

8-1-1984

Recent Collections of Fishes from the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River System, Tennessee and Kentucky

Christopher J. O'Bara

R. Don Estes

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/sfcproceedings>



Part of the [Marine Biology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Bara, Christopher J. and Estes, R. Don (1984) "Recent Collections of Fishes from the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River System, Tennessee and Kentucky," *Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings*: No. 15.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/sfcp15a3n0>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/sfcproceedings/vol1/iss15/5>

This article is brought to you freely and openly by Volunteer, Open-access, Library-hosted Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/sfcproceedings>.

Recent Collections of Fishes from the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River System, Tennessee and Kentucky

Robbins, C.R., R.M. Bailey, C.E. Bond, J.R. Brooker, E.A. Lachner, R.N. Lea, and W.B. Scott. 1980. A list of common and scientific names of fishes from the United States and Canada. Am. Fish. Soc. Spec. Publ., No. 12. 174 pp.

Vaughan, G.L. 1979. Effects of stripmining on fish and diatoms in streams of the New River drainage basin. J. Tenn. Acad. Sci. 54:110-114.

Wilson, D., B. Finalyson, and N. Morgan. 1981. Copper, zinc, and calcium concentrations of resident trout related to acid-mine wastes. Calif. Fish and Game 67:176-187.

Yancik, J.J. 1979. Coal's response to the challenge in the national energy plan: demand and supply projection through 1985. in, M.K. Walli, ed. Ecology and coal resource development. Pergamon Press, New York, NY.

Table 1. A list of fish species collected at selected study sites.

Scientific Name	Study Sites*
1. <i>Salmo gairdneri</i>	17
2. <i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>	6,8
3. <i>Camptostoma anomalum</i>	1,2,3,4,8,10,12,14-21
4. <i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	18
5. <i>Hemistremia flammnea</i> ^a	17
6. <i>Hybopsis amblopa</i>	1,3,7
7. <i>Hybopsis dissimilis</i>	7
8. <i>Hybopsis insignis</i>	1
9. <i>Nocomis micropogon</i>	1,2,14
10. <i>Notropis ardens</i>	5,8,14,16
11. <i>Notropis ariommus</i> ^a	5
12. <i>Notropis coccogenis</i> ^a	9,14
13. <i>Notropis c. chrysocephalus</i>	1,3,5,8,10,19,22
14. <i>Notropis galacturus</i>	2-5,7-9,16,19
15. <i>Notropis lirus</i>	8
16. <i>Notropis rubellus</i>	1,2,16,20
17. <i>Notropis stramineus</i>	5,7,16,20
18. <i>Notropis teleostichus</i>	3,7,9,14
19. <i>Notropis volucellus</i> ^a	5,7
20. <i>Pimephales notatus</i>	3,8,12,14,15
21. <i>Rhinichthys atratulus</i>	12,19
22. <i>Semotilus atromaculatus</i>	1-4,11,12,15,17,20,21,23
23. <i>Hypentelium nigricans</i>	1-5,7,8,10,12,15-17,19,20
24. <i>Moxostoma duquesnei</i>	2,4,7
25. <i>Moxostoma erythrum</i>	1,3,15-17,19,20
26. <i>Moxostoma macrolepidotum</i>	8
27. <i>Ictalurus melas</i>	22

Table 1. (continued)

