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#### Abstract

The paper describes the species composition of the Dol (Bag) net catches at Sassoon Dock, a major landing centre in Bombay, from January to December, 1971, grouping them into two main categories, those occurring throughout the year and the those having seasomal occurrence and then reclassifying them into market categories. The estimated dol net catches fluctuated between 275 and 1485 tonnes during the year. The monthly average catch was 829.5 tonnes which formed $41.6 \%$ of the total landings. A list of 33 species caught in Dol net and their percentage composition is given.


## INTRODUCTION

The Dol net is an important gear used in 20 Bombay-Gujarat coasts, mainly for catching Bombay duck, Marpodon neherens, third in importance in respect of marine fish landing in India and non-penaeid prawns like Acetes indicus, Palaemon tumuipes and Hippolysmata ensirostris. The Bombay duck forms $14.10 \%$ and $20.85 \%$ of the total catch of Maharashtra and Gujarat states respectively, while the nonpenaeid prawns form $58.35 \%$ and $4.50 \%$ of the total prawn catches of the above states respectively. (CM.F.R.I. Annual Report, 1976). The operation of the 'Dol' net has been described by Pillai (1948), Hornell (1950), Setna (1954) and Gokhale (1957).

Gokhale (1957) mentioned that $\boldsymbol{H}$. nehereus was taken along with Coilia dussumieri, species of Penaeus and Metapenaeus, immature Siromateus cinereus, Trichiurus savala and a few other less important species in Saurashtra waters. Chowdhury (1970) estimated the landings of
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Tig. 1. Map of Bombay harbour, Sassoon dock showing the nearshore Dol net fishing grounds.
fish at Sassoon Dock for a period of two months only. Apart from this there is no detailed published account of the 'Dol' net catches. The present paper deals with the catch composition of the fish caught by 'dol' nets operated between 15 to 20 km . from Bombay harbour and landed at Sassoon Dock from
the specics composition of the catch and their weight. The total catch and catch composition of species were estimated based on the average catch of unit. Stratified Random sampling method adopted by Fishery Resources Assessment Division of C.M.F.RI. was used for the estimation of the total landing as given below.

| Total landing for the observed units | X | Total No of units landed during the obscrvation period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of units observed |  |  |
| The estumate of catch for a day was obtained by adding the estimates for the forenoon ( 0.6 .00112 .00 hrs), afternoon ( $12.00-18.00 \mathrm{hrs}$ ) and night landings. The estimate for the month was obtained by the formula given below. |  |  |
| Total of the estimated landing for the number of observed days | x | No. of landing days in the month |

No. of observed days

January to December, 1971. These observations formed part of the work of the survey programme for resources assessment.
Sassoon Dock, situated in South Bombay, is one of the biggest fish landing centres (Fig. 1). Though the landing takes place round the clock, the activities have two peak periods, once in the morning between 0.6 .00 to 0.8 .00 hrs. and again in the afternoon from 13.00 to 15.00 hrs . Apart from Bombay based boats, from Karanja and Uran also land their catches at Sassoon Dock.

## Material and Methods

According to the survey programme, 10 to 12 observations of 6 hours duration each were made at Sassoon Dock every month. Data were collected from 12.00 to 18.00 hrs . on the first day and 0.6 .00 to 12.00 hrs . on the following day. The night landings were recorded after enquiry. Catches of each type of selected units were examined in detail to determine

## Gear and Craft

The Bag net locally known as 'Dol' is lowered and hauled depending upon the turn of the tides. A strong tidal current is very essential for the proper operation of the net. The mouth of the net is always in the direction of the tide and the bag net functions as a filter to retain the fish. The strong tidal current prevents the fish from escaping from the bag net (Bapat 1970).

Two types of boats are used at Sassoon Dock, mechanised and non-mechanised. The non-mechanised boats are further divided into canoes and said boats. The mechanised boats are of Machva type, Satpati type and Bassein type. They are propelled by diesel engines of 25 to 30 H.P. They save considerable time in going to the fishing grounds and back and can take advantage of 2-3 tides. In Sassoon Dock, $98 \%$ of the mechanised boats are used for 'Dol' net operation.

