# THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

PREDICTING LAKE TROUT PRESENCE AND ABSENCE IN SASKATCHEWAN LAKES USING HABITAT CRITERIA

by



# A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE

> DEPARTMENT OF ZOOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

> > April 1989



National Library of Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Bibliothèque nationale

du Canada

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable nonexclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission. L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-51593-7



# PREDICTING LAKE TROUT PRESENCE AND ABSENCE IN SASKATCHEWAN LAKES USING HABITAT CRITERIA

ΒY

ROBERT G. WALLACE

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

© **1989** 

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

#### ABSTRACT

Habitat characteristics (morphometry, physicochemistry, temperature, oxygen, and biota) and fish species data were extracted from reports of lake surveys on 330 lakes in central and northern Saskatchewan. Differences in the habitat of lakes, and criteria to predict lake trout presence or absence, were examined using non-parametric statistical methods. Habitat differed significantly between lakes with and without lake trout, and several variables predicted lake trout status at 90 % or better accuracy.

In Precambrian shield lakes, lake trout need a minimum of -2 hm<sup>3</sup> water below  $15^{\circ}$ C and above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen (96 % accuracy) or 10 hm<sup>3</sup> water between 6° and  $15^{\circ}$ C, during early to late summer. These threshold volumes appear to determine population survival during a critical period, which may be relatively brief. This may be related to observed densities of lake trout and to the presumed minimum number of mature lake trout in each lake.

The importance of maximum depth is believed to be due to its effects on temperature, oxygen, and/or sediment conditions. Clearing of spawning areas by wave action is predictable from simple wave models using depth and fetch.

Mean summer Secchi transparency of 4.2 m or greater predicts lake trout presence with 88 % accuracy. Lake trout populations may require that light sufficient for vision or

i

sensible to lake trout visual pigments (i.e. 510-540 nm wavelength) extends into the zone of suitable temperature. The theoretical lower depth of daylight-type vision by lake trout is predictable from the Secchi transparency of the water. Multiple discriminant analysis showed that Secchi transparency and the minimum volume of 6 to 15<sup>O</sup>C water contributed consistently to multivariate predictions of lake trout status.

Non-shield lakes apparently must have much greater volumes of water of suitable temperature and oxygen during summer than shield lakes. The effects of shallower morphometry and \_ greater waterlevel variations in non-shield lakes are only part of the reason. Post-glacial immigration routes and/or climatic conditions are believed to have restricted lake trout to larger lakes in the non-shield region.

Lake surveys are not completely representative of Saskatchewan lakes, particularly very small (<10 km<sup>2</sup>) lakes. Corrections for preferential surveying of larger lakes and lakes with lake trout present are essential for meaningful extrapolation of predictions. Several good criteria of lake trout status (e.g. maximum depth, stratification, minimum volume of 6 to 15<sup>o</sup>C water) can be reliably estimated from easily obtained survey, topographic, or other data. This allows the estimation of the total number of lake trout lakes in the shield region of Saskatchewan.

ii

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was possible due to the encouragement of Dr. A. R. Murray, the guidance and interest of Dr. K. W. Stewart, and the patience of my spouse Sue and children John, James, and Jessica, whose contributions are sincerely acknowledged. Comments from Dr. F. J. Ward and Dr. N. C. Kenkel of the thesis committee and from A. Seguin were most constructive. Funding by the former Department of Northern Saskatchewan for an educational leave of absence and the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Culture for computing and other expenses is appreciated. The continuing interest of supervisors A. R. Murray, D. G. Walton, and M. Y. Chen has been encouraging.

The assistance of many people is acknowledged. P. Naftel and A. Kooyman approved the use of provincial and federal lake survey reports. M. Chen and W. Liaw clarified lake survey methods. L. Heinze and B. Findlay provided data and advice on waterlevels. Staff of the University library (M. Clancy) and Saskatchewan Library (notably B. Blyth, J. Fleming, L. Kozun, W. Kabrud, and P. Somerton) provided numerous interlibrary and reference services. D. Romani, K. Kelly, D. Solheim, C. Northam, and H. Horn provided access to computer software. J. (Fontaine) Schulz and E. Remarchuk typed parts of the thesis, J. Merkowsky advised me on drafting, and B. Horn assisted greatly during the final stages.

iii

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	Ĺ
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	Ĺ
INTRODUCTION	L
BACKGROUND STUDIES	1
METHODS	5
Description of study area 6	5
Lake surveys	7
Prediction of lake trout presence	2
Univariate criteria	2
Shield and non-shield criteria 14	1
Multivariate criteria	5
Estimation of missing data	)
Marginal habitat	2
Validation and extrapolation	2
RESULTS	5
Fish species	5_
Survey habitat variables	)
Representative lakes	2
Prediction of lake trout presence 41	L
Univariate criteria	2
Shield and non-shield criteria 46	5
Multivariate criteria 62	2
Estimation of missing data	3
Marginal habitat	7
Validation and extrapolation 82	2
	ì
Perregentative lakes 01	) 
Drediction of lake trout presence	1
Temperature 94	r S
	, 7
	<u>'</u>
Depth 30/	, 1
	e 5
Shield and non-shield aritoria	י 2
Bogont habitat conditions	) :
Post-glagial conditions	ן ב
Multivariate griteria	י ג
Retimation of migging data	7 1
Marginal habitat and abundance	2 )
Walidation and extrapolation	2 2
	2
CONCLUSIONS	1
LITERATURE CITED	L

# LIST OF TABLES

<ol> <li>List of names and brief descriptions of most habitat</li> <li>variables which were used in the present study 9</li> </ol>
2. Numbers of fish species present in each surveyed northern Saskatchewan lake
3. Occurrences of preferred fish species in 228 surveyed Saskatchewan lakes north of 53 <sup>0</sup> N
4. Associations of preferred fish species in surveyed northern Saskatchewan lakes
5. Number of surveyed northern Saskatchewan lakes with lake trout present
6. Number of lakes with combinations of habitat variables available in relation to the number expected for
independent collections of variables
7. Occurrences of preferred fish species in northern lakes in the present study and in Saskatchewan lakes in other distributional studies north of 53 <sup>0</sup> N 34
8. Comparison of water areas of lakes in the present study to all Saskatchewan lakes north of 53 <sup>0</sup> N 36
9. Comparison of water areas of lakes in studies near La Ronge and Key Lake to nearby lakes
10. Comparison of total dissolved solids (TDS) in surveyed lakes to other Saskatchewan lakes 40
11. Univariate predictions of lake trout presence or absence by habitat variables 43
12. Criteria of lake trout presence or absence in shield and non-shield lakes
13. Small-sample criteria of lake trout presence or absence in shield lakes
14. Univariate predictions of lake trout presence or absence in subareas of the shield region 50
15. Changes in criteria of lake trout presence or absence as temperature-oxygen conditions became more restrictive

16. Number of lakes which have ten or more years of July- August waterlevel data available
17. Number of lakes used in the present study which have volume-at-depth data available
18. Expected loss of water volume from the combined effects of waterlevel variations and morphometry 62
19. Stepwise ranking of variables in multiple discrimination of lake trout presence and absence 65
20. Classification rules for lake trout and non-lake- trout lakes using multiple discriminant analysis 67
21. Useful regressions of habitat criteria on more numerous or more available habitat variables 70
22. Minor and major misclassifications of lake trout presence or absence in shield lakes by selected variables
23. Misclassifications of lake trout presence or absence in particular shield lakes by selected variables 79
24. Validation and final univariate criteria of lake trout presence and absence in surveyed Saskatchewan lakes.
25. Effects of incomplete surveys on some lakes and preferential surveying of lake trout lakes on the probability of trout presence

.

vi

# LIST OF FIGURES

1. Locations of 262 lakes used in the present study to develop predictions of lake trout presence or absence. 26 2. Number of lakes in each interval of water area . . 37 3. The hypothetical effect of waterlevel variations and/or morphometry on the apparent volume required by lake 53 4. Lakes with summer waterlevel data available for 10 or 54 5. Variety of observed and predicted low July-August 57 Waterlevel variations (i.e. typical year minus lowest 6. 1 in 100 years) in relation to water area. . . . . . 58 7. Regressions of relative volume above 2 m depth on water area, separately for shield and non-shield lakes 60 Regressions of residual volume on predicted waterlevel 8. variations, separately for shield and non-shield lakes 61 9. Lake trout presence and absence in Saskatchewan lakes in relation to predicted sediment distribution . . . 64 10. Relationship between log TDS and log specific conductivity in central and northern Saskatchewan lakes 69 Delineation of stratified and non-stratified lakes 11. 75 12. Two distinct relationships of log VOLT15T6 to log water area in Saskatchewan shield and non-shield lakes 76 13. Trend of the error rate of ten variables and of a 81 Relationship between errors of univariate criteria 14. in preliminary and validation sets of lakes. . . . . 83 15. The probability of lake trout presence according to 16. The depth of visibility (from corresponding Secchi depth) against the maximum depth of 15°C, separately for lakes with lake trout present and absent. . . . . . 109

Page

# viii

# LIST OF APPENDICES

Page

Α.	LAKE N	IAMES,	LOCAT	IONS,	AND	DATA	REFE	RENCE	es	•	•	159
B. VARI	DESCRI ABLES	PTION	OF LAN	KE SU	RVEY	METHC	DS A	ND HA	ABITA	т •	•	174
c.	FISH S	PECIES	COMPO	SITI	ONS .	•••	•••	• • •	••	•	•	187
D. OF H	SAMPLE IABITAT	SIZES VARIA	, MEAN BLES.	NS, A	ND FR	EQUEN	ICY D	ISTRI	BUTI	ons •	•	190
Е.	UNIVAR	IATE P	REDIC	TION	OF LA	KE TR	TUOS	PRESE	ENCE.	•	•	196
F. MORI	SHIELD HOMETR	AND N Y, AND	ON-SHI RESII	ELD UAL	LAKE VOLUM	WATER	LEVE	L VAF		ons •	,	203
G. HABI	ESTIMA TAT VA	TION O RIABLE	F MISS	SING :	DATA	AND E	IAS	USING	OTH	ER	•	225-

#### INTRODUCTION

Management of fisheries resources in Saskatchewan and most other provinces requires an understanding of the number of lakes containing each fish species and the sustainable supply which is available for perceived demands. Recent and future increases in accessibility of northern Saskatchewan lakes, which are within the natural range of lake trout (<u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>), mean that this species faces increased exploitation. Studies on a few specific fisheries annually do not provide a satisfactory basis for management (Wallace 1984). Only relatively large lakes are amenable to\_ management based on monitoring of trends and the accompanying evolution of suitable regulation.

Resource managers require methods to predict the occurrence and sustainable yield of lake trout, particularly in numerous small lakes and preferably without a survey of each lake. Central and northern Saskatchewan has an estimated 91,700 lakes, of which about 83,200 are on the Precambrian shield. Management of fisheries in these smaller lakes requires that an understanding of the resource has been established. Very small lake trout lakes may, in fact, be depleted in a single weekend of fishing (Ryder and Johnson 1972). The pace of exploitation of new resources far outstrips the acquisition of detailed information on preferred species.

The first objective of the present study was to develop and validate predictions for the presence or absence of lake trout in Saskatchewan lakes. Habitat variables from surveys of 330 lakes north of 53<sup>O</sup>N were evaluated. Some variables were recommended by other field or laboratory studies (see Background studies), while some were created to assess presumed critical requirements.

The second objective was to estimate good criteria of lake trout status, using variables which are most easily obtained during surveys or are available from other sources (e.g. topographic maps, remote sensors, or climatic records).

The third objective was to assess and correct any bias in predictive criteria due to non-random selection of lakes for surveying, and to estimate the total number of lake trout lakes in Saskatchewan.

This study was based on data from the provincial lake survey program begun in the 1930's, as were many earlier limnological and fisheries studies. The development of morphoedaphic indices of fish productivity relied on these surveys and data on fish harvests (Rawson 1952, Ryder 1965, Ryder <u>et al</u>. 1974, Oglesby 1977, Matuszek 1978). Other studies examined morphometry of shield lakes (Koshinsky 1970), invertebrates in relation to habitat (Murray 1974), and general limnology of large lakes (Rawson 1960). Potential uses of these surveys include seasonal thermal trends (e.g. Rawson 1936, Atton 1953, Shuter et al. 1983),

lake survey optimization (Hakanson 1978), net saturation (e.g. Kennedy 1951), and water chemistry variability, particularly in recent consultant studies (e.g. Beak 1979).

The emphasis on the effects of present habitat conditions on present-day lake trout distribution in Saskatchewan results from an assumption about post-glacial access. That is, that lake trout immigrated primarily from a Mississippi refugium via early Glacial Lake Agassiz (McPhail and Lindsey 1970, Black 1983), thereby gaining access to all of the study area.

#### BACKGROUND STUDIES

Lake morphometry has frequently been cited as important to lake trout biology. In temperate regions, lakes with greater mean or maximum depths contain lake trout populations (Scott and Crossman 1973) more frequently than other lakes. The few lakes south of the Precambrian shield in Saskatchewan in which lake trout occur naturally have mean depths of 13 m or more and maximum depths of at least 30 m (Marshall and Johnson 1971). Surveys of about 5,000 lakes in Ontario showed that lake trout occurred in only 14 % of lakes with mean depth 12 m or less and in only 11 % with maximum depth \_ of 30 m or less (Martin and Olver 1976).

As mean depth is significantly related to water area of lakes worldwide and in northern Saskatchewan (Neumann 1959, Liaw and Atton 1981b), area may be a general predictor of lake trout occurrence. On the shield, the ratio of mean to maximum depth depends on lake area (Koshinsky 1970). Volume of lakes may be more important to lake trout than depth or water area, particularly the volume of the hypolimnion due to the narrow thermal tolerances of lake trout.

Temperature preferences of about 12<sup>O</sup>C (Ferguson 1958, McCauley and Tait 1970) and oxygen requirements of 3 to 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Gibson and Fry 1954, Davis 1975) are well known for lake trout. The presence of lake trout in shallow, northern lakes suggests that temperature conditions override depth per

<u>se</u> (McPhail and Lindsey 1970). The minimum volume of water below 12 to  $15^{\circ}$ C and above 4 to 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen in early to late summer may be a reasonable index of critical conditions. In temperate lakes, mid-summer surface temperatures are frequently unsuitable and the degree of stratification becomes important. Thermocline behaviour may be predictable from area, fetch, and other habitat variables (Shuter <u>et al</u>. 1983, Ragotzkie 1978). Hypolimnetic oxygen behaviour is more complex (Cornett and Rigler 1979, Patterson et al. 1985).

Physical and chemical characteristics of lakes are important to lake trout. Water transparency as measured by Secchi disk depth was dominant (along with mean depth) in discriminating lake trout lakes from others in Ontario (Johnson et al. 1977). Only 10 % of Ontario lakes with Secchi depth less than 5 m have lake trout populations (Martin and Olver 1976). Lake trout are found in fewer than 5 % of Ontario lakes with total dissolved solids (TDS) over 100 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Martin and Olver 1976), and have been termed an "index species" of oligotrophy (Ryder 1972). TDS ranges widely in Saskatchewan lakes from less than 10 to more than  $300,000 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$  (Liaw and Atton 1980), and limits natural populations of several fish species in some lakes (Rawson and Moore 1944). The upper osmoregulatory limit for lake trout is about 12,000 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> NaCl (Boulva and Simard 1968 cited in Fargher 1977).

#### METHODS

# Description of study area

All of Saskatchewan, except the extreme southwest, was covered by Wisconsinan glaciation. The southern part of the study area shows the predominantly flat to gentle topography of lacustrine plains, with some rolling uplands of ground moraine (Richards and Fung 1969). The northern part is Precambrian shield and Athabascan sandstone plain, with gentle to strongly rolling topography (Koshinsky 1970) and some rugged bedrock. The climate is a cold continental type, with prevailing westerly to northerly winds and semi-arid to sub-humid moisture conditions. Mean annual air temperatures are 2.5 to  $-5^{\circ}$ C; frost-free periods are 100 to fewer than 60 days. Most climatic and vegetational zones change from southwest to northeast (see maps in Richards and Fung 1969).

Lakes cover about 10 % of Saskatchewan. Watersheds include the Gulf of Mexico (Missouri river system), Hudson Bay (Qu'Appelle, Winnipegosis, Saskatchewan, Churchill, and Kazan), Arctic (Mackenzie), and large internal drainages in south-central and southwestern areas (Atton and Merkowsky 1983). Fall freeze-up of small to large lakes coincides with the 3-day to 40-day average air temperature reaching 0<sup>o</sup>C, respectively (Ragotzkie 1978). Spring break-up is more complex as it depends on snow and ice conditions, spring temperature and wind patterns, and river inflows, but

generally coincides with an average temperature of 5°C.

#### Lake surveys

All Saskatchewan lakes located between  $53^{\circ}N$  and  $60^{\circ}N$ latitude which were surveyed between 1930 and 1982 were used in the analysis. Using only known lake trout lakes would have prevented any effective prediction of suitable and unsuitable conditions for this species.

Published and manuscript reports provided information on 330 lakes which were surveyed by the provincial Department of Parks and Renewable Resources (formerly Department of Tourism\_ and Renewable Resources and Department of Natural Resources), the federal Canadian Wildlife Service, and several environmental consulting firms (Appendix A).

Adherence to standardized methods in most studies meant that available data were fairly consistent from the 1930's onward. Lakes which lacked one or more habitat variables were nonetheless included, as correlations among variables allowed for the estimation of some missing data. Inclusion of these incomplete lake surveys was intended to reduce bias, as surveys were more likely, more intensive, and more often repeated on larger lakes and in more accessible areas (Liaw and Atton 1981).

Almost all variables available from lake surveys were considered, with closer scrutiny given to more probable predictors. Survey data were usually from the earliest lake

survey reported. About 1 % of data were randomly selected and checked for errors of interpretation and transcription during extraction from the reports. All data were checked following entry into the computerized data base for errors of transcription. Later, correlations between many pairs of variables revealed several outliers which were re-checked against the source reports. To minimize systematic subjectivity on my part, variables were amended only if they had been misquoted (e.g. transposed) or deleted only if the original author had noted unusual conditions (e.g. nonfiltered turbid water samples) or technical problems (e.g. faulty oxygen meter).

Survey variables were assigned to six arbitrary categories in the data base: location, morphometry, physicochemistry, temperature-oxygen, biota, and winter chemistry (Table 1). Lake survey methods and descriptions of basic and derived habitat variables are shown in Appendix B. Fish species collection methods and nomenclature are given in Appendix C.

Habitat data from a randomly selected 20 % of the lakes were set aside for later validation of predictions. These data were assiduously ignored and all predictive criteria were established on the basis of the remaining 262 lakes.

Table 1. List of names and brief descriptions of most habitat variables which were used in the present study.

Variable	Units	Description
Location		
LKNAME		lake name
LKNO	• • •	lake number
LATD	°N	latitude (decimal equivalent)
LONGD	oW	longitude (decimal equivalent)
NORD	• • •	nordicity (see Appendix B)
GEOZONE	• • •	five bedrock zones
WSHED	• • •	watershed
ALT	m	altitude
RANDOM	• • •	random subset of lakes
REF1	• • •	primary lake survey report
REF2	•••	secondary lake survey report
Morphometry		
WAREA	km <sup>2</sup>	water area
VOLUME	hm <sup>3</sup>	water volume (million m <sup>3</sup> )
ZBAR	m	mean depth
ZMAX	m	maximum depth
SHOLEN	km	shoreline length (including islands)
SHODEV	•••	shoreline development
FETCH	km	fetch length
ORIENT	0	orientation of fetch
FLUSH	yr	theoretical flushing time
SAn	8	area strata (see Appendix B)
DAn	m	area strata contours
SVn	8	volume strata (see Appendix B)
DVn	m	volume strata contours

9

continued

Table 1. continued.

Variable	Units	Description
Physicochem	istry	
SECCHI	m	Secchi depth (less than ZMAX)
PHOTOZ	m	photogenic depth
COLOUR	Pt	summer surface sample
PHMINS	• • •	minimum summer surface pH
PHMINB	• • •	minimum summer bottom pH
TDS	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	total dissolved solids, mid-summer
TOTALK	$mg.L^{-1}$	total alkalinity, methyl orange
		as CaCO <sub>3</sub> , summer
SPCON	uS	specific conductivity, summer surface
LOSSIG	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	loss on ignition, summer surface
CA	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	calcium, summer surface
MG	$mg.L^{-1}$	magnesium, summer surface
NA	$mg.L^{-1}$	sodium, summer surface
•••	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	all others are named similarly
Temperature	-Oxygen	
TMAXS	°c	maximum summer surface temperature
TMAXB	°c	maximum summer bottom temperature
STRAFN	• • •	degree of stratification
OMINS	$mg.L^{-1}$	minimum summer surface oxygen
OMINB	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	minimum summer bottom oxygen
HIGH6MG	m	depth of shallowest 6 mg.L <sup>-1</sup> oxygen,
		deepest station (see Appendix B)
VOL6MG	hm <sup>3</sup>	minimum volume with $\geq$ 6mg.L <sup>-1</sup> oxygen
T15T6U	m	upper and lower depths of deepest
T15T6L	m	15 <sup>0</sup> C and same-day 6 <sup>0</sup> C, resp.
VOLT15T6	hm <sup>3</sup>	minimum volume of 6 to 15 <sup>0</sup> C
T1506U	m	upper and lower depths of deepest
T1506L	m	15 <sup>0</sup> C and 6 mg.L <sup><math>-1</math></sup> oxygen, resp.
		continued

Table 1. continued.

Variable	Units	Description
VOLT1506	hm <sup>3</sup>	minimum volume $\leq 15^{\circ}$ C and $\geq 6 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$
T1504U	m	upper and lower depths of deepest
T1504L	m	15 <sup>0</sup> C and 4 mg.L <sup><math>-1</math></sup> oxygen, resp.
VOLT1504	hm <sup>3</sup>	minimum volume $\leq 15^{\circ}$ C and $\geq 4 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$
T1206U	m	upper and lower depths of deepest
T1206L	m	12 <sup>0</sup> C and 6 mg.L <sup>-1</sup> oxygen, resp.
VOLT1206	hm <sup>3</sup>	minimum volume $\leq 12^{\circ}C$ and $\geq 6 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$
<u>Biota</u>		
NETDRY	kg.ha <sup>-1</sup>	net plankton, average dry weight
NETORG	kg.ha <sup>-1</sup>	net plankton, average organic weight
BENNOA	number/ m <sup>2</sup>	benthic fauna, summer average weighted by area strata
BCn	taxon	faunal identification categories
BCn%	8	faunal composition by numbers
BENDRY	kg.ha <sup>-1</sup>	benthic fauna, dry weight, summer
		average weighted by area strata
Winter physi	cochemistry	۲
WINDATE	month	winter sample date

WINDATE	month	winter sample date
OWINS	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	surface oxygen near ice cover
OWINB	mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	bottom oxygen
PHWINS	• • •	surface pH near ice cover
• • •	• • •	all others are named similarly

a AAAn designates a multiple variable name using different n suffixes.

The representation of all Saskatchewan lakes by the set of lakes which were surveyed was assessed by comparing the distributions of (i) fish species in surveyed lakes with more extensive species lists, and (ii) several habitat variables with larger (presumably less biased) lake sets. The relative frequency of lake trout and others in surveyed lakes and in lakes reported by Atton and Merkowsky (1983) was assumed to reflect intensities of collection and/or species biases in the study. Two habitat variables (water area and TDS, see Table 1) were available in lake sets which nominally covered the entire province. Furthermore, water areas in two studies of small lakes (Koshinsky 1968, Beak 1979) were compared to those of nearby lakes in surrounding 10 x 10 km or 5 x 10 km area. These two studies were intuitively more representative of water areas than other surveys.

#### Prediction of lake trout presence

# Univariate criteria

All habitat variables available for 100 or more lakes (and also COLOUR) were examined for potential as univariate predictors of lake trout presence. Median differences between lakes with and without lake trout were tested by the non-parametric, two-tailed Mann-Whitney procedure (SAS 1982 p.206, Conover 1971). This tested whether a habitat variable tended to differ (i.e. larger or smaller) between these two classes of lakes. The statistical assumptions are: lakes are randomly and independently selected from each class population, and habitat variables are continuous so that tied values were infrequent (Conover 1971). The univariate criteria for predicting lake trout status in individual lakes were determined by ranking variable values in descending order, interpolating criteria which misclassified (approximately) equal numbers of lakes belonging to each class, and comparing known and predicted status to obtain the error rate of prediction. This method is non-parametric, but assumes that lakes are randomly selected at least in the region of overlap of the two classes along a variable axis (Conover 1971, Knoke 1982). If this is not true, then the resultant criteria will over-estimate the numbers of overrepresented lakes in future samples. The restriction of equal numbers of misclassifications has advantages over some alternatives (Lachenbruch 1975 p.15 and 87). Minimizing the total number of misclassifications can result in criteria which will not predict any lake trout in future samples, if lake trout lakes are relatively few. Minimizing the seriousness or cost of errors, which might be an objective of management, requires an estimate of social or economic costs of false positive or negative errors.

Variables were considered to be useful if they had significant median differences and error rates less than 25 %. These initial error rates are usually optimistic as

the same sample of lakes is used to create and test the criteria (Lachenbruch 1975, Dillon 1979).

### Shield and non-shield criteria

Water area, volume, and temperature-and-oxygen criteria were examined for differences in lake trout requirements in shield and non-shield lakes. Three issues were examined: (1) Anomalies in the set of lakes available may lead to spurious differences. (2) Morphometry and recent waterlevel fluctuations may differ between non-shield and shield lakes. (3) Post-glacial access routes and/or warmer and drier climatic conditions may have affected lake trout populations in part of the study area, according to literature sources (e.g. Stewart and Lindsey 1983, Christiansen 1979, Ritchie 1976, Wilson 1981).

#### (1) Anomalies

The representation of shield and non-shield lakes in surveys was compared to the estimated total number of lakes in each region.

Random subsets of shield lakes were examined to test the probability of similar differences for approximately equal numbers of shield and non-shield lakes. Enlarging the smaller non-shield subset of lakes for this comparison was impossible, except by the replication of data using the "bootstrap method" (Diaconis and Efron 1983).

Gradients within the shield area were examined by dividing these lakes into three groups (i.e. south of  $56^{\circ}N$ ,  $56 - 58^{\circ}N$ , and north of  $58^{\circ}N$ ). Separate univariate criteria for each group were compared to each other and to non-shield criteria.

Trends between water area, volume, and temperature-oxygen volumes in shield and non-shield lakes were compared.

# (2) Recent conditions

<u>Waterlevels</u> Analysis of recent area, volume, and other variations were necessarily indirect for several reasons. \_\_\_\_\_ Long-term trends were available only from federal-provincial records of lake waterlevels. Variability in surveyed lakes was largely unavailable as few lakes had both lake surveys and waterlevel records available. Furthermore, many lake surveys were based on arbitrary or estimated elevations so equivalence between data sets could not be established.

Waterlevels were analyzed for all lakes: (i) situated north of 52<sup>O</sup>N in Saskatchewan or neighbouring areas of Alberta or Manitoba; (ii) with at least 10 years of daily summer waterlevel records (based on a common elevation or "hydrological datum"); and (iii) with no significant man-made regulation of flows, or for years prior to this regulation.

The summer minimum for each year and each lake was defined by the lower of the July or August minimum daily waterlevel. Low waterlevels in typical and extreme years were predicted

from polynomial regressions of observed waterlevels <u>versus</u> cumulative probability. Recent waterlevel variations were defined as the difference between predicted low summer waterlevels for typical years (i.e. cumulative 50% probability, or median) and extreme years (i.e. cumulative 1% probability, or nominally 1 in 100 years). The effects of bedrock geology and water area were tested by the step-down method of linear regression and analysis of co-variance (Freund and Minton 1979 p.224).

<u>Morphometry</u> Changes in water volume due to waterlevel variations required the interpolation of volume-at-depth foravailable lakes. All lakes with volumetric data of <u>+</u>20% precision were used (see VOLT15T6' in Appendix B). Both relative volume (%) and absolute volume (hm<sup>3</sup>) were examined for arbitrary depths.

<u>Residual Volumes</u> Relative and absolute residual volumes were estimated for waterlevel variations predicted from water area and relative and absolute volumes-at-depth, with or without the effects of bedrock geology.

# Multivariate criteria

Trial transformations (i.e. logarithmic, logarithmic<sup>2</sup>, inverse, square root, and inverse hyperbolic sine) were applied to useful variables which were non-normally distributed within the classes (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of Gold in SAS 1983). Transformations which yielded normality,

or at least near-symmetry, in both classes were used in multivariate analyses. Several pairs of variables were plotted and linear criteria of lake trout status were determined, again by misclassifying equal numbers of each class. With the exception of depth <u>versus</u> water area, most pairs were used only to assess marginal habitat (see below).

Multiple discriminant analysis (MDA) was used to improve the prediction of lake trout status. Basically, MDA separates or discriminates between classes (e.g. lake trout and non-lake-trout lakes) by compounding two or more variables, neither of which is able to effect this alone, into a single criterion (Solberg 1978, Lachenbruch 1975).

Different versions of MDA were used: (1) Stepwise MDA assessed the relative discriminatory potential of variables which were good univariate predictors, and selected variables for inclusion or deletion according to sequential F-tests (STEPDISC in SAS 1982). (2) Classification MDA assessed the accuracy of classification by linear MDA and by nearestneighbour MDA (DISCRIM in SAS 1987). Error rates were determined by resubstitution and cross-validation (i.e. "apparent error rates" and "leaving-one-out method", respectively, of Lachenbruch 1975) in the initial set of lakes, and by use of the reserved set of lakes (Hocking 1976, Dillon 1979). (3) Canonical MDA created a canonical variate or axis of lake trout status in Saskatchewan lakes for description and comparison with other studies (CANDISC in SAS

1982). Canonical MDA maximizes between-class variations in habitat, relative to within-classes, using k-l axes for k classes (Lachenbruch 1975).

The assumptions of MDA for optimal results are: (i) the frequency distribution of all variables is multivariate normal in each class; (ii) the variance-covariance or dispersion is the same in both classes; (iii) the class is correctly assigned in all observations; and (iv) observations are randomly selected from the population and there are few, if any, missing variables (Lachenbruch 1975, Solberg 1978, Knoke 1982).

If variables are not multivariate normal, then selection of variables in stepwise MDA and error rates in classification MDA may be seriously biased (Dillon 1979). Approximately normal variables provide lower and more equal error rates in classes (Lachenbruch, Sneeringer, and Revo 1973). If necessary, normality was assumed, for "if the normality assumption is violated, the practitioner is faced with the most difficult task of specifying the appropriate joint probability distribution" (Dillon 1979 p.372). Canonical MDA explicitly does not depend on normality of variables to create an axis, but does if optimal classification is expected (Lachenbruch 1975 p.10, Solberg 1978 p.212 and 220).

The requirement of equal variance-covariance is "unlikely to be satisfied with ecological data" (Green and Vascotto

1978) and is frequently ignored (Johnson <u>et al</u>. 1977). This affects the tests of significance, error rates, and the optimal classification rules in linear MDA (Dillon 1979). One effect of linear MDA is to preferentially classify observations into the class with the greater dispersion (Solberg 1978). Nonetheless, the quadratic MDA which was developed for unequal dispersions is more sensitive to nonnormality and small sample sizes, and is not always recommended in practice.

If the status of some lakes is incorrect, then classes appear more alike and discrimination is more difficult (Solberg 1978). These errors frequently tend to occur near the borderline between classes, in which case the apparent error rates are not at all reliable (Lachenbruch 1975).

"In practice, the robustness problems just discussed may be secondary to the problem of missing values" (Lachenbruch 1975 p.49). In addition, non-biased sampling of lakes is a fundamental assumption (Solberg 1978, Knoke 1983), as it is in most statistical methods. These latter concerns were assessed and minimized as far as practicable (see Estimation of missing data and Validation and extrapolation).

Using non-parametric nearest-neighbour MDA, each observation is classified into the class with the highest probability density according to class frequencies among the k neighbouring observations (Lachenbruch 1975, SAS 1987). Five neighbours were used, largely due to available sample

sizes and the lack of clear rules for optimal k (SAS 1987). The need for multivariate normality and equal dispersion is obviated, but that for correct status, complete surveys, and random sampling is presumed.

Multicollinearity, which is a high degree of linear correlation among independent variables (Freund and Minton 1979), was expected in this study. For example, the area, volume, maximum depth, and shoreline length of lakes are intuitively correlated. The absence of multicollinearity is not an assumption, yet its presence complicates MDA (Lachenbruch 1975). Multicollinearity of continuous variables may reduce the usefulness of additional variables: each improves discrimination only if its correlation with the present variable(s) is quite large and positive or is negative (Lachenbruch 1975). It produces large variances of all coefficients, so that selected subsets of variables can change easily with new observations (SAS 1987). It presumably makes predictions unreliable for individual observations which lie outside the multivariate dispersion of data (even if not outside the ranges of separate variables), as in multiple regressions (Freund and Minton 1979 p.118).

## Estimation of missing data

Estimation of missing habitat data was necessary, since very few lakes had the full set of useful variables available. Missing data were estimated for the more

promising variables from (more or less redundant) correlated variables (Frane 1976). Data from all available lakes were used, rather than only the random subset. Estimation of total dissolved solids (TDS) from specific conductivity (SPCON) or alkalinity (TOTALK) is a common example of this approach (Ryder 1965, Liaw and Atton 1980).

Statistical complications are common among the large number of variables available in large data sets (Frane 1976, Hocking 1976). Judicious selection is necessary to prevent unwieldy regressions, mis-specification of regressors, and imprecision of coefficients (Freund and Minton 1979). In this study, all-subset and stepwise regressions preceded multiple linear regressions, which included analysis of residuals and multicollinearity (SAS 1982, Freund and Minton 1979). All-subset regression (SAS 1982) yields alternative regressions with similar predictive ability, but using variables that are sometimes easier to obtain and/or to interpret. Subsets were selected by the Cp-statistic to ensure that unused variables were non-essential (Hocking 1976), although the test itself is less reliable in the presence of multicollinearity (Freund and Minton 1979 p.120). Multicollinearity affects stepwise regressions by biasing the entry or deletion of all but the first variables (Freund and Minton 1979).

Supplementary data and analyses were required to predict non-stratification in lakes with high flushing rates, and to

assess the influence of surficial geology in a lake basin on maximum lake depth (see Appendix G).

#### Marginal habitat

Misclassifications were assessed to determine whether intuitive definitions of "marginal habitat" apply to the presence and absence of lake trout. Relative abundances were not available in this study. In the first method, the frequency of major classification errors for each lake estimated its marginality. Misclassifications of shield lakes within  $\pm$  10 % of the criterion of lake trout presence -were considered minor, while those outside this zone were considered major. The second method analysed trends in specific lakes between the better predictors (i.e. single and paired variables) and other variables.

## Validation and extrapolation

The criteria of lake trout presence were validated using the actual and predicted status in the 20 % of lakes which were reserved for this purpose. Univariate criteria were designed to predict the status of individual lakes.

Extrapolation to all lakes was based on the probability of lake trout presence at each habitat value, using logistic, actual, and polynomial probability curves. Logistic regression (CATMOD in SAS 1987) produces anti-symmetric

probabilities of presence in habitat x of:

B0 + B1(x) P = 1 / (1 + e )

where Bl(x) can be one or more coefficients and variables. In its multivariate form it is an alternative to MDA (Lachenbruch 1975, Solberg 1978, Efron 1975), but no stepwise method was available (SAS 1987). The requirement for normality of variables is more relaxed than in MDA (Solberg 1978), but anti-symmetry and random sampling are necessary. If classes of lakes are sampled non-randomly, the logistic intercept (i.e. B0) at least is affected (Lachenbruch 1975). Actual asymmetric probabilities were calculated from the proportion of lake trout lakes in running subsets of 5 to 10 lakes. These points were fitted using stepwise polynomial regressions:

$$P = A + A x + A x + \dots + A x 0 1 2 5$$

(see Appendix F).

The effects of variables missing from incomplete surveys (see Representative lakes) and/or preferential surveying of lake trout lakes were assessed. The preference toward lake trout lakes was judged to be several-fold higher than non-lake-trout lakes (Minns 1986). To avoid exaggerating this factor, 6-fold was assumed for very small lakes (< 10 km<sup>2</sup>), 4-fold for small lakes (10 - 50 km<sup>2</sup>), and 2-fold for medium lakes (50 - 100 km<sup>2</sup>); no preference was used for larger lakes. Data for randomly selected lakes were deleted from

the set (i.e. 5/6 of very small, 3/4 of small, and 1/2 of medium lake trout lakes) to give a more representative set.

Extrapolation to determine the total numbers of lake trout lakes in the shield region of Saskatchewan was based on: (i) the probability of lake trout presence in habitat interval x; and (ii) the distribution of habitat interval x in the 83,241 Water area (WAREA) and the minimum volume of shield lakes. suitable temperature (VOLT15T6) were used in extrapolation. The distribution of habitat values was estimated for lakes shown on randomly selected, topographic map sections (each 10 x 10 km, or 5 x 10 km weighted by a factor of 2 when lakes were numerous), stratified by latitude and bedrock geology. Lakes were assigned a water area of 0.01  $\text{km}^2$  if they were estimated to be < 0.02  $\text{km}^2$  by a "dot grid" on 1:50000-scale Since the distributions were highly skewed and these maps. small lakes were imprecisely measured, only the cumulative probabilities 0.5, 0.75, 0.9, 0.95, and 0.99 of log WAREA and log VOLT15T6 > x were fitted. The data at probability 0.9965 of WAREA and the largest WAREA and VOLT15T6 were added into these distributions.

#### RESULTS

Unless specifically noted, results concern only the 262 lakes which were used to develop criteria (Figure 1) and not the lakes reserved for validation of these criteria.

## Fish species

Fish species compositions were known in 228 lakes or about 87 % of the 262 lakes. Species were unknown primarily in very small lakes in the Key Lake area (16 lakes), Prince Albert National Park (8 lakes), and other localized areas. At least 10 lakes in the Key Lake area were wholly or partially drained for open-pit uranium mining before complete species compositions were known (P. Courtney, Environment Dept., Key Lake Mining Corp., pers. comm.).

About 37 native fish species were revealed in the lake surveys. This is 80 % of the 46 native species known from this area and 64 % of the provincial native species (from maps in Atton and Merkowsky 1983). In addition, lake surveys revealed 2 of the 6 introduced and accidental species known from north of 53°N. Several reported <u>Coregonus</u> species (e.g. <u>C. artedii</u>, <u>C. nigripinnis</u>, and <u>C. zenithicus</u>) cannot reliably be differentiated (Kooyman 1970). They represent only two species (i.e. <u>C. artedii</u> and <u>C. zenithicus</u>) (Clarke 1973) and were included in the <u>C. artedii</u> complex of McPhail and Lindsey (1970).
Figure 1. Locations of 262 lakes used in the present study to develop predictions of lake trout presence or absence. The solid line marks the southern edge of common lake trout occurrence; the hatched line marks the southern boundary of sporadic lake trout occurrence. The dotted line marks the southern edge of the Precambrian shield region; solid circles represent shield lakes and open circles, non-shield lakes. Numbers in circles represent the numbers of lakes coincident at a point.



Table	2.	Numbers	ot	fish	species	present	ın	each	surveyed	
northe	ern	Saskatche	war	n lake	е.					

	1		Numb	ber of	specie	s <sup>a</sup>	
	Number						
Lake set	of lakes	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20+	Mean
<u></u>		e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	8	90	ò	8	8
A11	228	36.9	25.7	19.1	15.7	2.6	8.0
Bedrock geo	ology:						
Shield	117	29.1	25.6	20.5	22.2	2.6	9.2
Non-shield	111	44.2	26.1	18.0	9.0	2.7	7.0
Water area	2:						
Very large	11	0	9.1	18.2	72.7	0	14.7
Large	16	0	0	43.7	37.5	18.8	16.1
Medium	17	0	11.7	35.3	47.1	5.9	14.6
Small	48	14.6	22.9	35.4	22.9	4.2	9.8
Very small	133	55.6	33.1	9.0	2.3	0	4.9

a "Regular species" only (see Appendix C).

b VL is >250 km<sup>2</sup>, L is >100-250 km<sup>2</sup>, M is >50-100 km<sup>2</sup>, S is >10-50 km<sup>2</sup>, and VS is  $\leq 10 \text{ km}^2$ . Data are missing in 3 lakes.

Most lakes which were surveyed (i.e. 63 %) contained fewer than 10 fish species. More species tended to occur in shield lakes and in larger lakes (Table 2). Shield lakes which were surveyed were generally larger than non-shield lakes. Lakes over 50 km<sup>2</sup> water area averaged about 15 species each, while small lakes of 10-50 km<sup>2</sup> averaged 10 species, and very small lakes under 10 km<sup>2</sup> averaged 5 species. Table 3. Occurrences of preferred fish species in 228 surveyed Saskatchewan lakes north of 53<sup>O</sup>N.

		Number of lakes								
-		Bedro	ck geology	Water area <sup>b</sup>						
Species <sup>a</sup>	A11	Shield	Non-shield	VL	L	М	S	VS		
Lake trout	46	36	10	5	8	4	11	18		
Lake whitefish	138	87	51	11	16	17	37	56		
Northern pike	196	113	83	11	16	17	44	105		
Walleye	100	50	50	10	14	13	32	31		

a Lake trout, lake whitefish, walleye, and northern pike are preferred by sport and commercial fisheries. b VL is >250 km<sup>2</sup>, L is >100-250 km<sup>2</sup>, M is >50-100 km<sup>2</sup>, S is >10-50 km<sup>2</sup>, and VS is <10 km<sup>2</sup>.

Lake trout occurred in 46 or 20 % of the lakes and were absent from 182 lakes (Table 3). This species occurred in 4 of the 11 different associations of major species (i.e. lake trout, lake whitefish <u>Coregonus clupeaformis</u>, northern pike <u>Esox lucius</u>, and walleye <u>Stizostedion vitreum</u>). Lake trout were found most commonly with both lake whitefish and northern pike, and less frequently with walleye as the fourth species. They were rarely found as the sole major species and only rarely in other associations (Table 4). In very small lakes 10 km<sup>2</sup> or less, lake trout were seldom associated with walleye. Only one very small lake contained both species (Table 4), although lake trout occurred in 18 of Table 4. Associations of preferred fish species in surveyed northern Saskatchewan lakes.

:	Spea	cie	s	Bedrock geology All			Wat	Water area <sup>b</sup>			
as	soc	iat.	ion <sup>a</sup>	lakes	Shield	Non-shield	VL	L	М	S	VS
LT	WF	NP	WA	18	11	7	4	6	2	5	1
$\mathbf{LT}$	WF	NP	Х	26	23	3	1	2	2	6	15
$\mathbf{LT}$	WF	Х	Х	l	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
$\mathbf{LT}$	X	NP	Х	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Х	WF	NP	WA	74	37	37	6	8	11	25	24
Х	WF	NP	Х	18	14	4	0	0	2	l	14
Х	WF	Х	Х	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Х	Х	NP	WA	7	2	5	0	0	0	2	5
х	Х	NP	Х	52	25	27	0	0	0	5	46
Х	Х	Х	WA	1	0	l	0	0	0	0	1
Х	Х	Х	Х	29	2	27	0	0	0	4	24
Tot	al			228	117	111	11	16	17	48	133

a LT=lake trout, WF=lake whitefish, NP=northern pike, WA=walleye, X=absence.

b Missing for 3 lakes. VL is >250  $\rm km^2,$  L is >100-250  $\rm km^2,$  M is >50-100  $\rm km^2,$  S is >10-50  $\rm km^2,$  and VS is  $\leq\!10$   $\rm km^2.$ 

these lakes and walleye in 31 lakes. Independently distributed species would be expected to co-occur in about four lakes, if species competition and/or habitat selection were not operating. By comparison, lake trout and lake whitefish co-existed in 17 very small lakes, about twice as many as expected for independently distributed species. Most medium and larger lakes over 50 km lacked only lake trout (57 %) or walleye (11 %) and seldom any other preferred species.

About 31 % of surveyed lakes on the Precambrian shield contained lake trout, in contrast to only 9 % in non-shield lakes (Table 5).

#### Survey habitat variables

Only 8 variables were available for 200 or more lakes: LAT, LONG, NORD, and WAREA which were available from independent sources (e.g. topographic maps) and VOLUME, ZBAR, ZMAX, and TMAXS which required specific fieldwore (Table 1). Another 27 variables were available for 100 to 199 lakes, while 9 (all winter physicochemistry variables) were available for fewer than 50 lakes each (see Appendix D).

Combinations of several habitat variables were available for more lakes than would be expected if each variable had been collected independently of others. Subsets of six variables were available for 1.7 to 3.6 times more lakes than expected (Table 6).

Table 5. Number of surveyed northern Saskatchewan lakes with lake trout present.

