

2022 Observer Program Annual Report June 2023

Jennifer Ferdinand – Fisheries Monitoring and Analysis Division, Alaska Fisheries Science Center Phil Ganz - Sustainable Fisheries Division, Alaska Regional Office

Page 1 U.S. Department of Commerce | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | National Marine Fisheries Service

Overview

- FMA maintained remote and hybrid observer training and briefing; other COVID precautions waned throughout the year (e.g., pre-trip quarantine)
- **375** individual observers were trained, briefed, and equipped for deployment to vessels and processing facilities operating in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska groundfish fisheries.
- Observers collected data onboard **336** fixed gear and trawl vessels and at **11** processing facilities for a total of **32,497** observer days.
- Observers and EM monitored 3,536 trips and 441 vessels



Amount of Catch Monitored – BSAI and GOA

- In the BSAI and GOA combined, 89.2% of pelagic trawl catch was on trips in the full coverage category and 10.8% was on trips in partial coverage
 - •All partial coverage pelagic trawl trips were in the GOA and 30.6% of their catch was monitored either by an at-sea or shoreside observer
 - Total monitoring of GOA pelagic trawl is higher if at-sea compliance EM is considered
- In the BSAI and GOA combined, 94% of non-pelagic trawl catch was on trips in the full coverage category and 6% was on trips in partial coverage
 - Partial coverage non-pelagic trawl trips occurred in both the BSAI and GOA with 50.7% and 34.7% of their catch monitored, respectively
 - The Pacific cod trawl CV cooperative program (PCTC) will move many partial coverage trips into full coverage in 2024



Observer Cost - Full Coverage

• The total invoiced amount for full coverage observer days in 2022 was \$11,469,305 for 29,069 invoiced days

- •Invoiced days differ from deployment days the latter includes days for which the observer provider did not charge yet the observer was deployed
- •Average cost per invoiced day was \$395
- •Average invoiced cost includes daily rate per observer day, transportation, and all other billed expenses
- •Both total invoiced dollars and days decreased in 2022 from 2021
 - Invoiced cost decreased by 7%
 - Invoiced days decreased by 11%



Electronic Monitoring - Full Coverage

•EM is used to supplement observer coverage in the following full coverage fisheries:

- •Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands non-pollock trawl catcher/processors
 - •Additional EM required on these vessels if they are participating in deck sorting of Pacific halibut
- •Bering Sea pollock catcher/processors and motherships
- •Central Gulf of Alaska rockfish trawl catcher/processors
- •BSAI Pacific cod longline catcher/processors
- •Vessels act as their own EM providers or arrange this service with a private company
- •NMFS does not collect any cost information associated with these EM programs and costs incurred by the industry are not included in full coverage cost reports
- •Pelagic Pollock Trawl EM Exempted Fishing Permit costs are also not included in full coverage cost reports



Observer Cost – Partial Coverage

- Total expenditures for partial coverage observer deployments was \$4,428,624 for 2,968 observer days
 - Average cost of \$1,492 per observer day
 - Cost is inclusive of non-deployed day costs (training, debriefing, travel, quarantine days, and running the ODDS Help Desk for both observer and EM deployment)



Differences Between Full Coverage and Partial Coverage Costs

- Partial coverage observer salaries are subject to Federal Acquisition Regulations, Fair Labor Standards Act, and Service Contract Act requirements, and applicable Department of Labor Wage Rate Determination which establish minimum wage and benefits for observers, including overtime.
- Travel costs and expenses in partial coverage are reimbursed per the Government's Travel Regulations. These include specified *per diem* rates which are paid regardless of actual expenses.
- Partial coverage observers are deployed out of small, remote port locations which increases travel and lodging costs.
- Partial coverage travel costs are increased due to the 72 hour timeframe in which partial coverage vessels log trips.
- Partial coverage observers are often deployed on a vessel for one trip which is significantly shorter (one to five days) than the typical deployment for full coverage observers (60 to 90 days), requiring more travel between vessels.