## OBSERVATIONS ON DOL NET FTSHERY

## Results

Catches from 997 boats were exammed for estimating the total catch, catch composition and weight of different species. Table 1 gives the number of observations per month, total number of dol nets observed with their percentage, the estimated total landings of dol net and the other types of units operated.
the catch shows a declining trend, the maximum being in July (Fig. 2). In July, the fishing operations were maximum ( $80.2 \%$ ) and the highest catch of 1485 tonnes were landed, with H. neherets contributing to $69.4 \%$ of the total catch.

The monthly landings of dol net in Sassoon Dock fluctuated between 275.347 tonnes (June) to 1485.006 tonnes (July) with an average

Tanle 1
Monthwise estimated doh (fad) ner carch of Sassoon Dock vor tue year 1971

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ycar } \\ & 1971 \end{aligned}$ | No. of days of observation (24.00 hrs) | Total number of Dol units during the period of observation | Total number of Dol units observed | Percentage <br> of Dol units observed | Monthly <br> Dol net catch | estimated <br> Percentage of the Dal units | total catch <br> Frawl <br> catch | Dol and Daltu or Gillnet catch | other units (in tonnes) Hook and Lines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 5 | 363 | 92 | 25.3 | 719.587 | 40.2 | 792.400 | 174.948 | 101. 368 |
| Tebruary | 4 | 189 | 53 | 28.0 | 343.686 | 26.7 | 671.988 | 202.293 | 68.915 |
| March | 5 | 341 | 116 | 34.0 | 632.620 | 38.8 | 867.538 | 95.038 | 34.148 |
| April | 4 | 271 | 78 | 28.8 | 495.145 | 32.2 | 879.669 | 100.012 | 60.862 |
| May | 4 | 274 | 58 | 21.1 | 1381.987 | 46.9 | 1447.808 | 101.212 | 17.077 |
| June | 5 | 295 | 55 | 18.7 | 275.347 | 53.6 | 189.888 | 30.359 | 17.669 |
| July | 6 | 1061 | 121 | 11.4 | 1485.006 | 81.3 | 311.316 | 16.686 | 14.136 |
| Areuthet | 6 | 1019 | 135 | 13.2 | 1281.349 | 69.4 | 451.153 | 89.571 | 23.503 |
| September | 6 | 604 | 75 | 12.4 | 1126.085 | 47.2 | 1185.665 | 64.110 | 8.955 |
| October | 6 | 422 | 72 | 17.1 | 855.498 | 25,6 | 2065.193 | 365.530 | 49.296 |
| November | 6 | 474 | 80 | 16.8 | 787.750 | 25.4 | 2076.260 | 174.010 | 59.520 |
| December | 6 | 269 | 62 | 23.0 | 569.994 | 32.8 | 1008.514 | 69.809 | 88.145 |
| Total |  |  | 997 |  | 9954.054 |  | 11947.392 | 1483.578 | 543.594 |

It is seen from the table No, I the estimated sotal catch for the year 1971 amounted to 23928.618 tonnes of which 9954.054 tonnes ( $41.6 \%$ ) were contributed by dol nets. 11947.392 tonnes ( $49.9 \%$ ) by trawl nets, 1483.578 tonnes ( $6.2 \%$ ) by Daldi or gill nets and 543.594 tomes ( $2.3 \%$ ) by hook and lines. A marked monthly fluctuation is seen during January-June and in August-December
of 829.5 tonnes (Fig. 2). During the monsoon months, Dol net catches showed an increase for the following reasons:

1 Number of 'Dol' units in operation during the monsoon months were considerably more as boats of nearby fishing villages also operated near Bombay harbour which is a prom tected area.
2. The landing of $\boldsymbol{H}$. nehereus was higher
in July. August and September (1031.8, 944.2 and 911.7 tonnes).
3. Palaemon tunuipes was caught in large quantities in the months of May, July and August the catch being 646.3. 54.0 and 66.4 tonnes respectively. The share of Hippolysmato
sp. was quite high in the months of May; August and September (11.9, 16.4 and 10.4 tonnes. table No. 3).

The quarterwise catch composition of fish caught in Dol net is given in Table 2. H. nehereus and non-penaeid prawns together


Fig. 2, Monthly fluctuations of fish caught in Dol (bag) net 1971.

