LIFE HISTORIES OF FIVE SPECIES OF MICHIGAN SUCKERS AND INDICATIONS OF THEIR ABUNDANCE AS RELATED TO POTENTIAL COMMERCIAL HARVEST

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JIM EDWARD GALLOWAY
1976

ABSTRACT

LIFE HISTORIES OF FIVE SPECIES OF MICHIGAN SUCKERS AND INDICATIONS OF THEIR ABUNDANCE AS RELATED TO POTENTIAL COMMERCIAL HARVEST

By

Jim Edward Galloway

Concurrent with recent increases in protein demand, the yield of traditionally high value species of Great Lakes fish has declined. Filling the void left by this decline makes harvest of new species desirable. Before the harvest of additional species is implemented, it is advisable to compile relevant information concerning their life history and abundance in the region.

Life history data on white suckers (*Catostomus commersoni*), longnose suckers (*Catostomus catostomus*), silver redhorse (*Moxostoma anisurum*), northern redhorse (*Moxostoma macrolepidotum*), and golden redhorse (*Moxostoma erythrurum*) are compiled from the available literature. Data on the past commercial catch of suckers from Michigan waters of the Great Lakes are compiled, and records of catch from Michigan Department of Natural Resources index stations are presented. Indications of natural fluctuations in spawning run intensity, and correlations between time of spawning and water temperature were obtained from U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service lamprey assessment weir records.

G-962

Growth rates for the species studied are dependent upon the richness of the environment. Sufficient data are not available to predict growth rates in the Great Lakes, but rates are expected to vary significantly. Lamprey weir data indicate maximum spawning migrations for large white suckers when temperatures are about 11-15 C, with smaller fish being less selective. Longnose suckers showed maximum migrations at temperatures of about 12-15 C. Weir records show no definite trends in annual numbers of spawning suckers over the years of weir operation. These records are not useful in determining the total number of migrating fish entering a stream.

Commercial catch records reveal an erratic decreasing trend in annual yield beginning as early as the late 19th century. Some fluctuations in catch correlate with shifts in fishing pressure due to gear changes and the invasion of the sea lamprey. Accurate assessment of stocks is not possible from commercial records as suckers were not actively pursued in most areas.

Limited data from Michigan Department of Natural Resources index stations indicate white suckers are the most abundant sucker species in Michigan waters, and in some regions of the Great Lakes are one of the most abundant of all fish species.

Commercial harvesting of these species is desirable but government aid may be necessary to initiate such a fishery. After inception of a fishery, careful regulation will be required to obtain maximum sustainable yields.

LIFE HISTORIES OF FIVE SPECIES OF MICHIGAN SUCKERS AND INDICATIONS OF THEIR ABUNDANCE AS RELATED TO POTENTIAL COMMERCIAL HARVEST

By

Jim Edward Galloway

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Fisheries and Wildlife

1976

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my graduate committee, Dr. Niles Kevern, Dr. Eugene Roelofs, and Dr. Estes Reynolds, for the time they spent advising me and reviewing this work. I am indebted to Asa Wright, Myrl Keller, Ned Fogel, and Mercer Patriarche of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources for the extensive information they provided. I would also like to express my appreciation to Mr. Bernie Smith and Mr. Harry Moore of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Mr. Howard Buettner of the National Marine Fisheries Service for their cooperation in obtaining records for the lamprey assessment weirs and the commercial fisheries respectively. Mr. Buck LaVallee and Mr. Roy Jenson provided personal accounts of the history of the sucker fishery in the Bay De Noc area, and Vern Applegate commented upon the effect of the sea lamprey on the relative abundance of the sucker species.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Selective exploitation of fish in the Great Lakes has in part been responsible for the wide fluctuation in abundance of preferred species. It is reasonable to assume that the maximum sustained yield of both preferred species and all fish can only be achieved if exploitation is balanced so all niches are maintained at high levels of productivity, and preferred species are never placed at a competitive disadvantage. Both these criteria require the management of more species of fish than those presently considered preferred.

Historically, the most economical means of management of a species has been controlled harvest. The exploitation of currently underutilized species would therefore not only immediately increase the productivity of the lakes, but would provide an additional tool for the management of the fishery resource as a whole. In an industry such as the commercial fisheries of the United States, where exploitation of a species is entirely dependent upon the economic advantage involved, the only way to create a fishery for a species is to increase the profit margin. This is most easily done by creating demand in the form of a desirable product. Frozen fish patties, where the identity of the fish need not be prominently displayed, may be the product required to maintain a stable, profitable market for species generally unaccepted by the public. However, it is necessary to estimate future production before processing plants for such a product can be developed.

The purpose of this study was to gather the available information on the life history, abundance, and commercial exploitation of some of the common members of the sucker family in Michigan. Hopefully this will provide useful background information on which future decisions concerning the commercial exploitation of the several species can be based.

The life history information was gathered by reviewing and compiling the available literature on the species in question. Records of the commercial catch of Great Lakes suckers dating from before 1900 to the present were reviewed and are presented in an effort to gain some idea of the productive capacity of Michigan waters for these species. Data from lamprey assessment weirs were inspected to examine current trends in population size in Lake Superior and to establish the validity of some of the spawning habits set forth in the literature on life histories. Data from all sources were converted to metric units with the exception of commercial catch records which are presented as found in the original publications. From the data compiled from all of these sources, preliminary conclusions were drawn on the feasibility of commercial exploitation of the species.

LIFE HISTORIES

White Sucker (*Catostomus commersoni*)

The white sucker is fairly common throughout most of the United States and Canada, with the Great Lakes region being nearly centrally located within its distribution. Scott and Crossman (1973) describe it as an extremely 'plastic' species with drastically varying characteristics according to its habitat. The species is known to show a slight north-south cline in its meristic characters, and a tendency to evolve dwarf populations. Metcalfe (1966) suggests that this combination of plasticity, varying meristics, and dwarf populations, may be responsible for the single species being given a variety of names across its range.

The white sucker is usually found in warm shallow lakes or bays, or in the tributary rivers of larger lakes. They are generally taken in water with depths up to 7 or 10 m, showing some tendency to move offshore with increased size and age. Because adults of the species tend to avoid light, individuals are most active in shallow water in the evening, tending to move inshore during the afternoon, and offshore in early morning (Lawler, 1969).

The importance of this species in the biological community depends upon its interaction with the other species present. In most situations, this species does not constitute serious competition in terms of food or space for other browsing species (Scott and Crossman, 1973). Evidence that white suckers do extensive damage on the spawning grounds of other species is inconclusive, and in all probability less damage is done than is usually supposed. The common use of young suckers as baitfish suggests that the species is probably important as forage in many areas. In some situations, however, the sucker does seem to compete with more desirable species, and is not used extensively as forage. This type of situation was reported by Burrows (1969) in regards to the walleye and white sucker in infertile northern lakes.

Stewart (1926) suggests that the white sucker may be a host for numerous parasites; Hoffman (1967) confirms this, listing 94 species which infect this fish (others have since been added to the list by Dechtiar, 1969).

This species is used in some localities as a baitfish, and as a food for humans and other animals. It is not considered a prime commercial species, but has been harvested when more desirable species were scarce. When marketed in the Great Lakes region, it is often labeled as 'mullet' and not distinguished from other suckers.

Reproduction

Age at sexual maturity varies greatly with location. Campbell (1935) found Waskesiu Lake, Saskatchewan males maturing at ages VI and VII, and females maturing at ages VI to IX. Hayes (1956) reported that in Colorado male C. c. suckleyi matured at age II, and females at age IV. Spoor (1938) found females in Wisconsin spawning younger than males at ages III and IV respectively, but most authors agree that males generally spawn earlier than females. Size at first spawning is small in some areas. Hayes found males spawning at 150 mm total length (T.L.) and females at 267 mm T.L., while Stewart (1926) referred to spawners as small as 152 mm to 178 mm in New York.

Spawning generally occurs in shallow streams with gravel bottoms, but white suckers will sometimes spawn in the shallow areas along the margin of a lake. Much of the research on this species has been conducted in conjunction with the upstream spawning run due to the ease with which specimens can be obtained at this time.

Various sources report the onset of spawning by the white sucker to occur from early May (Scott and Crossman, 1973) to mid June (Spoor, 1938), depending upon water temperatures. Geen et al. (1966) report spawning runs begin when stream temperatures reach 10 C, which seems to correlate well with the description of breeding activities given by Stewart (1926). Spawning is reported by Trautman (1957) at temperatures as high as 20 C.

The early segment of the upstream run is composed primarily of males in most years, with females following slightly later (Geen et al., 1966). The daily magnitude of a run in a particular stream seems to be linked to the increase in stream temperature above what it was on the previous day, with larger temperature rises provoking greater run intensities (Geen et al., 1966). Geen et al. also report that yearly run magnitude may be affected by stream levels, as only the largest individuals seem to migrate in years when stream flow is minimal.

Data from Sixteenmile Lake, British Columbia, suggest that only 25-50% of the adult population spawns in any one year (Geen et al., 1966). What factors, other than stream level, affect the number of spawners was not discussed, but Geen et al. did show that some individuals spawn in successive years, while others skip years in their spawning activities. Over the six year period of the study, they found 50-80% of those fish marked in a year returned to spawn one additional year, 10-30% two additional years, and less than 3% three additional years. From this, it can be seen that even though individuals may spawn over a period of several years, it is unusual for an individual to spawn more than four times (lake spawning was not considered as a possibility in these conclusions by Geen et al. apparently because it was felt there was no suitable substrate on which this could occur). They also found that roughly 20-40% of the fish spawned two successive years, and less than 10% three successive years. Some fish were recovered as long as seven years after being marked, indicating a rather low mortality for adult white suckers. Dence (1948) reported similar first year return rates for the dwarf sucker, C. commersonnii utawana, but found second year rates to be much lower, indicating perhaps higher mortality rates for this subspecies.

Olson and Scidmore (1963) investigated repeat spawning in terms of homing tendency and concluded that in Many Point Lake, Minnesota, there was a lake-wide tendency for individuals to return to the spawning stream in which they were originally marked despite being randomly distributed throughout the lake at other times of the year.

Scott and Crossman (1973), and Stewart (1926) report that on the spawning grounds two to four males often crowd around one female during spawning acts which lasts only 3-4 seconds and may occur as often as 40 times in an hour. Egg number has been reported as high as 140,000 (Slastenenko, 1958) with Scott and Crossman (1973) suggesting the usual number is 20,000-50,000. Campbell (1935) calculated that there were approximately 24,604 eggs per kilogram of body weight in individuals from Waskesiu Lake, Saskatchewan. Eggs are simply scattered and adhere to gravel or drift downstream and adhere to substrates in quieter areas.

Adult spawning mortality is low as would be expected from the high number of repeat spawners. Geen et al. (1966) estimated that mortality at most was 16-20%, and attributed this low figure to the lack of aggressiveness displayed by males during spawning. Scott and Crossman (1973) indicate Geen's figures are typical for the north and west, but are high for the eastern portion of the species' range.

The downstream migration of adults commences about 10-14 days after the onset of the upstream migration, with females generally returning to the lake prior to males (Geen et al., 1966). Geen's data also indicate that the earlier an individual fish migrated upstream, the more variable its time of return. He found in some cases a fish marked on the first day of the upstream run would be recovered on the last day of the return migration, while individuals migrating upstream late returned more immediately, many without spawning. Scott and Crossman (1973) indicate that in some populations migration without spawning followed by lake spawning is common. Downstream migration of spent suckers showed a daily peak during or shortly after the period of highest water temperature, and ceased when stream temperature fell to the daily minimum (Geen et al., 1966).

Egg incubation periods have been reported from 4 to 15 days under various conditions (Slastenenko, 1958; Geen et al., 1966; Hale, 1970; Oseid and Smith, 1971). Geen et al., report the young remain in the gravel for 1 to 2 weeks after hatching, and they and Hale (1970) both record the fry as being 12-14 mm after this period. According to Clifford (1972), downstream movement of the fry in a brown water stream of Alberta occurs almost entirely at night, their nocturnal drift pattern being more pronounced than any of the drifting invertebrates. Clifford (1972) notes that as the fry become larger they move closer to the stream surface. This behavior suggested to Clifford that the smaller fry move passively while the older ones move more actively. Geen et al. (1966) reported most movement occurred between dusk and dawn. They hypothesize this migration pattern to be due to loss of orientation in the dark which results in drifting, or to a light avoidance response which causes fry to hide in the gravel during daylight and avoid the current. Their findings, that increased water level and turbidity also resulted in more downstream movement, seem to agree with this hypothesis. Using data from both longnose and white suckers, Geen et al. (1966) roughly estimated the survival rate of eggs to migrant fry to be only 0.3%.

Food

Stewart (1926) provided a detailed account of the feeding habits of white suckers throughout their life cycle. The initial stage, the 'yolk-food period', ends with the beginning of what Stewart calls the 'top feeding period' when the fish are approximately 12 mm long and 9 days old. During this period, the mouth is terminal, but is in the process of becoming inferior, and the fish feeds close to the surface on floating organisms as shown in Table 1. Following the 'top feeding period' is the 'critical period' when the transition from top to bottom feeding takes place. This period covers about 9 days during which the fry make occasional trips to the bottom and take mouthfuls of sand. The 'fingerling period' (18-75 mm) which follows may last a period of years over which the fish is limited by the size

Table 1. Percent volume of stomach contents from white suckers of various sizes.[a]

Feeding Period	Top-feeding		Critical	Fingerling	Adult
Size	12 - 16 mm		16 - 18 mm	18 - 75 mm	75 mm+
Location	Pond	Stream	Pond	Unspecified	Unspecified
No. of Fish	9	23	9	57	52
Chironomid Larvae	15.0	62.0	19.0	28.0	30.0
Entomostraca	37.0	4.0	15.0	3.0	5.0
Diatoms and desmids	1.3	8.0	10.0	22.0	3.6
Protozoa	27.0	6.0	2.0	9.0	0.1
Rotifera	18.0	7.0	20.0	4.0	0.0
Arthopod fragments	0.0	7.0	0.0	1.0	5.4
Sand	0.0	0.0	27.0	21.0	0.9
Algae	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.4
Larger Insects	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.0
Other	1.7	6.0	5.0	10.0	21.6

[a]After data of Stewart, 1926.

and position of its mouth to consuming small bottom organisms. During this stage the fish is not capable of separating these organisms from the sand and must consume both. Beyond 75 mm in length, Stewart considered the fish to be in the 'adult feeding period'. During this period, the fish are characteristically shy, avoiding most light, and feeding most actively at dusk and dawn. The major differences between the diet of the adult and fingerling are due to the increased mouth size, and the ability of the fish to separate food from sand.

Carlander (1969) cited several authors who listed the following foods for young white suckers: entomostracans, small insects, rotifers, and algae. Larger and adult suckers were said to feed on chironomids, entomostraca, amphipods, fingernail clams, snails, and detritus. Campbell (1935) examined the food of adults of this species (217-244 mm) and cited the following ranges for percentage composition of gut contents: Chironomidae 5-90%, Trichoptera 2-70%, Mollusca 5-85%, Entomostraca 5-98%, Chaoborus, 0-50%.

Reports of the white sucker being a threat to other species through egg predation are largely unsubstantiated. Ellis and Roe (1917) reported that individuals may consume as many as 500 log perch eggs per day, but Campbell (1935) found no eggs in 100 white sucker stomachs taken on whitefish spawning grounds, and Stewart (1926) found no eggs in the stomachs of suckers he found in brook trout spawning grounds.

Age and Growth

Reliable age-growth data are scarce, as most of the authors who dealt with this relationship determined age by counting scale annuli, and this process is now considered unreliable for fish over five years old (Beamish and Harvey, 1969). From the data available, it is apparent that large variations in annual rates of growth do occur in different locations (Table 2). These variations may be due to genetic differences among populations, but are more likely due to the length of the growing season and level of enrichment of the body of water which the fish inhabit. Roland and Cumming (1969) reported that an increase in the hardness of the water of an impoundment significantly increased the growth rates of white suckers in the southeastern United States. Eddy and Carlander (1940) found that growth in Minnesota was correlated with total dissolved solids, total carbohydrates, pH, plankton abundance, bottom fauna and length of growing season. Parker (1958) found thinning of all of the fish populations in Flora Lake, Wisconsin increased the growth of the white sucker.

Growth rates for adult suckers have been calculated by three authors using methods other than scale reading. The results of Beamish (1970), using pectoral fin ray sections, Coble (1967) using tags, and Geen et al. (1966) using length frequency distribution, were similar. In Ontario, Beamish found an average annual growth rate of 20 mm at age VI and slower growth at ages of more than VI (Table 2). The work of

Table 2. Average calculated total length (mm) of white suckers at each annulus.

