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STRATEGY STATEMENT

Recreational
Largemouth bass are currently being managed to provide anglers the greatest opportunity of catching trophy size fish. The potential should be high, as this is a new, fertile reservoir with abundant forage and a high percentage of Florida-strain bass present. Poverty Point was designated as a trophy lake in 2004. The trophy lake designation implies management techniques are being applied to produce largemouth bass in the 10 – 15 pound range. Recreational harvest restrictions for largemouth bass include a 15" – 19" slot limit with an 8 fish creel. Anglers are allowed to harvest only 1 bass larger than 19" in length. Required criteria for successful trophy bass management include:

1. Successful introduction of Florida-strain largemouth bass.
2. Habitat with similar environmental features as original range of the Florida largemouth bass
3. No incompatible gear conflicts
4. Long term LDWF regulatory control
5. Angler understanding and support of associated regulations
6. Harvest of smaller bass to increase available forage for remaining fish.

Sunfish and other species are managed under the maximum sustained yield scheme, which results in abundant fish for anglers and forage for bass. This can normally be achieved through proper bass management and usually won't require any other species-specific regulations. The crappie creel limit has been reduced to 25 due to concern of excessive exploitation.

Commercial
No commercial fishing gears are allowed on the lake.

Species of Special Concern
No threatened or endangered fish species are known to exist in the lake.

EXISTING HARVEST REGULATIONS

Recreational
Crappie (Pomoxis spp.) – 25 daily per person, no size restriction

Sunfish (Bluegill Lepomis macrochirus, Redear L. microlophus, etc.) – no daily limit or size restriction

Largemouth Bass (Micropterus salmoides) – 15" – 19" slot limit (all bass measuring 15.0" to 19.0" must be released immediately), 8 fish daily limit, only 1 may exceed 19"

Yellow Bass (Morone mississippiensis) and White Bass (M. chrysops) – 50 daily per person, no size restriction

Channel Catfish (Ictalurus punctatus) – 100 daily per person, 11" minimum length (25 fish below the minimum length may be harvested)
The current recreational fishing regulations may be viewed at the web address below:
http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/regulations

**Commercial**
Commercial fish netting is prohibited.

The current commercial fishing regulations may be viewed at the web address below:
http://www.wlf.louisiana.gov/regulations

**Species of Special Concern**
None

**SPECIES EVALUATION**

**Recreational**

*Largemouth Bass*

**Catch per Unit Effort and Length Frequency**-
Electrofishing is the standard sampling method used to estimate various parameters of the largemouth bass population. Standardization of sampling and analysis of numerous samples performed over a long period of time are necessary for accurate estimates of fish populations. Largemouth bass are targeted as a species indicative of the overall fish population due to their high position in the food chain. Electrofishing is the selected method for determining largemouth bass abundance and size distribution. Electrofishing is not an efficient sampling technique for large bass. Gill nets are used to provide sampling data for large bass. In the chart below (Figure 1), bass abundance for different size classes is indicated by electrofishing catch rate. Catch per unit effort (CPUE) in this case is defined as the number of bass collected during 1 hour of sampling time.
Figure 1. The catch per unit effort of largemouth bass by size class from spring electrofishing results on Poverty Point Reservoir, LA, 2002 – 2014.

The above chart depicts what would normally be expected from a new reservoir with an expanding fish population: abundant small fish, with increasing numbers of larger fish over subsequent years. Year to year differences have little significance, but the longer term trends show that the population has become well established and appears properly balanced.

The following size distribution charts (Figure 2) show how the bass population has become more stabilized since the opening of the lake. In 2002, small fish dominated the population. The 2003 sample shows a fairly well distributed population before angling has had an effect. The number of large bass over 16 inches has steadily increased, while recruitment of smaller fish appears to be sufficient.

Figure 2. The largemouth bass size distributions (inch groups) from spring electrofishing samples on Poverty Point Reservoir, LA, for years ’02, ’03, ’04, ’05, ’07, and ’08.

Largemouth bass size distributions (inch groups) from electrofishing samples taken in 2012 and 2014 are shown below (Figures 3 and 4). The population appears to be normally distributed in 2012, with most inch groups represented. Smaller size fish were mostly missing from the 2014 sample, though the overall sample size was low (n = 55). This could also indicate poor recruitment of bass from 2012 – 2014. If these age classes are actually under-represented in the population, it is unclear whether this would be due to low spawning success or low survival of offspring. Sampling bias, especially with a low sample size, is also a possibility. The actual distribution may also be skewed
towards larger size fish, considering that electrofishing typically does not effectively sample that portion of the bass population.

