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## INTRODUCTION

The types of food utilized by young-of-the-year smallmouth bass, Micropterus dolomieui Lacepede, are well known. Important food studies of smallmouth bass have been made by Wickliff (1920), Sibley and Rimsky-Korsakoff (1931), Tester (1932), Surber (1940), Lackner (1950), and Robertson (1951). Each of these studies has been of the food of fry and fingerlings from lakes and streams except that of Robertson (1951). Robertson's study involved the types of food eaten by young smallmouth bass in one hatchery pond in Benton County, Arkansas.

The purpose of this study is to determine if selectivity of food exists by analyzing the types of food consumed by young smallmouth bass in four hatchery ponds and comparing them to the potential food items available as measured by zooplankton and benthic sampling.
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## DESCRIPTIONS OF THE REARING PONDS

The field work was conducted during the spring and summer of 1973 by Dr . Homer Buck at Stephen A. Forbes State Park near Kinmundy, Illinois. The four identical rearing ponds have a maximum depth of six feet and a minimum depth of one-half foot with a moderately sloped but even bottom. Each pond has a surface area of approximately one acre. The ponds had been drained in the fall of 1972
to eliminate contamination by other fish species. The bottoms of the four ponds were uniform, being primarily sand in the shallow areas and sandy-muck in the deeper areas.

The ponds were stocked with adult smallmouth bass which produced the young-of-the-year during the spring of 1973. No forage fish were allowed in the ponds. The only food available consisted of that which was produced in the ponds and the terrestrial and air borne materials deposited within.

METHODS AND EQUIPMENT

## PIANKTON SAMPLING

Zooplankton collections were made every other week beginning on 14 June 1973 and continuing through 29 August 1973. One continous long plankton haul was made in zig-zag fashion for the entire length of each pond with a Turtox \#6 standard plankton net (see diagram).


The zcoplankton was sampled at a depth of $0^{\prime}$ to $1^{\prime}$ on transect \#l; at $1^{\prime}$ to $2^{\prime}$ on transect \#2; at 2' to $3^{\prime}$ on transect \# 3, and at $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ on transect \#4. The samples were preserved in $10 \%$ formalin. These samples were later used to determine numbers per liter and relative abundance of the numbers of each genus present. Counting and identification of the zooplankton was done in a Sedgewick Rafter cell after recording the volume of the concentrate and preparing a 1:20 dilution of each sample. Zooplankters were identified with the aid of keys by Pennak (1953), Wilson (1959), Brooks (1959), Yeatman (1959), and Eddy and Hodson (1961).

BOTTOM SAMPLING
Benthos was sampled three times in each pond during middle and late summer. Each pond was visually divided into thirds and 10 random dredge samples
( $6^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}$ Ekmann): were taken in each third of each nond. The ten samples from each area were then combined, washed, and preserved in $10 \%$ formalin.

In the laboratory, each of these combined samples was passed through a 30 -mesh screen. The organisms were separated by hand from the residue containing sand particles and detritus and were retained for indentification, tabulation, and reference. Benthic organisms were identified with the aid of keys by Hilsenoff (1975), Pennak (1953), and Eddy and Hodson (1961). FISH COLLECTIONS

Beginning on 16 June 1973, ten young smallmouth bass were collected from each pond by seining the shorelines. The fish were sampled in this manner and preserved in $10 \%$ formalin every other week during the summer until 21 August 1973.

The total length of each fish was recorded to the nearest millimeter. Each stomach was then removed by dissection and all recognizeable contents identified. The contents from ten smallmouth bass were analyzed for each date and combined. Numbers present and frequency of occurrence were considered in determining the importance of the food items found in the bass (Windell, 1968). Detritus was not considered in the analysis of the stomachs. Most detritus was probably taken accidentally while obtaining other food items (Wickliff, 1920).

Selection of available food in the'environment by fish was determined by use of the quantitive Index of Electivity (E), described by Ivlev (1961). The Electivity Index is calculated by the formula: $E=\frac{r i-p i}{r i+p i}$ where ri is the relative quantity of any food organism in the digestive tract expressed as a percentage of the total, and pi is the relative quantity of the same organism in either the benthic or zooplankton community expressed as a percentage. E values occur within the limits of +1 and -1 for each major food group. Complete positive selection is indicated by +1 and complete rejection by -1 .

PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL WATER PARAMETERS
Methyl-orange and phenolphthalein alkalinities, were determined by titration (Table 1). Dissolved oxygen and water temperatures were determined by the use of a Yellow Springs Instrument Model \#5L (Table 2). A Beckman O-Matic pH meter was utilized to analyze pH (Table 1). Nitrate, nitrite, ortho-phosphates, ammonia, and hardness calculations were made at the Illinois Natural History Survey Laboratory at the University of Illinois utilizing a Technicon CSM-6 Automatic Analyzer (Table 3). The preceeding parameters were determined only to give an indication of the type and quality of environment required to sustain the zooplankton and benthic communities which were encountered in the four rearing ponds. The parameters were not analyzed quantitatively with respect to limiting factors affecting the numbers found in the aquatic community.

RESULTS

## ZOOPIANKTON

As illustrated in Table 4, The primary constituents of the zooplankton community in all four ponds were found to be cladocerans (of the genus Diaphanasoma), and calanoid copepods (of the genus Dlaptomus). The only exception occurred: in pond three on 29 August 1973, when another cladoceran, Ceriodaphnia, comprised a greater percentage of the population than did either Diaptomus or Diaphanasoma. The change in population composition actually existed or the data were affected by fluctuations within the zooplankton populations. According to Wells (1960), all zooplankton sampling is biased to some degree by the equipment and characteristics of plankton itself: the erratic horizontal distribution, pronounced diurnal and seasonal changes in vertical distribution and seasonal changes of species composition and abundance.

Rotifers were not considered in this study due to the large mesh size of the zooplankton net used to obtain samples (Turtox \#6). Most rotifers easily pass through this net during sampling.

Table 1. Average Alkalinity and pH , from June to September 1973, in four smailmouth bass rearing ponds at Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


Table 2. Average temperature (T) and dissolved oxygen (DO) at one foot depth intervals in four smallmouth bass rearing ponds, from June to September 1973, at Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy; Illinois.


Table 3. Water quality data for July, August, and September 1973, in four smallmouth bass rearing ponds, at Illinois Natural History laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.

Date 1973
Parameter Pond

Table 4. Numbers per liter and percent composition of zooplankton conmunities in four smallmouth bass young-of-the-year rearing ponds from 14 June29 August 1973, at Illinois Natural History laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


Table 4. (continued)


## BOTTOM FAUNA

The results from the three periods of benthos sampling are illustrated in Tables 5, 6, and 7. Numerically, the most commonly occurring taxa in all four ponds were larval members of the families Chaoboridae and Chironomidae of the order Diptera, and the genus Hyalella of the order Amphipoda. Hexagenia naiads (Ephemeroptera) were also abundant, but only during the 25-26 September sampling period.

POND 1
The most abundant organisms, comprised $48 \%^{\circ}$ of the population during 20 July 1973, were larval members of the family Chironomidae. The chironomid larvae were followed in numerical abundance by Hyalella, which comprised $20 \%$ of the benthic population and chaoborid larvae (phantom midges) which comprised山 (Table 5) .

During the 13-15 August sampling Hyalella were the most abundant organisms. Hyalella comprised $37 \%$ of the population with chironomid and chaoborid larvae comprising 31 and $29 \%$ respectively (Table 6).

The 25-26 September sampling showed the Chaoboridae larvae to be $57 \%$ of the population with Hyalella next in numerical importance at $13 \%$. POND 2

In all three sampling periods Hyalella were the principal benthic organisms, making up more than $50 \%$ of the population (Tables 5, 6, 7). Next in order of numerical value were chironomid larvae comprising 13, 26 , and $10 \%$ on 20 July , 13-15 August, and 25-26 September respectively. POND 3

During the first two sampling periods, chironomid larvae comprised more than 75\% of the Pond Three benthic population (Tables 6, 7). The last sampling period changed drastically as ephemeropterans, of the genus Hexagenia, were predominant. They made up $41 \%$ of the population while the chironomid larvae made up only $16 \%$ of

| Taxa | $\pi / \pi / x^{2}$ |  | $\# / m^{2}$ | $\stackrel{2}{6}_{6}$ | Ponds | $\# / \mathrm{M}^{2}$ | 38 | $\# / \mathrm{M}^{2}$ |  | $\# / \bar{m}^{2}$ | $\frac{2^{*}}{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NematodaAnnelida |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arthropoda Crustacea |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crustacea <br> Amphipoda |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Insecta <br> Ephemerontera naiads |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Caenis sp. | 1 | <1 | 3 | <1 |  |  |  | 7 | 4 | 13 |  |
| Odonata naiads |  | -- | 3 | <1 |  |  |  | 27 | 3 |  |  |
| Gomphus sp. | -- | -- | 1 | <1 |  | 1 | <1 | -- | -- | 1 | <1 |
| Megaioptera larvae Stalis sp. | -- | -- | 4 | <1 |  | 16 | <1 | 11 | 1 |  |  |
| Trichoptera larvae <br> Oecetis sp. <br> Coleoptara larvae | 3 | <1 | -- | -- |  | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | <1 |
| Hydrophilide Berosus sp. | 7 | 1 | 3 | <1 |  | -- | -- | -- | -- |  | <1 |
| Diptera larvae Tipulidae | -- | -- | 1 | <1 |  | 6 |  | -- |  |  |  |
| Culicidae | 11 | 1 |  | $\cdots$ |  | 5 |  | 84 |  |  |  |
| Chaoboridae | 139 | 14 | 153 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |
| Chironomidae | 471 | $\stackrel{1}{4} 8$ |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ceratopogonidae Unidentified pupae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mollusca |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gastropoda Physidae | 21 | 2 | -- |  |  |  |  | -- |  |  | <1 |
| Pelecypoda |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -- |  |  | 2 |
| Sphaeriidae | 69 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Arithretic mean of the four pond samples combined.