Authors	Eddy & Carlander (1942)[a] Smith & Moe (1949)[a]	Kuehn (1949)[a] Moyle & Burrows (1954)[a]	Montana Fish & Game Dept. (1964)		Spoor (1938)[c]	Kath-rein (1951)	Beamish (1970)[b]
Place	Minnesota	Minnesota	Montana Streams	Montana Lakes	Wis-consin	Mon-tana	Ontario
No. of fish	2,655	1,065	163	282	2,990	223	
Age							
I	109	94	53	53	71	66	179
II	206	180	135	147	117	135	274
III	295	259	198	229	163	208	336
IV	351	333	254	295	203	257	387
V	401	378	277	328	231	310	424
VI	424	424	302	378	262	348	452
VII	437	460	328	391	290	358	472
VIII	490	495	333	417	310	386	487
IX	495		378	434	345		499
X			394		335		509
XI							517
XII							524
XIII							529
XIV							533
XV							536

[a]Combined data as taken from Carlander (1969).

[b]Data converted from fork length using a factor of 1.07. Age by fin ray sections.

[c]Data converted from standard length using a factor of 1.18.

Coble (1967) in South Bay, Lake Huron showed tagged adult fish recaptured later in the same year having an average growth of 7-12 mm for the summer, but fish captured up to 5 years later showed an average annual growth rate of only 7.6 mm. Geen et al. (1966) obtained an estimated annual growth of only 10-20 mm for the population they studied in Sixteenmile Lake. The drastic difference between these estimates and those of Beamish for fish under 6 or 7 years of age exemplify the variance of growth rates possible by this species at different ages. Differences in growth rates for younger individuals at different locations can be seen in Table 2. Preliminary results of student studies on white suckers from Lake Michigan, near Ludington, Michigan, show calculated total lengths similar to the Minnesota studies (Table 2) at ages I and II, similar to Beamish's study at age III, and slightly larger than Beamish's study at ages V-VII (Tack, personal communication). The work of Beamish (1973) suggests in some studies errors in age and growth determinations may have resulted from interpreting a false annulus as the first true annulus. Growth rate differences also appear between males and females. Spoor (1938) found for the first 4 or 5 years of life both sexes increase in length at about the same rate, but from then on the females increase more rapidly than the males. He also reported that although the average annual increment in length decreases with age, the average annual increment in weight increases, the rate being the same per unit of length for males and females.

Carlander (1969) lists numerous length-weight relationships for this species in various conditions of sexual development. The only Great Lakes population studied was in South Bay, Lake Huron where Coble (1967) determined a relationship of $\log W = -4.67943 + 2.92262 \log L$ (W is weight in grams and L is fork length in millimeters) from individuals between 229 and 457 mm. Spoor (1938) and Bassett (1957) found no evidence of a sexual difference in length-weight relation or condition factor. Spoor and others also noted that no change in condition factor with age or length was discernible. The extremes of coefficients of condition (K) based on total length listed by Carlander (1942) were 1.02 and 1.27. These were used as Minnesota standards for fish in poor and excellent conditions.

The maximum length reported for white suckers is 635 mm (2.35 kg) by Trautman (1957) and the maximum weight 3.18 kg (579 mm) by Chambers (1963).

Mortality

Low natural mortality rates for adult white suckers have been reported by several authors. Olson and Scidmore (1963) estimated an annual mortality of 13.1% for adult white suckers in Many Point Lake, Minnesota. Geen et al. (1966) noted the longevity of the adult population as indicated by the high number of repeat spawners, but also pointed out the relatively high mortality of young indicated by the low annual recruitment into the spawning population. Coble (1967) considered the question in more detail and determined a mean annual mortality of 25.7% for the South Bay population. Coble's data also indicate the rate of mortality of fish larger than 380 mm increased with size. Maximum age of this species is about 17 years.

Longnose Sucker (*Catostomus catostomus*)

The distribution of the longnose sucker is somewhat more northern than that of the white sucker. It lives throughout most of the mainland of Canada, and is present in at least parts of all of the states of the United States which border upon Canada. This species is one of the most common in the northwest sections of Canada, and is the only North American sucker which appears in Asia. Scott and Crossman (1973) call it the most successful and widespread cypriniform in the north, stating that it occurs almost everywhere in clear cold water. In general, it is restricted to freshwater lakes or tributary streams, and has been reported to depths of about 200 m (Scott and Crossman, 1973).

As with the white sucker, the longnose does compete to some extent with more favored species for limited food supplies, but this competition in most instances is not considered extensive. Longnose were once thought to be serious egg predators, but evidence of this appears to be scarce and possibly the reputation is unjustified. Like the white sucker, this species is a common host for many parasites.

Hoffman (1967) listed 32 commonly occurring parasites, and others have been added by Dechtiar (1969).

The longnose is seldom sought by man commercially, but is sometimes locally sought as a game fish. Its flesh is considered more palatable than that of the white sucker, but is still primarily used only as dog food. The limited amount which is marketed for human consumption is usually labeled as 'mullet'.

Reproduction

As judged from samples taken during spawning runs, size at first sexual maturity varies from area to area. It appears that this difference cannot be entirely attributed to differential growth rates. Harris (1962) reports spawning by fish which averaged from 127 to 132 mm in Great Slave Lake, but Bailey (1969) reports that the minimum length at first spawning in Lake Superior was 267 mm for males and 292 mm for females. Apparently age and size at maturity are population dependent phenomenon.

The reproductive activities of the longnose sucker are similar to those of the previously discussed white sucker. The longnose sucker spawns primarily in streams or on the shallow reefs of lakes. The onset of the spawning run is influenced by water temperature, the critical temperature for the beginning of the run being reported as 5 C by Geen et al. (1966) with the peak being between 12.2 C and 15.0 C

(Brown and Graham, 1954; Harris, 1962). The majority of spawners move upstream between noon and midnight, with maximum movement during the evening hours.

The composition of the spawning run has been reported for several streams by various authors. Geen et al. (1966) noted that the longnose suckers appeared to be smaller than the white suckers during the spawning migration in Frye Creek, and that the males were smaller than the females. Their data, which show lengths ranging from 130-400 mm fork length (F.L.) and estimated ages from 5 to 15 years, also reveal that a large percentage of the migrating longnose suckers were immature whereas almost no immature white suckers were present in the streams during their spawning runs. Brown and Graham (1954) reported that the males sampled from a spawning run near Yellowstone Lake had total lengths ranging from 269 to 455 mm, while the females ranged from 345 to 510 mm. The youngest mature male found was age IV, and the youngest mature female age VI, with over 51% of the males being age V and 45% of the females age VI. These data indicate a slightly earlier maturation than was found by Bailey (1969), who reported average lengths and ages for the spawning population of the Brule River (Lake Superior) as 386 mm (7.2 years) for males and 422 mm (8.0 years) for females. Bailey also estimated over 91% of the males were from age groups VI-VIII, and over 75% of the females were from age groups VII-IX. The ages of the spawning populations reported by the previously mentioned authors is in sharp contrast with those reported by Harris (1962) and Hayes (1956). Harris (1962) found the greatest number of fish to be 11 years old and all fish examined to be between 9 and 15 years of age in Great Slave Lake. Hayes (1956) reported males of 2 years (100-125 mm) and females of 3 years (203 mm) spawning in a Colorado reservoir. The large differences may be due to local differences in maturation rates or to errors in scale reading, as Geen et al. (1966) found that the scales were not reliable for aging mature longnose suckers.

Repeat spawning of longnose suckers is common. Geen et al. (1966) reported 30-60% of those fish marked in one year would spawn again, with 12-24% spawning two additional years, and less than 3% three additional years. They also found 17-48% spawned in successive years. These first-year return figures are higher than those reported by Bailey (1969) for the Brule River (Lake Superior). He found that only 7-18% of the spawners returned in successive years, but did mention that his estimates may have been in error due to escapement, spawning in other streams, or lake spawning.

Geen et al. (1966) observed longnose spawning in a stream 15-30 cm deep with a bottom composed of gravel 0.5 cm in diameter, and a current of 30-45 cm/sec. They reported that during the day males rested upon the bottom and females remained along the banks in areas of still water. To initiate spawning, a female would move out among the males and generally two to four males would crowed around her. The group would thrash about for 3 or 4 seconds during egg deposition. Following this, each of the individuals returned to their previously held position in the stream. Geen et al. also noted that spawning occurred from 6 to 40 times per hour and usually took place between 0600 and 2130 hours.

The total number of eggs laid by a female in one season has been reported to be between 14,000 and 35,000 (averaging 26,000) for the Lake Superior population studied by Bailey (1969), and between 17,000 and 60,000 (averaging 35,000) for the Great Slave Lake population studied by Harris (1962). No aggressive behavior was reported among the male spawners by any of the authors. This seems to be reflected in the low spawning mortality rate (11-28%) for the species reported by Geen et al. (1966) in his studies of Sixteenmile Lake, British Columbia.

The downstream migration of adults follows a daily pattern similar to that of the white sucker, showing a maximum at about the time of highest water temperature and ceasing when stream temperatures fall to the daily minimum (Geen et al., 1966). Geen et al. report that the main downstream movement begins about 5 days after the spawning migration begins, with the females generally leaving the stream first. They estimate the suckers are present in the stream approximately one month, with the first individuals entering the stream being the last to leave. The length of time longnose were present in the stream is consistent with that reported by Brown and Graham (1954), who found individual males present in the tributaries of Yellowstone Lake for 5-39 days (average 17) and individual females present for 14-25 days (average 19) during a single year.

Geen et al. (1966) report that under laboratory conditions longnose eggs require 8 days to hatch at 15 C and 11 days at 10 C. They estimate from these figures that under the natural conditions prevalent in Frye Creek, eggs probably required 2 weeks to hatch. Because fry were not sighted until one month after spawning, Geen et al. also suggest that the larvae remained in the gravel 1-2 weeks prior to their downstream migration.

The downstream migration of fry is poorly documented, being studied by only Geen et al. (1966). They found fry first migrating at 10 to 12 mm in total length, and established these to be longnose sucker by comparison to known specimens. This migration preceded that of white sucker fry, presumably because of an earlier date of spawning. The effect of daylight and turbidity upon migration was the same as that previously described for the white sucker.

Food

The food of this species appears to be highly variable with respect to age and locality. Scott and Crossman (1973) list typical foods in order of frequency of occurrence as amphipods, Trichoptera, chironomid larvae and pupae, Ephemeroptera, ostracods, gastropods, Coleoptera, pelecypods, copepods, cladocerans, and plants. The limited results reported by Rawson and Elsey (1950) indicate some change in diet resulting from growth as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Percent volume of the stomach contents of longnose suckers from Pyramid Lake.[a]

Food Item	25 young fish	100 large fish
Amphipods	1	72
Chironomidae	6	19
Copepods	4	--
Cladocera	66	--
Snails	--	.6
Terrestrial insects	23	--
Other	--	8.4

[a]After data of Rawson and Elsey, 1950.

Inspection of these data suggests a possible change in feeding habit from midwater to bottom feeding, as occurs in the white sucker. The data of Rawson and Elsey (1950) varies considerably from that of Brown and Graham (1954) at Yellowstone Lake. The latter investigators found that 69% of the fish containing food had algae in their stomachs, and the algae composed about 33% of the stomach volume. Higher plants were found in 40% of the individuals and composed 10% of the stomach volume, their frequency of occurrence exceeding all other stomach contents except algae (69%) and Diptera (55%). Aquatic insects appeared to be much more important to the fish studied by Brown and Graham (1954) than to those studied by Rawson and Elsey (1950). Perhaps this is because the fish examined by Brown and Graham were captured in stream environments, while those studied by Rawson and Elsey were from a lake.

As with the white sucker, the label of egg predator seems to be erroneous. The only report of longnose suckers consuming eggs of a valuable species was by Stenton (1951) who found 6 of the 9 fish he examined had consumed brook trout eggs. He presumed, however, that the consumption was not willful, and that the eggs were probably dead prior to being taken.

Age and Growth

Age and growth determinations have been carried out by numerous investigators. Although the validity of these studies is in question due to the use of the scale method for aging, the results of some studies are shown in Table 4. Preliminary results from student studies of longnose suckers near Ludington, Michigan indicate growth which is much faster than any presented in Table 4. Calculated total lengths at the first four annuli from these studies are roughly comparable to the lengths observed in the northern population of Great Slave Lake (Table 4) at ages II, IV, VII, and IX (Tack, personal communication).

The study by Harris (1962) was not the only work showing differential growth rates between subpopulations in the same body of water. Bailey (1969) noted that growth rates varied in different localities in western Lake Superior and attributed this variance to differences in the richness of the habitat. Neither Bailey nor Harris reported significant differences between the growth rates of males and females within the populations they studied, but Brown and Graham (1954) found Yellowstone Lake females grew significantly faster than males. This was particularly evident after the first four years of life. Growth in weight was not reported as being related to any factor other than length by any of the investigators.

Length-weight relationships were calculated by several authors including Harris (1962), Bailey (1969) and Hayes (1956). Their results were:

Harris (1962) Great Slave Lake

$$\text{Log } W = -3.599 + 2.88 \text{ Log } S\,L$$

Weight in grams - Standard length in millimeters.

Table 4. Total lengths (mm) of longnose suckers.

	Calculated (at each annulus)				Observed		
	Yellowstone Lake, Brown & Graham (1954)	Missouri R. Kathrein (1951)	Lake Superior Bailey (1969)		Pyramid L. Rawson, Elsey (1950)[a]	Great Slave L. Harris (1962)[a]	
						North	South
No. of fish	575[b]	87[b]	1349[b]	1349[c]			
Age							
I	51	76	81	91	53	---	---
II	122	140	150	137	85	153	180
III	216	206	213	185	108	171	204
IV	297	264	269	234	133	254	240
V	345	312	323	279	153	291	307
VI	401	348	371	328	179	315	309
VII	442	373	399	358	204	331	364
VIII	460	394	424	389	225	373	413
IX				414	245	404	480
X				434	265	434	497
XI				464	316	466	497

[a]Data converted from fork length using formula given by Carlander (1969).

[b]Calculated by direct proportion.

[c]Obtained from empirical curve.

Bailey (1969) Western Lake Superior

$$\text{Log } W = -2.5413 + 2.8499 \text{ Log } T\ L$$

Weight in grams - Total length in millimeters.

Hayes (1956) Shadow Mountain Lake

$$\text{Log } W = -5.0685 + 3.0225 \text{ Log } T\ L$$

Weight in grams - Total length in millimeters.

Bailey noted that fish of particular ages and fish caught in certain areas showed consistent deviations either above or below the values predicted by the length-weight relationship he derived.

The only calculation of coefficient of condition found which was based on over 100 fish was that of Harris (1952), who reported a mean K_{SL} of 1.90 with a range of 1.73 to 2.04.

Mortality rates for this species were revealed to be low by Geen et al. (1966) in their study on longnose and white suckers, but the only quantitative estimate found in the literature was by Harris (1962) who calculated a 55% annual mortality for suckers over 14 years of age. Scott and Crossman (1973) state individuals may be as old as 22-24 years but Keleher (1961) estimated the largest fish on record (642 mm fork length, 3.3 kg) to be only 19 years.

Redhorses (*Moxostoma* spp.)

The group of suckers generally called redhorses consists of the genus *Moxostoma* which have been referred to as one of the most perplexing groups of fishes encountered by American ichthyologists. Because of the uncertain systematic position of the group, little reliable information is available on their life histories (Robins and Raney, 1956).

Both the silver redhorse (M. anisurum), and the northern or shorthead redhorse (M. macrolepidotum) are known to inhabit some streams on the United States shore of Lake Superior (Moore and Braem, 1965), and the golden redhorse (M. erythrurum) is common in some sections of Lake Huron. Each of these species occupies a range significantly smaller than white or longnose suckers. The southern shore of Lake Superior lies on the extreme northern edge of the distribution of silver redhorse with the drainage of the other Great Lakes forming the northeast portion of its boundary. The golden redhorse range borders on the Upper Great Lakes. This species being more commonly reported south from the Lake Erie drainage. The northern redhorse lives as far north as Hudson Bay with the Upper Great Lakes falling in about the center of its range. More detailed definitions of these ranges are available in Scott and Crossman (1973).

Habitat

The habitat requirements for each of these species are somewhat dependent on the population being considered. Meyer (1962) described the northern redhorse as having the strictest habitat requirements of the three.

In the DesMoines River he found this species only in fast moving water, usually over rock, gravel, and rubble bottoms, but occasionally over thick layers of silt behind eroded bank vegetation. Scott and Crossman (1973) note that prior to 1970, when Jenkins (1970) combined four conspecific forms (M. breuiceps, M. coregonus, M. lachrymale, M. macrolepidotum) into one, this species was considered more of a lake than a river form. However, the species must now be said to inhabit the shallow clear waters of lakes or rivers. Cross (1967) found M. macrolepidotum to be highly tolerant of high temperatures (up to 37 C), but relatively intolerant of chemical pollution and silting.

The silver redhorse was found by Meyer (1962) to frequent slower moving waters in the DesMoines River than the northern redhorse. He reported young silver redhorse congregated over areas with a soft-bottom, but adults showed little preference for bottom types. Scott and Crossman (1973) accept this description of the silver redhorse habitat, and add that the species is more common in streams than in lakes. However, Hackney, Hooper and Webb (1970) found that the fish of the population they studied remained in a reservoir except during spawning, suggesting they preferred the lentic to the lotic environment.

