



**North
West
Water**

Dawson House, Great Sankey
Warrington WA5 3LW
Telephone Penketh 4321
8th October 1981

F2/B5

To: Members of the Southern Area Fisheries
Advisory Committee:
(Messrs. J.S. Bailey; (Chairman);
D. Bridgewood; A.G.R. Brown; C. Holland;
P. Neal; R. Newton; J.A. Shanahan; Dr. M. Pugh Thomas;
and the Chairman of the Authority (G. Mann);
the Vice Chairman of the Authority (A. Richardson);
and the Chairman of the Regional Fisheries Advisory
Committee (T. A. F. Barnes) (ex officio)).

Dear Sir,

Will you please attend a meeting of the SOUTHERN AREA FISHERIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE to be held at 2.30 p.m. on WEDNESDAY, 21ST
OCTOBER 1981, in COMMITTEE ROOM NO. 1 at DAWSON HOUSE, GREAT
SANKEY for consideration of the following business.

Yours faithfully,

W. H. CRACKLE,

Secretary and Solicitor.

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for absence.
2. Minutes of the meeting held on 9th September 1981, (previously circulated and approved by the Regional Fisheries Advisory Committee on 21st September 1981. Enclosed herewith are the Minutes of the Regional Fisheries Advisory Committee for 21st September 1981).
3. Restructuring of Rod and Line Fishing Licence Duties.
4. Wirral Festival of Sport and the close season for Freshwater Fish.
5. Fishing Offences and Prosecutions 1980/81.
6. Income from the sale of Rod and Line Licences 1980.
7. Report by the Area Fisheries Officer on Fisheries Activities.
8. Any other business.

NOTE: Lunch will be served in the Members' Dining Room at approximately 1.00 p.m. The Menu for the day is enclosed, and Members attending for lunch are asked to indicate their choice of main course to the assistant on duty near the members' Retiring Room.

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
REGIONAL FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

21ST SEPTEMBER 1981

Present: T. A. F. Barnes, Esq. (Chairman)
 W. S. Bell, Esq. J. H. Fell, Esq.
 A. G. R. Brown, Esq. J. E. Gouldbourn, Esq.
 J. P. Brown, Esq. R. D. Houghton, Esq.
 (for I. Jones, Esq.) A. Jones, Esq.
 F. Bunting, Esq. J. E. Redhead, Esq.
 J. M. Croft, Esq. A. Richardson, Esq.
 E. P. Ecroyd, Esq. Major J. G. W. Skipwith

18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Mr. J. S. Bailey, Mr. H. Counce, Mr. T. M. Farrer, Mr. J. Johnson, Mr. I. Jones, Mr. G. E. Lowe, Mr. G. Mann, Mr. Wm. McKenna and Mr. G. Wilson.

19. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 13th July, 1981, be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

20. MINUTES OF AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEES

(A) Central Area

The Chairman of the Central Area Advisory Committee submitted the Minutes of the proceedings of the special meeting held on 7th September 1981.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That with the exception of Minute No's. 4, 5 and 6 the Minutes of the special meeting of the Central Area Advisory Committee held on 7th September 1981, be approved.
- (2) That the recommendations contained in Minute No. 4 (MAFF Consultation Paper) and Minute No. 5 (A National Salmon Policy) be considered under the appropriate Agenda items.
- (3) That the recommendation in Minute No. 6 (Commercial eel trapping on Lake Windermere) be approved for submission to the Policy and Resources Committee.

(B) Northern Area

The Chairman of the Northern Area Advisory Committee submitted the Minutes of the proceedings of the special meeting held on 8th September, 1981.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That with the exception of Minute No's. 6 and 7 the Minutes of the special meeting of the Northern Area Advisory Committee held on 8th September, 1981, be approved.
- (2) That the recommendations contained in Minute No. 6 (MAFF Consultation Paper) and Minute No. 7 (A National Salmon Policy) be considered under the appropriate Agenda items.

(C) Southern Area

In the absence of the Chairman of the Southern Area Advisory Committee, Mr. A.G.R. Brown submitted the Minutes of the proceedings of the special meeting held on 9th September, 1981.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That with the exception of Minute No's. 5 and 6 the Minutes of the special meeting of the Southern Area Advisory Committee held on 9th September, 1981, be approved.
- (2) That the recommendations contained in Minute No. 5 (MAFF Consultation Paper) and Minute No.6 (A National Salmon Policy) be considered under the appropriate Agenda items.

21. MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE FISHERIES AND FOOD CONSULTATION PAPER ON THE REVIEW OF INLAND AND COASTAL FISHERIES IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

Further to Minute No. 17 of the last meeting it was reported that the Government consultation paper on the review of inland and coastal fisheries in England and Wales along with a further paper containing the officers' comments on the proposals contained in the MAFF document had been considered by the three area committees at meetings held on 7th, 8th, 9th September. The recommendations of the area committees, (Appendix 1 to these Minutes) together with the officers' comments (Appendix 2 to these Minutes) and the consultation document itself were submitted to the Committee for consideration.

The Committee considered and resolved upon the comments of the Central and Northern Area Committees contained in Appendix 1 to these Minutes and added their own comments.

RESOLVED:

A. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE

- (i) Para. 12. Sea Fisheries Committees (Also Rec. of NAC)

Approved

- (ii) Para. 18. Objectives of review: salmon
(also Rec. of NAC)

Approved with the deletion of the word "estuary" from the recommended additional words.

- (iii) Para. 19. Salmon management

Approved with the additional deletion of the words "by nets".

- (iv) Para. 26. Sale of salmon

Approved.

- (v) Para. 54. Fish movement

Approved.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NORTHERN AREA COMMITTEE

- (i) Para.13. Fishing licences

(a) The officers' acceptance of this proposal be endorsed and accordingly the Area Committee's recommendation be not approved.

(b) Approved.

- (ii) Para. 23. Solway Firth salmon fishery

Approved.

- (iii) Para. 26. Illegal salmon netting

Approved.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF REGIONAL COMMITTEE

That the comments of the officers contained in Appendix 2, be recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee for submission to the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food, subject to the comments of the area committees as approved and amended above, together with the following additional comments:-

- (i) Para. 18. Objectives of the review - salmon

At end add:

"Grave concern is expressed on conservation grounds at the amount of estuarial salmon netting taking place round the coasts of England and Wales".

