

---

Subject: : Paflyfish General Forum

Topic: : Creel limit changes: typically not the effect that you might expect

Re: Creel limit changes: typically not the effect that you might expect

Author: : Chaz

Date: : 2013/9/7 10:08:46

URL:

Quote:

Maurice wrote:

Quote:

Chaz wrote:

So why has this come up? Does PFBC anticipate reducing the limit yet again? I don't see any reason to reduce limits on stocked streams any further than they have been on stocked water.

**Certainly a person or biologist could argue that reducing the limits on wild streams would increase the number of wild fish, and as reported at the "Summit" it did, Mike also presented that information.**

The highest impact was on the brook populations. And removing brookie streams from the stocking list really improved the biomass of those streams.

Chaz, IIRC the results were that when harvest was halted on like 13 streams, pops went up on 6 down on 5 and stayed the same on two so it was valued at no statistical significance. You know throwing the baby out with the bathwater.

Again, I think the point of Mike's post is to stick it to the anglers who believe harvest makes a difference. It's his MO.

I've re-thought what I said earlier, it wasn't the lower limit thing, it was reductions in stockings that increased wild trout pops.

As for stocked streams, I really don't care what the limit is, they could make it limitless for all I care, get the stockies out of the streams, they are by definition marginal trout water, but if they did that then I'd want them to not stock any wild trout water, no matter what the "Class" is.