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A THREE-YEAR CREEL CENSUS OF LAKE CATHERINE, LAKE HAMILTON, AND LAKE OUACHITA, ARKANSAS

James Stevenson Little Rock University Clinton Richards Arkansas Game and Fish Cummission

## INTRODUCTION

"Studies of the fishery resources of three lakes looated in series on the Ouachita River in West Central Arkansas were conducted during the summers of 1955, 1956, and 1957. Lake Catherine, the lower lake, is a 3,000 aore lake that was impounded in 1923 by bhe Arkansas Power and Light Company. Lake Hamilton, oreated just above Lake Catherine in 1931, by the same company, consists of 7, 200 acres. Lake Ouachita, which covers approximately 40,000 aores, was impounded in 1952 by the Corps of Engineers and is located just above Lake Hamilton.
"The pattern of high original reservoir productivity followed by gradual decline (in terms of angling suocessand desirable fish produotion) has been evidenced in these lakes. Reports from residents and fishermen on Lake Catherine have indioated that fishing was excellent for the first few years following impoundment, but has dealined in reoent years. Many believe that the same course is true in Lake Hamilton. On the other hand, Lake Ouachita, since it has been constructed, has attracted hundreds of thousands of fishermen as a result of the angling success that can be had in this new lake.
"The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission recognized that here was an unusual opportunity to study factors pertaining to fish production and fishing success in three lakes of widely different ages, all located in the same watershed. Therefore, in June, 1955, the Game and Fish Commission inaugurated a Dingell-Johnson Federal Aid to Sport Fish Restoration Project ( $F-5-R$ ) which was a three year comparative fisheries study of Lake Catherine, Lake Hamilton, and Lake Ouachita. The objectives of this study were to investigate and compare fishing resources of these lakes of different ages and to make recommendations for management." (Hulsey and Stevenson, 1958.)
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fishery study of these lakes. The purpose of this census was to compare angling success and harvest of fish in the lakes and to collect data for future evaluation of experimental management techniques (Stevenson and Hulsey, 1958).

## METHODS

The oreel census was conduoted by one man working six days a week during the summer. The oreel census olerk, except for the early part of 1955, wasa permanent employee of the Lake Hamilton State Fish Hatohery who worked on this project during the summer months and is the junior author of this paper. A schedule was set up so that each lake was oheoked approximately two days each week and ohecking rotated ondifferent days among the three lakes. An eight-hour day was worked and the census periods were adjusted so as to cheok each lake alternately from daylight to noon and from noon to thirty minutes after dark. Different areas were visited at eaoh trip to a lake in order to record oatohes and fishing pressure in various sections. Since there are a number of oommercial boat dooks on each lake, it was deoided that ohecking fishermen at these sites would give comparable data. Periodically, the daily census was made by boat where both boat and bank fishermen were cheoked. Hovever, most of the information was obtained from fishermen returning to commeroial boat dooks. The same form for reoording data was used each summer. The oatoh for each fisherman was recorded by number and size of species, as well as information on hours per fishing trip, methods of fishing, time of day most fish oaught, and the residence of each one in a party. A record of the daily weather conditions inoluding barometric readings was kept.

## LAKE CATHERINE

Reports from boat dook operators and residents indioate that fishing pressure is greater on Lake Catherine in the winter and spring than during any of the three summer months. During colder weather, good oatohes of largemouth bass and crappie have been made in the vioinity of the steam generating plant where exhausted cooling water is expelled into the lake. This water is usually 100 F warmer than the lake water. During the summer months, most
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of the fishermen on the lake are looal residents and sportsmen from Malvern, a nearby town. Summer fishing consists of considerable still-fishing for sunfish and trotline sets for atfish.

Table I gives a list of commercial boat docks on Lake Catherine where fishermen were cheoked. There are ten public docks renting boats. Two of these, however, the F.F. A. Camp and Camp Tanako, oater to olubs and other organizations using their grounds throughout the summer for short periods of camping. Most of the out-of-state fishermen were recorded at Lake Catherine State Park where there are outtages for rent and the natural park facilities are available for camping privileges. Since many lake residents use their own boats, an estimate of these was made by counting visible boats by cottages on the lake. Twenty-seven private fishing boats were counted. No attempt was madeto oaloulate the number of boats launohed from trailers; however, the number was considered small.

Table II gives a summary of fishing effort and success. The number of fishermen contacted on Lake Catherine was considerably greater in 1957 than in 1955 or 1956. Two hundred and twenty-eight fishermen were contacted as compared with 87 in 1955 and 123 in 1956. The oatoh-per-man-hour varied siightly during the three years with 0.73 in 1955; 0.91 in 1956; and 0.84 fish in 1957 giving an average of 0.83 fish per man-hour of effort over the three years. The pounds of fish oaught per man-hour effort dropped from 0.42 in 1955 and 0.49 in 1956 to 0.28 in 1957. This revealed a reduction in size of fish caught in 1957. Approximately two-thirds of the fishermen used live bait, fishing first for orappie and frequently, as a result of poor suocess, would fishfor sunfish. Approximately ninety-three percent of the fishermen censused were from Arkansas and most of these were looal residents.

