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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A stocking assessment was completed on Camp Lake in Eskers Provincial Park in 2003. The purpose of this assessment was to 1 ) document the status of this fishery, including changes in fish growth, and 2) to confirm and investigate the level of naturalized recruitment from the descendants of eastern brook trout (EB) stocked before 1997. Camp Lake currently contains both rainbow and eastern brook trout. Standard BC, Resource Inventory and Standards Committee methods were used to complete the surveys. Naturalized brook trout recruits were captured in a gill net and large numbers of spawning and mature brook trout were observed during the course of the survey. Growth rates and body condition of brook trout in Camp Lake were found to comparable to eastern brook trout sampled in other Omineca Lakes and have remained stable since 1999. However a high catch per unit of effort in 2003 and a decrease in the proportion of the catch greater than 350 mm since the 1999 survey may be indicative of a population that is growing. Similar populations of naturalized eastern brook trout in Kathie and Butterfly lakes in Eskers Park have grown to a point where resources have become limiting and average fish size has declined with associated decreases in sport fishery quality.

Rainbow trout were not captured in Camp Lake in 2003. Rainbow trout stocking in Camp Lake was suspended in 2000 following two surveys with poor net catches of rainbows. After a re-evaluation of this decision based on an opportunistic creel survey and the results of a stock assessment on Kathie Lake, brood requests for rainbows were made to the BC Freshwater Fisheries Society in 2003 and stocking was scheduled for 2004.

Based on the results of the 2003 survey, it is recommended that 1) Camp Lake continue to be stocked with rainbow trout until after it has been re-assed in fall 2006 or spring 2007, and 2) Camp Lake should be assessed through annual opportunistic creel surveys and periodic stock assessments (3-5 year interval) in an effort to monitor the population of eastern brook trout as well as to monitor the performance of the rainbow fishery.
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## INTRODUCTION 1.0

This report presents the results of a recreational fishery stock assessment of Camp Lake in 2003 with comparison to a stock assessments completed in 1991 (Van Schubert, 1991), 1999 and 2000 (Zimmerman, 2000). This assessment was completed on October 2, 2003 by the Ministry of Water Land and Air Protection (M.W.L.A.P.) with funding obtained through the Small Lakes Management and Conservation Initiative (SLMCI). Analysis and reporting of the field results were conducted by the author. Peer review of this report was completed by regional fisheries staff. Inquiries pertaining to this report should be directed to the M.W.L.A.P. in Prince George.

Camp Lake is a closed drainage system (Table 1, Figure 1, Photo 1) located 32 km northwest of Prince George in Eskers Provincial Park. The lake was initially surveyed in 1985 and was determined to be barren of fish based on gill net and minnow trap surveys. The lake was subsequently stocked with rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) in 1986, 1988 and 1989 and eastern brook trout (Salvelinus fontinalis) in 1988-1989 (Appendix 1). The original fishery management objective for Camp Lake was to provide a high use put and take fishery for rainbow trout and brook trout from one to two pounds. (MWLAP Lakes Files). Stocking was suspended at the request of the Parks Branch after 1989 as the result of concerns by Parks staff regarding uncontrolled angler access to the lakes in Eskers Park, which was occurring in response to the stocking program but in advance of the completion of adequate trail infrastructure to support the increased angler use.

After the stocking program ceased, unconfirmed reports were submitted to Fisheries and Parks staff that some of the lakes were continuing to produce brook trout, presumably through natural recruitment. Reports were also received that indicated that fish may have been transferred between lakes, a situation which, if true, would have a direct bearing on the management objectives for each of the lakes initially stocked. In 1993, stocking of Camp Lake was re-initiated and Parks Branch later requested that the stocking program be re-invoked in the rest of Eskers Park, as it was felt that angler use could now be controlled given the state of the park's infrastructure. Stocking of RB was reinitiated in Camp Lake in 1993 on an alternate year basis at a rate of 96 yearlings/ha (Appendix 2.Table 1). This stocking rate was reduced to 58 yearlings/ha in 1995. In 1999 the stocking of Camp Lake was suspended due to concerns that these fish were not surviving (Zimmerman 2000) (Appendix 2. Table 1). Stocking of RB was reinitiated on Camp Lake in 2004 on an alternate year basis at a rate of 96 yearlings/ha (Appendix 2.Table 1) following a re-evaluation of this decision.

Camp Lake was assigned status as a high priority lake for stock assessment in 1999 as only one survey had been completed since the lake had been initially stocked and this survey was completed in 1991, only three years after EB stocking was initiated and five years after RB had been first stocked. A third assessment was completed in 2000 to address quality assurance problems from the 1999 survey (Zimmerman 2000) as well as to confirm the low net catch of RB. The assessment reported here was completed opportunistically in October 2003 to visually assess the extent of spawning by eastern brook trout and to assess the relative abundance and growth of Camp Lake EB and RB.

## BACKGROUND 2.0

Camp Lake is one of five stocked lakes that are managed within Eskers Provincial Park, located 32 km northwest of Prince George. Access to all of the lakes in Eskers Park is by foot or by canoe portage through a developed trail system. Fish stocking in Eskers Park coincided with the initial park development in 1987 and was meant to provide a variety of angling opportunities utilizing "put and take" fisheries (BC Parks 1990). Currently within Eskers Park, there are five lakes that are intentionally stocked with sterile, all female triploid (AF3N) eastern brook trout and two that are also stocked with all female (AF) rainbow trout. These lakes include Bow, Butterfly, Byers, Camp and Kathie. The stocking of reproductively capable eastern brook trout prior to 1998 has resulted in several populations of brook trout that successfully shore-spawn within the park.

