

**ALASKA REGION
SCALE & CATCH WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS
OMB CONTROL NO. 0648-0330**

This is a resubmission of a request for revision, with the final rule, of a current collection associated with RIN 0648-BD90.

In response to public comments: 1) NMFS modified the regulations at § 679.28(b)(5)(v) to clarify that vessel operators that receive an at-sea scale inspection for a vessel after March 1, 2014, and before December 1, 2014, would not be required to comply with the calibration log requirements or the fault log requirements until that flow scale is reapproved by a NMFS-authorized scale inspector in 2015; 2) NMFS removed the reference to the version of USB port in the regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(ii). With this change, the video system could have one external port using any current or future versions of USB, or any other removable storage devices that are approved by NMFS.

BACKGROUND

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq. (Magnuson-Stevens Act) authorizes the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) to prepare and amend fishery management plans for any fishery in waters under its jurisdiction. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) manages the U.S. groundfish fisheries of the exclusive economic zone off Alaska under the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska and the Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area. 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. Catcher/processors participating in Crab Rationalization (CR) Program fisheries in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area (BSAI). The fishery management plans were approved by the Secretary of Commerce under authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act as amended in 2006. The fishery management plans are implemented by regulations at 50 CFR parts 679 and 680.

The At-Sea Scales Program was developed in response to a need for catch accounting methodologies that were more precise and verifiable at the level of the individual haul and less dependent on estimates generated by at-sea observers. This was necessary as a result of the implementation of large-scale quota programs that required NMFS to provide verifiable and defensible estimates of quota harvest. The requirements for weighing catch at-sea were implemented in 1998 (63 FR 5836) and affected only trawl catcher/processors participating in the Multiple Species Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program. The At-Sea Scales Program was expanded significantly in 2000 as a result of statutory requirements of the American Fisheries Act that required all at-sea catch by specified vessels in the BSAI pollock fishery to be weighed (65 FR 4520). Further expansion occurred in 2007 to include trawl catcher/processors participating in the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) rockfish pilot program (71 FR 67210) and non-American Fisheries Act catcher/processors participating in BSAI trawl fisheries (72 FR 52668). Finally, the program was expanded in 2013 to include freezer longliners that participate in BSAI Pacific cod fisheries (79 FR 59053).

INTRODUCTION

The use of at-sea scales can provide very precise and potentially accurate estimates of catch. These estimates are especially useful in quota type fisheries where catch accounting methods must be verifiable and not unduly reliant on observer estimates. At-sea scales have proven to be reliable and are now used to account for the vast majority of catch by catcher/processors fishing off Alaska. However, recent evidence of fraud calls into question the overall accuracy of the approach and indicates that catch estimates based on scale weights may systematically underestimate harvest in those fisheries dependent on scale weights for catch accounting. Since NMFS first implemented weighing requirements for some catcher/processors in 1998, the Program has grown dramatically. Scale technologies have evolved, and NMFS has developed greater expertise with at-sea scales. A suite of modifications to the at-sea scales program will reduce the potential for fraud, improve catch accounting accuracy, and bring regulations up to date with changes in technology.

This action requires that in addition to catcher/processors and motherships having to weigh catch on a NMFS-approved scale, they also must use a NMFS-approved electronic logbook (eLog) (see OMB Control No. 0648-0515). The vessel operator must ensure that each scale is tested as specified in § 679.28(b)(3) and that the information from all scale tests, including failed tests, is reported within 24 hours of the testing using the eLog (see § 679.5(f)). The operator of a vessel at any time during a year must comply with the requirements for eLogs.

A. JUSTIFICATION

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

The At-Sea Scales Program would be modified for catcher/processors and motherships that are required to weigh catch at sea by reducing the possibility of scale tampering and improving the accuracy of catch estimation. As with any other piece of equipment, it is possible to deliberately tamper with flow scales, resulting in consistent underestimation of catch in spite of the requirement for daily scale testing.

NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) has investigated several cases of potential scale fraud that may have resulted in large underestimations of catch in the BSAI pollock fishery. These investigations have resulted in the issuance of Notices of Violation (NOVAs) to three vessels owned by the American Seafoods Company: the American Dynasty, the Northern Eagle, and the Ocean Rover. Based on the allegations contained in these NOVAs, catch was frequently under-reported by over 10 percent compared with independent tests conducted by NMFS-certified observers using NMFS-tested and approved motion compensated platform scales.

2. 1Explain how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information will be used. 1If 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.

Two types of motion-compensated scales for weighing large volumes of catch are currently approved by NMFS. Flow scales (used for groundfish) continuously weigh fish as they move across the weighing platform on a belt. Hopper scales (used by the CR Program) weigh fish as they fill a container of known weight. Vessels choosing to use scales usually choose flow scales because of concerns with possible product quality issues and with respect to the smooth flow of fish along the processing line.

NMFS has implemented a three-part process for evaluating whether at-sea scales are meeting performance and technical requirements. NMFS will approve a scale used to weigh catch at sea if the scale meets the type evaluation requirements, the initial inspection, and the annual re-inspection requirements. No single element of the process alone is sufficient to determine whether a scale is meeting performance and technical requirements. This process consists of:

- ◆ Type evaluation of each model of scale.
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. Each model of scale approved for use at-sea must have been tested by an independent laboratory and found to meet specified standards of accuracy and reliability. The model of scale must be included on the list of scales posted on NMFS web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/scales/default.htm#approved>.
- ◆ Dockside inspection of each scale by NMFS-approved inspector once installed on a vessel and annually thereafter. Each scale must be inspected annually by NMFS inspectors in order to ensure that it remains accurate and has been adequately maintained and properly installed. 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.
- ◆ At-sea testing of each scale. Each scale must be tested daily when in use. 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 contents of this analysis are outlined below:

I. Offshore Processors Catch-Weighing & Monitoring System

- a. Flow scale
 1. Scale heads and calibration software
 2. Inspection request and maintenance, flow scale
- b. Flow scale tests
 1. Notify observer of flow scale tests
 2. Daily record of flow scale tests
- c. Printed reports from the flow scale
 1. Printed report for catch and cumulative weight

- 2. Printed report for audit trail
- 3. Printed report for calibration log
- 4. Printed report from the fault log
- d. Observer sampling station
 - 1. Installation of Observer sampling station [inactive]
 - 2. Observer sampling station, inspection request
- e. Bin Monitoring
 - a. Electronic Bin Monitoring System
 - b. Inspection Request, Bin Monitoring
- f. Video monitoring
 - 1. Video monitoring of flow scale area
 - 2. Video monitoring of flow scale area, inspection request
 - 3. Inspection request, electronic monitoring system [removed]
 - 4. Video monitoring for Chinook salmon bycatch system, inspection request
 - 5. Video monitoring for Freezer longline system, inspection request
 - 6. Video for bin monitoring, inspection request
- f. Longline flow scale
 - 1. Installation of longline flow scale [inactive]
 - 2. Notify NMFS of Pacific Cod Freezer Longline Monitoring Option

II. Crab Catch Monitoring (CMP) System

- a. CMP Plan
- b. CMP addendum
- c. Inspection request, CMP
- d. Installation of hopper scale
 - 1. Notify observer of hopper scale test
 - 2. Daily report from hopper scale tests
- e. Printed report from hopper scales
 - 1. Printed report for Catch weight
 - 2. Printed report for Audit trail

III. Catch Monitoring and Control Plan (CMCP) for Shoreside Processors and Stationary Floating Processors (SFPs)

- a. CMCP Plan
- b. CMCP Addendum
- c. Inspection request, CMCP
- d. Shoreside processor or SFP inseason scale tests
- e. NMFS test of State scales
- f. Printed report from the State scale
- g. Notify observer of BSAI pollock delivery
- h. Notify observer of CDQ delivery
- i. Notify observer of Rockfish Program delivery

IV. Scale Type Evaluation

- a. Scale type evaluation [inactive]
- b. Platform and hanging scales
- c. Belt-conveyor (flow) scale
- d. Automatic hopper scales

e. Potential, undefined scale

I. OFFSHORE PROCESSORS CATCH-WEIGHING & MONITORING SYSTEM

Currently four programs, totaling 78 potential vessels, require catcher/processors or motherships to weigh their catch at-sea.

Fishery	Number of potential vessels ¹	Number of vessels with currently/ recently approved scales ²
American Fisheries Act	22	19
Amendment 80/rockfish trawlers	22	19
BSAI Freezer-longline vessels	34	30
TOTAL	78	68

1. Includes vessels authorized by statute, FMP, or regulation to participate in a fishery that may require flow scale use. Under statute, AFA catcher/processors are required to weigh all catch at-sea. Regulations implementing the AFA also require motherships to weigh all catch at-sea. All AFA participating vessels must also provide a motion compensated platform scale for the observer's use.
2. This includes any vessel that has had a scale approved by NMFS during 2012-2013, plus three vessels NMFS expects to enter a fishery and begin using flow scales in 2014 or 2015.

American Fisheries Act (AFA). Subsection 208(e) of the AFA, which took effect on January 1, 1999, lists by name catcher/processors and motherships that are eligible to harvest the catcher/processor sector BSAI pollock directed fishing allowance. Vessels in this fleet range in size from 224 feet to 684 feet and are among the largest, most sophisticated fishing vessels in the world. They produce a wide variety of products but principally produce fillets and surimi.

NMFS allocates directed fishing allowances to a single cooperative for each sector (mothership and catcher/processor); the cooperative allocates to the individual vessels. Under statute, AFA catcher/processors and motherships are required to weigh all catch at-sea. All AFA participating vessels must also provide a motion-compensated platform scale for the observer's use.

Amendment 80 trawl catcher/processor and [Central GOA rockfish](#) catcher/processors.

Amendment 80 to the BSAI FMP established a quota-based program for non-AFA catcher/processors in the BSAI, and Amendment 88 to the GOA FMP established a similar program for catcher/processors that harvest rockfish in the Central GOA. All of the vessels that participate in the catcher/processor sector of the GOA rockfish fishery also participate in Amendment 80 fisheries in the BSAI and the fleets can be considered together. These vessels tend to be somewhat smaller (103 to 295 feet) than AFA catcher/processors and generally produce a "head and gut" product where the harvested catch is minimally processed and frozen at-sea for further processing at another location. These vessels participate in a wide array of trawl fisheries including Atka mackerel, Pacific Ocean perch, and various flatfish fisheries.

Under regulation, all catcher/processors that wish to participate in these fisheries must weigh all catch at-sea on a NMFS-approved scale as well as provide a motion-compensated platform scale for the observer's use.

BSAI Pacific cod Freezer Longliners. The freezer longline fleet fishes primarily for Pacific cod with stationary lines onto which baited hooks are attached by gangions. A gangion is a short length of moderate-weight line that bears hooks and is attached at regular intervals to the groundline. The longline is retrieved with hydraulic power over a roller mounted on the side of the vessel. Fish hauled onboard are immediately shaken loose and placed into a trough. A crew member known as the "bleeder" bleeds the fish as soon as possible. Fish are headed and gutted,

sorted by size, frozen in plate freezers, and packed. This fleet also fishes in the GOA for Pacific cod as well as sablefish IFQ fisheries.

a. Flow scale

1. Installation & maintenance of motion-compensated flow scale [NO CHANGES]

Maintenance costs captured in Item 3, below

2. Scale Heads and Calibration Software [NEW]

The estimated cost of new calibration software for the fleet is \$136,000.

Ten vessels will need to purchase new scale heads for their at-sea scales, because their current scale heads cannot run the new calibration software. They do not need to purchase the entire scale, just the scale head. The new scale heads are estimated to cost \$30,400 each. The total cost for all of these 10 vessels to replace scale heads or update software is estimated to be about \$41,000 (i.e., \$4,100/vessel).

The rest of the fleet has the new scale heads already, but they will need to upgrade to the new software.

Automatic recording of flow scale fault conditions and calibrations will enhance the audit trail, provide useful diagnostic information to vessels and NOAA staff, and highlight patterns of improper scale calibration for NOAA investigators.

Scale Heads & Software, Respondent	
Number of respondents	10
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0
Total capital cost	\$177,000
New scale heads @ \$4,100 x 10 = \$41,000	
Calibration software = \$136,000	

Scale Heads & Software, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

3. Inspection Request and Maintenance Costs, Flow Scale (ADJUSTED)

A scale inspection is a visual assessment and test of a scale after it is installed on the vessel, while the vessel is tied up at a dock and not under power at sea. 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, the inspector 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.