Fourteen species of fish were represented in the oreel during the three summers.l The species oomposition of oatoh, in order of average percent of the total, is given in Table III. The prinoipal fishery in all three years was that of bluegill
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## TABLE I <br> COMMERCIAL BEST LANDINGS ON LAKE CATHERINE WHERE FISHERMEN WERE CONTACTED

| Name of Landing | Looation N | Number of Rental Boats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barney's Landing | North side, by Gulpha Creek | 4 |
| Camp Tanako | South side, about midway between dams | 6 |
| Clem's Landing | North side, immediately above Remmel Dam | 14 |
| Cordell's Landing | North side, immediately below Carpenter Dam | 14 |
| Fada's Landing | North side, about three miles above Remmel Dam | 12 |
| F. F.A. Camp | South side, about midway between dams | $y \quad 10$ |
| Grady's Landing | South side, about two miles below Carpenter Dam | 12 |
| Knittel's Landing | North side, by Wilson's sawmill | 17 |
| Lake Catherine State Park | South side, about one mile above Remmel Dam | 14 |
| Roy and Tucker's Landing | North side, in Spencer Bay | 12 |
| TOTAL 10 |  | 115 |

## CREEL CENSUS, LAKE CATHERINE

|  | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | Average | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Hours Cheoked | 176 | 168 | 144 |  | 488 |
| Number Fishermen Contacted (Trips) | 87 | 123 | 228 |  | 438 |
| Total Fishermen-Hours | 409 | 412 | 865 |  | 1686 |
| Hours Fished per Trip | 4.7 | 3.35 | 3.84 | 3.96 |  |
| Total Fish Caught | 302 | 374 | 735 |  | 1411 |
| Fish Caught per Hour | 0.73 | 0.91 | 0.84 | 0.83 |  |
| Fish Caught per Trip | 3.47 | 3.04 | 3.22 | 3.24 |  |
| Tctal Weight Fish (Lbs.) | 174.0 | 202.4 | 239.0 | 3.24 | 615.4 |
| Pounds Caught per Hour | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.28 | 0.40 |  |
| Pounds Caught per Trip | 2.0 | 1.63 | 1.05 | 1.56 |  |
| Artificial Bait Fishermen | 48\% | 29\% | 25\% | 34\% |  |
| Live Bait Fishermen | 52\% | 71\% | 75\% | 66\% |  |
| Period Most Fish Caught | 5 to 9 A.M. | 6 to | 6 to 10 A.M. | $5: 40 \text { to }$ |  |
| Depth Most Fish Caught | 5 to. | 10 to | 10 to. | 10.3 to |  |
|  | 20 ft | 12 ft | 12 ft | 14.6 ft |  |
| Fishermen from Arkansas | 98\% | 91\% | 89\% | 92.67\% |  |
| Out-of-State-Fishermen | 2\% | 9\% | 11\% | 7.33\% |  |
| Successful Trips | 85\% | 83\% | 70\% | $79.0 \%$ |  |

## A THREE-YEAR CREEL CENSUS

## TABLE III

SPECIES COMPOSITION OF CATCH, LAKE CATHERINE

| Species | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | Avg. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1. Bluegill Sunfish
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 61.0 & 40.0 & 31.0 & 44.0 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 5.8 & 6.1 & 6.8 & 6.2 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.3\end{array}$
2. Largemouth Bass
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 13.0 & 22.0 & 5.0 & 13.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 12.7 & 10.9 & 10.1 & 11.2 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 1.8 & 0.8 & 0.7 & 1.1\end{array}$
3. Drum
A. Percent of Total
B. Average Lgth. (In.)
4.0
C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.)
9.5
5.0
20.0
9.7
0.7
12.7
1.0
11.7
11.3
0.8
4. Longear Sunfish
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 10.0 & 12.0 & 7.0 & 9.7 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 4.5 & 5.7 & 6.0 & 5.4 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.1 & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.2\end{array}$
5. White Bass
A. Percent of Total
B. Average Lgth. (In.)
C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.)
0.0

- 

1.0
10.0
-
0.0
A. Percent of Total
B. Average Lgth. (In.)
C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.)
-
13.
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## TABLE III (Continued)

SPECIES COMPOSITION OF CATCH, LAKE CATHERINE

| Species | 1.955 | 1956 | 1957 | Avg. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

9. Warmulth Bass

| A. Percent of Total | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 1.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B. Average Lgth. (In.) | 5.0 | 4.9 | 7.1 | 5.7 |
| C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 |

10. Black Crappie
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 3.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 \\ \text { B. Average Lggth. (In.) } & 8.4 & - & - & 8.4 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.5 & - & - & 0.5\end{array}$
11. Channel Catfish
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 1.0 & 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.7 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 11.5 & 15.2 & - & 13.4 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 1.4 & 1.9 & - & 1.7\end{array}$
12. Flathead Catfish
$\begin{array}{llrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 0.0 & 2.0 & 0.0 & 0.7 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & - & 15.5 & - & 15.5 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & - & 1.8 & - & 1.8\end{array}$
13. Rook Bass
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 0.0 & 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & - & 7.0 & - & 7.0 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & - & 0.3 & - & 0.3\end{array}$
14. Spotted Bass
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 11.0 & - & - & 11.0 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.7 & - & - & 0.7\end{array}$
sunfish. The percent of bluegills in the oreel deoreased from $61 \%$, in 1955 ; to $40 \%$, in 1956; and to $31 \%$, in 1957. The average size increased siightly. Age-growth studies, however, revealed a stunted population (Hulsey and Stevenson, op. oit.). Largemouth bass comprised 13\% of the total catoh in 1955; $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ in 1956; and $5 \%$ in 1957. The average size of
these diminished, with lengths of 12.7 inches, 10.9 inches, and 10.1 inches; and weights of 1.8 pounds, 0.8 pound, and 0.7 pound from 1955 through 1957. The percent of drum ought and retained by fishermen increased to $20 \%$ of the catch in 1957. In 1955 and 1956, the percentages were $4 \%$ and $5 \%$ respeotively. The higher number of drum recorded in 1957 was indicative of poorer fishing sucoess for the more desirable fish. Longear sunfish appeared to be abundant in this lake and although numerous undersizedfish were caught, many were released by the bream fishermen. The oatch ranged frcm 10\% in 1955; to $12 \%$ in 1956; to $7 \%$ in 1957. White bass made up $20 \%$ of the catoh in 1957 with an average length of 11.3 inches and a weight of 0.7 pound. Many of these were oaught in the headwaters immediately below Carpenter Dam. In 1956, $\mathbf{1 \%}$ of the oatoh was white bass and none was recorded in 1955. White orappie were ibundant in 1956, onnstituting $13 \%$ of returns, whereas none was recorded in 1955 and $5 \%$ in 1957. The size of white orappie averaged 8.4 inches and 0.3 pounds in 1956 and 8.8 inches weighing 0.5 pound in 1957. Green sunfish were fairly abundant in the atoh of all three years, however the percentage dropped in 1956. Redear sunfish inoreased to $4 \%$ of the catoh in 1957. Warmouth bass constituted an average of $1.7 \%$ of the oatoh. Blaok orappie made up $3 \%$ of the oreel in 1955 but none was reported for 1956 and 1957. One percent of the catoh in 1955 and 1956 was channel catfish with none recorded in 1957. Catfish caught by licensed commercial fishermen were not included in these data. Two percent of the catch in 1956 was flathead oatfish. Rook bass and spotted bass comprised the smallest average percent of catch with $0.3 \%$ each.

