THE NATIONAL ANGUILLA CLUB

BULLETIN

VOL: 18 NO: 5

SPECIAL REPORT ISSUE

1980

PART TWO

BULLETIN 18:

A REPORT ON THE 1980 REPORTING SCHEME (PART 2)

Contents

RICHARD BACZYK
Club Analyst
April 1981

INTRODUCTION

Well folks, its finally here, Part 2 of the 1980 Session Reporting analysis.

After countless hours, fags, cups of coffee and sleepless nights, the analysis has finally been completed. (For 1980) From the fiqures which I have been able to analyse. I have given a brief summarisation of how and where and when, it was best to fish for eels above the 2 lb barrier. I can only emphasise that the figures quoted in the text came from an average of all waters fished during 1980. If you expect the analysis to yield you better results for 1981, then I can only state that you stand a possible lesser chance of catching 2 lb plus eels.

It is necessary to do a 10 year analysis of all catogories that were analysed for 1980. To produce any sort of better reception, in which we can safely say that any year will produce better eels. As I see it the 10 year analysis will give a more benefical text, which will no doubt help us overcome so many blank sessions that we experienced during 1980. Just for your information, last year, the National Anguilla Club members put in 270 sessions. Only 106 of these session were successful. That makes a total of 164 sessions, where nothing was caught.

The idea behind the Session Reporting analysis, is to try and cut down on all these blank sessions, and during the successful sessions to catch eels in excess of 2 lbs.

The next point I'm about to make, is basically true. After all the trouble I took to prepare all the data that was needed, who amongst you will admit that you only glanced at the S.R.A. Bulletin issue, and then threw it to one side and forgot about it. I had a discussion with one of our members who just could not see the advantages of having our sessions for eels analyised. If this is feeling of you all, then there's no point in having a Club Analyst.

My biggest problem regarding the Session Report Forms, were the countless mistakes that were made. Near enough every question which had to be answered was given in the wrong manner. Only a handful of individuals bothered to refer to the guide, to give me the correct answers. The other thing that was badly done by you all was the use of rod hours. I must admit that the times of darkness didn't apply to all regions, but it was a guide line. You see I'm fortunate to be a Engineering Clerk, where a lot of my time is involved with time cards, where I sort them out to the nearest ¼ of a hour. After tonnes of SNOPAKE, I pleased to say that all the

rod hour conversions were finally corrected.

My only hope is that for 1981, the mistakes which were made for 1980, would disappear.

And so from now on lets talk about eel fishing. You'll notice that this year I've included OTHER baits analysis. Due to the lack of effort regarding this bait, the analysis as shown in the texts, indicate that its not worth fishing for eels with any other kind of bait apart from Worms or Deadbaits. Personally I think, its very important that we investigate this area very carefully as this may well alter the eel fishing techniques in the years to come.
For 1980, the OTHER baits fell in to several catogories. Namely MAGGOTS, LIVEBAITS, SWAN MUSSELS and LUNCHEON MEAT, etc. Out of them all Tony Hollerbach was the most succesful with his Swan mussels, which worked wonders on rivers..

All that I can say now is that, look carefully at the analysis work done by yours truly and if you have any comments to make then I will be only to pleased to answer them.

I would like to take this opportunity in thanking Brian Crawford, without whoms help this analysis would not have been completed. CHEERS BRI.

As you probably realise, I haven't made any correspondence regarding the Individual fisheries results. This is due to the fact, thatmany will probably be unable to give any sort of data for the future. Being that you probably wont fish these particular waters as thay didn't peoduce as well as you expected them to. However I do recommend that Dave Holman, continues fishing Whitemere.

Well that all folks, I wish you all the best for 1981 eel-wise. Tight lines.

Richard Baczyk.

Analysis of 1980 as regarding Worm Baits.

When fishing with Worm baits, the following information was obtained from a fully analysed report on all venues and expeditions where worms were used as the main bait.

"Fish on a EAST bank, cast over 30 YARDS, into DEEP water. Particularly in a area where's there's NO SNAGS, with SPARSE WEED content. The bottom which worked rather well for 1980, was the SAND & GRAVEL bottom. Preferably fish in CLEAR swims, with a HEAVY SURFACE DISTURBANCe.

Fish with a LARGE hook, size 2 or bigger, attached to a NYLON TRACE or use NO TRACE at all. IF using a trace use one with a low Breaking strain e.g. 0-5 lbs. The length of the trace to be no shorter than 13" LONG. The reel line's BREAKING STRAIN is ditto to that of the B.S. of the trace. Using NO WEIGHTS made a better chance of catching eels over 2 lb. The BOBBIN was the best indicator used in reference to catching 2 lb plus eels.

Fish on the BOTTOM; Don't use any sort of ADDATIVES, and don't GROUNDBAIT. PREBAITING worked fairly well. When fishing with Worm the DAY produced more 2 lb plus eels, then when Night fishing. Rod hours showed that to produce a eel over 2 lb, Only 99 hours were needed to catch a eel over 2 lbs in weight; whereas it took 135¼ Rod hours during the night.

Whereas the elements are concerned. The ideal air temperature was above 60 degrees F. As far as the WATER TEMPERATURE was concerned the opposite yeilded better results. i.e. BELOW 50F & between 51-60F. The Barometric Pressure analysis showed that a LOW PRESSURE reading which was steadily RISING increased your chances af catching a large eel. The WIND needed to be blowing fairly strongly, blowing in from the WEST. A LARGE CLOUD PERCENTAGE coupled with NO RAIN proved to be the best conditions.

The WATER DETAILS, which was analysed showed that a water with an acreage of between 5-10 acres was the ideal water, to fish with Worms. The surroundings of Woodland and Moorland coupled with a 75-100% BANK VEGETATION showed to be a more acceptable water to fish then any other.

