# Utah State University DigitalCommons@USU

Watershed Sciences Student Research

Watershed Sciences Student Works

10-14-2016

# A Lota lota consumption: trophic dynamics of non-native Burbot in a valuable sport fishery

Stephen L. Klobucar Utah State University, stephen.klobucar@gmail.com

W. Carl Saunders *Utah State University*, carl.saunders@usu.edu

Phaedra Budy Utah state University, phaedra.budy@usu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/wats\_stures

Part of the Aquaculture and Fisheries Commons

# **Recommended Citation**

Klobucar, Stephen L.; Saunders, W. Carl; and Budy, Phaedra, "A Lota lota consumption: trophic dynamics of non-native Burbot in a valuable sport fishery" (2016). *Watershed Sciences Student Research.* Paper 1. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/wats\_stures/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Watershed Sciences Student Works at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Watershed Sciences Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



2	Stephen L. Klobucar <sup>1</sup>	Email: stephen.klobucar@gmail.com
3	W. Carl Saunders <sup>1</sup>	Email: carl.saunders@usu.edu
4	Phaedra Budy <sup>2,1</sup>	Email: phaedra.budy@usu.edu
5		
6	<sup>1</sup> Department of Watershed So	ciences and The Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan,
7 8	Utah, 84322, USA	
9 10 11	<sup>2</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, Uta 84322, USA	h Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Logan, Utah,
12	Corresponding author:	
13	S.L. Klobucar	
14 15	Main Hill, Logan, Utah, 8432	iences and The Ecology Center, Utah State University, 5210 Old
16	Phone: (608)-289-5687	
17	Fax: (435)-797-4025	
18	Email: stephen.klobucar@gn	<u>nail.com</u>
19 20	W.C. Saunders	
20 21		iences, Utah State University, 5210 Old Main Hill, Logan, Utah,
22	84322-5210, USA	ionees, etan state eniversity, 5216 eta main min, Logan, etan,
23		
24	P. Budy	
25		n Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, 5290 Old Main Hill,
26 27	Logan, Utah, 84322, USA	
27		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		

A Lota lota consumption: trophic dynamics of non-native Burbot in a valuable sport fishery

38 <A>Abstract

39 In managed sport fisheries, unintentional and illegal introductions of species disrupt food 40 webs and threaten the success of these fisheries. While many populations of Burbot Lota lota are 41 declining in their native range, a non-native population recently expanded into Flaming Gorge 42 Reservoir, Wyoming-Utah, and threatens to disrupt predator-prey interactions within this popular 43 sport fishery. To determine potential impacts on sport fishes, especially trophy Lake Trout 44 Salvelinus namaycush, we assessed the relative abundance of Burbot and quantified potential 45 trophic or food web impacts of this population using diet, stable isotope and bioenergetic 46 analyses. While we did not detect significant potential for competition between Burbot and Lake 47 Trout for food resources (Schoener's index;  $\alpha = 0.13$ ), overall consumption by Burbot likely 48 affects other sport fishes as indicated by our analyses of trophic niche space. Our diet analyses 49 suggest that crayfish are important diet items across time (89.3% and 49.4% by weight in autumn 50 and winter) and size classes (77.5%, 76.6%, 39.7% by weight for small, medium, and large 51 Burbot). However, overall consumption by Burbot increases as water temperatures cool, and fish 52 consumption increased during winter. Specifically, large Burbot consume more salmonids and 53 we estimated (bioenergetically) up to 70% of growth occurs in late autumn and winter. Further, 54 our population-wide consumption estimates indicated that Burbot could consume up to double 55 the biomass of Rainbow Trout Oncorhynchus mykiss stocked annually  $(> 1.3 \cdot 10^5 \text{ kg}; > 1$ 56 million individuals) in Flaming Gorge Reservoir. Overall, we provide some of the first 57 information regarding trophic interactions of Burbot outside of their native range, and these 58 findings can help inform the management of sport fisheries should Burbot range expansion occur 59 elsewhere.

61 <A>Introduction

62 Non-native species continue to be a foremost threat to conservation and management 63 globally, and freshwater ecosystems are among the most highly altered by invasive species 64 (Mooney and Hobbs 2000, Marchetti et al. 2004a). Anthropogenic assisted introductions, both 65 intentional and unintentional, legal and illegal, have led to the proliferation of non-native fishes 66 across the United States (Rahel 2000, 2004). Accordingly, while some fishes are experiencing 67 declines in their native range, introductions and subsequent range expansions allow for 68 potentially more successful populations relative to the native ranges (e.g., Brook Trout Salvelinus fontinalis; Peterson et al. 2004; Hudy et al. 2008). Thus, regardless of introduction 69 70 pathway, introduced fishes can potentially prove detrimental to ecological and economic 71 underpinnings of successful fisheries (Dunham et al. 2004; Gozlan et al. 2010).

72 Widespread stocking programs that include non-native fishes support valuable sport 73 fisheries, and managers are tasked with creating a balance between angler satisfaction and food 74 web dynamics (Eby et al. 2006). Lake Michigan, where Burbot Lota lota are native, provides a 75 classic example of the many complexities associated fish introductions resulting from attempts to achieve this balance: a struggle that began in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and continues today (Stewart 76 77 et al. 1981; Tsehaye et al. 2014). Here, the balance of an invasive prey base (e.g., Rainbow Smelt 78 Osmerus mordax and Alewife Alosa pseudoarengus) and predators including native (e.g., Lake 79 Trout Salvelinus namaycush) and non-native (e.g., Chinook Salmon Oncorhyncus tshawytscha) 80 salmonids have become destabilized on a number of occasions due to disproportionate stocking 81 densities and non-native species introductions.

Across the western United States, stocked sport fisheries are especially prevalent in
 numerous man-made reservoirs, and often included stocked top predators (Moyle and Marchetti

2006). In accordance with the unnatural characteristic of reservoirs, stocked fishes often create a
mixed assemblage of native and non-native sport fishes, with almost entire non-native
assemblages relatively common (Martinez et al. 1994; Clarkson et al. 2005). Often times, these
mixed assemblages require annual stocking of predators, which can decouple the balance of
predator consumption demand and prey availability as seen in Lake Michigan (Johnson and
Martinez 2000).

90 Reservoirs represent novel habitats for both native (e.g., creating standing water in 91 naturally flowing river systems) and non-native species alike, creating sport fisheries that can be 92 relatively harmless to native fishes and highly popular among anglers for stocked non-native 93 fishes (Marchetti et al. 2004b; Johnson et al. 2009; but see Rubidge and Taylor 2005). 94 However, when unauthorized introductions occur, managers are confronted with uncertainty 95 toward food web dynamics and overall ecosystem stability in these highly managed fisheries 96 (Leung et al. 2002, Maguire 2004). In the face of this uncertainty, management can be difficult 97 and further complicated with balancing ecological, social, and economic concerns (Quist and 98 Hubert 2004).

99 In the upper Colorado River Basin, many reservoirs fragment the region, but also create 100 valuable sport fisheries as a result (Dibble et al. 2015). Prized sport fish in these reservoirs are 101 often non-native salmonids. However, illegal introductions of other fishes have led to many 102 populations of cool- and warm-water fishes across the basin, which pose threats to actively 103 managed species (Johnson et al. 2009). Flaming Gorge Reservoir (FGR), WY-UT, one of the 104 largest reservoirs and most popular fisheries in the upper Colorado River Basin, is threatened by 105 a relatively recent Burbot introduction and expansion. Within FGR, angling opportunities are 106 abundant for trophy Lake Trout, which are primarily supported by a Kokanee Salmon

Oncorhynchus nerka population that is popular among anglers. Additionally, Rainbow Trout
 Oncorhynchus mykiss and Smallmouth Bass *Micropterus dolomieu* provide further angling
 opportunities. While these sport fishes are also non-native, they are actively and intentionally
 managed within FGR.

