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# WESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

Project 1: Lake and Tailwater Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

Sampling conditions for each survey event are listed in Table 1.

## Kentucky Lake

During the spring, 556 black bass were collected by diurnal electrofishing (120 PPS, DC current). During this sampling period, 496 Largemouth Bass ( 86.3 fish/hr) were collected from Blood River, Jonathan Creek, and Big Bear (Table 2). The catch rate (fish/hr) for Largemouth Bass was highest in Big Bear (95.3 fish/hr). Unlike previous years, Sugar Bay was not sampled. This was done to avoid interference with the ongoing snorkel surveys of the bass spawning habitat in that embayment.

The spring bass data was used to complete the lake specific assessment (Table 3). The lake specific assessment suggests that the largemouth bass population rated "Fair". The catch rate of age-1 Largemouth Bass in the sample was good indicating a good spawn in 2021. This is very encouraging as our year classes have been inconsistent in recent years. Our habitat plan is focused on increasing recruitment of Largemouth Bass in the reservoir by placing shoreline cover in the form of small laydowns and artificial bass spawning beds. We are hopeful that improving habitat can help the bass population return to its previous highs from 2008 to 2014.

The size structure parameters used to assess the fishery by standards set in the Kentucky Lake Fish Management Plan (KLFMP) showed an above average catch of <8.0-in bass (Table 4). The catch rate of intermediate-size bass (12.0-14.9 in) which was ( 15.7 fish/hr) was below the plan recommendation. The increase from last year was expected due to the strong year class of 2020 . The catch rate of harvestable-size bass ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) increased from the previous years' data and exceeded the plan recommendation. The catch rate of trophy-size Largemouth Bass ( $\geq 20.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) was also below the average for the last 10 years and was below the KLFMP recommendation. The dominant size group of adult Largemouth was around 16.0 in which was expected based on the strong year class in 2016 (Table 2).

Proportional Size Distributions (PSD) values were calculated for black bass collected from each embayment sampled during the spring (Table 5). The average PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass were 61 and 34, respectively. These average values were used in the KLFMP assessment. The PSD value is within the assessment preferred range (55-75; Table 4). The $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ also falls inside the targeted range ( $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ of 20-40).

During October, 398 black bass were collected by diurnal electrofishing ( 120 PPS, DC current) from three embayments; Blood River, Jonathan Creek, and Sugar Bay (Table 6). Largemouth Bass comprised 70\% (65.7 fish/hr) of the sample in Blood River and Jonathan Creek. Smallmouth Bass comprised 28\% ( $26.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) of the 2022 sample for those two embayments, but no longer outnumbered the Largemouth in Blood River. Based on length frequency it appears that most of those Smallmouth were young-of-year, but this may be due to sampling bias.

Length and weight data were recorded from all bass collected during the fall sample to calculate relative weight values. The mean relative weight for harvestable-size Largemouth Bass was 92 (Table 7). This value was down from the 2021 estimated relative weight value of 94 and is just outside the preferred range of 95-105. The relative weight of Largemouth Bass is one parameter that is being watched as an indicator of the effects of the population of Silver and Bighead carp in the lake. If Silver and Bighead carp numbers increase, they could impact the plankton levels and hence the upper levels of the food chain.

Length-weight equations for black bass species at Kentucky Lake are:
Largemouth Bass $\quad \log _{10}($ weight $)=-3.47880+3.16323 \times \log _{10}$ (length)
Smallmouth Bass $\quad \log _{10}($ weight $)=-3.48509+3.14160 \times \log _{10}$ (length)

Otoliths were collected from a subsample of Smallmouth Bass and Largemouth Bass ( $<10.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) during fall sampling in 2022. Otoliths were used to age bass so that the catch rate and growth of age-0 fish could be evaluated. The catch rates of age-0 Smallmouth and Largemouth bass during the fall sample were 22.7 and $48.1 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively (Tables 8 and 9). The 2022 year class appears to be average, with below average growth, although growth did improve slightly from the prior year. The mean length of the age- 0 Largemouth Bass was ( 4.7 in ) at time of capture in the fall. The catch rate of age-0 Largemouth Bass $\geq 5.0$ in was 17.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$.

Because of a string of several weak bass spawns, WFD started placing bass spawning habitat in Kentucky Lake and Lake Barkley prior to the bass spawn in spring 2019. Habitat consisted of shallow-water laydowns (sometimes referred to as spawning benches) and artificial spawning beds. Artificial spawning beds are bowl-shaped structures that provide preferred substrate for bass. Our artificial beds were initially constructed with plastic sides but we have since changed our design to all concrete. Habitat was placed at water elevations slightly below winter pool in areas that were perceived as lacking good habitat. Our goal is to provide sufficient habitat at lower water elevations because it is possible that bass are sometimes ready to spawn before water is high enough to reach good shoreline habitat in the spring. A reduction in competition for habitat resources could lead to higher individual nest success. To help determine how fish use these structures we conducted 11 weekly snorkel surveys from March 31 June 9, 2022, at Sugar Bay on Kentucky Lake (Table 10). We rated the relative amount of observed eggs and fry at 68 sites and collected egg and fry samples to help with identification. An additional rating of "cleaned off" was added to track beds that had been brushed clean of debris but had no eggs or fry. Summary percentages of usage are in Tables 11, 12, and 13.

In $2022,40 \%$ of the sites were used at least once by spawning bass including $3 \%$ of sites that were used twice by bass. Forty-four percent of artificial beds next to laydowns were used by bass, while artificial beds without laydowns were used at a rate of $43 \%$. The usage rates of laydowns without artificial nests were lower at $27 \%$. Once water temperatures started to warm up closer to 70 F , sunfish started to use our spawning habitat heavily. About $65 \%$ of all experimental habitat sites were used at least once by sunfish, and $74 \%$ of the artificial spawning beds were used by sunfish. Usage rates in 2022 were lower across the board than in 2020-2021 (Table 13). We can speculate this was simply due to unfavorable environmental factors. However, we could also be seeing a decline in effectiveness as our structures age. We plan to continue this survey effort to see what trends arise.

Across 68 sites in Sugar Bay, we suspect 29 individual bass spawning events occurred based on weekly snorkel surveys. During the spawn of 2022 we had 366 artificial beds and 195 laydowns deployed in Kentucky Lake and 575 artificial beds and 1575 laydowns in Lake Barkley. Based on snorkel survey results, we determined the rate at which bass spawned at three different site types (artificial bed with an adjacent laydown; artificial bed only; and laydown only) in 2022. These rates differ slightly from usage rates because some sites produced multiple spawning events. If we assume identical rates across both lakes, we can extrapolate those numbers and estimate that bass spawned 427 times on our habitat in the spring of 2022. A typical bass nest may contain anywhere from 2,000-7,000 fry after hatch (Post et al., 1998), meaning our spawning habitat could have helped with the spawn of anywhere from about $855,000-3,000,000$ bass fry. It is possible however that bass would have spawned in these areas even without any artificial spawning habitat. This makes it very difficult to estimate the amount of additional bass fry produced because of our spawning habitat. During snorkel surveys we rarely noted any natural beds away from our habitat, but visibility often made that very difficult.

In order to further understand the timing and duration of the bass spawn, shoreline seining was conducted in Blood River on June 15, 2022, and in Sugar Bay on June 16, 2022. A 50 -foot seine with $1 / 4$-in mesh was used to collect YOY Largemouth Bass until a total of 100 specimens were collected from each embayment. One-hundred Smallmouth Bass were also collected from both embayments. Each bass was measured for total length in mm and the sagittal otoliths were removed. Otoliths were mounted convex side up using thermoplastic cement, sanded with 1200 grit sandpaper, and polished with 0.3 -micron alumina powder.

Each otolith was aged independently by two readers using a compound microscope at 100x-400x magnification. Reader agreement was typically within 1-3 days, but if the difference between readers was less than $10 \%$ of the fish's estimated age, the counts were averaged and accepted. To determine hatch dates we used the equation [(ordinal date collected)-(average ring count)-5)] (Dicenzo and Bettoli, 1995). To determine what dates bass were spawned on (when spawning activity took place on the nest), we used the equation [(hatch date)-3] (Heidinger, 1976). The results of the hatch date and spawn date analysis are provided in Tables 14 and 15.

Differences in spawn dates between species and embayments were initially compared with an F-test for variances. Then, depending on equal or unequal variance, the spawn dates were compared using appropriate T-tests. In 2022, the average Largemouth Bass spawn date in Sugar Bay (April 26 $\pm 0.5$ days) was not significantly different than in Blood River (April $26 \pm 0.7$ days; $\mathrm{p}=0.438$ ). The average Smallmouth Bass spawn date in Sugar Bay (April $26 \pm 0.6$ days) was significantly earlier than in Blood River (April $27 \pm 0.5$ days; $p=0.050$ ). However, the difference in average spawn dates was only 0.75 days and likely did not lead to any widespread differences among the two embayments. When both embayments were combined, the average Smallmouth Bass spawn date (April $26 \pm 0.4$ days days) was not significantly different than the average Largemouth Bass spawn date (April $26 \pm 0.4$ days; $p=0.200$ ). In 2022, the average spawn dates for both species in both embayments were all within one day of each other, and the overall spawning window seems to have been much shorter than it has been since this sampling effort started in 2019. Based on these results it seems unlikely that differences in size or abundance of the 2022 cohort among bays should be attributed to differences in spawn timing due to the presence or absence of the experimental spawning habitat.

Trap nets were fished for Crappie, White Bass, Yellow Bass, and Redear Sunfish in Blood River and Jonathan Creek embayments for 80 net-nights (nn) during October and November. In addition, Sledd Creek was sampled for 40 nn . Length frequencies of all species collected are provided in Table 16. Crappie otoliths were collected from a subsample of the entire population and used to assign ages and calculate mean lengths at age. The combined sampling effort yielded 906 crappie ( 7.6 fish/nn), of which 3.5 fish/nn ( $46 \%$ ) were White Crappie and 4.1 fish/nn (54\%) were Black Crappie (Table 17). The Blood River and Jonathan Creek data are listed as "sub-total" on Table 16 and only data from these two embayments were used in the proceeding assessments. The total catch rate of crappie >age 0 was 4.9 fish/nn which is well below the goal of 20.0 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$ set in the KLFMP (Table 18). The low total catch rate reflects the weak spawns in 2016, 2017, and 2020. However, the catch rate of $5.1 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ for age- 0 crappie this fall marks two consecutive years with respectable catch rates.

The number of crappie $\geq 8.0$ in and $\geq 10.0$ in collected in trap nets was 1.6 and .86 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$, respectively (Table 18). The KLFMP objective for crappie is to maintain a catch rate of at least 10.0 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$ for crappie $\geq 8.0 \mathrm{in}$, and $4.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ for crappie $\geq 10.0 \mathrm{in}$. Neither objective was met this year.

Crappie at Kentucky Lake had slightly below average growth rates in 2022. The growth management objective in the KLFMP is for age- 2 crappie collected in the fall to reach 9.5 inches in length. The average length of the age-2 crappie collected this year was 8.7 in (Table 18). However, White Crappie growth was above average at 11.0 in .

Another management objective in the KLFMP is to maintain a catch rate of age-1 crappie of at least 11.0 fish/nn (Table 18). The catch rate for this age group of crappie was 3.44 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$. This indicates a slightly below average spawn in 2021 and is well below the management objective. To help improve the year classes we continue to evaluate the crappie hatch on a daily and weekly level to help provide advice to the Tennessee Valley Authority and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers who manage the water levels and flows. For a discussion of the potential effects of environmental factors on the spawn, please refer to the 2017 Annual Performance Report.

These parameters are also used as part of the calculation for ranking the crappie fishery at Kentucky Lake. Overall, the crappie population at Kentucky Lake rated "Poor" this year (Table 18). However, the catch rate of age-0 crappie was encouraging.

The fall trap netting data was used to calculate proportional size distributions and length-weight equations for crappie. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}$ values are reported in Table 19

The mean relative weights of keeper-size (>10.0 in) White Crappie and Black Crappie were (99) and (98), respectively (Table 20). These relative weights are a great improvement over the last few years and represent excellent condition. Low numbers of adults and anecdotally high numbers of shad were likely the main drivers for this increase in condition factor. This is in stark contrast to 2017 when skinny crappie were a major source of complaints and concerns. Relative weights for White and Black crappie in 2017 were (89) and (85), respectively.

Length-weight equations for White and Black crappie are listed below.

| White Crappie | $\log _{10}($ weight $)=-3.76140+3.51008 \times \log _{10}$ (length) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Black Crappie | $\log _{10}($ weight $)=-3.93521+3.65440 \times \log _{10}$ (length) |

Tables 21-26 list the back-calculated lengths at age for all White Crappie, all male White Crappie, all female White Crappie, all Black Crappie, all male Black Crappie, and all female Black Crappie, respectively. Differences in growth rates between sexes were not obvious for either species. The mean length at capture and Von Bertalanffy growth parameters for the present year are provided on Table 27. Von Bertalanffy growth parameters were calculated in F.A.M.S. (Fisheries Analysis and Modeling Simulator) by entering the length at capture and assigning it an age of 0.8 for the current year. (i.e. 2 year old fish were entered as 2.8 year old fish to reflect the percentage of growth between annulus formation and date of capture in the fall). The age frequencies for White and Black crappie collected are listed in Tables 28 and 29, respectively. The poor White Crappie spawns reported in 2016 and 2017 are once again very noticeable as no 5- or 6-year-old White Crappie were collected in 2022.

During the spring of 2022, ichthyoplankton sampling was conducted in the Jonathan Creek embayment of Kentucky Lake. Weekly sampling began March 31, 2022, and ran through June 9, 2022. Samples were conducted using a rectangular neuston net with a 1000 -micron mesh size, towed 50 feet behind a boat, at a speed of 1.5 mph . Tow duration was either 5 or 3 minutes depending on an a priori assessment of the expected concentration of ichthyoplankton and leptodora to prevent clogging. A General Oceanics flowmeter was attached inside the mouth of the net to record the volume of water sampled during each run. Sampling began just after dusk and always followed the same site order. Each sampling event started closest to the main lake site and then progressed farther into the embayment (Appendix A).

Ichthyoplankton samples were preserved immediately in $95 \%$ ethanol and stored in mason jars. All larval fish were sorted and identified to the lowest practical taxon using "A Practical Key to Identify Families, Genera, and Species of Fish Larvae Commonly Collected in Tennessee Reservoirs" (Sammons, 1999), "Preliminary Guide to the Identification of Larval Fishes in the Tennessee River" (TVA, 1976), and "Early Development of Four Cyprinids Native to the Yangtze River, China" (Chapman, and Wang, 2006; Bolu Yi, et al. 1988). Once identified, fish were counted and measured for total length. In cases of more than 100 individuals in a sample, a random subsample of at least 30 individuals was measured and used to extrapolate the lengths of the fish from the entire sample. Larval crappies were not identified to species due to overlapping myomere counts between both species and their hybrids (Spier and Ackerson, 2004).

The geometric mean and median of the 6 sample sites were used to evaluate overall densities during each week (Table 30). The standard error and coefficients of variation of the mean and geometric mean were used to evaluate sample accuracy. In 2022, the peak weekly density of crappie occurred on May 26th and was 84.8 crappie/ $1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ (Table 31). This peak density, interestingly, was exactly the same as 2021 but occurred one week earlier. The peak in 2022 is tied for the second highest since 2015 (Table 32). Based on these results, the crappie spawn in Jonathan Creek in 2022 appears to have been average to above average. This will still need to be verified by trap netting age- 1 crappie in 2023. After tracking the crappie spawn since 2015 using ichthyoplankton nets, we have noticed a trend that the peak crappie catch rate in the spring is a good predictor of age- 0 catch rates in fall trapnets (Regression $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.94, \mathrm{p}<0.001$; Figure 1) and age-1 catch rates in trapnets the following fall $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.85\right.$, $\mathrm{p}=0.003$; Figure 2). This result supports the hypothesis that crappie year class strength is set at or prior to the larval phase.

In order to determine the hatch dates of crappies more precisely, based on growth rates, all crappie that were $7-12 \mathrm{~mm}$ in total length were assumed to represent a one-week cohort (Table 31). Crappie in this size range appeared to be fully recruited to the gear and were best represented in the sample. It is possible that crappie shorter than 7 mm were not located in the pelagic sample sites yet, and that crappie over 12 mm were more likely to avoid capture. This length range was also chosen because a 7 mm crappie would grow to 12.1 mm in one week (our sample interval), based on a growth rate of 0.86 mm per day after swim up. This was our estimated daily growth rate from daily otolith ring counts of Jonathan Creek crappie collected later in the year (next section).

In addition to weekly cohorts, we also estimated daily cohorts of hatched crappie. All crappie that were captured outside of the $7-$ to $12-\mathrm{mm}$ length range were excluded from the hatch date analysis to minimize the effects of gear bias and the longer exposure to natural mortality of older fish (Table 33). A hatch date was then back-
calculated for each individual fish using the assumed growth rate $(0.86 \mathrm{~mm} /$ day $)$ and the total length of each fish. A total length at hatch ( 4 mm ) was factored into the regression for hatch date. This technique has been employed in other systems (Mitzner 1991). An incubation period of 95 hours (based on temperature) was also factored into the regression so that the day when fertilization occurred could be estimated.

The estimated hatching densities indicated that the spawn in Jonathan Creek lasted at least 34 days and extended at least until late May (Table 33). It is possible that crappie did spawn after our sampling window, however, crappie catches started declining and the literature reports most crappie spawns to be relatively short (1-2 months; Mitzner 1991 and Travnichek, et. al.1996). There seems to have been one strong peak in spawning activity in 2022 along with one lesser peak about 2 weeks prior. The highest amount of spawning occurred from May 9 to May 11. Similar to prior years' surveys, we found higher densities of larval crappie farther into the embayment, west of the Highway 68 bridge (Table 30; Appendix A).

In June 2022 an effort was made to capture YOY crappie using a benthic otter trawl. Crappie were identified to species using dorsal fin counts, and otoliths were collected from a subsample of approximately 100 crappie for daily ring count analysis. The subsample was collected randomly without regard to crappie species or size. Crappie trawling has typically been conducted in the fall to assess year class strength. However, an earlier sample was necessary for accurate daily ring counts since those counts can become unreliable in fish $>100$ days old (Sweatman and Kohler, 1991). Trawling runs were conducted in Jonathan Creek because this is where the larval sampling occurred during the spring. To evaluate whether hatching periods and growth rates differed by embayment, trawling was also conducted at Blood River embayment. Otoliths were mounted convex side up using thermoplastic cement, sanded with 1200 grit sandpaper, and polished with 0.3-micron alumina powder.

Each otolith was aged independently by two readers using a compound microscope at $100 \mathrm{x}-400 \mathrm{x}$ magnification. Reader agreement was typically within 1-4 days, but if the difference between readers was less than $10 \%$ of the fish's estimated age, the counts were averaged and accepted. In 2022, one fish was excluded based on reader disagreement. We were able to estimate an average daily growth rate for both species of crappie by using the equation described by Sweatman and Kohler (1991) [(total length mm-4mm)/\#days old-4 days]. This growth rate estimate was coupled with the larval data to provide an accurate estimate of crappie hatch dates in Jonathan Creek as described earlier (Table 33). There is no way to practically differentiate between crappie species in the larval samples. Therefore, the estimated growth rate used in the larval hatch date back calculation combined both species together. Our estimated growth rate of $0.86 \mathrm{~mm} /$ day was similar to $2021(0.90 \mathrm{~mm} /$ day $)$ but still higher than the normal $0.67-0.71 \mathrm{~mm} /$ day we've seen throughout the years of this project.

Because the collection of black crappie was so low ( $n=23$ of 199; Table 34), both black and white crappie were combined when making comparisons across embayments. Differences in growth rates and hatch dates between embayments were initially compared with an F-test for variances. Then, depending on equal or unequal variance, comparisons were made using appropriate T-tests. In 2022, crappie in Blood River had a faster average growth rate $(0.92 \mathrm{~mm} /$ day ) than crappie in Johnathan Creek ( $0.86 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{day}$; $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ). Additionally, the average crappie hatch date in Johnathan Creek (May $13 \pm 0.7$ days) was significantly different than in Blood River (May $10 \pm 0.7$ days; $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ).

The catfish population was sampled at Kentucky Lake during June by using low pulse ( 15 PPS) electrofishing along the main lake river channel. A chase boat was utilized to help collect catfish around the electrofishing boat. One dipper was used in each boat. A total of 98 catfish were collected during 60 electrofishing runs (Table 35). Each run lasted 300 seconds, for a total sample time of 5.0 hours over a five-day period. Patterson's bay required three separate trips due to high winds. Of the samples, blue catfish had the highest catch rate at 10.8 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ and made up $53 \%$ of the catfish collected. The catch rate was lower than observed in some previous years, but consistent with the last four years' results. Relative weight values are listed in Table 36. The relative weight values are all high, suggesting the fish are healthy.
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## Lake Barkley

Black bass were collected during 8.5 hours of diurnal electrofishing (120 PPS, DC current) during the spring at sampling sites historically used on Lake Barkley. A total of 431 black bass were collected at a rate of 50.7 fish/hr (Table 37). Spotted and Smallmouth bass combined for about $6 \%$ of the total black bass sampled. The catch rate of small ( $\leq 8.0 \mathrm{in}$; 15.1 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) Largemouth Bass was below our long-term average dating back to 1997, while being very similar to our current ten-year average ( 14.6 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ). Catches of intermediate-size (8.0-11.9 in) Largemouth Bass were about equal to the current ten-year average, while the catch rates of large ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) and larger ( $\geq 18.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) Largemouth Bass continue to be below both long-term and ten-year averages for these size groups. Several below-average spawns from 2014-2021 on Lake Barkley resulted in weak catch rates of age- 1 fish following those spawns and have likely reduced the overall numbers of large bass currently in the system. However, in 2021 the recruitment of Largemouth Bass (catch rate of age-1 fish in the spring; 41.7 fish/hr) was the 5th highest it has been since 1997. The long-term average for age-1 Largemouth Bass in the spring is about $25.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, so we are optimistic that this strong 2020 cohort will provide a boost to the larger size classes of fish in the coming years. The overall Largemouth Bass catch rate was 47.9 fish/hr which is below the average of the past ten years and one of our lowest catches recorded since the early 1980s (Table 38). The overall Smallmouth Bass catch rate was $2.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ which is about equal to the average since 2005 which is when Smallmouth Bass started getting consistently collected in our spring sample at Lake Barkley.

The overall PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass at Lake Barkley, along with values for individual embayments are listed in Table 39. The PSD value (72) is within the objective goal (PSD of 55-75) established in the Barkley Lake Fish Management Plan (BLFMP). This value indicates a balanced bass fishery. The RSD 15 (33) was also within the set goal (20-40).

The lake specific assessment score for Lake Barkley was "Poor" (Table 40). The score was "Fair" or "Poor" for most of the last decade. Seasonal flooding as well as the occasional drought may have affected sampling in some years which in turn negatively influenced the assessment score. However, spring catch rates of most size classes of Largemouth Bass have generally been below average during this time as well. The fishery showed improvement in these ratings in 2017 and was rated as "Good". However, generally low catch rates overall have since negatively affected the score. We calculated age-3 Largemouth Bass mean length at capture as outlined by Murphy and Willis (1996) in addition to the traditional method. This method uses a weighted average based on the age-length key and includes all sampled fish per age class. Although differences are slight, we do feel that this calculation more accurately describes this metric, as all spring-sampled bass are included in the calculation. The annual mortality of Largemouth Bass older than a year was $36 \%$ as determined using catch-curve regression of fallcaught Largemouth Bass (Table 40).

Black bass were sampled in October to collect length-weight data to assess condition factors and to determine the strength of the 2022 year class. A total of 752 bass were collected from Little River, Eddy Creek, Taylor Bay, and Jakes Fork Bay with about 78\% being Largemouth Bass (Table 41). For historical comparisons, only data from Little River and Eddy Creek were used in the standardized population parameters of Lake Barkley bass. Largemouth Bass were caught at a rate of 106.5 fish/hr which is just below the historical average going back to 1998. The catch rate of small fish ( $<8.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) was nearly double the historical average and made up the majority of the fall catch. Catch rates of intermediate and large-size Largemouth Bass were all below their respective ten-year averages. Additional larger fish were collected from Donaldson Creek, Linton Bay, and Kuttawa for relative weight calculations. Relative weights were determined for all bass, but few adult Smallmouth Bass were collected (Table 42). Relative weights for all size groups of Largemouth Bass were good this year. The relative weight for harvestable-size ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) Largemouth Bass from Lake Barkley was 98 which is within the acceptable range. The length-weight equations for black bass at Lake Barkley are:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Largemouth Bass } & \log _{10}(\text { weight })=-3.496+3.2043 x \log _{10}(\text { length }) \\
\text { Smallmouth Bass } & \log _{10}(\text { weight })=-3.441+3.1257 x \log _{10}(\text { length })
\end{array}
$$

Mean length of the age-0 cohort of Largemouth Bass was 3.9 in (Table 43). This cohort has the shortest average length of any year class on record going back to 1984 . These fish fall well below our 5.0 -in goal. It has been suggested that bass which reach at least 5.0 in by the fall will have a better chance of survival during their first winter. This year's total catch rate of age-0 Largemouth Bass from Little River and Eddy Creek ( $80.3 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was well above the historical average ( 36.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ), while this year's catch rate of age-0 Largemouth Bass over 5.0 in ( $12.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was below the average catch rate since 2001 ( $23.9 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). This year we again collected age-0 length and catch data on Smallmouth Bass. Mean length of the age-0 cohort of Smallmouth Bass was also 3.9 in (Table 44). Total catch rate of age- 0 Smallmouth Bass was 22.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, while the catch rate of age- 0 Smallmouth Bass over 5.0 in was $2.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$. Despite what seems like great black bass production in spring 2022 based on number of fish, recruitment will likely be determined by over-winter survival which could be low based on such short average lengths.

Taylor Bay and Jake Fork Bay (test bays) were sampled in the fall of 2022 to continue assessing potential effects of artificial spawning habitat on black bass. As stated in the Kentucky Lake section, we have been placing this habitat as a result of some bad spawning years and overall low bass abundance recently. The additional spawning habitat at lower lake elevations in the test bays may provide more preferred areas for bass to spawn and areas for bass to spawn earlier in the year. Bass spawned earlier should, theoretically, be longer when sampled in the fall. Two of the metrics we're using to assess the effectiveness of artificial habitat are catch rate and average length of age-0 fish as compared to Little River and Eddy Creek (control bays), which both have no artificial habitat and are sampled every fall. In test bays there were totals of 211 artificial spawning beds and 235 spawning benches during the spawning season in 2022. Differences in average lengths between embayments were initially compared with ANOVA to test for any differences. If differences were present, we then used an F-test for variances, and then comparisons were made using appropriate T-tests. The average length of age-0 Largemouth Bass in Jake Fork and

Taylor Bay was 4.5 in ; statistically equal to Little River ( $4.3 \mathrm{in} ; \mathrm{p}=0.25$ ) but larger than Eddy Creek ( 3.7 in ; $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ). Interestingly, Little River also had a greater average age-0 length than Eddy Creek (p<0.01). Age-0 Largemouth Bass at Jake Fork and Taylor Bay were caught at 68.0 fish/hr which is greater than Little River (53.0 fish/hr) but less than Eddy Creek (107.5 fish/hr). Age-0 Largemouth Bass over 5.0 in were caught at a higher rate in test bays ( $18.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ vs 11.0 and 14.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ). Age-0 Smallmouth Bass displayed no significant differences in average length among test bays ( 4.2 in ) and control bays ( 3.9 in and 3.8 in ; ANOVA p=0.08). Age-0 Smallmouth Bass at Jake Fork and Taylor Bay were caught at 25.0 fish/hr which is greater than Eddy Creek ( $15.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) but slightly less than Little River ( 28.5 fish/hr). Experimental spawning habitat produced some interesting points within the 2022 cohort, but overall results were mixed. We will continue monitoring test bays to see if any trends develop in the coming years.

Trap nets were fished for crappie in Little River and Donaldson Creek embayments for 80 net-nights (nn) during October and November. A total of 1329 crappie were collected at a rate of 16.6 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$ (Table 45). Additionally, Crooked Creek (LBL) was sampled for another 40 net-nights. Crooked Creek ( $17.1 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ ) also provided a good sample and will remain on the sampling schedule in the future if possible.

White Crappie accounted for $90 \%$ of the total catch and were caught at 15.1 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$. Black Crappie accounted for the remaining $10 \%$ of the total catch and were collected at a rate of $1.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ (Table 45). The mean relative weights for keeper-size (>10.0 in) Black and White crappie were 106 and 108, respectively (Table 46). For historical comparisons, only data from Little River and Donaldson Creek were used in the standardized population parameters of Lake Barkley crappie in Table 47. The catch rate of harvestable-size ( $\geq 10.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) crappie was 0.5 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$, which is lower than the ten-year average of $1.1 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$. The catch rate of quality-size ( $\geq 8.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) crappie was $1.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$, which is below the management objective ( $4.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ ) set in the BLFMP. The catch rate of age- 1 crappie ( 7.8 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$ ) was good this year and was above the management objective ( $5.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ ).

The length-weight equations of White and Black crappie from Lake Barkley are:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { White Crappie } & \log _{10}(\text { weight })=-4.116+3.8569 \times \log _{10}(\text { length }) \\
\text { Black Crappie } & \log _{10}(\text { weight })=-4.0359+3.8504 \times \log _{10}(\text { length })
\end{array}
$$

Crappie collected in trap nets in Little River and Donaldson Creek were used to determine stock densities. The PSD (21) of White Crappie was well below the historic average of 56 , while the $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}(6.0)$ of White Crappie was also below the historic average of 27. These metrics suggest a skewed population of White Crappie with a lot of shorter fish in the system during the fall sampling period (Table 48). The PSD (38) of Black Crappie was well below the historic average of 54 , while the $\operatorname{RSD}_{10}(16)$ of Black Crappie was slightly lower than the historic average of 20. These metrics also suggest a skewed population of Black Crappie with a lot of shorter fish in the system during the fall sampling period.

Otoliths from 290 crappie were used for age and growth analysis. Ages ranged from 0-3 years for White Crappie and 0-4 years for Black Crappie (Tables 49 and 50). Growth continues to be good as crappie generally reached 10.0 in between age 1 and 2 at capture. There did not appear to be any major differences in growth patterns between male and female White Crappie (Tables 51 and 52) or Black Crappie (Tables 53 and 54). Von Bertalanffy growth curve parameters and mean length at capture are provided in Table 55. Von Bertalanffy growth parameters were calculated in FAMS (Fisheries Analysis and Modeling Simulator) by assigning ages of 0.8 to represent the amount of growth at the time of sampling, i.e. a fish aged at 2 years old was assigned an age of 2.8 to allow for a calculation of length at age instead of length at capture. Separate parameters for Black and White crappie could not be calculated due to the limited number of age cohorts available in the sample.

Age frequencies were estimated by combining catch data with age data. Forty-nine percent of White Crappies captured in Little River and Donaldson Creek were age-0 fish while age-1 fish made up another 49\% of the catch (Table 56). Few White Crappies age 2 and older were collected. Seventy-one percent of Black Crappies captured in Little River and Donaldson Creek were age-0 fish while age-1 fish made up another $26 \%$ of the catch. Few Black Crappies older than age 2 were collected (Table 57). The age-1 White Crappie catch rate was the $5^{\text {th }}$ highest on record back to 1985 . Some of these fish were already legal harvestable size at capture in the fall, and this strong year class should contribute a large increase of legal fish in the lake by late 2023. In addition, preliminary catch data of age-0 White Crappie suggests another good spawn in 2022.

The lake specific assessment of the crappie population yielded a rating of "Good" at Lake Barkley in 2022 (Table 58) The catch of age- 1 crappie was above the ten-year average, and the catch of age- 0 crappie was equal to our ten-year average. However, catches of larger, older fish have been low in recent surveys. The average lengths of age-2 White Crappie and Black Crappie at capture were 11.3 in and 10.9 in, respectively. In addition, we calculated age- 2 crappie mean length at capture as outlined by Murphy and Willis (1996) for all years. This method uses a weighted average based on the age-length key and includes all sampled fish per age class. Although differences are slight, we do feel that this calculation more accurately describes this metric, as all crappie are included in the calculation. The average length of age- 2 crappie continues to be good. We are hopeful that the high catch of age-1 White Crappie this year will boost catch rates of larger fish in the next year or so.

The catfish population was sampled along the main lake river channel at Lake Barkley in June and July with low-pulse ( 15 PPS ) electrofishing while utilizing a chase boat to collect fish further away from the electrofishing boat. One dipper was always positioned in each boat for a total of two dippers. A total of 793 catfish were collected during 60 electrofishing runs (Table 59). Each run lasted 300 seconds, for a total sample time of 5.0 hours over a three-day period. Blue Catfish had the highest catch rate at $151.6 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ and made up $96 \%$ of the catfish collected. Flathead Catfish and Channel Catfish are likely underrepresented using this method as these fish were often observed but were much harder to approach and dip than Blue Catfish. Relative weight values were all within or greater than ideal values of 95-105, except for Flathead Catfish 12.0-19.9 in, and are listed in Table 60.
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## Lake Barkley Tailwaters Creel Survey

A random, uniform probability, roving creel survey was conducted on the Lake Barkley tailwaters (75.2 a) from February 16 to December 31, 2022. The Lake Barkley tailwaters creel area extended from the dam to the Highway 62 bridge. The survey was conducted six hours per day with a random time chosen to conduct an angler count. The remaining time was dedicated to interviewing anglers actively fishing. Interviews were conducted at bank access points as no boat was used for this survey. The overall temporal sampling scheme was at least ten days per month, consisting of at least three weekend days and seven weekdays. Varying time period probabilities were assigned to each month. An angler attitude questionnaire concerning fishing at the Lake Barkley tailwaters was conducted by the creel clerk throughout the survey period (Appendix B). Our creel clerk ran this survey simultaneously with another survey at the Kentucky Lake tailwaters (see section below).

During the 2022 creel, the typical angler was a male ( $92 \%$ ) resident ( $79 \%$ ) who was casting ( $36 \%$ ) or bowfishing ( $35 \%$ ) from the bank ( $77 \%$; Table 61). The average fishing trip for all anglers was 2.8 hours. There was a decline in the number of trips of $(14,459)$ and total fishing pressure $(39,948$ angler hours). These are the lowest numbers of trips and angler hours ever recorded during a Lake Barkley tailwaters creel survey, following a trend starting in the early 1990s. Anglers caught a total of 95,284 fish of 26 species while harvesting 81,519 of these fish. Length frequencies of all harvested or released fish are given in Table 62. During this survey, fish returned to the water with a bowfishing wound or after being dispatched with a knife were considered harvested.

Table 63 provides fish catch and harvest statistics for the 2022 creel survey. Black bass anglers accounted for $3 \%$ of all fishing trips to the Lake Barkley tailwaters during 2022 (Table 63), which is approximately equal to surveys back to 2000 . There were 473 black bass fishing trips in the 2022 creel. The bass catch rate by bass anglers was $0.54 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 64) which is about equal to the long-term average. About one quarter of black bass caught were harvested. $54 \%$ of black bass caught were Largemouth Bass, while Smallmouth Bass made up and additional $37 \%$, and Spotted Bass made up 8\% (Table 65). About 53\% of black bass anglers reported being very or somewhat satisfied with black bass fishing at the Lake Barkley tailwaters. (Appendix B).

Catfish anglers accounted for $23 \%$ of all fishing trips in the Lake Barkley tailwaters in 2022 ( $23 \%$ in 2019, $34 \%$ in 2016; Table 63). The number of trips for catfish $(3,301)$ continues to decline. The catfish fishery remains highly harvest oriented. Almost $77 \%$ of the catfish caught were harvested (Table 66). Eighty-five percent of catfish
caught were blue catfish, while channel catfish made up $14 \%$ and flathead catfish catch was minimal (Table 67). Almost $75 \%$ of catfish anglers reported being very or somewhat satisfied with catfish fishing at the Lake Barkley tailwaters. (Appendix B).

Morone anglers accounted for $9 \%$ of all fishing trips in the Lake Barkley tailwaters in 2022 ( $12 \%$ in 2019, $9 \%$ in 2016; Table 63). This group includes white bass, yellow bass, striped bass, and hybrids. Positive ID on this genus can be difficult for anglers, so it is possible that some released fish were mis-identified. The number of trips for Morones $(1,251$; Table 68) continues to decline. Morone anglers caught 0.3 Morones $/ \mathrm{hr}$ which is about one third of the rate of the most recent surveys. Sixty-eight percent of Morones caught were White Bass, while Striped Bass made up an additional $14 \%$ (Table 69). About $51 \%$ of Morone anglers reported being very or somewhat satisfied with Morone fishing at the Lake Barkley tailwaters (Appendix B).

Skipjack anglers accounted for $20 \%$ of all fishing trips in the Lake Barkley tailwaters in 2022 ( $21 \%$ in 2019; Table 63). However, the number of trips for skipjack $(2,895)$ declined since 2019. Skipjack anglers harvested 2.1 skipjack/hr which is about half of the rate from 2019. The skipjack fishery is highly harvest oriented. Almost $83 \%$ of the skipjack caught were harvested (Table 70).

Asian Carp anglers accounted for $31 \%$ of fishing trips to the Lake Barkley tailwaters in 2022 ( $10 \%$ in 2019; Table 63). Estimated catch and harvest totals of Asian Carp were nearly three times higher than in 2019. Asian Carp anglers harvested $3.4 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 71). Only $25 \%$ of all anglers reported having ever tried eating Asian carp while the most popular method of disposal of Asian Carp was sinking (43\%; Appendix B).

## Kentucky Lake Tailwaters Creel Survey

A random, uniform probability, roving creel survey was conducted on the Kentucky Lake tailwaters (226.0 a) from February 16 to December 31, 2022. The Kentucky Lake tailwaters creel area extended from the dam to the Interstate 24 bridge. The survey was conducted six hours per day with a random time chosen to conduct an angler count. The remaining time was dedicated to interviewing anglers actively fishing. Interviews were conducted at bank access points as no boat was used for this survey. The overall temporal sampling scheme was at least ten days per month, consisting of at least three weekend days and seven weekdays. Varying time period probabilities were assigned to each month. An angler attitude questionnaire concerning fishing at the Kentucky Lake tailwaters was conducted by the creel clerk throughout the survey period (Appendix C). Our creel clerk ran this survey simultaneously with another survey at the Lake Barkley tailwaters (see previous section).

During the 2022 creel, the typical angler was a male ( $89 \%$ ) resident ( $80 \%$ ) who was still fishing ( $39 \%$ ) or casting ( $38 \%$ ) from the bank ( $55 \%$; Table 72). The average fishing trip for all anglers was 2.8 hours. There was a decline in the number of trips $(17,904)$, while total fishing pressure ( 49,382 angler hours) remained about the same as 2019. Anglers caught a total of 92,391 fish of 27 species while harvesting 81,108 of these fish. Length frequencies of all harvested or released fish are given in Table 73. During this survey, fish returned to the water with a bowfishing wound or after being dispatched with a knife were considered harvested.

Table 74 provides fish catch and harvest statistics for the 2022 creel survey. Black bass anglers accounted for $5 \%$ of all fishing trips to the Kentucky Lake tailwaters during 2022 (Table 74), which is approximately equal to surveys back to 2000. There were 956 black bass fishing trips in the 2022 creel. The bass catch rate by bass anglers was 0.43 fish/hr which is about equal to the long-term average. About $30 \%$ of black bass caught were harvested (Table 75). Thirty-two percent of black bass caught were Largemouth Bass, while Smallmouth Bass made up an additional $68 \%$ (Table 76). About $68 \%$ of black bass anglers reported being very or somewhat satisfied with black bass fishing at the Kentucky Lake tailwaters (Appendix C).

Catfish anglers accounted for $26 \%$ of all fishing trips in the Kentucky Lake tailwaters in 2022 ( $27 \%$ in $2019,19 \%$ in 2016; Table 74). The number of trips for catfish $(4,721)$ declined only slightly. The catfish fishery remains highly harvest oriented. About $89 \%$ of the catfish caught were harvested (Table 77). Eighty-six percent of catfish caught were blue catfish, while channel catfish made up $12 \%$ and flathead catfish catch was minimal (Table 78). Almost $71 \%$ of catfish anglers reported being very or somewhat satisfied with catfish fishing at the Kentucky Lake tailwaters (Appendix C).

Morone anglers accounted for $8 \%$ of all fishing trips in the Kentucky Lake tailwaters in 2022 ( $10 \%$ in $2019,7 \%$ in 2016; Table 74). This group includes White Bass, Yellow Bass, Striped Bass, and hybrids. Positive ID on this genus can be difficult for anglers, so it is possible that some released fish were mis-identified. The number of trips for Morones $(1,481$; Table 79) continues to decline. Morone anglers caught 0.7 Morones $/ \mathrm{hr}$ which is about half of the rate of the most recent surveys. Twenty-eight percent of Morones caught were White Bass, while Striped Bass made up an additional $62 \%$ (Table 80). About $58 \%$ of Morone anglers reported being very or somewhat satisfied with Morone fishing at the Kentucky Lake tailwaters (Appendix C).

Skipjack anglers accounted for $22 \%$ of all fishing trips in the Kentucky Lake tailwaters in 2022 ( $20 \%$ in 2019; Table 74). The number of trips for skipjack $(3,957)$ was about the same as 2019. Skipjack anglers harvested 4.2 skipjack/hr which is about half of the rate from 2019. The skipjack fishery is highly harvest oriented. About $99 \%$ of the skipjack caught were harvested (Table 81).

Asian Carp anglers accounted for $12 \%$ of fishing trips to the Kentucky Lake tailwaters in 2022 (5\% in 2019; Table 74). Estimated catch and harvest totals for Asian Carp were higher in 2022 than in 2019. Asian Carp anglers harvested 1.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 82). Only $22 \%$ of all anglers reported having ever tried eating Asian carp while the most popular method of disposal of Asian Carp was sinking (38\%; Appendix C).

## Lake Beshear

Largemouth Bass were collected by diurnal electrofishing (120 PPS, DC current) during April at Lake Beshear. Two-hundred-and-fifty-one Largemouth Bass were collected at a rate of 134.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 83). The catch rate of harvestable-size ( $\geq 12.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) Largemouth Bass was 50.9 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 84). This year's sample falls above the objective in the Lake Beshear Fish Management Plan (LBFMP) to maintain a catch rate of at least 45.0 fish/hr for harvestable-size Largemouth Bass. The catch of age- 1 fish was high this year ( $34.4 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Other objectives are to maintain high catch rates of bass $\geq 15.0$ and $\geq 20.0 \mathrm{in}$. Ideally, these catch rates should be greater than 30.0 and $3.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively. The catch rates per hour for these length groups of bass were 42.0 and 6.8 , respectively. Lake Beshear continues to have a quality bass fishery with good numbers of bass $\geq 15.0$ in. However, the lower catch of bass 12.0-14.9 in this spring is a potential concern and may lead to some slight angler dissatisfaction in the future. The fishery rated as "Excellent" in 2022 thanks in part to strong recruitment and solid numbers of trophy size fish (Table 85).

Largemouth Bass were also collected by diurnal electrofishing (120 PPS, DC current) in October (Table 83). The catch rate ( 181.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was an improvement over last year, but again the catch was skewed towards smaller fish. Relative weight data (Table 86) suggests that larger bass ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) are healthy with regard to their length-weight ratio. The average relative weight value was 93 for these larger bass and 84 for all sizes of bass. However, the reduced body weights of the smaller fish are indicative of a lack of smaller forage and should be monitored closely to see if this trend continues. The length-weight equation for Largemouth Bass at Lake Beshear is:

$$
\log _{10}(\text { weight })=-3.55476+3.18309 \times \log _{10}(\text { length })
$$

Otoliths were removed from a subsample of Largemouth Bass $\leq 10.0$ in to determine the mean fall length of the age- 0 cohort and determine their catch rate. The catch rate for age-0 Largemouth Bass was 101.6 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 87). The average length of an age-0 bass was 4.6 in. The catch rate of age-0 Largemouth Bass $\geq 5.0$ in was 30.8 fish/hr.

## Lake Pennyrile

Electrofishing for all species of sportfish at Lake Pennyrile was conducted on May 9, 2022. Largemouth Bass were captured at a rate of 122.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 88). This catch rate is above the 10 -year average of 93.8 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 89). The majority of Largemouth Bass were still below 12.0 in . Only $8(6.6 \%)$ bass were 12.0 in or larger, while only $2(1.7 \%)$ bass were over 15.0 in from this year's sample. The catch rate of Largemouth Bass 8.0-11.9 in
was $50.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ which is below the management objective of $80.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 89). It appears the bass had a good spawn in 2021 because a high percentage of Largemouth Bass caught were 4.0 in or less. As in previous years, most bass were stunted around 7.0-10.0 in. These high catch rates of intermediate-size Largemouth Bass are desirable to maintain good numbers of large sunfish in this system. The overall largemouth bass population was rated as "Fair" in 2022 (Table 90). Due to the shift in management focus towards trophy sunfish, it is unlikely that the largemouth bass population will be rated highly again soon.

The catch rate of large-size ( $\geq 8.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) Bluegill was below average at $4.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; however, we had a very high catch of Bluegill just below the 8.0 -in mark (Table 91). The catch rate of large ( $\geq 8.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) Redear Sunfish was above average at $34.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$. The catch of Redear Sunfish $\geq 8.0$ in 2022 was the highest since 2008 . We will continue to monitor the panfish populations at Lake Pennyrile in 2023.

PSD and RSD values for Largemouth Bass, Bluegill and Redear Sunfish are listed in Table 92. The PSD value for Largemouth Bass (14) suggests a population heavily skewed toward small bass. The Largemouth Bass fishery is stunted which is our goal when managing for large panfish. The PSD values for Bluegill (51) and Redear Sunfish (54) suggest fairly balanced populations.

## Lake George

Lake George (Marion, KY, Crittenden Co.) was drained in spring 2022 due to a failure in the levee. Agencies familiar with the situation will determine when/if the lake will be re-filled.

## $\underline{\text { Lake Morris }}$

Electrofishing for all species of fish in Lake Morris (Hopkinsville, KY, Christian Co.) was conducted on June 06, 2022. Catch rates of all fish are provided on Table 93. Eleven Largemouth Bass were captured at a rate of 22.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$. The Largemouth Bass population had a broad length distribution.

The catch rate of bluegill was 954.0 fish/hr (Table 93). This catch rate is extremely high but may be an artifact of our sampling locations and time of year. We had intended on 900 second runs but were forced to stop at 600 seconds due to livewell capacity. Undesirable species included Gizzard Shad, Common Carp, Yellow and Brown bullhead, Green Sunfish, Warmouth, and White Crappie. However, generally speaking, the sportfish population looked good and our recommendations to the county government focused on access enhancement rather than fishery enhancement.

## Ballard County Wildlife Management Area Lakes

On May 13, 2022, the Gravel Pit Pond on Ballard County Wildlife Management Area lakes was sampled with electrofishing. Unlike other lakes on the area, this lake does not connect with the river during flooding events. The length frequency of all species collected is provided on Table 94. The Largemouth Bass population is skewed toward smaller fish, but that seems to have allowed for some very nice Bluegill in the fishery. Unfortunately, some members of the public stocked both White and Black crappie into the lake. The crappie we collected were all removed, but we expect to continue to see excessive crappie reproduction in this small lake.

## West Kentucky Wildlife Management Area Lakes

On May 13, 2022, The Handicap Access Pond on West Kentucky Wildlife Management Area was sampled with electrofishing. This pond has a boat ramp, but only half of the lake is accessible due to a bridge/fishing pier which crosses the lake. The length frequency of all fish collected is provided in Table 95. The Largemouth Bass, Bluegill, and Redear Sunfish populations all looked good, but future samples may be warranted to evaluate for overfishing.

## Lake Kyle (Fort Campbell)

On May 24, 2022, Lake Kyle on Fort Campbell was sampled with electrofishing. Staff of Fort Campbell had contacted us requesting an electrofishing training opportunity for their staff. Fort Campbell has the goal of purchasing their own electrofishing boat and conducting their own samples in the future. The length frequencies of all fish collected are provided on Table 96. Some undesirable species were collected, but the Largemouth Bass, Bluegill, and Redear Sunfish populations looked good overall. A report was presented to Fort Campbell staff which focused primarily on access improvements rather than changes to the fishery.

## USFWS (Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge) Lakes

On May 10, 2022, two small USFWS lakes were sampled with electrofishing. The pond in Benton Kentucky is a small public fishing lake which we have sampled nearly annually. The Largemouth Bass catch rate was $22.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ which is concerning since it was supplementally stocked with 300 largemouth from our hatcheries during the fall of 2021 (Table 97). The Bluegill catch rate was 112.0 fish/hr. The catfish length distributions looked good. It is possible that some harvest restrictions may need to be implemented on the Largemouth Bass to address any possible overharvest.

We also sampled a smaller pond which was newly acquired by the USFWS near Symsonia Kentucky. The catch rate of bass in this pond was only $58.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 98). This pond was also supplemented with 350 Largemouth Bass from our hatcheries in the fall of 2021 and the stocking appears to have increased the population compared to the prior year. The wide range of species is indicative of prior flooding and connection with the nearby river. However, the USFWS have made efforts to prevent future flooding. Both the Symsonia pond and the Benton pond are being managed for large sunfish and high catch rates of bass.

| Water body | Location | Species | Date | Effort | Gear | Weather | $\begin{gathered} \text { Water } \\ \text { temp. }{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Water level | Secchi <br> (in) | Water conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barkley | Little River | black bass | 4/26/2022 | 2.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny/chilly | 64.5 | 358.8 | 25 | falling | fair sample |
| Barkley | Eddy Bay | black bass | 4/29/2022 | 2.5 hr | electrofishing | cloudy | 66 | 359.2 | 45 | stable | fair sample, bushes fully flooded |
| Barkley | Jonalsdon \& Fords Bays | black bass | 5/4/2022 | 2.5 hr | electrofishing | overcast | 67 | 359.2 |  | rising slightly | fair sample, new dipper |
| Barkley | Nickell Branch | black bass | 5/6/2022 | 1.0 hr | electrofishing | Jvercast/rain show ers | 66.5 | 359.4 | 37 | stable | fair sample, quit when rain picked up |
| Lake Pennyrile |  | sportfish | 5/9/2022 | 1.0 hr | electrofishing | sunny, windy | 67.9 | normal |  | stable | good sample for sunfish and bass |
| CNWR pond | Benton | community | 5/10/2022 | 0.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 73.0 | normal |  | stable | fair sample |
| CNWR pond | Symsonia | community | 5/10/2022 | 0.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Ky WMA | Handicap pond | community | 5/13/2022 | 0.35 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 80.8 | normal |  | normal | ramp side only |
| Ballard WMA | Gravel pit | community | 5/13/2022 | 0.37 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 85.0 | normal |  | normal | crappie removed |
| Lake Kyle | Fort Campbell | community | 5/24/2022 | 0.45 hr | electrofishing | cloudy | 72.0 |  | 48 |  | fair, sw itch malfunctioning |
| Lake Morris |  | community | 6/2/2022 | 0.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 81.2 | 2' low |  |  | fair sample |
| Barkley | Nickel Branch | catfish | 6/21/2022 | 1.67 hr | electrofishing | sunny, light wind | 84 | 359.3 |  | stable | fair sample, low pulse w ith chase boat |
| Barkley | Cravens Bay | catfish | 6/23/2022 | 1.67 hr | electrofishing | sunny, breezy | 85 | 359.3 |  | stable | fair sample, low pulse w ith chase boat |
| Barkley | Devils Ebow | catfish | 6/29/2022 | 1.67 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 82.5 | 359.1 |  | stable | fair sample, low pulse w ith chase boat |
| Cumberland River | Tilene | community | 9/15/2022 | 1.25 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 77.2 | 304.7 |  | calm | 0.5 hr low pule |
| Ohio River | Birdsville | community | 9/19/2022 | 1.5 hr | electrofishing | cloudy, breezy | 78.7 | 12.75 |  | calm | 0.5 hr low pule |
| Ohio River | Smithland Tailw ater | community | 9/22/2022 | 1.5 hr | electrofishing | w indy | 79.4 | 12.53 |  | calm | 0.25 hr low pule |
| Barkley | Little River | black bass | 10/4/2022 | 2.0 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 65.2 | 355 | 19 | stable | fair sample |
| Barkley | Taylor Bay | black bass | 10/7/2022 | 2.0 hr | electrofishing | overcast | 67.6 | 355.1 |  | stable | fair sample, experimental habitat sample |
| Barkley | Eddy Bay | black bass | 10/11/2022 | 2.0 hr | electrofishing | mostly sunny | 64.9 | 354.8 | 24 | stable | fair sample |
| Barkley | Kuttaw a | black bass | 10/12/2022 | 0.5 hr | electrofishing | rain, w ind | 67 | 354.8 |  | falling slightly | additional bass genetics sample |
| Barkley | Linton | black bass | 10/13/2022 | 0.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 62.1 | 354.8 |  | stable | additional bass genetics sample |
| Barkley | Donaldson Bay | black bass | 10/14/2022 | 0.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny, cold | 64 |  |  |  | additional bass genetics sample |
| Barkley | Crooked Creek | crappie | 10-18-10/21 | 40 nn | trapnet | variable | 59 | 354.7 | 21 | stable | fair sample |
| Barkley | Donaldson Bay | crappie | 10-25-10-28 | 40 nn | trapnet | variable | 59 | 354.7 | 22 | stable | fair sample |
| Barkley | Little River | crappie | 11-1-11-4 | 40 nn | trapnet | variable | 61 | 354.7 | 22 | stable | fair sample |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 3/31/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk | 53.4 | 354.5 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 4/7/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk |  | 355.7 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 4/14/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk | 61.1 | 358.7 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 4/21/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk | 60 | 360 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 4/28/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk | 67 | 359 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 5/4/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk |  | 358.9 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 5/12/2021 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk |  | 358.8 |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 5/19/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk |  | 359.4 |  |  | lots of zooplankton, cut tow duration to 3 min |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 5/26/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk |  |  |  |  | lots of zooplankton, cut tow duration to 3 min |


| Water body | Location | Species | Date | Effort | Gear | Weather | Water temp. ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ | Water level | Secchi <br> (in) | Water conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 6/2/2022 | 6 tow s | neustonic tow net | dusk |  | 358.8 |  |  | lots of zooplankton, cut tow duration to 3 min |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 6/9/2022 | 6 tows | neustonic tow net | dusk |  | 359.3 |  |  | lots of zooplankton, cut tow duration to 2.5 min |
| Kentucky | Blood River | black bass | 6/15/2022 |  | 50 ' seine |  |  |  |  |  | only bass w ere enumerated |
| Kentucky | Sugar Bay | black bass | 6/16/2022 |  | $50^{\prime}$ seine |  |  |  |  |  | only bass were enumerated |
| Kentucky | Blood River | crappie | 6/20/2022 |  | benthic traw I |  |  |  |  |  | fish w ere easy to find |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 6/24/2022 |  | benthic traw I |  |  |  |  |  | fish w ere easy to find |
| Lake Beshear |  | black bass | 5/2/2022 | 2.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 68.9 | normal | 43 | stable | fair sample |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | black bass | 4/27/2022 | 2.5 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 64.0 | 358.9 | 20 | rising slightly | fair, tva runs interfered with ours. |
| Kentucky | Big Bear | black bass | 5/3/2022 | 1.75 hr | electrofishing | w indy | 68.4 | 359.2 |  | rising slightly | good sample, w ind cut short |
| Kentucky | Blood River | black bass | 4/25/2022 | 1.75 hr | electrofishing | cloudy | 65.0 | 358.2 |  | falling | fair sample, rain stopped sample |
| Kentucky | Little Bear | catfish | 6/22/2022 | 1.66 hr | low pulse | sunny/light w ind | 85.0 | 359.2 |  | 14000 cfs | low discharge |
| Kentucky | Fenton | catfish | 6/28/2022 | 1.66 hr | low pulse | partly cloudy | 81.2 | 359.1 |  | w ind picked up |  |
| Kentucky | Patterson Landing | cattish | 6/24/2022 | 1.66 hr | low pulse | sunny/w indy | 82.0 | 359.2 |  | w indy, 14,000 cfs | took 3 attempts due to wind, low discharge |
| Lake Beshear |  | black bass | 10/6/2022 | 2.5 hr | electrofishing | cloudy | 67.0 | low |  |  | fair sample |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | black bass | 10/3/2022 | 2.0 hr | electrofishing | sunny/light wind | 68.6 | 355.0 |  |  | , shad wr taken |
| Kentucky | Blood River | black bass | 10/5/2022 | 2.23 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 64.0 | 355.0 | 29 | stable | runs in smaller test pockets |
| Kentucky | Sugar Bay | black bass | 10/10/2022 | 2.0 hr | electrofishing | sunny | 67.9 | 354.9 |  | stable | fair sample, shad Wr also collected |
| Kentucky | Sledd Creek | crappie | 10/17-10/21 | 40 nn | trapnet | sunny | 64.0 | 354.5 |  | stable | fair sample. moronids and redear also measured |
| Kentucky | Jonathan Creek | crappie | 10/24-10/28 | 40 nn | trapnet | sunny | 62.0 | 355.0 |  | steady | fair sample. moronids and redear also measured |
| Kentucky | Blood River | crappie | 10/31-11/4 | 40 nn | trapnet | variable/stormy | 62.0 | 354.5 | 31 | steady | fair sample. moronids and redear also measured |
| Tennessee River | Haddox Ferry | community | 9/16/2022 | 1.25 hr | electrofishing/low pulse | sunny | 77.1 | low |  | normal | some low pulse used |
| Mississippi River | Wyckliffe | community | 9/20/2022 | 1.25 hr | electrofishing/low pulse | sunny | 79.2 | low |  | steady | volunteer dipper, creek mouths plugged |
| Mississippi River | Columbus Belmont | community | 9/23/2022 | 1.0 hr | electrofishing/low pulse | partly cloudy | 77.0 | 42.0 |  | steady | dyke not passable, but water flow ing through notch |

Table 2. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 5.75 hours (11-30-minute runs; 1-15-minute run) of diurnal electrofishing at Kentucky Lake during April-May 2022.

| Area | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Blood River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 29 | 16.6 | 9.8 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.1 | 2.4 |
| Largemouth Bass | 2 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 124 | 70.9 | 6.3 |
| Jonathan Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 1 | 6 | 4 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 18 | 7.2 | 3.3 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 7 | 12 | 24 | 24 | 17 | 12 | 13 | 27 | 22 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 229 | 91.6 | 10.3 |
| Big Bear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 2 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 11 | 7.3 | 4.5 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 2 | 6 | 17 | 16 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  | 143 | 95.3 | 14.7 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 7 | 13 | 11 | 3 | 4 |  | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 58 | 10.1 | 3.6 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Largemouth Bass | 11 | 22 | 49 | 47 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 44 | 49 | 27 | 24 | 39 | 38 | 40 | 13 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 496 | 86.3 | 7.1 |

[^0]Table 3. Lake specific assessment for Largemouth Bass collected at Kentucky Lake from 2013-2022. This table includes the parameter estimates and the individual scores as well as the total score and assessment rating. The final two columns list the instantaneous mortality $(Z)$ and \% annual mortality (A). Only data collected from Blood River, Big Bear, Jonathan Creek, and Sugar Bay were used for historical comparison.

| Year | Mean <br> length age 3 at capture | ****Mean <br> length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Length group |  |  | Total <br> score | Assessment rating | Z | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | CPUE | CPUE | CPUE |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 12.7** | 13.4** | 27.7 | 15.7 | 19.8 | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 11 | F |  |  |
| 2021 | 12.7** | $13.4 * *$ | 36.5 | 10.4 | 12 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 |  | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2020 | 12.7 | 13.4 | 4.3 | 17.7 | 8 | 0.4 |  |  | ***0.356 | 30 |
| Score | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | P |  |  |
| 2019 | 13.2** |  | 3.3 | 11.9 | 8.1 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | P |  |  |
| 2018 | 13.2** |  | 24.7 | 7.9 | 12.2 | 1.3 |  |  | ***0.456 | 36.6 |
| Score | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | F |  |  |
| 2017 | 13.2** |  | 95.8 | 14.1 | 16.4 | 1.1 |  |  | ***0.513 | 40.1 |
| Score | 2 |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 | G |  |  |
| 2016 | 13.2 | 13.7 | 4.0 | 25.9 | 19.1 | 0.8 |  |  | ***0.410 | 33.7 |
| Score | 2 |  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 11 | F |  |  |
| 2015 | 13.9** |  | 10.2 | 22.0 | 15.6 | 1.2 |  |  | 0.408 | 33.5 |
| Score | 4 |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | G |  |  |
| 2014 | 13.9** |  | 32.6 | 15.0 | 15.7 | 0.9 |  |  | 0.452 | 36.3 |
| Score | 4 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | F |  |  |
| 2013 | 13.9** | 14.2 | 40.2 | 9.6 | 15.8 | 0.8 |  |  | 0.446 | 35.9 |
| Score | 4 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | F |  |  |
| Average | 13.0 | 13.8 | 27.9 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 0.8 | 9.7 |  | 0.217 | 30.763 |

Data from 1985 to 2012 is listed in previous annual reports.
Assessment quartiles were updated in 2015, previous years' APR's will list rating based on old assessment ranges.
** age and growth data was not collected this year, therefore used previous age data set estimates.
2013* samples were hampered by high water levels during flooding, sample was later than normal; overall a poor sample and not all embayments were sampled.
*** mortality rates were calculated from fall caught and aged fish.
****Mean length calculated using a weighted average applied to the entire sample
Rating
5-7 = Poor (P)
8-11 = Fair (F)
$12-16=\operatorname{Good}(\mathrm{G})$
$17-20=$ Excellent (E)
(Kentucky Bass Database.xls)

Table 4. Spring diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Kentucky Lake during May 2013-2022.

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture (in) | *Mean length age 3 at capture (in) | Age 1 |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $<8.0$ in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 18.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| 2022 | 12.7 | **13.4 | 27.7 | 6.3 | 27.6 | 6.3 | 15.7 | 2.2 | 19.8 | 2.7 | 4.0 |  | 0.7 | 0.5 | 86.3 | 9.5 | 61 | 34 |
| 2021 | 12.7 | **13.4 | 36.5 | 4.1 | 31.1 | 3.4 | 10.4 | 1.7 | 12.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 62.3 | 7.1 | 72 | 38 |
| 2020 | 12.7 | **13.4 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 1.6 | 17.7 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 34.9 | 7.0 | 85 | 26 |
| 2019 | 13.2 | **13.7 | 3.3 | 0.6 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 11.9 | 1.6 | 8.1 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 33.8 | 3.0 | 66 | 27 |
| 2018 | 13.2 | **13.7 | 24.7 | 3.5 | 23.7 | 3.4 | 7.9 | 1.1 | 12.2 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | <0.1 | 66.7 | 5.3 | 47 | 28 |
| 2017 | 13.2 | **13.7 | 95.8 | 10.6 | 66.4 | 7.1 | 14.1 | 1.7 | 16.4 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 136.3 | 11.8 | 44 | 23 |
| 2016 | 13.2 | **13.7 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 11.8 | 2.0 | 25.9 | 2.4 | 19.1 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 63.2 | 5.7 | 88 | 37 |
| 2015 | 13.9 | 14.2 | 10.2 | 1.1 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 22.4 | 2.1 | 14.1 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 60.4 | 4.2 | 65 | 25 |
| 2014 | 13.9 | 14.2 | 32.6 | 6.2 | 26.4 | 5.5 | 15.0 | 1.4 | 15.7 | 1.7 | 4.2 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 78.1 | 7.1 | 59 | 30 |
| 2013 | 13.9 | 14.2 | 40.2 | 7.0 | 30.5 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 1.3 | 15.8 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 78.2 | 7.1 | 53 | 33 |
| Average | 13.3 | 13.4 | 27.9 |  | 23.0 |  | 15.1 |  | 14.1 |  | 3.5 |  | 0.8 |  | 70.0 |  | 64.0 | 30.1 |
| KLFMP | $\geq 12.0$ in |  | $\geq 30$ |  |  |  | >22 |  | $\geq 18$ |  |  |  | $\geq 2$ |  |  |  | 55-75 | 20-40 |

(Kentucky Bass Database.xls)
Data for 1985-2012 is listed in previous annual reports; KLFMP - Kentucky Lake Fish Management Plan objective goal.
*Mean length calculated using a w eighted average applied to the entire spring sample
**Mean length in spring estimated by backcalulating lengths of fall aged fish and then estimating length frequency from spring sample
Table 5. PSD and RSD $_{15}$ values calculated for Largemouth
Bass collected during diurnal electrofishing at Kentucky Lake during April-May 2022; 95\% confidence limits are shown in parentheses.

| Area | $\geq$ Stock size* $^{*}$ | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blood River | 98 | $67( \pm 11)$ | $36( \pm 10)$ |
| Jonathan Creek | 145 | $49( \pm 8)$ | $25( \pm 6)$ |
| Big Bear | 94 | $71( \pm 9)$ | $46( \pm 11)$ |
| Total | 337 | $61( \pm 5)$ | $34( \pm 5)$ |

[^1]Table 6. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.23 hours of diurnal electrofishing at Kentucky Lake during October 2022.

| Area / Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Blood River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 2 | 19 | 31 | 10 | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 69 | 30.9 | 13.0 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | 32 | 36 | 23 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 126 | 56.5 | 1.7 |
| Jonathan Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 11 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 43 | 21.5 | 6.9 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 4.0 | 1.8 |
| Largemouth Bass | 6 | 34 | 15 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 152 | 76.0 | 22.2 |
| Sugar Bay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 1 | 24 | 25 | 19 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73 | 36.5 | 5.6 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 4 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 5 |  | 1 |  |  | 52 | 26.0 | 6.8 |
| *TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 2 | 30 | 47 | 15 | 4 | 3 | 7 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 112 | 26.5 | 8.2 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 1.9 | 0.9 |
| Largemouth Bass | 9 | 66 | 51 | 41 | 16 | 16 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 278 | 65.7 | 8.8 |
| wfdwrky.d22 <br> *TOTAL only for Blood |  | and | Jon | tha | Cre | kfor | his |  | com | pari |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7. Number of bass and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of black bass collected at Kentucky Lake during October 2022. Standard errors provided in parantheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Blood River | 8 | 102 (3) | 8 | 99 (5) | 1 | 90 (0) | 17 | 100 (3) |
|  | Jonathan Creek | 17 | 98 (2) | 31 | 98 (2) | 14 | 94 (2) | 62 | 97 (1) |
|  | Sugar Bay | 6 | 91 (3) | 7 | 93 (4) | 1 | 66 (0) | 14 | 90 (3) |
|  | Total | 31 | 98 (2) | 46 | 97 (2) | 16 | 92 | 93 | 96 (1) |
|  |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Species | Area | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Smallmouth Bass | Total | 12 | 92 (3) | 2 | 82 (3) | 3 | 88 (4) | 17 | $90(3)$ |

wfdwrky.d22

Table 8. CPUE (fish/hr) and mean length (in) of age-0 Smallmouth Bass collected in the fall, and CPUE of age-1 Smallmouth Bass collected the following spring during diurnal electrofishing at Kentucky Lake (Jonathan Creek and Blood River only).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { class } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Age } 0 \\ \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\mathrm{A}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Age $1^{B}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 22.7 | 7.6 | 4.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.0 | <0.1 | 49.7 | 8.8 | 4.4 |  | 7.6 | 4.4 |
| 2020 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 39.8 | 12.0 | 13.4 |  | 4.8 | 1.9 |
| 2019 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 30.1 | 6.3 | 3.4 |  |  |  |
| Average | 4.3 |  | 39.9 |  | 7.1 |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (October) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by analysis of otoliths removed from a subsample of SMB <8.0 in and extrapolated to the entire catch of the fall sample.
${ }^{B}$ Data from diurnal electrofishing samples collected the following spring (April/May). wfdwrky.dxx, wfdwragk.dxx, wfdpsdky.dxx

Table 9. CPUE (fish/hr) and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall, and CPUE of age-1 Largemouth Bass collected the following spring during diurnal electrofishing at Kentucky Lake (Jonathan Creek and Blood River only for historical comparison).

| Year class | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Age 0 } \\ \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\mathrm{A}} \end{array}$ |  | Age $1^{\text {B }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 48.1 | 5.2 | 17.8 | 2.7 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 47.3 | 7.3 | 17.6 | 1.8 | 27.7 | 6.31 |
| 2020 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 76.7 | 12.6 | 38.5 | 10.6 | 36.5 | 4.1 |
| 2019 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 37.1 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 1.8 | **4.3 | 1.5 |
| 2018 | 5.7 | 0.1 | 18.6 | 2.8 | 13.0 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 0.6 |
| 2017 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 28.9 | 5.2 | 18.2 | 3.6 | 24.7 | 3.5 |
| 2016 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 58.4 | 7.4 | 47.9 | 5.3 | 95.8 | 10.6 |
| 2015 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 32.6 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 0.7 |
| 2014 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 20.2 | 7.9 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 10.2 | 1.1 |
| 2013 | 5.7 | 0.1 | 31.3 | 5.2 | 21.5 | 4.1 | 32.6 | 6.2 |
| Average | 5.1 |  | 39.9 |  | 19.3 |  | 29.3 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (October) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by analysis of otoliths removed from a subsample of LMB $<8.0$ in and extrapolated to the entire catch of the fall sample. Since 2010, bass up to 10.0 in have been collected for analysis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {B }}$ Data from diurnal electrofishing samples collected the following spring (April/May). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 spring data was poor due to high water levels. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *2012 spring data was poor due to low water levels. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2020 spring sample only used 1 dipper due to covid19 pandemic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data from wfdwrky | 990 to 2 | 12 is | din pre | us year | ports. |  |  |  |

Table 10. Lake conditions and spawning activity rating for each survey site during snorkel surveys in Sugar Bay, 2022. WFD laydowns were placed by KDFWR staff and Natural laydowns were pre-existing laydowns that were monitored. Rating 0-5 was based on relative density of observed eggs or fry, $\mathrm{c}=$ cleaned off (bed brushed clean of debris), blank=not found/not searched for. LMB=largemouth bass, SMB=smallmouth bass, BASS=undetermined black bass, $\mathrm{SF}=$ sunfish.

| Conditions |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { March } \\ 31 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} & \text { April } \\ \text { April } 7 & 14\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | April 21 | April 28 | May 5 | May 12 | May 19 | May 26 | June 1 | June 9 |
| Air temp (F) |  |  | 45 | 50 | 55 | 55 | 65 | 60 | 75 | 85 | 80 | 85 | 80 |
| Water temp (F) |  |  | 56 | 57 | 60 | 60 | 66 | 68 | 76 | 77 | 74 | 79 | 80 |
| Secchi (in) |  |  | 42 | 43 | 37 | 36 | 40 | 49 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 43 | 45 |
| Elevation (ft) |  |  | 345 | 356 | 358 | 360 | 359 | 359 | 359 | 359 | 359 | 359 | 359 |
| Weather |  |  | overcast, breezy | sunny, breezy | sunny | overcast | sunny, calm | overcast, showers | sunny, hot | mostly sunny, breezy | cloudy | sunny | sunny |
| Site ID | Laydown | Spawning Bed | March 31 | April 7 | April 14 | April 21 | April 28 | May 5 | May 12 | May 19 | May 26 | June 1 | June 9 |
| K3-PSB-1 | WFD | Plastic | 0 | 0 | c | c | SMB 3 | SMB 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-2 | WFD | Plastic |  | c | c | c | SMB 3 | SMB 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-2.9 | WFD |  |  | 0 | c | c | c | c | SF 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c |
| K3-PSB-3 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | c | c | c | 0 | SF 4 | 0 | SF 3 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-4 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-4.9 | WFD |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-5 | WFD |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-6 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | SF 4 | SF 5 | 0 | c | SF 1 |
| K3-PSB-6.9 | WFD |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-7 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | LMB 3 | c | 0 | SF 5 | c | 0 | SF 4 | SF 1 |
| K3-PSB-8 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | c | LMB 3 | LMB 3 | LMB 3 | SF 5 | c |  | c | SF 5 |
| K3-PSB-8.8 | WFD |  | 0 | 0 | LMB 5 | LMB 3 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-8.9 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | c | c | BASS 2 | c | SF 5 | c | c | c | SF 2 |
| K3-PSB-9 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | c | LMB 3 | LMB 5 | SF 5 | SF 3 | c | SF 4 | c |
| K3-PSB-10 | WFD | Plastic |  |  | 0 | c | c | c | SF 3 | SF 3 | c | c | SF 2 |
| K3-PSB-10.9 | WFD |  |  |  | 0 | LMB 2 | 0 | c | SF 3 | SF 3 | c | SF 1 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-11 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | c | c | SF 4 | SF 2 | c | c | SF 2 | c |
| K3-PSB-12 | WFD |  |  |  | 0 | c | SMB 2 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | c | 0 |
| K3-PSB-12.9 | WFD |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-13 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | c | c | c | 0 | SF 4 | c | c | SF 3 | c |
| K3-PSB-14 | WFD | Plastic |  | 0 | c | c | LMB 4 | c | c | SF 3 | c | SF 4 | c |
| K3-PSB-14.8 | WFD |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-15 | WFD | Plastic |  |  | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-16 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 2 | 0 | SF 3 | c | SF 5 |
| K3-PSB-16.9 | WFD |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Site ID | Laydown | Spawning <br> Bed | March 31 | April 7 | April $14$ | April 21 | April 28 | May 5 | May 12 | May 19 | May 26 | June 1 | June 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K3-PSB-17 | WFD | Plastic |  |  | LMB 3 | LMB 3 | LMB 4 | 0 | SF 4 | SF 5 | SF 3 | SF 3 | SF 4 |
| K3-PSB-18 | Natural | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | C | 0 | SF 5 | SF 4 | C | C | 0 |
| K3-PSB-19 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | 0 | C | 0 | C | 0 |
| K3-PSB-20 | WFD | Plastic |  |  | 0 | C | C | C | C | C | SF 2 | SF 5 | C |
| K3-PSB-21 | WFD |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | c | SF 1 | 0 | SF 3 | c |
| K3-PSB-22 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | LMB 4 | 0 | 0 | C | SF 1 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-23 | WFD | Plastic |  |  | 0 | LMB 5 | LMB 4 | 0 | SF 2 | SF 4 | SF 4 | c | c |
| K3-PSB-25 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | LMB 3 | LMB 5 | SF 3 | SF 5 | C | SF 4 | c |
| K3-PSB-26 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 |
| K3-PSB-27 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | c | LMB 3 | LMB 3 | SF 2 | C | 0 | C | SF 4 |
| K3-PSB-28 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | c | LMB 3 | LMB 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-29 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | C | SMB 2 | SMB 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-30 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | C | SF 4 | SF 4 | c | SF 4 | SF 3 |
| K3-PSB-31 |  | Plastic |  |  | c | LMB 1 | c | c | SF 2 | SF 3 | C | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-33 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | 0 | C | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-33.9 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 |  | LMB 4 | c | SF 4 | SF 5 | C | SF 4 | c |
| K3-PSB-34 |  | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | SF 4 | SF 5 | C | SF 4 | SF 3 |
| K3-PSB-35 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 4 | c | SF 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-36 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | SF 5 | SF 2 | SF 3 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-37 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | C | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-38 |  | Plastic |  |  | 0 | C | 0 | SF 3 | SF 4 | C | C | 0 | 0 |
| K3-PSB-39 | Natural | Plastic |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-33.9 | WFD |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-34 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | c | LMB 1 | LMB 3 | 0 | SF 5 | 0 | SF 5 | SF 3 | c |
| K3-CSB-34.9 | WFD |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | c | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-35 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | C | 0 | c | 0 | SF 4 | c | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-35.9 | WFD |  | 0 | 0 | LMB 5 | c | 0 | SMB 3 | c | c | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-36 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | c | c | LMB 2 | 0 | 0 | SF 4 | c | SF 3 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-36.9 | WFD |  | 0 | C | C | C | C | C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-37 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | SF 5 | 0 | 0 | c |
| K3-CSB-38 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | LMB 5 | LMB 4 | LMB 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-39 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | SF 5 | 0 | SF 4 | SF 4 | SF 4 |
| K3-CSB-40 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | LMB 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-41 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-42 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | c | c | c | SF 2 | 0 | 0 | SF 1 | c |
| K3-CSB-43 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | c | SF 3 | c | SF 4 | SF 3 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-44 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | C | 0 | 0 | SF 2 |
| K3-CSB-45 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | SF 1 | 0 | SF 4 | SF 4 |

Table 10 (cont.)

| Site ID | Laydown | Spawning <br> Bed | March 31 | April |  |  | April 28 | May 5 | May 12 | May 19 | May 26 | June 1 | June 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | April 7 | 14 | April 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| K3-CSB-46 |  | Concrete |  | 0 | 0 | c | SMB 3 | SMB 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | C |
| K3-CSB-47 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | LMB 1 | 0 | 0 | SF 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-48 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | SMB 4 | SMB 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | SF 3 | 0 |
| K3-CSB-49 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | SF 4 | SF 3 | 0 | 0 | C |
| K3-CSB-50 |  | Concrete | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | c | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*Species or species group determined by presence of adult fish or identification of eggs or larvae collected

Table 11. Number of survey sites (includes all styles of spawning habitat) located and the percentage of each spawning activity rating among sites that were located during snorkel surveys in spring of 2022.

|  | March 31 | April 7 | April 14 | April 21 | April 28 | May 5 | May 12 | May 19 | May 26 | June 1 | June 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# beds located | 14 | 49 | 69 | 67 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 67 | 68 | 68 |
| cleaned off (\%) | 0.0 | 4.1 | 15.9 | 40.3 | 20.6 | 27.9 | 7.4 | 23.5 | 29.9 | 14.7 | 22.1 |
| 1 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 2.9 |
| 2 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 5.9 | 1.5 | 8.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 4.4 |
| 3 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 6.0 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 11.8 | 8.8 | 6.0 | 11.8 | 4.4 |
| 4 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 10.3 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 4.5 | 13.2 | 5.9 |
| 5 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 11.8 | 8.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.9 |
| Total (\%) | 0.0 | 4.1 | 20.3 | 53.7 | 50.0 | 54.4 | 52.9 | 57.4 | 43.3 | 47.1 | 42.7 |

Table 12. Number of artificial spawning beds located and the percentage of each spawning activity rating among beds that were located during snorkel surveys in 2022.

|  | March 31 | April 7 | April 14 | April 21 | April 28 | May 5 | May 12 | May 19 | May 26 | June 1 | June 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# beds located | 8.0 | 40.0 | 53.0 | 52.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 |
| cleaned off (\%) | 0.0 | 2.5 | 17.0 | 44.2 | 22.6 | 28.3 | 5.7 | 24.5 | 34.0 | 17.0 | 24.5 |
| 1 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| 2 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 5.7 | 1.9 | 11.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 5.7 |
| 3 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 5.8 | 17.0 | 11.3 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 5.7 | 13.2 | 5.7 |
| 4 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 13.2 | 17.0 | 13.2 | 5.7 | 17.0 | 7.6 |
| 5 (\%) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 5.7 | 15.1 | 11.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.8 |
| Total (\%) | 0.0 | 2.5 | 18.9 | 57.7 | 58.5 | 60.4 | 58.5 | 64.2 | 49.1 | 54.7 | 50.9 |

Table 13. Percentage of different habitat types that held black bass eggs or fry during at least one snorkel survey in 2020-2022.

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| overall | $50.8 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ |
| sites with a bed | $54.7 \%$ | $50.9 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ |
| beds with a laydown | $66.7 \%$ | $63.2 \%$ | $44.4 \%$ |
| sites with only a laydown | $38.5 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ |
| sites with only a bed | $46.9 \%$ | $44.1 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ |
| plastic beds | $58.3 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ | $44.4 \%$ |
| concrete beds | $47.1 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ |

Table 14. Estimated hatch dates of largemouth bass in Sugar Bay and Blood River at Kentucky Lake, derived using daily ring counts of juveniles in 2022. "\# hatch" represents the time when bass actually hatched on the nest. "\# spawned" represents the estimated time when eggs were fertilized. Elevation (mean feet above sea level) and mean daily discharge (cubic feet/second) at Kentucky Dam also provided. Daily mean temperature readings (1 meter below surface) taken at Hancock Biological Station in main channel. Environmental variables were provided by TVA and Murray State University.

## Largemouth Bass

|  | Sugar Bay |  | Blood River |  | Environmental variables |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \#hatch | \#spaw ned | \#hatch | \#spaw ned |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Eevation | Discharge (cfs) | Temp. F |
| 17-Apr |  |  |  | 2 | 360.45 | 95647 | 59.72 |
| 18-Apr |  | 1 |  | 4 | 360.56 | 96188 | 59.90 |
| 19-Apr |  |  |  | 1 | 360.93 | 85924 | 59.81 |
| 20-Apr |  |  | 2 |  | 360.55 | 104861 | 59.54 |
| 21-Apr | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 360.02 | 102685 | 59.79 |
| 22-Apr |  | 3 | 1 | 6 | 359.78 | 62908 | 60.89 |
| 23-Apr |  | 7 |  | 6 | 359.50 | 62402 | 61.54 |
| 24-Apr | 2 | 14 | 6 | 10 | 359.04 | 62786 | 62.64 |
| 25-Apr | 3 | 18 | 6 | 11 | 358.62 | 63624 | 64.04 |
| 26-Apr | 7 | 17 | 6 | 15 | 358.99 | 39136 | 63.86 |
| 27-Apr | 14 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 359.09 | 35434 | 64.51 |
| 28-Apr | 18 | 16 | 11 | 7 | 359.11 | 35819 | 66.16 |
| 29-Apr | 17 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 359.10 | 35345 | 66.29 |
| 30-Apr | 10 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 359.04 | 30931 | 65.84 |
| 1-May | 16 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 358.89 | 30565 | 66.90 |
| 2-May | 4 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 358.92 | 22175 | 68.32 |
| 3-May | 3 |  | 6 | 1 | 358.78 | 18407 | 67.80 |
| 4-May | 4 |  | 4 | 1 | 359.05 | 25180 | 68.63 |
| 5-May | 1 |  | 2 |  | 359.27 | 18884 | 68.68 |
| 6-May |  |  | 1 |  | 359.18 | 20611 | 68.05 |
| 7-May |  |  | 1 |  | 359.21 | 19610 | 67.66 |

Table 15. Estimated hatch dates of Smallmouth Bass in Sugar Bay and Blood River at Kentucky Lake, derived using daily ring counts of juveniles in 2022. "\# hatch" represents the time when bass actually hatched on the nest. "\# spawned" represents the estimated time when eggs were fertilized. Elevation (mean feet above sea level) and mean daily discharge (cubic feet/second) at Kentucky Dam also provided. Temperature readings (1 meter below surface) taken at Hancock Biological Station in main channel. Environmental variables were provided by TVA and Murray State University.

|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  | Environmental variables |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sugar Bay |  | Blood River |  |  |  |  |
|  | \#hatch | \#spaw ned | \#hatch | \#spaw ned |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Elevation | Discharge (cfs) | Temp. F |
| 19-Apr |  | 1 |  |  | 360.93 | 85924 | 59.81 |
| 20-Apr |  | 3 |  | 1 | 360.55 | 104861 | 59.54 |
| 21-Apr |  | 4 |  |  | 360.02 | 102685 | 59.79 |
| 22-Apr | 1 | 6 |  | 2 | 359.78 | 62908 | 60.89 |
| 23-Apr | 3 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 359.50 | 62402 | 61.54 |
| 24-Apr | 4 | 12 |  | 10 | 359.04 | 62786 | 62.64 |
| 25-Apr | 6 | 15 | 2 | 13 | 358.62 | 63624 | 64.04 |
| 26-Apr | 5 | 14 | 8 | 13 | 358.99 | 39136 | 63.86 |
| 27-Apr | 12 | 12 | 10 | 16 | 359.09 | 35434 | 64.51 |
| 28-Apr | 15 | 11 | 13 | 19 | 359.11 | 35819 | 66.16 |
| 29-Apr | 14 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 359.10 | 35345 | 66.29 |
| 30-Apr | 12 | 6 | 16 | 2 | 359.04 | 30931 | 65.84 |
| 1-May | 11 | 2 | 19 | 2 | 358.89 | 30565 | 66.90 |
| 2-May | 7 |  | 11 | 1 | 358.92 | 22175 | 68.32 |
| 3-May | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 358.78 | 18407 | 67.80 |
| 4-May | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 359.05 | 25180 | 68.63 |
| 5-May |  |  | 1 | 1 | 359.27 | 18884 | 68.68 |
| 6-May | 1 |  | 1 |  | 359.18 | 20611 | 68.05 |
| 7-May | 1 |  |  |  | 359.21 | 19610 | 67.66 |
| 8-May |  |  | 1 |  | 359.25 | 19152 | 68.18 |

Table 16. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/nn) with standard error (SE) of crappie collected by trap nets fished during 120 net-nights of effort at three embayments of Kentucky Lake during October-November 2022. The Sub-Total is used for historical comparison and excludes the data for an embayment which historically had not been sampled. White Bass, Yellow
Bass, and Redear Sunfish were also collected this year.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 |  |  |  |
| Blood River | White Crappie | 10 | 71 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 109 | 2.7 | 3.3 |
|  | Black Crappie | 25 | 8 | 5 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 99 | 2.5 | 0.7 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
|  | Yellow Bass | 1 |  | 14 | 55 | 39 | 17 | 21 | 14 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 163 | 4.1 | 0.8 |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 22 | 73 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 16 | 11 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 146 | 3.7 | 0.7 |
| Jonathan Cr. | White Crappie | 64 | 90 | 10 | 42 | 37 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 272 | 6.8 | 0.6 |
|  | Black Crappie | 83 | 24 | 15 | 88 | 31 | 12 | 11 | 22 | 16 | 7 | 6 | 3 |  |  | 318 | 8.0 | 0.5 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
|  | Yellow Bass | 1 | 4 | 10 | 48 | 21 | 19 | 11 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 119 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 10 | 66 | 3 | 17 | 26 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 146 | 4.9 | 0.8 |
| Sub-Total | White Crappie | 74 | 161 | 18 | 45 | 39 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  | 381 | 4.8 | 0.7 |
|  | Black Crappie | 108 | 32 | 20 | 104 | 41 | 15 | 12 | 28 | 30 | 14 | 9 | 3 | 1 |  | 417 | 5.2 | 0.8 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
|  | Yellow Bass | 2 | 4 | 24 | 103 | 60 | 36 | 32 | 16 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 282 | 4.0 | 0.5 |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 32 | 139 | 8 | 28 | 31 | 25 | 17 | 4 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 292 | 4.2 | 0.5 |
| Sledd Creek | White Crappie | 4 | 18 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 38 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
|  | Black Crappie | 34 | 10 |  | 2 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 73 | 1.8 | 0.3 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
|  | Yellow Bass | 3 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 32 | 19 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 111 | 2.8 | 0.7 |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 1 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 38 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| TOTAL | White Crappie | 78 | 179 | 23 | 46 | 39 | 13 | 11 | 17 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  | 419 | 3.5 | 0.5 |
|  | Black Crappie | 142 | 42 | 20 | 106 | 47 | 22 | 24 | 29 | 30 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 1 |  | 490 | 4.1 | 0.6 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 0.3 | <0.1 |
|  | Yellow Bass | 5 | 10 | 29 | 118 | 73 | 49 | 64 | 35 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 393 | 3.6 | 0.4 |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 33 | 151 | 12 | 29 | 38 | 32 | 21 | 5 | 5 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 330 | 3.0 | 0.4 |
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Table 17. Crappie population parameters used to manage the population at Kentucky Lake, with values determined from fall trap netting at Blood River and Jonathan Creek

| Year | Total CPUE(fish/nn) excludingage 0 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE (fish/nn) } \\ \text { age } 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Mean length (in) age 2 at capture |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE (fish/nn) } \\ \geq 8.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | CPUE (fish/nn) age 1 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE (fish/nn) } \\ \geq 10.0 \mathrm{in} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | *WC | BC | *BC | Crappie | *Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie |
| 2022 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 5.0 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| 2021 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 1 | 6.1 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 9 | 8.8 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| 2020 | 3.6 | 6.0 | 9.5 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 10.4 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 4.5 | 7.7 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 1.4 |
| 2019 | 3.5 | 6.7 | 10.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 3.0 |
| 2018 | 2.8 | 5.6 | 8.4 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 10.7 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| 2017 | 3.6 | 9.6 | 13.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 3.4 | 7.3 | 10.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 2.4 |
| 2016 | 1.7 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 10.0 | 9.8 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 9.7 | 8.9 | 1.4 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| 2015 | 7.7 | 15.0 | 22.7 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 4.3 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 9.3 | 4.1 | 5.8 | 9.9 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 |
| 2014 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 10.3 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 9.7 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 2.4 | 4.3 | 6.7 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 2.3 |
| 2013 | 2.5 | 7.4 | 9.9 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 5.5 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 2.4 | 6.3 | 8.7 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 4.6 |
| Average | 3.3 | 6.9 | 10.2 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 |
| KLFMP |  |  | $\geq 20$ |  |  | $\geq 8$ |  |  |  |  | $\geq 9.5$ in |  |  |  | $\geq 10$ |  |  | $\geq 11$ |  |  | $\geq 4$ |

*Mean length calculated using a w eighted average applied to the entire fall trapnet sample
Data from 1985 to 2012 is listed in previous annual reports.
KLFMP - Kentucky Lake Fish Management Plan objective goal.
Kentucky Lake Crappie Database

Table 18. Lake specific assessment for crappie collected at Kentucky Lake (Blood River and Jonathan Creek) from 2013-2022. This table includes the individual scores for each parameter, as well as the total scores and assessment ratings. The final columns list the instantaneous mortality ( $Z$ ) and annual mortality (A).

| Year | CPUE age 1 and older | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Mean length age 2 at capture | *Mean length age 2 at capture | Total score | Assessment rating | Instantaneous Mortality (Z) | Annual Mortality (A) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 1.6 | 8.6 | 8.7 |  |  | 0.939 | 60.9 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 7 | P |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 6.1 | 2.9 | 9.4 | 8.8 |  |  | 0.701 | 50.4 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2020 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 10.4 | 9.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 8 | F |  |  |
| 2019 | 10.2 | 3.4 | 9.0 | 6.6 | 8.0 | 8.5 |  |  | 0.643 | 47.4 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2018 | 8.4 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 9.9 | 9.8 |  |  | 0.504 | 39.6 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2017 | 13.1 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 10.6 | 8.9 | 8.7 |  |  | 0.805 | 55.3 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  | 7 | P |  |  |
| 2016 | 8.0 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 5.3 | 9.7 | 8.9 |  |  | 1.072 | 65.8 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 6 | P |  |  |
| 2015 | 22.7 | 9.9 | 4.3 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 8.4 |  |  | 0.925 | 60.3 |
| Score | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 14 | G |  |  |
| 2014 | 10.5 | 6.7 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 9.7 | 8.8 |  |  | 0.910 | 59.7 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 7 | P |  |  |
| 2013 | 9.9 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 9.5 |  |  | 0.657 | 48.2 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | 8 | P |  |  |
| Average | 10.2 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.8 | 9.3 | 9.0 |  |  | 0.8 | 54.2 |

*Mean length calculated using a weighted average applied to the entire fall trapnet sample
Rating
1-7 = Poor (P)
8-12 = Fair (F)
13-17 = Good (G)
18-20 = Excellent (E)
Assessment Quartiles updated in 2016.
Kentucky Lake Crappie Database

Table 19. Proportional stock density (PSD) and relative stock density ( $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}$ ) of White and Black crappie collected with trap nets (120 net-nights) at Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek and Sledd Creek) during October and November 2022.
95\% confidence intervals are shown in parentheses.

| Location | Species | $\geq$ Stock size* | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blood River | White Crappie | 20 | $70( \pm 21)$ | $25( \pm 20)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 61 | $52( \pm 13)$ | $41( \pm 12)$ |
| Jonathan Creek | White Crappie | 108 | $16( \pm 9)$ | $6( \pm 2)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 196 | $33( \pm 6)$ | $16( \pm 5)$ |
| Sub Total | White Crappie | 128 | $24( \pm 7)$ | $9( \pm 5)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 257 | $38( \pm 6)$ | $22( \pm 5)$ |
| Sledd Creek | White Crappie | 11 | $91( \pm 18)$ | $9( \pm 17)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 29 | $48( \pm 18)$ | $3( \pm 7)$ |
| Total | White Crappie | 139 | $29( \pm 8)$ | $9( \pm 5)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 286 | $39( \pm 6)$ | $20( \pm 5)$ |
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* Stock size $=5.0$ in

Table 20. Number of fish and relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for each length group of Black and White crappie collected at Kentucky Lake during trapnetting in October and November 2022. Standard errors provided in parentheses

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $>10.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| White Crappie | Blood River | 5 | 90 (4) | 9 | 103 (2) | 5 | 104 (4) |
|  | Jonathan Creek | 90 | 87 (1) | 10 | 108 (2) | 7 | 96 (2) |
|  | Sledd Creek | 1 | 95 (0) | 9 | 103 (2) | 1 | 103 (0) |
|  | Total | 96 | 87 (1) | 28 | 105 (1) | 13 | 99 (2) |
|  |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $>10.0$ in |  |
| Species | Area | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Black Crappie | Blood River | 29 | 87 (2) | 7 | 105 (11) | 25 | 98 (1) |
|  | Jonathan Creek | 116 | 85 (1) | 33 | 96 (2) | 32 | 99 (2) |
|  | Sledd Creek | 15 | 93 (2) | 13 | 97 (1) | 1 | 95 (0) |
|  | Total | 160 | 86 (1) | 53 | 97 (1) | 58 | 98 (1) |
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Table 21. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of White Crappie from an aged subsample, including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2021 | 55 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 2 | 4.3 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 6 | 4.4 | 8.7 | 11.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 4.3 | 7.9 | 11.0 | 12.3 |  | 10.8 | 11.8 | 12.9 |
| 2014 | 2 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 7.8 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 10.8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 66 | 4.1 | 7.9 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 12.9 |
| Smallest |  | 2.8 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 11.5 |
| Largest |  | 5.9 | 10.4 | 14.2 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 11.8 | 12.7 | 14.2 |
| Std err |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Low 95\% CI | 3.9 | 7.0 | 9.4 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 10.3 |  |
| High 95\% CI | 4.2 | 8.8 | 12.0 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 13.6 | 15.5 |  |

* Intercept $=0$.
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Table 22. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of MALE White Crappie from an aged subsample including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

| Year class | N | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2021 | 15 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 2 | 4.3 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 2 | 4.0 | 7.7 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 4.3 | 7.9 | 11.0 | 12.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 7.8 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 12.9 |
| Mean | 22 | 4.5 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 12.9 |
| Smallest |  | 2.8 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 11.5 |
| Largest |  | 5.9 | 8.6 | 11.0 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 11.8 | 12.7 | 14.2 |
| Std err |  | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Low 95\% Cl |  | 4.2 | 6.3 | 8.1 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 10.3 |
| High 95\% CI |  | 4.7 | 8.0 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 13.6 | 15.5 |

* Intercept $=0$.
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Table 23. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of FEMALE White Crappie from an aged subsample including the range in length at each age and the 95\% confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2021 |  | 15 | 4.1 |  |
| 2019 | 4 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 12.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 35 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 12.2 |
| Smallest |  | 3.3 | 7.9 | 11.1 |
| Largest |  | 5.0 | 10.4 | 14.2 |
| Std err |  | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Low 95\% Cl | 3.9 | 8.1 | 10.8 |  |
| High $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 4.4 | 10.4 | 13.6 |

* Intercept $=0$.
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Table 24. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of Black Crappie from an aged subsample, including the range in length at each age and the 95\% confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

| Year class | N | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2021 | 56 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 12 | 3.8 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 57 | 3.9 | 7.1 | 8.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 5 | 3.6 | 5.9 | 8.2 | 9.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 4 | 4.9 | 7.6 | 9.3 | 10.1 | 10.7 | 11.5 | 12.2 |  |
| 2014 | 4 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 12.5 |
| Mean | 138 | 3.9 | 7.0 | 8.9 | 9.8 | 10.4 | 11.2 | 12.0 | 12.5 |
| Smallest |  | 2.4 | 4.1 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 10.0 | 10.6 | 11.3 | 12.1 |
| Largest |  | 5.9 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 13.4 |
| Std err |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Low 95\% Cl |  | 3.8 | 6.8 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 10.1 | 10.7 | 11.6 | 12.0 |
| High 95\% Cl |  | 4.0 | 7.2 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 11.6 | 12.4 | 13.1 |

[^2]Table 25. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of MALE Black Crappie from an aged subsample including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2021 | 15 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 2 | 4.3 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 2 | 4.0 | 7.7 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 4.3 | 7.9 | 11.0 | 12.3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 7.8 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 12.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 22 | 4.5 | 7.2 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 12.9 |
| Smallest |  | 2.8 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 11.5 |
| Largest |  | 5.9 | 8.6 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 11.8 | 12.7 | 14.2 |
| Std err |  | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Low $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ | 4.2 | 6.3 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 10.3 |  |
| High $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 4.7 | 8.0 | 10.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 13.6 | 15.5 |

* Intercept $=0$.
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Table 26. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of FEMALE Black Crappie from an aged subsample including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2021 | 6 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 7 | 3.7 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 32 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 3.9 | 6.8 | 10.4 | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 1 | 5.5 | 8.5 | 9.4 | 10.2 | 11.0 | 12.1 | 12.9 |  |
| 2014 | 4 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 12.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 51 | 4.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 11.1 | 12.0 | 12.5 |
| Smallest |  | 3.2 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 10.6 | 11.6 | 12.1 |
| Largest | 5.5 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 12.0 | 11.0 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 13.4 |  |
| Std err |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Low 95\% Cl | 3.9 | 6.8 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 10.6 | 11.5 | 12.0 |  |
| High 95\% Cl | 4.1 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 10.9 | 10.7 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 13.1 |  |

* Intercept = 0 .
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Table 27. Mean length (in) at capture and standard error (SE) of Black and White crappie. Otoliths were collected from Kentucky Lake (Blood River, Jonathan Creek) in fall 2022.

| Species | N | Mean length at capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Von Bertalanffy growth parameters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Age at capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 | SE | 2 | SE | 3 | SE | 4 | SE | 7 | SE | 8 | SE | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {inf }}$ (in) | K | $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ |
| Crappie spp. | 801 | 6.2 | 0.1 | 8.7 | 0.29 | 10.5 | 0.15 | 10.9 | 0.7 | 12.7 | 0.4 | 13.2 | 0.4 | 13.446 | 0.399 | 0.238 |
| Black Crappie | 419 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 8.4 | 0.24 | 10.3 | 0.14 | 10.5 | 0.7 | 12.7 | 0.4 | 13.0 | 0.5 | 13.483 | 0.37 | 0.221 |
| White Crappie | 382 | 6.6 | 0.1 | 11.0 | 0.5 | 12.7 |  | 13.5 |  |  |  | 13.5 | 1.0 | 13.64 | 1.01 | 1.151 |
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Table 28. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of White Crappie collected in trap nets fished for 80 net-nights in Kentucky Lake (Blood River and Jonathan Creek) during October and November 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 74 | 161 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 249 | 65 | 3.1 | 0.5 |
| 1 |  |  | 5 | 45 | 39 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 122 | 32 | 1.5 | 0.3 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 74 | 161 | 19 | 45 | 39 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 382 |  | 4.8 |  |
| \% | 19 | 42 | 5 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |

wfdtpntk.d22, wfdtnagk.d22

Table 29. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of Black Crappie collected in trap nets fished for 80 net-nights in Kentucky Lake (Blood River and Jonathan Creek) during October and November 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 108 | 32 | 9 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 154 | 37 | 1.9 | 0.3 |
| 1 |  |  | 11 | 99 | 41 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 162 | 39 | 2.0 | 0.4 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 3 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 4 | 0.2 | <0.1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 20 | 27 | 13 | 3 | 2 |  | 73 | 17 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 1 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 5 | 1.2 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 4 | 1.0 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 108 | 32 | 20 | 104 | 41 | 15 | 12 | 29 | 29 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 419 |  | 5.2 |  |
| \% | 26 | 8 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | <1 |  |  |  |  |

wfdtpntk.d22, wfdtnagk.d22

Table 30. Length frequency, density (fish/1000M ${ }^{3}$ ), median density, and geometric mean density (standard error given in parentheses) of each 0.5 mm class of crappie collected during nocturnal neustonic tow net sampling ( 66 tows) at 6 sample sites in the Jonathan Creek embayment of Kentucky Lake from 31 March-9 June 2022.
See Appendix A for sample site locations.

| Date | Location | mm class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CPUE | *Median | *Geometric Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5 | 5.5 | 6 | 6.5 | 7 | 7.5 | 8 | 8.5 | 9 | 9.5 | 10 | 10.5 | 11 | 11.5 |  |  |  |
| 3/31/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 4/7/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 4/14/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 4/21/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 4/28/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 5/4/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 6.5 | 4.02 (3.69) |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  | 4.1 | 4.1 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 | 7.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.7 | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |
| 5/12/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 7.4 | 4.39 (4.45) |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  | 8.5 |  |  |  | 4.2 |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  | 7.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  | 8.2 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |  |  |
| 5/19/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 | 63.4 | 65.09 (27.61) |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  | 5.8 | 12 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  | 21 | 42 | 14 | 7 |  | 28 | 28 | 7 |  | 7 |  | 154 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  | 6.9 | 14 | 28 | 21 | 14 | 6.9 |  | 14 |  |  | 104 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 | 12 | 12 | 6.1 |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  | 13 |  | 6.4 |  | 13 | 6.4 |  |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 |  | 51 |  |  |
| 5/26/2022 | JC002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 100.8 | 84.81 (95.79) |
|  | JC003 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |
|  | JC004 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1 |  | 12 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 12 | 67 | 79 | 189 |  |  |
|  | JC006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.4 |  | 6.4 | 13 | 52 | 19 | 97 |  |  |
|  | JC007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 5.9 | 18 |  |  |
|  | JC005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  | 8.3 |  | 12 | 17 | 41 |  |  |

Table 30 (cont.).

*includes all lengths of yoy crappie collected

Table 31. Geometric mean density (\#/1000m³) for pelagic larval fish captured in neuston tow nets from March 31 - June 9, 2022 (six tows per sample night). Standard errors given in parentheses. Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) and water elevation (feet above sea level) also provided.

Geometric mean (standard error)

| Day | Geometric mean (standard error) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pomoxis spp. |  | Clupeid spp. | Lepomis spp.Total catch | Atherinid spp. <br> Total catch |  |  |
|  | $7.0-12.0 \mathrm{~mm}$ | Total catch |  |  |  | Temp | Elevation |
| 3/31/2022 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 57.04 | 354.6 |
| 4/7/2022 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 57.1 | 355.7 |
| 4/14/2022 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.1 | 359.0 |
| 4/21/2022 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.67 (0.77) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.8 | 360.0 |
| 4/28/2022 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.42 (1.20) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 66.2 | 359.1 |
| 5/4/2022 | 4.02 (3.69) | 4.02 (3.69) | 67.17 (13.80) | 1.31 (0.68) | 0.00 | 68.6 | 359.1 |
| 5/12/2022 | 4.12 (3.78) | 4.39 (4.45) | 435.76 (67.67) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 76.5 | 358.9 |
| 5/19/2022 | 54.03 (19.60) | 65.09 (27.61) | 3394.41 (1520.78) | 302.43 (165.34) | 1.71 (4.05) | 75.8 | 359.4 |
| 5/26/2022 | 36.39 (41.53) | 84.81 (95.79) | 4975.22 (2365.19) | 498.21 (248.75) | 24.88 (17.39) | 73.7 | 359.3 |
| 6/2/2022 | 5.66 (3.96) | 8.22 (7.09) | 2824.92 (1532.38) | 104.10 (29.81) | 95.16 (90.91) | 78.4 | 359.0 |
| 6/9/2022 | 1.47 (1.51) | 1.47 (1.51) | 3227.26 (2792.74) | 14.79 (67.26) | 160.97 (43.73) | 79.7 | 359.4 |

Table 32. Peak geometric mean density (\#/1000m ${ }^{3}$ ) and standard errors for pelagic larval crappie captured in neuston tow nets at the Jonathan Creek embayment of Kentucky Lake from 2015-2022. Catch rates of age0 crappie (fish/net-night) in fall trapnets and age-1 crappie from the following year from Kentucky Lake also reported.

|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | May 12 | May 19 | May 19 | May 19 | May 20 | April 21 | June 3 | May 26 |
| Peak density | 70.5 | 3.9 | 32.0 | 27.7 | 150.2 | 15.1 | 84.8 | 84.8 |
| Std Error | 27.2 | 1.4 | 20.3 | 35.1 | 161.3 | 3.5 | 77.4 | 95.8 |
| Catch age 0 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 9.0 | 1.7 | 6.1 | 5.0 |
| Catch age 1 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 3.4 | 7.7 | 1.5 | 3.4 |  |

Table 33. Estimated crappie hatch dates in Jonathan Creek, derived using larval fish lengths back calculated using a growth rate derived from the daily ring counts of juveniles in 2022. Hatch dates from Jonathan Creek and Blood River derived solely from daily ring counts of juveniles also provided. "\# hatch" represents the time when crappie actually hatched on the nest. "\#spawned" represents the estimated time when crappie eggs were fertilized. Elevation (mean feet above sea level) and mean daily discharge (cubic feet/second) at Kentucky Dam also provided. Temperature readings (1 meter below surface) taken at Hancock Biological Station in main channel. Environmental variables were provided by TVA and Murray State University.

| Jonathan Creek |  |  |  |  | Blood River |  | Environmental variables |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Back calculated estimate larval crappie | Back calculated estimate larval crappie | Juvenile daily ring count | Juvenile daily ring count | Juvenile daily ring count | Juvenile daily ring count |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# hatch / } \\ 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# spaw ned / } \\ 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | \# hatch | \# spaw ned | \# hatch | \# spaw ned | Elevation | Discharge (cfs) | Temp. F |
| 22-Apr |  | 1.43 |  |  |  |  | 359.8 | 62908 | 60.9 |
| 23-Apr |  | 4.84 |  |  |  |  | 359.5 | 62402 | 61.5 |
| 24-Apr |  | 1.31 |  |  |  |  | 359.0 | 62786 | 62.6 |
| 25-Apr | 1.43 |  |  |  |  |  | 358.6 | 63624 | 64.0 |
| 26-Apr | 4.84 |  |  |  |  |  | 359.0 | 39136 | 63.9 |
| 27-Apr | 1.31 |  |  |  |  |  | 359.1 | 35434 | 64.5 |
| 28-Apr |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 359.1 | 35819 | 66.2 |
| 29-Apr |  | 2.86 |  |  |  | 1 | 359.1 | 35345 | 66.3 |
| 30-Apr |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 359.0 | 30931 | 65.8 |
| 1-May |  | 3.33 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 358.9 | 30565 | 66.9 |
| 2-May | 2.86 | 1.89 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 358.9 | 22175 | 68.3 |
| 3-May |  | 4.56 |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 358.8 | 18407 | 67.8 |
| 4-May | 3.33 | 1.97 |  | 1 | 1 | 9 | 359.1 | 25180 | 68.6 |
| 5-May | 1.89 | 4.30 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 359.3 | 18884 | 68.7 |
| 6-May | 4.56 | 8.02 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 19 | 359.2 | 20611 | 68.1 |
| 7-May | 1.97 | 3.23 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 359.2 | 19610 | 67.7 |
| 8-May | 4.30 | 7.21 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 359.3 | 19152 | 68.2 |
| 9-May | 8.02 | 10.12 | 6 | 8 | 19 | 10 | 359.2 | 25435 | 68.3 |
| 10-May | 3.23 | 7.97 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 359.0 | 31238 | 69.4 |
| 11-May | 7.21 | 16.83 | 9 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 359.0 | 29775 | 72.2 |
| 12-May | 10.12 | 5.19 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 358.9 | 31609 | 76.5 |
| 13-May | 7.97 | 4.71 | 11 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 359.0 | 20006 | 75.3 |
| 14-May | 16.83 |  | 10 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 359.2 | 17431 | 74.7 |
| 15-May | 5.19 | 1.93 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 359.2 | 14947 | 76.1 |
| 16-May | 4.71 |  | 14 | 3 | 5 |  | 359.2 | 18121 | 75.8 |
| 17-May |  | 2.66 | 6 | 1 | 7 |  | 359.2 | 18992 | 76.2 |
| 18-May | 1.93 | 1.36 | 6 |  | 1 |  | 359.2 | 18223 | 75.5 |
| 19-May |  | 1.35 | 3 |  |  |  | 359.4 | 12820 | 75.8 |
| 20-May | 2.66 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 359.2 | 18087 | 75.2 |
| 21-May | 1.36 | 1.35 |  |  |  |  | 359.2 | 19989 | 75.8 |
| 22-May | 1.35 | 3.00 |  |  |  |  | 359.1 | 19778 | 75.4 |
| 23-May |  |  |  |  |  |  | 359.2 | 27370 | 74.6 |

Table 33 (cont.).

| Jonathan Creek |  |  |  |  | Blood River |  | Environmental variables |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Back calculated estimate larval crappie | Back calculated estimate larval crappie | Juvenile daily ring count | Juvenile daily ring count | Juvenile daily ring count | Juvenile daily ring count |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \# hatch / } \\ 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# spaw ned / } \\ 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3} \end{gathered}$ | \# hatch | \# spaw ned | \# hatch | \# spaw ned | Elevation | Discharge (cfs) | Temp. F |
| 24-May | 1.35 |  |  |  |  |  | 359.2 | 39747 | 74.1 |
| 25-May | 3.00 | 1.47 |  |  |  |  | 359.4 | 63656 | 73.7 |
| 26-May |  |  |  |  |  |  | 359.3 | 72934 | 73.5 |
| 27-May |  |  |  |  |  |  | 359.4 | 67169 | 73.4 |
| 28-May | 1.47 |  |  |  |  |  | 359.5 | 59974 | 73.4 |

Table 34. Estimated hatch dates of Black and White crappie in Jonathan Creek and Blood River, derived using daily ring counts of juveniles in 2022. "\# hatch" represents the time when crappie actually hatched on the nest. Elevation (mean feet above sea level) and mean daily discharge (cubic feet/second) at Kentucky Dam also provided. Temperature readings (1 meter below surface) taken at Hancock Biological Station in main channel. Environmental variables were provided by TVA and Murray State University.

|  | Jonathan Creek |  | Blood River |  | Environmental variables |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White Crappie \#hatch | Black Crappie \#hatch | White Crappie \#hatch | Black Crappie \#hatch |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Elevation | Discharge (cfs) | Temp. F |
| 1-May |  |  | 1 |  | 358.9 | 30565 | 66.9 |
| 2-May |  |  | 1 |  | 358.9 | 22175 | 68.3 |
| 3-May |  |  | 2 | 1 | 358.8 | 18407 | 67.8 |
| 4-May |  |  | 1 |  | 359.1 | 25180 | 68.6 |
| 5-May | 2 |  | 2 |  | 359.3 | 18884 | 68.7 |
| 6-May | 2 |  | 3 | 1 | 359.2 | 20611 | 68.1 |
| 7-May | 1 |  | 7 | 2 | 359.2 | 19610 | 67.7 |
| 8-May | 4 | 1 | 7 |  | 359.3 | 19152 | 68.2 |
| 9-May | 4 | 2 | 16 | 3 | 359.2 | 25435 | 68.3 |
| 10-May | 9 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 359.0 | 31238 | 69.4 |
| 11-May | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 359.0 | 29775 | 72.2 |
| 12-May | 8 |  | 10 |  | 358.9 | 31609 | 76.5 |
| 13-May | 9 | 2 | 9 |  | 359.0 | 20006 | 75.3 |
| 14-May | 9 | 1 | 5 |  | 359.2 | 17431 | 74.7 |
| 15-May | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 359.2 | 14947 | 76.1 |
| 16-May | 13 | 1 | 5 |  | 359.2 | 18121 | 75.8 |
| 17-May | 6 |  | 6 | 1 | 359.2 | 18992 | 76.2 |
| 18-May | 6 |  | 1 |  | 359.2 | 18223 | 75.5 |
| 19-May | 2 | 1 |  |  | 359.4 | 12820 | 75.8 |
| 20-May | 1 |  |  |  | 359.2 | 18087 | 75.2 |

Table 35. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Channel, Blue, and Flathead catfish collected from Kentucky Lake in June and July 2022 using low pulse (15 PPS) electrofishing along the main river channel. A chase boat was used. A total of 5.0 hours of sampling consisting of 60-300-second runs.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 32 | 36 |  |  |  |
| Blue Cattish | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 52 | 10.8 | 3.7 |
| Channel Catfish | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 1.7 | 0.8 |
| Flathead Catfish |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 38 | 7.9 | 1.5 |

Table 36. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ of each length group of Blue, Channel, and Flathead catfish collected from Kentucky Lake during June and July 2022. Fish were collected using low pulse (15 PPS) electrofishing. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blue Catfish | 12.0-19.9 in |  | 20.0-29.9 in |  | $\geq 30.0$ in |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 25 | 116 (2) | 13 | 118 (5) | 2 | 129 (4) | 40 | 118 (2) |
|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flathead Catfish | 12.0-19.9 in |  | 20.0-29.9 in |  | $\geq 30.0$ in |  | Total |  |
|  | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 16 | 105 (1) | 12 | 112 (2) | 2 | 119 (10) | 30 | 108 (1) |

wfdcatk.d22

Table 37. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 8.5 hours (17-30-minute runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Lake Barkley from 26 April to 6 May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Donaldson Cr. | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 3 | 8 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 27 | 27.0 | 11.0 |
| Fords | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 11 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 5 |  | 1 |  | 79 | 52.7 | 4.4 |
| Middle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eddy Cr . | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 2.8 | 1.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 15 | 23 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 161 | 64.4 | 7.9 |
| Little River | Smallmouth Bass |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 2.8 | 1.5 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 74 | 29.6 | 4.4 |
| Upper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nickell Cr. | Smallmouth Bass |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 5 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  | 1 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 66 | 66.0 | 8.0 |
| Total | Smallmouth Bass |  | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 2.7 | 0.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 5 | 23 | 48 | 31 | 21 | 15 | 14 | 20 | 30 | 43 | 37 | 29 | 24 | 21 | 10 | 21 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 407 | 47.9 | 5.0 |

Table 38. Spring diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Barkley during late April/early May since 2013. Mean length at capture of age-3 fish also provided.

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | Mean length age 3 at capture*** | Age 1 |  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CPUE | SE |  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 |  |  | 18.7 | 2.9 | 15.1 | 2.9 |  |  | 9.3 | 1.6 | 12.8 | 2.0 | 10.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 47.9 | 5.0 |
| 2021 |  |  | 41.7 | 4.5 | 35.7 | 4.2 | 9.4 | 1.4 | 11.8 | 2.6 | 12.2 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 69.1 | 6.1 |
| 2020* |  |  | 2.5 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 6.5 | 2.0 | 9.6 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 20.7 | 3.2 |
| 2019** | 12.9 | 13.1 | 14.6 | 4.0 | 11.7 | 3.5 | 8.7 | 2.4 | 16.9 | 3.9 | 16.0 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 53.3 | 10.4 |
| 2018 |  |  | 10.9 | 1.4 | 10.8 | 1.4 | 11.0 | 2.2 | 5.7 | 1.1 | 17.4 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 44.9 | 5.8 |
| 2017 |  |  | 26.5 | 5.1 | 19.0 | 3.8 | 11.7 | 2.5 | 9.7 | 1.3 | 26.8 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 67.2 | 6.2 |
| 2016 |  |  | 10.8 | 1.8 | 6.6 | 1.2 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 14.9 | 2.3 | 22.2 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 49.7 | 4.9 |
| 2015** | 13.4 | 13.6 | 10.3 | 1.3 | 8.5 | 1.3 | 15.1 | 2.1 | 29.7 | 4.0 | 26.3 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 79.6 | 7.1 |
| 2014 |  |  | 22.2 | 3.7 | 21.4 | 3.6 | 13.5 | 1.7 | 22.8 | 2.5 | 23.5 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 81.2 | 7.5 |
| 2013 |  |  | 18.2 | 2.7 | 14.6 | 2.3 | 16.2 | 2.4 | 22.9 | 3.2 | 19.3 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 73.0 | 7.9 |
| Average | 13.2 | 13.3 | 17.6 |  | 14.6 |  | 10.3 |  | 15.4 |  | 18.4 |  | 1.1 |  | 58.6 |  |

[^3]Data is available since 1985 in previous annual reports

* Only one dipper w as used due to covid19 protocols in 2020
** Back-calculated fall age data used in 2015 and 2019
${ }^{* * *}$ Mean length calculated using a w eighted average applied to the spring sample

Table 39. PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{15}$ values calculated for Largemouth Bass collected during 8.5 hours (17-30-minutes runs) of spring diurnal electrofishing at each area of Lake Barkley from 26 April to 6 May 2022.
$95 \%$ confidence intervals are shown in parentheses.

| Area | $\geq$ Stock size* | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Donaldson | 9 | $67( \pm 33)$ | $22( \pm 29)$ |
| Fords | 33 | $61( \pm 17)$ | $21( \pm 14)$ |
| Eddy Creek | 133 | $74( \pm 7)$ | $36( \pm 8)$ |
| Little River | 63 | $73( \pm 11)$ | $41( \pm 12)$ |
| Nickell | 41 | $71( \pm 14)$ | $20( \pm 12)$ |
| Total | 279 | $72( \pm 5)$ | $33( \pm 6)$ |
| wfdpsdb.d22 |  |  |  |

Table 40. Lake specific assessment for Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Barkley from 2013-2022. This table includes the parameter estimates and the individual scores as well as the total scores and assessment ratings. The final two columns list the instantaneous mortality rate $(Z)$ and the annual mortality (A).

| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean length } \\ & \text { age } 3 \text { at } \\ & \text { capture } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Mean length age 3 at capture ${ }^{\star \star \star}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { age } 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Length group |  |  | Total score | Assessment rating | Z | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | CPUE | CPUE | CPUE |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 12.9 | 13.1 | 18.7 | 12.8 | 10.7 | 1.3 |  |  | 0.443 | 35.8 |
| Score | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | P |  |  |
| 2021 | 12.9 | 13.1 | 41.7 | 11.8 | 12.2 | 0.4 |  |  | 0.358 | 30.1 |
| Score | 2 |  | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2020* | 12.9 | 13.1 | 2.5 | 6.5 | 9.6 | 0.5 |  |  | 0.450 | 36.3 |
| Score | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | P |  |  |
| 2019** | 12.9 | 13.1 | 14.6 | 16.9 | 16 | 1.5 |  |  | 0.436 | 35.3 |
| Score | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | P |  |  |
| 2018 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 10.9 | 5.7 | 17.4 | 1.1 |  |  | 0.249 | 22.0 |
| Score | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | F |  |  |
| 2017 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 26.5 | 9.7 | 26.8 | 1.7 |  |  | 0.322 | 27.5 |
| Score | 4 |  | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 13 | G |  |  |
| 2016 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 10.8 | 14.9 | 22.2 | 1.7 |  |  | 0.402 | 33.1 |
| Score | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2015** | 13.4 | 13.6 | 10.3 | 29.7 | 26.3 | 1.7 |  |  | 0.472 | 38.0 |
| Score | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | F |  |  |
| 2014 | 13.0 | 13.5 | 22.2 | 22.8 | 23.5 | 1.4 |  |  | 0.649 | 47.8 |
| Score | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2013 | 13.0 | 13.5 | 18.2 | 22.9 | 19.3 | 0.7 |  |  | 0.282 | 25.0 |
| Score | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | P |  |  |
| Average | 13.1 | 13.4 | 17.6 | 15.4 | 18.4 | 1.2 | 8.4 |  | 0.406 | 33.1 |

Older data is listed in previous annual reports.
(Revised _Barkley_bass_Database.xlsx)

* Only one dipper w as used due to covid19 protocols in 2020
** Used back calculated lengths from fall
*** Mean length calculated using a w eighted average applied to the spring sample

| Rating |
| :--- |
| $5-7=$ Poor (P) |
| $8-11=$ Fair (F) |
| $12-16=$ Good (G) |
| $17-20=$ Excellent (E) |

Table 41. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours of diurnal electrofishing (12-30-minute runs) for black bass in each area of Lake Barkley October 4-14, 2022. Sub-Total uses only data collected from Little River and Eddy Creek for historical comparison.

| Area / Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Eddy Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 23 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 17.5 | 6.7 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Largemouth Bass | 27 | 145 | 21 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 18 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 287 | 143.5 | 17.1 |
| Little River |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 2 | 34 | 18 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 72 | 36.0 | 9.3 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 2.5 | 1.9 |
| Largemouth Bass | 9 | 56 | 12 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 139 | 69.5 | 10.6 |
| Sub-Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 2 | 57 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 107 | 26.8 | 6.4 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| Largemouth Bass | 36 | 201 | 33 | 15 | 23 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 426 | 106.5 | 16.8 |
| Taylor Bay/Jake Fork Bay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 2 | 20 | 19 | 9 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 54 | 27.0 | 11.1 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 11 | 63 | 26 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 159 | 79.5 | 7.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 4 | 77 | 40 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  | 161 | 26.8 | 5.3 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Largemouth Bass | 47 | 264 | 59 | 27 | 31 | 20 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 10 | 26 | 24 | 18 | 13 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 585 | 97.5 | 11.8 |

Table 42. Number of fish and the mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for each length group of Largemouth and Smallmouth bass collected at Lake Barkley during 7.5 hours of diurnal electrofishing (15-30-minute runs) in October 2022. Sub-Total uses only data collected from Little River and Eddy Creek for historical comparison. Additional fish were collected from Donaldson Creek, Linton Bay, and Kuttawa for relative weight calculations. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Eddy Creek | 18 | 103 (1) | 42 | 104 (1) | 15 | 101 (2) | 75 | 103 (1) |
|  | Little River | 6 | 106 (3) | 15 | 103 (2) | 12 | 95 (4) | 33 | 100 (2) |
|  | Sub-Total | 24 | 104 (1) | 57 | 103 (1) | 27 | 98 (2) | 108 | 102 (1) |
|  | Taylor Bay/Jake Fork Bay | 13 | 102 (2) | 11 | 105 (3) | 4 | 105 (3) | 28 | 103 (2) |
|  | Donaldson Creek | 8 | 113 (3) | 6 | 108 (4) | 3 | 102 (2) | 17 | 109 (2) |
|  | Linton Bay | 1 | 106 | 1 | 118 |  |  | 2 | 112 (6) |
|  | Kuttawa | 2 | 109 (2) | 5 | 109 (3) | 6 | 91 (5) | 13 | 101 (3) |
|  | Total | 48 | 105 (1) | 80 | 104 (1) | 40 | 98 (2) | 168 | 103 (1) |
|  |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Species | Area | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Smallmouth Bass | Eddy Creek | 5 | 94 (3) | 1 | 103 |  |  | 6 | 95 (3) |
|  | Little River | 3 | 97 (3) | 4 | 94 (4) | 7 | 90 (5) | 14 | 93 (3) |
|  | Sub-Total | 8 | 95 (2) | 5 | 96 (4) | 7 | 90 (5) | 20 | 93 (2) |
|  | Taylor Bay/Jake Fork Bay | 1 | 102 |  |  | 2 | 86 (4) | 3 | 92 (6) |
|  | Donaldson Creek |  |  |  |  | 1 | 93 | 1 | 93 |
|  | Linton Bay | 2 | 101 (5) |  |  |  |  | 2 | 101 (5) |
|  | Kuttawa |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Total | 11 | 97 (2) | 5 | 96 (4) | 10 | 90 (3) | 26 | $94(2)$ |

wfdwrb.d22, wfdwrb1.d22

Table 43. CPUE (fish/hr) and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall and CPUE of age-1 Largemouth Bass collected the following spring during diurnal electrofishing at Lake Barkley.

| Year class | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $1^{\text {B }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 80.3 | 12.6 | 12.8 | 1.7 |  |  |
| 2021 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 47.5 | 8.6 | 23.0 | 3.3 | 18.7 | 2.9 |
| 2020 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 99.4 | 15.3 | 42.5 | 10.0 | 41.7 | 4.5 |
| 2019 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 98.7 | 17.5 | 16.9 | 2.8 | 2.5* | 0.9* |
| 2018 | 6.2 | 0.2 | 11.4 | 2.8 | 8.6 | 1.7 | 14.6 | 4.0 |
| 2017 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 26.0 | 5.2 | 11.1 | 3.4 | 10.9 | 1.4 |
| 2016 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 22.3 | 4.7 | 12.6 | 3.5 | 26.5 | 5.1 |
| 2015 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 39.1 | 8.9 | 17.5 | 4.4 | 10.8 | 1.8 |
| 2014 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 24.6 | 4.4 | 10.8 | 1.9 | 9.4 | 2.0 |
| 2013 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 60.1 | 7.1 | 47.8 | 5.2 | 22.2 | 3.7 |
| 2012 | 6.5 | 0.1 | 30.0 | 4.8 | 27.0 | 3.5 | 22.1 | 2.7 |
| Average | 5.2 |  | 49.0 |  | 21.0 |  | 17.9 |  |

${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (October) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by analysis of otoliths, removed from a subsample of LMB <12.0 in.
${ }^{\mathrm{B}}$ Data collected during the following spring (April/May) diurnal electrofishing sample.

