

## Impact of Dredging on the Fisheries of Igbedi Creek, Upper Nun River, Niger Delta, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Seiyaboh, E.I., Ogamba, E.N., <sup>2</sup>Utibe, D.I. and <sup>3</sup>Sikoki, F.D.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Yenagoa, Bayelsa State.

Department of Animal & Environmental Biology, University of Port Harcourt, PMB 53223, Port Harcourt, Nigeria,

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Marine Pollution Monitoring and Seafood Safety, University of Port Harcourt, PMB 5323, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

---

**Abstract:** The impact of dredging on the fisheries of Igbedi Creek, upper Nun River, Niger Delta was investigated from June 2009 to May 2011. Two locations – Ogobiri (Dredged) and Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) were studied. A total of 26,988 specimens representing 22 species belonging to 13 families were caught at Ogobiri (Dredged) Location; while a total of 33,275 representing 28 species belonging to 16 families were caught at Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) Location during the sampling period. There was a decrease in the number of fish species recovered in the undredged from 28 to only 22 in the dredged area. Fish from the dredged area exhibited negative allometric growth with length exponent ( $b$ ) ranging from  $0.911 \pm 0.04$  (*Brycinus macrolepidotus*). The only exception was *Schulbe uranoscopus*, which exhibited isometric growth with length exponent " $b$ " =  $3.027 \pm 0.03$ . In the undredged location, three species, exhibited isometric growth (*Synodontis batensodath* ( $b = 3.095 \pm 0.07$ ); *Schilbe uranoscopus* ( $b = 3.097 \pm 0.03$ ) and *Distichodus faciatus* ( $b = 3.021 \pm 0.11$ )). The other species exhibited negative allometric growth with length exponents ranging from  $0.777 \pm 0.004$  to  $2.560 \pm 0.04$  with the exception of *Hepsetus odoe* which exhibited positive allometric growth ( $b = 3.412 \pm 0.07$ ). Correlation coefficients between length and weight " $r$ " ranged from 0.739 (*Eleoties senegalensis*) to 0.978 (*Schulbe mystus*) in the dredged; and between 0.447 (*Polypterus ansorgi*) to 0.994 (*synodontis membranoceous*) in the undredged locations. Student's  $t$ -test values at 95% level showed significant differences in condition factor between the two areas. These results are clear indications that dredging significantly affected the fisheries of the creek.

---

### I. Introduction

Dredging is a process that involves the excavation of water beds to remove sediments, pollutants, shellfish and other materials. The methods and machinery used in dredging vary widely. Most dredging is done by ships that tow a dredge along the water bed. Self standing dredges and dredge pumping stations are used for routine tasks. A dredge, which is the catch all term for the different types of machinery that perform dredging, can cut away sediment, scoop materials out like a back hoe or suction them through a large pipe to be deposited into a ship.

The effects of dredging on aquatic organisms have been a source of environmental concern for several decades. One category of concern that has frequently arisen in connection with projects involving dredging for navigational purposes deals with mortality of fish and shellfish entrained during the dredging process (Reine and Clark, 1998).

Dredging and related activities could disrupt fisheries and/or damage spawning grounds which may also have deleterious impacts on key fishery resources and, to some extent, the fishing industry (Ault *et al.*, 1998; Gebhards, 1973).

Specifically, appropriately designed studies to address dredging impacts are very limited and the lack of relevant data continues to foster controversy on dredging impact assessments. Until adequate data are available, quantifying biological responses to the potential dredging-induced impacts must unfortunately remain subjective (Clark, 1979). Furthermore, for decades the effects of dredging on aquatic resources have been an issue of increasing environmental concern. However, very little work has been done to detect the effects of dredging at population-level of mobile epi-benthic macro-invertebrates and dermal fishes (Ault *et al.*, 1998).

This research is intended to assess the level of impact of dredging operations on the fisheries of Igbedi Creek, upper Nun River. It is intended to stress that in dredging operations particular attention should be paid to the reduction of the vulnerability of the environment and those species of organisms (fisheries in this case) most vulnerable to the risks associated with such operations. Basically, this research looked at some aspects of the fisheries of Igbedi Creek, upper Nun River in a Dredged site as compared to an Un-dredged site.

The objectives of the research are:

- To assess the fish species distribution in the Dredged and Un-dredged sites.

- To assess the Length and Weight relationship of the fish species in the Dredged and Un-dredged sites and determine Fish Assemblage; Catch Composition; Relative Abundance and Condition factor.
- Compare the data obtained in the Dredged and Un-dredged site and determine the possible impact of dredging on fisheries of Igbedi Creek, upper Nun River.

The study is expected to reveal the impact on the ecosystem as direct consequences of dredging operations in Igbedi Creek, upper Nun River using fish as an indicator. Fisheries impact is a significant conclusion for environmental and ecological change in aquatic systems (Karr, 1981).