		Shie	ld lakes		Non-shield lakes			
	Number	·						
Lake	of	Athabasca	Boundary	Shield	Boundary	Sedimentary		
trout	lakes	АТ	BA	SH	BD	SE		
Presen	t 46	6	5	25	3	7		
		25%	100%	28%	9%	98		
		• • • • •	31% .	• • • • •	•••	98		
Absent	182	18	0	63	31	70		
		75%	08	72%	91%	91%		
		• • • • •	69% .	• • • • •	. 9	18		

A composite description showed that the median 50% of surveyed lakes were between:  $54^{\circ}04'$  and  $56^{\circ}42'$  N latitude (LAT, n=262), 0.6 and 29.7 km<sup>2</sup> water area (WAREA, n=248), 2.6 and 8.8 m mean depth (ZBAR, n=215), 2.1 and 4.4 m Secchi depth (SECCHI, n=176), 40 and 213 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> TDS (n=197), 19.0 and 22.0°C maximum surface temperature (TMAXS, n=208), and 0.0 and 24.0 hm<sup>3</sup> (i.e. million m<sup>3</sup>) minimum volume of water between 6 and  $15^{\circ}C$  (VOLT15T6, n=157, see Appendix D). Table 6. Number of lakes with combinations of habitat variables available in relation to the number expected for independent collections of variables.

Number of	lakes	
Available	Expecte	d Habitat variables <sup>a</sup>
All lakes	:	
123	70	WAREA TDS ZMAX TMAXS FETCH SECCHI
78	22	VOLUME SHODEV BENDRY OMINB VOLT15T6 TOTALK
102	42	ZBAR TDS TMAXB SECCHI VOLT1506 NORD
Shield lak	<u>kes</u> :	
75	44	WAREA TDS ZMAX TMAXS FETCH SECCHI
68	29	VOLUME SHODEV BENDRY OMINB VOLT15T6 TOTALK
62	36	ZBAR TDS TMAXB SECCHI VOLT1506 NORD
Non-shield	l lakes:	
48	26	WAREA TDS ZMAX TMAXS FETCH SECCHI
10	3	VOLUME SHODEV BENDRY OMINB VOLT15T6 TOTALK
40	11	ZBAR TDS TMAXB SECCHI VOLT1506 NORD

a See Table 1 for variable names.

### Representative lakes

Limitations of the surveyed lakes as representatives of all northern Saskatchewan lakes were observed. These necessitated more complex approaches to prediction and extrapolation to all lakes than originally foreseen, particularly for extrapolation to all lakes.

Comparisons of fish species compositions in lakes which were surveyed and in lakes from other studies were inconclusive. Only 239 lakes north of 53<sup>O</sup>N were available for comparison (Atton and Merkowsky 1983), many of which were the same lakes used in the present study. In general, the present surveys were no more biased towards the major species than the broader lake set. In both sets 12 % of lakes contained no socio-economically preferred species (i.e. lake trout, lake whitefish, northern pike, or walleye) (Table 7). In northern drainage basins, a higher proportion of lakes which were surveyed contained preferred species (i.e. 12 % versus 0 % and 5 %), indicating bias towards these species. Distributional records in the southern basin were similarly biased (i.e. 28 % versus 12 %). Nonetheless, surveyed lakes showed no greater tendency than distributional records to have lake trout present. In comparison to distributional records, surveys were biased towards lakes with northern pike and lake whitefish (Table 7).

Table 7. Occurrences of preferred fish species in northern lakes in the present study and in Saskatchewan lakes in other distributional studies north of 53<sup>O</sup>N.

		Sp	ecies	prese	nt
Number		Pref	erred	a	Othora
Lake set lakes	LT	WF	WA	NP	only
	Ş	òò	ę	8	8
Arctic and Kazan basins <sup>b</sup> :					
Atlas lakes <sup>C</sup> 51	59	65	35	82	12
Surveyed lakes 27	56	78	30	96	0
Churchill basin:					
Atlas lakes 122	30	70	64	76	12
Surveyed lakes 118	23	74	55	93	5
Saskatchewan Basin <sup>d</sup> :					
Atlas lakes 66		٠	••		12
Surveyed lakes 83	5	36	33	72	28
All basins:					
Atlas lakes <sup>e</sup> 239				,	12
Surveyed lakes 228	20	60	44	86	12

a Lakes with other species are noted only if no preferred species are present.

b Drainage basins as defined by Atton and Merkowsky (1983).

c From lake files (J. Merkowsky, pers. comm.).

d Basins 73-86 and 73-89 to 73-93 inclusive (Atton and Merkowsky 1983) were used to approximate this region.

e Five surveyed lakes had no fish species present, which would not occur in the atlas records.

The distribution of water area (WAREA) in lake surveys did not correspond to the estimated total distribution of either shield or non-shield lakes. Very small lakes were seriously under-represented and all others over-represented (Table 8, Figure 2). A set of 8,540 very small lakes under 10  $\mbox{km}^2$  and 30 lakes over 10  $\mbox{km}^2$  area would represent all shield lakes proportionally. Two other studies of very small lakes under 10 km<sup>2</sup> in localized areas near Lac La Ronge and Key Lake were more representative (Koshinsky 1968, Beak 1979)(Table 9). However, even these latter studies underrepresented lakes under  $0.05 \text{ km}^2$  and over-represented lakes over 0.2 km<sup>2</sup> (Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-tailed test P<0.05 (Conover 1971, Elderton and Johnson 1969)). Nonetheless, further comparisons of lakes over 0.05  $\text{km}^2$  and with known fish species showed no conclusive differences between lakes in these studies and nearby lakes (Kolmogorov-Smirnov P>0.10).

Table 8. Comparison of water areas of lakes in the present study to all Saskatchewan lakes north of  $53^{\circ}N$ .

		Water area <sup>a</sup>						
	Number	<u></u>						
Lake set c	of lakes	VL	L	М	S	VS		
		90 O	8	<u> </u>	90	e k		
Shield lake	s:							
Surveyed	126	3.97	6.35	10.32	17.46	61.90		
All lakes <sup>b</sup>	83,241	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.28	99.65		
Non-shield	lakes:							
Surveyed	122	4.92	6.56	3.28	21.31	63.93		
All lakes <sup>b</sup>	8,477	0.14	0.17	0.18	1.00	98.51		

a VL is >250 km<sup>2</sup>, L is >100-250 km<sup>2</sup>, M is >50-100 km<sup>2</sup>, S is >10-50 km<sup>2</sup>, and VS is  $\leq 10 \text{ km}^2$ .

b Very small lakes were estimated by subsamples and other lakes were counted (A. R. Murray, Fisheries Branch, March 1984, pers. comm.). Figure 2. Number of lakes in each interval of water area. All Saskatchewan lakes north of 53N and the surveyed lakes used in the present study are shown for the shield (panel A) and non-shield (panel B) regions.



Table 9. Comparison of water areas of lakes in studies near La Ronge and Key Lake to nearby lakes.

	Number of lakes								
Water area	La Ronge area <sup>a</sup>		Key La	ke area <sup>b</sup>	Combine	Combined areas <sup>C</sup>			
( km <sup>2</sup> )	Study	Nearby	Study	Nearby	Study	Nearby			
	00	8	Ş	<u>Ş</u>	ક	ş			
<u>&lt;</u> 0.05	0	54.3	22.7	81.5	• • •	• • •			
0.05- 0.1	18.2	12.6	9.1	8.2	•••	•••			
0.1 - 0.2	6.1	9.1	3.6	4.4		• • •			
0.2 - 0.5	27.3	9.8	27.3	3.2	• • •	• • •			
0.5 - 1.0	18.2	7.5	13.6	1.2	38.1	51.1			
1.0 - 2.5	12.1	4.3	4.5	0.6	23.8	28.9			
2.5 - 5.0	12.1	1.6	9.1	0.6	28.6	13.3			
5.0 -10.0	6.1	0.8	0	0	9.5	4.4			
>10.0	0	0	0	1.0	0	2.2			
Number	33	254	22	248	21	45			

a Surveys by Koshinsky (1964, 1968) regarding new Highway 2 route, compared to nearby lakes in 700 km<sup>2</sup> area.
b Surveys by Beak (1979, excluding Russell and Martin lakes) regarding a mine, compared to nearby lakes in 200 km<sup>2</sup> area.

c Data were further restricted to surveyed lakes with known fish species and lakes over 0.5  ${\rm km}^2$  area.

TDS distributions of surveyed lakes were compared to TDS in 419 lakes from an acid-rain study (Liaw and Atton 1980) and to the estimated TDS of all lakes north of 53°N. Surveyed lakes tended to be lower in TDS than lakes in the acid-rain study (Table 10), although the latter study itself was questionably representative (see Discussion). In comparison to all shield lakes, surveyed lakes tended to under-represent TDS below 50 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> and over-represent TDS above 100 mg.L<sup>-1</sup>. In non-shield areas, surveyed lakes overrepresented TDS below 100 and above 200 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> slightly (Table 10). These discrepancies were not statistically significant by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (P>0.10 using discrete classes) in either shield or non-shield lakes. Furthermore, the highest TDS of any lake trout lake in 175 surveyed lakes was 186 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (see Appendix D), and lakes with lower TDS were reasonably well represented.

Table 10. Comparison of total dissolved solids (TDS) in surveyed lakes to other Saskatchewan lakes north of  $53^{\circ}N$ .

	TDS (mg.L <sup>-1</sup> )									
	Number									
Lake set	of lakes	0-20	20-50	50-100	100-200	200-500	500+			
	·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 %	8	ò	8	ê	8			
Shield:										
Acid rain <sup>a</sup>	158	4	32	54	9	0	0			
Surveyed	99	13	42	30	14	0	0			
All lakes <sup>b</sup>	83,241	75	5	24	1	0	0			
Non-shield:										
Acid rain <sup>a</sup> ,	c 261	0	0	3	32	65	0			
Surveyed	98	0	2	11	34	46	7			
All lakes <sup>b</sup>	8,477	0	0	7	45	33	15			

a From Figure 2 in Liaw and Atton (1980).

b Estimated by planimetry of TDS areas (Figure 1 in Liaw and Atton 1980) and numbers of lakes in each  $2^{\circ}$  latitude (A. R. Murray, March 1984, pers. comm.).

c Region differs marginally from surveyed region (see zones B and C in Liaw and Atton 1980).

#### Prediction of lake trout presence

Descriptions of lake trout lakes were not useful in predicting lake trout suitability. Nonetheless, certain characteristics of the lakes in the present study were noteworthy.

All 46 of the lake trout lakes were situated north of  $54^{\circ}N$ latitude, extending from Manitoba to Alberta. No natural lake trout populations exist south of this in Saskatchewan (Marshall and Johnson 1971). Most lake trout lakes were large, deep, clear, cold, and low in minerals and benthic fauna (Appendix D). About 75% were: greater than 7.05 km<sup>2</sup> in area or 92.8 hm<sup>3</sup> in volume, deeper than 8.0 m mean depth or 31.1 m maximum depth, clearer than 4.4 m Secchi disk depth or 11.5 Pt colour units, cooler than 9<sup>0</sup>C maximum bottom temperature or with at least 21.7 hm<sup>3</sup> water between 6<sup>0</sup>C and 15<sup>0</sup>C, and below 95 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> TDS or 7.2 kg.ha<sup>-1</sup> dry weight of benthic fauna.

The size of trout lakes also meant that shoreline lengths and fetches were typically long. Flushing time was available for only 9 lake trout lakes, but was as short as 0.7 years. Minimum summer oxygen concentrations at the bottom were below about 3 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> for one-quarter of the lake trout lakes.

# Univariate criteria

Many variables revealed significant differences between lakes with and without lake trout. In general, 42 of 50 variables examined differed significantly ( $P \le 0.05$ ) in their medians (Appendix E). Within the shield and non-shield areas, 35 and 31 variables (respectively) differed significantly. The ranges of some variables across and within these two major geological zones is important (see Discussion).

Fewer variables showed acceptably low classification error rates for lake trout presence and absence. In general, 27 variables misclassified 25 % or fewer lakes and only 3 variables achieved 10 % or fewer (i.e. VOLT1506', VOLT1504', and VOLT1206' in Table 11). (Recall that primed VOLTnnOn variables denote acceptable precision of  $\pm 20\%$  for volume strata of lake, see Appendix B). In the shield area, 11 of the 17 acceptable variables were temperature-oxygen indices and 2 variables achieved 10 % or less misclassification (i.e. VOLT1506' and VOLT1504'). In the non-shield area, 12 potential predictors related to location, morphometry, and temperature-oxygen conditions; three variables achieved 10 % or less misclassification (i.e. ZBAR, ZMAX and T15T6L in Table 11). Several variables were otherwise acceptable, but available in too few lake trout lakes to be considered reliable (see Appendix E).

Table 11. Univariate predictions of lake trout presence or absence by habitat variables. Only variables which have error rates of 25 % or less and represent 10 or more lakes with lake trout present are shown.

	Lake	trout	Classification				
Variable <sup>a</sup>	Present	Absent	Criterion of presence	Errors(%) <sup>b</sup>			
Location:							
LATD	46	182	> 56.525 <sup>0</sup> N	20			
NORD	46	182	> 7.042	21			
Morphometry	y:						
WAREA	46	179	> 46.7 km <sup>2</sup>	24			
VOLUME	44	157	> 430.01 hm <sup>3</sup>	21			
ZBAR	44	156	> 9.65 m	14			
ZMAX	46	178	> 32.65 m	11			
Physicocher	nistry:						
SECCHI	42	131	> 4.54 m	14			
PHOTOZ	42	138	> 4.54 m	13			
TDS	38	137	< 40.5 mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	21			
SPCON	32	118	< 41.0 uS.cm-1	21			
CA	37	136	< $4.30 \text{ mg}.\text{L}^{-1}$	22			
MG	36	136	< 1.55 mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	22			
NA	35	131	$< 1.28 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$	22			
нсоз	29	127	$< 21.0 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$	21			
Temperature	e-Oxygen:						
ТМАХВ	43	139	< 7.45 C	19			
OMINS	41	133	> 8.35 mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	24			
HIGH6MG	39	130	> 23.0 m	17			
T15T6L	43	139	> 29.5 m	19			
VOLT15T6'	39	116	$> 24.00 \text{ hm}^3$	14			
T1506L	36	127	> 24.5 m	17			
VOLT1506'	34	110	> 3.29 hm <sup>3</sup>	7			
			continu	ed			

# Table 11. continued

	Lake	trout	Classification				
Variable	Present	Absent	Criterion of presence	Errors(%)			
T1504L	36	125	> 29.5 m	14			
VOLT1504'	34	106	> 16.29 hm <sup>3</sup>	10			
T1206L	36	126	> 26.5 m	17			
VOLT1206'	34	107	> 1.04 hm <sup>3</sup>	9			
<u>Biota</u> :							
BENNOA	36	116	< 720 m-2	24			
BENDRY	38	116	< 4.65 kg.ha <sup>-1</sup>	19			
SHIELD LAKES	5						
Morphometry:							
ZBAR	34	77	> 8.30 m	17			
ZMAX	36	79	> 31.15 m	16			
Physicochemi	stry:						
SECCHI	36	69	> 4.15 m	12			
PHOTOZ	36	71	> 4.15 m	11			
Temperature-	Oxygen:						
TMAXB	10	62	< 7.70 C	19			
OMINS	8	59	> 8.17 mg.L <sup>-1</sup>	24			
HIGH6MG	8	57	> 26.5 m	19			
T15T6L	33	74	> 28.5 m	25			
VOLT15T6'	30	62	> 10.33 hm <sup>3</sup>	12			
T1506L	31	72	> 26.5 m	20			
VOLT1506'	29	61	> 2.15 hm <sup>3</sup>	4			
T1504L	31	70	> 29.5 m	21			
VOLT1504 '	29	59	> 7.39 hm <sup>3</sup>	9			
T1206L	31	71	> 28.5 m	20			
VOLT1206'	29	60	> 0.84 hm <sup>3</sup>	11			

continued

### Table 11. continued

Variable  Biota:	Present	Absent	Criterion of presence	Errors(%)
Biota:				
BENNOA	30	67	< 758 m-2	25
BENDRY	32	67	< 4.65 kg.ha <sup>-1</sup>	21
NON-SHIFLD I	AKEC.			
Location:	JAILUO.			
LATD	10	101	> 54.950 <sup>0</sup> N	٨٢
LONGD	10	101	$< 102.192^{0}$ W	16 <sup>C</sup>
NORD	10	101	> 0.958	14 <sup>C</sup>
Morphometry:				
WAREA	10	100	> 201.4 km <sup>2</sup>	16
VOLUME	10	80	> 1400.00 hm <sup>3</sup>	16
ZBAR	10	79	> 12.30 m	9
ZMAX	10	99	> 36.50 m	7
SHOLEN	10	51	> 130.4 km	23 <sup>C</sup>
Temperature-	Oxygen:			
TMAXS	10	78	< 18.60 C	23 <sup>C</sup>
TMAXB	10	62	< 7.45 C	17
T15T6U	10	65	> 16.5 m	17
T15T6L	10	65	> 32.5 m	5

a See Table 1 for variable names.

b Overall error rate for same lakes using criteria shown.

c Some criteria showed no significant difference in medians in Mann-Whitney tests (P>0.05, see Appendix E).

## Shield and non-shield criteria

Many of the better predictors of lake trout presence were related to size of the lake, encompassing both morphometric and temperature-oxygen conditions. Comparisons of criteria of lake trout presence showed that non-shield lakes must be larger and deeper than shield lakes. For example, non-shield lakes with WAREA greater than 201 km<sup>2</sup> and shield lakes greater than 27 km<sup>2</sup> (i.e. a 7.5-fold difference) were predicted to have lake trout (Table 12). This was initially assumed to be indicative of generally shallower morphometry, warmer conditions, and perhaps more frequent wind-circulation in non-shield lakes.

Inexplicably, non-shield lakes also required 10- to 43fold greater volumes of suitable temperature and oxygen (e.g. VOLT1506 of 69 <u>versus</u> 2 hm<sup>3</sup>). No other criteria showed differences of even 5-fold between shield and non-shield lakes.

### (1) Anomalies

Non-shield lakes, particularly lake trout ones, were represented better than their shield counterparts. The 10 non-shield lake trout lakes in this study were a high proportion of the 14 known in Saskatchewan (Marshall and Johnson 1971). The 122 surveyed non-shield lakes were a higher proportion of the estimated total of 8,477 lakes in this region than the 126 surveyed shield lakes out of a total of 83,241 shield lakes (see Table 8).

Table 12. Criteria of lake trout presence or absence in shield and non-shield lakes.

	Cri	teria of pro	Errors (%)			
Variable	Shield	Non-shield	Units	Factorb	Shield	Non-shield
WAREA	26.8	201.4	km <sup>2</sup>	7.5	31	16
VOLUME	217.7	1400.0	hm <sup>3</sup>	6.4	27	16
ZBAR	8.3	12.3	m	1.5	17	9
ZMAX	31.2	36.5	m	1.2	16	7
VOL6MG'	150.9	1583.5	hm <sup>3</sup>	10.5	29	15
VOLT15T6 '	10.3	204.2	hm <sup>3</sup>	19.8	12	6
VOLT1506 '	2.2	69.0	hm <sup>3</sup>	32.1	4	7
VOLT1504 '	7.4	202.9	hm <sup>3</sup>	27.5	9	4
VOLT1206'	0.8	35.7	hm <sup>3</sup>	42.6	11	8

a See Table 11 or Appendix E.

b Defined as non-shield criterion divided by shield criterion.

Random subsets of shield lakes were examined for VOLUME and VOLT15T6' only. VOLUME was one of the variables most amenable to assessment of recent conditions (see below) and VOLT15T6' represented an intermediate difference of 19-fold between shield and non-shield lakes. For these two criteria, mean non-shield requirements remained 2.4 to 7.4fold greater than for small samples of shield lakes. Twelve small-sample replicates showed VOLUME criteria of 551 to 772  $hm^3$  compared to 1400  $hm^3$  for non-shield lakes, and VOLT15T6' criteria of 18 to 55  $hm^3$  compared to 204  $hm^3$  (Table 13).

The mean small-sample shield criteria for VOLUME and VOLT15T6' were both greater than the full-sample shield criteria (i.e. 591 to 218 and 27 to 11, respectively). The ratios of small-sample to full-sample criteria were inversely related to the ratios of small-sample to full-sample trout incidence. That is, a subset of lakes of which 11 % had lake trout showed a criterion about 31/11 times that of a set of which 31 % had lake trout (see VOLUME above).

Shield criteria showed little evidence of a gradient with latitude. Only WAREA showed an orderly sequence to smaller criteria in more northerly lakes (Table 14). Most other variables showed minimal criteria for lakes between  $56^{0}$  and  $58^{0}$ N, which may reflect some aspect of lake-size bias or small sample sizes. Overall there was little indication of differences within the shield area comparable to those between shield and non-shield areas.

	Classification						
Replicate	Criterion of presence	Errors (%)					
VOLUME <sup>a</sup>							
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>&gt; 571.45 hm<sup>3</sup> 605.16 571.45 571.45 571.45 614.86 571.45 571.45 571.45 571.45 550.82 550.82 771.92</pre>	14 11 14 14 14 11 14 14 14 16 16					
Mean	591.14	13					
VOLT15T6'b 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Mean	<pre>&gt; 33.12 hm<sup>3</sup> 17.81 23.79 34.60 22.39 23.36 23.79 22.64 55.28 23.79 23.79 23.79 23.79 25.38 27.48</pre>	10 16 10 6 16 10 13 10 6 13 10 13 10 13					

Table 13. Small-sample criteria of lake trout presence or absence in shield lakes.

a Ten trout and 77 non-trout lakes, compared to 10 and 80 (respectively) for non-shield VOLUME sample.b Nine trout and 54 non-trout lakes, as for non-shield

VOLT15T6' sample.

Table 14. Univariate predictions of lake trout presence or absence in subareas of the shield region.

	Number o	of lakes	-			
Variable	with la	ke trout	Classification <sup>a</sup>	ion <sup>a</sup>		
Subarea	Present	Absent	Criterion of presence	Errors(%)		
WAREA:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Shield	36	79	> 26.8 km <sup>2</sup>	31		
N of 58 <sup>0</sup>	11	10	7.7	19		
56-58 <sup>0</sup>	13	13	9.5	38		
S of 56 <sup>0</sup>	12	56	52.8	26		
Non-shield	10	100	201.4	16		
VOLUME:			2			
Shield	34	77	> 217.68 hm <sup>3</sup>	27		
N of 580	9	10	219.95	11		
56-58	13	13	82.62	15		
S of 56	12	54	317.65	27		
Non-shield	10	80	1400.00	16		
VOL6MG':			2			
Shield	29	62	> 150.90 hm <sup>3</sup>	29		
N of 580	7	6	218.90	15		
56-58 <sup>0</sup>	11	11	82.54	18		
S of 560	11	45	215.45	29		
Non-shield	7	48	1583.50	15		
VOLT15T6':			2			
Shield	30	62	> 10.33 hm <sup>3</sup>	12		
N of 580	8	6	24.65	14		
56-580	11	11	2.01	5		
S of 56	11	45	10.46	11		
Non-shield	9	54	204.21	6		
VOLT1506'D:			2			
Shield	29	61	$> 2.15 hm^{3}$	4		
N of 580	7	5	2.2-40.9	•••		
56-580	11	11	0.62	9		
S of 560	11	45	2.25	4		
Non-shield	5	49	69.05	7		

a Approximately equal numbers of presence and absence are misclassified.

b VOLT1504' and VOLT1206' show similar differences.

c Delineation is too broad to give reliable criterion.

Shield and non-shield lakes showed similar declines in volume requirements as temperature-oxygen conditions became more restrictive (Table 15). For example, restricting VOLUME to volume of 6 to  $15^{\circ}C$  temperature (i.e. VOLT16T6') caused decreases of 95 % in shield and 85 % in non-shield criteria. Parallel tendencies suggested similar limnological and physiological mechanisms in lakes and lake trout in the two regions. Nonetheless, some irregularities occurred in these trends. Restricting VOLUME to VOL6MG' in non-shield lakes caused the requirement to increase 13 %, in contrast to a decrease of 31 % in shield lakes. This suggested a greater need for suitable summer oxygen and/or greater seasonal or annual variability in non-shield lakes. In non-shield lakes, cooler water was relatively less important than higher oxygen levels as criteria decreased 48 % and 66 %, respectively. In shield lakes, cooler water was almost as important as higher oxygen.

### (2) Recent conditions

Drought conditions which may have caused differences between shield and non-shield lakes for lake trout, were expected to show: (1) volumes under extreme low waterlevels which were notably less than under typical conditions, and (2) significant differences in this effect between shield and non-shield lakes (Figure 3).

Table 15. Changes in criteria of lake trout presence or absence as temperature-oxygen conditions became more restrictive.

	Change in criteria (%)				
Restriction	Shield	Non-shield			
VOLUME to VOLT15T6'	- 95	- 85			
VOLUME to VOL6MG'	- 31	+ 13			
VOLT15T6' to VOLT1506'	- 79	- 66			
VOLT1506' to VOLT1206'	- 61	- 48			
VOLT1504' to VOLT1506'	- 71	- 66			
VOLITSO4 CO VOLTISO6'	- 71	- 66			

<u>Waterlevels</u> Summer waterlevels were available for 10 or more years for 33 lakes (Figure 4 and Appendix F). One third were shield lakes, which were predominantly over 100 km<sup>2</sup>. Non-shield lakes represented water areas both larger and smaller than the criterion of lake trout presence (Table 16). Step-wise polynomial regression produced relatively simple predictive equations (Appendix F). Some examples of the variety of waterlevel fluctuations are shown in Figure 5. Figure 3. The hypothetical effect of waterlevel variations and/or morphometry on the apparent volume required by lake trout. If shield and non-shield lakes differ as shown, the same actual requirement for volume during years of low water would give rise to different apparent requirements during typical years.



Figure 4. Lakes with summer waterlevel data available for 10 or more years. Solid circles represent shield lakes and open circles, non-shield lakes.



Table 1	.6. 1	Number	or .	Lakes	wnich	nave	ten	or	more	years	OĽ
July-Au	igust	waterl	.eve	l data	avai]	lable.	•				

Bedrock	Number					
geology	of lakes	VL	L	М	S	VS
Shield	10	4	4	0	2 <sup>b</sup>	0
Non-shield	23	9	2 <sup>b</sup>	6	6	0

a VL is >250 km<sup>2</sup>, L is >100-250 km<sup>2</sup>, M is >50-100 km<sup>2</sup>, S is >10-50 km<sup>2</sup>, and VS is <10 km<sup>2</sup>.

b Criterion of lake trout presence lies in this area category.

Waterlevel variations (i.e. typical year minus the lowest 1 in 100 years) which were based on extrapolations of observed waterlevels (see Appendix F), ranged from 0.070 to 1.862 m but seldom exceeded 1 m. Shield and non-shield lakes showed increasing waterlevel variations with larger lake area (Figure 6). Although overlap of data was considerable, separate regressions for shield and non-shield lakes were statistically better than parallel lines or a single regression line (Appendix F). Morphometry The 209 lakes available for volume-at-depth analysis represented all categories of bedrock geology and lake area (Table 17). This set included the subset of lakes which were otherwise reserved for later testing of predictive models.

Relative water volume changes caused by waterlevel declines of 0.5 to 2.0 m were considerably greater in small lakes than larger lakes, as expected. A single regression was suitable for 0.5 m, but separate regressions for shield and non-shield lakes were required for 2.0 m (Figure 7 and Appendix F). Absolute volume below 2.0 m was greater in larger lakes than smaller, as expected. The relationship to water area was again significantly different for shield and non-shield lakes (Appendix F). Shield lakes of 100 km<sup>2</sup> had volumes below 2 m depth which were 1.5 x greater than non-shield lakes of similar area (Appendix F).

Figure 5. Variety of observed and predicted low July-August waterlevels. Only observations which do not lie on the line are shown.


Figure 6. Waterlevel variations (i.e. typical year minus lowest 1 in 100 years) in relation to water area. Circles represent variations as extrapolated from observed waterlevels; lines represent regressions of these variations on water area. 國際國家



		Water area <sup>a</sup>										
Bedrock	Number											
geology	of lakes	VL	L	М	S	VS						
Shield	124	б	9	11	24	74						
Non-shield	85	10	12	8	21	34						

Table 17. Number of lakes used in the present study which have volume-at-depth data available.

a VL is >250 km<sup>2</sup>, L is >100-250 km<sup>2</sup>, M is >50-100 km<sup>2</sup>, S is >10-50 km<sup>2</sup>, and VS is <10 km<sup>2</sup>.

<u>Residual volumes</u> Residual water volume (i.e. the volume below the predicted 1 in 100 year low summer waterlevel) increased with increasing water area, in spite of concurrently greater waterlevel variations. Shield and nonshield lakes differed significantly in regressions of both (1) residual volume against expected waterlevel variation (Figure 8) and (2) residual volume against water area.

The combined effects of waterlevel variation and morphometry suggest that shield lakes of 10 to 100 km<sup>2</sup> lost 2 to 3 % of volume and similar non-shield lakes 3 to 6 % of volume during extreme low summer waterlevels in the last 100 years (Table 18). (Recall that this loss is from a typical summer low, rather than from any seasonal high waterlevel). i de la

Figure 7. Regressions of relative volume above 2 m depth on water area, separately for shield and non-shield lakes (see Appendix F).



Figure 8. Regressions of residual volume on predicted waterlevel variations, separately for shield and non-shield lakes (see Appendix F).



		Volume								
Lake set	Area (km <sup>2</sup> )	Residual (hm <sup>3</sup> )	Total (hm <sup>3</sup> )	Loss (%)						
Shield	10	67.24	68.82	2						
	100	910.12	942.54	3						
Non-shield	10	56.60	58.33	3						
	100	637.24	679.36	6						

Table 18. Expected loss of water volume from the combined effects of waterlevel variations and morphometry.

### Multivariate criteria

Depth and water area A model of the influence of depth and lake area on sedimentation (Hilton 1985) correctly predicted the lake trout status in 86 % of shield lakes. The regions and boundaries were adopted from Hilton (1985): the peripheral wave action (PWA) boundaries were a minimum volume of 23.6 hm<sup>3</sup> (line b) and a minimum depth of one wavelength at wind speeds of 20 m.s-1 (line a, modified from Smith 1979); the intermittent complete mixing (ICM) boundary was a maximum volume of 23.6 hm<sup>3</sup>; and the random redistribution (RR) boundary was a maximum depth of one wavelength, as above (Figure 9).

Wave action in large deep lakes creates turbulence and resuspends sediments from near the shore, which are redeposited in off-shore areas (model PWA of Hilton 1985, Hakanson 1977 cited in Hilton 1985). Autumn overturn in small deep lakes resuspends sediments from the entire lake bed, which are redeposited in proportion to the depth of overlying water (model ICM). Both mechanisms result in a net transport of sediments from shallow to deeper areas. By contrast, shallow lakes are susceptible to periodic openwater resuspensions and redepositions over the entire lake. These do not transfer sediments from shallow into deeper zones (model RR).

<u>Multiple discriminant analysis</u> Stepwise rankings of variables in discriminant analyses showed that some variables were consistently ranked highly, particularly SECCHI and VOLT15T6 (Table 19). When both SECCHI AND VOLT15T6' were available, ZBAR, ZMAX, VOLUME, VOL6MG', and VOLT15O6' were left aside. Only when one was not available (e.g. subsets 2 and 3, see Table 19) did other variables contribute significantly. VOLT15T6 was ranked more highly than volumes of suitable oxygen or temperature-oxygen in direct comparisons (e.g. subset 3).

Figure 9. Lake trout presence and absence in Saskatchewan lakes in relation to predicted sediment distribution. The model by Hilton (1985) implies clearing of spawning sites above and to the right of the solid line (see text). Numbers in circles represent the number of lakes coincident at a point.



- 2

Stepwise ranking of variables in multiple discrimination of lake trout presence and Table 19. absence.

Ranking	(1)		Subsets of (2)	f variable	s and lake (3)	и	(4)	
of variable	A11	Shield	A11	Shield	A11	Shield	All	Shield
First	VOLT15T6 <sup>8</sup>	SECCHI	SECCHI	SECCHI	VOLT15T6	VOLT15T6	VOLT15T6	SECCHI
Second Third	SECCHI	VOLT15T6 BENDRY	SHODEV-	WAREA	VOLEMG VOLT1506	VOLEMG	SECCHI BENDRY	VOLI151 BENDRY
:	•		:	:	:	:	:	:
	BENDRY	ZBAR	ZBAR	ALT <sup>b</sup>	VOLT1504	V0LT1506	VOLT1506	ZMAX
Aside	TDS	ZMAX	HM I NS	ZBAR	V0LT1206	V0LT1206	TDS	TDS
	PHMINS <sup>b</sup>	TDS	INVALK <sup>C</sup>	INVALK <sup>C</sup>		VOLT1504	VOLUME	VOLT150
ZMAX	VOLEMG	WAREA	SNIWHA			ZMAX	VOLUME	
	VOLGMG	q SN I WHA	ALT <sup>b</sup>	SHODEV <sup>b</sup>				
	ZBAR							
Number of 1	akes:							
	91	57	39	32	138	87	32	57
Number of 1	akes with	lake trout	present/a	bsent:				
	29/62	24/33	18/21	16/16	34/104	29/58	28/64	24/33
a Constant before log	10 <sup>-6</sup> was transforma	added to V ation.	'OLT15T6 an	d VOL6MG a	ind 10 <sup>4</sup> to	VOLT1506.	VOLT1504.	and VOLT1206
for an lar	ULARIES OF ME	3 4 1 011 .						

b This variable is not log transformed. c INVALK is defined as 100/TOTALK.

Classification errors of lake trout status using MDA ranged from 2 to 12 % for 3 subsets of variables and 4 MDA methods (Table 20). These apparent error rates (from retesting the initial set of lakes) are comparable to those of univariate criteria. The cross-validation rates of 6 to 16 % are more reliable as each lake was classified using the rule determined from the other n - 1 lakes (Lachenbruch 1975, Dillon 1979). Some error rates for the reserved set of lakes were very low, but the small sample sizes of 3 to 27 lakes suggest these rates should be viewed with caution.

The non-parametric nearest-neighbour MDA was comparable in accuracy to the linear MDA. Both methods showed slightly lower cross-validated error rates when prior probabilities of each class were assumed to be equal (Table 20).

The canonical standardized coefficients showed that the relative importance (SAS 1987) of log SECCHI was similar to log VOLT15T6' (see coefficients 0.695 and 0.719, respectively) and greater than log WAREA, after adjusting for the dispersion of each variable. Altitude (ALT) was also relatively influential in the smallest set of 32 lakes. The raw coefficients were applicable to unadjusted habitat data of lakes in the shield region of Saskatchewan.

Table 20. Classification and description of lake trout presence and absence using multiple discriminant analysis.

Numbers of lakes	Classifi	cation errors (%) <sup>a</sup>
Lake trout	Linear	Neighbour
Present Absent Test	Proportional Equal	Proportional Equal
1) log SECCHI, log VO 28 52 16 2) log SECCHI, log WA	MLTI5T6', log BENDRY <sup>b</sup> 10% 14% 0% 12% 12% 0% REA <sup>b</sup>	8% 10% 0% 2% 6% 0%
36 69 27 3) log SECCHI, log WAI	7% 11% 4% 10% 10% 12% REA, ALT, 109 ZBAR, INVALK <sup>C</sup> , PHMIN	7% 13% 7% 10% 10% 10% 4% S. SHODEV
16 16 3	9% 16% 0% 9% 16% 0%	12% 16% 0% 12% 16% 0%
Corresponding canonic 1) Canonical = 3.240 = 0.695 2) Canonical = 5.981 = 1.301 = 1.301 3) Canonical = 3.374 = 0.100 = 0.901 ]	al equations: log SECCHI + 0.198 log VOLTI5T6' - log SECCHI + 0.719 log VOLTI5T6' - log SECCHI + 0.585 log WAREA (raw log SECCHI + 0.593 log WAREA + 0.00 log SECCHI + 0.369 log WAREA + 0.00 0 INVALK - 0.451 PHMINS + 0.018 SHO log SECCHI + 0.341 log WAREA + 0.80 log SECCHI + 0.341 log WAREA + 0.80 log SECCHI + 0.151 PHMINS + 0.117 SHO	1.010 log BENDRY (raw coefficients) 0.388 log BENDRY (standardized) coefficients) dardized) 39 ALT + 1.402 log ZBAR DDEV (raw coefficients) 39 ALT + 0.448 log ZBAR DDEV (standardized)
a Errors were determir initial data set. and	hed by resubstitution and cross-va) by use of the reserved dots out	iidation (Lachenbruch 1975) in the
b Subsets correspond t	to those in Table 19.	espectively.

c INVALK is defined as 100/TOTALK.

### Estimation of missing data

TDS from SPCON Correlation of TDS with SPCON was well defined (Figure 10). Separate regressions were indicated for shield and non-shield lakes (Table 21). Two studies by consultants were excluded because methods used were different than in all other surveys of shield lakes (see Appendix G).

SHODEV and RLOGSHOD SHODEV and RLOGSHOD were potential indicators of depth, wind-protection, and other conditions. SHODEV is the ratio of actual shoreline length to the circumference of a circle of equal area. Separate regressions of log SHODEV on log WAREA were indicated for shield and non-shield lakes (Table 21). RLOGSHOD, or the deviation of actual SHODEV of any lake from that predicted by its water area, is an alternative index to SHODEV itself (Koshinsky 1970). The predicted SHODEV was derived separately for shield and non-shield lakes. The ratio of actual to predicted minimized the correlation of RLOGSHOD with log SHODEV (see Appendix G). RLOGSHOD was a frequent predictor in stepwise regressions, typically after WAREA and concurrent with FETCH (Appendix G).

ZMAX and ZBAR Regressions of ZMAX on subsets of morphometric variables showed that log WAREA and log FETCH

Figure 10. Relationship between log TDS and log specific conductivity (SPCON) in central and northern Saskatchewan lakes (solid circles). Open circles represent lakes in the Key Lake and Midwest Lake areas which were excluded (see Appendix G).



Table 21. Useful regressions of habitat criteria using more numerous or more available habitat variables.

Regressions (multiple R<sup>2</sup>,n)

### All lakes:

log TISTGU = 0.936 + 0.427 log WAREA - 0.504 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.46, n=189)<sup>a</sup> log T1206U = 0.959 + 0.399 log WAREA - 0.410 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.50, n=183)<sup>a</sup> log SHODEV = 0.354 + 0.243 log WAREA - 0.109 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.44,n=219) log ZBAR = 0.694 + 0.271 log WAREA - 0.243 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.29,n=229) log ZMAX = 1.112 + 0.438 log WAREA - 0.4 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.39,n=249) log SHODEV = 0.318 + 0.184 log WAREA (R<sup>2</sup>=0.40,n=237) log VOLUME = 0.554 + 1.151 log WAREA ( $R^2=0.93, n=274$ ) log TDS = 0.142 + 0.880 log SPCON ( $\mathbb{R}^2=0.95$ , n=186)

### Shield lakes:

log TDS = 0.167 + 0.878 log SPCON ( $R^2 = 0.79$ , n=77) log SHODEV = 0.384 + 0.250 log WAREA ( $R^2 = 0.73$ , n=152) log SHODEV = 0.429 + 0.329 log WAREA - 0.164 log FETCH ( $R^2 = 0.74$ , n=144) log ZMAX = 1.212 + 0.556 log WAREA - 0.619 log FETCH ( $R^2 = 0.50$ , n=145) log ZBAR = 0.684 + 0.242 log WAREA - 0.165 log FETCH ( $R^2 = 0.32$ , n=143) log VOLUME = 0.636 + 1.159 log WAREA - 0.165 log FETCH ( $R^2 = 0.32$ , n=143)

### <u>Non-shield lakes:</u>

log TDS = -0.087 + 0.956 log SPCON ( $\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.96$ , n=109) log SHODEV = 0.180 + 0.130 log WAREA ( $\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.25$ , n=85) log SHODEV = 0.036 - 0.141 log WAREA + 0.574 log FETCH ( $\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.32$ , n=75) log ZMAX = 0.910 + 0.162 log WAREA + 0.062 log FETCH ( $\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.32$ , n=104) log ZBAR = 0.696 + 0.297 log WAREA - 0.313 log FETCH ( $\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.24$ , n=86) log VOLUME = 0.419 + 1.182 log WAREA ( $\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.90$ , n=123)

Table 21. cont'd.

Regressions (multiple R<sup>2</sup>,n)

## <u>Stratified lakes:</u>

log VOLTISTG = 3.545 - 0.935 log WAREA + 3.641 log FETCH - 0.219 TMAXS (R<sup>2</sup>=0.37,n=87) log VOLT15T6 = -0.805 - 0.290 log WAREA + 2.612 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.31,n=67) log T15T6U = 0.847 + 0.243 log WAREA - 0.134 log FETCH  $(R^2=0.74, n=93)^a$ log T1206U = 0.872 + 0.151 log WAREA + 0.095 iog FETCH  $(R^2=0.76, n=90)^{a}$ 

# Non-stratified lakes:

log T15T6U = 1.062 + 0.749 log WAREA - 1.100 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.49,n=80)<sup>a</sup> log T1206U = 1.077 + 0.754 log WAREA - 1.123 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.47,n=77)<sup>a</sup>

# <u>Non-riverine lakes with non-zero VOLTI5T6<sup>b</sup>.</u>

log VOLT15T6 = -0.288 + 1.193 log WAREA + 0.888 log SECCHI - 0.154 RLOGSHOD (R<sup>2</sup>=0.91,n=75) log VOLT15T6 = -0.025 + 1.070 log WAREA + 0.397 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.90,n=75)

# Lakes with non-zero VOLT15T6:

log VOLTISTG = -0.008 + 1.080 log WAREA + 0.188 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.84;n=88) log VOLT15T6 = -0.799 + 1.097 log WAREA + 1.428 log SECCHI (R<sup>2</sup>=0.88,n=88) a Lakes with T15T6U or T1206U = 0 m were excluded (i.e. TMAXS  $\leq$  15 or 12<sup>O</sup>C, respectively). b Non-riverine lakes have Froud index  $\leq$  0.03 (see STRAFN).

were important, explaining 39 % of total variation in all lakes (Table 21). Separate regressions explained about 50 and 32 % of variation in shield and non-shield lakes, respectively. Lakes oriented more northeasterly had greater maximum depth; the increase in correlation due to orientation was minor (Appendix G). Similarly, indices based on surficial geology (e.g. rocks, morainal, glaciofluvial, and organic material prevalence) did not improve estimation significantly in shield lakes (see Appendix G). ZBAR or mean depth was less predictable than maximum depth. The best predictions explained only 32 and 24 % of variation in shield and non-shield lakes, respectively (Table 21).

VOLUME Lake volume was clearly related to water area alone. This single predictor explained 96 and 90 % of variation in shield and non-shield lakes, respectively (Table 21). Other variables were not explored although FETCH, FETDEV, and ORINW may be useful.

STRAFN The presence of stratification in lakes is well predicted from ZMAX and WAREA and other morphometric indices. The degree of stratification was simplified to "no" (none or weak) or "yes" (moderate, strong, very strong). The boundary condition based on WAREA (Gorham 1980 cited in Cruikshank 1984) correctly classified 77 % of 225 lakes. An empirical

boundary condition derived in the present study using FETCH:

log ZMAX (m)  $\geq$  0.78 + 0.42 log FETCH (km) correctly classified 82 % of 199 lakes (see Appendix G). These predictions are based on morphometry and the effects of wind-generated turbulence.

Stratification can also be prevented or disrupted by rapid water exchange in "riverine" situations. The Froud index of relative flow-through (Orlob 1983) explained the observed non-stratification of several lakes which according to morphometric criteria alone ought to stratify. The Froud criteria appeared to be:

F in non-stratified lakes > 0.03

F in stratified lakes < 0.03 (see Appendix G). When riverine lakes were excluded using the Froud index, the alternate boundary condition for FETCH was:

log ZMAX (m)  $\geq 0.82 \pm 0.50$  log FETCH (km). This correctly classified stratification in 86 % of 185 lakes (Figure 11). Attempts to use estimated maximum depth in boundary conditions were unsuccessful, as stratified and nonstratified lakes overlapped in plots.

The maximum depth of 15<sup>0</sup>C during open water (T15T6U) was assessed as a potential contributor to VOLT15T6. Regressions of log T15T6U on subsets of variables showed that log WAREA and log FETCH were important, explaining about 46 % of total variation in all lakes (Table 21). In stratified lakes, log WAREA and log FETCH explained 74 % of variation in log T15T6U

(Table 21). In this respect, the maximum depth of  $15^{\circ}$ C behaved similarly to the thermocline in other studies (see Discussion). Nonetheless, the use of TMAXS was necessary for predictive-quality equations and explained 78 % of total variation; most other regressions were only marginally acceptable (Hocking 1976)(Appendix G). The NW-component of fetch (ORIFET) or elongation (FETDEV) was necessary for predictions, presumably to represent wind-driven mixing.

VOLT15T6 Two distinct classes of lakes occurred: those with some VOLT15T6, which was apparently related to WAREA and FETCH, and those with none (Figure 12). Regressions of log VOLT15T6 on morphometry and climate revealed strong correlations only for certain types of lakes. In nonriverine lakes with non-zero volume of 6 to 15<sup>0</sup>C water, VOLT15T6 was estimable at  $R^2=0.91$  (Table 21). Regressions using WAREA, SECCHI, RLOGSHOD, and/or TMAXS were marginally acceptable for prediction; estimations using only WAREA and FETCH were not acceptable statistically by comparison to other regressions using more more variables (see Appendix G). Furthermore, non-zero VOLT15T6 was estimable at  $R^2=0.88$ in all lakes (Table 21). This class does not require knowledge of ZMAX or discharge and regressions are similar, though less precise. Estimation was achieved in 152 shield lakes using area and fetch (and any others with these simple data), compared to 109 lakes with measured VOLT15T6.