Once a scale is installed on a vessel and approved by NMFS for use to weigh catch at sea, it must be re-inspected annually, must be tested daily, and must meet the maximum permissible error (MPE) requirements. 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. Each scale must be re-inspected within 12 months of the date of the most recent inspection.

The owner or operator must submit an Inspection Request for At-sea Scales to NMFS by fax or online. This request form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/scales/inspectrequest.pdf>. An At-Sea Scales Inspection Appointment Schedule is available at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/scales/calendar.htm>.

NMFS will coordinate with the vessel owner to schedule the inspection no later than 10 working days after NMFS receives a complete application for an inspection. Annual inspections are conducted by inspectors paid by NMFS on vessels tied up at docks in Kodiak, Alaska; Dutch Harbor, Alaska; and in the Puget Sound area of Washington State.

In addition, any change to the at-sea scale system that would affect the system's functionality must be submitted on an inspection request to, and approved by, the Regional Administrator in writing before that change is made.

Scale Preparation for Inspection

The owner must make the vessel and scale available for inspection by the scale inspector, as follows:

- ◆ Display and printer must be connected and operational.
- ◆ Scale must be installed in a rigid and level manner.
- ◆ 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).
- ◆ A crew member must be available to help the inspector transport test materials and conduct the testing; assist the scale inspector in performing the scale inspection and testing.
- ◆ 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 location on the vessel where the scale is installed.

- ◆ Apply test weights to the scale or convey test materials across the scale, if requested by the scale inspector.

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 to part 679. 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 (USCG) personnel).

Flow Scale Approval Sticker.

The scale inspector will complete an approval 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, Flow Scales

General

- Company name
- Vessel name
- Mailing address
- Exact location of vessel
- 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

The number of respondents has changed from 79 to 78 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Changed cost of fax from \$5 to \$6.

Inspection Request and Maintenance, Flow Scales, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
22 Amendment 80/rockfish trawlers	
22 AFA vessels	
34 BSAI Freezer longline vessels	
Total annual responses	78
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours (7.80)	8 hr
Time per response = 6 minutes	
Total personnel cost (8 x \$37/hr)	\$296
Total miscellaneous cost (259,117)	\$259,117
Photocopy (0.05 x 78 = 3.90)	
Fax (\$6 x 10 = 60)	
Online (0.05 x 68 = 3.40)	
Maintenance costs for 33 freezer longline flow scales (no burden associated so attaching to this IC) (7,850 x 33 = 259,050)	

Inspection Request, Flow Scales, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	78
Total burden hours (19.50) Time per response = 15 minutes	20 hr
Total personnel cost (20 x \$37/hr)	\$740
Total miscellaneous cost for management of 33 scales	\$26,000

b. Flow Scale Tests

The At-Sea Scale Program is dependent on two types of motion-compensated electronic scales.

- ◆ A platform scale with a capacity between 50 and 60 kg is used by NMFS-certified observers as part of their sampling duties and to verify the accuracy of the flow scale. A platform scale used for observer sampling must be tested at 10, 25, and 50 kg (or 20, 50, and 100 lb if the scale is denominated in pounds) using approved test weights. The MPE for the daily at-sea scale test is plus or minus 0.5 percent if the scale is used to determine the known weight of test material for the purpose of testing a belt scale. If the scale is not used for that purpose, the MPE for the daily at-sea scale test is plus or minus 1 percent.
- ◆ A flow scale, or self-contained belt scale, is capable of continuously weighing up to 100 metric tons (mt) of fish per hour and is used by the vessel to weigh either total catch or quota species.

1. Notify observer of flow scale tests (ADJUSTED)

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; vessel personnel verbally inform the observer that a scale test is scheduled.

Changed number of respondents from 79 to 78 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37.

Notify Observers of flow scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses Frequency of response = 135	10,530
Total burden hours Time per response = 2 minutes	351 hr
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 351)	\$12,987
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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

2. Daily record of flow scale test [REVISED]

To verify that the scale meets the Maximum Permissible Errors (MPEs), the vessel operator must test each scale or scale system used by the vessel to weigh catch at least one time during each calendar day. No more than 24 hours may elapse between tests when use of the scale is required. The vessel owner must ensure that these tests are performed in an accurate and timely manner.

Sand bags

This action would require that flow scale tests be conducted with sand bags. In the past, the operator could choose to test the scale using sand bags, fish, or a combination of fish and sand bags. About 1/3 of the regulated vessels (23 vessels) will have to start to use sand bags. Tests may take longer and sand bags need to be stored. A small initial purchase price may be necessary. Using only sand bags to test scales would improve scale-testing accuracy and would eliminate a potential way to manipulate test results. In addition, tests can take place when relatively few fish are aboard.

A material test must be conducted by weighing no less than 400 kg of test material, supplied by the scale manufacturer or approved by a NMFS-authorized scale inspector, on the scale under test. Conduct the scale test by placing the test material or test weights on or across the scale multiple times in order to total 400 kg; however, no single batch of test material may weigh less than 40 kg. The known weight of the test material must be determined at the time of each scale test by weighing it on a platform scale approved for use.

Each test weight must have its weight stamped on or otherwise permanently affixed to it. The weight of each test weight must be annually certified by a National Institute of Standards and Technology approved metrology laboratory or approved for continued use by the NMFS authorized inspector at the time of the annual scale inspection.

eLog

This action would require daily electronic reporting using an electronic logbook (eLog) through eLandings or seaLandings to record and report the results and timing of daily scale tests (see OMB Control No. 0648-0515). The operator of a vessel at any time during a year must comply with the requirements for eLog. Some additional time may be required to input – into an existing daily electronic report - a small amount of information for each test. Some vessels will have to adopt use of eLogs and will incur costs for this. Some training may be required, including a workshop estimated to cost about \$3,000.

Use of eLog is expected to reduce the potential for fraud and improve the ability for NMFS to monitor scale status during the year. This addition would allow NMFS staff to continuously monitor daily scale tests by vessels when they are at sea and work with vessel crew to ensure that any bias in daily scale tests could be discovered and corrected quickly. This makes it possible for NMFS to identify potential scale problems during, rather than after, a fishing year, and to more effectively analyze overall trends in scale testing, at a small additional cost to most vessels, and the cost to NMFS of updating its web-based data collection. A small number of vessels may be required to modify their business practices to use electronic logbooks.

Failed tests

The vessel operator must ensure that each scale is tested as specified in § 679.28(b)(3) and that the information from all scale tests, including failed tests, is reported within 24 hours of the testing. Additional record keeping will be required when multiple tests take place. However, the reporting of failed tests will result in less bias in overall test results and will improve the ability to monitor scale results. In addition, better consistency in reporting through time will be the result.

Record of daily flow scale test using sand bags as weight

Vessel name

Date

Time test started to the nearest minute

Weigh sand bags on observer platform scale

Weight of sandbags on platform (A)

Number of times each sand bag goes across the scale to reach 400 kg (B)

Multiply (A) x (B) for total weight of sandbags (C):

Record the scale indicator weight and send the sandbags across the scale

Run number

Indicator start

Indicator stop

Weight

Total weight of sandbags from flow scale (D)

Flow Scale Error (E)

Subtract flow scale weight from platform scale weight (D)-(C)

Flow scale percent error:

Divide Error by platform scale weight & multiply by 100 (E/Cx100)

If the percent error is between -3.0 % and +3.0% the scale passes. You may retest at any time

Sea Conditions at time of test (Beaufort Scale--between 1 and 12):

Signatures of vessel operator and observer

Changed number of respondents from 79 to 78 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Changed submittal to eLog.

Records of daily flow scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses (78 x 135)	10,530
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (7897.5)	7,898 hr
Time per response = 45 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 7,898)	\$292,226
Total miscellaneous costs	0

Records of daily flow scale tests, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	78
Total burden hours	13 hr
Time per response = 10 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 13)	\$481
Total miscellaneous cost	0

c. Printed reports from the flow scale

Each scale used to weigh catch must be equipped with a printer. 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. These reports are generated by software; the only human interaction is to push the button to print.

1. Printed report for catch weight and cumulative weight [ADJUSTED]

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. The printed report must be provided to the authorized scale inspector at each scale inspection and must also be printed at any time during the fishing year upon request of the observer, the scale inspector, NMFS staff, or an authorized officer. The printed reports must be retained by the vessel owner for three years after the test occurred.

Printed report of catch weight and cumulative weight.

- Vessel name
- FFP or FPP number
- Haul or set number
- Total weight of catch in the haul or set
- Total cumulative weight of all fish or other material weighed on the scale
- Date and time the information is printed

Changed number of respondents from 79 to 78 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37.

Printed report, catch weight, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses	10,530
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (175.5)	176 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 176)	\$6,512
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Printed report, catch weight, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

2. Printed report for audit trail. (NEW)

Current regulations require that adjustments to the scale be recorded in the form of an audit trail that can only be cleared by NMFS or other authorized personnel. 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.

An audit trail in the form of an event logger must be provided to document changes made using adjustable components. The following information must be provided in an electronic form that

cannot be changed or erased by the scale operator, can be printed at any time, and can be cleared by the scale manufacturer’s representative upon direction by NMFS or by an authorized scale inspector.

Printed report, audit trail

- Vessel name
- FFP or FPP number
- Haul or set number
- Date and time (A.l.t., to the nearest minute) adjustment was made
- Name or type of adjustment being made
- Initial and final values of the parameter being changed

Printed report, audit trail, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses	10,530
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (175.5)	176 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 176)	\$6,512
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Printed report, audit trail, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

3. Printed report, calibration log (NEW)

Because of improvements made to scale electronics, it is now possible to record the magnitude and direction of a calibration relative to the previous calibration. It is also possible to record the time a calibration occurred. Requiring the retention and reporting of calibration data could be used to detect purposeful mis-calibration, thereby reducing the likelihood of underreporting of catch.

NMFS would require vessel operators to print and retain a calibration log that records the last 1,000 calibrations or all calibrations since the scale electronics were first put into service, whichever is less. The limit of 1,000 faults and 1,000 calibrations would be expected to accommodate the total number of calibrations likely to occur between annual scale inspections. The calibration log must be printed and retained by the vessel owner before any information stored in the scale computer memory is replaced.

NMFS would not require submission of the printed record of the scale calibration log but would collect and review those data at the time of the annual scale inspection. Those data must also be available to OLE in cases where scale tampering is suspected.

The calibration log must be printed on request by NMFS staff or NMFS authorized personnel and must also be printed and retained by the vessel owner before any information stored in the scale computer memory is replaced.

Printed report from the calibration log

- Vessel name
- FFP or FPP number
- Month, day, and year of the calibration
- Time of the calibration (A.l.t.) to the nearest minute
- Weight used to calibrate the scale
- Magnitude of the calibration in comparison to the prior calibration

Printed report, calibration log, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses	10,530
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (175.5)	176 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 176)	\$6,512
Total miscellaneous cost (0.65)	0

Printed report, calibration log, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

4. Printed report from the fault log (NEW)

A fault, for the purposes of the fault log, is any condition other than underflow detected by the scale electronics that could affect the metrological accuracy of the scale. This action would add a requirement that vessel operators must print and retain a fault log that records the last 1,000 faults and scale startups, or all faults and startups since the scale electronics were first put into service, whichever is less. The fault log must be retained by the vessel owner before any information stored in the scale computer memory is replaced.

NMFS would not require submission of the printed record of the scale fault log but would collect and review those data at the time of the annual scale inspection. Those data must also be available to the OLE in cases where scale tampering is suspected. The fault log must be printed on request by NMFS staff or NMFS authorized personnel and must also be printed and retained by the vessel owner before any information stored in the scale computer memory is replaced.

Printed report from the fault log

- Vessel name
- FFP or FPP number
- Month, day, year, and time (A.l.t.) of each startup to the nearest minute
- Month, day, year, and time (A.l.t.) that each fault began to the nearest minute
- Month, day, year, and time (A.l.t.) that each fault was resolved to the nearest minute

Printed report, fault log, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses	10,530
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (175.5)	176 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 176)	\$6,512
Total miscellaneous cost (0.65)	0

Printed report, fault log, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

d. Observer sampling station

1. Installation of observer sampling station [inactive]

NMFS has not required installation of observer sampling stations recently.

2. Inspection request, observer sampling station

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. 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. This request may be submitted to NMFS by fax or online. The owner or operator must submit an Inspection Request for Observer Sampling Station to NMFS by fax or online. This request form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/scales/samplestationreq.pdf>.