Figure 3. The length frequency distribution for Largemouth bass from Poverty Point Reservoir, LA collected by electrofishing in spring (n=90) and fall (n=71) 2012.

Figure 4. The length frequency distribution for Largemouth bass from Poverty Point Reservoir, LA collected by electrofishing in spring (n=37) and fall (n=18) 2014.

Stock Density
Proportional stock density (PSD) and relative stock density (RSD) are indices used to numerically describe length-frequency data. Proportional stock density compares the number of fish of quality size (greater than 12 inches for largemouth bass) to the number of bass of stock size (>8 inches in length). The PSD is expressed as a percent. A fish population with a high PSD consists mainly of larger individuals, whereas a population with a low PSD consists mainly of smaller fish. Values for PSD, RSD_{preferred} (15” and greater), and RSD_{memorable} (20” and greater) are shown in the table below (Table 1). Fish exceeding 20
inches in length began showing up in 2005 samples. Ideal PSD and RSD values for largemouth bass range from 40-70 and 10-40, respectively.

Table 1. Largemouth bass stock density values from spring and fall electrofishing on Poverty Point Reservoir, LA from 2002 – 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Date</th>
<th>PSD</th>
<th>RSD_p</th>
<th>RSD_m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graph (Figure 5) compares the PSD and RSD_{preferred} for largemouth bass sampled by electrofishing from 2002 through 2012. As shown in the table above, 2014 values are exceptionally high. Recent values have been in the upper range or above what is considered desirable. These values could be an indication of low reproductive success or survival of small bass. Another possible explanation for the high values is that the lack of shoreline cover at some sample locations in Poverty Point is not attractive to smaller bass, thus underestimating their abundance. The slot limit, which protects bass between 15 and 19 inches, may also be affecting the size distribution of the population.
Figure 4. The Size structure indices (proportional stock density and relative stock density) values for largemouth bass from Poverty Point Reservoir, LA for spring electrofishing, 2002 –2012.

Age and Growth
The following graph (Figure 5) shows length at age of capture for largemouth bass from 2005 and 2008 fall collections. Largemouth bass in Poverty Point have grown at a very rapid rate, which is to be expected in a new reservoir located in the fertile Mississippi Alluvial Valley. Age, growth, and mortality results collected during the 2010 – 2012 stock assessment study are shown in Appendix A. Growth rates were slightly less during the study, but still considered to be fast growing.

Figure 5. The length at age of capture for largemouth bass from fall electrofishing on Poverty point Reservoir, LA in 2005 (n=76) and 2008 (n=88).

Genetics
Recent genetic samples (since 2005) show that over 50% of the bass population is being influenced by Florida strain genomes (Table 2). Stocking programs are considered successful when over 30% of the bass population contains these genetics. LDWF sampling and stocking efforts will be conducted to monitor and maintain a target level of at least 30% Florida influence in Poverty Point largemouth bass.

Table 2. Summary of genetic sampling conducted on largemouth bass from Poverty Point Reservoir, LA from 2001 – 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NLMB</th>
<th>FLMB</th>
<th>NLMB x FLMB</th>
<th>Total FLMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Largemouth Bass Stock Assessment
A three-year stock assessment study on largemouth bass was initiated in 2010. A summary is provided in Appendix A. The study involved intensive sampling in spring and fall, and included genetics, age and growth, and mortality analyses. A recreational creel survey was completed in 2012 to assess angler fishing mortality on the bass population. The primary purpose for this study was to provide information to assist in the management of largemouth bass in Poverty Point.

The following is a summary of the findings of the largemouth bass stock assessment study: Length distribution, age structure, growth rate, and mortality rate were found to be at levels that provide a stable LMB population in Poverty Point Reservoir. The population is much more influenced by natural factors than by fishing related mortality. The current LMB regulation was implemented to use angler harvest as a management tool to increase the abundance of bass larger than 19”. Angler harvest is critical for effectiveness of the regulation, but the results of this project indicate that Poverty Point Reservoir LMB harvest is lacking. Anglers are not utilizing the current Poverty Point Reservoir LMB regulations as a management tool. Further, if Poverty Point Reservoir anglers remain hesitant to harvest LMB, the effectiveness of any size regulation as a management tool would be severely limited.

