SUPPORTING STATEMENT NMFS ALASKA REGION SCALE and CATCH WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0330

INTRODUCTION

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) manages the groundfish fisheries in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) off Alaska. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) prepared the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (BSAI). NMFS manages the crab fisheries in the waters off the coast of Alaska under the Fishery Management Plan for Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab. The Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) were prepared under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*). On October 21, 1998, the President signed the The American Fisheries Act (AFA), 16 U.S.C. 1851 that imposed major structural changes on the BSAI pollock fishery. Regulations implementing the FMPs appear at 50 CFR part 679 and part 680.

This action is a renewal request for an existing collection.

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

NMFS manages the commercial groundfish harvest off Alaska using an annual total allowable catch for each species based on "round" weight, or the weight of the fish prior to processing. However, much of the fish harvested off Alaska is harvested by catcher/processors that process the catch at-sea. NMFS estimates the total weight of fish harvested by those trawl gear catcher/processors by requiring the vessel to weigh all or part of their catch on a motion-compensated scale. Trawl gear catcher/processors and motherships under the American Fisheries Act (AFA) and motherships under the Western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) Program are required to weigh all catch at-sea. The participants in the Crab Rationalization (CR) crab fisheries must weigh all crab prior to processing.

Non-trawl catcher/processors that harvest CDQ are not required to weigh all catch, but are required to weigh samples of catch. The non-AFA, trawl catcher/processors regulated under the annual Groundfish Retention Standard (GRS) are required to use NMFS-approved scales to determine the weight of total catch; then, calculate the percent of groundfish retained as a specified ratio of the round weight equivalent of total retained groundfish to total groundfish.

2. Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used. If the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support information that will be disseminated to the public, then explain how the collection complies with all applicable Information Quality Guidelines.

NMFS developed the catch weighing and monitoring system for catcher/processors and motherships based on the vessel meeting a series of design criteria. Because of the wide variations in factory layout for inshore processors, NMFS requires a performance-based catch monitoring system for inshore processors.

NMFS has identified the primary objectives for monitoring catch.

- Monitoring must ensure independent verification of catch weight, species composition, and location data for every delivery by a catcher vessel or every pot by a catcher/processor.
- ♦ All catch must be weighed accurately using NMFS-approved scales to determine the weight of total catch.
- The system must provide a verifiable record of the weight of each delivery.
- ♦ The system must provide data that will provide reliable independent estimates of the total catch. Vessel operators must ensure that each haul is observed by a NMFS-approved observer for verification that all fish are weighed.

The contents of this section are outlined below:

- I. Offshore Processors Catch-Weighing and Monitoring System
 - a. Scale type evaluation
 - 1. Platform and hanging scales evaluation
 - 2. Belt-conveyor (flow) scale evaluation
 - 3. Automatic hopper scales evaluation
 - 4. New, undefined scale evaluation
 - b. Inspection request, at-sea scales
 - c. Notification to observer of scale tests
 - d. Records of at-sea scale tests
 - 1. Daily flow scale test records
 - 2. Daily automatic hopper scale test records
 - e. Printed output of at-sea scales used to weigh catch at sea
 - f. Inspection request, observer sampling station
- II. Crab Catch Monitoring Plan (CMP)
 - a. Proposed CMP
 - b. CMP addendum
 - c. Inspection request, CMP

- III. Catch Monitoring and Control Plan (CMCP) for Shoreside Processors and Stationary Floating Processors (SFPs)
 - a. Proposed CMCP
 - b. CMCP Addendum
 - c. Inspection request, CMCP
 - d. Shoreside processor or SFP inseason scale tests
 - e. Printed record from the State scale
 - f. Notification to observer of BSAI pollock delivery
 - g. Notification to observer of CDQ delivery
 - h. Notification to observer of Rockfish Program delivery

IV. Bin Monitoring

- a. Electronic Bin Monitoring System
- b. Inspection Request, Bin Monitoring

I. OFFSHORE PROCESSORS CATCH-WEIGHING and MONITORING SYSTEM

NMFS has implemented a three-part process for evaluating whether at-sea scales are meeting NMFS' performance and technical requirements. This process consists of:

- ♦ Type evaluation of each model of scale
- ♦ Dockside inspection of each scale once installed on a vessel and once a year thereafter
- ♦ At-sea testing of each scale.

No single element of the process alone is sufficient to determine whether a scale is meeting performance and technical requirements.

The scale type evaluation or laboratory tests are designed to determine whether the model of scale meets technical and performance standards under a range of environmental and operating conditions on the vessel, including temperature, humidity, power fluctuations, short-time power reduction, power bursts, electrostatic discharge, and electromagnetic susceptibility. However, the laboratory tests are not designed to test the scale's performance in motion.

The dockside inspection of each scale will determine, among other things, whether the scale weighs accurately while in a nearly stationary position. This evaluation is necessary to identify scales that are not installed properly or do not meet other technical or performance requirements before the vessel starts fishing.

The at-sea scale tests are conducted daily to verify that the scale is weighing accurately at sea. This is the only test that will be performed while the scale is in motion. The maximum permissible errors (MPEs) are higher in the at-sea scale tests than in the dockside tests to allow a greater tolerance for scales tested in motion.

The scale is required to be tested once a day by the vessel crew at a time determined by the crew. NMFS acknowledges that these daily scale tests cannot identify all weighing problems that will occur between tests on successive days. However, other features of the scale program should minimize this risk. These other features include the type evaluation, and dockside tests, and the audit trail that electronically records and stores records of scale calibrations, adjustments, and observer monitoring.

NMFS requires that the owner of an offshore processor install a motion-compensated flow scale and to weigh each haul individually on that scale. Flow scales are intended to provide accurate records of total catch. In order to be approved by NMFS, a scale used to weigh catch at sea must meet the type evaluation requirements set forth at § 679.28(b)(1) and the initial inspection and annual reinspection requirements set forth in § 679.28(b)(2).

The forms for the NMFS-approved scales are attached to this summary. However, the cost and time burden estimates for each scale evaluation by type are not included because these forms for evaluation are inactive. This information is collected once for each scale type or model.

a. Scale type evaluation

The owner of an offshore processor must select an at-sea scale from the list of scales approved by NMFS for weighing catch at-sea. This list is displayed on the NMFS Alaska Region website at http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/scales/default.htm#approved

Type evaluation and testing must be conducted by a laboratory accredited by the government of the country in which the tests are conducted. Before NMFS can approve a model of scale for use, the manufacturer must submit the scale to a certified laboratory for evaluation and testing to insure that the scale meets international scale standards. Scales must meet the performance and technical requirements specified in Appendix A to 50 CFR part 679. The number of hours required to document a scale's characteristics varies, depending on the type of scale and the similarity to models that have already been approved.

Evaluation information identifies and describes the scale, sets forth contact information regarding the manufacturer, and sets forth the results of required type evaluations and testing. This information is collected once for each scale type or model. It is used by NMFS scale-evaluation staff to determine if a model of scale meets the requirements for type approval.

1. Platform and hanging scales evaluation

A platform scale by the nature of its physical size, arrangement of parts, and relatively small capacity (generally 220 kg or less) is adapted for use on a bench or counter or on the floor. A platform scale can be self contained. That is, the indicator and load receiver and weighing elements are all comprised of a single unit, or the indicator can be connected by cable to a separate load receiver and weighing element. The technology used may be mechanical, electromechanical, or electronic. Loads are applied manually.

A platform scale could be used as an observer sampling scale and to verify the weight of fish used to test the belt or automatic hopper scales on trawl catcher/processors and motherships. Or, a platform scale could be used to weigh total catch. A platform scale must be equipped with automatic means to compensate for the motion of a vessel at sea so that the weight values indicated are within the MPEs.

A platform scale must be rigidly installed in a level condition. When in use, a hanging scale must be freely suspended from a fixed support or a crane.

Platform and hanging scales evaluation

Block I. Information about the scale tested.

This block supplies basic background and contact information so that NMFS can maintain accurate contact records.

Name, mailing address, telephone number, and fax number of scale manufacturer

Name, mailing address (if different from manufacturer), telephone and fax numbers of representative

Model and serial number of scale submitted for evaluation.

Block II. Information about all scales.

Frequently scale manufacturers produce the same basic scale with different sizes, capacities or model numbers. This block allows the manufacturer to describe a "family" of similar scales so that all can be approved at one time. It also sets out the basic meterological characteristics of the scales.

Provide information about the scale submitted for evaluation at #1.

