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## INTRODUCTION

In 1992, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) initiated scientific sampling of the U.S. large pelagic fisheries fleet, as mandated by the U.S. Swordfish Fisheries Management Plan. Scientific observers were placed aboard vessels participating in the Atlantic large pelagic fishery by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC). The SEFSC coverage generally occurs on, but is not limited to, vessels fishing for large pelagic species in the northwest Atlantic south of Virginia. The scientific observer program contracted and monitored by the NEFSC provides coverage of the large pelagic fleet fishing the waters of the Mid-Atlantic Bight to the Grand Banks. Although both regional programs sample the pelagic longline fishery, the NEFSC data were not available for examination. Therefore, this document describes only the activities of the SEFSC Pelagic Observer Program (POP) through 1994.

As previously described in last years document (Lee et al. 1994), observer coverage by the POP during 1992 and 1993 was based on NMFS employed observers, as well as independent contractors. During 1994, the POP transitioned to one that primarily uses private contractors for field observation.

Also operating in association with the POP, are observers employed by Russell Research Associates, Inc. (RRA) with funds provided through a NMFS Marine Fisheries Initiative grant (MARFIN). This program has been vital in helping the SEFSC describe the longline fishery of the Gulf of Mexico. RRA observers, who received training at the SEFSC Miami facility, have made a major contribution in the collection of statistical and biological data from the Gulf of Mexico. Observers from RRA concentrate primarily on the Mississippi River Delta (Louisiana) ports because of their familiarity with vessel operations within that area.

Under the SEFSC program, a scientific observer is placed on board a vessel to record detailed information concerning gear characteristics, location and time the gear is set and retrieved, environmental conditions,
condition and status of the marine life caught by the gear (alive or dead, kept or discarded), as well as morphometric measurements (length and weight) and sex identification of the animal. Observers also record incidental interactions of marine mammals and sea turtles. Collections of biological samples (anal finrays, heads, reproductive tissue, heart tissue, etc.) from some species are used to support research studies directed at critical questions about fish biology and life history.

The data collected by both NMFS regional programs are used by scientists in a variety of ways. Observer catch and effort data help confirm and augment the information provided through the mandatory submission of Pelagic Logbook forms by vessel owners and operators. This information is also important in evaluating the effectiveness of management measures, as well as providing information for evaluating the status of harvested populations.

The purpose of this document is to provide a general overview of the POP and summary of data collected in the southeast region through 1994.

## VESSEL SELECTION

In order to obtain a representative, scientific sample of the fleet fishing effort, a list of randomly selected pelagic longline vessels is generated for each geographical area (Figure 1) and quarter for the current year, based upon reports of their effort (number of sets) from the Pelagic Logbook forms and landing records from the previous year. The objective of the selection is to achieve a representative, $5 \%$ cross-section of the fishing effort in each fishing area and during each calendar quarter of the year. The chance of selecting an individual vessel depends on fishing effort that particular vessel reported by area and quarter in the previous year. Due to the need of a $5 \%$ coverage for each quarter and area that the fleet fishes, an individual vessel could be selected for observation as many as four times in a year. Using the same procedure, a vessel might not be selected at all for the year.


Figure 1: The fishing area difinitions used in classifying the U.S. pelagic longline effort.

Observer coverage on a vessel becomes mandatory under U.S. fishery regulations when vessel owners and operators, permitted for the fishery, are selected and notified. In the southeast region, a letter of selection signed by the SESFC Center Director is mailed to the selected fishery permit holder. The NEFSC observer program handles notification of the selected vessels differently.