Forage
Forage availability is measured through shoreline haul seine sampling and indirectly through measurement of largemouth bass body condition or relative weight. Relative weight (Wr) is the ratio of a fish’s weight to the weight of a “standard” fish of the same length. The index is calculated by dividing the weight of a fish by the standard weight for its length, and multiplying the quotient by 100. Low largemouth bass relative weights (<80) indicate a potential problem with forage availability.

In Poverty Point Reservoir, sunfish and shad are the primary largemouth bass forage. These fish are very abundant and benefit from the high natural fertility of the reservoir. Relative weights for various size groups of LMB are given below (Figure 6) for years 2002 – 2012. To avoid bias from variation as a result of spawning, samples were collected in the fall. The majority of the relative weights exceed 100%, indicating sufficient forage in Poverty Point Reservoir. Relative weights have been exceptional for the most part with nearly all size fish exceeding 100% Wr in the fall. The value of 86 for “quality” size bass in 2014 has been the lowest thus far, though this was estimated from a low sample size (n=5).

![Figure 6. The relative weights for three size classes of largemouth bass from fall electrofishing on Poverty Point Reservoir, LA, 2002 – 2014.](image)

**Crappie**

Crappies have been sampled in Poverty Point Reservoir with the use of lead nets. Both black and white crappie are found in the reservoir. Black crappie were the dominant species just after the reservoir was filled, but white crappies have become more abundant since 2004, now comprising over 90% of the crappie population. The following chart (Figure 7) shows size distribution (length) of black and white crappie for all inch groups in 2004, when crappies were first sampled in Poverty Point Reservoir. The CPUE is the sum of 4 different mesh sized nets fished simultaneously, given in total catch per hour. The mesh sizes were 0.5", 1.0", 1.5", and 2.0" measured knot to knot.
Figure 7. Size distribution in inch groups of the crappie population from Poverty Point Reservoir, LA, results estimated from lead net sampling in Fall 2004 (n=279).

The above chart shows a normally distributed population of white crappie and a few mostly large black crappies. Reproduction of black crappie seems to be impaired as very few small fish were captured. The few large fish probably represent the original population of black crappie that was introduced into the lake during impoundment. The physical characteristics of the lake are probably more suitable to white crappie, as they can endure turbid conditions better than black crappie.

Charts depicting size distribution (inch groups) for both black and white crappie in 2006* (Figure 8) and 2008 (Figure 9) are shown below. These fish were collected in 1.0 inch lead nets only. The 1.0 inch nets have become the standardized crappie sampling gear of LDWF.

*the experimental nets of 0.5, 1.5, and 2.0 inch were also used in 2006, and that data is available.

Figure 8. The size distribution in inch groups of the crappie population from Poverty Point Reservoir, LA, from lead net sampling in fall 2006 (n=500).
The CPUE was lower in 2008 for all sizes of crappie, although the distribution of the population among size classes appears normal. Only a very small number of 8 and 9 inch black crappie showed up in both samples.

The latest crappie sample conducted in 2012 with 1.0 inch lead nets revealed a healthy and balanced crappie population, comprised mostly of white crappie. Nearly all inch groups were represented in the size distribution (Figure 10) of the population sample. The bimodal distribution may be the result of only two age classes dominating the population or excessive mortality of mid-size fish. The PSD and RSD_\text{preferred} values of 40 and 67, respectively, are considered desirable. Length distributions from samples conducted during the crappie stock assessment study in 2010 and 2011 are shown in the summary of this study in Appendix B.
In 2009, LDWF conducted a tag-return study to determine the rate of angler harvest on crappie in Poverty Point Reservoir. The study was initiated because of continued angler concern of excessive harvest, and to get an accurate estimate of angler-induced mortality on the crappie population. A total of 243 crappie were tagged in early 2009 and 135 tags were returned by anglers by May 31. Exploitation was estimated at 59.3%, assuming a 10% non-reporting rate and no mortality. The abstract of this study, which was published in the 2011 Proceedings of the Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Conference, is attached in Appendix C.

