LISTS OF SPECIES

Check List 12(2): 1879, 30 April 2016 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.15560/12.2.1879 ISSN 1809-127X © 2016 Check List and Authors

Check List the journal of biodiversity de

Stream fish fauna from the tributaries of the upper Itapetininga River, upper Paranapanema River basin, state of São Paulo, Brazil

Vitor Loreno de Almeida Cerqueira^{1, 2}, Mauricio de Proença Carvalho¹, Rodrigo da Silva Almeida³, Fabio Cop Ferreira⁴, Mauricio Cetra³ and Welber Senteio Smith^{1, 2 *}

- 1 Universidade Paulista, Laboratório de Ecologia Estrutural e Funcional, Av. Independência 752, Iporanga, CEP 18103-000, Sorocaba, SP, Brazil
- 2 Universidade de Sorocaba, Programa de Mestrado em Processos Tecnológicos e Ambientais, Rodovia Raposo Tavares km 92.5 CEP 18023-000, Sorocaba, SP, Brazil
- 3 Universidade Federal de São Carlos UFSCar, Departamento de Ciências Ambientais, Rodovia João Leme dos Santos, km 110, SP 264, CEP 18052-780, Sorocaba, SP, Brazil
- 4 Universidade Federal de São Paulo UNIFESP, Departamento de Ciências do Mar, Av. Saldanha da Gama, 89, Ponta da Praia, CEP 11030-400, Santos, SP, Brazil
- * Corresponding author. E-mail: welber_smith@uol.com.br

Abstract: The study area, which is located in urban and rural areas within the upper Paranapanema River basin, is undergoing several types of anthropogenic and non-anthropogenic impacts, such as chemical alterations, habitat disruption, and biological invasions. The aim of this study is to describe the fish faunal composition from tributaries of the Itapetininga River, upper Paranapanema River basin, state of São Paulo, Brazil. Herein, we include a list of 49 fish species, belonging to seven orders, 19 families and 35 genera, captured from September 2009 to November 2013. Thus, the present study fills part of the knowledge gap about the fish fauna from tributaries of the Paranapanema basin by adding data from small tributaries not studied so far. Moreover, our findings can help inform future conservational and/or management strategies within the upper Paranapanema basin.

Key words: Neotropical ichthyology; species inventory; ichthyofaunal diversity

INTRODUCTION

The state of São Paulo harbors about 390 species of fish (Oyakawa and Menezes 2011), corresponding to approximately 8.5% of the estimated total for the whole country. Of that total, 260 species occur in the upper Paraná Basin (Oyakawa and Menezes 2011). The Paraná River and its main tributaries (Tietê, Paranapanema and Grande) house several medium-sized and large fish species, such as curimbatás (*Prochilodus* sp.), piaparas (*Leporinus* sp.), pintados (*Pseudoplatystoma* sp.) and jaús (*Zungaro jahu*), which are widely distributed and important for commercial and subsistence fishing. However, in the headwaters of all four river basins within the state of São Paulo (Paraná, Paranapanema, Ribeira de Iguape and Paraíba do Sul), small to medium-sized fish species belonging to the orders Characiformes and Siluriformes are the most commonly found. In general, these species have a restricted distribution, little or no commercial value (except for a few species exploited in the trade of ornamental fish), and high dependence on riparian vegetation as a source of food of allochthonous origin, and for reproduction and protection (Castro and Menezes 1998; Langeani et al. 2007; Oyakawa and Menezes 2011).

Inventories conducted in the headwaters of the upper Paraná River, especially in the state of São Paulo (Castro and Casatti 1997; Casatti et al. 2001; Castro et al. 2003, 2004, 2005; Langeani et al. 2005) cited the presence of a diverse ichthyofauna: 310 species for the upper Paraná River (Langeani et al. 2007) and 391 species for the state of São Paulo (Oyakawa and Menezes, 2011). Many of species have not vet been described and several are exotic (Castro et al. 2003, 2004, 2005). Similar results were also obtained through reviews of ichthyological collections and other independent studies, reinforcing the fact that the ichthyofaunal survey in the Alto Paraná basin is incomplete (Agostinho and Gomes 2005). Nonetheless, the importance of increasing collection efforts in the area and of reviewing the deposited material in collections must be emphasized. The main goal of this study is to gather data from surveys on fish species diversity from the tributaries of the upper Itapetininga River, upper Paranapanema River basin, state of São Paulo, Brazil, based on available data for the rivers Turvo (Cerqueira and Smith 2015), Pinhal,

Pinhalzinho, Claro and Clarinho (Carvalho and Smith 2013; Almeida 2013), as well as the small hydroelectric plants (HEPs) Paineiras and Jorda Flor (Ferreira 2011), resulting in a fish species list.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The hydrographic basin of the Itapetininga River has a drainage area of 2,600 km². Its headwaters, formed by the Pinhal Grande and Turvo Rivers, near Pilar do Sul, begin on the western slope of the Serra de Paranapiacaba mountain, in the same river basin as the Sorocaba (Tietê River basin) and Juquiá (Ribeira de Iguape River basin) sub-basins (Figure 1).

The vegetation is preserved and partially preserved at the headwaters (Turvo and Pinhal Grande River) and close to the mouth of the Itapetininga River. In its middle portion, vegetation is less dense, due to its proximity to the municipality of Pilar do Sul (Cerqueira and Smith 2013). The margins of the Paineiras reservoir consist of shrubs and trees interspersed with areas of eucalyptus plantations in the middle and lower portions, and pasture in the upper portion. The banks of the Jorda Flor reservoir contrast with the Paineiras reservoir by being occupied predominantly by pastures, with some stretches of eucalyptus planting and signs of erosion (Ferreira 2011) (Figure 2).

The studied streams originate in the Serra de Paranapiacaba range, at approximately 1,100 m of altitude. The vegetation on this part of the basin is characterized by Atlantic Forest, with an average rainfall of 1,700 to 2,400 mm and an average annual temperature of 18°C to 20°C (Almeida 2013). Samplings were carried out in small streams where the Pinhal River joins the Turvo River to become the Itapetininga River (Figure 1). The 52 selected sampling sites are located in the southeastern portion of the state of São Paulo, within upper Paranapanema basin. All localities belong to the upper Paranapanema system, 15 are located in the rivers Clarinho, Claro, Pinhalzinho and Pinhal, 19 are located in the HEPs Paineiras and Jorda Flor, six are located in the Pinhal River and 12 are located in the Turvo River (Figure 1). Figure 2 shows some of the sampling localities and Table 1 shows the coordinates and the localities that correspond to the images. Stretches of streams within the Claro and Pinhal microbasins were analyzed, contemplating second to fourth order streams (Almeida 2013). We also sampled 15 sections, nine in the Claro River microbasin (C1 to C7 and CL1 and CL2) and six in the Pinhal River microbasin (P1 to P6). The junction point between the two streams was called the mouth (Almeida 2013). Another study was conducted by Carvalho and Smith (2013) in the Pinhal River, divided into six sampling localities, from its headwaters to its



Figure 1. Location of the sampling sites.



