
<td>0.2174</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27/2004</td>
<td>18.4080</td>
<td>3.6241</td>
<td>0.1969</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/2004</td>
<td>23.6472</td>
<td>3.6388</td>
<td>0.1539</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29/2004</td>
<td>30.0192</td>
<td>3.6017</td>
<td>0.1200</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2004</td>
<td>35.9664</td>
<td>3.6383</td>
<td>0.1012</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2004</td>
<td>39.6480</td>
<td>3.5309</td>
<td>0.0891</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2004</td>
<td>31.7184</td>
<td>3.4848</td>
<td>0.1099</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2004</td>
<td>21.1550</td>
<td>4.0905</td>
<td>0.1934</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3/2004</td>
<td>13.3670</td>
<td>4.6300</td>
<td>0.3464</td>
<td>-0.368</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2004</td>
<td>5.1259</td>
<td>4.6867</td>
<td>0.9143</td>
<td>-0.617</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2004</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>5.1067</td>
<td>1.2436</td>
<td>-0.199</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2004</td>
<td>28.6032</td>
<td>5.5269</td>
<td>0.1932</td>
<td>5.966</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2004</td>
<td>38.5152</td>
<td>5.9469</td>
<td>0.1544</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/2004</td>
<td>29.1696</td>
<td>6.1069</td>
<td>0.2094</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9/2004</td>
<td>19.1160</td>
<td>5.9523</td>
<td>0.3114</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2004</td>
<td>9.2040</td>
<td>5.5334</td>
<td>0.6012</td>
<td>-0.519</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/2004</td>
<td>4.3330</td>
<td>5.3182</td>
<td>1.2274</td>
<td>-0.529</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2004</td>
<td>4.0498</td>
<td>5.2485</td>
<td>1.2960</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2004</td>
<td>7.6181</td>
<td>4.8572</td>
<td>0.6376</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2004</td>
<td>5.9472</td>
<td>4.5326</td>
<td>0.7621</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2004</td>
<td>3.9648</td>
<td>4.4782</td>
<td>1.1295</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/2004</td>
<td>3.6250</td>
<td>4.4828</td>
<td>1.2366</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2004</td>
<td>3.6533</td>
<td>4.6125</td>
<td>1.2626</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/2004</td>
<td>2.7470</td>
<td>4.6139</td>
<td>1.6796</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2004</td>
<td>1.7558</td>
<td>4.5870</td>
<td>2.6124</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2004</td>
<td>1.5576</td>
<td>4.5969</td>
<td>2.9513</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2004</td>
<td>1.6709</td>
<td>4.4174</td>
<td>2.6437</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2004</td>
<td>1.8691</td>
<td>4.1460</td>
<td>2.2182</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23/2004</td>
<td>1.7842</td>
<td>4.2293</td>
<td>2.3705</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/2004</td>
<td>2.2656</td>
<td>3.8498</td>
<td>1.6993</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2004</td>
<td>2.3506</td>
<td>3.2432</td>
<td>1.3798</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/26/2004</td>
<td>2.9736</td>
<td>2.9175</td>
<td>0.9811</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2004</td>
<td>3.3134</td>
<td>2.9257</td>
<td>0.8830</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2004</td>
<td>3.4550</td>
<td>2.4027</td>
<td>0.6954</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/2004</td>
<td>3.1435</td>
<td>2.2384</td>
<td>0.7121</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2004</td>
<td>2.9170</td>
<td>2.5380</td>
<td>0.8701</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2004</td>
<td>4.7294</td>
<td>2.7292</td>
<td>0.5771</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2004</td>
<td>3.4267</td>
<td>2.9872</td>
<td>0.8717</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2004</td>
<td>2.0674</td>
<td>3.2327</td>
<td>1.5637</td>
<td>-0.397</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4/2004</td>
<td>1.6709</td>
<td>4.0560</td>
<td>2.4275</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX A, TABLE 2 (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SR Simms Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>FS Canal Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>Ratio FS/SR</th>
<th>Lag Prop. SR Flow</th>
<th>Lag Prop. FS Flow</th>
<th>Overall Study Fish/h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2004</td>
<td>1.6426</td>
<td>4.4562</td>
<td>2.7129</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>28.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2004</td>
<td>1.6709</td>
<td>5.1146</td>
<td>3.0610</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/7/2004</td>
<td>1.1611</td>
<td>5.2437</td>
<td>4.5161</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8/2004</td>
<td>1.0195</td>
<td>5.3740</td>
<td>5.2711</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2004</td>
<td>1.1611</td>
<td>5.4145</td>
<td>4.6632</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/2004</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>5.6657</td>
<td>5.2647</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2004</td>
<td>1.2178</td>
<td>5.7368</td>
<td>4.7109</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/2004</td>
<td>1.6709</td>
<td>5.6221</td>
<td>3.3647</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/2004</td>
<td>1.5859</td>
<td>6.2972</td>
<td>3.9707</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2004</td>
<td>1.4726</td>
<td>6.9888</td>
<td>4.7458</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2004</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>6.9554</td>
<td>6.4632</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/2004</td>
<td>0.9346</td>
<td>7.0803</td>
<td>7.5761</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/17/2004</td>
<td>1.1328</td>
<td>7.4247</td>
<td>6.5543</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/2004</td>
<td>1.4726</td>
<td>7.3315</td>
<td>4.9785</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2004</td>
<td>1.7842</td>
<td>7.2799</td>
<td>4.0803</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/2004</td>
<td>1.5859</td>
<td>7.2083</td>
<td>4.5452</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/2004</td>
<td>1.5010</td>
<td>7.3652</td>
<td>4.9070</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/22/2004</td>
<td>1.5293</td>
<td>7.2913</td>
<td>4.7678</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/2004</td>
<td>1.5010</td>
<td>7.2434</td>
<td>4.8258</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2004</td>
<td>1.5010</td>
<td>7.2029</td>
<td>4.7989</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2004</td>
<td>1.5576</td>
<td>7.1686</td>
<td>4.6024</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2004</td>
<td>1.6426</td>
<td>6.8520</td>
<td>4.1716</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27/2004</td>
<td>1.6426</td>
<td>6.7042</td>
<td>4.0816</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/2004</td>
<td>1.8408</td>
<td>6.7056</td>
<td>3.6428</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/2004</td>
<td>1.5859</td>
<td>6.6527</td>
<td>4.1948</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2004</td>
<td>1.2178</td>
<td>6.6790</td>
<td>5.4847</td>
<td>-0.232</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2004</td>
<td>1.0762</td>
<td>6.6849</td>
<td>6.2118</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2004</td>
<td>1.2744</td>
<td>6.7960</td>
<td>5.3327</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B.

**Table 1.** Temperature gage and moon phase data for Fort Shaw Canal at diversion during 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Moon phase</th>
<th>Mean Temp. at Canal ºC</th>
<th>Hours netted</th>
<th>Sum Fish Entrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/12/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18/2003</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19/2003</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2003</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/23/2003</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/24/2003</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/25/2003</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2003</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2003</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2003</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2003</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX B.**

Table 2: Temperature gage and moon phase data for Fort Shaw Canal at diversion during 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Moon phase</th>
<th>Mean Temp. at Canal °C</th>
<th>Hours netted</th>
<th>Sum Fish Entrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2004</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/2004</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6/2004</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2004</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/2004</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2004</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2004</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/29/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/4/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/10/2004</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11/2004</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/2004</td>
<td>Last Quarter</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/18/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/2004</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2004</td>
<td>First Quarter</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/27/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/29/2004</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT
Since wolves (Canis lupus) were reintroduced into Yellowstone National Park (YNP) in 1995 and 1996, the population has increased and expanded into adjacent areas. In this study, we documented the distribution of wolves in relation to habitat and human presence in the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness (ABW) in Montana during the summers of 2005 and 2006, prior to the onset of wolf hunting in 2009, by observing tracks and scat along USDA Forest Service (USFS) trails. Our results indicated that wolves in the ABW 1) were primarily located near the boundary of YNP, 2) did not prefer forested habitats when traveling on trails, 3) did not avoid USFS cabins or outfitter camps, and 4) did not differentiate between permanent cabins and temporary camps.

Key words: Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness, Canis lupus, gray wolf, human-wolf interactions, Montana, sign survey.

INTRODUCTION
Historically, the gray wolf (Canis lupus) was persecuted intensively by European settlers in North America (Bangs and Fritts 1996). In 1884, the Territorial Government of Montana initiated wolf bounties as part of an official eradication effort (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service et al. 2006). The last known wolf in Yellowstone National Park (YNP) was shot in 1926 (Smith 2005), and by the 1930s wolf populations had disappeared from Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming (Bangs and Fritts 1996). It was protected by law in 1974 under the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Smith 2005, USDI Fish and Wildlife Service et al. 2006).

Wolves were reintroduced into YNP in 1995 as a nonessential experimental population, i.e., not essential for the survival of the species, so it could be managed with more flexibility (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service et al. 2006). A total of 31 wolves were captured in Alberta and British Columbia, Canada, and released into YNP in 1995 and 1996 (Smith 2005). At the end of 2006, an estimated 390 wolves were in the Greater Yellowstone Recovery Area (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service et al. 2007). This population of wolves in Montana was removed from the protection of the Endangered Species Act on 4 May 2009, and the State of Montana began a quota-regulated hunting season in the fall of 2009. With the August 5, 2010 federal court decision that reinstated Endangered Species Act protection for wolves in the Northern Rocky Mountains, federal law again guides Montana’s management of the state’s wolf population.

Key components of wolf habitat include access to sufficient prey throughout the year, suitable and somewhat secluded denning and rendezvous sites, and sufficient space with minimal exposure to humans (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). Wolves use many different types of habitat,
including nonforested areas such as deserts, prairies, swamps and tundra (Fuller et al. 2003). They are still found in open habitats, for instance in Spain (Fritts et al. 2003, Blanco et al. 2005), but studies from Poland (Jedrzejewski et al. 2004, Jedrzejewski et al. 2005), Italy (Ciucci et al. 1997, Massolo and Meriggi 1998) and North America (Mladenoff et al. 1995, Johnson et al. 2005, Oakleaf et al. 2006) have shown that they prefer forests.