Crappie Stock Assessment
An assessment of the crappie population in Poverty Point Reservoir was conducted from 2010 – 2012. A summary of this study is found in Appendix B and the results are summarized as follows: The Poverty Point crappie population is much more influenced by fishing related mortalities than by natural factors. If natural mortality remains constant, no increase in crappie yield should be expected from the protection of a 10” or 12” minimum length limit. Moreover, the required release rates associated with both minimum length limits (1% and 89% respectively) would be poorly received by anglers that pursue crappie for food. The reduction in daily creel necessary for any impact would also have poor angler acceptance. No change could be expected unless the creel limit is lower than the average angler’s catch of 2.8 fish per day. Size distribution, recruitment levels, and fish condition were found to be at levels that indicate a stable and healthy crappie population in Poverty Point Reservoir. The fishery is currently managed with no size restrictions and a 25 fish per day harvest limit. Given the dynamics of this crappie population and fishery, no change in angler harvest regulation is recommended.

Channel Catfish

Over 75,000 Channel Catfish were stocked into the lake on different occasions in 2003 and 2004. Many of these original fish quickly reached large sizes, with several exceeding 10 lbs. being captured during sampling. The catfish soon began reproducing and have become very abundant in the lake. Lead nets have proven to be an efficient tool for capturing and assessing the channel catfish population. The following chart (Figure 11) shows a size distribution of channel catfish captured during lead net (1.0 in.) sampling in 2012. The values given are the total number of catfish caught in 288 net-hours of lead net sampling. The current channel catfish population has an abundance of desirable-size fish.
Commercial
There are an abundance of commercial species in Poverty Point Reservoir, though no commercial fishing is currently allowed. Species documented during sampling include common carp *Cyprinus carpio*, channel catfish, blue catfish *I. furcatus*, buffalo *Ictiobus* spp., and freshwater drum *Aplodinotus grunniens*. Gill net sampling conducted in 2014 revealed a significant population of several commercially important species. Table 3 shows the CPUE from this sample. The most abundant of these species were common carp, smallmouth buffalo *Ictiobus bubalus*, both channel and blue catfish and both spotted *Lepisosteus platostomus* and longnose *L. osseus* gar, and freshwater drum. This was the first sample of any type to show blue catfish to be of significant abundance.

Table 3. Catch per unit effort (CPUE) of commercially important species from 2014 gill net sampling in Poverty Point Reservoir, LA. CPUE is number per 100ft. net per net night.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>CPUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Carp</td>
<td>10.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo species*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Catfish</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Catfish</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Gar</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longnose Gar</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater Drum</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Smallmouth and black buffalo *Ictiobus niger*
Species of Special Concern - none

CREEL SURVEYS

Self-Clearing Creel (Sept. '03 – March '04)
Each vehicle entering the State Park was given a questionnaire to be filled out upon completion of a fishing trip. Details of this survey are given in Part A of the Poverty Point Management Plan. Information from 585 trips was obtained. The average number of anglers per trip was 1.7. The following Table 4 shows monthly summaries for number of trips and fish caught.

Table 4. The number of fishing trips and fish caught and harvested by month on Poverty Point Reservoir, LA for 2003 – 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass Trips</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Caught</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crappie Trips</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crappie Harvested</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>8,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 50% of the bass caught were in the slot limit and released. In the months of September, October, February, and March, 21% to 38% of the largemouth bass caught were of legal harvest size and released. The bass angling effort was very low in the other months, whereas crappie angling was very popular. Crappie anglers averaged 9.6, 15.2, 11.1, and 8.7 crappie per trip respectively, from November to February.

2005 Recreational Angler Creel
A non-uniform, random access-point creel survey was conducted throughout 2005 at the south and north boat ramps. The survey was designed to provide monthly estimates of catch, harvest, and release by species. Six surveys were conducted each month, with the length of the survey period being 5 hours. Surveys were done in both the morning and afternoon with morning surveys beginning 2 hours after sunrise and afternoon surveys beginning 4 hours before sunset. Anglers were asked the following questions: duration of trip, species fished for, how many kept and released, how far they drove, and their opinion of the current fish regulations on Poverty Point. A minimum of 10 fish of each species kept were measured to total length (bass, crappie), or inch group (all others). A total of 423 interviews were completed throughout the creel period. There were an estimated 14,500 angler trips in 2005. The harvest data is available upon request.

2008 Recreational Angler Creel
The 2008 survey was done identically to the 2005 survey except that only 3 surveys per month were conducted in the months of August to December instead of 6. A total of 377 interviews were conducted on 53 survey days. There was an estimated 27,755 angler hours (10.2 hrs. /acre). Anglers fishing for bass caught 0.7 bass/hr. for an estimated total catch of 21,365 bass with 7,389 being released. Anglers fishing for crappie comprised 57% of the total interviews and spent 15,080 hours fishing for crappie. They harvested an estimated
14,779 crappies or 0.76/hr. Bluegill and channel catfish were also harvested frequently by anglers.

