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### 1.1 Introduction

Ross Lake is situated in the Corrib catchment, located approximately 1 km south-east of Rosscahill and 3km north-west of Moycullen, Co. Galway in a chain of lakes entering Lough Corrib at Moycullen Bay (Plate 1.1, Fig. 1.1). It has a surface area of 139 ha , a mean depth of $>4 \mathrm{~m}$, a maximum depth of 14 m and is categorised as typology class 12 (as designated by the EPA for the purposes of the Water Framework Directive), i.e. deep ( $>4 \mathrm{~m}$ ), greater than 50 ha and high alkalinity ( $>100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ CaCO3). The lake is a coarse fishery and holds stocks of roach, bream, roach $x$ bream hybrids and pike. The presence of zebra mussels was confirmed in Ross Lake in May 2007 (IFI, pers. comm.).

Ross Lake and the surrounding woodlands have been designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) for containing a hard water lake, a habitat listed on Annex I of the EU Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) (NPWS, 1999). The SAC also contains a breeding colony of the lesser horseshoe bat (Rhinolophus hipposideros), a species listed on Annex II of the same Directive. The woodlands and lakeside vegetation on the site provide foraging habitat within a small radius of the roost site (NPWS, 1999). The underlying geology of the area is limestone, with the main habitat in the SAC being Ross Lake, which has a limestone bed covered by deposits of precipitated marl and a shoreline of marlencrusted limestone boulders. The lake supports communities of Chara pedunculata and Chara curta, both of which are characteristic of marl lakes. The rocky limestone shore supports mostly fen-type vegetation characterised by Black Bog-rush (Schoenus nigricans). The site also contains otter, a species listed on Annex II of the EU Habitats Directive, and a small colony of common gull. The main land-uses within the site are angling, commercial forestry, and grazing of the woodland and wetland areas (NPWS, 1999).

Ross Lake was previously surveyed in 2007, 2010 and 2013 as part of the WFD surveillance monitoring programme (Kelly and Connor, 2007 and Kelly et al., 2011 and 2014). During the 2013 survey perch were found to be the dominant species present in the lake followed by roach and roach x bream hybrids. Bream, eels and pike were also recorded.


Plate 1.1. Ross Lake


Fig. 1.1. Location map of Ross Lake showing net locations and depths of each net (outflow is indicated on map)

### 1.2 Methods

### 1.2.1 Netting methods

Ross Lake was surveyed over two nights from the $13^{\text {th }}$ to the $15^{\text {th }}$ of September 2016. A total of three sets of Dutch fyke nets, 12 benthic monofilament multi-mesh ( 12 panel, $5-55 \mathrm{~mm}$ mesh size) CEN standard survey gill nets (BM CEN) (4 @ 0-2.9m, 4 @ 3-5.9m and 4 @ 6-11.9m) and two floating monofilament multi-mesh (12 panel, $5-55 \mathrm{~mm}$ mesh size) CEN standard survey gill nets (FM CEN) were deployed in the lake (17 sites). The netting effort was supplemented using eight two-panel benthic braided ( 63.5 mm and 88.9 mm mesh knot to knot) survey gill nets (2-PBB).

Nets were deployed in the same locations as were randomly selected in the previous survey. A handheld GPS was used to locate 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 bream, roach, roach $x$ bream hybrids and pike. 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 retained for further analysis.

### 1.2.2 Fish diet

Fish were frozen before being dissected for stomach content analysis in the IFI laboratory. Total stomach contents were inspected and individual items were counted and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible. The percentage frequency occurrence (\%O) of prey items were then calculated to identify key prey items (Amundsen et al., 1996).

$$
\% \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}=\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{N}\right) \times 100
$$

## Where:

$\% \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the percentage frequency of prey item i , $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the number of a particular species with prey i in their stomach, N is total number of a particular species with stomach contents.
1.2.3 Biosecurity - disinfection and decontamination procedures

Procedures are required for disinfection of equipment in order to prevent dispersal of alien species and other organisms to uninfected waters. A standard operating procedure was compiled by Inland Fisheries Ireland for this purpose (Caffrey, 2010) and is followed by staff on the IFI NRSP team when moving between water bodies.

### 1.3 Results

### 1.3.1 Species Richness

A total of five fish species and one type of hybrid were recorded on Ross Lake in September 2016, with 414 fish being captured. The number of each species captured by each gear type is shown in Table 1.1. Roach was the most common fish species recorded, followed by perch and roach $x$ bream hybrids. Bream, pike and eel were also recorded. During the previous surveys in 2007, 2010 and 2013 a similar species composition was recorded (Kelly and Connor, 2007 and Kelly et al., 2011 and 2014).