## II. Methodology

### [1]Study Area

The study was carried out in Igbedi Creek, a tributary of the Upper Nun River in the Niger Delta located between latitude  $5^{\circ}N01^1$  and  $6^{\circ}17^1E$ . The stretch of the river is a long and wide meander whose outer concave bank is relatively shallow with sandy point bars (Abowei, 2000). The depth and width of the river vary slightly at different points (Sikoki *et. al.*, 1998). The minimum and maximum widths are 200 and 250 meters respectively. The river is subjected to tidal influence in the dry season. Water flows rapidly in one direction during the flood (May – October). At the peak of the dry season, the direction of flow is slightly reversed by the rising tide. At full tide the flow is almost stagnant.

### [2]Field Study & Collection of Samples

Two communities were chosen as sample communities for this study. These are: Ogobiri (Dredged Location), in the Sagbama Local Government Area (SALGA) i.e. the community where the dredging is taking place, and Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged Location), also in Sagbama Local Government Area (SALGA) which is a community that is relatively undisturbed. Both communities are located along the igbedi creek, upper Nun River and are both predominantly fishing communities.

For the purpose of this study, the selected dredged and non-dredged sites were divided into stations: Ogobiri – OGO<sub>1</sub>DA=Dredged Area, OGO<sub>1&2</sub>DS=Downstream, OGO<sub>1&2</sub>US=Upstream; Agoro-gbene – AGO<sub>1</sub>DS=Downstream, AGO<sub>1</sub>MD=Midstream, AGO<sub>1</sub>US=Upstream.

### Collection of Fish Samples

Sampling was carried out forth nightly between June 2009 and May 2011 using gillnets, long lines, traps and stakes. The researcher fished for himself and also employed the services of fishers for sampling. Catches were isolated and conveyed in thermos cool boxes to the laboratory on each sampling day. Fish specimens were identified using monographs, descriptions, checklists and keys (Daget, 1954; Boseman, 1963; Reed *et. al.*, 1967; Holden and Reed, 1972; Poll, 1974; Whyte, 1975; Jiri, 1976; Reed & Sydenham, 1978; Otobo, 1981; Alfred Ockiya, 1983; Whitehead, 1984; Loveque *et al.*, 1991.

Total length and weight of fish specimens were measured to the nearest centimetre and grammes respectively, to obtain data for length-weight relationship. The total length (TL) of the fish was measured from the tip of mouth to the caudal fin using meter rule calibrated in centimetre. Fish samples were measured to the nearest centimetre. The weight of each fish was obtained after draining water from the buccal cavity and blot drying samples with a piece of clean hand towel. Weighing was done with a tabletop weighing balance to the nearest gram.

### Length – Weight Relationship

The relationship between the length (L) and weight (W) of the various fish species were expressed by the exponential equation (Pauly, 1983):

$$W=aL^b \quad (\text{Eqn. 1})$$

Where

W=Weight of fish in (g)

L= Total Length of fish in (cm)

a= Constant (intercept)

b= The Length exponent (Slope)

The “a” and “b” values were obtained from a linear regression of the length and weight of fish. The correlation (r) that is the degree of association between the length and weight was computed from the linear regression analysis.

### Condition Factor

The condition factor (K) of the experimental fish was estimated from the relationship:

$$K=100W/L^3 \quad (\text{Eqn. 2})$$

Where;

K= Condition Factor  
 W= Weight of Fish (g)  
 L= Length of Fish (cm)

### [3]Analysis of Experimental Data

The following statistical tools were used to analyzed the data obtained – Regression and Correlation Analysis (RECA) for linear regression of length and weight of fish, Microsoft Excel (2010) for computation of means and standard deviation; Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and FISAT (Gayando and Pauly, 1997) for descriptive statistics, length-weight relationship and condition factor of fish.

### III. Results And Discussion

A total of 26,988 specimens representing 22 species belonging to 13 families were caught at Ogobiri (Dredged) Location; while a total of 33,275 representing 28 species belonging to 16 families were caught at Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) Location during the sampling period. A total of 60,263 specimens were obtained from both locations. In Ogobiri Location, *Polydactylus quadrifilis* was the most abundant in biomass (85.73Kg) accounting for 8.6% of the total weight of fish specimens caught. *Schilbe uranoscopus* was the most numerous (2021) accounting for 7.5% of the total number of fish specimens caught. In Agoro-Gbene location, *Distichodus brevipinnis* had the highest biomass (206.76Kg) accounting for 9.5% of the total weight of fish specimens caught. *Schilbe uranoscopus* was the most numerous (2245) accounting for 6.8% of the total number of fish specimens caught. The fish species with the least percentage composition in biomass in Ogobiri location was *Petrocephalus bovei* (7.60Kg) accounting for 0.8% of the total weight of fish specimens caught; and Agoro-Gbene location it was *Parallia pellucida* (7.66Kg) accounting for 0.4% of the total weight of fish specimens caught. In Ogobiri location, *Hepsetus odoe* was the least numerous (1012) accounting for 3.8% of the total number of fish specimens caught; while in Agoro-Gbene location, *Cynoglossus senegalensis* was the least numerous (828) accounting for 2.5% of the total number of fish specimens caught. Tables 3 & 4 show fish species caught and their composition in Ogobiri (Dredged) & Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) locations (June 2009 – May 2011). The result of the respective percentage composition in number and total weight of fish caught in the various locations showed that the following: Ogobiri (Dredged) location - 26,988 (44.8%); 1000.57 (31.5%) and Agoro-Gbene Un-dredged) location - 33,275 (55.2%); 2175.51 (68.5%). This study revealed that Agoro-Gbene location recorded the highest values both in total number and weight of 55.2% and 68.5% respectively. This may be attributed to the relatively better environmental condition in Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) location as revealed by this investigation when compared to Ogobiri (Dredged) location, which may be a direct consequence of the dredging in this location. The values obtained in Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) location are significantly higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) than those obtained in Ogobiri (Dredged) location.

