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#### Abstract

The present paper deals with the plankton diversity of siddheshwar dam near Aundha dist Hingoli Maharashtra in the year 2001.The water spread area of the dam 40.58 Sq.Km.at FRL 250.85 Mcum. The phytoplankton represented by chlorophyceae, bascillariophyceae, cyanophyceae, and euglenophyceae and zooplankton represents species of rotifer, copepods, cladocera and ostracoda.
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## INTRODUCTION

Planktons react quickly to environmental change because of their short life cycle. Standing crops and the species composition of planktons in water body therefore. Serve as good indicate of the quality of the water in that water body, because of their rapidly fluctuating populations which may often attain high densities, planktons may strongly influence such as physico- chemical and aesthetic aspects of water quality as $\mathrm{pH}, \mathrm{DO}$, Color, taste and odor. Certain text may even provide clues to the origin and recent history of water body. The disadvantage of the small size of planktons in the respects is their vulnerability towards currents in rivers they may be carried for away from their site of origin.

Plankton has been studied only in a few reservoirs of India [6,7,12] Studied on planktons of reservoirs in India.

The Siddheshwar dam is situated near Aundha about 6 k.m. away in Dist. Hingoli. Siddheshwar dam is formed as result of 1) construction of medium dam across the river Purna (19.0'.20" N and 2) $76.57^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ ) and the reservoir water spared area is 40.58 sq . km. at 3 ) FRL 250.85 Mcum, As the reservoir has a fairly developed fishery 4) therefore the present study on Plankton on this reservoir was undertaken during the Year 2001. To acquire some knowledge on the biological productivity of this water body.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Hydrobiological investigations were carried out during the 7) year 2001; Monthly samples were taken from the surface at four 8) different stations. Phytoplankton were collected by Van-Dorn sampler and counted by using Sedgwick-Rafter(S-R) cell. Identification was made by APHA [1] and IAAB-1998 Jhingarn at et.
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1989. Zooplankton sample were collected by using a plankton net made boten silk with a mesh of 150 nm . The zooplankton samples were preserved in $4 \%$ formaion. The different species of zooplankton isolated and temporary slides were prepared. Zooplanktons are identified by sing IAAB publication and relevant available standard literature

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION Phytoplankton

The phytoplankton population was represented by the Chlorophyceae, Bascillariophyceae, Cyanophyceae, and Euglenophyceae (Table 1) the other groups though represented. Where scarce and number and poor in forms and hence not considered in the present study.

## Chlorophyceae

It was the most significant contributing about $29.58 \%$ of the total annual production. It exhibited maximum density during April and may inhibiting maximum population during summer and minimum during winter (Fig 1) this group was represented by species of chlorella, chlanydomonas, chadophora, closterium, helimeda.

## Bascillariophyceae

This was also an important group of phytoplankton encountered having a contribution of $36.44 \%$ of the total annual production. It maximum value was noted in the months April (Table. 1) However its maximum density was noticed during summer season. The group was represented by speices as bascillario, diatoms, vragillaria, navicula, nitzschia and synedra.

## Cyanophycease

This was also an important group having contribution of $13.27 \%$ to the annual production exhibited the highest density during the month of April and may. Maximum density during summer and minimum during rainy season were found and represented by
anabaena, anacystic, merismo pedia, microcystis, nostoc, oscillatoria, phormidium.

## Euglenophyceae

It contributes 20.69\% of the total phytoplankton production and was represented by Euglena sp . Seasonal variation of phytoplankton along with temperature changes.May be due to oxygen and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ variations along with other chemical characteristic of water.

Tripathy and Pandey [13] have reported that besides oxygen and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ variations and physico chemical characteristic like temp. Ph , chloride Alkalinity calcium magnesium, nitrates and sulphates in different seasons which affects growth of diatoms species, several another have been emphasized the importance of water temperature in the periodicity of blue green algae $[4,5,10,11]$ the present investigation a direct relationship between dissolved oxygen and phytoplankton was observed Mathew [8] has reported positive relationship with oxygen content.