Figure 2. Sites sampled in tributaries of the upper Paranapanema River, SP, Brazil. See Table 1 for detailed location information. Photos by Mauricio de Proença Carvalho (A, Clarinho River; and B, Pinhal River) and Vitor Loreno de Almeida Cerqueira (C and D, Turvo River; 2E and 2F, Pinhal River).

mouth where it joins with the Turvo River.

The fishes were captured from September 2009 to November 2013, using electrofishing, gillnets and traps. All collected specimens were fixed in 10% formalin and, after 72 hours, transferred to 70% ethanol. Specimens were identified according to Reis et al. (2003) and Oliveira et al. (2011), and deposited in the Ichthyology Laboratory of the Department of Zoology and Botany, UNESP, São José do Rio Preto (DZSJRP) and in the Zoology Laboratory of the Paulista University, Sorocaba (LZUNIP). The collection licenses were issued by IBAMA with the numbers 24151-1, 10275-2 and 13352-1.

RESULTS

Our findings report the occurrence of 49 species, seven orders and 19 families (Table 2). Characiforms and Siluriforms were dominant in number of captured species, with 50% and 36% of the recorded species, respectively. Perciformes and Gymnotiformes, both with 4% of the recorded species, and Synbranchiformes, Cyprinidae and Cyprindotiformes each with 2% of the recorded species, were less representative. The families were represented in the following descending relative percentage order: Characidae (22%), Loricariidae (16%), Heptapteridae (14%), Anostomidae (10%), Crenuchidae

 Table 1. Sampling localities in tributaries of the upper Paranapanema river: environments, locations, collection method and geographical coordinates.

Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 2578/27.5, 04774 [21] Stretch composed of preserved animeter segration, with high level of hading sign. Average with of 6m, shallow depth. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 2756/27.5, 04774 [24] Nie the disk paint and evengenous, with high level of hading term of the disk paint and evengenous with of 6m, shallow depth. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 2759/27.5, 04774 [24] Stretch composed of preserved averaget another segretishin, with high level of hading term of the disk paint and there of the creek bodi. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 2759/27.5, 04774 [24] Stretch composed of depained forest and ferrepetitively. Margins are stable, since they have a high amount of vegetation and nots. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 2759/27.5, 04774 [24] Stretch composed of depained forest and strenge. Stretch composed of depained forest and strenges. Stretch composed of depained forest and stretch strenges and preserving. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 2751715.04774074 Stretch composed of depained forest and stretch strenges and the margin stretch strenges and the margin stretch strenges and the margin strenge and the dephane and the	Environment	Locality	Method	Coordinates	Environmental characterization
Lotic Ro Claro Gonde electrofthing 2355/2015, 0474/213 'W Stretch composed of preserved anidnost vegetation, with level of hading and toos. Average with of a m, hallow depth. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofthing 2354/3215, 0474/24'W Weich Lands have had a forestry plantations. The shading is 30-79 with the ceake bed. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofthing 23753/215, 0474/24'W Stretch composed of preserved existence in and adom. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofthing 23753/195, 0474/24'W Stretch composed of preserved anid preserved anid preserved anid preserved anid preserved parameters in an adjust preserved parameters in an adjust preserved parameters in a main adjust preserved parameters in adjust preserved paramaters in adjust preserved parameters in adjust preserv	Lotic	Rio Claro Grande	electrofishing	23°58′22″ S, 047°41′21″ W	Stretch composed of preserved rainforest vegetation, with high level of shading on its bed. Its banks are heterogeneous, with rocks, vegetation, roots, trunks and slopes. Average width of 6m, shallow depth.
Lotic Ris Claro Grande electrofishing 23°54'32", 5.07'22 4FW Stretch composed of preserved vagetation, however thes is and along is Margin and Sa well as Stretch composed of degraded frost and forest, Salading of 50-75% on the case bed. Average width and depth of 7 and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 23°54'32', 5.047'42'4'W Stretch composed of degraded frost and forest, Salading of 50-75% on the case bed. Average width and degraded forest and grands. The sala has preserved with and degraded forest and grands. The sala has preserved with and degraded forest and anglish. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23'5'3'10''S, 04'7'4'3'W Stretch composed of degraded forest and grands. The salading anomat of vegatation and grands. The salading anomat of vegatation and grands. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23'5'1'S', 04'7'4'3'W Stretch composed of degraded forest and small mount of pasture. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23'5'1'S', 04'7'4'3'W Stretch composed of degraded forest and small mount of pasture. Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23'5'1'S', 04'7'4'3'W Stretch composed of degraded forest. Shading o -25% of the back. The main grange present adopts. The average width and degraded forest. Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23'5'2'1'S, 04'7'8'3'W Stretch composed of degraded forest. Sha	Lotic	Rio Claro Grande	electrofishing	23°56′20″ S, 047°42′31″ W	Stretch composed of preserved rainforest vegetation, with high level of shading on its bed. Its banks have a high amount of vegetation, followed by rocks, trunks and roots. Average width of 8 m, shallow depth.
Lotic Rio Claro Grande electrofishing 23°54°2°, 047°424°1 Stretch composed of dagraded forest and forest, shading on 25-75% on the propert of the banks are monitory of stable, bits, there is the propert of dagsaded forest and agniculture. Shading on 25-55% of the banks are monitory of dagsaded forest and agniculture. Shading on 25-55% of the banks are monitory of dagsaded forest and agniculture. Shading on 25-55% of the banks are monitory of dagsaded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50-75% of the bank are manifes present skipes. The average width and depth are 6 m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23°51°5°, 047°42°271 Stretch composed monitory of dagsaded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50-75% of the bank manifes present skipes. The average width and depth are 6 m and 0.2 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23°51°51°, 047°46°271 Stretch composed monitory of dagsaded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50-75% of the bank manifes present skipes. The average width and depth are 50 m and 0.2 m, respectively. Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23°54°25°, 047°46°271 Stretch composed of dagsaded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50-75% of the bank manifes present skipes. The average width and depth are 50 m and 0.2 m, respectively. Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23°54°5°, 047°46°40 Stretch composed of parsaded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading for forest, dadspash and 2.5 m, respectively.	Lotic	Rio Claro Grande	electrofishing	23°54′52″ S, 047°42′48″ W	Stretch composed of preserved vegetation, however there is a road along its banks as well as forestry plantations. The shading is 50–75% on the creek bed. Average width and depth of 7.5 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Margins are stable, since they have a high amount of vegetation and roots.
Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23*3719*5, 047*45211V Stretch composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest and agriculture shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26-50% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest. Shading on 25% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest. Shading on 25% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest. Shading on 25% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest. Shading on 25% of the bed its banks are composed of degraded forest. Shading on 25% of the bed. The bed its banks are composed of pressert and inforest. Shading on 25% of the bed. The average width and depth are 5.m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23*57.57% 5.07*462*W Stretch composed of pressert and inforest. Shading on 25% of the bed. The average width and depth are 5.m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*57.57% 5.07*462*W Stretch composed of pressert and inforest. Shading on 20% of the sed. Margins composed of pressert and inforest. Shading on ore than 76% of the bed. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*57.50*7% 047*462*W Stretch composed of pressert direnset. Shading on ored	Lotic	Rio Claro Grande	electrofishing	23°54′52″ S, 047°42′48″ W	Stretch composed of degraded forest and forestry. Shading of 50–75% on its bed. The banks are mostly not stable, that is, there is the presence of slopes and exposed soil, however there is some vegetation. Its average width and depth are
Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23'51'54'', 5,047'43'4G'W Stretch composed mostly of degraded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50-75% of the bed. The margins present slopes. The average width and depth are 6.6 m and 0.4 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Claro electrofishing 23'31'31''s, 047'46'2T'W Wittech composed of of bed. The margins present slopes. The average width and depth are 7 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23'53'32''s, 047'39'12'W Wittech composed of degraded forest and forestry. Shading on 23% of its bed. On the banks there is the predominance of vegetation. The average width and depth are 5.5 m and 0.23 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23'53'32''s, 047'46'4'W Wittech composed of preserved inforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. On the banks there is the predominance of vegetation. The average width and depth are 5.1 m and 0.23 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23'57'85''s, 047'46'4'W Wittech composed of preserved inforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. Angins composed of slopes. The average width and depth are 6.5 m and 0.4 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23'57'85''s, 047'46'4'W Wittech composed of preserved inforest. Shading on soly of its bed. On the margins. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. Margins composed of slopes. The average width and depth are 6.5 m and 0.4 m, respectively.	Lotic	Rio Claro	electrofishing	23°53'19″ S, 047°42'51″ W	Stretch composed of degraded forest and agriculture. Shading on 26–50% of the bed. Its banks are composed predominantly of slopes. The average width and depth are 6 m and 0.35 m, respectively.
Lotic Pio Caro electrofishing 23°51°15'S, 047°46'27" Stretch composed mostly of degradef forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50–75% of the bed. The marging present signes. The average width and depth are 7 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23'54'21'S, 047'39'12" Stretch composed of degraded forest. Shading 0.25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of degraded forest. Shading 0.25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of degraded forest. Shading 0.25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of degraded forest. Shading 0.25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of degraded forest. Shading 0.25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of degraded forest. Shading 0.05% networks with and depth are 5.5 m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23'58'55'.5'.047'46'24" Stretch composed of preserved rainforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. On the average width and depth are 5.5 m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23'56'15'.5'.047'46'24" Stretch composed of preserved rainforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. On the average width and depth are 5.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23'56'15'.5'.047'46'24" Stretch composed of preserved forest. Advances and urban occupation. The average width and depth are 5.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23'52'15'.5'.047'46'34" Stretch composed of preserved forest. Advances and urban	Lotic	Rio Claro	electrofishing	23°51′54″ S, 047°43′46″ W	Stretch composed mostly of degraded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50–75% of the bed. The margins present slopes. The average width and depth are 6.6 m and 0.4 m, respectively.
Lotic Clarinho electrofishing 23*54*21*5, 047*96*21*W Stretch composed of degraded forest: 3nding 0-25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of redisplayed forest and forests. Shading on 25% of fis bed. On the banks there is the predominance of vegetation. The average width and depth are 5.5 m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23*57*35*5, 047*66*07*W Stretch composed of orgestreed failorest, silvaling on 25% of fis bed. Marging composed of vegetation, rocks and slopes. The average width and depth are 5.5 m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23*57*85*5, 047*66*07*W Stretch composed of preserved failorest, although there is a road along on or fis margins. Shading on more than 76% of fis bed. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*57*85*5, 047*66*02*W Stretch composed of preserved fairStrets, shading on 50% of the bed. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*57*85*5, 047*66*02*W Stretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. More than 25% shading. Staking predominant with vegetation. The average width and depth are 2.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*52*5, 047*46*14*W Stretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*52*19*5, 047*46*14*W Stretch composed of agr	Lotic	Rio Claro	electrofishing	23°51′51″ S, 047°46′27″ W	Stretch composed mostly of degraded forest and a small amount of pasture. Shading from 50–75% of the bed. The margins present slopes. The average width and depth are 7 m and 0.5 m, respectively.
Lotic Clainho electrofshing 23*53*25*, 0.47*36*30* Stretch composed of degraded forest. Shading on 25% of its bed. On the backs three is the prodominance of vegetation and rocks. The average width and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofshing 23*58*5*5, 047*46*30* Stretch composed of praserved frainforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. Margins composed of vegetation, rocks and slopes. The average width and depth are 5.7 m and 0.25 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofshing 23*56*16*5, 047*46*32* Stretch composed of praserved frainforest. Although there is a road along one of its margins. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. Margins composed of slopes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 6.3 m and 0.4 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofshing 23*56*16*5, 047*46*32* Stretch composed of praserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. Shading on 50% of the bed. Margins composed of slopes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.2 m do 5.m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofshing 23*52*13*5, 047*46*34* Stretch composed of praserved forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominant with vegetation. The average width and depth are 7.2 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofshing 23*52*13*5, 047*46*34* Stretch composed of apraina vegetation. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofshing <td< td=""><td>Lotic</td><td>Clarinho</td><td>electrofishing</td><td>23°54′21″ S, 047°39′12″ W</td><td>Stretch composed of degraded forest. Shading 0–25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of rocks, slopes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 4.4 m and 0.4 m, respectively.</td></td<>	Lotic	Clarinho	electrofishing	23°54′21″ S, 047°39′12″ W	Stretch composed of degraded forest. Shading 0–25% of the bed. Its banks are mostly composed of rocks, slopes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 4.4 m and 0.4 m, respectively.
Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23*58*54*5, 047*46*0*W Stretch composed of preserved inforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed, margins composed of vegetation, rocks and slopes. The average width and depth are 6.7 m and 0.38 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23*5785*5, 047*46*22*W Stretch composed of preserved inforest, although there is a road along one of the average width and depth are 6.7 m and 0.4 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*56*16*5, 047*46*2*W Stretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. Shading on 50% of the bed. Margins composed of slopes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.7 and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*52*12*5, 047*46*3*W Stretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. More than 25% shading. Banks predominant with vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.7 and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23*52*17*5, 047*46*4W Stretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantify with slopes and exposed soil. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal sieves, covo 23*52*17*5, 047*46*4W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. The average width and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Pinhal sieves, covo 23*517*5, 047*46*	Lotic	Clarinho	electrofishing	23°53′32″ S, 047°39′38″ W	Stretch composed of degraded forest and forestry. Shading on 25% of its bed. On the banks there is the predominance of vegetation and rocks. The average width and depth are 5.5 m and 0.25 m, respectively.
Lotic Pinhalzinho electrofishing 23°5785°S, 047°46′23°W Stretch composed of preserved rents, degraded forest, and urban occupation. The average width and depth are 6.5 m and 0.4 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23°56′16′S, 047°46′23°W Stretch composed of or specerved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. The average width and depth are 8.7 and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23°56′16′S, 047°46′23°W Stretch composed of or specerved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. The average width and depth are 5.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23°52′4′S, 047°46′33′W Stretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed sol. The average width and depth are 7.4 m and 0.5 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23°52′13′S, 047°46′34′W Stretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed sol. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.7 m, respectively. Lotic Pinhal electrofishing 23°52′13′S, 047°46′34′W Stretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed sol. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.7 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Pinhal sieves, covo 23°53′17″S, 047°46′34′W Stretch composed of ripar	Lotic	Pinhalzinho	electrofishing	23°58′54″ S, 047°46′40″ W	Stretch composed of preserved rainforest. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. Margins composed of vegetation, rocks and slopes. The average width and depth are 6.7 m and 0.38 m, respectively.
LoticPinhalelectrofishing23*56'16''S, 047*46'42''WStretch composed of prest, degraded forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. Shading on 50% of the bed. Margins composed of supes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.7 and 0.5 m, respectively.LoticPinhalelectrofishing23*52'47''5, 047*46'8''WStretch composed of prestrevel forest, degraded forest, shading on 50% of the bed. Margins Banks predominant with vegetation. The average width and depth are 12.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively.LoticPinhalelectrofishing23*52'13''S, 047*46'3''WStretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed soil. The average width and depth are 7.4 m and 0.6 m, respectively.LoticPinhalelectrofishing23*52'13''S, 047*46'3''WStretch composed of fiparian vegetation, but with and egth are 7.4 m and 0.6 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23*53'12''S, 047*46'10''WStretch composed of fiparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23*53'17''S, 047*46'10''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23*48'06''S, 047*47'3''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectivel	Lotic	Pinhalzinho	electrofishing	23°57′85″ S, 047°46′23″ W	Stretch composed of preserved rainforest, although there is a road along one of its margins. Shading on more than 76% of its bed. Margins composed of slopes. The average width and depth are 6.5 m and 0.4 m, respectively.
LoticPinhalelectrofishing23°53'28°S, 047°46'63''WStretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. More than 25% shading. Banks predominant with vegetation. The average width and depth are 12.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively.LoticPinhalelectrofishing23°52'47°S, 047°46'34''WStretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominanty with slopes and exposed soil. The average width and depth are 7.4 m and 0.6 m, respectively.LoticPinhalelectrofishing23°52'13°S, 047°46'34''WStretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominanty with slopes and exposed soil. Respectively. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.7 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°53'17''S, 047°46'10''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with the absence of marginal aquat- ic vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°48'06''S, 047°47'3''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°47'58''S, 047°46'0''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°47'58''S, 047°46'0''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration	Lotic	Pinhal	electrofishing	23°56′16″ S, 047°46′42″ W	Stretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. Shading on 50% of the bed. Margins composed of slopes and vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.7 and 0.5 m, respectively.
LoticPinhalelectrofishing $23^{\circ}52'47''5, 047'46'34'WStretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed.Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed soil. The average width and depthare 7.4 m and 0.6 m, respectively.LoticPinhalelectrofishing23^{\circ}52'13''5, 047'46'34'WStretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of thebed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed soil. The averagewidth and depth are 7.0 m and 0.7 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covoagillnets23^{\circ}53'42''5, 047'46'10'WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with the absence of marginal aquat-ic vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covoagillnets23^{\circ}53'17''5, 047'46'10''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration.Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covoagillnets23^{\circ}48'06''5, 047'47'31''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration.Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covoagillnets23^{\circ}47'58''5, 047'48'03''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration.Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covoagillnets23^{\circ}47'58''5, 047'48'03''WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration.Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Av$	Lotic	Pinhal	electrofishing	23°53′28″ S, 047°46′63″ W	Stretch composed of preserved forest, degraded forest and urban occupation. More than 25% shading. Banks predominant with vegetation. The average width and depth are 12.7 m and 0.5 m, respectively.
LoticPinhalelectrofishing23°52'13"S, 047°46'34"WStretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed soil, respectively. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.7 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°53'17"S, 047°46'10"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with the absence of marginal aquat- ic vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°53'17"S, 047°46'10"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°43'05"S, 047°46'10"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58"S, 047°47'31"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°47'58"S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 	Lotic	Pinhal	electrofishing	23°52′47″ S, 047°46′34″ W	Stretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed soil. The average width and depth are 7.4 m and 0.6 m, respectively.
LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°53'42" \$, 047°46'10"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with the absence of marginal aquat- ic vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°45'3'17" \$, 047°46'10"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°48'06" \$, 047°47'31"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo 	Lotic	Pinhal	electrofishing	23°52′13″ S, 047°46′34″ W	Stretch composed of agriculture and degraded forest. Shading on 50% of the bed. Banks predominantly with slopes and exposed soil, respectively. The average width and depth are 7.0 m and 0.7 m, respectively.
LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°53'17" S, 047°46'10"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°48'06" S, 047°47'31"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 1.65 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°45'27" S, 047°49'46"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.45 m and 1.65 m, respectively.LoticRio Turvosieves, covo gillnets23°81'05" S, 047°66'67"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation with low level of human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 15.45 m and 1.65 m, respectively.Lotic<	Lotic	Rio Pinhal	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°53′42″ S, 047°46′10″ W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with the absence of marginal aquat- ic vegetation. The average width and depth are 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.
LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets23°48'06" S, 047°47'31"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"WStretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 	Lotic	Rio Pinhal	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°53'17″ S, 047°46'10″ W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.0 m and 0.85 m, respectively.
LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo traps and gillnets $23^{\circ}47'58''S, 047^{\circ}48'03''W$ Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets $23^{\circ}47'58''S, 047^{\circ}48'03''W$ Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 1.65 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets $23^{\circ}45'27''S, 047^{\circ}49'46''W$ Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 1.65 m, respectively.LoticRio Pinhalsieves, covo gillnets $23^{\circ}45'27''S, 047^{\circ}49'46''W$ Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.45 m and 1.65 m, respectively.LoticRio Turvosieves, covo gillnets $23^{\circ}81'05''S, 047^{\circ}66'75''W$ Stretch composed of riparian vegetation with low level of human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 15.45 m and 1.67 m, respectively.LoticRio Turvosieves, covo 	Lotic	Rio Pinhal	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°48'06″ S, 047°47'31″ W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.
Lotic Rio Pinhal sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°47'58" S, 047°48'03"W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 1.65 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Pinhal sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°45'27" S, 047°49'46"W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 1.65 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°81'05" S, 047°66'75"W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.45 m and 1.65 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°80'41" S, 047°66'66"W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 15.45 m and 1.67 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo gillnets 23°80'41" S, 047°66'66"W Stretch with absence of riparian vegetation and a certain level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 12.8 m 	Lotic	Rio Pinhal	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°47′58″ S, 047°48'03" W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.5 m and 1.35 m, respectively.
Lotic Rio Pinhal sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°45'27" S, 047°49'46"W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.45 m and 1.65 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°81'05" S, 047°66'75"W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation with low level of human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 15.45 m and 1.67 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°80'41" S, 047°66'66"W Stretch with absence of riparian vegetation and a certain level of human distur- traps and gillnets Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo gillnets 23°80'41" S, 047°66'66"W Stretch with absence of riparian vegetation and a certain level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 12.8 m and 2.35 m, respectively.	Lotic	Rio Pinhal	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°47′58″ S, 047°48'03" W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 12.13 m and 1.65 m, respectively.
Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo 23°81'05" S, 047°66'75" W Stretch composed of riparian vegetation with low level of human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 15.45 m and 1.67 m, respectively. Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo traps and gillnets 23°80'41" S, 047°66'66"W Stretch with absence of riparian vegetation and a certain level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 12.8 m and 2.35 m, respectively.	Lotic	Rio Pinhal	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°45′27″ S, 047°49′46″ W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation, but with some level of alteration. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth is 8.45 m and 1.65 m, respectively.
Lotic Rio Turvo sieves, covo 23°80'41" S, 047°66'66"W Stretch with absence of riparian vegetation and a certain level of human distur- traps and gillnets and 2.35 m, respectively.	Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°81′05″ S, 047°66′75″ W	Stretch composed of riparian vegetation with low level of human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 15.45 m and 1.67 m, respectively.
	Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°80′41″ S, 047°66′66″ W	Stretch with absence of riparian vegetation and a certain level of human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 12.8 m and 2.35 m, respectively.