An average water with a AVERAGE DEPTH of 5-20 ft with a access for eels of 1000yds produced last years best eels. The SHAPE OF BOTTOM showed that both the FLAT & IRREGULAR bottoms proved equally successful. The analysis showed that fishing with somebody else made a considerable difference to the rod hours and Median weights. E.g. it took 163 rod hours to catch a eel over 2 lb when fishing by

yourself. Whereas if you fished with up to a maximum of 5 others, the rod hours fell by 47%. It only took 76½ hours to catch a 2 lb plus eel.

If you happen to catch a eel in these circumstances, the chances are that you would land a eel over 2 lb, which is likely to be a colour other of that of either Dark or Light Brown. Its mouth is likely to be BROAD and it will probably be in a normal condition. Finally as the analysation showed you will more than likely RETURN it alive.

Analysis of 1980, as regarding Deadbaits.

As with Fishing with worm baits, it was analysed that fishing with Deadbaits, it was far more productive fishing on the EAST bank. Apart from the fact that the larger eels were caught no further out than 15 YARDS. Unlike the worm it seems that the deadbaits produced better eels in much more shallow swims. i.e. 0-5ft. Similarities arose again were snags appeared. Being that it was better suited to fish in a swim with NO SNAGS.

WEED was also voted as being a NO NO, so it was better suited that when fishing with deadbaits, a swim with NO WEED, produced more and better eels. A SAND/GRAVEL bottom accompanied with CLOUDY WATER and NO SURFACE DISTURBANCE again showed a distinct character in catching the larger eels.

When using tackle for Deadbaits, a few of the points made for Worms coincided with that of DB's. Apart from that of HOOKS, LINE & WEIGHT. It was found that by using smaller hooks i.e. size 16-12 coupled to either NO TRACE or a NYLON TRACE of at least 13" long, produced more and bigger eels than all the rest put together. The reel LINE showed that a MEDIUM LINE was better suited i.e. 6-15 lbs. Ditto to that of the TRACE. Whereas WEIGHTS are concerned a LIGHT weight proved to be the most productive. (0-1 ozs) Again as with the Worm the BOBBIN turned up trumps.

When fishing the data of the S.R.F. showed that fishing MID-WATER and that the D.B's given some sort of addative worked reasonably well. Whereas groundbaiting was concerned this only reduced your chances. Last year only one eel was caught on DB where groundbaiting was introduced. And it took 132½ rod hours. Mind you the particular eel weighed in at 3 lb 2 ozs. (N.B. There was only 1 2 lb plus eel caught during Groundbaiting, and infact 7 in all were caught .) Furthermore PREBAITING again was a basic feature in catching the more decent eels. Overall the Deadbaits proved to be catching more and larger eels at night as compared to that of days. That is it took 595 rod hours to produce a 2 lb + eel during the day compared to only 134 rod hours during the Night. So as per the analysis given NIGHT time fishing with DB's are AOK.

As for Mother nature, both air and water temperatures needed to be above 60 F. Strangely the BAROMETRIC PRESSURE needed to produce 2 lb + eels showed that a LOW B.P. was required. I must stress that this particular piece of information may be inaccurate, because so many of the S.R.F. were not correctly filled in where B.P. was concerned. Just to prove my point it was necessary that the B.P.

was to be either STEADY or FALLING.The Wind Analysis showed that both NIL and STRONG winds both produced good eels,although preferably NIL winds produced larger eels with less effort.i.e. 90 rod hours per 2 lb + eel,compared to 265 rod hours when the wind was blowing strongly.If the situation did occur it was found that a WESTERLY wind was the best.CLOUD COVER again showed the distinctive resembles to that of the wind.Where Nil cloud cover took 143 rod hours to produce a eel over 2 lb,and where there was a large cloud cover 50-100% it took 190¼ rod hours.In between i.e. 0-50% cloud cover it took 236½ rod hours.Although the weights are rather small the median for the Nil cover was 1½ lbs,compared to that of a Large cloud cover of 1 lb 10 ozs.

Showers,unmistakably showed better suited for DB's.

A much larger water ACREAGE was found to suit DB's.They happened to fall in the 10-20 acre catogory.A water surrounded by FARMLAND with a small vegetation percentage proved to be more succesful. The AVERAGE DEPTH coincided with that of what was mention earlier in this text regarding DB's i.e. 0-5 ft. ACCESS was somewhat similar to that of the worm,whereas in this case a access of 25-1000 yards made fishing for eels more rewarding,probably with that distance,it elimanated most of the bootlaces. This time two catogories came to hand regarding the shape of the bottom.Both FLAT & IRREGULAR showed again a very close relationship regarding both rod hours and Median, Upper and Lower quartile weights.That is,using DB's on a flat bottom it took 60¼ rod hours to produce a eel,whereas it took 66 rod hours to produce a eel on the irregular bottom.As far as 2 lb plus eels are concerned it took 195¼ rod hours on Flat bottom compared to 186¼ rod hours on a irregular bottom.The weights varied very slightly,as you can see on Analysis of Water Details Vs Baits table 6. Unlike fishing with worm,the analysis showed that when fishing by yourself;You would more than likely to catch more 2 lb plus eels. The analysis showed that it only took 57 rod hours to produce such a eel.Compare that to the other variables ,where while fishing with a group of 1-5,it took 607½ rod hours to produce a 2 lb+eel,and it took 564 rod hours when fishing with more than 5 others.

In the event that under these circumstances you did catch a eel,it would more than likely to be a DARK BROWN one,with a BROAD head.More than likely it will also be a long eel.To me this would indicate that the poor ol eel was starved,and in this circumstance more than likely would devour the bait.Finally as the analysis showed the eel would be RETURNED as you probably took pity on the poor thing.

Analysis of 1980, as regarding OTHER baits.

As mentioned in the introduction, the data supplied for this analysis, was insufficient to give a detailed account in which the perfect conditions could be obtained to indicate the capture of eels over 2 lbs.

