SURVEY SUMMARY
NCWRC - Inland Fisheries Division - Coastal Region
Contentnea Creek Fish Survey Following a Reported Fish Kill, 2022

NEED

During May 2022, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission received multiple reports of a fish kill occurring in the Snow Hill, NC to Grifton, NC area of Contentnea Creek. Species initially observed and reported to have been affected included catfish spp., sunfish spp., Largemouth Bass, and American Eel. The purpose of this investigation was to determine if management actions would be warranted to mitigate negative, long-term impacts of this event.

## OBJECTIVE

Assess the status of fish populations in Contentnea Creek following a fish kill event. Collect, identify, and tally all fish species. Perform length and weight measurements for inland game fish species. Conduct relative abundance, relative frequency, and relative weight analysis when 40 or more individuals per species are collected.

## METHODS

Personnel: Nick Shaver and Todd VanMiddlesworth - District 2 Fisheries Biologists.
Waterbody: Contentnea Creek - 7 sampling sites.
Fish Sampling Gear: Smith-Root 7.5 GPP Boat-Mounted Electrofishing Unit, High Frequency, 120 PPS, 10 A. Long-handled dipnet with $3 / 4$-in ( 19 mm ) mesh.
Other Gear Utilized: YSI water quality meter for temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, dissolved oxygen ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ), \% saturation, conductivity ( $\mu \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{cm}$ ), salinity ( ppt ).
Sample Date(s): October 20-21, 2022.
Funding Source: Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration and agency license receipts.
Project Name in BIODE Fish: Neuse River Sportfish Community Survey.
Citation: Shaver, N., and T. VanMiddlesworth. 2023. Contentnea Creek Fish Survey Following a Reported Fish Kill, 2022. North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration, survey summary, Raleigh.
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## BIOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

Water quality parameters measured prior to electrofishing each site were within seasonally normal ranges for aquatic systems in the region (Table 1). The most abundant inland game fish species collected were Bluegill ( $n=153$ ) comprising $44 \%$ of the total fish collected, Redear Sunfish ( $n=49 ; 14 \%$ of total fish) and Largemouth Bass ( $n=48 ; 14 \%$ of total fish). Additional fish species collected, but not in sufficient abundance to warrant additional analysis, include Channel Catfish, American Shad, Black Crappie, Redbreast Sunfish, Pumpkinseed, and Warmouth (Table 2).

Relative abundance (CPUE, fish/hr) for Bluegill was 93 fish/hr followed by Redear Sunfish ( 30 fish/hr), and Largemouth Bass ( 29 fish/hr). Bluegill total length ( TL ) ranged $52-217 \mathrm{~mm}$ with $49(33 \%)$ individuals quality-length and $8(5 \%)$ individuals preferred-length. Redear Sunfish TL ranged 114-302 mm with 34 (69\%) individuals quality-length, four (8\%) individuals preferred length, and one (2\%) individual memorable-length. Largemouth Bass TL ranged 75-566 mm
with 15 (43\%) individuals quality-length, nine (26\%) individuals preferred-length, and two (6\%) individuals memorable-length (Table 3, Figures 1-3). Mean relative weights for Bluegill, Redear Sunfish, and Largemouth Bass suggest adequate body conditions (Table 3; Figures 4-6). Our data suggest that the Contentnea Creek fish populations show minimal negative effects from fish kills and should provide adequate angling opportunity.

## MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Survey Contentnea Creek fish populations every 5 years or as needed (e.g., fish kill) to document changes in population characteristics.
2. Supplemental stocking of inland game fish species is not warranted at this time.
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TABLE 1. Site and water quality information collected during the Contentnea Creek Fish Survey, October 2022.

| Date | Site | Pps | Effort (s) | Do | \%Do | Cond | Sal | Temp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 / 20 / 2022$ | NR-Contentnea79 | 120 | 900 | 8.2 | 80 | 179 | 0.1 | 14.0 |
| $10 / 20 / 2022$ | NR-Contentnea80 | 120 | 900 | 8.0 | 78 | 184 | 0.1 | 14.0 |
| $10 / 20 / 2022$ | NR-Contentnea 51 | 120 | 900 | 8.7 | 83 | 124 | 0.1 | 13.5 |
| $10 / 20 / 2022$ | NR-Contnentnea50 | 120 | 900 | 8.2 | 79 | 128 | 0.1 | 13.9 |
| $10 / 21 / 2022$ | NR-Contentnea37 | 120 | 900 | 8.9 | 86 | 119 | 0.1 | 13.8 |
| $10 / 21 / 2022$ | NR-Contentnea36 | 120 | 900 | 8.9 | 86 | 119 | 0.1 | 13.8 |
| $10 / 21 / 2022$ | NR-Contentnea6 | 120 | 499 | 9.7 | 96 | 122 | 0.1 | 15.7 |

TABLE 2. Summary statistics of fish species encountered and ordered by most to least number collected via boat electrofishing. Asterisks (*) indicate no data available or no further analysis warranted.

| Species | Number <br> Collected | Percent <br> Collected (\%) | Minimum Total <br> Length (mm) | Minimum Total <br> Length (mm) | Mean Total <br> Length (mm) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 153 | $44 \%$ | 52 | 217 | 137 |
| Redear Sunfish | 49 | $14 \%$ | 114 | 302 | 195 |
| Largemouth Bass | 48 | $14 \%$ | 75 | 566 | 270 |
| Gizzard Shad | 14 | $4 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Channel Catfish | 11 | $3 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Bowfin | 10 | $3 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Chain Pickerel | 10 | $3 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Common Carp | 10 | $3 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| American Shad | 7 | $2 \%$ | 91 | 94 | $*$ |
| Black Crappie | 7 | $2 \%$ | 134 | 257 | $*$ |
| Flathead Catfish | 6 | $2 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Lake Chubsucker | 6 | $2 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Redbreast Sunfish | 5 | $1 \%$ | 87 | 164 | $*$ |
| Longnose Gar | 4 | $1 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Notchlip Redhorse | 4 | $1 \%$ | $*$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Pumpkinseed | 1 | $0 \%$ | 141 | 141 | $*$ |
| Warmouth | 1 | $0 \%$ | 180 | 180 | $*$ |
| Total | 346 | $100 \%$ |  |  |  |

TABLE 3. Relative abundance, proportional size indices, and relative weight (Wr) of select species.

| Species | CPUE (fish/hr) | PSD-Q | PSD-P | PSD-M | Mean Wr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bluegill | 93 | 33 | 5 |  | 83 |
| Redear Sunfish | 30 | 69 | 8 | 2 | 85 |
| Largemouth Bass | 29 | 43 | 26 | 6 | 87 |



FIGURE 1. Length frequency distribution of Bluegill.
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FIGURE 2. Length frequency distribution of Redear Sunfish.


FIGURE 3. Length frequency distribution of Largemouth Bass.
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FIGURE 4. Relationship between total length and relative weight of Bluegill. The dashed line represents the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of relative weight for Bluegill across their geographical distribution.
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FIGURE 5. Relationship between total length and relative weight of Redear Sunfish.
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FIGURE 6. Relationship between total length and relative weight of Largemouth Bass.