## OBSERVATIONS ON DOL NET FISHERY

Table 2
Quarterwisg percentace composimon and list of specigs caucht in dol net in 1971

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { St. } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Species | Jan.-Mar. Ist Quarter | Apr-June IInd Quarter | July-Sept. IIIrd. Quarter | Oct.-Dec. 1Vth. Quarter |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Shark and Rays | 0.52 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 0.39 |
| 2. | Coilia dussumieri Other clupeids | 10.19 | 6.30 | 3,32 | 4.81 | 5,47 |
| $3 .$ <br> 4. <br> 6. <br> 7. | Chirocentrus <br> Sardines, 5. Hillsa toll Thrissiocles Dussumicria acuta | $8.86$ | 2.26 | 0.81 | 4.78 | 3.39 |
| 8. | Fi. nehercuts | 0.79 | 9.26 | 74.19 | 15.85 | 34.67 |
| $\begin{gathered} 9 . \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | Small sciacnids F. sciacha | $1.63$ | 2.05 | 0.63 | 2.66 | 1.57 |
| 11. | O. Irtuneus |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. | P. Masta | - | - | - | 0,79 | 0.18 |
| 13. | Trichiurus spp, | 2.08 | 2,90 | 1.21 | 7.68 | 3.17 |
| 14. | Cyblum spp. | 0.54 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.27 |
| 15. | Stromateus spp. | 2.91 | 2.89 | 0.50 | 2.41 | 1.85 |
| 16. | Bregmaceros sp. | 9.59 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 1.55 | 2.04 |
| 17. | Arius sp. Lactarius lactarius |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. | Caranx sp. | 0.38 | 1.25 | 0.37 | 0.65 | 0.53 |
| 20. | Cynoglossus sp. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22. | A. Indicus | 56.01 | 32.05 | 10.79 | 51.26 | 32.09 |
| 23. | P. tumulpes | - | 34.32 | 3.48 | - | 8.78 |
| 24. | Hippolysmata sp. | - | 0.67 | 0.76 | 0.36 | 0.52 |
| 25. | Penaeid prawns | 5.88 | 3.91 | 3.40 | 4.74 | 4.22 |
| 26. | Solenoccra indica | 0.23 | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.23 | 0.16 |
| 27. | Other fishes |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28. Eels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29. | Upeneus spp. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30. | Poiynenus spp. | 0.29 | 0.91 | 0.01 | 0.48 | 0.39 |
| 31. | Lobster |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33. | Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |

contributed to $62.91 \%, 80.47 \%, 92.64 \%$ and $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 4 \%}$ for the four quarters respectively.
In the first quarter, A. indicus dominated ( $56.01 \%$ ) in the catch and penaeid prawn including Solenocera indica ( $0.23 \%$ ) formed
$6.11 \%$. H. nehereus was caught in very small quantities ( $0.79 \%$ ) which was compensated by significant increase of Collia dussumieri ( $10.19 \%$ ), other clupeids ( $8.86 \%$ ) and Bregmaceros sp. ( $9.59 \%$ ). The important species
were Stronateus spp., Trichiturus spp. and increased from 0.79 to $9.26 \%$ and A. indicus Sciacnids accounting for 2.91, 2.08 and $1.63 \%$ respectively The share of rest of the fishes is $1.83 \%$. decreased from 56.01 to $32.05 \%$ and together formed $41.31 \%$ of the total catch. $\boldsymbol{P}$. tunuipes showed an increase and ranked first $34.32 \%$.
In the second quarter, 11 . nehereus catch The non-penacid prawns $A$. indicts, $P$. tunui-


Fig. 3. The monthy perecntage composition of Bombay duck and Acetes indicus in the Dol net catch at Sassoon dock, Bombay showing the inverse relationship.

## CATCH COMPOSITION (Percentages)



Fig. 4.