111 In the early 2000s, Burbot began to expand downstream in the Green River drainage of 112 the upper Colorado River Basin from Big Sandy Reservoir, WY, where Burbot were established 113 from illegal introductions in the 1990s (Garduino et al. 2011). By 2006, Burbot were established 114 in FGR. Burbot, demonstrated to be voracious predators in their native range, could pose a 115 threat to highly valued fisheries within FGR through direct and indirect competition (Rudstam et 116 al. 1995; Jacobs et al. 2010). Unlike the Lake Trout and Kokanee Salmon populations that FGR 117 is noted for, Burbot can inhabit both lotic and lentic waters. As such, Burbot pose a threat for 118 further expansion throughout the basin and managers fear their expansion will be detrimental to 119 the sport fish of FGR. As a Holarctic, circumpolar species, Burbot are relatively well studied in 120 their native ranges throughout Asia, Europe, and North America; however, many native 121 populations have experienced dramatic declines (Stapanian et al. 2010), and very little is known 122 about Burbot in non-native ranges (but see Klein et al. 2015). While niche partitioning between 123 Burbot and fishes in their native range has been explored (e.g., Guzzo et al. 2015), we require an 124 understanding of trophic dynamics that have contributed to their success in their non-native 125 range, especially as nearby native populations are in decline (e.g., Krueger and Hubert 1997). 126 In this study, we investigated the population status of Burbot in FGR, and assessed 127 potential direct and indirect impacts of Burbot on valued sport fish, with a primary focus on

128 trophy Lake Trout. We collected diet and stable isotope samples, and extended our findings 129 using a bioenergetics model to quantify predation potential and competition. Collectively, we used these data to show how a newly established population of Burbot, across a range of
population densities, could affect highly managed sport fisheries, especially where annual
stocking promotes angler success. Our findings demonstrate that efficient predators such as
Burbot can consume many stocked sport fishes (e.g., Rainbow Trout) as well as important prey
resources (e.g., crayfish) for these sport fishes. If Burbot expansion continues to other
waterbodies, our study provides a baseline to better understand and manage the fishery.

137 <A>Methods

138 Study site.—

139 Flaming Gorge Reservoir, created by the impoundment of the Green River in 1962, lies 140 on the border of northeast Utah and southwest Wyoming (Figure 1). At capacity, FGR is 141 approximately 145 km long, encompasses 17,000 ha of water, and has a mean depth of 34 m. 142 Previous studies (e.g., Yule and Luecke 1993) separated the reservoir into three distinct regions 143 based on physical and chemical characteristics: 1) the Canyon region—a narrow and deep 144 (maximum depth = 134m), stratified, nearly oligotrophic region extending approximately 38 km 145 north of the dam; 2) the Open Hills region—a wider, wind-blown stretch of moderately deep 146 (maximum depth= 61m) water classified as mesotrophic which extends 48 km north of the 147 Canyon region; and, 3) the Inflow region—a relatively shallow (maximum depth = 24 m), often 148 turbid region that receives water from the Green and Blacks Fork rivers and extends 32 km 149 above the Open Hills region. Few Burbot are found in the Canyon region, thus, we excluded 150 those samples from our analyses in this study.

151 Currently, all sportfish in FGR are introduced. Lake Trout and Smallmouth Bass are self-152 sustaining, while Kokanee Salmon and Rainbow Trout populations are supplemented by annual 153 stocking. Northern Crayfish Orconectes virilis are abundant and an important food resources for 154 bass and trout. Additional sport fish in the reservoir include Brown Trout Salmo trutta, Cutthroat 155 Trout Onchorhynchus clarkii, and Channel Catfish Ictalurus punctanus. Non-game fishes 156 include White Sucker Catostomus commersonii, Utah Chub Gila atraria, Common Carp 157 Cyprinus carpio, Redside Shiner Richadsonius balteatus, and Flannelmouth Sucker Catostomus 158 *latipinnis*. Only the Flannelmouth Sucker is native to the basin and is listed as a species of 159 concern. For anglers, Burbot are under a catch and kill regulation in FGR (both states).

160

# 161 Burbot catch and diet collection.—

162 To assess population trend, diet composition, and total consumption by Burbot and Lake 163 Trout in FGR, we sampled fishes during two distinct seasons, autumn 2012 and winter 2013. 164 Autumn sampling occurred during 24 October – 15 November, 2012 and winter sampling 165 occurred during 15 January – 22 February, 2013. During autumn, we used multi-filament 166 trammel nets (33m long by 1.5m tall; internal mesh=20mm, external mesh=100mm) set in the 167 littoral zone (5-25m) to collect fish. We set nets at established sampling sites in the Inflow and 168 Open Hills regions of the reservoir. Nets were set at dusk and fished overnight (approximately 1700-0900 hrs). Additionally, in conjunction with our sampling, we used data from long-term 169 170 autumn trammel net sampling (since 2006, Wyoming Department of Game and Fish and Utah 171 Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), unpublished data), to estimate population growth rate. 172 We estimated population growth rate ( $\lambda$ ) based on the trend in corrected CPUE using a log-linear 173 regression-based trend model (Dennis and Taper 1994; Morris and Doak 2002). This analysis

provides support to better understand how population trend (e.g., population declining, stable, or
increasing) might affect reservoir wide consumption estimates.

During winter sampling, we collected fish through the ice using hook-and-line sampling, and targeted Burbot in the evening (approximately 1700-0200 hrs). Winter sampling occurred at or near sites sampled during autumn in the Inflow and Open Hills regions. We targeted large Lake Trout (> 500 mm) during the day in the Open Hills region (approximately 0900-1600 hrs), which we hypothesized would be the region large Lake Trout and Burbot are most likely to

181 overlap.

We identified, weighed (g), and measured (total length, TL; mm) all fish. To gather diets and stable isotopes, we sacrificed all Burbot and a subset of Lake Trout ( $\leq 600 \text{ mm TL}$ , including all mortalities, n = 26). In the field, we placed stomachs in 95% ethanol for later processing. We performed gastric lavage on large Lake Trout captured via hook-and-line ( $\geq 600$ 

186 mm TL, n = 11). All non-target species were released.

187

188 Diet analysis.—

189 To characterize fish diet and selectivity, we identified prey items to the lowest taxon 190 possible and divided prey into representative categories (crayfish, fish, other). When possible, 191 we further divided these general categories (e.g., 'fish' by species, 'other' by group), measured 192 percent wet weight of each prey category for each individual fish, and then calculated diet 193 proportion and occurrence relative to the total sample size. We weighed prey fish individually. 194 For zooplankton and invertebrate prey, we weighed each taxonomic group en masse to the 195 nearest 0.001 g blot-dry wet weight. To estimate total consumption (g), we subtracted empty 196 stomach weight from full stomach weight, or summed the weight of all prey items (e.g., diets

197 obtained via gastric lavage). We analyzed Burbot diets for temporal (autumn vs. winter) and size 198 class (<400 mm = small, 400-650 mm = medium, and >650 mm = large) variability. Due to 199 lower sample size, we analyzed Lake Trout diets by size class, but pooled across season and site. 200 To determine potential interspecific competition between Burbot and Lake Trout, we calculated 201 diet overlap using Schoener's index,  $\alpha$  (Schoener 1970):

$$\alpha = 1 - 0.5 \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^{n} |p_{xi} - p_{yi}|),$$

where *i* is a given prey item, *p* is the proportion of *i*, and *x* and *y* are Burbot and Lake Trout. The single value  $\alpha$  is diet overlap from 0 (no overlap) to 1 (complete overlap), and values greater than 0.6 are indicative of significant diet overlap (Schoener 1970).