Identify all other models of scales of the same type of scale that will be covered by laboratory evaluation.

Model designation

Maximum capacity

Value and number of scale divisions

Minimum load

Accuracy class

Block III. Information about the certifying laboratory.

This block gives NMFS information on the independent laboratory that evaluated the scale for future reference Name of laboratory

Mailing address, telephone and fax numbers of laboratory

Name and Address of Government Agency accrediting laboratory

Block IV. Certification of compliance with NMFS at-sea scale requirements.

This block is to certify that the manufacturer's representative believes the scale or scale component is in compliance with regulations at 50 CFR 679 as indicated in the checklist and test report forms.

Printed name and signature of representative

Date

Block V. List of Attachments.

This block is a checklist of attachments intended to help the manufacturer's representative include the correct documentation needed for scale approval.

Block VI. General Requirements Checklist

This checklist helps the manufacturer's representative to review the requirements for approval and to note any possible problems.

2. Belt-conveyor (flow) scale evaluation

Flow scales are used to weigh catch at sea. This scale or scale system employs a conveyor belt in contact with a weighing element to determine the weight of a bulk commodity being conveyed across the scale. A belt scale must be equipped with automatic means to compensate for the motion of a vessel at sea so that the weight values indicated are within the MPEs. An operator generally directs the flow of product onto the input conveyor.

Belt-conveyor (flow) scale evaluation

Block I. Information about the scale tested.

This block supplies basic background and contact information so that NMFS can maintain accurate contact records.

Name, mailing address, telephone number, and fax number of scale manufacturer

Name, mailing address (if different from manufacturer), telephone and fax numbers of representative

Model and serial number of scale submitted for evaluation.

Block II. Information about all scales.

Frequently scale manufacturers produce the same basic scale with different sizes, capacities or model numbers. This block allows the manufacturer to describe a "family" of similar scales so that all can be approved at one time. It also sets out the basic meterological characteristics of the scales.

Provide information about the scale submitted for evaluation.

Identify all other models of scales of the same type of scale that will be covered by laboratory evaluation.

Model designation

Maximum capacity

Value of scale divisions

Maximum flow rate, minimum flow rate, minimum totalized load

Belt speed

Weigh length

Maximum capacity

Block III. Information about the certifying laboratory.

This block gives NMFS information on the independent laboratory that evaluated the scale for future reference.

Name of laboratory

Mailing address, telephone and fax numbers of laboratory

Name and Address of Government Agency accrediting laboratory

Block IV. Certification of compliance with NMFS at-sea scale requirements.

This block is to certify that the manufacturer's representative believes the scale or scale component is in compliance with regulations at 50 CFR 679 as indicated in the checklist and test report forms.

Printed name and signature of manufacturer's representative

Date

Block V. List of Attachments.

This block is a checklist of attachments intended to help the manufacturer's representative include the correct documentation needed for scale approval.

Block VI. General Requirements Checklist - Belt scale.

This checklist helps the manufacturer's representative to review the requirements for approval and to note any possible problems.

3. Automatic hopper scales evaluation

Automatic hopper scales are used to weigh catch at sea. An automatic hopper scale is adapted to the automatic weighing of a bulk commodity (fish) in predetermined amounts. Capacities vary from 20 kg to 50 mt. It is generally equipped with a control panel, with functions to be set by an operator, including the start of an automatic operation.

A scale manufacturer or their representative may request that NMFS approve a custom-built automatic hopper scale under the following conditions:

- ♦ The scale electronics are the same as those used in other scales on the Regional Administrator's list of scales eligible for approval;
- ◆ Load cells have received Certificates of Conformance from National Type Evaluation Program or International Organization of Legal Metrology;

- ♦ The scale compensates for motion in the same manner as other scales made by that manufacturer which have been listed on the Regional Administrator's list of scales eligible for approval;
- ♦ The scale, when installed, meets all of the requirements set forth in paragraph 3 of Appendix A to § 679.28, except those requirements set forth in paragraph 3.2.1.1.

Automatic hopper scales evaluation

Block I. Information about the scale tested.

This block supplies basic background and contact information so that NMFS can maintain accurate contact records.

Name, mailing address, telephone number, and fax number of scale manufacturer

Name, mailing address (if different from manufacturer), telephone and fax numbers of representative

Model and serial number of scale submitted for evaluation.

Block II. Information about all scales.

Frequently scale manufacturers produce the same basic scale with different sizes, capacities, or model numbers.

This block allows the manufacturer to describe a "family" of similar scales so that all can be approved at one time. It also sets out the basic meterological characteristics of the scales.

Provide information about the scale submitted for evaluation at #1.

Identify all other models of scales of the same type of scale that will be covered by laboratory evaluation.

Model designation

Maximum capacity

Value and number of scale divisions

Minimum weighment

Minimum totalized load

Block III. Information about the certifying laboratory.

This block gives NMFS information on the independent laboratory that evaluated the scale for future reference.

Name of laboratory

Mailing address, telephone and fax numbers of laboratory

Name and Address of Government Agency accrediting laboratory

Block IV. Certification of compliance with NMFS at-sea scale requirements.

This block is to certify that the manufacturer's representative believes the scale or scale component is in compliance with regulations at 50 CFR 679 as indicated in the checklist and test report forms.

Printed name and signature of manufacturer's representative

Date

Block V. List of Attachments.

This block is a checklist of attachments intended to help the manufacturer's representative include the correct documentation that NMFS needs to approve the scale.

Block VI. General Requirements Checklist – Automatic hopper scale.

This checklist helps the manufacturer's representative to review the requirements for approval and to note any possible problems.

NMFS received no requests for scale evaluation in the past three years. A scale type evaluation is only triggered if someone wants a new type of scale approved for use at sea. Currently there is one manufacturer with approved scales (they bought the other two companies formerly reported) and one manufacturer that has discussed getting an undefined scale approved.

4. New, undefined scale type evaluation

Representatives from two scale manufacturers have expressed interest in having a new scale evaluated for use to weigh catch at sea. Because details are not available on this scale, an estimate of costs is given below.

Scale Type Evaluation, Respondent	
Number of respondents	2
Total annual responses	2
Frequency of response = 1	
Total burden hours	100 hr
Time per response = 50 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$2500
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	
Total capital and startup cost	\$2,500
Total miscellaneous costs	\$24,050
Scale evaluation costs by an independent laboratory	
$= 10,000 \times 2 = 20,000$	
Miscellaneous supplies (binders, printer paper)	
$= 15 \times 2 = 30$	
Photocopying and fax = $10 \times 2 = 20$	
Laboratory Testing costs of scale model	
with market life of 5 yr	
= \$10,000 or annual cost of \$2,000/yr	
x = \$4,000	

Scale Type Evaluation, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	2
Total burden hours	81 hr
review submissions (80 hr)	
maintain list of approved scales (1 hr)	
Total Personnel cost	\$2,025
Personnel cost = \$25	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

b. Inspection Request, At-sea Scales

Once a scale is installed on a vessel and approved by NMFS for use to weigh catch at sea, the scale must be inspected and approved annually by a NMFS-approved scale inspector to determine if the scale meets all of the applicable performance and technical requirements. An inspection is a visual assessment and test of a scale after it is installed on the vessel and while the vessel is tied up at a dock and not under power at sea. Each scale must be inspected and approved before the vessel may participate in any fishery requiring the weighing of catch at sea with an approved scale.

The owner or operator must submit an inspection request annually to NMFS for each vessel that is required to have approved scales. The request is used by NMFS-authorized scale inspectors to schedule and conduct a scale inspection on belt scales, automatic hopper scales, and platform scales. A request for a scale inspection must be submitted at least 10 working days in advance of the requested inspection. Scale inspections will be conducted in Dutch Harbor, Alaska, or the Puget Sound area of Washington State.

At the time of scale inspection,

- The scale must be installed in a rigid and level manner;
- The display and printer must be connected and operational;
- ♦ The belts leading to the scale must be connected and operational (not applicable to platform and hanging scales);
- ♦ Test weights and test weight certification documents must be available for inspection (platform scales only); and
- ♦ A crew member must be available to help the inspector transport test materials and conduct the testing.

After installing a NMFS-approved scale and requesting a scale inspection, the vessel owner must make the vessel and scale available for inspection by the NMFS-authorized scale inspector. The owner must also:

- ♦ Provide a copy of the scale manual supplied by the scale manufacturer to the inspector at the beginning of the inspection.
- ♦ Transport test weights, test material, and equipment required to perform the test to and from the inspector's vehicle and the scale location on the vessel.
- ♦ Apply test weights to the scale or convey test materials across the scale, if requested by the scale inspector.
 - Assist the scale inspector in performing the scale inspection and testing.

