

Draft Meeting Summary
Ad Hoc Observer Committee
April 20, 1993

The Ad Hoc Observer Committee, chaired by Dr. Wally Pererya, met April 20, 1993. Other Council members in attendance included: Bob Alverson, Ron Hegge, CAPT Anderson, Bob Mace, Steve Pennoyer, and Oscar Dyson.

The Committee reviewed questions comprising the Domestic Observer Vessel Report and heard from Janet Wall of the NMFS Observer Program at the Alaska Fisheries Science Center, and from the Center Director, Dr. William Aron. They provided a report proposing various changes to the way questions are handled, in response to concerns that have been raised by industry, and earlier by the Committee. They suggested that some questions be deleted, some be revised, and that others stay phrased the way they are now.

The Committee then heard from industry including Sara Hemphill, Dave Fraser, and Steve Hughes. Their main points were:

1. Vessel owners need to be able to access the observer reports for their vessel(s);
2. Observers should restrain their comments to items they are trained to observe so that erroneous impressions are not included in their reports;
3. Observer contractors and vessel operators/owners frequently are unaware of the types of information being collected; bycatch rates need to be published by vessel name; and
4. Haul-by-haul bycatch data need to be made available to the industry, perhaps with a two-three year lag to protect the data's competitive value.


On the topic of reporting on vessel safety, the Committee suggested that observers, upon first going aboard, discuss with the vessel captain, the types of information that will be collected and take a safety tour of the vessel with the captain or designee to ensure that safety requirements are being met. An alternative would be for the Coast Guard to give a courtesy exam and decal before an observer would be allowed to embark.

The observer also should go over with the captain the other types of information, such as MARPOL observations, that will be reported on. The Committee recognizes that although the observer is not intended to be a compliance monitor for MARPOL or other regulations, observer reports and data collected have great potential to be used for those purposes. This needs to be made very clear to the vessel operator from the outset.

All-in-all the Committee thinks that progress is being made and that NMFS has been very forthcoming and responsive to concerns raised with observer reports. The Committee requested NOAA GC to expedite their review of the confidentiality of observer reports and the releasability of catch data and the observer reports to vessel owners.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council, SSC and AP Members

FROM: Clarence G. Pautzke
Executive Director 

DATE: April 12, 1993

SUBJECT: Observer Program

ACTION REQUIRED

- (a) Receive status report on North Pacific Fisheries Research Plan.
- (b) Receive report from Ad Hoc Committee on scope of observer information and its confidentiality.

BACKGROUND

(a) Research Plan

The Proposed Rule to implement the Research Plan has been drafted and is under review by NOAA CG. We expect it to be submitted for Secretarial review by the end of April and published by the Secretary within 60 days of receipt. A 60-day public comment period then commences which will include a public hearing in Alaska, Washington, and Oregon. This schedule means that the Plan will not become effective until mid- to late summer. Once effective, the 12-month 'start-up' funding period begins which is designed to accumulate the necessary money in the Observer Fund to implement the full scope of the program. The Plan in its entirety could be up and running in late 1994 or the first of 1995.

Council-recommended changes to the existing Observer Plan are now being developed in a Proposed Rule and should be in effect sometime this year. The existing Observer Plan, as amended, will remain in effect until the Research Plan is fully implemented.

(b) Ad Hoc Committee on Observer Information

In January the Council established an ad hoc Observer Committee to examine information collected by the Observer Program and confidentiality issues surrounding that information. The Committee met on March 16 in Seattle; their report is provided in your notebook under Item C-1(b)(1). The Committee is scheduled to meet once again on Tuesday-afternoon, April 20. As a follow-up from the first meeting, the Committee will receive a report from the NMFS Observer Program which addresses concerns voiced by the Committee. The Committee expects that this meeting will generate additional discussion of those issues between the NMFS, the Council, and interested fishing industry participants.

For additional background, Item C-1(b)(2) is a copy of a Domestic Observer Vessel Report which contains post-trip questions to be completed by observers. The Plant Reports contain similar questions.

