# THE 1999 U.S. CENTRAL-WESTERN PACIFIC TROPICAL TUNA PURSE SEINE FISHERY ${ }^{1}$ 

Atilio L. Coan Jr. Gary T. Sakagawa and Doug Prescott Southwest Fisheries Science Center<br>La Jolla, CA, USA<br>Peter Williams<br>Oceanic Fisheries Program<br>Secretariat of the South Pacific Community<br>Noumea, New Caledonia<br>Karl Staish<br>Forum Fisheries Agency<br>Honiara, Solomon Islands<br>Gordon Yamasaki<br>Southwest Region<br>National Marine Fisheries Service<br>Pago Pago, American Samoa, USA

## AUGUST 2000

## ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT LJ-00-10

[^0]
# THE 1999 U.S. CENTRAL-WESTERN PACIFIC TROPICAL TUNA PURSE SEINE FISHERY ${ }^{1}$ 

Atilio L. Coan Jr., Gary T. Sakagawa and Doug Prescott Southwest Fisheries Science Center<br>La Jolla, CA, USA<br>Peter Williams<br>Oceanic Fisheries Program<br>Secretariat of the South Pacific Community<br>Noumea, New Caledonia<br>Karl Staish<br>Forum Fisheries Agency<br>Honiara, Solomon Islands<br>Gordon Yamasaki<br>Southwest Region<br>National Marine Fisheries Service<br>Pago Pago, American Samoa, USA

## INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes and reviews fisheries data collected from the 1999, U.S. tuna purse seine fishery in the central-western Pacific. At the time of preparing this report, processing of landing statistics and observer data for the 1999 season was not fully completed. Approximately $86 \%$ of the landings, port size and species composition samples and logbook data, $59 \%$ of the observer records and $73 \%$ of the size composition samples collected by observers had been processed. Available landings data were adjusted to represent a preliminary estimate of the year's total landing.

## VESSEL OPERATIONS

During the 1999 fishing season, 36 licensed purse seiners fished in the central-western Pacific, under the South Pacific Tuna Treaty (SPTT), and made 175 trips (Table 1). This was 3 vessels and 25 trips less than in 1998. The number of trips per vessel was approximately 5 , and similar to those recorded for the last nine years. The average number of days per trip was 41.5 and sets per trip, 20.8, a decrease of $11 \%$ and $24 \%$ respectively from 1998 levels. Overall catch rate (all species combined) in 1999 was 38.3 t/day fished, and is the highest recorded for the fishery (Table 2). This exceptional catch rate is largely attributed to increased use of Fish Aggregation Devices (FADs) ${ }^{2}$.

[^1]
## Distribution of fishing effort

In 1999, the fleet conducted 4,758 days of fishing. This effort was concentrated mostly in the area between Kiribati and Tuvalu (Figure 1). Over $64 \%$ of the fishing effort was in areas west of the International Date Line (IDL). The fleet made approximately 3,478 sets during 1999. Of these, $90 \%$ were sets on FADs, $6 \%$ on logs and $4 \%$ on free-swimming schools (Figure 2).

In comparison, 1998 fishing effort was distributed very similar to the 1999 pattern, but with $21 \%$ more days fished than in 1999. Total number of sets was 4,856 and only $25 \%$ was on FADs, $29 \%$ on logs and $46 \%$ on free-swimming schools.

## Fleet Carrying Capacity

The number of U.S. purse seiners fishing under the SPTT has fluctuated between 35 and 39 since 1996. The average carrying capacity per vessel, however, increased steadily from $1,122 \mathrm{t}$ /vessel in 1996 to $1,184 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{vessel}$ in 1999, an increase of approximately $6 \%$ (Table 1). Available records indicate that 2 vessels in both 1998 and 1999 underwent capacity modification. This trend of increased carrying capacity is continuing into 2000.

