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## ABSTRACT

Ryan, P. M. 1980. Fishes of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador. Fish. Mar. Serv. Tech. Rep. 922: vii + 189 p.

The fish populations and water quality of five sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, were surveyed from June to August, 1975-76; prior to the proposed creation of the Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs. Overall, the fish habitat was characterized by very soft water having a pH of 6.3 , a conduc.tance of $18.9 \mu \mathrm{mhos} / \mathrm{cm}$, a total hardness of 8 ppm , a total alkalinity of 6 ppm , a calcium concentration of 1.4 ppm , a turbidity of 3.4 JTU , and a chloride concentration of 0.8 fpm . Fish species captured in gillnets during the survey were, in order of relative abundance by weight, northern pike, lake whitefish, longnose suckers, white suckers, brook trout, burbot, lake trout, ouananiche, round whitefish, lake chub, and rainbow smelt. In addition, threespine sticklebacks and a species of sculpin were identified in stomach contents. The relative abundance, growth rates, sex ratios, and stomach contents of species captured varied from section to section throughout the river. Detailed information on the relative abundance and biology of the individual species throughout the river are included in this report. Long-term potential fish yields were estimated to be $1.01 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr}$ or $20,099 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{yr}$ in the proposed Gull Island Reservoir and $1.26 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr}$ or $12,474 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{yr}$ in the proposed Muskrat Falls Reservoir. In each reservoir, just over half of the potential yield estimated was comprised of longnose and white suckers. Of greatest potential impact of impoundment upon fish populations in the proposed reservoirs are fluctuating water levels and increased sedimentation.

Key words: abundance, food, growth, maturity, mortality, potential yield, reservoirs, sex ratios

Ryan, P. M. 1980. Fishes of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador. Fish. Mar. Serv. Tech. Rep. 922: vii +189 p.

Avant la création des réservoires de Gull Island et Musskrat Falls, la population des poissons et la qualité de l'eau furent examinees dans cinq endroits sur la rivière de Lower Churchill, durant les mois de juin, jusqu'au mois d'août 1975-76. L'habitat marine en majorité était caractérisé par I'eau extrêmement douce ayant un pH de 6.3 , une conductance de $18.9 \mu \mathrm{mhos} / \mathrm{cm}$ une dureté totale de 8 ppm , une alkalinité totale de 6 ppm , une concentration du calcium de 1.4 ppm , une turbidité de 3.4 JTU , et une concentration du chlorure de 0.8 ppm . Les espèces de poissons pêchées par fillets maillants durant l'étude, énumérées par l'abondance du poid cueilli furent le grand brochet, la grande corrégone, le meunier rouge, le meunier noir, la truite,
la lotte, le touladi, l'ouananiche, le ménomini rond, le méné de lac et l'éperlan arc-en-ciel. L'épinoche à trois épines et une espèce de chabot furent identifiés dans le contenu d'estomac. L'abondance relative, le taux de croissance, la proportion des sexes et le contenu des estomacs des espèces capturées varient de section en section le long de la rivière. L'information détaillée sur l'abondance relative et la biologie des espèces individuelles sont inclus dans ce rapport. Le potentielle du rendement au long terme fut estimé à $1.01 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{an}$ ou $20,099 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{an}$ pour le réservoir proposé de Gull Island et $1.26 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{an}$ ou $12,474 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{an}$ pour le réservoir proposé de Muskrat Falls. Pour chaque réservoir, le meunier rouge et le meunier noir comprenaient plus que la moitié de l'estimé du rendement. L'oscillation du niveau de l'eau et l'augmentation du sédiment dans les réservoirs própósés sont les potentiels d'impact plus prononcés sur la population des poissons internés.

## INTRODUCTION

This report is an assessment of the fishery resource of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador.

The Lower Churcinill River (Fig. 1) has been proposed as the location of two reservoirs to be used for the development of hydroelectric power. The Gull Island hydroelectric project entails the erection of a dam across the Lower Churchill River near Gull Island approximately 110 km upstream from Happy Valley-Goose Bay. The Muskrat Falls project will derive power from a dam at Muskrat Falls, 30 km upstream from Happy Valley-Goose Bay. The two reservoirs (Table 1) will depend largely on available river discharge for power generation in a run-of-the-river scheme. Detailed descriptions of the two proposed reservoirs and their operating modes have been documented by Thurlow and Associates (1974), Gull Island Power Company Limited (1977), Acres Consulting Services Limited (1978), and Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited (1979).


Fig. 1. Location of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador and five river sections considered in the present study.

Table 1. Physical features of the proposed Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs.

| Feature | Reservoir |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gul7 Island | Muskrat Falls |
| Volume (total storage $\mathrm{m}^{3} \times 10^{9}$ )* | 4.1 | 1.3 |
| Mean water flow ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{s}$ )* | 1770 | 1833 |
| Surface area ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) $\dagger$ | 199 | 99 |
| Maximum drawdown (m) $\dagger$ | 6.1 | 4.0 |
| Maximum depth (m) $\dagger$ | 88 | 36 |
| Mean reservoir depth (m) $\ddagger$ | 20.6 | 13.1 |

* Acres Consulting Services Limited, 1978.
+ Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited, 1979.
$\dagger$ Volume/area

Detailed information on aquatic vegetation, physical features, and habitat classification of the Lower Churchill River have yet to be documented. This information is to be documented by the Lower Churchill Development Corporation as part of the project environmental impact study. Et!

It is accepted among hydrobiologists that it is generally difficylt to predict the condition of fishery resources in a proposed reservoir;-particularly one obtained by damming a river. This difficulty is primarily due to the complexity of ecological interactions that affect fish and the fact that few impact assessments have been made before and after the creation of a reservoir. In Canada, there is as yet no measure of the accuracy of a pre-impoundment prediction of a fishery resource (Harvey 1976). However, certain similarities have been observed among reservoirs created from rivers.

As reviewed by Geen (1974), the damming of a free-flowing river generally results in:

- lost river fauna
-blocked access to spawning areas -...enct
-initial increases in reservoir productivitidifallowed by an eventual decline
- low littoral productivity as a result of draw̄down
-decreased turbidity through settling of sediments in the reservoir
-initial increases in total dissolved solids from the leeching of flooded terrain and breakdown of terrestrial plant material
-a little affected plankton production and water chemistry in the long term
-reduced growth rates of littoral feeding fishes
-and an altered abundance of fish and their food organisms

Obviously, it may take many years before a period of biological stability can be attained by a new impoundment. In the Kerelian U.S.S.R., an area similar to western Labrador, stabilization of reservoir ecology begins to take place about 20 years after flooding (Baranov 1961). Thus, the accuracy of pre-impoundment predictions cannot be fully assessed within a short time frame.

It is hoped that the data presented here will assist in the utilization of the available fish resource in the Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs and assist in the prediction of effects of other reservoirs. With these objectives in mind, emphasis was placed on the following areas of study:

1. The relative abundance of fish species in the Lower Churchill River. The estimates of relative abundance and the presence or absence of the various species (Table 2) were based on catches obtained during survey work in 1975 and 1976 and on distribution maps of fishes presented by Scott and Crossman (1973).

Table 2. List of fishes occurring in the Lower Churchill River, Labrador. Based on surveys in 1975 and 1976 and on distribution maps presented by Scott and Crossman (1973).

| Northern pike | - | Esox lucius |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lake whitefish | - | Coregonus clupeaformis |
| Longnose sucker | - | Catostomus catostomus |
| White sucker | - | Catostomus cormersoni |
| Brook trout (sea-run and resident). | - | Salvelinus fontinalis |
| Burbot | 0 C | Lota lota |
| Lake trout | \%00\% | Salvelinus namaycush |
| Atlantic salmon (sea-run and resident ouananiche) | - | Salmo salar |
| - Round whitefish | - | Prosopium cylindraceum |
| Rainbow smelt (sea-run) | - | Osmerus mordax |
| Lake chub | - | Couesius plumbeus |
| Arctic char (sea-run) | - | Salvelinus alpinus |
| Threespine stickleback | - | Gasterosteus aculeatus |
| Ninespine stickTeback | - | Fungitius pungitius |
| Mottled sculpin | - | Cottus bairdi |
| Slimy sculpin | - | Cottus cognatus |
| American eel (sea-run) |  | Anguilla rostrata |
| Longnose dace | $\bigcirc$ - | Rhinichthys cataractae |
| Atantic sturgeon (sea-run) | - | Acipenser oxyrhynchus |

2. The biology of the fish species in the Lower Churchill River. This information was obtained from analyses of the individuals captured during the surveys and from literature sources. The potential impact of reservoir construction on each species is considered.
3. The potential yield of fishes in the Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs. Estimates of maximum sustainable yields were based on catches obtained during the surveys and predictive models previously used.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## STUDY SECTIONS

The Lower Churchill River, from its mauth to the tailrace at Churchill Falls, was divided into five study sections on the basis of physical characteristics and the locations of the proposed dams. Within each section, stations were selected at approximately 8 km intervals (Fig. 1). The five sections chosen and the survey dates are:

> I - River Mouth to Muskrat Falls - $28 / 6 / 75-4 / 7 / 75$;
> II - Muskrat Falls to Gull Island - $3 / 8 / 75-24 / 8 / 75$;
> III - Gull Island to Devil's Hole, Winokapau Lake - 21/6/76-29/7/76;
> IV - Winokapau Lake - $31 / 7 / 76-5 / 8 / 76$;
> V - Winokapau Lake to the Churchil1 Fal1s tailrace - $17 / 7 / 75-6 / 8 / 75$.

## WATE゙R CHEMISTRY

Water samples, generally two from each station and one from the mouth of major tributaries, were drawn from the subsurface, stored in polyethylene bottles, and analyzed in the St. John's labonatory. Sample sites are presented in Appendix I. The pH was determined electrometrically. Specific conductance was determined with a Yellow Springs Instruments conductivity bridqe. jitotal hardness, expressed as ppm calcium carbonate, was measured by means of the ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid (EDTA) method (American Public Health Association et a1. 1971) with calmagite substituted as an indicator. Total alkalinity was determined by potentiometric titrations (American Public Health Association et al. 1971). The concentration of calcium was determined with a Jarrell-Ash atomic-absorption spectrophotometer. Turbidity was determined with a Hach Chemical Co. laboratory turbidimeter model 2100. Chloride concentrations were measured by means of the mercuric nitrate method (American Public Health Association et a1. 1971).

## FISH CAPTURE

Each study section of the river was fished with gangs of 47 m long gillnets of stretched mesh size $3.8,5.1,7.6,10.2$, or 12.7 cm . Typically each gang of nets was composed of all mesh sizes. In several instances, as a result of space constraints or in an attempt to avoid overfishing, some mesh sizes were deleted. Nets were fished overnight on bottom or, occasionally, on the surface. Gillnet locations are shown in Appendix I. Fish were angled at several locations as well.

## CATCHES

Catches were reported as total numbers and weight of gillnetted fish and as numbers and weight per unit effort. A unit of effort was defined as one 47 m gillnet comprised of all mesh sizes fished overnight for an approximate 24 h period. Thus equal emphasis was placed on each mesh size fished so that catches were reported on the basis of an equal period of effort by each mesh size.

GROWTH IN LENGTH
Fork lengths or, in the case of burbot, total lengths to the nearest millimetre were obtained from all fish. Scale sampies or, in the case of burbot, otoliths were obtained from the catch or a subsample representative of the fish lencths obtained. Scales were removed from above the lateral line just posterior to the dorsal fin. Scales were examined with a Bausch and Lomb microprojector at a magnification of 43 diameters. Otolith cross-sections were examined with a microscope. An age was assigned to each fish equal to the number of completed annuli as described by Tesch (1971). Fish in their first year of life were considered members of age-group 0 or age 0 while fish in their second year were considered to be members of age-group 1 or age 1 and so on. In the case of burbot and in those instances where only small numbers of fish were captured, growth in length was reported as the mean length of each age group at capture. For the remainder, the following back-calculation procedure was used to compensate for apparent differences in growth resulting from the different times of capture of the fish.

A scale from each aged fish was measured from the focus to the scale margin and to each annulus along the anteriormost radius. With the data on each species separated by study section, the relationships between fish length and magnified scale radius were calculated by least-squares regression. Averages, rather than individual values, of the variates were employed with several data sets to give equal weight to less numerically represented portions of the data. In the case of obvious curvilinearity of a relationship, double logarithmic transformations were employed. The resulting equations (Appendix IV) were then solved for the various annulus measurements to calculate the average lengths of the fish at the end of each full year of life.

## gRowth in weight relative to lengit

Fish were weighed on a triple-beam balance to the nearest gram, or if weights were more than 2000 g , on a chatillion scale to the nearest 10 grams. Length-weight relationships were obtained by least-squares regression of the logarithms of weight on the logarithms of length using all data or a representative (by length) subsample of each species in each study section.

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

Sex and maturity were determined by macroscopic examination of the gonads. Sex ratios were calculated for the total catch or a representative subsample (by length) of each species from each river section. Data were combined and an overall sex ratio of each species in the river was calculated. A chi-square $\left(x^{2}\right)$ test was then applied to test for a significant departure from a $1: 1$ sex ratio.

The state of sexual maturity of individuals in the total catch or a subsample representative of the lengths obtained was determined for each species in most river sections, depending on the expertise of the surveyors. Maturity was categorized as immature or mature. A mature fish was defined as one that was going to spawn in the year of capture or that had previously spawned. Fish categorized by both sex and maturity were examined with respect to length. No obvious or consistent differences in length at maturity were apparent between fish of different sexes or from different river sections. Accordingly, all available data from each species were grouped by length intervals to obtain an estimate of length at maturity in the Lower Churchill River as a whole. Corresponding ages were than obtained from the age-length relationships.

## FOOD STUDIES

Food items in the stomachs of the catch of a particular species (or a random subsample of each species) from each river section were determined. The number of stomachs containing each food item was expressed as a percentage of the number of stomachs examined.

## SELECTION BY GEAR

The gillnet mesh size in which each fish was captured was recorded in river sections above Muskrat Falls. Average length, weight, age and catch per unit effort of fish obtained by the different mesh sizes within the individual river sections and in the river as a whole above Muskrat Falls were calculated. Data were also presented by means of length and age-frequency distributions of fish captured in the various mesh sizes above Muskrat Falls.

## MORTALITY RATE

Instantaneous ( $M$ ) and annual ( $A$ ) mortality rates for the different species were obtained from least-squares regression of $\log _{\text {n }}$ number of fish on age as outlined by Ricker (1975). As sample sizes were inadequate to provide reasonable estimates in most individual river sections, all data obtained by gillnets above Muskrat Falls were combined with the assumption that natural mortality rates were reasonably constant throughout the river. As negligible fishing pressure occurs upstream of Muskrat Falls, it can be assumed that these mortality rates are natural mortality rates.

## POTENTIAL FISH YIELDS IN THE PROPOSED RESERVOIRS

Quantitative estimates of potential fish yields in the proposed reservoirs were based on the Ryder (1965) and Gulland (1970) models. Total potential fish yields were estimated using the morphoedaphic index (i.e. total dissolved solids in ppm (TDS) divided by mean reservoir depth in metres ( $\bar{Z}$ )) according to the relationship outlined by Ryder et a1. (1974):

$$
\text { Total yield }(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr})=0.966 \sqrt{\frac{\text { TDS }}{\bar{Z}}}
$$

The components of this yield were estimated using Gulland's (1970) model relating potential yield to the instantaneous natural mortality rate and theichthyiomass of exploitable stocks. The computations are similar to those employed by Ryder and Henderson (1975) to estimate long-term fish yields in the Nasser Reservoir, Egypt. Component yields were related to total yield by:

$$
\text { Yield of species i }(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr})=\frac{M i B i}{\Sigma M i B i} \times \text { Total yield }
$$

where $M_{i}=$ instantaneous natural mortality rate of species $i$;
$B_{i}=$ relative biomass of species $i$.

Relative biomass of a given species was estimated from the proportion of the weight of that species obtained per unit effort to the total weight obtained per unit effort in Winokapau Lake. Winokapau Lake's fish population was chosen as a model for those of the two proposed reservoirs as Winokapau Lake is that section of the Lower Churchill River which will most closely resemble the two reservoirs in characteristics such as shape, thermal regime, and water quality.

## HABITAT DESCRIPTION

PHYSICAL
The Lower Churchill River flows from the Churchill Falls hydroelectric generating station's tailrace through Lake Winokapau over Muskrat Falls, a natural barrier to sea-run fish, and into Lake Melville at Happy Valley, a distance of some 320 km . Prior to the natural flow being regulated by the Churchill Falls hydroelectric development since 1971, the Lower Churchill had "one of the greatest and wildest descents of any stream in eastern America" (Riche 1965).

Detailed biophysical descriptions of the Lower Churchill River valley can be found in Thurlow et al. (1974) and Lopoukhine et al. (1978). In general, the river is comprised of three major physically distinct habitat types: the region downstream of Gull Island (Sections I and II); the regions immediately above and below Winokapau Lake (Sections V and III); and Winokapau Lake (Section IV).

The river bottom is primarily gneiss bedrock with localized outcrops of sandstones and shales. The most readily noticeable feature of Section I below Muskrat Falls is the predominance of sand on the shoreline and river bottom (Fig. 2). Section II, from Muskrat Falls to Gull Island has a sandy bottom but a higher current speed has exposed more rock and gravel (Fig. 3). Sections I and II are the shallowest stretches of the river. With the exception of Winokapau Lake, the river upstream of Gull Island flows rapidly over a rocky bottom. The highest water velocities are found in Section III (Fig. 4), the stretch of river from Winokapau Lake to Gull Island and Section V, below Churchill Falls (Fig. 5). Winokapau Lake, a deep lake some 56 km long, is characterized by an extremely steep rocky shoreline and the lowest water velocity of the five study sections (Fig. 6).


I

Fig. 2. Section I downstream of Muskrat Falls.


Fig. 3. Section II between Gull Island and Muskrat Falls.


Fig. 4. Section III near Gull Island.


Fig. 5. Section $V$ downstream of Churchill Falls.


Fig. 6. Winokaupau Lake.

WATER QUALITY
The Lower Churchill River is oligotrophic (Table 3). Its water is similar in chemical composition to lakes of Labrador (Duthie and Ostrofsky 1974, 1975) and to the least biologically productive waters of the world (Wetzel 1975). With calcium concentrations less than 10 ppm , it can be termed calcium deficient (Wetzel 1975).

The tributaries of the Lower Churchill vary in chemical composition, but on the whole are characterized by a greater degree of oligotrophy than the Lower Churchill itself (Table 4).

## DISCUSSION

Apart from the previously documented new dimensions of the reservoirs, physical changes are difficult to predict. However, certain generalizations can be made. As a result of the construction of dams at Gull Island and Muskrat Falls, the upstream river-lake complex will be changed into more of a lake-like environment with a probable reduction in habitat diversity. As the rate of flow decreases, or becomes more regular, temperature and chemical stratification will become more evident throughout the system. The increased loading of sediment and detritus after flooding may produce anoxic conditions in the deeper water of the reservoirs. Clear-cutting of the forest prior to flooding may lessen this problem somewhat and speed up biological stabilization of the reservoir.

The proposed reservoirs, in the long term, will likely have a surface water quality similar to their major water source, the Smallwood Reservoir, and the only lentic environment on the river, Winokapau Lake. The Smallwood Reservoir's Lobstick and Sandgirt Lakes were characterized in August of 1974 by a pH of 6.5, a conductance of 20.7 micromhos $/ \mathrm{cm}$, a total hardness of 10.6 ppm , a total alkalinity of 8.3 ppm , a calcium concentration of 2.1 ppm , a turbidity of 1.2 JTU , and a chloride concentration of 0.8 ppm (Bruce 1975). Turbidity will likely decline as a result of settling of sediments in the reservoirs after initial increases as was the case with the Smallwood Reservoir (Duthie and Ostrofsky 1975).

The Lower Churchill River below the proposed Muskrat Falls Reservoir will have a similar but more regulated flow. The water chemistry will probably approximate that of the Smallwood and Lower Churchill Reservoirs with the most noticeable change being, in the long term, a reduction in turbidity as solids are precipitated in the reservoirs.

Expected changes in the fish populations as a result of these changes in the physical and chemical environment are described in the following sections.

Table 3. Water quality of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76. Means and ranges are given. (Individual station measurements are presented in Appendix II).

| River section | pH | Conductance $\left(\mu \mathrm{mhos} / \mathrm{cm} \text { at } 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | Total hardness (ppm) | Tota 1 <br> alkalinity (ppm) | Calcium (ppm) | Turbidity (JTU) | Chloride (ppm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I - River mouth to Muskrat Falls | $\begin{gathered} 6.4 \\ 6.0-6.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.7 \\ 14.3-19.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 5-10 \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{5}{4-6}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ 0.8-7.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.8 \\ 3.5-20.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ 1.0-1.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| II - Muskrat Falls to Gull Island | $\begin{gathered} 6.2 \\ 6.0-6.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.0 \\ 18.0-20.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 6-9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 3-7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.3 \\ 1.1-1.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.6 \\ 3.5-9.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 1.0-2.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| III - Gull Island to Devil's Hole, Winokapau Lake | $\stackrel{6.3}{6.2-6.6}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.8 \\ 17.0-22.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 7-10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 4-8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ 1.1-2.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 0.5-4.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 0.6-0.8 \end{gathered}$ |
| IV - Winokapau Lake | $\begin{gathered} 6.3 \\ 6.2-6.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.5 \\ 18.0-22.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 7-10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 5-7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ 1.3-1.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.2 \\ 0.6-2.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \\ 0.6-0.7 \end{gathered}$ |
| V - Winokapau Lake to Churchill Falls tailrace | $\begin{gathered} 6.4 \\ 6.1-6.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.4 \\ 13.2-26.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ 6-12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ 4-8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.4 \\ 0.8-2.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ 0.3-3.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 0.5-1.5 \end{gathered}$ |
| I-V - Entire River | $\begin{gathered} 6.3 \\ 5.8-6.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.9 \\ 13.2-26.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ 5-12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 3-8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.4 \\ 0.8-2.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.4 \\ 0.3-20.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 0.5-2.0 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 4. Water quality of major tributaries of the Lower Churchill River, August 31, 1976. (Tributaries are listed in order of increasing distance upstream from Goose Bay.)

| No. Tributary Name | Mouth location (river section) | pH | Conductance <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{mhos} / \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | Total hardness (ppm) | Total alkalinity (ppm) | Calcium (ppm) | Turbidity (JTU) | Chloride (ppm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Caroline Brook | I | 6.1 | 18.0 | 10 | 4 | 1.3 | 6.5 | 1.5 |
| 2. Mackenzie River | I | 6.4 | 15.0 | 7 | 4 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 3. Lower Brook | II | 6.5 | 15.0 | 7 | 3 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.5 |
| 4. Upper Brook | II | 6.0 | 15.0 | 7 | 3 | 1.3 | 5.0 | 1.5 |
| 5. Pinus River | II | 6.3 | 11.0 | 7 |  | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 6. Unnamed | II | 6.2 | 17.0 | 8 | 4 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.0 |
| 7. Unnamed | II | 5.9 | 12.0 | 5 | 1 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| 8. Minipi River | III | 6.3 | 14.0 | 7 | 2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| 9. Dominion River | III | 6.2 | 13.0 | 7 | 2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 10. Cache River | III | 6.0 | 12.0 | 6 | 1 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| 11. Shoal River | III | 6.1 | 10.0 | 6 | 2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| 12. Fig River | IV | 6.1 | 11.0 | 6 | 3 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| 13. Elizabeth River | V | 6.4 | 15.0 | 7 | 4 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| 14. Metchin River | V | 5.6 | 12.0 | 6 | 1 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| 15. Unnamed | V | 5.8 | 12.0 | 7 | 1 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| Averaged data |  | 6.1 | 13.5 | 6.9 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.2 |

## RELATIVE ABUNDANCE OF FISH

## TOTAL CATCHES

In the river as a whole, one unit of gillnet effort yielded 5.5 fish weighing 3.2 kg . Eleven of the 19 species reported present by Scott and Crossman (1973) were captured. These data are similar to comparative catch per unit effort statistics of 5.0 fish weighing 3.3 kg from the main body of the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1975). Nine species were taken in the reservoir. Catch rates and number of species captured varied from section to section within the river (Fig. 7). Total catches and number of species captured were greatest in those river sections upstream of Gull Island and least in Section II, the area of the proposed Muskrat Falls reservoir. Greater catches were associated with the capture of a greater number of species (Appendix III).