Scientific Name	Study Sites*
28. <i>Ictalurus natalis</i>	4,10,18
29. <i>Noturus flavus</i>	4,7
30. <i>Fundulus catenatus</i>	18
31. <i>Fundulus notatus</i>	8
32. <i>Chologaster agassizii</i> ^a	17
33. <i>Labidesthes sicculus</i> ^a	7,19
34. <i>Ambloplites rupestris</i>	2-5,7-10,15,18
35. <i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>	1,6,8,11,21
36. <i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>	2-5,10,15-19,22
37. <i>Lepomis megalotis</i>	1-5,7,10,20
38. <i>Lepomis microlophus</i>	4,18
39. <i>Micropterus dolomieu</i>	1,2,4,5,7,9,10,19,22
40. <i>Micropterus punctulatus</i>	1,7,10,15,20
41. <i>Micropterus s. salmoides</i>	4,10,17
42. <i>Etheostoma atripinna</i> ^a	4,7
43. <i>Etheostoma blennioides</i>	1-3,5,7-9,16,19,20
44. <i>Etheostoma caeruleum</i>	2,3,5,7,10,16,20
45. <i>Etheostoma camurum</i>	16,17
46. <i>Etheostoma duryi</i> ^a	3,8,17
47. <i>Etheostoma flabellare</i> ^a	4,8,10
48. <i>Etheostoma kennicotti</i>	12,15
49. <i>Etheostoma maculatum</i> ^a	2,9
50. <i>Etheostoma obervense</i>	7
51. <i>Etheostoma rufilineatum</i>	1,3,7,9,10,19
52. <i>Etheostoma sagitta</i> ^a	12,15
53. <i>Etheostoma simotermum</i> ^a	1,8-10,19
54. <i>Etheostoma stigmaeum</i> ^a	4,7,8
55. <i>Etheostoma baileyi</i>	20
56. <i>Etheostoma zonale</i>	1
57. <i>Percina caprodes</i>	4,5,7,8,10,20
58. <i>Percina maculata</i> ^a	5,15,16,20
59. <i>Percina sciera</i> ^a	6
60. <i>Percina squamata</i> ^b	2
61. <i>Cottus bairdi</i>	3
62. <i>Cottus caroliniae</i>	1,3,8,17

*reference numbers from collection sites

^aTennessee Technological University

^bUniversity of Tennessee

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. David A. Etnier (University of Tennessee) and Dr. Frank J. Bulow (Tennessee Technological University) for their help in the identification of certain troublesome species. The assistance of William A. Swartley and Joy I. Broach (Tennessee Technological University) for their aide in the field is also appreciated.

RECENT COLLECTIONS OF FISHES FROM THE BIG SOUTH FORK OF THE CUMBERLAND RIVER SYSTEM, TENNESSEE AND KENTUCKY

Christopher J. O'Bara and R. Don Estes

Tennessee Cooperative Fishery Research Unit and
Biology Department
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee

The Big South Fork of the Cumberland River (BSFCR) system originates with the confluence of the Clear Fork and the New River in Tennessee, and flows in a northerly direction for approximately 40 miles, until it reaches Lake Cumberland, Kentucky. The majority of the tributaries drain the Cumberland Plateau region, which is of Pennsylvanian geologic age. The main river and some larger tributaries have created a gorge, resulting in exposed strata of Mississippian geologic age (Luther 1959).

Comiskey (1970) studied the fishes of this system, and Comiskey and Etnier (1972) later formally published the results of this work, in which they summarized the limited number of earlier publications dealing entirely or in part with the fishes of the system (Cope 1870; Kirsch 1893; Fowler 1907, 1924; Evermann 1918; Shoup and Peyton 1940), and included lists of species recorded by each. They also provided an annotated list

of all species known from the system (although they did not include specific locality data for most species), and discussed the probable method (man-induced) by which two species (*Etheostoma sagitta* and *E. kennicotti*) have reached the Big South Fork system from adjacent parts of the upper Cumberland drainage (i.e. above Cumberland Falls) to the east. The reader is referred to Comiskey and Etnier's 1972 paper for further information.

Recent studies have concentrated on degradation of the aquatic environment due to man's activities. Species distributions have become reduced by acid mine drainage, oil and natural gas field runoff, logging, and domestic and industrial pollution in many streams (Parsons 1959; Winger et al 1979; O'Bara et al 1982). Renewed interest in the BSFCR system has surfaced since establishment of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation area. This area comprises approximately 100,000 acres within the BSFCR system, and provides environmental protection for many tributaries.