## CATCH AND CATCH COMPOSITION

The U.S. purse seine fleet in the central-western Pacific caught about $182,000 \mathrm{t}$ of yellowfin, skipjack and bigeye tunas in 1999 (Table 2). About $72 \%$ of the catch was skipjack tuna, $19 \%$ yellowfin tuna and $9 \%$ bigeye tuna. The 1999 catch is $4 \%$ higher than the 1998 catch and would have been higher yet, if low prices in the second semester did not discourage vessels from operating. The 1999 bigeye tuna catch is the highest recorded for the fishery, up by over $200 \%$ from the 1998 level. This increase is attributed to the substantial increase in FAD sets in 1999.

Seventy-eight percent of the catch was landed in American Samoa in 1999, a decrease from the $89 \%$ landed there in 1998 (Figure 3). The rest of the landings were in the Philippines (11\%); Fiji (5\%), Solomon Islands (3\%) and others ( $\sim 3 \%$ ). 1999 was the first year of substantial landings in the Philippines.

## Size Composition

NMFS port samplers in American Samoa and FFA observers onboard purse seiners measured the catch for fish sizes. Port samplers measured approximately 26,000 yellowfin tuna, 22,400 skipjack tuna and 15,600 bigeye tuna in 1999. Skipjack tuna ranged from 31 to 79 cm fork length (FL) and averaged 54 cm FL (Figure 4), yellowfin tuna ranged from 36 to 142 cm FL and averaged 67 cm FL (Figure 5), and bigeye tuna ranged from 35 to 120 cm FL and averaged 64 cm FL (Figure 6). In general, fish caught in floating object sets were smaller than fish caught in free-swimming school sets.

FFA observers measured 15,100 yellowfin tuna, 34,111 skipjack tuna and 3,552 bigeye tuna from single sets in 1999. The observers randomly drew and measured five fish from each brail. Skipjack tuna
ranged between 20 and 100 cm FL and averaged 56 cm FL (Figure 4), yellowfin tuna ranged between 24 and 153 cm FL and averaged 74 cm FL (Figure 5), and bigeye tuna ranged between 30 and 155 cm FL and averaged 70 cm FL (Figure 6). The ranges of fish sizes and the average lengths of fish sampled by observers were greater than those obtained by port samplers. Most of this difference can be explained by observers having access to sampling of undersized fish before they are discarded at sea and to large fish that may be more easily selected from single sets.

## Species Composition

Species composition samples were also collected by NMFS port samplers in American Samoa. The sampling was largely geared for sorting out bigeye tuna in landings labeled as yellowfin tuna. In 1999, landings labeled as skipjack tuna were observed to contain a significant mixture of species. Sampling was, therefore, modified to pay closer attention to species composition sampling of skipjack tuna landings.

A total of 34,100 fish were examined for species identification in 1999. About $33 \%$ of the overall landing labeled as yellowfin tuna was actually bigeye tuna. This was a significant increase from the $12 \%$ recorded in 1998 and is related to increased fishing with FADs (Table 3a).

In landings labeled skipjack tuna, about $4.9 \%$ was yellowfin tuna and $2.2 \%$ bigeye tuna (Table 3b). The presence of other species in skipjack tuna landings appeared to be more pronounced for landings containing fish less than 1.4 kg .

## By-catch and discards

Vessel captains reported by-catch in purse seine sets for $73 \%$ of the trips and tuna discards for $45 \%$ of the trips. Approximately 164 t of by-catch species and 683 t of tuna were reported as discarded at sea (Table 4). The most frequently reported by-catch species were rainbow runner (Elagatis bipinnulata) followed by baitfish, sharks and marlin. Small skipjack tuna was the most frequently discarded tuna species.

By-catch information for 1999 from FFA observer trips is preliminary. Information from 24 trips or $59 \%$ coverage indicate that 128 t of by-catch and 568 t of tuna was discarded at sea (Table 5, 6). As with logbook data, floating object sets accounted for the majority of this by-catch. The most frequently discarded tuna species was skipjack tuna. Rainbow runner was the most common by-catch species. Whereas $100 \%$ of the by-catch is reported as discarded at sea in logbooks, only $75 \%$ is reported by observers as discarded at sea.

