Management of Pike in Designated Brown Trout Fisheries Review Group

15 February 2018, Citywest

Attending: Sean Long, Myles Kelly, Declan Cooke, Sam Sheppard, Colm Fitzgerald, Paul O'Reilly, Paul Byrne, David Hamill

Apologies: Catherine Kerins

Note: NARA and TAFI have withdrawn from the Group

Agenda

- 1. Review of Interim Report
- 2. Review of Position Papers

Martin O'Grady

Sean Long acknowledged the passing of Martin O'Grady and passed his condolences to his family and friends. The sentiments were echoed by all present.

Review of Position papers

A position paper was received by NARA/TAFI prior to their departure. This will be considered by the Group in their absence.

Paul Byrne and David Hamill requested it be recorded that they have seen no evidence of the bias referenced by NARA/TAFI in their paper.

It was agreed that the policy proposal should contain a section to specifically address the deliberate introduction of pike to waters where they are currently absent.

The audit of wild brown trout rivers referenced in their paper is not in the scope of the Group.

Paul Byrne and David Hamill went through their position paper point by point.

3.2 (c) SS has a paper in production which should inform some of the debate on pike/trout interactions and co-existence

3.2 (d) CF outlined how roach and pike are integrated in the predation model and its limitations regarding competition between species.

3.2 (f) SS stated that the model used in this area discards ambiguous or questionable data. Sheelin is not as good an index as Conn due to extra variables (such as pig farm inputs). SS cautioned that it is not ideal to use just one system for cause and effect.

3.2 (k) DC estimated that only 20-30 brown trout are intercepted in the Lough Conn stock management operations each year.

3.4 (a) And (b) A food of pike paper should be published later this year which will help inform this element of the debate.

3.4 (c) SS stated that comparison of CPUEs in this situation is valid

3.4 (d) while the models will not be able to examine inter species competition they will be able to look at the effects of stock composition in waters.

3.4 (e) SS acknowledged the limitations in the system but confirmed that the Lough Sheelin is useful to the model with the data sets

3.4 (f) SS confirmed that this particular Lough Sheelin data is not used in the model

3.4 (g) Group to revert to Karen Delanty for comment

3.5 (c) SL - the Irish name for pike is not wholly germane to the work of the group but we could make a recommendation on directing some resources to improving our knowledge of the situation

3.5 (d) Fiona Kelly is looking at using eDNA from lake cores in the WFD work to establish how long pike are in certain waters

3.5 (h) SS to follow up with Cathal Gallagher regarding the science elucidating the native/non-native status of pike

3.7 (b) DC clarified that the vessel used in operations is not a RIB. SL reminded the Group that the SOP falls outside of the remit of the Group and that any issues with these be raised directly with Ciaran Byrne. SL confirmed that the group would recommend that Policy would always supersede operations.

3.7 (d) SL confirmed that EIA's are being carried out for the 2018 stock management operations.

3.9 (a) While it was DC's opinion that there were not that many pike anglers in Sligo/Mayo; Lough conn is very quiet outside of the trout season and he does not see anglers on the water. POR reminded the Group that the TDI findings were that there was considerable crossover between pike and trout anglers, and the ESRI study also had similar findings.

Actions

The following actions were assigned:

- POR to follow up with ESRI regarding the value of trout angling and pike angling on the managed lakes.
- SL to follow up with Karen Delanty regarding the points raised in IPS and IFPAC Summary Position Paper 3.4 (g)
- SS to follow up with Cathal Gallagher regarding the points raised in IPS and IFPAC Summary Position Paper 3.5 (h)

Next meeting

Date of the next meeting will be advised.