The following report lists the results of collections made from 48 stations during the summer and fall of 1981. Only tributaries of the free-flowing section of the BSFCR were sampled, using a combination of 120-volt backpack electroshocker, seines, and ichthyocides. Three sampling sites were selected on

each tributary, primarily on the Cumberland Plateau and in the gorge area. These collections do not represent a complete re-survey of the BSFCR system, but rather are intended to supplement the earlier report by Comiskey and Etnier (1972). This is obvious from the large number of species reported by those authors that were not taken by us, particularly from the Little South Fork (which we did not sample). In general, ecological perturbations (natural gas drilling, logging, domestic and industrial pollution) were much more severe in the eastern than in the western tributaries, a situation that in most cases is reflected in a much lower fish-species diversity (Table 1). In analyzing the number of species at each collecting site, however, it should be remembered that in some cases lower diversity is merely a natural reflection of a more upstream location. Overall we conclude that the fish fauna of the BSFCR system has remained reasonably diverse, despite man-induced environmental degradation.

The Little South Fork is probably the most pristine stream in the BSFCR system, and in addition may have certain ecological characteristics not found in other streams in the area. The following 15 species were recorded by Comiskey and Etnier (1972) only from the Little South Fork, and were not taken during our work: Ichthyomyzon bdellium, Hybopsis dissimilis, Hybopsis insignis, Nocomis effusus, Notropis new species cf. N. procne, Notropis ariomus, Notropis photogenis, Pimephales notatus, Pimephales promelas (possible introduction), Lagochila lacera (now extinct; pre-1900 collection only), Fundulus catenatus, Etheostoma atripinne, Etheostoma flabellare, Percina macrocephala (pre-1900 collection only), and Cottus caroliniae. Other species not taken by us that were recorded by Comiskey and Etnier (1972) from other parts of the BSFCR system include Salvelinus fontinalis (introduction), Esox masquinongy, Clinostomus funduloides (possible introduction), Notropis atherinoides, Notropis leuciodus, Moxostoma erythrurum, Moxostoma macrolepidotum breviceps, Noturus exilis, Ictalurus natalis, Labidesthes sicculus, Morone chrysops, Ammocrypta asprella (pre-1900 collection only), Etheostoma kennicotti, Etheostoma new species cf. E. flabellare, Etheostoma baileyi, Etheostoma spectabile, Etheostoma tippecanoe, Etheostoma zonale, Percina burtoni, Percina copelandi, and Percina sciera. The following species were taken by us for the first time from the system: Lepomis gulosus, Micropterus salmoides, Aplodinotus grunniens. Finally, Hybopsis amblops, which was listed by Comiskey and Etnier (1972) only on the basis of old records and a 1953 collection and was thought possibly to be extirpated from the BSFCR system, was rediscovered during our work.

Annotated List of Fishes

The common and scientific names and phylogenetic arrangement follow Robins et al (1980). Collection site numbers are included for each species, as is the location of selected voucher specimens (TTU-Tennessee Technological University; UT-University of Tennessee, Knoxville).

Family Petromyzontidae-lampreys

1. Ichthyomyzon greeleyi Hubbs and Trautman-mountain brook lamprey. Stas. 2, 16, 22, 24, 28, 29, 31, 37, 40. (TTU). Fourteen ammocoetes were collected from seven streams, with most being found in sandy areas at the mouths of streams.

Family Salmonidae-trouts.

2. Salmo gairdneri Richardson-rainbow trout. Stas. 32, 33. This introduced species was undergoing natural reproduction, as evidenced by the presence of several age classes and lack of stocking in recent years.

3. Salmo trutta Linnaeus-brown trout. Stas. 33, 41. This introduced species also showed signs of natural reproduction.

Family Cyprinidae-minnows.

4. Campostoma anomalum (Rafinesque)-central stoneroller. Stas. 2, 6, 13, 15, 19, 23-27, 29-32, 38-40, 43, 46, 48. One of the most abundant species in the system. Found in riffle or run areas at all localities except those of extremely small size or those that were heavily impacted.

5. Hybopsis amblops (Rafinesque)-bigeye chub. Sta. 2. (UT). Kirsch (1893) reported the bigeye chub from the Little South Fork, Kennedy Creek, and Rock Creek, but subsequent investigators did not find it at any of these localities. The species was recently reported by Harker et al (1979) from Rock Creek, and was also taken there during our study.