* Only one dipper used because of covid19 protocols in spring 2020
wfdwrb.dxx, wfdwrb1.dxx, wfdpsdb.dxx

Table 44. CPUE (fish/hr) and mean length (in) of age-0 Smallmouth Bass collected in the fall and CPUE of age-1 Smallmouth Bass collected the following spring during diurnal electrofishing at Lake Barkley.

| Year class | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $1^{\text {B }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 22.0 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 0.9 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 24.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| 2020 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 42.5 | 20.7 | 13.8 | 5.8 | 3.3 | 1.0 |
| 2019 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 18.9 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.5* | 0.3* |
| Average | 4.2 |  | 27.0 |  | 6.2 |  | 1.7 |  |

${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (October) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by analysis of otoliths, removed from a subsample of SMB <12.0 in.
${ }^{\mathrm{B}}$ Data collected during the following spring (April/May) diurnal electrofishing sample.

* Only one dipper used because of covid19 protocols in spring 2020
wfdwrb1.dxx, wfdpsdb.dxx

Table 45. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of each inch class of White and Black crappie collected by trap nets (120 net-nights) at Lake Barkley from 18 October-4 November 2022. Sub-Total is shown for comparisons with historical data which included only Little River and Donaldson Creek.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |  |  |
| Little River | White Crappie | 15 | 42 | 5 | 138 | 286 | 18 | 12 | 41 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 580 | 14.5 | 1.3 |
|  | Black Crappie | 5 | 17 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 39 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| Donaldson Creek | White Crappie | 302 | 224 | 1 | 20 | 16 | 5 | 17 | 22 | 6 | 8 |  | 621 | 15.5 | 2.2 |
|  | Black Crappie | 45 | 20 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |  | 89 | 2.2 | 0.5 |
| Sub-Total | White Crappie | 317 | 266 | 6 | 158 | 302 | 23 | 29 | 63 | 21 | 12 | 4 | 1,201 | 15.0 | 1.3 |
|  | Black Crappie | 50 | 37 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 |  | 128 | 1.6 | 0.3 |
| Crooked Creek | White Crappie | 208 | 215 | 11 | 61 | 40 | 3 | 4 | 39 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 605 | 15.1 | 2.8 |
|  | Black Crappie | 51 | 18 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 77 | 1.9 | 0.3 |
| Total | White Crappie | 525 | 481 | 17 | 219 | 342 | 26 | 33 | 102 | 35 | 19 | 7 | 1,806 | 15.1 | 1.3 |
|  | Black Crappie | 101 | 55 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 205 | 1.7 | 0.2 |

wfdtpntb.d22, wfdtpnb1.d22

Table 46. Number of fish mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for each length group of Black and White crappie collected by trap nets (120 net-nights) at Lake Barkley from 18 October-4 November 2022.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| White Crappie | Little River | 414 | 81 (<1) | 51 | 108 (1) | 23 | 107 (2) | 488 | 85 (1) |
|  | Donaldson Bay | 34 | 86 (2) | 39 | 109 (1) | 14 | 112 (3) | 87 | 101 (2) |
|  | Crooked Creek | 104 | 86 (1) | 42 | 109 (1) | 24 | 107 (1) | 170 | 94 (1) |
|  | Total | 552 | 83 (<1) | 132 | 109 (1) | 61 | 108 (1) | 745 | 89 (1) |
| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  |  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr |
| Black Crappie | Little River | 13 | 87 (1) | 2 | 112 (3) | 1 | 103 | 16 | 91 (3) |
|  | Donaldson Bay | 9 | 89 (3) | 6 | 116 (4) | 5 | 109 (2) | 20 | 102 (3) |
|  | Crooked Creek | 4 | 84 (3) | 1 | 104 | 2 | 99 (5) | 7 | 90 (4) |
|  | Total | 26 | 87 (1) | 9 | 113 (3) | 8 | 106 (2) | 43 | 96 (2) |

Table 47. Crappie population parameters used to manage the population at Lake Barkley for 2013-2022, with values determined from fall trap netting. To allow for historical comparisons, only data from Little River and Donaldson Creek are presented.

| Year | Total CPUE (fish/nn) excluding age 0 |  |  | CPUE (fish/nn) age 2 |  |  | Mean length (in) age 2 at capture |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE (fish/nn) } \\ \geq 8.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | CPUE (fish/nn) age 1 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE (fish/nn) } \\ \geq 10.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie | Crappie* | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie | WC | BC | Crappie |
| 2021 | 7.7 | 0.5 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 7.4 | 0.4 | 7.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| 2021 | 3.8 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| 2020 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 10.7 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| 2019 | 3.5 | 0.8 | 4.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| 2018 | 1.8 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 11.8 | 10.9 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| 2017 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 11.2 | 9.9 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 1.3 |
| 2016 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 9.7 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 2.6 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 1.8 |
| 2015 | 11.4 | 3.1 | 14.4 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 11.6 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 5.1 | 10.8 | 1.4 | 12.2 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| 2014 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 11.8 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| 2013 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 11.1 | 10.6 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 3.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 2.5 |
| Average | 4.2 | 1.4 | 5.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 11.1 | 10.1 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.1 |

*Mean length calculated using a w eighted average applied to the w hole fall trapnet sample
Data is available from 1985 in previous annual reports.
Revised_Barkley_Crappie_Database

Table 48. Proportional stock density (PSD) and relative stock density ( $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}$ ) of White and Black crappie collected by trap nets (120 net-nights) at Lake Barkley from 18 October-4 November 2022. Sub-Total uses only data collected from Little River and Donaldson Creek. Numbers in parentheses represent $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

| Location | Species | $\geq$ Stock size* $^{\prime}$ | PSD | RSD $_{10}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Little River | White Crappie | 518 | $15( \pm 3)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 16 | $19( \pm 20)$ | $6( \pm 12)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Donaldson | White Crappie | 94 | $56( \pm 10)$ | $15( \pm 7)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 21 | $52( \pm 22)$ | $24( \pm 19)$ |
| Sub-Total | White Crappie | $\mathbf{6 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 ( \pm 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{6 ( \pm 2 )}$ |
|  | Black Crappie | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 ( \pm 1 6 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 ( \pm 1 2 )}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Crooked Creek | White Crappie | 171 | $39( \pm 7)$ | $14( \pm 5)$ |
|  | Black Crappie | 7 | $43( \pm 40)$ | $29( \pm 36)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | White Crappie | $\mathbf{7 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 ( \pm 3 )}$ | $\mathbf{8 ( \pm 2 )}$ |
|  | Black Crappie | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 ( \pm 1 5 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 ( \pm 1 2 )}$ |

wfdtpntb.d22, wfdtpnb1.d22
*Stock size $=5.0$ in

Table 49. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of White Crappie including the range in length at each age and the 95\% confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2021 | 162 | 4.4 |  |  |
| 2020 | 26 | 4.4 | 8.8 |  |
| 2019 | 6 | 4.5 | 9.0 | 11.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 194 | 4.4 | 8.8 | 11.6 |
| Smallest |  | 2.6 | 7.5 | 11.1 |
| Largest |  | 8.8 | 10.9 | 12.4 |
| SE | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |
| Low 95\% CI |  | 4.3 | 8.6 | 11.2 |
| High 95\% Cl |  | 4.6 | 9.1 | 12.0 |
| *IIcept |  |  |  |  |

*Intercept = 0
wfdtnagb.d22

Table 50. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of Black Crappie including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2021 | 36 | 4.3 |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 6 | 4.9 | 8.5 |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 10.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 43 | 4.4 | 8.3 | 9.5 | 10.8 |
| Smallest |  | 2.9 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 10.8 |
| Largest |  | 6.6 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 10.8 |
| SE | 0.1 | 0.4 |  |  |  |
| Low $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 4.1 | 7.4 |  |  |
| High $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 4.7 | 9.2 |  |  |

*Intercept $=0$
wfdtnagb.d22

Table 51. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of MALE White Crappie including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2021 | 50 | 5.1 |  |  |
| 2020 | 17 | 4.4 | 8.8 |  |
| 2019 | 1 | 4.7 | 8.4 | 11.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 68 | 4.9 | 8.8 | 11.4 |
| Smallest |  | 3.4 | 7.5 | 11.4 |
| Largest |  | 8.8 | 10.5 | 11.4 |
| SE |  | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |
| Low 95\% Cl |  | 4.7 | 8.4 |  |
| High 95\% Cl |  | 5.1 | 9.2 |  |
| *lntercept = 0 |  |  |  |  |
| wfdtnagb.d22 |  |  |  |  |

Table 52. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of FEMALE White Crappie including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2021 | 53 | 4.8 |  |  |
| 2020 | 9 | 4.5 | 8.8 | 11.6 |
| 2019 | 4 | 4.5 | 9.2 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 11.6 |
| Mean | 66 | 4.8 | 8.9 | 11.1 |
| Smallest |  | 2.6 | 8.2 | 12.4 |
| Largest |  | 8.5 | 10.9 | 0.3 |
| SE |  | 0.1 | 0.2 | 11.0 |
| Low 95\% CI |  | 4.5 | 8.5 | 12.2 |
| High 95\% Cl |  | 5.0 | 9.4 |  |

*Intercept = 0
wfdtnagb.d22

Table 53. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of MALE Black Crappie including the range in length at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 |
| 2021 | 12 | 4.8 |  |
| 2020 | 4 | 5.4 | 9.0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 16 | 4.9 | 9.0 |
| Smallest |  | 2.9 | 7.8 |
| Largest |  | 6.6 | 10.1 |
| SE | 0.3 | 0.5 |  |
| Low 95\% CI |  | 4.4 | 8.0 |
| High $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 5.5 | 10.1 |

*Intercept = 0
wfdtnagb.d22

Table 54. Mean back-calculated length (in) at each annulus of FEMALE Black Crappie including the range in length at each age and the 95\% confidence interval of each age group. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and
Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | N | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 2021 | 16 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 2 | 4.0 | 7.5 |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 10.8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 19 | 4.2 | 7.4 | 9.5 | 10.8 |  |
| Smallest |  | 2.9 | 7.0 | 9.5 | 10.8 |  |
| Largest |  | 6.3 | 7.7 | 9.5 | 10.8 |  |
| SE |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| Low $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 3.8 | 7.0 |  |  |  |
| High $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ |  | 4.5 | 7.7 |  |  |  |

*Intercept $=0$
wfdtnagb.d22

Table 55. Von Bertalanffy growth curve parameters, mean length (in) at capture, and standard error (SE) of Black and White crappie. Otoliths were collected from Lake Barkley (Little River, and Donaldson Creek) in fall 2022.

| Species | N | Mean length at capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Von Bertalanffy growth parameters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Age at capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 0 | SE | 1 | SE | 2 | SE | 3 | SE | 4 | SE | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {inf }}(\mathrm{in})$ | K | $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ |
| Crappie spp. | 1329 | 2.97 | 0.02 | 6.85 | 0.05 | 11.21 | 0.12 | 12.50 | 0.00 | 11.50 | 0.00 | 11.986 | 2.071 | 1.391 |
| Black Crappie | 128 | 2.99 | 0.06 | 7.35 | 0.28 | 10.83 | 0.33 |  |  | 11.50 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | 1201 | 2.96 | 0.02 | 6.78 | 0.06 | 11.28 | 0.13 | 12.50 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |

wfdtnagb.d22, wfdtpntb.d22

Table 56. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of White Crappie collected during 120 net-nights at Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022. Little River and Donaldson Creek also shown separately for historical comparison.

## Little River and Donaldson Creek

| Age | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | Total | $\%$ | CPUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 317 | 266 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SE |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  | 3 | 158 | 302 | 23 | 29 | 63 | 16 |  |  | 586 | 49 | 7.3 | 1.3 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 12 | 1 | 594 | 49 | 7.4 | 0.9 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| Total | 317 | 266 | 6 | 158 | 302 | 23 | 29 | 63 | 21 | 12 | 4 | 1,201 |  | 15.0 | 1.3 |
| $\%$ | 26 | 22 | $<1$ | 13 | 25 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | $<1$ |  |  |  |  |

## Lake Barkley Total

|  | Age | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | Total | $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CPUE | SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 525 | 481 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,015 | 56 | 8.5 | 1.1 |
| 1 |  |  | 9 | 219 | 342 | 26 | 33 | 102 | 27 |  |  | 758 | 42 | 6.3 | 0.6 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 19 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 0.2 | $<0.1$ |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 | 0 | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| Total | 525 | 481 | 18 | 219 | 342 | 26 | 33 | 102 | 35 | 19 | 7 | 1,807 |  | 15.1 | 1.3 |
| $\%$ | 29 | 27 | 1 | 12 | 19 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | $<1$ |  |  |  |  |

wfdtpntb.d22, wfdtpnb1.d22, wfdtnagb.d22

Table 57. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of Black Crappie collected during 120 net-nights at Lake Barkley (Little River, Donaldson Creek, and Crooked Creek) from 18 October-4 November 2022. Little River and Donaldson Creek also shown separately for historical comparison.

## Little River and Donaldson Creek

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 50 | 37 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 91 | 71 | 1.1 | 0.2 |
| 1 |  |  |  | 7 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 33 | 26 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 50 | 37 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 128 |  | 1.6 | 0.3 |
| \% | 39 | 29 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

## Lake Barkley Total

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 101 | 55 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 161 | 79 | 1.3 | 0.2 |
| 1 |  |  |  | 7 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 38 | 19 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 101 | 55 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 205 |  | 1.7 | 0.2 |
| \% | 49 | 27 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | <1 |  |  |  |  |

Table 58. Lake specific assessment for crappie collected at Lake Barkley (Little River and Donaldson Creek) from 2013-2022. This table includes the parameter estimates and the individual scores as well as the total scores and assessment ratings. The final columns list the instantaneous mortality ( $Z$ ) and annual mortality ( $A$ ).

| Year | CPUE age 1 and older | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { age } 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { age } 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Mean length age 2 at capture | *Mean length age 2 at capture | Total score | Assessment rating | Z | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 1.8 | 11.2 | 11.2 |  |  | 1.018 | 63.9 |
| Score | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 |  | 16 | G |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 16.2 | 2.4 | 10.5 | 10.5 |  |  | 0.507 | 39.8 |
| Score | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |  | 12 | F |  |  |
| 2020 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 9.8 | 1.8 | 10.5 | 10.7 |  |  | 0.801 | 55.1 |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |  | 11 | F |  |  |
| 2019 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 17.0 | 1.0 | 9.7 | 10.0 |  |  | 0.900 | 59.4 |
| Score | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 10 | F |  |  |
| 2018 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 7.6 | 1.3 | 11.5 | 11.5 |  |  | 0.848 | 57.2 |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |  | 12 | F |  |  |
| 2017 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 7.9 | 2.4 | 10.7 | 10.5 |  |  | 0.949 | 61.0 |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 |  | 11 | F |  |  |
| 2016 | 9.7 | 6.7 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 10.3 | 10.0 |  |  | 1.472 | 77.0 |
| Score | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  | 14 | G |  |  |
| 2015 | 14.5 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 10.5 | 10.1 |  |  | 0.680 | 49.3 |
| Score | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 17 | G |  |  |
| 2014 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 9.2 | 1.9 | 11.2 | 11.5 |  |  | 0.418 | 34.2 |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |  | 12 | F |  |  |
| 2013 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 10.9 | 11.0 |  |  | 0.788 | 54.5 |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  | 10 | F |  |  |
| Average | 5.6 | 4.4 | 8.5 | 2.6 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 12.5 |  | 0.838 | 55.13 |

Rating
1-7 = Poor (P)
8-12 = Fair (F)
13-17 = Good (G)
18-20 = Excellent (E)
*Mean length calculated using a weighted average applied to the entire fall trapnet sample
(Revised_Barkley_Crappie_Database.xIsx)

Table 59. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Channel, Blue, and Flathead catfish collected from Lake Barkley in June-July 2022 using low pulse (15 PPS) electrofishing along the main lake river channel. A chase boat was used during a total of 5.0 hours of sampling (60-300-second runs).

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 33 | 44 |  |  |  |
| Blue Catfish |  | 26 | 102 | 50 | 29 | 107 | 129 | 61 | 59 | 50 | 25 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 19 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 758 | 151.6 | 21.7 |
| Channel Catfish | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 3.6 | 0.9 |
| Flathead Catfish |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |  | 17 | 3.4 | 1.0 |

w fdcatb.d22

Table 60. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ of each length group of Blue, Channel, and Flathead catfish collected from Lake Barkley during June-July 2022. Fish were collected using low pulse (15 PPS) electrofishing.

| Species | Length group |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Blue Catfish | $12.0-19.9$ in | $20.0-29.9$ in | $\geq 30.0 \mathrm{in}$ |


|  | Length group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel Catfish $11.0-15.9 \mathrm{in} \quad 16.0-23.9 \mathrm{in} \quad \geq 24.0 \mathrm{in} \quad$ Total |  |
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Table 61. Fishery statistics derived from a creel survey at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.


Table 62. Length distribution for each species of fish harvested or released (lengths of released fish were estimated by anglers) at Lake Barkley Tailwaters ( 75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| Largemouth | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 11 | 145 | 11 |  | 11 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bass | R |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 55 | 28 | 97 | 14 | 28 | 138 | 14 | 28 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 23 |  | 12 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bass | R |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 62 |  | 150 | 25 | 12 | 50 | 12 | 25 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spotted Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | H |  | 22 | 45 | 134 | 78 | 123 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  | 65 | 76 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Redear | H |  |  |  | 33 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunfish | R |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Longear | H |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Channel | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 98 | 197 | 455 | 246 | 98 | 135 | 111 |  | 12 |  | 25 |  |  |  | 14 |
| Catfish | R |  |  | 53 | 26 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 383 | 79 | 119 | 40 | 26 | 13 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Catfish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 699 | 873 | 1,374 | 1,514 | 1,619 | 862 | 990 | 384 | 838 | 116 | 268 | 210 | 175 | 198 | 47 |
|  | R |  |  | 68 | 81 | 230 | 311 | 54 | 664 |  | 339 | 203 | 176 | 108 | 135 | 54 | 135 |  | 81 | 54 |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| Flathead | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| Catfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Bass | H |  |  | 13 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 13 | 54 | 54 | 67 | 148 | 40 | 27 | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  | 24 | 107 | 203 | 143 | 131 | 24 | 36 | 24 | 60 |  | 36 | 48 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R | 20 | 51 | 20 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Striped Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| Hybrid striped | H |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 28 |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |
| bass | R |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sauger | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drum | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  | 67 |  | 13 | 13 | 13 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 132 |  | 212 | 119 | 463 | 66 | 304 | 79 | 608 |  | 145 | 13 | 79 |  | 67 |  |  |
| Skipjack | H | 706 | 1,396 | 1,246 | 781 | 180 | 105 | 75 | 1,831 | 1,066 | 3,558 | 991 | 2,507 | 645 | 600 | 931 | 465 | 180 | 105 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Herring | R | 1,766 | 1,700 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |  |  | 131 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shad | H | 29 |  | 14 | 14 |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R 8 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Common Carp H

|  | R |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buffalo | H | 24 | 12 | 59 | 47 | 12 | 10 |
|  | R |  |  | 38 |  |  |  |
| Blue Sucker | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  | 20 | 61 |  |  |

Table 62 (cont).

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 23 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| Bighead Carp | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  | 22 | 11 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Silver Carp | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 12 | 72 | 1,062 | 465 | 7,077 | 2,995 | 3,699 | 3,508 | 17,148 | 2,339 | 1,647 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  | 11 |  | 44 |  | 553 | 55 | 66 | 55 | 265 |  |  |
| Grass Carp | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 128 | 12 | 163 | 70 | 267 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Gar | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 38 | 38 | 64 | 434 | 13 | 894 | 89 | 26 | 13 | 447 |  | 26 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |  | 23 |  | 369 |  | 254 |  |  |  | 46 |  | 12 |
| Paddlefish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bow fin | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 62 (cont).

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50+ |  |
| Largemouth | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Bass | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 429 |
| Smallmouth | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57 |
| Bass | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 374 |
| Spotted Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 74 |
| Bluegill | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 413 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 162 |
| Redear | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| Sunfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| Longear | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| Sunfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Channel | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,403 |
| Catfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 819 |
| Blue Catfish | H 47 | 23 | 47 | 128 | 12 |  | 23 |  | 23 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,492 |
|  | R |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,749 |
| Flathead | H |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |
| Catfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| White Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 525 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 846 |
| Yellow Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 102 |
| Striped Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 109 |
| Hybrid striped | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 129 |
| bass | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 66 |
| Sauger | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Drum | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 134 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,287 |
| Skipjack | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17,383 |
| Herring | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,645 |
| Shad | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 72 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| Common Carp | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| Buffalo | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 164 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| Blue Sucker | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 81 |
| Bighead Carp | H 22 | 225 | 79 | 966 |  | 270 | 90 | 169 | 978 | 45 | 236 |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3,202 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

Table 62 (cont).

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50+ |  |
| Silver Carp | H 955 | 609 | 36 | 800 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42,470 |
|  | R |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,072 |
| Grass Carp | H | 407 | 23 | 302 | 47 |  |  |  | 12 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,464 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| Gar | H | 204 |  | 51 |  | 64 | 13 |  |  | 166 |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 128 |  | 51 | 2,798 |
|  | R | 35 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 796 |
| Paddlefish | H | 35 | 12 | 46 |  |  | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 |  |  |  | 23 |  | 12 |  |  | 43 | 219 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Bow fin | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

Table 63. Fish harvest statistics derived from a creel survey at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\overline{0}} \\ & \frac{0}{\bar{n}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © O } \\ & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { 은 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. caught (per acre) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1 , 1 5 9} \\ & (15.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 630 \\ (8.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 432 \\ (5.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \\ (1.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,528 \\ & (206.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,223 \\ & (29.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 64 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,241 \\ & (176.1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 640 \\ (8.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 576 \\ (7.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (0.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,016 \\ & (26.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,373 \\ & (18.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 290 \\ (3.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 196 \\ (2.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. harvested (per acre) | $\begin{gathered} 282 \\ (3.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 201 \\ (2.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,944 \\ & (158.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,403 \\ & (18.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48 \\ (0.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,492 \\ & (139.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 467 \\ (6.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 413 \\ (5.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ (0.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 891 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 526 \\ & (7.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (0.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 180 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130 \\ & (1.7) \end{aligned}$ |
| \% of total no. harvested | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | ( $)^{\text {) }}$ | 14.7 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 12.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.1 | (T) | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Lb. harvested (per acre) | $\begin{gathered} 510 \\ (6.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 369 \\ (4.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107 \\ (1.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,982 \\ & (265.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,507 \\ & (20.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 183 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,293 \\ & (243.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ (1.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 81 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (T) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,400 \\ & (18.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 388 \\ & (5.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 665 \\ (8.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 325 \\ & (4.3) \end{aligned}$ |
| \% of total lb. harvested | 0.2 | 0.1 | (T) | ( 7 ) | 6.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 5.5 | (T) | ( 7 ) | ( $)^{\text {) }}$ | ( 7 ) | 0.4 | 0.1 | ( 7 ) | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Mean length (in) |  | 15.2 | 14.9 | 15.5 |  | 15.0 | 20.5 | 17.9 |  | 6.3 | 6.3 | 7.0 |  | 11.7 | 10.0 | 21.1 | 14.6 |
| Mean w eight (lb) |  | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 |  | 1.1 | 3.8 | 2.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  | 0.7 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 2.0 |
| No. of fishing trips for that species | 473 |  |  |  | 3,301 |  |  |  | 264 |  |  |  | 1,251 |  |  |  |  |
| \% of all trips | 3.3 |  |  |  | 22.9 |  |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) | $\begin{aligned} & 1,306 \\ & (17.4) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 9,120 \\ (121.3) \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 729 \\ & (9.7) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3457 \\ & (46.0) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| No. harvested fishing for that species | 236 |  |  |  | 11,581 |  |  |  | 326 |  |  |  | 405 |  |  |  |  |
| Lb harvested fishing for that species | 427 |  |  |  | 19,145 |  |  |  | 59 |  |  |  | 951 |  |  |  |  |
| No./hour harvested fishing for that species | 0.2 |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| \% success fishing for that species | 15.6 |  |  |  | 46.4 |  |  |  | 20.0 |  |  |  | 13.9 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\circ}{\overline{0}} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{1}{0} \\ & \frac{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 으̃ } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N } \\ & \tilde{\pi} \\ & \text { ত゙ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{亠}{\overleftarrow{0}} \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { 心 } \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\sigma} \\ \text { ত্, } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No．caught （per acre） | $\begin{aligned} & 48,238 \\ & (641.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43,543 \\ & (579.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,203 \\ & (42.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,493 \\ & (19.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,422 \\ & (32.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,594 \\ & (47.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21,031 \\ & (279.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 231 \\ (3.1) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| No．harvested （per acre） | $\begin{aligned} & 47,137 \\ & (626.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42,471 \\ & (564.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,203 \\ & (42.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,465 \\ & (19.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 135 \\ (1.8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,798 \\ & (37.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17,384 \\ & (231.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 220 \\ (2.9) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| \％of total no． harvested | 57.8 | 52.1 | 3.9 | 1.8 | （T） | 0.2 | 3.4 | 21.3 | 0.3 |  |
| Lb．harvested （per acre） | $\begin{aligned} & 296,631 \\ & (3944.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 244,910 \\ & (3256.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51,721 \\ & (687.8) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 296 \\ (3.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,611 \\ & (48.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7,698 \\ (102.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,171 \\ & (28.9) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\%$ of total lb． harvested | 89.1 | 73.5 | 15.5 |  | （T） | 0.1 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.7 |  |
| Mean length（in） |  | 22.7 | 32.5 | 27.8 | 16.0 | 17.1 | 22.7 | 9.0 | 39.2 |  |
| Mean w eight（lb） |  | 5.6 | 16.1 |  | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 10.1 |  |
| No．of fishing trips for that species | 4，526 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2，895 | 205 | 1，502 |
| \％of all trips | 31.3 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  | 20.0 | 1.4 | 10.4 |
| Hours fished for that species （per acre） | $\begin{aligned} & 12,504 \\ & (166.3) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 22 $(0.3)$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 7,999 \\ (106.4) \end{gathered}$ | $567$ (7.5) | $55$ <br> （0．7） |
| No．harvested fishing for that species | 42，930 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 17，041 | 92 |  |
| Lb harvested fishing for that species | 220，513 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 7，534 | 579 |  |
| No．／hour harvested fishing for that species | 3.4 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 2.1 | 0.2 |  |
| \％success fishing for that species | 58.8 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 54.0 | 50.0 | 24.8 |
| $\mathrm{T}=<0.05$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 64. Monthly black bass angling success at Lake Barkley Tailwaters ( 75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of bass caught | Total no. of bass harvested | No. of black bass fishing trips | Hours fished by bass anglers | Bass caught by bass anglers | Bass caught/hour by bass anglers | Bass harvested by bass anglers | Bass harvested/hour by bass anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 43 | 0 | 21 | 58 | 21 | 0.36 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Apr | 152 | 0 | 35 | 97 | 17 | 0.17 | 0 | 0.00 |
| May | 164 | 61 | 82 | 227 | 102 | 0.45 | 51 | 0.22 |
| Jun | 588 | 207 | 131 | 361 | 428 | 1.19 | 185 | 0.51 |
| Jul | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Aug | 148 | 0 | 72 | 199 | 82 | 0.41 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Sept | 65 | 13 | 20 | 55 | 52 | 0.94 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Oct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nov | 0 | 0 | 42 | 116 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Dec | 0 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 1,159 | 282 | 473 | 1,306 | 702 | 0.54 | 236 | 0.18 |
| Mean | 105 | 26 | 38 | 105 | 64 |  | 21 |  |

Table 65. Black bass catch and harvest statistics derived from Lake Barkley Tailwaters ( 75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

|  | Largemouth bass |  |  |  | Smallmouth bass |  |  |  | Spotted bass |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Harvest | Release |  | Total | Harvest | Release |  | Total | Harvest | Release |  | Total |
|  | $\geq 12.0$ in | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 12.0$ in | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Total no. of bass | 201 | 139 | 193 | 630 | 58 | 187 | 101 | 432 | 23 | 74 | 0 | 97 |
| \% of bass harvested by number | 71.3\% |  |  |  | 20.5\% |  |  |  | 8.2\% |  |  |  |
| Total weight of bass (lb) | 369 | 186 | 259 | 944 | 107 | 181 | 97 | 470 | 35 | 58 | 0 | 93 |
| \% of bass harvested by weight | 72.3\% |  |  |  | 20.9\% |  |  |  | 6.8\% |  |  |  |
| Mean length (in) | 15.2 |  |  |  | 14.9 |  |  |  | 15.5 |  |  |  |
| Mean weight (lb) | 1.80 |  |  |  | 1.60 |  |  |  | 1.50 |  |  |  |
| *Catch rate (fish/hr) | 0.02 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  | <0.01 |  |  |  |
| *Harvest rate (fish/hr) | 0.005 |  |  |  | 0.001 |  |  |  | 0.001 |  |  |  |

*Includes effort and catch of non-bass anglers

Table 66. Monthly catfish angling success at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of catfish caught | Total no. of catfish harvested | No. of catfish fishing trips | Hours fished by catfish anglers | Cattish caught by catfish anglers | Cattish caught/hour by catish anglers | Catfish harvested by catfish anglers | Catish harvested/hour by catfish anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | - | 0.00 |
| Mar | 64 | 0 | 42 | 116 | 64 | 0.55 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Apr | 371 | 321 | 211 | 583 | 372 | 0.64 | 321 | 0.55 |
| May | 1,647 | 1,411 | 411 | 1,134 | 1,370 | 1.21 | 1,135 | 1.00 |
| Jun | 2,051 | 1,740 | 392 | 1,083 | 2,006 | 1.85 | 1,718 | 1.59 |
| Jul | 680 | 588 | 324 | 896 | 681 | 0.76 | 588 | 0.66 |
| Aug | 2,125 | 1,351 | 564 | 1,558 | 2,107 | 1.35 | 1,333 | 0.86 |
| Sept | 2,394 | 1,980 | 370 | 1,023 | 2,381 | 2.33 | 1,980 | 1.93 |
| Oct | 3,768 | 2,366 | 616 | 1,703 | 3,768 | 2.21 | 2,366 | 1.39 |
| Nov | 1,899 | 1,677 | 323 | 893 | 1,844 | 2.07 | 1,629 | 1.82 |
| Dec | 528 | 511 | 47 | 131 | 529 | 4.05 | 511 | 3.91 |
| Total | 15,528 | 11,944 | 3,301 | 9,120 | 15,122 | 1.66 | 11,581 | 1.27 |
| Mean | 1,412 | 1,086 | 300 | 829 | 1,375 |  | 1,053 |  |

Table 67. Catfish catch and harvest statistics derived from Lake Barkley Tailwaters ( 75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.


* Includes effort and catch of non-catfish anglers

Table 68. Monthly Morone angling success at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of Morone caught | Total no. of Morone harvested | No.of Morone fishing trips | Hours fished by Morone anglers | Morones caught by Morone anglers | Morones caught/hour by Morone anglers | Morones harvested by Morone anglers | Morones harvested/hour by Morone anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 55 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 0 | 0 | 21 | 58 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Apr | 591 | 337 | 152 | 421 | 136 | 0.32 | 68 | 0.16 |
| May | 522 | 184 | 149 | 413 | 305 | 0.74 | 122 | 0.30 |
| Jun | 207 | 12 | 148 | 409 | 151 | 0.37 | 12 | 0.03 |
| Jul | 81 | 35 | 155 | 428 | 70 | 0.16 | 35 | 0.08 |
| Aug | 198 | 33 | 180 | 497 | 165 | 0.33 | 33 | 0.07 |
| Sept | 78 | 52 | 130 | 360 | 52 | 0.14 | 39 | 0.11 |
| Oct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nov | 215 | 175 | 162 | 446 | 96 | 0.22 | 96 | 0.22 |
| Dec | 72 | 9 | 75 | 207 | 18 | 0.09 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 2,016 | 891 | 1,251 | 3,457 | 994 | 0.29 | 405 | 0.12 |
| Mean | 183 | 81 | 107 | 294 | 90 |  | 37 |  |

Table 69. Morone catch and harvest statistics derived from Lake Barkley Tailwaters ( 75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.


* includes effort and catch of non-morone anglers

Table 70. Monthly Skipjack angling success at Lake Barkley Tailwaters ( 75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of Skipjack caught | Total no. of Skipjack harvested | No. <br> of Skipjack fishing trips | Hours fished by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack caught by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack caught/hour by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack harvested by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack harvested/hour by Skipjack anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 3,345 | 3,238 | 273 | 755 | 3,345 | 4.43 | 3,238 | 4.29 |
| Apr | 7,036 | 6,968 | 1,360 | 3,758 | 6,766 | 1.80 | 6,749 | 1.80 |
| May | 3,058 | 3,048 | 396 | 1,093 | 3,017 | 2.76 | 3,007 | 2.75 |
| Jun | 173 | 161 | 96 | 265 | 161 | 0.61 | 161 | 0.61 |
| Jul | 1,049 | 1,049 | 88 | 244 | 1,049 | 4.29 | 1,049 | 4.29 |
| Aug | 5,386 | 2,092 | 336 | 928 | 5,303 | 5.71 | 2,009 | 2.16 |
| Sept | 984 | 828 | 190 | 526 | 932 | 1.77 | 828 | 1.58 |
| Oct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nov | 0 | 0 | 28 | 78 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Dec | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 21,031 | 17,384 | 2,895 | 7,999 | 20,573 | 2.57 | 17,041 | 2.13 |
| Mean | 1,912 | 1,580 | 252 | 695 | 1,870 |  | 1,549 |  |

Table 71. Monthly Asian Carp angling success at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (75.2 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of Carp caught | Total no. of Carp harvested | No. of Carp fishing trips | Hours fished by Carp anglers | Carp caught by Carp anglers | Carp caught/hour by Carp anglers | Carp harvested by Carp anglers | Carp harvested/hour by Carp anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 55 | 55 | 20 | 56 | 55 | 0.98 | 55 | 0.98 |
| Mar | 943 | 900 | 116 | 320 | 686 | 2.15 | 686 | 2.15 |
| Apr | 1,164 | 1,147 | 117 | 324 | 169 | 0.52 | 169 | 0.52 |
| May | 18,399 | 18,031 | 1,120 | 3,094 | 16,323 | 5.28 | 16,323 | 5.28 |
| Jun | 10,867 | 10,625 | 1,089 | 3,009 | 10,406 | 3.46 | 10,406 | 3.46 |
| Jul | 6,107 | 5,877 | 1,150 | 3,176 | 5,623 | 1.77 | 5,623 | 1.77 |
| Aug | 9,519 | 9,453 | 528 | 1,458 | 9,058 | 6.21 | 9,058 | 6.21 |
| Sept | 803 | 790 | 370 | 1,023 | 595 | 0.58 | 595 | 0.58 |
| Oct | 30 | 30 | 16 | 44 | 15 | 0.34 | 15 | 0.34 |
| Nov | 127 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Dec | 224 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 48,238 | 47,137 | 4,526 | 12,504 | 42,930 | 3.43 | 42,930 | 3.43 |
| Mean | 4,385 | 4,285 | 411 | 1,137 | 3,903 |  | 3,903 |  |

Table 72. Fishery statistics derived from a creel survey at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Fishing Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of fishing trips (per acre) | 17,904 |
| Fishing Pressure |  |  |
|  | Total angler-hours (SE) | 49,382 |
|  | Angler-hours/acre | 218.5 |
| Catch / Harvest |  |  |
|  | No. of fish caught (SE) | 92,391 |
|  | No. of fish harvested (SE) | 81,108 |
|  | Lb of fish harvested | 143,391 |
| Harvest Rates |  |  |
|  | Fish/hour | 1.7 |
|  | Fish/acre | 358.9 |
|  | Pounds/acre | 634.5 |
| Catch Rates |  |  |
|  | Fish/hour | 1.9 |
|  | Fish/acre | 408.8 |
| Miscellaneous Characteristics (\%) |  |  |
|  | Male | 89.3 |
|  | Female | 10.7 |
|  | Resident | 79.6 |
|  | Non-resident | 20.4 |
| Method (\%) |  |  |
|  | Still fishing | 39.0 |
|  | Casting | 37.9 |
|  | Fly Fishing | 0.1 |
|  | Trolling | 0.0 |
|  | Spider Rigging | 0.1 |
|  | Snagging | 9.4 |
|  | Bow Fishing | 11.6 |
|  | Drifting | 2.1 |
| Mode (\%) |  |  |
|  | Boat | 18.6 |
|  | Bank | 55.1 |
|  | Dock/Pier | 26.2 |

Table 73. Length distribution for each species of fish harvested or released (lengths of released fish were estimated by anglers) at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| White Crappie | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 57 | 28 | 14 |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 113 | 71 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 71 | 28 | 14 | 14 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 | 105 | 45 | 105 | 30 | 15 |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  | 84 | 14 | 211 | 112 | 239 | 141 | 84 | 42 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spotted Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | H | 134 | 214 | 307 | 227 | 80 | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R | 407 | 318 | 230 | 389 | 35 | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Redear Sunfish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Sunfish | H |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57 | 143 | 471 | 186 | 143 | 29 | 157 | 14 | 43 | 14 |  |  | 29 |  |  |
|  | R |  | 14 |  | 28 |  |  |  | 71 |  | 56 | 42 | 14 | 28 | 14 |  |  |  | 56 |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |
| Blue Catfish | H |  |  |  |  | 353 |  |  | 78 |  | 706 | 1,157 | 1,431 | 2,352 | 961 | 569 | 1,176 | 118 | 569 | 118 | 314 | 137 | 98 | 39 |  |
|  | R |  | 67 | 33 | 67 | 17 | 116 |  | 150 |  | 150 | 50 | 17 | 50 | 33 | 17 | 33 | 33 | 17 | 17 |  |  |  | 17 |  |
| Flathead Cattish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 24 | 24 | 24 | 12 |  | 24 |  | 12 |  |  | 24 |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Bass | H |  |  |  |  | 13 | 51 | 13 | 38 | 51 | 77 | 89 | 166 | 51 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R 15 | 15 | 61 | 45 | 121 | 45 | 76 |  | 106 | 15 | 91 |  | 61 | 15 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yellow Bass | H |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R | 15 | 77 |  |  | 31 | 15 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Striped Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 172 | 125 | 360 | 235 | 31 | 297 | 94 | 219 | 94 | 94 | 235 | 63 |
|  | R |  |  |  | 14 | 14 |  |  | 85 | 14 | 85 |  | 99 | 99 | 14 |  | 28 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hybrid striped bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 43 | 14 | 14 | 43 |  |  |  |  | 29 | 14 | 14 |  |  |
|  | R |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |  | 38 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sauger | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 11 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 74 | 32 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drum | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  | 7 | 6 |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  | 13 | 13 |  |  |  | 104 | 117 | 143 | 208 | 325 | 156 | 559 | 156 | 208 | 39 | 78 |  | 78 |  |  |
| Skipjack Herring | H | 1,485 | 2,703 | 1,960 | 1,485 | 1,440 | 1,930 | 1,737 | 6,311 | 4,009 | 8,449 | 5271 | 4,588 | 2,153 | 2,049 | 178 | 104 | 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  | 76 |  | 76 |  |  |  | 30 | 45 | 106 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shad | H |  | 257 | 339 | 467 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R 13 | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buffalo | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 28 | 14 |  | 42 | 14 | 42 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 15 |  |  | 15 | 60 |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bighead Carp | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 73 (cont.).


## Table 73 (cont).

| Species |  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50+ |  |
| White Crappie | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| Largemouth Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 213 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 396 |
| Smallmouth Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 360 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 941 |
| Spotted Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bluegill | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,001 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,414 |
| Redear Sunfish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Green Sunfish | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Channel Cattish | H | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,299 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 338 |
| Blue Catfish | H | 59 | 157 |  | 39 |  | 59 |  | 39 | 39 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,586 |
|  | R |  | 17 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 17 | 100 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  | 1,064 |
| Flathead Catfish | H | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 193 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 |
| White Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 574 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 681 |
| Yellow Bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 153 |
| Striped Bass | H | 78 | 125 | 31 | 47 | 16 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,331 |
|  | R |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 480 |
| Hybrid striped bass | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 185 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 127 |
| Sauger | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 157 |
| Drum | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,197 |
| Skipjack Herring | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45,898 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 348 |
| Shad | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,075 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 |
| Buffalo | H |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 183 |
|  | R |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 149 |
| Bighead Carp | H |  | 13 |  | 529 | 13 | 26 | 53 |  | 40 | 13 |  |  |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 727 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Silver Carp | H | 161 | 227 | 27 | 776 | 13 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15,035 |
|  | R |  | 29 |  | 43 |  |  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,409 |

Table 73 (cont).

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50+ |  |
| Grass Carp | H |  | 88 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 313 |
|  | R |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
| Gar | H |  |  |  | 23 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 691 |
|  | R | 41 |  | 14 | 14 |  | 41 |  |  | 55 | 96 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  | 1,488 |
| Paddlefish | H |  | 35 | 12 | 23 |  |  | 23 |  |  | 12 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 185 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| Bowfin | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| Pickerel | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| American Eel | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |

Table 74. Fish harvest statistics derived from a creel survey at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters ( 226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ס} \\ & \text { \# } \\ & 0 \\ & 00 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\overline{\bar{O}}} \\ & \frac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{O}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. caught (per acre) | $\begin{aligned} & 1,925 \\ & (8.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 610 \\ (2.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,302 \\ & (5.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13,569 \\ & (60.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,638 \\ & (7.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 280 \\ (1.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,651 \\ & (51.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,486 \\ & (11.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,416 \\ & (10.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4,555 \\ & (20.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,256 \\ & (5.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 174 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,812 \\ & (12.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 313 \\ (1.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| No. harvested (per acre) | $\begin{array}{r} 587 \\ (2.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 214 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 360 \\ & (1.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12,079 \\ & (53.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,299 \\ & (5.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 193 \\ (0.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,586 \\ & (46.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,072 \\ & (4.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,002 \\ & (4.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,113 \\ & (13.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 574 \\ (2.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,332 \\ & (10.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 186 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of total no. harvested | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | ( 7 ) | 14.9 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 13.1 | 1.3 | 1.2 | ( 7 ) | (T) | 3.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 |
| Lb. harvested (per acre) | $\begin{aligned} & 1,092 \\ & (4.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 418 \\ (1.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 645 \\ & (2.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,594 \\ & (73.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,606 \\ & (7.1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 668 \\ (3.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14,320 \\ & (63.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 115 \\ (0.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9,712 \\ & (43.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 475 \\ (2.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,694 \\ & (38.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 543 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| \% of total llb. harvested | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.5 | ( 7 ) | 11.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 10.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | ( 7 ) | ( $)^{\text {) }}$ | 6.8 | 0.3 | ( 7 ) | 6.1 | 0.4 |
| Mean length (in) |  | 15.5 | 15.5 | 18.0 |  | 16.5 | 19.2 | 16.1 |  | 5.4 | 10.0 | 4.0 |  | 12.0 | 4.5 | 21.4 | 16.9 |
| Mean w eight (lb) |  | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.3 |  | 1.7 | 3.2 | 1.4 |  | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 |  | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 2.6 |
| No. of fishing trips for that species | 956 |  |  |  | 4,721 |  |  |  | 337 |  |  |  | 1,481 |  |  |  |  |
| \% of all trips | 5.3 |  |  |  | 26.4 |  |  |  | 1.9 |  |  |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) | $\begin{aligned} & 2,636 \\ & (11.7) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | \#\#\#\#\# <br> (57.6) |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 929 \\ & (4.1) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $4085$ <br> (18.1) |  |  |  |  |
| No. harvested fishing for that species | 348 |  |  |  | 10,703 |  |  |  | 643 |  |  |  | 2,450 |  |  |  |  |
| Lb harvested fishing for that species | 643 |  |  |  | 13,352 |  |  |  | 70 |  |  |  | 7,821 |  |  |  |  |
| No./hour harvested fishing for that species | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.8 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| \% success fishing for that species | 11.0 |  |  |  | 32.0 |  |  |  | 24.2 |  |  |  | 41.7 |  |  |  |  |

Table 74 （cont．）．

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\bar{\circ}} \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\bar{\omega}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 읃 } \\ & 0 \\ & \mathscr{W} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \hline ⿳ 亠 口 冋 刂 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 厄ত } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No．caught | 17，547 | 16，445 | 728 | 374 | 234 | 2，218 | 1，840 | 46，247 | 206 |  |
| （per acre） | （77．6） | （72．8） | （3．2） | （1．7） | （1．0） | （9．8） | （8．1） | （204．6） | （0．9） |  |
| No．harvested | 16，077 | 15，036 | 728 | 313 | 77 | 20 | 691 | 45，898 | 185 |  |
| （per acre） | （71．1） | （66．5） | （3．2） | （1．4） | （0．3） | （0．1） | （3．1） | （203．1） | （0．8） |  |
| \％of total no． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| harvested | 19.8 | 18.5 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.1 | （ $)^{\text {）}}$ | 0.9 | 56.6 | 0.2 |  |
| Lb．harvested | 96，612 | 86，343 | 10，269 |  | 89 | 84 | 386 | 16，813 | 949 |  |
| （per acre） | （427．5） | （382．0） | （45．4） |  | （0．4） | （0．4） | （1．7） | （74．4） | （4．2） |  |
| \％of total lb． harvested | 67.4 | 60.2 | 7.2 |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 11.7 | 0.7 |  |
| Mean length（in） |  | 24.2 | 31.7 | 23.3 | 15.4 | 22.3 | 18.8 | 9.9 | 33.8 |  |
| Mean w eight（lb） |  | 6.7 | 14.7 |  | 1.2 | 4.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 5.7 |  |
| No．of fishing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| trips for that species | 2，181 |  |  |  | 148 |  |  | 3，957 | 720 | 3，277 |
| \％of all trips | 12.2 |  |  |  | 0.8 |  |  | 22.1 | 4.0 | 18.3 |
| Hours fished for that species | 6，016 |  |  |  | 407 |  |  | 10，913 | 1，986 | 9，038 |
| （per acre） | （26．6） |  |  |  | （1．8） |  |  | （48．3） | （8．8） | （40．0） |
| No．harvested fishing for that species | 10，131 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 45，714 | 110 |  |
| Lb harvested fishing for that species | 59，008 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 16，788 | 681 |  |
| No．／hour harvested fishing for that species | 1.7 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 4.2 | 0.1 |  |
| \％success fishing for that species | 51.4 |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 63.6 | 26.3 | 21.2 |

Table 75. Monthly black bass angling success at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of bass caught | Total no. of bass harvested | No. of black bass fishing trips | Hours fished by bass anglers | Bass caught by bass anglers | Bass caught/hour by bass anglers | Bass harvested by bass anglers | Bass harvested/hour by bass anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 36 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Apr | 193 | 77 | 82 | 226 | 115 | 0.51 | 38 | 0.17 |
| May | 721 | 174 | 181 | 498 | 524 | 1.05 | 151 | 0.30 |
| Jun | 73 | 10 | 70 | 193 | 31 | 0.16 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Jul | 129 | 23 | 119 | 329 | 81 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Aug | 266 | 106 | 201 | 555 | 266 | 0.48 | 107 | 0.19 |
| Sept | 223 | 37 | 151 | 415 | 111 | 0.27 | 37 | 0.09 |
| Oct | 138 | 77 | 99 | 272 | 15 | 0.06 | 15 | 0.06 |
| Nov | 20 | 7 | 15 | 41 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Dec | 125 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 1,925 | 587 | 956 | 2,636 | 1,143 | 0.43 | 348 | 0.13 |
| Mean | 175 | 53 | 83 | 230 | 104 |  | 32 |  |

Table 76. Black bass catch and harvest statistics derived from Kentucky Lake Tailwaters ( 226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

|  | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Harvest | Release | Total | Harvest | Release |  | Total | Harvest | Release |  | Total |
|  | $\geq 12.0$ in | 12.0-14.9 in $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 12.0$ in | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Total no. of bass | 214 | $70 \quad 143$ | 610 | 360 | 464 | 57 | 1,302 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| \% of bass harvested by number | 36.4\% |  |  | 61.4\% |  |  |  | 2.1\% |  |  |  |
| Total weight of bass (lb) | 418 | $85 \quad 172$ | 898 | 645 | 357 | 43 | 1,370 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| \% of bass harvested by weight | 38.3\% |  |  | 59.1\% |  |  |  | 2.6\% |  |  |  |
| Mean length (in) | 15.5 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  |  | 18.0 |  |  |  |
| Mean weight (lb) | 1.93 |  |  | 1.78 |  |  |  | 2.25 |  |  |  |
| *Catch rate (fish/hr) | 0.01 |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  | <0.01 |  |  |  |
| *Harvest rate (fish/hr) | 0.004 |  |  | 0.007 |  |  |  | <0.001 |  |  |  |

*Includes effort and catch of non-bass anglers

Table 77. Monthly catfish angling success at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

|  | Total no. <br> of catfish <br> caught | Total no. <br> of catfish <br> harvested | No. of <br> catfish <br> fishing <br> trips | Hours <br> fished by <br> catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> caught by <br> catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> caught/hour <br> by catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> harvested <br> by catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> harvested/hour <br> by catfish <br> anglers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | 1400 | 1400 | 218 | 600 | 1400 | 2.33 | 1400 | 2.33 |
| Feb | 72 | 54.34 | 201 | 554 | 54 | 0.10 | 36 | 0.07 |
| Mar | 2,358 | 2,068 | 393 | 1,084 | 2,165 | 2.00 | 1,913 | 1.76 |
| Apr | 1,837 | 1,605 | 874 | 2,412 | 1,581 | 0.66 | 1,349 | 0.56 |
| May | 1,482 | 1,190 | 541 | 1,491 | 1,441 | 0.97 | 1,159 | 0.78 |
| Jun | 666 | 584 | 372 | 1,027 | 410 | 0.40 | 351 | 0.34 |
| Jul | 1,118 | 958 | 579 | 1,597 | 673 | 0.42 | 532 | 0.33 |
| Aug | 3,572 | 3,200 | 753 | 2,077 | 3,572 | 1.72 | 3,200 | 1.54 |
| Sept | 784 | 754 | 676 | 1,865 | 662 | 0.36 | 631 | 0.34 |
| Oct | 168 | 154 | 95 | 262 | 107 | 0.41 | 94 | 0.36 |
| Nov | 113 | 113 | 19 | 53 | 38 | 0.72 | 38 | 0.72 |
| Dec | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 12,079 | 4,721 | 13,020 | 12,103 | 0.93 | 10,703 | 0.82 |
| Total | 13,569 | 1,098 | 429 | 1,184 | 1,100 |  | 973 |  |
| Mean | 1,234 | 1,302 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 78. Catfish catch and harvest statistics derived from Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.


* includes effort and catch of non-catfish anglers

Table 79. Monthly Morone angling success at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of Morone caught | Total no. of Morone harvested | No. of Morone fishing trips | Hours fished by Morone anglers | Morones caught by Morone anglers | Morones caught/hour by Morone anglers | Morones harvested by Morone anglers | Morones harvested/hour by Morone anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 743 | 670 | 268 | 738 | 706 | 0.96 | 670 | 0.91 |
| Apr | 1,353 | 908 | 197 | 542 | 966 | 1.78 | 831 | 1.53 |
| May | 384 | 198 | 114 | 315 | 117 | 0.37 | 82 | 0.26 |
| Jun | 480 | 157 | 102 | 281 | 145 | 0.52 | 52 | 0.19 |
| Jul | 666 | 596 | 133 | 368 | 478 | 1.30 | 455 | 1.24 |
| Aug | 248 | 142 | 126 | 347 | 124 | 0.36 | 124 | 0.36 |
| Sept | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Oct | 384 | 277 | 141 | 388 | 216 | 0.56 | 216 | 0.56 |
| Nov | 60 | 40 | 70 | 193 | 20 | 0.10 | 20 | 0.10 |
| Dec | 125 | 125 | 67 | 186 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 4,555 | 3,113 | 1,481 | 4,085 | 2,772 | 0.68 | 2,450 | 0.60 |
| Mean | 414 | 283 | 111 | 305 | 252 |  | 223 |  |

Table 80. Morone catch and harvest statistics derived from Kentucky Lake Tailwaters ( 226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

|  | White Bass |  |  |  | Yellow Bass |  |  | Hybrid striped bass |  |  |  | Striped Bass |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Harvest | Release |  | Total | Harvest | Release | Total | Harvest | Release |  | Total | Harvest | Release |  | Total |
|  | 12.0 -14.9 in $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.0 -14.9 in $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  | $\geq 15.0$ in 12.0-14.9 in $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Total no. of Morone | 574 | 152 | 31 | 1,256 | 21 | 154 | 175 | 186 | 102 | 12 | 313 | 2332 | 184 | 169 | 2812 |
| \% of Morone harvested by number | 18.4\% |  |  |  | 0.7\% |  |  | 6.0\% |  |  |  | 74.9\% |  |  |  |
| Total w eight of Morone (lb) | 475 | 62 | 12 | 750 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 543 | 107 | 14 | 677 | 8694 | 238 | 221 | 9317 |
| \% of Morone harvested by w eight | 4.9\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 5.6\% |  |  |  | 89.5\% |  |  |  |
| Mean length (in) | 12.0 |  |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 16.9 |  |  |  | 21.4 |  |  |  |
| Mean w eight (lb) | 0.75 |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 2.61 |  |  |  | 4.47 |  |  |  |
| *Catch rate (fish/hr) | 0.03 |  |  |  | <0.01 |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  | 0.06 |  |  |  |
| *Harvest rate (fish/hr) | 0.012 |  |  |  | <0.001 |  |  | 0.004 |  |  |  | 0.047 |  |  |  |

* includes effort and catch of non-morone anglers

Table 81. Monthly Skipjack angling success at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of Skipjack caught | Total no. of Skipjack harvested | No.of Skipjack fishing trips | Hours fished by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack caught by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack caught/hour by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack harvested by Skipjack anglers | Skipjack harvested/hour by Skipjack anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 5,561 | 5,525 | 485 | 1,338 | 5,525 | 4.13 | 5,525 | 4.13 |
| Apr | 11,614 | 11,575 | 1,098 | 3,027 | 11,556 | 3.82 | 11,537 | 3.81 |
| May | 7,721 | 7,710 | 684 | 1,887 | 7,698 | 4.08 | 7,686 | 4.07 |
| Jun | 7,586 | 7,545 | 293 | 807 | 7,587 | 9.40 | 7,545 | 9.35 |
| Jul | 2,512 | 2,512 | 140 | 387 | 2,512 | 6.48 | 2,512 | 6.48 |
| Aug | 5,233 | 5,198 | 503 | 1,389 | 5,091 | 3.67 | 5,091 | 3.67 |
| Sept | 2,307 | 2,307 | 284 | 784 | 2,307 | 2.94 | 2,307 | 2.94 |
| Oct | 3,691 | 3,506 | 394 | 1,088 | 3,676 | 0.00 | 3,491 | 0.00 |
| Nov | 20 | 20 | 55 | 151 | 20 | 0.13 | 20 | 0.13 |
| Dec | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 46,247 | 45,898 | 3,957 | 10,913 | 45,972 | 4.21 | 45,714 | 4.19 |
| Mean | 4,204 | 4,173 | 358 | 987 | 4,179 |  | 4,156 |  |

Table 82. Monthly Asian Carp angling success at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (226.0 acres) from 16 February through 31 December 2022.

| Month | Total no. of Carp caught | Total no. of Carp harvested | No. of Carp fishing trips | Hours fished by Carp anglers | Carp caught by Carp anglers | Carp caught/hour by Carp anglers | Carp harvested by Carp anglers | Carp harvested/hour by Carp anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Mar | 326 | 326 | 151 | 415 | 199 | 0.48 | 199 | 0.48 |
| Apr | 3,131 | 2,976 | 213 | 587 | 2,705 | 4.60 | 2,628 | 4.47 |
| May | 7,105 | 6,756 | 485 | 1,337 | 3,559 | 2.66 | 3,559 | 2.66 |
| Jun | 3,506 | 3,381 | 439 | 1,210 | 1,627 | 1.34 | 1,575 | 1.30 |
| Jul | 479 | 479 | 323 | 891 | 421 | 0.47 | 421 | 0.47 |
| Aug | 1,188 | 816 | 239 | 660 | 1,100 | 1.67 | 745 | 1.13 |
| Sept | 1,339 | 1,302 | 318 | 877 | 1,004 | 1.15 | 1,004 | 1.15 |
| Oct | 415 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Nov | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Dec | 50 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | 17,546 | 16,076 | 2,167 | 5,977 | 10,615 | 1.78 | 10,131 | 1.69 |
| Mean | 1,595 | 1,461 | 197 | 543 | 965 |  | 921 |  |

Table 83. Length frequency, CPUE (fish/hr), and standard error of Largemouth Bass collected during diurnal electrofishing at Lake Beshear during 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Spring | 3 | 35 | 38 | 9 | 4 | 46 | 26 | 22 | 24 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 27 | 26 | 20 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 335 | 134.0 | 11.0 |
| Fall | 39 | 138 | 67 | 10 | 11 | 45 | 25 | 33 | 29 | 17 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 453 | 181.2 | 37.4 |

[^4]Table 84. Spring diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Beshear during April or May of 2013 to 2022.

| Year | Mean length *Mean length <br> age 3 at <br> capture age 3 at <br> capture |  | Age 1 |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | <8.0 in | $\geq 12.0$ in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 18.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |  |  |
| 2022 | 13.8 | 13.8 |  |  | 34.4 | 7.6 | 35.6 | 7.9 | 50.9 |  | 9.2 | 1.2 | 42.0 | 5.4 | 25.2 |  | 6.8 | 1.6 | 134.0 | 11.0 | 52 | 43 |
| 2021 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 23.2 | 5.6 | 26.0 | 6.4 | 45.2 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 36.4 | 5.6 | 18.8 | 2.9 | 6.0 | 1.1 | 100.4 | 11.7 | 61 | 49 |
| **2020 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 28.0 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 24.8 | 3.8 | 16.0 | 3.4 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 38.8 | 3.4 | 79 | 70 |
| 2019 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 28.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 23.2 | 3.7 | 16.0 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 36.8 | 5.0 | 85 | 71 |
| 2018 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 6.0 | 1.3 | 6.8 | 0.8 | 43.6 | 2.7 | 5.6 | 1.0 | 38.0 | 3.0 | 24.4 | 2.0 | 8.0 | 1.8 | 59.6 | 4.6 | 83 | 72 |
| $2017{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 13.8 | 13.8 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 20.0 | 3.9 | 43.6 | 3.1 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 31.6 | 4.6 | 19.2 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 72.8 | 5.9 | 69 | 50 |
| $2016{ }^{\text {AB }}$ | 13.8 | 13.8 | 30.4 | 4.0 | 16.4 | 3.4 | 67.2 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 2.3 | 56.4 | 7.0 | 32.8 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 1.2 | 102.8 | 6.5 | 78 | 65 |
| $2015{ }^{\text {B }}$ | 13.8 | 13.8 | 4.4 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 1.5 | 78.4 | 4.5 | 17.6 | 3.5 | 60.8 | 3.4 | 28.0 | 3.0 | 8.0 | 0.6 | 91.6 | 3.9 | 90 | 70 |
| $2014{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 13.3 | 13.4 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 61.6 | 5.6 | 18.0 | 2.3 | 43.6 | 6.1 | 20.4 | 2.3 | 4.4 | 1.2 | 83.6 | 6.8 | 77 | 54 |
| $2013{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 13.3 | 13.4 | 33.8 | 9.6 | 37.5 | 10.3 | 63.0 | 11.8 | 18.0 | 5.5 | 45.0 | 7.2 | 23.5 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 1.4 | 127.0 | 18.4 | 70 | 50 |
| Average | 13.6 | 13.6 | 14.8 |  | 15.7 |  | 51.0 |  | 10.8 |  | 40.2 |  | 22.1 |  | 5.9 |  | 84.7 |  | 74.3 | 59.3 |
| LBFMP | $\geq 12.0$ in |  | $\geq 10$ |  |  |  | $\geq 45$ |  | $\geq 15$ |  | $\geq 30$ |  |  |  | $\geq 3$ |  |  |  | 55-75 | 20-40 |

(Lake Beshear Bass Database.xls)
Data for 1985-2012 is listed in previous year reports.
${ }^{\text {A }}$ Age and grow th data w as not collected. Previous year data used for age estimates.
${ }^{\text {B }}$ Age and grow th data $w$ as collected in the Fall. Mean length age $3 w$ as calculated from back calculations. Spring CPUE age 1 w as determined from back-calculations and extrapolation w ith spring data. Mortality w as determined from fall age frequency data.
LBFMP - Lake Beshear Fish Management Plan objective goal.

* Mean length calculated using a w eighted average applied to entire catch
** Only one dipper used due to covid19 pandemic restrictions

Table 85. Lake specific assessment for Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Beshear from 2013-2022. This table includes the parameter estimates and the individual score as well as the total score and assessment rating. The final two columns list the instantaneous mortality (Z) and annual mortality (A).

| Year | Meanlengthage 3 atcapture | *Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | Length group |  |  | Total score | Assessment rating | Z | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | CPUE | CPUE | CPUE |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 34.4 | 9.2 | 42.0 | 6.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 |  | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |  |  |
| 2021 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 23.2 | 8.8 | 36.4 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 16 | G |  |  |
| **2020 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 24.8 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2019 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 4 | 4.8 | 23.2 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 | F |  |  |
| 2018 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 38.0 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 |  | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 14 | G |  |  |
| 2017 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 6.4 | 12.0 | 31.6 | 4.8 |  |  | 0.349 | 29.4 |
| Score | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 14 | G |  |  |
| 2016 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 30.4 | 10.8 | 56.4 | 5.6 |  |  | 0.423 | 34.5 |
| Score | 3 |  | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |  |  |
| $2015{ }^{\text {B }}$ | 13.8 | 13.8 | 4.4 | 17.6 | 60.8 | 8.0 |  |  | 0.457 | 36.7 |
| Score | 3 |  | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |  |  |
| $2014{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 13.3 | 13.4 | 1.9 | 18.0 | 43.6 | 4.4 |  |  | 0.145 | 13.5 |
| Score | 3 |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 15 | G |  |  |
| $2013{ }^{\text {A }}$ | 13.3 | 13.4 | 33.8 | 18.0 | 45.0 | 6.0 |  |  | 0.355 | 29.9 |
| Score | 3 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 19 | E |  |  |
| Average | 13.6 | 13.6 | 14.8 | 10.8 | 40.2 | 5.9 | 14.8 |  | 0.345 | 28.8 |

Data from 1985 to 2012 is listed in previous year reports.
**only one dipper used in spring 2020 due to covid19 pandemic restrictions
${ }^{\text {A }}$ age and growth data was not collected. Previous year data used for age estimates.
${ }^{\mathrm{B}}$ age and growth data was collected in the Fall. Mean length age-3 was calculated from back calculations.
Spring CPUE age-1 was determined from back-calculations and extrapolation with spring data. Mortality was determined from fall age frequency data.
*Mean length calculated using a weighted average applied to the entire spring sample
Assessment Quartiles were updated in 2016
Rating
1-7 = Poor (P)
8-11 = Fair (F)
$12-16=\operatorname{Good}(\mathrm{G})$
$17-20=$ Excellent (E)
Lake Beshear Bass Data Base

Table 86. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ values for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Beshear during 2.5 hours of diurnal electrofishing ( 5 - 30-minute runs) in October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Lake Beshear | 128 | 82 (1) | 38 | 86 (1) | 18 | 93 (2) | 184 | 84 (1) |

wfdwrlb.d22

Table 87. CPUE (fish/hr) and mean length (in) of age-0 largemouth bass collected in the fall, and CPUE of age- 1 largemouth bass collected the following spring during diurnal electrofishing at Lake Beshear.

| Year class | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $1^{\text {B }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 101.6 | 26.9 | 30.8 | 12.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 83.6 | 6.1 | 34.8 | 8.3 | 34.4 | 7.55 |
| 2020 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 60.8 | 25.0 | 36.0 | 17.7 | 23.2 | 5.6 |
| 2019 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 63.2 | 9.9 | 26.4 | 10.3 | *3.2 | 1.5 |
| 2018 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 50.7 | 4.3 | 29.6 |  | 4.0 | 2.2 |
| 2017 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 38.0 | 2.9 | 6.5 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 1.3 |
| 2016 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 50.5 | 6.0 | 10.0 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 1.3 |
| 2015 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 34.5 | 7.0 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 30.4 | 4.0 |
| 2014 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 24.8 | 4.4 | 11.0 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.5 |
| 2013 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 25.0 | 7.0 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 0.9 |
| 2012 | 6.3 | 0.1 | 34.0 | 8.8 | 33.2 | 7.4 | 33.8 | 9.6 |
| 2011 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 41.6 | 14.8 | 23.6 | 7.6 | 27.6 | 5.5 |
| 2010 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 54.0 | 4.6 | 22.0 | 4.5 | 11.7 | 2.2 |
| Average | 4.8 |  | 50.9 |  | 20.9 |  | 16.7 |  |

${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (October) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by analysis of otoliths removed from a subsample of LMB <10.0 in, which were extrapolated to the entire catch of the fall sample, and length frequencies.
${ }^{\text {B }}$ Data collected during the following spring (April/May) diurnal electrofishing sample.
WFDWRLB.Dxx, WFDWRAGB.Dxx, WFDPSDLB.Dxx

* Only one dipper was used due to covid19 protocols in 2020

Table 88. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected during 1.0 hour (4-900-sec runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Lake Pennyrile on 9 May, 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | 1 | 14 | 32 |  |  | 17 | 16 | 14 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 122 | 122.0 | 9.6 |
| Bluegill | 3 | 17 | 56 | 47 | 29 | 52 | 83 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 291 | 291.0 | 96.0 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  | 15 | 13 | 28 | 38 | 59 | 32 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 187 | 187.0 | 48.4 |
| Longear Sunfish | 1 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 40.0 | 8.5 |
| Channel Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Warmouth |  | 6 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 44.0 | 10.7 |
| Yellow Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 11.0 | 1.9 |
| Hybrid sunfish |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3.0 | 1.9 |
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Table 89. Spring, diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Pennyrile Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 64.0 | 6.7 | 50.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 122.0 | 9.6 |
| 2021 | 13.0 | 3.4 | 18.0 | 6.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 33.0 | 10.4 |
| 2020* | 35.0 | 7.6 | 75.0 | 11.8 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 114.0 | 13.1 |
| 2019 | 10.0 | 2.0 | 9.0 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 25.0 | 7.9 |
| 2018 | 29.0 | 5.0 | 63.0 | 16.8 | 7.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 101.0 | 21.3 |
| 2017 | 35.0 | 11.0 | 67.0 | 9.7 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 111.0 | 18.4 |
| 2016 | 44.0 | 9.7 | 62.0 | 6.2 | 13.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 122.0 | 10.0 |
| 2015 | 44.0 | 3.6 | 68.8 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 124.8 | 10.6 |
| 2014 | 17.0 | 3.0 | 36.0 | 5.2 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 61.0 | 8.2 |
| 2013** | 63.0 | 11.8 | 48.0 | 4.9 | 11.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 124.0 | 12.3 |
| Mean | 35.4 |  | 49.7 |  | 6.6 |  | 2.1 |  | 0.6 |  | 93.8 |  |

wfdpsdp.dxx
Data from 1990 to 2012 is listed in previous year reports.

* Only one dipper was used due to covid19 protocols in 2020
** 2013 sample collected in June due to water conditions at normal sample time in May

Table 90. Lake specific assessment for Largemouth Bass collected at Pennyrile Lake from 2013-2022. This table includes the parameter estimates and the individual scores as well as the total scores and assessment ratings. The final columns list the instantaneous mortality $(Z)$ and annual mortality $(A)$ in years when age and growth was collected.

| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Mean length age 3 at capture | Total score | Assessment rating | Z | A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 32.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 |  | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 9 | F |  |  |
| 2021 | 11.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 7 | P |  |  |
| 2020* | 33.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 11 | F |  |  |
| 2019 | 9.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 |  | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 7 | P | 0.164 | 15.1 |
| 2018 | 29.0 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 13 | G |  |  |
| 2017 | 28.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 14 | G |  |  |
| 2016 | 38.0 | 13.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 16 | G |  |  |
| 2015 | 36.0 | 8.8 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 15 | G |  |  |
| 2014 | 19.8 | 7.0 | 1.0 |  | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 4 | 8 | F |  |  |
| 2013** | 10.6 | 11.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Score | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 | F |  |  |
| Average | 24.6 | 6.6 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 11.2 |  |  |  |  |

Rating
$1-7=$ Poor (P)
$8-12=$ Fair (F)
$13-17=$ Good (G)
$18-20=$ Excellent (E)

* Only one dipper was used due to covid19 protocols in 2020
** 2013 sample collected in June due to water conditions at normal sample time in May

Table 91. Spring, diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Lake Pennyrile from 2013-2022.

| Species | Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $<3.0$ in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| Bluegill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | 20.0 | 4.3 | 132.0 | 31.3 | 135.0 | 58.6 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 291.0 | 96.0 |
|  | 2021 | 33.0 | 18.7 | 28.0 | 1.6 | 97.0 | 12.0 | 22.0 | 2.6 | 180.0 | 30.1 |
|  | 2020* | 6.0 | 2.6 | 101.0 | 28.1 | 70.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 3.7 | 185.0 | 35.6 |
|  | 2019 | 17.0 | 5.3 | 54.0 | 3.5 | 37.0 | 7.9 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 118.0 | 15.2 |
|  | 2018 | 35.0 | 12.8 | 94.0 | 20.8 | 134.0 | 9.0 | 27.0 | 7.7 | 290.0 | 35.2 |
|  | 2017 | 6.0 | 2.6 | 87.0 | 13.3 | 42.0 | 22.5 | 19.0 | 9.2 | 154.0 | 35.4 |
|  | 2016 | 45.0 | 16.4 | 65.0 | 3.4 | 51.0 | 12.3 | 41.0 | 18.4 | 202.0 | 49.1 |
|  | 2015 | 30.4 | 3.0 | 84.0 | 11.4 | 64.8 | 13.9 | 32.0 | 5.7 | 211.2 | 14.1 |
|  | 2014 | 0.0 |  | 12.0 | 4.3 | 15.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 |  | 27.0 | 7.9 |
|  | 2013** | 1.0 | 1.0 | 18.0 | 5.8 | 21.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 |  | 40.0 | 12.1 |
|  | Mean | 19.3 |  | 67.5 |  | 66.7 |  | 16.3 |  | 169.8 |  |
|  |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | <3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | Total |  |
|  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | 0.0 |  | 56.0 | 6.7 | 97.0 | 38.8 | 34.0 | 11.6 | 187.0 | 48.4 |
|  | 2021 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 19.0 | 6.8 | 28.0 | 10.5 | 13.0 | 8.5 | 62.0 | 22.0 |
|  | 2020* | 0.0 |  | 63.0 | 14.8 | 34.0 | 9.3 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 107.0 | 16.2 |
|  | 2019 | 0.0 |  | 14.0 | 1.2 | 21.0 | 2.5 | 15.0 | 7.2 | 50.0 | 6.2 |
|  | 2018 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 33.0 | 12.8 | 24.0 | 5.4 | 27.0 | 4.1 | 86.0 | 19.1 |
|  | 2017 | 0.0 |  | 15.0 | 3.0 | 14.0 | 10.4 | 25.0 | 18.4 | 54.0 | 30.4 |
|  | 2016 | 0.0 |  | 16.0 | 5.9 | 15.0 | 3.0 | 30.0 | 7.4 | 61.0 | 15.8 |
|  | 2015 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 12.0 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 1.5 | 32.8 | 15.3 | 50.4 | 18.1 |
|  | 2014 | 0.0 |  | 8.0 | 5.4 | 17.0 | 5.7 | 8.0 | 3.7 | 33.0 | 12.5 |
|  | 2013** | 0.0 |  | 4.0 | 2.3 | 9.0 | 5.5 | 12.0 | 2.8 | 25.0 | 6.6 |
|  | Mean | 0.5 |  | 24.0 |  | 26.4 |  | 20.7 |  | 71.5 |  |
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Data from 1990 to 2012 is listed in previous year reports.

* Only one dipper was used due to covid19 protocols in 2020
** 2013 sample collected in June due to water conditions at normal sample time in May

Table 92. PSD and RSD values obtained for Largemouth Bass, Bluegill, and Redear Sunfish collected during 1.0 hour of diurnal electrofishing (4-900-sec runs) at Lake Pennyrile on 9 May, 2022. 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size* | PSD | RSD $^{* *}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 58 | $14( \pm 9)$ | $3( \pm 5)$ |
| Bluegill | 271 | $51( \pm 6)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| Redear Sunfish | 172 | $54( \pm 7)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |

* Largemouth stock size $=8.0$ in, Bluegill stock size $=3.0$ in, Redear Sunfish stock size= 4.0 in .
** Largemouth $=R_{\text {RSD }}^{15}$, Bluegill $=R^{2} D_{8}$, Redear Sunfish $=R_{S D}$.
wfdpsdp.d22

Table 93. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected during 0.50 hours (3-600-sec runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Lake Morris (Christian Co) on 6 June 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 26 |  |  |  |
| Gizzard Shad |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 24.0 | 3.4 |
| Common Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Golden Shiner |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Yellow Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Brown Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| Green Sunfish |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 14.0 | 3.9 |
| Warmouth |  |  | 5 | 6 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 28.0 | 12.9 |
| Bluegill | 49 | 66 | 54 | 98 | 192 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 477 | 954.0 | 211.9 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 17 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 | 54.0 | 21.2 |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 11 | 22.0 | 3.9 |
| White Crappie |  |  | 1 | 2 | 22 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 64.0 | 25.0 |
| Sunfish hybrids |  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 16.0 | 8.6 |
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Table 94. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of sportish collected from Ballard Wildlife
Management Area lakes on 13 May 2022. The entire accessible shoreline was sampled with electrofishing.

| Area | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Gravel Pit Pond |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 9 | 24.3 | 0.0 |
| Warmouth |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
| Bluegill | 1 | 12 | 18 | 8 | 25 | 18 | 29 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 114 | 307.3 | 0.0 |
| Largemouth Bass |  | 1 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 |  | 6 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 51 | 137.5 | 0.0 |
| White Crappie | 1 |  |  | 11 | 13 | 3 |  | 22 | 14 | 5 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 70 | 188.7 | 0.0 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 16.2 | 0.0 |
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Table 95. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of sportfish collected from West Kentucky Wildlife Management Area lakes on 13 May 2022. The entire accessible shoreline was sampled with electrofishing.
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Table 96. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected during 0.45 hours of diurnal electrofishing at Fort Campbell's Lake Kyle on 24 May, 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Yellow Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 15.6 | 7.3 |
| Channel Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| Green Sunfish |  |  | 5 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 77.8 | 74.0 |
| Warmouth |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 31.1 | 8.7 |
| Bluegill | 5 | 12 | 14 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 148.9 | 51.3 |
| Longear Sunfish |  | 6 | 10 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 51.1 | 48.1 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 1 | 2 | 16 | 17 | 14 | 10 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 148.9 | 53.6 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  | 1 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 24 | 23 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 86 | 191.1 | 17.3 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4.4 | 2.9 |
| Bluegill hybrids |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.2 | 2.2 |

Table 97. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected during 0.5 hours (2-900-sec runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge Benton pond (36.855573, -88.334829) on 10 May, 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 11 | 22.0 | 14.0 |
| Bluegill | 1 | 8 | 2 | 18 | 11 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56 | 112.0 | 16.0 |
| Spotted Sucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Longear Sunfish |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 6.0 | 2.0 |
| Warmouth | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 26.0 | 2.0 |
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Table 98. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected during 0.5 hours (2-900-sec runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Clarks River National Wildlife Refuge Symsonia pond (36.963681, -88.523353) on 10 May, 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 24 | 26 | 28 |  |  |  |
| Spotted Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 8 | 16.0 | 8.0 |
| Shortnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Gizzard Shad |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 18.0 | 6.0 |
| Common Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Bullhead Minnow |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| River Carpsucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Smallmouth Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| Bigmouth Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 16.0 | <0.1 |
| Spotted Sucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Blackstripe Topminnow |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Warmouth | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 10.0 | 6.0 |
| Orange Spotted Sunfish | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Bluegill | 3 | 23 | 52 | 30 | 8 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | 248.0 | 60.0 |
| Longear Sunfish |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 14.0 | 10.0 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 58.0 | 2.0 |
| White Crappie |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 16.0 | 8.0 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4.0 | <0.1 |
| Sunfish hybrids |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |



Figure 1. Peak geometric mean density ( $\# / 1000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) of pelagic larval crappie captured in neuston tow nets at Jonathan Creek, Kentucky Lake from 2015-2022 plotted against the catch rates of age-0 crappie (fish/net-night) in fall trapnets from Kentucky Lake in both Jonathan Creek and Blood River. Line of best fit shown.


Figure 2. Peak geometric mean density $\left(\# / 1000 m^{3}\right)$ of pelagic larval crappie captured in neuston tow nets at Jonathan Creek, Kentucky Lake from 2015-2021 plotted against the catch rates of age-1 crappie (fish/net night) in fall trapnets from Kentucky Lake in both Jonathan Creek and Blood River from following year. Line of best fit shown.

Appendix A. 2021 Larval fish sample sites in Jonathan Creek embayment, Kentucky Lake


## Appendix B. LAKE BARKLEY TAILWATER ANGLER ATTITUDE SURVEY 2022

1. Have you been surveyed this year? Yes - stop survey No - continue
2. Zip Code $\qquad$
3. How many times do you fish the Lake Barkley Tailwaters each year? $\mathrm{N}=168$

First time here $11.3 \% \quad 1$ to $427.4 \% \quad 5-1019.0 \% \quad$ More than $1042.3 \%$
4. What angling techniques do you use when fishing at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (check all that apply)? $\mathrm{N}=168$ Rod and reel 73.8\% Snagging 0.0\% Bowfishing 48.8\% Castnet 0.6\%
5. Which species of fish do you fish for at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (check all that apply)? $\mathrm{N}=169$ Asian carp 46.7\% Catfish 46.2\% Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrids 26.6\% Skipjack 23.1\% Paddlefish 19.5\% Gar 13.0\% Black Bass 11.8\% Panfish 3.6\% Drum 2.4\% Crappie 1.8\% Bait Fish 1.8\% Buffalo 1.8\% Anything 1.8\% Bow species 1.2\% Sauger 0.6\% Walleye 0.6\% Suckers 0.6\%
6. Which one species do you fish for most at Lake Barkley Tailwaters (check only one)? N=169 Asian carp 42.0\% Catfish 29.6\% Skipjack 13.0\% Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrids 9.5\% Black Bass 2.4\% Panfish 1.8\% Paddlefish 0.6\% Bait Fish 0.6\% Anything 0.6\%

## Answer the following questions for each species you fish for - (see question 5)

## Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrid Anglers

7. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrid fishing at Lake Barkley Tailwaters? $\mathrm{N}=45$
Very satisfied 8.9\% Somewhat satisfied 42.2\% Neutral 24.4\% Somewhat dissatisfied 20.0\%
Very dissatisfied 4.4\% No opinion 0.0\%
7a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (7) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? $\mathrm{N}=11$
Number of fish 63.6\% Size of fish 0.0\% Not happy with regulations 0.0\% Too many anglers 0.0\%
Asian carp 36.4\%

## Crappie Anglers

8. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Lake Barkley Tailwaters? N=3

Very satisfied 0.0\% Somewhat satisfied 0.0\% Neutral 33.3\% Somewhat dissatisfied 66.7\%
Very dissatisfied 0.0\% No opinion 0.0\%

8a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (8) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? $\mathrm{N}=2$
Number of fish 50.0\% Size of fish 0.0\% Not happy with regulations 0.0\% Too many anglers 0.0\%
Asian carp 0.0\% Lock approach closed to fishing 50.0\%

## Black Bass Anglers

9. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with the black bass fishing at Lake Barkley Tailwaters? $\mathrm{N}=19$ Very satisfied 10.5\% Somewhat satisfied 42.1\% Neutral 36.8\% Somewhat dissatisfied 5.3\% Very dissatisfied 5.3\% No opinion 0.0\%

9a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (9) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? N=2
Number of fish $100.0 \%$ Size of fish $0.0 \%$ Not happy with regulations $0.0 \%$ Too many anglers $0.0 \%$ Asian carp $0.0 \%$

## Catfish Anglers

10. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with the catfish fishing at Lake Barkley Tailwaters? $\mathrm{N}=78$

Very satisfied 29.5\% Somewhat satisfied 44.9\% Neutral 14.1\% Somewhat dissatisfied 10.3\%
Very dissatisfied 1.3\% No opinion 0.0\%
10a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (10) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? N=9
Number of fish $33.3 \% \quad$ Size of fish $0.0 \%$ Not happy with regulations $0.0 \%$ Too many anglers $0.0 \%$
Asian carp 33.3\% Too much commercial fishing 11.1\% Dislike electrofishing surveys $11.1 \%$ Too many snags $11.1 \%$

## Paddlefish Anglers

11. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with the Paddlefish fishing at Lake Barkley Tailwaters? $\quad \mathrm{N}=33$ Very satisfied 15.2\% Somewhat satisfied 24.2\% Neutral 45.5\% Somewhat dissatisfied 15.2\% Very dissatisfied $0.0 \%$ No opinion $0.0 \%$

11a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (11) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? $\mathrm{N}=5$
Number of fish 80.0\% Size of fish 0.0\% Not happy with regulations 0.0\% Too many anglers 0.0\% Asian carp 20.0\%

## Bow Anglers

12. How many trips do you make to bow fish in Kentucky during the months of March - August? N=82

| First time $2.4 \%$ | $1-1039.0 \%$ | $11-20$ | $17.1 \%$ | $21-30$ | $9.8 \%$ | $31-40$ | $3.7 \%$ | $41-50$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad 51-603.7 \% \quad 61-700.0 \%$ $71-803.7 \% \quad 81-900.0 \% \quad 91-1002.4 \% \quad 101+13.4 \%$

13. On average how many pounds of the following species do you harvest per trip bowfishing?

Pounds of Invasive carp $\mathrm{N}=82$
$0-5035.4 \% \quad 51-10023.2 \% \quad 101-1502.4 \% \quad 151-20012.2 \% \quad 201-2503.7 \% \quad 251-3004.9 \%$
$301-3504.9 \% \quad 351-4003.7 \% \quad 401-4500.0 \% \quad 451-5003.7 \% \quad 501+6.1 \%$

Pounds of Buffalo N=82
$054.9 \% \quad 1-1019.5 \% \quad 11-206.1 \% \quad 21-306.1 \% \quad 31-40 \quad 0.0 \% \quad 41-503.7 \% \quad 51-1003.7 \% \quad 101+6.1 \%$

Pounds of Gar N=82
$022.0 \% \quad 1-1035.4 \% \quad 11-20 \quad 18.3 \% \quad 21-307.3 \% \quad 31-403.7 \% \quad 41-506.1 \% \quad 51-1003.7 \% \quad 101+3.7 \%$

Pounds of Other $\mathrm{N}=80$
$078.8 \% \quad 1-1010.0 \% \quad 11-202.5 \% \quad 21-301.3 \% \quad 31-400.0 \% \quad 41-502.5 \% \quad 51-1003.8 \% \quad 101+1.3 \%$
14. How many paddlefish do you shoot per year in Kentucky? N=82

First time 1.2\% $048.8 \% \quad 118.3 \% \quad 24.9 \% \quad 33.7 \% \quad 42.4 \% \quad 54.9 \% \quad 63.7 \% \quad 82.4 \% \quad 106.1 \% \quad 201.2 \% \quad 502.4 \%$
14a. The current statewide season for snagging paddlefish is February 1 - May 10. Would you support creating a paddlefish season for bowfishing that aligned with these dates? N=82
Support 48.8\% Oppose 41.5\% No opinion 9.8\%

## All Anglers

15. Are you aware that you can sell harvested Asian carp to local fish processors with a recreational fishing license? $N=169$ Yes 59.2\% No 40.8\%

15a. If yes, have you ever sold Asian carp to any area processors? $N=98$ Yes 23.5\% No 76.5\%

15b. If NO on 15a, what is the single most important reason you haven't sold to a processor? $\mathrm{N}=75$
Don't know the buyers $9.3 \% \quad$ No way to transport 6.7\% Don't get enough to bother 64.0\%
They don't pay enough 6.7\% Tournament disposes of them 1.3\% Too much time 1.3\%
Takes too long to get paid 1.3\% Take them home to eat $1.3 \%$ Live far away and there's no local Asian carp to sell $1.3 \%$ Just recently learned of it 1.3\% First time fishing at Barkley tailwaters 2.7\% Don't want to pay taxes 1.3\%
Don't need the money $1.3 \%$
16. What do you normally do with Asian carp that you catch? $\mathrm{N}=169$

Eat 1.8\% Sink 43.2\% Let go alive 16.0\% Use for bait 13.0\% Sell 5.3\% Never caught one 11.8\% Fertilizer 4.1\% Tournament disposes 1.8\% Throw on rocks 0.6\% Give to someone else 1.8\%
Sink or sell depending on proximity to buyers $0.6 \%$
17. Have you ever tried eating Asian carp? $\mathrm{N}=169$

Yes 25.4\% No 74.6\%
18. Are you satisfied with the current size and creel limits on all sport fish at the Lake Barkley Tailwaters? N=169 Yes 97.6\% No 2.4\%

18a. If not, which species are you dissatisfied with and what species size and creel limits would you prefer? $\mathrm{N}=4$ White Bass minimum length 13" 25.0\% Daily limit of 5 fish 25.0\% Remove trophy catfish regulation 25.0\%
Crappie minimum length 9" $25.0 \%$

## Appendix C. KENTUCKY LAKE TAILWATER ANGLER ATTITUDE SURVEY 2022

1. Have you been surveyed this year? Yes - stop survey No - continue
2. Zip Code $\qquad$
3. How many times do you fish the Kentucky Lake Tailwaters each year? N=188 First time here $9.0 \% \quad 1$ to $423.9 \% \quad 5-1016.0 \% \quad$ More than $1051.1 \%$
4. What angling techniques do you use when fishing at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (check all that apply)? N=188 Rod and reel 87.8\% Snagging 16.0\% Bowfishing 21.8\%
5. Which species of fish do you fish for Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (check all that apply)? $\mathrm{N}=188$ Catfish 51.1\% Skipjack 27.1\% Asian carp 26.1\% Black Bass 22.9\% Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrids 21.3\% Paddlefish 11.2\% Crappie 8.0\% Gar 7.4\% Panfish 7.4\% Anything 4.8\% Sauger 4.3\% Bluegill 3.2\% Bait Fish 2.7\% Shad 0.5\% Yellow bass 0.5\% Drum 0.5\% Bow species 0.5\%
6. Which one species do you fish for most at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters (check only one)? N=188 Catfish 33.5\% Asian carp 16.5\% Skipjack 13.8\% Black Bass 10.6\% Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrids 10.1\% Anything 4.8\% Bait Fish 2.7\% Panfish 2.1\% Crappie 1.6\% Paddlefish 1.6\% Sauger 1.1\% Yellow bass 0.5\% Bluegill 0.5\% Carp 0.5\%

## Answer the following questions for each species you fish for - (see question 5)

## Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrid Anglers

7. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with Striped Bass/White Bass/Hybrid fishing Kentucky Lake Tailwaters? $\mathrm{N}=40$
Very satisfied 17.5\% Somewhat satisfied 40.0\% Neutral 17.5\% Somewhat dissatisfied 22.5\%
Very dissatisfied 2.5\% No opinion $0.0 \%$
7a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (7) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? N=10
Number of fish $80.0 \% \quad$ Size of fish $0.0 \% \quad$ Not happy with regulations $0.0 \%$ Too many anglers $0.0 \% \quad$ Asian carp 20.0\%

## Crappie Anglers

8. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters? N=15

Very satisfied 0.0\% Somewhat satisfied 20.0\% Neutral 53.3\% Somewhat dissatisfied 26.7\%
Very dissatisfied 0.0\% No opinion 0.0\%
8a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (8) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? N=4
Number of fish $50.0 \%$ Size of fish $0.0 \%$ Not happy with regulations $0.0 \%$ Too many anglers $0.0 \%$ Asian carp $50.0 \%$

## Black Bass Anglers

9. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with the black bass fishing at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters? N=43

Very satisfied 4.7\% Somewhat satisfied 62.8\% Neutral 20.9\% Somewhat dissatisfied 11.6\%
Very dissatisfied 0.0\% No opinion 0.0\%
9a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (9) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? $\mathrm{N}=5$
Number of fish 80.0\% Size of fish 0.0\% Not happy with regulations 0.0\% Too many anglers 0.0\% Asian carp 20.0\%

## Catfish Anglers

10. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with the catfish fishing at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters? N=96 Very satisfied 24.4\% Somewhat satisfied 46.2\% Neutral 37.2\% Somewhat dissatisfied 10.3\%
Very dissatisfied 5.1\% No opinion 0.0\%
10a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (10) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? N=12
Number of fish 75.0\% Size of fish 0.0\% Not happy with regulations 8.3\% Too many anglers 0.0\% Asian carp 0.0\% Bank access closed for construction 8.3\% Difficult to snag 8.3\%

## Paddlefish Anglers

11. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with the Paddlefish fishing at Kentucky Lake Tailwaters? $\quad \mathrm{N}=21$ Very satisfied 4.8\% Somewhat satisfied 42.9\% Neutral 33.3\% Somewhat dissatisfied 9.5\%
Very dissatisfied 4.8\% No opinion 4.8\%

11a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (11) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? N=3
Number of fish 100.0\% Size of fish 0.0\% Not happy with regulations 0.0\% Too many anglers 0.0\% Asian carp 00.0\%

## Bow Anglers

12. How many trips do you make to bow fish in Kentucky during the months of March - August? $\mathrm{N}=41$
$0-1029.3 \% \quad 11-2026.8 \% \quad 21-307.3 \% \quad 31-402.4 \% \quad 41-502.4 \% \quad 51-602.4 \% \quad 61-704.9 \%$
$71-802.4 \% \quad 81-900.0 \% \quad 91-1007.3 \% \quad 101+14.6 \%$
13. On average how many pounds of the following species do you harvest per trip bowfishing?

Pounds of Invasive carp $\mathrm{N}=41$
$0-5053.7 \% \quad 51-10026.8 \% \quad 101-1502.4 \% \quad 151-2007.3 \% \quad 201-2502.4 \% \quad 251-3002.4 \%$
$301-3502.4 \% \quad 351-4000.0 \% \quad 401-450 \quad 0.0 \% \quad 451-5000.0 \% \quad 501+4.9 \%$

Pounds of Buffalo $\mathrm{N}=41$
$065.9 \% \quad 1-1019.5 \% \quad 11-204.9 \% \quad 21-302.4 \% \quad 31-402.4 \% \quad 41-500.0 \% \quad 51-1002.4 \% \quad 101+2.4 \%$

Pounds of Gar N=41
$024.4 \% \quad 1-1034.1 \% \quad 11-2024.4 \% \quad 21-300.0 \% \quad 31-404.9 \% \quad 41-507.3 \% \quad 51-1004.9 \% \quad 101+0.0 \%$

Pounds of Other $\mathrm{N}=37$
$086.5 \% \quad 1-102.7 \% \quad 11-208.1 \% \quad 21-300.0 \% \quad 31-400.0 \% \quad 41-502.7 \% \quad 51-1000.0 \% \quad 101+0.0 \%$
14. How many paddlefish do you shoot per year in Kentucky? $\mathrm{N}=41$
$061.0 \% 19.8 \% \quad 29.8 \% \quad 32.4 \% \quad 72.4 \% \quad 104.9 \% \quad 154.9 \% \quad 252.4 \% \quad 302.4 \%$

14a. The current statewide season for snagging paddlefish is February 1 - May 10 . Would you support creating a paddlefish season for bowfishing that aligned with these dates? $\mathrm{N}=41$
Support 36.6\% Oppose 41.5\% No opinion 22.0\%

## All Anglers

15. Are you aware that you can sell harvested Asian carp to local fish processors with a recreational fishing license? $\mathrm{N}=188$ Yes 45.7\% No 54.3\%

15a. If yes, have you ever sold Asian carp to any area processors? N=86 Yes 4.7\% No 95.3\%
15b. If NO on 15 a , what is the single most important reason you haven't sold to a processor? $\mathrm{N}=82$
No way to transport 6.1\% Don't get enough to bother 78.0\% They don't pay enough 2.4\%
Tournament disposes of them 1.2\% Too far too travel 1.2\% Out of state 1.2\%

Not worth the effort 1.2\% Never caught one 1.2\% No local markets where they're from 1.2\%
Just never done it $1.2 \% \quad$ Slimy, messy boat $1.2 \% \quad$ Don't want to $1.2 \%$
Don't want them in the boat 1.2\% Buyers not open 24/7 1.2\%
16. What do you normally do with Asian carp that you catch? $\mathrm{N}=188$

Eat $0.5 \%$ Sink 37.8\% Let go alive 19.1\% Use for bait 13.8\% Never caught one 22.3\% Fertilizer 2.7\%
Throw on rocks 2.1\% Give to someone else 1.6\%

## 17. Have you ever tried eating Asian carp? $\mathrm{N}=188$ <br> Yes 21.8\% No 78.2\%

18. Are you satisfied with the current size and creel limits on all sport fish at the Kentucky Lake Tailwaters? N=188 Yes 96.8\% No 3.2\%

18a. If not, which species are you dissatisfied with and what species size and creel limits would you prefer? $\mathrm{N}=6$ Statewide crappie minimum length 8-9" 16.7\% Wants a daily creel limit on catfish 16.7\%
Catfish minimum length 10 " $16.7 \% \quad$ Remove trophy catfish regulation $16.7 \% \quad$ Skipjack daily limit 50 16.7\%
Slot limit on blue catfish 16.7\% Catfish maximum length 30" 16.7\%
Add a maximum length limit on paddlefish 16.7\%

# NORTHWESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

## Project 1: Lake and Tailwater Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

Table 1 presents a summary of conditions encountered while sampling at state-owned or managed lakes and ACOE reservoirs during the 2022 field season.

## Nolin River Lake

## Black Bass Sampling

Diurnal boat electrofishing to sample the black bass population at Nolin River Lake was conducted in May 2022 (Tables 2-4). Catch rates are consistent with previous samples. Largemouth Bass accounted for around $79 \%$ of black bass collected. Total CPUE for Largemouth Bass in 2022 increased slightly from 2021 and remains on the high end of collections through time. Catch rates for fish $\geq 15.0$ and $\geq 20.0$ in are on the high end of previous collections. Largemouth Bass PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ have both decreased since the 2021 sample but remain acceptable.

Diurnal boat electrofishing to survey the black bass population at Nolin River Lake was conducted in October 2022 (Tables 5-7). Catch rates for Largemouth Bass were lower than previous samples, but relative weights were consistent. However, we would like to see higher relative weights. There appears to be sufficient forage available to produce improved body condition. The reason behind unsatisfactory body condition indices is unknown.

Slight variability exists concerning catch of larger fish and seems to be attributable to environmental variables at time of sampling rather than changes in the population. The Largemouth Bass population at Nolin River Lake is relatively stable and performing consistently well (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Good- to Excellent; Table $8)$.

## Crappie Sampling

Trap netting to assess the crappie populations at Nolin River Lake was conducted during two non-consecutive weeks, October 31-November 4 and November 14-17 (Tables 9-14). Low catch rates resulting from stable weather/water conditions during week-one necessitated week-two sampling. A total of 260 crappie ( 152 White Crappie, $58.5 \%$ ) were collected during 119 net-nights of sampling for a total CPUE of 2.2 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$. Weights were taken and otoliths removed from a representative sample of each inch class. All catch rates used in the population assessment are much lower than typical collections and, as such, should be taken into consideration when looking at the statewide assessment. Growth data remains highly variable but has improved considerably since the last sample. Mean length of age-2+ White Crappie at capture is the highest recorded. Body condition is very good for all three length groups and is evident when handling fish. The crappie population at Nolin River Lake is stable and performing much better than the data acknowledges. The 2019 sample was not composed of many larger fish (>10.0 in), but the 2022 sample contained more large fish in proportion to smaller fish. Survey data and anecdotal information from anglers together describes a fast-growing population with good numbers of fish greater than 10.0 in available for harvest. Low catch rates dictated a "Poor" ranking based on the statewide assessment for 2022.

## White Bass/Walleye Sampling

The White Bass and Walleye populations were not directly assessed in 2022. They are scheduled to be surveyed with gill nets fall 2023.

## Rough River Lake

## Black Bass Sampling

The black bass population at Rough River Lake was unable to be surveyed in spring 2022 due to undesirable weather and water conditions during the survey window.

Diurnal boat electrofishing to survey the black bass population at Rough River Lake was conducted in October 2022 (Tables 15-17). Fall catch rates were higher than any other fall sample in the last decade. Sublegal ( $<15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) fish made up $94 \%$ of the catch. Condition factors are consistent with previous samples. Bigger fish were noticeably absent from the 2022 collection. The population will be surveyed spring 2023 for further evaluation.

The Largemouth Bass population at Rough River Lake is experiencing some variability and will be monitored consistently moving forward. There was insufficient data collected in 2022 to provide a value for the statewide assessment.

## Crappie Sampling

The crappie population was not directly assessed in 2022. It is scheduled to be surveyed during fall 2024.

## Hybrid Striped Bass Sampling

Gill netting to assess the hybrid striped bass population was conducted during October (Tables 18-22). A total of 245 hybrids were collected in 7 net-nights ( 35.0 fish/nn) over the two-day sampling period.

Catch rates in 2022 fall within the range of previous samples. On average, body condition continues the trend of decreasing with size. There has been an abundance of forage available year-round over the past decade, which should produce high relative weights for the larger fish ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) which are feeding exclusively on shad. Since that is not the case, it leads us to hypothesize that poor water quality conditions (temperature and dissolved oxygen) lead to enough stress during the summer months to reduce foraging to the point that fish are losing weight. Stress due to high temperature and low D.O. will affect larger fish to a greater extent. As water quality improves in the early fall, fish resume feeding and gain back some, but not all, of the weight lost during the stressful period. The extent of the poor water quality has been well documented over the past several years with Temp/D.O. profiles. We know that fish are being caught during the summer months, and that fish are being caught below, or at least in the bottom of, the thermocline. This tells us that fish are actively selecting cooler water over higher dissolved oxygen concentrations. The amount of time spent in cooler water is unknown, but it seems fish are moving up and down throughout the water column multiple times a day. Since the acoustic tags included sensors, data from the telemetry project may shed some light on this hypothesis. Data processing is ongoing and will be reported when complete.

The mean length of age-2+ fish at capture decreased slightly from 2022 back to reported values in 2019; however, it remains within the expected range. Growth remains a bit variable but is similar to previous collections. We routinely collect old fish between ages 7-11 during sampling events; however, relatively few fish age-4 or older were collected in 2022.

Telemetry data is still being analyzed and will be reported when complete. Over 1.2 million data points were collected. A workflow in Program R is being developed to analyze this and future telemetry data.

The hybrid striped bass population continues to be relatively stable and thriving despite increased catch/harvest and poor summer water quality. The hybrid stiped bass population at Rough River Lake maintained an "Excellent" rating based on statewide assessment criteria.

## Catfish Sampling

Gill netting to assess the Channel Catfish population was conducted concurrently with hybrid striped bass sampling (Tables 23-24). A total of 86 Channel Catfish were collected over 7 net-nights for a CPUE of 12.3 fish per net-night. Catch rate and length distribution is similar to previous collections. Body condition across length groups was lower than most previous collections. Fish appeared to be healthy, so the low observed condition is likely a result of sample timing.

## Dam Mitigation Project

Rough River Lake USACE is in the process of a major dam remediation project. Several phases of construction have been completed. Through intensive monitoring the USACE determined that previous efforts were insufficient. After much deliberation it was determined the next phase of remediation will include construction of a new outlet tower, conduit, outlet works, tailwater interface, and a concrete cutoff wall across the full length of the dam. This is a very large and complex project that is projected to require 6-8 years of construction. To reduce immediate risk associated with the status of the dam, USACE announced a five-foot reduction in summer pool ( 490 vs 495 MSL ) and a delayed start to annual spring filling. USACE is allowing dock owners to extend their walkways in order to safely access the lake. This will result in less open water across much of an already narrow lake. The effects on recreational boating, recreational angling, and the fish population remains to be seen.

## Lake Malone

## Largemouth Bass Sampling

Diurnal boat electrofishing to survey the black bass population at Lake Malone was conducted in April (Tables 2528) and October 2022 (Tables 29-31). Spring catch rates fluctuated slightly but are similar to previous collections. Total CPUE was among the lowest collected during the last fifteen surveys. Sampling conditions were good, but sample timing near the end of April may have influenced catch. Largemouth bass PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ are within acceptable ranges.

Total fall catch rate was higher than the spring collection. However, less than half of the number of fish greater than 15.0 in were collected during this survey compared to the spring. Relative weights for each length group were similar to previous collections but remain below the desired range.

Mean $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ for all length groups is lower than desired. This may indicate a need to remove bass from within or below the protected slot. An alternative would be to remove the protective slot and manage the lake with the statewide minimum size limit ( 12.0 in ). Overall, the bass population at Lake Malone has been relatively stable and performing well for the last two decades (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Good- to Excellent).

## Channel Catfish Sampling

The Channel Catfish population at Lake Malone was not surveyed during 2022. If time and conditions allow, it will be surveyed with baited tandem hoop nets during 2023. If not, it will be assessed in 2024.

## Creel Survey

A random, stratified, roving, 5 day-per-week creel survey was conducted at Lake Malone from 01 April - 29 October 2022 to estimate angler pressure and catch/harvest statistics (Tables 32-36). Days were divided into two time periods (morning and afternoon) each with equal probability and 6 hours in length. Weekend day probability was 2.5 times weekday probability. The lake was divided into 3 "sub-areas" of approximately equal size in which the creel clerk would spend 2 hours out of the 6 -hour time period counting and interviewing before moving to the next sub-area.

Approximately 1,800 angler interviews were conducted during the 2022 survey. Surveys were well distributed around the lake (Figure 1). The total estimated number of fishing trips for 2022 was an increase from 2011; however, total man hours decreased by 17,640 hours. Anglers took more shorter trips in 2022 compared to 2011. Demographics show similar percentages of male and female anglers when compared to the 2011 survey. There was a noticeable increase in the number of non-resident anglers. This is likely due to the increase in non-resident homeowners surrounding the lake. An increase in the number of anglers casting compared to still fishing was also found during the 2022 survey.

Black bass was the most sought-after group in 2022 followed by the panfish, "anything", crappie, and catfish groups. The estimated total catch $(74,461)$ is a slight increase from $2011(70,121)$, but total harvest $(26,839)$ is a relatively significant decrease from $2011(35,838)$. Both remain dramatically less than 2006 total catch $(109,937)$
and harvest $(57,801)$ estimates. Catch and harvest estimates for black bass and catfish decreased from 2011, with only $3 \%$ of Largemouth Bass caught being harvested compared with $12 \%$ in 2011. Estimated catch and percent harvest increased for panfish and crappie groups in 2022. The mean length at harvest for Largemouth Bass decreased from the two most recent surveys down to 12.3 in . This is a good thing as it indicates anglers are keeping more fish below the protected slot. The month of April had the most black bass fishing trips but only the fourth most bass caught. June, July, and September each had estimated higher numbers of bass caught than April.

An angler attitude (AA) survey was conducted during the creel survey to gather angler preference and satisfaction data (Figures 2 and 3). A total of 502 angler attitude surveys were completed at Lake Malone in 2022. Each respondent was first asked for his or her home zip code. Approximately $94 \%$ of respondents were Kentucky residents; the remaining $6 \%$ provided home zip codes from six other states. In general, anglers fishing most often for crappie have increased along with a decrease in anglers most often targeting Channel Catfish. Anglers most often targeting bass and crappie remained similar to the previous survey. Bass angler satisfaction has declined since the 2011 angler attitude survey. However, the main reason anglers indicated they were dissatisfied is also the same reason others indicated they were satisfied with the fishery (number of fish). Crappie angler satisfaction declined from 2011, with increases in the percentages of anglers who are neutral, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied. Anglers who were satisfied and dissatisfied claimed the same reasons for their feelings, number of fish, and size of fish. Bluegill and Redear Sunfish anglers had a slight increase in dissatisfaction from 2011 but remain mostly positive regarding the fishery. There were fewer Channel Catfish anglers found in 2022 and their level of satisfaction decreased from 2011. One hundred percent of anglers surveyed in 2011 were satisfied or neutral about the Channel Catfish fishery. In 2022, the percentage of very satisfied anglers dropped to $19.4 \%$ from $80 \%$, while the incidence of dissatisfaction rose to $18 \%$.

The near majority ( $97 \%$ ) of anglers interviewed noted that they fished at least one day in 2021 , with another $21 \%$ fishing more than 50 days. Approximately $54 \%$ of respondents fished an average 1-10 days at Lake Malone per year. Ninety percent of respondents feel that there is adequate fish habitat in Lake Malone. The remaining 10\% ( $\mathrm{N}=$ 50 ) felt that brush piles $(60.5 \%)$, hinged trees $(44.2 \%)$, and artificial structures $(55.8 \%)$ would be beneficial if placed on main lake points $(46.8 \%)$ or $10-20$ ' deep ( $39.5 \%$ ). Additional responses included rock piles, more grass, coves, and 3-10' deep. The last question asked if anglers were satisfied with current size and creel limits on sport fish in Lake Malone. Approximately $88 \%$ of respondents indicated they were content with current regulations. The remaining $12.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=62)$ provided a number of responses, mostly related to Largemouth Bass size limits. Over $56 \%$ of respondents indicated their desire for Malone to change to statewide regulations ( 12.0 -in minimum size).

In general, responses were in line with expectations. Anglers are taking more, shorter trips and have high expectations for catch, with limited interest in harvest.


Figure 1. Distribution of creel interviews at Lake Malone in 2022 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,798$ ). Several interviews did not generate an accurate GPS location and were not included on the map.


Figure 2. Distribution of angler attitude surveys at Lake Malone in $2022(\mathrm{~N}=502)$. Several interviews did not generate an accurate GPS location and were not included on the map.

## LAKE MALONE ANGLER ATTITUDE SURVEY 2022

Have you been surveyed this year? Yes - stop survey No - continue

1. Home zip code $(\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{5 0 2}):$ Unique $\mathrm{Zips}=97(7$ states: $\mathrm{KY}, \mathrm{TN}, \mathrm{IN}, \mathrm{OH}, \mathrm{IL}, \mathrm{MI}, \mathrm{IA})$
2. Which species of fish do you fish for at Lake Malone (check all that apply)? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{5 0 2}$

Bass 80.7\% ( $\mathrm{N}=405$ ) Crappie $44.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=225) \quad$ Bluegill $40.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=205) \quad$ Redear Sunfish $7.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=39)$
Channel Catfish 13.5\% ( $\mathrm{N}=68$ )
3. Which one species do you fish for most at Lake Malone (check only one)? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{5 0 2}$

Bass 62.9\% ( $\mathrm{N}=316$ ) Crappie $15.1 \%(\mathrm{~N}=76) \quad$ Bluegill $19.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=98) \quad$ Channel Catfish 2.4\% ( $\mathrm{N}=12$ )
-Answer the following questions for each species you fish for - (see question 2)

## Bass Anglers

4. In general, what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction do you have with bass fishing at Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 9 8}$

Very satisfied 14.6\% ( $N=58$ ) Somewhat satisfied 34.2\% ( $N=136$ ) Neutral 27.1\% ( $N=108$ )
Somewhat dissatisfied $21.1 \%(N=84)$ Very dissatisfied $3.0 \%(N=12)$

4a. If you responded with somewhat or very satisfied in question (4) - What is the single most important reason for your satisfaction?

## $\mathrm{N}=193$

Number of fish $50.8 \%(N=98) \quad$ Size of fish $45.6 \%(N=88) \quad$ Creel Limit $2.1 \%(N=4) \quad$ Other $1.6 \%(N=3)$

4b. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (4) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
$\mathrm{N}=97$
Number of fish $38.1 \%(N=37) \quad$ Size of fish $21.6 \%(N=21) \quad$ Too many anglers $34.0 \%(N=33) \quad$ Other $5.2 \%(N=5)$

## Crappie Anglers

5. In general, what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{2 2 5}$

Very satisfied $13.3 \%(N=30)$ Somewhat satisfied 34.2\% ( $N=77$ ) Neutral 32.9\% ( $\mathrm{N}=74$ )
Somewhat dissatisfied $16.0 \%(N=36)$ Very dissatisfied $3.1 \%(N=7)$

5a. If you responded with somewhat or very satisfied in question (5) - What is the single most important reason for your satisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=106 \quad$ Number of fish $63.2 \%(N=67) \quad$ Size of fish $36.8 \%(N=39) \quad$ Other $0.9 \%(N=1)$

5b. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (5) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=43 \quad$ Number of fish $60.5 \%(N=26) \quad$ Size of fish $34.9 \%(N=15) \quad$ Other $4.7 \%(N=2)$

## Bluegill Anglers

6. In general, what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction do you have with bluegill fishing at Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{2 0 4}$ Very satisfied $42.6 \%(N=87) \quad$ Somewhat satisfied $33.3 \% ~(N=68) \quad$ Neutral 17.2\% ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ )
Somewhat dissatisfied $5.4 \% ~(\mathrm{~N}=11) \quad$ Very dissatisfied $1.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=3)$

6a. If you responded with somewhat or very satisfied in question (6) - What is the single most important reason for your satisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=154 \quad$ Number of fish $67.5 \%(N=104) \quad$ Size of fish $31.8 \%(N=49) \quad$ Other $\quad 0.6 \%(N=1)$

6b. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (6) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=13 \quad$ Number of fish $76.9 \%(N=10) \quad$ Size of fish $23.1 \%(N=3)$

## Redear Sunfish Anglers

7. In general, what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction do you have with redear sunfish fishing at Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 3}$ Very satisfied $6.1 \%(\mathrm{~N}=2) \quad$ Somewhat satisfied $36.4 \%(\mathrm{~N}=12) \quad$ Neutral $33.3 \%(\mathrm{~N}=11)$ Somewhat dissatisfied 21.2\% ( $\mathrm{N}=7$ ) $\quad$ Very dissatisfied $3.0 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$

7a. If you responded with somewhat or very satisfied in question (7) - What is the single most important reason for your satisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=14 \quad$ Number of fish $35.7 \%(\mathrm{~N}=5)$ Size of fish $64.3 \%(\mathrm{~N}=9)$

7b. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (7) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=9 \quad$ Number of fish $100 \%(\mathrm{~N}=9)$

## Channel Catfish Anglers

8. In general, what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction do you have with channel catrish fishing at Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{6 7}$ Very satisfied $19.4 \%(N=13) \quad$ Somewhat satisfied $35.8 \%(N=24) \quad$ Neutral $26.9 \%(N=18)$

Somewhat dissatisfied 16.4\% ( $\mathrm{N}=11$ ) Very dissatisfied $1.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$
8a. If you responded with somewhat or very satisfied in question (8) - What is the single most important reason for your satisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=37 \quad$ Number of fish $40.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=15) \quad$ Size of fish $56.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=21) \quad$ Other $2.7 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$

8b. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (8) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
$\mathbf{N}=12 \quad$ Number of fish $91.7 \%(\mathrm{~N}=11) \quad$ Size of fish $8.3 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$

## All Anglers

9. Approximately how many days did you fish in Kentucky last year (2021)?

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 15 | $3.0 \%$ |
| $1-10$ | 105 | $20.9 \%$ |
| $11-25$ | 139 | $27.7 \%$ |
| $26-50$ | 136 | $27.1 \%$ |
| $50+$ | 107 | $21.3 \%$ |
| Total (N) | $\mathbf{5 0 2}$ |  |

10. On average, how many days do you fish Lake Malone in a single year?

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 8 | $1.6 \%$ |
| $1-10$ | 270 | $54.0 \%$ |
| $11-25$ | 135 | $27.0 \%$ |
| $26-50$ | 47 | $9.4 \%$ |
| $50+$ | 40 | $8.0 \%$ |
| Total (N) | 500 |  |
| No Answer | 2 |  |

11. Do you feel there is adequate fish habitat in Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{5 0 1}$

Yes $90 \%(\mathrm{~N}=45)$
No 10\% ( $\mathrm{N}=50$ )
12. If you answered No to Question eleven (11) - what type and location of structure do you think would be beneficial?

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brush piles | 26 | $60.5 \%$ |
| Hinged trees | 19 | $44.2 \%$ |
| Artificial structures | 24 | $55.8 \%$ |
| Rock pile | 3 | $7.0 \%$ |
| Other | 15 | $34.9 \%$ |
| Coves | 35 | $8.0 \%$ |
| Main lake points | 29 | $46.8 \%$ |
| Shallow (3-10') | 30 | $6.0 \%$ |
| Deep (10-20') | 17 | $39.5 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Total (N) | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |  |

13. Are you satisfied with the current size and creel limits on all sport fish at Lake Malone? $\mathbf{N}=498$ Yes $87.7 \%(\mathrm{~N}=436) \quad$ No $12.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=62)$

13a. If you answered No to Question thirteen (13) - which size and creel limits would you prefer on fish species in Lake Malone?

| 13a. Bass Size Limits |  |  | 13a. Crappie Size Limits |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Frequency | Percent |  | Frequency | Percent |
| 12" size limit | 26 | 56.5\% | 9" size limit | 1 | 11.1\% |
| 14" size limit | 3 | 6.5\% | 10" size limit | 7 | 77.8\% |
| 15" size limit | 5 | 10.9\% | none | 1 | 11.1\% |
| 15-18" slot | 1 | 2.2\% | Total ( N ) | 9 |  |
| 15-18" slot, 2 in slot | 1 | 2.2\% | No Answer |  |  |
| 17" size limit | 1 | 2.2\% |  |  |  |
| none | 5 | 10.9\% | 13a. Crappie Creel Limits |  |  |
| 1<15", 6>15" | 2 | 4.3\% | 25 | 1 | 25\% |
| Other | 1 | 2.2\% | 30 | 1 | 25\% |
| Total (N) | 46 |  | Other (Reduce numbers, Keep more) | 2 | 50\% |
|  |  |  | Total (N) | 4 |  |
| 13a. Bass Creel Limits |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 or 5 | 1 | 100\% | 13a. Redear Size Limits | N/A |  |
| Total (N) | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 13a. Redear Creel Limits | N/A |  |
| 13a. Bluegill Size Limits | N/A |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 13a. Other Size Limits | N/A |  |
| 13a. Bluegill Creel Limits |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 1 | 100\% | 13a. Other Creel Limits |  |  |
| Total (N) | 1 |  |  | Frequency | Percent |
|  |  |  | Other (Reduce Tournaments) | 1 | 100\% |
|  |  |  | Total ( N ) | 1 |  |
| 13a. Catfish Size Limits |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Frequency | Percent |  |  |  |
| Other (Stock more CCF) | 1 | 100\% |  |  |  |
| Total (N) | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13a. Catfish Creel Limits | N/A |  |  |  |  |

Figure 3. Results of the 2022 Lake Malone angler attitude survey $(\mathrm{N}=502)$.

## Temperature and Dissolved Oxygen

A single temperature and dissolved oxygen profile was collected at Lake Malone on 8 June 2022 (Table 37). Dissolved oxygen dropped below 3.0 ppm between 10 and 12 feet deep. There are no current concerns with trophic status or thermal habitat in Lake Malone. Water quality will be monitored multiple times throughout the summer moving forward.

## Mauzy Lake

## Largemouth Bass Sampling

Diurnal boat electrofishing to evaluate the Largemouth Bass population was conducted in April and October 2022 (Tables 26, 30, 38-42). Both spring and fall sampling conditions were fair, with significant aquatic vegetation present. Total spring catch rate was higher than 2021 but still on the low end of collections since 2009. Approximately $69 \%$ of fish captured were $10.0-13.9$ in. Only one fish $\geq 15.0$ in was captured, and no fish $\geq 20.0$ in were captured for the second consecutive year. PSD is much improved from 2021, as a group of fish have moved through the inch classes. Fall catch rate was also low; however, relative weights were consistent with previous collections.

