
APPENDIX II NORTH AMERICAN INFORMATION

From the USA and Canada the non-published information obtained was equivocal. A summary is presented below.

East coast of USA

- few bag limits in force
- little opposition to their introduction
- marine enforcement poor
- chances of getting caught are small
- conservation ethic not well developed
- no cost-effectiveness evaluations before introduction
(Dick Stone, NMFS; Gil Ridonski, Sport Fishing Institute)

California

- bag limits in force over 100 years
- daunting array of bag limits
(possession limits in place (See Appendix 2))
- bag limits are effective though no surveys have been done
- citations for violations in marine waters are about 500-1000 p.a. of which over half relate to licences
- public perception that fishing is deteriorating leads to acceptance of bag limits.
- the bag limit on kelp bass was reduced and led to "better fishing" - ie. people believe they are catching more kelp bass
- salmon bag limits in SFO Bay reduced from 3 to 2 fish when salmon catches were down; party boats were happy because they could run shorter trips (and more trips)!
- fish identification is a problem; only 75% of anglers could recognise even barracuda - how do they distinguish other fish
- an education program (posters & brochures) produced each year for regulations
- bag limits regarded as reasonable and successful
- no cost effectiveness evaluations before or after bag limit information.
(California Fish and Game Officers).

British Columbia

- a daunting array of bag limits in place (Appendix 3) with daily and possession limits (usually twice the daily limit), but considerable variations by area
- also an annual bag limit is in force on chinook salmon where each fish is recorded on the anglers licence with date and place of capture.
- limits on salmon firmed up in 1982 when US-Canadian international salmon treaty came into effect and a total catch assigned to recreational fishing; the recreational catch quota has not been exceeded for 2 years and halved the pre-quota catch for Strait of Georgia
- following treaty, an extra 6 enforcement officers provided for sports-fishery
- there appears to be increased escapement since bag limit etc.

- for ground fish, fish recognition is a problem
- procession limits not based on biological considerations
- only 3 letters received by Recreational Fishing Co-ordinator when bag limits imposed
- limit of 8 imposed because managers wanted to be "generous"
- no hard evidence that stocks are declining but anecdotal evidence
- most people do not catch 8 fish
- can not judge the effectiveness of the bag limit
- annual surveys in Strait of Georgia gave good catch information for salmon and groundfish
- some concern that low bag limits e.g.. salmon, lingcod become targets in themselves (Department of Fisheries and Oceans Offices).