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## 1. Introduction

Investigations of river fauna show Mayfly larvae to be a very important group in the rivers of N.E. England. They play a considerable part in the energy turnover and food webs found in fresh water, as they are known to be consumers of primary production (mainly in the form of algae) and of detritus (Jones, 1950 and Brown, 1961). In turn these animals as larvae and as adults provide a valuable source of food for carnivores. The relationships between feeding fish and the emergence of Mayflies has long been studied by those interested in fly fishing. Consequently local knowledge of adult Mayflies and their habits is often well documented but far less is known regarding the larval life in particular rivers.

The larvae take varying lengths of time to mature, undergo different numbers of ecdyses and grow to variable sizes (even within the same species) beforeemerging as adult flies. This variability is known to be partially if not wholly temperature dependent (Harris, 1956). Records of life histories of the same species show variability in different rivers of the British Isles. Harker, (1952) showed Ecdyonurus torrentis in one river to have three generations in two years, whilst Macan, (1957) has shown E. torrentis larvae, in another river, to have only one generation per year.

Three aspects of the ecology of Ephemeropheran larvae were examined closely in this study. Firstly by means of sequential sampling, the changes in the numbers and sizes of larvae were investigated to ascertain their growth pattern; secondly the change in biomass of certain species was investigated by dry weight measurements and thirdly an attempt was made to determine the food intake of the genus with the highest numbers of larvae present.

The study was made from spring to midsummer, (the time allocaited on the course at Durham). This time restriction limited the full investigation of the problems encountered but the results obtained show the patterns of the life histories, and the growth of the animals in two different rivers.

Two rivers, fairly typical of N.E. England, were chosen for the study - the large and often turbulent River Wear and the quieter River Deerness with its swaller volume of water.

Collection of material from the rivers for investigation into the numbers and lengths of animals, was fairly straightforward but certain sampling problems were experienced, due to the varying state of the water in the rivers. Difficulties were also experienced in keeping animals alive for laboratory experiments. Given more time, more of the initial problems would probably have been resolved and different techniques found for keeping specimens alive. Early ideas on feeding experiments had to be abandoned as the animals did not eat proffered food, so gut analysis was used in an attempt to determine quantities and types of food eaten by Baetis larvae. The results for B. rhodani were obtained after Dr. Macan (of the Freshwater Biological Association) informed me of the work of D.S. Brown, (1959) on the food of the larvae of B. rhodani. A comparison of results for feeding was then to some extent possible.

Previously, little work appears to have been carried out on Ephemeropteran larvae in the rivers of County Durham but this study enables some light to be thrown on the ecology of these animals in this area and also provides data upon which further work could be based.


2 Ephemerella ignita $\times 3$

## |.I. Species Studied

The animals studied in this project were only those mayfly larvae caught by lifting stones in fresh water rivers, consequently larvae living in other habitats such as in weed were not collected and hence were not recorded.

Baetis scambus. Etn. This species is referred to in the text as Baetis A., it is the most common species in the rivers particularly in early June. The larva is very similar to B. fuscatus (L) but identification at the adult stage (Table 12.) enables a definite verification to be made.

Baetis muticus (Linn.) and Baetis rhodani (Pict.) Small specimens of these two species were found difficult to distinguish and for most numerical purposes in this study the two species have been put together as Baetis B. In actual fact most were B. rhodani and in the latter part of the study during the gut analysis careful separation and identification of specimens was made before the larvae were used.

Ecdyonurus torrentis. Kimmins. Small larvae of Ecdyonurus are difficult to separate into species as the backward projections of the pronotum (used to separate the species) are not present on small larvae. Larger larvae collected were all found to be E. torrentis. The identification was verified at the F.B.A. Laboratory.

Ephemerella ignita. (Poda) This larval form is readily distinguished by its characteristic shape. It has a pinched 'waist' and the striped tails separate it from E. notata with uniformly pigmented tails. Only E. ignita was found in this study.

The adult of this species has three tails - all the other species found produced adults with two tails.

3. Ecdyonurus \& emerging Baet is $\times 2.5$

4. Baetis subimago - 30 secs after emergence.

Rithrogena semi colorata. (Curt.) The larvae of this species have a flattened appearance and at first closely resemble those of Ecdyonums but the pronotum has no backward projections and the first gill on each side is very large - meeting on the ventral side of the body.

Caenis rivulorum. Etn. Onl.y a fou specimens yere found. Tho gonus has a flap on each side of the body covering the gills - so that at first glance the animals appear to have two paiins of wing cases.

The photographs illustrate the main genera found and the phases through which the animale grow. At first the larvae have no external wing cases (as seen in photograph 1.), later they develop wing cases, (photographs 2 and 3); and then the wing cases become darkly pigmented just before the animal emerges - (Baetis larva on photograph 3). The change from larva to subimago is dramatic and in the case of the Baetis specimen in the photograph very fast. The back of the animal split open and the subimago emerged and flew all within three minutes.

At this stage the subimago is dull in colour (and known to fishermen as a dun). The ability to fly and the length of time before its final moult into the full imago varies with species. As can be seen from the results (Table 12) the final moult takes place usually within 24 hours. The final adult is more brightly coloured and of a shiny appearance - the wings also glisten - (photograph 5). Anglers refer to the fully adult fly as the 'spinner'.

It is at the time of the emergence of the larva as a subimago that the greatest predation of mayflies by fish takes place. The eating of the subimago affects the next generation but the removal of spent spinners (after egg laying) by fish does not affect the population as these animals are already dying.

5. Imago of Ecdyonurus $\times 3 / 4$.

Of the animals collected in this study, those not required for numerical and other data were kept in an aquarium for observation of their activity and behaviour. Emerging flies were trapped and kept as specimens - a list can be found in the appendix (Table/2). These specimens were used to confirm the species present particularly in the case of B. scambus.


Skelch map to show relative positons of collecting sites and their altitudes.

## River Deerness

The sampling area on this river was 100 metre stretch (Grid ref. NZ.227423) near to a village - Ushaw Moor, where there have been extensive mine worikings. Remains of colliery waste and the tip, produce a run off of water heavily polluted with metallic waste.

The river, narrow compared with the River Wear flows into the Kiver Browney about 1 mile S.W. of Durham City. The River Browney flows into the River Wear near Croxdale, so the water from the Deerness finally flows into the Wear about 5 miles fron the collecting site, (-see sketch map).

The water at all times (during the project) flowed with speed in the fast stretches but when the river was low the slow stretches dried up near the edges. Silting of the sluggish areas took place when the river was low, producing a muday bottom but in fast stretches the stones were always free from silt.

Sampling was carried out at three points along the 100 metre stretch (altitude $260 f$ t, above mean sea level) where the water showed definite differences in speed of flow. The changes in speed are partly due to the meandering nature of the river - the fast stretches wearing away the bank and being relatively narrow, whilst round the bend the river dramatically slowed its pace, this stretch can be seen in photograph 6. Vegetation on the banks was very thick and in places overhanging; casting varying amounts of shade over the three sites, (slow, medium and fast speeds of water).

These sites were visited each time that samples were obtained, care being taken to replace lifted stones in the same position after removal of


6-The River Deerness.


7-The River Wear.
animals. In this way variation in the habitat was not increased due to removal of the original stones by sampling.

Stones in sample squares of $50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$. were counted to show the average numbers of stones for each site. For the actual collection of animals only stones easily lifted by hand and approximately 10 x 10 cm . or larger were used.

Animals for gut analysis and for comparative weight data were collected from the River Deerness - the site being near enough to the laboratory in Durham for quick processing.

## River Wear

The sampling area on this river was 100 metre stretch (grid ref. NZ.201311) near to the town of Bishop Auckland. Another site on the river at Durham was initially sampled but here there was much interference, by young boys fishing the stretch and by a profuse growth of filamentous green algae. The Durham site was therefore abandoned and the Bishop Auckland site soley used for collection of River Wear animels.

At this site (altitude 245 ft.$)$ the river is comparatively wide, and free from overhanging vegetation (photograph 7). Projections have been built into the river, narrowing it and increasing the speed of the water flowing past at these points.

As with the Deerness the slowest edges of the Wear dried up and sampline was not always possible. At times of flooůing, standing in the river was impossible and the height of the water prevented collection of samples.

Gut analysis was not carried out on any of the animals from this site (it being more than 20 mins. away by car from the laboratory). Analysis of stone size was carried out here as at the Deerness site, but the river
flowed over large boulders and smaller stones were seen to be moved when the river was in spate. Results of $50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$. square sampling therefore only reflect the sample on the day on which it was made and cannot be considered accurate enough for analysis, (due to movement of stones). The results are given in the appendix (Tableo 23. ).

