

Please provide the following information, and submit to the NOAA DM Plan Repository.

Reference to Master DM Plan (if applicable)

As stated in Section IV, Requirement 1.3, DM Plans may be hierarchical. If this DM Plan inherits provisions from a higher-level DM Plan already submitted to the Repository, then this more-specific Plan only needs to provide information that differs from what was provided in the Master DM Plan.

URL of higher-level DM Plan (if any) as submitted to DM Plan Repository:

1. General Description of Data to be Managed

1.1. Name of the Data, data collection Project, or data-producing Program:

Gear Selectivity of a Longfin Squid Bottom Trawl

1.2. Summary description of the data:

Loligo pealeii (longfin inshore squid) co-occurs with Atlantic butterfish (Peprilus triacanthus) throughout the year and discarding in the L. pealeii bottom trawl fishery is the primary source of fishing mortality on the butterfish stock. Consequently, a codend mesh size increase in the Loligo fishery has been proposed as a management measure to minimize discarding of butterfish and other bycatch species. A paired-tow study was conducted using a Loligo twin trawl to assess the effects of a codend mesh size increase, from 50 mm to 65 mm (inside stretched mesh), on catch rates and size selection of the target and bycatch species. Relative mesh selection factors estimated from a SELECT model were: 1.7, 1.5, 2.2, and 3.0 for L. pealeii; P. triacanthus; Illex illecebrosus (Northern shortfin squid); and Merluccius bilinearis (silver hake), respectively. Catches of butterfish and silver hake in the 65 mm codend were reduced by 58% and 41% in terms of numbers, respectively. However, a larger mesh size would be necessary to allow 50% escapement of the median sizes of mature silver hake and butterfish. A trade-off associated with the bycatch reductions is a 29% loss in the catch weight of the target species. However, the reduction in ex-vessel value of Loligo catch is probably not proportional to the percent loss in Loligo catch because most of the loss consisted of squid from the smallest market size categories which have the least value and are primarily discarded. In addition, a greater percentage of large, more valuable squid was caught in the 65 mm codend. The September study results likely represent a worst-case scenario with respect to Loligo catch loss because the monthly mean body size of Loligo tends to be smallest during September. Most catches of the three bycatch species evaluated herein and Loligo smaller than 10 cm are discarded, most likely dead, in the Loligo fishery. Therefore, a codend mesh size increase to 65 mm should provide some conservation benefits to these stocks if a portion survive escapement. On a fleet-wide basis, the magnitude of bycatch reductions and Loligo catch loss will vary depending on seasonal changes in mean body size, vessel-specific gear characteristics and fishing practices.

1.3. Is this a one-time data collection, or an ongoing series of measurements?

One-time data collection

1.4. Actual or planned temporal coverage of the data:

2008

1.5. Actual or planned geographic coverage of the data:

W: -73.82214, E: -71.253833, N: 40.746565, S: 38.311567

1.6. Type(s) of data:

(e.g., digital numeric data, imagery, photographs, video, audio, database, tabular data, etc.)

Table (digital)

1.7. Data collection method(s):

(e.g., satellite, airplane, unmanned aerial system, radar, weather station, moored buoy, research vessel, autonomous underwater vehicle, animal tagging, manual surveys, enforcement activities, numerical model, etc.)

Instrument: Minilog, Seabird, Inclinometer

Platform: Vessel: Karen Elizabeth

Physical Collection / Fishing Gear: Longfin Squid Bottom Trawl Net

1.8. If data are from a NOAA Observing System of Record, indicate name of system:**1.8.1. If data are from another observing system, please specify:****2. Point of Contact for this Data Management Plan (author or maintainer)****2.1. Name:**

Robert Johnston

2.2. Title:

Metadata Contact

2.3. Affiliation or facility:

Northeast Fisheries Science Center

2.4. E-mail address:

Robert.Johnston@noaa.gov

2.5. Phone number:

(508) 495-2061

3. Responsible Party for Data Management

Program Managers, or their designee, shall be responsible for assuring the proper management of the data produced by their Program. Please indicate the responsible party below.

3.1. Name:

Paul Kostovick

3.2. Title:

Data Steward

4. Resources

Programs must identify resources within their own budget for managing the data they produce.

4.1. Have resources for management of these data been identified?

Yes

4.2. Approximate percentage of the budget for these data devoted to data management (specify percentage or "unknown"):

Unknown

5. Data Lineage and Quality

NOAA has issued Information Quality Guidelines for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information which it disseminates.