(ii) Para. 26. Illegal salmon netting (sale of salmon)

At end add:

"An additional factor in the danger to salmon stocks is the ease with which salmon (even when taken illegally) can be turned into hard cash, due to there being no control whatsoever over sales or purchases at any level of business".

(iii) Para. 38. Responsibilities

At end add:

"There should be some degree of control over the species of fish that could be introduced into fish farms and it is suggested that Section 30 of the Salmon & Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 should apply in the case of any fish other than certain specified species (which would need to be agreed)".

22. A NATIONAL SALMON POLICY

The Directors of the Atlantic Salmon Trust and the Salmon and Trout Association had recently written to the Government, as the principal addressee, and to all Regional Water Authorities expressing their concern at present indications of decline in the general well being of the country's salmon fisheries.

Both Trust and Association were agreed that among the main obstacles to more effective measures being taken for the proper conservation of Atlantic salmon and for effective management of salmon fisheries, were the anomalies in United Kingdom legislation. Accordingly, they advocated an agreed national policy for salmon conservation by all interested parties as a first step towards amending legislation.

This matter had been considered by the three area advisory committees at their September round of meetings when they were unanimous in recommending:

'That the Authority support the proposition that the Government be urged to seek agreement on a uniform policy of salmon conservation as a pre-requisite to the necessary amending legislation'.

RECOMMENDED:

- (1) That the recommendation of the area committees be approved for submission to the Policy and Resources Committee on 28th September, 1981.
- (2) That subject to the approval of the recommendation by that committee, then the Salmon and Trout Association, the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food, the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland and the Department of Agriculture (Fisheries Division) Northern Ireland, be notified of the Authority's support.

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYRECOMMENDATIONS OF AREA FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEES
ON THE REVIEW OF INLAND AND COASTAL FISHERIES
IN ENGLAND AND WALES

On 7th, 8th, 9th September, 1981, the Area Fisheries Advisory Committees considered the Government consultation paper on the review of inland and coastal fisheries in England and Wales along with a further report containing the officers' comments on the proposals in that paper. Of the three committees, the Southern Area Committee approved all the comments of the officers. The observations of the two remaining area committees were as follows:-

A. Central Area(i) Para. 12. Sea Fisheries Committees

The Committee endorse the view of the officers that the formation of a "small management group" formed from Sea Fisheries Committees and the Authority with a view to joint responsibility for the regulation and management of salmon and sea trout in designated tidal waters where there are significant stocks of these fish, would not be in the best interests of the fisheries in the north west.

(ii) Para. 18. Objectives of the review - salmon

The words 'licensed estuary' be inserted between the words 'between' and 'netmen' where they appear in line 2 of this paragraph.

(iii) Para. 19. Salmon management

The words 'and rods alike' be deleted where they appear in line 5 of this paragraph.

(iv) Para. 26. Sale of salmon

Full support be given to the licensing of salmon dealers as a measure to combat the disposal of salmon caught illegally.

(v) Para. 54. Fish movement

Support be given to the proposal for extending MAFF's control of fish movements within Great Britain, to all types of live shellfish, farmed marine fish and dead fish and shellfish.

B. Northern Area

Observations as in paras. (i) and (ii) above and also:

(i) Para. 13. Fishing licences

(a) The proposal to discontinue the practice of an Authority submitting proposals to increase fishing licence duties

for Ministerial approval (welcomed by the officers in their comment) be not approved, it being felt that this step would deprive anglers of the right to independent arbitration on any objection to a proposed increase.

(b) In Committee's opinion any proposal to widen the base of licence duty income by the introduction of rod licences for sea anglers would be impractical and undesirable.

(ii) Para. 23. Solway Firth salmon fishery

The following paragraph be added to the Officers' comments:-

"It must be emphasised, however, that any new autonomous organisation which might be envisaged for the administration and control of the migratory fisheries of the Solway Firth must be empowered to operate on both shores of the Firth within a clearly defined area. It would be impossible to set up such an organisation through liaison and consultation at local level. It would need to be established as a result of agreement at Government level, after full consultation with all the interests affected, and its powers and responsibilities clearly defined."

(iii) Para. 26. Illegal salmon netting

The Committee do not accept that it is impossible to provide some way of regulating the sale of salmon and urge that in the interests of combating the sale of salmon caught illegally legislation be introduced.

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYAREA AND REGIONAL
FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEES7TH, 8TH, 9TH AND 21ST SEPTEMBER 1981MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FISHERIES AND FOOD
CONSULTATION PAPER ON REVIEW OF INLAND AND COASTAL FISHERIES
IN ENGLAND AND WALES

1. The attached consultation paper was published by the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) on 8th July 1981 and follows upon a review of Government policies towards inland and coastal fisheries in England and Wales initiated over two years ago. The review was undertaken for the reasons set out in paragraph 1 of the paper.
2. The paper sets out proposals arising from the review which are grouped under four main headings:

II	Local Fisheries Administration	(page 2)
III	Salmon	(page 8)
IV	Fish Farming	(page 14)
V	Fish Diseases	(page 20)

The basic Ministry proposals in respect of each of these sections and headings are as follows:

(a) II Local Fisheries Administration

Sea Fisheries Committees should be retained with a membership that reflects local fishing interests and should carry out local fisheries regulatory and management functions in estuaries and out to the 3 mile band. They should also have particular responsibilities for the development of the shellfisheries which MAFF regard as a valuable growth area. Fisheries responsibilities of Water Authorities would relate to the rivers and inland waters. However, it is proposed that Water Authorities and Sea Fisheries Committees should be jointly responsible for the conservation of salmon and sea trout in designated tidal waters where there are significant stocks (see paras. 12 and 13 of the paper).

(b) III Salmon

The paper contains proposals which should make an important contribution to combating illegal salmon netting. It is also proposed that the salmon drift net fishery off the Northumbrian and Yorkshire coast be retained but be subject to greater restrictions to safeguard, in particular, salmon destined for the River Tweed. The objectives for salmon policies are clearly stated in para. 18.

(c) IV Fish Farming

It is explained in this section that the derating of fish farms (already introduced under recent legislation) combined with the measures in the Fisheries Act 1981, are expected to help this important growth industry. Whilst not advocating compulsory licensing of fish farms, MAFF are prepared to consider some form of compulsory registration if this appears justified. Included in the consultation paper under this section are proposals on the problem of fish farm effluents and on water abstraction licensing. The Water Authorities' existing responsibilities for controlling fish movements would be restricted to the "public" waters for which the WA's have management responsibilities. It will be necessary to seek definition here (see later).