Meyer (1962) found golden redhorse to inhabit areas similar to those inhabited by the silver redhorse, but Martin and Campbell (1953) found them in deeper, faster waters near riffle areas in Missouri. Hall and Jenkins (1953) indicate the golden redhorse is better adapted to river than to lake habitats, but from statements presented by Carlander (1969) it appears that growth increases progressively in more lentic environments, being faster in larger rivers than in headwater streams. Cross (1967) describes the species as sedentary in streams when stream conditions are relatively constant; however, during extended periods of highwater or drought, populations move to areas with more favorable stream conditions.

Scott and Crossman (1973) note that the golden redhorse is one of the few species of suckers whose range has not been recently diminished by habitat changes. This suggests that the golden redhorse may be more tolerant of man-induced environmental changes than other related species.

Ecology

The species of redhorse being considered here interact with their biologic community in much the same way. All are probably highly subject to predation when young, but as adults are only preyed upon by the largest of the piscivorous species. Direct competition for each of the species is limited to other bottom feeding fishes, particularly other suckers, but indirect competition must include to a limited extent all species which depend upon invertebrates spending part of their life cycles on or in the bottom. This would include such high value fishes as the trouts, sunfish, and basses.

The incidence of parasites in these species is not as well documented as for the white and longnose suckers, but it appears that the redhorses are a common host. Hoffman (1967) found only five species of parasites for the silver redhorse and northern redhorse and thirteen species for the golden redhorse, but Dechtiar (1972) reports that by examining only six silver redhorse he found fifteen species of parasites. Fredrickson and Ulmer (1965) found that the northern redhorse along the Iowa, South Dakota border were subject to seasonal infestations of tapeworm which infected as much as 38% of the population.

Reproduction

The spawning activities of the silver, northern, and golden redhorse are similar with the exception of stream type. Scott and Crossman (1973) report that silver redhorse spawning takes place in the main channel of turbid rivers in 0.38-1.0 m of water, over gravel or rubble bottoms, and that the northern redhorse migrates from larger bodies of water into smaller rivers or streams to spawn on gravelly riffles. Gerking (1953) found that the golden redhorse in Indiana preferred to spawn in the riffles of main streams, like the silver redhorse, but would ascend small streams near their home territory.

The onset of the spawning run for each of the species is highly dependent upon water temperatures. Both Meyer (1962) in lowa, and Hackney et al. (1970) in Alabama, found 13.3 C to be a good estimate of the water temperature at the beginning of the silver redhorse spawning run. The northern redhorse spawns slightly earlier when the water temperature reaches 11.1 C and the golden redhorse slightly later when the stream temperature is 15.0 C (Meyer, 1962). Males of all species congregate on spawning grounds before the females, apparently to defend home territories. Sex ratios (males: females) on the spawning grounds during spawning have been reported for the three species combined as about 2:1 (Meyer, 1962), and for silver redhorse alone as about 4:1 (Hackney et al., 1970). No nest is built by any of the species, and all of the species show highest spawning intensity in early morning and evening. Meyer (1962) found female silver redhorse carrying from 14,910 to 36,340 eggs, female northern redhorse carrying from 13,500 to 27,150 eggs, and female golden redhorse carrying from 6,100 to 23,350 eggs. From a limited number of samples, Meyer arrived at regression equations for the number of eggs per female as (-19.7 + 0.101 TL) 1000 for northern redhorse, (18.8 + 0.103 TL) 1000 for silver redhorse, and (-33.1 + .136 TL) 1000 for golden redhorse, where total length was measured in millimeters.

The size of the fish involved in the spawning runs has been reported only by Hackney et al. (1970) from Alabama. They found female silver redhorse ranging from 548 mm upward (with most between 548 mm and 600 mm), and males ranging from 507 mm upward (with most between 510 mm and 530 mm). Their data showed most fish of both sexes becoming mature at age VII with a very few spawners being ages V and VI. Meyer (1962) showed similar results for the silver redhorse in his study in Iowa, and also found that male northern redhorse commonly mature at age III. His data were not sufficient to show the age at which females mature. Scott and Crossman (1973) report ages at maturity of II for female northern redhorse in South Dakota, IV or V for both sexes in Saskatchewan, and III or IV for both sexes in the Great Lakes. Meyer (1962) reported golden redhorse to first mature at age III, with most being mature at age IV.

Food

Each of these redhorse species obtain food exclusively by sucking up bottom material and straining from it a random variety of invertebrates (Scott and Crossman, 1973). Due to this habit, the diet of these species probably varies greatly with habitat. Meyer (1962) reports each of the three species utilized the same foods in the streams he studied. By frequency of occurrence these foods were: immature chironomids (91%), immature Ephemeroptera (62%), immature Trichoptera (18%), and a few small molluscs. Northern redhorse food habits in Lake Nipigon were reported by Clemens, Dymond, and Bigelow (1924) as consisting of immature forms of Ephemeroptera, Trichoptera, Chironomidae, Tipulidae, Stratiomyidae, Ostracoda, molluscs, Oligochaeta, various crustaceans, Hydracarina, and diatoms.

Age and Growth

Silver redhorse:

Few age and growth studies have been conducted on this species. The results of those which have been published are presented in Table 5.

Meyer (1962) noted that for this species annual gains in weight continue to increase throughout the life of the fish despite decreases in annual length gains. Sexual dimorphism in growth, with the female becoming larger after sexual maturity (age VI), was reported by Hackney et al. (1970), but was not noted by Meyer (1962). The longest fish recorded of this species may be the specimen listed by Trautman (1957) as 635 mm in length and weighing 3.74 kg, however he noted specimens of 4.54 km have been reported from the Ohio River.

Length-weight relationships for this species were calculated by Meyer (1962) using first-degree, second-degree, third-degree, and logarithmic regressions. He found the logarithmic relationship Log W = -4.236 + 3.1243 log TL (W = weight in grams, TL = total length in millimeters) to be the most accurate in describing the length-weight relationship. Meyer also found that the coefficient of condition fluctuated between a high of 1.43 in May prior to spawning, to a low of 1.08 in June.

Northern redhorse:

Age and growth records are more numerous for the northern redhorse than for most of the other redhorse species. Results of those studies using more than 100 fish are presented in Table 6.

Meyer (1962) found that annual weight gains for this species increase through age VI but then decline. It should

Table 5. Calculated and observed total lengths (mm) of silver redhorse at each annulus.

	Observed mean total length at capture		Calculated mean total length				
	DesMoines R. Iowa Meyer (1962)	Flint R. Alabama Hackney (1970)	DesMoines R. Iowa Meyer (1962)	Flint R. Alabama Hackney (1970)	St.Francis R. Missouri Purkett (1958)	Meramaec R. Missouri Purkett (1958)	Gasconade R. Missouri Purkett (1958)
Age							
I	108	---	109	171	114	94	94
II	168	305	195	296	201	178	170
III	302	---	271	381	269	269	262
IV	349	---	328	451	312	338	333
V	392	484	379	503	351	399	406
VI	452	548	432	537	386	439	455
VII	497	565	470	559	414	467	457
VIII	514	581	505	589	437	---	---
IX	518	603	513	602	455	---	---
X	---	620	---	---	462	---	---

Table 6. Average calculated total length (mm) of northern redhorse at each annulus.

Age Class	Statewide Minnesota Eddy & Carlander (1942)	Illinois R. Oklahoma Hall & Jenkins (1953)	Statewide Missouri Purkett (1958)	DesMoines R. Iowa Meyer (1962)
I	107	79	107	117
II	190	188	193	224
III	264	328	264	293
IV	330	384	305	343
V	381	447	335	417
VI	427	538	371	521
VII	483			589
VIII	579			655
IX	615			

be noted however, that very few specimens above age VI were used for this determination. Scott and Crossman (1973) state that growth in Saskatchewan is much slower than in Minnesota. This statement, along with the data presented in Table 6 implies that growth is faster in the southern part of the species' range. No sexual dimorphism in growth was reported by any of the investigators cited. The largest specimen noted by Trautman (1957) was 620 mm in length and 1.87 kg in weight, but Meyer (1962) found one age VIII fish of 655 mm, and 3.06 kg.

Length-weight relationships for this species were calculated by several investigators including Greenbank (1950), Purkett (1958), and Meyer (1962). Their results were as follows:

Greenbank - upper Mississippi River

$\log W = -3.20 + 2.83 \log TL$

Purkett - Missouri

$\log W = -4.887 + 2.958 \log TL$

Meyer - Iowa

$\log W = -4.042 + 3.021 \log TL$

where weight (W) is in grams and total length (TL) in millimeters. Meyer reported the average condition factor of the northern redhorse to have an annual fluctuation less than that of the silver redhorse. In Iowa, the northern redhorse reached its highest coefficient of condition in October ($K_{TL} = 1.11$) and its lowest in mid June ($K_{TL} = 0.91$).

Fogle (1961, 1963) reported condition factors (K_{TL}) as high as 1.35 in South Dakota during parts of the annual fluctuation, but noted a condition decrease during the first few years of impoundment of the reservoir he was studying.

Golden redhorse:

The results of the most extensive age and growth studies published concerning golden redhorse are presented in Table 7.

From Table 7 no definite north south growth gradient can be determined. Faster growth in slower flowing waters seems evident, but this may reflect stream richness more than the velocity of flow. Sexual dimorphism in growth was not noted in any of the studies cited. Trautman (1957) listed maximum size in Lake Erie as 660 mm and 2.04 kg, with females tending to be slightly heavier.

Length-weight relationships have been reported from Illinois, Missouri, and Iowa as follows (in millimeters and grams):

Lewis and Elder (1953) - Illinois

$\log W = -4.85 + 3.07 \log SL$

Purkett (1958) - Missouri

$\log W = -4.881 + 2.975 \log TL$

Meyer (1962) - Iowa

$\log W = -4.202 + 3.098 \log TL$

Condition factors for this species, as for the other redhorse species, vary greatly throughout the year. Roach (1948) recorded an average K_{TL} of 1.39 in Ohio, while Meyers

Table 7. Average calculated total length (mm) of golden redhorse at each annulus.

Age Class	Missouri (several streams) Purkett (1958)					
	Statewide	Headwater	Middle	Lower	Worst Station	Best Station
I	79	76	79	79	61	86
II	150	147	147	168	119	208
III	218	190	218	262	165	333
IV	272	236	274	333	208	396
V	310	274	307	371	239	419
VI	333	302	330	399	274	434
VII	---	---	---	---	300	445
VIII	---	---	---	---	307	457
IX	---	---	---	---	335	376
X	---	---	---	---	333	404
XI	---	---	---	---	356	366

Table 7 (Cont'd)

Age Class	(Unspecified Habitat) Ohio	Illinois R. Oklahoma	L. Eucha Oklahoma	Spavinaw L. Oklahoma	DesMoines R. Iowa
	Roach (1948)	Jenkins, Leonard & Hall (1952)	Jackson (1966)		Meyer (1962)
I	97	94	145	122	124
II	251	218	302	297	188
III	330	305	391	361	264
IV	391	378	434	427	290
V	434	445	490	551	325
VI	---	521	---	---	472
VII	---	579	---	---	488
VIII	---	625	---	---	---
IX	---	---	---	---	---
X	---	---	---	---	---
XI	---	---	---	---	---

(1962) recorded monthly mean condition factors (K_{TL}) of from 1.02 in June to 1.19 in May, in Iowa.

Mortality rates for these three species of redhorse were not discovered in the literature, but very few silver redhorse beyond 8 years, and very few golden or nothern redhorse beyond 5 years were reported. However, Scott and Crossman (1973) did report northern redhorse from slow growing Canadian populations survived to 12 or 14 years of age.

HISTORY OF THE COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE OF SUCKERS IN MICHIGAN

The Great Lakes have always provided the major portion of the freshwater fish produced in the United States. The traditionally high value of many of the species resulted in the fishing industry being important to the economy of the Great Lakes States. Unfortunately, the total United States production from the Great Lakes is gradually declining as can be seen from Table A1. Total international production from the Great Lakes does not appear to have decreased much since 1920 because of increasing Canadian exploitation throughout this period.

The decline of the United States fishery can be traced to problems originating on the watershed as well as in the waters themselves. The increasing population of the United States shores has resulted in areas receiving large quantities of domestic and industrial wastes. Farming practices have led to increased soil erosion and the introduction of fertilizers and pesticides to the lakes. Although these problems may not have drastically altered the main body of water in the lakes, they have degraded many spawning grounds. Catastrophes occurring within the lakes themselves include the collapse of some stocks, presumably due to overfishing (particularly in Lake Erie), the mass mortality of smelt in

Lakes Huron and Michigan in 1942-1943, and most importantly, the invasion of the alewife and sea lamprey into the upper Great Lakes (Buettner, 1968).

The species of suckers considered here have been affected by some of these changes as have most other species. Despite their known tolerance to high water temperatures and relatively low oxygen concentrations, most species of suckers are also known to be relatively intolerant to chemical pollutants. This fact would suggest they are sensitive to industrial wastes and pesticide runoff. Most suckers also have highly specific spawning requirements which make them sensitive to the increased silting in streams affected by the erosion of agricultural lands. The sea lamprey is known to have affected the populations of suckers in some areas of the upper Great Lakes (Buettner, 1968). This is particularly true of the white sucker, which is more vulnerable to predation by the sea lamprey than is the longnose sucker. In some areas sea lamprey predation possibly caused a temporary change in the population composition from mostly white to mostly longnose suckers (Applegate, personal communication). One factor which probably has not affected these species is overfishing.

Although suckers, or 'mullet' as they are referred to commercially, have been locally popular as human or animal food, and some are occasionally sought as sport fish, they have never been a widely successful item on the freshwater fish market. Historically the only substantial market for these fish was in the New York area where they were used in 'gefilte fish', but this market was seasonal, and has been gradually decreasing with changes in religious traditions. The loss of this eastern market is probably the major cause for the decrease in the price of suckers relative to other species. As the relative price of suckers decreased, those few fishermen who actively sought them gradually went out of business, and those fishermen who landed suckers as incidental catch, found it unprofitable to continue doing so. Thus suckers, which Buettner (1968) reported as being important in the early shallow water fisheries, have faded from commercial importance.

Lake Erie

Lake Erie is the shallowest and warmest of the Great Lakes. Due to the limited Lake Erie shoreline in Michigan, it is also the least important lake to this state in terms of commercial production.

Buettner (1968) reported the early fishery of the lake consisted largely of blue pike, lake herring, sauger, yellow perch, and walleye; with carp, sheepshead and suckers being abundant but little used. A succession of collapses of the most favored species which seriously affected the fishing industry in this lake are discussed by Buettner (1968). Lake herring was the first major species to show a drastic decline, with the population collapsing in 1925. This decline was followed by the collapse of the sauger stocks in the early 1950's, the blue pike and whitefish in the late 1950's, and the walleye in the mid 1960's. These decreases in catch have greatly affected the total United States production from the lake. In the period 1874-1908 the average annual production was 46.0 million pounds. This declined to 37.7 million in 1914-1929, 30.6 million in 1930-1939, 26.3 million in 1940-1949, 25.2 million in 1950-1959, 15.2 million in 1960-1969, and all the way to 8.9 million in the period from 1970 to 1974. The total sucker production from the lake was fairly steady prior to 1940, with the annual catch ranging between 0.9 and 1.4 million pounds in all but 7 years. Since that year, however, the United States catch has shown a steady decline and has been below 200,000 pounds since 1965. Michigan's portion of the catch has always been small, but has shown an erratic decreasing trend, seldom being above 50,000 pounds since 1935.

The decline in the catches of the favored species was probably caused by a combination of changing environmental conditions and overfishing, but the latter of these two factors probably has not affected the sucker. The decreasing sucker catch can probably be attributed to pollution and the blocking of spawning streams, but an additional factor could possibly be a decrease in fishing effort, particularly in shallow waters with seines and trap nets.

Lake Huron

The U. S. Department of Interior report, published in 1969, noted that from 1897-1909, the annual production of six species of Lake Huron fish averaged over 1 million pounds each. These species included lake herring, whitefish, lake trout, suckers, yellow perch, and walleye. No major changes in the production of these species occurred until the late 1930's when the lake trout and whitefish populations began to show the effects of sea lamprey predation. These two species were severely depleted by the mid to late 1940's. The walleye population also began to decline in the Saginaw Bay area after 1943. This decline was probably the result of a combination of changing environmental conditions and sea lamprey predation. In addition to these declines, decreases appeared in the catch of lake herring, yellow perch and suckers in Saginaw Bay. These trends were attributed by the Department of Interior to decreasing fishing effort rather than a lesser abundance of fish, but Buettner (1968) reported that the sea lamprey significantly reduced the sucker population, and the lake herring population fell due to a failure to reproduce successfully.

Inspection of Table A3 reveals that the commercial production of suckers from Lake Huron was significant in all years prior to 1956, only once dipping below one million pounds during this period. The report of Koelz (1926) reveals that in the years from 1893-1922 'mullet' commonly ranked in the top three species in annual U. S. production. Inspection of records extending into the mid 1960's reveal that this ranking was maintained despite falling sucker catches. Historically the majority of the suckers harvested were captured by trap and pound nets in Saginaw Bay. Other areas of significant catch were north of Cheboygan, where trap nets were commonly used, and in the North Channel, where pound nets were employed.