Table 3

## MONTHWISE SPECIES COMPOSITION OF FISH CAUGHT IN DOL (BAG) NET in SASSOON DOCK for the year 1971 (Catch in xg)

| SI. <br> No. Species name | Jan. | Feb, | March | April | May | June | July | August | Sept. | Oct. | Nov | Dec. | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. H. nehcreus | 8587 | 1330 | 3495 | 2767 | 79146 | 117480 | 1031814 | 944298 | 911705 | 291803 | 46980 | 12216 | 3451621 | 34.67 |
| 2. A. indicus | 326696 | 178633 | 444580 | 332145 | 304792 | 52980 | 287700 | 76575 | 55985 | 297879 | 408750 | 427950 | 3194665 | 32.09 |
| 3. P. tunuipes | - | - | - | 38962 | 646395 | 53442 | 54060 | 66440 | 15055 | - | - | - | 874354 | 8.78 |
| 4. C. dussumieri | 46301 | 75131 | 51496 | 28725 | 100770 | 6174 | 24888 | 47009 | 57560 | 36518 | 51700 | 18270 | 544542 | 5.47 |
| 5. Other clupeids | 105038 | 24409 | 20929 | 15337 | 26311 | 7079 | 9426 | 13111 | 9320 | 21607 | 57110 | 27270 | 336947 | 3.39 |
| 6. Penaeid prawns | 38656 | 18480 | 41650 | 18592 | 58163 | 7566 | 29778 | 82244 | 20585 | 33449 | 48580 | 22905 | 420648 | 4. 22 |
| 7. Trichturus spp | 21582 | 5313 | 8497 | 26887 | 33285 | 2442 | 17274 | 13884 | 16235 | 103354 | 53510 | 13320 | 315583 | 3.17 |
| 8. Bregmaceros sp. | 137274 | 6937 | 18452 | 2820 | 1162 | - | 768 | 226 | 745 | 3224 | 9990 | 21150 | 202748 | 2.04 |
| 9. Stromateus spp. | 13869 | 12425 | 23119 | 9480 | 51150 | 1656 | 4314 | 2544 | 12610 | 15841 | 30440 | 7043 | 184491 | 1.85 |
| 10. Sciaenids | 12219 | 7574 | 7893 | 9900 | 29123 | 5166 | 9468 | 7549 | 7720 | 24149 | 24700 | 10171 | 155632 | 1.57 |
| 11. Shark and rays | 2653 | 3710 | 2452 | 1867 | 4538 | 1650 | 4398 | 5829 | 3970 | 3100 | 1530 | 2093 | 37790 | 0.39 |
| 12. Cybium spp. |  |  |  | 605 | 5992 | 180 | 3948 | 324 | 335 | 115 | 2090 | 2160 | 25962 | 0.27 |
| 13. Hippolysmata sp. <br> 14. Solenocera | - | - | - | 705 | 11978 | 1824 | 2682 | 16469 | 10480 | 6975 | 825 | 270 | 52208 | 0.52 |
| indica | - | 574 | 3386 | 1440 | 2520 | 1704 | - | 803 | - | - | 4030 | 1148 | 15605 | 0.16 |
| 15. Other Fishes | 2676 | 7238 | 3426 | 3913 | 26662 | 16004 | 4488 | 4044 | 3780 | 17484 | 47515 | 4028 | 141258 | 1.41 |
|  | 719587 | 343686 | 632620 | 495145 | 1381987 | 275347 | 1485006 | 1281349 | 1126085 | 855498 | 787750 | 569994 | 9954054 | 100 |

pes and Hippolysmata ensirostris together contributed $67.04 \%$. Penaeid prawns including the Solenocera indica ( $0.26 \%$ ) formed $4.17 \%$. C. dussumieri and other clupeids together form ed $8.56 \%$. Stromateus spp. constituted $2.89 \%$, Trichiurus spp. $2.90 \%$ Sciaenids $2.05 \%$ and remaining fishes $\mathbf{3 . 1 3 \%}$.

In the third quarter $H$. nehereus formed bulk of the catch $74.19 \%$ while A. indicus ( $10.79 \%$ ), the other non-penaeid prawns $\boldsymbol{P}$. tunuipes ( $3.48 \%$ ) and $H$. ensirostris $(0.76 \%$ ) constituted $15.03 \%$. The share of penaeid prawn including $S$. indica was $3.42 \%$. C. dussumieri and other clupeids formed $4.13 \%$ and Trichituras spp. $1.21 \%$. The decline of $C$. dussumieri and Bregmaceros sp. in the third quarter may mainly due to the abundant of H. nehereus while the former formed the important food items of Bombay duck next to A. indicus (Bapat 1970) The share of the rest of the fishes is $2.02 \%$.

