

---

Subject: : Conservation

Topic: : good article on brookie restoration (w/ image of WVA brookie, big as a largemouth)

Re: good article on brookie restoration (w/ image of WVA brookie, big as a largemouth)

Author: : Chaz

Date: : 2013/3/6 19:16:33

URL:

I'm of the firm belief that hatcheries had no role in the recovery of brook trout. I believe that they survived because there were places that weren't defiled by loggers, tanneries and coal mines. That even streams that were trees were removed completely up the the extreme head waters still head some trout.

Those trout survived and brook trout being quite prolific, started reproducing and eventually the trees regrew and the populations would recover to the extent we see brookies today, not because of hatcheries, but despite hatcheries. The Fish Commission did everything in their power to keep trout fishing alive, by stocking foreign fish, but still brookies survived. They just aren't as big as they used to be because they are forced to live in mostly infertile headwater streams.

By 1900 the forests had been cut 3 times in many places, first they cut the pines, then the hemlocks, then the hardwoods that replaced the other 2 species. Audubon writes about how the Poconos were already being cut during the late 1820's. In my local watershed the forest were removed for farming 300 years ago. Wm. Penns did a very good job of attracting people to his new colony.

As for coal mines there is only a small percentage of streams toatly dead because of AMD, the number giver is 2900 miles plus or minus.