Otoliths were collected from a subsample of fish for enumeration of age and growth statistics. Growth rates remain highly variable, with slow growth across age classes. Growth appears to be improving in recent years but the population primarily consists of smaller fish. Improved growth may be attributable to slight annual improvements in vegetation control over the past few years. Assessment values are improved from 2021, due to an updated mean length at age-3 value and an increase in catch rate for fish 12.0-14.9 in (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair).

Excessive aquatic vegetation (coontail, Eurasian watermilfoil) continues to be an issue despite management efforts. Additional Grass Carp (200) were stocked in 2021 and did have a noticeable positive effect. However, a significant amount of vegetation remained throughout the fall of 2022. Aquatic vegetation negatively impacts sampling efforts and makes accurate evaluation of the fishery difficult. Additional efforts using herbicide will be attempted during 2023. It is hopeful the additional Grass Carp and herbicide treatments will be enough to keep the vegetation at a reasonable level.

## Bluegill/Redear Sunfish Sampling

Electrofishing to assess the Bluegill and Redear Sunfish populations was conducted in May. Bluegill data is shown in Tables 43-44 and 46-47. Total Bluegill catch was the highest recorded since 2012. Slight improvements in vegetation coverage likely allowed for more efficient survey capture. The majority of Bluegill captured were 2.0-3.9 in with the significant increase in total catch rate being attributed to increases in catch of Bluegill less than 6.0 in. The abundance of small fish leads to a low PSD with no fish $\geq 8.0$ in captured yet again. The Bluegill population continues to perform poorly ( 2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Poor- to Fair). If improved vegetation management does not allow for increased performance, a full lake renovation seems to be the next course of action.

Redear Sunfish catch rates increased from 2021 (Tables 43, 45-46, 48), attributable to an increase in fish <6.0 in. More, smaller Redear Sunfish are becoming common. Redear outnumbered Bluegill through most recent surveys, with the exception being 2022. There are typically good numbers of Redear $>8.0$ in but we have yet to find fish $>10.0$ in. The Redear Sunfish population appears to be stable and performing consistently, albeit less than preferable (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair- to Good).

## Lake Renovation Plans

Across all species, growth continues to decline or remain constant at undesirable levels. Additionally, there are numerous undesirable species present in the lake (Gizzard Shad, crappie spp., Flathead Catfish, Spotted Gar, etc.). Ultimately, Mauzy Lake will benefit from another, more complete, renovation. Plans to dredge and deepen extensive shallow areas, upgrade existing bank fishing access, install fish habitat, lime the lake basin, renovate the fishery, and construct a headwater wetland are being created. Mauzy Lake is wholly contained within a WMA and renovation efforts can be easily accomplished.

## Carpenter Lake

## Largemouth Bass

Diurnal boat electrofishing to survey the largemouth bass population at Carpenter Lake was completed in April and October 2022 (Tables 26, 30, 49-52). Total catch rate was slightly improved from 2021 and catch rates by length groups were in line with previous collections. Both PSD and RSD 15 are currently at acceptable levels. Bass catch rate was lower for the fall sample (CPUE 117.0 to 147.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) as is typical. Body condition remains within the range established in previous samples. The Largemouth Bass population at Carpenter Lake is stable and performing well (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Good).

## Bluegill/Redear Sunfish Sampling

Electrofishing to assess the Bluegill and Redear Sunfish populations was conducted in May (Tables 46, 53-56). Total catch rate for Bluegill more than doubled from 2022, establishing a new all-time high ( $742.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Again, no Bluegill greater than 8.0 in were collected. This is likely the result of abundant Gizzard Shad and submerged aquatic vegetation. Grass Carp (300) were stocked in 2021 to help manage excessive aquatic vegetation (coontail). Several Grass Carp were documented during the spring and fall bass surveys. Bluegill PSD is within the desired range for balanced predator/prey population management; however, a slight increase is desirable (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair- to Good).

One hundred thirty-three Redear Sunfish were collected in May in conjunction with Bluegill sampling. Total catch rate is a new all-time high ( 177.3 fish/hr). Redear Sunfish $>10.0$ in were not documented in 2022 but anglers continue to report catching some fish over 10.0 in . Due to historically low sample catches, a statewide assessment rating has not been produced for Redear Sunfish at Carpenter Lake. If catch rates continue their recent trend an assessment will be started in 2023.

Gizzard Shad are likely negatively affecting the Bluegill and Redear Sunfish populations. After two failed shad eradication efforts, saugeye were stocked at 85 fish/acre in May 2019. Stocking rate was increased to 100 fish/acre in 2020 and 2021. Stocking rate was increased again to 150 fish/acre for 2022. Anglers report catching a few saugeye throughout the year from approximately 10.0 to 18.0 in . A handful of fish have been captured during standardized bass survey events. Fish representing each year class have been collected annually. Seven saugeye were collected during 2022 fall bass sampling, ranging from 8.7-22.5 in. Nighttime electrofishing events will be attempted in 2023 to try to get a better idea of how the population is progressing. There are plenty of small shad, crappie, and Bluegill for the saugeye to forage on. Growth appears to be very good thus far, although relative abundance seems to remain low. This is likely due to predation on stocked fingerlings by smaller bass and crappie.

## Emergency Spillway

The emergency spillway at Carpenter Lake suffered a complete failure during the winter of 2021. Water undercut the concrete weir and created a channel under the structure. The concrete apron affixed to the front of the weir broke off when all supporting material eroded away. The Engineering Division made several visits and devised a plan for repair. Several nearby trees were removed and the area in front of the weir was excavated, Grout was then pumped into all voids. Clay was brought in and compacted to the top of the spillway. Finally, a layer of riprap was added on top of the clay. NWFD assisted with gaining access to the property, finding clay, and installing the last section of grass seed and erosion control netting. The repair was completed during June 2022.

## New Kingfisher Lake

## Largemouth Bass

Diurnal electrofishing to assess the Largemouth Bass population at New Kingfisher Lake was conducted in April and October (Tables 26, 30, 57-60). Spring catch rate increased from 2021 due to an increase in fish 8.0-19.9 in. Catch rates for fish greater than 15.0 in and greater than 20.0 in remain high and the Largemouth Bass fishery should continue to grow over the next few years as multiple year classes develop and stabilize. Bass PSD is within
the desirable range. Fall sampling produced a consistent length distribution and fish in good condition, especially fish $\geq 15.0$ in. Fall CPUE for bass $\geq 15.0$ in was 29.0 fish/hr. The Largemouth Bass population at New Kingfisher Lake is performing well and continuing to improve (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Good).

## Bluegill/Redear Sunfish Sampling

The sunfish population was sampled via electrofishing in May (Tables 46, 61-63). Bluegill catch rates rebounded in 2022 with a near eight-fold increase in total CPUE. No Bluegill greater than 8.0 in were collected in 2022. Fish were not collected for age and growth analysis in 2022. Increased catch resulted in an improved assessment (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair- to Good).

No Redear Sunfish were collected in New Kingfisher Lake in 2022. Gizzard Shad were documented in both spring and fall samples. A shad eradication project was completed on New Kingfisher Lake on 24 January 2023. Numerous Gizzard Shad and small crappie were observed deceased over the next several days. The spring Largemouth Bass survey will be the next electrofishing event that will confirm the presence or absence of shad.

## Channel Catfish Sampling

Three baited, tandem hoop nets were set for three net nights during October 2022 to assess the Channel Catfish population in New Kingfisher Lake. One full cheese log was used per tandem set. Only three Channel Catfish were captured during this sampling event (17.4, 19.8, and 19.9 in). Crappie, Bluegill, bullheads, and turtles were present in most nets. Weather was relatively stable and warm, with a few sprinkles one day. Hoop net sampling will be attempted again in 2023.

## Old Kingfisher Lake

## Largemouth Bass

Diurnal electrofishing to assess the Largemouth Bass population was conducted at Old Kingfisher Lake in April and October (Tables 26, 30, 64-67). A total of 45 bass were collected during the spring survey for a total CPUE of 135.1 fish/hr for the second consecutive year. PSD remains in the desired range (48). Fall sampling yielded an increased catch of Largemouth Bass, primarily due to increased numbers of fish <10.0 in. In general, relative weights improved from 2021 and continue to be good across the board. Fish were not collected for age and growth analysis in 2022. The Largemouth Bass population at Old Kingfisher Lake is still evolving but does have quality fish available for anglers (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair).

## Bluegill/Redear Sunfish Sampling

The sunfish population at Old Kingfisher Lake was sampled via electrofishing in May (Tables 46, 68-70). Total Bluegill CPUE increased significantly from 2019-2021 values (1,129.4 fish/hr). The increase was primarily in fish 3.0-5.9 in. This total is well above the presumed desirable range; however, current Bluegill PSD is within the established range for providing considerable forage for Largemouth Bass. Bluegill were not collected for age and growth analysis in 2022. As the Largemouth Bass population grows and stabilizes, sunfish growth and size structure will improve (Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair- to Good).

Only six Redear Sunfish were collected during standardized sampling, ranging from 4.0 to 9.0 in. Gizzard Shad were documented in both spring and fall samples. A shad eradication project was completed on Old Kingfisher Lake on 24 January 2023. Numerous Gizzard Shad and small crappie were observed deceased over the next several days. The spring Largemouth Bass survey will be the next electrofishing event that will confirm the presence or absence of shad.

## Channel Catfish Sampling

Three baited, tandem hoop nets were set for three net nights during October 2022 to assess the Channel Catfish population in Old Kingfisher Lake. One full cheese log was used per tandem set. No Channel Catfish were captured
during this sampling event. Crappie, Bluegill, bullheads, and turtles were present in most nets. Weather was relatively stable and warm, with a few sprinkles one day. Hoop net sampling will be attempted again in 2023.

## Water Quality

In recent years, excessive nutrients have led to extensive algae blooms, often composed of blue-green algae during the summer. The presumed primary source of nutrient loading is the breakdown of terrestrial vegetation that grew during the renovation project. Anoxic conditions at the water-sediment interface during stratification releases a large amount of phosphorus into the water column, feeding the algae blooms. Additionally, Gizzard Shad are known detritivores who dip down and "sip" sediment, further encouraging phosphorus cycling. Multiple water samples were sent for testing to Aquatic Control. After consultation, Aquatic Control experts suggested use of two different products. During June, three different treatments were made to Old Kingfisher Lake. On 13 June, 35 gallons of SeClear was applied. On 24 June, a temperature/dissolved oxygen profile was completed and then another 30 gallons of SeClear was applied. SeClear contains a low dose of copper to kill algae and flocking agents to bind to free reactive phosphorus in the water column. The goals were to reduce the algae present, sequester some phosphorus along the way, and then apply a stronger flocking product. On 27 June, 80 PDU of EutroSORB was applied to Old Kingfisher Lake. Approximately a week after treatment water samples were sent for testing. Each treatment provided positive results but not at the intended level. However, major blue-green algae blooms did not occur in 2022. Further testing will be conducted in 2023 and additional treatments may be made using several different products. Feasibility of a bottom diffused aeration system will also be explored.

## Washburn Lake

## Largemouth Bass

Diurnal electrofishing to assess the Largemouth Bass population was conducted at Washburn Lake in April and October (Tables 26, 30, 71-74). Total spring CPUE ( $310.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr)}$ ) is slightly below the long-term average ( 348.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ). The high number of 8.0- to 11.9 -in fish seen in 2021 did translate to a few fish 12.0-14.9 in. Fish 12.0-20.0 in were noticeably missing once again, with no fish captured >15.0 in. PSD remains low (16) due to an abundance of fish less than stock size. In May, NWFD staff returned to Washburn to fertilize and remove bass. A total of 59 Largemouth Bass 4.0-9.9 in were relocated to a new home. Recruitment remains high, but there were no fish $>12.0$ in captured during the fall survey. Additional bass may need to be removed in 2023 to facilitate growth. Near the end of 2022, we confirmed the presence of a large family group of otters living in Washburn Lake. A single otter can eat over three pounds of fish per day. They may be contributing to the lack of larger bass present in the lake. We plan to employ a nuisance trapper to remove some otters during 2023. The Largemouth Bass population at Washburn needs some help. Multiple options are being explored to help the fishery (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating $=$ Fair- to Good).

## Bluegill/Redear Sunfish Sampling

The sunfish population at Washburn Lake was sampled via electrofishing in May (Tables 46, 75-79). Total CPUE for Bluegill increased from 2021 to a record high in 2022. Increases were seen for all length groups except for fish $\geq 8.0$ in. Bluegill PSD is 19 and ideally should be a little higher (20-40). Age and growth data was not collected in 2022. The Bluegill population at Washburn Lake is performing decent and remains the only NWFD state lake to hold 8.0-in Bluegill (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair- to Good).

Total CPUE for Redear Sunfish decreased to less than half of the 2021 collection. The largest change was the fourfold decrease in Redear $\geq 8.0 \mathrm{in}$. This change may be attributable to the resident otters. Redear sunfish PSD is 60 , which is fine, as long as Bluegill recruitment can be maintained. However, we have not collected a redear sunfish $>10.0$ in to date. Age and growth data was not collected in 2022. The Redear Sunfish population in Washburn Lake is performing fairly well and providing a supplemental fishery. Once the bass population stabilizes and otters are removed it should continue to improve (2022 Statewide Assessment Rating = Fair- to Good).

## Lake Renovation

Washburn Lake would benefit greatly from another full renovation. Plans to dredge and deepen extensive shallow areas, create more bank fishing access, install fish habitat, lime the lake, renovate the fishery, create a headwater wetland, and replace the existing water control structure have been created. The current water control tower leaks profusely and could fail at any time, requiring plans to be in place to move forward with a renovation when necessary. The lakeshore that adjoins the county road needs to be stabilized and parking added for angler safety. This renovation will require more planning, cooperation, and financial commitment than the renovation at Mauzy due to the proximity of private landowners and county roads serving as two of the lake boundaries.

## Otter Creek Angler Survey and Water Temperature Data

Otter Creek Outdoor Recreation Area provides a significant trout fishery for west central Kentucky. Over 10,000 trout are stocked annually in Otter Creek on OCORA and adjacent sections of Ft. Knox. Data on the utilization of the fishery is extremely limited. To that end, an angler survey was created for Otter Creek to gather data. Initially, the survey was printed out and provided to users checking in to fish. A mailbox was placed at the OCORA exit and checked by OCORA staff. Later, an online version of the survey was created in Survey 123 and made publicly available via QR code in addition to the paper survey. The survey and results can be found in Figure 4.

A total of 57 survey responses were obtained for 2022. Approximately $75 \%$ of respondents were Kentucky residents. The remainder hailed from Indiana, Ohio, and Maryland. The average length of fishing trip for respondents was 3.5 hours.

Approximately $81 \%$ of survey respondents targeted trout during their fishing trip. Survey respondents reported catching 482 trout or about 11 fish per trip. However, only $2.5 \%$ of trout caught were harvested. Otter Creek is mostly utilized as a catch and release fishery, which makes sense as it is closed to harvest from October through March. We also know that many of the anglers at Otter Creek are fly fishermen (72.7\%), who are typically strongly catch and release oriented. Approximately $96 \%$ of respondents indicated they are satisfied or neutral regarding the fishing at OCORA. The two most selected reason for satisfaction were number and size of fish available. The survey included a map and asked anglers to indicate the general areas they fished. Most anglers are fishing in the zones that trout are being stocked or can easily move into. Trout are stocked at Garnettsville Picnic area (Zone A) where $68 \%$ of the survey respondents indicated they fish. Trout are also stocked at Blue Hole (Zone C) where $28 \%$ of the survey respondents indicated they fish. These areas (A and C) also provide the best stream access. Approximately $35 \%$ of anglers had only fished one other time and $68 \%$ of anglers had fished OCORA five or less times in 2022. Since most anglers $(89.3 \%)$ indicate they are somewhat to very satisfied, low number of trips to OCORA may be dependent on other factors not directly related to the fishing. We will continue to collect data as resources allow.

## 2022 OTTER CREEK OUTDOOR RECREATION AREA DAILY FISHING SURVEY

Total Surveys: 57
(2.5\%), MD-1 (2.5\%),

Avg. Hours Fished: $3.5 \quad$ Unique Zip Codes: 40 KY-31 (77.5\%), IN-7 (17.5\%), OH-1

How many times have you fished OCORA so far this year (2022)? Avg: 4.6


Fishing Log
Fish Targeted ( $\mathrm{N}=57$ ):

| Species <br> Targeted | Trout | Smallmouth <br> Bass | Rock Bass | Anything | Other (Bluegill) | Other (sucker <br> spp) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage | $80.7 \%(\mathrm{~N}=46)$ | $14.0 \%(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ | $3.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=2)$ | $15.6 \%(\mathrm{~N}=9)$ | $1.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ | $1.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ |


| Total (Avg/Trip) | Trout | Smallmouth Bass | Rock Bass | Other (Specify) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number Caught | $482(10.95)$ | $10(0.59)$ | $12(0.80)$ | $12(0.57)^{*}$ |
| Number Harvested | $12(0.57)$ | $0(0.00)$ | $1(0.07)$ | $1(0.07)^{* *}$ |

*Species caught include sucker spp. and Spotted Bass
**Species harvested include catfish
Section of Otter Creek fished: (See map on back)

| Section of Otter Creek fished: (See map on back) |
| :--- |
|  |
| \begin{tabular}{\|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\end{tabular} |
| Percent Utilized |

## Fishing Method ( $\mathrm{N}=55$ )

Spin Fishing: 29.1\% ( $\mathrm{N}=16$ )

Fly Fishing: 72.7\% ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ )

Type of fly or lure most successful

| Lure Type | Number of Responses |
| :---: | :---: |
| Various Worm Flies | 7 |
| Jigs | 3 |
| Various Egg Flies | 2 |
| Spinners/Lures | 4 |
| Live Bait | 1 |
| Various Insect Flies | 7 |

## Satisfaction (answer Questions $1 \& 2$ only once per year)

1. In general, what level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction do you have with fishing at Otter Creek Outdoor Recreation Area? $\mathrm{N}=56$

| Very Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Neutral | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $75 \%(\mathrm{~N}=42)$ | $14.3 \%(\mathrm{~N}=8)$ | $7.1 \%(\mathrm{~N}=4)$ | $1.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ | $1.8 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ |

2. What is the single most important reason for your Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction? $N=45$

| Number of Fish | Size of Fish | Size Limit | Creel Limit | Low Angler <br> Pressure | Too Many <br> Anglers | Harvest/Gear <br> Restrictions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $43.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=20)$ | $43.5 \%(\mathrm{~N}=20)$ | $0 \%(\mathrm{~N}=0)$ | $0 \%(\mathrm{~N}=0)$ | $23.9 \%(\mathrm{~N}=11)$ | $2.2 \%(\mathrm{~N}=1)$ | $13.0 \%(\mathrm{~N}=6)$ |



Figure 4. Otter Creek Outdoor Recreation Area Daily Fishing Survey with results. N = 57

Six HOBO Tidbit temperature loggers are in place in Otter Creek. Two are located on OCORA, one under the Highway 1638 Bridge and the other near Blue Hole. Four loggers are located on Ft. Knox. One below the dam at the Pump House, one in McCracken Spring, one near the Airstrip road crossing and the last downstream of New Cut Road crossing. Data is downloaded several times annually. Data will be analyzed to determine trout are able to hold over in most years. Additional sites will be visited during 2023 to check summer water temperatures. Follow up backpack electrofishing surveys may be conducted to determine if trout are present in locations with suitable temperatures.

Table 1. Annual summary of sampling conditions by waterbody, species sampled, and date for Northwestern Fishery District lakes during 2022.

| Water body | Species | Date | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Time } \\ (24 \mathrm{hr}) \end{gathered}$ | Gear | Weather | Water temp. F | Water level | Secchi <br> (in) | Conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nolin River Lake | LMB | 5/11-5/13 | 930 | EF | NA | 72.9-78.4 | 515.3 | 60-96 | Fair |  |
| Nolin River Lake | LMB | 10/20-10/21 | 930 | EF | Sunny, light breeze, 39-55F | 60.3-63.7 | 512.0-511.0 | 27-31 | Good |  |
| Nolin River Lake | Crappie | 10/31-11/4 | 930 | TN | Sunny, light breeze to cloudy w/ drizzle and very windy, 60s | 59.3-63.3 | 507.5-506.5 | 18-30 | Poor | Limited draw, pretty stable w eather, few fish |
| Nolin River Lake | Crappie | 11/14-11/17 | 930 | TN | Cloudy w/ some drizzle, 35-40F | 49.0-56.5 | 501.9-501.1 | 22-30 | Poor | Limited draw, pretty stable w eather, few fish |
| Rough River Lake | LMB | 10/13, 10/19 | 930 | EF | Sunny, breezy, 38-50F | 62.6-68.7 | 494.6-492.7 | 22-40 | Fair |  |
| Rough River Lake | HSB | 10/25-10/27 | 900 | GN | Sunny to cloudy and rainy, light breeze to windy, 45-70F | 58.0-63.9 | 488.5-486.9 | 18-36 | Fair |  |
| Lake Malone | LMB | 4/26 | 900 | EF | Mostly sunny, light breeze, 50-60F | 64.4-66.2 | pool | 25-30 | Good |  |
| Lake Malone | ALL | 6/8 | 1300 | Temp/DO | NA | 82.7 | pool |  | Good |  |
| Lake Malone | LMB | 10/11-12 | 900 | EF | Sunny, breezy, 55-62F | 65.5-67.1 | -8" | 25-32 | Good |  |
| Mauzy | LMB | 4/28 | 845 | EF | Sunny, 60F | 65 | pool | 64 | Fair |  |
| Mauzy | BG | 5/23 | 900 | EF | Cloudy, windy, 60F | 73.2 | pool | 41 | Fair | Excessive milfoil |
| Mauzy | LMB | 10/10 | 900 | EF | Sunny, blue skies, 50F | 64.4 | pool | 30 | Fair | M. Street netter |
| Carpenter | LMB | 4/27 | 800 | EF | Sunny, light breeze, 60F | 65.1 | pool | 24 | Good |  |
| Carpenter | BG | 5/16 | 830 | EF | Sunny, 70F | 77.5 | pool | 24 | Good |  |
| Carpenter | LMB | 10/7 | 830 | EF | Sunny, blue skies, breezy, 57F | 67.1 | pool | 16 | Fair | Captured 7 saugeye, $8.7-22.5{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| New Kingfisher | LMB | 4/27 | 1015 | EF | Sunny, blue skies, light breeze, 68F | 67.8 | pool | 31 | Good |  |
| New Kingfisher | BG | 5/16 | 1215 | EF | Sunny, 70F | 80.6 | pool | 23 | Good |  |
| New Kingfisher | LMB | 10/7 | 1045 | EF | Sunny, blue skies, breezy, 60F | 66.4 | pool | 15 | Fair |  |
| New Kingfisher | CCF | 10/3-6 |  | HN | Sunny, breezy to overcast w/ rain sprinkles, 65-70F | 68.5 | pool | 15 | Fair |  |
| Old Kingfisher | LMB | 4/27 | 1215 | EF | Sunny, blue skies, light breeze, 70F | 68.0 | pool | 18 | Good |  |
| Old Kingfisher | BG | 5/16 | 1340 | EF | Sunny, 70F | 82 | pool | 23 | Good |  |
| Old Kingfisher | LMB | 10/7 | 1140 | EF | Sunny, blue skies, breezy, 60F | 68.2 | pool | 14 | Fair |  |
| Old Kingfisher | ALL | 6/24 | 830 | Temp/DO | NA | 83.2 | pool | 16 | Good |  |
| Old Kingfisher | CCF | 10/3-6 |  | HN | Sunny, breezy to overcast w/ rain sprinkles, 65-70F | 68.5 | pool | 15 | Fair |  |
| Washburn | LMB | 4/20 | 800 | EF | 53F | 56.5 | pool | 27 | Good |  |
| Washburn | BG | 5/24 | 900 | EF | Cloudy, breezy, 60F | 71.8 | pool | 28 | Good |  |
| Washburn | LMB | 10/5 | 900 | EF | Sunny, light wind, 50F | 66.2 | pool | 24 | Good | M. Street netter |
| Washburn | LMB | 5/9 | 1030 | EF |  | 68 | pool | 65 | Good | Remved 59 LMB 3.9-9.9" |

Table 2. Species composition, length frequency, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 5.0 hours of 30-minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Nolin River Lake in May 2022

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 1 |  | 5 | 24 | 46 | 55 | 45 | 33 | 74 | 83 | 67 | 23 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 515 | 206.0 | 28.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 26 | 16 | 8 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 81 | 32.4 | 11.0 |
| Mid | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 1 |  | 6 | 13 | 17 | 6 | 12 | 29 | 26 | 43 | 31 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 224 | 112.0 | 13.5 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 7 | 27 | 9 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 105 | 52.5 | 10.6 |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 1 |  |  | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 46 | 92.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 40.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 5 | 1 | 5 | 34 | 64 | 74 | 52 | 46 | 108 | 114 | 118 | 60 | 37 | 28 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 785 | 157.0 | 21.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 23 | 27 | 25 | 58 | 30 | 9 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 206 | 41.2 | 7.2 |

nwd1psd.d22

Table 3. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples in each area of Nolin River Lake during May 2022;
$95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | PSD | RSD $^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 439 | $53( \pm 5)$ | $13( \pm 3)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 80 | $65( \pm 11)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid | Largemouth Bass | 201 | $68( \pm 7)$ | $18( \pm 5)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 94 | $40( \pm 10)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 36 | $75( \pm 14)$ | $22( \pm 14)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 18 | $61( \pm 13)$ | $6( \pm 10)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 676 | $59( \pm 4)$ | $15( \pm 3)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 192 | $53( \pm 7)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |

[^5]Table 4. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Nolin River Lake during spring electrofishing 1999-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 21.8 | 4.1 | 56.0 | 10.3 | 58.4 | 7.8 | 20.8 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 157.0 | 21.7 |
| 2021 | 37.8 | 4.2 | 24.2 | 3.4 | 46.3 | 4.6 | 33.7 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 142.0 | 7.9 |
| 2017 | 36.2 | 8.8 | 46.2 | 8.0 | 60.6 | 4.0 | 21.0 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 164.0 | 17.4 |
| 2016 | 19.6 | 5.3 | 23.8 | 6.0 | 37.1 | 6.6 | 12.0 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 92.4 | 14.0 |
| 2014 | 21.4 | 2.3 | 29.2 | 2.5 | 64.0 | 5.4 | 15.0 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 129.6 | 6.9 |
| 2012 | 76.9 | 9.6 | 52.7 | 6.4 | 53.8 | 4.7 | 16.0 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 199.3 | 14.8 |
| 2009 | 30.0 | 5.7 | 25.1 | 4.3 | 36.0 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 96.4 | 7.1 |
| 2008 | 50.4 | 7.9 | 45.8 | 5.4 | 34.2 | 4.3 | 11.3 | 1.6 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 141.8 | 11.2 |
| 2007 | 53.3 | 10.0 | 17.3 | 2.2 | 27.6 | 4.9 | 8.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 106.4 | 14.2 |
| 2006 | 17.8 | 2.8 | 15.8 | 1.5 | 23.6 | 2.7 | 7.6 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 64.7 | 5.7 |
| 2005 | 27.1 | 5.0 | 27.1 | 4.1 | 25.3 | 3.9 | 14.2 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 93.8 | 10.1 |
| 2004 | 23.7 | 1.6 | 16.4 | 3.7 | 16.2 | 2.4 | 8.9 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 65.3 | 6.8 |
| 2003 | 12.9 | 3.7 | 10.2 | 2.3 | 8.9 | 2.2 | 7.6 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 39.6 | 9.2 |
| 2002 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 9.8 | 2.6 | 8.0 | 3.1 | 8.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 29.8 | 5.4 |
| 2001 | 5.5 | 1.7 | 27.0 | 7.4 | 18.0 | 3.3 | 9.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 |  | 59.5 | 11.7 |
| 2000 | 9.5 | 3.1 | 35.0 | 6.3 | 41.5 | 5.1 | 14.0 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 100.0 | 13.1 |
| 1999 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{d}$ |  | 61.3 | 16.8 | 56.9 | 9.2 | 8.0 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 126.2 | 26.0 |

Table 5. Species composition, length frequency, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 4.0 hours of 30-minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Nolin River Lake in October 2022.

nwd1Imb.d22

Table 6. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth
Bass collected at Nolin River Lake during October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Upper | 34 | 87 (1) | 43 | 88 (1) | 21 | 89 (2) |
| Largemouth Bass | Middle | 25 | 89 (3) | 36 | 86 (2) | 29 | 95 (2) |
| Largemouth Bass | Total | 59 | 88 (2) | 79 | 87 (1) | 50 | 93 (1) |

nwd1Imb.d22

Table 7. Indicies of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected during fall electrofishing samples at Nolin River Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.4 | 0.2 | 29.0 | 11.0 | 9.3 | 1.4 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.6 | 6.6 |
| 2020 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46.3 | 5.4 |
| nwd1Imb.d22 <br> nwd1psd.d22 <br> nwd1psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Nolin River Lake from 2000-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 2+ at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality (A) $\%$ | Total <br> score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  | 36.6 (3) | 58.4 (4) | 20.8 (4) | 1.4 (4) |  |  | $\geq 16$ | G - E |
| 2021 |  | 46.3 (4) | 46.3 (4) | 33.7 (4) | 2.3 (4) |  |  | > 17 | Excellent |
| 2017 | 12.9 (3) | 58.8 (4) | 60.6 (4) | 21.0 (4) | 1.6 (4) | 0.968 | 58.7 | 19 | Excellent |
| 2016 |  | 23.1 (3) | 37.1 (4) | 12.0 (2) | 1.6 (4) |  |  | > 14 | G - E |
| 2014 |  | 22.2 (2) | 64.0 (4) | 15.0 (3) | 1.4 (4) |  |  | > 14 | G-E |
| 2012 | 13.4 (4) | 82.9 (4) | 53.8 (4) | 16.0 (3) | 0.2 (2) | 0.582 | 44.1 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2009 | 12.6 (3) | 29.2 (3) | 36.0 (4) | 5.3 (1) | 0.7 (3) |  |  | 14 | Good |
| 2008 | 12.6 (3) | 49.7 (4) | 34.2 (4) | 11.3 (2) | 3.6 (4) | 0.553 | 42.5 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2007 | 12.6 (3) | 51.6 (4) | 27.6 (3) | 8.2 (2) | 0.7 (3) | 0.609 | 45.0 | 15 | Good |
| 2006 | 12.6 (3) | 17.0 (2) | 23.6 (3) | 7.6 (2) | 0.4 (2) | 0.447 | 36.0 | 12 | Fair |
| 2005 | 13.1 (3) | 26.2 (3) | 25.3 (3) | 14.2 (3) | 0.2 (2) | 0.617 | 46.0 | 14 | Good |
| 2004 | 13.1 (3) | 22.9 (3) | 16.2 (1) | 8.9 (2) | 0.4 (2) | 0.684 | 49.5 | 11 | Fair |
| 2003 | 13.1 (3) | 11.3 (1) | 8.9 (1) | 7.6 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 0.534 | 41.4 | 8 | Poor |
| 2002 | 13.1 (3) | 3.8 (1) | 8.0 (1) | 8.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 8 | Poor |
| 2001 | 13.1 (3) | 5.0 (1) | 18.0 (2) | 9.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 9 | Fair |
| 2000 | 13.1 (3) | 9.0 (1) | 41.4 (4) | 14.0 (3) | 0.5 (3) |  |  | 14 | Good |

Table 9. Species composition, length frequency, and CPUE (fish/nn) for crappie collected in 119 net-nights of sampling at Nolin River Lake during November 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | 7 | 12 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 20 | 41 | 44 | 10 | 1 | 152 | 1.3 | 0.3 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 65 | 12 | 13 | 8 |  |  | 108 | 0.9 | 0.2 |

nwd1tn.d22

Table 10. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}$ values calculated for crappie collected in trap nets from Nolin River Lake during November 2022; 95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{10}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White Crappie | 133 | $100( \pm 0)$ | $72( \pm 8)$ |
| Black Crappie | 108 | $91( \pm 5)$ | $19( \pm 7)$ |

nwd1tn.d22

Table 11. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of crappie collected at Nolin River Lake during November 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5.0-7.9$ in | $8.0-9.9$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |
| Species | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | - | (2) | 96 | $92(1)$ |  |  |
| Black Crappie | 10 | $106(4)$ | 72 | $110(1)$ | 21 | $99(1)$ |
| nwd1tn.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for White Crappie collected at Nolin River Lake in November 2022.

| Year |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| 2021 | 23 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 6 | 5.1 | 9.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 16 | 4.7 | 7.9 | 9.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 9 | 4.0 | 6.7 | 9.0 | 10.6 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 2 | 2.1 | 4.9 | 7.2 | 8.8 | 10.3 |  |  |
| 2016 | 1 | 2.4 | 4.4 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 8.7 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 4.3 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 8.7 |  |
| No. |  | 57 | 34 | 28 | 12 | 3 | 1 |  |
| Smallest |  | 1.9 | 4.4 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 8.7 |  |
| Largest |  | 6.6 | 9.8 | 11.6 | 12.4 | 11.0 | 8.7 |  |
| Std error |  | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.0 |  |  |
| 95\% CI $( \pm)$ |  | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 2.1 |  |  |

[^6]Table 13. Age-frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) per inch class of White Crappie trap netted for 119 net-nights at Nolin River Lake in October-November 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 7 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 13.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 18 |  |  |  |  | 35 | 24.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 13 | 2 |  | 18 | 12.0 | 0.2 | <0.1 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 23 | 21 | 3 |  | 49 | 33.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 20 | 13.0 | 0.2 | <0.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 3.0 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 2.0 | <0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 20 | 39 | 42 | 10 | 1 | 148 |  |  |  |
| (\%) | 5.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 27.0 | 28.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 |  | 100.0 |  |  |

Table 14. Population assessment for White Crappie based on fall trap net sampling at Nolin River Lake from 2001-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | CPUE <br> (excluding age 0) | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Mean length age 2+ at capture | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022* | 1.3 (1) | 0.3 (1) | 0.2 (1) | 1.1 (1) | 11.4 (4) | 0.047 | 4.6 | 8 | Poor* |
| 2019 | 9.7 (3) | 9.3 (4) | 2.0 (3) | 3.5 (3) | 10.9 (4) | 2.600 | 92.6 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2018* | 1.6 | 0.2 | 36.4 | 1.6 | 10.7 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 5.6 (2) | 2.6 (2) | 5.6 (4) | 3.3 (3) | 10.7 (4) | 1.112 | 67.1 | 15 | Good |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 14.0 (3) | 9.5 (4) | 1.5 (2) | 10.4 (4) | 10.2 (3) | 1.140 | 68.2 | 16 | Good |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 6.7 (3) | 4.5 (3) | 1.1 (2) | 3.2 (2) | 10.1 (3) | 1.112 | 67.1 | 13 | Good |
| 2011 | 5.7 (2) | 4.4 (3) | 1.6 (3) | 3.5 (3) | 10.9 (4) | 1.274 | 72.3 | 15 | Good |
| 2010 | 6.7 (3) |  |  | 6.0 (4) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 14.1 (3) | 11.7 (4) | 1.2 (2) | 8.9 (4) | 10.4 (4) | 1.638 | 80.6 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2008 | 6.0 (2) | 3.5 (3) | 2.4 (3) | 4.8 (3) | 10.4 (4) | 0.976 | 62.3 | 15 | Good |
| 2007 | 7.4 (3) | 3.7 (3) | 0.4 (1) | 6.1 (4) | 10.4 (4) | 0.882 | 58.6 | 15 | Good |
| 2006 | 5.9 (2) | 3.2 (2) | 2.0 (3) | 4.4 (3) | 9.7 (3) | 0.876 | 58.3 | 13 | Good |
| 2005 | 8.8 (3) | 3.6 (3) | 1.4 (2) | 7.4 (4) | 9.7 (3) | 0.749 | 52.7 | 15 | Good |
| 2004 | 8.6 (3) | 4.2 (3) | 5.1 (4) | 6.9 (4) | 9.7 (3) | 0.630 | 46.7 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2003 | 13.2 (3) | 8.0 (4) | 2.0 (3) | 8.7 (4) | 9.8 (3) | 1.107 | 66.9 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2002 | 12.0 (3) | 10.0 (4) | 4.3 (4) | 8.8 (4) | 9.5 (2) | 1.571 | 79.2 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2001 | 10.2 (3) | 4.8 (3) | 2.6 (3) | 3.9 (3) | 9.1 (2) | 0.910 | 59.7 | 14 | Good |

*Poor sampling conditions/few fish captured/incomplete data

Table 15. Species composition, length frequency, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 4.0 hrs of electrofishing at Rough River Lake during October 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| North Fork | Largemouth Bass | 12 | 171 | 49 | 19 | 21 | 21 | 14 | 45 | 32 | 25 | 54 | 31 | 22 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 545 | 272.5 | 33.5 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 12 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 25.0 | 10.3 |
| South Fork | Largemouth Bass | 10 | 58 | 72 | 45 | 26 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 43 | 50 | 43 | 34 | 26 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 515 | 257.5 | 78.9 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 6 | 12 | 16 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | 30.0 | 17.3 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 22 | 229 | 121 | 64 | 47 | 47 | 39 | 69 | 75 | 75 | 97 | 65 | 48 | 24 | 12 | 13 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1060 | 265.0 | 39.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 7 | 24 | 18 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 110 | 27.5 | 9.4 |

nwd2lmb.d22

Table 16. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth Bass collected at Rough River Lake during October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | North Fork | 112 | 87 (1) | 107 | 88 (1) | 29 | 92 (2) |
| Largemouth Bass | South Fork | 142 | 89 (1) | 103 | 87 (1) | 33 | 92 (1) |
| Largemouth Bass | Total | 254 | 88 (1) | 210 | 88 (1) | 62 | 92 (1) |

[^7]Table 17. Indicies of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth
Bass collected during fall electrofishing samples at Rough River Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 130.8 | 24.5 | 37.8 | 9.0 |  |  |

Table 18. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) for hybrid striped bass collected in 7 net-nights of sampling at Rough River Lake during October 2022. Previous data included for reference.

| Species | Year | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Hybrid striped bass | 2022 | 21 | 37 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 8 | 54 | 67 | 3 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 245 | 35.0 | 8.0 |
|  | 2020 | 27 | 52 | 8 |  |  |  | 10 | 45 | 56 | 20 | 67 | 63 | 33 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 405 | 36.8 | 4.7 |
|  | 2019 | 8 | 40 | 114 | 78 | 5 |  | 2 | 14 | 32 | 34 | 45 | 21 | 12 | 4 | 6 |  | 5 | 3 |  | 423 | 30.2 | 7.1 |
|  | 2018 | 8 | 38 | 69 | 39 | 11 | 1 | 43 | 132 | 117 | 19 | 10 | 16 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 520 | 52.0 | 11.9 |
|  | 2017 | 17 | 35 | 35 | 80 | 22 |  |  | 2 | 34 | 61 | 16 | 25 | 31 | 12 | 13 | 5 | 3 |  |  | 391 | 32.6 | 3.8 |
|  | 2016 |  | 6 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 11 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 23 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 3 |  | 165 | 27.5 | 13.5 |

Table 19. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of hybrid striped bass collected at Rough River Lake during fall samples 2006-2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0 -11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| 2022 | 44 | 88 (3) | 62 | 85 (1) | 118 | 84 (1) |
| 2020 | 60 | 87 (1) | 55 | 87 (1) | 263 | 83 (1) |
| 2019 | 225 | 95 (1) | 16 | 87 (1) | 162 | 83 (1) |
| 2018 | 156 | 93 (1) | 176 | 87 (1) | 179 | 86 (1) |
| 2017 | 172 | 93 (1) | 2 | 88 (5) | 201 | 86 (1) |
| 2016 | 31 | 90 (2) | 8 | 86 (7) | 126 | 81 (1) |
| 2014 | 56 | 95 (1) | 51 | 88 (1) | 142 | 82 (1) |
| 2012 | 3 | 88 (2) | 70 | 81 (1) | 170 | 82 (1) |
| 2010 | 14 | 83 (2) | 124 | 90 (6) | 223 | 83 (1) |
| 2008 | 38 | 91 (1) | 51 | 78 (1) | 149 | 85 (4) |
| 2006 | 21 | 96 (2) | 65 | 89 (1) | 108 | 81 (1) |

Table 20. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for hybrid striped bass collected at Rough River Lake in October 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2021 | 78 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 10 | 9.3 | 15.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 18 | 11.2 | 15.6 | 17.7 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 8 | 10.9 | 16.3 | 18.0 | 19.1 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 4 | 10.4 | 15.9 | 17.9 | 18.9 | 19.8 |  |  |
| 2015 | 1 | 12.6 | 17.4 | 19.4 | 20.6 | 21.4 | 22.6 | 23.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 10.2 | 15.7 | 17.9 | 19.1 | 20.1 | 22.6 | 23.1 |
| No. |  | 119 | 41 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Smallest |  | 6.9 | 14.1 | 16.0 | 16.7 | 17.9 | 22.6 | 23.1 |
| Largest |  | 13.0 | 17.4 | 19.4 | 20.8 | 21.4 | 22.6 | 23.1 |
| SE | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 |  |  |  |
| 95\% Cl $( \pm)$ |  | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.2 |  |  |
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Table 21. Age-frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) per inch class of hybrid striped bass collected in 7 net-nights of sampling at Rough River Lake during October 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 21 | 37 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 | 26.5 | 9.3 | 2.9 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 54 | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 129 | 52.7 | 18.4 | 4.4 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 4.5 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 12 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 10.2 | 3.6 | 0.8 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 9 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 0.4 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 5 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total | 21 | 37 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 54 | 67 | 3 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 245 |  |  |  |
| (\%) | 8.6 | 15.1 | 2.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 22.0 | 27.3 | 1.2 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 4.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |  | 100.0 |  |  |

nwd2gn.d22, nwd2hsba.d22

Table 22. Population assessment for hybrid striped bass based on fall gill net sampling at Rough River Lake from 1999-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

|  | CPUE <br> (excluding <br> age 0) | Mean length <br> age 2+ <br> at capture | CPUE <br> $\geq 15.0$ in | CPUE <br> age 1 | Instantaneous <br> mortality <br> $(\mathrm{z})$ | Annual <br> mortality <br> $($ A $) \%$ | Total <br> score | Assessment <br> rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 2022 | $25.7(4)$ | $17.2(2)$ | $16.9(4)$ | $18.4(4)$ | 0.529 | 41.1 | 14 |
| 2020 | $28.9(4)$ | $17.7(3)$ | $23.9(4)$ | $29.1(4)$ | 0.603 | 45.3 | 15 | Excellent |
| 2019 | $12.7(3)$ | $17.2(2)$ | $11.6(3)$ | $3.2(2)$ | 0.882 | 58.6 | 10 | Excellent |
| 2018 | $35.5(4)$ | $18.2(3)$ | $17.9(4)$ | $31.1(4)$ | 1.660 | 81.0 | 15 | Excellent |
| 2017 | $16.8(3)$ | $18.5(3)$ | $16.7(4)$ | $8.2(4)$ | 0.616 | 46.0 | 14 | Excellent |
| 2016 | $22.3(3)$ | $17.6(3)$ | $21.0(4)$ | $4.8(3)$ | 0.525 | 40.8 | 13 | Good |
| 2014 | $43.8(4)$ | $16.8(2)$ | $32.6(4)$ | $14.2(4)$ | 0.453 | 36.4 | 14 | Excellent |
| 2012 | $35.1(4)$ | $16.7(2)$ | $25.1(4)$ | $11.6(4)$ | 0.704 | 50.5 | 14 | Excellent |
| 2010 | $60.2(4)$ | $16.8(2)$ | $34.5(4)$ | $28.9(4)$ | 0.528 | 41.0 | 14 | Excellent |
| 2008 | $25.1(4)$ | $16.3(1)$ | $19.3(4)$ | $6.3(3)$ | 0.544 | 42.0 | 12 | Good |
| 2006 | $23.7(4)$ | $16.9(2)$ | $14.5(4)$ | $8.9(4)$ | 0.447 | 36.0 | 14 | Excellent |
| 2003 | $33.9(4)$ | $16.5(2)$ | $30.9(4)$ | $3.1(2)$ | 0.679 | 49.3 | 12 | Good |
| 2001 | $29.9(4)$ | $15.9(1)$ | $16.8(4)$ | $13.1(4)$ | 0.630 | 46.8 | 13 | Good |
| 1999 | $26.4(4)$ | $16.5(2)$ | $18.5(4)$ | $8.1(4)$ | 0.987 | 62.7 | 14 | Excellent |

Table 23. Species composition, length frequency, and CPUE (fish/nn) for catfish collected in 7 net-nights of gill net sampling at Rough River Lake during October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 86 | 12.3 | 3.71 |
| Flathead Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 1.0 | 0.38 |

nwd2gn.d22
Table 24. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each
length group of Channel Catfish collected at Rough River Lake
during samples 2006-2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $11.0-15.9$ in |  |  |  |  |  |  | $16.0-23.9$ in |  | $\geq 24.0$ in |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 13 | $77(2)$ | 53 | $78(1)$ | 18 | $88(3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 18 | $80(2)$ | 37 | $91(5)$ | 4 | $95(8)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 9 | $87(4)$ | 66 | $88(1)$ | 8 | $92(3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 4 | $78(4)$ | 64 | $85(1)$ | 6 | $94(5)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 12 | $83(3)$ | 41 | $90(1)$ | 2 | $103(3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 8 | $86(3)$ | 104 | $95(1)$ | 13 | $93(2)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 4 | $79(1)$ | 12 | $91(3)$ | 3 | $75(3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 2 | $82(1)$ | 1 | $88(0)$ | 2 | $93(7)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 14 | $76(1)$ | 19 | $79(2)$ | 14 | $86(3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 15 | $82(1)$ | 31 | $87(2)$ | 2 | $94(6)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 18 | $89(2)$ | 23 | $96(1)$ | 0 | - |  |  |  |  |
| nwd2gn.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 25. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 2.5 hours of 30 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Lake Malone in April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 7 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 16 | 17 | 25 | 31 | 31 | 25 | 37 | 32 | 36 | 36 | 28 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 5 | 386 | 154.4 | 18.1 |

Table 26. PSD and RSD $_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass collected in spring electrofishing samples at NWFD state-owned lakes 2021-2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Lake | Species | Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Malone | Largemouth Bass | 2022 | 343 | $70( \pm 5)$ | $42( \pm 5)$ |
|  |  | 2021 | 339 | $69( \pm 5)$ | $33( \pm 5)$ |
| Mauzy | Largemouth Bass | 2022 | 147 | $42( \pm 8)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
|  |  | 2021 | 145 | $15( \pm 6)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| Carpenter | Largemouth Bass | 2022 | 117 | $74( \pm 8)$ | $40( \pm 9)$ |
|  |  | 2021 | 103 | $51( \pm 9)$ | $37( \pm 9)$ |
| New Kingfisher | Largemouth Bass | 2022 | 85 | $52( \pm 11)$ | $29( \pm 10)$ |
|  |  | 2021 | 50 | $44( \pm 14)$ | $36( \pm 13)$ |
| Old Kingfisher | Largemouth Bass | 2022 | 25 | $48( \pm 20)$ | $32( \pm 19)$ |
|  |  | 2021 | 29 | $28( \pm 17)$ | $14( \pm 13)$ |
| Washburn | Largemouth Bass | 2022 | 63 | $16( \pm 9)$ | - |
|  |  | 2021 | 102 | $7( \pm 2)$ | $5( \pm 4)$ |
| nwd3psd.d22 | nwd3psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |
| nwd4psd.d22 | nwd4psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |
| nwd5psd.d25 | nwd5psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |
| nwd6psd.d22 | nwd6psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |
| nwd7psd.d22 | nwd7psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |
| nwd8psd.d22 | nwd8psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |

Table 27. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Malone 19992022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 17.2 | 4.5 | 41.6 | 7.1 | 37.6 | 4.8 | 58.0 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 154.4 | 18.1 |
| 2021 | 12.8 | 2.3 | 42.0 | 11.7 | 49.2 | 4.8 | 44.4 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 148.4 | 16.3 |
| 2018 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 37.6 | 7.2 | 60.4 | 7.2 | 59.2 | 7.8 | 10.8 | 2.6 | 162.8 | 17.8 |
| 2017 | 14.0 | 3.2 | 32.0 | 6.8 | 44.8 | 8.1 | 37.2 | 9.2 | 5.6 | 1.3 | 128.0 | 16.8 |
| 2015 | 18.8 | 2.7 | 81.6 | 7.7 | 60.8 | 5.3 | 42.8 | 7.2 | 8.4 | 1.2 | 204.0 | 17.2 |
| 2014 | 9.6 | 1.3 | 44.4 | 9.6 | 23.2 | 4.6 | 29.8 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 107.0 | 16.7 |
| 2012 | 46.4 | 18.4 | 123.6 | 18.1 | 48.8 | 10.9 | 48.8 | 10.3 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 267.6 | 44.5 |
| 2011 | 45.6 | 10.3 | 56.0 | 7.3 | 35.2 | 7.7 | 34.4 | 6.8 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 171.2 | 26.8 |
| 2010 | 37.2 | 8.8 | 49.6 | 5.0 | 49.6 | 5.4 | 62.0 | 7.1 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 198.4 | 16.3 |
| 2009 | 10.0 | 1.4 | 29.6 | 4.4 | 51.2 | 7.6 | 37.2 | 3.6 | 5.6 | 0.4 | 128.0 | 11.7 |
| 2008 | 18.8 | 6.5 | 78.8 | 6.6 | 77.2 | 5.0 | 43.6 | 8.1 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 218.4 | 12.4 |
| 2007 | 29.2 | 4.0 | 80.4 | 10.4 | 30.8 | 2.0 | 37.6 | 10.3 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 178.0 | 17.8 |
| 2006 | 31.6 | 3.7 | 81.6 | 14.3 | 22.4 | 2.1 | 28.0 | 5.9 | 5.2 | 1.6 | 163.6 | 19.8 |
| 2005 | 32.4 | 4.8 | 69.2 | 14.3 | 32.0 | 8.7 | 53.6 | 5.7 | 8.4 | 1.2 | 187.2 | 30.1 |
| 2004 | 28.4 | 3.9 | 53.6 | 5.7 | 26.4 | 4.2 | 53.2 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 161.6 | 12.8 |
| 2003 | 57.0 | 3.3 | 76.5 | 6.8 | 35.0 | 5.0 | 57.5 | 4.9 | 9.5 | 2.8 | 226.0 | 12.1 |
| $2002{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8.6 | 3.3 | 43.4 | 5.0 | 43.4 | 8.5 | 41.7 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 3.0 | 137.1 | 17.5 |
| $2001{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 18.0 | 8.1 | 66.0 | 12.0 | 50.0 | 8.0 | 31.3 | 6.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 165.3 | 15.6 |
| $2000^{\text {a }}$ | 13.3 | 3.4 | 46.0 | 4.2 | 51.3 | 7.8 | 24.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 134.7 | 14.5 |
| $1999{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{d}$ |  | 48.7 | 9.8 | 61.3 | 7.0 | 23.3 | 4.9 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 133.3 | 12.7 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Nocturnal sample
nwd3psd.d22

Table 28. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Lake Malone from 2001-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age-3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality $\text { (A) } \%$ | Total <br> score | Assessment $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  | 11.6 (2) | 37.6 (3) | 58.0 (4) | 7.2 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | G - E |
| 2021 | 12.8 (4)* | 9.6 (2) | 49.2 (4) | 44.4 (4) | 2.0 (3) | 0.398 | 32.8 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2018 |  | 5.6 (1) | 60.4 (4) | 59.2 (4) | 10.8 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | G-E |
| 2017 |  | 12.8 (2) | 44.8 (4) | 37.2 (4) | 5.6 (4) |  |  | $\geq 15$ | G-E |
| 2015 | 11.4 (3)* | 10.3 (2) | 60.8 (4) | 42.8 (4) | 8.4 (4) |  |  | $\geq 16$ | G-E |
| 2014 |  | 7.8 (2) | 23.2 (2) | 29.8 (4) | 5.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 13$ | F-G |
| 2012 |  | 31.2 (3) | 48.8 (4) | 48.8 (4) | 2.8 (3) |  |  | $\geq 15$ | G-E |
| 2011 |  | 41.2 (3) | 35.2 (3) | 34.4 (4) | 4.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 15$ | G-E |
| 2010 | 10.4 (2) | 15.1 (2) | 49.6 (4) | 62.0 (4) | 3.6 (3) | 0.397 | 32.7 | 15 | Good |
| 2009 | 10.3 (2) | 8.8 (2) | 51.2 (4) | 37.2 (4) | 5.6 (4) | 0.293 | 25.4 | 16 | Good |
| 2008 | 10.3 (2) | 16.4 (2) | 77.2 (4) | 43.6 (4) | 6.4 (4) | 0.357 | 30.0 | 16 | Good |
| 2007 | 10.3 (2) | 29.2 (3) | 30.8 (3) | 37.6 (4) | 3.6 (3) | 0.330 | 28.1 | 15 | Good |
| 2006 | 11.5 (4) | 20.2 (2) | 22.4 (2) | 28.0 (4) | 5.2 (4) | 0.526 | 40.9 | 16 | Good |
| 2005 | 11.5 (4) | 19.0 (2) | 32.0 (3) | 53.6 (4) | 8.4 (4) | 0.387 | 32.0 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2004 | 11.5 (4) | 19.0 (2) | 26.4 (3) | 53.2 (4) | 6.0 (4) | 0.365 | 31.1 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2003 | 11.5 (4) | 35.0 (3) | 35.0 (3) | 48.0 (4) | 8.5 (4) | 0.416 | 34.1 | 18 | Excellent |
| 2002 | 11.5 (4) | 6.0 (1) | 43.4 (3) | 41.7 (4) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2001 | 12.9 (4) | 14.0 (2) | 50.0 (4) | 31.3 (4) | 0.7 (2) |  |  | 16 | Good |

Table 29. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 2.5 hours of 30 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Lake Malone in October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 18 | 79 | 64 | 25 | 36 | 57 | 33 | 36 | 37 | 29 | 22 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 509 | 203.6 | 28.0 |

Table 30. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth Bass collected in fall electrofishing samples at NWFD state-owned lakes during 2021-2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Lake | Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr |
| Malone | 2022 | 162 | 86 (1) | 68 | 88 (2) | 56 | 87 (1) |
|  | 2021 | 108 | 87 (1) | 80 | 87 (1) | 68 | 90 (1) |
| Mauzy | 2022 | 43 | 86 (1) | 35 | 88 (1) | 5 | 92 (2) |
|  | 2021 | 55 | 84 (1) | 21 | 85 (1) | 1 | 88 (-) |
| Carpenter | 2022 | 40 | 89 (1) | 15 | 89 (2) | 29 | 96 (2) |
|  | 2021 | 49 | 86 (1) | 33 | 88 (1) | 42 | 94 (1) |
| New Kingfisher | 2022 | 34 | 92 (1) | 25 | 89 (1) | 10 | 101 (3) |
|  | 2021 | 26 | 88 (1) | 14 | 92 (2) | 19 | 97 (2) |
| Old Kingfisher | 2022 | 35 | 92 (2) | 9 | 95 (2) | 4 | 93 (12) |
|  | 2021 | 10 | 88 (2) | 1 | 85 (-) | 1 | 109 (-) |
| Washburn | 2022 | 35 | 85 (3) | - | - | 1 | 96 (-) |
|  | 2021 | 58 | 80 (1) | 4 | 91 (4) | - | ( |
| nwd3lmb.d22 | nd3lmb.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nwd4lmb.d22 | nd4lmb.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nwd51mb.d22 | nd5Imb.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nwd6lmb.d22 | nd6lmb.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nwd71mb.d22 | nd7lmb.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| nwd81mb.d22 | nd8lmb.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 31. Indicies of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected during fall electrofishing samples at Lake Malone.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 5.0 | 0.1 | 74.4 | 13.2 | 35.6 | 5.2 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.6 | 2.9 |
| 2020 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.6 | 2.2 |
| nwd31mb. 22 <br> nwd3psd.d22 <br> nwd3psd.d21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 32. Fishery statistics derived from a roving creel survey at Lake Malone (767 a) during 01 April - 31 October 2022, 18 April - 31 October 2011, and 16 March - 30 October 2006.

| Fishing tripsNo. of fishing trips (per acre) | 2022 |  | 2011 |  | 2006 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 15,136 | (18.32) | 13,439 | (16.27) | 18,116 | (21.93) |
| Fishing pressure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total man-hours (SE) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 46,490 | (925.86) | 64,130 | $(1,390.95)$ | 80,141 | $(1,113)$ |
| Man-hours/acre | 56.28 |  | 77.6 |  | 97.02 |  |
| Catch/harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of fish caught (SE) | 74,461 | $(7,397.82)$ | 70,121 | $(5,258.62)$ | 109,937 | $(6,388)$ |
| No. of fish harvested (SE) | 26,839 | $(3,186.16)$ | 35,838 | $(3,506.41)$ | 57,801 | $(4,073)$ |
| Lbs. of fish harvested | 8,285 |  | 16,984 |  | 20,674 |  |
| Harvest rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fish/hour | 0.61 |  | 0.53 |  | 0.73 |  |
| Lb/hour | 0.4 |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |
| Fish/acre | 32.49 |  | 43.39 |  | 69.98 |  |
| Lb/acre | 10.03 |  | 20.56 |  | 25.03 |  |
| Catch rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fish/hour | 1.67 |  | 1.07 |  | 1.38 |  |
| Fish/acre | 90.15 |  | 84.49 |  | 133.1 |  |
| Miscellaneous characteristics (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 87.2\% |  | 86.3\% |  | 81.6\% |  |
| Female | 12.8\% |  | 13.7\% |  | 18.5\% |  |
| Resident | 89.5\% |  | 95.6\% |  | 95.3\% |  |
| Non-resident | 10.5\% |  | 4.4\% |  | 4.7\% |  |
| Method (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Still fishing | 30.2\% |  | 48.2\% |  | 57.8\% |  |
| Casting | 67.7\% |  | 49.3\% |  | 41.4\% |  |
| Fly fishing | 0.1\% |  | 0.6\% |  | 0.3\% |  |
| Trolling | 0.6\% |  | 0.6\% |  | 0.4\% |  |
| Trotline | 1.0\% |  | 0.4\% |  |  |  |
| Jugging | 0.4\% |  | 0.4\% |  |  |  |
| Spider Rig |  |  | 0.4\% |  |  |  |
| Mode (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boat | 89.6\% |  | 87.1\% |  | 85.2\% |  |
| Bank | 4.4\% |  | 6.7\% |  | 6.4\% |  |
| Dock | 3.8\% |  | 6.2\% |  | 8.4\% |  |
| Kayak | 2.1\% |  |  |  |  |  |

t < 0.5\%
${ }^{\text {a }}$ SE $=$ standard error

Table 33. Fish harvest statistics derived from a roving creel survey at Lake Malone (767 a) during 01 April - 31 October 2022.

|  | Bullhead | Channel Cattish | Green Sunfish | Longear Sunfish | Warmouth | Redear <br> Sunfish | Bluegill | $\begin{gathered} \text { Largemouth } \\ \text { bass } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | White Crappie | Black Crappie | $\begin{gathered} \text { Black bass } \\ \text { Group } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Catfish Group | Panfish Group | Crappie Group | Anything Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. caught | 122 | 979 | 38 | 11 | 72 | 491 | 36,745 | 18,675 | 10,530 | 6,710 | 18,675 | 1,102 | 37,427 | 17,239 |  |
| (per acre) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 23 | 13 | 8 | 23 | 1 | 45 | 21 |  |
| No. harvested | 11 | 770 |  | 11 | 12 | 441 | 16,390 | 808 | 5,050 | 3,334 | 808 | 781 | 16,865 | 8,385 |  |
| (per acre) | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 10 |  |
| \% of total no. harvested | 0.04 | 2.87 |  | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.64 | 61.07 | 3.01 | 18.82 | 12.42 | 3.01 | 2.91 | 62.84 | 31.24 |  |
| Lb harvested | 12.40 | 1,296.70 |  | 2.10 | 1.80 | 242.50 | 2,921.10 | 736.20 | 1,711.10 | 1,357.60 | 736.20 | 1,309.10 | 3,171.40 | 3,068.70 |  |
| (per acre) | 0.02 | 1.57 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 3.54 | 0.89 | 2.07 | 1.64 | 0.89 | 1.58 | 3.84 | 3.72 |  |
| \% of total lb harvested | 0.15 | 15.65 |  | 0.03 | 0.02 | 2.93 | 35.26 | 8.89 | 20.65 | 16.39 | 8.89 | 15.80 | 38.28 | 37.04 |  |
| Mean length (in) | 15.00 | 17.76 |  | 7.00 | 6.00 | 8.06 | 6.13 | 12.33 | 9.23 | 9.07 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean w eight (lb) | 1.10 | 1.82 |  | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.39 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 0.35 | 0.38 |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of fishing trips for that species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,566 | 422 | 2,366 | 1,890 | 1,892 |
| \% of all trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.59 | 2.79 | 15.63 | 12.48 .50 | 12.50 |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $26,310.24$ 31.85 | $1,296.15$ 1.57 | $7,267.36$ 8.80 | $5,804.25$ 7.03 | $5,811.81$ 7.04 |
| No. harvested fishing for that species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 690 | 546 | 15,534 | 7,886 |  |
| Lb harvested fishing for that species No./hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 628.80 | 992.60 | 2,950.10 | 2,882.40 |  |
| harvested fishing for that species \% success |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 | 0.45 | 2.48 | 1.14 |  |
| fishing for that species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.23 | 34.62 | 61.35 | 56.41 | 17.70 |

Table 34. Length distribution for each species of fish harvested or released at Lake Malone (767 a) during 01 April - 31 October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 30 |
| Bluegill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  | 208 | 907 | 6,926 | 6,509 | 1,569 | 270 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  | 289 | 9,122 | 7,703 | 2,287 | 741 | 213 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Redear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 61 | 257 | 49 |  | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  |  | 37 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 385 | 192 |  |  |  | 51 | 103 | 26 | 26 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,430 | 281 | 2,673 | 2,713 | 3,261 | 3,074 | 1,684 | 895 | 842 | 254 | 561 | 67 | 80 | 27 | 13 | 12 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  | 44 | 117 | 910 | 2,628 | 866 | 323 | 147 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  |  | 774 | 2,978 | 1,251 | 462 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  | 14 | 184 | 795 | 1,107 | 922 | 184 | 114 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  |  | 1,614 | 1,199 | 444 | 118 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Channel catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 106 | 40 | 80 | 66 | 40 | 172 | 93 | 40 | 13 | 13 |  | 40 | 13 | 13 |
| Released |  |  |  |  | 13 | 13 | 39 |  | 79 |  |  | 13 | 26 |  |  |  | 13 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bullhead |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |  | 49 |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green sunfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Longear sunfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Warmouth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Released |  |  | 30 |  | 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 35. Monthly black bass angling success at Lake Malone (767 a) during the 01 April - 31 October, 2022 creel survey period; data does not include bass $<8.0$ in that were caught and released.

| Month | Total no. of bass caught | Total no. of bass harvested | No. of black bass fishing trips | Hours fished by bass anglers | Bass caught by bass anglers | Bass caught/hour by bass anglers | Bass harvested by bass anglers | Bass harvested/ hour by bass anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr | 2,638 | 47 | 1,649 | 5,065 | 2,261 | 0.45 | 47 | 0.01 |
| May | 2,189 | 168 | 1,024 | 3,144 | 2,068 | 0.64 | 156 | 0.05 |
| Jun | 3,550 | 164 | 1,186 | 3,644 | 3,400 | 0.84 | 76 | 0.02 |
| Jul | 2,315 | 104 | 1,154 | 3,544 | 2,072 | 0.62 | 8 | 0.03 |
| Aug | 3,537 | 207 | 1,202 | 3,691 | 3,503 | 0.97 | 207 | 0.06 |
| Sep | 2,843 | 56 | 1,387 | 4,260 | 2,719 | 0.62 | 56 | 0.01 |
| Oct | 1,604 | 62 | 964 | 2,962 | 1,567 | 0.50 | 62 | 0.02 |
| Total | 18,675 | 808 | 8,566 | 26,310 | 17,590 | 0.68 | 690 | 0.03 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  | 0.66 |  | 0.03 |

Table 36. Black bass catch and harvest statistics derived from a creel survey at Lake Malone (767 a) during 01 April-31 October, 2022.


Table 37. Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) and dissolved oxygen (ppm) profile conducted at Lake Malone 08 June 2022.

|  | Location |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Site 1 | $1: 02 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |
| Depth (ft) | Temp | DO |  |
| Surface | 82.7 | 9.09 |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 82.4 | 9.15 |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 82.3 | 9.15 |  |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 82.2 | 9.14 |  |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 81.7 | 8.77 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 74.3 | 5.30 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 70.1 | 0.85 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 64.7 | 0.24 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 60.4 | 0.09 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 57.6 | 0.03 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 55.4 | 0.01 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ |  | 28 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 38. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hr of 15 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Mauzy Lake in April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 30 | 41 | 35 | 20 | 7 |  | 1 | 183 | 183.0 | 45.8 |

Table 39. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Mauzy Lake 20032022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 36.0 | 9.4 | 84.0 | 23.7 | 62.0 | 13.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 183.0 | 45.8 |
| 2021 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 123.0 | 16.4 | 20.0 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 169.0 | 17.5 |
| 2020 | 96.0 | 18.0 | 413.0 | 59.5 | 49.0 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 564.0 | 79.4 |
| 2018 | 35.0 | 2.5 | 162.0 | 10.4 | 18.0 | 1.2 | 19.0 | 3.0 | 8.0 | 3.3 | 234.0 | 11.5 |
| 2017 | 110.7 | 17.3 | 212.0 | 14.0 | 40.0 | 4.6 | 12.0 | 2.3 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 374.7 | 34.7 |
| 2015 | 40.0 | 12.1 | 133.0 | 21.8 | 20.0 | 7.8 | 15.0 | 1.9 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 208.0 | 37.1 |
| 2014 | 65.0 | 7.2 | 110.0 | 3.5 | 21.0 | 3.4 | 35.0 | 5.7 | 13.0 | 6.8 | 231.0 | 8.4 |
| 2013 | 80.0 | 24.3 | 98.7 | 19.6 | 13.3 | 4.8 | 34.7 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 226.7 | 25.3 |
| 2012 | 96.0 | 16.5 | 42.0 | 2.6 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 40.0 | 9.1 | 15.0 | 3.4 | 198.0 | 12.8 |
| 2011 | 48.0 | 11.6 | 21.3 | 3.5 | 58.7 | 2.7 | 40.0 | 4.6 | 10.7 | 3.5 | 168.0 | 8.0 |
| 2010 | 26.7 | 3.5 | 78.7 | 13.1 | 21.3 | 2.7 | 44.0 | 10.1 | 17.3 | 8.1 | 170.7 | 26.7 |
| $2009{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 104.0 | 31.4 | 147.0 | 16.3 | 21.0 | 5.0 | 83.0 | 9.3 | 7.0 | 1.9 | 355.0 | 48.2 |
| 2007 | 46.0 | 5.3 | 49.0 | 12.3 | 40.0 | 2.8 | 64.0 | 17.5 | 0.0 | - | 199.0 | 31.0 |
| 2006 | 68.0 | 14.1 | 40.0 | 4.0 | 24.0 | 4.0 | 60.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | - | 192.0 | 21.2 |
| 2005 | 52.0 | 8.6 | 25.0 | 6.6 | 147.0 | 11.5 | 21.0 | 7.9 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 245.0 | 22.3 |
| 2004 | 20.0 | 9.2 | 132.0 | 2.3 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | - | 164.0 | 10.6 |
| $2003{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 98.6 | 18.7 | 163.2 | 31.9 | 73.6 | 6.1 | 20.8 | 6.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 356.3 | 58.7 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lake drawn down for repairs in 2009
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Lake renovated in 2003
nwd4psd.d22

Table 40. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour of 15-minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Mauzy Lake in October 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 2 | 36 | 20 | 3 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 158 | 158 | 18.7 |

Table 41. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for Largemouth Bass collected at Mauzy Lake in October 2022.

| Largemouth Bass collected at Mauzy Lake in October 2022. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| 2022 | 31 | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 8 | 5.8 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 13 | 5.7 | 8.8 | 11.2 |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 15 | 5.8 | 9.1 | 10.5 | 12.2 |  |  |
| 2018 | 8 | 5.4 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 11.6 | 12.7 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 5.8 | 9.1 | 10.8 | 12.0 | 12.7 |  |
| No. |  | 75 | 44 | 36 | 23 | 8 |  |
| Smallest |  | 4.1 | 7.4 | 9.4 | 10.4 | 11.4 |  |
| Largest |  | 4.9 | 11.4 | 12.5 | 14.1 | 15.1 |  |
| SE | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |  |  |
| $95 \% ~ C I ~$ | $( \pm)$ |  | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 |  |

nwd41mba.d22

Table 42. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Mauzy Lake from 2003-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 11.4 (3) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 34.0 (2) | 62.0 (4) | 1.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2021 |  | 10.0 (2) | 20.0 (2) | 2.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | Poor |
| 2020 |  | 71.0 (4) | 49.0 (4) | 6.0 (2) | 3.0 (3) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | Good |
| 2018 | $9.8(1)^{\text {b }}$ | 27.0 (2) | 18.0 (1) | 19.0 (3) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2017 |  | 78.7 (4) | 40.0 (3) | 12.0 (2) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | G - E |
| 2015 | $10.2(2)^{\text {b }}$ |  | 20.0 (2) | 15.0 (2) | 5.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 13$ | Good |
| 2014 |  | 40.0 (2) | 21.0 (2) | 35.0 (4) | 13.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 13$ | Good |
| 2013 |  | 63.1 (3) | 13.3 (1) | 34.7 (4) | 4.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 13$ | Good |
| 2012 | 13.6 (4) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 74.0 (3) | 20.0 (2) | 40.0 (4) | 15.0 (4) | 0.965 | 61.9 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2011 |  | 61.3 (3) | 56.7 (4) | 40.0 (4) | 10.7 (4) |  |  | $\geq 16$ | G - E |
| 2010 |  |  | 21.3 (2) | 44.0 (4) | 17.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 11$ | F -G |
| 2009* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 12.2 (4) | 99.0 (4) | 21.0 (2) | 83.0 (4) | 7.0 (4) | 0.466 | 37.3 | 18 | Excellent |
| 2007 | 12.2 (4) | 21.0 (2) | 40.0 (3) | 64.0 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 0.374 | 31.2 | 13 | Good |
| 2006 | 10.3 (2) | 24.0 (2) | 24.0 (2) | 60.0 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 0.755 | 53.0 | 10 | Fair |
| 2005 | 10.3 (2) | 34.0 (2) | 147.0 (4) | 21.0 (3) | 4.0 (4) |  |  | 15 | Good |
| 2004 | 10.3 (2) | 2.7 (1) | 5.3 (1) | 6.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 0.884 | 58.7 | 6 | Poor |
| 2003* | 10.3 (2) | 86.8 (4) | 73.6 (4) | 20.8 (3) | 2.8 (3) |  |  | 16 | Good |

[^8]* Lake renovated in 2003, drawn down for repairs in 2009

Table 43. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected during 0.625 hours of electrofishing at Mauzy Lake in May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 1 | 112 | 142 | 52 | 36 | 22 | 5 |  |  | 370 | 592.0 | 81.8 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 2 | 44 | 79 | 53 | 59 | 44 | 14 | 1 | 296 | 473.6 | 115.2 |

nwd4bg.d22

Table 44. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected at Mauzy Lake 2000-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | < 3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 180.8 | 50.0 | 368.0 | 36.0 | 43.2 | 5.4 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 592.0 | 81.8 |
| 2019 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 97.3 | 18.9 | 45.3 | 14.6 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 158.7 | 26.4 |
| 2018 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 52.6 | 13.3 | 74.3 | 19.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 130.3 | 27.8 |
| 2017 | 13.3 | 7.9 | 197.3 | 24.4 | 37.3 | 9.61 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 248.0 | 30.8 |
| 2015 | 17.3 | 12.1 | 165.3 | 27.1 | 44.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 226.7 | 31.2 |
| 2014 | 10.3 | 2.3 | 253.7 | 55.6 | 104.0 | 21.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 368.0 | 69.1 |
| 2013 | 91.2 | 21.1 | 417.6 | 54.0 | 73.6 | 11.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 582.4 | 60.9 |
| 2012 | 23.0 | 7.8 | 553.0 | 108.5 | 55.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 631.0 | 126.7 |
| 2011 | 182.4 | 72.9 | 726.4 | 144.1 | 216.0 | 51.4 | 121.6 | 43.3 | 0.0 |  | 1246.4 | 195.0 |
| 2010 | 238.4 | 76.5 | 280.0 | 41.0 | 97.6 | 34.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 616.0 | 74.4 |
| $2009{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2008{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 101.3 | 11.1 | 621.3 | 39.6 | 38.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 761.3 | 44.5 |
| 2006 | 96.0 | 27.9 | 614.0 | 137.7 | 10.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 720.0 | 163.4 |
| 2005 | 289.7 | 45.5 | 596.2 | 101.3 | 14.1 | 5.8 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 900.0 | 86.6 |
| 2004 | 101.1 | 18.0 | 84.6 | 17.5 | 64.8 | 12.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 |  | 251.7 | 36.1 |
| $2003{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 9.3 | 3.5 | 94.7 | 19.6 | 125.3 | 29.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 230.7 | 48.0 |
| 2001 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 65.3 | 16.2 | 137.3 | 27.9 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 209.3 | 40.7 |
| 2000 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 52.0 | 4.0 | 73.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 130.7 | 10.9 |

[^9]Table 45. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Redear Sunfish collected at Mauzy Lake 2007-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | < 3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 281.6 | 61.0 | 164.8 | 59.1 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 |  | 473.6 | 115.2 |
| 2019 | 0.0 |  | 206.7 | 20.7 | 208.0 | 27.3 | 16.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 |  | 430.7 | 43.5 |
| 2018 | 0.0 |  | 41.1 | 10.8 | 258.3 | 39.2 | 78.9 | 20.3 | 0.0 |  | 378.3 | 52.5 |
| 2017 | 0.0 |  | 109.3 | 22.9 | 304.0 | 50.6 | 37.3 | 16.2 | 0.0 |  | 450.7 | 54.4 |
| 2015 | 0.0 |  | 140.0 | 17.4 | 254.7 | 53.9 | 18.7 | 7.4 | 0.0 |  | 413.3 | 59.5 |
| 2014 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 112.0 | 19.7 | 208.0 | 26.1 | 27.4 | 6.0 | 0.0 |  | 348.6 | 33.1 |
| 2013 | 0.0 |  | 72.0 | 11.0 | 161.6 | 26.0 | 65.6 | 15.5 | 0.0 |  | 299.2 | 40.8 |
| 2012 | 0.0 |  | 107.0 | 13.7 | 39.0 | 7.6 | 33.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 |  | 179.0 | 21.9 |
| 2011 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 8.0 | 6.2 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 35.2 | 26.4 | 0.0 |  | 78.4 | 65.3 |
| 2010 | 0.0 |  | 16.0 | 10.1 | 240.0 | 48.3 |  | 7.3 | 0.0 |  | 270.4 | 61.0 |
| $2009{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2008{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 41.3 | 13.1 | 14.7 | 3.8 | 6.7 | 5.2 | 0.0 |  | 65.3 | 12.6 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lake drawn down for repairs in 2008-2009 nwd4bg.d22

Table 46. PSD and RSD values obtained for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in spring electrofishing samples at NWFD state-owned lakes during 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Lake | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $^{\text {a }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mauzy | Bluegill | 257 | $11( \pm 4)$ | - |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 250 | $24( \pm 5)$ | - |
| Carpenter | Bluegill | 548 | $37( \pm 4)$ | - |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 131 | $61( \pm 8)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
| New Kingfisher | Bluegill |  |  |  |
|  | Redear Sunfish | - | $32( \pm 6)$ | - |
|  |  |  | - | - |
| Old Kingfisher | Bluegill | 330 | $38( \pm 5)$ | - |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 6 | - | - |
| Washburn | Bluegill | 147 | $19( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
|  | Redear Sunfish | 50 | $60( \pm 14)$ | $8( \pm 7)$ |

[^10]Table 47. Population assessment for Bluegill based on spring electrofishing at Mauzy Lake from 2001-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 2 at capture | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years to } \\ 6.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 6.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ```Instantaneous mortality (z)``` | Annual mortality $(\mathrm{A}) \%$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  |  | 43.2 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 5$ | P - F |
| 2019 |  |  | 45.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 5$ | P - F |
| 2018 | 3.1 (1)* | $\geq 5$ (1) | 74.3 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 5 | Poor |
| 2017 |  |  | 37.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 5$ | P - F |
| 2015 | 3.4 (1) | $\geq 5$ (1) | 44.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 5 | Poor |
| 2014 |  |  | 104.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2013 |  |  | 73.6 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | P-F |
| 2012 | 4.0 (2) | 4-4+ (2) | 55.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 0.884 | 58.7 | 7 | Fair |
| 2011 |  |  | 337.6 (4) | 121.6 (4) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | Good |
| 2010 |  |  | 97.6 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | P - F |
| $2009^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2008{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 3.3 (1) | 4-4+ (2) | 38.7 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 0.642 | 35.8 | 6 | Poor |
| 2006 | 3.7 (1) | 4-4+ (2) | 10.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.755 | 53.0 | 5 | Poor |
| 2005 | 4.3 (3) | 2-2+ (4) | 14.1 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 9 | Fair |
| 2004 | 4.3 (3) | 2-2+(4) | 65.9 (3) | 1.1 (2) |  |  | 12 | Good |
| $2003{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  | 0.0 (1) |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 4.3 (3) | 2-2+ (4) | 126.7 (4) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | 13 | Good |
| 2001 | 4.3 (3) | 2-2+ (4) | 138.7 (4) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | 13 | Good |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lake drawn down for repairs in 2009
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Lake renovated in 2003

* Back calculated from age table

Table 48. Population assessment for Redear Sunfish based on spring electrofishing at Mauzy Lake from 2007-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Years to } \\ & 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 10.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A)\% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  |  | 24.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2019 |  |  | 16.0 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | P - F |
| 2018 | 6.2 (1)* | $\geq 6$ (1) | 78.9 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 7 | Fair |
| 2017 |  |  | 37.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2015 | 5.9 (1) | $\geq 6$ (1) | 18.7 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 6 | Poor |
| 2014 |  |  | 27.4 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F - G |
| 2013 |  |  | 65.6 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2012 | 7.6 (3) | 4-4+ (3) | 33.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2011 |  |  | 35.2 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F - G |
| 2010 |  |  | 14.4 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | P-G |
| $2009{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2008^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 8.2 (4) | 3-3+ (4) | 6.7 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 0.790 | 54.6 | 11 | Good |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lake drawn down for repairs in 2009

* Back calculated from age table

Table 49. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour of 15 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Carpenter Lake in April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 11 | 1 | 17 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 20 | 14 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 147 | 147.0 | 20.1 |

Table 50. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Carpenter Lake from 2003-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 30.0 | 7.0 | 31.0 | 6.6 | 39.0 | 7.9 | 47.0 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 147.0 | 20.1 |
| 2021 | 26.0 | 13.1 | 50.0 | 10.5 | 15.0 | 1.0 | 38.0 | 7.6 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 129.0 | 16.6 |
| 2020 | 26.0 | 6.2 | 50.0 | 13.1 | 24.0 | 6.7 | 51.0 | 9.6 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 151.0 | 32.2 |
| 2019 | 37.0 | 10.4 | 29.0 | 12.3 | 21.0 | 9.3 | 65.0 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 152.0 | 30.1 |
| 2018 | 40.0 | 9.2 | 17.3 | 7.4 | 108.0 | 12.0 | 49.3 | 13.1 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 214.7 | 10.4 |
| 2017 | 32.0 | 2.3 | 44.0 | 12.9 | 100.0 | 20.8 | 24.0 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 200.0 | 38.6 |
| 2016 | 97.3 | 31.5 | 57.3 | 5.8 | 65.3 | 11.4 | 33.3 | 5.3 | 12.0 | 6.1 | 254.3 | 41.9 |
| 2015 | 21.3 | 5.8 | 86.7 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 2.3 | 17.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 137.3 | 4.8 |
| 2014 | 16.0 | 6.7 | 131.2 | 17.6 | 48.0 | 13.2 | 30.4 | 5.9 | 12.8 | 5.4 | 225.6 | 37.0 |
| 2013 | 80.0 | 26.2 | 138.7 | 9.6 | 20.0 | 4.0 | 22.7 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 261.3 | 38.5 |
| 2012 | 40.0 | 16.7 | 74.7 | 15.0 | 46.7 | 7.4 | 22.7 | 12.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 184.0 | 46.7 |
| 2011 | 182.7 | 15.4 | 166.7 | 9.6 | 73.3 | 13.1 | 9.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 432.0 | 30.2 |
| 2010 | 73.3 | 19.4 | 198.7 | 39.6 | 10.7 | 5.8 | 12.0 | 4.6 | 2.7 |  | 294.7 | 34.7 |
| 2009 | 102.7 | 18.7 | 166.7 | 26.3 | 18.7 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 296.0 | 27.2 |
| 2008 | 136.0 | 17.7 | 229.0 | 28.8 | 9.0 | 2.5 | 11.0 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 385.0 | 50.3 |
| 2007 | 45.3 | 7.4 | 128.0 | 24.3 | 12.0 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 3.5 | 1.3 |  | 196.0 | 31.8 |
| 2006 | 97.3 | 12.0 | 134.7 | 8.7 | 24.0 | 1.3 | 9.3 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 265.3 | 55.4 |
| 2005 | 157.3 | 3.5 | 165.3 | 48.6 | 30.7 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 356.0 | 54.6 |
| 2004 | 80.0 | 16.7 | 128.0 | 28.0 | 22.7 | 3.5 | 21.3 | 8.7 | 2.7 |  | 252.0 | 47.7 |
| 2003 | 181.3 | 49.3 | 97.3 | 11.4 | 18.7 | 4.8 | 36.0 | 12.2 | 1.3 |  | 333.3 | 63.4 |

Table 51. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour of 15-minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Carpenter Lake in October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 7 | 12 | 13 |  | 2 | 18 | 14 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 117 | 117.0 | 32.3 |

Table 52. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Carpenter Lake 2001-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 <br> at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A)\% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  | 12.0 (2) | 39.0 (3) | 47.0 (4) | 6.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | Good |
| 2021 |  | 26.0 (3) | 15.0 (2) | 38.0 (4) | 7.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | Good |
| 2020 |  | 12.0 (2) | 24.0 (2) | 51.0 (4) | 2.0 (3) |  |  | $\geq 12$ | F - G |
| 2019 |  | 37.0 (3) | 21.0 (2) | 65.0 (4) | 6.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | Good |
| 2018 | 11.3 (3)* | 40.0 (3) | 108.0 (4) | 49.3 (4) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2017 |  | 34.7 (3) | 100.0 (4) | 24.0 (3) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 15$ | G-E |
| 2016 |  | 97.3 (4) | 65.3 (4) | 33.3 (4) | 12.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 17$ | Excellent |
| 2015 | 10.6 (2)* |  | 12.0 (1) | 17.3 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 8$ | P - F |
| 2014 |  | 16.0 (2) | 48.0 (4) | 30.4 (4) | 12.8 (4) |  |  | $\geq 15$ | G-E |
| 2013 |  | 69.3 (4) | 20.0 (2) | 22.7 (3) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | Good |
| 2012 |  | 12.0 (2) | 46.7 (4) | 22.7 (3) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | $\geq 12$ | F-G |
| 2011 |  | 182.7 (4) | 73.3 (4) | 9.3 (2) | 4.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 15$ | G-E |
| 2010 | 10.1 (1) | 72.0 (4) | 10.7 (1) | 12.0 (2) | 2.7 (3) | 0.438 | 35.5 | 11 | Fair |
| 2009 | 10.3 (2) | 97.9 (4) | 18.7 (2) | 8.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2008 | 10.3 (2) | 120.3 (4) | 9.0 (1) | 11.0 (2) | 1.0 (2) | 0.561 | 42.9 | 11 | Fair |
| 2007 | 10.3 (2) | 39.9 (3) | 12.0 (1) | 10.7 (2) | 1.3 (2) | 0.560 | 42.9 | 10 | Fair |
| 2006 | 11.6 (4) | 78.7 (4) | 24.0 (2) | 9.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 1.160 | 68.7 | 13 | Good |
| 2005 | 11.6 (4) | 132.0 (4) | 30.7 (3) | 2.7 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 13 | Good |
| 2004 | 11.6 (4) | 56.0 (4) | 22.7 (2) | 21.3 (3) | 2.7 (3) | 1.155 | 68.5 | 16 | Good |
| 2003 | 11.6 (4) | 162.7 (4) | 54.7 (4) | 36.0 (4) | 1.3 (2) | 0.943 | 61.1 | 18 | Excellent |
| 2002 | 11.6 (4) | 12.0 (2) | 12.0 (1) | 21.3 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2001 | 11.6 (4) | 8.0 (2) | 90.7 (4) | 66.7 (4) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | 16 | Good |

[^11]Table 53. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected during 0.75 hours of electrofishing at Carpenter Lake in May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 9 | 87 | 140 | 120 | 189 | 12 |  |  | 557 | 742.7 | 104.7 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 2 | 6 | 37 | 8 | 30 | 46 | 4 | 133 | 177.3 | 48.3 | nwd5bg.d22

Table 54. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected at Carpenter Lake 2001-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<3.0$ in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 12.0 | 4.5 | 462.7 | 58.1 | 268.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 742.7 | 104.7 |
| 2021 | 98.7 | 15.7 | 190.7 | 30.3 | 69.3 | 23.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 358.7 | 43.3 |
| 2020 | 50.7 | 16.2 | 536.0 | 112.3 | 144.0 | 53.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 732.0 | 156.0 |
| 2019 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 249.3 | 51.8 | 104.0 | 34.8 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 358.7 | 81.9 |
| 2018 | 17.3 | 6.0 | 528.0 | 85.3 | 49.3 | 8.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 594.7 | 93.9 |
| 2017 | 89.3 | 27.9 | 348.0 | 38.8 | 170.7 | 22.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 608.0 | 84.3 |
| 2016 | 8.0 | 3.6 | 133.3 | 30.5 | 156.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 297.3 | 52.5 |
| 2015 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 125.3 | 17.9 | 220.0 | 52.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 348.0 | 65.5 |
| 2014 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 352.0 | 34.6 | 332.0 | 34.1 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 690.7 | 49.7 |
| 2013 | 20.0 | 9.2 | 138.7 | 27.1 | 312.0 | 42.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 470.7 | 70.8 |
| 2012 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 144.0 | 31.9 | 147.2 | 22.3 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 292.8 | 49.7 |
| 2011 | 16.0 | 10.4 | 400.0 | 157.5 | 180.8 | 50.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 596.8 | 214.4 |
| 2010 | 10.7 | 6.4 | 100.0 | 18.6 | 101.3 | 19.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 212.0 | 30.8 |
| 2009 | 17.3 | 9.6 | 124.0 | 24.4 | 140.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 281.3 | 42.9 |
| 2008 | 0.0 |  | 88.0 | 18.8 | 150.0 | 50.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 238.0 | 68.5 |
| 2007 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 61.3 | 17.7 | 168.0 | 38.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 233.3 | 9.1 |
| 2006 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 57.3 | 10.0 | 102.7 | 12.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 161.3 | 21.3 |
| 2005 | 12.1 | 9.8 | 190.1 | 17.1 | 98.9 | 6.8 | 18.7 | 9.0 | 0.0 |  | 319.8 | 23.1 |
| 2004 | 12.3 | 4.6 | 26.2 | 7.1 | 46.2 | 11.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 |  | 86.2 | 20.4 |
| 2003 | 7.7 | 2.8 | 102.6 | 23.0 | 47.4 | 13.2 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 |  | 161.5 | 34.1 |
| 2002 | 2.3 |  | 8.1 |  | 17.2 |  | 1.2 |  | 0.0 |  | 28.7 | 0.0 |
| 2001 |  |  | 198.7 | 74.7 | 152.0 | 22.7 | 41.3 | 12.7 | 0.0 |  | 392.0 | 108.9 |

Table 55. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Redear Sunfish collected at Carpenter Lake 2010-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | < 3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 0.0 |  | 60.0 | 30.2 | 50.7 | 16.4 | 66.7 | 14.1 | 0.0 |  | 177.3 | 48.3 |
| 2021 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 25.3 | 12.3 | 38.7 | 15.1 | 0.0 |  | 65.3 | 21.8 |
| 2020 | 0.0 |  | 14.5 | 6.7 | 34.7 | 11.4 | 49.3 | 17.0 | 0.0 |  | 98.7 | 29.1 |
| 2019 | 0.0 |  | 10.7 | 4.9 | 73.3 | 22.7 | 18.7 | 3.4 | 0.0 |  | 102.7 | 27.3 |
| 2018 | 0.0 |  | 21.3 | 3.4 | 16.0 | 4.1 | 16.0 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 53.3 | 6.4 |
| 2017 | 0.0 |  | 29.3 | 19.0 | 17.3 | 5.2 | 22.7 | 10.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 69.3 | 19.8 |
| 2016 | 0.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 | 8.0 | 2.9 | 12.0 | 6.4 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 21.3 | 7.9 |
| 2015 | 0.0 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 | 10.7 | 3.4 | 40.0 | 9.9 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 53.3 | 11.4 |
| 2014 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 10.7 | 4.0 | 72.0 | 11.7 | 0.0 |  | 82.7 | 11.4 |
| 2013 | 0.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 | 9.3 | 2.5 | 12.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 22.7 | 2.5 |
| 2012 | 0.0 |  | 8.0 | 3.6 | 41.6 | 20.3 | 6.4 | 3.0 | 0.0 |  | 56.0 | 25.2 |
| 2011 | 0.0 |  | 32.0 | 24.4 | 28.8 | 17.6 | 16.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 |  | 76.8 | 43.1 |
| 2010 | 0.0 |  | 2.7 | 2.7 | 16.0 | 4.6 | 9.3 | 2.5 | 0.0 |  | 28.0 | 6.5 |

Table 56. Population assessment for Bluegill based on spring electrofishing at Carpenter Lake from 2001-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 2 at capture | $\begin{gathered} \text { Years to } \\ 6.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 6.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  |  | 268.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F - G |
| 2021 |  |  | 69.3 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | F-G |
| 2020 |  |  | 145.3 (4) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | $\geq 8$ | F-G |
| 2019 |  |  | 104.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2018 | 4.8 (4)* | 3-3+(3) | 49.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 10 | Good |
| 2017 |  |  | 170.7 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2016 |  |  | 156.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2015 | 4.9 (4) | 4-4+ (2) | 220.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2014 |  |  | 333.3 (4) | 1.3 (2) |  |  | $\geq 8$ | F-E |
| 2013 |  |  | 312.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2012 |  |  | 147.2 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2011 |  |  | 180.8 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2010 | 4.9 (4) | 3-3+ (3) | 101.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 0.615 | 45.9 | 12 | Good |
| 2009 | 4.6 (3) | 3-3+ (3) | 140.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2008 | 4.6 (3) | 3-3+ (3) | 150.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 0.571 | 43.9 | 11 | Good |
| 2007 | 4.6 (3) | 3-3+ (3) | 169.3 (4) | 1.3 (2) | 0.386 | 32.0 | 12 | Good |
| 2006 | 5.6 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 84.6 (3) | 0.0 (1) | 1.657 | 80.9 | 12 | Good |
| 2005 | 5.6 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 117.6 (4) | 18.7 (4) |  |  | 16 | Excellent |
| 2004 | 5.6 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 47.7 (2) | 1.5 (2) |  |  | 12 | Good |
| 2003 | 5.6 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 53.3 (2) | 4.0 (3) | 1.427 | 76.0 | 13 | Good |
| 2002 | 5.6 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 18.4 (1) | 1.2 (2) |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2001 |  |  | 145.7 (4) | 41.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | G - E |

[^12]Table 57. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.5 hours of 7.5 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at New Kingfisher Lake in April 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 10 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 117 | 234.0 | 53.6 |

Table 58. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at New Kingfisher Lake from $2003-2022$.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | < 8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 64.0 | 14.6 | 82.0 | 22.0 | 38.0 | 13.2 | 50.0 | 8.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 234.0 | 53.6 |
| 2021 | 72.0 | 28.1 | 74.7 | 19.2 | 10.7 | 7.1 | 48.0 | 25.7 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 205.3 | 25.4 |
| 2020 | 168.0 | 62.1 | 45.3 | 14.1 | 50.7 | 7.1 | 58.7 | 22.8 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 322.7 | 41.9 |
| 2019 | 48.0 | 24.4 | 21.3 | 9.6 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 61.3 | 2.7 | 10.7 | 7.1 | 136.0 | 12.2 |
| 2018 | 10.7 | 5.3 | 32.0 | 4.6 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 104.0 | 12.2 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 157.3 | 29.7 |
| $2017{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 56.0 | 21.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 26.7 | 2.7 | 61.3 | 30.1 |  |  | 146.7 | 43.7 |
| 2012-2016 |  |  |  |  |  | mplin | Renova |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 213.3 | 75.9 | 128.0 | 28.1 | 24.0 | 4.6 | 16.0 | 8.0 |  |  | 381.3 | 99.6 |
| 2010 | 178.7 | 48.5 | 112.0 | 25.5 | 34.7 | 9.6 | 16.0 | 8.0 |  |  | 341.3 | 84.2 |
| 2009 | 109.3 | 37.3 | 24.7 | 2.7 | 21.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 165.3 | 37.3 |
| $2008{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 282.7 | 37.3 | 240.0 | 33.3 | 56.0 | 9.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 578.7 | 71.8 |
| 2007 | 98.7 | 27.8 | 392.0 | 92.7 | 21.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |  |  | 514.7 | 112.8 |
| 2006 | 189.3 | 14.1 | 333.3 | 46.3 | 10.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 533.3 | 62.9 |
| 2005 | 287.2 | 97.4 | 428.2 | 53.5 | 41.0 | 6.8 | 12.8 | 5.1 |  |  | 769.2 | 141.2 |
| 2004 | 161.5 | 45.1 | 243.6 | 45.6 | 12.8 | 6.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 |  |  | 420.5 | 92.5 |
| 2003 | 105.6 | 28.2 | 425.0 | 55.5 | 8.3 | 4.8 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 538.9 | 59.8 |

${ }^{2}$ Major fish kill 9/5/08
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ First standardized sample since renovation
nwd6psd.d22

Table 59. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.375 hours of 7.5 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at New Kingfisher Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 7 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 14 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 92 | 245.3 | 57.8 |

Table 60. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at New Kingfisher Lake from 2003-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  | 36.0 (3) | 38.0 (3) | 50.0 (4) | 2.0 (3) |  |  | $\geq 14$ | Good |
| 2021 |  |  | 10.7 (1) | 48.0 (4) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 11$ | Good |
| 2020 |  | 154.7 (4) | 50.7 (4) | 58.7 (4) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 17$ | Excellent |
| 2019 |  |  | 5.3 (1) | 61.3 (4) | 10.7 (4) |  |  | $\geq 11$ | F-G |
| 2018 |  | 10.7 (2) | 10.7 (1) | 104.0 (4) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 12$ | F-G |
| $2017{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  | 26.7 (3) | 61.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2012-2016 | No sampling - Renovation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  | 192.0 (4) | 24.0 (2) | 16.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2010 |  |  | 34.7 (2) | 16.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | P-G |
| 2009 | 10.5 (2) | 77.3 (4) | 21.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 10 | Fair |
| $2008{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10.5 (2) | 250.7 (4) | 56.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.562 | 43.0 | 12 | Fair |
| 2007 | 10.5 (2) | 96.0 (4) | 21.3 (2) | 2.7 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.608 | 39.2 | 10 | Fair |
| 2006 | 11.0 (3) | 149.3 (4) | 10.7 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 1.335 | 73.7 | 10 | Fair |
| 2005 | 11.0 (3) | 248.7 (4) | 41.0 (3) | 12.8 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 13 | Good |
| 2004 | 11.0 (3) | 94.9 (4) | 12.8 (1) | 2.6 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 1.230 | 70.8 | 10 | Fair |
| 2003 | 11.0 (3) | 100.0 (4) | 8.3 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 1.330 | 73.6 | 10 | Fair |

[^13]Table 61. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in 0.375 hours of 7.5 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at New Kingfisher Lake in May 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Total | CPUE | SE |
| Bluegill <br> Redear Sunfish | 5 | 81 | 53 | 62 | 33 | 62 | 9 | 305 | 813.3 | 85.2 |
| nwd6bg.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 62. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected at New Kingfisher Lake during 2003-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<3.0$ in |  | $3.0-5.9$ in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 229.3 | 119.6 | 394.7 | 40.4 | 189.3 | 83.3 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 813.3 | 85.2 |
| 2021 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 52.0 | 25.6 | 40.0 | 13.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 112.0 | 31.0 |
| 2020 | 24.0 | 16.7 | 426.7 | 72.2 | 208.0 | 90.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 658.7 | 166.7 |
| 2019 | 42.7 | 13.3 | 448.0 | 48.0 | 138.7 | 34.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 632.0 | 72.2 |
| 2018 | 21.3 | 17.5 | 885.3 | 314.5 | 72.0 | 12.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 981.3 | 335.4 |
| $2017{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 18.7 | 5.3 | 853.3 | 203.7 | 85.3 | 28.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 957.3 | 222.3 |
| 2012-2016 |  |  |  |  |  | No s | pling |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 338.7 | 37.3 | 413.3 | 97.6 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 760.0 | 92.3 |
| 2010 | 130.7 | 27.1 | 274.7 | 30.8 | 80.0 | 21.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 485.3 | 47.2 |
| 2009 | 194.7 | 21.3 | 338.7 | 35.3 | 74.7 | 30.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 608.0 | 53.3 |
| $2008{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 42.7 | 5.3 | 242.7 | 65.5 | 37.3 | 14.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 322.7 | 85.2 |
| 2007 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 69.3 | 26.3 | 45.3 | 5.3 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 120.0 | 33.3 |
| 2006 | 16.0 | 13.5 | 104.0 | 33.8 | 14.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 134.0 | 44.0 |
| 2005 | 0.0 |  | 53.9 | 7.7 | 12.8 | 6.8 | 10.3 | 6.8 | 0.0 |  | 76.9 | 8.9 |
| 2004 | 0.0 |  | 15.4 | 8.9 | 23.1 | 11.8 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 38.5 | 4.4 |
| 2003 | 12.8 | 6.8 | 56.4 | 2.6 | 15.4 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 0.0 |  | 89.7 | 5.1 |

[^14]Table 63. Population assessment for Bluegill based on spring electrofishing at New Kingfisher Lake from 2003-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

${ }^{2}$ Major fish kill $9 / 5 / 08$
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ First standardized sample since renovation

Table 64. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.333 hours of diurnal electrofishing at Old Kingfisher Lake in April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 7 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 45 | 135.1 | 0.0 |

Table 65. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Old Kingfisher Lake during 2017-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 60.1 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 135.1 | 0.0 |
| 2021 | 48.1 | 0.0 | 63.1 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 135.1 | 0.0 |
| 2020 | 93.8 | 0.0 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 149.6 | 0.0 |
| 2019 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 32.2 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 77.8 | 0.0 |
| 2018 | 58.1 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 0.0 | 35.5 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 112.9 | 0.0 |
| *2017 | 148.3 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 28.4 | 0.0 | 47.3 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 227.1 | 0.0 |

*First standardized sample since renovation
nwd7psd.d22

Table 66. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.325 hours diurnal electrofishing runs at Old Kingfisher Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 2 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 76 | 228.2 | 0.0 |

Table 67. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Old Kingfisher Lake 2017-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  | 36.0 (3) | 12.0 (1) | 24.0 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | Fair |
| 2021 |  |  | 12.0 (1) | 12.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | P - F |
| 2020 |  | 67.1 (4) | 14.7 (2) | 14.7 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 11$ | F-G |
| 2019 |  |  | 2.7 (1) | 32.2 (4) | 2.7 (3) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2018 |  |  | 9.7 (1) | 35.5 (4) | 3.2 (3) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2017* |  |  | 28.4 (3) | 47.3 (4) | 3.2 (3) |  |  | $\geq 12$ | F-E |

*First standardized sample since renovation

Table 68. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in 0.340 hours of 7.5-minute diurnal electrofishing at Old Kingfisher Lake in May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 54 | 59 | 82 | 65 | 90 | 34 |  |  | 384 | 1129.4 | 0.0 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 17.7 | 0.0 |

nwd7bg.d22

Table 69. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected at Old Kingfisher Lake during 2017-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<3.0$ in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 158.8 | 0.0 | 605.9 | 0.0 | 364.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 1129.4 | 0.0 |
| 2021 | 304.0 | 122.2 | 226.7 | 46.3 | 216.0 | 134.4 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 746.7 | 99.7 |
| 2020 | 16.0 | 9.2 | 533.3 | 59.6 | 325.3 | 159.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 874.7 | 204.5 |
| 2019 | 10.7 | 5.3 | 466.7 | 44.4 | 149.3 | 50.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 626.7 | 82.7 |
| 2018 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 952.4 | 0.0 | 190.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 1149.7 | 0.0 |
| 2017* | 58.7 | 14.1 | 965.3 | 100.6 | 309.3 | 72.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 1333.3 | 178.0 |

*First standardized sample since renovation nwd7bg.d22

Table 70. Population assessment for Bluegill based on spring electrofishing at Old Kingfisher Lake for 2017-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 2+ at capture | Years to $6.0 \text { in }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 6.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A)\% | Total <br> score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  |  | 364.7 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2021 |  |  | 216.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2020 |  |  | 325.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2019 |  |  | 149.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2018 |  |  | 190.5 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | P-G |
| 2017 |  |  | 309.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |

[^15]nwd7bg.d22

Table 71. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.5 hours of diurnal electrofishing at Washburn Lake in April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 4 | 32 | 33 | 20 | 3 | 4 | 24 | 16 | 9 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 155 | 310.0 | 38.1 |

Table 72. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Washburn Lake during 20012022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 184.0 | 29.6 | 106.0 | 12.4 | 20.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 310.0 | 38.1 |
| 2021 | 168.0 | 17.0 | 190.0 | 22.5 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 10.0 | 7.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 372.0 | 32.3 |
| 2020 | 186.7 | 48.5 | 58.7 | 21.8 | 10.7 | 7.1 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 266.7 | 58.7 |
| 2018 | 69.3 | 14.1 | 269.3 | 48.5 | 77.3 | 14.9 | 18.7 | 7.1 | 0.0 |  | 434.7 | 44.4 |
| 2017 | 258.7 | 31.4 | 306.7 | 9.6 | 42.7 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 613.3 | 46.3 |
| 2015 | 66.7 | 22.8 | 253.3 | 61.5 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 10.7 | 2.7 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 338.7 | 44.9 |
| 2014 | 90.7 | 7.1 | 333.3 | 30.8 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 10.7 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 442.7 | 23.3 |
| 2012 | 213.3 | 39.8 | 218.7 | 46.3 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 456.0 | 77.7 |
| 2011 | 205.3 | 44.9 | 133.3 | 35.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 346.7 | 78.6 |
| 2010 | 96.0 | 28.1 | 80.0 | 16.7 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 184.0 | 45.5 |
| 2009 | 104.0 | 60.0 | 82.7 | 39.8 | 0.0 |  | 10.7 | 5.3 | 0.0 |  | 197.3 | 104.3 |
| 2008 | 170.7 | 42.9 | 61.3 | 21.8 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 9.6 | 0.0 |  | 261.3 | 59.6 |
| 2007 | 133.3 | 35.3 | 80.0 | 4.6 | 16.0 | 4.6 | 21.3 | 9.6 | 0.0 |  | 250.7 | 30.8 |
| 2006 | 96.0 | 9.2 | 98.7 | 39.3 | 64.0 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 277.3 | 25.4 |
| 2005 | 43.6 | 11.2 | 146.2 | 16.0 | 28.2 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 220.5 | 25.3 |
| 2004 | 46.2 | 4.4 | 353.9 | 49.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 400.0 | 51.2 |
| 2003 | 123.1 | 33.5 | 438.5 | 49.5 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 561.5 | 52.4 |
| 2002 | 50.0 |  | 321.4 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 371.4 | 0.0 |
| 2001 | 260.0 |  | 8.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 268.0 | 0.0 |

[^16]Table 73. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.5 hours of 7.5 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Washburn Lake in October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 8 | 37 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 135 | 270.0 | 35.1 |

Table 74. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Washburn Lake 2003-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous Mortality <br> (z) | Annual Mortality (A) $\%$ | Total score | Assessment Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  | 110.0 (4) | 20.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F-G |
| 2021 |  | 166.0 (4) | 4.0 (1) | 10.0 (2) | 4.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 11$ | F-G |
| 2020 |  | 165.3 (4) | 10.7 (1) | 10.7 (2) | 2.7 (3) |  |  | $\geq 11$ | F-G |
| 2018 |  |  | 77.3 (4) | 18.7 (3) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2017 | 10.4 (2) | 258.7 (4) | 42.7 (3) | 5.3 (1) | 5.3 (4) | 0.939 | 60.9 | 14 | Good |
| 2015 |  |  | 8.0 (1) | 10.7 (2) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F-G |
| 2014 |  | 90.7 (4) | 8.0 (1) | 10.7 (2) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 12$ | F-G |
| 2012 |  |  | 16.0 (1) | 8.0 (2) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F-G |
| 2011 |  |  | 2.7 (1) | 5.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 6$ | P-F |
| 2010 | 10.7 (2) | 96.0 (4) | 5.3 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.819 | 55.9 | 9 | Fair |
| 2009 | 13.1 (4) | 99.7 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 10.7 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 12 | Fair |
| 2008 | 13.1 (4) | 165.9 (4) | 16.0 (1) | 13.3 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 1.117 | 67.3 | 12 | Fair |
| 2007 | 13.1 (4) | 131.2 (4) | 16.0 (1) | 21.3 (3) | 0.0 (1) | 0.944 | 61.1 | 13 | Good |
| 2006 | 11.2 (3) | 94.7 (4) | 64.0 (4) | 18.7 (3) | 2.7 (3) | 0.669 | 48.8 | 17 | Excellent |
| 2005 | 11.2 (3) | 41.0 (3) | 28.2 (2) | 2.6 (1) | 2.6 (3) |  |  | 12 | Good |
| 2004 | 11.2 (3) | 48.3 (3) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 9 | Fair |
| 2003 | 11.2 (3) | 131.6 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 10 | Fair |

Table 75. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in 0.5 hours of 7.5 minute diurnal electrofishing runs at Washburn Lake in May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 1 | 64 | 74 | 24 | 21 | 19 | 4 | 5 |  | 212 | 424.0 | 70.1 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  | 1 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 8 | 18 | 4 | 51 | 102.0 | 31.2 | nwd8bg.d22

Table 76. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected at Washburn Lake during spring samples 2001-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<3.0$ in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 130.0 | 24.5 | 238.0 | 62.3 | 46.0 | 22.5 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 |  | 424.0 | 70.1 |
| 2021 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 84.0 | 35.0 | 38.0 | 8.3 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  | 144.0 | 38.2 |
| 2020 | 10.0 | 6.0 | 134.0 | 38.8 | 58.0 | 12.8 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 206.0 | 49.5 |
| 2018 | 24.0 | 12.2 | 258.7 | 27.8 | 101.3 | 33.4 | 29.3 | 16.2 | 0.0 |  | 413.3 | 55.7 |
| 2017 | 72.0 | 25.7 | 144.0 | 25.7 | 42.7 | 19.2 | 37.3 | 20.8 | 0.0 |  | 296.0 | 8.0 |
| 2015 | 26.0 | 13.6 | 152.0 | 18.2 | 122.0 | 17.4 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 |  | 308.0 | 20.8 |
| 2014 | 0.0 |  | 181.3 | 64.1 | 133.3 | 9.6 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 |  | 322.7 | 55.9 |
| 2013 | 10.7 | 7.1 | 101.3 | 16.2 | 109.3 | 58.5 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 224.0 | 46.2 |
| 2012 | 30.0 | 11.9 | 158.0 | 27.6 | 64.0 | 23.3 | 22.0 | 6.8 | 0.0 |  | 274.0 | 49.1 |
| 2011 | 24.0 | 10.7 | 93.3 | 16.5 | 33.3 | 10.4 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 156.0 | 19.6 |
| 2010 | 53.3 | 16.2 | 152.0 | 57.9 | 32.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 237.3 | 41.7 |
| 2009 | 60.0 | 15.1 | 80.0 | 19.0 | 138.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 278.0 | 20.8 |
| 2008 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 152.0 | 37.8 | 168.0 | 48.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 322.7 | 69.5 |
| 2007 | 58.7 | 14.1 | 245.3 | 37.1 | 40.0 | 12.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 344.0 | 54.5 |
| 2006 | 58.7 | 50.7 | 138.7 | 39.3 | 32.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 229.3 | 81.6 |
| 2005 | 161.5 | 31.9 | 155.8 | 18.9 | 9.6 | 3.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 326.9 | 39.3 |
| 2004 | 80.8 | 7.4 | 48.1 | 3.7 | 11.5 | 5.0 | 21.2 | 10.6 | 0.0 |  | 161.5 | 13.0 |
| 2003 | 7.7 | 3.1 | 71.2 | 12.7 | 113.5 | 39.9 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 192.3 | 39.9 |
| 2002 |  |  | 46.5 |  | 102.3 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 148.8 | 0.0 |
| 2001 |  |  | 28.0 |  | 64.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 96.0 | 0.0 |

* Washburn Lake renovated summer 1999 and restocked spring 2000
nwd8bg.d22

Table 77. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Redear Sunfish collected at Washburn Lake during spring samples from 2012-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<3.0$ in |  | $3.0-5.9$ in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  | Total |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 0.0 |  | 16.0 | 5.7 | 42.0 | 11.5 | 44.0 | 17.7 | 0.0 |  | 120.0 | 31.2 |
| 2021 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 94.0 | 20.5 | 168.0 | 24.7 | 0.0 |  | 268.0 | 39.9 |
| 2020 | 0.0 |  | 40.0 | 13.9 | 108.0 | 9.5 | 62.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 |  | 210.0 | 25.6 |
| 2018 | 0.0 |  | 133.3 | 18.7 | 154.7 | 63.7 | 144.0 | 50.8 | 0.0 |  | 432.0 | 127.6 |
| 2017 | 0.0 |  | 178.7 | 57.8 | 45.3 | 9.6 | 53.3 | 29.3 | 0.0 |  | 227.3 | 29.7 |
| 2015 | 0.0 |  | 44.0 | 12.4 | 74.0 | 23.0 | 94.0 | 29.5 | 0.0 |  | 212.0 | 55.1 |
| 2014 | 0.0 |  | 5.3 | 2.7 | 85.3 | 14.9 | 98.7 | 30.8 | 0.0 |  | 189.3 | 39.8 |
| 2013 | 0.0 |  | 96.0 | 20.1 | 85.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 181.3 | 22.8 |
| 2012 | 0.0 |  | 28.0 | 12.4 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 11.0 |

Table 78. Population assessment for Bluegill based on spring electrofishing at Washburn Lake from 2003-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 2 <br> at capture | Years to 6.0 in | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 6.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  |  | 56.0 (3) | 10.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F - G |
| 2021 |  |  | 50.0 (2) | 12.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 8$ | F-G |
| 2020 |  |  | 62.0 (3) | 4.0 (3) |  |  | $\geq 8$ | F-G |
| 2018 | 3.5 (1) | 4-4+ (2) | 130.7 (4) | 29.3 (4) |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2017 |  |  | 80.0 (3) | 37.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F-G |
| 2015 |  |  | 130.0 (4) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2014 |  |  | 141.3 (4) | 8.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 10$ | F-G |
| 2013 |  |  | 112.0 (4) | 2.7 (3) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F-G |
| 2012 |  |  | 86.0 (3) | 22.0 (4) |  |  | $\geq 9$ | F-G |
| 2011 |  |  | 38.7 (2) | 5.3 (4) |  |  | $\geq 8$ | P-G |
| 2010 |  |  | 32.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 5$ | P - F |
| 2009 | 4.7 (3) | 3-3+ (3) | 138.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 0.599 | 45.1 | 11 | Good |
| 2008 | 5.3 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 168.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) | 2.046 | 87.1 | 13 | Good |
| 2007 | 5.3 (4) | 2-2+(4) | 40.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) | 1.050 | 65.0 | 11 | Good |
| 2006 | 5.3 (4) | 2-2+(4) | 32.0 (2) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2005 | 5.4 (4) | 2-2+(4) | 9.6 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 10 | Good |
| 2004 | 5.4 (4) | 2-2+(4) | 32.7 (2) | 22.0 (4) |  |  | 14 | Excellent |
| 2003 | 5.4 (4) | 2-2+ (4) | 118.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 13 | Good |

Table 79. Population assessment for Redear Sunfish based on spring electrofishing at Washburn Lake from 2012-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year | Mean length age 3 at capture | Years to 8.0 in | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \mathrm{in} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 10.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (A) \% | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 |  |  | 44.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F - G |
| 2021 |  |  | 168.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2020 |  |  | 62.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F - G |
| 2018 | 8.4 (4) | 3-3+ (4) | 144.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | 13 | Good |
| 2017 |  |  | 53.3 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2015 |  |  | 94.0 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | $F-G$ |
| 2014 |  |  | 98.7 (4) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 7$ | F-G |
| 2013 |  |  | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 4$ | P-F |
| 2012 |  |  | 0.0 (1) | 0.0 (1) |  |  | $\geq 4$ | P-F |

# SOUTHWESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

## Project 1: Lake and Tailwater Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

Lake sampling conditions are summarized in Table 1.

## Barren River Lake (10,000 acres)

## Black Bass

Black bass were collected with diurnal electrofishing in early-May from both lake arms (Tables 2-5) and once again in early October (Tables 6-7). A total of 834 black bass were collected in the spring at a rate of $139.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 2). Largemouth Bass made up $83 \%$ of the total catch while Spotted Bass made up $17 \%$, and their distribution remains tied to the lower $1 / 3$ of the reservoir. The overall catch rate for Largemouth Bass ( $115.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was about average over the last 10 years (Table 3), even though catch rates of 8.0 - to 11.9 -in and 12.0 - to 14.9 -in fish are the lowest among the last 10 years of sampling. Catch rates of the $8.0-$ to 11.9 -in length group ( $14.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) and 12.0 - to 14.9-in ( 28.0 fish/hr) length group reflect poorer 2019 and 2020 year classes, respectively. The water level fluctuation effect on spawning success remains enigmatic as the 2018-2020 springs were similarly plagued by flooding, yet 2018 produced a very strong year class. Poor overwinter survival of the 2020 Largemouth year-class (age-1 CPUE $=3.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; Tables 4 and 7) may be a result of a prolonged stay at winter pool level, in contrast to the 2018 year class that never experienced any prolonged stays near winter pool levels. The Largemouth Bass population assessment increased back to "Excellent" due to the recruitment of age-1 fish (Table 4).

Largemouth Bass size structure indices remain on the high end of the range (PSD $=84$ and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=53$; Table 5) and were higher than previous years. These indices confirm the higher-than-average numbers of $\geq 15.0$-in fish. Spotted Bass size structure remains high quality as well ( $\mathrm{PSD}=91$ and $\operatorname{RSD}_{14}=51$ ), even with the low numbers of fish sampled. The Smallmouth Bass population remains poorly represented in samples (Tables 2 and 6), but larger fish are reported by anglers.

Fall young of year sampling suggests a moderate 2022 year class (Table 7). Age-0 CPUE $\geq 5.0$ in ( 38.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was just below average for the past 10 years, but still higher than 7 of the 10 . Age-0 Largemouth Bass mean length (4.0 in) was slightly lower than average for the past 10 years. Though age- 0 Largemouth Bass production was highest in the Barren River arm of the lake (Walnut Creek and Peter Creek sites), Beaver Creek yielded more $\geq 5.0$-in bass (Table 6). Poorer growth and numbers characterized the lower end of the lake (the Peninsula sites). Largemouth Bass made up most of the fall YOY bass sample (95\%), while Spotted Bass made up the other 5\% (Table 6). Smallmouth Bass were nonexistent in these samples.

## Blue Catfish

Blue Catfish were collected with diurnal electrofishing in early- to mid-September from both lake arms. A total of 53 Blue Catfish were collected at a rate of 17.7 fish/hr (Table 8). Fish $<15.0$ inches in length were taken for aging to assess spawning contributions from non-stocking years (2020-2022). Two age-0 naturally spawned fish (<3.0 in) were noted. All other fish came from previous stockings. Condition indices $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for all size groups was good (Table 9 ), similar to samples in 2021. The length-weight equation for Blue Catfish was also similar to prior samples:

$$
\log _{10}(\text { Weight })=-4.00744+3.40588 * \log _{10}(\text { Length })
$$

Blue Catfish were also collected during gillnet sampling for hybrid striped bass in mid- to late-November and earlyDecember. A total of 46 Blue Catfish were collected at a rate of 4.2 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$ (Table 10). Most of the fish were within the 20.0 - to 29.0 -in range, but a few were close to 40.0 -in. The trophy Blue Catfish component of the fishery is commonly reported by recreational anglers, buoyed by catfish tournament trail use.

## Hybrid Striped Bass

Gillnet sampling for hybrids in mid- to late-November and early-December yielded a poor catch rate ( $4.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$ ) overall, with mostly larger ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) sizes represented (Table 10 ). Despite low catch rates overall, the double stocking rate ( $\mathrm{n}=$ approx. 400,000) year class of 2018 (age 4+) was the most well represented year class in the fishery (Tables 11 and 14). The assessment rating for the fishery dipped to "Poor" due to the overall poor sample (Table 12). Condition indices across all size ranges was fair ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=87-88$ ) which is what has been seen in previous sampling years (Table 13). The length-weight equation for hybrid striped bass ( $\mathrm{n}=53$ ) was:

$$
\log _{10}(\text { weight })=-5.3137+3.1592 * \log _{10}(\text { Length })
$$

## Fagan Branch Reservoir (140 acres)

## Largemouth Bass

Largemouth Bass were sampled by nocturnal electrofishing on April 21 (Table 15). The overall Largemouth Bass catch rate ( $361.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; Table 16) was the fourth highest recorded over the last 20 years of sampling. Most of the fish sampled were in the 8.0 - to 11.9 -in length group ( 242.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ), similar to previous years. The $\geq 15.0$-in length group ( $14.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was the second highest and the $\geq 20.0$-in length group ( $4.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) saw the highest number over the past 20 years (Table 16). Largemouth Bass size structure indices are not great ( $\mathrm{PSD}=17$ and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=5$; Table 17) but are higher than previous years. Improvements in size structure are perhaps related to recent removal events of sub- 12.0-in fish (May 2020; $\mathrm{n}=542$; 4.0 fish/acre). The bass population rating has increased to "Good" due to the higher number of bigger fish ( $\geq 15.0$ in and $\geq 20.0$ in) sampled (Table 18). Larger-size bass were in fair condition ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=90$ ) but smaller size groups remained marginal $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=79-81\right.$; Table 19). The lake's low productivity and its obligation to remain so (back up water supply lake for city of Lebanon) remains a handicap for bass growth and size structure improvements.

## Sunfish

Bluegill and Redear Sunfish were sampled by nocturnal electrofishing on April 21 (Table 20). Despite the lake's low productivity, it has historically supported a good Bluegill and Redear Sunfish fishery. Overall CPUE for Bluegill ( 338.3 fish/hr) was slightly higher than average when compared to previous years, but the overall Redear Sunfish CPUE ( $272.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was the second highest recorded over the last 23 years of sampling (Tables 21 and 22). The majority of the Bluegill sampled were in the $<3.0$-in and 3.0- to 5.9 -in length groups ( 185.6 and 137.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, respectively), and the <3.0-in length group was well above average while the 3.0- to 5.9 -in length group was average when compared to previous years (Table 21). The majority of the Redear Sunfish sampled were in the 3.0to 5.9 -in and 6.0 - to 7.9 -in length groups ( 95.8 and 116.8 fish/hr, respectively), and they were the highest and second highest catch rates within the last 23 years (Table 22). Size structure indices for both populations were significantly lower (Bluegill PSD $=10$, Redear Sunfish PSD $=50$ ) than the previous sample in 2019 (Bluegill PSD $=54$, Redear Sunfish PSD $=62$; Table 23). Changes in sunfish population structure are perhaps related to smaller bass removal (4.0 fish/acre) in May of 2020. The Bluegill population assessment decreased to "Poor" due to the very low numbers of $\geq 6.0$-in fish and no catch rate for $\geq 8.0$-in fish (Table 24 ). The Redear Sunfish population assessment remains "Good", similar to previous years (Tables 25).