## LAKE HAMILTON

Lake Hamilton is tho most developed lake in the state from the s sandpoint of number of permanent homes, week-cnd cottages, and tourist facilities. Many residents own their own boats and fish in the early mornings and late evenings. Several of these fishermen were contaoted by boat. The majority of the data was collected, however, by visiting publio boat dooks and questioning returning fishermen at these points. It was found that the more experienced fishermen, as a rule, used their own boats;
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but, data collected at public docks was considered oomparable to data collected on other lakes. Table IV shows a list of public boat dooks on Lake Hamfiton that were regularly visited for oreel census purposes. These were representative of various fishing areas on the lake.

Table $V$ gives a summary of fishing effort and suocess on Lake Hamilton. The number of fishermen oontacted in 1957 was considerably greater than those in 1956 and slightly greater than those censused in 1955. Since the same method of censusing was used eaoh year, it can be assumed that fishing pressure was the greatest in 1957. The oatch-per-man-hour was greatest in 1956 with 1.18 fish while in 1955, the oatch-per-man-hour was 0.73 and in 1957, 0.84 fish giving an average of 0.92 fish per man-hour effort over the three years. Pounds oaught per hour averaged slightly more in 1957 with 0.57 pounds as compared with 0.42 in 1955 and 0.50 pound in 1956. Fishing with artifioial bait was more popular than live bait. During the threa years, $47 \%$, $66 \%$, and $72 \%$ of the fishermen used artifioial bait respeotively. Many of the tourists used live beit. A type of fishing employed by fishermen seeking large bass was that of trolling with adult gizzard shad. This method resulted in slow fishing but was often effective in catching "lunkers." Early morning and late afternoon "spot-oasting" for bass, feeding near the surface on sohools of shad, was the most popular type of fishing. Surface lures cast into thefeeding area were usually effective in oatohing one to two-pound bass. More out-of-state fishermen were found on Lake Hamilton in 1957 than in previous years. Fifty-eight percent (58\%) were from out-of-state in 1957 as compared with $27 \%$ in 1955, and $33 \%$ in 1956.

Table VI shows the species composition and average size of fish caught from Lake Hamilton. Eleven species were recorded. Largemouth bass oomprised the highest percentage of the oreel. In 1956, the percentage dropped to $22 \%$ from $34 \%$ in the previous year but increased to $38 \%$ to 1957. An average weight of approximately one pound for largemouth bass remained fairly oonstant all three years. Bluegill sunfish ranked slightly below largemouth bass in average percent of total fish checked in the oreel over the three years. Harvest of bluefill incressed in 1956 and 1957 over that of 1955. The percentages showed these to make up $12 \%$ of the oatoh in Published by Arkansas Academy of Science, 1959
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1955, $44 \%$ in 1956 and $35 \%$ in 1957.
TABLE IV
COMMERCIAL BOAT LANDINGS ON LAKE HAMILTON WHERE FISHERMEN WERE CONTACTED

| Name of Landing | Location | Number of Rental Boats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chamber's Landing | Near mouth of Hot Springs Creek | 18 |
| Chestnut Landing | West end of Big Mazarn area | 6 |
| Dean's Landing | Hot Springs Creek | 8 |
| File's Landing | Three miles above Carpenter Dam | 18 |
| Henderson's Landing | Glazypeau Creek, below Blakely Mt. Dam | 8 |
| Hook's Landing | North side, one-half mile above Dam | 6 |
| Little Joe's Landing | West end, above Little Mazarn Creek |  |
| Little Mazarn Landing | Little Mazarn Creek | 6 |
| Maok's Landing | North side, one mile above Dam | 10 |
| Miller's Landing | West side, near Highway \#270 | 6 |
| Moore's Landing | South side, by Highway \#ク | 6 |
| Morris' Landing | South side, on Fouche Loupe Creek | 10 |
| Sam's Landing | West side, by Highway \#270 | 6 |
| Stewart's Landing | West side by Highway $770$ | 12 |
| TOTAL 14 |  | 128 |

The percentage bluegill in 1956 surpassed largemouth bass but was less in 1955 and 1957. The average size of bluegill checked, increased from an average length of 5.0 inohes, ( 0.2 pound) in 1955 http://scholarworks.uark.edu/jaas/volis/iss1/7
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|  | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | Average | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Hours Cheoked | 176 | 168 | 144 |  | 488 |
| Number Fishermen Contacted (Trips) | 182 | 115 | 195 |  | 492 |
| Total Fishermen-Hours | 630 | 397 | 606 |  | 1633 |
| Hours Fished per Trip | 3.6 | 3.45 | 3.57 | 3.57 |  |
| Total Fish Caught | 457 | 470 | 518 |  | 1445 |
| Tish Caught per Hour | 0.73 | 1.18 | 0.84 | 0.92 |  |
| Fish Caught per Trip | 2.5 | 4.08 | 2.6 | 3.06 |  |
| Total Weight Fish (Lbs.) | 267.5 | 199.4 | 343.4 |  | 810.3 |
| Pounds Caught per Hour | 0.42 | 0.50 | 0.57 | 0.50 |  |
| Pounds Caught per Trip | 1.50 | 1.73 | 1.76 | 1.66 |  |
| Artificial Bait Fishermen | 47\% | 66\% | $72 \%$ | 62\% |  |
| Live Bait Fishermen | 53\% | 34\% | 28\% | $38 \%$ |  |
| Period Most Fish Caught | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 10 \text { A.M. } \end{gathered}$ | 6 to | $\begin{gathered} 6 \text { to } \\ 12 \text { A.M. } \end{gathered}$ | $5: 40 \text { to }$ |  |
| Depth Most Fish Caught | $\begin{aligned} 10 & \text { A.M. } \\ 8 & \text { to } \end{aligned}$ | 11 A.M. <br> 10 to | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \text { A.M. } \\ & 4 \text { to } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \text { A.M. } \\ & 7.3 \text { to } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | 20 ft | 15 ft | 18 ft | 17.67 ft |  |
| Fishermen from Arkansas | 73\% | 67\% | 42\% | 61\% |  |
| Out-of-State-Fishermen | 27\% | 33\% | 58\% | 39\% |  |
| Successful Trips | 86\% | 75\% | 74\% | 78\% |  |
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## TABLE VI