Figure 11. Delineation of stratified and non-stratified lakes using maximum depth and fetch (hatched line). Lakes which were riverine according to the Froud index were excluded (see text).



Figure 12. Two distinct relationships of log VOLT15T6 to log water area in Saskatchewan shield and non-shield lakes. Lakes with non-zero VOLT15T6 have a logarithm greater than -6.



By comparison, the best correlations for stratified and non-stratified lakes were  $R^2=0.37$  and 0.18, respectively (Table 21, Appendix G). Similarly, regressions explained only 15 and 54 % of variation in lakes predicted to stratify and not to stratify by the fetch-boundary condition.

<u>VOLT1506</u> The Secchi depth criterion of 4 m predicted suitable conditions with 84 % accuracy in 86 shield lakes (Appendix G). Transparency was a good predictor of the existence of a minimum volume of water having temperature below  $15^{\circ}$ C and oxygen above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup>.

### Marginal habitat

The occurrence of major misclassifications increased fairly regularly as the accuracy of the criteria declined. VOLT16T6' correctly classified 96 % and definitely misclassified 3 % of shield lakes, and VOLUME 71 % and 28 %, respectively (Table 22). Minor errors were lower at 0 to 6%, but not regular in occurrence. In addition, lakes in which lake trout were considered to be transient or extinct, or were unverified by surveys (i.e. presumably of lower abundance) had only slightly lower occurrences in these zones. Analyses were not suitable for non-shield lakes since post-glacial immigration and/or climate (rather than present habitat) may be dominant influences in this region.

Table 22. Minor and major misclassifications of lake trout presence or absence in shield lakes by selected variables.

		Misclassifications (%)							
Variable <sup>a</sup>	Number of lakes	None	Minor	Major					
VOLT1506'	90	96	1	3					
VOLT1504 '	88	91	0	9					
PHOTOZ	107	88	4	8					
ZMAX	115	84	6	10					
ТМАХВ	110	81	3	16					
BENDRY	99	79	2	19					
COLOUR	50	72	6	22					
VOLUME	111	71	1	28					

a See Table 1 for variable names.

Specific shield lakes which were misclassified by more accurate variables had a clear tendency to be misclassified more frequently by other variables (Table 23). Since this is based on specific lakes, it is not merely a generality over all lakes. Given this tendency, about 72 % of lakes for which any criterion was perfect would be misclassified by other variables (Figure 13). Some lakes were definitely misclassified by very many or very few variables (e.g. Middle Foster and Riou lakes, respectively), but it was not common.

			Vá	aria	abl	еo	r p	air	E		
Lake	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Dickens	Х				x	X		X		·	
Middle Foster	х	Х	х	х	Х	Х	х	Х	х	х	Х
Mirond	Х	Х			х		х		х	х	
Sandy	Х	Х	Х	х	х		х		х	х	х
Contact		Х					Х		х	х	
Haugen		Х							Х		
McDonald		Х	Х	Х			х		х	Х	х
Wapata		Х				Х		Х			
Wathaman		Х			Х		х		х	х	
Bartlett	-		х	х	х	Х		Х	х	х	
Karl Ernst			х	х	••	••	••	••			х
Mackay			Х							х	х
Mullock			Х	Х	Х	Х					х
Richter			Х	х							х
Wood			Х	х							х
Hatchet	••	••	••	х		Х	• •	••		••	х
Upper Foster				х	х	Х	Х		Х		х
Riou				Х							х
Wildnest	••	••	• •	Х			х	••	х	••	
Hebden					Х	Х		Х	х	Х	
Кеу					х	Х		Х			
Mekewap					х	Х		Х			х
Frout					х				х	Х	
∛ierzycki					х	х	х	х	х	х	
Hourglass						х		х		-	
AcIntosh						х					
McMahon	• •	• •				х					

Table 23. Misclassifications of lake trout presence or absence in particular shield lakes by selected variables.

continued

Table 23. continued.

				Vâ	iria	ıbl∈	e or	pa	lir				<u></u>
Lake	1	2	3	3 4	5	6	5 7	8	9	10	11		
Cluff							X						
Fafard							Х		Х	X			
Giles	••	• •	••		••	••	Х						
Jan									х	х			
Mountain	• •		••						х				
Ourom									х	Х			
Baldhead											х		
Carswell											х		
Five Fingers											х		
Hunter Bay											х		
Lower Foster											х		
Pechey											Х		
Reindeer											Х		
Sim											Х		
Upper Seahorse											Х		
Accuracy (%)	96	91	90	89	89	88	88	87	84	84	81		
Errors (%) <sup>b</sup>	65	49	49	48	47	37	46	40	40	42	24		
a X are misclassi	ficat	io	ns,	bla	anks	s a	re (	cor	rect	, a	and	••	are
missing data. Vari	ables	a ai	nd j	pai	rs a	are	: 1	= 1	JOL 1	r150	D6',	2	=
VOLT1504', $3 = VOL$	T1506	5' á	and	TM	AXB	, 4	= 2	ZMA	K ar	nd 1	MAX	в,	5 =
ZMAX and PHOTOZ, 6	= PH	юто	DZ,	7 =	= ZM	AAX	and	B BI	ENDF	RΥ,	8 =		
VOLT1506' and PHOT	OZ, 9	) =	ZM	ΑX,	10	- 1	/OL1	150	)6'	and	I ZM	AX,	and
11 = TMAXB.													

b Errors are overall misclassifications by remaining variables of lakes which have been misclassified by named variable.

Figure 13. Trend of the error rate of ten variables (vertical axis) and of a single variable (horizontal axis). The hatched line extrapolates to an intercept of 72 % of lakes.



### Validation and extrapolation

The accuracy of most criteria was similar for the 68 reserved lakes and the preliminary 262 lakes (Figure 14). Notable differences were observed for SECCHI in shield lakes and ZMAX in non-shield lakes (i.e. greater accuracy), and VOLT1506' in shield lakes and VOLUME in all lakes (i.e. lesser accuracy). The numbers of reserved lakes with known species and habitat ranged from 28 to 65, correspondingly less in separate shield and non-shield classes. Final criteria based on all available 330 lakes were within ± 10 % of preliminary criteria with some exceptions (Table 24). These were WAREA, VOLUME, VOLT15T6', VOLT1506', VOLT1504', and VOLT1206'.

Using log VOLT15T6, the probability of trout presence at habitat x decreased when corrections for incomplete surveys in some lakes and for preferential surveying of lake trout lakes were made (Table 25). As an example, the probability was 10 % at log VOLT15T6=-0.4 (i.e. 0.4 hm<sup>3</sup>) for the biased set of lakes and log VOLT15T6=0.6 (i.e. 4.0 hm<sup>3</sup>) for the doubly corrected set (Figure 15). Actual asymmetric, logistic, and polynomial trends behaved similarly.

The distribution of estimated log VOLT15T6 in 1450 randomly selected shield lakes showed a median about 0.014  $hm^3$ . The proportion of lakes with log VOLT15T6 > x was well described by the exponential curve:

P = 0.030344 e (n=6, r<sup>2</sup>=0.997)

Figure 14. Relationship between errors of univariate criteria in preliminary and validation sets of lakes. The line indicates perfect agreement between these two sets.


		Final classification			
Variables	Validation errors (%) <sup>a</sup>	Number of lakes	Criterion of presence	Errors(%)	
Location:		······································			
LATD	17	293	> 56.58	19	
NORD	15	293	> 6.86	19	
Morphometry:				27	
WAREA <sup>b</sup>	28	289	> 52.9	25	
VOLUME <sup>b</sup>	30	257	> 490.13	23	
ZBAR	12	257	> 9.70	14	
ZMAX	5	287	> 32.65	4 Q	
Physicochemist	ry:			5	
SECCHI	11	226	> 4.35	12	
TDS	14	226	< 40.0	19	
SPCON	20	195	< 39.65	21	
<u>Temperature-Ox</u>	ygen:				
TMAXB	24	237	< 7.80	20	
VOLT15T6 <sup>, b</sup>	19	168	> 31.80	17	
VOLT1506' <sup>b</sup>	13	159	> 3.29	9	
VOLT1504' <sup>b</sup>	14	152	> 19.80	11	
VOLT1206' <sup>b</sup>	17	155	> 0.47	12	
<u>Biota</u> :					
BENDRY	20	199	< 4.60	17	
SHIELD LAKES				- /	
Morphometry:					
ZBAR	22	138	> 8.10	19	
ZMAX	11	142	> 31.15	15	
Physicochemist	<u>:</u>				
SECCHI	4	132	< 4.10	12	
			continued		

Table 24. Validation and final univariate criteria of lake trout presence and absence in surveyed Saskatchewan lakes.

Table 24. continued

		Final classification			
Variables	Validation errors (%) <sup>a</sup>	Number of lakes	Criterion of presence	Errors(%)	
Temperature-Ox	ygen:				
TMAXB	24	135	< 8.25	21	
VOLT15T6 <sup>, b</sup>	19	107	> 11.63	13	
VOLT1506' <sup>b</sup>	13	105	> 2.15	15	
VOLT1504 '	13	102	> 7.40	10	
VOLT1206 <sup>,b</sup>	19	104	> 0.47	10	
Biota:			- 0.4)	12	
BENDRY	26	122	< 4.60	22	
NON-SHIELD LAK	ES			2.3	
Location:					
LATD	14	147	> 54.88	15	
NORD	11	147	> 0.96	14	
Morphometry:			0190	74	
WAREA	11	146	> 219.1	14	
VOLUME <sup>b</sup>	13	119	> 1661 0	13	
ZBAR	0	119	> 12.3		
ZMAX	3	145	> 39 0	י ד	
Temperature-Oxy	ygen:			/	
VOLT15T6' <sup>C</sup>	13	61	> 195.86	10	
VOLT1506, b, c	7	54	> 37.77	7	
VOLT1504,b,c	8	50	> 166.41	, В	
VOLT1206 <sup>,b,c</sup>	14	51	> 4.06	12	

a Errors from use of preliminary criteria (Table 11) on 20 % of lakes which were reserved.

b Final criterion differs by >  $\pm$  10 % from preliminary.

c See Table 12 for preliminary criteria.

Table 25. Effects of incomplete surveys on some lakes and preferential surveying of lake trout lakes on the probability of trout presence according to log VOLT15T6.

	Preference towards lake trout			
Set of lakes	None	6,4,2-fold		
Log VOLT15T6 known:				
Univariate	1.023	1.529		
(% errors, n)	(11%,91)	(8%,74)		
Logistic B0	1.9099	3.1844		
B1	-1.8610	-1.7563		
P=0.1	0.191	0.562		
P=0.5	0.782	1.813		
P=0.9	1.372	3.064		
(% errors,n)	(11%,91)	(8%,74)		
Polynomial A0 A1 A2 A3 A4 (R <sup>2</sup> ,n)	0.22372 0.30921 -0.00756  (0.94,92)	0.06097 0.12524 0.04846  -0.00081 (0.98,75)		
Missing log VOLT15T6	estimated:			
Univariate	1.235	1.728		
(% errors,n)	(14%,113)	(9%,91)		
Logistic B0	2.3778	3.8883		
B1	-1.9576	-1.9499		
P=0.1	0.092	0.867		
P=0.5	1.215	1.994		
P=0.9	2.7	3.121		
(% errors,n)	(13%,113)	(5%,91)		
Polynomial A0	0.08346	0.02605		
A1	0.34611	0.08822		
A2	0.10290	0.05240		
A3	-0.05940	0.00268		
A4		-0.00062		
A5	0.00187			
(R <sup>2</sup> ,n)	(0.95,114)	(0.99,92)		

Figure 15. The probability of lake trout presence according to log VOLT15T6: (A) using only known habitat data and assuming no preferential surveying of lake trout lakes, and (B) correcting for missing habitat data and for assumed preference towards lake trout lakes.



The estimated number of lake trout lakes in Saskatchewan ranged from 1778 using the biased criteria to 333 using the doubly corrected criteria of lake trout proportions (Table 26). Most of the difference in numbers occurred among the very numerous, very small lakes. The biased probability predicted 319 lakes over 10 hm<sup>3</sup> (equivalent to about 6.6 km<sup>2</sup>) and the corrected, 155 lakes of this size. Use of smaller habitat intervals would change both biased and corrected estimates, particularly for very small lakes, as the probability of lake trout presence and the number of lakes is changing rapidly within each interval.

Table 26. Estimates of the total number of lake trout lakes in the shield region of Saskatchewan. Predictions are based on log VOLT15T6 under conditions of (A) no preference, or (B) assumed preference towards lake trout lakes (see text).

			Proportio	n with	Number	of lake
Log VOLTI 5T6	Shield	lakes	lake trou	t present	trout :	lakes
(hm <sup>3</sup> )	Proportio	on Number	A	В	A	В
-1	0.83900	69839.2	0	0	0	0
-0.5	0.09110	7583.3	0.03503	0	265.6	0
0	0.03955	3292.2	0.14689	0.00652	483.6	21.5
0 5	0.01717	1429.2	0.30055	0.05481	429.5	78.3
1	0.00745	620.1	0.45138	0.12615	279.9	78.2
1 5	0.00324	269.7	0.59370	0.22546	160.1	60.8
2	0.00140	116.5	0.72184	0.35290	84.1	41.1
2 5	0.00061	50.8	0.83014	0.50769	42.2	25.8
2.5	0.00026	21.6	0.91293	0.68811	19.7	14.9
Э г	0.00011	9.2	0.96452	0.89152	8.9	8.2
4	0.00005	4.2	1.00	1.00	4.2	4.2
Total	0.99994	83236.0	•••	•••	1777.8	333.0

## DISCUSSION

The lake surveys initiated in the 1920's in Prince Albert National Park (Rawson 1936) and continued by the province since 1950 (Saskatchewan 1947) comprise invaluable baseline data for this and other studies. Due to adherence to standardized methods in provincial and many consultant surveys, available data were remarkably consistent from the 1930's well into the 1970's (see Rawson 1936, Reed 1959, Koshinsky 1968, Tones 1979, Dean 1981). Undoubtedly this restricted innovative methods (e.g. Rawson 1953, Koshinsky 1968 p.245 and 271) and reduced attention to factors in fisheries management other than habitat (Kallemeyn 1969). Nonetheless, the consistency and length of surveys were valuable in this study.

As a direct result of consistent methodology over 30 years, subsets of habitat variables were available for several times as many lakes as statistically expected. Inter-relationships among variables allowed the estimation of missing variables to further augment the dataset. This consistency largely overcame the lack of comparability of non-standard surveys (e.g. Beak 1979). Likewise, the fact that most surveys extended from late spring-early summer to late summer-early fall allowed fairly detailed coverage. This provided seasonal trends in temperature and oxygen profiles, TDS during the optimal mid-July to mid-August

period, and seasonal averages of benthos, plankton, and fish abundance (Rawson 1936, Shuter <u>et al</u>. 1983, Ryder 1965, Matuszek 1978). These important facets are often unavailable from more cursory surveys (e.g. Mayhood <u>et al</u>. 1973, Falk 1979).

## Representative lakes

A major concern of this study was whether lakes which have been surveyed are representative of all Saskatchewan lakes, and to mitigate bias if this was not so. This allowed the identification of the important biological factors and the use of classification criteria on other sets of lakes. In a study of species associations in 2500 Ontario lakes, Johnson et al. (1977) noted that using only lakes with at least one species present "tended to give a distorted sample of the conditions that determine presence/absence of any one of the ... species". Even with both lake trout and non-lake-trout lakes included, the magnitudes of univariate or multivariate criteria depend on the density of lake trout and non-laketrout lakes in the sample. For that reason, formal rules of multiple discriminant analysis require randomness across classes (Knoke 1982).

The most direct definition of "representative" is in terms of fish species compositions. Nonetheless, comparisons of species in these surveyed lakes and in other sets of lakes

were inconclusive. Both the lakes used in this study and 239 lakes in an atlas of fish distribution (Atton and Merkowsky 1983) lacked preferred species in 12 % of cases. In northern drainage basins, surveys were relatively biased toward lakes with preferred species (i.e. Arctic, Kazan, and Churchill basins, see Table 7), presumably because greater logistical difficulties led to more critical selection of lakes for surveys. In southern areas, distributional records were relatively biased in favour of lakes with preferred species (i.e. Saskatchewan River basin, see Table 7), presumably due to greater interest and easier access to lakes with socioeconomically preferred species. This reasoning suggests intuitively that the surveyed lakes had no greater tendency to have lake trout than those lakes with distributional records, which themselves were biased. Other studies have seldom accomplished more objective species comparisons. Although only 2 % of Ontario lakes were surveyed, Martin and Olver (1976) noted that about 50 % of the estimated total number of lake trout lakes were included. Obviously, studies can avoid this problem by surveying all or almost all lakes in an area (e.g. Beamish et al. 1976, Harvey 1978).

The comparison of surveyed lakes with respect to lake areas was more conclusive. Generally, larger lakes were over-represented in surveys by comparison to all Saskatchewan lakes or even nearby lakes. "Very small" lakes were underrepresented in surveys, sometimes exceedingly so, even in

studies concerned primarily with very small lakes (Table 9). The reasons are logistic and socio-economic. True representation of shield lakes by a set of 8,540 very small lakes and 30 lakes over 10 km<sup>2</sup> would involve considerable problems of access and greater effort to attain minimum samples in each lake. Given the large-scale fisheries in many larger lakes and the trend of more species in each larger lake, demands for surveys on larger lakes are more justifiable and have taken precedence (Minns 1986).

Studies aimed specifically at very small lakes were satisfactorily representative of lakes over 50 ha (Table 9). The smallest lake trout lake among 225 lakes was 91 ha (see Appendix D), implying that lakes over 50 ha include the region of transition from absence to presence. Thus, criteria of area and correlated variables based on these study lakes should be more reliable than criteria from the larger set.

The comparison of TDS with a larger data set was more complex. Surveyed lakes did not appear comparable to lakes in Liaw and Atton (1980), even though most were included in the latter study. Since the latter required only single water chemistry samples, it was potentially more representative. Nonetheless, Liaw and Atton (1981) later noted a bias in their set towards larger, higher-TDS lakes. Only 36 % of their shield lakes had TDS of 50 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> or lower, yet 75 % of the shield region is in this category.

The present study appears to be more representative of TDS in shield lakes than was Liaw and Atton (1980). Correlated variables such as alkalinity (TOTALK), calcium (CA), and magnesium (MG) (Liaw and Atton 1981) are presumably similar.

## Prediction of lake trout presence

Descriptions of lake trout lakes in Saskatchewan may not be comparable to those for other regions. The lowest or highest value of any habitat variable is too dependent on numbers of lakes examined and regional variability in lakes for all but anecdotal purposes. Martin and Olver (1976) reported the smallest lake trout lake of about 5,100 Ontario lakes was 4.4 ha, in contrast to 91.1 ha in the present study of 225 lakes. Yet samples of 225 lakes from their larger set would undoubtedly show a higher minimum on average, just as some of the thousands of unsurveyed Saskatchewan lakes less than 91 ha presumably have lake trout.

Furthermore, descriptions of lake trout lakes are counterproductive for predicting the suitability of other lakes. Firstly, there is no objective way to choose among the minimum, median, maximum, or other quantile of any variable as a reasonable descriptor. Secondly, any such descriptor would only be predictive if it were erroneously inferred that lake trout were present in similar lakes. For example, all lake trout lakes in the present study were over 13.5 m

maximum depth and 75 % were over 31.1 m (Appendix D).
Neither descriptor is intrinsically better and neither
predicts lake trout in all lakes over 13.5 m or even in 75 %
of lakes over 31.1 m deep.

The significant differences for many habitat variables between lake trout and non-lake-trout lakes have various explanations. Some of the 42 variables which differed significantly are undoubtedly important per se, while others are more likely important due to correlations with other variables. For example, given the stenothermal nature of this species, the maximum temperature in the hypolimnion of a lake is a likely proximate cause of lake trout absence or presence (see below). However, greater maximum depth of a lake is believed to be indirectly important (McPhail and Lindsey 1970) only insofar as it increases the probability of a thermocline and suitable hypolimnetic temperatures. Other variables (such as total alkalinity) differed significantly between lake trout and non-lake-trout lakes over the survey region, but not within the shield and non-shield areas separately (Appendix E). This may reflect trends in alkalinity from an area of infrequent lake trout presence to one of greater frequency, rather than suitability of individual lakes themselves. An analogous argument by Prepas (1983) disputed the predictive usefulness of TDS for fish productivity.

As post-glacial dispersal and climatic conditions confound

the prediction of lake trout presence in non-shield lakes, the following discussion will focus on useful criteria of shield lakes (Table 11).

## Temperature

The temperature preference of lake trout is an important factor in their presence or absence. The existence of water below  $7.7^{\circ}C$  at the lake bottom (TMAXB) or water of  $6^{\circ}C$  at 28.5 m depth (T15T6L) both imply hypolimnetic temperatures in the preferred range of 12 to  $15^{\circ}C$ . (Maximum surface temperatures were above  $13^{\circ}C$  in all 208 lakes examined and above  $19^{\circ}C$  in 75 % of lakes.).

Yearling lake trout have upper lethal temperatures of 22 to 23.5°C when acclimated at 8 to 20°C in laboratory studies (Gibson and Fry 1954). Yearling lake trout have a "final preferendum" of 11.7°C (McCauley and Tait 1970), which is the "temperature around which all individuals will ultimately congregate, regardless of their thermal experience before being placed in the gradient" (Fry 1947). Some salmonids show changes of  $\pm$  2 to 4°C in preferred temperatures caused by starvation (Javaid and Anderson 1967). Yearling lake trout preferred temperatures of 0 and 3°C below this preferendum when fed <u>ad libitum</u> and below maintenance rations, respectively (Mac 1985). Otherwise, "the lake trout ... not only shows no seasonal differences in thermal preference, but it is even more extreme in that its acute

thermal preferenda apparently are unaffected even by acclimation temperature" (McCauley and Huggins 1979).

Lake trout and other salmonids show close agreement between laboratory and field observations (Ferguson 1958). Summer concentrations of lake trout occur within <u>+</u>3°C of this preferendum, generally 2°C cooler: 8-10°C in Lake Louisa (Ontario), 7-13°C in Cayuga Lake (New York), 8-11°C in Lac La Ronge (Saskatchewan), 8-10°C in Redrock Lake (Ontario), and 11°C in Mooseland Lake (Maine)(McCauley and Tait 1970, Ferguson 1958).

The minimum volume of water between 6 and  $15^{\circ}C$  (VOLT15T6') quantifies the critical habitat, rather than simply implying it exists, as do the other criteria. Accordingly, the error in prediction was reduced from 19 or 25 % to only 12 % of lakes. Furthermore, this criterion can be estimated from readily available data on water area and fetch (Table 21). The lower boundary of 6°C in VOLT15T6 reflects the indirect effects of optimal growth at 6 to 8°C and 10 to 12°C in yearling trout fed above maintenance ration and <u>ad libitum</u>, respectively (O'Connor <u>et al</u>. 1981). The excluded volume below 6°C is assumed to represent a small proportion of total volume in most lakes.

## Oxygen

Oxygen is another important factor in lake trout presence or absence in shield lakes. In laboratory studies, yearling

trout required at least 3 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen at 9.5 to  $16^{\circ}$ C for standard metabolic respiration (i.e. lowest rate for quiescent fish)(Gibson and Fry 1954). The same trout showed that active respiration during swimming was restricted by oxygen levels below about 6 to 7 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> at 9 to  $18^{\circ}$ C. Field studies found similarly that lake trout in Lac La Ronge migrated from cooler to warmer water when oxygen declined to about 4 mg.L<sup>-1</sup>, but did not migrate further from oxygen of about 7.5 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Rawson and Atton 1953). Fewer than 10% of Ontario lakes had lake trout present if hypolimnetic August oxygen was below 4 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Martin and Olver 1976).

The criterion of minimal surface oxygen (OMINS) above 8.2 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> presumably distinguishes eutrophic from meso- or oligotrophic lakes. It would not usually distinguish nonstratified from stratified lakes and was relatively imprecise. The higher error rate of 29% for VOL6MG', in contrast to 12% for VOLT15T6', implies that the minimum volume of water oxygenated above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> does not quantify critical habitat as precisely as does temperature. However, given that minimum oxygen needed by lake trout may be 3 to 5 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Gibson and Fry 1954, Davis 1975), the volume of water above 4 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> may have been a better criterion for oxygen (Rawson and Atton 1953).

Most of the literature on oxygen has focussed on low oxygen as a limiting factor (see reviews by Fry 1971, Jones and Randall 1978, and Holeton 1980). It may also be important

at concentrations above 4 to 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup>. Oxygen below 10 to 12 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> or high carbon dioxide concentrations reduce sustainable speeds of salmonids (Dahlberg <u>et al</u>. 1968 cited in Beamish 1978). The most efficient swimming over a given distance for salmonids occurs at a rate of respiration about twice standard metabolic level (Jones and Randall 1978). Holeton (1980) suggested that many pelagic fish which inhabit the photic zone may only realize their full aerobic potential under hyperoxic conditions. Anaerobic sprinting or "burst" swimming "... may well be restricted by moderate oxygen deficiency" (Beamish 1978 p.158). Nonetheless, it is still debated whether hyperoxic conditions increase performance (Holeton 1980, Jones and Randall 1978).

Metabolic "scope for activity" is the difference between maximal active and minimum standard respiratory rates. Scope increases when oxygen increases above atmospheric saturation and indicates "incipient limiting" conditions higher than usually believed (Brett 1964, Fry 1971 p.43 and 59). This is seldom tested experimentally, but may reveal the benefits of potentially high oxygen conditions at depth (see below).

## Temperature-Oxygen

These factors in concert exert a strong influence on lake trout presence. A minimum volume of water with temperature less than  $12-15^{\circ}$ C and oxygen greater than  $4-6 \text{ mg.L}^{-1}$  appears to be essential in shield lakes. The best predictor (i.e.

VOLT1506') indicates that a minimum volume of 2.15  $\text{hm}^3$  of water below 15°C and above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen is required during summer. The higher error rates of VOLT1504' and VOLT1206' may imply that 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen and 15°C are more reliable indices for populations than 4 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> and 12°C, respectively.

A more precise version of this minimum volume would consider spatial and temporal variations (e.g. Jensen and Chen 1986), possible life-stage differences (e.g. Coutant 1985), and a minimum duration of restricted temperature and oxygen conditions. The estimate of the minimum volume of suitable temperature and oxygen in this study assumed uniform thermal and oxygen conditions across the lake. The effects of decomposition on near-bottom oxygen concentrations (Rawson 1936) may extend up to 6 m from the sediments (Jones 1982 cited in Fulthorpe and Paloheimo 1985). This effect would cause an increasing over-estimation of the minimum volume with decreasing lake depth in shallower lakes, until stratification no longer occurred in polymictic lakes. Temperature-oxygen data were available at 150 limnological stations for 970 occasions on 77 of these surveyed lakes. Nonetheless, not all depth-profiles had data at suitable intermediate depths, no objective means of weighting each station or interpolating temporally were known, and considerable effort would have been required.

Similar criteria include the use of the mid-summer fraction of lake volume below  $10^{\circ}C$  and above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen

to assess impacts on lake trout habitat from nutrient loading (Genge 1986; R. Genge, Ontario Min. Environment, pers. comm.). Guidelines such as (1) a minimum of 1.5 m of water below  $13^{\circ}$ C and above 5 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen in mid-August (Minnesota 1982) and (2) a minimum of 3 m below  $10^{\circ}$ C and above 5 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen (Ontario 1977) are clearly related. Although their accuracy is not known, these rules deserve further evaluation in light of their simplicity. An early example of such thinking was the explanation of cisco (<u>C</u>. <u>artedii</u>) presence and abundance in Indiana lakes on the basis of the depth of water below 20°C and above 3 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen at "maximum stagnation" (Frey 1955).

The success of the minimum volume of suitable temperature and oxygen suggests that a maximum density of lake trout is sustainable and/or a critical minimum number of reproductive lake trout is needed to initiate or maintain a population. Reviews by Healey (1978) and Martin and Olver (1980) indicate densities of 0.8 to 14 lake trout per hectare in 14 lakes across North America. Another seven lakes have densities of 0.5 to 13 (Bailey 1977, Ball 1985, Chen 1979, George 1985, Martinot 1978, Sawchyn 1987). Five lakes for which volumetric data are available have densities of 26 to 332 mature lake trout per hm<sup>3</sup> of suitable temperature and/or oxygen (Bailey 1977, Martinot 1978, Chen 1979, Sawchyn 1987). Recent programs of introduction or restoration of lake trout presume that a minimum critical number is necessary (Hatch

1984, Loftus 1986). The criteria of VOLT15T6 and VOLT15O6 (Table 11) imply critical minimum numbers of 608 to 893 and 55 to 714 mature trout, respectively, in each lake. VOLT15T6 may be estimable in more lakes with known numbers of lake trout (see Appendix G). Nonetheless, problems in identifying depleted populations (e.g. Paterson 1968, George 1985), with the reliability and comparability of estimates of trout density (Healey 1978), and with species or limnological anomalies remain. A clearer view of minimum numbers or maximum density will require published assessments such as Bridges and Hambly (1971) and Hitchins and Samis (1986).

The suggestion of a maximum density and critical number assumes that most populations have not evolved the specialized reproductive strategies postulated for Arctic populations by Johnson (1976). Lake trout in severe climates frequently show bimodal size composition, divergent growth at maturity, slow growth, and low fecundity (Benoit and Power 1981). This is thought to represent adaptation for reproductive stability under extreme and variable conditions (Johnson 1976, but see Power 1978). These indicators, and others such as uniformly large body sizes of trout, intermittent spawning, and variable year-class abundances also occur in more southerly lakes. Examples are Contact Lake (Koshinsky 1964), Bartlett and Haugen lakes (Koshinsky 1968), Swan Lake (Paterson 1968), Squeers Lake (Ball 1985; H. Ball, Lakehead Univ., pers. comm.), and Crean Lake (Cuerrier

1952). These are typically small lakes with marginal conditions for lake trout. These reproductive strategies may allow the critical minimum number of lake trout to be lower or the maximum density of lake trout to be higher.

The discussion above assumes that the minimum volume is not a requirement of a forage species such as cisco, rather than of lake trout <u>per se</u>. This assumption is likely valid, even though cisco is a common food of lake trout (Scott and Crossman 1973, Kerr 1971b). Cisco prefer temperatures of  $12^{\circ}$ C or lower and oxygen of 4 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> or higher (Rudstam and Magnuson 1985), but they are generally tolerant of higher temperatures and lower oxygen (Ferguson 1958, 20°C and 3 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> by Frey 1955). Furthermore, lake trout are present in lakes which lack cisco (e.g. Martin 1966, Murray 1979, Paterson 1968, Donald and Alger 1986).

The volumes used in this study represent a thermal and/or oxygen "squeeze" (Coutant 1985) during open-water season. The demonstrated hypothesis is that presence or absence is determined during the most critical period, which may be as brief as several days. Temperature is treated as a "lethal" or "tolerance" factor (Fry 1971) of lake trout presence. Seasonal trends and annual variability in relation to a threshold or critical volume determine long-term population survival, and perhaps reproductive strategies. This complements the conclusion of Christie and Regier (1986), that the sustainable yield of lake trout is determined by the

cumulative volume of water of suitable temperature over the open-water season. In their view, temperature is a "controlling" factor (Fry 1971) of growth, abundance, and productivity, implicitly at levels above the threshold. A comparison of the critical and cumulative indices to presence, abundance, and sustainable yields in small to large lakes with stable to variable conditions may confirm this interpretation.

## Depth

Lake depth is a good predictor of lake trout presence in shield lakes: lakes require a minimum 31.2 m maximum depth or 8.3 m mean depth (Table 11). Mean depth was a very important factor in the discrimination of lake trout and non-lake-trout lakes in Ontario (Johnson <u>et al</u>. 1977). Mean and maximum depths are closely correlated in many regions (Koshinsky 1970, Ryan 1980, Gorham 1958), so are discussed almost interchangeably.

Mean depth has been shown to be important in regional studies of winter hypoxia in very small lakes. Even in eutrophic lakes with high summer algal concentrations, a deeper lake fully "charged" with oxygen during autumn turnover may have reserves to withstand over-winter loss of oxygen (Barica and Mathias 1979). In shallower lakes (say, less than 5 m mean depth), winter conditions are dependent on mean depth or lake volume and late summer algal and/or

macrophyte densities. Relative amount of the littoral zone is frequently correlated with the depth of lakes (Johnson <u>et</u> <u>al</u>. 1977). Most southern Saskatchewan lakes are more-or-less eutrophic, in contrast to most shield lakes which are oligotrophic and seldom develop winter anoxia (Barica and Mathias 1979, Schindler 1971). Data on over-winter oxygen conditions were scarce in the present study, precluding assessment of this factor (see Appendix D).

There appears to be little indication of a physiological basis for depth as a direct factor in lake trout presence. Some potential mechanisms are that the hydrostatic pressure induced by depth improves swimming and therefore feeding efficiency by this predator, reduces oxygen demands and/or increases uptake, or improves metalimnetic or hypolimnetic oxygen concentrations. In sustained swimming, the adaptive mode for salmonid fish (Webb 1984), frictional drag is the major resistance (relative to inertia). Drag varies with density and viscosity of water, surface area of the fish, and speed to the exponent 1.5 to 2 (Webb 1978). Hydrostatic pressure at 10 to 30 m reduces seawater viscosity by much less than 4% (Gordon 1970). However, water viscosity increases 15% between 15 and 10°C (CRC 1968 p.F36). Accordingly, temperature selection, size of fish, and swimming speed would appear to be considerably more important than hydrostatic pressure for efficiency of swimming.

Hydrostatic pressure allows greater absolute oxygen

concentrations in water (Ricker 1934) and increased oxygen uptake as the potential oxygen difference across the gill surface is increased (Jones and Randall 1978). Absolute saturation at depth can be several-fold greater than saturation in surface waters, by about 1 atmosphere for each 10 m of depth. Nonetheless, depth does not by itself increase oxygen concentrations above the 12 to 13  $\rm mg.L^{-1}$ attained during spring turnover (Ricker 1934). Metalimnetic oxygen maxima above 13 mg. $L^{-1}$ , however, may be caused by the photosynthesis of algae adapted to low temperatures and relatively low light (Eberly 1964) or littoral macrophytes (Dubay and Simmons 1979). These maxima may be temporary or persist throughout stratification. They are more frequently found in smaller lakes with greater relative depth (Wetzel 1983). Nonetheless, the relative depth of 115 shield lakes in the present study was only 55 % accurate as a criterion of lake trout presence. Lake trout were much more common in lakes of greater area and volume than in smaller lakes with similar relative depth. This suggests that metalimnetic maxima may be infrequent occurrences and/or dependent on several factors rather than solely on relative depth. Transparency to stimulate photosynthesis in the metalimnion is obviously one co-requisite (Fulthorpe and Paloheimo 1985).

## Transparency

Transparency of the lake was the next most useful

predictor at 88 % accuracy in shield lakes (Table 11). Lakes required a summer mean Secchi disk depth of 4.15 m or greater to have lake trout present, similar to other studies. Data from Martin and Olver (1976) suggest a criterion of about 5 m in shield and non-shield lakes. Lake trout and non-laketrout lakes in Ontario were discriminated by Secchi transparency and depth combined (Johnson <u>et al</u>. 1977). However, transparency was relatively unimportant among five variables in the discrimination of northwestern Ontario lakes (Hamilton <u>et al</u>. 1980), possibly due to interference by coloured matter (Ryan 1980).

Transparency may be a factor in lake trout presence due to photosynthetic generation of oxygen (see above), correlation of oxygen conditions with coloured matter and nutrient concentrations, or visual requirements.

In most shield lakes, Secchi depth is closely related to concentrations of dissolved and colloidal colouring matter (e.g. humic substances) (Koshinsky 1968, Schindler 1971). Low Secchi transparency may indicate under-saturated oxygen conditions (Ruttner 1963, Wetzel 1983 p.175). In this study, transparency of 4 m predicts the existence of a minimum volume of suitable temperature and oxygen (see Estimation of missing data). In more productive lakes, lower Secchi transparency is indicative of higher particulate concentrations, especially phytoplankton (Wetzel 1983). Both under-saturation and high algal density predispose a lake to

winterkill and/or summerkill oxygen conditions (Barica 1975, Barica and Mathias 1979, Liaw 1979). Hypoxia may limit survival of adults, fry, or eggs (Garside 1959).

Transparency may also be important for vision per se. There are several approaches to assessing the effects of light: general guidelines for fish vision, the sensitivity of visual pigments of lake trout to wavelengths of available light, the minimum angle subtended by a perceivable object, and the contrast between objects and the background.

The criterion of 4.2 m Secchi depth may be an index of general visibility. In field studies, several fish species require 0.001 to 1 meter-candle (abbreviated m.c., Blaxter 1975). "Light-controlled behaviour such as feeding and schooling, net avoidance and vertical migration seem to become extinct at light intensities near [0.1 meter-candle] equivalent to late dusk or early dawn..." (Blaxter 1975 p.770). If the Secchi depth represents about 10% of surface incident light (Wetzel 1983 p.66), the deepest visibility at 0.1 m.c. at mid-day is 18 m for lakes with Secchi depth of 3 m, and 62 m for 10 m (Figure 16). This assumes incident radiation of 6.3 x  $10^4$  uW/cm<sup>2</sup> (Ruttner 1963 p.139, Wetzel 1983 p.756) and a conversion of 1 uW/cm<sup>2</sup> = 2.5 m.c. (Blaxter 1970 p.213). Visibility occurs only at shallower depths if 1.0 m.c. is required.

By the sensitivity hypothesis, visual pigments of fish should have maximal absorption at the wavelength of ambient light (Dartnall 1975 p.557). Water transmits wavelengths

Figure 16. The depth of visibility (from corresponding Secchi depth) against the maximum depth of  $15^{\circ}$ C, separately for lakes with lake trout present (panel A) and absent (panel B). Solid circles represent lakes with suitable temperature and oxygen (see text) and open circles, those without suitability. Lines represent depths of 1.0 and 0.1 meter-candle intensity, and light of sensible wavelength for lake trout.



from 450 to 700 nm preferentially and narrows the bandwidth with increasing depth towards 470 to 580 nm in very clear and slightly coloured water, respectively (Wetzel 1983, Dartnall 1975). The two visual pigments of lake trout are reasonably adapted to clear water, having maximal reception at 510 and 540 nm (Ali and Wagner 1975, McFarland and Munz 1965).

The clearest known water (Secchi depth about 70 m) retains sufficient light of 510 nm for photopic or daylight-type vision down to 500 m, and water of Secchi depth about 35 m does so to 180 m. Water of Secchi depth about 5 m does so for 540 nm light to only 20 m (from Figure 4 in Dartnall 1975). The depth at which light of sensible wavelength disappears is related to Secchi depth: log (sensitive depth) = 0.450 + 1.200 log (Secchi depth),

n = 3,  $r^2 = 0.996$ .

This implies that lake trout have vision to depths of 180 m in very clear lakes, but would be limited visually to less than 20 m in less transparent lakes.

The sensitivity hypothesis appears to be relevant to lake trout presence. In addition to a minimum volume of suitable temperature and oxygen, sensible light below the observed depth of  $15^{\circ}$ C seems a necessity (Figure 16). For example, the 3 uppermost lakes in the figure have sensitive depths of 12 to 36 m (from corresponding Secchi of 3.3 to 8 m) and temperatures of  $15^{\circ}$ C or cooler at the surface. Only lakes to the upper right of the line are predicted to have sufficient light below 15°C for lake trout. The one exception to the rule is Wierzycki Lake, which lies to the lower left but has lake trout. Its transparency was unusually low during its survey due to erosion caused by recent forest fires (Sawchyn and Kardash 1976). Most non-lake-trout lakes do not have suitable VOLT1506'. One exception has a deeper sensitive depth of about 11 m than the observed depth of 15°C at 6 m, which should allow lake trout by this hypothesis. The scarcity of surveyed lakes with 15°C near the surface and relatively low sensitive depth prevents confirmation of this trend.

The effects of minimum subtended angles and object contrasts relate to feeding behaviour. Lake trout are generally piscivorous and adults prey preferentially on ciscoes (Scott and Crossman 1973, Martin and Olver 1980). Lake trout may adapt to planktivory: greater numbers and more highly developed gill rakers are found (Martin and Sandercock 1967, Qadri 1967) and condition factors and natural mortality are similar (Kerr and Martin 1968) in such cases. Nonetheless, planktivorous populations have sufficiently different growth rates, ages at maturity, and lifespans (Martin 1966) and lower metabolic efficiency in spite of a larger forage base (Kerr and Martin 1968) to indicate that non-piscivory is unusual for the species.

The minimum subtended angle which is required to elicit

visual response may vary with movement of an object, age of fish, and other factors (several references in Ali 1975). Kerr (1971a) used 0.55° in modelling growth, while Confer et al. (1978) reported about 0.85° for lake trout feeding on plankton. If 0.75<sup>0</sup> is reasonable, maximal visual range would be 3 m for ciscoes viewed posteriorly (i.e. 4 cm wide amplitude) and 11 m laterally (i.e. 15 cm main body length), which is not restrictive (Kerr 1971a). The significance of the contrast in brightness between an object (e.g. prey) and background water is limited to specific conditions (Lythgoe 1975 and others in Ali 1975). At shallow depths, light which is reflected from the object travels a shorter distance horizontally through water on average than the background light. Therefore, it undergoes less band-width narrowing and scattering, which causes the object to appear "coloured" and "brighter" against the background light (Lythgoe 1968). In clear water, this contrast is effective for larger objects up to 20 to 25 m distant under photopic conditions. However, the effect is only relevant up to 5 m distance for objects which are only slightly brighter inherently than background water (e.g. ciscoes?) and/or small (e.g. plankton?)(Lythgoe 1968 p.1010).

Another specific feeding requirement may arise from the importance of the crustacean <u>Mysis</u> to young lake trout (Scott and Crossman 1973). These are generally distributed in glaciated lakes across North America, typically selecting

depths with minimum light, minimum temperature, and maximum dissolved oxygen (Dadswell 1974). Only light is relevant as  $18^{\circ}C$  and 2 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen were tolerated by mysids. The selected light ranged from 3 to 4 times Secchi depth, which lies between the lines marked "sensible" and "0.1" (Figure 16). A Secchi depth of 4.2 m implies that mysids will be available to trout at 12 to 16 m depth. Transparency of less than 4.2 m may be sufficient in early summer or small lakes since the thermocline is shallow. However, as the Secchi depth decreases in mid-summer and/or the thermocline deepens in mid-summer and in larger lakes, mysids may not be available at suitable depths in lakes with lower transparency.

Given a need for temperatures below 15°C, these visual requirements may restrict lake trout. Lake trout may require clearer water in lakes with deeper thermoclines than in lakes with shallower thermoclines. Predictions based on the volume of suitable temperature-and-visibility conditions (similar to temperature-oxygen criteria above) may be useful.

# Shield and non-shield criteria

The evaluation of differences between these two arbitrary regions was particularly instructive. The 5 to 40-fold differences in water area, volume, and temperature-oxygen volume criteria remained essentially unexplained on the basis

of possible anomalies in the lake set. Assessments of nonshield lake representativeness, small-sample criteria, latitudinal gradients within the shield area, and trends in temperature-oxygen restrictions were consistent. Results suggested collectively that differences in water area, volume, and temperature-oxygen criteria were not likely due to so-called anomalies of lakes in this study. The analyses are interpreted to indicate greater habitat variability in the non-shield area in recent or post-glacial periods, or lack of access to southern and central Saskatchewan during immigration of lake trout.

One notable anomaly was that the incidence of lake trout lakes in small samples influenced the supposedly robust criteria. The small-sample criteria shifted away from the characteristics of the over-represented class, sometimes considerably. A similar over-representation of "acidified" lakes caused Beggs <u>et al</u>. (1985) to predict more extinctions of lake trout in Ontario than a more representative data set suggested. This artifact re-emphasizes the importance of random lake surveys (Knoke 1983 p.192), particularly in the region of overlap between classes (see Validation and Extrapolation).

# Recent habitat conditions

Drought conditions which may have caused differences between shield and non-shield lakes for lake trout, were only partially confirmed for available lakes. Furthermore, the process used by various agencies to select lakes for collection of both waterlevel data and lake morphometry is unknown and unquantifiable. Thus, it is uncertain that the results are representative for all lakes.

Increasing waterlevel variations with larger lake area and significant differences in the relationships of shield and non-shield lakes were both observed. A plausible explanation would be a general correlation between lake area and drainage basin area (see Gorham 1958, Brunskill and Schindler 1971, data in Demers 1974, and Minns 1984). This may expose larger lakes to greater and/or more prolonged regional climatic variations. Presumably this correlation or climatic variation differs between shield and non-shield areas.

Waterlevel variations do not appear sufficient by themselves to account for observed differences in lake trout criteria. Variations were typically less than 1.0 m in the last 100 years in both shield and non-shield lakes (Figure 6). Although non-shield lakes generally have greater variation, as hypothesized earlier, there is considerable overlap with shield lakes.

Morphometry likewise seems to play a minor role in the observed differences in lake trout criteria in shield and non-shield lakes. The hypothesized tendencies of more shallows in small and non-shield lakes are generally confirmed. This is interpreted to mean that a smaller average volume is needed in shield lakes to maintain lake trout populations during years of low waterlevel. The effects of combined waterlevel and morphometric differences seem smaller than necessary.