2009 Crappie Exploitation Study Creel
A creel survey in conjunction with the crappie exploitation study was conducted in similar fashion to the standardized creel surveys previously conducted on Poverty Point, with the exception that no surveys were conducted June – September due to the low amount of crappie angling during this period. A total of 348 interviews of crappie angling parties were conducted in 48 surveys. Crappie anglers comprised 67% of all angling parties. There were an estimated 23,866 angler hours directed toward crappie (21.8 hrs./ha or 9.1 hrs./ac). Anglers harvested an average of 6.3 crappies per trip or 1.33 per hour which expanded to a total of 30,462 crappie during the creel period. Only 3% of anglers had harvested the legal limit of 25 crappies/day and the mean length of harvested crappie was 290 mm (11.4 in.). The survey also revealed that 89% of crappie anglers were satisfied with the current crappie regulations on Poverty Point.

2012 Population Assessment Creel Survey
This creel survey was a necessary component of the 3-year population assessment study for crappies and largemouth bass. The information collected was used to assess the angling mortality component of the fisheries. The survey was conducted in similar fashion to the 2005 survey described above. A total of 285 interviews were conducted during 52 survey days. Creel survey results indicate that 13% of interviewed anglers were primarily fishing for largemouth bass and 54% were fishing for crappie. Bass anglers caught 0.97 bass per trip but harvested only .01 bass per trip. The results suggested that bass anglers voluntarily release a much larger percentage of LMB than they harvest (92% of legal size fish are released). Survey results indicated that 72% of crappie anglers harvested from 1 - 10 crappie per trip, while 25% of these anglers harvested no crappie at all. The average annual harvest rate for Poverty Point crappie was 2.8 fish per crappie angler per trip.

HABITAT EVALUATION

Aquatic Vegetation
Submerged vegetation in Poverty Point is primarily limited to pondweed (Potamogeton spp.) along the shoreline. Even though there is ample shallow water in the reservoir, the high turbidity (visibility less than 14 inches) prevents excessive growth of submerged species. Emerged species include water pennywort (Hydrocotyle umbellata), and water primrose (Ludwigia repens). Water hyacinth (Eichhornia crassipes) has also appeared on the lake in small patches but has been controlled with herbicide applications. All aquatic vegetation in Poverty Point Reservoir is restricted to shallow shoreline areas. Hydrilla (Hydrilla verticillata) was first observed in a cove near the northeast corner of the lake in 2006. It was successfully treated with granular endothall and has not been observed elsewhere in the lake.

Recent vegetation control has involved herbicide application on floating and emergent species in a few shallow protected coves around the lake. In 2009, a total of 52 acres were treated [water hyacinth = 42, alligator weed (Alternanthera philoxeroides) = 10]. No herbicide applications were necessary in 2010 and 2011. A total of 31 acres were treated
(alligator weed = 20, primrose = 6, pennywort = 5) in 2012. A total of 13 acres of emergent vegetation was treated in 2013, while no treatments were necessary in 2014 and 2015. These species have typically been treated with 2,4-D (0.5 gal/acre) and/or glyphosate (0.75 gal/acre) when a waiver is required (March 15 – September 15). Imazapyr (0.5 gal/acre) has become the primary herbicide for alligator weed control in undeveloped areas. Near homes and developed shorelines, imazamox (0.5 gal/acre) is used because it is not harmful to non-target species.

Substrate
Prior to impoundment, the topsoil was removed from the lake bottom, leaving a soil high in clay content. Much of the lake bottom should be suitable for the spawning of nest building fish, including bass and sunfish. The substrate will become softer over time and less suitable for spawning. Prior to impoundment, nine sand beds were placed in protected locations to provide adequate spawning substrate in the future. The sand beds were recommended to be around 4,000 ft² in size.

Artificial Structure
Prior to impoundment, approximately 50 large piles of woody debris were constructed throughout the lake bottom prior to impoundment. They were covered in dirt in such a way to prevent floating. These structures serve as the major offshore fish habitats, especially in the open main lake area. The tops of many of the piles can be seen sticking up slightly above the surface, but the majority must be located with the use of sonar and/or a global positioning system.