Eskers Provincial Park currently supports a regionally important recreational fishery during both summer and winter months and Camp Lake supports an important component of that fishery. However, stocking errors and possible illegal transfer of reproductively capable brook trout between the lakes in Eskers Park have compromised future recreational fishing quality and opportunities, as well as conservation of biodiversity objectives in adjacent unstocked lakes in the Park.

## METHODS 3.0

A 91.4 m long, 2.4 m deep floating monofilament gill net with experimental mesh sizes was set in the north end of the main body of Camp Lake (Figure 1) on October 3, 2003 at 14:30 hrs and retrieved on October 3 at 18:10 hrs for a total soak time of four hours. The net was extended south-east on the surface from the shore near the first constriction in the lake along the three meter contour (Figure 2). An angling sample was also collected while the net was soaking; total angling effort by two people was approximately 6 hours. All trout collected were sampled for fork length (mm), weight (g), sex, and maturity. Weights were measured to the nearest 10 g and lengths were measured to the nearest 1 mm . Otoliths were collected from all brook trout for age structure analyses by Birkenhead Scale Analyses (Lone Butte, BC). A qualitative visual assessment of potential spawning habitat was also completed during this survey.

## RESULTS 4.0

## Catch summary 4.1

Only brook trout (EB) were captured in the gillnet sampling and angling events in 2003 (Table 2, Table 3, Figure 3, Figure 4) and the raw assessment data for all sample years can be found in Appendix 3. Angling catch per unit effort for EB in 2003 was high at 8.0 EB/rod-hour.

The EB gillnet catch was strongly biased towards males with $26 \%$ females and $51 \%$ males, and $23 \%$ unknown. At the time of sampling, $61 \%$ of the fish were in a late
maturity state near or past spawning with $21 \%$ of sample being ready to spawn (Figure 5). Thirty percent of the EB sample was immature. In the 2003 catch $65.5 \%$ of the two-year-old, $91 \%$ of the three-year-old and $100 \%$ of the four-year-old EB were mature (Table 3). Eighty percent of the mature two-year-old EB were male.

Length Frequency, Condition and Growth 4.2
The EB gillnet catch ranged in length from 104 mm to $373 \mathrm{~mm}(\bar{x}=266 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) (Table 3, Figure 3) and the EB angling catch ranged in length from 201 mm to 360 mm ( $\bar{x}=294$ mm ).

The mean body condition of EB in 2003 (1.21) was slightly higher compared with fish sampled from previous surveys in 1999 and 2000 (1.12 and 1.19). For the three of the four sample years EB weight increased as power of length according to the following equations (Figure 6):

$$
\begin{gathered}
2003 W=.000007 L^{3.111}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}=\mathbf{0 . 9 9}\right) \\
2000 W=.0004 L^{2.6484}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}=\mathbf{0 . 9 2}\right) \\
1999 W=.00004 L^{2.7579}\left(\mathbf{R}^{2}=\mathbf{0 . 6 7}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

The exponent value in the growth equation can be used as a relative measure of fish condition. A value of three indicates isometric growth (growth without change in body shape). Values less than three indicate a drop in mass relative length as the fish grows (negative allometric growth).

## Visual Spawner and Spawning Habitat Survey 4.2.3

The 2003 stocking assessment was completed in early October 2003 during the time period when EB spawning activity would likely have been at its highest intensity. Extensive schools of mature EB exhibiting spawning colour and morphology were observed cruising the littoral zone of the lake, frequently in less than one meter of water. Redd locations as well as sites where digging had occurred were also observed in the near shore areas throughout the lake (Figure 1). In one area located near the southern end of Camp Lake an extensive congregation of two to three hundred spawning EB was observed. The spawning area was located in about three meters of water and was estimated to cover an area of about $120 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. With the exception of the immediate spawning area, the substrate was covered with a thick layer of aquatic macrophytes (0.5 to 1 m depth). Most of the fish caught in the angling sample were captured in the vicinity of this site.

## DISCUSSION 5.0

## Eastern Brook Trout 5.1

The stocking of reproductively viable brook trout in Camp Lake from 1991-1997 has resulted in a naturalized brook trout population. Growth rates and body condition have remained relatively stable between sample years however, and the average size in the gillnet catch has declined.

Catch per unit effort (CPUE) data for EB in Camp Lake increased between gillnet sampling events, ranging from 0.98-15.41 fish per net hour (Table 2), which may indicate a growing population of EB. This variability is however difficult to interpret as the result of inconsistencies in the timing of sampling events. Typically gillnet catch success is dependant upon a variety of factors related to seasonal variation in preferred habitat at the time of the surveys. The 2003 net set (Figure 2) was located in a different area than the previous two surveys and this along with the seasonal timing of the survey, may have resulted in a higher net catch.