Electronic Monitoring - Partial Coverage

- Preliminary expenditures for fixed gear EM deployments was \$896,635
- EM operational costs include project coordination by EM vendors and image reviewers; data review, processing and analysis; equipment services; and field technical services
- Cost reflects only imagery review through March 15, 2022
- Using new EM Committee reporting categories, and amortized costs from past years which have not yet been accounted for are not included



Chapter 3: Deployment Performance Review



2022 Deployment Strata

Full coverage:

- 1. FULL Trips taken by vessels required to have, or opted into, full observer coverage;
- 2. EM TRW EFP Trips in the full coverage trawl EM stratum;

Partial coverage EM:

- 1. EM HAL Trips by vessels accepted into the EM pool and fished with hook-and-line gear
- 2. EM POT Trips by vessels accepted into the EM pool and fished with pot gear
- 3. EM TRW EFP Trips in the partial coverage trawl EM stratum

Partial observer coverage:

- HAL Trips using hook-and-line gear
 POT Trips using pot gear
- 3. TRW Trips using trawl gear

Zero coverage:

1. ZERO - Trips by jig vessels and vessels under 40 ft LOA



Table 3-1. -- Number of total vessels (V), sampled vessels (v), total trips (N), and sampled trips (n) for each stratum in 2022.

-					Cove	rage	
Strata	V	v	Ν	n	Expected	Realized	Meets expected?
Full	113	112	1,647	1,644	100.0	99.8	No - lower than expected*
EM TRW EFP	50	50	897	897	100.0		Yes
Full Coverage Total	145	144	2,544	2,541	100.0	99.9	

* Three trips were not monitored: one occurred on a vessel that had opted into full coverage and two were on vessels greater than 46 ft. in length fishing HAL CDQ groundfish, meeting the criteria for full coverage fishing. In each case they failed to obtain a full coverage observer.



Table 3-1. -- Number of total vessels (V), sampled vessels (v), total trips (N), and sampled trips (n) for each stratum in 2021. The coverage and 95% confidence interval columns are expressed as percentages of the total number of trips taken within each stratum.

					Cov	erage	95% Co	onfiden	ce
Strata	V	v	N	n	Expected	Realized	Lower	Uppe	r Meets expected?
Partial coverage EM									
EM HAL	118	63	658	133	30	20.2	17.2	23.5	Preliminary data**
ЕМ РОТ	50	34	349	85	30	24.4	19.9	29.2	Preliminary data**
EM TRW EFP	40	33	526	160	33.3	30.4*	26.5	34.5	Yes
Partial coverage observ	ved								
HAL	299	122	1,346	196	19.0	14.6	12.7	16.6	No - lower than expected
РОТ	172	100	1,163	211	17.5	18.1	16.0	20.5	Yes
TRW	72	53	725	210	29.7	29	25.7	32.4	Yes
Zero coverage	310	0	1,599	0	0.0	0.0			Yes
Partial Coverage Total	974	441	8,910	3,536		39.7% Tri	ps: 45.3%	6 Vesse	ls

* Trawl EM EFP requires cameras at-sea on 100% of trips and shoreside sampling by observers on all trips in the BSAI and a random selection of trips in the GOA. This table evaluates shoreside sampling goals to collect biological samples and census counts of salmon and halibut PSC.

** Sampled trips and realized coverage rates reflect video review through April 10, 2023.

Table 3-4. -- Monitored catch¹ (metric tons), total catch, and percent monitored (%) of groundfish and halibut retained and discarded in the groundfish and halibut fisheries in 2022 in the Gulf of Alaska. Empty cells indicate that no catch occurred.

		Catcher	/Process	sor	Catch	er vessel		Catcher ve pro	ssel: Roc ogram	kfish	Gea	r total	
Gear	Catch	Monitored	Total	%	Monitored	Total	%	Monitored	Total	%	Monitored	Total	%
Hook	Retained	2,533	2,626	96%	2,041	16,095	13%				4,574	18,721	24%
and Line	Discard	770	807	95%	1,1451	11,462	13%				2,221	12,269	18%
Non Pologic	Retained	30,935	30,935	100%	2,634	7,673	34%	4,295	4,295	100%	37,864	42,903	88%
Trawl	Discard	3,889	3,889	100%	245	628	39%	363	363	100%	4,496	4,879	92%
Pot	Retained	692	771	90%	3,584	17,712	20%				4,276	18,483	23%
1.00	Discard	9	12	81%	105	596	18%				114	607	19%
Pelagic	Retained	2,327	2,327	100%	39,648	129,701	31%	10,393	10,393	100%	52,368	142,421	37%
Trawl	Discard	167	167	100%	341	996	34%	174	174	100%	682	1,337	51%
¹ Monitor	red reflect	either trips y	with an o	hserver.	EM fixed ge:	ar trips fo	r whicl	n some video	was revi	ewed. or	r EM trawl t	rins wher	е

observers sampled shoreside.

