

**PE1558/J**

Petitioner Email of 8 September 2015

Dear Chris

The Committee Thanks you and your team for sending this report to them. Please find a list of things we can confirm contrary to their submissions

The import of live Crayfish cannot be stopped in Scotland unless the law is challenged at the European court of justice Germany tried this and was found against as it breached the treaty of Rome on free movement of goods.

ITV News report on the check clean and dry campaign also showed the damage to the flood defences causing dangerous flooding when they give way 2 years ago Scottish power to stop generating sooner and start generating later as the flood bankings had been under mind by the Crayfish flooding the roads and call outs for the fire rescue with people in cars with the surges of water through the breaches a meter high, this has happened 5 times in the last 2 years thankfully no fatalities as yet

1) Fish farm willed brown trout stocking fish on loch ken now closed with the loss of 8 jobs because of Crayfish.

2) Bio-security at first available event's fishing competition 3-day event 29/30/31 August event, 36 fishermen, 1673 Crayfish caught. Triathlon over a hundred entrants 5/6 September, non-appearances of SEPA or SNH at either event. Still no cleaning sites or equipment around the loch to monitor this there is one Ranger to cover Dumfries and Galloway.

3) Loch Ken Chairman has scrutinised the minutes of their meetings and has found no references to what is mentioned in this report regarding the placement of signage or the strategies mentioned .We have also checked the minutes of the local fishing club and the community councils that surrounds Loch Ken, no mention of plans for the loch just a change in the charter to enable the Committee to apply for grants.

4) Educational courses for fisheries trusts and boards which are now being disbanded to be absorbed into SNH, SEPA staff, not for the people that have to deal with the problem.

5) Fisheries monitoring project Loch Ken. Fishing clubs have no records of this of this nor has the fishing bailiff or the riparian owners over the last 3 years.

6) Loch Ken trapping project 1999 recommended that a large trapping program be started as soon as possible. This was rejected by Dr Bean, SNH, this is the only study to be carried out on behalf of Scottish Government and Dumfries and Galloway council. A small trapping program carried out by New Galloway angling club all so confirming that intensify trapping reduced the numbers and the spread significantly as for local colleges carrying out studies into the biodiversity of the Ken Dee Loch Ken there are no local colleges, the nearest are in Glasgow.

7) The amount of cash spent on crayfish, £996 thousand pounds, £105 thousand on Loch Ken. This was a waste of money as the programs were either carried out at the wrong time of year or were of no consequence. If they had bothered to ask the locals that were trapping the Crayfish and slowing down their spread they would have been informed of the best way of trapping

8) Another on-going work, these programs were also on the drawing board 15 years ago and as now nothing is being done to solve the problem. It is noticeable by this submission and the one by the SNH representative on the Rural Affairs Committee when she stated that we do not speak the same language they do, so drawing on that statement and the rejection of the evidence, SNH and SEPA have no interest whatsoever in reducing the numbers of Crayfish in the Ken Dee catchment as this is just a study location and to trap or interfere with their experimental area must not be allowed.

In conclusion the Committee having studied all the reports from SNH and SEPA and other scientific findings from around the Globe, the RNBCC Ken Dee Catchment have come to the conclusion that SNH and SEPA in making the decision that trapping was not the way in dealing with Crayfish no matter what the scientific or practical or cost effective way, they will reject it as they have made up their minds no matter the evidence and by allowing such a program to go ahead would prove them wrong.

John Thom  
Chairperson, RNBCC Ken Dee Catchment

This proposal was not submitted by the RNBCC. A proposal has been submitted to the councils around the loch to remove the authority of SNH and SEPA from any further decisions on the American signal Crayfish controlment as they are an advisory quango and not a statutory body with a conflict of interest in this matter. Being licensing and adviser at the same time, having failed to reduce the damage to the economy or the environment in ward 3 of the regen for the past 11 years in this matter.

Addendum

Petitioner Email of 11 September 2015

### **Dr Lennart Edsman's Letter to Parliament**

It appears that Dr. Edsman has got the wrong end of the stick as they say for no one is proposing to start commercial Crayfish farming.

The proposal is for a change in the law so as a large long-term scientific none commercial programme can be started financing is self not for profit.

Dr. Edsman and SLU papers published on sustainable Crayfish farming warns against overfishing as this may trigger a sudden drop in the population of crayfish. This is exactly what we wish to achieve

As SNH and SEPA cannot finance such a long-term project over a minimum of 10 years, this is how long it is estimated it will take unless the government gives them a lot more taxpayers money to finance their over inflated costs for such projects as shown in their own submitted accounts With no discernable impact on the numbers or spread of Crayfish with this current agenda allowing their numbers to increase the illegal trapping has also increased dramatically