The River Wear flows North from the Bishop Auckland site and about 10 miles along its course the water from the Deerness flows into it, via the Browney. Migration of animals from one site to the other is therefore quite possible. Macan (1957) shows that Ephemeropteran larvae migrate - so the populations at the two sites may not be discrete.
2. Methods used for collection and investigation of material

## 2. Methods used in the Study

### 2.1 River Data

As it was considered important to make measurements of factors which might influence the habitat of the animals, records were kept of the state of the rivers etc.

| On each sample date - | temperature recordings were made of the |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | river water. |
| - | subjective assessments of the state of the |
|  | river were made and noted. |
| $-\quad$ growth of vegetation and interference by |  |
|  | humans was also noted. |

On one occasion when the rivers were moderately high, measurements of rate of flow were made at each site, and the width at each site was measured. The results of these measurements and recordings can be found in Tables 9,10 and 23.

Investigation of stone size arı number of animals per stone was made early in the project (Table \| ) but there appeared to be no relationship. Froiil observations üade whilst collecting, it became apparent that texture, mineral content, colour and the number of crevices influence the numbers of animals found on a stone. Use of standardized stones of known properties would make an interesting line for further study.

### 2.2 Method used for collection and counting of animals

## for size and number analysis

Three sampling points were selected at each site where the water flowed at different speeds. These were slow, medium and fast. At times it was not possible to collect from certain of these sites owing to the state of the river. As far as possible the samples were taken at fortnightly intervals.

At each point samples were collected as follows. A stone was lifted and swiftly put into a bucket (which was held between the legs). The bucket was tipped to allow water in at the same time as the stone was placed in and any animals falling off were thus caught. Animals still adhering to the stone were carefully swilled off using a wash bottle. The stones were replaced on the river bed. Twenty stones at each point were sampled and the catches put into separately labelled pots. This provided sixty stone catches per river per visit. (On occasions only half this number were sampled.)

The pots containing the samples were brought back to the laboratory, excess river water was drained off and the animals killed and preserved using 70\% alcohol. They were then sorted into genera and subsorted into sizes.

Measurement of the larvae was taken from the anterior end of the head to the posterior end of the abdomen (tails not included). They were sorted into size classes of 1 mm . starting at 1.5 mm . (Those smaller than 1.5 mm were not counted.) The following size classes were measured and the animals recorded as follows:-

| $1.5-2.4 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Animals recorded as 2 mm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2.5-3.4 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $"$ | $"$ | $" 3 \mathrm{~mm}$ |  |
| $3.5-4.4 \mathrm{~mm}$ | $"$ | $"$ | $" 4 \mathrm{~mm}$ |  |
| etc. |  |  |  | etc. |

The largest size class was $15.5-16.4 \mathrm{~mm}$, reached by some
Ecdyonurus larvae.

A binocular microscope was used for this measuring and a millimetre scale was fixed to the stage so that each animal could be placed on a glass slide and viewed directly above the scale. The animals were identified at the same time as their length was measured. Each species of aninal (after it had been sorted and measured), was stored in a separate labelled tube for each sample.

### 2.3. Method used for collecting and keeping animals <br> used for laboratory experiments

Special trips were made to the river when animals were required for laboratory experiments - they were collected by lifting stones and shaking off the animals carefully in water in a pie dish. They were then transferred to plastic topped jars and these were half filled to allow a good air space above the water. The animals were then transported as fast as possible back to the laboratory.

Animals to be kept in the aquarium were kept in their pots which were floated on the aquarium water until the temperatures had equalized they were then allowed to swin out into the aquarium water. The aquariums had air pumped through the water constantly, but no method was used to control the temperature. A net was placed over the top and emerging subimagos were able to cling to this whilst changing into full adults.

Other animals that were needed for experimental work were kept in pots of aerated river water in the constant temperature room (at $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) until required.
2.4 Method used for determining the dry weights of larvae

A preliminary experiment was carried out to deterinine both wet and dry weights of captured animals. Due to adhesion of water to the animals, wet weights were found to vary whilst dry weights were constant.

Animals were then collected (from the Deerness) specifically for dry weighing; sorted into species and separated into size classes. Numbers of each size class 2, 4, 6 etc. mm . were then put into porcelain crucibles and heated to $105^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours. They were then weighed, re-dried and re-weighed to constant weight. The weight of individual animals (Table 13.) was then obtained by dividing the actual weight by the number of animals weighed for each size class.

### 2.5. Diatom Counts

## Preparation of gut contents and method of counting

Freshly caught nymphs were brought back to the laboratory - they were then measured and decapitated. (From catching to killing took approximately half an hour.)

The gut of each was removed under a binocular microscope and separately immersed in $5 \%$ sodium hydroxide in a Durham tube (the capacity of which had previously been measured). Tubes were then incubated at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 minutes. The resultant mixture was well mixed and the level again made up to the full capacity of the tube using distilled water and a small quantity of aqueous methylene blue.

Small quantities of well mixed gut sample were mounted onto a haemocytometer slide using a fresh micropipette tube for each specimen. Counts of diatoms lying within the grid of the haemocytometer slide were taken - five separate sample counts being made for each specimen.

When gut contents were examined without sodiun hydroxide treatment the diatoms were difficult to distinguish from the other organic particles present, and partially digested plant remains were not easily identifiable. After treatment with sodium hydroxide, the diatoms and resistant forms of filamentous algae were clearly visible in the liquid when viewed under high power.

Animals which were kept alive for sometime before gut analysis were found to have defaecated large quantities of their gut contents and some of this was undigested; - live diatoms were found in the discharge (Table No. 24). However, these organisms could have been adhering to the outside of the animal's body and not travelled through the gut. Analysis of faecal material was therefore discontinued due to possible large errors involved.

Nymphs were caught and kept for varying lengths of time in aerated distilled water without food. They were then decapitated and diatom counts of the gut contents were carried out after sodium hydroxide treatinent.


### 3.1 Results of Sequential Sampling

The full results are tabulated in the appendix (Tables 1-3 for River Deerness and Tables $4-6$ for the River Wear). Figures 1-3, show in histogram form, the results for the main genera found during sampling. I'ables 7 and 8, give the separate figures for Baetis species for fast and medium water.

Baetis scambus (Baetis A) Fisure 14.

The larvae range in length from $2-9 \mathrm{~mm}$; the complete range of sizes being found in the May samples. The largest animals had black wing cases, were mature and ready to emerge. Numbers, particularly in the River Wear were low, but by Sample II a dramatic increase in the populations at both sites was found; 2 mm larvae increasing from 0 to over 100 in the Deerness and from 0 to over 200 in the Wear (medium speed water). The numbers of larger larvae at this time were low but as the sampling proceeded the numbers showed a change to a higher proportion of langer animals in the samples - e.g. Sample IV, larger larvae with black wing cases being found again, with high numbers of 4 and 5 mm larvae.

In both rivers the populations fluctuate enormously; the River Wear after flooding (Sample V) showing a strange lack of specimens in the medium speed water, whilst the fast water had many larvae of all sizes. At most other times more larvae were found in the medium speed water than in the fast.

A peak of hatching is shown in late fiay and early June with these animals maturing within two months. Hatching of small numbers continues through late June and into July. Probably two generations per year are to be found in these rivers with considerable overlap of development. Hynes, (1961) believes B. scambus to have only one generation in North Wales whilst Elliot, (1967) records two generations in Dartmoor streams.


FIquRE IB To show numbers and lengths of BAETISB

The latter would probably be true of rivers in Co. Durham but more detailed study would be required to confirm this supposition.

Baetis B. (Baetis rhodani and B. Imaticus) Figure IB.

Few large B. muticus were found in the samples but due to the fact that small specimens were difficult to distinguish from B. rhodanit the two species were counted together.

Harker (1952) showed that B. rhodani were present throughout the year in the stream she was examining; also she found two sizes of penultimate instar larvae (7 and 10mm). Macan (1957) has shown B. rhodani which over winter produce big larvae, whilst the summer larvae mature at a smaller size - there being two generations. Two sizes of mature larvae were found in the Deerness samples (12mm Sample I and 9 mm Sample II) (Table 26).

The eggs of B. rhodani are known to hatch over a long time and certainly hatching appeared to be continuing during June and July in the Deerness; whether this was from eggs laid by the adults in late May or delayed hatching of earlier eggs it would be difficult to say, fron just the samples available.

Competition between B. scambus and Baetis B may influence the numbers of these animals, for the Deerness figures show a sudden rise in the numbers of Baetis B (Sample I) that is matched by a dramatic drop in the numbers of B. scambus.

The numbers of animals of the two species do fluctuate alternately as can be seen from Figures IA 18 +4 , and this may point to interspecific competition between Baetis species in the rivers studied.


Ecdyonurus torrentis Figure 2.

The sequential sampling showed very clearly the change in composition and frequency of the population. In early May there were mainly large mature larvae, with only a very few smaller animals (4mm) in the Rivers. By 23rd May, however, both rivers had a population of newly hatched larvae. These formed the dominant size classes ( $2-3 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) during late May and early June. The last of the large larvae emerged during the last weeks of June. There appeared to be no further hatching of young Ecdyonurus after 20th June. The growth of these mayflies takes place very fast - the graphs show larvae on 20 th June to be 8 and 9 mm long which must have hatched after 16th May. As can be seen also in graph (3) the biomass increase for these animals shows a very rapid assimilation of food.

