#### OTTER PIT

## Warrick County

# Supplemental Crappie Survey

Date of Survey: March 7 to 20, 2018

Biologist: Tyler D. Ham, District 6 Assistant Fisheries Biologist

Survey Objectives: 1. Collect catch rate and growth data for crappie in Otter Pit. 2. Evaluate the potential for improving size structure and yield of crappie in Otter Pit.

Methods: Fish collection effort consisted of 26 overnight standard trap net lifts as well as 8 overnight Michigan-style trap net lifts. Both Black and White Crappie were measured to the nearest 0.1 in (TL) and weighed to the nearest 0.01 lb. Otoliths were extracted from a subsample of fish for analyses of age and growth. Fisheries Analysis and Modeling Simulator (FAMS) was employed to determine if a minimum length limit (MLL) could potentially improve size structure and therefore yield (Slipke 2010).

Summary: A total of 205 White Crappie and 66 Black Crappie were collected during sampling efforts. White Crappie ranged in length from 3.9 to 12.6 in, while Black Crappie ranged from 6.2 to 11.1 in. Nearly 30% of the White Crappie were over 9 in and over 60% were above 8 in,





similar to the results of the most recent survey in 2011. White Crappie relative weights (Wr) were average, down slightly from 2011. Relative weights for crappie that were at least 8.0 in and 10.0 in were 81 and 89, respectively. Catch rates were similar between gears for both species. For White Crappie, the catch rates were 6.1 (+\-2.1 SE) and 6.0/lift (+\-0.94) for the Michigantrap and standard trap respectively. Catch rates were 1.8 (+\-0.73) and 2.0 (+\-0.57) for Black Crappie between the same gears. The 2011 catch rates were 4.8/lift for White Crappie and 1.2/lift for Black Crappie using standard trap nets only.

Due to the smaller sample size of Black Crappie, growth and FAMS analyses focused on White Crappie only. White Crappie growth remained slow, following the trend from 2011. Crappie fell below district averages for growth at nearly all ages. Age-4 and age-5 crappie averaged 8.8 and 9.4 inches compared to 8.9 and 9.6 inches in 2011. Growth was highly variable with age-4 fish ranging from 6.9 to 11.1 inches, age 5 between 7.4 and 11.0 inches, and age 6 between 9.3 and 12.6 inches. This similar growth pattern was observed in 2011.

Population statistics were calculated using a catch curve analysis in FAMS (Ricker 1975). Instantaneous mortality (Z) was 0.81, total annual mortality (A) was 0.45, survival was (S) 0.55, conditional rate of natural mortality (cm) was 0.41, instantaneous rate of fishing mortality (F) was 0.28, conditional rate of fishing mortality (cf) was 0.24, and the rate of exploitation (u) was 0.08. In 2011, cm was 0.48 and cf was 0.19. From these analyses, it appears that overall fishing pressure remains low and it appears most White Crappie were succumbing to natural mortality.

The potential benefits of implementing a MLL on Otter Pit were modeled. Under current conditions there would be no benefit to the fishery by implementing a MLL. Instead, harvest should be encouraged to reduce crappie numbers and stimulate growth via reduced competition.





## **Recommendations:**

• No changes are recommended.

## Literature Cited:

Ricker, W.E. 1975. Competition and interpretation of biological statistics of fish populations.

Bull. Fish. Res. Board Can. 191: 382p.

Slipke, J.W. 2010. Fishery analysis and modeling simulator. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Submitted by: Tyler D. Ham, Assistant Fisheries Biologist

Date: June 25, 2018

Approved by:

Daniel P. Carnahan, South Region Fisheries Supervisor

Date: August 16, 2018





LAKE SURVEY REPORT		Initial Survey X Re-Survey					
Lake Name	,	County		Ī	ate of survey (	Month, day, year)	
Otter Pit		Warrick				March 7 to 20, 2018	
Biologist's name		TVAITION				(Month, day, year)	
Rebecca A. Munter and Tyler D. H	lam			[		gust 16, 2018	
Rebecca A. Muliter and Tyler D. Ti	Iam		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Aug	just 10, 2010	
		LOCATION					
Quadrangle Name		Range		ſs	ection		
Daylight		, and the second	9W			7, 18	
Township Name	Nearest Town	000	<u> </u>		7, 10		
58				D	aylight		
					ayngiit	•	
		ACCESSIBILI	TY		7.00		
State owned public access site		Privately owned	Hart Harty Antonior Colors (1999)	access site	Other access	s site	
Concrete boat ramp	n						
Surface acres Maximum depth	Average depth	Acre feet		Water level		Extreme fluctuations	
73.7 63 ft	20 ft	1,474			nown	6 ft	
Location of benchmark	1 2011	1,777		unk	HOWH	1 011	
		NIS-H-C					
Name	Location	INLETS		l Origin			
Culvert		:4		Origin			
Culvert	North end of p	II.		Loon Pit			
A STATE OF THE STA				<u> </u>			
		OUTLETS			100000		
Name	Location	PRETITE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE		TO COME STORY AND DESIGNATION OF THE PROPERTY		on the control of the	
Ditch leading to Pigeon Creek	South west						
Water level control	4.0.4.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0						
POOL	ELEVATION	(Feet MSL)	-	ACRES		Bottom type	
TOP OF DAM						Bolder	
					$\dashv$	Gravel	
TOP OF FLOOD CONTROL POOL					4	<b>  </b>	
TOP OF CONSERVATION POOL				73.7		Sand	
TOP OF MINIMUM POOL						X Muck	
STREAMBED						Clay	
OTTLEANIBLE		L				Mari	
						Iviaii	
Watershed use		<u> </u>					
Reclaimed coal strip mine ground.	Based on the 12	2 digit HUC wa	atershe	ed (05140202	20302), land	cover (2018) is	
48% agriculture, 19% forest, and 1				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Development of shoreline	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,						
One boat ramp area.							
Previous surveys and investigations							
Crappie Supplemental Survey 2006	s, 2008 and 2011	l					
General fisheries survey 2001.						M	
Lake Standard survey 2009.							