Maximum size of EB in the gill net catch has declined since 1999 (Figure 3) and the percentage of fish larger than 350 mm was only $3.7 \%$ in 2003 compared to $37 \%$ in 1999 and $70 \%$ 2000. Samples sizes in the $1999(n=27)$ and 2000 and ( $n=10$ ) catch were much smaller than in 2003 ( $\mathrm{n}=57$ ), which may have biased the results as age-two or younger fish were not captured. Camp Lake is also popular winter fishery and the apparent decline in the number of larger fish in the sample may also be evidence of increased angling effort since the surveys in 1999-2000. Increased angling effort and exploitation would normally result in fewer, older fish in the population. Additional gillnet as well as creel surveys would be required in future to determine if this is the case.

The mean length of three-year-old Camp Lake EB ranged from 271-334 mm across sample years (Table 3, Figure 9) and has apparently increased since 1991. Interpretation of the 1991 results is however confounded by a much higher stocking rate for both rainbow and eastern trout during that period. An equivalent of 770 fish/ha was stocked into Camp Lake in 1989 (Appendix 2 Table 1) versus a range of 135-154 fish/ha in the late 1990's. The higher stocking rate in the late 1980's likely resulted in a substantial decrease in the growth rates of the fish that were captured in 1991 survey.

Body condition of Camp Lake EB has remained relatively stable between sample years (Table 4) suggesting that intraspecific competition for food resources is not resulting in poor growth. In fact, the exponent for the EB length-weight relationship was 3.11 in 2003 and was comparable to fish sampled from two other EB lakes in the Omineca Region that are consistently excellent performers. For comparison, samples of EB from Shere and Ferguson lakes from two stock assessments in 1998-99, exhibited slightly positive allometric growth, with exponent values of 3.128 and 3.097 respectively (Zimmerman 1999a, 1999b). In contrast EB samples from Kathie and Butterfly lakes in 2003 exhibited negative allometric growth and fish populations resident in both of those lakes appear to expanding (Williamson 2004a, 2004b).

Based on the visual surveys for spawning habitat, it is likely that recruitment in Camp Lake in not limited by the availability of spawning habitat. Most of the shoreline in Camp Lake is composed of a loose mixture of gravels and sands overlain with a thin layer of organic material (Photo 2). There are few areas of overland drainage in Eskers Park and Camp Lake has no tributary or outlet streams. As a result the drainage of precipitation from Camp Lake is subsurface which, in combination with the porous shoreline substrate, provides for extensive, high-quality shore-spawning habitat. It is however unclear how much of this shore habitat allows for successful egg and larval incubation.

Despite the satisfactory performance of the fishery in Camp Lake in terms of fish growth, the presence of naturalized brook trout populations in Camp Lake presents hazards in terms of conservation of biodiversity and sport fishing quality if fish are illegally transferred between lakes within the Park. At present, the risk of fish transfer from Camp Lake is lower than for other lakes in Eskers Park such as Butterfly or Kathie lakes (Williamson 2004a, 2004 b). Within Eskers Park, the most probable location for illegal fish transfer would be along the established trail system. Considering ease of access, two small lakes and are accessible by trail and are within 300 m of Camp Lake. The lake at the south end of Camp Lake is small and shallow and likely would not support a fish population through winter. The highest probability for successful transfer would be to Redstart Lake which is located at the north end of Camp Lake. Redstart Lake is not presently stocked, although it was not fishless in 2003; one mature female EB was captured during the course of the 2003 surveys (Williamson 2004c). Compared with the trails between other lakes in Eskers Park, the trail to Redstart Lake is more challenging to traverse; the hike involves an immediate climb greater than twenty meters in elevation over a large esker, a 300 meter walk and then a similar descent to Redstart Lake. The probability that anglers would move a substantial number of fish from Camp Lake to Restart Lake is considered low due to the considerable effort required to capture and carry fish between lakes.

Although the risk of fish transfer from Camp Lake is considered low, options to reduce the hazards to biodiversity and fishing quality in the park could include

1) Increase in brook trout quotas to reduce wild naturalized population sizes;
2) Eradication of EB through the use of gillnets or trapnets in the smaller lakes (ex Butterfly, Redstart and Kinglet);
3) Park signage explaining the risks and hazards.

At a minimum a communication plan including signage should be established to inform anglers in the park of the hazards of fish transfer to biodiversity and sport fishing quality as well as the legal consequences of transferring fish.

At present EB population levels, Camp Lake appears to be capable of providing a high yield brook trout fishery, consistent with the original management objective established
in 1997 (BC Parks, 1997). However the increases in net catch per unit of effort and the declines in the proportion of the catch greater than 350 mm in 2003 may be of concern and these observations are consistent with observation from Kathie and Butterfly lakes where the populations appear to be growing (Williamson 2004a, 2004b). Monitoring of this fishery will be therefore be required to maintain the fishing quality as well as to explain patterns of angling effort so that staff can adequately plan for and manage park use.