206

# 207 Stable isotopes.—

We used carbon ( $\delta^{13}$ C) and nitrogen ( $\delta^{15}$ N) stable isotopes to further explore a time-208 209 integrated representation of Burbot diets and potential for competition with other sport fishes in 210 FGR. For stable isotope analyses, we used dorsal muscle tissue and dorsal fin clips from fish 211 predators (small Burbot n = 15, medium Burbot n = 25, large Burbot n = 6, Lake Trout n = 29, 212 Rainbow Trout n = 12, Smallmouth Bass n = 4, and Kokanee Salmon n = 2). Samples were 213 dried for 48 hrs at 70°C, ground into a homogenized powder, and placed into pre-weighed tin 214 capsules. Fish tissues samples were processed at the Washington State University Stable Isotope Core laboratory for analysis of  $\delta^{13}$ C and  $\delta^{15}$ N, and percent composition of both carbon and 215 216 nitrogen. Isotopic signatures are reported in  $\delta$ -notation:

217 
$$\delta^{13}C \text{ or } \delta^{15}N = \left[\left(\frac{R_{sample}}{R_{standard}}\right) - 1\right] \cdot 1000 ,$$

where  $R_{sample}$  is the ratio of <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C or <sup>15</sup>N/<sup>14</sup>N found in the tissue or filter sample, and  $R_{standard}$  is the ratio of <sup>13</sup>C/<sup>12</sup>C or <sup>15</sup>N/<sup>14</sup>N found in the standard sample. The standard for  $\delta^{13}$ C is PeeDee belemnite and the standard for  $\delta^{15}$ N is atmospheric nitrogen.

221 To calculate trophic position of Burbot and other sport fishes in FGR, we used:

222 
$$TP_i = \left(\frac{\delta^{15}N_i - \delta^{15}N_{baseline}}{3.4}\right) + 1,$$

where  $TP_i$  is the trophic position of species *i*,  $N_i$  is the nitrogen signature of species *i*, and  $N_{baseline}$ is the nitrogen signature for primary producers (Vander Zanden & Rasmussen 1999). We assumed that primary producers have a trophic position of 1 and a  $\delta^{15}N$  trophic fractionation value of  $3.4 \pm 1.1\%$  (Minagama & Wada 1984). We used an average value of macrophytes and phytoplankton to represent primary producers ( $\delta^{15}N = 9.36\%$ ; Luecke and Mears 2011).

To evaluate characteristics trophic overlap of Burbot with other sport fishes, we used SIBER (Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses) in R, which uses Bayesian inference techniques to describe niche and community metrics (Jackson et al. 2011). The SIBER model uses bivariate  $\delta 13C$  and  $\delta 15N$  data to represent isotopic trophic niche space for a species or group. The SIBER model produces ellipses around the centroid that include  $\pm 1$  SD. We calculated the percent species overlap at the intersection of ellipse areas. Kokanee Salmon were not included in this analysis owing to low sample size; however, our initial plots showed no potential overlap.

235

236 Bioenergetics.—

We modified equations from Bioenergetics 3.0 (Hanson et al. 1997) to run in R version 3.2.1 (R Development Core Team, 2015) to estimate annual Burbot consumption (kg; Kitchell et al. 1977). We used physiological parameters from Rudstam et al. (1995). To estimate reservoirwide annual consumption by Burbot, we first estimated size-specific annual consumption based

241 on individual Burbot, and then applied these estimates to an age structure and abundance index 242 of Burbot within FGR. First, annual growth (mm) was approximated using the difference 243 between modes from a length-frequency histogram of our 2012 - 2013 catch, and we determined 244 mean length at age for each year class from 1000 randomly drawn lengths from normally 245 distributed Burbot lengths for estimated year classes. We corroborated these growth estimates 246 using otoliths and mark-recapture information from Burbot tagged during 2011 - 2016 (UDWR, 247 unpublished data). Mark-recapture data is derived from annual UDWR Burbot fishing derbies, in 248 which 'prize fish' are tagged and released for a given year's tournament, but often caught during 249 subsequent years (1 - 4 years growth; n = 37, length at first capture = 279 - 731 mm TL). These 250 data provide accurate estimates of yearly growth, which we used to corroborate length-frequency 251 modes. We applied age-3 to our smallest size class sampled, and our largest fish were grouped to 252 a size class of age-10+. Otoliths confirmed that our sampling methods captured burbot age-3 and 253 older (Luecke and Mears 2011), and our length-frequencies modes appropriately fit the FGR 254 Burbot population. We then fit a von Bertalanffy growth model (Ricker 1975) for final length-at-255 age predictions:

256

burbot length = 
$$1065.58 \cdot (1 - e^{-(0.13 \cdot (burbot age - 0.16))})$$
,

To obtain an appropriate growth input for bioenergetics (annual change in weight, g), we developed a length-weight relationship for Burbot caught in FGR during 2012-2013 (n = 318) and applied the above length-at-age model, where the power transformed length-weight relationship yielded:

261

burbot weight =  $e^{-12.32+3.02 \cdot \log_e(burbot \ length)}$ ,

For bioenergetic analyses, we combined Burbot diet proportions (% wet weight, g), as
described above, by length (e.g., < 400, 400 - 650, > 650 mm) and season (e.g., fall, winter). We

264	used temperature profiles (early May to early December; 2009 – 2015; UDWR, unpublished
265	data) in bi-weekly periods averaged across years to obtain a 'typical' thermal experience for
266	Burbot and extrapolated water temperatures for dates in between. Between December 15 and
267	March 15, we assumed the reservoir was ice covered or completely mixed at or below 4°C.
268	Throughout the remained of the year, we assumed Burbot behaviorally thermoregulated to live at
269	the optimal temperature for gadoids (13.7°C; Rudstam et al. 1995, but see Harrison et al. 2016).
270	When optimal temperature was not available in the water column, we assumed Burbot would
271	occupy the temperature nearest to $13.7^{\circ}C$ (e.g., $4^{\circ}C$ from December 15 – March 15).
272	As a coarse index of relative Burbot abundance and density in FGR, we applied the
273	Schumacher and Eschmeyer method (Krebs 1999) using mark-recapture of tagged Burbot
274	(UDWR, unpublished data). While we acknowledge we violated some assumptions of this
275	method, confounding factors (e.g., catch and kill regulation) limited our overall ability to use a
276	more robust method. Nonetheless, our index of abundance (mean = 140,000 individuals; range =
277	80,000 – 510,000 individuals; 95% CI) provides density estimates similar to other studies where
278	Burbot are successful in their native range (e.g., Parker et al. 1989; Rudstam et al. 1995).
279	Further, this estimate provides us a relative measure of the potential impact of the total
280	population (e.g., a low and high estimate). To estimate annual consumption across the reservoir,
281	we multiplied bioenergetic estimates of consumption for the mean length fish for each age class
282	(3 - 10 +  years old) by the proportion of sampled Burbot in each age class and by the range of
283	total population estimates. Due to smaller sample size and growth approaching the asymptote of
284	our von Bertalanffy growth model, we pooled fish age 10 and greater to a single age category
285	(e.g., Madenjian et al. 2011)

287 <A>Results

#### 288 <B>Burbot Catch and Diets

The Wyoming Department of Game and Fish and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources have monitored the fall distribution and abundance of Burbot in FGR since 2006, following similar trammel netting methods as described above. Overall, catch per unit effort is variable, but our analyses demonstrate a relatively stable population across the Inflow and Open Hills regions  $(\lambda_{Inflow} = 1.10, 95\% \text{ CI} = 0.71 - 1.69; \lambda_{Open Hills} = 1.06, 95\% \text{ CI} = 0.79 - 1.42).$ 

We examined stomach contents from 385 Burbot (518 mm  $\pm$  5.8 [mean TL  $\pm$  1 SE]; range = 307 – 850 mm) collected during autumn 2012 (n = 188) and winter 2013 (n = 197). Of these, 307 stomachs contained diet items, while 78 were empty; we excluded empty stomachs from further diet analyses. Of the Burbot stomachs that contained prey items, Northern Crayfish (81.4 % by occurrence) were most often consumed, followed by fish (40.1 % by occurrence; Table 1). However, we noted variation in diet composition and consumption across time and size classes.

301 We analyzed diets from 78 % of Burbot captured in autumn (n = 147) and 81% of Burbot 302 captured in winter (n = 160). Total mean consumption by Burbot was significantly greater ( $t_{\text{IDF}}$  = 303  $_{189} = 3.70, P < 0.01$ ) in winter than during autumn (Table 1;  $26.2 \pm 3.9$  vs.  $11.3 \pm 1.2$  g [mean  $\pm$ 304 1 SE]); however, mean length of Burbot captured in winter was also greater than in autumn. 305 During autumn, Burbot most often consumed crayfish (89.3% by weight) and some fish (7.8% 306 by weight). In winter, Burbot consumption of crayfish (49.4% by weight) was considerably less 307 than autumn, and similar to consumption of fishes during winter (47.8% by weight). 308 Consumption of fish was more than six-fold greater during winter relative to autumn.