Report from
Council's Ad Hoc Observer Committee
March 16, 1993

The Council's Ad Hoc Observer Committee, appointed to examine information collected by the Observer Program, its use by the agency, and its accessibility to FOIA requests, met at 9:00 a.m. on March 16, 1993 at the Alaska Fisheries Science Center in Seattle. The meeting lasted three hours, adjourning at 12:00 noon. Members in attendance were:

Bob Alverson	NPFMC
Bill Aron	AFSC-NMFS
Joe Blum	AFTA
Dave Fraser	NPFMC-Advisory Panel
Ron Hegge	NPFMC
Lisa Lindeman	NOAA-General Counsel
Paul MacGregor	Mundt, MacGregor
Russ Nelson	AFSC-NMFS
Chris Oliver	NPFMC-Staff
Wally Pereyra (Chairman)	NPFMC
Janet Wall	AFSC-NMFS
Gregg Williams	IPHC
Laurie Williams	Pacific Observers

Chairman Pereyra convened the meeting with opening remarks noting the focus of the discussion would be on post-trip reports filled out by observers. Opening remarks were also provided by Dr. Aron, Center Director, noting the importance of the Observer Program to the fishery management process, and the program's efforts to minimize hardships and disruptions to fishing operations, while collecting the information necessary to the Observer Program. Dr. Pereyra echoed the importance of the Program as well as the Committee's overall satisfaction with the operations and results of the Program. The Committee was generally concerned, however, with some of the questions observers are required to answer and with the general nature of some post-trip reports which include additional information not directly related to biological monitoring of the fisheries.

The Committee was provided with copies of post-trip reports which include all questions to be directly answered by observers. Russ Nelson then provided a detailed description of the purpose of the questions and how the answers are used by the Observer Program to facilitate management of the fisheries and to provide feedback to the Program to prepare observers for their time at sea. Some of the questions are designed specifically to provide a characterization of the working environment which the observers will be entering. The following major topic areas were discussed by the Committee:

Safety Related Information

The post-trip reports (for vessel and processing operations) contain questions specific to safety equipment on the vessels. The Committee was concerned that although observers are provided with a checklist, there may be inaccuracies reported with regard to whether specific equipment

was actually present and in working condition. They were further concerned that information reported by the observer could later be used in legal actions such as liability suits. This concern extended in particular to observer reports which went beyond the specific questions on the report or beyond the observer checklist. For example, observer comments on general vessel safety aspects could be very subjective in nature, yet are included in the Observer Program records. One suggestion was to require a mandatory checklist which the observer would be required to fill out, with assistance from captain or crew, as soon as boarding the vessel.

Although there are specific questions regarding safety (as well as catch and bycatch estimations, observer logbook information, PSC handling, and miscellaneous observations), observers are invited to provide additional comments on any of these issues. These observer reports are not censored by the program and remain in the records. It is these often "narrative" portions of the reports which the Committee had strong concerns over; the content of such reports could be subjective to the personalities of individual observers, but have the potential to be damaging to the vessel or plant operation, particularly if available to FOIA requests or legal actions.

Confidentiality Concerns

The Committee was very interested in the issue of confidentiality and whether the information contained in the post-trip reports would be accessible to persons other than the vessel owner/operator. For example, could information on discharge of pollutants or throwing debris overboard be used later to enforce MARPOL or EPA regulations? Or, could this information be "FOIAable" for any other reason? Should observers even be collecting this information?

Ms. Lindeman advised that the information is not statutorily confidential under the Magnuson Act, and it is not definite as to whether the information would be considered confidential or not under other FOIA exemptions. It would depend, likely, on a case-by-case basis and whether release of such information would create a situation of "competitive harm."