## Rainbow Trout 5.2

In 1999 and 2000 only one rainbow trout was captured in Camp Lake. Due to concerns over stock performance, the stocking of rainbow trout was temporarily suspended (Zimmerman, 2000). At the time of the 1999 and 2000 gillnet sampling events, water temperatures in the Camp Lake were near 20 Celsius, as a result, rainbow trout may have been occupying different areas of habitat than were sampled. A variety of other factors including, differential habitat selection, interspecific competition by direct predation, resource competition or interference competition with EB may be responsible for the low catch of rainbows in 1999 and 2000. In spring of 2001 it was later determined through an angling sample that rainbow trout were performing adequately in Camp Lake and were contributing to the sport fishery (Photo 3). Anecdotal reports from anglers and Parks staff also suggested that the rainbow fishery was attracting anglers to Camp Lake.

Results of the 2000 Kathie Lake assessment were similar to Camp Lake in that only one rainbow was captured. It was later determined during the 2003 stock assessment on Kathie Lake that the stocked rainbow trout were surviving and growing well (Williamson 2004b). The 2003 sample as well as preliminary unpublished creel data from the winter 2003/2004 indicate that there are sufficient numbers of rainbow trout in Kathie Lake to provide a fishery attractive to anglers. As a result of Kathie Lake surveys as well as the angling assessment in 2002, brood requests for 2500 yearling rainbow trout were made in 2003 and 2004 for Camp Lake (Appendix Table 2). These fish were scheduled for stocking in 2004 and 2005.

In summary, for the rainbow fishery in Camp Lake it is recommended that:

1) A stocking assessment at Camp should be completed in fall 2006 or spring 2007 and then at a three to five-year interval to assess the relative growth and survival of the rainbow stocked in 2004 and subsequent years; and
2) Opportunistic creel surveys should be completed to assess the contribution of these fish to the fishery.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE MANAGEMENT 6.0

1. Complete a stock assessment in fall 2006 or spring 2007 to evaluate the relative growth and performance of stocked rainbow trout.
2. Continue monitoring the EB fishery and population levels through annual opportunistic creel surveys and stocking assessments at a three year interval.
3. Change the brood stock requests for RB to include a preference for 20 g yearlings to reduce the likelihood that predation by brook trout is reducing post stocking survival of RB.
4. Complete an updated angling management and stocking plan for all Eskers Lakes that reflects the presence of naturalized brook trout in Eskers Park and balances the need for conservation while providing for quality recreational opportunities.
5. Establish a communication plan to reduce the incidence of fish transfer in the park.
6. If populations of naturalized EB increase in Camp Lake with a resulting decrease in fishing quality, management options such as: 1) increases to EB quotas, and/or 2) eradication methods (ex. removal by gill nets or trap-nets) could be considered to protect biodiversity and fishery values.
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## TABLES 8.0

Table 1. Attributes of Camp Lake.*

| Attributes |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| UTM Coordinates | 10.488204 .5990808 |
| Nearest Center | 33 km NW of Prince George |
| Waterbody identifier | 01286 STUR |
| Wateshed Code | $182-209700-95100$ |
| Water surface area | 26 Ha |
| Littoral area |  |
| (above 6 m contour) | 13.2 Ha |
| Shoreline perimeter | 5040 m |
| Maximum depth | 24 m |
| Volume | $1,911,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| Mean depth | 7 m |
| Elevation | 755 m |
| T.D.S. | $116 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ |
| Morphoedaphic |  |
| index | 16 |

*from Philip (1985)

Table 2. Catch Summary for the years 1991-2003; CPUE- Catch per unit effort; AF3N- all female triploid.

| Gillnet <br> Year | Brook Trout |  | Rainbow Trout |  | Set Time |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Catch | Net CPUE | Catch | Net CPUE | (Hours) | Set Date |  |
| 2003 | 57 | 15.41 | 0 | 0.00 | 3.7 | $03-$ Oct-03 |
| 2000 | 10 | 5.00 | 1 | 0.50 | 2 | 10-Aug-00 |
| 1999 | 27 | 0.98 | 0 | 0.00 | 27.5 | 10-Aug-99 |
| 1991 | 8 | 2.00 | 15 | 3.75 | 4 | 24-May-91 |


| Angling | Brook Trout |  | Rainbow Trout |  | Angling |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Catch | Rod CPUE | Catch | Rod CPUE | (Hours) | Date |
| 2003 | 48 | 8.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 03-Oct-03 |

Table 3. Mean length, weight and condition for EB captured in all sample years.

| Brook Trout (Gill Net) |  | Length (mm) |  |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  | Condition (k) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Year | Size | Mean | Min | Max | StdDev | Mean | Min | Max | StdDev | Mean | Min | Max | StdDev | Var |
| 2003 | 54 | 266 | 104 | 373 | 81.1 | 289 | 12 | 560 | 167.1 | 1.21 | 0.87 | 1.43 | 0.13 | 0.02 |
| 2000 | 10 | 381 | 321 | 425 | 30.3 | 666 | 400 | 880 | 136.0 | 1.19 | 1.08 | 1.35 | 0.08 | 0.01 |
| 1999 | 27 | 337 | 240 | 383 | 34.4 | 434 | 80 | 600 | 100.6 | 1.12 | 0.51 | 1.74 | 0.22 | 0.05 |
| 1991 | 8 | 271 | 250 | 300 | 19.6 | 265 | 180 | 360 | 69.7 | 1.30 | 1.12 | 1.59 | 0.15 | 0.02 |
| Brook trout (Angling) | Sample <br> Size | Mean | Min | Max | StdDev | Mean | Min | Max | StdDev | Mean | Min | Max | StdDev | Var |
| 2003 | 48 | 294 | 201 | 360 | 39.8 | 339 | 129 | 606 | 122.1 | 1.28 | 0.99 | 1.63 | 0.13 | 0.02 |

