Original: TAFS

cc:

INSTITUTE FOR FISHERIES RESEARCH DIVISION OF FISHERIES MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION COOPERATING WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN TAFS Fish Division Education-Game Inst. for Fish. Res. Pigeon R. Station W. C. Latta Hunt Creek Station

ADDRESS UNIVERSITY MUSEUMS ANNEX ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

GERALD & COOPER PH.D.

October 28, 1963

Report No. 1678

EFFECTS OF A FLIES-ONLY REGULATION

ON ANGLING AND TROUT POPULATIONS

IN FORD LAKE, OTSEGO COUNTY,

MICHIGAN¹

by

William C. Latta

↓ Contribution from Dingell-Johnson Project No. F-27-R, Michigan.



Introduction

In 1955, Shetter and Allison showed conclusively that mortality of trout released after they were caught with worm-baited hooks was significantly higher than mortality of trout caught with artificial flies and released. Immediately the question arose of whether a regulation which permitted the angler to use only the commonly accepted wet or dry fly as a lure would, subsequently, increase the catch of trout. Seemingly the elimination of the fatal hooking of sublegal trout with worm bait would increase survival in a trout population unless mortality from other sources offset the increased survival resulting from the use of flies. In 1962, Shetter and Alexander evaluated the effects of a fliesonly restriction on a wild, brook trout population in 5,000 feet of Hunt Creek, Montmorency County, Michigan. They concluded that the main result of the flies-only regulation was a greater catch per hour for the fewer anglers fishing the restricted water during 1955-59. The sublegal or protected segment of the population did not increase under the regulation.

Since 1955, only the commonly accepted wet or dry fly has been used as bait in Ford Lake, Otsego County, Michigan. The effects of the regulation on angling and on the trout population in the lake were evaluated. Ford is one of the seven experimental lakes at the Pigeon River Trout Research Station. Hemlock, another of the lakes, was used as a control. In Hemlock Lake, anglers could use any bait except

-2-

minnows. In both lakes a daily creel limit of 5 trout, at least 7 inches long, was in force. The fishing season extended from the last Saturday in April through the second Sunday in September.

Ford Lake is 10.2 acres in area, and has a maximum depth of 29 feet; Hemlock Lake is 5.9 acres, and has a maximum depth of 59 feet. Geologists describe the lakes as limestone sinks, i.e., they were formed through the solution of underlying limestone by ground water, accompanied by a settling of the surface layer of sand and gravel, producing a coneshaped pothole. For a more complete physical and chemical description of each lake, see Eschmeyer (1938) and Tanner (1960).

Although the fish populations in both lakes were poisoned in the early 1950's, the mudminnow (<u>Umbra limi</u>) is present in Ford Lake and the bluntnose minnow (<u>Pimephales notatus</u>) in Hemlock Lake. The mudminnow survived the poisoning but the bluntnose minnow was introduced into Hemlock Lake after the poisoning, probably by an angler fishing illegally with minnows.

Trout spawning is unsuccessful in these lakes, and the fishery is maintained by annual fall plantings of fingerling brook trout (<u>Salvelinus</u> <u>fontinalis</u>). A nearly complete record of the harvest is obtained by a permit-type creel census which has been in operation at the station since 1949. All anglers are required to report their catch at the end of each trip to each lake.

Plantings and harvest

The initial planting rate was about 500 brook trout (age-group 0, average length about 4 inches) per acre. Each autumn, Ford Lake received 5, 850 and Hemlock, 3,000 fingerling brook trout. In 1957, however, the planting rate was reduced to 100 fingerlings per acre; Ford Lake received 1,170, and Hemlock Lake, 600 trout each autumn. In 1956, with an improvement in the hatchery diet, the brook trout averaged more than 4 inches by autumn, and since then 5- to 6-inch trout (average total length about 5.5 inches) have been selected for planting each year.

In addition to the fingerling plants, legal-size trout were planted in Ford Lake in 1952-55, and in Hemlock Lake in 1952-53. The plantings and the subsequent harvests, in number and weight, for Ford and Hemlock lakes are given in Tables 1 and 2.

With the increase in 1956 of size of trout planted and a decrease in 1957 of number planted per acre, there has been an approximate doubling of the percentage of a year class caught both in numbers (Figure 1) and pounds (Figure 2). However, in both lakes the actual number and weight harvested from a year class is generally less now than under the previous planting program. In Hemlock Lake, the total number caught in recent years is about one half as great as in the early years prior to changes in planting program; weight is about three quarters as great (Table 2). In Ford Lake, the catch from the fingerling plants in the

-4-

early years was extremely variable, undoubtedly as a result of the competition and predation from the plantings of legal-size trout, but it was usually larger than in recent years (Table 1).