## SELECTION LETTER

The SEFSC selection letter states that the POP coordinator must. be notified by the vessel
ownersoperators, in writing, of each fishing trip directed at swordfish or tuna during the time period stated in the letter. Planning and coordination of observer coverage prior to each trip departure is very important. For convenience, each selection letter is mailed with a trip notification form that, when returned prior to a trip, provides the POP coordinator with written information conceming the vessel's name, captain, contact persons and phone numbers, communications and safety equipment available aboard the vessel, and information about the vessel's location and times of departure and return. The form can also be used to inform the POP coordinator when a vessel is active in another fishery,
under repair, or no longer fishing. The written notification is also necessary to document the owner's or operator's efforts to comply with mandatory coverage. Telephone calls are helpful, after written notification, to determine other specific details prior to the deployment of the observer to meet the vessel. It is important to keep in mind that observer coverage by the SEFSC is usually for a single trip during the specified calendar quarter. However, additional coverage may be requested if the trip is shorter than expected.

## VESSEL NON-COMPLIANCE

The Swordfish Fisheries Management Plan specifies that once notified in writing, the owner and/or the operator must accommodate an observer. Vessel owners/operators must understand an observer assigned to monitor a fishing trip can be a male or female due to federal regulations prohibiting discrimination in hiring and/or contracting practices. In general, the lack of bathroom facilities, privacy, or spartan living conditions aboard a vessel are not sufficient grounds to prohibit observer coverage by either a male or a female observer. However, once ärrangements have been made by this office to assign an observer to a vessel, the vessel operator must wait until the observer has arrived. Advance notification of departure times and locations can prevent any unnecessary delays. If the vessel departs once observer coverage has been arranged or if the operator rejects an observer present for boarding, this will be documented and the vessel name submitted for noncompliance to the SEFSC Regional Office which is responsible for issuing annual permits for participation in the fishery.

Observers receive training in sampling techniques, first aid and marine safety, as well as how to conduct themselves professionally in the field. They are also made aware that living conditions aboard oceangoing vessels can be variable (e.g. lack of personal bunk, shower or toilet facilities). Once an observer is aboard your vessel, the operator and crew must allow the observer time to collect statistical and biological data. In general, the crew's normal routine of processing the fish may be delayed slightly due to measurement requirements
and placement of a carcass identification tag, but this delay will be minimal. However, the vessel operator and/or crew must understand that the observer cannot be hindered from observing discarded fish, collecting of data (both during the trip and unloading), or communicating with the SEFSC Miami Laboratory, when necessary. If an observer is hindered from performing any of these duties, the observer will document the situation and the permit holder submitted for non-compliance to the SEFSC Regional Office.

Finally, it is the responsibility of the owner and/or operator who is issued the selection letter, to communicate with the POP coordinator of your fishing intentions prior to departure of each fishing trip during the quarter. The coordinator initially waits to see if the trip notification form provided with the selection letter is returned so that contact can be made by the POP office. However, if notification is not returned, telephone calls by the program coordinator are attempted at various times during the quarter. When no written or verbal communication occurs during the quarter selected, the observer coordinator, again, has no alternative but to submit the name of the permit holder to the SEFSC Regional Office for investigation of observer noncompliance.

Submission of a vessel owner's or operator's name for observer non-compliance is not taken lightly and is only initiated when various efforts leave no alternative. The permit holder who receives written notification of the actions (or lack thereof) are considered in non-compliance with permit requirements for carrying an observer. It is the intent of this program to seek a good working relationship between the scientific personnel involved in the data collection and the daily routine of the vessel crew.

## DATA COLLECTION FORMS

In order to record data needed to describe the catch and effort of the longline fishery, the POP observer must complete three data forms (Appendix 1). The first is called the "Longline Gear Characteristic Log", which is used to record the type of mainline used, length of drop
line, number and length of gangions, make and model of hooks used, as well as number of floats, high fliers, and radio beacons used. The second data form is the "Longline Haul Log", which is used to describe the fishing effort. This form allows the observer to record the length, location and time duration for each set and haulback, as well as envirommental information, the speed at which the vessel sets the gear, and type of bait used. The last of the data forms is called the "Large Pelagic Individual Animal Log". This data sheet allows the observer to record the species of fish caught, condition of the catch (alive, dead, damaged, or unknown) of the fish when brought to the vessel, and the final disposition of the catch (kept, throw-back, finned, etc.). When an animal is brought onboard the vessel, the observer will verify the species and record the length measurements. A final weight of the carcass is recorded during unloading at the dock. This weight is matched to the length measurements on the data sheets using a specially numbered tag to identify the carcass of primary interest. Similar information is collected by the NEFSC observers aboard longline vessels, as well as for many other gear types and fisheries.