CONDITION IMBALANCE / PROBLEM

Common carp, bullhead catfish, and buffalo have become very abundant in the lake, this being determined through observations and gill netting. The invasive carp have a reputation for lowering water quality and destroying the spawning habitat of game species. Bullheads feed on a multitude of prey items and compete with more desirable species. Buffalo can destroy nests of game fish and may also contribute to lake turbidity. The impact of these species is not known yet but could potentially be detrimental to populations of other species.

CORRECTIVE ACTION NEEDED

There are no practical means of eradicating the above mentioned species from the lake. A proposal to establish a limited commercial fishing season in Poverty Point will be sent to the LDWF Commission for review in 2016. The proposed season would be open from October 1 through the last day of February. Only gill and trammel nets with 3.5 inch square mesh or larger would be allowed.
1. Continue scheduled standardized sampling.

2. Continue stocking of Florida largemouth bass to maintain at least 30% Florida genetic influence as indicated by LDWF sampling.

3. Utilize results of the recently completed stock assessment studies conducted on largemouth bass and crappie to determine if current regulations are achieving fisheries goals.

4. Plan annual meetings with Poverty Point State Park staff and the Poverty Point Reservoir District to present sampling results and discuss management.

5. Continue efforts for an artificial reef project with Reservoir District.

6. Treat nuisance floating and emergent vegetation as needed. Emergent species should be treated with glyphosate (0.75 gal/acre) or diquat (0.75 gal/acre). Water hyacinth should be treated when observed by spray crews. It should be treated with 2,4-D (0.5 gal/acre) when outside of the waiver period (March 15 – September 15) and with glyphosate (0.75 gal/acre) during this period. Alligator weed should be controlled with imazapyr (0.5 gal/acre) in undeveloped areas and imazamox (0.5 gal/acre) near homes and developed shorelines.
Every fish population is the product of a unique set of influences, both natural and man-induced. A thorough understanding of those influences and the corresponding population response is essential to good fisheries management. As part of a statewide effort, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) recently completed a study to describe the Poverty Point Reservoir largemouth bass (LMB) population. The project included data collection over a three year period from 2010 – 2012. Population dynamics including relative abundance, spawning success, growth, body condition, mortality, and longevity were measured. Poverty Point Reservoir anglers were also surveyed to determine their collective influence on the LMB population.

Electrofishing gear was used by fisheries biologists to collect LMB from Poverty Point Reservoir each spring of the study. Length and weight measurements were recorded for each fish and ear bones (called otoliths) were removed from approximately 84% of the sampled fish for age and growth analyses. Annual growth rings on the otoliths provide an accurate measurement of fish age. Size and age for all of the sample fish were combined to generate estimates of average growth rate and longevity. Angler surveys were conducted during the sample period to document fishing effort, angler catch rate and harvest rates.

Figure 1 illustrates that Poverty Point Reservoir supports a healthy bass population with some LMB reaching 23 inches. Good representation of fish in the 12 to 20 inch range was observed in all three years of the project. It is important to note that spring sampling typically does not include fingerling size bass. However, the recurring presence of small 4 to 9 inch (age-1) bass indicates successful reproduction.

Age structure of the complete electrofishing sample (2010-2012) is shown in Figure 2. Age-1 and age-2 bass comprised 45% of the total sample. The majority of the age 9+ fish were males. While bass up to 11 years old were found, only a small percentage of Poverty Point Reservoir LMB were 8 years and older. Average length at age for Poverty Point Reservoir bass is provided in Table 1. Growth is rapid through age-5, and then slows to only a half inch or less in length per year.

Body condition for Poverty Point Reservoir bass can be described as very robust. Good physical condition of bass generally is the product of an adequate food supply that is readily available to predation.

Table 1. Length at age of Poverty Point Reservoir largemouth bass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length in Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment of age-1 LMB in Poverty Point Reservoir is moderately stable. Contributing factors include quality spawning substrate and adequate cover for fingerlings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>CPUE (Bass Per Electrofishing Hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The age structure of Poverty Point Reservoir Bass.

The rate at which fish die each year is referred to as mortality. Mortality consists of two parts: natural mortality (predation, disease) and fishing mortality (angler harvest and discard mortality). Results of the study indicate that the total mortality rate for Poverty Point Reservoir LMB is lower than ten other recently sampled Louisiana lakes at 34% per year. The following example is provided to illustrate the effect: at 34% mortality, if you start with 100 age-1 Poverty Point Reservoir bass, 19 will remain alive by age 5.