309 Prev fish composition in Burbot diets, and total consumption of fishes, also varied by 310 season (Table 1). During autumn, of fish consumed, Burbot primarily consumed forage fishes 311 (e.g., sucker and chub spp.; 68.6% by weight). We observed no consumption of salmonids, and 312 the only sport fish we identified in autumn diets was Smallmouth Bass (5.6% by weight). 313 However, during winter salmonids composed the greatest proportion of fish in Burbot diets 314 (71.7% by weight). Burbot still consumed forage fishes, but in lesser proportion than autumn 315 (11.9% by weight). Of the salmonids consumed during the winter, Rainbow Trout (60.5% by 316 weight) and Lake Trout (31.1% by weight) made up the majority of salmonids consumed. 317 Overall, cannibalism was approximately three times more common in winter than autumn (17.9 318 % vs 5.7 % occurrence) but made up a greater proportion of the total diet in autumn (22.7% vs. 319 8.6% by weight).

320 When compared across size classes, small (< 400 mm; n = 37) and medium (400 - 650321 mm; n = 225) Burbot exhibited similar feeding patterns; however, diet composition and 322 consumption of large Burbot (> 650 mm; n = 45) was significantly different from these size 323 classes (Table 1; Figure 2a). Small and medium sized Burbot consumed similar proportions of 324 crayfish (77.5% and 76.6% by weight), and ate fishes in similar proportions (18.3% and 20.1% 325 by weight). Large Burbot were primarily piscivorous (57.9% by weight), but also consumed 326 about 40% crayfish. Total consumption increased significantly with size class. Large Burbot 327 consumed the greatest prev biomass (52.5 g  $\pm$  10.0 [mean  $\pm$  1 SE]), while medium (13.5 g  $\pm$  1.2) 328 and small Burbot (4.1 g  $\pm$  0.7) consumed significantly less ( $F_{(2,304)} = 36.1, P < 0.001$ ). When 329 consuming fish, small Burbot most often consumed Smallmouth Bass (51.5% by weight) and 330 forage fishes (20.4% by weight). Small Burbot consumed no salmonids. Medium Burbot 331 consumed salmonids (32.5% by weight), forage fishes (26.8% by weight), and Smallmouth Bass (21.5% by weight) with similar frequency. In contrast, large Burbot predominately consumed
salmonids (86% by weight), while forage fishes comprised the only other significant fish prey
(9.0% by weight). Of the salmonids consumed, most were Rainbow Trout (67.8% by weight)
and Lake Trout (22.6% by weight), and this pattern was similar for salmonids consumed by
medium Burbot (59.7% and 17.5% by weight, respectively).

337

338 <B>Lake Trout Catch and Diets

339 We analyzed a total of 37 Lake Trout diets from trammel net and hook-and-line sampling 340 in autumn and winter 2012-2013 (Table 2). Small Lake Trout (<400 mm; n = 9) consumed mostly zooplankton (76.5% by weight) and few fish (23.5% by weight), medium-sized Lake 341 342 Trout (400-650 mm; n = 17) consumed mostly fish (84.0% by weight) and few crayfish (11.0%) 343 by weight; Figure 2b). When consuming fishes, small and medium-sized Lake Trout almost 344 entirely consumed forage fishes (95.2% by weight). Large, trophy Lake Trout (>650 mm, mean 345  $TL = 883.6 \pm 42.4 \text{ mm}; n = 11$ ) consumed fish exclusively (100% by weight), and mean total 346 consumption by large Lake Trout was much greater than large Burbot (212.1  $\pm$  63.24 vs. 52.5  $\pm$ 347 10.0 g) These large Lake Trout consumed almost entirely other salmonids (>99.9% by weight), 348 with most of these salmonids being Kokanee Salmon (83.8% by count). We did not observe 349 consumption of Burbot by Lake Trout.

350

351

354	Based Schoener's index, we observed no potential for interspecific competition, and very
355	little overall diet overlap, between Burbot (all sizes pooled) and Lake Trout (all sizes pooled; $\alpha$ =
356	0.13). We also observed very little overlap when comparing small, medium, and large Burbot
357	separately to all Lake Trout ( $\alpha = 0.01, 0.06$ , and 0.19, respectively). This notion matches our
358	diet analyses; large Lake Trout consumed mostly Kokanee Salmon, while Kokanee Salmon
359	accounted for less than 3% of salmonids consumed by large Burbot (Tables 1, 2). $\delta^{15}N$
360	signatures and thus, trophic positions, of small (TP = $2.16 \pm 0.07$ [mean $\pm 1$ SE]), medium (TP =
361	$2.63 \pm 0.26$ [mean $\pm 1$ SE]), and large Burbot (TP = $2.99 \pm 0.07$ [mean $\pm 1$ SE]), were
362	significantly different ( $F_{(2,43)} = 15.7$ , $P < 0.005$ ), and $\delta^{13}$ C signatures indicated Burbot may
363	compete more with littoral Rainbow Trout and Smallmouth Bass than pelagic Lake Trout (Figure
364	3). Large Lake Trout trophic position (TP = $3.24 \pm 0.06$ [mean $\pm 1$ SE]) was significantly
365	greater than that of large Burbot ( $t_{(189)} = 2.63$ , $P = 0.02$ ). Rainbow Trout trophic position (TP =
366	$2.22 \pm 0.38$ [mean $\pm 1$ SE]) was similar to small Burbot (t <sub>19</sub> = 0.43, p = 0.67), and Smallmouth
367	Bass trophic position (TP = $2.49 \pm 0.07$ [mean $\pm 1$ SE]) was similar to medium Burbot (t <sub>12</sub> =
368	1.36, $P = 0.20$ ). Additionally, our analyses of trophic niche space showed no overlap between
369	Burbot (of any size group) and Lake Trout. However, we did note diet overlap between Burbot
370	and Rainbow Trout, and Burbot and Smallmouth Bass. Specifically, small Burbot and medium
371	Burbot niche space overlapped with 21.8% and 17.9% of Rainbow Trout niche space, and
372	medium Burbot also overlapped with 44% of Smallmouth Bass niche space (see Appendix 1).
373	Annual consumption by Burbot, on an individual basis, increased with age (1622 – 8318
374	g·yr <sup>-1</sup> , age-3 – age-10+), and age specific bioenergetic efficiency (proportion of maximum
375	consumption, <i>BioEff</i> ; Budy et al. 2013) decreased with age, but was relatively high overall

376	( $BioEff = 0.57 - 0.69$ ; age-10+ and age-3; see Appendix 2). Overall, at the population level, we
377	estimate that Burbot consumed between $3.3 \cdot 10^5 - 2.4 \cdot 10^6$ kg of prey annually (mean = 5.8.
378	$10^5$ kg). Crayfish accounted for 84% of annual Burbot consumption, while fish and other prey
379	items accounted for 14% and 2% of annual Burbot consumption (Table 3; Figure 4a). When
380	consuming fishes, 62% of annual Burbot consumption was salmonids (66% Rainbow Trout, 22%
381	Lake Trout, 10% unidentified, and 2% Kokanee Salmon, respectively; Figure 4c) while 17% was
382	forage fishes, 10% other Burbot, 10% Smallmouth Bass, and 1% unidentified. Age-5 Burbot
383	(451 - 524  mm; mean = 490  mm) made up the greatest proportion of the overall population
384	(30%), and also consumed the most prey biomass annually ( $1.5 \cdot 10^5$ kg). Age-3 Burbot (307 –
385	367 mm; mean = 324 mm; 10% of the population) consumed the least prey biomass annually
386	$(2.27 \cdot 10^4 \text{ kg})$ . Age-5 and age-7 (589 – 646 mm; mean = 619 mm) Burbot consumed the most
387	and similar amounts of fish prey annually (1.48 and 1.50 $\cdot$ 10 <sup>4</sup> kg); however, 1.29 $\cdot$ 10 <sup>4</sup> kg of age-
388	7 fish prey was salmonid while only $4.86 \ 10^3$ kg was salmonid for age-5 Burbot (Figure 4b).