Fig. 7. Catches of all fish species from the Lower Churchill River, JuneAugust, 1975-76. (Number of species captured in each river section is indicated).

## SPECIES COMPOSITION

The most numerous species in the catch from the river as a whole were, in order of abundance, longnose suckers, lake whitefish, white suckers, brook trout, and northern pike (Fig. 8). Their relative abundance varied greatly from section to section within the river and each river section was in contrast to the Smallwood Reservoir. In catches from the Smallwood Reservoir, lake whitefish, longnose suckers, lake trout, and round whitefish were most numerous (Bruce 1975).


Fig. 8. Catch in numbers of major fish species in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

In terms of weight, northern pike was most abundant in the catch from the river as a whole, followed by lake whitefish, longnose suckers, white suckers, and brook trout (Fig. 9). Reiative abundance by weight varied greatly from section to section in the river. In the Smallwood Reservoir, lake whitefish made up the greatest portion of the catch followed by lake trout, longnose sucker, and northern pike (Bruce 1975).


Fig. 9. Catch in weight of major fish species in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

In addition to the species indicated in Fig. 8 and 9 , two rainbow smelt were captured in Section I. Three lake chub were taken in Section III and identified in the stomachs of fish from Section IV. Threespine sticklebacks were identified in stomach contents from Sections I, IV, and V. Unidentified species of sculpins were found in the stomachs of fish from Sections III and $V$.

## DISCUSSION

There is some evidence that the overall fish production in the proposed reservoirs will be greater than exists, on the average, throughout the Lower Churchill. The greater catches and the greater numbers of species obtained above Gull Island suggest that adequate numbers of viable species will be present to enable colonization of most available habitat in the Gull Island Reservoir. Also, the comparatively large catches and number of species in Winokapau Lake (that area of the Lower Churchill system most closely resembling both reservoirs) suggests that fish biomass and hence production will increase after impoundment.

Several species reported as present in the river by Scott and Crossman (1973) were not identified during the survey. This was likely a result of their small size and resultant non-susceptibility to capture by gillnets or, in the case of sea-run species, their scarcity in the river during the survey.

After impoundment, physical and chemical conditions in the reservoirs will most closely resemble those of Winokapau Lake. This suggests relative abundance and species composition will also resemble those in the lake at the present time. If excessive anomalous environmental conditions are not created and this occurs, the most abundant species in the reservoirs, in terms of numbers and weight, will be longnose suckers followed by white suckers and lake whitefish.

No ouananiche or lake trout were captured in Section II, the area proposed for the Muskrat Falls Reservoir. This suggests that, if optimal use is to be made of this reservoir and all habitats are to be used, these species should be introduced if they do not colonize the reservoir themselves. This should result in a fish community composition in both reservoirs similar to that in Winokapau Lake; again providing that excessive anomalous environmental conditions are not created.

After impoundment, the community structure downstream of the Muskrat Falls Reservoir should not change significantly provided that the flow of water is maintained.

NORTHERN PIKE

## CATCHES

In the river as a whole, 689 gillnets fished overnight caught 265 northern pike with a total weight of 549.8 kg (Fig. 10). This corresponds to 0.4 fish weighing $0.80 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night with equal weight being given to each mesh size fished. Captured pike had a mean length of 63.6 cm , a mean weight of 2.08 kg , and a mean age of 8.5 years.


Fig. 10. Northern pike.

Catches were variable from section to section within the river (Fig. 11). In terms of number and weight obtained per net night, Section II was the most productive and Section III the least productive.


Fig. 11. Catches of northern pike in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

Northern pike in the Lower Churchill River tended to exhibit a declining growth rate until lengths of about 70 cm were reached (Fig. 12 and Appendix V). Fish of this length exhibited an increase in growth rate suggestive of the availability of a new food source to fish of this length. On the whole, growth in length was more rapid than that typically exhibited by pike in northern Canadian waters but slower that than experienced by the usually fast-growing southern populations (Scott and Crossman 1973). The rate of growth in the river as a whole was a little greater than that observed in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1974, 1975).


Fig. 12. Growth of northern pike in the Lower Churchill River, 1975-76. Presented for contrast is an approximation of growth in northern Canadian lakes (solid heavy line) (Miller and Kennedy 1948) and Wisconsin lakes (dashed heavy line) (Van Engel 1940).

Growth rates were variable within the river. Growth in the first four year of life was similar in all but Section I which contained the fastest growing young fish. Growth rates in later years were similar in all but Section $V$ which contained the fastest growing older fish. The extremely small calculated length of age-group 1 fish in Section $V$ was likely an artifact of the methods employed.

The longevity of pike in the Lower Churchill was similar to that usually observed in slow-growing northern populations (Miller and Kennedy 1948). The oldest fish was in its 18th year.

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

Exponents in the length-weight relationships of northern pike ranged from 2.68 to 3.17 and had a mean of 3.01 (Table 5); lower than the range of 3.1-3.9 reported by Bruce $(1974,1975)$ for pike in the Smallwood Reservoir.

Table 5. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight $(g)$ on
$\log _{10}$ fork length (cm) for northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River <br> section | $Y$ <br> intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -2.30 | 3.11 | 0.984 | 55 |
| II | -2.25 | 3.07 | 0.996 | 131 |
| IV | -2.43 | 3.17 | 0.997 | 18 |
| V | -4.52 | 2.68 | 0.980 | 60 |

SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY
The overall sex ratio indicated an equal abundance of the sexes, contrary to the slight relative abundance of females observed in southern Ontario catches over the summer months (Casselman 1975). Numbers of males per female in the five sections were $0.88-1.62$ with an overall ratio of 1.19 (Appendix VI).

Of the 265 northern pike examined, $88.3 \%$ were mature fish (Appendix VII). Pike matured at approximately 40 cm ; the average length attained by fish in their fourth to fifth year of life. This is an age at maturity similar to the usual 2-4 years in the south of Canada, but younger than the usual 5-6 years in the north (Scott and Crossman 1973).

## FOOD STUDIES

Northern pike captured in the Lower Churchill were primarily piscivorous as is usual for this species (Scott and Crossman 1973). Suckers and lake whitefish were the most frequently identified food items (Table 6).

Table 6. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of northern pike in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food Item | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V combined |
| Fish remains | 38.2 | 18.7 | 100.0 | 44.4 | 15.0 | 26.5 |
| Catostomus sp. | 9.1 | 12.0 |  | 33.3 | 47.5 | 20.6 |
| Coregonus clupeaformis | 14.6 |  |  |  | 30.0 | 10.6 |
| Gasterosteus aculeatus | 10.9 |  |  | 11.1 |  | 4.2 |
| Lota lota |  | 4.0 |  |  | * | 1.6 |
| Esox Zucius |  | 4.0 |  |  |  | 1.6 |
| Insect remains |  |  |  | 16.7 |  | 1.6 |
| Detritus |  |  |  | 16.7 |  | 1.6 |
| Diptera (larvae) |  |  |  | 16.7 |  | 1.6 |
| Prosopium cylindraceum |  |  |  |  | 5.0 | 1.1 |
| Ostracoda |  |  |  | 5.6 |  | 0.5 |
| Cottus sp. |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 0.5 |
| Number of stomachs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| examined | 55 | 75 | 1 | 18 | 40 | 189 |
| Number of stomachs | 19 | 43 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 74 |

## SELECTION BY GEAR

On the whole, mean lengths, weights and ages of captured pike tended to be greater with increasing mesh size (Fig. 13 and 14; Table 7). These trends were also visible within the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX). The most efficient mesh size, in terms of number and weight of fish captured per net night, was 10.2 cm . One net night of fishing with this mesh size yielded 0.6 fish weighing 1.46 kg . Pike captured by this mesh size were all age 5 and over and 50 cm or larger.

## MORTALITY RATE

The natural mortality rate ( $A=0.26$ ) of pike upstream of Muskrat Falls (Fig. 15) was lower than the 0.38-0.44 annual mortality rate of pike in commercially fished Lake Ontario (Wolfert and Miller 1978).


Fig. 13. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 14. Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Table 7. Catch statistics of northern pike from Sections II-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh <br> size <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | No. of <br> net <br> nights | No. of <br> fish <br> caught | No. of <br> fish per <br> net night | Mean <br> (length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Total <br> weight <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Mean <br> weight <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Weight <br> per net <br> night <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Mean <br> age <br> $(\mathrm{yr})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 42 | 0.4 | 49.9 | 64.1 | 1.53 | 0.59 | 6.1 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 36 | 0.3 | 55.8 | 71.3 | 1.98 | 0.67 | 6.9 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 57 | 0.5 | 58.4 | 96.4 | 1.69 | 0.88 | 7.3 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 64 | 0.6 | 66.8 | 159.2 | 2.49 | 1.46 | 8.3 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 11 | 0.1 | 77.1 | 40.5 | 3.68 | 0.38 | 10.5 |



Fig. 15. Catch curve of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

## DISCUSSION

As reviewed by Machniak (1975a), reproduction, growth, and abundance of northern pike generally improve after the impoundment of waters. Later, reproductive success fluctuates with water level regulation while growth and abundance are dependent upon the supply of forage species.

Northern pike usually spawn on heavily vegetated floodplains and bays, preferring water depths of 50 cm or less. Impoundment of the Lower Churchill may create many new possible spawning sites. However, drawdowns in excess of 50 cm from the time of spawning soon after ice-out to about a month later when the young become mobile will be deleterious. It is likely that spring drawdown will be an important factor limiting pike reproduction in the reservoirs.

Pike growth will likely exhibit greater variation than exists at the present time. While growth below the site of the Muskrat Falls dam should remain the same due to a similar physical, chemical, and biological environment, growth in the areas of the reservoirs will likely improve. The larger bodies of slow-moving water and likely abundance of forage fishes such as whitefish and suckers should produce faster-growing individuals. Pike biomass will likely be made up of faster-growing individuals rather than a larger number of slow growers since reproduction will often be impeded by drawdown.

An additional indication of a faster growth rate in the reservoirs is the comparatively high exponent in the length-weight relationship in Winokapau Lake. As conditions in the river approach those of Winokapau Lake, growth in weight with respect to length should more closely resemble that in the lake and increase.

There is some indication that pike production will increase in the reservoirs. The habitat of pike is usually slow-moving, heavily vegetated rivers or weedy bays of lakes. Also, pike catches in the Lower Churchill were least in the rapid waters of Section III below Winokapau Lake.

Of possible concern to fishermen on the reservoirs is the infestation of pike by the parasite, Triaenophomus crassus. This parasite uses the commercially valuable lake whitefish as its intermediate host and renders the flesh less desirable. An increase in the pike population in the reservoirs may heighten the potential for infestation by this parasite.

If a commercial pike fishery is started on the new reservoirs, 10.2 cm may prove to be the most beneficial mesh size for gillnets. Since all of the pike captured by the 10.2 cm mesh were 50 cm or greater, it can be expected that, after the spawning run, this most efficient mesh size would capture relatively few fish that had not spawned at least once.

## LAKE WHITEFISH

## CATCHES

In the river overall 689 gillnets fished overnight captured 837 lake whitefish with a total weight of 469.0 kg (Fig. 16). Giving equal weight to each mesh size fished, this corresponds to an average of 1.2 fish weighing $0.68 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night. Captured whitefish had a mean length of 32.8 cm , a mean weight of 0.56 kg , and a mean age of 7.0 years.


Fig. 16. Lake whitefish.

Whitefish catches within the river ranged from $0.36 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night in the site of the Muskrat Falls Reservoir (Section II) to $0.98 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night at Section $V$ below Churshill Falls (Fig. 17).


Fig. 17. Catches of lake whitefish in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

On the average, catches above the site of the Gull Island dam tended to be greater than those from the two river sections below the dam site.

Mean lengths, weights, and ages of captured fish tended to be similar in all sections except those from below Muskrat Falls (Appendix VIII). Fish from this section tended to be the smallest and youngest fish.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

Lake whitefish in the Lower Churchill River tended to exhibit a declining growth rate with age (Fig. 18 and Appendix V). On the whole, growth in length was within the range previously described for whitefish over the whole of their zoogeographic range and slower than that usually seen in lightly exploited populations (Healey 1975). The rate of growth in the river as a whole was lower than that experienced by whitefish in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1974, 1975).

Fig. 18. Growth of lake whitefish in the Lower Churchill River, 1975-76. Presented for contrast is the total range in growth (solid heavy lines) for whitefish over the zoogeographic range (Healey, 1975).

Growth rates were variable within the river. Growth was faster upstream of the proposed Gull Island dam than below. In the three sections above the site of the proposed dam, growth tended to be slower with greater distance upstream. The most rapid growth occurred between Gull Island and Winokapau Lake. Below the Gull Island site, growth was faster with greater distance upstream.

The maximum age of lake whitefish was similar to that usually recorded over the range (Scott and Crossman 1973; Healey 1975); with one fish being in its 18th year and one in its 21 st.

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

Exponents in the length-weight relationships of lake whitefish ranged from 2.92 to 3.30 with a mean of 3.11 (Table 8). The average value was at the low end of the usual range of about 3.1-3.5 (Healey 1975) but the same as that of whitefish in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1974, 1975).

Consistent with growth in length, exponents tended to be lesser with greater distance upstream in the three sections above the Gull Island dam site but greater with greater distance upstream below. the dam site.

Table 8. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight ( $g$ ) on $\log _{10}$ fork length (cm) for lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River section | $\begin{gathered} Y \\ \text { intercept } \end{gathered}$ | STope | Correlation coefficient | No. of fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | -1.88 | 2.97 | 0.986 | 148 |
| II | -2.33 | 3.30 | 0.995 | 128 |
| II I | -2.23 | 3.23 | 0.960 | 119 |
| IV | -2.06 | 3.11 | 0.979 | 58 |
| V | -4.75 | 2.92 | 0.976 | 152 |
| Means | -2.65 | 3.11 |  |  |

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

The overall sex ratio indicated an equal abundance of the sexes as is usual for this species (Machniak 1975b). Numbers of males per female were 0.57-1. 38 with an overall ratio of 0.95 (Appendix VI).

Of 737 lake whitefish examined, $84.3 \%$ were mature (Appendix VII). The smallest length interval in which more than $50 \%$ of the individuals were mature was $20.0-21.9 \mathrm{~cm}$; having $57.9 \%$ mature individuals. This interval corresponded to the length attained by fish in their third to fifth year of life. Some immature individuals were found in each 2 cm interval up to 42 cm . These data are low compared to the wide range in length at maturity of $20-40 \mathrm{~cm}$ in other northern populations (Healey 1975) and the usual age of 4 years at which most whitefish spawn (Machniak 1975b).

Lake whitefish captured in the Lower Churchill River fed primarily on benthic invertebrates as is usual for this species (Scott and Crossman 1973). Insects were the major food source followed by occasional arachnids, crustaceans, molluscs and fish (Table 9).

## SELECTION BY GEAR

Mean lengths, weights, and ages of captured lake whitefish tended to be greater with increasing mesh size when the data were combined (Fig. 19 and 20, Table 10) and in the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX). The most efficient mesh size was the 7.6 cm ; catching 2.2 fish weighing $1.43 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{net}$ night. It captured fish over almost the whole range of ages and lengths in the total catch. Ninety-nine percent of the whitefish captured by this mesh size were age 4 and over and $97 \%$ were 30 cm or larger.

Table 9. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of lake whitefish in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.



Fig. 19. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 20. Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76

Table 10. Catch statistics of lake whitefish from Sections II-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh <br> size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean <br> ( yr ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 40 | 0.4 | 25.3 | 11.6 | 0.29 | 0.11 | 4.5 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 74 | 0.7 | 30.7 | 32.4 | 0.44 | 0.30 | 5.6 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 240 | 2.2 | 36.2 | 155.7 | 0.65 | 1.43 | 8.0 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 178 | 1.6 | 37.5 | 131.8 | 0.74 | 1.21 | 8.3 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 11 | 0.1 | 40.1 | 10.4 | 0.95 | 0.09 | 10.3 |



Fig. 21. Catch curve of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

## MORTALITY RATE

The natural mortality rate $(M=0.40)$ of whitefish taken above Muskrat Falls (Fig. 21) was slightly less than the 0.49 average of unexploited northern whitefish populations (Healey 1975).

## DISCUSSION

In his review of the literature on lake whitefish in reservoirs, Machniak (1975b) has written, "....river reservoirs will probably develop sizeable whitefish populations provided conditions are fairly amiable...."

There are indications that the growth rate of lake whitefish will improve in the Lower Churchill if the river is impounded. The facts that overall growth is slow in the Lower Churchill and slower than in the Smallwood Reservoir suggest that as conditions in the river approach those of the reservoir, growth rateswill increase. Also, the comparatively rapid growth of whitefish from Winokapau Lake suggests that as the river becomes more of a lake-like environment, growth rates will increase.

Catch per unit effort of whitefish in the Smallwood Reservoir was greater, by a factor of about 4-7 times, than in the Lower Churchill River (Bruce 1975). Although it is more difficult to fish a river, this large difference suggests that production will improve after impoundment. This suggestion is supported by the usually higher density of benthic food organisms found in rivers after impoundment (Machniak 1975b).

The attainment of potential whitefish production may be impaired by several factors. Lake whitefish in Labrador usually spawn in October or November (W. Bruce, pers. comm.). Although they utilize a variety of habitats for spawning, they generally spawn in shallow water over clean, hard or stony bottom less than 8 m deep. Young usually hatch in April or May and remain in shallow water until early summer. Thus, after a reservoir has been flooded, bank instability, high water turbidity, offshore sedimentation and drawdowns may have deleterious effects on reproduction and yield.

A potential problem for any commercial whitefish fishery on the reservoirs is an increase in the population of the parasite, Triaenophorus crassus. This may cause marketing problems. These problems may be eliminated by exploiting northern pike, a final host of the parasite.

If a commercial fishery is started on the Lower Churchill River, there may be difficulties in harvesting only commercial-size whitefish. The generally accepted commercial size of 0.9 kg (Scott and Crossman 1973) is greater than the average weight of fish caught in all but the 12.7 cm mesh size. This was the least efficient mesh size used in the present study. Most of the fish caught in the 7.6 cm mesh, the most efficient, would have spawned at least once. However, the average weight of individuals taken in this mesh size was only 0.74 kg .

## LONGNOSE SUCKER

## CATCHES

Overall, 689 gillnets fished overnight caught 1191 longnose suckers with a total weight of 401.5 kg (Fig. 22). A single net night averaged 1.7 fish weighing 0.58 kg . Captured fish had a mean length of 29.6 cm , a mean weight of 0.34 kg , and a mean age of 8.8 years.


Fig. 22. Longnose sucker.

Within the river, catches per net night varied from 0.10 kg in Section II to 1.44 kg in Section IV (Fig. 23). Catches tended to be less downstream of Gull Island than they were upstream.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

Ages assigned to longnose suckers age 5 and over are, as in the case of white suckers, liable to underestimation when scales are employed (Scott and Crossman 1973). Bruce and Parsons (1979) found no significant differences between the growth of longnose suckers in western Labrador indicated by scales and that indicated by fin rays. As determined from scales, longnose sucker growth in the river as a whole appeared linear (Fig. 24 and Appendix V). The rate of growth was similar to that in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1974, 1975) and near the low part of the range exhibited by this species (Rawson and Elsey 1950; Reed 1962).


Fig. 23. Catches of longnose suckers in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 24. Growth of longnose suckers in the Lower Churchill River, 1975-76. Presented for contrast is growth in the Northern Saskatchewan River (heavy dashed line) (Reed 1962) and Pyramid Lake, Alberta (solid heavy line) (Rawson and Elsey 1950).

Growth rates were variable within the river. Growth was slowest in the rapid waters of Section $V$ below Churchill Falls and fastest in the slow-moving waters downstream of Muskrat Falls (Section I) and in Winokapau Lake (Section IV).

The maximum age of longnose suckers was similar to that obtained from scales by other workers. One fish was in its 20th year as compared to the maximum age of about 22-24 years (Scott and Crossman 1973).

GROWTH IN WEIGHT
Exponents in the length-weight relationship ranged from 3.08 to 3.35 with a mean of 3.17 (Table 11). This was the value reported by Bruce (1974) for longnose suckers from Jacopie Lake in the Smallwood Reservoir but higher than the value of 2.8 for fish from Lobstick and Sandgirt lakes in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1975).

Table 11. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight ( g ) on $\log _{10}$ fork length ( cm ) for longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River <br> section | Y <br> intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | -2.01 | 3.08 | 0.968 | 157 |
| II | -2.09 | 3.11 | 0.997 | 55 |
| III | -2.17 | 3.14 | 0.992 | 268 |
| IV V | -2.24 | 3.18 | 0.976 | 171 |
| Means | -5.48 | 3.35 | 0.985 | 150 |

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

Sex ratios in the individual river sections ranged from 0.24 to 0.75 (Appendix VI). The overall ratio, 0.49 males per female, indicated an overall relative abundance of the longer-living females.

Of 698 longnose suckers examined, $87.4 \%$ were mature. On the average, longnose suckers matured at about 20 cm , the length attained by fish in their sixth or seventh year of life.

FOOD
Longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River fed primarily on benthic invertebrates (Table 12), the usual food of this species (Scott and Crossman 1973).

Table 12. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of Tongnose suckers in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V. | I-V combined |
| Diptera (larvae) | 49.3 | 100.0 | 64.0 | 72.0 | 69.3 | 68.4 |
| Detritus | 77.3 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 53.3 |  | 57.6 |
| Insect remains | 45.3 | 94.3 | 33.3 | 37.3 | 62.7 | 49.9 |
| Diptera (pupa) | 13.3 | 68.6 | 48.0 | 6.7 | 90.7 | 42.7 |
| Trichoptera |  | 45.7 | 36.0 | 5.3 | 20.0 | 18.5 |
| Plecoptera |  |  | 18.7 | 5.3 | 16.0 | 9.0 |
| Hydracarina |  |  | 1.3 | 5.3 | 32.0 | 8.7 |
| Invertebrate eggs |  | 22.9 | 1.3 | 5.3 |  | 3.9 |
| Ephemeroptera |  |  | 5.3 | 9.3 |  | 3.4 |
| Mollusca |  |  |  | 10.7 |  | 2.4 |
| Coleoptera |  |  | 5.3 |  |  | 1.2 |
| Hirudinea |  | 8.6 |  |  |  | 0.9 |
| Copepoda |  |  |  | 4.0 |  | 0.9 |
| Cladocera |  |  |  | 4.0 |  | 0.9 |
| Certopogonidae |  |  |  | 2.7 |  | 0.6 |
| Hemiptera |  |  |  | 1.3 |  | 0.3 |
| Algae |  |  |  | 1.3 |  | 0.3 |
| Fish eggs |  |  |  | 1.3 |  | 0.3 |
| Number of stomachs |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| examined | 75 | 35 | 75 | 75 | 75 | 335 |
| Number of stomachs empty | 8 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 20 |

SELECTION BY GEAR
Overall, mean lengths, weights and ages of captured longnose suckers tended to be greater with greater mesh size (Fig. 25 and 26, Table 13). These trends were also obvious within the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX). The most efficient mesh size, 7.6 cm , yielded 3.9 fish weighing $1.99 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night. All fish captured by this mesh were age 7 and over and $98 \%$ were 30 cm or larger.