Table 1. Continued.

Environment	Locality	Method	Coordinates	Environmental characterization
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°79′63″ S, 047°67′13″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and a low level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 6.7 m and 3.25 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°79′33″ S, 047°68′27″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present at some points. Average width and depth are 10.45 m and 2.9 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°78′97″ S, 047°73′11″ W	Stretch with low level of riparian vegetation and a highly disturbed. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 6.56 m and 3.5 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°78′94″ S, 047°74′00″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and presence of disturbed areas. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 8.97 m and 1.8 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°78′08″ S, 047°75′55″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and a few areas showing human disturbance. Aquatic marginal vegetation absent. Average width and depth are 13.13m and 2.2m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°76′88″ S, 047°76′27″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and a low level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 7.65 m and 2.4 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°78′77″ S, 047°76′88″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and a low level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present. Average width and depth are 9.87 m and 2.2 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°80′38″ S, 047°75′97″ W	Stretch with certain level of riparian vegetation and human disturbance. High amount of aquatic marginal vegetation. Average width and depth are 10.11 m and 2.4 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°81′97″ S, 047°76′44″ W	Stretch with a high level of riparian vegetation and low level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present at some points. Average width and depth are 11.13 m and 2.0 m, respectively.
Lotic	Rio Turvo	sieves, covo traps and gillnets	23°75′73″ S, 047°82′73″ W	Stretch with a high level of riparian vegetation and low level of human distur- bance. Aquatic marginal vegetation present at some points. Average width and depth are 10.91m and 2.5m, respectively.
Lentic	Jorda flor	covo traps and gillnets	23°50'00″ s, 047°39'41″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations and almost no native vegetation. Approximate distance to the dam was 3,280 m.
Lentic	Jorda flor	covo traps and gillnets	23°49′10″ S, 047°39′43″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations and almost no native vegetation. Approximate distance to the dam was 1,586 m.
Lentic	Jorda flor	covo traps and gillnets	23°49'11" S, 047°39'54" W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations and almost no native vegetation. Approximate distance to the dam was 1,204 m.
Lentic	Jorda flor	covo traps and gillnets	23°49′12″ s, 047°40′20″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations and almost no native vegetation. Approximate distance to the dam was 725 m.
Lentic	Jorda flor	covo traps and gillnets	23°48′57″ s, 047°40′27″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations and almost no native vegetation. Approximate distance to the dam was 222 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°52'03″ S, 047°35'12″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 1,268 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°52'06″ s, 047°35'25″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 1,524 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′51″ s, 047°35′43″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 2,964 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′44″ s, 047°36′02″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 4,588 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′57″ s, 047°36′12″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 5186m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′25″ s, 047°36′16″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 5,822 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′32″ s, 047°36′22″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 7,265 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′29″ s, 047°36′47″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 1,310 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′10″ s, 047°37′08″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 3,530 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′21″ s, 047°37′40″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 4,320 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°51′34″ s, 047°37′48″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 5,780 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°50′54″ s, 047°38′22″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 7,200 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°50'20″ s, 047°38'27″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 7,500 m.
Lentic	Paineiras	covo traps and gillnets	23°50′25″ s, 047°38′35″ W	Stretch with riparian vegetation made up of pasture and <i>Eucalyptus</i> plantations. Approximate distance from the dam was 8,650 m.

(6%), Curimatidae and Cichlid (4% each), and Bryconidae, Prochilodontidae, Erythrinidae, Paradontidae, Pimelodidae, Callichthydae, Trichomycteridae, Sternopygidae, Gymnotidae, Cyprinidae, Poeciliidae and Synbranchidae (all adding up to 2%). Two migratory species were recorded, *Prochilodus lineatus* (curimbatá) and *Salminus hilarii* (tabarana), both represented by few individuals.

DISCUSSION

Of the 49 recorded species, 47 are native to the upper Paranapanema basin. The most abundant native ones are the lambari (Astyanax altiparanae), the acará (Geophagus brasiliensis) and the traíra (Hoplias malabaricus), species typically found in reservoirs in southeastern Brazil (Agostinho et al. 2007). Some species of lower occurrence or low density in the surveyed tributaries are little known to local residents, for example Serrasalmus maculatus and Trichomycterus sp. Many locals do not even recognize these species as typical of rivers, streams and municipal reservoirs (Cerqueira and Smith, 2015). None of the recorded species are endemic or threatened of extinction. These results are similar to ichthyofaunal surveys conducted in rivers of the upper Paraná (Langeani et al. 2007; Ortega and Hidalgo, 2008; Vari et al. 2009; Oyakawa and Menezes, 2011; Le Bail et al. 2012).

Migratory species in the adult stage are mostly residents of larger streams or rivers, being occasionally found in these low-order streams when in their young stage (Pompeu and Godinho 2003). These two species were collected in lotic stretches of the inventoried rivers. It is important to emphasize that *S. hilarii* can be used as an environmental indicator (Honji et al. 2011).

