

AK EM Marching orders for PSMFC

Projects in order of priority (From Chris Rilling and Farron Wallace)

1. IPHC halibut longline survey
2. Northern Endurance Setline
3. Volunteer longline vessels
4. Northern Endurance Pot – not working on this until further notice from Farron

Data to be collected for each project:

1. IPHC halibut longline survey (from FW's February 2015 SSC presentation)
 - a. Capture trip and haul start and end times and locations
 - b. Hook level – no hook counts but order of fish on line is important - Since at sea sampler is possibly subsampling sets, will we also only be reviewing these sets? How do we get the sets selected? Or should we only review sets we can see the at-sea sampler handling?
IPHC sampler will be collecting hook specific species catch for all hooks in a set and skate number there is no sub-sampling. Therefore;
 - EM reviewer will provide species counts for all fish species to the lowest taxa possible, grouping of inverts is fine (i.e. starfish, coral, etc.)
 - EM reviewer will identify each skate (a large weight separate skates)
 - No need to maintain sequential catch information, but all species count data must be within the skate.
 - The EM reviewer will identify snarls in the data set.
 - No need to collect hook release method.
 - i. Identification of fish – Fish only?
To lowest taxa possible
 - ii. Counts of fish – Fish only?
Count all fish and invertebrates
 - iii. Disposition of fish (retained or discarded) – Fish only?
Fish only since my assumption is that all non-fish species are discard
 - iv. Some video will be reviewed by two video reviewers for: Catch order species specific identification made by two video reviewers
Within skate only and species order not required.
 - v. What is the difference between this survey and the Northern Endurance setline? Isn't identification being addressed by the Northern Endurance setline project? Are we not going to assess halibut release method and condition?

Do not record halibut release method as it may not be comparable to “normal” fishing operations. Species composition comparison between EM reviewer and At-Sea sampler from both IPHC and N. Endurance will be used to evaluate the efficacy of spp. ID and evaluate the sampling rates. If you are going to compare sea sampler species ID with 1 or 2 EM reviewer species ID, I would think you need species order. What can be learned from skate level aggregation?
 - vi. Why can't the set level aggregate for a set answer this question? Pinpoint the exact fish that was confusing?
Skate level aggregation is fine.

2. Northern Endurance Setline (from FW's February 2015 SSC presentation)
 - a. Capture trip and haul start and end times and locations
 - b. Hook level – no hook counts but order of fish on line is important - Since at sea sampler is possibly subsampling sets, will we also only be reviewing these sets? How do we get the sets selected? Or should we only review sets we can see the at-sea sampler handling?
NMFS will identify which video has corresponding hook-by-hook data prior to review to PSMFC. Only sets that include at-sea sampler data will be reviewed. I understood all hauls will receive the level 1-3 review for system performance plus an assessment of video quality. Is that still the intent?
 - i. Identification of fish – Fish only?
Same as IPHC
 - ii. Counts of fish – Fish only?
Same as IPHC
 - iii. Disposition of fish (retained or discarded) – Fish only?
Same as IPHC
 - iv. Some video will be reviewed by two video reviewers for: Catch order species specific identification made by two video reviewers
3. Volunteer vessels (From DataReviewProtocol_subcommitteeMeetingNotes- Jan 13 2015.docx)
 - a. Paper/dockside data (effort logs, IPHC logs and dockside monitor data)
 - i. Key punch all data and maintain data tables
 - b. Video data
 - i. Current marching orders from Chris Rilling re: reviewing for catch: Review all trips that pass (full video, full rockfish retention, dockside monitoring) until IPHC video comes in. Trips that don't pass should be put on the backburner.
 - ii. For all data drives received:
 1. Metadata
 - a. ADFG permit #
 - b. Date drive retrieved
 - c. Field assessment notes (Saltwater/Archipelago notes when drive was picked up)
 - d. Logbook: Y/N
 - e. **Alia added – Vessel Attributes? Still need list of what these are. Are most captured as part of vessel monitoring plan? Characteristics will drive subsampling. I believe Page 11 of the Jan 20 operational testing plan Howard distributed lists the attributes as: vessel configuration; fishing gear; deck gear; camera location; EM configuration; and fishing characteristics. The document provides details on categories under each of these headings**
 2. Initial review to answer the following:
 - a. Is sensor data complete? Y/N
 - b. Is imagery/video complete? Y/N
 - c. Was there dockside monitoring? Y/N
 3. Trip and Haul data
 - a. Port code