## SPECIES COMPOSITION OF CATCH, LAKE HAMILTON

| Speoies | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Avg. |  |  |  |

1. Largemouth Bass
A. Percent of Total $34.0 \quad 22.0 \quad 38.0 \quad 31.3$
B. Average Lgth. (In.) $11.0 \quad 11.4 \quad 11.6$ 11.3
C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) $0.8 \quad 0.8 \quad 1.0 \quad 0.9$
2. Bluegill Sunfish
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 11.0 & 44.0 & 35.0 & 30.0 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 5.0 & 5.7 & 6.3 & 5.7 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.3\end{array}$
3. White Crappie
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 23.0 & 10.0 & 1.0 & 11.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 10.0 & 8.2 & 10.3 & 9.5 \\ \text { C. Average Vgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.6 & 0.3 & 0.8 & 0.6\end{array}$
4. Black Crappie
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Peroent of Total } & 15.0 & 15.0 & 2.0 & 10.7 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 10.0 & 10.1 & 10.8 & 10.3 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.5 & 0.5 & 0.7 & 0.6\end{array}$
5. Longear Sunfish
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 4.0 & 2.0 & 18.0 & 8.0 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 5.0 & 5.5 & 6.3 & 5.6 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.1 & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.2\end{array}$
6. Drum
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 3.0 & 6.0 & 3.0 & 4.0 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 11.0 & 13.0 & 9.9 & 11.3 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.7 & 1.1 & 0.7 & 0.8\end{array}$
7. Channel Catfish
$\begin{array}{lrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 5.0 & 0.0 & 0.6 & 1.9 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 14.0 & - & 14.0 & 14.0 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 1.9 & - & 1.9 & 1.9\end{array}$
8. Green Sunfish
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 2.0 & 0.0 & 2.0 & 1.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 5.0 & - & 7.3 & 6.2 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.2 & - & 0.4 & 0.3\end{array}$
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TABLE IV (Continued)

## SPECIES COMPOSITION OF CATCH, LAKE HAMILTON

Speoies $1955 \quad 1956 \quad 1957$ Avg.
9. Rook Bass

| A. Percent of Total | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B. Average Lgth. (In.) | 7.0 | - | - | 7.0 |
| C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) | 7.3 | - | - | 0.3 |

10. Spotted Bass

| A. Peroent of Total | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B. Average Lgth. (In.) (In.) | - | 7.0 | - | 7.0 |
| C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) | - | 0.5 | - | 0.5 |

11. Redear Sunfish

| A. Percent of Total | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B. Average Lgth. (In.) | - | - | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) | - | - | 0.4 | 0.4 |

to 5.7 inohes ( 0.3 pound), 1956, to 6.3 inches ( 0.4 pound in 1957. White orappie showed up well in 1955 oonstituting $23 \%$ but deoreased to $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ in 1956 and $1 \%$ in 1957. The harvest of blaok orappie was comparatively the same in 1955 and 1956 with $15 \%$ of the total, but deolined to $2 \%$ in 1957. Intensive orappie fishing normally ocours during April and May and this period was not inoluded in the census. However, reports from fishermen revealed that orappie pishing was poor in 195\%. Longear sunfish made up $18 \%$ of the total in 1957, increasing from $2 \%$ in 1956 and $4 \%$ in 1955. Drum were reoorded all three years. In 1955, drum constituted $3 \%$; in $1956,6 \%$; and in $19573 \%$ of the total. Many drum were oaught by fishermen but released as undesirable and consequently not reoordad. Channel Catfish oomprised $5 \%$ of the oatoh in 1955; none was reoorded in 1956 and they made up $0,6 \%$ of the oatoh in 1957. Green sunfish, rook bass, spotted bass, and redear sunfish made up an average of $1.3 \%, 1.0 \%$, $0.3 \%$, and $0.1 \%$ respectively of the oreel during the three years. No yellow pike peroh (walleye) were recorded in the census although reputable sources reported four walleye oaught during the three-year
period. In earlier years, walleye were oaght in considerable numbers but the population has apparently diminished as the lake aged.

## LAKE OUACHITA

Since its impoundment in the winter and early spring of 1952-53, Lake Ouachita has provided exoellent fishing as is generally oharaoteristio of all new impoundments. By the end of the summer and continuing on through 1956, phenomenal oatohes of small size black orappie and largemouth bass were made. These oatches appeared to be made up of those fish that were stooked during the initial filling period and the first-year class spawned from the original stooking. This is especially true of the black orappie that was non-existent in the lake area prior to stooking from the Lake Hamilton Hatohery. Lake Ouaohita is apparently changing from a orappie lake to a largemouth bass lake, as the survey indicates.

Table VII shows the publio landings, together with the number of available rental boats, where fishermen were contacted. In the vioinity of each landing, there is a publio access area where private boats may be launched. On several ocasions returning fishermen were oensused at these areas. In addition to the looations listed, there are six other main access areas provided by the Corps of Engineers. No attempt was made to interview fishermen at these other aooess points.