6. Nocomis micropogon (Cope)-river chub. Stas. 14, 28, 31, 33, 34, 37-40, 48. Shows an evident preference for a medium to large cobble substrate in medium to large streams, or at the mouths of small streams.

7. Notropis ardens (Cope)-rosefin shiner. Stas. 2, 14, 22-24, 29, 30, 39, 40, 46-48. A common species in medium to large streams of good water quality. Its absence from the eastern tributaries, Troublesome Creek and Bandy Creek, may be attributed to poor water quality or heavy siltation.

8. Notropis chrysocephalus (Rafinesque)-striped shiner. Sta. 48. Recorded by Comiskey and Etnier (1972) as Notropis cornutus. Found only at one station in association with seven other species of Notropis.

9. Notropis galacturus (Cope)-whitetail shiner. Stas. 2, 37, 38, 47, 48. Found only in western tributaries of fair to good quality habitat, in areas having a medium cobble or gravel substrate.

10. Notropis rubellus (Agassiz)-rosyface shiner. Stas. 14, 22, 37, 40, 47, 48. Common in medium to large streams having a medium-sized cobble substrate; apparently intolerant of siltation.

11. Notropis new species cf. N. spectrunculus-sawfin shiner. Stas. 29, 30, 37, 48. This undescribed species, which was collected in three western tributaries, was found in streams of good to excellent water quality with little siltation.

12. Notropis spilopterus (Cope)-spotfin shiner. Sta. 13. The surprising scarcity of this normally common species confirms Comiskey and Etnier's (1972) observations. The single collection was from a large pool.

13. Notropis stramineus (Cope)-sand shiner. Stas. 6, 14, 22-24, 29, 30, 43, 47, 48. The range of this species in the Cumberland, Tennessee and other drainages south of the Ohio River is surprisingly disjunct and spotty. Only two pockets of abundance are known, one in the upper Tennessee River drainage in eastern Tennessee, and the other in the Big South Fork system (Gilbert 1980). This species is widely distributed in the system, and is widely tolerant of a variety of environmental conditions, being found in streams receiving acid mine, domestic, agricultural, and industrial pollutants.

14. Notropis telescopus (Cope)-telescope shiner. Stas. 2, 13, 14, 19, 22-24, 29, 30, 38, 40, 46, 48. This widely distributed species inhabits both small and large streams throughout the system. Nuptial tubercles found on the snout and chin of all age classes and both sexes provide an easily identifiable field character.

15. Notropis volucellus (Cope)-mimic shiner. Stas. 2, 29, 30, 46, 48. Restricted to three western tributaries, all of which have good to excellent habitat quality.

16. Phoxinus erythrogaster (Rafinesque)-southern redbelly dace. Sta. 42. A headwater species limited to cool waters, where found in association with Rhinichthys atratulus and Semotilus atromaculatus. Recent bridge construction upstream of the collection site has severely altered the habitat, and may have eliminated this species from the Laurel Fork watershed.

17. Rhinichthys atratulus (Hermann)-blacknose dace. Stas. 11, 12, 17, 32-35, 39, 41, 42. Found in most headwater streams draining the Cumberland Plateau. Preference for cool waters and heavy canopy

cover was evident.

18. Semotilus atromaculatus (Mitchill)-creek chub. Stas. 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-12, 15-17, 19-21, 24, 26, 29-35, 40-42, 44-48. The most widely distributed species in the BSFCR system. Found in every watershed, including streams where no other species was found. Tolerant of all but the most severe conditions, and found in streams where flow was reduced to interstitial flow and standing pools. Tolerance to such adverse conditions may partly be explained by its feeding habits, since it consumes mostly terrestrial insects and is not dependent on the aquatic ecosystem for its food supply (Lotrich 1973).

Family Catostomidae-suckers.

19. Catostomus commersoni (Lacepede)-white sucker. Sta. 15. Probably more widespread.

20. Hypentelium nigricans (Lesueur)-northern hog sucker. Stas. 2, 3, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 23-26, 28-31, 34, 37-40, 43, 46-48. Found in a variety of habitats, and appears to be tolerant to most adverse conditions.

