

Proposed byelaws on stillwater brown trout and salmon close seasons – a summary of the response to the public consultation

1. Purpose

In June 2009, we consulted with fisheries and other interests on new byelaws to remove the angling close season for brown trout and salmon in still-waters. In this document, we describe who and how we consulted, and summarise the key issues raised in the consultation response. We also explain how we will use this information to develop the byelaws and what will happen next.

2. Background

Close seasons exist to protect fish during vulnerable spawning times or to limit exploitation. In most cases, stillwater brown trout are not expected to spawn and stillwater trout fisheries are managed on a “put and take” basis.

Whilst the close season is necessary to protect wild stocks, we believe it is an unnecessary restriction on stillwater fisheries that have no wild stocks present. Many stillwater fisheries also stock rainbow trout, which already have no statutory close season.

Several enclosed stillwater salmon fisheries exist. These rely on stocking with farm-strain salmon, which will not spawn in stillwaters. Removing the close season here will not affect wild salmon stocks.

The Marine and Coastal Access Bill, which we expect will become law this autumn, will give us new powers to remove the close season for brown trout and salmon on still-waters.

The consultation process

What we consulted on

On 22 June 2009, we launched a consultation document – *Close seasons for salmon and brown trout in still-waters*. This described the background to the proposals and asked a variety of questions to help us identify the issues around our proposals. The document can be found at <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/library/consultations/108768.aspx>.

Specifically, we asked whether respondents –

- agreed in principle with removing the angling close season for brown trout on stillwaters;
- agreed that the close season should be kept on stillwaters with significant stocks of wild brown trout;
- which of the two options for removing the stillwater brown trout close season they supported;
- could help us identify stillwaters with stocks of wild brown trout where the close season could be kept;
- agreed in principle with removing the angling close season for salmon on enclosed stocked stillwaters;
- agreed this should be removed through a specific dispensation linked to the stocking consent.

In each case, we asked respondents to explain their answer. We also asked for any additional comments.

How and who we consulted

Initially, we consulted our statutory Fisheries, Ecology and Recreation Advisory Committees. This happened in June and July 2009.

We posted the consultation document (in English and English/Welsh) on our website and linked it to our new on-line consultation facility. The on-line facility allows people to view and respond to consultations directly over the internet. It also allows people to view other responses that have been made on-line (these responses are displayed anonymously).

We also invited people to respond by post or e-mail where this was more convenient. Hardcopies of the consultation document were available on request.

We wrote to the various national fisheries and conservation organisations, inviting them to view and respond to the consultation. A list is detailed in Appendix 1.

We included an article on the consultation in our e-mail newsletter which was sent to over 300 000 anglers who bought their licence on-line.

We publicised the consultation and how to respond through angling media.

We asked our local Fisheries teams to notify local fisheries interests and to circulate posters advertising the consultation to fisheries and tackle shops.

3. The response

Overall response

We received a total of 68 responses, comprising 56 responses using the on-line system, 9 by e-mail and 3 by post.

We are grateful to those who took the time to respond.

We received responses from the following –

Individual anglers –	42	(61.8%)
Angling clubs –	7	(10.3%)
Fishery owners –	3	(4.4%)
Other fisheries organisations –	5	(7.4%)
Conservation organisations/interests –	4	(5.9%)
General public –	3	(4.4%)
Other (not specified) –	4	(5.9%)
Total -	68	(100.0%)

How we have processed the responses

Our consultation document asked people whether they agreed or disagreed with specific proposals (or did not know) and to explain their answer. From this, we are able to gain a quantitative and qualitative response.

Whilst the quantitative response gives us an overall indication of the likely support for the proposals, analysing consultation responses must primarily be a qualitative rather than a quantitative exercise. The focus is on the evidence given by consultees to back up their arguments, rather than the number supporting a particular argument. This follows the Government's [Code of Practice on Consultation](#).

For each of the questions we posed in the consultation document, we have given the numbers of each response ("yes"/"no"/"don't know" or did not specify). More importantly, in terms of informing our position, we have analysed and presented the key issues, arguments respondents have made.

What our statutory committees said

We received advice from our Regional Fisheries, Ecology and Recreation Advisory Committees (FERACs) at their June meetings. FERACs were divided over the options, veering slightly towards option 2, dispensation by written authorisation. Regions with naturally occurring stillwater wild brown trout stocks tended to be more precautionary and go for option 2.