(d) V Fish Diseases

This section deals with proposals relating to fish disease and particular attention is paid to preventing the importation of serious fish diseases. Proposals are also made for greater flexibility in the powers available for controlling imports and for preventing or dealing with outbreaks of serious fish diseases, and it is suggested that shellfish diseases should be brought fully into the fish disease arrangements. Compulsory slaughter of farmed fish in the event of outbreaks of VHS (Viral Haemorrhagic Septicaemia) or IHN (Infectious Haematopoietic Necrosis) is proposed. There would also be a statutory obligation on fish farmers to maintain fish movement records for use in tracing disease outbreaks.

3. To assist the Committee in their consideration of the consultation paper the comments of officers on the proposals are given below, numbered according to the paragraph number in the consultation paper. In the light of these points, the Committee is now invited to comment on the consultation paper for submission to the Regional Committee on 21st September, 1981 with a view to the consolidated comments of Area and Regional Committees being forwarded to MAFF prior to their stated deadline of 30th October, 1981.

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

- Para 3 If effective revision of fisheries legislation is to be achieved, and if such revised legislation is to be properly enforced, increases in requirements for manpower and expenditure will inevitably result.

SECTION II - LOCAL FISHERIES ADMINISTRATION

Objectives of the review : local fisheries administration

- Para 5 The requirement to take account of the EEC Common Fisheries Policy and of European Community Law must leave a large question mark over any proposals which may now be made in this country.

- Para 6 (ii) The resolution of local problems at local level is an admirable aim. Inevitably, however, occasions will arise when the views of local interests conflict with those of Fisheries Management (e.g. Over a matter such as the date of commencement of a close season, when anglers are likely to want the longest possible open season, regardless of other considerations). Some form of arbitration must be available to resolve conflicts of this kind.

Responsibilities at local level

- Para 7 Representation of fish farming interests on Area and possibly also Regional Fisheries Committees appears a sensible idea in view of the progressive development of this industry. It is considered however that development in the NWWA area has not reached a point where such representation is essential. The initiative in this matter should, perhaps come from the British Trout Farmers Association or the NFU, rather than from the Authority.

Sea Fisheries Committees

- Paras 8-12 In the light of experience, some doubt is felt about the practical value throughout the Region of the arrangements suggested. The Authority's relationship with Lancashire and Western SFJC is an excellent one and there is often close co-operation in dealing with particular problems (e.g. the Leven/Kent Estuary Survey in 1980/81, and the use of certain SFJC Officers to give expert evidence in some Authority fishery prosecutions). Unfortunately, similar co-operation which is essential if the proposals are to be implemented has not been enjoyed with the Cumbria Sea Fisheries Committee.

- Para 10 In Para.10, the statement is made that: "The WAs themselves have suggested that they should be relieved of responsibilities for migratory fish outside estuary mouths". Enquiries by the Regional Fisheries Officer have failed to identify any WA to which this statement can be attributed.

- Para 11 The expression "Nets operated from, or adjacent to, the shore outside the estuaries" would need very precise interpretation to avoid the immediate creation of anomalies.

In relation to the proposed ban on fishing for salmon at sea outside estuaries, it would appear that the small local industries are to be suppressed, but that the very large, drift-net fishery off the Northumbrian coast, which is recognised as taking salmon destined for Scottish rivers is to be left untouched. (The later reference, in Para.21, to the effect of the "Tweed Box" appears somewhat irrelevant. If the bulk of the catches have already been made further south, all the Box can protect is the survivors). Although it is suggested that

management of designated estuaries where there are salmon should be a joint responsibility of the SFC and the adjacent WA, paragraph 12 of the paper concerning financing seems to indicate not an equal sharing of the total net costs but that expenditure (and income from commercial salmon fishing licences) should lie where it falls. The WA would give up the income it presently receives from nets and fixed engines (£10,000) but would still contribute bailiffing and legal services having been relieved of salmon management at sea. It is doubtful if salmon rods used in the estuary would provide much income to offset the costs.

The proposed joint responsibility for regulation and management of mixed fisheries stocks in estuaries could lead to practical problems unless the enforcement staff are integrated under common management and direction, or responsibilities and chains of command are clearly defined and understood against a background of a duty of co-operation between WAs and SFCs.

Para 12 It is not clear here whether the "small management groups" proposed would consist of members or officers (or both). In any case, it is arguable that with SFCs being largely county council oriented, and concerned principally with keeping the precept down, proposals from management groups might not be implemented. In the same para., it is suggested that: "..... the WA might continue to provide land-based bailiffing services while the SFC might make available their water-borne protection services " It would be necessary to overcome the reluctance of Cumbria SFC to be involved in the protection of migratory fish stocks at sea.

At the end of Para.12, there is a reference to SFCs being responsible for processing Net Limitation Orders and Byelaws. It is very important that SFCs should be required, as is suggested, to liaise with "joint groups" and, in particular, (which is not mentioned) with appropriate Authority staff who may have long experience and considerable knowledge of local requirements, and of particular hazards to stocks of migratory fish.

Fishing Licences

Para 13 There is a suggestion here that sea anglers might be required to hold a rod licence. Leaving aside the problems of enforcement (which would be likely to be considerably greater than on inland waters) such an extension of the licensing system could, it is suggested, be seen as discriminating against the rod angler because commercial net fishermen do not require a licence for species other than migratory fish. However, if the costs of managing estuaries were to be shared equally, some relief to the WAs share would be obtained from levying a rod licence duty upon sea anglers if there were satisfactory financial arrangements between the WA and the SFC. It should, however, be borne in mind that rod fishing licences for sea anglers would be costly to administer and extremely difficult to control and enforce apart from strong inherent opposition to the proposal, which is already evident, from the anglers themselves.

The proposal to discontinue the practice of submitting increases in rod licence duties for Ministerial approval is welcomed.

At present, the Authority is obliged to regulate fishing for freshwater fish of any description or eels by means of a system of licensing except so far as excused by the Minister.

It is suggested that the Authority put forward an amending proposition so that it is left to a WA to decide whether or not it wants a licensing system for regulating fishing for freshwater fish and eels without the requirement of Ministerial approval (not covered in the consultative document).