**Table 1: Fish Species caught and their Composition in Ogobiri (Dredged) Location (June 2009 – May 2011)**

Family/Species	No. of Specimens	% No. of Specimen	Weight (Kg) of Specimens	% Weight Specimen
CHARACIDAE				
<i>Brycinus nurse</i>	1121	4.2	31.66	3.2
<i>Brycinus macrolepidotus</i>	1025	3.8	79.92	8.0
<i>Heterocentrus brevis</i>	1227	4.6	74.77	7.5
<i>Alestes baremose</i>	1048	3.9	33.36	3.3
MONOCHOKIDAE				
<i>Synodontis batensoda</i>	1145	4.2	30.24	3.0
<i>Synodontis membranaceus</i>	1211	4.5	18.20	
BAGRIDAE				
<i>Chrysichthys burcanis</i>	1204	4.5	69.70	7.0
<i>Glanotis laticeps</i>	1196	4.4	45.00	4.5
POLYNEMIDAE				
<i>Polydactylus quadrifilis</i>	1186	4.4	85.73	8.6
CLUPEIDAE				
<i>Odaxotrhissa mento</i>	1144	4.2	14.60	1.5
CYNOGLOSSIDAE				
<i>Cynoglossus senegalensis</i>	1258	4.7	57.54	5.8
CYPRINIDAE				
<i>Labeo esohie</i>	1232	4.6	62.89	6.3
<i>Labeo senegalensis</i>	1286	4.8	57.90	5.8
MORMYRIDAE				
<i>Gnathonemus abadii</i>	1210	4.5	36.77	3.7
<i>Petrocephalus bovei</i>	1036	3.8	7.60	0.8
DISTICHODONTIDAE				
<i>Distichodus brevipinnis</i>	1188	4.4	73.85	7.4
SCHILBEIDAE				
<i>Schilbe uranoscopus</i>	2021	7.5	28.41	2.8
<i>Schilbe mystus</i>	1813	6.7	28.09	2.8
<i>Parallia pellucida</i>	1234	4.6	11.20	1.1
CITHARINIDAE				
<i>Citharus citharus</i>	1204	4.5	69.70	7.0
HEPSETIDAE				
<i>Hepsetus odoe</i>	1012	3.8	62.05	6.2
ELEOTRIDAE				
<i>Eleotris senegalensis</i>	1052	3.9	21.39	2.1
	<b>26,988</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1000.57</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2: Fish Species caught and their Composition in Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged Location) Location (June 2009 – May 2011)**