According to Lima-Junior (2004) and Honji et al. (2011), this is due to their degree of habitat selectivity and to them being at the top of the food chain. This species is currently classified as 'endangered' in the state of São Paulo. Due to the fact that these species are migratory, Froese and Pauly (2012) in particular, believe that the barriers created by the dams (Paineiras and Jorda Flor) disrupt upstream spawning migration of these species (Dugan 2008).

The analyzed tributaries, considering both lentic and lotic ones, have a great diversification in species composition patterns. Only three species (*Astyanax altiparanae*, *A. fasciatus* and *Hypostomus ancistroides*) appear in all the study sites. On the other hand, there are species considered rare that were not captured in any of the tributaries. With the exception of *Cyprinus carpio*, an invasive species present in the Paineiras reservoir, seven species were caught occurring in only one type of tributary. These species are: *Eigenmannia virescens*, *Leporinus friderici, Leporinus paranensis, Leporinus striatus, Cyphocharax modestus, Steindachnerina insculpta* and *Serrasalmus maculatus*. The other species are common in the basins of the Upper Paranapanema according to Oyakawa and Menezes (2011).

In tributaries downstream both cited dams, the presence of many specimens of the anostomids *L*. *friderici*, *L*. *paranensis* and *L*. *striatus* were recorded in the Turvo River. Other species also present in the Turvo River were S. maculatus, C. modestus and S. insculpta. In the streams of the Pinhal River the following species were collected: A. paranae, P. argentea, C. gomesi, C. schubarti, P. nasus, P. tenebrosa, H. nigromaculatus, P. reisii and S. marmoratus. According to our results and Alegretti et al. (2012), the fish population in southeastern Brazil is

Table 2. List of fish species collected in tributaries of the upper Paranapanema River. The samples were collected from 2009 to 2013 counting a total of

 40 species. "Genus sp." tags were not included in this count, so as to avoid counting the same species twice. * migratory species,** exotic species.

Order/family/species	Voucher
CHARACIFORMES	
Characidae	
Astyanax altiparanae (Garutti & Britski, 2000)	DZSJRP 13655/15395 / LZUNIP 0073 / LZUNIP 0101
Astyanax fasciatus (Cuvier, 1819)	DZSJRP 13673/13682/12365 / LZUNIP 0074 / LZUNIP 0102
Astyanax paranae (Eigenmann, 1914)	DZSJRP 15325
Bryconamericus stramineus (Eigenmann, 1908)	DZSJRP 13663 / LZUNIP 0075
Hyphessobrycon anisitsi (Eigenmann, 1907)	DZSJRP 15327/12364
Piabina argentea (Reinhardt, 1867)	DZSJRP 15330/12366 / LZUNIP 0103
Oligosarcus paranensis (Menezes & Géry, 1983)	DZSJRP 15394 / LZUNIP 0076
<i>Astyanax</i> aff. <i>paranae</i> (Eigenmann, 1914)	LZUNIP 0104
Astyanax sp.	LZUNIP 0105
Oligosarcus sp.	LZUNIP 0106
Serrassalmidae	
Serrasalmus maculatus (Kner,1858)	LZUNIP 0087
Crenuchidae	
Characidium gomesi (Travassos, 1956)	DZSJRP 13643/13665
Characidium schubarti (Travassos, 1955)	DZSJRP 13650
Characidium zebra (Eigenmann, 1909)	DZSJRP 13654 / LZUNIP 0107

Continued

Table 1. Continued.

Ouder/femily/meries	Veucher
Druer/rammy/species	vouciiei
Parodontidae	
Parodon nasus (Kner, 1859)	DZSJRP 13642
Erythrinidae	
Hoplias malabaricus (Bloch, 1794)	DZSJRP 15396 / LZUNIP 0077 / LZUNIP 0108
Anostomidae	
Leporinus octofasciatus (Steindachner, 1915)	LZUNIP 0078 / LZUNIP 0109
Leporinus paranensis (Garavello & Britski, 1987)	LZUNIP 0084
Leporinus friderici (Bloch, 1794)	LZUNIP 0085
Leporinus striatus (Kner, 1858)	LZUNIP P 0086
Schizodon nasutus (Kner, 1858)	DZSJRP 15393 / TURUNIP 0079 / LZUNIP 0110
Prochilodontidae	
Prochilodus lineatus (Valenciennes, 1837)	LZUNIP 0080 / LZUNIP 0111
Bryconidae	
Salminus hilarii (Valenciennes, 1850)	LZUNIP 0081 / LZUNIP 0112
Curimatidae	
Cyphocharax modestus (Fernández-Yépez, 1948)	LZUNIP 0082
Steindachnerina insculpta (Fernández-Yépez, 1948)	LZUNIP 0083
PERCIFORMES	
Cichlidae	
Geophagus brasiliensis (Quov & Gaimard 1824)	D75 IRP 13674/15392 /
ocophagas brasilichisis (quoy & Gaintard, 1024)	LZUNIP 0090
Oreochromis niloticus (Linnaeus, 1758)**	NOVOUCHER
SYNBRANCHIEORMES	
Synbranchidae	
Synbranchus marmoratus (Bloch, 1795)	D7SIRP 13667
CYPRINODONTIFORMES	
Poeriliidae	
Phallocaroc raisi (Lucinda, 2008)	D75 IPD 12600
Currinidao	
Cyprinude	
Gimmon Formes	
Gymnotidae	
Gymnotus carapo (Linnaeus, 1758)	DZSJRP 15400
Sternopygidae	
Eigenmannia virescens (Valenciennes, 1836)	LZUNIP 0091
Siluriformes	
Heptapteridae	
Cetopsorhamdia iheringi (Schubart & Gomes, 1959)	DZSJRP 13648
Imparfinis borodini (Mees & Cala, 1989)	DZSJRP 13694 / LZUNIP 0092
Imparfinis mirini (Haseman, 1911)	DZSJRP 13666 / LZUNIP 0093
Phenacorhamdia tenebrosa (Schubart, 1964)	DZSJRP 13656
Pimelodella avanhandavae (Eigenmann, 1917)	DZSJRP 13695 / LZUNIP 0094
Rhamdia quelen (Quoy & Gaimard, 1824)	DZSJRP 13685/15397
Loricariidae	
Hisonotus sp.	DZSJRP 15323 / LZUNIP 0095
Hypostomus ancistroides (Ihering, 1911)	DZSJRP 13692/13701/15399 / LZUNIP 0070 LZUNIP 0096
Hypostomus nigromaculatus (Schubart, 1964)	DZSJRP 15319/15320
Neoplecostomus sp.	DZSJRP 13676
Rineloricaria pentamaculata (Langeani & de Araujo, 1994)	DZSJRP 13686 / LZUNIP 0097
Hypostomus margaritifer (Regan, 1908)	DZSJRP 15402 / LZUNIP 0071
Hypostomus sp. 1	17UNIP 0098
Hypostomus sp. 2	
Trichomycterus so	D75 IBP 13687/15324
Callichthyidaa	TJUUI 1JUUI 1JJZT
Kanichanyudac Honlastarnum littarala (Honcock, 1929)	D75 IDD 15209
	DCJUL 12220
rimeloaidae	
Pimelodus maculatus (Lacepéde, 1803)	LZUNIP 0072 / LZUNIP 0100

mostly composed of small and non-migratory species.