In the fourth quarter A. mdicus dominated ( $51.26 \%$ ) in the catch. H. nehereus declined to $15.85 \%$. The penaeid prawns including the Solenocera indica ( $0.23 \%$ ) formed $4.97 \%$. The landings of C. dussumieri increased from $3.32 \%$ to $4.81 \%$ and other clupeids from $0.81 \%$ to $4.78 \%$. The share of Trichiurus spp. was very high ( $7.68 \%$ ). Catches of Bregmaceros sp. increased from $0.04 \%$ to $1.55 \%$. The contribitions of sciaenids and Stromatets spp. formed 2.66 and $2.41 \%$ respectively. The cephalopods improved to $1.26 \%$ and rest of the fishes contributed $2.77 \%$.

In the monthly 'Dol' net catch $H$. nehereus fluctuated between 0.4 to $81 \%$ and $A$. indicus between 5.0 to $75 \%$. $H$. nehereus and A. indicus showed an inverse relation in the catch composition (Fig. 3). The possible explanation for this inverse relation may be the grazing by Bombay duck as $A$. indicus is one of the principal components of its food (Bapat 1970).

Among the different species, $H$. nehereus takes the first place in the 'Dol' net catch. The annual average composition was $34.67 \%$ (Fig. 4). July showed the highest monthly catch followed by August, September (Table 3) and caught throughout the year in the Dol net. A. indicus was next in importance ( $32.09 \%$ ). It dominated during October to May with a maximum eatch in March (444.5 tonnes). P. cunuipes was third in importance ( $8.78 \%$ ) and was noticed in the catch from April to September. Among clupeids C. dussumieri occupied the first place and formed $5.47 \%$ of the Dol net catch. Other Clupeids like Chirocentrus spp., Hilsa tofi, Dussumieria acuta and sardines together contributed $3.39 \%$. Penaeid prawns occupied the fifth place forming $4.22 \%$ of the total catch and consists of Metapenaeus hrevicornis, P. sculptiles, and P. stylifera. The ribbon fish took the sixth place and consists largely of juveniles of T. haumela and T. savala forming $3.17 \%$. Bregmaceros sp. occupied the seventh place and formed $2.04 \%$ of the total catch, occurring throughout the year. Among the three species of Stromateus, S. cinereus was caught in large quantities. They generally con* sisted of juveniles forming $1.85 \%$. Small sciaenids like Johnius carutta, Johnius sina, Otolithus argenteus, O. nuber and large one like Psendosciaena diacanthus and Otolithodies brumneus together formed $1.57 \%$. Sharks and rays $\mathbf{~} 0.39 \%$ ) and Cybium ( $0.27 \%$ ) were caught in small quantities in all the months of the year. Hippolysmata and Solenocera indica together formed $0.68 \%$. The rest of the fishes formed $1.41 \%$ of the total catch. Trypauchen vagina, Palaemon stylfera and Squilla species occurred in small quantities in monsoon months only.
The Dol net catch is categorised into the following grades based on the consumer preference. of class I fish $8.32 \%$ consisting of
penacid prawn, Stromateus spp. and Cybium; class II fish $51.23 \%$ consisting of $P$. unuipes, H. nehereus, Hippolysmata, Solenocera, Coilia etc. Class III fish $2.73 \%$ consisting of Sciaenids, Thrissocles etc. and class IV fish $37.68 \%$ consisting of A. indicus and Trichiurus ete. The non-edible fish Trypauchen vagina comprised $0.04 \%$. The list of 33 species caught in Dol net catch and their annual percentages are given in the Table 3.

## Remarks

The increase or decrease in the monthly catch during the year has been mainly due to fuctuation of $H$. nehereus and $A$. indicus. These together with other prawns contributed
to $80.44 \%$ of the total Dol net catch. The inverse relationship observed in the landings of $H$. nehereus and $A$. indicus is an interesting feature and detailed studies are necessary to determine the factors causing the same.
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