Fig. 25. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Fal1s, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 26. Age-frequency distribution by gilinet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Table 13. Catch statistics of longnose suckers from Sections II-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mesh } \\ & \text { size } \\ & (\mathrm{cm}) \end{aligned}$ | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean <br> (yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 195 | 1.8 | 18.9 | 16.0 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 4.7 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 224 | 2.1 | 27.3 | 54.1 | 0.24 | 0.51 | 7.7 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 432 | 3.9 | 34.9 | 216.6 | 0.50 | 1.99 | 11.3 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 48 | 0.4 | 40.9 | 41.4 | 0.86 | 0.38 | 13.0 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 3 | <0.1 | 44.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 0.03 | 14.0 |

## MORTALITY RATE

The instantaneous mortality rate ( $M=0.57$ ) of longnose suckers in the Lower Churchill River (Fig. 27) was similar to the 0.55 observed in Great Slave Lake (Harris 1962).


Fig. 27. Catch curve of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

## DISCUSSION

The longnose sucker is an adaptable fish widespread over Canada's north. A relatively abundant fish in the Lower Churchill River, it should do well in the new reservoirs.

Upstream of Muskrat Falls, growth rates of longnose suckers should improve after impoundment as suggested by the faster growth in the two slower velocity sections at present. If conditions downstream of the dam remain similar, it is to be expected that growth rates will also.

Production of longnose suckers is likely to increase if the usual increase in benthic invertebrates occurs after impoundment. Longnose suckers will likely form the bulk of sucker biomass in the reservoirs since they are, at present, more abundant than white suckers in the river and in the north as a whole.

Spring drawdowns may impair production of longnose suckers in the reservoirs. Longnose suckers in Labrador spawn usually in June (W. Bruce, pers. comm.) in streams or shallow lake areas. Drawdowns from that time until about a month later when fry move to deeper waters may cause mortalities.

WHITE SUCKER

## CATCHES

Overall, 689 gillnets fished overnight caught 711 white suckers with a total weight of 353.4 kg (Fig. 28). Giving equal weight to each mesh size, a single net night averaged 1.0 fish weighing 0.51 kg . Captured fish had a mean length of 32.2 cm , a mean weight of 0.50 kg , and a mean age of 7.5 years.


Fig. 28. White sucker.

Catches per net night in different river sections varied from 0.11 kg in Section III to 1.06 kg in Section IV (Fig. 29). Yields tended to be greater upstream of Gull Island.


Fig. 29. Catches of white suckers in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

The ages of white suckers age 5 and over are usually underestimated from scales (Beamish and Harvey 1969). As a result, the obtained age-length relationships (Fig. 30 and Appendix V) may portray a faster rate of growth than actually occurs. Overall the rate of growth was close to the middle of the range previously described for white suckers (Beamish 1973) and slightly lower than the rate of growth in Ten Mile Lake, Labrador (Parsons 1975).


Fig. 30. Growth of white suckers in the Lower Churchill River, -1975-76. Presented for contrast is the total range in growth (solid heavy lines) of white suckers over the zoogeographic range (Beamish 1973).

Within the river, growth was most rapid in Section III downstream of Winokapau Lake and slowest in Section I downstream of Muskrat Falls. Little variation was evident in the remaining three sections.

The maximum age of white suckers in the Lower Churchill River, 18 years, was similar to the usual maximum age of this species obtained from scales (Scott and Crossman 1973).

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

Exponents in the length-weight relationship of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River ranged from 3.13 to 3.60 and had a mean of 3.30 (Table 14); higher than the values of 2.4-2.5 observed in other areas of Labrador (W. Bruce, pers. comm.).

Table 14. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight ( $g$ ) on $\log _{10}$ fork length (cm) for white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River <br> section | intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | -2.16 | 3.18 | 0.974 | 199 |
| II | -2.19 | 3.23 | 0.996 | 171 |
| III | -2.79 | 3.60 | 0.982 | 20 |
| IV | -2.09 | 3.13 | 0.995 | 113 |
| V | -5.46 | 3.37 | 0.987 | 150 |
| Means | -2.94 | 3.30 |  |  |

SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY
The overall sex ratio (males per female) of white suckers in the river indicated an equal abundance of the sexes (Appendix VI). . Ratios were 0.861.22 with an overall ratio of 1.01 .

Of 550 white suckers examined, $76.4 \%$ were mature (Appendix VII). On the average, white suckers matured at about 22 cm ; the length attained by fish in their fifth to sixth year of life. The age at maturity over the range varies from 3 to 8 years (Scott and Crossman 1973).

FOOD
White suckers from the Lower Churchill River fed primarily on benthic invertebrates (Table 15), the usual food of this species (Scott and Crossman 1973).

Table 15. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of white suckers in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V combined |
| Detritus | 62.7 | 77.3 | 100.0 | 80.3 | 86.1 | 77.6 |
| Diptera (larvae) | 42.7 | 74.7 | 86.7 |  | 76.4 | 49.8 |
| Insect remains | 76.0 | 65.3 | 6.7 | 28.9 | 23.6 | 49.5 |
| Diptera (pupae) | 24.0 | 34.7 | 13.3 | 25.0 | 55.6 | 33.5 |
| Hirundinea | 25.3 | 21.3 | 26.7 | 14.4 | 27.8 | 22.4 |
| Mollusca |  |  | 26.7 | 29.5 | 52.8 | 23.0 |
| Trichoptera |  | 24.0 |  | 30.3 | 8.3 | 15.0 |
| Invertebrate eggs | 16.0 | 10.6 |  | 6.6 | 5.6 | 9.3 |
| Copepoda |  |  |  | 25.0 |  | 6.0 |
| Plecoptera | 14.7 |  |  | 1.3 | 6.9 | 5.4 |
| Coleptera |  |  |  | 17.1 |  | 4.2 |
| Ephemeroptera |  |  |  | 10.5 |  | 2.6 |
| Hydracarina |  |  |  | 5.3 | 11.1 | 3.8 |
| Ceratopogonidae |  |  |  | 3.9 |  | 1.0 |
| Cladocera |  |  |  | 3.9 |  | 1.0 |
| Amphipoda |  |  |  | 2.6 |  | 0.6 |
| Hymenoptera |  |  |  |  | 2.8 | 0.6 |
| Arachnida |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| Number of stomachs examined | 75 | 75 | 15 | 76 | 72 | 313 |
| Number of stomachs empty | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 23 |

## SELECTION BY GEAR

Mean lengths, weights, and ages of captured white suckers tended to be greater with greater mesh size in the river as a whole (Fig. 31 and 32, Table 16) and in the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX).

The most efficient, in terms of weight, was the 10.2 cm mesh size. This mesh captured 1.3 fish weighing $1.28 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night. All fish captured in the 10.2 cm mesh were age 7 and over and 30 cm or larger.


Fig. 31. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76

Fig. 32. Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Table 16. Catch statistics of white suckers from Sections II-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean age (yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 51 | 0.5 | 19.4 | 5.8 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 4.2 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 102 | 0.9 | 26.4 | 23.7 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 5.9 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 163 | 1.5 | 36.1 | 112.7 | 0.69 | 1.03 | 8.5 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 138 | 1.3 | 41.6 | 139.5 | 1.01 | 1.28 | 11.3 |
| 12.7 | 107 | - 5 | <0.1 | 47.9 | 6.8 | 1.36 | 0.06 | 15.0 |

## MORTALITY RATE

The total instantaneous mortality rate of white suckers (Fig. 33) at $M=0 ; 56$ was nearly identical to that of longnose suckers and may have been overestimated as a result of age underestimation.


Fig. 33. Catch curve of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

## DISCUSSION

The white sucker is an adaptable fish widespread throughout Canadian waters. These facts and its present levels of abundance in the Lower Churchill River suggest that white suckers will be abundant in the new reservoirs.

It is not expected that growth rates will change significantly in the long term after construction of the reservoirs. The likely similarity of chemical and physical conditions below the site of the Muskrat Falls dam suggests that white sucker growth will remain similar in this area. The lack of a marked variation in the growth of younger fish above the dam site at present, in spite of varied habitats, suggests that growth will not change markedly in the future.

White sucker production should increase after impoundment with the usual increase in benthic food organisms. This is also indicated by the greatest catches being obtained from Winokapau Lake, that part of the river system most resembling the reservoirs.

Fluctuating water levels in the spring may prevent white suckers from attaining their potential production. White suckers usually spawn in June in Labrador in or near streams or on lake margins in shallow water (W. Bruce, pers. comm.). Drawdowns from that time until about a month later when the fry move to deeper water will likely be deleterious.

BROOK TROUT

## CATCHES

Overall, 689 gillnet nights of fishing yielded 579 brook trout weighing 261.6 kg ; corresponding to a catch per unit effort of 0.8 fish weighing $0.38 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{net}$ night (Fig. 34). Captured trout had a mean length of 30.6 cm , a mean weight of 0.45 kg , and a mean age of 3.7 years.

Catches were highly variable within the river. In terms of numbers and weight, catch per unit effort was highest in Section III and lowest in Section II (Fig. 35). Catches were greater above the dam site at Gull Island than they were below and greatest in the two fastest-flowing river sections, III and $V$.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

Brook trout growth in the Lower Churchill River was nearly linear (Fig. 36, and Appendix V). On the whole, growth in length was more rapid than that on the Avalon Peninsula of Newfoundland (Whelan and Wiseman 1977) but slower than that in Ten Mile Lake, Labrador (Parsons 1975), the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1974), and Lake Anne Marie, Labrador (Flick 1977).


Fig. 34. Brook trout.


Fig. 35. Catches of brook trout in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.


Fig. 36. Growth of brook trout in the Lower Churchill River, 1975-76. Solid heavy lines approximate the greatest (Flick 1977) and lowest (Whelan and Wiseman 1977) rates of growth renorted for Newfoundland and Labrador.

Within the river, growth was most rapid in the fast waters of Section III downstream of Winokapau Lake and slowest in Section I below Muskrat Falls.

The longevity of brook trout from the Lower Churchil1, 6 years, was within the 5-8 years usually observed in wild brook trout populations (Scott and Crossman 1973).

GROWTH IN WEIGHT
Exponents in the length-weight relationships of brook trout ranged from 2.69 to 3.23 and had a mean of 2.99 (Table 17); lower than the 3.2-3.3 reported for other Labrador populations (Bruce 1974; Parsons 1975).

Table 17. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight (g) on $\log _{10}$ fork length ( cm ) for brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River <br> section | $Y$ <br> intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | -1.57 | 2.69 | 0.964 | 35 |
| III | -2.04 | 3.06 | 0.987 | 183 |
| $V$ | 5.28 | 3.23 | 0.990 | 87 |
| Means | -2.90 | 2.99 |  |  |

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

The overall sex ratio indicated an equal abundance of the sexes. Numbers of males per female in the five sections were $0.67-2.00$ with an overall ratio of 1.07 (Appendix VI).

Of 695 brook trout examined, $91.9 \%$ were mature (Appendix VII). The smallest length interval in which more than $50 \%$ of the individuals were mature was $16.0-$ 17.9 cm ; having $63.0 \%$ mature fish. This length interval corresponded to the length attained by fish in their third to fourth year of life; the usual age of brook trout at maturity (Scott and Crossman 1973). There were a few immature individuals in most length intervals up to 46 cm .

FOOD
Brook trout from the Lower Churchill River fed primarily on benthic invertebrates, the usual food of medium-size trout (Scott and Crossman 1973). Fish also comprised a part of the diet (Table 18).

Table 18. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of brook trout in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River Section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V combined |
| Insect remains | 61.8 |  | 42.7 | 75.0 | 48.6 | 46.4 |
| Plecoptera | 23.5 |  | 56.0 | 25.0 | 35.7 | 39.2 |
| Diptera (pupae) |  |  | 84.0 |  | 12.9 | 37.1 |
| Detritus |  |  | 56.0 | 50.0 | 38.6 | 36.6 |
| Coleoptera | 38.2 | 50.0 | 34.7 | 50.0 | 25.7 | 30.9 |
| Fish remains | 41.2 |  | 14.7 |  | 22.9 | 21.1 |
| Trichoptera |  |  | 24.0 | 75.0 | 21.4 | 18.6 |
| Hymenoptera | 14.7 |  | 16.0 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 17.0 |
| Ephemeroptera |  |  | 4.0 |  | 15.7 | 7.2 |
| Odonata |  |  | 1.3 |  | 18.6 | 7.2 |
| Diptera (larvae) | 17.7 |  | 4.0 | 25.0 |  | 5.2 |
| Diptera (adult) |  |  |  |  | 14.3 | 5.2 |
| Arachnida |  |  | 2.7 | 50.0 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Gasterosteus aculea |  |  |  | 25.0 | 5.7 | 2.6 |
| Invertebrate eggs |  |  | 2.7 |  | 2.9 | 2.1 |
| Hemiptera |  |  |  |  | 5.7 | 2.1 |
| Lota Zota |  |  |  |  | 5.7 | 2.1 |
| Cladocera |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 1.6 |
| Lepidoptera |  |  |  |  | 4.3 | 1.6 |
| Catostomus sp. |  |  | 1.3 |  |  | 0.5 |
| Fish eggs |  |  | 1.3 |  |  | 0.5 |
| Homoptera |  |  |  | 25.0 |  | 0.5 |
| Orthoptera |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 0.5 |
| Cottus Sp. |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 0.5 |
| Number of stomachs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| examined | 34 | 2 | 75 | 4 | 79 | 194 |
| Number of stomachs empty | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 |

## SELECTION BY GEAR

Overal1, mean lengths, weights, and ages tended to increase with increasing mesh size; but these trends were not very strong (Fig. 37 and 38, Table 19). These trends were less pronounced within the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX). The most efficient mesh size, 7.6 cm , captured 2.5 fish weighing $1.31 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night. Ninety-eight percent of the trout taken in this mesh size were age 3 and over and $93 \%$ were 30 cm or larger.

Table 19. Catch statistics of brook trout from Sections II-V of the Lower Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh size (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { age } \\ (\mathrm{yr}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 84 | 0.8 | 20.8 | 10.5 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 2.4 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 87 | 0.8 | 27.6 | 22.6 | 0.26 | 0.21 | 3.1 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 270 | 2.5 | 35.0 | 142.6 | 0.53 | 1.31 | 3.9 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 93 | 0.9 | 40.2 | 75.3 | 0.81 | 0.69 | 3.9 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 7 | 0.1 | 37.0 | 5.6 | 0.80 | 0.05 | 4.1 |

## MORTALITY RATE

The mortality rate of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, $M=1.18$ (Fig. 39), was slightly lower than the value of 1.21 from Jacopie Lake, Smallwood Reservoir, and the value of 7.49 from Valley River, Labrador (W. Bruce, pers. comm.).

## DISCUSSION

There are indications that the growth rate and production of brook trout in the Lower Churchill River will decrease after the river is impounded. The more rapid growth in length and weight and the greater catches of trout from the faster-flowing river sections suggest that, after impoundment, growth rates and production will decrease in these sections.

It is possible that much of the variation in the catch from section to section is attributable to migrations of the trout to preferred locations. Usually, however, brook trout tend to move from streams and rivers to larger bodies of water when temperatures rise.

It is likely that the reproductive success of brook trout will decrease after the impoundment of the river. At the present time, brook trout probably utilize the river itself as well as its tributaries for spawning. Slower


Fig. 37. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 38. Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 39. Catch curve of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.
water velocities in these favorable locations and drawdown from fall spawning until fry emergence in spring will probably be detrimental. In addition, increased sediment loads on spawning beds and greater water depths over present spawning areas may be harmful.

BURBOT

## CATCHES

Overall, 689 gillnet nights of fishing yielded 85 burbot weighing 59.9 kg or 0.1 fish weighing $0.09 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night (Fig. 40). Captured burbot had a mean length of 44.6 cm , a mean weight of 0.70 kg and a mean age of 7.4 years.

Catches varied from 0.03 kg net/night in Section I to $0.30 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{net}$ night in Section IV (Fig. 41). Catches tended to be greater above the site of the Gull Island dam than below and, with one exception, greater with greater distance upstream.


Fig. 40. Burbot.


Fig. 41. Catches of burbot in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

The growth of burbot from the Lower Churchill River (Fig. 42 and Appendix V) tended to be midway between the extremes reported for Canadian waters (McCirimmon and Devitt 1954; Beamish et al. 1976).

Within the river, mean lengths of the age groups tended to be the least in Section $V$ and greatest in Section III. Sample sizes were, however, small in all sections and negated the back-calculation of growth.

The age of the oldest burbot, 14 years, was within the probable maximum age in Canada of $10-15$ years (Scott and Crossman 1973).


Fig. 42. Growth of burbot in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-75. Solid heavy lines approximate the greatest (McCrimmon and Devitt 1954) and lowest (Beamish et al. 1976) rates of growth in Canada.

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

Length-weight relationships of burbot from the Lower Churchill had exponents of 3.14-3.28 with a mean of 3.19 (Table 20).

Table 20. Least squares 1 inear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight $(g)$ on $\log _{10}$ total length (cm) for burbot from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River <br> section | Y <br> intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| III | -2.44 | 3.14 | 0.989 | 18 |
| IV | -2.69 | 3.28 | 0.988 | 23 |
| V | -5.42 | 3.14 | 0.998 | 24 |

SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY
The overall sex ratio of the 84 burbot examined, 0.68 , did not indicate a differential abundance of the sexes. Within river sections, the number of males per female ranged from 0.18 to 5.00 (Appendix VI).

Of 79 burbot examined, $86.1 \%$ were mature (Appendix VII). On the average, burbot were mature at a length of about 33 cm ; corresponding to fish in their fifth year of life. This is similar to the usual attainment of maturity in the third or fourth year at lengths of $28-48 \mathrm{~cm}$ (Scott and Crossman 1973).

FOOD
Burbot from the Lower Churchill River fed on fish and aquatic invertebrates (Table 21) as is usual for this species (Scott and Crossman 1973).

SELECTION BY GEAR
Mean lengths, weights, and ages of captured burbot tended to increase with increasing mesh size when the data were combined (Fig. 43 and 44, Table 22) and in the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX). The most efficient mesh size in terms of weight was the 10.2 cm ; catching 0.2 fish weighing $0.22 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night. Ninety-five percent of burbot taken in this mesh size were 40 cm or larger and $93 \%$ were age 9 or over.

Table 21. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of burbot in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V combined |
| Fish remains | 85.7 | 30.8 | 20.0 | 15.4 | 41.7 | 32.5 |
| Insect remains | 57.1 | 53.9 | 80.0 | 11.5 |  | 27.5 |
| Detritus |  | 30.8 | 50.0 | 19.2 |  | 17.5 |
| Plecoptera | 57.1 |  |  | 11.5 | 25.0 | 16.3 |
| Trichoptera |  |  | 40.0 |  | 33.3 | 15.0 |
| Lota lota |  | 7.7 |  | 3.8 | 25.0 | 10.0 |
| Gasterosteus |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| aculeatus | 57.1 |  |  | 7.7 |  | 7.5 |
| Diptera (pupae) |  | 23.1 | 20.0 | 3.8 |  | 7.5 |
| Diptera (larvae) | 28.6 | 7.7 |  | 3.8 |  | 5.0 |
| Invertebrate eggs |  |  | 10.0 | 3.8 |  | 2.5 |
| Ephemeroptera |  |  | 20.0 |  |  | 2.5 |
| Coregonus clupeafo |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 1.3 |
| Cottus Sp. |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 1.3 |
| Couesuis plumbius |  |  |  | 3.8 |  | 1.3 |
| Catostomus sp. |  |  |  | 3.8 |  | 1.3 |
| Odonata |  |  |  | 3.8 | - | 1.3 |
| Number of stomachs examined | 7 | 13 | 10 | 26 | 24 | 80 |
| Number of stomachs empty | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 24 |

Table 22. Catch statistics of burbot from Sections II-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh <br> size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean <br> ( yr ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 2 | $<0.1$ | 22.5 | 0.1 | 0.05 | $<0.01$ | 3.0 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 13 | 0.1 | 30.9 | 2.3 | 0.18 | 0.02 | 5.1 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 33 | 0.3 | 44.1 | 17.6 | 0.53 | 0.16 | 7.2 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 22 | 0.2 | 53.3 | 23.5 | 1.07 | 0.22 | 9.9 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 8 | 0.1 | 55.1 | 12.1 | 1.51 | 0.11 | 9.4 |



Fig. 43. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76

Fig. 44. Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

## MORTALITY RATE

The instantaneous mortality rate of burbot above Muskrat Falls was 0.72 (Fig. 45); slightly lower than the value of $M=1.00$ for burbot from Heming Lake, Manitoba (calculated from data of Lawler 1963).


Fig. 45. Catch curve of burbot from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

## DISCUSSION

Data collected to date suggest that burbot production in the Lower Churchill River will increase after the river is impounded. The fact that the greatest length-weight exponent and the greatest catch were observed in Winokapau Lake suggest that, as the river becomes more of a lake-like environment, burbot production in the river will approach that of Winokapau Lke.

Increases in burbot production will be assisted if the usual increase in benthic invertebrates occurs after impoundment. Burbot production may be impaired by excessive drawdown. Burbot usually spawn under the ice from January to March in Canada at depths of about 0.3-3.0 metres and the young usually annear from late February to June (Scott and Crossman 1973). Drawdowns over this period will kill the eggs.

## CATCHES

Lake trout (Fig. 46) were captured only in three sections upstream of Gull Island (Fig. 47). Overall, 689 gillnet nights of fishing yielded 15 lake trout weighing 51.8 kg . Captured trout had a mean length of 57.0 cm , a mean weight of 3.45 kg , and a mean age of 10.3 years.

Catches were greatest in Winokapau Lake (Section IV).


Fig. 46. Lake trout.

Fig. 47. Catches of lake trout in three sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.


## GROWTH IN LENGTH

The small sample of lake trout prevented back-calculation of growth. However, the mean lengths of the fish in each age group indicated an overall rate of growth similar to that in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1974, 1975) (Fig. 48 and Appendix V) and within the extremes reported over the zoogeographic range (Healey 1978).


Fig. 48. Growth of lake trout in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76. The solid heavy lines approximate the variation in growth over the zoogeographic range (Healey 1978).

No marked variation in growth within the river was apparent, possibly due to the small sample size.

The maximum age of lake trout captured, 15 years, was similar to that recorded in Labrador by Bruce (1974, 1975) and Parsons (1975) but less than the 20-25 years of the largest North American lake trout (Scott and Crossman 1973).

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

Sample sizes were too small for computation of length-weight relationships. Exponents in the length-weight relationships of Labrador lake trout generally have ranged from 2.9 (Bruce 1974, 1975) to 3.2 (Parsons 1975).

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

Numbers of males per female in the three sections of river ranged from 0.50 to 3.00 (Appendix VI). The overall ratio, 0.88 , did not indicate a differential abundance of the sexes.

Of 15 lake trout examined, only one was immature (Appendix VII). The small sample suggested that, on the average, maturity was achieved at a length of about 35 cm ; a length corresponding to fish in their seventh year. Sexual maturity is usually attained at age 6 or 7 (Scott and Crossman 1973).