Table 3-5. -- Monitored catch¹ (metric tons), total catch, and percent monitored (%) of groundfish and halibut retained and discarded in the groundfish and halibut fisheries in 2022 in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands. Empty cells indicate that no catch occurred.

		Catche	r/Process	or	Mot	hership		Catc	her Vessel		G	ear Total	
Gear	Catch	Monitored	Total	%	Monitored	Total	%	Monitored	Total	%	Monitored	Total	%
Hook and	Retained	85,493	85,493	100%				249	1,915	13%	85,742	87,411	98%
Line	Discard	17,422	17,422	100%				160	1,201	13%	17,582	18,624	94%
Non Pelagic	Retained	342,512	342,512	100%	23,482	23,482	100%	9,111	18,070	50%	375,105	384,064	98%
Trawl	Discard	27,113	27,113	100%	1,220	1,220	100%	632	1,139	56%	28,965	29,471	98%
Pot	Retained	3,792	3,792	100%				3,926	20,816	19%	7,718	24,607	31%
	Discard	92	92	100%				84	644	13%	176	736	24%
Pelagic	Retained	494,511	494,511	100%	95,208	95,208	100%	475,561	475,561	100%	1,065,281	1,065,281	100%
Trawl	Discard	1,590	1,590	100%	286	286	100%	500	500	100%	2,376	2,376	100%

¹ Monitored reflects either trips with an observer, EM fixed gear trips for which some video was reviewed, or EM trawl trips where observers sampled shoreside. EM trawl trips also require 100% at-sea video monitoring for compliance with maximized retention requirements, but that monitoring is not reflected in this table.

Chapter 4: Enforcement and Compliance



Data Analysis Methods

- A "statement" is a potential violation reported to FMA and OLE
 - Each statement submitted by an observer may contain multiple occurrences of potential violations.
- OLE Priority: Inter-personal is calculated occurrences per assignment rather than deployed days.
 - •OLE prioritizes any activity that may pose a threat to an observer and their data.
- OLE takes reporting trends into consideration when planning outreach, patrols, and other operations.
- Refer to page 56 of the Annual Report for more specifics on data preparation.



Trends in Reporting

OLE Priority: Inter-personal (unwanted, unwelcome behavior)

Assault

- Rate of 0.33/assignment on C/P non-pelagic trawl in the Gulf of Alaska
- Rate of 0.02/ assignment on C/P A80 non-pelagic trawl in the BSAI
- •There were no assaults reported in 2021

Sexual harassment

- •A80 C/Ps, AFA C/Ps and motherships, freezer longliners in the BSAI, and catcher vessel longliners in the Gulf of Alaska **each** had a rate of 0.07 per assignment
- Multiple incidents involve repeated unwelcome advances towards observers that persisted after requests for the behavior to cease.
- •NOAA has recently released a Notice which reiterates that owners and operators may be charged jointly and severally liable for incidents involving sexual assault and sexual harassment of observers.
- Occurrences of Sexual Harassment per assignment declined from 2022 to 2021 by 33%.



Trends in reporting

Protected Resources and Prohibited Species

- In the Gulf of Alaska, observers reported 54 occurrences involving salmon being inaccessible at shoreside plants and 20 occurrences when observer-reported salmon numbers didn't match the fish ticket
- Observers reported 27 occurrences of undersized halibut not being released properly aboard longline IFQ vessels
- Observers reported 64 occurrences of mishandling halibut during deck sorting and 65 occurrences of mishandling halibut in the factory aboard C/P non-pelagic trawl vessels
- Occurrences per 1,000 deployed days involving Prohibited Mishandling increased from 2021 to 2022 by 40%



Outreach letters & Meetings with Industry

Outreach letters

- Observer Work Environment
- Impacts to Observer Data
- •CP Operational Requirements
- •Amendment 80 Requirements
- Halibut Deck Sorting Requirements
- Catcher Vessel Requirements
- Voluntary Online Training Ensuring a Safe Work Environment for Observers
- Meetings with vessel companies
 - •22 meetings in total discussions focused on current issues detected in the fishing fleet in general and in specific sectors.



Chapter 5: NMFS Recommendations



• Continue analysis to **integrate** monitoring methods.