Early studies on the effects of human presence on wolves have shown that they avoid areas where road densities are above a particular threshold value, such as 0.45 (Mladenoff et al. 1995, Mladenoff et al. 1999), 0.58 (Thiel 1985, Jensen et al. 1986, Mech et al. 1988) or 0.70 km/km² (Fuller et al. 1992). Roads serve as an indicator of human presence, and because humans are a major contributor to wolf mortality (Mech 1977, Forbes and Theberge 1992, Wydeven et al. 1992, Boyd and Pletscher 1999), wolves risk being killed by trappers, hunters, or vehicles when they are near roads (Jensen et al. 1986, Mech et al. 1988). More recent studies have moderated this conclusion by indicating that roads with relatively low levels of use can benefit wolves by creating easy paths of travel (Thurber et al. 1994, James and Stuart-Smith 2000, Pedersen et al. 2003, Whittington et al. 2005). Merrill (2000) reported successful wolf reproductions at road densities of 1.42 km/km² and Thiel et al. (1998) found that wolves denned close to areas with high degrees of human activity. These two cases illustrate that the main concern is the attitudes of local people, not the roads themselves (Carroll et al. 2003). Wolves avoid human settlements and buildings in some areas (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a, Jedrzejewski et al. 2004, Jedrzejewski et al. 2005, Kaartinen et al. 2005), but are not affected by them (Pedersen et al. 2003), or may actively seek them out in search of food, in other areas (Fritts et al. 2003). To our knowledge, researchers have not investigated whether wolves differentiate between permanent and temporary structures.

The goal of this study was to document the distribution of wolves in the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness (ABW), immediately north of YNP, as indicated by their scats and tracks along USFS trails to test the following hypotheses: 1) Because several studies from North America have found that wolves preferred forested habitat, we predicted that there would be sign on trails more often in forested areas than in areas without forest cover; 2) If wolves actively avoid humans and their activities, we would expect sign less often on trails near outfitter camps and USFS cabins than on trails far from these structures; 3) If wolves habituate more easily to permanent structures, we predicted that wolves would avoid temporary outfitter camps more than permanent USFS cabins.

**STUDY AREA**

The study was conducted in the ABW, which is located in south-central Montana adjacent to the northern boundary of YNP (Fig. 1). The USFS manages this area, which encompasses portions of three National Forests (Gallatin, Shoshone and Custer) and five Ranger Districts (Gardiner, Beartooth, Big Timber, Clark’s Fork, and Livingston). The ABW has a total area of 3819 km², primarily in Montana but with a small portion in Wyoming. The area was officially designated in 1978 as a Wilderness Area under the U. S. Wilderness Act of 1964. Regulations prohibit use or possession of motorized and mechanized equipment, which was intended to minimize disturbance to wildlife and to preserve the wilderness character.

Our effort centered primarily in the Gardiner Ranger District (GRD), which borders YNP and comprises about one-third of the ABW. The GRD has the highest ungulate/prey density in the ABW, is adjacent to YNP, and wolf packs occurred within its boundaries. We also conducted field work in other ABW Ranger Districts, but not as intensively as in the GRD.

The terrain is remote, rugged, mountainous, and consists of deeply incised glacial valleys and high plateaus. Vegetation includes montane forests.
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The varied topography of the Rocky Mountains creates a wide range of weather conditions and unique local climates (Alden et al. 1999). At high elevations, there is snow from early October to early July, and at lower elevations, from late October to late May (Despain 1990). The annual rainfall in the Rocky Mountains ranges from 18 to 109 cm (Despain 1990).

METHODS

The ABW has about 1437 km of trails, which we delineated into 379 labeled and easily defined segments, generally from one trail junction to another. The trail segments varied between 0.2 to 13.4 km in length and were used by the GRD Forest Service backcountry crew, hikers, etc. between 15 May and 1 November each year. Tasks of the backcountry crew were many, and sampling for wolf sign was done while hiking the trails. The backcountry crew used 278 trail segments in 2005 and 216 in 2006. The backcountry crew recorded the number of wolf scats and tracks representing individual wolves for each segment on each trip. Multiple tracks scattered over a distance were thought to have originated from a single wolf.
from one individual if the tracks were going
in the same direction within the same trail
segment. The crew was trained to identify
wolf scats and tracks by Jim Halfpenny,
director of “A Naturalist’s World” in
Gardiner.

Common ways to differentiate between
wolf and dog (*Canis familiaris*) sign, e.g.,
difference in paw size, movement behavior,
amount of hair and bone in scats, are not
always reliable (Aronson and Eriksson 1992,
Landa 1999). To minimize uncertainty, we
considered the frequency by which trail
segments were used by hikers with dogs.
If the crew encountered hikers with dogs,
or the trail was known to be a popular
recreation area for people with dogs, we
considered the probability of a large canine
track belonging to a dog to be high and
disregarded all observed sign. However,
YNP has a ban on dogs, so we classified sign
found on ABW trails originating from YNP
as wolf sign.

We distinguished coyote tracks from
wolf tracks based on the fact that wolves
have larger paws than coyotes (Murray and
Lariviere 2002). To differentiate between
coyote and wolf scat, we used Halfpenny’s
(1986) cutoff diameter and classified all
canine scat ≥ 23 mm as wolf scat. The large
overlap in diameter (Weaver 1979, Reed et
al. 2004, Prugh and Ritland 2005) caused
some bias because some of the collected
scats could be from coyotes, and small wolf
scats would be classified as coyote and not
included in the sample.

Sign of wolves was recorded as a binary
variable, observed or not. We then created
maps using ArcGIS 9.1 and analyzed data
using a combination of tools in ArcGIS 9.1,
Hawth’s Analysis Tools 3.26 and ET Geo
Wizards 9.6. We classified trail segments as
forested or nonforested by using vegetation
maps provided by the Gallatin National
Forest. Permanent structures included three
USFS cabins located on Slough Creek,
Buffalo Fork and Hellroaring creeks, as
well as the Silver Tip Ranch in Slough
Creek. Temporary structures included 13
outfitter camps. Outfitter camps were present
in the ABW from 2 wks to 4 mos. The
USFS cabins were used between May and
November.

We tested the hypotheses with a binary
logistic regression (Agresti 2002) using
MINITAB 14 Statistical Software (Minitab
Inc). When testing hypothesis No. 3 (wolves
should be found farther from permanent
than temporary structures), we measured
the distance from each trail to the nearest
structure. When testing hypothesis No. 1
(wolves should prefer forested habitats),
we classified the habitat type for each trail
according to the dominant vegetation type
along its length. To test for other variables,
we included the distance to the YNP
boundary in the model, using the shortest
distance from the center of each trail
segment to the boundary of the YNP. We
corrected for sampling effort by including
the average number of times a trail had
been sampled in the model. We used only
trail segments within the GRD for this test.
Hypotheses were tested using a significance
threshold of $P < 0.05$.

**RESULTS**

The monitoring frequency for trail
segments decreased from 2005 to 2006
(Table 1) with sampling efforts of 1050
km and 709 km, respectively, but the
average number of times a trail was
sampled increased from 2005 to 2006. The
unadjusted total amount of sign in 2005
was 115; 74 tracks and 41 scats. In 2006,
this doubled to 241; 137 tracks and 104
scats. A significantly greater frequency of
trail segments (all segments) showed wolf
presence in 2006 than 2005 ($\chi^2 = 22.28$,
d.f. = 1, $P < 0.001$). In 2005, the majority
of sign was located from the eastern part
of the Gardiner Basin, eastwards through
the Hellroaring, Buffalo Fork and Slough
Creek drainages, to the southern part of the
Stillwater Drainage and was also high in the
southern part of the Beartooth Plateau and
the western part of the Boulder Drainage,
close to the Mill Creek Drainage. Single
cases of wolf sign were registered on four
different trail segments on the north-eastern
boundary of the ABW. In 2006, the areas
with the highest amount of sign shifted
slightly. Sign was greater along the southern boundary of the ABW, i.e., from the middle of the Gardiner Basin, eastwards through the Hellroaring, Buffalo Fork and Slough Creek drainages. There was, however, a gap in the presence of sign between the Gardiner Basin and Hellroaring/Buffalo Fork/Slough Creek drainages. There still was sign in the southern part of the Beartooth Plateau, but the sign in the western part of the Boulder Drainage continued over into the Mill Creek Drainage in 2006. In addition to wolf sign, wolves were observed once and wolves were heard howling four times during 2006 by the backcountry crew.

According to the binary logistic model we used to explain wolf presence in the GRD, wolves did not avoid temporary camps or permanent cabins or differentiate between them, nor did they use forested and nonforested trail segments differently (Table 2). Wolf presence was significantly and negatively correlated with distance to YNP. According to the logistic model, 50 percent probability of finding wolf sign occurred when the trail segment was 21.5 km from the YNP boundary. The variable “average number of times a trail segment was traveled” was added to the model to correct for effort and naturally showed that there was a higher probability of encountering wolf sign if the trail had been traveled often. By including this variable, we corrected for the bias that it otherwise would have caused in the analysis of the effects of the other variables. The interaction term showed that the field crew traveled less on trail segments located far from camps and cabins. The fit of the model was not high, however. A Pearson goodness-of-fit was 0.35, which indicated that the model did not explain much variation in wolf distribution.

**Discussion**

Track surveys and other noninvasive methods are becoming more popular in wildlife and conservation research, because of few negative effects, such as immobilizing and handling the animals, in addition to being less time-consuming and expensive (Kendall et al. 1992, Smallwood and Fitzhugh 1995, Alexander et al. 2005).

**Distribution of wolves**

As expected from our hypothesis, a logistic regression analysis corrected for effort indicated that the probability of finding wolf sign in the ABW was higher in the vicinity

of YNP. Given the dispersal capabilities of wolves, it is surprising that wolves had not traveled further into the wilderness area. Wolves have been recorded dispersing long distances, such as 670 (Van Camp and Gluckie 1979), 732 (Ballard et al. 1983), 840 (Boyd and Pletscher 1999) and 886 (Fritts 1983) km. Even though wolves have a great capacity for dispersal, they maximize their chance of breeding rather than maximizing resources (Mech and Boitani 2003). Studies have shown that territorial species are attracted to areas that already are inhabited (Stamps 1988, Smith and Peacock 1990, Ray et al. 1991), presumably because areas that are occupied by conspecifics offer mates and an assurance of good habitat (“cuing”) (Stamps 1988). The colonization rate for wolves in the GYA averages 9.78 km/year, which is considerably lower than would be expected from the high reproductive rate and long distance dispersal of wolves (Hurford et al. 2006) and was consistent with our results. In addition to the drainages located close to YNP, sign also was detected on the southern slope of the Beartooth Plateau and in the Boulder/Mill Creek drainages, perhaps due to the occurrence of reproducing packs in these areas. Single tracks and scats were observed on separate trail segments in 2005. These trail segments were located on the wilderness boundary from the north to the east.