FOOD
Fishes, followed by insects, were the principal food items in the stomachs of captured lake trout (Table 23).

Table 23. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of lake trout in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River section |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | III | IV | V | I-V combined |
| Fish remains | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 55.6 |
| Gasterosteus aculeatus |  | 50.0 |  | 22.2 |
| Insect remains |  | 50.0 |  | 22.2 |
| Detritus |  | 50.00 |  | 22.2 |
| Coregonus clupeaformis |  |  | 25.0 | 11.1 |
| Number of stomachs |  |  |  |  |
| examined | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 |
| Number of stomachs |  |  |  |  |
| empty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

SELECTION BY GEAR
Captured lake trout were all between 30 and 100 cm (Fig. 49). The small sample was irregularly distributed with respect to age (Fig. 50). No consistent variation in length, weight, or age with mesh size was evident in the river as a whole (Table 24) or in the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX).

The most efficient mesh size, in terms of weight and numbers, was the 10.2 cm ; yielding 0.1 fish weighing $0.21 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night.


Fig. 49. Length-frequency distribution of gillnetted lake trout from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the proposed Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.


Fig. 50. Age-frequency distribution of gillnetted lake trout from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the proposed Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.

Table 24. Catch statistics of lake trout from Sections III-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh size (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean Tength (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean } \\ & \text { age } \\ & (\mathrm{yr}) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 1 | $<0.1$ | 92.0 | 10.4 | 10.40 | 0.09 | 15.0 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 1 | $<0.1$ | 37.4 | 0.8 | 0.80 | 0.01 | 7.0 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 1 | $<0.1$ | 56.5 | 2.1 | 2.13 | 0.02 | 11.0 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 9 | 0.1 | 54.2 | 22.8 | 2.53 | 0.21 | 10.5 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 3 | $<0.1$ | 69.3 | 15.7 | 5.23 | 0.15 | 12.7 |

## MORTALITY RATE

The natural mortality rate ( $M=0.41$ ) of Lower Churchill River lake trout (Fig. 51), obtained from very few data, was higher than the 0.20-0.30 instantaneous rate typical of unexploited populations (Healey 1978), but lower than the 0.55 instantaneous rate of unexploited Smallwood Reservoir fish aged by scales (W. Bruce, pers. commm.).


Fig. 51. Catch curve of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the proposed Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.

## DISCUSSION

There is some indication that lake trout production in the Lower Churchill River will improve after impoundment. In his literature review, Machniak (1975c), has concluded that lake trout in reservoirs may do well if flooding doesn't upset predator-prey relationships and spawning.

As previously discussed, whitefish, suckers and benthic invertebrates can be expected to be abundant in the reservoirs. These should provide adequate forage for lake trout.

The comparative relative abundance of lake trout above the site of the Gull Island dam as compared to below and the greatest catch in Winokapau Lake also suggest that, as the river is impounded, trout production will increase.

The absence of lake trout in catches obtained from the site of the Muskrat Falls Reservoir suggests that, if available habitat in that reservoir is to be fully used, lake trout must be introduced after construction is finished. In the following discussion it is assumed that this will be done.

Drawdowns may be detrimental to lake trout production in the reservoirs. Machniak (1975c) has reported that water level fluctuations may be overcome by changes in spawning locations. However, there is a period of about 5 months or more in Labrador when eggs, especially those on shallow bars and reefs, are
liable to die during drawdown. In Maine, the policy has been to suggest that no drawdowns should occur between September 15 and late April to ensure that the loss of lake trout spawn is minimized.

Siltation of spawning areas in the reservoirs is likely to be harmful to lake trout. Once created, the reservoir will act as a settling basin for silt, thus impairing egg and fry survival.

## OUANANICHE (LANDLOCKED SALMON)

## CATCHES

Overall, 689 gillnet nights of fishing yielded 30 ouananiche weighing 35.3 kg (Fig. 52). Captured fish had a mean length of 41.7 cm , a mean weight of 1.18 kg and a mean age of 6.2 years.


Fig. 52. Ouananiche.

No ouananiche were caught downstream of the site of the Gull Island dam (Fig. 53). Upstream of the dam site, catches were highest in Winokapau Lake (Section IV) and lowest in Section III just above the site of the Gull Island dam.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

The rate of growth of landlocked salmon in Section IV of the Lower Churchill River (Fig. 54 and Appendix V) was similar to the maximum previously reported for Newfoundland and Labrador (Bruce 1974). The large calculated lengths at younger ages were most likely artifacts of the small sample size. Little variation in growth rates was apparent within the river, likely as a result of the small



Fig. 53. Catches of ouananiche in three sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

Fig. 54. Growth of ouananiche in Section IV of the Lower Churchill River, 1976. Solid heavy lines approximate previously reported minimum (Bruce 1976) and maximum (Bruce 1974) rates of growth in Newfoundland and Labrador.
samples obtained from Sections III and $V$ (Appendix $V$ ). The small amounts of data from these sections prevented back-calculation.

The maximum age of landlocked salmon from the Lower Churchill River, 9 years, was usual for eastern Canadian salmon (Scott and Crossman 1973) but less than the 14 years reported by Pippy (1966) for Long Lake, Newfoundland.

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

The mean length-weight exponent of Lower Churchill ouananiche (Table 25) was nearly indentical to the 3.18 of ouananiche from Red Indian Lake, Newfoundland (Morry and Cole 1977) but greater than the 2.62 of fish from Thomas Pond Reservoir, Newfoundland (Wiseman 1971).

Table 25. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight (g) on $\log _{10}$ fork length (cm) for ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| River <br> section | Y <br> intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IV | -4.67 | 2.82 | 0,984 | 22 |
| $V$ | -5.81 | 3.56 | 0.957 | 11 |
| Means | -5.24 | 3.19 |  |  |

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

The overall sex ratio of ouananiche, 0.90 (Appendix VI), did not indicate a differential abundance of the sexes.

Of 35 ouananiche examined, $82.9 \%$ were mature (Appendix VII). No length at maturity was evident in the small sample. Age at maturity of Newfoundland landlocked salmon has been reported at 2-3 years of age (Leggett and Power 1969).

## FOOD

Ouananiche from the Lower Churchill were primarily piscivorous (Table 26). This likely produced their comparatively rapid growth in length and weight.

Table 26. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of ouananiche in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River section |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | III | IV | V | III-V combined |
| Gasterosteuc aculeatus |  | 72.2 |  | 40.6 |
| Fish remains |  | 22.2 | 54.5 | 28.1 |
| Plecoptera | 66.7 | 27.8 |  | 21.9 |
| Detritus |  | 33.3 |  | 18.8 |
| Hymenoptera |  | 27.8 |  | 15.6 |
| Insect remains | 66.7 | 16.7 |  | 15.6 |
| Trichoptera | 1.00 .0 | 5.6 |  | 12.5 |
| Catostomus sp. |  |  | 36.4 | 12.5 |
| Invertebrate eggs | 66.7 | 5.6 |  | 9.4 |
| Coregonus clupeaformis and |  |  |  |  |
| Erosopium oy indraceum |  |  | 27.3 | 9.4 |
| Diptera (larvae) |  | 16.7 |  | 9.4 |
| Hemiptera |  | 11.1 |  | 6.3 |
| Ephemeroptera |  | 5.6 |  | 3.1 |
| Diptera (pupae) |  | 5.6 |  | 3.1 |
| Esox Iucius |  | 5.6 |  | 3.1 |
| Coleoptera | 33.3 |  |  | 3.1 |
| Number of stomachs examined | 3 | 18 | 11 | 32 |
| Number of stomachs empty | 0 | I | 1 | 2 |

## SELECTION BY GEAR

All ouananiche captured were between 10 and 70 cm with $83 \%$ being 40 cm or greater (Fig. 55). Ages ranged from 3 to 9 years with $93 \%$ being 5 and over (Fig. 56). There were no consistent relationships between length, weight, or age and mesh size in the river as a whole (Table 27) or in the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX). This was probably due to the small sample size.


Fig. 55. Length-frequency distribution of gillnetted ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, above the site of the proposed Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.


Fig. 56. Age-frequency distribution of gillnetted ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the proposed Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.

Table 27. Catch statistics of ouananiche from Sections III-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { age } \\ (\mathrm{yr}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 9 | 0.1 | 44.9 | 9.6 | 1.1 | 0.09 | 6.0 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 7 | 0.1 | 43.4 | 8.1 | 1.2 | 0.08 | 6.0 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 4 | $<0.1$ | 44.8 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 0.04 | 6.5 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 8 | 0.1 | 45.4 | 9.9 | 1.2 | 0.09 | 6.8 |
| 12.7 | 107 | 2 | <0.1 | 50.7 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 0.03 | 8.0 |

The most efficient mesh sizes were the 3.8 and 10.2 cm ; each yielding 0.1 fish weighing $0.09 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{net}$ night.

## MORTALITY RATE

The annual mortality rate (A) of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River was 0.68 (Fig. 57). Although based on few data, the estimate was similar to the approximate 0.60 annual rate in Gambo Pond, Newfoundland (calculated from data of Leggett and Power 1969) and the 0.62 annual statewide average in Maine (Havey and Warner 1970).

## DISCUSSION

The greater catches of ouananiche from the lake portion as opposed to the river portions, of the Lower Churchill, their comparatively rapid growth in length and weight in Winokapau Lake, and their utilization of a variety


Fig. 57. Catch curve of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River ahnve the site of the proposed Gull Island dam JuneAugust, 1975-76.
of food sources suggest that landlocked salmon will do well after the river is impounded.

Reservoir drawdown and siltation may pose a problem for ouananiche. Fluctuating water levels from the time of spawning in September or October until the fry emerge from the gravel in May or June may kill the eggs and young of shore-spawning ouananiche. Fluctuations in water levels may prevent access to some spawning streams. Siltation of spawning areas will impair egg and fry survival.

The absence of ouananiche in catches made on the site of the proposed Muskrat Falls Reservoir suggests that ouananiche should be stocked in the reservoir to utilize all habitat types. This may be assisted by a natural colonization.

## ROUND WHITEFISH

## CATCHES

In the river as a whole, 689 gillnet nights of fishing yielded 169 round whitefish weighing 32.8 kg (Fig. 58). Captured fish had a mean length of 26.4 cm , a mean weight of 0.19 kg , and a mean age of 5.8 years.

Catches within the river varied from a high of $0.21 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night in Section III to a low of $0.01 \mathrm{~kg} /$ net night in Sections I, II, and IV (Fig. 59). Catches tended to be greater, upstream of the site of the Gull Island dam.


Fig. 58. Round whitefish.


Fig. 59. Catches of round whitefish in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

## GROWTH IN LENGTH

Round whitefish growth in the Lower Churchill was suggestive of a tendency towards a maximum ultimate size (Fig. 60 and Appendix V). On the whole, growth was slightly more rapid than growth in the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1975) and intermediate to the range previously reported for North America (Mraz 1964; Mackay and Power 1968).

Growth in the river was most rapid in Section III (between Winokapau Lake and the site of the Gull Island dam) and slowest below Muskrat Falls (Section I).

The age of the oldest round whitefish captured, 13 years, was similar to that previously reported (Scott and Crossman 1973).


Fig. 60. Growth of round whitefish in the Lower Churchill River, 1975-76. Solid heavy lines approximate minimum (MacKay and Power 1968) and maximum (Mraz 1964) rates of growth in North America.

## GROWTH IN WEIGHT

Exponents in the length and weight relationships of round whitefish ranged from 2.62 to 3.19 and had a mean of 2.91 (Table 28); higher than the value of 2.3 reported from the Smallwood Reservoir (Bruce 1975), but lower than the 3.4 value from Ten Mile Lake, Labrador (Parsons 1975). Consistent with growth in length, round whitefish tended to gain weight faster with increasing length in Section III where they were longer at a given age.

Table 28. Least squares linear regressions of $\log _{10}$ weight ( $g$ ) on $\log _{10}$ fork length (cm) for round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| River <br> section | $Y$ <br> intercept | Slope | Correlation <br> coefficient | No. of <br> fish |
| III | -2.27 | 3.19 | 0.989 | 116 |
| Means | -4.48 | 2.62 | 0.870 | 30 |

## SEX RATIOS AND MATURITY

The overall sex ratio of captured round whitefish, 1.06 , did not indicate a differential abundance of the sexes (Appendix VI). Sex ratios within river sections ranged from 0.00 to 3.29 males per female.

Of 169 round whitefish examined, $84.0 \%$ were mature (Appendix VII). Each 2 cm length interval from 16 to 44 cm contained more than $50 \%$ mature fish. The largest interval containing immature fish was 32.0 to 33.9 cm . In the Great Lakes, round whitefish usually mature in their third or fourth year (Armstrong et al. 1977).

FOOD
Round whitefish captured in the Lower Churchill were primarily benthic insectivores (Table 29) as is usual for this species (Scott and Crossman 1973).

## SELECTION BY GEAR

Round whitefish captured above Muskrat Falls were between 10 and 50 cm and had a modal length of between 20 and 30 cm (Fig. 61). Ages were from 2 to 13 and had a mode of 3 (Fig. 62).

With all available data combined, mean lengths, weights, and ages tended to increase with increasing mesh size (Table 30). These trends were less evident within the individual river sections (Appendices VIII and IX).

The most efficient mesh size, in terms of weight, was the 7.6 cm ; capturing fish with a mean length of 34.9 cm , a mean weight of 0.49 kg , and a mean age of 7.7 years.

Table 29. Percentage occurrence of major food items in the stomachs of round whitefish in the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Food item | River section |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | III | IV | V | III-V combined |
| Trichoptera | 88.0 | 100.0 | 69.2 | 83.7 |
| Detritus | 48.0 | 100.0 |  | 37.5 |
| Plecoptera | 41.3 |  | 7.7 | 31.7 |
| Insect remains | 22.7 | 33.3 | 26.9 | 24.0 |
| Diptera (pupae) | 13.3 |  |  | 9.6 |
| Diptera (larvae) | 9.3 |  | 23.1 | 12.5 |
| Invertebrate eggs | 9.3 |  |  | 6.7 |
| Ephemeroptera | 8.0 |  |  | 5.8 |
| Coleoptera | 2.7 |  |  | 1.9 |
| Fish remains | 2.7 |  |  | 1.9 |
| Hymenoptera | 2.7 |  |  | 1.9 |
| Gastropoda | 1.3 |  |  | 1.0 |
| Arachnida | 1.3 |  | 3.8 | 1.0 |
| Number of stomachs examined | 75 | 3 | 26 | 104 |
| Number of stomachs empty | 3 | 0 | 4 | 7 |



Fig. 61. Length-frequency distribution of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.


Fig. 62. Age-frequency distribution of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Table 30. Catch statistics of round whitefish from Sections II-V of the Lower Churchill River, June-August 1975-76.

| Mesh size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ \text { age } \\ (\mathrm{yr}) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.8 | 107 | 68 | 0.6 | 21.0 | 6.3 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 3.0 |
| 5.1 | 107 | 57 | 0.5 | 26.9 | 11.1 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 4.5 |
| 7.6 | 109 | 23 | 0.2 | 34.9 | 11.3 | 0.49 | 0.10 | 7.7 |
| 10.2 | 109 | 3 | $<0.1$ | 36.1 | 2.1 | 0.70 | 0.02 | 9.7 |
| 12.7 | 107 | I | <0.1 | 29.4 | 0.3 | 0.30 | $<0.01$ | 7.0 |

## MORTALITY RATE

The mortality rate of fish captured above Muskrat Falls (Fig. 63) at. $M=0.33$ was slightly lower than the 0.45 value for round whitefish from the Northwest River, Labrador (W. Bruce, pers. comm.).


Fig. 63. Catch curve of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, JuneAugust, 1975-76.

## DISCUSSION

There are indications that round whitefish growth and production will decrease in the Lower Churchill River after impoundment.

The slightly more rapid growth of round whitefish in the Lower Churchill River as opposed to the Smallwood Reservoir suggests that, as conditions in the Lower Churchill approach those of the Smallwood Reservoir, growth rates will lessen.

The fact that round whitefish catches were greater in rapid-flowing Sections III and $V$ than they were in Winokapau Lake suggests that, as the river becomes more of a lake environment, round whitefish production will decrease.

These expected decreases in growth rate and production may be compounded by a relative abundance of lake whitefish, a potential competitor of round whitefish.

The scarcity of round whitefish in the river below the site of the Muskrat Falls dam and the expected similarity of conditions in that sector after impoundment suggest that round whitefish will remain scarce downstream of the impounded area of the Lower Churchill River.

Of potential harm to round whitefish, as is the case with lake whitefish, are sedimentation, turbidity, and drawdown; particularly in the early stages of the reservoirs.

## CATCHES

Three lake chub were captured in Section III (Fig. 64, Table 31). All were mature females and taken in the 3.8 cm mesh.


Fig. 64. Lake chub.

Table 31. Lake chub captured in Section III of the Lower Churchill River, June-July 1976.

| Fork <br> length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Weight <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Age-group <br> $(\mathrm{yr})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.8 | 0.047 | 5 |
| 15.2 | 0.043 | 6 |
| 16.5 | 0.052 | 8 |

FOOD
All three fish contained insect remains. Trichoptera and plecoptera were identified in two.

## DISCUSSION

As a result of the large mesh sizes employed and the small sample obtained, the data cannot be considered representative of populations in the Lower Churchill River. The lake chub is potentially valuable as forage for other species. Its utilization of streams for spawning and its apparent preference for lakes as opposed to faster waters (Scott and Crossman 1973) suggest that lake chub production will increase after the Lower Churchill is impounded.

## RAINBOW SMELT

## CATCHES

Two rainbow smelt were captured in Section I (Fig. 65). Fork lengths were 17.8 and 19.4 cm . Weights were, respectively, 53 and 61 g . Both fish were mature age-group 3 females.


Fig. 65. Rainbow smelt.

FOOD
Both fish contained insect remains and detritus.

## DISCUSSION

Apparently, the only smelt in the Lower Churchill are anadromous ones downstream of Muskrat Falls. It is unlikely that this stock will be harmed by the creation of the reservoirs provided that conditions downstream of the Muskrat Falls dam remain fairly similar.

## OTHER SPECIES

The presence of the following fishes in the Lower Churchill River is indicated by distribution maps for Canadian fishes presented by Scott and Crossman (1973).

Arctic char, American eel and Atlantic sturgeon, three sea-run species not captured during the survey, are apparently confined to waters downstream of the obstruction at Muskrat Falls as are sea-run brook trout and Atlantic salmon. These economically valuable species are not likely to be affected by the presence of the reservoirs providing that an adequate flow of water is maintained downstream of the reservoir area to allow migration.

Threespine and ninespine sticklebacks, both potentially valuable forage species, usually spawn in the summer in nests constructed in shallow water over sandy or weedy bottom. The young remain near the nest for about two months after hatching. These species prefer lake rather than river environments and hence have a potential to increase in abundance after the river is impounded. However, drawdown will adversely affect their reproduction and thus alter predator-prey relationships in the reservoirs.

Longnose dace, generally a stream inhabitant and a potentially valuable forage fish, usually begin spawning in May-July in riffles over a gravelly bottom. The young remain in quiet areas near shore for about 4 months. The preference of the longnose dace for fast waters suggests that it will not be abundant in the reservoirs. Drawdown and siltation may impair reproductive success.

Slimy and mottled sculpin are potentially valuable forage fish. They prefer habitats similar to those of brook trout; suggesting that they will not become more abundant after the river is impounded. Both species spawn in shallow water in the spring. Drawdown and siltation will be detrimental to eggs and young.

## FISH HARVESTS FROM THE GULL ISLAND AND MUSKRAT FALLS RESERVOIRS

## POTENTIAL FISH YIELDS

The specific conductance of the Gull island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs will likely be similar to the 20.7 micromhos/cm measured in the Smallwood Reservoir; corresponding to a value of total dissolved solids of about 22 ppm (based on equations of Lennon 1959). This figure, divided by mean reservoir depths, results in a morphoedaphic index of 1.1 for the Gull Island Reservoir and 1.7 for the Muskrat Falls Reservoir. These values indicate, for large, northtemperate lakes, maximum sustainable fish yields of, respectively 1.01 and $1.26 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr}$. In the Gull Island Reservoir, this represents a potential annual fish harvest of $20,099 \mathrm{~kg}$. In the Muskrat Falls Reservoir, this represents a potential annual fish harvest of $12,474 \mathrm{~kg}$.

The use of Gulland's (1970) model to estimate the components of these potential yields (Table 32) indicates that just over half of the annual potential harvest in each reservoir would be made up of the two sucker species. The remaining portion of the harvest would be comprised of the five most economically valuable species and burbot (Fig. 66). These estimates are based on the assumption that lake trout and ouananiche, two species not captured on the site of the proposed Muskrat Falls Reservoir, colonize the area after construction or are stocked.

Table 32. Data used in estimating long-term potential fish yield for the Gull Island Reservoir and the Muskrat Falls Reservoir. Based on the Ryder (1965) and the Gulland (1970) models and the assumption that relative fish biomass in the reservoirs will approximate that in Winokapau Lake.

| Species | Mortality <br> rate $\left(M_{i}\right)$ | Relative biomass (Bi) | MiBi | Yield (kg/ha/yr) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Guli Island Muskrat Fa11s } \\ & \frac{M i B i}{M M B i} \times 1.01^{*}{ }_{\Sigma M i B i}^{M B i} \times 1.26^{\dagger} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Longnose sucker | 0.57 | 0.289 | 0.16473 | 0.299 | 0.373 |
| White sucker | 0.56 | 0.212 | 0.11872 | 0.215 | 0.269 |
| Ouananiche | 1.15 | 0.076 | 0.08740 | 0.159 | 0.198 |
| Lake whitefish | 0.40 | 0.132 | 0.05280 | 0.096 | 0.120 |
| Burbot | 0.72 | 0.060 | 0.04320 | 0.078 | 0.098 |
| Northern pike | 0.30 | 0.124 | 0.03720 | 0.068 | 0.084 |
| Lake trout | 0.41 | 0.092 | 0.03772 | 0.068 | 0.085 |
| Brook trout | 1.18 | 0.012 | 0.01416 | 0.026 | 0.032 |
| Round whitefish | 0.33 | 0.002 | 0.00066 | 0.001 | 0.002 |
| Totals |  | 1.000 | 0.55659 | 1.01 | 1.26 |

*Predicted potential total fish yield based on a morphoedaphic index (Ryder 1965) of 1.1 for the Gull Island Reservoir.
$\dagger$ Predicted potential total fish yield based on a morphoedaphic index of 1.7 for the Muskrat Falls Reservoir.


Fig. 66. Estimated long-term potential fish yield from the Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs.

## DISCUSSION

The estimates of potential fish yields in the reservoirs should only be considered as preliminary guidelines to be used until data are acquired after impoundment. The estimates of total yield are based on the relationship between yield and the morphoedaphic index in large, north-temperate lakes. Anomalous environmental conditions such as frequent drawdowns will decrease the potential harvest. Also, as pointed out by Henderson et al. (1973), it can be expected that the potential yield predicted by the morphoedaphic index may be exceeded before a reservoir has attained biotic stability and afterwards may not be met unless fishing effort is moderately intense and constant.

The method employed to estimate the component yields required the assumptions that mortality rates did not change significantly from one portion of the river to another, that the exploitable species were caught in proportion to their abundance, and that the relative abundance and population dynamics of a given species in Winokapau Lake are not significantly different from what they will be in the proposed reservoirs. This latter assumption will be invalid if excessive drawdowns and siltation occur causing mortality rates to increase and community stability to decrease or if lake trout and ouananiche do not inhabit the Muskrat Falls Reservoir.