SAMPLING EFFORT								
ELECTROFISHING	Day hours			Night hours		Total hours		
TRAP NETS	Number of traps			Number of Lift	S	Total effort		
		26			1	26 overnight lifts		
MICHIGAN TRAP NETS	Number of nets			Number of Lifts		Total effort		
INICHIGAN TRAP NETS	4				2	8 overnight lifts		
ROTENONE	Gallons	ppm	Acre F	eet Treated	SHORELINE SEINING	Number of 100 Foot Seine Hauls		

	PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL CHARACTERISTICS										
Color			Turbidity								
			Feet	Inches (SECCI	HI DISK)						
Alkalinity (ppm)*			рН								
	Surface:	Bottom:	Surface:		Bottom:						
Conductivity:	-		Air temperature:	٥E							
		micromhos		Г							
Water chemistry GPS	S coordinates:										
		N		W							

	TEMPERATURE AND DISSOLVED OXYGEN (D.O.)											
DEPTH (FEET)	Degrees (°F)	D.O. (ppm)	DEPTH (FEET)	DEGREES (°F)	D.O. (ppm)	DEPTH (FEET)	DEGREES (°F)	D.O. (ppm)				
DATE	SURFACE		36			72						
3/8/2018	46.1		38			74						
3/15/2018	46.0		40			76						
3/20/2018	48.9		42			78						
			44			80						
			46			82						
			48			84						
		-	50			86						
			52			88						
			54			90						
			56			92						
			58			94						
			60			96						
			62			98						
			64			100						
			66									
			68									
***************************************			70									





COMMENTS

SPECIES AND RELATIVE ABUNDANCE OF FISHES COLLECTED BY NUMBER AND WEIGHT									
*COMMON NAME OF FISH	NUMBER	PERCENT	LENGTH RANGE (inches)	WEIGHT (pounds)	PERCENT				
White Crappie	205	75.6	3.9 - 12.6	56.52	74.5				
Black Crappie	66	24.4	6.2 - 11.1	19.37	25.5				
Totals	271			75.89					

<sup>\*</sup>Common names of fishes recognized by the American Fisheries Society.





		NUMBER	, PERCENT	AGE, WEIG	HT, AND	AGE OF WH	ITE CRAPPI	E La	
TOTAL LENGTH (inches)	NUMBER COLLECTED	PERCENT OF FISH COLLECTED	AVERAGE WEIGHT (pounds)	AGE OF FISH	TOTAL LENGTH (inches)	NUMBER COLLECTED	PERCENT OF FISH COLLECTED	AVERAGE WEIGHT (pounds)	AGE OF FISH
1.0					19.0				
1.5					19.5				
2.0					20.0				
2.5					20.5				
3.0					21.0				
3.5					21.5				
4.0	1	0.5	0.05	1	22.0				
4.5					22.5				
5.0	3	1.5	0.09	2,3	23.0				
5.5	2	1.0	0.12	2	23.5				
6.0	4	2.0	0.11	2,3	24.0				
6.5	12	5.9	0.14	3	24.5				
7.0	22	10.8	0.18	2,3,5	25.0				
7.5	34	16.7	0.20	3,4	25.5				
8.0	38	18.6	0.25	3,4	26.0				
8.5	33	16.2	0.31	3,4,5,6	TOTAL	204			
9.0	21	10.3	0.35	3,4,5,6					
9.5	17	8.3	0.42	4,5					
10.0	9	4.4	0.48	4,5					
10.5	5	2.5	0.48	4,5,6					
11.0	1	0.5	0.66	5,6					
11.5	1	0.5	0.66	Not Aged					
12.0									
12.5	1	0.5	0.79	6					
13.0									
13.5									
14.0									
14.5							***		
15.0									
15.5									
16.0									
16.5									
17.0									
17.5									
18.0									
18.5						-			