Dr. Aron advised the Committee that, while the whole issue of confidentiality may still be in question, the Observer Program will continue to treat all information collected as confidential, unless and until directed to do otherwise by legal mandate. Ms. Lindeman advised that the situation could be remedied by a rather simple amendment to the Magnuson Act this fall. This amendment could be retroactive, would cover both the existing Program and the Research Plan, and could allow the information to be released back to the vessel owner. The following draft language was offered for review by the Committee:

(d) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.**--Any information submitted to the Secretary in compliance with any requirement under subsections (a) and (b) or under section 313, including any information reported by an observer under subsection (b)(8) or section 313, shall not be disclosed if disclosure would significantly impair the commercial interests of the person from whom the information was obtained; except--

- (1) to Federal employees and Council employees who are responsible for management plan development and monitoring;
- (2) to State employees pursuant to an agreement with the Secretary that prevents disclosure of such information; or
- (3) when required by court order.

The Secretary shall, by regulation, prescribe such procedures as may be necessary to protect such information from disclosure. Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted or construed to prevent the use for conservation and management purposes by the Secretary, or with the approval of the Secretary, the Council, of any information submitted in compliance with a requirement under subsection (a) or (b) or section 313. This provision applies to any such information submitted to the Secretary since March 1, 1977.

[Legislative history would state that the "person" from whom observer information was obtained is the vessel owner, operator, or crew member.]

Some concerns were noted as to the extent of confidentiality which would be imposed by such an amendment. For example, some members felt this might put a veil over biological information which they felt should be accessible to the public and industry. They still want to see individual bycatch rates published, not only by PIN number but by vessel name as well. This issue fostered discussion of the possibility of making some observer program information available to the public (including catch, bycatch, and geographic coordinates but with vessel name hidden) while keeping confidential the information in the post-trip reports. The Committee felt that this issue was very critical and warranted further consideration by the Committee, Council, and affected industry. It was noted that vessel owners find the information in observer reports very useful to themselves.

Trust Relationship

Much of the discussion at this meeting centered on the trust relationship between an observer and the observed, and how important this is to the viability of the program. Some industry members are increasingly getting the feeling of observers as a "Gestapo" entity whose purpose is similar to a secret police organization. Examples cited include observer reports which relate viewpoints and conversations of the crew which may have been overheard and may be viewed as anecdotal information and beyond the type of information the Observer Program was intended to collect. It was noted that some observers could have their own agendas and the lack of strict guidelines on appropriate information allows too much latitude in the type and tenor of observer post-trip narratives.

Mr. Nelson noted that Council-imposed programs, such as the VIP and performance-based pelagic trawl definition, exacerbate the perception of observers as cops, due to the enforcement aspects of these programs. The CDQ program and future ITQ programs will likely intensify these problems due to the individual accountability inherent in these management programs. Specific to the CDQ program, it was noted that standardized catch-estimation techniques to be employed by observers should be determined up front with cooperation of CDQ participants.

Other

One other specific question discussed by the Committee was the one which asks about the number of women on the crew. The Committee wondered why this was necessary and felt that this should fall under the responsibility of the observer contractor to provide this type of information, if necessary. Mr. Nelson noted that this is simply one way to help prepare an observer for their potential work environment.

Since the Committee did not spend much more time on specific questions from the post-trip reports, Mr. Nelson suggested that the Committee make a list of the specific questions with which they had concerns. Therefore, the Observer Program could evaluate these specific questions and determine whether they were essential to the program or whether they might be dropped or altered.

Dr. Aron also suggested that the training program for observers might benefit from industry input such as actual input from members of the fishing industry during the training period. Videotape training tools depicting the perspective of the fishermen might be another tool to help the observer more fully understand the work environment and foster better working relationships between observers and crew.

Conclusions

The Committee recommends further exploration of these issues by adding this issue to the Council's agenda for the April plenary session. Given the timing of the Magnuson Act reauthorization, the Committee feels that the following major issues need to be addressed promptly:

1. Appropriateness of questions in post-trip reports and possibility of providing stricter guidelines to limit "open-ended" observer reports.
2. Confidentiality and accessibility issues surrounding all information collected by the program.
3. Possible amendment proposal for Magnuson Act reauthorization.

The Committee feels that additional public and industry input is necessary before making any final recommendations on these issues. The Council forum would be the appropriate vehicle for such input. The Committee will meet once again during the week of the April meeting (prior to Council taking up the issue) to provide a follow-up report based on responses to their concerns from the Observer Program.