A better picture of tuna discards and by-catch can be gained from observer records for 1998 (Table 7, 8). Data for all 35 observer trips have been processed and extrapolated to the entire U.S. fleet for 1998. Tuna discards amounted to an estimated $6,500 \mathrm{t}$ of which about $58 \%$ was attributed to FAD sets, and $31 \%$ to log sets. By-catch discards amounted to an estimated $3,300 \mathrm{t}$ of which about $25 \%$ was in FAD sets and $72 \%$ in log sets.

## FISHERY ANALYSIS

In 1999, fishing effort for the U.S. fleet was largely concentrated west of the IDL and distributed in a spatial pattern characteristic of non-El NiZo conditions in the central-western Pacific. Virtually all of the effort was with FADs ( $90 \%$ of sets), unlike past years when FAD sets did not exceed $35 \%$. This heavy dependence on FADs is believed to be related to efficiency advantages. Sets on FADs are about 95\% successful whereas sets on free-swimming schools are only $50 \%$ successful. Yields of successful sets of both set types are about the same. Also, search time for FADs is minimal owing to use of radio location devices on the FADs, whereas it is considerable for locating fee-swimming schools. Performance indicators (Tables 1 and 2) for 1999 reflect these advantages-high total catch $(182,100 \mathrm{t})$, highest catch rate on record ( $38 \mathrm{t} /$ day fished), shortest fishing trips on record ( 41.5 days/trip), and fewest sets per trip to date ( 20.8 sets/trip).

While fishing was exceptionally good in 1999, market conditions created havoc for the fleet. Supplies of tuna were plentiful world-wide and prices fell to record lows in the second half of the year. The oversupply caused exceptionally long delays in unloading of vessels in American Samoa and poor returns for vessel owners. A number of vessels opted to unload their catches ( $22 \%$ or $40,000 \mathrm{t}$ ) in ports to the west, such as in the Philippines, Fiji and Solomon Islands, and scheduled early and extended tie-ups for maintenance and other vessel services to by-pass delays in American Samoa and to wait for improved prices. As a result, the number of days fished per vessel fell to the lowest on record for the fleet.

The increased 1999 landings in foreign ports are of special concern because the landings were not sampled for size and species composition. A comparison of cannery receipts from landings in foreign ports and American Samoa landings for 1999 (Figures 7-9) was made to explore the impact. Landings by cannery size categories indicate that similar sizes of fish were landed in American Samoa and in foreign ports, although foreign ports received a higher proportion of large-sized fish (Figure 7). A majority of landings made in foreign ports, separated by NMFS sampling area (Figure 10) and month of catch, had counterpart landings in American Samoa, except for Area 1 (Figures 8 and 9). Area 1 is a westerly fishing area for the fleet and is the farthest from American Samoa. Because it is closer to the foreign ports than American Samoa, proximity may have played a large role in the decision to land in foreign ports. If landings in foreign ports continue, modification of the sampling design, to include sampling of these landings, should be considered.

Tuna and by-catch discard rates reported by observers for floating object sets in 1999 were 1.52 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{set}$ for undersize tuna and $0.34 \mathrm{t} /$ set for by-catch (Table 5). In comparison, the 1998 rates were higher, $2.41 \mathrm{t} /$ set for tuna and $1.13 \mathrm{t} /$ set for by-catch (Table 7). The reason for this significant difference is unclear and needs to be examined further when all 1999 observer data have been processed.