What respondents said

The following table provides the quantitative response to each question we posed in the consultation. It is important to read this in context of the qualitative overview, presented below.

Question	Yes	No	Don't know	Didn't specify	-	Total
Do you agree in principle with removing the stillwater close season for brown trout?	53*	13	2	0	-	68
Do you agree with the need to protect wild stocks?	59	5	0	4	-	68
Which option do you prefer?	Opt 1	Opt 2	Neither	No pref.	Didn't specify	Total
	27	10	9	18	4	68
Do you agree in principle with removing salmon close season on enclosed stillwaters?	Yes	No	Don't know	Didn't specify	-	
	51	10	6	1	-	68
Do you agree with the proposed mechanism?	41	9	14	4	-	68

* One response was conditional on other factors.

The following section describes the response we received to each question, in terms of the quantitative response and the key issues raised by respondents. We have necessarily aggregated individual comments, to give a reasonable overview.

Brown trout

Questions 1a/1b. Do you agree in principle with removing the brown trout close season on stillwaters? Please explain your answer.		
Response	Number	Percent
Yes –	52	76.5
No –	13	19.1
Conditional -	1	1.5
Don't know –	2	2.9
Did not specify -	0	0.0
Total	68	100.0

Over 95% of respondents expressed a positive opinion. The majority of these (79%) agreed, in principle, that the close season for stillwater brown trout should be removed. Their principal reasons included –

- Stocked brown trout do not spawn in stillwaters and these fisheries are not reliant on natural spawning, especially where triploid brown trout are stocked. The close season serves no purpose;
- Removing the rainbow trout close season on stillwaters has worked well – stocked brown trout should be treated similarly;
- Year round angling will help fishery owners and trout suppliers, especially during the current economic conditions. One fishery owner, who opens for year-round rainbow trout fishing, cites winter as his busiest season;
- Year round angling will encourage greater angling participation/club membership;
- Stillwater brown trout can be caught during the close season at present, in fisheries with rainbow trout and/or coarse fishing;
- Stocked stillwaters are the venue of choice for novice or inexperienced anglers – returning deeply hooked or exhausted brown trout may not be or appear to be humane;
- Brown trout are preferable to anglers than rainbows – removing the close season will encourage their wider use in stillwater fisheries;
- Fishery owners would be able to impose their own fishery rules to protect wild brown trout stocks, where they exist;
- Fishery owners should be able to decide close seasons and catch and release policies on their own waters;

The minority (20%) disagreed with the proposal. Their reasons included –

- Close seasons reduce disturbance - year-round angling will have an impact on wildlife;
- There are many waters with wild brown trout stocks. Many of these will be unique (genetically distinct) and ecologically significant. Year round angling could impact on these and the Environment Agency should adopt a precautionary approach;
- There is no definition of “significant” when it comes to retaining a close season to protect “significant stocks of wild brown trout” – a local wild stock may be small, but of significant ecological value;

- Year round angling may especially impact on wild fish when they migrate into spawning streams, particularly where bait fishing is permitted;
- Stocked brown trout spawn in many stillwater fisheries;
- Stocked brown trout will still go into spawning condition, even if they do not spawn. Fishing pressure will place additional stress on these fish;
- Having different close season arrangements on different, but neighbouring waters will create enforcement problems;
- The Environment Agency should stand by its National Trout and Grayling Fisheries Strategy and protect wild brown trout stocks.

One respondent gave a conditional response, that the close season could be removed from stillwaters, providing this does not be detrimental to wildlife, particularly to internationally important sites. Removing the close season from Special Protection Areas (designated under the EU Birds Directive), for example, could increase disturbance to wildfowl and detrimental to the long-term conservation of these sites.

Question 1c/1d Do you agree that we should keep the close season on stillwaters where there are significant stocks of wild brown trout? Please explain your answer.		
Response	Number	Percent
Yes –	59	86.8
No –	5	7.4
Conditional –	0	0.0
Don't know –	0	0.0
Did not specify -	4	5.9
Total	68	100.0

Over 90% of respondents expressed a positive opinion on the issue of protecting wild stocks.