However, with the information that was at hand, I have been able to draw up a suitable classification where OTHER baits did produce eels.

The analysis indicated that unlike the Worm or DB's, fishing with a other bait; It was far more advantageous to fish on the SOUTH bank, not more than 15 yards out in a depth of 6-20ft. Where there's plenty of snags, but no WEED; With a ROCK/BOULDER bottom. This automatically suggests BALA.

Fish in a very clear swim, with NO SURFACE DISTURBANCE. Regarding Tackle, the analysis showed that by using a MEDIUM size HOOK, size 10-4 coupled with a NYLON COATED MULTI STRAND WIRE TRACE or NO TRACE AT ALL. If using a trace it was recommended that the breaking strain should be that of 6-15 lbs. Ditto for the reels line. The length of the trace (if using one) should be at least 13" long. Again no weights should be used. As with the Worms and DB's the BOBBIN also suited the OTHER baits.

Fishing on the bottom, with plenty of groundbaiting also helped in the capture of a eel over 2 lbs. PREBAITING also helped. It also showed that fishing throughout the NIGHT improved your chances. I.E. It took 34½ rod hours during the night to catch a 2 lb plus eel, compared to no eels being caught at all during the day in excess of 2 lbs. The rod hours required to produce an eel in the 3 lb plus bracket, followed suit with 86¼ RH/3 lb plus eel. Compared to no 3 lb + eels caught during the day.

The AIR & WATER TEMPERATURES both fell to the same catogory being that of COLD i.e. below 50°F. Which indicates that either fishing during the start of the season (April time) or early morning. Counteracting the depth, as shown above, the water analysis gave the other baits as being better used in Very deep water. I.E. 20ft plus. Again this only goes to show that not enough data was at hand to fully analyse other baits more carefully.

The BAROMETRIC PRESSURE analysis was a complete failure as insufficient data was not available.

The Wind in favour of producing 2 lb + eels, indicated that it should be blowing in a FRESH manner, preferably blowing from a NORTHERLY direction.

A sky with NO CLOUDS was best suited, However the analysis showed that a CONTINUOUS downpour virtually doubled your chances of catching a 2 lb + eel. Looking at the analysis again, I found I made a mistake regarding this particular interpretation. The cloud cover also indicated that a LARGE cloud cover, also produce more 2 lb plus eels, but with almost double the rod hours. Mind you, the rod hours needed to produce 2lb + eels, during a NIL cloud cover was 29, compared to 44½ rod hours during a Large cloud cover. However the Median, upper and lower quartiles on the large cloud cover section, was more significant than those of the NIL cover.

Fish a water with a acerage of more than 50 acres, in a Industrial or Moorland estate. A bank vegetation of only 25% covering the venue, makes an ideal location. Again to the lack of data, the analysis went haywire again and suggested that fishing in a average depth of 20ft + made it ideal for catching 2 lb + eels. Whereas earlier on, it was stated that fishing in a depth of 6-20ft was more suitable.

SOURCE OF ACCESS, indicating that a direct access produce more efficiently than any other. Were it took only 38 rod hours to produce 2 lb + eels, and 17¼ rod hours to produce an eel. The weights of these eels in their respective order, i.e. Med, U & LQ can be seen on table 11.5 . The shape of the bottom suggested that for 1980, the VERY IRREGULAR bottoms produced both eels and 2 lb + eels far more frequently, than in either the flat or Irregular bottoms. The rod hours required to produce a eel in the V. Irregular waters was 8 hours (nearest hour), were it took 12 hours to produce an eel of 2 lb plus. Again the Medium weight showed that you were more likely to catch an eel over 2 lbs. The only confusion that arises here, is that the Irregular shaped bottom produced more eels, but with slightly more rod hours compared to that of the V. Irregular bottom. But the Median, U & lower quartile weights were slightly less, thus indicating that to have a better eel for the less rod hours, it was more significant to fish the V. Irregular bottoms.

The analysis also showed that while fishing on a water, being fished with not more than 5 others, your chances also increased.

In the event that you do catch a eel, the analysis predicts, that the eel caught will be colored either LIGHT BROWN or B/S, GREEN, OLIVE or GREY. Again its head is more than likely to be BROAD, and it will probably be in a normal condition. And like the rest, it will be more than likely returned.

Table 10. Analysis of Weather Details Vs Bait. 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
1. AIR TEMPERATURE.										
WORM	C = Below 50F	7	1	416½	59½	416½	0:12	1:07	0:07	1:00
	W = 51-60F	61	18	2066	33¾	114¾	1:02	2:01	0:07	1:10
	H = Above 60F	45	16	1578¼	35	98½	1:01	2:14	0:12	2:02
DEAD BAIT	C	1	1	301¾	301¾	301¾	-	-	-	-
	W	42	14	2345½	55¾	167½	1:08	2:02	1:00	1:02
	H	17	7	927½	54½	132½	1:09	2:12	1:07	1:05
OTHER	C	1	1	21	21	21	-	-	-	-
	W	9	4	221¾	24½	55½	1:14	2:10	0:15	1:11
	H	3	-	35	11½	-	0:04	0:05	0:04	0:01
2. Water Temperature										
WORM	C	9	3	217	24	72⅓	1:00	2:00	0:08	1:08
	W	58	22	1892½	32½	86	1:05	2:06	0:09	1:13
	H	32	4	1228¼	38⅓	307	0:12	1:02	0:08	0:10
DEAD BAIT	C	9	3	547	60¾	182⅓	1:07	2:03	0:14	1:05
	W	25	8	2191¼	87½	274	1:05	2:03	1:00	1:03
	H	23	9	819¼	35½	91	1:11	2:07	1:07	1:00
OTHER	C	3	1	14½	4¾	14½	0:04	1:05	0:04	1:01
	W	7	3	110¼	15¾	36¾	1:14	2:08	1:03	1:05
	H	2	-	142½	71¼	-	0:08	-	-	-
3. Barometric Pressure.										
WORM	HIGH	27	4	831	30¾	207¾	0:12	1:00	0:08	0:08
	MEDIUM	11	2	599½	54½	299¾	0:12	1:00½	0:04	0:12½
	LOW	23	15	937¼	40¾	62½	2:08	3:04	1:08	1:12
DEAD BAIT	H	12	4	607	50½	151¾	1:07	2:00	1:07	0:09
	M	26	6	1380¼	53	230	1:04	1:10	0:14	0:12
	L	6	3	283	47	94⅓	1:15	2:01	1:12	0:05
OTHER	H	2	-	12	6	-	0:04	-	-	-
	M	2	-	68	34	-	0:09	-	-	-
	L	1	-	106	106	-	-	-	-	-