21. Moxostoma duquesnei (Lesueur)-black redhorse. Stas. 2, 14, 24. Occurs only in medium-sized streams, where it was collected in large pools.

Family Ictaluridae-catfishes.

22. Ictalurus punctatus (Rafinesque)-channel catfish. Sta. 43. Comiskey and Etnier (1972) reported this species to be common in the main river.

23. Noturus flavus Rafinesque-stonecat. Stas. 2, 13, 14, 16, 19, 22, 25, 31, 40. Inhabits riffle areas of medium-sized streams.

24. Pylodictis olivaris (Rafinesque)-flathead catfish. Sta. 13. Only one juvenile collected during survey. Likely common in the main river.

Family Centrarchidae-sunfishes and black basses.

25. Ambloplites rupestris (Rafinesque). Stas. 2, 6, 14, 22-25, 28-32, 37-40, 43, 46-48. Found in a wide variety of habitats and tolerant of most adverse conditions. The most abundant game fish in the system.

26. Lepomis gulosus (Cuvier)-warmouth. Sta. 37. (TTU). The first record of this species from the BSFCR system upstream of Lake Cumberland (O'Bara et al 1983). Most likely represents a recruit from Lake Cumberland.

27. Lepomis macrochirus Rafinesque-bluegill. Stas. 4-6, 10, 13-15, 19, 25, 28, 30, 31, 37-45, 47. Found in a wide variety of habitats. One of the few species seemingly tolerant of severe acid mine drainage.

28. Lepomis megalotis (Rafinesque)-longear sunfish. Stas. 4, 5, 10, 14, 19, 22, 25, 28, 29, 31, 40, 43, 46-48. The most common species of Lepomis in the BSFCR system, and seems to exhibit extreme tolerance to acid mine drainage. Often found in association with the creek chub.

29. Micropterus dolomieu Lacepede-smallmouth bass. Stas. 2, 13, 14, 22, 23, 29, 30, 37-39, 43, 47, 48. Present in a number of medium to large streams, but never in large numbers. Apparently prefers streams of good water quality and little siltation.

30. Micropterus punctulatus (Rafinesque)-spotted bass. Stas. 4-6, 10, 14, 15, 20, 25, 28-31, 37, 40, 43. Found in streams of similar size to those inhabited by smallmouth bass, and the two occurred sympatrically in some places. In general, occupies slightly less pristine waters than M. dolomieu.

31. Micropterus salmoides (Lacepede)-largemouth bass. Stas. 28, 43, 44. Collected only at the mouths of streams where they entered the main river. Not previously reported by Comiskey and Etnier (1972), and individuals collected may represent recruits from Lake Cumberland.

Family Percidae-perches and darters.

32. Etheostoma blennioides Rafinesque-greenside darter. Stas. 2, 13, 14, 19, 22, 25, 26, 28-31, 34, 37, 38, 40, 46-48. Occurs primarily in riffles and is

one of the more widely distributed species in the system.

33. Etheostoma caeruleum Storer-rainbow darter. Stas. 2, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 22-26, 28-31, 34, 37, 38, 46-48. The most abundant percid in the system, and occurs in all tributaries except those severely affected by pollution.

34. Etheostoma camurum (Cope)-bluebreast darter. Stas. 2, 10, 13, 14, 19, 22, 29, 31, 38, 40, 46-48. Widely distributed, but never present in large numbers. Prefers a substrate of larger cobbles than the greenside or rainbow darters.

35. Etheostoma cinereum Storer-ashy darter. Stas. 14, 19, 28, 29, 31, 37, 38, 40, 46, 48. Listed as threatened in Tennessee. Found in medium-sized streams with good to excellent water quality. Widely distributed in western tributaries, but in eastern tributaries found only in Williams Creek.

36. Etheostoma maculatum Kirtland-spotted darter. Stas. 14, 22, 25, 26, 38, 47, 48. Occurs sporadically in a wide range of habitats, but appears to prefer a medium cobble substrate.