Figure 2 shows the growth of these animals (hatched about 16th May) through to a length of 12 mm . Froin Table 26 , it can be seen that spring animals were ready to emerge at 13 mm (or more) in length and presumably the larger animals would be emerging during August unless their growth stops.
E. torrentis has been shown to have a quick summer generation and to have three generations in four years (Harker, (1952)) in Walford Stream, Bolton, Lancashire, whilst Macan, (1957), has found in Ford Wood Beck, Cumbria, a simple single-generation-a-year life history.

Fluctuations of numbers of E. torrentis larvae have been shown to be typical of this species and it has also been shown (by Dr. Harker) to migrate upstrean.

The results of this study would point to the probability of more than one generation per year of E. torrentis.


This species shows a clearly defined pattern of growth, unlike the two previous genera examined. This year the young larvae hatched between 16 th and 23rd May in both rivers and their growth pattern, frequency of size class and time of first adults emerging, were similar at both sites. Numbers per sample were greater in the River Deerness but class sizes present and their changing representation in the histograms can be seen to be almost identical.

Ephemerella larvae grow fast. At the time of sample II (23.5.74) the class with highest frequency was size $2 \mathrm{~mm} .$, whilst by sample III (a fortnight later) the class with the highest frequency is 4 rmm long, by 20th June high frequencies are found at 5,6 and 7 mm with high numbers of penultimate instar larvae present in all samples. This shows that some larvae hatching after l6th Nay were already mature enough to emerge by 20th June. The earliest captured Ephemerella to hatch in the laboratory, was that on 9th July and even this can only have spent about 8 weeks as a larva. (Table 12.)

Figure 3 shows very clearly the larval life history of Epimemerella ignita in both rivers. Ihis species is able to complete its cycle in less than three months, and by the beginning of August only 8inm larvae are Lef't in the river. (Observation made 5.8.74). Other workers have shown that Ephemerella ignita has a single generation per year and that the eggs do not hatch for 10 months. The results for the rivers studied here would appear to confirm these findings. The pattern of growth appears to be similar in both rivers for fast and medium water, although marginally larger numbers are to be found in the samples from the fast stretches.

The number of these animals found in the samples selected was very small. In the River Deerness they were found in fast water only, but in the River Wear they were found in all speeds of water. From the numbers available it is obvious that this animal is much more common in the bigger river, during May and June.

Young small animals were almost completely absent from samples during the study period - the smallest found being 5 mm long. No young hatched during the period of study as can be seen by examining the tables of sequential sampling (1-6). The final size for the larvae appears to be lomm and the majority appear to emerge during the latter half of May leaving the river devoid of Rithrogena larvae.

In contrast with Ecdyonurus this species appears to be part of the river fauna only during cooler months of the year in the rivers investigated. Other workers have found Rithrogena present in rivers in all months of the year (Harker, 1952) but Macan (1970) states that Rithrogena are unlike Ephemerella ignita and dislike warner temperatures. (The warmer months are spent in the egg stage.) Harker concludes from her studies, that emergence may be spread over months and that the time of emergence depends on seasonal factors. The winter and spring in the N.E. of England 1973-74 was less severe than usual and this could be responsible for all the larvae emerging before the middle of June.

Another factor to be taken into account is the similarity in habit of Rithrogene and Ecdyonurus and the possible competition between these two species for the sam niche. It is notable that with the decrease in numbers of Rithrogena there is a rapid increase in the numbers of Ecdyonurus. It would be useful to sample the same rivers later in the season to see if there is a change in balance between these two species and to ascertain if there is a correlation with temperature. It should be noted that the
temperature of the River Wear (Table No. 10) during the early part of the study was sometimes lower (on the days samples were taken) than that of the River Deerness. It could be this factor which accounts for the different numbers found in the two sets of samples.

## Caenis rivulorum

Only a few specimens of this species were found. They were not confined to any particular stretch of the river and appeared during the study in all the sampling areas. They did not appear to constitute a very important or variable factor in the fauna of the rivers.

$300 \frac{\text { FAST }}{\text { R.Wear }}$




Graph 1. To show changes in tatal Numbers of Mayfly Lanvae.
Key. Baetis $\mathrm{A} \times \cdots \times$ Baetis $\mathrm{B} \ldots \ldots$ Ecdyonirus $0 \cdots \cdots$ Ephemerella

### 3.2 Examination of total population changes

Total numbers of the four main species are given in Graph 1, Figure 4 and Pable 25.

Sample I shows low numbers at all sites. B. scambus is the species showing the most dramatic rise and this takes place before the increase in numbers of the other species. Later a change in the balance occurs with higher numbers of all species in Sample III (6.6.74). A simultaneous rise in the numbers of Ephemerella and Ecdyonurus is found at both sites for fast and medium water. However, the rise for Ecdyonurus is less pronounced in fast water.

The spate of the Wear on July 4 th probably accounts for the drop in numbers, in Sample V at Bishop Auckland on 8th July. The return to higher numbers is noticeable by the next sample date when the river was less turbulent. From the graphs it would appear that Ecdyonurus prefers calmer conditions and there is a rise in numbers to correspond (Sample VI).

The graphs demonstrate that B. scambus numbers drop at all places when Baetis B numbers rise, the rise of Baetis B also corresponds with . a drop in numbers of Ecdyonurus and Ephemerella.

The histograms (Figure 4) show a drop in numbers of Rithrogena with a rise of Ecdyonurus. This could be due to competition (particularly for food and shelter). The change in stone pattern, shifting of stones by the current and change in the velocity of the water must cause changes in the populations even if other factors such as availability of food were to remain constant. It is known that changes in food (the algal population) fluctuate enormously over short periods of time (Patrick,1954) and this too will have a marked effect on the population and growth of Mayfly larvae.


The distribution of different sized larvae in the river can be examined using the data collected.

A chi squared test was applied to those samples having high enough numbers to test. The results are given below:

|  | Fast water |  | Medium water |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| River Deerness | $<4 \mathrm{~mm}$ | . 74 mm | $<4 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 74 mm | $x^{2}$ | p. |
| Baetis scambus |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample II | 102 | 34 | 223 | 36 | 7.54 | $<0.01$ |
| III | 146 | 68 | 106 | 42 | 0.48 | $>0.05$ |
| IV | 170 | 136 | 24 | 36 | 4.87 | <0.05* |
| Baetis B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample V | 386 | 48 | 0 | 0 | Obvio | sly fast |
| VI | 114 | 12 | 132 | 14 | 0.00 | >0.99 |
| River Wear |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B. scambus |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample III | 410 | 34 | 410 | 92 | 23.23 | <0.01* |
| IV | 312 | 42 | 78 | 6 | 1.55 | $>0.05$ |
| V | 114 | 84 | 0 | 0 | Obvi | sly fast erred |

Using the Null Hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the numbers of animals below 4 mm to those above 4 mm in fast and medium water, it can be seen from the above figures that in only three sets of samples is there any significant difference for B. scambus and at the time of the most turbulent water (Sample V) Baetis spp. preferred the fast water exclusively.

Ecdyonurus samples were examined similarly but insufficient numbers were available for chi squared tests to be applied to different sizes of larvae. It is, however, clearly to be seen that Ecdyonurus torrentis in these two rivers prefer medium speed of water to both fast and slow. Ephemerella ignita showed no significant preference when chi squared tests were applied (for either si.te).

The distribution of different sized larvae in different speeds of water has been demonstrated by other workers, e.g. Rawlinson (1939). Harris, (1956) says larger specinens are found in shallower water where there is less current but from the results obtained in this study no conciusive statement can be made regarding the distribution of larvae of different sizes.

Total DryWEIGHT.




GRAPH 2. To show total numbers and dry weights of
BAETIS A \& BAETIS B in size classes $2,4,6+8$ mmfrom sequential samples.

### 3.3. Biomass Results for Baetis spp. and Ecdyonurus

The numbers of animals in various size classes were totalled together with equivalent dry weights - results are given in Tables 14 and 15 and shown graphically (Graphs 2 and 3).

Biomass results are given for Baetis spp. and Ecdyonumus as sufficient numbers of these animals were available for weighing at the same time. Ephemerella, however, had such a speedy life cycle that all the small larvae had disappeared by the time weight measurements were made. Consequently only 8 mm larvae of this species were weighed and no biomass calculations were made for this species.

The quick rise in numbers of B. scambus (Baetis A) early in the study period was followed by a later rise in weight and even though the animals were fewer in number the actual biomass was greater contributing more to the food chain. During May and early June B. scambus contributed the bulk of the mayfly biomass.

I'he importance of size weight ratio is more clearly seen in the case of Ecdyonurus, the total numbers do not give any idea of the biomass for example whilst the number of animals in the fast stretch of the River Deerness remained constant between Sample $V$ and VI the biomass increased twofold - (Graph 3 top). (Numbers and consequently biomass in the River Wear were obviously affected by the spate (Sample V) with a later return to greater biomass (Sample VI) - Sample V numbers have been bypassed on the graph by the dotted line.)