Table 4. Physical attributes of brook trout and rainbow trout sampled in Camp Lake 1991-2003 listed by age class. Note: sample year "2003" data includes all fish captured; "2003GN" only included fish sampled in the gillnet set.

| Brook Trout |  | Length (mm) | Weight (g) | Condition (k) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Year | Age | Size | Mean |  |  |


| 2003 | 1 | 7 | 122 | 104 | 165 | 20.9 | 21 | 12 | 40 | 9.4 | 1.11 | 0.89 | 1.22 | 0.1 | 0.01 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2003 | 2 | 29 | 258 | 201 | 295 | 21.3 | 226 | 129 | 320 | 50.6 | 1.29 | 1.15 | 1.63 | 0.1 | 0.01 |
| 1999 | 2 | 2 | 245 | 240 | 250 | 7.1 | 160 | 80 | 240 | 113.1 | 1.12 | 0.51 | 1.74 | 0.9 | 0.75 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 3 | 44 | 319 | 287 | 360 | 14.9 | 404 | 264 | 556 | 54.0 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.02 |
| 2000 | 3 | 2 | 334 | 321 | 346 | 17.7 | 450 | 400 | 500 | 70.7 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| 1999 | 3 | 11 | 330 | 305 | 363 | 17.7 | 425 | 350 | 505 | 46.2 | 1.18 | 1.06 | 1.34 | 0.1 | 0.01 |
| 1991 | 3 | 8 | 271 | 250 | 300 | 19.6 | 265 | 180 | 360 | 69.7 | 1.30 | 1.12 | 1.59 | 0.1 | 0.02 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 4 | 8 | 344 | 320 | 373 | 16.9 | 498 | 402 | 606 | 68.6 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.02 |
| 2000 | 4 | 7 | 394 | 370 | 425 | 19.6 | 724 | 640 | 880 | 85.4 | 1.19 | 1.08 | 1.35 | 0.1 | 0.01 |
|  | 4 | 12 | 354 | 320 | 383 | 20.9 | 475 | 340 | 600 | 64.8 | 1.08 | 0.86 | 1.40 | 0.2 | 0.03 |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Rainbow Trout Sampl |  |  |  | Length (mm) |  |  | Weight (g) |  |  |  | Condition (k) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Mean | Min | Max |  |  |  |  | StdDev | Var |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | 2 | 1 | 260 | 260 | 260 |  | 160 |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 3 | 11 | 275 | 230 | 350 | 40.8 | 212 | 110 | 420 | 102.5 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.01 |
| 2000 | 3 | 1 | 410 |  |  |  | 700 |  |  |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 4 | 3 | 290 | 270 | 320 | 26.5 | 237 | 200 | 300 | 55.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 |

FIGURES 9.0


Figure 1. Map of Eskers Provincial Park showing lakes that were included in the 2003 survey (Note Byers Lake was not assessed in 2003).


Figure 2. Bathymetric map of Camp Lake showing the sites used for gill net sets between 1999 and 2003. (see Appendix 1 Figure 1 for full size image).


Figure 3. Length frequency distribution for the 1991-2003 gill net samples for Camp Lake Eastern Brook trout (EB). 2003, n=57; 2000, n=10; 1999, n=27; 1991, $\mathbf{n = 8}$.


Figure 4. Length frequency distribution for the 1991-2003 gill net samples for Camp Lake Rainbow Trout (RB). 2000, n=1; 1991, n=15.


Figure 5. Maturity states of EB captured in 2003 listed by percent.


Figure 6. Percentage of mature EB in each age class for 2003.


Figure 7. Length weight relationship for Camp Lake brook trout (EB) from 1991 to 2003.


Figure 8. Length weight relationship for Camp Lake rainbow trout (RB) from 1991 and 2000.


Figure 9. Mean length at age-three for EB, for all sample years with $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ confidence limits.

Photos 10.0


Photo 1. View of Camp Lake looking north-west (Phillip, 1985).


Photo 2. Typical shoreline observed in Camp Lake (Phillip, 1985).


Photo 3. Rainbow trout captured by Andrew Wilson (MWLAP, Fish Biologist) in Camp Lake in spring, 2002.

APPENDICES 10.0


Appendix 2 Table 1. Stocking history and recent brood requests for Camp Lake.


Appendix 3 Table 1. Stock assessment data for Camp Lake eastern brook trout in 2003 (Gillnet sample).