Table 1. Fleet performance statistics for U.S. tuna purse seiners fishing in the central-western Pacific

| Year | Vessels |  |  | Days/ Trip ${ }^{2}$ | Sets/Trip ${ }^{2}$ | Trips/ Vessel ${ }^{2}$ | Capacity ${ }^{3}$ / <br> Vessel (mt) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Licensed ${ }^{1}$ | Fished ${ }^{1}$ | Trips ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1988 | 35 | 31 | 71 | 69.42 | 46.07 | 2.29 | 1,164 |
| 1989 | 35 | 35 | 154 | 58.07 | 41.88 | 4.40 | 1,148 |
| 1990 | 51 | 43 | 181 | 47.32 | 34.79 | 4.21 | 1,131 |
| 1991 | 48 | 43 | 229 | 42.38 | 40.40 | 5.33 | 1,138 |
| 1992 | 44 | 44 | 212 | 46.32 | 35.11 | 4.82 | 1,144 |
| 1993 | 42 | 42 | 199 | 51.92 | 37.27 | 4.74 | 1,144 |
| 1994 | 48 | 49 | 241 | 44.11 | 35.21 | 4.88 | 1,142 |
| 1995 | 47 | 44 | 206 | 49.14 | 33.38 | 4.68 | 1,138 |
| 1996 | 40 | 39 | 182 | 50.09 | 33.02 | 4.67 | 1,122 |
| 1997 | 35 | 35 | 177 | 58.05 | 35.60 | 5.06 | 1,128 |
| 1998 | 39 | 39 | 200 | 46.58 | 27.48 | 5.13 | 1,167 |
| $1999{ }^{4}$ | 38 | 36 | 175 | 41.54 | 20.81 | 4.86 | 1,184 |

${ }^{1}$ The number of vessels that fished can be different from the number of licensed vessels because vessels are licensed from June 15 of one year to June 14 of the next year; whereas, a vessel fishing in a calendar year is recorded as fished in that calendar year.
${ }^{2}$ Includes all trips that started or ended in the calendar year.
${ }^{3}$ Average carrying capacity of vessels that fished in the calendar year.
${ }^{4}$ Data are preliminary.
Ocean.

Table 2. Catches (t) and catch-per-unit effort ( $\mathrm{t} /$ day fished) for the U.S. tuna purse seine fishery in the

| Year | Catch $^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | Catch-Per-Unit Effort $^{$$}$ |  |  | Yellowfin | Skipjack | Bigeye | Total | Yellowfin $^{3}$ | Skipjack | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18,832 | 93,636 | $1,948^{4}$ | 114,416 | 3.01 | 15.37 | 18.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 42,886 | 95,027 | 2,421 | 140,334 | 7.26 | 14.59 | 21.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 52,089 | 110,044 | 1,762 | 163,895 | 8.91 | 16.66 | 25.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 37,330 | 177,389 | 1,550 | 216,269 | 5.70 | 24.78 | 30.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 43,693 | 155,898 | 3,480 | 203,071 | 6.39 | 21.48 | 27.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 46,011 | 148,419 | 3,731 | 198,161 | 6.46 | 18.29 | 24.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 56,426 | 151,486 | 1,711 | 209,623 | 7.63 | 18.61 | 26.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 31,845 | 132,518 | 3,190 | 167,553 | 4.68 | 17.39 | 22.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 19,417 | 120,127 | 9,860 | 149,404 | 4.13 | 16.93 | 21.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 54,638 | $79,386^{2}$ | 10,058 | 144,082 | 8.45 | 12.06 | 20.51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 37,501 | $131,564^{2}$ | 5,561 | 174,626 | 6.71 | 21.62 | 28.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1999^{5}$ | 34,384 | $131,000^{2}$ | 16,673 | 182,057 | 8.16 | 30.11 | 38.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Includes reported discards in logbooks and cannery rejects.
${ }^{2}$ Skipjack tuna species composition samples were used to separate the yellowfin and bigeye tuna from the reported skipjack tuna catch in 1997-1999.
${ }^{3}$ Includes bigeye tuna catch.
${ }^{4}$ Estimated from species composition sampling for 6 months (June to December 1988).
${ }^{5}$ Data are preliminary.
central-western Pacific Ocean.