The increase of biomass twofold in a fortnight has very important implications when the food chain of the river is considered - more primary production is converted per animal into food for others in the food chain, and each larva eaten will provide twice the food for predators such as trout.

Total NUMBERS of classes $214,6,8$, and 10 mm .







GRAPH 3 To show total numbers and dry weights of Ecdyonurus insize classes $2,4,6,8 \sigma 10 \mathrm{~mm}$ from sequential samples.

Both genera of mayflies show large fluctuations in biomass which must influence the growth and population of other members of the river fauna and flora. The effect on the food chain is also influenced by the type of primary production available for conversion to secondary production. Fluctuations in the primary production of the rivers are considerable and are often very speedy - a matter of a few days will be enough for the flora of the river to change, (Vollenweider, 1969). Brow, (1961) gives graphs of fluctuations in the food of B. rhodani and Patrick, (1954) gives a method to measure daily changes in the diatom population of rivers.

If it had been possible to determine accurately the total number of animals per unit area of river bed, determinations for total Ephemeropteran biomass could have been attempted, (with a possible comparison of species productivity). Owing to the variability of the river beds and shifting nature of the stones from which these animals were collected, it was not possible from the data obtained in this study to make predictions about total biomass. However, Graphs 2 and 3 give a relative picture of this level of secondary production, for the number of stones selected was constant and only stones of similar size were sampled.

### 3.4. Results of feeding oxperiments and gut analysis

At first it was hoped to grow algae colonies on microscope slides and to allow prestarved mayfly larvae to feed upon the cultured algae. Measurement of algal numbers before and after feeding were to be obtained. After much abortive effort this was abandoned for although it was found possible to culture the algae it was impossible to induce the animals to feed. They either refused to feed altogether and clung to the sides of the container, or died within a few hours after making little or no effort to feed. If a clean stone was introduced they clung to that and at no time did single specimens appear to eat with anything like the normal vigour observed under more natural conditions.

Animals kept in an aquarium tank with aerated river water, stones and a natural growth of plant material, appeared to thrive. Many grew and emerged as adults (Table 12.). They were always seen to be browsing on the walls of the tank and crawling over the stones both during day and night. The small nymphs were not alarmed by movement and shadows falling onto the tank - they would continue to feed even if the light was dramatically altered, whilst the larger nymphs ceased feeding and swam for cover when the light was altered.

After trying to get the animals to feed, an attempt was made to investigate the food they had eaten by examining the contents of their intestines immediately after collection from the river. Dissection showed all the species investigated (Baetis A and B, Ecdyonurus and Ephomerclla) to havc a mixture of brow mashed material of unidentifiable origin, mineral particles, a few cells of filamentous algae and many diatoms. The numbers of diatoms seemed to show a promising line of investigation for the larger animals appeared to contain larger numbers of diatoms - diatoms appeared to be the most consistent factor for all the animals. It was decided to investigate Baetis spp. for this genus showed the highest number of larvae in the samples collected.

The results of gut analysis and diatom counting showed great variability in the possible numbers of diatoms in the gut. This was particularly noticeable with results of animals collected 8.7.74. (Specimens 1B-11B Table No. 16). The animals with smaller numbers of diatoms in the gut were found to have other plant material - mainly Stigeoclonium present.

Brow, (1959) states that different species of Baetis have different diets and after consulting his papers it was decided to repeat gut analysis using distinct species of Baetis namely B. scambus and B. rhodani.

Results of B. scambus (Table 17 ) show relatively low numbers of diatoms, whilst B. rhodani show higher numbers, (Tables 18 and19). Brown, states that the chief food of B. rhodani is deitritus, but this was not found to be so in the specimens investigated. In specimens of B. rhodani bacteria as well as diatoms were present, particularly in 5 mm specimens. Brown, (1961) states that local differences in food available may account for different diets found during his investigations. It would seem from the results of this present study that in the River Deerness when diatoms are plentiful the larvae of B. rhodani 5 mm and larger actively feed on them and on other available plant material.
B. rhodani nymphs smaller than 5 mm were not dissected in this study so no comparative results were obtained for animals $0-1 \mathrm{~mm}$ and 4 mm length. Brown, mainly worked on larvae of these two sizes, together with animals of 6 mm . The larvae from his Red lodge site had large numbers of diatoms in their diet and these numbers fluctuated correspondingly with the fluctuations of the diatoms available in the river. He found evidence for selective feeding.

Evidence in this study would seem to bear out these findings and it is noticeable despite the variability of the results, that the larger 8 mm larvae enjoy a diet with a higher number of diatoms. (The smaller
animals have a lower number and more non diatomaceous material). The result was found to be significant showing the greater number of diatoms in the guts of 8 mm B. rhodani. The statistical test used shows the difference in the number of diatoms to be significant.

To test the significance of the difference between the number of diatoms in the gut contents of 5 mm Baetis rhodeni with the number in 8 mm Baetis rhodani.

$$
\text { Variance }=\left\{\frac{x^{2}}{N}-\bar{x}^{2}\right.
$$

where $x$ is the diatom number
$\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is the mean of all diatom No.
$N$ is No. of counts of $x$

5 min B. rhodani $-\underset{(\text { Table No.18) })}{(\text { SAMPLE A) }} \quad \bar{x}_{a}=1734$

```
variance = standard deviation = S.D. = 104.2
```

$\frac{\text { SoD. }}{\sqrt{N}}=$ standard error $=467.5$ (a)

8 mm B. rhodani $-\underset{(\text { Table No.19 })}{(\text { SAMPLE B) }} \quad \bar{x}_{\text {b }}=4246$

$$
\sqrt{\text { variance }}=\text { S.D. }=2203
$$

$$
\frac{\text { S.D. }}{\sqrt{N}}=\text { S.E. }=987.9(\mathrm{~b})
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{x}_{a}-\bar{x}_{b}=2512 \\
& \text { S.E. of difference }=\sqrt{a^{2}+b^{2}} \\
&=1093 \\
& t=\frac{\text { difference }}{\text { S.E. of difference }}=\frac{2512}{1093}=2.30
\end{aligned}
$$

p>0.05 so difference is significant.

## Results of gut analysis after several hours starvation

The results of starving the animals and examining the gut contents after differing lengths of time showed interesting features.

It has been stated that the usual time for passage of food through the gut is half an hour but that elgee are retained a wile longer, (Brown, 1961). From analysis of the results obtained in this study, all the animals examined retained gut contents for longer than half an hour (the time it took from collecting site to laboratory). Animals kept for six and twelve hours in distilled water before killing, were also found to have considerable numbers of diatoms remaining in the gut (see Tables20,21 and 22.) and that only after eighteen hours were the animals found to have finally removed all diatoms. (Specimen 2D, however, still had a few diatoms left).

Whilst it may be true of smaller Baetis larvae that the usual time for passage of food through the gut is approximately half an hour the above results clearly demonstrate that in many cases for specimens of Baetis the time is considerably longer.

It is also suggested that the results of gut analysis in this study show diatoms to be an important element in the diet of larger larvae, even if this has not been shown for smaller animals (Brown, 1959).

The main types of diatoms found in this investigation are listed (Table 28.) in the appendix.

## 4. General Discussion

Ephemeropteran larvae live only in fresh water. Those studied in this project were found in fast running rivers with stony beds and a high oxygen content in the water. Species normally found in still water such as clöeon dipterum (studied by Brown, 1959) were not investigated. The morphology and life histories of most species have been well investigated by other workers, e.g. Elliot, Harker, Kimmins, Macan and Needham - The list of references refers to some of their works.

The activity patterns of larvae and the effect of temperature on their distribution have also been investigated (Elliot, 1968 and Ide, 1935) but much of the other literature available is of a general nature. Little detailed investigation appears to have been carried out on the place of Ephemeropteran larvae in food chains and the interspecific relationships within a common habitat. To attempt a. detailed investigation and to answer questions satisfactorily regarding the ecology of mayflies requires carefully controlled experiments of long duration - such is the work of Macan (1957) at Ford Wood Beck.

The present study was only of a limited extent, and as it proceeded, more questions arose as a result of the information collected than could be investigated in one early summer season.

Changes in the rivers studied were such that controls in experimental methods were not feasible, e.g. a spate in the river changed the speed of water to different speeds in different places, and drought led to some collecting sites drying up completely.

The sampling technique employed has some disadvantages but it does allow for comparative sampling (Macan, 1958 b ) and many of the sampling errors incurred are common to all the samples.

The results brought out some interesting comparisons between rivers - the temperature of the water in the larger river being usually less than that in the smaller river - but not subject to such variation over short periods of time. The largest animals caught per sample were nearly always from the Deerness (Graphs 4-7 in appendix) the only exceptions being Sample I Baetis and Sample IV Ecdyonurus.

The population of larvae was also higher at Ushaw Moor (Deerness) than at Bishop Auckland (Wear) except in the case of Baetis A (Figures 1A and 4) where the reverse was true. The Deerness therefore appears to be a more favourable habitat for larvae of Ephemerella, Ecdyonurus and Baetis B.