## DATA SUMMARY 1992-1994

## Vessel Coverage

From May, 1992 through December, 1994 (11 calendar quarters), scientific observers associated with the SEFSC observed a total of 174 fishing trips ( 172 pelagic longline and 2 bottom longline) in waters of the northwest Atlantic Ocean (Table 1). In total, observers spent 1,918 days at-sea during which 1,066 sets were observed (Table 1; Figures 2, 3, and 4). Of the vessels monitored, some were observed more than once over this time, although not more than once during any given calendar quarter. In general, data collected through 1994 continues to substantiate the belief that fishing methods in the Gulf of Mexico are more variable than in other regions. Observed vessels fishing in the Gulf of Mexico continued to spend $40-50 \%$ of their days-at-sea setting longline gear, while observed vessels in areas along the southeast Atlantic Coast and in the Caribbean spent 60-
$80 \%$ of their days at-sea setting gear. Non-fishing time involves transit of the vessel to fishing grounds or time spent seeking live baitfish (a common fishing method that is used by many vessels fishing in the Gulf).

## Species Observed

The presence of a scientific observer onboard a commercial fishing vessel provides an opportunity for collecting valuable information for monitoring both the fishery and the stocks being harvested. The data forms, as previously mentioned, provide scientists with basic information concerning gear configuration, baits used, number of hooks set, and the environmental parameters associated with a particular set. Equally important, observers record data concerning the species of fish encountered, their size, sex and condition.

Data collected during a fishing trip are entered into a computer usually within 7 days upon the observer's return to port. Data are screened for accuracy during the debriefing meeting with the observer followed by data entry. Quality control programs are used by the POP that help to catch data entry errors (eg. dead fish entered as released alive, etc.). Because of the continuous refinement of the quality control programs, the accuracy of the observer database has been improved (Figures 24).

Summarizing the 1992-1994 catch data, POP and RRA observer personnel identified a total of 30,289 fish, marine mammals, and sea turties to species level (Tables 2 and 3). Animals released or lost at the ocean surface ( $\mathrm{N}=656$ ) that could not be identified to the species level (Table 3; Figures 2-5) were marked as an "UNKNOWN" group category (ie. unknown tuna, unknown shark, etc).

Although a wide variety of fish were caught by the observed longline vessels, only about six species were routinely valued as a marketable product. These primary species (swordfish, yellowfin tuna, bigeye tuna, bluefin tuma, dolphin (mahi mahi), and shortin mako) comprise about $55 \%(N=17,123)$ of the total observed catch. Of

Figure 2: Observer data compiled for 1992 showing (A) number of vessels covered, days at sea, number of sets; (B) location of sets observed; and (C) number and percent of fish observed.


Figure 3: Observer data compiled for 1993 showing (A) number of vessels covered, days at sea, number of sets; (B) location of sets observed; and (C) number and percent of fish observed.


Figure 4: Observer data compiled for 1994 showing (A) number of vessels covered, days at sea, number of sets; (B) location of sets observed; and (C) number and percent of fish observed.



## 1992-1994



## Species Observed <br> $$
(N=30,289)
$$

MELOOWFW, BGEYE, BLUEFIN

## Figure 5: Observer data compiled for 1992-1994 showing number and percent of animals observed

the total observed fish (Figure 5), swordfish made up $28 \%$ of the catch; while yellowfin, bigeye, and bluefin tunas, combined, made up $19 \%$ of the observed catch. Sharks, a by-catch of the tuna and swordfish fishery, made up the other major portion of the pelagic longline catch, about $25 \%$.