Use of forested and nonforested habitat

Contrary to our hypothesis, we detected no difference in use of forested and nonforested habitats by wolves. This may have been an error due to definitions used in the study because the vegetation maps used in the analysis divided vegetation into only four categories; aspen (forest), conifer (forest), sagebrush grassland (nonforested) and willow (nonforested), which may have been too coarse to allow any patterns of selection to be manifested. Also, trail segments often crossed several vegetation types, but only the dominant vegetation type was recorded for each trail. The dominant vegetation type was usually forest, so the number of trail segments with nonforested habitat was low compared to the number of trail segments with forest. Although the results did not support our hypothesis and assuming that they were not a statistical error, they did fit well with the fact that wolves are habitat generalists (Fuller et al. 2003) and are limited only by access to a sufficient prey base when not hunted by humans (USDI Fish and Wildlife Service 1987). The method we used possibly did not allow documentation of the true preference for forested and nonforested areas but only showed if wolves used trails more or less in these habitats. Because the trails represent easy paths of travel (Thurber et al. 1994, James and Stuart-Smith 2000, Whittington et al. 2005, Shepherd and Whittington 2006), there is no reason why wolves should leave the trails once they enter a different habitat.

Avoidance of humans

Also contrary to our hypothesis, we found no evidence that wolves either differentiated between temporary outfitter camps and permanent USFS cabins, or avoided camps or cabins. The outfitter camps and USFS cabins in the ABW differed in two main aspects. The cabins are permanent structures, whereas the camps are temporary. Also, the camps are always occupied by one or more people who look after the camp, whereas the cabins are occasionally vacant of people. Our results suggested that wolves view these structures equally.

In a study conducted in the Canadian central Arctic, Johnson et al. (2005) found that wolves selected mineral exploration sites and outfitter camps, probably because of the availability of food rewards. However, with the “leave no trace” policies in the ABW, i.e. packing out all trash, leftover food, and litter, there is little or no food around camps and cabins to attract wolves. Generally, wolves are believed to avoid human contact spatially in areas with low human density, and temporally in areas with high human density (Vilà et al. 1992, Ciucci et al. 1997, Pedersen et al. 2003, Theuerkauf et al. 2003a). In Poland,
where human density is high, wolves avoid being in the same place at the same time as humans (Theuerkauf et al. 2003a, Theuerkauf et al. 2003b). Wam (2003) studied wolf behavior towards humans in densely populated parts of Norway and found that, when approached, wolves ran away with a mean tolerance distance of 257 m. Because our data only included sign to indicate wolf presence, we were unable to determine whether wolves in the ABW avoided humans temporally. In areas with no legal or illegal hunting, however, wolves are thought to be less wary of humans (Thiel et al. 1998, Merrill 2000, McNay 2002, Whittington et al. 2005), and wolves are currently colonizing a wide range of habitats that previously were not thought to be suitable wolf habitat (Mech 1995). A study investigating carnivore responses to big-game hunting on the boundary between ABW and YNP found that wolves did not change their movement patterns during the pre-hunt and hunting periods (Ruth et al. 2003). Because wolves in the ABW and YNP were not hunted by humans during our study, it is reasonable to conclude that wolves do not avoid humans in this area.

CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

We found no evidence that wolves in the ABW selected between forested and nonforested habitats, differentiated between temporary outfitter camps and permanent USFS cabins, or avoided these centers of human activity. The latter may suggest that little illegal hunting of wolves was taking place in the ABW. However, the model gave a relatively poor fit, which suggested that important factors explaining wolf presence were not included in the model. Possible additional factors that are important for the distribution of wolves are location of prey and reproducing wolf packs. Therefore, the model may have been improved by incorporating seasonal distribution of ungulates, locations of active wolf dens, and by including more seasons of data. Our results suggest that, at present, no special precautions are needed to ensure survival of wolves in the ABW. We recommend that this study be continued to document whether the behavior of wolves in the ABW changes after the advent of hunting in 2009.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Gerry Bennett, Dick Ohman and Jim Wood for financial support and Heidi Bergsjo, Herbjørg Arntsen, Kristine Ulvund, Jeremy Zimmer, Siri Framness, Craig Olwert, and Hans Ole Ørka for help with the data and the paper. We also thank everyone that worked on the Forest Service trail crew in 2005 and 2006.

LITERATURE CITED


Received 19 July 2009
Accepted 15 July 2010
AN APPROACH TO DETERMINE THE EFFECT OF EL NIÑO ON EXTREME DAILY WEATHER OCCURRENCE

Joseph M. Caprio, Professor Emeritus, Department of Land Resources and Environmental Sciences, 334 Leon Johnson Hall, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, 59717-3120
Perry R. Miller, Department of Land Resources and Environmental Sciences, 334 Leon Johnson Hall, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, 59717-3120
Jon M. Wraith1, Department of Land Resources and Environmental Sciences, 334 Leon Johnson Hall, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, 59717-3120

ABSTRACT

We developed a procedure using the chi-square statistic to determine the effect of El Niño-Southern Oscillation on the frequency of extreme daily weather occurrence. Its application is demonstrated for a site in southwestern Montana, located east of the Continental Divide 970 km from the Pacific Ocean. The study used daily weather data focused on a 29-wk period from 3 Dec to 23 Jun in a 100-yr weather record at Montana State University (Bozeman) and compared this weather in relation to November-March sea-surface temperature anomalies in an area of the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Daily weather extremes were compared between 25 El Niño years and 50 ‘normal’ years. During El Niño years, December-June weather at Bozeman was characterized by more days of extreme high maximum temperatures, fewer days of extreme low minimum temperatures, fewer days of high precipitation amounts, and fewer days with small diurnal temperature ranges. For the 29-wk period, we determined the difference between El Niño years and normal years to be about 20 percent for each of these four extreme daily weather conditions. An increase or decrease of extreme daily weather occurrences can impact natural resources and a wide range of human activities including agriculture, forestry, recreation, construction, and other businesses.

Keywords: El Niño, extreme daily weather, Northwestern United States, iterative Chi-square

INTRODUCTION

The variability of the El Niño-Souther Oscillation (ENSO) sea-surface temperature anomalies affect extremes of climate over much of the world with important consequences for natural resources and a wide range of human activities (McPhaden et al. 2006). Since El Niño sea surface temperature anomalies tend to persist for many months and have predictable climatic associations, it is prudent to undertake research to understand how El Niño affects extremes of weather for individual locations in order to provide useful information for decision makers.

Numerous studies of the El Niño effect have compared the monthly mean temperatures and/or precipitation at given locations during El Niño years with so-called ‘normal’ years (Shabbar et al. 1997, Wang and Fir 2000, Twine et al. 2005). Researchers have also studied extremes of daily weather events associated with the El Niño in which given values of extreme daily weather occurrences are selected for analysis or the daily extremes are determined as percentages of occurrences, such as being beyond the 95-percent probability level (Gershunov et al. 1998, Cayan et al. 1999).

Caprio (1966) first described the conceptual basis and details of the statistical procedure used in this study, known as the iterative chi-square method. Caprio and Quamme (2002) applied this methodology in previous research to determine daily weather effects on grape production, and to determine climate change of daily maximum and minimum temperature and precipitation.
over a 56-yr period in the Okanagan Valley of British Columbia, Canada. It has also been applied in research to determine the impact of daily weather on growth of tree rings in Arizona (Caprio et al. 2003) and to determine recent climate change of extreme daily temperatures at two locations in northwestern North America (Caprio et al. 2009). Our research objective was to develop a procedure to determine the effect of El Nino on frequency of extreme daily occurrence of several climatic elements. This was achieved by applying the iterative chi-square approach that considered climate differences between El Nino years and ‘normal years.’ We demonstrated the technique by using daily weather data for a 100-yr period at the Montana State University Weather Station, Bozeman, Montana, which is located in the Rocky Mountain foothills east of the Continental Divide 970 km from the Pacific Ocean.

**METHODS**

**Year Characterization**

The ENSO Index chosen for use in this study is based on the Japanese Meteorological Agency (JMA) estimate of sea-surface temperature (SST) anomalies, known as the JMA ENSO Index (Sittel 1994, Green 1995). The Index is based on SST anomalies in the tropical Pacific Ocean in an area bounded by 4° S to 4° N latitude and 150° W to 90° W longitude. When we initiated this study the JMA ENSO Index was the only century-long El Nino index available. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) identified several El Nino areas in the eastern Pacific Ocean. The JMA ENSO Index is based on ocean temperatures in a rectangle area that is the same as NOAA NCEP/NCAB El Nino Region 3 Index area except the NOAA Index extends 5 degrees north and south of the equator rather than 4 degrees. (Trenberth 1997, Trenberth and Stepaniak 2001).

The JMA mean normal SST for the period 1961-1990 is as follows: Jan (25.4 °C), Feb (26.2 °C), Mar (26.9 °C), Apr (27.1 °C), May (26.6 °C), Jun (26.1 °C), July (25.2 °C), Aug (24.6 °C), Sep (24.6 °C), Oct (24.6 °C), Nov (24.6 °C), and Dec (24.9 °C). We determined the JMA Index for each month by computing a 5-mo running mean (labeled as the central month) of the monthly SST anomalies (Sittel 1994, Green 1995). Thus, a given monthly JMA Index includes information for each of the five monthly SST anomaly values in order to smooth out possible intra-seasonal variations.

The annual values used in this analysis to identify an El Nino year were chosen to be the mean of the five JMA Index values for the 5-mo period, Nov-Mar, which includes weather data from Sep-May. The year of the El Nino is identified here as the year of the Jan-Mar period. The 100 annual values of the JMA Index were ordered from low to high and divided into quartiles. The highest quartile years were considered the El Nino years and the lowest quartile years were considered the La Nina years. The central two quartiles constituted the ‘normal years’.