SECTION III - SALMON

Objectives of the review : salmon

Para 18 Para. 18(i) and (ii) refer to the general aim of a fair distribution of migratory fish between netmen, rodmens and spawning stock. Certainly the present regime, whereby the nets take four or five or more times as many fish as the rods on some rivers does not achieve this aim.

The stated objectives are sound but that in para. 18 (iii), to maximise the effectiveness of measures to prevent salmon poaching is unlikely even to approach achievement without the injection of considerably greater resources in both men and equipment than exist at present. In some areas, considerable assistance is received from the Police and this arrangement should receive every encouragement.

Salmon management

Para 19 The objective of allowing an adequate proportion of salmon to return to their spawning rivers would be greatly facilitated if exploitation were to be restricted to the home estuary and river, and if more flexible (and readily variable) arrangements existed for limiting the catch by nets and rods alike, in the light of actual catches. (The last sentence of Para.20 seems to suggest that this may be envisaged by MAFF).

North east salmon drift net fishery

Paras 21 & 22 Brief comment has already been made under the heading Paras. 8-12. The final suggestion at the end of Para.22 whereby the Minister can introduce emergency provisions at short notice to increase the weekly close time is an admirable one which might well be more widely applied in estuarine net fisheries also. The fact remains, however, that the continuance of a major fishery at sea which is largely dependent upon fish destined for rivers in another country appears to run counter to all sound principles of the management of migratory fish stocks.

Solway Firth salmon fishery

Para 23 MAFF's apparent readiness to discuss proposals for some form of joint management of the migratory fish stocks of the Solway Firth is warmly welcomed, in view of the initiative by Annan District Salmon Fishery Board in this direction. The matter has been discussed by the Authority's own Fisheries Committees and there will be further talks with the Annan Board. There seems to be a genuine will to develop new and better joint arrangements.

Authorised fishing methods

Para 24 The 50mm (4") stretched mesh size mentioned in the draft notice might be a very suitable mesh size for the taking of grilse. The detailed wording of the proposed ban and mode of operation of fixed fishing nets will require clarification if practical difficulties are to be avoided.

Towards the end of para. 24 it is suggested that it would be unrealistic to expect salmon netsmen to use less effective fishing methods than are currently available. To do so would surely be no more unrealistic than artificially restricting the fishing time available to them? Monofilament nets, are already banned by byelaw in the North West.

Illegal salmon netting

Para 25 In the light of earlier comments it should be clear that a good working relationship already exists with Lancashire and Western SFJC but not with Cumbria SFC. In relation to combined operations by WA and SFC staff, a decision would need to be made as to who would have the overall control which would be necessary for the direction of operations.

Para 26 The paper notes the likely objection to proposals for licensing sales of salmon and the introduction of associated arrangements which place the burden of proof upon the defendant. Such an arrangement, in relation to the sale of salmon, has existed for the past 58 years in what is now S.22(4) of the Salmon & Freshwater Fisheries Act, 1975. A similar arrangement, applying even more widely, exists in the Northern Ireland Fisheries Act of 1966.

Salmon ranching

Para 27 Salmon ranching is a very fashionable concept, but its worthwhileness appears to depend to a very great degree upon salmon catching activities by third parties on the high seas and around the coasts of the British Isles. Until this is effectively controlled it is unlikely to be a viable method of ensuring the capture, near the site of release, of large numbers of salmon. Further clarification is needed about who would carry out the suggested research on ranching of non-indigenous salmon the presence of which in British waters must in any case be regarded with some suspicion.

SECTION IV - FISH FARMING

Controls over fish farming operations

Para 32 The licensing of fish farms by Government agencies is carried out in Northern Ireland apparently without any insuperable problems and it is difficult to see why such a system should not operate in England and Wales although the number of farms would be greater. Even if licensing should eventually be considered to be impracticable, some form of compulsory registration is indeed desirable to make it possible to keep track of new farms which are opened, often in remote areas.

Para 33 It is strongly recommended that fish farms should come within the water abstraction licensing arrangements operated by the WAs. The invidious distinction between farming fish for the table and farming fish for stocking should be removed.

Para.35 A great deal of thought needs to be given to steps which might be taken effectively to control the discharge of effluents, from fish farms. In this context, the NWC Directors of Scientific Services Group have been asked to comment in more detail on effluent controls for fish farming operations and already comments have been made by Mr. R. Toms, the Chief Scientific Officer of the Wessex WA, which NWWA would endorse. In summary, the three major points made by Mr. Toms are as follows:

- (1) That the present control over fish farm effluents by means of the Pollution Prevention legislation, is not able properly to control pollution resulting from fish farms;
- (2) Control over fish farm effluents must not be taken out of the hands of the Water Authorities; but their powers should be strengthened because the existing Pollution Prevention legislation is inadequate properly to control this type of discharge; and
- (3) Water Authorities should have a much better control over chemical additives used by fish farmers.

In para. 35 it is suggested that no action be taken to restrict fish farm development until the appropriate environmental quality objective could not be met. In effect, this means that action will have been delayed too long and the damage done!

Responsibilities

Para.36 The statement that the nature of many fish farms is sophisticated and their management highly skilled, resulting in little need for comprehensive advisory work must be open to question. In any case comprehensive advisory work would seem likely to be needed by newcomers to the industry, both from the point of view of good husbandry and from the effect of fish farming activities on river systems.

- Para.37 The comment that the role of WAS in fish disease matters should relate to those waters under their direct management needs clarification. It should surely relate to all waters within the region.
- Para 38 The expression "public waters" needs defining. It is not used in the 1975 Act or elsewhere. The role of WAS in disease control needs further elaboration, as do several of the suggestions in paras. 36 - 38.

Financial assistance

- Para 39 Where practicable and economic, WAS should have the means of producing fish for restocking on a long term basis, and cannot rely on the vagaries of market forces, or short term changes in production.

Planning

- Para 41 Reference has been made above, under comments on Para.33, to the need for all fish farming to be on an identical legal basis, regardless of whether its intention is to produce fish for the table or fish for stocking.