The results of this study suggest that the Poverty Point Reservoir LMB population has a total mortality that is much more influenced by natural factors than by fishing related mortalities (31% natural and 3% fishing, respectively). The fishing mortality rate comes from two sources; 1) harvest and 2) discard (post release) mortality. Creel survey results indicate that 13% of interviewed anglers were primarily fishing for largemouth bass. The results also suggest that these same bass anglers voluntarily release a much larger percentage of LMB than they harvest (92% of legal size fish are released).

SUMMARY
It is important to note that LMB populations and their fisheries are not only influenced by fishing effort, but also by human and environmental factors. The type and degree of human activity within watersheds, riparian zones, and specific waterbodies can affect LMB populations by altering critical habitats. Additional factors influencing LMB populations include aquatic vegetation coverage, water level management, supplemental LMB stocking programs, and habitat improvements. The frequency of floods, drought, and storms can also influence LMB populations. While consideration of these factors are important in effective fisheries management, evaluating how these factors affect the Poverty Point Reservoir LMB population/fishery is beyond the scope of this report.

Length distribution, age structure, growth rate, and mortality rate were found to be at levels that provide a stable LMB population in Poverty Point Reservoir. The population is much more influenced by natural factors than by fishing related mortalities. The current LMB regulation was implemented to use angler...
harvest as a management tool to increase abundance of bass larger than 19”. Angler harvest is critical for effectiveness of the regulation, but the results of this project indicate that Poverty Point Reservoir LMB harvest is lacking. Anglers are not utilizing the current Poverty Point Reservoir LMB regulations as a management tool. Further, if Poverty Point Reservoir anglers remain hesitant to harvest LMB, the effectiveness of any size regulation as a management tool would be severely limited.

* West, Joe, S. Beck, and D. Davis. 2013. Poverty Point Reservoir largemouth bass: population and fishery characteristics with size regulation simulations. Fisheries Research and Assessment Section. LDWF.
Every fish population is the product of a unique set of influences, both natural and man-induced. A thorough understanding of those influences and the corresponding population response is essential to good fisheries management. As part of a statewide effort, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) recently completed a study to describe the Poverty Point black crappie and white crappie (crappie) populations. The project included data collection over a three year period from 2010 – 2012. Population dynamics including relative abundance, spawning success, growth, body condition, mortality, and longevity were measured. Anglers were also surveyed to determine their collective influence on the crappie population.

Leadnet fishing gear was used to collect crappie each fall. Length and weight measurements were recorded for each fish and ear bones (called otoliths) were removed from approximately 31% of the sampled fish for age and growth analyses. Annual growth rings on the otoliths provide an accurate measurement of fish age. Since both species of crappie are managed under the same harvest regulations, size and age for all of the sample fish were combined to generate estimates of average growth rate and longevity. Angler surveys were conducted during 2012 to document fishing effort, angler catch rate and harvest rates.

Figure 1 illustrates that Poverty Point supports a healthy crappie population with some individual crappie reaching at least 15 inches. Six to 12 inch fish were observed in all three years of the project. It is important to note that fall leadnet sampling typically does not include young-of-the-year size crappie. However, the recurring presence of small 5 to 10 inch (age-1) crappie indicates successful reproduction from the previous year.
Figure 1. Length distributions of crappie collected from Poverty Point Reservoir during fall leadnet surveys in 2010-2012. Sample sizes (n) are presented in each graphic.

Age structure of the complete leadnet sample (2010-2012) is shown in Figure 2. Ninety-three percent of the total sample was comprised of age-0 and age-1 crappie. While crappie up to 4 years of age were found, only a small percentage of crappie were 2 years and older. Average age at length is provided in Table 1. Growth is extremely rapid through age-2, but then slows to only two inches or less in length per year.

Body condition for Poverty Point crappie can be described as robust. Good physical condition of crappie generally is the product of an adequate food supply that is readily available to predation.

Poverty Point crappie exhibited moderately stable recruitment to age-1 during the three year study. Consistently favorable spawning conditions for crappie are attributed.

Figure 2. The age structure of Poverty Point Reservoir crappie 2010 - 2012.
Table 1. Average age at length for Poverty Point Reservoir crappie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Length in Inches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rate at which fish die each year is referred to as mortality. Mortality consists of two parts: natural mortality (predation, disease) and fishing mortality (angler harvest and post-release mortality). Results of the study indicate that the total mortality rate for crappie is high (93%) when compared to other recently sampled Louisiana waterbodies. The following example is provided to illustrate the effect. At 93% mortality, if you start with 100 age-1 fish, 7 will remain alive by age-2, and less than one fish will remain alive by age-3.