The inspector will check whether the scale is properly installed and that all components of the scale are functioning (printer, display, software). The performance test consists of weighing a known quantity of test material (sand in bags) to ensure that the scale being tested weighs the material accurately. In order to perform this test on a flow scale, NMFS passes the test material across the scale in the same manner that fish would pass across the scale, so in-feed belts must be operational before the test can be done.

Scale Inspection Report.

The inspector will approve a scale if it meets all of the applicable performance and technical requirements. Upon scale approval, the scale inspector will complete and sign a Scale Inspection Report verifying that the scale meets all of the requirements specified in § 679.28(b)(2) and Appendix A. The vessel owner or operator must ensure that the Scale Inspection Report is available for authorized personnel (NMFS staff or observers, United States Coast Guard personnel).

At-Sea Scale Approval Sticker.

The scale inspector will complete a sticker for each approved scale. The owner or operator must ensure that a "NMFS approved scale" sticker is on each approved scale and that the scale sticker remains legible. The sticker lists the month and year of the scale approval.

Inspection Request, At-sea Scales

General

Company name and vessel name

Mailing address

Vessel location

Contact person on board

Telephone and fax numbers for contact person

Requested inspection date

Today's date

Telephone number on vessel where inspector may be contacted during inspection

Scales To Be Inspected

Manufacturer name and model

Indicate whether repair company will be onsite at time of inspection

Repair company name

Contact person name and telephone number

Inspection Request, At-sea Scales, Respondent	
Number of respondents	46
21 Amendment 80, rockfish, and GRS	
22 AFA	
3 crab	
Total annual responses	46
Responses per respondent $= 1$	
Total burden hours (4.6)	5 hr
Time per response = $6 \text{ minutes } (0.1 \text{ hr})$	
Total personnel cost (5 x \$25)	\$125
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost (9.55)	\$10
Cost of photocopy $(0.05 \times 46 = 2.30)$	
Cost of fax ($\$5 \times 1 = 5$)	
Cost of email $(0.05 \times 45 = 2.25)$	

Inspection Request, At-sea Scales, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	46
Total burden hours (11.50)	12 hr
Time per response = $15 \text{ minutes} = 0.25$)	
Total personnel cost	\$300
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

c. Notification to Observers of at-sea scale tests

Each vessel operator must notify the observer at least 15 minutes before the time that a scale test will be conducted and must conduct the test while the observer is present. No form exists for this notice. This notice consists of vessel personnel verbally informing the observer that a scale test is scheduled.

Notification to Observers of scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	46
Total annual responses	6,210
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (186.30)	186 hr
Hours per response (2 min /60 min= 0.03)	
Total personnel cost	\$4,650
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Notification to Observer of scale tests, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

d. Records of at-sea scale tests

Some motion-compensated flow scales are specifically designed to be recalibrated regularly in order to weigh accurately. Because the operator must adjust the scale several times a day, NMFS believes that a daily test of the scale is necessary to monitor the performance of the scale.

NMFS may re-evaluate the need for daily tests for at-sea scales in the future if scales with sealed calibration mechanisms become available or if daily scale test results indicate that fewer tests would provide sufficient information about the scale's performance.

Upon NMFS approval of a scale used to weigh catch at sea, the vessel operator must test each scale or scale system that is used to weigh total catch. The test must occur one time during each 24-hour period; the test must be recorded on a test report form. The scale must meet the maximum permissible error requirements described in § 679.28(b)(3) to ensure that it is accurate within an approved range.

Information from the scale test form is used by NMFS observers, enforcement staff, and scale program staff to ensure regulatory compliance and to monitor the accuracy of the scales.

The flow scale daily test information may be recorded as a .pdf file at http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/scales/dailytest_fillable.pdf or and as an excel file at http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/scales/default.htm#inspections. Although not submitted to NMFS, the daily test forms must be available for inspection on board or onsite until the end of the fishing year during which the tests were conducted. The owner must retain the daily test records for three years after the test occurred.

1. Daily flow scale test records.

Daily flow scale test records

Vessel name

Month, day, and year of test

Time test started to the nearest minute

I. Weigh fish on observer platform scale

Collect approximately 400 kg of fish in baskets and weigh it on the platform scale.

Record the weight of each basket of fish (basket plus fish)

II. Calculate percent error of flow scale

Record the total weight of all baskets plus fish in the first box

Record the weight of the baskets in the second box.

Subtract the weight of the baskets from the total weight of fish plus baskets to determine the weight of the fish only; record this weight in the third box. This is the platform scale weight of the fish (A).

Record the weight displayed on the flow scale before and after the test fish are weighed.

Weigh the fish from the baskets on the flow scale. Record the weight in the fourth box (B).

Calculate error of flow scale by subtracting the platform scale weight (A) from the flow scale weight (B).

Record the error (C) in the fifth box

Calculate percent error by dividing the error (C) by the known weight of the fish (A) and multiplying by 100. Record this information in the last box of Section II. When tested, the total catch weighing scale and the observer sampling station scale must agree within 3 percent. If the scale fails the daily test, it may be retested at any time. However, it may not be used to weigh fish until it passes the daily test. The scale is weighing within 3 percent error if the result is between -3.0% and +3.0%.

III. Sea Conditions (Beaufort Scale) at Time of Scale Test (Check One)

Record Beaufort Scale sea conditions at time of test

Signatures of vessel operator and observer

Records of daily flow scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	43
21 Amendment 80, rockfish, and GRS	
22 AFA	
Total annual responses (43 x 135)	
Frequency of response = 135	5805
Total burden hours (4353.75)	
Time per response (45 min/60 min = 0.75)	4,354 hr
Total personnel cost	
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	\$108,850
Total miscellaneous costs (\$1505)	
Binders, printer paper = $$35 \times 43$	\$1,505

Records of daily flow scale tests, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

2. Daily Automatic Hopper Scale Test Records

Three crab processors in the Crab Rationalization Program use hopper scales.

Daily Automatic Hopper Scale Test Records

Vessel name

Vessel operator signature

Date of test

Time test started

Minimum capacity of scale

Test weights

Weight on scale indicator

Error

% Error

Maximum capacity of scale

Test weights

Weight on scale indicator

Error

% Error

Sea conditions (Beaufort scale) at time of scale test

Records of daily hopper scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses (3 x 135)	405
Frequency of response =135	
Total burden hours (303.75)	304 h r
Hours per response (45 min/60 min= 0.75)	
Total personnel cost (\$25 x 304)	\$7,600
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous costs (3 x \$35)	\$105
Binders, printer paper = 35	

Records of daily hopper scale tests, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous costs	0

e. Printed output of at-sea scales used to weigh catch

Each scale used to weigh catch must be equipped with a printer. A printout(s) showing the total weight of each haul, set, or delivery must be generated after each delivery has been weighed. Reports must be printed at least once every 24 hours when use of the scale is required. Reports must be printed before any information stored in the scale computer memory is replaced.

Although scales may be recalibrated or tested at any time during the day, the audit trail is designed to record information that will be used to determine whether a scale had been incorrectly adjusted and then readjusted just prior to the scale test. The printed output of scale weights is used by NMFS staff, observers, and NOAA enforcement personnel to maintain accurate records of catch and to ensure compliance with quotas. The scale printout also forms

the basis of an audit trail for each haul that can be used to resolve inconsistencies in catch reports submitted by the observer and the vessel or processor.

These printouts are not submitted to NMFS, but they must be available for inspection at any time upon request of the observer, the scale inspector, NMFS staff, or an authorized officer on board the vessel during the fishing year and retained by the vessel owner for three years after the test occurred.

Printed output from the at-sea scale

The scale software is programmed to print the required information, and printing is nearly automatic.

Vessel name

Federal fisheries permit number

Haul or set number

Total weight of the haul or set

Total cumulative weight of all fish or other material weighed on the scale

Printed output, at-sea scale, Respondent	
Number of respondents	46
Total annual responses (46 x 135)	6,210
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (124.2)	124 hr
Time per response (1 min/60 min=0.02)	
Total personnel cost	\$3,100
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost (46 x \$35)	\$1,610
Binders, paper = \$35	

Printed output, at-sea scale, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Each vessel must provide a single collection point for observers (observer sampling station) to collect samples of unsorted catch. Observer sampling of each haul is necessary to determine the percentage of the total catch that is comprised of groundfish and to estimate total groundfish weight.

f. Inspection request, observer sampling station.