SECTION V - FISH DISEASES

- Para 43 Eels and "ornamental fish" are specifically excluded from the health certification procedure (but see para.47(b) and (d) of consultation paper). Advice on the safety and acceptability of this arrangement presumably comes from the Ministry's Fish Diseases Laboratory, but it must be emphasised that "ornamental fish" include a number of species closely related to, or even identical with, those occurring in the wild. Further, it seems by no means certain that these fish, when imported, can be guaranteed to arrive in a disease-free condition. Many are used for stocking garden ponds, the overflow from which sooner or later reaches a watercourse. As it seems at least possible that these fish could carry "serious exotic diseases" (para.44), the logic of excluding them from the health certification procedure is difficult to understand, except on the basis that inclusion would result in additional work for the Ministry. (From the remarks in Para.47(d) it appears that the Ministry do have their own doubts about the advisability of this course of action).

Objectives of the Review : Fish Diseases

- Para 44 Again, eels and "ornamental fish" are not mentioned (but see para 47(b) and (d)).
- Para 45 This paragraph makes the point that it is practically impossible to exert disease control because of a very large wild fish population; vague suggestions for doing so are however made in para.38.

Para 46

(ii) It is suggested that the words

"or from one wild fish population to another (whether through the activities of man or otherwise)" be added at the end of sub-para. (ii).

Import controls

Shellfish

Para 47

(c) A ban on emptying of water from holding tanks direct to rivers is proposed here. Thought would thus need to be given to a recommended means of disposal for such water.

Dead fish

Para 47

(e) The derogation in respect of trade with Northern Ireland is not understood in the light of the value placed on our "island status" for disease prevention, referred to in the introduction to para. 47. The same would apply to imports from the Isle of Man.

Import Licences

Para 48

A full investigation of the risks of unlicensed import of "ornamental fish" should be made before consideration is given to any relaxation of the rules. This should be done in collaboration with the Fish Diseases Laboratory. The consultation paper does not however indicate whether such investigation will take place.

Broodstock certificate

Para 50

Here it needs to be made clear who would certify the hatcheries - the WAS or MAFF. In view of the inevitable involvement of the Ministry's Fish Diseases Laboratory, it might be appropriate for them to undertake the actual certification.

Notifiable diseases

Para 51

This paragraph does not make clear who does what, or in consultation with whom, in the notification procedures. This needs to be clarified.

List A - Notifiable Diseases

Para 51

Under A(i) Furunculosis is an endemic disease throughout Britain and has been for many years. The value of its retention as a "notifiable disease" must therefore be open to question.

Under A(viii) and (ix) Erythrodermatitis of carp is not mentioned.

Under A (vii) it is difficult to understand the proposal to withdraw UDN from the notifiable disease list. The disease is still prevalent in many rivers within the NWWA region.

Para 52 It seems wholly inequitable that livestock farmers should continue to receive compensation for compulsory slaughter while fish farmers should not. If fish farming is accepted as a branch of agriculture it is suggested that this form of discrimination should cease.

Movement controls

Para 55 Clarification is needed as to whether the "persons authorised by Fisheries Ministers", referred to in this paragraph to whom records should be made available in the event of an outbreak of a serious fish disease, would include WA staff.

FF2/A21

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYSOUTHERN AREA
FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE21ST OCTOBER, 1981RESTRUCTURING OF ROD AND LINE FISHING LICENCE DUTIES

1. At the meeting held on 1st April, 1981, (Minute No. 19) the Central Area Advisory Committee requested details of other water authorities licence structures, the amount of expenditure which is transferred from Fisheries account to be recovered from the Environmental Service Charge, and the revenue from the sale of freshwater fish licences in 1979 compared with the income from the combined freshwater fish and brown trout licence in 1980. These details are to be found in Appendices I and II.
2. At the 13th July meeting the Regional Committee was reminded that a former recommendation (Minute No. 40(2) of 15th February, 1979) provided that in any future restructuring prime consideration be given to the introduction of a single tier rod and line whole area licence, but the committee resolved that this report be based on the following guidelines:-
 1. a four tier structure comprising separate licences for salmon, migratory trout, non migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels;
 2. a three tier structure, comprising separate licences for salmon and migratory trout, non migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels;
 3. a three tier structure comprising separate licences for salmon, migratory trout and non migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels;
 4. that the part season salmon licence be excluded from the structures;
 5. that the nil duty licence for juveniles aged 10-13 years inclusive be excluded from the structures.
3. To assist in this restructuring exercise the Fisheries Department has prepared an analysis of their activities to show how their time and resources are deployed with the following results:-

Migratory fisheries	51.2%
Non migratory trout	22.0%
Coarse fisheries	26.8%

The detailed analysis is shown in Appendix III

4. No new licence structure can operate before 1st January 1983 therefore the full impact will not be felt until the financial year 1983-84. When the Policy and Resources Committee agreed to the structure review they made the proviso that the level of contribution towards working expenses should at least be maintained. It is estimated that the income from rod and line licence duties to obtain such a contribution in 1983-84 should be £430,000 being 47.2% of the total estimated direct costs of fisheries. The direct costs are those costs directly controlled by the Regional Fisheries Officer.

5. When this amount is apportioned in accordance with the Fishery Department's time and resources analysis the result is:-

	£'000
51.2% to be met from migratory fish licences	= 220
22.0% to be met from non migratory fish licences	= 95
26.8% to be met from freshwater fish licences	= 115

and the appropriate unit prices per licence, expressed in terms of a full season licence, are as follows:-

1982 Unit Prices (including 10% applied for)		Estimated Sales (in terms of Full Season)	4 Tier	3 Tier	3 Tier
£p		No	£p	£p	£p
19.80	Salmon	5,400	36.00)		36.00
)	28.90	
6.60	Migratory Trout	2,200	12.00))	
	(Non Migratory)	4.30
	(Trout	26,100	3.60	3.60)	
3.90	(
	(Freshwater Fish				
	(and Eels	43,400	2.60	2.60	2.60

To facilitate presentation the estimated number of licences to be sold has been based on the assumption that concessionary licences for juniors and pensioners and seven day licences will be fixed in the same ratio to a full season licence as at present e.g. juniors and pensioners at 50% of the full season licence and the seven day salmon licence at 1/6 of the full season duty. If these ratios were increased it would have the effect of reducing the full season licence duty.