Reference to Table VIII shows data obtained from interviewing anglers on Lake Ouachita. In 1955, the number of fish oaught per hour was 1.3. There was a deoline in 1956 with 0.75 fish per hour and in 1957 with 0.80 fish per hour. The three-year average was 0.95 fish per-man-hour. Pounds-oanght-per-hour was highest in 1955, averaging 0.66 , lowest in 1956 with 0.48 pound, and inoreasing to 0.63 in 1957. The average size of fish oaught increased in 1956 and 1957. In 1955 and 1956, live bait fishermen surpassed those using artifioial bait, but in 1957, $55 \%$ of the fishermen used artificial bait. The percentage of out-of-state fishermen increased in 1957, averaging $42 \%$ of the tctal. This was undoubtediy due to the out-of-state publicity given Lake Ouachita and inoreased tourist aooommodations. The oreation and opening of other public fishing Waters within the state that were more acoessible

## TABLE VII

## COMMERCIAL BOAT LANDINGS ON LAKE OUACHITA WHERE FISHERMEN WERE CONTACTED

| Name of Landing | Looation | Number of <br> Rentas <br> Boats |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brady Mountain Landing | South Side | 82 |
| Crystal Springs Landing | South Side | 87 |
| Denby Point Landing | South Side | 72 |
| Highway 27 Landing | West End | 50 |
| Tron Forks Landing | North Side | 50 |
| Little Fir Landing | West End | 30 |
| Mountain Harbor Landing | South Side | 82 |
| Navy Landing | North Side | 62 |
| Spiliway Landing | South Side | 50 |
| Shangri-La Landing | South Side | 60 |
| Three Sisters Landing | North Side | 50 |
| TOTAL |  |  |

to the residents of Arkansas had a tendency to attract some of the native fishermen to these waters.

Table IX gives the species composition of the oatch in Lake Ouaohita. Blaok orappie constituted the highest average percentage of all fish in the creel with an average of $43.7 \%$ of the total over the three years. Crappie were the dominant fish in the creel in 1955 and 1956. Blaok orappie comprised $48 \%$ of the oatoh in 1955, $54 \%$ in 1956, but dropped to $29 \%$ in 1957. The average size of black orappie inoreased from 10.0 inches ( 0.5 pound), in 1955, to 10.3 inohes ( 0.6 pound), in 1956, to 10.9 inches ( 0.8 pound), in 1957. In 1955, white orappie represented $6 \%$ of the oatoh and $1 \%$ in 1957. None was recorded in 1956. It is possible that early in 1955 a few blaok crappie were erroneously recorded as white orappie since black orappie were stocked in the lake and this stook appeared to acoount for the heavy harvest at this time. Largemouth bass were second in abundance in the oreel. They inoreased from $15 \%$ in 1955, to $18 \%$ in 1956 , to $38 \%$ in 1957. The average size was found to increase Published by Arkansas Academy of Science, 1959

CREEL CENSUS, LAKE OUACHITA

|  | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | Average | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Hours Cheoked | 176 | 168 | 144 |  | 488 |
| Number Fishermen |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contaoted (Trips) | 309 | 421 | 301 |  | 1031 |
| Total Fishermen-Hours | 1337 | 2150 | 1329 |  | 4816 |
| Hours Fished per Trip | 4.3 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 4.6 |  |
| Total Fish Caught | 1754 | 1608 | 1064 |  | 4426 |
| Fish Caught per Hour | 1.3 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.95 |  |
| Fish Caught per Trip | 5.7 | 3.82 | 3.53 | 4.35 |  |
| Total Weight Fish (Lbs.) | 878 | 1035.2 | 802.9 |  | 2716.1 |
| Pounds Caught per Hour | 0.66 | 0.48 | 0.63 | 0.59 |  |
| Pounds Caught per Trip | 2.90 | 2.45 | 2.34 | 2.56 |  |
| Artificial Bait Fishermen | 19\% | 44\% | 55\% | 39\% |  |
| Live Bait Fishermen <br> Period Most Fish Caught | $\begin{array}{r} 81 \% \\ 5 \text { to } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 56 \% \\ 6 \text { to } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 45 \% \\ 6 \text { to } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \% \\ & 5: 40 \text { to } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Period Most Fish Caught | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { to } \\ 11 \text { A.M. } \end{gathered}$ | 6 to $11 \mathrm{~A} \cdot \mathrm{M} \text {. }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { to } \\ & 12 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5: 40 \text { to } \\ 11: 20 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{M} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Depth Most Fish Caught | 6 to | 12 to | 4 to | 7.33 to |  |
|  | 20 ft | 25 ft | 25 ft | 23.33 ft |  |
| Fishermen from Arkansas | 72\% | 80\% | 58\% | 70\% |  |
| Out-of-State Fishermen | 28\% | 20\% | 42\% | 30\% |  |
| Successful Trips | 97\% | 92\% | 86\% | 91.67\% |  |
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## TABLE IX

SPECIES COMPOSITION OF CATCH, LAKE OUACHITA

| Species | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

1. Black Crappie
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 48.0 & 54.0 & 29.0 & 43.7 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 10.0 & 10.3 & 10.9 & 10.4 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.5 & 0.6 & 0.8 & 0.6\end{array}$
2. Largemouth Bass
A. Percent of Total $15.0 \quad 18.0 \quad 38.0 \quad 23.7$
B. Average Lgth. (In.) 10.011 .311 .711 .0
C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) 0.9 1.0 1.11 .0
3. Longear Sunfish
A. Percent of Total
B. Average Vt. (In.)
$18.0 \quad 16.8$
10.0
14.9
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.3\end{array}$
4. Bluegill Sunfish
$\begin{array}{lllllr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 8.0 & 6.0 & 20.0 & 11.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 5.0 & 6.4 & 7.7 & 6.4 \\ \text { C. Average Wit. (Lbs.) } & 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.3\end{array}$
5. White Crappie
$\begin{array}{llrrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 6.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & 2.3 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 11.0 & - & 11.3 & 11.2 \\ \text { C. Average Wit. (Lbs.) } & 0.5 & - & 0.8 & 0.7\end{array}$
6. Green Sunfish
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 3.0 & 2.0 & 0.6 & 1.9 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 6.0 & 6.8 & 7.0 & 6.6 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.5 & 0.4\end{array}$
7. Smallmouth Bass
A. Percent of Total