Oreochromis niloticus (Nile Tilapia) and Cyprinus carpio (Carp), two invasive species, were recorded herein. These species were collected in the Paineiras and Jorda Flor reservoirs, both located in the Turvo River, municipality of Pilar do Sul. O. niloticus and C. carpio can easily adapt to lentic environments, being commonly used to restock dammed environments. Usually, these species occupy lentic environments seeking for shelter in macrophytes, submerged rocks and logs that provide suitable habitats for the survival of their populations (Smith et al. 2005a, 2005b; Biagioni et al. 2013). O. niloticus, originally from the African continent, was brought to Brazil mainly for fish farms. Similarly, C. carpio, originally from Asia, was also brought to Brazil for fish farms, which makes both species the most cultivated in the country (MPA 2012). The number of introduced species may be even higher than reported in this study due to the large number of fish breeding sites in the sub-basin, providing unintentional escape routes. Moreover, invasive species could have also been added to the sub-basin deliberately in order to improve sport fishing (Smith et al. 2007).

Fish fauna inventories from low-ordered water bodies are important in highlighting the regional biodiversity. Thus, the present study fills part of the knowledge gap about the fish fauna from tributaries of the Paranapanema basin by adding data from small tributaries not studied so far. Moreover, our findings can help inform future conservational and/or management strategies within the upper Paranapanema basin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the Chico Mendes Institute (ICMBio) for the sampling licenses. We are also grateful to Prof. Francisco Langeani Neto (UNESP/São José do Rio Preto) for the curatorial assistance and help in the identification of species, and Bruno Mello for providing the map. Authors were funded by the Foundation for the São Paulo State Research, FAPESP (Process No. 07/50981-7, 07/50982-3, 2012/09346-4).

LITERATURE CITED

- Agostinho, A.A., L.C. Gomes and F.M. Pelicice. 2007. Ecologia e manejo de recursos pesqueiros em reservatórios do Brasil. Maringá: Eduem. 501 pp.
- Agostinho, A.A. and L.C. Gomes. 2005. O manejo da pesca em reservatórios da bacia do alto rio Paraná: avaliações e perspectivas; pp. 23–56, in: M.G. Nogueira, R. Henry and A. Jorcin (eds.). Ecologia de reservatórios: impactos potenciais, ações de manejo e sistemas em cascata. São Carlos: RIMA.
- Alegretti, L., G.L. Ferreira, B.A. Burstin, W.R.L. Pereira and M.N. Flynn. 2012. Composição específica, comportamento migratório e capacidade natatória da ictiofauna coletada na Bacia do Rio Grande. RevInter Revista Intertox de Toxicologia, Risco Ambiental e Sociedade 5(1): 115-127. http://revistarevinter.com. br/index.php/toxicologia/article/view/114/329

Almeida, R.S. 2013. Estrutura de metacomunidades de peixes

em uma microbacia da Mata Atlântica. [M.Sc. dissertation]. Sorocaba: Universidade Federal de São Carlos. 100 pp.

- Biagioni, R.C., A.R. Ribeiro and W.S. Smith. 2013. Checklist of nonnative fish species of Sorocaba River Basin, in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. Check List 9(2): 235-239. doi: 10.15560/9.2.235
- Carvalho, E.D. and I.P. Ramos. 2010. A Aquicultura em grandes represas Brasileiras: Interfaces ambientais, socioeconômicas e sustentabilidade. Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Limnologia 38: 49-57. http://www.ablimno.org.br/boletins/pdf/bol_38(1-3).pdf
- Carvalho, M.P. and W.S. Smith. in press. Distribuição longitudinal e composição da ictiofauna do rio Pinhal, Pilar do Sul, SP, Brasil. Journal of the Health Sciences Institute.
- Casatti, L., F. Langeani and R.M.C. Castro. 2001. Peixes de riacho do Parque Estadual Morro do Diabo, bacia do Alto Rio Paraná. Biota Neotropical (1–2): 1–15. doi: 10.1590/S1676-06032001000100005
- Castro, R.M.C. and L. Casatti. 1997. The fish fauna from a small forest stream of the upper Paraná river basin, southeastern Brazil. Ichthyological Exploration of Freshwaters 7(4): 337–352.
- Castro, R.M.C. and N.A. Menezes. 1998. Estudo diagnóstico da diversidade de peixes do estado de São Paulo; pp. 3–13, in: C.A. Joly and C.E.M. Bicudo (eds.). Biodiversidade do estado de São Paulo, Brasil: síntese do conhecimento ao final do século XX. São Paulo: Programa BIOTA/FAPESP.
- Castro, R.M.C., L. Casatti, H.F. Santos, K.M. Ferreira, A.C. Ribeiro, R.C. Benine, G.Z.P. Dardis, A.L.A. Melo, T.X. Abreu, F.A. Bockmann, M. Carvalho, F.Z. Gibran and F.C.T. Lima. 2003. Estrutura e composição da ictiofauna de riachos do Rio Paranapanema, sudeste e sul do Brasil. Biota Neotropica 3: 1–31. doi: 10.1590/ S1676-06032003000100007
- Castro, R.M.C., L. Casatti, H.F. Santos, A.L.A. Melo, L.S.F. Martins, K.M. Ferreira, F.Z. Gibran, R.C. Benine, M. Carvalho, A.C. Ribeiro, T.X. Abreu, F.A. Bockmann, G.Z.P. Dardis, R. Stopiglia and F. Langeani. 2004. Estrutura e composição da ictiofauna de riachos da bacia do Rio Grande, no Estado de São Paulo, Sudeste do Brasil. Biota Neotropica 4(1): 1–39. doi: 10.1590/S1676-06032004000100006
- Castro, R.M.C., L. Casatti, H.F. Santos, R.P. Vari, A.L.A. Melo, L.S.F. Martins, T.X. Abreu, R.C. Benine, F.Z. Gibran, A.C. Ribeiro, F.A. Bockmann, M. Carvalho, G.Z. Pelição, K.M. Ferreira, R. Stopiglia and A. Akama. 2005. Structure and composition of the stream ichthyofauna of four tributary rivers of the upper Rio Paraná basin, Brazil. Ichthyological Exploration of Freshwaters 16(3): 193-214. http://pfeilbook.de/04biol/pdf/ief16_3_01.pdf
- Cerqueira, V.L.A. and W.S. Smith. 2015. Inventário Ictiofaunístico do Rio Turvo, Pilar do Sul, SP, Brasil. Journal of the Health Sciences Institute 33(1): 7–14. http://www.unip.br/comunicacao/ publicacoes/ics/edicoes/2015/01_janmar/V33_n1_2015_p7a14. pdf
- Cetra M., W. Barrella, F. Langeani Neto, A.G. Martins, B.J. Mello and R.S. Almeida. 2012. Fish fauna of headwater streams that cross the Atlantic Forest of south São Paulo state. Check List 8(3): 421–425. http://www.checklist.org.br/getpdf?SL106-11
- Dugan, P. 2008. Mainstream dams as barriers to fish migration: International learning and implications for the Mekong. Catch and Culture 14: 9–15. http://www.mrcmekong.org/assets/ Publications/Catch-and-Culture/CatchCulturevol14.3.pdf
- Ferreira, F.C. 2011. Adaptação do índice de assembleia de peixes em reservatórios (IAPR) as áreas das PCHs — Usinas Batista e Jorda Flor, Rio Turvo (SP) [PhD thesis]. Rio Claro: Universidade Estadual Paulista. 135 pp.
- Froese, R. and Pauly, D. (2012). FishBase: World Wide Web electronic publication. Version 01/2012. Accessed at: http://www.fishbase. org, 17 November 2012.
- Godinho, A.L. and P.S., Pompeu. 2003. A importância dos ribeires