Family/Species	No. of Specimens	% No. of Specimen	Weight (Kg) of Specimens	% Weight of Specimens
<b>CHARACIDAE</b>				
<i>Brycinus nurse</i>	1227	3.7	88.10	4.1
<i>Brycinus macrolepidotus</i>	1133	3.4	124.88	5.7
<i>Hydrocynus brevis</i>	1185	3.6	112.06	5.2
<i>Alester baremoze</i>	1192	3.6	70.65	3.3
<b>MONOCHOKIDAE</b>				
<i>Synodontis batensoda</i>	1271	3.8	45.61	2.1
<i>Synodontis membranaceus</i>	1103	3.3	63.22	2.9
<b>BAGRIDAE</b>				
<i>Chrysichthys furcatus</i>	1013	3.0	61.48	
<i>Clarias laticeps</i>	1032	3.1	65.69	3.0
<b>POLYNEMIDAE</b>				
<i>Polydactylus quadrifilis</i>	1032	3.1	94.16	4.3
<b>CLUPEIDAE</b>				
<i>Odaxotricha mento</i>	1031	3.1	20.46	0.9
<b>CYNOGLOSSIDAE</b>				
<i>Cynoglossus senegalensis</i>	828	2.5	98.53	4.5
<b>CYPRINIDAE</b>				
<i>Labeo coubitis</i>	1099	3.3	115.41	5.3
<i>Labeo senegalensis</i>	1223	3.7	144.01	6.6
<b>MORMYRIDAE</b>				
<i>Gnathanemus abadii</i>	1113	3.4	87.11	4.0
<i>Petrocephalus bavei</i>	1012	3.3	9.35	0.4
<b>DISTICHODONTIDAE</b>				
<i>Distichodus brevifinnis</i>	1006	3.0	206.76	9.5
<i>Distichodus elongiceps</i>	1188	3.8	75.92	3.5
<b>SCHILBEIDAE</b>				
<i>Schilbe uranoscopus</i>	2245	6.8	23.49	1.1
<i>Schilbe mystus</i>	1927	5.8	43.99	2.0
<i>Parallia pallucida</i>	1273	3.8	7.66	0.4
<b>CITHARINIDAE</b>				
<i>Citharus citharus</i>	1054	3.2	145.67	6.7
<b>HEPSETIDAE</b>				
<i>Hepsetus odoe</i>	1195	3.6	139.84	6.4
<b>ELEOTRIDAE</b>				
<i>Eleotris senegalensis</i>	1003	3.0	27.56	1.3
<b>CICHLIDAE</b>				
<i>Hemichromis fasciatus</i>	1203	3.6	39.36	1.8
<b>POLYPTERIDAE</b>				
<i>Polypterus ansorgii</i>	1239	3.7	156.70	7.2
<b>NOTOPTERIDAE</b>				
<i>Pareuchanna asfer</i>	1121	3.4	51.24	2.4
<i>Xenomystus nigri</i>	1109	3.3	56.60	2.6
	<b>33,275</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2175.51</b>	<b>100</b>

The LWR was determined following a Log – Log transformation. The Exponential Equation, Degree of Association (r), Coefficient of Determination (r<sup>2</sup>) and significance of Correlation of the Length – Weight relationship for the various fish species in both locations are shown in Tables 3 & 4 respectively.. The regression trend indicated that in Ogobiri (Dredged) Location, all fish species exhibited negative allometric weight growth with length exponent (b) ranging from 0.911±0.01 (*Polydactylus quadrifilis*) to 2.709±0.04 (*Brycinus macrolepidotus*) except *Schilbe uranoscopus*, which exhibited an isometric weight growth with length exponent “b” = 3.027±.03; while in Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) location, *Synodontis batensoda* (b=3.095±0.07), *Schilbe uranoscopus* (b=3.097±0.03) and *Distichodus fasciatus* (b=3.021±0.11) exhibited isometric growth; others exhibited negative allometric growth with length exponent (b) ranging from 0.777±0.004 (*Synodoontis membranaceus*) to 2.560±0.04 (*Synodontis nigrita*) except *Hepsetus odoe* which exhibited positive allometric growth (b=3.412±a.0.07).The correlation coefficients “r” ranged from 0.739 (*Eleotris senegalensis*) to 0.978 (*Schilbe mystus*) in Ogobiri location and 0.447 (*Polypterus ansorgii*) to 0.994 (*Synodontis membranaceus*) in Agoro-Gbene location.

The length exponent (b) ranging from 0.911 – 3.027 representing 22 fish species in Ogobiri location and 0.777 – 3.097 representing 28 fish species in Agoro-Gbene location recorded in this study is not in agreement with (b) values ranging from 2.73 – 3.03 recorded by Hart and Abowei (2007) for 10 fish species in the Lower Nun River; (b) ranging from 2.790 – 3.210 recorded by Fafioye and Oluajo (2005) for 5 fish species in Epe Lagoon, Nigeria; (b) ranging from 2.012 – 2.991 recorded by Kumolu-Johnson and Ndimele (2010) for 21 fish species in Ologe Lagoon, Lagos; (b) ranging from 2.719 – 3.580 recorded by Abowei and George (2009) for 5 fish species from Nkoro River, Niger Delta. The correlation coefficient (r) which is the degree of association between length and weight ranging from 0.546 – 0.956 in Ogobiri location and 0.336 – 0.988 in Agoro-Gbene location is in agreement with 0.951 – 0.996 recorded by Hart and Abowei (2007) for 10 fish species in the Lower Nun River. The result from this study shows that in Ogobiri (Dredged) location, the rate of increase in body length is not proportional to the rate of increase in body weight in almost all the fish species except *Schilbe uranoscopus*; whereas in Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) location, the rate of increase in body length is proportional to the rate of increase in body weight in some of the fish species.

