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### 1.1 Introduction

White Lough (Plate 1.1, Fig. 1.1) is located in the Erne catchment, approximately 5 km south-west of Ballybay, Co. Monaghan. The lake is situated at an altitude of 80 m a.s.l. It has a surface area of 54ha, a mean depth of $<4 \mathrm{~m}$ and a maximum depth of 6 m . The lake is categorised as typology class 6 (as designated by the EPA for the purposes of the Water Framework Directive), i.e. shallow ( $<4 \mathrm{~m}$ ), greater than 50 ha and moderately alkaline $(20-100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{CaCO} 3)$. The lake has been classed as 1 a (i.e. risk of failing to meet good status by 2015) in the WFD Characterization report (EPA, 2005).

White Lough was previously surveyed in 1969 by the Inland Fisheries Trust (IFT unpublished data) and also during 2006 by the Central and Northern Regional Fisheries Boards (Kelly et al., 2007). Bream and rudd were abundant during the 1969 survey, with pike (up to 6300 g ), perch (up to 675 g ), roach (up to 675 g ), and roach x bream hybrids also being recorded (Inland Fisheries Trust, unpublished data). During the 2006 survey, perch was the dominant species in the lake, followed by roach, bream, roach x bream hybrids, eel and tench (Kelly et. al., 2007).


Plate 1.1. White Lough (Ballybay) looking northwest across the lake


Fig. 1.1. Location map of White Lough (Ballybay) showing locations and depths of each net (outflow is indicated on map)

### 1.2 Methods

White Lough was surveyed over one night on the $31^{\text {st }}$ of August 2009. A total of three sets of Dutch fyke nets and four benthic monofilament multi-mesh (12 panel, 5-55mm mesh size) CEN standard survey gill nets (2 @ $0-2.9 \mathrm{~m}$ and 2 @ $3-5.9 \mathrm{~m}$ ) were deployed in the lake ( 7 sites). Nets were deployed in the same locations as were randomly selected in the previous survey. A handheld GPS was used to mark the precise location of each net. The angle of each gill net in relation to the shoreline was randomised.

All fish apart from perch were measured and weighed on site and scales were removed from all roach, pike, hybrids and bream. Live fish were returned to the water whenever possible (i.e. when the likelihood of their survival was considered to be good). Samples of fish were returned to the laboratory for further analysis.

### 1.3 Results

### 1.3.1 Species Richness

A total of five fish species and one type of hybrid were recorded in White Lough in August 2009, with 278 fish being captured (Table 1.1). Perch was the most abundant fish species recorded, followed by roach. During the previous survey in 2006 (Kelly, el al., 2007), the same species composition was recorded, with the exception of tench, which were present during the 2006 survey but were not captured in the current survey. However, pike were present in the current survey and were not recorded during the 2006 survey.

Table 1.1. List of fish species recorded (including numbers captured) during the survey on White Lough, August 2009

| Scientific name | Common name | Number of fish captured |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Benthic mono <br> multimesh gill nets | Fyke nets | Total |
| Perca fluviatilis | Perch | 182 | 0 | 182 |
| Rutilus rutilus | Roach | 82 | 0 | 82 |
| Rutilus rutilus $x$ | Roach x bream hybrid | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Abramis brama | Bream | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Abramis brama | Pike | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Esox lucius | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Anguilla anguilla | European eel |  |  |  |

### 1.3.2 Fish abundance

Fish abundance (mean CPUE) and biomass (mean BPUE) were calculated as the mean number/weight of fish caught per metre of net. For all fish species except eel, CPUE/BPUE is based on all nets, whereas eel CPUE/BPUE is based on fyke nets only. Mean CPUE and BPUE for all fish species are summarised in Table 1.2.

The mean CPUE of both perch and roach were lower in 2009 than 2006 (Fig. 1.2); however, these differences were not statistically significant. The differences in the mean perch CPUE and mean roach CPUE between White Lough and two other similar lakes were also assessed, with no statistically significant differences being found (Figs. 1.3 and 1.4).