389

# 390 <A>Discussion

391 We combined field measurements of Burbot diets from a recently expanded population 392 across seasons and sizes with stable isotope analyses and bioenergetic models to assess the 393 potential for direct and indirect competition with sport fish (e.g., large Lake Trout) in FGR. To 394 better understand and quantify the success of the Burbot expansion into FGR, we extended our 395 bioenergetic predictions to a range of estimated population densities in order to bracket the 396 extent to which a stable Burbot population could affect the food web of this important sport 397 fishery. We observed little evidence that Burbot are competing with Lake Trout for prey 398 resources. However, Burbot are consuming large quantities of fish, including other sport fishes, as well as large quantities of important sport fish prey resources (e.g., crayfish), which coulddisrupt predator-prey dynamics and the food web within FGR.

401 Since the expansion of Burbot into FGR, there has been concern and uncertainty about 402 the potential trophic impacts of this novel predator with regard to popular sport fishes. In FGR, 403 the Lake Trout population is popular, long-established and stable, and no longer requires 404 stocking to supplement the fishery. In contrast, the Lake Trout population in Lake Michigan, 405 where Burbot and Lake Trout are both native, has declined as a result of the invasion of other 406 species that lead to the decimation of Lake Trout prey (Rogers et al. 2014; Tsehaye et al. 2014). 407 As such, while these species previously co-existed here in their native range (see also Cott et al. 408 2011; Guzzo et al. 2016), today Burbot consumption of Lake Trout likely limits rehabilitation 409 efforts in Lake Michigan via direct consumption of an already diminished Lake Trout population 410 (Jacobs et al. 2010). Our results indicate that Burbot and Lake Trout can live in sympatry, in 411 their non-native ranges, especially when prey is not limiting and Lake Trout populations are 412 stable and performing well (e.g., biotic resistance; Fausch 2008). Accordingly, this study and 413 others (e.g., Yule and Luecke 1993) demonstrate Lake Trout feed predominately on Kokanee in 414 FGR, and as such, maintaining a healthy Kokanee population is important for Lake Trout 415 success. On the other hand, Burbot consume other sport fishes, such as Rainbow Trout, in large 416 quantities.

While our study shows that Burbot in FGR primarily consume crayfish, there is potential
for direct and indirect competition with other sport fish. From 2006 – 2012, an average of
535,060 (377,906 – 821,121) Rainbow Trout were stocked annually in FGR (UDWR,
unpublished data). Assuming these trout are stocked at a catchable size of 200 mm, and weigh
approximately 120 g each, an average of 64000 kg of Rainbow Trout are stocked annually. Our

bioenergetic analyses indicate the population of Burbot in FGR could consume 29% of these Rainbow Trout at a low Burbot abundance estimate and more than double the biomass of the total Rainbow Trout (> 1 million individuals) stocked annually at the high end of this estimate. Furthermore, competition for food resources between Smallmouth Bass and Burbot could also be substantial, as crayfish are often the primary prey of Smallmouth Bass (Garvey et.al. 2003), and Burbot in FGR could consume more than 117 kg  $\cdot$ ha<sup>-1</sup> of crayfish annually.

428 In their native range, Burbot show the potential to feed opportunistically and outcompete 429 other fishes for desired prey (Knudsen et al. 2010); thus, in non-native waters, the potential for 430 burbot to fill open niche space could contribute to their expansion success (e.g., Vatland and 431 Budy 2007). In FGR, crayfish are relatively abundant and, for benthic predators such as Burbot, 432 relatively easy to capture. On the other hand, because Burbot consume primarily crayfish in 433 FGR, there could be unknown consequences should the cravitsh population decline dramatically 434 (e.g., Hein et al. 2007). Conversely, Paragamian (2010) suggests a strong link between Burbot 435 and crayfish in that crayfish abundance increased in Kootenai River following a decline in 436 Burbot. Our bioenergetic analyses suggests high levels of reservoir-wide crayfish consumption, 437 but we have inadequate information on the availability of crayfish across and within years to 438 truly understand how crayfish abundance might control Burbot. However, if crayfish became 439 limited, it is plausible, based on our dietary analyses, that burbot in FGR could shift to other prev 440 (e.g., increased piscivory on sport fish). Cott et al. (2011) demonstrated Burbot can play a role in 441 structuring fish communities with other top predators, and in the Great Lakes, Burbot diets 442 shifted correspondingly as proliferation of new invasive species created abundant new prey (e.g., 443 Round Gobies; Jacobs et al. 2010; Hares et al. 2015). Previous work in FGR demonstrated an 444 increase in juvenile forage fishes following a high water year resulting in increased forage fish

recruitment. The following autumn, greater consumption of forage fish was observed, suggesting
Burbot opportunistically consumed abundant prey fish (Luecke and Mears 2011). Accordingly,
variability in Burbot diets may be due to variability in prey abundance and availability
(Pääkkönen 2000); however, in FGR we would need a better understanding of overall prey
availability to make better determinations of prey selectivity versus availability.

450 Across seasons, prey selection could be driven by Burbot life history and/or metabolic 451 demands. Previous work on FGR found that consumption by Burbot increased from summer to 452 autumn (Luecke and Mears 2011); however, in the past, too few winter samples were available 453 to make strong seasonal comparisons. Summer temperatures in the top 10 m of the water 454 column may be too warm for daily vertical migrations to forage, as has been documented in 455 cooler waterbodies of Canada where Burbot are native (Harrison et al. 2013). The increase in 456 consumption from summer to autumn is likely associated with cooling of water temperatures 457 towards the thermal optimum of Burbot, an obligate cold water fish (McPhail and Paragamian 458 2000). We hypothesize that Burbot consumption further increases in winter, as prey metabolism 459 slows and as they are recovering from winter spawning activities that are energetically costly 460 (Saunders et al. 2014). We also observed increased Burbot cannibalism during winter, which 461 may reflect opportunistic feeding and/or greater intraspecific competition as a result of spawning 462 congregation (Hofmann and Fischer 2001; Cott et al. 2013; Gallagher and Dick 2015) Our observed differences in Burbot diets and consumption across sizes are likely driven 463

by ontogenetic shifts in behavior. During 2012-2013, small and medium Burbot fed primarily on crayfish prey, while large Burbot were primarily piscivorous. While it is possible small and medium size classes of Burbot may be gape limited; we also observed fish in the diets of Burbot as small as 301 mm, and 11% of Burbot less than 400 mm consumed fish. However, the

468 majority of fish prev consumed by these size classes were bottom and littorally oriented fishes. 469 Small and medium Burbot may avoid feeding in profundal zones to avoid predation themselves 470 and cannibalism, while large Burbot can likely forage more freely and successfully in the littoral 471 with predation fear (Harrison et al. 2013). Overall, the physiological ability of Burbot, across 472 size classes, to consume prey (e.g., gape limitation) corroborates the concept that they are highly 473 effective predators, as has been demonstrated herein and elsewhere (e.g., Kahilainen and 474 Lehtonen 2003). This effective predation may necessarily influence management strategies (e.g., 475 size of fish stocked). As an illustration, in FGR, we observed large Burbot consuming fish 476 greater than 50% of their own total body length. In winter 2013, a 780 mm Burbot consumed an 477 approximately 420 mm Rainbow Trout, more than double average length at stocking, suggesting 478 rainbow trout that overwinter still remain susceptible to predation.