8. Rook Bass
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & \mathbf{1 . 2} & 0.3 & 0.0 & 0.5 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 7.0 & 7.8 & - & 7.4 \\ \text { C. Average Wit. (Lbs.) } & 0.4 & 0.5 & - & 0.5\end{array}$
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## TABLE IX (Continued)

SPECIES COMPOSITION OF CATCH, LAKE OUACHITA
Speoies 195519561957 Avg.
9. Spotted Bass
$\begin{array}{lcrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 0.0 & 1.0 & 0.2 & 0.4 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) (In.) } & - & 11.8 & 10.5 & 11.2 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & - & 0.8 & 0.9 & 0.9\end{array}$
10. Warmouth Bass
$\begin{array}{lclll}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 0.0 & 0.4 & 0.7 & 0.4 \\ \text { B. Average Igth. (In.) (In.) } & - & 6.8 & 7.0 & 6.9 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & - & 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.4\end{array}$
11. Channel Catfish
A. Percent of Total
$\begin{array}{llrl}\text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & 8.0 & 16.0 & \text { - } \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & 12.0 \\ 0.6 & 2.6 & - & 1.6\end{array}$
12. Flathead Catfish
$\begin{array}{llrrr}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 0.0 & 0.2 & 0.0 & 0.1 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) (In.) } & - & 26.6 & - & 26.6 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs. }\end{array}$
13. Walleye Pike
$\begin{array}{lcrrc}\text { A. Percent of Total } & 0.0 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.07 \\ \text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } & - & 21.0 & 24.0 & 22.5 \\ \text { C. Average Wgt. (Lbs.) } & - & 3.8 & 5.1 & 4.5\end{array}$
14. Redear Sunfish
A. Percent of Total $0.0 \quad 0.0 \quad 0.10 .03$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { B. Average Lgth. (In.) } \\ \text { C. Average } & \text { (Igt. (Lbs.) } & \text { - } & 9.0 \\ 9.0 \\ 0.4 & 0.4\end{array}$
from 10.0 inches ( 0.9 pound) in 1955, to 11.3 inches (1.0 pound) in 1956, to 11.7 inches ( 1.1 pounds) in 1957. Fishermen reported numerous small-sized largemouth bass (less than 10.0 inches) as having been oaught and subsequently released during the summer of 1955. In the early years of impoundment, many thousands of these small largemouth bass were ought and reportedily removed from the lake. Longear sunfish have long been a popular pan fish in the Ouachita River and its tributaries. In Lake http://scholarworks.uark.edu/jaas/vol13/iss1/7
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Ouachita they have grown to an especially desirable size and have as a result provided a lot of familytype fishing. In 1955, longear sunfish comprised $18 \%$ of the oatoh averaging 6.0 inches and 0.3 pound. In 1956 they made up $16 \%$ of the catoh and averaged 6.1 inohes, 0.3 pound. In 1957, their relative numbers deoreased to $10 \%$ and their average size remained about the same ( 6.2 inches, 0.3 pound). The percentage of bluegill sunfish caught in 1955 and 1956 was comparatively small but inoreased in 1957. In 1955, bluegills constituted $8 \%$, in 1956, $6 \%$ and in 1957, $20 \%$ of the total catch. The average size inoreased from 5.0 inches ( 0.2 pound) in 1955 , to 6.4 inohes ( 0.3 pound) in 1956 , to 7.7 inohes $(0.4$ pound) in 1957. In 1955 and 1956, green sunfish made up $3.0 \%$ and $2.0 \%$, respeotively, of the oreel but dropped to $0.6 \%$ in 1957. Green sunfish have reached a desirable size and have long provided good fishing in the Ouachita River. During the early years of impoundment they provided a substantial part of the lake fishing but as populations of orappie and largemouth bass inoreased, green sunfish have becomea minor part of the oatoh. Prior to impoundment, smallmouth bass were abundant in the Ouaohita River but oreel census data showed only $1.0 \%$ of the oatoh was smallmouth bass in 1955 and 1956 and $0.1 \%$ in 1957. Even though roak bass and warmouth bass are known to be present in considerable numbers in the tributaries of Lake Ouachita, their percontage of the oreel was small. In the tributary waters, they are an active fish and provide good sport fishing. The few recorded in the census were oaught in the South Fork arm of the lake. Spotted bass were not numerous, averaging $0.4 \%$ of the total. No white bass were recorded. Few ohannel and flathead oatfish were reported. This is probably due to emphasis placed on other types of fishing in this lake. An endemic population of yellow pike perch (walleye) was reported existing in the river before the lake was constructed; however, none was tabulated in the oatoh in 1955 snd only $0.1 \%$ in 1956 and 1957. No redear sunfish were recorded in 1955 and 1956 and only 0.1\% of the oatch was redear in 1957. It was believed that redear constituted a slightly larger portion of the harvest than was revealed by the oensus. Fishermen in the Avant area, a rather inaccessible region on the North side of the lake, reported oatohes of large
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## COMPARISON OF FISHING EFFORT AND SUCCESS ON THE THREE LAKES

Fishing sucoess on Leke Ouaohita, the newest lake, has been good in so far as individual fishing effort is conoerned. A new lake attraots a variety of fishermen, including family groups, and these numbers must be taken into consideration where averages are caloulated. Since party groups were more numerous on Lake Ouachita, the census data may not be truly representative of individual fishing suocess when compared with data collected from the other lakes.