[^0]| Pond | $\# / \mathrm{m}^{2-\frac{1}{\square}}$ |  | $\# /{\frac{\mathrm{m}^{2}}{}}_{2}^{8}$ |  | $. H / M^{2-3} \%$ |  | $\# / \frac{M^{2}}{4}$ |  | $\# / \bar{M}^{2} \%$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taxa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nematoda | -- | -- | 13 | 1 | 16 | $<1$ | 1.0 | 4 |  |  |
| Crust.acea |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amphiroda |  | 37 | 552 | 51 | 54 | 3 | 23 | 3 | 264 | 20 |
| Ephemeroptera naiads |  | 37 | 552 | 51 | 54 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Caenis sn. |  | - | 7 | $<1$ | 99 | <1 | 42 229 | 25 | 85 |  |
| Fexagenia sp. | 4 | <1 | 7 |  | 99. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Odonata naiads. Gomphus sp. | 1 | <1 | -- | - | -- | -- | - | - | <1 | <1 |
| Lihellula sp. | 3 | <1 | 77 | 7 | 10 | <1 | 3 | <1 | 17 | 1 |
| pachidiplax sn. | 3 | <1 | 30 | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Megaloptera Larvae Sialis sn. | 4 |  | 21 | 2 | 46 | 2 | 23 | 3 | 24 | 2 |
| Trichontera larvae | 4 | <1 | -- | -- | 4 | <1 | 3 | <1 | 3 | <1 |
| Coleontera larvae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hydronhilidae Rerosus sp . | 1 | <1 | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | <1 |
| Diptera larvae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tipulidae | -- |  | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | <1 | <1 | < |
| Culicidae | -- | -- | - | - | 156 |  | 9 | <1 |  | <1 |
| Chaohoridae | 342 |  | 53 | 5 | 156 | 7 | 249 | 27 | 201 | 15 |
| Chironomidae | 365 |  | 285 | 26 | 1659 | 80 | 257 | 28 | 641 | 49 |
| Ceratopogonidae |  |  | -- | -- | 3 | <1 | 4 | $<1$ | 3 |  |
| Unidentified punae |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mollusca |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gastropoda Physidae |  | <1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | <1 | -- | -- | 2 | <1 |

* Prithmetic mean of the pond samples combined.

Table 7. Number por square meter $\left(M^{2}\right)$ and percent composition of benthic organisms found in four smallmouth bass young-of-the-year rearing ponds on 25-26 September 1973, at Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


[^1]the population.
POND 4
Chaoboridae larvae were the most abundant organisms in Pond Four during the first sampling period making up $84 \%$ of the population (Table 5). Hexagenia naiads, chironomid and chaoborid larvae were most abundant in the second sampling period making up 25,28 , and $27 \%$ of the population respectively (Table 6). On the last sampling period the population underwent a definite shift as Hexagenia were found to comprise $74 \%$ of the population. The earlier predominants were $10 \%$ or less of the benthic population (Table 7).

FISH STOMACHS
This study was conducted to determine if selectivity of food organisms by young-of-the-year smallmouth bass exists. Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 show percent occurrence and percent composition of food organisms in 302 stomachs. The Tables also show the mean total length of the bass ( 10 per sample) and the date each was taken. Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 show graphically the percent occurrence of the most frequently occurring food items in the stomack $s$ of the smallmouth bass and the percent composition of the most freouently occurring members of the zooplankton and benthic communities in each pond from 12-14 June until 21-29 August 1973. The 25-26 Sentember benthic data are included to show the dynamic trend of the benthic communities at the time of the last smallmouth bass sampling. Table 12 is a summary of the total number of bass stomachs examined, the total percent occurrence, and the percent composition of those organisms found in the stomachs.

Figure 5 shows graphically an Electivity Index (Ivlev, 1961). E values for each major food group occur within the limits of +1 and -1 , the former value indicating complete positive selection and the latter, complete rejection of a food item.