479

# 480 Management Implications.—

481 Here, we present some of the first data to describe the success and potential impacts of 482 Burbot in their non-native range. Specifically, our study describes potential pathways in which 483 Burbot could affect popular sport fisheries. Overall, there is little evidence for competition 484 between newly established Burbot and long-established Lake Trout, and the lack of trophic 485 overlap suggests they can coexist in novel waterbodies. However, our study indicates that other 486 sport fishes are more likely to be impacted by Burbot. Rainbow Trout and Smallmouth Bass in 487 particular may compete with Burbot for prey, and Burbot consumption of Rainbow Trout could 488 further limit their annual stocking success. Historically, however, Rainbow Trout perform poorly 489 in FGR (Haddix and Budy 2005), and our reservoir-wide consumption estimates suggest that 490 stocked Rainbow Trout could now be essentially feeding Burbot. If maintaining a put-and-take

491 Rainbow Trout fishery is the goal, trout stocked in late spring may have a greater chance of 492 survival than those stocked in autumn due to seasonal diet preferences of Burbot, more 493 opportunity for Rainbow Trout growth, and greater habitat segregation between Rainbow Trout 494 and Burbot in summer. Conversely, populations of non-native Burbot could present a new sport 495 fish (as they are classified by many agencies in their native range), and in FGR they offer the 496 additional benefit of not require supplemental stocking.

497 While many anthropogenic influences play a role in the decline of Burbot in their native 498 range, anthropogenic influences will also likely facilitate the range expansion of burbot to new 499 ecosystems. Burbot are successful in FGR, but prey does not appear to be limiting in this system 500 and other abiotic factors are suitable. Our population estimates of consumption suggest the 501 potential for stronger trophic interactions with other top sport fishes, if the prey base decreases. 502 If Burbot are introduced and/or expand into additional non-native waterbodies, they maybe be 503 able to outcompete popular sport fishes if resources are limiting, or if sport fish populations are 504 already limited by other factors (e.g., over-harvest, invasive species). As such, intentional 505 introductions of Burbot to non-native ranges should be discouraged and prevented when 506 possible; however, should they expand, our study provides a baseline understanding for 507 management to adapt and preserve sport fisheries.

- 508
- 509
- 510
- 511
- 512
- 513
- 514

JIJ <a>Ackilowicugeillelius</a>	515	<a>Acknowledgements</a>
---------------------------------	-----	-------------------------

516	Our research was supported by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Sportfish Research
517	grant #121041. We thank C. Walker and T. Hedrick for their technical assistance and are
518	indebted to R. Mosley for considerable logistical support, FGR knowledge, and willingness to
519	share data. R. Keith and C. Amadio of Wyoming Game and Fish Department assisted with the
520	development and execution of this project and A. Bonser provided angling expertise. C. Luecke
521	provided supporting data for this manuscript. Additional support was provided by the US
522	Geological Survey, Utah Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit (in-kind) and The
523	Ecology Center at Utah State University. J. Augspurger, M. Meier, M. Stephens, G.P. Thiede, B.
524	Roholt, R. Walker, B. Wegleitner provided additional assistance in the field and lab. Any use of
525	trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by
526	the U.S. Government. This study was performed under the auspices of Utah State University
527	IACUC protocol number 1539.
528	
529	
530	
550	
531	
532	
533	
521	
534	
535	

# 536 <A> Tables and Figures

TABLE 1. Diet composition (percent prey weight and occurrence) by season and size class for
Burbot sampled in Flaming Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT, in 2012 – 2013. Subcatergories within
'fish' are the percent occurrence by weight and count for fish prey items, and subcatergories
within 'salmonid *spp*.' are the percent prey occurrences by weight and count for fish prey items
that were salmonids. Percent by occurrence or by count values are in parentheses.

	Autumn	Winter	<400 mm	400 - 650 mm	>650 mm
Number of Burbot	188	197	52	278	55
Percent with prey	78	81	73	82	82
Total consumption (g)	1657	4199	150	3045	2363
Consumption per fish (g)	11.3	26.2	4.1	13.5	52.5
$Mean \ length \pm SE \ (mm)$	$494\pm9$	$544\pm9$	$351\pm4$	$509 \pm 4$	$720\pm7$
Prey by weight and occurrence	<u>e (%)</u>				
Crayfish	89.3 (77.6)	49.4 (85.0)	77.6 (78.4)	76.7 (83.6)	39.6 (71.1
Fish	7.8 (32.7)	47.8 (48.9)	18.3 (27.0)	20.1 (35.6)	57.9 (77.8
Burbot	22.7 (5.7)	8.6 (17.9)	15.1 (10.0)	16.7 (16.0)	4.8 (8.3)
Forage	68.6 (77.4)	11.9 (37.9)	20.4 (50.0)	26.8 (57.4)	9.0 (41.7)
Salmonid	0.0	71.7 (26.3)	0.0	32.5 (6.4)	86.0 (41.7
Smallmouth Bass	5.6 (7.5)	7.0 (5.3)	51.5 (20.0)	21.5 (7.5)	0.0
Unidentified	3.1 (9.4)	0.8 (12.6)	13.0 (20.0)	2.5 (12.8)	0.1 (8.3)
Salmonid spp.					
Kokanee	0.0	0.0 (4.0)	0.0	0.0	2.8 (10.0
Lake Trout	0.0	31.1 (28.0)	0.0	17.5 (16.7)	22.6 (25.0
Rainbow Trout	0.0	60.5 (60.0)	0.0	59.7 (66.7)	67.8 (60.0
Unidentified	0.0	8.4 (8.0)	0.0	22.8 (16.7)	6.8 (5.0)

550 TABLE 2. Lake Trout diets (percent prey occurrence) by size for Lake Trout sampled in Flaming

551 Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT, in 2012 – 2013. Subcatergories within 'fish' are the percent

552 occurrence by count for fish prey items, and subcatergories within 'salmonid *spp*.' are the

553 percent prey occurrences by count for fish prey items that were salmonids.

	< 400 mm	400 - 650 mm	> 650 mm
Number of Lake Trout	9	17	11
Percent with prey	100	100	100
Total consumption (g)	6.6	40.4	2333
Consumption per fish (g)	0.7	2.4	212.0
Mean length $\pm$ SE (mm)	$360 \pm 11$	535 ± 13	$883 \pm 42$
Prey by weight and occurren	<u>ce (%)</u>		
Crayfish	0.0	11.0 (23.5)	0.0
Fish	23.5 (11.1)	84.0 (35.3)	100.0
Burbot	0.0	0.0	0.0
Forage	100.0	90.6 (83.3)	0.1 (3.4)
Salmonid	0.0	9.3 (8.3)	99.9 (96.6)
Smallmouth Bass	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unidentified	0.0	(0.1) 8.3	0.0
Salmonid spp.			
Kokanee	0.0	100.0	83.8 (85.7)
Lake Trout	0.0	0.0	10.5 (3.6)
Rainbow Trout	0.0	0.0	5.6 (10.7)
Unidentified	0.0	0.0	0.0
Zooplankton	76.5 (88.9)	5.0 (47.1)	0.0

561 TABLE 3. Age specific estimates for total, crayfish, fish, and other consumption by Burbot in

562 Flaming Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT, scaled to estimated Burbot abundance in FGR. Values in

		Total consumption	Crayfish consumption	Fish consumption	Other consumption
	Age	$(kg \cdot 10^4)$	$(kg \cdot 10^4)$	$(\text{kg} \cdot 10^3)$	$(\text{kg} \cdot 10^3)$
	3	2.2 (1.3 - 9.4)	1.9 (1.1 - 7.7)	3.2 (1.8 - 13.2)	0.9 (0.5 - 3.8)
	4	7.4 (4.2 - 30.6)	6.5 (3.7 - 26.8)	7.0 (4.0 - 28.9)	2.2 (1.3 - 9.2)
	5	15.5 (8.9 - 64.7)	13.6 (7.8 - 56.6)	14.8 (8.5 - 61.6)	4.7 (2.7 - 19.4)
	6	10.1 (5.8 - 42.0)	8.9 (5.1 - 36.7)	9.7 (5.5 - 40.3)	3.0 (1.7 - 12.6)
	7	7.6 (4.4 - 31.6)	6.0 (3.4 - 24.8)	15.0 (8.6 - 62.3)	1.5 (0.9 - 6.3)
	8	6.3 (3.6 - 26.2)	5.0 (2.8 - 20.5)	12.5 (7.1 - 51.8)	1.3 (0.7 - 5.3)
	9	4.2 (2.4 - 17.2)	3.2 (1.9 - 13.5)	8.2 (4.7 - 34.0)	0.8 (0.5 - 3.4)
	10+	4.7 (2.7 - 19.3)	3.6 (2.0 - 15.1)	9.2 (5.2 - 38.1)	0.9 (0.5 - 3.9)
1 _	TOTAL	58.1 (33.2 - 241.2)	48.6 (27.8 - 201.8)	79.5 (45.4 - 330.1)	15.4 (8.8 - 63.9)

563 parentheses represent the estimated range of possibilities.