para os peixes de piracema; pp. 361–372, in: H.P. Godinho and A.L. Godinho (org.). Águas, peixes e pescadores do São Francisco da Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte: PUC Minas.

- Hayashi, C., W.R. Boscolo, C.M. Soares, V.R. Boscolo and E.M. Galdioli. 1999. Uso de diferentes graus de moagem dos ingredientes em dietas para a tilápia do Nilo (*Oreochromis niloticus* L.) na fase de crescimento. Acta Scientiarum 21(3): 733–737. doi: 10.4025/ actascianimsci.v21i0.4340
- Hayashi, C., W.R. Boscolo, C.M. Soares and M. Fabio. 2002. Exigência de proteína digestível para larvas de tilápia do Nilo (Oreochromis niloticus) durante a reversão sexual. Revista Brasileira de Zootecnia 31(2): 823–828. doi: 10.1590/S1516-359820020004000031
- Honji R.M., P.H. Mello, B.C. Araújo, J.A. Almeida-Filho, A.W.S. Hilsdorf and R.G. Moreira. 2011. Influence of spawning procedure in gametes fertilization success in *Salminus hilarii* Valenciennes, 1850 (Teleostei: Characidae): implications for conservation of this species. Neotropical Icthyology 9(2): 363–370. doi: 10.1590/ S1679-62252011005000012
- IBAMA (Instituto Brasileiro do Meio Ambiente e dos Recursos Naturais Renováveis). 2015. Lista de espécies aquáticas ameaçadas de extinção. Accessed at http://www.ibama.gov.br/institucional/ lista-de-especies-aquaticas-ameacadas-de-extincao, 10 November 2015.
- Langeani, F., L. Casatti, H.S. Gameiro, A. Bellucco-do-Carmo and D.C. Rossa-Feres. 2005. Riffle and pool fish communities in a large stream of southeastern Brazil. Neotropical Ichthyology 3(2): 305–311. doi: 10.1590/S1679-62252005000200009
- Langeani, F., R.M.C. Castro, O.T. Oyakawa, O.A. Shibatta, C.S. Pavanelli and L. Casatti. 2007. Diversidade da ictiofauna do Alto Rio Paraná: composição atual e perspectivas futuras. Biota Neotropica 7(3): 181–197. doi: 10.1590/S1676-06032007000300020
- Le Bail, P.Y., R. Covain, M. Jégu, S. Fisch-Muller, R. Vigouroux and P. Keith. 2012. Updated checklist of the freshwater and estuarine fishes of French Guiana. Cybium 36(1): 293–319. http://www. documentation.ird.fr/hor/PAR00008933
- MPA (Ministério da Pesca e Aquicultura). 2012. Boletim Estatístico da Pesca e Aquicultura. Brasil 2008–2009. Brasília, Ministério da Pesca e Aquicultura. 101 pp. Accessed at http://www.mpa.gov. br/index.php/aquiculturampa/informacoes/producao, 26 March 2014.
- Ortega, H, and M. Hidalgo. 2008. Freshwater fishes and aquatic habitats in Peru: Current knowledge and conservation.

Aquatic Ecosystem Health & Management 11(3): 257–271. doi: 10.1080/14634980802319135

- Oyakawa, O.T. and N.A. Menezes. 2011. Checklist of fresh water fishes from São Paulo state, Brazil. Biota Neotropica 11(1a). Accessed at http://www.biotaneotropica.org.br/v11n1a/pt/abst ract?inventory+bn0021101a2011, 22 August 2013.
- Vari, R.P., C.J. Ferraris Jr., A. Radosavljevic and V.A. Funk. 2009. Checklist of the freshwater fishes of the Guiana Shield. Bulletin of the Biological Society of Washington 17: 1–94. doi: 10.2988/0097-0298-17.1.i
- Smith, W. S., M. Petrere Jr. and W. Barrella. 2003. The fish fauna in tropical rivers: The case of the Sorocaba river basin, SP, Brazil. Revista de Biologia Tropical 51(3–4): 769–782. http://ref.scielo. org/4ktfr5
- Smith, W.S., M. Petrere Jr., and W. Barrella. 2007. Fish, Sorocaba river sub-basin, state of São Paulo, Brazil. Check List 3(3): 282–286. doi: 10.15560/3.3.282
- Smith, W.S., E.L.G. Espíndola and O. Rocha. 2005a. As espécies de peixes introduzidas no Rio Tietê; pp. 165-179, in: O. Rocha, E.L.G. Espíndola, N. Fenerich-Verani, J.R. Verani and A.C. Rietzler (eds.). Espécies invasoras de águas doces — estudos de caso e propostas de manejo. São Carlos: Editora Universidade Federal de São Carlos.
- Smith, W.S., E.L.G. Espíndola and O. Rocha. 2005b. As introduções de espécies de peixes exóticos e alóctones em bacias hidrográficas brasileiras; pp. 25–44, in: O. Rocha, E.L.G. Espíndola, N. Fenerich-Verani, J.R. Verani and A.C. Rietzler (eds.). Espécies invasoras de águas doces – estudos de caso e propostas de manejo. São Carlos: Editora Universidade Federal de São Carlos.
- Suzuki, H.I., C.K. Bulla, A.A. Agostinho and L.C. Gomes. 2005. Estratégias reprodutivas de assembleias de peixes em reservatórios; pp. 223–242, in: L. Rodrigues, S.M. Thomaz, A.A. Agostinho and L.C. Gomes (eds.). Biocenoses em reservatórios: padrões espaciais e temporais. São Carlos: RiMA Editora.

Author contributions: VLAC, MPC, RSA, FCP, MC and WSS collected the data and identified specimens, VLAC and WSS wrote the text, and VLAC and WSS made the analysis.

Received: 8 April 2015 Accepted: 29 March 2016 Academic editor: Marina Loeb