In percent composition of total organisms eaten, and in percent occurrence, Diaphanasoma were the predominant organisms eaten (Table 12). They totaled 73.9\%

Table 8. The number, percent composition, and percent occurrence of organjsms
found in smallmouth bass stomachs from Pond One, 16 June through 21 August 1973. Smallmouth bass mean total lengths, range and stomach samples were based on ten fish per date. All samples were obtained from Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


AnNumber of organlsms in the stomachs of ten analinouth kass.

- Fercent composition of ingented orcanismm In the stomehs of ten

Cofercnnt nccurrence of Incested orcandmms In the stomsch of ten


Table 9. The number, percent composition, and percent occurrence of organisms found in smallmouth bass stomachs from Pond Two, 16 June through 21 August 1973. Smallmouth bass mean total lengths, range and stomach samples were based on ten fish per date. All samples were obtained from Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.

$A=$ Number of orcaniswe in the gtomachs of ten smallmouth tass.
Emercent conpos! tion of Incested orcanisms In the witomers of
ten esallmouth bass.
C-Percent occurrence of Ingasted orcaniems in the stomnche of
ten smallmouth besp.

Table 10. The number, percent comnosition, and percent occurrence of organisms found in smallmouth bass stomachs from Pond Three, 16 June through 21. August 1973. Smallmouth bass mean total lengths, range and stomach ssamples were based on ten fish per date. All samples were obtained from Illinois Natural History Survey lahoratories, Kinrundy, Illinois.

 Fa!rrest corfisiting of incestat oreanisma in thr ntemehem of ien smallmouth bass
copercont oscirrence of incented orpanioms in the potomatra of tan pmallmaith bote.

Table 11. The number, percent composition, and percent occurrence of organisms found in smallmouth hass stomachs from Pond Four, 16 June through 21 August; 1973. Smallmouth bass mean total lengths, range and stomach samples were based on ten fish per date. All samples were obtained from Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


Finmber nef organisma in the stameche of ton smallmouth baps.

- Dercent romposition of inpestad organismg in the stomache of ten smillmouth hass.
-rercent necurrence of ingesten orcanisma in the atomacha of
ton fmallmouth hasa.

Le 12. Total number, vercent comnosition, and vercent occurrence of food organisms found in the stomachs of 302 smallmouth bass from four young-of-the-year rearine ponds, 16 June - 21 August 1973, at Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


Percent Composition* percentage of total organisms found in all the stomach amples combined.

Percent Occurrence $=$ percentage total stomachs containing that organism.
of all organisms eaten and occurred in $60.6 \%$ of the stomachs examined.
Hyalella, at $7.6 \%$, were next in order of total organisms eaten. They also were second in percentage of occurrence, being found in $40.1 \%$ of all stomachs analyzed (Table 12). Individuals of the genus Daphnia were third, comprising $5.6 \%$ of the total organisms eaten, followed by cyclopoid copepods ( $2.8 \%$ ), nematodes (2.4\%), chironomid larvae (1.6\%), cladocerans of the genus Chydorus (1.6\%), and Caenis naiads (1.2\%).

The preceding; order of importance differed with respect to percent occurrence as Caenis naiads were found in $21.5 \%$ of the stomachs sampled, cyclopoid copepods in $19.9 \%$, chironomid larvae in $19.5 \%$, Daphnia in $18.2 \%$, nematodes in 17.9\%, and Odonata naiads, of the family Libellulidae in $16.6 \%$ of the stomachs. Cladocerans (of the genus Eubosmina), damselfly naiads (Argia) and dipterous pupae were found in approximately nine percent of the stomachs. The remainder of the organisms listed in Table 12 were found in six percent or less of the stomachs.

POND 1
In Pond One, Diaphanasoma were not utilized as a food source during the first sampling period (Table 8). They comprised $57 \%$ of the organisms eaten during the second sampling period and were found in $90 \%$ of the stomachs. During the third sampling period Diaphanasoma decreased as a food source (comprising only $21 \%$ of the total organisms eaten) and were present in only $10 \%$ of the stomachs. During the remaining five sampling periods Diaphanasoma never constituted less than $84 \%$ of the total organisms eaten, and were consistently in at least $60 \%$ of the stomachs each sampling period.

Chydorus and cyclopoid copepods were next in percent composition during the first sampling date. In Pond One they comprised 15 and $13 \%$ respectively of the total organisms eaten. During the second sampling period Chydorus were only two percent of the total organisms eaten, while cyclopoid copepods increased to $34 \%$
and were found in $90 \%$ of the stomachs. Cyclopoid copebods were again important in percent composition and percent occurrence in the third sampling period comprising $53 \%$ of the organisms eaten and being found in $50 \%$ of the stomachs examined.