Shield and non-shield lakes of 10 to 100 km<sup>2</sup> area lose only 2 to 3 % and 3 to 6 % of volume during extreme low summer waterlevels, respectively (see Appendix F). This seems negligible since only 1.5-fold out of a total 6.4-fold difference in volume criteria can be explained on this basis.

The conclusion that waterlevel variations and morphometric differences had negligible effects on lake volumes is at odds with anecdotal and survey records in some non-shield lakes. In saline lakes of south-central Saskatchewan (i.e.  $50^{\circ}$  to  $54^{\circ}N$ ), salinity increased 1.7 to 3.7 % annually from predrought 1920-1925 to drought 1937-1941 periods (Rawson and Moore 1944). Assuming that these changes reflect solely decreases in lake volume, it appears that volumes declined 19.6 to 49.4 % in two decades.

The discrepancies between estimates from salinity and from the present study arise for several reasons. Firstly, few waterlevel data were available from pre-1950, so that

climatic extremes of the late 1930s may not be well represented in this study. Nonetheless, the common perception of the 1930s drought as unique is based largely on the socio-economic upheavals. Actual hydrological conditions have been as severe in more recent periods (Findlay 1981) and the mid-1960s specifically were relatively dry (Environment Canada 1986, Rutherford 1970). Secondly, the assumption of direct correlation between lake volume and salinity is simplistic. Increases in dissolved solids depend on precipitation, evaporation, ratio of lake volume to area, concentrations in inflowing water, and rate of water exchange (Rawson and Moore 1944). A widespread correlation between higher TDS and lower-than-average streamflow, as found by Rutherford (1970), inflates estimates of changes in volumes. Thirdly, the lakes cited by Rawson and Moore (1944) were noteworthy partly because of their large changes. These were primarily lakes of internal drainage basins, all with salinities over 5,000  $mg.L^{-1}$  (Rawson and Moore 1944, Rutherford 1970, Liaw and Atton 1980). They may reflect conditions in the 30 % of Saskatchewan south of  $54^{\circ}$  which is internal drainage (Last and Schweyen 1983), but not other non-shield lakes. Freshwater lakes in central forested areas were much less variable in salinity, although waterlevels changed considerably (Rawson 1957a, 1958).
## Post-glacial conditions

Lake trout migrated into Saskatchewan following deglaciation from a Mississippi refugium between 12,000 and 9,500 years ago (Stewart and Lindsey 1983, Teller <u>et al</u>. 1980), contemporaneously with Phases 4 and 8 of Christiansen (1979) although his dates differ. Evidence from postglacial vegetational patterns show serious climatic changes, particularly warmer and drier conditions farther north than today (Ritchie 1976). "Prairie" conditions reached their maximum extent about 6,500 years ago and moved southerly to their present position by 2,500 years ago (Ritchie 1976). Direct paleolimnological information is more limited (Ritchie 1983, Wilson 1981), but indicates that over a large part of the prairies "probably only the largest and deepest lakes retained water" (Delorme 1965 p.109).

If lake trout immigrated earlier, they had access to most of the study area <u>via</u> ice-marginal lakes (see Christiansen 1979) and pro-glacial water, but faced extirpation in many of the smaller lakes. If they immigrated later, dispersal was limited to a much smaller part of the study area, but climate remained more favourable. Later immigration may have led to more frequent colonization of larger lakes than smaller, if water connections to smaller lakes were no longer extant.

The differences between shield and non-shield lake criteria strongly suggest that immigration and/or climate

were important factors of lake trout status. Evaluation of the relative importance of these post-glacial factors would be difficult for several reasons. (1) The regions of immigration and climate are highly correlated. Very few lakes show either earlier deglaciation and less severe climate or later deglaciation and more severe climate. (2) Climatic effects show local anomalies due to site-specific factors. A uniform shift in vegetation zones " ... seems overly simplistic [in light of] local variations in topography, relief aspects, elevation, hydrogeology, and soils" (Vance et al. 1983 p.374). The paleolimnology of lakes would be at least as sensitive to specifics such as depths, winds, and seasonal temperatures. (3) Dispersal routes depend on glacial re-advances, spillway connections (Stewart and Lindsey 1983), and intermittent headwater connections (Legendre and Legendre 1984). Only major examples of these have been mapped in central Saskatchewan (Christiansen 1979).

## Multivariate criteria

Depth and water area The 86 % accuracy of the sedimentation model of Hilton (1985) in predicting lake trout was very impressive. Both the model and my assessment used idealized conical lake basins rather than individual lake morphometries and used fetch derived from lake area rather

than actual "effective fetch" (Smith and Sinclair 1972). This undoubtedly reduced the precision of the criterion to some degree.

Wave action in large deep lakes (model PWA of Hilton 1985) occurs periodically during open water and predicts a negative accumulation of sediments in shallower areas. Autumn overturn in small deep lakes (model ICM) occurs annually about the time of lake trout spawning, and removes sediments at least temporarily (Hilton 1985). The cleaning of spawning sites is an important factor in lake trout egg survival (e.g. Machniak 1975, Sly 1984, Nester and Poe 1984), perhaps more important in small lakes than stratification. Most lakes in the ICM zone did not have lake trout present and yet most were "moderately" or "strongly" stratified (Figure 9). The absence of clean spawning sites in lakes under 5  $km^2$  may be limiting in spite of acceptable thermal conditions. Confirmation would require data on lake bottom slopes, presence or absence of sedimentation, and minimal amounts of spawning area needed by lake trout populations. This may not disprove the alternative explanation of a required minimum number of mature lake trout, which cannot be met in very small lakes (see Temperature - Oxygen above). The low incidence of walleye in small lakes may similarly be due to lack of cleaning action (Johnson et al. 1977) but remains unproven.

As wave action is shallower in lakes with shorter fetches

(Wetzel 1983, Smith 1979), this model predicts that spawning may range over a greater proportion of lake depth in larger lakes and be more restricted proportionally in smaller lakes. Wave action extends to 9.0 m in a 50-km<sup>2</sup> and 4.5 m in a 5-km<sup>2</sup> lake (from Figure 4 in Smith and Sinclair 1972), or possibly 18 m and 9 m if sediments are very soft (Hilton 1985). In practice, the depth of the thermocline averages 16.5 m and 10.2 m in  $50-km^2$  and  $5-km^2$  shield lakes (Cruikshank 1984). Machniak (1975) suggested that larger, deeper lakes contain more area suitable for spawning due to greater currents and wave action. Martin (1957) noted that "In general, spawning becomes deeper with increasing lake size probably because of deeper shoals and greater wave action". The prediction of potential spawning sites from wave models and depth contours could follow the example of Smith and Sinclair (1972 p.395). Spawning sites are known for Lac la Ronge, Hunter Bay, Whelan Bay, Crean, and other lakes.

<u>Multiple discriminant analysis</u> Stepwise rankings of variables in discriminant analyses showed that Secchi transparency (SECCHI) and minimum volume of suitable temperature (VOLT15T6) were consistently useful (Table 19). When both were available, no other depth, volume, or temperature-oxygen index was selected. VOLT15T6 was ranked more highly than volumes of suitable oxygen or temperatureoxygen in direct comparisons.

Using discriminant analysis, Hamilton <u>et al</u>. (1980) suggested that mean depth and morphoedaphic index (i.e. MEI = TDS / ZBAR) were more important than Secchi transparency or lake volume in 389 Ontario shield lakes. Nonetheless, higher MEI was associated with lake trout presence, which suggested that other factors should be considered (Hamilton <u>et al</u>. 1980) and that caution is in order in any comparison. The dominance of Secchi transparency and mean depth in the largescale study of Johnson <u>et al</u>. (1977) has been discussed. Neither of these studies used temperature-oxygen volumetric data comparable to VOLT15T6 or VOLT1506.

The accuracy of classification by MDA was good at 88 to 98 % (Table 20), but lower than expected and typically no better than univariate criteria. The reason may be partly the unmet statistical requirements of MDA. The requirements of normality of variables, equal covariances of classes, known class status, and random observations are all violated to some degree, as in many studies (Lachenbruch 1975, Dillon 1979, Solberg 1978, Johnson <u>et al</u>. 1977). The collective effect has not been evaluated statistically in this study.

A more interesting consideration is that some variables (e.g. VOLT15T6) may singly represent the suitability of lakes for lake trout. This can be seen in terms of both the statistical behaviour of variables and limnological behaviour. In multivariate data sets with low to moderate correlation, each additional variable frequently contributes

negligible additional separation of classes (Lachenbruch 1975). The correlations must be large and positive (or negative) to overcome this effect. The moderately to highly correlated variables in this study should succeed, but the lack of improved predictions indicates otherwise. Limnologically, the volume of suitable temperature and oxygen is inter-related with depth, water area, fetch, and others. These factors determine the total lake volume, the influence of river inflows on incipient stratification, and the persistence and depth of any thermocline (see Estimation of missing data), for which VOLT15T6 is the final index.

Non-parametric MDA has fewer of the above restrictions, but did not clearly predict lake trout presence or absence more accurately. The use of fewer or more than five nearest neighbours was not examined, although this may show <u>ad hoc</u> improvements in accuracy (SAS 1987). One major disadvantage of non-parametric MDA is that the entire initial data set must typically be used to classify new observations. However, if the multi-dimensional surface which delineates the classes is expressed polynomially, it can be used (Lachenbruch 1975).

### Estimation of missing data

The estimation of useful predictors from more-or-less correlated variables was more complex and less successful than planned. Even clear-cut relationships such as that between TDS and specific conductivity required adjustments for different methodologies.

The advantage of some estimations may not be obvious in the present data set: SPCON is available in fewer lakes than its correlate TDS. Yet SPCON can be measured electronically in the field rather than gravimetrically later in the lab, with the attendant problems of preservation. Others simply delimit certain behaviour: Estimated TMAXS shows that very few lakes are expected to have maximum surface temperatures below 15°C. Other estimations are relatively complex: Estimations of VOLT15T6 and VOLT1506 were complicated by the uncertainty of thermal stratification and the complexity of oxygen behaviour.

The advantage of others is obvious: Secchi transparency is an excellent predictor of lake trout presence. Furthermore, it is easily measured in the field or is estimable from remotely sensed LANDSAT satellite data (Middleton and Munday 1980). Correlation of actual and remotely sensed Secchi depth has been excellent in some studies (Chagarlamudi <u>et al</u>.

1978 cited in Alfoldi 1982). A large-scale project to estimate Secchi depth and other water-quality indices in lakes over 8 ha in Wisconsin was successful (Scarpace <u>et al</u>. 1978). The seasonal nature of Secchi readings (Scarpace <u>et</u> <u>al</u>. 1978), the number of data needed for required precision, and methods of calibrating satellite data using multiple dates within the data set itself (Alfoldi 1982) have been addressed. Still, water-quality indices tax not only the technology but also present analytical approaches of remote sensing (Alfoldi 1982).

TDS from SPCON Correlation of TDS with SPCON was well defined, as expected. Results were similar to published regressions:

log TDS = 0.17 + 0.88 log SPCON (present shield lakes), = -0.09 + 0.96 log SPCON (present non-shield lakes), = -0.18 + 1.00 log SPCON

> (Schlesinger and McCombie 1983), and =  $-0.35 + 1.05 \log SPCON$  (Wetzel 1983 at  $20^{\circ}C$ ).

Caution is advised if these regressions are extrapolated beyond 20 to 32,000 uS, particularly into more saline waters. The stoichiometry of major ions (e.g. carbonates, sulfates, calcium, and magnesium) may change at 200 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Ryder <u>et</u> <u>al</u>. 1974). Saskatchewan lakes change from carbonate-type to sulfate-type at TDS about 700 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> (Rawson and Moore 1944) and exceed 100,000 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> in areas (e.g. Last and Schweyen 1983, Liaw and Atton 1980).

SHODEV and RLOGSHOD The original use of SHODEV was as an index of the "potential effect of littoral processes on the lake, area being constant" (Hutchinson 1957). SHODEV is used in this study as an index of shoreline extent, depth, and wind protection. The stipulation of equal area has been frequently forgotten, although Koshinsky (1968 p.251, 1970) showed that SHODEV increases with increasing WAREA in Saskatchewan shield lakes. The regression for 152 shield lakes was similar to earlier studies:

log SHODEV = 0.384 + 0.250 log WAREA (present study)

= 0.408 + 0.237 log WAREA (Koshinsky 1970).

RLOGSHOD, the ratio of actual to expected SHODEV, appears to be a better index of shoreline extent than SHODEV itself, as suggested by Koshinsky (1970). This ratio contributed to predictions of maximum depth, volume of suitable temperature, and maximum surface temperatures. Lakes with many islands and/or particularly sinuous shorelines are shallower, less voluminous, and more sheltered from wind than other lakes of similar area (see Appendix G). A disadvantage of RLOGSHOD is that the measurement of shoreline length on most lakes is more difficult than many other morphometric variables, such as FETCH or ORINW. It does not appear in selected regressions only for this reason (Table 21).

ZMAX and ZBAR Maximum depth (ZMAX) is related to water area in Saskatchewan lakes (Liaw and Atton 1980, 1981; Koshinsky 1970), mean depth (ZBAR), and other morphometric factors (Zimmerman <u>et al</u>. 1983). The present estimates based on log WAREA and log FETCH, with or without RLOGSHOD and ORINW, were certainly significant (Table 21).

Several indices based on surficial geology (e.g. rocky, morainal, glaciofluvial, and organic material prevalence) did not improve estimations significantly (see Appendix G). This is counter-intuitive as lakes situated on organic plains ought to be shallower than those on moraine or glacially scoured rock. It may be that simplifications (e.g. condensing detailed map data) or errors (e.g. relative depthpotentials assigned to rock, morainal, and other materials) have obscured this effect. One alternative approach that merits attention would be to estimate depth from surrounding terrestrial topographic contours, using land areas proportional to lake areas. In this case, ZBAR may be a more stable index of topography than ZMAX. Koshinsky (1970) indicated that the observed higher ratio of ZMAX to ZBAR in larger shield lakes results from greater probability of anomalously deep spots in a region of generally low relief.

ZMAX affects sedimentation and stratification in relatively well defined ways (Hilton 1985, Gorham 1980). However, assessment of spawning substrate conditions and the presence of a hypolimnion requires, at the least, a field survey of

each lake to determine maximum depth. ZMAX cannot be estimated with the precision required to reliably predict sedimentation and stratification.

STRAFN The prediction of stratification using ZMAX and WAREA or FETCH considers only morphometry and wind-generated turbulence. The existence of a thermocline affects the transfer of heat, maximum surface temperatures, and heat storage capacity of a lake (Ragotzkie 1978, Zimmerman <u>et al</u>. 1983).

Stratification is also dependent on the rate of water exchange in more-or-less "riverine" situations. The Froud index of relative flow-through (Orlob 1983) explains the observed non-stratification of several lakes which morphometrically ought to stratify. The sequential use of both Froud and morphometric criteria not only improves the accuracy of predictions, but is presumably suitable to a wider range of lake conditions. Hydrological models relating seasonal discharge to watershed area, regional precipitation, and other conditions (e.g. Rochelle et al. 1988), would be particularly useful for extrapolation. There are only about 36 active and discontinued streamflow gauging stations in the shield region of Saskatchewan (Environment Canada 1983). The need for actual ZMAX in both Froud and morphometric criteria is also a definite constraint in assessing unsurveyed lakes.

The behaviour of the maximum depth of  $15^{\circ}$ C was similar to that of the thermocline in other studies. The present explanation of 74 % of variation compares to explanations of 36 to 85 % (Shuter <u>et al</u>. 1983, Patalas 1984, Cruikshank 1984) of thermocline or epilimnion depth using morphometry. The influence of fetch and the notable contribution of the NW-component of fetch (Appendix G), imply a dependence on wind-driven mixing as in thermocline formation. Greater fetch, which tends to be correlated with water area, volume, and maximum and mean depths, allows for greater mixing depth by wind-generated waves (Smith and Sinclair 1972). Other factors such as surface water temperature, wind speeds, local topography, and patterns of stratification are also relevant (Arai 1981, Patalas 1984, Zimmerman <u>et al</u>. 1983).

In stratified lakes, log WAREA and TMAXS were necessary for predictive-quality equations; most other regressions were only marginally acceptable (Hocking 1976)(Appendix G). Surface water temperatures may modify the thermocline depth by 10 to 30 % (Patalas 1984). Higher temperatures increase stability of the metalimnion and reduce the mixing depth (Arai 1981).

The depth of 15°C in non-stratified lakes is less predictable and few studies address non-stratified lakes successfully. In his review of temperature simulation in single-lake studies, Orlob (1983 p.269) noted that "for larger water bodies [and] for those that are not strongly

stratified, ... we shall require more realistic models". For these situations, multi-dimensional models which assess the longitudinal and lateral gradients as well as the vertical profile of temperature are needed (Watanabe <u>et al</u>. 1983).

VOLT15T6 Predictions of lake trout presence or absence were 88 % accurate on the basis of VOLT15T6' or minimum volume of suitable temperature (Table 11). It appeared that this criterion might be estimable from water area, fetch, and air temperature (Arai 1981, Patalas 1984), but this was complex.

Regressions of log VOLT15T6 on morphometry and climate were excellent for non-riverine lakes with non-zero volume of 6 to 15<sup>0</sup>C water (Table 21). This class of lakes can be defined if ZMAX and June discharge (i.e. for the Froud index) are known. Regressions using WAREA, SECCHI, RLOGSHOD, and/or TMAXS were marginally acceptable for prediction. This implies that estimation is acceptable for lakes similar to this data set, but is not suitable for outlier lakes with unusual conditions (Hocking 1976). Estimations using only WAREA and FETCH were not acceptable statistically in comparison to other regressions using more variables (see Appendix G), but use easily available data. Non-zero VOLT15T6 was estimable in all lakes, even without knowledge of ZMAX or June discharge.

VOLT15T6 was poorly predictable based on status of

stratification. This is perplexing as stratification creates a major dichotomy in thermal behaviour. The poor predictability may arise because "stratification" in this study was a subjective evaluation of the entire lake during mid-summer. By contrast, "VOLT15T6" was objectively based on conditions at the point of deepest known depth over the openwater survey period.

<u>VOLT1506</u> VOLT1506 is a better predictor than VOLT15T6, but estimation of the magnitude of VOLT1506 was not attempted as studies have shown that modelling is far more complex for oxygen than temperatures (e.g. Lasenby 1975, Watanabe <u>et al</u>. 1983). "Unlike temperature, variation in [dissolved oxygen] concentration within the water column may be brought about by an array of factors, not all of which are forced from the surface, and many of which are difficult to describe in a complete way" (Patterson <u>et al</u>. 1985).

Secchi transparency was a good predictor of the existence of suitable temperature and oxygen. In shield lakes, Secchi depth may be generally related to under-saturated oxygen conditions (Wetzel 1983 p.175). The best estimation of suitable VOLT1506 may be Secchi depth (Appendix G), but the SECCHI criterion of lake trout status is more accurate (Table 11). This suggests that transparency used directly is the best predictor which does not require a detailed survey. Thus we have come full circle from the proximate

cause, which is believed to be temperature and oxygen, to reliance on transparency if we wish to minimize actual fieldwork or use auxiliary data from remote sensing.

# Marginal habitat and abundance

The difficulty with assessing marginal habitat stems from defining what seems very clear intuitively. Two definitions emerged as useful: (1) Minor errors within <u>+</u> 10 % of the criterion indicate marginal habitat, so that lake trout may reasonably be lacking or present. These errors also allow for statistical imprecision of the criterion itself in a general way. (2) Major errors indicated poor accuracy by specific habitat variables, a need for further fish collections (Dadswell 1974), and/or anomalies such as lack of post-glacial immigration routes, presence of transients in unsuitable habitat, or population extinction in suitable habitat.

Some lakes must be deemed marginally suitable for trout if one accepts that clarity, cool temperatures, and/or abundant oxygen are requisite. These include Lac Ile-a-la-Crosse, Nemeiben, and Namew lakes. Lac Ile-a-la-Crosse has restricted area of suitable depth, low transparency, high benthic fauna, and only minor commercial harvests of lake trout (Saylor 1972). Nemeiben Lake is suitable over a small proportion of its area, in which all harvests by survey nets

and all known lake trout fishing occurs (Koshinsky 1964). Namew Lake is similar, with the few, large lake trout which are frequently notable in extreme or variable environments (Reed 1959). Some intuitively suitable lakes have no natural lake trout. The most notable is Whelan Bay, for which all criteria predict lake trout and which presently supports a self-reproducing population and an intensive sport fishery based on only 4 years of moderate stocking of fry (Murray 1979).

Nonetheless, it appears that presence/absence data and/or the definitions used do not delineate a group of lakes in which habitat is distinctly distinguishable as marginal. Rather, habitat seems to form a continuum of suitability. Data on relative species compositions or lake trout abundance specifically may confirm this indication.

## Validation and extrapolation

The accuracy of most criteria on the 68 test lakes was acceptable. Final criteria for all 330 lakes were within <u>+</u> 10 % of preliminary ones, which suggests that most were stable predictors at least in shield lakes in Saskatchewan. Some authors reserve "validation" for tests on independent sets of data (Beck 1983). The reserved test lakes are independent, and an additional 50 or more lakes are available in provincial and consultant studies since 1982. Predictions of lake trout presence/absence in sets of 9,000 lakes in Ontario (Beamish <u>et al</u>. 1976, Minns 1986), about 80 lakes in the Northwest Territories (Falk 1979, Moshenko <u>et al</u>. 1980), 91 lakes in the Yukon (Lindsey <u>et al</u>. 1980), or elsewhere would be interesting.

Validation on lakes which are more representative of small and very small lakes and their species compositions would be more useful. By their nature, environmental baseline or impact assessment studies for mine, road, or powerline development (Koshinsky 1968, Beak 1979, Beak 1980) can be less selective than most resource management surveys. The adjustment of lake sets for incomplete and preferential surveys is essential for extrapolation, yet difficult. Random selection of lakes without regard for species composition would include many non-inhabited lakes. Surveys complete with detailed morphometry and seasonal trends in temperature and oxygen profiles are demanding of staff and They will likely remain unrepresentative of very small time. lakes, particularly those lacking preferred species, as noted elsewhere (Minns 1986).

One technique to reduce bias involves assigning lake trout status in lakes with unknown species. The initial classification rule is used, and then a new rule is estimated for the new, larger set. McLachlan (1975) showed that the second rule produces a lower error rate, and that one iteration usually suffices. This approach has been

recommended but seldom used (Solberg 1978), and might be effective in cases of non-random sampling of lake trout status.

The presumed preferences for lake trout of 6, 4, and 2fold are much less than reported in the only known study. Preferences were estimated at 32-fold for lake trout and 16fold for walleye in 8,900 Ontario lakes (Minns 1986), assuming (i) that lake surveys mimicked a selective predation model, and (ii) an "exhaustive search" revealed all lake trout and walleye lakes. However, the converse approach of estimating the number of lake trout lakes was not suitable since this number was sensitive to the approximation (Minns 1986) in the model. The present study uses conservative, subjective preferences to estimate the number of lake trout lakes. More objective preferences might be possible from independent opinions of resource managers who proposed or selected Saskatchewan lakes for surveying since 1930.

Extrapolation relies on the joint probability of habitat x and the presence of trout given habitat x. The probability of lake area or log VOLT15T6 is essentially a numerical exercise, but the probability curves of lake trout are open to interpretation. Using the frequency distribution of log VOLT15T6 and zero to 6,4,2-fold preferences towards lake trout lakes, the total number of lake trout lakes in the shield region of Saskatchewan is about 320 to 160 lakes over  $6.6 \text{ km}^2$ . There are fewer than 1460 to 180 smaller lake trout

lakes. The total number of lake trout lakes represents between 2 and 0.4 % of shield lakes in Saskatchewan. This is similar to the assumed 1 % occurrence in Ontario (Minns 1986), the only known comparison.

#### CONCLUSIONS

 Lakes with and without lake trout differed significantly in 42 of 50 habitat variables available from lake surveys.
Within the shield and non-shield regions, these classes differed in 35 and 31 traits, respectively.

2. Prediction of lake trout status was correct for 75 % or more of the lakes for 27 variables. In the shield region, many good criteria were temperature and oxygen indices; two variables achieved 90 % or better accuracy. In the nonshield region, good criteria related to location, morphometry, and temperature and oxygen; three variables achieved 90 % or better accuracy.

3. Non-shield lakes appeared to require 5 to 40-fold greater minimum area, volume, and volumes of suitable temperature and oxygen than shield lakes in order to have lake trout.

(a) Some of this difference was due to the effects of small sample sizes and non-random selection of lakes.

(b) Some may be due to greater variability of lake volume in non-shield lakes than shield lakes in the last 100 years. Greater waterlevel variations and generally shallower depths of non-shield lakes result in significantly less habitat during low-water periods than shield lakes.

(c) Effects of post-glacial immigration and/or climate are 137

thought to be considerable in the non-shield region. Later immigration by lake trout may have, and the warmer and drier post-glacial climate would have, caused fewer occurrences of lake trout in smaller lakes in the southern part of the study area. The northern shield region <u>per se</u> coincides with the area which was least affected by either factor.

4. In shield lakes, lake trout need a minimum of (i) 2.2  $hm^3$  water below 15°C and above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen (96 % accuracy of classification), or (ii) 10.3  $hm^3$  water between 6 and 15°C (88 % accuracy), during summer. The available volume is believed to determine population survival during a critical period, which may be relatively brief.

5. The minimum volumes of water of suitable temperature and/or oxygen may relate observed densities of lake trout to a maximum density during a critical period, and to a presumed minimum number of lake trout for population survival. The few shield lakes for which data are available have a maximum of 300 mature lake trout per hm<sup>3</sup>; the threshold volumes indicate about 600 to 900 mature lake trout per lake.

6. In shield lakes, maximum depth of 31.2 m or greater predicts lake trout status with 92 % accuracy. However, its importance is believed to be due to its influence on temperature, oxygen, or sediment distribution. Clearing of spawning areas by periodic wave action is essential, and is predictable from simple wave models using depth and fetch. The effect of depth on winter oxygen conditions was not evaluated.

7. In shield lakes, mean summer Secchi transparency of 4.2 m or greater predicts status with 88 % accuracy. More specifically, lake trout may depend on light sufficient for vision (about 1.0 meter-candle) or light sensible to lake trout visual pigments (i.e. 510-540 nm wavelength) extending into the zone of suitable temperature. The lower boundary of vision by lake trout is theoretically: log (sensible depth) = 0.450 + 1.200 log (Secchi depth).

8. Multiple discriminant analysis showed that Secchi transparency and minimum volume of water of 6 to 15°C (VOLT15T6) contributed strongly and consistently to predictions, more so than all other criteria. Other studies have shown the importance of transparency, but have not evaluated volumetric temperature (or temperature and oxygen) indices in relation to presence and absence.

9. Several good criteria of lake trout status can be estimated from easily available data.

(a) maximum depth (ZMAX): Reasonable predictions from water area (WAREA) and fetch, but these are unreliable for use in

sedimentation or stratification models.

(b) stratification (STRAFN): Good predictions using morphometric and river flow-through concepts. These required ZMAX and FETCH and Froud index (FETCH, ZBAR, VOLUME, and river discharge) data, respectively.

(c) minimum volume of 6-15°C (VOLT15T6): Good to excellent predictions in lakes with non-zero VOLT15T6. Good to excellent predictions if riverine lakes are excluded by Froud index and if non-zero VOLT15T6 is assumed, which leads to over-estimation of suitability of some lakes.

10. Lake surveys are generally not representative of water areas or TDS of Saskatchewan lakes, particularly very small (<10 km<sup>2</sup>) or low-TDS (<50 mg.L<sup>-1</sup>) lakes. Corrections for preferential surveying of larger lakes and lakes with lake trout present are essential for extrapolation to the total number of lake trout lakes.

11. There are an estimated 320 to 160 lake trout lakes over  $6.6 \text{ km}^2$  in the shield region of Saskatchewan. Numbers of smaller lake trout lakes are less precisely known (1480 to 180 lakes).

### LITERATURE CITED

- Alfoldi, T.T. 1982. Remote sensing for water quality monitoring. p.317-328 in Johannsen, C.J., and J.L. Sanders (eds.). Remote sensing for resource management. Soil Cons. Soc. Amer., 688 p.
- Ali, M.A. (ed.). 1975. Vision in fishes New approaches in research. NATO Advanced Study Inst., Life Sci. Vol. 1, xiv and 836 p.
- Ali, M.A. 1980. Environmental physiology of fishes. NATO Advanced Study Inst., Life Sci. Vol. 35, xi and 723 p.
- Ali, M.A., and H.J. Wagner. 1975. Visual pigments: phylogeny and ecology. p.481-516 in Ali, M. A. (ed.). Vision in fishes - New approaches in research.
- Arai, T. 1981. Climate and geomorphological influences on lake temperature. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 21:130-134.
- Atton, F.M. 1955. Thermal studies of Lac la Ronge 1949 to 1952. M.A. Thesis, Dept. Biology, Univ. Saskatchewan.

÷,

- Atton, F.M., and J.J. Merkowsky. 1983. Atlas of Saskatchewan fish. Saskatchewan Dep. Parks Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 83-2, vi and 281 p.
- Bailey, J.K. 1977. Wassegam Lake, Prince Albert National Park - A biological and limnological survey with recommendations for the management of the lake trout (<u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>) population. Can. Wildl. Serv., MS Rep., iii and 52 p.
- Ball, H. 1985. Lake trout population of Squeers Lake. in Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc. Lake trout seminar. North Central Region MS Rep., unpag.
- Barica, J. 1975. Summerkill risk in prairie ponds and possibilities of its prediction. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 32:1283-1288.
- Barica, J., and J.A. Mathias. 1979. Oxygen depletion and winterkill risk in small prairie lakes under extended ice cover. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 36:980-986.
- Beak (Beak Consultants Limited). 1979. Key Lake Mining Corporation - Key Lake project. 3 vols: Environmental impact statement, Appendix I - VI, and Appendix VII - XI, unpag.

- Beak (Beak Consultants Limited). 1980. Midwest Lake -Environmental baseline study: Supporting Document No. 1, 3 vols. and app., unpag.
- Beamish, F.W.H. 1978. Swimming capacity. p.101-187 in Hoar, W.S., and D.J. Randall (eds.). Fish physiology. Vol. VII Locomotion.
- Beamish, R.J., L.M. Blouw, and G.A. McFarlane. 1976. A fish and chemical study of 109 lakes in the Experimental Lakes Area (ELA), Northwestern Ontario, with appended reports on lake whitefish ageing errors and the Northwestern Ontario baitfish industry. Canada Fish. Mar. Serv., Tech. Rep. No. 607, iii and 115 p.
- Beck, M. 1983. A procedure for modelling. p. 11-41 in Orlob, G.T. (ed.). Mathematical modeling of water quality: streams, lakes, and reservoirs. Vol. 12 in Internat. Ser. Appl. Systems Analysis. Wiley and Sons, xx and 518 p.
- Beggs, G.L., J.M. Gunn, and C.H. Olver. 1985. The sensitivity of Ontario lake trout (<u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>) and lake trout lakes to acidification. Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc., Ontario Fish. Tech. Rep. Ser. No. 17, iii and 24 p.
- Benoit, J., and G. Power. 1981. Biologie de deux populations arctiques de touladi, <u>Salvelinus namaycush</u> (Walbaum), de la région du Lac Minto, Nouveau-Québec. Naturaliste Canadien 108:1-16.
- Black, G.A. 1983. Origin, distribution, and post-glacial dispersal of a swimbladder nematode, <u>Cystidicola</u> <u>stigmatura</u>. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 40:1244-1253.
- Blaxter, J.H.S. 1970. Light Fishes. p.213-320 in Kinne, O. (ed.). Marine ecology - Vol.1 Environmental factors, part 1. Wiley-Interscience, ix and 681 p.
- Blaxter, J.H.S. 1975a. Do fish have an absolute sense of light intensity? p.719-729 in Ali, M.A. (ed.). Vision in fishes - New approaches in research.
- Blaxter, J.H.S. 1975b. Fish vision and applied research. p.747-773 in Ali, M.A. (ed.). Vision in fishes - New approaches in research.
- Brett, J.R. 1964. The respiratory metabolism and swimming performance of young sockeye salmon. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 21:1183-1226.

- Bridges, C.H., and L.S. Hambly. 1971. A summary of eighteen years of salmonid management at Quabbin Reservoir, Massachusetts. p.243-254 in Hall, G.E. (ed.). Reservoir fisheries and limnology. Amer. Fish. Soc. Spec. Publ. 8.
- Brunskill, G.J., and D.W. Schindler. 1971. Geography and bathymetry of selected lake basins, Experimental Lakes Area, northwestern Ontario. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 28:139-155.
- Carper, G.L., and R.W. Bachmann. 1984. Wind resuspension of sediments in a prairie lake. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 41:1763-1767.
- Chen, M.Y. 1979. Lake trout Lac la Ronge, 1978. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 79-2, xiii and 133 p.
- Christiansen, E.A. 1979. The Wisconsinan deglaciation of southern Saskatchewan and adjacent areas. Can. J. Earth Sci. 16:913-938.
- Christie, G.C., and H.A. Regier. 1986. Measures of optimal thermal habitat and their relationship to yields for four commercial fish species. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 45:301-314.
- Confer, J.L., G.L. Howick, M.H. Corzette, S.L. Kramer, S. Fitzgibbon, and R. Landesberg. 1978. Visual predation by planktivores. Oikos 31:27-37.
- Conover, W.J. 1971. Practical nonparametric statistics. Wiley and Sons Inc., x and 462 p.
- Cornett, R.J., and F.H. Rigler. 1979. Hypolimnetic oxygen deficits: their prediction and interpretation. Science 205:580-581.
- Coutant, C.C. 1985. Striped bass, temperature, and dissolved oxygen: a speculative hypothesis for environmental risk. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 114:31-61.
- CRC. 1968. Handbook of chemistry and physics. Chemical Rubber Co., xxvii and Sections A - F unpag.
- Cruikshank, D.R. 1984. The relationship of summer thermocline depth to several physical characteristics of lakes. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 1248, iv and 33 p.
- Cuerrier, J.P. 1952. Transfer of anaesthetized adult lake trout by means of aircraft. Can. Fish Cult. 13:1-4.

- Dadswell, M.J. 1974. Distribution, ecology, and postglacial dispersal of certain crustaceans and fishes in eastern North America. Nat. Mus. Natur. Sci., Publ. Zoology No. 11, xviii and 110 p.
  - Dartnall, H.J.A. 1975. Assessing the fitness of visual pigments for their photic environments. p.543-563 in Ali, M.A. (ed.). Vision in fishes - New approaches in research.
  - Davis, J.C. 1975. Minimal dissolved oxygen requirements of aquatic life with emphasis on Canadian species: a review. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 32:2295-2332.
  - Dean, E.L. 1981. Seven headwater lakes in the Richardson and Clearwater drainage basins: northwest Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 81-2, vii and 151 p.
  - Demers, J. 1974. Canadian survey on the water balance of lakes. Can. Nat. Comm., Internat. Hydrol. Decade, MS Rep., iii and 92 p.
  - Diaconis, p., and B. Efron. 1983. Computer-intensive methods in statistics. Sci. Amer. 248:116-130.
  - Dillon, W.R. 1979. The performance of the linear discriminant function in nonoptimal situations and the estimation of classification error rates: a review of recent findings. J. Market. Res. XVI:370-381.

÷.

- Donald, D.B., and D.J. Alger. 1986. Stunted lake trout (<u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>) from the Rocky Mountains. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 43:609-612.
- Dubay, C.I., and G.M. Simmons. 1979. The contribution of macrophytes to the metalimnetic oxygen maximum in a montane, oligotrophic lake. Amer. Midland Naturalist 101:108-117.
- Eberly, W.R. 1964. Further studies on the metalimnetic oxygen maximum, with special reference to its occurrence throughout the world. Invest. Indiana Lakes Streams VI:103-139.
- Efron, B. 1975. The efficiency of logistic regression compared to normal discriminant analysis. J. Amer. Stat. Assoc. 70:892-898.
- Elderton, W.P., and N.L. Johnson. 1969. Systems of frequency curves. Cambridge Univ. Press, viii and 219 p.

- Environment Canada. 1983. Surface water data Reference index - Canada 1983. Water Surv. Can., xv and 386 p.
- Environment Canada. 1986. An applied climatology of drought in the prairie provinces. Atmos. Environ. Serv., Can. Climate Centre Rep. No. 86-4, viii and 197 p.
- Falk, M.R. 1979. Biological and limnological data on ten lakes surveyed in the Northwest Territories, 1971-72. Canada Fish. Mar. Serv., Data Rep. No. 129, v and 41 p.
- Fargher, R.C. 1977. Salinity tolerance and aspects of sodium regulation in lake trout (<u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>). M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. Manitoba, viii and 65 p.
- Ferguson, R.G. 1958. The preferred temperature of fish and their midsummer distribution in temperate lakes and streams. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 15:607-624.
- Findlay, B. 1981. Drought in the Alberta perspective. p.23-46 in Leggat, K.R., and J.T. Kotylak (eds.). The impacts of climatic fluctuations on Alberta's resources and environment. Envir. Canada, Atmos. Environ. Serv., Rep. No. WAES-1-81, vii and 107 p.
- Frane, J.W. 1976. Some simple procedures for handling missing data in multivariate analysis. Psychometrica 41:409-415.
- Freund, R.J., and P.D. Minton. 1979. Regression methods: a tool for data analysis. Vol. 30 in Statistics: textbooks and monographs. Dekker Inc., xi and 261 p.
- Frey, D.G. 1955. Distributional ecology of the cisco (<u>Coregonus artedii</u>) in Indiana. Invest. Indiana Lakes Streams IV:177-228.
- Fry, F.E.F. 1947. Effects of the environment on animal activity. Publ. Ontario Fish. Res. Lab. No. 68, 62 p.
- Fry, F.E.J. 1971. The effect of environmental factors on the physiology of fish. p.1-98 in Hoar, W.S., and D.J. Randall (eds.). Fish physiology. Vol. VI Environmental relations and behavior. Academic Press, xvi and 559 p.
- Fulthorpe, R.R., and J.E. Paloheimo. 1985. Hypolimnetic oxygen consumption in small lakes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 42:1493-1500.
- Garside, E.T. 1959. Some effects of oxygen in relation to temperature on the development of lake trout embryos. Can. J. Zool. 37:689-698.

- Genge, R.E. 1986. Development and application of a model to predict nutrient enrichment effects on lake trout habitat. 6th Ann. Internat. Symp. Lake Reservoir Manage., Oregon, USA.
- George, J. 1985. Niobe Lake: A residual lake trout population. in Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc. Lake trout seminar. North Central Region MS Rep., unpag.
- Gibson, E.S., and F.E.J. Fry. 1954. The performance of the lake trout, <u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>, at various levels of temperature and oxygen pressure. Can. J. Zool. 32:254-260.
- Gold, H.J. 1983. The KSLTEST procedure. p.167-169 in SAS Inst. Inc. (ed.). SUGI supplemental library user's guide, iv and 399 p.
- Goldstein, M., and W.R. Dillon. 1977. A stepwise discrete variable selection procedure. Commun. Statist. 6:1423-1436.
- Gordon, M.S. 1970. Hydrostatic pressure. p.445-464 in Hoar, W.S., and D.J. Randall (eds.). Fish physiology. Vol. IV The nervous system, circulation, and respiration. Academic Press, xviii and 532 p.
- Gorham, E. 1958. The physical limnology of northern Britain: an epitome of the bathymetrical survey of the Scottish freshwater lochs, 1897-1909. Limnol. Oceanogr. 3:40-50.
- Green, R.H. 1971. A multivariate statistical approach to the Hutchinsonian niche: bivalve molluscs of central Canada. Ecology 52:543-556.
- Green, R.H., and G.L. Vascotto. 1978. A method for the analysis of environmental factors controlling patterns of species composition in aquatic communities. Water Res. 12:583-590
- Gunn, J.M., and W. Keller. 1981. Emergence and survival of lake trout (<u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>) and brook trout (<u>S.</u> <u>fontinalis</u>) from artificial substrates in an acidic lake. Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc., Ontario Fish. Tech. Rep. Ser. No. 1, iii and 9 p.
- Haines, T.A. 1981. Acidic precipitation and its consequences for aquatic ecosystems: a review. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 110:669-707.
- Hakanson, L. 1978. Optimization of lake hydrographic surveys. Water Resourc. Res. 14:545-560.

- Hamilton, G.D., M. Eckersley, and W. Dentry. 1980. A multivariate approach to predicting habitat suitability and the presence of important game fishes in lakes of the west Patricia planning area. Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc., West Patricia Land Use Plan, Fish. Tech. Rep. No. 8, 17 p. and app.
- Harvey, H.H. 1978. Fish communities of the Manitoulin Island lakes. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 20:2031-2038.
- Hatch, R.W. 1984. Population dynamics and species interactions. p.4-10 in Eshenroder, R.L., T.P. Poe, and C.H. Olver (eds.). Strategies for rehabilitation of lake trout in the Great Lakes: Proceedings of a conference on lake trout research, August 1983. Great Lakes Fish. Comm., Tech. Rep. No. 40, iii and 62 p.
- Healey, M.C. 1978. The dynamics of exploited lake trout populations and implications for management. J. Wildl. Manage. 42:307-328.
- Healey, M.C., and W.L. Woodall. 1973. Limnological surveys of seven lakes near Yellowknife, Northwest Territories. Fish. Res. Bd. Can., Tech. Rep. No. 407, 36 p.
- Hilton, J. 1985. A conceptual framework for predicting the occurrence of sediment focusing and sediment redistribution in small lakes. Limnol. Oceanogr. 30:1131-1143.
- Hitchins, J.R., and W.G.A. Samis. 1986. Successful reproduction by introduced lake trout in 10 northeastern Ontario lakes. N. Amer. J. Fish. Manage. 6:372-375.
- Hoar, W.S., and D.J. Randall (eds.). 1978. Fish physiology. Vol. VII Locomotion. Academic Press, xx and 576 p.
- Hocking, R.R. 1976. The analysis and selection of variables in linear regression. Biometrics 32:1-49.
- Holeton, G.F. 1980. Oxygen as an environmental factor of fishes. p.7-32 in Ali, M.A. (ed.). Environmental physiology of fishes.
- Hutchinson, G.E. 1957. A treatise on limnology. I. Geography, physics, and chemistry. Wiley and Sons Inc., 1015 p.
- Hutchinson, G.E. 1978. An introduction to population ecology. Yale Univ. Press, xi and 260 p.

- Javaid, M.Y., and J.M. Anderson. 1967. Influence of starvation on selected temperature of some salmonids. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 24:1515-1519.
- Jensen, R.E., and M.Y. Chen. 1986. Feasibility of cage incubation of lake trout eggs in Lake Diefenbaker. Saskatchewan Dep. Parks Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 86-1, iv and 24 p.
- Johnson, L. 1976. Ecology of Arctic populations of lake trout, <u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>, lake whitefish, <u>Coregonus</u> <u>clupeaformis</u>, Arctic char, <u>S</u>. <u>alpinus</u>, and associated species in unexploited lakes of the Canadian Northwest Territories. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 33:2459-2488.
- Johnson, M.G., J.H. Leach, C.K. Minns, and C.H. Olver. 1977. Limnological characteristics of Ontario lakes in relation to associations of walleye (Stizostedion vitreum vitreum), northern pike (Esox lucius), lake trout (Salvelinus namaycush), and smallmouth bass (Micropterus dolomieui). J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 34:1592-1601.
- Jones, D.R., and D.J. Randall. 1978. The respiratory and circulatory systems during exercise. p.425-501 in Hoar, W. S., and D.J. Randall (eds.). Fish physiology. Vol. VII Locomotion.
- Kallemeyn, L.W. 1969. The biology of the Canoe Lake fishery, 1968. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 57 p.
- Kennedy, W.A. 1951. The relationship of fishing effort by gill nets to the interval between lifts. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 8:264-274.
- Kerr, S.R. 1971a. Prediction of fish growth efficiency in nature. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 28:809-814.
- Kerr, S.R. 1971b. A simulation model of lake trout growth. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 28:815-819.
- Kerr, S.R., and N.V. Martin. 1968. Trophic dynamics of lake trout production systems. p.365-376 in Steele, J.H. (ed.). Marine food chains. Oliver and Boyd, U.K.
- Knoke, J.D. 1982. Discriminant analysis with discrete and continuous variables. Biometrics 38:191-200.
- Kooyman, A.H. 1970. Taxonomy of the cisco in Waskesiu Lake, Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect., MS Rep.

- Koshinsky, G.D. 1964. The limnology and fisheries of five Pre-Cambrian headwater lakes of the MacKay Lake drainage in north central Saskatchewan 1960-64. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 91 p.
- Koshinsky, G.D. 1968. The limnology and fisheries of 28 small lakes situated on the precambrian shield near Lac la Ronge, Saskatchewan, 1960-1967. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., 530 p.
- Koshinsky, G.D. 1970. The morphometry of shield lakes in Saskatchewan. Limnol. Oceanogr. 15:695-701.
- Lachenbruch, P.A. 1975. Discriminant analysis. Hafner Press, ix and 128 p.
- Lachenbruch, P.A., C. Sneeringer, and L.T. Revo. 1973. Robustness of the linear and quadratic discriminant function to certain types of non-normality. Commun. Statistics 1:39-56.
- Lane, C.B. 1967. The limnology, fisheries, and management potential of 17 lakes located along the Hanson Lake road, 1964-66. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 132 p.
- Lasenby, D.C. 1975. Development of oxygen deficits in 14 southern Ontario lakes. Limnol. Oceanogr. 20:993-999.
- Last, W.M., and T.H. Schweyen. 1983. Sedimentation and geochemistry of saline lakes of the great plains. Hydrobiologia 105:245-263.
- Legendre, P., and V. Legendre. 1984. Postglacial dispersal of freshwater fishes in the Quebec peninsula. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 41:1781-1802
- Liaw, W.K. 1979. Land use effects on Saskatchewan lakes. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 79-6, v and 40 p.
- Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1980. Potential impact on fish habitat from acid rain in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 80-1, v and 58 p.
- Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1981a. Acid rain on northern lakes: background studies in Saskatchewan. Musk-Ox 28:26-42.

- Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1981b. Sensitivity to acid of fishing waters in northern Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 81-1, 65 p.
- Liaw, W.K., and J.F. O'Connor. 1975. Impact on five Churchill River lakes. Churchill River Study, Final Report 8, xix and 198 p.
- Lindsey, C.C., K. Patalas, R.A. Bodaly, and C.P. Archibald. 1980. Glaciation and the physical, chemical and biological limnology of Yukon lakes. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 966, vi and 37 p.
- Loftus, A.J. 1986. An evaluation of lake trout (<u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>) hooking mortality in the upper Great Lakes. Michigan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Res. Rep. No. 1941, 15 p.
- Loftus, K.H., and H.A. Regier (eds.). 1972. Salmonid communities in oligotrophic lakes. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada 29.
- Low, C.J., and D.A. Fernet. 1974. A preliminary survey of seven small lakes along the Smoothstone Lake road, 1973. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 36 p.
- Lythgoe, J.N. 1968. Visual pigments and visual range underwater. Vision Res. 8:997-1011.
- Lythgoe, J.N. 1975. Problems of seeing colours under water. p.619-634 in Ali, M.A. (ed.) Vision in fishes - New approaches in research.
- Mac, M.J. 1985. Effects of ration size on preferred temperature of lake charr <u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>. Environ. Biol. Fish. 14:227-231.
- Machniak, K. 1975. The effects of hydroelectric development on the biology of northern fishes (reproduction and population dynamics). A literature review and bibliography. IV Lake trout. Canada Fish. Mar. Serv., Tech. Rep. No. 530.
- Marshall, T.L., and R.P. Johnson. 1971. History and results of fish introductions in Saskatchewan 1900-1969. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 8, 30 p.
- Martin, N.V. 1957. Reproduction of lake trout in Algonquin Park, Ontario. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 86:231-244.

- Martin, N.V. 1966. The significance of food habits in the biology, exploitation, and management of Algonquin Park, Ontario, lake trout. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 95:415-422.
- Martin, N.V., and C.H. Olver. 1976. The distribution and characteristics of Ontario lake trout lakes. Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Wildl. Res. Br., Res. Rep. No. 97.
- Martin, N.V., and C.H. Olver. 1980. The lake charr, <u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>. p.205-277 in Balon, E.K. (ed.). Charrs, salmonid fishes of the genus <u>Salvelinus</u>. Dr. W. Junk Publ., ix and 928 p.
- Martin, N.V., and F.K. Sandercock. 1967. Pyloric caeca and gill raker development in lake trout, <u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>, in Algonquin Park, Ontario. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 24:965-974.
- Martinot, J.P. 1978. Acclimatation de l'omble du Canada <u>Salvelinus namaycush</u> Walbaum (Salmonidae) dans un lac de haute montagne du Parc National de la Vanoise. Travaux Scient. Figues du Parc National de la Vanoise Chambery 9:103-139.
- Matuszek, J.E. 1978. Empirical predictions of fish yields of large North American lakes. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 107:385-394.
- Mayhood, D.W., A.H. Kooyman, R.L. Hare, and R.D. Saunders. 1973. A limnological survey of some waters in southern Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect., MS Rep., viii and 101 p.
- McCauley, R.W., and N.W. Huggins. 1979. Ontogenetic and nonthermal seasonal effects on thermal preferenda of fish. Amer. Zool. 19:267-271.
- McCauley, R.W., and J.S. Tait. 1970. Preferred temperature of yearling lake trout, <u>Salvelinus namaycush</u>. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 27:1729-1733.
- McFarland, W.N., and F.W. Munz. 1965. Codominance of visual pigments in hybrid fishes. Science 150:1055-1057.
- McLachlan, G.J. 1975. Iterative reclassification procedure for constructing an asymptotically optimal rule of allocation in discriminant analysis. J. Amer. Stat. Assoc. 70:365-369.

- McPhail, J.D., and C.C. Lindsey. 1970. Freshwater fishes of northwestern Canada and Alaska. Fish. Res. Bd. Can., Bull. 173, 381 p.
  - Middleton, E.M., and J.C. Munday. 1980. LANDSAT What is operational in water resources? p.43-52 in Alfoldi, T.T. (ed.). Proceedings of the 6th Canadian symposium on remote sensing. Canadian Aeronautics and Space Institute, Ottawa, vii and 699 p.
  - Minnesota. 1982. Lake management planning guide. Minnesota Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish, Div., Spec. Publ. No. 132.
  - Minns, C.K. 1984. Analysis of lake and drainage area counts and measures for selected watersheds across Ontario's shield region. Can. Manus. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 1748, vii and 17 p.
- Minns, C.K. 1986. A model of bias in lake selection for survey. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 1496, v and 21 p.
- Moshenko, R.W. 1980. Biological data on the major fish species from fifty-nine inland lakes in the Northwest Territories, 1959-68. Can. Data Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 175, viii and 81 p.
- Murray, A.R. 1979. Whelan Bay lake trout: status and management. Dep. Northern Saskatchewan, Fish. Manage. Rep., viii and 26 p.
- Neumann, J. 1959. Maximum depth and average depth of lakes. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 16:923-927.
- Nester, R.T., and T.P. Poe. 1987. Visual observations of historical lake trout spawning grounds in western Lake Huron. N. Amer. J. Fish. Manage. 7:418-424.
- O'Connor, D.V., D.V. Rottiers, and W.H. Berlin. 1981. Food consumption, growth rate, conversion efficiency, and proximate composition of yearling lake trout. U. S. Fish. Wildl. Serv., Great Lakes Fish. Lab. Admin. Rep. No. 81-5, 19 p.
- Oglesby, R.T. 1977. Relationships of fish yield to lake phytoplankton standing crop, production, and morphometric factors. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 34:2271-2279.
- Ontario. 1977. Report on water quality management of lake trout waters of south eastern Ontario. Ontario Min. Environ. and Min. Natur. Resourc., MS Rep., 35 p.

- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 1985. Lake trout seminar. North Central Region, MS Rep., unpag.
- Orlob, G.T. 1983. One-dimensional models for simulation of water quality in lakes and reservoirs. p.227-273 in Orlob, G.T. (ed.). Mathematical modeling of water quality: streams, lakes, and reservoirs. Vol. 12 in Internat. Ser. Appl. Systems Analysis. Wiley and Sons, xx and 518 p.
- Patalas, K. 1984. Mid-summer mixing depth of lakes of different latitudes. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 22:97-102.
- Paterson, R.J. 1968. The lake trout, <u>Salvelinus</u> <u>namaycush</u>, of Swan Lake, Alberta. Alberta Fish. Wildl. Div., Res. Rep. No. 2, xi and 149 p.
- Patterson, J.C., B.R. Allanson, and G.N. Ivey. 1985. A dissolved oxygen budget model for Lake Erie in summer. Freshw. Biol. 15:683-694.
- Power, G. 1978. Fish population structure in Arctic lakes. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 35:53-59.
- Prepas, E.E. 1983. Total dissolved solids as a predictor of lake biomass and productivity. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 40:92-95.
- Press, S.J., and S. Wilson. 1978. Choosing between logistic regression and discriminant analysis. J. Amer. Stat. Assoc. 73:699-705.
- Ragotzkie, R.A. 1978. Heat budgets of lakes. p.1-19 in Lerman, A. (ed.). Lakes: chemistry, geology, physics. Springer-Verlag Inc., xi and 363 p.
- Rawson, D.S. 1936. Physical and chemical studies in lakes of the Prince Albert Park, Saskatchewan. J. Biol. Bd. Can. 2(3):227-284.
- Rawson, D.S. 1943. The experimental introduction of smallmouth black bass into lakes of the Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 72(1942):195-211.
- Rawson, D.S. 1951. The total mineral content of lake waters. Ecology 32:669-672.
- Rawson, D.S. 1952. Mean depth and the fish production of large lakes. Ecology 33:513-521.
Rawson, -D.S. 1953. The standing crop of net plankton in lakes. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada 10:224-237.

Rawson, D.S. 1957a. Mineral analysis of Saskatchewan lake waters. p.19-21 in Saskatchewan Res. Counc., 11th Ann. Rep.

Rawson, D.S. 1957b. Limnology and fisheries of five lakes in the upper Churchill drainage, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 3, 61 p.

Rawson, D.S. 1958. Mineral analysis of Saskatchewan lake waters. p.20-23 in Saskatchewan Res. Counc., 12th Ann. Rep.

Rawson, D.S. 1960. A limnological comparison of twelve large lakes in northern Saskatchewan. Limnol. Oceanogr. 5:195-211.

Rawson, D.S. 1961. A critical analysis of the limnological variables used in assessing the productivity of northern Saskatchewan lakes. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 14:160-166.

Rawson, D.S., and J.E. Moore. 1944. The saline lakes of Saskatchewan. Can. J. Res. D 22:141-201.

Reed, E.B. 1959. The limnology and fisheries of Cumberland and Namew lakes, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 74 p.

Reinelt, E.R., A.H. Laycock, and W.M. Schultz (eds.). 1973. Proceedings of the symposium on the lakes of western Canada. Univ. Alberta Water Resourc. Centre, Publ. No. 2, xviii and 455 p.

Richards, J.H., and K.I. Fung (eds.). 1969. Atlas of Saskatchewan. Univ. Saskatchewan, viii and 236 p.

Ricker, W.E. 1934. A critical discussion of various measures of oxygen saturation in lakes. Ecology 15:348-363.

Ritchie, J.C. 1976. The late-quaternary vegetational history of the western interior of Canada. Can. J. Bot. 54:1793-1818.

Ritchie, J.C. 1983. The paleoecology of the central and northern parts of the Glacial Lake Agassiz basin. p.157-170 in Teller, J.T., and L. Clayton. (eds.). Glacial Lake Agassiz. Geol. Assoc. Can., Spec. Pap. No. 26, v and 451 p. Rochelle, B.P., M.R. Church, W.A. Gebert, D.J. Graczyk, and W.R. Krug. 1988. Relationship between annual runoff and watershed area for the eastern United States. Water Resourc. Bull. 24:35-41.

- Rudstam, L.G., and J.J. Magnuson. 1985. Predicting the vertical distribution of fish populations: analysis of cisco, <u>Coregonus artedii</u>, and yellow perch, <u>Perca</u> <u>flavescens</u>. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 42:1178-1188.
- Rutherford, A.A. 1970. Water quality survey of Saskatchewan surface waters. Saskatchewan Res. Counc., Chem. Div., Rep. C70-1, iv and 1 p.
- Ruttner, F. 1963. Fundamentals of limnology. Univ. Toronto Press, xvi and 295 p.
- Ryan, P.A. 1980. Physical and chemical characteristics of the waters of 14 lakes in northwestern Ontario, 1980. Ontario Min. Natur. Resourc., MS Rep., 28 p.
- Ryder, R.A. 1965. A method for estimating the potential fish production of north-temperate lakes. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 94:214-218.
- Ryder, R.A., and L. Johnson. 1972. The future of salmonid communities in North American oligotrophic lakes. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 29:941-949.
- Ryder, R.A., S.R. Kerr, K.H. Loftus, and H.A. Regier. 1974. The morphoedaphic index, a fish yield estimator - Review and evaluation. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 31:663-688.
- SAS (ed.). 1982. SAS user's guide: statistics. SAS Inst. Inc., xiv and 584 p.
- SAS (ed.). 1987. SAS/STAT guide for personal computers, version 6. SAS Inst. Inc., xviii and 1028 p.
- Saskatchewan. 1947. Report of the royal commission on the fisheries of Saskatchewan. King's Printer, Regina, 131 p.
- Saskatchewan. 1981. Proposed goals and strategies for fisheries management in the 1980's. Dep. Northern Saskatchewan and Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., 79 p.
- Sawchyn, W.W. 1975. Impact on the Reindeer River and four Churchill River lakes. Churchill River Study, Final Report 9, xxiv and 260 p.

- Sawchyn, W.W. 1987. Evaluation of lake trout and lake whitefish resources in Lac la Plonge. Saskatchewan Dep. Parks, Rec. and Cult., Fish. Tech. Rep. 87-1, ix and 65p.
- Sawchyn, W.W., and E.W. Kardash. 1976. Limnology and fisheries of 5 lakes: Brabant, Wierzycki, Dickens, Davis, McLennan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 76-7, vi and 163 p.
- Saylor, M.L. 1972. Lac Ile-a-la-Crosse ecological baseline survey. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 59 p.
- Scarpace, F.L., K.W. Holmquist, and L.T. Fisher. 1978. LANDSAT analysis of lake quality for statewide lake classification. p.173-195 in Proc. Amer. Soc. Photogrammetry, 44th Ann. Meeting, Washington, D. C.
- Schindler, D.W. 1971. Light, temperature, and oxygen regimes of selected lakes in the Experimental Lakes Area, northwestern Ontario. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 28:157-169.
- Schlesinger, D.A., and A.M. McCombie. 1983. An evaluation of climatic, morphometric, and effort data as predictors of yields from Ontario's sport fisheries. Ontario Fish. Tech. Rep. Ser. No. 10, iii and 14 p.
- Scott, W.B., and E.J. Crossman. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Fish. Res. Bd. Can., Bull. 184, xi and 966 p.
- Shuter, B.J., D. A. Schlesinger, and A.P. Zimmerman. 1983. Empirical predictors of annual water surface temperature cycles in North American lakes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 40:1838-1845.
- Sly, P.G. 1984. Habitat. p. 35-39 in Eshenroder, R.L., T.P. Poe, and C.H. Olver (eds.). Strategies for rehabilitation of lake trout in the Great Lakes: Proceedings of a conference on lake trout research, August 1983. Great Lakes Fish. Comm., Tech. Rep. No. 40, iii and 62 p.
- Smith, I.R. 1979. Hydraulic conditions in isothermal lakes. Freshw. Biol. 9:119-145.
- Smith, I.R., and I.J. Sinclair. 1972. Deep water waves in lakes. Freshw. Biol. 2:387-399.
- Solberg, H.E. 1978. Discriminant analysis. CRC Critical Rev. Clinical Lab. Sci. 9:209-242.

- Solman, V.E.F. 1948. An investigation of the status of lake trout in Crean Lake, Prince Albert National Park. Can. Wildl. Serv., MS Rep., 8 p.
- Stewart, K.W., and C.C. Lindsey. 1983. Postglacial dispersal of lower vertebrates in the Lake Agassiz region. p.391-419 in Teller, J.T., and L. Clayton. (eds.). Glacial Lake Agassiz. Geol. Assoc. Can., Spec. Pap. No. 26, v and 451 p.
- Teller, J.T., S.R. Moran, and L. Clayton. 1980. The Wisconsinan deglaciation of southern Saskatchewan and adjacent areas: discussion. Can. J. Earth Sci. 17:539-541.
- Tones, P.I. (ed.). 1979. Additional environmental baseline studies for the Cluff Lake area, Saskatchewan: Final report. Saskatchewan Res. Counc., Rep. No. C79-19, xviii and 378 p. and app.
- Tyler, J.E. 1968. The Secchi disk. Limnol. Oceanogr. 13: 1-6.
- Vance, R.E., D. Emerson, and T. Habgood. 1983. A mid-Holocene record of vegetative change in central Alberta. Can. J. Earth Sci. 20:364-376.
- Wallace, R.G. 1984. Sport fisheries on small lakes along Highway 955 in northwestern Saskatchewan, 1980. Saskatchewan Dep. Parks Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 84-10, v and 52 p.
- Watanabe, M., D.R.F. Harleman, and O.F. Vasiliev. 1983. Twoand three-dimensional mathematical models for lakes and reservoirs. p.274-6 in Orlob, G.T. (ed.). Mathematical modeling of water quality: streams, lakes, and reservoirs. Vol. 12 in Internat. Ser. Appl. Systems Analysis. Wiley and Sons, xx and 518 p.
- Webb, P.W. 1978. Hydrodynamics: nonscombroid fish. p.189-237 in Hoar, W.S., and D.J. Randall (eds.). Fish physiology. Vol. VII Locomotion.
- Webb, P.W. 1984. Form and function of fish swimming. Sci. Amer. 251(1):72.
- Wetzel, R.G. 1983. Limnology. CBS College Publ., xii and 767 p. and app.
- Wilson, M.A. 1981. The climate and vegetational history of the postglacial in central Saskatchewan. Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. Saskatchewan.

Zimmerman, A.P., K.M. Noble, M.A. Gates, and J.E. Paloheimo. 1983. Physicochemical typologies of south-central Ontario lakes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 40:1788-1803.

## Appendix A

# LAKE NAMES, LOCATIONS, AND DATA REFERENCES

Table Al. Names, locations, general descriptions, and sources of data for lakes in this study.

Lake name $O_N O_W$ Lake area TDS trout (km <sup>2</sup> ) (mg.L <sup>-1</sup> ) Reference ALTHOUSE 5530 10450 X 0	s
trout (km <sup>2</sup> ) (mg.L <sup>-1</sup> ) Reference	s
ALTHOUSE 5530 10450 X 0	:s
ALTHOUSE 5530 10450 X 0 2	
AMISK 5435 10215 LT 321 94 22 22	
AMISKOWAN 5353 10608 X 0 145 05 103	
AMYOT 5342 10638 X 4 1201 05	
ANNABEL 5450 10210 X 12 70 10	
ATHABASCA 5915 10915 LT 7800	
ATTITTI $5532 10228 LT$ 27 · 21 22	
BALDHEAD 5526 10452 X 0 . 24	
BALDY 5406 10438 X 0 2	
BALLANTYNE BAY 5440 10324 X 271 98 .	
BARTLETT 5530 10450 $Im$ 5 34 72 .	
BEAVERLODGE 5930 10935 Im 5 2	
BEETLE 5357 10626 V 48 186 96	
BELCHER 5515 10220 X 0 65 95	
BESNARD 5525 30600 V 18 . 24	
BEWLEY 5240 10212 x 177 60 39	
BIELBY 5522 10440 W 8 215 41	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
BIG PETER POND 5555 10215 X 10 260 41	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
BIGSTONE 5427 10505 X 80 190 18	
BIRCHBARK 5304 10524 X 19 142 90 100	
BIRCHBARK 5338 10219 X 3 4060 41	
BITTERN 5333 10507 X 12 495 58	
BLACK 5358 10550 X 31 8	
BLACK 5449 10201 X 0 95 18	
BLACK 5912 10515 LT 445 10 19 20	
BLACK 5712 10542 X . 26 68	
BLACK FOREST 5710 10538 . 26 68	
BLOODSUCKER 5352 10233 X 15 245 41	
BOG 5346 10210 X 10 255 41	
BRABANT 5600 10343 X 52 58 25	
BROACH 5743 10922 LT 10 31 1	
C1 5819 10402 X 1 23 74	
CABIN 5356 10644 X 0 154 05	
CAMP ONE 5341 10613 X 0 279 05	
CANDLE 5350 10520 X 129 235 30	

continued

160
-----

Table Al. continued.

Lake name $O_N$ $O_W$ Lake area trout $(km^2)$ $TDS$ $(mg, L^{-1})$ ReferencesCARSWELL551010815X21117526.CARSWELL583710920LT361444243CHEEYAS542310604X35270.CHURCHILL555510820X4331363.CLAM515110534X425128.CUTF582210934LT3844243CONTACT54331000LT348.3637CONTACT552710452LT45510738.COW535010229X230541.COW535010229X230541.COW535010229X2.41.CREAN540510218X24619040.CREE573010630LT1155.4CMWERLAND540510218X24619040CUT BEAVER534710239X3321541DAVIN565010340LT623541DAVIN565110218X2461907DAVIN565110234X<	T _ 1	Location	Water			
trout (km²) (mg.L²1) References           CANOE         5510 10815 X         211         175         26           CARSWELL         5837 10920 LT         36         144         42         43           CHEESEMAN         5350 10217 X         2         225         41         .           CHEEVAS         5423 10604 X         3         52         70         .           CHERCHILL         5555 10820 X         433 136         3         .           CLAM         5519 10543 X         42         51         28         .           CLURF         5822 10934 LT         3         84         42         43           CONTACT         5555 10452 LT         57         47         38         .           COTE         5527 10453 X         0         .         2         .           COW         5350 10229 X         2         305         41         .           COWAN         5400 10715 X         32         412         33         .           CRES         5730 10630 LT         1155         .         4         .           CONAN         5405 10218 X         246         190         40         .           COWAN	Lake name	N OW Lake	area	TDS		
CANOE         5510         10815         211         175         26         .           CARSWELL         5837         10920         LT         36         144         42         43           CHEESEMAN         5350         10217         X         2         225         41         .           CHEEYAS         5423         10604         X         3         52         70         .           CLAM         5519         10543         X         42         51         28         .           CLAM         519         10534         X         42         51         28         .           CLUFF         5822         10934         LT         3         84         42         43           CONTACT         5525         10452         LT         4         55         13         .         .           COW         5350         10229         X         2         305         41         .         .           COW         5350         10229         X         2         305         41         .           COW         5350         10204         X         2         .         .         . </td <td></td> <td>trou</td> <td>it <math>(km^2)</math></td> <td><math>(mq.L^{-1})</math></td> <td>Ref</td> <td>erencec</td>		trou	it $(km^2)$	$(mq.L^{-1})$	Ref	erencec
CARSWELL       5510       10815 X       211       175       26       .         CARSWELL       5837       10920 LT       36       144       42       43         CHEESEMAN       5350       10217 X       2       225       41       .         CHEEYAS       5423       10604 X       3       52       70       .         CHURCHILL       5555       10820 X       433       136       3       .         CLEARSAND       5350       10534 X       9       .       8       88         COLD       5433       1000 LT       348       .       36       37         CONTACT       5555       10452 LT       4       55       13       .         COVE       527       10453 X       0       .       2       .         COW       5350       10229 X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350       10218 X       24       12       33       .         CWEENAN       5400       10218 X       24       190       40       .         COWAN       5400       10239 X       33       215       41       .	CANOF	5 5 3 A		(	nei	erences
CHEESEMAN       5350 / 10920 LT       36       144       42       43         CHEEYAS       5423 10604 X       3       52       70       .         CHEWAS       5423 10604 X       3       52       70       .         CLAM       5515 10820 X       433       136       3       .         CLAM       5510 10534 X       9       .       8       88         CULTF       5822 10934 LT       3       84       42       43         CONTACT       5525 10452 LT       4       55       13       .         CONTACT       5525 10452 LT       4       55       13       .         COW       5350 10229 X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350 10229 X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350 10229 X       2       305       41       .         COWAN       5400 10715 X       32       412       33       .         COWAN       5405 10218 X       246       190       40       .         CUMBERLAND       5405 10218 X       26       190       40       .         CUT BEAVER       5447 10239 X	CARSWELL	5510 10815 X	211	175	26	
CHEEVAS         5423         10604         x         3         52         70         .           CHURCHILL         5555         10820         x         433         136         3         .           CLAM         5519         10534         x         42         51         28         .           CLAM         5350         10534         x         9         .         8         88           CLUFF         5822         10934         LT         3         84         42         43           CONTACT         5525         10452         LT         4         55         13         .           COW         5350         10629         X         2         305         41         .           COW         5350         10229         X         2         305         41         .           COWAN         5405         10609         LT         104         .         8         10           CREE         5730         10630         LT         1155         .         4         .           CMBERLAND         5405         10218         246         190         40         . <td< td=""><td>CHERSENAN</td><td>5837 10920 LT</td><td>36</td><td>144</td><td>42</td><td>43</td></td<>	CHERSENAN	5837 10920 LT	36	144	42	43
CHURCHILL       5555       10820 X       433       136       3         CLAM       5519       10543 X       42       51       28       28         CLEARSAND       5350       10534 X       9       8       88         CLUFF       5822       10934 LT       3       84       42       43         CONTACT       5525       10452 LT       4       55       13       .         CONTACT       5527       10453 X       0       .       2       .         COW       5350       10229 X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350       10630 LT       104       8       10         CREE       5405       10630 LT       1155       .       4       .         CWMS       5405       10218 X       246       190       40       .         CUT BEAVER       5470       10546       .       20       68       .         DAVIN       5651       10516 X       0       .       2       .       .         DAN       5707       10546       .       .       .       .       .         DAVIN       5652	CHEEVAC	5350 10217 X	2	225	41	
CLAM       5555       10820       X       433       136       3       .         CLAM       519       10543       X       42       51       28       .         CLUFF       5822       10934       LT       3       84       42       43         CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       4       35       13       .         COSTIGAN       5657       10555       LT       57       47       38       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       305       41       .         COWAN       5400       10715       X       32       412       33       .         CREE       5730       10630       LT       104       .       8       10         CUM BERLAND       5405       10218       X       246       190       40       .         CYCLOID       5515       10516       X       0       .       2       .         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29       . </td <td>CHIDCUTT</td> <td>5423 10604 X</td> <td>3</td> <td>52</td> <td>70</td> <td>•</td>	CHIDCUTT	5423 10604 X	3	52	70	•
CLEARSAND       5519       10543       X       42       51       28       .         CLUFF       5822       10934       LT       3       84       42       43         COLD       5433       11000       LT       348       .       36       37         CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       4       55       13       .         CONTACT       5527       10453       X       0       .       2       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       305       41       .         COWAN       5400       10715       X       32       412       33       .         CREE       5730       10630       LT       1104       .       8       10         CUMBERLAND       5405       10218       X       246       190       40       .         CYCLOID       5515       10516       X       0       .       2       .         DAN       5707       10546       .       20       68       .	СТАМ	5555 10820 X	433	136	3	•
CLUFF       5350       10534       X       9       .       8       88         COLD       5433       11000       LT       348       .36       37         CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       4       55       13       .         CONTACT       5527       10453       X       0       .2       .       .       .       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       .305       41       . <t< td=""><td>CLEADCAND</td><td>5519 10543 X</td><td>42</td><td>51</td><td>28</td><td>•</td></t<>	CLEADCAND	5519 10543 X	42	51	28	•
COLD       5822       10934       LT       3       84       42       43         CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       348       .       36       37         CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       4       55       13       .         CONTACT       5525       10453       0       .       2       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       305       41       .         COW       5350       10229       X       2       .       41       .         COWAN       5400       10715       X       32       412       33       .         CREAN       5405       10218       X       246       190       40       .         CUMBERLAND       5405       10218       X       246       190       40       .         CVCLOID       5515       10516       X       0       .       2       .         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29       .         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25       .	CLUEF	5350 10534 X	9	•	8	88
COND       5433       11000       LT       348        36       37         CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       4       55       13          CONTACT       5525       10452       LT       4       55       13          COTE       5527       10453       X       0        2          COW       5350       10229       X       2       305       41          COWAN       5400       10715       X       32       412       33          CREE       5730       10630       LT       1104        8       10         CROSS       5400       10218       X       246       190       40          CUMBERLAND       5405       10218       X       246       190       40          CYCLOID       5515       10516       X       0        2          DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29          DEEP       5350       10234       K       6       235 <td>COLD</td> <td>5822 10934 LT</td> <td>3</td> <td>84</td> <td>42</td> <td>43</td>	COLD	5822 10934 LT	3	84	42	43
CONTRACT         5525         10452         LT         4         55         13            CONTE         5527         10555         LT         57         47         38            COTE         5527         10453         X         0          2            COW         5350         10229         X         2         305         41            COWAN         5400         10715         X         32         412         33            CREAN         5405         10630         LT         1155          4            CUMBERLAND         5405         10218         246         190         40            CUT BEAVER         5347         10239         X         33         215         41            CYCLOID         5515         10516         X         0          2            DAVIN         5650         10340         LT         64         33         29            DEEP         5350         10234         X         6         235 <td>COMUNIC</td> <td>5433 11000 LT</td> <td>348</td> <td>•</td> <td>36</td> <td>37</td>	COMUNIC	5433 11000 LT	348	•	36	37
COTE       5657 10555 LT       57       47       38       .         COW       5350 10229 X       2 305       41       .       .         COW       5350 10229 X       2 305       41       .       .         COWAN       5400 10715 X       32       412       33       .         CREAN       5405 10609 LT       104       .       8       10         CREE       5730 10630 LT       1155       .       4       .         CUMBERLAND       5405 10218 X       246       190 40       .       .         CUMBERLAND       5405 10218 X       246       190 40       .       .       .       2       .         DAN       5707 10546       .       2       .       .       .       2       .         DAVIN       5650 10234 X       6       235 41       .       .       .       .       .         DELARONDE       5358 10658 X       135       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .         DELARONDE       5358 10658 X       135       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       . <td>COSTICAN</td> <td>5525 10452 LT</td> <td>4</td> <td>55</td> <td>13</td> <td></td>	COSTICAN	5525 10452 LT	4	55	13	
COND         5527         10453         X         0         2         .           COW         5350         10229         X         2         305         41         .           COWAN         5400         10715         X         32         412         33         .           CREAN         5405         10630         LT         1155         .         4         .           CREE         5730         10630         LT         1155         .         4         .           CUMBERLAND         5405         10218         X         2         .         41         .           CUT BEAVER         5347         10239         X         33         215         41         .           CYCLOID         5515         10516         0         .         2         .         41         .           DAN         5707         10546         .         20         68         .         .         21         .         .         21         .         10218         X         21         .         .         21         .         .         21         .         .         22         .         .         . <td>COME</td> <td>5657 10555 LT</td> <td>57</td> <td>47</td> <td>38</td> <td>•</td>	COME	5657 10555 LT	57	47	38	•
COWAN       5350 10229 x       2       305       41         CCWAN       5400 10715 x       32       412       33         CREAN       5405 10609 LT       104       .8       10         CREE       5730 10630 LT       1155       .41       .         CUMBERLAND       5405 10218 X       246       190       40         CUT BEAVER       5347 10239 X       33       215       41         CUT BEAVER       5370 10546       .0       .2       .2         DAN       5707 10546       .20       68       .         DAVIS       5552 10420 LT       12       30       25         DELARONDE       5358 10658 X       135       221       31         DES ILES       5426 10925 X       46       .35       .35         DECKANMBAULT       5442 10334 X       267       109       .2         D	COW	5527 10453 X	0	•	2	•
CORAN       5400       10715 x       32       412       33       .         CREAN       5405       10609 LT       104       .       8       10         CREE       5730       10630 LT       1155       .       4       .         CUMBERLAND       5405       10218 X       246       190       40       .         CUMBERLAND       5405       10218 X       246       190       40       .         CUMBERLAND       5405       10218 X       246       190       40       .         CYCLOID       5515       10516 X       0       .       2       .         DAN       5707       10546       .       20       68       .         DAVIN       5650       10340 LT       64       33       29       .         DEEP       5350       10234 X       6       235       41       .         DES ILES       5426       10925 X       46       .35       .       .         DICKENS       5444       10437 LT       7       39       25       .       .         DICKENS       5446       10717 X       616       190       7       .	COMAN	5350 10229 X	2	305	41	•
CREAN       5405 10609 LT       104       .       8       10         CREE       5730 10630 LT       1155       .       4       .         CUMBERLAND       5405 10218 X       246       190       40       .         CUT BEAVER       5347 10239 X       33       215       41       .         DAN       5707 10546       .       20       68       .         DAVIN       5650 10340 LT       6       235       41       .         DEEP       5350 10234 X       6       235       41       .         DES ILES       5426 10925 X       46       .35       .       .         DES ILES       5426 10925 X       46       .35       .       .         DESCHAMBAULT       5442 10334 X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544 10437 LT       7       39       25       .         DICKENS       5446 10717 X       616       190       7       .         DOWRE       5424 10412 X       16       126       44       .         DOWRE       5522 10456 X       0       .22       .       .         DUPUEIS       5420 10412 X	CREAN	5400 10715 X	32	412	33	•
CROSS       5730       10630       LT       1155	CREAN	5405 10609 LT	104	•	8	10
CUMBERLAND       5400       10204 X       2       41         CUMBERLAND       5405       10218 X       246       190       40         CUT BEAVER       5347       10239 X       33       215       41         CYCLOID       5515       10516 X       0       .       2       .         DAN       5707       10546       .       20       68       .         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29       .         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25       .         DEEP       5350       10234 X       6       235       41       .         DES ILES       5426       10925 X       46       .35       .         DES CHAMBAULT       5442       10334 X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544       10477 X       616       190       7       .         DORE       5712       10541 X       0       28       68       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514 X       0       .       34       .         DUCK       5522       104	CREE	5730 10630 LT	1155		4	10
CUMBERLAND       5405       10218       X       246       190       40         CUT BEAVER       5347       10239       X       33       215       41       .         DAN       5707       10546       .       0       .       2       .         DAN       5707       10546       .       20       68       .         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29       .         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25       .         DEEP       5350       10234       X       6       235       41       .         DESCHAMBAULT       5442       10334       X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25       .         DORE       5446       10717       K       616       190       7       .         DOUGLAS       5712       10541       X       0       .       .       .         DOUGLAS       5712       10541       X       0       .       .       .       .	CIUNDEDIAND	5400 10204 X	2		41	•
CYCLOID       5347       10239 X       33       215       41         CYCLOID       5515       10516 X       0       .       2         DAN       5707       10546       .       20       68         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25         DEEP       5350       10234 X       6       235       41         DES ILES       5426       10925 X       46       .35       .         DESCHAMBAULT       5442       10334 X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25       .         DORE       5446       10717 X       616       190       7       .         DOUGLAS       5712       10541 X       0       28       68       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514 X       0       .       34       .         DUQUGLAS       5712       10412 X       16       126       44       .         DUPUE       5526       10428 X       10 <td>CUMDERLAND</td> <td>5405 10218 X</td> <td>246</td> <td>190</td> <td>40</td> <td>•</td>	CUMDERLAND	5405 10218 X	246	190	40	•
DAN       5515       10516       X       0       2         DAN       5707       10546       20       68       .         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29       .         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25       .         DEEP       5350       10234       X       6       235       41       .         DES ILES       5426       10925       X       46       .       35       .         DES ILES       5442       10334       X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25       .         DORE       5446       10717       X       616       190       7       .         DOWE       5524       10514       0       28       68       .       .         DOWE       5524       10412       16       126       44       .       .         DOWE       5526       10428       10       .       .       .       .       .         DUCK       5522       1	CUT BEAVER	5347 10239 X	33	215	41	•
DAN       5707       10546       .       20       68         DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29       .         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25       .         DEEP       5350       10234       X       6       235       41       .         DES       ILES       5426       10925       X       46       .35       .         DES       Std26       10925       X       46       .35       .       .         DIE       5442       10334       X       267       109       .       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7	CICLOID	5515 10516 X	0		2	•
DAVIN       5650       10340       LT       64       33       29         DAVIS       5552       10420       LT       12       30       25       .         DEEP       5350       10234       X       6       235       41       .         DELARONDE       5358       10658       X       135       221       31       .         DES ILES       5426       10925       X       46       .       35       .         DESCHAMBAULT       5442       10334       X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25       .         DICKENS       5544       10717       X       616       190       7       .         DOUGLAS       5712       10541       X       0       .       .       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514       X       0       .       .       .         DUVK       5522       10456       X       0       .       .       .       .         DUVK       5522       10456       X       0       .       .       .	DAUTH	5707 10546	•	20	68	•
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DAVIN	5650 10340 LT	64	33	29	•
DELP       5350       10234       X       6       235       41         DELARONDE       5358       10658       X       135       221       31       .         DES ILES       5426       10925       X       46       .       35       .         DESCHAMBAULT       5442       10334       X       267       109       72       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25       .         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25       .         DORE       5446       10717       X       616       190       7       .         DOUGLAS       5712       10541       X       0       28       68       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514       X       0       .       34       .         DROPE       5526       10428       X       10       .       .       2       .         DUCK       5522       10456       X       0       .       2       .       .         DUPUEIS       5420       10432       X       1       .       .	DEED	5552 10420 LT	12	30	25	•
DELARONDE       5358 10658 X       135       221       31         DES ILES       5426 10925 X       46       .35         DESCHAMBAULT       5442 10334 X       267       109       72         DICKENS       5544 10437 LT       7       39       25         DIETER       5713 10539       0       22       68         DOWE       5446 10717 X       616       190       7         DOUGLAS       5712 10541 X       0       .34       .         DOWNTON       5508 10514 X       0       .34       .         DROPE       5526 10428 X       10       .75       .         DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       .2       .         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       .98       .         EAST TROUT       5422 10505 LT       25       130       45       .         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41       .         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49       .         ELM       5341 10617       0       141       95       .         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94       .		5350 10234 X	6	235	41	•
DES TLES       5426       10925       X       46       .35         DESCHAMBAULT       5442       10334       X       267       109       72         DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25         DIETER       5713       10539       0       22       68         DORE       5446       10717       X       616       190       7         DOUGLAS       5712       10541       X       0       28       68       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514       X       0       .34       .       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514       X       0       .       .       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514       X       0       .       .       .         DUCK       5526       10428       10       .       .       .       .       .         DUPUEIS       5420       10432       X       1       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .       .	DEC IL DO	5358 10658 X	135	221	31	•
DESCHAMBAULT       5442 10334 X       267       109       72         DICKENS       5544 10437 LT       7       39       25         DIETER       5713 10539       0       22       68         DORE       5446 10717 X       616       190       7         DOUGLAS       5712 10541 X       0       28       68         DOWNTON       5508 10514 X       0       .34         DROPE       5524 10412 X       16       126       44         DROPE       5526 10428 X       10       .75       .         DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       .2       .         DUVK       5522 10456 X       0       .2       .         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       .98       .         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       .98       .         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1 <td< td=""><td>DES ILES</td><td>5426 10925 X</td><td>46</td><td></td><td>35</td><td>•</td></td<>	DES ILES	5426 10925 X	46		35	•
DICKENS       5544       10437       LT       7       39       25         DIETER       5713       10539       0       22       68       .         DORE       5446       10717       X       616       190       7       .         DOUGLAS       5712       10541       X       0       28       68       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514       X       0       .       34       .         DRINKING       5524       10412       X       16       126       44       .         DROPE       5526       10428       X       10       .       .       .         DUPUEIS       5420       10432       X       1       .       .       .         EAST       TROUT       5422       10505       LT       25       130       45       .         EGG       5353       10220       X       15       265       41       .         ELK       5341       10617       0       141       95       .       .         FAFARD       5613       10306       X       14       34       94       .         <	DICKENC	5442 10334 X	267	109	72	•
DIETER       5713 10539       0       22       68         DORE       5446 10717 X       616       190       7         DOUGLAS       5712 10541 X       0       28       68         DOWNTON       5508 10514 X       0       .34       .34         DRINKING       5524 10412 X       16       126       44         DROPE       5526 10428 X       10       .75       .         DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       .2       .         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       .98       .         EAST TROUT       5422 10505 LT       25       130       45         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         ELM       5344 10153 X       5       1360       41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       .98          FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       552	DICKENS	5544 10437 LT	7	39	25	•
DORE       5446 10717 X       616       190       7         DOUGLAS       5712 10541 X       0       28       68         DOWNTON       5508 10514 X       0       .34       .         DRINKING       5524 10412 X       16       126       44       .         DROPE       5526 10428 X       10       .75       .       .         DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       .2       .       .         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       .98       .         EAST TROUT       5422 10505 LT       25       130       45       .         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41       .         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49       .         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95       .         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94       .         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       .98       .       .         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       .2       .       .	DIETER	5713 10539	0	22	68	•
DOUGLAS       5712       10541 X       0       28       68       .         DOWNTON       5508       10514 X       0       .34       .         DRINKING       5524       10412 X       16       126       44       .         DROPE       5526       10428 X       10       .75       .         DUCK       5522       10456 X       0       .2       .         DUPUEIS       5420       10432 X       1       .98       .         EAST TROUT       5422       10505 LT       25       130       45       .         EGG       5353       10220 X       15       265       41       .       .         ELAINE       5427       10621 X       6       157       49       .         ELM       5341       10617       0       141       95       .         FAFARD       5613       10306 X       14       34       94       .         FAIRY GLEN       5405       10446 X       0       .98       .         FISH       5340       10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526       10457 X       <	DORE	5446 10717 X	616	190	7	•
DOWNTON       5508 10514 X       0       .34         DRINKING       5524 10412 X       16       126       44         DROPE       5526 10428 X       10       .75       .         DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       .2       .         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       .98       .         EAST TROUT       5422 10505 LT       25       130       45       .         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41       .         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49       .         ELM       5341 10617       0       141       95       .         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94       .         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       .98       .         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       .2       .       .	DOUGLAS	5712 10541 X	0	28	68	•
DRINKING       5524       10412       X       16       126       44         DROPE       5526       10428       X       10       .75       .         DUCK       5522       10456       X       0       .2       .         DUPUEIS       5420       10432       X       1       .98       .         EAST TROUT       5422       10505       LT       25       130       45       .         EGG       5353       10220       X       15       265       41       .         ELAINE       5427       10621       X       6       157       49       .         ELK       5341       10617       0       141       95       .         FAFARD       5613       10306       X       14       34       94       .         FAIRY GLEN       5405       10446       X       0       .98       .       .         FIVE FINGERS       5526       10457       X       1       462       95       101	DOWNTON	5508 10514 X	0		34	•
DROPE       5526 10428 X       10       75         DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       2         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       98         EAST TROUT       5422 10505 LT       25       130       45         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       .       .	DRINKING	5524 10412 X	16	126	44	•
DUCK       5522 10456 X       0       2         DUPUEIS       5420 10432 X       1       98         EAST TROUT       5422 10505 LT       25       130       45         EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         ELM       5344 10153 X       5       1360       41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       .	DROPE	5526 10428 X	10	-20	75	•
DOPOLIS       5420       10432       X       1       98         EAST TROUT       5422       10505       LT       25       130       45         EGG       5353       10220       X       15       265       41       1         ELAINE       5427       10621       X       6       157       49       1         ELK       5341       10617       0       141       95       1         ELM       5344       10153       X       5       1360       41       1         FAFARD       5613       10306       X       14       34       94       1         FAIRY GLEN       5405       10446       X       0       98       98       1         FISH       5340       10610       X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526       10457       X       1       2       2       2	DUDUETO	5522 10456 X	0	-	2	٠
EAST TROOT       5422 10505 LT       25 130       45         EGG       5353 10220 X       15 265       41         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6 157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0 141       95         ELM       5344 10153 X       5 1360       41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       2       0	DUPUEIS	5420 10432 X	1	•	98	•
EGG       5353 10220 X       15       265       41         ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         ELM       5344 10153 X       5       1360       41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       Continued	EAST TROUT	5422 10505 LT	25	130	20 45	•
ELAINE       5427 10621 X       6       157       49         ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         ELM       5344 10153 X       5       1360       41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       Continued	EGG	5353 10220 X	15	265	41	•
ELK       5341 10617       0       141       95         ELM       5344 10153 X       5       1360       41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       .	ELAINE	5427 10621 X	6	157	10	•
FAFARD       5344 10153 X       5 1360 41         FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14 34 94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1 462 95 101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2	БЬК FIN	5341 10617	Õ	141	7 <i>2</i> Q5	•
FAFARD       5613 10306 X       14       34       94         FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       Continued	БЛШИ БИШИЛО	5344 10153 X	5	1360	41	•
FAIRY GLEN       5405 10446 X       0       98         FISH       5340 10610 X       1       462       95       101         FIVE FINGERS       5526 10457 X       1       2       .	FAFARD	5613 10306 X	14	34	0 / T T	•
FISH         5340 10610 X         1         462         95 101           FIVE FINGERS         5526 10457 X         1         2         .	FAIRY GLEN	5405 10446 X	0		94	•
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LTOH DIMONS	5340 10610 X	1	462	90 95	101
	FIVE FINGERS	5526 10457 X	ī		25	TOT
				cont i	nued	•

1.1.1.1

1	6	1
	-	_

Table Al. continued.