DOMESTIC OBSERVER VESSEL REPORT

7/22/92

CRUISE # _____ OBSERVER NAME _____
V CODE _____ VESSEL NAME _____
CAPTAIN _____
FISHING MASTER/DECK BOSS _____
FACTORY MANAGER _____
#DAYS FISHED _____ #TOWS/SETS MADE _____ #TOWS/SETS SAMPLED _____
VESSEL LENGTH (FT) _____

For each of the following questions, circle the letters of all answers that apply. Multiple answers are allowed.

I. GENERAL VESSEL INFORMATION

1. What was the total ship's complement?
 - a. 5 or less
 - b. 6-10
 - c. 11-15
 - d. 16-20
 - e. 21-30
 - f. >30
2. How many people at a time were assigned to your room with you?
 - a. none
 - b. 1-2
 - c. 3-4
 - d. 5-6
 - e. 7 or more
3. What was the approximate average haul/set weight (MT)?
 - a. <5
 - b. 5-20
 - c. 21-50
 - d. 51-100
 - e. >100
4. In which area(s) did this vessel fish?
 - a. Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands
 - b. Gulf of Alaska
 - c. Washington/Oregon/California coast
 - d. "Donut Hole" - outside U.S. EEZ in Bering Sea
 - e. any other area inside U.S. EEZ not listed
 - f. any area outside U.S. EEZ other than the "Donut Hole"
5. Which gear type(s) was (were) used?
 - a. bottom trawl (nonpelagic trawl)
 - b. pelagic trawl
 - c. hook-and-line (longline) with j-hooks
 - d. hook-and-line with circle hooks
 - e. pot
 - f. pair trawl
 - g. jig
 - h. other _____

6. Longline vessel observers only: Were "soft" hooks used? (These are hooks designed to unbend under heavy strain. An example is Mustad E-Z Baiter circle hook, model 39981 D.)
- yes
 - no
 - don't know
7. All observers: How were the fish caught by this vessel processed? Circle all that apply.
- fish partially processed delivered to shorebased plant
 - fish partially processed delivered to floating processor
 - catch partially or completely sorted delivered to shorebased plant
 - catch partially or completely sorted delivered to floating processor
 - unsorted catch delivered to shorebased plant
 - unsorted catch delivered to floating processor
 - some or all of catch sold as bait
 - codend delivered to mothership
 - catch processed on board
 - vessel is a mothership
 - catch partially or completely sorted delivered to tender
 - unsorted catch delivered to tender

Use the following key to answer questions 8-15:

- pollock
- Pacific cod
- sablefish
- Atka mackerel
- hake
- rock sole
- Greenland turbot
- yellowfin sole
- other flatfish
- rockfish (any Sebastes or Sebastolobus)
- other
- no species

8. Catcher boat only: which species were target species?
- a.
 - b.
 - c.
 - d.
 - e.
 - f.
 - g.
 - h.
 - i.
 - j.
 - k.

"Other" species code(s) _____

Catcher-processor observers only, questions 9-15: circle the letter(s) of the fish species utilized for each processing method. If a particular product wasn't made, circle "1" to indicate "no species" were made into that product. If many species were used in fish meal production, use general codes for unidentified fish or invertebrates.

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 9. frozen whole | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |
| 10. headed | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |
| 11. head and gut | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |
| 12. fillet | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |
| 13. surimi | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |
| 14. roe | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |
| 15. fish meal | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. | g. | h. | i. | j. | k. | l. |

If you circled "K" (other), list the question number(s) and species code(s) _____

II. CATCH ESTIMATES

1. How was observer estimate of total catch obtained? Circle all that apply.
 - a. codend measurement
 - b. bin volume measurement
 - c. extrapolation of sample data to total hooks or pots
 - d. verified delivery weights added to at-sea discard weight
 - e. very few or none obtained