Table 3a. Percentage of bigeye tuna in yellowfin tuna landings of U.S. tuna purse seiners in the central-

| Year | All Set Types <br> and Sizes | Free-Swimming School Sets |  | FAD + Log Sets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  | Large Fish | Small Fish | Large Fish |  |
| 1988 | 9.39 | 15.31 | 0.17 | 26.72 | 1.32 |
| 1989 | 5.36 | 4.01 | 0.05 | 17.70 | 14.10 |
| 1990 | 3.30 | 8.17 | 0.16 | 20.28 | 7.34 |
| 1991 | 3.99 | 7.17 | 0.18 | 14.52 | 6.23 |
| 1992 | 7.40 | 6.51 | 0.39 | 22.59 | 10.09 |
| 1993 | 7.52 | 5.24 | 0.51 | 19.84 | 7.53 |
| 1994 | 2.95 | 15.12 | 0.16 | 27.20 | 2.58 |
| 1995 | 9.12 | 5.01 | 0.51 | 26.29 | 9.13 |
| 1996 | 36.36 | 14.87 | 0.84 | 47.87 | 46.31 |
| 1997 | 13.68 | 1.86 | 1.73 | 37.32 | 11.84 |
| 1998 | 12.20 | 26.69 | 0.00 | 49.08 | 6.51 |
| $1999^{1}$ | 33.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 45.10 | 25.12 |

${ }^{1}$ Data are preliminary.
western Pacific Ocean from species composition samples. Large fish are greater than 9 kg , or 78 cm fork length.

| Year | Yellowfin Tuna |  |  | Bigeye Tuna |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Set <br> Types | Free-Swimming <br> School Sets | FAD + Log <br> Sets | All Set <br> Types | Free-Swimming <br> School Sets | FAD + Log <br> Sets |
|  | 4.02 | 2.32 | 5.03 | 2.29 | 0.36 | 3.43 |
| 1998 | 1.29 | 0.21 | 1.90 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.69 |
| $1999^{1}$ | 4.86 | 10.93 | 4.74 | 2.21 | 2.71 | 2.20 |

[^2]Table 3b. Percentage of bigeye and yellowfin tuna in skipjack tuna landings of U.S. tuna purse seiners in the central-western Pacific Ocean from species composition samples.

Table 4. Logbook reports ${ }^{1}$ of by-catch for U.S. tuna purse seiners fishing in the central-western Pacific Ocean in 1999.

| Species | Weight (t) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Billfishes |  |
| Black marlin | 0.02 |
| Blue marlin | 0.07 |
| Marlin | 16.67 |
| Sailfish | 0.17 |
| Unclassified | 0.20 |
| Sharks |  |
| Silky shark | 0.02 |
| Hammerhead shark | 0.09 |
| Oceanic whitetip shark | 0.08 |
| Sharks | 48.29 |
| Others |  |
| "Baitfish"2 | 31.06 |
| Barracuda | 0.01 |
| Dolphinfish | 0.05 |
| Mackerel | 0.13 |
| Manta ray | 0.03 |
| Marlin/shark ${ }^{3}$ | 2.41 |
| Marlin/"baitfish" | 4.20 |
| Rainbow runner | 51.31 |
| Rainbow runner/triggerfish | 5.84 |
| Sailfish/shark ${ }^{3}$ | 0.09 |
| Shark/manta ray ${ }^{3}$ | 0.23 |
| Shark/rainbow runner ${ }^{3}$ | 0.07 |
| Shark/rainbow runner/mackerel ${ }^{3}$ | 1.61 |
| Shark/rainbow runner/triggerfish ${ }^{3}$ | 1.84 |
| Triggerfish | 0.13 |
| Wahoo | 0.02 |

${ }^{1}$ Fishermen are instructed to report by-catch in weight or numbers. Reports in numbers were not used and consisted of 12 marlin, 48 sharks, 70 triggerfish and 498 rainbow runner caught and discarded.
${ }^{2}$ Included mackerel, bonito, and other species.
${ }^{3}$ Sharks were sometimes reported in combination with other species.