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 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

Diagram for catcher/processors using trawl gear and motherships, 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.

Diagram for all other vessels, 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.

Changed number of respondents from 79 to 78 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Corrected cost of fax from \$5 to \$6 and number of fax from 2 to 3.

Inspection Request, observer sampling station, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses	78
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	156 hr
Time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 156)	\$5,772
Total miscellaneous cost (25.65)	\$26
Cost of photocopy (0.05 x 78 = 3.90)	
Cost of fax (\$6 x 3 = 18)	
Cost of email (0.05 x 75 = 3.75)	

Inspection Request, observer sampling station, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	78
Total burden hours (19.50)	20 hr
Time per response = 15 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 20)	\$740
Total miscellaneous cost	0

e. 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.

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

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.

1. Electronic Bin Monitoring System (ADJUSTED to reflect lower remaining capital costs)

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.

Changed number of respondents from 21 to 22 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Added cost of fax \$6.

Electronic Bin Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	22
18 AFA trawl catcher/processors	
3 AFA motherships	
1 non-AFA trawl catcher/processor	
Total annual responses	264
Responses per respondent = 12 (1/month)	
Total burden hours	264 hr
Time per response to record & store video data = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$9,768
Personnel cost = \$37/hr	
Total miscellaneous cost	\$89,980
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 *22	
-------------------------------	--

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

2. Inspection Request, Bin Monitoring

(Changed from Electronic bin monitoring system)

Trawl catcher/processors authorized to fish for groundfish under Amendment 80 to the BSAI FMP or rockfish in the Central GOA often use video to monitor the crew activities inside of fish bins that are generally located aft of, but near, the flow scale. The name of this form is inclusive of two non-electronic monitoring system that originated with inspection of the bin monitoring system. With time, electronic monitoring of the bin was added, and now the practice of video monitoring replaces the electronic bin monitoring.

Amendment 80 and the Central GOA Rockfish Programs allow catcher/processors to select a bin monitoring option, one of which includes the use of video, to ensure that the observer is able to determine that no sorting has occurred prior to the collection of a species composition sample. When submitting a bin monitoring inspection request, the vessel owner or operator may choose one of the following monitoring options for his or her vessel.

- ◆ No crew in bin or tank option. No crew may enter any bin or tank preceding the point where the observer samples unsorted catch
- ◆ Line of sight option. From the observer sampling station, the location where the observer sorts and weighs samples, and the location from which the observer collects unsorted catch, an observer of average height (between 64 and 74 inches (140 and 160 cm)) must be able to see all areas of the bin or tank where crew could be located preceding the point where the observer samples catch. The observer must be able to view the activities of crew in the bin from these locations.
- ◆ Video Monitoring system option. A vessel may provide and maintain a NMFS-approved video monitoring system

The owner or operator choosing to operate under the line of sight bin monitoring option or the video option must submit an Inspection Request for a Bin Monitoring System to NMFS by fax or online. The request form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/scales/binmonitoringreq.pdf>

Any change to the video bin monitoring system that would affect the system's functionality must be submitted on an inspection request to, and approved by, the Regional Administrator in writing before that change is made.

The owner may arrange the time and place for an inspection of the video bin monitoring by submitting to NMFS by fax (206) 526-4066 or online. The

online video bin monitoring inspection request form is found on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov>.

Request for Inspection, Video Bin Monitoring System

Select bin monitoring option: line of sight or video

Diagram **attachment** (drawn to scale)

- All locations where all catch will be weighed and sorted by the observer
- Location where unsorted catch will be collected
- Location of any video equipment or viewing panels or ports

Vessel information

- Vessel name and Federal fisheries permit number
- Requested inspection date
- Business mailing address
- Contact person on vessel
- Today's date
- Telephone number and fax number for contact person
- Location of vessel, including street address and city
- Requesting person's signature
- If vessel previously received a video monitoring system inspection, enter the date of the most recent inspection report

Changed number of respondents from 21 to 22 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Added cost of fax \$6.

Inspection Request, Video Bin Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	22
Total annual responses	22
Responses per year = 1	
Total burden hours	44
Estimated time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 44)	\$1,628
Total miscellaneous cost (14.10)	14
Photocopy (0.05 x 22 = 1.10)	
Fax (\$6 x 2 = 12)	
Online (0.05 x 20 = 1)	

Inspection request, Video Bin Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	22
Total burden hours (2.20)	2
Time per response = 6 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 2 = 74)	\$74
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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	22
Total annual responses	22
Responses per year = 1	
Total burden hours	44
Estimated time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost	\$1,628
Cost per hour = \$37	
Total miscellaneous cost (2.10)	\$14
Photocopy (0.05*21)	
Email submittal (0.05*21)	

Inspection request, Electronic Bin Monitoring System,

Federal Government	
Total annual responses	22
Total burden hours (2.31) Time per response = 0.11 hr x 21	2
Total personnel cost Cost per hour = \$37	\$74
Total miscellaneous cost	0

f. Video monitoring

1. Installation of video bin monitoring [inactive]

NMFS has not required installation of video bin monitoring recently.

2. Video monitoring of flow scale area [NEW]

Vessels required to weigh catch at-sea must provide video monitoring of fish entering, moving across, and leaving the weighing platform of the scale. This action also requires video monitoring of all access panels allowing adjustments to the scale, and of crew activities in these areas. The scale display head and the light showing when the scale is in fault mode would need to be within the camera view. NMFS will be able to verify that all catch is being weighed, that no one is tampering with the scale, and that the scale is operating correctly.

The system must:

- ◆ Provide sufficient resolution and field of view to monitor:
 - all areas where catch enters the scale, moves across the scale and leaves the scale;
 - any access point to the scale that may be adjusted or modified by vessel crew while the vessel is at sea; and
 - the scale display and the indicator for the scale operating in a fault state.
- ◆ Record and retain video for all periods when catch that must be weighed is on board the vessel.

Video monitoring of the scale and its components (display head and fault light), as well as any crew activities around the scale, will allow OLE to verify that all catch is being weighed, that no one is tampering with the scale, and that scale is functioning correctly. The video, in conjunction with the new daily scale test reporting requirements and the new calibration and fault logs, will increase efficiency in reviewing potential scale fraud cases. Video may serve as a deterrent to tampering with the scale or allowing the scale to

run continuously while in fault mode. OLE may be able to use video to verify reports.

The required video monitoring system would have one or more color cameras, a digital video recorder (DVR) for storing the video, a monitor for reviewing the video, power sources, and cables to connect the different elements. The system must be operating when the vessel is on the fishing grounds (no matter the intended target species). The system must meet the following technical specifications:

- ◆ The system must:
 - Have 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 (A.l.t.). The system must record from the beginning of the first trip of the year until the end of the final haul or set for the year.
 - Include at least one external USB (1.1 or 2.0) port or other removable storage device approved by NMFS.
 - Use commercially available software that allows for conversion to an open source format such as mpeg.
 - Record at a speed of no less than 5 frames per second
- ◆ Color cameras must have a minimum 470 TV lines of resolution, auto-iris capabilities, and output color video to the recording device with the ability to revert to black and white video output when light levels become too low for color recognition.
- ◆ The 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 date the video is recorded, unless NMFS has notified the vessel operator that the video data may be retained for less than this 120-day period.
- ◆ NMFS staff, or any individual authorized by NMFS, must be able to view any footage from any point in the trip using a 16-bit or better color monitor that can display all cameras simultaneously and must be assisted by crew knowledgeable in the operation of the system.

Costs may vary considerably among vessels to acquire the video monitoring of scales, depending on existing video installations. Costs may be small for vessels that have existing monitoring systems, since an additional camera may be added to an existing system at minimal cost. However, for vessels that do not have approved video monitoring systems, the costs would be

higher. Aggregate fleetwide costs were expected to range between \$108,000 and \$630,000, with a midpoint estimate of about \$369,000.

The requirement to monitor the scale area anticipates that most of the affected vessels will use or expand an existing NMFS-approved monitoring system to comply with new regulations. NMFS wishes to ensure that technical requirements for all vessels and systems are identical to avoid confusion and to prevent inconsistencies that could make compliance with the new video monitoring requirements more difficult.

Flow Scale Video Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses (one-time install, no responses since no hours)	78
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0
Total capital cost	\$369,000

Flow Scale Video Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	\$7,000

3. Inspection Request, Flow Scale Video monitoring system [NEW]

The owner or operator must submit an Inspection Request for a Flow Scale Video Monitoring System to NMFS by fax or online. This request form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov> and may be submitted either by fax or online.

A diagram drawn to scale must be attached to the request showing all sorting locations, the location of the motion-compensated scale, the location of each camera and its coverage area, and the location of any additional video equipment must be submitted with the request form.

Any change to the video monitoring system that would affect the system's functionality must be submitted on an inspection request to, and approved by, the Regional Administrator in writing before that change is made.

Video Monitoring System Inspection Report.

After a successful inspection, NMFS will issue a Video Monitoring System Inspection Report to the vessel owner which is valid for 12 months from the date it is issued by NMFS. The vessel owner must maintain the Video Monitoring System Inspection Report onboard the vessel at all times the vessel is required to provide an approved video monitoring system. The Video Monitoring System Inspection Report must be made available to the observer, NMFS personnel, USCG, or to an authorized officer upon request.

Request for Inspection, Flow Scale Video Monitoring System

Diagram **attachment** (drawn to scale)

- All locations where sorting occur
- Location of the motion-compensated scale
- Location of each camera and its coverage area
- Location of any additional video equipment, including monitors and hard drives

Vessel information

- Vessel name and Federal fisheries permit number
- Business mailing address
- Business telephone number, business fax number, and business e-mail address
- Name of individual or company who will install and maintain the system
- Name of person on vessel who will maintain system and aid observer

System specifications

- Pixel length and width of image
- File type to which data are recorded
- Compression type
- Frame rate at which data are recorded
- Storage device type and size
- Brand and model number of the cameras
- Brand, model, and specifications of the lenses
- Type, speed, and operating system of any computer that is part of the system

Inspection Request, Flow Scale Video Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	78
Total annual responses	78
Responses per year = 1	
Total burden hours	156 hr
Estimated time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 156)	\$5,772
Total miscellaneous cost (25.65)	\$26
Photocopy (0.05 x 78 = 3.90)	
Fax (\$6 x 3 = 18)	
Online (0.05 x 75 = 3.75)	

Inspection request, Flow Scale Video Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	78
Total burden hours (7.8)	8
Time per response = 6 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 8)	\$296
Total miscellaneous cost	0

4. Inspection Request, Electronic Monitoring System [REMOVED]

This form was replaced by two forms, the Inspection Request for Chinook Salmon Bycatch Video Monitoring System and the Inspection Request for Freezer Longline Video Monitoring System

5. Inspection Request, Chinook Salmon Bycatch Video monitoring system [ADJUSTED]

Catcher/processors and motherships participating in BSAI pollock fisheries are required to use video to monitor the sorting and retention of salmon, which generally takes place immediately after catch is weighed on the flow scale (§ 679.28(j)). Chinook Salmon Bycatch Management measures for AFA catcher/processors require the use of video to ensure that all salmon are sorted and stored according to the regulatory requirements. The video monitoring system must be inspected and approved annually by NMFS to ensure that it continues to meet the regulatory requirements.

The owner or operator of a catcher/processor or a mothership must submit an Inspection Request for a Chinook Salmon Bycatch Video Monitoring System to NMFS by fax or online. This request form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sustainablefisheries/bycatch/salmon/chinook/forms/inspection_req.pdf.

A diagram drawn to scale must be attached to the request showing all sorting locations, the location of the motion-compensated scale, the location of each camera and its coverage area, and the location of any additional video equipment must be submitted with the request form.

Any change to the video monitoring system that would affect the system's functionality must be submitted on an inspection request to, and approved by, the Regional Administrator in writing before that change is made.

Video Monitoring System Inspection Report.

After a successful inspection, NMFS will issue a Video Monitoring System Inspection Report to the vessel owner which is valid for 12 months from the date it is issued by NMFS. The vessel owner must maintain the Video Monitoring System Inspection Report onboard the vessel at all times the vessel is required to provide an approved video monitoring system. The Video Monitoring System Inspection Report must be made available to the observer, NMFS personnel, United States Coast Guard (USCG), or to an authorized officer upon request.