The effect of the sea lamprey, pollution, and declining numbers of fishermen upon the catch of suckers has been mentioned earlier in this section, but it is difficult to determine the impact of each factor. Throughout the earlier years of the fishery (prior to 1930) the records reveal the sucker catch to be cyclic, reaching a peak about every 12 years (1895, 1906, 1919, 1931). The first two peaks in this cycle are of approximately equal magnitude suggesting the population was fairly stable during this period.

The large drop in catch which occurred between 1906 and 1919 was primarily due to decreases in the Saginaw Bay landings. During this period, the total lakewide production of all species remained fairly stable and no clearcut reason for this decline is apparent. Possible factors influencing this decline may have been competition with carp in Saginaw Bay, and the pollution of spawning streams by expanded agricultural and industrial efforts.

The next major drop in production occurred after 1931 and was probably due to three factors. The first of these to occur was the introduction of the deep trap net in 1929. This probably resulted in a shifting of fishing effort from shallow areas heavily populated by suckers, to deeper offshore areas. The sea lamprey also established itself in the lake during this period and presumably caused a decline in the stocks of suckers in some areas. The third factor, a reduced number of fishermen, is a direct result of the declining stocks of high value species caused by the first two factors mentioned. Continuing decreases in catch are most likely the result of the decreasing effort caused by low prices.

Lake Michigan

The records reported by Buettner (1968) reveal that the early fishery of Lake Michigan was largely supported by yellow perch, chubs, lake herring, lake trout, whitefish, and probably suckers. Buettner (1968) provides fairly complete records for all of these species except the sucker. These records show that the fishery of the lake as a whole for these species was relatively stable prior to the establishment of the sea lamprey. The lake trout catch was first to be affected, declining in 1945 and being almost completely destroyed by 1952. The whitefish catch increased briefly when the lake trout catch first began their decline, but they too began to decline after 1952. The lake herring followed a pattern similar to the whitefish, but did not decline greatly until the late 1950's. Chubs responded to the absence of lake trout predation, and increased fishing pressure by yielding larger catches beginning in the early 1950's. Yellow perch catches have fluctuated widely since 1889, but no definite trend is evident. Sucker records, incomplete on a lakewide basis until 1929, showed a fairly stable catch of close to two million pounds annually until they began to decline in the mid 1940's.

Koelz (1926) reported that in 1925 the catch of suckers ranked 4th in annual poundage, being slightly less than that of whitefish. Suckers were also reported as ranking no lower than 5th in every survey taken since 1890, but fishermen were noted as saying sucker abundance was beginning to decline. The report recorded the largest portion of the catch from Green Bay, while Grand Traverse Bay was noted as supplying the next largest number of fish. The most successful gear used was trap nets.

Inspection of catch records for the state of Michigan (Table A4) from the lake reveal a gradually increasing catch through 1907, followed by about a 20-year period of wide fluctuations. This ended with a catch of only about 456,000 pounds in 1928. The annual yield then rapidly increased to over two million pounds in 1935, but this increase was followed by an irregular decrease to only 21,000 pounds in 1968. Since then, the catch has fluctuated between 120,000 and 522,000 pounds annually.

The fluctuations which occurred in the sucker fishery in Lake Michigan are difficult to explain for the years prior to the establishment of the sea lamprey in the area. Declines which occurred after this time can probably be attributed to a combination of decreasing populations, the withdrawal of fishermen from the industry, and the shifting of fishing effort in the Bay DeNoc area to whitefish, which were more valuable and becoming increasingly plentiful (LaValle, personal communication).

Lake Superior

The records of Buettner (1968) reveal that historically, Lake Superior has produced only lake trout, lake herring, and whitefish in large quantities. Whitefish showed significant declines in catch between 1908 and 1913 and have remained at these depressed levels, except for a brief increase from the mid 1940's to mid 1950's. Catches of lake herring showed increases from the turn of the century to the early 1940's. Since then, the catch of this species also has slowly decreased. Lake trout catches were fairly stable and usually in excess of two million pounds until the establishment of the sea lamprey in the lake during the 1950's. The commercial catch steadily declined after that, but never collapsed as entirely as in the other lakes.

Suckers were never extremely abundant in Lake Superior due to the lack of shallow water. Commercial records for these species are incomplete on a lakewide basis until 1929 (Table A5), with the highest recorded catch being 447,000 pounds in 1937. In 1947 the catch dropped to 71,000 pounds and has exceeded that value only six times since then. Michigan's harvest had a high of 378,000 pounds in 1937, and was above 100,000 pounds for most years prior to 1947. In that year it fell to 38,000 pounds, and since then has exceeded 50,000 pounds only three times. The decline of this fishery is believed to be largely the result of declining fishing effort.

Careful inspection of the data in Appendix A reveals simultaneous variations in catch occurring in at least the three upper lakes. This could suggest simultaneous changes in fishing effort in these lakes as a result of changing economic conditions. Or, these changes could reflect simultaneous changes in spawning success in each of the lakes due to favorable or unfavorable spring weather conditions. The first of the two explanations seems most probable.

LAMPREY WEIR DATA

In the early 1950's electric barriers were installed across many of the streams of the upper Great Lakes in an effort to assess the abundance of the sea lamprey (*Petromyzon marinus*), and to block this species from entering streams to spawn. In order to avoid blocking the spawning runs of indigenous species of fish, traps were incorporated into the barriers. Fish accumulating in these traps during their upstream migration were manually removed, with daily records being kept of the numbers of each species handled, and the physical characteristics of the stream. These records provide information on the run intensity of many fish species in Great Lakes streams, but because they were not designed for this purpose, they have serious limitations.

Four such limitations affect this study. The first is due to the common practice of releasing captured suckers downstream from the barrier rather than upstream. This practice would effectively reduce the available spawning grounds for suckers, as well as make the recapture of individual fish possible. Secondly, the efficiency of the traps would certainly vary over the years studied as the result of changes in the pattern of sedimentation caused by the presence of the weirs. The third factor which may have resulted in some changes in apparent run intensity is the filling of the traps during certain periods by other migrating species (most notably smelt). When the traps are filled, they become inaccessible to suckers, and give the appearance that no migration is occurring. Although this situation was noted in the data, and may have affected the total numbers of fish caught, it is not believed to have affected interpretations concerning the effects of temperature upon spawning. The single factor which probably most influenced the number of fish captured is the tendency for the fish to congregate below the weirs rather than trying to go around them and being captured. This behavior is especially common in the species of the sucker family (Moore, personal communication), and resulted in total sucker captures well below the true number of spawners present.

Appendix B shows the number of fish handled (trapped or killed) annually at each of the stream barriers monitored by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. These figures show large annual fluctuations in run intensity, with changes as large as 153,000 fish (2300%) occurring in one year (Table B1, Pensaukee River, 1956-57). These large fluctuations reveal no well defined patterns in run intensity over the period of years monitored, but several streams have shown periods when the catch was unusually high or low for successive years. Although in most cases all streams did not fluctuate in the same direction during the same years, the eight barriers still in operation on

Lake
sucke
numb
over
reac
year
in t
year
are
in
can
few
rec
Ju
an
ca
Be
In
su
nu
pa
ma
to
fa

w
t

Lake Superior did show totals of both white and longnose suckers decreasing sharply during the early 1970's. The number of fish handled in 1974 showed a definite increase over those of the earlier 1970's, but totals have not yet reached the former high levels. Annual totals for each year and stream suggest that there may be large differences in the number of fish entering a stream during successive years, and that extensive fluctuations in run intensities are not unusual for these species. Although sudden decreases in the number of fish caught between two successive years cannot be completely explained by the data available, in a few instances low or highly variable stream flows may have reduced the number of fish caught in a particular year. Judging from flow data gathered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service at weir sites, this could be a possible cause for the low numbers of white suckers captured in the Betsy River, 1963, and the Sturgeon River, 1965 (Table B2). In most cases, large increases in the number of large white suckers captured followed years in which there were large numbers of small white suckers reported from the weirs. This pattern suggests that the increases are the result of the maturation of large year classes rather than differences due to mature individuals spawning only in years with the most favorable conditions.

Despite the previously mentioned limitations on the weir data, which greatly restrict their usefulness in relation to the total number of spawners in a stream, reliable data concerning the preferred temperature at spawning can be obtained. The annual spawning runs of both white and longnose suckers for six streams (34 stream-year combinations) were examined according to the date and water temperature at which 10%, 50% and 90% of the total fish handled were recorded. These data reveal that in each situation involving an annual capture of over 100 9-inch or larger white suckers, 10% of them had been captured by the time the stream temperature was 4.4-10.0 C (April 21 - May 25), 50% by the time the temperature was 7.8-17.2 C (May 2 - June 1), and 90% by the time the temperature was 9.4-22.2 C (May 9 - June 17). Smaller white suckers showed wider ranges of temperature for each division, suggesting they may not be as temperature sensitive as larger individuals. Longnose suckers appeared to be slightly more sensitive than either size group of white suckers, 10% being captured by the time the water temperature reached 6.7-15.0 C (April 25 - May 15), 50% by the time the temperature was 8.9-17.8 C (May 4 - May 21), and 90% by the time the temperature was 14.4-20.0 C (May 8 - June 10). Both the 10 C requirement for the onset of spawning of white suckers, and the 12.2-15.0 C optimum spawning range for longnose suckers described in the life history section seem reasonable according to these calculations. However, the wide ranges of temperatures involved, which are the result of rapid irregular fluctuations in stream temperature, limit the usefulness of the data.

In order to reduce the problems caused by high fluctuations in temperature, the average temperature for 5-day periods was calculated, and compiled along with the number of fish handled during that period. Examination of the data for large white suckers reveals that the average temperature for the 5-day period during which the largest number of fish were caught varied from 6.4 C to 16.1 C. The smaller white suckers again displayed less selectivity, with maximum captures being recorded when average temperatures ranged from 3.0 C to 24.4 C. Average temperatures for the 5-day periods in which the largest numbers of longnose were captured ranged between 8.4 C and 16.4 C. Even the ranges arrived at by using this method were rather wide so a qualitative inspection of the original data was used to identify key temperatures.

Inspection of the data for large white suckers indicated most maximum daily catches occurred when water temperatures were between 10.0 C and 14.4 C. It also appeared that consistent temperatures around 7.0 C to 10.0 C induced upstream movement, but rapid rises in temperature usually resulted in readings well above 10 C before movement was recorded. When temperatures were consistently above 15.5 C, movement appeared to cease. This information agrees well with that cited earlier from Geen et al. (1966). Optimal temperature appears to be around 11 - 15 C for large white suckers, but is less consistent and appears slightly higher for smaller individuals. Longnose suckers exhibit temperature preferences very similar to those of the larger white suckers with optimum temperatures appearing to be around 12 - 15 C. This correlates well with the optimum temperatures noted by Brown and Graham (1954) and Harris (1962) of 12.2 - 15 C, however, the temperature first inducing movement is often significantly higher (at 10 - 11 C) than the 5 C noted by Geen et al. (1966). That this species spawns earlier than the white sucker, as reported by other authors (Scott and Crossman, 1973), was not confirmed by this data.

Temperature preferences more specific than those given are not possible to determine due to the rapid changes in temperature exhibited by the streams examined.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES INDEX STATION CATCHES

As well as being a low-value commercial fish, suckers bring a relatively small amount of money into the economy of the state as a sport fish. According to the Michigan DNR Management Report No. 5 (1973) an estimated 2,616,360 suckers were caught by 86,720 fishermen in 1971. Only one of the other 14 species listed had fewer fishermen pursuing them than did the suckers. Due to this low economic value in both the commercial and sport fields, little research has been done by any government agency on the abundance of these fish.

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources has collected data from index stations throughout the Michigan waters of Lakes St. Clair, Erie, Huron and Michigan since 1970. Catch per unit effort (CPE), where unit effort is one trap net lift or 304.8 m of gill nets (graded 63.5 - 152.4 mm mesh), is listed for white and longnose suckers at these stations in Appendix C.

Because such a small amount of data exists, only general comparative statements can be made concerning abundance. The data from Lakes St. Clair and Erie indicate that only white suckers are present at the index stations, and they are present in low to moderate numbers. Catches of white suckers in Lake Huron and Saginaw Bay were, at most stations, significantly higher than those in Lakes St. Clair and Erie. Catches per unit effort at Pinconning and Sand Point in Saginaw Bay were consistently high. In the lake proper, the highest concentrations appeared to be along the southern shore of the Upper Penninsula with moderate catches noted in areas close to Saginaw Bay and along the northern shore of the Lower Penninsula.

In Lake Michigan, the greatest concentration of white suckers is noted around Little Traverse Bay and Beaver Island. Some other stations show high catches per unit effort for single dates, but these were offset by extremely low catches for other dates, or were the result of very small amounts of effort. Moderate catches were recorded for a large number of stations, but little consistency was apparent at those stations sampled in more than one year. Surprisingly few white suckers were taken in Green Bay despite historically high commercial catches of 'mullet' from that area.

In Lake Huron, longnose suckers do not appear in the index records for most of the stations in the southern portion of the lake. Some longnose are recorded for stations at the northern tip of the thumb region, and a few were listed at stations along the eastern shore of the Lower Penninsula, but the highest catches per unit effort appeared along the northern shore of the Lower Penninsula at Hammond Bay and Cheyboygan Point. Longnose suckers were conspicuously absent from the catches of some of the index stations along the southern shore of the Upper Penninsula in this lake.

Lake Michigan catches per unit effort of longnose suckers are not very high for any station where fishing effort was above minimal. The only areas where longnose appeared to be more important than white suckers was northern Green Bay and along the southern shore of the Upper Penninsula. Other areas where moderate catches have been made are scattered along the eastern shore of the lake, but these catches seem to be inconsistent from year to year and season to season.

In general, the records in Appendix C show white suckers being the predominant sucker in the lakes surveyed. Longnose suckers, when present, were more common in the northern regions of the lakes. The available data show higher catches per unit effort for spring periods than for other times of the year. This presumably is due to these species congregating near shore prior to spawning.

DISCUSSION

Close investigation would certainly reveal that the recent decline in the United States Great Lakes fishery is even more serious than indicated by the decrease in weight of the annual catch alone. Many of the high value species have been all but eliminated from the fishery either by a sheer decrease in their numbers, or by legal restrictions designed to protect them. In many areas, only one or two species commonly used for human consumption are still available for commercial harvest. If the Great Lakes commercial fishery is to survive it will be necessary to harvest species which are now relatively unexploited. Increasing the number of species harvested would not only increase total yield, but also provide for better overall management by allowing biologists to control the populations of low value fish which are competing directly, or indirectly, with higher value species. Although the biology of the species considered in this paper suggests that they probably do not compete with high value fish to a large extent under most conditions, their numbers and palatability may make them economically feasible to harvest.

Abundance and Stability of Stocks

The commercial catch records of the Great Lakes bordering upon Michigan show that at least Lakes Huron and Michigan have supported substantial fisheries for 'mullet' in the past. The decline in these fisheries after the invasion of the sea lamprey seems to be due more to an alteration in fishing effort than to the effects of predation, although the sea lamprey did affect sucker stocks. If this is true, it seems reasonable to conclude that in those areas where no large scale environmental changes have occurred (particularly with respect to chemical pollutants and stream alterations), significant populations may still exist. Some evidence is available which suggests this is true.

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (1974) reports that the Lake Huron catch of suckers reflects demand rather than abundance, suggesting increased effort could substantially increase yield if the demand were there. In Lake Michigan it was reported that longnose and white sucker could be excellent commercial species and that their abundance, as indicated by the catch at index stations, is high relative to other species (Keller, personal communication). In Lake Superior, suckers are reported as being less abundant and more scattered than in the other lakes (Wright, personal communication). This situation would be anticipated from the morphology of the lake basin and the early commercial records.

The biology of the suckers suggests that the areas of most importance to a commercial fishery for them would be the bays and shallow inshore areas of the lakes. Examination of the commercial records show this to have been true in the past with major areas of production being Green Bay, Grand Traverse Bay, and Saginaw Bay. Index station catches show other small bays and river mouths to have abundances equal to these areas at the present time, but estimates of maximum commercial yield from any of the areas are little more than guesses. In terms of environmental changes, it seems that the area most likely to be able to reach former high levels of production would be the Michigan portion of Green Bay, but even here the estimated annual yields made by biologists familiar with the area ranged anywhere from 250,000 to 1,000,000 pounds. This suggests accurate estimates of sucker populations are not available for important areas of potential production.

The available evidence indicates that commercial catches of 'mullet' would consist mostly of white sucker, with significant numbers of longnose being included, but very few redhorse. The biology of all of these species suggests that their contribution to the overall commercial fishery would depend, to a large extent, upon their environment. The literature shows a rather wide variance of growth rates, ages, and sizes at maturity for both the white and longnose suckers. These variances seem to be largely dependent upon the richness of the environment as discussed in the life history section.