**Table 3: Length – Weight Regression Equation, Correlation Coefficient (r), Coefficient of Determination (r<sup>2</sup>) and Significance of Correlation for Various Fish Species in Ogobiri Location**

Fish Species	Regression Equation	r	r <sup>2</sup>	Significance of Correlation
<i>Brycinus murse</i>	LogW=0.028+2.648LogL	0.940	0.884	P<0.05; t=92.41, df=1119
<i>Brycinus macrolepidotus</i>	LogW=0.024+2.708 LogL	0.894	0.799	P<0.05; t=63.77, df=1023
<i>Syndontis balensoda</i>	LogW=0.034+2.567 LogL	0.865	0.747	P<0.05; t=58.11, df=1141
<i>Syndontis membranaceus</i>	LogW=0.078+2.105 LogL	0.716	0.838	P<0.05; t=39.23, df=1209
<i>Chrysichthys furcatus</i>	LogW=0.067+2.183 LogL	0.946	0.895	P<0.05; t=98.44, df=1139
<i>Polydactylus quadrifilis</i>	LogW=0.817+0.911 LogL	0.935	0.874	P<0.05; t=90.78, df=1184
<i>Odaxothrissa mento</i>	LogW=0.285+1.643 LogL	0.953	0.908	P<0.05; t=106.03, df=1142
<i>Parallia pelucida</i>	LogW=0.052+2.245 LogL	0.848	0.720	P<0.05; t=56.23, df=1232
<i>Cynoglossus senegalensis</i>	LogW=0.506+0.954 LogL	0.950	0.902	P<0.05; t=107.73, df=1256
<i>Hydrocynus brevis</i>	LogW=0.018+2.160 LogL	0.825	0.681	P<0.05; t=51.12, df=1225
<i>Labeo coubie</i>	LogW=0.038+2.580 LogL	0.967	0.935	P<0.05; t=133.01, df=1230
<i>Labeo senegalensis</i>	LogW=0.718+1.802 LogL	0.952	0.907	P<0.05; t=111.89, df=1284
<i>Gnathonemus abadii</i>	LogW=0.022+2.616 LogL	0.915	0.837	P<0.05; t=78.75, df=1208
<i>Distichodus brevipinnis</i>	LogW=0.041+2.601 LogL	0.972	0.945	P<0.05; t=142.69, df=1186
<i>Schilbe uranoscopus</i>	LogW=0.070+3.027 LogL	0.918	0.842	P<0.05; t=103.78, df=2019
<i>Schilbe mystus</i>	LogW=0.032+2.426 LogL	0.978	0.956	P<0.05; t=198.98, df=1811
<i>Citharus citharus</i>	LogW=0.024+1.983 LogL	0.780	0.609	P<0.05; t=43.25, df=1202
<i>Hepsetus odoe</i>	LogW=0.521+1.632 LogL	0.935	0.874	P<0.05; t=83.60, df=1010
<i>Clarotes latticeps</i>	LogW=0.606+2.346 LogL	0.863	0.746	P<0.05; t=59.16, df=1194
<i>Alestes baremose</i>	LogW=0.357+1.621 LogL	0.933	0.870	P<0.05; t=83.53, df=1046
<i>Petrocephalus bovei</i>	LogW=0.644+1.165 LogL	0.933	0.870	P<0.05; t=83.08, df=1034
<i>Eleotris senegalensis</i>	LogW=0.328+1.011 LogL	0.739	0.546	P<0.05; t=35.51, df=1050

Table 4: Length – Weight Regression Equation, Correlation Coefficient (r), Coefficient of Determination (r<sup>2</sup>) and Significance of Correlation for Various Fish Species in Agoro - Gbene Location