| Lake | Sample\# | Set \# | Species Caught | Age | Length (mm) | Weight (grams) | Condition <br> (k) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scale } \\ \text { Age } \end{gathered}$ | Structure | Cond. <br> Code | Clip | Sex | Maturity | Ageing Comments | Comments | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camp | 106 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 125 | 21 | 1.1 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 107 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 125 | 23 | 1.2 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 108 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 165 | 40 | 0.9 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 109 | GN1 | EB |  |  |  |  | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | length weight er | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 110 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 118 | 20 | 1.2 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 111 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 111 | 16.6 | 1.2 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 114 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 105 | 13 | 1.1 | $1+$ | 0 | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 119 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 104 | 12 | 1.1 | $1+$ | o | 2 |  | Unk | im | broken | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 71 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 278 | 290 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 75 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 204 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 79 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 218 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | mt |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 84 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 245 | 199 | 1.4 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 87 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 250 | 207 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | mt |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 88 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 271 | 279 | 1.4 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 100 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 268 | 238 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | m | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 104 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 231 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | f | mt |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 115 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 220 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | m | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 54 | GN1 | EB |  |  |  |  | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | length weight er | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 63 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 310 | 376 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | N | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 64 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 318 | 433 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 65 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 350 | 403 | 0.9 | $3+$ | o | 1 | $n$ | F | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 67 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 317 | 404 | 1.3 | $3+$ | - | 2 | n | F | sp | broken; age estimate | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 68 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 314 | 381 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 2 | n | F | m | broken | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 70 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 287 | 311 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | N | M | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 73 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 308 | 397 | 1.4 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | F | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 76 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 316 | 396 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 77 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 311 | 390 | 1.3 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | F | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 80 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 317 | 369 | 1.2 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | M | st |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 81 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 315 | 368 | 1.2 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | F | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 82 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 318 | 377 | 1.2 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | F | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 83 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 344 | 459 | 1.1 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | M | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 85 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 320 | 435 | 1.3 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | M | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 86 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 325 | 453 | 1.3 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | m | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 89 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 325 | 400 | 1.2 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 93 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 310 | 427 | 1.4 | $3+$ | - | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 94 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 290 | 308 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 2 |  | f | sp | opaque; age estimate | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 95 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 303 | 264 | 0.9 | $3+$ | o | 2 |  | f | sp | broken | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 98 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 328 | 424 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 |  | m | st |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 101 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 322 | 441 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m | length \& weight changed | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 103 | GN1 | EB | 3 | 315 | 412 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 66 | GN1 | EB | 4 | 373 | 560 | 1.1 | $4+$ | o | 1 | $n$ | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 72 | GN1 | EB | 4 | 341 | 461 | 1.2 | $4+$ | 0 | 1 |  | F | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 74 | GN1 | EB | 4 | 320 | 402 | 1.2 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 78 | GN1 | EB | 4 | 327 | 452 | 1.3 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | F | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 90 | GN1 | EB | 4 | 343 | 555 | 1.4 | $4+$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1 |  | F | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 92 | GN1 | EB | 4 | 356 | 465 | 1.0 | $4+$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 1 |  | f | sp |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 69 | GN1 | EB |  | 289 | 314 | 1.3 | n/a | ${ }^{0}$ | 8 | N | M | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 91 | GN1 | EB |  | 288 | 295 | 1.2 | n/a | 0 | 8 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 96 | GN1 | EB |  | 248 | 198 | 1.3 | n/a | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 7 |  | M | mt | broken | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 97 | GN1 | EB |  | 322 | 441 | 1.3 | n/a | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 7 |  | F | sp | broken | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 99 | GN1 | EB |  | 334 | 459 | 1.2 | n/a | 0 | 8 |  | M | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 102 | GN1 | EB |  |  |  |  | n/a | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 7 |  | M | m |  | length weight er | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 105 | GN1 | EB |  | 148 | 42 | 1.3 | n/a | o | 8 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 112 | GN1 | EB |  | 130 | 25 | 1.1 | n/a | 0 | 8 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 113 | GN1 | EB |  | 124 | 21 | 1.1 | n/a | o | 8 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 116 | GN1 | EB |  | 132 | 20 | 0.9 | n/a | o | 8 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 118 | GN1 | EB |  | 118 | 16 | 1.0 | n/a | 0 | 8 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |

Appendix 3 Table 2. Stock assessment data for Camp Lake eastern brook trout in 2003 (Angling sample).