Table 5. Preliminary observer report of tuna catch and by-catch by set type from U.S. tuna purse seiners fishing in the central-western Pacific Ocean in 1999. Data represent $59 \%$ of the observed trips.

| Type of Sets | Number of Sets | Species | Catch |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Tons | Tons/Set |  |
| Anchored FAD | 5 | Skipjack | 225 | 44.94 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 49 | 9.71 | 3.2\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 43 | 8.63 | 1.0\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 12 | 2.34 | 12.9\% |
| Drifting log, debris or dead animal | 3 | Skipjack | 105 | 35.07 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 14 | 4.53 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 1 | 0.35 | 97.6\% |
| Drifting FAD | 369 | Skipjack | 15,646 | 42.40 | 2.3\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 4,590 | 12.44 | 4.1\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 1,035 | 2.80 | 1.7\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 158 | 0.43 | 80.1\% |

Table 6. Preliminary observer report of by-catch from U.S. tuna purse seiners fishing in the centralwestern Pacific Ocean in 1999. Data represent $59 \%$ of the observed trips.

| Species | Sets |  | By-catch ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq. | \% Freq. | Tons | Discarded ${ }^{2}$ | Number | Discarded ${ }^{2}$ |
| Billfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Marlin | 34 | 9.0\% | 5.18 | 75.5\% | 42 | 78.5\% |
| Black Marlin | 17 | 4.5\% | 2.12 | 84.3\% | 23 | 86.9\% |
| Sailfish (Indo-Pacific) | 2 | 0.5\% | 0.06 | 50.0\% | 2 | 50.0\% |
| Short-billed Spearfish | 1 | 0.2\% | 0.01 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Sharks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sharks (Unidentified) | 109 | 28.9\% | 18.17 | 94.2\% | 700 | 94.8\% |
| Silky Shark | 126 | 33.4\% | 15.95 | 99.3\% | 762 | 99.2\% |
| Oceanic White-tip Shark | 110 | 29.1\% | 13.82 | 99.6\% | 540 | 99.6\% |
| Blue Shark | 5 | 1.3\% | 0.34 | 100.0\% | 22 | 100.0\% |
| Silver-tip Shark | 4 | 1.0\% | 0.06 | 100.0\% | 6 | 100.0\% |
| Other Tunas, Tuna-like Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albacore | 17 | 4.5\% | 31.67 | 1.4\% | 2,718 | 2.3\% |
| Wahoo | 81 | 21.4\% | 2.11 | 40.0\% | 287 | 40.4\% |
| Bullet Tuna | 2 | 0.5\% | 0.00 | 100.0\% | 2 | 100.0\% |
| Frigate and Bullet Tunas | 1 | 0.2\% | 0.00 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Kawakawa | 2 | 0.5\% | 0.00 | 50.0\% | 2 | 50.0\% |
| Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rainbow Runner | 261 | 69.2\% | 68.51 | 99.5\% | 21,539 | 99.5\% |
| Mahi Mahi, Dolphinfish, Dorado | 99 | 26.2\% | 5.75 | 7.3\% | 685 | 7.8\% |
| Oceanic (Pelagic) Triggerfishes | 127 | 33.6\% | 5.50 | 100.0\% | 7,204 | 100.0\% |
| Barracudas | 56 | 14.8\% | 0.72 | 36.6\% | 112 | 17.8\% |
| Great Barracuda | 15 | 3.9\% | 0.22 | 19.3\% | 22 | 13.6\% |
| Manta Rays | 5 | 1.3\% | 0.19 | 100.0\% | 5 | 100.0\% |
| Mackerel Scad - Saba | 6 | 1.5\% | 0.13 | 97.6\% | 64 | 96.8\% |
| Mackerel (Unidentified) | 2 | 0.5\% | 0.07 | 100.0\% | 73 | 100.0\% |
| Pacific Rudderfish | 1 | 0.2\% | 0.01 | 16.6\% | 40 | 12.5\% |
| Unspecified | 1 | 0.2\% | 0.00 | 100.0\% | 1 | 100.0\% |