6. In the past when restructuring of licence duties was under discussion there has been considerable argument about what costs the Authority should bear and what licence income should cover. In this exercise direct costs only are under consideration and administrative overheads, financing charges etc. have been left out of account. This is in accordance with the requirement of the Policy and Resources Committee that the contribution from licence income towards operating costs should be at the same level as at present. That contribution is estimated at £430,000 in 1983-84 and the above unit licence duties are set at a level to produce that income being only 47.2% of direct costs. There can therefore be no argument about licence income contributing to some activities to which it should not contribute. Any suggestion to reduce any of the above unit licence duties could only be met by a commensurate increase in the other licence duties in order to achieve the overall target income of £430,000. This is the first time that income from the various types of licences has been related to the manner in which fisheries resources are deployed. It is a firm basis which can be justified to all classes of anglers.

7. In 1979, the year before the last restructuring, there was a combined salmon and migratory trout licence. There was considerable objection to this which resulted in separate licences being proposed and included in the new structure which came into operation on 1st January 1980. As a result the number of licences sold increased and there was a consequent increase in revenue as the following figures show:-

	<u>Price</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>Amount</u>
	£p	No.	£	£p	No.	£
Salmon - season	15.60	1723	26,957	15.00	1862	27,930
Salmon to 31st May	7.80	25	195			
Salmon from 1st June	9.00	3040	27,360	10.00	2673	26,730
Salmon season - reduced duty	6.50	686	4,459	7.50	644	4,830
Salmon to 31st May - reduced duty	3.25	7	23			
Salmon from 1st June - reduced duty	4.00	583	2,332	5.00	571	2,855
Salmon 7 day	2.60	3174	5,652	2.50	2013	5,032
Migratory trout - season				5.00	1867	9,335
Migratory trout - reduced duty				2.50	305	763
Migratory trout - seven day				1.00	956	956
		<u>9238</u>	<u>66,978</u>		<u>10891</u>	<u>78,431</u>

It would be a retrograde step to introduce a combined salmon and migratory trout licence.

8. If there was a combined migratory trout and brown trout licence the migratory trout angler would be paying a lesser amount than under the separate licence proposals and the brown trout anglers would be paying more. This would be contrary to the basic principle that the total licence revenue should be equitably shared by the various classes of anglers by reference to the way in which the fisheries resources are deployed.
9. This basic principle is a fair and rational basis which can be justified to all classes of anglers. It would be totally unjustifiable to seek a greater or lesser contribution from any one particular class of angler. For this reason and the ones outlined above it is recommended that the revised structure should be a four tier structure comprising separate licences for salmon, migratory trout, non migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels.

1. SUMMARY OF ROD LICENCE STRUCTURES IN OTHER COMPARABLE WATER AUTHORITIES

<u>South West</u>	Three Tier	
	1.	Salmon and migratory trout
	2.	Non-migratory trout
	3.	Freshwater fish and eels
<u>Northumbria</u>	Three Tier	
	1.	Salmon and migratory trout
	2.	Non-migratory trout
	3.	Freshwater fish and eels
<u>Wales</u>	Three Tier	
	1.	Salmon and migratory trout
	2.	Non migratory trout
	3.	Freshwater fish and eels
<u>Wessex</u>	Three Tier	
	1.	Salmon
	2.	Trout (including migratory)
	3.	Freshwater fish and eels
<u>Southern</u>	Three Tier	
	1.	Salmon
	2.	Trout (including migratory)
	3.	Freshwater fish and eels
<u>Severn Trent</u>	Two Tier	(Proposals for 1982-83)
	1.	Salmon and migratory trout
	2.	Non-migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels
<u>Yorkshire</u>	Two Tier	(Proposals for 1982-83)
	1.	Salmon and migratory trout
	2.	Non-migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels

2. FISHERY EXPENDITURE CHARGED TO ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CHARGE (1981-82 Revised Estimate)

		£'000
Fisheries Gross Expenditure		1,351
<u>Less</u> Licence Income - Rod and Line	344	
	Nets	10
Other Income	<u>8</u>	<u>362</u>
Balance charged to ESC		<u>989</u>

LICENCE SALES 1979 AND 1980

1. To make the figures comparable, the 1979 figures include the sales of non-migratory trout licences.

2. <u>1979</u>	<u>Licence Duty</u> £p	<u>No. Sold</u>	<u>Value</u> £p
<u>Non-Migratory Trout</u>			
Full year	2.60	23,878	62,082.80
Reduced duty	1.25	4,382	5,477.50
Seven day	0.65	<u>13,245</u>	<u>8,609.25</u>
		<u>41,505</u>	<u>76,169.55</u>
<u>Freshwater Fish and Eels</u>			
Full year	1.25	29,840	37,300.00
Reduced duty	0.65	5,937	3,859.05
Seven day	0.35	3,979	1,392.65
<u>Mersey and Weaver Area</u>			
Full year	0.65	11,961	7,774.65
Reduced duty	0.35	<u>3,294</u>	<u>1,152.90</u>
		<u>55,011</u>	<u>51,479.25</u>
		<u>96,516</u>	<u>127,648.80</u>
		=====	=====
<u>1980</u>			
<u>Non-Migratory Trout & Freshwater Fish</u>			
Full year	3.00	57,459	172,377.00
Reduced duty	1.50	12,740	19,110.00
Seven day	0.50	<u>18,944</u>	<u>9,472.00</u>
		<u>89,143</u>	<u>200,959.00</u>
		=====	=====

DIRECT COSTS OF FISHERIES - 1981-2 ESTIMATES

1. <u>Subjective Analysis</u>		2. <u>Activity Analysis</u>		Mig.	Non	Coarse	Total	
	£			Fish	Mig.	Fish		
				£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%
Employees:								
Salaries	471,292							
Wages	3,625	1. Patrols, licence						
Other	9,830	checks & enforcement	51	74	68	193	27	
		2. Anti-poaching	168	1	-	169	23	
Running Costs:		3. Propagation	85	38	10	133	18	
Electricity	4,042	4. Coarse fish -						
Other power	101	removal & transfer	-	-	46	46	6	
Rents	1,370	5. Fish surveys	20	17	37	74	10	
Rates	1,295	6. Advice to clubs	2	6	8	16	2	
SESC	20	7. Offences and other						
Chemicals	12,575	reports	23	11	14	48	6	
Materials	6,880	8. Fish mortalities and						
Hired & Contracted Services	920	pollution	6	7	8	21	3	
Transport and Plant		9. Stocking consents	-	6	5	11	2	
Own Vehicles and Plant	32,186	10. Fish counters	18	-	-	18	3	
Car allowances	87,345							
Telephones	150			<u>373</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>196</u>	<u>729</u>	<u>100</u>
Travel subsistence	11,563	% of Total Cost		51.2	22	26.8		100
Other	32,185			=====	===	=====		===
Inflation Provision	<u>54,000</u>							
	<u>729,379</u>							
	=====							