According to this classification, all those years where the mean Nov-Mar JMA Index was ≥ +0.46 °C were considered El Nino years. For the La Nina years, the mean Nov-Mar JMA index was ≤ -0.50 °C. This study considers only the relation between the 25 El Nino yr, sometimes referred to as the ‘Warm Phase’ and the two central quartile, i.e., 50 yrs, ‘normal’ years. According to this classification the 25 El Nino years were: 1903, 1905, 1906, 1912, 1914, 1919, 1920, 1926, 1928, 1930, 1931, 1941, 1952, 1958, 1966, 1969, 1970, 1973, 1977, 1983, 1987, 1988, 1992, 1995, and 1998. The 25 La Nina years were: 1904, 1909-11, 1917, 1918, 1923, 1939, 1943, 1945, 1946, 1950, 1955, 1956, 1965, 1968, 1971, 1974-76, 1985, 1989, 1996, 1999, and 2000. This classification method was highly consistent with a report spanning from 1951 to 2008 (National Weather Service 2008). All other years during 1901-2000 not listed as El Nino or La Nina were considered the 50 ‘normal’ years. The average monthly JMA Index SST anomaly for Nov-Mar was +1.01 °C during the 25 El Nino yrs and the two most extreme values were +2.58 °C and
+2.82 °C in 1983 and 1998, respectively. During the 25 La Nina yrs, the average monthly JMA Index SST anomaly for Nov-Mar was -0.93 °C and the two most extreme values were -1.74 °C and -1.34 °C in 1917 and 1971, respectively.

**Chi-Square Analyses**

Weather data at the Bozeman, Montana, site (45º 40'N, 111º 03'W, elevation 1480 m) were measured and analyzed in Imperial units and the results were converted to metric units. Daily meteorological data were recorded to the nearest whole °F (temperature) or 0.01 in (precipitation) from 26 Nov to 30 Jun each year. For chi-square analyses, we used a sliding window of 3 wks, adding a new week and dropping the first week as the overlapping 3-wk time frame advanced. For example, the first 3-wk period included days 1-21, i.e., 26 Nov-16 Dec, with all associated daily weather values and was labeled as the central or 11th day, i.e., 6 Dec. The second 3-wk period included days 8-28, i.e., 3 -23 Dec, and was labeled as 13 Dec, etc., continuing until 29 successive 3-wk periods, spanning 31 wks, i.e., 26 Nov-30 Jun), were recorded within each ‘year.’ A 3-wk span of daily weather data was used in this study since previous studies found this smoothing process to provide reasonable conclusions about the occurrence of extreme weather.

Within each 3-wk period, temperature was broken down into classes of 2 °F in order to have an adequate number of observations in most classes and precipitation was broken down into classes of 0.05 in. The climate variables, maximum and minimum temperature, precipitation, and diurnal temperature range, were each sorted from low to high values, separately within the 25 El Nino and 50 ‘normal’ years. The terms maximum and daytime temperature and the terms minimum and nighttime temperature were used interchangeably in this study. For each overlapping 3-wk period for the four climate variables, the chi-square statistic was used to test the significance of the difference from an expected 1:2 ratio of the frequency of days between the 25 El Nino years and the 50 ‘normal’ years in cumulative scans in both increasing and decreasing directions, explained below. For the test of each class of a given climatic variable, the total number of daily occurrences in each 3-wk period was 525 (21 days x 25 yr). The total number of days in the normal category was 1050 (21 days x 50 yr). The chi-square test is made, iteratively, of the total number of days accumulating in each class of the given variable in succession ordered from high to low values (high-low scan) or from low to high values (low-high scan). The first chi-square value in the high to low scan includes data in the highest class only, the second for cumulative data in the first plus the second (next highest) class, the third for cumulative data in the first plus the second plus the third class, etc. The low to high scan is performed identically, but starting with the lowest class.

When the counts for the El Nino years deviate from the expected 1:2 ratio with the ‘normal’ years the chi-square values in the scan increase to a maximum and then decrease beyond the point in which the relationship no longer exists, i.e., final cumulative data analysis for each 3-wk period must, by definition, contain 525 El Nino counts and 1050 ‘normal’ counts. The maximum chi-square point in the scan identifies the “cardinal value” of the climatic element. The “cardinal value” is that point which defines the beginning of the extreme values above or below, depending on the scan direction. In this way, the iterative chi-square method provides a way to determine whether the number of extreme daily occurrences during ENSO years differs significantly from the expected number of occurrences during normal years.

Chi-square values for temperature were taken as statistically significant at P = 0.01 (df = 1); when the actual value was ≥ 6.63. For efficient data analysis, we considered temperature differences in this study significant when $\chi^2 \geq 7$ (rounded up from the actual valued of 6.63), so the significance was slightly more conservative than P = 0.01. Chi-square values for precipitation were taken as statistically significant at P = 0.05 (df = 1); when $\chi^2$ was ≥ 3.84. Similarly,
we rounded 3.84 up to ‘4’ for efficient computation. Previous studies have used this level of significance for precipitation because a large percentage of days are without precipitation and in view of the large spatial variability of precipitation (Caprio and Quamme 2002, Caprio et al. 2003). When the relation is significant, the hypothesis that the extreme climate during El Nino years is the same as during normal years is rejected. The larger the value of chi-square, the higher the probability that there is a real extreme climatic effect of the El Nino. We performed high-low and low-high scans for each of the four climatic elements.

A minus sign is given to the chi-square value when the extreme climatic occurrence in the El Nino years is less than in the normal years (inverse relationship). Positive and negative values in the chi-square values plotted against time of year reveal those periods when the El Nino affects extreme climate. Chi-square probability levels are not strictly applicable when counts of the daily weather elements are small (Snedecor 1946). However, chi-square values based on low counts tend to be insignificant and superseded by larger chi-square values in the classes further up (or down) in the scan.

Data for two examples are presented in Table 1 to show how the χ² value is computed considering extreme low daily minimum temperature for El Nino years versus normal years. In Equation 1 below, ‘A’ and ‘E’ represent actual and expected number of occurrences, respectively. The letters ‘e’ and ‘n’ are for El Nino and normal years, respectively.

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{(Ae - Ee)^2}{Ee} + \frac{(An - En)^2}{En}
\]

For the first 3-wk period:

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{(43 - 81)^2}{81} + \frac{(200 - 162)^2}{162} = 27
\]

For the second 3-wk period:

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{(150 - 121)^2}{121} + \frac{(212 - 241)^2}{241} = 10.
\]

The total number of extreme low daily minimum temperature in the first sample was 43 + 200 = 243 and in the second sample 150 + 212 = 362 (Table 1). We expected the 243 occurrences in the first sample to be proportional in a ratio of 1:2, or 81 for El Nino years and 162 for normal years. In the first sample, the 43 occurrences during El Nino years was less than the 81 expected occurrences, resulting in the large significant χ² value of 27 (deficit). In the second sample, the 150 occurrences during El Nino years were greater than the 121 expected occurrences, resulting in the large significant χ² value of 10 (excess). The cardinal temperatures in the two samples were ≤ -19 ºC (-3 ºF) in deficit and ≤ -12 ºC (+11 ºF) in excess, respectively.

For each overlapping 3-wk period and scan, our computer output included the maximum χ², the accumulated counts of daily weather occurrences, and associated cardinal values. We assigned the χ² value of each 3-wk sliding window to the center week. Section A of Figures 1-4 gives 3-wk running averages of the weekly χ² values. The cardinal value of the most statistically significant week within each significant period was entered near the appropriate peak shown in Figures 1 to 4. Reference in the text to an association is usually made only if the association was significant for a period of > 2 consecutive weeks.

**Table 1.** Counts, cardinal temperatures, and chi-square for El Nino vs. ‘normal’ years for the 3-wk periods centered on 7 Jan and 7 Mar using the low to high scans of extreme low daily minimum temperature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-wk center date</th>
<th>Scan direction</th>
<th>El Nino year’s count</th>
<th>Normal year’s count</th>
<th>Cardinal temperature</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Jan</td>
<td>Low-high</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>≤ -19 ºC (-3 ºF)</td>
<td>27 (deficit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mar</td>
<td>Low-high</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>≤ -12 ºC (+11 ºF)</td>
<td>10 (excess)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determination of Size of Departure from Normal

Applying the iterative chi-square method offers a number of advantages. The method requires no limiting assumptions as to linearity. In addition, the method provides measures of significance and gives threshold values ≥ and ≤ when there are significant responses of the climatic elements to the El Nino effect. Also, use of daily weather provides 1-wk resolution to determine the effect of El Nino on occurrence of extreme daily weather elements. Caprio et al. (2003) provide a more detailed description of the iterative chi-square method with examples of the interpretation of computer output in a paper on tree ring weather relations, along with comparisons with some other statistical methods.

For each overlapping 3-wk period during 31 wk from 26 Nov to 30 Jun, i.e., 29, 3-wk periods, we calculated the difference in the number of extreme days in the 25 El Nino yrs compared to one half the number of extreme days in the 50 ‘normal’ yrs. This value divided by 25 (number of yrs) gives the difference in number of days/year during that 3-wk period. In turn, this value divided by three (number of wks) gives the difference in the mean number of extreme days/week. We calculated 3-wk running averages of these weekly values. Thus, smoothed weekly values of the difference in number of extreme days/week were then divided by 7 (days/wk) and multiplied by 100 to yield the average daily percent of an extreme daily weather event due to the El Nino. These daily percentage values were plotted for each week in the B- sections of Figures 1-4. For example, if each day within a particular week during an El Nino year had an average of one-tenth (or 10%) of a day greater extreme daily occurrence due to the El Nino effect, this was referred to as a 10-percent climate change. Since one day represents 14.3 percent of a week, percentages shown in the B-section of the graphs indicates one day of climatic change/week for each 14 percent. Thus, seven percent on the graph represents 0.5 day of climatic change/week.

Percentages in the tables and in part B of the graphs indicate the increase or decrease in percent of a day within each particular week of an El Nino year having an extreme daily weather occurrence due to the El Nino effect. For example, if the percentage for a particular week is indicated in a table or in the B section of the graph as 10 percent, it indicates that each day within that week of an El Nino year had an extra 0.1 day of an extreme weather event due to the El Nino effect.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chi-Square Test for Extreme High Daily Maximum Temperature (High-Low Scan)

Our data indicated an excess of days of extreme high maximum temperature during 15 of the 29 wks of the study, whereas no weeks had a deficit of days of extreme high maximum temperature (Fig. 1). The excess of extreme high daily maximum temperature was most numerous during two periods (Table 2).