[^3]Table 7. Final observer report of tuna catch and by-catch by set type from U.S. tuna purse seiners fishing in the central-western Pacific Ocean in 1998. Data represent 35 observed trips.

| Type of Sets | Number of Sets | Species | Tons | Tons/Set | \% Discarded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Floating Object Sets |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anchored FAD | 2 | Skipjack | 38 | 19.05 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 3 | 1.36 | 8.0\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 3 | 1.27 | 1.8\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 1 | 0.66 | 99.6\% |
| Drifting log | 247 | Skipjack | 9,040 | 36.60 | 3.1\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 1,304 | 5.28 | 6.3\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 228 | 0.92 | 0.8\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 466 | 1.89 | 91.2\% |
| Drifting FAD | 339 | Skipjack | 11,856 | 34.97 | 7.8\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 1,892 | 5.58 | 6.8\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 694 | 2.05 | 3.6\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 286 | 0.84 | 83.3\% |
| Live Whale | 9 | Skipjack | 27 | 3.04 | 3.8\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 16 | 1.79 | 3.5\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 1 | 0.08 | 58.0\% |
| Live Whale Shark | 2 | Skipjack | 3 | 1.32 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 2 | 0.80 | 0.3\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 0 | 0.16 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 13 | 6.27 | 100.0\% |
| Free Swimming Sets |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unassociated | 160 | Skipjack | 2,863 | 17.89 | 3.9\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 1,344 | 8.40 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 3 | 0.02 | 86.8\% |
| Feeding on Baitfish | 293 | Skipjack | 4,853 | 16.56 | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 2,909 | 9.93 | 0.1\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 11 | 0.04 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 23 | 0.08 | 79.7\% |
| Other Sets |  |  |  |  |  |
| No information | 42 | Skipjack | 903 | 21.51 | 0.9\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 532 | 12.67 | 0.3\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 17 | 0.42 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 39 | 0.92 | 96.6\% |
| Other (Please Specify) | 3 | Skipjack | 41 | 13.70 | 0.2\% |
|  |  | Yellowfin | 1 | 0.42 | 13.0\% |
|  |  | Bigeye | 1 | 0.32 | 5.0\% |
|  |  | By-catch | 2 | 0.51 | 82.6\% |

Table 8. Final observer report of by-catch from U.S. tuna purse seiners fishing in the central-western Pacific Ocean in 1998. Data represent 35 observed trips.