## Marion County Lake ( 25 acres)

## Largemouth Bass

Nocturnal Largemouth Bass electrofishing was conducted on April 26 (Table 26). The overall catch rate of bass ( $241.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was the lowest noted in the past 17 years; below the management objective of $300.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 26). Size structure indices ( $\mathrm{PSD}=16$ and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=3$ ) increased from the previous sample but remain very low. The population is dominated by fish in the 8.0 - to 11.9 -in range ( 151.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) with very poor numbers of fish $\geq 15.0$ in ( 6.0 fish/hr; Tables 27 and 28). The bass population assessment remains "Fair", and it should be noted that the lake is managed for quality-size sunfish (Table 29).

## Green River Lake

## Black Bass

Nocturnal bass electrofishing was conducted on the upper and lower ends of each lake arm (Green River and Robinson Creek) during late April and early May (Table 30). The overall Largemouth CPUE of 153.2 fish/hr was similar to the last few years (Table 31) as were most length group catch rates. Quality-size Largemouth Bass catch rates ( $\geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}$; 65.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) were the highest we've documented at Green River Lake. Largemouth size structure indices ( $\mathrm{PSD}=76$; RSD=51; Table 32) were similar to previous years. The population assessment for Largemouth Bass remained "Excellent"; similar to the last ten years (Table 33).

Spotted Bass catch rate (44.7 fish/hr; Table 30) returned to the average range after the high CPUE's of the previous two years ( $2019=79.2 ; 2018=66.0$ fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ). High numbers of Spotted Bass from these years did not persist into 2021 or reappear in the 2022 spring sample. The population continues to produce notable numbers of fish $>12.0$ inches in length ( $\mathrm{PSD}=41$; Table 32), which was rare prior to Alewife introduction in 2004, when few spotted bass achieved such lengths.

Fall YOY sampling (Tables 34 and 35) suggests a moderate 2022 Largemouth Bass year class as age-0 CPUE >5.0 in ( $16.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was slightly less than the average of the last 10 years. The lower lake sites (more nutrient challenged) from both lake arms continue to produce lower numbers of age-0 fish. The higher overall catch rate of age- 0 Largemouth ( 68.5 fish/hr) was bolstered by age- 0 fish from upper lake sites. Bass condition indices were reported despite low numbers of larger fish even with a later sampling date (Table 36). Good condition $(\mathrm{Wr}=95)$ was noted for larger size ranges

## Crappie

Trap netting for crappie was conducted during early- to mid-December (Table 1). The White Crappie population is represented by multiple year classes containing mainly slower growing individuals (Tables 37 and 39). The White Crappie size structure index $(\operatorname{PSD}=41$; Table 38) returned to prior year values ( 2018 PSD=47 and 2014 PSD =49) with a stronger influence of the 2019 year class. Mean age-2+ size of White Crappie ( 7.8 in ) fell below the average of the last 10 years (Table 43); reflective of a slower growing, mildly crowded population. Age-2+ crappie lengths in years prior to 2006, before the persisting population increase, were typically 9.0 in plus. The White Crappie population assessment remained "Good"; only held back by poor grow rates, like prior years (Table 43). The lengthweight equation for White Crappie in 2022 was:

$$
\log _{10}(\text { weight })=-3.86033+3.52315 \times \log (\text { length })
$$

Black Crappie representation in trapnet samples remains low overall ( $n=47$; Tables 37 and 40), but numbers show an increase when combining multiple sampling gears (creel, netting and electrofishing).

## Muskellunge

Muskellunge diurnal winter electrofishing was done over multiple days and months (Table 1); however, data use for relative abundance estimates continues to be sketchy. Condition indices ( Wr and length-weight regression) based on a limited number of fish $(\mathrm{n}=16)$ suggests Muskellunge condition was "fair", but slightly less fit than previous years (Table 44). This was the first year out of the last four that Muskellunge sampling wasn't precluded by prolonged high water. The length-weight equation for Muskellunge ( $\mathrm{n}=16$ ) was:
$\log _{10}($ weight $)=-3.72639+3.07713 * \log _{10}($ Length $)$

## Mill Creek Lake (109 acres)

## Black Bass

Largemouth Bass were collected by diurnal electrofishing on October 27 to assess condition and collect fin clips for
genetic analysis. Relative weight indices (Wr) indicate bass condition is good for larger sizes ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$; $\mathrm{Wr}=94$ ) and fair for smaller sizes (Table 45). Although the lake has ample sunfish, gizzard shad, and alewife populations, the average condition of smaller size ranges of Largemouth Bass is likely due to competition with the sizeable spotted bass population. The length-weight equation for Largemouth Bass ( $\mathrm{n}=101$ ) was:
$\log 10($ weight $)=-3.52645+3.14769 * \log _{10}($ Length $)$

## Channel Catfish

Tandem hoop nets were deployed from September 27-30 with a 20.0 fish per net set catch rate. Channel Catfish have been stocked at 15 fish/acre since 2015 (odd year stockings). Although the sample was dominated by smaller sizes (<13.0 in; Table 46), fish were in fairly good condition ( $\mathrm{Wr}=88-92$; Table 47). The length-weight equation for Channel Catfish ( $\mathrm{n}=100$ ) was:
$\log 10($ weight $)=-3.94212+3.34777 * \log _{10}($ Length $)$

## Spurlington Lake (25 acres)

## Black Bass

Largemouth Bass were sampled by nocturnal electrofishing on April 26 (Table 48). The 2021 and 2022 year classes were both poorly represented (Tables 49 and 51 ). Catch rates of larger size groups were above average ( $\geq 15.0$ in $=$ $66.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, >20.0 in = $8.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; Table 50) while intermediate size groups dipped well below average (Table 49). Size structure indices ( $\mathrm{PSD}=76, \mathrm{RSD}=35$; Table 50) reflect the skewed population of larger fish. The Largemouth Bass population assessment remains "Excellent", similar to previous years (Table 51).

Table 1. Lake sampling conditions in the Southwestern Fisheries District in 2022.

| Lake | Date | Species | Water temp. <br> surface (F) | Conductivity (umhos) | Secchi <br> (in) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barren River | 5/2 | Bass | 74 |  | 42 | 3 ft above summer pool \& falling; 3236 cfs outflow |
|  | 5/4 | Bass | 67-68 | 170 | 38 \& 56 | 2 ft above summer pool \& falling; 3218 cfs outflow |
|  | 5/5 | Bass | 67 | 170 \& 180 | 56 \& 120 | 1 ft above summer pool \& falling; 3200 cfs outflow |
|  | 9/7-8,14 | Blue Catfish | 78-83 | 200-ish |  | Thermocline $16-17 \mathrm{ft}$ |
|  | 10/3 | YOY bass | 72-73 | 210 | 50 | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ below summer pool \& steady; 91 cfs outflow |
|  | 10/4 | YOY bass | 71 | 190 | 22 | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ below summer pool \& steady; 91 cfs outflow |
|  | 10/11 | YOY bass | 68 | 195 | 27 | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ below summer pool \& steady; 90 cfs outflow |
|  | 10/12 | YOY bass | 68 | 205 | 34 | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ below summer pool \& steady; 90 cfs outflow |
|  | 11/16-11/17 | Hybrid/White Bass | 54-56 |  |  | 18 to 19 ft below summer pool \& falling; 824 cfs outflow |
|  | 12/1-12/2 | Hybrid/White Bass | 49 |  |  | 23 to 24 ft below summer pool \& falling; 1552 cfs outflow |
|  | 12/6-12/7 | Hybrid/White Bass | 46-54 |  |  | Winter pool \& rising; 403 cfs outflow |
| Fagan Branch | 4/21 | Bluegill \& Redear/Bass | 58 | 107 | 84 | Normal |
|  | 10/20 | Wr Bass | 59 |  |  | Normal |
| Green River | 4/27 | Bass | 64-66 |  | 74 | 1 ft above summer pool \& falling; 2333 cfs outflow |
|  | 4/28 | Bass | 64-67 |  | 66 \& 74 | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ above summer pool \& falling; 2322 cfs outflow |
|  | 5/2 | Bass | 66-71 |  | 61 \& 66 | Summer pool \& steady; 398 cfs outflow |
|  | 11/1 | YOY Bass | 64 | 125 | 36 | 2 ft below summer pool \& steady; 454 cfs outflow |
|  | 11/2 | YOY Bass | 64 | 135 | 51 \& 62 | 3 ft below summer pool \& steady; 454 cfs outflow |
|  | 11/3 | YOY Bass | 64-66 | 125 \& 135 | 48 \& 62 | 4 ft below summer pool \& steady; 454 cfs outflow |
|  | 12/7 | Crappie | 51-55 |  |  | Winter pool \& rising; 438 cfs outflow |
|  | 12/8 | Crappie | 51-54 |  |  | 1 ft above winter pool \& rising; 442 cfs outflow |
|  | 12/13 | Crappie |  |  |  | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ above w inter pool \& steady; 438 cfs outflow |
|  | 12/14 | Crappie | 50 |  |  | $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ above w inter pool \& steady; 438 cfs outflow |
|  | 4/26 | Bass | 68 | 53 | 26 | Normal |
| Marion Co. | 9/30 | Channel Cattish | 64-69 |  | 40 | Normal |
| Mill Creek | 10/27 | Wr Bass | 61 | 210 |  | Normal |
| Spurlington | 4/26 | Bass | 68 | 58 | 18 | Normal |

Table 2. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours (12-0.50-hour runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Barren River Lake in early May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Peninsula | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 24 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 109 | 72.7 | 9.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 23 | 27 | 14 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 169 | 112.7 | 5.7 |
| Beaver Creek | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  |  | 1 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 20 | 29 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 1 |  |  | 155 | 103.3 | 8.5 |
| Peter Creek | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 15 | 10.0 | 2.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 19 | 16 | 24 | 30 | 18 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 182 | 121.3 | 10.4 |
| Walnut Creek | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 10.7 | 4.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 9 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 17 | 16 | 33 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 187 | 124.7 | 13.7 |
| TOTAL | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 20 | 23 | 31 | 26 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 140 | 23.3 | 9.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 17 | 27 | 19 | 42 | 44 | 39 | 15 | 18 | 15 | 45 | 53 | 70 | 115 | 75 | 49 | 34 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 693 | 115.5 | 4.9 |
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Table 3. Spring diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Barren River Lake 2012-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 25.0 | 3.4 | 14.5 | 2.2 | 28.0 | 2.9 | 48.0 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 115.5 | 4.9 |
| 2021 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 20.0 | 1.9 | 35.7 | 4.5 | 31.2 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 90.0 | 6.6 |
| 2020 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 31.7 | 9.5 | 27.8 | 5.5 | 30.0 | 3.3 | 35.2 | 5.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 124.7 | 12.9 |
| 2016 | 7.5 | 1.6 | 16.5 | 2.8 | 48.0 | 4.9 | 23.5 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 95.5 | 7.4 |
| 2015 | 10.5 | 3.1 | 44.3 | 6.7 | 40.2 | 5.8 | 24.7 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 119.7 | 12.2 |
| 2014 | 26.9 | 10.0 | 45.8 | 6.1 | 48.7 | 5.5 | 44.0 | 7.2 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 165.3 | 18.5 |
| 2013 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 31.3 | 9.0 | 52.7 | 7.3 | 65.2 | 7.0 | 54.7 | 5.6 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 203.8 | 15.8 |
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Table 4. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on spring sampling at Barren River Lake 2012-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  | 2021* |  | 2017 |  | 2016 |  | 2015 |  | 2014* |  | $\underline{2012}$ |  |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Grow th |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | 15.8 | 4 | 15.8 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 | 14.4 | 4 |
| Size structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | 28.0 | 3 | 35.7 | 4 | 30.0 | 3 | 48.0 | 4 | 40.2 | 4 | 48.7 | 4 | 65.2 | 4 |
| Size structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | 48.0 | 4 | 31.2 | 4 | 35.2 | 4 | 23.5 | 4 | 24.7 | 4 | 44.0 | 4 | 54.7 | 4 |
| Size structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | 0.7 | 3 | 0.7 | 3 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.5 | 3 | 1.2 | 3 | 2.0 | 4 | 2.7 | 4 |
| Recruitment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | 29.4 | 3 | 3.5 | 1 | 46.8 | 4 | 8.0 | 1 | 19.2 | 2 | 44.5 | 4 | 43.8 | 4 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  | -0.619 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.558 |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A)\% |  |  | 46.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.2 |  |  |  |
| Total score |  | 17 |  | 16 |  | 18 |  | 16 |  | 17 |  | 20 |  | 20 |
| Assessment rating |  | Excellent |  | Good |  | Excellent |  | Good |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |
| sw dbrlbb.d12-d22 <br> brlbbag.d22 <br> * Age data collected in fall |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species collected during 6.0 hours (12-0.50-hour runs) of spring diurnal electrofishing at each area of Barren River Lake in early May 2022. $95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}^{\text {A }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peninsula | Largemouth Bass | 117 | $83( \pm 7)$ | $62( \pm 8)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 104 | $91( \pm 5)$ | 56 ( $\pm 9)$ |
| Beaver Creek | Largemouth Bass | 132 | $78( \pm 7)$ | $48( \pm 8)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 0 | * | * |
| Peter Creek | Largemouth Bass | 151 | $86( \pm 5)$ | $47( \pm 8)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 15 | $100( \pm 0)$ | $33( \pm 24)$ |
| Walnut Creek | Largemouth Bass | 143 | $88( \pm 5)$ | $57( \pm 8)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 16 | $81( \pm 20)$ | $38( \pm 24)$ |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 543 | $84( \pm 3)$ | $53( \pm 4)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 135 | $91( \pm 5)$ | $51( \pm 9)$ |

[^17]Table 6. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours (12-0.50-hour runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Barren River Lake in early October 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Peninsula | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass | 10 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 28.7 | 9.7 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 56 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 136 | 90.7 | 9.0 |
| Beaver Creek | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 188 | 59 | 21 | 25 | 46 | 24 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 418 | 278.7 | 2.4 |
| Peter Creek | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 6.0 | 2.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 52 | 527 | 44 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 701 | 467.3 | 184.2 |
| Walnut Creek | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 20 | 12 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 | 24.7 | 21.7 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 37 | 188 | 45 | 33 | 26 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 375 | 250.0 | 38.8 |
| TOTAL | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass | 12 | 31 | 14 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 7 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89 | 14.8 | 6.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 146 | 926 | 154 | 62 | 73 | 77 | 37 | 21 | 30 | 26 | 16 | 12 | 17 | 9 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1630 | 271.7 | 56.9 |
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Table 7. Indices of year-class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected during diurnal fall electrofishing at Barren River Lake 2012-2022.

| Year-class | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $1^{B}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.0 | <0.1 | 242.6 | 57.9 | 38.2 | 7.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.4 | <0.1 | 301.7 | 59.0 | 69.7 | 19.6 | 29.4 | 3.5 |
| 2020 | 3.9 | <0.1 | 241.0 | 67.2 | 29.7 | 8.1 | 3.5 | 1.2 |
| 2019 | 4.3 | <0.1 | 116.1 | 20.5 | 27.1 | 5.7 | ND |  |
| 2018 | 3.9 | <0.1 | 210.1 | 23.7 | 43.8 | 11.2 | ND |  |
| 2017 | 4.1 | <0.1 | 148.7 | 36.3 | 22.0 | 3.7 | ND |  |
| 2016 | 4.3 | <0.1 | 179.5 | 38.2 | 34.2 | 9.9 | 46.8 | 13.4 |
| 2015 | 4.0 | <0.1 | 154.8 | 25.0 | 18.6 | 3.2 | 8.0 | 1.7 |
| 2014 | 4.0 | <0.1 | 156.2 | 25.0 | 36.3 | 6.6 | 19.2 |  |
| 2013 | 3.9 | <0.1 | 365.3 | 91.4 | 57.4 | 8.3 | 44.5 | 13.1 |
| 2012 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 69.1 | 16.5 | 31.8 | 10.6 | ND |  |

${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (September-November) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by analysis of otoliths removed from a subsample of $\mathrm{LMB}<10.0 \mathrm{in}$, and extrapolated to the entire catch of the fall sample.
${ }^{\text {B }}$ Data collected during the following spring (April/May) diurnal electrofishing sample.
ND = no data available
swdbrlbb.d12-d22
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Table 8. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) for Blue and Flathead catfish collected by electrofishing for 3.0 hours ( 36 - 0.0833 -hour runs) on September 7, 8, and 14 at Barren River Lake, KY 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 1 | 7 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 31 | 32 | 34 | 38 | 39 |  |  | SE |
| Blue Catfish | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 3 | 5 |  | 6 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 53 | 17.7 | 3.5 |
| Flathead Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 21 | 7.0 | 1.9 |
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Table 9. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Blue Catfish collected by diurnal lowpulse electrofishing at Barren River Lake in early- to mid-September 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $12.0-19.9$ in | $20.0-29.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $\geq 30.0$ in |
| $\mathrm{W}_{r}$ | $92(5)$ | $99(3)$ | $95(5)$ |
| N | 27 | 17 | 6 |
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Table 10. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) for Blue Catfish, White Bass, and hybrid striped bass collected by experimental gillnets (11 netnights) from mid- to late-November and early December at Barren River Lake, KY 2022.

swdbrlgn.d22

Table 11. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of hybrid striped bass collected from experimental gillnets in mid-November and earlyDecember at Barren River Lake, 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 6 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 23 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 15 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 10 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 15 | 31 | 1.4 | 0.5 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1$ |  | 1 | $2$ | $4$ | $0.2$ | $0.1$ |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | $1$ | 2 | $0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| Total | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 48 | 100 |  |  |
| \% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 2 | 100 |  |  |  |

Table 12. Hybrid striped bass population assessment from experimental gillnetting at Barren River Lake 20122022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2022}$ |  | $\underline{2020}$ |  | $\underline{2017}$ |  | $\underline{2015}$ |  | $\underline{2012}$ |  |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Population Density |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPUE age 1 and older | 4.4 | 2 | 21.3 | 3 | 15.5 | 3 | 10.1 | 3 | 18.0 | 3 |
| Growth Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean length age 2+ at capture | 18.6 | 3 | 18.5 | 3 | 19.5 | 4 | 18.5 | 3 | 18.4 | 3 |
| Size Structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | 3.4 | 2 | 19.3 | 4 | 13.0 | 4 | 8.0 | 3 | 12.3 | 3 |
| Recruitment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPUE age 1 | 1.0 | 1 | 1.6 | 2 | 9.3 | 4 | 2.4 | 2 | 7.0 | 3 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.308 |  |
| Annual mortality (A)\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Total score |  | 8 |  | 12 |  | 15 |  | 11 |  | 12 |
| Assessment rating |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Excellent |  | Good |  | Good |
| swdbrlag.d12-22 swdbrlgn.d12-22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 13. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of hybrid striped bass collected by gill nets (11 net-nights) at Barren River Lake from mid-November and early-December, 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $8.0-11.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $12.0-14.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | $88(4)$ | $87(2)$ | $88(2)$ |
| No. | 4 | 10 | 35 |
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Table 14. Mean back calculated length (in) at each annulus for hybrid striped bass collected from Barren River Lake in mid-November to early-December 2022, including the range of hybrid striped bass at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval for each age.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2021 | 8 | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 3 | 10.3 | 16.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 4 | 8.5 | 15.5 | 19.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 12 | 9.9 | 16.9 | 19.8 | 21.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 2 | 7.6 | 16.0 | 20.3 | 22.3 | 23.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 2 | 9.9 | 17.5 | 20.2 | 21.9 | 22.4 | 22.9 |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 2 | 12.9 | 16.3 | 19.0 | 20.6 | 21.8 | 22.8 | 23.7 | 24.6 |  |
| 2013 | 1 | 10.1 | 16.9 | 20.0 | 21.3 | 22.1 | 22.6 | 23.1 | 23.9 | 24.4 |
| Mean |  | 9.0 | 16.5 | 19.7 | 21.4 | 22.5 | 22.8 | 23.5 | 24.4 | 24.4 |
| No. |  | 11 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Smallest |  | 5.4 | 12.2 | 17.3 | 19.4 | 21.1 | 21.8 | 23.1 | 23.9 | 24.4 |
| Largest |  | 13.8 | 19.6 | 21.9 | 23.7 | 23.7 | 23.9 | 23.7 | 24.9 | 24.4 |
| SE |  | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |  |
| 95\% CI (+/-) |  | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; intercept $=0$
swdbrlag.d22

Table 15. Largemouth Bass length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) collected during 1.0 hour (4-0.25-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Fagan Branch Reservoir on 21 April 2022.


Table 16. Spring nocturnal electrofishing CPUE of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Fagan Branch Reservoir 2000-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 69.0 | 17.8 | 242.0 | 16.7 | 36.0 | 9.9 | 14.0 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 361.0 | 28.8 |
| 2019 | 102.0 | 6.0 | 287.0 | 35.0 | 45.0 | 8.7 | 6.0 | 2.0 |  |  | 440.0 | 39.8 |
| 2016 | 82.0 | 11.4 | 174.0 | 25.2 | 17.0 | 4.1 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 279.0 | 29.7 |
| 2013 | 56.0 | 5.2 | 143.0 | 4.1 | 37.0 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 240.0 | 7.7 |
| 2010 | 80.8 | 15.5 | 152.8 | 9.0 | 80.8 | 6.0 | 13.6 | 3.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 328.0 | 20.0 |
| 2007 | 84.8 | 18.2 | 202.4 | 4.5 | 72.8 | 5.6 | 8.0 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 368.0 | 24.3 |
| 2005 | 105.6 | 19.2 | 173.6 | 19.7 | 76.8 | 4.6 | 15.2 | 2.9 |  |  | 371.2 | 39.1 |
| 2002 | 16.0 | 5.6 | 50.5 | 9.2 | 99.7 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 3.2 |  |  | 174.2 | 12.9 |
| 2001 | 23.3 | 4.3 | 34.0 | 3.8 | 110.7 | 8.1 | 2.7 | 1.3 |  |  | 170.7 | 7.6 |
| 2000 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 88.0 | 9.4 | 64.0 | 13.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 |  |  | 162.7 | 18.6 |

swdlclbb.d00-d22

Table 17. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour (4-
0.25-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Fagan Branch Reservoir on 21 April 2022.

95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 292 | $17( \pm 4)$ | $5( \pm 3)$ |

swdlclbb.d22

Table 18. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on nocturrnal spring sampling at Fagan Branch Reservoir 1999-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment)

| Parameter | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2022}$ |  | $\underline{2019}$ |  | $\underline{2016}$ |  | 2013 |  | $\underline{2010}$ |  | 2007 |  | $\underline{2005}$ |  | 2002 |  | 2001 |  | 2000 |  |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | 10.6* | 2 | 10.6* | 2 | 10.6* | 2 | $10.6{ }^{*}$ | 2 | 10.6* | 2 | 10.6 | 2 | 11.5* | 3 | 11.5* | 3 | 11.5* | 3 | 11.5 | 3 |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | 27.8 | 3 | 26.9 | 3 | 67.0 | 4 | 32.0 | 3 | 12.8 | 2 | 20.8 | 2 | 44.0 | 3 | 16.0 | 2 | 17.3 | 2 | 4.7 | 1 |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | 36.0 | 3 | 45.0 | 4 | 17.0 | 2 | 37.0 | 3 | 80.8 | 4 | 72.8 | 4 | 76.8 | 4 | 100.6 | 4 | 110.7 | 4 | 64.0 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | 14.0 | 3 | 6.0 | 2 | 6.0 | 2 | 5.0 | 1 | 13.6 | 3 | 8.0 | 2 | 15.2 | 3 | 8.6 | 2 | 2.7 | 1 | 0.7 | 1 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | 4.0 | 4 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 3 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.8 | 2 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.629 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.361 |  |
| Annual mortality (A)\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.3 |  |
| Total score |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 12 |  | 13 |  | 12 |  | 14 |  | 12 |  | 11 |  | 10 |
| Assessment rating |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Fair |  | Fair |

* No age data, values carried over from years with age data
sw dlclag.d00 \& d07
sw dlclbb.d00-d22

Table 19. Mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour (4-0.25-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Fagan Branch Reservoir on 20 October 2022.
Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $8.0-11.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $12.0-14.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ |
| $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | $81(1)$ | $79(1)$ | $90(4)$ |
| No. | 74 | 53 | 8 |

swdlclwr.D22

Table 20. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected during 0.67 hours ( $4-0.167$-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Fagan Branch Reservoir on 21 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 67 | 57 | 47 | 27 | 18 | 7 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 226 | 338.3 | 42.2 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 5 | 27 | 10 | 27 | 38 | 40 | 20 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 182 | 272.5 | 52.7 |

Table 21. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected at Fagan Branch Reservoir from 1999-2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <3.0 in | 3.0-5.9 in | 6.0-7.9 in | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |
| 2022 | 185.6 | 137.7 | 15.0 |  | 338.3 |
|  | (34.7) | (4.2) | (5.2) |  | (42.2) |
| 2019* | 40.0 | 144.0 | 142.0 | 30.0 | 356.0 |
|  | (12.7) | (56.4) | (24.7) | (11.9) | (93.4) |
| 2016 | 16.5 | 53.9 | 115.3 | 62.9 | 248.5 |
|  | (6.2) | (5.5) | (5.1) | (11.6) | (13.5) |
| 2013 | 46.4 | 52.4 | 83.8 | 28.4 | 212.0 |
|  | (12.3) | (5.1) | (34.1) | (6.6) | (25.6) |
| 2010 | 220.0 | 526.0 | 242.0 | 14.0 | 1002.0 |
|  | (47.6) | (63.4) | (39.7) | (8.3) | (96.0) |
| 2007 | 76.0 | 50.0 | 78.0 | 36.0 | 240.2 |
|  | (11.6) | (20.8) | (24.1) | (20.8) | (47.8) |
| 2005 | 74.3 | 198.2 | 42.8 | 42.8 | 319.8 |
|  | (18.9) | (30.6) | (11.9) | (11.9) | (37.6) |
| 2001 | 99.1 | 102.1 | 105.1 | 22.5 | 328.8 |
|  | (46.1) | (48.9) | (32.7) | (9.5) | (97.9) |
| 2000 | 16.7 | 32.0 | 47.3 | 6.7 | 102.7 |
|  | (6.5) | (8.3) | (6.4) | (2.2) | (10.8) |
| 1999 | 5.3 | 20.0 | 46.0 | 4.0 | 75.3 |
|  | (2.2) | (8.3) | (9.6) | (2.1) | (14.0) |

Table 22. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Redear Sunfish collected at Fagan Branch Reservoir from 1999-2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <3.0 in | 3.0-5.9 in | 6.0-7.9 in | $\geq 8.0$ in | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |
| 2022 | 7.5 | 95.8 | 116.8 | 52.4 | 7.5 | 272.5 |
|  | (4.5) | (10.7) | (25.7) | (24.6) | (1.5) | (52.7) |
| 2019* |  | 64.0 | 154.0 | 136.0 | 8.0 | 354.0 |
|  |  | (16.0) | (30.0) | (34.1) | (3.3) | (37.2) |
| 2016 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 10.5 | 41.9 | 1.5 | 56.9 |
|  | (1.7) | (1.5) | (5.1) | (10.1) | (1.5) | (9.0) |
| 2013 | 1.5 | 25.5 | 62.9 | 31.4 | 1.5 | 120.0 |
|  | (1.5) | (8.9) | (24.5) | (6.2) | (1.5) | (31.2) |
| 2010 |  | 86.0 | 40.0 | 42.0 | 4.0 | 168.0 |
|  |  | (18.3) | (19.6) | (7.6) | (2.3) | (40.3) |
| 2007 | 12.0 | 40.0 | 36.0 | 114.0 | 16.0 | 202.0 |
|  | (12.0) | (17.0) | (20.0) | (43.0) | (8.6) | (69.5) |
| 2005 |  | 24.8 | 58.6 | 31.5 | 2.3 | 114.9 |
|  |  | (10.0) | (16.7) | (9.4) | (2.3) | (22.2) |
| 2001 |  | 3.0 | 27.0 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 39.0 |
|  |  | (1.0) | (6.6) | (2.3) | (1.9) | (9.2) |
| 2000 |  |  | 1.3 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 6.0 |
|  |  |  | (0.8) | (1.2) | (1.3) | (0.9) |
| 1999 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 4.0 | 20.7 |
|  | (1.3) | (1.3) | (3.1) | (2.5) | (1.5) | (5.4) |

swdlclbg.d99-d22

* Based on 4 runs of 450s vs the normal 600s

Table 23. Proportional stock density (PSD) and relative stock density (RSD) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected by nocturnal electrofishing at Fagan Branch Reservoir on 21 April 2022. Numbers in parentheses represent $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 102 | $10( \pm 6)$ | 0 |
| Redear Sunfish | 150 | $50( \pm 8)$ | $10( \pm 5)$ |

[^18]Table 24. Bluegill population assessments from 1999-2022 at Fagan Branch Reservoir (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  | $\underline{2019}$ |  | $\underline{2016}$ |  | $\underline{2013}$ |  | $\underline{2010}$ |  | $\underline{2007}$ |  | 2005 |  | 2001 |  | 2000 |  | 1999 |  |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |  | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value Score |  |
| Mean length age 2 at capture | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9 | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 | 2.9* | 1 |
| Years to 6.0 in | 3.8* | 3 | $3.8{ }^{*}$ | 3 | $3.8{ }^{*}$ | 3 | $3.8{ }^{*}$ | 3 | 3.8 | 3 | 3.8* | 3 | $3.8{ }^{*}$ | 3 | $3.8{ }^{*}$ | 3 | $3.8{ }^{*}$ | 3 | 3.8* | 3 |
| CPUE $\geq 6.0$ in | 15.0 | 1 | 172.0 | 4 | 178.1 | 4 | 112.3 | 4 | 256.0 | 4 | 114.0 | 4 | 47.3 | 2 | 127.6 | 4 | 54.0 | 2 | 50.0 | 2 |
| CPUE $\geq 8.0$ in | 0.0 | 1 | 30.0 | 4 | 62.9 | 4 | 28.4 | 4 | 14.0 | 4 | 36.0 | 4 | 4.5 | 3 | 22.5 | 4 | 6.7 | 4 | 4.0 | 3 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total score: |  | 6 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 9 |  | 12 |  | 10 |  | 9 |
| Assessment rating |  | Poor |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Good |  | Fair |

[^19]Table 25. Redear Sunfish population assessments from 1999-2022 at Fagan Branch Reservoir (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  | $\underline{2019}$ |  | $\underline{2016}$ |  | $\underline{2013}$ |  | 2010 |  | 2007 |  | 2005 |  | 2001 |  | 2000 |  | 1999 |  |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 | 5.7* | 1 | 5.7* | 1 | 5.7 | 1 | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 | $5.7^{*}$ | 1 |
| Years to 8.0 in | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6 | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 | 4.6* | 3 |
| CPUE $\geq 8.0$ in | 52.4 | 4 | 290.0 | 4 | 41.9 | 4 | 31.4 | 4 | 40.0 | 4 | 36.0 | 4 | 58.6 | 4 | 27.0 | 4 | 1.3 | 1 | 10.0 | 3 |
| CPUE $\geq 10.0$ in | 7.5 | 4 | 8.0 | 4 | 1.5 | 3 | 1.5 | 3 | 4.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 4 | 2.3 | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 1.3 | 3 | 4.0 | 4 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total score: |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 11 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 8 |  | 11 |
| Assessment rating |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |

*No age data, values carried over from years with age data
sw dlclag.d10
sw dlcllbg.d99-d22

Table 26. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour (4-0.250-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Marion Co. Lake on 26 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 4 | 19 | 26 | 10 | 3 | 30 | 53 | 35 | 33 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 241 | 241.0 | 17.0 |

Table 27. Spring nocturnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Marion County Lake 2005-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022* | 62.0 | 8.1 | 151.0 | 13.5 | 22.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 241.0 | 17.0 |
| 2019* | 148.0 | 25.5 | 241.0 | 9.2 | 16.0 | 5.7 | 8.0 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 413.0 | 40.1 |
| 2016 | 110.9 | 45.9 | 181.7 | 18.7 | 14.9 | 4.4 | 25.1 | 6.4 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 332.6 | 45.9 |
| 2013 | 56.0 | 12.1 | 121.1 | 19.2 | 51.4 | 8.0 | 14.9 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 243.4 | 30.4 |
| 2010 | 140.6 | 24.1 | 316.6 | 22.2 | 11.4 | 4.9 | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |  | 470.9 | 44.7 |
| 2009 | 125.0 | 19.3 | 472.0 | 43.0 | 12.0 | 3.4 | 11.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 620.0 | 56.0 |
| 2008 | 209.1 | 28.5 | 385.1 | 30.4 | 16.0 | 3.9 | 16.0 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 626.3 | 50.0 |
| 2007 | 221.0 | 23.9 | 371.0 | 32.2 | 28.0 | 6.9 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 632.0 | 47.7 |
| 2006 | 112.0 | 20.8 | 170.3 | 30.6 | 59.4 | 5.5 | 38.9 | 4.1 |  |  | 380.6 | 53.8 |
| 2005 | 101.7 | 17.7 | 123.4 | 13.4 | 133.7 | 20.2 | 9.1 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 368.0 | 44.8 |

swdmclbb.d05-d22

* Based on 4 runs of 900 sec vs the normal 7 runs of 450 sec

Table 28. PSD and RSD $_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass collected during 1.0 hour (4-0.250-hour runs) of spring nocturnal electrofishing at Marion County Lake on 26 April 2022. 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 179 | $16( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |

swdmclbb.d22

Table 29. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on nocturnal spring sampling at Marion County Lake from 2005-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2022 |  | 2019 |  | $\underline{2016}$ |  | 2013 |  | 2010 |  | 2009 |  | 2008 |  | 2007 |  | 2006 |  | 2005 |  |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | 10.7* | 2 | 10.7* | 2 | 10.7* | 2 | 10.7* | 2 | 10.7* | 2 | 10.7 | 2 | 11.9* | 4 | 11.9* | 4 | 11.9* | 4 | 11.9* | 4 |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | 60.0* | 4 | 145.0* | 4 | 94.0* | 4 | 49.0* | 4 | 76.0* | 4 | 55.0 | 4 | 201.1 | 4 | 7.0 | 1 | 19.4 | 2 | 101.7 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | 22.0 | 2 | 16.0 | 2 | 14.9 | 2 | 51.4 | 4 | 11.4 | 1 | 12.0 | 1 | 16.0 | 2 | 28.0 | 3 | 59.4 | 4 | 133.7 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | 6.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 2 | 25.1 | 3 | 14.9 | 3 | 2.3 | 1 | 11.0 | 2 | 16.0 | 3 | 12.0 | 2 | 38.9 | 4 | 9.1 | 2 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | 1.0 | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 4.6 | 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 0.0 | 1 | 4.0 | 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 1.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.1 | 2 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A)\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total score |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 15 |  | 16 |  | 9 |  | 13 |  | 16 |  | 12 |  | 15 |  | 16 |
| Assessment rating |  | Fair |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Good |  | Fair |  | Good |  | Good |

* No age data collected, age-0 cutoff breakpoint by length frequency.
sw dmclbb.d05-d22

Table 30. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours (12-0.50-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Green River Lake from April 27-May 2, 2022

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Green River Arm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holmes Bend | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 2 |  |  | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 14.7 | 7.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 1 | 14 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 25 | 12 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 16 | 3 | 1 |  | 245 | 163.3 | 17.9 |
| Ramp 1 | Smallmouth Bass |  | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 17 | 11.3 | 4.4 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  | 1 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 12 | 24 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 94 | 62.7 | 24.7 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 1 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 25 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 26 | 23 | 28 | 17 | 8 | 3 |  | 242 | 161.3 | 14.6 |
| Robinson Creek Arm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smith Ridge | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 26.7 | 9.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 2 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 13 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 2 |  | 148 | 99.0 | 7.1 |
| Lone Valley | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 25 | 16.7 | 2.9 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 16 | 7 | 18 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 112 | 74.7 | 11.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 13 | 24 | 11 | 21 | 24 | 23 | 29 | 44 | 36 | 17 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 284 | 189.3 | 22.3 |
| TOTAL | Smallmouth Bass |  | 6 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 49 | 8.2 | 2.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 18 | 22 | 37 | 36 | 16 | 39 | 44 | 20 | 11 | 11 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 268 | 44.7 | 9.8 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 8 | 43 | 24 | 31 | 36 | 21 | 57 | 69 | 43 | 52 | 75 | 66 | 91 | 102 | 101 | 58 | 29 | 11 | 2 | 919 | 153.2 | 12.3 |

sw dgrlbb.d22

Table 31. Spring diurnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass by length group collected at Green River Lake during late-April to early-mid May since 1997.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 23.7 | 3.5 | 31.7 | 4.6 | 32.2 | 3.3 | 65.7 | 9.4 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 153.2 | 12.3 |
| 2021 | 16.5 | 3.0 | 35.5 | 6.3 | 35.0 | 4.2 | 38.8 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 125.8 | 11.6 |
| 2020 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 26.7 | 4.8 | 35.7 | 3.8 | 40.7 | 3.9 | 37.5 | 4.6 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 140.5 | 5.6 |
| 2018 | 13.3 | 3.8 | 37.8 | 6.4 | 40.2 | 4.2 | 45.8 | 4.4 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 137.2 | 16.1 |
| 2017 | 21.8 | 5.9 | 41.5 | 6.3 | 40.8 | 6.4 | 59.8 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 164.0 | 11.7 |
| 2016 | 15.0 | 3.7 | 13.0 | 2.7 | 25.0 | 4.7 | 40.0 | 5.8 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 93.5 | 9.1 |
| 2015 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 23.3 | 6.0 | 23.7 | 3.7 | 51.7 | 5.9 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 107.8 | 15.0 |
| 2014 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 23.7 | 3.7 | 44.0 | 4.8 | 52.8 | 5.3 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 124.7 | 11.7 |
| 2012 | 16.5 | 4.3 | 54.8 | 6.3 | 35.3 | 6.4 | 38.0 | 5.4 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 144.7 | 16.3 |
| 2011 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | no data due to flooding |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 7.2 | 1.8 | 11.3 | 3.4 | 13.0 | 2.7 | 42.8 | 7.9 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 74.3 | 12.3 |
| 2008 | 22.8 | 9.5 | 25.8 | 4.7 | 27.8 | 4.0 | 30.2 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 106.7 | 17.0 |
| 2007 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 20.5 | 2.5 | 33.7 | 5.8 | 22.2 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 80.2 | 10.3 |
| 2006 | 15.1 | 2.0 | 44.4 | 3.6 | 23.1 | 2.8 | 18.9 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 96.2 | 5.3 |
| 2005 | 67.8 | 8.0 | 30.7 | 2.8 | 11.7 | 1.9 | 16.8 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 127.0 | 12.5 |
| 2004 | 17.3 | 2.7 | 22.8 | 2.1 | 11.6 | 1.8 | 15.6 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 67.3 | 6.4 |
| 2003 | 5.8 | 1.4 | 12.3 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 18.2 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 42.2 | 4.1 |
| 2002 | 5.0 | 1.1 | 9.5 | 1.5 | 20.5 | 2.5 | 13.0 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 48.0 | 4.2 |
| 2001 | 10.2 | 2.5 | 26.7 | 3.0 | 32.2 | 6.5 | 12.5 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 81.5 | 7.8 |
| 2000 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 41.0 | 4.4 | 24.2 | 3.4 | 14.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 82.3 | 8.6 |
| 1999 | 21.4 | 3.8 | 53.5 | 7.2 | 19.4 | 4.0 | 14.3 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 108.6 | 12.5 |
| 1998 | 33.5 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 1.8 | 8.8 | 2.0 | 17.5 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 68.8 | 8.6 |
| 1997 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 22.3 | 2.5 | 23.3 | 2.8 | 23.2 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 72.5 | 5.2 |

sw dgrlbb.D97-D22

Table 32. PSD and RSD values for each black bass species collected during 6.0 hours (12-0.50-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing by area at Green River Lake from April 27 - May 2, 2022. 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD ${ }^{\text {A }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Green River Arm |  |  |  |  |
| Holmes Bend | Largemouth Bass | 200 | 70 ( $\pm 6)$ | $47( \pm 7)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 20 | $35( \pm 21)$ | * |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 0 | * | * |
| Ramp 1 | Largemouth Bass | 200 | 75 ( $\pm 7)$ | 53 ( $\ddagger 7$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 86 | 70 ( $\pm 6)$ | 12 ( $\pm 6)$ |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 3 | * | * |
| Robinson Creek Arm |  |  |  |  |
| Smith Ridge | Largemouth Bass | 112 | $73( \pm 8)$ | $42( \pm 9)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 33 | $33( \pm 10)$ | * |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 1 | * | * |
| Lone Valley | Largemouth Bass | 265 | 82 ( $\pm 6)$ | $48( \pm 8)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 99 | $55( \pm 10)$ | 11 ( $\pm 6)$ |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 15 | $47( \pm 26)$ | $27( \pm 23)$ |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 777 | $76( \pm 3)$ | $51( \pm 4)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 238 | 53 ( $\pm 6)$ | $10( \pm 4)$ |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 27 | 41 ( $\pm 19)$ | $22( \pm 18)$ |

[^20]Table 33. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on nocturnal spring sampling at Green River Lake from 2009-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | 2022 |  | 2021 |  | 2019 |  | 2018 |  | 2017 |  | 2016 |  | 2015 |  | $\underline{2013}$ |  | 2012 |  | 2009 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | 13.1 | 4 | 13.1 | 4 | 13.1 | 4 | 13.1 | 4 | 13.1 | 4 | 13.1 | 4 | 13.1 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 | 14.6 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | 25.5 | 3 |  | data | 34.3 | 3 | 17.7 | 2 | 34.5 | 3 | 17.3 | 2 | 16.0 | 2 | 3.8 | 1 | 15.5 | 2 | 7.2 | 1 |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | 32.2 | 4 | 35.0 | 4 | 40.7 | 4 | 40.2 | 4 | 40.8 | 4 | 25.0 | 3 | 23.7 | 3 | 44.0 | 4 | 35.3 | 4 | 13.0 | 1 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | 65.7 | 4 | 38.8 | 4 | 37.5 | 4 | 45.8 | 4 | 59.8 | 4 | 40.0 | 4 | 51.7 | 4 | 52.8 | 4 | 39.3 | 4 | 42.8 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | 2.2 | 4 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.8 | 4 | 2.7 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 2.5 | 4 | 2.7 | 4 | 3.3 | 4 | 1.3 | 4 | 1.7 | 4 |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.473 |  |  |  |  |  | -0.610 |  |
| Annual mortality (A)\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37.71 |  |  |  |  |  | 45.7 |  |
| Total score |  | 19 |  | >16 |  | 19 |  | 18 |  | 19 |  | 17 |  | 17 |  | 17 |  | 18 |  | 14 |
| Assessment rating |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Excellent |  | Good |

[^21]sw dgrlbb.D09-D22

Table 34. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours (12-0.50-hour runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Green River Lake from November 1-3, 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Green River Arm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holmes Bend | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 22 | 30 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 82 | 54.7 | 8.1 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 6 | 88 | 64 | 27 | 13 | 23 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 273 | 182.0 | 18.2 |
| Ramp 1 | Smallmouth Bass | 1 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 39 | 26.0 | 3.1 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 7 | 41 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69 | 46.0 | 8.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 12 | 38 | 5 |  |  | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 80 | 53.3 | 8.1 |
| Robinson Creek Arm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smith Ridge | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2.7 | 1.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 18 | 13 | 2 |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 53 | 35.3 | 7.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 47 | 19 | 8 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 141 | 94.0 | 25.1 |
| Lone Valley | Smallmouth Bass | 1 | 11 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 40 | 26.7 | 12.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 23 | 60 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 103 | 68.7 | 18.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 9 | 23 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  | 6 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 54 | 36.0 | 11.0 |
| TOTAL | Smallmouth Bass | 2 | 29 | 21 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 86 | 14.3 | 4.6 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 31 | 141 | 48 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 307 | 51.2 | 6.1 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 30 | 196 | 88 | 35 | 29 | 38 | 21 | 26 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 548 | 91.3 | 18.5 |

sw dgrly.$d 22$

Table 35. Largemouth Bass mean length (in) at age 0 and catch rates at age 0 and age 1 at Green River Lake since 2002.

| Year class | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}^{\text {A }}$ |  | Age $1^{\text {B }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 68.5 | 15.7 | 16.2 | 3.8 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 69.3 | 16.4 | 24.5 | 7.3 | 25.5 | 3.7 |
| 2020 | 4.3 | <0.1 | 79.5 | 15.3 | 19.7 | 4.9 | ND |  |
| 2019 | 3.5 | <0.1 | 108.0 | 20.3 | 9.8 | 3.4 | ND |  |
| 2018 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 72.2 | 9.4 | 36.8 | 6.9 | 34.3 | 5.6 |
| 2017 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 19.0 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 2.5 | 17.7 | 4.5 |
| 2016 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 55.3 | 8.7 | 30.3 | 7.9 | 34.7 | 8.8 |
| 2015 | 5.7 | 0.1 | 65.0 | 22.6 | 44.7 | 15.8 | 17.5 | 4.2 |
| 2014 | data collected too late for comparision to other years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 26.0 | 15.4 | 19.3 | 12.9 | ND |  |
| 2012 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 16.5 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 0.8 |
| 2011 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 28.8 | 7.5 | 5.8 | 1.5 | 15.5 | 4.0 |
| 2010 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 45.0 | 8.1 | 18.3 | 4.9 | ND |  |

${ }^{\text {A }}$ Data collected by fall (late-Sept through early November) diurnal electrofishing. Mean lengths were determined by otolith taken from a subsample of LMB <9.0 in and extrapolated to the entire catch of the fall sample.
${ }^{B}$ Data collected during the following spring (May) nocturnal electrofishing.
swdgrlbb.D10-D22
swdgrlag. D10-D22
swdgrlyy. D10-D13, 15-
ND = no data due to spring flooding

Table 36. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of black bass collected by diurnal electrofishing from each area sampled at Green River Lake during early-November 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  |  |  |  | Len | group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Area |  | . 9 in |  | 4.9 in |  | 0 in |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Holmes Bend | 35 | 89 (1) | 8 | 91 (3) | 9 | 92 (5) |
|  | Ramp 1 | 13 | 87 (2) | 2 | 84 (18) | 7 | 99 (3) |
|  | Lone Valley | 5 | 81 (2) | 6 | 89 (1) | 9 | 88 (3) |
|  | Smiths Ridge | 22 | 84 (2) | 5 | 91 (5) | 9 | 101 (4) |
|  | Total | 75 | 87 (1) | 21 | 90 (2) | 34 | 95 (2) |
|  |  |  | . 9 in |  | 3.9 in |  | 0 in |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Spotted Bass | Holmes Bend | 20 | 97 (3) | 3 | 86 (6) | 0 | 0 |
|  | Ramp 1 | 12 | 94 (2) | 2 | 92 (2) | 2 | 106 (5) |
|  | Lone Valley | 10 | 98 (4) | 3 | 94 (7) | 2 | 86 (0) |
|  | Smiths Ridge | 10 | 93 (3) | 5 | 97 (6) | 4 | 102 (4) |
|  | Total | 52 | 96 (2) | 13 | 93 (3) | 8 | 99 (3) |

swdgrlyy.D22

Table 37. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) for each inch class of crappie collected by trap net ( 59 net-nights) at Green River Lake on November 7-8 and 13-14, 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | 85 | 24 | 122 | 373 | 611 | 311 | 236 | 151 | 57 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1990 | 33.7 | 5.6 |
| Black Crappie |  |  | 3 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 47 | 0.8 | 0.3 |

swdgrltn.d22

Table 38. Proportional stock density (PSD) and relative stock density $\left(\mathrm{RSD}_{10}\right)$ of White and Black crappie collected by trap nets (59 net-nights) at Green River Lake from early-mid November 2022. Numbers in parentheses represent 95\% confidence intervals.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{10}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | 1881 | $41( \pm 2)$ | $12( \pm 2)$ |
| Black Crappie | 47 | $49( \pm 15)$ | 0 |

swdgrltn.D22

Table 39. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of White Crappie collected during 51 net-nights at Green River Lake during late-November 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 85 | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 109 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 0.6 |
| 1 |  |  | 122 | 311 | 64 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 510 | 26.0 | 8.7 | 1.6 |
| 2 |  |  |  | 31 | 257 | 104 | 11 | 16 |  |  |  |  | 419 | 21.0 | 7.1 | 1.2 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | 162 | 156 | 150 | 111 | 23 | 1 |  |  | 603 | 30.0 | 10.2 | 2.1 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 31 | 64 | 13 | 43 | 24 | 23 | 2 |  |  | 200 | 10.0 | 3.4 | 0.6 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 21 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 39 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 64 | 13 | 11 |  | 7 | 5 | 2 |  | 102 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0.0 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 0.0 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 85 | 24 | 122 | 373 | 611 | 311 | 236 | 151 | 57 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1990 | 99.0 |  |  |
| \% | 4 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 31 | 16 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 1 | <1 | <1 | 100 |  |  |  |

Table 40. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of Black Crappie collected during 59 net-nights at Green River Lake during early-mid November 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total | $\%$ | CPUE | SE |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 25.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 1 | 3 | 7 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 11.0 | 0.09 | 0.03 |
| 2 |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 22 | 47.0 | 0.37 | 0.11 |
| 3 |  |  | 7 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | 2 | 5 | 1 |  | 8 | 16.0 | 0.1 | $<0.1$ |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3.0 | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 3 | 7 | 14 | 16 | 6 | 1 | 47 | 100 |  |  |
| $\%$ | 6 | 15 | 30 | 34 | 13 | 2 | 100 |  |  |  |
| swdgrltn.d22; swdgrlag.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 41. Mean back calculated length (in) at each annulus for White Crappie collected from Green River Lake in early-mid November 2022, including the range of White Crappie at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval for each age.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2021 | 23 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 21 | 4.7 | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 53 | 4.9 | 7.2 | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 21 | 5.1 | 7.2 | 8.5 | 9.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 7 | 4.4 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 10.7 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 4 | 4.8 | 7.1 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 11.4 | 12.2 |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 12 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 10.6 |  |  |
| 2014 | 1 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 9.2 | 10.4 | 11.6 | 12.5 | 13.1 |  |
| 2013 | 1 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 9.8 | 11.0 | 11.6 | 12.2 | 12.5 |
| Mean |  | 4.8 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 10.6 | 10.8 | 12.7 | 12.5 |
| No. | 143 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallest |  | 3.4 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 12.2 | 12.5 |
| Largest |  | 6.8 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 12.0 | 13.6 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 13.1 | 12.5 |
| SE |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 |  |
| 95\% CI (+/-) |  | 0.2 | 0.03 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.4 |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; intercept $=0$
swdgrlag.d22

Table 42. Mean back calculated length (in) at each annulus for Black Crappie collected from Green River Lake in early-mid November 2022, including the range of Black Crappie at each age and the $95 \%$ confidence interval for each age.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2021 | 11 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 3 | 4.5 | 6.5 |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 14 | 4.6 | 6.7 | 7.8 |  |  |
| 2018 | 5 | 4.5 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 7.9 |  |
| 2017 | 1 | 4.3 | 6.7 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 4.5 | 6.5 | 7.7 | 8.1 | 9.0 |
| No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smallest |  | 3.7 | 5.5 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 9.0 |
| Largest |  | 6.1 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 9.0 |
| SE | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |  |  |
| 95\% CI (+/-) |  | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.1 |  |
| O |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; intercept $=0$
swdgrlag.d22

Table 43. White Crappie assessment from fall trap net samples at Green River Lake from 2008-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

|  | CPUE excludingage 0 |  | CPUE age 1 |  | CPUE age 0 |  | CPUE $\geq 8.0$ in |  | Mean length age 2 at capture |  | Mortality |  | Assessment | Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Value | Assessment | Value | Assessment | Value | Assessment | Value | Assessment | Value | Assessment | Instantaneous <br> (z) | Annual <br> (A) |  |  |
| 2022 | 31.9 | 4 | 8.7 | 4 | 1.9 | 3 | 13.1 | 4 | 7.8 | 1 |  |  | 16 | G |
| 2020 | 14.8 | 4 | 7.8 | 4 | 1.6 | 3 | 4.7 | 3 | 8.3 | 2 | -0.67998 | 49.4 | 16 | G |
| 2018 | 21.0 | 4 | 5.7 | 3 | 3.6 | 3 | 10.0 | 4 | 8.7 | 2 | NA |  | 16 | G |
| 2016 | 16.8 | 4 | 2.2 | 2 | 2.3 | 3 | 4.5 | 3 | 7.5 | 1 | NA |  | 13 | G |
| 2014 | 23.1 | 4 | 8.8 | 4 | 2.6 | 3 | 11.2 | 4 | 8.5 | 2 | -0.58989 | 44.6 | 17 | E |
| 2012 | 18.2 | 4 | 3.8 | 3 | 0.1 | 1 | 8.8 | 4 | 8.1 | 2 | NA |  | 14 | G |
| 2011 | 22.9 | 4 | 8.3 | 4 | 2.6 | 3 | 10.0 | 4 | 7.9 | 1 | NA |  | 16 | G |
| 2010 | 17.8 | 4 | 0.7 | 1 | 1.3 | 2 | 11.1 | 4 | 7.5 | 1 | -1.10117 | 66.8 | 12 | F |
| 2009 | 20.1 | 4 | 4.1 | 3 | 0.9 | 2 | 9.7 | 4 | ND | 1 | ND |  | 14 | G |
| 2008 | 9.0 | 3 | 0.7 | 1 | 0.9 | 2 | 4.7 | 3 | 7.8 | 1 | -0.728739 | 51.7 | 10 | F |

NA - catch data not amenable to mortality estimates
ND - no age data available
sw dgltn.D08-D22
sw dgrlag.D08-D22

Table 44. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Muskellunge collected by diurnal electrofishing at Green River Lake during winter months (Feb. 8 - Mar. 16) of 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $20.0-29.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $30.0-37.9 \mathrm{in}$ | $>38.0 \mathrm{in}$ |
| $\mathrm{W}_{r}$ | $*$ | $89(2)$ | $87(12)$ |
| N | 0 | 14 | 2 |

grlmywr.D22

Table 45. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected by diurnal electrofishing at Mill Creek Lake from 27 October 2023. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $8.0-11.9$ in | $12.0-14.9$ in | $\geq 15.0$ in |
| $W_{r}$ | $81(1)$ | $87(2)$ | $94(1)$ |
| N | 24 | 32 | 45 |

swdmilwr.D22

Table 46. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/set-night) of channel catfish collected in baited, tandem set hoopnets (5 set-nights; 5 nets per set w/3-day soak time) at Mill Creek Lake September 27-30, 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 3 | 21 | 19 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 20.0 | 7.6 |

swdmilcc.d22

Table 47. Mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of channel catfish collected by tandem set hoopnets (8 set-nights) at Mill Creek Lake from September 27-30 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Length group |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $11.0-15.9$ in | $16.0-23.9$ in | $\geq 24.0$ in |
| $W_{r}$ | $88(2)$ | $92(2)$ | $*$ |
| N | 46 | 30 | 0 |

swdmilcc.D22

Table 48. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 0.50 hours (4-0.125-hour runs) of nocturnal electrofishing at Spurlington Lake on 26 April, 2022.

swdsplbb.D22

Table 49. Spring nocturnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Spurlington Lake during mid-April to early-May since 2002.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 44.0 | 9.5 | 76.0 | 14.8 | 66.0 | 8.9 | 8.0 | 3.3 | 190.0 | 29.3 |
| 2019 | 32.0 | 3.3 | 78.0 | 15.1 | 130.0 | 13.6 | 184.0 | 24.0 | 14.0 | 6.8 | 424.0 | 33.9 |
| 2016 | 20.0 | 10.1 | 96.0 | 16.7 | 206.0 | 8.9 | 84.0 | 12.4 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 406.0 | 27.8 |
| 2013 | 22.0 | 8.3 | 160.0 | 25.9 | 96.0 | 5.7 | 44.0 | 11.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 322.0 | 42.0 |
| 2010 | 10.0 | 7.6 | 136.0 | 20.7 | 68.0 | 12.4 | 34.0 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 247.0 | 24.0 |
| 2009 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 128.0 | 9.8 | 118.0 | 26.2 | 58.0 | 10.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 310.0 | 45.3 |
| 2008 | 46.0 | 20.8 | 150.0 | 26.0 | 164.0 | 15.5 | 32.0 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 392.0 | 46.7 |
| 2007 | 12.0 | 5.2 | 92.0 | 6.9 | 66.0 | 6.0 | 14.0 | 3.8 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 184.0 | 3.3 |
| 2006 | 30.4 | 11.7 | 168.0 | 26.9 | 137.6 | 22.7 | 28.8 | 7.4 | 4.8 | 3.2 | 364.8 | 19.7 |
| 2005 | 42.0 | 13.2 | 130.0 | 26.2 | 146.0 | 12.4 | 20.0 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 338.0 | 23.2 |
| 2004 | 28.9 | 6.6 | 200.0 | 40.6 | 109.6 | 10.6 | 19.2 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 372.0 | 39.8 |
| 2003 | 61.5 | 14.4 | 233.9 | 29.2 | 123.1 | 11.4 | 12.3 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 448.0 | 47.2 |
| 2002 | 21.6 | 3.9 | 145.1 | 14.1 | 174.5 | 22.1 | 35.3 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 384.0 | 32.8 |

swdsplbb. D02 - D22

Table 50. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass collected during spring nocturnal electrofishing at Spurlington Lake during late-April to mid-May. $95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 93 | $76( \pm 7)$ | $35( \pm 10)$ |
| 2019 | 196 | $80( \pm 6)$ | $47( \pm 7)$ |
| 2016 | 193 | $75( \pm 6)$ | $22( \pm 8)$ |
| 2013 | 150 | $47( \pm 8)$ | $15( \pm 6)$ |
| 2010 | 119 | $43( \pm 9)$ | $14( \pm 7)$ |
| 2009 | 152 | $58( \pm 8)$ | $19( \pm 6)$ |
| 2008 | 173 | $57( \pm 7)$ | $9( \pm 4)$ |
| 2007 | 86 | $47( \pm 10)$ | $8( \pm 6)$ |
| 2006 | 209 | $49( \pm 7)$ | $9( \pm 4)$ |
| 2005 | 148 | $56( \pm 8)$ | $7( \pm 4)$ |

swdsplbb.D05 -D22

Table 51. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on nocturnal spring sampling at Spurlington Lake from 2006-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Parameter | 2022 |  | 2019 |  | $\underline{2016}$ |  | $\underline{2013}$ |  | $\underline{2010}$ |  | 2009 |  | 2008 |  | 2007 |  | 2006 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score | Value | Score |
| Mean length age-3 at capture | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 | 12.0 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE age-1 | 18.0 | 2 | 8.0 | 2 | 20.0 | 2 | 22.0 | 2 | 10.0 | 2 | 6.0 | 1 | 46.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 1 | 16.0 | 2 |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | 44.0 | 4 | 130.0 | 4 | 206.0 | 4 | 96.0 | 4 | 68.0 | 4 | 118.0 | 4 | 164.0 | 4 | 66.0 | 4 | 137.6 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | 66.0 | 4 | 184.0 | 4 | 84.0 | 4 | 44.0 | 4 | 34.0 | 4 | 58.0 | 4 | 32.0 | 4 | 14.0 | 3 | 28.8 | 4 |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | 8.0 | 4 | 14.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 4.0 | 4 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 3 | 2.0 | 3 | 4.8 | 4 |

Instantaneous mortality ( z )

| Annual mortality $(\mathrm{A}) \%$ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 15 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total score | 18 | Excellent | Excellent | Excellent | Excellent | Excellent | Good | Excellent | Good |

# CENTRAL FISHERIES DISTRICT 

## Project 1: Lake and Tailwater Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

Lake sampling conditions for 2022 are summarized in Table 1.

## Taylorsville Lake (3,050 acres)

Spring nocturnal electrofishing was completed in April 2022 to assess the black bass population. Three sections (Big Beech Creek, Ashes/Jacks Creek, and Van Buren area) of Taylorsville Lake were sampled for 7.5 hours ( 2.5 hours per section; 15-minute runs). Length distribution and CPUE for Largemouth Bass are presented in Tables 2 and 3. The catch rate of bass collected in 2022 ( $107.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was lower than the lake's historic average of 120.1 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$. Catch rates for keeper-size bass ( $\geq 15.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) was $27.2 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; higher than the lake average (19.3 fish/hr). The Big Beech Creek area recorded the highest catch rate for Largemouth Bass. The PSD for Largemouth Bass was 74, which was higher than the lake's average of 57 (Table 4). Additionally, the $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ value was 31 , which is higher than the lake's average of 22. The Largemouth Bass population assessment score, based on spring electrofishing data, was "Excellent", which has been the average rating at Taylorsville Lake since 2014 (Table 5). Length frequency, relative weights, and index for year class strength at age 0 for Largemouth Bass, based on September 2022 electrofishing data, are presented in Tables 6-8. Average body condition for Largemouth Bass in 2022 ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=96$; Table 7) was acceptable, and equal to the lake's historic average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=96$ ). Catch rate of age-0 Largemouth Bass in the fall of 2022 ( 44.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake's historic average of $37.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 8). The year class strength model indicated above average recruitment for young-of-the-year Largemouth Bass in 2022. A total of 15,263 surplus Largemouth Bass ( 5.0 fish/acre; 4.3 in ) were stocked into Taylorsville Lake in October 2022.

Saugeye were collected during the spring and fall Largemouth Bass samples. During the spring sample, 22 saugeye were collected from the 9.0 - to 23.0 -in size class for a catch rate of $2.9 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 2). Saugeye were collected at 3.3 fish/hr during the fall bass sample up to the 23.0-in size class (Table 6). Taylorsville Lake was stocked with 13,490 saugeye ( 4.4 fish/acre; 1.5 in) in May 2022

Trap netting for crappie ( 48 net-nights) resulted in the collection of 781 White Crappie and 53 Black Crappie (Table 9). PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{10}$ values are shown in Table 10. Age and growth determinations and age frequency for Black and White crappie were completed using otoliths (Tables 11-14). Age studies indicated White Crappie, on average, reach the 10.0-in size limit between age 2 and age 3. The crappie population assessment scores rated White Crappie as "Good" and Black Crappie as "Poor" (Tables 15 and 16, respectively). Historically, the crappie population at Taylorsville Lake has been very cyclic with peaks occurring every 7 to 9 years. More recently, there have been significant spawns in 2013, 2015, and 2019 based off trap net data. Body condition of White and Black crappie in the fall of 2022 was lower than the historical averages (Table 17).

Summer diurnal low-pulse electrofishing was completed in July 2022 to assess the Blue Catfish population. Two sections (Lower Lake: Big Beech/Ashes/Jacks creeks, and Upper Lake: Chowning Lane area) of Taylorsville Lake were sampled for 3.0 hours ( $15-$ minute runs). Two hundred and sixty-two Blue Catfish were collected in the lower section compared to 245 Blue Catfish collected in the upper section of the lake (Table 18). The number of Blue Catfish collected in 2022 ( $169.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake's historic average of $130.6 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 19). Relative weight values revealed good body condition for all sizes of Blue Catfish (Table 20). No Blue Catfish were stocked in 2022 in Taylorsville Lake due to production issues at the hatchery.

Taylorsville Lake was stocked with 61,131 reciprocal-cross hybrid striped bass (20.0 fish/acre; 1.4 in ) in June 2022.

## Herrington Lake (2,410 acres)

Diurnal electrofishing studies were completed in April 2022 to monitor the crappie population. Upper, middle, and lower lake sections were sampled for a total of 4.5 hours. A total of 35 crappie were collected in 2022 (Table 21). The PSD for White Crappie (83) was lower than the historical average, while Black Crappie (100) was higher than the historical average of 98 (Table 22). The overall catch was dominated by Black Crappie, which made up $82.9 \%$ of the crappie sampled at Herrington Lake. A population assessment was developed for spring electrofishing for White and Black crappie at Herrington Lake. The population assessment for White Crappie indicated a "Poor" population, lower than the lake's average of "Fair" (Table 23). The population assessment for Black Crappie was "Fair", equal to the lake's average rating (Table 24). Herrington Lake was stocked with 121,500 blacknose Black Crappie (50.4 fish/acre; 2.0 in) in July 2022.

Spring diurnal electrofishing studies were completed in April 2022 to monitor the black bass population. Upper, middle, and lower sections were sampled for a total of 7.5 hours ( 2.5 hours per section). Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE of black bass collected in the spring are presented in Table 25. Largemouth Bass $(92.0 \%$ ) dominate the black bass fishery at Herrington Lake. The catch rate of Largemouth Bass collected in 2022 (104.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was lower than the lake's historic average of 115.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 26). Fluctuations in the overall catch rates at Herrington Lake seems to be related to lake levels during sampling. The higher the lake level the lower the catch rate of bass. Catch rate for keeper bass ( $\geq 12.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) was 42.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, lower than the lake's historic average ( $48.1 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). The PSD for Largemouth Bass was 62; higher than the lake's average of 58 (Table 27). Additionally, the $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ value was 31 , which is higher than the lake average of 25 . The Largemouth Bass population assessment score, based on spring electrofishing data, was "Good", which is an average rating for Herrington Lake (Table 28). Length frequency, relative weight, and index of year class strength at age 0 of Largemouth Bass based on October 2022 electrofishing data at Herrington Lake are presented in Tables 29-31. Largemouth Bass condition ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=92$ ) was equal to the lake's historic average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=92$; Table 30). Age-0 CPUE for Largemouth Bass ( $29.6 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was lower than the lake average ( $34.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; Table 31 ). A total of 12,078 surplus Largemouth Bass ( 5.0 fish/acre; 4.0-4.5 in) were stocked into Herrington Lake in October 2022.

Gill netting for hybrid striped bass and White Bass was completed in October 2022. During the 16 netnight sampling period, 124 hybrid striped bass and 120 White Bass were collected (Table 32). Otoliths were taken from both species for age and growth determinations. Results of these studies indicated excellent growth rates for both hybrid striped bass (Tables 33 and 34) and White Bass (Tables 37 and 38). Hybrid striped bass reached 15.0 in between age 1 and age 2, as they have historically (Table 33). Of the hybrid striped bass sampled, $85.5 \%$ were age $1+$ or older (Table 34). Condition of hybrid striped bass in $2022\left(\mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{r}}=97\right)$ was higher than the lake's historic average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=93$; Table 35). The population assessment for hybrid striped bass indicated a "Good" population (Table 36). White Bass age and growth determinations showed that White Bass reached 12.0 in between age 1 and age 2 (Table 37). Of the White Bass sampled, $97 \%$ were age $1+$ and older (Table 38). The White Bass population assessment indicated a "Good" population (Table 39). Body condition of White Bass ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=98$ ) was higher than the lake's historic average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=96$; Table 40). Herrington Lake was stocked with 48,000 reciprocal-cross hybrid striped bass (19.9 fish/acre; 1.7 in ) in June 2022.

## Guist Creek Lake (317 acres)

Spring nocturnal electrofishing studies were completed for length frequency, CPUE, and population assessment for Largemouth Bass in May 2022 (Table 41). The total Largemouth Bass catch rate ( 193.0 fish/hr) was higher than the lake average of 168.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 42). The PSD for Largemouth Bass was 70, compared to the lake average of 66 (Table 43). The RSD $_{15}$ was 42, compared to the lake average of 40. The Largemouth Bass population assessment score, based on spring electrofishing data, was "Excellent", which has been the average rating at Guist Creek Lake since 2013 (Table 44). Fall Largemouth Bass sampling was conducted for length frequency, relative weight, and index of year class strength at age 0 (Tables 45-47). Relative weight indicated good body condition for bass, especially for bass over 15.0 in (Table 46). The catch rate of age-0 Largemouth Bass (57.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake average (avg. $=45.1$ fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$; Table 47). Largemouth Bass were stocked at 5.1 fish/acre (1,606 fish) and averaged 4.5 in at Guist Creek Lake in October 2022. Additionally, Largemouth Bass removed from Benjy Kinman Lake were stocked at 0.3 fish/acre ( 86 fish) ranging from the $7.0-$ to 11.0 -in size classes in May 2022.

Saugeye were collected during the spring and fall Largemouth Bass samples. During the spring sample, only one 10.0 -in saugeye was collected for a catch rate of 0.3 fish/hr (Table 41). No saugeye were collected during the fall sample (Table 45). Guist Creek Lake was stocked with 31,700 saugeye (100.0 fish/acre; 1.5 in) in May 2022.

Channel Catfish were sampled in November 2022 using five sets of tandem hoop nets at Guist Creek Lake. Although population parameters are presented, only eight fish were collected. Length frequency results for Channel Catfish showed a size distribution between the 12.0 -in and 30.0 -in size classes (Table 48). The PSD and RSD 24 values for Channel Catfish were 50 and 13, respectively (Table 49). Relative weights indicated fair body condition ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=89$ ) for Channel Catfish (Table 50). Overall, catch rates ( 1.6 fish/set) were much lower than the lake average of 104.1 fish/set (Table 51). Guist Creek Lake was not stocked with Channel Catfish in 2022.

Guist Creek Lake was stocked with 9,512 reciprocal-cross hybrid striped bass (30.0 fish/acre; 2.2 in) in June 2022.

## Beaver Lake (158 acres)

A spring diurnal electrofishing sample was completed in May 2022 to assess the black bass population (Table 52). The CPUE for all sizes was 222.5 fish/hr, lower than the lake average of 258.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 53). The PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{15}$ for Largemouth Bass was 42 and 9, respectively, compared to the lake average of 28 and 4, respectively (Table 54). The population assessment score indicated a "Good" bass population, which is the average assessment rating for Beaver Lake (Table 55). Fall diurnal electrofishing was conducted for relative weight and index of age-0 year class strength of Largemouth Bass (Tables 56-58). The overall relative weight indicated acceptable condition ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=88$ ); the lake average is 85 (Table 57). Fall sampling indicated near average numbers of age-0 bass, ( 135.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$; average $=138.9$ fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) and the average size of age-0 Largemouth Bass ( 4.4 in ) was higher than the lake's average of 4.3 in (Table 58).

Spring diurnal electrofishing was completed in May 2022 to assess the panfish populations (Tables 59-65). Length frequency results showed a good size distribution of Bluegill up to the 8.0 -in size class (Table 59). The PSD for Bluegill was 40 , compared to the lake average of 34 (Table 60). The $\mathrm{RSD}_{8}$ was 0 , compared to the lake average of 1. CPUE for all length groups of Bluegill was 444.8 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, compared to the lake average of 258.4 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 61). The population assessment for Bluegill indicated a "Good" population rating, which is the average rating since 2011 (Table 62). The Redear Sunfish catch rate was 96.8 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, which is higher than the lake's average catch rate ( 66.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) for all sizes. The catch rate of Redear Sunfish $\geq 8.0$ in was $28.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ and was higher than the lake average of 19.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 63). Redear Sunfish PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{9}$ was 55 and 6, respectively (Table 60). The population assessment indicated an "Excellent" Redear Sunfish fishery (Table 64). Overall, relative weight data was acceptable for both Bluegill and Redear Sunfish (Table 65). A total of 6,642 Redear Sunfish ( 42 fish/acre; 2.25 in ) were stocked on 20 September 2022. An additional 24,958 Redear Sunfish ( 158.0 fish/acre; 0.75 in ) were stocked on 27 September 2022.

A diurnal electrofishing study to evaluate the crappie population was completed in October 2022. A total of 196 crappie ( 177 Black Crappie and 19 White Crappie) were collected in 1.5 hr of electrofishing (Table 66). Age and growth results indicate that both White and Black crappie average 8.4 in at age 2 (Tables 67 and 68). Overall, relative weight data indicates fair condition for both White and Black crappie (Table 69).

Channel Catfish were sampled in November 2022 using tandem hoop nets. Length frequency results for Channel Catfish show a size distribution between the 13.0 -in and 29.0 -in size classes (Table 70). PSD and RSD 24 values were 90 and 15 , respectively (Table 71). Overall, the catch rate in 2022 was 31.8 fish/set, which is lower than the lake average ( 40.8 fish/set; Table 72). Relative weight indicated good body condition for Channel Catfish ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=98$; Table 73). In May 2022, 25 wooden boxes were installed to promote Channel Catfish spawning. These boxes were monitored for usage weekly beginning May $24^{\text {th }}$ and continuing through June $20^{\text {th }}$. Overall, Channel Catfish were observed using 4 ( $16 \%$ ) of these boxes, while Flathead Catfish used 11 (44\%) boxes in 2022. During this period, Channel Catfish were observed on 5 separate events guarding eggs. Flathead Catfish were observed guarding eggs on 4 observations and paired in boxes on 6 other observations. Overall, Channel and Flathead catfish were observed in 15 of the 25 boxes ( $56 \%$ ) during 2022.

In May, 550 lbs of granular 10-52-4 fertilizer was applied in Beaver Lake. During June, two applications of aquatic herbicides were applied to maintain bank fishing areas, the boat ramp, and fishing pier at Beaver Lake.

## Benjy Kinman Lake (88 acres)

A spring nocturnal electrofishing sample was completed in both April and May 2022 at Benjy Kinman Lake to assess the Largemouth Bass population (Table 74). The overall CPUE for all sizes was $215.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, compared to the lake average of 167.6 fish/hr (Table 75). The PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ for Largemouth Bass was 8 and 4, respectively (Table 76). The population assessment score indicated a "Fair" bass population (Table 77). Fall Largemouth Bass sampling was conducted for relative weight and index of year class strength at age 0 in September 2022 (Tables 78-80). Overall, relative weight indicated fair body condition for bass ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=88$ ), with larger fish exhibiting better condition compared to smaller length groups (Table 79). The better condition of larger fish is due to the Gizzard Shad forage base. Fall sampling indicated above average numbers of age-0 bass, ( $140.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; average $=85.9 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) and the average size of age- 0 Largemouth Bass ( 5.1 in ) was larger than the lake's average of 4.7 in (Table 80). During 2022, five efforts were made to reduce the crowded Largemouth Bass population at Benjy Kinman Lake. A total of 1,118 (12.7 fish/acre) Largemouth Bass were removed in 2022. Fish removed were stocked into Eagle Creek, Guist Creek Lake, the Kentucky River, and Lake Jericho. Largemouth Bass removed ranged in size from 4.0 to 11.0 in ( $<8.0$ in $=283$ fish ( $25.4 \%$ ); 8.0-10.9 in $=833$ fish ( $74.5 \%$ ); 11.0 in $=2$ fish $(0.1 \%)$ ). Since 2021, a total of 1,858 Largemouth Bass (21.1 fish/acre) have been removed from Benjy Kinman Lake.

A spring diurnal electrofishing sample was completed at Benjy Kinman Lake in May 2022 to assess the panfish populations (Tables 81-84). Length frequency results show a good distribution of Bluegill through the 7.0in size range (Tables 81 and 83 ). The PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{8}$ for Bluegill was 53 and 0 , respectively (Table 82). Length frequency results showed the majority of the Redear Sunfish were in the 6.0 - to 8.0 -in size range (Tables 81 and 84). Redear Sunfish PSD and RSD 9 was 54 and 6, respectively (Table 82). Relative weights for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish were collected during the fall bass sample at Benjy Kinman Lake (Table 85). Overall, relative weights were "good" for both Bluegill and Redear Sunfish.

Channel Catfish were sampled in November 2022 using tandem hoop nets. Length frequency results for Channel Catfish show a size distribution between the 14.0 -in and 25.0 -in size classes (Table 86). PSD and RSD 24 values were 83 and 20, respectively (Table 87). Overall, the catch rate ( 6.0 fish/set) in 2022 was lower than the historic average of 7.6 fish/set (Table 88). Relative weight indicated good body condition for Channel Catfish $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=\right.$ 98; Table 89). In 2020, 15 wooden boxes were installed to promote Channel Catfish spawning. These boxes were monitored for usage in 2022. All boxes were evaluated for usage weekly beginning May $19^{\text {th }}$ and continuing through June $6^{\text {th }}$. Of the 15 boxes, fish were observed using eight ( $53.3 \%$ ) of these boxes in 2022. This was identical to the usage observed in 2021. During this period, three boxes were observed with spawning pairs and two boxes with adult catfish guarding eggs.

Two rough fish removal events took place in June and August 2022, resulting in a total of 52 Bigmouth Buffalo, Smallmouth Buffalo, Grass Carp, Silver Carp, Common Carp, Freshwater Drum, and Longnose Gar being removed from Benjy Kinman Lake. The average weight of rough fish removed in 2022 was 10.0 lbs. Therefore, it was estimated that 520 lbs of rough fish were removed. The nine-year total for rough fish removed from Benjy Kinman Lake is 4,464 fish ( 50.7 fish/acre) at an estimated weight of $34,819 \mathrm{lbs}$ ( $395.7 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{acre}$ ).

Three hundred and seventy-five pounds of granular fertilizer (10-52-4) was applied in May 2022 at Benjy Kinman Lake.

Water willow collected from the spillway at Boltz Lake was transplanted into Benjy Kinman Lake to create 4 new water willow beds during the summer 2022.

## Boltz Lake (92 acres)

Spring nocturnal electrofishing was completed in May 2022 to assess the black bass population (Table 90). The Largemouth Bass catch rate ( $214.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake's historic average ( $193.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; Table 91). The PSD for Largemouth Bass was 56 compared to the lake average of 45 (Table 92). The RSD 15 was 23, higher than the lake average of 17. The population assessment indicated an "Excellent" bass population (Table 93). In October 2022, diurnal electrofishing was conducted for relative weight and index of age-0 year class strength (Tables 94-96). Relative weight indicated good body condition ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=95$ ) and was higher than the lake's average relative weight of 91 (Table 95). Fall sampling indicated above average numbers of age-0 bass ( $292.3 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$; average $=87.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ), and the average size (3.9 in) was smaller than the historic lake average of 4.1 in (Table 96). No bass were stocked into Boltz Lake in 2022.

Saugeye were collected during the spring Largemouth Bass sample in May 2022 (Table 90). A total of 4 saugeye were collected at 2.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ranging in size from the 19.0 - to 21.0 -in size classes. Saugeye were collected during fall Largemouth Bass sampling at a rate of 3.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ with fish ranging between the 18.0 -in and 23.0 -in size classes (Table 94). Saugeye were not stocked into Boltz Lake in 2022. The next planned stocking will be in 2023.

Spring diurnal electrofishing for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish was conducted in May 2022 (Table 97). The overall catch rate for Bluegill ( 362.4 fish/hr) was lower than the lake average ( 495.6 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$; Table 98). The PSD for Bluegill was 64 compared to the lake average of 29 (Table 99 ). The $\mathrm{RSD}_{8}$ was 0 compared to the lake average of 1. The population assessment for Bluegill indicated a "Good" population, which has been the average rating since 2013 (Table 100). Relative weight for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish was collected during the fall bass sample at Boltz Lake (Table 101). The relative weight index reflected fair condition for Bluegill $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=89\right)$ and excellent condition for Redear Sunfish $\left(W_{r}=107\right)$.

Channel Catfish were sampled in November 2022 using tandem hoop nets. Length frequency from sampling resulted in a size distribution from the 14.0- to 24.0 -in size classes (Table 102). The PSD and RSD 24 for Channel Catfish was 30 and 10, respectively (Table 103). Relative weight indicated good body condition for Channel Catfish $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=95\right)$ and was higher than the lake average $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=92\right.$; Table 104). Overall, catch rates at Boltz Lake remain lower than the lake average of 48.2 fish/hr (Table 105). Channel Catfish were not stocked during 2022. An attempt was made to sample Blue Catfish at Boltz Lake in 2022. A total of 4 fish were collected that ranged in size from the 15.0 - to 28.0 -in size classes. During this sample, several Flathead Catfish were observed of various sizes. Boltz Lake was stocked with 920 Blue Catfish (10.0 fish/acre; 7.0 in) in October 2022.

During routine sampling, 12 Common Carp that averaged 8.5 lbs were removed. Since 2008, 599 Common Carp ( 6.5 fish/acre) have been removed from Boltz Lake at an estimated weight of $4,758 \mathrm{lbs}$ ( $51.7 \mathrm{lbs} /$ acre ).

Two applications of aquatic herbicides were applied in July and August 2022 to maintain the dam and spillway areas at Boltz Lake.

Time-lapse cameras were installed at the boat ramp access at Boltz Lake from March 2022 - February 2023 to estimate total usage (trips) and pressure (hours) at this public access area. This approach differs from previous daytime roving creel surveys in that these counts capture all usage types (boat anglers, bank anglers and recreational boaters). However, the primary usage of these sites was by anglers. The time-lapse camera recorded a picture of the entire fishing area (parking lot and boat ramp) every 10 minutes during daylight hours throughout the study period. Images were analyzed by randomly selecting 16 days ( 10 week and 6 weekend days) each month. For each randomly selected day, the total number of vehicles were counted for the entire day. From these counts, monthly averages were calculated. Average trip length ( 3.34 hrs ) and average party size per vehicle ( 1.62 individuals) was derived from the averages from prior pressure count surveys conducted at Beaver, Benjy Kinman, Bullock Pen, and Corinth lakes.

Overall, it was estimated that 4,914 trips ( 53.4 trips/acre) were taken to Boltz Lake from March 2022February 2023 (Table 106). Monthly trip totals ranged from 53 trips in January 2023 to 1,010 trips in May 2022 (Figure 1). May ( 3,375 hours) and June ( 2,659 hours) recorded the highest usage rates (Figure 2). It was estimated that Boltz Lake received 16,412 hours (178.4 hours/acre) of recreational pressure during this 12 -month study period (Table 106).

## Bullock Pen Lake (134 acres)

Spring diurnal electrofishing was completed in May 2022 to assess the black bass population (Table 107). The total catch rate of Largemouth Bass ( 202.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the historic lake average catch rate of 155.6 fish/hr (Table 108). The PSD for Largemouth Bass was 54; lower than the lake average of 68 (Table 109). The $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ for Largemouth Bass was 19 ; lower than the lake average of 38 . The population assessment for Largemouth Bass was rated "Good", which is the historical lake average rating (Table 110). Fall diurnal electrofishing was conducted in October 2022 to determine length frequency, relative weight, and index of age-0 year class strength for Largemouth Bass (Tables 111-113). Relative weight indicated acceptable body condition for bass ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=91$ ) but was lower than the lake average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=93$; Table 112). Larger fish exhibited better condition compared to smaller length groups, which is a function of the shad forage base. Age-0 CPUE ( $10.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was lower than the lake average (22.4 fish/hr); therefore, 2,015 Largemouth Bass (15.0 fish/acre; 4.6 in) were stocked in 2022 (Table 113).

Saugeye were collected during the spring and fall Largemouth Bass samples. Two saugeye were collected during the spring sample at $1.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ between the 21.0 -in and 24.0 -in size classes (Table 107). Two saugeye ( 1.3 fish/hr) were collected in October 2022 between the 14.0 -in and 22.0 -in size classes (Table 111). Bullock Pen Lake was stocked with 13,400 saugeye (100.0 fish/acre; 1.5 in) in May 2022.

Bullock Pen Lake was stocked with 1,460 Blue Catfish (10.9 fish/acre; 7.0 in) in October 2022.

## Corinth Lake (96 acres)

Spring nocturnal electrofishing was completed in May 2022 to assess the black bass population (Table 114). The total catch rate of Largemouth Bass ( 269.5 fish/hr) was higher than the lake average catch rate of 249.6 fish/hr (Table 115). The PSD for Largemouth Bass was 30; higher than the lake average of 23 (Table 116). The $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ for Largemouth Bass was 8 ; higher than the lake average of 7. The population assessment for Largemouth Bass was rated "Good", which has been the average rating since 2005 (Table 117). Fall diurnal electrofishing for Largemouth Bass was conducted to determine length frequency, relative weight, and index of year class strength at age 0 (Tables 118-120). The overall relative weight in $2022\left(\mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{r}}=84\right)$ was equal to the historic average relative weight at Corinth Lake ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=84$; Table 119). Age-0 CPUE (157.2 fish/hr) was higher than the lake average (90.3 fish/hr; Table 120).

Fall diurnal electrofishing for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish was conducted for relative weight. Relative weight indicated fair condition for Bluegill (86) and good condition for Redear Sunfish (91; Table 121).

No fertilizer was applied to Corinth Lake in 2022. One application of aquatic herbicides was applied in July 2022 to maintain bank fishing areas, the boat ramp, fishing pier, and dam control structure at Corinth Lake.

## Elmer Davis Lake (149 acres)

Spring diurnal electrofishing studies were conducted in May 2022 for length frequency, PSD, and CPUE for Largemouth Bass (Table 122). The total catch rate ( $380.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the historical lake average of 308.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 123). Largemouth Bass PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ were 43 (average $=33$ ) and 8 (average $=8$ ), respectively (Table 124). The population assessment indicated an "Excellent" bass population, which has been the average rating since 2016 (Table 125). Fall electrofishing for Largemouth Bass was completed to evaluate relative weight and index of year class strength at age 0 (Tables 126-128). Largemouth Bass relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=88\right)$ was similar to the historical lake average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=87$; Table 127). The year class strength model indicated that 2022 was above average for young-of-year Largemouth Bass. Age-0 CPUE ( 225.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake average (141.7 fish/hr; Table 128). No Largemouth Bass were stocked during 2022.

Relative weight index reflected good condition for Bluegill $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=93\right)$ and excellent condition for Redear Sunfish ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=102$; Table 129). Elmer Davis Lake was stocked with 2,800 surplus Redear Sunfish (18.8 fish/acre; 0.75 in ) in September 2022.

Channel Catfish were sampled during November 2022 using tandem hoop nets. No fish were collected during this sample (Table 130). During May 2021, 25 wooden catfish spawning boxes were installed to promote spawning. In 2022, all spawning boxes were evaluated for spawning activities weekly from May $23^{\text {rd }}$ through June $28^{\text {th }}$. Fish were observed using $22(88 \%)$ of the 25 boxes. Throughout this period, 24 individual observations were made of adult fish guarding an egg mass. One box was observed with an adult catfish guarding fry and multiple spawns were observed in 9 boxes. No Channel Catfish were stocked in 2022.

Two applications of aquatic herbicides were applied in July and August 2022 to maintain the dam spillway, parking lots, and boat ramp at Elmer Davis Lake.

## Kincaid Lake (183 acres)

Spring diurnal electrofishing studies were conducted in May 2022 for length frequency, PSD, and CPUE for Largemouth Bass (Table 131). The total catch rate ( $121.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was lower than the lake average of 211.3 fish/hr (Table 132). Largemouth Bass PSD and RSD $_{15}$ was 72 (average $=68$ ) and 45 (average $=45$ ), respectively (Table 133). The population assessment indicated a "Good" bass population, which is the average assessment rating at Kincaid Lake (Table 134). Diurnal fall electrofishing for Largemouth Bass in October 2022 was completed to collect length frequency, relative weight, and index year class strength at age 0 (Tables 135-137). Relative weight was acceptable ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=92$ ) and equal to the lake average (Table 136). CPUE for age-0 bass ( $40.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake average of 38.0 fish/hr (Table 137). No Largemouth Bass were stocked at Kincaid Lake in 2022.

## McNeely Lake (51 acres)

Spring diurnal electrofishing studies were conducted in April 2022 for PSD, length frequency, and CPUE for Largemouth Bass (Table 138). The total catch rate in 2022 ( $259.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was higher than the lake average of 237.1 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 139). Largemouth Bass PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{15}$ was 40 (average $=34$ ) and 16 (average $=10$ ), respectively (Table 140). The population assessment indicated an "Excellent" bass population, compared to the lake average assessment of "Good" (Table 141). Diurnal fall electrofishing for Largemouth Bass was completed in October 2022 to collect length frequency, relative weight values, and index the year class strength at age 0 (Table 142-144). Relative weights were less than the lake average ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}=88$ ) in fall 2022 (Table 143). CPUE for age-0 bass ( 89.0 fish/hr) was lower than the lake average of 121.9 fish/hr (Table 144). However, no Largemouth Bass were stocked in 2022.

Relative weight for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish was collected during the fall diurnal electrofishing sample. Overall condition was poor for Bluegill (80) and good for Redear Sunfish (99; Table 145).

McNeely Lake was stocked with 1,275 Channel Catfish (25.0 fish/acre; 6.0 in) in November 2022.
Two applications of aquatic herbicides were applied in June and September 2022 to maintain the dam spillway, boat ramp, fishing pier, and bank fishing access sites at McNeely Lake.

## A.J. Jolly Lake ( 175 acres)

Relative abundance and CPUE of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected at A.J. Jolly Lake in May 2022 are shown in Table 146. Largemouth Bass were collected from the 3.0- to 19.0-in size classes at a catch rate of 75.5 fish/hr. No Largemouth Bass were stocked in 2022.

Saugeye were collected at 10.5 fish/hr from the 3.0 - to 24.0 -in size classes. A total of 17,500 saugeye (100.0 fish/acre; 1.5 in ) were stocked in May 2022.
A.J. Jolly Lake was stocked with 1,750 Blue Catfish (10.0 fish/acre; 7.0 in) in October 2022.

## General Butler State Park Lake (28 acres)

Length frequency, relative abundance, and CPUE of fish collected by electrofishing at General Butler State Park Lake in May 2022 are shown in Table 147. Largemouth Bass were collected from the 5.0 - to 17.0 -in size classes. Bluegill were abundant with fish collected up to the 10.0 -in size class with the majority of Bluegill in the 5.0 - to 6.0 -in size classes. Redear Sunfish were collected up to the 9.0 -in size class.

## $\underline{\text { Jericho Lake ( } 126 \text { acres) }}$

Relative abundance and CPUE of Largemouth Bass collected in May 2022 are shown in Table 148. Largemouth Bass were collected from the 2.0- to 21.0-in size classes. Excellent numbers of bass were present above the 12.0 -in size limit. Largemouth Bass removed from Benjy Kinman Lake were stocked in Jericho Lake at 1.4 fish/acre (176 fish) from the 6.0- to 10.0-in size classes in June 2022.

## Shelby Lake (64 acres)

Relative abundance and CPUE of Largemouth Bass collected at Shelby Lake in May 2022 are shown in Table 149. Largemouth Bass were collected from the 3.0- to 21.0-in size classes. Good numbers of bass were above the 15.0 -in size limit. Additional sport fish such as Redear Sunfish, Bluegill, and crappie were also observed during this sample. Shelby Lake has an abundant population of Common Carp and Gizzard Shad.

| Water body | Species | Date | Time (24hr) | Gear | Weather | Water temp. F | Water level | Secchi (in) | Conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herrington Lake | Crappie | 4/20 | 1000 | Shock | Mostly sunny | 58 | 736.9 | 58 | Good | Cane Run (lower) |
|  |  | 4/21 | 1100 |  | Overcast, drizzle | 59 | 736.7 | 36 |  | Gwinn Island (middle) |
|  |  | 4/22 | 1000 |  | Mostly sunny | 66 | 736.6 | 34 |  | Kings Mill (upper) |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | LMB | 4/21 | 1800 | Shock | Clear | 59 | Down 7" | 39 | Good | Good sample |
| Herrington Lake | LMB | 4/25 | 1030 | Shock | Cloudy | 69 | 736.4 | 44 | Good | Cane Run (lower) |
|  |  | 4/26 | 1030 |  | Clear | 63 | 736.6 | 36 |  | Gwinn Island (middle) |
|  |  | 4/27 | 1030 |  | Clear | 65 | 736.6 | 34 |  | Kings Mill (upper) |
| Taylorsville Lake | LMB | $4 / 27$ | 1930 | Shock | Clear, calm | 65 | 547.3 |  | Good | Chowning Lane |
|  |  | 4/28 | 1930 |  | Clear | 63 | 547.2 | 36 |  | Ashes/Jacks creeks (Habitat crew completed sample) |
|  |  | 4/28 | 1030 |  | Clear | 65 | 547.2 | - |  | Big Beech Creek |
| McNeely Lake | LMB | 4/28 | 1000 | Shock | Clear, sunny | - | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Boltz Lake | LMB | 5/2 | 1930 | Shock | Cloudy | 65 | Full | - | Good | Habitat crew completed sample |
| Elmer Davis Lake | LMB | 5/2 | 1400 | Shock | Mostly sunny | - | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Corinth Lake | LMB | 5/2 | 2000 | Shock | Clear | 69 | Full | 44 | Good | Good sample |
| Lake Shelby | LMB | 5/3 | 1100 | Shock | Cloudy, windy | 69 | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Beaver Lake | LMB | 5/4 | 1000 | Shock | Cloudy, cool | 67 | Full | 90 | Good | Good sample |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | LMB | 5/4 | 2000 | Shock | Cloudy | 67 | Full | 48 | Good | Good sample |
| Bullock Pen Lake | LMB | 5/5 | 10300 | Shock | Cloudy, cool | 63 | Full | 53 | Good | Good sample |
| Guist Creek Lake | LMB | 5/9 | 1000 | Shock | Clear | 69 | Full | 34 | Good | Good sample |
| Kincaid Lake | LMB | 5/10 | 1030 | Shock | Mostly sunny | 67 | Full | 11 | Fair | Very muddy |
| Lake Jericho | LMB | 5/11 | 1000 | Shock | Cloudy, warm | 70 | Spilling | 34 | Good | Good sample |
| AJ Jolly Lake | LMB | 5/12 | 1030 | Shock | Sunny, warm | 75 | Full | 20 | Good | Good sample |
| Beaver Lake | BG/RES | 5/16 | 1003 | Shock | - | 77 | Full | 104 | Good | Good sample |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | BG/RES | 5/19 | 1015 | Shock | - | 75 | Full | 42 | Good | Good sample |
| Boltz Lake | BG/RES | 5/20 | 1045 | Shock | Sunny | - | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| General Butler State Park Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 5/23 | 1030 | Shock | Cloudy, cool | 70 | Full | 20 | Good | Good sample |
| City of Crittenden Park Lake | Sportish | 6/16 | - | Shock | Sunny | 85 | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Taylorsville Lake (Upper Lake) | Blue Cattish | 7/6 | 0830 | Shock | Hot, heat advisory | 86 | 546.4 | 20 | Good | Good sample |
| Taylorsville Lake (Lower Lake) | Blue Catish | 7/7 | 0830 | Shock | Cloudy | 85 | 546.4 | 31 | Good | Good sample |
| Boltz Lake | Blue Cattish | 7/11 | 1000 | Shock | - | - | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Herrington Lake | LMB | 9/20 | 0930 | Shock | Sunny | 77 | 725.8 | 48 | Good | Cane Run (lower) |
|  |  | $9 / 21$ $9 / 22$ | 0930 0930 |  | Sunny | 78 78 | $724.7$ $723.7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ |  | Gwinn Island (middle) Kings Mill (upper) |
| Guist Creek Lake | LMB | 9/23 | 1000 | Shock | Mostly sunny | 74 | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Taylorsville Lake | LMB | 9/26 | 1030 | Shock | Sunny, windy | 74 | 546.9 | 44 | Good | Big Beech Creek Ashes/Jacks creeks Chowning Lane |
|  |  | 9/27 | 1030 |  | Sunny, windy | 73 | 546.9 | 38 |  |  |
|  |  | 9/29 | 1030 |  | Sunny, windy | 71 | 546.8 | 33 |  |  |

## Table 1 (cont.).

| Water body | Species | Date | Time (24hr) | Gear | Weather | Water temp. F | Water level | Secchi <br> (in) | Conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 9/28 | 1030 | Shock | Mostly cloudy | 70 | Down ~12" | 36 | Good | Good sample |
| Beaver Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 9/30 | 1100 | Shock | Sunny, windy | 65 | Full | 33 | Good | Good sample |
| Boltz Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 10/3 | 1030 | Shock | Sunny, light wind | 67 | Full | 50 | Good | Good sample |
| Corinth Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 10/4 | 1030 | Shock | Sunny | - | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Bullock Pen Lake | LMB | 10/5 | 1000 | Shock | Sunny | 66 | Full | 39 | Good | Good sample |
| Kincaid Lake | LMB | 10/6 | 1100 | Shock | - | - | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| McNeely Lake | LMB/BG/RESF | 10/7 | 1030 | Shock | Mostly sunny | 65 | Full | 33 | Good | Good sample |
| Taylorsville Lake | LMB | 10/10 | 1030 | Shock | - | - | 546.2 | - | Good | Wr's only |
| Herrington Lake | LMB | 10/11 | 1100 | Shock | Sunny, light wind | 67 | 718.0 | - | Good | Wr's only |
| Guist Creek Lake | LMB | 10/12 | 1000 | Shock | Cloudy, rain | 62 | Full | - | Good | Wr's only |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 10/14 | 1000 | Shock | Sunny | 62 | Down ~12" | - | Good | Wr's only |
| Beaver Lake | Crappie | 10/18 | 1015 | Shock | Cold, cloudy, windy | 59 | Down ~10" | - | Good | Good sample |
| Elmer Davis Lake | LMB/BG/RES | 10/19 | 1000 | Shock | Sunny, windy | 55 | Down ~12" | 36 | Good | Good sample |
| Taylorsville Lake | Crappie | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 10 / 25 \\ & 10 / 26 \\ & 10 / 27 \\ & 10 / 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1030 | Trap net | Sunny, breezy Overcast, cool Sunny, cool | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 58 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 545.4 \\ & 545.4 \\ & 545.4 \\ & 545.4 \end{aligned}$ | - | Good | FINs crew assisted with sample |
| Herrington Lake | Morones | $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 1 \\ & 11 / 2 \\ & 11 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1000 \\ & 1000 \\ & 1000 \end{aligned}$ | Gill net | Mostly cloudy <br> Mostly sunny <br> Mostly sunny | $\begin{aligned} & 64 \\ & 63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 716.5 \\ & 716.5 \\ & 716.4 \end{aligned}$ | - | Good Good Good | Lake elevation 8.5 feet below winter pool due to dam repairs |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | LMB | 11/9 | 1030 | Shock | Sunny | - | Down ~12" | - | Good | Wr's only |
| Beaver Lake | Channel Catfish | 11/17 | 1030 | Hoop net | Overcast, cold | 50 | Down ~10" | - | Good | Good sample |
| Elmer Davis Lake | Channel Catfish | 11/18 | 1030 | Hoop net | Sunny, cool | 46 | Down ~12" | - | Good | No fish collected |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | Channel Catfish | 11/21 | 1030 | Hoop net | Sunny, cool | 44 | Down ~12" | - | Good | Good sample |
| Boltz Lake | Channel Catfish | 12/1 | 1100 | Hoop net | Partly cloudy | 44 | Full | - | Good | Good sample |
| Guist Creek Lake | Channel Catish | 12/2 | 1030 | Hoop net | Mostly cloudy | 44 | Down ~24" | - | Good | Good sample |

Table 2. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 7.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Taylorsville Lake in April 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Van Buren | Largemouth Bass |  |  | 2 | 9 | 28 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 31 | 22 | 35 | 33 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 227 | 90.8 | 7.6 |
|  | Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2.8 | 0.9 |
| Ashes Creek | Largemouth Bass |  |  | 1 | 5 | 17 | 14 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 29 | 21 | 28 | 32 | 41 | 26 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  | 262 | 104.8 | 7.6 |
|  | Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  | 12 | 4.8 | 1.8 |
| Big Beech Creek | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 31 | 39 | 34 | 47 | 42 | 29 | 16 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 319 | 127.6 | 8.0 |
|  | Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 2 | 9 | 26 | 57 | 45 | 25 | 16 | 48 | 83 | 86 | 97 | 109 | 03 | 51 | 19 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 1 |  |  | 808 | 107.7 | 5.1 |
|  | Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 22 | 2.9 | 0.7 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpstvl.d22

Table 3. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Taylorsville Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 18.7 | 1.9 | 22.9 | 2.4 | 38.9 | 2.6 | 27.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 107.7 | 5.1 |
| 2021 | 13.5 | 2.9 | 37.7 | 3.1 | 77.2 | 5.6 | 20.9 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 149.3 | 11.4 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  | No sam | due | ovid-19 | stric |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 20.7 | 2.6 | 77.5 | 5.4 | 46.8 | 3.6 | 19.6 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 164.5 | 9.3 |
| 2018 | 24.7 | 3.6 | 83.5 | 7.6 | 41.3 | 4.1 | 35.3 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 184.4 | 14.5 |
| 2017 | 22.5 | 2.7 | 27.2 | 2.5 | 74.4 | 4.7 | 46.9 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 171.1 | 7.5 |
| 2016 | 15.9 | 2.5 | 59.2 | 4.8 | 98.8 | 6.6 | 44.8 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 218.7 | 13.2 |
| 2015 | 18.5 | 3.9 | 39.3 | 5.3 | 32.7 | 3.2 | 19.3 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 109.9 | 11.7 |
| 2014 | 17.1 | 2.8 | 40.5 | 7.6 | 35.1 | 4.1 | 21.3 | 2.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 114.0 | 13.4 |
| 2013 | 19.6 | 2.1 | 49.9 | 4.6 | 42.0 | 4.5 | 22.1 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 133.6 | 10.5 |

Dataset = cfdpstvl.d13- .d22

Table 4. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in each area of Taylorsville Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Beech | Largemouth Bass | 271 | $70( \pm 6)$ | $24( \pm 5)$ |
| Ashes Creek | Largemouth Bass | 225 | $75( \pm 6)$ | $39( \pm 7)$ |
| Van Buren | Largemouth Bass | 172 | $80( \pm 6)$ | $30( \pm 7)$ |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 668 | $74( \pm 4)$ | $31( \pm 4)$ |

Dataset = cfdpstvl.d22

Table 5. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Taylorsville Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | ${ }_{13.4^{\star}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.1 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | -0.446 | 36\% | 18 | Excellent |
| 2021 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4^{\star} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 77.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | -0.535 | 41\% | 17 | Excellent |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | No Sampl |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4^{\star} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | -0.616 | 46\% | 17 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | -0.539 | 42\% | 17 | Excellent |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 12.9^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | -0.552 | 42\% | 16 | Good |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 12.9^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $-0.511$ | 40\% | 17 | Excellent |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 12.9^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32.7 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | -0.616 | 46\% | 14 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 12.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | -0.590 | 45\% | 17 | Excellent |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.1^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | -0.657 | 48\% | 15 | Good |

[^22]Table 6. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 4.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Taylorsville Lake in September 2022.


Dataset = cfdwrtvl.d22

Table 7. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Taylorsville Lake in September and October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | Wr | No. | Wr | No. | Wr | No. | Wr |
| Van Buren | Largemouth Bass | 32 | 99 (1) | 24 | 99 (1) | 20 | 104 (2) | 76 | 100 (1) |
| Ashes Creek | Largemouth Bass | 43 | 89 (2) | 33 | 94 (2) | 4 | 107 (1) | 80 | 92 (1) |
| Big Beech Creek | Largemouth Bass | 33 | 94 (1) | 30 | 94 (2) | 36 | 98 (2) | 99 | 95 (1) |
| Total |  | 108 | 94 (1) | 87 | 95 (1) | 60 | 101 (1) | 255 | 96 (1) |

[^23]Table 8. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Taylorsville Lake. Age-1 CPUE and standard error could not be calculated for 2019 year class due to COVID-19 work restrictions.