2. Which of the following were used for official total catch? Circle all that apply.
 - a. captain's estimate/hail weight
 - b. production data (retained wt) added to discard weight
 - c. proportion from delivery weight
 - d. adjustment factor from sampled hauls/sets applied to retained weight for unsampled hauls/sets
 - e. longline/pot sample data applied to total hooks/pots in unsampled sets
 - f. observer estimate

3. How was retained catch obtained? Circle all that apply.
 - a. application of observer PRR's to production data
 - b. application of vessel PRR's to production data
 - c. application of NMFS published PRR's to production data
 - d. proportioned weights from delivery information
 - e. skipper tally of target species
 - f. observer sampling data applied to official total catch
 - g. longline/pot sample data applied to total # hooks/pots
 - h. actual counts and/or weights from whole haul/set sample

III. PROHIBITED SPECIES AND SPECIES COMPOSITION SAMPLING

Use the following key to answer questions 1-4:

- a. whole haul sampling
- b. partial whole haul sampling
- c. basket sampling
- d. longline/pot sample

What was the predominant sampling method you used for each prohibited species group?

- 1. salmon a. b. c. d.
 - 2. halibut a. b. c. d.
 - 3. king crab a. b. c. d.
 - 4. Tanner crab a. b. c. d.
5. Where did you sample for prohibited species? Circle all that apply.
- a. on weather deck
 - b. in ship's factory
 - c. at plant/floating processor delivered to
6. Where did you obtain prohibited species viability estimates? Circle all that apply.
- a. on weather deck
 - b. in ship's factory
 - c. at plant/floating processor delivered to
 - d. none obtained
7. What sampling method or methods did you use for species composition sampling?
- a. whole haul sampling
 - b. partial whole haul sampling
 - c. basket (weighed) sampling
 - d. longline/pot sample
8. Where did you sample for species composition?
- a. on deck
 - b. in the ship's factory
 - c. at the plant/processor delivered to
 - d. tally on deck, weigh & measure in factory
9. What was your special project?
- a. target otoliths
 - b. other otoliths
 - c. stomach collection
 - d. crab length, viability and molting
 - e. product recovery rates
 - f. density
 - g. hake ovaries
 - h. marine debris
 - i. fish collection
 - j. other; describe _____
 - k. none

IV. SAFETY

Questions 1-10: Did you see the following safety equipment on this vessel? If so, please comment on its latest condition, using this key:

- a. not present
- b. presence unknown
- c. present - functional
- d. present - not functional
- e. present - condition unknown

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. General alarm: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 2. 406 EPIRB: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 3. Survival suits for all aboard: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 4. Life preservers for all aboard: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 5. Life rafts for all aboard: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 6. Fire extinguishers: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 7. First aid equipment: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 8. Life rings/buoys: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 9. Flares; smoke or dye markers: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |
| 10. Radio: | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. |

11. Were you given a tour of the safety equipment on this vessel?
a. yes
b. no
12. If yes, who gave you the tour?
a. captain
b. mate
c. crewmember
d. NMFS personnel
e. contractor
f. other _____
13. Were you shown what to do on this vessel in case of an emergency?
a. yes
b. no
14. If yes, who showed you?
a. captain
b. mate
c. crewmember
d. NMFS personnel
e. contractor
f. other _____
15. How many safety drills were held while you were on board?
a. none
b. 1-2
c. 3-4
d. 5-6
e. >6
16. If safety drills were held, which of the following emergency situations were addressed?
a. man overboard
b. fire
c. collision or grounding
d. vessel flooding
e. loss of power
f. abandon ship