Table 1.1. Number of each fish species captured by each gear type during the survey on Ross Lake, September 2016

| Scientific name | Common name | Number of fish captured |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2-PBB | BM CEN | FM CEN | Fyke | Total |
| Rutilus Rutilus | Roach | 0 | 146 | 24 | 1 | 171 |
| Perca fluviatilis | Perch | 0 | 123 | 0 | 3 | 126 |
| Rutilus rutilus $x$ Abramis brama | Roach $x$ bream hybrid | 17 | 79 | 3 | 0 | 99 |
| Abramis brama | Bream | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Esox lucius | Pike | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Anguilla anguilla | European eel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

### 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 captured in the 2016 survey are summarised in Table 1.2.

The mean CPUE and BPUE (excluding the larger 88.9 mm mesh panel) for all species captured in the 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 surveys are illustrated in Figure 1.2 and 1.3.

Roach was the dominant fish species in terms of abundance (CPUE) and roach $x$ bream hybrids were the dominant fish species in terms of biomass (BPUE) (Table 1.2).

Table 1.2. Mean (S.E.) CPUE and BPUE for all fish species captured on Ross Lake, 2016

| Scientific name | Common name | Mean CPUE ( $\pm$ S.E) ${ }^{* *}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Rutilus Rutilus | Roach | $0.227(0.065)$ |
| Perca fluviatilis | Perch | $0.166(0.056)$ |
| Rutilus rutilus x Abramis brama | Roach x bream hybrid | $0.122(0.031)$ |
| Abramis brama | Bream | $0.009(0.004)$ |
| Esox lucius | Pike | $0.007(0.003)$ |
| Anguilla anguilla* | European eel* | $0.006(0.006)^{*}$ |
|  |  | Mean BPUE (土 S.E) |
| Rutilus Rutilus | Roach | $18.769(6.188)$ |
| Perca fluviatilis | Perch | $7.010(2.745)$ |
| Rutilus rutilus x Abramis brama | Roach x bream hybrid | $29.333(7.854)$ |
| Abramis brama | Bream | $9.216(4.633)$ |
| Esox lucius | Pike | $8.670(3.584)$ |
| Anguilla Anguilla* | European eel* | $0.018(0.018)^{*}$ |

Note: On the rare occasion where biomass data was unavailable for an individual fish, this was determined from a length/weight regression for that species.
*Eel CPUE and BPUE based on fyke nets only
**CPUE and BPUE data above for all fish species except eels are not comparable to earlier surveys as an extra panel was added to the 2-PBB to provide additional information on large coarse fish.

## Roach

The mean roach CPUE and BPUE fluctuated slightly over the four sampling occasions; however these differences were not statistically significant (Fig 1.2 and 1.3).

## Perch

Perch CPUE and BPUE also fluctuated over the four sampling occasions; however these differences were not statistically significant (Fig 1.2 and 1.3).


Fig. 1.2. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) CPUE for all fish species captured in Ross Lake (Eel CPUE based on fyke nets only), 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016


Fig. 1.3. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) BPUE for all fish species captured in Ross Lake (Eel BPUE based on fyke nets only), 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016

### 1.3.3 Length frequency distributions and growth

## Roach

Roach captured during the 2016 survey ranged in length from 5.3 cm to 30.0 cm (mean $=14.9 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) (Fig.1.4) with ten age classes present, ranging from $1+$ to $10+$ with a mean L 1 of 3.1 cm (Table 1.3). The dominant age class was 2+ (Fig.1.4). Roach captured during the 2010 and 2013 surveys had a similar length and age range (Fig 1.4).