Request for Inspection, Chinook Salmon Bycatch Video Monitoring System

Diagram **attachment** (drawn to scale)

- All locations where salmon will be sorted
- Location of the salmon storage container
- Location of each camera and its coverage area
- Location of any additional video equipment, including monitors and hard drives

Vessel name and Federal fisheries permit number

Business mailing address, business telephone number, business fax number, and business e-mail address

Name of individual or company who will install and maintain the system

Name of person on vessel who will maintain system and aid observer

System specifications

- Pixel length and width of image
- File type to which data are recorded
- Compression type
- Frame rate at which data are recorded
- Storage device type and size
- Brand and model number of the cameras
- Brand, model, and specifications of the lenses
- Type, speed, and operating system of any computer that is part of the system

Changed number of respondents from 54 to 22 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Added cost of fax \$6.

Inspection Request, Chinook Salmon Bycatch Video Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	22
Total annual responses	22
Responses per year = 1	
Total burden hours	44 hr
Estimated time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 44)	\$1,628
Total miscellaneous cost (14.10)	\$14
Photocopy (0.05 x 22 = 1.10)	
Fax (\$6 x 2 = 12)	
Online submittal (0.05 x 20 = 1)	

Inspection request, Chinook Salmon Bycatch Video Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	22
Total burden hours (2.20) Time per response = 6 minutes	2
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 2)	\$74
Total miscellaneous cost	0

6. Inspection Request, Freezer Longline Video Monitoring System [ADJUSTED]

Video Monitoring is used by the BSAI Freezer longline fleet to ensure that all Pacific cod and only Pacific cod pass over the motion- compensated flow scale. The video monitoring system must be inspected and approved annually by NMFS to ensure that it continues to meet the regulatory requirements.

The owner or operator of a catcher/processor or a mothership may arrange the time and place for an inspection of the video monitoring system by submitting an inspection request to NMFS by fax (206) 526-4066 or online. This form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region Web site at <http://www.alaskafisheries.noaa.gov>.

A diagram must be attached to the inspection request drawn to scale showing all sorting locations, the location of the motion-compensated scale, the location of each camera and its coverage area, and the location of any additional video equipment, including monitors and hard drives.

Any change to the video monitoring system that would affect the system's functionality must be submitted on an inspection request to, and approved by, the Regional Administrator in writing before that change is made.

Video Monitoring System Inspection Report.

After a successful inspection, NMFS will issue a Video Monitoring System Inspection Report to the vessel owner verifying that the video system meets all of the requirements. The video monitoring system report is valid for 12 months from the date it is issued by NMFS. The vessel owner or operator must ensure that the Video Monitoring System Inspection Report is on board the vessel at all times the vessel is required to provide an approved video monitoring system. The Video Monitoring System Inspection Report must be made available to the observer, NMFS personnel, or to an authorized officer upon request.

Request for Inspection, Freezer Longline Video Monitoring System

Diagram attachment (drawn to scale)

- All locations where sorting occurs
- Location of the motion-compensated scale
- Location of each camera and its coverage area
- Location of any additional video equipment, including monitors and hard drives

Vessel information

- Name and Federal fisheries permit number
- Business mailing address, business telephone number, business fax number, and business e-mail address
- Name of individual or company who will install and maintain the system

Name of person on vessel who will maintain system and aid observer

System specifications

- Pixel length and width of image
- File type to which data are recorded
- Compression type
- Frame rate at which data are recorded
- Storage device type and size
- Brand and model number of the cameras
- Brand, model, and specifications of the lenses
- Type, speed, and operating system of any computer that is part of the system

Changed number of respondents from 54 to 34 based on current numbers. Changed hourly personnel rate from \$25 to \$37. Added cost of fax \$6.

Inspection Request, Freezer Longline Video Monitoring System, Respondent	
Number of respondents	34
Total annual responses	34
Responses per year = 1	
Total burden hours	68 hr
Estimated time per response = 2 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 68)	\$2,516
Total miscellaneous cost (27.2)	\$27
Photocopy (0.05 x 34 = 1.70)	
Fax (\$6 x 4 = 24)	
Online (0.05 x 30 = 1.5)	

Inspection request, Freezer Longline Video Monitoring System, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	34
Total burden hours (3.40)	3
Time per response = 6 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 3)	\$111
Total miscellaneous cost	0

g. Longline flow scale

1. Installation of longline flow scale [inactive]

NMFS has not required installation of longline flow scale recently.

2. Notification of Pacific Cod Freezer Longline Monitoring Option [ADJUSTED]

Owners of longline catcher/processors that participate in BSAI Pacific cod fisheries may annually opt out of the fisheries subject to the increased monitoring requirements or to select between two monitoring options: increased observer coverage or scales. Once a vessel owner made a selection, the vessel would be required to operate under that option for the entire year. The monitoring options apply for an entire year to reduce the risk for data processing or catch accounting errors that may occur if monitoring provisions change during the season.

If NMFS does not receive a notification of choice of monitoring options, NMFS will assign that

vessel to the increased observer coverage option for the upcoming calendar year.

Labor cost has been adjusted due to the change from \$25 to \$37 hourly wage.

A notification form is available on the NMFS Alaska Region website (<http://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/>).

Notification of Pacific Cod Freezer Longline Monitoring Option

Vessel Information

- Name of vessel
- Federal Fishery Permit No.
- Name of Vessel Owner or Operator (circle one)
- Permanent Business Address
- Business Telephone Number
- Business Fax Number
- Business E-mail Address

Pacific Cod Monitoring Option

Check one to indicate monitoring option

- Opt-out of directed fishing for Pacific cod in the BSAI and groundfish CDQ fishing Motion Compensated Scales

If this option is chosen complete :

- Scale Inspection Request Form
- Observer Sample Station Inspection Request Form
- Electronic Monitoring Inspection Request Form

Increased Observer Coverage

If this option is chosen complete:

- Observer Sample Station Inspection Request Form

Notify NMFS of Pacific cod Monitoring Option, Respondent	
Number of respondents	33
Total annual responses	33
Responses per year = 1	
Total burden hours (16.50)	17 hr
Estimated time per response = 30 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 17)	\$629
Total miscellaneous cost (3.30)	\$3
Photocopy (0.05 x 33 = 1.65)	
Email submittal (0.05 x 33 = 1.65)	

Notify NMFS of Pacific Cod Monitoring Option, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	33
Total burden hours (5.50)	6 hr
Time per response = 10 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 6)	\$222
Total miscellaneous cost	0

II. CRAB MONITORING SYSTEM

a. Crab Catch Monitoring Plan (CMP) [ADJUSTED]

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 CR crab. The CMP must detail how the RCR

will meet the catch monitoring standards. All crab, including crab parts and crab that are dead or otherwise unmarketable, delivered to the RCR must be sorted and weighed by species. The RCR must provide plant liaison for orienting new observers to the plant, assisting in the resolution of observer concerns, and informing NMFS if changes must be made to the CMP. 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.

An RCR that processes only CR crab harvested under a CPO or CPC IFQ permit is not required to prepare a CMP. NMFS will approve a CMP for 1 year if it meets the performance standards.

Mail completed CMP, Printed Record and Drawing to:
National Marine Fisheries Service
P. O. Box 21668
Juneau, AK 99802-1668

For more information contact: Jennifer Watson at (907)586-7537 or Jennifer.Watson@noaa.gov or Alan Kinsolving at (928) 774-4362 or Alan.Kinsolving@noaa.gov.

Crab Monitoring Plan

Date of CMP

Name of RCR

RCR Contact number, fax number, and e-mail address

Plant liaison

Crab sorting and weighing procedures

List all locations where crab can be offloaded

Describe how crab are removed from vessel

Describe how and where crab are sorted

Describe how crab are transported from the vessel to the scale

Describe how crab are weighed on the scale (include procedure for taring container for holding crab)

Describe how dead loss, crab parts or unmarketable crab are sorted and weighed (if different from above)

Describe any other steps involved in sorting and weighing of crab

Scales used for weighing crab

Identify each scale used for weighing crab and the reason for its use.

Manufacturer

Model

Serial Number

Type

Scale Test Procedures (Refer to §680.23(f)(4) Inseason Scale Testing)

Describe how each scale used for weighing crab is tested. Include the maximum capacity of the scale.

Scale Serial Number

Testing Procedure

List all test weights

Where will the test weights be stored

List personnel responsible for conducting scale tests

Observation Area

Describe the location where an individual can monitor the entire offloading, sorting and weighing of crab.

The observation area must

Be freely accessible at any time during an offload

Provide an unobstructed view of the entire offload between the 1st location where crab are offloaded and a location where all sorting and weighing of each species has taken place

Be sheltered from the weather and not exposed to unreasonable safety hazards

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).

Include an example of a printed record of a delivery. The printout should include

- RCR Name
- Total weight of crab in each landing
- Date and time information is printed
- Name and ADF&G number of each delivering vessel (may be handwritten).

Attachment

- 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
 - Location of printer

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

Changed personnel cost form \$25/hr to \$37/hr. Miscellaneous cost changed from \$11 to \$25 due to postage increase.

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 (\$37/hr x 240)	\$8,800
Total miscellaneous cost (24.75)	\$25
Photocopy 0.05 x 15 pp x 15 = \$11.25	
Postage .90 x 15 = 13.50	

Crab CMP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	15
Total burden hours	240 hr
Hours per response = 16	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 240)	\$8,800
Total miscellaneous cost	0

b. CMP Addendum

An RCR may change an approved CMP by submitting a CMP addendum to NMFS. Depending on the nature and magnitude of the change requested, NMFS may require a CMP inspection.

Mail CMP Addendum to:

National Marine Fisheries Service
 PO Box 21668
 Juneau, AK 99802-1668

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

Changed personnel cost from \$25/hr to \$37/hr.

CMP Addendum, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses	3
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	24 hr
Time per response = 8 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 24)	\$888
Total miscellaneous cost (4.20)	\$4
Photocopy (0.05 x 10 pp x 3 = 1.5)	
Postage (.90 x 3 = 2.70)	

CMP Addendum, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	3
Total burden hours	3
Time per response = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 3)	\$111
Total miscellaneous cost	0

c. Inspection Request, Catch Monitoring Plan (CMP) [ADJUSTED]

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 to NMFS 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 of the submitter
- Date of the request
- Business mailing address
- Telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address of submitter
- Proposed CMP

Labor cost was changed from \$25 to \$37 hourly rate, and miscellaneous cost from \$1 to \$2.

Inspection Request, CMP, Respondent	
Number of respondents	15
Total annual responses	15
Frequency of response = 1	
Total burden hours (1.25)	1 hr
Time per response = 5 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 1)	\$37
Total miscellaneous cost (1.50)	\$2
Photocopy 0.05 x 1 pp x 15 = 0.75)	
Online (0.05 x 15 = 0.75)	

Inspection Request, CMP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	15
Total burden hours (7.5)	8 hr
Time per response = 30 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 8)	\$296
Total miscellaneous cost	0

d. Installation of hopper scale [inactive]

NMFS has not required installation of hopper scales recently.

1. Notify observer of hopper scale test [NEW, formerly subset of “notification of at-sea scale test”]

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, which consists of vessel personnel verbally informing the observer that a scale test is scheduled. This item was not visible due to the format of the analysis. The notification previously was for “scale tests” without breaking it down into hopper scales and flow scales.

Notify Observers of hopper scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses	405
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (13.5)	14 hr
Time per response = 2 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 14)	\$518
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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

2. Daily records from hopper scale tests [NEW, formerly subset of at-sea scales]

To verify that the scale meets the MPEs, the vessel operator must test each scale or scale system used to weigh CR crab one time during each 24-hour period when use of the scale is required.

The vessel owner must ensure that these tests are performed in an accurate and timely manner. An automatic hopper scale must be tested at its minimum and maximum capacity with approved test weights. Test weights must be placed in the bottom of the hopper unless an alternative testing method is approved by NMFS.

This action would require eligible catcher/processors to use eLandings or seaLandings electronic logbook (eLog) to record and report the results and timing of daily scale tests electronically each day to NMFS (see OMB Control No. 0648-0515). This addition would allow NMFS staff to continuously monitor daily scale tests by vessels when they are at sea and work with vessel crew to ensure that any bias in daily scale tests could be discovered and corrected quickly.

This makes it possible for NMFS to identify potential scale problems during, rather than after, a fishing year, and to more effectively analyze overall trends in scale testing, at a small additional cost to most vessels, and the cost to NMFS of updating its web-based data collection. A small number of vessels may be required to modify their business practices to use electronic logbooks.