Table 9. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/nn) of crappie collected at Taylorsville Lake in 48 net-nights in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | 8 | 32 | 4 | 19 | 216 | 239 | 123 | 82 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 781 | 16.3 | 2.8 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  | 1 | 10 | 25 | 17 |  |  |  |  | 53 | 1.1 | 0.5 |

Dataset = cfdtntvl.d22

Table 10. PSD and RSD 10 values calculated for crappie collected at Taylorsville Lake in 48 net-nights during October 2022. 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{10}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White Crappie | 741 | $68( \pm 3)$ | $19( \pm 3)$ |
| Black Crappie | 53 | $79( \pm 11)$ | 0 |
| Dataset $=$ cfdtntvld22 |  |  |  |

Dataset = cfdtntvl.d22

Table 11. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for otoliths from White Crappie trap netted at Taylorsville Lake in 2022.

| Year class | No. | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2021 | 29 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 33 | 5.0 | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 41 | 5.5 | 9.1 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 4 | 5.9 | 10.0 | 11.3 | 12.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 3 | 4.7 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 11.0 | 11.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 3 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 10.3 |  |  |
| 2013 | 1 | 4.5 | 6.7 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 9.5 |
| Mean | 114 | 5.1 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 10.5 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 9.5 |
| Smallest |  | 3.3 | 5.7 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 9.5 |
| Largest |  | 7.1 | 10.8 | 12.3 | 12.1 | 12.7 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 9.3 | 9.5 |
| Std error |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |  |  |
| 95\% ConLo |  | 5.0 | 8.2 | 9.9 | 9.5 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 8.8 |  |  |
| 95\% ConHi |  | 5.3 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 11.2 |  |  |

[^24]Dataset $=$ cfdagtvl.d22

Table 12. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) per inch class of White Crappie trap netted for 48 net-nights at Taylorsville Lake in 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| 0+ | 8 | 32 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 6 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| 1+ |  |  |  | 16 | 165 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  | 213 | 27 | 4.4 | 0.8 |
| 2+ |  |  |  | 3 | 51 | 175 | 90 | 22 |  |  |  | 341 | 44 | 7.1 | 1.1 |
| 3+ |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 16 | 52 | 41 | 8 | 1 | 150 | 19 | 3.1 | 0.8 |
| 4+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5 | 1 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 5+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 6+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| 7+ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 14 | 2 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 8+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| 9+ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 1 | 0.2 | <0.1 |
| Total | 8 | 32 | 4 | 19 | 216 | 239 | 123 | 82 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 781 | 100 | 16.3 | 2.8 |
| (\%) | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 28 | 31 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 2 | <1 | 100 |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdtntvl.d22 and cfdagtvl.d22
CPUE of $\geq 8.0$-in White Crappie $=10.5 \pm 2.0$ fish $/ \mathrm{nn} ; \geq 10.0-\mathrm{in}=2.9 \pm 0.9 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$

Table 13. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for otoliths from Black Crappie trap netted at Taylorsville Lake in 2022.

| Year |  | Age |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2021 | 9 | 4.6 |  |  |
| 2020 | 24 | 4.9 | 7.8 | 8.9 |
| 2019 | 6 | 4.7 | 7.9 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 8.9 |
| Mean | 39 | 4.8 | 7.8 | 8.6 |
| Smallest |  | 4.1 | 6.4 | 9.2 |
| Largest |  | 6.4 | 8.5 | 0.1 |
| Std error |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 8.7 |
| 95\% ConLo |  | 4.6 | 7.6 | 9.1 |
| 95\% ConHi |  | 5.0 | 7.9 |  |

Intercept value $=0.00$
Dataset $=$ cfdagtvl.d22

Table 14. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) per inch class of Black Crappie trap netted for 48 net-nights at Taylorsville Lake in 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | Total | $\%$ | CPUE |
|  | 6 | 9 |  |  |  | SE |  |  |
| $1+$ | 1 | 9 |  |  | 19 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |
| $2+$ |  | 1 | 25 | 10 |  | 36 | 67 | 0.7 |
| $3+$ |  |  |  | 7 | 7 | 14 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Total | 1 | 10 | 25 | 17 | 53 | 100 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| $\%$ | 2 | 19 | 47 | 32 | 100 |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdtntvl.d22 and cfdagtvl.d22
CPUE of $\geq 8.0$-in Black Crappie $=0.9 \pm 0.4 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn} ; \geq 10.0$ - $\mathrm{in}=0.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{nn}$

Table 15. Population assessment for White Crappie collected during fall trap netting at Taylorsville Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | CPUE age 1 and older | Mean length age 2+ at capture | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 8.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CPUE age $1+$ | CPUE age $0+$ | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 15.4 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 4.4 | 0.9 | -0.7424 | 52\% | 15 | Good |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | Value | 14.3 | 9.4 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 0.7 | -0.7882 | 55\% | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value | 10.8 | 11.0 | 8.3 | 10.2 | 1.1 | -1.1281 | 68\% | 17 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019* | Value | 7.5 | 9.7* | 7.3 | 0.9* | 8.8 | ND |  | 15 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value | 11.0 | 9.7 | 11.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | -0.5899 | 45\% | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 12.5 | 9.3 | 10.8 | 2.2 | 0.3 | -1.6256 | 80\% | 12 | Fair |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value | 16.8 | 11.3 | 7.9 | 16.4 | 0.4 | -1.8811 | 85\% | 17 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value | 5.6 | 10.5 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 16.9 | -1.5272 | 78\% | 16 | Good |
|  | Score | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 2.9 | 10.9 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 0.4 | -1.9429 | 86\% | 11 | Fair |
|  | Score | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Value | 1.7 | 10.2 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 6.7 | -0.9991 | 63\% | 11 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |

* Age data not collected

ND = not determined
Table 16. Population assessment for Black Crappie collected during fall trap netting at Taylorsville Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { age } 1 \\ \text { and older } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Mean length age $2+$ at capture | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 8.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | CPUE age $1+$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 0+ \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 1.1 | 8.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | -0.1783 | 16\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 7 | Poor |
| 2021 | Value | 2.1 | 9.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | -0.6960 | 50\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 10 | Fair |
| 2020 | Value | 0.7 | 9.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | -0.6272 | 47\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 7 | Poor |
| 2019* | Value | 1.2 | $9.8{ }^{*}$ | 0.9 | $0.8{ }^{*}$ | 0.1 | ND |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 10 | Fair |
| 2018 | Value | 2.3 | 9.8 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.1 | ND |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 12 | Fair |
| 2017 | Value | 3.8 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 0 | -0.7052 | 51\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 12 | Fair |
| 2016 | Value | 4.8 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 0.1 | -1.1342 | 68\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 12 | Fair |
| 2015 | Value | 8.6 | 9.2 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 1.2 | -1.6083 | 80\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2014 | Value | 6.3 | 9.3 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 0.9 | -1.2768 | 72\% |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 |  |  | 15 | Good |
| 2013 | Value | 4.5 | 9.1 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 2.2 | ND |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 |  |  | 16 | Good |

[^25]Table 17. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{r}\right)$ for each length group of crappie at Taylorsville Lake in October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| White Crappie | 238 | 88 (1) | 362 | 89 (1) | 140 | 94 (1) | 740 | 89 (1) |
| Black Crappie | 11 | 85 (2) | 42 | 88 (1) | 0 |  | 53 | 88 (1) |

Table 18. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Blue Catfish collected in 3.0 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for Blue Catfish in Taylorsville Lake in July 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Species | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 37 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Blue Catfish |  | 2 | 41 | 102 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 24 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 245 | 163.3 | 54.5 |
| Lower | Blue Catfish | 1 | 19 | 56 | 54 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 19 | 24 | 20 | 17 | 11 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 262 | 174.7 | 22.1 |
| Total | Blue Catfish | 1 | 21 | 97 | 156 | 24 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 43 | 39 | 31 | 24 | 13 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 507 | 169.0 | 28.1 |

Table 19. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Blue Catfish collected from Taylorsville Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<12.0$ in |  | 12.0-19.9 in |  | 20.0-29.9 in |  | $\geq 30.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 91.7 | 27.8 | 60.7 | 12.6 | 15.3 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 169.0 | 28.1 |
| 2021 | 34.7 | 17.7 | 104.0 | 32.5 | 11.0 | 3.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 150.3 | 39.6 |
| 2020 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 108.7 | 16.8 | 13.0 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 124.7 | 17.0 |
| 2019 | 7.0 | 3.5 | 92.3 | 17.5 | 12.0 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 112.0 | 21.7 |
| 2018 | 45.7 | 8.5 | 111.7 | 16.1 | 15.7 | 3.4 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 175.3 | 21.8 |
| 2017 | 87.3 | 23.7 | 118.0 | 21.2 | 9.0 | 5.5 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 216.7 | 30.8 |
| 2016 | 35.3 | 15.4 | 53.0 | 21.5 | 6.7 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 96.7 | 31.5 |
| 2015 | 31.4 | 16.0 | 47.1 | 16.6 | 4.6 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 84.9 | 24.6 |
| 2014 | 31.1 | 11.3 | 119.4 | 21.1 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 167.1 | 27.5 |
| 2013 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 42.0 | 6.5 | 11.0 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 0.9 | 60.0 | 8.2 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpstvl.d13-.d22

Table 20. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Blue Catfish collected at Taylorsville Lake on 6 and 7 July 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12.0-19.9 in |  | 20.0-29.9 in |  | $\geq 30.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Upper | Blue Catfish | 86 | 96 (1) | 10 | 96 (2) | 3 | 113 (2) | 99 | 96 (1) |
| Lower | Blue Catfish | 93 | 97 (1) | 36 | 101 (2) | 1 | 125 | 130 | 98 (1) |
| Total | Blue Catfish | 179 | 97 (1) | 46 | 100 (1) | 4 | 115 (4) | 229 | 98 (1) |

Dataset = cfdpstvl.d22

Table 21. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of crappie collected in 4.5 hours of 15-minute electrofishing runs in Herrington Lake, April 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |
| Upper | White Crappie |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
|  | Black Crappie |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 7.3 | 3.2 |
| Middle | White Crappie | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | 2.7 | 2.0 |
|  | Black Crappie |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 12 | 8.0 | 2.7 |
| Lower | White Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Black Crappie |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 6 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Total | White Crappie | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 6 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
|  | Black Crappie |  | 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 29 | 6.4 | 1.7 |

Dataset = cfdpsher.d22

Table 22. PSD and RSD 10 values calculated for crappie electrofished from Herrington Lake during April 2022. 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{10}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White Crappie | 6 | $83( \pm 33)$ | $50( \pm 44)$ |
| Black Crappie | 29 | $100( \pm 0)$ | $76( \pm 16)$ |

Dataset = cfdpsher.d22

Table 23. Population assessment for White Crappie collected during spring electrofishing at Herrington Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on lake-specific assessment).

| Year |  | Total CPUE | Mean length age 2 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 10.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | CPUE age 2 | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 1.3 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.8^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4^{\wedge} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 7 | Poor |
| 2021 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.8^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3^{\wedge} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 7 | Poor |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  | No sample |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score |  |  |  | No sample |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value Score |  |  |  | No sample |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value Score |  |  |  | No sample |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.8^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.8^{\wedge} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 8 | Fair |
| 2015 | Value Score |  |  |  | No sample |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 16.7 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 10 | Fair |
| 2013 | Value Score |  |  |  | No sample |  |  |  |

* Age data not collected
${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years

Table 24. Population assessment for Black Crappie collected during spring electrofishing at Herrington Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on lake-specific assessment).

| Year |  | Total CPUE | Mean length age 2 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 10.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 6.4 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.3^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.4 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6^{\wedge} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 8 | Fair |
| 2021 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 8.2 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $7.8$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.3 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.6^{\wedge} \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 8 | Fair |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value <br> Score |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value Score |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 34.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.9^{\star} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 34.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.8^{\wedge} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | 16 | Good |
| 2015 | Value Score |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.6 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 7 | Poor |
| 2013 | Value Score |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |

[^26]Table 25. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 7.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Herrington Lake, April 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass |  | 12 | 16 | 9 | 24 | 23 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 195 | 78.0 | 5.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass |  | 14 | 24 | 22 | 55 | 52 | 25 | 21 | 37 | 23 | 34 | 17 | 22 | 13 | 17 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 401 | 160.4 | 15.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 9.2 | 2.6 |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 27 | 12 | 18 | 30 | 21 | 17 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 184 | 73.6 | 9.9 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 45 | 18.0 | 4.1 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 27 | 40 | 32 | 85 | 80 | 38 | 28 | 63 | 64 | 59 | 45 | 58 | 44 | 46 | 31 | 19 | 11 | 7 | 780 | 104.0 | 9.6 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 68 | 9.1 | 2.1 |

Dataset = cfdpsher.d22

Table 26. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Herrington Lake from 2013-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 35.6 | 5.9 | 25.7 | 3.7 | 21.6 | 2.7 | 21.1 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 104.0 | 9.6 |
| 2021 | 16.4 | 2.7 | 16.0 | 2.5 | 16.9 | 1.9 | 27.5 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 76.8 | 6.0 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  | o samp | due | id-19 | tric |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 32.7 | 4.8 | 27.6 | 2.6 | 40.0 | 3.7 | 37.5 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 137.7 | 9.7 |
| 2018 | 45.3 | 7.9 | 50.8 | 5.9 | 58.5 | 5.1 | 29.9 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 184.5 | 13.8 |
| 2017 | 26.4 | 3.0 | 40.5 | 4.4 | 30.8 | 3.6 | 16.3 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 114.0 | 6.5 |
| 2016 | 32.8 | 4.7 | 43.1 | 5.5 | 16.4 | 1.9 | 17.7 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 110.0 | 9.0 |
| 2015 | 32.9 | 3.4 | 16.8 | 2.2 | 20.9 | 1.9 | 17.6 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 88.3 | 6.1 |
| 2014 | 30.1 | 4.1 | 20.5 | 2.0 | 28.5 | 2.7 | 18.0 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 97.2 | 6.4 |
| 2013 | 11.7 | 2.2 | 29.6 | 4.0 | 18.5 | 2.7 | 12.9 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 72.8 | 7.0 |

Dataset = cfdpsher.d13- .d22

Table 27. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in each area of Herrington Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 168 | $70( \pm 7)$ | $34( \pm 7)$ |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 234 | $55( \pm 6)$ | $24( \pm 5)$ |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 111 | $68( \pm 9)$ | $41( \pm 9)$ |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 513 | $62( \pm 4)$ | $31( \pm 6)$ |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsher.d22

Table 28. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Herrington Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{array}{r} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { age } 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\underset{4}{13.6^{*}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.6 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2021 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.4 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.9 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 14 | Good |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4^{*} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.5 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 19 | Excellent |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4^{*} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.1 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.2 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\underset{4}{13.4^{\star}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.4 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.7 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.9 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 15 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.8^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 13.8^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.5 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.9 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 14 | Good |

[^27]Table 29. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 4.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Herrington Lake in September 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 6 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 129 | 86.0 | 18.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 6 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 14.0 | 2.7 |
|  | Smallmouth bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 13 | 23 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 129 | 86.0 | 14.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 6 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 4 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 38 | 25.3 | 4.2 |
|  | Smallmouth bass |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 20 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 86 | 57.3 | 7.6 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 2 | 13 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 14.0 | 4.0 |
|  | Smallmouth bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 10 | 47 | 41 | 23 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 12 | 17 | 11 | 20 | 18 | 19 | 25 | 24 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 344 | 76.4 | 8.3 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 14 | 26 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 1 |  | 4 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 80 | 17.8 | 2.4 |
|  | Smallmouth bass |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Dataset = cfdwrher.d22

Table 30. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Herrington Lake in September and October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 26 | 90 (1) | 28 | 92 (1) | 43 | 93 (1) | 97 | 92 (1) |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 44 | 91 (1) | 38 | 92 (1) | 38 | 92 (1) | 120 | 92 (1) |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 11 | 92 (2) | 14 | 96 (2) | 22 | 95 (2) | 47 | 95 (1) |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 81 | 91 (1) | 80 | 93 (1) | 103 | 93 (1) | 264 | 92 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrher.d22

Table 31. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Herrington Lake. Age-1 CPUE and standard error could not be calculated for 2019 year class due to COVID-19 work restrictions

| Year class | Age 0 |  |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 (natural) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 29.6 | 4.0 | 7.9 | 1.5 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 3.7 | 0.1 | 48.7 | 6.7 | 11.8 | 2.2 | 38.5 | 6.1 |
| 2020 | Total | 5.0 | 0.1 | 16.4 | 2.8 | 8.4 | 1.5 | 21.1 | 3.1 |
| 2019 | Total | 4.9 | 0.1 | 23.6 | 4.3 | 11.8 | 2.0 | - |  |
| 2018 | Total | 5.8 | 0.1 | 11.6 | 1.6 | 9.3 | 1.5 | 20.5 | 3.8 |
| 2017 | Total | 5.0 | 0.1 | 26.0 | 4.2 | 13.3 | 3.5 | 42.5 | 7.7 |
| 2016 | Total | 5.4 | 0.1 | 24.9 | 3.6 | 16.7 | 2.8 | 39.1 | 4.2 |
| 2015 | Total | 5.2 | 0.1 | 67.8 | 10.3 | 44.8 | 7.9 | 59.7 | 7.8 |
| 2014 | Total | 4.7 | 0.1 | 36.9 | 6.0 | 20.0 | 3.5 | 38.4 | 3.9 |
| 2013 | Total | 4.5 | 0.1 | 49.1 | 4.9 | 19.3 | 3.1 | 33.9 | 4.3 |

Dataset = cfdwrher.d22

Table 32. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of White Bass and hybrid striped bass collected during 16 net-nights of gill netting in Herrington Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |  |
| White Bass | 2 | 1 |  | 5 | 12 | 23 | 37 | 35 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 7.5 | 1.5 |
| Hybrid striped bass | 3 | 12 | 3 |  | 4 | 1 |  | 3 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 34 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 124 | 7.8 | 1.7 |
| Reciprocal | 3 | 12 | 3 |  | 4 | 1 |  | 3 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 10 | 1 |  |  | 90 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| Original |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 2.1 | 0.6 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

[^28]Table 33. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for otoliths from hybrid striped bass gill netted at Herrington Lake in 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2021 | 21 | 11.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 26 | 13.3 | 18.7 |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 33 | 14.1 | 18.3 | 20.6 |  |  |
| 2018 | 10 | 14.1 | 18.5 | 20.4 | 21.4 | 22.6 |
| 2017 | 9 | 13.5 | 19.0 | 20.8 | 21.9 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.6 |
| Mean | 99 | 13.3 | 18.6 | 20.6 | 21.6 | 21.1 |
| Smallest |  | 5.9 | 16.3 | 18.6 | 20.4 | 25.1 |
| Largest |  | 15.8 | 20.7 | 23.0 | 24.4 | 0.4 |
| Std error |  | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 21.8 |
| 95\% ConLo |  | 12.9 | 18.4 | 20.3 | 21.2 | 23.4 |
| 95\% ConHi |  | 13.6 | 18.8 | 20.8 | 22.1 | 2 |

Intercept Value $=0.00$
Dataset $=$ cfdagher.d22

Table 34. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) per inch class of hybrid striped bass gill netted for 16 net-nights at Herrington Lake in 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |  |  |
| 0+ | 3 | 12 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 15 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| 1+ |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |  | 3 | 7 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 18 | 1.4 | 0.4 |
| 2+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 15 | 11 |  |  |  |  | 28 | 22 | 1.7 | 0.5 |
| 3+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 2 |  |  | 37 | 30 | 2.3 | 0.7 |
| 4+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4 |  |  |  | 10 | 8 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| 5+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Total | 3 | 12 | 3 |  | 4 | 1 |  | 3 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 34 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 124 | 100 | 7.8 | 1.7 |
| \% | 2 | 10 | 2 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 27 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 100 |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdagher.d22 and cfdgnher.d22

Table 35. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ) for each length group of hybrid striped bass collected at Herrington Lake in November 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Hybrid striped bass | Total | 18 | 93 (2) | 5 | 99 (5) | 101 | 98 (1) | 124 | 97 (1) |

Dataset = cfdgnher.d22

Table 36. Population assessment for hybrid striped bass collected during fall gill netting at Herrington Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessments).

| Year |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { (excluding } \\ \text { age 0) } \end{gathered}$ | Mean length age 2+ at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | CPUE age $1+$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 6.7 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.4 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2021 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.1 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 13 | Good |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 7 | Fair |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 8.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 13 | Good |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 3.1 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.3 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 9 | Fair |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.6 \\ 4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 7 | Fair |

Table 37. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for otoliths from White Bass gill netted at Herrington Lake in 2022.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2021 | 26 | 10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 8 | 9.9 | 12.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 77 | 9.6 | 12.8 | 14.2 |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 9.1 | 12.8 | 13.7 | 14.1 | 14.7 |  |
| 2017 | 1 | 11.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 15.8 | 16.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 113 | 9.8 | 12.9 | 14.2 | 14.8 | 15.3 | 16.0 |
| Smallest |  | 4.2 | 11.1 | 12.6 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 16.0 |
| Largest |  | 0.1 | 14.7 | 15.9 | 15.4 | 15.8 | 16.0 |
| Std error | 0.5 | 12.7 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 14.2 |  |  |
| 95\% ConLo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% ConHi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept Value $=0.0$ | 13.0 | 14.4 | 16.0 | 16.3 |  |  |  |
| Dataset $=$ cfdagher.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 38. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) per inch class of White Bass gill netted for 16 net-nights at Herrington Lake in 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| 0+ | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 1+ |  |  |  | 5 | 12 | 9 |  |  |  | 26 | 22 | 1.6 | 0.4 |
| 2+ |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 8 | 7 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| 3+ |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 31 | 34 | 4 | 81 | 68 | 5.1 | 1.1 |
| 4+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 6+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 2 | 1 |  | 5 | 12 | 23 | 37 | 35 | 5 | 120 | 100 | 7.5 | 1.5 |
| \% | 2 | 1 |  | 4 | 10 | 19 | 31 | 29 | 4 | 100 |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdagher.d22 and cfdgnher.d22

Table 39. Population assessment for White Bass collected during fall gill netting at Herrington Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { (excluding } \\ \text { age 0) } \end{gathered}$ | Mean length age $2+$ at capture | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 12.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1+ \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 7.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.3 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $1.6$ |  |  | 12 | Good |
| 2021 | Value Score | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.7 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 14 | Excellent |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 7 | Fair |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 2.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 2.3 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.3 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 5.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.3 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 5.7 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.9 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 12 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 7 | Fair |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 2.2 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |

Table 40. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $W_{r}$ ) for each length group of White Bass collected at Herrington Lake in October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6.0-8.9 in |  | 9.0-11.9 in |  | $\geq 12.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| White Bass | 2 | 106 (4) | 6 | 105 (6) | 112 | 98 (1) | 120 | 98 (1) |

Dataset = cfdgnher.d22

Table 41. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 3.0 hours of 15-minute diurnal electrofishing runs in Guist Creek Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 10 | 14 | 27 | 19 | 24 | 51 | 49 | 23 | 22 | 54 | 42 | 42 | 51 | 45 | 30 | 37 | 25 | 9 | 5 | 579 | 193.0 | 15.9 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |

Dataset = cfdpsgcl.d22

Table 42. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Guist Creek Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 31.3 | 4.9 | 48.3 | 5.1 | 46.0 | 3.0 | 67.3 | 8.3 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 193.0 | 15.9 |
| 2021 | 9.0 | 1.8 | 56.3 | 6.6 | 35.7 | 3.6 | 53.3 | 7.8 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 154.3 | 12.2 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  | sampl | due | vid-19 r | trictio |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 22.7 | 5.1 | 42.3 | 5.7 | 57.0 | 6.7 | 67.7 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 1.2 | 189.7 | 13.9 |
| 2018 | 11.0 | 1.9 | 111.7 | 10.3 | 64.7 | 5.6 | 64.3 | 8.1 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 251.7 | 18.3 |
| 2017 | 13.0 | 3.3 | 57.3 | 7.3 | 36.0 | 5.0 | 70.0 | 11.2 | 5.7 | 1.7 | 176.3 | 21.2 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 28.7 | 8.4 | 86.0 | 6.5 | 47.0 | 4.9 | 63.7 | 10.2 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 225.3 | 22.2 |
| 2014 | 13.3 | 2.4 | 43.3 | 5.4 | 32.7 | 4.6 | 49.3 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 138.7 | 15.8 |
| 2013 | 21.3 | 7.0 | 44.0 | 5.1 | 51.0 | 5.4 | 63.0 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 179.3 | 11.6 |

Dataset = cfdpsgcl.d13- d22

Table 43. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring nocturnal electrofishing samples in Guist Creek Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 485 | $70( \pm 4)$ | $42( \pm 5)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdpsgcl.d22 |  |  |  |

Table 44. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Guist Creek Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 12.5* | 21.7 | 46.0 | 67.3 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 19 | Excellent |
| 2021 | Value | 12.5* | 8.3 | 35.7 | 53.3 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2020 | Value |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value | 12.5* | 16.0 | 57.0 | 67.7 | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 18 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value | 12.5* | 7.0 | 64.7 | 64.3 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2017 | Value | 12.5 | 12.7 | 36.0 | 70.0 | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2016 | Value |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value | $12.2^{*}$ | 13.0 | 47.0 | 63.7 | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2014 | Value | 12.2* | 3.7 | 32.7 | 49.3 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2013 | Value | 12.2 | 17.0 | 51.0 | 63.0 | 5.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 18 | Excellent |

* Age data not collected
${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
-Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

Table 45. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 1.5 hours of 15-minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Guist Creek Lake in September 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 30 | 45 | 10 | 5 | 22 | 19 | 8 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 10 | 18 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 244 | 162.7 | 13.7 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrgcl.d22

Table 46. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Guist Creek Lake in September and October, 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses. $\qquad$

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 81 | 91 (1) | 60 | 93 (1) | 66 | 99 (1) | 207 | 94 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrgcl.d22

Table 47. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Guist Creek Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 57.3 | 8.9 | 7.3 | 1.6 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 23.7 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 21.7 | 3.4 |
| 2020 | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 32.0 | 5.8 | 9.3 | 3.2 | 8.3 | 1.9 |
| 2019 | Total | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Total | 4.8 | 0.1 | 29.3 | 6.6 | 10.7 | 3.4 | 15.3 | 4.5 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 75.3 | 20.3 | 18.7 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 1.8 |
| 2016 | Total | 5.0 | 0.1 | 56.0 | 8.6 | 29.3 | 7.4 | 11.0 | 3.0 |
| 2015 | Total | 5.0 | 0.1 | 49.3 | 5.1 | 28.0 | 2.3 | --- |  |
| 2014 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 27.3 | 5.2 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 13.0 | 6.4 |
| 2013 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 38.7 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 1.0 |

Table 48. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/set) of Channel Catfish at Guist Creek Lake. Channel Catfish were collected using baited, tandem hoop nets ( 72 hours soak time) that were set on 29 November 2022. Nets were pulled three days after setting them and 5 sets of tandem nets were used for the sampling event.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Average per set | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 8 | 1.6 | 1.2 |

Dataset $=$ cfdhngcl.d22

Table 49. PSD and RSD 24 values obtained for Channel Catfish from tandem hoop net samples in Guist Creek Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{24}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel Catfish | 8 | $50( \pm 37)$ | $13( \pm 13)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdhngcl.d22 |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdhngcl.d22

Table 50. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Channel Catfish collected at Guist Creek Lake in November 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11.0-15.9 in |  | 16.0-23.9 in |  | $\geq 24.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | W | No. | Wr | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Channel Catfish | 4 | 83 (2) | 3 | 90 (3) | 1 | 108 (-) | 8 | 89 (2) |

Dataset $=$ cfdhngcl.d22

Table 51. CPUE (fish/set) for each length group of Channel Catfish collected by hoop net from the past 10 samples at Guist Creek Lake.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\geq 12.0$ in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| 2018 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 2016 | 63.0 | 25.7 | 44.7 | 18.6 | 16.3 | 7.8 | 66.0 | 26.6 |
| 2014 | 47.8 | 14.0 | 25.0 | 9.5 | 11.2 | 3.3 | 79.8 | 20.6 |
| 2012 | 21.8 | 12.0 | 8.2 | 5.5 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 50.2 | 26.4 |
| 2011 | 13.2 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 31.6 | 7.3 |
| 2010 | 42.0 | 10.3 | 18.8 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 1.6 | 78.6 | 19.9 |
| 2009 | 45.4 | 11.9 | 22.2 | 5.8 | 4.4 | 1.6 | 73.0 | 16.0 |
| 2008 | 87.4 | 24.4 | 26.6 | 10.4 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 107.2 | 29.2 |
| 2007 | 208.2 | 106.1 | 60.0 | 32.6 | 13.0 | 7.6 | 382.0 | 184.4 |

Dataset = cfdhngcl.d07- .d22

Table 52. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 2.0 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Beaver Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 18 | 51 | 33 | 24 | 52 | 68 | 28 | 28 | 32 | 46 | 23 | 17 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 445 | 222.5 | 31.5 |

Dataset = cfdpsbvr.d22

Table 53. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Beaver Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 89.0 | 18.5 | 78.0 | 9.5 | 43.0 | 7.5 | 12.5 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 222.5 | 31.5 |
| 2021 | 108.0 | 9.9 | 116.0 | 8.8 | 38.0 | 4.1 | 16.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 278.0 | 16.4 |
| 2020 | 136.0 | 13.2 | 182.0 | 14.6 | 27.0 | 6.5 | 9.5 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 354.5 | 24.3 |
| 2019 | 117.5 | 16.8 | 118.0 | 11.8 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 9.5 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 265.0 | 22.5 |
| 2018 | 130.0 | 12.1 | 223.0 | 18.4 | 30.0 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 386.5 | 23.7 |
| 2017 | 279.0 | 37.2 | 160.5 | 16.5 | 35.5 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 480.0 | 45.1 |
| 2016 | 106.5 | 21.4 | 104.0 | 13.2 | 38.0 | 2.4 | 15.0 | 2.9 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 263.5 | 31.0 |
| 2015 | 64.8 | 9.5 | 126.5 | 19.9 | 22.8 | 4.1 | 12.5 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 226.5 | 31.3 |
| 2014 | 73.5 | 10.7 | 116.0 | 12.5 | 21.0 | 3.3 | 14.5 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 225.0 | 21.2 |
| 2013 | 60.0 | 8.8 | 137.3 | 12.3 | 48.7 | 9.3 | 16.7 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 262.7 | 16.4 |

Dataset = cfdpsbvr.d13-.d22

Table 54. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in Beaver Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 267 | $42( \pm 6)$ | $9( \pm 4)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdpsbvr.d22 |  |  |  |

Table 55. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Beaver Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 11.3* | 57.5 | 43.0 | 12.5 | 1.0 |  |  | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | Value | $11.3^{*}$ | 107.5 | 38.0 | 16.0 | 4.0 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value | $11.3^{*}$ | 131.5 | 27.0 | 9.5 | 2.0 |  |  | 15 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value | $11.3 *$ | 117.5 | 20.0 | 9.5 | 1.5 |  |  | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value | 11.3 | 126.5 | 30.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 |  |  | 12 | Fair |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 10.8* | 279.0 | 35.5 | 5.0 | 0.5 |  |  | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value | 10.8* | 103.0 | 38.0 | 15.0 | 4.5 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value | 10.8* | 46.3 | 22.8 | 12.5 | 2.8 |  |  | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 10.8 | 47.3 | 21.0 | 14.5 | 2.0 |  |  | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Value | 10.7* | 50.0 | 48.7 | 16.7 | 1.3 |  |  | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |

[^29]Table 56. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Beaver Lake in September 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 74 | 84 | 36 | 9 | 12 | 31 | 44 | 50 | 41 | 30 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 441 | 294.0 | 31.7 |

Dataset = cfdwrbvr.d22

Table 57. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Beaver Lake in fall 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 101 | 87 (1) | 68 | 87 (1) | 30 | 94 (2) | 199 | 88 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrbvr.d22

Table 58. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Beaver Lake.

| Year class |  | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 135.3 | 16.3 | 30.0 | 6.2 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 69.3 | 12.4 | 9.3 | 3.4 | 57.5 | 15.9 |
| 2020 | Total | 3.7 | 0.1 | 232.0 | 26.1 | 17.3 | 2.2 | 107.5 | 9.8 |
| 2019 | Total | 5.1 | 0.1 | 209.3 | 29.7 | 119.3 | 20.3 | 131.5 | 13.5 |
| 2018 | Total | 5.2 | 0.1 | 196.0 | 31.6 | 118.7 | 26.8 | 117.5 | 16.8 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.8 | 0.1 | 227.3 | 23.1 | 84.0 | 13.0 | 126.5 | 11.8 |
| 2016 | Total | 5.6 | 0.1 | 370.0 | 34.9 | 320.0 | 25.8 | 279.0 | 37.2 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 184.5 | 23.6 | 28.5 | 4.4 | 103.0 | 20.9 |
| 2014 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 94.7 | 15.0 | 14.0 | 3.5 | 46.3 | 7.6 |
| 2013 | Total | 3.8 | 0.1 | 78.7 | 6.2 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 47.3 | 7.4 |

Table 59. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in 1.25 hours of 7.5-minute electrofishing runs in Beaver Lake, May 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total | CPUE | SE |
| Species | 12 | 67 | 106 | 155 | 119 | 96 | 1 |  |  | 556 | 444.8 | 58.1 |
| Bluegill | 12 | 20 | 25 | 8 | 28 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 121 | 96.8 | 10.0 |  |

Dataset = cfdpsbvr.d22

Table 60. PSD and RSD values calculated for sunfish collected during 1.25 hours of electrofishing at Beaver Lake during May 2022. Fish were collected in 7.5 -minute runs. $95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $^{\text {a }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 544 | $40( \pm 4)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| Redear Sunfish | 117 | $55( \pm 9)$ | $6( \pm 4)$ |

${ }^{\text {abluegill }}=$ RSD $_{8} ;$ Redear $=$ RSD $_{9}$
Dataset $=$ cfdpsbvr.d22

Table 61. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected from Beaver Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 9.6 | 2.3 | 262.4 | 33.3 | 172.0 | 31.3 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 444.8 | 58.1 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  | No S | mple |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  | No S | mple |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 94.4 | 10.6 | 117.6 | 16.0 | 8.8 | 2.5 | 222.4 | 16.0 |
| 2018 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 150.4 | 18.5 | 150.4 | 28.9 | 12.8 | 3.0 | 314.4 | 43.0 |
| 2017 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 136.8 | 23.5 | 247.2 | 66.1 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 402.4 | 87.8 |
| 2016 | 33.6 | 12.0 | 213.6 | 30.6 | 201.6 | 45.1 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 450.4 | 81.4 |
| 2015 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 160.8 | 16.6 | 212.0 | 37.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 372.8 | 44.9 |
| 2014 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 252.8 | 33.4 | 252.8 | 56.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 507.2 | 37.4 |
| 2013 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 192.8 | 16.5 | 77.6 | 9.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 273.6 | 23.4 |

Dataset = cfdpsbvr.d13-.d22

Table 62. Population assessment for Bluegill collected during spring electrofishing at Beaver Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 2 at capture | Years to 6.0 in | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 6.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality <br> (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $4.1$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+ \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 172.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 11 | Good |
| 2021 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+{ }^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 126.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 15 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.4^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+* \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 163.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 15 | Excellent |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+ \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 261.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 15 | Excellent |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.7^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+{ }^{\star} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 203.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 13 | Good |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.7 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+ \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 212.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 11 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.7^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+ \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 252.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 12 | Good |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.7 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{4}{2-2+}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79.2 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 13 | Good |

* Age data not collected

Table 63. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Redear Sunfish collected from Beaver Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 38.4 | 4.4 | 28.8 | 6.1 | 28.8 | 7.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 96.8 | 10.0 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 10.4 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 4.6 |
| 2018 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 4.5 |
| 2017 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 4.8 | 2.1 | 7.2 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 16.0 | 2.9 |
| 2016 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 2.1 |
| 2015 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 1.6 |
| 2014 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 6.4 | 1.6 | 12.8 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 3.2 | 22.4 | 3.0 |
| 2013 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 12.0 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 21.6 | 5.2 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbvr.d13 - .d22

Table 64. Population assessment for Redear Sunfish collected during spring electrofishing at Beaver Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | Years to 8.0 in | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 10.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) $\qquad$ | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 8.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 14 | Excellent |
| 2021 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 8.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+ \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 12 | Good |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.1^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+{ }^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 11 | Good |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+ \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 14 | Excellent |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 7.0^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+{ }^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.4 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 7.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+ \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 8 | Fair |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 8.8^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2-2+ \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.8 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 15 | Excellent |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 8.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{4}{2-2+}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 15 | Excellent |

[^30]Table 65. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Beaver Lake during September and October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. $\quad W_{r}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |
|  | 3.0-5.9 in | $6.0-7.9$ in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  | Total |  |
| Bluegill | 7594 (2) | 34 | 83 (2) | 0 |  |  |  | 109 | 91 (2) |
|  | 1.0-3.9 in | 4.0-6.9 in |  | 7.0-9.0 in |  | $\geq 9.0$ in |  | Total |  |
| Redear Sunfish | $8 \quad 106$ (5) | 72 | 95 (1) | 36 | 98 (1) | 9 | 102 (2) | 125 | 97 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrbvr.d22

Table 66. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of crappie collected in 1.5 hours of 15-minute electrofishing runs for crappie in Beaver Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie |  |  | 8 | 6 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 19 | 12.7 | 4.8 |
| Black Crappie | 1 |  | 132 | 35 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 177 | 118.0 | 58.6 |

Dataset = cfdwrbvr.d22

Table 67. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for otoliths collected during White Crappie electrofishing at Beaver Lake in October 2022.

| Year |  | Age |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| class | No. | 1 | 2 |
| 2021 | 2 | 6.2 |  |
| 2020 | 17 | 6.1 | 8.4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 19 | 6.1 | 8.4 |
| Smallest |  | 5.2 | 7.5 |
| Largest |  | 8.0 | 10.1 |
| Std error |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 95\% ConLo |  | 5.8 | 8.0 |
| $95 \%$ ConHi |  | 6.5 | 8.7 |

Intercept value = 0.00
Dataset $=$ cfdagtvl.d22

Table 68. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for otoliths collected during Black Crappie electrofishing at Beaver Lake in October 2022.

| Year |  | Age |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| class | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| 2021 | 1 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 23 | 5.6 | 8.1 |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 3 | 6.9 | 10.1 | 11.3 |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 7.1 | 9.9 | 11.4 | 12.2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean | 28 | 5.8 | 8.4 | 11.3 | 12.2 |  |
| Smallest |  | 4.3 | 7.1 | 11.1 | 12.2 |  |
| Largest |  | 7.4 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 12.2 |  |
| Std error |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |
| $95 \%$ ConLo |  | 5.4 | 8.0 | 11.1 |  |  |
| $95 \%$ ConHi |  | 6.1 | 8.7 | 11.5 |  |  |

Intercept value $=0.00$
Dataset = cfdagtvl.d22

Table 69. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of crappie at Beaver Lake in October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| White Crappie | 0 |  | 14 | 83 (2) | 5 | 88 (2) | 19 | 84 (1) |
| Black Crappie | 1 | $88(-)$ | 52 | 89 (1) | 9 | 87 (2) | 62 | 89 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrbvr.d22

Table 70. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/set-night) of Channel Catfish at Beaver Lake sampled on 11 November 2022. Channel Catfish were collected using 5 set-nights of baited, tandem hoop nets ( 72 hours soak time).

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Average per set | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 1 | 1 | 14 | 24 | 31 | 27 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 159 | 31.8 | 8.4 |

[^31]Table 71. PSD and RSD 24 values obtained for Channel Catfish from tandem hoop net samples in Beaver Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{24}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel Catfish | 159 | $90( \pm 5)$ | $15( \pm 6)$ |

Dataset = cfdhnbvr.d22

Table 72. CPUE (fish/set-night) for each length group of Channel Catfish collected by hoop net from the past 10 samples at Beaver Lake.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\geq 12.0$ in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  | CPUE | SE |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPE |  |  |
| 2022 | 31.8 | 8.4 | 31.4 | 8.2 | 9.8 | 3.6 | 31.8 | 8.4 |  |
| 2021 | 34.6 | 7.2 | 14.4 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 35.4 | 7.7 |  |
| 2019 | 28.3 | 2.7 | 27.7 | 2.4 | 7.3 | 2.6 | 28.3 | 2.7 |  |
| 2017 | 22.7 | 12.2 | 21.3 | 11.0 | 5.7 | 3.2 | 22.7 | 12.2 |  |
| 2015 | 16.0 | 3.5 | 14.3 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 16.0 | 3.5 |  |
| 2011 | 44.8 | 14.0 | 28.0 | 8.7 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 72.8 | 24.5 |  |
| 2010 | 40.0 | 8.2 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 41.8 | 8.8 |  |
| 2009 | 71.4 | 17.2 | 21.6 | 5.1 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 94.8 | 29.1 |  |
| 2008 | 14.0 | 4.1 | 5.4 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 28.2 | 8.8 |  |
| 2007 | 35.8 | 12.6 | 6.2 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 36.4 | 12.8 |  |

Dataset = cfdhnbvr.d07-.d22

Table 73. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Channel Catfish collected at Beaver Lake in November 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11.0-15.9 in |  | 16.0-23.9 in |  | $\geq 24.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Channel Catfish | 16 | 94 (3) | 119 | 97 (1) | 24 | 110 (2) | 159 | 98 (1) |

[^32]Table 74. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 2.0 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass at Benjy Kinman Lake during April and May, 2022.

| Month | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| April | 1 | 21 | 32 | 19 | 9 | 115 | 115 | 61 | 19 | 7 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 2 | 410 | 205.0 | 11.8 |
| May |  | 28 | 48 | 35 | 14 | 104 | 112 | 60 | 18 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 450 | 225.0 | 27.0 |
| Total | 1 | 49 | 80 | 54 | 23 | 219 | 227 | 121 | 37 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 860 | 215.0 | 14.5 |

Dataset = cfdpsbkl.d22

Table 75. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Benjy Kinman Lake during 2015-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 51.8 | 8.9 | 151.0 | 8.2 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 7.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 215.0 | 14.5 |
| 2021 | 53.0 | 9.3 | 188.0 | 12.4 | 8.5 | 2.4 | 14.0 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 263.5 | 19.1 |
| 2020 | 52.0 | 13.9 | 78.0 | 12.6 | 10.0 | 2.1 | 11.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 151.0 | 23.0 |
| 2019 | 74.0 | 13.2 | 130.0 | 15.5 | 9.5 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 219.5 | 25.2 |
| 2018 | 31.5 | 6.3 | 73.5 | 11.0 | 13.5 | 1.1 | 9.5 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 128.0 | 14.1 |
| 2017 | 27.0 | 7.0 | 66.0 | 10.7 | 22.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 120.0 | 18.6 |
| 2016 | 23.0 | 7.0 | 82.0 | 11.5 | 15.0 | 2.9 | 7.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 127.0 | 18.6 |
| 2015 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 84.2 | 5.1 | 17.4 | 1.7 | 12.9 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 126.6 | 7.8 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbkl.d15-.d22

Table 76. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing sample in Benjy Kinman Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 653 | $8( \pm 2)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdpsbkl.d22 |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbkl.d22

Table 77. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Benjy Kinman Lake from 2015-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality <br> (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 10.2* | 46.5 | 5.3 | 7.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 10 | Fair |
| 2021 | Value | 10.2 | 48.5 | 8.5 | 14.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2020 | Value | 10.7* | 50.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2019 | Value | 10.7* | 70.5 | 9.5 | 6.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2018 | Value | 10.7* | 29.5 | 13.5 | 9.5 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 11 | Fair |
| 2017 | Value | 10.7 | 24.0 | 22.5 | 4.5 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 10 | Fair |
| 2016 | Value | 10.1* | 51.1 | 15.0 | 7.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 10 | Fair |
| 2015 | Value | 10.1* | 11.1 | 17.4 | 12.9 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |  | 11 | Fair |

[^33]Table 78. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Benjy Kinman Lake in September 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 10 | 91 | 86 | 23 | 13 | 94 | 67 | 31 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 423 | 282.0 | 54.4 |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrbkl.d22

Table 79. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Benjy Kinman Lake during September and October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 91 | 85 (1) | 31 | 88 (1) | 29 | 97 (2) | 151 | 88 (1) |

Table 80. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Benjy Kinman Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 5.1 | 0.1 | 140.0 | 29.4 | 72.7 | 20.6 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.6 | 0.1 | 100.7 | 17.7 | 30.0 | 7.8 | 46.5 | 8.1 |
| 2020 | Total | 4.8 | 0.1 | 104.0 | 20.2 | 46.0 | 7.7 | 48.5 | 7.8 |
| 2019 | Total | 5.1 | 0.1 | 124.7 | 37.5 | 75.3 | 30.7 | 50.0 | 12.9 |
| 2018 | Total | 4.9 | 0.1 | 73.3 | 3.8 | 39.3 | 4.7 | 70.5 | 13.7 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.7 | 0.1 | 92.7 | 13.8 | 38.7 | 7.4 | 29.5 | 6.4 |
| 2016 | Total | 4.7 | 0.1 | 43.3 | 6.0 | 15.3 | 3.2 | 24.0 | 5.9 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 78.0 | 16.2 | 8.7 | 2.4 | 51.1 | 9.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 16.0 | 5.4 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 11.1 | 2.2 |

Table 81. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in 1.25 hours of 7.5-minute electrofishing runs in Benjy Kinman Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 16 | 32 | 72 | 33 | 88 | 69 |  |  |  | 310 | 248.0 | 37.9 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 12 | 9 | 1 | 21 | 14 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 80 | 64.0 | 12.8 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbkl.d22

Table 82. PSD and RSD values calculated for sunfish collected during 1.25 hours of electrofishing at Benjy Kinman Lake during May 2022. Fish were collected in 7.5 -minute runs. $95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSDa |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 294 | $53( \pm 6)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| Redear Sunfish | 68 | $54( \pm 12)$ | $6( \pm 6)$ |

${ }^{\text {abluegill }}=$ RSD $8 ;$ Redear $=$ RSD9
Dataset $=$ cfdpsbkl.d22

Table 83. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected from Benjy Kinman Lake.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 12.8 | 7.3 | 109.6 | 19.6 | 125.6 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 248.0 | 37.9 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  | No | mple |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 27.2 | 8.3 | 170.4 | 19.9 | 226.4 | 40.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 424.0 | 33.4 |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  | No S | mple |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 35.2 | 8.4 | 177.6 | 17.2 | 96.8 | 11.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 309.6 | 22.1 |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  | No S | mple |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 56.8 | 13.4 | 225.6 | 30.9 | 81.6 | 15.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 365.5 | 30.9 |

Dataset = cfdpsbkl.d22-.d16

Table 84. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Redear Sunfish collected from Benjy Kinman Lake.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 7.2 | 28.0 | 5.8 | 18.4 | 5.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 64.0 | 12.8 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 2.1 | 27.2 | 9.4 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 9.6 |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 2.8 | 13.6 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.4 | 3.3 |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 6.4 | 22.4 | 6.2 | 12.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 61.6 | 10.4 |

Table 85. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Benjy Kinman Lake during September and October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |
|  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  | Total |  |
| Bluegill | 71 | 103 (2) | 72 | 87 (1) | 0 |  |  |  | 143 | 95 (1) |
|  | 1.0-3.9 in |  | 4.0-6.9 in |  | 7.0-9.0 in |  | $\geq 9.0$ in |  | Total |  |
| Redear Sunfish | 12 | 97 (8) | 56 | 104 (1) | 47 | 101 (1) | 6 | 92 (2) | 121 | 102 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrbkl.d22

Table 86. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/set) of Channel Catfish at Benjy Kinman Lake. Channel Catfish were collected using five (5) baited, tandem hoop nets (72 hours soak time) that were set on 21 November 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Average per set | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 30 | 6.0 | 3.1 |

Dataset = cfdhnbkl.d22

Table 87. PSD and $R_{24}$ values obtained for Channel Catfish from tandem hoop net samples in Benjy Kinman Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{24}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel Catfish | 30 | $83( \pm 15)$ | $20( \pm 15)$ |

[^34]Table 88. CPUE (fish/set) for each length group of Channel Catfish collected by hoop net at Benjy Kinman Lake from 2015-2022.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\geq 12.0$ in |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 6.0 | 3.1 | 5.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 6.0 | 3.1 |
| 2021 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| 2020 | 9.1 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 10.1 | 2.8 |
| 2019 | 6.7 | 3.7 | 6.7 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 6.7 | 3.7 |
| 2018 | 14.3 | 8.4 | 13.0 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 2.3 | 14.3 | 8.4 |
| 2015 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 3.7 |

Dataset = cfdhnbkl.d15-.d22

Table 89. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $W_{r}$ ) for each length group of Channel
Catfish collected at Benjy Kinman Lake in November 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11.0-15.9 in |  | 16.0-23.9 in |  | $\geq 24.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Channel Catfish | 5 | 83 (2) | 19 | 96 (3) | 6 | 117 (6) | 30 | 98 (3) |

Dataset = cfdhnbkl.d22

Table 90. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 2.0 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing runs in Boltz Lake, May 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | 8 | 10 | 15 | 17 | 38 | 46 | 34 | 48 | 52 | 44 | 28 | 28 | 29 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 5 |  | 1 |  |  | 429 | 214.5 | 11.1 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 2.0 | 1.1 |

Saugeye
Dataset $=$ cfdpsbol.d22

Table 91. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Boltz Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 26.5 | 7.8 | 83.0 | 8.7 | 62.0 | 6.1 | 43.0 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 214.5 | 11.1 |
| 2021 | 29.0 | 6.5 | 60.5 | 2.8 | 63.0 | 7.5 | 36.0 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 188.5 | 14.8 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 21.0 | 4.1 | 66.0 | 6.4 | 83.0 | 3.2 | 17.0 | 5.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 187.0 | 12.8 |
| 2018 | 14.0 | 3.2 | 97.5 | 7.6 | 82.5 | 9.7 | 25.5 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 219.5 | 12.7 |
| 2017 | 29.0 | 5.5 | 131.5 | 9.1 | 40.0 | 4.3 | 18.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 218.5 | 13.0 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 47.5 | 6.9 | 79.5 | 8.4 | 22.0 | 4.3 | 21.5 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 170.5 | 14.1 |
| 2014 | 68.5 | 10.5 | 73.0 | 6.5 | 18.5 | 3.5 | 16.0 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 176.0 | 17.2 |
| 2013 | 66.5 | 14.6 | 67.5 | 6.7 | 17.5 | 2.0 | 13.5 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 165.0 | 13.6 |

Dataset = cfdpsbol.d13-.d22

Table 92. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in Boltz Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 376 | $56( \pm 5)$ | $23( \pm 5)$ |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbol.d22

Table 93. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Boltz Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 12.2* | 19.0 | 62.0 | 43.0 | 3.0 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | Value | 12.2* | 15.0 | 63.0 | 36.0 | 1.0 |  |  | 16 | Good |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value | 12.2 | 15.0 | 63.0 | 36.0 | 1.0 |  |  | 16 | Good |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value | 11.4* | 8.0 | 83.0 | 17.0 | 0.5 |  |  | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value | 11.4* | 14.0 | 85.2 | 25.5 | 1.5 |  |  | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 11.4* | 26.0 | 40.0 | 18.0 | 0.5 |  |  | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value | 11.4 | 29.5 | 22.0 | 21.5 | 2.0 |  |  | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 10.7* | 57.0 | 18.5 | 16.0 | 2.5 |  |  | 11 | Fair |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Value | 10.7* | 21.5 | 17.5 | 13.5 | 2.5 |  |  | 10 | Fair |
|  | Score | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |

[^35]Table 94. Length distribution and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Boltz Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 37 | 242 | 130 | 35 | 11 | 32 | 24 | 9 | 15 | 31 | 26 | 25 | 26 | 21 | 10 | 5 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 683 | 417.3 | 38.7 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3.3 | 1.2 |

Dataset = cfdwrbol.d22

Table 95. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Boltz Lake in October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $8.0-11.9$ in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr | No. | W |
| Largemouth Bass | 72 | 91 (1) | 77 | 96 (1) | 40 | 99 (1) | 189 | 95 (1) |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrbol.d22

Table 96. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Boltz Lake.

| Year class | Age 0 |  |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 3.9 | 0.0 | 292.3 | 34.4 | 19.6 | 4.5 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 250.0 | 27.2 | 30.7 | 6.0 | 19.0 | 6.4 |
| 2020 | Total | 3.6 | 0.0 | 239.3 | 41.4 | 20.0 | 6.0 | 15.0 | 4.6 |
| 2019 | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 191.3 | 24.7 | 37.3 | 4.5 | 10.0 | 1.9 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 164.0 | 18.9 | 40.7 | 8.9 | 14.0 | 3.2 |
| 2016 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 69.3 | 7.8 | 15.3 | 2.8 | 20.5 | 5.3 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 47.3 | 3.6 | 6.0 | 1.4 | --- |  |
| 2014 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 38.7 | 10.9 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 29.5 | 5.2 |
| 2013* | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 68.0 | 16.2 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 4.0 | 0.8 |

*Only includes wild Largemouth Bass CPUE for age 1 year class; stocked Largemouth Bass were marked by fin clip and removed from dataset.

Table 97. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected in 1.25 hours of 7.5-minute electrofishing runs in Boltz Lake, May 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | Total | CPUE | SE | Species |
| :--- |

Dataset = cfdpsbol.d22

Table 98. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill collected during the past 6 samples from Boltz Lake.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<3.0$ in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 17.6 | 5.0 | 122.4 | 14.5 | 221.6 | 34.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 362.4 | 38.4 |
| 2020 | 46.4 | 11.7 | 238.4 | 29.9 | 232.0 | 31.1 | 15.2 | 4.2 | 532.0 | 55.7 |
| 2018 | 18.4 | 4.6 | 96.0 | 15.4 | 383.2 | 41.0 | 24.8 | 7.9 | 522.4 | 43.2 |
| 2016 | 29.6 | 10.7 | 392.8 | 36.7 | 85.6 | 15.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 508.8 | 38.4 |
| 2014 | 11.2 | 3.0 | 144.8 | 21.1 | 164.0 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 320.0 | 37.6 |
| 2013 | 36.8 | 11.5 | 162.4 | 20.0 | 117.6 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 316.8 | 33.8 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbol.d22-.d13

Table 99. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{8}$ values calculated for Bluegill collected during 1.25 hours of electrofishing at Boltz Lake during May 2022. Fish were collected in 7.5 -minute runs. $95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $R^{2} D_{8}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 431 | $64( \pm 5)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |

Dataset = cfdpsbol.d22

Table 100. Population assessment for Bluegill collected during spring electrofishing at Boltz Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessments).

| Year |  | Mean length age 2 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Years to } \\ & 6.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 6.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 8.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+* \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 222.4 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 12 | Good |
| 2020 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+{ }^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 247.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.2 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 14 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6^{\star} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+{ }^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 408.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.8 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 14 | Excellent |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+ \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86.4 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 11 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.6 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3-3+ \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 164.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 11 | Good |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 4.5^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{4}{2-2+^{*}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 117.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | - | - | 12 | Good |

Dataset = cfdpsbol.d10-.d22

* Age data not collected

Table 101. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $W_{r}$ ) for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Boltz Lake during October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |
|  | $3.0-5.9$ in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  | Total |  |
| Bluegill | 76 | 91 (2) | 27 | 85 (2) | 0 |  |  |  | 103 | 89 (2) |
|  | 1.0-3.9 in |  | $4.0-6.9$ in |  | 7.0-9.0 in |  | $\geq 9.0$ in |  | Total |  |
| Redear Sunfish | 8 | 116 (6) | 11 | 102 (3) | 11 | 106 (2) | 2 | 101 (3) | 32 | 107 (2) |

[^36]Table 102. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/set) of Channel Catfish at Boltz Lake. Channel Catfish were collected using baited, tandem hoop nets ( 72 hours soak time) that were set on 28 November 2022. Nets were pulled three days after setting them, and 5 sets of tandem nets were used for the sampling event.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Average per set | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |  |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 3 | 4 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 10 | 2.0 | 1.1 |

Dataset = cfdhnbol.d22

Table 103. PSD and RSD $_{24}$ values obtained for Channel Catfish from tandem hoop net samples in Boltz Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{24}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel Cattish | 10 | $30( \pm 30)$ | $10( \pm 10)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdhnbol.d22 |  |  |  |

Table 104. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Channel Catfish collected at Boltz Lake in December 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

|  |  |  |  | Leng | roup |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 11.0 | 5.9 in |  | 3.9 in |  |  |  |  |
| Species | Area | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Channel Catfish | Total | 7 | 96 (3) | 2 | 90 (1) | 1 | 102 | 10 | 95 (3) |

Dataset = cfdhnbol.d22

Table 105. CPUE (fish/set) for each length group of Channel Catfish collected by hoop net from the past 10 samples at Boltz Lake.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\geq 12.0$ in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  | Total |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 2018 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| 2016 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 5.7 | 3.0 |
| 2014 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| 2012 | 1.7 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 1.2 |
| 2010 | 15.6 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 32.6 | 9.0 |
| 2009 | 29.8 | 14.0 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 57.8 | 27.7 |
| 2008 | 9.6 | 3.1 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 27.4 | 7.2 |
| 2007 | 31.2 | 3.3 | 6.4 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 76.8 | 12.7 |
| 2006 | 43.8 | 12.5 | 6.0 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 274.2 | 95.6 |

Dataset = cfdhnbol.d06 -.d22

Table 106. Trail camera counts used to derive usage statistics from March 2022- February 2023 at Boltz Lake (92 acres).

Total Trips*
No. of trips 2022-2023
4,914
Trips/acre 53.4
Pressure*
Total man-hours $\quad 16,412$
Man-hours/acre
178.4
*Usage hours (angler and non-angler usage combined)


Figure 1. Number of trips per month at Boltz Lake from March 2022 through February 2023.


Figure 2. Number of usage hours by month at Boltz Lake from March 2022 through February 2023.

Table 107. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 2.0 hours of 15 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs in Bullock Pen Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 7 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 13 | 28 | 27 | 44 | 65 | 57 | 26 | 38 | 17 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  | 405 | 202.5 | 13.6 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1.0 | 0.7 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbpl.d22

Table 108. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Bullock Pen Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 25.5 | 4.5 | 82.0 | 6.3 | 60.5 | 7.1 | 34.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 202.5 | 13.6 |
| 2021 | 44.5 | 4.6 | 116.0 | 8.1 | 51.5 | 5.4 | 53.0 | 5.8 | 11.0 | 2.6 | 265.0 | 15.4 |
| 2020 | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 24.0 | 2.6 | 63.0 | 6.2 | 47.5 | 7.3 | 61.5 | 8.3 | 6.5 | 1.7 | 196.0 | 14.3 |
| 2018 | 20.0 | 3.9 | 59.5 | 7.6 | 67.5 | 4.4 | 78.0 | 10.3 | 11.0 | 3.0 | 225.0 | 11.7 |
| 2017 | 23.0 | 4.7 | 40.0 | 4.9 | 66.0 | 5.9 | 75.5 | 7.7 | 12.5 | 3.9 | 204.5 | 13.9 |
| 2016 | No Sample No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 13.0 | 2.7 | 61.5 | 8.5 | 57.0 | 6.9 | 58.0 | 3.2 | 4.5 | 1.4 | 189.5 | 14.0 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbpl.d13 - .d22

Table 109. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in Bullock Pen Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 354 | $54( \pm 5)$ | $19( \pm 4)$ |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsbpl.d22

Table 110. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Bullock Pen Lake from 2013 2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 11.5* | 17.5 | 60.5 | 34.5 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2021 | Value | 11.5* | 14.5 | 51.5 | 53.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2020 | Value |  |  |  |  | No Samp |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value | 11.5* | 17.2 | 47.5 | 61.5 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value | 11.5 | 15.5 | 67.5 | 78.0 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2017 | Value | 10.5* | 21.0 | 66.0 | 75.5 | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2016 | Value |  |  |  |  | No Samp |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value |  |  |  |  | No Samp |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 10.5* | 2.5 | 57.0 | 58.0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 15 | Good |
| 2013 | Value |  |  |  |  | No Samp |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Age data not collected
${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
-Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

Table 111. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass and saugeye collected in 1.5 hours of 15-minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Bullock Pen Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 8 | 11 | 16 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 |  | 169 | 112.7 | 16.3 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |

Table 112. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Bullock Pen Lake in October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Total | 60 | 87 (1) | 48 | 92 (1) | 31 | 99 (2) | 139 | 91 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrblp.d22

Table 113. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Bullock Pen Lake. Age-1 CPUE and standard error could not be calculated for 2019 year class due to COVID-19 work restrictions

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 3.9 | 0.3 | 10.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 0.9 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 3.7 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 17.5 | 3.7 |
| 2020 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 30.0 | 5.9 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 12.5 | 2.8 |
| 2019 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 46.7 | 0.7 | 7.3 | 3.2 | --- |  |
| 2018 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 34.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 17.2 | 2.9 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 32.7 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 2.5 | 15.5 | 3.9 |
| 2016 | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Total | 4.0 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 1.5 | --- |  |
| 2013 | Total | 4.0 | 0.2 | 14.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 0.7 |

Table 114. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 2.0 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing runs in Corinth Lake, May 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 6 | 5 | 7 | 43 | 93 | 80 | 95 | 68 | 50 | 33 | 23 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 |  | 539 | 269.5 | 16.3 |

Dataset = cfdpscor.d22

Table 115. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Corinth Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 30.5 | 4.7 | 168.0 | 12.6 | 53.0 | 6.5 | 18.0 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 269.5 | 16.3 |
| 2021 | 30.5 | 3.4 | 174.0 | 8.8 | 77.5 | 9.0 | 20.0 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 302.0 | 9.6 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 24.0 | 4.2 | 194.5 | 16.6 | 75.5 | 9.2 | 26.0 | 6.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 320.0 | 25.9 |
| 2018 | 45.0 | 6.1 | 145.0 | 8.5 | 66.5 | 7.8 | 20.0 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 276.5 | 15.6 |
| 2017 | 107.0 | 11.9 | 226.5 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 4.4 | 21.0 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 380.5 | 39.7 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 93.0 | 4.5 | 141.0 | 3.8 | 38.0 | 4.1 | 16.0 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 288.0 | 9.0 |
| 2014 | 33.0 | 5.5 | 152.5 | 9.7 | 17.0 | 3.8 | 15.0 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 189.5 | 14.0 |
| 2013 | 24.5 | 4.5 | 161.0 | 15.3 | 22.5 | 5.4 | 24.5 | 6.6 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 232.5 | 17.3 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpscor.d13 - .d22

Table 116. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in Corinth Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 478 | $30( \pm 4)$ | $8( \pm 2)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdpscor.d22 |  |  |  |

Table 117. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Corinth Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).


* Age data not collected
${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
-Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

Table 118. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Corinth Lake on 4 October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 57 | 116 | 46 | 21 | 6 | 29 | 42 | 51 | 42 | 37 | 13 | 6 | 7 |  | 2 | 475 | 316.7 | 23.5 |

Dataset = cfdwrcor.d22

Table 119. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Corinth Lake on 4 October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Total | 101 | 83 (1) | 49 | 85 (1) | 9 | 89 (3) | 159 | 84 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrcor.d22

Table 120. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Corinth Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | Std. error | CPUE | Std. error | CPUE | Std. error | CPUE | Std. error |
| 2022 | Total | 4.6 | 0.1 | 157.2 | 18.6 | 41.9 | 9.9 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 85.3 | 15.3 | 16.7 | 2.4 | 8.0 | 1.5 |
| 2020 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 82.7 | 9.5 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 23.0 | 3.5 |
| 2019 | Total | 4.9 | 0.1 | 107.3 | 20.0 | 50.7 | 9.9 | - |  |
| 2018 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 62.7 | 8.1 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 11.0 | 2.6 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 35.3 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| 2016 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 30.0 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 19.5 | 4.0 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 35.3 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | NS |  |
| 2014 | Total | 3.4 | 0.04 | 56.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 |  | 29.9 | 2.5 |
| 2013 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 170.7 | 18.6 | 34.7 | 7.4 | 29.0 | 4.3 |

Dataset = cfdwrcor.d13-.d22

Table 121. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $W_{r}$ ) for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Corinth Lake on 4 October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. | Wr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |
| Bluegill | 3.0-5.9 in | $6.0-7.9$ in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | $77 \quad 88$ (2) |  | 80 (1) | 0 |  |  |  | 107 | 86 (1) |
|  | 1.0-3.9 in |  | 6.9 in | 7.0 | . 0 in |  | in |  |  |
| Redear Sunfish | 0 | 36 | 91 (2) | 13 | 90 (1) | 3 | 87 (1) | 52 | 91 (1) |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrcor.d22

Table 122. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 2.0 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Elmer Davis Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 13 | 64 | 59 | 8 | 13 | 51 | 36 | 115 | 142 | 91 | 84 | 34 | 21 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 760 | 380.0 | 16.8 |

Dataset = cfdpselm.d22

Table 123. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Elmer Davis Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 78.5 | 10.0 | 172.0 | 10.1 | 104.5 | 7.6 | 25.0 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 380.0 | 16.8 |
| 2021 | 44.5 | 7.3 | 158.5 | 11.1 | 54.0 | 9.8 | 13.5 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 270.5 | 20.8 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 80.0 | 10.5 | 86.5 | 8.9 | 91.5 | 7.9 | 32.0 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 2.1 | 290.0 | 15.5 |
| 2018 | 91.0 | 10.4 | 87.0 | 12.6 | 125.0 | 8.8 | 28.5 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 331.5 | 23.6 |
| 2017 | 65.5 | 10.6 | 87.5 | 5.5 | 95.5 | 5.9 | 31.0 | 2.8 | 8.0 | 1.9 | 279.5 | 14.4 |
| 2016 | 57.5 | 6.3 | 113.0 | 10.6 | 126.0 | 7.9 | 44.5 | 2.8 | 8.0 | 1.3 | 341.0 | 18.1 |
| 2015 | 34.5 | 5.5 | 119.0 | 7.0 | 78.5 | 8.9 | 19.5 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 1.7 | 251.5 | 18.3 |
| 2014 | 27.5 | 4.1 | 113.5 | 13.8 | 75.0 | 14.2 | 23.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 1.4 | 239.5 | 31.7 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ple |  |  |  |  |  |

Dataset = cfdpselm.d13 - .d22

Table 124. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in Elmer Davis Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 603 | $43( \pm 4)$ | $8( \pm 2)$ |
| Dataset $=$ cfdpselm.d22 |  |  |  |

Table 125. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Elmer Davis Lake from 2014-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.0^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $104.5$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 18 | Excellent |
| 2021 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 15 | Good |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.7^{\star} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 18 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.7^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 91.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.7^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 18 | Excellent |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.7 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 126.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.5^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.5^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 15 | Good |

* Age data not collected
${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
-Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

Table 126. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.50 hours of 15-minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Elmer Davis Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 54 | 164 | 89 | 42 | 13 | 36 | 39 | 32 | 46 | 46 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 596 | 398.0 | 49.0 |

Dataset = cfdwrelm.d22

Table 127. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Elmer Davis Lake on 19 October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 100 | 86 (1) | 55 | 91 (1) | 6 | 92 (4) | 161 | 88 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrelm.d22

Table 128. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Elmer Davis Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.7 | 0.1 | 225.3 | 32.4 | 80.0 | 9.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 91.3 | 11.4 | 14.0 | 2.8 | 72.0 | 9.3 |
| 2020 | Total | 3.8 | 0.1 | 176.0 | 35.6 | 14.0 | 1.7 | 41.0 | 6.8 |
| 2019 | Total | 4.6 | 0.1 | 151.3 | 16.6 | 50.0 | 8.1 | - | - |
| 2018 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 100.7 | 23.3 | 8.7 | 1.9 | 60.0 | 8.6 |
| 2017 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 366.4 | 74.7 | 71.2 | 15.9 | 91.0 | 10.4 |
| 2016 | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 7.6 | 24.7 | 4.9 | 60.5 | 10.8 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 77.3 | 9.1 | 11.3 | 3.5 | 46.5 | 6.2 |
| 2014 | Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | 28.0 | 5.3 |
| 2013 | Total | 3.5 | 0.1 | 20.0 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 2.3 |

Dataset= cfdwrelm.d13-.d22

Table 129. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Elmer Davis Lake on 19 October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |
| Bluegill | 3.0-5.9 in | $6.0-7.9$ in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | 7693 (2) | 51 | 92 (1) | 10 | 91 (3) |  |  | 137 | 93 (1) |
|  | $1.0-3.9$ in |  | 6.9 in |  | 9.0 in |  | 0 in |  |  |
| Redear Sunfish | 292 (18) | 59 | 102 (1) | 50 | 103 (1) | 6 | 105 (2) | 117 | 102 (1) |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrelm.d22

Table 130. CPUE (fish/set) for each length group of Channel Catfish collected by hoop net from the past 9 samples at Elmer Davis Lake.

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | $\geq 12.0$ in |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  | Total |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 16.3 | 7.0 | 16.0 | 7.1 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 16.3 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 54.0 | 5.7 | 23.7 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 66.7 | 10.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 39.8 | 14.3 | 20.0 | 6.6 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 75.0 | 25.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 28.0 | 10.8 | 17.0 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 32.4 | 11.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 103.4 | 38.6 | 21.4 | 7.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 106.4 | 39.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 111.8 | 14.6 | 23.4 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 134.0 | 17.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 71.2 | 26.0 | 14.0 | 4.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 118.4 | 45.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dataset $=$ cfahnelm.d07-. d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 131. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 2.0 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Kincaid Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 20 | 28 | 10 | 23 | 20 | 24 | 14 | 20 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 243 | 121.5 | 6.9 |

Dataset = cfdpskin.d22

Table 132. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Kincaid Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 32.0 | 3.6 | 30.5 | 3.3 | 51.0 | 6.4 | 7.5 | 1.8 | 121.5 | 6.9 |
| 2021 | 24.0 | 4.3 | 76.0 | 9.0 | 41.0 | 4.3 | 88.0 | 9.1 | 19.5 | 3.3 | 229.0 | 14.3 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 16.5 | 3.2 | 53.5 | 7.4 | 31.5 | 4.4 | 86.0 | 6.5 | 15.0 | 2.6 | 187.5 | 15.2 |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 20.0 | 2.8 | 41.5 | 3.1 | 53.0 | 5.6 | 106.5 | 4.1 | 14.0 | 1.5 | 221.0 | 10.4 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 16.0 | 5.8 | 52.0 | 5.9 | 47.5 | 7.4 | 79.5 | 6.3 | 8.5 | 11.9 | 195.0 | 22.3 |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 34.5 | 4.3 | 91.5 | 11.0 | 69.0 | 6.3 | 83.0 | 6.3 | 10.5 | 2.5 | 278.0 | 19.6 |

Dataset = cfdpskin.d13-.d22

Table 133. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in Kincaid Lake in 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 227 | $72( \pm 6)$ | $45( \pm 7)$ |

Dataset = cfdpskin.d22

Table 134. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at Kincaid Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Instantaneous mortality <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.6^{\star} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $1.0$ | $\begin{gathered} 30.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2021 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 88.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2020 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\underset{4}{11.6^{*}}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2018 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 106.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2016 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.7^{*} \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 47.5 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 16 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score |  |  |  |  | No Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 11.7 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 83.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.5 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |

* Age data not collected
${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
-Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

Table 135. Length distribution and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of 15 -minute electrofishing runs in Kincaid Lake in October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 15 | 25 | 16 | 5 | 6 | 24 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 216 | 144.0 | 12.0 |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrkin.d22

Table 136. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Kincaid Lake during October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 46 | 90 (1) | 38 | 89 (1) | 41 | 99 (2) | 125 | 92 (1) |

Table 137. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at Kincaid Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 3.7 | 0.1 | 40.7 | 9.7 | 3.3 | 1.9 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 3.6 | 0.1 | 20.0 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.0 | (0.7) |
| 2020 | Total | 3.2 | 0.1 | 56.7 | 7.5 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 10.0 | (2.9) |
| 2019 | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Total | 3.5 | 0.1 | 48.0 | 8.1 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 8.0 | (2.3) |
| 2017 | Total | 3.5 | 0.1 | 29.3 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| 2016 | Total | 3.8 | 0.1 | 34.0 | 6.4 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 2.0 | (1.3) |
| 2015 | No Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Total | 2.6 | 0.1 | 24.7 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | (0.5) |
| 2013 | Total | 3.6 | 0.1 | 37.3 | 13.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrkin.d22

Table 138. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.0 hour of 7.5 -minute electrofishing runs for black bass in McNeely Lake in April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 2 | 21 | 17 | 3 | 11 | 27 | 47 | 33 | 16 | 20 | 17 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 259 | 259.0 | 21.1 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsmcl.d22

Table 139. Electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from McNeely Lake from 2013-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 54.0 | 8.5 | 123.0 | 11.2 | 49.0 | 5.7 | 33.0 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 259.0 | 21.1 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 97.0 | 30.9 | 205.0 | 19.3 | 43.0 | 5.7 | 27.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 372.0 | 46.1 |
| 2018 | 73.3 | 25.5 | 173.3 | 16.6 | 72.0 | 7.9 | 25.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 344.0 | 41.4 |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 46.0 | 12.9 | 130.0 | 10.4 | 44.0 | 4.3 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 229.0 | 15.8 |
| 2015 | 110.0 | 27.8 | 198.0 | 18.5 | 33.0 | 7.6 | 13.0 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 354.0 | 43.1 |
| 2014 | 26.0 | 6.2 | 167.0 | 11.8 | 18.0 | 2.6 | 21.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 232.0 | 16.3 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |

Dataset = cfdpsmcl.d13 - .d22

Table 140. PSD and RSD ${ }_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass from spring electrofishing samples in McNeely Lake in April 2022; confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 205 | $40( \pm 7)$ | $16( \pm 5)$ |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsmcl.d22

Table 141. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring electrofishing at McNeely Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Instantaneous mortality $\qquad$ <br> (z) | Annual mortality (AM) | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.9^{\star} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.9^{\star} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 94.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2018 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.9^{*} \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 70.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.3 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 17 | Excellent |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.9 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 12 | Fair |
| 2015 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.5^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 109.0 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 14 | Good |
| 2014 | Value Score | $\begin{gathered} 10.5^{*} \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.0 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.0 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 12 | Fair |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  | Sample |  |  |  |  |

[^37]Table 142. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.00 hour of 15.0 -minute electrofishing runs in McNeely Lake in October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 9 | 32 | 45 | 6 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 37 | 26 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 260 | 260.0 | 27.2 |

Dataset = cfdwrmcl.d22

Table 143. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at McNeely Lake on 7 October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 97 | 84 (1) | 23 | 89 (1) | 13 | 95 (3) | 133 | 86 (1) |

Dataset $=$ cfdwrmcl.d22

Table 144. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall in electrofishing samples at McNeely Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 4.9 | 0.1 | 89.0 | 9.7 | 48.0 | 4.9 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.5 | 0.1 | 132.0 | 36.3 | 37.3 | 14.3 | 42.0 | 7.1 |
| 2020 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 73.0 | 10.4 | 4.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| 2019 | Total | 5.0 | 0.0 | 171.3 | 16.0 | 88.0 | 17.3 | - | - |
| 2018 | Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | 94.0 | 30.4 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.4 | 0.1 | 177.6 | 11.6 | 32.8 | 4.1 | 70.0 | 26.1 |
| 2016 | Total | 5.0 | 0.1 | 96.0 | 21.1 | 56.8 | 14.3 | - | - |
| 2015 | Total | 4.2 | 0.0 | 126.4 | 14.9 | 12.0 | 4.2 | 38.0 | 13.1 |
| 2014 | Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | 109.0 | 27.8 |
| 2013 | Total | 4.2 | 0.0 | 86.0 | 11.5 | 7.3 | 2.8 | 18.0 | 7.8 |

Dataset = cfdwrmcl.d13-.d22

Table 145. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $W_{r}$ ) for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at McNeely Lake during October 2022; standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. $\quad W_{r}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |  |  |
| Bluegill | 3.0-5.9 in | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | 7580 (2) | 39 | 80 (1) | 0 |  |  |  | 114 | 80 (1) |
|  | 1.0-3.9 in |  | 6.9 in |  | 9.0 in |  | in |  |  |
| Redear Sunfish | 0 | 30 | 102 (3) | 19 | 97 (2) | 11 | 93 (1) | 60 | 99 (1) |

Dataset = cfdwrmcl.d22

Table 146. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected in 2.0 hours of 15 - minute electrofishing runs in AJ Jolly Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 23 | 24 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 5 | 11 | 2 |  | 11 | 31 | 15 | 6 | 20 | 12 | 8 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 75.5 | 10.3 |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 10.5 | 3.5 |

Dataset = cfdpsajj.d22

Table 147. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of fish collected in 0.75 hours of 7.5 - minute electrofishing runs in General Butler State Park Lake, May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  | 6 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 59 | 78.7 | 8.1 |
| Bluegill | 1 | 4 | 31 | 154 | 206 | 21 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 418 | 557.3 | 15.3 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 28 | 23 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 68 | 90.7 | 15.3 |

Dataset $=$ cfdpsgbs.d22

Table 148. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of 15 - minute electrofishing runs in Jericho Lake,
May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 22 | 28 | 24 | 19 | 25 | 36 | 21 | 40 | 44 | 57 | 57 | 38 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 444 | 296.0 | 40.4 |

Dataset = cfdpsjer.d22

Table 149. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.0 hour of 15 - minute electrofishing runs in Shelby Lake,
May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 35 | 16 | 22 | 7 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 165 | 165.0 | 31.0 |
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# NORTHEASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

Project 1: Lake and Tailwaters Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

All sampling conditions can be found in Table 1.

## Cave Run Lake (8,720a)

## Muskellunge sampling

On April 11-13, the upper, middle, and lower sections of Cave Run Lake were diurnally electrofished for an assessment of the Muskellunge population. In total, 86 fish were captured ranging in size from 13.0 to 51.0 in (Table 2). Weights of sampled fish were also obtained and showed a similar relative weight to previous years on Cave Run Lake (Table 3). All Muskellunge stocked into Cave Run Lake are marked with a unique fin clip or wire tag implant to indicate year class. Fish collected in 2022 ranged in age from 1 to 11 years old, and their size was in the historical range for their given age (Table 4). Based on all sample data, the assessment rating of the Muskellunge population was determined to be "Good" (Table 5). A reduction in stocking effort over the last several years is likely hampering this assessment.

Black bass sampling (Spring)
On April 25-27, the upper, middle, and lower sections of Cave Run Lake were nocturnally electrofished for assessment of the black bass population. In total, 926 fish were captured. Most of these fish were Largemouth Bass ( $75 \%$ ), followed by Spotted Bass ( $24 \%$ ), and Smallmouth Bass ( $1 \%$; Table 6). As is normally the case, the percentage of the population represented by Spotted and Smallmouth bass increases as you head from the upper sections of the lake to the lower sections of the lake. Catch rates were higher than the 1990-2021 average for Largemouth Bass less than 8.0 in and were on average for the larger size classes (over 15.0 in and over 20.0 in; Table 7). Catch rates of the larger fish continue to be better now than the pre-slot limit time periods ( 13.1 versus 4.5 fish/hr of electrofishing for Largemouth Bass over 15.0 in and 0.6 versus 0.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ for Largemouth Bass over 20.0 in). PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass demonstrate that most of the fish in the lake are below 12.0 in (Table 8). Overall, the Largemouth Bass and Spotted Bass populations rated as "Fair" (Tables 9 and 10, respectively). It should be noted, however, that the parameter "Spring CPUE age-1", for both Spotted Bass and Largemouth Bass, continues to be debilitatingly high.

## Black and White crappie sampling (Fall)

From October 31 through November 1, trap nets were run in the upper reaches of Cave Run Lake for assessment of the Black and White crappie populations. A total of 397 crappie were captured (Table 11). Of those, $93 \%$ were White Crappie that ranged in size from 2.0 to 14.0 in . The majority of the greater-than-stock-size individuals for both species were below 8.0 in (Table 12). White Crappie relative weights were in the lower $80 \%$ range, while Black Crappie were in the lower $90 \%$ range (Table 13). A subsample of White Crappie were collected for determination of age and growth characteristics of the population. This subsample showed that the average fish reached 10.0 inches in their $5^{\text {th }}$ year (although some as early as their 4th; Table 14) and that the majority of the population was in their second to fourth year and ranged in size from 5.0 to 14.0 in (Table 15). The overall assessment of the White Crappie population in the upper reaches of the lake was rated as "Fair" (Table 13).

## Cave Run Lake Tailwaters

## Creel Survey

From 01 March to 31 October, a roving creel survey was conducted in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters. There were over 2,500 angling trips across just over 5,700 man-hours made in the tailwaters during this time (Table 17). While
the number of trips were lower than previous years, the catch rates (both harvest and catch of fish per hour) were higher than previous surveys. As in prior surveys, most anglers were casting male residents still fishing from the bank. Crappie made up most of the fish caught ( 6,517 fish), followed by panfish ( 3,015 fish) , and catfish ( 326 fish; Table 18). Most of the trips made to the tailwaters were for black bass ( $54.1 \%$ of trips), followed by crappie ( $18.4 \%$ of trips), and Muskellunge ( $8.49 \%$ of trips). Table 19 shows the number of fish harvested and released by inch class. White Crappie made up most of the fish caught ( 5,270 fish), with anglers harvesting fish as small as 5.0 in , but harvest started in earnest at around 8.0 in . Tables 20 through 25 show the harvest by month for the major species groups. Anglers caught the most crappie from April through June, with May and June being the most successful (Table 20). The fall was the best time to fish for black bass, with anglers having the most success in September (Table 21). Anglers caught catfish evenly throughout the whole year (Table 22). Trips for Muskellunge were only made in May, June, and October with 15 fish being caught in May (Table 23). Anglers caught the most panfish in May but had the most success in July (Table 24). Finally, no trips were made specifically for trout to the tailwaters, and of the 6,000 trout stocked in the year, only 153 were reported caught in this creel survey (Table 25).

## Angler Attitude Survey

In conjunction with the creel survey, anglers were asked a series of questions pertaining to their attitudes towards fishing in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters (Table 26). Reflective of the creel survey, the most fished for species was crappie. Most bass, crappie, muskie, sauger/walleye, and catfish anglers were satisfied with their angling experiences ( $60.4 \%, 84.2 \%, 63.7 \%, 57.7 \%$ and $83.5 \%$, respectively). However, most trout anglers (N=9) were neutral on their experience. All anglers surveyed used rod and reel with only one individual ever targeting Paddlefish in the tailwaters. Most of the anglers fish primarily from the bank ( $94.9 \%$ ). Of those bank anglers, $64.5 \%$ (169 individuals) stated they never fished from the hatchery side of the river, and only $1.1 \%$ (3 individuals) claimed to always fish from the hatchery side. Only $5.3 \%$ of anglers claimed to have observed a Bighead Carp or Silver Carp while fishing in the Cave Run Tailwater; however, only $64.1 \%$ think they could accurately identify one of those species.

## Grayson Lake (1,512a)

## Black bass sampling (Spring/Fall)

The black bass population of Grayson Lake was nocturnally electrofished on 02-04 of May. In total, 877 fish were collected ranging in size from 3.0 to 20.0 in (Table 27). Most of these fish $(78 \%)$ were Largemouth Bass and the remainder were Spotted Bass ( $22 \%$ ). Catch rates by length group were similar to the 1999 to 2021 average with the exception of fish in the less than 8.0 -in range which were slightly lower (Table 28). Of those Largemouth Bass over 8.0 in, the majority were under 12.0 in as demonstrated by PSD values. In addition, the upper portions of the lake have a higher ratio of bigger fish to smaller fish, although the upper section also produced the lowest catch rates of fish overall (Table 29). Overall, the Largemouth Bass population was rated as "Fair" (Table 30).

The black bass population of Grayson Lake was also sampled in October for determination of relative weights and spawning strength of Largemouth Bass. From October 17-19, 990 fish were collected using nocturnal electrofishing (Table 31). Overall, relative weights ranged from the low to upper 80's (Table 32). Larger fish seemed to exhibit better condition but were sampled in far lower numbers. When compared to previous years' relative weight values, weights in 2022 were slightly lower than the 1990- to 2021-average but very similar to values collected in fall of 2021 (Table 33). Indices of year class strength for Largemouth Bass were interesting in 2022. Mean length of age-0 fish was well above average, while CPUE of overall age-0 fish was much lower than average, and CPUE of age-0 fish over 5.0 in was slightly lower than average (Table 34). After several decades of excessively high reproduction and recruitment, 2022 brought a welcome dip in these parameters. The lake was again not stocked with age- 0 Largemouth Bass.

## Hybrid Striped Bass sampling (Fall)

From 24-28 October, gill nets were run across the lake for determination of the health of the hybrid striped bass population. In total, 86 fish were collected in 16 net-nights (Table 35). Relative weights were similar to previous years' averages (Table 36). A subsample of individuals were collected for determination of age and growth
characteristics. This showed that the fish in Grayson Lake reach preferred size ( 15.0 in ) in their second or third year, memorable size ( 20.0 in ) in their third or fourth year, and a trophy size ( 25.0 in ) in their sixth year (Table 37). Most of the two- to three-year-old hybrid striped bass in the lake are between 16.0 and 22.0 in (Table 38). Overall, the population was rated as "Good" with scoring based on lake specific values (Table 39).

## Lake Carnico (114a)

## Creel Survey

From April through October, a roving creel survey was conducted on Lake Carnico. Based on our records, this is the first creel survey done on Lake Carnico. Overall, 710 trips were made on the lake, and this represented almost 2,500 man-hours (Table 40). The majority of the anglers were resident males casting from a boat (Table 40). Relatively few fish were caught or harvested during this creel survey. The most frequently caught fish was Largemouth Bass ( 854 caught, 0 harvested) and the most frequently harvested group was crappie ( 98 caught, 51 harvested; Table 41). Most of the Largemouth Bass caught were 12.0 in or less and catch rates of fish across the board were disappointingly low (Table 42). Monthly success tables are provided for crappie (Table 43), Largemouth Bass (Table 44), and Bluegill (Table 45); however, catch rates are low and variable so caution must be used when examining these tables.

## Angler Attitude Survey

In conjunction with the creel survey, anglers were asked a series of questions pertaining to their attitudes towards fishing at Lake Carnico (Table 46). The most fished for species was bass, followed by sunfish, saugeye, catfish, and crappie. The majority of those that fished Lake Carnico in 2022 were not residents of the Nicholas County Development Area. More bass, sunfish, saugeye, catfish, and crappie anglers were satisfied than were dissatisfied and all anglers were evenly split on support of a move to a 12.0 -in minimum size limit on Largemouth Bass. Over $70 \%$ of anglers felt as though the vegetation situation on the lake was getting worse or staying the same.

## Greenbo Lake (181a)

## Black bass sampling (Spring/Fall)

On 28 April, Greenbo Lake was nocturnally electrofished for an assessment of the Largemouth Bass population. In total, 235 fish were captured ranging in size from 2.0 to 22.0 in (Table 47). Except for the 8.0- to $11.9-\mathrm{in}$ and 12.0to 14.9 -in length groups of fish, all length groups had similar or higher catch rates when compared to previous years (Table 48). PSD values were similar to previous years, but $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values were significantly higher, indicating a better population of fish over 15.0 in when compared to past years (Table 49). The overall assessment rating was "Good" for the Largemouth Bass population at Greenbo Lake when compared to other lakes of similar size (Table 50).

On 30 September, the lake was sampled to determine the strength of the spawning class. Assessment of the spawning class showed a slightly lower than normal year class of fish and therefore Greenbo Lake was supplementally stocked with Largemouth Bass to make up for this drop off (stocked at a rate of 15 fish/acre or 2,715 fish; Table 51).

## Lake Reba (76a)

## Black bass sampling (Spring/Fall)

On 25 April, Lake Reba was diurnally electrofished for assessment of the Largemouth Bass fishery. In total, 575 fish were collected ranging in size from 3.0 to 21.0 in (Table 52). Catch rates by inch class were all higher when compared to previous years (Table 53), but PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values were slightly lower than the average (Table 54). Overall assessment of the Largemouth Bass population was "Excellent" for 2022 (Table 55).

The Largemouth Bass population of Lake Reba was also sampled in October for determination of relative weights and spawning strength. On 03 October, 304 fish were collected (Table 56). Overall, relative weights ranged in the low 90 's and were very comparable to previous years' conditions (Table 57). Indices of year class strength for Largemouth Bass were slightly lower than average, but supplemental stocking was not conducted due to previous years' high recruitment levels (Table 58).

## Smokey Valley (36a)

## Largemouth Bass sampling (Spring/Fall)

On 02 May, Smoky Valley Lake was diurnally electrofished for assessment of the Largemouth Bass fishery. In total, 150 fish were captured ranging in size from 3.0 to 17.0 in (Table 59). Catch rates for smaller fish (less than 8.0 in and 8.0-11.0 in) were lower than the ten-year average, while catch rates for larger fish (12.0-14.9 in, greater than 15.0 in, and greater than 20.0 in ) were similar to the 10 -year average (Table 60). PSD values were higher than the 10 -year average, while $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values were similar to previous years (Table 61). Overall, the Largemouth Bass population was rated as "Fair" (Table 62).

On 17 October, the Largemouth Bass population at Smoky Valley Lake was again diurnally electrofished for determination of relative weights. In total, 152 fish were sampled in this effort ranging in size from 3.0 to 16.0 in (Table 63). Relative weights were in the middle 80 's with the larger fish showing slightly better condition than the smaller size classes of fish (Table 64). Fish condition was similar to previous sampling years with the exception of the larger fish, which were higher.

## Lake Wilgreen (131a)

## Largemouth Bass sampling (Spring)

On 22 April, Lake Wilgreen was diurnally electrofished for assessment of the Largemouth Bass fishery. In total, 278 fish were captured ranging in size from 2.0 to 21.0 in (Table 65). Catch rates for fish under 15.0 in were lower than the historical average, while catch rates for larger fish (greater than 15.0 in and greater than 20.0 in) were similar to previous years (Table 66). Both PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values were higher than previous years (Table 67). Overall, the Largemouth Bass population was rated as "Excellent" (Table 68).

Table 1. Yearly summary of sampling conditions by waterbody, species sampled, and date.

| Water body | Species | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Date } \\ (2022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ \text { (24hr) } \end{gathered}$ | Gear | Weather | Water Temp ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) | Water level | Secchi <br> (in) | Conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cave Run Lake | Muskie | 4/11 | 800 | electro | cloudy | 53 | 727.90 | 17 | good | upper section |
| Cave Run Lake | Muskie | 4/12 | 800 | electro | rainy/w ind | 50 | 727.80 | 20 | good | middle section |
| Cave Run Lake | Muskie | 4/13 | 800 | electro | cloudy/w ind | 52 | 727.80 | - | good | low er section |
| Cave Run Lake | LMB | 4/25 | 2000 | electro | nocturnal | 67 | 729.06 | 26 | good | upper section |
| Cave Run Lake | LMB | 4/26 | 2000 | electro | nocturnal | 63 | 729.14 | 36 | good | middle section |
| Cave Run Lake | LMB | 4/27 | 2000 | electro | nocturnal | 64 | 729.29 | - | good | low er section |
| Cave Run Lake | BC/WC | 11/1 | 800 | trap net | cloudy/w arm | 59 | 727.59 | - | good | upper section only |
| Cave Run Lake | BC/WC | 11/2 | 800 | trap net | cloudy/cooler | 58 | 727.47 | - | good | upper section only |
| Cave Run Lake | BC/WC | 11/3 | 800 | trap net | fog/cool | 58 | 727.38 | - | good | upper section only |
| Cave Run Lake | BC/WC | 11/4 | 800 | trap net | sunny/w arm | 59 | 727.27 | - | good | upper section only |
| Grayson Lake | LMB | 5/2 | 2000 | electro | nocturnal | 66 | 646.11 | 12 | good | upper section (Caney) |
| Grayson Lake | LMB | 5/3 | 2000 | electro | nocturnal | - | 646.11 | 72 | fair | middle section (Bruin), rain 2 samples only |
| Grayson Lake | LMB | 5/4 | 2030 | electro | nocturnal | 68 | 645.88 | 84 | good | low er section (Dam/Deer Creek) |
| Grayson Lake | LMB | 10/17 | 1900 | electro | nocturnal | 57 | 643.76 | 30 | good | upper section (Caney) |
| Grayson Lake | LMB | 10/18 | 1900 | electro | nocturnal | 58 | 643.71 | 36 | good | middle section (Bruin) |
| Grayson Lake | LMB | 10/19 | 1900 | electro | nocturnal | 61 | 643.65 | 48 | good | low er section (Dam/Deer Creek) |
| Grayson Lake | Hybrid | 10/25 | 800 | gill net | sunny/w arm | 58 | 643.25 | - | good | *note: 125', 5 panel nets used |
| Grayson Lake | Hybrid | 10/26 | 800 | gill net | cloudy/w ind | 61 | 643.21 | - | good | *note: 125', 5 panel nets used |
| Grayson Lake | Hybrid | 10/27 | 800 | gill net | cloudy | 59 | 643.15 | - | good | *note: 125', 5 panel nets used |
| Grayson Lake | Hybrid | 10/28 | 800 | gill net | cloudy/cool | 59 | 643.09 | - | good | *note: 125', 5 panel nets used |
| Greenbo Lake | LMB | 4/28 | 2030 | electro | cool, clear | 64 | normal | 140 | good |  |
| Greenbo Lake | LMB | 9/29 | 2030 | electro | cool, clear | 70 | normal | - | good |  |
| Lake Reba | LMB | 4/25 | 930 | electro | sun, w ind | 67 | normal | 60 | good |  |
| Lake Reba | LMB | 10/3 | 930 | electro | clear, cool | 65 | ~6" Low | - | good |  |
| Smoky Valley | LMB | 5/2 | 900 | electro | clear, w arm | 63 | normal | 25 | good |  |
| Smoky Valley | LMB | 10/17 | 900 | electro | overcast | 58 | ~6" Low | 60 | good |  |
| Lake Wilgreen | LMB | 4/22 | 930 | electro | sunny, hot | 58 | normal | 30 | fair |  |

Table 2. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Muskellunge collected in the upper, middle, and lower sections during 18 hours of 30 -minute runs (6 hours in each section) at Cave Run Lake on 11-13 April.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Species | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 43 | 44 | 51 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Muskellunge | 1 |  | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 1.8 | 0.5 |
| Middle | Muskellunge |  | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 | 1 |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 5.2 | 1.2 |
| Lower | Muskellunge | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 44 | 7.3 | 1.3 |
| Total |  | 2 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 86 | 4.8 | 0.1 |

Table 3. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for length groups of Muskellunge collected across all lake units in Cave Run Lake from 2003-2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\leq 20.0$ in |  | 20.1-30.0 in |  | $30.1-38.0$ in |  | $\geq 38.1$ in |  |  |  |
|  | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | N | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| 2022 | 8 | 77 (3) | 5 | 93 (3) | 39 | 87 (3) | 24 | 86 (2) | 76 | 86 (2) |
| 2021* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 15 | 80 (4) | 6 | 90 (5) | 25 | 89 (2) | 8 | 82 (4) | 54 | 86 (2) |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 8 | 80 (1) | 21 | 88 (2) | 20 | 92 (2) | 10 | 87 (3) | 59 | 88 (1) |
| 2017 | 4 | 88 (3) | 31 | 92 (1) | 54 | 88 (1) | 18 | 87 (3) | 107 | 89 (1) |
| 2016 | 5 | 81 (1) | 25 | 89 (2) | 31 | 89 (1) | 9 | 100 (4) | 70 | 90 (1) |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 30 | 80 (1) | 24 | 89 (1) | 57 | 91 (1) | 29 | 91 (2) | 140 | 88 (1) |
| 2013 | 11 | 79 (2) | 4 | 95 (2) | 41 | 94 (2) | 17 | 92 (3) | 73 | 91 (1) |
| 2012 | 14 | 75 (1) | 28 | 88 (2) | 58 | 102 (12) | 20 | 86 (1) | 120 | 93 (6) |
| 2011 | 23 | 83 (2) | 29 | 93 (2) | 40 | 91 (1) | 27 | 88 (2) | 119 | 89 (1) |
| 2010 | 19 | 79 (1) | 64 | 92 (1) | 52 | 94 (2) | 18 | 90 (1) | 153 | 91 (1) |
| 2009 | 12 | 88 (4) | 11 | 97 (2) | 36 | 93 (1) | 23 | 93 (1) | 82 | 93 (1) |
| 2008 | 27 | 76 (1) | 40 | 114 (17) | 48 | 94 (1) | 11 | 89 (2) | 126 | 96 (6) |
| 2007 | 35 | 84 (1) | 9 | 102 (4) | 18 | 95 (3) | 14 | 92 (2) | 76 | 90 (1) |
| 2006 | 17 | 75 (1) | 13 | 88 (2) | 26 | 89 (1) | 13 | 87 (1) | 69 | 85 (1) |
| 2005 | 26 | 81 (4) | 23 | 91 (1) | 38 | 89 (1) | 22 | 85 (2) | 109 | 87 (1) |
| 2004 | 10 | 79 (2) | 10 | 90 (3) | 32 | 87 (1) | 15 | 80 (1) | 67 | 85 (1) |
| 2003 | 22 | 82 (3) | 16 | 96 (3) | 33 | 92 (2) | 9 | 87 (2) | 80 | 90 (1) |

nedmuscr.d22-d03

* Sample was not collected

Table 4. Average length and weight of known-age muskellunge. Standard errors are in parentheses.

|  | Age class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Age 1 | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Age 6 | Age 7 | Age 8 | Age 9 | Age 10 | Age 11 |
| 2011 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc\|} \hline 33 & \\ 14.9 & (0.2) \\ 0.6 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 61 & \\ 14.4 & (0.1) \\ 0.5 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 15 & \\ 23.4 & (0.5) \\ 2.7 & (0.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 74 & \\ 13.9 & (0.1) \\ 0.5 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 25.1 \\ 19.5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 7 & \\ 31.0 & (0.4) \\ 7.5 & (0.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | 73  <br> 14.8 $(0.1)$ <br> 0.6 $(0.0)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 23 & \\ 23.4 & (0.4) \\ 2.9 & (0.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 9 & \\ 31.7 & (0.4) \\ 8.1 & (0.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 15  <br> 34.0 $(0.8)$ <br> 10.2 $(0.9)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 40 & \\ 14.0 & (0.1) \\ 0.5 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 18 & \\ 23.2 & (0.2) \\ 2.8 & (0.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 15 & \\ 31.0 & (0.4) \\ 7.3 & (0.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 13 & \\ 34.2 & (0.5) \\ 10.2 & (0.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 39.1 \\ 16.0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 5 & \\ 38.5 & (1.0) \\ 15.0 & (2.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | $\mathrm{N}=$ <br> L= $W=$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 59 & \\ 13.5 & (0.1) \\ 0.4 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 17 & \\ 24.1 & (0.7) \\ 2.9 & (0.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 22  <br> 29.8 $(0.5)$ <br> 6.3 $(0.3)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 17 & \\ 34.3 & (0.4) \\ 10.2 & (0.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 9  <br> 37.3 $(0.5)$ <br> 13.5 $(0.9)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 5 & \\ 37.5 & (0.5) \\ 12.8 & (0.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 4 & \\ 37.6 & (0.4) \\ 13.2 & (0.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc\|} \hline 45 & \\ 14.0 & (0.1) \\ 0.5 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 23  <br> 21.9 $(0.4)$ <br> 2.3 $(0.2)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 3 & \\ 32.0 & (1.2) \\ 8.4 & (1.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 2 & \\ 32.1 & (0.7) \\ 9.9 & (0.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 7  <br> 35.1 $(0.7)$ <br> 11.0 $(0.7)$ | 2  <br> 36.2 $(2.2)$ <br> 11.8 $(1.8)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 4 & \\ 38.3 & (2.4) \\ 15.2 & (3.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2019* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 34 & \\ 14.7 & (0.2) \\ 0.6 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 2 & \\ 18.5 & (1.6) \\ 1.0 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3  <br> 28.5 $(1.4)$ <br> 6.3 $(0.9)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 12 & \\ 33.4 & (0.5) \\ 9.4 & (0.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 2 & \\ 38.0 & (2.4) \\ 12.3 & (1.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 4 & \\ 36.9 & (0.8) \\ 12.1 & (0.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 38.2 \\ 8.8 \end{gathered}$ | 4  <br> 38.3 $(1.1)$ <br> 14.5 $(1.9)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 39.2 \\ 12.4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 2021* | $\mathrm{N}=$ <br> L= <br> $W=$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | $\mathrm{N}=$ <br> L= <br> W= | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 18 & \\ 14.8 & (0.2) \\ 0.5 & (0.0) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | $\begin{array}{cc} 12 & \\ 30.6 & (0.4) \\ 7.3 & (0.4) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 2 & \\ 32.5 & (1.0) \\ 8.8 & (1.1) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3  <br> 36.7 $(0.8)$ <br> 12.7 $(1.0)$ | 7  <br> 38.0 $(0.9)$ <br> 13.8 $(1.0)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 11 & \\ 36.8 & (0.4) \\ 12.0 & (0.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 2 & \\ 38.2 & (0.4) \\ 14.1 & (0.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 2 & \\ 39.1 & (0.5) \\ 14.7 & (0.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 38.3 \\ 15.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 37.2 \\ 11.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Average (Present) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}= \\ & \mathrm{L}= \\ & \mathrm{W}= \end{aligned}$ | 437  <br> 14.3 $(0.0)$ <br> 0.5 $(0.0)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 99 & \\ 23.0 & (0.2) \\ 2.9 & (0.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc\|} \hline 71 & \\ 30.6 & (0.2) \\ 7.1 & (0.2) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 61 & \\ 33.9 & (0.3) \\ 10.0 & (0.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 26 & \\ 36.6 & (0.4) \\ 12.5 & (0.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 23 & \\ 37.7 & (0.4) \\ 13.4 & (0.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 20 & \\ 37.3 & (0.5) \\ 12.7 & (0.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6  <br> 38.3 $(0.7)$ <br> 14.3 $(1.2)$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 3 & \\ 39.1 & (0.3) \\ 13.9 & (0.8) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ 38.3 \\ 15.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \\ 37.2 \\ 11.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

nedmuscr.d22-d11

* Sample was not collected

Table 5. Population assessment of Muskellunge based on spring electrofishing at Cave Run Lake from 2003-2022.

| Year |  | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 30.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 36.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 40.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 1.0 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |  |
| 2021* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 6 | Poor |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| 2019* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value | 3.3 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 9 | Fair |
|  | Score | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 3.8 | 5.9 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 17 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| 2016 | Value | 2.4 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 9 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 4.1 | 6.1 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 18 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| 2013 | Value | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 2012 | Value | 3.5 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 16 | Good |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  |
| 2011 | Value | 1.9 | 5.3 | 3.7 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| 2010 | Value | 6.8 | 7.4 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 18 | Excellent |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |  |
| 2009 | Value | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 14 | Good |
|  | Score | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  |
| 2008 | Value | 2.7 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 13 | Good |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  |
| 2007 | Value | 3.6 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 9 | Fair |
|  | Score | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| 2006 | Value | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 9 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| 2005 | Value | 2.9 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 16 | Good |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| 2004 | Value | 1.3 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 10 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 2003 | Value | 1.9 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 8 | Poor |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |

nedmuscr.d20-09; nedMS2cr.d08; nedMK1cr.d07; nedmuscr.d06-95

* Sample was not collected

Table 6. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 1.5 hours ( 4.5 hours total) of 30 -minute nocturnal electrofishing runs in each area of Cave Run Lake from 25-27 April.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass |  | 3 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 72 | 48.0 | 8.3 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 4.7 | 2.4 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 27 | 57 | 53 | 13 | 5 | 31 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 255 | 170.0 | 44.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 11 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 | 53.3 | 16.4 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 8 | 40 | 89 | 65 | 20 | 43 | 32 | 20 | 15 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 363 | 242.0 | 26.9 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 6 | 38 | 6 | 14 | 29 | 17 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 132 | 88.0 | 32.2 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 9.3 | 7.4 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 10 | 70 | 157 | 127 | 35 | 50 | 67 | 49 | 30 | 33 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 690 | 153.3 | 32.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 6 | 49 | 17 | 19 | 40 | 37 | 30 | 17 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 219 | 48.7 | 16.0 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 3.8 | 2.6 |

nedpsdcr.d22

Table 7. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Cave Run Lake from 1990-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 88.7 | 23.5 | 43.6 | 10.0 | 14.2 | 2.6 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 153.3 | 32.3 |
| 2021 | 107.1 | 25.3 | 81.6 | 17.7 | 20.2 | 4.9 | 15.3 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 224.2 | 35.5 |
| 2020* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 185.6 | 45.1 | 89.1 | 13.6 | 38.4 | 3.5 | 21.3 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 334.4 | 57.9 |
| 2018 | 34.3 | 4.9 | 85.0 | 13.9 | 28.0 | 3.5 | 16.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 163.3 | 18.5 |
| 2017 | 73.5 | 8.0 | 55.3 | 7.4 | 32.3 | 3.0 | 21.5 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 182.7 | 15.4 |
| 2016 | 83.8 | 12.7 | 99.7 | 9.2 | 64.3 | 8.4 | 25.5 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 273.3 | 22.8 |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 59.0 | 7.5 | 69.3 | 10.6 | 23.8 | 3.4 | 20.0 | 3.1 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 172.0 | 12.9 |
| 2013 | 93.0 | 6.1 | 56.7 | 5.0 | 20.7 | 2.3 | 17.7 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 188.0 | 10.1 |
| 2012 | 46.0 | 6.7 | 88.0 | 4.9 | 25.5 | 3.6 | 18.3 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 177.8 | 10.7 |
| 2011* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 25.8 | 6.2 | 23.3 | 2.6 | 8.3 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 61.0 | 8.5 |
| 2007 | 67.5 | 7.2 | 43.3 | 3.5 | 19.9 | 2.8 | 7.9 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 138.7 | 10.7 |
| 2006 | 50.7 | 10.1 | 48.5 | 7.7 | 14.7 | 2.0 | 10.2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 124.0 | 19.1 |
| 2005 | 75.0 | 13.1 | 41.7 | 6.4 | 14.7 | 2.7 | 7.2 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 138.5 | 22.2 |
| 2004 | 29.0 | 3.0 | 60.7 | 5.9 | 26.0 | 3.0 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 129.8 | 10.1 |
| 2003 | 41.0 | 6.0 | 64.6 | 5.2 | 24.8 | 2.3 | 20.3 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 150.6 | 13.0 |
| 2002* ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 22.8 | 3.7 | 54.7 | 5.4 | 27.6 | 2.3 | 12.6 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 117.7 | 8.6 |
| 2000 | 45.1 | 4.9 | 78.3 | 6.5 | 26.8 | 2.9 | 9.0 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 159.3 | 10.7 |
| 1999 | 67.6 | 7.2 | 51.3 | 3.5 | 21.6 | 1.8 | 8.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 |  | 149.0 | 8.7 |
| 1998 | 18.7 | 3.5 | 17.9 | 2.9 | 20.6 | 2.1 | 6.9 | 1.5 | 0.0 |  | 64.0 | 7.6 |
| 1997 | 37.1 | 3.6 | 50.4 | 5.2 | 24.6 | 2.6 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 116.5 | 10.4 |
| 1996 | 58.9 | 6.5 | 42.4 | 4.0 | 15.3 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |  | 116.1 | 9.5 |
| 1995 | 27.8 | 5.3 | 80.5 | 11.5 | 36.6 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 151.3 | 17.9 |
| 1994 | 62.5 | 7.0 | 54.7 | 7.9 | 38.8 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 159.6 | 15.5 |
| 1993 | 47.1 | 5.4 | 110.7 | 10.3 | 36.2 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 198.8 | 15.3 |
| 1992 | 52.0 | 4.3 | 77.9 | 5.1 | 21.9 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 152.8 | 6.8 |
| 1991 | 32.5 | 4.7 | 64.5 | 4.9 | 31.0 | 2.1 | 6.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 134.3 | 7.2 |
| 1990 | 23.3 | 2.7 | 43.0 | 2.7 | 18.5 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 88.2 | 5.8 |

Table 8. PSD and RSD values obtained for Largemouth and Spotted bass taken in spring electrofishing samples in each area of Cave Run Lake; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 47 | 66 ( $\pm 14)$ | $19( \pm 11)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 7 | - | - |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 103 | $32( \pm 9)$ | $12( \pm 6)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 53 | $2( \pm 4)$ | - |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 141 | $22( \pm 7)$ | $7( \pm 4)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 68 | $4( \pm 5)$ | - |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 291 | $33( \pm 5)$ | $11( \pm 4)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 128 | $3( \pm 3)$ | - |
| nedpsdcr.d22 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {a }}$ Largemouth Bass $=\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$, Spotted Bass $=\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |  |  |  |  |

Table 9. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on samples collected at Cave Run Lake from 2007-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment)

nedpsdcr.d22-d00

* Sample was not collected

Table 10. Population assessment of Spotted Bass based on samples collected at Cave Run Lake from 2000-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 11.0-14.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 14.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | CPUE age 1 | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value |  | 0.9 | 0.0 | 20.2 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  | Fair |
| 2021 | Value |  | 2.7 | 0.0 | 22.9 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | Fair |
| 2020 | Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value |  | 4.0 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2018 | Value |  | 4.2 | 0.3 | 39.5 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 8.7 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 27.2 | 8 | Fair |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |
| 2016 | Value |  | 5.3 | 0.8 | 24.8 | 8 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |
| 2015* | Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value |  | 1.8 | 0.3 | 10.8 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2013 | Value |  | 4.2 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | Fair |
| 2012 | Value |  | 7.0 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 8 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 2 | 1 | 4 | 8 | Fair |
| 2011* | Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010* | Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009* | Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | Value |  | 0.7 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2007 | Value |  | 2.3 | 0.2 | 13.6 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2006 | Value |  | 2.8 | 0.3 | 15.3 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | Fair |
| 2005 | Value |  | 1.7 | 0.3 | 9.2 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2004 | Value |  | 2.9 | 0.4 | 5.9 | 8 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | Fair |
| 2003 | Value |  | 3.0 | 0.4 | 13.3 | 8 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |
| 2002* | Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | Value |  | 2.5 | 0.3 | 9.0 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| 2000 | Value |  | 2.7 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 7 | Fair |
|  | Score | (1) | 1 | 1 | 4 |  | Fair |

Table 11. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/nn) for crappie collected in 4 netnights (4 nights with 10 nets) of sampling at Cave Run Lake from 31 October to 04 November.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |
| White Crappie | 1 | 46 | 5 | 72 | 65 | 68 | 37 | 18 | 16 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 370 | 9.3 | 1.4 |
| Black Crappie |  | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 | 0.7 | 0.3 |

Table 12. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{10}$ values obtained for Black and White crappie
in Cave Run Lake; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{10}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White Crappie | 318 | $36( \pm 5)$ | $18( \pm 4)$ |
| Black Crappie | 15 | $7( \pm 13)$ |  | nedctncr.d22

Table 13. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for length groups of Black and White crappie collected in Cave Run Lake by trap netting. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.0-7.9 in |  | 8.0-9.9 in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| White Crappie | 205 | 83 (1) | 55 | 80 (1) | 58 | 84 (1) | 318 | 83 (1) |
| Black Crappie | 14 | 92 (5) | 1 | $92(-)$ |  |  | 15 | 92 (5) |
| nedctncr.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 14. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for White Crappie collected from Cave Run Lake in November 2022; includes 95\% confidence interval (Cl) for mean length for each age class.

| Year | No. | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2022 | (8) | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 15 |  | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 15 |  | 3.7 | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 14 |  | 4.1 | 6.2 | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 23 |  | 4.2 | 6.2 | 7.7 | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 13 |  | 4.2 | 6.4 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 10.6 |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 5 |  | 4.5 | 6.7 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 10.4 | 11.6 |  |  |
| 2015 | 4 |  | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.2 | 8.2 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 11.2 |  |
| 2014 | 2 |  | 4.2 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 9.9 | 11.1 | 12.3 |
| Mean |  | 3.6 | 4.0 | 6.1 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 10.8 | 11.2 | 12.3 |
| Number |  | (8) | 91 | 76 | 61 | 47 | 24 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| Smallest |  | 3.1 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 11.8 |
| Largest |  | 4.8 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 10.2 | 12.0 | 12.1 | 12.9 | 12.0 | 12.7 |
| SE |  | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| $\underline{95 \% ~ C l ~( \pm) ~}$ |  | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.7 |

Table 15. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of White Crappie sampled at Cave Run Lake in 2022.

| Age | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 46 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49 | 13.5 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| 1 |  |  | 3 | 60 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 18.4 | 2.0 | 0.4 |
| 2 |  |  |  | 12 | 51 | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 108 | 29.7 | 2.7 | 0.5 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 15 | 8 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 48 | 13.2 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 2 |  | 54 | 14.8 | 1.3 | 0.2 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 2 |  | 23 | 6.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 5 | 1.4 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 1 | 46 | 5 | 72 | 55 | 68 | 37 | 20 | 17 | 24 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 364 | 100 | 9.3 | 1.4 |
| \% | $<1$ | 13 | 1 | 20 | 15 | 19 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 100 |  |  |  |

Table 16. Population assessment of White Crappie based on samples collected at Cave Run Lake from 2010-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment). Location of the sample ( $U=$ Upper lake, $M=$ Middle lake, $L=$ Lower lake) is also included.

nedctncr.d22, d20, d19-d18, d16-d15, d13-d10; nedaagcr.d22, d20, d16, d15, d12

Table 17. Fishery statistics derived from a daytime creel survey at the Cave Run Lake tailwaters during the 2022 creel (March through October).

|  | 2022 | 2004 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishing trips |  |  |
| No. of fishing trips (per acre) | $\begin{gathered} 2,632 \\ (2632.2) \end{gathered}$ | 9,882 |
| Fishing pressure |  |  |
| Total man-hours (SE) | 5,701 (176.7) | 20,878 (619.7) |
| Man hours/acre | 5700.6 | 20878.0 |
| Catch/harvest |  |  |
| No. of fish caught (SE) | 10,586 (1,582.1) | 28,011 (3,639.7) |
| No. of fish harvested (SE) | 3,544 (581.24) | 10,165 (1,518.2) |
| Lbs. of fish harvested | 1,345 | 5,476 |
| Harvest rate |  |  |
| Fish/hour | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Fish/acre | 3544.5 | 10,165 |
| Lbs/acre | 1345.0 | 5,476 |
| Catch rate |  |  |
| Fish/hour | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| Fish/acre | 10586.0 | 28,011 |
| Misc. characteristics (\%) |  |  |
| Male | 86.6 | 82.8 |
| Female | 13.4 | 17.1 |
| Resident | 94.6 | 96.0 |
| Non-resident | 5.4 | 3.9 |
| Method (\%) |  |  |
| Still fishing | 69.5 | 77.8 |
| Casting | 30.4 | 22.0 |
| Trolling | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Fly Fishing | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Mode (\%) |  |  |
| Bank | 94.4 | 97.7 |
| Boat | 5.4 | 2.2 |
| Kayak | 0.2 | 0.1 |

Table 18. Fish harvest statistics derived from the 2022 creel survey in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters.

|  | White Crappie | Black Crappie | Crappie Group | Bluegill | Rock <br> Bass | Redbreast Sunfish | Warmouth | Redear Sunfish | Green Sunfish | Panfish Group | Channel Catfish | Flathead Cattish | Catfish Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number caught | 5383 | 1134 | 6517 | 2905 | 50 | 31 |  | 8 | 4 | 3015 | 294 | 32 | 326 |
| (per acre) | 5383.2 | 1133.6 | 6516.8 | 2904.7 | 49.6 | 30.7 | 17.9 | 8.3 | 4.1 | 3015.3 | 293.5 | 32.3 | 325.9 |
| Number harvested | 1814 | 514 | 2328 | 766 | 9 | 26 | 5 |  |  | 806 | 193 | 25 | 218 |
| (per acre) | 1813.9 | 514.1 | 2328.1 | 765.9 | 9.4 | 25.6 | 4.9 |  |  | 805.8 | 193.3 | 24.5 | 217.8 |
| \% of total number harvested | 51.2 | 14.5 | 65.7 | 21.6 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.1 |  |  | 22.7 | 5.5 | 0.7 | 6.1 |
| Pounds harvested | 476.8 | 167.0 | 643.8 | 94.6 | 0.7 | - | 1.7 |  |  | 97.0 | 212.7 | 41.2 | 253.9 |
| (per acre) | 476.8 | 167.0 | 643.8 | 94.6 | 0.7 | - | 1.7 |  |  | 97.0 | 212.7 | 41.2 | 253.9 |
| \% of total pounds harvested | 35.4 | 12.4 | 47.9 | 7.0 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 |  |  | 7.2 | 15.8 | 3.1 | 18.9 |
| Mean length (in) | 8.07 | 8.39 |  | 5.89 | 4.50 | 7.00 | 8.00 |  |  |  | 14.90 | 16.25 |  |
| Mean w eight (lb) | 0.22 | 0.30 |  | 0.13 | 0.07 | - | 0.35 |  |  |  | 1.07 | 1.70 |  |
| Number fishing trips for that species |  |  | 485.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124.2 |  |  | 151.0 |
| \% of all trips |  |  | 18.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.7 |  |  | 5.7 |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1,050.3 \\ (1050.3) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 268.9 \\ (268.9) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 482.0 \\ (482.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number harvested fishing for that species |  |  | 1854 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 159 |  |  | 97 |
| Pounds harvested fishing for that species |  |  | 529.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.0 |  |  | 127.2 |
| Number harvested per hour fishing for that species |  |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |  | 0.2 |
| \% success fishing <br> for that species |  |  | 31.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.0 |  |  | 16.3 |

Table 18 (cont).

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Largemouth } \\ \text { Bass } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Spotted Bass | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Smallmouth } \\ \text { Bass } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Black Bass } \\ \text { Group } \end{gathered}$ | Rainbow Trout | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { White } \\ & \text { Bass } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Walleye | Muskie | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Com. } \\ & \text { Carp } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FW } \\ \text { Drum } \end{gathered}$ | Sauger | Buffalo Spp. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gar } \\ & \text { Spp. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Redhorse Spp. | Anything |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number caught | 211 | 42 | 42 | 295 | 153 | 112 | 45 | 31 | 28 | 27 | 20 | 11 | 4 | 3 |  |
| (per acre) | 211.3 | 41.8 | 41.7 | 294.8 | 153.1 | 111.7 | 44.6 | 30.7 | 28.2 | 27.0 | 19.7 | 11.1 | 4.1 | 3.2 |  |
| Number harvested | 20 | 3 |  | 24 | 83 | 49 | 19 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (per acre) | 20.5 | 3.2 |  | 23.7 | 82.9 | 49.4 | 19.2 | 17.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of total number harvested | 0.6 | 0.1 |  | 0.7 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds harvested | 27.9 | 1.4 |  | 29.3 | 40.2 | 41.5 | 38.7 | 200.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (per acre) | 27.9 | 1.4 |  | 29.3 | 40.2 | 41.5 | 38.7 | 200.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% of total pounds harvested | 2.1 | 0.1 |  | 2.2 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 14.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean length (in) | 13.89 | 10.00 |  |  | 10.91 | 12.79 | 17.20 | 35.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean w eight (lb) | 1.38 | 0.45 |  |  | 0.47 | 0.86 | 1.85 | 1.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number fishing trips for that species |  |  |  | 1,423.4 |  | 2.7 |  | 223.47 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,423.4 |
| \% of all trips |  |  |  | 54.1 |  | 0.1 |  | 8.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54.1 |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3,082.6 \\ & (3082.6) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 5.8 \\ (5.8) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 483.94 \\ (483.94) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 3,082.6 \\ (3082.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number harvested fishing for that species |  |  |  | 4 |  | 0 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds harvested fishing for that species |  |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  | 52.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number harvested per hour fishing for that species |  |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% success fishing for that species |  |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  | 1.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.707 |

Table 19. Length distribution (length of released fish are estimates) for each species of fish harvested (H) or released (R) at Cave Run Lake
Tailwaters from March through October 2022.


Table 19 (cont).


Table 20. Monthly crappie angling success in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length (in) |  | Mean weight (lbs) |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | BC | WC | BC | WC |
| MAR | 67.2 | 145.5 | 474 | 3.3 | 488 | 208 | 0.4 | 208 | - | 8.5 | - | 0.26 |
| APR | 143.7 | 311.2 | 1,041 | 3.3 | 1,241 | 330 | 0.3 | 384 | - | 8.1 | - | 0.22 |
| MAY | 84.7 | 183.5 | 1,544 | 8.4 | 1,959 | 521 | 0.3 | 672 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 0.39 | 0.34 |
| JUN | 90.2 | 195.2 | 1,281 | 6.6 | 1,512 | 533 | 0.4 | 591 | - | 8.6 | - | 0.27 |
| JUL | 33.5 | 72.6 | 194 | 2.7 | 576 | 76 | 0.1 | 94 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 0.31 | 0.17 |
| AUG | 17.5 | 38.0 | 15 | 0.4 | 72 | 0 | 0.0 | 31 | 8.0 | - | 0.25 | - |
| SEP | 17.0 | 36.8 | 188 | 5.1 | 403 | 48 | 0.1 | 122 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 0.31 | 0.20 |
| OCT | 31.2 | 67.6 | 162 | 2.4 | 267 | 138 | 0.5 | 226 | 8.5 | 6.8 | 0.31 | 0.12 |
| Total | 485.0 | 1050.3 | 4,899 | 4.7 | 6,517 | 1,854 | 0.3 | 2,328 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.4 | 8.1 | 0.30 | 0.22 |

Table 21. Monthly black bass angling success in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length <br> (in) |  | Mean weight (lbs) |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | LMB | SPB | LMB | SPB |
| MAR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 5 |  |  | 0 |  | - |  |  |
| APR | 12.5 | 27.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 13 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 13.0 | 10.0 | 1.11 | 0.45 |
| MAY | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 29 | - |  | 5 | 15.0 | - | 1.73 | - |
| JUN | 42.3 | 91.5 | 4 | 0.0 | 37 | 4 | 0.1 | 12 | 13.7 | - | 1.29 | - |
| JUL | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 33 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| AUG | 17.5 | 38.0 | 10 | 0.3 | 87 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| SEP | 14.9 | 32.2 | 22 | 0.7 | 33 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| OCT | 17.8 | 38.6 | 20 | 0.5 | 57 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 105.0 | 227.4 | 56 | 0.2 | 295 | 4 | 0.0 | 24 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.9 | 10.0 | 1.38 | 0.45 |

Table 22. Monthly cattish angling success in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length (in) |  | Mean weight (lbs) |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | CCF | FHC | CCF | FHC |
| MAR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| APR | 25.0 | 54.1 | 13 | 0.2 | 38 | 10 | 0.3 | 29 | 15.0 | - | 1.08 | - |
| MAY | 63.6 | 137.6 | 15 | - | 44 | 5 | 0.1 | 29 | 14.0 | 16.5 | 0.88 | 1.78 |
| JUN | 36.6 | 79.3 | 17 | 0.2 | 54 | 17 | 0.3 | 29 | 15.6 | - | 1.21 | - |
| JUL | 40.2 | 87.2 | 5 | - | 33 | 0 | 0.0 | 9 | 13.5 | - | 0.79 | - |
| AUG | 11.7 | 25.3 | 26 | 1.0 | 56 | 26 | 0.5 | 46 | 14.2 | - | 0.93 | - |
| SEP | 19.1 | 41.4 | 22 | 0.5 | 70 | 22 | 0.3 | 52 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 1.31 | 1.62 |
| OCT | 15.6 | 33.8 | 17 | 0.5 | 30 | 17 | 0.6 | 24 | 16.0 | - | 1.31 | - |
| Total | 211.8 | 458.7 | 115 | 0.3 | 326 | 97 | 0.3 | 218 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.9 | 16.3 | 1.07 | 1.70 |

Table 23. Monthly Muskellunge angling success in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours <br> fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length (in) | Mean weight (lbs) |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  |  |  |
| MAR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| APR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| MAY | 45.4 | 98.3 | 15 | 0.2 | 19 | 5 | 0.3 | 10 | 36.0 | 11.64 |
| JUN | 45.1 | 97.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 36.0 | 11.64 |
| JUL | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| AUG | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| SEP | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 4 | - | - | 4 | 35.0 | 10.58 |
| OCT | 33.5 | 72.4 | 3 | 0.0 | 3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| Total | 123.9 | 268.4 | 18 | 0.1 | 31 | 5 | 0.2 | 18 |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.7 | 11.29 |

Table 24. Monthly panfish angling success in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length (in) | Mean weight (lbs) |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  |  |  |
| MAR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 29 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| APR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 221 | - | - | 64 | 6.9 | 0.20 |
| MAY | 42.4 | 91.8 | 219 | 2.4 | 292 | 39 | 0.1 | 68 | 6.5 | 0.17 |
| JUN | 31.0 | 67.1 | 104 | 1.5 | 983 | 83 | 0.1 | 289 | 5.1 | 0.09 |
| JUL | 13.4 | 29.1 | 184 | 6.3 | 618 | 0 | 0.0 | 123 | 5.1 | 0.08 |
| AUG | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | 97 | 0 | 0.0 | 92 | 6.5 | 0.18 |
| SEP | 17.0 | 36.8 | 163 | 4.4 | 724 | 37 | 0.1 | 166 | 6.2 | 0.15 |
| OCT | 6.7 | 14.5 | 3 | 0.2 | 51 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.0 | 0.08 |
| Total | 110.4 | 239.2 | 673 | 2.8 | 3,015 | 159 | 0.1 | 806 |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.9 | 0.13 |

Table 25. Monthly trout angling success in the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length (in) | Mean weight (lbs) |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  |  |  |
| MAR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| APR | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 29 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| MAY | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 29 | - | - | 29 | 10.7 | 0.44 |
| JUN | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 98 | - | - | 54 | 11.2 | 0.51 |
| JUL | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| AUG | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| SEP | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| OCT | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| Total | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 153 | - | - | 83 |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.9 | 0.47 |

Table 26. Angler attitude survey carried out with 2022 creel survey on the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters.
2. Which species do you fish for at Cave Run Tailwaters (check all that apply)? ( $\mathrm{N}=278$ )

Crappie $=54.1 \%$; Catfish=43.1\%; Muskie=27.4; Bass=22.4\%; Other=18.2\%;
Sauger/Walleye=9.6\%; Trout=3.2\%
(Other includes "Bluegill" (19 anglers), "panfish" (4 anglers), "White Bass" (4 anglers), "Drum" (2 anglers) and "Suckers" (2 anglers)).
3. Which species do you fish for most at Cave Run Tailwaters (check only one)?

```
Crappie \(=39.5 \%\); Catfish=25.6\%; Other \(=11.7 \%\); Bass = 10.7\%; Muskie = 10.3\%;
Sauger/Walleye = 1.1\%; Trout \(=0.7 \%\)
```

(Other includes "Bluegill" (9 anglers), "panfish" (2 anglers), "White Bass" (2 anglers), and "Suckers" (1 angler)).
4. On average, how many times do you fish Cave Run Tailwaters in a year? ( $\mathrm{N}=280$ )

| 1st Time $=$ | $12.1 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 - 4}=$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{5 - 1 0}=$ | $22.8 \%$ | $\geq \mathbf{1 0}=$ |
|  | $21.7 \%$ |  |
| $43.1 \%$ |  |  |

## Bass Anglers

5. What level of satisfaction do you have with bass fishing at Cave Run Tailwaters? ( $\mathrm{N}=63$ )

| Very Satisfied | $30.2 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $30.2 \%$ | Total | $60.4 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $2.1 \%$ | Somew hat Dissatisfied | $4.8 \%$ | Total | $6.9 \%$ |
| Neutral | $33.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

5a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
*Note: These numbers are percentages ONLY of those who were dissatisfied (6.9\%)
Number of Fish 100.0\%

## Crappie Anglers

6. What level of satisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Cave Run Tailwaters? $(\mathrm{N}=144)$

| Very Satisfied | $47.9 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $33.3 \%$ | Total | $81.2 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $1.4 \%$ | Somew hat Dissatisfied | $5.6 \%$ | Total | $7.0 \%$ |
| Neutral | $11.8 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

6a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
*Note: These numbers are percentages ONLY of those who were dissatisfied (7.0\%)
Number of Fish $\quad 70.0 \%$ Size of Fish 30.0\%

## Muskie Anglers

7. What level of satisfaction do you have with muskie fishing at Cave Run Tailwaters? ( $\mathrm{N}=77$ )

| Very Satisfied | $33.8 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $29.9 \%$ | Total | $63.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Somew hat Dissatisfied | $3.9 \%$ | Total | $3.9 \%$ |
| Neutral | $32.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

7a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
$\begin{array}{lrlr}\text { *Note: These numbers are percentages } & \text { ONL } \boldsymbol{Y} \text { of those who were dissatisfied (3.9\%) } \\ \text { Number of Fish } & 66.7 \% & \text { Size of Fish }\end{array}$
8. About what percentage of legal-size muskie have you harvested in the last 3 years from the Cave Run Lake Tailwaters? ( $\mathrm{N}=76$ )

| Almost All $=$ | $17.1 \%$ | About 75\% $=$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| About $50 \%=$ | $0.0 \%$ | About 25\% $=$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Very Few $=$ | $10.5 \%$ | None $=$ | $71.0 \%$ |

## Sauger/Walleye Anglers

9. What level of satisfaction do you have with sauger/walleye fishing at Cave Run Tailwaters? $(\mathrm{N}=26)$

| Very Satisfied | $15.4 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $42.3 \%$ | Total | $57.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $3.8 \%$ | Somew hat Dissatisfied | $15.4 \%$ | Total | $19.2 \%$ |
| Neutral | $23.1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

9a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
*Note: These numbers are percentages ONLY of those who were dissatisfied (19.2\%)
Number of Fish 100.0\%

Table 26 (cont).