| Lake | Sample\# | Set \# | Species Caught | Age | Length (mm) | Weight (grams) | Condition (k) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scale } \\ \text { Age } \end{gathered}$ | Structure | Cond. Code | Clip | Sex | Maturity | Ageing Comments | Comments | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camp | 15 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 235 | 166 | 1.3 | ${ }^{2+}$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 16 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 270 | 284 | 1.4 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 20 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 290 | 320 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 2 | n | M | m | broken | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 23 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 201 | 129 | 1.6 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 24 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 278 | 271 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 27 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 226 | 161 | 1.4 | $2+$ | 0 | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 30 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 272 | 250 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 31 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 244 | 176 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 32b | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 248 | 178 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n |  | im |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 33 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 280 | 263 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 2 | n | M | m | broken | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 39 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 265 | 229 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 51 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 221 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 53 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 235 | 158 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 55 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 278 | 270 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 56 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 215 | 134 | 1.3 | $2+$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | n |  | im | small 1st year growth | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 57 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 261 | 289 | 1.6 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 58 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 295 | 298 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 60 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 268 | 222 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 61 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 267 | 236 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 62 | ANG1 | EB | 2 | 253 | 209 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 17 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 325 | 398 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 19 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 324 | 513 | 1.5 | $3+$ | o | 2 | n | M | m | broken | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 21 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 360 | 556 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 22 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 329 | 443 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M |  |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 25 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 300 | 380 | 1.4 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 26 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 332 | 411 | 1.1 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 28 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 318 | 400 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 29 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 315 | 399 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 34 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 300 | 364 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | F | sp |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 36 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 337 | 426 | 1.1 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 37 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 322 | 416 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 38 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 340 | 480 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 40 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 301 | 428 | 1.6 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 41 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 322 | 434 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 42 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 318 | 319 | 1.0 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 44 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 325 | 472 | 1.4 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 45 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 295 | 301 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 46 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 308 | 384 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | F | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 48 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 320 | 406 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 49 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 333 | 416 | 1.1 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 50 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 330 | 436 | 1.2 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | F | sp |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 52 | ANG1 | EB | 3 | 299 | 353 | 1.3 | $3+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 35 | ANG1 | EB | 4 | 339 | 479 | 1.2 | $4+$ | o | 1 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 43 | ANG1 | EB | 4 | 355 | 606 | 1.4 | $4+$ | o | 1 | n | F | r |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 18 | ANG1 | EB |  | 335 | 488 | 1.3 | n/a | o | 8 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 32 | ANG1 | EB |  | 315 | 399 | 1.3 | n/a | o | 8 | n | M | m | No otolith envelope | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 47 | ANG1 | EB |  | 345 | 505 | 1.2 | n/a | o | 8 | n | M | m |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 59 | ANG1 | EB |  | 230 | 175 | 1.4 | n/a | o | 7 | n | M | mt |  | fishing | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 106 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 125 | 21 | 1.1 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 107 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 125 | 23 | 1.2 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 108 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 165 | 40 | 0.9 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 109 | GN1 | EB |  |  |  |  | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | length weight er | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 110 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 118 | 20 | 1.2 | $1+$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 111 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 111 | 16.6 | 1.2 | $1+$ | 0 | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 114 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 105 | 13 | 1.1 | $1+$ | o | 1 |  | Unk | im |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 119 | GN1 | EB | 1 | 104 | 12 | 1.1 | $1+$ | o | 2 |  | Unk | im | broken | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 71 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 278 | 290 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 | n | M | r |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 75 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 204 | 1.2 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 79 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 218 | 1.2 | $2+$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |  | M | M |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 84 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 245 | 199 | 1.4 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | M |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 87 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 250 | 207 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | mt |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 88 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 271 | 279 | 1.4 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | M | M |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 100 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 268 | 238 | 1.2 | $2+$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |  | m | m |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |
| Camp | 104 | GN1 | EB | 2 | 260 | 231 | 1.3 | $2+$ | o | 1 |  | f | mt |  | gillnet | 03-Oct-03 |

Appendix 3 Table 3. Stock assessment data for Camp Lake eastern brook trout in 2000.

| Lake | Sample\# | Set \# | Species Caught | Age | Length $(\mathrm{mm})$ | Weight (grams) | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scale } \\ \text { Age } \end{gathered}$ | Structure | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cond. } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Clip | Sex | Maturity | Ageing Comments | Comments | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camp | 7 | 1 | eb | 3 | 321 | 400 | 1.21 | $3+$ | o | 1 |  | F | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 11 | 1 | eb | 3 | 346 | 500 | 1.21 | $3+$ | o | 1 |  | F | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 2 | 1 | eb | 4 | 389 | 640 | 1.09 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | F | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 3 | 1 | eb | 4 | 402 | 700 | 1.08 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | M | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 4 | 1 | eb | 4 | 378 | 730 | 1.35 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | F | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 5 | 1 | eb | 4 | 381 | 680 | 1.23 | ${ }^{+}$ | o | 1 |  | F | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 8 | 1 | eb | 4 | 370 | 650 | 1.28 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | M | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 9 | 1 | eb | 4 | 425 | 880 | 1.15 | $4+$ | o | 1 |  | M | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 10 | 1 | eb | 4 | 410 | 790 | 1.15 | $4+$ | o | 4 |  | F | mt | otolith broken, age estimate |  | 10-Aug-00 |
| Camp | 6 | 1 | eb | 5 | 385 | 690 | 1.21 | $5+$ | o | 1 |  | F | im | Maturity shouldn't read Imm. |  | 10-Aug-00 |

Appendix 3 Table 4. Stock assessment data for Camp Lake eastern brook trout in 1999.