Daily Record of hopper scale test

Vessel name

Vessel operator signature

Date

Time test started to the nearest minute

Minimum capacity of scale

Test weights (A)

Weight on scale indicator (B)

Error [(B) – (A)] (C)

% error [C / (A) x 100]

Maximum capacity of scale

Test weights (A)

Weight on scale indicator (B)

Error [(B) – (A)] (C)

% error [C / (A) x 100]

Sea Conditions at time of test (Beaufort Scale--between 1 and 12):

Daily Record of hopper scale tests, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses (3 x 135) Frequency of response = 135	405
Total burden hours (303.75) Time per response = 45 min	304 hr
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 304)	\$11,248
Total miscellaneous costs	0

Daily Record of hopper scale tests, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	3
Total burden hours (0.5) Time per response = 10 min	1 hr
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 1)	\$37
Total miscellaneous cost	0

e. Printed report from hopper scales [NEW, formerly subset of at-sea scales]

1. Printed report for catch weight

The scale must produce a complete and accurate printed report 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 report. A report of each landing must be printed before the RCR submits a CR crab landing report (see OMB 0648-0515).

Reports must be printed at least once every 24 hours prior to submitting a CR crab landing report as described in § 680.5. Reports must also be printed before any information stored in the scale computer memory is replaced.

Printed reports from the scale must be maintained on board the vessel until the end of the year during which the reports were made and be made available to NMFS or NMFS authorized personnel. In addition, the vessel owner must retain printed reports for 3 years after the end of the year during which the printouts were made.

Printed report from hopper scales

- Vessel name
- Federal crab vessel permit number
- Weight of each load in the weighing cycle
- Date and time the information was printed
- Total amount weighed since the last printout was made
- Total cumulative weight of all crab or other material weighed on the scale

Printed report, hopper catch weight, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses	405
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (6.75)	7 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 7)	\$259
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Printed report, hopper catch weight, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	3
Total burden hours (1.05)	1 hr
Time per response = 15 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 1)	\$37
Total miscellaneous cost	0

2. Printed report for the crab audit trail [NEW, formerly subset of at-sea scales]

An audit trail in the form of an event logger must be provided to document changes made using adjustable components. The following information must be provided in an electronic form that cannot be changed or erased by the scale operator, can be printed at any time, and can be cleared by the scale manufacturer’s representative upon direction by NMFS or by an authorized scale inspector.

The printed report must be provided to the authorized scale inspector at each scale inspection and must also be printed at any time upon request of NMFS staff or other NMFS-authorized personnel.

Printed report, audit trail

- Vessel name
- FFP or FPP number
- Haul or set number
- Date and time (to the nearest minute) that the adjustment was made
- Name or type of adjustment being made
- Initial and final values of the parameter being changed

Printed report, audit trail, Respondent	
Number of respondents	3
Total annual responses	405
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (6.75)	7 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 7)	\$259
Total miscellaneous cost	0

Printed report, audit trail, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	3
Total burden hours (1.05)	1 hr
Time per response = 15 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 1)	\$37
Total miscellaneous cost	0

III. CATCH MONITORING AND CONTROL PLAN (CMCP) FOR SHORESIDE PROCESSORS AND STATIONARY FLOATING PROCESSORS (SFPS)

a. CMCP Plan [ADJUSTED]

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.

Identify by serial number each scale used to weigh groundfish and describe the rationale 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, 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
- List 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
- 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.

Observation area is location designated on CMCP where individual may monitor the flow of fish during 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

Describe communication equipment (such as radios, pagers or cellular telephones) used to facilitate communications within the plant and provide the NMFS-certified observer with the same communications equipment

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

Attachment

- Scale drawing of inshore processor plant_showing
- Delivery point
- Observation area
- Observer work station
- Location of each scale used to weigh catch
- Each location where catch is sorted

Changed personnel cost from \$25/hr to \$37/hr.

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 (\$37/hr x 520)	\$19,240
Total miscellaneous cost (\$9.75)	
Photocopy 0.05 x 15 pp x 13	\$10

CMCP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	13
Total burden hours	65 hr
Time per response = 5 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 65)	\$2,405
Total miscellaneous cost	0

b. CMCP Addendum [ADJUSTED]

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
- Describe proposed CMCP change

Changed personnel cost from \$25/hr to \$37/hr.

CMCP Addendum, Respondent	
Number of respondents	4
Total annual responses	4
Responses per respondent = 1	
Total burden hours	32 hr
Time per response = 8 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 32)	\$1,184
Total miscellaneous cost	
Photocopy 0.05 x 10 pp x 4 = 2	\$2

CMCP Addendum, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	4
Total burden hours	4
Time per response = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 4)	\$148
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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.

c. Inspection Request, CMCP [ADJUSTED]

The owner or manager may arrange for a CMCP inspection by contacting NMFS to request 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.

Inspection Request, CMCP

- Name of the submitter
- Date of the request
- Business mailing address
- Business telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address of submitter
- Proposed CMCP

Changed personnel cost from \$25/hr to \$37/hr.

Inspection Request, CMCP, Respondent	
Number of respondents	13
Total annual responses	13
Frequency of response = 1	
Total burden hours (1.08)	1 hr
Time per response = 5 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 1)	\$37
Total miscellaneous cost 1.30)	\$1
Photocopy (0.05 x 1 pp x 13 = 0.65)	
E-mail (0.05 x 13 = 0.65)	

Inspection Request, CMCP, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	13
Total burden hours	52 hr
Time per response = 4 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 52)	\$1,924
Total miscellaneous cost	0

d. Shoreside processor or SFP inseason scales

Scales in shoreside processors plants and SFPs are under the jurisdiction of the State of Alaska Division of Measurement Standards. The State of Alaska (Alaska) requires that fish delivered shoreside 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. Because these performance requirements are designed for a more stable environment (without wind and wave action) and are conducted inside a plant on solid ground, they are significantly more restrictive with maximum permissible errors 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.

e. NMFS test of State scales [NEW, was included in the regulations but not in the PRA]

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 State scales annually during the CMCP and CMP review, after the State approves the scales, and will approve or pass an inseason test of a shoreside processor or SFP scale by verifying that:

- ◆ 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.

- ◆ Scale does not exceed the maximum permissible errors.

There is no respondent burden for these tests.

NMFS test of State scales, Respondent	
Number of respondents	0
Total annual responses	0
Total burden hours	0
Total personnel cost	0
Total miscellaneous cost	0

NMFS test of State scales, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	13
Total burden hours	13
Time per response = 1 hr	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 13)	\$481
Total miscellaneous cost	0

f. Printed record from the State of Alaska scale [ADJUSTED]

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.

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.

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 ADF&G 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.)

Changed personnel cost from \$25/hr to \$37/hr. Hours corrected from 35 to 29.

Printed output, State scale, Respondent	
Number of respondents	13
Total annual responses	1,755
Frequency of response = 135	
Total burden hours (29.25)	29 hr
Time per response = 1 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 29)	\$1,073
Total miscellaneous cost (13 x 35)	\$455
Binders, paper = \$35	

Printed output, State scale, Federal Government	
Total annual responses	13
Total burden hours (3.25)	3
Time per response = 15 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 3)	\$111
Total miscellaneous cost	0

f. Notify observer of BSAI pollock delivery [ADUSTED]

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. Labor cost changed from \$25 to \$37.

Notify Observer of pollock delivery, Respondent	
Number of respondents	8
Total annual responses	1,080
Responses per respondent = 135	
Total burden hours	90 hr
Time per response = 5 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 90)	\$3,330
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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

h. Notify observer of CDQ delivery [ADJUSTED]

The manager of each shoreside processor or SFP that is required to have a CDQ observer must notify the level 2 observer of the offloading schedule of each CDQ delivery at least 1 hour prior to offloading. This notification would provide the level 2 observer an opportunity to monitor the sorting and weighing of the entire delivery. This notice typically consists of plant personnel verbally informing the observer that an incoming vessel will make a CDQ delivery. No form exists for this notice.

Respondents changed from 8 to 4. Labor cost changed from \$25 to \$37.

Notify Observer of CDQ delivery, Respondent	
Number of respondents	4
Total annual responses (4 x 14)	56
Frequency of response = 14	
Total burden hours (1.87)	2 hr
Time per response = 2 minutes	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 2)	\$74
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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

i. Notify observer of Rockfish Program delivery [ADJUSTED]

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. This notice consists of plant personnel verbally informing the observer that a Rockfish Program delivery is scheduled. No form exists for this notice.

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.

Labor cost changed from \$25 to \$37.

Notify Observer of Rockfish delivery, Respondent	
Number of respondents	5
Total annual responses	675
Responses per respondent = 135	
Total burden hours (56.25)	56 hr
Time per response = 5 min	
Total personnel cost (\$37/hr x 56)	\$2,072
Total miscellaneous cost	0

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

IV. SCALE TYPE EVALUATION [inactive – removed]

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.

NMFS received no requests for scale evaluation in the past few years. A scale type evaluation is only triggered if someone wants a new type of scale approved for use at sea.

a. 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, electro-mechanical, 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.

b. 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.

c. 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 meteorological 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 weightment
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.

d. Potential, undefined scale

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.

It is anticipated that the information collected be disseminated to the public or used to support publicly disseminated information. NMFS will retain control over the information and safeguard it from improper access, modification, and destruction, consistent with National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (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 [Section 515 of Public Law 106-554](#)

3. 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.

The following table presents the use of automated, electronic, and online techniques used in this collection.

Name of form	Paper/fax or email	Online	eLog	Automatic
Inspection request, at-sea scale	√	√		
Record of daily flow scale test			√	
Printed report of groundfish catch weight				√
Printed report for groundfish audit trail				√
Printed report from groundfish calibration log				√
Printed report from groundfish fault log				√
Inspection request, observer sampling station	√	√		
Video monitoring of flow scale area				√
Inspection request, flow scale video monitoring	√	√		
Inspection request, Chinook Salmon Bycatch video monitoring	√	√		
Inspection request, Freezer Longline video monitoring	√	√		
Inspection request, Bin video monitoring	√	√		
Inspection request, Crab Catch monitoring (CMP)	√	√		
Record of daily hopper scale test			√	
Printed report of crab catch weight on hopper scale				√
Printed report for crab audit trail on hopper scale				√
Crab Catch monitoring plan (CMP)	√			
CMP Addendum	√			
Printed report from State of Alaska scale				√

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. If the collection of information involves small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

This action would directly regulate firms with catcher/processors that are required to use scales to account for catch at sea under various management programs. These programs include: trawl catcher/processors permitted to fish for pollock in the BSAI under the AFA; motherships permitted to receive pollock in the BSAI under the AFA; trawl catcher/processors permitted to fish for groundfish under Amendment 80 to the BSAI FMP or rockfish in the Central Gulf of Alaska (GOA); longline catcher/processors with a license limitation program license endorsed for catcher/processor operations, Pacific cod, hook-and-line gear, and BS or AI areas; and catcher/processors that harvest catch in the BSAI under the MS-CDQ program.

NMFS has examined these vessels and their corporate and cooperative affiliations and has determined these vessels are predominately fishing for finfish and that their size for the purposes of the RFA is governed by the \$19 million threshold. NMFS has also determined that all of these vessels have corporate and cooperative affiliations whose combined gross revenues exceed the \$19 million threshold. All of these firms are affiliated through cooperative arrangements, whether through the AFA catcher/processor Pollock Conservation Cooperative, one of the two cooperatives formed under the terms of Amendment 80 to the BSAI FMP, or the privately

organized Freezer Longline Conservation Cooperative. Thus, none of the firms directly regulated by this action are small entities for the purpose of the RFA.

This action would not have a significant economic impact on small entities.

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

If this collection were not conducted, NMFS would continue to be inconsistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

This action would revise the at-sea scales program for catcher/processors and motherships that are required to weigh catch at sea. This action would make three major changes to current regulations. First, this action would change regulations concerning daily scale testing and require electronic reporting of daily scale test results. Second, this action would require that scales used to weigh catch have electronics capable of logging and printing the frequency and magnitude of scale calibrations as well as the time and date of each scale fault and scale startup. Third, this action would require that the area around the scale be monitored using video. This action is being proposed to reduce the possibility of scale tampering and to improve the accuracy of catch estimation by the catcher/processor and mothership sector.