Fish Species	Regression Equation	r	r <sup>2</sup>	Significance of Correlation
<i>Brycinus murse</i>	LogW=0.285+1.406LogL	0.975	0.951	P<0.05; t=154.78, df=1225
<i>Brycinus macrolepidotus</i>	LogW=0.233+1.554LogL	0.939	0.881	P<0.05; t=91.45, df=1131
<i>Syndontis balensoda</i>	LogW=0.020+2.895 LogL	0.765	0.585	P<0.05; t=86.41, df=1269
<i>Syndontis membranaceus</i>	LogW=0.374+ 1.156LogL	0.994	0.988	P<0.05; t=101.82, df=1101
<i>Chrysichthys furcatus</i>	LogW=0.261+ 1.997LogL	0.986	0.972	P<0.05; t=125.31, df=1011
<i>Syndontis nigri</i>	LogW=0.046+ 2.560LogL	0.888	0.789	P<0.05; t=67.39, df=1216
<i>Polydactylus quadrifilis</i>	LogW=0.040+ 0.770LogL	0.984	0.968	P<0.05; t=131.42, df=1030
<i>Odaxothrissa mento</i>	LogW=0.466+1.573LogL	0.991	0.981	P<0.05; t=136.08, df=1029
<i>Parallia pelucida</i>	LogW=0.582+ 1.266LogL	0.988	0.977	P<0.05; t=94.12, df=1271
<i>Cynoglossus senegalensis</i>	LogW=0.580+1.097LogL	0.992	0.985	P<0.05; t=231.58, df=826
<i>Hydrocynus brevis</i>	LogW=0.054+ 1.943LogL	0.965	0.931	P<0.05; t=126.92, df=1183
<i>Labeo coubie</i>	LogW=0.033+ 1.623LogL	0.986	0.972	P<0.05; t=195.80, df=1097
<i>Labeo senegalensis</i>	LogW=0.711+ 1.844LogL	0.937	0.879	P<0.05; t=94.08, df=1221
<i>Gnathonemus abadii</i>	LogW=0.227+ 1.392LogL	0.976	0.952	P<0.05; t=148.49, df=1111
<i>Distichodus brevipinnis</i>	LogW=0.103+ 1.839LogL	0.982	0.964	P<0.05; t=163.13, df=1004
<i>Schilbe uranoscopus</i>	LogW=0.008+ 3.077LogL	0.915	0.833	P<0.05; t=107.75, df=2243
<i>Schilbe mystus</i>	LogW=0.131+ 2.045LogL	0.931	0.867	P<0.05; t=207.48, df=1925
<i>Citharus citharus</i>	LogW=0.741+ 1.880LogL	0.933	0.871	P<0.05; t=68.52, df=1052
<i>Hepsetus odoe</i>	LogW=0.002+ 3.412LogL	0.820	0.673	P<0.05; t=101.72, df=1193
<i>Clarotes latticeps</i>	LogW=0.178+ 2.208LogL	0.940	0.883	P<0.05; t=84.01, df=1030
<i>Alestes baremose</i>	LogW=0.281+ 1.965LogL	0.961	0.923	P<0.05; t=118.42, df=1190
<i>Petrocephalus bovei</i>	LogW=0.162+ 0.884LogL	0.981	0.963	P<0.05; t=162.23, df=1010
<i>Eleotris senegalensis</i>	LogW=0.112+ 2.355LogL	0.962	0.926	P<0.05; t=111.52, df=1001
<i>Distochodus enguacephalus</i>	LogW=0.330+ 1.830LogL	0.702	0.492	P<0.05; t=33.92, df=1186
<i>Hemichromis fasciatus</i>	LogW=0.027+ 3.021LogL	0.622	0.387	P<0.05; t=27.56, df=1201
<i>Polypterus ansorgii</i>	LogW=0.262+ 1.842LogL	0.447	0.200	P<0.05; t=17.59, df=1237
<i>Pagrus afer</i>	LogW=0.083+ 1.308LogL	0.984	0.968	P<0.05; t=184.32, df=1119
<i>Xenomystus nigri</i>	LogW=0.466+ 1.071LogL	0.336	0.113	P<0.05; t=11.87, df=1107

The mean Condition Factor of the various fish species in this study ranged from 0.10 – 2.24 in Ogobiri (Dredged) location for 22 fish species and 0.58 – 5.64 in Agoro-Gbene (Undredged) location for 28 fish species. For most species in the present study, condition factor values were higher than the 0.917 – 0.985 recorded by Abowei and George (2009) for 5 fish species from Nkoro River, Niger Delta; 0.92 – 0.98 recorded by Hart and Abowei (2007) for 10 fish species in the Lower Nun River; 0.64 – 1.99 recorded by Fafioye and Oluajo (2005) for 5 fish species in Epe Lagoon, Nigeria; 0.12 – 16.29 recorded by Kumolu-Johnson and Ndimele (2010) for 21 fish species in Ologe Lagoon, Lagos. The values obtained for mean Condition Factor and monthly Condition Factor for the various fish species in Agoro-Gbene (Un-dredged) location were significantly higher (p<0.05) than values obtained for Ogobiri (Dredged) location. The statistical analysis of twenty two (22) representative organisms occurring in both locations clearly shows this trend. The mean Condition Factor of the various fish species in Ogobiri (Dredged) location were lesser than those values (2.9 – 4.8) documented by Bagenal and Tesch (1978) for mature fresh water fish. This suggests that the condition of Igbedi creek, upper Nun River around Ogobiri location in comparison to other fresh water bodies is unfavorable to fishes irrespective of season. The results of the Physico-Chemical characteristics of water and sediment samples from this location further confirm this assertion. Water and sediment quality impact can have adverse effect on fisheries resources (Seiyaboh, et. al., (2007). From the results obtained in this study, we can conclude that the fish species in Agoro-Gbene were relatively in a better

condition than those in Ogobiri location. This might not be unconnected with the dredging operation in Ogobiri location.

#### IV. Conclusion

The results indicate that the fish species in the Un-dredged location were generally in a better condition than those in the Dredged location. From the above information, it is concluded that there has been an impact of dredging on the fisheries of Igbedi Creek, Upper Nun River.