Each vessel is required to provide an observer sampling station that meets specifications for size, location, and content. These stations provide a location where observers can work safely and effectively. An inspection request for an observer sampling station provides the basic information needed to schedule and conduct an inspection.

Each observer sampling station must be inspected and approved by NMFS prior to its use for the first time and then one time each year within 12 months of the date of the most recent inspection. In addition, if the observer sampling station is moved or if the space or equipment available to the observer is reduced or removed when use of the observer sampling station is required, the observer sampling station must be re-inspected and approved by NMFS.

Observer Platform Scale Inspection Report.

Upon approval of the scale after inspection, the inspector will issue an Observer Platform Scale Inspection Report to the operator. This report must be maintained on board the vessel when use of the observer sampling station is required and made available to authorized NMFS and United States Coast Guard (USCG) personnel.

Observer sampling station inspection request form

Vessel name

Federal fisheries permit number

Requested inspection date

Business mailing address

Name, telephone number, and fax number for contact person on vessel

Vessel location, including street address and city

Today's date

Signature of requestor

If the vessel received and passed a scale inspection, indicate the date of the most recent inspection Attachment

<u>For catcher/processors using trawl gear and motherships</u>, include a diagram drawn to scale showing the location(s) where all catch will be weighed, the location where observers will sample unsorted catch, and the location of the observer sampling station, including the observer sampling scale, and the name of the manufacturer and model of the observer sampling scale.

<u>For all other vessels</u>, include a diagram drawn to scale showing the location(s) where catch comes on board the vessel, the location where observers will sample unsorted catch, the location of the observer sampling station, including the observer sampling scale, and the name of the manufacturer and model of the observer sampling scale.

Inspection Request, observer sampling station, Respondent	
Number of respondents	46
Total annual responses	46
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	92 hr
Time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$2,300
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost (9.55)	\$10
Cost of photocopy (0.05 x $46 = 2.30$)	
Cost of fax ($$5 \times 1 = 5$)	
Cost of email $(0.05 \times 45 = 2.25)$	

Inspection Request, observer sampling station, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	46
Total burden hours (11.50)	12 hr
Time per response = $15 \text{ minutes} = 0.25$	
Total personnel cost	\$300
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

I. CRAB CATCH MONITORING PLAN (CMP)

a. Proposed CMP

A CMP is a plan submitted by a Registered Crab Receiver (RCR) for each location or processing vessel where the RCR wishes to take deliveries of Crab Rationalization Program (CR) crab. The CMP must detail how the RCR will meet the catch monitoring standards detailed in §680.23(g)(5), except that an RCR that processes only CR crab harvested under a catcher/processor owner or catcher/processor crew Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) permit is not required to prepare a CMP. Catcher/processor owner IFQ means crab IFQ derived from quota share initially issued to persons who held LLP crab permits and had qualifying landings derived from landings processed at sea, to annually harvest and process CR crab. Catcher/processor crew IFQ means crab IFQ derived from quota share initially issued to persons who historically held Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission crab permits and signed fish tickets for qualifying landings based on landings processed at sea, to annually harvest and process CR crab.

There are 15 shore based crab processing plants. Three catcher/processors are required to have an RCR but are not required to have a CMP. The other RCRs use one of the 15 processing facilities to process their crab and follow that processor's approved CMP.

CMP

Crab Sorting and weighing

All crab, including crab parts and crab that are dead or otherwise unmarketable, delivered to the RCR must be sorted and weighed by species. CMP must show how and where crab are sorted and weighed.

Scales used for weighing crab

The CMP must identify by serial number each scale used to weigh crab and describe the rationale for its use. Scale testing plan

Scales identified in the CMP must be accurate. For each scale identified in the CMP a testing plan list:

Test weights and equipment required to test the scale

Where the test weights and equipment will be stored

Names of the personnel responsible for conducting the scale testing

Printed record

The scale must produce a complete and accurate printed record of the weight of each species in a landing. All of the crab in a delivery must be weighed on a scale capable of producing a complete printed record. A printed record of each landing must be printed before the RCR submits a CR crab landing report (see OMB 0648-0515).

Observation area.

Each CMP must designate an observation area. The observation area is a location where an individual may monitor the offloading and weighing of crab. The observation area must meet the following standards:

<u>Access to the observation area.</u> must be freely accessible to NMFS staff or NMFS-authorized personnel at any time during the effective period of the CMP.

Monitoring the offloading and weighing of crab. From the observation area, must have an unobstructed view or otherwise be able to monitor the entire offload of crab between the first location where crab are removed from the boat and a location where all sorting has taken place and each species has been weighed.

Sheltered. must be sheltered from extreme weather and not exposed to unreasonable safety hazards

Plant liaison

Orienting new observers to the plant

Assisting in the resolution of observer concerns

Informing NMFS if changes must be made to the CMP

Drawing to scale of delivery location.

CMP must be accompanied by a drawing to scale of the delivery location or vessel showing:

Where and how crab are removed from the delivering vessel

The observation area

The location of each scale used to weigh crab

Each location where crab is sorted

All offload and weighing locations detailed in a CMP must be located on the same vessel or in the same geographic location. If a CMP describes facilities for the offloading of vessels at more than one location, it must be possible to see all locations simultaneously.

Crab CMP, Respondent	
Number of respondents	15
Total annual responses	15
Responses per respondent $= 1$	
Total burden hours (15 x 16)	240 hr
Hours per response = 16	
Total personnel cost	\$6,000
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost	\$11
Photocopy $0.05 \times 15 \text{ pp } \times 15 = \11.25	

Crab CMP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	15
Total burden hours	240 hr
Hours per response = 16	
Total personnel cost	\$6,000
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

b. CMP addendum

An RCR must notify NMFS in writing if changes are made in operations or layout during the approval year by submitting a CMP addendum. Depending on the nature and magnitude of the change requested, NMFS may require an additional CMP inspection.

CMP addendum

Name and signature of the submitter

Address, telephone number, fax number and e-mail address (if available) of submitter Complete description of the proposed CMP change

CMP Addendum, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses	3
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	24 hr
Time per response $= 8 \text{ hr}$	
Total personnel cost	\$600
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost	\$2
Photocopy $0.05 \times 10 \text{ pp x } 3 = 1.5$	

CMP Addendum, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	3
Total burden hours	3
Time per response = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$75
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

c. Inspection request, CMP

The location or vessel identified in the CMP must be inspected by NMFS prior to approval of the CMP to ensure that the location conforms to the elements addressed in the CMP. If NMFS disapproves a CMP, the plant owner or manager may resubmit a revised CMP.

An annual CMP inspection may be arranged by submitting a request for a CMP inspection. No form exists for the CMP inspection request; the request is made by telephone or e-mail. An inspection must be requested no less than 10 working days before the requested inspection date. NMFS staff will conduct CMP inspections in any port located in the United States that can be reached by regularly scheduled commercial air service. This inspection request is usually done by telephone or email.

Inspection request, CMP

Name and signature of the submitter and date of the request Address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address (if available) of submitter Proposed CMP

Inspection Request, CMP, Respondent	
Number of respondents	15
Total annual responses	15
Frequency of response = 1	
Total burden hours (1.20)	1 hr
Time per response $(5\min/60 \min = 0.08)$	
Total personnel cost	\$25
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost (0.75)	\$1
Photocopy 0.05 x 1 pp x 15	

Inspection Request, CMP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	15
Total burden hours (7.5)	8 hr
Time per response $(30 \text{ min}/60 \text{ min} = 0.5)$	
Total personnel cost	\$200
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

III. CATCH MONITORING AND CONTROL PLAN (CMCP) FOR SHORESIDE PROCESSORS AND SFPs

Scale requirements in this section are in addition to those requirements set forth by the State of Alaska, and nothing in this paragraph may be construed to reduce or supersede the authority of the State of Alaska to regulate, test, or approve scales within the State of Alaska or its territorial sea. Scales used to weigh groundfish catch that are also required to be approved by the State of Alaska under Alaska Statute 45.75 must meet the following requirements:

- ♦ The scale must display a valid State of Alaska sticker indicating that the scale was inspected and approved within the previous 12 months.
- ♦ The scale and scale display must be visible simultaneously to the observer. Observers, NMFS personnel, or an authorized officer must be allowed to observe the weighing of fish on the scale and be allowed to read the scale display at all times.
- Printouts of the scale weight of each haul, set, or delivery must be made available to observers, NMFS personnel, or an authorized officer at the time printouts are generated and thereafter upon request for the duration of the fishing year.

a. CMCP

A CMCP is a plan submitted by the owner or manager of each shoreside processor or SFP and approved by NMFS, detailing how the processing plant will meet the catch monitoring and control standards detailed in §679.28(g)(7). The owner or manager of a shoreside processor or SFP receiving fish harvested in the following fisheries must prepare, submit, and have approved a CMCP prior to the receipt of fish harvested in these fisheries:

- ♦ AFA pollock,
- ♦ Aleutian Islands directed pollock,
- Rockfish Program, unless those fish are harvested under the entry level rockfish fishery as described under § 679.83.