Although this action would apply to catcher/processors and motherships that harvest and/or receive catch in the BSAI under the CDQ program, these catcher/processors and motherships also participate in one of the four other listed fisheries and would be subject to the provisions applicable for those fisheries. All catcher/processors and motherships that harvest catch in the BSAI under the CDQ program would be subject to the same requirements as all other vessels that are required to weigh groundfish catch at sea under this action. This action would be consistent with section 305(i)(1)(B)(iv) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, that requires that CDQ fisheries “shall be regulated by the Secretary [NMFS] in a manner no more restrictive than for other participants in the applicable sector.”

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 proposed rule (RIN 0648-BD90) was published July 31, 2014 (79 FR 44372) coincidentally with this analysis to request public comments. NMFS received 5 letters containing 15 distinct comments on the proposed rule. A summary of the relevant comments and NMFS’ responses follows.

Two technical corrections were made to the final rule as a result of these comments.

- ◆ In response to Comment 6, NMFS modified the regulations at § 679.28(b)(5)(v) to clarify that vessel operators that receive an at-sea scale inspection for a vessel after March 1, 2014, and before December 1, 2014, would not be required to comply with the calibration log requirements or the fault log requirements until that flow scale is reapproved by a NMFS-authorized scale inspector in 2015.

- ◆ In response to Comment 14 re the video system, NMFS removed the reference to the version of USB port in the regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(ii). With this change, the video system could have one external port using any current or future versions of USB, or any other removable storage devices that are approved by NMFS.

In addition, NMFS has conducted other activities to inform the public and to request public comment (see below).

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule	
<p>Comment 1: The commenter supports the use of at-sea scales and recognizes the need to update aging scale technology to ensure accurate data.</p>	<p>Response: NMFS acknowledges the comment. Since NMFS first implemented at-sea scale requirements for some C/Ps in 1998, the program has grown dramatically; scale technologies have evolved; and NMFS has developed greater expertise with at-sea scales. The suite of proposed modifications to the at-sea scales program will reduce the potential for fraud, improve catch account accuracy, and bring regulations up to date with improvements in technology.</p>
<p>Comment 2: NMFS has cited a series of fraud cases as one of the reasons for changes to the at-sea scale requirements. Not all of the vessels using flow scales have been charged with scale fraud, so new regulations are unnecessary for many vessels.</p>	<p>Response: NMFS agrees that not all of the vessels using flow scales have been charged with scale fraud. However, NMFS disagrees that all vessels need to have been charged with fraud before at-sea scale regulations are improved and revised. NMFS has an obligation and responsibility to ensure accurate and reliable catch accounting, particularly if documented cases of fraud undermine accuracy and reliability. Improving at-sea scale regulations will help ensure accurate and reliable catch accounting among all vessels and reduce the risk of additional cases of fraud.</p> <p>While NMFS notes reducing the potential for fraud as one of the reasons for revising the at-sea scales program, NMFS cites other reasons for revising the at-sea scale program in the problem statement for this action (see the Introduction section of the Analysis). First, the program has grown from 20 vessels when the program was first developed to over 60 vessels today. This increase in the number and variety of vessel types has created the need to be more efficient with time and resources by automating many of the tasks needed to monitor the at-sea scales program. This final rule establishes regulations to improve the automation of many of these tasks. Second, when the at-sea scale program was first developed NMFS did not have a direct communication link with the vessels at sea, such as the e-logbook program that is now in place. This final rule requires the use of the e-logbook will allow daily reporting of scale tests to better track the accuracy of the flow scale improving catch accounting for these programs. Third, at the time the at-sea scale program was implemented flow scales could only store minimal data. Today, flow scales are significantly easier to program and offer much greater storage capacity that allow NMFS to collect more information to determine how well the flow scales are performing while at sea, and improve the accuracy and reliability of flow scale measurements. Finally, the advent of video technology allows NMFS to monitor activities around the flow scale at times when an observer may not be present or is completing other duties. This final rule establishes regulations to require video technology to ensure that all fish are sorted and weighed correctly which, enhances overall catch accounting.</p>
<p>Comment 3: The proposed rule states that NMFS anticipates most of these first-generation flow scale electronics would be replaced by the time of this proposed action. However, not all</p>	<p>Response: NMFS disagrees. In Section B of the Analysis, on page 31, NMFS acknowledges that 9 vessels of the 68 vessels are using first generation flow scale electronics and that these vessels were not planning to acquire new flow scale electronics prior to the implementation of these proposed regulations. Section B of the Analysis on page 31 describes the estimated costs for the vessels that</p>

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule	
<p>affected vessels were planning to update their first-generation flow scale electronics. Therefore, the assumptions and cost projections in the analysis are likely underestimated and significant.</p>	<p>were not planning to upgrade to new flow scale electronics. The commenter does not present any new information to suggest that the number of vessels or the estimated costs of compliance with the revised at-sea scale requirements presented in the Analysis are inaccurate.</p>
<p>Comment 4: The proposed rule includes provisions that require vessel operators to invest in new software and cameras to capture additional data from the flow scale and more comprehensively monitor activity at and around the flow scale area. The proposed regulations will be onerous and expensive and are unnecessary for the vessels in the longline C/P fleet since the flow scales and cameras on these vessels are no more than a year old.</p>	<p>Response: NMFS disagrees. The requirements outlined in this final rule are necessary to reduce the potential for fraud, improve catch account accuracy, and bring regulations up to date with improvements in technology for all C/Ps subject to this final rule. Although NMFS implemented regulations to allow the use of at-sea scales to monitor catch on longline C/Ps in 2013, these regulations do not preclude additional regulatory changes to enhance the monitoring of flow scales used by these longline C/Ps (see final rule implementing revised regulations for longline C/Ps, 77 FR 59053, September 26, 2012). The improvements outlined in this final rule are appropriate even though at-sea scale regulations were more recently established for longline C/Ps compared to other C/Ps.</p> <p>NMFS notes that because at-sea scales have only recently been placed on longline C/Ps, the costs of compliance with this final rule are likely to be lower for longline C/Ps compared to other C/Ps. Table 4 in Section C of the Analysis notes that because the flow scales used on longline C/Ps are the most current generation of flow scales, these vessels will not be required to purchase new flow scales, but will be required to update their flow scale software. The cost of updating software is significantly lower than the costs of replacing flow scale electronics. The requirement for video monitoring systems implemented by this action are very similar to ones that were implemented in 2013 to enhance the monitoring of at-sea scales used by longline C/Ps (see the final rule, 77 FR 59053, September 26, 2012). As Table 4 notes, the number of longline C/P impacted by the video monitoring requirements in this action is small (only 7 vessels out of 30 active vessels in the longline C/P fleet).</p>
<p>Comment 5: The installation of new video monitoring systems and flow scale software, while not cost prohibitive, is nonetheless an additional expense for vessels since they will have to spend valuable time to install these systems and software while at the dock. This will leave less time to prepare the vessel for fishing.</p>	<p>Response: NMFS acknowledges this comment. Section C of the Analysis, beginning on page 34, describes the costs to install the video monitoring systems, install new software, and the time required to complete these installations. Section C also notes the administrative costs to NMFS to approve and monitor installations. Based on past experience with video monitoring system and software installations, NMFS anticipates most video and software installations would occur just prior to an annual inspection. Annual inspections usually occur when a vessel is already in a shipyard or after the fishery season when the vessel is already at the dock so that additional fishing time is not lost. Therefore, in some, if not most cases, video installation and software installations would not be expected to reduce the fishing time available to vessels. NMFS notes that software upgrades on vessels with the latest generation of</p>

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule

<p>Comment 6: The proposed regulations at § 679.28(b)(5)(v) allow vessels that have been inspected between March 1, 2014, and December 31, 2014, the ability to wait until the next annual at-sea scale inspection to meet the new software requirements. It is unclear if vessels that are inspected during December 2014, but that plan to begin fishing on January 20, 2015, will have to meet the new flow scale software requirements or if they will be able to wait until December 2015 to meet the new flow scale software requirements.</p> <p>Comment 7: The commenter proposes a phased-in approach to the software and flow scale electronics upgrade requirements for vessels using first generation flow scale electronics. The commenter notes that the proposed rule already allows some flexibility for flow scales that have recently been certified.</p>	<p>flow scale electronics are not expected to take long and would likely be incorporated as part of the annual maintenance to the flow scale. NMFS does note that installation of video monitoring systems may take longer depending on the layout of a specific vessel. However, NMFS notes that the personnel needed to install video monitoring systems are likely not the same personnel doing other work on board a vessel (e.g., preparing the factory) so video monitoring system installation and other vessel preparations may occur concurrently. NMFS notes that the specific time required will vary from vessel-to-vessel depending on a range of design factors and requirements for personnel.</p> <p>Response: As stated in the preamble to the proposed rule, NMFS intends that software updates to require fault and calibration logs would be effective in 2015. The proposed regulations at § 679.28(b)(5)(v) were intended to delay the requirements to comply with flow scale fault and calibration reporting only for those vessels that received an at-sea scale inspection outside the winter scale inspection schedule (i.e., prior to December). As described in the preamble to the proposed rule, the timing of some fisheries requires NMFS to conduct inspections of some vessels' at-sea scales during the spring and summer. Without this regulation, vessels that are normally inspected in the spring and summer would be required to have an additional at-sea scale inspection at the beginning of 2015. Requiring an additional inspection within 6 months of the last inspection would present significant logistical difficulties and increased costs for both NMFS and the vessel owners and at-sea scale providers. However, this regulation was not intended to delay at-sea scale inspections for vessels that normally have the at-sea scale inspections conducted after December 1, 2014, and prior to fishing in 2015. The intent of this regulation is to require all vessels that normally have their inspections completed in December and January to comply with the regulations in this final rule prior to fishing in 2015. Therefore, NMFS modifies the proposed regulations at § 679.28(b)(5)(v) to clarify that vessel operators that receive an at-sea scale inspection for a vessel after March 1, 2014, and before December 1, 2014, would not be required to comply with the calibration log requirements or the fault log requirements until that flow scale is reaproved by a NMFS-authorized scale inspector in 2015.</p> <p>Response: NMFS disagrees. As stated in the preamble to the proposed rule NMFS intends to require that flow scale software be updated to ensure that accurate reporting of scale faults and calibration tests would be effective in early 2015. NMFS does provide flexibility in this final rule to allow vessels that were inspected from March 1, 2014, through December 1, 2014, to delay the implementation of the new software requirements until their next annual inspection during 2015 (see regulations at § 679.28(b)(5)(v)). This flexibility is available to all vessels that were inspected during the March 1 through December 1 time frame for the reasons</p>
---	--

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule

The commenter states that allowing all vessels this flexibility would amortize these significant capital expenses over several years.

described in the response to Comment 7. NMFS did not intend to further delay the requirements of this final rule beyond 2015. As stated in the problem statement of the Analysis, recent compliance concerns have emerged with the current at-sea scale program regulations. These compliance concerns can and should be expeditiously addressed to ensure accurate and reliable catch accounting. Failure to address these concerns can lead to a systematic underestimate of harvest in those fisheries dependent on scale weights for catch accounting. Ultimately, this can lead to an unknown and undetectable source of error in the amount of fishery harvest that can adversely affect fishery stocks.

The regulatory requirement to incorporate the fault and calibration logs into flow scales is an integral piece in preventing scale fraud and reducing concerns about systematic underestimation of harvest because it will provide useful information to NMFS investigators about improper flow scale use. Additionally, the first generation flow scale electronics are nearing the end of their service life. First generation flow scale electronics are no longer sold and finding replacing parts for these scales is becoming increasingly difficult. Recent annual inspections by NMFS and inseason reports have identified problems with the maintenance and functioning of these flow scales that have required multiple attempts to pass both the daily tests and the annual inspection. Given these problems, it is likely that some of these first generation flow scale electronics would not be able to pass at their annual inspections or daily scale tests in the future even under existing regulatory requirements. Therefore, this final rule is necessary to improve regulatory compliance. The implementation of this final rule is appropriate and timely given the recent advances in scale and software technology and the limited serviceable life of existing first generation flow scale electronics.

Comment 8: The proposed rule at § 679.28(e)(7) would require NMFS’ approval for changes to a vessel’s video monitoring system. However, the proposed rule is not clear about what constitutes a change and would require approval. Vessel personnel need the ability to maintain video monitoring systems during fishing operations. This regular maintenance includes replacing cameras, computers, and wiring and monitors that are no longer serviceable, and other similar tasks. NMFS should clarify what activities would require approval.

