WYOMING GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

FISH DIVISION

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

TITLE: Instream Flow Studies on Giraffe Creek (tributary to Thomas Fork River), a Bonneville Cutthroat Trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki utah*) Stream.

PROJECT: IF-PE96-07-9504

AUTHOR: Paul D. Dey and Thomas C. Annear

DATE: June 1996

ABSTRACT

Instream flow data were collected in 1995 on Giraffe Creek to determine flows needed to maintain or improve Bonneville cutthroat trout (BRC) habitat and populations. Studies were designed to complement ongoing monitoring of BRC index streams (Remmick et al. 1994).

Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM), the Habitat Quality Index (HQI), and the Habitat Retention Method were used to derive instream flow recommendations. Recommendations are: October 1 - April 30 = 1.5 cfs, May 1 - June 30 = 5.5 cfs, and July 1 - September 30 = 4.6 cfs.

INTRODUCTION

Wyoming Bonneville cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki utah*) populations occur primarily in the Thomas Fork and Smiths Fork watersheds. Physical, chemical, and biological characteristics were inventoried between 1966 and 1977 (Miller 1977). Binns (1981) reviewed the distribution, genetic purity, and habitat conditions for Bonneville cutthroat trout populations. Recent population and habitat survey results are in Remmick (1981, 1987) and Remmick et al. (1994). In general, populations are limited by seasonally low flows, lack of riparian cover, thermal pollution arising in conjunction with low flows and reduced riparian vegetation, and silt pollution (Binns 1981).

Bonneville Cutthroat trout were recently petitioned for listing under the Endangered Species Act but are not listed at this time. Status review was initiated in response to concerns expressed by the Idaho Fish and Game Department, the Desert Fishes Council and the Utah Wilderness Association. This species is considered "rare" by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD 1977).

A 5-year management plan for Wyoming, developed by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) in coordination with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), outlines management goals and provides criteria for listing Bonneville cutthroat trout as threatened (Remmick et al. 1994). The plan's purpose is to outline management practices to prevent listing by moving toward wider distribution and higher populations. The plan recommends that status decisions be made after five-years of population and habitat monitoring. Habitat protection by acquiring instream flow water rights will not directly achieve the plan's goals but rather serve to prevent additional population declines.

Fish and other resource management practices could be significantly affected by listing Bonneville cutthroat trout as Threatened or Endangered. Instream flow water right identification and acquisition on Bonneville cutthroat trout streams is important to help avoid listing. Therefore, the WGFD filed for water rights on Huff Creek, Giraffe (Howland) Creek, Hobble Creek, Porcupine Creek, Smiths Fork River, and Raymond Creek in 1993 and 1994. Studies in 1995 focused on Giraffe Creek, Salt Creek, Water Canyon Creek, Coal Creek, and Coantag Creek.

Study objectives were to 1) investigate the relationship between discharge and physical habitat quantity and quality for Bonneville cutthroat trout and, 2) determine an instream flow necessary to maintain or improve Bonneville cutthroat trout populations.

METHODS

Study Area

Giraffe Creek is a tributary to the Thomas Fork River (Figure 1). The drainage basin is privately owned at lower elevations and managed by the USFS at higher elevations. Livestock grazing occurs throughout the watershed. Sagebrush/grass communities predominate at lower to middle elevations with mixed aspen and conifers at higher elevations and hillside valleys. Willow are scattered in the riparian zone and beaver activity has resulted in several old and new ponds. Overall stream gradient is moderate (<2.5 %) and the channel type was rated as B2 (Rosgen 1985). This rating indicates a moderately entrenched channel that is well confined by its valley and has bed material composed of large cobble, course gravel, and sand.

Fisheries

Trout populations, particularly in small mountain streams, normally fluctuate widely. It is not unusual for pristine streams to contain different trout numbers among consecutive years. In a western Oregon stream studied for 11 years, density of age 0 cutthroat trout (fry, <2 inches) varied from 8 to 38 per 100 m^2 and density of age 1 cutthroat trout (juveniles, 4-4.5 inches) ranged from 16 to 34 per 100 m^2 (House 1995). In this example, population fluctuations occurred despite the fact that habitat conditions were not degraded and appeared to be relatively stable. The author suggested that small changes in peak winter flows between years would have accounted for shifts in overwinter survival between age-classes.