Observations of the status (alive/dead) of fish caught is an important component needed for assessing the effectiveness of some fishery management tools, likeminimum sizes. The observer records the status (alive, dead, damaged) of the fish as it is brought alongside the vessel (Tables 2 and 3), whether it is kept or thrown back. From these data, mortality of discards can be estimated. As an example, the percent of swordfish observed brought to the side of the vessel that were dead (Table 2) is $76 \%$, which is slightly (and not statistically) different from the observed percent of swordfish discards which are thrown back dead (78\%) as indicated in Table
4. The latter of the values expressed from these tables is meaningful in understanding the mortality of that part of the population that is not represented in the landed catch. In general, these proportions are similar to the alive/dead proportions for various pelagic species reported in the literature (Farber and Lee, 1991; Hoey, 1992; Lee et al., 1994).

Overview of Gear and Fishing Technique
As mentioned previously, coverage of the selected vessels using POP observers was not limited only to the Atlantic waters of the southeast U.S., rather, observed coverage took place in all nine of the geographical areas used in analysis of these data (Figure 1). As an overview of the gears deployed, the shortest average length of mainline set on an observed trip was 4.3 nautical miles (NM) while the longest average set during a trip was 40.0 NM . Additionally, of the 1,066
sets observed, a total of 629,904 hooks were recorded during this period (Table l).

General trends in fishing techniques were also examined Hook fishing depth (ie. length of floatline plus length of gangion) is a fishing technique which is quite variable among vessel operators. Although POP coverage occurred in all nine areas (Figure 1), as a preliminary look, four larger geographical regions were examined (to increase sample size): (1) subtropical Atlantic (combining CAR, OTH, and NOREQ), (2) the Gulf of Mexico, (3) the off shore waters of the southeast U.S. (combining SAB and FEC), and (4) the off shore waters of the northeast U.S. (combining MAB, NEC, and NED; see Figure 1).

The average minimum and maximum depths of the baited hooks are similar for the GOM and the southeast Atlantic.regions (Table 5), with a range from 26 and 38 fathoms ( $48-71 \mathrm{~m}$, respectively): Vessels observed fishing in the waters off the southeast U.S. target mostly swordfish or mahi-mahi, with yellowfin found as a by-catch, whereas, observed vessels in the Gulf of Mexico primarily target yellowfin tuna with a bycatch of swordfish. In examining such trends, it appears yellowfin tuna and swordfish overlap in their habitat and depth availability.

In the northeast Atlantic region, data indicated that baited hooks on observed trips were fished shallower (Table 5), ranging from 13 to 22 fathoms ( $23-40 \mathrm{~m}$, respectively). Generally speaking, observed vessels fishing in these waters target mostly yeliowfin and bigeye tuna rather than swordfish. A comparison of our data with the data collected by the NEFSC (not yet available) should be examined to confirm this observation.

Baited hooks were observed being fished the deepest in the subtropical Atlantic region (Table 5), with depth ranging from 36 to 46 fathoms ( $66-84 \mathrm{~m}$, respectively). Observed vessels fishing in this region often fished in areas of deep submarine trenches, the open waters of the mid-Atlantic ridge, and at convergence
zones of various oceanic currents. Observed catches in this region tended towards swordfish, although our data indicates relative large numbers of yellowfin, bigeye, and albacore tunas were also found in the catches.

