

General Comments

- 1) We need consistency in the law for all lakes. I know that it is the responsibility of an individual to know the regulations, but why can't we use the same regulations for all lakes for a period of time and then study. I would also like to see how DNR decided to have so many different rules for each lake. I may understand the reasoning better if I saw the data.

The SCDNR develops creel and size statutes for fisheries based on a combination of biological, social and political information and attempts to be as consistent as possible throughout the state. Scientific data is one of the main resources the SCDNR uses to propose creel and size statutes; this data is collected through various research and monitoring programs.

- 2) Are there any changes to the following section (50-13-50)? The wording is causing some confusion about how many rods can be used from a boat.

SECTION 50-13-50. Lawful methods and number of devices for taking freshwater game fish, It is unlawful to take freshwater game fish except by game fish devices. A fisherman fishing from the bank or a structure or wading may use only four game fishing devices. A fisherman fishing from a boat may use only four devices provided a fisherman in a boat may use an unlimited number of game fishing devices if all persons in the boat older than sixteen years have valid fishing licenses.

The currently proposed statutes allow for anglers in a boat to use an unlimited number of devices. Section 50-13-50 has been rewritten to state, "It is unlawful to take freshwater game fish except by game fish devices. A fisherman fishing from the bank or a structure or wading may use only four game fishing devices. A fisherman fishing from a boat may use an unlimited number of game fishing devices if all persons in the boat older than sixteen years have valid fishing licenses."

- 3) The above proposed (Section 50-13-50) restriction is not grammatically correct (it is a run on sentence). Why not just state "four fishing devices for each licensed person in the boat older than sixteen years and four devices for each unlicensed person in the boat under the age of sixteen years"? This would seem to be much easier to enforce.

Please refer to the response to Question #2, above.

- 4) I would also like to see a rod limit of 4 poles per person with an 8 rod per boat maximum. Nearly all the national crappie tournament trails have an 8 pole limit policy in effect. Several states that are renowned for great crappie fishing have a 3 pole per person limit. With the current SC law, boaters can use an unlimited number of poles. It is not uncommon for some boats to use 16 to 24 or more poles at a time. This is not fishing, its seining for crappie and the fish don't stand a chance.

Comment acknowledged. After discussions with the constituent groups and fisheries biologists, the SCDNR decided to retain the statute allowing unlimited devices in a boat,

General Comments

provided all persons in the boat older than 16 years of age have a valid fishing license. Regardless of the number of devices allowed, the creel limits remain the same per angler. Therefore, someone fishing with twelve rods for any fish is still only allowed the creel limit for that species, as is true for an angler fishing with two rods.

- 5) He stated that we should cut down the number of poles you can use from a boat. He uses 6, but could do with 3 or 4 (would prefer 4). He thinks we should make it the same as on the bank.

As stated above, Section 50-13-50 has been rewritten to state, "It is unlawful to take freshwater game fish except by game fish devices. A fisherman fishing from the bank or a structure or wading may use only four game fishing devices. A fisherman fishing from a boat may use an unlimited number of game fishing devices if all persons in the boat older than sixteen years have valid fishing licenses." Although this proposed statute does not limit the number of devices in a boat, it does increase the number of devices allowed on the bank from two to four.

- 6) When using fishing devices, it states that one person in a boat is only allowed 4. Does this change mean that I cannot have more than 4 lines in the water when I am fishing by myself? I think this statement as it pertains to crappie fishermen needs to limit the number of rods any individual may use to a maximum of four per person. It is appalling to see the "Spider Rigs" with upwards of 30 rods per boat when I am fishing with only 1 or 2 rods.

Please refer to the response to Question #4, above.

- 7) Maybe you could make this just a little more COMPLICATED!!!

Comment acknowledged.

- 8) Its simple. The government thinks all the fish belongs to them. They want you to leave their fish alone unless you actually insist on going fishing, then they want to make it as difficult as possible. They also think all the money belongs to them. They want you to give them their money back. Same deal with the federal fishing gestapo. King John gave up the monarch's claim to fisheries in the Magna Carta. This crowd snatched it back.

Comment acknowledged.

- 9) Bob, the bureaucrats need to set this up, out of self-preservation. You hit it right on the head.

Comment acknowledged.

- 10) It's a shame corporations aren't as regulated as fisherman.

Comment acknowledged.

General Comments

11) I have taken the opportunity to read the drafts that have been provided by DNR on their website and want to commend DNR for giving the people of SC the chance to see the re-writes and comment on them. I, for one, see absolutely nothing in the proposed legislation that I cannot live with. I recognize the need to place restrictions on our valuable resources and applaud DNR for the fine work they do in this arena.

Comment acknowledged.

12) I concur with the proposed changes to the fishing regs.

Comment acknowledged.

13) After reviewing this title and the proposed new bill, I find it very unfair to place this bill on the DNR website for review without adding plain language to further explain these changes. You're asking for public review on a bill that many people do not understand. It is my belief that it would further benefit this "public review" if plain language were added to better explain what exactly is changing other than putting the bill on the web with lines crossed out and sentences underlined. Not everyone understands legal jargon and the way these laws are written. If a further "plain language" explanation was added, I believe this would create a better and more educated response. Thank you for your time.

The SCDNR agrees that the information placed on the website for review was very confusing. Therefore, public open houses will be held throughout the state to explain the changes and gather public input during July and August, 2010.