Concurrent with the change in the planting program, there has been an increase in the average total length of trout in the catch from Ford Lake (Table 3) and Hemlock Lake (Table 4).

The flies-only regulation was imposed on Ford Lake in 1955. The 1954 year class which was planted after the close of the fishing season in the autumn of 1954, was the first to be subjected to the new regulation. If there was to be an increase in survival of sublegal trout and a corresponding increase in the catch, the change should have first appeared in the returns from the 1954 year class which was harvested in 1955-59. However, the percentage of year class caught, both in number and weight, did not increase until 1958-60 when the 1957 year class was harvested (Figures 1 and 2). A similar increase in percentage of harvest, occurred in the 1957 year class in Hemlock Lake. The increase in percentage of harvest in both lakes must be attributed to the reduction in planting rate and larger size of trout planted rather than the fliesonly regulation.

Population and mortality estimates

The methods used to determine number of trout in Ford and Hemlock lakes each spring and fall and to estimate mortality rates were described in detail by Latta (1963). Samples of fish to be used in the

-5-

"mark-and-recapture" estimates of population size were taken by angling, by shocking with direct current at night with underwater lights, and by creel census. Mortality rates were calculated by methods described by Ricker (1958); and the same symbols have been used. Catches and population estimates for each spring and fall, 1960-62, are given for Ford Lake in Table 5, and for Hemlock Lake in Table 6. The corresponding mortality estimates for each winter and summer are given in Tables 7 and 8. The instantaneous and conditional mortality rates presented here plus those in Latta (1963) provide estimates from 1956 through 1962.

One would expect the natural mortality rate of the sublegal trout (during the first summer in the lake) to be less under a flies-only regulation than under an any-bait regulation unless there were some other source of mortality. A comparison of instantaneous natural mortality rates, \underline{q} , for the first summer of life in Ford Lake with corresponding rates for the first summer of life in Hemlock Lake, for 1957-62, is shown in Figure 3. A "t" test indicated there was no significant difference between the natural mortality rates, \underline{q} , in the two lakes.

Fishing pressure and angling quality

The number and percentage of successful fishing trips, hours fished in total and per acre, and average number of brook trout caught per hour per trip for each year, 1953-62, for Ford and Hemlock lakes

-6-

are given in Tables 9 and 10, respectively. Means for these data and for similar data from the four other experimental lakes under the same planting program as Ford and Hemlock lakes for the years 1955-62 are given in Table 11.

Fishing pressure, measured in number of hours of fishing per acre each year, was plotted for Ford and Hemlock lakes in Figure 4. Since 1955, the beginning of the flies-only regulation, the fishing pressure on Ford Lake has been rather constant. Fishing pressure on Hemlock Lake has varied more, but it has been higher than on Ford Lake. Hemlock Lake has had a mean of 147.6 hours per acre of fishing pressure as compared with the mean of 48.5 hours per acre for Ford Lake for the years 1955-62 (Table 11). Of the six experimental lakes where fingerling brook trout are planted annually, mean fishing pressure per acre was lowest on Ford Lake, the only lake under the flies-only regulation. (In the other lakes any bait except minnows could be used.) In 1953 and 1954, before the flies-only regulation, total fishing pressure on Ford Lake was almost twice as high (mean--935 hours) as after (mean--494 hours) the regulation was imposed (Table 9).

Angling quality, as measured by the average number of trout caught per hour per trip, was plotted for the two lakes in Figure 5. Since 1955, the catch per hour per trip has varied considerably in both lakes but it has been higher in Ford than in Hemlock in 6 of 8 years. The mean for Ford Lake was 0.69 trout while for Hemlock Lake it was

-7-

0.43 trout for the years 1955-62 (Table 11). Of the six experimental lakes, the mean of 0.69 trout on Ford Lake was the highest.

With the imposition of the flies-only regulation on Ford Lake, the fishing pressure has been approximately halved and it has remained lower than on any of the experimental lakes. As a consequence of the lower fishing pressure, the fishing quality (or number of fish caught per hour per trip) has been consistently higher than on the other lakes.