Table 10. Continued; Analysis of Weather Details Vs Bait. 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
4.	Rise/Fall									
WORM	Rise	2	2	83¾	41¾	41¾	2:12	-	-	-
	Fall	4	1	266¾	66¾	266¾	0:13	1:00	0:10	0:06
	Steady	55	18	1985¾	36	110⅓	1:00	2:08	0:10	1:14
DEAD BAIT	R	6	1	411½	68½	411½	1:01	1:08	0:14	0:10
	F	2	1	183½	91¾	183½	2:02	-	-	-
	S	32	8	1621¾	50½	202¾	1:07	1:14	1:00	0:14
OTHER	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	F	-	-	20½	-	-	-	-	-	-
	S	5	-	154	30¾	-	0:06	0:08	0:04	0:04
5.	Wind.									
WORM	Nil	48	9	1430¼	29¾	159	1:00	1:10	0:09	1:01
	Fresh	43	10	1812¾	42	181¼	0:12	1:12	0:08	1:04
	Strong	21	16	638¼	30⅓	39¾	3:00	3:06	2:02	1:04
DEAD BAIT	N	35	15	1348½	38½	90	1:09	2:03	1:00	1:03
	F	26	6	2266¾	87	377¾	1:07	1:14	1:02	0:12
	S	4	2	529¾	132¼	264¾	2:09	3:04	1:15	1:05
OTHER	N	9	3	192½	21⅓	64	1:07	2:10	0:06	0:04
	F	4	2	102¼	25½	51	1:05	2:00	0:10	1:06
	S	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.	Direction.									
WORM	North	22	5	534¾	24⅓	107	0:12	1:09	0:09	1:00
	South	14	5	784¾	56	157	1:10	2:07	1:00	1:07
	East	6	2	325	54	162½	1:09	2:03	0:13	1:06
	West	19	14	763	40	54½	3:00	3:09	1:12	1:13
DEAD BAIT	N	8	-	728¾	91	-	1:03	1:07	0:14	0:09
	S	12	3	1194¼	99½	398	1:10	1:15	1:07	0:08
	E	7	2	433	61¾	216½	1:06	1:14	0:09	1:05
	W	3	3	421½	140½	140½	2:12	-	-	-

Table 10. Continued; Analysis of Weather Details Vs Bait. 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
6. Direction cont.										
OTHER	N	1	1	32¾	32¾	32¾	-	-	-	-
	S	2	1	44½	22¼	44½	1:07	-	-	-
	E	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W	1	-	25	25	-	-	-	-	-
7. Cloud.										
WORM	Nil	24	7	865¼	36	123½	1:08	2:00	0:13	1:03
	Small (0-50%)	17	4	1012	59½	253	1:00	1:15	0:06	1:09
	Large (50%+)	71	24	1978¾	27¾	82½	1:01	2:05	0:09	1:12
DEAD BAIT	N	26	8	1144¼	44	143	1:08	2:00	1:02	0:14
	S	12	4	945½	78¾	236½	1:06	2:10	0:14	1:12
	L	27	11	2092¼	77½	190¼	1:10	2:10	1:04	1:06
OTHER	N	3	1	29	9½	29	0:04	1:07	0:04	1:03
	S	1	-	93	93	-	-	-	-	-
	L	9	4	178¾	20	44½	1:14	2:06	0:15	1:07
8. Rain										
WORM	Nil	63	21	2340	37	111½	1:00	2:08	0:09	1:15
	Showers	31	9	1154	37¼	128¼	1:05	2:02	0:12	1:06
	Contin.	1	-	260½	260½	-	-	-	-	-
DEAD BAIT	N	32	10	2758½	86¼	275¾	1:08	2:03	1:00	1:03
	S	24	8	1063¾	44⅓	133	1:09	2:01	1:05	0:12
	C	2	1	196¼	98	196¼	2:07	-	-	-
OTHER	N	6	2	163¾	27¼	81¾	1:00	1:12	0:06	1:06
	S	3	1	70	23⅓	70	0:10	1:08	0:08	1:00
	C	4	2	53	13¼	26½	2:07	3:00	1:14	1:02