Table 1.2. Mean (S.E.) CPUE and BPUE of all fish species captured on White Lough, 2006 and 2009

| Scientific name | Common name | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean CPUE |  |
| Perca fluviatilis | Perch | $1.604(0.714)$ |  | $0.867(0.416)$ |
| Rutilus rutilus | Roach | $0.673(0.291)$ | $0.390(0.161)$ |  |
| Rutilus rutilus | Roach x bream | $0.117(0.048)$ | $0.048(0.020)$ |  |
| x Abramis brama | hybrid | $0.012(0.008)$ | $0.010(0.010)$ |  |
| Abramis brama | Bream | 0 | $0.005(0.005)$ |  |
| Esox lucius | Pike | $0.003(0.003)$ |  | 0 |
| Tinca tinca | Tench | $0.011(0.011)$ |  | $0.006(0.006)$ |
| Anguilla anguilla | European eel |  | Mean BPUE |  |
|  |  | $48.831(17.800)$ |  | $27.524(10.795)$ |
| Rutilus rutilus | Roach | $36.289(14.797)$ |  | $11.867(5.182)$ |
| Perca fluviatilis | Perch | 0 |  | $11.429(11.429)$ |
| Esox lucius | Pike | $19.135(8.746)$ |  | $8.057(4.146)$ |
| Rutilus rutilus | Roach x bream | $22.466(19.455)$ |  | $0.271(0.271)$ |
| x Abramis brama | hybrid | $5.782(5.782)$ | 0 |  |
| Abramis brama | Bream | $5.556(5.556)$ | $2.628(2.628)$ |  |
| Tinca tinca | Tench |  |  |  |
| Anguilla anguilla | European eel |  |  |  |
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Fig. 1.2. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) CPUE of all fish species captured on White Lough 2006 and 2009 (Eel CPUE based on fyke nets only)


Fig. 1.3. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) perch CPUE in three lakes surveyed during 2009


Fig. 1.4. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) roach CPUE in three lakes surveyed during 2009

### 1.3.3 Length frequency distributions

Perch ranged in length from 5.0 cm to 20.5 cm (mean $=8.8 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) (Fig. 1.5). Perch captured during the 2006 survey ranged in length from 6.0 cm to 21.6 cm (Fig. 1.5) (Kelly et al., 2007). Roach ranged in length from 10.8 cm to 25.0 cm (mean $=15.4 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) (Fig.1.6). Roach captured during the 2006 survey ranged in length from 4.0 cm to 27.4 cm (Fig. 1.6) (Kelly et al., 2007). Roach x bream hybrids ranged in length from 9.2 cm to 27.3 cm . The one eel captured measured 63.5 cm in length and bream ranged in length from 11.2 cm to 13.0 cm . One pike measuring 67.5 cm was also recorded.


Fig. 1.5. Length frequency of perch captured on White Lough


Fig. 1.6. Length frequency of roach captured on White Lough

### 1.3.4 Fish age and growth

Three age classes of perch were present, ranging from $1+$ to $3+$, with a mean L 1 of 5.7 cm (Table 1.3). Perch captured during the 2006 survey ranged from $0+$ to $5+$, with a mean L1 of 6.2 cm (Kelly et al., 2007). The dominant length class in both 2006 and 2009 was 5 cm to 8 cm , corresponding to the $0+$ and $1+$ age classes (Fig. 1.5).

Six age classes of roach were present, ranging from $2+$ to $9+$, with a mean L 1 of 3.5 cm (Table 1.4). Roach captured during the 2006 survey ranged in age from $1+$ to $10+$, with a mean L1 of 2.7 cm (Kelly et al., 2007). Four age classes of roach $x$ bream hybrids were present, ranging from 3+ to 7+ (similar to the 2006 survey where they ranged in age from $2+$ to $8+$ ). Two bream were captured, both aged $2+$ and one pike was captured aged $9+$.