Since 1958 in Hemlock Lake, and 1959 in Ford Lake, the quality of the fishing has decreased (Figure 5). This can be attributed to the reduction in 1957 of the planting rate from 500 to 100 trout per acre.

Discussion

Although the use of artificial flies as a lure reduces mortality from hocking, apparently in Ford Lake mortality from other sources was great enough to offset the survival gained by using only flies. There was no indication of increased survival either in percentage of return from a year class or in a comparison of natural mortality rates for the first summer in the lake (the time when the brook trout are of sublegal size and growing into the catch). The quality of the fishing was higher on Ford Lake than on the control lake (and the other experimental lakes in the area), but this was a result of the lower fishing pressure. The better fishing on Ford Lake did not attract fishermen from the other lakes.

-8-

The difference in fishing pressure (hours per acre) between Ford and Hemlock lakes was considerable (48.5 as compared to 147.6 hours). Undoubtedly, an increase in fishing pressure on Ford Lake would result in an increased catch, a reduction in number of trout caught per hour per trip, a lesser density of trout in the lake and, probably, an increase in survival of the remaining trout. What effect the flies-only regulation would have under an increased fishing pressure is unknown.

Acknowledgments

Gerald F. Myers, Harold H. Brado, Doyle E. Edson, and Floyd E. Simonis assisted with the field work. Walter R. Crowe and Gerald P. Cooper read the manuscript and made suggestions. Paul M. Earl drafted the figures.

Literature cited

- Eschmeyer, R. William. 1938. Further studies of perch populations. Pap. Mich. Acad. Sci., Arts, and Letters, 23: 611-631.
- Latta, William C. 1963. Semiannual estimates of natural mortality of hatchery brook trout in lakes. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc., 92(1): 53-59.
- Ricker, W. E. 1958. Handbook of computations for biological statistics of fish populations. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada, Bull. 119, 300 pp.
- Shetter, David S., and Leonard N. Allison. 1955. Comparison of mortality between fly-hooked and worm-hooked trout in Michigan streams. Mich. Dept. Cons., Inst. Fish. Res., Misc. Publ. 9, 44 pp.
- Shetter, David S., and Gaylord R. Alexander. 1962. Effects of a flies-only restriction on angling and on fall trout populations in Hunt Creek, Montmorency County, Michigan. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc., 91(3): 295-302.
- Tanner, Howard A. 1960. Some consequences of adding fertilizer to five Michigan trout lakes. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc., 39(2): 198-205.

INSTITUTE FOR FISHERIES RESEARCH William C. Latta

Report approved by G. P. Cooper Typed by M. S. McClure

Date	Number and weigh	Average t length			Nur	nber an	d weigh	t (pound	ds) caug					Percentage return by
(Year and month)	(pounds) planted	(inches) planted	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Total	number and weight
1952 October	2, 650 106	4.0	263 42.0	211 41.9	6 3.0	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	480 86.9	18.1 82.0
	265 60	8.1	141 29.1	1 0.3	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	•••	• • •	• • •	142 29.4	53.6 49.0
1953 Septembe	5,850 r 133	3.5		240 38.9	234 61.6	22 9.7	•••	•••		•••	•••	•••	496 110.2	8.5 82.9
August	650 143	8.1	203 35.0	$155\\28.4$	3 1.0	12 2.4	•••	•••	•••	•••	• • •	•••	373 66.8	57.4 46.7
1954 November	5,850 r 176	4.2	•••	•••	6 0.9	$\begin{array}{c} 167\\ 34.7\end{array}$	2 0.4	1 0.5	1 2.4		•••	•••	177 38.9	3.0 22.1
April	600 85	7.0		$\begin{array}{c} 364 \\ 61.9 \end{array}$	19 5.6	4 1.1	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	•••	387 68.6	64.5 80.7
1955 October	5,850 172	4.3	•••	•••	•••	54 8.2	186 40.3	20 8.2	3 1.7	•••	•••	•••	263 58.4	4.5 34.0
May	300 38	6.7	•••	•••	41 5.9	51 11.0	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	92 16.9	30.7 44.5
1956 October	5,850 380	5.7	•••	• • •	•••	•••	14 1.5	261 37.0	292 63.0	36 10.8	•••	• • •	603 112.3	10.3 29.6
1957 Novembe	1,170 r 72	5.6	•••	•••	• • •	• • •	•••	7 0.9	252 48.0	23 6.4	•••	•••	282 55.3	24.1 76.8
1958 Novembe:	1,170 r 74	5.6	•••	•••	•••	•••		•••	6 0 .9	257 51.3	6 1.9	•••	269 54.1	23.0 73.1
1959 Novembe	1,170 r 63	5,5		• - •		•••		•••	•••	101 18.8	157 54.7	9 5.0	267 78.5	22.8 124.6
1960 Novembe	1,170 r 67	5.5	•••	•••	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	•••	152 26.9	$124\\42.1$	276 69.0	23.6 103.0
196 1 Novembe	1,170 r 65	5.5	•••	•••	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	• • •		75 13.8	75 13.8	6.4 21.2
	Total Num	lber	607	986 ‡	3271	310	202	289	554	417	315	2 08		
	Wei	ght (pound	ls) 106.1	173.9	83.7	67.1	42.2	46.6	116.0	87.3	83.5	60.9		