T . 1	Location	Water			
Lake name	ON OW Lake	area	ШDC		
	trout	$(km^2)$	$(ma_{L}^{1DS})$	Def	
EL OBBEN		· (	(mg.D)	Rer	erences
FLOTTEN	5437 10832 X	24	210	70	
FONTAINE	5942 10627 LT	67	210	/9	•
FRANK	5714 10539	• • •	22	40	•
FRED	5714 10536		23	60	•
FREDETTE	5937 10832 LT	6	• 111	68	•
FROBISHER	5625 10830 X	313	70	96	•
GEDAK	5743 10926 X	213	/9	3	•
GERALD	5713 10541 X	2	40 E 4	L CO	•
GERMAINE	5819 10935 x	•	54	68	•
GILES	5855 10548 x	22	•	43	•
GILLINGHAM	5448 10251 x	33 1	-	19	20
GOOSE	5336 10230 x	1	70	18	•
GRACE	5358 10431 V	<u>ک</u> ۲	29440	41	•
GRANITE	5455 10232 x	0	•	98	•
GREEN	5410 10743 V	12	•	55	•
GREIG	5427 10843 V	29	256	52	•
HACKETT	5405 10657 V	10 10	300	15	•
HALKETT	5339 10609 v	9	218	53	•
HAMELL	5448 10157 V	10	276	8	87
HAMMER	5711 10520	2	80	18	•
HANNAH	5906 10225 Tm	0	•	68	•
HANSON	5442 10250 Im	45	21	69	
HARBO	5744 10250 LT	42	90	55	•
HARRISON	5749 10925 LT	3	27	1	•
HATCHET	5830 10929 LT	6	24	1	•
HAUGEN	5530 10340 LT	134	23	51	
HEART	5350 10450 LT	1	•	2	
HEBDEN	5539 10611 X	1	168	95	101
HENDAY	5528 10448 LT	5	45	13	
HIGHBANK	5819 10413 LT	•	17	74	•
HIGHROCK	5352 10227 X	8	265	41	•
HINE	5704 10530 LT	89	21	54	•
HIRTZ	5531 10449 X	1	•	2	•
HODGE	5429 10949 X	2	335	79	•
HORSEELV	5748 10924 LT	5	29	1	•
HOURGIAGE	5712 10537	0		68	•
HUNTED DAV	5712 10540 X	0	37	68	•
TLE A LA CROCCE	5510 10430 LT	129	112	со қ	60
TSKWAMAN	5541 10745 X	414	180	56	00
TST MATAM	5534 10304 X	20	92	04	•
	5821 10939 X	2	52	24 10	•
INCURAN	5400 10441 X		52	42 00	43
UACKFISH TAN	5304 10824 X	75	1735	90 61	•
	5455 10253 X	114	- / 3 3	01 70	•
JERD	5433 10832 X	4	195	72	•
0 FEF	5356 10633 X	0	295	/9	•
			04	90	•

continued

### 162

## Table Al. continued.

	Location		Water				
Lake name	ON OW	Lake	area	m D C			
		trout	$(km^2)$	(ma I	1, -	· · ·	
TOTINGON			(	(	) P	ererei	nces
JUNOTION	5452 10215	X	7	85	1.8		
JUNCTION KADI DDNGT	5349 10227	Х	4	245	10	•	
KARL ERNST	5713 10539	Х	0	245	69	٠	
KATHY	5714 10537		0	30	60 69	•	
KEELEY	5455 10808	Х	90	160	65	•	
KEG	5524 10403	Х	24	110	11	•	
KENNEDY	5335 10255	Х	18	300	44	•	
KEWEN	5811 10351	Х	3	500	41 71	•	
KEY	5713 10537	Х	2	23	69	•	
KIMBALL	5425 10849	Х	3	345	16	•	
KINGSMERE	5406 10627	$\mathbf{LT}$	47	545	0 T 0	•	
KINIKINIK	5713 10538		0	•	60	10	
KIRCHNER	5713 10539		•	• 25	00 20	•	
KISTAPISKAW	5450 10243	Х	3	20	10	•	
KUSKAWAO	5527 10453 2	Х	Õ	00	10	•	
LA LOCHE	5628 10930 2	X	206	175	66	•	
LA PLONGE	5510 10725 I	LT	197	±/5	00	•	
LA RONGE	5510 10500 I	LT.	1178	130	2/	· · ·	
LAVALLEE	5417 10634 y	ζ	24	100	2	60	
LEADLEY	5421 10604		23	•	8	88	
LEPINE	5428 10937 X	X	3	146	70	•	
LIMESTONE	5438 10313 X	<u> </u>	36	140	/9	•	
LINDSTROM	5522 10327 X	[	11	140 61	10	•	
LITTLE AMYOT	5511 10750 X			63 01	99	•	
LITTLE BEAR	5420 10435 L	т	15	144	5/	•	
LITTLE DEER	5524 10455 X		4	244 744	12	٠	
LITTLE MCDONALD	5711 10537		л О	55	13	•	
LITTLE PETER PON	ND5555 10844 X		189	• 1 <i>1 1</i>	08	٠	
LITTLE RASPBERRY	5424 10848 X		105	194 195	3	•	
LITTLE SANDY	5356 10509 X		- 2	433 10E	/9	•	
LOBSTICK	5340 10207 X		4	120	58	•	
LOST	5402 10609 X		2	420	41	•	
LOST ECHO	5408 10445 X		1	•	95	101	
LOWER FISHING	5403 10439 X		3	• 215	98	•	
LOWER FOSTER	5635 10520 L	r	ر ۵۱	210	50	•	2
LOWER KEY	5714 10537	-	- - -	23	4/	•	
LOWER SEAHORSE	5712 10541 X		1	20	68	٠	
LUSSIER	5535 10448 X		Ň	20	68	•	
LYNX	5521 10458 X		2	•	2	•	
MACKAY	5527 10456 LT	ı	2 Q	c ò	2	•	
MACLENNAN	5427 10619 x		2	00	13	•	
MANAWAN	5524 10314 x		66	40 AT	70	•	
MARTIN	5720 10538 x		6	48 10	99	•	
MATHESON	5425 10856 x		U 2	19	68	•	
MCBRIDE	5451 10205 x		ر د	235	79	•	
	n		4	80	T.8		

continued

16	3
----	---

T plan a	Location	Water			
Lake name	ON OW	Lake area	m D C		
		trout (km <sup>2</sup> )	(ma_L <sup>-1</sup>	۰ ۱	<b></b>
NOOT THE		(11.1.)	(mg.r	) R	ererences
MCCLEAN	5815 10353	X 2	22	7 4	
MCCOMB	5532 10449 3	Χ Ñ	23	/4	•
MCDONALD	5712 10535 1	LT 3	•	2	•
MCINTOSH	5545 10510 1	ີ ແລະ	22	68	•
MCLENNAN	5554 10420 I	01 ርጥ 21	40	81	•
MCMAHON	5820 10404 >		34	25	•
MCNICHOL	5529 10440 3		1/	74	•
MEADOW	5333 10245 x	· 1	•	2	•
MEKEWAP	5524 10452 y	· · · ·	265	41	•
MID	5450 10238 v	: 0	•	2	•
MIDDLE FOSTER	5640 10525 1	· U	85	18	•
MIDWAY	5515 10520 V	T 30	20	47	•
MIDWEST	$5820 \pm 0.000$ x	1	•	2	•
MILE 109E (CLU	2F15747 1000c	4	21	74	•
MILE 109W (CLU	PF)5747 10920	1	27	71	•
MILE 11 (SMOOTHS	T 15/4/ 1092/ X	0	20	71	
MILE 110 (CLUER	103422 10613	0	•	70	
MILE 119 (CLUER	) 5748 10926	0	28	71	•
MILE 3 (SMOOTHS	) 5/54 10925	1	24	71	•
MILE 8 (SMOOTHS	TO5417 10559	0	•	70	•
MTLL	105422 10607	0	•	70	•
MILLIKEN	5822 10935	0	64	42	43
MINTO	5927 10845 LT	r 10	117	96	40
MIROND	5/53 10920 X	11	18	1	•
MISTOURY	5510 10249 X	108	90	72	•
MONTOTAL	5427 10905 X	6	235	70	•
MOOGE TAN	5420 10540 X	440	229	90	100
MOUNTA TA	5351 10237 X	1	280	11	100
MULLOOK	5529 10430 X	54	140	75	•
MUDIOCK	5528 10452 X	0	<b>T</b> 40	75	•
MURISON	5752 10925 LT	ğ	• 1 4	2	•
MURPHY	5713 10540		17	<u> </u>	•
MURRAY	5303 10818 X	12	1 / L	08	•
MUSKEG	5349 10234 X	2	240 225	01	•
MUSTUS 1ST	5426 10849 X	2. A	235	41	•
MUSTUS 2ND	5426 10852 x	-# 1	230	/9	•
MUSTUS 3RD	5427 10853 x	1	205	/9	•
NAMEKUS	5347 10601 x	נ ר	200	79	•
NAMEW	5410 10157 LT	196	180	8	12
NANISKAK EAST	5526 10456 x	100	105 4	40	•
NANISKAK WEST	5526 10456 y	0	•	2	•
NEMEIBEN	5520 10525 rm	0	•	2	•
NESOOTAO EAST	5450 10204 V	155	45 7	73	•
NESOOTAO WEST	5450 10204 X	1	נ 70	. 8	•
NIPEKAMEW	5424 10404 X	1	80 1	.8	•
NISTOWIAK	5525 10400 X	15	165 4	5	•
	5525 IU420 X	28	• 7	5	•
			cont	inue	đ

Table Al. continued.

. . . . .

Table	Al.	continued.
		concinued.

<b>T</b> . 1	Location	Water			
Lake name	o <mark>n ow</mark> Lake	area	UD C		
	trou	$t (km^2)$	(ma L-	L, p	• <del>•</del> • • • •
NODDDVD		(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(	) R	ererences
	5904 10330 LT	42	30	60	
NORTHEAST	5715 10533	•	21	68	٠
O'LEADY	5715 10542	•	18	68	•
	5351 10628 X	1	157	00	•
OUROM	5535 10439 X	53	146	75	•
OWAA	5536 10312 X	9	125	13	•
DAND 1050	5341 10610 X	1	338	44 05	•
PANP 1052	5354 10602	0	96	95	•
DAND 1100	5355 10630 X	0.	40	95	101
PANP 1103	5356 10630 X	0	39	95	101
PANP 1138	5357 10615	Ō	213	95	•
PAND 100	5358 10609	0	186	95	•
PANP 180	5337 10611	0	213	95	•
PANP 207	5337 10606 X	Ō	363	95	•
PANP 300	5342 10604	Ō	176	95	TOT
PANP JUL	5342 10605	Ő	190	95	•
PAND COL	5349 10644	0	1513	95	•
PANP OUL PAND 705	5356 10633 X	Õ	139	95	•
PANP 785	5348 10604	Ō	208	95	•
PANP 841	5350 10629 X	Õ	132	95	101
PANTER	5356 10636 X	Ō	75	95	101
PECUEV	5347 10234 X	1	250	95 41	•
PPTUDUTODN	5523 10454 X	1	200	2	•
PELIANIGAN	5427 10857 X	3	295	70	•
DEUTCAN	5506 10301 X	100	95	72	•
PIEDCE	5344 10211 X	4	280	41	•
	5430 10942 LT	26	160	70	•
PIC 2ND	5817 10406	•		74	•
PIC 3PD	5817 10407	•	•	74	•
DINKNEW	5817 10407		•	74	•
	5403 10505 X	2	70	58	•
ΈΓΓΛΟΟΟ	5409 10454 X	1	, 0	76	•
	5533 10243 X	31	89	94	•
POLITION	5342 10207 X	9	1370	24 41	•
PPFUTEM	5527 10454 X	0	_0,0		•
	5525 10448 X	1	•	2	•
	5436 10615 X	2	57	70	•
RAI NORTH	5344 10213 X	2	230	/0	•
REDENDUTH	5354 10213 X	3	245	41	•
RELUCARTH	5331 10253 X	15	220	-≭⊥ ∕11	•
RICUMED	5715 10215 LT	5297	21	81 81	•
NICHIEK	5526 10454 X	0	~ 1	24	•
ROUND	5907 10625 LT	181	63	2	•
ROUND	5713 10538	0		77 68	٠
NOTAD	5603 10307 X	19	33	9 <i>1</i>	•
			CON	 tinua	• đ
			0011	~ + 11 U C	u

Table Al. continued.

Lake name	Location		Water			
Lane name	N W	Lake	area	TDS		
		trout	(km²)	$(mg.L^{-1})$	) F	eferences
RUSSELL	5726 10520	LT	34			
RUSTY	5425 10846	X	2	105	50	•
SAHLI	5505 10255	$\mathbf{LT}$	5	790	79	•
SANDY	5819 10947	Х	2	118	/0	•
SARGINSON	5443 10310	Х	3	105	43	•
SCYTHES	5524 10455	х	0	105	10	•
SEALEY	5416 10436	Х	ĩ	•	2	•
SHAGWENAW	5554 10741	Х	42	224	90	•
SHALLOW	5817 10407	X		224	80	•
SHANNON	5401 10441	X	0	20	/4	•
SIM	5527 10442	X	2	•	98	•
SNAKE	5821 10938	X	0	60	2	•
STEEPHILL	5558 10309	X	41	00	42	43
STICKLEY	5406 10440	X	1	40	94	•
STURGEON	5325 10605	X	6	252	98	•
SULPHIDE	5522 10454	X	1	333	90	100
TENEYCKE	5526 10455	ĸ	0 1	55	13	•
THE TWO RIVERS	5548 10309	ζ.	52	•	2	٠
TIBISKA	5416 10608 1	- ጋጥ	7	21	94	•
TIE	5350 10649 >	ζ	2	405	8	88
TOBIN	5335 10330 >	- (	228	405	93	•
TOO SMALL	5818 10403 x	-	220	245	83	•
TORCH	5343 10516 x	-	וו	20	/4	•
TRADE	5522 10344 x	-	60	100	30	•
TRAPPERS	5348 10602 x		2	100	44	•
TRIVEET	5525 10600 x	•	14	101	95	101
TROUT	5537 10517 x		30	20	28	•
TULABI	5446 10300 x		52	130	81	•
TURNOR	5635 10835 x		, , , ,	90	18	•
TURTLE	5336 10838 x		232 61	69	82	•
TYRRELL	5454 10207 x		6 6	340	92	•
UNSER	5442 10312 x		U I	90	18	•
UPISES	5526 10454 x		1	110	Τ8	•
JPPER FISHING	5403 10437 x		U I		2	•
JPPER FOSTER	5647 10520 L	p	102	225	50	•
JPPER SEAHORSE	5712 10541 x	*	102	38	46	•
JSKIK	5532 10317 x		1 1	31	68	•
JTIKUMAK	$5450 \ 10814 \ y$		23	102	44	•
/IVIAN	$5425 \ 10854 \ y$		3	150	65	•
11	5817 10410 V		L L	190	79	•
ABENO	5419 10624 v		L L	15	74	•
арата	5851 10544 V		б С Л	T83	95	101
APAWEKKA	5450 10450 V		04	20	19	20
APISEW	5347 10228 V		238	93	91	•
APUMON	5534 10255 V		21	250	41	•
			b	84	94	•
				con	tinu	ed

. . . . .

166	
-----	--

Lake namo	Location	Water			
Dake name	N W Lak	e arga	TDS		
	tro	ut (km <sup>2</sup> )	$(mq.L^{-1})$	Re	ferences
WASEKANTO			,		rerences
WACKECTH	5645 10845 X	134	70	82	
WASSECTU	5358 10612 X	70	181	8	•
WADEDUEN	5416 10614 LT	9		8	10
WALERHEN	5428 10825 X	69	220	17	10
WATERHEN	5354 10225 X	8	270	<u>,</u>	•
WATHAMAN	5655 10343 X	73	41	20	•
WEYAKWIN	5430 10600 X	76	106	29 0 <i>C</i>	•
WHELAN BAY	5405 10510 X	19	155	00 50	•
WHITE GULL	5356 10504 X	15	135	59	•
WHITESWAN	5405 10510 x	10	470	58	•
WIERZYCKI	5601 10356 LT	• 7		58	59
WILDNEST	5500 10220 x	1	55	25	•
WILLOW AB	5350 10206 x	40	65	55	•
WILLOW C	5348 10206 X	10	220	41	•
WILLOW D	5347 10206 X	14	220	41	•
WILLOW E	5346 10206 V	6	•	41	•
VINTEGO	5533 10250 X	7	•	41	•
VINTERINGHAM	5448 10252 X	18	91	94	•
VITSUKITSHAK	5340 10252 X	1	65	18	•
OLLASTON	5915 10011 X	1	251	95	•
100D	5612 10315 LT	2062	40	4	•
ROBEL	5517 10317 X	93	51	99	
EDEN	5/12 10541	•	18	68	•
TMMED	5359 10440 X	0		98	•
a character and the second sec	5710 10545 LT	3	29	60	•

Table Al. continued.

#### REFERENCES

1. Dean, E.L. 1981. Seven Headwater Lakes in the Richardson and Clearwater Drainage Basins: Northwest Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 81-2, vii and 151 p. 2. Koshinsky, G.D. 1968. The Limnology and Fisheries of 28 Small Lakes Situated on the Precambrian Shield near Lac La Ronge, Saskatchewan 1960-67. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., 4 vols: 530 p. 3. Rawson, D.S. 1957. Limnology and Fisheries of Five Lakes in the Upper Churchill Drainage, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 3, 61 p. 4. Rawson, D.S. 1959. Limnology and Fisheries of Cree and Wollaston Lakes in Northern Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 4, 73 p. 5. Rawson, D.S. 1961. A Critical Analysis of the Limnological Variables Used in Assessing the Productivity of Northern Saskatchewan Lakes. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 6. Ruggles, C.P. 1959. Biological and Fisheries Survey of Dore Lake, 1956. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Tech. Rep. 59-3, ii and 44 p. Fish. 7. Johnson, R.P. 1968. Changes in the Fishery of Dore Lake Between 1956 and 1967. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 99 p. 8. Rawson, D.S. 1936. Physical and Chemical Studies in Lakes of the Prince Albert Park, Saskatchewan. J. Biol. Bd. Canada 2:227-284. 9. Rawson, D.S. 1942. The Experimental Introduction of Smallmouth Black Bass into Lakes of the Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 72:19-10. Cuerrier, J.P. 1952. Transfer of Anaesthetized Adult Lake Trout by Means of Aircraft. Can. Fish-Cult. 13:1-4. 11. Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1981. Acid Rain on Northern Lakes: Background Studies in Saskatchewan. Musk-Ox 28:26-42. 12. Rawson, D.S., and J.E. Moore. 1944. The Saline Lakes of Saskatchewan. Can. J. Res. 22:144-201. 13. Koshinsky, G.D. 1964. The Limnology and Fisheries of Five Pre-Cambrian Headwater Lakes of the MacKay Lake Drainage in North Central Saskatchewan 1960-64. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 91 p. and app. 14. Lane, C.B. 1967. The Limnology and Management of Lac des Iles, 1966. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 72 p. and app. 15. Lane, C.B. 1967. A Survey of the Limnology of Greig Lake in Meadow Lake Park, 1966. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 61 p. and app. 16. Lane, C.B. 1969. A Survey of the Limnology of Kimball Lake in Meadow Lake Park, 1966. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 56 p.

17. Atton, F.M., and N.S. Novakowski. 1956. Biological Survey and Fisheries Management of Waterhen and Adjoining Lakes. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 50 p. 18. Lane, C.B. 1967. The Limnology, Fisheries, and Management Potential of 17 Lakes Located Along the Hanson Lake Road, 1964-66. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 132 p. 19. Johnson, R.P. 1971. Limnology and Fishery Biology of Black Lake, Northern Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 9, 47 p. 20. Johnson, R.P. 1970. A Biological Survey of Black, Giles, and Wapata Lakes in Northern Saskatchewan, 1969. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 112 p. 21. Rawson, D.S. 1947. Lake Athabaska. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada Bull. 72: 69-85. 22. Rawson, D.S. 1960. A Limnological Comparison of Twelve Large Lakes in Northern Saskatchewan. Limnol. Oceanog. 5:195-211. 23. Rawson, D.S. 1952. Biological and Fisheries Investigation of Amisk Lake, Saskatchewan, 1950, 1951. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 41 p. 24. Lowe, D.R. 1973. The Limnology and Biology of Belcher and Attitti Lakes, 1971. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 46 p. 25. Sawchyn, W.W., and E.W. Kardash. 1976. Limnology and Fisheries of 5 Lakes: Brabant, Wierzycki, Dickens, Davis, McLennan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 76-7, vi and 163 p. 26. Kallemeyn, L.W. 1969. The Biology of the Canoe Lake Fishery, 1968. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 57 p. 27. Ruggles, C.P. 1959. Biological and Fisheries Survey of Lac la Plonge and Canoe Lake. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 70 and app. (amendments by R.P. Johnson, pers. comm.). 28. Chen, M.Y. 1974. Fishery Survey on Clam and Triveet Lakes, 1973. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 68 p. 29. Liaw, W.K. 1976. Davin and Wathaman Lakes - Comparative Fisheries and Limnology. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 76-1, iv and 82 p. 30. Johnson, R.P. 1963. A Biological Survey of Candle Lake. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 77 p. 31. Liaw, W.K. 1976. Delaronde Lake Limnology and Fishery. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 76-9, viii and 102 p.

- 32. Larkin, P.A. 1948. Pontoporeia and Mysis in Athabaska, Great Bear and Great Slave Lakes. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada Bull. 78:1-33. 33. Liaw, W.K. 1978. Cowan Lake - An Assessment of the Habitat and Fishery Resource. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 78-2, vi and 76 p. 34. Atton, F.M. 1949. Examination of a Small Lake Northeast of La Ronge Townsite. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., 35. Atton, F.M., and N.S. Novakowski. 1956. Survey and Fisheries Management of Lac des Iles. Biological Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 36. Miller, R.B. 1946. Report on Cold Lake. Alberta Dep. Lands Forests, Fish. Tech. Rep., 12 p. 37. Paetz, M.J., and K.A. Zelt. 1974. Studies of Northern Alberta Lakes and Their Fish Populations. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada 31:1007-1020. 38. Dean, E.L. 1979. Costigan Lake Fishery Survey. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 79-7, v and 76 p. 39. Chen, M.Y. 1974. The Fisheries Biology of Besnard Lake, 1973. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 74-7, iii and 56 p. 40. Reed, E.B. 1959. The Limnology and Fisheries of Cumberland and Namew Lakes, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 74 p. and app. Dep. 41. Royer, L.M. 1966. The Limnology and Fisheries Resources of the Saskatchewan River Delta, 1964-66. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 112 p. 42. Stearns - Roger Canada Ltd. 1976. Environmental Assessment and Safety Report for AMOK Ltd. Uranium Project, Cluff Lake, Saskatchewan. 2 vols: xiv and 219 p. and App. A -43. Tones, P.I. 1979 (ed.) Additional Environmental Baseline Studies for the Cluff Lake Area, Saskatchewan: Final Report. Saskatchewan Res. Counc. Rep. No. C79-19, xviii and 378 p. and App. A - E unpag. 44. Liaw, W.K., and J.F. O'Connor. 1975. Churchill River Lakes. Churchill River Study, Final Report 8, xix and 198 p. 45. Marshall, T.L. 1970. The Limnology, Biology and Fisheries Management Potential of East Trout and Nipekamew Lakes, 1967. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 69 p. 46. Dean, E.L. 1979. Upper Foster Lake: Fishery Survey. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 79-1, vi and 81 p. 47. Dean, E.L. 1980. Middle and Lower Foster Lakes: Fishery Survey. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 80-3, vi and 91 p.

Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 78-1, iv and 26 p. Saskatchewan

Lakes in Nipawin Provincial Park, 1963. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 47 p. 51. Johnson, R.P. 1971. A Brief Investigation of Hatchet Lake in Northern Saskatchewan, 1970. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 29 p. 52. Naftel, P.C. 1965. Observations on the Biology of Green Lake, 1956 and 1964. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. , ii and 18 p. 53. Liaw, W.K. 1976. Hackett Lake Management Report 1975. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 76-2, iii and ll p. 54. Dean, E.L. 1980. Highrock Lake Fishery Survey. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 80-2, vi and 83 p. 55. Sawchyn, W.W. 1967. Hanson and Wildnest Lakes, 1966 and Preliminary Investigation into the Productivity of Granite Lake, 1966. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 130 p. 56. Saylor, M.L. 1972. Lac Ile-a-la-Crosse Ecological Baseline Survey. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 59 p. 57. Royer, L.M. 1972. Little Amyot Lake Study, 1971. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 58. Johnson, R.P. 1962. Observations on Five Lakes in the Candle Lake Area, 1961. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 15 p. 59. Johnson, R.P. 1961. Observations on Whalen Bay, Whiteswan Lakes, 1960. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 16 p. 60. Rawson, D.S., and F.M. Atton. 1953. Biological Investigation and Fisheries Management at Lac La Ronge, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. 61. Atton, F.M., and N.S. Novakowski. 1956. Biological and Fisheries Survey of Jackfish and Murray Lakes. Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 66 p. Saskatchewan 62. Naftel, P.C. 1965. Fish Population Changes Associated with Water Level Reduction in Jackfish and Murray Lakes, 1955 to 1964. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 91 p. 63. Liaw, W.K., 1978. Jackfish and Murray Lakes: Environmental Changes and Whitefish Populations. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep.

78-5, vii and 97 p.

48. Dean, E.L. 1978. Fontaine Lake. Saskatchewan Dep.

49. Low, C.J., and D.A. Fernet. 1974. A Survey of the

Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 29 p. 50. Royer, L.M. 1964. Biological Survey of the Fishing

Limnology and Fishery of Elaine Lake, 1973.

64. Johnson, R.P. 1963. Biological Survey of Little Bear Lake in Central Saskatchewan, 1960. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 66 p. 65. Kallemeyn, L.W. 1972. Limnology and Fisheries of Keeley and Utikumak Lakes, 1966-1968. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 69 p. 66. Kallemeyn, L.W. 1972. The Limnology and Fishery of Lac La Loche 1969-70. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 48 p. and app. 67. Rawson, D.S., and F.M. Atton. 1951. Fisheries Investigation of Lac La Plonge, Saskatchewan 1948, 1949. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 54 p. and app. 68. Beak (Beak Consultants Limited). 1979. Key Lake Mining Corporation - Key Lake Project. 3 vols: Environmental Impact Statement unpag. and Appendix I - VI unpag. and Appendix VII - XI unpag. 69. Dean, E.L. 1978. Nordbye and Hannah Lakes. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 78-3, iv and 39 p. 70. Low, C.J., and D.A. Fernet. 1974. A Preliminary Survey of Seven Small Lakes along the Smoothstone Lake Road, 1973. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 36 p. 71. Dean, E.L. 1981. Fisheries Potential of Four Small Lakes on Semchuk Trail. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 81-3, iv and 17 p. 72. Johnson, R.P. 1967. The Fishery Biology of the Pelican - Deschambault Lakes: A Study of Mirond - Pelican - Jan -Deschambault. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 164 p. 73. Koshinsky, G.D. 1964. A Biological Survey of Nemeiben Lake in North Central Saskatchewan, 1960-63. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 65 p. and app. 74. Beak (Beak Consultants Limited). 1980. Midwest Lake -Environmental Baseline Study: Supporting Document No. 1, 3 vols. and app. (unpag.). 75. Rawson, D.S. 1960. Five Lakes on the Churchill River near Stanley, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 5, 39 p. 76. Johnson, R.P. 1961. Report on Piprell Lake Study, 1960. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., i and 23 77. Dean, E.L. 1978. Riou Lake. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 78-4, v and 52 p. 78. Lowe, D.R. 1972. The Limnology and Biology of Sahli Lake, 1971-72. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 35 p. 79. Kallemeyn, L.W. 1970. Limnology and Fisheries of Fourteen Small Lakes in Meadow Lake Park, Saskatchewan, 1966-1968. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep.,

80. Fernet, D.A. 1975. Shagwenaw Lake Limnology and Fishery 1974. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 75-14, iii and 72 p.

81. Koshinsky, G.D. 1971. Trout and McIntosh Lakes - The Comparative Limnology and Fisheries of a Churchill River Lake and an Adjacent Shield Lake in Central Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 97 p.

82. Kallemeyn, L.W. 1973. Limnology and Fisheries of Turnor and Wasekamio Lakes, 1970-71. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 79 p.

83. Royer, L.M. 1969. A Limnological and Fisheries Survey of Tobin Lake, an Impoundment on the Saskatchewan River, 1966-67. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 85 p.

84. Dean, E.L. 1975. Reindeer Lake Aquatic Ecology and Fisheries. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 75-3, xiii and 176 p.

85. Rawson, D.S. 1929. The Game Fish Situation in Prince Albert National Park (Report of Investigation in Summer of 1928). Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect. MS Rep. 569, 98 p. 86. Low, C.J., and D.A. Fernet. 1974. The Limnology and Fisheries of Weyakwin Lake 1973. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 74-4, iii and 36 p.

87. Kooyman, A.H. 1970. Sport Fishery Management, Prince Albert National Park. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect. MS Rep., i and 12 p.

88. Rawson, D.S. 1929. Second Report on the Game Fish Situation in Prince Albert National Park. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect. MS Rep., 19 p.

89. Solman, V.E.F. 1948. An Investigation of the Status of Lake Trout in Crean Lake, Prince Albert National Park. Can. Wildl. Serv. MS Rep., 8 p.

90. Mendis, A.S. 1956. A Limnological Comparison of Four Lakes in Central Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Rep. No. 2, 23 p.

91. Chen, M.Y. 1975. Wapawekka Lake Fishery Survey, 1974. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 75-13, ii and 66 p.

92. Sawchyn, W.W. 1967. Report on Biology of the Turtle Lake Fishery. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and 68 p.

93. Liaw, W.K. 1975. Tie Lake Fishery Resources and Trophic Conditions. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 75-15, ii and 23 p.

94. Sawchyn, W.W. 1975. Impact on the Reindeer River and Four Churchill River Lakes. Churchill River Study, Final Report 9, xxiv and 260 p.

95. Mayhood, D.W., A.H. Kooyman, R.L. Hare, and R.D. Saunders. 1973. A Limnological Survey of Some Waters in Southern Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect. MS Rep., vi + 171 p. and app.

96. Barclay, R. 1983. Limnology and Fisheries of Beaverlodge, Fredette and Milliken Lakes. Saskatchewan Res. Counc., Publ. No. C-805-23-E-83, vii and 116 p. 97. Bailey, J.K. 1977. Wassegam Lake, Prince Albert National Park: A Biological and Limnological Survey

with Recommendations for the Management of the Lake Trout (Salvelinus namaycash) Population. MS Rep., iii and 52 p. and app.

98. Edwards, P.H. 1966. Fisheries Survey and Management of Ten Small Lakes Along the Hanson Lake Road in the Nipawin Provincial Park Area of Saskatchewan, 1959-1965. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and

99. Schmidt, A.E. 1971. The Limnology and Fisheries of the

Wood - Manawan Area in East Central Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., ii and

100. Mendis, A.S. 1956. A Limnological Comparison of Four Lakes in Central Saskatchewan. MSc Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, iv and 103 p.

101. Banks, G.D. 1972. A Preliminary Report on Species of Fish Found in Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan, Summer - 1972. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect. MS Rep., i

102. Mayhood, D.W., R.F. Collacott, L.I. Ingell, and L.A. Yaremko. 1971. A Preliminary Report on an Aquatic Resource Inventory in Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan, Summer - 1971. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect. MS Rep., 14

103. Novakowski, N.S. 1955. Report on Biological and Fisheries Survey of Reindeer Lake 1954. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Branch MS Rep., iii and 62 p.

104. Rawson, D.S. 1952. A Brief Investigation of Reindeer Lake, August 1951. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Branch MS Rep., i and 13 p. 105. Walton, D.G. 1973.

Test Netting Canoe Lake 1973. Dep. of Northern Saskatchewan, Fish. Div. MS Rep., 14 p. and app. 106. Walton, D.G. 1973. Keeley Lake Test Net. Dep. of

Northern Saskatchewan, Fish. Div. MS Rep., 12 p. and app. 107. Kallemeyn, L.W. 1973. The Peter Pond and Churchill Lakes Fishery, 1969-1972. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 146 p.

108. Walton, D.G. 1975. Big Peter Pond Lake Test Netting Dep. Northern Saskatchewan, Fish. Div. MS Rep., 37 p. 1974. 109. Sawchyn, W.W. 1973. Environmental Survey of Wollaston Lake, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Res. Counc., Chem. Div. MS Rep., vi and 124 p.

#### Appendix B

## DESCRIPTION OF LAKE SURVEY METHODS AND HABITAT VARIABLES USED IN PRESENT STUDY

Habitat variables are described and physical and chemical methods are cited as necessary.

#### LOCATION

Lake Name (abbreviated LKNAME) - Reported name or gazetteer name (if necessary) or best known common name. "Lake" or "lac" excluded from name.

Lake Number (LKNO) - Arbitrary identifier of lake.

Latitude (LAT, or LATD for decimal  $^{O}N$ ) - As reported or gazetteered, or estimated from topographic 1:50,000 maps.

Longitude (LONG, or LONGD for decimal  $^{O}W$ ) - See LAT.

Nordicity (NORD) - Isolines defined as NORD = 4(LATD) -LONGD - 114. Related to climatic and vegetational zones in Saskatchewan (Richards and Fung 1969).

Geological Zone (GEOZONE) - Bedrock geology (i.e. sedimentary SE, boundary BD, Precambrian shield SH, Athabasca sandstone AT, and boundary Athabasca BA) from map by Saskatchewan Dept. Mineral Resources and Saskatchewan Research Council (1972). Determined from lake outline (not watershed) on topographic 1:50,000 maps or consultant studies, if necessary. Descriptions BD and BA took precedence over either contiguous zone overlain by lake.

Altitude (ALT) - For mean summer water surface as reported in survey. Units m.

References (REF1 and REF2) - Primary and secondary lake survey reports used as source for habitat and fish species data. Earliest survey was given preference, unless seriously incomplete.

Random Lake (RANDOM) - One of about 20% of lakes which were selected randomly for later validation of criteria.

#### MORPHOMETRY

Water Area (WAREA) - Lake water area as reported. Determined from dot grids in early surveys and small lakes and from polar planimetry in later surveys. Units  $\rm km^2$ .

Volume (VOLUME) - Water volume as reported (from truncated-cone method, see Wetzel 1983) or determined from water area and mean depth. Units  $hm^3$  or million  $m^3$ .

Mean Depth (ZBAR) - As reported, infrequently a simple mean of numerous depth soundings (Koshinsky 1970). Units m.

Maximum Depth (ZMAX) - Maximum known depth from handline soundings or echo sounder transects. Units m.

Shoreline Length (SHOLEN) - As reported. Determined from suitably-scaled maps, including island shorelines. Units km.

Shoreline Development (SHODEV) - As reported or calculated as SHODEV = SHOLEN/2 x 3.1416 x WAREA (Hutchinson 1957).

Fetch (FETCH) - Longest straight line distance over water (disregarding only islands too small to be mapped), as

defined by Hutchinson (1957). Units km.

Orientation (ORIENT) - Compass degrees between map north and fetch direction, restricted to  $0^{\circ}$  to  $180^{\circ}$ . Units °.

Flushing Time (FLUSH) - Theoretical time for complete water exchange. Earlier surveys used regional precipitation to estimate inflows (Rawson 1957b). Later surveys used actual outflows, although muskeg and groundwater seepage remained largely intractable (Koshinsky 1968). Units years.

Area Strata - Percent of water area between adjacent depth contours (i.e. hypsographic data). As reported, with a maximum of ten strata. Estimated by dot grid or polar planimetry (see WAREA). Abbreviated SA1, SA2,...SA10 for area and DA1, DA2,...DA10 for depth contours. Units % and m, respectively.

Volume Strata - Percent of water volume between adjacent depth contours. As reported, or calculated from area strata, depth of strata, and mean depth by a modified truncated-cone method (Wetzel 1983):

% volume in stratum Zl to Z2

= (Z2 - Z1) (%Al + %A2 +  $(((%Al)(%A2))^{0.5}/(3 \times ZBAR)))$ . Strata were considered imprecise if the sum of calculated volume strata was not between 80 and 120 % of lake volume (see Temperature-Oxygen section). Abbreviated SV1, SV2,...SV10 for volume and DV1, DV2,...DV10 for depth contours. Units % and m, respectively.

#### PHYSICOCHEMISTRY

Secchi Depth (SECCHI) - Summer average of all open-water limnological stations. Secchi disc was white-and-black or all-white, 20 or 25 cm diameter, and read in shade during midday. No reading was used if Secchi transparency extended to ZMAX. Units m.

Photo Depth (PHOTOZ) - Same as above, except may equal ZMAX. This variable estimates light transmission for photosynthesis (Wetzel 1983 p.66), rather than water clarity <u>per se</u>. Units m.

Generally, surface water samples were collected periodically over the field season (i.e. late spring to early fall). Water chemistry samples were usually filtered through plankton net material (68 meshes.cm-1) to remove settleable material (Atton and Johnson 1970). Typically, data from a single sample in open water at the station of maximum depth and the mid-summer period (i.e. late June to early August) were used. Late July or early August samples are most indicative of mean annual total dissolved solids (Ryder <u>et</u> <u>al</u>. 1974). Readings below detection levels were generally shown at this limit (e.g. SO4 less than 1.0 was shown as 1.0). Early surveys occurred in southern and central regions where TDS, salinity, and constituents were moderate to very high. Detection limits improved as recent surveys were conducted in more northerly, more dilute lakes.

Methods of collection, storage, and analysis have varied

between years, personnel, and agencies. In a similar retrospective study of TDS and TOTALK, Liaw and Atton (1980) noted that "the accuracy of the reported individual values should not be over-emphasized".

Colour (COLOUR) - Mid-summer surface sample, usually filtered. Field analyses by U. S. Geological Survey colorimetric method. Units Pt (= USGS = Hazen units).

Surface pH (PHMINS) - Minimum summer surface pH. Almost all surveys used the colorimetric Hellige pH comparator in the field; most recently electronic pH meters were used.

Bottom pH (PHMINB) - Minimum summer bottom pH.

Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) - Mid-summer surface sample. Analysis by weighing residue after filtration and drying to constant weight at 105 or  $110^{\circ}$ C (Liaw and Atton 1980). Some early analyses used drying 1 hr at  $180^{\circ}$ C (Rawson and Moore 1944), which may decompose bicarbonates and organic matter (Rawson 1951, Ryder <u>et al</u>. 1974). Some surveys used "sum of constituents" for total dissolved solids (Mayhood <u>et al</u>. 1973). Units mg.L<sup>-1</sup>.

Total Alkalinity (TOTALK) - Mid-summer surface sample. Most analyses by titration with standard acid solution, using methyl orange as indicator (Rawson 1936, APHA 1955 p.35, Liaw and Atton 1980) or recently to inflection point (APHA 1971). No adjustment was made for any over-estimation of true alkalinity in dilute waters, unlike Liaw and Atton (1981). Units  $mg.L^{-1}$  CaCO3.

Specific Conductivity (SPCON) - Mid-summer surface sample. Analyses by standard conductivity cell (Atton and Johnson 1970) or electronic meters (APHA 1971), corrected to  $25^{\circ}$ C. Units uS (= umhos.cm<sup>-1</sup>).

Loss on Ignition (LOSSIG) - Mid-summer filtered surface sample. Earliest analyses by ignition at 950°C of residue from TDS analysis (Rawson 1936, APHA 1925 p. 25); most analyses by ignition at 500 or 550°C for 1 hr (APHA 1955, 1971). Loss of ignition represents organic matter in the residue and volatilization of carbonates, nitrates, and other components (APHA 1925). Loss of carbonates (and others?) is reduced by ignition below 600°C (Golterman 1975 p.215).

Cations and Anions - Mid-summer surface sample. Analyses for calcium (CA), magnesium (MG), sodium (NA), potassium (K), bicarbonate (HCO3), carbonate (CO3), sulfate (SO4) and chloride (CL) have followed the standard methods of the day (APHA 1955, 1971). Units  $mg.L^{-1}$ .

CA in early surveys by gravimetric or permanganate titration method; for many years by EDTA titration. MG in early surveys by gravimetric or photometric method; for many years by modified EDTA titration of hardness and subtraction of CA; some recently by atomic absorption spectrometry (e.g. Tones 1979). NA and K in early surveys were not differentiated in analyses "by difference" (i.e. TDS minus known CA, MG, HCO3, CO3, SO4, and CL). By 1957, it was clear that NA (including K) levels by this method were misleadingly

high, usually "by at least 30 percent" and occasionally 3 to 5 times more than by direct analyses (Rawson 1957a). For many years, NA by gravimetric and K by colorimetric or volumetric standard methods; both recently by flame photometry.

HCO3 and CO3 for many years by nomographic calculation from methyl orange alkalinity and phenolphthalein alkalinity; more recently pH meters have replaced indicators. Hydroxide alkalinity was rarely found in these lakes. SO4 for many years by gravimetric barium method; some recently by ion chromatography. CL for many years by silver nitrate titration; some recently by ion chromatography, especially in dilute waters.

#### TEMPERATURE-OXYGEN

Generally temperature and oxygen readings were taken periodically over the field season at the deepest station of the lake. In this study, preference was given to this station, although other stations were also frequently available in larger or multi-basin lakes.

Some early surveys used reversing thermometers and bathythermographs for intermediate and bottom temperatures; recent surveys used electrical telethermometers for temperature profiles. All surface temperatures and calibrations were by standard rod thermometers. Dissolved oxygen determinations used the modified Miller method (Miller

1914, Ellis and Kanamori 1973) for decades for convenience in field analyses (Rawson 1936, Atton and Johnson 1970). Some recent surveys used Winkler's method or electronic oxygenelectrode meters. The Winkler method is generally more precise, although the Miller method is effective in highcarbonate waters (Walker <u>et al</u>. 1970, Ellis and Kanamori 1973).

Temperature, Maximum Surface (TMAXS) - Summer maximum temperature was used only if rise-and-fall of temperatures was reported or if at least several mid-July to mid-August temperatures were available. Units <sup>O</sup>C.

Temperature, Maximum Bottom (TMAXB) - As above, for the deepest limnological station reported. Units <sup>O</sup>C.

Stratification (STRAFN) - Degree of thermal
stratification. Based on survey author's description of one
to several summers' temperature profiles, with minor
modifications imposed for consistency between authors and/or
lakes. Criteria were primarily sharpness and persistence of
thermocline. Five subjective classes: 0 = non-stratified, 1
= weak, 2 = moderate, 3 = strong, 4 = very strong.

Oxygen, Minimum Surface (OMINS) - Summer minimum was used only if several readings throughout the field season were available. Units  $mg.L^{-1}$ .

Oxygen, Minimum Bottom (OMINB) - As above. Few studies attempted to delineate microstratification at the lake bottom

(Rawson 1936), so readings were for "near bottom". Units  $mg.L^{-1}$ .

Depth of shallowest 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen (HIGH6MG) - Shallowest open-water depth below which oxygen was less than 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup>  $(4.2 \text{ cm}^3.\text{L}^{-1})$  at least temporarily. Used only if several readings throughout the summer and at useful intermediate depths were available. Units m.

Minimum volume of water at or above 6 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> oxygen (VOL6MG) - Minimum volume of surface water with acceptable oxygen levels, calculated from HIGH6MG depth and volume strata (see above) as described in VOLT15T6 below. Units hm<sup>3</sup>.

Depths of deepest 15°C and same-day 6°C (T15T6U and T15T6L) -See similar variables in Table 1. Deepest openwater depth below which temperature was acceptable (i.e. T15T6U, T15O6U, etc.) and same-day depth above which temperature or oxygen was acceptable (i.e. T15T6L, T15O6L, etc.) for lake trout. Available under similar conditions as OMINS and HIGH6MG. Units m.

Minimum volume of 6-15<sup>o</sup>C water (VOLT15T6) - See similar variables in Table 1. Minimum volume of water with temperature or temperature and oxygen acceptable for lake trout. Calculated as volume between upper criterion (e.g. T15T6U, T1506U, etc.) and lower criterion (e.g. T15T6L,

T1506L, etc). Interpolated from area strata (as necessary) by a truncated-cone approximation:

% volume from Z1 to Za, which is between Z1 and Z2
= (%A2) x (Za - Z1)/ZBAR + ((%A1 - %A2) x (Za - Z1) x
[1 + (Z2 - Za)/(Z2 - Z1) + (Z2 - Za)<sup>2</sup>/(Z2 - Z1)<sup>2</sup>] /
(3 x ZBAR)).

#### BIOTA

Net plankton samples were taken periodically over the field season at the deepest station on the lake, and usually at auxiliary stations in larger or multi-basin lakes. A large Wisconsin net (mouth diameter 25 cm) with a straining cone of 68 meshes.cm<sup>-1</sup> was hauled vertically from near bottom (typically 2 m above bottom) to surface at 1.0 m.s<sup>-1</sup>. Net efficiency was usually averaged from beginning, middle, and end-of-field-season comparisons with vertical series of 10-L trap samples (Rawson 1953, Atton and Johnson 1970). Identification and relative abundance by taxa were usually reported, but not considered in this study.

Net plankton dry weight (NETDRY) - Above samples were dried at 52 to  $60^{\circ}$ C for 48-72 hr to constant weight. Dry weight was averaged over the season and stations reported. Units kg.ha<sup>-1</sup>.

Net plankton organic weight (NETORG) - Above dried samples were ashed over open flame and then at  $600^{\circ}$ C for 15 minutes. See LOSSIG above. Units kg.ha<sup>-1</sup>. Benthic fauna were typically sampled once or more per summer to represent proportionally all depths and bottom types of each basin. Ekman dredges (225-500 cm<sup>2</sup>) and Peterson dredges (675 cm<sup>2</sup>) were used on softer and harder substrates, respectively. Rocky areas were assumed to contain no benthic fauna (Atton and Johnson 1970). Dredgings were washed through three screens (finest 11 meshes.cm<sup>-1</sup>, occasionally 15) and specimens preserved in 70 % ethanol.

Benthic Fauna Numbers (BENNOA) - Numbers per unit area were averaged by proportional sampling or by weighted depth zone areas for the summer. Units numbers. $m^{-2}$ .

Benthic Fauna Categories - Numerical composition of faunal taxa were averaged for the lake, as above. Abbreviated BC1, BC2,...for taxa and BC1%, BC2%,...for numerical composition. Units taxon codes and %, respectively.