F1/A20

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYSOUTHERN AREA
FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE21ST OCTOBER, 1981WIRRAL FESTIVAL OF SPORT AND THE CLOSE SEASON
FOR FRESHWATER FISH

1. In May, 1981, and on several previous occasions, the Director of Leisure Services, Metropolitan Borough of Wirral, wrote to the Authority to enquire about the possibility of holding, in connection with the Wirral Festival of Sport, a special annual coarse angling event on a date during the first two weeks of June. In his reply, the Regional Fisheries Officer pointed out that the existing regionwide close season for freshwater fish (15th March to 15th June inclusive) was the result of a clear recommendation from the Authority's Local Fisheries Advisory Committees when the present fishery byelaws were made. (The original proposal that the close season for freshwater fish should be abolished was reversed at the instance of the LFAC's.) Wirral's Director of Leisure Services has requested that the matter be raised with the Area Committee.
2. While the present close season may not be perfect, it does, in the main, achieve the aim of close seasons generally, namely, to prevent disturbance of fish by angling during their spawning period. Unless, therefore, there is some good biological reason for abolishing the close season, either generally or locally within the region, it is considered that it should remain. The officers are unaware of any change of circumstance since the present byelaws were made which could justify its abolition, temporarily or permanently on biological grounds and indeed in the recent review of the fishery byelaws (proposed byelaw No.7) it has been recommended that the existing close season for freshwater fish be retained.
3. To vary the season to enable a water to be fished in connection with a local festival would clearly be contrary to the purpose behind the legislation and in these circumstances, the Committee is requested to endorse the officers' view that no exceptions be made to the close season provisions.

F2/A7

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYSOUTHERN AREA
FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE21ST OCTOBER 1981FISHING OFFENCES AND PROSECUTIONS 1980/81

1. The total number of persons prosecuted by the Authority within the whole region for fishing offences during 1980/81 was 327 compared with 414 in 1979/80.
2. In the area of this Committee, 22 persons were prosecuted for byelaw offences and giving false names and addresses, and 54 for fishing without a licence. Action was taken on a further 19 cases which did not result in legal proceedings being instituted.
3. The following is a summary of offences and prosecutions within the Committee area during 1980/81.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Byelaw Offences and false names and addresses</u>	<u>Licence Offences</u>
Number of prosecutions	76	22	54
Warning letters	82	5	77
Other cases not taken to court due to insufficient evidence or being unable to trace alleged offenders.	19	5	14
Total fines imposed	£1,088	£585	£503
Costs awarded to the Authority	£449	£170	£279

F2/A5

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYSOUTHERN AREAFISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE21ST OCTOBER 1981INCOME FROM SALE OF ROD AND LINE LICENCES 1980

1. This report and the Appendix, which gives a summary of income from the sale of rod and line licences during 1980, were originally submitted to the Regional Committee on 13th July, 1981 (Minute No. 13).
2. For the information of Members the statistics for 1979 (which are also included in the Appendix) and 1980 are not directly comparable, due to the re-introduction in 1980 of a separate migratory trout licence in place of the combined salmon and migratory trout licence, the introduction in that year of the combined non-migratory trout, freshwater fish and eels licence, (in place of separate licences for non-migratory trout and for freshwater fish and eels) and the abolition of the concessionary freshwater fish and eels licence in the former Mersey and Weaver area.
3. If the issues of the three latter licences in 1979 are added together the total is 96,474 licences yielding revenue of £127,593. By comparison, the single combined licence issued in 1980 resulted in a total issue of 89,126 licences yielding revenue of £200,930. The 7.6% decrease in the number of licences sold was thus more than compensated for by the 57.5% increase in revenue.
4. There was a slight rise (475) in the total number of salmon licences sold and an increase in revenue of £400 from this source. Season licence sales were up by 8% but sales of part-season licences from 1st June were down by 12%.

INCOME FROM SALE OF
ROD AND LINE FISHING LICENCES
1980

TYPE	VALUE £p	NO.	AMOUNT £p
Salmon Season	15.00	1,862	27,930.00
Salmon from 1st June	10.00	2,673	26,730.00
Salmon Season - reduced duty	7.50	644	4,830.00
Salmon from 1st June reduced duty	5.00	571	2,855.00
Salmon Seven Day	2.50	2,013	5,032.50
Total Salmon		7,763	67,377.50
Migratory Trout Season	5.00	1,867	9,335.00
Migratory Trout - reduced duty	2.50	305	762.50
Migratory Trout Seven Day	1.00	956	956.00
Total Migratory Trout		3,128	11,053.50
Non-Migratory Trout Freshwater Fish and Eels Season	3.00	57,459	172,377.00
Non-Migratory Trout Freshwater Fish and Eels reduced duty	1.50	12,720	19,080.00
Non-Migratory Trout Freshwater Fish and Eels Seven Day	0.50	18,947	9,473.50
Total Non-Migratory Trout Freshwater Fish and Eels		89,126	200,930.50
TOTAL		100,017	279,361.50
NO CHARGE - ALL SPECIES	0.00	14,852	Nil
TOTAL		114,869	

INCOME FROM SALE OF
ROD AND LINE FISHING LICENCES
1979

TYPE	VALUE £p	NO.	AMOUNT £p
Salmon Season	15.60	1,723	26,956.80
Salmon to 31st May	7.80	25	195.00
Salmon from 1st June	9.00	3,040	27,360.00
Salmon Season - reduced duty	6.50	686	4,459.00
Salmon to 31st May - reduced duty	3.25	7	22.75
Salmon from 1st June reduced duty	4.00	583	2,332.00
Salmon Seven Day	2.60	3,174	5,652.40
<hr/>			
Total Salmon and Migratory Trout		8,238	66,977.95
<hr/>			
Non-Migratory Trout Season	2.60	23,871	62,064.60
Non-Migratory Trout - reduced duty	1.25	4380	5,475.00
Non-Migratory Trout Seven Day	0.65	13,245	8,609.25
<hr/>			
Total Non-Migratory Trout		41,496	76,148.85
<hr/>			
Freshwater Fish and Eels Season	1.25	29,817	37,271.25
Freshwater Fish and Eels reduced duty	0.65	5,927	3,852.55
Freshwater Fish and Eels Seven Day	0.35	3,979	1,392.65
<hr/>			
Total Freshwater Fish and Eels		39,723	42,516.45
<hr/>			
Former Mersey and Weaver			
Freshwater Fish and Eels Season	0.65	11,961	7,774.65
Freshwater Fish and Eels reduced duty	0.35	3,294	1,152.90
<hr/>			
Total Mersey and Weaver Freshwater Fish		15,255	8,927.55
<hr/>			
TOTAL		104,712	194,570.80
<hr/>			