**Table 5: Condition Factor of Various Fish Species in Ogobiri (June 2009 – May 2011)**

Fish Species	Total No.	Min.	Max.	Mean ± S.E
<i>Brycinus nurse</i>	1121	0.47	3.45	1.19 ± 0.01
<i>Brycinus macrolepidotus</i>	1025	0.12	4.10	1.13 ± 0.02
<i>Syndontis batensoda</i>	1143	0.28	4.44	1.16 ± 0.01
<i>Syndontis membranaceus</i>	1211	0.30	1.77	0.86 ± 0.01
<i>Chrysichthys furcatus</i>	1141	0.19	3.53	0.88 ± 0.02
<i>Polydactylus quadrifilis</i>	1186	0.72	5.42	2.24 ± 0.03
<i>Odaxothrissa mento</i>	1144	0.63	1.80	1.19 ± 0.01
<i>Parallia pelucida</i>	1234	0.36	1.78	1.21 ± 0.01
<i>Cynoglossus senegalensis</i>	1258	0.23	2.11	0.81 ± 0.01
<i>Hydrocynus brevis</i>	1227	0.14	1.75	0.65 ± 0.01
<i>Labeo coubie</i>	1232	0.60	2.29	1.25 ± 0.01
<i>Labeo senegalensis</i>	1286	0.55	4.09	1.47 ± 0.03
<i>Gnathonemus abadii</i>	1210	0.11	2.05	0.84 ± 0.01
<i>Distichodus brevipinnis</i>	1188	0.88	2.00	1.38 ± 0.01
<i>Schilbe uranoscopus</i>	2021	0.15	1.67	0.79 ± 0.01
<i>Schilbe mystus</i>	1813	0.39	1.28	0.71 ± 0.004
<i>Citharinus citharus</i>	1204	0.30	4.11	1.41 ± 0.01
<i>Hepsetus odoe</i>	1012	0.63	2.96	1.21 ± 0.02
<i>Clarotes laticeps</i>	1196	0.46	9.51	1.10 ± 0.02
<i>Alestes baremose</i>	1048	0.00	0.34	0.10 ± 0.003
<i>Petrocephalus bovei</i>	1036	0.62	3.38	1.50 ± 0.02
<i>Eleotris senegalensis</i>	1052	0.76	7.83	2.73 ± 0.05

**Table 6 : Condition Factor of Various Fish Species in Agoro-Gbene (June 2009 – May 2011)**

Fish Species	Total No.	Min.	Max.	Mean ± S.E
<i>Brycinus nurse</i>	1227	1.30	5.82	3.03±0.04
<i>Brycinus macrolepidotus</i>	1133	1.22	8.38	4.03 ± 0.06
<i>Syndontis batensoda</i>	1271	0.77	2.62	1.57 ± 0.02
<i>Syndontis membranaceus</i>	1103	0.43	4.71	1.79 ± 0.04
<i>Chrysichthys furcatus</i>	1013	0.73	4.37	2.17 ± 0.93
<i>Synodontis nigrita</i>	1218	0.23	2.30	1.53±0.01
<i>Polydactylus quadrifilis</i>	1032	0.81	6.88	3.07 ± 0.06
<i>Odaxothrissa mento</i>	1031	0.93	2.37	1.61 ± 0.01
<i>Parallia pelucida</i>	1273	1.00	3.90	2.01 ± 0.03
<i>Cynoglossus senegalensis</i>	828	0.51	3.52	1.68 ± 0.03
<i>Hydrocynus brevis</i>	1185	2.33	5.82	3.22 ± 0.03
<i>Labeo coubie</i>	1232	0.60	2.29	1.25 ± 0.01
<i>Labeo senegalensis</i>	1286	0.55	4.09	147 ± 0.03
<i>Gnathonemus abadii</i>	1113	0.43	4.56	2.35 ± 0.04
<i>Distichodus brevipinnis</i>	1006	2.79	8.96	5.64 ± 0.05
<i>Schilbe uranoscopus</i>	2245	0.15	1.98	0.81 ± 0.01
<i>Schilbe mystus</i>	1927	0.37	2.34	1.02 ± 0.01
<i>Citharinus citharus</i>	1054	1.50	5.16	2.55 ± 0.02
<i>Hepsetus odoe</i>	1012	0.63	2.96	1.21 ± 0.02
<i>Clarotes laticeps</i>	1032	0.61	2.68	2.18 ± 0.01
<i>Alestes baremose</i>	1192	0.39	2.53	1.70 ± 0.01
<i>Petrocephalus bovei</i>	1012	0.90	4.98	1.95 ± 0.03
<i>Eleotris senegalensis</i>	1003	1.52	4.59	2.59 ± 0.48
<i>Distichodus engycephalus</i>	1188	0.19	2.87	1.26±0.01
<i>Hemichromis faciatus</i>	1203	1.08	3.98	2.34±0.02
<i>Polypterus ansorgii</i>	1239	0.29	0.91	0.58±0.003
<i>Papyrocraus afer</i>	1121	0.52	2.45	1.11±0.02
<i>Xenomystus nigri</i>	1109	1.00	3.47	1.24±0.45