Response: NMFS acknowledges the comment. The regulation noted by the commenter is not substantively new. Existing regulations § 679.28(i)(1)(iii)(K), (j)(4), and (k)(7) also required changes to the video monitoring systems be approved by NMFS or the Regional Administrator. NMFS is modifying these regulations not to introduce new requirements, but to consolidate this approval process into one regulatory provision that applies to all video monitoring programs where regulations require changes to be submitted for approval to the Regional Administrator. As noted in other final rules that have established these requirements, changes to approved video monitoring systems that must be submitted for approval are those that would affect the functionality of the video system. Any replacements that allow the system to continue to function in the same manner as when it was approved would not be subject to re-approval. For example, replacing broken or malfunctioning components of the video system with identical parts would not be considered to affect the functionality of the system. However, moving cameras to different locations or changing video software systems would need re-approval since both of these activities could

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule

Comment 9: NMFS claims that the proposed regulations would improve its ability to detect fault and calibration fraud through retention of the last 1,000 faults and scale startups (calibrations). However, the rule does not provide detail into how and when the additional data would be used. For example, how will NMFS use data in a timely fashion to determine if fraud is occurring in real time? The assumption that collecting more data provides deterrence to intentional fraud is false if NMFS is not able to detect fraud under the current reporting requirement (last 10 faults and startups).

Comment 10: The proposed rule includes new provisions on flow scale tests that would require daily submission of flow scale tests to NMFS and reporting of all daily scale tests, (see regulations at § 679.5(f)(1)(ix)). These reporting requirements will create additional burdens on vessel crew and additional work and expenditures by NMFS to review and process the data collected under the new regulations. The value of the additional data does not warrant the expense for the industry and NMFS. If NMFS is interested in all flow scale tests performed on a vessel in a day, there already exists capabilities for the observer to monitor these actions as needed. It is also likely that video monitoring could capture the activities of interest.

change the functionality of the video system.

Response: NMFS disagrees. The current software does not have the capability to record any faults or calibrations. The current regulations only require an audit trail that records when the weighing parameters inside the flow scale software are changed. As stated in the Analysis in Section B on page 30, miscalibrating the flow scale and frequently running the flow scale in fault mode are both ways that fraudulent activity could occur. One miscalibration or fault error may occur accidentally and be quickly resolved by the vessel. By requiring the vessel to provide a printout of this information at the end of the year with the last 1,000 calibrations and 1,000 faults, NMFS investigators can look for patterns that might suggest improper flow scale calibrations or detect significant amounts of time when the flow scale is running in fault mode. Although NMFS anticipates reviewing these data on an annual basis, NMFS staff or enforcement personnel could request this printout at any time during the year.

Response: NMFS disagrees. Video monitoring systems are unable to determine the specific results of a flow scale test. The video monitoring systems are meant to ensure that the flow scale is functioning properly (e.g., that the flow scale is not running while in a fault (error) state), ensure that all fish are being weighed, detect when crew members are working on the flow scale, and ensure that daily flow scale tests are being conducted on the required schedule and with the appropriate test weights. Observers monitor the daily flow scale test, but they are not required to report those results to NMFS.

The vessel operator is responsible for ensuring that the flow scale is in working order and passes the daily flow scale test before weighing fish. The vessel operator is also responsible for reporting those results to NMFS and maintaining the at-sea scales so that the performance error is as close to zero as practicable. By requiring electronic submission of the daily flow scale tests, NMFS is reducing the reporting requirements for the vessel overall. Although, the vessel operator must now report all the flow scale tests performed (pass and fail), which could nominally increase the workload of the vessel operator, the vessel would be conducting these flow scale tests anyway until the flow scale passed the test or the vessel repaired the flow scale. The information that is reported electronically is simplified compared to the paper form currently required. Under this final rule only three blocks of information are required: the weight of the test material on the platform scale, the weight of the material on the flow scale being tested, and the time of the test. Prior to this final rule, the vessel operator had to report ten blocks of information. These blocks were the vessel name, the date of test, the time of test, the weight of fish or sandbags on the

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule

Comment 11: Currently, two companies provide certified at-sea flow scales: Marel and Scanvaegt. However, currently Scanvaegt’s flow scale will not meet the proposed requirements, eliminating competition among at-sea flow scale providers. Scanvaegt is working towards a solution that meets proposed requirements. However, NMFS should not adopt regulations that can only be met by a single vendor and should delay implementation until at-sea flow scales from additional vendors are approved.

Comment 12: The proposed regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(iv) state that “color cameras must have at a minimum 470 TV (television) lines of resolution.” There are many digital video cameras that no longer use TV lines within their specifications and have their

platform scale, the weight of fish or sandbags on the flow scale, the calculated error of the flow scale, the calculated percent error of the flow scale, the sea conditions at the time of the test, the signature of the vessel operator, and the signature of the observer. The electronic reporting also allows data to be automatically submitted. For example, the percent error of a flow scale test is automatically calculated and entered into the report by the electronic reporting software. Also, because the reporting of the daily flow scale tests is part of the software that the majority of vessels already use to report catch and effort data daily to NMFS, no additional transmission requirements would be required for most vessel operators. Additionally, the vessel operator would only be required to sign the electronic logbook form not both the logbook form and the daily scale test form. Finally, as stated in the Analysis in Section A.2 on page 22, by requiring this information on a daily basis, NMFS can monitor the test results daily and identify flow scale issues immediately instead of requesting the test results at the end of the year and reviewing hundreds of paper forms and entering the results by hand. Overall, this daily reporting is likely to reduce workload and allow for errors in flow scale functions to be identified and corrected more quickly than under existing reporting requirements.

Response: NMFS disagrees. The proposed regulations are written so that any scale company could meet the requirements. The flow scale software requirements were developed independent of any specific scale company’s available products. Other entities, including other commercial scale manufacturers other than the two noted by the commenter, can develop an at-sea flow scale that meets the requirements described in the regulations and NMFS would approve those at the time they became available. NMFS has no information to indicate that the company currently providing at-sea flow scales that meet these requirements will increase costs beyond the normal market prices that were estimated in the analysis. NMFS does not have any information to indicate when other scale manufacturers may choose to enter the market with an at-sea flow scale that can meet these requirements. Because flow scales are currently available that meet the requirements established in this final rule and new manufacturers can choose to enter the market at any time, delaying these regulations until additional scale manufacturers have entered the market is neither necessary nor appropriate.

Response: NMFS disagrees. While some digital camera manufacturers may not use TV lines in their specifications, it is still the industry standard to determine video quality and digital cameras can be tested and their resolution can be compared to a TV line standard. As the commenter mentions a higher MP rating will not necessarily result in higher video quality. As the commenter also states, most current digital cameras are able to meet the 470 TV line standard. Because digital cameras can be tested against a TV line standard, it is not necessary to establish a new minimum MP

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule	
<p>resolution measured in pixels. Digital cameras with specific Megapixel (MP) ratings do not directly compare to TV line ratings. Some manufacturers produce video cameras that have high MP ratings but a low quality lens, which may contribute to distortion and blurriness of the image. In most cases, a digital camera will output to the equivalent of 470 TV lines so the regulations should provide an alternative standard in MP for digital cameras.</p> <p>Comment 13: The proposed regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(iii) state that the video files from the video monitoring system must output to an open source format. This regulation should be rephrased to correspond with the video output formats currently provided with commercially available equipment. Most commercially available video recording software and digital video recorders do not use, or output to, open source formats, rather they use industry-generated standards like H.264 or MPEG4. The regulations should require video data to use formats such as H.264. This revision would establish a standard data format, but allow the use of alternative data formats, provided those formats are not proprietary and meet the performance standards set forth by the video security surveillance industry.</p> <p>Comment 14: The proposed regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(ii) require that video systems to have at least one external Universal Serial Bus (USB) port using version 1.1 or 2.0. There are currently</p>	<p>standard in these regulations to ensure adequate video quality requirements are met.</p> <p>Response: NMFS disagrees that changes to the regulations are required to allow the use of multiple video data formats. The regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(iii) state that the video monitoring system “must output video files to an open source format or the vessel owner must provide software capable of converting the output video file to an open source format or commercial software must be available for converting the output video file to an open source format.” This regulation does not require that the software must use an open source format, but instead that the software has the ability to convert to an open source format. Most H.264 video compression formats have the ability to be converted to an open source format using commercially available software. However, some video surveillance systems use software that is not commercially available. These are considered custom written or proprietary format systems. Although video monitoring systems using a proprietary format may have advantages in that the video files are less likely to be manipulated, these proprietary format systems limit the ability for NMFS to store and review the output video imagery from several different systems that may be deployed on different vessels without using proprietary video software. The video monitoring systems currently in use by all of the vessels subject to this final rule do have the ability to output video data in an open source format that does not require NMFS to purchase specific proprietary video software. NMFS does not intend to change the regulations to require one specified video format, such as H.264, because this may limit the types of video systems that could be used in this program and a specified video format may become outdated in short period of time.</p> <p>Response: NMFS agrees. The proposed regulations stated that the video system must have at least one external USB (1.1 or 2.0) port or other removable storage device approved by NMFS. NMFS notes that under the proposed rule the new industry standard USB 3.0 port would be covered because its use could be approved by NMFS. However, the commenter highlights the potential for confusion. To minimize confusion and ensure the intent of this regulation is met,</p>

Comments and Responses on Proposed Rule	
<p>computers that are available that only offer USB ports with version 3.0. This regulation should be revised to include “USB 3.0” or remove the reference to specific versions of USB and allow any external USB port.</p> <p>Comment 15: NMFS should consider including a minimum recording resolution for the proposed video monitoring requirements, such as 640 x 480 pixels. The proposed rule specifies that a video system must record at a speed of no less than 5 unique frames per second (FPS) at all times when the use of a video monitoring system is required (see regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(vi)). The requirement to record at 5 unique FPS does not specify the resolution of the video image that is saved to the storage device. Without a minimum recording resolution requirement, it does not matter if images are recorded at 5 unique FPS because the quality of the image may not be adequate for review and storage.</p>	<p>under this final rule NMFS removes the reference to the version of USB port in the regulations at § 679.28(e)(1)(ii). With this change, the video system could have one external port using any current or future versions of USB, or any other removable storage devices that are approved by NMFS.</p> <p>Response: NMFS agrees and the regulations do require that the video system meet a performance standard for the recording resolution. This final rule does not specify one resolution standard because there are four different video monitoring programs, each with a different resolution need. These programs are the bin monitoring program for Amendment 80 vessels; video monitoring program on C/Ps and motherships in the BS pollock fishery, including CDQ; the video monitoring program for BSAI longline C/Ps, and the video monitoring program for flow scales. Each video monitoring program has a different monitoring objective, and a single recording resolution standard is not applicable to all of these video monitoring programs. Instead, each of these video monitoring programs describes qualitatively what the recorded resolution must be to meet the monitoring objectives. For example, regulations for BSAI longline C/Ps at § 679.28(k)(1)(i) state the video monitoring system must “Provide sufficient resolution and field of view to monitor all areas where Pacific cod are sorted from the catch, all fish passing over the motion-compensated scale, and all crew actions in these areas.” Other standards apply to other video monitoring programs.</p> <p>Additionally, NMFS requires the vessels to identify their recording resolution on the Video Monitoring Inspection Request Form that must be submitted in order to conduct an inspection. This form and the qualitative description of the resolution for each system allow NMFS to determine if the video system will be approved.</p>

Other Activities to Inform the Public and to Request Public Comment	
Electronic Monitoring/ Electronic Reporting Strategic Plan	NMFS, working with the Council, developed an Electronic Monitoring/Electronic Reporting strategic plan that will guide development and implementation of electronic monitoring tools in the North Pacific.
Electronic Monitoring/ Electronic Reporting Pilot Project	In 2013 and 2014, NMFS is conducting an electronic monitoring pilot project in Alaska that provides EM equipment (video cameras) to vessels that volunteer. The EM pilot project evaluates the efficacy of video cameras to collect catch, discard, and fishing effort data in Alaska and is focused on vessels between 40-57.5 ft. in length that fish with hook and line gear.
Use of Video Monitoring, Research Results	NMFS and industry conducted several case studies and pilot projects exploring the use of electronic monitoring in Alaska: <u>Assessment of Electronic Monitoring to quantify discards in the Central GOA Rockfish Fishery -- Phase 1 Project Report</u>

Other Activities to Inform the Public and to Request Public Comment	
	<p>Phase 2 Project Report is presented at Case study on the applicability of video technology for longline fisheries management Bycatch characterization in the Pacific halibut fishery: A field test of electronic monitoring technology: Final Report on project to test Trainable Video Analytic Software Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association Project to test video on small fixed gear vessels in southeast Alaska Bycatch characterization in the Pacific halibut fishery: A field test of electronic monitoring technology</p> <p>Final Report on project to test Trainable Video Analytic Software</p> <p>Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association Project to test video on small fixed gear vessels in southeast Alaska</p>
Workshops & Discussion Papers	<p>79 FR 23944, April 29, 2014 196 kb NMFS announces a workshop to solicit input from owners and operators of catcher/processor vessels and motherships that are required to weigh catch at sea. The workshop concerns proposed changes to equipment and operational equipment for motion compensating scales. The workshop will be held May 16, 2014.</p> <p>NOAA Fisheries Office of Policy and EM Working Group Electronic Monitoring White Papers, February 2013</p> <p>Discussion paper presented by NMFS to North Pacific Fishery Management Council: Use of Electronic Monitoring (EM) Technologies in Alaskan Fisheries, June 2011</p> <p>An Electronic Fisheries Monitoring Workshop was conducted July 29-30, 2008 to assess the current status of video monitoring technology for fisheries, its applicability to research and management in the North Pacific, its future potential, and research and development needs. Electronic Fisheries Monitoring Workshop Proceedings</p> <p>Discussion paper presented by NMFS to Council: Issues Associated with Large Scale Implementation of Video Monitoring, May 2006</p>
NMFS Policy	<p>Policy on Electronic Technologies and Fishery-Dependent Data Collection</p>

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

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 [NOAA Administrative Order 216-100](#), which sets forth procedures to protect confidentiality of fishery statistics.