Table $X$ and Figure 1 show a comparison of threeyear averages of data relative to fishing suocess. The number of hours fished per trip varied from 3.96 on Lake Catherine, to 3.54 on Lake Hamilton, to 4.60 on Lake Ouachita. Fish oanght per man-hour effort averaged 0.83 , Lake Catherine; 0.92 , Lake Hamilton; and 0.95, Lake Ouachita. Pounds oaught per hour were 0.40 on Lake Catherine, 0.50 on Lake Hamilton, and 0.59 on Lake Ouachita. The number of fish oaught per trip was greater on Lake Ouachita with 4.35 as compared with 3.24 on Lake Catherine and 3.06 on Lake Hamilton. Pounds of fish oaught per trip were likewise greater on Lake Ouachita with 2.56 as compared with 1.56 on Lake Catherine and 1.66 on Lake Hamilton. More isishermen ( $66 \%$ ) used live bait on Lake Catherine and on Lake Ouachita ( $61 \%$ ) than on Lake Hamilton (38\%). Out-of-state fishermen were comparatively few on Lake Catherine with $7.3 \%$ as compared with $39 \%$ on Lake Hamilton and $30 \%$ on Lake Ouachita. Determination of a successful fishing trip may be somewhat questionable. In this survey, a successful trip was listed where a fisherman oaught at least, one keeper fish. On this basis there were $75.7 \%$ successful trips on Lake Catherine, $78.0 \%$ on Lake Hamilton, and $91.7 \%$ on Lake Ouachita.

## COMPARISON OF SPECIES COMPOSITION

Since Lake Catherine and Lake Hamilton are old lakes, a threeyear oreel census did not necessarily show trends in species composition. On the other hand a definite charge wis noted in Lake Ouachita in that there was a reduction in the harvest of orappie in 1957 and an increase in the percentage of largemouth bass and bluegill sunfish in http://scholarworks.uark.edu/jaas/vol $13 /$ iss $1 / 7$
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## TABLE X

## THREE-YEAR AVERAGE OF DATA COLLECTED FROM CREEL CENSUS ON LAKES CATHERINE, HAMILTON, AND OUACHITA

|  | Lake <br> Cather- <br> ine | Lake <br> Hamil- <br> ton | Lake <br> Ouach- <br> ita |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hours Fished per Trip | 3.96 | 3.54 | 4.6 |
| Fish Caught per Hour | 0.83 | 0.92 | 0.95 |
| Fish Caught per Trip | 3.24 | 3.06 | 4.35 |
| Pounds Caught per Hour | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.59 |
| Pounds Caught per Trip | 1.56 | 7.66 | 2.56 |
| Artificial Bait Fishermen | $34 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Live Bait Fishermen | $66 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| Out-of-State Fishermen | $7.3 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Suocessful Trips | $75.7 \%$ | $78.0 \%$ | $91.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

the oreel for that year. In an attempt to compare species harvest in all lakes, the average percent by number of species in the oreei for three years was taken.

Table XI and Figure 2 show the three-year average of species composition. Fourteen species were represented in the creel on Lake Catherine with bluegill sunfish, largemouth bass, longear sunfish, drum, white bass, and crappie (both species), respectively, the most common. Eleven species were recorded from Lake Hamilton with largemouth bass, bluegill sunfish, orappie and longear sunfish representing the major groups. Fourteen species were recorded from Lake Ouachita with orappie, largemouth bass, longear sunfish, and bluegill sunfish comprising most of the oatch. Bluegill sunfish made up $44 \%$ of fish oaught on Lake Catherine, $30 \%$ on Lake Hamilton, and $11.3 \%$ on Lake Ouachita. Largemouth bass constituted $31.3 \%$ of the harvest on Lake Hamilton, $23.7 \%$ on Ouachita, and $13.3 \%$ on Catherine. Crappie, both black and white, made up $46.0 \%$ of the Ouachita creel, $22 \%$ of the Hamilton oreel, but only $7.0 \%$ of the fish caught in Catherine. Black orappie were the dominant orappie species in Ouachita, white crappie in Catherine, and about equal $11 \begin{aligned} & \text { y divided be tween black and white in Hamil- } \\ & \text { Published }\end{aligned}$ Published by Arkansas Academy of Science, 1959
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Fig. 1. Comparison of catch in terms of fish-per-man-hour and pounds-per-man-hour effort.

## TABLE XI

> THREE-YEAR AVERAGE OF SPECIES COMPOSITION IN THE CREEL

| Species | Percent by Number |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | Lake <br> Catherine | Lake <br> Hamilton | Lake <br> Ouachita |
|  | 13.3 | 31.3 | 23.7 |
| Spotted Bass | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Smallmouth Bass | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| White Bass | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Black Crappie | 16.0 | 10.7 | 43.7 |
| White Crappie | 6.0 | 11.3 | 2.3 |
| Channel Catfish | 0.7 | 1.9 | 0.1 |
| Flathead Catfish | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Walleyed Pike | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.07 |
| Bluegill Sunfish | 44.0 | 30.0 | 11.3 |
| Redear Sunfish | 1.7 | 0.1 | 0.03 |
| Longear Sunfish | 9.7 | 8.0 | 14.9 |
| Green Sunfish | 4.0 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| Warmouth Bass | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Rook Bass | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| Drum | 9.7 | 4.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  |

ton. On Ouachita, longear sunfish were caught in greater numbers than bluegill. Longear comprised $\mathbf{1 4 . 7 \%}$ of the oatch in Ouachita, $9.7 \%$ in Catherine, and $8.0 \%$ in Hamilton. White Bass made up $7 \%$ of the oreel in Catherine but none was recorded from the other lakes. Catching of drum was usually inoidental to the intent of the fishermen, although many were recorded in the oreels of bank fishermen. These fish are edible but not highly regarded as food. Nine and seven-tenths percent ( $9.7 \%$ ) of the oreel on Lake Catherine and $4.0 \%$ from Lake Hamilton were drum.