In western Wyoming, Binns (1981) noted significant trout number declines in several Bonneville cutthroat trout streams following drought in 1977. Giraffe Creek population data collected in 1978 from 2 stations indicate an average of 284 trout/mile (Remmick et al. 1994). Data from 1995 indicate a population of 390 trout/mile.

Long-term trout population maintenance in small streams depends on periodic strong year classes produced in good flow years. Without benefit of periodic favorable flows, populations in some streams would decline or disappear. The WGFD instream flow strategy recognizes the inherent variability of trout populations as documented in Giraffe Creek and other streams (House 1995) and thus defines the "existing fishery" as a dynamic feature. Instream flow recommendations are based on a goal of maintaining habitat conditions that provide the opportunity for trout numbers to fluctuate within existing natural levels.

Habitat Modeling

After visually surveying approximately 2.0 stream miles, a study site was located downstream from a small tributary entering from the north (this stream is not named on maps but a local rancher referred to it as "Poison Creek")in Township 29N, Range 119W, Section 32, NE1/4 (Figure 1). The representative site had trout cover associated mostly with lateral scour and backwater pools and undercut banks. Ten transects were distributed among pool, run, and riffle habitat types (Appendix 1).

Data were collected between May 24 and August 24, 1995. Collection dates and corresponding discharges are listed in Table 1. Instream flow filing recommendations derived from this site were applied to an approximately 2.4 mile-long reach extending downstream from the confluence of Robinson Creek in section 30 in T29N, R119W to the Forest boundary at T29N, R119W, S32. The land through which the proposed segment passes is under Bridger-Teton National Forest administration.

Table 1. Dates and discharges Giraffe Creek instream flow data were collected in 1995.

Date	Discharge (cfs)
May 24	28.1
June 27	9.8
August 22	5.4

Determining critical trout life stages (fry, juvenile, adult, etc.) aids in focusing flow recommendations. Critical life stages are those most sensitive to environmental stresses. Annual population integrity is sustained by providing adequate flow for critical life stages. In many cases, trout populations are constrained by spawning and young (fry and juvenile) life stage habitat "bottlenecks" (Nehring and Anderson 1993). Therefore, our general approach includes ensuring that adequate flows are provided to maintain spawning habitat in the spring as well as adult and juvenile habitat throughout the remainder of the year. (Table 2).

Table 2. Bonneville cutthroat trout life stages and months considered in Giraffe Creek instream flow recommendations. Numbers indicate method used to determine flow requirements.

LIFE STAGE	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
SPAWNING							1	1	1			
ADULT					2	2						
ALL	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

1 - Habitat Quality Index
2 - PHABSIM
3 - Habitat Retention



INSTREAM FLOW SEGMENT NO. 1 – POINT OF BEGINNING
Confluence of Robinson Creek, NE 1/4, SE 1/4,
Section 30, T.29 N., R.119 W.
NORTH
IDAHO
WYOMING
Robinson Cr.
BRIDGER-TETON
NATIONAL
FOREST
30
29
32
Giraffe Cr
Giraffe
Creek
R. 119 W.
T. 29 N.
T. 28 N.
R. 120 W.
R. 119 W.
GIRAFFE CREEK INSTREAM FLOW SEGMENT NO. 1
(LENGTH OF STREAM SEGMENT = 2.4 MILES)
INSTREAM FLOW SEGMENT NO. 1 – POINT OF ENDING
To the Forest Boundary, SE 1/4, SE 1/4,
Section 32, T.29 N., R.119 W.

Habitat Retention Method

A Habitat Retention method (Nehring 1979, Annear and Conder 1984) was used to identify a maintenance flow by analyzing data from three riffle transects. A maintenance flow is defined as the continuous flow required to maintain specific hydraulic criteria in stream riffles. Year-round criteria maintenance ensures passage between habitat types for all trout life stages. In addition, the criteria maintain adequate benthic invertebrate survival. A maintenance flow is realized at the discharge for which any two of the three criteria in Table 3 are met for all riffle transects in a study area. The instream flow recommendations from the Habitat Retention method are applicable year round except when higher instream flows are required to meet other fishery management purposes (Table 2).