The vast majority of respondents (over 85%) agreed that we should retain the close season to protect significant stocks of wild trout. Their principal reasons included –

- Wild brown trout stocks and the genetic diversity they exhibit, need protection, including from year round angling;
- Any stillwater or reservoir with wild brown trout stock should still be covered with a close;
- The Environment Agency sets out the rationale for protecting wild brown trout stocks in its National Trout & Grayling Fisheries Strategy. It should not now propose actions that will undermine this;
- We do not define the term “significant”. We would need robust selection criteria to prevent harm to wild stocks. In the absence of qualification, the close season should apply wherever wild trout are known to exist or could potentially exist in the future. Close season stocking and angling should be restricted to totally enclosed stocked stillwater fisheries;
- It is impossible to target stocked brown trout and not catch wild fish;

Several respondents indicated that they disagreed with the need to retain the close season to protect wild stocks on stillwaters. However, the only reason cited was that –

- The close season is not necessary if a fishery can sustain year round angling. Bag limits and limits on angler numbers may be necessary to prevent over-exploitation.

Question 1e/1f. Which option (to retain the close season to protect wild brown trout) do you prefer? Please explain your answer.		
Response	Number	Percent
Option 1 –	27	39.7
Option 2 –	10	14.7
Neither –	9	13.2
No preference –	18	26.5
Didn't specify –	4	5.9
Total	68	100.0

Almost 70% expressed a positive opinion about the two options presented to retain the close season where it was necessary to protect wild brown trout stocks. The majority of these (57%) favoured option 1, ie. removing the close season on all stillwaters, except those with significant wild trout stocks. Their reasons are –

- A simple list of waters where the close season is retained will make it clear where anglers can and can not fish;
- Clarity will also make enforcement easier;
- Option 1 is administratively more simple option 2;
- The number of stillwaters where the close season is retained is likely to be limited and therefore the list will be manageable;

Ten respondents (15% of those expressing a positive response) favoured option 2. Their reasons are –

- The balance should be in favour of protecting wild stocks, with the close season removed only where wild or naturally spawning stocks were not present;
- Linking dispensation for close season fishing should not be burdensome;
- Option 2 is more flexible, allowing fisheries to be added as and when they apply/qualify;

Those stating neither option was acceptable reiterated their opposition to removing the close season from all stillwaters or from all but fully enclosed stillwaters (which could be defined by byelaw).

Question 1g. Please tell us about any stillwaters with stocks of wild brown trout where you think the close season should be kept.

A number of respondents repeated their opposition to the proposal to change the current situation. Many felt there are too many to list as part of this exercise and this ought to be done separately in consultation with local interest. Others suggested different geographic areas where the close season should be retained on all waters, for example north Wales and the Lake District. One respondent queried how we would cater for the numerous broad-waters and on-line/stream-fed ponds, present on many Cotswold rivers and chalk-streams.

Several respondents named specific stillwaters/groups of stillwaters where they suggested the close season needs to be retained. These include –

- Rosebush Reservoir, Pembrokeshire;
- the Cheshire Meres;
- Roadford Reservoir, Devon;
- Colliford Lake, Cornwall;
- Meldon Reservoir, Devon;
- Avon Dam Reservoir, Devon;
- Burrator Reservoir, Devon;
- Fernworthy Reservoir, Devon;
- Bewl Water, Kent;
- The Elen and Claerwen Reservoirs, Powys;
- Upper Neuadd Reservoir, Mid-Glamorgan;
- Talybont Reservoir, Mid-Glamorgan;
- Beacons Reservoir, Mid-Glamorgan;
- Pontsticill Reservoir, Mid-Glamorgan;
- Urswick Tarn, Cumbria;
- Kentmere Fishery, Cumbria;
- Malham Tarn, Yorkshire.

Salmon

<i>Question 2a/2b. Do you agree in principle with removing the salmon close season on enclosed stocked stillwaters? Please explain your answer.</i>		
Response	Number	Percent
Yes –	51	75.0
No –	10	14.7
Conditional –	0	0.0
Don't know –	6	8.8
Did not specify -	1	1.5
Total	68	100.0

Almost 90% of respondents expressed a positive opinion on whether the close season should be removed from enclosed stillwater salmon fisheries. The majority of these (83%) supported the proposal. The reasons given included –

- There is no expectation of stock (farm-strain) salmon spawning in enclosed waters;
- The measure would benefit stillwater fisheries, which in turn could reduce angling pressure on wild salmon stocks and introduce salmon fishing to more people;
- The close season is an unnecessary financial barrier to stillwater salmon fishery owners;

A smaller number of respondents disagreed with the proposal. Their reasons included –

- The close season should be retained for all species;
- The close season benefits wildlife and allows banks to regenerate.