## Catfish Anglers

10. What level of satisfaction do you have with catfish fishing at Cave Run Tailwaters? ( $\mathrm{N}=121$ )

| Very Satisfied | $52.1 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $31.4 \%$ | Total | $83.5 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Somewhat Dissatisfied | $5.8 \%$ | Total | $5.8 \%$ |
| Neutral | $10.7 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

10a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?

| *Note: These numbers are percentages | ONL $\boldsymbol{Y}$ of those who were dissatisfied (5.8\%) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Fish | $85.7 \%$ | Size of Fish |

## Trout Anglers

11. What level of satisfaction do you have with Trout fishing at Cave Run Tailwaters? ( $\mathrm{N}=9$ )

| Very Satisfied | $11.1 \%$ | Somewhat Satisfied | $22.2 \%$ | Total | $33.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Somewhat Dissatisfied | $22.2 \%$ | Total | $22.2 \%$ |
| Neutral | $44.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

11a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction?
*Note: These numbers are percentages ONLY of those who were satisfied (22.2\%)
Number of Fish 100.0\%

## All Anglers

12. When you fish Cave Run Tailwaters, what method do you use the most (check all that apply)? N=275

| Rod and Reel $=$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Snagging $=$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Bow fishing $=$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Other $=$ | $0.0 \%$ |

13. Do you specfically target paddlefish while fishing in the Cave Run Tailwaters? N=269
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Yes }=0.4 \% & \text { No }=\quad 99.6 \%\end{array}$
13a. If yes, what method do you use? $\mathrm{N}=1$

| Snagging $=$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Bow fishing $=$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Other $=$ | $0.0 \%$ |

14. When you fish Cave Run Tailwaters do you primarily: $\mathrm{N}=277$

| Fish from the Bank $=$ | $94.9 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Fish from a Boat $=$ | $4.3 \%$ |
| Fish from a Kayak $=$ | $0.7 \%$ |

14a. If you responded as "Fish from the Bank" in question 14, what percentage of your trips do you fish from the Hatchery side of the river? N=262

Always = $1.1 \%$
About 75\% = $6.1 \%$
About 50\% = $5.0 \%$
About 25\% = 23.3\%
Never = 64.5\%
15. Have you observed any Bighead or Silver Carp while fishing in the Cave Run Tailwaters? N=281

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Yes }=5.3 \% & \text { No }=94.7 \%
\end{array}
$$

15a. Do you feel like you could properly identify Bighead or Silver Carp from other fish species? N=281
Yes $=35.9 \% \quad$ No $=64.1 \%$

Table 27. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 1.5 hours (4.5 hours total) of 30-minute nocturnal electrofishing runs in each area of Grayson Lake from 02-04 May.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass |  | 4 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 27 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 136 | 90.7 | 16.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2.7 | 1.8 |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 47 | 72 | 15 | 19 | 43 | 18 | 29 | 19 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 281 | 281.0 | 33.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 19.0 | 17.0 |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass |  | 19 | 37 | 8 | 26 | 59 | 17 | 40 | 24 | 14 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  | 267 | 178.0 | 22.1 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 12 | 18 | 17 | 22 | 33 | 30 | 21 | 11 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 170 | 113.3 | 21.2 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 70 | 113 | 32 | 58 | 129 | 51 | 85 | 64 | 28 | 18 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 684 | 171.0 | 30.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 13 | 22 | 18 | 26 | 39 | 33 | 23 | 12 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 193 | 48.3 | 20.6 |

nedpsdgl.d22

Table 28. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Grayson Lake from 1999-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | < 8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 68.8 | 20.7 | 82.3 | 10.9 | 13.8 | 2.4 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 171.0 | 30.0 |
| 2021 | 105.8 | 36.0 | 94.7 | 15.1 | 10.4 | 1.6 | 10.2 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 221.1 | 47.9 |
| 2020* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 145.5 | 47.4 | 86.0 | 17.1 | 15.0 | 2.2 | 9.5 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 256.0 | 59.4 |
| 2018 | 130.4 | 26.9 | 117.6 | 22.1 | 16.7 | 3.9 | 8.4 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 273.1 | 51.4 |
| 2017 | 90.9 | 13.7 | 107.1 | 17.9 | 19.8 | 2.3 | 8.9 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 226.7 | 25.5 |
| 2016 | 178.3 | 15.4 | 93.7 | 7.4 | 15.7 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 298.7 | 16.1 |
| 2015 | 55.1 | 14.2 | 90.9 | 12.5 | 18.9 | 4.0 | 14.9 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 179.8 | 27.8 |
| 2014 | 53.5 | 10.7 | 97.3 | 11.3 | 12.7 | 1.6 | 13.5 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 176.9 | 18.3 |
| 2013 | 75.2 | 11.3 | 78.2 | 5.7 | 13.2 | 1.5 | 16.3 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 182.8 | 14.4 |
| 2012 | 67.0 | 11.4 | 91.0 | 6.5 | 16.8 | 2.2 | 13.3 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 188.0 | 16.1 |
| 2011* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 22.8 | 4.0 | 41.0 | 4.2 | 17.0 | 2.7 | 12.7 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 93.5 | 10.3 |
| 2008 | 25.7 | 7.2 | 22.5 | 4.4 | 11.5 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 63.3 | 11.5 |
| 2007 | 48.0 | 8.0 | 46.8 | 3.8 | 16.0 | 2.1 | 5.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 115.8 | 11.6 |
| 2006 | 18.8 | 2.9 | 55.5 | 7.4 | 23.7 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 103.3 | 10.1 |
| 2005 | 50.1 | 8.0 | 70.2 | 7.9 | 25.1 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 148.3 | 15.9 |
| 2004 | 162.3 | 22.0 | 77.8 | 10.1 | 12.9 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 255.9 | 31.9 |
| 2003 | 128.3 | 10.7 | 79.5 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 216.3 | 15.1 |
| 2002 | 132.5 | 17.9 | 54.5 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 194.8 | 22.7 |
| 2001 | 220.8 | 30.6 | 54.2 | 3.2 | 6.7 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 283.9 | 30.2 |
| 2000 | 143.3 | 20.6 | 65.7 | 5.9 | 13.4 | 1.5 | 6.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 229.1 | 25.9 |
| 1999 | 172.7 | 21.6 | 102.4 | 10.1 | 24.1 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 303.8 | 31.3 |

nedpsdgl.d22-d21; d19-d12; d09-d99

* Sample was not collected

Table 29. PSD and RSD values obtained for Largemouth and Spotted bass taken in spring electrofishing samples in each area of Grayson Lake; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 106 | $25( \pm 8)$ | $12( \pm 6)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 4 | - | - |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass | 126 | $13( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 9 | $11( \pm 22)$ | - |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 177 | $21( \pm 6)$ | $5( \pm 3)$ |
|  | Spotted Bass | 101 | $6( \pm 5)$ | - |
|  |  | 409 | $20( \pm 4)$ | $6( \pm 2)$ |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 114 | $6( \pm 4)$ | - |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |
| nedpsdgl.d22 |  |  |  |  |
| a Largemouth Bass $=$ RSD $_{15}$, Spotted Bass $=R S D_{14}$ |  |  |  |  |

Table 30. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on samples collected at Grayson Lake from 2007-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

nedpsdgl.d22-d02; nedaaggl.d21, d17, d08

* Sample was not collected

Table 31. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 1.5 hours (4.5 hours total) of 30-minute nocturnal electrofishing runs in each area of Grayson Lake from 17-19 October.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass Spotted Bass | 1 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 70.0 | 16.4 |
| Middle | Largemouth Bass |  | 6 | 50 | 63 | 12 | 30 | 81 | 92 | 67 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 437 | 291.3 | 55.1 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 19 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78 | 52.0 | 12.7 |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass |  | 2 | 11 | 19 | 7 | 13 | 38 | 46 | 29 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 194 | 129.3 | 7.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 48 | 38 | 13 | 25 | 21 | 16 | 9 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 176 | 117.3 | 20.7 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 15 | 76 | 92 | 21 | 44 | 132 | 153 | 114 | 37 | 19 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 1 |  | 2 | 4 | 736 | 163.6 | 37.1 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 67 | 63 | 19 | 31 | 27 | 23 | 17 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 254 | 56.4 | 37.1 |

nedwrsgl.d22

Table 32. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for each length group of Largemouth Bass captured at Grayson Lake by section. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Section | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Overall |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | W | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Upper | 54 | 84 (1) | 9 | 88 (3) | 5 | 89 (4) | 68 | 85 (1) |
| Middle | 255 | 79 (1) | 14 | 79 (2) | 7 | 92 (3) | 276 | 80 (1) |
| Lower | 126 | 77 (1) | 9 | 79 (3) | 7 | 85 (2) | 142 | 77 (1) |
| Total | 435 | 79 (0) | 32 | 81 (2) | 19 | 89 (2) | 486 | 80 (0) |

Table 33. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ values for each length group of Largemouth Bass captured at Grayson Lake from 1990 to 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Overall |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| 2022 | 435 | 79 (0) | 32 | 81 (2) | 19 | 89 (2) | 486 | 80 (0) |
| 2021 | 463 | 80 (0) | 42 | 79 (2) | 13 | 90 (2) | 518 | 80 (0) |
| 2020* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 464 | 84 (2) | 57 | 84 (1) | 20 | 90 (2) | 541 | 84 (1) |
| 2016* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 300 | 83 (0) | 37 | 86 (2) | 10 | 100 (3) | 347 | 84 (0) |
| 2011 | 235 | 85 (1) | 34 | 86 (2) | 19 | 92 (2) | 288 | 85 (1) |
| 2010 | 174 | 81 (1) | 31 | 77 (1) | 3 | 90 (3) | 208 | 81 (1) |
| 2009 | 115 | 80 (1) | 25 | 82 (2) | 14 | 95 (3) | 154 | 72 (1) |
| 2008 | 124 | 80 (1) | 16 | 86 (2) | 12 | 96 (1) | 152 | 82 (1) |
| 2007 | 120 | 83 (1) | 20 | 84 (2) | 6 | 95 (3) | 146 | 84 (1) |
| 2006 | 130 | 84 (1) | 33 | 85 (2) | 12 | 95 (3) | 175 | 85 (1) |
| 2005 | 234 | 81 (0) | 61 | 81 (1) | 10 | 89 (4) | 305 | 81 (0) |
| 2004 | 313 | 87 (0) | 64 | 84 (1) | 8 | 86 (2) | 385 | 86 (0) |
| 2003 | 642 | 82 (0) | 72 | 81 (1) | 10 | 90 (3) | 724 | 82 (0) |
| 2002 | 350 | 84 (1) | 40 | 83 (1) | 15 | 90 (3) | 405 | 84 (1) |
| 2001 | 89 | 81 (1) | 42 | 82 (1) | 14 | 93 (2) | 145 | 83 (1) |
| 2000* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 179 | 77 (1) | 35 | 78 (2) | 7 | 88 (3) | 221 | 77 (1) |
| 1998 | 556 | 90 (0) | 89 | 84 (1) | 16 | 94 (3) | 661 | 89 (0) |
| 1997 | 392 | 85 (0) | 89 | 81 (1) | 9 | 92 (3) | 490 | 84 (0) |
| 1996 | 433 | 82 (0) | 95 | 81 (1) | 7 | 90 (2) | 535 | 82 (0) |
| 1995 | 437 | 87 (0) | 57 | 83 (1) | 20 | 95 (2) | 514 | 86 (0) |
| 1994 | 493 | 84 (0) | 86 | 81 (1) | 13 | 93 (2) | 592 | 84 (0) |
| 1993 | 704 | 87 (0) | 93 | 81 (1) | 22 | 96 (3) | 819 | 86 (0) |
| 1992 | 317 | 85 (0) | 45 | 82 (1) | 5 | 90 (4) | 367 | 84 (0) |
| 1991 | 18 | 84 (2) | 1 | 83 | 0 |  | 19 | 84 (2) |
| 1990 | 79 | 84 (1) | 13 | 85 (3) | 1 | 105 | 93 | 84 (1) |

nedwrsgl.d22-d21,d17, d12-d01, d99-d90

* Sample was not collected

Table 34. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in September of 2003 to 2022 while nocturnal electrofishing at Grayson

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 5.0 | <0.1 | 44.7 | 12.7 | 24.2 | 8.4 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.7 | <0.1 | 67.6 | 18.9 | 23.6 | 10.2 | 54.3 | 18.9 |
| 2020 |  | * |  | * |  | * |  | 97.1 | 36.5 |
| 2019 | Total | 4.8 | <0.1 | 167.7 | 36.5 | 67.7 | 14.3 | * |  |
| 2018 | Total | 4.9 | <0.1 | 164.2 | 39.3 | 74.2 | 19.8 | 142.8 | 47.3 |
| 2017 | Total | 5.2 | <0.1 | 91.1 | 20.1 | 63.1 | 15.3 | 126.9 | 28.0 |
| 2016 | Total | 4.7 | <0.1 | 116.4 | 24.1 | 38.9 | 9.7 | 85.1 | 12.7 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.8 | <0.1 | 126.0 | 16.7 | 48.7 | 8.6 | 169.3 | 15.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 4.6 | <0.1 | 101.8 | 15.7 | 31.8 | 8.3 | 53.8 | 14.3 |
| 2013 | Total | 4.3 | <0.1 | 81.3 | 11.2 | 15.3 | 3.3 | 46.9 | 9.5 |
| 2012 | Total | 4.5 | <0.1 | 139.1 | 23.0 | 41.8 | 6.1 | 65.7 | 9.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 4.0 | <0.1 | 83.6 | 15.0 | 11.1 | 2.6 | 48.5 | 12.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 4.8 | <0.1 | 98.2 | 17.3 | 42.0 | 6.9 | * |  |
| 2009 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 33.1 | 5.7 | 4.2 | 1.4 | * |  |
| 2008 | Total | 4.1 | <0.1 | 66.0 | 16.4 | 8.7 | 2.8 | 19.9 | 3.8 |
| 2007 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 44.9 | 9.2 | 12.9 | 2.8 | 29.8 | 10.0 |
| 2006 | Total | 4.1 | <0.1 | 87.1 | 17.9 | 12.0 | 2.6 | 45.9 | 8.0 |
| 2005 | Total | 4.0 | <0.1 | 72.3 | 17.0 | 11.7 | 2.2 | 17.3 | 2.8 |
| 2004 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 40.4 | 5.7 | 11.3 | 2.1 | 46.8 | 7.8 |
| 2003 | Total | 4.3 | <0.1 | 59.1 | 6.8 | 10.4 | 1.7 | 158.9 | 21.7 |

nedbsigl.d19-d18, d16-d13 nedwrsgl.d22-d21,d17,d12-d03; nedpsdgl.d22-d21,d19-d12, d09-d04
nedaaggl.d03, d08, d17, d21

* Sample was not collected

Table 35. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) for hybrid striped bass collected at Grayson Lake while gill netting (16 net-nights) 24-28 October.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |  |  |  |
| Hybrid striped bass | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 11 | 10 |  | 8 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 86 | 5.4 | 1.1 |

nedhybgl.d22

Table 36. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for each length group of hybrid striped bass collected at Grayson Lake from 2011 to 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| 2022 | 4 | 83 (3) | 21 | 77 (1) | 60 | 84 (1) | 85 | 82 (1) |
| 2018 | 17 | 86 (2) | 31 | 84 (1) | 65 | 83 (1) | 113 | 84 (1) |
| 2016 | 21 | 85 (2) | 26 | 79 (1) | 27 | 81 (1) | 74 | 81 (1) |
| 2014 | 23 | 79 (2) | 10 | 76 (2) | 43 | 83 (1) | 76 | 81 (1) |
| 2011 | 4 | 72 (1) | 26 | 81 (1) | 43 | 85 (1) | 71 | 83 (1) |

Table 37. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for hybrid striped bass collected from Grayson Lake in October 2022; includes $95 \%$ confidence interval (CI) for mean length for each age class.

| Year | No. | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 2021 | 21 | 8.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 20 | 9.0 | 14.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 34 | 8.8 | 14.8 | 18.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 2 | 10.3 | 16.0 | 18.9 | 21.4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 1 | 9.4 | 15.2 | 18.1 | 19.9 | 21.1 |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 2 | 9.3 | 15.0 | 17.7 | 20.3 | 22.6 | 24.2 |  |  |
| 2013 | 1 | 9.9 | 15.4 | 17.9 | 19.7 | 22.2 | 22.8 | 23.4 | 23.9 |
| Mean |  | 8.9 | 14.7 | 18.3 | 20.5 | 22.1 | 23.7 | 23.4 | 23.9 |
| Number |  | 81 | 60 | 40 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Smallest |  | 3.3 | 5.8 | 15.3 | 18.4 | 21.1 | 28.8 |  |  |
| Largest |  | 11.0 | 16.8 | 20.2 | 22.2 | 23.6 | 25.1 |  |  |
| SE |  | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 |  |  |
| 95\% CI ( $\pm$ ) |  | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.7 |  |  |

nedaaggl.d22

Table 38. Age frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of hybrid striped bass sampled using gill nets for 16 net-nights at Grayson Lake in October 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1112 | 13 | 1 | 4 |  | 16 | 17 | 7 | 18 | 19 |  | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 6 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 | 24 | 1.3 | 0.4 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 22 | 1.2 | 0.3 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 10 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 35 | 41 | 2.2 | 0.6 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 11 | 1 |  |  | 8 | 7 |  | 5 | 4 |  | 16 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 86 | 100 |  |  |
| \% | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 13 | 1 |  |  | 9 | 8 |  | 6 | 5 |  | 19 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 3 |  | 1 | 100 |  |  |  |

nedhybgl.d22; nedaaggl.d22

Table 39. Population assessment for hybrid striped bass based on samples collected during the fall at Grayson Lake from 2011 to 2022 (scoring based on lake-specific assessment for 125-foot nets).

| Year |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { (excl age 0) } \end{gathered}$ | Mean length age 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | Total score | Assessment rating | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality $(\mathrm{A}) \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value | 5.1 | 16.6 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 12 | Good | -0.684 | 49.50\% |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value | 8.7 | 15.1 | 2.7 | 5.9 | 13 | Good | -0.675 | 49.10\% |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value | 2.6 | 17.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 11 | Good | -0.415 | 34.00\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 3.2 | 14.4 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 9 | Fair | -0.352 | 29.70\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Value | 3.6 | 16.5 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 11 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |

nedhybgl.d22, nedaaggl.d22

Table 40. Fishery statistics derived from a daytime creel survey at Lake Carnico during 2022 creel (April through October; SE = standard error) .

|  | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fishing trips |  |
| No. of fishing trips (per acre) | $\begin{gathered} 710 \\ (06.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fishing pressure |  |
| Total man-hours (SE) | 2,465 (146.12) |
| Man hours/acre | 22.0 |
| Catch/harvest |  |
| No. of fish caught (SE) | 1,508 (292.57) |
| No. of fish harvested (SE) | 123 (54.53) |
| Lbs. of fish harvested | 73 |
| Harvest rate |  |
| Fish/hour | 0.0 |
| Fish/acre | 1.1 |
| Lbs/acre | 0.7 |
| Catch rate |  |
| Fish/hour | 0.7 |
| Fish/acre | 13.5 |
| Misc. characteristics (\%) |  |
| Male | 92.7 |
| Female | 7.3 |
| Resident | 96.3 |
| Non-resident | 3.7 |
| Method (\%) |  |
| Casting | 69.1 |
| Still fishing | 23.6 |
| Trolling | 6.1 |
| Spider Rig | 1.2 |
| Mode (\%) |  |
| Boat | 68.7 |
| Bank | 24.4 |
| Dock | 6.9 |

Table 41. Fish harvest statistics derived from the 2022 creel survey at Lake Carnico.

|  | Largemouth |  | Redear | Panfish |  |  | Crappie | Channel |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bass | Bluegill | Sunfish | Group | Crappie | Crappie | Group | Catfish | Saugeye | Carp | Anything |
| Number caught | 854 | 513 | 5 | 518 | 23 | 75 | 98 | 23 | 12 | 4 |  |
| (per acre) | 7.6 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |
| Number harvested | 0 | 43 | 0 | 43 | 12 | 39 | 51 | 14 | 12 | 4 |  |
| (per acre) |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |
| \% of total number harvested |  | 34.5 |  | 34.5 | 10.0 | 31.7 | 41.7 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 2.9 |  |
| Pounds harvested |  | 3.4 |  | 3.4 | 10.5 | 20.7 | 31.2 | 15.4 |  | 22.9 |  |
| (per acre) |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 |  | 0.2 |  |
| \% of total pounds harvested |  | 4.7 |  | 4.7 | 14.4 | 28.4 | 42.8 | 21.1 |  | 31.4 |  |
| Mean length (in) |  | 5.00 |  |  | 12.00 | 10.00 |  | 15.50 | 15.00 | 24.00 |  |
| Mean w eight (lb) |  | 0.08 |  |  | 0.85 | 0.53 |  | 1.20 |  | 6.44 |  |
| Number fishing trips for that species | 390.5 |  |  | 73.9 |  |  | 118.3 | 41.9 |  |  | 84.9 |
| \% of all trips | 55.0 |  |  | 10.4 |  |  | 16.7 | 5.9 |  |  | 12.0 |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) | $\begin{aligned} & 1356.7 \\ & (12.1) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 256.8 \\ (2.3) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 410.9 \\ & (3.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145.7 \\ & (1.3) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 295.1 \\ (2.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number harvested fishing for that species | 0 |  |  | 21 |  |  | 49 | 14 |  |  |  |
| Pounds harvested fishing for that species |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |  | 29.8 | 16.0 |  |  |  |
| Number harvested per hour fishing for that species |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| \% success fishing for that species | 0.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 11.5 | 10.0 | 3.3 |  |  |

Table 42. Length distribution (length of released fish are estimates) for each species of fish harvested (H) or released (R) at Lake Carnico from April through October 2022.

| Species |  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 24 | Capture | Overall |
| Largemouth | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 854 |
| Bass | R |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 | 17 | 109 | 37 | 365 | 55 | 66 | 20 | 66 | 6 | 14 | 9 | 4 |  | 854 | 854 |
| Bluegill | H |  |  | 21 |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 514 |
|  | R | 71 | 240 | 120 | 37 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 471 | 514 |
| Black | H |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  | 10 | 10 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39 | 74 |
| Crappie | R |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 74 |
| White | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 23 |
| Crappie | R |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 23 |
| Channel | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 23 |
| Catfish | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 9 | 23 |
| Saugeye | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 12 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Redear | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| Sunfish | R |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |
| Carp | H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |

Table 43. Monthly crappie angling success in Lake Carnico during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length <br> (in) |  | Mean weight <br> (lbs) |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | Total | Fish/hr |  | BC | WC | BC | WC |
| APR | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| MAY | 83.9 | 291.4 | 49 | 0.0 | 49 | 49 | 0.2 | 49 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 0.85 | 0.53 |
| JUN | 6.1 | 21.3 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 10.0 | - | 0.45 | - |
| JUL | 2.3 | 8.2 | 28 | 3.4 | 35 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | 9.5 | - | 0.45 |
| AUG | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 4.0 | - | 0.02 | - |
| SEP | 5.7 | 19.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | - | 10.0 | - | 0.53 |
| OCT | 15.2 | 52.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 113.2 | 393.5 | 79 | 0.2 | 96 | 49 | 0.1 | 51 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.7 | 10.0 | 0.80 | 0.50 |

Table 44. Monthly Largemouth Bass angling success in Lake Carnico during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours <br> fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length (in) | Mean weight (lbs) |
|  |  |  | Number | Fish/hr |  | Number | Fish/hr |  |  |  |
| APR | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| MAY | 83.9 | 291.4 | 87 | 0.3 | 87 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| JUN | 36.8 | 128.0 | 25 | 0.2 | 25 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| JUL | 58.7 | 204.0 | 153 | 0.8 | 163 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| AUG | 127.5 | 443.0 | 377 | 0.9 | 377 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| SEP | 49.7 | 172.8 | 148 | 0.9 | 150 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| OCT | 28.4 | 98.8 | 49 | 0.5 | 51 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| Total | 385.1 | 1338.1 | 839 | 0.6 | 853 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |  |  |

Mean

Table 45. Monthly Bluegill angling success in Lake Carnico during the 2022 creel survey period.

| Month | Trips fishing for | Hours fishing for | Catch |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fishing for |  | Total catch | Fishing for |  | Total harvest | Mean length <br> (in) | Mean weight (lbs) |
|  |  |  | Number | Fish/hr |  | Number | Fish/hr |  |  |  |
| APR | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| MAY | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 25 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| JUN | 6.1 | 21.3 | 62 | 2.9 | 69 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| JUL | 9.4 | 32.6 | 184 | 5.6 | 291 | 21 | 0.6 | 43 | 5.0 | 0.1 |
| AUG | 5.0 | 17.4 | 61 | 3.5 | 94 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| SEP | 7.7 | 26.6 | 30 | 1.1 | 32 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| OCT | 3.8 | 13.2 | 2 | 0.2 | 7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | - | - |
| Total | 32.0 | 111.1 | 339 | 3.1 | 518 | 21 | 0.2 | 43 |  |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 0.1 |

Table 46: Angler attitude survey carried out in conjunction with 2022 creel survey on Lake Carnico.
2. Which species do you fish for at Lake Carnico (check all that apply)? ( $\mathrm{N}=278$ )

Bass=61.51\%; Sunfish=6.47\%; Saugeye=1.44\%; Catfish=14.39\%; Crappie=17.63\%; Other=5.4\%
(Other includes "Anything" (13 anglers)).
3. Which species do you fish for most at Lake Carnico (check only one)?

Bass $=57.91 \%$; Sunfish=6.83\%; Saugeye $=0.36 \%$; Catfish=14.03\%; Crappie $=16.55 \%$; Other $=4.32 \%$ (Other includes "Anything" (12 anglers)).
4. On average, how many times do you fish Lake Carnico in a year? ( $\mathrm{N}=272$ )

| 1 st Time $=$ | $23.2 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 - 4}=$ | $26.8 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| $5-10$ | $=23.9 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0}=$ | $26.1 \%$ |

5. Are you a resident of Lake Carnico or the Nicholas County Development Area surrounding Lake Carnico? ( $\mathrm{N}=268$ )
Yes = $9.7 \%$
No = $90.3 \%$

## Bass Anglers

6. What level of satisfaction do you have with bass fishing at Lake Carncio? ( $\mathrm{N}=167$ )

| Very Satisfied | $12.0 \%$ | Somewhat Satisfied | $37.7 \%$ | Total | $49.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $1.8 \%$ | Somewhat Dissatisfied | $26.4 \%$ | Total | $28.2 \%$ |
| Neutral | $22.2 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

6a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? (note: This only includes the $28.2 \%$ dissatisfied anglers)

| Size of Fish | $4.3 \%$ | Number of Fish |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other | $55.3 \%$ | (Other includes "Vegetation" (24 anglers)). |

## Sunfish Anglers

7. What level of satisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Lake Carnico? ( $\mathrm{N}=17$ )

| Very Satisfied | $17.7 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $47.1 \%$ | Total | $64.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Somew hat Dissatisfied | $23.5 \%$ | Total | $23.5 \%$ |
| Neutral | $11.8 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

7a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? (note: This only includes the $23.5 \%$ dissatisfied anglers)

| Size of Fish | $75.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other | $25.0 \%$ | (Other includes "Vegetation" (1 angler)). |

## Saugeye Anglers

8. What level of satisfaction do you have with saugeye fishing at Lake Carncio? ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ )

| Very Satisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Somew hat Satisfied | $66.7 \%$ | Total | $66.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Somewhat Dissatisfied | $0.0 \%$ | Total | $0.0 \%$ |
| Neutral | $33.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

8a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? (note: This only includes the 0\% dissatisfied anglers)

Catfish Anglers
9. What level of satisfaction do you have with catfish fishing at Lake Carnico? ( $\mathrm{N}=38$ )

| Very Satisfied | $7.9 \%$ | Somewhat Satisfied | $36.8 \%$ | Total | $44.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $3.1 \%$ | Somewhat Dissatisfied | $21.1 \%$ | Total | $24.2 \%$ |
| Neutral | $31.6 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

8a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? (note: This only includes the 24.2\% dissatisfied anglers)

| Number of Fish | $55.6 \%$ | (Other includes "Vegetation" (4 anglers) and "Private |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other | $44.5 \%$ | dock ow ners feeding fish (1 angler)). |

Table 46 (cont.)..
Crappie Anglers
10. What level of satisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Lake Carnico? ( $\mathrm{N}=45$ )

| Very Satisfied | $13.3 \%$ | Somewhat Satisfied | $42.2 \%$ | Total | $55.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very Dissatisfied | $2.2 \%$ | Somewhat Dissatisfied | $8.9 \%$ | Total | $11.1 \%$ |
| Neutral | $33.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |

10a. If angler responds with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question 5: what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? (note: This only includes the 11.1\% dissatisfied anglers)

| Number of Fish | $20.0 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Other | $80.0 \%$ | (Other includes "Vegetation" (4 anglers)). |

## All Anglers

11. Would you support a change to a $12^{\prime \prime}$ minimum size limit on Largemouth Bass at Lake Carnico ( $N=265$ )?
Yes = $56.6 \%$
No = $43.4 \%$
12. Over the last 3 years, do you feel like the vegetation issues at Lake Carnico are ( $N=206$ )?

| Getting Worse $=$ | $40.3 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Improving | $=23.3 \%$ |$\quad$ Staying the Same $=36.4 \%$

Table 47. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours of nocturnal electrofishing (6-15-minute runs) at Greenbo Lake (Greenup Co.) on 28 April.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 26 | 24 | 17 | 22 | 14 | 34 | 29 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 3 |  | 4 | 3 |  | 1 | 235 | 156.7 | 5.4 | nedpsdgb.d22

Table 48. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Greenbo Lake from 2009 to 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | < 8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 48.7 | 7.8 | 58.0 | 5.1 | 34.0 | 3.2 | 16.0 | 4.6 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 156.7 | 5.4 |
| 2021 | 60.0 | 12.8 | 75.3 | 19.5 | 38.7 | 4.7 | 35.3 | 12.3 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 209.3 | 26.8 |
| 2020* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 31.7 | 3.9 | 35.3 | 6.1 | 47.7 | 4.1 | 9.0 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 176.0 | 15.2 |
| 2018 | 63.3 | 7.8 | 72.7 | 10.8 | 95.3 | 7.6 | 20.0 | 5.0 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 251.3 | 22.8 |
| 2017 | 24.0 | 5.6 | 78.0 | 13.1 | 82.7 | 10.7 | 16.0 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 200.7 | 17.2 |
| 2016 | 40.7 | 7.8 | 103.3 | 5.5 | 76.7 | 7.6 | 18.0 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 2.9 | 238.7 | 15.0 |
| 2015 | 38.7 | 4.8 | 68.0 | 7.7 | 58.0 | 8.1 | 12.7 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 177.3 | 16.8 |
| 2014 | 28.0 | 7.2 | 52.7 | 3.0 | 116.0 | 16.1 | 7.3 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 204.0 | 16.0 |
| 2013 | 14.0 | 1.7 | 78.7 | 7.4 | 75.3 | 17.3 | 8.7 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 176.7 | 22.4 |
| 2012 | 25.3 | 4.8 | 111.3 | 11.8 | 64.7 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 210.0 | 21.1 |
| 2011 | 46.0 | 13.1 | 91.3 | 9.3 | 58.0 | 8.9 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 202.0 | 14.8 |
| 2010 | 78.0 | 12.9 | 87.3 | 3.5 | 45.3 | 9.3 | 13.3 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 224.0 | 11.3 |
| 2009 | 44.7 | 9.4 | 60.0 | 8.7 | 50.0 | 8.0 | 18.0 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 172.7 | 16.7 |
| nedps * Sam | $\text { od22-d }{ }^{\prime}$ <br> was n | t colle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 49. Largemouth Bass PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values for spring electrofishing at Greenbo Lake from 2009 to 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2022 | 162 | $46( \pm 8)$ | $15( \pm 5)$ |
| 2021 | 224 | $50( \pm 7)$ | $24( \pm 6)$ |
| $2020^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 214 | $60( \pm 6)$ | $11( \pm 4)$ |
| 2018 | 282 | $61( \pm 6)$ | $11( \pm 4)$ |
| 2017 | 265 | $56( \pm 6)$ | $9( \pm 3)$ |
| 2016 | 297 | $48( \pm 6)$ | $8( \pm 3)$ |
| 2015 | 208 | $51( \pm 7)$ | $9( \pm 4)$ |
| 2014 | 264 | $70( \pm 6)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
| 2013 | 244 | $52( \pm 6)$ | $5( \pm 3)$ |
| 2012 | 277 | $40( \pm 6)$ | $5( \pm 3)$ |
| 2011 | 234 | $51( \pm 6)$ | $4( \pm 3)$ |
| 2010 | 219 | $40( \pm 7)$ | $9( \pm 4)$ |
| 2009 | 192 | $53( \pm 7)$ | $14( \pm 5)$ |
| nedpsdgb. d22-d21, d19-d09 |  |  |  |
| * Sample was not collected |  |  |  |

Table 50. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on samples collected at Greenbo Lake from 2009-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-15.0 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality (A)\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value |  | 32.7 | 34.0 | 16.0 | 2.7 | 14 | Good | -0.311 | 26.70\% |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | Value | 10.5 | 44.0 | 38.7 | 35.3 | 4.7 | 16 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020* | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value | 3 | 25.3 | 47.7 | 9.0 | 3.3 | 14 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score |  | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value |  | 22.7 | 95.3 | 20.0 | 7.3 | 16 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 3 | 6.0 | 82.7 | 16.0 | 4.0 | 14 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score |  | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value |  | 14.7 | 76.7 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 16 | Good | -1.17 | 68.80\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value | 11.2 | 38.7 | 58.0 | 12.6 | 2.0 | 15 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 11.2 | 21.3 | 116.0 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 14 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Value | 11.2 | 3.8 | 75.3 | 8.7 | 1.3 | 12 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | Value | 11.2 | 2.0 | 64.7 | 8.7 | 2.0 | 13 | Good | -0.812 | 56.60\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Value | 10.7 | 9.5 | 58.0 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 12 | Good | - | - |
|  | Score | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | Value | 10.7 | 5.3 | 45.3 | 13.3 | 2.0 | 13 | Good | -0.597 | 45.00\% |
|  | Score | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | Value | 10.7 | 3.2 | 50.0 | 18.0 | 2.7 | 13 | Good | -0.415 | 34.00\% |
|  | Score | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |

nedpsdgb.d22-d21, d19-d09

* Sample was not collected

Table 51. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0
Largemouth Bass collected in September of 2005 to 2022 while nocturnal electrofishing at
Greenbo Lake.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { class } \end{aligned}$ | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 3.2 | 0.1 | 61.3 | 8.5 | 2.0 | 1.4 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 88.0 | 29.3 | 24.0 | 9.5 | 32.7 | 5.0 |
| 2020 | Total | 3.5 | 0.1 | 40.0 | 15.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 44.0 | 11.5 |
| 2019 |  | * |  |  |  |  |  | * |  |
| 2018 |  | * |  |  |  |  |  | 25.3 | 4.1 |
| 2017 |  | * |  |  |  |  |  | 26.7 | 5.0 |
| 2016 |  | * |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0 | 2.9 |
| 2015 | Total | 3.4 | 0.2 | 63.3 | 6.7 | 9.3 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 2.7 |
| 2014 | Total | 4.2 | 0.2 | 51.3 | 10.8 | 15.3 | 4.1 | 38.7 | 4.8 |
| 2013 | Total | 3.3 | 0.1 | 99.3 | 9.8 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 21.3 | 6.3 |
| 2012 | Total | 3.5 | <0.1 | 219.3 | 35.0 | 13.3 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 1.4 |
| 2011 | Total | 3.5 | 0.2 | 44.0 | 11.9 | 6.0 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 |
| 2010 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 40.7 | 9.2 | 8.7 | 2.6 | 9.5 | 2.8 |
| 2009 | Total | 5.1 | 0.2 | 48.0 | 6.0 | 26.0 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 0.4 |
| 2008 | Total | 3.5 | 0.1 | 82.0 | 7.6 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 1.3 |
| 2007 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 44.7 | 11.3 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| 2006 | Total | 3.6 | 0.1 | 45.3 | 9.2 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.0 |
| 2005 | Total | 3.8 | 0.1 | 32.0 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 35.6 | 5.5 |

nedbsigb.d22, d20 d15-d13, nedwrsgb.d21, d16, d12-05; nedpsdgb.d22-d21, d19-d05
nedaaggl.d21, d16, d12, d11-d05

* Sample was not collected

Table 52. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.25 hours (5-15-minute runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Lake Reba on 25 April.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 10 | 68 | 83 | 64 | 11 | 6 | 43 | 70 | 102 | 51 | 13 | 25 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 575 | 460.0 | 40.3 |
| nedpsdlr.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 53. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for various length groups of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Reba from 1995-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 188.8 | 32.0 | 176.8 | 22.4 | 71.2 | 10.3 | 23.2 | 6.6 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 460.0 | 40.3 |
| 2021 | 94.0 | 18.9 | 154.0 | 19.5 | 49.0 | 10.8 | 12.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 309.0 | 37.3 |
| 2020 | 251.0 | 34.1 | 191.0 | 24.9 | 54.0 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 500.0 | 37.0 |
| 2019 | 187.0 | 55.2 | 223.0 | 34.7 | 34.0 | 9.3 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 449.0 | 30.6 |
| 2018 | 193.0 | 45.5 | 56.0 | 8.2 | 29.0 | 6.8 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 286.0 | 28.3 |
| 2017 | 373.6 | 51.5 | 175.2 | 19.9 | 94.4 | 21.2 | 21.6 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 0.8 | 664.8 | 53.0 |
| 2016 | 108.0 | 15.8 | 102.0 | 23.7 | 41.0 | 10.0 | 13.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 264.0 | 19.5 |
| 2015 | 103.2 | 26.5 | 84.0 | 9.2 | 96.8 | 12.9 | 33.6 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 317.6 | 23.0 |
| 2014 | 56.0 | 11.0 | 144.0 | 12.4 | 95.0 | 10.8 | 75.0 | 18.1 | 7.0 | 5.7 | 370.0 | 22.7 |
| 2013 | 60.1 | 7.8 | 102.4 | 7.7 | 63.3 | 11.0 | 27.1 | 8.7 | 0.0 |  | 252.9 | 26.9 |
| 2012 | 103.3 | 16.5 | 90.7 | 9.0 | 68.0 | 8.2 | 16.7 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 278.7 | 13.5 |
| 2011 | 66.0 | 11.4 | 108.7 | 16.8 | 106.0 | 18.6 | 25.3 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 306.0 | 35.8 |
| 2010 | 67.7 | 8.1 | 118.3 | 19.4 | 57.7 | 8.0 | 6.8 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 246.0 | 26.8 |
| 2009 | 47.3 | 7.6 | 238.7 | 12.9 | 92.7 | 7.3 | 26.0 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 404.7 | 23.4 |
| 2008 | 77.3 | 18.4 | 208.0 | 28.4 | 34.0 | 6.3 | 12.7 | 2.6 | 0.0 |  | 332.0 | 47.1 |
| 2007 | 134.7 | 20.9 | 216.7 | 45.9 | 60.7 | 5.2 | 18.7 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 430.7 | 52.2 |
| 2006 | 189.3 | 18.9 | 70.7 | 13.5 | 26.0 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 292.0 | 27.1 |
| 2005 | 53.3 | 9.3 | 57.3 | 8.1 | 45.3 | 4.3 | 13.3 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 169.3 | 16.4 |
| 2004 | 30.0 | 8.9 | 125.3 | 21.5 | 51.3 | 9.2 | 6.7 | 2.2 | 0.0 |  | 213.3 | 26.0 |
| 2003 | 110.0 | 17.9 | 126.0 | 10.9 | 52.0 | 6.1 | 8.0 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 296.0 | 27.3 |
| 2002 | 138.0 | 33.6 | 140.0 | 31.3 | 31.0 | 6.6 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 314.0 | 67.0 |
| 2001 | 196.0 | 25.0 | 32.0 | 15.1 | 9.3 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 241.3 | 32.4 |
| 2000 | 104.1 | 17.3 | 35.1 | 6.6 | 4.6 | 0.6 | 8.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 |  | 151.7 | 11.3 |
| 1999 | 122.7 | 29.4 | 10.0 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 2.1 | 18.0 | 4.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 158.7 | 27.3 |
| 1998 | 76.0 | 23.7 | 10.0 | 2.6 | 23.0 | 5.5 | 21.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 130.0 | 28.5 |
| 1997 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 104.0 | 32.2 | 7.0 | 3.4 | 15.0 | 5.7 | 14.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 |  | 140.0 | 28.8 |
| 1995 | 160.0 | 52.9 | 21.0 | 7.7 | 74.0 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |  | 258.0 | 61.5 |

nedpsdlr.d22-d95

Table 54. Largemouth Bass PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values from spring electrofishing at Lake Reba from 1995 to 2022; $95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 2022 | 339 | $35( \pm 5)$ | $9( \pm 3)$ |
| 2021 | 215 | $28( \pm 1)$ | $6( \pm 3)$ |
| 2020 | 249 | $23( \pm 5)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
| 2019 | 262 | $15( \pm 4)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
| 2018 | 93 | $40( \pm 10)$ | $9( \pm 6)$ |
| 2017 | 364 | $40( \pm 5)$ | $7( \pm 3)$ |
| 2016 | 156 | $35( \pm 7)$ | $8( \pm 4)$ |
| 2015 | 268 | $61( \pm 6)$ | $16( \pm 4)$ |
| 2014 | 314 | $54( \pm 6)$ | $24( \pm 5)$ |
| 2013 | 243 | $47( \pm 6)$ | $14( \pm 4)$ |
| 2012 | 263 | $48( \pm 6)$ | $10( \pm 4)$ |
| 2011 | 360 | $55( \pm 5)$ | $11( \pm 3)$ |
| 2010 | 270 | $35( \pm 6)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
| 2009 | 536 | $33( \pm 4)$ | $7( \pm 2)$ |
| 2008 | 382 | $18( \pm 4)$ | $5( \pm 2)$ |
| 2007 | 444 | $27( \pm 4)$ | $6( \pm 2)$ |
| 2006 | 154 | $31( \pm 7)$ | $6( \pm 4)$ |
| 2005 | 174 | $51( \pm 7)$ | $11( \pm 5)$ |
| 2004 | 275 | $32( \pm 6)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
| 2003 | 279 | $32( \pm 5)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
| 2002 | 176 | $20( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| 2001 | 33 | $30( \pm 16)$ | $9( \pm 10)$ |
| 2000 | 43 | $28( \pm 14)$ | $19( \pm 12)$ |
| 1999 | 98 | $72( \pm 12)$ | $50( \pm 13)$ |
| 1998 | 26 | $81( \pm 10)$ | $39( \pm 13)$ |
| $1997^{*}$ |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 54 | $96( \pm 8)$ | $62( \pm 19)$ |
| 1995 | 54 | $79( \pm 8)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
| nedpsdlr.d22 - d98, d96-d95 |  |  |  |
| $*$ Sample was not collected |  |  |  |

Table 55. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on samples collected at Lake Reba from 2007-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-15.0 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating | Instantaneous mortality (z) | Annual mortality (A)\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Value |  | 71.2 | 23.2 | 1.6 | 189.6 | 18 | Excellent | -1.037 | 64.60\% |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | Value |  | 49.0 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 83.0 | 17 | Excellent |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | Value | 11.6 | 54.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 234.0 | 15 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | Value | 3 | 34.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 162.0 | 12 | Fair |  |  |
|  | Score |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | Value | 3 | 29.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 184.0 | 13 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Value | 3 | 94.4 | 21.6 | 4.8 | 321.6 | 18 | Excellent |  |  |
|  | Score |  | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Value |  | 41.0 | 13.0 | 2.0 | 101.0 | 15 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Value | 11.0 | 96.8 | 33.6 | 4.0 | 72.8 | 19 | Excellent | -0.464 | 37.10\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Value | 3 | 95.0 | 75.0 | 7.0 | 50.0 | 18 | Excellent |  |  |
|  | Score |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Value | 3 | 63.3 | 27.1 | 0.0 | 28.4 | 15 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score |  | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | Value | 3 | 68.0 | 16.7 | 1.3 | 76.0 | 16 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Value |  | 106.0 | 25.3 | 2.0 | 52.7 | 16 | Good |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | Value | 11.4 | 57.7 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 47.1 | 14 | Good | -1.019 | 63.90\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | Value |  | 92.7 | 26.0 | 0.7 | 65.3 | 16 | Good | -0.162 | 15.00\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | Value |  | 34.0 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 113.0 | 13 | Good | -1.030 | 64.30\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | Value |  | 60.7 | 18.7 | 0.7 | 183.7 | 16 | Good | -1.040 | 65.00\% |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |

Table 56. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.0 hour (4-15-minute runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Lake Reba on 03 October.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 14 | 57 | 34 | 12 | 6 | 23 | 48 | 35 | 22 | 17 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 304 | 304.0 | 38.3 | nedwrslr.d22

Table 57. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass captured at Lake Reba from 1994 to 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Overall |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $8.0-11.9$ in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | W ${ }_{\text {r }}$ |
| 2022 | 121 | 92 (7) | 28 | 91 (2) | 8 | 94 (2) | 157 | 92 (5) |
| 2021* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 220 | 89 (1) | 57 | 88 (1) | 5 | 99 (2) | 282 | 89 (1) |
| 2016* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 216 | 91 (1) | 62 | 89 (1) | 7 | 91 (4) | 285 | 91 (1) |
| 2014* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 114 | 93 (1) | 80 | 89 (1) | 16 | 94 (2) | 210 | 92 (1) |
| 2010 | 191 | 90 (3) | 116 | 86 (1) | 12 | 86 (7) | 319 | 89 (2) |
| 2009 | 91 | 86 (1) | 31 | 84 (1) | 2 | 88 (11) | 124 | 85 (1) |
| 2008 | 219 | 84 (1) | 32 | 86 (1) | 1 | 81 | 252 | 84 (1) |
| 2007 | 142 | 91 (5) | 17 | 83 (2) | 8 | 93 (3) | 167 | 90 (5) |
| 2006 | 243 | 91 (1) | 75 | 93 (1) | 18 | 101 (2) | 336 | 92 (0) |
| 2005 | 134 | 90 (1) | 27 | 90 (3) | 9 | 92 (3) | 170 | 90 (1) |
| 2004 | 186 | 87 (1) | 73 | 90 (1) | 10 | 95 (2) | 269 | 88 (0) |
| 2003 | 65 | 85 (1) | 28 | 87 (2) | 2 | 83 (3) | 95 | 86 (1) |
| 2002 | 67 | 92 (2) | 12 | 87 (3) | 1 | 93 | 80 | 91 (1) |
| 2001 | 92 | 94 (1) | 53 | 92 (1) | 12 | 99 (2) | 157 | 93 (1) |
| 2000 | 60 | 97 (1) | 13 | 95 (3) | 9 | 98 (3) | 82 | 97 (1) |
| 1999 | 56 | 90 (1) | 6 | 92 (3) | 3 | 96 (4) | 65 | 91 (1) |
| 1998 | 9 | 93 (3) | 3 | 94 (5) | 3 | 103 (5) | 15 | 95 (2) |
| 1997 | 25 | 94 (2) | 6 | 98 (1) | 9 | 101 (2) | 40 | 96 (1) |
| 1996* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 12 | 99 (3) | 27 | 99 (3) | 10 | 107 (3) | 49 | 101 (2) |
| 1994 | 37 | 92 (2) | 56 | 95 (1) | 3 | 104 (6) | 96 | 95 (1) |

nedwrslr.d22, d20, d15, d11-d97, d95-d94

* Sample was not collected

Table 58. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass while diurnal electrofishing at Lake Reba from 2003 to 2022.

| Year <br> class |  | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 120.0 | 28.8 | 15.0 | 5.3 |  |  |
| 2021 | Total | 4.3 | <0.1 | 371.0 | 54.2 | 70.0 | 19.2 | 189.6 | 31.9 |
| 2020 | Total | 4.6 | 0.1 | 122.0 | 24.5 | 34.0 | 11.1 | 83.0 | 15.6 |
| 2019 | Total | 4.8 | 0.1 | 373.0 | 28.7 | 153.0 | 22.0 | 234.0 | 41.3 |
| 2018 | Total | 4.8 | <0.1 | 318.0 | 43.0 | 126.0 | 27.4 | 162.0 | 46.7 |
| 2017 | Total | 4.8 | 0.1 | 501.3 | 123.3 | 196.0 | 34.2 | 184.0 | 42.3 |
| 2016 | Total | 5.1 | 0.1 | 490.0 | 43.9 | 279.0 | 8.1 | 321.6 | 48.5 |
| 2015 | Total | 4.5 | 0.6 | 116.0 | 34.5 | 35.2 | 10.2 | 101.0 | 15.2 |
| 2014 | Total | 4.1 | 0.1 | 375.0 | 29.6 | 74.0 | 16.5 | 100.0 | 27.3 |
| 2013 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 16.4 | 12.0 | 4.4 | 50.0 | 8.9 |
| 2012 | Total | 4.5 | 0.1 | 129.1 | 16.8 | 37.2 | 6.0 | 54.6 | 9.4 |
| 2011 | Total | 4.4 | <0.1 | 334.9 | 44.8 | 84.4 | 19.5 | 76.0 | 14.9 |
| 2010 | Total | 3.9 | 0.1 | 58.7 | 18.9 | 10.7 | 4.8 | 57.3 | 10.5 |
| 2009 | Total | 4.0 | 0.1 | 58.7 | 15.6 | 11.3 | 8.1 | 47.1 | 7.0 |
| 2008 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 58.7 | 15.6 | 11.3 | 8.1 | 65.3 | 7.1 |
| 2007 | Total | 4.3 | 0.1 | 44.0 | 11.2 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 113.0 | 27.2 |
| 2006 | Total | 4.3 | <0.1 | 175.3 | 35.9 | 30.0 | 8.7 | 183.7 | 22.1 |
| 2005 | Total | 5.2 | 0.1 | 225.0 | 48.6 | 133.0 | 30.2 | 192.0 | 19.5 |
| 2004 | Total | 4.2 | 0.1 | 76.7 | 9.6 | 15.3 | 1.9 | 61.0 | 10.4 |
| 2003 | Total | 3.7 | 0.2 | 23.3 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 47.3 | 14.0 |

nedwrslr.d22, nedpsdlr.d22

Table 59. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) for Largemouth Bass collected in 0.75 hours of diurnal electrofishing (3-15-minute runs) at Smoky Valley Lake (Carter Co.) on 02 May.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 17 | 8 | 15 | 27 | 17 | 8 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 150 | 200.0 | 19.7 | nedpsdsv.d22

Table 60. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for various length groups of Largemouth Bass collected at Smoky Valley Lake from 1990-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 72.0 | 16.2 | 89.3 | 4.8 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 200.0 | 19.7 |
| 2021 | 70.7 | 31.4 | 97.3 | 15.0 | 33.3 | 16.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 202.7 | 62.2 |
| 2020 | 73.3 | 9.3 | 98.7 | 24.9 | 29.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 202.7 | 21.5 |
| 2019 | 134.7 | 43.7 | 106.7 | 32.7 | 37.3 | 16.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 284.0 | 66.1 |
| 2018 | 127.7 | 30.1 | 178.7 | 28.2 | 36.0 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 |  | 341.3 | 59.3 |
| 2017* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 110.6 | 29.5 | 125.2 | 21.1 | 18.1 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 256.0 | 52.8 |
| 2015 | 46.1 | 14.3 | 86.4 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 147.9 | 26.5 |
| 2014 | 71.1 | 16.6 | 177.4 | 28.8 | 24.4 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 273.9 | 42.6 |
| 2013 | 100.9 | 8.5 | 109.8 | 11.5 | 8.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 221.6 | 6.5 |
| 2012 | 112.1 | 21.8 | 98.9 | 22.3 | 12.8 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 224.7 | 41.4 |
| 2011 | 150.0 | 34.0 | 69.0 | 8.7 | 10.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 229.5 | 31.8 |
| 2010 | 47.7 | 9.3 | 65.9 | 7.8 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 117.9 | 15.3 |
| 2009 | 97.0 | 6.6 | 145.0 | 23.7 | 14.0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 383.0 | 153.4 |
| 2008 | 155.0 | 23.3 | 199.0 | 34.4 | 46.0 | 7.8 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 607.0 | 260.2 |
| 2007 | 119.0 | 21.8 | 229.0 | 32.5 | 37.0 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 573.0 | 223.4 |
| 2006 | 112.0 | 12.8 | 256.0 | 33.8 | 62.0 | 8.7 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 633.5 | 234.4 |
| 2005 | 54.4 | 10.2 | 190.4 | 22.7 | 63.2 | 9.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 |  | 397.6 | 90.9 |
| 2004* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 117.3 | 11.6 | 180.0 | 14.1 | 46.7 | 12.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 346.7 | 11.6 |
| 2000 | 68.0 | 13.0 | 218.0 | 22.1 | 69.0 | 13.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 356.0 | 46.8 |
| 1999* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 135.0 | 32.2 | 132.0 | 25.5 | 75.0 | 15.1 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  | 546.0 | 264.9 |
| 1997 | 46.0 | 8.9 | 63.0 | 6.0 | 39.0 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |  | 151.0 | 3.8 |
| 1996 | 30.0 | 5.8 | 77.0 | 11.5 | 50.0 | 7.8 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |  | 160.0 | 14.3 |
| 1995 | 41.0 | 14.4 | 104.0 | 21.9 | 84.0 | 17.7 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 231.0 | 43.7 |
| 1994 | 72.0 | 5.9 | 104.0 | 14.5 | 94.0 | 10.5 | 7.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 277.0 | 13.2 |
| 1993 | 34.7 | 18.3 | 58.7 | 28.6 | 24.7 | 13.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |  | 122.0 | 63.1 |
| 1992 | 43.4 | 8.9 | 96.1 | 10.9 | 94.0 | 6.8. | 7.3 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 261.0 | 36.8 |
| 1991 | 18.0 | 2.6 | 129.0 | 17.1 | 18.0 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 171.0 | 16.9 |
| 1990 | 58.7 | 9.7 | 109.2 | 21.8 | 34.1 | 1.2 | 18.6 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 352.0 | 158.0 |

nedpsdsv.d22-d18, d16-d05, d01-d00, d98-d90

* Sample was not collected

Table 61. Largemouth Bass PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values from spring electrofishing at Smoky Valley Lake from 1990 to 2022;
95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 96 | $30( \pm 9)$ | $1( \pm 3)$ |
| 2021 | 99 | $26( \pm 9)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2020 | 97 | $24( \pm 9)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2019 | 112 | $29( \pm 8)$ | $4( \pm 3)$ |
| 2018 | 164 | $18( \pm 6)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
| 2017* |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 137 | $14( \pm 6)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2015 | 91 | $15( \pm 7)$ | $2( \pm 3)$ |
| 2014 | 156 | $12( \pm 5)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 2013 | 105 | $10( \pm 6)$ | $2( \pm 3)$ |
| 2012 | 101 | $13( \pm 7)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2011 | 70 | $14( \pm 8)$ |  |
| 2010 | 67 | $6( \pm 6)$ | $1( \pm 3)$ |
| 2009 | 160 | $9( \pm 5)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 2008 | 245 | $19( \pm 5)$ | $\pm 0$ ) |
| 2007 | 268 | $15( \pm 4)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 2006 | 322 | $20( \pm 4)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 2005 | 318 | $25( \pm 5)$ | $0( \pm 1)$ |
| 2004* |  |  |  |
| 2003* |  |  |  |
| 2002* |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 172 | $22( \pm 6)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2000 | 288 | $24( \pm 5)$ | $0( \pm 1)$ |
| 1999* |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 210 | $37( \pm 7)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 1997 | 105 | $40( \pm 9)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
| 1996 | 130 | $41( \pm 8)$ | $2( \pm 3)$ |
| 1995 | 190 | $45( \pm 7)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 1994 | 205 | 49 ( $\pm 7$ ) | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| 1993 | 131 | $33( \pm 8)$ | $5( \pm 4)$ |
| 1992 | 213 | $51( \pm 7)$ | $4( \pm 3)$ |
| 1991 | 153 | 16 ( $\pm 6)$ | $4( \pm 3)$ |
| 1990 | 194 | $30( \pm 6)$ | $11( \pm 4)$ |
| nedpsdsv.d22-d18, d16-d05, d01-d00, d98-d90 |  |  |  |

Table 62. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on samples collected at Smoky Valley Lake from 2007-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

nedpsdsv.d22-d18, d16-d05, d01-d00, d98-d90

* Sample was not collected

Table 63. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) for Largemouth Bass collected in 0.75 hours of diurnal electrofishing (3-15-minute runs) at Smoky Valley Lake (Carter Co.) on 17 October, 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 11 | 16 | 7 |  | 5 | 24 | 20 | 16 | 25 | 19 | 7 | 1 |  | 1 | 152 | 202.7 | 58.5 |
| nedpsdsv.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 64. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass captured at Smoky Valley Lake from 1990 to 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Overall |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| 2022 | 84 | 83 (1) | 27 | 81 (1) | 1 | 94 | 112 | 83 (1) |
| 2001* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 65 | 84 (1) | 35 | 84 (1) | 2 | 92 (9) | 102 | 84 (1) |
| 2019* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 123 | 84 (1) | 24 | 84 (1) | 6 | 87 (3) | 153 | 84 (1) |
| 2017* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 79 | 79 (1) | 24 | 73 (2) | 1 | 79 | 104 | 77 (1) |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 | 117 | 87 (1) | 23 | 78 (3) | 1 | 81 | 141 | 85 (1) |
| 2010 | 90 | 81 (1) | 12 | 82 (2) |  |  | 102 | 81 (1) |
| 2009 | 80 | 83 (1) | 9 | 86 (2) | 1 | 89 | 90 | 83 (1) |
| 2008 | 104 | 83 (1) | 20 | 81 (1) |  |  | 124 | 82 (1) |
| 2007 | 99 | 85 (1) | 10 | 87 (3) |  |  | 109 | 85 (1) |
| 2006* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 108 | 85 (1) | 43 | 84 (1) |  |  | 151 | 85 (1) |
| 2003* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 111 | 83 (0) | 25 | 83 (1) |  |  | 136 | 83 (0) |
| 2001 | 129 | 83 (1) | 27 | 84 (1) |  |  | 156 | 83 (0) |
| 2000 | 70 | 82 (1) | 32 | 83 (2) | 1 | 88 | 103 | 82 (1) |
| 1999* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 92 | 91 (1) | 37 | 87 (1) | 1 | 85 | 130 | 90 (1) |
| 1997* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 93 | 87 (1) | 34 | 81 (1) | 5 | 79 (5) | 132 | 85 (1) |
| 1995* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 57 | 86 (1) | 40 | 82 (1) | 4 | 84 (7) | 101 | 84 (1) |
| 1993 | 81 | 91 (2) | 67 | 86 (1) | 5 | 93 (1) | 153 | 89 (1) |
| 1992 | 83 | 87 (1) | 54 | 81 (1) | 3 | 72 (8) | 140 | 85 (1) |
| 1991 | 85 | 86 (1) | 58 | 81 (1) | 5 | 76 (3) | 148 | 84 (1) |
| 1990 | 150 | 89 (1) | 33 | 85 (1) | 11 | 92 (2) | 194 | 88 (0) |

Table 65. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in 1.5 hours (6-15-minute runs) of diurnal electrofishing at Lake Wilgreen on 22 April.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 4 | 17 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 26 | 17 | 8 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 22 | 15 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 278 | 185.3 | 17.4 |
| nedpsdlw.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 66. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for various length groups of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Wilgreen from 1991-2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 56.0 | 10.3 | 47.3 | 5.2 | 28.0 | 6.3 | 54.0 | 7.1 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 185.3 | 17.4 |
| 2021* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 20.0 | 4.5 | 40.0 | 8.8 | 21.3 | 4.1 | 42.0 | 5.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 123.3 | 10.3 |
| 2018* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 68.7 | 12.9 | 91.3 | 10.2 | 80.0 | 7.0 | 164.0 | 12.8 | 6.7 | 1.7 | 404.0 | 26.8 |
| 2015* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 18.7 | 2.5 | 71.3 | 7.1 | 49.3 | 9.7 | 117.3 | 12.0 | 8.7 | 1.9 | 256.7 | 21.0 |
| 2013* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 58.0 | 13.1 | 118.0 | 11.0 | 46.7 | 10.2 | 78.7 | 8.2 | 10.7 | 2.2 | 301.3 | 25.1 |
| 2011 | 84.0 | 18.0 | 66.0 | 12.9 | 25.3 | 4.1 | 42.0 | 4.7 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 217.3 | 31.2 |
| 2010 | 42.7 | 5.7 | 79.3 | 14.4 | 53.3 | 6.5 | 51.3 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 226.7 | 21.7 |
| 2009 | 19.3 | 5.6 | 76.0 | 14.2 | 52.0 | 12.0 | 50.0 | 9.5 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 197.3 | 26.5 |
| 2008 | 8.7 | 1.9 | 24.7 | 5.9 | 18.7 | 3.8 | 10.7 | 3.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 62.7 | 9.0 |
| 2007 | 238.7 | 25.9 | 194.7 | 16.1 | 115.3 | 15.0 | 18.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 567.3 | 30.6 |
| 2006 | 56.7 | 9.9 | 195.3 | 8.6 | 148.0 | 15.8 | 22.0 | 5.8 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 422.0 | 29.1 |
| 2005 | 86.7 | 17.9 | 12.0 | 12.8 | 108.7 | 23.0 | 6.0 | 2.7 |  |  | 371.3 | 45.3 |
| 2004* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 89.2 | 11.1 | 376.8 | 41.0 | 48.0 | 6.3 | 12.8 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 526.8 | 50.2 |
| 2002* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 361.0 | 51.0 | 274.0 | 10.6 | 58.0 | 12.3 | 6.0 | 1.2 |  |  | 699.0 | 57.0 |
| 1999 | 152.0 | 6.3 | 235.0 | 29.6 | 43.0 | 11.8 | 8.0 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 438.0 | 42.9 |
| 1998* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1997* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 149.0 | 47.8 | 247.0 | 24.8 | 90.0 | 19.8 | 15.0 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 601.0 | 73.0 |
| 1995 | 77.0 | 22.7 | 382.0 | 45.3 | 42.0 | 9.3 | 10.0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 511.0 | 71.6 |
| 1994 | 298.0 | 79.5 | 427.0 | 50.1 | 46.0 | 7.4 | 24.0 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 795.0 | 122.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 244.0 | 42.4 | 100.0 | 22.3 | 70.7 | 14.1 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 426.7 | 64.1 |
| 1991 | 72.0 | 6.1 | 206.7 | 16.7 | 58.7 | 5.8 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 342.7 | 18.7 |

nedpsdlw.d22, d18, d16, d14, d12-d05, d03, d00-d99, d96-d94, d92-d91

* Sample was not collected

Table 67. Largemouth Bass PSD and RSD $_{15}$ values from spring electrofishing at Lake Wilgreen from 1991 to 2022;
$95 \%$ confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 194 | $63( \pm 7)$ | $42( \pm 7)$ |
| 2021* |  |  |  |
| 2020* |  |  |  |
| 2019* |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 155 | $61( \pm 8)$ | $41( \pm 8)$ |
| 2017* |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 503 | $73( \pm 4)$ | $49( \pm 4)$ |
| 2015* |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 357 | $70( \pm 5)$ | $49( \pm 5)$ |
| 2013* |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 365 | $52( \pm 5)$ | $32( \pm 5)$ |
| 2011 | 200 | $51( \pm 7)$ | $32( \pm 6)$ |
| 2010 | 276 | $57( \pm 6)$ | 28 ( $\pm 5)$ |
| 2009 | 267 | $57( \pm 6)$ | $28( \pm 5)$ |
| 2008 | 81 | $54( \pm 11)$ | $20( \pm 9)$ |
| 2007 | 493 | $41( \pm 4)$ | 6 ( $\pm 2)$ |
| 2006 | 548 | $47( \pm 4)$ | $6( \pm 2)$ |
| 2005 | 427 | $40( \pm 5)$ | $2( \pm 1)$ |
| 2004** |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 1094 | $14( \pm 2)$ | $3( \pm 1)$ |
| 2002* |  |  |  |
| 2001* |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 338 | $19( \pm 4)$ | $2( \pm 1)$ |
| 1999 | 286 | $18( \pm 4)$ | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| 1998* |  |  |  |
| 1997* |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 352 | $30( \pm 5)$ | $4( \pm 2)$ |
| 1995 | 434 | $12( \pm 3)$ | $2( \pm 1)$ |
| 1994 | 497 | $14( \pm 3)$ | $5( \pm 2)$ |
| 1993** |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 137 | $45( \pm 8)$ | $7( \pm 4)$ |
| 1991 | 203 | $24( \pm 6)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
| nedpsdlw.d22, d18, d16, d14, d12-d05, d03, d00-d99, d96-d94, d92-d91 <br> * Sample was not collected |  |  |  |

Table 68. Population assessment of Largemouth Bass based on samples collected at Lake Wilgreen from 2006-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

nedpsdlw.d22, d18, d16, d14, d12-d05, d03, d00-d99, d96-d94, d92-d91

* Sample was not collected


# SOUTHEASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

Project 1: Lake and Tailwater Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

Conditions encountered during sampling at southeastern district lakes are listed in Table 1.

## Lake Cumberland (50,250 acres)

Lake levels in Lake Cumberland rose to 705 msl in 2013 and 723 msl in 2014 with the completion of repairs to Wolf Creek Dam. Sampling completed after 2013 was conducted in areas that were sampled prior to 2007. Samples from 2007-2012 were conducted in areas farther downstream in the embayments due to reduced water levels during dam repairs; therefore, any comparisons of the 2007-2012 data should be interpreted accordingly.

## Black Bass Sampling (Spring)

Diurnal electrofishing studies were conducted at Wolf Creek dam, Faubush Creek, Fishing Creek, and Lily Creek embayments of Lake Cumberland during May 2022 to assess the black bass populations. The length-frequency and catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) of the black bass species collected in each area is shown in Table 2, and the catch-perhour (by area and length group) of the three black bass species are shown in Tables 3-6. Spotted Bass (51\%) comprised the majority of the black bass population in Lake Cumberland, and Largemouth Bass made up an additional $44 \%$ of the black bass population. Catch rates of Largemouth Bass in 2022 were slightly lower than rates observed in 2021; however, overall catch rates remain above the 10 -year average ( 51.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ). Catch rates of Largemouth Bass $\geq 15.0$ in declined for the second consecutive year, but good numbers of fish in the smaller size classes should bolster the population going forward. Catch rates for Spotted Bass continue to increase, and with increasing catch rates of Spotted Bass $\leq 14.0$ in, the population should remain strong over the next several years. Overall catch rates for Smallmouth Bass declined for the second year, with the biggest decline being observed in fish $\geq 14.0$ in. Catch rates for Smallmouth Bass $\leq 11.0$ in are better than average, which will help boost the population going forward. Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of black bass in Lake Cumberland to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022.

Largemouth Bass catch rates greatly exceeded three of the four CPUE management objectives, with only the catch rate of fish $\geq 20.0$ in failing to meet the objective (Assessment rating=Good; Table 8). Spotted Bass greatly exceeded two of the three catch rate management objectives, with only the CPUE of age- 1 fish failing to meet the objective (Assessment rating=Excellent; Table 9). The Smallmouth Bass population did not meet any of the CPUE management objectives (Assessment rating=Fair; Table 10).

Largemouth Bass exhibited excellent size structure, with a PSD value of $78\left(\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=48\right.$; Table 11$)$. Spotted bass had a good size distribution with a PSD of $56\left(\operatorname{RSD}_{14}=11\right.$; Table 11). Smallmouth Bass had a moderate size structure $\left(\mathrm{PSD}=36, \mathrm{RSD}_{14}=26\right.$; Table 11). Table 12 compares the size structure of black bass populations in Lake Cumberland to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022.

## Black Bass Sampling (Fall)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted in the Fishing Creek embayment on 28 September 2022 to index Largemouth Bass year class strength (Tables 13 and 14). Catch rates of age-0 Largemouth Bass in 2022 were more than double the rates that were observed in 2021 (Table 14). Table 15 compares the CPUE of age-0 Largemouth Bass in Lake Cumberland to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass and Spotted Bass collected during the September sampling are shown in Table 16. Table 17 compares Wr values for black bass in Lake Cumberland to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022.

## Walleye and White Bass Sampling

Gill nets were used in November 2022 to evaluate the Walleye and White Bass populations in the

Jamestown/Bugwood, Conley Bottom, and Waitsboro/Burnside areas of Lake Cumberland. A total of 197 Walleye were captured in 30 net-nights for a catch rate of 6.6 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$. Length frequency and CPUE of Walleye is shown in Table 18. Walleye ranged from 9.0-23.0 in, with the mode being the 16.0 -in class ( 39 fish). None of the catch rate management objectives for Walleye were met during the 2022 sampling (Table 19). Mean length of age 2+ Walleye at capture ( 18.8 in ) met the growth objective of 18.0 in (Table 19). Age-growth data for male and female Walleye are shown in Tables 20 and 21, respectively. The age-growth for both sexes combined is shown in Table 22. Eight year classes were represented in the catch, with the 2021 year class (age $1 ; 38 \%$ ) and 2020 year class (age 2;36\%) comprising the majority of the Walleye population (Table 23). The Walleye assessment score was 12 (rating=Good; Table 24). Relative weight (Wr) values for Walleye are shown in Table 25. The Walleye population in Lake Cumberland is in a rebuilding phase following a fish die-off in 2019, and with consistent stockings, the population should continue to improve over time.

A total of 5 White Bass were captured in 30 net-nights for a catch rate of 0.2 fish/nn. Length frequency and CPUE of White Bass is shown in Table 18. White Bass ranged from 11.0-14.0 in. Due to the low number of fish collected, additional age-growth analyses were not performed. Relative weight (Wr) values for White Bass are in Table 25.

Striped Bass were also recorded during Walleye gill netting. Thirty net-nights captured 157 Striped Bass for a catch rate of 5.2 fish $/ \mathrm{nn}$. Length-frequency and CPUE of Striped Bass are shown in Table 18. Striped Bass ranged from 7.0 to 30.0 in with the mode being the 17.0-in class ( 25 fish). The age-growth data for Striped Bass collected during 2022 is shown in Table 26. Six year-classes were represented in the catch, with the 2021 (age 1) year class being the most abundant ( $52 \%$; Table 27). Increased numbers of Striped Bass stocked the last few years is helping to rebuild the population following poor year classes in 2018 and 2019. Relative weight (Wr) values for Striped Bass are listed in Table 25. Relative weight values for 12.0- to 19.9-in Striped Bass have been lower than average the last few years, so we will continue to monitor the population to determine if changes in stocking rates are needed.

## Cumberland Tailwater

## Trout Sampling (Fall)

Nocturnal electrofishing sampling was conducted November 6 and 72022 to assess the trout population in the Lake Cumberland tailwater. Electrofishing was completed in seven different areas of the tailwater. Table 28 has the length-frequency and CPUE for the four trout species that were collected in each area. Cutthroat Trout, which were first introduced in March 2019, were observed at three locations during the fall sampling, and five Brook Trout were observed during sampling. Catch rates of Rainbow Trout increased in the $<15.0$-in and $18.0-$ to 19.9 -in groups during 2022 (Table 29). Brown Trout catch rates for fish < 15.0 in showed a marked improvement in 2022; however, population numbers remain well below the historic average of 65.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 30). Relative weight (Wr) values for each trout species are shown in Table 31. Relative weights for Rainbow Trout declined for the second consecutive year, and Brown Trout relative weights during 2022 were consistent with the previous two years of sampling.

## Laurel River Lake (6,060 acres)

## Black Bass Sampling (Spring)

Electrofishing sampling was conducted during May 2022 to assess the black bass population in Laurel River Lake. Electrofishing was conducted in four areas of the lake including the dam, Spruce Creek, the upper Laurel River arm, and upper Craigs Creek. Length-frequency and CPUE of the three black bass species collected in each area is shown in Table 32. The catch-per-hour (by area and length group) of the three black bass species are shown in Tables 33-36. Largemouth Bass ( $62 \%$ ) comprised the majority of the black bass population in Laurel River Lake. Spring catch rates for all three species of black bass in Laurel River Lake were lower in 2022 compared to 2021. Largemouth Bass catch rates for fish $\geq 15.0$ in and $\geq 20.0$ in increased in 2022 but catch rates for smaller fish declined during the spring sampling. Although overall Spotted Bass catch rates were lower in 2022, increases in catch rates of fish $\geq 15.0$ in were observed. In addition, Spotted Bass $\geq 17.0$ in were collected during sampling. Smallmouth Bass overall catch rates were slightly lower in 2022; however, catch rates of fish $\leq 14.0$ in increased,
which should help the population going forward. Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of black bass in Laurel River Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in spring 2022.

The Largemouth Bass population met two of the four catch rate objectives, with the CPUE of Largemouth Bass $\geq 20.0$ in ( 0.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) and the CPUE of age- 1 fish ( $4.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) failing to meet the objectives (Assessment rating=Good; Table 37). Spotted Bass met two of the three catch rate management objectives, with the catch rate of age-1 fish failing to meet the objective (Assessment rating=Fair; Table 38). The Smallmouth Bass population met two of the three catch rate management objectives, with the catch rate of age- 1 fish failing to the meet the objective (Assessment rating=Good; Table 39).

Size structure values were excellent for Largemouth Bass ( $\mathrm{PSD}=82, \mathrm{RSD}_{15}=31$ ) and Smallmouth Bass PSD=66, $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}=25$; Table 40). Spotted Bass exhibited good size structure with a PSD of 50 and an $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ of 8 (Table 40). Table 12 compares the size structure values of black bass populations in Laurel River Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022.

## Black Bass Sampling (Fall)

Nocturnal electrofishing was conducted in the Laurel River arm on 29 September 2022 to index Largemouth Bass year class strength (Tables 41 and 42). Age-0 catch rates in 2022 were lower than rates observed in 2021, and as a result, age-0 Largemouth Bass were stocked in Laurel River Lake to help bolster the 2022 year class (Table 42). Table 15 compares the CPUE of age-0 Largemouth Bass in Laurel River Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022. Relative weight (Wr) values for black bass collected during September sampling are shown in Table 43. Relative weight values for Largemouth Bass ranged from 93-97 across the size classes, and Spotted Bass relative weights were 106-111. Table 17 compares Wr values for black bass in Laurel River Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022.

## Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres)

## Black Bass Sampling (Spring)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 12 May 2022 to assess the Largemouth Bass population in Cedar Creek Lake. The length-frequency and CPUE of Largemouth Bass is shown in Table 44. Size structure of Largemouth Bass was excellent ( $\mathrm{PSD}=77$, $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=63$; Table 45). Table 12 compares the size structure values of the Largemouth Bass population in Cedar Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. The catch-per-hour (by length group) of Largemouth Bass from 2013-2022 is shown in Table 46. Although overall catch rates of Largemouth Bass in Cedar Creek Lake decreased for the third consecutive year, catch rates of bass $\geq 20.0$ in increased in 2022 (Table 46). Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of Largemouth Bass in Cedar Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. Three of the four CPUE management objectives were exceeded for the Largemouth Bass population, with the CPUE of bass 12.0-14.9 in ( $16.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) failing to meet the objective of $20.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Assessment rating=Good; Table 47).

## Black Bass Sampling (Fall)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 26 September 2022 to index the Largemouth Bass year-class strength (Tables 48 and 49). Catch rates of age-0 Largemouth Bass in 2022 were the highest observed in the last 10 years (Table 49). Table 15 compares the CPUE of age-0 Largemouth Bass in Cedar Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass are found in Table 50. Although relative weights are good for bass $\geq 12.0$ in, we would like to see improvements in the fish <12.0 in. Table 17 compares Wr values for Largemouth Bass in Cedar Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022.

## Bluegill/Redear Sunfish Sampling

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 18 May 2022 to assess the Bluegill and Redear Sunfish populations in Cedar Creek Lake. The length-frequency and CPUE of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish is shown in Table 51. The catch-per-hour (by length group) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish is shown in Table 52. Bluegill catch rates
increased in 2022, and fish up to 8.0 in were collected during sampling. The Redear Sunfish catch rate remained consistent from 2021, and the catch rate of fish $\leq 6.0$ in also increased, which should help bolster the population in the coming years. PSD and RSD values for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish are shown in Table 53. The Bluegill population exhibited a poor size structure $\left(\mathrm{PSD}=6, \mathrm{RSD}_{8}=0\right.$; Table 53). The Redear Sunfish population exhibited a good size structure $\left(\mathrm{PSD}=40, \mathrm{RSD}_{9}=3\right.$; Table 53).

## $\underline{2022 \text { Daytime Creel Survey }}$

A roving daytime creel survey was conducted on Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres) from 1 April-29 October 2022. Results from the creel survey are shown in Tables 54-61. Anglers made an estimated 14,226 fishing trips and expended 74,335 hours ( 94.82 man-hours/acre) during the survey period. Angler pressure decreased dramatically from the last survey in 2009 (Table 54). Black bass anglers accounted for $74 \%$ of all fishing trips to the lake, followed by crappie ( $9 \%$ ) and panfish ( $9 \%$ ) anglers (Table 55). Table 56 shows the number of fish harvested and released by anglers on Cedar Creek Lake. Anglers harvested approximately $2 \%$ of the legal ( $\geq 20.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) Largemouth Bass that were caught.

## Cedar Creek Angler Attitude Survey

An angler attitude survey was conducted in conjunction with the creel survey to gather angler opinions about the various fisheries in Cedar Creek Lake (Figure 1). A total of 425 anglers were interviewed. Nearly $50 \%$ percent of the anglers interviewed fish Cedar Creek Lake ten or more times per year. Anglers identified bass as the species they fished for most ( $78 \%$ ), followed by crappie (11\%), and Bluegill (8\%). Eighty-six percent of the bass anglers were satisfied with the bass fishery in the lake, with the number of fish being the number one reason for angler dissatisfaction, followed by anglers feeling there are too many anglers (32\%).

Crappie angler satisfaction (68\%) increased from 2009 when only $39 \%$ of the crappie anglers were satisfied. Of those crappie anglers who were dissatisfied, $76 \%$ reported size of fish as the reason for their dissatisfaction.

Panfish anglers were generally satisfied with the fishing at Cedar Creek Lake. Nearly $84 \%$ of the Bluegill anglers were satisfied with the Bluegill fishing, and the size of fish was the main reason for angler dissatisfaction. Eightythree percent of the Redear Sunfish anglers were satisfied with the Redear Sunfish fishery, and the number of fish and size of fish were listed as the reasons for angler dissatisfaction.

Seventy percent of the Channel Catfish anglers were satisfied with the Channel Catfish fishery in the lake. The most common response for angler dissatisfaction was the number of fish.

Eighty-five percent of the anglers are satisfied with the current fishing regulations on the lake. In addition, anglers who fished Cedar Creek Lake were split in their opinion on the amount of vegetation in the lake. Fifty-one percent of anglers responded there was too much vegetation and $48 \%$ responded the amount of vegetation was just right.

## Bert T. Combs Lake (36 acres)

## Largemouth Bass Sampling (Spring)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 27 April 2022 at Bert T. Combs Lake to assess the Largemouth Bass population. Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of Largemouth Bass in Bert T. Combs Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. The size structure values of the Largemouth Bass population in Bert T. Combs Lake and other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022 are compared in Table 12. Length frequency and CPUE for Largemouth Bass is shown in Table 62. Catch-per-hour (by length group) for Largemouth Bass is shown in Table 63. The catch rates for the Largemouth Bass population were lower than rates observed in 2019, but still higher than catch rates observed prior to 2019. The Largemouth Bass size structure was poor, with a PSD value of $14\left(\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=3\right.$; Table 64).

## Beulah Lake (87 acres)

## Largemouth Bass Sampling (Spring)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 27 April 2022 at Beulah Lake to assess the black bass population. Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of black bass in Beulah Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. The size structure values of black bass populations in Beulah Lake and other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022 are compared in Table 12. Length frequency and CPUE for black bass is shown in Table 65. Catch-per-hour (by length group) for black bass is shown in Table 66. The catch rates for the Largemouth Bass population were slightly lower than rates observed in previous years. The Largemouth Bass size structure was poor, with a PSD value of 18 ( $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=2$; Table 67).

## Largemouth Bass Sampling (Fall)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 3 October 2022 at Beulah Lake to determine age-growth and body condition of the Largemouth Bass population. Age-growth data from Largemouth Bass collected in 2022 is shown in Table 68. Relative weight values for Largemouth Bass are shown in Table 69.

## Cannon Creek Lake (243 acres)

## Black Bass Sampling (Spring)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 25 April 2022 at Cannon Creek Lake to assess the black bass population. Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of black bass in Cannon Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. The size structure values of the black bass population in Cannon Creek Lake and other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022 are compared in Table 12. Length frequencies and CPUE for black bass are shown in Table 70. The catch-per-hour (by length group) for the three bass species is shown in Table 71. The catch rates of the black bass populations were slightly lower than rates observed in 2018 and the population is mostly comprised of smaller individuals. Table 72 lists the PSD and RSD values for the black bass species in the lake.

## Liberty Lake (81 acres)

## Channel Catfish Sampling

Channel Catfish sampling using tandem hoop nets was conducted at Liberty Lake from 24-27 October 2022 to assess the success of Channel Catfish spawning boxes in the lake. Forty-five Channel Catfish were collected and ranged in size from 14.0-23.0 in (Table 73). Relative weights for the Channel Catfish ranged from 82-84 across the size class (Table 74). Although Channel Catfish use of the spawning boxes has been documented from 2020-2022, recruitment appears to be limited based on data collected during hoop net sampling.

## Angler Utilization Survey

One Browning Dark Ops HD Pro X trail camera was installed at Liberty Lake from March 2022 to February 2023 to assess angler utilization of the reservoir. The trail camera was configured to take motion-detected and time-lapse pictures of the boat ramp, courtesy dock, and surrounding bank access areas. Angler utilization data was collected bimonthly from March 2022 to February 2023 and included number of anglers, angling type (boat, bank, or canoe/kayak), and estimated length of each angling trip (hours). Angler utilization data was analyzed by randomly selecting 16 days each month. Due to a camera malfunction, no data was collected for the first two weeks of March 2022.

Between March 2022 and February 2023, an estimated 1,275 angling trips to were taken to Liberty Lake with an annual average of 6.9 trips per day and 16.0 trips per acre. Total monthly angling trips ranged from 280 trips in June 2022 to 11 trips in January 2023. Most angling trips ( $76 \%$ : 975 trips) were taken between May 2022 and September 2022. Overall, bank angling trips accounted for $50 \%$ ( 635 trips) of total trips taken to Liberty Lake. Boat angling
trips accounted for 31\% (396 trips) and canoe/kayak angling trips accounted for 19\% (244 trips) of total angling trips (Table 75).
Additionally, between March 2022 and February 2023, it was estimated that Liberty Lake received 1,926 hours of angling pressure with May ( 458 hours) and June ( 401 hours) having the highest angler utilization rates. The average angling trip length during this period was 1.5 hours. Monthly average trip lengths ranged from 0.7 hours in December 2022 to 1.9 hours in May and October 2022. Boat angling trips accounted for $46 \%$ of total angling pressure ( 880 hours) with an overall average trip length of 2.2 hours. Bank angling trips accounted for $33 \%$ ( 635 hours) and canoe/kayak angling trips accounted for $21 \%$ ( 411 hours) of total angling pressure. The overall average trip length for bank and canoe/kayak angling was 1.0 hours and 1.7 hours, respectively (Table 76).

## Wood Creek Lake (625 acres)

## Black Bass Sampling (Spring)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 28 April 2022 in the Pump Station and Dock areas of Wood Creek Lake to assess the black bass population. Length frequency and CPUE for black bass are shown in Table 77. The size structure for Largemouth Bass and Spotted Bass was poor, with Largemouth Bass having a PSD value of 24 $\left(\operatorname{RSD}_{15}=11\right)$ and Spotted Bass having a PSD of $0\left(\operatorname{RSD}_{14}=0\right.$; Table 78$)$. Table 12 compares the size structure values of black bass populations in Wood Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. Catch-per-hour (by length group) for Largemouth Bass and Spotted Bass are shown in Tables 79 and 80, respectively. The Largemouth Bass population is dominated by fish <12.0 in, and the Spotted Bass population continues to decline. Table 7 compares the catch-per-hour by length group of black bass in Wood Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in 2022. The Largemouth Bass population assessment is shown in Table 81, and only one of the four catch rate management objectives was met (Assessment rating=Fair).

## Black Bass Sampling (Fall)

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 27 September 2022 in the Pump Station and Dock areas of Wood Creek Lake to index Largemouth Bass year class strength (Tables 82 and 83). Catch rates of age-0 Largemouth Bass in 2022 were higher than catch rates observed over the last five years (Table 83). Table 15 compares the CPUE of age0 Largemouth Bass in Wood Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022. Relative weight values for Largemouth Bass and Spotted Bass in Wood Creek are shown in Table 84. Table 17 compares Wr values for black bass in Wood Creek Lake to other SEFD lakes sampled in fall 2022.

| Water body Location | Species | Date | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ (24 \mathrm{hr}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Gear | Weather | Water temp. F | Water level | Secchi <br> (in) | Conditions | Pertinent sampling comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake Cumberland |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | black bass | 5/9/2022 | 1035 | shock | Sunny, high 60s S winds at 7-9 mph | 63-65 | 721.8 | 96 | good | Floating debris present |
| Faubush Creek | black bass | 5/12/2022 | 815 | shock | Sunny, 60s, calm w inds early | 69-70 | 722.6 | 40-60 | good |  |
| Fishing Creek | black bass | 5/12/2022 | 1131 | shock | Sunny, 70s, winds at 5 mph | 70-74 | 722.6 | 24-40 | fair | flooded standing trees kept boat off bank |
| Lily Creek | black bass | 5/9/2022 | 1355 | shock | Sunny, high 70s S winds at 7-9 mph | 70-72 | 721.8 | 72 | good | back of coves murky |
| Fishing Creek | black bass | 9/28/2022 | 1015 | shock | Increasing clouds, mid 50s, NE w inds 8-12 | 72 | 700.5 | 22 | fair | w ater w as murky |
| Jamestow n | Walleye | 11/14-11/16 |  | gill net | Sun and clouds, 40 s w inds variable | 61 | 688.7 | 72 | good |  |
| Conley Bottom | Walleye | 11/14-11/16 |  | gill net | Sun and clouds, 40 s w inds variable | 61 | 688.7 | 53 | good |  |
| Waitsboro | Walleye | 11/21-11/23 |  | gill net | Sunny, 40-60s, winds at variable | 56-57 | 687.7 | 48 | good |  |
| Cumberland Tailw ater |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Above Helms | trout | 11/6/2022 | 1750 | shock | Overcast, occasional rain, 68 | 62.4 | 3160 cfs |  | good |  |
| Below Helms | trout | 11/6/2022 | 1800 | shock | Clouds early, 70, SW winds decreasing | 61.5 | 3160 cfs |  | good |  |
| Rainbow Run | trout | 11/6/2022 | 1800 | shock |  | 63.5 | 3160 cfs |  | good |  |
| Big Willis | trout | 11/6/2022 | 1820 | shock | Cloudy and warm, 71 |  | 3160 cfs |  | good |  |
| Crocus Creek | trout | 11/6/2022 | 1800 | shock |  |  | 3160 cfs |  | good |  |
| Hw y 61 Traces | trout | 11/7/2022 | 1740 | shock | 70, clear, N w inds 10-14 mph | 62.7 | 3740 cfs |  | good |  |
| Cloyds | trout | 11/7/2022 | 1800 | shock |  |  | 3740 cfs |  | good |  |
| Laurel River Lake |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | black bass | 5/10/2022 | 925 | shock | Sunny, mid 60s, light winds | 68 | 1016 | 84 | good |  |
| Spruce Creek | black bass | 5/11/2022 | 1140 | shock | Overcast, 80s, light w inds | 74 | 1016 | 40 | good |  |
| Craig's Creek | black bass | 5/10/2022 | 1200 | shock | Sunny, 70s and low 80s, light w inds | 70-72 | 1016 | 96 | good |  |
| 312 Bridge | black bass | 5/11/2022 | 830 | shock | Overcast, 70s, light w inds | 70 | 1016 | 18 | poor | w ater murky and overhanging trees kept boat off bank |
| 312 Bridge | black bass | 9/29/2022 | 1930 | shock | Clear, mid to upper $50 \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{~N}$ w inds at 8 mph | 72 | 1007 | 24 | fair | w ater w as somew hat murky |
| Cedar Creek Lake | LMB | 5/2/2022 | 1000 | shock | Sunny, clear, 70s, N w inds 8 mph | 65-67 | full | 40 | fair | Eurasian w atermilfoil getting thick |
|  | LMB | 9/26/2022 | 1050 | shock | Sunny, clear, $66^{\circ}$, NW w ind 10-15, gusts to 28 | 69-72 | full | 33 | fair | vegetation w as thick \& kept boat off bank |
|  | BLG/RESF | 5/18/2022 | 830 | shock |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bert T. Combs Lake | LMB | 4/27/2022 | 1335 | shock | Sunny, breezy, mid 60's | 63 | full | 73 | fair | High water lev els and overhanging trees kept boat off bank |
| Beulah Lake | LMB | 4/27/2022 | 940 | shock | Sunny, breezy, low 50's | 63 | full | 108 | good | Water clarity varied throughout sampling |
|  | LMB | 10/3/2022 | 1030 | shock | Cloudy, 5-8 mph w inds, Mid 50's | 66 | low | 85 | good | Fish collected for age-grow th |
| Cannon Creek Lake | black bass | 4/25/2022 | 1115 | shock | Mostly sunny, some clouds, low 70's | 66 | full | 138 | good | Water very clear |
| Liberty Lake | catfish | 11/24-11/27 |  | hoop net | daytime highs 50-70, some rain, windy | 57-59 | down $6.5{ }^{\prime}$ | 48 | good |  |
| Wood Creek Lake | black bass | 4/28/2022 | 1000 | shock | Sunny,upper 40s, slight breeze | 62-64 | 1020 | 40-68 | good | no vegetation in the upper part of the lake |
|  | black bass | 9/27/2022 | 1000 | shock | Clear, cool, 50 s, W w inds 10 , gusts to 24 | 72 | 1019.3 | 36-52 | good | Elodea not present, some w ater w illow around banks |

Table 2. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours of 15 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs for black bass in Lake Cumberland during May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Dam | Largemouth Bass |  |  |  | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 30 | 23 | 14 | 4 | 2 |  | 121 | 80.7 | 15.9 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 41 | 50 | 10 | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 155 | 103.3 | 17.2 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 5 | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| Faubush | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 3 |  |  | 83 | 55.3 | 7.4 |
| Creek | Spotted Bass | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 38 | 16 | 15 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 120 | 80.0 | 17.1 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 6 | 4.0 | 2.1 |
| Fishing | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 12 |  | 8 | 17 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 1 |  | 124 | 82.7 | 8.0 |
| Creek | Spotted Bass | 2 |  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 | 20.7 | 8.9 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Lily | Largemouth Bass | 1 |  | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 11 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 |  | 67 | 44.7 | 12.2 |
| Creek | Spotted Bass |  |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 27 | 12 | 11 | 13 | 26 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 148 | 98.7 | 6.3 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 1 |  | 2 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 35 | 23.3 | 5.1 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 7 | 9 | 19 | 27 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 28 | 20 | 30 | 48 | 60 | 47 | 37 | 12 | 4 |  | 395 | 65.8 | 6.3 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 3 | 6 | 11 | 23 | 32 | 77 | 36 | 36 | 33 | 76 | 76 | 23 | 16 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 454 | 75.7 | 9.3 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 1 |  | 2 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 47 | 7.8 | 2.3 |
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Table 3. Comparison of catch-per-hour of black bass (by area) captured during spring electrofishing on Lake Cumberland during the period of 2017-2022.

|  | Stock |  |  |  |  | Quality |  |  |  |  | Preferred |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species/Area | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | 54.7 | 34.7 | 61.3 | 84.0 | 74.7 | 45.3 | 28.7 | 48.7 | 82.0 | 61.3 | 31.3 | 26.0 | 42.0 | 70.0 | 48.7 |
| Faubush Creek | 63.3 | 48.0 | 46.0 | 57.3 | 51.3 | 59.3 | 41.3 | 39.3 | 50.0 | 41.3 | 38.7 | 25.3 | 31.3 | 26.7 | 22.0 |
| Fishing Creek | 30.0 | 38.0 | 123.3 | 84.0 | 56.7 | 26.0 | 31.3 | 94.0 | 70.0 | 38.0 | 10.7 | 12.7 | 54.0 | 28.0 | 21.3 |
| Lily Creek | 28.7 | 20.0 | 36.0 | 36.0 | 37.3 | 28.0 | 18.0 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 31.3 | 20.7 | 12.7 | 20.0 | 13.3 | 14.7 |
| Mean | 44.2 | 35.2 | 66.7 | 63.6 | 55.0 | 39.7 | 29.8 | 52.2 | 54.9 | 43.0 | 25.3 | 19.2 | 36.8 | 31.3 | 26.7 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | 48.7 | 101.3 | 75.3 | 96.0 | 98.7 | 43.3 | 78.0 | 50.0 | 87.0 | 83.3 | 16.0 | 27.3 | 12.7 | 19.0 | 12.0 |
| Faubush Creek | 13.3 | 15.3 | 55.3 | 34.0 | 67.3 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 30.7 | 22.7 | 14.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 8.0 | 6.0 | 4.7 |
| Fishing Creek | 9.3 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 4.0 | 17.3 | 8.0 | 3.3 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Lily Creek | 40.7 | 96.0 | 98.0 | 71.3 | 90.7 | 21.3 | 50.0 | 62.0 | 34.0 | 49.3 | 6.0 | 19.3 | 18.0 | 9.3 | 12.7 |
| Mean | 28.0 | 56.0 | 60.0 | 47.3 | 68.5 | 19.5 | 34.3 | 37.5 | 31.8 | 38.3 | 5.5 | 12.8 | 9.8 | 7.6 | 7.5 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | 8.7 | 3.3 | 20.0 | 17.0 | 2.7 | 6.7 | 2.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 2.0 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 11.3 | 16.0 | 0.7 |
| Faubush Creek | 0.7 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| Fishing Creek | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Lily Creek | 3.3 | 21.3 | 24.7 | 18.0 | 18.7 | 2.0 | 14.0 | 19.3 | 14.0 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 8.0 | 12.7 | 10.7 | 4.0 |
| Mean | 3.2 | 7.3 | 11.5 | 8.4 | 6.5 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 8.5 | 7.3 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 1.7 |

[^39]Smallmouth Bass and Spotted bass - $\geq 7.0$ in $=$ stock, $\geq 11.0$ in $=$ quality, $\geq 14.0$ in $=$ preferred.
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Table 4. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Lake Cumberland May 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 10.8 | 2.5 | 12.0 | 2.2 | 16.3 | 2.2 | 26.7 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.8 | 6.3 |
| 2021 | 5.8 | 1.6 | 8.7 | 1.5 | 23.6 | 3.4 | 31.3 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 69.5 | 6.7 |
| 2019 | 18.7 | 3.4 | 14.5 | 2.9 | 15.3 | 3.7 | 36.8 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 85.3 | 12.8 |
| 2018 | 4.3 | 0.8 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 10.7 | 1.6 | 19.2 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 39.5 | 3.9 |
| 2017 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 1.4 | 14.3 | 2.4 | 25.3 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 47.0 | 5.6 |
| 2016 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 9.3 | 3.3 | 9.8 | 1.5 | 12.8 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 37.0 | 6.4 |
| 2015 | 6.3 | 2.3 | 9.3 | 2.6 | 14.2 | 3.4 | 8.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 37.8 | 7.8 |
| 2014 | 9.5 | 3.7 | 12.8 | 4.4 | 9.7 | 2.4 | 8.2 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 40.2 | 8.5 |
| 2013 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 8.2 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 22.8 | 5.0 |
| 2012 | 15.3 | 3.8 | 21.0 | 3.7 | 21.7 | 4.9 | 11.7 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 69.7 | 13.0 |

sedpsdcb.d22

Table 5. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Spotted Bass collected at Lake Cumberland during May 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  | $\geq 17.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 12.5 | 1.9 | 24.8 | 5.1 | 30.8 | 6.4 | 7.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.7 | 9.2 |
| 2021 | 8.9 | 2.7 | 13.3 | 3.5 | 24.2 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 54.0 | 9.2 |
| 2019 | 16.2 | 3.0 | 17.8 | 2.7 | 27.7 | 4.3 | 9.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.5 | 9.9 |
| 2018 | 12.8 | 2.4 | 15.5 | 3.2 | 21.5 | 5.3 | 12.8 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 62.7 | 11.7 |
| 2017 | 6.5 | 1.3 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 14.0 | 2.4 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.7 | 5.2 |
| 2016 | 4.8 | 1.9 | 7.2 | 1.2 | 9.7 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.2 | 4.5 |
| 2015 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 10.3 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 4.2 |
| 2014 | 7.2 | 1.9 | 11.2 | 2.5 | 7.7 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 6.0 |
| 2013 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 7.7 | 1.6 | 9.8 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 3.8 |
| 2012 | 27.3 | 4.7 | 20.5 | 3.9 | 8.8 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.3 | 10.1 |
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Table 6. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Smallmouth Bass collected at Lake Cumberland during May 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  | $\geq 17.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 7.8 | 2.3 |
| 2021 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 6.2 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 9.6 | 2.8 |
| 2019 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 12.7 | 3.5 |
| 2018 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 9.2 | 2.4 |
| 2017 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 3.5 | 1.4 |
| 2016 | 4.2 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 8.8 | 2.6 |
| 2015 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 9.0 | 2.4 |
| 2014 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 8.0 | 2.8 |
| 2013 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 5.3 | 1.3 |
| 2012 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 8.7 | 2.1 |

sedpsdcb.d22

Table 7. Catch-per-hour of black bass captured during spring electrofishing on lakes in the Southeastern Fishery District during 2022.

| Species/Lake | Stock $^{*}$ | Quality* | Preferred |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth bass |  |  |  |
| Lake Cumberland | 55.0 | 43.0 | 26.7 |
| Laurel River Lake | 55.5 | 45.7 | 17.2 |
| Cedar Creek Lake | 122.0 | 94.0 | 77.3 |
| Bert T. Combs Lake | 138.7 | 19.6 | 4.4 |
| Beulah Lake | 129.3 | 22.7 | 2.7 |
| Cannon Creek Lake | 57.3 | 11.3 | 1.3 |
| Wood Creek Lake | 133.3 | 32.0 | 14.0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Spotted bass | 68.5 | 38.3 | 7.5 |
| $\quad$ Lake Cumberland | 29.3 | 14.7 | 2.3 |
| Laurel River Lake | 2.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Beulah Lake | 25.3 | 10.0 | 0.0 |
| Cannon Creek Lake | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Wood Creek Lake |  |  |  |
|  | 6.5 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Smallmouth bass | 5.3 | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| $\quad$ Lake Cumberland | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Laurel River Lake |  |  |  |
| Cannon Creek Lake |  |  |  |

*Largemouth Bass - $\geq 8.0$ in = stock, $\geq 12.0$ in = quality, $\geq 15.0$ in = preferred
*Smallmouth Bass and Spotted bass $-\geq 7.0$ in = stock, $\geq 11.0$ in = quality, $\geq 14.0 \mathrm{in}=$ preferred
sedpsdcb.d22
sedpsdlr.d22
sedpsccl.d22
sedpsdbc.d22
sedpsdbl.d22
sedpsdcc.d22
sedpsdwc.d22

Table 8. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Lake Cumberland from 2012-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \mathrm{in} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \mathrm{in} \end{gathered}$ | Total Assessment score rating |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 13.0$ in | $\geq 5.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 10.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 8.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 0.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 15.3 | 16.3 | 26.7 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 13 | G |
| 2021 | Value | 14.1 | 8.7 | 23.6 | 31.3 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 14 | G |
| 2019 | Value |  | 29.0 | 15.3 | 36.8 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 14 | G |
| 2018 | Value |  | 6.3 | 10.7 | 19.2 | 0.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 11 | F |
| 2017 | Value |  | 3.8 | 14.3 | 25.3 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 12 | F |
| 2016 | Value | 13.7 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 12.8 | 0.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | F |
| 2015 | Value |  | 8.3 | 14.2 | 8.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | F |
| 2014 | Value |  | 12.8 | 9.7 | 8.2 | 0.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | F |
| 2013 | Value |  | 6.6 | 8.2 | 4.7 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | F |
| 2012 | Value | 14.0 | 21.0 | 21.7 | 11.7 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 | F |
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Table 9. Population assessment for Spotted Bass based on spring electrofishing at Lake Cumberland from 2012-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 11.0-13.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 14.0 \mathrm{in} \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 9.6$ in | $\geq 4.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 7.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 2.0$ fish/hr |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 2.1 | 30.8 | 7.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 14 | E |
| 2021 | Value |  | 5.8 | 24.2 | 7.6 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 15 | E |
| 2019 | Value |  | 7.5 | 27.7 | 9.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 15 | E |
| 2018 | Value |  | 2.5 | 21.5 | 12.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 14 | E |
| 2017 | Value |  | 0.6 | 14.0 | 5.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 12 | G |
| 2016 | Value |  | 1.2 | 9.7 | 3.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 | G |
| 2015 | Value |  | 1.7 | 10.3 | 3.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 13 | G |
| 2014 | Value |  | 1.2 | 7.7 | 2.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | G |
| 2013 | Value | 11.1 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 1.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 10 | G |
| 2012 | Value |  | 14.0 | 8.8 | 0.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 12 | G |

sedpsdcb.d22

Table 10. Population assessment for Smallmouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Lake Cumberland from 2012-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 11.0-13.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 14.0 \mathrm{in} \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 11.0$ in | $\geq 2.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 3.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\geq 2.0$ fish/hr |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | F |
| 2021 | Value |  | 1.1 | 1.1 | 6.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | G |
| 2019 | Value |  | 0.5 | 2.3 | 6.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 11 | G |
| 2018 | Value |  | 1.0 | 1.5 | 3.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 10 | G |
| 2017 | Value |  | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | F |
| 2016 | Value |  | 2.8 | 1.0 | 2.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 11 | G |
| 2015 | Value |  | 0.3 | 1.7 | 5.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | F |
| 2014 | Value |  | 0.2 | 1.7 | 2.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 9 | F |
| 2013 | Value |  | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | F |
| 2012 | Value |  | 2.5 | 0.3 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 | F |
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Table 11. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples at Lake Cumberland during May 2022; 95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

| Year | Area | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\geq$ Stock size* | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | Stock <br> size* | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |  | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| 2022 | Dam | 112 | $82( \pm 7)$ | $65( \pm 9)$ | 148 | $84( \pm 6)$ | $12( \pm 5)$ | 4 | $75( \pm 49)$ | $25( \pm 49)$ |
|  | Faubush Creek | 77 | $81( \pm 9)$ | $43( \pm 11)$ | 101 | $22( \pm 8)$ | $7( \pm 5)$ | 6 | $50( \pm 44)$ | $33( \pm 41)$ |
|  | Fishing Creek | 85 | $67( \pm 10)$ | $38( \pm 10)$ | 26 | $35( \pm 19)$ | $4( \pm 8)$ | 1 | $100( \pm 0)$ | $100( \pm 0)$ |
|  | Lily Creek | 56 | $84( \pm 10)$ | $39( \pm 13)$ | 136 | $54( \pm 8)$ | $14( \pm 6)$ | 28 | $25( \pm 16)$ | $21( \pm 15)$ |
|  | Total | 330 | $78( \pm 5)$ | $48( \pm 5)$ | 411 | $56( \pm 5)$ | $11( \pm 3)$ | 39 | $36( \pm 15)$ | $26( \pm 14)$ |
| 2021 | Total | 350 | $86( \pm 4)$ | $49( \pm 5)$ | 260 | $67( \pm 6)$ | $16( \pm 5)$ | 46 | $87( \pm 10)$ | $74( \pm 13)$ |
| 2019 | Total | 400 | $78( \pm 4)$ | $55( \pm 5)$ | 360 | $63( \pm 5)$ | $16( \pm 4)$ | 69 | $74( \pm 10)$ | $54( \pm 12)$ |
| 2018 | Total | 211 | $85( \pm 5)$ | $55( \pm 7)$ | 336 | $61( \pm 5)$ | $23( \pm 5)$ | 44 | $61( \pm 15)$ | $41( \pm 15)$ |
| 2017 | Total | 265 | $90( \pm 4)$ | $57( \pm 6)$ | 168 | $70( \pm 7)$ | $20( \pm 6)$ | 19 | $74( \pm 20)$ | $53( \pm 23)$ |
| 2016 | Total | 192 | $71( \pm 6)$ | $40( \pm 7)$ | 136 | $58( \pm 8)$ | $15( \pm 6)$ | 32 | $66( \pm 17)$ | $47( \pm 18)$ |
| 2015 | Total | 189 | $70( \pm 7)$ | $25( \pm 6)$ | 132 | $63( \pm 8)$ | $16( \pm 6)$ | 47 | $87( \pm 10)$ | $66( \pm 14)$ |
| 2014 | Total | 184 | $58( \pm 7)$ | $27( \pm 6)$ | 150 | $40( \pm 8)$ | $9( \pm 5)$ | 45 | $49( \pm 15)$ | $27( \pm 13)$ |
| 2013 | Total | 126 | $61( \pm 9)$ | $22( \pm 7)$ | 121 | $56( \pm 9)$ | $7( \pm 5)$ | 27 | $44( \pm 19)$ | $37( \pm 19)$ |
| 2012 | Total | 326 | $61( \pm 5)$ | $21( \pm 4)$ | 224 | $25( \pm 6)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ | 33 | $36( \pm 17)$ | $30( \pm 16)$ |

sedpsdcb.d22
*Largemouth Bass $=\geq 8.0$ in, Smallmouth Bass and Spotted Bass $=>7.0$ in

Table 12. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples at Lake Cumberland, Laurel River Lake, Cedar Creek Lake, Bert T. Combs Lake, Beulah Lake, Cannon Creek Lake, and Wood Creek Lake during 2022; 95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

| Lake | LargemouthBass |  | SmallmouthBass |  | Spotted Bass |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| Lake Cumberland | $78( \pm 5)$ | $48( \pm 5)$ | $36( \pm 15)$ | $26( \pm 14)$ | $56( \pm 5)$ | $11( \pm 3)$ |
| Laurel River Lake | $82( \pm 4)$ | $31( \pm 5)$ | 66 ( $\pm 17)$ | $25( \pm 15)$ | $50( \pm 7)$ | $8( \pm 4)$ |
| Cedar Creek Lake | $77( \pm 6)$ | $63( \pm 7)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bert T. Combs Lake | $14( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Beulah Lake | $18( \pm 5)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |  |  | $25( \pm 49)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| Cannon Creek Lake | $20( \pm 8)$ | $2( \pm 3)$ | $50( \pm 98)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | $39( \pm 16)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| Wood Creek Lake | $24( \pm 6)$ | $11( \pm 4)$ |  |  | $0( \pm 0)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| sedpsdcb.d22 sedpsdlr.d22 sedpsccl.d22 sedpsdbc.d22 sedpsdbl.d22 sedpsdcc.d22 sedpsdwc.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 13. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 1.5 hours of 15 -minute diurnal electrofishing runs for black bass in Fishing Creek of Lake Cumberland on 28 September 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 5 | 9 | 1 | 14 | 21 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | 116 | 77.3 | 17.6 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 13 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 44 | 29.3 | 7.7 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 2.7 | 1.3 |
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Table 14. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall (September and October) in electrofishing samples in the Fishing Creek area of Lake Cumberland.

|  |  | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age $1^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year class | Area | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |

## Lake Cumberland

| 2022 | Fishing Creek | 5.8 | 0.2 | 44.7 | 13.2 | 34.7 | 13.1 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 | Fishing Creek | 4.5 | 0.3 | 20.7 | 4.3 | 10.0 | 4.9 | 33.3 | 6.2 |
| 2020 | Fishing Creek | 4.1 | 0.4 | 16.0 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 12.7 | 4.4 |
| 2019 | Fishing Creek | 5.8 | 0.4 | 6.7 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 3.2 | NA | NA |
| 2018 | Fishing Creek | 6.2 | 0.2 | 17.3 | 2.9 | 15.3 | 2.2 | 58.0 | 11.0 |
| 2017 | Fishing Creek | 4.2 | 0.5 | 11.3 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 6.7 | 2.0 |
| 2016 | Fishing Creek | 6.8 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 9.2 | 19.3 | 8.7 | 4.0 | 2.1 |
| 2015 | Fishing Creek | 5.1 | 0.2 | 18.7 | 14.1 | 8.7 | 6.4 | 13.3 | 4.9 |
| 2014 | Fishing Creek | 6.7 | 0.2 | 9.3 | 2.2 | 9.3 | 2.2 | 26.0 | 4.9 |
| 2013 | Fishing Creek | 6.1 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 23.8 | 61.3 | 15.9 | 26.0 | 13.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^40]Table 15. Year class strength at age 0 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in September 2022 in electrofishing samples at Lake Cumberland, Laurel River Lake, Cedar Creek Lake, and Wood Creek Lake.

| Lake | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| Lake Cumberland | Fishing Creek | 5.8 | 0.2 | 44.7 | 13.2 | 34.7 | 13.1 |
| Laurel River Lake | Laurel River Arm | 4.7 | 0.2 | 15.9 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 1.3 |
| Cedar Creek Lake |  | 4.0 | 0.1 | 158.0 | 55.3 | 19.3 | 6.1 |
| Wood Creek Lake |  | 4.4 | 0.1 | 56.7 | 21.4 | 14.0 | 6.4 |
| sedyoycb.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sedyoylr.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sedyoycc.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sedyoywc.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 16. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of black bass collected in Fishing Creek of Lake Cumberland on 28 September 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species |  | Length group |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 8.0-11.9 in | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. $\quad W_{r}$ | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 3087 (1) | 1085 (2) | 1383 (3) |
| Spotted Bass | 7.0-10.9 in | 11.0-13.9 in | $\geq 14.0$ in |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 1393 (2) | 789 (3) | 296 (9) |
| Smallmouth Bass | 7.0-10.9 in | 11.0-13.9 in | $\geq 14.0$ in |
|  | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. $\quad W_{r}$ | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 283 (2) | $0 \quad 0$ (0) | 176 (-) |

sedyoycb.d22

Table 17. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of black bass collected in Lake Cumberland, Laurel River Lake, Cedar Creek Lake, and Wood Creek Lake during September 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Location | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass |  | $8.0-11.9$ in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | Lake Cumberland (Fishing Creek) | 30 | 87 (1) | 10 | 85 (2) | 13 | 83 (3) |
|  | Laurel River Lake (Laurel River Arm) | 26 | 96 (2) | 21 | 93 (2) | 16 | 97 (2) |
|  | Cedar Creek Lake | 32 | 87 (2) | 24 | 93 (2) | 37 | 97 (1) |
|  | Beulah Lake | 40 | 81 (1) | 19 | 82 (2) | 1 | $90(-)$ |
|  | Wood Creek Lake | 67 | 85 (1) | 11 | 82 (2) | 2 | 82 (4) |
| Spotted Bass |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  | Lake Cumberland (Fishing Creek) | 13 | 93 (2) | 7 | 89 (3) | 2 | 96 (9) |
|  | Laurel River Lake (Laurel River Arm) | 13 | 111 (3) | 6 | 106 (3) | 7 | 106 (3) |
|  | Wood Creek Lake | 7 | 93 (2) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  | Lake Cumberland (Fishing Creek) | 2 | 83 (2) | 0 | 0 (0) | 1 | 76 (-) |
|  | Laurel River Lake (Laurel River Arm) | 6 | 86 (6) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
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Table 18. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of Walleye, White Bass, Sauger, Striped Bass, and hybrid striped bass collected from the Jamestown/Bugwood (10 net-nights), Conley Bottom (10 net-nights), and Burnside/Waitsboro (10 net-nights) areas of Lake Cumberland in November 2022.

|  |  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Species | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |  |  |  |
| Jamestow $\mathrm{n} /$ Bugw ood |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Walleye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 11 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 | 7.1 | 1.0 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Sauger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Striped Bass |  | 5 | 6 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | 41 | 4.1 | 1.1 |
|  | Hybrid striped bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Conley Bottom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Walleye |  |  | 2 | 1 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 8 | 18 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63 | 6.3 | 1.2 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Sauger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Striped Bass | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 3 |  | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |  | 71 | 7.1 | 1.5 |
|  | Hybrid striped bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Burnside/Waitsboro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Walleye |  |  | 8 | 6 | 4 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63 | 6.3 | 1.1 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
|  | Sauger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
|  | Striped Bass | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 45 | 4.5 | 1.4 |
|  | Hybrid striped bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Walleye |  |  | 10 | 7 | 10 |  |  | 2 | 29 | 39 | 21 | 31 | 23 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 197 | 6.6 | 0.6 |
|  | White Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Sauger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Striped Bass | 2 | 13 | 12 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 25 | 10 | 3 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 157 | 5.2 | 0.8 |
|  | Hybrid striped bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
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Table 19. Population assessment for Walleye based on fall gill netting at Lake Cumberland from 2004-2022.

| Year |  | Parameters |  |  |  | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq \text { age } 1+ \end{gathered}$ | Mean length age 2+ at capture | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age 1+ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Management objective |  | $\begin{gathered} \geq 6.0 \\ \text { fish/nn } \end{gathered}$ | $\geq 18.0$ in | $\geq 1.5$ <br> fish/nn | $\geq 3.0$ <br> fish/nn |  |  |
| 2022 | Value | 5.6 | 18.8 | 0.8 | 2.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | G |
| 2020 | Value | 4.9 | 18.8 | 0.8 | 1.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 11 | G |
| 2018 | Value | 12.5 | 18.7 | 1.5 | 8.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 15 | E |
| 2016 | Value | 8.4 | 19.4 | 1.1 | 4.9 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 16 | E |
| 2014 | Value | 9.3 | 18.3 | 0.8 | 3.6 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 13 | G |
| 2012 | Value | 6.3 | 18.2 | 0.2 | 3.1 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | G |
| 2010 | Value | 3.3 | 17.6 | 0.1 | 1.9 |  |  |
|  | Score | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | F |
| 2008 | Value | 5.9 | 18.5 | 0.9 | 2.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | G |
| 2006 | Value | 14.8 | 19.1 | 3.9 | 3.1 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 15 | E |
| 2004 | Value | 8.9 | 18.8 | 1.8 | 4.6 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 15 | E |
| sedgncbw.d22 sedagcbw.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 20. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for male Walleye collected from Lake Cumberland during 2022, including the 95\% confidence interval (Cl) for each mean length per age group.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 20 | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 19 | 10.5 | 16.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 3 | 12.2 | 17.2 | 19.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 3 | 10.7 | 15.1 | 17.0 | 18.2 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 2 | 11.5 | 16.4 | 17.6 | 18.8 | 19.6 |  |  |
| 2016 | 2 | 11.1 | 16.7 | 18.7 | 19.8 | 20.8 | 21.8 |  |
| 2015 | 1 | 9.8 | 16.9 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 20.3 | 21.0 | 21.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 10.9 | 16.2 | 18.2 | 19.0 | 20.2 | 21.6 | 21.4 |
| Number |  | 50 | 30 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Smallest |  | 7.7 | 13.5 | 16.2 | 16.9 | 19.4 | 21.0 | 21.4 |
| Largest |  | 13.7 | 17.8 | 19.5 | 20.3 | 21.4 | 22.1 | 21.4 |
| SE |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |
| 95\% Cl $\pm$ |  | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.7 |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; Intercept $=0$
sedagcwm.d22

Table 21. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for female Walleye collected from Lake Cumberland during 2022, including the $95 \%$ confidence interval $(\mathrm{Cl})$ for each mean length per age group.

|  |  | Age |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 9 | 11.3 | 17.2 |  |
| 2019 | 2 | 13.5 | 18.1 | 20.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 11.7 | 17.4 | 20.0 |
| Number |  | 11 | 11 | 2 |
| Smallest |  | 6.9 | 14.6 | 18.5 |
| Largest |  | 14.4 | 19.0 | 21.5 |
| SE |  | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.5 |
| $95 \% \mathrm{Cl} \pm$ |  | 1.2 | 0.7 | 2.9 |

* Otoliths were used for age-growth
determinations; Intercept = 0
sedagcwf.d22

Table 22. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for Walleye (both sexes) collected from Lake Cumberland during 2022, including the $95 \%$ confidence interval (CI) for each mean length per age group.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 28 | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 28 | 10.8 | 16.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 5 | 12.7 | 17.6 | 19.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 3 | 10.7 | 15.1 | 17.0 | 18.2 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 2 | 11.5 | 16.4 | 17.6 | 18.8 | 19.6 |  |  |
| 2016 | 2 | 11.1 | 16.7 | 18.7 | 19.8 | 20.8 | 21.8 |  |
| 2015 | 1 | 9.8 | 16.9 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 20.3 | 21.0 | 21.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 11.0 | 16.5 | 18.5 | 19.0 | 20.2 | 21.6 | 21.4 |
| Number |  | 69 | 41 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Smallest |  | 6.9 | 13.5 | 16.2 | 16.9 | 19.4 | 21.0 | 21.4 |
| Largest |  | 14.4 | 19.0 | 21.5 | 20.3 | 21.4 | 22.1 | 21.4 |
| SE |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |
| 95\% Cl $\pm$ |  | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.7 |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; Intercept $=0$
sedagcbw.d22

Table 23. Age-frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of Walleye collected at Lake Cumberland in 30 net-nights during November 2022.

| Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 9 | 10 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 10 | 7 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 | 13.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 29 | 36 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 74 | 37.8 | 2.5 | 0.3 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 14 | 25 | 18 | 11 |  |  | 71 | 36.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 2 |  |  | 8 | 4.1 | 0.3 | <0.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 | 2.0 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1.0 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0.5 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Total | 10 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 29 | 39 | 21 | 31 | 23 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 196 | 100.0 | 6.5 |  |
| \% | 5.1 | 3.6 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 14.8 | 19.9 | 10.7 | 15.8 | 11.7 | 9.7 | 1.5 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| sedgn sedag | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bw.d2 } \\ & \text { bw.d2 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 24. Population assessment for Walleye gill netted at Lake Cumberland in November 2022.

| Parameter | Actual <br> value | Assessment <br> score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Population density <br> (CPUE age 1 and older) <br> Growth rate <br> (Mean length age 2+ at capture) | 5.6 | 3 |
| Size structure <br> (CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in) | 18.8 | 3 |
| Recruitment <br> (CPUE age 1) | 0.8 | 3 |
| Instantaneous mortality (Z) | 0.5 | 3 |
| Annual mortality (A) | 52.5 | G |
| Total score |  | 12 |
| Assessment rating |  |  |
| sedgncbw.d22 <br> sedagcbw.d22 |  |  |

Table 25. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Walleye, White Bass, Sauger, Striped Bass, and hybrid striped bass collected in Lake Cumberland during November 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Walleye | 10.0-14.9 in |  | 15.0-19.9 in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 19 | 94 (1) | 133 | 94 (1) | 22 | 92 (1) |
|  | 6.0-8.9 in |  | 9.0-11.9 in |  | $\geq 12.0$ in |  |
| White Bass | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 0 | 0 (0) | 1 | 94 (-) | 1 | 91 (-) |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Sauger | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 4 | 95 (5) |
| Striped Bass | 12.0-19.9 in |  | 20.0-29.9 in |  | $\geq 30.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 66 | 86 (1) | 35 | 82 (1) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Hybrid striped bass | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 2 | 86 (1) |

Table 26. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for Striped Bass collected from Lake Cumberland during 2022, including the $95 \%$ confidence interval (Cl) for each mean length per age group.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 51 | 10.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 28 | 11.9 | 19.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 1 | 14.2 | 20.8 | 26.4 |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 1 | 13.3 | 17.1 | 20.5 | 22.6 |  |  |
| 2017 | 4 | 13.2 | 19.0 | 21.7 | 24.1 | 26.5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 11.1 | 19.1 | 22.3 | 23.8 | 26.5 |  |
| Number |  | 85 | 34 | 6 | 5 | 4 |  |
| Smallest |  | 6.3 | 15.5 | 20.5 | 22.6 | 26.0 |  |
| Largest |  | 15.3 | 21.0 | 26.4 | 25.3 | 26.8 |  |
| SE |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.2 |  |
| $95 \% \mathrm{Cl} \pm$ |  | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; Intercept $=0$
sedagcbs.d22

Table 27. Age-frequency and CPUE (fish/nn) of Striped Bass collected at Lake Cumberland in 30 net-nights of Walleye gill netting during November 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | \% | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 27 | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2 | 13 | 12 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 18.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 25 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 | 51.9 | 2.7 | 0.5 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 4 |  |  | 32 | 20.8 | 1.1 | 0.2 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0.6 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 0.6 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 3 | 11 | 7.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Total | 2 | 13 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 25 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 154 | 100.0 | 5.1 |  |
| \% | 1.3 | 8.4 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 4.5 | 8.4 | 13.0 | 16.2 | 6.5 | 1.9 | 5.2 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 5.2 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  |
| sedgn sedag | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{w} . \mathrm{d}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{~s} . \mathrm{d} 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 28. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of trout collected during 8.75 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing runs for trout in Cumberland tailwater during November 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |  |  |  |
| Above Helms | Rainbow Trout |  | 4 | 35 | 107 | 130 | 55 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 382 | 305.6 | 30.0 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  | 4 | 28 | 52 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 107 | 85.6 | 46.3 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Below Helms | Rainbow Trout | 2 |  | 7 | 14 | 35 | 30 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 121 | 96.8 | 19.7 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  |  | 9 | 14 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 20.8 | 9.2 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Rainbow Run | Rainbow Trout | 1 | 2 | 5 | 26 | 30 | 19 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 126 | 100.8 | 17.4 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  | 3 | 24 | 35 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 85 | 68.0 | 20.0 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Big Willis | Rainbow Trout | 1 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 19 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 12 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 116 | 92.8 | 13.8 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  |  | 5 | 25 | 8 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 42 | 33.6 | 10.0 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Crocus Creek | Rainbow Trout |  | 1 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 7 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 61 | 48.8 | 10.5 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  |  | 6 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 23.2 | 5.1 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Hwy 61 Bridge | Rainbow Trout |  | 4 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 40 | 32.0 | 8.7 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 10.4 | 4.1 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cloyd's Landing | Rainbow Trout |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 15.2 | 2.9 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 10.4 | 1.6 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | Rainbow Trout | 4 | 22 | $61$ | $174$ |  | $136$ |  | $28$ | $32$ | $36$ | $31$ | 27 | $19$ | 5 | $1$ | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 98.9 | 16.5 |
|  | Brown Trout |  |  | 8 | 78 | 144 | 54 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  | $1$ |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 315 | 36.0 | 8.3 |
|  | Brook Trout |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
|  | Cutthroat Trout |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |

sedcbtwn.d22

Table 29. Fall electrofishing mean CPUE (fish/hr) of $<15.0 \mathrm{in}, 15.0-17.9 \mathrm{in}, 18.0-19.9 \mathrm{in}$, and $\geq 20.0$ in Rainbow Trout in the Lake Cumberland tailwater from 2000 to 2022. Data collected from sample sites 1-5 each year, except 2007 and 2020 which was based on sites 1-4.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <15.0 in |  | 15.0-17.9 in |  | 18.0-19.9 in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 112.8 | 19.9 | 12.6 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| 2021 | 96.5 | 9.5 | 15.8 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| 2020 | 80.2 | 14.9 | 10.4 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| 2019 | 79.4 | 15.5 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| 2018 | 75.5 | 20.7 | 13.1 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 2017 | 44.5 | 7.1 | 21.8 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 |  |
| 2016 | 196.5 | 38.2 | 6.2 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| 2015 | 60.6 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 2014 | 127.7 | 15.7 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 2013 | 118.9 | 15.3 | 23.2 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 |  |
| 2012 | 127.5 | 18.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |
| 2011* | 55.2 | 7.7 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 2010 | 129.0 | 18.7 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |
| 2009 | 78.4 | 14.7 | 5.4 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 |  |
| 2008 | 166.1 | 32.3 | 18.1 | 4.3 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 |  |
| 2007 | 175.0 | 40.5 | 25.0 | 3.5 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| 2006 | 185.8 | 33.4 | 29.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| 2005 | 166.2 | 28.9 | 9.3 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 |  |
| 2004 | 66.1 | 10.7 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  |
| 2003 | 55.0 | 11.4 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 2002 | 121.0 | 18.6 | 10.7 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| 2001 | 109.7 | 17.2 | 21.0 | 3.7 | 5.5 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| 2000 | 65.8 | 12.4 | 9.4 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| sedctw | .t22 | condu | in Februa |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 30. Fall electrofishing mean CPUE (fish/hr) of $<15.0 \mathrm{in}, 15.0-17.9 \mathrm{in}, 18.0-19.9 \mathrm{in}$, and $\geq 20.0$ in Brown Trout in the Lake Cumberland tailwater from 2000 to 2022. Data collected from sample sites 1-5 each year, except 2007 and 2020 which was based on sites 1-4.

| Year | $<15.0$ in |  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 15.0-17.9 in |  | 18.0-19.9 in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 45.1 | 10.9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| 2021 | 13.1 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2020 | 7.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| 2019 | 16.8 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| 2018 | 29.3 | 6.8 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.6 |
| 2017 | 31.4 | 6.4 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| 2016 | 27.5 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 0.8 |
| 2015 | 41.0 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 0.7 |
| 2014 | 86.4 | 13.6 | 7.2 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| 2013 | 70.2 | 12.0 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 4.6 | 1.5 |
| 2012 | 32.0 | 8.5 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 3.2 | 1.2 | 2.7 | 0.9 |
| 2011* | 26.6 | 4.4 | 6.6 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 1.2 |
| 2010 | 14.4 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| 2009 | 55.8 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 1.1 |
| 2008 | 108.6 | 15.6 | 14.1 | 2.9 | 6.4 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| 2007 | 112.2 | 25.1 | 29.0 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 0.7 |
| 2006 | 56.6 | 11.7 | 30.2 | 10.1 | 5.6 | 1.5 | 5.0 | 1.5 |
| 2005 | 84.5 | 10.2 | 14.9 | 3.1 | 7.0 | 1.7 | 9.3 | 2.4 |
| 2004 | 42.7 | 4.1 | 11.8 | 3.3 | 7.7 | 2.0 | 3.2 | 0.9 |
| 2003 | 52.0 | 7.0 | 20.2 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 0.7 |
| 2002 | 97.9 | 13.2 | 31.2 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 0.9 |
| 2001 | 71.2 | 9.0 | 30.2 | 8.7 | 5.8 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 1.3 |
| 2000 | 71.5 | 13.1 | 18.9 | 4.7 | 6.6 | 1.6 | 9.0 | 2.5 |
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*2011 sampling was conducted in February.