Observers also recorded various bait types (species) used during fishing activities. The "Dead bait" species recorded aboard the observed vessels for all nine geographical areas (Figure 1), included: Atlantic mackerel (Scomber scombrus), herring (Clupea sp), and squid (Illex sp). These baits are usually brought aboard the vessel frozen and thawed just prior to use. Although the technique of placing "dead bait" on hooks is used in the Gulf of Mexico, another baiting technique commonly observed on many of the vessels in that region was the use of "live bait". These "live bait" species, caught at sea and kept alive onboard the vessel in holding tanks, included: bigeye scad (Selar crumenophthamus), chub mackerel (Scomber japonicus), and Spanish sardines (Sardinella aurita). Of the 4 geographical regions described previously (Table 5), mackerel and suuid were by far the most preferred dead baits used by the longline fishery for all areas. However, in the Gulf of Mexico, $53 \%$ of the sets observed used the live bait technique (bigeye scad, chub mackerel, or Spanish sardines), while the remaining portion of the observed sets in this region (47\%) used dead bait (mackerel (6\%), herring (10\%), and squid (31\%)).

Analysis of hook depth, baits methods, as well as hook model or monofilament test strengths with respect to target species or dominant species caught may provide insight into prospects for by-catch reduction:

## RESEARCH STUDIES UNDERWAY

## Swordfish Reproduction

Due to a need for more information on the spawning potential of Atlantic swordfish, a reproductive study was initiated in 1990 under the direction of the NMFS Miami Laboratory. In previous studies, biologists have attempted to estimate female swordfish fecundity (number of eggs produced) and define maturity stages, however the data have either been from too small a


Figure 6: Location of sets where 6,316 paired gonads from male and female Atlantic swordfish were collected by from 1990 to 1995.
number of fish or from a very restricted geographical area to be convincing. Paired gonads from 6,316 Atlantic swordfish (females: $N=4,127$; males: $N=2,189$ ) and size measurements were collected from April 1990 through March 1995 (Figure 6) through the cooperative efforts of captains and crews of the Blue Water Fishermen's Association and observer personnel from NMFS and the Fondo Nacional de Investigaciones Agropecuaries (FONAIAP) of Venezuela. Using these data and biological samples, the Miami Laboratory is re-evaluating prior scientific understanding of sexual maturity in swordfish by analyzing gonadal index values (the gonadal index is calculated from ovary weight and carcass weight
of female swordfish). We also are continuing to examine sex ratios for various geographical areas. Because male and female swordfish appear to grow at different rates and to different maximum sizes, the number of large fish in the catch which are female is generally greater than the number of large fish caught that are male. Sex ratio-atsize information is also needed to more accurately estimate the age of the fish caught and provide the means to assess stock status. The geographical region from which these samples were obtained extends from George's Bank in the north Atlantic to the Caribbean Sea and into the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, estimates of fecundity based on the presence of hydrated ova (ready to
spawn eggs) have been derived for female swordfish, as well as documenting several likely spawning areas, primarily in the Caribbean and along the Florida east coast. Results of these analyses are reported in Arocha and Lee (1995.

## Age and Growth Studies

In an effort to determine the age, longevity, and growth rate of swordfish, these same cooperative groups and agencies have also been collecting swordfish anal finrays and otoliths (tiny calcified structures found in the head of fish). These bony, calcified structures display internal growth zonations that may be useful in determining the age of swordfish. From 1990 to March 1995, approximately 4,000 anal finrays were collected from swordfish caught in the Atlantic. These fish ranged in size of 65 to 285 cm (lower jaw to fork of tail). Finray samples were collected for each month of the year and were collected within the same geographical areas as the gonadal material previously discussed. Currently, the 2nd anal finray is being separated from the overall finray system, cleaned of tissue, and cross sectioned. The cross sections from over 1,647 anal finrays have been examined and analyzed for age determination. This is accomplished by counting the growth zonations in the finray cross section much like counting tree rings. Analysis of the growth zonations is underway to see if these are being laid down as an annular event. Analyses from this research are reported in Ehrhardt (1995).

Collection of swordfish heads by observers for otolith removal has been less routine due to variability swordfish processing between boats (otoliths are located close to where many fishermen cut off the fish head and are sometimes lost or damaged during this process) and the difficulty in locating otoliths in the heads. However, over 500 otolith pairs have been collected from specimens ranging in size from $6.5-258 \mathrm{~cm}$ LJFL. Scientists at Louisiana State University (Baton Rouge, LA) are examining otoliths from these samples for age analysis based on daily growth zone counts (a much finer grouping of rings than those found in the anal finrays).