37. Etheostoma obeyense Kirsch-barcheek darter. Stas. 2, 3. (TTU). Found only in Rock Creek, and reported also from Little South Fork system by Comiskey and Etnier (1972).

38. Etheostoma sagitta (Jordan and Swain)-arrow darter. Stas. 5, 6. (TTU). Comiskey and Etnier (1972) discussed possible means by which this species (otherwise restricted to the upper Cumberland River drainage) made its way downstream of Cumberland Falls via a man-made diversion in town of Stearns, Kentucky. Present records constitute further indication of range expansion in lower Cumberland drainage.

39. Etheostoma stigmaeum (Jordan)-speckled darter. Sta. 14. Only capture was in a large pool-run sequence. Comiskey and Etnier (1972) reported species from main river, Station Camp Creek, and the Little South Fork.

40. Percina caprodes (Rafinesque)-logperch. Stas. 4, 13, 14, 19, 28-31, 37, 38. Found in a wide range of habitats, including Roaring Paunch Creek, a severely degraded stream.

41. Percina maculata (Girard)-blackside darter. Stas. 40, 47. These two stations differ widely in character. Station 40 (Laurel Fork) is a cool, medium-sized stream of excellent water quality, whereas station 47 (White Oak Creek) is a large, warm, slightly polluted stream.

42. Percina squamata (Gilbert and Swain)-olive darter. Stas. 37, 38, 43. Both of these stations are similar in size and habitat quality.

43. Stizostedion vitreum vitreum (Mitchill)-walleye. Sta. 14. Reported by Comiskey and Etnier (1972) to be fairly numerous in the main river.

Family Sciaenidae-drums.

44. Aplocheilichthys grunniens Rafinesque-freshwater drum. Sta. 37. First record for BSFCR system. One specimen collected.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the personnel of the U.S. National River and Recreation Area for their aid in conducting field work. We would also like to thank Drs. David A. Etnier (University of Tennessee-Knoxville) and Frank J. Bulow (Tennessee Technological University) for their help in identifying certain troublesome species. This project was funded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-Nashville District. Cooperators for the Tennessee Cooperative Fishery Research Unit are the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Tennessee Wildlife Resource Agency, and Tennessee Technological University.