Maximum $\chi^2$ of 23 occurred during weeks 22-23 (27 May-9 Jun) with a CT of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Max weekly $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Daily average period change*</th>
<th>Dates of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
<th>Daily average change of Max $\chi^2$ wks*</th>
<th>Cardinal temp of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 8</td>
<td>14 Jan – 24 Feb</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+8.6%</td>
<td>28 Jan – 3 Feb</td>
<td>+16%</td>
<td>≥ 1°C (+33°F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 25</td>
<td>22 Apr – 2 June</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+5.7%</td>
<td>27 May – 9 June</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>≥ 27°C (+81°F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Positive signs indicate the average fraction of a day (in percent) increase in extreme high daily minimum temperatures during the two intervals that were attributable to El Nino.
Figure 1. (A) Significance of the difference in the number of extreme high maximum temperature days during the 25 El Nino years compared to the 50 normal years. Cardinal values (the extreme high maximum temperature occurrence during the week of maximum $\chi^2$) are indicated on the graph. Chi-square values =7 (indicated by the dotted lines) are the critical values for significance ($P=0.01$, 1df).

(B) For each date (plotted weekly) in an El Nino year, the average percent that had an extreme high maximum temperature occurrence due to the El Nino effect.
≥ 27 °C (81 °F). Departure from normal during this period was an increase of 8 percent. However, the maximum percentage departure from normal occurred during week 5 (28 Jan-3 Feb) with an increase of 16 percent associated with a χ² of 15 and a CT of ≥ 1 °C (33 °F). Considering seven percent as the level for 0.5 day/wk as the El Nino effect and 14 percent as the level for 1 day/wk, we can make the following interpretations:

1. For extreme high maximum temperatures there were 8 wks with at ≥ 1 day increase associated with the El Nino and 2 wks that had at ≥ 1 day/wk increase associated with the El Nino.

2. We observed no weeks with low maximum temperature cooling associated with the El Nino.

3. The greatest percentage increase in extreme maximum temperatures occurred during week 5 (28 Jan-3 Feb) when we detected a 16 percent increase. Whereas the biggest departure from normal occurred during winter (14 Jan-24 Feb), a greater number of days of extreme high maximum temperatures occurred during weeks 17-25 (22 Apr-23 Jun), as indicated by the large chi-square values, but with a percentage increase consistently < 8 percent. This was consistent with earlier onset of spring, which has been reported previously for this region (Cutforth et al. 1999, Cayan et al. 2001).

4. During the first significant departure period (14 Jan-24 Feb), peak response occurred during week five (28 Jan-3 Feb) when an excess of daily maximum temperatures ≥ +1 °C (+33 °F) occurred. During this 6-wk period, occurrence of extreme maximum daily temperatures averaged 26 percent more frequently, i.e., 249.5 vs. 198, during El Nino years than during normal years.

Additional comparisons can be made for each significant departure period using information from the associated table and text. An example is given below for the significant departure period covering weeks 3-8 (14 Jan-24 Feb) for extreme high daily maximum temperature at Bozeman. Since the 0.086 fraction of extreme days from Table 2 represents a 26-percent increase of the fraction of extreme days compared with ‘normal’ years, i.e., 249.5/198 x 100 = 26 percent, the fraction of extreme days in normal years equates to 0.331, i.e., 0.086/0.26 = 0.331, and the total fraction of extreme days in El Nino years is 0.331 plus 0.086 which equals 0.417. Given that the percent of extreme days in normal years is 33.1 percent while the percent of extreme days in El Nino years is 41.7 percent, the percent of non-extreme days in normal and El Nino years is 66.9 and 58.3 percent, respectively.

During the second significant period (22 Apr-23 Jun) peak response occurred during weeks 22-23 (27 May-9 Jun) when an excess of daily maximum temperatures ≥ +27 °C (+81 °F) occurred. During this 9-wk period the occurrence of extreme maximum daily temperatures averaged 67 percent more frequent during El Nino years than during normal years. We determined for all 29 wks combined that El Nino years averaged 20 percent more days, i.e., 119.9 vs. 100.2, with extreme high maximum temperature than normal years.

Chi-Square Test for Extreme Low Minimum Temperature (Low-High Scan)

We detected a deficit of days of extreme low minimum temperatures during the El Nino years during 7 of the 29 wks of the study (Fig. 2). The deficit of days extended from 7 Jan to 24 Feb. Alternatively, there was an excess of days of extreme low minimum temperatures during only 2 of the 29 wks, from 4 to 17 Mar (Table 3). Maximum χ² of 32 occurred during week 5 (28 Jan-3 Feb) with a CT of ≤ -19 °C (-3 °F). The percent change during this week was a decrease of 12 percent.

For extreme low minimum temperatures there were 5 wks that had ≥ 0.5 day decrease associated with the El Nino and 2 wks that had nearly 1 day/week decrease associated with the El Nino (Fig. 2). The greatest percentage decrease in extreme low minimum temperature occurred during weeks 4 and 5 (21 Jan-3 Feb) when we
Figure 2. (A) Significance of the difference in the number of extreme low minimum temperature days during the 25 El Nino years compared to the 50 normal years. Cardinal values (the extreme low minimum temperature occurrence during the week of maximum $\chi^2$) are indicated on the graph. Chi-square values $=7$ (indicated by the dotted lines) are the critical values for significance ($P=0.01$, 1df).

(B) For each date (plotted weekly) in an El Nino year, the average percent that had an extreme low minimum temperature occurrence due to the El Nino effect.
Table 3. Data on the seven-week period that had a significant decrease in the number of days of extreme low daily minimum temperatures due to El Nino.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Max weekly $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Daily average period change*</th>
<th>Dates of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
<th>Daily average change of Max $\chi^2$ wks*</th>
<th>Cardinal temp of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 8</td>
<td>7 Jan – 24 Feb</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
<td>28 Jan – 3 Feb</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>≤ -19°C (-3°F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Negative sign indicates the average fraction of a day (in percent) decrease in extreme low daily minimum temperatures during the interval that was attributable to El Nino.

detected a 13-percent decrease. Peak response during 7 Jan-24 Feb occurred during week 5 (28 Jan-3 Feb) when a deficit of extreme daily minimum temperatures ≤ -19 °C (-3 °F) occurred. During this 6-wk period, occurrence of extreme daily minimum temperatures averaged 50 percent less frequent during El Nino years than during normal years. El Nino years averaged 18 percent fewer days, i.e., 71.6 vs. 87.6, for all 29 wks combined with extreme low daily minimum temperature than normal years.

Chi-Square Test for Extreme High Precipitation (High-Low Scan)

We detected a deficit of days of high precipitation during El Nino years during 13 of 29 wks of the study (Fig. 3). Only during weeks 14-15 (1-14 Apr, 21.6 mm) the analysis indicated that high precipitation days were more frequent during the December-June period of the 25 El Nino years. Ten of 12 total days that had precipitation amounts of ≥ 12.7 mm (0.50 in) occurring during weeks 14-15 (1-14 Apr) coincided with unusually warm January SSTA of ≥ +1.00 °C. These 10 days with large precipitation amounts occurred during eight different El Nino years.

The deficit of days with heavy precipitation was significant during two periods (Table 4). Maximum $\chi^2$ of 7 occurred during week 6 (4-10 Feb) and $\chi^2$ of 8 for week 23 (3-9 Jun) both with a CT of 1.3 mm (0.05 in; Table 4). For high precipitation there were only 2 wks that had ≥ 0.5 day of decrease of high precipitation (Fig. 3). The greatest percentage decrease in high precipitation amounts occurred during week 23 (3-6 Jun) when we detected an 8-percent decrease. This study did not compare total accumulated precipitation during El Nino years with that during normal years. However, a previous report by the National Weather Service indicated that the South-central Crop District of Montana received only 74 percent of normal precipitation during El Nino years (National Weather Service 2003).

Peak response during the first significant period (4 Feb-17 Mar) occurred during week 7 (4-10 Feb) when a deficit of high precipitation days ≥ 1.3mm (0.05 in) occurred. During this 6-wk period, high precipitation days averaged 41 percent fewer during El Nino years than during normal years. Peak response during the second significant period occurred during weeks

Table 4. Data on two periods that had a significant decrease in the number of days of extreme high precipitation days due to El Nino.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Max weekly $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Daily average period change*</th>
<th>Dates of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
<th>Daily average change of Max $\chi^2$ wks*</th>
<th>Cardinal temp of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - 11</td>
<td>4 Feb – 17 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>28 Jan – 10 Feb</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>≥ 1.3 mm (0.05 in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 23</td>
<td>27 May – 9 June</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>27 May – 9 Jun</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>≥ 1.3 mm (0.05 in)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Negative signs indicate the average fraction of a day (in percent) increase in extreme high daily precipitation during the two intervals that were attributable to El Nino.
Figure 3. (A) Significance of the difference in the number of high precipitation days during the 25 El Nino years compared to the 50 normal years. Cardinal values (the extreme high precipitation occurrence during the week of maximum $\chi^2$) are indicated on the graph. Chi-square values = 7 (indicated by the dotted lines) are the critical values for significance ($P=0.05, 1\text{df}$).

(B) For each date (plotted weekly) in an El Nino year, the average percent that had a high precipitation occurrence due to the El Nino effect.
An Approach to Determine the Effect of El Nino on Extreme Daily Weather Occurrence

22-23 (27 May–9 June) when a deficit of high precipitation days > 1.3mm (0.05 in) occurred. During this 2-wk period, high precipitation days averaged 24 percent fewer during El Nino years than during normal years. We determined that for the entire 29-wk study period, El Nino years averaged 21 percent fewer days, i.e., 48.9 vs. 61.7, with high precipitation amounts than normal years.

**Chi-Square for Extreme Small Diurnal Temperature Range (Low-High Scan)**

There was a deficit of extreme small diurnal temperature ranges during El Nino years during seven of the 29 wks of the study (Fig, 4), with no periods of excess (Table 5).

Maximum $\chi^2$ of 13 occurred during week 22 (27 May–3 Jun) with a CT of 14 °C (25 °F), representing a 12-percent decrease during this week. For the deficit of extreme small diurnal temperature ranges there were 4 wks that had $\geq 0.5$ day associated with the El Nino and no weeks that had at least one whole day/week decrease associated with the El Nino.