The changes in populations from May to July show many parallels in the two rivers and the growth pattern shows a slower development of most species in the Wear. As growth and maturity is said to be temperature dependent (Harris, 1956) this could account for slower growth in the Wear.

Population changes in biomsss as well as numbers, could well be examined further but weighings of the animals should have been made from the start of the project so that Fithrogena, Caenis and Ephemerella could all have been estimated whilst they were available. The speed at which some species of larvae mature (e.g. Ephemerella) and the fact that only one generation was to be seen during the course of the project was not appreciated until too late, and the animals had flow. This meant that comparable valid results could not be obtained during this season except in the case of Baetis and Ecdyonurus.

Comparison of fluctuating diatom and larval numbers could well provide interesting future study - the diatom results from the gut analysis show great fluctuations and this may be due to availability. Animals in samples were collected all at once (dates are given on the Tables) but sampling was spread over a period of weeks. The vast numbers
of larvae all feeding in June must make a great demand on available food and if this is not met, starvation could result in migration, slower growth or death. Variation in numbers of diatoms in larvae may be due to feeding preferences but it may also reflect availability, (Brown, 1961).

With the observations made during the investigation it would now be possible to redesign some of the methods and construct new experiments to try to answer some of the problems arising out of the study. Variations in river habitats are difficult to measure accurately and investigation over several seasons would be necessary in order to balance the fluctuations of factors such as flooding, drought, early and late seasons and changes in available food - all of which must affect the life of Ephemeropteran larvae.

## 5. Summary

1. By examination of sequential samples the growth and changing populations of Ephemeropteran larvae (in the Rivers Deerness and Wear) have been demonstrated.
2. The relative biomass of Baetis and Ecdyonurus have been calculated for numbers collected in the samples.
3. The diets of Baetis spp. have been investigated (using gut analysis) and are shown to have diatoms as an important component.

All these results lead to the conclusion that the influence of Ephemeropteran larvae as members of the river fauna have a profound effect on the ecology of a river. These animals obviously have a warked effect on the primary production of the river, by eating considerable quantities of plant material and they in turn provide a substantial food source for other animals. The vast numbers of larvae and the available biomass and food source they represent indicate: the importance of these animals in the ecology of fresh water and the food chains found in rivers.
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8. Appendix

SIZE AND NUMBER OF ANDMALS - 20 stones

|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Length } \\ & \text { in mm. } \end{aligned}$ | 16.5.74 | 23.5.74 | 6.6.74 | 20.6.74 | 8.7 .74 | 18.7 .74 |
| BAETIS | 2 | 12 | 30 | 44 | 30 | 232 | 38 |
|  | 3 | 23 | 38 | 52 | 72 | 104 | 42 |
|  | 4 | 28 | 38 | 56 | 80 | 66 | 58 |
|  | 5 | 13 | 25 | 28 | 68 | 40 | 16 |
|  | 6 | 8 | 12 | 33 | 60 | 22 | 2 |
|  | 7 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 20 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 8 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ECDYONURUS | 2 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 8 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 |
|  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
|  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EPHEMERELLA |  | 0 | 23 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 6 | 48 | 38 | 2 | 4 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 112 | 14 | 8 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 78 | 26 | 8 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 42 | 6 | 4 |
|  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RITHROGENA | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CAENIS | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

SIZE AND NUMBER OF ANINALS - 20 stones

|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length in mm . | 16.5.74 | 23.5.74 | 6.6.74 | 20.6.74 | 8.7.74 | 18.7.74 |
| BAETIS | 2 | 0 | 105 | 32 | 2 | 18 | 68 |
|  | 3 | 5 | 66 | 42 | 12 | 10 | 46 |
|  | 4 | 5 | 57 | 32 | 10 | 10 | 38 |
|  | 5 | 2 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 10 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 18 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ECDYONURUS | 2 | 0 | 29 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 5 | 98 | 10 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 12 | 8 | 4 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 10 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 2 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 8 |
|  | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
|  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
|  | 12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 15 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EPHENERELLA | 2 | 0 | 26 | 24 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 15 | 60 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 6 | 132 | 32 | 12 | 2 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 1 | 68 | 34 | 22 | 2 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 28 | 4 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 24 | 8 |
|  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 2 |
| CAENIS | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |



|  |  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Length } \\ & \text { in } \mathrm{mm} \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | 9.5.74 | 23.5.74 | 6.6 .74 | 20.6.74 | 8.7 .74 | 18.7 .74 |
| BAETIS | 2 | 1 | 1 | 150 | 28 | 28 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 2 | 6 | 156 | 170 | 52 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 3 | 106 | 130 | 92 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 34 | 48 | 2 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 28 | 2 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
|  | 9 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ECDYONURUS | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 6 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
|  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
|  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EPHEMERELLA | 2 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 12 | 4 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 24 | 20 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 26 | 52 | 4 |
|  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 32 | 44 | 6 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 28 | 4 |
|  | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 |
| RITHROGENA | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 7 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CAENIS | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

RIVER WEAR. BISHOP AUCKLAND - MEDIUM SPEED WATER
SIZE AND NUMBER OF ANIMALS - 20 stones


RIVER WEAR. BISHOP AUCKLAND - SLOW RUNNING WATER
SIZE AND NUMBERS OF ANDMALS - 20 stones


## Number of animals per size class. Baetis A/Baetis B.

Baetis $\mathrm{A}=$ B.scambus and $\mathrm{B}_{0}=\underline{\text { B.rhodani }}+$ B. muticus

River Deerness

| Length in mm . FAST 2 | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B |
|  | 12 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 232 | 4 | 34 |
| 3 | 23 | 0 | 37 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 64 | 6 | 10 | 104 | 4 | 38 |
| 4 | 25 | 3 | 35 | 3 | 52 | 4 | 80 | 0 | 16 | 50 | 20 | 38 |
| 5 | 10 | 3 | 18 | 7 | 28 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 2 | 40 | 6 | 10 |
| 6 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 26 | 12 | 54 | - 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| 7 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | I | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MEDIUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 2 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 12 | 56 |
| 3 | 5 | 0 | 63 | 3 | 42 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 42 |
| 4 | 5 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 34 |
| 5 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

```
Baetis A = B.scambus and B. = B.rhodani + B. muticus
```

River Wear

| Length in mm. FAST 2 | I |  | II |  | III |  | TV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B | A | B |
|  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 160 | 10 | 48 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 104 | 2 | 124 | 6 | 72 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 32 | 2 | 48 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MEDIUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 5 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| River Deerness |  |  | River Wear |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Date |  | Date |  |
| I | 16.5 .74 | I | 9.5 .74 |  |
| II | 23.5 .74 | II | 23.5 .74 |  |
| III | 6.6 .74 | III | 6.6 .74 |  |
| IV | 20.6 .74 | IV | 20.6 .74 |  |
| V | 8.7 .74 | V | 8.7 .74 |  |
| VI | 18.7 .74 | VI | 18.7 .74 |  |

Grid references for sampling points
River Deernoss River Near
NZ. 227423 NZ. 201311

Average speed of water

| River | Deerness | River Wear |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FAST | 43.8 metres $/$ minute | FAST | $75 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$ |
| MEDIUM | $25.8 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$ | MEDIOM | $34 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$ |
| SLOW | $12.0 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$ | SLOW | $4.4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$ |

## River Wear at Bishop Auckland



TABLE NO. 11.

|  | $\frac{\text { Area of }}{\text { base of }}$ | No. of animals |  | $\frac{\text { Area of }}{\text { base of }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {stone }}$ | $\frac{\text { No. of }}{\text { animals }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BISHOP <br> AUCKLAND <br> 10 stones from:- | sa.cm- | 1 | DURHAM SANDS | $\frac{\mathrm{sg} . \mathrm{cm}}{150}$ | 1 |
|  | 132 |  | slow |  |  |
|  | 117 | 1 |  | 110 | 3 |
|  | 72 | 5 |  | 126 | 1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { slow running } \\ & \text { water } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 1 |  | 224 | 3 |
|  | 150 | 2 |  | 54 | 0 |
|  | 88 | 2 |  | 99 | 0 |
|  | 160 | 1 |  | 144 | 1 |
|  | 187 | 0 * |  | 240 | 0 |
|  | 100 | 2 |  | 117 | 7 |
|  | 143 | 2 |  | 45 | 0 |
| medium | 96 | 9 | medium | 98 | 1 |
|  | 140 | 1 |  | 180 | 2 |
|  | 108 | 3 |  | 242 | 1 |
|  | 80 | 5 |  | 63 | 3 |
|  | 160 | 2 |  | 187 | 0 |
|  | 105 | 7 |  | 99 | 2 |
|  | 49 | 0 * |  | 88 | 2 |
|  | 80 | 3 |  | 70 | 2 |
|  | 72 | 1 |  | 56 | 0 |
|  | 130 | 1 |  | 72 | 0 |
| fast | 165 | 4* | fast | 88 | 0 |
|  | 88 | 5 |  | 154 | 0 |
|  | 64 | $10 \%$ |  | 56 | 1 |
|  | 77 | 3 |  | 99 | 1 |
|  | 80 | 2 |  | 72 | 0 |
|  | 96 | 1 |  | 72 | 0 |
|  | 120 | 1 |  | 56 | 2 |
|  | 80 | 2 |  | 88 | 1 |
|  | 126 | 4 |  | 195 | 1 |
|  | 56 | 6 |  | 90 | 0 |

