

Subject: : Paflyfish General Forum

Topic: : "wild" rainbows

Re: "wild" rainbows

Author: : pcray1231

Date: : 2009/7/2 11:21:40

URL:

Quote:

I do think it makes a difference in management decisions. If dealing with a population that is not heritage, it eliminates any justification for extraordinary efforts to preserve the non-indigenous brook trout strain at the expense of any other trout species that might thrive as well or better than the non-native brookie strain.

Agreed, but I know of no such extraordinary efforts to preserve brook trout at the expense of browns, nor do I foresee any such effort in the near future. I'm advocating greater efforts to highlight and preserve our brook trout resources, but not at any expense of browns whatsoever.

Quote:

There are additional possible explanations here, and mine is missing. You mention a. bias for type of fish and b. angler preference for type of water. My position is that it has more to do with the extent to which special regulations can have a positive effect on the wild populations.

I think this is the same as angler preference. I wasn't talking about vocal lobbying for special regs, though as you mention that plays a part as well. Special regulations are the PFBC's way of reducing angler impact in sections that are especially harmed by such impact. Angler impact is much greater in places where anglers prefer, i.e. that see a lot of pressure, hence special regs are more effective there, hence they are more often placed there.

I have no problem with that whatsoever. My point was that special regulations are in essence, advertisements for a fishery or type of fishery. The unintended side effect is beating a bunch of brown trout streams into fishermen's head, and they go out looking for more just like them. The brook trout fishery, as a whole, gets ignored. While having a stream be ignored is often good for the fishing in a particular stream, as was said, angler overuse isn't the biggest danger to such streams, they need more interest in order to validate allocating resources to them for preserving public access, preventing pollution, etc. I think this was the primary reason for the WBTEP; advertisement for a type of resource rather than advertising an individual stream or trying to protect an individual stream. It's a step in the right direction.

Quote:

~~—— I cannot accept the conclusion, which I do not believe really even follows from yours and other poster's view, that "brook trout are [treated by the PFBC as] an undervalued resource."~~

I didn't say they were treated by the PFBC as undervalued, I said they were undervalued by fishermen. Of course that's my opinion. You'd be shocked at how many people don't even know the brookies exist in their locales. I have people tell me all the time that they like fishing brookies and would do it more if there were more of them locally. When you ask where they live, you find out there's a dozen streams within a 20 minute drive that they didn't even know about. These aren't just truck chasers, they're so-called wild trout enthusiasts.

Quote:

I think the dominance of brown trout in certain waters has everything to do with fertility. Brown trout have their genetic origins in highly fertile, typically limestone waters. They are genetically programmed to thrive in such waters.

I didn't say the dominance of browns in streams has nothing to do with fertility. I said the greater SIZE of browns over brookies has nothing to do with fertility, as they are bigger in every water I know of that holds both browns and brookies, and that holds for fertile or infertile waters.