

Estimation of species misidentification in the commercial landing data of
tilefish in the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009.

Ching-Ping Chih

March, 2010

Southeast Fisheries Science Center
National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
75 Virginia Beach Drive
Miami, FL 33149

Abstract

This report documents the misidentification of tilefish in the landing records from the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009. The percentage of species misidentification was calculated based on samples obtained from the Trip Interview Program. About 5.48% of tilefish were misidentified as other species or placed in the general bony fish category in landing records, while about 0.51% of tilefish landings were actually other species. The net effect of the species misidentification was an approximate 4.97% underestimation of tilefish landings from 1984 to 2009.

Methods

All data used for this analysis were from the Trip Interview Program (TIP) database. The main assumption of this analysis was that TIP samples represented landings. The percentage of tilefish misidentified as other species was calculated by dividing the number of tilefish samples identified in landing records as another species by the total number of tilefish samples. The percentage of other species misidentified as tilefish was calculated by dividing the number of other species samples identified as tilefish in tilefish landing records by the total number of samples recorded as tilefish in landing records. Not all samplers recorded a landing species based on the dealer's landing records in the historical TIP database (i.e., sometimes samplers accounted for mistakes in a dealer's landing records or were not able to obtain dealer's landing records). Thus, the percentage of species misidentification in the TIP database is probably underestimated.

Results and discussion

About 5.48% of tilefish samples were misidentified as other species in the landing records (Table 1). Most of this misidentification was due to tilefish ending up in bony fish landings. Tilefish were most frequently misidentified as blueline tilefish or goldface tilefish. The percentage of misidentification varied significantly from year to year (Table 2). Some of the variation was due to small sample sizes. Also, the percentage of misidentification varied significantly between different counties (Table 3). Since different dealers

tended to group landings differently, the variations between different counties was expected. About 0.51% of tilefish landings were actually other species, such as blueline tilefish, goldface tilefish and yellowedge groupers. The overall effect of species misidentification is a 4.97% underestimation of tilefish landings from 1984 to 2009.

Table 1. Number and percentage of tilefish misidentified as other species in the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009.

Species name	Number of tilefish samples misidentified as other species	Percentage of misidentified samples
BLUELINE TILEFISH	14	0.07%
BONY FISHES	1074	5.20%
GOLDFACE TILEFISH	18	0.09%
GREATER AMBERJACK	2	0.01%
JACKS	2	0.01%
RED PORGY	13	0.06%
SNOWY GROUPER	1	0.00%
YELLOWEDGE GROUPER	8	0.04%
Total	1132	5.48%

Table 2. Number and percentage of tilefish misidentified as other species in the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009 listed by year.

Year	Number of misidentified samples	Total number of tilefish samples	Percentage of misidentified samples
1984	8	207	3.86%
1986	61	63	96.83%
1987	132	152	86.84%
1988	172	253	67.98%
1989		84	
1990	129	284	45.42%
1991	142	487	29.16%
1992	166	514	32.30%
1993	61	333	18.32%
1994	212	1748	12.13%
1995	1	654	0.15%
1996	1	851	0.12%
1997	3	1270	0.24%
1998	13	565	2.30%
1999		1061	
2000		1417	
2001	12	1224	0.98%
2002	2	387	0.52%
2003	10	821	1.22%
2004		1791	
2005		2029	
2006		1189	
2007		1010	
2008	11	957	1.15%
2009	7	1320	0.53%

Table 3. Number and percentage of tilefish misidentified as other species in the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009 listed by county.

State	County name	Number of misidentified samples	Total number of tilefish samples	Percentage of misidentified samples
AL	Baldwin		4560	
AL	Mobile		11	
FL			181	
FL	Bay		1307	
FL	Escambia	15	1345	1.12%
FL	Franklin	1	1282	0.08%
FL	Gulf		78	
FL	Hillsborough		1	
FL	Lee	11	75	14.67%
FL	Manatee	2	121	1.65%
FL	Monroe		611	
FL	Okaloosa	3	769	0.39%
FL	Pinellas	20	6233	0.32%
FL	Santa Rosa		370	
FL	Sarasota	1	33	3.03%
FL	Wakulla	11	124	8.87%
LA		48	48	100.00%
LA	Cameron	7	31	22.58%
LA	Jefferson	449	682	65.84%
LA	Lafourche	575	1854	31.01%
LA	Plaquemines		19	
LA	Terrebonne		20	
MS	Jackson		2	
TX	Cameron		800	
TX	Galveston		114	

Table 4. Number and percentage of other species samples misidentified as tilefish in the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009.

Species name	Number of other species samples misidentified as tilefish	Percentage of tilefish landings that were actually other species
BEARDED BROTLA	1	0.01%
BLACKBELLY ROSEFISH	1	0.01%
BLUELINE TILEFISH	36	0.18%
DOLPHIN	1	0.01%
GOLDFACE TILEFISH	16	0.08%
GREATER AMBERJACK	1	0.01%
SPINYCHEEK SCORPIONFISH	11	0.06%
WAHOO	1	0.01%
YELLOWEDGE GROUPE	32	0.16%
Total	100	0.51%

Table 5. Number and percentage of other species samples misidentified as tilefish in the Gulf of Mexico from 1984 to 2009 listed by year.

YEAR	Number of other species samples misidentified as tilefish	Total number of samples with landing recorded as tilefish	Percentage of tilefish landings that were actually other species
1984		199	
1986		2	
1987		20	
1988		81	
1989		84	
1990		155	
1991		345	
1992		348	
1993		272	
1994	1	1536	0.07%
1995		653	
1996		850	
1997	15	1267	1.18%
1998	12	552	2.17%
1999	3	1061	0.28%
2000	1	1417	0.07%
2001	4	1212	0.33%
2002		385	
2003	1	811	0.12%
2004		1791	
2005	1	2029	0.05%
2006	14	1189	1.18%
2007		1010	
2008	41	946	4.33%
2009	7	1313	0.53%