Several qualified their support for removing the stillwater salmon close season, by reiterating their opposition for stillwater salmon fisheries.

<i>5. Do you agree that this should be achieved through special dispensation linked to stocking consent? Please explain your answer.</i>		
Response	Number	Percent
Yes –	41	60.3
No –	9	13.2
Conditional –	0	0.0
Don't know –	14	20.6
Did not specify -	4	5.9
Total	68	100.0

Over 70% of respondents expressed a positive opinion this question. Those in favour of the proposals stated –

- This would retain the required control over which fisheries could dispense with the close season;
- It is administratively sensible;

Those who opposed the proposal gave no reasons for doing so, other than repeating their opposition to removing the close season.

4. What happens next

The comments received through the consultation will inform our decision on whether to apply for new byelaws and what form such byelaws might take.

If we decide to progress with these proposals, we would like to introduce them before the start of the 2010 close season. Before they can be introduced, we must –

Stage	Expected timescale
Refine our proposals, taking into account the feedback from the consultation, as summarised in this report, and seeking legal advice on some of the substantive recommendations	September/ October 2009
Seek further advice from our statutory Regional Fisheries, Ecology and Recreation Advisory Committees, and use this to finalise the draft byelaws	November 2009
Make the byelaws and advertise them, as we are required to do by law, for 4 weeks	December
Respond to all objections to the advertised byelaws	January and February 2010
apply to Defra and Welsh Assembly Government for confirmation	February 2010
Defra and Welsh Assembly Government ministers consider the byelaws, their legality and justification, the objections made to the advertised byelaws and our response, and make a decision whether to approve them, with or without any amendments.	March 2009 -

1. Further information

For further information on these proposals, please contact Paul Lidgett at paul.lidgett@environment-agency.gov.uk or in writing to –

Environment Agency,
Rio House,
Waterside Drive,
Aztec West,
Almondsbury,
Bristol BS32 4UD.

Appendix 1

Fisheries and conservation stakeholder organisations

Angling Trust
Association of Rivers Trusts
Association of Stillwater Game Fishery Managers
Atlantic Salmon Trust
British Trout Association
British Trout Farmers Restocking Association
British Waterways
Centre for Environment, Fisheries and
Aquaculture Science
Coarse Fish Farmers and Traders Association
Countryside Alliance
Countryside Council for Wales
Federation of Welsh Anglers
Institute of Fisheries Management
National Anguilla Club
Natural England
Partnership for Action against Wildlife Crime
Professional Coarse Fisheries Association
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Salmon and Trout Association
Severn Elvermens Association
Wildlife Trusts
Wild Trout Trust

Appendix 2

The text of the Salmon and Trout Association response

Trout

1. Do you agree in principle with the removal of the brown trout close season on stillwaters?

Yes, subject to the points made below. The purpose of the close season for brown trout is to protect fish during the spawning season. In stocked stillwater fisheries where there are no, or a minimal, breeding populations, it serves no useful purpose, and there is no reason why brown trout should not be treated in the same way as rainbow trout, which are not subject to a close season.

2. Do you agree that we should retain the close season on stillwaters where there are significant stocks of wild brown trout?

Yes in principle, although in some stillwaters the position is not clear cut. Fish that were originally stocked may have established viable breeding populations, and in such waters we do not consider that the close season should be removed. In many cases, the existence of a breeding population of brown trout will not be widely known, particularly in small stillwaters, nor will it always be clear whether a stillwater allows egress under certain water conditions and thus is contributing to brown (and in some cases sea) trout stocks more widely.

3. Which Option do you prefer?

For the reasons given above at 2, we favour Option 2, removing the close season on specified stillwaters. If, as is proposed for salmon, this was implemented via a dispensation linked to stocking consents, we do not believe that this would be burdensome to administer.

Salmon

In our view the Agency should not consent to the stocking of salmon in stillwaters. If for any reason this is done, we accept that a close season serves no useful purpose, and the approach proposed seems a reasonable one.