Table 3. Hydraulic criteria for determining maintenance flow with the Habitat Retention method.

Category	Criteria
Mean Depth (feet)	Top Width[a] X 0.01
Mean Velocity (feet/second)	1.00
Percent Wetted Perimeter[b]	50

a - At average daily flow. Minimum depth = 0.20.
b - Percent of bank full wetted perimeter

Habitat Quality Index

The Habitat Quality Index (HQI; Binns and Eisermann 1979) was used to estimate trout production over a range of late summer flow conditions. This model was developed by the WGFD and received extensive testing and refinement. It has been reliably used in Wyoming for trout standing stock gain or loss assessment associated with instream flow regime changes. The HQI model includes nine attributes addressing biological, chemical, and physical aspects of trout habitat. Results are expressed in trout Habitat Units (HUs), where one HU is defined as the amount of habitat quality that will support about 1 pound of trout. HQI results were used to identify the flow needed to maintain or improve existing levels of Bonneville cutthroat trout production between July 1 and September 30 (Table 2).

In the HQI analysis, habitat attributes measured at various flow events are assumed to be typical of mean late summer flow conditions. Under this assumption, HU estimates are extrapolated through a range of potential late summer flows (Conder and Annear 1987). Giraffe Creek habitat attributes were measured on the same dates PHABSIM data were collected (Table 1). Some attributes were mathematically derived to establish the relationship between discharge and trout production at discharges other than those measured. Average daily flow (ADF;8.0 cfs) and peak flow (89 cfs) estimates are based on elevation and basin area (Lowham 1976).

Physical Habitat Simulation

Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM) methodology was used to quantify physical habitat (depth and velocity) availability over a range of discharges. This methodology was developed by the Instream Flow Service Group of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Bovee and Milhous 1978) and is widely used for assessing instream flow relationships between fish and physical habitat (Reiser et al. 1989).

The PHABSIM method uses empirical relationships between physical variables (depth, velocity, and substrate) and suitability for fish to derive weighted usable area (WUA; suitable ft^2 per 1000 ft of stream length) at various flows. Depth, velocity, and substrate were measured along transects (*sensu* Bovee and Milhous 1978) on the dates in Table 1. Hydraulic calibration techniques and modeling options in Milhous et al. (1984) and Milhous et al. (1989) were employed to incrementally estimate physical habitat between 1.0 and 50 cfs. Precision declines outside this range; however, the modeled range accommodates typical Giraffe Creek flows.

Curves describing depth, velocity and substrate suitability for trout life stages are a vital component of the PHABSIM modeling process. Suitability curves are listed in Appendix 2.

Estimates by Binns (1981) indicate BRC spawning activity in upper Giraffe Creek (elevation 6800-7000 feet) peaks approximately between May 6 and May 24. Because spawning onset and duration varies between years due to differences in flow quantity and water temperature, spawning recommendations should extend from May 1 to June 30. Even if spawning is completed by June 1, maintaining flows at a selected level throughout June will benefit trout egg incubation by preventing dewatering. The PHABSIM model was used to obtain flow recommendations for maintaining or improving BRC spawning habitat from May 1 to June 30 (Table 2).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Habitat Retention Analysis

Habitat retention analysis indicates that 1.5 cfs is required to maintain hydraulic criteria at all riffles to provide passage between habitats for all trout life stages (Table 4). Maintenance of naturally occurring flows up to this flow is necessary at all times of the year. Higher flows are needed during May through September to support critical life stages (Table 2).

Table 4. Simulated hydraulic criteria for three Giraffe Creek riffles. Average daily flow = 8.0 cfs. Bank full discharge = 52 cfs.