Table 31. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each species of trout collected in the Cumberland tailwater during November 2022.
Standard error is in parentheses.

| Location | Species |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rainbow Trout |  | Brown Trout |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Above Helms | 374 | 82 (0) | 107 | 83 (1) |
| Below Helms | 119 | 78 (1) | 25 | 81 (1) |
| Rainbow Run | 123 | 85 (2) | 85 | 84 (1) |
| Big Willis | 104 | 81 (1) | 42 | 83 (1) |
| Crocus Creek | 56 | 82 (1) | 29 | 89 (2) |
| Hwy 61 | 36 | 81 (1) | 13 | 88 (2) |
| Cloyds | 19 | 84 (1) | 13 | 92 (2) |
| Total | 831 | 82 (0) | 314 | 84 (1) |

sedcbtwn.d22

Table 32. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 6.0 hours of 15-minute electrofishing runs for black bass in Laurel River Lake during May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |
| Dam | Largemouth Bass |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 29 | 17 | 4 |  |  |  | 1 | 97 | 64.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 14 | 9.3 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4.0 |
| Spruce Creek | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 21 | 23 | 28 | 8 | 2 |  |  |  | 114 | 76.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 67 | 44.7 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  | 3 |  | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 33 | 22.0 |
| Laurel | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 19 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 |  | 97 | 64.7 |
| River | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 16.7 |
| Arm | Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2.7 |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 1 |  | 3 | 10 | 19 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 63 | 42.0 |
| Craigs | Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 14 | 18 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 | 53.3 |
| Creek | Smallmouth Bass | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 | 2.0 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 8 | 27 | 58 | 86 | 69 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 371 | 61.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 2 |  |  | 8 | 23 | 31 | 18 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 32 | 13 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 186 | 31.0 |
|  | Smallmouth Bass | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 46 | 7.7 |

[^41]Table 33. Comparison of catch-per-hour of black bass (by area) captured during spring electrofishing on Laurel River Lake during the period of 20182022.

| Species/Area | Stock |  |  |  |  | Quality |  |  |  |  | Preferred |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | 47.3 | 30.7 | 40.0 | 58.0 | 60.0 | 36.7 | 24.7 | 11.3 | 43.3 | 52.7 | 16.0 | 8.7 | 5.3 | 9.3 | 14.7 |
| Spruce Creek | 50.7 | 50.7 | 24.0 | 46.7 | 71.3 | 39.3 | 42.7 | 14.0 | 36.0 | 59.3 | 18.0 | 25.3 | 10.7 | 11.3 | 25.3 |
| Laurel River Arm | 75.3 | 74.0 | 97.3 | 88.0 | 54.7 | 50.7 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 68.0 | 45.3 | 33.3 | 27.3 | 19.3 | 22.7 | 24.7 |
| Craigs Cr. headwaters | 51.3 | 68.0 | 36.0 | 60.7 | 36.0 | 36.7 | 36.7 | 14.0 | 45.3 | 25.3 | 12.0 | 13.3 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 4.0 |
| Mean | 56.2 | 55.8 | 49.3 | 63.3 | 55.5 | 40.8 | 37.7 | 21.5 | 48.2 | 45.7 | 19.8 | 18.7 | 9.8 | 13.2 | 17.2 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | 2.0 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 |
| Spruce Creek | 30.0 | 17.3 | 14.7 | 30.0 | 42.7 | 12.7 | 13.3 | 6.7 | 18.0 | 26.0 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 5.3 |
| Laurel River Arm | 15.3 | 22.7 | 33.3 | 37.3 | 14.7 | 3.3 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 24.0 | 8.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Craigs Cr. headwaters | 30.7 | 18.7 | 26.0 | 48.0 | 51.3 | 16.0 | 6.7 | 11.3 | 24.7 | 20.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Mean | 19.5 | 15.5 | 19.2 | 31.0 | 29.3 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 17.7 | 14.7 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dam | 0.7 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
| Spruce Creek | 4.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 8.0 | 16.0 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 10.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| Laurel River Arm | 0.7 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 |
| Craigs Cr. headwaters | 1.3 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 0.7 |
| Mean | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 6.3 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 3.5 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 1.3 |

Largemouth Bass - $\geq 8.0$ in = stock, $\geq 12.0$ in = quality, $\geq 15.0$ in = preferred.
Smallmouth Bass and Spotted bass $-\geq 7.0 \mathrm{in}=$ stock, $\geq 11.0 \mathrm{in}=$ quality, $\geq 14.0 \mathrm{in}=$ preferred.
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Table 34. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Laurel River Lake during May 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 9.8 | 1.6 | 28.5 | 3.7 | 17.2 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 61.8 | 6.2 |
| 2021 | 14.0 | 4.8 | 15.2 | 2.2 | 35.0 | 3.6 | 13.2 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.3 | 7.4 |
| 2020 | 16.8 | 2.7 | 27.8 | 3.7 | 11.7 | 2.5 | 9.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.2 | 8.0 |
| 2019 | 9.0 | 1.9 | 18.2 | 3.4 | 19.0 | 1.8 | 18.7 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 64.8 | 6.3 |
| 2018 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 15.3 | 2.2 | 21.0 | 2.2 | 19.8 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 59.3 | 4.9 |
| 2017 | 8.7 | 1.3 | 24.5 | 3.0 | 22.0 | 2.6 | 24.0 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 79.2 | 5.2 |
| 2016 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 18.2 | 3.3 | 25.2 | 2.9 | 20.7 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 70.5 | 7.9 |
| 2015 | 11.5 | 2.6 | 16.5 | 2.5 | 23.0 | 3.2 | 21.7 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 72.7 | 7.1 |
| 2014 | 5.8 | 1.2 | 20.0 | 4.9 | 16.8 | 2.5 | 21.5 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 64.2 | 7.9 |
| 2013 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 13.3 | 2.1 | 26.3 | 3.0 | 21.2 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 65.8 | 4.6 |
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Table 35. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Spotted Bass collected at Laurel River Lake during May 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  | $\geq 17.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 10.8 | 2.2 | 12.3 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 31.0 | 6.5 |
| 2021 | 8.5 | 1.6 | 9.8 | 2.0 | 16.0 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 6.7 |
| 2020 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 10.0 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 5.5 |
| 2019 | 3.5 | 0.8 | 6.2 | 1.4 | 6.7 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 2.6 |
| 2018 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 8.5 | 1.4 | 5.2 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 3.2 |
| 2017 | 4.8 | 1.1 | 5.3 | 0.9 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 3.2 |
| 2016 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 6.3 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.2 | 2.4 |
| 2015 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 1.9 |
| 2014 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 8.2 | 1.7 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 3.6 |
| 2013 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 1.4 | 10.8 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.2 | 3.9 |
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Table 36. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Smallmouth Bass collected at Laurel River Lake during May 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  | $\geq 17.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 7.7 | 2.3 |
| 2021 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 8.2 | 1.5 |
| 2020 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 1.1 |
| 2019 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.6 |
| 2018 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.2 | 0.9 |
| 2017 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.7 |
| 2016 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 1.1 |
| 2015 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.9 |
| 2014 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 0.9 |
| 2013 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.8 |
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Table 37. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Laurel River Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 15.0 \mathrm{in} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 20.0 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 13.0$ in | $\geq 10.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 20.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 10.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 0.5$ fish/hr |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 4.0 | 28.5 | 17.2 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 13 | G |
| 2021 | Value |  | 12.2 | 35.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 14 | G |
| 2020 | Value |  | 22.7 | 11.7 | 9.8 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 11 | F |
| 2019 | Value |  | 15.5 | 19.0 | 18.7 | 0.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 14 | G |
| 2018 | Value | 13.4 | 1.5 | 21.0 | 19.8 | 0.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | G |
| 2017 | Value |  | 4.3 | 22.0 | 24.0 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 12 | F |
| 2016 | Value |  | 3.3 | 25.2 | 20.7 | 0.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 14 | G |
| 2015 | Value |  | 1.3 | 23.0 | 21.7 | 1.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 14 | G |
| 2014 | Value |  | 1.6 | 16.8 | 21.5 | 0.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 13 | G |
| 2013 | Value | 13.1 | 1.2 | 26.3 | 21.2 | 1.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 14 | G |

Table 38. Population assessment for Spotted Bass based on spring electrofishing at Laurel River Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 11.0-13.9 \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \geq 14.0 \mathrm{in} \end{gathered}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 11.0$ in | $\geq 3.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 7.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 1.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 0.3 | 12.3 | 2.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 | F |
| 2021 | Value |  | 1.7 | 16.0 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 10 | G |
| 2020 | Value |  | 0.8 | 4.8 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | P |
| 2019 | Value |  | 0.8 | 6.7 | 1.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | P |
| 2018 | Value |  | 0.7 | 5.2 | 3.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | F |
| 2017 | Value |  | 1.3 | 6.3 | 3.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | F |
| 2016 | Value |  | 1.0 | 4.5 | 2.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | F |
| 2015 | Value |  | 0.3 | 4.8 | 3.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | F |
| 2014 | Value |  | 0.5 | 6.3 | 3.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | F |
| 2013 | Value |  | 0.3 | 10.8 | 2.2 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 | F |

Table 39. Population assessment for Smallmouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Laurel River Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 11.0-13.9 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 14.0 \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessment rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 13.0$ in | $\geq 3.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 1.5 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ | $\geq 1.0$ fish/hr |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 12 | G |
| 2021 | Value |  | 1.1 | 1.2 | 3.5 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 | G |
| 2020 | Value |  | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | F |
| 2019 | Value |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | F |
| 2018 | Value |  | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | F |
| 2017 | Value |  | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | F |
| 2016 | Value |  | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | G |
| 2015 | Value |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | F |
| 2014 | Value |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | G |
| 2013 | Value | 13.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | F |
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Table 40. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples at Laurel River Lake during May 2022; 95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

| Year | Area | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Stock <br> size* | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |  | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |  | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| 2022 | Dam | 90 | $88( \pm 7)$ | $24( \pm 9)$ | 13 | 46 ( $\pm 28$ ) | $15( \pm 20)$ | 3 | 67 ( $\pm 65$ ) | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | Spruce Creek | 107 | $83( \pm 7)$ | $36( \pm 9)$ | 64 | $61( \pm 12)$ | $13( \pm 8)$ | 24 | $63( \pm 20)$ | $29( \pm 19)$ |
|  | Laurel River Arm | 82 | $83( \pm 8)$ | $45( \pm 11)$ | 22 | $59( \pm 21)$ | $5( \pm 9)$ | 3 | $100( \pm 0)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | Upper Craigs Creek | 54 | $70( \pm 12)$ | $11( \pm 9)$ | 77 | $39( \pm 11)$ | $4( \pm 4)$ | 2 | $50( \pm 98)$ | $50( \pm 98)$ |
|  | Total | 333 | $82( \pm 4)$ | $31( \pm 5)$ | 176 | $50( \pm 7)$ | $8( \pm 4)$ | 32 | $66( \pm 17)$ | $25( \pm 15)$ |
| 2021 | Total | 380 | $76( \pm 4)$ | $21( \pm 4)$ | 186 | $57( \pm 7)$ | $5( \pm 3)$ | 38 | $74( \pm 14)$ | $55( \pm 16)$ |
| 2020 | Total | 296 | $44( \pm 6)$ | $20( \pm 5)$ | 115 | $34( \pm 9)$ | $9( \pm 5)$ | 14 | $43( \pm 27)$ | $43( \pm 27)$ |
| 2019 | Total | 335 | $67( \pm 5)$ | $33( \pm 5)$ | 93 | $51( \pm 10)$ | $8( \pm 5)$ | 14 | $79( \pm 22)$ | $71( \pm 25)$ |
| 2018 | Total | 337 | $73( \pm 5)$ | $35( \pm 5)$ | 117 | $42( \pm 9)$ | $15( \pm 7)$ | 10 | $60( \pm 32)$ | $50( \pm 33)$ |
| 2017 | Total | 423 | $65( \pm 5)$ | $34( \pm 5)$ | 99 | $57( \pm 10)$ | $18( \pm 8)$ | 10 | $90( \pm 20)$ | $50( \pm 33)$ |
| 2016 | Total | 384 | $72( \pm 5)$ | $32( \pm 5)$ | 89 | $46( \pm 10)$ | $16( \pm 8)$ | 22 | $68( \pm 20)$ | $55( \pm 21)$ |
| 2015 | Total | 367 | $73( \pm 5)$ | $35( \pm 5)$ | 70 | $70( \pm 11)$ | $29( \pm 11)$ | 13 | $69( \pm 26)$ | $62( \pm 28)$ |
| 2014 | Total | 350 | $66( \pm 5)$ | $37( \pm 5)$ | 120 | $51( \pm 9)$ | $19( \pm 7)$ | 22 | $77( \pm 18)$ | $64( \pm 21)$ |
| 2013 | Total | 365 | $78( \pm 4)$ | $35( \pm 5)$ | 114 | $68( \pm 9)$ | $11( \pm 6)$ | 13 | $85( \pm 20)$ | $38( \pm 28)$ |

sedpsdlr.d22
*Largemouth Bass $=\geq 8.0$ in, Smallmouth Bass and Spotted Bass $=\geq 7.0$ in

Table 41. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 1.5 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing runs for black bass in Laurel River Lake on 29 September 2022.
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Table 42. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall (September and October) in electrofishing samples at Laurel River Lake.

| Year class | Area | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age $1^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean <br> length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Laurel River Arm | 4.7 | 0.2 | 15.9 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 1.3 |  |  |
| 2021 | Laurel River Arm | 3.1 | 0.0 | 98.7 | 18.3 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 10.0 | 2.3 |
| 2020 | Laurel River Arm | 5.0 | 0.2 | 12.0 | 6.0 | 7.3 | 4.2 | 10.7 | 2.5 |
| 2019 | Laurel River Arm | 4.2 | 0.4 | 12.7 | 4.1 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 26.7 | 4.6 |
| 2018 | Laurel River Arm | 4.2 | 0.3 | 21.3 | 7.6 | 6.7 | 3.7 | 17.3 | 5.5 |
| 2017 | Laurel River Arm | 3.6 | 0.3 | 7.3 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.4 |
| 2016 | Laurel River Arm | 3.4 | 0.1 | 24.0 | 4.8 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 1.9 |
| 2015 | Laurel River Arm | 3.5 | 0.1 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 2.5 |
| 2014 | Laurel River Arm | 4.4 | 0.1 | 19.3 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 |
| 2013 | Laurel River Arm | 4.0 | 0.1 | 21.3 | 6.6 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 6.7 | 2.2 |

[^42]Table 43. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of black bass collected at 312 Bridge in Laurel River Lake on 29 September 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 8.0-11.9 in | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 26 96 (2) | 21 | 93 (2) | 16 | 97 (2) |
| Spotted Bass | 7.0-10.9 in | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 13111 (3) | 6 | 106 (3) | 7 | 106 (3) |
| Smallmouth Bass | 7.0-10.9 in | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 686 (6) | 0 | - (-) | 0 | - (-) |
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Table 44. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected at Cedar Creek Lake in 1.5 hours ( 0.75 hours in lower end; 0.75 hours upper end; 15-min runs) of diurnal electrofishing on 12 May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 5 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 2 |  | 4 | 8 | 12 | 18 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 118 | 157.3 | 2.7 |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 107 | 142.7 | 17.3 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 8 | 7 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 17 | 15 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 20 | 17 | 7 | 2 | 225 | 150.0 | 8.5 |
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Table 45. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass taken in spring electrofishing samples in each area of Cedar Creek Lake on 12 May 2022; 95\% confidence levels are in parentheses.

| Year | Lower Lake |  |  | Upper Lake |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | $\geq$ <br> Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| 2022 | 92 | $75( \pm 9)$ | $62( \pm 10)$ | 91 | $79( \pm 8)$ | $65( \pm 10)$ | 183 | $77( \pm 6)$ | $63( \pm 7)$ |
| 2021 | 91 | $69( \pm 10)$ | $48( \pm 10)$ | 133 | $85( \pm 6)$ | $59( \pm 8)$ | 224 | $79( \pm 5)$ | $55( \pm 7)$ |
| 2020 | 118 | $61( \pm 9)$ | $31( \pm 8)$ | 120 | $85( \pm 6)$ | $52( \pm 9)$ | 238 | $73( \pm 6)$ | $41( \pm 6)$ |
| 2019 | 101 | $69( \pm 9)$ | $59( \pm 10)$ | 103 | $73( \pm 9)$ | $53( \pm 10)$ | 204 | $71( \pm 6)$ | $56( \pm 7)$ |
| 2018 | 45 | $49( \pm 15)$ | $36( \pm 14)$ | 53 | $74( \pm 12)$ | $62( \pm 13)$ | 98 | $62( \pm 10)$ | $50( \pm 10)$ |
| 2017 | 37 | $54( \pm 16)$ | $30( \pm 15)$ | 81 | $72( \pm 10)$ | $52( \pm 11)$ | 118 | $66( \pm 9)$ | $45( \pm 9)$ |
| $2016{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 73 | $67( \pm 11)$ | $47( \pm 12)$ | 104 | $75( \pm 8)$ | $52( \pm 10)$ | 177 | $72( \pm 7)$ | $50( \pm 7)$ |
| $2015{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 95 | $79( \pm 8)$ | $52( \pm 10)$ | 107 | $81( \pm 7)$ | $53( \pm 9)$ | 202 | $80( \pm 6)$ | $52( \pm 7)$ |
| 2014 | 237 | $82( \pm 5)$ | $48( \pm 6)$ | 345 | $81( \pm 4)$ | $47( \pm 5)$ | 582 | $82( \pm 3)$ | $47( \pm 4)$ |
| 2013 | 448 | $69( \pm 4)$ | $33( \pm 4)$ | 299 | $66( \pm 5)$ | $36( \pm 5)$ | 747 | $68( \pm 3)$ | $34( \pm 3)$ |

[^43]Table 46. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected from Cedar Creek Lake from 2013-2022

| Year | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | Total | 28.0 | 6.2 | 28.0 | 6.7 | 16.7 | 3.9 | 77.3 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 0.9 | 150.0 | 8.5 |
| 2021 | Total | 26.7 | 7.1 | 32.0 | 5.7 | 35.3 | 5.3 | 82.0 | 13.5 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 176.0 | 11.3 |
| 2020 | Total | 24.7 | 12.1 | 42.7 | 8.8 | 50.7 | 8.0 | 65.3 | 10.5 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 183.3 | 15.9 |
| 2019 | Total | 58.7 | 20.7 | 39.3 | 6.1 | 20.0 | 5.1 | 76.7 | 8.7 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 194.7 | 25.4 |
| 2018 | Total | 48.7 | 21.7 | 24.7 | 6.8 | 8.0 | 1.5 | 32.7 | 7.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 114.0 | 23.4 |
| 2017 | Total | 44.7 | 8.9 | 26.7 | 6.5 | 16.7 | 2.6 | 35.3 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 123.3 | 9.3 |
| 2016 | Total | 19.3 | 5.0 | 33.3 | 3.2 | 26.0 | 5.7 | 58.7 | 8.2 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 137.3 | 7.5 |
| 2015 | Total | 14.0 | 4.8 | 26.7 | 4.2 | 37.3 | 5.7 | 70.7 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 148.7 | 8.7 |
| 2014 | Total | 6.3 | 1.7 | 30.3 | 6.0 | 57.7 | 8.8 | 78.3 | 12.0 | 5.7 | 1.1 | 172.6 | 25.7 |
| 2013 | Total | 6.3 | 2.1 | 69.1 | 3.7 | 72.0 | 8.1 | 72.3 | 5.0 | 10.3 | 2.3 | 219.7 | 12.1 |
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Table 47. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Cedar Creek Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ \text { 12.0-14.9 in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Total score | Assessement rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Management objective |  | $\geq 11.5$ in | $\geq 16.0$ fish | $\geq 20.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 30.0 \mathrm{fish} /$ | $\geq 4.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 22.0 | 16.7 | 77.3 | 6.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 16 | G |
| 2021 | Value |  | 21.3 | 35.3 | 82.0 | 4.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |
| 2020 | Value | 12.4 | 22.7 | 50.7 | 65.3 | 3.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 18 | E |
| 2019 | Value |  | 47.3 | 20.0 | 76.7 | 5.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |
| 2018 | Value |  | 51.3 | 8.0 | 32.7 | 1.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 14 | G |
| 2017 | Value |  | 44.7 | 16.7 | 35.3 | 2.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 16 | G |
| 2016 | Value |  | 16.0 | 26.0 | 58.7 | 5.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |
| 2015 | Value | 12.0 | 8.0 | 37.3 | 70.7 | 5.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |
| 2014 | Value |  | 3.7 | 57.7 | 78.3 | 5.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |
| 2013 | Value |  | 4.9 | 72.0 | 72.3 | 10.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 17 | E |
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Table 48. Length-frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected during 1.5 hours of diurnal electrofishing ( 0.75 hours in lower end; 0.75 hours in upper end; 15-minute runs) at Cedar Creek Lake on 26 September 2022.

|  |  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Species | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 11 | 79 | 61 | 17 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 220 | 293.3 |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 8 | 30 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 |  | 123 | 164.0 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 19 | 109 | 80 | 25 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 343 | 228.7 |
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Table 49. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in the fall (September and October) in electrofishing samples at Cedar Creek Lake.

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean <br> length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 158.0 | 55.3 | 19.3 | 6.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | 3.6 | 0.1 | 103.3 | 26.6 | 6.7 | 2.5 | 22.0 | 5.0 |
| 2020 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 69.3 | 16.7 | 5.3 | 2.5 | 21.3 | 5.6 |
| 2019 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 113.3 | 14.9 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 22.7 | 12.2 |
| 2018 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 52.7 | 10.6 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 47.3 | 17.4 |
| 2017 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 68.7 | 15.8 | 10.7 | 3.8 | 51.3 | 21.9 |
| 2016 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 131.3 | 45.2 | 36.7 | 10.1 | 44.7 | 8.9 |
| 2015 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 50.0 | 18.6 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 16.0 | 4.5 |
| 2014 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 19.3 | 7.6 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 8.0 | 4.0 |
| 2013 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 9.4 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 1.2 |

Table 50. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected in Cedar Creek Lake on 26 September 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | Lower | 18 | 84 (2) | 7 | 95 (2) | 16 | 98 (2) |
|  | Upper | 14 | 90 (2) | 17 | 91 (3) | 21 | 96 (2) |
|  | Total | 32 | 87 (2) | 24 | 93 (2) | 37 | 97 (1) |
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Table 51. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Cedar Creek Lake in 1.25 hours (7.5-min runs) of diurnal electrofishing on 18 May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Bluegill | 46 | 348 | 294 | 167 | 64 | 29 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 955 | 764.0 | 84.8 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 29 | 23 | 71 | 42 | 53 | 77 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 327 | 261.6 | 46.4 |
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Table 52. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Bluegill and Redear Sunfish collected at Cedar Creek from 2011-2022.

| Species | Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | <3.0 in |  | 3.0-5.9 in |  | 6.0-7.9 in |  | $\geq 8.0$ in |  | $\geq 10.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| Bluegill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | 315.2 | 42.7 | 420.0 | 61.9 | 28.0 | 4.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 |  |  | 764.0 | 84.8 |
|  | 2021 | 136.0 | 42.6 | 238.4 | 28.5 | 14.4 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 388.8 | 63.9 |
|  | 2019 | 257.6 | 47.6 | 204.0 | 30.3 | 18.4 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 |  |  | 481.6 | 48.7 |
|  | 2018 | 492.0 | 137.7 | 268.0 | 31.4 | 8.8 | 5.5 | 0.8 | 0.8 |  |  | 769.6 | 150.6 |
|  | 2016 | 599.2 | 108.4 | 464.0 | 90.4 | 8.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 1071.2 | 164.8 |
|  | 2015 | 372.0 | 51.8 | 510.4 | 66.9 | 12.8 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 895.2 | 110.5 |
|  | 2014 | 396.5 | 60.6 | 367.5 | 98.4 | 27.5 | 5.9 | 1.0 | 0.7 |  |  | 792.5 | 116.2 |
|  | 2013 | 410.0 | 102.7 | 318.5 | 48.2 | 21.5 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 750.0 | 126.4 |
|  | 2012 | 65.1 | 14.0 | 206.9 | 40.8 | 16.5 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 288.5 | 52.7 |
|  | 2011 | 301.0 | 45.9 | 411.0 | 56.7 | 21.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 733.0 | 81.1 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2022 | 23.2 | 6.8 | 108.8 | 26.2 | 104.0 | 24.0 | 25.6 | 13.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 261.6 | 46.4 |
|  | 2021 | 5.6 | 3.2 | 81.6 | 24.0 | 116.8 | 32.6 | 58.4 | 29.6 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 262.4 | 53.3 |
|  | 2019 | 10.4 | 4.0 | 54.4 | 14.7 | 37.6 | 11.3 | 15.2 | 5.9 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 117.6 | 25.1 |
|  | 2018 | 14.4 | 4.9 | 52.0 | 7.1 | 26.4 | 7.5 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 94.4 | 12.8 |
|  | 2016 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 63.2 | 16.3 | 24.0 | 6.5 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 95.2 | 20.7 |
|  | 2015 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 45.6 | 9.2 | 42.4 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 98.4 | 14.9 |
|  | 2014 | 5.0 | 1.6 | 45.0 | 10.8 | 27.0 | 7.6 | 8.5 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 85.5 | 16.1 |
|  | 2013 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 33.0 | 7.2 | 163.5 | 75.4 | 31.0 | 10.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 231.5 | 84.4 |
|  | 2012 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 22.4 | 5.3 | 43.7 | 10.5 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.5 | 14.7 |
|  | 2011 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 56.5 | 10.7 | 21.0 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 81.0 | 14.3 |
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Table 53. PSD and RSD values obtained for Bluegill and Redear Sunfish taken in spring electrofishing samples in Cedar Creek Lake on 18 May 2022; 95\% confidence levels are in parentheses.

| Species | Year | No. $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $^{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 2022 | 561 | $6( \pm 2)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2021 | 316 | $6( \pm 3)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2019 | 280 | $9( \pm 3)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
|  | 2018 | 347 | $3( \pm 2)$ | $0( \pm 1)$ |
|  | 2016 | 590 | $2( \pm 1)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2015 | 654 | $2( \pm 1)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2014 | 792 | $7( \pm 2)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2013 | 419 | $6( \pm 2)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2012 | 864 | $7( \pm 3)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | 2011 |  | $5( \pm 1)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |

Redear Sunfish

| 2022 | 275 | $40( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 | 307 | $52( \pm 6)$ | $9( \pm 3)$ |
| 2019 | 121 | $31( \pm 8)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
| 2018 | 82 | $20( \pm 9)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2016 | 73 | $19( \pm 9)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2015 | 115 | $29( \pm 8)$ | $4( \pm 4)$ |
| 2014 | 144 | $34( \pm 8)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2013 | 434 | $65( \pm 4)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 2012 | 124 | $35( \pm 8)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2011 | 140 | $6( \pm 4)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |

[^44]Table 54. Fishery statistics derived from creel surveys on Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres) from 1 April - 29 October 2022, 1 April - 31 October 2009, and 5 April - 29 October 2005.

|  | 2022 | 2009 | 2005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishing trips |  |  |  |
| Number of fishing trips (per acre) | 14,226 (18.15) | 38,561 (49.18) | 10,110 (12.89) |
| Average trip length | 5.23 | 5.00 | 3.93 |
| Fishing pressure |  |  |  |
| Total man-hours (SE) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 74,335 (1,573) | 192,691 (4,288) | 39,735 (939) |
| Man hours/acre | 94.82 | 245.78 | 50.68 |
| Catch/harvest |  |  |  |
| Number of fish caught (SE) | 85,817 (9,012) | 296,539 (20,314) | 76,439 (5,559) |
| Number of fish harvested (SE.) | 18,835 (3,780) | 85,321 (8,672) | 36,879 (3,017) |
| Pounds of fish harvested | 5,107 | 20,921 | 6,887 |
| Harvest rates |  |  |  |
| Fish/hour | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0.90 |
| Fish/acre | 24.02 | 108.83 | 47.04 |
| Pounds/acre | 6.51 | 26.68 | 8.78 |
| Catch rates |  |  |  |
| Fish/hour | 1.09 | 1.46 | 1.88 |
| Fish/acre | 109.46 | 378.24 | 97.50 |
| Miscellaneous characteristics (\%) |  |  |  |
| Male | 93 | 85 | 83 |
| Female | 7 | 15 | 17 |
| Resident | 98 | 97 | 97 |
| Non-resident | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Method (\%) |  |  |  |
| Still fishing | 21 | 78 | 54 |
| Casting | 78 | 21 | 46 |
| Fly | 0 | <1 | 1 |
| Trolling | <1 | <1 | 0 |
| Spider rigging | <1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mode (\%) |  |  |  |
| Boat | 88 | 77 | 82 |
| Bank | 3 | 23 | 18 |
| Kayak | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Dock | 0 | <1 | 0 |

[^45]|  | Black bass group | Largemouth Bass | Crappie group | Black Crappie | White Crappie | Catfish group | Channel Catfish | Panfish group | Bluegill | Redear Sunfish | Green Sunfish | Anything |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. caught | 37,968 | 37,968 | 16,512 | 11,702 | 4,810 | 460 | 460 | 30,876 | 24,157 | 6,682 | 37 |  |
| (per acre) | 48.43 | 48.43 | 21.06 | 14.93 | 6.14 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 39.38 | 30.81 | 8.52 | 0.05 |  |
| No. harvested | 42 | 42 | 7,294 | 5,386 | 1,908 | 214 | 214 | 11,284 | 7,840 | 3,445 | - |  |
| (per acre) | 0.05 | 0.05 | 9.30 | 6.87 | 2.43 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 14.39 | 10.00 | 4.39 | - |  |
| \% of total no. harvested | t | t | 38.7 | 28.6 | 10.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 59.9 | 41.6 | 18.3 | - |  |
| Lbs. harvested | 226 | 226 | 2,499 | 1,879 | 620 | 326 | 326 | 2,056 | 1,110 | 945 | - |  |
| (per acre) | 0.29 | 0.29 | 3.19 | 2.40 | 0.79 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 2.62 | 1.42 | 1.21 | - |  |
| \% of total lbs harvested | 4.43 | 4.43 | 48.9 | 36.8 | 12.1 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 40.2 | 21.7 | 18.5 | - |  |
| Mean length (in) |  | 21.3 |  | 8.5 | 9.1 |  | 15.6 |  | 6.0 | 5.9 | - |  |
| Mean weight (lb) |  | 5.23 |  | 0.32 | 0.35 |  | 1.35 |  | 0.14 | 0.15 | - |  |
| Number of fishing trips for that species | 10,488 |  | 1,308 |  |  | 145 |  | 1,282 |  |  |  | 1,003 |
| Percent of all trips | 73.7 |  | 9.2 |  |  | 1.0 |  | 9.0 |  |  |  | 7.1 |
| Hours fished for that species | 54,802 |  | 6,835 |  |  | 757 |  | 6,701 |  |  |  | 5,240 |
| Hours fished for that species (per acre) | 69.90 |  | 8.72 |  |  | 0.97 |  | 8.55 |  |  |  | 6.68 |
| Number harvested fishing for that species | 11 |  | 5,731 |  |  | 164 |  | 8,900 |  |  |  | - |
| Lb harvested fishing for that species | 47 |  | 2,114 |  |  | 299 |  | 1,617 |  |  |  | - |
| No./hr harvested fishing for that species | t |  | 1.01 |  |  | 0.23 |  | 1.52 |  |  |  | - |
| Percent success fishing for that species | t |  | 46.5 |  |  | 38.5 |  | 47.4 |  |  |  | 21.4 |

Table 56. Length distribution for each species of fish harvested and released at Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres) during 1 April - 29 October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 28 |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  | 28 |  |  |  | 42 |
| Released |  |  |  |  |  | 1,002 | 247 | 2,731 | 189 | 5,244 | 1,496 | 5,636 | 4,387 | 4,517 | 3,413 | 4,445 | 2,280 | 1,612 | 378 | 247 | 87 | 15 |  | 37,926 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  | 991 | 80 | 1,279 | 2,062 | 559 | 16 | 304 | 16 | 32 | 16 | 16 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,386 |
| Released |  | 124 | 2,271 | 2,722 | 529 | 513 | 16 | 93 |  | 31 |  |  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,316 |
| White Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  | 143 | 158 | 301 | 660 | 430 | 57 | 129 |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,908 |
| Released |  | 86 | 915 | 1,244 | 300 | 343 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,902 |
| Channel Catish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61 | 15 |  |  | 46 |  | 15 |  | 31 | 15 | 15 |  | 16 |  | 214 |
| Released |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 66 |  | 82 | 16 | 16 |  |  |  | 16 |  | 33 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 246 |
| Bluegill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  | 183 | 3,479 | 1,481 | 2,081 | 616 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,840 |
| Released | 1,544 | 6,877 | 4,585 | 2,611 | 239 | 461 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16,317 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  | 359 | 54 | 1,794 | 1,005 | 18 | 215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,445 |
| Released |  | 306 | 1,529 | 1,097 | 36 | 270 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,238 |
| Green Sunfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Released |  |  |  | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |

Table 57. Black bass catch and harvest statistics derived from a daytime creel survey at Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres) for each species of black bass caught and released by all anglers from 1 April - 29 October 2022.

|  | Largemouth Bass C\&R |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Harvest | 12.0-14.9 | >15.0 | Total |
| Total number of bass | 42 | 12,376 | 21,381 | 37,968 |
| \% of black bass harvested by number | 100 |  |  |  |
| Total weight of fish (lb) | 226 | 21,496 | 37,140 | 66,103 |
| \% of black bass harvested by weight | 100 |  |  |  |
| Mean length (in) | 21.3 |  |  |  |
| Mean weight (lb) | 5.23 |  |  |  |
| Rate (fish/hour) | 0.001 |  |  |  |

Table 58. Monthly black bass angling success at Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres) during the 2022 daytime creel survey period; data does not include black bass < 8.0 inches.

| Month | Total no. of bass caught | Total no. of bass harvested | Number of bass fishing trips | Hours fished by bass anglers | Bass caught by bass anglers | Bass caught/hour by bass anglers | Bass harvested by bass anglers | Bass harvested/hour by bass anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr | 5,326 | 17 | 1,478 | 7,724 | 5,118 | 0.58 | 0 | 0.000 |
| May | 5,009 | 0 | 1,229 | 6,421 | 4,679 | 0.70 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Jun | 6,678 | 14 | 1,513 | 7,908 | 6,396 | 0.72 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Jul | 7,663 | 0 | 1,968 | 10,284 | 7,557 | 0.69 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Aug | 6,335 | 0 | 1,793 | 9,370 | 6,193 | 0.65 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Sep | 3,860 | 0 | 1,302 | 6,805 | 3,772 | 0.54 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Oct | 3,097 | 11 | 1,204 | 6,290 | 3,021 | 0.45 | 11 | 0.002 |
| Total | 37,968 | 42 | 10,487 | 54,802 | 36,736 |  | 11 |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  | 0.62 |  | 0.000 |


| Table 59. Monthly crappie angling success at Cedar Creek Lake | (784 acres) during the 2022 daytime creel survey period. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> no. of <br> crappie <br> caught | Total <br> no. of <br> crappie <br> harvested | Number <br> of crappie <br> fishing <br> trips | Hours <br> fished by <br> crappie <br> anglers | Crappie <br> caught <br> by crappie <br> anglers | Crappie <br> caught/hour <br> by crappie <br> anglers | Crappie <br> harvested <br> by crappie <br> anglers | Crappie <br> harvested/hour <br> by crappie <br> anglers |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apr | 2,568 | 2,064 | 407 | 2,129 | 2,480 | 1.86 | 2,047 | 1.532 |  |
| May | 5,651 | 1,780 | 190 | 993 | 3,174 | 3.25 | 1,101 | 1.128 |  |
| Jun | 2,057 | 986 | 111 | 580 | 591 | 2.40 | 141 | 0.571 |  |
| Jul | 1,991 | 987 | 157 | 820 | 1,991 | 3.26 | 987 | 1.614 |  |
| Aug | 1,690 | 490 | 106 | 554 | 1,213 | 2.69 | 490 | 1.086 |  |
| Sep | 1,246 | 463 | 145 | 756 | 1,192 | 1.58 | 464 | 0.615 |  |
| Oct | 1,309 | 523 | 192 | 1,003 | 1,286 | 1.43 | 501 | 0.559 |  |
| Total | 16,512 | 7,293 | 1,308 | 6,835 | 11,927 |  |  | 5,731 |  |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 60. Monthly cattish angling success at Cedar Creek Lake (784 acres) during the 2022 daytime creel survey period.

|  | Total <br> no. of <br> catfish <br> caught | Total <br> no. of <br> catfish <br> harvested | Number <br> of catfish <br> fishing <br> trips | Hours <br> fished by <br> catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> caught <br> by catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> caught/hour <br> by catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> harvested <br> by catfish <br> anglers | Catfish <br> harvested/hour <br> by catfish <br> anglers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| May | 73 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.000 |  |
| Jun | 28 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Jul | 247 | 88 | 60 | 315 | 211 | 0.89 | 88 | 0.370 |
| Aug | 90 | 65 | 27 | 138 | 78 | 0.37 | 65 | 0.309 |
| Sep | 11 | 11 | 15 | 80 | 11 | 0.14 | 11 | 0.135 |
| Oct | 11 | 0 | 7 | 39 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Total | 460 | 215 | 109 | 572 | 300 |  |  | 164 |
| Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Month | Total no. of panfish caught | Total no. of panfish harvested | Number of panfish fishing trips | Hours fished by panfish anglers | Panfish caught by panfish anglers | Panfish caught/hour by panfish anglers | Panfish harvested by panfish anglers | Panfish harvested/hour by panfish anglers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr | 538 | 434 | 93 | 487 | 521 | 2.31 | 434 | 1.923 |
| May | 16,679 | 6,863 | 608 | 3,177 | 13,688 | 4.56 | 5,560 | 1.852 |
| Jun | 5,607 | 2,423 | 141 | 738 | 3,085 | 6.95 | 1,381 | 3.111 |
| Jul | 5,285 | 1,427 | 229 | 1,199 | 3,699 | 4.02 | 1,409 | 1.530 |
| Aug | 1,471 | 116 | 97 | 508 | 1,213 | 2.67 | 116 | 0.256 |
| Sep | 838 | 11 | 84 | 438 | 706 | 2.06 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Oct | 458 | 11 | 30 | 154 | 294 | 2.41 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Total <br> Mean | 30,876 | 11,285 | 1,282 | 6,701 | 23,206 | 4.11 | 8,900 | 1.525 |

Table 62. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected at Bert T. Combs Lake in 1.125 hours (7.5-min runs) of diurnal electrofishing on 27 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 28 | 32 | 61 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 169 | 150.2 | 24.7 |
| sedpsdbc.d22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 63. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Bert T. Combs Lake on 27 April 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 11.6 | 5.4 | 119.1 | 22.0 | 15.1 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 150.2 | 24.7 |
| 2019 | 53.6 | 21.1 | 110.4 | 11.3 | 35.2 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 200.8 | 27.9 |
| 2015 | 15.2 | 5.3 | 67.2 | 11.0 | 14.4 | 5.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 27.9 |
| 2012 | 30.7 | 12.0 | 71.3 | 14.3 | 24.0 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 126.7 | 28.9 |
| 2009 | 21.3 | 9.3 | 45.3 | 7.9 | 38.7 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 111.3 | 16.2 |
| 2006 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 100.7 | 21.2 | 25.3 | 4.3 | 11.3 | 2.8 | 4.7 | 3.2 | 142.7 | 25.7 |
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Table 64. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass taken
in spring electrofishing samples at Bert T. Combs Lake on 27 April 2022; 95\% confidence levels are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 156 | $14( \pm 6)$ | $3( \pm 3)$ |
| 2019 | 184 | $25( \pm 6)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2015 | 103 | $18( \pm 8)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |
| 2012 | 144 | $26( \pm 7)$ | $1( \pm 1)$ |
| 2009 | 135 | $50( \pm 8)$ | $7( \pm 4)$ |
| 2006 | 206 | $27( \pm 6)$ | $8( \pm 4)$ |
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Table 65. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected at Beulah Lake in 1.5 hours (15.0-min runs) of diurnal electrofishing on 27 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 20 | 23 | 24 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | 7 | 7 | 20 | 48 | 23 | 17 | 58 | 62 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 279 | 186.0 | 10.4 |
| Spotted Bass | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 5.3 | 3.2 |
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Table 66. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of black bass collected at Beulah Lake on 27 April 2022.

| Species Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 56.7 | 12.2 | 106.7 | 9.2 | 20.0 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 186.0 | 10.4 |
| 2018 | 42.7 | 8.5 | 146.7 | 16.2 | 25.3 | 3.7 | 4.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 219.3 | 20.9 |
| 2015 | 90.0 | 16.1 | 124.0 | 5.2 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 230.0 | 18.3 |
| 2012 | 54.0 | 11.0 | 155.3 | 19.9 | 22.0 | 4.1 | 10.0 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 241.3 | 29.7 |
| 2009 | 82.0 | 12.8 | 168.7 | 23.3 | 51.3 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 308.7 | 20.5 |
| 2006 | 87.3 | 18.2 | 185.3 | 13.3 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 282.0 | 23.9 |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  | $\geq 17.0$ in |  | Total |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 3.2 |
| 2018 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 |
| 2015 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| 2012 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2009 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2006 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2018 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 3.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 8.7 | 3.5 |
| 2015 | 15.3 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 2.0 |
| 2012 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2009 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2006 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
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Table 67. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values obtained for Largemouth Bass taken in spring electrofishing samples at Beulah Lake on 27 April 2022; 95\% confidence levels are in parentheses.

| Year | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 194 | $18( \pm 5)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
| 2018 | 265 | $17( \pm 5)$ | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| 2015 | 210 | $11( \pm 4)$ | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| 2012 | 281 | $17( \pm 4)$ | $5( \pm 3)$ |
| 2009 | 340 | $26( \pm 5)$ | $3( \pm 2)$ |
| 2006 | 292 | $5( \pm 2)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ |
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Table 68. Mean back calculated lengths (in) at each annulus for Largemouth Bass collected from Beulah Lake during fall 2022, including the $95 \%$ confidence interval (CI) for each mean length per age group.

|  |  | Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 15 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 18 | 4.6 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 7 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 15 | 5.7 | 9.2 | 10.6 | 11.5 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 6 | 5.8 | 9.1 | 10.9 | 11.9 | 12.6 |  |  |
| 2016 | 8 | 5.3 | 8.0 | 10.6 | 11.7 | 12.4 | 13.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 5.0 | 8.4 | 10.5 | 11.6 | 12.5 | 13.0 |  |
| Number |  | 69 | 54 | 36 | 29 | 14 | 8 |  |
| Smallest |  | 3.3 | 5.7 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 11.5 | 12.1 |  |
| Largest |  | 7.2 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 13.0 | 14.3 | 15.3 |  |
| SE |  | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 |  |
| $95 \%$ Cl $_{ \pm}$ |  | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 |  |
| Otill |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Otoliths were used for age-growth determinations; Intercept $=0$
sedagbl.d22

Table 69. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Beulah Lake on 3 October 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 40 | 81 (1) | 19 | 82 (2) | 1 | 90 (-) |

sedwrbl.d22

Table 70. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected at Cannon Creek Lake in 1.5 hours ( 15.0 -min runs) of nocturnal electrofishing on 25 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 23 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 |  |  | 1 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 30 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 88 | 58.7 | 10.1 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 2 |  |  |  | 40 | 26.7 | 1.7 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |

sedpsdcc.d22

Table 71. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of black bass collected at Cannon Creek Lake on 25 April 2022.

sedpsdcc.d22

Table 72. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples at Cannon Creek Lake on 25 April 2022; 95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

Largemouth Bass
Spotted Bass
Smallmouth Bass

| Year | $\geq$ <br> Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | $\geq$ <br> Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | $\geq$ <br> Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | 86 | $20( \pm 8)$ | $2( \pm 3)$ | 38 | $39( \pm 16)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | 2 | $50( \pm 98)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2018 | 91 | $16( \pm 8)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ | 72 | $14( \pm 8)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | 5 | $80( \pm 39)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2015 | 30 | $50( \pm 18)$ | $3( \pm 7)$ | 32 | $22( \pm 15)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | 4 | $100( \pm 0)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2012 | 59 | $22( \pm 11)$ | $5( \pm 6)$ | 70 | $13( \pm 8)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | 14 | $57( \pm 27)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2009 | 46 | $43( \pm 14)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | 85 | $25( \pm 9)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ | 22 | $86( \pm 15)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2006 | 51 | $25( \pm 12)$ | $12( \pm 9)$ | 47 | $17( \pm 11)$ | $2( \pm 4)$ | 18 | $39( \pm 23)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
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Table 73. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/net-set) of Channel Catfish collected from Liberty Lake.
Channel Catfish were collected using three sets of baited, tandem hoop nets (3 nets with three nets each set with 72 hour soak time) that were set on 24 October 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average per set | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | Total |  |  |
| Channel Catfish | 2 | 1 | 11 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 45 | 15.0 | 12.6 |

sedhnlib.d22

Table 74. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Channel Catfish collected at Liberty Lake during October 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 11.0-15.9 in |  | 16.0-23.9 in |  | $\geq 24.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr | No. | Wr |
| Channel Catfish | Total | 3 | 84 (2) | 42 | 82 (1) | 0 | - | 45 | 82 (1) |

Table 75. Cumulative angler counts based on trail camera data for Liberty Lake (79 acres) from March 2022 to February 2023. Angling type percentage is in parentheses.

|  | Angling Trips |  |  | Angling Trips by Type |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trips | Trips/Day | Trips/Acre | Boat | Bank | Canoe/Kayak |
| March* | 26 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 3 (12) | 23 (88) | 0 (0) |
| April | 120 | 7.5 | 1.5 | 29 (24) | 63 (53) | 28 (23) |
| May | 242 | 15.1 | 3.1 | 72 (30) | 112 (46) | 58 (24) |
| June | 280 | 17.5 | 3.5 | 79 (28) | 149 (53) | 52 (19) |
| July | 202 | 12.6 | 2.6 | 55 (27) | 109 (54) | 38 (19) |
| August | 121 | 7.6 | 1.5 | 40 (33) | 55 (46) | 26 (21) |
| September | 130 | 8.1 | 1.6 | 51 (39) | 48 (37) | 31 (24) |
| October | 83 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 50 (60) | 26 (31) | 7 (9) |
| November | 26 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 8 (31) | 18 (69) | 0 (0) |
| December | 12 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 2 (17) | 9 (75) | 1 (8) |
| January | 11 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 6 (55) | 5 (45) | 0 (0) |
| February | 22 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 1 (5) | 18 (82) | 3 (13) |
| Total | 1275 | 6.9 | 16.0 | 396 (31) | 635 (50) | 244 (19) |

*partial month's data

Table 76. Cumulative angling pressure based on trail camera data for Liberty Lake (79 acres) from March 2022 to February 2023.

|  | Angling Trip Length |  |  | Angling Trip Length by Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Boat |  |  | Bank |  |  | Canoe/Kayak |  |  |
|  | Trips | Total hours | Hours/ <br> Trip | Trips | Total hours | Hours/ <br> Trip | Trips | Total hours | Hours/ <br> Trip | Trips | Total <br> hours | Hours/ Trip |
| March* | 26 | 39 | 1.5 | 3 | 8 | 2.8 | 23 | 31 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| April | 120 | 195 | 1.6 | 29 | 79 | 2.7 | 63 | 65 | 1.0 | 28 | 51 | 1.8 |
| May | 242 | 458 | 1.9 | 72 | 273 | 3.8 | 112 | 101 | 0.9 | 58 | 84 | 1.4 |
| June | 280 | 401 | 1.4 | 79 | 149 | 1.9 | 149 | 179 | 1.2 | 52 | 73 | 1.4 |
| July | 202 | 267 | 1.3 | 55 | 93 | 1.7 | 109 | 107 | 1.0 | 38 | 67 | 1.8 |
| August | 121 | 170 | 1.4 | 40 | 66 | 1.7 | 55 | 65 | 1.2 | 26 | 39 | 1.5 |
| September | 130 | 145 | 1.1 | 51 | 40 | 0.8 | 48 | 30 | 0.6 | 31 | 75 | 2.4 |
| October | 83 | 155 | 1.9 | 50 | 127 | 2.5 | 26 | 18 | 0.7 | 7 | 10 | 1.4 |
| November | 26 | 27 | 1.0 | 8 | 15 | 1.9 | 18 | 12 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| December | 12 | 9 | 0.7 | 2 | 1 | 0.5 | 9 | 6 | 0.7 | 1 | 2 | 2.0 |
| January | 11 | 29 | 2.6 | 6 | 27 | 4.5 | 5 | 2 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| February | 22 | 31 | 1.4 | 1 | 2 | 2.0 | 18 | 19 | 1.1 | 3 | 10 | 3.3 |
| Total | 1275 | 1926 | 1.5 | 396 | 880 | 2.2 | 635 | 635 | 1.0 | 244 | 411 | 1.7 |

*partial month's data

Table 77. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 1.5 hours of 15-minute diurnal electrofishing runs for black bass in Wood Creek Lake on 28 April 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Pump | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 16 | 26 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 125 | 166.7 | 28.9 |
| Station | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 5.3 | 2.7 |
| Dock | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 14 | 22 | 23 | 28 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 146 | 194.7 | 23.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 18 | 25 | 3 | 21 | 34 | 39 | 54 | 25 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 271 | 180.7 | 17.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2.7 | 1.7 |
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Table 78. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples at Wood Creek Lake on 28 April 2022; 95\% confidence limits are in parentheses.

| Year | Area | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\geq$ <br> Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| 2022* | Pump Station | 93 | $29( \pm 9)$ | $11( \pm 6)$ | 4 | $0( \pm 0)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | Dock | 107 | $20( \pm 8)$ | $10( \pm 6)$ | 0 | $0( \pm 0)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
|  | Total | 200 | $24( \pm 6)$ | $11( \pm 4)$ | 4 | $0( \pm 0)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2021* | Total | 176 | $25( \pm 6)$ | $10( \pm 4)$ | 22 | $33( \pm 33)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2020* | Total | 248 | $25( \pm 5)$ | $10( \pm 4)$ | 22 | $27( \pm 19)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2019* | Total | 320 | $16( \pm 4)$ | $2( \pm 2)$ | 12 | $17( \pm 22)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2018* | Total | 223 | $33( \pm 6)$ | $12( \pm 4)$ | 17 | $41( \pm 24)$ | $6( \pm 12)$ |
| 2017* | Total | 181 | $25( \pm 6)$ | $4( \pm 3)$ | 32 | $34( \pm 17)$ | $3( \pm 6)$ |
| 2016* | Total | 110 | $42( \pm 9)$ | $8( \pm 5)$ | 23 | $26( \pm 18)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2015 | Total | 259 | $41( \pm 6)$ | $10( \pm 4)$ | 37 | $30( \pm 15)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2014 | Total | 334 | $34( \pm 5)$ | $10( \pm 3)$ | 61 | $21( \pm 10)$ | $0( \pm 0)$ |
| 2013 | Total | 256 | $23( \pm 5)$ | $9( \pm 4)$ | 79 | $14( \pm 8)$ | $1( \pm 2)$ |

* Lower lake area was not sampled
sedpsdwc.d22

Table 79. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Wood Creek Lake during April 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022* | 47.3 | 7.1 | 101.3 | 11.0 | 18.0 | 4.4 | 14.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 180.7 | 17.8 |
| 2021* | 52.0 | 17.9 | 88.0 | 15.5 | 17.3 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 169.3 | 29.6 |
| 2020* | 40.0 | 17.5 | 124.7 | 26.7 | 24.0 | 5.2 | 16.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 205.3 | 44.7 |
| 2019* | 55.3 | 23.0 | 178.7 | 39.9 | 30.0 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 268.7 | 67.1 |
| 2018* | 56.7 | 15.9 | 99.3 | 15.9 | 32.0 | 5.8 | 17.3 | 3.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 205.3 | 36.8 |
| 2017* | 121.3 | 48.5 | 90.0 | 19.9 | 25.3 | 4.3 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 242.0 | 70.8 |
| 2016* | 40.0 | 14.5 | 42.7 | 9.0 | 24.7 | 3.2 | 6.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 113.3 | 21.3 |
| 2015 | 11.7 | 2.4 | 51.3 | 10.6 | 26.3 | 6.0 | 8.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 98.0 | 15.8 |
| 2014 | 19.0 | 4.2 | 74.0 | 13.4 | 25.7 | 4.7 | 11.7 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 130.3 | 19.8 |
| 2013 | 16.7 | 5.4 | 65.3 | 12.1 | 12.0 | 1.8 | 8.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 102.0 | 17.7 |
| 2012 | 13.7 | 4.6 | 57.0 | 15.2 | 11.0 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 85.3 | 19.4 |

[^46]Table 80. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Spotted Bass collected at Wood Creek Lake during April 2022.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  | $\geq 17.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022* | 2.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 1.7 |
| 2021* | 0.7 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 3.0 |
| 2020* | 2.0 | 1.4 | 9.3 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 10.9 |
| 2019* | 2.0 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 4.7 |
| 2018* | 2.0 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 5.5 |
| 2017* | 6.7 | 4.0 | 11.3 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.3 | 12.5 |
| 2016* | 5.3 | 4.6 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.7 | 10.6 |
| 2015 | 4.3 | 1.7 | 7.3 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 3.9 |
| 2014 | 6.3 | 2.5 | 13.7 | 2.7 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.3 | 5.1 |
| 2013 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 19.7 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.3 | 7.0 |
| 2012 | 17.7 | 4.4 | 11.0 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.0 | 7.1 |

* Lower lake area was not sampled
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Table 81. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass based on spring electrofishing at Wood Creek Lake from 2013-2022 (scoring based on statewide assessment).

| Year |  | Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \text { age } 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CPUE } \\ 12.0-14.9 \text { in } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 15.0 \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPUE } \\ & \geq 20.0 \mathrm{in} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total <br> score | Assessement $\qquad$ rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Managem | jectives | $\geq 11.5$ in | $\geq 8.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 20.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 17.0$ fish/hr | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ |  |  |
| 2022 | Value |  | 34.0 | 18.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 10 | F |
| 2021 | Value |  | 32.0 | 17.3 | 12.0 | 2.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | F |
| 2020 | Value |  | 34.0 | 24.0 | 16.7 | 2.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 | F |
| 2019 | Value | 10.1 | 44.7 | 30.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | F |
| 2018 | Value |  | 40.7 | 32.0 | 17.3 | 1.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 14 | G |
| 2017 | Value |  | 105.3 | 25.3 | 5.3 | 0.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 12 | F |
| 2016 | Value |  | 29.3 | 24.7 | 6.0 | 0.7 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 | F |
| 2015 | Value |  | 5.0 | 26.3 | 8.7 | 1.3 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | F |
| 2014 | Value | 11.3 | 6.0 | 25.7 | 11.7 | 1.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 11 | F |
| 2013 | Value |  | 14.0 | 12.0 | 8.0 | 1.0 |  |  |
|  | Score | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | F |

sedpsdwc.d22

Table 82. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected during 1.5 hours of 15-minute diurnal electrofishing runs for black bass in Wood Creek Lake on 27 September 2022; standard error is in parentheses.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |  |
| Pump station | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 5 | 3 |  |  | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 42 | 56.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 13.3 |
| Dock | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 20 | 33 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 128 | 170.7 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2.7 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 25 | 36 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 19 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 170 | 113.3 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 2 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 8.0 |

Table 83. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean lengths (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected in fall (September and October) electrofishing samples at Wood Creek Lake.

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 56.7 | 21.4 | 14.0 | 6.4 |  |  |
| 2021 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 43.3 | 6.7 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 34.0 | 5.2 |
| 2020 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 43.3 | 15.3 | 6.0 | 2.9 | 32.0 | 12.0 |
| 2019 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 45.3 | 14.3 | 9.3 | 3.8 | 34.0 | 15.6 |
| 2018 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 37.3 | 14.9 | 8.0 | 3.7 | 44.7 | 20.4 |
| $2017{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4.1 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 4.4 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 40.7 | 12.7 |
| 2016 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 74.7 | 22.6 | 8.7 | 1.6 | 105.3 | 43.5 |
| 2015 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 32.7 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 2.2 | 29.3 | 12.8 |
| $2014{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3.7 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 |
| $2013{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3.4 | 0.2 | 11.3 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 6.0 | 1.7 |
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${ }^{\text {a }}$ Age-0 Largemouth Bass stocked in the fall

Table 84. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of black bass collected at Wood Creek Lake during 27 September 2022. Standard error is in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Largemouth Bass | 8.0-11.9 in | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 67 85 (1) | 11 | 82 (2) | 2 | 82 (4) |
| Spotted Bass | 7.0-10.9 in | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  | No. $\quad \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | $7 \quad 93$ (2) | 0 | - | 0 | - |

sedyoywc.d22

Figure 1. Results of the Cedar Creek Lake angler attitude survey conducted from April 1-October 29, 2022.

## CEDAR CREEK LAKE ANGLER ATTITUDE SURVEY 2022

14. Have you been surveyed this year? Yes - stop survey
15. Name $\qquad$ Zip code $\qquad$
1\% No Have you ever fished at Ced
If NO, go to question $\mathbf{1 2}$.
16. How many times do you fish Cedar Creek Lake a year? $(\mathrm{N}=406)$
$\underline{24 \%} 1$ to $4 \quad \underline{27 \%} 5$ to $10 \quad$ 49\% More than 10
17. Which species of fish do you fish for at Cedar Creek Lake (check all that apply)? ( $\mathrm{N}=419$ ) 89\% Bass 27\% Crappie 19\% Bluegill 16\% Redear Sunfish 7\% Channel Catfish
18. Which one species do you fish for most at Cedar Creek Lake (check only one)? $(\mathrm{N}=419)$

78\% Bass $\quad \underline{11 \%}$ Crappie $\quad$ Bluegill $\quad$ (\% Redear Sunfish $\quad$ Channel Catfish
-Answer the following questions for each species you fish for - (see question 5)

## Largemouth Bass Anglers

20. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with Largemouth Bass fishing at Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=367$ ) $\underline{43 \%}$ Very satisfied $\quad \underline{43 \%}$ Somewhat satisfied $\quad \underline{5 \%}$ Neutral $\underline{9 \%}$ Somewhat dissatisfied $\underline{0 \%}$ Very dissatisfied $\quad$ No opinion
7a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (7) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ )
$\underline{47 \%}$ Number of fish $\underline{12 \%}$ Size of fish $\underline{0 \%}$ Not happy with regulations $\underline{32 \%}$ Too many anglers $9 \%$ Other $\qquad$

## Crappie Anglers

21. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with crappie fishing at Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=112$ ) 11\% Very satisfied $\quad \underline{57 \%}$ Somewhat satisfied $\quad \underline{13 \%}$ Neutral $\underline{19 \%}$ Somewhat dissatisfied $\quad \underline{0 \%}$ Very dissatisfied $\quad$ No opinion
8a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (8) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ )
$\underline{19 \%}$ Number of fish $\underline{76 \%}$ Size of fish $\underline{0 \%}$ Not happy with regulations $\underline{5 \%}$ Too many anglers $\underline{9 \%}$ Other $\qquad$

## Bluegill Anglers

22. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with Bluegill fishing Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=78$ ) 19\% Very satisfied $\quad \underline{65 \%}$ Somewhat satisfied $\quad \underline{5 \%}$ Neutral $\quad \underline{10 \%}$ Somewhat dissatisfied $\quad \underline{0 \%}$ Very dissatisfied No opinion

9a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (9) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? $(\mathrm{N}=8)$
$\underline{37 \%}$ Number of fish $\underline{63 \%}$ Size of fish $\underline{0 \%}$ Not happy with regulations $\underline{0 \%}$ Too many anglers $\underline{0 \%}$ Other $\qquad$

## Redear Sunfish Anglers

23. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with Redear Sunfish fishing Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=68$ ) 12\% Very satisfied $\quad \underline{71 \%}$ Somewhat satisfied $\quad \underline{9 \%}$ Neutral $\quad \underline{9}$ Somewhat dissatisfied $\quad \underline{0 \%}$ Very dissatisfied $\quad$ No opinion

10a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (10) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? ( $\mathrm{N}=6$ )

50\% Number of fish $\underline{50 \%}$ Size of fish $\quad \underline{\%}$ Not happy with regulations $\quad 0 \%$ Too many anglers 0\% Othe $\qquad$

## Channel Catfish Anglers

24. In general, what level of satisfaction do you have with Channel Catfish fishing at Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=27$ ) $\underline{22 \%}$ Very satisfied $\quad \underline{48 \%}$ Somewhat satisfied $\quad \underline{11 \%}$ Neutral $\quad 15 \%$ Somewhat dissatisfied $\quad \underline{\%}$ Very dissatisfied $0 \%$ No opinion
11a. If you responded with somewhat or very dissatisfied in question (11) - what is the single most important reason for your dissatisfaction? ( $\mathrm{N}=5$ )

80\% Number of fish $\underline{20 \%}$ Size of fish $\quad \underline{0}$ Not happy with regulations $0 \%$ Too many anglers $0 \%$ Other $\qquad$

## All Anglers

25. Are you satisfied with the current size and creel limits on all sport fish at Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=422$ ) $\quad \underline{85 \%}$ Yes $\quad 15 \%$ No If NO :
12a. If not, which species are you dissatisfied with and what size and creel limits would you prefer?

| Largemouth Bass size limit ( $\mathrm{N}=44$ ) | Largemouth Bass creel limit ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 14\% 18 in | 20\% 0 |
| 14\% 15-18 in slot | 18\% 1 |
| 11\% slot limit | 20\% 2 |
| 9\% 24 in | 18\% 3 |
| 9\% 22 in | 3\% 4 |
| 7\% 12-15 in slot | 10\% 5 |
| 5\% 15 in | 5\% 1 or 2 |
| 5\% 12-18 in slot | 5\% 3 or 4 |
| 2\% 20 in | 3\% 4 or 5 |
| 2\% 17-19 in reverse slot |  |
| 2\% 17 in |  |
| 2\% 16-19 in slot \& keep 1 over 22 in |  |
| 2\% 15-18 in reverse slot |  |
| 2\% 14-17 in slot |  |
| 2\% 14 in |  |
| 2\% 13-16 in slot |  |
| 2\% 13 in |  |
| 2\% 12-16 in slot |  |
| 2\% 12 or 15 in |  |
| 2\% 12 in |  |
| Crappie size limit ( $\mathrm{N}=9$ ) | Crappie creel limit ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) |
| $\underline{22 \%} 9$ in | 50\% 30 |
| 33\% 10 in | 50\% raise limit |
| $\underline{22 \%} 9$ or 10 in |  |
| 11\% 12 in |  |
| 11\% need size limit |  |

Bluegill size limit ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ )
100\% 4 in

Channel Catfish size limit ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) Channel Catfish creel limit $(\mathrm{N}=3)$
100\% 12 in

67\% 4
33\% raise limit
26. During the past three years, what are your feelings regarding the amount of aquatic vegetation in Cedar Creek Lake? ( $\mathrm{N}=421$ ) $\underline{51 \%}$ Too much vegetation $\quad \underline{48 \%}$ Just the right amount $\quad \underline{1 \%}$ Too little vegetation
27. Do you own a smart phone? ( $\mathrm{N}=425$ )

96\% Yes $\quad 4 \%$ No
14a. If YES, do you use it regularly as a fishing tool, such as accessing the KDFWR website for regulations or for GPS locations? ( $\mathrm{N}=407$ )
$62 \%$ Yes $\quad 38 \%$ No

## EASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 1: Lake and Tailwater Fishery Surveys

Table 1 shows sampling conditions by water body for eastern fishery district lakes in 2022.

## Buckhorn Lake

## Muskellunge

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted during mid-March (Tables 2-4). Only 6 fish were collected and they ranged in size from 13.3-39.7 in (Table 2), with the largest fish weighing 21.5 pounds. Relative weight ( Wr ) values by length group are listed in Table 3 and range from $95 \%$ to $117 \%$. Relative weight increased with increasing fish size. An assessment rating of "Poor" was observed for the fishery primarily due to low overall catch rates (Table 4). Please note that the 2017-2019 samples were conducted during poor conditions. There is a narrow window of opportunity to conduct early spring electrofishing at Buckhorn Lake due to dynamic fluctuations in water levels and muddy lake conditions which significantly affect visibility. Sampling conditions for the 2022 sample included turbid water with reduced visibility (Table 1). A total of 327 Muskellunge ( 13.0 in ) were stocked in 2022 which is a slight reduction from the standard 405 fish/yr. Stocking sites included the marina and Trace Fork Confluence boat ramps. These fish did not have any wire tag or fin clip for identification due to an ongoing Muskellunge research project being conducted on the Kentucky River. Future stockings should include an appropriate identification mark.

## Black Bass

Spring nocturnal electrofishing was conducted in the upper and lower sections of the lake during May 2022 to assess the black bass populations. Length-frequency and catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) of Largemouth Bass collected in each area is shown in Table 5, and the CPUE by length group over time is shown in Table 6. The overall Largemouth Bass catch rate ( 128.9 fish/hr; Table 5) was up slightly from 2021 (Table 6). Water levels and sampling conditions were significantly better at the time of spring sampling in 2022. Fish in the 8.0 - to 11.9 -in length group showed the largest increase in catch rate compared to 2021 ( 61.8 and 38.0 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, respectively). Catch rates for the four remaining length groups were all slightly higher than the 2021 catch rates and were within the range of observed values through time. Size structure indices were similar to previous years $\left(\mathrm{PSD}=34, \mathrm{RSD}_{15}=3\right.$; Table 7) and indicative of a population skewed towards smaller individuals. The Largemouth Bass population rated "Fair" based on assessment parameters (Table 8).

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed for black bass to determine length frequency and year class strength. Length-frequency data shows that the highest density of fish in the fall 2022 sample ranged from 9.0 to 12.0 inches in length (Table 9). The 2022 catch rates of age-0 Largemouth Bass ( 97.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) were higher than the results of the fall 2020 and 2021 surveys (Table 10). Mean age-0 length ( 5.0 in ) was slightly above average. Recruitment has been higher in recent years with above average CPUE observed for age-0 fish from 2016-2019 and 2022. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass collected during the September sample are shown in Table 11.

Other species stocked in Buckhorn Lake in 2022 include 24,600 Redear Sunfish ( 2.25 in ) during September and approximately 5,050 Rainbow Trout ( $8.0-12.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) stocked in the tailwater during the months of April-June and October-November.

## Carr Creek Lake

## Black Bass

Spring nocturnal electrofishing was completed in May to assess the black bass population. The length-frequency and CPUE of Largemouth Bass collected in each area is shown in Table 12. The overall Largemouth Bass CPUE ( 238.8 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) was the highest it has been in the last 20 years. Fish in the 8.0 - to 11.9 -in length group showed the largest increase in catch rate ever documented (Table 13). The recruitment of age-1 fish has consistently remained
high since 2013 and is most likely due to the continuing expansion of hydrilla in the lake. The catch rate of Largemouth $\geq 15.0$ in ( 10.4 fish/hr) remains slightly below average (Table 13). Largemouth Bass size structure indices were lower than previous years $\left(P S D=27 ; \operatorname{RSD}_{15}=7\right)$ and indicative of a population skewed toward smaller individuals (Table 14). The population assessment improved to "Good" for Largemouth in 2022 (Table 15). Age and growth data was last taken in 2019. Growth rates over the last 12 years have remained high indicating a stable population. With continued high recruitment and the increase in catch rates of 8.0- to 11.9-in fish, it is likely that growth rates will soon begin to decrease. Age and growth data will be collected again in the spring of 2024.

Nocturnal black bass electrofishing was completed in September to index Largemouth Bass year class strength (Tables 16 and 17). Catch rates of age-0 Largemouth Bass were higher in 2022 than in most previous years (Table 17). Extreme flooding in Knott County during summer 2022 caused Carr Creek Lake to reach record pool levels and remain high and muddy for an extended period through late summer. The lack of water clarity significantly suppressed hydrilla growth lake wide. As a result, fall sampling efforts were more effective and electrofishing boats were able to reach critical bank line, shallow water habitat that young-of-year Largemouth Bass typically occupy. Mean age-0 Largemouth Bass length ( 5.1 in ) was above average. Fall YOY sampling suggests an above average Largemouth Bass year class in 2022 with good potential for overwinter survival due to the increase in mean length. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass collected during the September sample are shown in Table 18. Relative weight increased with increasing fish size. Largemouth Bass DNA samples for genetic analysis were collected as fin clips in October.

## Walleye

Diurnal electrofishing samples were collected in the early spring for Walleye (Tables 19-21). Additionally, during this sampling effort, broodfish were collected for Minor Clark Fish Hatchery. Over multiple days sampling for broodfish, a total of 65 Walleye were sampled for a catch rate of $8.4 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$. The majority of fish were in the 18.0to 22.0 -in size class (Table 19). Catch rates by age group are shown in Table 20. The majority of Walleye collected are between 2 and 5 years old. The total relative weight value was 98 (Table 21). All length groups showed an increase in Wr value over the 2021 sample. A total of 35,190 (1.6 in) Walleye were stocked in May.

In previous years, Grass Carp were stocked jointly by KDFWR and the USACE in an effort to help control hydrilla. No grass carp were stocked in 2022. A Redear Sunfish stocking program was initiated in October 2018 and stocking continued in 2019 and 2020 with $14,200(1.2 \mathrm{in})$ fish stocked in September of each year. Due to a sudden and unexpected loss of fish at the hatchery, Redear Sunfish were not stocked in 2021. Stocking resumed in 2022 with $14,200(2.25 \mathrm{in})$ fish stocked in September. Due to the recent establishment of zebra mussels, an annual Blue Catfish stocking program was initiated in October 2020. Stocking has continued through September 2022 with 7,100 (7.0 in) fish. In 2021, a Black Crappie stocking program was initiated with 17,790 Black Crappie ( 2.5 in) stocked in August. Stockings continued in 2022 with 17,780 (2.1 in) blacknose Black Crappie. Tailwater stockings included 4,000 (total) Rainbow Trout during the months of April, May, October, and November.

During 2019, zebra mussels were documented for the first time in the lake, and they became prolific in number by year end. For 2020, the zebra mussel population peaked by early summer and numbers looked to have significantly reduced by fall. As of 2021, the zebra mussel population appears to have reached carrying capacity and has stabilized. This follows several other recent invasive species introductions to Carr Creek Lake including purple loosestrife (2013), hydrilla (2008), and Alewife (2000).

## Cranks Creek Lake

## Black Bass

Spring diurnal electrofishing was completed in May to assess the black bass population. Due to the distance from the district office, diurnal electrofishing was utilized in an effort to increase efficiency. Two lakes (Cranks Creek and Martins Fork) were sampled in one day as well as completion of fish habitat improvement projects at both locations. Length distribution and CPUE are presented in Tables 22 and 23. The overall largemouth CPUE of 126.4 fish/hr was down slightly from recent years but within the range of observed values through time. This number may have been affected by the decision to utilize diurnal electrofishing. Largemouth Bass size structure indices were
slightly better than previous years $\left(\mathrm{PSD}=24 ; \mathrm{RSD}_{15}=10\right.$; Table 24). The population assessment dipped to "Fair" for Largemouth Bass in 2022 (Table 25). Cranks Creek Lake receives limited tournament fishing pressure; however, it is considered a location of high angler harvest of all species. Catch rates drop off quickly once largemouth reach the 12.0 -in minimum length limit. Age and growth data over time continues to show that Largemouth Bass growth at Cranks Creek Lake is slow with fish only reaching a mean length of 10.7 in by age 3 (Table 25). Largemouth Bass are the dominant black bass species and this lake continues to produce some trophy-size fish. In the spring 2021 survey, 23.0-in and 25.0-in Largemouth Bass were sampled.

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed in October for black bass to determine length frequency and year class strength (Tables 26 and 27). Age-0 Largemouth Bass CPUE ( 8.0 fish/hr) was observed to be well below average. Mean age-0 length ( 4.8 in ) was above average. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass collected during the October sample are shown in Table 28. This lake's weighted regression shows that the YOY year class is often density dependent. Stocking advanced fingerlings in the fall does not always benefit the year class. Catch rates for young-of-year Largemouth Bass were low enough that the decision was made to stock fingerlings (4.4-in fish) at a rate of 15 fish/acre in October 2022. This is a clear, relatively infertile lake. Past efforts to apply fertilizer have had little to no effect due to water chemistry.

Approximately 5,000 Rainbow Trout (total) were stocked in the lake during the months of January, April, May, and October. Channel Catfish (2,640; 6.0 in) were also stocked in November. No vegetation controls were utilized in 2022; however, herbicides have been used when needed in the past, and future work may include a low-rate stocking of Grass Carp.

## Dewey Lake

## Black Bass

Nocturnal boat electrofishing to assess the black bass population at Dewey Lake was conducted in April (Tables 2932). Largemouth Bass accounted for around $93 \%$ of the black bass collected during standardized spring sampling. The length-frequency and CPUE of Largemouth Bass collected in each area is shown in Table 29. The catch rate for Largemouth Bass increased to 105.2 fish/hr but remains slightly below the lake average of 143.6 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 30). Largemouth Bass size structure indices ( $\mathrm{PSD}=60$; $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=25$; Table 31) were similar to previous years, offering anglers good opportunity for catching quality fish. The spring assessment for Largemouth Bass improved in 2022 to "Good" (Table 32). The most recent assessment shows that catch rate of fish $\geq 15.0$ in is increasing. Previous assessments suggest that recruitment of spring age-1 Largemouth Bass had been decreasing. Advanced fingerling Largemouth Bass were overwintered (2021) at Minor Clark fish hatchery for stocking in the spring of 2022. Due to predatory bird loss at the hatchery, a reduced number of advanced fingerlings (3,645 total, 5.7-in fish) survived and were stocked in March.

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed in October for black bass to determine length frequency and year class strength (Tables 33 and 34). Mean age-0 length in the fall ( 5.2 in ) was above the average of 4.7 in . Fall YOY sampling suggests good potential for overwinter survival due to the increase in mean length. The total CPUE of age-0 ( $39.2 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) and age- $0 \geq 5.0 \mathrm{in}(22.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) fish was consistent with the lake average ( 42.6 and $18.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively). No supplemental stocking of young-of-year fingerlings was required in the fall of 2022. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass collected during the September sample are shown in Table 35. Average relative weight for Largemouth Bass $\geq 15.0$ in was good (93) and considered acceptable for length groups ranging from 8.0-11.9 and 12.0-14.9 in (89 and 90, respectively).

## Crappie

Trap netting was conducted in the fall to sample White and Black crappie. Due to drought conditions statewide, the US. Army Corps. of Engineers (Huntington District) delayed drawdown of lake water levels to winter pool until the first week in December. This is a departure from the typical November $1^{\text {st }}$ start date. The timing of our crappie sampling efforts is planned to coincide with the winter pool drawdown schedule. This delay in schedule caused us to sample a month later than normal and outside of normal water temperatures. As a result, our catch rates were significantly reduced. The crappie populations at Dewey Lake have been stable over time and we have no reason to
suspect that these reduced catch rates accurately reflect the actual population. As such, the data has not been included in this report. Crappie sampling efforts will resume as scheduled in the fall of 2024.
Due to a reduction in hatchery production, a total of 8,029 Blue Catfish ( 7.0 in) were stocked in October. The normal stocking rate would be 11,000 . An additional 305 Muskellunge (12.2 in) were stocked in September. A total of 4,000 Rainbow Trout ( $1,000 / \mathrm{mo} ; 9.5 \mathrm{in}$ ) were stocked in the Dewey Lake tailwater in April, May, October, and November.

## Fishtrap Lake

## Black Bass

Spring nocturnal electrofishing was completed in May to assess the black bass population. The length-frequency and CPUE of black bass collected in each area is shown in Table 36, and the catch-per-hour (by length group) is shown in Table 37. Overall catch rates for Largemouth Bass decreased slightly in 2022 when compared to 2021, especially for fish in the 8.0 - to 11.9 -in range (Table 37). PSD data showed a Largemouth Bass population skewed towards larger sizes $\left(\operatorname{PSD}=73, \mathrm{RSD}_{15}=25\right.$; Table 38). The $\mathrm{PSD}^{2}$ and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values were higher than that seen in 2021. The spring assessment was once again "Fair" for Largemouth Bass (Table 39). The most recent assessments suggest that recruitment of spring age-1 Largemouth Bass is down significantly with the age-1 CPUE for 2021 and 2022 both being the two lowest recorded over the last 12 years (Table 39). Largemouth Bass advanced fingerlings were stocked in the fall of 2021 at a rate of 10 fish/acre. The spring sample for 2023 will be closely monitored to see if numbers return to normal.

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed in September for black bass to determine length frequency and year class strength (Tables 40 and 41). Mean age-0 Largemouth Bass length ( 5.4 in ) in the fall was above average ( 5.0 in) for the third year in a row. The total CPUE of age-0 ( $30.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) and age- $0 \geq 5.0-\mathrm{in}(20.8 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr})$ fish was well below average ( 98.3 and 47.1 fish/hr, respectively). When fall age- 0 catch data suggests the need for stocking, advanced fingerlings for Fishtrap Lake can be held over winter for stocking the following spring. Advanced fingerling Largemouth Bass will be overwintered at Minor Clark fish hatchery and stocked in the spring of 2023 if available. Relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ values for all black bass collected during the September sample are shown in Table 42. Largemouth Bass DNA samples for genetic analysis were collected as fin clips in September.

Due to a reduction in hatchery production, a total of 8,925 Blue Catfish ( 7.0 in ) were stocked in the lake during October. The normal stocking rate would be 11,500 . A total of 23,124 hybrid striped bass ( 1.5 in ) were stocked in June. Rainbow Trout ( 6,000 total) were stocked in the tailwater in May, June, October, and November.

Fishtrap Lake is an aging reservoir with limited habitat currently available to fish populations lake wide. Reductions in recruitment as well as overall abundance of both black bass and crappie populations supports the need for fish habitat improvement projects at this lake. EFD staff began implementing improvements during the summer of 2021 with hinged, hardwood trees. These efforts were well received by both anglers and USACE personnel. Habitat improvement work continued in 2022 and will expand on a broader scale as more staff and resources become available in 2023.

## Grants Branch Lake

## Black Bass

Nocturnal boat electrofishing was conducted on 28 April 2022 at Grants Branch Lake to assess the black bass population. Length distribution and CPUE are presented in Tables 43 and 44. Largemouth Bass accounted for around $97 \%$ of the black bass collected during standardized spring sampling. Total catch rate for Largemouth Bass was 152.0 fish/hr. PSD and $\operatorname{RSD}_{15}$ values ( 29 and 16, respectively) suggest a Largemouth Bass population that is out of balance (Table 45). The population is skewed by an abundance of smaller bass ( $\leq 12.0$ in), yet a good number of individuals of memorable size ( $\geq 20.0 \mathrm{in}$ ) are also present. With an $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ value of 16 and a CPUE of $6.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ for $\geq 20.0$-in fish, there is good opportunity for an above average angler success rate for larger fish.

Approximately 4,550 Rainbow Trout (total) were stocked in the lake during the months of January, March, and November. Channel Catfish (550; 6.0 in) were also stocked in November.

## Martins Fork Lake

## Black Bass

Nocturnal boat electrofishing to sample the black bass population on Martins Fork Lake was conducted on 4 May 2022. Spotted Bass made up $16 \%$ of all black bass collected during spring standardized sampling. A total of 46 Spotted Bass were collected ranging from 4.0-11.0 in (Table 46). A total of 228 Largemouth Bass were collected in 1.25 hours of spring sampling for a total CPUE of $182.4 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ (Table 46). This catch rate was more than double the previous sample (2021). The most significant CPUE increase was in the $<8.0$-in size range suggesting high recruitment of spring age-1 fish to the population (Table 47). Size structure indices for Largemouth Bass continue to decrease over time $\left(\mathrm{PSD}=23, \mathrm{RSD}_{15}=5\right.$; Table 48). Martins Fork Lake has a 12.0 -in minimum size limit and offers anglers limited opportunity to catch trophy bass. Age and growth data was last collected in 2020 and growth rates of Largemouth Bass have slowly decreased with the mean length of age-3 fish only reaching 10.4 inches in 2021. The spring assessment was once again "Fair" for Largemouth Bass in 2022 (Table 49).

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed in October for black bass to determine length frequency and year class strength. Total fall catch rate was less than the spring with fewer fish greater than 15.0 in collected during this survey (Table 50). Mean age-0 Largemouth Bass length ( 5.1 in ) was above average. The year class strength model indicated that 2022 was an average recruitment year for young-of-year Largemouth Bass ( 66.4 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) while number of age-0 fish $\geq 5.0$ in ( $38.4 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was above average (Table 51). No supplemental stocking of young-ofyear fingerlings was required in the fall of 2022. The average relative weight (Wr) value for Largemouth Bass $\geq 15.0$ in was good (96) but we would like to see increases for fish 8.0-11.9 and 12.0-14.9 in (Table 52). Like several other flood control reservoirs in the district, Martins Fork Lake is an aging reservoir that is becoming increasingly void of available fish habitat. EFD staff increased fish habitat improvement efforts here in 2022 and will continue these efforts as staff and resources allow. Black bass fin clips were sampled for DNA analysis in October.

## Walleye

Native-strain Walleye have been stocked annually since 2013. While electrofishing for black bass species in May, only 8 Walleye ( $9.0-\mathrm{in}$ ) were observed (Table 46). During the fall survey for black bass species in October, two 11.0 -in Walleye were collected (Table 50).

A total of 4,154 native-strain Walleye (5.4 in) were stocked in July. In addition, 6,700 Redear Sunfish (2.25 in) were stocked in September. Rainbow Trout ( 750 fish/mo) were stocked at the tailwater in April, May, June, October, and November.

## Pan Bowl Lake

## Black Bass

Diurnal electrofishing was conducted on 21 April 2022 to assess the Largemouth Bass population. The lengthfrequency and CPUE of Largemouth Bass is shown in Table 53 and the catch-per-hour (by length group) is shown in Table 54. Fish were sampled from approximately 4.0 to 21.0 in (Table 53). The highest density of Largemouth Bass collected were in the 8.0- to 11.9 -in size range resulting in a marginal size structure (Table 54). PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values (11 and 6, respectively) suggest a Largemouth Bass population that is out of balance (Table 55). The population is skewed by an abundance of smaller bass (8.0-11.9 in). High fishing pressure, due to the lake's location within the city of Jackson, is likely contributing to the low number of keeper fish ( $>12.0 \mathrm{in}$ ). During the 1990's to early-2000's, it was common to observe Largemouth Bass PSD values of 60-70. For 2023, a 12- to 15.0in protective slot limit for Largemouth Bass will be instituted. This regulation will allow anglers to harvest small bass <12.0 in and hopefully help reduce the number of small fish in the population while still offering protection for larger fish up to 15.0 in.

Approximately 6,000 Rainbow Trout (total) were stocked in the lake during the months of March and October. Channel Catfish ( 1,865 ; 6.0 in) were also stocked in November.

## Paintsville Lake

## Black Bass

Spring nocturnal electrofishing studies were conducted in the upper and lower sections of the lake in May to assess the black bass population. Length-frequency and CPUE results from each area are shown in Table 56, and the catch-per-hour (by length group) over time is shown in Table 57. Overall catch rates for Largemouth Bass increased across all length groups in 2022 when compared to 2021. For the second year in a row, there has been an increase in catch rate of fish 12.0-14.9 in with the 2022 catch rate being the highest recorded since 2005 (Table 57).
Largemouth Bass at Paintsville Lake continue to exhibit marginal size structure but with a slight improvement over previous years. The population is skewed toward smaller fish while having a few large fish present ( $\mathrm{PSD}=38$, $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=10$; Table 58). The most recent assessments (Table 59) suggest that recruitment of spring age-1 Largemouth Bass is beginning to slow down with a smaller catch rate over the past two springs ( $24.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ in 2021; $21.6 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ in 2022). The Largemouth Bass population assessment improved to "Good" for 2022 based on assessment parameters. The higher catch rates of fish ranging from 12.0-14.9 in and fish $\geq 20.0$ in contributed to the improved assessment.

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed in October for black bass and specifically to determine length frequency and year class strength of Largemouth Bass (Tables 60 and 61). Mean age-0 Largemouth Bass length (4.9 in) was average. The year class strength model indicated that recruitment of young-of-year Largemouth for 2022 was above average ( $106.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Numbers of age-0 fish $\geq 5.0$ in ( $52.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) were also above average (Table 61). No supplemental stocking of young-of-year fingerlings was required in the fall of 2022. Average relative weight (Wr) for bass $\geq 15.0$ in was good (98) but we would like to see increases for fish 8.0-11.9 and 12.0-14.9 in (Table 62). The $12.0-$ to 15.0 -in slot length limit for Largemouth Bass was replaced with a minimum length limit of 12.0 in beginning 1 March 2019. The slot length regulation was in effect for 17 years (2002-2018). Bass angler acceptance of the new regulation has been largely positive. Largemouth Bass DNA samples for genetic analysis were collected as fin clips in October.

Paintsville Lake is an aging reservoir with limited habitat currently available to fish populations lake wide. Angler requests for lake enhancements support the need for fish habitat improvement projects at this location. EFD staff began implementing improvements during the summer of 2022 in a cooperative effort with a local group of anglers. A total of 59 pallet/tree structures and 10 experimental "Shelbyville Cube" PVC structures were added to lower, middle, and upper sections of the lake. The cooperative effort of habitat improvement is planned to continue for 2023.

Walleye broodfish collection was conducted in March; no females were collected.
The lake received a stocking of 10,000 Rainbow Trout ( 9.7 in ) during February and 10,000 Brown Trout (8.1 in) in April. In addition, 57,058 Walleye ( 1.3 in ) were stocked in May as well as 28,780 surplus blacknose Black Crappie in July.

The tailwater trout fishery received approximately 14,000 Rainbow Trout from April to July and September to November. Due to an increase in temperature in the tailwater, the Brown Trout stocking was permanently removed beginning in 2020.

## Yatesville Lake

## Black Bass

Spring nocturnal electrofishing studies were conducted in the upper and lower sections of the lake during April 2022 to assess the Black Bass populations at Yatesville Lake. Length distribution and CPUE are presented in Tables 63
and 64. The overall largemouth CPUE of 170.3 fish/hr was well above catch rates collected in the spring of 2021 and above the lake's historical average of 137.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$. Catch rates were higher for all length groups of Largemouth Bass. Bass size structure indices were consistent with previous years and are within acceptable ranges ( $\mathrm{PSD}=44$; $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}=19$; Table 65). The population assessment climbed to "Excellent" for Largemouth Bass in 2022 (Table 66). Above average catch rates for the 12.0-14.9 and $\geq 15.0$-in size groups made the most significant contributions to the improved assessment rating. Recruitment of spring age-1 Largemouth Bass remains above average. Due to heavy angling pressure via tournaments from spring into fall, the population is monitored closely.

Fall nocturnal electrofishing was completed in September to determine year class strength of Largemouth Bass and to record length frequency data for all black bass species (Table 67 and 68). Largemouth Bass made up nearly all of the fall sample ( $99.5 \%$ ). Total fall catch rate was slightly less than the spring with significantly fewer fish greater than 15.0 in collected during this survey as compared to the spring survey (Table 67). Age-0 overall CPUE (51.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) and age- $0 \geq 5.0$-in CPUE ( 18.7 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) suggests that the 2022 year class was slightly below average ( 60.5 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ and $32.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, respectively; Table 68). These values have been very consistent for the past three fall survey periods indicating stable reproductive success. No supplemental stocking of young-of-year fingerlings was required in the fall of 2022. Relative weight (Wr) values for Largemouth Bass collected during the September sample are shown in Table 69. Average relative weight for Largemouth Bass $\geq 15.0$ in was very good (99). Largemouth Bass DNA samples for genetic analysis were collected as fin clips in September.

## Crappie

Trap netting was conducted in the fall to sample White and Black crappie. Due to drought conditions statewide, the US. Army Corps. of Engineers (Huntington District) delayed drawdown of lake water levels to winter pool until the first week in December. This is a departure from the typical November $1^{\text {st }}$ start date. The timing of our crappie sampling efforts is planned to coincide with the winter pool drawdown schedule. This delay in schedule caused us to sample a month later than normal and outside of normal water temperatures. As a result, our catch rates were significantly reduced. The most recent crappie population assessments on Yatesville Lake (2018 and 2020) scored a rating of "Excellent" both years. The crappie population here shows high catch rates of age-0 and age- 1 fish indicating strong natural reproduction. We have no reason to suspect that the reduced catch rates for 2022 accurately reflect the actual population. As such, the data has not been included in this report. Crappie sampling efforts will resume as scheduled in the fall of 2024.

A total of $22,800(7.0-\mathrm{in})$ Blue Catfish were stocked in the lake in October. Rainbow Trout were stocked in the tailwater of Yatesville Lake in April-May and October-November (750 fish each month).

Table 1. Summary of 2022 sampling conditions by waterbody, species sampled, and date.

| Water body | Species | Date | Time (24hr) | Gear | Weather | Water Temp ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) | Water level (elev ft) | Secchi <br> (in) | Pertinent sampling comments ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buckhorn Lake | Muskie | 22-Mar | 1100 | shock | pt. cloudy | 57.2 | 758.5 | 18 | outflow : 379cfs; bp: 30.12; cond: 314; 1 boat; low er lake |
| Buckhorn Lake | LMB | 19-May | 2000 | shock | cloudy | 76.8 | 782.2 | 109 | outflow : 311 cfs ; bp: 29.77; cond: 274; 2 boats |
| Buckhorn Lake | LMB | 22-Sep | 2000 | shock | pt. cloudy | 77.7 | 781.7 | 84 | outflow : 106cfs; bp: 29.95; 2 boats; YOY, Wr |
| Carr Creek Lake | Walleye | 8-Mar | 1000 | shock | cloudy | 50.1 | 1017.5 | 46 | broodf ish collection; cond: 350; 2 boats; w hole lake; w ater muddy |
| Carr Creek Lake | Walleye | 15-Mar | 1000 | shock | cloudy | 50.1 | 1018.3 | 72 | broodfish collection; outflow : 175cfs; bp: 30.33; cond: 388; 2 boats; w hole lake; $w$ ater clear |
| Carr Creek Lake | LMB | 12-May | 2000 | shock | clear | 77.7 | 1028.2 | 30 | outflow : 67cfs; bp: 30.04; cond: 402; 2 boats; w ater clear |
| Carr Creek Lake | LMB | 19-Sep | 2000 | shock | clear | 77.0 | 1028.0 | 97 | outflow :155cfs; cond: 508;2 boats; w ater clear; YOY, Wr |
| Carr Creek Lake | LMB | 25-Oct | 1000 | shock | pt. cloudy | 64.7 | 1026.3 | 34 | outflow 44cfs; bp: 30.0; 1 Boat; DNA collection |
| Cranks Creek Lake | LMB | 4-May | 1600 | shock | pt.cloudy | 73.4 | normal | 31 | bp:30.04; cond: 245; 1 boat; w hole lake; w ater turbid |
| Cranks Creek Lake | LMB | 5-Oct | 2000 | shock | Clear/cool | 64.3 | normal | 78 | bp: 30.07; cond: 242; 1 boat; w hole lake; w ater clear; YOY, Wr, DNA collection |
| Dew ey Lake | LMB | 18-Apr | 2000 | shock | cloudy/t.rain | 58.4 | 650.5 | 104 | outflow : 13.4cfs; bp: 30.01; cond: 412; 2 boats; w hole lake; w ater clear and w indy |
| Dew ey Lake | LMB | 3-Oct | 2000 | shock | clear/t. w ind | 68.0 | 650.4 | 60 | outflow : 85.2; bp: 30.17; 2 boats; cond: 437; YOY, Wr; lake turning over |
| Dew ey Lake | Crappie | 12/5-12/7 | 1000 | trap net | cloudy | 44.0 | 649.5 | 41 | outflow : variable 264-152.1cfs; bp: 30.01; 10 nets; upper lake; w ater clear; crappie A\&G |
| Fish Pond | LMB | 25-Oct | 1000 | shock | pt.cloudy | 58.6 | 1 ' low | 190 | bp: 30.00; cond: 581; 1 boat; w hole lake; w ater clear; DNA collection; Wr |
| FishTrap | LMB | 17-May | 2000 | shock | pt.cloudy | 76.4 | 757.6 | 102 | outflow : 319.5 bp : 29.95; cond 571; 2 boats; w ater clear |
| FishTrap | LMB | 26-Sep | 2000 | shock | w indy pt.cloudy | 73.5 | 757.6 | 49 | outflow : 101.0cfs; bp: 29.86; cond: 619; 2bBoats; DNA collection, YOY, Wr; Water clear |
| Grants Branch Parl | LMB | 28-Apr | 2000 | shock | pt.cloudy | 63.5 | normal | 60 | bp: 30.17; boats; w hole lake; cond.96; w ater-clay colored |
| HighSplint | LMB | 24-Oct | 1000 | shock | clear | 60.8 | low 1.0 | 142 | cond: 367; 1 boat; w hole lake; w ater clear; DNA collection, Wr |
| Martins Fk Lake | LMB | 4-May | 2000 | shock | clear | 72.1 | 1309.8 | 77 | bp: 30.04; cond: 174; 1 boat; w hole lake; w ater clear |
| Martins Fk Lake | LMB | 5-Oct | 2000 | shock | clear | 67.2 | 1309.1 | 53 | outflow : minimum; bp: 30.07; 1 boat; cond: 194; w ater; clear; DNA collection, YOY, Wr |
| N.Fork Ky River | w alleye | 16-Feb | 1000 | shock | clear/w indy | 40.6 |  | 38 | broodfish collection; flow : 710cfs; bp: 30.01; 1 boat; 1 dipper; w ater clear |
| Paintsville Lake | w alleye | 11-Mar | 1000 | shock | clear | 51.0 | 709.4 | 34 | broodfish collection; outflow : 677.3cfs; bp: 33.03; cond: 115; 1 boat; w ater turbid |
| Paintsville Lake | w alleye | 16-Mar | 1000 | shock | cloudy | 48.5 | 709.5 | 42 | outflow : 529.3cfs; bp: 30.15; cond: 113; 1 boat; broodfish collection |
| Paintsville Lake | LMB | 2-May | 2000 | shock | pt.cloudy | 69.6 | 709.9 | 89 | outflow : 218cfs; bp: 30.0; cond: 87; 2 boats; w ater clear |
| Paintsville Lake | LMB | 11-Oct | 2000 | shock | clear | 65.3 | 708.4 | 68 | outflow : 17.9cfs; bp: 30.19; cond: 132; 2 boats; w ater clear; DNA collection, YOY, Wr |
| Pan Bowl | LMB | 21-Apr | 1000 | shock | cloudy/t.rain | 59.7 | normal | 110 | cond: 194; bp: 30.3 ; 1 boat; 7.5 min runs; w ater clear |
| Yatesville Lake | LMB | 27-Apr | 2000 | shock | pt. cloudy | 66.3 | 630.3 | 64 | bp: 30.19; cond: 157; 2 boats; w ater clear |
| Yatesville Lake | LMB | 29-Sep | 2000 | shock | clear | 71.1 | 629.9 | 42 | outflow : 30cfs; bp: 30.24; cond: 184; 2 boats; lake turning over; YOY, Wr, DNA collection |
| Yatesville Lake | Crappie | 11/28-11/30 | 1000 | trap net | cloudy | 46.0 | 629.8 | 28 | outflow : 33.7cfs; bp: 30.0; upper-middle lake; w ater clear; crappie A\&G |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ cond = conductivity <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{bp}=$ barometric pr <br> L= lower lake <br> $\mathrm{U}=$ upper lake | ty in $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ ressure in | nches |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Length frequency and electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of Muskellunge collected during spring sampling on Buckhorn Lake from $1998-2022$.
Results from 2002 are from fall electrofishing.


[^47]LFRBHLSP.D11, D13

Table 3. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Muskellunge collected at Buckhorn Lake (710 acres) from spring electrofishing. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\leq 19.9$ in |  | 20.0-29.9 in |  | $30.0-37.9 \mathrm{in}$ |  | $\geq 38.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | W | No. | Wr | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| 2022 | 4 | 95 (4) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 1 | 117 (0) | 5 | 100 (5) |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  | ample |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 14 | 82 (1) | 1 | $92(<1)$ | 4 | 93 (2) | 1 | 102 (<1) | 20 | 86 (2) |
| 2019 | 1 | 72 (<1) | 2 | 91 (1) | 0 |  | 5 | 92 (3) | 8 | 89 (3) |
| 2018 | 4 | 83 (4) | 2 | 91 (4) | 6 | 95 (3) | 0 |  | 12 | 90 (3) |
| 2017 | 0 |  | 5 | 81 (5) | 4 | 84 (1) | 2 | 98 (2) | 11 | 85 (3) |
| 2016 | 4 | 78 (5) | 6 | 87 (2) | 4 | 91 (3) | 3 | 96 (2) | 17 | 87 (2) |
| 2014 | 2 | 79 (1) | 8 | 95 (2) | 2 | 93 (4) | 3 | 92 (1) | 15 | 92 (2) |
| 2013 | 0 |  | 1 | 73 (<1) | 3 | 96 (2) | 0 |  | 4 | 90 (6) |
| 2012 | 22 | 82 (1) | 12 | 91 (3) | 8 | 96 (3) | 4 | 92 (1) | 46 | 88 (1) |
| 2011 | 11 | 79 (1) | 10 | 85 (2) | 13 | 92 (2) | 3 | 92 (4) | 37 | 87 (1) |
| 2010 | 20 | 79 (1) | 33 | 94 (1) | 15 | 96 (1) | 10 | 97 (4) | 78 | 91 (1) |
| 2009 | 29 | 78 (1) | 12 | 96 (4) | 15 | 94 (3) | 5 | 90 (4) | 61 | 86 (2) |
| 2008 | 16 | 83 (2) | 6 | 98 (3) | 9 | 96 (2) | 3 | 97 (1) | 34 | 90 (2) |
| 2007 | 4 | 87 (2) | 14 | 95 (2) | 7 | 100 (2) | 6 | 91 (5) | 31 | 94 (1) |
| 2006 | 6 | 90 (1) | 6 | 106 (2) | 9 | 94 (2) | 5 | 93 (<1) | 26 | 95 (2) |
| 2005 | 7 | 75 (5) | 5 | 93 (4) | 4 | 94 (2) | 7 | 93 (2) | 23 | 87 (3) |
| 2004 | 10 | 58 (3) | 15 | 69 (5) | 19 | 78 (5) | 4 | 98 (4) | 48 | 73 (3) |
| 2003 | 1 | 73 (<1) | 6 | 88 (3) | 5 | 98 (2) | 1 | 73 (<1) | 13 | 89 (3) |

EFDBLMSS.D03-D20, D-22

Table 4. Population assessment for Muskellunge from Buckhorn Lake ( 1,230 acres) captured during spring electrofishing from 2009-2022. Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2022 |
| CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (9.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 3 \\ (5.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (7.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (7.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (2.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (8.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (7.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (7.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2}{(4.7)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (5.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| CPUE $\geq 30.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (4.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (3.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (2.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (3.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (2.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (1.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (2.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (2.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| CPUE $\geq 36.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| CPUE $\geq 40.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score Assessment | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & \text { Exc } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ | $13$ <br> Good | 15 Good | $6$ Poor | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ \text { Fair } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ \text { Fair } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6 Poor | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ \text { Poor } \end{gathered}$ | 7 <br> Poor | $13$ <br> Good | 6 Poor |

EFDBLMSS.D09-D14, D16-D20, D21
LFRBHLSP.D11, D13

Table 5. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.25 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing samples at Buckhorn Lake (1,230 acres) on 19 May 2022.

|  |  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Species | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 17 | 12 | 15 | 18 | 10 | 4 | 3 |  | 110 | 110.0 | 11.4 |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 7 | 27 | 19 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 22 | 40 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 180 | 144.0 | 23.9 |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 8 | 33 | 28 | 11 | 17 | 33 | 34 | 55 | 36 | 20 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 290 | 128.9 | 14.7 |

EFDBLLSS.D22

Table 6. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Buckhorn Lake (1,230 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 35.6 | 7.6 | 61.8 | 6.3 | 28.9 | 5.2 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 128.9 | 14.7 |
| 2021 | 32.5 | 12.5 | 38.0 | 7.0 | 22.5 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 95.0 | 15.2 |
| 2020 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 40.0 | 11.6 | 56.0 | 4.3 | 26.7 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 128.0 | 16.6 |
| 2018 | 46.4 | 7.0 | 59.2 | 6.4 | 28.4 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 136.8 | 11.3 |
| 2017 | 91.3 | 19.9 | 40.0 | 4.3 | 34.7 | 7.1 | 8.7 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 174.7 | 19.7 |
| 2016 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 56.4 | 6.0 | 29.8 | 5.2 | 27.1 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 116.9 | 9.1 |
| 2014 | 9.3 | 3.4 | 25.3 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 43.3 | 9.9 |
| 2013 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 32.5 | 6.3 | 26.5 | 5.3 | 7.5 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 70.0 | 8.3 |
| 2011 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 21.2 | 4.5 | 31.8 | 6.6 | 18.3 | 3.7 | 10.7 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 82.0 | 11.7 |
| 2009 | 41.2 | 3.5 | 32.0 | 7.7 | 17.2 | 4.8 | 14.5 | 3.0 | 0.0 |  | 104.8 | 13.2 |
| 2008 | 14.8 | 5.5 | 27.0 | 7.2 | 21.4 | 3.3 | 13.8 | 1.8 | 0.0 |  | 77.0 | 12.0 |
| 2007 | 14.5 | 4.3 | 26.0 | 2.7 | 20.5 | 3.3 | 14.0 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 75.0 | 6.0 |
| 2006 | 14.2 | 2.2 | 35.2 | 4.6 | 40.5 | 5.1 | 15.2 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 105.1 | 11.0 |
| 2005 | 17.0 | 3.5 | 45.0 | 5.1 | 38.3 | 5.5 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 108.7 | 7.9 |
| 2004 | 38.0 | 6.2 | 51.7 | 6.5 | 29.3 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 123.3 | 11.6 |
| 2003 | 22.7 | 3.5 | 18.7 | 2.3 | 28.3 | 3.8 | 6.3 | 1.2 | 0.0 |  | 76.0 | 6.9 |

EFDBLLSS.D03-D22

Table 7. PSD and RSD $_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass in each area of Buckhorn Lake ( 1,230 acres) on 19 May 2022. Numbers in parentheses are $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

| Area | Species | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD ${ }_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower | Largemouth Bass | 89 | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (29-50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0 \\ (3-7) \end{gathered}$ |
| Upper | Largemouth Bass | 121 | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (22-38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0-5) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | Largemouth Bass | 210 | $\begin{gathered} 34 \\ (27-40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1-5) \end{gathered}$ |

EFDBLLSS.D22

Table 8. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected during spring at Buckhorn Lake (1,230 acres). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2021 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (43.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (26.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (36.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (56.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (90.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (48.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (48.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (37.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (44.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (21.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (17.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (18.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (7.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (6.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (27.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (34.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (26.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (22.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (14.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.7) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 10 | 13 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 14 | 9 | 12 |
| Assessment rating | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Poor | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.42 | 0.64 | 0.73 | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 34.20 | 47.40 | 51.80 | 54.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EFDBLLSS.D06-D10, D12, D14-D19, D21-D22 } \\ & \text { EFDBLLAS.D04, D09 } \\ & \text { EFDBLLAF.D20 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 9. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.50 hours of 15minute electrofishing samples at Buckhorn Lake (1,230 acres) on 22 September 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Largemouth bass | 8 | 26 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 123 | 98.4 | 16.4 |
| Upper | Largemouth bass | 23 | 66 | 58 | 26 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 19 | 12 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 260 | 208.0 | 39.9 |
| Total | Largemouth bass | 31 | 92 | 87 | 33 | 3 | 15 | 30 | 27 | 22 | 27 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 383 | 153.2 | 27.3 |

Table 10. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected by electrofishing at Buckhorn Lake (1,230 acres).

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 97.2 | 24.3 | 48.0 | 11.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 58.8 | 9.3 | 26.4 | 3.6 | 44.9 | 7.6 |
| 2020 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 50.9 | 6.2 | 22.9 | 2.6 | 37.5 | 12.2 |
| 2019 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 119.3 | 14.6 | 28.7 | 6.0 | no sprin | sample |
| 2018 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 114.5 | 29.8 | 44.5 | 9.1 | 48.7 | 12.2 |
| 2017 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 161.6 | 20.1 | 49.6 | 9.4 | 48.4 | 7.9 |
| 2016 | 5.0 | <0.1 | 169.7 | 44.0 | 85.7 | 23.9 | 90.7 | 20.0 |
| 2015 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 80.0 | 15.9 | 17.6 | 2.0 | no sprin | sample |
| 2014 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 86.5 | 24.9 | 26.5 | 8.6 | 56.0 | 6.0 |
| 2013 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 68.8 | 10.8 | 16.8 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 3.5 |
| 2012 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 39.0 | 9.6 | 21.0 | 7.2 | no sprin | sample |
| 2011 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 126.7 | 26.7 | 42.0 | 10.0 | 36.1 | 6.5 |
| 2010 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 67.0 | 5.0 | 22.5 | 5.8 | no sprin | sample |
| 2009 |  |  | no fall | ample |  |  | 26.1 | 5.2 |
| 2008 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 21.4 | 3.7 | 9.9 | 2.3 | 43.8 | 3.5 |
| 2007 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 18.8 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 11.2 | 3.8 |
| 2006 | 4.2 | 0.2 | 17.6 | 4.1 | 5.3 | 1.9 | 13.0 | 3.7 |
| 2005 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 44.7 | 6.6 | 10.0 | 3.5 | 11.2 | 2.1 |
| 2004 | 3.6 | <0.1 | 176.7 | 34.0 | 9.3 | 4.6 | 16.3 | 3.5 |
| 2003 | 4.7 | 0.5 | 106.0 | 13.8 | 39.7 | 4.6 | 35.5 | 5.4 |
| 2002 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 99.3 | 7.4 | 38.7 | 2.6 | 19.2 | 3.3 |
| EFDBLLSF.D02-D08, D10- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDBLLAS.D04, D09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDBLLAF.D20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDBLLSS.D02-D22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 11. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth and Spotted bass collected at Buckhorn Lake during September 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 36 | 86 (1) | 14 | 90 (2) | 1 | 89 (1) |
|  | Upper | 47 | 92 (4) | 23 | 89 (2) | 2 | 79 (24) |
|  | Total | 83 | 89 (2) | 37 | 89 (1) | 3 | 82 (14) |
|  |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Spotted Bass | Lower | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper | 1 | 87 (1) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 1 | 87 (1) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |

EFDBLLSF.D22

Table 12. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.5 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing samples at Carr Creek Lake (710 acres) on 12 May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 6.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 27 | 31 | 29 | 33 | 26 | 22 | 12 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 220 | 176.0 | 43.2 |
| Upper | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 6.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 8 | 46 | 73 | 28 | 66 | 50 | 25 | 23 | 25 | 16 | 6 | 8 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 377 | 301.6 | 32.2 |
| Total | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 6.4 | 1.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 11 | 73 | 104 | 57 | 99 | 76 | 47 | 35 | 38 | 22 | 9 | 16 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 597 | 238.8 | 32.7 |

Table 13. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Carr Creek Lake (710 acres).

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | $8.0-11.9$ in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 98.0 | 17.1 | 102.8 | 15.0 | 27.6 | 5.4 | 10.4 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 238.8 | 32.7 |
| 2021 | 69.5 | 9.4 | 28.5 | 4.7 | 11.0 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 118.0 | 118.0 |
| 2020 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 59.5 | 20.6 | 48.5 | 9.5 | 22.5 | 3.2 | 16.5 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 147.0 | 29.2 |
| 2018 | 107.0 | 13.8 | 41.0 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 2.1 | 19.0 | 5.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 178.0 | 20.0 |
| 2017 | 28.5 | 6.6 | 25.5 | 7.1 | 12.5 | 3.3 | 17.0 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 83.5 | 12.6 |
| 2016 | 30.0 | 7.6 | 40.0 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 3.0 | 15.3 | 3.6 |  |  | 96.0 | 16.8 |
| 2015 | 69.5 | 23.2 | 18.5 | 4.1 | 15.5 | 3.7 | 22.0 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 125.5 | 28.5 |
| 2014 | 115.0 | 23.6 | 48.0 | 7.8 | 25.0 | 4.3 | 18.5 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 206.5 | 18.1 |
| 2013 | 113.3 | 51.4 | 20.0 | 4.5 | 16.0 | 3.7 | 16.7 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 166.0 | 53.2 |
| 2012 | 15.0 | 3.1 | 21.5 | 3.5 | 9.0 | 1.5 | 13.5 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 59.0 | 8.4 |
| 2011 | 11.0 | 4.4 | 10.5 | 2.6 | 5.5 | 1.3 | 16.0 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 43.0 | 9.8 |
| 2010 | 13.8 | 3.2 | 10.8 | 2.6 | 10.8 | 2.1 | 12.6 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 47.9 | 4.8 |
| 2009 | 5.1 | 0.7 | 10.3 | 2.6 | 17.1 | 3.0 | 16.0 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 48.6 | 6.1 |
| 2008 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 16.4 | 2.6 | 24.7 | 5.4 | 23.7 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 67.8 | 8.4 |
| 2007 | 8.0 | 1.9 | 20.8 | 4.7 | 18.6 | 3.4 | 15.7 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 63.0 | 5.5 |
| 2006 | 22.3 | 7.0 | 30.9 | 4.8 | 27.9 | 3.3 | 29.9 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 111.0 | 10.2 |
| 2005 | 20.0 | 2.7 | 19.8 | 1.6 | 24.8 | 2.4 | 14.0 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 78.6 | 4.9 |
| 2004 | 135.0 | 17.7 | 24.4 | 5.3 | 8.4 | 1.4 | 9.0 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 176.9 | 18.8 |
| 2003 | 67.6 | 11.3 | 15.9 | 2.2 | 11.1 | 1.5 | 10.7 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 105.2 | 14.4 |
| 2002 | 116.3 | 14.2 | 16.9 | 1.7 | 12.3 | 1.6 | 7.1 | 1.2 |  |  | 152.7 | 13.3 |

BBRPSCFL.D02-D05
EFDCLLSS.D02-D22

Table 14. PSD and RSD values for each species of black bass collected in each area of Carr Creek Lake (710 acres) on 12 May 2022. Numbers in parentheses are 95\% confidence intervals.

|  | Smallmouth bass |  |  | Spotted bass |  |  | Largemouth bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| Lower | 0 |  |  | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (0-74) \end{gathered}$ |  | 130 | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (21-30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12 \\ (6-17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Upper | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 222 | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (20-32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (2-8) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 0 |  |  | 4 | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (0-37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 352 | $\begin{gathered} 27 \\ (22-32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (5-10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

EFDCLLSS.D22

Table 15. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected from Carr Creek Lake (710 acres). Actual values are in parentheses.
Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (13.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (114.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (116.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (71.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (35.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (31.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (111.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (64.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (71.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (106.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (16.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (25.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (22.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (27.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (18.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (18.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (15.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (17.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (19.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (2.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score Assessment rating | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ \text { Fair } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 12 \\ \text { Fair } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 12 \\ \text { Fair } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 12 \\ \text { Fair } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 12 \\ \text { Fair } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ \text { Good } \end{gathered}$ |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.34 | 0.27 | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 29.10 | 23.80 | 35.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ```BBRPSCFL.D05 EFDCLLSS.D08-D19, D21-D22 EFDCLLAS.D08 EFDCLLAF.D13, D19``` |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 16. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.5 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing samples at Carr Creek Lake (710 acres) on 19 September 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 22.4 | 8.6 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 7 | 30 | 5 | 11 | 56 | 44 | 24 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 203 | 162.4 | 25.9 |
| Upper | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 2 | 1 |  | 7 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 | 29.6 | 5.7 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 34 | 35 | 12 | 37 | 100 | 47 | 38 | 18 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 353 | 282.4 | 62.3 |
| Total | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.4 | <0.1 |
|  | Spotted Bass | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 12 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 | 26.0 | 5.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 41 | 65 | 17 | 48 | 156 | 91 | 62 | 25 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 556 | 222.4 | 37.6 |

EFDCLLSF.D22

Table 17. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected by electrofishing at Carr Creek Lake (710 acres).

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 44.5 | 10.1 | 26.5 | 5.8 |  |  |
| 2021 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 19.6 | 5.4 | 16.4 | 4.9 | 106.4 | 18.5 |
| 2020 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 50.9 | 6.2 | 22.9 | 2.6 | 71.0 | 9.8 |
| 2019 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 6.7 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 1.6 | no s | mple |
| 2018 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 18.7 | 5.4 | 12.7 | 4.2 | 64.0* | 21.2 |
| 2017 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 19.3 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 1.9 | 111.5* | 13.9 |
| 2016 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 32.0 | 7.9 | 10.4 | 3.0 | 31.0 | 6.4 |
| 2015 | 4.7 | 0.2 | 45.3 | 9.6 | 16.0 | 6.1 | 35.3 | 8.0 |
| 2014 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 1.7 | $71.0{ }^{*}$ | 23.2 |
| 2013 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 14.0 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 1.8 | $116.0{ }^{*}$ | 23.8 |
| 2012 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 34.5 | 10.9 | 11.5 | 4.0 | $114.7{ }^{*}$ | 51.8 |
| 2011 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 17.6 | 5.7 | 7.2 | 3.0 | 13.2 | 2.6 |
| 2010 | 4.6 | 0.2 | 13.5 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 9.0 | 3.1 |
| 2009 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 12.5 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 10.0 | 2.5 |
| 2008 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 15.2 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 0.8 |
| 2007 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 1.2 |
| 2006 | 4.2 | 0.2 | 11.0 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 7.6 | 2.0 |
| 2005 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 15.8 | 6.7 | 5.6 | 1.7 | 21.3 | 6.7 |
| 2004 | 5.2 | <0.1 | 132.0 | 17.3 | 88.2 | 12.7 | 18.8 | 2.6 |
| 2003 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 14.0 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 2.3 | 133.8* | 17.5 |

[^48]Table 18. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for length groups of black bass collected at Carr Creek Lake during September 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 98 | 84 (1) | 12 | 83 (1) | 6 | 95 (4) |
|  | Upper | 82 | 85 (1) | 22 | 83 (1) | 7 | 95 (3) |
|  | Total | 180 | 84 (1) | 34 | 83 (1) | 13 | 95 (2) |
| Spotted Bass |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 20 | 88 (2) | 3 | 85 (3) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper | 16 | 90 (2) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 36 | 89 (2) | 3 | 85 (3) | 0 | 0 (0) |


|  | Lower | No. | W | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | Wr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 0 | 0 (0) | 1 | 76 (1) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 (0) | 1 | 76 (1) | 0 | 0 (0) |

Table 19. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Walleye collected at Carr Creek Lake (710 acres) during daytime spring electrofishing.

| Year | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |  |  |  |
| 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 5 | 4 |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 65 | 8.4 | 1.6 |
| 2021 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 9 | 26 | 43 | 38 | 18 | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 141 | 13.8 | 3.4 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 11 | 21 | 17 | 23 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 87 | 8.9 | 1.4 |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 | 9 | 18 | 39 | 58 | 39 | 25 | 9 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 208 | 16.6 | 2.7 |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 25 | 30 | 12 | 22 | 9 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 128 | 14.7 | 2.0 |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 6 | 7 | 18 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 71 | 21.9 | 3.1 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 7 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  | 113 | 20.6 | 2.3 |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 82 | 21.6 | 17.4 |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 14 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 56 | 11.8 | 2.9 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 16 | 21 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 88 | 10.7 | 1.4 |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 19 | 22 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  | 87 | 20.8 | 2.5 |
| 2011 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | 81 | 15.4 | 5.2 |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 9 |  | 1 | 138 | 12.7 | 3.3 |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 18 | 21 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 2 |  |  |  | 124 | 21.3 | 1.3 |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 16 | 19 | 21 | 19 | 15 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 136 | 12.8 | 1.2 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 |  |  | 60 | 32.9 | 7.4 |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  | 55 | 31.3 | 5.4 |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 46 | 28.2 | 5.0 |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 61 | 27.1 | 7.4 |
| 2003 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 7 |  | 4 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 28 | 26.7 | 8.5 |
| 2002 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 44 | 20.4 | 4.7 |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 28 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 78 | 20.8 | 4.6 |

EFDCLWSS.D00-D22

Table 20. Spring electrofishing catch rate (fish/hr) for each age of Walleye collected from Carr Creek Lake (710 acres) from 2010-2022.

| Age | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| 3 | 3.2 | 5.0 | 7.8 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 5.2 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 3.4 |
| 4 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 1.6 |
| 5 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| 6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| 7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| 9 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| 10 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |

Table 21. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for each length group of Walleye collected at Carr Creek Lake ( 710 acres) on 8 and 15 March 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\leq 9.9$ in | 10.0-14.9 in |  | 15.0-19.9 in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| No. $\quad W_{r}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| $0 \quad 0$ (0) | 2 | 103 (0) | 27 | 99 (1) | 25 | 97 (1) | 54 | 98 (1) |

EFDCLWSS.D22

Table 22. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 1.25 hours of 15 -min electrofishing runs at Cranks Creek Lake (219 acres) on 4 May 2022.

|  | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 14 | 8 | 5 | 33 | 13 | 26 | 24 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 158 | 126.4 | 9.1 |

EFDCCLSS.D22

Table 23. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Cranks Creek Lake (219 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 48.8 | 2.3 | 59.2 | 9.8 | 10.4 | 2.4 | 8.0 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 126.4 | 9.1 |
| 2021 | 50.4 | 6.4 | 79.2 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 2.7 | 9.6 | 6.0 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 144.8 | 7.3 |
| 2020 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 118.4 | 21.9 | 92.8 | 6.3 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 221.6 | 21.9 |
| 2018 | 60.8 | 5.3 | 71.2 | 3.4 | 8.0 | 3.4 | 11.2 | 2.3 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 151.2 | 6.5 |
| 2017 | 76.8 | 14.3 | 62.4 | 13.9 | 18.4 | 2.7 | 15.2 | 3.9 | 8.8 | 3.8 | 172.8 | 17.8 |
| 2016 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 27.2 | 6.0 | 76.0 | 8.3 | 15.2 | 0.8 | 13.6 | 2.4 | 6.4 | 1.6 | 132.0 | 10.8 |
| 2014 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 34.4 | 12.0 | 32.8 | 4.6 | 5.6 | 2.4 | 8.8 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 81.6 | 14.5 |
| 2011 | 57.6 | 6.0 | 52.0 | 10.5 | 9.6 | 1.6 | 11.2 | 3.9 | 5.6 | 3.5 | 130.4 | 15.4 |
| 2010 | 80.8 | 27.6 | 43.2 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 3.0 | 14.4 | 2.0 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 148.0 | 41.2 |
| 2009 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 33.0 | 7.9 | 51.0 | 6.6 | 27.0 | 4.4 | 8.0 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 119.0 | 8.2 |
| 2007 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 59.2 | 16.6 | 70.4 | 10.5 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 140.0 | 17.3 |
| 2004 | 40.7 | 7.6 | 40.0 | 5.8 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 88.0 | 11.1 |
| 2003 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 20.0 | 6.4 | 22.0 | 8.3 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 46.7 | 13.8 |
| 2000 | 51.3 | 11.1 | 24.7 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 80.7 | 12.5 |

EFDCCLSS.D00-D22

Table 24. PSD and RSD values for each species of black bass in each area of Cranks Creek Lake (219 acres) on 4 May 2022. Numbers in parentheses are $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

|  | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| Total | 97 | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (15-32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (4-16) \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 |

EFDCCLSS.D22

Table 25. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected from Cranks Creek Lake ( 219 acres). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2015 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (68.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (45.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (19.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (72.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (42.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (115.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (60.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (22.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (18.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (14.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (13.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (15.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (4.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (8.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (4.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (3.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 15 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 13 | 11 |
| Assessment rating | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.49 | 0.56 | 0.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 38.90 | 43.10 | 40.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDCCLAS.D08 <br> EFDCCLAF.D13,D19 <br> EFDCCLSS.D10-D19, D21-D2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 26. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 1.25 hours of 15-min nocturnal electrofishing runs at Cranks Creek Lake (219 acres) on 5 October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Spotted Bass | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4.0 | 2.5 |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 39 | 35 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 124 | 99.2 | 12.7 |

EFDCCLSF.D22

Table 27. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected by electrofishing at Cranks Creek Lake (219 acres).

| Year <br> class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 8.0 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.4 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 31.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 22.4 | 2.0 |
| 2020 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 43.2 | 17.6 | 8.0 | 4.2 | 60.0 | 9.1 |
| 2019 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 17.6 | 9.9 |  |  | no s | ple |
| 2018 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 58.0 | 6.6 | 19.0 | 10.3 | 115.2 | 22.1 |
| 2017 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 77.3 | 11.6 | 13.3 | 3.5 | 42.4 | 6.7 |
| 2016 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 70.4 | 29.7 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 72.8 | 12.6 |
| 2015 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 37.0 | 14.6 | 9.0 | 3.0 |  |  |
| 2014 | 4.0 | 0.1 | 104.8 | 24.5 | 20.8 | 5.1 | 19.2 | 5.3 |
| 2013 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 11.2 | 5.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 |  |  |
| 2012 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 66.4 | 27.4 | 10.4 | 5.3 |  |  |
| 2011 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 51.2 | 5.4 | 34.4 | 5.3 | 28.0 | 10.7 |
| 2010 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 93.3 | 28.5 | 16.0 | 6.1 | 45.6 | 6.0 |
| 2009 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 64.0 | 29.8 | 7.2 | 4.8 | 68.8 | 26.1 |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 32.0 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 2.9 | 23.0 | 7.3 |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.4 | 15.3 |
| 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.0 | 4.3 |
| 2002 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 34.4 | 10.6 | 20.8 | 7.7 |  |  |
| 2001 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 27.3 | 5.2 | 13.3 | 3.0 |  |  |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.3 | 4.8 |
| 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.3 | 10.4 |

EFDCCLSF.D01-D02, D07, D09-D22
EFDCCLAS.D08
EFDCCLSS.D00-D01, D04-D05, D08, D10-D12, D15, D17-D19, D21
EFDCCLAF.D13, D19

Table 28. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth and Spotted bass collected at Cranks Creek Lake during October 2022.
Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 50 | 75 (1) | 4 | 82 (3) | 4 | 101 (8) |
|  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | Wr | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Spotted Bass | 4 | 84 (2) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |

Table 29. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.5 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing samples by area at Dewey Lake (1,100 acres) on 18 April 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Spotted Bass | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 15.2 | 4.8 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 14 | 18 | 15 | 8 | 13 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 149 | 119.2 | 16.0 |
| Upper | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 3 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 114 | 91.2 | 16.2 |
| Total | Spotted Bass | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 7.6 | 3.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 17 | 22 | 25 | 11 | 22 | 19 | 18 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 19 | 21 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 263 | 105.2 | 11.7 |

## EFDDLLSS.D22

Table 30. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Dewey Lake ( 1,100 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 30.4 | 9.8 | 30.0 | 3.2 | 26.4 | 2.3 | 18.4 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 105.2 | 11.7 |
| 2021 | 11.2 | 3.0 | 23.6 | 4.1 | 22.0 | 3.3 | 11.6 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 68.4 | 7.2 |
| 2020 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 11.0 | 1.0 | 32.0 | 3.7 | 34.0 | 4.8 | 25.0 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 102.0 | 5.0 |
| 2018 | 30.0 | 9.0 | 32.0 | 2.5 | 28.0 | 5.7 | 23.2 | 4.3 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 113.2 | 8.6 |
| 2017 | 22.7 | 5.7 | 27.3 | 7.1 | 20.0 | 5.4 | 23.3 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 93.3 | 10.3 |
| 2016 | 22.5 | 3.1 | 25.5 | 4.9 | 47.0 | 5.4 | 24.0 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 119.0 | 9.9 |
| 2015 | 21.2 | 3.0 | 35.2 | 5.2 | 43.2 | 5.4 | 24.0 | 4.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 123.6 | 11.2 |
| 2014 | 12.4 | 2.6 | 40.4 | 8.1 | 31.2 | 6.6 | 20.0 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 104.0 | 16.2 |
| 2013 | 20.8 | 3.9 | 92.8 | 14.8 | 54.0 | 6.5 | 17.2 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 184.8 | 20.8 |
| 2012 | 27.2 | 4.6 | 63.2 | 7.0 | 34.9 | 3.9 | 10.7 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 136.0 | 8.6 |
| 2011 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 42.6 | 5.9 | 98.0 | 27.6 | 12.3 | 2.8 | 8.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 161.2 | 33.0 |
| 2009 | 83.7 | 12.7 | 62.8 | 6.3 | 18.8 | 1.9 | 14.4 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 179.8 | 16.9 |
| 2008 | 87.4 | 10.4 | 86.5 | 9.5 | 21.6 | 3.6 | 16.3 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 211.7 | 12.4 |
| 2007 | 54.9 | 9.6 | 80.8 | 9.8 | 35.1 | 5.0 | 30.2 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 200.9 | 19.9 |
| 2006 | 32.3 | 5.7 | 66.4 | 8.6 | 24.2 | 3.6 | 24.9 | 3.6 | 0.7 |  | 147.8 | 10.0 |
| 2005 | 39.3 | 5.0 | 59.2 | 6.3 | 31.0 | 3.2 | 24.5 | 1.9 | 0.3 |  | 153.9 | 12.8 |
| 2004 | 96.2 | 11.9 | 34.7 | 3.8 | 20.0 | 3.2 | 17.5 | 2.6 | 1.0 |  | 168.3 | 13.9 |
| 2003 | 71.1 | 10.1 | 55.6 | 4.4 | 23.1 | 1.8 | 22.0 | 2.1 | 0.7 |  | 171.8 | 14.6 |
| 2002 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 150.1 | 17.2 | 57.8 | 5.7 | 26.9 | 2.7 | 17.8 | 1.6 | 0.6 |  | 252.6 | 22.8 |
| 2000 | 62.2 | 4.7 | 44.0 | 4.4 | 23.6 | 3.5 | 10.3 | 1.3 | 0.1 |  | 140.1 | 9.5 |
| 1999 | 78.9 |  | 34.6 |  | 39.5 |  | 12.8 |  | 0.5 |  | 165.8 | 12.7 |
| 1998 | 20.1 |  | 51.4 |  | 43.2 |  | 7.2 |  | 0.6 |  | 122.0 | 8.5 |
| 1997 | 15.3 |  | 53.3 |  | 32.3 |  | 11.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 112.0 | 12.2 |
| 1996 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 46.6 |  | 59.6 |  | 28.5 |  | 3.6 |  | 0.0 |  | 138.3 | 16.9 |
| 1994 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 43.7 |  | 71.8 |  | 15.6 |  | 8.8 |  | 0.8 |  | 140.0 |  |
| 1992 | 57.4 |  | 64.1 |  | 17.2 |  | 7.4 |  | 0.2 |  | 146.1 |  |
| 1991 | 73.8 |  | 50.6 |  | 18.4 |  | 3.5 |  | 0.2 |  | 146.4 |  |
| 1990 | 58.8 |  | 68.0 |  | 32.0 |  | 11.4 |  | 0.6 |  | 171.4 |  |
| 1989 | 75.0 |  | 27.5 |  | 10.8 |  | 7.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 120.7 |  |
| 1988 | 84.0 |  | 40.7 |  | 26.7 |  | 2.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 154.7 |  |
| 1987 | 44.6 |  | 38.3 |  | 12.0 |  | 0.6 |  | 0.0 |  | 95.4 |  |

[^49]Table 31. PSD and RSD values for each species of black bass collected in each area of Dewey Lake (1,100 acres) on 18 April 2022. Numbers in parentheses are $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

| Area | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD ${ }_{15}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD ${ }_{14}$ |
| Lower | 93 | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ (56-75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 32 \\ (23-42) \end{gathered}$ | 14 | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (0-33) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| Upper | 94 | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ (44-64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (9-25) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |  |  |
| Total | 187 | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (53-67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (18-31) \end{gathered}$ | 14 | $\begin{gathered} 14 \\ (0-33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 |

EFDDLLSS.D22

Table 32. Population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected from Dewey Lake (1,100 acres). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2009 | 2010 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (55.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (16.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (19.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (17.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (21.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (29.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (29.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (18.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (34.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (54.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (31.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (43.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (47.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (34.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (22.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (26.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (14.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (17.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (20.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (24.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (24.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (23.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (23.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (25.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (18.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 14 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 15 |
| Assessment rating | Good | Poor | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.48 | 0.77 | 0.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 38.40 | 53.90 | 35.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

EFDDLLSS.D09-D10, D13-D19, D21-D22
EFDDLLAS.D08
EFDDLLAF.D13, D18

Table 33. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass captured during 2.50 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing runs at Dewey Lake (1,100 acres) on 3 October 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total CPUE |  | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Spotted Bass | 2 | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 13.6 | 7.9 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 21 | 25 | 15 | 6 | 20 | 19 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 156 | 124.8 | 12.0 |
| Upper | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 6 | 11 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 3 |  |  |  | 148 | 118.4 | 26.9 |
| Total | Spotted Bass | 2 | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 6.8 | 4.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 9 | 32 | 40 | 19 | 11 | 34 | 30 | 22 | 18 | 28 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 304 | 121.6 | 16.2 |

EFDDLLSF.D22

Table 34. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected from electrofishing at Dewey Lake ( 1,100 acres).