During the first significant period (18 Feb–10 Mar), peak response occurred during weeks 8-10 (18 Feb–10 Mar), when a deficit of small diurnal temperature range days $\leq 8$ °C (15 °F) occurred (Table 5); this occurrence of extremely small diurnal temperature-range days averaged 29 percent fewer during El Nino years than during normal years. During 13 May–9 Jun, peak response occurred during week 22 (27 May–2 Jun) when a deficit of small diurnal temperature range days $\leq 14$ °C (25 °F) occurred. During this 4-wk period, occurrence of extreme small diurnal temperature days averaged 26 percent fewer during El Nino years than during normal years. For the entire 29-wk study period, El Nino years averaged 18 percent fewer days, i.e., 86.7 vs. 105.2, with extreme small diurnal temperature ranges than normal years.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

These results were consistent with other studies on the effect of El Nino on temperature and precipitation in Montana (Sittel 1994, Green et al. 1997, Bernhardt 2002, NOAA 2003). This analysis indicated that based on 100 yr of climate record, Bozeman’s local climate was significantly impacted by the El Nino conditions. The 29-wk study period from 3 Dec to 23 June was characterized by a greater number of extreme high daytime temperatures, a deficit of low nighttime temperatures, a deficit of high precipitation days, and a deficit of days with extremely small diurnal temperature ranges. We determined the difference between El Nino years and normal years to be about 20 percent for each of these four extreme daily weather conditions.

The influence of El Nino on daytime temperatures was most significant during the period from about mid January to mid February and from about mid April to early June, during which time a greater number of extreme high daytime temperatures occurred. Peak percent increase of extreme high daytime temperatures occurred

**Table 5. Data on two periods that had a significant decrease in the number of days of extreme small diurnal temperatures due to El Nino.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Max weekly $\chi^2$</th>
<th>Daily average period change*</th>
<th>Dates of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
<th>Daily average change of Max $\chi^2$ wks*</th>
<th>Cardinal temp of Max $\chi^2$ wks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - 10</td>
<td>18 Feb–10 Mar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
<td>18 Feb–10 Mar</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>&lt; 8°C (15°F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>13 May–9 June</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>27 May–2 June</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>&lt; 14°C (25°F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Negative signs indicate the average fraction of a day (in percent) increase in extreme high daily diurnal temperatures during the two intervals that were attributable to El Nino.
Figure 4. (A) Significance of the difference in the number of low diurnal temperature range days during the 25 El Nino years compared to the 50 normal years. Cardinal values (the extreme low diurnal temperature occurrence during the week of maximum $\chi^2$) are indicated on the graph. Chi-square values $=7$ (indicated by the dotted lines) are the critical values for significance ($P=0.01$, 1df).

(B) For each date (plotted weekly) in an El Nino year, the average percent that had a low diurnal temperature range occurrence due to the El Nino effect.
during these two periods at 13 and nine percent, respectively. Extreme high daytime temperatures during the most significant period (22 Apr-23 June) averaged 67 percent more frequent during El Nino years than during normal years.

The influence of El Nino on extreme low nighttime temperatures was most significant during the period from about early January to late February during which time a deficit of extreme low nighttime temperatures was experienced. The greatest decrease in extreme low nighttime temperatures was 12 percent. During the one significant period (7 Jan-24 Feb), extreme low nighttime temperatures averaged 50 percent less frequent during El Nino years than during normal years.

The influence of El Nino on fewer days of high precipitation amounts was most significant during the periods from about early February to mid March and from late May to early June. The greatest percentage decreases of high precipitation amounts observed during these two periods were three and eight percent respectively. High precipitation days during the most extreme precipitation periods, 28 Jan-17 Mar and 20 May-9 Jun, averaged 44 and 24 percent less frequently during El Nino years than during normal years.

The influence of El Nino on the deficit of extreme small diurnal temperature ranges was most significant during the period from about mid February to mid March and from about mid May to early June. Peak percent deficit of extreme small diurnal temperature ranges during these two periods were seven and 13 percent, respectively. Extremely small diurnal temperature range days during the most significant period (13 May-9 Jun) averaged 29 percent less frequently during El Nino years than during normal years.

This approach to determine extreme daily weather associated with the El Nino can be applied at any location for which an uninterrupted long daily weather record is available. The technique provides important information concerning the specific time when El Nino-caused extreme daily weather occurrences may be expected with a time resolution of one week. This procedure revealed extreme high or low thresholds (≥, or ≤) of the most significant climatic elements; thus, the analyst is not required to select arbitrary extreme thresholds for each climate element. Important information is provided on significant levels and percent of extreme daily weather occurrences that can help assess the potential impact of an El Nino event.
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TRAINING VOLUME AND METHODS OF ATHLETES COMPETING AT A MIXED MARTIAL ARTS EVENT

John Amtmann, Applied Health Science, Montana Tech of the University of Montana, Butte, MT 59701

ABSTRACT
This study surveyed 32 athletes competing at a mixed martial arts (MMA) event held in Butte, Montana. The survey attempted to gather information regarding overall training volume, supplement use, volume change and specific exercises used. The survey return rate was 100 percent (32/32). Twenty-five of 32 athletes supplemented their training with strength training. Overall frequency of strength training ranged from one to six sessions/week, and overall frequency of fighting-specific training sessions/week ranged from two to 10. Two of 32 athletes used/had used anabolic-androgenic steroids. Sixteen MMA athletes performed exercises specifically for the neck musculature, and eight used the power clean within their strength-training program. Results suggested that strength and conditioning specialists should educate MMA athletes regarding the importance of, volume variation and periodization, balanced training, effective exercises, and the side effects of anabolic androgenic steroid use.

Key words: mixed martial arts, periodization, strength training, conditioning

INTRODUCTION
The sport of mixed martial arts (MMA) is becoming one of the most popular sports in the world today, and training for the sport must be comprehensive in nature. The sport is a mixture of various combat sports that include stand-up striking, i.e., boxing, kickboxing, muay thai, stand-up grappling, i.e., judo, greco-roman and freestyle wrestling, and ground grappling, i.e., ju-jitsu, judo and wrestling. The most successful athletes in this arena combine elite level skills with extraordinary strength and conditioning levels. Because MMA combines different sports, high training volumes for MMA athletes have been frequently reported and overtraining is a serious risk, which is probably why there is also serious concern over anabolic androgenic steroid (AAS) use in the sport.

Although strength and conditioning guidelines have been formally established for grappling and striking sports (Cordes 1991, Ebben 1997,Grisaffi 1996, Kovaleski Gurchiek and Pearsall 2001, Lansky 1999, Pulkkinen 2001, Takahashi 1992), an extensive literature search yielded only two results in peer reviewed sources regarding training methods employed by MMA athletes (Amtmann 2002, Amtmann et al. 2008). Neither of these studies, however, revealed insight into training volume changes in the months prior to an MMA event.

Recently, a MMA event was held in Butte, Montana. The Event Director designated time for surveys to be completed just prior the rules meeting. The major purpose of the survey was to add to the existing information about the strength and conditioning practices employed by MMA competitors and how training volume varied as the date of the bout approached.

METHODS
Experimental Approach to the Problem
This was an exploratory descriptive study that sought to add to the minimal information in peer-reviewed research journals regarding the strength and conditioning methods MMA athletes employ.

Subjects—Thirty-two athletes from across the country competed at an MMA event held...
in Butte, Montana, and completed surveys that questioned the athletes about their overall training methods. The competitors for the event ranged in age from 19 to 41 years. An institutional review board approved this project and each subject signed an informed consent form that informed them of their rights relative to this survey.

**Procedures**—The questionnaire consisted of three sections, and took ~15 min to complete. The first section of the survey addressed the athletes’ overall MMA training and strength training volume.

The athletes were surveyed regarding the volume of MMA specific training four, three, two and one month away from an MMA bout, and volume of strength training when more than two months or less than two months out from an MMA bout.

The second section surveyed the athletes regarding anabolic-androgenic steroid (AAS) use and a final third section sought to gain information about the specific exercises the athletes used.

Previous research has shown that if the respondents of a survey know and trust the individual distributing the survey, the response rate will be higher than an unknown surveyor (10). The author was well acquainted with several of the coaches and most of the athletes competing at this event, and he was competing in the event, which may have had a positive influence on the 100 percent (32/32) survey return rate.

**Survey Distribution**—The director of the event designated a 15-min period of time prior to the rules meeting for the surveys to be distributed. The rules meeting was held about 4 hrs before the start of the event. The survey was designed with efficiency of completion in mind and was short enough that the athletes would take their time in completing it. The survey also allowed us to gain more information than in previous surveys. Analysis of the data consisted of descriptive statistics that identified the responses to each item/question.

**RESULTS**

Twenty five of 32 respondents participated in some type of weight training program in addition to their fight specific training. A slight change in the number of strength training (ST) sessions/week was noted as the bout neared within 2 mos (Table 1). When > 2 mos out from the bout, 17 athletes participated in ST sessions one to three times/week and eight participated in ST sessions three to six times/week, and 21

**Table 1. Strength Training Sessions Per Week and Number of Sets Per Exercise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST* Sessions/Week</th>
<th>More than 2 MO**</th>
<th>Less than 2 MO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>5***</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets/Exercise</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ST = Strength Training
** MO = Months out from bout
*** Number of athletes responding to this range or number respondents performed one to three sets/exercise with the other four performing four or more sets/exercise. When the bout was within two months nineteen athletes participated in ST sessions one to three times/week and six athletes participated three to six times/week, and 19 performed one to three sets/exercise and six athletes performed four or more sets/exercise.

Frequency (sessions/wk) of MMA specific training sessions ranged from two to 10, and the volume of MMA specific training varied depending on how close the athlete was to the date of the bout. A summary of results from this section of the survey appear in Table 2. When the bout was more than four months away, 14 athletes trained two to three times/week, 11 trained four to five times/week and seven trained six or more sessions/week. When the bout was
one month away only six athletes trained two to three days/week, 17 trained four to five times/week, and nine trained six or more sessions/week.

Survey results also revealed that 16 of 32 athletes performed exercises specifically for the neck musculature, six used the power snatch, and eight used the power clean in their strength training program. Finally, two of 32 athletes responded positively to previous AAS use.