During the last five sampling periods Hyalella were next in numerical importance to Diaphanasoma (Table 8). Nematodes were numerically important on one occasion, as 57 individuals were utilized by three bass as a food source. POND 2

During the first sampling period Daphnia and cyclopoid copepods comprised 38 and $49 \%$ of the total organisms eaten and both were in $100 \%$ of all stomachs examined (Table 9).

The second sampling period showed Diaphanasoma to be $44 \%$ of the total organisms consumed and in $70 \%$ of the stomachs. Eubosmina were $27 \%$ of the total organisms consumed and in $30 \%$ of the stomachs.

Within the third sampling period Diaphanasoma comprised 59\% of the total organisms eaten and were in $80 \%$ of the stomachs. Dipterous nupae comrrised $12 \%$ of total organisms consumed and were in $20 \%$ of the stomachs.

During the fourth sampling period Chydorus comprised $64 \%$ of the total organisms consumed and were found in $20 \%$ of the stomachs with Hyalella being $23 \%$ of the total organisms consumed and in $80 \%$ of the stomachs.

During the fifth and sixth sampling periods Diaphanasoma were predominant, comprising 62 and $54 \%$ of the total number of orgnisms eaten respectively. Hyalella were next in importance, comprising 26 and $39 \%$ of the total number of organisms consumed.

The seventh sampling period showed Diaphanasoma to be $95 \%$ of the total number of organisms taken and in $80 \%$ of the stomachs, while during the eighth sampling period Diaphanasoma were found to be only $22 \%$ of the total number of organisms consumed and in $10 \%$ of the stomachs. Nematodes totaled $50 \%$ of the total organisms consumed, and were in $60 \%$ of the stomachs. These were followed by Hyalella.

POND 3
As shown in Table 10, zooplankton was the most utilized food source during the first two sampling periods. Diaphanasoma were the most imnortant zooplankters utilized during both periods, making up $54 \%$ of the total organisms eaten and were: in $90 \%$ of the stomachs in the first sampling period. In the second period, they made up $90 \%$ of the total organisms eaten and were in $100 \%$ of the stomachs sampled. During the third sampling period cyclopoid copepods and Hyalella comprised 51 and $37 \%$ respectively of the total organisms eaten. Hyalella were found in $80 \%$ of the stomachs and cyclopoid copepods in $20 \%$.

Diaphanasoma comprised $57 \%$ of the organisms eaten and were found in only $30 \%$ of the stomachs during the fourth sampling period. Hyalella and Caenis naiads were next in abundance, being 17 and $12 \%$ respectively of the total organisms sampled, and found in 70 and $30 \%$ respectively of the stomachs sampled. During the fifth sampling, Daphnia, found in $70 \%$ of the stomachs sampled, and chironomid larvae, found in $80 \%$ of the stomachs sampled, were 72 and $12 \%$ respectively of the total organisms eaten.

During the sixth period Diaphanasoma, Daphnia and Hyalella comprised 55, 17, and $14 \%$ of the total organisms eaten. Diaphanasoma were found in $50 \%$ of the stomachs sampled, with Daphnia in $30 \%$ and Hyalella in $60 \%$.

Hyalella, Diaphanasoma, and libelullid naiads comprised 62, 21, and 6\% of the total organisms eaten and were found in 90,50 , and $60 \%$ respectively of the stomachs sampled during the seventh sampling period (Table 10). In the eighth period, only two smallmouth bass stomachs were available for examination. Diaphanasoma and libellulid naiads were found in both. POND 4

No stomachs were available for examination during the first sampling period. As shown in Table il, during the second sampling period, Hyalella and chironomid larvae comprised 82 and $8 \%$ respectively of the total organisms eaten with
yalella found in $60 \%$ of the stomachs examined. The third oeriod showed Diaphanaoma to make up $92 \%$ of the total organisms eaten and to be in $70 \%$ of the stomachs.

During the fourth sampling period Daphnia, Hyalella, and Caenis naiads were 6, 13, and $9 \%$ respectively of the total organisms eaten. Daphnia were found in $10 \%$ of the stomachs examined with Hyalella and Caenis naiads each in $70 \%$.

Diaphanasoma, chironomid larvae, Hyalella and Caenis naiads were found to e $46,11,9$, and $9 \%$ respectively of the total number of organisms eaten during he fifth sampling period. None of these organisms were in more than $40 \%$ of the itomachs sampled.

During the sixth sampling period Diaphanasoma, Hyalella, chironomid larvae, lipterous pupae and Caenis naiads comprised $28,21,18,16$, and $14 \%$ respectively If the total organisms consumed. None of these were found in more than $10 \%$ of the stomachs.