The most discouraging factors found in the literature are the apparent low annual recruitment and the slow growth rates of adult white suckers, but this would be expected to improve when the adult population was thinned by exploitation.

A situation paralleling commercial exploitation has been observed in South Bay, Lake Huron, during the late 1950's where Coble (1967) studied the effect of sea lamprey predation on white suckers. He found that the white sucker population decreased sharply about the time that the sea lamprey destroyed the lake trout population. The sucker population began to rebound after about five years, but the average size of individuals caught continued to decline from a high of about 39 cm to a low of about 32 cm over the period of study which ended in the mid 1960's. During this period, Coble estimated the total annual mortality of white suckers to be only 25 - 30%, and because of this suggested that even without lamprey predation the population of larger suckers could not have been sustained under moderate fishing pressure. Rawson and Elsey (1950) also found that the removal of larger fish resulted in larger numbers of small individuals appearing in the popualtion. However, commercial catch records support the idea that sucker stocks can be successfully exploited. These records show that under favorable conditions populations of white and longnose suckers have been sustained during long periods of steady commercial exploitation. It seems that the final determination on the feasibility of commercially harvesting suckers must await some sort of trial fishing period.

Management Considerations

Because of current fishery restrictions designed to protect high value species, it is likely that the Michigan sucker fishery would be limited to the use of shallow water impoundment gear as a capture method. This type of gear has not been widely used in recent years, and is fairly expensive. Due to this expense, and the question of market popularity and profit which accompanies any enterprise, there is some question as to the number of fishermen who might be drawn into the fishery. The suggestion has been made by some fishermen that a government agency should initiate the fishing effort in order to estimate stocks of fish and market price, thus giving commercial fishermen something on which to base an investment. Such an approach seems reasonable since a large percentage of the catch will come from small areas of water, and it would allow an accurate stock assessment.

In view of the collapse of the fishery for so many species of Great Lakes fish, such an assessment would appear to be desirable as a management tool in future years. Once economic feasibility was established, commercial fishermen could take over under some management scheme. A limited access fishery based on gear and area restrictions, or a quota system would seem to be a reasonable approach to take in managing these species. The quota system would be most likely to protect fish stocks without forcing the industry to become inefficient. Spawning run intensity in key streams could possibly be used as a guide for the establishment of annual quotas, but the high fluctuations in annual run intensities recorded at weir stations suggest this may not be acceptable. If mature fish returning from spawning migrations are found to be in good condition, the quota system could result in a seasonal fishery of high efficiency in some areas.

Conclusions

The literature on the biology of suckers reveals that in most situations the mortality and growth rates of adults of these species are low. It also appears that these species are not often important in the food chain, and do not pose serious competition for more favorable species. Such conditions would suggest that the sucker population is relatively static and that establishment of a fishery for these species would not greatly affect the ecosystem as a whole. Unfortunately, not enough information is available to determine if such conditions actually do exist in the Great Lakes.

Commercial catch records, data from lamprey weirs, and index station records all reveal that suckers are widespread in the upper three Great Lakes. The lack of information concerning abundance on a commercial scale arises from the low value of the species and subsequent lack of fishing effort. Substantial data concerning abundance and the effect of fishing upon sucker stocks is likely to be gathered only by the establishment of a fishery.

Because of the lack of solid information about the species, a fishing industry should be established on a small scale and then gradually expanded if it becomes evident that the stocks can support the fishing pressure. Judging from the problems arising in the past in fisheries governed by economics alone, such an approach would probably require a quota system or a limited access fishery.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMMERCIAL FISHERY STATISTICS FOR LAKES ERIE, HURON, MICHIGAN, AND SUPERIOR, 1879-1974

Data for Tables A1-A5 were compiled from the sources listed below. Average prices were calculated using total weight landed and total value.

Table A1

Grand total (all species)	1879-1966
United States total (all species)	1979-1966
United States total suckers	1879-1966
Michigan total (all species)	1879-1966
After Buettner, 1968	
Michigan total suckers	1889-1966
After Baldwin and Saalfeld, 1962	
All statistics	1966-1968
After Baldwin and Saalfeld, 1970	
All statistics	1969,1971,1972
After National Marine Fisheries Service, 1971, 1973, 1974	
All statistics	1970,1973,1974
*Howard Buettner, personal communication	

Tables A2, A3, A4, A5

All statistics (other than price)	Before 1968
After Baldwin and Saalfeld, 1962, 1970	
Average price of suckers	1926-1939
After data from Bureau of Fisheries, 1928-1941	
Average price of combined species	Before 1939
*Howard Buettner, personal communication	
Average price	1940-1968
After data from Fish and Wildlife Service, 1943-1971	

All statistics After data from National Marine Fisheries Service 1971, 1973, 1974	1969,1971,1972
Saginaw Bay and Green Bay production	1969-1974
All statistics *Howard Buettner, personal communication	1970,1973,1974

---

*Howard Buettner, National Marine Fisheries Service, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Table A1. Annual catch of fish (thousands of pounds) from Great Lakes waters.

Year	Grand Total All Species	U. S. Total All Species	U. S. Total Suckers	Michigan Total All Species	Michigan Total Suckers
1879	76,238	66,891			
1885	121,290	97,623			
1889	143,937	115,575	3,883		1,048
1890	140,196	111,550			
1892					2,145
1893	134,211	107,582			3,107
1894					4,437
1895					
1896					1,858
1897	115,470	94,930			
1899	145,530	119,424			2,108
1903	113,024	94,185	7,911		5,329
1908	137,789	113,315	6,901		4,152
1911					
1912					2,835
1913					2,647
1914	135,138	103,407			4,972
1915	149,865	111,587			3,590
1916	121,987	89,085			3,715
1917	135,237	97,439	6,918		4,776
1918	145,367	106,181			2,708
1919	115,947	85,400			4,230
1920	104,848	73,168			3,063
1921	117,625	87,741			2,691
1922	113,127	81,107	4,793		2,937
1923	112,433	78,285			2,255
1924	112,461	77,969			1,926
1925	100,050	73,586			2,497
1926	97,900	73,182			2,994
1927	107,354	79,508			3,491
1928	89,040	62,027			2,516
1929	98,388	71,174	5,866		2,410
1930	115,765	87,412	6,687		3,675
1931	114,431	87,341	6,529		3,480
1932	104,313	79,370	6,195		3,810
1933	94,454	70,751	5,532		3,267
1934	116,149	90,880	5,563		3,665
1935	116,143	87,011	5,826	30,621	4,016
1936	118,363	90,570	5,675	28,972	3,904
1937	111,099	81,001	5,707	28,409	3,900
1938	108,228	79,299	4,820	28,682	3,343
1939	110,229	82,720	4,457	28,898	2,703

Table A1 (Cont'd)

Year	Grand Total All Species	U. S. Total All Species	U. S. Total Suckers	Michigan Total All Species	Michigan Total Suckers
1940	98,358	76,588	4,267	26,044	2,709
1941	97,365	76,429	4,135	28,132	2,492
1942	94,228	73,563	4,312	26,279	2,427
1943	101,227	76,667	4,439	25,700	2,747
1944	99,312	74,167	4,114	22,111	2,552
1945	105,541	77,413	4,658	23,960	3,025
1946	104,301	77,192	4,215	24,159	2,835
1947	87,466	68,261	3,565	25,545	2,270
1948	105,108	81,968	3,681	30,136	2,646
1949	111,144	83,483	3,557	25,534	2,274
1950	95,408	68,906	2,963	23,153	1,921
1951	92,771	68,623	2,912	25,020	2,072
1952	110,017	79,663	2,679	29,232	1,758
1953	112,473	75,525	2,370	25,013	1,636
1954	119,614	79,748	2,224	27,231	1,514
1955	113,778	75,207	2,027	25,438	1,379
1956	131,165	78,948	1,555	24,636	899
1957	117,783	74,041	1,507	22,477	773
1958	107,303	68,897	1,441	25,487	822
1959	103,562	63,464	1,389	22,323	756
1960	103,854	65,936	1,551	25,021	794
1961	112,508	67,140	1,441	24,535	761
1962	115,384	61,850	1,292	22,121	836
1963	98,617	55,823	1,096	20,326	672
1964	87,604	53,559	951	19,761	549
1965	97,735	54,156	794	19,748	500
1966	120,464	69,450	1,170	21,284	393
1967	126,783	81,957	859	29,221	346
1968	114,543	67,324	835	23,962	227
1969	122,548	66,969	1,168	21,948	336
1970	110,556	70,389	1,324	21,169	722
1971	100,930	62,824	1,708	15,592	592
1972	97,210	58,428	743	16,051	310
1973	114,543	66,657	1,054	15,880	434
1974		76,989	888	15,341	324

Table A2. Lake Erie production in thousands of pounds and average price in cents.

Year	Total Production	U. S. Total	U. S. Suckers	Michigan Total	Average Price	Michigan Sucker	Average Price
1889	73,189	63,563	1,072			33	
1890	73,648	65,224					
1891						124	
1892						77	
1893	52,548	43,136	1,361			296	
1894						274	
1895						277	
1896						271	
1897	44,607	35,954				137	
1898						274	
1899	68,975	58,912	1,628			243	
1900						282	
1901						390	
1902						261	
1903	29,340	23,937	877			305	
1904						255	
1905						222	
1906						353	
1907						370	
1908	53,212	42,466	1,810			349	
1909							
1910							
1911							
1912						137	
1913						126	
1914	71,274	54,144	1,350			120	
1915	76,313	59,773	1,124				
1916	53,818	41,195	1,321			219	
1917	61,429	42,649	1,058			252	

Table A2 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	U. S. Total	U. S. Suckers	Michigan Total	Average Price	Michigan Sucker	Average Price
1918	70,974	51,479	911			148	
1919	49,293	35,165	953			92	
1920	49,044	32,232	1,061			222	
1921	63,126	46,717	1,420			65	
1922	58,583	40,898	991			96	
1923	62,149	44,377	1,038			161	
1924	59,249	40,273	684			134	
1925	37,640	26,644	905			95	
1926	33,807	25,057	1,045			80	4.6
1927	33,862	23,795	1,142	1,413	6.5	89	5.3
1928	30,056	19,762	1,319	747	5.7	71	5.0
1929	29,905	18,646	1,293	839	3.8	44	2.5
1930	42,264	29,584	2,024	987	4.0	57	3.4
1931	48,606	34,800	1,416	1,548	4.5	162	3.5
1932	46,494	33,761	1,321	1,705	5.5	173	3.0
1933	35,351	25,120	1,525	1,422	2.6	140	
1934	43,598	32,098	1,024	852	2.9	145	2.0
1935	44,726	30,297	1,086	1,130	4.9	182	
1936	48,702	36,749	946	1,078	4.5	86	2.7
1937	41,590	26,925	1,102	998	4.9	74	3.0
1938	42,120	27,619	756	1,219	4.5	70	3.0
1939	42,927	28,663	1,008	1,251	5.8	42	2.0
1940	32,711	22,944	714	1,042	7.3	51	3.0
1941	31,013	22,063	698	1,124	5.0	23	3.0
1942	34,168	24,131	698	1,321	4.4	32	2.3
1943	41,598	27,115	576	1,261	9.2	45	7.0
1944	44,092	28,837	456	1,158	7.3	54	3.6
1945	47,580	28,631	426	1,157	11.2	35	5.5
1946	48,046	29,121	432	1,426	12.7	50	6.7

Table A2 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	U. S. Total	U. S. Suckers	Michigan Total	Average Price	Michigan Sucker	Average Price
1947	32,152	19,818	586	1,191	11.6	47	3.3
1948	41,428	26,502	469	1,248	12.5	56	4.1
1949	53,342	34,249	634	1,178	7.8	42	2.6
1950	40,848	23,982	650	1,136	9.1	37	3.2
1951	34,065	20,921	558	1,183	9.9	49	3.2
1952	42,768	25,351	627	1,395	8.7	31	5.5
1953	50,736	27,347	352	1,800	7.0	27	3.3
1954	57,252	28,340	361	1,770	6.5	22	2.9
1955	57,080	26,796	256	1,505	7.8	20	2.7
1956	75,426	30,744	269	1,357	7.5	11	3.0
1957	66,811	29,706	328	1,259	8.6	20	2.2
1958	53,326	22,575	244	1,757	10.0	39	3.2
1959	54,030	22,433	429	1,570	8.5	18	2.6
1960	50,477	21,253	250	1,901	6.6	31	4.0
1961	55,261	19,563	330	1,921	7.6	62	2.5
1962	64,124	19,660	261	1,838	5.5	56	2.1
1963	52,539	17,238	224	1,334	10.0	62	2.1
1964	38,735	13,354	240	1,128	9.4	54	2.5
1965	48,620	13,524	197	1,257	8.4	58	2.7
1966	54,124	12,698	187	1,389	7.8	44	2.6
1967	49,385	11,615	177	1,052	13.7	52	2.1
1968	51,335	11,920	141	778	12.3	10	3.0
1969	59,077	11,050	173	744	11.7	25	2.7
1970	41,301	9,546	123	420	6.7	10	2.1
1971	37,918	8.842	129	173	15.4	--	---
1972	38,102	7,920	153	366	11.0	6	3.2
1973	48,110	8,281	123	371	8.0	10	3.1
1974		9,826	114	374	7.0	2	5.4

Table A3. Lake Huron production in thousands of pounds and average price in cents.

Year	Total Production	Total Michigan Production	Average Price	Michigan Suckers	Average Price	Saginaw Bay Production	Saginaw Bay Suckers
1889	27,149	15,429		1,007			
1890	24,520	10,330		1,110			
1891	24,921	12,702		1,036			907
1892	26,467	11,776		1,836			1,640
1893	26,128	14,816		2,345			2,059
1894	24,615	14,677		2,971			2,705
1895	23,971	14,470		3,365			3,164
1896	22,668	13,541		1,387			1,217
1897	19,145	12,393		1,600			1,341
1898	21,478	13,448		1,317			1,065
1899	24,597	14,320		1,383			1,047
1900	21,603	14,151		1,710			1,342
1901	24,436	16,813		1,745			1,355
1902	28,050	20,003		2,814			1,413
1903	26,907	18,566		3,525			1,622
1904	27,464	17,989		2,853			1,389
1905	25,122	16,895		3,458			2,316
1906	24,937	16,860		4,020			3,002
1907	25,068	17,821		3,646			2,755
1908	20,718	13,075		1,871			841
1909							
1910							
1911							
1912	20,937	13,876		1,320			
1913	18,074	11,258		1,580			
1914	15,354	8,291		1,501			
1915	18,980	10,245		2,306			
1916	26,607	17,212		2,266			1,012

Table A3 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	Total Michigan Production	Average Price	Michigan Suckers	Average Price	Saginaw Bay Production	Saginaw Bay Suckers
1917	20,342	12,577		1,465			490
1918	21,831	14,977		1,779			641
1919	21,861	15,242		2,714			1,135
1920	17,865	11,541		1,900			1,164
1921	16,044	9,607		1,803			1,028
1922	20,471	13,279		1,986			1,214
1923	16,943	10,102		1,445			704
1924	16,202	8,877		1,073			408
1925	20,254	12,600		1,374			602
1926	20,667	13,128		1,827	6.4		855
1927	24,603	15,706	9.0	2,461	7.4		1,582
1928	17,836	9,993	10.3	1,873	5.0		859
1929	16,319	8,829	8.9	1,576	3.5	5,304	1,219
1930	22,189	15,317	8.1	2,237	2.7	9,386	1,694
1931	23,706	16,467	8.5	2,132	3.5	9,674	1,218
1932	22,903	15,414	7.2	2,403	2.1	9,238	1,321
1933	21,279	13,471	7.0	1,890		6,927	1,109
1934	21,935	14,390	6.6	2,123	2.6	7,785	1,184
1935	22,036	13,640	9.0	1,766		7,371	832
1936	20,548	12,734	7.8	1,814	2.6	7,668	951
1937	19,438	11,844	8.0	1,726	3.0	7,501	927
1938	19,324	12,033	6.3	1,788	3.0	7,446	786
1939	19,777	13,333	6.5	1,382	3.0	9,200	750
1940	14,671	9,012	7.5	1,343	3.0	6,387	886
1941	14,150	8,727	7.8	1,312	3.0	6,342	825
1942	13,244	8,466	11.9	1,196	3.9	6,097	687
1943	13,028	8,610	12.5	1,414	5.6	6,412	898
1944	9,925	6,433	12.9	1,236	6.0	4,217	747
1945	10,504	7,475	15.1	1,554	9.0	5,259	825

Table A3 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	Total Michigan Production	Average Price	Michigan Suckers	Average Price	Saginaw Bay Production	Saginaw Bay Suckers
1946	9,683	7,147	11.7	1,646	4.9	5,478	1,223
1947	10,074	8,034	14.4	1,282	5.3	5,197	939
1948	11,634	8,836	15.4	1,305	5.7	5,223	827
1949	8,953	5,580	10.7	1,022	5.3	3,663	632
1950	9,835	5,073	8.1	977	4.6	3,536	642
1951	11,264	5,521	10.0	1,197	5.4	4,123	904
1952	13,646	6,118	11.7	1,199	7.0	4,721	941
1953	14,227	5,498	10.7	1,144	6.0	4,169	972
1954	11,571	5,421	10.5	1,185	5.7	4,341	1,063
1955	8,356	4,561	10.6	1,024	5.5	3,603	894
1956	6,398	3,635	10.6	611	5.5	2,801	536
1957	5,185	3,341	12.9	482	6.2	2,535	433
1958	7,780	5,094	13.3	451	6.3	3,545	403
1959	7,641	5,041	16.9	464	5.3	2,633	435
1960	10,251	6,338	19.7	454	6.0	2,962	379
1961	12,125	6,918	17.2	551	4.2	2,931	518
1962	10,055	5,880	15.3	707	3.8	2,599	663
1963	8,881	5,206	15.1	509	4.8	2,718	472
1964	8,062	4,095	16.6	438	4.8	2,348	399
1965	8,240	4,674	16.6	389	4.0	2,885	353
1966	6,686	3,769	14.6	313	4.3	2,557	299
1967	5,878	3,212	14.8	243	3.8	2,412	219
1968	5,108	2,678	16.4	162	5.9	1,294	149
1969	5,226	2,897	17.0	136	4.8	2,417	123
1970	4,536	2,411	16.8	140	6.3	2,227	138
1971	5,572	2,815	17.7	134	8.1	2,614	132
1972	4,381	1,984	21.1	91	6.1	1,706	91
1973	4,482	1,942	23.1	145	5.4	1,789	145
1974		1,718	27.0	112	6.3	1,462	111

Table A4. Lake Michigan production in thousands of pounds and average price in cents.