The text of the Atlantic Salmon Trust response

Brown Trout Close Season

The Trust's interest in this proposal relates to the conservation of wild brown and sea trout stocks, bearing in mind that on many rivers these form a single stock..

We agree in principle with this proposal. The purpose of the close season for brown trout is to protect fish during the spawning season. In stocked stillwater fisheries where there are no, or a minimal, breeding populations, it serves no useful purpose, and there is no reason why brown trout should not be treated in the same way as rainbow trout, which are not subject to a close season. On the other hand, the close season should be retained on waters with sustainable stocks of wild brown trout

In some stillwaters the position is not clear cut. Fish that were originally stocked may have established viable breeding populations; in many cases, the existence of a breeding population of brown trout will not be widely known, particularly in small stillwaters, nor will it always be clear whether a still water allows egress under certain water conditions and thus is contributing to brown (and on some rivers sea) trout stocks more widely.

Given this uncertainty, we favour Option 2, removing the close season on specified stillwaters, rather than Option 1 (removing it on all stillwaters other than exceptions listed in the byelaw.) **This would ensure that where there was not clear information about the status of a stock, the close season would be retained.** If, as is proposed for salmon, this was implemented via a dispensation linked to stocking consents, we do not believe that this would be burdensome to administer.

Salmon

The Trust does not support the stocking of salmon in stillwaters for angling purposes. Where this is done, we accept that a close season serves no useful purpose, and can support the approach proposed

The text of the Wild Trout Trust response

1 Trout

1a *Do you agree in principle with removing the brown trout close season on stillwaters?*

No

1b *Please explain your answer.*

The Wild Trout Trust believes that there are too many situations (e.g. on-line, upland reservoirs) where stocking and fishing outside current close seasons could impact on local stocks of wild brown trout. These stocks may be unique and thus ecologically significant and in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Environment Agency should adopt the precautionary principle as a protective measure.

We acknowledge that the consultation does recognise the need to protect wild stocks of brown trout (e.g. Page 5 reads "If wild fish are present, they will be protected by a close season while spawning in feeder streams'), yet subsequent discussion of the brown trout options (Page 6) introduces the term 'significant'.

The consultation refers to "significant" wild stocks without defining its meaning. A wild stock may be locally very significant in ecological terms yet exist in small numbers as a stable population, be in decline or even recovery and thus deserving of every protection.

Angling in stillwaters throughout the year may especially impact on local populations of wild brown trout during spawning migrations to and from feeder streams, particularly where bait fishing is allowed.

1c *Do you agree that we should keep the close season on stillwaters where there are significant stocks of wild brown trout?*

Yes

1d *Please explain your answer.*

As above. To reiterate the point, in the absence of a definition of 'significant', the precautionary principle should be applied wherever wild brown trout populations are known to exist or where there is potential for their future existence. To simplify the situation, stocking of brown trout beyond the traditional fishing season should be confined to fully enclosed (non-mandatory) waters.

1e *Which option do you prefer? Option 1 or 2?*

Neither.

1f *Please explain your answer.*

The Wild Trout Trust believes the existing close season should be maintained on all but fully enclosed waters, otherwise described as non-

mandatory waters. Since the distinction currently exists between mandatory and non-mandatory waters in the lexicon of Section 30 consenting, this may be a relatively simple process.

The inflexibility of Option 1 is demonstrated by reference in the consultation to the fact that a byelaw change will be required to alter the status of any stillwater after publication of lists identifying where a close season applies.

1g Please tell us about any stillwaters with stocks of wild brown trout where you think the close season should be kept.

Numerous waters (e.g. S-W, Pennines) where wild stocks exist, migrating into and from adjoining streams to spawn.

1h Please provide any further comments.

The current close season does cause confusion where both rainbow and brown trout are stocked but where the latter must be returned upon capture during the traditional close season. However, the proposals potentially seek to create further confusion by classification of waters where this situation continues and others where all fish may be taken at all times of year.

Salmon

2a Do you agree in principle with removing the salmon close season on enclosed stocked stillwaters?

Yes

2b Please explain your answer.

2.c Do you agree that this should be achieved through special dispensation linked to stocking consent?

2.d Please explain your answer?

2.e Please provide any further comments.