Data Collected - Catch	At-Sea Observers	Trawl EM + Shoreside	Fixed Gear EM
Trip Characteristics (E.g., Duration, Total Effort)			
Haul Characteristics (E.g., Location, Effort, Depth, Gear Performance)		\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Haul Level Species Composition - Counts		X	
Haul Level Species Composition - Weights		X	×
Trip Level Species Composition - Counts			\checkmark
Trip Level Species Composition - Weights			×
Speciation of Similar Species (e.g., large red rockfishes, king crabs)			×
Haul Specific Salmon Enumeration		X	\bigcirc
Trip Specific Salmon Enumeration			\bigcirc
USCG Marine Casualty Information		\bigcirc	\bigcirc



• Continue analysis to **integrate** monitoring methods.

Data Collected - Biologicals	At-Sea Observers	Trawl EM + Shoreside	Fixed Gear EM
Sexed Length Data (fish and crab)			X
Pacific Halibut Size and Mortality Assessment			X
Trip Specific Age Structures (e.g., otoliths, scales, fin rays)			×
Trip Specific Tissues for Genetic Analyses			X
Tagged Organism Information			X
Stomach Samples (Trophic Interactions)		\bigcirc	X
Maturity Information		\bigcirc	X



• Continue analysis to **integrate** monitoring methods.

Data Collected - Protected Species	At-Sea Observers	Trawl EM + Shoreside	Fixed Gear EM
Marine Mammal Injury and Mortality		\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Marine Mammal Tissue (genetics, trophic Information, contaminants)		X	×
Marine Mammal Interaction (non-lethal; non-injury)		X	\bigcirc
Marine Mammal Sighting		X	×
Verify Seabird Avoidance		N.A.	
Seabird Mortality (catch by gear)			
Seabird Mortality (vessel interaction)		\bigcirc	\bigcirc
ESA-Listed Seabird Carcass		\bigcirc	X



Deployment Design:

- Continue analysis to integrate monitoring methods.
 O Evaluate 3 stratification options and 4 allocation methods
 - Account for PCTC implementation and trawl EM



Summary of Priorities

- Design a monitoring program that collects credible, statistically rigorous scientific data
- Collect the best and most data for a given budget
- Collect data for a wide range of analytic needs (multi-objective program)

Challenge is to...

- Meet the data needs of data users with a wide range of analytic objectives (MSA)
- Collect data that reflects the full range of fishing activities



Stratification

- How fishing trips are grouped for sampling
- Groups are defined by trip characteristics known *before* random selection

Can be used to:

- Focus sampling on a particular objective
- Control costs

Can be defined by:

- Monitoring method
- Gear
- FMP

Bering Sea / Aleutian Islands / Gulf of Alaska



Stratification

Status quo: 7 strata defined by monitoring method and gear

•		Monitoring Method								
		At-sea Observer	At-sea EM	EM Compliance + Shoreside OB	None (Zero)					
a	HAL	1,352	722		1 601					
, Typ	POT	1,086	353		1,001					
Geal	TRW	631		620						

Under Consideration for Observer and EM:

Split by FMP	Mixed-gear Trips (fishing both HAL and POT)
• BSAI/GOA	• Combine fixed-gear trips into a single stratum
	OR
	• Create mixed-gear strata separate from HAL and POT



Allocation

Distributing samples to different strata

Equal Rates

Goal: Representative sample with equal burden of monitoring

• commonly used when don't know about population

Status Quo - current standard

Goal: *Equal Rates* to 15% plus variance minimization

- Add sample to decrease between-trip variance of discards
 - o salmon, halibut, & total groundfish
- Observed strata only
- EM fixed gear strata 30% sample rate and EM trawl at 33.3%



Allocation

Distributing samples to different strata

Novel approaches: Representative sample without data gaps Cost-weighted boxes

Goal: maximize the proportion of "boxes" monitored (or near), penalizing strata with high monitoring costs

- Stratum specific monitoring costs
- Minimize areas and times without data

Proximity

Goal: maximize proportion of trips near monitored trips while guarding against low sample sizes

- Create index, constant index for all strata
- Weight by inverse of sample size

Both rely on a reasonable box definition



Defining appropriate "box'

Boxes defined by a unit of **space** and a unit of **time**

- Pick of scale of time and space that is useful
 - Spatial cells are all equal in size (vs. NMFS areas)
- Allow boxes to rely on **neighboring** boxes

Final Definition

- Each box : 200km-wide hexagon cell and 1week
- Neighboring trips : Include adjacent cells and +/- 1 week



Red: NMFS Reporting Area Boundaries

Filled hexagons: 125 km across; Blue hexagons: 200 km across; Green hexagons: 750 km across