The seventh period showed Diaphanasoma to be $81 \%$ of the total organisms con. sumed and in $50 \%$ of the stomachs. Hyalella made up eight percent of the total rganisms consumed and were found in $30 \%$ of the stomachs.

The eighth sampling period also showed Diaphanasoma to be numerically most mportant, comprising $48 \%$ of the organisms eaten and in $70 \%$ of the stomachs samsled. Diaphanasoma were followed in numerical importance by nematodes and lexagenia naiads which were 16 and $8 \%$ of the total organisms eaten, and were in ' 0 and $60 \%$ respectively of the stomachs sampled.

DISCUSSION
The purpose of this study was to analyze the types of food consumed by fry and fingerling smallmouth bass in four hatchery ponds and to compare them to the rotential food items available as measured by plankton and bottom sampling. This tas done to determine if the young smallmouth bass had beén selective in obtainlng particular food items or simply fed at random.

In determining selectivity one must first consider the size of the small-
mouth bass being discussed. It can be seen by examining tables $8,9,10$, and 11 that bass approximately 30 mm in length and smaller selected zooplankton as their major food source. This was due to the relative size of the smallmouth bass and zooplankton and was to be expected as Wickliff (1930), Tester (1932), and Robertson (1951) all reported that zoolankton was a primary food source of smallmouth bass this size. Zooplankton (primarily cladocerans) remained numerically important throughout the entire study, but after the bass reached approximately 30 mm the food sources utilized became more diversified. The extended dependence on zooplankton as a food source throughout the study was probably due (as postulated by Robertson, 1951) to the lack of forage fish in any of the study ponds. Siefert (1968), working with white crappie, noted that early larvae fed exclusiveIy on zooplankton and showed an obvious preference for smaller organisms. This is congruent with the data presented in tables $8,9,10$, and 11 . Most of the organisms selected during this early stage of life were small.

The question still exists as to whether selectivity extends beyond the point of actively selecting organisms which are quite small. Bailey et al. (1975) speculated that it is highly probable that different species of zooplankton vary In quality as food. It would logically follow that different genera of zooplankton also vary in food quality. If this is the case, those fish with the ability to actively select a higher quality food source would have a decided advantage over those fish that did not or were unable to select higher quality food sources. Bailey et al. (1975) reported that chum salmon selected zooplankton which were, for the most part, larger than the average zooplankton of the same species collected with the Clarke-Bumpus sampler. Robertson (1951) reported that the total length of individuals of the genus Ceriodaphnia varied from 0.3 to 0.55 mm and individuals of the genus Diaphanasoma varied from 0.38 to 0.88 mm . He postulated that, if there was an abundant supply of the 0.88 mm
organisms, it would be only logical that they would be taken instead of those 0.4 to 0.5 mm . in length. It would follow that relatively larger prey which were equally abundant would be selected before smaller prey.

In Pond One during the first sampling date, Eubosmina were selected by $70 \%$ of the bass and comprised $63 \%$ of the total organisms consumed even though they did not show up in the zooplankton sampling. Perhaps these organisms, during this sampling period, were found in the vertical water column where they were easily obtained by the smallmouth bass, or they were larger than the numerically more abundant members of the genus Diaphanasoma.

In Pond Two during the first sampling period, Daphnia and cyclopoid copepods were selected by the bass. Again neither of these organisms were the predominant members of the zooplankton community. Individuals of the genus Daphnia are usualiy larger than members of the genera Diaphanasoma and Diaptomus which were more abundant.

In Pond Three the predominant members of the zooplankton community, Diaphanasoma, were the primary food source. They may have been selected because of their high relative abundance. Diaptomus, the other abundant member of the zooplankton community in all three ponds, were rejected as a food source, probably because of their limnetic characteristics. They tend to be found in deeper waters while cyclopoid copepods, which were selected in Pond Two, tend to be littoral (nearer to the shoreline) where one would expect to find schools of very young smallmouth bass (Lagler, 1956).

It may also be considered that these fish are small and weak swimmers, therefore a potential food item must be small enough to ingest, slow enough to capture, and in the immediate vicinity of the fish. The feeding of smallmouth bass upon a single genus or two of food organisms may be áfforded by a form of facilitation. If the feeding action of a school of young bass is initiated by the feeding of one or several members of that school, and feeding is promoted
for the individual fish by being in a school, then the fact that one or two genera of food organisms are often the most numerous in the stomachs is logical.