**DISCUSSION**

Most athletes surveyed (25 of 32 respondents) participated in a ST program to prepare for their bout with only 16 of 25 performing exercises specific to the neck. In a previous study, Amtmann (2004) reported that only five of 28 athletes used exercises specifically for the neck, so 16 of 25 is a relative good percentage. The volume of ST, both number of ST sessions/week and sets/exercise varied only slightly as the bout neared. The volume of MMA-specific training sessions varied slightly more with the largest trend being an increase in MMA-specific training. This suggested that some of the athletes may understand and implement periodization and volume variation to suit their MMA specific needs. Obviously the best way to train for an MMA style bout is to participate in MMA-specific training, and results of this survey suggested that some athletes involved in this particular event understand that concept.

It isn’t always the athlete that trains the most, but the one who trains the smartest, who is successful. Smart training may include an adjustment to overall strength training volume to allow for metabolic conditioning specific to MMA, which may require increases in MMA specific training and adjustments to strength training. Smart training would also include training the entire musculature of the body, including the neck. Finally, smart training should exclude the AAS use.

One of the limitations to this study is that the sample was a convenience sample of athletes fighting at a specific event that included both amateur and professional fighters. Some of the professional fighters are sponsored and are able to train with much greater frequency than the amateur fighters who have to fit their training into work and family schedules.

**PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

The sport of mixed martial arts combines several combative sports, and the overall volume of training for these athletes might likely be very high. As a bout nears it may be necessary to vary overall training volume to fit the individual needs of the athlete. This information is beneficial to the strength and conditioning specialist in several ways. First it appears that some of the athletes did not include strength training in their training. Second, many of those that did include strength training did not perform any strength training for the neck. Third, it appears that some of the athletes adjust their training volume to allow for more MMA specific training. The certified strength and conditioning specialist could be well-utilized by some of these athletes to develop sound programs specific to the needs of each individual MMA athlete.

---

**Table 2. MMA-Specific Training Sessions Per Week**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions/Week</th>
<th>4 Months Out</th>
<th>3 Months Out</th>
<th>2 Months Out</th>
<th>1 Month Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of athletes responding to this particular frequency
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Accipiter gentiles, see northern goshawk
Acetylcholinesterase, 1:1-15
cute toxicity, 9:53-58
adrenocorticotropin, 1: 29-36
algae, 2(2):17-26
amino acid decarboxylase (AADC), 6:95-101
Amphibians:
surveys, 4:33-49
toxicity of piscicides, 13:1-8
Antilocapra Americana, see pronghorn
arginine vasopressin, 1:29-36
Artemisia cana, see silver sagebrush
Artemisia spp., see sagebrush
Aspen:
browsing, 6:49-55
clear-cutting, 6:49-55
dioecious reproduction, 7:107-123
embryology, 7:107-123
morphology, 7:107-123
regeneration, 6:49-55
stem photosynthesis, 15:18-25
stem respiration, 15:18-25
Aquatic ecology:
competition, 6:197-216, 6:217-222, 8:153-177, 8:191-211
cover, 6:232-248
egg mortality, 3:7-10
fish barrier, 8:191-211
fish ecology, 6:10-17
fish passage, 6:232-248
habitat, 3:125-130, 6:178-196, 6:232-248
introduced fish, 6:57-67, 7:22-23, 8:143-152, 13:49-71, 14:1-16
lake morphometry, 3:78-81, 14:1-16
macrinovertrebrates, 6:178-196, 7:49-56
macrophytes, 6:249-262
mountain lakes, 8:143-152
movements, 6:232-248
native fish, 6:57-67, 7:22-33, 14:1-16
prairie stream fishes, 6:57-67
redds, 6:223-231
river regulation, 7:49-56
sedimentation, 6:232-248
spawning, 6:223-231, 9:59-61
survival, 6:197-216, 6:217-222, 6:232-248
tailwaters, 7:49-56
toxicity to piscicides, 13:9-12
winter research, 6:232-248
Aquila chrysaetos, see golden eagle
average plume spread 10:8-19
avian assemblages, 5:1-11, 6:33-48
- B -
bald eagle, 1:1-15
bats, 9:19-25
bears, grizzly, 3:17-37
beaver, 3:11-16
behavior, 3:55-61
benthos, 3:11-16
Bighorn sheep:
habitat selection, 11:25-30
interspecific associations, 6:339-354
spatial independence, 11:25-30
Bighorn Mountains, Wyoming, 7:22-33
Biculturalism, 3:131-142
binary vector spaces, 4:82-87
biodiversity, 13:99-109
bioindicators, 13:110-115
Birds, general:
Montana, 9:66-77
radar monitoring, 9:66-77
Wyoming, 3:73-81
bison, 6:18-32
Bitterroot River, Montana, 4:68-81
black fly, 13:32-43
Black Hills, South Dakota, 6:33-48, 14:78-88
Blackfoot River, Montana, 13:72-85
black-tailed prairie dog, 13:116-123
bottled water, 7:41-45
brook trout, 6:217-222, 6:232-248, 7:22-33, 8:191-211
bull trout, 8:143-152, 14:1-16
Burbot:
conservation strategy, 8:178-190
conservation, Montana, 14:61-77
Kootenai River, Montana, 8:178-190
burrowing owl, 7:63-69
Buteo regalis, see ferruginous hawk
butyrycholinesterase: 1:1-15
Canada lynx, 14:40-50
Canis latrans, see coyote
Castor canadensis, see beaver
catalysis: 2:35-39
Census:
capture efficiency, 3:1-6
distance sampling (streams), 6:223-231
live trap, 2(2):10-16, 3:1-6, 12:54-60
pitfall trap, 2(2):10-16, 3:1-6
Shannon diversity index, 2(2):10-16
snap trap, 2(2):10-16, 3:1-6
spatial patterns of decline, 12:63-73
track surveys, 6:78-85
Centrocercus urophasianus, see sage grouse
Cervus elaphus, see elk
cetyltrimethylammonium bromide: 1:37-43
channel catfish: 5:28-34
Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge, Montana, 6:57-67
choroflourocarbons: 6:119-142
chromatography: 1:44-52
Clark Fork River, Montana: 2(2):17-26
Climate change, 13:99-109
Coluber constrictor flaviventris, see Yellow-bellied racer
composted sewage sludge: 3:38-46
computational complexity: 4:82-87
Conservation Reserve Program, 2(2):10-16
corticotropin releasing factor, 1:29-36
Cottus cognatus, see slimy sculpin
Cornus sericea, see red-osier dogwood
Cougar:
bounty, 12:63-73
exploitation, 12:63-73
food habits, 1:16-28
habitat selection, 1:16-28
predation, 1:16-28
historical populations, 12:63-73
Coyote:
age structure, 7:93-106
bounties, 3:62-72
control, 3:62-72, 7:93-106
density, 6:78-85
diets, 6:355-367
longevity, 3:62-72
prey, 6:355-367
reproduction, 7:93-106
survival, 3:62-72
Cutthroat trout:
captive broodstock, 9:59-61
conservation, 8:125-142, 8:191-211
distribution, 8:153-177
hybridization, 8:153-177
native, 7:22-33, 8:125-142, 8:191-211
restoration, 8:125-142, 13:72-85
Utah, 8:125-142
Cygnus buccinator, see trumpeter swan
Cyprinidae, see minnows

decarboxylation, 2:35-39
Deer:
forage use, 11:58-65
northwest Montana, 11:58-65
intelligent transportation systems, 8:1-18
vehicle collision mitigation, 8:1-18
mule deer, 2:1-7, 3:62-72, 8:213-222
white-tailed deer, 2:1-7, 3:87-93, 11:58-65
Deer mice:
abundance, 2(2):10-16
Colorado, 12:54-60
habitat relations, 3:117-124, 5:12-22, 12:54-60
hantavirus, 8:38-44, 15:26-30
marking techniques, 11:66-70
mercury levels in hair, 13:110-115
Wyoming, 3:117-124
diatoms, 13:99-109
Didymosphenia spp., see diatoms
differential adjustment: 3:131-142
discriminant functions: 3:47-53
Distriionella spp., see diatoms
Douglas-fir, 2:1-7, 14:31-39

efficiency wage theory, 9:38-52
Ephemeroptera, 6:178-196
electrical conductivity: 1:37-43
electrogravimetric analysis: 4:50-55
electrolysis: 4:50-55
Elk:
browsing, 4:57-67, 6:49-55
effects of ecosystem management, 2:1-7
habitat selection, 7:70-77, 11:10-24
habitat management, 13:86-97
interspecific interactions, 6:339-354
Montana, 13:86-97, 15:7-17
mortality, 6:86-94, 15:7-17
population trends, 4:1-9
security cover, 7:70-77
sexual segregation, 7:70-77
South Dakota, 11:10-24
vulnerability, 6:86-94
winter range, 4:1-9, 13:86-97, 15:7-17
environmental contaminants: 1:1-15
epinephrine: 1: 29-36

- F -
feedback iteration function: 2:16-25
ferruginous hawk, 13:116-123
Festuca idahoensis, see Idaho fescue
Fisheries management:
angler response, 3:94-100, 6:68-77
electrofishing, 3:7-10, 5:35-38, 8:192-211
hatcheries, 6:197-216
invasive species, 15:41-53
slat trap, 15:1-6
telemetry, 13:72-85
turbulent fountain, 9:101-106
Flathead Indian Reservation, Montana, 4:33-49, 13:49-71
fluid flow, 2:26-34
forensic anthropology, 3:47-53
Forestry:
ecosystem management: 2:1-7
forest stand structure, 4:10-21
growth form: 4:57-67
landscape analysis, 4:10-21, 6:86-94
landscape ecology, 5:12-22
logging effects on song birds, 6:33-48
road density, 11:10-24
thinning treatment effects on small mammals, 5:12-22, 14:40-50

- G -
geographical information systems (GIS):
geomorphometry:
digital elevation models, 7:78-91
ecological mapping, 7:78-91
Glacier National Park, Montana, 13:99-109, 14:1-16
Great Plains:
Crow Creek, Wyoming, 3:11-16
Laramie Plains Lakes, Wyoming, 3:73-81
southwestern Wyoming, 3:11-16
Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, 14:31-39, 14:40-50, 15:7-17
green space, 8:30-37
Gulo gulo, see wolverine