The CMCP must be maintained on the premises and made available to authorized officers or NMFS-authorized personnel upon request.

CMCP

Catch Sorting and weighing

All groundfish delivered to the plant must be sorted and weighed by species. The CMCP must detail

Amount and location of space for sorting catch

Number of staff assigned to catch sorting

Maximum rate that catch will flow through the sorting area

Scales used for weighing groundfish.

The CMCP must identify by serial number each scale used to weigh groundfish and describe the rational for its use

Scale testing procedure

Scales identified in the CMCP must be accurate within the specified limits.

For each scale identified in the CMCP a testing plan must

Describe the procedure the plant will use to test the scale

List the test weights and equipment required to test the scale

List where the test weights and equipment are stored

Lists the plant personnel responsible for conducting the scale testing

Printed record

Request for exemption

Identification of any scale that cannot produce a complete printed record

Explain how the processor will use the scale, and

Explain how the plant intends to produce a complete record of the total weight of each delivery

Delivery point

The delivery point is the first location where fish removed from a delivering catcher vessel can be sorted or diverted to more than one location.

If the catch is pumped from the hold of a catcher vessel or a codend, the delivery point is where the pump first discharges the catch.

If catch is removed from a vessel by brailing, the delivery point normally is the bin or belt where the brailer discharges the catch.

Observation area.

The observation area is a location designated on the CMCP where an individual may monitor the flow of fish during a delivery.

Must be freely accessible to NMFS staff or NMFS-authorized personnel at any time a valid

CMCP is required

Must have an unobstructed view or otherwise be able to monitor the entire flow of fish between the delivery point and a location where all sorting has taken place and each species has been weighed

Observer work station

Must identify an observer work station for the exclusive use of NMFS-certified observers.

The observer area must be located near the observer work station.

The plant liaison must be able to walk between the work station and the observation area in less than 20 seconds without encountering safety hazards.

The work station must meet the following criteria

Be located in an area protected from the weather where the observer has access to unsorted catch

Provide a platform scale of at least 50 kg capacity

Include a workspace

at least 4.5 sq m

a table

a secure and lockable cabinet or locker of at least 0.5 cu m.

Communication with observer

Each CMCP must describe what communication equipment (such as radios, pagers or cellular telephones) is used to facilitate communications within the plant and provide the NMFS-certified observer with the same communications equipment used by plant staff.

Plant liaison

Each CMCP must designate a plant liaison responsible for

Orienting new observers to the plant

Assisting in the resolution of observer concerns

Informing NMFS if changes must be made to the CMCP

Scale drawing of inshore processor plant

Each CMCP must be accompanied by a scale drawing of the plant showing

Delivery point

Observation area

Observer work station

Location of each scale used to weigh catch

Each location where catch is sorted

CMCP, Respondent	
Number of respondents	13
8 AFA	
5 GOA Rockfish	
Total annual responses	13
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	520 hr
Time per response = 40 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$13,000
Personnel cost = $$25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost (\$9.75)	\$10
Photocopy 0.05 x 15 pp x 13	

CMCP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	13
Total burden hours	65 hr
Time per response = 5 hr	
Total personnel cost = \$25/hr	\$1,625
Total miscellaneous cost	0

b. CMCP Addendum

An owner or manager of a shoreside processor or SFP must notify NMFS in writing if changes are made in plant operations or layout that does not conform to the CMCP. An owner or manager may change an approved CMCP by submitting a CMCP addendum to NMFS. NMFS will approve the modified CMCP if it continues to meet the performance standards.

CMCP Addendum

Name and signature of the submitter Address, telephone number, fax number and email address (if available) of submitter Complete description of the proposed CMCP change

CMCP Addendum, Respondent	
Number of respondents	4
Total annual responses	4
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	32 hr
Time per response $= 8 \text{ hr}$	
Total personnel cost	\$800
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	\$2
Photocopy 0.05 x 10 pp x $4 = 2$	

CMCP Addendum, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	4
Total burden hours	4
Time per response = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$100
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

c. Inspection Request, CMCP

The owner or manager may arrange for a CMCP inspection by submitting to NMFS a request for a CMCP inspection. No form exists for the CMCP inspection request; the request is made by telephone or e-mail. NMFS will annually approve a CMCP if it meets all the performance standards and requirements. The processor must be inspected by NMFS prior to approval of the CMCP to ensure that the processor conforms to the elements addressed in the CMCP. NMFS will complete its review of the CMCP within 14 working days of receiving a complete CMCP and conducting a CMCP inspection. This inspection request is usually done by telephone or email.

Inspection Request, CMCP

Name and signature of the submitter Date of the application Address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address (if available) of submitter Proposed CMCP

Inspection Request, CMCP, Respondent	
Number of respondents	13
Total annual responses	13
Frequency of response = 1	
Total burden hours (1.04)	1 hr
Time per response $(5\min/60 \min = 0.08)$	
Total personnel cost	\$25
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost (0.65)	\$1
Photocopy 0.05 x 1 pp x 13	

Inspection Request, CMCP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	13
Total burden hours	52 hr
Time per response = 4 hr	
Total personnel cost = \$25/hr	\$1,300
Total miscellaneous cost	0

d. Shoreside processor or SFP inseason scale tests

Scales in shoreside processors plants and SFPs are under the jurisdiction of the State of Alaska Division of Measurement Standards. The State of Alaska requires that fish be weighed on a scale approved under Alaska statutes, because the buying and selling of fish is commerce. The State of Alaska determines what constitutes an approved scale, how often the scale has to be tested, what tests must be conducted, and what performance requirements shoreside processors and SFPs must meet. These performance requirements are significantly more restrictive -- maximum permissible errors -- and operate in a less hostile environment than those scales used at sea. The environment in which the weighing occurs is different from at-sea, and, therefore, the design of the land-based versus at-sea scales is different. Once calibrated and sealed, land-based scales are expected to hold their calibration over an extended period.

Scales identified in an approved CMCP must be tested in accordance with the CMCP when testing is requested by NMFS-staff or NMFS- authorized personnel. NMFS must provide plant personnel no less than 20 minutes notice that a scale is to be tested. No form exists for this notice. This notice consists of NMFS staff or NMFS-authorized personnel verbally informing the plant personnel that a scale test is scheduled.

NMFS or NMFS-authorized personnel will test the scales and will approve or pass an inseason test of a shoreside processor or SFP scale by verifying that:

- ♦ The scale display and printed information are clear and easily read under all conditions of normal operation.
 - Weight values are visible on the display until the value is printed.
 - Finally, the scale does not exceed the maximum permissible errors.

There is no respondent burden for these tests.

e. Printed record from the State of Alaska scale

A scale identified in a CMCP must produce a printed record for each delivery, or portion of a delivery, weighed on that scale. All of the groundfish in a delivery must be weighed on a scale capable of producing a complete printed record. Printouts must be retained and made available to NMFS-authorized personnel including observers.

If approved by NMFS as part of the CMCP, scales not designed for automatic bulk weighing may be exempted from part or all of the printed record requirements.

Printed output from the State of Alaska scale

Processor name

Weight of each load in the weighing cycle

Total weight of fish in each delivery, or portion of the delivery that was weighed on that scale

Total cumulative weight of all fish or other material weighed on the scale since the last annual inspection Date and time the information is printed

Name and Alaska Department of Fish and Game number of the vessel making the delivery (This information may be written on the scale printout in pen by the scale operator at the time of delivery.)