Year	Total Production	Michigan Production	Average Price	Total Suckers	Michigan Suckers	Average Price	Green Bay Production	Green Bay Suckers
1889	26,007			1,729	7			
1890	26,434			1,801	481			
1891					45			
1892	28,039				222			
1893	40,723			1,691	450			
1894	42,728				189			
1895	38,212				282			
1896	47,004				187			
1897	39,634				337			
1898					287			
1899	37,547			1,119	516			
1900					630			
1901					588			
1902					926			
1903	36,623			3,272	1,495			
1904					1,803			
1905					1,623			
1906					1,695			
1907					2,288			
1908	47,356			2,809	1,737			
1909								
1910								
1911	26,493				1,017			
1912	24,814				1,113			
1913	27,091				700			
1914	28,201				3,093			
1915	31,642				824			
1916	21,984				963			
1917	31,674			4,039	2,955			

Table A4 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	Michigan Production	Average Price	Total Suckers	Michigan Suckers	Average Price	Green Bay Production	Green Bay Suckers
1918	27,708				663			
1919	23,922				1,097			
1920	19,999				919			
1921	21,978				639			
1922	19,394			1,536	626			
1923	15,380				570			
1924	18,316				624			
1925	21,341				903			
1926	20,494				967	5.1		
1927	23,697	11,959	9.7		813	5.7		
1928	17,998	6,942	15.5		456	5.0		
1929	26,186	17,662	11.1	2,698	863	5.5		
1930	26,962	13,927	9.1	2,258	1,253	2.4		
1931	24,374	9,599	10.4	2,762	1,222	3.5		
1932	19,305	9,593	7.4	2,209	1,293	2.5		
1933	21,002	6,516	9.2	1,881	1,108			
1934	26,055	8,252	7.8	2,178	1,392	1.9		
1935	24,432	9,659	9.6	2,623	2,003			
1936	24,478	8,612	8.8	2,686	1,899	2.6		
1937	25,602	9,850	9.3	2,382	1,726	3.0		
1938	24,101	10,266	9.4	1,858	1,301	3.0		
1939	22,448	8,425	12.3	1,853	1,152	3.0		
1940	22,601	9,201	8.7	2,017	1,227	3.0		
1941	22,931	9,843	10.0	1,935	1,044	3.0		
1942	21,413	8,738	15.0	2,251	1,106	3.9		
1943	22,175	8,768	20.8	2,200	1,199	5.7		
1944	19,252	6,829	25.2	2,223	1,185	5.8		
1945	22,090	9,080	26.3	2,373	1,265	6.7		
1946	22,392	9,048	19.3	1,895	1,007	5.4		
1947	24,958	10,452	16.8	1,621	894	4.9		

Table A4 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	Michigan Production	Average Price	Total Suckers	Michigan Suckers	Average Price	Green Bay Production	Green Bay Suckers
1948	27,023	12,799	19.8	1,806	1,249	5.5		
1949	25,573	11,900	19.0	1,810	1,180	4.3		
1950	27,078	12,223	15.3	1,228	831	4.6		
1951	27,648	12,898	12.5	1,008	761	5.0		
1952	32,061	15,875	13.7	744	488	6.5		
1953	28,834	13,068	11.9	820	446	5.4	8,575	368
1954	30,291	14,239	9.8	609	280	5.3	10,056	232
1955	30,036	13,964	10.2	684	326	4.6	9,141	284
1956	30,798	14,207	11.1	640	257	4.2	9,568	238
1957	27,223	11,655	10.1	641	247	4.4	7,120	228
1958	27,771	12,177	9.7	685	307	4.5	7,616	290
1959	20,808	8,154	9.4	612	258	4.4	5,100	252
1960	24,311	9,135	9.9	767	286	4.0	4,892	283
1961	25,559	7,344	11.6	495	125	5.2	2,908	103
1962	23,475	7,584	10.8	263	42	4.0	2,676	30
1963	21,021	6,382	11.4	299	77	4.0	2,730	70
1964	26,201	8,563	13.7	215	38	4.0	2,282	26
1965	26,994	8,337	14.1	168	44	4.5	1,539	26
1966	42,764	11,522	10.8	403	23	7.0	4,235	4
1967	58,951	20,966	7.2	391	34	3.9	11,185	4
1968	45,810	17,412	9.2	465	21	4.6	7,278	11
1969	47,489	15,416	9.1	789	120	2.9		97
1970	53,090	16,197	12.2	969	522	2.6		479
1971	44,680	10,113	16.0	1,387	425	2.0		330
1972	43,771	11,684	20.1	437	185	1.0		84
1973	50,708	11,540	25.3	710	248	1.3		155
1974	59,598	11,105	24.3	508	188	1.7		76

Table A5. Lake Superior production in thousands of pounds and average price in cents.

Year	Total Production	U. S. Production	U. S. Suckers	Michigan Total	Average Price	Michigan Suckers	Average Price
1889	10,067	7,884					
1890	8,059	6,116					
1891							
1892						11	
1893	10,214	7,979				16	
1894						3	
1895							
1896						13	
1897	8,410	6,028					
1898							
1899	9,340	6,335				17	
1900						16	
1901						19	
1902						18	
1903	16,399	13,986	164			5	
1904						73	
1905						88	
1906						19	
1907						10	
1908	12,487	9,601	283			194	
1909							
1910							
1911						100	
1912						268	
1913	12,818	10,173				240	
1914	15,989	12,475				259	
1915	17,760	9,543				240	
1916	13,981	8,350				234	
1917	15,564	9,911	347			207	
1918	14,823	10,527				196	

Table A5 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	U. S. Production	U. S. Suckers	Michigan Total	Average Price	Michigan Suckers	Average Price
1919	14,823	10,527				196	
1920	12,622	9,066				179	
1921	9,986	7,525				154	
1922	9,182	6,571	260			164	
1923	12,173	7,585				106	
1924	12,726	9,510				134	
1925	16,119	12,555				140	
1926	18,026	13,715				111	5.7
1927	20,781	15,630		3,421	11.9	147	4.8
1928	18,820	13,420		3,736	10.8	144	4.8
1929	21,421	16,565	226	4,395	7.5	95	4.0
1930	19,627	14,867	94	4,289	7.8	86	2.7
1931	14,427	11,258	166	3,440	10.4	89	3.5
1932	12,857	10,369	211	2,983	7.1	83	2.2
1933	13,739	10,631	204	3,425	7.9	124	
1934	21,608	17,620	163	5,182	7.9	93	2.3
1935	21,450	17,872	227	6,189	9.4	161	
1936	20,980	16,008	191	6,548	7.4	117	2.6
1937	20,521	16,012	447	6,183	8.3	378	3.0
1938	18,913	14,856	289	5,192	9.2	212	3.0
1939	20,090	16,783	159	5,857	9.2	119	3.0
1940	23,991	20,672	158	6,789	6.8	115	3.0
1941	25,547	22,111	138	8,438	7.7	103	3.0
1942	22,590	19,228	148	7,754	9.8	80	3.9
1943	21,719	18,372	203	7,061	15.8	81	5.6
1944	23,006	19,245	166	7,691	15.9	96	5.8
1945	22,537	18,725	276	6,248	23.2	156	7.9
1946	21,437	17,848	228	6,538	19.8	135	5.1
1947	17,817	14,987	71	5,868	14.8	38	5.1
1948	22,592	19,221	83	7,253	15.5	50	5.6

Table A5 (Cont'd)

Year	Total Production	U. S. Production	U. S. Suckers	Michigan Total	Average Price	Michigan Suckers	Average Price
1949	20,919	17,730	64	6,876	17.0	34	4.7
1950	15,239	12,584	100	4,721	23.5	64	4.6
1951	16,886	14,035	127	5,418	20.8	83	5.5
1952	18,592	15,465	90	5,844	19.7	44	6.8
1953	16,420	13,650	52	4,647	22.4	24	6.2
1954	18,275	15,385	54	5,801	19.4	29	5.6
1955	16,121	13,581	57	5,408	17.0	18	5.3
1956	15,736	13,591	26	5,437	16.9	11	5.1
1957	16,361	13,565	48	6,222	13.1	25	5.6
1958	16,065	13,194	43	6,459	14.0	26	5.6
1959	18,806	14,956	50	7,558	12.8	16	5.0
1960	16,599	13,771	68	7,647	9.4	23	5.2
1961	17,103	14,749	47	8,352	8.9	22	4.3
1962	15,749	12,602	45	6,819	9.7	31	3.8
1963	15,098	12,125	53	7,404	9.1	25	4.5
1964	12,324	9,642	45	5,976	9.4	19	4.4
1965	11,018	8,748	34	5,481	12.7	9	4.0
1966	10,104	8,258	27	4,604	14.6	12	4.3
1967	10,463	7,895	39	3,991	17.8	19	3.7
1968	9,939	6,574	64	3,084	22.6	34	5.6
1969	8,190	5,239	64	2,891	25.5	54	4.1
1970	8,391	5,009	86	2,141	22.0	50	3.4
1971	9,549	6,182	56	2,492	24.0	34	2.4
1972	8,127	4,471	62	2,017	29.4	29	3.0
1973	8,587	5,427	68	2,028	38.3	28	1.7
1974		2,144	149	2,144	45.4	22	2.3

APPENDIX B

NUMBERS OF FISH HANDLED ANNUALLY AT LAMPREY ASSESSMENT WEIRS

Table B1 contains the numbers of large white suckers, small white suckers and longnose suckers handled annually at Lake Michigan Lamprey Assessment weirs. Streams were omitted if they were monitored only one year, or if they were monitored three or less years and never showed over 300 fish in any one classification. Only the Pensaukee River and the East Twin River yielded annual captures of redhorse (all species combined) which exceeded 5 fish in more than one year during the period of weir operation. From 1955 through 1960 annual captures of redhorse from the Pensaukee were 90, 403, 200, 0, 27, and 34. During the same period, data from the East Twin River were 39, 22, 28, 15, 5 and 0. In several other streams, the number of fish handled the first year of weir operation was significant (over 100), but few redhorse were captured in later years. The records reveal that most fish handled the first year were dead. Perhaps the relatively small populations which were present initially were destroyed by stream blockage.

Table B2 illustrates the number of white suckers (sizes combined) and longnose suckers handled at Lake Superior weir stations. Some streams were excluded which had weirs in operation two or less years or which never yielded over 500 fish of either species.

Table B3 reports redhorse suckers handled each year at Lake Superior weirs. Streams in which redhorse were not recorded for more than three years were omitted.

The only weir records obtained from Lake Huron were for the Oqueoc River. In the years 1965, 1966, and 1974 the numbers of fish handled at this weir were: large white suckers 1,258, 1,624, and 3,746; small white suckers 57, 23, and 12; longnose suckers 0, 0, and 2,788.

Table B1. Numbers of fish handled yearly at Lake Michigan lamprey assessment weirs.

_____ Large White Suckers (≥ 12"[30.5cm])
(   ) Small White Suckers (< 12"[30.5cm])
* Longnose Suckers

Year	Brevort River	Black River	Millecoquins River	Crow River	Cataract River	Milakokia Creek	Big Fish-dam River	Sturgeon River
1954							441 (0) *248	793 (0) *61
1955							322 (80) *0	81 (2) *0
1956							2350 (754) *1	35 (18) *0
1957	2065 (161) *3		159 (35) *32				1553 (577) *3	19 (36) *0
1958	335 (288) *1	281 (13) *2905	297 (100) *6	830 (793) *1309	293 (165) *170	49 (268) *0	1307 (709) *0	514 (36) *0
1959	2079 (388) *1	205 (19) *515	385 (116) *1	2004 (245) *461	1492 (34) *27	1361 (248) *3	2795 (2538) *3	2170 (89) *8
1960							2343 (1273) *0	2331 (145) *0
1961								2139 (130) *25
1962								624 (119) *3
1963								1174 (128) *8
1964								3653 (298) *2
1965								652 (170) *0
1966								1259 (107) *1

Table B1 (Cont'd)

Year	Ogontz River	Squaw River	Whitefish River	Rapid River	Tacoosh River	Day's River	Ford River	Bark River
1954		19 (0) *1	121 (0) *0	402 (0) *29	439 (0) *7	273 (0) *12		
1955		23 (41) *0	51 (227) *0	79 (112) *0	39 (140) *0	357 (52) *0		66 (329) *35
1956		28 (217) *0	57 (143) *0	633 (289) *0	26 (227) *0	275 (123) *0	229 (88) *26	406 (1149) *7
1957		50 (195) *0	318 (176) *0	197 (163) *5	83 (68) *5	207 (75) *3	42 (135) *4	264 (472) *4
1958	2115 (3454) *0	21 (1214) *1	2832 (150) *1	489 (502) *0	145 (85) *0	169 (98) *0	169 (761) *0	520 (1955) *14
1959	5756 (593) *4	35 (403) *2	3549 (335) *1	473 (471) *0	231 (168) *0	1781 (562) *0	326 (655) *0	322 (561) *1
1960		37 (293) *0	1083 (276) *0	296 (312) *0	179 (111) *0	494 (102) *0	231 (417) *2	480 (7045) *1
1961								96 (778) *25
1962								150 (1712) *6
1963								253 (1081) *22
1964								168 (820) *13
1965								526 (577) *8
1966								604 (1474) *216

Table B1 (Cont'd)

+ Most of these fish were dead and may have been forced into the trap by other migrating species (Moore, personal communication).