565 <A> Figure Captions

566 FIGURE 1. Map of Flaming Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT. Shading represents each distinct region567 of the reservoir (Inflow, Open Hills, Canyon).

568

FIGURE 2. Diet proportions (% by wet weight; g) of total fish prey consumed by size class for (a)
small Burbot (<400 mm; left), medium Burbot (400 – 650 mm; middle), and large Burbot (> 650
mm; right); and, (b) small Lake Trout (<400 mm; left), medium Lake Trout (400 – 650 mm;</li>
middle), and large Lake Trout (> 650 mm; right) captured in Flaming Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT
(2012 – 2013). See Tables 1 and 2 for further breakdown of prey fishes, in particular, salmonids
consumed by Burbot and Lake Trout > 650 mm.

575

FIGURE 3. Isotopic bi-plot of mean (± 2SE) carbon and nitrogen signatures of small, medium,
and large Burbot, along with Lake Trout, Rainbow Trout, Smallmouth Bass, and Crayfish in
Flaming Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT, 2012 – 2013.

579

580 FIGURE 4. Bioenergetic estimates of annual total consumption (kg) for the Burbot population in

581 Flaming Gorge Reservoir, WY-UT, by age class (ages 3 - 10+) for: (a) crayfish and fish; (b)

582 Burbot, forage fishes, salmonids, Smallmouth Bass; and, (c) salmonid prey including Kokanee

583 Salmon, Lake Trout, Rainbow Trout. Note changes in the y-scale.

584

585

587 <A> References

- Budy, P., G.P. Thiede, L. Lobon-Cervia, G.G. Fernandez, P. McHugh, A. McIntosh, L.A.
  Vollestad, E. Becares, and P. Jellyman. Limitation and facilitation of one of the world's most invasive fish: an intercontinental comparison. Ecology 94: 356 – 367.
- 592 Clarkson, R.W., P.C. Marsh, S.E. Stefferud, and J.A. Stefferud. 2005. Conflicts between native
   593 fish and nonnative sport fish management in the southwestern United States. Fisheries
   594 **30**: 20–27.
- 595 Cott, P.A., T.A. Johnston, and J.M. Gunn. 2011. Food web position of burbot relative to lake
  596 trout, northern pike, and lake whitefish in four sub-Arctic boreal lakes. Journal of
  597 Applied Ichthyology 27: 49 56.
- Cott, P.A., T.A. Johnston, and J.M. Gunn. 2013. Sexual dimorphism in an under-ice spawning
   fish: the burbot (*Lota lota*). Canadian Journal of Zoology **91:** 732 740.
- Dennis B., and M.L. Taper. 1994. Density dependence in time series observations of natural
   populations: estimation and testing. Ecological Monographs 64: 205 224.
- Dibble, K.L., C.B. Yackulic, T.A. Kennedy, and P. Budy. 2015. Flow management and fish
   density regulate salmonid recruitment and adult size in tailwater across western North
   America. Ecological Applications 25: 2168 2179.
- Dunham, J.B., D.S. Pilliod, and M.K. Young. 2004. Assessing the consequences of nonnative
   trout in headwater ecosystems in western North America. Fisheries 29: 18-26.
- Eby, L.A. W.J. Roach, L.B. Crowder, and J.A. Stanford. 2006. Effects of stocking-up freshwater
   food webs. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 21: 576 584.
- Fausch, K.D. 2008. A paradox of trout invasion in North America. Biological Invasions 10: 685
  -701.
- Gallagher, C.P. and T.A. Dick. 2015. Winter feeding ecology and the importance of cannibalism
  in juvenile and adult burbot (*Lota lota*) from the Mackenzie Delta, Canada.
  Hydrobiologia **757**: 73 88.
- Garduino, E.I., C.A. Myrick, R.A. Ridenour, R.M. Keith, and C.J. Amadio. 2011. Invasion of
   illegally introduced burbot in the upper Coloardo River Basin, USA. Journal of Applied
   Ichthyology 27: 36-42.
- Garvey, J.E., J.E. Rettig, R.A. Stein, D.M. Lodge, and S.P. Klosiewski. 2003. Scale-dependent
   associations among fish predation, littoral habitat, and distributions of crayfish species.
   Ecology 84: 3339 3348.
- Gozlan, R.E., J.R. Britton, I. Cowx, and G.H. Copp. 2010. Current knowledge on non-native
   freshwater fish introductions. Journal of Fish Biology 76: 751 786.
- Guzzo, M.M, P.J Blanchfield, A.J. Chapelsky, and P.A. Cott. 2016. Resource partitioning among
   top-level piscivores in a sub-Arctic lake during thermal stratification. Journal of Great
   Lakes Research 42: 276 285.
- Haddix, T. and P. Budy. 2005. Factors that limit growth and abundance of rainbow trout across
   ecologically distinct areas of Flaming Gorge Reservoir, Utah-Wyoming. North American
   Journal of Fisheries Management 25: 1082 1094.
- Hanson, P.C., T.B. Johnson, D.E. Schindler, and J.F. Kitchell. 1997. Fish Bioenergetics 3.0.
   University of Wisconsin Sea Grant. Madison, Wisconsin.
- Hares, C.J., J.L. Jonas, and J.B.K. Leonard. 2015. Diet analysis of burbot (*Lota lota*) from
  eastern Lake Michigan: 1996 2012. Hydrobiologia **757**:89 -99.

- Harrison, P.M., L.F.G. Gutowsky, E.G. Martins, D.A. Patterson, A. Leake, S.J. Cooke, and M.
  Power. 2014. Diel vertical migration of adult burbot: a dynamic trade-off among feeding
  opportunity, predation avoidance, and bioenergetic gain. Canadian Journal of Fisheries
  and Aquatic Sciences **70**: 1765 1774.
- Harrison, P.M., L.F.G. Gutowsky, E.G. Mareins, D.A. Patterson, S.J. Cooke, and M. Power.
  2016. Temporal plasticity in thermal-habitat selection of burbot *Lota lota* a diel migrating
  winter-specialist. Journal of Fish Biology. 88: 2111 2129.
- Hein, C.L., M.J. Vander Zanden, and J.J. Magnuson. 2007. Intensive trapping and increased fish
   predation cause massive population decline of an invasive crayfish. Freshwater Biology
   52: 1134 1146.
- Hofmann, N. and P. Fischer. 2001. Seasonal changes in abundance and age structure of burbot
   *Lota lota* (L.) and stone loach *Barbatual barbatula* (L.) in the littoral zone of a large pre alpine lake. 2001. Ecology of Freshwater Fish 10: 21 25.
- Hudy, M., T.M. Theiling, N. Gillespie, and E.P. Smith. 2008. Distribution, status, and land use
  characteristics of subwatersheds within the native range of brook trout in the eastern
  United States. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 28: 1069 1085.
- Jackson, A.L., R, Inger, A.C. Parnell, and S. Bearhop. 2011. Comparing isotopic niche widths
   among and within communities: SIBER Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses in R. Journal
   of Animal Ecology 80: 595 602.
- Jacobs, G.R., C.P. Madenjian, D.B. Bunnell, and J.D. Holuszko. 2010. Diet of lake trout and
   burbot in northern Lake Michigan during spring: evidence of ecological interaction.
   Journal of Great Lakes Research 36: 312-317.
- Johnson, B.M. and P.J. Martinez. 2000. Trophic economics of lake trout management in
   reservoirs of differing productivity. North American Journal of Fisheries Management
   20: 127-143.
- Johnson, B.M., R. Arlinghaus, and P.J. Martinez. 2009. Are we doing all we can to stem the tide
   of illegal fish stocking? Fisheries 34: 389-394.
- Kahilainen, K. and H Lehtonen. 2003. Piscivory and prey selection of four predator species in a
   whitefish dominated subarctic lake. Journal of Fish Biology. 63: 659 672.
- Kitchell, J.F., D.J. Stewart, and D. Weininger. 1977. Applications of a bioenergetics model to
   yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) and walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum vitreum*). Journal of
   Fisheries Research Board of Canada 34: 1922 1935.
- Klein, Z.B., M.C. Quist, D.T. Rhea, and A.C. Senecal. 2015. Habitat use of non-native burbot in
   a western river. Hydrobiologia 757: 61-71.
- 666 Krebs, C.J. 1999. Ecological Methodology 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, CA.
- Krueger, K.L. and W.A. Hubert. 1997. Assessment of lentic burbot populations in the Big
   Horn/Wind River Drainage, Wyoming. Journal of Freshwater Ecology 12: 453 463.
- Knudsen, R. P.A. Amundsen, and A. Klemetsen. 2010. Arctic charr in sympatry with burbot:
   ecological and evolutionary consequences. Hydrobiologia 650: 43 54.
- Leung, B., D.M. Lodge, D. Finnoff, J.F. Shogren, M.A. Lewis, and G. Lamberti. 2002. An ounce
  of prevention of a pound of cure: bioeconomic risk analysis of invasive species.
  Proceedings of the Royal Society of London 269: 2407-2413.
- Luecke C. and J. Mears. 2011. The distribution, diet, and age structure of exotic burbot in
   Flaming Gorge Reservoir: implications for reservoirs fisheries. Technical report to Utah
   Division of Wildlife Resources #F-47-R V, 39pp.