5.1. Processing workflow of the data from collection or acquisition to making it publicly accessible

(describe or provide URL of description):

Lineage Statement:

Vessel sensor data were collected electronically using SCS. Catch and biological data were collected electronically using FSCS 1.6. At the completion of the cruise, a database copy was inserted into the shoreside database.

5.1.1. If data at different stages of the workflow, or products derived from these data, are subject to a separate data management plan, provide reference to other plan:**5.2. Quality control procedures employed (describe or provide URL of description):**

Data validation during data collection using FSCS 1.6, Data auditing post-survey by established auditing routines, Data validation during database load

6. Data Documentation

The EDMC Data Documentation Procedural Directive requires that NOAA data be well documented, specifies the use of ISO 19115 and related standards for documentation of new data, and provides links to resources and tools for metadata creation and validation.

6.1. Does metadata comply with EDMC Data Documentation directive?

Yes

6.1.1. If metadata are non-existent or non-compliant, please explain:**6.2. Name of organization or facility providing metadata hosting:**

NMFS Office of Science and Technology

6.2.1. If service is needed for metadata hosting, please indicate:**6.3. URL of metadata folder or data catalog, if known:**

<https://inport.nmfs.noaa.gov/inport/item/27378>

6.4. Process for producing and maintaining metadata

(describe or provide URL of description):

Metadata produced and maintained in accordance with the NMFS Data Documentation Procedural Directive: <https://inport.nmfs.noaa.gov/inport/downloads/data-documentation-procedural-directive.pdf>

7. Data Access

NAO 212-15 states that access to environmental data may only be restricted when distribution is explicitly limited by law, regulation, policy (such as those applicable to personally identifiable information or protected critical infrastructure information or proprietary trade information) or by security requirements. The EDMC Data Access Procedural Directive contains specific guidance, recommends the use of open-standard, interoperable, non-proprietary web services, provides information about resources and tools to enable data access, and includes a Waiver to be submitted to justify any approach other than full, unrestricted public access.

7.1. Do these data comply with the Data Access directive?

Yes

7.1.1. If the data are not to be made available to the public at all, or with limitations, has a Waiver (Appendix A of Data Access directive) been filed?**7.1.2. If there are limitations to public data access, describe how data are protected from unauthorized access or disclosure:****7.2. Name of organization of facility providing data access:**

Northeast Fisheries Science Center

7.2.1. If data hosting service is needed, please indicate:**7.2.2. URL of data access service, if known:**

<ftp://ftp.nefsc.noaa.gov/>

7.3. Data access methods or services offered:

Please contact Point of Contact via email.

NEFSC Data Access Procedure:

1. Formal request in writing usually to the data owner/contact or Center Director;
2. Requester is contacted by data owner to review and verify the request content and details for data delivery options.

3. If data is confidential then owner will determine if the data may be released to the requester;

4. If data can be released, the data is downloaded and packaged for delivery electronically; or the requester may be directed to where the data is available online.

7.4. Approximate delay between data collection and dissemination:

not applicable

7.4.1. If delay is longer than latency of automated processing, indicate under what authority data access is delayed:

8. Data Preservation and Protection

The NOAA Procedure for Scientific Records Appraisal and Archive Approval describes how to identify, appraise and decide what scientific records are to be preserved in a NOAA archive.

8.1. Actual or planned long-term data archive location:

(Specify NCEI-MD, NCEI-CO, NCEI-NC, NCEI-MS, World Data Center (WDC) facility, Other, To Be Determined, Unable to Archive, or No Archiving Intended)

To Be Determined

8.1.1. If World Data Center or Other, specify:

8.1.2. If To Be Determined, Unable to Archive or No Archiving Intended, explain:

Archiving solution for Oracle Data Sets is yet to be determined

8.2. Data storage facility prior to being sent to an archive facility (if any):

NEFSC Woods Hole Lab - Woods Hole, MA

8.3. Approximate delay between data collection and submission to an archive facility:

Unknown

8.4. How will the data be protected from accidental or malicious modification or deletion prior to receipt by the archive?

Discuss data back-up, disaster recovery/contingency planning, and off-site data storage relevant to the data collection

Archival of source data preserving unaltered collected data, Scheduled backups, Remote storage backups, Password protection

9. Additional Line Office or Staff Office Questions

Line and Staff Offices may extend this template by inserting additional questions in this section.