The results of this study suggest that the Poverty Point crappie population has a total mortality that is much more influenced by fishing mortality than by natural factors (63% and 30%, respectively). The fishing mortality rate was determined to be 63% per year. This rate comes from two sources; 1) harvest and 2) post release mortality.

Louisiana crappie fisheries are described as harvest oriented. According to the 2000 Louisiana Crappie Fishing Survey, 74% of crappie anglers reported that they harvested crappie for food. The size distribution of angler harvested crappie from Poverty Point during 2012 is shown in Figure 3. While some small crappie were observed in the surveys, most were 8 inches and larger in length with 9 to 12 inch crappie dominating the catch. Survey results also indicated that 72% of crappie anglers harvested from 1-10 crappie per trip, while 25% of the anglers harvested no crappie at all (Figure 3). The average annual harvest rate for Poverty Point crappie was 2.8 fish per crappie angler per trip.

Population simulations illustrating the effects of two theoretical size regulations were calculated using the 93% mortality rate determined for Poverty Point crappie. Estimated effects from a 10”minimum length limit (MLL) are negligible. Due to the rapid growth rate of Poverty Point crappie, angler catch is already
mostly comprised of crappie larger than 10”. Anglers would be required to release 89% of fish caught under a 12” MLL and harvest per trip would be reduced by 63%.

SUMMARY

It is important to note that crappie populations and their fisheries are not only influenced by fishing effort, but also by anthropogenic and environmental factors. The type and degree of human activity within watersheds, riparian zones, and specific waterbodies can affect crappie populations by altering critical habitats. Additional factors influencing crappie populations include aquatic vegetation coverage, water level management, and habitat improvements. The frequency of floods, drought, and hurricanes can also influence crappie populations. While consideration of these factors is important in effective fisheries management, evaluating how these factors affect the Poverty Point crappie population and fishery is beyond the scope of this report.

This population is much more influenced by fishing related mortalities than by natural factors. If natural mortality remains constant, no increase in crappie yield should be expected from the protection of a 10” or 12” minimum length limit. Moreover, the required release rates associated with both minimum length limits (1% and 89% respectively) would be poorly received by anglers that pursue crappie for food. The reduction in daily creel necessary for any impact would also have poor angler acceptance. No change could be expected unless the creel limit is lower than the average angler’s catch of 2.8 fish per day.

Size distribution, recruitment levels, and fish condition were found to be at levels that indicate a stable and healthy crappie population in Poverty Point Reservoir. The fishery is currently managed with no size restrictions and a 25 fish per day harvest limit. Given the dynamics of this crappie population and fishery, no change in angler harvest regulation is recommended.

* West, Joe, S. Beck, and D. Davis. 2013. Poverty Point Reservoir crappie: population and fishery characteristics with size regulation simulations. Fisheries Research and Assessment Section. LDWF.
APPENDIX C: Abstract of Crappie Exploitation Study

An Analysis of Exploitation and Harvest of White Crappie in Poverty Point Reservoir, Louisiana
Ryan S. Daniel, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Inland Fisheries Division, 368 CenturyLink Dr., Monroe, LA 71203.

Abstract
Because of growing angler concern regarding excessive crappie (Pomoxis spp.) harvest in Poverty Point Reservoir, Louisiana, we estimated exploitation rate of white crappie (P. annularis) from 1 January – 31 May, 2009, and gathered data on angler characteristics throughout the year at this relatively new reservoir. A reward-tag approach was utilized to assess exploitation, while angler characteristics were determined through a stratified, random, access-point creel survey. White crappie (N=243) were tagged from January – March 2009 with Floy T-bar anchor tags labeled with REWARD and a sequential tag number. A total of 135 tagged crappie were harvested and reported by anglers by May 31, 2009. Exploitation was estimated at 59.3% based on the assumption of a 10% non-reporting rate and no mortality, but could have exceeded 70% if tagging mortality or non-reporting were higher than estimated. The creel survey revealed that crappie anglers harvested 1.33 crappie per hour, with an average total length of 290 mm. Angler effort for crappie was estimated at 21.8 hrs./ha within the eight-month creel period. Fishing mortality and harvest data obtained from this study will supplement future age and growth data to obtain an accurate assessment of total annual mortality, and be utilized in simulations to model the effects of various harvest regulations on the crappie population in Poverty Point Reservoir. This study will also be used as a model in the investigation of specialized crappie management in Louisiana.