[^0]|  | Date of emergence |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | subimago | fullimago | Species |
| 1. | 23.5 .74 | 24.5 .74 | Ecdyonurus torrentis |
| 2. | 25.5 .74 | 25.5 .74 | E. torrentis |
| 3. | 27.5 .74 | 28.5 .74 | Baetis scambus |
| 4. | 17.6 .74 | 18.6 .74 | B. maticus |
| 5. | 28.6 .74 | 29.6 .74 | Baetis sp. ? |
| 6. | 1.7 .74 | 1.7 .74 | B. muticus |
| 7. | 9.7 .74 | 11.7 .74 | Ephemerella ignita |
| 8. | 14.7 .74 | 15.7 .74 | Baetis rhodani |
| 9. | 17.7 .74 | 19.7 .74 | B. rhodani |
| 10. | 20.7 .74 | 21.7 .74 | B. rhodani |
| 11. | 21.7 .74 | 21.7 .74 | Ephemerella ignita |
| 12. | 21.7 .74 | 21.7 .74 | E. ignita |
| 13. | 13.8 .74 | 13.8 .74 | E. ignita |
| 14. | 14.8 .74 |  | B. maticus flew away as |
|  |  |  |  |

TABLE NO. 13.

## Weights of larvae after drying (given in milligrams)

Several animals a class size were dried at $102^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and weighed, redried and reweighed to constant weight.

Final results (after division of weight for single animal weights) were as below.

|  | Length in <br> BAETIS | Dry wt. of <br> single larva |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | 2 | 0.035 mg |
|  | 4 | 0.13. |
|  | 6 | 0.67 |
|  | 8 | 0.96 |
| ECDYONURUS | 2 | 0.26 |
|  | 4 | 0.68 |
|  | 6 | 3.91 |
|  | 8 | 4.42 |
|  | 10 | 5.81 |
| EPHEMERELILA | 8 | 2.45 |
|  |  | . |

Relative weights in milligrams of samples of Baetis A and Baetis B. BAETIS A $=$ B. scambus and BAETIS $\mathrm{B}=$ B.rhodani + B.muticus

River Deerness

|  | SAMPLE | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length in mm. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. |
| FAST <br> BAETIS A | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 25 \\ 6 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.42 \\ & 3.25 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 0.96 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ 35 \\ 12 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.05 \\ 4.55 \\ 8.0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 44 \\ 52 \\ 26 \\ 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.54 \\ 6.76 \\ 17.4 \\ 5.76 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26 \\ 80 \\ 54 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0.91 \\ 10.4 \\ 36.2 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 16 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 2.08 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 20 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.14 \\ 2.6 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |
| BAETIS B | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0.39 \\ 1.34 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0.39 \\ 0 \\ 3.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 4 \\ 12 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.52 \\ & 8.0 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 6 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ 0 \\ 4.0 \\ 3.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 232 \\ 50 \\ 22 \\ 4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.12 \\ 6.5 \\ 14.7 \\ 3.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ 38 \\ 2 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.19 \\ 4.94 \\ 1.34 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |
| MEDIOM <br> BAETIS A | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 0 5 0 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0.65 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} 103 \\ 57 \\ 18 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.6 \\ 7.4 \\ 12.1 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ 32 \\ 16 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.12 \\ 4.16 \\ 10.7 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 10 \\ 8 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ 1.3 \\ 5.4 \\ 0 \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18 \\ 10 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.63 \\ 1.3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 4 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.42 \\ 0.52 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |
| BAETIS B | 2 4 6 8 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 | 2 0 0 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.07 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.96 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56 \\ 34 \\ 12 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.96 \\ 4.42 \\ 8.0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |

Relative weights in milligrams of samples of Baetis A and Baetis B.

## River Wear

|  | SAMPLE | I |  | II |  | - III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length <br> in mm. | Ño. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. |
| BAETIS A | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.035 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0.96 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0.035 \\ 0.39 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{r} 150 \\ 104 \\ 12 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.25 \\ 13.5 \\ 8.04 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 28 \\ 124 \\ 10 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 0.98 \\ 16.1 \\ 6.7 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ 72 \\ 24 \\ 8 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 0.84 \\ 9.36 \\ 16.1 \\ 7.7 \end{gathered}\right.$ | 0 0 2 0 | r 0 0 1.34 0 |
| BAETIS B | 2 4 6 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0.26 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 6 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0.78 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 20 \\ 4 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ 2.6 \\ 2.68 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 |
| MEDIUM <br> BAETIS A | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.39 \\ & 0.67 \\ & 2.88 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 237 \\ 68 \\ 8 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.29 \\ 8.84 \\ 5.36 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 114 \\ 130 \\ 18 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 3.99 \\ 16.9 \\ 12.1 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 36 \\ 2 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.35 \\ 4.68 \\ 1.34 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | 0 2 0 0 | 0 0.26 0 0 |
| BAETIS B | 2 4 6 8 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 2 8 2 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 0.07 \\ 1.04 \\ 1.34 \end{array}$ |

TABLE NO. 14. (cont.)

Total Baetis weights (in milligrams) of size classes 2, 4, 6 and 8 mm added together

Baetis A - B. scambus
Baetis B - B. muticus and B. rhodani

## River Deerness

|  | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAST | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. |
| Baetis A | 44 | 8.63 | 77 | 12.6 | 128 | 31.46 | 260 | 47.51 | 16 | 2.08 | 24 | 2.74 |
| Baetis B | 5 | 1.73 | 7 | 4.19 | 18 | 9.42 | 14 | 7.94 | 308 | 33.12 | 74 | 7.45 |
| MEDIUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baetis A | 5 | 0.65 | 178 | 23.1 | 80 | 15.98 | 20 | 6.77 | 28 | 1.93 | 16 | 0.94 |
| Baetis B | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.03 | 2 | 1.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 14.38 |

River Wear

|  | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAST | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. |
| Baetis A <br> Baetis B | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0.99 0 | 4 0 | 0.43 0 | 266 | 26.8 0.26 | 162 6 | 23.78 0.78 | 128 | 34.0 5.42 | 2 0 | 1.34 0 |
| MEDIUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baetis A <br> Baetis B | 7 0 | 3.94 0 | 303 |  | 262 | 32.99 | 48 0 | 6.37 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 12 | 0.26 2.45 |


|  | SAMPLE | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length <br> in mm. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Vt. | No. | Wt. |
| FAST | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 4 \\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0.68 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.04 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ 12 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.24 \\ 8.16 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 2 4 6 2 0 | $\begin{gathered} 0.52 \\ 2.72 \\ 23.4 \\ 8.8 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 8 \\ 10 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.04 \\ 5.44 \\ 39 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 0 0 8 12 2 | 0 0 31.2 52.8 11.6 |
| MEDIUM | 2 4 6 8 10 | $\left.\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned} \right\rvert\,$ | 0 0 0 4.4 5.8 | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.54 \\ 0.68 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 66 \\ 30 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.16 \\ 20.4 \\ 7.8 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 10 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 8.16 \\ 46.8 \\ 44 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r}0 \\ 8 \\ 14 \\ 8 \\ 2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 0 <br> 5.44 <br> 54.6 <br> 35.2 <br> 11.6 | 0 4 2 8 6 | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2.72 \\ 7.8 \\ 35.2 \\ 34.8 \end{gathered}$ |

## River Wear

|  | SAMPLE | I |  | II |  | III |  | IV |  | V |  | VI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Length <br> in mm . | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. | No. | Wt. |
| FAST | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 4 \\ 6 \\ 8 \\ 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.52 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 16 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.12 \\ 10.88 \\ 7.8 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 14 \\ 16 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.56 \\ 9.52 \\ 62.4 \\ 11.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 4 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 2.72 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 4 \\ 62 \\ 125 \\ 63 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2.72 \\ 23.4 \\ 52.8 \\ 34.8 \end{gathered}$ |
| MEDIUM | 2 4 6 8 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 4.4 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.78 \\ 0.68 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 20 \\ 4 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.12 \\ 13.6 \\ 15.6 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 4 32 14 4 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.04 \\ & 21.76 \\ & 54.6 \\ & 17.6 \\ & 34.8 \end{aligned}$ | 0 2 4 2 4 4 | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 1.36 \\ 15.6 \\ 8.8 \\ 23.2 \end{array}$ | 0 4 14 4 4 | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 2.72 \\ 54.6 \\ 17.6 \\ 23.2 \end{gathered}$ |

TABLE NO. 15. (cont.)