## METHODS OF FISHING

Fishermen using live bait out-numbered artificial bait fishermen on Lakes Catherine and Ouachita. Worms and crickets vere the most popular live bait used on Lake Catherine, since bream constituted the
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Fig. 2. Three-year average of major species composition catch.
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major portion of the fishing. Minnows and worms were used extensively on Lake Ouachita. Minnows were used primarily in fishing for orappie and worms for bream. A number of large redear sunfish were caught along the north side of Lake Ouachita in 1957. Sizeable longear sunfish were caught in the Twin Creeks area of Lake Ouachita. Minnows, worms, and gizzard shad were the types of live bait oommonly used on Lake Hamilton. Minnows were used in fishing for orappie and largemouth bass, worms for bluegill, longear and redear sunfish, and gizzard shad used as bait for largemouth bass. Gizzard shad were snagged by casting a treble hook into a surfacing school. The shad was then hooked under the dorsal fin and permitted to run deep where "jumbo" largemouth bass were often oaught. This method of fishing was usually slow but appealed to fishermen desiring to oatoh large bass.

More fishermen used artifioial than live bait on Lake Hamilton. In all lakes, more largemouth bass were taken with artificial lures. Undoubtedly, live bait was justas effective but more fishermen preferred using artificial bait. During the early part of June, most bass fishing was done by using deep running lures and fishing off points where the water was deep. During the latter part of June, July, and early August, spot oasting for largemouth bass, feeding on schools of shad near the surface, was popular. This type of fishing was started a number of years ago for white bass at a time when they were more plentiful in Lake Hamilton. Top water and shallow running lures are cast into the area as the bass break the surface for the shad. If the lure hits the proper spot at the right time, bass will usually strike the lure. Sohooling of this type usually diminishes around the first of August. During late August most bass fishing was done with deep running lures in deeper water.

Table XII gives a list of lures found to be most commonly used by artifioial bait fishermen on the three lakes. There are hundreds of lures in use, however, there seemed to be a seasonal tendency to use certain lures. Often times when new lures are first put on the market, they may be successful for a short time and then cease to be as effective as when first used. During the latter part of 1957, the plastic worm became quite popularand effective in oatching bass and replaced some of the older more established lures.
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## TABLE XII

SOME COMMONLY USED ARTITICIAL LURES

| Surface | Underwater | Deep Running | Multipurpose |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Tail | Peoo Perch | Upperman | Bomber |
| Skip Jack | River Runt | Black Eel | Water Dog |
| Luoky 13 | Hell Bender | Mr. Champ | Hawa ian Wiggler |
| Jerk Bait | Baby Zara | Plastio Worm | Shimmy Wigglex |
| Shadrac | Hot Shot | Lead Head |  |
| Devil Horse | Pan Master | Spin Fin |  |
| Jitter Bug | Mirro-lure | H \& H Spinner Bait |  |
| Chugger | Swimming Minnow |  |  |
| Zara Spook | Sonic |  |  |
| Pago Stick | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Martin } \\ & \text { Lizzard } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Crippled } \\ \text { Minnow } \end{gathered}$ | Shannon Spinner |  |  |
| Darter | Lazy Ike |  |  |
| Hula Popper | Little Mo |  |  |

Fishing around weed beds, in comparatively shallow water with worms or oriokets or using artifioial flies, was effeotive in oatching sunfish during most of the summer in Lake Catherine. In early summer orappie were caught in Spencer Bay, Tigre Bay, and in a bay west of Spencer Bay, by fishing depths of from four to twelve feet with minnows. Largemouth bass were oaught in areas off the main ohannel using deep running lures. A number of drum were recorded in the creel but these were usually incidental to fishing for the more desirable bream.

Fishing for largemouth bass with artificial bait appeared to be quite popular in Lake Hamilton during the summer months. Much of this was spot assting. Fishing for crappie was less popular during the summer months as these became more difficult to loate and catch. Fishing for sunfish was popular throughout the summer in many of the marginal areas partioularly in White Oaks Basin. Bays in
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the region of mouths of oreeks provided fair bass fishing during the warmer weather.

The number of live bait fishermen on Lake Ouachita decreased from 1955 to 1957. This was probably due to a deorease in availability of crappie and an increased effort towards largemouth bass fishing using artificial bait. Fishing sucoess for largemouth bass remained good all three years and, infaot, increased, percentage wise, in 1957. Fishing for bass off steep banks was effective in early June and August. During July, spot casting for bass in open water attracted many fishermen. Crappie fishing with minnows was conducted in sheltered wooded areas in water fifteen to twenty-five feet deep. Crappie fishing appeared to be best around Housley Point and the Avant area. Fishermen seeking miscellaneous sunfish were comparatively few on Iake Ouachita. Good catohes of longear and bluegill sunfish could be obtained around many of the shoreline areas and, particularly, in water of inundated oultivated fields.

## WEATHER CONDITIONS AND FISHING SUCCESS

Daily weather records were kept in an effort to determine what effect weather conditions might have on fishing success. Records of the weather, such as oloudy or olear, rain or fair, and barometrio readings, were made each day. Ordinarily, in Arkansas, the spring rainy season is over by the first of June, and, during the summer, rains are usually local showers or thunderstorms of short duration.

It was found that impending showers did not often discourage fishermen. The number of fishermon on a lake was slightly reduced when it was raining early in the morning, particularly during the first and middle part of the week. Over a week-end, oloudy weather or local showers seemed to have little effect on numbers of fishermen. Fishing efforts undoubtedly were curtailed during a shower but records showed as many fish oaught per-man-hour effort during inclement weather as on clear cays.

There was found to be no correlation between banometric readings and fishing success.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the results of greatest significance in this creel census lie in the comparison
of catch-per-man-hour of fishing effort and in the species composition of the oreel. The summer harvest of fish does not necessarily reflect the population size but it does indicate the oatchability of certain species during this season of the year and their relative abundance in the three lakes.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Names of fish used are the acoepted common names as listed in Amerioan Fisheries Sooiety, Speoial Publication No. 1, 1948.