Table 11. Analysis of Water Details Vs Bait. 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
1.	Size of Water.									
WORM	0-1 acres	3	-	47	15½	-	0:12	0:12	0:08	0:04
	1-5 "	7	1	341¾	49	341¾	1:00	1:04	0:08	0:12
	5-10 "	19	4	250¾	13	62½	1:05	1:12	0:14	0:14
	10-20 "	7	1	332¾	47½	332¾	1:00	1:11	0:06	1:05
	20-50 "	34	19	1520½	44¾	80	2:05	3:04	0:12	2:08
	50 plus	19	5	1203¾	63¼	240¾	1:04	2:00	0:08	1:08
DEAD BAIT	0-1	6	-	60½	10	-	1:00	1:00	0:12	0:04
	1-5	7	3	534½	76½	178	1:08	2:06	1:06	1:00
	5-10	3	1	415½	138½	415½	1:15	2:09	1:14	0:11
	10-20	8	4	520	65	130	1:14	3:02	1:08	1:10
	20-50	12	3	1089¾	90¾	363¼	1:06	1:10	0:14	0:12
	50 plus	14	7	1375¼	98¼	196½	1:14	2:02	1:08	0:10
OTHER	0-1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1-5	2	-	21¾	10¾	-	0:04	-	-	-
	5-10	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
	10-20	5	2	69½	14	34¾	1:14	3:00	0:15	2:01
	20-50	-	-	78	-	-	-	-	-	-
	50 plus	4	2	68	17	34	1:11	2:00	1:07	0:09
2.	Water surrounds.									
WORM	Woodland	47	24	2314¼	49¼	96½	2:00	3:03	0:14	2:05
	Farmland	59	8	1448¼	24½	181	0:12	1:08	0:08	1:00
	Moorland	3	2	36¾	12¼	18½	2:00	2:03	1:07	0:12
	Industrial	-	-	44½	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Resident	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other	2	1	145	72½	145	2:02	-	-	-
DEAD BAIT	Woodland	15	5	1730½	115⅓	346	1:05	2:03	1:02	1:01
	Farmland	43	14	2010¼	46¾	143½	1:10	2:03	1:00	1:03
	Moorland	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Industrial	7	1	406½	58	406½	1:05	1:09	0:12	0:13
	Resident	3	1	276	92	276	1:12	2:00	1:09	0:07
	Other	9	3	465¾	51¾	155¼	1:08	2:04	0:14	1:06

Table 11. Continued; Analysis of Water Details Vs Bait. 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
2.Cont.										
	Water surrounds.									
OTHER	Woodland	7	1	139¼	20	139¼	0:08	1:00	0:06	0:10
	Farmland	1	1	125	125	125	-	-	-	-
	Moorland	4	2	30	7½	15	2:07	3:00	1:14	1:02
	Industrial	1	1	10	10	10	-	-	-	-
	Resident	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.	% Bank Vegetation.									
WORM	0-24%	55	7	865¼	15¾	123½	1:00	1:08	0:10	0:14
	25-75%	25	10	1443¾	96¼	288¾	1:00	2:09	0:06	2:03
	75-100%	33	17	1679¾	51	98¾	2:02	3:02	0:10	2:08
DEAD BAIT	0-24%	46	17	1784¾	38¾	105	1:09	2:04	1:02	1:02
	25-75%	15	5	1546½	103	309⅓	1:08	2:06	1:04	1:02
	75-100%	7	1	1181¼	168¾	1181¼	1:07	1:13	0:15	0:14
OTHER	0-24%	2	2	52	26	26	2:08	-	-	-
	25-75%	9	3	132½	14¾	44	1:07	2:00	0:08	1:08
	75-100%	2	-	116¼	58	-	0:08	-	-	-
4.	Average depth.									
WORM	0-5ft	18	4	449¼	25	112⅓	1:02	1:09	0:10	0:15
	5-20ft	83	30	3046¼	36¾	101½	1:01	2:06	0:10	1:12
	20 plus	10	1	493¼	49⅓	493¼	0:13	1:04	0:06	0:14
DEAD BAIT	0-5ft	18	6	489½	27	81½	1:09	2:00	1:00	1:00
	5-20ft	35	13	3095	88½	238	1:10	2:12	1:02	1:10
	20 plus	14	4	903	64½	225¾	1:07	1:15	1:04	0:11
OTHER	0-5ft	1	1	55¾	55¾	55¾	-	-	-	-
	5-20ft	4	1	152½	38	152½	0:09	0:10	0:08	0:02
	20 plus	8	3	92½	11½	30¾	1:10	2:00	0:15	1:01

Table 11. Continued; Analysis of Water Details Vs Baits.1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
5. Source of Access.										
WORM	Direct	62	9	1875½	30¼	208⅓	0:12	1:04	0:08	0:12
	0-25yds	9	2	194½	21½	97¼	1:01	1:12	0:12	1:00
	25-1000yds	18	8	704¾	39	88	1:10	2:08	1:02	1:06
	1000yds plus	24	16	1251	52	78	2:11	3:03	1:06	1:13
DEAD BAIT	Direct	35	9	1818	52	202	1:07	1:15	1:00	0:07
	0-25yds	9	3	511½	56¾	170½	1:09	2:04	1:04	1:00
	25-1000yds	17	9	1053¼	62	117	2:03	3:00	1:07	1:09
	1000yds plus	7	2	1149¾	164¼	574¾	1:14	2:01	1:10	0:07
OTHER	Direct	11	5	190	17¼	38	1:14	2:08	0:12	1:12
	0-25yds	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	25-1000yds	2	-	20¾	10⅓	-	0:04	-	-	-
	1000yds plus	-	-	90	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Shape of Bottom.										
WORM	Flat	36	8	984¾	27⅓	123	0:12	1:04	0:08	0:12
	Irregular	70	27	2539½	36¼	94	1:09	2:07	0:12	1:11
	V.Irregular	6	-	464½	77½	-	0:08	0:12	0:04	0:08
DEAD BAIT	Flat	13	4	783	60¼	195¾	1:08	2:10	1:07	1:03
	Irregular	51	18	3361	66	186¾	1:08	2:03	1:00	1:03
	V.Irregular	4	1	368½	92	368½	1:09	1:12	1:07	0:05
OTHER	Flat	2	-	85½	42¾	-	0:08	-	-	-
	Irregular	8	3	191¾	24	64	1:06	2:06	0:08	1:14
	V.Irregular	3	2	23½	7¾	11¾	2:00	2:05	1:11	0:10