Benthic Fauna Dry Weight (BENDRY) - Wet weights of specimens were determined after (partial) drying on absorbent paper; crayfish, large clams, and mollusc shells (estimated as 1/3 of mollusc wet weights) were excluded. Dry weights were reported as 12 to 15 % (largely chironomid or amphipod benthos, respectively) of wet weight (Rawson 1953, Atton and Johnson 1970).

### WINTER PHYSICOCHEMISTRY

Winter water chemistry was available infrequently, usually from a single sample at a mid-lake station. Surface (i.e.

immediately below ice cover) and bottom samples were analyzed as described for summer physicochemistry. Preference was given to readings from March, the generally critical period for oxygen (Barica and Mathias 1979), or to lowest observed oxygen conditions.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- APHA (American Public Health Assoc.) 1925. Standard methods for the examination of water and sewage. 6th ed., xi and 119 p.
- APHA (American Public Health Assoc.) 1955. Standard methods for the examination of water, sewage, and industrial waste. 10th ed., xix and 522 p.
- APHA (American Public Health Assoc.) 1971. Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. 13th ed., xxxv and 874 p.
- Atton, F.M., and R.P. Johnson. 1970. Procedures manual. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., MS Rep., iv and 72 p.
- Barica, J., and J.A. Mathias. 1979. Oxygen depletion and winterkill risk in small prairie lakes under extended ice cover. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 36:980-986.
- Ellis, J., and S. Kanamori. 1973. An evaluation of the Miller method for dissolved oxygen analysis. Limnol. Oceanogr. 18:1002-1005.
- Golterman, H.L. 1975. Physiological limnology An approach to the physiology of lake ecosystems. Elsevier Publ.
- Koshinsky, G.D. 1968. The limnology and fisheries of 28 small lakes situated on the precambrian shield near Lac la Ronge, Saskatchewan, 1960-1967. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., 530 p.

Koshinsky, G.D. 1970. The morphometry of shield lakes in Saskatchewan. Limnol. Oceanogr. 15:695-701.

- Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1980. Potential impact on fish habitat from acid rain in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 80-1, v and 58 p.
- Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1981. Sensitivity to acid of fishing waters in northern Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 81-1, 65 p.
- Mayhood, D.W., A.H. Kooyman, R.L. Hare, and R.D. Saunders. 1973. A limnological survey of some waters in southern Prince Albert National Park, Saskatchewan. Can. Wildl. Serv., Limnol. Sect., MS Rep., viii and 101 p. and app.
- Miller, J. 1914. A field method for determining dissolved oxygen in water. J. Soc. Chem. Ind. 33:185-186.
- Rawson, D.S. 1936. Physical and chemical studies in lakes of the Prince Albert Park, Saskatchewan. J. Biol. Bd. Can. 2(3):227-284.
- Rawson, D.S. 1953. The standing crop of net plankton in lakes. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada 10:224-237.
- Rawson, D.S. 1957. Mineral analysis of Saskatchewan lake waters. p.19-21 in Saskatchewan Res. Counc., 11th Ann. Rep.
- Rawson, D.S., and J.E. Moore. 1944. The saline lakes of Saskatchewan. Can. J. Res. D 22:141-201.
- Ryder, R.A., S.R. Kerr, K.H. Loftus, and H.A. Regier. 1974. The morphoedaphic index, a fish yield estimator - Review and evaluation. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 31:663-688.
- Tones, P.I. (ed.). 1979. Additional environmental baseline studies for the Cluff Lake area, Saskatchewan: Final Report. Saskatchewan Res. Counc. Rep. No. C79-19, xviii and 378 p. and App. A - E unpag.
- Walker, K.F., W.D. Williams, and U.T. Hammer. 1970. The Miller method for oxygen determination applied to saline waters. Limnol. Oceanogr. 15:814-815.
- Wetzel, R.G. 1983. Limnology. CBS College Publ., xii and 767 p. and app.

#### Appendix C

## FISH SPECIES COMPOSITIONS:

## NOMENCLATURE, DEFINITIONS, AND METHODS USED

### FISH SPECIES COMPOSITION

Surveys were generally planned to determine the presence and relative abundances of all fish species in all areas and depths of the lake throughout the field season. Standard gillnets were used predominantly, augmented frequently by shoreline seining and occasionally by poisoning, angling, stomach analysis, or other methods.

Each standard gillnet consisted of 46 m each of six different meshes (Table C1) fished as one gang in order of mesh size. Sets were made with the smallest mesh alternately furthest from shore and nearest shore, and in the deepest area and shallowest area, to reduce obvious bias (Atton and Johnson 1970). Gillnets were typically fished on the bottom for 24 hr, with longer sets usually adjusted to 24 hr using Kennedy (1951). From one to tens of net sets were made on each lake, depending on lake area, the number of basins, the survey objectives, and available staffing. The seine used was typically 9 m long, 2 m deep in the centre and 1 m at each end, bagged in the centre, and constructed of 13-mm stretched mesh (Atton and Johnson 1970). Seining was usually done in several locations, limited primarily by available staff and time and by nearshore suitability.

Mesh size <sup>a</sup> (mm)	Length (m)	Depth <sup>b</sup> (meshes)	Material <sup>C</sup>
38	46	60	210/2 nylon
51	46	45	210/2 nylon
76	46	30	210/2 nylon
102	46	22	210/3 nylon
127	46	16	210/3 nylon
140	46	16	210/3 nylon

Table Cl. Specifications of the standard gillnet used in provincial lake surveys.

a Stretched measure.

b Approximately 1.8 m.

c Multifilament nylon replaced cotton about 1953 (Atton 1955, Novakowski 1955).

No criterion was established for a minimum number of gillnet sets or seine hauls which would be sufficient. A tautology was implicit since an author's judgement of reasonable success in catching specimens of the (expected) fish species was accepted. Additions to the species lists by later surveys demonstrated the incompleteness of some surveys, particularly for smaller or less preferred species (e.g. cyprinids, catostomids, and cottids).

"Regular" fish species were those species found by lake survey methods and which were permanent residents of the lake (Atton and Merkowsky 1983). - "Auxiliary" species were found by surveys but believed to be transients (T), were presumed or known to be extirpated (E), were known to be introduced whether self-sustaining or not (I), were reported in commercial (C) or sport (S) fishing records, or were reported by other means (R). Fish species nomenclature followed Scott and Crossman (1973), with minor exceptions.

### LITERATURE CITED

- Atton, F.M. 1955. The relative effectiveness of nylon and cotton gill nets. Can. Fish Cult. 17:1-9.
- Atton, F.M., and R.P. Johnson. 1970. Procedures manual. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., MS Rep., iv and 72 p.
- Atton, F.M., and J.J. Merkowsky. 1983. Atlas of Saskatchewan fish. Saskatchewan Dep. Parks Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 83-2, vi and 281 p.
- Kennedy, W.A. 1951. The relationship of fishing effort by gill nets to the interval between lifts. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 8:264-274.
- Novakowski, N.S. 1955. Report on biological and fisheries survey of Reindeer Lake 1954. Saskatchewan Dep. Natur. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep., iii and 62 p.

Scott, W.B., and E.J. Crossman. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Fish. Res. Bd. Can., Bull. 184, xi and 966 p.
## Appendix D

# SAMPLE SIZES, MEANS, AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS

OF HABITAT VARIABLES

9245.66 Maximum 109.82 5296.5 18.77 697.0 59.70 95250 35.8 215 107 30 103.73 105.28 106.36 55.17 56.70 257.91 527.0 111.65 29.67 7.45 75 % 27.1 5.85 9.89 8.8 Quartiles 490.0 5.445 30.22 -2.70 2.36 23.34 R 13.4 4.30 5.6 2.3 50 54.08 340.0 0.642 3.628 R 1.66 7.05 1.60 2.6 22 ഗ variables in the random subset of 262 lakes. deviation Minimum 101.88 -10.13 53.05 265.0 0.006 0.085 0.76 1.05 0.14 0.4 0.8 380.191 7105.88 114.56 21.805 722.30 Standard 2.172 1.588 6.170 5.409 12.29 3.97 105.38 1100.0 Mean 55.43 73.073 19.519 163.55 455.7 6.818 2.35 4.11 8.39 Variable<sup>a</sup> Number lakes 262 262 119 262 248 216 of 215 247 189 189 197 Morphometry: Location: Bedrock geology VOLUME SHODEV LONGD SHOLEN LATD WAREA FETCH NORD ZBAR ZMAX ALT

Table D1. Sample sizes, means, and frequency distributions of all habitat

continued

continued
ä
0
~
Tal

Variable	Number				ð	uartile	5	
Bedrock	of		Standard					
geology	lakes	Mean	deviation	Minimum	32 52 5	50 %	75 %	Maximum
ORIENT	183	78.32	54.51	0	35	65	101	170
FLUSH	58	7.73	23.53	0.1	0.25	1.95	5.75	175
Phys i coche	emistry:							
SECCHI	176	3.60	2.33	0.3	2.12	ო	4.38	13.9
PHOTOZ	183	3.51	2.33	0,3	0	2.9	4.3	13.9
COLOUR	06	24.9	23.5	0	თ	20	37	130
SNIWHA	168	7.36	0.61	Q	~	7.2	7.9	с С
PHMINB	161	6.94	0.65	5.6	6.4	6.9	7.3	с С
TDS	197	329.26	2115.35	10	39.5	105	213	29440
TOTALK	159	70.02	79.07	1.5	13	26	124	396
SPCON	169	470.19	3100.98	Ø	38.5	117	321	40000
LOSSIG	88	98.75	237.42	0	29.5	50	75	1885
CA	195	24.04	50.43	0.39	4	16.3	e e	662
MG	194	15.91	39.70	0.11	1.48	9	16.3	438
NA	185	67.58	701.21	0.3	1.3	2.9	9.55	9500
							continu	red

continued
<u>.</u>
Table

Variable	Number				ŏ	uartile.	6	
Bedrock	of		Standard					
geology	lakes	Mean	deviation	Minimum	25 %	¥ 20	75 <b>%</b>	Maximum
K	174	3.81	12.90	0	0.8	1.8	ع 4	1 6 F
C03	173	2.75	8.69	0	0	0		
HC03	175	114.97	107.55	1	23.2	85	173	591
S04	184	18.83	98.02	0	0		2.85	A5.7
CL	189	107.03	1172.65	0	0.5	1	4	16000
Temperatu	re-0xyger	 						
TMAXS	208	20.40	2.28	13	19	20.5	22	27.4
TMAXB	184	13.48	5.66	4	7.58	14.2	18.98	23 1
SNIWO	176	7.73	0.89	3.43	7.14	7.75	8.3B	9.85
OMINB	173	4.42	3.06	0	1.14	4.85	7.21	9 71
HIGH6MG	171	15.97	18.1	0	4	თ	20	25
VOL6MG	148	1383.88	8082.63	0	3.74	36.81	278.82	89242
TISTGU	185	10.52	8.08	0	പ	თ	13	46
TISTGL	184	18.92	15.55	1	9	16	28.8	74

193

continued

Table D1. continued

58174.5 58174.5 58174.5 26083.4 Maximum 13231 217 46 46 06 97 46 06 1280.5 2054.5 24.00 13.13 23.75 46.45 75 % 21.2 2.29 0.73 18 13 13 26 Quartiles 0.19 х 59.6 50 10 11 4 12 10 ø 0 თ ó 0 751.8 19.55 -0.01 24.4 25 X 5.5 0 4 ഗ o ω o ഹ d -1064.47 -492.37 Mean deviation Minimum -108.97 0.9 3.7 : 0 0 o 0 0 ч 0 5668.29 5458.58 2334.23 5742.15 1542.26 Standard 18.18 19.21 17.99 28.92 40.21 8.18 8.30 9.49 1659.53 297.46 712.26 779.55 735.32 10.39 17.11 16.61 10.39 19.19 12.54 36.65 53.08 Variable Number lakes 179 157 170 146 170 163 142 169 164 143 143 113 οĮ 152 VOLT15T6 VOLT1506 Bedrock VOLT1504 VOLT1206 geology T1606U T1506L T1504U T1504L T1206L T1 206U BENNOA Biota: NETDRY NETORG

194

89

17.9

9.8

4.6

0.8

14.68

14.29

154

BENDRY

continued

Table D1. continued

5

Maximum 13.99 6390 45.5 12.6 13.1 803 110 9.5 11.42 163.2 22.05 75 % 195 4.7 2.8 2.1 ----Quartiles 8.71 ₽ 2.1 2.2 1.5 75 50 73 ω 0 4.33 25 % 75.5 51.2 1.25 3.2 1.5 0.8 0 Mean deviation Minimum 0.39 0.24 0.73 0.3 10 0 0 4 160.4 Standard 924.9 24.58 4.45 9.49 2.34 2.15 1.89 334.1 133.2 17.46 7.78 6.08 2.80 1.96 0.87 lakes Variable Number 60 27 66 53 53 53 51 e S of SPCOWINS Bedrock geology TDSWINS Winter: CAWINS SNIMO MGWINS NAWINS CLWINS KWINS

a Excludes variables which are available in fewer than 50 lakes.

Appendix E

# UNIVARIATE PREDICTION OF LAKE TROUT PRESENCE

Table El. Univariate prediction of lake trout presence or absence and sample sizes and error rates in 262 lakes.

Variable	Number	of lakes			Er	rors (%)C
	with la	ke trout	Statisti	cal Criterion		1010 (0)
Bedrock			differen	ce of	A11	Present
geology	Present	Absent	(P <u>&lt;</u> ) <sup>a</sup>	$presence^{b}$		/absent
Location:						
LATD	46	182	0.0001	> 56.52	20	50/12
shield	36	81	0.0001	> 57.21	20	53/21
non-shie	ld 10	101	0.0118	> 54.95	14	90/21 80/2
LONGD	46	182	0.0930	> 107.10		76/10
shield	36	81	0.0120	> 105.38	33	56/22
non-shiel	Ld 10	101	0.9221	< 102.19	16	00/0
NORD	46	182	0.0001	> 7.042	21	50/9
shield	36	81	0.0004	> 8.125	34	56/25
non-shiel	d 10	101	0.2660	> 0.958	14	30/25 80/9
ALT	29	72	0.7355	> 523.5	47	74/34
shield	22	29	0.1482	> 444.0	47	55/41
non-shiel	d 7	43	0.3071	< 266.4	20	96/0
Morphometry:					20	00/9
WAREA	46	179	0.0001	> 46.7	24	50/15
shield	36	79	0.0001	> 26.8	21	50/22
non-shiel	d 10	100	0.0010	> 201.4	16	00/23 00/0
VOLUME	44	157	0.0001	> 430.01	21	20/9 40/12
shield	34	77	0.0001	> 217.67	2± 27	40/13
non-shield	10 E	80	0.0002	> 1400.00	16	44/19 70/0
ZBAR	44	156	0.0001	2 9.65	14	22/0
shield	34	77	0.0001	> 8.30	17	20/12
non-shield	1 10	79	0.0001	> 12.30	т, т,	29/12
ZMAX	46	178	0.0001	> 32.65	ש וו	4U/D D6/7
shield	36	79	0.0001	> 31.15	лт ТТ	20//
non-shield	10	99	0.0001	> 36.50	10 7	23/11
					/	40/4

continued

Variable	Number	of lakes			Er	rors (%)
	with la	ke trout	Statisti	cal Criterion		2010 (0)
Bedrock			differer	ice of	 All	Present
geology	Present	Absent	( P <u>&lt;</u> )	presence		/absent
SHOLEN	46	128	0.0001	> 118.1		59/21
shield	36	77	0.0001	> 109.1	34	53/25
non-shie	ld 10	51	0.1018	> 130.4	23	JJ/25
SHODEV	46	128	0.0005	> 5.85	20	70/14 50/22
shield	36	77	0.0030	2 6.35	30	59/22
non-shie	ld 10	51	0.8992	> 3.60	26	90/16
FETCH	44	128	0.0001	> 11.67	20	00/10 57/10
shield	36	73	0.0001	$\frac{1}{2}$ 2 40	29	37/18
non-shie]	ld 8	65	0.0075	$\frac{1}{2}$ 7.40	10	4//23
ORIENT	42	126	0.3024	$\frac{2}{23.10}$ > 124 5	19	88/11
shield	35	66	0.9602	< 38 5	42	83/28
non-shiel	.d 7	60	0.9265	> 172 0	40 10	09/30
Physicochemi	stry:			<u>~</u> 1/2.0	18	86/10
SECCHI	42	131	0.0001	> 4 5 4	۰.	20 /0
shield	36	69	0.0001	> 1 15	14	29/9
non-shiel	d 6	62	0.0011	<u>&gt; 4.15</u>	12	19/9
PHOTOZ	42	138	0.0001	<u>~</u> 4.93	12	6//6
shield	36	71	0.0001	<u>~</u> 4.54	13	29/9
non-shiel	d 6	67	0.0008	<u>&gt; 4.15</u>	11	17/8
COLOUR	9	62	0.0021	<u>&lt; 4.95</u>	11	67/6
shield	9	41	0.0059		18	78/10
non-shield	d 0	21	0.0039	< /.5	28	78/17
PHMINS	39	127	0 0062	ь Голган	••	• • •
shield	33	74		< 7.0-	30	64/20
non-shield	1 6	53	0.0002	< 7.0~	39	64/28
PHMINB	40	119	0 0004	< /.1	19	100/9
shield	32	 70		< 0.4	31	60/21
non-shield	8	Λ7	0.1002	< b.4	41	72/28
		4/	0.1003	< 7.04	25	88/15

198

. .

Variable	Number	of lakes			Er	rors (%)
	with la	ke trout	Statisti	cal Criterion		
Bedrock			differen	ice of	A11	Present
geology	Present	Absent	(₽ <u>&lt;</u> )	presence		/absent
TDS	38	137	0.0001	< 40.5	21	47/14
shield	32	53	0.0345	< 38.5	35	47/19 A7/28
non-shie	eld 6	84	0.0032	< 86.5	13	100/7
TOTALK	32	105	0.0001	< 14.5	30	66/10
shield	30	57	0.3278	< 14.5	45	63/35
non-shie	eld 2	48	0.1247	< 37.0		100/4
SPCON	32	118	0.0001	< 41.0	21	50/14
shield	27	50	0.0711	< 31.5	39	56/30
non-shie	ld 5	68	0.0206	< 96.0	14	100/7
CA	37	136	0.0001	< 4.30	22	51/14
shield	31	52	0.1023	< 3.80	39	52/31
non-shie	ld 6	84	0.0466	< 13.70	11	92/51 83/6
MG	36	136	0.0001	< 1.55	22	53/14
shield	31	52	0.5978	< 1.33	41	55/22
non-shie	ld 5	84	0.0093	< 3.85	q	80/5
NA	35	131	0.0001	< 1.28	22	54/14
shield	31	51	0.0718	< 1.28	25	18/17 18/27
non-shie	ld 4	80	0.1201	< 1.10	10	100/5
К	33	122	0.0001	< 0.90	27	64/17
shield	30	49	0.0848	< 0.90	44	60/35
non-shiel	ld 3	73	0.0716	< 0.20	8	100/4
<b>C</b> O3	28	126	0.0053	< 0.0 <sup>d</sup>	30	82/19
shield	23	50	0.4976	< 0.0 <sup>d</sup>	44	70/32
non-shiel	.d 5	76	0.1054	< 0.0 <sup>d</sup>	12	100/7
HCO3	29	127	0.0001	< 21.0	<u></u> 21	55/12
shield	23	48	0.3195	< 16.5	<u> </u>	55/20
non-shiel	d 6	79	0.0429	< 62.0	14	100/8

continued

Variable	Νι	mber	of lakes			Er	rors (%)
	wi	th la	ke trout	Statisti	cal Criterion		. ,
Bedrock				differer	nce of	A11	Present
geology	Pr	esent	Absent	(P≤)	presence		/absent
S04		35	130	0.8883	< 0.0 <sup>d</sup>	20	60/10
shield	l	30	46	0.1955	> 1 0d	29	09/18
non-sh	ield	5	84	0.4308	< 0 0d	ےد ۱۱	40/26
CL		36	134	0.6544	< 0.05	22	100/6
shield		31	53	0.0121	> 1.05	20	/2/21
non-sh	ield	5	81	0.0159	< 0.0d	30	42/23
Temperatu	re-0	xygen:				9	80/5
TMAXS		43	158	0.0002	< 18.85	26	E0 /1 7
shield		33	80	0.0002	< 18.85	20	20/1/
non-sh	ield	10	78	0.8229	< 18.60	27	45/19
TMAXB		43	139	0.0001	< 7 45	10	100/13
shield		33	77	0.0001	< 7.70	19	42/12
non-sh:	ield	10	62	0.0017	< 7.45	17	50/14
OMINS		41	133	0.0001	> 8 35	1/ 2/	00/10
shield		33	74	0.0001	> 8,17	24	49/1/
non-shi	leld	8	59	0.3472	> 8.92	10	39/10 75/10
OMINB		40	131	0.0063	> 7 21	10 20	/5/10
shield		30	75	0.0063	> 6.92	20	52/22
non-shi	eld	10	56	0.4156	> 7.93	30 26	53/2I
HIGH6MG		39	130	0.0001	> 23 0	20	90/14
shield		31	73	0.0001	> 26 5	10	22/14
non-shi	eld	8	57	0.0001	> 18.0	19	32/14
VOL6MG' <sup>e</sup>		36	110	0.0001	$\frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{10.0}{5}$	26	25/4
shield		29	62	0.0001	> 150 00	20	33/1/
non-shi	eld	7	48	0.0017	> 1583 50	29	45/21
F15T6U		43	140	0.0704	<u>-</u> 13 5	20 T2	5//8 70/05
shield		33	75	0.5039	<u>~</u>	30	79/25
non-shi	eld	10	65	0.0010	> 16 F	40	13/35
						1 /	7870

200

e e

3

Variable	Number	of lakes			Er	rors (%)
,	with la	ke trout	Statisti	cal Criterion		. ,
Bedrock .		······································	differen	ce of	A11	Present
geology 1	Present	Absent	(P <u>&lt;</u> )	presence		/absent
T15T6L	43	139	0.0001	> 29.5	19	40/12
shield	33	74	0.0001	- > 28.5	25	42/18
non-shie]	Ld 10	65	0.0001	> 32.5		20/3
VOLT15T6' <sup>e</sup>	39	116	0.0001	> 24.00	14	20/5
shield	30	62	0.0001	> 10.33	12	17/10
non-shiel	.d 9	54	0.0001	> 204.21		22/4
T1506U	39	131	0.0738	> 13.5	3 Q	22/4
shield	33	74	0.4290	> 11.5	46	73/25
non-shiel	d 6	57	0.0016	> 16.5	16	83/0
T1506L	36	127	0.0001	> 24.5	17	30/10
shield	31	72	0.0001	26.5	20	32/15
non-shiel	đ 5	55	0.0007	> 15.5	20	32/13
VOLT1506' <sup>e</sup>	34	110	0.0001	> 3.29	י ד	40/4 15/5
shield	29	61	0.0001	> 2.15	, Л	1))) 7/2
non-shield	d 5	49	0.0116	2 69.05	יי ר	1/3
T1504U	39	129	0.1167	> 13.5	30 1	40/4 05/04
shield	33	72	0.4467	> 11 5	20	00/24
non-shield	1 6	57	0.0058	> 17.5	י <del>ג</del> י וו	73/35 50/7
T1504L	36	125	0.0001	> 29.5	1 A	21/10
shield	31	70	0.0001	> 29.5		22/10
non-shield	l 5	55	0.0003	> 33.0	21	32/10
VOLT1504' <sup>e</sup>	34	106	0.0001	> 16 29	د ۱۵	20/2
shield	29	59	0.0001	> 7 39	10	21/7
non-shield	5	47	0.0001	> 202 00	9 A	14// 20/2
T1206U	39	128	0.0001	> 18 5	4	20/2
shield	33	71	0.0124	= 10.3	34 45	72/22
non-shield	6	57	0.0038	<u>~</u> +/.0 > 10 F	40 14	/0/34
		•		<u>~ 19.0</u>	14	6//9

-

Variable	Number	of lakes			Er	rors (%)
Bedrock	with la	ke trout	Statisti differen	cal Criterion ce of	 A]]	Present
geology	Present	Absent	(P <u>&lt;</u> )	presence	****	/absent
T1206L	36	126	0.0001	> 26.5		36/11
shield	31	71	0.0001	> 28.5	20	32/14
non-shie	ld 5	55	0.0019	>.19.5	20	40/4
VOLT1206' <sup>e</sup>	34	107	0.0001	- > 1.04	9	18/6
shield	29	60	0.0001	> 0.84	11	17/8
non-shie	ld 5	47	0.0107	 > 35.74	8	40/4
<u>Biota</u> :					Ū	10/1
NETDRY	37	104	0.0005	< 25.8	33	62/22
shield	31	68	0.0231	< 24.2	40	65/22
non-shie	ld 6	36	0.4084	< 40.6	19	67/11
NETORG	33	79	0.0020	< 23.2	33	54/24
shield	27	51	0.0380	< 22.2	41	59/31
non-shie]	.d 6	28	0.3428	< 29.0	24	67/14
BENNOA	36	116	0.0001	< 720	2.4	50/16
shield	30	67	0.0013	< 758	25	40/18
non-shiel	d 6	49	0.0402	< 554	15	40/10 67/8
BENDRY	38	116	0.0001	< 4.6	19	37/13
shield	32	67	0.0001	< 4.6	21	31/16
non-shiel	d 6	49	0.0163	< 4.8	15	67/8

a Difference by Mann-Whitney test.

b Midpoint of delineation is shown.

c Apparent error rate for all lakes when numbers of errors were (approximately) equal for true presences and true absences, followed by those with and without lake trout, respectively. d Numerous tied rankings for this criterion were classified randomly.

e Only lakes with total water volumes estimable within + 20 % are shown (see Appendix B).

## Appendix F

## SHIELD AND NON-SHIELD LAKE

# WATERLEVEL VARIATIONS, MORPHOMETRY, AND RESIDUAL VOLUMES

### INTRODUCTION

This appendix is basically a repository for the mathematical and other analyses of the differences between shield and non-shield lakes in recent habitat conditions.

#### METHODS

## RECENT CONDITIONS

<u>Waterlevels</u> The minimum daily waterlevel for each month with at least 3 days' data was obtained (Environment Canada 1983; Water Survey of Canada, Regina, Calgary, and Winnipeg Regions, November 1983 microfiches). Two or more periods-ofrecord on a lake were tied to a common elevation by the principle of "water level transfer" (L. Heinze, Water Survey of Canada, Regina, pers. comm.). Monthly mean waterlevels were preferable to daily, but were not readily available for all months. Fluctuations due to "wind set-up" or seiches were excluded, if reported or observed. As July and August are critical months for temperature-and-oxygen volumes, the lower minimum daily waterlevel was used to represent the

summer minimum.

Typical and extreme low waterlevels were estimated from polynomial regressions of the probability of observed waterlevels. Polynomials were fitted by stepwise linear regression:

where Yi was the predicted waterlevel (m) corresponding to a given cumulative probability Xi, and Xi was the observed probability of the ith or lower waterlevel (m) from:

Xi = Ri / (n+1) (equation F2) where Ri was the rank-order of the ith waterlevel when the lowest observed waterlevel was ranked 1, and n was the number of observations. Linear regression required the redefinitions:

 $Z = Xi, Z = Xi^{2}, Z = Xi^{3}, \dots Z = Xi^{9}$  (equation F3) (Freund and Minton 1979 p.161).

Variables were added to regression equation Fl stepwise using significance levels of 0.25 for entry and 0.25 for removal (SAS 1982). Equation F2 above provides probabilities which are "correct on the average" for replicate 20-year periods representing actual 2000-year conditions (Hjelmfelt and Cassidy 1975 p.34).

An alternate method, that of maximizing the multiple coefficient of determination  $(R^2)$  to the best 1-variable, 2-

variable, ... 9-variable equations and selecting by the Cp statistic (SAS 1982), had been rejected. Theoretically, selection by Cp produces the best regression for a minimal subset of variables. The selection requires that 2p-t-l <= Cp <= 2p-t (equation F4) for extrapolation and parameter estimation, Cp <= p (equation F5) for prediction, and  $Cp \le t+1$  (equation F6) for marginally acceptable prediction (Hocking 1976 p.18). Here p variables are a subset of the t variables comprising the full equation, with the intercept making p+l and t+l terms. By this method, most regressions satisfied equation F4 and some equations F5 or F6; a few lakes required the full 9-variable model. Nonetheless, Cp statistics led to high-degree polynomial regressions and predicted waterlevels clearly out of line with recorded fluctuations, occasionally with disconcerting inflections at very low or high probability. Extrapolation to 100-year predictions appeared inadvisable, even when parameter estimation was good (see Hocking 1976 p.15, Freund and Minton 1979 p.161).

Differences between predicted low summer waterlevels for typical years (i. e. cumulative 50 % probability or median) and extreme years (i. e. cumulative 1 % probability, or nominally 1 in 100 years) represented recent waterlevel variations. The effects of bedrock geology on these variations were tested by the step-down method of linear regression and analysis of covariance (Freund and Minton 1979

p.224, SAS 1982 p.139). Prediction intervals for 95 % of single observations were calculated.

Morphometry Effects of waterlevel variations were interpolated from volume-at-depth data for surveyed lakes in the present study. Most lakes with waterlevel data did not have morphometric data available.

<u>Residual volumes</u> Residual volumes were estimated using the two separate lake sets. Waterlevel variations were predicted from water area, and residual volumes from waterlevel variations and morphometry. The confidence limits of residual volumes assumed that the effects of waterlevel variation and morphometry were multiplicative and independent. The standard error (Sr) of the residual volume at any water area was calculated as:

 $Sr/\bar{r} = (Sw^2/\bar{w} + Sm^2/\bar{m})^{0.5}$ 

where r, w, and m denote residual volume, waterlevel variation, and morphometric depth (from Meyer 1975 p.40, Sokal and Rohlf 1969 p.422). The 95 % confidence limits used n=10 shield lakes and n=23 non-shield lakes from the waterlevel lake set, which was the smaller set.

### RESULTS

## RECENT CONDITIONS

<u>Waterlevels</u> Summer waterlevel data were available for 33 lakes in central and northern Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta (Table F1). Usually 15 to 20 years of data were available on one lake, with the longest 51 years. Some short periods-of-record on the same lake were unusable since a common elevation could not be established.

The chosen stepwise method produced polynomial regressions of good to excellent correlation and lower degree than the alternative (Table F2). Inflections were infrequently seen and predicted waterlevels were seemingly credible (Table F3) although the problem of extrapolation remained in principle.

Predicted waterlevel variations ranged from 0.070 m for Little Bear (non-shield, small lake) to 1.862 m for Winnipegosis (non-shield, very large lake). Regressions showed increasing waterlevel variations with larger lake areas which were significantly different for shield and nonshield lakes (Table F4).

Table Fl. Lakes with a minimum of 10 years of July or August waterlevels for 1982 and earlier.

					-
				Static	n <sup>a</sup>
	Wate	r			
	area		Lat	Long	
Lake	(km²)	) Number	°N	٥W	Years of data <sup>b</sup>
Shield lakes:					
Athabasca	7850	07MC003	3 59 <sup>0</sup> 23	108 <sup>0</sup> 53	17 (193767) <sup>d</sup>
Cree	1230	07LD001	. 57 <sup>0</sup> 21	. 107 <sup>0</sup> 08	15 (196582)
Deschambault	267	05KF003	54 <sup>0</sup> 40	103 <sup>0</sup> 24	11 (1965-82)
Footprint	27	05TF001	55 <sup>0</sup> 48	98 <sup>0</sup> 51	14 (1961-75) <sup>e</sup>
Jan	114	05KG010	54 <sup>0</sup> 54	102 <sup>0</sup> 50	16 (1965-81)
Nemeiben	154	06CB003	55 <sup>0</sup> 16	105 <sup>0</sup> 22	16 (1965 - 82)
Reed	190	05TA001	54 <sup>0</sup> 35	100029	20 (1963 - 82)
Schist	18	05KG004	54 <sup>0</sup> 45	101050	33 (1950-82)
Wintering	106	05TD002	55 <sup>0</sup> 19	97 <sup>0</sup> 41	33 (1040-92)
Wollaston <sup>f</sup>	2290	06DA003	58029	103017	31 (1052.02)
Non-shield lake	s:			100 17	51 (1952-82)
Amisk		05KG003	54039	102005	22 (1060 02)
Big Quill	255	05MA010	51047	104010	23 (1960-82)
Brightsand	32	05EG010	52020	100051	14 (1969-82)
Chitek	34	0600010	53 39	102044	15 (1966-82)
Churchill	544	06880012		107-44	19 (1964-82)
Clearwater <sup>9</sup>	59	0588000	55°51	108-29	28 (1955-82)
Cold	265	0600000	53-59	101-10	22 (1959-82)
Des Tles	305	OCAPU02	54~28	110010	24 (1955-82)
Doro	40	06AF009	54°26	109019	15 (1967-82)
	642	06AG003	54038	107 <sup>0</sup> 24	15 (196582)
Greig	12	06AF010	54 <sup>0</sup> 27	108 <sup>0</sup> 42	17 (1965-82)
La BICNE	234	07CA004	54 <sup>0</sup> 46	111 <sup>0</sup> 58	51 (1930-82)
La Ronge	1178	06CB001	55 <sup>0</sup> 06	105 <sup>0</sup> 18	35 (1930-67) <sup>h</sup>
					continued

				Statio	n
	Water				
	area		Lat	Long	
Lake	(km <sup>2</sup> )	Number	°N	ow	Years of data
Little Bear	15	05KF002	54 <sup>0</sup> 18	104 <sup>0</sup> 41	18 (1965-82)
Little Quill	112	05MA002	51 <sup>0</sup> 53	104 <sup>0</sup> 08	10 (191982)
Makwa	30	06AD014	54 <sup>0</sup> 05	109 <sup>0</sup> 12	17 (1963-82)
Red Deer	252	05LC003	52 <sup>0</sup> 54	101 <sup>0</sup> 28	19 (1963 - 82)
Redberry	64	05GD003	52 <sup>0</sup> 42	107 <sup>0</sup> 06	14 (1966-82)
Simonhouse	82	05TA002	54 <sup>0</sup> 32	101 <sup>0</sup> 08	19 (1963 - 82)
Swan	313	05LE007	52 <sup>0</sup> 32	100 <sup>0</sup> 52	(195282)
Turtle	64	05EG009	53 <sup>0</sup> 37	108 <sup>0</sup> 35	18 (1964 - 82)
Waskesiu	70	06CA002	53 <sup>0</sup> 55	106 <sup>0</sup> 05	24 (1954 - 79)
Waterhen	73	06AF007	54 <sup>0</sup> 28	108 <sup>0</sup> 31	17 (1965 - 82)
Winnipegosis	5150	05LD002	52 <sup>0</sup> 58	100 <sup>0</sup> 58	20 (1963-82)

Canada (1983)).

b " - " designates most years and " ... " sporadic years.

c Includes station 07MC002 data adjusted by -2.220 m.

d Regulated in 1968 (see Bennett 1970).

e Apparently regulated in 1976.

f Includes station 06DA001 data adjusted by +0.008 m.

g Includes station 05KK003 data with no adjustment required.

h Regulated in 1968.

	C X OTALINI 'SIAAAAA OT AAAAAA TA AAAAAA
Shield lake	:5
Athabasca	$Y = 208.524 + 1.464X + 0.384X^2  (n=17, R^2=0.98)$
Cree	$Y = 486.592 + 0.779X - 0.737X^2 + 0.428X^5 (n=15 m^2-n as)$
<b>Deschambau</b> l	$t Y = 324.469 + 1.728X - 1.445X^2 + 1.118X^9 (n=11 R^2=0.94)$
Footprint	$Y = 237.984 + 1.411X^2$ (n=14, $R^2$ =0.92)
Jan	Y = 28.705 + 0.729X + 2.761X <sup>8</sup> - 2.122X <sup>9</sup> (n=16 R <sup>2</sup> =0 ao)
Vemethen	$Y = 370.220 + 2.043X^2 - 2.309X^3 + 3.028X^8 - 2.311X^9 (n=16 P^2=0.00)$
leed	$Y = 278.656 + 1.116X - 0.744X^2 + 0.758X^9 (n=20 R^2=0.97)$
Schist	$Y = 291.649 + 0.475X - 0.145X^2 + 0.277X^6  (n=33)  R^2=0  a_0$
Vintering	$Y = 181.104 + 0.840X - 135.776X^{6} + 473.378X^{7} - 559.475X^{8} + 222.675Y^{9}$
	(n=33, R <sup>2</sup> =0.98)
lollaston	$Y = 27.835 + 1.224X - 0.923X^2 + 0.872X^9 (n=31, R^2=0.9R)$
on-shield 1	akes:
misk	$Y = 0.805 + 0.247X + 0.541X^2$ (n=23, $R^2 = 0.99$ )
ig Quill	$Y = 514.278 + 1.646X - 0.218X^9$ (n=14, $R^2 = 0.99$ )
rightsand	$Y = 663.014 + 0.502X - 2.937X^{6} + 3.146X^{9}$ (n=15 $R^{2} = 0.983$ )
hitek	$Y = 565.900 + 1.794X - 3.522X^2 + 2.501X^3$ (n=19. R <sup>2</sup> =0 98)
hurchill	$Y = 29.989 + 4.336X - 6.701X^{2} + 119.708X^{7} - 231.219X^{8} + 116.506X^{9}$ $(n=28, R^{2}=0.99)$
learwater	Y = 259.823 + 0.779X - 0.384X <sup>2</sup> + 0.093X <sup>8</sup> (n=22 b <sup>2</sup> -n ao)
bld	

Table F2. Predictive polynom:

les Iles	$Y = 26.185 + 0.831X - 0.542X^3 + 1.271X^9 (n=15, R^2=0.98)$
Jore	$Y = 27.879 + 2.303X - 2.448X^2 + 7.402X^8 - 5.916X^9 (n=15 R^2=0.97)$
reig	$Y = 475.542 + 0.324X + 0.110X^5$ (n=17, $R^2=0.95$ )
a Bíche	Y = 543.080 + 1.744X - 5.300X <sup>2</sup> + 9.588X <sup>3</sup> - 7.585X <sup>5</sup> + 3.077X <sup>8</sup> (n=51, R <sup>2</sup> =0.99)
a Ronge	Y = 362.366 + 4.840X - 6.183X <sup>2</sup> + 3.967X <sup>4</sup> - 0.413X <sup>9</sup> (n=35, R <sup>2</sup> =0 qq)
ittle Bear	$Y = 620.042 + 0.120X + 0.090X^3  (n=18, R^2=0.99)$
ittle Quill	$Y = S17.744 + 1.185X (n=10, R^2=0.97)$
akwa	$Y = 523.805 + 0.553X - 0.418X^4 + 0.642X^9  (n=17, H^2=0.98)$
ed Deer	$Y = 261.317 + 1.588X - 1.378X^3 + 1.816X^9  (n=19, R^2=0.99)$
edberry	$Y = 504.570 + 2.698X - 1.139X^2 + 0.496X^9$ (n=14, $R^2=0.98$ )
imonhouse	Y = 295.071 + 2.599X - 1.732X <sup>2</sup> + 0.774X <sup>9</sup> (n=19, R <sup>2</sup> =0.99)
wan	Y = 258.330 + 1.056X - 1.790X <sup>5</sup> + 2.402X <sup>9</sup> (n=22, R <sup>2</sup> =0.98)
<b>urtle</b>	Y = 654.206 + 0.930X (n=18, R <sup>2</sup> =0.96)
askesiu	$Y = 532.156 + 0.876X - 2.104X^2 + 1.762X^3 - 0.272X^9  (n=24, R^2=0.98)$
aterhen	$Y = 472.031 + 3.620X - 5.543X^2 + 4.291X^4$ (n=17, $R^2=0.98$ )
nnipegosis	$Y = 250.738 + 29.587X - 208.186X^2 + 803.055X^3 - 1760.390X^4$
	+ 2193.718X <sup>5</sup> - 1443.675X <sup>6</sup> + 388.674X <sup>7</sup> (n=20, R <sup>2</sup> =0.99)

Table F2. continued.

Table F3. Predicted low daily waterlevels in July or August for typical and extremely low years.

	Predicted waterlevel (m)					
Lake	Typical	Extreme	eme Variation			
Shield lakes:						
Athabasca	209.351	208.538	0.813			
Cree	486.811	486,600	0.211			
Deschambault	324.974	324.486	0.488			
Footprint	238.337	237,984	0.353			
Jan	29.076	28.713	0 363			
Nemeiben	370.450	370.220	0.230			
Reed	279.030	278.668	0.362			
Schist	291.855	291.654	0 201			
Wintering	181.351	181.112	0.239			
Wollaston	28.218	27.847	0.371			
Non-shield lakes:			0.3/1			
Amisk	1.064	0.808	0 256			
Big Quill	515.201	514.297	0.250			
Brightsand	663.260	663,020	0.240			
Chitek	566.229	565.918	0.240			
Churchill	30.741	30.031	0.710			
Clearwater	260.116	259.830	0.286			
Cold	535.038	534,778	0.260			
Des Iles	26.535	26,193	0.342			
Dore	28.436	27.902	0.542			
Greig	475.708	475.546	0.354			
La Biche	543.600	543.097	0.102			
La Ronge	363.488	362,413	1 075			
Little Bear	620.114	620.044	T.0/2			
Little Quill	518.336	517.756	0.070			
Makwa	524.057	523.811	0.246			

212

continued

Table F3. continued.

	Pred	Predicted waterlevel (m)					
Lake	Typical	Extreme	Variation				
Red Deer	261.942	261.333	0.609				
Redberry	505.635	504.597	1.038				
Simonhouse	295.939	295.097	0.842				
Swan	258.807	258.341	0.466				
Turtle	654.671	654.216	0.455				
Waskesiu	532.287	532.164	0.123				
Waterhen	472.723	472.067	0.656				
Winnipegosis	252.875	251.013	1.862				

Morphometry The 209 lakes showed greater relative volume changes in small lakes than in larger ones as a result of waterlevel variations. Regressions were similar for 0.5 m in shield and non-shield lakes, but significantly different at 2 m (Table F5). Note that equations under "added intercepts" are not statistically unique solutions and probably biased (Freund and Minton 1979, SAS 1982). 214

Table F4. Regressions of low waterlevel variations (m) on log water area  $(km^2)$ .

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	32	4.128	• • •	
One regression: Y=-0.137 + 0.285X (r <sup>2</sup> =0.31)	1	1.271	1.271	Fl=13.82 ***
Residual	31	2.857	0.092	
Added intercept: Shield Y=-0.4058 + 0.3203X	1	0.504	0.504	F2=6.42 **
Non-shield Y=-0.1318 + 0.32033 Residual	x 30	2.354	0.078	
Added coefficient: Shield Y=0.0344 + 0.1369X (r <sup>2</sup> =	1 =0.3	0.355 9)	0.355	F3=5.14 **
Non-shield Y=-0.4030 + 0.4487) Residual	( r 29	<sup>2</sup> =0.50) 1.999	0.069	

\*\* significant at 0.01<P<0.05 \*\*\* significant at P<0.01</pre>

Table F5. Regressions of relative volume above 2 m (%) on log water area  $(km^2)$ .

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	209	70510.40	• • •	
One regression: Y=37.629 - 7.659X (r <sup>2</sup> =0.23	l , n=:	16072.18 210)	16072.18	Fl=61.409***
Residual	208	54438.22	261.72	
Added intercept: Shield Y=36.946 - 7.887X (	1 r <sup>2</sup> =0.	222.53 32, n=124	222.53	F2=0.850 NS
Non-shield Y=39.105 - 7.88'	7X (r	<sup>2</sup> =0.09, n	i=86)	
Residual	207	54215.69	261.91	
Added coefficient: Shield Y=37.755 - 9.136X	1	846.94	846.94	F3=3.269*
Non-shield Y=35.894 - 5.252	2X			
Residual	206	53368.75	259.07	

NS not significant at P=0.10 \* significant at 0.05<P<0.10 \*\*\* significant at P<0.01

Waterlevel variations of 2 m affected the volume of shield lakes over 100 km<sup>2</sup> less than comparable non-shield lakes (Table F5). Larger non-shield lakes tended to fall near or above the upper 95 % prediction limits of the regression. Absolute volume below 2 m was greater in larger lakes than smaller, as expected. The regression of absolute volume below 2 m depth on water area was again significantly different for shield and non-shield lakes.

<u>Residual volumes</u> Residual volume increased with increasing water area in spite of greater waterlevel variation. Residual volumes predicted from expected waterlevel variations (Table F6) and corresponding water area (Table F7) showed statistical differences between shield and non-shield lakes.

The effect of waterlevel variation on volume of lakes, however, was negligible. Certainly no major reduction from typical water volumes found in lake surveys were predicted for the lowest waterlevels expected 1 in 100 years (see Tables F7 and F8). Table F6. Regressions of log residual volume (hm<sup>3</sup>) on predicted waterlevel variation (m).

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	208	345.88	• • •	
One regression:	l	230.32	230.32	Fl=412.55***
$Y=0.7333 + 4.7122X (r^2=0.66)$	, n=2	09)		
Residual	207	115.56	0.558	}
Added intercept:	1	0.12	0.120	F2=0.21 NS
Shield Y=0.7477 + 4.7437X				
Non-shield Y=0.6970 + 4.743	7X			
Residual	206	115.44	0.560	I
Added coefficient:	1	69.52	69.516	F3=310.34 **:
Shield ¥=0.0562 + 9.5562X ()	$r^{2}=0.9$	90. n=12	4)	
Non-shield Y=1.1076 + 3.2311	1X (r <sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup> =0.76.	-, n=85)	
Residual	205	45.92	0.224	

NS not significant at P=0.10 \*\*\* significant at P<0.01

Table F7. Regressions of log residual volume (hm<sup>3</sup>) on log water area (km<sup>2</sup>).