KEY: Min. = Minimum, Max. = Maximum, S. E. = Standard Error

### References

- [1] Abowei, J. F. N. (2000): Aspects of the fisheries of the lower Nun River. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Port Harcourt. 180pp.
- [2] Abowei, J. F. N. and George, A. D. I. (2009). Some physical and chemical characteristics in Okpoka Creek, Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Research Journal of Environmental and Earth Sciences* 1(2):45-53.
- [3] Alfred-Ockiya, J. F. (1983) Field characteristics of some common fresh water fishes of the Niger Delta, Nigeria. Unpublished Department paper. No. 3. 36pp. .
- [4] Ault, J. S., Bohnsack, B.A., and Meester, G.A. (1998). A retrospective (1979-1996) multispecies assessment of coral reef fish stocks in Florida Keys. *Fishery \ Bulletin* 96(3): 395-414.
- [5] Bagenal, T. B. and Tesch, A. T. (1978). *Conditions and Growth Patterns in Fresh Water Habitats*. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, pp: 75-89.
- [6] Boseman, M. (1963) Annotated list of fishes from the Niger Delta. *Zool. Verh. Lediden* 61: 1- 48
- [7] Clark, S. H. (1979): Application of Bottom Trawl Surve. *Fisheries* 4 (3): 9 – 15.
- [8] Daget, J. (1954): Less poisons du Niger Superieur – Bul. L. I. F. A. N. 36:1-391..
- [9] Fafioye, O.O. and Oluajo, O.A. (2005) Length-weight relationships of five fish species in Epe Lagoon, Nigeria. *African journal of Biotechnology*, 4 (7). --. 749-751 ISSN 1684-5315.
- [10] Gayando, F. C. Jr. and Pauly, D. (1997) eds. *FAO-ICLARM Stock Assessment Tools (FiSAT) Reference manual* FAO Computerised Information series (Fisheries) No. 8 Rome, FAO, 262p.
- [11] Gebhards, S. (1973). Effects of channelization on fish. In Panel of Stream Channelization and Trout Fisheries (White, R.J. ed.). Trout. 14.
- [12] Hart, A. I. and Zabbey, N. (2005). Physico-chemical and benthic fauna of Woji Creek in the Lower Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Environ. Ecol.*, 23(2): 361-368.
- [13] Hart, A. I. and Abowei, J. F. N. (2007). A study of the length-weight relationship, condition factor and age of ten fish species from the lower Nun River. Niger Delta. *Afr. J. Appl. Z Zool. Environ. Biol.*, 9:13-19.
- [14] Holden, M. and Reed, W. (1972). *West African Fresh water fishes*. Longmans Limited London 33p.
- [15] Jiri, C. (1976). *A colour guide of familiar fresh water fishes*. Octopus Books Ltd. London 25p.
- [16] Karr, J.R. (1981). Assessment of biotic integrity using fish communities. *Fisheries* 6:21-27.
- [17] Loveque, C., Pyugy, O. and Teugels, G. G ed (1991). *The fresh and brackish water fishes of West Africa*. Vol. 1 Musee Royale de l Afrique Centrale. Tervurem, Belgique, Editions de IORSTOM: 384 p.
- [18] Otobo, A. J. T. (1981) Identification of fish species in a stretch of River Nun. HND Project Rivers State University of Science & Technology, Port Harcourt.
- [19] Pauly, D. (1983). Some simple methods for the assessment of tropical fish stock FAO Fish Tech. paper No. 234. 52p.
- [20] Poll, M. (1974): Synopsis and Geographical Distribution of the clupeidea in Africa Firewater. *Distribution of three New species*. Bull. De Ca Class Des Sci: 5 Sere Tom LX(2)141-161
- [21] Reine, K., and Clarke, D.(1998). Entrainment by hydraulic dredges - A review of potential impacts. Technical Note Dredging Operations and Environmental Research (DOER)-E1. U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS
- [22] Reed, W., Burchard, J., Jennes, J. and Yaro I., (1967). Fish and fisheries of Northern Nigeria MOA 226pp. [AQF] [FISR]
- [23] Reid, G.M. and Sydenham, H. (1978). A check list of lower Benue River Fishes and on ichtho-geographical review of the Benue River. *J. Nat Hist* 13(1) 41-67.
- [24] Seyaboh, E.I., Ekweozor, I.K.E., Ootobo, A.J.T. and Ogamba, E.N. (2007) Effect of Tombia Bridge Construction on the Fisheries of Nun River iin Central Niger Delta. *World Journal of Biotechnology*. 8 (1) : 1272-1279.
- [25] Sikoki, F.D., Hart, A.I. & Abowei, F. (1998) Gill-net Selectivity and Fish Abundance in the lower Nun River, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Science and Environmental Management*. Vol. 1, No. 1 pp 13-19.
- [26] Whitehead, P. J. P. (1984). Family clupeidae Daget, J. Gosse, J. P. Thys. Van den. Audennerede, D. F. S (eds). Checklist of the freshwater fishes of Africa vol. 1 ORSTOM: 11-20.
- [27] Whyte, S.A, (1975) Distribution, trophic relationship and breeding habits of the fish population in a tropic lake basin. Lake Busumtwi, Ghana. *J. Zool. Lond.* 177:25