Fig. 1.4. Length frequency of roach captured on Ross Lake, 2010, 2013 and 2016

Table 1.3. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) roach length (cm) at age for Ross Lake, September 2016

|  | $\mathrm{L}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{6}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{\mathbf{7}}$ | $\mathrm{L}_{8}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{9}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{10}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 3.1 | 6.7 | 10.6 | 13.7 | 16.5 | 18.4 | 20.2 | 22.6 | 24.4 | 26.0 |
| $( \pm$ S.E.) | $(0.1)$ | $(0.2)$ | $(0.2)$ | $(0.3)$ | $(0.4)$ | $(0.5)$ | $(0.4)$ | $(0.6)$ | $(1.1)$ |  |
| N | 63 | 57 | 44 | 32 | 24 | 19 | 16 | 9 | 5 | 1 |
| Range | $2.3-4.5$ | $5.4-12.4$ | $8.1-16.8$ | $9.5-16.8$ | $12.2-20.6$ | $14.5-24.0$ | $16.4-22.6$ | $18.5-24.8$ | $20.9-27.4$ | $26.0-26.0$ |

## Perch

Perch captured during the 2016 survey ranged in length from 5.0 cm to 29.9 cm (mean $=12.4 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) (Fig.1.5) with five age classes present, ranging from $0+$ to $4+$ with a mean $L 1$ of 6.3 cm (Table 1.4). The dominant age class was 3+ (Fig. 1.5). Perch captured during the 2010 and 2013 surveys had a similar length, with some larger fish recorded in those years (Fig.1.5); however the age range in the 2010 and 2013 surveys was wider than the 2016 survey (Fig 1.5).


Fig. 1.5. Length frequency of perch captured on Ross Lake, 2010, 2013 and 2016

Table 1.4. Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) perch length (cm) at age for Ross Lake, September 2016

|  | $\mathrm{L}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~L}_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean ( $\pm$ S.E.) | $6.3(0.2)$ | $11.0(0.4)$ | $15.2(0.5)$ | $19.4(1.4)$ |
| N | 42 | 35 | 26 | 9 |
| Range | $4.7-11.3$ | $8.6-18.1$ | $12.1-22.4$ | $14.5-27.8$ |

## Other fish

One eel measuring 70.5 cm was captured during the 2016 survey and bream ranged in length from 17.3 cm to 49.1 cm . Pike ranged from 17.5 cm to 67.5 cm and roach x bream hybrids ranged from 4.6 cm to 49.0 cm .

### 1.3.4 Stomach and diet analysis

Dietary analysis studies provide a good indication of the availability of food items and the angling methods that are likely to be successful. However, the value of stomach content analysis is limited unless undertaken over a long period as diet may change on a daily basis depending on the availability of food items. The stomach contents of a subsample of perch captured during the survey were examined and are presented below.

## Perch

Perch initially start to feed on pelagic zooplankton. Once they reach an intermediate size they begin feeding on benthic resources eventually moving on to feed on fish once they are large enough (Hjelm et al., 2000). A total of 49 stomachs were examined. Of these 18 were found to contain no prey items. Of the remaining 31 stomachs containing food, $48 \%$ contained unidentified digested material, 19\% fish, 26\% zooplankton and 7\% invertebrates (Fig. 1.6).


Fig 1.6. Diet of perch ( $\mathrm{n}=31$ ) captured on Ross Lake, 2016 (\% occurrence)

### 1.4 Summary and ecological status

A total of five fish species and one type of hybrid were recorded on Ross Lake in September 2016. Roach was the dominant fish species in terms of abundance (CPUE) and roach $x$ bream hybrids were the dominant fish species in terms of biomass (BPUE) captured in the survey gill nets during the 2016 survey.

The mean roach CPUE and BPUE fluctuated slightly over the four sampling occasions; however, these differences were not statistically significant. Roach ranged in length from 5.3 cm to 30.0 cm and ranged in age from 1+ to 10+, indicating reproductive success in ten of the previous eleven years. The dominant age class was 2+.

Perch CPUE and BPUE also fluctuated over the four sampling occasions; however, these differences were not statistically significant. Perch ranged in length from 5.0 cm to 29.9 cm and ranged in age from $0+$ to 4+, indicating reproductive success in each of the previous five years. The dominant age class was $3+$

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 if Ireland is not to incur penalties. A multimetric fish ecological classification tool (Fish in Lakes - 'FIL') was developed for the island of Ireland (Ecoregion 17) using IFI and Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute Northern Ireland (AFBINI) data generated during the NSSHARE Fish in Lakes project (Kelly et al., 2008). This tool was further developed during 2010 (FIL2) in order to make it fully WFD compliant, including producing EQR values for each lake and associated confidence in classification (Kelly et al., 2012b). Using the FIL2 classification tool, Ross Lake has been assigned an ecological status of Poor for 2016 based on the fish populations present. The lake was also assigned a fish status of Poor for both 2010 and 2013 and Moderate for 2007.

In the 2010 to 2015 surveillance monitoring reporting period, the EPA assigned Ross Lake an overall ecological status of Poor.
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