For the above reasons and for the purpose of accurately quantifying the effect of the impoundment of Labrador rivers, it is desirable to undertake a continuous monitoring of the fishery of the Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs.

It is unlikely that the estimated annual yields of fishes from the proposed reservoirs could support an economically viable commercial fishery. However, if a fishery is undertaken, consideration should be given to problems posed by infestations of species of the parasite mazenophomus and excessively high levels of mercury as were found in fish flesh in the Smallwood Reservoir and Winokapau Lake (Bruce et al. 1979). Both of these will affect the marketability of the product.

## SUMMARY

1. The fish populations and water quality of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, were surveyed from June to August, 1975-76; prior to the proposed creation of the Gull Island and Muskrat Falls Reservoirs to be used for hydroelectric power.
2. Overall, the Lower Churchill River is characterized by a pH of 6.3 , a conductance of $18.9 \mu \mathrm{mhos} / \mathrm{cm}$, a total hardness of 8 ppm , a total alkalinity of 6 ppm , a calcium concentration of 1.4 ppm , a turbidity of 3.4 JTU , and a chloride concentration of 0.8 ppm . Tributaries of the Lower Churchill tend to be more dilute waters.
3. Eleven of the 19 fish species whose presence is indicated by distribution maps (Scott and Crossman 1973) were captured with gillnets during the survey. These were: northern pike, lake whitefish, longnose sucker, white sucker, brook trout, burbot, lake trout, ouananiche, round whitefish, lake chub, and rainbow smelt. Threespine sticklebacks and a species of sculpin were identified in stomach contents. All species identified, except rainbow smelt, were obtained upstream of the impassable barrier to fishes, Muskrat Falls. All species identified, except lake trout, ouananiche, lake chub and the species of sculpin, were obtained downstream of Muskrat Falls.
4. The must numerous of the species captured in the river as a whole were, respectively, longnose sucker, lake whitefish, white suckers, brook trout, and northern pike. In terms of weight, northern pike was most abundant followed by lake whitefish, longnose suckers, white suckers and brook trout.
5.. The relative abundance, growth rates, sex ratios and stomach contents of the species captured varied from section to section throughout the river.
5. In the river as a whole, northern pike growth is rapid compared to that in other northern Canadian waters including the Smallwood Reservoir. Pike mature at about 40 cm and $3-4$ years of age. They are primarily piscivorous. Pike were caught most efficiently in 10.2 cm mesh gillnets. Pike taken in this mesh size were all age 5 and over and 50 cm or larger.
6. Lake whitefish in the river are slow growing in comparison to those in other Canadian waters including the Smallwood Reservoir. They mature at about 21 cm and $2-4$ years of age. They are primarily benthic insectivores. Nearly all of the fish captured in the most efficient mesh size, 7.6 cm , were age 4 and over and 30 cm or larger.
7. Longnose suckers in the Lower Churchill grow at a rate similar to that in the Smallwood Reservoir and are comparatively slow growing. They mature at about 20 cm and 5 or 6 years of age. They feed primarily on benthic invertebrates. Nearly all of the fish captured in the most efficient mesh size, 7.6 cm , were age 7 and over and 30 cm or larger.
8. White suckers in the Lower Churchill grow at a rate close to the middle of the range in Canadian waters. They mature at about 22 cm and $4-5$ years of age. They feed primarily on benthic invertebrates. The most efficient mesh size, 10.2 cm , captured fish age 7 and over and 30 cm or larger.
9. Brook trout in the Lower Churchill River grow at a rate intermediate to the range in Newfoundland and Labrador and slower than those in the Smallwood Reservoir. They mature at about 17 cm and 2-3 years of age and feed primarily on benthic invertebrates. Brook trout were caught most efficiently in 7.6 cm mesh gillnets. Nearly all of the fish taken in this mesh size were age 3 and over and 30 cm or larger.
10. Burbot in the Lower Churchill River grow at a rate within the range previously documented for this species in Canada and mature at about 20 cm and $5-6$ years of age. They feed primarily on benthic invertebrates. Nearly all of the fish captured in the most efficient mesh size, 10.2 cm , were age 7 and over and 30 cm or larger.
11. Lake trout growth rates in the Lower Churchill River are intermediate to the overall range and similar to those in the Smallwood Reservoir. On the basis of a small sample size, they mature at about 35 cm and 6 years of age. They are primarily piscivorous and were caught most efficiently in 10.2 cm mesh gillnets.
12. Ouananiche in the Lower Churchill River have relatively high growth rates; similar to those in western Labrador. They are primarily piscivorous. The 3.8 and 10.2 cm mesh gillnets were equally efficient for the capture of ouananiche.
13. Round whitefish in the Lower Churchill River have a growth rate slightly greater than that in the Smallwood Reservoir and intermediate to the North American range. They are primarily benthic insectivores and were most efficiently caught in 7.6 cm mesh gillnets.
14. Long-term potential fish yields in the Gull Island Reservoir were estimated to be $1.01 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr}$ or $20,099 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{yr}$ with just over half of this potential to be made up of longnose and white suckers. In estimating this yield the author assumed that stress conditions such as excessive drawdown and sedimentation would not occur.
15. Long-term potential fish yields in the Muskrat Falls Reservoir were estimated to be $1.26 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr}$ or $12,474 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{yr}$ with just over half made up of longnose and white suckers. In estimating the yield the author assumed that stress conditions would not occur and that lake trout and ouananiche would colonize the reservoir or be introduced.
16. Of greatest potential harm to fish populations in the Lower Churchill River as a result of impoundment are fluctuating water levels and increased sedimentation.
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Appendix I<br>Sample Sites<br>(i) Section I<br>(ii) Section II<br>(iii) Section III<br>(iv) Section IV<br>(v) Section V<br>(vi) The Tributaries

Appendix I(i). Sample sites in Section I of the Lower Churchill River, June 28-July 4, 1975.


Appendix I(ii). Sample sites in Section II of the Lower Churchill River, August 3-24, 1975.


Appendix I(iii). Sample sites in Section III of the Lower Churchill River, June 21-July 29, 1976


Appendix I(iv). Sample sites in Section IV of the Lower Churchill River, July 31-August 5, 1976.


Appendix I(v). Sample sites in Section V of the Lower Churchill River, July 17-August 6, 1975.


Appendix $I(v i)$. Location of the mouths of tributaries to the Churchill River from which water samples were obtained in 1976.

| Number | Location | Tributary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 60^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Caroline Brook |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime N} \mathrm{~N} \\ & 60^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Mackenzie River |
| 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime N} \\ & 60^{\circ} 51^{\prime} 45^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Lower Brook |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime N} \\ & 60^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Upper Brook |
| 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 61^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Pinus River |
| 6. | $\begin{aligned} & 52^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 61^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Unnamed-south side of the Churchill below Gull Lake |
| 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 52^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 60^{\circ} 36^{\prime} \cdot 40^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Unnamed-north side of the Churchill at Horseshoe Rapids |
| 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 52^{\circ} 51^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 62^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Minipi River |
| 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 52^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 61^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Dominion River |
| 10 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 04^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime \mathrm{N}} \\ & 62^{\circ} 13^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Cache River |
| 11 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 62^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Shoal River |
| 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 52^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 63^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Fig River |
| 13 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 63^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Elizabeth River |
| 14 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 45^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 63^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Metchin River |
| 15 | $\begin{aligned} & 53^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} \\ & 63^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} \end{aligned}$ | Unnamed-north side of the Churcnilll above the Metchin |

## Appendix II

Individual measurements of water quality, Lower Churchill River

Appendix II. Individual measurements of water quality, Lower Churchill River.

| Sample date | Sample site | pH | Total hardness (ppm) | Conductance ( $\mu$ mhos $/ \mathrm{cm}$ at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | Turbidity (JTU) | Total <br> alkalinity (ppm) | Calcium (ppm) | Chloride (ppm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28675 | W 1 | 6.6 | 5 | 14.3 | 3.5 | 4 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| 30675 | W 2 | 6.8 | 5 | 15.4 | 4.0 | 5 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| 3675 | W 3 | 6.4 | 8 | 15.4 | 4.0 | 4 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| 5675 | W 4 | 6.3 | 6 | 16.5 | 5.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 5675 | W 5 | 6.6 | 7 | 17.4 | 20.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 7675 | W 6 | 6.6 | 7 | 17.4 | 14.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 10675 | W 7 | 6.1 | 6 | 18.0 | 11.0 | 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 11675 | W 8 | 6.0 | 10 | 18.3 | 16.5 | 5 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 13675 | W 9 | 6.3 | 7 | 19.1 | 20.0 | 6 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| 14775 | W 10 | 6.2 | 8 | 18.8 | 10.0 | 6 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 3875 | W 11 | 6.2 | 8 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 3 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| 5875 | W 12 | 6.0 | 8 | 19.1 | 3.5 | 5 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 6875 | W 13 | 6.1 | 8 | 19.7 | 9.0 | 4 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 7875 | W 14 | 6.2 | 6 | 20.9 | 4.0 | 5 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| 9875 | W 15 | 6.2 | 7 | 18.6 | 4,5 | 6 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 10875 | W 1E | 6.1 | 8 | 18.1 | 4.5 | 6 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| 14875 | W 17 | 6.1 | 7 | 18.1 | 5.5 | 6 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 15875 | W 18 | 6.1 | 7 | 18.7 | 9.0 | 6 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 17875 | W 19 | 6.1 | 7 | 18.7 | 6.0 | 5 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| 18875 | W 20 | 6.2 | 8 | 19.2 | 3.5 | 6 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| 21875 | W 21 | 6.0 | 9 | 20.3 | 5.5 | 5 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| 21875 | W 22 | 6.5 | 8 | 18.7 | 4.0 | 7 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| 22875 | W 23 | 6.4 | 8 | 18.7 | 5.0 | 7 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| 23875 | W 24 | 6.3 | 8 | 18.7 | 9.0 | 6 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| 20676 | W 25 | 6.3 | 8 | 17.0 | 1.0 | 5 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 20676 | W 26 | 6.2 | 7 | 17.0 | 0.8 | 4 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| 23676 | W 27 | 6.4 | 8 | 18.0 | 0.8 | 5 | 1. 3 | 0.6 |
| 22676 | W 28 | 6.3 | 8 | 18.0 | 0.8 | 5 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 24676 | W 29 | 6.3 | 8 | 18.0 | 0.6 | 5 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 24676 | W 30 | 6.3 | 8 | 19.0 | I. 2 | 5 | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| 27676 | W 31 | 6.4 | 8 | 17.0 | 1.4 | 5 | 1.1 | 0.6 |
| 27776 | W 32 | 6.2 | 8 | 17.0 | 0.5 | 5 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 27776 | W 33 | 6.4 | 7 | 17.0 | 0.6 | 5 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 27776 | W 34 | 6.3 | 8 | 19.0 | 2.0 | 5 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 21776 | W 35 | 6.2 | 10 | 22.0 | 1.0 | 6 | 2.0 | 0.6 |
| 21776 | W 36 | 6.3 | 10 | 20.0 | 0.7 | 5 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| 23776 | W 37 | 6.5 | 10 | 20.0 | 2.5 | 7 | 1.8 | 0.7 |
| 23776 | W 38 | 6.5 | 10 | 20.0 | 1.2 | 8 | 1.8 | 0.6 |
| 24776 | W 39 | 6.2 | 10 | 19.0 | 1.0 | 6 | 2.0 | 0.7 |
| 24776 | W 40 | 6.3 | 10 | 19.0 | 1.0 | 6 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| 29776 | W 41 | 6.3 | 10 | 20.0 | 0.5 | 5 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| 25776 | W 42 | 6.4 | 10 | 19.0 | 1.1 | 6 | 1.6 | 0.8 |
| 26776 | W 43 | 6.2 | 9 | 21.0 | 0.8 | 7 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| 26776 | W 44 | 6.3 | 10 | 18.0 | 1.5 | 6 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| 27776 | W 45 | 6.5 | 10 | 18.0 | 0.5 | 5 | 1.4 | 0.8 |
| 27776 | W 46 | 6.5 | 8 | 20.0 | 0.8 | 8 | 2.0 | 0.6 |
| 28776 | W 47 | 6.6 | 8 | 20.0 | 0.7 | 8 | 2.0 | 0.6 |
| 28776 | W 48 | 6.3 | 8 | 19.0 | 1.5 | 7 | 2.0 | 0.6 |
| 29776 | W 49 | 6.4 | 10 | 18.0 | 4.0 | 5 | 1.8 | 0.8 |
| 29776 | W 50 | 6.3 | 10 | 19.0 | 0.5 | 6 | 1.7 | 0.7 |
| 31776 | W 51 | 6.4 | 9 | 21.0 | 2.2 | 7 | 1.8 | 0.6 |
| 31776 | W 52 | 6.4 | 9 | 20.0 | 1.5 | 7 | 1.5 | 0.6 |
| 1876 | W 53 | 6.3 | 8 | 18.0 | 1.2 | 5 | 1.4 | 0.6 |
| 1876 | W 54 | 6.4 | 9 | 21.0 | 0.7 | 6 | 1.7 | 0.6 |
| 2876 | W 55 | 6.5 | 9 | 22.0 | 1.5 | 6 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| 2876 | W 56 | 6.2 | 10 | 21.0 | 0.9 | 6 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| 3876 | W 57 | 6.3 | 9 | 19.0 | 1.0 | 6 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 3876 | W 58 | 6.3 | 10 | 19.0 | 1.2 | 7 | 1.4 | 0.6 |
| 4876 | W 59 | 6.3 | 7 | 18.0 | 0.6 | 6 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 4876 | W 60 | 6.3 | 8 | 18.0 | 1.4 | 5 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| 5876 | W61 | 6.4 | 8 | 19.0 | 1.0 | 6 | 1.5 | 0.6 |
| 5876 | W 62 | 6.3 | 8 | 18.0 | 0.8 | 6 | 1.6 | 0.7 |
| 6875 | W 63 | 6.4 | 10 | 20.9 | 1.5 | 6 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 5875 | W 64 | 6.4 | 8 | 17.1 | 0.7 | 6 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 5875 | W 65 | 6.1 | 6 | 13.2 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| 27775 | W 66 | 6.4 | 10 | 20.9 | 0.9 | 8 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| 30775 | W67 | 6.5 | 12 | 26.4 | 1.5 | 8 | 2.3 | 0.5 |
| 27775 | W 68 | 6.4 | 10 | 20.4 | 1.6 | 8 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| 27775 | W 69 | 6.5 | 10 | 20.4 | 1.7 | 8 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| 25775 | W 70 | 6.5 | 10 | 22.0 | 3.7 | 8 | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| 20775 | W 71 | 6.4 | 8 | 22.0 | 1.5 | 6 | 1.3 | 0.5 |



Appendix III(i). Numerical composition of the gillnet catch by species in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76. Percentages are shown in brackets.

| Species | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V |
| Longnose sucker | $\begin{gathered} 289 \\ (30.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (10.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 268 \\ (26.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 170 \\ (41.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 409 \\ (40.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1191 \\ (30.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lake whitefish | $\begin{gathered} 294 \\ (30.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145 \\ & (27.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 119 \\ (12.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58 \\ (14.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 221 \\ (22.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 837 \\ (21.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| White sucker | $\begin{gathered} 252 \\ (26.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 171 \\ & (32.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (2.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 113 \\ (27.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 155 \\ & (15.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 711 \\ (18.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Brook trout | $\begin{gathered} 38 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{3}{(0.6)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 446 \\ & (44.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{5}{(1.2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87 \\ (8.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 579 \\ (14.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Northern pike | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (5.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 133 \\ (25.4) \end{gathered}$ | $(0.1)$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (3.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & (6.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 265 \\ (6.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| Round whitefish | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (1.8) \end{gathered}$ | $(0.6)$ | $\begin{gathered} 116 \\ (17.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(0^{3} .7\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (3.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 169 \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Burbot | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ (0.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ (2.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ (1.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \\ (5.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ (2.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 85 \\ (2.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Ouananiche |  |  | $\left(0^{2} .2\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & (4.1) \end{aligned}$ | $(11.1)$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (0.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lake trout |  |  | $\left(0^{3} .3\right)$ | ${ }^{8}$ | $\left(0^{4} .4\right)$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lake chub |  |  | $\left(0^{3} .3\right)$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Rainbow smelt | $\stackrel{2}{(-)}$ |  |  |  |  | $\left(\begin{array}{c}2 \\ -\end{array}\right.$ |
| All species | 954 | 523 | 996 | 413 | 1001 | 3887 |

> Appendix III(ii). Catch per unit effort (No. fish/net night) of the gillnet catch by species in the Lower Churchili River, June-August, $1975-76$. Percentages are shown in brackets.

| Species | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V |
| Longnose sucker | $\begin{gathered} 1.9 \\ (29.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ (12.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.3 \\ (26.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ (40.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.8 \\ (40.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.7 \\ (30.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lake whitefish | $\begin{gathered} 2.0 \\ (30.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ (28.0) \end{gathered}$ | $(11.0)$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ (14.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ (21.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l} 1.2 \\ (21.8) \end{array}\right.$ |
| White sucker | $\begin{gathered} 1.7 \\ (26.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ (32.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ (2.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.9 \\ (27.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ (15.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.0 \\ (18.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Brook trout | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ (4.6) \end{gathered}$ | $(-)$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.9 \\ (45.4) \end{gathered}$ | $(1.4)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \\ (8.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ (14.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| Northern pike | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ (6.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \\ (24.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ (5.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ (7.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Round whitefish | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ (1.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <0.1 \\ & (-) \end{aligned}$ | $(11.6)$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ (1.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ (2.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ (5.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| Burbot | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & (1.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ (4.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ (2.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ (5.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ (2.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ (1.8) \end{gathered}$ |
| Ouananiche |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ (4.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ (1.5) \end{gathered}$ | $(-)$ |
| Lake trout |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} <0.7 \\ (-) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \\ (1.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{array}$ |
| Lake chub |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{array}$ |
| Rainbow smelt | $\begin{array}{r} <0.1 \\ (-) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | <0.1 |
| All species | 6.5 | 2.5 | 8.6 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 5.5 |

[^0]Appendix III(iii). Weight composition (kg) of the gillnet catch by species in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76. Percentages are shown in brackets.

| Species | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V |
| Northern pike | $\begin{aligned} & 118.3 \\ & (30.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 246.0 \\ & (54.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \\ & (0.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37.4 \\ (12.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145.8 \\ & (22.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 549.8 \\ & (24.8) \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake whitefish | $\begin{aligned} & 127.1 \\ & (32.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78.2 \\ (17.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 78.3 \\ (17.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39.3 \\ (13.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 146.1 \\ & (22.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 469.0 \\ & (21.2) \end{aligned}$ |
| Longnose sucker | $\begin{gathered} 70.4 \\ (18.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.7 \\ & (4.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.0 \\ (22.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86.1 \\ (28.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 125.9 \\ & (19.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 401.5 \\ & (18.1) \end{aligned}$ |
| White sucker | $\begin{gathered} 64.9 \\ (16.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 90.4 \\ (20.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.1 \\ & (2.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 63.4 \\ (21.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122.6 \\ & (19.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 353.4 \\ & (16.0) \end{aligned}$ |
| Brook trout | $\begin{gathered} 5.0 \\ (1.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 209.5 \\ & (47.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.7 \\ (1.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.3 \\ & (6.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 261.6 \\ & (11.8) \end{aligned}$ |
| Burbot | $\begin{gathered} 4.3 \\ (1.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.9 \\ & (2.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.3 \\ (2.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.8 \\ & (6.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \\ & (2.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.9 \\ & (2.7) \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake trout |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ (0.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.8 \\ & (9.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.3 \\ & (3.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.8 \\ & (2.3) \end{aligned}$ |
| Ouananiche |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.2 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.0 \\ & (7.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.1 \\ & (1.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.3 \\ & (1.6) \end{aligned}$ |
| Round whitefish | $\begin{gathered} 1.7 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.9 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.6 \\ & (5.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \\ (0.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \\ (0.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.8 \\ & (1.5) \end{aligned}$ |
| Lake chub |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & (-) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 0.1 $(-)$ |
| Rainbow smelt | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & (-) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |
| All species | 391.8 | 449.6 | 438.1 | 298.9 | 636.9 | 2215.3 |

Appendix III(iv). Catch per unit effort (kg/net night) of the gillnet catch by species in the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76. Percentages are shown in brackets.

| Species | River section |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | I-V |
| Northern pike | $\begin{array}{r} 0.79 \\ (30.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.12 \\ (54.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.62 \\ (12.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.98 \\ (22.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.80 \\ (24.8) \end{array}$ |
| Lake whitefish | $\begin{array}{r} 0.85 \\ (32.6) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.36 \\ (17.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.68 \\ (17.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.66 \\ (13.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.98 \\ (22.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.68 \\ (21.1) \end{array}$ |
| Longnose sucker | $\begin{array}{r} 0.47 \\ (18.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.10 \\ (4.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.85 \\ (22.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.44 \\ (28.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.86 \\ (20.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.58 \\ (18.0) \end{array}$ |
| White sucker | $\begin{array}{r} 0.43 \\ (16.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.41 \\ (19.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.11 \\ (2.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.06 \\ (21.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.82 \\ (19.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.51 \\ (15.8) \end{array}$ |
| Brook trout | $\begin{array}{r} 0.03 \\ (1.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.82 \\ (47.9) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \\ & (1.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (6.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.38 \\ (11.8) \end{array}$ |
| Burbot | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (1.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.05 \\ (2.4) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (2.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.30 \\ (6.0) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (2.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.09 \\ (2.8) \end{array}$ |
| Lake trout |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0.02 \\ (0.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 \\ (9.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.15 \\ (3.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.08 \\ & (2.5) \end{aligned}$ |
| Ouananiche |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 0.01 \\ (0.3) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.38 \\ & (7.6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (1.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.05 \\ (1.6) \end{array}$ |
| Round whitefish | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (5.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.01 \\ (0.2) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.03 \\ (0.7) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (1.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Lake chub |  |  | $\begin{gathered} <0.01 \\ (-) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} <0.01 \\ (-) \end{gathered}$ |
| Rainbow smelt | $\begin{gathered} <0.01 \\ (-) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} <0.01 \\ (-) \end{gathered}$ |
| All species | 2.61 | 2.06 | 3.80 | 4.99 | 4.31 | 3.22 |

$\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{A}}$ net night is one 47 metre gillnet of stretched mesh $3.8-12.7 \mathrm{~cm}$ fished for a 24 hour period. Data are weighted to compensate for different efforts by different mesh sizes.
Appendix IV
Body-scale relationships of fishes from the Lower Churchill River

Appendix IV. Linear regressions of fork length (L)(cm) on scale radius (S) (cm $\times 43$ ) for fishes from the Lower Churchill River, 1975-76.

| Species | River Section | Regression | No. of data pairs | Correlation Coefficient |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern pike | 1. | $\log _{10} L=0.74 \log _{10} S+0.93$ | 55 | 0.923 |
|  | II. | $\log _{10} \mathrm{~L}=0.84 \log _{10} \mathrm{~S}+0.83$ | 131 | 0.932 |
|  | IV. | $\log _{10} L=0.88 \log _{10} S+0.55$ | 117 | 0.918 |
|  | V. | $110 \mathrm{~L}=4.70{ }^{10} \mathrm{~S}-6.10$ | 60 | 0.900 |
| Lake whitefish | I. | $L=1.06 \quad S+8.78$ | 150 | 0.904 |
|  | II. | $L=1.11 \quad S+8.37$ | 140 | 0.936 |
|  | III. | $\log _{10} L=0.46 \log _{10} S+0.94$ | 104 | 0.794 |
|  | IV. | ${ }^{109} 10{ }_{L}=1.10{ }^{1} 10 \mathrm{~S}+12.86$ | 54 a | 0.867 |
|  | $v$. | $L=2.57 \quad S+9.07$ | $10^{\text {a }}$ | 0.983 |
| Longnose sucker |  |  |  |  |
|  | I. | $\log _{10} L=0.67 \log _{10} S+0.78$ | 148 | 0.895 |
|  | II. | $\log _{10} \mathrm{~L}=0.73 \log _{10} \mathrm{~S}+0.69$ | 53 | 0.926 |
|  | III. | ${ }^{10} \mathrm{log}_{10} \mathrm{~L}=0.72 \log _{10} \mathrm{~S}+0.73$ | 189 | 0.889 |
|  | IV. | ${ }^{\log _{10} \mathrm{~L}}=0.57 \mathrm{log}^{\text {L }}=2.39 \mathrm{~S}+0.89$ | ${ }^{95}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.849 0.993 |
| White sucker | I. | $\log _{10} L=0.62 \log _{10} S+0.69$ | 182 | 0.938 |
|  | II. | $10 \mathrm{~L}=1.13 \quad 10 \mathrm{~S}+7.68$ | 150 | 0.900 |
|  | III. | $\log _{10} L=0.54 \log _{10} S+0.82$ | 20 | 0.961 |
|  | IV. | ${ }^{10} L=1.05{ }^{10} \mathrm{~S}+10.50$ | 102 | 0.951 |
|  | V. | $L=2.32 \quad S+7.66$ | $9{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.991 |
| Brook trout | I. | ${ }^{\log } 10 \mathrm{~L}=0.58 \log _{10} \mathrm{~S}+1.13$ | 37 | 0.750 |
|  | III. | $\log _{10} L=0.94 \log _{10} \mathrm{~S}+1.03$ | 183 | 0.844 |
|  | $V$. | ${ }^{\log } 10 \mathrm{~L}=1.11 \log _{10} \mathrm{~S}+0.86$ | 87 | b |
| Ouananiche | IV. | $L=2.74 \quad S+8.66$ | 22 | 0.875 |
| Round whitefish | III. | $L=1.62 \quad S+8.14$ | 105 | 0.929 |
|  | V. | $L=2.65 \quad S-2.09$ | $8^{\text {a }}$ | 0.985 |

a. Data were averaged by intervals of fork length.
b. Not available.