Total Ecdyonumus weights (in milligrams) of size classes $2,4,6,8$ and 10 mm added together

River Deerness

|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAST | 0.68 | 1.04 | 14.40 | 35.44 | 45.48 | 105.6 |
| Weight <br> No. of animals <br> 1 | 4 | 36 | 14 | 22 | 22 |  |
| MEDIUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weight <br> No. of animals | 2 | 30 | 98 | 34 | 32 | 20 |

## River Wear

|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAST <br> Weight <br> No. of animals | 0 | 0.52 | 21.8 | 85.08 | 2.72 | 113.72 |
| 2 | 30 | 38 | 4 | 28 |  |  |
| MEDIUM <br> Weight <br> No. of animals | 1.4 | 1.46 | 32.32 | 129.8 | 48.96 | 98.12 | Using Haemocytometer slide $1 \mathrm{mn}^{2} \times \frac{1}{10} \mathrm{~mm}$ Deep $\quad 30.6 .74$

Specimen 1A． 8 mm long． Tube capacity 0.49 mi ．

Specimen 2A． 6 mm long．
Tube capacity 0.46 ml ．

Specimen 3A． 7 mm long．
Tube capacity 0.49 ml ．

| Count No． | Diatoms <br> per count | $\frac{\text { No．diatoms }}{\text { per gut }}$ <br> 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 4 | 1960 |
| 3 | 2 | 980 |
| 4 | 3 | 1470 |
| 5 | 4 | 2450 |
|  |  | 1960 |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 | 4 | 1840 |
| 3 | 4 | 3680 |
| 4 | 9 | 1840 |
| 5 | 3 | 4140 |
|  |  | 1380 |
| 1 | 21 |  |
| 2 | 15 | 10290 |
| 3 | 11 | 7350 |
| 4 | 16 | 5390 |
| 5 | 18 | 7840 |
|  |  | 8820 |
|  |  |  |

## Counts from specimens collected on 8．7．74．

Specimen 1B．8um long．
Tube capacity 0.49 ml ．

Specimen 2B．
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { length．} & 8 \mathrm{~mm} \\ \text { tube } & 0.46 \mathrm{ml} .\end{array}$
（Stigeoclonium present in gut contents）

Specimen 3B．
length 9 mm
tube． 0.49 ml ．
（Stigeoclonium present in gut）

| vown：－ | GAWNr | vawnr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| トだったい | かひぁがす。 | 成和以品 |
|  |  |  |

TABLE NO. 16. (cont.)
77.

|  | Count No. | Diatoms | $\frac{\text { No. diatoms }}{\text { per gut }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Specimen 4B. | 1 | 11 | 5170 |
| length 8 mm | 2 | 6 | 2820 |
| tube 0.47 ml . | 3 | 4 | 1880 |
| 俍 0.47 me. | 4 | 9 | 4230 |
| (Filamentous algae present in gut) | 5 | 4 | 1880 |
| Specimen 5B. | 1 | 2 | 920 |
| length 8 mm | 2 | 5 | 2300 |
| tube 0.46 ml . | 3 | 4 | 1840 |
| (Stigeoclonium present | 4 | 6 | 2760 |
| (Stigeoclonium present in quantity) | 5 | 4 | 1840 |
| Specimen 6B. | 1 | 21 | 10290 |
| length 7 7 mm |  | 39 | 17940 |
| tube 0.49 ml . | 4 | 67 | 32830 |
|  | 5 | 30 | 14700 |
| Specimen 78. | 1 | 41 | 20910 |
| length 8 mm | 2 | 32 | 16320 |
| tube 0.51 ml . | 3 | 32 | 16320 |
|  | 4 | 19 | 9690 |
|  | 5 | 41 | 20910 |
| Specimen 8B. | 1 | 54 | 28080 |
| length 7 mm | 2 | 20 | 10400 |
| tube 0.52 ml . | 3 | 24 | 12480 |
|  | 5 | 23 | 11960 |
| Specimen 98. | 1 | 4 | 1840 |
| length 6 mm | 2 | 4 | 1840 |
| . tube 0.46 ml . | 3 | 3 | 1380 |
|  | 4 | 2 | 920 |
| (Filamentous greon algae present in quantity) | 5 | 8 | 3680 |
| Specimen 10B. | 1 | 18 | 8820 |
| length 6 mm | 2 | 21 | 10290 |
| tube 0.49 ml . | 3 4 | 11 | 5390 |
|  | 5 | 18 | 8820 |
| Specimen 11B. | 1 | 15 | 6900 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { length } & 6 \mathrm{~mm} \\ \text { tube } & 0.46 \mathrm{ml} . \end{array}$ | 2 | 9 | 4140 |
|  | 3 | 8 | 3680 |
|  | 4 | 12 | 5520 |
|  | 5 | 9 | 4140 |

## Counts after $\frac{1}{2}$ hour captivity

Snecimen Sl.
length 4 mm
tube 0.46 ml .

Specimen S2.
length 4 mm
tube 0.46 ml .

Spacimen S3.
length 3 mm
tube 0.50 ml .
(Remains of xylem vessels from dicot plants in gut)

| Count No. | Diatoms <br> per count | $\frac{\text { No. diatoms }}{\text { per gut }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 7 | 3200 |
| 2 | 4 | 1840 |
| 3 | 5 | 2300 |
| 4 | 4 | 1840 |
| 5 | 4 | 1840 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 | 2760 |
| 2 | 4 | 1840 |
| 3 | 3 | 1380 |
| 4 | 2 | 920 |
| 5 | 3 | 1380 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 1000 |
| 2 | 3 | 1500 |
| 3 | 1 | 500 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 500 |
|  |  |  |

Material collected 10.8.74. R. Deerness
Animal guts removed $\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{hr}$. after collection

Specimen 6R.
Tube capacity 0.51 ml .
(Bacteria present in quantity)

Specimen 7R.
Tube capacity 0.51 ml .
(Bacteria present in quantity)

Specimen 8R.
Tube capacity 0.48 ml .
(Bacteria present in quantity)

Specimen 9R.
Tube capacity 0.48 ml .
(Bacteria present in quantity)

Specimen 10R.
Tube capacity 0.47 ml .
(Some bacteria present)

| Count No. | per count | Calculated total number of Diatoms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 | 1530 |
| 2 | 3 | 1530 |
| 3 | 1 | 510 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 1020 |
| 1 | 10 | 5100 |
| 2 | 3 | 1530 |
| 3 | 4 | 2040 |
| 4 | 7 | 3570 |
| 5 | 9 | 4590 |
| 1 | 3 | 1440 |
| 2 | 3 | 1440 |
| 3 | 6 | 2880 |
| 4 | 9 | 4320 |
| 5 | 5 | 2400 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 480 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 5 | 2400 |
| 1 | 1 | 470 |
| 2 | 1 | 470 |
| 3 | 3 | 1410 |
| 4 | 3 | 1410 |
| 5 | 6 | 2820 |

## Diatom counts from Baetis rhodani - 8 mm specimens

Material collected 10.8.74. R. Deerness
Animal guts removed $\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{hr}$. after collection

Specimen 1R.
Tube capacity 0.50 ml .

## Specimen 2R.

Tube capacity 0.48 ml .

Specimen 3R.
Tube capacity 0.49 ml .

Specimen 4R.
Tube capacity 0.50 ml .

Specimen 5R.
Tube capacity 0.49 ml .

| Count No. | Diatoms <br> per count | $\frac{\text { Calculated }}{\text { total number }}$ <br> of Diatoms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 2500 |
| 2 | 7 | 3500 |
| 3 | 6 | 3000 |
| 4 | 5 | 2500 |
| 5 | 5 | 2500 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 3 | 1440 |
| 2 | 5 | 2400 |
| 3 | 4 | 1920 |
| 4 | 2 | 960 |
| 5 | 4 | 1920 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 17 | 8330 |
| 2 | 15 | 7350 |
| 3 | 15 | 7350 |
| 4 | 9 | 4410 |
| 5 | 11 | 5390 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 19 | 9500 |
| 2 | 13 | 6500 |
| 3 | 11 | 5500 |
| 4 | 12 | 6000 |
| 5 | 17 | 8500 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 3 | 1470 |
| 2 | 4 | 1960 |
| 3 | 8 | 2940 |
| 4 | 10 | 4900 |
| 5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Counts after 6 hours in distilled water at $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

|  |  | Count No. | $\frac{\text { Diatoms }}{\text { per count }}$ | $\frac{\text { No. diatoms }}{\text { per gut }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Specimen S S $^{\text {S }}$ |  | 1 | 4 | 1960 |
|  | 4 mm | 2 | 3 | 1470 |
| tube | 0.49 ml . | 3 | 1 | 490 |
|  |  | 4 | 3 | 1470 |
|  |  | 5 | 2 | 980 |
| Specimen S5 |  | 1 | 2 | 980 |
|  | 4 mm | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| tube | 0.46 ml . | 3 | 1 | 460 |
|  |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 5 | 1 | 460 |
| Specimen S6 |  | 1 | 1 | 490 |
| length tube | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \mathrm{~mm} \\ & 0.49 \mathrm{ml} . \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 4 | 2 | 980 |
|  |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Specimen S7 |  | 1 | 2 | 960 |
| length tube |  | 2 | 1 | 480 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \mathrm{~mm} \\ & 0.48 \mathrm{mll} . \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Specimen S8 |  | 1 | 2 | 980 |
| length tube | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \mathrm{~mm} \\ & 0.49 \mathrm{ml} \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 1 | 490 |
|  |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 5 | 1 | 490 0 |

Specimen 1C.
length 7 mm tube 0.49 ml .