F2/A12

NORTH WEST WATER AUTHORITYSOUTHERN AREA
FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE21ST OCTOBER, 1981REPORT BY THE AREA FISHERIES OFFICER
ON FISHERIES ACTIVITIES
MARCH - AUGUST 19811. RIVER CONDITIONS AND FISHING

Since the opening of the season most waters have fished reasonably well with large catches of chub and dace taken on the River Dane. The River Weaver produced good catches of chub, dace and gudgeon in the Nantwich area and roach and bream made good pleasure fishing in the Winsford Flash and at Hartford.

The canals have generally fished well, particularly the Leeds - Liverpool where excellent catches of roach, tench and perch have been reported and the Trent and Mersey canal where roach, perch and bream are the pre-dominant species taken. The St. Helens canal in the Newton area has produced good catches of roach and perch, and carp introduced from the pilot hatchery are being taken from the warm water section.

Stillwaters have also fished well with Capesthorpe Pool and Crabmill Flash producing carp of 27 and 23 lbs respectively. Most of the well stocked trout waters have produced consistent catches when conditions were suitable.

It is encouraging to note that roach shoals have been seen in the River Douglas in the Standish area and in the River Lostock at Leyland. During a recent survey roach and gudgeon fry were taken upstream of Church Minshull weir where they had not been recorded previously. A further encouraging sign for the River Weaver is that elvers were seen at Aston Bridge, Northwich, which suggests an improvement in the quality of this stretch of river.

2. HATCHERIESHollingworth Hatchery

The rainbow trout being reared at Hollingworth have developed well and produced excellent growth rates throughout the period. Interference with the rearing cages and the theft of fish from this hatchery have become a serious problem and it became necessary from midsummer onward to mount night patrols in an effort to reduce the frequency of these raids.

Pilot Hatchery

Due to manning problems and the necessity to construct suitable automatic feeders, no stripping was undertaken during the review period and brood carp are being held in readiness for the production of a further batch of fish. Suitably sized ripe chub could not

be collected during the spawning period because of the high water levels and so planned work will not proceed.

3. STOCKING BY THE AUTHORITY

During the review period 100 roach from Bostock Hall stockpond were given to Liverpool University for research purposes. 400 common and mirror carp fry from the pilot hatchery were put out into old filter beds at Bury ETW. In addition stockings of 1,000 brown trout to the River Goyt and 200 brown trout to the River Etherow were made to reinstate fish populations affected by pollution.

Transfers for clubs carried out by Authority staff

A total of 94,360 mixed coarse fish were moved for 9 angling clubs during the review period. The largest of these operations was the rescue of 42,300 mixed coarse fish from clay pits in Bredbury which were to be filled in.

4. STOCKING AND/OR RESTOCKING BY ANGLING ASSOCIATIONS

Consents have been issued to introduce the following fish:-

Brown trout	7,450
Rainbow trout	40,718
Brook trout	1,550
Mirror carp	3,051
Common carp	118
Crucian carp	6,140
Roach	31,753
Bream	13,110
Tench	4,164
Perch	4,845
Pike	197
Rudd	7,806
Gudgeon	6,400
Chub	300
Mixed coarse fish	66,500

TOTAL 194,102

In addition to the above 5,500 brown trout and 16,700 rainbow trout were stocked into the Authority's own Reservoir Trout Fisheries in the area.

5. FISH MORTALITIES

During the review period 29 incidents of fish mortality were investigated. Species and numbers of fish killed were as follows:-

Brown trout	229
Rainbow trout	1,330

Roach	9,617
Bream	3,600
Crucian carp	55
Mirror carp	40
Grayling	40
Pike	9
Perch	507
Tench	15
Mixed coarse fish	2,910
TOTAL	18,352

Of these 29 incidents, twelve involved over 100 fish, as follows:-

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Species</u>	<u>Approx.No:</u>	<u>Cause</u>
10.3.81	River Goyt Whaley Bridge	Brown trout	100 +	Lime spillage
25.3.81	Pond at Gt. Crosby	Mixed coarse	500	Unknown
1.4.81	Capesthorpe Hall trout pond	Rainbow trout	Several hundred	Post stocking into low pH water.
29.4.81	Lodges at Failsworth	Mixed coarse	200	Sewer collapse
11.5.81	Pond at Widnes	Roach	112	Unknown
31.5.81	Lea Forge Mill	Rainbow trout	1,000	Dairy washings (low D.O.)
4.6.81	Capesthorpe Hall upper pool	Roach Crucian carp	100 5	Spillage of silage liquor
17.6.81	Springwood Lake, Mobberley	Mirror carp Roach & bream	40 7,500	Silage liquor discharge
8.7.81	Pond at Speke Hall	Mixed coarse	2,000	Deoxygenation (algal bloom collapse)
30.7.81	Railway Flash, Sandbach.	Roach Pike Bream	220 3 100	Discharge from blocked sewer.
8.8.81	Abbeyfields Lake, Sandbach.	Tench Crucian carp Perch Roach	15 50 500 5,000	Deoxygenation
2.8.81	Rochdale Canal	Roach	100	Unknown

In two of these cases fisheries staff were able to reduce the number of fish killed by using air compressors to re-aerate the water. In another instance fish were saved by transferring them to other waters. In the case of the rainbow trout mortality the fish had died before notification was received.

6. FISH DISEASE

During the review period 16 occurrences of fish disease were noted. In all cases fish losses were negligible.

7. MANAGEMENT

During the review period 52 site visits were made for the purpose of giving fisheries advice. In addition 13 fishery investigations, involving the use of netting and electrofishing equipment, were carried out.