17. Were alcohol and/or drugs used by vessel personnel to a degree that you felt your safety was compromised?
a. yes
b. no
18. Were there any accidents or illnesses aboard this vessel during your deployment which required emergency medical treatment or a medevac?
a. yes
b. no
19. How many crewmembers required emergency treatment or medevac during your deployment?
a. none
b. 1-2
c. 3-4
d. 5-6
e. >6
20. If emergency medical treatment of a crewmember was required, who performed it?
a. captain
b. mate
c. ship doctor or EMT
d. crewmember
e. observer
f. Coast Guard doctor or medic
g. other _____
21. Did you incur an injury while working on this vessel that required, or will require, a doctor's attention or medevac?
a. yes
b. no
22. Did you have any illness or injury which prevented you from doing your job?
a. yes
b. no
23. Were there any accidents on this vessel during your deployment that resulted in a fatality?
a. yes
b. no
24. Did any other safety problems or accidents occur during your deployment? Circle all that apply.
a. no problems or accidents
b. man (woman) overboard
c. fire
d. collision
e. grounding
f. vessel flooding
g. loss of electrical power
h. loss of engine power
i. gas leaks (e.g. ammonia, freon, fuel)
j. parting cables
25. Did the Coast Guard board this vessel during your deployment?
a. yes
b. no

For the following questions circle the appropriate answer or answers. Some responses will require a written explanation in your logbook. If you have already dealt with NMFS Enforcement regarding any of these questions, note that in lieu of a detailed response.

All written answers must be in your logbook, not on this form.

V. VESSEL LOGBOOK

1. Did the vessel maintain the Daily Cumulative Logbook or Daily Fishing Logbook in an accurate and timely manner?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. don't know, didn't inspect
2. How did this vessel obtain their estimates of prohibited species discards? Circle all that apply.
 - a. skipper/vessel personnel visual estimate
 - b. skipper/vessel personnel actual counts/weights
 - c. observer data
 - d. none obtained
3. Were you asked to maintain any part of the vessel's logbook?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
4. Did you maintain any part of the vessel's logbook?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
5. Did you notice discrepancies between the vessel's logbook and your own observations?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
6. If you noticed any discrepancies, did you try to find out the reason(s) for any differences?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
7. Were you ever denied access to the vessel logbook?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

Please document in your logbook difficulties with the vessel logbook, including discrepancies noticed and reasons for them.

VI. PROHIBITED SPECIES HANDLING

1. Were you able to observe the normal handling of prohibited species when you weren't sampling?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
2. If you answered yes, how were prohibited species handled relative to when you were sampling?
 - a. same (viability not changed)
 - b. better (viability improved)
 - c. worse (viability adversely affected)
3. How were prohibited species discarded?
 - a. discarded at roller (hook-and-line vessel)
 - b. discarded from trawl/fishing deck
 - c. discarded whole from factory or sorting area
 - d. discarded cut up from factory or sorting area
 - e. discarded at plant/processing vessel delivered to
4. If this vessel delivered its catch to a plant or floating processor, how were prohibited species sorted?
 - a. all prohibited species sorted at sea
 - b. partial sorting of prohibited species with some delivered
 - c. no sorting prior to delivery
5. If this vessel delivered its catch, how did the processing plant or vessel dispose of prohibited species which were part of the delivery?
 - a. returned to catcher vessel
 - b. discarded into water by processor (plant or floater)
 - c. disposition unknown
 - d. all prohibited species sorted out before delivery

Trawler observers only, questions 6-12:

6. Were the holding bins flooded with enough water to enhance viability of prohibited species?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. don't know
7. How long, on average, did it take to sort the catch and discard all prohibited species, if the catch was sorted on board?
 - a. less than 30 minutes
 - b. 30 minutes to two hours
 - c. more than 2 hours

Use this key for questions 8-11:

- a. never presorted
- b. presorted only when observer present
- c. presorted only when observer not sampling
- d. only prominent or large individuals presorted
- e. majority of prohibited species presorted
- f. presorting never observed

Were prohibited species presorted on deck, as the net was being dumped, before you could collect your sample? Circle all letters that apply.

- | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 8. king crab | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. |
| 9. Tanner crab | a. | b. | c. | d. | e. | f. |

10. halibut a. b. c. d. e. f.
11. salmon a. b. c. d. e. f.
12. Did you observe halibut being handled with pews/gaffs?
a. yes
b. no

Hook-and-line vessel observers only, questions 13-14:

13. To remove halibut from the line, did the vessel utilize any hook stripping device ("crucifier")?
a. yes
b. no
14. If a gaff was used to remove halibut from the line, what method was most often employed?
a. hook removed from fish with little or no damage
b. gaff used as a crucifier - damage to mouth
c. gaff used to pierce heads or flesh of fish

All observers, questions 15-16:

15. Did you observe large halibut being hoisted by a line tied around the caudal peduncle?
a. yes
b. no
16. Did you observe any retention or consumption of prohibited species caught by this vessel?
a. yes
b. no

Describe any additional information on prohibited species handling in your logbook.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

1. How were your weekly catch messages transmitted?
 - a. FAX from ship
 - b. telex from ship
 - c. COMSAT/CC mail
 - d. radio to Kodiak Observer office
 - e. radiotelephone (ship to shore)
 - f. FAX from port
 - g. telephone from port
 - h. other _____
2. If you did not transmit your catch messages yourself, was there any difficulty in having them transmitted in a timely manner?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

Please document catch message transmission difficulties in your logbook.

3. Did you ever weigh sample units of product?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. not applicable
4. If you used the ship's scales for your own weights, or for unit weights, did you check the calibration?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

Describe in your logbook any unit weight and/or scale comparisons.

5. Were you ever offered any monetary or other type of inducement to alter your data or routine?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
6. If yes, was it from vessel, plant or fishing company personnel or your contractor?
 - a. vessel/plant/company personnel
 - b. contractor

Please document the details in your logbook.

7. If you were subject to any impediments during your deployment, please circle the letter(s) of the type(s) of impediment(s).
 - a. verbal harassment
 - b. physical harassment
 - c. sexual harassment
 - d. interference with sampling
 - e. denial of access to equipment, personnel, vessel areas
 - f. intimidation, threats, coercion
 - g. biasing of samples
 - h. refusal of reasonable assistance
 - i. refusal to notify observer of haulback
 - j. destruction/theft of property
 - k. no impediments encountered

Please document details of any impediments in your logbook.

8. Did you observe any of the following violations?
 - a. dumping netting or other plastics at sea
 - b. discharge of oil into the water
 - c. intentional taking of marine mammals
 - d. intentional killing of seabirds
 - e. none of the above observed
9. Did you advise any personnel about any fisheries violations or inform them of any observed fisheries violations?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

Please document in your logbook details of any observed violations and any actions you took.

Please write your answers to the following questions in your logbook.

1. Explain your choice for official total catch. If PRR's were used, explain how and why you chose them. If observer estimate was used, how did you obtain an estimate for unsampled hauls or sets? Explain any formulas used.
2. Describe in detail how the observer estimate was made. What formulas were used? What densities were used? If no observer estimate was obtained, explain.
3. Describe in detail how retained weight was obtained. How was discard of the target species determined? If PRR's were used, explain your choice(s).
4. Why did you choose your particular sampling method(s)? Describe your sampling area and methods used to obtain data, including length frequencies. Describe any difficulties you had in trying to sample. How were discards treated? If you had a special project, explain how you completed it.
5. Summarize any safety concerns you had regarding this vessel. Be sure to include details from the safety questions (Section IV). Describe any injuries you or other crewmembers incurred, including fatalities. If you were unable to work due to illness or injury please describe the circumstances.
6. Describe anything unusual regarding the catches.
7. If this vessel fished in the Donut Hole or in any other areas outside the U.S. 200 mile limit, describe the amount of fishing activity, products, incidental catches of salmon, herring or marine mammals, etc.
8. Comment on the general cleanliness of this vessel, including the toilet and bathing facilities, and the quality of the drinking water.
9. What did you do, if anything specific, to help build good working relationships with the captain/crew? How were you treated? What were your quarters like? Indicate the numbers, ship status and sex of those with whom you shared quarters. Where did you do your paperwork? Were there any women in the crew?

10. Report anything you feel the Observer Program or NMFS Enforcement should know about this vessel. Were there any noteworthy comments or opinions (regarding the fishery, observers, NMFS, ADF&G, etc.) given by the captain/crew that you feel we should know?