Table 1.--Number, weight (pounds) and average length (inches) of brook trout planted in Ford Lake and the subsequent harvest in numbers and weight (pounds), 1953-62

VFor 1954, 15 trout weighing a total of 2.5 pounds and, for 1955, 18 trout weighing 5.7 pounds, were added to the totals. They could not be assigned to a year class because of errors in recording and/or marking.

Date	Date Number Aver stocked and weight leng				Number and weight (pounds) caught								Percentage return by	
(Year and month)	(pounds) planted	(inches)	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Total	number and weight
1952 October	1,475 61	4.0	• • •	1 0.1	• • •	•••	•••	•••			•••	•••	1 0.1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.1 \\ 0.2 \end{array}$
	148 32	8.1	• • •	•••	• • •	•••	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	
1953 September	3,000 67	3.5	•••	427 83.3	49 21.6	1 1.2	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	477 106.1	15.9 158.4
	450 66	8.1	•••	6 2.4	• • •	•••	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	•••	6 2.4	1.3 3.6
1954 November	3,000 87	4.2	•••	•••	213 29,9	453 75.4	4 1.0	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	670 106.3	22.3 122.2
1955 October	3,000 91	4.3	•••	• • •	• • •	28 2 42.5	274 49.2	6 1.4	•••	•••	•••	•••	562 93.1	18.7 102.3
1956 October	3,000 190	5.7	•••	•••	•••		$\begin{array}{c} 322\\ 46.9 \end{array}$	319 74.7	5 2.9		•••	•••	$646 \\ 124.5$	21.5 65.5
1957 November	600 38	5.6	•••		•••	•••	•••	244 56.0	4 0 20.8	3 3.0	• • •	•••	287 79.8	47.8 210. 0
1958 November	600 3 8	5.6	•••	•••	• • •	•••	• • • ·	•••	254 51.1	83 36.6	2 2.4		339 90.1	56.5 237.1
1959 November	600 35	5.3			•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	149 27.3	143 58.8	5 4.4	297 90.5	49.5 258. 6
1960 November	600 35	5.5	•••		•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	105 19.6	86 40.8	$\begin{array}{c} 191 \\ 60.4 \end{array}$	31.8 172.6
1961 November	600 33	5.5				•••	•••	•••	•••		•••	176 32.4	176 32.4	29.3 98.2
	Total Numl	ber	•••	4 35↓	263¥	736	600	569	299	235	250	267		
	Weig	ht (pound	s)	86.1	51.8	119.1	97.1	132.1	74.8	66.9	80.8	77.6		

Table 2. -- Number, weight (pounds) and average length (inches) of brook trout planted in Hemlock Lake and the subsequent harvest in numbers and weight (pounds), 1953-62

 $\oint_{\text{For 1954, 1 trout weighing 0.3 pound and, for 1955, 1 trout weighing 0.3 pound were added to the totals. They$ could not be assigned to a year class because of errors in recording and/or marking.