Literature Cited

Comiskey, C.E. 1970. The fishes of the Big South Fork

- of the Cumberland River system. M.Sc. thesis, Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville, 91 p.
- Comiskey, C.E. and D.A. Etnier. 1972. The fishes of the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River. J. Tenn. Acad. Sci. 47(4):140-146.
- Cope, E.D. 1870. On some etheostomine perch from Tennessee and North Carolina. Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. 11:262-270.
- Evermann, B.W. 1918. The fishes of Tennessee and Kentucky: A distributional catalog of the known species. Bull. U.S. Fish Comm. (1915-1916) 36:293-368.
- Fowler, H.W. 1907. Some new and little-known percoid fishes. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. 58:510-528.
- Fowler, H.W. 1924. Notes on North American cyprinoid fishes. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. 76:389-416.
- Gilbert, C.R. 1980. *Notropis stramineus* (Cope), sand shiner. p. 314 In D.S. Lee et al. Atlas of North American Freshwater Fishes. North Carolina St. Mus. Nat. Hist., Raleigh. 1-X + 854 pp.
- Harker, Jr., D.F., S.M. Call, M.L. Warren, Jr., K.E. Camburn and P. Wigley. 1979. Aquatic biota and water quality survey of the Appalachian Province, eastern Kentucky. Kentucky Nature Preserves Comm., Frankfort, 1152 pp.
- Kirsch, P.H. 1893. Notes on a collection of fishes from the southern tributaries of the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee. Bull. U.S. Fish Comm. 11:257-268.
- Lotrich, V.A. 1973. Growth, production, and community composition of fishes inhabiting a first-, second-, and third-order stream of eastern Kentucky. Ecol. Monogr. 43(3):377-397.
- Luther, E.T. 1959. The coal reserves of Tennessee. Tennessee Div. of Geology, Nashville, TN, 294 p.
- O'Bara, C.J., W. Pennington, and W.P. Bonner. 1982. A survey of water quality, benthic macroinvertebrates and fish of sixteen streams within the Big South Fork River and Recreational Area. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville District, 219 p.
- Parsons, J.W. 1959. Muskellunge in Tennessee streams. J. Tenn. Acad. Sci. 88:136-140.
- Robins, C.R., R.M. Bailey, C.E. Bond, J.R. Brooker, E.A. Lachner, R.N. Lea, and W.B. Scott. 1980. A list of common and scientific names of fishes from the United States and Canada. Amer. Fish. Soc. Spec. Publ. 12:1-174.
- Shoup, C.S. and J.H. Peyton. 1940. Collections from the drainage of the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River. J. Tenn. Acad. Sci. 15:106-116.
- Winger, P.V., P. Bettoli, M. Brazinski, and C. Lokey. 1977. Fish and benthic populations of the New River, Tennessee. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Nashville, TN, 245 p.
9. downstream of the confluence with Williams Creek Scott Co., KY: no fish collected.
- Troublesome Creek (W)
10. at mouth, McCreary Co., KY: 18,20,27,28,30,33,34.
 11. downstream of the confluence with Cliff Branch, McCreary Co., KY: 17,18.
 12. 300 meters upstream of the confluence with Cliff Branch, McCreary Co., KY: 17,18.
- Williams Creek (E)
13. downstream of confluence with Grassy Fork, Scott Co., TN: 4,12,14,20,23,24,27,29,32,33,34,40.
 14. upstream of the confluence with Puncheoncamp Creek, Scott Co., TN: 6,7,10,13,14,20,21,23,25,27,28,29,30,32,33,34,35,36,39,40,43.
 15. headwaters, Scott Co., TN: 4,18,19,27,30.
- Grassy Fork of Williams Creek (E)
16. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 1,18,20,23,33.
 17. downstream of the confluence with Indian Rock Branch, Scott Co., TN: 17,18.
 18. upstream of Indian Rock Branch, Scott Co., TN: no fish collected.
- Puncheoncamp Creek (E)
19. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 4,14,18,20,23,27,28,32,33,34,35,40.
 20. near Chestnut Ridge, Scott Co., TN: 18,30.
 21. near Puncheon Knob, Scott Co., TN: 18.
- No Business Creek (W)
22. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 1,7,10,13,14,23,25,28,29,32,33,34,36.
 23. at the confluence with Betty Branch, Scott Co., TN: 4,7,13,14,20,25,29,33.
 24. at the confluence with Anderson Cave Branch, Scott Co., TN: 1,4,7,13,14,18,20,21,25,32,33.
- Parch Corn Creek
25. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 4,20,23,25,27,28,30,32,33,36.
 26. upstream of the confluence with Right Prong, Scott Co., TN: 4,18,20,32,33,36.
 27. headwaters, Scott Co., TN: 4.
- Station Camp Creek (W)
28. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 1,6,20,25,27,28,30,31,32,33,35,40.
 29. downstream of the confluence with Chariot Creek, Scott Co., TN: 1,4,7,11,13,14,15,18,20,25,28,29,30,32,33,34,35,40.
 30. at the confluence with Middle Creek, Scott Co., TN: 4,7,11,13,14,15,18,20,25,27,29,30,32,33,40.
- Laurel Fork of Station Camp Creek (W)
31. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 1,4,6,18,20,23,25,27,28,30,32,33,34,35,40.
 32. 1 1/2 mile upstream of mouth, Scott Co., TN: 2,4,17,18,25.
 33. downstream of the confluence with Rockhouse Branch, Scott Co., TN: 2,3,6,17,18.
- Bandy Creek (W)
34. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 6,17,18,20,32,33.
 35. near White Pine, Scott Co., TN: 17,18.
 36. headwaters, Scott Co., TN: no fish collected.
- North White Oak Creek (W)
37. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 1,6,9,10,11,20,25,26,27,29,30,32,33,35,40,42,44.
 38. near Zenith, Fentress Co., TN: 4,6,9,14,20,25,27,29,32,33,34,36,40,42.
 39. at the confluence with Lick Branch, Fentress Co., TN: 4,6,7,17,20,25,27,29.
- Laurel Fork of North White Oak Creek (W)
40. mouth, Scott Co., TN: 1,4,6,7,10,14,18,20,23,25,27,28,30,32,34,41.
 41. downstream of the confluence with Hatfield Creek, Fentress Co., TN: 3,17,18,27.
- Table 1. Sampling sites, locations, and species distribution of fish collected from the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River system, Tennessee and Kentucky. (w=western tributary; e=eastern tributary).
-
- Rock Creek (W)
1. near Yamacrow, McCreary Co., KY: no fish collected.
 2. near Wright's Camp, Scott Co., TN: 1,4,5,7,9,14,15,18,20,21,23,25,29,32,33,34,37.
 3. at Pickett State Park, Pickett Co., TN: 18,20,37.
- Roaring Paunch Creek (E)
4. at mouth, McCreary Co., KY: 27,28,30,40.
 5. near Barthell, McCreary Co., KY: 18,27,28,30,38.
 6. near Revelo, McCreary Co., KY: 4,13,18,25,27,30,38.
- Bear Creek (E)
7. at mouth, McCreary Co., KY: no fish collected.
 8. Turkey Branch, a tributary to Bear Creek, McCreary Co., KY: 18.