	Mean Depth (ft)	Mean Velocity (ft/s)	Wetted Perimeter (ft)	Discharge (cfs)
Riffle 1	0.96	3.51	17.0	52.0
	0.89	3.01	16.5	40.0
	0.78	2.46	16.1	28.1
	0.50	1.46	15.0	10.0
	0.45	1.30	14.9	8.0
	0.36	1.03[a]	14.5	5.0
	0.33	0.81	12.4	3.0
	0.25	0.60	10.9	1.5
	0.21	0.48	8.7[a]	0.8[b]
	0.20[a]	0.43	7.5	0.6
Riffle 2	0.71	4.07	18.7	52.0
	0.65	3.49	18.4	40.0
	0.57	2.86	17.9	28.1
	0.40	1.68	15.4	10.0
	0.30	1.22	14.2	5.0
	0.25	1.00[a]	12.4	3.1
	0.23	0.85	10.8	2.0
	0.22	0.76	9.4[a]	1.5[b]
	0.21	0.64	7.7	1.0
	0.20[a]	0.59	7.0	0.8
Riffle 3	0.77	3.75	18.6	52.0
	0.73	3.22	17.5	40.0
	0.66	2.62	16.6	28.1
	0.49	1.48	14.4	10.0
	0.46	1.29	14.0	8.0
	0.41	1.11	13.5	6.0
	0.38	1.00[a]	13.2	4.9
	0.27	0.63	12.0	2.0
	0.20[a]	0.46	11.3	1.0[b]
	0.15	0.36	9.5[a]	0.5

a - Hydraulic criteria met

b - Discharge at which 2 of 3 hydraulic criteria are met

Based on habitat retention results, an instream flow of 1.5 cfs is recommended for the October 1 to April 30 time period. If approved, this flow level will maintain the existing fishery because it protects existing natural flow patterns up to the identified maintenance level. Trout populations are naturally limited by low flow conditions during the winter months (October through March; Needham et al. 1945, Reimers 1957, Butler 1979, Kurtz 1980, Cunjak 1988). Such factors as snow fall, cold intensity, and duration of cold periods can influence winter trout survival. Fish populations are influenced primarily through the effects of frazil ice including metabolic stress and anchor ice formation which limits habitat and may result in stranding.

These winter mortality causes are all influenced by winter flows. Higher flows minimize temperature changes and increase stream areas where trout can escape frazil ice impacts. Any artificial reduction of natural winter stream flows would increase trout mortality and effectively reduce the number of fish the stream could support. Therefore protection of natural winter stream flows up to the recommended maintenance flow is necessary to maintain existing survival rates of trout populations.

The 1.5 cfs identified by the Habitat Retention Method may not always be present during the winter. Because the existing fishery is adapted to natural flow patterns (see above fisheries discussion), occasional periods of natural shortfall during the winter do not imply a need for additional storage. Instead, they illustrate the necessity of maintaining all natural winter stream flows, up to 1.5 cfs, to maintain existing trout survival rates.

Habitat Unit Analysis

Article 10, Section d of the Instream Flow Act states that waters used for providing instream flows "shall be the minimum flow necessary to maintain or improve existing fisheries". Often, HU's measured during low flow are used to define the existing late summer fisheries. In situations where the goal is to "maintain" existing fisheries, we determine the flow range with the same HU's as measured and the minimum flow in that range becomes the recommendation. At the measured late summer flow of 5.4 cfs, HQI analysis indicates approximately 71 trout HUs (Figure 2). This level of habitat is maintained between late summer flows of 4.6 and 5.6 cfs. Maintaining higher late summer flows (5.7 to 12.0 cfs) would maximize habitat at 83 HU's.



Figure 2. Trout habitat units at several late summer Giraffe Creek flow levels. X-axis discharges are not to scale.

Based on HQI analysis and in consideration of the Bonneville cutthroat trout Management Plan's goals (Remmick et al. 1994), an instream flow of 4.6 cfs is recommended to maintain existing trout production between July 1 and September 30. This flow represents the lowest stream flow that will accomplish this objective. Storage to achieve this flow solely for instream flow purposes is likely not in the State's best interest.

