

May – July 2010 for the Groundfish Fishery Progress Report

Pre-Trip Notification System

Month	Number of Calls fielded by PTNS Coordinator
May	800
June	600
July	450

Month	Number of Trips Entered by PTNS Coordinator
May	1238 out of 1790 (69%)
June	1078 out of 2378 (45%)
July	1185 out of 2621 (45%)
<i>Combined Total</i>	<i>3501 out of 6789 (51% overall)</i>

While there doesn't seem to be too much of a transition from the phone system to the web-based system, there has overall been less calls about minor problems or misunderstandings on how to use the system.

iPAQ

Data used for quota management are collected by observers and at-sea monitors on handheld computers called iPAQ's. Since the implantation of the iPAQ (April 2010) several data collection software versions have been adapted. The Northeast Fisheries Science Center has completed the final version (2.0) and it is expected that it will be fully used by all At-Sea Monitors by the week of August 7th, 2010.

INCIDENT REPORTS

As of 07/26/10 there have been 25 Incident Reports completed by At-Sea Monitor's and referenced to the Office for Law Enforcement. See below for the main incident types.

Incident Type	Number of Occurrences
Refusal	13
Safety Refusal	4
Harassment/Other	8

The incidences have occurred in a variety of ports. They are:

Area	Number of Incidents
Gloucester, MA	11
Chatham, MA	8
New Bedford, MA	5

Seabrook, NH	1
--------------	---

TRAINING

Since April of 2010 the Fisheries Sampling Branch has trained a total of 203 individuals who have obtained a total of 297 certifications (At-Sea Monitoring and Dockside Monitoring). The below table describes the number of trained individuals who attended each training. Note that some individuals attended both the At-Sea Monitoring Training and the Dock-Side Monitoring Training.

AT-SEA MONITORING TRAINING

Status	Number
Trained	178
Did not pass training	4
Certified	174

DOCK-SIDE MONITORING TRAINING

Status	Number
Trained	128
Did not pass training	5
Certified	123

DATA PROCESSING

Fleet	Number of Trips Observed	Number of Days Observed	Number of Trips Available in SIMM	Number of Days Available in SIMM
Sector	918	2129	724 (79%)	1712 (80%)
Common Pool	89	128	80 (90%)	116 (91%)

** date table created: 07/29/10

Trip Coverage Rates by Sector

Sector/Fleet	# Trips	# of Seadays	Trip Coverage Rate (%)	Seaday Rates (%)
Common Pool	87	127	14	15
Fixed Gear	167	245	26	28
NCCS	20	20	100	91
NEFS 10	76	79	30	27
NEFS 11	89	114	26	29
NEFS 12	13	15	36	38
NEFS 13	19	138	42	45
NEFS 2	82	167	23	27
NEFS 3	165	199	24	24

NEFS 5	34	81	39	33
NEFS 6	3	19	43	37
NEFS 7	20	122	26	39
NEFS 8	12	98	43	43
NEFS 9	22	206	48	53
Port Clyde	61	96	28	34
SHS	79	402	37	41
Tri-State	14	61	23	36

SHADOW TRIPS

Goals and priorities

The primary goal of the shadow trip program is to provide an opportunity to exchange information in the field between observer program staff and with the fishing industry. During a shadow trip, a Fisheries Sampling Branch staff member accompanies a Northeast Fisheries Observer Program (NEFOP) observer on an observed commercial fishing trip. During the trip the FSB staff member observes the observer and interacts with the captain and crew. They are assessing the observer's work load and sampling prioritization, as well as aiding with sub-sampling to increase accuracy, and getting feedback from the fishing industry regarding the observer program. There are multiple benefits for doing the trips:

For the fishermen - to have an opportunity to communicate their opinions on the program directly, to ensure observers are properly following protocol, and to have more of an opportunity to discuss the goals of the program and how data are used; and

For the observer - to work cooperatively to obtain a higher sub-sampling rate, to describe challenges with data collection while at sea, and to discuss data collection priorities; and

For the FSB staff member - to assess the observer's work load, to address consistency of following sampling protocols among observers, to improve training by testing data collection protocols, to collect digital photographs and/or video of observers sampling to be used in training and education, to address individual observer's data quality and performance.

During these trips, the observer is expected to follow the regular trip protocols - same trip logs, regular trip numbering, etc. The FSB staff member observes the observer working, and also helps to sample, sort catch, collect length frequencies, age structures, etc. and all is submitted along with the observer's trip. The FSB staff member and the observer act as a team in working up the catch and getting the gear measurements, with the observer taking the lead in data collection. The first priority is to learn about the fishing operations and provide an opportunity for communication with industry members (not just the captain, but crew members as well). The second priority is to assess the method of data collection

techniques applied by the observer. The third priority is to gain hands-on experience in sampling and identifying species and gear. The below table provides the number of shadow trips organized by port:

Port	Number of Shadow Trips
Chatham, MA	2
Gloucester, MA	2
Harwichport, MA	2
Scituate, MA	3
Point Judith, RI	1

SPECIES ID VERIFICATION PROGRAM

The Species ID Verification Program was implemented as a way to verify that monitors are identifying species correctly. Through this program, monitors are provided a list of species they are required to send in upon first encounter. Once the species identity is verified in-house the monitor is informed. If the species is not identified correctly, FSB may require the monitor to come in-house and complete a fish identification exercise or exam. Species identification is reviewed thoroughly throughout training, which includes labs, review sessions, open book exam, and closed book exam. Since May 1st 2010, 321 groundfish specimens have been processed with a 94% successful identification rate. Additionally, 56 skate specimens have been processed with an 86% successful identification rate. A 97% success rate is expected within 3 months of observing experience but FSB is always striving for 100% accuracy.