Year	Cedar River	Walton River	Beattie Creek	Little River	Pensaukee River	Suamico River	Ephraim Creek	Hibbards Creek
1954								
1955	130 (699) *0			924 (8) *0	14427 (12) *0		46 (0) *0	0 (0) *0
1956	2133 (807) *1226			2963 (18) *0	6965 (122) *0		23 (0) *0	1 (0) *0
1957	56 (233) *2	89 (319) *0	134 (26) *1	3083 (65) *0	160595+ (99) *0		10 (0) *0	5 (9) *0
1958	712 (841) *8	143 (1123) *0	970 (113) *0	4795 (176) *0	11263 (298) *0	2910 (847) *0	79 (0) *0	0 (64) *3
1959	395 (667) *17	12 (530) *0	164 (29) *0	4681 (475) *0	6748 (619) *0	883 (122) *0	137 (4) *0	563 (17) *0
1960	806 (773) *32	162 (7668) *0	682 (727) *0	1430 (63) *0	3972 (468) *0	1985 (114) *0		53 (132)
1961	519 (385) *59							
1962	365 (410) *6							
1963	433 (698) *18							
1964	1027 (563) *400							
1965	300 (376) *71							
1966	405 (523) *1131							

Table B1 (Cont'd)

Year	Shivering Sands Creek	Lilly Bay Creek	Ahnapee River	Three Mile Creek	Kewaunee River	East Twin River	Lincoln River	Pere Marquette
1954								
1955		93 (0) *0		17 (107) *0	116 (73) *1	233 (10) *16		
1956	162 (3) *0	54 (13) *0		19 (34) *4	115 (16) *0	39 (6) *0		
1957	18 (285) *0	27 (31) *0		71 (15) *0	240 (88) *0	111 (18) *0		
1958	161 (56) *0	76 (104) *0	1035 (36) *0	10 (3) *0	80 (102) *0	99 (110) *0		
1959	329 (1) *0	151 (3) *0	277 (52) *0	89 (20) *0	97 (94) *0	22 (104) *0		
1960				53 (38) *0	97 (46) *0	52 (30) *0		
1961								
1962								
1963								
1964								
1965							926 (153) *0	12858 (1949) *28
1966								

Table B2. Numbers of fish handled yearly at Lake Superior lamprey assessment weirs.
_____ White Suckers (all sizes) *_____ Longnose Suckers (all sizes)

Year	Waiska River	Pendills Creek	Betsy River	Little Two Hearted	Two Hearted	Sucker River	Miners River	Furnance Creek
1953		16 *1334	734 *2658		307 *229	645 *23	45 *24	186 *280
1954	1715 *6	9 *414	502 *1562		1375 *1860	468 *36	176 *265	177 *129
1955	635 *12	59 *268	294 *1602		831 *527	1247 *86	156 *790	163 *875
1956	2473 *3	1591 *762	476 *2387		3705 *2128	1258 *179	135 *419	1112 *103
1957	736 *2	19 *136	346 *4736	1793 *3641	2245 *2076	291 *217	343 *581	424 *64
1958	1578 *1	20 *11	328 *2366	1840 *2169	2336 *2641	1474 *276	79 *7	157 *11
1959	1446 *1	64 *332	268 *3420	263 *1521	2341 *2366	2302 *222	942 *486	142 *15
1960	3928 40	52 *839	1271 *3288	258 *374	718 *934	2776 *548	592 *517	564 *42
1961	2694 *34	24 *1372	2163 *3260	275 *724	1620 *1880	1486 *530	1716 *394	115 *7
1962	5773 *0	27 *115	2380 *7053	101 *624	1686 *270	131 *618	853 *949	430 *0
1963	1201	21	1381 *4391		1782 *603	364 *756	501 *1353	241
1964	4055		1974 *4910		2134 *86	661 *832	1031 *2685	152
1965			1090 *8157		1688 *87	853 *90	484 *1354	392
1966			344 *1368		789 *586	1733 *398	979 *1105	511
1967			650 *1234		2274 *1824	1017 *287	2663 *2615	626
1968			644 *4367		1928 *995	2796 *189	2669	701
1969			838 *5186		1726 *3253	2780 *448	1389	884
1970			610 *2017		1053 *5256	2600 *96	1524	1503
1971			520 *2917		593 *1777	3050 *233		
1972			325 *3222		1360 *4543	3175 *113		
1973			161 *944		7332 *3700	1781 *241		
1974			358 *1208		3118 *5072	2191 *70		

Table B2 (Cont'd)

Year	Au Train River	Rock River	Laughing Whitefish R.	Chocolay River	Carp River	Harlow Creek	Big Garlic River	Iron River
1953	127 *9		62 *62					
1954	128 *4		265 *1333	3126 *26023	77 *58	160 *98	248 *778	175 *2875
1955	166 *1	80 *0	152 *446	694 *4034	592 *3136	164 *26	352 *734	311
1956	62 *3	80 *1	489 *4695	2080 *5389	*901	91 *48	611 *857	252 *4272
1957	559 *66	10 *0	146 *3517	1934 *4943	184 *1457	142	403 *817	193 *4356
1958	102 *83	15 *0	591 *3456	3076 *3812	65 *586	166 *31	216 *371	164 *2166
1959	246 *175	12 *0	452 *834	3165 *5611	157 *202	151 *111	914 *1017	302 *1060
1960	176 *7	30 *0	262 *1710	1845 *2712	260 *215	79 *23	354 626	183 *6403
1961	52 *0	144 *115	264 *3663	1402 *6984		70 *9		634 *5647
1962	66 *0	44 *0	254 *2478	2506 *6470		142 *34		1135 *5237
1963	94	46		1573 *9069		238 *551		379
1964	107			3077 *8010		*49		1142
1965				1542 *3707				501 *9782
1966				2911 *9016				1185 *8499
1967				2299 *8146				383 *8253
1968				1516 *4594				139 *7402
1969				2087 *2195				625 *421
1970				2205 *1246				315 *4450
1971				2906 *495				548 *4761
1972				1755 *401				351 *749
1973				656 *1476				64 *397
1974				1825 *1936				634 *2810

Table B2 (Cont'd)

Year	Salmon Trout R.	Pine River	Huron River	Ravine River	Silver River	Sturgeon River	Traverse River	Little Gratiot R.
1953								
1954	327 *1861	151 *609	285 *3098	224 *497	6420 *143	40 *17	139 *754	948 *268
1955	69	163 *1067	546 *2275	346 *993	3349 *136	144 *37	134 *815	893 *862
1956	111 *576	479 *3400	697 *5669	281 *682	4981 *77	35 *0	141 *306	3387 *1999
1957		194 *1126	1185 *8269	118 *658	3172 *135	86 *8	532 *185	687 *630
1958		199 *1008	3272 *10164	119 *2	5770 *150	232 *918	115 *232	82 *0
1959	83 *0	141 *418	3915 *9276	154 *78	4778 *43	3484 *2101	285 *119	196 *594
1960	73 *1908	197 *226	1803 *5992	398 *924	3748 *71	1232 *605		
1961	37 *502	220 *572	1958 *5864	175 *344	3028 *74	3700 *4343		
1962	179 *1548	260 *422	1645 *2837	167 *147	5240 *264	3126 *3322		
1963		327 *1119	2202 *4190	470 *358	5126 *61	5089 *4519		
1964		*2158	2105 *3460		3724 *250	6902 *3605		
1965			1405 *6453		1689 *66	440 *117		
1966			982 *6193		2304 *131	7698 *2765		
1967			2428 *8198		3172 *14	6845 *3506		
1968			2332 *4320		3086 *17	5468 *2747		
1969			1502 *4332		2854 *25	816 *2031		
1970			469 *2454		2579 *36	2387 *3600		
1971					1186 *36			
1972					412 *13			
1973					450 *3			
1974					554 *3			

Table B2 (Cont'd)

Year	Misery River	Firesteel River	Flintsteel River	Bad River	White River	Fish Creek	Cranberry River	Brule River
1953								
1954		642 *1525	236 *534					
1955	82 *6	1273 *1944	204 *115	20143 *6666	2950 *1416			
1956	206 *6	1439 *3624	1410 *69	3638 *867	1729 *298	4658 *2		
1957	402 *8	2028 *3873	344 *0	1356 *1143	1532 *19	2873 *11		406 *2499
1958	180 *13	3737 *2826	499 *69	4549 *3381	681 *55	9179 *42	1149 *8700	1953 *8696
1959	203 *6	4776 *6733	255 *196		162 *15	5872 *43	252 *519	1767 *15171
1960	116 *2	3567 *3432	1976 *180				42 *3766	2124 *11186
1961	64 *0	3202 *5682					174 *1663	1306 *10613
1962	121 *12	3628 *4939					37 *1510	1088 *7331
1963	71 *12	4873 *11330					73 *1773	486 *3036
1964	190	2008 *3560						1960 *975
1965	16 *1	1273 *5304						2029 *3067
1966	176 *35	1876 *7447						5137 *7977
1967	325 *9	1425 *8697						2595 *3052
1968	267 *19	3476 *6238						3838 *11981
1969	459 *12	1540 *2860						2567 *2326
1970	420 *11	1529 *4378						2764 *8644
1971								3922 *3212
1972								2340 *429
1973								1410 *755
1974								807 *536

Table B2 (Cont'd)

Year	Poplar River	Middle River	Amnicon River	Nemadji River				
1953								
1954								
1955								
1956								
1957	1857 *265	1988 *516	461 *819					
1958	887 *546	1626 *210	126 *279	1071 *3460				
1959	1823 *617	2509 *790	220 *473	87 *19				
1960	576 *168	2161 *567	98 *709	64 *17				
1961	382 *768	1120 *1613	116 *1137					
1962	769 *151	768 *546	207 *491					
1963	423 *72	829 *255	249					
1964		1333 *782	235					
1965		5410 *1490	250 *147					
1966		796 *83	526 *106					
1967		948 *156	433 *99					
1968		737 *448	365 *108					
1969		166 *78	65 *617					
1970		1467 *198	91 *102					
1971			242 *33					
1972			131 *128					
1973			145 *177					
1974			3622 *51					

Table B3. Numbers of redhorse suckers handled yearly at Lake Superior lamprey assessment weirs.

Streams reporting redhorse suckers less than 4 years omitted.

Year	Sturgeon River	Firesteel River	Poplar River	Brule River	Middle River	Amnicon River	Bad River	White River
1953								
1954	9	34						
1955	64							
1956	46	7					1853	317
1957	68	15	5	262	26	250	405	878
1958	97	30		116	5	5	82	571
1959	1183	24	1	41	10	7	31	150
1960	2642	23	3	13	4	12		62
1961	1213	5	2	4	10	2		
1962	689	5	5	6	3	6		
1963	1091	56	2		12			
1964	2052	3			3			
1965	468	10			10			
1966	1680	7			1			
1967	1034	2						
1968	0							
1969	0							
1970	108							
1971								
1972								
1973								
1974								

APPENDIX C

CATCHES OF WHITE AND LONGNOSE SUCKERS AT INDEX STATIONS IN THE GREAT LAKES

This data was provided by Mercer Patriarche, Institute for Fisheries Research, Department of Natural Resources, State of Michigan. Included in the tables are catch per unit effort (CPE) data for longnose and white suckers from Lakes Erie, St. Clair, Huron and Michigan, and station locations and dates when available. Effort for trap nets is defined as 1 lift. Effort for gill nets is measured by 304.8 m of 63.5 - 152.4 mm graded mesh. Catch data which appears in parenthesis represents actual numbers of fish caught rather than catch per unit effort. Lake Michigan stations followed by the initials GTB indicate locations along Grand Traverse Bay. (EGTB and WGTB refer to the East and West areas respectively).

Table C1. Index station catches of white sucker from Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair, 1970-1974.

LAKE ERIE

Station	Date	Gear	CPE	Effort
All	1970	Gill	0	
All	11/71	Gill	1.25	6.4
All	8/72	Trap	(2)	36
All	11/72	Gill	3.13	3.2
Swan Creek	Sp.73	Gill	2.19	6.4
Monroe	Sp.73	Gill	3.39	19.2
All	Fa.73	Gill	1.00	16.0
Balles Harbor	1974	Gill	5.20	15.0
Balles Harbor	5/74	Trap	10.50	8
Balles Harbor	Su.74	Trap	1.00	22

LAKE ST. CLAIR

Unspecified	1970		0	
All	11/71	Gill	(4)	2.4
Unspecified	9/71	Trap	1.92	12
Unspecified	5-6/72	6' Trap	(6)	23
Unspecified	5-6/72	10' Trap	0	22
Unspecified	8/72	Gill	(7)	.90
Unspecified	5-6/73	Gill	(7)	8.0
Unspecified	5-6/73	6' Trap	.27	51
Unspecifiec	5-6/73	10' Trap	(1)	21
Unspecified	10/73	Gill	1.41	7.8
Unspecified	5-6/74	6' Trap	.38	66
Unspecified	5-6/74	10' Trap	0	19
Anchor Bay	5-6/74	Gill	10.50	2.0
Middle Channel	5-6/74	Gill	3.50	2.0
Grosse Pointe	5-6/74	Gill	4.00	2.0
Unspecified	10/74	6' Trap	(1)	70

Table C2. Index station catches of white and longnose suckers from Saginaw Bay, 1970-1974.

Station	Date	Gear	CPE White	CPE Longnose	Effort
Unspecified	5/71	Gill	6.25	7.29	4.8
	8/71	Gill	11.50	0	14.0
	8/71	Trap	.75	0	17.0
	10/71	Gill	18.12	0	8.0
	8/73	Trap	(6)	0	43.0
	10/73	Gill	14.29	0	22.4
	8/74	Trap	(1)	0	27.0
	10/74	Gill	(5)	(1)	3.2
Sand Point	1970	Gill	17.50	0	2.4
	10/72	Gill	36.56	0	3.2
Fish Point	1970	Gill	11.67	0	2.4
	10/72	Gill	4.38	0	3.2
Pinconning	1970	Gill	61.67	0	2.4
	10/72	Gill	27.50	0	3.2
Tawas Bay	1970	Gill	(5)	0	2.4
	10/72	Gill	6.88	(1)	3.2
North Island	1970	Gill	9.25	0	4.0
	10/72	Gill	18.44	0	3.2

Table C3. Gillnet catches of white and longnose suckers from Lake Huron, 1971-1974.

Station	Date	CPE White	CPE Longnose	Effort
Port Huron	1971	0	0	3.2
Lake Port	1971	0	0	3.2
	5/72	0	0	1.6
	6-7/72	20.31	0	9.6
	9-11/72	(4)	0	4.1
Port Sanilac	1971	0	0	3.2
	5/72	0	0	1.6
	6-7/72	1.25	0	25.6
	9-11/72	1.58	0	24.0
	7-8/74	3.44	0	3.2
Port Hope	1971	0	0	1.6
	5/72	7.92	0	2.4
	6-7/72	10.86	0	12.8
	9-11/72	9.48	0	9.6
Harbor Beach	1971	(1)	0	1.6
	5/72	(5)	0	1.6
	6-7/72	1.29	0	25.6
Forestville	1971	31.90	0	1.6
Port Austin	1971	4.38	0	1.6
	5/72	12.50	0	3.2
	6-7/72	10.47	1.09	6.4
	9-11/72	22.81	0	3.2
Mouth AuSable River	8/72	1.85	(5)	27.5
	9-10/74	0	0	7.2
Harrisville	6-7/72	9.56	3.19	9.1
	7-8/74	3.74	3.74	9.9
	9-10/74	8.33	0	3.6
Sturgeon Pt.	6-7/72	2.77	7.86	22.0
	1973	1.72	2.20	39.6
	7-8/74	0	0.57	29.9
AuSable Pt.	6-7/72	7.67	1.87	24.0
	1973	6.13	1.37	50.4
	7-8/74	15.20	0.51	19.8
Thompson Harbor	6-7/72	2.35	15.85	20.0
Rockport	6-7/72	3.10	28.30	10.0
North Pt.	4-6/74	0	2.80	10.0
(Thunder Bay)	9-10/74	1.25	13.13	8.0
Thunder Bay Mouth	6-7/72	5.59	0	5.9
	9-10/74	2.81	0	3.2
Partridge Pt.	1973	0	(4)	2.0
	4-6/74	4.00	4.00	2.0

Table C3 (Cont'd)

Station	Date	CPE White	CPE Longnose	Effort
Munuscong Bay	9-11/72	8.50	0	4.0
	1973	(3)	5.0	4.0
Raber Bay	9-11/72	3.83	0	6.0
	1973	9.00	0	6.0
Maud Bay	9-11/72	3.17	0	6.0
	1973	8.17	0	6.0
	9-10/74	8.23	(3)	13.0
Potagannissing Bay	9-11/72	12.00	0	2.0
Hessel Bay	9-11/72	23.50	0	2.0
	9-10/74	(7)	0	2.0
Muscallonge Bay	9-11/72	3.00	0	4.0
	9-10/74	(6)	0	2.0
Government Bay	9-11/72	(3)	0	1.0
Carp R. (Mouth)	4-6/72	58.41	12.88	13.2
Rabbits Back Pk.	1971	(4)	5.76	14.4
	4-6/72	.97	3.71	34.0
	1973	(1)	.80	20.0
	4-6/74	.33	.60	30.0
Cedarville Wreck	1971	(1)	.63	14.4
Mackinaw City	1971	8.17	12.50	12.0
Cordwood Pt.	4-6/72	13.40	24.90	10.0
Cheboygan Pt.	4-6/72	10.10	42.40	10.0
Bois Blanc Is.	4-6/72	10.80	3.00	10.0
Cheboygan R.	1973	5.50	(1)	2.0
(Mouth)	9-10/74	6.50	(3)	4.0
Hammond Bay	1971	11.35	82.05	19.2
Nine Mile Pt.	1973	.75	2.20	20.0
	4-6/74	.73	1.37	30.0

Table C4. Gillnet catches of white and longnose suckers from Lake Michigan, 1971-1974.