- H -
Haliaeetus leucocephalus, see bald eagle
Headwaters State Park, Montana: 2(2):1-9
heavy metals, 1:1-15
Henry’s Lake, 6:263-284
Henry’s Fork of the Snake River, Idaho:
aquatic resources, 6:312-332
bibliography, 6:312-332
consumer surplus, 6:285-292
economics, 6:106-118, 6:285-292
gEOgraphy, 6:106-118
geomorphology, 6:159-177
hydrology, 6:119-142, 6:312-332
history of fisheries management, 6:263-284
landuse, 6:178-196
nonnative fish, 6:197-216
recreation, 6:285-292
watershed, 6:106-118, 6:178-196
watershed management, 6:293-311
home range fidelity, 3:62-72
Horse Creek, Wyoming, 9:62-65

- I -
Ictalurus punctatus, see channel catfish
Idaho fescue, 4:22-26
Immigration Russian-Americans, 3:131-142
immiscible fluid, 2:26-34
incubation, 3:55-61
insulin replacement, 1: 29-36
Island Park Reservoir, Idaho, 6:263-284

- J -
juniper-woodland, 8:19-29
jump training, 15:54-57

- K -
kine, 2:35-39
- L -
landscape analysis, 4:10-21
lake trout, 8:143-152
lead toxicity, 13:116-123
Lemmiscus curtatus, see vole, sagebrush
Lepus americanus, see snowshoe hare
Lewis and Clark Journals, 11:31-43
Lewis and Clark Caverns State Park, 11:1-7
Lewis’ woodpecker, 3:55-61
light scattering: 1:37-43
limestone, 1:44-52
Little Bighorn River, Wyoming 7:22-33
Liu pyramids, 2:16-25
Lota lota, see burbot
Lynx canadensis, see Canada lynx

- M -
Madison River, Montana: 6:1-9
Machrybopsis gelida, see sturgeon chub
Macroinvertebrates, 3:11-16
magnetic float, 2:35-39
mass spectrometry, 1:44-52
martial arts, 10:20-24, 11:71-75
Melanerpes lewis, see Lewis’ woodpecker
Merriam’s turkey: 
  nesting, 9:26-37
  population characteristics, 9:26-37
  survival, 9:26-37
  poult survival, 14:78-88
metal complexation, 3:38-46
micelles, 1:37-43, 3:101-106
Micropterus dolomieu, see smallmouth bass
Microtus spp., see voles
Microtus ochrogaster, see prairie vole
mining, 8:213-222, 13:110-115
mine reclamation: 3:38-46, 8:213-222, 12:19-26
minnows, 6:10-17
miscible fluid, 2:26-34
Mississippian Lodgepole Formation, 1:44-52
Missouri River, Montana, 6:10-17, 6:68-77, 7:1-21, 15:1-6
Missouri River Breaks, Montana, 3:62-72
Modeling:
  broad-scale species distribution 12:12-17
monoid, 2:16-25
Myxobolus cerebralis, see whirling disease

- N -
natural resources: 6:293-311
New Zealand mud snail: 9:53-58, 15:41-53
normal alkanes, 1:44-52
northern goshawk, 7:34-40
noxious weeds, 6:368-369
Noturus flavus, see stonecat
NP-complete: 4:82-87
nuclear magnetic resonance spectra, 3:101-106
numerical wave propagation, 1:53-60

- O -
Odocoileus hemionus, see deer, mule deer
Odocoileus virginianus, see deer, white-tailed
Oncorhynchus clarki, see cutthroat trout
O. c. bouvieri, see Yellowstone cutthroat trout
O. mykiss, see rainbow trout
Organochlorines, 1:1-15
Ovis canadensis, see bighorn sheep

- P -
Paddlefish, 3:94-100, 5:35-38, 6:68-77
peer mediation, 2:8-15
pesticides, 1:1-15
Peromyscus maniculatus, see deer mice
Peromyscus truei, see pinyon mice
photo interpretation, 4:10-21
photosynthesis, 15:18-25
Phencobius mirabilis, see suckermouth minnow
pine, ponderosa, 2:1-7, 14:78-88
pinyon mice, 12:54-60
Plecoptera, 6:178-196
pollutant behavior, 9:87-100
Polydon spatula, see paddlefish
Populus tremuloides, see aspen
porous media, 2:26-34
Potomopyrgus antipodarum, see New Zealand mud snail
Powder River Basin, Wyoming, 8:213-222
prey delivery rates, 7:34-40
pronghorn, 8:213-222
propagule, 4:27-32
Pseudotsuga menziesii, see Douglas-fir
Pteronarcy's California, see salmonflies
Public involvement:
  communication, incentives, 6:293-311
  community building, 6:293-311
  cooperation, 6:293-311
  incentives, 6:293-311

- R -
Reithrodontomys megalotis, see western harvest mice
red-osier dogwood, 15:18-25
remote sensing, 4:10-21
reptiles, 4:33-49, 12:61-62
Riparian:
  ecology, 6:159-177
  vegetation, 6:159-177
Rocky Mountains: 3:1-6
  East Front, Montana, 3:17-37
  Bangtail Range, Montana, 4:22-26
  Bridger Range, Montana, 1:44-52
  Laramie Range, Wyoming, 3:55-61
  Teton Range, Wyoming, 6:106-118
Rocky Mountain snail, 13:13-31

- S -
Sagebrush:
  characteristics, 8:46-59
  distribution in Montana, 8:46-59
  management, 8:46-59, 8:67-81
  silver sagebrush: 4:27-32
taxonomy, 8:46-59
  sagebrush-grassland: 8:19-29, 12:1-11
  conservation, 8:60-66
  management, 8:60-66
Sage grouse, greater:
  ecology, 8:67-81
  habitat, 8:94-104, 8:105-116, 2:1-11
  hatching chronology, 8:82-93
  lek abandonment, 12:1-11
  livestock interaction, 8:105-116
  management, 8:67-81
  migration, 8:67-81
  molt, 8:67-81
  productivity, 8:82-93
  status, 8:67-81
  salmonflies, 6:1-9
Salmonidae, 7:22-33
Salvelinis confluentus, see bull trout
S. fontinalis, see brook trout
S. namaycush, see lake trout
sauter, 7:1-21
scat analysis, 6:355-367
seed dissemination, 4:27-32
selenium, 1:1-15
shrews, general, 2(2)10-16
shrew, dwarf, 3:117-124
Simulium spp., see black fly
slimy sculpin, 13:9-12
Small mammals, general:
  abundance, 5:12-22, 12:54-60
  capture efficiency, 3:1-6
  community structure, 8:19-29, 5:12-22
  diversity, 2(2)10-16, 8:19-29
  habitat, 3:1-6, 3:117-124, 8:223-225
  New Mexico, 8:223-225
smallmouth bass, 13:49-71
Snake River, Wyoming, 5:1-11
Snowshoe hare:
  diet, 14:31-39
  habitat use 14:40-50
Soils:
  fertility, 4:22-26
gypsum block sensitivity, 14:51-59
leaching, 4:22-26
water potential, 14:51-59
song birds, 5:1-11, 6:33-48
Sorex spp., see shrews
Sorex nanus, see dwarf shrew
spectrophotometric analysis, 4:50-55
Speotyto cunicularia, see burrowing owl
stable isotopes, 6:119-142
Stizostedion vitreum, see walleye
Stizostedion canadense, see sauger
springs, 6:119-142
stonecat, 15:1-6
stem respiration, 15:18-24
Streams:
  channel morphology, 6:143-158
discharge, 3:82-86
  groundwater seepage impacts, 4:68-81
  morphology, 4:68-81, 7:22-33
  peak flood, 3:82-86
  riparian corridor, 5:1-11
  spring-fed, 6:143-158, 6:159-177, 6:178-196
  strength training, 13:45-48

streptozotocin, 1: 29-36
sturgeon chub, 3: 125-130
suburban development, 6: 78-85, 6: 355-367
suckermouth minnow, 9: 62-65
surfactants, 2: 35-39, 3: 101-106
Sun River, Montana, 15: 1-6

- T -

Tamias amoenus, see yellow pine chipmunk
tardigrades, 12: 45-53
Terrestrial ecosystems:
browsing history, 4: 57-67, 6: 49-55
food habits, 1: 16-28, 6: 355-367
foraging, 3: 55-61, 6: 18-32
forest openings, 3: 87-93
grazing influences, 3: 17-37, 6: 18-32
habitat, 2: 1-7, 3: 1-6, 3: 55-61, 8: 213-222
habitat fragmentation, 6: 33-47
habitat security, 3: 87-93, 6: 86-94
habitat selection, 1: 16-28, 14: 40-50
human disturbance, 5: 1-11
invertebrates, general, 9: 78-86
silviculture, 14: 40-50
terrain ruggedness, 5: 23-27
vascular plants: 6: 333-338
vernal migration, 9: 66-77
tracer investigations, 10: 8-19
Trichoptera, 6: 178-196
tROUT, 7: 22-33, 11: 45-57
trumpeter swan, 6: 249-262
Tubifex tubifex, see whirling disease

- U -

urban planning: 8: 30-37
Ursus arctos horribilis, see bear, grizzly

- V -

visible spectra, 3: 101-106
vOLE, 2:(2)10-16
vOLE, prairie, 3: 117-124
vOLE, sagebrush, 3: 117-124

- W -

walleye, 3: 7-10
Water:
management, 6: 249-262
uality, 6: 1-9, 6: 312-332
waterfowl, 3: 73-81
western harvest mice, 3: 117-124
whirling disease, 7: 57-62, 11: 45-57
Wildlife management:
furbearers, 9: 1-18
human dimensions, 9: 1-18
Montana Indian reservations, 3: 107-115
mail survey, 9: 1-18
Northern Yellowstone elk herd, 4: 1-9
trapping, 9: 1-18
tribal law enforcement and criminal
codes, 3: 107-115
wildfire, 10: 1-7
Wolves:
bounty, 12: 63-73
exploitation, 12: 63-73
historical populations, 12: 63-73
Wolverine:
Montana, 14: 17-30
regional modeling, 12: 12-17
reproduction, 14: 17-30

- X -

Xanthoria elegans, see lichens

- Y -

Yellow-bellied racer, 12: 61-62
yellow pine chipmunk, 5: 12-22
Yellowstone cutthroat trout, 6: 263-284
population status, 6: 197-216
Yellowstone National Park, 4: 1-9, 4: 57-67,
6: 18-32, 6: 143-158, 15: 7-17
Yellowstone River, Montana:
paddle fishery, 3: 94-100, 5: 28-34
Montana fishes, 7: 1-21
Two Moon Park, 6: 333-338, 6: 368-369
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