PHABSIM Analyses

Weighted usable area estimates for Bonneville cutthroat trout generally agree with HQI results (Figure 3). Adult and juvenile physical habitat peak at about 5.0 and 4.0 cfs, respectively. At higher flow levels (>5.0 cfs) physical habitat curves are fairly broad indicating relative insensitivity to changing flows. However, adult WUA decreases rapidly as undercut bank and other habitat decrease at flows less than 5.0 cfs. The recommended late-summer flow of 4.6 cfs will maintain over 90% of maximum adult and juvenile physical habitat. The maintenance flow of 1.5 cfs will result in about 50% of maximum adult and 75% of maximum juvenile physical habitat.

Spawning was identified as a critical life stage. Peak spawning physical habitat occurs at 5.5 cfs. Normal spring flows are much higher - 28 cfs was measured in this study (Table 1). Such high flows might limit spawning activity near the study site or cause migration to more favorable (upper) reaches. Though trout can usually find someplace to spawn whenever temperatures are appropriate and flows allow unrestricted movement, maximum physical habitat in the study site occurs at a flow of 5.5 cfs. Therefore, an instream flow of 5.5 cfs is recommended for the period May 1 to June 30.



Figure 3. Weighted usable area (percent of maximum) for Bonneville Cutthroat trout life stages in Giraffe Creek over a range of discharges.



Figure 4. Spawning Bonneville Cutthroat trout weighted usable area averaged from three Giraffe Creek transects.

INSTREAM FLOW RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analyses and results outlined above, the instream flow recommendations in Table 5 will maintain the existing Giraffe Creek Bonneville cutthroat trout fishery. These recommendations apply to 2.4 mile segment of Giraffe Creek extending downstream from the confluence of Robinson Creek in section 30 in T29N, R119W to the Forest boundary at T29N, R119W, S32. Because data were collected from representative habitats and simulated over a wide flow range, additional data collection under different flow conditions would not significantly change these recommendations.

Table 5. Instream flow recommendations to maintain or improve the existing Giraffe Creek trout fishery.

Time Period	Instream Flow Recommendation (cfs)
May 1 to June 30	5.5
July 1 to September 30	4.6
October 1 to April 30	1.5

This analysis does not consider periodic requirements for channel maintenance flows. Because this stream is unregulated, channel maintenance flow needs are adequately met by natural runoff patterns. If regulated in the future, additional studies and recommendations may be appropriate for establishing channel maintenance flow requirements.

LITERATURE CITED

Annear, T.C. and A.L. Conder. 1984. Relative bias of several fisheries instream flow methods. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 4:531-539.

Binns, N.A. 1981. Bonneville cutthroat trout Salmo clarki utah in Wyoming. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fisheries Technical Bulletin No. 5.

Binns, N.A. and F. Eiserman. 1979. Quantification of fluvial trout habitat in Wyoming. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 108:215-228.

Bovee, K. and R. Milhous. 1978. Hydraulic simulation in instream flow studies: theory and technique. Instream Flow Information Paper 5, FWS/OBS-78/33, Cooperative Instream Flow Service Group, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fort Collins, Colorado.

Bozek, M.A. and F.J. Rahel. 1992. Generality of microhabitat suitability models of young Colorado River Cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki pleuriticus*) across site and among years in Wyoming streams. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 49:552-564.

Butler, R. 1979. Anchor ice, its formation and effects on aquatic life. Science in Agriculture, Vol XXVI, Number 2, Winter, 1979.

Conder, A.L. and T.C. Annear. 1987. Test of weighted usable area estimates derived from a PHABSIM model for instream flow studies on trout streams. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 7:339-350.

Cunjak, R.A. 1988. Physiological consequences of overwintering in streams; the cost of acclimatization? Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 45:443-452.

House, R. 1995. Temporal variation in abundance of an isolated population of cutthroat trout in western Oregon, 1981-1991. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 15:33-41.

Kurtz, J. 1980. Fishery management investigations. - a study of the upper Green River fishery, Sublette County, Wyoming (1975-1979). Completion Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Lowham, H. W. 1976. Techniques for estimating flow characteristics of Wyoming streams. U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations 76-112. 83p.