Printed output, State scale, Respondent	
Number of respondents	13
Total annual responses	1,755
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (35.10)	35 hr
Time per response (1 min/60 min= 0.02)	
Total personnel cost (25 x 35)	\$875
Personnel cost = $25/hr$	
Total miscellaneous cost (13 x 35)	\$455
Binders, paper = \$35	

Printed output, State scale, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

NMFS may exempt scales not designed for automatic bulk weighing from some or all of the printed record requirements if the CMCP identifies any scale that cannot produce a complete printed record, states how the processor will use the scale, and states how the plant intends to produce a complete record of the total weight of each delivery.

f. Notification to observer of BSAI pollock delivery

The plant manager or plant liaison must notify the observer of the offloading schedule for each delivery of BSAI pollock by an AFA catcher vessel at least 1 hour prior to offloading. No form exists for this notice. This notice consists of plant personnel verbally informing the observer that a pollock delivery is scheduled. An observer must monitor each delivery of BSAI pollock from an AFA catcher vessel and be on site the entire time the delivery is being weighed or sorted.

There are eight shoreside processors and stationary floating processors that accept deliveries of BSAI pollock.

Observer notification of pollock delivery, Respondent	
Number of respondents	8
Total annual responses	1,080
Responses per respondent = 135	
Total burden hours (89.99)	90 hr
Time per response (5 min/60 min)	
Total personnel cost (\$25 x 86)	\$2,250
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Observer notification of pollock delivery, Federal	
Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

g. Notification to observer of CDQ delivery.

The plant manager or plant liaison must notify the level 2 observer of the schedule for each CDQ delivery at least 1 hour prior to offloading. No form exists for this notice. This notice consists of plant personnel verbally informing the observer that a CDQ delivery is scheduled. The observer must monitor the sorting and weighing of the entire delivery.

Observer notification of CDQ delivery, Respondent	
Number of respondents	8
Total annual responses	1,080
Responses per respondent =135	
Total burden hours	90hr
Time per response (5 min/60 min)	
Total personnel cost (\$25 x 86)	\$2,250
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Observer notification of CDQ delivery, Federal	
Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

f. Notification to observer of Rockfish Program delivery.

The plant manager or plant liaison must notify the observer of the offloading schedule for each delivery of groundfish harvested in a Rockfish Program fishery at least 1 hour prior to offloading. No form exists for this notice. This notice consists of plant personnel verbally informing the observer that a Rockfish Program delivery is scheduled.

The observer must be available to monitor each delivery of groundfish harvested in a Rockfish Program fishery and must be available the entire time the delivery is being weighed or sorted.

There are five processors eligible to accept deliveries of GOA Rockfish.

Observer notification of Rockfish delivery, Respondent	
Number of respondents	5
Total annual responses	675
Responses per respondent $= 135$	
Total burden hours (56.25)	56hr
Time per response (5 min/60 min)	
Total personnel cost (\$25 x 54)	\$1400
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Observer notification of Rockfish delivery, Federal	
Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

IV. BIN MONITORING (Cameras, Monitors, and Digital Video Recording System)

Each operator must facilitate observation and monitoring of crew activities within a bin or tank by one of three options:

- ♦ Prohibit crew members from entering bins unless the observer is able to monitor all crew activities within the bin
- ♦ Install viewing ports in the bins
- ♦ Install video monitoring system in the bins.

<u>Prohibit crew members from entering bins unless the observer is able to monitor all crew activities within the bin.</u>

Vessel operators that choose the first option must ensure that crew members do not enter a fish bin when fish are in it, unless the observer has been given a chance to observe the activities of the crew inside the bin. Based on conversations with vessel owners and operators in this sector, a crew member may be required to be inside the bin to facilitate the movement of fish from the bin. Crew members would be allowed inside bins if the flow of fish has been stopped between the tank and the location where the observer collects unsorted catch, all catch has been cleared from all locations between the tank and the location where the observer collects unsorted catch, and the observer has been given notice that the vessel crew must enter the tank.

When informed by an observer that all sampling has been completed for a given haul, crew would be able to enter a tank containing fish from that haul without stopping the flow of fish or clearing catch between the tank and the observer sampling station. Vessel operators may be able to use water to facilitate the movement of fish in some fisheries. However, industry has indicated that water may degrade the quality of some fish species (e.g., AI POP), which could decrease the value of these fish. Therefore, options were developed to allow an observer to see inside the bin while fish are exiting the bin, and ensure that presorting activities are not occurring.

Install viewing ports in the bins.

Vessel operators that choose the second option would be required to provide a viewing window into the bin. The observer must be able to see all actions of the crew member inside the bin from the same position they are conducting their normal sampling duties. For example, while the observer is sorting catch at the observer sample station table, crew member activities inside the bin must be viewable by the observer through the window from the sample station table. This option would be acceptable for vessels that may not need a crew member in the bin frequently or have uniformly shaped bins and an observer sampling station in close proximity to the bin area.

Install video monitoring system in the bins.

Vessel operators that choose the third option would be required to develop and install a digital video monitoring system. The system would include a sufficient number of cameras to view all activities of anyone inside the bin. Video cameras would be required to record images in color and in low light conditions. To ensure that an observer can monitor crew member activities in

the bin while sampling, a color monitor would be required to be located in the observer sampling station. An observer would be given the opportunity to review any video data at any time during a trip. Each video system would be required to provide enough storage capacity to store all video data for an entire trip. Because NMFS may not be aware of potential presorting violations until after an observer disembarks the vessel and is debriefed, the vessel must retain all data for a minimum of 120 days from the beginning of each trip, unless notified by NMFS that the data may be removed. Specific requirements for cameras, resolution, recording formats, and other technical information is detailed in the regulatory text under § 679.28(i)(1)(iii).

If at any time during a trip, the viewing port or video options do not allow an observer to monitor crew activities within the fish bin or do not meet the required specifications, the vessel must revert to the first option and prohibit crew from entering the bin. The use of options two and three would be approved by NMFS during the vessel's annual bin monitoring inspection as described at § 679.28(d).

If the video monitoring option is chosen, the processor would be required to provide and maintain cameras, a monitor, and a digital video recording system for all areas of the bin or tank where crew could be located preceding the point where the observer collects catch.

A number of electronic monitoring technologies are now being applied to fisheries monitoring. Video technology is proposed as a potential way to:

- Supplement existing observer coverage
- ♦ Enhance the value of the data NMFS receives
- Fill data gaps that have proven difficult to fill with human observers.

a. Electronic Bin Monitoring System

Software And Hardware

The vessel owner or operator must ensure that the electronic monitoring system

- ♦ Has sufficient data storage capacity to store all video data from an entire trip. Each frame of stored video data must record a time/date stamp in Alaska local time. At a minimum, all periods of time when fish are inside the bin must be recorded and stored.
- ♦ Includes at least one external Universal Serial Bus (USB) (1.1 or 2.0) port (hard drive) or other removable storage device approved by NMFS. An USB is a way of setting up communication between a computer and peripheral devices.
- Uses commercially available software.

- ♦ Color cameras must have at a minimum 420 TV lines of resolution, a lux rating of 0.1, and auto-iris capabilities.
- ♦ Video data must be maintained and made available to NMFS staff, or any individual authorized by NMFS, upon request. These data must be retained onboard the vessel for no less than 120 days after the beginning of a trip unless NMFS has notified the vessel operator that the video data may be retained for less than this 120-day period.
- ♦ Provides sufficient resolution and field of view to see and read a text sample written in 130 point type (corresponding to line two of a standard Snellen eye chart) from any location within the tank where crew could be located;
- Records at a speed of no less than 5 frames per second at all times when fish are inside the tank;
- Provides a 16-bit or better color monitor, for viewing activities within the tank in real time within the observer sampling station. The monitor must:
 - Have the capacity to display all cameras simultaneously;
 - Be operating at all times when fish are in the tank;
 - Be securely mounted at or near eye level;
- Enables the observer to view any earlier footage from any point in the trip and be assisted by crew knowledgeable in the operation of the system.

Specifications of the System

At a minimum, must include:

Length and width (in pixels) of each image

File type in which the data are recorded

Type and extent of compression

Frame rate at which the data will be recorded

Brand and model number of the cameras used

Brand, model, and specifications of the lenses used

Size and type of storage device

Type, speed, and operating system of any computer that is part of the system

Miscellaneous Costs

Assuming that vessels choose to purchase redundant storage capacity, and that Universal Serial Bus (USB) compatible hard drives cost approximately \$1.00 per GB, NMFS estimates that storage will cost between \$400 and \$3,000, for an average cost of \$1,700. Maintenance costs are difficult to estimate because much of this technology has not been extensively used at sea by the

U.S. fleet. However, a hard disk failure rate is estimated at 20 percent per year, and a DVR/computer lifespan of three years, or between \$680 and \$4,100 per year.