| Mear - 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Months | Jan | Feb | March | April | May | June | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| Sample SiteA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chlorophyceae | 150 | 360 | 275 | 900 | 440 | 50 | 120 | 20 | 10 | 55 | 200 | 30 | 2610 |
| Bacillariophyceae | 40 | 455 | 300 | 935 | 495 | 10 | 320 | 30 | 15 | 200 | 240 | 195 | 3235 |
| Cyanophyceae | 140 | 130 | 110 | 180 | 220 | 10 | 100 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 105 | 115 | 1145 |
| Euglenophyceae | 300 | 190 | 310 | 390 | 200 | 190 | 40 | 25 | 17 | 12 | 75 | 120 | 1869 |
| Total | 630 | 1135 | 995 | 2405 | 1355 | 260 | 580 | 90 | 52 | 277 | 620 | 460 | 8859 |
| Sample SiteB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chlorophyceae | 155 | 365 | 280 | 905 | 445 | 55 | 125 | 25 | 15 | 60 | 205 | 35 | 2670 |
| Bacillariophyceae | 45 | 460 | 305 | 940 | 500 | 15 | 325 | 35 | 20 | 205 | 245 | 200 | 3295 |
| Cyanophyceae | 145 | 135 | 115 | 185 | 225 | 15 | 105 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 110 | 120 | 1205 |
| Euglenophyceae | 305 | 195 | 315 | 395 | 205 | 195 | 45 | 30 | 22 | 17 | 80 | 125 | 1929 |
| Total | 650 | 1155 | 1015 | 2425 | 1375 | 280 | 600 | 110 | 72 | 297 | 640 | 480 | 9099 |
| Sample SiteC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chlorophyceae | 145 | 355 | 270 | 895 | 435 | 45 | 115 | 20 | 10 | 50 | 195 | 28 | 2563 |
| Bacillariophyceae | 40 | 450 | 292 | 927 | 470 | 12 | 307 | 31 | 12 | 192 | 233 | 177 | 3143 |
| Cyanophyceae | 140 | 127 | 109 | 168 | 221 | 13 | 96 | 15 | 10 | 11 | 98 | 111 | 1119 |
| Euglenophyceae | 282 | 165 | 287 | 378 | 191 | 169 | 36 | 27 | 18 | 14 | 72 | 116 | 1755 |
| Total | 607 | 1097 | 958 | 2368 | 1317 | 239 | 554 | 93 | 50 | 267 | 598 | 432 | 8580 |
| Sample SiteD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chlorophyceae | 127 | 332 | 251 | 867 | 429 | 36 | 104 | 18 | 12 | 42 | 173 | 24 | 2415 |
| Bacillariophyceae | 35 | 426 | 281 | 907 | 443 | 10 | 292 | 29 | 11 | 181 | 209 | 138 | 2962 |
| Cyanophyceae | 136 | 129 | 115 | 172 | 240 | 15 | 93 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 93 | 103 | 1133 |
| Euglenophyceae | 261 | 154 | 276 | 349 | 182 | 145 | 30 | 22 | 17 | 10 | 65 | 109 | 1620 |
| Total | 559 | 1041 | 923 | 2295 | 1294 | 206 | 519 | 81 | 51 | 247 | 540 | 374 | 8130 |

## Zooplankton

Zooplankton numbers and diversity in the reservoir water were low (Table 2) twelve species were present with there species of rotifers, six species pf copepods and there species of 5 cladocera. Total zooplankton number ranged from 283 to 342 individual L-1.t

The zooplankton principally; rotifer > cladocera > copepod>ostracoda. rotifers were represented by the species belonging to the genus branchionus ( $B$. falcatus, $B$. forcipulata, $B$ plicetities spp.) Filinia (F.longiseta,F.terminalis) keratella (K.cochlaeria, K.serrulata, K. tropica, K. vulgaris). Copepods by
canthocymptus spp., Cyclops spp.,diaptomus spp. Limnocalanus spp.,Mesocyclops spp.,Neo diaptonus spp.Cladocerans by daphania (D.pulex and D. carinata), Monia spp., Alora spp.,Bosmania spp,Ceriodaphnia spp. are noteworthy. In zooplankton naupi were encountered throughout the year. The zooplankton naupi were encountered in table (2). Zooplankton drastically produced in the month of April 2001. Copepods decreased remarkably in the month of April 2001.tremendous increase in the of rotifers quantitatively during the month of April.2001. Number of cladocerans was high in the month of December 2001 and low in Aug 2001.


| Year-2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Months | Jan | Feb | March | April | May | June | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
| Sample Site A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 7 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 84 |
| Rotifer | 9 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 110 |
| Copepoda | 5 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 94 |
| Cladocera | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 12 | 54 |
| Total | 28 | 32 | 31 | 39 | 24 | 22 | 18 | 21 | 24 | 32 | 36 | 35 | 342 |
| Sample Site B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 71 |
| Rotifer | 7 | 9 | 12 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 90 |
| Copepoda | 7 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 68 |
| Cladocera | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 54 |
| Total | 25 | 19 | 26 | 34 | 25 | 21 | 17 | 16 | 20 | 21 | 28 | 31 | 283 |
| Sample Site C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 4 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 81 |
| Rotifer | 4 | 7 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 79 |
| Copepoda | 8 | 10 | 16 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 86 |
| Cladocera | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 58 |
| Total | 19 | 28 | 31 | 28 | 20 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 29 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 304 |
| Sample Site D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ostracoda | 7 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 83 |
| Rotifer | 8 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 102 |
| Copepoda | 8 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 80 |
| Cladocera | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 67 |
| Total | 29 | 23 | 30 | 38 | 29 | 26 | 21 | 20 | 24 | 25 | 32 | 35 | 332 |
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