Table 11. Continued; Analysis of Water Details Vs Baits 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
7. No.Fishing water.										
WORM	Nil	34	10	1631	48	163	1:04	2:00	0:12	1:04
	1-5	49	21	1609½	32¾	76½	1:11	2:14	0:12	2:02
	5+	29	3	783¼	27	261	0:10	0:12	0:04	0:08
DEAD BAIT	Nil	29	17	971¼	33½	57	2:01	2:10	1:09	1:01
	1-5	29	4	2430	83¾	607½	1:04	1:08	1:00	0:08
	5+	10	2	1128¼	112¾	564	1:09	1:15	1:02	0:13
OTHER	Nil	6	2	126¾	21	63⅓	1:06	2:07	0:09	1:14
	1-5	4	3	119	29¾	39½	2:03	2:06	2:00	0:06
	5+	3	-	55	18⅓	-	0:08	0:09	0:07	0:02

Table 12. Analysis of Eel Details Vs Bait 1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
1. Eel Colour										
WORM	Dark Brown	36	16	756	21	47¼	1:10	2:08	0:12	1:12
	Light Brown	41	9	525¼	12¾	58⅓	0:12	1:14	0:08	1:06
	Other	36	10	454¾	12½	45½	1:02	2:03	0:09	1:10
DEAD BAIT	DB	25	9	609¼	24⅓	67¾	1:09	2:01	1:00	1:01
	LB	26	6	698½	26¾	116½	1:07	1:11	1:01	0:10
	O	17	8	381¼	22½	47½	1:14	2:04	1:09	0:11
OTHER	DB	2	-	30½	15¼	-	0:14	-	-	-
	LB	6	2	48½	8	24¼	0:09	1:05	0:06	0:15
	O	5	3	60	12	20	2:06	3:00	1:14	1:02
2. Shape of Head.										
WORM	Broad	25	13	281¾	11¼	21½	2:00	2:09	1:04	1:05
	Pointed	87	22	1454¼	16¾	66	1:00	2:02	0:08	1:10
DEAD BAIT	Broad	31	13	624¼	20	48	1:11	2:10	1:04	1:06
	Pointed	37	10	1014¼	27½	101½	1:07	2:00	1:00	1:00
OTHER	Broad	4	2	52	13	26	1:11	2:00	1:07	0:09
	Pointed	9	3	87	9½	29	0:15	2:10	0:06	2:04

Table 12. Continued; Analysis of Eel Details Vs Baits.1980.

Bait	Feature	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
3. Condition										
WORM	Small	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Normal	108	35	1557¼	14½	44½	1:02	2:05	0:10	1:11
	Long	4	-	49	12¼	-	0:12	1:00	0:08	0:08
DEAD BAIT	Small	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Normal	61	21	1531¾	25	73	1:08	2:03	1:02	1:01
	Long	5	2	87¾	17½	43¾	1:14	3:00	1:10	1:06
OTHER	Small	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Normal	12	5	114	9½	22¾	1:10	2:06	0:08	1:14
	Long	1	-	25	25	-	-	-	-	-
4. Fate.										
WORM	Returned	99	35	1418¾	14⅓	40½	1:04	2:06	0:10	1:12
	Killed	9	-	144	16	-	0:04	1:00	B	?
	Died	3	-	41½	14	-	1:00	1:00	0:14	0:02
DEAD BAIT	Returned	67	22	1433¼	21⅓	65	1:08	2:03	1:01	1:02
	Killed	1	1	164¾	164¾	164¾	(3:00	!!!?)	-	-
	Died	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER	Returned	12	5	135	11¼	27	1:10	2:06	0:10	1:12
	Killed	1	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
	Died	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

!!!? Tony Hollerbach, WHY DO YOU HAVE TO GO AND KILL A GOOD EEL LIKE THAT. ??????????

Table 13; Analysis of Individual Fisheries Results 1980.

Type	Water	County	S	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
CANAL	Grand Union	North'ton	4	4	3	61	15¼	20⅓	61	2:05	2:09	2:00	0:09
	Llangollen	Cheshire	1	-	-	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Shropshire Un.	Shropshire	15	19	6	455	24	75¾	-	1:09	2:00	1:04	0:12
	Staff/Worcs	Warks	1	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLAY PITS	Bra Lake	Cambs	6	6	1	205½	34¼	205½	-	1:08	1:10	1:06	0:04
	Bundies 1	"	6	10	3	259½	26	86½	259½	1:06	1:14	0:11	1:03
	Butlers	"	31	16	1	930¾	58	930¾	-	0:14	1:06	0:12	0:10
Estate Waters	Luckystone 1	Midlands	15	5	5	300½	60	60	75	4:00	4:01	3:06	0:11
GRAVEL PITS.													
	Ashledon Pit	Essex	5	4	-	204	51	-	-	0:10	1:00	0:04	0:12
	Belmore	Notts	2	1	-	25	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Boreham	Essex	6	-	-	197	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Castle Waters	Sussex	2	-	-	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Doggets	Essex	8	2	1	241½	120¾	241½	241½	2:09	-	-	-
	Grebe Lake	Bucks	2	-	-	42¾	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Heron Lake	"	14	5	2	529¾	106	265	529¾	1:15	2:04	1:11	0:09
	Otter Lake	"	2	-	-	66¼	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Snipe Lake	"	1	-	-	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Gunwade Lake	Cambs	6	15	1	109	7¼	109	-	0:12	1:02	0:09	0:09
	Long Lake	Sussex	1	-	-	12½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Maxey Pit	Cambs	2	-	-	73½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 13; cont. Analysis of Individual Fisheries Results 1980.