Electronic Bin Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	21
17 AFA trawl catcher/processors	
3 AFA motherships	
1 non-AFA trawl catcher/processor	
Total annual responses	252
Responses per respondent = 12 (1/month)	
Total burden hours	252 hr
Time per response = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$6,300
Personnel cost = \$25/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	\$85,890
Data storage (\$400 to \$3,000 = av. \$1,700)	
Annual system maintenance	
(\$680 to \$4,100= avg \$2,390)	
\$1,700 + \$2,390 = 4,090 *21	

Electronic Bin Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

b. Inspection Request, Bin Monitoring

The owner may arrange the time and place for an inspection of the electronic bin monitoring by submitting to NMFS by fax (206) 526-4066 or e-mail station.inspections@noaa.gov an Inspection Request available. The electronic bin monitoring inspection request form is also found on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov.

Inspections will be scheduled no later than 10 working days after NMFS receives a complete application for an inspection. Inspections will be conducted on vessels tied to docks in Alaska at Dutch Harbor and Kodiak and in the Puget Sound area of Washington State.

Electronic Monitoring System (EMS) Inspection Report

An Electronic Monitoring System (EMS) Inspection Report, valid for 12 months from the date it is signed by NMFS, will be issued to the vessel owner if the electronic monitoring system meets the requirements. The EMS Inspection Report must be made available to the observer, NMFS personnel, or to any authorized officer upon request. The vessel owner must maintain a current EMS Inspection Report onboard the vessel at all times the vessel is required to provide an approved electronic monitoring system.

Scale Inspection Report and Scale Inspection Sticker

A Scale Inspection Report and a Scale Inspection Sticker, valid for 12 months, will be issued to the vessel owner or operator if the bin monitoring system meets the requirements under the line of sight option described in §679.28(i)(1)(ii) or the video option described in §679.28 (i)(1)(iii). The vessel owner must maintain a current Scale Inspection Report and a Scale Inspection Sticker onboard the vessel at all times the vessel is required to provide an approved bin monitoring inspection.

Request for Inspection, Bin Monitoring, Video Option

Vessel name and Federal fisheries permit number

Requested inspection date

Business mailing address

Printed name and signature of contact person on vessel

Today's date

Telephone number and fax number for contact person

Location of vessel, including street address and city

If vessel previously received an electronic monitoring system inspection,

enter the date of the most recent inspection report

Indicate bin monitoring option

Attachment

Include a diagram drawn to scale showing the locations

where all catch will be weighed and sorted by the observer

Where unsorted catch will be collected

Where any video equipment or viewing panels or ports

Inspection Request, Electronic Bin Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	21
Total annual responses	21
Responses per year $= 1$	
Total burden hours	42
Estimated time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$1,050
Cost per hour = $$25$	
Total miscellaneous cost (2.10)	\$2
Photocopy (0.05*21)	
Email submittal (0.05*21)	

Inspection request, Electronic Bin Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	21
Total burden hours (2.31)	2
Time per response = $0.11 \text{ hr x } 21$	
Total personnel cost	\$50
Cost per hour = \$25	
Total miscellaneous cost	0

It is anticipated that the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. As explained in the following paragraphs, the information gathered has utility. NOAA Fisheries will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with NOAA standards for confidentiality, privacy, and electronic information. See response to Question 10 of this Supporting Statement for more information on confidentiality and privacy. The information collection is designed to yield data that meet all applicable information quality

guidelines. Prior to dissemination, the information will be subjected to quality control measures and a pre-dissemination review pursuant to <u>Section 515 of Public Law 106-554</u>.

3. <u>Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological techniques or other forms of information technology.</u>

The CMCP and CMP are large documents with various sizes of pages which are not suitable for automated submittal. These documents would be mailed or delivered.

The inspection requests are "fillable" forms available at the NMFS Alaska Region Home Page at www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov, for the participant to complete online, download, print, and fax to NMFS.

The required printed output format is programmed into each scale. Complying with NMFS' requirements is either automatic when the scale operator changes memories or requires only invoking the "print" command on the scale display.

The daily flow scale test form is available as a Microsoft Excel template that can be installed on the vessel's computer if the operator wishes to do so. The daily flow scale and daily hopper scale test forms also are available as "fillable" forms on the web page indicated above.

The scale type evaluation package is not available electronically. Because of the complexity of this process, we prefer that an applicant directly contact the program manager so that he can work with them personally on completing the package.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

None of the information collected as part of this information collection duplicates other collections. This information collection is part of a specialized and technical program that is not like any other.

5. <u>If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.</u>

This collection of information does not impose a significant impact on small entities. No small businesses are affected by this collection: 32 large AFA, 0 small; 7 large Rockfish, 0 small; 3 large CR crab, 0 small.

6. <u>Describe the consequences to the Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently.</u>

This collection-of-information describes performance, technical, operational, maintenance, and testing requirement for motion-compensated scales that are required by NMFS to weigh catch at sea.

Without the daily scale test results and the printed output from the scale, NMFS would be unable to effectively audit catch in fisheries requiring use of scales. Without the daily scale testing and printed output frequency, NMFS would not be as confident of the accuracy of the scales. Given that scales are used only in fisheries where there are expectations of highly accurate catch monitoring, this would not be acceptable.

Without the inspection request forms, NMFS would be unable to coordinate and schedule inspections expeditiously. The video option for crew monitoring in the tank or bin is one of three options to satisfy the regulatory requirement; it is the NMFS-preferred option. Without the requirements to monitor crew, the Program's ability to control halibut PSC would be decreased.

7. Explain any special circumstances that require the collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

No special circumstances are associated with this information collection.

8. Provide information on the PRA Federal Register Notice that solicited public comments on the information collection prior to this submission. Summarize the public comments received in response to that notice and describe the actions taken by the agency in response to those comments. Describe the efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

A <u>Federal Register</u> Notice was published on March 1, 2010 (75 FR 9157) soliciting public comments on the information collection. No comments were received.

9. Explain any decisions to provide payments or gifts to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No payment or gift will be provided under this program.

10. <u>Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.</u>

As stated on the forms, the information collected under Magnuson-Stevens Act, as amended in 2006, is confidential under section 402(b). The information is also confidential under <u>NOAA</u> <u>Administrative Order 216-100</u>, which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics.

11. <u>Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.</u>

This information collection does not involve information of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide an estimate in hours of the burden of the collection of information.

Estimated total unique respondents: 61 (2 scale manufacturers, 46 at-sea processors, 13 inshore processors) down from 113. Estimated total responses: 23,650, up from 9,305. Estimated total time burden: 6,548 hours, up from 5,209 hours. Estimated total personnel cost: \$163,700, up from \$130,232. Personnel labor costs are estimated to the average wage equivalent to a GS-7 employee in Alaska, including COLA, at \$25 per hour.

13. <u>Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to the respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection (excluding the value of the burden hours in Question 12 above).</u>

Total operational and maintenance costs: \$113,664, up from \$51,131. Total annualized capital costs: \$2,500, down from \$577,373.

Capital costs are costs incurred for a flow scale, observer sampling station, and video monitoring system to be used in the production of product -- in other words, the total cost needed to bring a project to a commercially operable status. Capital costs are fixed and are therefore independent of the level of output. Unlike operating costs, capital costs are one-time expenses, although payment may be spread out over several years for financial purposes and for three years for PRA purposes.

In 2005, NMFS submitted a revision of this collection for the Groundfish Retention Program for a capital total of \$320,000 with the costs dispersed each year over three years. By the end of 2008, these capital costs were accounted for. In 2006, NMFS submitted a revision for the Rockfish Pilot Program for a capital total of \$231,173 with the costs dispersed each year over three years. By the end of 2009, these capital costs were accounted for. And finally, in 2007 NMFS submitted a revision for the Amendment 80 Program for a total of \$83,312 with the costs dispersed each year over three years. By the end of 2010, these capital costs will be accounted for. With this renewal, NMFS submits a renewal with capital costs involved with a scale type evaluation at \$2,500 which will be accounted for by the end of 2013.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government.

Estimated total responses: 178, down from 182. Estimated total time burden: 479 hr, down from 868. Estimated total personnel cost: \$11,975, down from \$21,706.

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

This action contains program adjustments which update, and in some cases, correct this existing collection. In addition, numbers are adjusted to reflect actual values in some cases, e.g., number of respondents and frequency of responses.

There is a decrease of 52 respondents. Responses have increased by a net of 14,345. The net increase in hours is 1,339. The total cost has decreased by a net of \$512,340: operational

and maintenance costs have increased by a net of 62,533 and capital costs have decreased by a net of \$574,873 (previous capital costs have expired; there is a new cost of \$2,500).