| Lake | Sample\# | Set \# | Species Caught | Age | Length (mm) | Weight (grams) | Condition <br> (k) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scale } \\ & \text { Age } \end{aligned}$ | Structure | Cond. <br> Code | Clip | Sex | Maturity | Ageing Comments | Comments | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camp | 1 | 1 | eb | 4 | 375 | 495 | 0.94 | ${ }^{4+}$ | s |  |  | m | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 2 | 1 | eb | 3 | 320 | 420 | 1.28 | $3+$ | s |  |  | f | im | 4 ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 3 | 1 | eb | 3 | 305 | 380 | 1.34 | $3+$ | s |  |  | f | st |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 4 | 1 | eb | 3 | 313 | 410 | 1.34 | $3+$ | s |  |  | f | im | 4 ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 5 | 1 | eb | 4 | 320 | 450 | 1.37 | ${ }^{4+}$ | s |  |  | f | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 6 | 1 | eb | 2 | 250 | 80 | 0.51 | $2+$ | s |  |  | na | na | 3 ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 7 | 1 | eb | 3 | 335 | 440 | 1.17 | $3+$ | s |  |  | m | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 8 | 1 | eb | 4 | 350 | 600 | 1.40 | 4 | s |  |  | f | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 9 | 1 | eb | 3 | 324 | 430 | 1.26 | $3+$ | s |  |  | na | na |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 10 | 1 | eb | 4 | 383 | 510 | 0.91 | 4 | s |  |  | na | na |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 11 | 1 | eb | 4 | 333 | 450 | 1.22 | 4 | $s$ |  |  | f | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 12 | 1 | eb |  | 379 | 520 | 0.96 |  | s |  |  | m | mt | regenerated |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 13 | 1 | eb | 3 | 330 | 447 | 1.24 | $3+$ | s |  |  | m | im | 4 ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 14 | 1 | eb | 3 | 355 | 480 | 1.07 | $3+$ | s |  |  | na | na | 4 ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 15 | 1 | eb | 6 | 355 | 500 | 1.12 | 6 | s |  |  | f | mt | 5 ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 16 | 1 | eb | 4 | 368 | 505 | 1.01 | 4 | s |  |  | m | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 17 | 1 | eb | 4 | 380 | 470 | 0.86 | $4+$ | s |  |  | f | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 18 | 1 | eb | 4 | 355 | 480 | 1.07 | $4+$ | s |  |  | f | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 19 | 1 | eb | 4 | 363 | 540 | 1.13 | $4+$ | s |  |  | f | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 20 | 1 | eb | 4 | 350 | 440 | 1.03 | $4+$ | s |  |  | f | st |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 21 | 1 | eb | 4 | 330 | 340 | 0.95 | $4+$ | s |  |  | f | st | $3+$ ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 22 | 1 | eb | 4 | 335 | 420 | 1.12 | $4+$ | s |  |  | f | mt | $3+$ ? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 23 | 1 | eb | 3 | 363 | 505 | 1.06 | $3+$ | s |  |  | f | st | 4? 1st ann? |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 24 | 1 | eb | 3 | 325 | 370 | 1.08 | $3+$ | s |  |  | f | mt |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 25 | 1 | eb | 3 | 320 | 350 | 1.07 | $3+$ | s |  |  | m | st |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 26 | 1 | eb | 3 | 345 | 440 | 1.07 | $3+$ | s |  |  | f | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |
| Camp | 27 | 1 | eb | 2 | 240 | 240 | 1.74 | $2+$ | s |  |  | f | im |  |  | 10-Aug-99 |

Appendix 3 Table 5. Stock assessment data for Camp Lake rainbow trout in 2000.

| Lake | Sample\# | Set \# | Species Caught | Age | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | Weight (grams) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Condition } \\ & \text { (k) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scale } \\ \text { Age } \end{gathered}$ | Structure | Cond. Code | Clip | Sex | Maturity | Ageing Comments | Comments | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camp | 1 | 1 | Rbt | 3 | 410 | 700 | 1.0 | $3+$ | Scale | 1 |  | F | mt |  |  |  |

Appendix 3 Table 6. Stock assessment data for Camp Lake rainbow trout in 1991.

| Lake | Sample\# | Set \# | Species Caught | Age | Length (mm) | Weight (grams) | Condition (k) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scale } \\ \text { Age } \end{gathered}$ | Structure | Cond. Code | Clip | Sex | Maturity | Ageing Comments | Comments | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 2 | 260 | 160 | 0.9 | 2.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 350 | 420 | 1.0 | 3.0 | s |  |  | F |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 340 | 380 | 1.0 | 3.0 | s |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 300 | 200 | 0.7 | 3.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 290 | 260 | 1.1 | 3.0 | s |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 270 | 190 | 1.0 | 3.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 260 | 200 | 1.1 | 3.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 250 | 150 | 1.0 | 3.0 | s |  |  | F |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 250 | 150 | 1.0 | 3.0 | s |  |  | F |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 240 | 150 | 1.1 | 3.0 | s |  |  | F |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 240 | 120 | 0.9 | 3.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 3 | 230 | 110 | 0.9 | 3.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 4 | 320 | 300 | 0.9 | 4.0 | s |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 4 | 280 | 210 | 1.0 | 4.0 | s |  |  | F |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB | 4 | 270 | 200 | 1.0 | 4.0 | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |
| Camp |  |  | RB |  | 240 | 140 | 1.0 |  | s |  |  | M |  |  |  | 24-May-91 |

## PROJECT EVALUATION 11.0

Project Budget Summary:
Budget allocated: 5000
Budget spent: 5000
Cost savings: 0
The project was:
$\sqrt{ }$ on budgetover budget Why?
under budget Why? $\qquad$

## Was the project completed as planned?

Yes.
$\checkmark$ No. If not, describe problems that arose and changes made to address problems. We were unable to complete the Bow/ Butterfly Lake paired lake study as the result of a fish stocking error. A follow-up survey is planned for 2004.

Would the proponent recommend changes to similar projects in the future?
$\checkmark$ No.Yes (Please provide details). $\qquad$

## Contractor performance:

$\checkmark$ Not applicable. No contractor employed.Acceptable. Would employ again.Acceptable. But some concerns (please provide details):
Unacceptable. Would not recommend for future projects (please provide reasons): $\qquad$