## Stock Identification

Beginning in 1992, collection of blood and tissues (small portions of the meat, liver, heart, and gonad) by POP observers for stock identification has been actively pursued for swordfish, yellowfin tuna, bigeye tuna, and bluefin tuna. Scientists at the NMFSCharleston Laboratory and the University of South Carolina, as well as various international organizations, such as the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) in Australia, are examining genetic variability at the cellular (DNA) level. The application of these techniques may help detect differences in fish in widely separated geographical areas and determine if these differences are important in stock management. Initial tests are being conducted using swordfish, yellowfin, and bluefin tuna samples for the reason that scientists are unclear which genetic marker (DNA protein) will be the most informative. Results of these analyses are reported in Alverado et al. (1995) and Graves et al. (1995).
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## For more information

For information about the observer program or for schectuling an observer trip, please contact the Pelagic Observer Program Coordinator, Dennis Lee:
(Office) 800 858-0624 (FAX) 305 361-4515
Address: $\quad$ Southeast Fisheries Science Center Miami Laboratory
75 Virginia Beach Drive
Miami, FL 33149

General information or questions about programs concerning dealer reporting, logbook submission, or the tagging program, persons should contact the NMFS Miami Laboratory's main office telephone number (305) 361-5761. The following contact persons are provided:

DEALER REPORTING: John Poffenberger or Andy Bertolino PELAGIC LOGBOOK REPORTING: Emie Snell GAMEFISH TAGGING PROGRAM: Dr. Eric Prince - 800 473-3936
Fish tagging liaison (commercial fisheries): Dennis Lee 305 361-4236

Information on fishing permits or regulation should be directed to the NMFS Southeast Regional Office, St. Petersburg, FL:
REGULATIONS AND PERMTS BRANCH: (813) 570-5326
FISHERIES OPERATIONS BRANCH: (813) 570-5305
Address: NMFS Southeast Regional Office
9721 Executive Center Drive
St. Petersburg, FL 33702

TABLE 1. Number of vessels covered, sets observed, total hooks set, days spent at sea, and percent of sets observed from the total sets required for 5\% coverage of the fishing effort by quarter from 1992 to 1994

```
SEFSC OBSERVER COVERAGE
    1992 - }199
```

| YEAR | CAILENDAR QUARTERS | VESSELS COVERED | $\begin{gathered} \text { SETS } \\ \text { OBSERVED } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { HOOKS SET } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DAYS } \\ \text { AT-SEA } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { SETS } \\ \text { COVERED }^{1} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1992 | 2 | 9 | 47 | 14,970 | 69 | 27\% |
|  | 3 | 9 | 36 | 13,334 | 63 | 32\% |
|  | 4 | 13 | 88 | 52,122 | 160 | >100\% |
|  |  | $31$ |  | $80,426$ | 292 |  |
| 1993 | 1 | 17 | 150 | 95,863 | 271 | >100\% |
|  | 2 | 22 | 145 | 92,015 | 246 | >100\% |
|  | 3 | 23 | 161 | 61,074 | 303 | >100\% |
|  | $4$ | 13 | 92 | 105,601 | 157 | >100\% |
|  | Total | $75$ | $\widehat{548}$ | $\frac{102,001}{356,353}$ | 977 |  |
| 1994 | 1 | 17 | 99 | $56, .552$ | 212 | 86\% |
|  | 2 | 17 | 85 | 48,046 | 163 | 84\% |
|  | 3 | 17 | 86 | 44,633 | 139 | 72\% |
|  |  | $17$ | $\frac{77}{347}$ | 43,894 | 135 | 69\% |
|  | Total | 68 | $\overline{347}$ | $193,125$ | $\frac{1349}{}$ |  |
| Overall |  | 174 | 1,066 | 629,904 | 1,918 | 77\% |