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	208	345.883	• • •	
One regression: $Y=0.6883 + 1.0976X (r^2=0.95)$	1 , n=2	330.040 209)	330.040	Fl=4286.2 ***
Residual	207	15.843	0.077	
Added intercept: Shield Y=0.7127 + 1.1058X	1	0.286	0.286	F2=3.76 *
Non-shield Y=0.6350 + 1.1058 Residual	8X 206	15.557	0.076	
Added coefficient: Shield Y=0.6961 + 1.1315X ()	$1 e^{2} = 0$ .	0.359 97, n=12	0.359 24)	F3=4.851 **
Non-shield Y=0.7013 + 1.0519 Residual	5X (r 205	<sup>2</sup> =0.92, 15.198	n=85) 0.074	

NS not significant at P=0.10 \*\* significant at 0.01<P<0.05 \*\*\* significant at P<0.01

Table F8. Regressions of log total water volume  $(hm^3)$  on log water area  $(km^2)$ .

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	208	350.359	• • •	
One regression:	1	335.223	335.223	F1=4586.8***
$Y=0.6924 + 1.1062X$ ( $r^2=0.9$	96, n=2	209)		
Residual	207	15.136	0.073	
Added intercept:	1	0.262	0.262	F2=3.63*
Shield Y=0.7158 + 1.1140X				
Non-shield Y=0.6414 + 1.11	L40X			
Residual	206	14.874	0.072	
Added coefficient:	l	0.278	0.278	F3=3.91**
Shield Y=0.7011 + 1.1366X	$(r^2=0.$	97, n=12	4)	
Non-shield Y=0.6997 + 1.06	62X (r	$2_{=0.92}$	, n=85)	
Residual	205	14.595	0.071	

\* significant at 0.05<P<0.10
\*\* significant at 0.01<P<0.05 \*\*\* significant at P<0.01</pre>

### DISCUSSION

#### RECENT CONDITIONS

<u>Waterlevels</u> The polynomial regressions used were preferable to other approaches to hydrological prediction. Pearson Type III curves are well established for prediction of water discharges as minimum values are bounded by zero flow (Hjelmfelt and Cassidy 1975). Waterlevels may resemble a Pearson Type IV curve (Elderton and Johnson 1969) but have not been modelled in this way.

The predictions of waterlevels in this study agree reasonably with the few available predictions by hydrologists for the same lakes. Retrospective studies by other agencies show variations for pre-regulated Lake Athabasca of 1.5 m (1 in 40 years) compared to 0.8 m from the present regressions, for Cree Lake of 0.5 m by prediction and 1.2 m by local residents (1 in 37 years) compared to 0.6 m from this study, and for pre-regulated Cumberland Lake of 2.9 m (1 in 49 years) (Bennett 1970, Canada 1970, 1977).

Lakes with long-term waterlevel data may or may not represent all lakes of similar size and location or allow direct comparisons between periods of drought and wet. Some lakes have been described as representative of the region hydrologically (e.g. Big Quill by Whiting 1972). Some were selected for monitoring under the International Hydrological Decade program and are assumed to be representative. Some

were studied during hydro-electric use (e.g. Lac Ile-a-la-Crosse and Churchill) or for hydro-electric potential (e.g. Cree Lake by Canada 1970). It is assumed that the monitored lakes are more useful socio-economically and possibly larger than others nearby, and may represent the shield and nonshield regions reasonably.

Individual lake waterlevels were not adjusted to regional trends, so that lakes monitored since 1930 may or may not be comparable to those monitored since only 1960. Twelve of the 33 lakes analysed had data for 20 or more years, but only 3 lakes had data prior to 1950 (Table F1). Predictions of components of the hydrologic cycle (or "water balance") are available for 1925 to 1980 for Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta (Environment Canada 1986). In particular, smoothed data on precipitation, runoff, evapotranspiration, and water storage are available for 10-day periods for 100 grids between 49-60°N and 92-120°W (Environment Canada 1986). Correlation of lake waterlevels with hydrologic components has been demonstrated (e.g. Laycock 1973). Trends in these indicators may allow better comparability between lakes with dissimilar periods-of-record of waterlevels.

Morphometry The 209 lakes showed the anticipated differences: a greater proportion of the lake volume above 0.5 and 2 m depth in smaller lakes, and above 2 m in nonshield lakes. Absolute volume below 2 m shows corresponding

trends: shield and non-shield lakes about 10 km<sup>2</sup> area are similar, but larger shield lakes have greater volume than non-shield lakes. The large variability in data, however, means that the relationships do not reliably diverge at common lake areas. This variability reflects differences in lake substrate or origin in some regions: many non-shield lakes near Cumberland Lake lie in glaciolacustrine sediments and are essentially cylindrical in cross-section, compared to others in river or former river valleys which are distinctly V-shaped.

<u>Residual volumes</u> The conclusion is that changes in summer lake volumes within the last 100 years have been generally small in the study area. The effects of climate on deepwater temperature conditions via changes in fetch and maximum depth (see Estimation of missing data) are assumed to be similar. Changes in volumes of suitable temperature-andoxygen, TDS, spawning habitat, and other factors influenced by climatic conditions cannot be assessed with available data.

Clearly several factors have weakened this analysis. The uncertain representation by lakes with long-term waterlevel data hinders the extrapolation of results to other lakes in the study area. The lack of morphometric data on many lakes which were monitored for waterlevel prevents direct estimates of volume changes. For example, greater fluctuations of

waterlevels due to high precipitation/evaporation potential and greater relative volume changes are expected in lakes with low volume to area ratios . The mathematical coalition of two data sets to assess the combined effects of waterlevel variation and morphometry may mask these inter-related factors. In addition, the non-linearities of some relationships (e.g. Figure 8 in text) and the lack of very shallow, small non-shield lakes may be relatively unimportant.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Bennett, R.M. 1970. Lake Athabasca water levels 1930-1970. Water Surv. Can., Inl. Waters Br., ii and 155 p.
- Canada. 1970. Appendix B Cree Lake diversion Cree Lake to Churchill River - Hydrology. Dep. Reg. Econ. Expan., Prairie Farm Rehab. Admin., Hydrol. Rep. No. 53.
- Canada. 1977. Report on Cumberland Lake water level control study - Appendix A: Hydrological studies. Dep. Reg. Econ. Expan., Prairie Farm Rehab. Admin., Hydrol. Rep. No. 88, v and 48 p.
- Elderton, W.P., and N.L. Johnson. 1969. Systems of frequency curves. Cambridge Univ. Press, viii and 219 p.
- Environment Canada. 1983. Surface water data Reference index - Canada 1983. Water Surv. Canada, xv and 386 p.
- Environment Canada. 1986. An applied climatology of drought in the prairie provinces. Atmos. Environ. Serv., Can. Climate Centre Rep. No. 86-4, viii and 197 p.
- Freund, R.J., and P.D. Minton. 1979. Regression methods: a tool for data analysis. Vol. 30 in Statistics: textbooks and monographs. Dekker Inc., xi and 261 p.
- Hjelmfelt, A.T., and J.J. Cassidy. 1975. Hydrology for engineers and planners. Iowa State Univ. Press, vii and 207 p.

Hocking, R.R. 1976. The analysis and selection of variables in linear regression. Biometrics 32:1-49.

- Laycock, A.H. 1973. Lake level fluctuation and climatic variations in central Alberta. p.83-98 in Reinelt, E.R., A.H. Laycock, and W.M. Schultz. (eds.). Proceedings of the symposium on the lakes of western Canada. Univ. Alberta Water Resourc. Centre, Publ. No. 2, xviii and 455 p.
- Meyer, S.L. 1975. Data analysis for scientists and engineers. Wiley and Sons Inc.
- SAS (ed.) 1982. SAS user's guide: statistics. SAS Inst. Inc., xiv and 584 p.
- Sokal, R.R., and F.J. Rohlf. 1969. Biometry The principles and practice of statistics in biological research. W.H. Freeman and Co., xxi and 776 p.
- Whiting, J.M. 1972. Big Quill Lake annual report 1971. Saskatchewan Res. Counc., Eng. Div., ARDA Prog. Rep. E72-3.

## Appendix G

## ESTIMATION OF MISSING DATA AND BIAS USING OTHER HABITAT VARIABLES

## INTRODUCTION

Some lakes in this study lack one or more variables which are available for most other lakes. The estimation of missing variables from correlated variables allows for a larger sample size. More importantly, it also reduces bias if smaller or non-lake-trout lakes are surveyed less frequently, yet differ in habitat traits (see text). Furthermore, criteria which predict lake trout presence or absence accurately can sometimes be estimated from more easily available variables.

### METHODS

General methods of all-subset and stepwise regression and associated tests are described in the text.

Three surficial geology indices and their logarithmic transformations were examined for potential contribution to predictions of ZMAX. Maps in Schreiner (1984) showed types
of materials (i.e. Rock, Morainal, GlacioFluvial, GlacioLacustrine, Eolian, Organic, Alluvial, and Lacustrine) and their relative proportions (i.e. >60 / <40 / <15 %). These were collated and condensed, if necessary, into three or fewer zones for each lake and assigned type-proportions:

A / B / C was assigned 70 / 25 / 5 %,

A / B / . was assigned 75  $\,$  / 25 / 0 %,

A / . / C was assigned 95 / 0 / 5 %,

A / . / . was assigned 100 / 0 / 0 %.

Each zone was weighted by its proportion of the applicable lake basin. Potential for greater depth for each type of material was arbitrarily set at: R=10, M=5, GF=2, GL or E=1, and O or A or L=0.

The first index (GEO1) was an average of type-potentials, weighted by type-proportions and zone-proportions. The second index (GEO2) was simply the weighted proportion of rock in the lake basin. The third index (GEO3) was the absolute area of rock available in the lake basin (i.e. GEO2 times the water area  $(km^2)$ ).

The Froud index (Orlob 1983) predicts stratification of lakes from water-exchange rates. This index is:

 $F = \frac{1}{d} \frac{Q}{V} (r_0 / g r)^{0.5}$ 

where 1, d, and V are the length (m), average depth (m), and volume (m<sup>3</sup>) of the lake, Q is the flow-through discharge  $(m^3.s^{-1})$ , g is the acceleration of gravity (9.8 m.s<sup>-2</sup>), and r<sub>0</sub> and r are the reference density and the density difference

of the water over depth d  $(g.cm^{-3})$ . Incipient stratification of 10<sup>o</sup>C surface and 4<sup>o</sup>C bottom or reference water was assumed for June conditions, implying  $r_0 = 1$  and r = 0.0003. The modified equation was then:

$$F = \frac{(1000*FETCH)(June discharge)}{(ZBAR)(1000000*VOLUME)} (d / 0.00294)^{0.5}$$

Average June discharges were available for lakes with streamflow stations (Environment Canada 1983), lakes with EIA studies, and connected lakes for single or three-year periods.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

About 67 % of the pairs of morphometric variables were correlated significantly (Table Gl). The highest correlations were between fetch and water area  $(r^2=0.96)$ , volume and area  $(r^2=0.92)$ , volume and fetch  $(r^2=0.90)$ , and maximum and mean depths  $(r^2=0.86)$ . The ratio of actual to expected log SHODEV (i.e. RLOGSHOD) was uncorrelated in 12 of 15 comparisons, which made it noteworthy in this highly collinear set of variables.

TDS from SPCON Correlation of TDS with SPCON was well defined. However, initial regressions showed higher TDS than predicted at SPCON below 20 uS in many shield lakes from two

Table G1. Pairwise Pearson correlations (r) of habitat variables and numbers of lakes. Statistical significance is P40.01 unless indicated otherwise.

-----

-0.29 -0.08 -0.07 194NS 0.56 TMAXB TIST6U 0.48 0.57 0.50 0.48 0.44 194 228 227 194 231 231 201 -0.01 237NS -0.18 0.01 204NS -0.60 -0.59 204NS 204NS -0.05 -0.87 -0.15 0.03 227 237 226 185 -0.16 266 THAXS -0.19 -0.22 266 -0.14 217\*\* -0.15 240\*\* -0.08 208NS -0.25 -0.26 0.19 217 241 193 STRAFN<sup>a</sup> -0.04 225NS 211\*\* -0.05 199NS -0.07 199NS 196NS 0.16 0.56 0.62 0.07 0.83 0.06 225 210 170 ONINB 0.17 218\*\* 0.08 212NS -0.12 0.18 187\*\* 0.11 195NS -0.15 212## -0.03 187NS -0.20 218\* 0.18 179 RLOGSHOD -0.01 219NS -0.01 216NS 0.05 219NS -0.02 215NS -0.02 219NS 162NS -0.00 219# -0.01 0.13 0.27 219 VOLGMG -0.23 0.66 0.76 0.71 0.54 0.55 0.50 0.23 204 172 178 0.33 204 204 204 172 181 VOLT1506 156NS -0.12 0.31 183 0.33 0.26 0.20 0.31 0.34 0.26 183 183 183 156 161 181 ÷ VOLT15T6 194\*\* 166\*\* -0.03 166NS 0.18 0.36 0.67 0.68 0.16 0.22 194 194 194 170 : FETDEV SHODEV -0.15 219\*\* 0.49 0.64 0.32 -0.12 0.61 231 0.64 219 236 237 230 ; -0.18 -0.18 -0.16 0.06 249NS 229## 230 249 249 : FETCH Log<sub>10</sub> of 0.95 0.59 0.43 0.98 0.51 249 230 250 229 ÷ 0.93 ZBAR 0.66 274 274 274 ÷ 0.51 0.66 275 ZMAX 312 : WAREA VOLUME 0.96 275 : ; Log<sub>10</sub> of: WAREA VOLT15T6 VOLT1506 VOLUME SHODEV FETDEV FETCH ZBAR ZMAX

228

18 3NS

173\*\*

183

159NS

171\*\*

154NS

Table Gl.	continued.	
E.	ble Gl. (	
	Ē	

....

. . ..

·		Log	0 of											
	WAREA VOLUME	Z XANZ	BAR FE	TCH	FETDEV SHODEV	VOLT15T6	VOLT1506	VOLENG	REGGHOD		croand <sup>8</sup>	22.04		
											NEWTO	THUND	1 TAAB	091611
RLOGSHOD														
									:	-0.06	0.04	0.32	0.06	0.04
										183NS	181NS	193	189NS	189NS
OMINB														
										÷	-0.47	-0.32	0.30	-0.08
											189	218	213	214NS
STRAFN														
											:	-0.02	-0.87	-0.11
												215NS	206	197NS
THAXS														
												÷	0.22	0.02
													239	230NS
THAXB														
													÷	0.17
														219**

a Categorical variables are more suited to non-parametric correlation, rather than Pearson's as shown. NS not significant at P > 0.10 \* significant at 0.05 < P < 0.10 \*\* significant at P > 0.10 \* 0.01 < P < 0.05

studies (see Figure 10 in text). Provincial survey procedures included filtering water samples with plankton netting of 80-um mesh, conductivity readings in the field, and TDS analysis in the lab (Atton and Johnson 1970). These problem samples were not filtered or otherwise treated in the field, but were filtered during lab analysis (Beak 1979 Volume 1 p.5-60 and Volume 2 p.5A-13). Field readings of specific conductivity were assumed to be accurate, but decomposition of non-ionic suspended solids may have contributed to anomalously high dissolved solids during later analysis (W.K. Liaw, Fisheries Branch, pers. comm.). When these two studies were excluded, regressions became more linear and more similar in slope to non-shield lakes. Separate regressions were indicated for shield and non-shield lakes (Table G2).

SHODEV and RLOGSHOD In this study, SHODEV was a potential indicator of depth, wind-protection, and other habitat conditions. Separate regressions of log SHODEV on log WAREA were indicated for shield and non-shield lakes (Table G3). Non-shield lakes had greater residuals at larger log WAREA, suggesting greater variability in lake outline.

Table G2. Regressions of log TDS (mg.L<sup>-1</sup>) on log SPCON (uS) over the range 20 to 32,000 uS.

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	185	35.217	• • •	
One regression: Y=0.142 + 0.880 X (R <sup>2</sup> =0.95,n=	1 =186)	33.418	33.418	Fl=3418 ***
Residual	184	1.799	0.010	
Separate regressions: Shield $Y=0.167 + 0.878 \times (R^2 =$	2 =0.79,	0.172 n=77)	0.086	F3=9.56 ***
Non-shield Y=-0.087 + 0.956 X	()R <sup>2</sup> =	0.96,n=1	.09)	
Residual	182	1.627	0.009	

\*\*\* significant at P<0.01

Deviation of actual SHODEV of any lake from that predicted by water area (Koshinsky 1970) was represented in this study by the ratio of actual log SHODEV to predicted log SHODEV (based on shield and non-shield regressions in Table G3). The use of a ratio reduced the correlation with log SHODEV (r=0.27, see Table G1) from that observed using a difference between actual and predicted (r=0.57), but clearly did not obviate the confounding effect of lake area. This ratio was later assessed as a predictor of maximum and mean depth, volume, and maximum surface temperatures. 232

Table G3. Regressions of log SHODEV on log WAREA (km<sup>2</sup>).

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	236	23.819	• • •	
One regression: Y=0.318 + 0.184 X (R <sup>2</sup> =0.40,n=	1 =237)	9.632	9.632	Fl=160 ***
Residual	235	14.187	0.060	
Separate regressions: Shield Y=0.384 + 0.250 X (R <sup>2</sup> =	2 •0.73,	6.175 n=152)	3.088	F3=91 ***
Non-shield Y=0.188 + 0.130 X Residual	(R <sup>2</sup> =0 233	0.25,n=8 8.012	5) 0.034	

\*\*\* significant at P<0.01

Elongation of lakes was thought to be more important than shoreline sinuosity in causing high SHODEV values (Koshinsky 1970, Hutchinson 1957). Elongation was defined as the ratio of actual FETCH to the fetch of a circle of the same area (called FETDEV, cf. shoreline development). The term "sinuous" is subjective (except implicitly in the definition of SHODEV) and cannot be assessed directly. However, elongation was relatively minor compared to WAREA and FETCH, and was not selected in stepwise regressions (Table G4). Shield lakes showed a statistically significant regression, but the correlation was unimpressive for practical purposes; non-shield lakes showed non-significant correlation. Regressions of log SHODEV on log WAREA  $(km^2)$ , log FETCH (km), and log FETDEV. Table 64.

Number of

variables Equations (multiple R<sup>2</sup>, Cp-reliability)a

<u>All lakes (n=219):</u>

- 1 Y=0.325 + 0.190 log WAREA (R<sup>2</sup>=0.44 M)
- Y=0.353 + 0.243 log WAREA 0.109 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.44 M)

N

3b Y=0.240 + 0.186 log WAREA + 0.002 ORINW (R<sup>2</sup>=0.46 M)

Shield lakes (n=144):

- 1 Y=0.387 + 0.250 log WAREA (R<sup>2</sup>=0.74 M) 2 Y=0.429 + 0.329 log WAREA - 0.64 /---
- Y=0.429 + 0.329 log WAREA 0.164 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.74 M)

Non-shield lakes (n=75):

~ ~

- Y=0.105 + 0.296 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.32 U)
- Y=0.036 + 0.141 log WAREA 0.574 log FETCH ( $R^2=0.33$  M)

Reliability of equations according to Cp-statistics is: E is suitable for extrapolation, P ಸ

Variable ORINW (<sup>O</sup> from NW orientation) was available for selection and n differed slightly. is suitable for prediction. M is marginally acceptable for prediction, and U is unacceptable. Q

ZMAX and ZBAR Regressions of log ZMAX on subsets of morphometric variables showed that log WAREA and log FETCH were important, explaining 37 % of total variation (Table G5). Minor increases in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  were possible using orientation as lakes oriented more northeasterly have greater maximum depth. Separate regressions explained about 50 and 20 % of variation in shield and non-shield lakes, respectively.

Surficial geology indices were determined for about 135 shield lakes. Index GEOl was bi-modally non-normally distributed, and ranged from 0.6 to 9.8 on the theoretical 0 to 10 range. GEO2 was positively skewed (median 0.005) and ranged from 0 to 0.95 on the theoretical 0 to 1 range. GEO3 was positively skewed (median 0.08) and ranged from 0 to 187  $km^2$ , in a set in which the largest lake was 1156  $km^2$ . LogGEO2 and logGEO3 were bi-modal as a result of adding the small constant  $10^{-3}$  to zero data.

The three indices rated different lakes as very high or very low in depth potential (Table G6). GEO1 and GEO2 rated some of the same lakes very highly since both indices are weighted towards rock materials. GEO2 and GEO3 rated lakes without rock as very low on proportional and areal bases.

Table G5. 1	Regressions of log ZMAX (ш) on other morphometric variables.
Lake set	Equations (multiple R2, n, Cp-reliability)
All lakes (r	<u>1=219) :</u>
1	Y=1.034 + 0.213 log WAREA (R2=0.35 U)
2	Y=1.172 + 0.471 log WAREA - 0.534 log FETCH (R2=0.37 M)
в	Y=1.151 + 0.490 log WAREA - 0.572 log FETCH + 0.032 BLOGSHOD (R2≞0 37 M)
4P	Y=1.017 + 0.452 log WAREA - 0.515 log FETCH + 0.003 ORINW (R2=0.40 M)
Shield lakes	. (D=144):
1	Y=1.065 + 0.252 log WAREA (R2=0.47 U)
23	Y=1.236 + 0.576 log WAREA - 0.674 log FETCH (R2≡0 50 M)
n	Y=1.186 + 0.595 log WAREA - 0.704 log FETCH + 0.052 BLOGSHOD (R2=0 50 M)
4Þ	Y=1.119 + 0.594 log WAREA - 0.743 log FEICH + 0.003 ORINW (R2=0.53 M)
√on-shield l	<u>akes (n=75);</u>
Ħ	Y=0.895 + 0.333 log FETCH (R2=0.19 P)
1b	Y=0.980 + 0.167 log WAREA (R2=0.20 P)
8	Y=0.959 + 0.130 log WAREA + 0.076 log FETCH (R2=0.20 M)
8	Y=0.969 + 0.161 log WAREA + 0.020 RLOGSHOD (R2=0.20 P)
2b	Y=0.825 + 0.348 log FETCH + 0.001 ORINW (R2=0.22 P)
Log WAREA	$(km^2)$ , log FETCH, log FEIDEV, ratio of log SHODEV, and ORINW ( <sup>o</sup> from NW

orientation) were available. ದ

b Reliability according to Cp is: E is suitable for extrapolation, P is suitable for prediction, M is marginally acceptable for prediction, and U is unacceptable. c Variable ORINW was available for selection and n differed slightly.

Table G6. Lakes which are rated very high and very low by three surficial geological indices of depth.

		Index	
Ranking	GEO1	GEO2	GEO3
Highest	Milliken	Milliken	Deschambault
2nd highest	Beaverlodge	Fontaine	Jan
3rd highest	Tyrrell	Beaverlodge	Nemeiben
4th highest	Fontaine	Island	Black
5th highest	Trout	Snake	Pelican
5th lowest	Costigan	Riou <sup>ab</sup>	Riou <sup>b</sup>
4th lowest	Broach	Drope <sup>b</sup>	Drope <sup>b</sup>
3rd lowest	Mid	Henday <sup>b</sup>	Kewen <sup>b</sup>
2nd lowest	Kewen	Kewen <sup>b</sup>	Martin <sup>b</sup>
Lowest	Germaine	Gerald <sup>b</sup>	Russell <sup>b</sup>

a Vertical symbols group lakes with the same index value.b All of these lakes lack rock material.

In all-subset regressions, none of the indices improved predictions of log ZMAX notably. In two trials, no index added significantly to regressions based on other morphometry (Table G7). GEO2 was the simplest index and was preferred marginally over the other indices. GEO1, which weighted potential according to both type and prevalence of materials, was the most general index. Therefore, it was most Table G7. Regressions of log ZMAX on three surficial geological indices and other morphometric variables.

Lak	e set		Equations (multiple R <sup>2</sup> , n, Cp-reliability)
Shie	eld la	akes	<u>:</u>
log	ZMAX	=	1.293 + 0.649 log WAREA - 0.850 log FETCH
			$(R^2=0.48, n=111, M)^a$
log	ZMAX	=	1.310 + 0.658 log WAREA - 0.851 log FETCH -
			0.115 GEO2 (R <sup>2</sup> =0.48, n=111, M) <sup>a</sup>
log	ZMAX	=	$1.071 + 0.242 \log WAREA (R^2=0.43, n=111, M)^{b}$
log	ZMAX	=	1.088 + 0.250 log WAREA - 0.113 GEO2
			$(R^2=0.43, n=111, M)^b$

Available variables included GEO1, GEO2, GEO3, log GEO2, log GEO3, log WAREA, log FETCH, RLOGSHOD, and ORINW.
Available variables included GEO1, GEO2, GEO3, log GEO2, log GEO3, log WAREA, log FETCH, log FETDEV, and ORIFET.

susceptible to mis-assignment of potential to various types: rock may not be 10 in relation to moraine at 5 and lacustrine material at 0. The term "rock" assimilates Precambrian igneous material with pronounced "topographic trends" and late Precambrian sediment on the "relatively flat lying" Athabasca basin (Schreiner 1984 p.6). Ground moraine is composed of (1) sandy till in the Precambrian region, which contains "an abundance of large, angular ... boulders which commonly dominate the deposit" and (2) very sandy till in the Athabasca basin, which "commonly contains subangular to

(7)/N

subrounded boulders of varying sizes" (Schreiner 1984 p.30). Yet the coarsest glaciofluvial material generally comprises cobbles and pebbles, so that the ordination of other types appears correct.

Mean depth (ZBAR) was less predictable than maximum depth. Regressions showed that log WAREA was most important, followed by log FETCH in shield lakes and log FETDEV in nonshield lakes (Table G8). Minor improvements in R<sup>2</sup> due to orientation of lakes were observed again. Liaw and Atton (1981) reported 33 % correlation for ZBAR and WAREA in Saskatchewan lakes.

STRAFN and T15T6U The degree of stratification (STRAFN) was simplified to "no" (none or weak) or "yes" (moderate, strong, very strong) for this analysis. The boundary condition for stratification according to Gorham (1980 cited in Cruikshank 1984):

log ZMAX (m)  $\geq 0.60 + 0.25$  (2 + log WAREA) (km<sup>2</sup>) correctly classified 77 % of 225 lakes (i.e. 68 % of 125 shield lakes and 88 % of non-shield lakes). This improved to 82 % when all lakes with log ZMAX over 26 m were assumed to stratify. An alternate boundary condition using FETCH was derived in the present study:

log ZMAX (m)  $\geq$  0.78 + 0.42 log FETCH (km) and correctly classified 82 % of 199 lakes (i.e. 82 % of 119 shield lakes and 84 % of 80 non-shield lakes).



Fetch has been measured in several different ways (Arai 1981, Patalas 1984), the best of which may be "effective fetch" or a weighted mean of 15 individual lines upwind from any given point (Smith and Sinclair 1972). This definition, however, characterises a single point for sedimentation and other site-specific purposes, rather than the entire lake as required for vertical temperature profiling. Fetch in the present study is essentially "axial length", which overestimates the effects of wind in long narrow lakes (Smith 1979).

The Froud index was available for 46 lakes and correctly predicted non-stratification for lakes with F > 0.03. This index compares the inertial force of moving surface water in an impoundment or lake to the stability induced by density differences between the surface and bottom layers in the waterbody. The present criterion is different than recommended: F for non-stratified lakes > 0.1 and F for stratified lakes << 0.32 (Orlob 1983).

The present modification simplifies several factors: (1) Fetch was used for length since no other datum was easily available, but "length along flow-through" is intended; (2) Discharges were based on June data, although Orlob (1983) did not specify monthly or annual discharges; (3) The assumption of  $10^{\circ}$ C surface and  $4^{\circ}$ C bottom water seemed reasonable for early summer, and r varies little within feasible limits for this region (Wetzel 1983, CRC 1968).

Although maximum depth was itself predictable from water area, fetch, and other morphometric variables, attempts to use estimated depth in a boundary condition were unsuccessful. The individuality of lakes was lost in the estimation of ZMAX by linear regressions, so that stratified and non-stratified lakes intermingled in plots. Similarly, pairs of variables (e.g. log FETCH and log WAREA, log FETCH and ORINW, and RLOGSHOD and log WAREA) showed no delineation of stratification.

Regressions of log T15T6U on subsets of variables showed that log WAREA and log FETCH were important, explaining about 47 % of total variation (Table G9). TMAXS was a relatively unimportant variable when stratified and non-stratified lakes were combined in this regional study.

In 86 stratified lakes, log WAREA and log FETCH explained 74 % of variation (Table G9). Other studies on stratified lakes have explained 66 to 72 % (Shuter et al. 1983), 85 % (Patalas 1984), and 36 to 79 % (Cruikshank 1984) of thermocline or epilimnion depth using area, fetch, or other morphometry. The maximum depth of 15°C behaves similarly to the thermocline, and is apparently also dependent on winddriven mixing. The NW-component of fetch was necessary for predictive purposes, presumably due to wind-mixing. Log WAREA and TMAXS explained 77 % of variation. Furthermore, use of TMAXS produced equations which were suitable for prediction according to the Cp-statistic (Hocking 1976).

Table ( <sup>o</sup> C), (NW-co	G9. Regressions of log T15T6U (maximum depth of 15 <sup>o</sup> C, m) on log WAREA (km <sup>2</sup> ), TMAXS log FETCH, log FETDEV, ratio of log SHODEV, ORINW ( <sup>o</sup> from NW orientation), and ORIFET mponent of log fetch, km) for lakes with TMAXS above 15 <sup>o</sup> C.
Number	of
variab	les Equations (multiple $\mathbb{R}^2$ , Cp-reliability)
ALL LA	Kes (n=171):
7	Y=0.787 + 0.186 log WAREA (R <sup>2</sup> =0.44 M)
\$	Y=0.925 + 0.418 log WAREA - 0.491 log FETCH (R <sup>2</sup> =0.47 P)
ო	Y=0.927 + 0.421 log WAREA + 0.508 log FEICH + 0.021 ORIFET (R <sup>2</sup> =0 47 P)
ო	Y=0.909 + 0.421 log WAREA + 0.496 log FETCH + 0.016 RLOGSHOD (R <sup>2</sup> =0.47 b)
4	Y=0.841 + 0.297 log FETCH - 0.848 log FETDEV + 0.001 ORINW + 0.024 ORIGEN (22-0.22)
Stratif	1ed lakes (n=96):
1b	Y=0.809 + 0.179 log WAREA (R <sup>2</sup> =0.74 M)
2b	Y=0.643 + 0.239 log WAREA - 0.126 log FEICH (R <sup>2</sup> =0.74 m)
<b>∾</b>	$Y=1.168 + 0.168$ log WAREA - 0.017 TMAXS ( $R^2=0.77$ M)
e	Y=1.224 + 0.169 log WAREA - 0.018 TMAXS - 0.001 ORINW (R <sup>2</sup> =0.77 M)
ო	Y=1.191 + 0.153 log WAREA - 0.018 TMAXS - 0.066 ORIFET (R <sup>2</sup> =0 77 M)
4	Y=1.223 + 0.220 log WAREA - 0.018 TMAXS - 0.147 log FETCH + 0.011 OPTEFT (P <sup>2</sup> -0.76 b)
4	Y=1.200 - 0.018 TMAXS + 0.293 log FETCH - 0.439 log FETTNEV + 0.081 ODIEET (5 <sup>2</sup> -0.70 r)
<u>Nen-str</u>	atified lakes (n=74);
2	Y=1.024 + 0.709 log WAREA - 1.005 log FETCH (R <sup>2</sup> =0.49 M)
ო	Y=1.023 + 0.719 log WAREA - 0.899 log FETCH - 0.191 ORIFFET (P <sup>2</sup> =n 50 M)
ю	Y=0.921 + 0.732 log WAREA - 1.037 log FETCH + 0.100 RIACHADD (P <sup>2</sup> -A 51 M)
4	Y=0.925 + 0.740 log WAREA - 0.937 log FETCH + 0.095 RLOGSHOD - 0.178 ORIFET (R <sup>2</sup> =0.52P)
a Reli suitable b Varie	ability of equations according to Cp are: E is suitable for extrapolation, P is e for prediction, M is marginally acceptable for prediction, and U is unacceptable. able TMAXS was not available for selection and n differed slightly
	• <b>h</b> ( <b>a</b> ) • <b>b</b> ( <b>a</b> ) • <b>b</b> ( <b>b</b> ) • <b>b</b> ( <b>a</b> ) • <b>b</b> ( <b>b</b> ( <b>b</b> ) • <b>b</b> ( <b></b>

Arai (1981) and Patalas (1984) noted that the effect of higher surface temperatures was to increase stability of the metalimnion and reduce the mixing depth. Shield and nonshield lakes have statistically different regressions on log WAREA and TMAXS (Table G10), but the reason was not evident.

<u>VOLT15T6</u> Attempts to estimate VOLT15T6 were complex. Six northern lakes were entirely below 15°C, ranging from Midwest at 4 km<sup>2</sup> to Wollaston at 2062 km<sup>2</sup>. These lakes were near others which reached 15.8 to 21.0°C surface temperatures and no explanation for these lower temperatures was obvious (Table G11). Deletion of lakes with TMAXS below 15°C was only partially useful. Secondly, two distinct classes of lakes occurred: those with some predictable VOLT15T6 and those with none. It appeared that stratification caused nonlinear behaviour of the depth of 15°C. Stratification forces a thermocline at least 2 m but seldom more than 20 m deep regardless of lake size (Patalas 1984).

Table G10. Regressions of log T15T6U (m) on log WAREA ( $km^2$ ) and TMAXS (<sup>O</sup>C) in stratified lakes.

Source and regressions	df	SS	MS	F-statistic
Total	90	4.398	• • •	
One regression:	2	3.372	1.686	Fl=140.5 ***
Y=1.171 + 0.169 logWAREA Residual	- 0.017 88	TMAXS (R 1.026	<sup>2</sup> =0.77, 0.012	n=91)
Separate regressions:	3	0 117	0 030	
Shield Y=1.126 + 0.167 log	gWAREA -	0.016 T	MAXS (R <sup>2</sup>	$2^{2}=0.76$ , n=65)
Non-shield Y=1.268+0.136 ] Residual	LogWAREA 85	-0.017 T	MAXS (R <sup>2</sup>	<sup>2</sup> =0.76,n=26)
	00	0.909	0.011	

\*\* significant at 0.01<P<0.05 \*\*\* significant at P<0.01

Table Gll. Lakes with TMAXS of 15<sup>0</sup>C or lower.

Lake	TMAXS	WAREA (km <sup>2</sup> )	FETCH (km)	ZMAX (m)	
Wollaston	14.3	2062		97	
Upper Foster	14.0	102	• • •	24	
Fontaine	14.3	67	• • •	72	
Douglas	14.4a	36	1	11	
Karl Ernst	15.0a	10	0.5	15	
Midwest	13.0b	4	• • •	6	

a Another ten lakes in the Key Lake area had temperatures between 15.8 and 19.0°C.

b Another seven lakes in the Midwest Lake area were between 16.0 and  $21.0^{\circ}$ C.

Initial regressions of log VOLT15T6 on morphometry and climate did not reveal strong correlations. The best equations explained about 37 % of variation in 87 stratified lakes and only 18 % in 59 non-stratified lakes (Table Gl2). Similarly, regressions explained only 15 % of variation in 96 lakes predicted to stratify by the fetch-boundary condition (see STRAFN), and 54 % in 50 lakes predicted not to stratify. Known and predicted stratification produced generally similar equations, which suggested common mechanisms. However, the low correlations did not allow useful predictions of VOLT15T6.

Regressions of log VOLT15T6  $(hm^3)^a$  on log WAREA  $(km^2)$ , log FETCH, log FETDEV, ratio of log SHODEV, ORIFET (NW component of log fetch, km), and TMAXS (<sup>O</sup>C). Table G12.

Number of

variables Equations (multiple R<sup>2</sup>, Cp-reliability)

Stratified lakes (n=87). Y=-0.111 + 0.956 log WAREA ( $R^2$ =0.29 M)<sup>C</sup> Y=-0.657 + 2.024 log FETCH ( $R^2$ =0.30 M)<sup>C</sup> Y=-0.605 - 0.290 log WAREA + 2.612 log FETCH ( $R^2$ =0.31 M)<sup>C</sup> Y=3.545 - 0.935 log WAREA + 3.641 log FETCH - 0.219 TMAXS ( $R^2$ =0.37 P) Mon-stratified lakes (n=59): Y=-5.926 + 1.385 log FETCH - 1.631 ORIFET ( $R^2$ =0.13 M)<sup>C</sup> Y=-5.926 + 1.385 log FETCH - 1.631 ORIFET ( $R^2$ =0.13 M)<sup>C</sup> Y=-5.411 + 0.601 log WAREA - 0.132 RLOGSHOD - 1.805 ORIFET ( $R^2$ =0.14 P)<sup>C</sup> Y=-2.414 + 0.605 log WAREA - 1.812 ORIFET - 0.148 TMAXS ( $R^2$ =0.18 P)

<u>Predicted stratification (n=96):</u>

Y=-2.288 + 2.436 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.11 P)<sup>c</sup> Y=-1.424 + 2.333 log FETCH - 0.766 RLOGSHOD (R<sup>2</sup>=0.12 P)<sup>c</sup> Y=3.456 + 2.066 log FETCH - 0.268 TMAXS (R<sup>2</sup>=0.15 P) Y=3.469 - 0.590 log WAREA + 3.214 log FETCH - 0.282 TMAXS (R<sup>2</sup>=0.15 P) continued

•
τ
ō
Ĵ
ĉ
- 8
نذ
Ċ.
ភ
~
04
C)
۵
A.
ai.

Number of

variables Equations (multiple R<sup>2</sup>, Cp-reliability)

<u> Predicted non-stratification (n≂50);</u>

Y=-7.525 + 7.403 log FETCH - 6.711 ORIFET (R<sup>2</sup>=0.53 P)<sup>C</sup> Y=-7.525 + 7.403 log FETCH - 6.711 ORIFET (R<sup>2</sup>=0.53 P) Y=-5.985 + 3.339 log WAREA + 0.656 RLOGSHOD - 6.529 ORIFET (R<sup>2</sup>=0.53 P)<sup>C</sup> Y=-3.706 + 7.177 log FETCH - 6.614 ORIFET - 0.178 TMAXS (R<sup>2</sup>=0.54 P)

## <u>Lakes with non-zero VOLTI5T6 (n=88);</u>

log VOLTI5T6 = -0.858 + 1.027 log WAREA + 1.480 log SECCHI + 0.291 log ORIFET (R<sup>2</sup>=0.88 M)<sup>C</sup> log VOLT15T6 = 1.392 + 1.114 log WAREA - 0.264 RLOGSHOD -0.050 TMAXS (R<sup>2</sup>=0.86 M) log VOLTIST6 = -0.799 + 1.097 log WAREA + 1.428 log SECCHI ( $R^2=0.88$  M)<sup>c</sup> log VOLT15T6 = -0.008 + 1.080 log WAREA + 0.188 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.84 U)<sup>c</sup>

Non-riverine lakes with non-zero VOLT15T6 (n=75).

log VOLT15T6 = -0.288 + 1.193 log WAREA + 0.888 log SECCH1 -0.154 RLOGSHOD (R<sup>2</sup>=0.91 M)<sup>C</sup> log VOLTI5T6 = 1.113 + 0.840 log WAREA + 0.741 log FETCH - 0.058 TMAXS (R<sup>2</sup>=0.91 M) log VOLTIST6 = -0.025 + 1.070 log WAREA + 0.397 log FETCH (R<sup>2</sup>=0.90 U)<sup>C</sup>

a The small constant 10<sup>-6</sup> was added before log transformation.

suitable for prediction, M is marginally acceptable for prediction, and U is unacceptable. Reliability of equations according to Cp are: E is suitable for extrapolation, P is മ

Variable TMAXS was not available for selection and n may have differed slightly. υ

Further analyses showed that lakes which were assumed to have non-zero VOLT15T6 were well predicted at 84 to 88 % of variation (Table G13). If only non-riverine lakes were considered, this improved further.

<u>TMAXS</u> The effect of TMAXS on maximum depth of 15°C has been shown, but data are frequently not available. A sinusoidal trend of seasonal surface temperature has been observed (Rawson 1936, Shuter et al. 1983). Freeze-up and break-up of lakes lag seasonal air temperatures, and summer water temperatures approach mean annual air temperatures (Ragotzkie 1978, Schindler 1971, Shuter et al. 1983). Mean air temperature (Shuter et al. 1983) was represented by the variable NORD (see Appendix B) or its square, NORD2. The correlation of NORD with temperature was reasonable for exploratory purposes (Figure G1).

In lakes of known stratification status, about 29 % of variation in TMAXS was explained (Table G13). RLOGSHOD and either NORD or NORD<sup>2</sup> were common in useful equations: higher TMAXS was predicted for more sinuous shorelines and higher air temperatures, respectively. In stratified lakes, log WAREA and ORINW were added: higher TMAXS was predicted for smaller lakes and those oriented more northwesterly. In nonstratified lakes, ORINW was added: higher TMAXS was predicted for northeasterly orientations (Table G13). Similar

Figure Gl. Relationship between mean annual air temperature (solid lines) and NORD (hatched lines, see Appendix B). MEAN ANNUAL AIR TEMPERATURE (°C)





equations resulted when these 164 lakes were classed as stratified or non-stratified by area or fetch boundary conditions (see STRAFN above).

The prediction of TMAXS using log ZBAR, log T15T6U, NORD, and NORD<sup>2</sup> was much less successful than the 80 to 90 % reported by Shuter et al. (1983). For 92 stratified lakes, up to 41 % of variation was explained, but for 77 nonstratified lakes only 15 %, and the use of additional variables log WAREA and/or log FETCH was necessary. Shuter et al. (1983) used the thermocline depth and mean depth to indicate the heat storage volume of stratified and nonstratified lakes, respectively. However, the best equations including only one measure of depth were always considerably less useful in this study.

VOLT1506 The Secchi depth criterion of 4 m predicted suitable conditions with 84 % accuracy in 86 shield lakes. Transparency was a good predictor of the existence of suitable temperature and oxygen (VOLT1506), but the magnitude of VOLT1506 was not assessed.

- Arai, T. 1981. Climate and geomorphological influences on lake temperature. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 21:130-134.
- Beak (Beak Consultants Limited). 1979. Key Lake Mining Corporation - Key Lake project. 3 vols: Environmental impact statement, Appendix I - VI, and Appendix VII - XI, unpag.
- CRC. 1968. Handbook of chemistry and physics. Chemical Rubber Co., xxvii and unpag.
- Cruikshank, D.R. 1984. The relationship of summer thermocline depth to several physical characteristics of lakes. Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 1248, iv and 33 p.
- Environment Canada. 1983. Surface water data Reference index - Canada 1983. Water Surv. Can., xv and 386 p.
- Hocking, R.R. 1976. The analysis and selection of variables in linear regression. Biometrics 32:1-49.
- Hutchinson, G.E. 1957. A treatise on limnology. I. Geography, physics, and chemistry. Wiley and Sons Inc., 1015 p.
- Koshinsky, G.D. 1970. The morphometry of shield lakes in Saskatchewan. Limnol. Oceanogr. 15:695-701.
- Liaw, W.K., and F.M. Atton. 1981. Sensitivity to acid of fishing waters in northern Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Dep. Tourism Renew. Resourc., Fish. Tech. Rep. 81-1, 65 p.
- Orlob, G.T. 1983. One-dimensional models for simulation of water quality in lakes and reservoirs. p.227-273 in Orlob, G.T. (ed.). Mathematical modeling of water quality: streams, lakes, and reservoirs. Vol. 12 in Internat. Ser. Appl. Systems Analysis. Wiley and Sons, xx and 518 p.
- Patalas, K. 1984. Mid-summer mixing depth of lakes of different latitudes. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 22:97-102.
- Ragotzkie, R.A. 1978. Heat budgets of lakes. p.1-19 in Lerman, A. (ed.). Lakes: chemistry, geology, physics. Springer-Verlag Inc., xi and 363 p.

Rawson, D.S. 1936. Physical and chemical studies in lakes of the Prince Albert Park, Saskatchewan. J. Biol. Bd. Can. 2(3):227-284.

- Schindler, D.W. 1971. Light, temperature, and oxygen regimes of selected lakes in the Experimental Lakes Area, northwestern Ontario. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 28:157-169.
- Schreiner, B.T. 1984. Quaternary geology of the precambrian shield, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Geol. Surv., Rep. 221, xii and 106 p. and maps.
- Shuter, B.J., D. A. Schlesinger, and A.P. Zimmerman. 1983. Empirical predictors of annual water surface temperature cycles in North American lakes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 40:1838-1845.
- Smith, I.R. 1979. Hydraulic conditions in isothermal lakes. Freshw. Biol. 9:119-145.
- Smith, I.R., and I.J. Sinclair. 1972. Deep water waves in lakes.Freshw. Biol. 2:387-399.
- Wetzel, R.G. 1983. Limnology. CBS College Publ., xii and 767 p. and app.