Specimen 2C.
length 8 mm tube 0.46 ml .

| Count No. | Diatoms <br> per. count | No. diatoms <br> per_gut |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 8 | 3920 |
| 2 | 4 | 1960 |
| 3 | 8 | 3920 |
| 4 | 5 | 2450 |
| 5 | 9 | 4410 |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 9 | 4140 |
| 2 | 5 | 2300 |
| 3 | 2 | 920 |
| 4 | 6 | 2760 |
| 5 | 8 | 3680 |
|  |  |  |

Specimen 1D.
length 6 mm tube 0.46 ml .

Specimen 2D.
length 8mm tube 0.49 ml .

Specimen 3D.
length 5 mm
tube 0.51 ml .

Specimen 4D.
length 6 mm
tube 0.49 ml .

Specimen 5D.
length 5 mm
tube 0.49 ml .

Specimen 6D.
length 4 mm
tube 0.48 ml .

| Count No. | $\underline{\text { Diatoms }}$ per count |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 2* |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 |

## Numbers of Stones in $50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{sq}$. on bed of river

River Wear, Bishop Auckland

| Stones from slow running water. Width of River 21.25m. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sample No. | No. of Stones |
| 1 | 12 |
| 2 | 9 |
| 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 17 |
| 5 | 13 |
| Medium speed water. | Width of River 21.25in. |
| 1 | 14 |
| 2 | 15 |
| 3 | 14 |
| 4 | 12 |
| 5 | 14 |
| Fast speed water. | Width of River 7.92m. |
| 1 | 6 |
| 2 | 8 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 9 |
| 5 | 10 |
| River Deerness - Ushaw Moor |  |
| Slow speed water. | Width of River 9.17m |
| Sample No. | No. of Stones |
| 1 | 20 |
| 2 | 19 |
| 3 | 17 |
| 4 | 17 |
| 5 | 16 |

River Deerness - Ushaw Moor (continued)
Medium speed water.
Width of River 10m.


TABLE NO. 24.

## Animal defescation in distilled water in $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Floom

Freshly caught animals kept in 20 ml centrifuge tubes in aerated distilled water.

## Ephemerella

| 2.7 .74 | 3.00 p.m. | 2 specimens in 2 tubes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.7 .74 | 3.00 p.m. | Specimens removed from tubes. |
|  | Tubes cent from water | ged - live and dead diatoms recovered |
| 3.7 .74 | $11.00 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$. | 2 specimens in 2 tubes. |
|  | 3.00 p.m. | Specimens removed. |
|  | Tubes cent from water | ged - live and dead diatoms recovered |

## Ecdyonurus

| 2.7 .74 | 3.00 p.m. $\quad 2$ specimens in 2 tubes. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3.7 .74 | 3.00 p.m. $\quad$ Both dead - removed. |
|  | Tubes centrifuged - live and dead diatoms recovered <br> from water. |

## Baetis

| 2.7 .74 | $3.00 \mathrm{p.m} \quad$.5 specimens in 2 tubes. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3.7 .74 | $3.00 \mathrm{p.m}$.$\quad All dead.$ |
|  | Tubes centrifuged - live and dead diatoms recovered <br> from water. |


| SITE | BAET'IS A | BAETIS B | ECDYONURUS | EPHEMERELLA | RITHROGENA | CAENIS | SAMPLE NUMBER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIVER | 82 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | I |
| DEERNESS | 136 | 21 | 6 | 41 | 0 | 0 | II |
|  | 214 | 22 | 52 | 150 | 0 | 2 | III |
| FAST | 306 | 27 | 22 | 304 | 0 | 0 | IV |
|  | 28 | 434 | 52 | 48 | 0 | 0 | V |
|  | 34 | 122 | 40 | 27 | 0 | 0 | VI |
| TOTAL | 800 | 635 | 180 | 570 | 1 | 3 |  |
| $\frac{\text { RTVER }}{\text { DEERNESS }}$ | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | I |
|  | 259 | 9 | 37 | 48 | 0 | 1 | II |
|  | 148 | 8 | 206 | 352 | 0 | 10 | III |
| MEDIUM | 60 | 0 | 52 | 138 | 0 | 2 | IV |
|  | 38 | 0 | 60 | 98 | 0 | 0 | V |
|  | 28 | 146 | 32 | 18 | 0 | 0 | VI |
| TOTAL | 545 | 163 | 399 | 654 | 0 | 13 |  |
| RTVER | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 0 | I |
|  | 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | II |
|  | 444 | 8 | 54 | 88 | 6 | 0 | III |
| FAST | 354 | 18 | 62 | 148 | 0 | 0 | IV |
|  | 228 | 32 | 4 | 160 | 0 | 0 | V |
|  | 4 | 0 | 46 | 14 | 0 | 0 | VI |
| TOTAL | 1046 | 58 | 170 | 414 | 39 | 7 |  |
| $\frac{\text { RIVER }}{\text { WEAR }}$ | 18 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 0 | I |
|  | 435 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 5 | 9 | II |
|  | 502 | 0 | 52 | 80 | 0 | 0 | III |
| MEDIUM | 84 | 0 | 138 | 184 | 0 | 0 | IV |
|  | 0 | 0 | 20 | 108 | 0 | 0 | V |
|  | 12 | 20 | 48 | 90 | 0 | 0 | VI |
| TOTAL | 1051 | 20 | 273 | 479 | 16 | 9 |  |


|  |  |  |  | Length | Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baetis sp. | R. Wear <br> H. Deerness <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Wear <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Wear | Fast <br> Slow <br> Fast <br> Fast <br> Medium <br> Medium <br> Fast <br> Fast <br> Fast | $\begin{array}{r} 9.5 .74 \\ 16.5 .74 \\ 16.5 .74 \\ 23.5 .74 \\ 23.5 .74 \\ 6.6 .74 \\ 6.6 .74 \\ 20.6 .74 \\ 8.7 .74 \end{array}$ | 9 mm <br> llmm <br> 12 mm <br> 10 mm <br> 7 mm <br> 8 mm <br> 8 mm <br> 8 mm <br> 9 mm <br> 8 mm | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 5 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ecdyonurus | R. Wear <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Deerness <br> R. Wear <br> R. Deerness | Fast <br> Medium <br> Slow <br> Medium | $\begin{gathered} 9.5 .74 \\ 16.5 .74 \\ 23.5 .74 \\ 6.6 .74 \end{gathered}$ | 13 mm 14 mm 15 mm All above 13 mm All $14,15+$ 16 mm 15 mm 12 mm 16 mm $15+16 \mathrm{~mm}$ All $\mathrm{B} . \mathrm{W}$. 15 mm | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ <br> 2 <br> 1 $1$ |
| Ephemerella All 8 mm larvae had Black Wing cases. | All 8 mm larvae had Black Wing cases. |  |  |  |  |
| Rithrogena | R. Wear | Fast <br> Medium | 9.5.74 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |

## TABLE NO. 27.

Animal Survival in $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Room

Freshly caught animals kept in 250ml beakers in aerated river water. (18 hours Light, 6 hours Dark)

## Sample 1.

14.6 .74
17.6 .74
18.6 .74

6 Baetis alive
1 Baetis alive
18.6 .74

All dead

## Sample 2.

| 14.6 .74 | 2 Ecdyonurus |
| :--- | :--- |
| 17.6 .74 | 1 Ecdyonurus |
| 18.6 .74 | All dead |

Sample 3.

| 21.6 .74 | 6 Baetis alive |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2.4 .6 .74 | All dead |

Sample 4 .

| 25.6 .74 | 4 | Ephemerella |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.7 .74 | 4 | Ephemerella |
| 5.7 .74 | 4 | Ephemerella |
| 6.7 .74 | All dead |  |

Sample 5.

| 25.6 .74 | 6 Baetis +1 Ecdyonurus alive |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.7 .74 | All dead |

The following types of diatoms were found in the gut contents of Ephemeropteran nymphs examined from the River Deerness:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Naricula sp. } \\
& \text { Pinnularia sp. } \\
& \text { Gomphonema sp. } \\
& \text { Nitzschia sp. } \\
& \text { Cymbella sp. } \\
& \text { Achnanthes sp. } \\
& \text { Coccoeneis sp. }
\end{aligned}
$$

The first three genera were the most commonly found in the animals investigated.

To show larqest anumal caught persanjble in R. Deerness and R.uear

Baeticsp. -fast water.



To show size of largest animal caught per sample. m Rue Deerness and Rue wear.

Exdypmens.sp. Fast speed water


Sample numbers $\rightarrow$
GRAPH 5.




[^0]:    \# There appears to be no correlation between size of stone and number of animals caught.