## Appendix V

Age-Length Data
(i) Northern Pike
(ii) Lake Whitefish
(iii) Longnose Suckers
(iv) White Suckers
(v) Brook Trout
(vi) Burbot
(vii) Lake Trout
(viii) Ouananiche
(ix) Round Whitefish
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Appendix $V(i)$. Growth of northern pike, Esox lucius, in four sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section ${ }^{2}$ | Mean calculated fork length (cm) at age - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | T | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |
| I | 13.1 | 25.8 | 34.7 | 41.7 | 48.4 | 53.4 | 58.3 | 62.5 | 65.3 | 67.1 | 66.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |
| 11 | 11.8 | 20.2 | 29.5 | 38.1 | 45.3 | 50.7 | 55.9 | 60.1 | 63.1 | 66.1 | 68.7 | 71.6 | 74.1 | 74.9 | 78.1 | 84.6 | 131 |
| IV | 8.7 | 15.9 | 23.1 | 31.6 | 42.6 | 50.6 | 56.8 | 59.0 | 64.2 | 64.6 | 66.0 | 70.2 | 74.0 | 78.2 |  |  | 16 |
| $v$ | 1.7 | 12.9 | 25.3 | 37.9 | 49.9 | 58.0 | 63.7 | 69.6 | 72.4 | 75.9 | 79.4 | 81.9 | 84.0 | 90.6 | 95.9 |  | 60 |
| I-V <br> Mean of Means | 8.8 | 18.7 | 28.2 | 37.3 | 46.6 | 53.2 | 58.7 | 62.8 | 66.3 | 68.4 | 70.1 | 74.6 | 77.4 | 81.2 | 87.0 | 84.6 | - |

[^1]Appendix $V(i i)$. Growth of lake whitefish, Coregonus clupeaformis, in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mean calculated fork length (cm) at age - No. of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 1617 | fish |
| I | 11.4 | 15.6 | 18.4 | 20.6 | 22.2 | 25.0 | 26.2 | 28.4 | 30.1 | 39.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |
| $\mathrm{II}^{\text {a }}$ | 11.4 | 15.2 | 18.3 | 21.4 | 24.3 | 27.1 | 29.3 | 31.2 | 33.4 | 35.1 | 36.4 | 37.8 | 39.3 |  |  |  | 140 |
| III | 12.8 | 19.2 | 23.3 | 26.3 | 29.1 | 31.4 | 33.1 | 34.3 | 35.8 | 35.4 | 36.3 | 36.8 | 36.9 |  |  |  | 104 |
| IV | 15.8 | 19.5 | 23.4 | 26.4 | 28.1 | 30.6 | 32.1 | 33.9 | 35.1 | 36.4 | 38.0 | 39.1 |  |  |  |  | 54 |
| $V$ | 13.1 | 17.7 | 21.4 | 24.5 | 27.1 | 29.4 | 31.3 | 33.1 | 34.2 | 35.9 | 37.6 | 41.4 | 43.1 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 54.155 .6 | 152 |
| I-V <br> Mean of means | 12.9 | 17.4 | 21.0 | 23.8 | 26.2 | 28.7 | 30.4 | 32.2 | 33.7 | 36.4 | 37.1 | 38.8 | 39.8 | 52.3 | 53.1 | 54.155 .6 | - |

a. Fish of ages 14-20 were deleted due to insufficient sample size.

Appendix V(iii). Growth of longnose suckers, Catostomus catostomus, in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mean calculated fork length (cm) at age - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |
| I | 6.4 | 10.4 | 13.7 | 17.0 | 19.9 | 22.4 | 25.0 | 27.5 | 29.3 | 30.7 | 33.5 | 35.4 | 38.8 | 41.8 |  |  | 148 |
| II | 4.7 | 7.7 | 11.0 | 14.4 | 17.2 | 20.8 | 23.7 | 26.8 | 30.2 | 32.7 | 34.7 | 37.1 | 38.7 | 39.7 |  |  | 53 |
| III | 5.4 | 8.34 | 11.4 | 14.8 | 17.9 | 21.0 | 23.8 | 26.5 | 29.0 | 30.8 | 33.5 | 35.3 | 37.5 | 38.9 | 43.9 |  | 189 |
| IV ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 7.0 | 10.1 | 13.2 | 15.9 | 18.7 | 21.5 | 24.1 | 26.5 | 29.0 | 30.8 | 32.2 | 34.7 | 36.3 | 38.6 | 40.3 | 46.6 | 189 |
| $V$ | 3.0 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 11.3 | 14.5 | 17.8 | 21.7 | 24.5 | 27.5 | 30.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24.5 | 27.5 | 30.5 | 33.2 | 35.1 | 38.2 | 38.9 |  |  | 148 |
| Mean of means | 5.3 | 8.4 | 11.5 | 14.7 | 17.6 | 20.7 | 23.7 | 26.4 | 29.0 | 31.1 | 33.4 | 35.5 | 37.9 | 39.6 | 42.1 | 46.6 | - |

a. One fish in its 19th year was not included.

Appendix V(iv). Growth of white suckers, Catostomus commersoni, in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mean calculated fork length (cm) at age - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { fich } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 1617 |  |
| 1 | 5.7 | 9.2 | 13.5 | 17.6 | 21.0 | 23.7 | 25.8 | 28.1 | 29.8 | 30.2 | 31.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 182 |
| 11 | 9.5 | 11.6 | 14.6 | 18.2 | 21.7 | 25.7 | 29.9 | 33.1 | 35.2 | 37.3 | 38.7 | 39.7 | 41.2 |  |  |  | 150 |
| III | 8.8 | 13.2 | 17.9 | 22.2 | 26.5 | 30.8 | 33.6 | 36.7 | 40.5 | 42.6 | 43.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| IV | 11.8 | 12.7 | 14.4 | 17.2 | 20.0 | 22.8 | 26.5 | 29.3 | 32.1 | 34.9 | 36.6 | 38.6 | 41.1 | 43.0 | 46.5 | 48.349 .5 | 102 |
| $v^{\text {a }}$ | 9.6 | 11.6 | 14.5 | 17.9 | 21.4 | 25.2 | 28.7 | 31.5 | 34.3 | 37.2 | 39.2 | 41.0 | 42.9 | 44.4 | 44.6 | 46.1 | $155^{*}$ |
| I-V <br> Mean of means | 9.1 | 11.7 | 15.0 | 18.6 | 22.1 | 25.5 | 28.9 | 31.7 | 34.4 | 36.4 | 37.9 | 39.8 | 41.7 | 43.7 | 45.6 | 47.249 .5 | 5 |

a. One fish in its 19th year was not included.

Appendix $V(v)$. Growth of brook trout, Salvelinus fontinalis, in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

a. Lengths are lengths at capture.
b. Includes 41 angled fish.

Appendix $V(v i)$. Growth of burbot, Lota lota in five sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, $1975-76$.

| River | M Mean total length (cm) at capture of fish in age group - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| section | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |
| I |  |  |  |  | 34.6 | 36.6 | 51.2 | 48.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| II |  |  |  |  | 30.5 | 44.1 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 54.6 | 52.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| III |  |  | ${ }^{23.1}$ | 33.9 | 33.2 | 46.4 | 46.8 | 51.0 | 56.0 |  | 42.5 |  |  | 53.5 |  |  | 18 |
| IV |  |  |  | 40.1 | 34.7 |  | 43.2 |  | 46.5 | 55.9 | 56.1 |  | 68.7 |  |  |  | 23 |
| $v$ |  |  | 22.5 | 29.7 | 29.7 | 30.5 | 32.5 | 43.8 | 43.8 | 53.8 | 56.1 | 60.3 | 68.9 |  |  |  | 24 |
| I. $-V$. <br> Mean of means |  |  | 22.8 | 34.6 | 32.5 | 39.4 | 44.5 | 48.2 | 50.2 | 53.9 | 51.6 | 60.3 | 68.8 | 53.5 |  |  | \% |

Appendix $V(v i i)$. Growth of lake trout, Salvelinus namaycush in three sections of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.


Appendix V(viii). Growth of ouananiche, Salmo salar in one section of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

a. Lengths are lengths at capture.
b. Includes one angled fish.
c. Includes five angled fish.

Appendix V(ix). Growth of round whitefish, Prosopium cylindraceum, in five section of the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mean calculated fork length (cm) at age - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No. of fish |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |
| $1^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  | 21.5 | 20.5 | 23.7 | 23.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| $11^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32.9 | 34.5 |  |  |  | 40.4 |  |  |  | 3 |
| III | 11.4 | 16.1 | : 20.0 | 23.1 | 25.4 | 27.4 | 29.4 | 30.9 | 31.7 | 34.4 | 34.2 | 36.0 |  |  |  |  | 105 |
| $1 V^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | 20.5 |  | 26.6 | 26.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| $v$ | 5.7 | 14.0 | 17.7 | 19.1 | 22.1 | 22.9 | 27.4 | 27.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
| III and $V$ mean of means | 8.6 | 15.1 | 18.9 | 21.1 | 23.8 | 25.2 | 28.4 | 29.2 | 31.7 | 34.4 | 34.2 | 36.0 |  |  |  |  | - |

a. Lengths are lengths at capture.


Appendix VI
Sex ratios of fishes from the Lower Churchill River

Appendix VI. Sex ratios (number of males per female) of fishes from the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

| Species | River Section | No. Of Fish Examined | Sex <br> Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern Pike | I | 55 | 1.62 |
|  | II | 130 | 0.88 |
|  | III | 2 | a |
|  | IV | 18 | 1.25 |
|  | $V$ | 60 | $1.61{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | I-V | 265 | $1.19{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| Lake Whitefish | I | 294 | 0.57 |
|  | II | 145 | 1.38 |
|  | III | 119 | 0.95 |
|  | IV | 58 | 1.15 |
|  | V | 221 | 1.38 b |
|  | I-V | 837 | $0.95{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| Longnose Sucker | I | 289 | 0.24 |
|  | II | 55 | 0.45 |
|  | III | 261 | 0.51 |
|  | IV | 171 | 0.75 |
|  | $v$ | - | ${ }^{\text {c }}$ d |
|  | I-V | 776 | 0.43 |
| White Sucker | I | 239 | 1.19 |
|  | II | 171 | 0.86 |
|  | III | 20 | 1.22 |
|  | IV | 113 | 0.88 |
|  | $V$ |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{V}$ | 543 | $1.01{ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| Brook Trout | I | 35 | 0.84 |
|  | II | 3 | 2.00 |
|  | III | 569 | 1.10 |
|  | IV | 5 | 0.67 |
|  | $V$ | 87 | 0.98 b |
|  | I-V | 699 | $1.07{ }^{\text {b }}$ |

Appendix VI - Continued.

a. All males.
b. $x^{2}$ \& 3.84 indicates no departure from 1:1 sex ratio.
c. Not determined.
d. $x^{2}>3.84$ indicates departure from 1:1 sex ratio.
Appendix VII
Length at maturity of fishes from the Lower Churchill River
(i) Northern pike
(ii) Lake whitefish and round whitefish
(iii) White suckers, longnose suckers and brook trout
(iv) Burbot and ouananiche
(v) Lake trout

Appendix VII (i). Length at maturity of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fork } \\ & \text { Length (cm) } \end{aligned}$ | Number Examined | \% Mature |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.0-24.9 | 9 | 0.0 |
| 25.0-29.9 | 11 | 0.0 |
| 30.0-35.9 | 6 | 16.7 |
| 35.0-39.9 | 4 | 50.0 |
| 40.0-44.9 | 7 | 71.4 |
| 45.0-49.9 | 16 | 100.0 |
| 50.0-54.9 | 16 | 87.5 |
| 55.0-59.9 | 37 | 100.0 |
| 60.0-64.9 | 59 | 100.0 |
| 65.0-69.9 | 46 | 100.0 |
| 70.0-74.9 | 20 | 100.0 |
| 75.0-79.9 | 7 | 100.0 |
| 80.0-84.9 | 8 | 100.0 |
| 85.0-89.9 | 10 | 100.0 |
| 90.0-94.9 | 4 | 100.0 |
| 95.0-99.9 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 100.0-104.9 | 3 | 100.0 |
| 105.0-109.9 |  |  |
| Total | 265 | 88.3 |

Appendix VII (ii). Length at maturity of lake whitefish and round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

| Fork <br> Length (cm) | Lake Whitefish |  | Round Whitefish |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
|  | Examined | Mature | Examined | Mature |
| 12.0-13.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 14.0-15.9 | 5 | 40.0 |  |  |
| 16.0-17.9 | 27 | 25.9 | 1 |  |
| 18.0-19.9 | 52 | 38.5 | 28 | 64.3 |
| 20.0-21.9 | 38 | 57.9 | 33 | 72.3 |
| 22.0-23.9 | 51 | 76.5 | 25 | 88.0 |
| 24.0-25.9 | 41 | 92.7 | 23 | 91.3 |
| 26.0-27.9 | 32 | 93.8 | 14 | 92.9 |
| 28.0-29.9 | 17 | 52.9 | 11 | 100.0 |
| 30.0-31.9 | 21 | 76.2 | 3 | 100.0 |
| 32.0-33.9 | 45 | 91.1 | 14 | 85.7 |
| $34.0-35.9$ $36.0-37.9$ | 107 | 95.3 | 8 | 100.0 |
| $36.0-37.9$ $38.0-39.9$ | 143 | 97.2 | 6 | 100.0 |
| $38.0-39.9$ $40.0-41.9$ | 91 | 98.9 | 1 | 100.0 |
| $40.0-41.9$ $42.0-43.9$ | 37 | 92.3 | 1 | 100.0 |
| $42.0-43.9$ $44.0-45.9$ | 18 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 44.0-45.9 | 6 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 46.0-47.9 | 2 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 48.0-49.9 | 1 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 50.0-51.9 | 3 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 52.0-53.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 737 | 84.3 | 169 | 84.0 |

new perse

Appendix VII (iii). Length at maturity of white suckers, longnose suckers, and brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

| Fork <br> Length (cm) | White suckers |  | Longnose suckers |  | Brook trout |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Examined | \% Mature | Number Examined | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & \text { Mature } \end{aligned}$ | Number Examined | \% <br> Mature |
| 10.0-11.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12.0-13.9 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 14.0-15.9 | 2 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.0 | 8 | 50.0 |
| 16.0-17.9 | 46 | 32.6 | 46 | 17.4 | 27 | 63.0 |
| 18.0-19.9 | 32 | 25.0 | 40 | 27.5 | 42 | 78.6 |
| 20.0-21.9 | 64 | 43.8 | 33 | 81.8 | 16 | 87.5 |
| 22.0-23.9 | 71 | 66.2 | 80 | 92.5 | 32 | 81.3 |
| 24.0-25.9 | 38 | 73.7 | 63 | 92.1 | 29 | 93.1 |
| 26.0-27.9 | 11 | 90.9 | 34 | 100.0 | 38 | 80.0 |
| 28.0-29.9 | 13 | 92.3 | 19 | 100.0 | 35 | 91.4 |
| 30.0-31.9 | 47 | 100.0 | 68 | 100.0 | 59 | 100.0 |
| 32.0-33.9 | 59 | 100.0 | 79 | 100.0 | 70 | 94.3 |
| 34.0-35.9 | 41 | 100.0 | 89 | 100.0 | 77 | 98.7 |
| 36.0-37.9 | 25 | 100.0 | 60 | 100.0 | 84 | 97.6 |
| 38.0-39.9 | 27 | 100.0 | 42 | 100.0 | 71 | 95.8 |
| 40.0-41.9 | 31 | 100.0 | 16 | 100.0 | 46 | 97.8 |
| 42.0-43.9 | 24 | 95.8 | 9 | 100.0 | 42 | 100.0 |
| 44.0-45.9 | 13 | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 14 | 92.9 |
| 46.0-47.9 | 3 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 48.0-49.9 | 2 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 50.0-51.9 |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 52.0-53.9 | 1 | 100.0 |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 54.0-55.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 550 | 76.4 | 698 | 87.4 | 695 | 91.9 |

Appendix VII (iv). Length at maturity of burbot and ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length (cm) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Burbot |  | Ouananiche |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Examined | \% Mature | Number Examined | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { Mature } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16.0-17.9 |  |  | 1 | 0.0 |
| 18.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-21.9 |  |  |  |  |
| 22.0-23.9 | 5 | 40.0 |  |  |
| 24.0-25.9 |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 26.0-27.9 |  |  | 1 | 0.0 |
| 28.0-29.9 | 5 | 20.0 |  |  |
| 30.0-31.9 | 4 | 25.0 |  |  |
| 32.0-33.9 | 4 | 75.0 |  |  |
| 34.0-35.9 | 1 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 36.0-37.9 |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 38.0-39.9 | 3 | 100.0 | 3 | 66.7 |
| 40.0-47.9 | 4 | 100.0 | 4 | 50.0 |
| 42.0-43.9 | 8 | 100.0 | 4 | 100.0 |
| 44.0-45.9 | 7 | 100.0 | 4 | 75.0 |
| 46.0-47.9 | 9 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 48.0-49.9 | 4 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 50.0-51.9 | 3 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 52.0-53.9 | 4 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 |
| 54.0-55.9 | 3 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 56.0-57.9 | 5 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| 58.0-59.9 | 2 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 60.0-61.9 | 3 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 62.0-63.9 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 64.0-65.9 | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| 66.0-67.9 | 1 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 68.0-69.9 | 2 | 100.0 |  |  |
| 70.0-71.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 79 | 86.1 | 35 | 82.9 |

a. Lengths are total lengths for burbot and fork lengths for ouananiche.

Appendix VII (v). Length at maturity of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, June-August, 1975-76.

| Fork <br> Length (cm) | Number <br> Examined | $\%$ <br> Mature |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $30.0-39.9$ | 2 | 50.0 |
| $40.0-49.9$ | 3 | 100.0 |
| $50.0-59.9$ | 3 | 100.0 |
| $60.0-69.9$ | 1 | 1000 |
| $70.0-79.9$ | 1 | 100.0 |
| $80.0-89.9$ | 1 | 100.0 |
| $90.0-99.9$ |  |  |
| $00.0-109.9$ | 15 | 93.3 |
| Total |  |  |



Appendix VIII (i). Catch statistics of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mesh size (cm) | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of } \\ \text { net } \\ \text { nights } \end{gathered}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weigh (kg) |  | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night(kg) | Mean age ( yr ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I_{1}{ }^{b}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 | 55 (100\%) | 0.4 | 62.2 | 118.3 | (100\%) | 2.15 | 0.79 | 7.5 |
|  | 3.8 | 44 | 36 (27.1\%) | 0.8 | 46.2 | 44.2 | (18.0\%) | ) 1.30 | 1.01 | 5.6 |
|  | 5.1 | 44 | 29 (21.8\%) | 0.7 | 54.4 | 55.1 | (22.4\%) | ) 1.90 | 1.25 | 6.9 |
|  | 7.6 | 44 | 34 (25.6\%) | 0.8 | 55.2 | 47.6 | (19.3\%) | ) 1.40 | 1.08 | 7.4 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 | 29 (21.8\%) | 0.7 | 69.3 | 81.2 | 33.0\%) | 2.80 | 1.85 | 9.5 |
|  | 12.7 | 44 | 5 ( $3.8 \%$ ) | 0.1 | 73.9 | 17.9 | ( 7.3\%) | ) 3.60 | 0.41 | 10.4 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 133 (100\%) | 0.6 | 56.4 | 246.0 | (100\%) | 1.85 | 1.12 | 7.4 |
| III | 12.7 | 21 | 1 (100\%) | 0.1 | 68.2 |  | (100\%) | 2.31 | 0.11 | 11.0 |
|  | 3.3-12.7 | 113 | 1 (100\%) | $<0.1$ | 68.2 |  | (100\%) | 2.31 | 0.02 | 11.0 |
| IV | 3.8 | 12 | 3 (18.8\%) | 0.3 | 72.5 |  | (26.7\%) | ) 3.30 | 0.83 | 10.7 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 | 2 (12.5\%) | 0.2 | 52.9 | 3.3 | (8.8\%) | ) 1.60 | 0.28 | 7.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 12 | 6 (37.5\%) | 0.5 | 65.4 | 13.3 | (35.6\%) | ) 2.20 | 1.11 | 8.3 |
|  | 10.2 | 12 | 5 (31.3\%) | 0.4 | 66.0 | 10.8 | (28.9\%) | ) 2.20 | 0.90 | 8.0 |
|  | 12.7 | 12 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0.0 | - |  | (0.0\%) | - | 0.00 | . |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 16 (100\%) | 0.3 | 65.4 | 37.4 | (100\%) | 2.34 | 0.62 | 8.5 |
| $v$ | 3.8 | 28 | 3 (5.0\%) | 0.1 | 72.7 |  | (6.8\%) | 3.28 | 0.35 | 7.7 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 5 (8.3\%) | 0.2 | 65.0 | 12.9 | (8.9\%) | 2.58 | 0.46 | 7.2 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 | 17 (28.3\%) | 0.6 | 62.3 | 35.5 | (24.4\%) | ) 1.97 | 1.18 | 6.9 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 | 30 (50.0\%) | 1.0 | 64.5 | 67.2 | (46.1\%) | ) 2.24 | 2.24 | 7.1 |
|  | 12.7 | 30 | 5 (8.3\%) | 0.2 | 82.1 | 20.3 | (13.9\%) | ) 4.07 | 0.68 | 10.4 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 60 (100\%) | 0.4 | 65.8 | 145.8 | (100\%) | 2.43 | 1.00 | 8.2 |
| I-V | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 265 | 0.4 | 63.6 | 549.8 |  | 2.08 | 0.80 | 8.5 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.
b. Catch data by mesh size not available.

