

Nick

sorry for the late reply to your email regards sea trout catch and release policy where I believe that we as responsible fishers should be looking at preservation of the stock of sea trout, but it makes it more difficult to encourage people to buy tickets for the fishing being now or soon to be a catch and release river with conditions on the salmon fishing also will we get enough people interested in buying permits to help regenerate money back into the system to help the stocking levels?. may I suggest that maybe the introduction of tags being given to each member say 3 tags per season member and when used up they have to purchase more this would generate more money into the stocking programme. A daily permit would have 1 tag per fish 1 salmon 1 sea trout and if the same fisher came back to purchase another he would get the same tags to a total of 3 times then catch and release all sea trout, it makes it difficult for fishers who travel a distance to come and fish the Annan and go home with no fish at all unless you were fortunate enough to catch a salmon but we all know that the Annan is a good river when sea trout run the water, am all for preservation but the thought of travelling 180 miles to fish and coming back with none for the pot or to put on the table when entertaining friends, we must have some kind of answer to help the stock level and keep the angler happy whilst paying there permits.

once again sorry for late input I have used the tagging system before and it works well the tags are designed so once you put them through the gills and mouth you cannot use them again and you send it into the club for recording as each tag has a number on it

To: Mary Colville,
Clerk to the River Annan Fishery Board

I am secretary of a group that has received funding from the Common Good Fund. The grant has enabled us to carry out projects that have benefited the community.

I endorse the well-reasoned submissions from the Royal Burgh of Annan Common Good Fund and others opposing the application for legislation to ban the taking of sea trout.

This measure, not undertaken by any other river board on the Solway, based on one data set that may or not be accurate, is a sledgehammer to crack a nut and is unscientific as no account of has been taken of the effect of

- Habitat degradation
- Weather conditions especially rainfall
- Pollution
- Physical barriers to spawning grounds
- Pests eg sea lice
- Diseases

- Predators – mammalian, avian, piscatorial

The implications resulting from the ban would be

- Financial community groups reduced income to CGF therefore reduced grants to community groups
- Heritage reduced income for haaf netters and nets
- Culture rods will go elsewhere – reduced visitor spend in area a birthright, a unique selling point for tourism once lost can never be restored.

The imposition of a catch and release policy on its own does not guarantee improvement in stocks of sea trout. What happens at the end of 5 years if no improvement? The real underlying causes of decrease in sea trout stocks will still be there perhaps worse.

To whom it may concern: - please take this letter as a **Strong Objection** to the River Annan and District Salmon Fishery Boards consultation proposals on Sea Trout Fishing.

I am two things - Firstly I am member of the local community born and raised in Annan

Secondly - I am Fisherman. I have 43 years' experience and have seen good times and bad times throughout all these years.

This is a letter to highlight one or two points, if your proposals ever get to the Scottish Government a more detailed objection will be forwarded to them.

It is widely accepted that this document you have produced is attributed to Mr Chisholm, although funny enough his name does not appear on it.

This guy contradicts and trips himself up frequently throughout this document.

1. He puts together an eight page document, most of which is irrelevant and not related to the topic in hand.
2. He accepts that the local nets men have abided by any voluntary measures that have been agreed, yet he plainly explains that most of the riparian owners do not.
3. He accepts that wet summers have a detrimental effect on both types on fishing and that fishing efforts are greatly reduced whilst these conditions persist. Resulting in either low or nil returns. Yet he takes his figures from 2006 to 2011 knowing that these are some of the wettest summers on record.
4. He conveniently omits 2012 where we had a good run of early trout in May and the first week of June before the rain started. If he could have waited until the 2013 returns were in, I'm pretty sure they would have shown a decent increase also.
5. He knows, as do most fishermen that there is not the experienced fishing effort on the river nowadays. The casual angler is probably fishing during daylight hours for trout where the

experienced one would be fishing through the dark hours especially during times of low river levels.

5. He mentions loss of revenue. It makes no sense to reduce your ticket sales. If people stop coming they may never come back. The whole area and community will suffer in so many different ways. If nobody fishes there are no returns and no-one will know what's in the system.

Let's look at Mr Chisholm's theory and calculation.

**Wet summers = reduced fishing effort = low or nil returns=no fish in the river,
Unbelievable.**

Can you honestly believe any Mathematician, Academic or someone with half an ounce of common sense will accept a calculation like this, based on false or incorrect data? (Not bloody likely).

When trout come into the system and we see a decent run, even as in this year when we had a prolonged dry spell the fish disappear from us. Where do they go? Do you think they go back out to sea? No- they still take the rivers. They go upstream into the pools etc. I do accept that they are very difficult to catch, but I believe that they are there.

They must be there or we would not see increasing numbers returning as seen in 2012 and this year.

If I were a River Board Member I would be asking the question- are we paying this man to sit on his arse at a computer and produce data that is inconsistent and full of holes or could we spend our finances more wisely and actually employ a river manager.

All this man seems to have done since coming here is restrict the spring salmon fishing, limit the number of trout people can catch and most of all, he with his data and theory's has limited revenue capability on the river.

Why don't you open your eyes, and open the river back up to fishermen before they go elsewhere. Because once they get used to going somewhere else they probably will never return and the whole community misses out.

My personal opinion is – **A Vote of No Confidence** In this man and his theory's.

I know and sincerely believe that a negotiated alternative to a No Fish Policy can be achieved by all parties for the good of both types of fishing's and the community as a whole.

Thank you