

**Industry Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
November 13, 2007  
Division of Fish and Wildlife  
Jamestown, RI**

There were 16 people present (\* IAC member)

Ken Ketcham, Chair	Todd Sutton
Jim Lowe*	Kevin Duckworth
Lanny Dellinger*	Todd Sutton
Rick Bellavance*	Brian Murphy, RIDFW
Stephen Parente	
Ian Parente	
Bob Buscher	
Dean Pesante	
Bill Mackintosh	
Brent Bowen	

*Gillnet Proposals*

B. Buscher reviewed a proposal submitted by Ted Platz. He stated that the proposal was designed to place some control on the gillnet fishery. Some of the features in the proposal include a control date to eliminate latent effort, tags for gillnets, a 50 net limit, and a 300 foot length limit. Another feature of the proposal is a limit of 12 tied down nets having a mesh size less than 10" in the water at a time per 100 pounds of fluke possession limit. So if the possession limit is 200 pounds a license holder could set up to 24 tied down nets with mesh less than 10". A tied down net was described as a net that is fished on the bottom with the float line tied down so that it is only 2 to 3 feet off the bottom. There was also discussion on the proposal to raise the license fee to \$300 per year. Many thought that raising the fee would be unnecessary. The argument in support of raising the fee was to discourage latency. Someone suggested as an alternative to charge money for each tag if a tag program is adopted. K. Ketcham stated that the State would probably not adopt another tag program. There was discussion on a tag program and how it would be organized. There was one suggestion to require tags to be on nets while in water only not on boats because they would need ability to interchange tags between nets. There were no votes taken on the proposal, just a general discussion that would be forwarded to the Council.

The Committee next reviewed a proposal submitted by the RI Commercial Road and Reel Association. The proposal included tending requirements and specifications for net materials. Some commented that the tending requirements would increase the number of nets put in the water because it would force people to put more nets in to make up for lost soak time. Others stated that not being able to leave the nets in overnight would

eliminate the fishery because that is the time when fish are caught. The specification for bio-degradable material was included to purportedly reduce mortality associated with ghost nets. Responses were that ghost nets are not a problem because most people remove their gear from the water during storms which is when gear could become lost. One individual commented that the results of a study on the effects of ghost gillnets on fish mortality indicated that mortality is not that severe. There was also opposition to the proposed bio-degradable material because materials other than mono become fouled to quickly. There was also discussion on where the conflicts were occurring between gillnetters and other fishermen, which was identified as the area between Scarborough Beach and Point Judith. Many felt that the conflicts had been resolved partly due to a greater presence from enforcement. In support of the proposal it was stated that ghost nets are a problem and materials besides mono are used. It was also stated that restrictions similar to those in the proposal have been adopted in other states. It was stated that the proposal would be submitted to the Council.

A third proposal submitted by K. Duckworth was also reviewed. The proposal included an increase in soak time. It was suggested that an increase in soak time would decrease the number of nets in water, increase safety, and cut fuel expenses. The proposal also addressed ghost gillnets and pingers. It was stated that the proposal would be forwarded to the Council.