- Madenjian, C.P., M.A. Stapanian, L.D. Witzel, D.W. Einhouse, S.A. Pothoven, and H.L.
  Whitford. 2011. Evidence for predatory control of the invasive round goby. Biological Invasions 13: 987 – 1002.
- Maguire, L.A. 2004. What can decision analysis do for invasive species management? Risk
   Analysis 24: 859-868.
- Marchetti, M.P., P.B. Moyle, and R. Levine. 2004a. Invasive species profiling? Exploring the
   characteristics of non-native fishes across invasion stages in California. Freshwater
   Biology 49: 646-661.
- Marchetti, M.P., T. Light, P.B. Moyle, and J.H Viers. 2004b. Fish invasion in California
  watersheds: testing hypotheses using landscape patterns. Ecological Applications. 14:
  1507-1525.
- Matrinez, P.J., T.E. Chart, M.A. Trammell, J.G. Wullschleger, and E.P. Bergersen. 1994. Fish
   species composition before and after construction of a main stem reservoir on the White
   River, Colorado. Environmental Biology of Fishes 40: 227–239.
- McPhail, J.D., and V. L. Paragamian. 2000. Burbot biology and life history *in* Burbot: biology,
   ecology, and management. D.W. Willis and V.L. Paragamian, eds. Fisheries Management
   Section of the American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MA.
- Minigama, M. and E. Wada. 1984. Stepwise enrichment of <sup>15</sup>N and animal age. Geochimica et
   Cosmochimica Acta 48: 1135 1140.
- Mooney, H.A., and R.J. Hobbs. 2000. Invasive species in a changing world. Island Press,
   Washington D.C.
- Morris, W.F., and D.F. Doak. 2002. Quantitative conservation biology: theory and practice of
   population variability analysis. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- Moyle, P.B., and M.P. Marchetti. 2006. Predicting invasion success: freshwater fishes in
   California as a model. BioScience 56: 515-524.
- Pääkkönen, J.-P.J. 2000. Feeding biology of burbot *lota* lota (L.): adaptation to profundal
   lifestyle? Doctoral Thesis. Biological Research Reports from the University of Jyvaskyla
   87.
- Parker, J.F., R. Lafferty, W.D. Potterville, and D.R. Bernard. 1989. Stock assessment and
   biological characteristics of burbot in lakes of interior Alaska during 1988. Alaska
   Department of Fish and Game, Juneau, Alaska Fish. Data Ser. 98
- Paragamian, V.L. 2010. Increase in abundance of signal crayfish may be due to decline in
   predators. Journal of Freshwater Ecology 25: 155 157.
- Peterson, D.P., K.D. Fausch, and G.C. White. 2004. Population ecology of an invasion: effects of
   brook trout on native cutthroat trout. Ecological Applications 14: 754-772
- Quist, M.C., and W.A. Hubert. 2004. Bioinvasive species and the preservation of cutthroat trout
   in the western United States: ecological, social, and economic issues. Environmental
   Science and Policy 7: 303-313.
- Rahel, F.J. 2000. Homogenization of fish faunas across the United States. Science 288: 854 –
  856.
- Rahel, F.J. 2004. Unauthorized fish introductions: fisheries management of the people, for the
  people, or by the people? American Fisheries Society Symposium 44: 431 443.
- Ricker, W.E. 1975. Computation and interpretation of biological statistics of fish populations
   bulletin of the fisheries research board of Canada, Vol. 191. Department of Fisheries and
   Oceans, Ottawa, Canada.

- Rogers, M.W., D.B. Bunnell, C.P. Madenjian, and D.M. Warner. 2014. Lake Michigan offshore
   ecosystem structure and food web changes from 1987 to 2008. Canadian Journal of
   Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **71**: 1072 1086.
- Rubidge, E.M., and E.B. Taylor. 2005. An analysis of spatial and environmental factors
   influencing hybridization between native westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii lewisi*) and introduced rainbow trout (*O. mykiss*) in the upper Kootenay River drainage,
   British Columbia. Conservation Genetics 6: 369 384.
- Rudstam, L.G., P.E. Peppard, T.W. Fratt, R.E. Bruesewitz, D.W. Coble, F.A. Copes and J.F.
  Kitchell. 1995. Prey consumption by the burbot (*Lota lota*) population in Green Bay,
  Lake Michigan, based on a bioenergetic model. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and
  Aquatic Sciences 52: 1074-1082.
- Saunders, W.C., S.L. Klobucar, and P. Budy. 2014. Food web effects, seasonal movements, and
  spawning ecology of Burbot, a large invasive piscivore, in Flaming Gorge Reservoir,
  Utah and Wyoming. 2014 Completion Report to Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.
  Sportfish Research: Project ID 121041. UTCFWRU 2014(3):1-57.
- Schoener, T.W. 1970. Nonsynchronous spatial overlap of lizards in patchy habitats. Ecology 51:
  408-418.
- Stapanian, M.A., V.L. Paragamian, C.P. Madenjian, J.R. Jackson, J. Lappalaninen, M.J.
  Evenson, and M.D. Neufeld. 2010. Worldwide status of burbot and conservation
  measures. Fish and Fisheries 11: 34-56.
- Stewart, D.J., J.F. Kitchell, and L.B. Crowder. 1981. Forage fishes and their salmonid predators
   in Lake Michigan. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 110: 751 763.
- Tsehaye, I., M.L. Jones, T.O. Brenden, and J.R. Bence. 2014. Changes in the salmonine
  community of Lake Michigan and their implications for predator-prey balance.
  Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 143: 420-437.
- 747 Vander Zanden, M.J., and J.B. Rasmussen. 1999. Primary consumer  $\delta^{13}$ C and  $\delta^{15}$ N and the 748 trophic position of aquatic consumers. Ecology **80**: 1395 – 1404.
- Vatland, S. and P. Budy. 2007. Predicting the invasion success of an introduced omnivore in a
   large, heterogeneous reservoir. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 64:
   1329 1345.
- Yule, D.L. and C. Luecke. 1993. Lake trout consumption and recent changes in the fish
  assemblage of Flaming Gorge Reservoir. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society
  122: 1058-1069.

755 756

760 761

762

763

764

765 766

767