Milhous, R.T., D.L. Wegner, and T. Waddle. 1984. User's guide to the physical habitat simulation system. Instream Flow Paper 11, FWS/OBS-81/43, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Milhous, R.T., M.A. Updike, and D.M. Schneider. 1989. Physical habitat simulation system reference manual - version II. Instream Flow Information Paper No. 26. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biol. Rep. 89(16).

Miller, D.D. 1977. Comprehensive survey of the Bear River drainage. Wyoming Game and Fish, Administrative Report.

Needham, P., J. Moffett, and D. Slater. 1945. Fluctuations in wild brown trout populations in Convict Creek, California. Journal of Wildlife Management 9:9-25.

Nehring, R. 1979. Evaluation of instream flow methods and determination of water quantity needs for streams in the state of Colorado. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Fort Collins.

Nehring, B.R. and R.M. Anderson. 1993. Determination of population-limiting critical salmonid habitats in Colorado streams using the Physical Habitat Simulation System. Rivers 4:1-19.

Reimers, N. 1957. Some aspects of the relation between stream foods and trout survival. California Fish and Game 43:43-69.

Reiser, D.W., T.A. Wesche, and C. Estes. 1989. Status of instream flow legislation and practices in North America. Fisheries 14(2):22-29.

Remmick, R. 1981. A survey of native cutthroat populations and associated stream habitats in the Bridger-Teton National Forest. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Administrative Report.

Remmick, R. and N.A. Binns. 1987. Effect of drainage wide habitat management on Bear River Cutthroat trout (*Salmo clarki utah*) populations in the Thomas Fork drainage, Wyoming. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Administrative Report.

Remmick, R., K. Nelson, G. Walker, and J. Henderson. 1994. Bonneville cutthroat trout inter-agency five year management plan (1993-1997).

Rosgen, D. 1985. A stream classification system. IN: Riparian Ecosystems and Their Management; Reconciling Conflicting Uses. Proceedings of the First North American Riparian Conference, April 16-18, Tucson, Arizona. GTR-RM120, pp. 91-95.

WGFD. 1977. Current Status and Inventory of Wildlife in Wyoming. 133 p.

Appendix 1. Reach weighting used for PHABSIM Analysis.

Transect	Length	Weight	Percent	Habitat Type
0.0	1.0	0.10	0.7	Riffle/Control/IFG1
10.4	17.1	0.50	11.7	Pool
25.8	11.8	0.30	8.0	Run
39.3	24.4	0.50	16.7	Riffle/Run
69.3	16.7	0.10	11.4	Riffle/Control/IFG1
85.8	24.4	0.50	16.7	Riffle/Run
105.0	14.7	0.40	10.0	Riffle/Control/IFG1
117.7	22.0	0.90	15.0	Run
133.7	8.0	0.50	5.5	Riffle/Run/Spawning
146.5	6.4	0.50	4.4	Riffle/Spawning

Appendix 2. Spawning suitability index data used in PHABSIM analysis. Spawning index data were developed by WGFD from 1994 observations in Huff Creek.

Spawning	Velocity	Weight		Depth	Weight		Substrate	Weight
	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
	0.10	0.00		0.10	0.03		4.10	0.00
	0.20	0.01		0.15	0.08		4.20	1.00
	0.32	0.02		0.20	0.15		5.70	1.00
	0.45	0.03		0.25	0.30		5.80	0.00
	0.60	0.06		0.30	0.51		100.00	0.00
	0.76	0.11		0.35	0.70			
	0.91	0.19		0.40	0.90			
	1.01	0.25		0.45	1.00			
	1.10	0.32		0.50	1.00			
	1.22	0.44		0.55	0.82			
	1.32	0.54		0.60	0.64			
	1.41	0.64		0.65	0.41			
	1.50	0.74		0.70	0.23			
	1.60	0.83		0.75	0.12			
	1.72	0.93		0.80	0.05			
	1.81	0.98		1.00	0.01			
	1.91	1.00		1.50	0.00			
	1.97	1.00		100.00	0.00			
	2.09	0.96						
	2.19	0.91						
	2.31	0.80						
	2.41	0.71						
	2.50	0.60						
	2.62	0.47						
	2.72	0.38						
	3.20	0.00						
	100.00	0.00						