Type	Water	County	S	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
GRAVEL PITS													
	Overton Lake	Cambs	2	4	-	9½	2½	-	-	0:12	1:00	0:08	0:08
	Stanstead Abbott	Essex	6	1	1	123	123	123	123	-	-	-	-
	Stanford Le Hope	"	2	4	4	42	10½	10½	21	3:01	3:06	2:12	0:10
	Trees 2	Cambs	1	-	-	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Westwood Park	Worcs	2	1	-	75	75	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Whittles	Essex	6	1	1	133	133	133	-	-	-	-	-
	Whyke Lake	Sussex	2	2	2	46	23	23	46	3:02	-	-	-
LAKES	Bala Lake	Gwynedd	32	14	1	1038¼	74	1038¼	-	0:04	1:01	BL	-
	Birth Mere	Shropshire	7	7	-	286	40¾	-	-	0:08	1:04	0:05	0:15
	Blake Mere	"	3	-	-	128	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Chapel Mere	Cheshire	1	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	The Creek	Essex	4	16	4	127½	8	32	-	1:05	2:03	1:00	1:03
	Crosemere	Shropshire	4	2	-	216	108	-	-	0:12	-	-	-
	Gosfield	Essex	2	1	-	38	38	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hawk Lake	Shropshire	3	1	1	140	140	140	140	-	-	-	-
	Lake Meadows	Essex	6	-	-	144½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Marbury Mere	Cheshire	6	1	-	308	308	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Rudyard Lake	Staffs	1	-	-	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Whitemere	Shropshire	17	18	16	1477	82	92⅓	134¼	3:02	3:08	2:07	1:01
PONDS	Drax Bridle	Yorks	2	-	-	20¼	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Leigh Park	Hants	1	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Lurgasmall Mill	Sussex	1	3	-	32	32	-	-	BL	-	-	-

Table 13 cont; Analysis of Individual Fisheries 1980.

Type	Water	County	S	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
RESERVOIRS	Abberton	Essex	1	1	1	10	10	10	-	-	-	-	-
	Gnat Bite	"	1	1	-	40½	40½	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hurleston	Cheshire	1	1	-	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERS	Avon	Hants	1	1	1	6½	6½	6½	-	-	-	-	-
	Bedford Marina	Beds	11	11	8	149½	13½	18½	37½	2:06	3:00	1:15	1:01
	Crouch	Essex	1	-	-	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	The Ditch	" "	3	3	-	46	15⅓	-	-	0:04	-	-	-
	Grt Ouse	Bucks	1	-	-	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Lea	Herts	1	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Nene	Cambs	4	12	-	86	7	-	-	0:11	1:00	0:06	0:10
TIDAL	Clements Green Creek	Essex	3	1	-	50	50	-	-	-	-	-	-
QUARRY	Rowton Quarry	Cheshire	1	-	-	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 14: Analysis of Individual Fisheries /Worm Baits 1980.

Type	Water	County	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
CANAL	G.U.	Northampton	4	3	43½	10¾	14½	43½	2:04	2:09	1:15	0:10
	Llangollen	Cheshire	-	-	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Shropshire Union	Shropshire	7	-	218	31	-	-	1:04	1:06	0:13	0:09
	Staffs/Worcs	Warks	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLAY PITS	Bundies 1.	Cambs	1	-	20	20	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Butlers	"	3	-	91	30⅓	-	-	0:04	0:06	0:04	0:02
ESTATE WATERS	Luckystone 1.	Midlands	4	4	230	57½	57½	76½	3:11	4:00	3:06	0:10
GRAVEL PITS												
	Asheldon Pit	Essex	2	-	45	22½	-	-	BL	-	-	-
	Belmore	Notts	1	-	12½	12½	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Boreham Pits	Essex	-	-	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Grebe Lake	Bucks	-	-	19¾	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Gunwade Lake	Cambs	12	1	88½	7⅓	88½	-	0:10	0:14	0:08	0:06
	Heron Lake	Bucks	-	-	117½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Long Lake	Sussex	-	-	12½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Maxey Pit	Cambs	-	-	73½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Otter Lake	Bucks	-	-	11¼	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Overton Lake	Cambs	4	-	9½	2½	-	-	0:12	1:00	0:08	0:08
	Snipe Lake	Bucks	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Trees 2	Cambs	-	-	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Westwood Park	Worcs	1	-	66	66	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Whittles	Essex	1	1	121¾	121¾	121¾	-	-	-	-	-

Table 14 cont. Analysis of Individual Fisheries /Worm Baits 1980.

Type	Water	County	E	2+e	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
GRAVEL PITS	Whyke Lake	Sussex	1	1	23	23	23	23	-	-	-	-
LAKES	Bala Lake	Gwynedd	9	-	361¾	40	-	-	BL	0:09	BL	-
	Birth Mere	Shropshire	6	-	170	28⅓	-	-	0:12	1:04	0:06	0:14
	Blake Mere	"	-	-	94	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Chapel Mere	Cheshire	-	-	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	The Creek	Essex	16	4	127½	8	32	-	1:05	2:03	1:00	1:03
	Crosemere	Shropshire	2	-	216	108	-	-	0:12	-	-	-
	Gosfield	Essex	1	-	38	38	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hawk Lake	Shropshire	1	1	140	140	140	140	-	-	-	-
	Lake Meadows	Essex	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Marbury Mere	Cheshire	1	-	278	278	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Whitemere	Shropshire	18	16	956	53	59¾	87	3:02	3:08	2:07	1:01
PONDS	Lurgasmall Mill	Sussex	2	-	4	2	-	-	BL	-	-	-
RESERVOIRS	Gnat Bite	Essex	1	-	31½	31½	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hurleston	Cheshire	1	-	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERS	Bedford Marina	Beds	5	4	80¾	16	20	80¾	2:00	2:06½	2:00	0:06½
	Crouch	Essex	-	-	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	The Ditch	"	3	-	27	9	-	-	0:04	-	-	-
	Gt.Ouse	Bucks	-	-	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	R.Nene	Cambs	5	-	31	6	-	-	0:10	0:12	0:04	0:08
TIDAL	Clements Green Creek	Essex	1	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
QUARRY	Rowton	Cheshire	-	-	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 15; Analysis of Individual Fisheries /Deadbait 1980.