NMFS-approved flow scales is removed, as new scales are not required at this time.

```
a decrease of 2 respondents and responses, 0 instead of 2 a decrease of $73,333 capital costs, $0 instead of $73,333
```

Scale type evaluation is revised, as two new scales may be evaluated.

```
a decrease of 1 respondent, 2 instead of 3
an increase of 1 response, 2 instead of 1
an increase of 79 hr burden, 100 hr instead of 21 hr
an increase of $1,975 personnel costs, $2,500 instead of $525
an increase of $10,034 miscellaneous costs, $24,050 instead of $14,016
an increase of $2,500 capital costs, $2,500 instead of $0
```

<u>Inspection request for at-sea scales</u> is corrected to reflect actual numbers of requests and the fact that no new scales are required.

```
a decrease of 8 respondents and responses, 46 instead of 54 a decrease of 1 hour, 5 instead of 6 a decrease of $25 personnel costs, $125 instead of $150 a decrease of $251 miscellaneous costs, $10 instead of $261
```

<u>At-sea scale approval report/sticker</u> is removed to correct an error, as this sticker is awarded by the NMFS-approved inspector to the operator when a scale passes the scale test; no time or cost is required from the respondent.

```
a decrease of 54 respondents and responses, 0 instead of 54 a decrease of 108 hr burden, 0 hr instead of 108 hr a decrease of $2,700 personnel costs, $0 instead of $2700
```

Observer notification of scale tests is corrected, to reflect actual values, and to correct the value for responses which is based on number of fishing days. In the previous statement written to include the Amendment 80 Program, NMFS indicated that one test per vessel each day of 30 fishing days occurred about which the observer should be notified $(53 \times 30 = 1590)$. The current number is one test per day per vessel for 135 days (46×135) .

```
a decrease of 7 respondents, 46 instead of 53
an increase of 4,620 responses, 6,210 instead of 1,590
an increase of 138 hr burden, 186 hr instead of 48 hr
an increase of $3,450 personnel costs, $4,650 instead of $1,200
```

Records of daily flow scale tests is revised, to reflect an increased response frequency.

```
a decrease of 2 respondents, 43 instead of 45 an increase of 4,455 responses, 5,805 instead of 1,350 an increase of 3,342 hr burden, 4354 hr instead of 1,012 hr an increase of $83,550 personnel costs, $108,850 instead of $25,300 a decrease of $70 miscellaneous costs, $1,505 instead of $1,575
```

Records of daily hopper scale tests is revised, to reflect actual values.

- a decrease of 5 respondents, 3 instead of 8
- a decrease of 675 responses, 405 instead of 1,080
- a decrease of 506 hr burden, 304 hr instead of 810 hr
- a decrease of \$12,650 personnel costs, \$7,600 instead of \$20,250
- a decrease of \$175 miscellaneous costs, \$105 instead of \$280

<u>Printed output from at-sea scale</u> is revised, to reflect actual values and increased response frequency.

- a decrease of 7 respondents, 46 instead of 53
- an increase of 4,620 responses, 6,210 instead of 1,590
- an increase of 92 hr burden, 124 hr instead of 32 hr
- an increase of \$2,300 personnel costs, \$3,100 instead of \$800
- a decrease of \$245 miscellaneous costs, \$1,610 instead of \$1,855

Observer sampling station is removed, because no new stations are required.

- a decrease of 53 respondents and responses, 0 instead of 53
- a decrease of \$6,000 capital costs, 0 instead of \$6,000

<u>Inspection request for observer sampling station</u> is revised to reflect actual values.

- a decrease of 7 respondents and responses, 46 instead of 53
- a decrease of 14 hours burden, 92 instead of 106 hours
- a decrease of \$350 personnel costs, \$2,300 instead of \$2,650
- a decrease of \$458 miscellaneous costs, \$10 instead of \$468

Crab CMP is revised to reflect actual values.

- a decrease of 28 respondents and responses, 15 instead of 43
- a decrease of 448 hours burden, 240 instead of 688 hours
- a decrease of \$11,200 personnel costs, \$6,000 instead of \$17,200
- a decrease of \$32 miscellaneous costs, \$11 instead of \$43

Crab CMP Addendum is revised to reflect actual values.

- a decrease of 1 respondents and responses, 3 instead of 4
- a decrease of 8 hours burden, 24 instead of 32 hours
- a decrease of \$200 personnel costs, \$600 instead of \$800
- an increase of \$2 miscellaneous costs, \$2 instead of \$0

<u>Inspection request for CMP</u> is added, not because it is new, but because it was inadvertently omitted from earlier analyses.

- an increase of 15 respondents and responses, 15 instead of 0
- an increase of 1 hour burden, 1 instead of 0 hours
- an increase of \$25 personnel costs, \$25 instead of \$0
- an increase of \$1 miscellaneous costs, \$1 instead of \$0

CMCP is revised to reflect actual values.

- a decrease of 1 respondents and responses, 13 instead of 14
- a decrease of 40 hour burden, 520 instead of 560 hours
- a decrease of \$1,000 personnel costs, \$13,000 instead of \$14,000
- a decrease of \$32 miscellaneous costs, \$10 instead of \$42

CMCP Addendum is revised to reflect actual values.

an increase of \$2 miscellaneous costs, \$2 instead of \$0

<u>Inspection request for CMCP</u> is revised to reflect actual values.

- a decrease of 1 respondents and responses, 13 instead of 14
- a decrease of 6 hour burden, 1 instead of 7 hours
- a decrease of \$150 personnel costs, \$25 instead of \$175
- a decrease of \$181 miscellaneous costs, \$1 instead of \$182

<u>Printed output from state scale</u> is revised, to reflect actual values and an increase in response frequency.

```
a decrease of 1 respondents, 13 instead of 14
```

- an increase of 1,335 responses, 1755 instead of 420
- an increase of 27 hr burden, 35 hr instead of 8 hr
- an increase of \$675 personnel costs, \$875 instead of \$200
- a decrease of \$35 miscellaneous costs, \$455 instead of \$490

Observer notification.

The analyses previously listed observer notification as one collection. NMFS breaks down this category by distinct type of activity that needs the observer's attention: pollock delivery, CDQ delivery, and Rockfish Program delivery. This action divides observer notification by management program. The number of respondents and the number of notifications remain the same.

- a. Observer notification of pollock delivery is revised, to reflect actual values.
 - a decrease of 13 respondents, 8 instead of 21
 - a decrease of 1,755 responses, 1,080 instead of 2,835
 - a decrease of 141 hr burden, 86 hr instead of 227 hr
 - a decrease of \$3,525 personnel costs, \$2,150 instead of \$5,675
- <u>b.</u> <u>Observer notification of CDQ delivery</u> is added; it was previously inadvertently omitted from earlier analyses.
 - an increase of 8 respondents, 8 instead of 0
 - an increase of 1,080 responses, 1,080 instead of 0
 - an increase of 86 hr burden, 86 hr instead of 0 hr
 - an increase of \$2,150 personnel costs, \$2,150 instead of \$0
- <u>c.</u> <u>Observer notification of Rockfish delivery</u> is added; it was previously inadvertently omitted from earlier analyses.
 - an increase of 5 respondents, 5 instead of 0

an increase of 675 responses, 675 instead of 0 an increase of 54 hr burden, 54 hr instead of 0 hr an increase of \$1,350 personnel costs, \$1,350 instead of \$0

<u>Electronic bin monitoring system</u> is revised, to reflect actual values.

an increase of 13 respondents, 21 instead of 8 an increase of 156 responses, 252 instead of 96 an increase of 156 hr burden, 252 hr instead of 96 hr an increase of \$3,900 personnel costs, \$6,300 instead of \$2,400 an increase of \$81,800 miscellaneous costs, \$85,890 instead of \$4,090 a decrease of \$3,979 capital costs, \$0 instead of \$3,979

Inspection request for electronic bin monitoring is revised to reflect actual values.

an increase of 20 respondents and responses, 21 instead of 1 an increase of 40 hours burden, 42 instead of 2 hours an increase of \$1,000 personnel costs, \$1,050 instead of \$50 a decrease of \$3 miscellaneous costs, \$2 instead of \$5

16. For collections whose results will be published, outline the plans for tabulation and publication.

The information collected will not be published.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons why display would be inappropriate.

Not Applicable.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

Not Applicable.

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This collection does not employ statistical methods.