Species	Count	Correct	Incorrect	% Correct
Winter Flounder	33	30	3	91
Witch Flounder	29	28	1	97
Yellowtail Fl	42	41	1	98
American Plaice Fl	37	37	0	100
Sand Dab Flounder	24	21	3	88
Haddock	33	30	3	91
White Hake	16	13	3	81
Atlantic Halibut	13	12	1	92
Redfish	28	27	1	96
Ocean Pout	20	17	3	85
Pollock	22	22	0	100
Atlantic Wolfish	24	24	0	100

FISHERMENS COMMENT CARD & DATA RELEASES

Data represented in this summary report include comment cards from May 2010 to present. Data were summarized based on the NEFOP_IMS COMMENT CARD table and 15 additional comment cards that have not yet been entered into the database. FSB is in the process of implementing a scanning template to upload comment card data on a timelier basis. FSB also anticipates utilizing an electronic form online

that will automatically load into the database. Once the cards are checked-in the card is passed onto the Data Quality Lead and FSB Branch Chief who review the data and follow up with any issues or data requests. Once the card is reviewed the data are entered into an excel spreadsheet and uploaded into the database.

COMMENT CARD STATISTICS

Total Comment Cards

Comment cards are issued to all NEFOP observers and ASMs. Since May 2010 NEFOP observers and ASMs have taken nearly 1,700 trips. FSB received a total of 35 returned comment cards from 35 different people since May 2010. 26 different observers/monitors received returns. Of those cards all included names of the captain/owner who filled out the cards.

States and Ports

FSB received returns from 6 different states and 12 different ports.

State

- Massachusetts (66%)
- New Jersey (3%)
- Rhode Island (3%)
- Maine (11%)
- New Hampshire (9%)
- Virginia (3%)
- Unknown State (3%)

Ports

- Boston, MA (9%)
- Scituate, MA (6%)
- Fairhaven, MA (3%)
- Gloucester, MA (20%)
- New Bedford, MA (29%)
- Cape May, NJ (3%)
- Point Judith, RI (3%)
- Portland, ME (11%)
- Rye, NH (3%)
- Portsmouth, NH (3%)
- Seabrook, NH (3%)
- Chincoteague, VA (3%)
- Unknown Port (3%)

Issues with Observer Performance or Observer Procedures

Of the 35 cards submitted 4 (11%) had an issue with the observer's performance or observer procedures. The issues are listed below:

1. "Observer did not record latitude and longitude positions on all the hauls." The Data Quality Lead followed up with this issue and found that some haul coordinates were missing from 3 out of the 4 hauls. However, the observer noted that a power outage knocked out power to the Loran, and therefore the issue was not pursued any further.
2. "Issues with setting up the trip." NMFS Staff member followed up with monitor to obtain more information.
3. "Observer did not ask for trip and tow level target species data." NMFS Staff member followed up with monitor to ensure they were asking for target species on both a trip level and a tow level.
4. Captain/Owner had an issue with program procedures and requested information on what constitutes a "saleable fish." The Data Quality Lead called Captain, but was not able to reach him.

Positive Comments on Observer Performance

Of the 35 cards submitted, 30 (86%) reported positive feedback regarding observers and their performance. One card did not answer any of the questions and simply requested a copy of the trip logs. Of those positive 30 responses, 6 (17%) included additional comments regarding the observer's performance and work ethic. Those comments are listed below:

1. "Best observer I ever had. Takes job very serious. Would be a pleasure to have."
2. "Monitor seems to have more experience about his job than most, not only his job but fishing in general; had a small issue at the dock but no problem with him at all out to sea, he can sail with me anytime."
3. "Monitor was an extremely efficient monitor and the first one I have ever seen to actually measure the samples & weights on both sides every tow that he observed. He also observed a higher c/c of tows than any other observer I have had."
4. "Monitor is a hard worker and very dedicated to his job and was a pleasure to have aboard."
5. "Observer was as professional as you get, he was good."
6. "The young lady who made this trip was very good. Her work ethic good and attitude excellent. Hope they are all like that. Some of the situations these folks are placed in due to questions beyond their control are unfortunate. This whole new system seems to be aimed at counting people out rather than counting fish."

Requested Data

If requested (via the comment card) fishermen may have access to several sources of informative data related to NEFOP. The options are listed below;

1. Copy of trip logs
2. Booklet with a detailed description of the observer program

3. Data Release Policy with a Data Release Form
4. Observer Program Vessel Safety Checklist
5. Federal Register with List of Fisheries (Categorization of Fisheries, MMPA)
6. Other (must be specified)

Of the 35 comment cards 15 (43%) requested additional information. The results are listed below;

- Booklet; 1 person (7%)
- Data Release Policy and Form; 3 people (20%)
- Safety Checklist; 1 person (7%)
- Trip Logs; 9 people (60%)
- Federal Register; 1 person (7%)

All of these requests have been met, including a letter of appreciation.

Data Release Form

Information can also be requested via the Data Release Form. Since May1st a total of 200 Data Release Forms have been submitted to the Fisheries Sampling Branch for copies of data. The numbers of forms submitted by month are listed below;

Month	Number of Data Release Forms Submitted
May	39 (20%)
June	45 (22%)
July	116 (58%)

Additionally, from April through July of 2010 240,000 copies were made on our in-house photocopiers.

MASTER DATA FLOW OF SECTOR AND COMMON POOL DATA