Appendix VIII (ii). Catch statistics of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mesh size (cm) | No. of net nights ${ }^{a}$ | No. of fish per <br> fish caught net night |  |  | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) |  | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net t (kg) | Mean age ( yr ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I^{\text {b }}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 |  | (100\%) | 2.0 | 22.7 | 127.1 | (100\%) | 0.43 | 0.85 | 4.3 |
| II | 3.8 | 44 |  | (18.6\%) | 0.6 | 22.6 | 5.5 | (7.0\%) | 0.20 | 0.13 | 3.8 |
|  | 5.1 | 44 |  | (18.6\%) | 0.6 | 27.8 | 8.6 | (11.0\%) | 0.32 | 0.20 | 5.4 |
|  | 7.6 | 44 |  | (42.8\%) | 1.4 | 35.8 | 40.6 | (51.9\%) | 0.67 | 0.92 | 8.8 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 |  | (16.6\%) | 0.6 | 37.7 | 19.0 | (24.3\%) | 0.79 | 0.43 | 10.0 |
|  | 12.7 | 44 |  | (3.5\%) | 0.1 | 39.2 | 4.5 | (5.8\%) | 0.89 | 0.10 | 11.2 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 145 | (100\%) | 0.7 | 32.3 | 78.2 | (100\%) | 0.54 | 0.36 | 7.5 |
| III | 3.8 | 23 |  | (0.8\%) | <0.1 | 25.0 | 0.2 | (0.3\%) | 0.17 | 0.01 | 4.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 23 |  | (6.7\%) | 0.1 | 31.6 | 3.9 | (5.0\%) | 0.49 | 0.17 | 6.3 |
|  | 7.6 | 23 |  | (41.2\%) | 0.4 | 35.3 | 29.6 | (37.8\%) | 0.60 | 1.27 | 7.5 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 |  | (51.3\%) | 0.5 | 37.4 | 44.6 | (57.0\%) | 0.73 | 1.94 | 8.3 |
|  | 12.7 | 21 |  | (0.0\%) | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | (0.0\%) | - | 0.00 | - |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 |  | (100\%) | 1.1 | 36.0 | 78.3 | (100\%) | 0.66 | 0.69 | 7.8 |
| IV | 3.8 | 12 |  | (6.8\%) | 0.3 | 40.2 | 3.2 | (8.1\%) | 0.81 | 0.27 | 9.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 |  | (15.5\%) | 0.8 | 32.5 | 4.5 | (11.5\%) | 0.50 | 0.38 | 6.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 12 |  | (43.1\%) | 2.1 | 36.4 | 15.6 | (39.7\%) | 0.62 | 1.30 | 8.2 |
|  | 10.2 | 12 |  | (34.5\%) | 1.7 | 39.0 | 16.0 | (40.7\%) | 0.80 | 1.33 | 8.5 |
|  | 12.7 | 12 |  | (0.0\%) | 0.0 | - |  | (0.0\%) |  | 0.00 | - |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 |  | (100\%) | 1.0 | 37.0 | 39.3 | (100\%) | 0.68 | 0.66 | 8.0 |
| v | 3.8 | 28 |  | (3.6\%) | 0.3 | 27.0 | 2.7 | (1.8\%) | 0.34 | 0.10 | 4.7 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 |  | (13.6\%) | 1.1 | 32.5 | 15.4 | (10.5\%) | 0.51 | 0.55 | 5.5 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 |  | (47.1\%) | 3.5 | 36.7 | 69.9 | (47.8\%) | 0.67 | 2.33 | 7.6 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 |  | (33.0\%) | 2.4 | 37.1 | 52.2 | (35.7\%) | 0.72 | 1.74 | 7.6 |
|  | 12.7 | 30 | 6 | (2.3\%) | 0.2 | 40.9 | 5.9 ( | (4.0\%) | 0.99 | 0.20 | 9.5 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 221 | (100\%) | 1.5 | 36.0 | 146.1 ( | (100\%) | 0.66 | 1.00 | 7.3 |
| $I-V$ | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 837 |  | 1.2 | 32.8 | 469.0 |  | 0.56 | 0.68 | 7.0 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.
b. Catch data mesh size not available.

Appendix VIII(iii), Catch statistics of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River Section | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mesh } \\ & \text { size } \\ & (\mathrm{cm}) \end{aligned}$ | No. of net nights ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean age (yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I^{\text {b }}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 | 289 (100\%) | 1.9 | 25.5 | 70.4 (100\%) | 0.31 | 0.47 | 6.9 |
| II | 3.8 | 44 | 15 (27.3\%) | 0.3 | 18.8 | 1.2 (5.6\%) | 0.08 | 0.03 | 5.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 44 | 19 (34.6\%) | 0.4 | 29.2 | 3.6 (17.0\%) | 0.19 | 0.08 | 7.2 |
|  | 7.6 | 44 | 14 (29.9\%) | 0.3 | 35.7 | 8.1. (38.4\%) | 0.58 | 0.18 | 11.0 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 | 6 (10.9\%) | 0.1 | 43.7 | 6.6 (31.3\%) | 1.10 | 0.15 | 13.0 |
|  | 12.7 | 44 | 1 (1.8\%) | 0.1 | 49.1 | 1.6 (7.6\%) | 1.60 | 0.04 | 14.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 55 (100\%) | 0.3 | 30.0 | 21.1. $100 \%$ ) | 0.38 | 0.10 | 8.3 |
| III | 3.8 | 23 | 61 (22.8\%) | 2.7 | 19.5 | 5.3 (5.4\%) | 0.09 | 0.23 | 5.3 |
|  | 5.1 | 23 | 63 (23.5\%) | 2.7 | 27.3 | 14.9 (15.2\%) | 0.24 | 0.65 | 7.7 |
|  | 7.6 | 23 | 121 (45.2\%) | 5.3 | 34.8 | 60.4 (61.6\%) | 0.50 | 2.63 | 10.8 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 | 22 (8.2\%) | 1.0 | 39.6 | 17.1 (17.5\%) | 0.78 | 0.74 | 12.5 - |
|  | 12.7 | 21 | 1 (0.4\%) | 0.1 | 33.4 | 0.4 (0.4\%) | 0.44 | 0.02 | 12.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 | 368 (100\%) | 2.4 | 30.1 | 98.0 (100\%) | 0.37 | 0.87 | 9.0 |
| IV | 3.8 | 12 | 1 (0.6\%) | 0.1 | 46.0 | 1.2 (1.4\%) | 1.20 | 0.10 | 5.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 | 13 (7.6\%) | 1.1 | 27.4 | 3.1 (3.6\%) | 0.20 | 0.26 | 9.2 |
|  | 7.6 | 12 | 142 (83.0\%) | 11.8 | 34.7 | 69.5 (80.7\%) | 0.50 | 5.79 | 12.5 |
|  | 10.2 | 12 | 13 (7.6\%) | 1.1 | 40.9 | 11.3 (13.1\%) | 0.90 | 0.94 | 13.7 |
|  | 12.7 | 12 | 1 (0.6\%) | 0.1 | 49.5 | 1.0 (1.2\%) | 0.10 | 0.08 | 16.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 170 (100\%) | 2.8 | 34.8 | 86.1 (100\%) | 0.51 | 1.44 | 12.3 |
| V | 3.8 | 28 | 118 (28.9\%) | 4.2 | 18.3 | 8.3 (6.6\%) | 0.07 | 0.30 | 4.4 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 129 (31.5\%) | 4.6 | 27.0 | 32.5 ( $25.8 \%$ ) | 0.25 | 1.16 | 7.6 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 | 155 (37.9\%) | 5.2 | 35.1 | 78.6 (62.4\%) | 0.51 | 2.62 | 10.6 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 | 7 (1.7\%) | 0.2 | 42.5 | 6.4 (5.1\%) | 0.92 | 0.21 | Not available |
|  | 12.7 | 30 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0.0 | - | 0.0 (0.0\%) | , | 0.00 | - |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 409 (100\%) | 2.8 | 27.8 | 125.9 (100\%) | 0.31 | 0.86 | 7.5 |
| I-V | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 1191 | 1.7 | 29.6 | 401.5 | 0.34 | 0.58 | 8.8 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.
b. Catch data by mesh size not available.

Appendix VIII (iv). Catch statistics of white suckers fron the Lower Churchill River, Labrador June-August, 1975-76.

| River Section | Mesh <br> size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean age $(y r)$ <br> (yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I^{\text {b }}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 | 252 (100\%) | 1.7 | 25.6 | 64.9 (100\%) | 0.26 | 0.43 | 6.0 |
| II | 3.8 | 44 | 29 (17.0\%) | 0.7 | 17.7 | 2.0 (2.2\%) | 0.07 | 0.05 | 3.7 |
|  | 5.1 | 44 | 40 (23.4\%) | 0.9 | 29.1 | 10.0 (11.1\%) | 0.25 | 0.23 | 5.3 |
|  | 7.6 | 44 | 72 (42.1\%) | 1.6 | 35.0 | 43.2 (53.3\%) | 0.67 | 1.10 | 7.1 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 | 30 (17.9\%) | 0.7 | 40.2 | 30.2 (33.4\%) | 1.00 | 0.69 | 9.6 |
|  | 12.7 | 44 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0.0 | \% | 0.0 (0.0\%) | . | 0.00 | O. 6 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 171 (100\%) | 0.8 | 31.6 | 90.4 (100\%) | 0.53 | 0.41 | 6.5 |
| III | 3.3 | 23 | 3 (15.0\%) | 0.1 | 21.4 | 0.3 (2.4\%) | 0.10 | 0.01 | 3.7 |
|  | 5.1 | 23 | 1 (5.0\%) | <0.1 | 24.5 | 0.2 (1.7\%) | 0.15 | 0.01 | 4.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 23 | 11 (55.0\%) | 0.5 | 35.8 | 7.1 (58.7\%) | 0.64 | 0.31 | 7.1 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 | 5 (25.0\%) | 0.2 | 39.0 | 4.5 (37.2\%) | 0.90 | 0.20 | 8.2 |
|  | 12.7 | 21 | 0 (0.0\%) | 0.0 | - | 0.0 (0.0\%) | $\cdots$ | 0.00 | 8.2 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 | 20 (100\%) | 0.2 | 33.9 | 12.1 (100\%) | 0.61 | 0.11 | 6.7 |
| IV | 3.8 | 12 | $9(8.0 \%)$ | 0.3 | 24.6 | 2.7 (4.2\%) | 0.30 | 0.22 | 6.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 | 39 (8.0\%) | 3.3 | 23.5 | 7.2 (11.4\%) | 0.20 | 0.60 | 6.7 |
|  | 7.6 10.2 | 12 | 37 (32.7\%) | 3.1 | 37.0 | 26.0 (41.0\%) | 0.70 | 2.17 | 10.4 |
|  | 10.2 | 12 | 27 (23.9\%) | 2.3 | 41.9 | 26.6 (42.0\%) | 1.00 | 2.22 | 12.0 |
|  | 12.7 | 12 | 1 (0.9\%) | 0.1 | 49.7 | 0.9 (1.4\%) | 0.93 | 0.08 | 12.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 113 (100\%) | 1.9 | 32.6 | 63.4 (100\%) | 0.56 | 1.06 | 9.1 |
| $v$ | 3.8 | 28 | 10 (6.5\%) | 0.4 | 18.9 | 0.8 (0.7\%) | 0.08 | 0.03 | 4.3 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 22 (14.2\%) | 0.8 | 26.9 | 6.3 (5.1\%) | 0.29 | 0.23 | 6.1 |
|  | 7.6 10.2 | 30 30 | 43 ( $27.7 \%$ ) | 1.4 | 37.1 | 31.4 ( $25.6 \%$ ) | 0.73 | 1.05 | 9.7 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 30 | 76 (49.0\%) | 2.5 | 42.2 | 78.2 (63.8\%) | 1.03 | 2.61 | 12.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 155 (100\%) | 1.1 | 37.2 | 122.9 (4.8\%) | 1.48 | 0.20 | 15.0 |
| I-V | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 711 | 1.0 | 32.2 | 353.4 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 7.5 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.
b. Catch data by mesh size not available.

Appendix VIII (v). Catch statistics of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River Section | Mesh size (cm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { net } \\ & \text { nights } \end{aligned}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean age (yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I^{\text {b }}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 | 38 (100\%) | 0.3 | 22.8 | 5.0 (100\%) | 0.13 | 0.03 | 3.8 |
| II | 3.8 | 44 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0.1 | 19.2 | 0.1 (9.1\%) | 0.09 | 0.01 | 2.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 44 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0.1 | 23.4 | 0.2 (18.2\%) | 0.15 | 0.01 | 3.0 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0.1 | 38.2 | 0.8 (72.7\%) | 0.80 | 0.02 | 4.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 3 (100\%) | 0.1 | 26.9 | 1.1 (100\%) | 0.37 | 0.01 | 3.0 |
| III ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3.8 | 23 | 74 (16.6\%) | 3.2 | 20.6 | 9.0 (4.3\%) | 0.12 | 0.39 | 2.4 |
|  | 5.1 | 23 | 61 (13.7\%) | 2.7 | 28.1 | 16.2 (7.7\%) | 0.27 | 0.70 | 3.2 |
|  | 7.6 | 23 | 233 (52.2\%) | 10.1 | 35.1 | 123.2 (58.8\%) | 0.53 | 5.36 | 3.9 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 | 76 (17.0\%) | 3.3 | 40.3 | 60.7 (29.0\%) | 0.80 | 2.64 | 4.6 |
|  | 12.7 | 21 | 2 (0.1\%) | 0.1 | 26.7 | 0.4 (0.2\%) | 0.21 | 0.02 | 3.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 | 446 (100\%) | 4.0 | 32.6 | 209.5 (100\%) | 0.47 | 1.85 | 3.7 |
| IV | 3.8 | 12 | 1 (20.0\%) | 0.1 | 38.8 | 0.7 (18.9\%) | 0.74 | 0.06 | 4.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 | 2 (40.0\%) | 0.2 | 39.0 | 1.7 (50.0\%) | 0.85 | 0.14 | 4.5 |
|  | 7.6 | 12 | 2 (40.0\%) | 0.2 | 38.0 | 1.3 (35.1\%) | 0.63 | 0.11 | 4.5 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 5 (100\%) | 0.1 | 38.6 | 3.7 (100\%) | 0.74 | 0.06 | 4.4 |
| $v$ | 3.8 | 28 | 8 (9.2\%) | 0.3 | 20.4 | 0.7 (1.7\%) | 0.09 | 0.03 | 2.4 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 23 (26.4\%) | 0.8 | 25.6 | 4.5 ( $70.6 \%$ ) | 0.19 | 0.16 | 2.8 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 | 35 (40.2\%) | 1.2 | 34.5 | 13.1 (42.8\%) | 0.52 | 0.60 | 4.0 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 | 16 (18.4\%) | 0.5 | 39.7 | 13.8 (32.6\%) | 0.86 | 0.46 | 4.5 |
|  | 12.7 | 30 | 5 (5.7\%) | 0.2 | 41.1 | 5.2 (12.3\%) | 1.04 | 0.17 | 4.6 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 87 (100\%) | 0.6 | 32.2 | 42.3 (100\%) | 0.49 | 0.29 | 3.7 |
| I-V | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 579 | 0.8 | 30.6 | 261.6 | 0.45 | 0.38 | 3.7 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.
b. Catch data by mesh size not available.
c. Thirteen man hours of angling yielded 123 fish weighing 57.5 kg with a mean length of 34.0 cm and a mean age of 3.8 yrs .

Appendix VIII (vi). Catch statistics of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mesh <br> size <br> (cm) | No. of net nights ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight ( kg ) | Weight per net ht (kg) | Mean age (yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}^{\text {b }}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 | 7 (100\%) | 0.1 | 41.5 | 4.3 (100\%) | 0.61 | 0.03 | 6.4 |
| II | 5.1 | 44 | 1 (7.7\%) | <0.1 | 30.5 | 0.2 (1.8\%) | 0.16 | 0.01 | 5.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 44 | 5 (38.5\%) | 0.1 | 45.5 | 3.1 (23.4\% | 0.62 | 0.07 | 7.4 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 | 7 (53.9\%) | 0.2 | 54.1 | 7.6 (69.7\%) | ) 1.10 | 0.17 | 8.6 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 13 (100\%) | 0.1 | 49.0 | 10.9 (100\%) | 0.84 | 0.05 | 7.9 |
| III | 5.1 | 23 | 2 (11.1\%) | 0.1 | 30.8 | 0.4 (4.3\%) | 0.17 | 0.02 | 4.5 |
|  | 7.6 | 23 | 12 (66.7\%) | 0.5 | 43.9 | 6.5 (69. ${ }^{\circ}$ \% | ) 0.55 | 0.28 | 6.5 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 | 2 (11.1\%) | 0.1 | 54.7 | 2.3 (24.7\%) | ) 0.11 | 0.10 | 11.5 |
|  | 12.7 | 21 | 2 (11.1\%) | 0.1 | 23.6 | 0.1 (1.1\%) | 0.07 | 0.01 | 3.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 | 18 (100\%) | 0.2 | 41.4 | 9.3 (100\%) | 0.52 | 0.08 | 6.4 |
| IV | 5.1 | 12 | 3 (13.0\%) | 0.3 | 32.1 | 0.5 (2.8\%) | 0.10 | 0.04 | 5.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 12 | 13 (56.5\%) | 1.1 | 43.9 | 6.5 (36.5\%) | ) 0.50 | 0.54 | 7.5 |
|  | 10.2 | 12 | 4 (1\%.4) | 0.3 | 56.8 | 4.5 (25.3\%) | ) 1.10 | 0.33 | 10.3 |
|  | 12.7 | 12 | 3 (13.0\%) | 0.3 | 65.8 | 6.3 (35.4\%) | ) 2.10 | 0.53 | 11.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 23 (100\%) | 0.4 | 47.5 | 17.8 (100\%) | 0.77 | 0.30 | 8.1 |
| V | 3.8 | 23 | 2 (8.3\%) | 0.1 | 22.5 | 0.1 (0.6\%) | 0.05 | <0.01 | 3.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 7 (29.2\%) | 0.3 | 30.5 | 1.2 (6.8\%) | 0.17 | 0.04 | 5.3 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 | 3 (12.5\%) | 0.1 | 43.8 | 1.5 (8.5\%) | 0.50 | 0.05 | 8.7 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 | 9 (37.5\%) | 0.3 | 50.9 | 9.1 (51.7\%) | $) 1.01$ | 0.30 | 10.4 |
|  | 12.7 | 30 | 3 (12.5\%) | 0.1 | 65.5 | 5.7 (32.4\%) | ) 1.89 | 0.19 | 12.0 |
|  | 3.3-12.7 | 146 | 24 (100\%) | 0.2 | 43.5 | 17.6 (100\%) | 0.73 | 0.12 | 8.3 |
| I-V | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 85 | 0.1 | 44.6 | 59.9 | 0.70 | 0.09 | 7.4 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period
b. Catch data by mesh size not available.

Appendix VIII (vii). Catch statistics of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

a. A net night is one metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.

Appendix VIII (viii). Catch statistics of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mesh size (cm) | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of } \\ \text { net } \\ \text { nights }{ }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight ( kg ) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night (kg) | Mean age ( yr ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| III ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 5.1 | 23 | 1 (50.0\%) | <0.1 | 24.1 | 0.2 (16.7\%) | 0.15 | 0.01 | 5.0 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 | 1 (50.0\%) | <0.1 | 44.6 | 1.0 (83.3\%) | 0.99 | 0.04 | 7.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 | 2 (100\%) | <0.1 | 34.4 | 1.2 (100\%) | 0.60 | 0.01 | 6.0 |
| IV ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 3.8 | 12 | 8 (47.1\%) | 0.7 | 44.8 | 8.5 (37.0\%) | 1.07 | 0.71 | 5.9 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 | 3 (17.7\%) | 0.3 | 56.2 | 5.3 (23.0\%) | 1.78 | 0.44 | 7.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 12 | 1 (5.9\%) | 0.1 | 42.5 | 1.0 (4.4\%) | 1.00 | 0.08 | 7.0 |
|  | 10.2 | 12 | 3 (17.7\%) | 0.3 | 51.6 | 5.1 (22.2\%) | 1.69 | 0.43 | 7.0 |
|  | 12.7 | 12 | 2 (11.8\%) | 0.2 | 50.8 | 3.0 (13.0\%) | 1.52 | 0.25 | 8.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 17 (100\%) | 0.3 | 48.6 | 23.0 (100\%) | 1.35 | 0.38 | 6.6 |
| V | 3.8 | 28 | 1 (9.1\%) | $<0.1$ | 45.8 | 1.2 (10.8\%) | 1.15 | 0.04 | 7.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 3 (27.3\%) | 0.1 | 37.2 | 2.6 (23.4\%) | 0.87 | 0.09 | 5.3 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 | 3 (27.3\%) | 0.1 | 45.6 | 3.5 (31.5\%) | 1.18 | 0.12 | 6.3 |
|  | 10.2 | 30 | 4 (36.4\%) | 0.1 | 42.7 | 3.8 (34.2\%) | 0.96 | 0.13 | 6.5 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 11 (100\%) | 0.1 | 42.3 | 11.1 (100\%) | 1.01 | 0.08 | 6.2 |
| I-V | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 30 | <0.1 | 41.7 | 35.3 | 1.18 | 0.05 | 6.2 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fishol for a 24 hour period.
b. One $41.1 \mathrm{~cm}, 0.76 \mathrm{~kg}$, age-group 7 fish was analed.
c. Five fish averaging $48.8 \mathrm{~cm}, 1.20 \mathrm{~kg}$, and 6.4 year old were angled.