Type/Water	County	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
CANAL G.U.	Northampton	-	-	17½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shropshire Union	Shropshire	12	6	216	18	36	-	1:15	2:01	1:11	0:06
Staffs/Worcs	Warks	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLAY PITS											
Bra Lake	Cambs	6	1	205½	34¼	205½	-	1:08	1:10	1:06	0:04
Bundies 1	"	7	3	238	34	79⅓	238	1:08	2:06	1:06	1:00
Butlers	"	13	1	839¾	64½	839¾	-	1:02	1:06	0:14	0:08
ESTATE WATERS											
Luckystone 1.	Midlands	1	1	70½	70½	70½	70½	-	-	-	-
GRAVEL PITS											
Asheldon Pit	Essex	2	-	159	79½	-	-	1:07	-	-	-
Belmore	Notts	-	-	12½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Boreham Pits	Essex	-	-	123	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Castle Waters	Sussex	-	-	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Doggets	Essex	2	1	241½	120¾	241½	241½	2:09	-	-	-
Grebe Lake	Bucks	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gunwade Lake	Cambs	3	-	20½	7	-	-	1:07	1:07	1:05	0:02
Heron Lake	Bucks	5	2	412¼	82½	206	412¼	1:15	2:04	1:11	0:09
Otter Lake	"	-	-	55	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Snipe Lake	"	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stanstead Abbott	Essex	1	1	111½	111½	111½	111½	-	-	-	-
Stanford Le Hope	"	4	4	42	10½	10½	21	3:01	3:06	2:12	0:10
Westwood Park	Worcs	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whyke Lake	Sussex	1	1	23	23	23	-	-	-	-	-

Table 15 continued; Analysis of Individual Fisheries / Deadbaits 1980.

Type/Water	County	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
LAKES											
Bala Lake	Gwynedd	2	-	645½	322¾	-	-	0:10	-	-	-
Birth Mere	Shropshire	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Blake Mere	"	-	-	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lake Meadows	Essex	-	-	134½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rudyard Lake	Staffs	-	-	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whitemere	Shropshire	-	-	464	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PONDS											
Drax Bridle	Yorks	-	-	20¼	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Leigh Park Gardens	Hants	-	-	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lurgasmall Mill	Sussex	1	-	14	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
RESERVOIRS											
Abberton	Essex	1	1	10	10	10	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERS											
Bedford Marina	Beds	1	1	28¾	28¾	28¾	28¾	-	-	-	-
The Ditch	Essex	-	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gt.Ouse	Bucks	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lea	Herts	-	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
R.Nene	Cambs	6	-	20	3⅓	-	-	1:00	1:00	0:12	0:04
TIDAL											
Clements Green Creek	Essex	-	-	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 16 ; Analysis of Individual Fisheries /Other Baits 1980.

Type/Water	County	E	2+E	RH	RH/E	RH2	RH3	MEDIAN	UQ	LQ	IQR
CANAL											
Llangollen	Cheshire	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shropshire Union	Shropshire	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CLAY PITS											
Bundies 1	Cambs	2	-	1½	¾	-	-	0:04	-	-	-
GRAVEL PITS											
Stanstead Long Pond	Essex	-	-	11½	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whittles	"	-	-	11¼	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAKES											
Bala	Gwynedd	3	1	28	9⅓	28	-	1:07	1:11	0:15	0:12
Birth Mere	Shropshire	1	-	16	16	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chapel Mere	Cheshire	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marbury Mere	"	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Whitemere	Shropshire	-	-	54	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PONDS											
Lurgasmall Mill	Sussex	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RESERVOIRS											
Gnat Bite	Essex	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERS											
Avon	Hants	1	1	6½	6½	6½	-	-	-	-	-
Bedford Marina	Beds	5	3	40	8	13⅓	20	2:06	3:00	1:14	1:02
R.Nene	Cambs	1	-	35	35	-	-	-	-	-	-
TIDAL											
Clements Green Creek	Essex	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CHAIRMAN'S PAGE

As I write this page, I've started my account at Bra Lake with eels of 2:4 and 1:1 from swim 1. I've been getting runs at all depths usually between 2100 to 0200. The water temperature in the shallows is about 51 and in the de ps 48°F.

I thought the conference went very well with Dave Holman's paper one of the best presented and in content. Well done Dave. The forum on the Saturday night was very well attended and proved most interesting. I am positive lots of useful contacts and friends were made. It was also nice to have a friendly chat to John Watson again.

Last Sunday (12th April) I attended the NASG AGM, Andy also was there. Among the items discussed was the setting up of a new freshwater fish record fish committee and a sub committee has been set up to look at terms of reference. Andy is on this. I will also be presenting the NASG viewpoint at the NAC AGM in London onMay 16th as the NASG has put forward a proposal to scrap the BRCFC.

Also at the NASG AGM I had a good chat to Barry Rickards who attended that meeting of the professional eel netsmen as I reported at our SGM. He said that they could clear a 25acre lake of eels in just two weeks or in a similar period, a 10 mile length of fen drain such as the 20 or 16 foot drains. I feel our next step in the anti-eel netting campaign is to try to obtain a close season plus limited areas that the netsmen can operate in. As yet we are still awaiting the AWA proposals but it looks like the netsmen will have to pay £12 per net instead of the £2 originally proposed by the AWA.

Incidently one netsman reported by Hugh Reynolds for poaching has had thousands of pounds worth of tackle confiscated plus a large fine.

As a point of interest on a different topic, the 2lb eel in my pond has suddenly changed its habits. After living on the bottom (3 feet deep) for the past year, it has now decided it likes to lie only half in the water. It lies amongs the roots of the reeds half out of the water. I've tried to persuade it not to by pushing it into the deeps but next day it is back again. It is in the shade, but perhaps the top layer of water is warmer also the bottom of the pond could contain dead decaying leaves etc., and is making it unpleasant.

The rest of the fish however, goldfish, chub, roach and rudd, are all quite content to live near the bottom.

Well that's all for now. I look forward to hearing of all the big eels you are going to catch this year.

Tight lines

Brian Crawford