GILL NET



MICHIGAN TRAP



STANDARD TRAP

. n. T. 18. s.,	NUMBER, PERCENTAGE, WEIGHT, AND AGE OF BLACK CRAPPIE									
TOTAL LENGTH	NUMBER	PERCENT OF FISH	AVERAGE WEIGHT	AGE OF	TOTAL LENGTH	NUMBER	PERCENT OF FISH	AVERAGE WEIGHT	AGE OF	
(inches)	COLLECTED	COLLECTED	(pounds)	FISH	(inches)	COLLECTED	COLLECTED	(pounds)	FISH	
1.0					19.0					
1.5					19.5					
2.0					20.0					
2.5					20.5					
3.0					21.0					
3.5					21.5					
4.0					22.0					
4.5					22.5					
5.0					23.0					
5.5					23.5					
6.0	1	1.5	0.12	3	24.0					
6.5	3	4.5	0.15	3,4	24.5					
7.0	10	15.2	0.20	3,4	25.0					
7.5	16	24.2	0.23	3,4,5	25.5					
8.0	9	13.6	0.25	4,5	26.0					
8.5	13	19.7	0.33	3,4,5,6	TOTAL	66				
9.0	8	12.1	0.39	4,5						
9.5	4	6.1	0.50	3,5,6,10						
10.0									,	
10.5										
11.0	2	3.0	0.72	4						
11.5										
12.0										
12.5										
13.0										
13.5										
14.0										
14.5										
15.0										
15.5										
16.0										
16.5										
17.0										
17.5										
18.0			W							
18.5										



MICHIGAN TRAP

**NET CATCH** 



2.0 /lift

N/A

STANDARD TRAP

**NET CATCH** 

**GILL NET** 

CATCH

1.8 /lift

WHITE CRAPPIE AGE-LENGTH KEY										
Length	Total	Sub-			AGE					
group (in)	number	sample <sup>–</sup>	1	2	3	4	5	6		
4.0	1	1	1							
4.5										
5.0	3	3		2	1					
5.5	2	2		2						
6.0	4	4		2	2					
6.5	12	12			12					
7.0	22	22		3	16		3			
7.5	34	34			20	14				
8.0	38	38			25	13				
8.5	33	33			21	4	4	4		
9.0	21	21			3	6	9	3		
9.5	17	17				9	9			
10.0	9	9				3	6			
10.5	5	5				3	1	1		
11.0	1	1					1	1		
11.5	1	0								
12.0										
12.5	1	1						1		
Totals	204	203	1	9	100	50	33	10		

		AGE-LEN	GTH KEY S	SUMMARY		
		Mean			Lower	Upper
Age	Number	TL	Var	SE	95%CI	95%CI
1	1	4.3				
2	9	6.3	0.69	0.28	5.7	6.8
3	100	7.9	0.59	0.08	7.7	8.0
4	50	8.8	0.88	0.13	8.5	9.0
5	33	9.4	0.82	0.16	9.1	9.7
6	10	9.7	1.83	0.43	8.8	10.5





#### **BLACK CRAPPIE AGE-LENGTH KEY** Total Sub-AGE Length group (in) 6.0 number sample 6.5 7.0 7.5 8.0 8.5 9.0 9.5 10.0 10.5 11.0 Totals

	AC	GE-LENG	TH KEY SU	JMMARY		
		Mean			Lower	Upper
Age	Number	TL	Var	SE	95%CI	95%CI
3	12	7.7	0.96	0.28	7.1	8.2
4	30	8.1	1.15	0.20	7.7	8.5
5	17	8.7	0.36	0.14	8.4	9.0
6	5	8.9	0.19	0.19	8.6	9.3
7						
8						
9						
10	1	9.8				





		GPS I	OCATION OF S	AMP	LING EQUIPMEN	NT	
		TRAP N	ETS	MICHIGAN TRAP NETS			
1	Ν	38.06937	W -87.45234	1	N 38.06937	W -87.45220	
2	N	38.06704	W -87.45597	2	N 38.06659	W -87.45631	
3	N	38.06972	W -87.45211	3	N 38.06001	W -87.44948	
4	N	38.06634	W -87.45631	4	N 38.06903	W -87.46098	
5	Ν	38.06012	W -87.44976	5	N	W	
6	N	38.05984	W -87.44900	6	N	W	
7	Ζ	38.06865	W -87.46070	7	N	W	
8	Ν	38.06910	W -87.46102	8	N	W	
9	N	38.06383	W -87.45523	9	N	W	
10	N	38.06290	W -87.45491	10	N	W	
11	Ν	38.06947	W -87.45767	11	N	W	
12	N	38.06995	W -87.45433	12	N	W	
13	N	38.06933	W -87.45295	13	N	W	
14	N	38.06974	W -87.45215	14	N	W	
15	N	38.06588	W -87.45666	15	N	W	
16	N	38.06781	W -87.45475	16	N	W	