Data from the second sampling neriod tend to support this theory. In Pond One, $89 \%$ of the food organisms consumed are of two genera (Table8). In Pond Two, $80 \%$ are of three genera (Table 9). In Pond Three, $89 \%$ of the organisms consumed are of one genus and in Pond Four, $90 \%$ of the organisms consumed are of two genera (Tables 10 and 11 ). If a school of smallmouth bass should encounter a large group of food organisms and feed by a facilitative method, it would explain the low number of genera constituting major portions of food.

In contemplating selectivity by smallmouth bass 30 mm or larger, one must. consider the fact that they are large enough to swim freely and readily obtain items such as necton, plankton, benthos and those organisms which fall into the water. For purposes of this study the frequency of occurrence, and numerical method as described by Windell, (1968) were used: His volumetric, gravimetric, points' and dominance method were considered, but were not used because of this study's magnitude. In analyzing stomach contents, one should realize that just because an organism is predominant, it may not necessarily be the most valuable food source. For instance, one libellulid naiad may be several hundred times larger than a member of the genus Diaphanasoma, yet Diaphanasoma may be much more abundant. Figures 1-4 demonstrate the compositions of the organisms in the ponds and the number of stomachs each organism occurs in, thus taking into consideration size differences of varied genera. If a food item is valuable it should occur in more stomachs. In comparing Figures l-L with Figure 5 one should see any existing trends in selectivity.

In Pond One, there tended to be net positive selection of Diaphanasoma from 14 June until 29 August 2973. This was probably due to the extreme abundance of the plankter. Daphnia tended to be selected in Pond One during the
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Figure 1. A comparison of food organisms present and those selected as food by smallmouth hass in Pond One. Graph A illustrates the percent composition by number of the most frequently occurring members of the zooplankton community (samnled from 14 June 29 August 1973) and benthic community (sampled from 20 July - 25-26 September 1973). Graph B illustrates those organisms most frequently occurring in the stomachs of 60 smallmouth bass from Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


Figure 2. A comnarison of food organisms present and those selected as food by smallmouth hass in Pond Two. Graph A illustrates the nercent comnosition by number of the most frequently occurring members of the sooplankton community (samnled from its June 29 August 1973) and benthic community (samnled from 20 July - 25-26 September 1973). Graph B illustrates those organisms most frequently occurring in the stomachs of 60 smallmouth bass from Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.


Figure 3. A comparison of food orgamisms nresent and those selected as food by smallmouth bass in Pond Three. Graph A illustrates the percent comoorition by number of the most frequently occurring members of the zoonlankton communjity (sampled from lh June 29 August 1973) and benthic community (sampled from 20 July - $25-26$ September 1973). Graph B illustrates those orpanisms most frequently occurring in the stomachs of 60 smallmouth bass from Illinois Natural History Survoy laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.



Figure 4. A comparison of food organisms present and those selected as food by smallmouth bass in Pond Four. Graph A illustrates the percent composition by number of the most frequently occurring members of the zooplankton community (sampled from. 14 June 29 August 1973) and benthic community (sampled from 20 July - $25-26$ September 1973). Graph B illustrates those organisms most frequently occurring in the stomachs of 60 smallmouth bass from Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.
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Figure 5. Flectivity indexes indicating selection or refection of food organisms by smallmouth bass in four young-of-tr:z-year rearing nonds at Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois, from 13 June through 21 August 1973.

28 June sampling period. This was probably due to their increased :1 abundance. Cyclopoid copepods were selected during the 14 June and 28 June sampling periods and not again until the last sampling period when their population started to rise. These three zooplankters seem to indicate that an organism may be selected when it is present in sufficient quantities; when only a few members of the population exist the smallmouth bass will not actively seek them out, Caenis naiads which are normally larger than Hyalella and chironomid larvae (the benthic numerical dominants), were actively being selected in the last sampling period (Figure 5). Hyalella were once found in $50 \%$ of the stomachs (Figure 1). Thus, even though low in the Electivity Index and in stomach numerical value, Hyalella were selected to some degree as food organisms.

In Pond Two, Diaphanasoma (Figure 5), had a relatively low Electivity Index, but were found in a high percent of the stomachs. This again was pirobably'due to the high abundance of Diaphanasoma.

Chydorus were selected and utilized as a food source during the first two sampling periods. The high Electivity Index value may result from the fact that the sampling net was large in mesh size and allowed Chydorus, a relatively small zooplankter, to slip through. Hyalella were found in a high number of stomachs but were not high in Electivity Index value. Hyalella were also most abundant in the benthic population and were selected to some extent. Caenis naiads were found in a relatively low number of stomachs but were not found at all in benthic samples. They therefore were high in Electivity Index value (Figure 5). As demonstrated by the Electivity Indexes of Ponds One, Two, and Three (Figure 5), Caenis naiads were selected in the last sampling period when the smallmouth bass were larger. Robertson (1951) suggested that bass 90 mm or larger were unable to utilize zooplankton in their diet. Data from Ponds $O_{n e}$, Two, and Three would tend to support this
as Caenis were positively selected by smallmouth bass which had an average total length approaching 60-70 mm (Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11).