- b. Date/time/location start of trip
 - c. Date/time/location end of trip
 - d. Number of hauls
 - e. Date/time/location start of each haul
 - f. Date/time/location end of each haul
- c. For those trips that have:
- i. full video
 - ii. full rockfish retention and **The question has come up about sets with dockside monitoring where some rockfish were also discarded. The goal of this exercise is to validate EM reviewer rockfish species ID to see if we need full retention or not. I would think the more sets we can compare counts on the better. Is there value in comparing the EM reviewer's count of retained rockfish with the DSM count?**
 - iii. dockside monitoring - complete video review of trip
 - 1. Catch
 - a. All fish species IDs to lowest level
 - b. All fish counts
 - c. All fish disposition (discarded at rail; retained at rail) – with better views in 2015, does the discarded and retained at rail delineation still hold? If we see a fish go overboard from the other side of the boat, should we not record it as discarded? **We do not know what gets discarded after the cameras are off anyway, so I would stick with immediate at-rail release only. No change from last year. I believe we can drop the “at rail” words and classify as discard any fish that goes back overboard. The vessel scorecard Adam is developing will have a field to grade the vessel on discarding at control points identified in the VMP. It is also important to continue tracking “drop-of” separate from discards.**
 - d. All other species – counts, ID, Disposition? **yes**
 - e. Birds, inverts, mammals – counts, ID, Disposition? **Yes, and the operators compliance with extended presentation for seabirds will be noted on the vessel score card**
 - f. For discarded Halibut Catch
 - i. Injury key/Release condition
 - ii. Release method
 - 2. Time to review
 - 3. Confidence in species ID. EM reviewers will provide a data confidence rating (high, medium, low).
 - 4. Image quality: EM reviewers will provide an image quality assessment (high, medium, low). – this is new for 2015
 - a. For low image quality, they will assign a reason for the low image quality. Note that AMR will provide field assessment notes that might provide more information about why there was low quality.
 - iv. Fill out vessels score card**
- d. For all other trips
 - i. Based on Howard's vessel attributes, subsample trips for the following:
 - 1. Catch
 - a. All fish species IDs to lowest level
 - b. All fish counts

c. All fish disposition (discarded at rail; retained at rail) – with better views in 2015, does the discarded and retained at rail delineation still hold? If we see a fish go overboard from the other side of the boat, should we not record it as discarded? **We do not know what gets discarded after the cameras are off anyway, so I would stick with immediate at-rail release only. No change from last year. . I believe we can drop the “at rail” words and classify as discard any fish that goes back overboard. The vessel scorecard Adam is developing will have a field to grade the vessel on discarding at control points identified in the VMP. It is also important to continue tracking “drop-of” separate from discards.**

d. All other species – counts, ID, Disposition? **yes**

e. Birds, inverts, mammals – counts, ID, Disposition? **Yes, and the operators compliance with extended presentation for seabirds will be noted on the vessel score card**

f. For discarded Halibut Catch
 i. Injury key/Release condition
 ii. Release method

2. Time to review

3. Confidence in species ID. EM reviewers will provide a data confidence rating (high, medium, low).

4. Image quality: EM reviewers will provide an image quality assessment (high, medium, low). – this is new for 2015

a. For low image quality, they will assign a reason for the low image quality. Note that AMR will provide field assessment notes that might provide more information about why there was low quality.

ii. Fill out vessels score card

+++++

From the subcommittee meeting notes:

Rules of Review:

- For all trips: Do review level 1-3 (metadata, initial review, trip data).
- If there is complete video for whole trip & there was full retention of rockfish & there was dockside monitoring: Conduct full review through level 4.
 - Note: Might need to sub-sample and randomly review a sub-sample of *trips* if we end up with more dockside trips than the budget can handle.
- For the rest of the trips (complete video or not): identify the trips based on operational characteristics, and randomly select *hauls* to full level review level 4.
 - Howard will come up with the list of operation attributes that will be used. For example:
 - vessel configuration (side haul, stern haul)
 - day vs night

- The number of hauls that will be reviewed will be based on the budget.

+++++

- 4. Northern Endurance Pot (from FW's February 2015 SSC presentation)
 - a. Capture trip and haul start and end times and locations
 - b. Pot level - Since at sea sampler is sampling only randomly selected pots, will we also only be reviewing these pots? How do we get the pots selected? Or should we only review pots we can see the at-sea sampler handling?

This is low priority at this time and should wait until we finish post processing on the IPHC, N. Endurance and Volunteer. I think it is important to the pot boats to continue making progress on the ability of EM to meet management objectives in those fisheries. I would recommend we conduct a level 1-3 review on all trips plus assess image quality, then identify a target number of pot hauls to review for species ID comparisons with sea sampler counts.

- i. Identification of fish
- ii. Counts of fish
- iii. Disposition of fish (retained or discarded)
- iv. Some video will be reviewed by two video reviewers for: Pot-specific species identification made by two video reviewers