11. 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.

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: 140 (78 groundfish catcher/processors, 15 crab catcher/processors, 13 shoreside processors, 34 freezer longline catcher/processors) increased from 94. Estimated total responses: 69,038, increased from 38,221. Estimated total time burden: 11,037 hours, decreased from 11,259 hours. Estimated total personnel cost: \$409,057, up from \$267,575. Personnel labor costs are estimated to the average wage equivalent to a GS-7 employee in Alaska, including COLA, at \$37 per hour.

13. 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).

Total operational and maintenance costs: \$349,706, down from \$485,963.

Total capital costs, \$546,000.

Total costs: \$895,706.

The benefits from improved accuracy of scale estimates pay off ultimately with improvements in fisheries stock management and cooperative management that increase the value of the fish stock to society. The magnitude of these benefits cannot be quantitatively estimated at this time.

Summary of costs and benefits

Action	Costs	Benefits
Use sand bags for tests	About 1/3 of the regulated vessels (23 vessels) will have to start to use sand bags. Tests may take longer, sand bags need to be stored, small initial purchase price.	Improve scale-testing accuracy; eliminate a potential way to manipulate test results; tests can take place when relatively few fish are aboard.
Daily electronic reporting	Some additional time required to input – into an existing daily electronic report - a small amount of information for each test. Some vessels will have to adopt use of electronic logbooks and will incur costs for this. Some training required, including a workshop estimated to cost about \$3,000.	Reduced potential for fraud and improved ability for NMFS to monitor scale status during the year.
Document failed tests	Additional record keeping when multiple tests take place.	Less bias in overall test results. Ability to monitor scale results.
Clarify regulations on testing frequency	Number of tests should not be affected, but a small number of vessels may be required to suspend fishing for testing more often.	Better consistency in reporting through time. Enhanced regulatory clarity.
Change maximum allowable percent error	Costs of changing the maximum permissible error to 2 percent or to 1 percent are difficult to estimate. They could be substantial if vessels are forced to end trips prematurely and return to port for flow scale adjustments or repairs. Costs would be greater for the 1 percent threshold than for the 2 percent threshold (depending upon the precision of the instrumentation).	If catch estimates are made more accurate, there would be benefits for stock management and for cooperative management. Benefits would be greater for the 1 percent threshold than for the 2 percent threshold (depending upon the precision of the instrumentation). Benefits may be limited if vessels keep testing until they reach the threshold, but actual scale performance reverts to mean during operations.
Log calibrations and faults	The estimated cost of new software for the fleet is about \$136,000. Ten vessels will need to purchase new scale heads, because their current scale heads cannot run the new calibration software. They do not need to purchase the entire scale though, just the scale head. The new scale heads are estimated to cost \$30,400 each. The total cost for all of these 10 vessels to replace scale heads or update software is estimated to be about \$41,000 (i.e., \$4,100/vessel). The rest of the fleet has the new scale heads already, but they will need to upgrade to the new software.	Automatic recording of flow scale fault conditions and calibrations will enhance the audit trail, provide useful diagnostic information to vessels and NMFS staff, and highlight patterns of improper scale calibration for NOAA investigators.
Require video monitoring of scales	Costs may vary, depending on existing video installations. Aggregate fleetwide costs were expected to range between \$108,000 and \$630,000, with a midpoint estimate of about \$369,000. Estimated costs of \$7,000 would be incurred for NMFS inspections. Costs for use of the video by OLE in enforcement cases are unknown.	NMFS will be able to verify that all catch is being weighed, that no one is tampering with the scale, and that the scale is operating correctly.

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

Estimated total responses: 548, up from 389. Estimated total time burden: 463 hr, up from 432. Estimated total personnel cost: \$17,051, up from \$10,675. Estimated total miscellaneous cost: \$33,000. Total costs: \$50,051.

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

Capital costs are fixed, one-time expenses incurred on the purchase of land, buildings, construction, and equipment used in the production of goods or in the rendering of services.

Program changes

Scale heads & calibration software are required.

Includes purchase and installation, \$177,000

A new Flow scale video monitoring system is required.

Includes purchase and installation, \$ 369,000.

Inspection request for flow scale video monitoring system

an increase of 78 respondents and responses, 78 instead of 0

an increase of 156 hours, 156 instead of 0 hours

an increase of \$5,772 personnel costs, \$5,772 instead of \$0

an increase of \$26 miscellaneous costs, \$26 instead of \$0

Printed output flow scale, audit trail [NEW]

an increase of 78 respondents, 78 instead of 0

an increase of 10,530 responses, 10,530 instead of 0

an increase of 176 hours, 176 instead of 0

an increase of \$6,512 personnel costs, \$6,512 instead of \$0

Printed output flow scale, calibration log [NEW]

an increase of 78 respondents, 78 instead of 0

an increase of 10,530 responses, 10,530 instead of 0

an increase of 176 hours, 176 instead of 0

an increase of \$6,512 personnel costs, \$6,512 instead of \$0

Printed output flow scale, fault log [NEW]

an increase of 78 respondents, 78 instead of 0

an increase of 10,530 responses, 10,530 instead of 0

an increase of 176 hours, 176 instead of 0

an increase of \$6,512 personnel costs, \$6,512 instead of \$0

Electronic monitoring system –REMOVED

a decrease of 648 responses, 0 instead of 648

a decrease of 648 hours, 0 instead of 648

a decrease of \$435,737 in capital costs, 0 instead of \$435,737.

Net program changes: Increases of 31,020 responses, 36 hours and \$110,289.

Adjustments (mostly increase in hourly rate)

Notify observer of flow scale tests

- a decrease of 1 respondent, 78 instead of 79
- a decrease of 101 responses, 10,530 instead of 10,665
- a decrease of 5 hours, 351 instead of 356 hours
- an increase of \$4,087 personnel costs, \$12,987 instead of \$8,900

Daily records from flow scale tests

- a decrease of 1 respondent, 78 instead of 79
- a decrease of 101 responses, 10,530 instead of 10,665
- a decrease of 54 hours, 7,898 instead of 7,999 hours
- a decrease of 92,251 personnel costs, \$199,975 instead of \$29,226
- a decrease of \$2,765 miscellaneous costs, \$0 instead of \$2,765

Printed output flow scale, catch weight

- a decrease of 1 respondent, 78 instead of 79
- a decrease of 135 responses, 10,530 instead of 10,665
- a decrease of 2 hours, 176 instead of 178 hours
- an increase of \$2,062 personnel costs, \$6,512 instead of \$4,450
- a decrease of \$2,765 miscellaneous costs, \$0 instead of \$2,765

Inspection request for observer sampling station

- a decrease of 1 respondents and responses, 78 instead of 79
- a decrease of 2 hours, 156 instead of 158
- an increase of \$1,822 personnel costs, \$5,772 instead of \$3,950
- an increase of \$56 miscellaneous costs, \$26 instead of \$13

Inspection request, bin video monitoring system

- an increase of 1 respondents and responses, 22 instead of 21
- an increase of 2 hours, 44 instead of 42
- an increase of \$578 personnel costs, \$1,628 instead of \$1,050
- an increase of \$12 miscellaneous costs, \$14 instead of \$2

Inspection request for Chinook salmon bycatch video monitoring system

- a decrease of 32 respondents and responses, 22 instead of 54
- a decrease of 64 hours, 44 instead of 108
- a decrease of \$1,072 personnel costs, \$1,628 instead of \$2,700
- an increase of \$9 miscellaneous costs, \$14 instead of \$5

Inspection request for Freezer longline video monitoring system

- a decrease of 20 respondents and responses, 34 instead of 54
- a decrease of 40 hours, 68 instead of 108
- a decrease of \$184 personnel costs, \$2,516 instead of \$2,700
- an increase of \$22 miscellaneous costs, \$27 instead of \$5

Notify NMFS Pacific cod monitoring option

an increase of \$204 personnel costs, \$629 instead of \$425

Inspection request for CMP (includes hopper scale)

an increase of \$12 personnel costs, \$37 instead of \$25

an increase of \$1 miscellaneous costs, \$2 instead of \$1

Notify observer of hopper scale tests (was in existing regulations, but not in PRA)

an increase of 1 respondent, 3 instead of 0

an increase of 405 responses, 405 instead of 0

an increase of 14 hours, 14 instead of 0

an increase of \$518 personnel costs, \$518 instead of \$0

Daily records of hopper scale tests (was in existing regulations, but not in PRA)

an increase of 3 respondents, 3 instead of 0

an increase of 405 responses, 405 instead of 0

an increase of 304 hours, 304 instead of 0

an increase of \$1,258 personnel costs, \$1,258 instead of \$0

Printed output hopper scale, catch weight tests (was in existing regulations, but not in PRA)

an increase of 3 respondents, 3 instead of 0

an increase of 405 responses, 405 instead of 0

an increase of 7 hours, 7 instead of 0

an increase of \$259 personnel costs, \$259 instead of \$0

Printed output hopper scale, audit trail tests (was in existing regulations, but not in PRA)

an increase of 3 respondents, 3 instead of 0

an increase of 405 responses, 405 instead of 0

an increase of 7 hours, 7 instead of 0

an increase of \$259 personnel costs, \$259 instead of \$0

Inspection request CMCP

an increase of \$12 miscellaneous costs, \$37 instead of \$25

Printed output State scale

an increase of 6 hours, 29 instead of 35

an increase of \$198 personnel costs, \$1,073 instead of \$875

Notify observer of Bering Sea pollock delivery

an increase of 4 hours, 90 instead of 86

an increase of \$1,180 personnel costs, \$3,330 instead of \$2,150

Notify observer of CDQ delivery

a decrease of 4 respondents, 4 instead of 8

a decrease of 1,024 responses, 56 instead of 1,080

a decrease of 84 hours, 2 instead of 86

a decrease of \$2,076 personnel costs, \$74 instead of \$2150

Notify observer of Rockfish delivery

an increase of 8 hours, 56 instead of 64

an increase of \$722 personnel costs, \$2,072 instead of \$1,350

Crab CMP plan

an increase of \$2,800 personnel costs, \$8,800 instead of \$6,000

an increase of \$14 miscellaneous costs, \$25 instead of \$11

Crab CMP addendum

an increase of \$288 personnel costs, \$888 instead of \$600

an increase of \$2 miscellaneous costs, \$4 instead of \$2

CMCP plan

an increase of \$6,240 personnel costs, \$19,240 instead of \$13,000

CMCP addendum

an increase of \$384 personnel costs, \$1,184 instead of \$800

Testing of new scales – REMOVED temporarily

a decrease of 2 respondents and responses, 0 instead of 2

a decrease of 100 hours, 0 instead of 100

a decrease of \$24,850 in miscellaneous costs, 0 instead of \$24,850.

Net adjustments: Decreases of 203 responses, 258 hours and \$4,156,663.

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 information collection does not employ statistical methods.