19

Year			, <u></u> , <u></u>		Year	caught			······	
class	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
1952	7.4	8.5	10.8	• • •						
1953	• • •	7.5	9.2	10.7	• • •	• • •	•••	•••	•••	•••
1954	•••		7.4	8 .6	8.7	11.7	16.6		•••	•••
1955		• • •	•••	7.4	8.7	10.1	10.9	•••	•••	•••
1956		•••	•••	•••	7.2	7.7	8.7	9.4	•••	•••
1957	•••	•••		•••	•••	7.3	8.5	9.4	•••	•••
1958	•••		•••	•••		•••	7.4	8.5	9.5	•••
1959	•••	•••			•••		•••	7.8	9.9	11.1
1960	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	7.8	9.7
1961	•••	•••		•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	7.8

Table 3. -- Average total length of brook trout (planted as fingerlings) in catch

class	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	196
1952	7.4	8.5	10.8							••
1953	• • •	7.5	9.2	10.7	•••	• • •	•••	•••	•••	••
1954	•••		7.4	8.6	8.7	11,7	16.6			••
1955		•••		7.4	8.7	10.1	10.9		•••	••
1956		•••	•••	•••	7.2	7.7	8.7	9.4		••
1957		•••		•••		7.3	8.5	9.4		••
1958	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	7.4	8.5	9.5	••
1959		•••	•••	•••	•••	•••		7.8	9.9	11.
1960	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	7.8	9.
1961	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	•••	7.

from Ford Lake, 1953-62

Year		Year caught												
class	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962				
1952	•••	7.5				•••		• • •	•••					
1953	•••	8.0	10.6	14.2	•••	· • •		•••	•••	•••				
1954		. 	,я • **;	8 .2	9.0	•••								
1955	•••			. 4	8 .2	8.8		•••	• • •	•••				
1956	•••	•••	•••		7.3	8.7	10.9		•••	•••				
1957	•••			•••	•••	8.2	10.7	12.9	•••	•••				
1958	•••			•••			8.0	10.2	13.0	•••				
1959	•••	•••		•••		•••	•••	7.9	10.2	12.9				
1960			•••	•••					7.9	10.5				
1961	•••		•••						•••	7.7				

Year	P	opulation estim	ates ar	nd catches, by y	years₩			
ologe -	1960		1961		1962			
CIASS	№ 2	N1 &	С	N2	N ₁	С	N2	
1958	18	23	6		• • •	• • •	• • •	
1959	342 (272-451)	209 (155-319)	157	19	1∛	9	4	
1960	••••	640 (522-893)	152	276 (234-349)	256 (170-585)	124	28 (22-56)	
1961			• • •	•••	854 (681-1,119)	75	483 (418-595)	
Totals	360	851	315	295	1, 111	2 08	515	

Table 5.--Catches, and spring and fall population estimates of brook trout in Ford Lake, 1960-62 [The 95-percent confidence limits for population estimates are given in parentheses]

 $\sqrt[4]{N_1}$ = April population estimate, C = catch, N₂ = October population estimate.

Fifty to 100 trout were removed illegally during the winter. Probably most of trout taken were from the 1959 year class.

³Minimum estimate; number of fish handled. N₁ assumed to be 6 in 1961, and 13 in 1962.

Year	<u> </u>	opulation estim	ates an	nd catches, by y	ears¥	<u>s¥</u> 1962			
class	N2	N ₁	C	N ₂	N ₁	C	N ₂		
1958	2∛	2	2	•••	•••	• • •	•••		
1959	183 (146-251)	176 (144-234)	14 3	5	1&	5	•••		
1960		512 (397-682)	105	140 (118-180)	126 (89-218)	86	20		
1961			•••	•••	453 (391-553)	176	238 (174-402)		
Totals	185	690	2 50	145	580	267	2 58		

[The 95-percent confidence limits for population estimates are given in parentheses]

Table 6.--Catches, and spring and fall population estimates of brook trout in Hemlock Lake, 1960-62

 $\sqrt[4]{N_1}$ = April population estimate, C = catch, N₂ = October population estimate.

 $\stackrel{\diamond}{\forall}$ Minimum estimate; number of fish handled. N₁ assumed to be 5 in 1962.

37	Mortality		Y	ear and sea	son	
Year	rate	1960		1961		1962
class	symbol		Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer
	i		1.10	\sim	<u></u>	
	р		0.00	∞		
1050	q		1.10	0.00		
1998	а		0.67	1.00		
	m		0.00	1.00		
	n		0.67	0.00		
<u></u>	i		0.49	2.40	0.38	1.18
	р		0.00	1.98	0.00	1.18
	q		0.49	0.42	0.38	0.00
1 959						
	а		0.39	0.91	0.32	0.69
	m		0.00	0.36	0.00	0.69
	n		0.39	0.34	0.32	0.00
	i		0.60	0.84	0.07	2.22
	р		0.00	0.35	0.00	1.21
1080	q		0.60	0.49	0.07	1.01
1900	а		0.45	0.57	0.07	0.89
	m		0.00	0.30	0.00	0.70
	n		0.45	0.39	0.07	0.64
	i			an a	0.31	0.57
	р				0.00	0.12
1001	ą				0.31	0.45
1901	а				0.27	0.43
	m				0.00	0.11
	n				0.27	0.36

Table 7.--Instantaneous and conditional mortality rates for brook trout in Ford Lake, 1960-62

.