Table 1.3. Mean ( $\pm$ SE) perch length at age for White Lough, August 2009

|  | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | $5.7(0.1)$ | $9.6(0.2)$ | $14.9(0.6)$ |
| N | 70 | 26 | 7 |
| Range | $4.4-6.9$ | $8.1-12.2$ | $12.8-16.9$ |

Table 1.4. Mean ( $\pm$ SE) roach length at age for White Lough, August 2009

|  | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{4}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{5}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{6}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{7}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{9}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | $3.5(0.7)$ | $7.5(0.1)$ | $11.7(0.2)$ | $15.6(0.3)$ | $18.1(0.6)$ | $20.0(0.4)$ | 21.2 | 22.5 | 24.4 |
| N | 57 | 57 | 53 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Range | $2.5-5.2$ | $5.1-9.8$ | $9.0-14.4$ | $14.4-17.2$ | $16.5-19.6$ | $19.3-20.6$ | $21.2-$ | $22.5-$ | $25.4-$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 21.2 | 22.5 | 25.4 |  |

### 1.4 Summary

Perch was the dominant species in terms of abundance (CPUE) and roach was the dominant species in terms of biomass (BPUE).

The mean CPUE of perch was lower in 2009 than in 2006 however this was not statistically significant. The mean perch CPUE in White Lough was also not significantly different to other similar lakes surveyed. The dominant age class of perch was $0+$ and $1+$, with age classes ranging from $1+$ to $3+$, indicating reproductive success in each of the previous three years.

The mean CPUE of roach was also lower in 2009 than in 2006 however this was not statistically significant. The mean roach CPUE in White Lough was relatively high when compared to other similar lakes; however, this difference was not statistically significant. Roach ranged in age from 2+
to $9+$, indicating reproductive success in the last number of years. However, no $0+$ or $1+$ individuals were captured during the current survey.

Classification and assigning lakes with an ecological status is a critical part of the WFD monitoring programme. It allows River Basin District managers to identify and prioritise lakes that currently fall short of the minimum "Good Ecological Status" that is required by 2015 if Ireland is not to incur penalties.

A WFD multimetric fish classification tool has been developed for the island of Ireland (Ecoregion 17) using CFB and Agri-Food and Biosciences Northern Ireland (AFBINI) data generated during the NSSHARE Fish in Lakes project (Kelly et al., 2008). Using this tool, White Lough has been assigned a fish classification of Good status.

The EPA has assigned an overall status of Moderate to White Lough in an interim draft classification. This is based on physico-chemical parameters and biotic elements such as macroinvertebrates, macrophytes and fish.

### 1.5 References

EPA (2005) Submission in accordance with Article 5 of Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of $23^{\text {rd }}$ October 2000 establishing a framework for community action in the field of water policy, and in accordance with EC-DE Environment D. 2 document "Reporting Sheets for 2005 Reporting" dated 19 November 2004. Version 2, May 2005. Prepared by the Office of the Environment Assessment EPA, Johnstown Castle, Wexford

Kelly, F., Connor, L. and Champ T. (2007) A Survey of the Fish Populations in 46 lakes in the Northern Regional Fisheries Board, June to September 2005 and 2006. Central Fisheries Board, unpublished report.

Kelly, F.L., Harrison, A., Connor, L., Allen, M., Rosell, R. and Champ, T. (2008) FISH IN LAKES Task 6.9: Classification tool for Fish in Lakes. FINAL REPORT. Central Fisheries Board, NSSHARE project.

The Central Fisheries Board
Swords Business Campus,
Swords,
Co. Dublin, Ireland.

Web: www.wfdfish.ie
www.cfb.ie
Email: info@cfb.ie
Tel: +353 18842600
Fax: +353 18360060


[^0]:    * On the rare occasion where biomass data was unavailable for an individual fish, this was determined from a length/weight regression for that species. Standard error is displayed in brackets.