1

$$
\text { \% Sets }=\frac{\text { Sets Observed }}{\text { Sets Required }} \times 100
$$

TABLE 2: Numbers of alive, dead, and damaged (shark bitten) swordfish, billfish, tunas, and sharks when brought along side the boat as recorded by pOP observers while deployed aboard U.S. pelagic longline vessels from 1992 to 1994

| FISH GROUP | COMMON NAME | ALIVE | DEAD | DAMAGED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SWORDFISH | Swordfish | 1,603 | 6,552 | 425 |
| TUNAS | Bigeye | 609 | 425 | 35 |
|  | Bluefin | 34 | 61 | 3 |
|  | Yellowfin | 2,685 | 1,903 | 323 |
| BILLFISH | Atlantic Sailfish | 222 | 319 | 33 |
|  | Blue Marlin | 243 | 106 | 15 |
|  | White Marlin | 176 | 176 | 8 |
|  | Spearfish Longnose | 24 | 35 | 1 |
| SHARKS |  |  |  |  |
| Small Coastal | Atlantic Sharpnose | 220 | 214 | 3 |
| Large Coastal | Bignose | 3 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Blacktip | 64 | 86 | 2 |
|  | Bull | 10 | 8 | 0 |
|  | Dusky | 197 | 142 | 4 |
|  | Finetooth | 17 | 11 | 0 |
|  | Hammerhead ssp | 10 | 7 | 1 |
|  | Hammerhead Great | 6 | 10 | 0 |
|  | Hammerhead Scalloped | 80 | 149 | 8 |
|  | Hammerhead Smooth | 1 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Night | 4 | 18 | 0 |
|  | Reef | 4 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Sand Tiger | 3 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Sandbar | 144 | 28 | 0 |
|  | Silky | 375 | 688 | 12 |
|  | Spinner | 18 | 8 | 0 |
|  | Tiger | 135 | 5 | 0 |
| Pelagic | Blue | 2,709 | 861 | 4 |
|  | Mako ssp | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Mako Longfin | 15 | 13 | 0 |
|  | Mako Shortfin | 195 | 88 | 3 |
|  | Porbeagle | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Thresher ssp | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Thresher Bigeye | 36 | 44 | 0 |
|  | Thresher Common | 8 | 4 | 0 |
|  | Oceanic Whitetip | 81 | 37 | 0 |
| OTHERS | Skates/rays | 955 | 4 | 1 |
|  | Smooth Dog | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nurse | 7 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 3: Numbers of alive, dead, and damaged (shark bitten) finfish, other tunas, marine mammals, marine turtles, and unknown species groups when brought along side the boat as recorded by POP observers while deployed aboard U.S. commercial longline vessels from 1992 to 1994

| SPECIES GROUP | COMMON NAME | ALIVE | DEAD | DAMAGED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OTHER TUNA | Blackfin Tuna | 64 | 136 | 10 |
|  | Bonito | 4 | 27 | 1 |
|  | Little Tunny | 22 | 132 | 3 |
|  | Albacore | 40 | 191 | 6 |
|  | Skipjack | 5 | 159 | 5 |
| FINFISH | Cobia | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Dolphin Fish | 1,743 | 418 | 25 |
|  | Wahoo | 47 | 290 | 17 |
|  | Amberjack | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Barracuda | 51 | 10 | 1 |
|  | Bigeye Cigarfish | 11 | 9 | 0 |
|  | Eel | 93 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Escolar | 502 | 604 | 34 |
|  | Grouper | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Jack spp | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | King Mackeral | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Lancetfish | 320 | 824 | 165 |
|  | Snake Mackeral | 10 | 34 | 3 |
|  | Oilfish | 118 | 74 | 6 |
|  | Opah | 2 | 5 | 0 |
|  | Pomfret | 43 | 39 | 2 |
|  | Puffer | 26 | 4 | 0 |
|  | Red Snapper | 13 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Remora | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Sunfish | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| MARINE MAMMAL | Atlantic spotted | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Bottlenose dolphin | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pilot whale | 3 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Pantropical spotted | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Rissos dolphin | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| MARINE TURTLE |  |  | 0 | 0 |
|  | Leatherback Turtle | 58 | 1 | 0 |
|  | Loggerhead Turtle | 19 | 1 | 0 |
| UNKNOWN | Unknown Tuna | 7 | 7 | 93 |
|  | Unknown Finfish | 20 | 30 | 1 |
|  | Unknown Billfish | 14 | 9 | 5 |
|  | Unknown Sharks | 343 | 123 | 2 |
|  | Unknown Turtle | 2 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 4: Numbers of alive and dead ${ }^{1}$ fish of 6 species recorded by pop observers while deployed aboard U.S. commercial longline vessels from 1992 to 1994