Appendix VIII (ix). Catch statistics of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Labrador, June-August, 1975-76.

| River section | Mesh size (cm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. of } \\ & \text { net } \\ & \text { nights } \end{aligned}$ | No. of fish caught | No. of fish per net night | Mean length (cm) | Total weight (kg) | Mean weight (kg) | Weight per net night(kg) | Mean age ( yr ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 3.8-12.7 | 150 | 17 (100\%) | 0.1 | 22.1 | 1.7 (100\%) | 0.10 | 0.01 | 5.9 |
| II | 5.1 | 44 | 1 (33.3\%) | $<0.1$ | 40.4 | 0.8 (42.1\%) | 0.80 | 0.02 | 13.0 |
|  | 7.6 | 44 | 1 (33.3\%) | $<0.1$ | 32.9 | 0.5 (26.3\%) | 0.47 | 0.01 | 8.0 |
|  | 10.2 | 44 | 1 (33.3\%) | <0.1 | 34.5 | 0.6 (31.5\%) | 0.63 | 0.01 | 9.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 220 | 3 (100\%) | <0.1 | 35.9 | 1.9 (100\%) | 0.63 | 0.01 | 10.0 |
| III | 3.8 | 23 | 47 (40.5\%) | 2.0 | 20.9 | 4.3 (17.5\%) | 0.09 | 0.19 | 3.2 |
|  | 5.1 | 23 | 46 (39.7\%) | 2.0 | 26.8 | 8.6 (35.0\%) | 0.19 | 0.37 | 4.4 |
|  | 7.6 | 23 | 20 (17.2\%) | 0.9 | 35.3 | 9.9 (40.2\%) | 0.49 | 0.43 | 7.7 |
|  | 10.2 | 23 | 2 (1.7\%) | 0.1 | 36.9 | 1.5 (6.1\%) | 0.75 | 0.07 | 10.0 |
|  | 12.7 | 21 | 1 (0.9\%) | 0.1 | 29.4 | 0.3 (1.2\%) | 0.27 | 0.01 | 7.0 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 113 | 116 (100\%) | 1.0 | 26.1 | 24.6 (100\%) | 0.21 | 0.22 | 4.6 |
| IV | 3.8 | 12 | 1 (33.3\%) | 0.1 | 20.5 | 0.1 (25.0\%) | 0.65 | 0.01 | 4.0 |
|  | 5.1 | 12 | 2 (66.7\%) | 0.2 | 26.6 | 0.4 (75\%) | U. 19 | 0.02 | 6.5 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 60 | 3 (100\%) | 0.1 | 24.6 | 0.4 ( $100 \%$ ) | 0.15 | 0.01 | 5.7 |
| v | 3.8 | 28 | 20 (66.7\%) | 0.7 | 21.3 | 1.9 (45.2\%) | 0.09 | 0.07 | 2.5 |
|  | 5.1 | 28 | 8 (26.7\%) | 0.3 | 25.8 | 1.5 (35.7\%) | 0.18 | 0.05 | 3.5 |
|  | 7.6 | 30 | 2 (6.7\%) | 0.1 | 33.0 | 0.9 (21.4\%) | 0.43 | 0.03 | 7.5 |
|  | 3.8-12.7 | 146 | 30 (100\%) | 0.2 | 23.3 | 4.2 (100\%) | 0.14 | 0.03 | 3.1 |
| $I-V$ | 3.8-12.7 | 689 | 169 | 0.3 | 26.4 | 32.8 | 0.19 | 0.05 | 5.8 |

a. A net night is one 47 metre gillnet fished for a 24 hour period.
b. Catch data by mesh size not available.


## Appendix IX

Age and length-frequency distributions of fishes from the Lower Churchill River.
(i) Northern Pike
(ii) Lake Whitefish
(iii) Longnose Suckers
(iv) White Suckers
(v) Brook Trout
(vi) Burbot
(vii) Lake Trout
(viii) Ouananiche
(ix) Round Whitefish

Appendix IX (i). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Age (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 3 | 9 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 16 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 |  |  | 9 |
| 5 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4 |  | 22 |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 1 | 32 |
| 7 | 1 |  | 12 | 13 | 1 | 27 |
| 8 | 3 |  | 7 | 6 | 2 | 18 |
| 9 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 22 |
| 10 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 19 |
| 11 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 13 |
| 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 13 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |
| 14 | 2 |  |  | 3 |  | 6 |
| 15 |  |  |  | 2. | 2 | 4 |
| 16 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 42 | 35 | 57 | 63 | 11 | 208 |

Appendix IX (i). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 17 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 23 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 1 | 7 | 1 |  | 1 | 10 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 1 | 8 | 13 |  |  | 22 |
| 50.0-59.9 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 15 | 1 | 40 |
| 60.0-69.9 | 11 | 7 | 21 | 32 | 2 | 73 |
| 70.0-79.9 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 18 |
| 80.0-89.9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 18 |
| 90.0-99.9 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 100.0-109.9 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 3 |
| Totals | 42 | 36 | 60 | 64 | 11 | 213 |

Appendix IX (i). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (y r) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 3 | 9 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 16 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 1 |  | 15 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 6 |  | 1 | 10 |
| 7 | 1 |  | 3 | 2 |  | 6 |
| 8 | 2 |  | 6 | 5 | 1 | 14 |
| 9 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 14 |
| 10 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 |  | 14 |
| 11 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 |  | 11 |
| 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 7 |
| 13 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
| 14 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| $15$ |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 16 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 36 | 28 | 34 | 28 | 5 | 131 |

Appendix IX (i). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | $3.8-12.7$ |
| 10.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 | 17 | 3 |  |  |  | 20 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 1 | 6 | 1 |  | 1 | 9 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 1 | 7 | 11 |  |  | 19 |
| 50.0-59.9 | 3 | 2 | 12 | 6 |  | 23 |
| 60.0-69.9 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 12 | , | 34 |
| 70.0-79.9 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| 80:0-89.9 | 2 | 1 |  | 7 | 1 | 11 |
| 90.0-99.9 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Totals | 36 | 29 | 34 | 29 | 5 | 133 |

Appendix IX (i). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( yr ) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |

Appendix IX (i). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | class |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX (i). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 7 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 4 |
| 8 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 9 |  | 1 | 4 |  |  | 5 |
| 10 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | $\because$ | 16 |

Appendix IX (i). Length-frequency distribution by gill net mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.


Appendix IX (i). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (y r) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 5 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 6 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 12 |  | 21 |
| 7 |  |  | 7 | 9 | 1 | 17 |
| 8 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 9 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 10 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |
| 11 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| 14 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  | 1. | 1 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 3 | 5 | 17 | 30 | 5 | 60 |

Appendix IX (i). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of northern pike from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30.0-39.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40.0-49.9 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  | 5 | 9 |  | 14 |
| 60.0-69.9 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 1 | 31 |
| 70.0-79.9 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 80.0-89.9 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |
| 90.0-99.9 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 100.0-109.9 |  |  |  |  | 1 | , |
| Totals | 3 | 5 | 17 | 30 | 5 | 60 |

Appendix IX(ii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Age <br> (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 2 | 14 | 2 |  |  |  | 16 |
| 3 | 8 | 12 | 1 | 1 |  | 22 |
| 4 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 1 |  | 27 |
| 5 |  | 10 | 14 | 5 |  | 29 |
| 6 | 4 | 10 | 35 | 17 | 1 | 67 |
| 7 | 1 | 7 | 38 | 20 | 1 | 67 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 25 |  | 62 |
| 9 | 3 | 2 | 38 | 21 | 1 | 65 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 15 |  | 35 |
| 11 |  | 4 | 14 | 11 |  | 29 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 22 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 9 |  | 1 | 11 |
| 14 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 15 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 17 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 37 | 65 | 222 | 128 | 7 | 459 |

Appendix IX(ii). Length frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Lengt (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 18 | 1 |  |  |  | 19 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 9 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 49 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 9 | 37 | 208 | 148 | 5 | 407 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 30 | 5 | 65 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| Totals | 40 | 74 | 239 | 179 | 11 | 543 |

Appendix IX(ii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (\mathrm{yr}) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size ( cm ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 13 | 1 |  |  |  | 14 |
| 3 | 8 | 8 |  | 1 |  | 17 |
| 4 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |
| 5 |  | 4 | 1 |  |  | 5 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 | 9 |  | 1 | 15 |
| 7 |  | 1 | 14 | 3 | , | 18 |
| 8 |  |  | 7 | 1 |  | 8 |
| 9 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 18 |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 |  | 9 |
| 11 |  | 2 | 6 | 5 |  | 13 |
| 12 |  |  | 3 | 8 | 1 | 12 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 5 |  | 1 | 7 |
| 14 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 15 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 26 | 27 | 63 | 24 | 5 | 145 |

Appendix IX(ii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 16 |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 6 | 17 | 4 | 1 | , | 29 |
| 30-0-39.9 | 4 | 9 | 48 | 16 | 1 | 78 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 21 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 27 | 27 | 61 | 25 | 5 | 145 |

Appendix IX(ii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 5 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 |  | 8 |
| 6 |  | 2 | 12 | 6 |  | 20 |
| 7 |  | 3 | 9 | 6 |  | 18 |
| 8 |  | 1 | 4 | 11 |  | 16 |
| 9 |  | 1 | 7 | 12 |  | 20 |
| 10 |  |  | 5 | 2 |  | 7 |
| 11 |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 5 |
| 12 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 4 |
| 13 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 10 | 50 | 43 |  | 104 |

Appendix IX(ii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | class |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX(ii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV., July-August, 1976.

| Age <br> (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 4 |  | 1 | 4 | I |  | 6 |
| 5 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 7 |
| 7 |  | 1 |  | 3 |  | 4 |
| 8 | 1 |  | 4 | 5 |  | 10 |
| 9 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 7 |
| 10 | 1 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 7 |
| 11 |  | 2 | 2 | 3 |  | 7 |
| 12 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 4 |
| 13 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 4 | 9 | 25 | 20 |  | 58 |

Appendix IX(ii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | class |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Appendix IX(ii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, JulyAugust, 1975.

| Age (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 |  |  | 11 |
| 5 |  | 5 | 6 | 3 |  | 14 |
| 6 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 9 |  | 25 |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 1 | 27 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 8 |  | 28 |
| 9 |  |  | 13 | 7 |  | 20 |
| 10 |  | 1 | 5 | 6 |  | 12 |
| 11 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| 12 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| 13 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Totals | 6 | 19 | 84 | 41 | 2 | 152 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX(ii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | class |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Appendix IX(iii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Age <br> (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | $3.8-12.7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Totals | 95 | 137 | 222 | 30 | 3 | 487 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX(iii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 160 | 2 |  |  |  | 162 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 34 | 168 | 8 |  |  | 210 |
| . $30.0-39.9$ | 1 | 52 | 402 | 19 |  | 474 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  | 2 | 21 | 29 | 2 | 54 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Totals | 195 | 224 | 432 | 48 | 3 | 902 |

Appendix IX(iii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.


Appendix IX(iii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.


Appendix IX(iii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 5 | 16 | 4 |  |  |  | 20 |
| 6 | 4 | 9 |  |  |  | 13 |
| 7 | 3 | 11 | 2 |  |  | 16 |
| 8 | 2 | 5 | 4 |  |  | 11 |
| 9 |  | 3 | 13 |  |  | 16 |
| 10 |  | 8 | 22 | 2 |  | 32 |
| 11 |  | 2 | 20 | 3 |  | 25 |
| 12 |  |  | 24 | 2 | 1 | 27 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 6 | 9 |  | 16 |
| 14 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 4 |
| 15 |  |  | 1 | 1 | - | 2 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 32 | 43 | 94 | 19 | 1 | 189 |

Appendix IX(iii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 43 | 1 |  |  |  | 44 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 18 | 45 | 2 |  |  | 65 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  | 16 | 116 | 12 | 1 | 145 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  | 1 | 3 | 10 |  | 14 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 61 | 63 | 121 | 22 | 1 | 268 |

Appendix IX(iii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Age <br> (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 8 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 8 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| 10 |  | 1 | 10 |  |  | 118 |
| 11 |  | 1 | 17 |  |  | 18 |
| 12 |  |  | 20 |  |  | 20 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 16 | 4 |  | 2 |
| 14 |  |  | 7 | 1 |  | 8 |
| 15 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 4 |
| 17 |  |  | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 9 | 80 | 6 | 1 | 97 |

Appendix IX(iii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Length <br> (cm) | class |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX(iii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Age (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 15 |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 4 | 14 | 3 |  |  |  | 17 |
| 5 | 11 | 8 |  |  |  | 19 |
| 6 | 2 | 12 |  |  |  | 14 |
| 7 | 3 | 19 8 | 1 |  |  | 11 |
| 8 | 1 | 8 | 2 |  |  | 8 |
| 9 | 1 | 3 | 4 |  |  | 10 |
| 10 |  | 6 | 4 |  |  | 22 |
| 11 |  | 3 | 19 |  |  | - 3 |
| 12 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| 13 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| 14 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 16 |  | 1 |  |  | . | 1 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 47 | 67 | 34 |  |  | 148 |

Appendix IX(iii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet meshsize of longnose suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 103 | , |  |  |  | 104 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 14 | 97 | 3 |  |  | 114 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 1 | 30 | 146 | 2 |  | 179 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  | 1 | 6 | 4 |  | 11 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 118 | 129 | 155 | 6 |  | 408 |

Appendix IX(iv). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Age (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 20 |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| 4 | 11 | 18 | 2 |  |  | 31 |
| 5 | 11 | 23 | 2 |  |  | 36 |
| 6 | 4 | 36 | 11 |  |  | 51 |
| 7 | 1 | 11 | 52 | 3 |  | 67 |
| 8 |  | 3 | 17 | 9 |  | 29 |
| 9 |  | 5 | 17 | 7 |  | 29 |
| 10 |  |  | 6 | 14 |  | 20 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 28 |  | 44 |
| 12 |  | 1. | 6 | 27 |  | 34 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 9 | 18 | 1 | 29 |
| 14 |  | 1 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 20 |
| 15 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 16 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 17 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 48 | 100 | 143 | 124 | 4 | 419 |

Appendix IX(iv). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River above luskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 |  | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 43 | 1 |  |  |  | 44 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 6 | 84 | 6 |  |  | 96 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  | 13 | 118 | 34 |  | 165 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 2 | 4 | 38 | 97 | 4 | 145 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Totals | 51 | 102 | 163 | 132 | 5 | 453 |

Appendix IX(iv). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 6 | 11 | 2 |  |  | 19 |
| 5 | 6 | 17 | 2 |  |  | 25 |
| 6 | 1 | 3 | 9 |  |  | 13 |
| 7 |  | 6 | 30 | 1 |  | 37 |
| 8 |  |  | 9 | 6 |  | 15 |
| 9 |  | 2 | 3 | 6 |  | 11 |
| 10 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 11 |  |  | 1 | 5 |  | 6 |
| 12 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 13 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 39 | 57 | 24 |  | 149 |
| Totals | 29 | 39 |  |  |  |  |

Appendix IX(iv). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| Length class(cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 28 |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 1 | 33 | 5 |  |  | 39 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  | 6 | 55 | 12 |  | 73 |
| 30.0-49.9 |  | 1 | 11 | 18 |  | 30 |
| $50.0-59.9$ |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 29 | 40 | 72 | 30 |  | 171 |

Appendix IX(iv). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( y ) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  | 8 | 2 |  | 10 |
| 8 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 3 | 1 | 11 | 5 |  | 20 |

Appendix IX(iv). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.


Appendix IX(iv). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size ( cm ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( yr ) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 6 | 2 | 29 |  |  |  | 31 |
| 7 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 8 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 5 |
| 9 |  | 1 | 12 | 1 |  | 14 |
| 10 |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 5 |
| 11 | 1 |  | 3 | 5 |  | 9 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 |  | 11 |
| 13 |  | 1 | 3 | 4 |  | 8 |
| 14 |  | 1 | 4 | 2 |  | 7 |
| 15 |  |  | 1 |  | - | 1 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 8 | 39 | 33 | 22 |  | 102 |

Appendix IX(iv). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  | 7 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 1 | 34 |  |  |  | 35 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  | 2 | 22 | 7 |  | 31 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 20 | 1 | 40 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 9 | 39 | 37 | 27 | 1 | 113 |

Appendix IX(iv). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 6 |  |  |  | 9 |
| 5 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 6 |
| 7 | 1 | 5 | 12 |  |  | 18 |
| 8 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 |  | 5 |
| 9 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 4 |
| 10 |  |  | 4 | 8 |  | 12 |
| 11 |  | 1 | 10 | 17 |  | 28 |
| 12 |  |  | 2 | 19 |  | 21 |
| 13 |  |  | 5 | 13 | 1 | 19 |
| 14 |  |  | 2 | 10 | 1 | 13 |
| 15 |  |  |  | 4 | 1. | 5 |
| 16 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 8 | 21 | 42 | 73 | 4 | 148 |

Appendix IX(iv). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of white suckers from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.


Appendix IX (v). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (\mathrm{yr}) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 2 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 1 |  | 37 |
| 3 | 23 | 38 | 20 | 18 | 2 | 101 |
| 4 | 2 | 5 | 51 | 17 |  | 75 |
| 5 |  | 1 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 21 |
| 6 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| TOTALS | 55 | 51 | 85 | 42 | 6 | 239 |

Appendix IX (v). Length-Frequency distribution by gillnèt mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | class | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | $3.8-12.7$ |  |
| $10.0-19.9$ | 57 | 1 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| $20.0-29.9$ | 20 | 66 | 12 |  | 3 | 65 |  |
| $30.0-39.9$ | 6 | 19 | 220 | 41 |  | 101 |  |
| $40.0-49.9$ | 1 | 1 | 31 | 51 | 4 | 886 |  |
| $50.0-59.9$ |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| TOTALS | 84 | 87 | 270 | 93 | 7 | 541 |  |

Appendix IX(v). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age (yr) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 2 | 23 | 1 |  |  |  | 24 |
| 3 | 21 | 21 | 14 |  | 1 | 57 |
| 4 |  | 3 | 29 | 10 |  | 42 |
| 5 |  |  | 6 | 11 |  | 17 |
| 6 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| Totals | 45 | 25 | 50 | 23 | 1 | 144 |

Appendix IX(v). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Length class <br> (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | . 2 |  | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 51 |  | 6 |  |  | 57 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 17 | 45 | 12 |  | 2 | 76 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 5 | 16 | 186 | 30 |  | 237 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 1 |  | 29 | 46 |  | 76 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 74 | 61 | 233 | 76 | 2 | 446 |

Appendix IX(v). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Chuchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size ( cm ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  | , |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | . |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 |
| 5 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 5 |

Appendix IX(v). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30.0-39.9 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 4 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 5 |

Appendix IX(v). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Age Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 11 |
| 3 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 26 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 8 |  | 31 |
| 5 |  |  | 7 | 5 | 4 | 16 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  | ? |
| Totals | 8 | 23 | 35 | 16 | 5 | 87 |

Appendix IX(v). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of brook trout from the Lower Churchill River, Saction V, July-August, 1975.



Appendix IX(vi). Age-freauency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot
from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76. from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

Appendix IX (vi). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 12 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  | 7 | 3 |  |  | 10 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  |  | 27 | 3 |  | 30 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  | 2 | 16 |  | 18 |
| 60.0-69,9 |  |  |  | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Totals | 2 | 13 | 33 | 22 | 8 | 78 |

Appendix IX(vi). Age-frequency distribution by gilinet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Age } \\ (\mathrm{vr}) \end{gathered}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 7 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| 8 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 9 |  |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| 10 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  | 1 | 5 | 7 |  | 13 |

Appendix IX(vi). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section II, August, 1975.

| $\underset{(\mathrm{cm})}{\text { Length class }} 3$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37.0-39.9 | 1 | \% |  |  |  |
| 47.0-49.9 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 7 |
| 50.7-59.9 |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| $67.7-60.7$ |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Totals | 1 | 5 | 7 |  | 13 |

Annendix IX(vi). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( yr ) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |
| 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 6 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| 8 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 9 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 14 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Totals |  | 2 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 15 |

Appendix IX(vi). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.


Appendix IX(vi). Age-freauency tistribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (y r) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 5 |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 4 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |
| 10 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 11 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 3 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  | 3 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 23 |

Appendix IX(vi). Length-frequencv distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Length class <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ |  |  |  |  |

Appendix IX(vi). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Seection V, July-August, 1975.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (\mathrm{yr}) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 5 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 4 |
| 6 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | - 2 |
| 7 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 8 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 9 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 10 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 11 |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| 12 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Totals | 2 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 24 |

Appendix IX(vi). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of burbot from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.9-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 | 2 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 8 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 47.0-49.9 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| 57.0-59.9 |  |  |  | 8 |  | 8 |
| 60.0-69.9 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| Totals | 2 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 24 |

Appendix IX(vii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 7 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 10 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 11 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| 12 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 13 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 14 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 15 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Totals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 15 |

Appendix IX(vii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.


Appendix IX(vii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |

Appendix IX(vii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976

| Length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX(vii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976

| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (yr) |  | 3.8 | 5.1 | Mesh size $(\mathrm{cm})$ |  |

Appendix IX(vii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.


Appendix IX(vii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Age <br> (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | $3.8-12.7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 9 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 10 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Appendix IX(vii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of lake trout from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.


Appendix IX(viii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & \text { (yr) } \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  | 9 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 8 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Totals | 9 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 30 |

Appendix IX(viii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River above the site of the Gull Island dam, June-August, 1975-76.

| Length class$(\mathrm{cm})$ |  | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | $9-1$ |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 20.0-29.9 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 91 |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| 40.0-49.9 | $9 \quad 4$ | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 16 |
| 50.0-59.9 | $9 \quad 2$ | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| 60.0-69.9 | $9 \quad 1$ |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 9 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 30 |

Appendix IX(viii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | , |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |

Appendix IX(viii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, 1976.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40.0-49.9 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60.0-69.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |

Appendix IX(viii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 6 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 |
| 9 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Totals | 8 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 17 |

Appendix IX(viii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.


Appendix IX(viii). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 6 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 4 |
| 7 | 1 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 5 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  | 11 |

Appendix IX(viii). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of ouananiche from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20.0-29.9 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 30.0-39.9 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 40.0-49.9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |  | 9 |
| 50.0-59.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60.0-69.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  | 11 |

Anpendix IX(ix). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76. 4

| Age |  |  | Me | (cm) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 15 | 1 |  |  |  | 16 |
| 3 | 39 | 12 |  |  |  | 51 |
| 4 | 6 | 19 |  |  |  | 25 |
| 5 | 1 | 10 |  |  |  | 11 |
| 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 8 |
| 7 |  | 2 | 7 |  | 1 | 10 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 |  | 11 |
| 9 |  |  | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |
| 10 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| 13 | $\cdots$ | 1 | , |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 63 | 51 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 141 |

Appendix IX(ix). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River above Muskrat Falls, June-August, 1975-76,

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 29 |
| 27.0-29.9 | 37 | 51 |  |  | 1 | 89 |
| 30.0-39.9 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 3 |  | 32 |
| 47.7-49.9 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Totals | 68 | 57 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 15 ? |

Appendix IX(ix). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section III, June-July, $1970^{\circ}$.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Age } \\ & (\mathrm{yr}) \end{aligned}$ | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
| 3 | 36 | 6 |  |  |  | 42 |
| 4 | 3 | 19 |  |  |  | 22 |
| 5 |  | 8 |  |  |  | 8 |
| 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 7 |
| 7 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 1 | 8 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 |  | 9 |
| 9 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |
| 17 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 42 | 40 | $2)$ | 2 | 1 | 105 |

Appendix IX(ix). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Charchill River, Section III, June-duly, 1976.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.9-19.9 | 19 |  |  |  |  | 19 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 27 | 41 |  |  | 1 | 69 |
| 30.7-39.9 | 1 | 5 | 19 | 2 |  | 27 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Totals | 47 | 46 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 116 |

$\qquad$

Appendix IX(ix). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Age | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (yr) | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 10.2 | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 7 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 3 |

Appendix $I X(i x)$. Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section IV, July-August, 1976.

| Length <br> (cm) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Appendix IX(ix). Age-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.


Appendix IX(ix). Length-frequency distribution by gillnet mesh size of round whitefish from the Lower Churchill River, Section V, July-August, 1975.

| Length class (cm) | Mesh size (cm) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.8 | 5.1 | 7.6 | $10.2$ | 12.7 | 3.8-12.7 |
| 10.0-19.9 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| 20.0-29.9 | 9 | 8 |  |  |  | 17 |
| 30.7-39.9 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |
| 40.0-49.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 20 | 8 | ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | 30 |
|  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2ay |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ A net night is one 47 metre gillnet of stretched mesh $3.8-12.7 \mathrm{~cm}$ fished for a 24 hour period. Data are weighted to compensate for different efforts by different mesh sizes.

[^1]:    1. Two fish from section III were 65.6 and 68.2 cm and aged $9+$ and $11+$ respectively.