Allocation - Drivers

Cost-Weighted Boxes



Summary of Designs

Considering 12 designs 3 stratification options X 4 allocation methods

Gear & monitoring method Status Quo, Equal Rates, Cost-weighted boxes, Proximity Gear & monitoring method by FMP (**BSAI** & **GOA**) Status Quo, Equal Rates, Cost-weighted boxes, Proximity Split or Combine Gear & monitoring method by FMP (**BSAI** & **GOA**)

Status Quo, Equal Rates, Cost-weighted boxes, Proximity



Evaluation Metrics

- Data collection opportunities
 - Trips sampled (observers)
 - Trips monitored (observers or EM)
- Variance in *expenses*
- Burden share
- Power to detect
 - Rare events (Short-tailed albatross, Steller sea lion)
 - Observer effects
- Data timeliness
- Variance between trips
 - Salmon PSC
 - Halibut PSC
 - Groundfish discards
 - Crab PSC

• Interspersion (monitored trips near unmonitored trips)

Evaluations of Designs

- It is unlikely that one design will be the best across all metrics
- Scores and rankings will change with different budgets
- We want the best design that will work on small and large budgets.

Metric		Desi	gn	
	Α	В	С	D
Trips sampled (observers, all data)	291	126	221	237
Trips monitored (observers or EM)	20	37	60	43
Variance in expenses	3115	3028	3017	2979
Short-tailed albatross	0.03	0.07	0.25	0.15
Steller sea lion	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.01
Observer effects	0.45	0.47	0.39	0.56
Burden share	0.42	0.85	1	0.49
Data timeliness	164	164	200	159
Salmon PSC (#)	3940	4444	3892	4602
Halibut PSC (t)	60	180	98	181
Crab PSC	51	111	70	38
Groundfish discards (t)	651	735	1198	338
Interspersion	0.16	0.11	0.54	0.5

*Random numbers for illustration only. Not actual results.

Deployment Design:

- Continue analysis to **integrate** monitoring methods.
 - Evaluate 3 stratification options and 4 allocation methods
 - Account for PCTC implementation and trawl EM
- Continue evaluation of Zero Coverage using criteria that are predictable from year to year
 - Look at fixed-gear EM vessels that have not fished for groundfish in multiple years
- Evaluate high cancellation rates in HAL stratum



Changes to ODDS:

- Modify ODDS to ask operators of vessels greater than 56ft with a history of fishing for CDQ groundfish to alert them they are in full coverage.
- Incorporate PCTC into ODDS to alert vessels that they are in full coverage.



Fixed Gear EM:

- Maintain the size of the 2023 fixed gear pool (172 vessels)
 - As funds are available, expand up to Council's recommendation of 200 vessels.
- Prioritize placement in EM pool by:
 - Vessels size; fishing effort; vessels unlikely to introduce data gaps; and cost efficiency
- Continue to notify operators of VMP non-compliance.
 - NMFS may remove vessels with repeated problems.



Trawl EM EFP:

- Continue the pelagic trawl EM EFP
- Support increasing the number of participants and continuing efforts to improve processor participation and support.
- Support combination of federal and NFWF funds to cover costs in 2024.

Collaborate with industry on EM development Projects:

- Testing EM on trawl catcher vessels participating in the CGOA rockfish program;
- Real time electronic logbook data collection and reporting in Alaska's groundfish and halibut fisheries; and
- Improving and enhancing EM Data in Western GOA.



Other Cost Efficiency Ideas Separate From Deployment Design

- Program elements that provide flexibility to fishery participants but increase cost
 - E.g. vessels pick up observers in specific ports; increase time for observer provider to get observers to selected vessels, etc
 - Not supported by PCFMAC/FMAC. No further work planned
- EM Improvements might also bring some cost efficiency
 - E.g. Utilize trawl EM equipment on vessels that also fish fixed gear; Change catch handling on pot boats to focus data collection on discards only
 - Ongoing work occurring, could be implemented under any of the deployment designs
- Apply survey derived weight data to EM; increase reliance on survey for biological data
 - Problematic for stock assessment. No further work planned
- Preliminary look so far:
 - Increase timeless of EM data review
 - Hire observers as federal employees



Acknowledgments

- Thank you to the observers, observer providers, captains, crew members, EM providers, video reviewers, and agency staff who made fishery-dependent data collection possible in 2022.
- Thank you to the AFSC, AKR, and PSMFC staff who have developed new deployment models to evaluate for 2024.
- Thank you to the members of the FMAC, PCFMAC, and EM Trawl Committee for their input, feedback, and dedication to sustainable fisheries management.



Discussion