The Wild Trout Trust believes that this proposal seeks to treat salmon and brown trout stocking in quite different ways based on potential impacts on wild fish from farm-reared, stocked fish, with greater weight of protection apparently being afforded salmon. Yet the scientific evidence suggests that for both species there are significant risks from genetic introgression of domesticated 'strains' into wild populations. As such, the species should be treated and protected equally and close-season stocking for both species restricted to fully-enclosed waters only.

The text of the Natural England response

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Natural England was established under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. It is a non-departmental public body. We are charged with the responsibility to ensure that England's unique natural environment including its flora and fauna, land and seascapes, geology and soils are protected and improved. Natural England's purpose as outlined in the Act is to "ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development".

2.0 Natural England's comments

2.1 Many inland waters stocked with game fish are also designated sites, for example, Esthwaite Water SSSI and Grafham Water SSSI. As well as helping to conserve any natural populations of brown trout in these waters, retaining the close season on these sites could also benefit other wildlife, such as wildfowl, that might suffer from disturbance by anglers.

2.2 If a close season has no environmental benefits then it restricts access to the outdoors to no purpose. This conflicts with one of Natural England's strategic outcomes - to increase enjoyment of the natural environment. Natural England therefore has no objection to the removal of close seasons provided that doing so is not detrimental to the interests of wildlife.

3.0 Detailed comments

Natural England's comments on specific questions:

1a. *Do you agree in principle with removing the brown trout close season on stillwaters?*

Natural England believes that the brown trout close season should be removed on stillwaters if this will not be detrimental to wildlife. The advantages of the close season must not be considered solely in relation to brown trout as there may be occasions where other wildlife also benefits. For example, many large stillwater sites stocked with trout are also used by internationally important populations of wildfowl (for example, Chew Valley Lake SPA and Rutland Water SPA). In these cases, the removal of the close season could increase the disturbance these wildfowl face, an additional pressure that would be detrimental to their long-term conservation.

1c. *Do you agree that we should keep the close season on stillwaters where there are significant stocks of wild brown trout?*

In the absence of a definition of 'significant', Natural England believes that the close season should be kept on all stillwaters used by wild brown

trout. Any breeding population of wild brown trout normally resident in a stillwater should be protected by a close season, regardless of its size.

The consultation document suggests that wild brown trout entering stillwaters from feeder streams would not do so in large enough numbers to make it worthwhile protecting them with a stillwater close season (a close season would still apply on the feeder streams). Natural England would support this view if it could be shown that the removal of these wild brown trout from stillwaters would not reduce the long-term viability of the populations to which they belong.

1e. Which option do you prefer? Option 1 or 2?

Natural England prefers Option 1 - 'To list waters where a close season will apply'.

As stated in our response to 1a, the close season can benefit wildlife other than brown trout. As such, Natural England would need to be consulted on the removal of the close season where this would affect, or would be likely to affect, a protected area. In some cases Natural England might agree to the removal of a close season subject to certain conditions. For example, a close season might be lifted on a stillwater in exchange for the creation of year-round exclusion zones that protected particularly sensitive areas within a site (for example, stands of emergent vegetation used by breeding birds). In other cases, the condition might involve a change in fishing practices (for example, restrictions on boat fishing).

Since local conditions and concerns are so variable, decisions regarding the brown trout close season will have to be made on a site-by-site basis through consultation with Natural England's regional staff.

2a. Do you agree in principle with removing the salmon close season on enclosed stocked stillwaters?

Natural England's comments regarding the brown trout close season (see 1a) apply equally to salmon.

***The text of the Association of Stillwater Game Fishery
Managers response***

1 Trout

1a *Do you agree in principle with removing the brown trout close season on stillwaters?*

Yes

1b *Please explain your answer.*

Many fisheries stock brown trout which are caught whilst the anglers fish for the rainbows. With the stocking of triploid browns there should be no problem.

1c *Do you agree that we should keep the close season on stillwaters where there are significant stocks of wild brown trout?*

Yes

1d *Please explain your answer.*

Any reservoir, stillwater with a wild population of brown trout should still be covered by a close season.

1e *Which option do you prefer? Option 1 or 2?*

Option 1

1f *Please explain your answer.*

Option 1 will make it easier for the anglers, manager and EA staff on the ground.

1g *Please tell us about any stillwaters with stocks of wild brown trout where you think the close season should be kept.*

1h *Please provide any further comments.*