Station	Date	CPE White	CPE Longnose	Effort
MidGreen Bay	4-6/71	0	1.92	12.0
	9-10/71	0	0	19.2
	1974	0	0	4.8
N. Green Bay	4-6/71	(2)	11.31	31.2
	9-10/71	0.73	1.61	19.2
	4-8/72	0	3.49	18.6
	1974	0	1.04	14.4
Big Bay DeNoc	4-6/71	16.41	5.06	31.2
Pt. Aux Barques	4-8/72	1.87	44.58	9.6
	9-10/72	0	0	14.4
Seul Choix Pt.	4-6/71	(2)	28.40	31.2
	9-10/71	0	5.90	14.4
	1974	5.52	20.83	9.6
Little Traverse Bay	4-8/82	60.42	1.92	12.0
	6/73	24.42	0.77	15.6
	1974	98.54	3.02	9.6
Nine Mile Pt.	4-6/71	7.22	0.83	7.2
	9-10/72	0	0	7.2
North Point	4-6/71	0	(1)	21.6
	9-10/71	6.50	2.33	24.0
South Point	4-6/71	0	0	4.8
Northport (GTB)	4-8/72	0	1.67	4.8
Old Mission (GTB)	4-6/71	6.36	4.24	3.3
Eld Rapids (EGTB)	4-6/71	4.55	14.24	3.3
	4-8/72	28.54	0	4.8
Willow Pt. (EGTB)	4-6/71	12.12	3.33	3.3
Bowers Harbor(WGTB)	4-6/71	7.88	4.55	3.3
	4-8/72	20.00	7.08	4.8
Suttons Bay (WGTB)	4-6/71	4.85	(3)	3.3
Northport Bay(GTB)	4-6/71	16.82	0	6.6
Good Harbor Bay	4-8/72	0.36	0.47	19.2
	9-10/72	(2)	1.43	16.8
Frankfort	4-6/71	0	0.28	24.9
	9-10/71	(2)	0.98	26.4
	4-8/72	0.63	0.56	14.4
	7-8/73	1.87	3.54	14.4
	1974	0	0	9.6
Portage Lake	4-8/72	3.47	4.72	7.2
	7-8/73	5.56	6.88	14.4
Manistee	4-8/72	96.67	306.67	0.3
	9-10-/72	(5)	2.64	7.2
	1974	(6)	0.96	10.4

Table C4 (Cont'd)

Station	Date	CPE White	CPE Longnose	Effort
Pentwater	1974	0	0	14.0
Little Sable Pt.	4-8/72	0	0	14.4
	7-8/73	22.92	6.25	14.4
White Lake	4-8/72	0	0	14.4
	1973	(5)	1.94	14.4
Muskegan	9-10/72	0	0	4.8
Grand Haven	4-6/71	18.12	20.21	14.4
	1974	38.14	1.36	11.8
Holland	9-10/72	13.19	5.00	7.2
	9-10/73	3.33	4.10	14.4
South Haven	9-10/72	0	(3)	9.6
	9-10/73	0	0	4.8
Benton Harbor	9-10/72	8.33	2.71	9.6
	9-10/73	12.29	(2)	9.6
	1974	(8)	0	3.0
N. of Beaver Is.	4-8/72	22.08	7.36	7.2
W. of Beaver Is.	4-8/72	56.94	5.97	7.2
Omena Bay (GTB)	4-6/71	23.94	(4)	3.3
Yuma (EGTB)	4-6/71	68.18	13.94	3.3
Simmons Reef	1974	0	0	4.8
Fagans Reef	1974	0	0	4.8

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Applegate, V. C. Former biologist, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hammond Bay, Mich.

Baldwin, N. S., and R. W. Saalfeld. 1962. Commercial fish production in the Great Lakes, 1867-1960. Great Lakes Fishery Commission Tech. Rept. No. 3, 166 p.

__________. 1970. Supplement to technical report No. 3. Commercial fish production in the Great Lakes, 1867-1960. Great Lakes Fishery Commission. n.p.

Bailey, M. M. 1969. Age, growth, and maturity of the longnose sucker *Catostomus catostomus*, of western Lake Superior. *J. Fish. Res. Board Canada* 26: 1289-1299.

Bassett, H. M. 1957. Further life history studies of two species of suckers in Shadow Mountain Reservoir, Grand County, Colorado. M.S. Thesis, Colo. St. Univ., 112 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

Beamish, R. J. MS 1970. Factors affecting the age and size of the white sucker, *Catostomus commersoni*, at maturity. Ph.D. Thesis, Dep. Zool., Univ. Toronto, Toronto, Ont. (From Scott and Crossman, 1973).

__________. 1973. Determination of age and growth of populations of the white sucker (*Catostomus commersoni*) exhibiting a wide range in size at maturity. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 30: 607-616.

__________, and H. H. Harvey. 1969. Age determination in the white sucker. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 26(3): 633-638.

Brown, C. J. D., and R. J. Graham. 1954. Observations on the longnose sucker in Yellowstone Lake. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 83: 38-46.

Buettner, H. J. Area Coordinator, National Marine Fisheries Service, U. S. Dep. of Comm., Ann Arbor, Mich.

__________. 1968. Commercial fisheries of the Great Lakes, 1879-1966. Fishery Statistics of the United States, 1966. Bureau of Comm. Fish., Stat. Digest No. 60: 557-576.

Bureau of Fisheries. 1928-1941. Fishery industries of the United States. U. S. Dep. of Commerce (data for 1926-1939).

Burrows, C. R. 1969. Our walleyes and the sucker game. Conservation Volunteer, Vol. 32, No. 186, pp. 17-20.

Campbell, R. S. MS 1935. A study of the common sucker, Catostomus commersoni (Lacepede), of Waskieu Lake. MA Thesis, Dept. Biol., Univ. Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask., 48 p.

Carlander, K. D. 1942. An investigation of Lake of the Woods, Minnesota, with particular reference to the commercial fisheries. Minn. Bur. Fish. Res. Invest. Rep. 42: 1-534. Typewritten. (From Carlander, 1969).

__________. 1969. Handbook of freshwater fishery biology. Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames, Iowa. 752 p.

Chambers, K. J. 1963. Lake of the Woods survey. Northern sector - 1963. (Preliminary report). Ont. Dep. Lands Forests, Maple, Ont. 65 p. (From Scott and Crossman, 1973).

Clemens, W. A., J. R. Dymond, and N. K. Bigelow. 1924. Food studies of Lake Nipigon fishes. Univ. Toronto Stud. Biol. Ser. 25, Publ. Ont. Fish. Res. Lab. 25: 101-165. (From Scott and Crossman, 1973).

Clifford, H. F. 1972. Downstream movements of white sucker Catostomus commersoni, fry in a brown water stream of Alberta. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 29: 1091-1093.

Coble, D. W. 1967. The white sucker population of South Bay, Lake Huron, and effects of the sea lamprey on it. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 24(10): 2117-2136.

Cross, F. B. 1967. Handbook of fishes of Kansas. University of Kanses, Lawrence, Kansas, 357 p.

Dechtiar, A. O. 1969. Two new species of monogenetic trematodes (Trematoda: Monogenea) from nasal cavities of catostomid fishes. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 26(4): 865-869.

__________. 1972. Parasites of fish from Lake of the Woods, Ontario. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 29: 275-283.

Dence, W. A. 1948. Life history, ecology, and habits of the dwarf sucker Catostomus commersoni utawana (Mather), at the Huntington Wildlife Station. Roosevelt Wildlife Bull. 8(4): 81-150.

Eddy, S., and K. D. Carlander. 1940. The effect of environmental factors upon the growth rates of Minnesota fishes. Proc. Minn. Acad. Sci. 8: 14-19. (From Carlander, 1969).

__________. 1942. Growth rates studies of Minnesota fish. Minn. Dept. Conserv. Fish. Res. Invest. Rep. 28, 64 p. Mimeo. (From Carlander, 1969).

Ellis, M. M., and G. C. Roe. 1917. Destruction of log perch eggs by suckers. Copeia 1917(47): 69-71.

Fish and Wildlife Service, U. S. Dep. of Interior. 1943-1971. Fishery statistics of the United States, Stat. Digest Nos. 4, 7, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30, 34, 36, 39, 41, 43, 44, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62.

Fogle, N. E. 1961. Report of fisheries investigations during the second year of impoundment of Oahe Reservoir, South Dakota, 1959. S. D. Dept. Game Fish Parks D-J Proj., F-1-R-9 (Jobs 12-14): 43 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

__________. 1961. Report of fisheries investigations during the third year of impoundment of Oahe Reservoir, South Dakota, 1960. S. D. Dept. Game Fish Parks D-J Proj., F-1-R-10 (Jobs 9-12): 57 p. Mimeo. (From Carlander, 1969).

__________. 1963. Report of fisheries investigations during the fourth year of impoundment of Oahe Reservoir, South Dakota, 1961. S. D. Dingell-Johnson Proj., F-1-R-11 (Jobs 10-12): 43 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

__________. 1963. Report of fisheries investigations during the fourth year of impoundment of Oahe Reservoir, South Dakota, 1962. S. D. D-J Proj., F-1-R-12 (Jobs 10-12): 43 p. (The title is "fourth year," but the report apparently refers to the fifth year of impoundment). (From Carlander, 1969).

Fredrickson, L. H., and M. J. Ulmer. 1965. Caryophyllaeid Cestodes from two species of redhorse (Moxostoma). Iowa Acad. of Science 72: 444-461.

Geen, G. H., T. G. Northcote, G. E. Hartman, and C. C. Lindsey. 1966. Life histories of two species of catostomid fishes in Sixteenmile Lake, British Columbia, with particular reference to inlet spawning. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 26(11): 1761-1788.

Gerking, S. D. 1953. Evidence for the concepts of home range and territory in stream fishes. Ecology 34: 347-365.

Greenbank, J. 1950. The length-weight relationship of some upper Mississippi River fishes. Upp. Miss. R. Conserv. Commit. 12 p. ms. (From Carlander, 1969).

Hackney, P. A., G. R. Hooper, and J. F. Webb. 1970. Spawning behavior, age and growth, and sport fishery for the silver redhorse, Moxostoma anisurum (Rafinesque), in the Flint River, Alabama. Proc. 24th Ann. Conf. Stheast Assoc. of Game and Fish Commrs: 569-676.

Hale, J. G. 1970. White sucker spawning and culture of the young in the laboratory. Prog. Fish. Cult. 32(3): 169.

Hall, G. E., and R. M. Jenkins. 1953. Continued fisheries investigation of Tenkiller Reservoir, Oklahoma, during its first year of impoundment, 1953. Okla. Fish. Res. Lab. Rep. 33: 1-54. (From Carlander, 1969).

Harris, R. H. D. 1952. A study of the sturgeon sucker in Great Slave Lake, 1950-51. M.S. Thesis, Univ. Alta. 44 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

__________. 1962. Growth and reproduction of the longnose sucker Catostomus catostomus (Forster) in Great Slave Lake. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 19: 113-126.

Hayes, M. L. 1956. Life history studies of two species of suckers in Shadow Mountain Reservoir, Grand County, Colorado. M.S. Thesis, Colo. A.M. Coll. 126 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

Hoffman, G. L. 1967. Parasites of North American freshwater fishes. Univ. Calif. Press, Los Angeles, Calif. 486 p.

Jackson, S. W., Jr. 1966. Summary of fishery management activities on Lakes Eucha and Spavinaw, Oklahoma, 1951-1964. Proc. Stheast. Assoc. Game and Fish Comm. 19: 315-343.

Jenkins, R. E. MS 1970. Systematic studies of the catostomid fish tribe Moxostomatini. Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y. 800 p. (From Scott and Crossman, 1973).

Jenkins, R. M., E. M. Leonard, and G. E. Hall. 1952. An investigation of the fisheries resources of the Illinois River and pre-impoundment study of Tenkiller Reservoir, Oklahoma. Okla. Fish. Res. Lab. Rep. 26: 136 p. Mimeo. (From Carlander, 1969).

Kathrein, J. W. 1951. Growth rate of four species of fish in a section of the Missouri River between Holster Dam and Cascade, Montana. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 80: 93-98.

Keleher, J. J. 1961. Comparison of largest Great Slave Lake fish with North American records. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada MS Rep. Biol. Sta. 557: 9 + 12 tables.

Keller, M. Supervisor, Charlevoix Great Lakes Station, Mich. Dep. Nat. Res., Charlevoix, Mich.

Koelz, Walter. 1926. Fishing industry of the Great Lakes. U. S. Dep. of Commerce, Bureau of Fisheries Doc. No. 1001: 553-617.

Kuehn, J. H. 1949. Statewide average total length in inches at each year. Minn. Fish. Res. Lab. Invest. Rep. 51 (Suppl., 2nd rev.). (From Carlander, 1969).

Lawler, G. H. 1969. Activity periods of some fishes in Hemming Lake, Canada. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 26: 3266-3267.

LaVallee, B. Retired commercial fisherman. Garden, Mich.

Lewis, W. M., and D. Elder. 1953. The fish population of the headwaters of a spotted bass stream in southern Illinois. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 82: 193-202.

Martin, Robert O., and Robert S. Campbell. 1953. The small fishes of Black River and Clearwater Lake, Missouri. Univ. Missouri Studies 26: 45-66. (From Meyer, 1962).

Metcalf, A. L. 1966. Fishes of the Kanses River System in relation to zoogeography of the Great Plains. Univ. Kansas Publ. Mus. Natur. Hist. 17(3): 23-189, 4 fig., 51 maps.

Meyer, W. H. 1962. Life history of three species of redhorse (Moxostoma) in the Des Moines River, Iowa. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 91(4): 412-419.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 1973. Michigan's Great Lakes trout and salmon fishery 1969-1972. Fisheries Management Report No. 5: 105 p.

__________. 1974. Status of selected fish stocks in Michigan Great Lakes waters and recommendations for commercial harvest. 239 pp.

Montana Fish and Game Department. 1964. Age and growth studies. D-J Completion Rep., F-23-R-7 (Jobs I, II): 6 p. Mimeo. (From Carlander, 1969).

Montana Fish and Game Dept. Fisheries Division, ed. Peters, J. C. 1964. Summary of calculated growth data on Montana fishes, 1948-61. D-J Job Completion Rep., F-23-R-6 (Jobs I-II: 76 p. Mimeo. (From Carlander, 1969).

Moore, H. H. Supv., Fishery Biologist (Res.), Fish and Wildlife Service, U. S. Dep. of Interior, Marquette, Mich.

__________, and R. A. Braem. 1965. Distribution of fishes in U. S. streams tributary to Lake Superior. U. S. Dept. of the Interior, Fish and Wildl. Service, Bur. Comm. Fish. Special Scientific Report - Fisheries No. 516: 41-43.

Moyle, J. B., and C. R. Burrows. 1954. Manual of instructions for lake survey. Minn. Bur. Fish. Fish Res. Unit Spec. Publ. 1: 70 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

National Marine Fisheries Service. 1971. Great Lakes fisheries 1969. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Current Fishery Statistics No. 5474. 9 p.

__________. 1973. Great Lakes fisheries 1971. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Current Fishery Statistics No. 6234. 11 p.

__________. 1974. Great Lakes fisheries, annual summary 1972. U. S. Dept. of Commerce, Current Fishery Statistics No. 6571. 11 p.

Olson, D. E., and W. J. Scidmore. 1963. Homing tendency of spawning white suckers in Many Point Lake, Minnesota. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 92: 13-16.

Oseid, D. M., and L. L. Smith, Jr. 1971. Survival and hatching of white sucker eggs at various dissolved oxygen levels. Prog. Fish. Cult. 33(3): 158-159.

Parker, R. A. 1958. Some effects of thinning on a population fishes. Ecology 39(2): 304-317.

Patriarche, M. H. Biologist in Charge, Great Lakes Research Unit, Mich. Dep. Nat. Res., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Purkett, C. A., Jr. 1958. Growth rates of Missouri stream fishes. Missouri Dingell-Johnson Ser. 1:46 p. (From Carlander, 1969).

Rawson, D. S., and C. A. Elsey. 1950. Reduction in the longnose sucker population of Pyramid Lake, Alberta, in an attempt to improve angling. Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc. 78: 13-31.

Roach, L. S. 1948. Golden mullet. Ohio Conserv. Bull. 12(2): 13. (From Carlander, 1969).

Robins, C. R., and E. C. Raney. 1956. Studies of the catostomid fishes of the genus Moxostoma, with descriptions of two new species. Mem. Agr. Exp. Sta. Ithaca 343: 56 p. (From Scott and Crossman, 1973).

Roland, J. V., and K. B. Cumming. 1969. The effect of water quality alteration on the growth rate of white sucker. Proc. 23rd Ann. Conf. Stheast Assoc. of Game and Fish Commrs., Oct. 19-22, 1969, pp. 332-352.

Scott, W. B., and E. J. Crossman. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Bulletin 184, Fish. Res. Board Canada, Ottawa. 966 p.

Slastenenko, E. P. 1958. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Kiev Printers, Toronto, Canada. 283 p.

Smith, L. L., Jr., and N. L. Moe (compilers). 1944. Minnesota fish facts. Minn. Dept. Conserv. Bull. 7: 1-31. (From Carlander, 1969).

Smith, M. W. 1952. Limnology and trout angling in Charlotte County Lakes, New Brunswick. J. Fish. Res. Board Canada 8(6): 383-452.

Spoor, W. A. 1938. Age and growth of the sucker, Catostomus commersoni (Lacepede), in Muskellunge Lake, Vilas County, Wisconsin. Trans. Wisc. Acad. Sci. Arts and Lett. 31: 475-505.

Stenton, J. E. 1951. Eastern brook trout eggs taken by longnose suckers in the Bauff National Park, Canada. Copeia 1951(2): 171-173.

Stewart, N. H. 1926. Development, growth, and food habits of the white sucker, Catostomus commersonii Lesueur. Bull. of the Bureau of Fisheries, Vol. XLII: 147-184.

Tack, P. I. Professor, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

Trautman, M. B. 1957. The fishes of Ohio with illustrated keys. Ohio State Univ. Press, Columbus, Ohio. 683 p.

United States Department of Interior. 1969. Fish and wildlife as related to water quality of the Lake Huron Basin. 134 p.

Wright, A. Biologist, Region I Headquarters, Mich. Dep. Nat. Resources, Marquette, Mich.