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 39.2 | 6.9 | 22.8 | 5.4 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 32.0 | 8.3 | 15.6 | 5.3 | 29.6 | 9.9 |
| 2020 | 4.6 | 0.2 | 11.6 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 1.34 | 11.2 | 3.0 |
| 2019 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 41.5 | 9.8 | 21.5 | 5.0 | no s | mle |
| 2018 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 43.6 | 7.8 | 22.2 | 3.1 | 11.0 | 1.0 |
| 2017 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 50.0 | 9.4 | 16.5 | 3.6 | 29.2 | 9.0 |
| 2016 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 33.5 | 5.1 | 17.0 | 3.5 | 21.3 | 5.8 |
| 2015 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 38.7 | 9.9 | 7.3 | 3.0 | 20.5 | 3.2 |
| 2014 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 36.8 | 8.3 | 10.0 | 4.3 | 17.2 | 3.5 |
| 2013 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 25.2 | 6.3 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 10.8 | 2.8 |
| 2012 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 26.0 | 5.3 | 7.2 | 1.7 | 20.8 | 3.9 |
| 2011 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 37.2 | 9.3 | 14.8 | 3.6 | 19.5 | 4.4 |
| 2010 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 67.6 | 14.2 | 38.4 | 8.5 | no s | ple |
| 2009 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 45.7 | 8.8 | 28.8 | 5.2 | 16.4 | 3.3 |
| 2008 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 54.9 | 14.3 | 30.0 | 7.4 | 55.6 | 12.1 |
| 2007 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 54.3 | 12.8 | 21.2 | 4.2 | 49.5 | 10.0 |
| 2006 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 39.0 | 9.9 | 21.3 | 5.8 | 49.0 | 9.2 |
| 2005 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 58.7 | 16.1 | 16.9 | 6.6 | 27.9 | 5.5 |
| 2004 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 45.2 | 7.1 | 25.4 | 4.6 | 24.8 | 4.1 |
| 2003 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 38.9 | 10.6 | 15.1 | 3.8 | 79.7 | 10.5 |
| 2002 | 5.0 | <0.1 | 75.6 | 14.2 | 37.6 | 9.4 | 61.2 | 9.4 |

BBRPSDEW.D03-D05
BBRDLLSF.D02
BBRWRDEW.D03-D04
BBRSCDEW.D03
EFDDLLSF.D02-D21
EFDDLLSS.D06-D10, D12-D19, D22
EFDDLLAS.D08
EFDDLLAF.D13, D18

Table 35. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth and Spotted bass collected at Dewey Lake during October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 54 | 92 (10) | 17 | 89 (2) | 15 | 88 (3) |
|  | Upper | 48 | 87 (2) | 35 | 90 (3) | 18 | 96 (1) |
|  | Total | 102 | 89 (6) | 52 | 90 (2) | 33 | 93 (2) |
| Spotted Bass |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 9 | 90 (3) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 9 | 90 (3) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |

EFDDLLSF.D22

Table 36. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.5 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing samples at Fishtrap Lake (1,143 acres) on 17 May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4.0 | 2.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 1 | 76 | 60.8 | 11.4 |
| Upper | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 |  | 1 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 76 | 60.8 | 7.4 |
| Total | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 2.4 | 1.2 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 152 | 60.8 | 6.4 |

EFDFLLSS.D22

Table 37. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass at Fishtrap Lake (1,143 acres) from 2000-2020.

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | S.E. | CPUE | S.E. | CPUE | S.E. | CPUE | S.E. | CPUE | S.E. | CPUE | S.E. |
| 2022 | 12.4 | 3.6 | 13.2 | 2.9 | 23.2 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 60.8 | 6.4 |
| 2021 | 6.8 | 2.24 | 23.2 | 4.87 | 28.8 | 2.6 | 12.4 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 71.2 | 6.6 |
| 2020 | 62.0 | 15.3 | 30.7 | 5.2 | 38.0 | 7.8 | 15.3 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 146.0 | 9.9 |
| 2019 | 34.0 | 5.7 | 17.6 | 1.9 | 31.2 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 89.6 | 8.7 |
| 2018 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 62.0 | 17.7 | 22.7 | 5.5 | 20.7 | 6.5 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 109.3 | 25.6 |
| 2016 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 23.6 | 3.5 | 48.4 | 6.8 | 33.6 | 4.6 | 18.0 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 123.6 | 8.6 |
| 2014 | 25.6 | 5.5 | 32.8 | 10.2 | 35.2 | 5.9 | 16.8 | 5.3 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 110.4 | 15.2 |
| 2013 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 54.7 | 9.0 | 20.7 | 1.9 | 12.0 | 2.3 | 12.7 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 9.4 |
| 2011 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 52.4 | 3.1 | 35.6 | 5.6 | 20.4 | 2.8 | 10.4 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 118.8 | 11.3 |
| 2009 | 44.2 | 10.7 | 61.4 | 11.8 | 20.4 | 4.8 | 9.9 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 135.9 | 15.1 |
| 2008 | 39.5 | 12.7 | 31.1 | 3.5 | 32.0 | 5.8 | 9.4 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 111.9 | 15.0 |
| 2007 | 28.7 | 4.7 | 53.9 | 8.3 | 33.0 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 123.5 | 13.5 |
| 2006 | 52.5 | 8.8 | 37.6 | 1.9 | 33.0 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |  | 127.1 | 11.6 |
| 2005 | 61.8 | 10.2 | 67.6 | 10.0 | 38.9 | 6.5 | 14.9 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 183.3 | 20.8 |
| 2004 | 44.7 | 6.8 | 45.1 | 5.8 | 19.3 | 2.2 | 13.1 | 3.9 | 1.5 |  | 122.2 | 10.7 |
| 2003 | 43.0 | 4.4 | 25.0 | 7.6 | 16.0 | 4.9 | 11.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 |  | 95.0 | 4.1 |
| 2002 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 20.3 | 3.7 | 32.7 | 4.3 | 17.3 | 2.5 | 10.3 | 2.9 | 1.3 |  | 80.7 | 7.7 |
| 2000 | 28.7 | 4.2 | 29.0 | 2.3 | 19.0 | 2.6 | 23.0 | 4.3 | 3.4 |  | 99.7 | 9.9 |

EFDFLLSS.D00-D22

Table 38. PSD and RSD values for each species of black bass in each area of Fishtrap Lake (1,143 acres) on 17 May 2022. Numbers in parentheses are $95 \%$ confidence intervals

|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  | Largemouth Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ |
| Lower | 5 | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ (12-108) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (0-59) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |  |  | 58 | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ (55-79) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 31 \\ (19-43) \end{gathered}$ |
| Upper | 1 | 100 | 100 | 0 |  |  | 63 | $\begin{gathered} 78 \\ (67-88) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 \\ (9-29) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total | 6 | $\begin{gathered} 67 \\ (25-108) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ 0-74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 |  |  | 121 | $\begin{gathered} 73 \\ (65-81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ (17-33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

EFDFLLSS.D22

Table 39. Spring population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected from Fishtrap Lake ( $1,143 \mathrm{acres}$ ). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (13.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (38.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (44 . .2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (51.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (50.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (24.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (22.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (61.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (35.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (64.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (13.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (33.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (32.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (35.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (33.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (31.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (38.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (23.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (7.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (18.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (15.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (3.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (3.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 16 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 10 | 11 |
| Assessment rating | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Excellent | Fair | Fair |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.72 | 0.59 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.50 | 0.43 | 0.52 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 51.30 | 44.30 | 49.10 | 48.20 | 39.20 | 35.20 | 40.70 |  |  |  |  |  |

EFDFLLSS.D06-D22
EFDFLLAS.D04, D10
EFDFLLAF.D17

Table 40. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.50 hours of 15 -minute nocturnal electrofishing samples at Fishtrap Lake (1,143 acres) on 26 September 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 10 | 8.0 | 1.3 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 9.6 | 8.6 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 111 | 88.8 | 15.2 |
| Upper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  | 9 | 5 | 20 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 5 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 120 | 96.0 | 12.7 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 10 | 4.0 | 1.5 |
|  | Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 4 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 4.8 | 4.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 1 | 10 | 12 | 27 | 21 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 25 | 23 | 17 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 231 | 92.4 | 9.4 |

EFDFLLSF.D22

Table 41. Indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass electrofished at Fishtrap Lake (1,143 acres).

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 30.0 | 7.5 | 20.8 | 7.8 |  |  |
| 2021 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 40.0 | 9.8 | 21.6 | 5.3 | 13.2 | 3.3 |
| 2020 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 66.0 | 15.9 | 34.8 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 2.5 |
| 2019 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 58.5 | 19.6 | 24.5 | 12.3 | 64.0* | 15.1 |
| 2018 | 5.0 | <0.1 | 184.5 | 24.5 | 88.0 | 14.0 | 35.6 | 5.4 |
| 2017 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 105.8 | 20.5 | 76.9 | 15.9 | no s |  |
| 2016 | 4.7 | <0.1 | 105.2 | 25.1 | 32.0 | 6.3 | 61.3* | 17.9 |
| 2015 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 139.0 | 25.2 | 62.0 | 16.7 | no s | ple |
| 2014 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 54.0 | 8.8 | 21.2 | 3.6 | 22.1 | 3.1 |
| 2013 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 63.5 | 16.4 | 19.5 | 5.2 | 24.2 | 6.2 |
| 2012 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 72.7 | 24.3 | 38.0 | 12.0 | no s |  |
| 2011 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 119.4 | 26.9 | 69.1 | 13.3 | 50.8 | 8.2 |
| 2010 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 111.6 | 16.4 | 61.6 | 8.4 | no s |  |
| 2009 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 83.3 | 15.1 | 39.3 | 5.4 | 51.6 | 3.2 |
| 2008 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 75.3 | 25.9 | 26.3 | 9.5 | 44.2 | 10.7 |
| 2007 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 114.2 | 23.7 | 63.5 | 11.0 | 38.5 | 12.1 |
| 2006 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 72.7 | 14.1 | 36.5 | 8.0 | 28.3 | 4.5 |
| 2005 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 108.0 | 41.3 | 24.0 | 11.1 | 52.5 | 8.8 |
| 2004 | 5.0 | <0.1 | 256.0 | 51.1 | 122.7 | 23.9 | 61.5 | 10.2 |
| 2003 | 5.1 | <0.1 | 106.2 | 32.9 | 59.6 | 15.9 | 35.4 | 6.0 |

* Includes supplemental spring stocked fish

EFDFLLSF.D03-D21
EFDFLLSS.D04-D22
EFDFLLAS.D04, D10
EFDFLLAF.D17

Table 42. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth, Smallmouth, and Spotted bass collected at Fishtrap Lake during September 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 29 | 89 (1) | 34 | 87 (1) | 27 | 93 (2) |
|  | Upper | 20 | 92 (2) | 26 | 90 (1) | 16 | 88 (3) |
|  | Total | 49 | 90 (1) | 60 | 88 (1) | 43 | 92 (2) |
|  |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Spotted Bass | Lower | 6 | 92 (2) | 2 | 89 (5) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 6 | 92 (2) | 2 | 89 (5) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | W |
| Smallmouth Bass | Lower | 3 | $89(<1)$ | 1 | $13(<1)$ | 6 | 85 (3) |
|  | Upper | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 3 | $89(<1)$ | 1 | 13 (<1) | 6 | 85 (3) |

EFDFLLSF.D22

Table 43. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 1.0 hour of 15-min. nocturnal electrofishing runs in Grants Branch Lake (21 acres) on 28 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Spotted Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5.0 | 2.5 |
| Largemouth Bass | 9 | 16 | 15 | 36 | 40 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 152 | 152.0 | 27.9 |

EFDGBLSS.D22

Table 44. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Grants Branch Lake (21 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 76.0 | 13.6 | 54.0 | 13.5 | 10.0 | 3.5 | 12.0 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 152.0 | 27.9 |

Table 45. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass taken in spring electrofishing samples in Grants Branch Lake (21 acres) on 28 April 2022. Numbers in parentheses are 95\% confidence intervals.

| $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76 | 29 | 16 |
|  | $(19-39)$ | $(8-24)$ |

EFDGBLSS.D22

Table 46. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass and Walleye collected in 1.25 hours of 15 -min nocturnal electrofishing runs in Martins Fork Lake (330 acres) on 4 May 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 2 | 20 | 51 | 45 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 27 | 21 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 228 | 182.4 | 26.3 |
| Spotted Bass |  | 6 | 15 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46 | 36.8 | 9.1 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.4 | 1.6 |
| Coosa Bass |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Walleye |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 6.4 | 2.4 |

EFDMLLSS.D22
`Table 47. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Martins Fork Lake (330 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 104.8 | 22.0 | 60.0 | 11.2 | 13.6 | 5.5 | 4.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 182.4 | 26.3 |
| 2021 | 28.8 | 9.6 | 44.0 | 10.1 | 12.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 88.8 | 16.0 |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 73.6 | 24.0 | 64.0 | 16.0 | 12.0 | 4.2 | 14.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 164.0 | 15.0 |
| 2018 | 19.2 | 7.7 | 38.4 | 3.7 | 15.2 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 79.2 | 8.7 |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 26.4 | 5.7 | 46.4 | 7.9 | 40.8 | 8.3 | 20.8 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 134.4 | 14.9 |
| 2014 | 38.0 | 6.6 | 46.0 | 12.5 | 11.0 | 6.2 | 11.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 106.0 | 18.9 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 16.8 | 4.6 | 12.0 | 3.8 | 5.6 | 2.4 | 10.4 | 4.3 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 44.8 | 8.3 |
| 2011 | 23.2 | 5.6 | 34.4 | 9.7 | 16.8 | 3.9 | 16.0 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 90.4 | 12.8 |
| 2010 | 17.6 | 6.3 | 26.4 | 16.4 | 8.0 | 2.8 | 19.2 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 71.2 | 22.8 |
| 2009 | 11.2 | 4.1 | 19.9 | 3.3 | 9.6 | 2.0 | 11.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 51.8 | 7.4 |
| 2008 | 7.8 | 4.8 | 19.5 | 7.2 | 20.2 | 3.7 | 19.4 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 66.9 | 12.2 |
| 2007 | 7.9 | 3.3 | 48.6 | 13.3 | 15.7 | 2.6 | 21.1 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 93.3 | 19.3 |
| 2006 | 9.3 | 2.0 | 19.9 | 6.0 | 13.3 | 3.0 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 51.7 | 10.7 |
| 2005 | 4.8 | 2.3 | 23.2 | 6.0 | 17.6 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 50.4 | 10.8 |
| 2004 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 89.3 | 19.2 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 5.3 | 3.5 | 0.0 |  | 101.3 | 26.8 |
| 2003 | 14.0 | 3.7 | 22.0 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 68.0 | 15.7 |

EFDMLLSS.D03-D22

Table 48. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring diurnal electrofishing samples in Martins Fork Lake (330 acres) on 4 May 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  | Smallmouth Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| 97 | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (14-31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (1-10) \end{gathered}$ | 18 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ (0-31) \end{gathered}$ |  | 2 | $\begin{gathered} 50 \\ (0-148) \end{gathered}$ |  |

EFDMLLSS.D22

Table 49. Spring electrofishing population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected from Martins Fork Lake (330 acres). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2014 | 2015 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (14.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (14.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (11.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (10.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (7.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (22.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (22.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (17.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (71.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (29.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (106.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (8.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (16.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (40.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (15.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (13.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (21.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (19.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (19.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (20.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (14.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE >20.0 in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (1.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 10 |
| Assessment rating | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.80 | 0.48 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 55.10 | 38.40 | 41.60 | 31.30 | 28.40 | 41.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

EFDMLLSS.D07-D12, D14-D15, D18-D19, D21-D22
EFDMLLAS.D03, D09, X20
EFDMLLAF.D14

Table 50. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass and Walleye collected at Martins Fork Lake (330 acres) during 1.25 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing samples on 5 October 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Smallmouth Bass | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3.2 | 0.8 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  | 14 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 47 | 37.6 | 5.7 |
| Largemouth Bass |  | 4 | 31 | 41 | 7 | 6 | 26 | 27 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 180 | 144.0 | 35.8 |
| Coosa Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Walleye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.6 | 1.6 |

Table 51. Electrofishing indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected at Martins Fork Lake (330 acres).

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 66.4 | 18.1 | 38.4 | 8.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 87.2 | 16.9 | 36.8 | 5.9 | 106.0 | 22.6 |
| 2020 | 4.5 | 0.2 | 16.0 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 29.6 | 9.7 |
| 2019 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 46.0 | 10.5 | 21.0 | 7.6 | no s | ple |
| 2018 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 67.0 | 11.1 | 44.0 | 8.2 | 71.2 | 23.3 |
| 2017 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 95.0 | 24.6 | 25.0 | 4.4 | 17.6 | 7.4 |
| 2016 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 67.0 | 26.5 | 15.0 | 9.0 | no | ple |
| 2015 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 59.0 | 24.4 | 18.0 | 7.4 | no s | ple |
| 2014 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 39.2 | 11.8 | 21.6 | 8.2 | 22.4 | 4.1 |
| 2013 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 21.0 | 6.6 | 6.0 | 1.2 | 22.0 | 5.3 |
| 2012 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 28.8 | 4.6 | 13.6 | 3.9 | no s | ple |
| 2011 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 20.0 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 1.5 | 8.8 | 2.7 |
| 2010 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 40.0 | 11.6 | 26.7 | 9.3 | 11.2 | 3.4 |
| 2009 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 23.2 | 8.3 | 7.2 | 2.3 | 4.8 | 2.0 |
| 2008 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 31.9 | 14.3 | 10.3 | 2.7 | 7.2 | 2.9 |
| 2007 | 4.6 | 0.2 | 28.7 | 8.7 | 10.4 | 3.0 | 10.0 | 5.1 |
| 2006 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 38.4 | 14.5 | 11.2 | 3.2 | 10.1 | 3.4 |
| 2005 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 32.0 | 4.3 | 10.0 | 2.6 | 10.0 | 2.3 |
| 2004 |  |  | no fall | mple |  |  | 24.6 | 5.9 |
| 2003 |  |  | no fall | mple |  |  | 77.5 | 18.5 |
| 2002 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 34.4 | 8.6 | 25.6 | 7.9 | 15.3 | 3.6 |
| EFDMLLSF.D02, D05-D21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDMLLSS.D03-D19, D22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDMLLAS.D03, D09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDMLLAF.D20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 52. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth, Smallmouth, and Spotted bass collected at Martins Fork Lake during
October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Length group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.0-11.9 in | 12.0-14.9 in | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
|  | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 6789 (10) | 1273 (3) | 2 | 96 (9) |


|  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Spotted Bass | 16 | 88 (1) | 4 | 84 (3) | 0 | 0 (0) |
| Smallmouth Bass | No. | $W_{r}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | 2 | 81 (4) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | 10.0-14.9 in |  | 15.0-19.9 in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |
|  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| Walleye | 2 | 69 (5) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |

## EFDMFLSF.D22

Table 53. Length frequency and CPUE (fish/hr) of Largemouth Bass collected in approximately 1.0 hour of $7.5-$ min. electrofishing runs in Panbowl Lake (98 acres) on 21 April 2022.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Largemouth Bass | 7 | 25 | 5 | 21 | 46 | 44 | 28 | 11 | 4 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 3 | 1 | 203 | 203.0 | 22.1 |
| EFDPBLSS.D22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

EFDPBLSS.D22

Table 54. Spring electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Panbowl Lake (98 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 58.0 | 13.2 | 129.0 | 14.0 | 7.0 | 1.8 | 9.0 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 203.0 | 22.1 |
| 2020 | 51.2 | 14.0 | 147.2 | 17.8 | 11.2 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 211.2 | 24.0 |
| 2018 | 93.6 | 18.0 | 168.0 | 21.1 | 6.4 | 2.4 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 273.6 | 31.7 |
| 2016 | 75.4 | 9.1 | 148.6 | 23.4 | 16.0 | 3.9 | 9.1 | 2.7 | 4.6 | 1.6 | 249.1 | 23.9 |
| 2014 | 81.3 | 16.2 | 86.7 | 15.7 | 0.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 |  | 169.3 | 24.6 |
| 2012 | 37.0 | 10.7 | 81.0 | 13.9 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 123.0 | 21.9 |
| 2011 | 102.0 | 10.9 | 108.0 | 11.9 | 11.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 225.0 | 20.0 |
| 2010 | 72.0 | 22.5 | 105.0 | 19.4 | 7.0 | 2.8 | 10.0 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 194.0 | 32.1 |
| 2009 | 50.4 | 8.4 | 120.0 | 17.8 | 11.2 | 3.2 | 8.4 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 190.0 | 22.6 |
| 2008 | 28.0 | 10.0 | 91.0 | 15.6 | 21.5 | 6.4 | 18.0 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 1.8 | 158.5 | 26.9 |
| 2007 | 90.3 | 26.6 | 149.7 | 20.2 | 12.6 | 3.9 | 22.9 | 4.4 | 6.9 | 2.7 | 275.4 | 39.2 |
| 2005 | 12.8 | 4.1 | 65.8 | 13.3 | 9.4 | 3.6 | 18.0 | 4.3 | 1.8 |  | 106.0 | 18.9 |
| 2003 | 28.8 | 10.2 | 47.2 | 9.6 | 12.0 | 1.3 | 25.6 | 4.1 | 3.2 |  | 113.6 | 20.5 |
| 2000 | 34.0 |  | 52.0 |  | 18.0 |  | 34.7 |  | 8.7 |  | 138.7 | 21.8 |
| 1999 | 17.3 |  | 24.7 |  | 30.0 |  | 15.3 |  | 4.0 |  | 87.3 | 22.7 |
| 1998 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 10.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 61.0 | 20.6 |
| 1997 | 12.1 |  | 39.5 |  | 8.1 |  | 15.3 |  | 0.8 |  | 75.0 | 19.9 |
| 1996 | 20.0 |  | 56.0 |  | 9.0 |  | 14.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 99.0 | 27.4 |
| 1992 | 19.4 |  | 22.3 |  | 14.3 |  | 25.7 |  | 1.1 |  | 81.7 |  |

EFDPBLSS.D03-D22

Table 55. PSD and $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ values for Largemouth Bass taken in spring electrofishing samples in Pan Bowl Lake (98 acres) on 21 April 2022. Numbers in parentheses are $95 \%$ confidence intervals.

| $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD $_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 145 | 11 | 6 |
|  | $(6-16)$ | $(2-10)$ |

EFDPBLSS.D22

Table 56. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 2.5 hours of $15-\mathrm{minute}$ nocturnal electrofishing samples in Paintsville Lake (1,150 acres) on 2 May 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 7.2 | 2.3 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 28 | 27 | 21 | 23 | 22 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 216 | 172.8 | 19.1 |
| Upper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4.0 | 2.2 |
|  | Largemouth Bass |  |  | 6 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 17 | 20 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 114 | 91.2 | 7.9 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 5.6 | 1.6 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 9 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 38 | 43 | 35 | 19 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 330 | 132.0 | 16.7 |

Table 57. Spring nocturnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass collected at Paintsville Lake ( 1,150 acres).

|  | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $<8.0$ in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
| Year | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 32.4 | 6.2 | 62.0 | 9.5 | 28.0 | 3.4 | 9.6 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 132.0 | 16.7 |
| 2021 | 26.4 | 5.1 | 46.0 | 8.1 | 16.4 | 2.8 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 95.6 | 13.3 |
| 2020 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 50.9 | 16.4 | 52.6 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 2.5 | 11.4 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 126.9 | 16.2 |
| 2018 | 64.6 | 17.1 | 43.4 | 7.3 | 13.1 | 2.1 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 126.9 | 15.4 |
| 2017 | 35.2 | 5.3 | 61.2 | 11.3 | 6.4 | 1.4 | 6.4 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 109.2 | 16.3 |
| 2016 | 67.6 | 6.2 | 80.0 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 2.0 | 10.4 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 167.2 | 9.1 |
| 2015 | 83.6 | 7.4 | 68.4 | 11.5 | 17.8 | 3.6 | 10.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 180.4 | 15.4 |
| 2014 | 62.4 | 8.1 | 64.5 | 6.0 | 24.8 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 156.0 | 8.6 |
| 2013 | 58.6 | 4.9 | 60.0 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 127.1 | 7.0 |
| 2012 | 63.2 | 10.5 | 61.6 | 7.0 | 9.9 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 136.8 | 14.8 |
| 2011 | 40.6 | 7.2 | 56.9 | 5.1 | 9.4 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 110.6 | 11.6 |
| 2010 | 51.2 | 16.4 | 86.4 | 11.6 | 13.3 | 1.7 | 5.6 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 156.5 | 26.3 |
| 2009 | 28.1 | 8.0 | 69.2 | 24.6 | 6.2 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 105.9 | 16.4 |
| 2008 | 37.8 | 6.6 | 79.3 | 11.9 | 9.8 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 130.8 | 14.1 |
| 2007 | 39.8 | 9.5 | 81.6 | 23.0 | 11.1 | 3.1 | 6.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 139.0 | 20.5 |
| 2006 | 30.6 | 4.4 | 65.1 | 12.6 | 13.6 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 111.9 | 14.3 |
| 2005 | 80.4 | 31.9 | 133.3 | 38.9 | 35.1 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 255.1 | 72.7 |
| 2004 | 62.7 | 10.9 | 92.0 | 19.2 | 17.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 173.7 | 25.4 |
| 2003 | 106.0 | 21.2 | 71.0 | 10.8 | 19.7 | 5.7 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 199.7 | 35.2 |
| 2002 | 41.8 | 1.8 | 70.5 | 2.7 | 36.0 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 150.9 | 14.2 |
| 2001 | 42.3 | 5.5 | 63.0 | 10.8 | 46.7 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 156.3 | 17.5 |
| 2000 | 12.7 | 5.0 | 95.0 | 19.6 | 27.0 | 7.8 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 136.7 | 28.0 |
| 1999 | 36.3 |  | 65.7 |  | 36.7 |  | 2.3 |  | 0.0 |  | 141.0 | 12.1 |
| 1998 | 25.7 |  | 87.7 |  | 26.3 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 139.7 | 17.9 |
| 1997 | 29.0 |  | 40.0 |  | 26.3 |  | 1.0 |  | 0.3 |  | 96.3 | 11.5 |
| 1996 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |  | mple |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 34.0 |  | 47.4 |  | 26.6 |  | 3.6 |  | 0.3 |  | 111.6 | 15.6 |
| 1993 | 16.4 |  | 26.3 |  | 22.5 |  | 2.8 |  | 0.6 |  | 68.0 |  |
| 1992 | 16.4 |  | 44.0 |  | 21.3 |  | 0.7 |  | 0.0 |  | 82.4 |  |
| 1991 | 26.6 |  | 33.1 |  | 12.0 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 |  | 72.0 |  |
| 1990 | 34.0 |  | 31.3 |  | 2.7 |  | 2.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 70.0 |  |
| 1989 | 15.4 |  | 16.0 |  | 3.4 |  | 0.9 |  | 0.0 |  | 36.3 |  |
| 1988 | 6.8 |  | 10.6 |  | 1.6 |  | 0.3 |  | 0.0 |  | 19.3 |  |

EFDPLLSS.D88-D22

Table 58. PSD and RSD values obtained for each black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples in each area of Paintsville Lake (1,150 acres) on 2 May 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{15}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| Lower | 154 | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (28-43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ (5-14) \end{gathered}$ | 9 | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (1-66) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| Upper | 95 | $\begin{gathered} 41 \\ (31-51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (4-17) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 249 | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (32-44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ (6-13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9 | $\begin{gathered} 33 \\ (1-66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0 |

EFDPLLSS.D22

Table 59. Spring nocturnal electrofishing population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected in Paintsville Lake (1,150 acres). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

| Parameter | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2021 | 2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (10.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (58.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (35.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (68.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (64.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (63.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (90.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (71.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (39.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (56.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (42.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (24.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (21.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (13.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (24.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (17.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (9.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (13.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (12.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (16.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (3.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (2.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (10.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (6.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (9.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (2.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (1.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 12 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 9 | 13 | 12 | 13 |
| Assessment rating | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Good |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 1.18 | 0.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 69.40 | 83.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EFDPLLSS.D08-D19, D21-D22 } \\ & \text { EFDPLLAS.D06, D11 } \\ & \text { EFDPLLAF.D12, D18 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 60. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in 2.5 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing samples in Paintsville Lake (1,150 acres) on 11 October 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 |  |  |  |
| Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 3 | 29 | 67 | 82 | 26 | 5 | 22 | 36 | 26 | 18 | 12 | 4 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 337 | 269.6 | 38.2 |
| Upper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 6 | 20 | 10 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 22 | 13 | 24 | 11 | 5 | 3 |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 149 | 119.2 | 19.4 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 9 | 49 | 77 | 94 | 35 | 8 | 44 | 49 | 50 | 29 | 17 | 7 |  | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 486 | 194.4 | 32.2 |

EFDPLLSF.D22

Table 61. Nocturnal electrofishing indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected at Paintsville Lake ( 1,150 acres).

| Year class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 106.0 | 22.5 | 52.0 | 16.6 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 81.8 | 30.0 | 26.7 | 7.6 | 21.6 | 5.0 |
| 2020 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 71.2 | 13.9 | 6.0 | 4.3 | 24.0 | 8.3 |
| 2019 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 74.7 | 9.3 | 25.3 | 4.5 | no s | ple |
| 2018 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 50.9 | 9.8 | 22.9 | 7.8 | 42.9 | 15.9 |
| 2017 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 125.2 | 20.2 | 62.4 | 12.9 | 56.6 | 14.6 |
| 2016 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 70.0 | 6.3 | 34.0 | 8.6 | 39.2 | 6.1 |
| 2015 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 95.1 | 17.7 | 42.2 | 6.7 | 71.2 | 5.6 |
| 2014 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 60.0 | 11.0 | 27.0 | 7.3 | 90.7 | 7.4 |
| 2013 | 4.9 | <0.1 | 111.7 | 13.8 | 53.1 | 5.0 | 63.7 | 8.3 |
| 2012 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 58.1 | 10.6 | 32.3 | 7.3 | 64.9 | 5.0 |
| 2011 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 36.3 | 7.2 | 19.7 | 4.3 | 68.8 | 11.1 |
| 2010 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 86.4 | 19.5 | 31.5 | 6.9 | 35.6 | 6.7 |
| 2009 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 64.6 | 13.3 | 23.1 | 10.7 | 58.1 | 17.6 |
| 2008 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 24.8 | 8.8 | 8.1 | 5.2 | 35.6 | 9.7 |
| 2007 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 52.4 | 24.0 | 30.2 | 15.6 | 51.5 | 7.3 |
| 2006 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 72.4 | 12.0 | 33.6 | 5.1 | 44.0 | 8.4 |
| 2005 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 46.0 | 9.6 | 10.7 | 2.7 | 43.5 | 5.9 |
| 2004 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 65.7 | 10.8 | 37.3 | 8.6 | 75.6 | 29.2 |
| 2003 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 31.3 | 6.1 | 14.0 | 2.2 | 61.4 | 10.7 |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95.2 | 20.1 |
| EFDPLLSF.D03-D21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDPLLSS.D02-D19, D22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDPLLAS.D03, D06, D11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EFDPLL | .D12, D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 62. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth and Spotted bass collected at Paintsville Lake during October 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 60 | 82 (1) | 16 | 82 (2) | 7 | 98 (3) |
|  | Upper | 56 | 88 (6) | 8 | 87 (4) | 11 | 98 (2) |
|  | Total | 116 | 85 (3) | 24 | 84 (2) | 18 | 98 (2) |
| Spotted Bass |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 1 | $92(<1)$ | 1 | $107(<1)$ | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper | 1 | 100 (<1) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 2 | 96 (4) | 1 | 107 (<1) | 0 | 0 (0) |

EFDPLLSF.D22

Table 63. Species composition, relative abundance, and CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected in approximately 3.0 hours of 15-minute nocturnal electrofishing samples at Yatesville Lake (2,280 acres) on 27 April 2022.

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |  |  |  |
| Lower | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.0 | 1.4 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 19 | 21 | 18 | 8 | 20 | 28 | 21 | 28 | 23 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | 252 | 168.0 | 11.7 |
| Upper | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 2 | 22 | 24 | 26 | 5 | 26 | 48 | 18 | 16 | 19 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 259 | 172.7 | 24.1 |
| Total | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.7 | 0.8 |
|  | Largemouth Bass | 4 | 41 | 45 | 44 | 13 | 46 | 76 | 39 | 44 | 42 | 23 | 25 | 20 | 21 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 511 | 170.3 | 12.8 |

EFDYLLSS.D22

Table 64. Spring nocturnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) for each length group of Largemouth Bass at Yatesville Lake (2,280 acres).

| Year | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | <8.0 in |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  | $\geq 20.0$ in |  |  |  |
|  | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 49.0 | 8.8 | 68.3 | 5.9 | 30.0 | 3.5 | 23.0 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 170.3 | 12.8 |
| 2021 | 26.3 | 5.3 | 27.0 | 7.7 | 14.7 | 2.3 | 11.0 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 79.0 | 14.6 |
| 2020 | 71.5 | 15.8 | 46.0 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 2.9 | 13.0 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 150.5 | 20.8 |
| 2019 | 49.7 | 5.2 | 58.3 | 6.6 | 28.3 | 5.4 | 15.7 | 3.1 | 0.0 |  | 152.0 | 11.9 |
| 2018 | 55.3 | 7.2 | 64.3 | 7.1 | 23.0 | 3.9 | 14.0 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 156.7 | 9.4 |
| 2017 | 76.7 | 11.1 | 55.3 | 8.7 | 37.3 | 4.8 | 21.0 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 190.3 | 17.0 |
| 2016 | 57.3 | 9.9 | 50.7 | 8.8 | 16.0 | 4.8 | 16.7 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 140.7 | 16.5 |
| 2015 | 57.3 | 7.3 | 67.3 | 5.4 | 23.0 | 3.1 | 23.3 | 3.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 171.0 | 8.6 |
| 2014 | 46.0 | 2.7 | 67.7 | 6.7 | 23.3 | 2.7 | 16.7 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 153.7 | 10.3 |
| 2013 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 23.2 | 2.8 | 49.2 | 7.4 | 21.6 | 2.6 | 8.4 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 102.4 | 10.3 |
| 2011 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 44.0 | 6.3 | 57.0 | 8.7 | 19.3 | 3.8 | 11.0 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 131.3 | 11.7 |
| 2009 | 28.6 | 5.4 | 68.3 | 7.5 | 30.6 | 2.8 | 16.6 | 3.2 | 0.0 |  | 144.1 | 9.7 |
| 2008 | 47.0 | 8.4 | 38.3 | 3.8 | 20.4 | 3.7 | 16.6 | 4.9 | 0.0 |  | 122.3 | 10.3 |
| 2007 | 47.7 | 5.9 | 62.3 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 4.2 | 15.8 | 2.7 | 0.0 |  | 157.1 | 10.7 |
| 2006 | 47.3 | 7.4 | 68.0 | 10.3 | 20.3 | 2.2 | 16.0 | 4.0 | 0.7 |  | 151.7 | 17.5 |
| 2005 | 43.7 | 7.8 | 61.3 | 6.6 | 42.0 | 4.7 | 21.7 | 2.1 | 0.3 |  | 168.7 | 15.4 |
| 2004 | 12.7 | 2.8 | 40.3 | 10.5 | 23.7 | 5.1 | 9.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 |  | 85.7 | 19.4 |
| 2003 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 54.3 | 7.8 | 50.0 | 4.4 | 19.3 | 2.9 | 16.7 | 3.2 | 0.0 |  | 140.3 | 7.4 |
| 2001 | 35.0 | 7.0 | 58.3 | 7.5 | 19.3 | 3.2 | 9.7 | 2.1 | 0.3 |  | 122.3 | 7.8 |
| 2000 | 63.3 | 8.0 | 55.7 | 7.9 | 9.3 | 1.1 | 7.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 |  | 135.5 | 13.7 |
| 1999 | 42.7 |  | 29.0 |  | 16.3 |  | 13.7 |  | 0.3 |  | 101.7 | 12.2 |
| 1998 | 10.7 |  | 25.7 |  | 16.3 |  | 5.7 |  | 0.0 |  | 58.3 | 7.2 |
| 1997 | 50.7 |  | 23.7 |  | 16.7 |  | 2.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 93.0 | 10.5 |
| 1996 | 21.5 |  | 65.5 |  | 7.8 |  | 1.5 |  | 0.0 |  | 96.3 | 11.5 |
| 1995 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | no sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 153.7 |  | 82.9 |  | 20.1 |  | 7.4 |  | 0.0 |  | 264.0 |  |

EFDYLLSS.D93-D22

Table 65. PSD and RSD values for black bass species taken in spring electrofishing samples in each area of Yatesville Lake ( 2,280 acres) on 27 April 2022; 95\% confidence intervals are in parentheses.

| Area | Largemouth Bass |  |  | Spotted Bass |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | RSD ${ }_{15}$ | $\geq$ Stock size | PSD | $\mathrm{RSD}_{14}$ |
| Lower | 184 | 47 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | (40-55) | (13-25) |  |  |  |
| Upper | 180 | 40 | 19 | 2 | 50 | 0 |
|  |  | (33-47) | (13-25) |  | (0-148) |  |
| Total | 364 | 44 | 19 | 5 | 20 | 0 |
|  |  | (39-49) | (15-23) |  | (0-60) |  |

EFDYLLSS.D22

Table 66. Spring nocturnal electrofishing population assessment for Largemouth Bass collected at Yatesville Lake (2,280 acres). Actual values are in parentheses. Scoring based on statewide assessment.

|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter | 2009 | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Mean length age 3 at capture | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \\ (13.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (12.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (11.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (12.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE age 1 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (42.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (19.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (37.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (54.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (56.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (73.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (51.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (46.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (70.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (23.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (52.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE 12.0-14.9 in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (19.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (21.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (23.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (23.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (16.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (37.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (23.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (28.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (20.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (14.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (30.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 15.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (8.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (23.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (16.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (21.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (14.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (15.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (13.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (11.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (23.0) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spring CPUE $\geq 20.0$ in | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (1.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Total score | 14 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 17 |
| Assessment rating | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Excellent |
| Instantaneous mortality (z) | 0.91 | 1.22 | 0.79 | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual mortality (A) | 59.80 | 70.40 | 54.60 | 53.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

EFDYLLSS.D08-D10, D12, D14-D22
EFDYLLAS.D06, D12
EFDYLLAF.D21*

* Back calculated fall age file

Table 67. Length frequency and nocturnal electrofishing CPUE (fish/hr) of black bass collected at Yatesville Lake ( 2,280 acres) during 3.0 hours of 15-minute samples on 29 September 2022

| Area | Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |
| Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  | Largmouth Bass | 21 | 34 | 28 | 5 | 16 | 38 | 21 | 24 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 225 | 150.0 | 11.0 |
| Upper |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  | Largmouth Bass | 10 | 34 | 23 | 9 | 23 | 60 | 30 | 17 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 239 | 159.3 | 13.1 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
|  | Largmouth Bass | 31 | 68 | 51 | 14 | 39 | 98 | 51 | 41 | 22 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 464 | 154.7 | 8.3 |

Table 68. Fall electrofishing indices of year class strength at age 0 and age 1 and mean length (in) of age-0 Largemouth Bass collected during 2003-2022 at Yatesville Lake (2,280 acres).

| Year <br> class | Age 0 |  | Age 0 |  | Age $0 \geq 5.0$ in |  | Age 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean length | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE | CPUE | SE |
| 2022 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 51.7 | 5.8 | 18.7 | 3.1 |  |  |
| 2021 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 52.7 | 13.4 | 21.0 | 5.5 | 52.3 | 9.0 |
| 2020 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 53.7 | 9.8 | 22.0 | 4.5 | 23.2 | 8.4 |
| 2019 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 85.3 | 16.1 | 34.7 | 9.5 | 70.0 | 15.3 |
| 2018 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 79.6 | 17.8 | 49.2 | 14.4 | 46.0 | 5.2 |
| 2017 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 84.4 | 8.7 | 46.4 | 7.1 | 51.3 | 7.1 |
| 2016 | 5.8 | 0.1 | 67.3 | 7.1 | 61.3 | 7.2 | 73.3 | 10.9 |
| 2015 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 92.0 | 11.3 | 48.7 | 9.9 | 56.7 | 9.9 |
| 2014 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 79.3 | 14.8 | 29.3 | 7.8 | 54.3 | 7.7 |
| 2013 | 5.2 | 0.1 | 39.6 | 5.8 | 25.6 | 5.0 | 37.0 | 2.9 |
| 2012 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 82.9 | 20.0 | 45.1 | 10.1 | no sa |  |
| 2011 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 55.3 | 9.6 | 28.7 | 4.9 | 19.4 | 2.5 |
| 2010 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 78.6 | 11.5 | 45.1 | 8.7 | no sa | ple |
| 2009 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 32.7 | 6.5 | 16.3 | 4.0 | 42.6 | 6.4 |
| 2008 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 45.9 | 7.8 | 28.4 | 6.0 | 28.2 | 5.3 |
| 2007 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 37.4 | 10.6 | 23.2 | 6.1 | 45.0 | 8.1 |
| 2006 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 29.5 | 7.8 | 13.8 | 3.8 | 47.0 | 6.0 |
| 2005 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 47.0 | 12.3 | 20.0 | 7.1 | 45.9 | 7.2 |
| 2004 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 69.5 | 13.5 | 32.5 | 10.8 | 42.3 | 7.1 |
| 2003 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 46.0 | 6.3 | 29.3 | 4.4 | 12.7 | 2.8 |
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Table 69. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ for length groups of Largemouth and Spotted bass collected at Yatesville Lake during September 2022. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | Area | Length group |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 8.0-11.9 in |  | 12.0-14.9 in |  | $\geq 15.0$ in |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 61 | 84 (4) | 17 | 87 (2) | 10 | 99 (3) |
|  | Upper | 59 | 81 (1) | 17 | 85 (2) | 4 | 98 (3) |
|  | Total | 120 | 83 (2) | 34 | 86 (1) | 14 | 99 (2) |
| Spotted Bass |  | 7.0-10.9 in |  | 11.0-13.9 in |  | $\geq 14.0$ in |  |
|  |  | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
|  | Lower | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Upper | 1 | $98(<1)$ | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |
|  | Total | 1 | 98 (<1) | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 | 0 (0) |

EFDPLLSF.D22

# WESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

Project 2: Stream Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

## Lower Tennessee River

Diurnal electrofishing (120 PPS DC current) was conducted on September 16, 2022, in the lower Tennessee River at river mile 17. A total of 1.25 hours of sampling yielded 650 fish, comprised of 33 species (Table 1). An additional sample at river mile 22.4 was conducted by the Critical Species Investigation (CSI) branch. The results of their sampling can be found in the CSI annual report for 2022. The methods for this year's survey were different than past years in that all species were collected. Of the sportfish collected in the most recent study, Smallmouth Bass had the highest catch rate at 35.2 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$. The catch rate ( $13.6 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) for Largemouth Bass was down from the 20.0 fish/hr collected in 2019. No Blue or Flathead catfish were collected. Low pulse (15 PPS) DC current was used to help collect catfish during one of the 900 sec. survey runs. Relative weights are provided in Table 2.

## Lower Cumberland River

The lower Cumberland River was sampled using diurnal electrofishing on 15 September 2022, near Dycusburg, KY (CRM 20.0). A total of 1.5 hours of electrofishing yielded 397 fish, comprised of 27 species (Table 3). As seen in previous years, bluegill accounted for the highest catch rates of all sportfish species ( 11.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) while spotted bass had the second highest catch rate of all sportfish species ( 3.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ). Largemouth bass were caught at $2.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$. The catch rate of silver carp was $14.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$, compared to 12.6 and $10.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ collected during the 2015 and 2019 studies, respectively. The highest catch rates (excluding shad) were those of longnose gar ( $25.3 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ). Relative weights are provided in Table 4.

## $\underline{\text { Ohio River }}$

The Ohio River was sampled using diurnal electrofishing on 19 and 22 September 2022. Sampling areas included Smithland Tailwater (ORM 918.5-920.1) and the area between Dam \#52 and Shawnee Steam Plant (ORM 938.9-946.4). A total of 3.0 hours of electrofishing yielded 561 ( $187.0 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) fish, comprised of 30 species (Table 5). The catch rate for largemouth bass ( $1.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) was less than half of what it was in 2019. Blue catfish had the highest catch rate ( $28.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) of all species, excluding shad. Low pulse ( 15 PPS ) DC current was used to help collect catfish in some of the sampling locations. Silver carp catch rates were 7.3 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, compared to 12.0 and 4.7 fish/hr in 2017 and 2019, respectively. Relative weights are provided in Table 6.

## Mississippi River

The Mississippi River was sampled at two locations on September 20 and 23, 2022 by diurnal electrofishing. Water elevations were extremely low and prevented us from accessing any creeks. The first site was near Wickliffe, KY. The second site was near Columbus Belmont, KY. The 2.25 hours of sampling effort yielded 504 fish comprised of 25 different species (Table 7). White bass were collected at a rate of 4.4 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$, down from $6.7 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{hr}$ collected in 2019 , although some additional hybrid striped bass were caught as well. The catch rate for all catfish was 84.9 fish/hr and was comprised of mainly flathead catfish. Low pulse ( 15 PPS) DC current was used for 0.75 hours to collect catfish species. Silver carp catch rates were lower in the Mississippi river ( 3.6 fish $/ \mathrm{hr}$ ) than in other rivers we sampled this year, but as with past years this may have more to do with sampling conditions rather than actual relative abundance. Relative weights are provided in Table 8.

Table 1. Relative abundance and size distribution of species collected during diurnal electrofishing (PPS 120) on the Lower Tennessee River on 16 September 2022. Sample sites were in the area of river mile 17. Total effort was 1.25 hours. Low pulse (15 PPS) was used for 0.25 hours of the total sample time.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  | 8 | 9 | 10 |  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 7 | 28 |  | 3 | 31 | 323338 |  |  |  |  |
| Spotted Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Longnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 13 | 10.4 | 5.7 |
| Shortnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 12.8 | 6.4 |
| Bow fin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Skipjack Herring |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| Gizzard Shad |  | 1 | 29 | 61 | 12 | 36 | 1 |  | 10 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 173 | 138.4 | 41.1 |
| Threadfin Shad |  | 18 | 24 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49 | 39.2 | 30.5 |
| Grass Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Common Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4.0 | 3.1 |
| Silver Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 9.6 | 8.6 |
| Emerald Shiner |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| Smallmouth Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 12.8 | 10.8 |
| Bigmouth Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4.0 | 2.2 |
| Black Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 5.6 | 5.6 |
| Spotted Sucker |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Shorthead Redhorse |  |  | 2 | 21 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 22.4 | 15.7 |
| Channel Catfish |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.4 | 1.6 |
| Inland Silverside |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| White Bass |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3.2 | 1.5 |
| Yellow Bass |  | 8 | 31 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 32.0 | 20.9 |
| Green Sunfish |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3.2 | 2.3 |
| Warmouth |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Bluegill | 3 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36 | 28.8 | 7.4 |
| Longear Sunfish |  | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 7.2 | 2.9 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  | 1 | 20 | 12 | 8 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44 | 35.2 | 22.5 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4.0 | 1.8 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 13.6 | 5.5 |
| White Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Black Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Logperch |  |  | 6 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 13.6 | 11.6 |
| Sauger |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Freshw ater Drum |  | 3 | 85 | 33 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 125 | 100.0 | 86.2 |
| Sunfish hybrids |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
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*Kentucky Lake tailwater sampling data is available in Western Kentucky CSI branch Annual Performance Report

Table 2. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(W_{r}\right)$ values for species collected during diurnal electrofishing on the Lower Tennessee River on 16 September 2022.
Sample sites were in the area of river mile 17. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gizzard Shad | 33 | $93(1)$ |
| Channel Catfish | 1 | 76 |
| White Bass | 1 | 81 |
| Bluegill | 3 | $110(4)$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | $92(15)$ |
| White Crappie | 3 | $95(1)$ |
| Black Crappie | 1 | 98 |
| Sauger | 1 | 104 |
| Freshwater Drum | 2 | $83(8)$ |

wfdtn.d22

Table 3. Relative abundance and size distribution of species collected during diurnal electrofishing on the Lower Cumberland River on 15 September 2022. Sample sites were in the area of river mile 20. Total effort was 1.5 hours targeting all fish species. Standard pulse (120 PPS) was used for 1.0 hour and low pulse (15 PPS) was used for 0.50 hours of the total sample time.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |  |  |  |
| Longnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 38 | 25.3 | 6.3 |
| Shortnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 6.7 | 2.7 |
| Bow fin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Skipjack Herring |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Gizzard Shad | 1 | 22 | 34 | 11 | 14 | 40 | 24 | 11 | 1 |  | 6 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 167 | 111.3 | 44.6 |
| Threadf in Shad | 25 | 16 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 28.7 | 20.5 |
| Grass Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Common Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Silver Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 21 | 14.0 | 5.5 |
| River Carpsucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 8.7 | 5.6 |
| Blue Sucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Smallmouth Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 3 | 4 | 4 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 11.3 | 4.2 |
| Bigmouth Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Black Buffalo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Golden Redhorse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Channel Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 1.33 |
| Flathead Catfish |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2.7 | 1.7 |
| White Bass |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Green Sunfish |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Warmouth |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Bluegill | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 11.3 | 4.1 |
| Longear Sunfish | 3 | 7 | 18 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 19.3 | 11.0 |
| Redear Sunfish |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.0 | 1.4 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 3.3 | 1.6 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Freshw ater Drum |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2.7 | 1.3 |

wfdcr.d22
*Lake Barkley tailw ater sampling data is available in Western Kentucky CSI branch Annual Performance Report

Table 4. Number of fish and mean relative weight $\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}\right)$ values for species collected during diurnal electrofishing on the Lower Cumberland River on 15 September 2022. Sample sites were in the area of river mile 20. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gizzard Shad | 85 | $91(1)$ |
| Channel Catfish | 2 | $102(1)$ |
| Flathead Catfish | 1 | 103 |
| White Bass | 1 | 108 |
| Bluegill | 16 | $114(3)$ |
| Redear Sunfish | 3 | $100(2)$ |
| Smallmouth Bass | 2 | $86(10)$ |
| Spotted Bass | 3 | $95(1)$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 3 | $111(3)$ |
| Freshwater Drum | 4 | $105(4)$ |
| wfdcr.d22 |  |  |

wfdcr.d22

Table 5. Relative abundance and size distribution of species collected during diurnal electrofishing ( 120 PPS) on the Ohio River on 19 and 22 September 2022. Sample sites were in the area of river mile 944 and 920 . Total effort was 3.0 hours consisting of twelve, 900 -second runs directed at all fish species. Low pulse ( 15 PPS ) was used for approximately 0.75 hours of the total sample time.

| Species | Inch class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | CPUE | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | $32 \quad 33 \quad 34$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spotted Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| Longnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 9 | 3.0 | 1.2 |
| Shortnose Gar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 6.3 | 3.0 |
| Bow fin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Skipjack Herring |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 2.0 | 0.8 |
| Gizzard Shad |  | 2 | 15 | 25 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 74 | 24.7 | 10.8 |
| Threadf in Shad |  | 9 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62 | 20.7 | 20.0 |
| Grass Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Common Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 2.3 | 1.7 |
| Silver Chub |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Silver Carp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 22 | 7.3 | 2.7 |
| Emerald Shiner |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| River Carpsucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Blue Sucker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Smallmouth Buffalo |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 5 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 11.3 | 5.0 |
| Blue Catfish |  | 9 | 31 | 12 | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 86 | 28.7 | 16.4 |
| Channel Catfish |  |  | 12 | 10 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32 | 10.7 | 5.2 |
| Flathead Catfish |  |  | 3 | 14 | 3 |  | 3 | 6 | 2 |  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39 | 13.0 | 10.5 |
| Brook Silverside |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| White Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Striped Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Orangespotted Sunfish |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Bluegill | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 5.7 | 5.0 |
| Longear Sunfish | 6 | 13 | 17 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 15.0 | 8.8 |
| Redear Sunfish |  | 4 |  | 9 | 5 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | 8.0 | 5.6 |
| Smallmouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Spotted Bass |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 8.7 | 3.8 |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| Sauger |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Freshw ater Drum |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 6.0 | 2.8 |

wfdor.d22

Table 6. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ) values for species collected during diurnal electrofishing on the Ohio River on 19 and 22 September 2022. Sample sites were in the area of river mile 944 and 920. Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gizzard Shad | 16 | $89(2)$ |
| Blue Catfish | 25 | $111(2)$ |
| Channel Catfish | 8 | $98(5)$ |
| Flathead Catfish | 6 | $91(1)$ |
| White Bass | 3 | $89(8)$ |
| Striped Bass | 2 | $91(6)$ |
| Bluegill | 5 | $111(4)$ |
| Redear Sunfish | 16 | $115(3)$ |
| Spotted Bass | 16 | $106(2)$ |
| Sauger | 3 | $91(4)$ |
| Freshwater Drum | 18 | $111(3)$ |

wfdor.d22

Table 7. Relative abundance and size distribution of species collected during diurnal electrofishing ( 120 PPS) on the Mississippi River on 20 and 23 September 2022. Sample sites were in the area of river mile 950 (just downstream of Wickliffe, KY) and 936 (just downstream of Columbus Belmont, KY). Total effort, 2.25 hours, of electrofishing was exerted; 9-900-second runs at each site where all species were dipped. Low pulse (15 PPS) was used for 0.5 hours of the total sample time.

wfdmsr.d22

Table 8. Number of fish and mean relative weight ( $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ) values for species collected during diurnal electrofishing on the Mississippi River on 20 and 23 September 2022.
Sample sites were in the area of river mile 950 and 936 .
Standard errors are in parentheses.

| Species | No. | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{r}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Gizzard Shad | 2 | $99(1)$ |
| Blue Cattish | 33 | $95(3)$ |
| Channel Catfish | 8 | $95(4)$ |
| Flathead Cattish | 11 | $115(2)$ |
| White Bass | 7 | $91(3)$ |
| Bluegill | 2 | $120(1)$ |
| Largemouth Bass | 1 | 90 |
| Black Crappie | 1 | 102 |
| Hybrid Striped Bass | 7 | $85(1)$ |
| Freshwater Drum | 17 | $102(3)$ |

wfdmsr.d22

## WESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

Table 1. Technical guidance given to pond owners in the Western Fishery District during the 2022 project year (April 1, 2022 - March 31, 2023). Approximately 100 telephone calls to the office regarding technical guidance and stocking were also handled. Additionally, numerous emails were replied to requesting farm pond technical guidance information.

| County | Date of <br> Inspection | Findings | Management Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## No on-site visits were made during this project year

## NORTHWESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

Requests for technical guidance information were received via e-mails, phone calls, and office visits. Problems included unbalanced populations, new pond construction, stocking, fish disease and fish kills, water quality issues, aquatic vegetation control, and general pond management. Requested information was relayed via phone, e-mail, office visit, and referencing the Pond Management section of the web site. There were 19 on-site visits conducted in 2021, providing various recommendations or surveying fish populations. On-site visits are only conducted for City, County, State, or Federally owned properties with public fishing opportunities.

## SOUTHWESTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

Emails, phone calls, texts and a few office visits were means of providing technical guidance to landowners. Fish stocking and aquatic vegetation remained the top technical guidance requests.

## CENTRAL FISHERIES DISTRICT

Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

A total of 223 phone calls, 144 e-mails, and 1 walk-in office visits concerning farm pond problems were handled this year. Most common problems were unbalanced fish populations and excessive aquatic plant growth. During 2022, one landowner requested a Fisheries Special Management Permit (FMP) for their pond.

## NORTHEASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 2: Streams Fishery Surveys

## FINDINGS

## Trout Stream Temperature Assessments

Temperature loggers were installed in all NEFD trout designated waters. Data collection spanned from May through November (Table 1). For our put-grow-take trout streams, Big Caney, Chimney Top, Dog Fork, Laurel, and Parched Corn all remained at a Class I designation, but East Fork Indian Creek dropped to a Class II designation (it had more than 5 days above $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ for the year; Table 2). For our put-take streams, East Fork Indian Creek and Middle Fork Red River both dropped a Class from their 2021 designation (East Fork Indian Creek from a I to a II and Middle Fork Red River from a III to a III/IV) while the rest remained at their existing designation (Table 3).

Table 1. Water temperature data ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) for designated trout streams in 2022.


Table 2. Stream classification ratings for put-grow-take streams in the Northeastern Fishery District.

| Stream | Year | ```Number of days avg temp \geq72 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{F in the year``` | Max avg daily temp from JuneSeptember | ```Number of days avg temp \geq73 }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{F in June``` | Max avg daily temp in June | Stream classification rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Caney Creek | 2022 | 0 | 64.7 | 0 | 64.9 | I |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 70.3 | 0 | 67.6 | 1 |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 70.1 | 0 | 64.8 | , |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 69.4 | 0 | 64.9 | 1 |
| Chimney Top Creek | 2022 | 0 | 63.8 | 0 | 62.0 | I |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 67.8 | 0 | 64.8 | I |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 69.7 | 0 | 63.5 | 1 |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 70.8 | 0 | 66.9 | 1 |
| Dog Fork | 2022 | 0 | 63.4 | 0 | 62.2 | I |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 66.6 | 0 | 64.7 | I |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 68.5 | 0 | 64.2 | I |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 67.9 | 0 | 64.6 | I |
| East Fork Indian Creek | 2022 | 20 | 68.7 | 5 | 69.1 | II |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 71.2 | 0 | 69.3 | I |
|  | 2020 | 25 | 75.7 | 0 | 69.7 | III |
|  | 2019 | 11 | 72.9 | 0 | 68 | 1 |
| Laurel Creek | 2022 | 0 | 64.3 | 0 | 63.1 | 1 |
|  | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 1 | 72.7 | 0 | 66.9 | , |
| Parched Corn Creek | 2022 | 0 | 64.5 | 0 | 63.3 | 1 |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 68.3 | 0 | 66.5 | 1 |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 70.0 | 0 | 65.3 | I |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 68.6 | 0 | 64.5 | 1 |

Table 3. Stream classification ratings for put-take streams in the Northeastern Fishery District.

| Stream | Year | Number of days avg temp $\geq 72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the year | Max avg daily temp from JuneSeptember | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number of } \\ \text { days avg } \\ \text { temp } \geq 73^{\circ} \mathrm{F} \\ \text { in June } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Max avg daily temp in June | Stream classification rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Caney Creek | 2022 | 0 | 64.7 | 0 | 64.9 | I |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 70.3 | 0 | 67.6 | I |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 70.1 | 0 | 64.8 | I |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 69.4 | 0 | 64.9 | 1 |
| Craney Creek | 2022 | 52 | 71.1 | 2 | 69.6 | III |
|  | 2021 | 20 | 75.8 | 2 | 75.8 | III |
|  | 2020 | 52 | 78.5 | 2 | 74.3 | III |
|  | 2019 | 48 | 77.0 | 0 | 72.2 | III |
| East Fork Indian Creek | 2022 | 20 | 38.7 | 5 | 69.1 | II |
|  | 2021 | 0 | 71.2 | 0 | 69.3 | I |
|  | 2020 | 25 | 75.7 | 0 | 69.7 | III |
|  | 2019 | 11 | 72.9 | 0 | 68 | II |
| East Fork Little Sandy River | 2022 | 74 | 71.4 | 11 | 72.1 | IV |
|  | 2021 | 75 | 79.4 | 7 | 79.4 | IV |
|  | 2020 | 85 | 80.2 | 6 | 75.3 | IV |
|  | 2019 | 76 | 80.3 | 4 | 77.6 | IV |
| Laurel Creek | 2022 | 0 | 64.3 | 0 | 63.1 | I |
|  | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 1 | 72.7 | 0 | 66.9 | 1 |
| Middle Fork Red River | 2022 | 70 | 71.6 | 9 | 71.7 | IIIIV |
|  | 2021 | 44 | 75.6 | 3 | 75.6 | III |
|  | 2020 | 80 | 79.2 | 5 | 75 | IV |
|  | 2019 | 83 | 80.2 | 3 | 74.4 | IV |
| Station Camp Creek | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 101 | 80.1 | 2 | 74.4 | IV |
| Sturgeon Creek | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 83 | 80.0 | 3 | 76.1 | IV |
| Swift Camp Creek | 2022 | 33 | 69.7 | 4 | 70.3 | II |
|  | 2021 | 14.0 | 73.9 | 2 | 73.9 | II |
|  | 2020 | 25.0 | 76.6 | 0 | 71.9 | III |
|  | 2019 | 53.0 | 81.3 | 1 | 73.1 | III |
| Triplett Creek - <br> Mainstem | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Triplett CreekNorth Fork | 2022 | 80 | 73.2 | 16 | 73.6 | IV |
|  | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 90 | 81.0 | 4 | 78 | IV |

## NORTHEASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

## Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

In 2021, on-site visits were permanently suspended. Consultations will continue to be handled via telephone and written correspondence. In 2022, roughly 100-125 phone calls and about 20 written correspondences were handled. Most vegetation problems and a few population problems were resolved using email pictures, pond harvest log data, or the use of the "Managing Your Farm Ponds" web page. Typical problems responded to include: pond stocking, aquatic vegetation problems, undesirable species, fishing information, fish kills, farm pond management, fish pathogens, water quality, pond construction, structural problems with dams, and pond nuisances.

# SOUTHEASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT 

Project 2: Stream Fishery Surveys - Trout Streams

## FINDINGS

## Trout Stream Temperature Monitoring

HOBO MX TidbiT 400 (MX2203) temperature data loggers were deployed in Beaver Creek, Clear Creek, Elk Spring Creek, Hatchery Creek, and Rock Creek, to evaluate current trout management strategies. Data loggers were deployed at one upstream and one downstream location within each stream except Hatchery Creek, where one data logger was deployed in the middle wetland location. Water temperatures ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) were recorded hourly from mid-April to late-October. Temperature data loggers were visually inspected to verify condition and continued submersion in mid-August. Monthly mean, maximum, and minimum temperatures for each stream are found in Table 1. Historical water temperatures and classifications for other trout streams within the Southeastern Fisheries District can be found in Tables 2-4.

## Beaver Creek

Beaver Creek recorded 41 days with daily average temperatures equal to or exceeding $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, a maximum average daily temperature of $79^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ between June and September, a maximum average daily temperature of $78.7^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June, and 13 days with an average temperature equal to or exceeding $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June. Observed temperatures in June were substantially higher than June temperatures observed during previous temperature monitoring (Table 3).

## Clear Creek

Clear Creek recorded 36 days with daily average temperatures equal to or exceeding $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, a maximum average daily temperature of $76.8^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ between June and September, a maximum average daily temperature of $76.8^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June, and 7 days with an average temperature equal to or exceeding $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June. Observed temperatures from June to September were slightly higher than temperatures for the time-period during previous temperature monitoring (Table 3).

## Elk Spring Creek

Elk Spring Creek recorded zero days with daily average temperatures equal to or exceeding $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, a maximum average daily temperature of $69.8^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ between June and September, a maximum average daily temperature of $68.2^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June, and zero days with an average temperature equal to or exceeding $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June (Table 3). The temperature data logger located in the upper section of Elk Spring Creek was unable to be retrieved.

## Hatchery Creek

Hatchery Creek recorded zero days with daily average temperatures equal to or exceeding $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, a maximum average daily temperature of $62^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ between June and September, a maximum average daily temperature of $51^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June, and zero days with an average temperature equal to or exceeding $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June (Table 4). The temperature data logger deployed in Hatchery Creek was unable to be retrieved; however, daily temperature records were received from The Wolf Creek National Fish Hatchery and used for trout stream classification purposes.

## Rock Creek

Rock Creek recorded 32 days with daily average temperatures equal to or exceeding $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$, a maximum average daily temperature of $76.6^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ between June and September, a maximum average daily temperature of $75.9^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June, and six days with an average temperature equal to or exceeding $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during June (Table 3). Observed temperatures in June were substantially higher than June temperatures observed during previous temperature monitoring (Table $3)$.

As outlined in the Trout Streams Program in Kentucky (found on the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources website), trout streams are currently classified as Class I, II, III, and IV streams based on four water temperature parameters: 1) the number of days overall stream temperatures average above $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in a calendar year, 2) maximum average daily temperature reached in the period June-September, 3) number of days overall stream temperatures average equal to or above $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the month of June and 4) maximum average daily stream temperatures in the month of June. Class I streams have a minimal number of days (<5) above $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in a calendar year and have a maximum temperature that remains below $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during the period June-September. Class II streams have a low number of days $(<25)$ above $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in a calendar year and have a maximum temperature that remains below $75^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during the period June-September. Class III and Class IV streams have a significant number of days ( $>25$ ) above $72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in a calendar year and most likely will be unable to provide significant carry-over to the next year. Separation of Class III and IV streams is based on the number of days the stream temperatures remain equal to or greater than $73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ during the month of June and the maximum stream temperature in June. Streams categorized as Class III have the potential to be stocked in June while Class IV streams are considered too warm to be stocked in June.

Based on these four water temperature parameters and historical temperature records, Elk Spring Creek and Hatchery Creek are classified as Class I trout streams (Tables 1, 3-4). Additionally, Beaver Creek and Clear Creek are classified as Class III trout streams and Rock Creek is classified as a Class IV trout stream (Tables 1 and 3). Changes to current management strategies for each of these streams are not recommended at this time.

## Trout Stream Angler Utilization Surveys

Browning Dark Ops HD Pro X trail cameras were placed at Beaver and Elk Spring Creeks on February 28, 2022 (one camera at Elk Spring Creek and two cameras at Beaver Creek) to monitor angler utilization of these trout streams. Angler utilization data from each camera was collected monthly from March 2022-February 2023. Previously, one camera was placed at Laurel River Tailwaters from June 2021 to February 2022 and angler utilization data was also collected monthly. This data will be used to establish baseline angler utilization trends for future stocking recommendations.

Between March 2022 and February 2023, an estimated total of 307 anglers utilized Beaver Creek with an estimated utilization rate of 0.43 anglers per day. A high percentage of anglers ( $90.9 \%$ ) utilized Beaver Creek between March and September and $94.1 \%$ of total anglers utilized the upper section of Beaver Creek (Table 5). An estimated total of 70 anglers utilized Elk Springs Creek with an estimated utilization rate of 0.2 anglers per day. More than $75 \%$ of anglers utilized Elk Springs Creek between March and September (Table 5). Both Beaver Creek and Elk Springs Creek are managed as put-and-take trout fisheries.

Between June 2021 and February 2022, an estimated total of 82 anglers utilized Laurel River Tailwaters with an estimated utilization rate of 0.31 anglers per day. Anglers utilizing Laurel River Lake Tailwaters during October and December accounted for $50 \%$ of total anglers (Table 6). The Laurel River Tailwaters is managed for a put-grow-take Brown Trout fishery and a put-and-take Rainbow Trout fishery.

Table 1. Water temperature data $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ for designated trout streams in 2022.

| Stream name | Stream <br> class <br> rating | Location |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | May |  |  | June |  |  | July |  |  | August |  |  | September |  |  | October |  |  | November |  |  |
|  |  |  | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max |
| Beaver Creek | III | Upper | 57 | 64.8 | 71 | 67 | 72.6 | 78 | 62 | 71.6 | 79 | 64 | 70.3 | 75 | 58 | 67.8 | 73 | 47 | 56.8 | 62 |  | N/A |  |
|  |  | Low er | 57 | 65.1 | 72 | 67 | 72.7 | 79 | 63 | 71.4 | 79 | 64 | 69.8 | 75 | 56 | 67.7 | 73 | 47 | 54.1 | 60 |  | N/A |  |
| Clear Creek | III | Upper | 59 | 65.5 | 70 | 67 | 71.4 | 78 | 68 | 72.6 | 76 | 68 | 71.1 | 74 | 56 | 66.4 | 72 | 49 | 55.0 | 59 |  | N/A |  |
|  |  | Low er | 58 | 64.8 | 70 | 66 | 70.4 | 76 | 68 | 72.2 | 76 | 68 | 70.7 | 74 | 56 | 65.8 | 72 | 48 | 53.8 | 57 |  | N/A |  |
| Ek Spring | I | Upper | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N/A |  |
| Creek | 1 | Low er | 58 | 61.1 | 65 | 62 | 65.5 | 68 | 62 | 65.6 | 70 | 62 | 63.7 | 66 | 57 | 62.8 | 66 | 51 | 56.8 | 60 |  | N/A |  |
| Rock Creek | IV | Upper | 55 | 61.6 | 67 | 65 | 68.6 | 74 | 67 | 71.0 | 75 | 67 | 68.9 | 71 | 54 | 64.1 | 70 | 48 | 55.6 | 69 |  | N/A |  |
|  |  | Lower | 56 | 63.7 | 69 | 68 | 72.3 | 78 | 69 | 73.5 | 78 | 68 | 71.2 | 75 | 57 | 66.9 | 72 | 51 | 57.4 | 69 |  | N/A |  |
| Hatchery Creek** | I | WCNFH | 50 | 50.6 | 52 | 50 | 50.2 | 51 | 50 | 51.2 | 53 | 52 | 54.3 | 57 | 55 | 58.5 | 62 | 59 | 60.8 | 63 | 56 | 57.5 | 59 |

* missing data
** Data from Wolf Creek National Fish Hatchery

Table 2. Stream classification ratings for put, grow, and take streams in the Southeastern Fishery District.

| Stream | Year | Number of days average temperature $\geq 72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the year | Maximum average daily temperature from June-September | Number of days average temperature $\geq 73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in June | Maximum average daily temperature in June | Stream classification rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bark Camp Creek* | 2021 | 0 | 71.7 | 0 | 70.2 | I |
|  | 2018 | 2 | 72.2 | 0 | 70.8 | II |
|  | 2011 | 23 | 73.8 | 0 | 71.6 | II |
| Laurel River Tailwaters* | 2021 | 0 | 57.0 | 0 | 50.4 | 1 |

*Put, grow, and take for Brown Trout; Put, take for Rainbow Trout

Table 3. Stream classification ratings for put, take streams in the Southeastern Fishery District.

| Stream | Year | Number of days average temperature $\geq 72^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the year | Maximum average daily temperature from JuneSeptember | Number of days average temperature $\geq 73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in June | Maximum average daily temperature in June | Stream classification rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beaver Creek* | 2022 | 41 | 79.0 | 13 | 78.7 | IV |
|  | 2019 | 69 | 77.9 | 0 | 70.8 | III |
|  | 2011 | 60 | 78.8 | 0 | 72 | III |
| Cane Creek* | 2021 | 7 | 72.8 | 0 | 69.9 | II |
|  | 2018 | 5 | 73.6 | 0 | 71.1 | II |
|  | 2010 | 6 | 72.9 | 0 | 70.2 | II |
| Clear Creek* | 2022 | 36 | 76.8 | 7 | 76.8 | IV |
|  | 2018 | 35 | 74.9 | 2 | 73.5 | III |
|  | 2011 | 44 | 75.9 | 4 | 72.7 | III |
| Elk Spring Creek* | 2022 | 0 | 69.8 | 0 | 68.2 | 1 |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 66.1 | 0 | 63.2 | I |
|  | 2011 | 0 | 63.4 | 0 | 61.9 | 1 |
| Upper Hatchery Creek** | 2022 | 0 | 62.0 | 0 | 51 | 1 |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 58.0 | 0 | 57 | I |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 64.0 | 0 | 58 | 1 |
|  | 2018 | 0 | 58.0 | 0 | 58 | I |
|  | 2017 | 0 | 64.0 | 0 | 57 | 1 |
| Right Fork Buffalo Creek* | 2021 | 21 | 74.3 | 0 | 71.5 | II |
|  | 2020 | 58 | 77.7 | 0 | 71.9 | III |
|  | 2011 | 39 | 76.7 | 1 | 73.4 | III |
| Rock Creek* | 2022 | 32 | 76.6 | 6 | 75.9 | IV |
|  | 2019 | 30 | 75.4 | 0 | 71.6 | III |
|  | 2011 | 66 | 78.6 | 18 | 77.1 | IV |
| War Fork Creek* | 2021 | 5 | 71.3 | 0 | 69.3 | , |
|  | 2020 | 14 | 73.8 | 0 | 67.1 | II |
|  | 2010 | 2 | 70.0 | 0 | 65.9 | 1 |

*Put and take for Rainbow Trout
**Put and take for all trout species

Table 4. Stream classification ratings for catch and release only streams in the Southeastern Fishery District.

| Stream | Year | Number of days average temperature $\geq 72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the year | Maximum average daily temperature from JuneSeptember | Number of days average temperature $\geq 73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in June | Maximum average daily temperature in June | Stream classification rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lower Hatchery Creek* | 2022 | 0 | 62.0 | 0 | 51.0 | 1 |
|  | 2020 | 0 | 58.0 | 0 | 57.0 | I |
|  | 2019 | 0 | 64.0 | 0 | 58.0 | 1 |
|  | 2018 | 0 | 58.0 | 0 | 58.0 | 1 |
|  | 2017 | 0 | 64.0 | 0 | 57.0 | 1 |

*Catch and release for all trout species

Table 5. Cumulative angler counts at put and take trout streams based on trail camera data. No. of Days (D) signifies the number of full days the camera was running, Count $(A)$ is the number of anglers counted at the sites and $A / D$ is the number of anglers counted per day the cameras were running.

| Stream | Year | Location | Month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mar-May |  |  | June-July |  |  | Aug-Sep |  |  | Oct |  |  | Nov-Dec |  |  | Jan-Feb |  |  |
|  |  |  | No. Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. <br> Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D |
| Beaver Creek | 22/23 | Upper* | 86 | 88 | 1.0 | 59 | 115 | 1.9 | 60 | 58 | 0.9 | 31 | 9 | 0.3 | 61 | 10 | 0.2 | 52 | 9 | 0.2 |
|  |  | Lower | 92 | 5 | 0.1 | 60 | 5 | 0.1 | 60 | 8 | 0.1 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | Total | 178 | 93 | 0.5 | 119 | 120 | 1.0 | 120 | 66 | 0.6 | 62 | 9 | 0.1 | 122 | 10 | 0.1 | 104 | 9 | 0.1 |
| Ek Springs Creek | 22/23 | Stocking <br> Site** | 89 | 17 | 0.2 | 60 | 21 | 0.4 | 59 | 15 | 0.3 | 31 | 3 | 0.1 | 61 | 9 | 0.1 | 52 | 5 | 0.1 |

[^50]Table 6. Cumulative angler counts at put, grow, and take trout streams based on trail camera data. No. of Days (D) signifies the number of full days the camera was running, Count $(A)$ is the number of anglers counted at the sites and $A / D$ is the number of anglers counted per day the cameras were running.

| Stream | Year | Location | Month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Jan -Mar |  |  | Apr-June |  |  | July-Sep |  |  | Oct-Dec |  |  |
|  |  |  | No. Days (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. Days (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. <br> Days <br> (D) | Count <br> (A) | A/D | No. Days (D) | Coun <br> (A) | A/D |
| Laurel River <br> Tailwaters* | 20/21 | Stocking Site | 57 | 6 | 0.1 | 30 | 7 | 0.2 | 89 | 28 | 0.3 | 90 | 41 | 0.5 |

* Put, grow, take for Brown Trout (stocked in March); Put, take for Rainbow Trout (stocked in March-June, October)


## SOUTHEASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

Onsite technical guidance was not provided during 2022. Technical guidance requests were handled over the telephone, text, or by written correspondence. Topics encountered and responded to included: fish population balance, aquatic vegetation problems, fish stocking information, water quality problems, and fish disease.

Several other requests for information (approximately 200) about area fisheries and miscellaneous information about fish management in lakes and ponds were handled over the telephone and email.

## EASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 2: Stream Surveys

## FINDINGS

## Trout Stream Assessments

In-stream temperature data loggers were deployed in Wolf Creek (Martin County) to record water temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ ) once every hour from 24 March - 3 November. Two sites were monitored in this stream. The upstream monitoring site was four miles from the stocking site and the downstream site was about two miles below the stocking.

Wolf Creek is managed as a put-take fishery for rainbow trout (spring and fall stockings). Trout are stocked in April and November at a rate of 1000 trout/month. Recorded minimum and maximum temperature ranges are displayed in Table 1. Wolf Creek had supporting temperatures for trout during spring and fall time periods. Rainbow trout are managed under statewide limits. The trout management program should continue as currently set.

Stream classification ratings for put, grow, take, and put, take streams are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1. Water temperature data $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ for designated trout streams in 2022.

| Stream <br> Class |  | Location | Month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | April | May |  |  | June |  |  | July |  |  | August |  |  | September |  |  | October |  |  | November |  |  |
| Stream name | Rating |  | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max | Min | Mean | Max |
| Wolf Creek | III |  | Upper | 46.8 | 56.0 | 67.9 | 57.1 | 64.0 | 69.6 | 66.7 | 70.5 | 76.6 | 69.0 | 72.7 | 75.7 | 67.4 | 70.3 | 73.3 | 57.8 | 66.9 | 72.0 | 48.6 | 55.8 | 68.7 | 68.4 | 68.4 | 68.4 |
|  |  | Lower | 45.5 | 56.1 | 68.8 | 56.7 | 64.3 | 69.8 | 66.4 | 69.2 | 73.2 | 69.0 | 71.6 | 73.7 | 68.4 | 71.1 | 74.0 | 57.8 | 67.3 | 72.7 | 49.2 | 56.4 | 68.4 | 68.1 | 68.3 | 68.6 |

Table 2. Stream classification ratings for put, grow, take streams in the Eastern Fishery District.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of Days <br> Average Temperature <br> $\geq 72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the Year | Maximum Average <br> Daily Temperature <br> from June-September | Number of Days <br> Average Temperature <br> $\geq 73{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in June | Maximum Average <br> Daily Temperature <br> in June | Stream <br> Classification |
| Stream | Year | Rating |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Stream classification ratings for put, take streams in the Eastern Fishery District.

| Stream | Year | Number of Days Average Temperature $\geq 72{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in the Year | Maximum Average Daily Temperature from June-September | Number of Days Average Temperature $\geq 73^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ in June | Maximum Average Daily Temperature in June | Stream Classification Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paintsville Lake Tailwaters | 2018 | 30 | 75.6 | 5 | 75.6 | III |
| Russell Fork | 2018 | 54 | 77.8 | 3 | 76.6 | III |
|  | 2011 | 40 | 77.2 | 1 | 73.1 | III |
| Greasy Creek | 2020 | 70 | 79.6 | 0 | 72.8 | III |
|  | 2010 | 102 | 81.3 | 22 | 80.4 | IV |
| Right Fork Beaver Creek | 2019 | 81 | 77.9 | 4 | 75.9 | III |
| Wolf Creek | 2022 | 28 | 74.9 | 3 | 74.9 | III |

## EASTERN FISHERY DISTRICT

Project 3: Technical Guidance

## FINDINGS

Onsite technical guidance was not provided during 2022. Technical guidance requests were handled over the telephone, by written correspondence, and through office walk-ins. Topics encountered and responded to included: nuisance fish species, vegetation issues, fish stocking, pond renovation, and pond seepage.

Many other requests for information about area fisheries and miscellaneous information about fish management in lakes and ponds were also handled.

Project 4: Fish Habitat Improvement - Public Lakes Fertilization

| Lake |  | County | Size (acres) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Northwestern Fishery District | Subtotal |  | 18 |
| Washburn Lake | Ohio | 18 |  |
| Southwestern Fishery District | Subtotal |  |  |
| Marion County Lake |  | Marion | 204 |
| Spurlington Lake | Taylor | 25 |  |
| Briggs Lake | Logan | 25 |  |
| Shanty Hollow Lake | Warren | 18 |  |
| Central Fishery District |  |  | 136 |
| Beaver Lake | Subtotal |  | 234 |
| Benjy Kinman Lake |  | Anderson | 146 |

Project 4: Fish Habitat Improvement - Fish Attractors

| District / Lake | Fish Attractor Sites |
| :---: | :---: |
| Western Fishery District |  |
| Barkley Lake | 1630 cypress trees were planted ( $\sim 5 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{tall}$ ) |
| Kentucky Lake | Refurbished 355 hardwood shallow water stake beds and made 2 new sites (new site=~50 stakes, refurbished site=~20 stakes); 55 plastic units ${ }^{* * *}$ were used to refurbish 4 existing deepwater fish attractor sites; 219 Christmas tree units** were used to refurbish 19 existing deepwater fish attractor sites; 234 hardwood units* were used to refurbish 78 existing deepwater fish attractor sites; 5 hardwood units* were used to make 2 new deepwater sites; 118 cypress trees were planted ( $\sim 5 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{tall}$ ) |
|  | * Hardwood: 1 tree = 1 unit |
|  | ** Christmas tree: 1 tree = 1 unit |
|  | *** Plastic: 18 " concrete block filled with concrete and plastic gas pipe $=$ 1 unit |
| Northwestern Fishery District |  |
| Nolin River Lake | 1 New Site |
|  | * 48 reef balls |
| Mauzy Lake | 7 Sites |
|  | * 11 HDPE spider squares |
|  | * 11 large shrubs |
| Carpenter Lake | 3 Sites |
|  | * 11 HDPE suspended gas pipe trees |
|  | - 4 reef balls |
| Washburn Lake | 17 Sites |
|  | * 2 reef balls |
|  | -108 Christmas trees |
| Goose Lake (PWMA) | 1 Site |
|  | * 105 Christmas trees |
| Highwall Pit (PWMA) | 5 Sites |
|  | * 5 HDPE suspended gas pipe structures |
|  | * 7 HDPE gas pipe trunks with Christmas trees |
|  | * 278 Christmas trees |

Project 4: Fish Habitat Improvement - Fish Attractors cont.

| District / Lake | Fish Attractor Sites |
| :---: | :---: |
| Southwestern Fishery District |  |
| Barren River Lake | 5 brush pile sites (2 refurbished xmas tree brush piles at fishing piers and 3 new hardwood and cedar combo drag in sites) ; BRL fish habitat project - see Fish Habitat Branch annual report |
| Green River Lake | 9 brush pile sites ( 4 refurbished xmas tree sites at fishing piers and 1 hardwood tops, 4 cedar tree sites) |
| Mill Creek Lake | 5 brush piles (cedar tree haul in and laydown drag in) |
| Shanty Hollow Lake | 8 hardwood brush piles (laydown/drag in tops) |
| Three Springs/Basil Griffen Lake | Xmas tree brush piles (2 refurbished sites) |
| Central Fishery District |  |
| Beaver Lake | 2,123 Christmas trees (refurbished 31 sites and 1 new brush site); 40 wooden pallet structures (2 trees/structure) |
| Benjy Kinman Lake | 4 new water willow beds; 3 buttonbushes $\sim 18-24$ " tall were planted |
| Elmer Davis Lake | 5 refurbished brush piles (49 trees from spillway) |
| Guist Creek Lake | 14 brush piles ( 389 Christmas trees) - 13 sites refurbished and 1 new brush site |
| Long Run Park Lake | 9 brush piles (428 Christmas trees) - 9 new sites |
| Taylorsville Lake | 12 brush piles and 32 hinge style laydowns ( 140 large cedar trees) - 6 new brush sites -6 brush sites refurbished $-1 / 2$ mile shoreline with 32 trees (pull into lake to resemble a hinge tree) |
| Northeastern Fishery District |  |
| Cave Run Lake | - Sites on the Zilpo Flats were refreshed with 25 gas pipe/cedar tree structures and 3 brush sites (cedar tree sites - 100+ additional trees) |
| Grayson Lake | -Refurbished 5 brush sites (Christmas tree sites - 200+ trees) |
| Lake Reba | -Refurbished all existing brush sites and created 2 new tree sites (Christmas tree sites-250+ trees) |
| Lake Wilgreen | - Refurbished all existing brush sites and created 1 new tree site (Christmas tree sites-250+ trees) |
| Lake Carnico | - Refurbished all existing brush sites (Christmas tree sites-200 trees) |

Project 4: Fish Habitat Improvement - Fish Attractors cont.

| District / Lake | Fish Attractor Sites |
| :--- | :--- |
| Southeastern Fishery District <br> Laurel River Lake | 1 new brush site (350 Christmas trees total) |
| Eastern Fishery District <br> Buckhorn Lake | 5 hinged cuts (hardwood), 3 refurbished shallow brush piles (58 <br> Christmas trees and drift wood), 2 new pallet structures |
| Cranks Creek Lake | 20 hinged cuts (hardwood) |
| Dewey Lake | 3 refurbished shallow water brushpiles (8 Christmas trees and drift <br> wood); 1 refurbished reef (16 Christmas trees and hardwood drift); 12 <br> hinged-cut tree (hardwood); 1 new shallow brush pile (20 Christmas <br> trees |
| Fishtrap Lake | 1 refurbished reef (65 Christmas trees) |
| Yatesville Lake | 2 refurbished reefs (72 Christmas trees), 20 hinged cut (hardwood) |
| Martins Fork Lake | 20 hinged cuts (hardwood) |
| Paintsville Lake | 52 new pallet structures with cedar trees; 10 new plastic structures |

Minor Clark Fish Hatchery 2022 Sport Fish Production

| Species | Planned |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number S | Size (in) Location/Use | Number | Size (in) | Pounds | No./lb. | Notes |
| Muskellunge | 0 | 0 West Virginia | 112,500 |  |  |  | Eggs |
|  | 0 | 0 Licking River | 325,340 |  |  |  | Fry |
| Total Fry/Eggs |  |  | 437,840 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 398 | 9 Kentucky River Pool 11* | 398 | 8.0 | 29.3 | 13.6 |  |
|  | 380 | 9 Kentucky River Pool 12** | 380 | 8.0 | 28.0 | 13.6 |  |
|  | 182 | 9 Kentucky River Pool 13*** | 182 | 8.0 | 13.4 | 13.6 |  |
|  | 50 | 9 Kentucky River Pool 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 50 | 9 Kentucky River Pool 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 705 | 9 Barren River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 500 | 9 Green River Pool 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 350 | 9 South Fork Kentucky River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 375 | 9 North Fork Kentucky River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 400 | 9 Licking River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 200 | 9 Little Sandy River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 145 | 9 Drakes Creek | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 250 | 9 Green River Pool 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 195 | 9 Tug Fork | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 500 | 9 Levisa Fork | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 85 | 9 Red River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 9 West Fork Drakes Creek | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 9 Sexton Creek | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 9 Goose Creek | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40 | 9 Redbird River | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 15 | 9 Station Camp | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 9 Triplett Creek | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 9 North Fork Triplett Creek | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4,945 |  | 960 | 8.0 | 70.7 | 13.6 |  |
|  |  | *Left Pectoral Fin Clip <br> **Right Pectoral Fin Clip <br> ***Left Pelvic Fin Clip |  |  |  |  |  |
| Muskellunge | 2,700 | 13 Cave Run Lake** | 2,700 | 12.0 | 752.0 | 3.6 |  |
|  | 2,700 | 13 Green River Lake** | 2,135 | 12.1 | 627.9 | 3.4 |  |
|  | 400 | 13 Buckhorn Lake** | 327 | 12.2 | 99.1 | 3.3 |  |
|  | 375 | 13 Dewey Lake** | 305 | 12.2 | 92.4 | 3.3 |  |
| Total | 6,175 |  | 5,467 | 12.1 | 1,571.4 | 3.4 |  |
| Grand Total | 11,230 |  | 444,267 |  | 1,642.1 |  |  |
|  |  | **Right Pectoral Fin Clip |  |  |  |  |  |


| Species | Planned |  | Actual |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Size (in) Location/Use | Number | Size (in) | Pounds | No./lb. |  |
| Hybrid Striped | 200,000 | 1.5 Barren River Lake | 201,736 | 1.4 | 152.9 | 1,319 |  |
| Bass | 15,000 | 1.5 Grayson Lake | 15,228 | 1.7 | 22.9 | 665 |  |
|  | 102,000 | 1.5 Rough River Lake | 102,455 | 1.6 | 95.6 | 799 |  |
|  | 61,000 | 1.5 Taylorsville Lake | 61,131 | 1.4 | 50.6 | 1,208 |  |
|  | 48,000 | 1.5 Herrington Lake | 48,000 | 1.7 | 75.0 | 640 |  |
|  | 23,000 | 1.5 Fishtrap Lake | 23,124 | 1.5 | 23.1 | 1,001 |  |
|  | 7,200 | 1.5 Lake Linville | 7,258 | 1.8 | 23.9 | 304 |  |
|  | 9,500 | 1.5 Guist Creek Lake | 9,512 | 2.2 | 44.6 | 213 |  |
|  | 4,100 | 1.5 KY River Pool 4 | 4,111 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 1,326 |  |
|  | 3,600 | 1.5 KY River Pool 5 | 3,600 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1,632 |  |
|  | 4,700 | 1.5 KY River Pool 6 | 4,723 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 1,632 |  |
|  | 3,500 | 1.5 KY River Pool 8 | 3,590 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 1,632 |  |
|  | 4,100 | 1.5 KY River Pool 9 | 4,100 | 2.1 | 14.8 | 277 |  |
|  |  | Ohio River |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 54,500 | 1.5 Markland Pool | 79,244 | 1.2 | 43.3 | 1,830 |  |
|  | 41,500 | 1.5 McAlpine Pool | 41,889 | 1.2 | 26.3 | 1,593 |  |
|  | 50,000 | 1.5 Cannelton Pool | 50,012 | 1.3 | 33.4 | 1,467 |  |
|  | 36,000 | 1.5 Newburg Pool | 71,574 | 1.4 | 48.8 | 1,467 |  |
|  | 43,700 | 1.5 JT Meyers Pool | 43,754 | 1.6 | 52.4 | 835 |  |
|  | 60,500 | 1.5 Smithland Pool | 60,566 | 1.3 | 45.3 | 1,337 |  |
| Grand Total | 771,900 |  | 835,607 | 1.5 | 763.3 | 1,095 |  |
| Walleye (Erie) | 0 | 0 Licking River | 115,270 |  |  |  | Fry |
|  | 0 | 0 Laurel River Lake | 1,012,275 |  |  |  | Fry |
|  | 0 | 0 West Virginia | 1,051,362 |  |  |  | Fry |
| Total |  |  | 2,178,907 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 350,000 | 1.5 Lake Cumberland | 309,495 | 1.2 | 135.6 | 2,282 |  |
|  | 40,000 | 1.5 Dale Hollow Lake (KY) | 40,075 | 1.3 | 22.9 | 1,750 |  |
|  | 260,000 | 1.5 Laurel River Lake | 220,274 | 1.3 | 118.9 | 1,853 |  |
|  | 200,000 | 1.5 Nolin River Lake | 107,738 | 1.3 | 54.0 | 1,995 |  |
|  | 200,000 | 1.5 Green River Lake | 146,303 | 1.3 | 69.2 | 2,114 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 Russell Fork | 10,040 | 1.6 | 9.7 | 1,035 |  |
|  | 35,000 | 1.5 Carr Creek Lake | 35,190 | 1.6 | 34.0 | 1,035 |  |
|  | 13,000 | 1.5 Licking River | 13,051 | 1.8 | 14.4 | 906 |  |
|  | 57,000 | 1.5 Paintsville | 57,058 | 1.3 | 33.4 | 1,708 |  |
| Total |  |  | 939,224 | 1.3 | 492.1 | 1,909 |  |
| Grand Total |  |  | 3,118,131 |  |  |  |  |


|  | Planned |  | Actual |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Number Size (in) Location/Use | Number | Size (in) | Pounds | No./lb. | Notes |
| Walleye (Native) | 0 | 0 Tennessee | 52,582 |  |  | Fry |
|  | 7,500 | 2.5 North Fork Ky River | 7,833 | 2.3 | 20.7 | 378 |
|  | 7,500 | 2.5 South Fork Ky River | 8,676 | 2.3 | 25.5 | 340 |
|  | 5,000 | 2.5 Middle Fork Ky River | 5,561 | 2.3 | 13.8 | 388 |
|  | 0 | 0 Cumberland River | 34,944 | 1.5 | 21.0 | 1,664 |
|  | 0 | 0 Wood Creek Lake | 8,789 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 1,793 |
|  | 27,200 | 2.5 Upper Cumberland River | 28,834 | 2.2 | 68.8 | 419 |
|  | 3,280 | 4.5 Rockcastle River | 3,280 | 4.8 | 66.0 | 50 |
|  | 8,180 | 4.5 Lower Barren | 6,180 | 5 | 175.2 | 35 |
| Total | 8,540 | 4.5 Martins Fork Lake | 4,144 | 5.3 | 134.0 | 31 |
| Total | 47,200 | 2.5 | 50,904 | 2.3 | 128.8 | 395 |
| Grand Total | 67,000 | 4.5 | 13,604 | 5.0 | 376.1 | 36 |


| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 200,000 Eggs | Pfeiffer Hatchery | $1,266,000$ |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total |  |  | $1,266,000$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Striped Bass | 500,000 | 1.5 Lake Cumberland | 600,886 | 1.6 | 696.7 | 863 |  |
|  | 50,000 | 1.5 Kentucky Lake tailwater | 50,057 | 1.7 | 56.9 | 880 |  |
|  | 50,000 | 1.5 Barkley Lake tailwater | 50,024 | 1.6 | 57.6 | 868 |  |
|  | $\quad$ Ohio River |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 49,000 | 1.5 Markland Pool | 49,013 | 1.6 | 70.5 | 695 |  |
|  | 38,000 | 1.5 McAlpine Pool | 37,635 | 1.6 | 47.4 | 794 |  |
|  | 46,000 | 1.5 Cannelton Pool | 46,046 | 1.7 | 68.8 | 669 |  |
|  | 33,000 | 1.5 Newburg Pool | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40,000 | 1.5 J.T. Meyers | 39,990 | 1.7 | 82 | 488 |  |
|  | 55,000 | 1.5 Smithland Pool | 54,967 | 1.7 | 89.3 | 616 |  |
| Grand Total | 861,000 | 1.5 | 928,618 | 1.6 | 1,169 | 794 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Nose Crappie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Black Nose Crappie | Herrington Lake |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20,250 | 2.0 Chimney Rock Ramp | 40,500 | 2.0 | 90.0 | 450.0 |
|  | 20,000 | 2.0 Gwinn Island Ramp | 40,500 | 2.0 | 90.0 | 450.0 |
| 20,000 | 2.0 Bryants Camp Ramp | 40,500 | 2.0 | 90.0 | 450.0 |  |
|  | Carr Creek Lake |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8,875 | 2.0 Littcar Ramp | 8,920 | 2.1 | 25.8 | 339.0 |
| 8,875 | 2.0 Marina Ramp | 8,920 | 2.1 | 25.8 | 339.0 |  |
|  | 0 | Hatchery Pond | 812 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 337.0 |
|  | 0 | Paintsville Lake | 28,780 | 2.1 | 85.4 | 337.0 |
| Grand Total | 78,000 | Laurel River Lake | 41,656 | 2.0 | 94.0 | 443.0 |



| Species | Planned |  | Actual |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Size (in) | Location/Use | Number | Size (in) | Pounds | No./lb. |  |
| Largemouth | 75,000 5.0 | Priority 1 lakes at 15/acre |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.0-inch |  | Greenbo Lake | 2,728 | 4.6 | 88.0 | 31 |  |
|  |  | Kentucky River | 1,608 | 4.0 | 36.5 | 41.5 |  |
|  |  | Herrington Lake | 12,078 | 4.3 | 351.1 | 34.4 |  |
|  |  | Taylorsville Lake | 15,263 | 4.4 | 459.3 | 33.2 |  |
|  |  | Laurel River Lake | 34,743 | 4.6 | 1204.0 | 28.9 |  |
|  |  | Bullock Pen | 2,015 | 4.6 | 72.5 | 27.8 |  |
|  |  | Cranks Creek | 3,296 | 4.4 | 104.0 | 31.7 |  |
|  |  | Guist Creek Lake | 1,606 | 4.5 | 55.0 | 29.2 |  |
|  |  | Hatchery Oxbow | 116 | 9.0 |  |  |  |
|  | 15,000 | Dewey Lake | 3,645 | 5.7 | 270.0 | 13.5 |  |
| Total | 115,000 |  | 77,098 | 4.1 | 2,640.4 | 40.4 |  |
| Grand Total | 245,230 |  | 226,911 |  | 2,950.9 |  |  |
| Grass Carp | 0 | Lake Carnico | 76 | 8.8 | 27.0 | 2.8 |  |
| Grand Total |  |  | 76 | 8.8 | 27.0 | 2.8 |  |

## Nonsport Forage Species

Forage Species

| Fathead Minnows | Pounds $\quad$ Location/use |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | 1,017 Muskellunge Ponds |
|  | 854 Hatchery Oxbow |
|  | 2,946 Overwinter LMB |
| Total Pounds FHM | 4,817 |

Goldfish

| 6,350 Muskellunge Ponds |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| 4,717 Walleye Broodstock |  |
| 1,119 Overwinter pond |  |
| 344 Future Brood stock |  |
| 275 Hatchery Oxbow |  |
| 3,676 Overwinter Display Pool |  |
| 404 Largemouth Bass |  |
| 2,920 Smallmouth Bass and Crappie |  |
| Total Pounds GOF | 19,805 |

Peter W. Pfeiffer Fish Hatchery 2022 Sport Fish Production

| Species | Planned |  | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Size (in) | Location/Use | Number | Size (in) | Pounds | No./lb. | Notes |
| Channel Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 |  | WV DNR | 129,421 | Fry | 99 | 1,304.6 | Surplus Fry |
|  |  |  |  | 129,421 |  | 99 |  |  |
|  | 120,800 | 15 | FINS program | 57,700 |  | 45,846 | 1.3 |  |
|  | 74,070 | 8-10 | Stockers | 75,270 | 8-10 | 6,968 | 10.8 |  |
|  | 194,870 |  |  | 132,970 |  | 52,814 |  |  |
| Blue Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 |  | KY River Pool 1 | 73,894 | Fry | 37 | 1,980.0 | Surplus Fry |
|  | 0 |  | KY River Pool 2 | 76,923 | Fry | 39 | 1,980.0 | Surplus Fry |
|  | 0 |  | KY River Pool 4 | 58,014 | Fry | 29 | 1,980.0 | Surplus Fry |
|  |  |  |  | 58,014 |  | 29 |  |  |
|  | 11,000 | 5-7 | Dewey Lake | 11,000 | 5-7 | 786 | 14.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 11,500 | 5-7 | Fishtrap Lake | 11,500 | 5-7 | 822 | 14.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 7,100 | 5-7 | Carr Creek Lake | 7,100 | 5-7 | 789 | 9.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 22,800 | 5-7 | Yatesville Lake | 22,800 | 5-7 | 2,533 | 9.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 920 | 5-7 | Boltz Lake | 920 | 5-7 | 102 | 9.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 1,460 | 5-7 | Bullock Pen Lake | 1,460 | 5-7 | 162 | 9.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 1,750 | 5-7 | AJ Jolly Lake | 1,750 | 5-7 | 194 | 9.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 7,600 | 5-7 | Lake Beshear | 7,600 | 5-7 | 543 | 14.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 950 | 5-7 | Mill Creek Lake | 950 | 5-7 | 68 | 14.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 210 | 5-7 | Metcalf Co. Lake | 210 | 5-7 | 15 | 14.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 1,690 | 5-7 | Wilgreen Lake | 1,690 | 5-7 | 121 | 14.0 | Hatch/stock 2022 |
|  | 42,300 | 5-7 | KY River |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 24,000 | 5-7 | Taylorsville Lake |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 133,280 |  |  | 66,980 |  | 6,135 |  |  |


| Hybrid Catfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 120,800 | 15 | FINS Program | 62,800 | 10-24 | 55,941 | 1.1 |
|  |  |  | 62,800 |  | 55,941 |  |
| Largemouth Bass |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 600 | 2 | Waymond Morris | 600 |  | 1.7 |  |
| 1,800 | 2 | Audubon Park | 1,800 |  | 5.3 |  |
| 400 | 2 | Sandy Watkins | 400 |  | 1.2 |  |
| 0 | 2 | Elkhorn Creek Oser Landing | 1,149 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 0 | 2 | Elkhorn Creek Cardome | 1,149 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 0 | 2 | Elkhorn Creek great crossing | 1,149 |  | 3.3 |  |
| 75,100 | 2 | Ohio River Markland Pool | 75,100 |  | 176.8 |  |
| 25,000 | 2 | Ohio River Meldahl Pool | 7,900 |  | 22.9 | 345.0 |
| 25,000 |  |  | 89,247 |  | 218 |  |


| Species | Planned |  |  | Actual |  |  |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Size (in) | Location/Use | Number | Size (in) | Pounds | No./lb. |  |
| Sauger |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | fry | KY River pools 3 and 4 | 235,974 |  |  |  | Surplus fry |
|  | 5,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 2 | 5,000 | 1.75 | 6.1 | 819.7 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 3 | 10,000 | 1.5 | 7.2 | 1,388.9 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 4 | 20,985 | 1.75 | 29.3 | 716.2 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 5 | 10,000 | 1.75 | 13.1 | 763.4 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 6 | 11,823 | 1.5 | 7.9 | 1,496.6 |  |
|  | 15,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 8 | 15,000 | 1.75 | 21.0 | 714.3 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 9 | 10,000 | 1.75 | 12.9 | 775.2 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 10 | 10,000 | 1.75 | 14.0 | 714.3 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 11 | 10,000 | 1.75 | 14.0 | 714.3 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 12 | 10,000 | 1.75 | 12.9 | 775.2 |  |
|  | 5,000 | 1.5 | Kentucky River Pool 13 | 5,000 | 1.75 | 6.1 | 819.7 |  |
|  | 105,000 |  |  | 117,808 |  | 144.5 |  |  |
| Saugeye |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 31,700 | 1.5 | Guist Creek Lake | 31,700 | 1.5 | 44.5 | 712.4 |  |
|  | 13,400 | 1.5 | Bullock Pen Lake | 13,400 | 1.5 | 17.0 | 790.6 |  |
|  | 16,900 | 1.5 | Wilgreen Lake | 16,904 | 1.5 | 21.8 | 775.4 |  |
|  | 9,600 | 1.5 | Carpenter Lake | 9,753 | 1.5 | 7.0 | 1,393.3 |  |
|  | 11,200 | 1.5 | Lake Carnico | 11,200 | 1.5 | 13.6 | 823.5 |  |
|  | 17,500 | 1.5 | A.J. Jolly Lake | 17,500 | 1.5 | 19.3 | 909.1 |  |
|  | 61,000 | 1.5 | Taylorsville Lake | 13,490 | 1.5 | 42.4 | 318.2 |  |
|  | 161,300 |  |  | 113,947 |  | 165.5 |  |  |
| Redear Sunfis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1.5 | Elmer Davis Lake | 2,800 | . 75 | 1.6 | 1,750 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 14,200 | 1.5 | Carr Creek Lake | 14,200 | 2.25 | 77.2 | 184 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 31,600 | 1.5 | Beaver Lake | 31,600 | 2.25 | 50.4 | 627 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 1,800 | 1.5 | Audubon State Park | 1,800 | 2.25 | 9.8 | 184 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 1,400 | 1.5 | Walton City Lake | 1,400 | 2.25 | 7.6 | 184 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 6,700 | 1.5 | Martin's Fork Lake | 6,700 | 2.25 | 36.4 | 184 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 0 | 1.5 | Cave Run Lake | 225,484 | . 75 | 128.9 | 1,749 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 24,600 | 1.5 | Buckhorn Lake | 24,600 | 2.25 | 133.6 | 184 | 2022 spawn |
|  | 80,300 |  |  | 308,584 |  | 445.5 |  |  |
| Lake Sturgeon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6,000 | 8 | Upper Cumberland River | 9,600 | 5.76 | 240 | 40 |  |
|  | 6,000 |  |  | 9,600 |  | 240 |  |  |
| Bluegill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2,000 |  | City of Walton Lake | 2,000 | 2.61 | 23 | 86.2 |  |
|  | 2,000 |  | Waymond Morris | 2,000 | 2.61 | 6 | 327.9 |  |
|  | 5,400 |  | Audubon State Park | 5,400 | 2.61 | 17.7 | 305.1 |  |
|  | 10,000 | 6-8 | FINS Program | 11,740 | 7.0 | 2,935.0 | 4.0 |  |
|  | 15,400 |  |  | 17,140 |  | 2,952.7 |  |  |
| Grand Total |  |  |  | 1,342,485 |  | 119,184 |  |  |

Trout Stocking Numbers

| Species | Waterbody | Actual Number | Length (in) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brook Trout | Lake Cumberland Tailwater | 14,200 | $9-10$ |


| Species | Waterbody | Actual Number | Length (in) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown Trout | Fagan Branch Lake | 1,000 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Fort Campbell | 3,250 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Greenbo Lake | 2,000 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Herrington Lake Tailwater | 300 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Jennings Creek | 500 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Lake Cumberland Tailwater | 30,100 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Looney Creek | 700 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Nolin River Lake Tailwater | 250 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Otter Creek | 500 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Paintsville Lake | 4,175 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Roundstone Creek | 200 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Sulphur Springs Creek | 200 | $8-9$ |
| Brown Trout | Trammel Creek | 600 | $8-9$ |


| Species | Waterbody | Actual Number | Length (in) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rainbow Trout | Alexandria Community Park Lake | 3,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Anderson County Community Park Lake | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Beaver Creek | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Beaver Creek - Right Fork | 500 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Bert T. Combs Lake | 2,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Beulah Lake | 9,500 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Big Bone Lick State Park | 800 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Big Caney Creek | 750 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Bloomfield Park Lake | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Boone Tract 6 Acre Lake | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Boulder Lake | 400 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Brickyard Pond | 1,500 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Buckhorn Lake Tailwater | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Buffalo Creek | 250 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Camp Ernst Lake | 9,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Cannon Creek Lake | 9,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Carr Creek Lake Tailwater | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Casey Creek | 3,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Cave Run Lake Tailwater | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Cherokee Park Lake | 1,500 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Clear Creek | 800 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Clinton Rotary Park Lake | 1,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Cranks Creek Lake | 3,000 | $9-11$ |
| Rainbow Trout | Dewey Lake Tailwater | 1,000 |  |


| Species | Waterbody | Actual Number | Length (in) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow Trout | Eagle Lake (Morehead State) | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Easy Walker Park Pond | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Elk Spring Creek | 800 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Fisherman's Park Lakes | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Fishpond Lake | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Fishtrap Lake Tailwater | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Flemingsburg City Reservoir (Old) | 1,525 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Floyds Fork Creek | 6,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Fort Campbell | 2,400 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Grants Branch Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Grayson Lake Tailwater | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Greasy Creek | 400 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Greenbo Lake | 5,550 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Gunpowder Creek Nature Park | 800 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Herrington Lake Tailwater | 900 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Higginson \& Henry WMA | 500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Highsplint Lake | 1,250 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Jacobson Park Lake | 6,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | James Beville Park Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Jennings Creek | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Kentucky Horse Park Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Kess Creek Park Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Kingdom Come State Park Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lake Cumberland Tailwater | 10,150 | 4-6 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lake Cumberland Tailwater | 5,000 | 15-16 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lake Cumberland Tailwater | 57,400 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lake Mingo | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lake Montgomery | 3,025 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lake Pollywog | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Laurel Creek | 1,750 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Leary Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Little Sandy River - East Fork | 1,600 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Logan Hubble Park | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Looney Creek | 500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lower Sportsman's Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lusby Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Lynn Camp Creek | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Madisonville Park | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Martin County Lake | 1,250 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Martins Fork Lake Tailwater | 750 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Mason County Recreational Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Metcalfe County Park Lake | 500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Middlesboro Canal | 400 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Middleton Mills Park Lake | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Mike Miller Park Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |


| Species | Waterbody | Actual Number | Length (in) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rainbow Trout | Miles Park Lakes | 2,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Mill Creek Lake (Wolfe \& Powell Co.) | 2,750 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Millenium Park Pond | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Nolin River Lake Tailwater | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Otter Creek | 4,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Paintsville Lake | 14,375 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Paintsville Lake Tailwater | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Panbowl Lake | 2,199 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Panther Creek Park Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Peabody WMA | 3,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Pikeville City Lake | 1,250 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Prisoners Lake | 1,525 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Robert Barth Park Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Roundstone Creek | 800 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Royal Springs | 400 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Russell Fork Creek | 750 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Sandy Watkins Park | 500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Scott County Park Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Sinking Creek | 800 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Southgate Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Southland Church Lake | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Station Camp Creek | 750 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Sturgeon Creek | 400 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Sulphur Springs Creek | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Taylorsville Lake Tailwater | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Three Springs Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Tom Wallace Park Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Trammel Creek | 2,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Triplett Creek | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Upper Sportsman's Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Waverly Park Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Waymond Morris Park | 1,500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | West Hickman Creek | 500 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Whitehall Park Lake | 3,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Wolfe Creek | 1,000 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Wood Creek Lake | 4,025 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Yatesville Lake Tailwater | 750 | 9-11 |
| Rainbow Trout | Yellow Creek Park Lake | 1,500 | 9-11 |


[^0]:    w fdpsdk.d22

[^1]:    wfdpsdk.d22
    *Stock size $=8.0$ in

[^2]:    * Intercept $=0$.
    wfdtnagk.d22

[^3]:    (Revised_Barkley_Bass_Database.xlsx)

[^4]:    wfdpsdlb.d22 and wfdwrlb.d22

[^5]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Largemouth Bass $=8.0$ in, Spotted Bass $=7.0$ in
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Largemouth Bass $=$ RSD $_{15}$, Spotted Bass $=$ RSD $_{14}$ nwd1psd.d22

[^6]:    nwd1wca.d22

[^7]:    nwd2lmb.d22

[^8]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Only one age-3 fish
    ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Used psd file and modified fall age file

[^9]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lake drawn down for repairs in 2008-2009
    ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Lake renovated in 2003
    nwd4bg.d22

[^10]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Bluegill $=R^{2} D_{8}$, Redear $=R S D_{9}$
    nwd4bg.d22
    nwd5bg.d22
    nwd6bg.d22
    nwd7bg.d22
    nwd8bg.d22

[^11]:    * Back calculated from age table

[^12]:    * Back calculated from age table

[^13]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Major fish kill 9/5/08
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ First standardized sample since renovation

[^14]:    ${ }^{2}$ Major fish kill 9/5/08
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ First standardized sample since renovation
    nwd6bg.d22

[^15]:    *First standardized sample since renovation

[^16]:    * Washburn Lake renovated summer 1999 and restocked spring 2000
    nwd8psd.d22

[^17]:    A Largemouth Bass $=R_{\text {R }}^{15}$, Spotted Bass $=$ RSD $_{14}$.

    * No fish of sufficient size were collected during sampling. swdbrlbb.d22

[^18]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Bluegill= $=\mathrm{RSD}_{8}$; Redear $=\mathrm{RSD}_{9}$ swdlclbg.d22

[^19]:    *No age data, values carried over from years w ith age data
    sw dlclag.d10
    sw dlclbg.d99-d22

[^20]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{A}}$ Largemouth bass $=$ RSD $_{15}$, Spotted Bass and Smallmouth Bass $=$ RSD $_{14}$. swdgrlbb.d22

[^21]:    sw dgrlag.D09, 15

[^22]:    * Age data not collected
    ${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years

[^23]:    Dataset = cfdwrtvl.d22

[^24]:    Intercept value $=0.00$

[^25]:    * Age data not collected

    ND = not determined

[^26]:    * Age data not collected
    ${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years

[^27]:    * Age data not collected
    ${ }^{\wedge}$ calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
    -Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

[^28]:    Dataset = cfdgnher.d22

[^29]:    * Age data not collected
    ${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
    -Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

[^30]:    * Age data not collected

[^31]:    Dataset = cfdhnbvr.d22

[^32]:    Dataset = cfdhnbvr.d22

[^33]:    -Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

    * Age data not collected (data collected in 2014)

[^34]:    Dataset = cfdhnbkl.d22

[^35]:    * Age data not collected
    -Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

[^36]:    Dataset = cfdwrbol.d22

[^37]:    * Age data not collected
    ${ }^{\wedge}$ Calculations based on age data gathered in previous years
    -Instantaneous and annual mortality not calculated in years where age and growth data are not collected

[^38]:    Dataset $=$ cfdpsshb.d22

[^39]:    Largemouth Bass - $\geq 8.0$ in = stock, $\geq 12.0$ in = quality, $\geq 15.0$ in = preferred.

[^40]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Age-1 Largemouth Bass CPUE based only on Fishing Creek location sedyoycb.d22

[^41]:    sedpsdlr.d22

[^42]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Age-1 Largemouth Bass CPUE based only on Laurel River Arm location sedyoylr.d22

[^43]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ diurnal sampling beginning in 2016
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ sampling effort was reduced to 1.5 hours beginning in 2015 sedpsccl.d22

[^44]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Bluegill $=$ RSD $_{8}$, Redear Sunfish $=$ RSD $_{9}$
    sedbgccl.d22

[^45]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ SE $=$ standard error

[^46]:    * Lower lake area was not sampled sedpsdwc.d22

[^47]:    EFDBLMSS.D98-D10, D12, D14, D16-D20, D22

[^48]:    * Includes supplemental spring stocked fish

    BBRWRCFL.D03-D05
    BBRSCCFL.D03
    EFDCLLSF.D03-D21
    EFDCLLAS.D08
    EFDCLLSS.D03-D19, D21-22
    EFDCLLAF.D13, D19

[^49]:    EFDDLLSS.D87-D22
    BBRPSDEW.D03-D05

[^50]:    * Stocked in April, May, October
    ** Stocked in April, May, June, October