Southeastern Fishes Council
PROCEEDINGS

Florida State Museum, University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

DEDICATED TO THE PRESERVATION OF SOUTHEASTERN FISHES

16

42. at Tennessee Route 154, Fentress Co., TN: 16,17, 18,27.

Pine Creek (E)

43. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 4,13,20,22,25,27,28, 29,30,31,42.
44. 2 miles upstream of mouth, Scott Co., TN: 18, 27, 31.
45. near Toomy, Scott Co., TN: 18,27.

White Oak Creek (W)

46. at mouth, Scott Co., TN: 4,7,14,15,18,20,25,28, 32,33,34,35.
47. near Horseshoe Bend, Scott Co., TN: 7,9,10,13, 18,20,25,27,28,29,32,33,34,36,41.
48. near Rugby, Morgan Co., TN: 4,6,7,8,9,10,11,13, 14,15,18,20,25,28,29,32,33,34,35,36.

manuscripts redone on a different word processor were such that we decided instead to go with what you see here.

Several individuals have recently inquired about the availability of new fish buttons for this year. Glenn Clemmer informs us these should be available shortly.

It has come to our attention that a number of Council members are not members of the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists. We understand, of course, that individuals support the SEFC for different reasons, and that some may only be ichthyologists peripherally. Nevertheless, we urge that you consider joining ASIH if you are not already a member, since the journal of that society, *Copeia*, is one of the best "bargains" in the biological journal field and contains a wealth of high-quality scientific papers. Subscription rates are \$18 for students, \$24 for domestic members (including Canada and Mexico) and \$27 for foreign members.

For reasons of economy we have decided to go to a photo-offset style for this (and possibly future) issues of the Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings. You will also note that, for the first time, we have opted to include several papers in a single issue, which again was done for reasons of economy. We trust that SEFC members will appreciate and understand the need for doing so.

We apologize for the unjustified margins, and hope that these will not be repeated in the future. The manuscripts were originally typed with justified margins, but the finished product was so esthetically displeasing and so wasteful of space that we had little choice but to reject them in that form. The costs involved (not to mention loss of time) in having these

George Fenwick of The Nature Conservancy recently contacted the Southeastern Fishes Council regarding possible sites to be purchased by his organization. Members present at the 1984 annual meeting in Memphis were polled about worthy localities, and a list of 19 sites was developed. No priorities were assigned to the sites other than for the Conasauga River, TN and GA, which was the consensus top choice. Members willing to "go to bat" for each site in the form of a short description of its value and uniqueness were also recorded, and the lists forwarded to the Conservancy. Interested members may contact George H. Burgess, Secretary-Treasurer, Florida State Museum, University of Florida, Gainesville 32611 for further information, or additional suggested sites.