| Species | Sets |  | By-Catch ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq. | \% Freq. | Tons | \% Discarded $^{2}$ | Number | \% Discarded $^{2}$ |
| Billfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Marlin | 44 | 4.0\% | 6.81 | 62.6\% | 61 | 49.1\% |
| Blue Marlin | 79 | 7.2\% | 49.98 | 81.3\% | 146 | 65.7\% |
| Marlins, Sailfishes, Spearfish | 14 | 1.2\% | 1.79 | 42.5\% | 16 | 62.5\% |
| Sailfish (Indo-Pacific) | 7 | 0.6\% | 0.29 | 74.5\% | 14 | 71.4\% |
| Short-billed Spearfish | 6 | 0.5\% | 0.17 | 67.6\% | 16 | 81.2\% |
| Striped Marlin | 10 | 0.9\% | 3.59 | 79.7\% | 51 | 78.4\% |
| Swordfish | 2 | 0.1\% | 0.10 | 0.0\% | 2 | 0.0\% |
| Sharks |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Shark | 3 | 0.2\% | 0.06 | 49.1\% | 4 | 25.0\% |
| Oceanic White-tip Shark | 141 | 12.8\% | 26.11 | 60.2\% | 1,300 | 63.0\% |
| Sharks (Unidentified) | 237 | 21.6\% | 68.84 | 99.0\% | 3,369 | 9.1\% |
| Silky Shark | 84 | 7.6\% | 12.46 | 89.3\% | 729 | 90.2\% |
| Silver-tip Shark | 7 | 0.6\% | 0.39 | 29.9\% | 30 | 26.6\% |
| Whale Shark | 2 | 0.1\% | 14.80 | 84.4\% | 2 | 50.0\% |
| Other Tunas, Tuna-like Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albacore | 16 | 1.4\% | 1.29 | 0.0\% | 52 | 0.0\% |
| Bullet Tuna | 3 | 0.2\% | 0.15 | 39.3\% | 132 | 39.3\% |
| Frigate and Bullet Tunas | 5 | 0.4\% | 0.15 | 100.0\% | 46 | 100.0\% |
| Kawakawa | 5 | 0.4\% | 0.04 | 86.3\% | 15 | 86.6\% |
| Tuna (Unidentified) | 4 | 0.3\% | 201.01 | 100.0\% | 502,514 | 100.0\% |
| Wahoo | 214 | 19.5\% | 9.89 | 61.0\% | 1,273 | 64.8\% |
| Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amberjacks | 3 | 0.2\% | 0.06 | 46.5\% | 45 | 46.6\% |
| Amberjack (Giant Yellowtail) | 2 | 0.1\% | 92.50 | 100.0\% | 1,000 | 100.0\% |
| Barracudas | 109 | 9.9\% | 6.25 | 16.8\% | 1,213 | 15.5\% |
| Mackerel (Unidentified) | 47 | 4.2\% | 8.12 | 98.1\% | 9,261 | 98.0\% |
| Mackerel Scad - Saba | 150 | 13.6\% | 20.35 | 94.5\% | 10,454 | 93.9\% |
| Mahi Mahi, Dolphinfish, Dorado | 203 | 18.5\% | 47.80 | 22.6\% | 3,405 | 34.5\% |
| Manta Rays | 17 | 1.5\% | 1.14 | 100.0\% | 18 | 100.0\% |
| Oceanic (Pelagic) Triggerfishes | 330 | 30.0\% | 72.27 | 98.7\% | 103,264 | 98.8\% |
| Rainbow Runner | 414 | 37.7\% | 135.58 | 94.3\% | 46,930 | 97.5\% |
| Trevallies (Unidentified - Jacks) | 18 | 1.6\% | 0.39 | 43.6\% | 205 | 44.8\% |
| Unspecified | 74 | 6.7\% | 49.24 | 82.1\% | 2,549 | 64.9\% |
| Dolphin/Porpoise | 7 | 0.6\% | 0.98 | 96.9\% | 33 | 96.9\% |
| Loggerhead Turtle | 6 | 0.5\% | 0.06 | 100.0\% | 6 | 100.0\% |

[^4]

Figure 1. Distribution of fishing effort (days fished) for the 1999 U.S. tuna purse seine fishery in the central western Pacific Ocean.


Figure 2. Percentage of sets by set type (free-swimming school, log and fish aggregation device (FAD)) for the U.S. tuna purse seine fishery in the centrat western Pacific Ocean.


Figure 3. Percentage of 1999 tuna landings by landing port for the U.S. tuna purse seine fishery in the centra-western Pacific Ocean.


Figure 10. Boundaries of the South Pacific Regional Tuna Treaty Area and the four NMFS Sampling Areas used for length sampling of catches in the Treaty area.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Document prepared for the annual meeting of parties to the South Pacific Regional Tuna Treaty, 3-10 March 2000, Niue

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Document prepared for the annual meeting of parties to the South Pacific Regional Tuna Treaty, 6-10 March 2000, Alofi, Niue.
    ${ }^{2}$ The majority of FADs used by the U.S. fleet are drifting FADs. A few anchored FADs are occasionally used.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Data are preliminary.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Observers were encouraged to record weight of by-catch. However, occasionally numbers of animals were recorded. Data were adjusted to reflect total by-catch in weight or numbers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Nearly all of the by-catch retained were for crew consumption.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Observers were encouraged to record weight of by-catch. However, occeasionally numbers of animals were recorded. Data were adjusted to reflect total by-catch in weight or numbers.
    ${ }^{2}$ Nearly all of the by-catch retained were for crew consumption.