| COMMON NAME | DISCARDED |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PROPORTION } \\ \frac{D}{D+A} \end{array}$ | DEAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ALIVE (A) | DEAD (D) |  |  |
| Swordfish | 868 | 3,187 | 0.786 |  |
| Bigeye Tuna | 72 | 104 | 0.591 |  |
| Yellowfin Tuna | 177 | 408 | 0.697 |  |
| Blue Marlin | 243 | 121 | 0.332 |  |
| White Marlin | 176 | 184 | 0.511 |  |
| Sailfish | 222 | 351 | 0.613 |  |
| DEAD $=$ Dead + Damaged | sh |  |  |  |

Table 5: Average hook depth (minimum and maximum in fathoms) and bait type used as recorded by POP observers aboard U.S. commercial longline vessels fishing in 4 geographical regions: Gulf of Mexico (GOM); Subtropical Atlantic (ST_ATL); Atlantic waters south of the $35^{\circ}$ latitude line (SE_ATL); and Atlantic waters north of the $35^{\circ}$ latitude line (NE_ATL). Bait recored are Atlantic mackeral ${ }^{1}(M)$; herring ${ }^{2}(H)$; squid ${ }^{3}(S)$, and live bait ${ }^{4}$ (LB)

| Area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fished | Avg Hook Depth (fathoms) | Percent (\%)Occurrence   <br> Min   |  |  |  | Max | M |
| ST_ATL | 36 | 46 | 18 |  | 82 |  |  |
| GOM | 29 | 38 | 18 | 10 | 31 | 53 |  |
| SE_ATL | 26 | 38 | 49 |  | 51 |  |  |
| NE_ATL | 13 | 22 | 21 |  | 79 |  |  |

1 Scomber scombrus
2 Clupea spp.
3 Illex spp.
4 bigeye scad (Selar crumenophthamus), chub mackeral (Scomber japonicus), or spanish sardine (Sardinella aurita).

|  | Loveumatan loc | L.E Hownes scimer centen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


(B) Longline Haul Log form


## APPENDIX 1 (CONTINUED)

(C) Large Pelagics Individual Animal Log form

| NOAA FISHERUES - SEA SAMPLING PROGRAM LARGE PELAGICS INDIVIDUAL ANMMAL LOG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ohertup heont. |  |  | Vossed Nimo |  | Vosed/ Number |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Date of Houl } \\ \text { lon } / \mathrm{d} y \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Howl Number |  |  |  |  |
| cancass Tag Number | sercers |  | Morow |  |  | LENGTH MEASUREMENTS fomi |  |  |  |  |  | The wromantrow <br> An, | $\begin{aligned} & m(\eta) \\ & m \in(z) \\ & n \in(3) \end{aligned}$ | cime |
|  | , | cate |  |  |  | sumbera |  | Avomose |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 87 | 2 | Lemen | cade |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | . |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\cdots \cdot$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