	Mortality		Year and season								
Year	rate	1960		1961	·····	1962					
class	symbol		Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer					
	;		0 00	\sim							
	1 D		0.00	\sim							
	P		0.00	0 00							
1958	4		0.00	0.00							
1000	а		0.00	1.00							
	m		0.00	1.00							
	n		0.00	0.00							
	i		0.04	3.58	0.00	\otimes					
	р		0.00	2.99	0.00	∞					
	q		0.04	0.59	0.00	0.00					
1959											
	a		0.04	0.97	0.00	1.00					
	m		0.00	0.95	0.00	1.00					
	n		0.04	0.44	0.00	0.00					
	i		0,16	1.30	9.11	1.84					
	р		0.00	0.37	0.00	1.49					
	q		0.16	0.93	0.11	0.35					
1960	-										
	а		0.15	0.73	0.10	0.84					
	m		0.00	0.31	0.00	0.78					
	n		0.15	0.61	0.10	0.29					
	i				0.28	0.65					
	p				0.00	0.53					
	q				0.28	0.12					
1961	•										
	a				0.24	0.48					
	m				0.00	0.41					
	n				0.24	0.11					

Table 8.--Instantaneous and conditional mortality rates for brook trout in Hemlock Lake, 1960-62

.

Year I	Fishin Number	g trips Percentage successful	Hours f Total	ished Per acre	Average number of fish caught per hour per trip
1953	286	63.5	694.5	38.1	1.09
1954	435	82. 8	1,176.0	115.3	0.94
1955	214	50.5	494.0	48.4	0.82
1956	243	43.6	576.0	56.5	0.54
1957	175	40.0	417.5	40.9	0.43
1958	163	51.5	360.0	35.3	0.83
1959	232	61.6	510.5	30. 0	1.15
1960	204	60.3	503.0	49.3	0.82
1961	224	56.2	592.5	58 . 1	0.54
1962	198	39.4	500.5	49.1	0.37

Table 9.--Number and percentage of successful fishing trips, hours fished in total and per acre, and average number of brook trout caught per hour per trip for Ford Lake, 1953-62

Table 10 Number and percentage of successful fishing trips, hour
fished in total and per acre, and average number of brook trout
caught per hour per trip for Hemlock Lake, 1953-62

	Fishir	ng trips	Hours f	ished	Average number of
Year	Number	Percentage successful	Total	Per acre	fish caught per hour per trip
1953	22		32.0	5.4	
1954	265	51.3	846.5	145.5	0.49
1955	255	32.6	773.0	131.0	0.30
1956	336	64.0	974.5	165.2	0.75
1957	383	46.5	992.5	168.2	0.61
1958	339	50.1	995.0	168.6	0.66
1959	256	41.8	745.5	126.4	0.37
1960	219	37.4	670.5	113.6	0.29
1961	291	33.7	930.0	157.6	0.21
1962	251	42 .2	887.0	150.3	0.26

Table 11.--Means for fishing trips, hours fished and average

number of brook trout caught per hour per trip for six

experimental lakes, 1955-62

•

	Fishing trips		Hours fished		Average number of
Lake	Number	Percentage successful	Total	Per acre	fish caught per hour per trip
Ford	207	50.4	494.2	48.5	0.69
Hemlock	291	43.5	371.0	147.6	0.43
North Twin	311	41.2	849.6	130.8	0.43
South Twin	292	29.6	881.9	174.8	0.30
West Lost	334	37.4	906.9	245.1	0.35
Lost	210	38.0	524.9	150.0	0.43







Figure 2.--Percentage (pounds) of brook trout, from each year class, 1953-59, caught in Ford and Hemlock lakes.



Figure 3. --Instantaneous natural mortality rates, \underline{q} , for brook trout during their first summer in Ford and Hemlock lakes, 1957-62.



Figure 4.--Hours of fishing per acre each year, 1953-62, on Ford and Hemlock lakes.



Figure 5. --Average number of trout caught per hour per trip each year, 1953-62, on Ford and Hemlock lakes.