It can be seen by examining Figures 3 and 5 that Diaphanasoma were not selected in Pond Three. During the 11 July sampling period Diaphanasoma were found in $60 \%$ of the stomachs examined, yet had a very low Electivity Index value. This was due to the large abundance of the organism in the environment and few of them being found in many of the stomachs. This would indicate that Diaphanasoma were not actively being selected, but were being taken at random due to their great abundance.

Daphnia were not consistently selected or rejected in Pond Three (Figure 5). They tended to be selected during 11 July and 23 July, possibly because of the relative size of the fish and the organism. Daphnia are not usually as large as Hyalella or as small as Diaphanasoma, therefore would be a logical food of a midrange sized fish.

Hyalella and chironomid larvae were rejected during the last three sampling periods and libellulid naiads and Caenis naiads were selected. This again was probably related to the relative size of the smallmouth bass and the organisms. Chironomid larvae and Hyalella were not selected because of their small size and the relatively large size of the bass. Libellulid naiads and Caenis naiads were positively selected because of their larger size.

The smallmouth bass in Pond Four were apparently spawned about one sampling period after the bass in the other three ponds. No sample was available during the first period and the mean size of the second period (Pond Four) was similar to that of the first period of the other three ponds. Diaphanasoma were again taken in Pond Four when abundant; however, according to Figures 4 and 5, they were not actively selected. Hyalella were selected during the 26 June sampling period, (Figure 5). This again was probably due to high relative abundance of the organism although no benthic data were available to support this hypothesis.

Caenis naiads were also positively selected during two out of three of the sampling periods (Figure 5). Caenis naiads, found in a high percentage of the stomachs, were probably selected due to their size.

Hexagenia naiads, according to Figures $1-4$ and Tables $8-11$ were not selected. During the last sampling neriod Hexagenia naiads were found in $60 \%$ of the stomachs sampled. This was due to the larger relative size of the average Hexagenia naiads. The larger smallmouth bass would logically select Hexagenia naiads during the last period. One naiad would probably fill the stomach of a smallmouth bass, thus the low Electivity Index which is based on numerical value. Libellulid naiads were selected during the 3 August and 21 August sampling period. Being selected during the last two periods and in $50 \%$ of the stomachs indicates that the size of the libellulid naiads may play an important role in selection. Chironomid larvae were not selected during the last two sampling periods. This was due to the size of the food organisms in relation to the size of the fish. Chironomid larvae, being small, were rejected by smallmouth bass in the $50-7 \mathrm{~mm}$ size range.

The average growth rate of the smallmouth bass in Pond One was .56 mm per day, Pond Two .60 mm per day, Pond Three .73 mm per day, and Pond Four .75 mm per day. The growth rates were based on average lengths of the first and last collections. Robertson (1951) reported an average of .98 mm growth per day over approximately the same time period encountered in this study. Wickliff (1930) suggested the growth rate to be . 8 to .9 mm per day and to be directly related to the food supply. If the growth rates of the bass in the four ponds being investigated were directly related to the food supplies, then the food supplies present in the four ponds were not conducive to optimum growth. The low growth rates may have been the result of the lack of forage fish available to the young bass or could have been related to intraspecific competition within each of the ponds.

The author believes that the establishment of the fact of selectivity in the feeding habits of young-of-the-year smallmouth bass is important. It may be of considerable value to those in hatchery work, or those wishing to establish as efficiently as possible, a smallmouth bass population in a reservoir, stream, or lake. If placement of smallmouth bass can be carefully matched to areas where food organisms known to be selected are abundant, then the probability of successful stocking will increase.

This study was one of preliminary groutidwork. Much more work would be: beneflcial in dealing with feeding selectivity. For instance, a comparative study assessing the value of an area with forage fish versus a similar area lacking forage fish would be interesting. In such a study one could determine the optimum time of transfer of smallmouth bass from a rearing pond into a more natural environment (stream, pond, lake, or impoundment).

Young-of-the-year selectivity should be explored in other species of fish. Stidies involving the young-of-the-year of common species of fish may explain the sometimes disastrous failures common to stocking.
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[^0]:    Table 6. Number per square meter $\left(\mathrm{M}^{2}\right)$ and percent composition of benthic organisms found in four smallmouth bass young-of-the-year rearing ponds on 13-15 August 1973, at Illinois Natural History Survey laboratories, Kinmundy, Illinois.

[^1]:    * Arithmetic mean of the four pond samples combined.

