

## CONSIDERATION OF INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

The Council set optimum yield (OY) levels and various management measures for the 2006 groundfish management season with the understanding these management measures will likely need to be adjusted periodically through the year with the goal of attaining, but not exceeding, the OYs.

Proposed inseason adjustments for Washington and Oregon recreational fisheries are outlined in Agenda Item(s) F.5.c., WDFW Report and ODFW Report, respectively. Agenda Item F.5.c, CDFG Report describes the proposed methodology for projecting impacts in the California recreational groundfish fishery. This methodology was reviewed and approved by the Groundfish Management Team in February. Specific proposals for inseason adjustments to the 2006 California recreational groundfish fishery are anticipated to be forthcoming at the March Council meeting. There may also be some proposed adjustments to ongoing commercial fisheries for Council consideration at this meeting.

Under this agenda item, the Council is to consider advisory body advice and public comment on the status of ongoing fisheries and adopt inseason adjustments to ongoing groundfish fisheries as necessary.

### **Council Action:**

- 1. Consider information on the status of ongoing fisheries.**
- 2. Consider and adopt inseason adjustments as necessary.**

### **Reference Materials:**

1. Agenda Item F.5.c, WDFW Report: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Report on Consideration of Inseason Adjustments.
2. Agenda Item F.5.c, ODFW Report: Inseason Adjustments to the 2006 Oregon Recreational Groundfish Fishery.
3. Agenda Item F.5.c, CDFG Report: Draft California Department of Fish and Game Report on Inseason Management Proposals for the 2006 California Recreational Fishing Season.
4. Agenda Item F.5.e, Public Comment.

### **Agenda Order:**

- a. Agenda Item Overview
- b. Report of the Groundfish Management Team
- c. Agency Comments
- d. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies
- e. Public Comment
- f. **Council Action:** Adopt Recommendations for Adjustments to 2006 Fisheries

John DeVore  
Susan Ashcraft

WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
REPORT ON CONSIDERATION OF INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

For 2005 and 2006, the Washington recreational harvest target for yelloweye rockfish was 3.5 mt and, for canary rockfish, it was 1.7 mt. The Council adopted these targets to be implemented as recreational harvest guidelines, which are shared with Oregon.

In July, working with recreational catch data through the end of June, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) anticipated that the harvest target for canary rockfish would be exceeded. To address this projected overage, WDFW took inseason action to prohibit the retention of bottom fish seaward of a line approximating 30 fms off the majority of the coast (from Cape Flattery south to Leadbetter Pt.), beginning August 5, 2005. WDFW anticipated that this action would significantly reduce canary (and subsequently, yelloweye) rockfish impacts.

However, port sampling data from July through September indicates that catches were even higher than originally projected. As such, the final catch estimates for the Washington recreational fishery are 5.2 mt of yelloweye rockfish and 1.88 mt of canary rockfish, which exceed the harvest targets for these two species.

To help ensure that the Washington harvest targets for canary and yelloweye rockfish are not exceeded in 2006, WDFW recommends the following inseason actions be taken:

Neah Bay and La Push (Marine Areas 3 and 4)

- Prohibit retention of rockfish and lingcod deeper than a line approximating 20 fms from May 22, 2006, through September 30, 2006 on days that halibut fishing is closed (i.e., except June 22 and 24, and all other days halibut fishing is open).

Westport (Marine Area 2)

- Prohibit retention of rockfish and lingcod deeper than a line approximating 30 fms from March 18, 2006, through June 15, 2006.

It is anticipated, based on the data from 2005, that these measures will result in catches that achieve, but not exceed, the Washington recreational harvest targets. WDFW will monitor the catches inseason, consult with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife on the attainment of the shared harvest guideline, and will recommend further inseason action, as appropriate.

PFMC  
02/16/06

## INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 2006 OREGON RECREATIONAL GROUNDFISH FISHERY

At its November 2005 meeting, the Council approved inseason adjustments to the 2006 Oregon recreational groundfish fishery, reverting the regulations to those set in the pre-season process. In December 2005, the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission (OFWC) refined management measures for the 2006 Oregon recreational groundfish fishery, based on the angler effort patterns observed in 2005. There was a significant increase in angler effort targeting groundfish in 2005, due primarily to the poor salmon season in the waters off Oregon. In order to remain within the 2006 Oregon harvest guideline for black rockfish and provide a twelve-month fishing season, the OFWC adopted a marine fish bag limit of 6 fish in aggregate. All other management measures (i.e. length restrictions for lingcod, cabezon, and kelp greenling, >40 fms closure during June-September) remain status quo.

Currently, a discard mortality rate of 100% is applied to all rockfish (except canary rockfish) released in the Oregon recreational groundfish fishery. In an effort to provide the best data available, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) has developed a series of discard mortality rate calculations to be applied to the estimated amount of fish reported released in this fishery. Using several years of data collected by Oregon's recreational at-sea observer program, the fishery was profiled over depth, to determine the proportion of fish discarded at each depth increment. This data was combined with the mortality rates (by depth stratum) calculated by the Groundfish Management Team using both mortality studies by Albin and Karpov, and Tom Barnes (CDFG), and logbook data collected in the Oregon commercial nearshore fishery. The ODFW will be providing a detailed report of the development of these discard mortality calculation to the GMT and the Council at the March Council meeting with the goal of implementing these discard mortality calculations in the 2006 Oregon recreational groundfish fishery.

PFMC  
02/16/06

## DRAFT CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME REPORT ON INSEASON MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE 2006 CALIFORNIA RECREATIONAL FISHING SEASON

### BACKGROUND AND PROPOSED ACTION

The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (Council) approved inseason changes to California's recreational 2005 season and depth structure at its March 2005 meeting. The Council, in adopting these changes, took into account a number of factors including: 1) the 2004 annual California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS) estimates of recreational take which showed that harvest of overfished species was below their respective California recreational harvest targets in 2004; and 2) the improved ability for real-time inseason catch monitoring through the new CRFS program. The March 2005 inseason changes provided more recreational fishing opportunity while keeping projected impacts (derived from California's recreational catch model) within recreational harvest guidelines or allocations for overfished and constraining species.

In early February 2006, complete CRFS estimates of recreational take for 2005 (through December) became available. These estimates indicated that even under the modified management structure (with increased fishing opportunities), the California recreational harvest guidelines or allocations for overfished species were not exceeded and, in some cases, catch was well below the projected impacts. These results suggest that the current 2006 management structure could be further modified to allow for additional fishing opportunities while still remaining within recreational harvest targets for overfished and constraining species. The California Department of Fish and Game is exploring what specific options would be appropriate for inseason consideration, and intends to provide these options at the March PFMC meeting for discussion. The modeling approach for projecting impacts is described below. This approach has already been reviewed and approved by the Groundfish Management Team for use in crafting 2007-2008 recreational fishery management options.

### PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR PROJECTING IMPACTS

Impacts from the proposed changes to the current 2006 management structure will be evaluated using an updated version of California's recreational catch projection model using 2004 and 2005 data to project future fishing behavior.

#### **I. Background**

The recreational catch model incorporates a number of parameters and assumptions, all of which are either risk-neutral or risk-adverse. The basic analytical approach is the same as that used for the 2005-06 model projections. Because the estimates from the CRFS program and the original Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey program have not been calibrated, only the 2004 and 2005 annual catch estimates obtained from the new CRFS program serve as the baseline

catches. The model uses a 0.67 decay function (which translates into a weighting of 60% for 2005 and 40% for 2004). Reasons for weighting the 2005 estimates more heavily than the 2004 estimates include: the recognition that constraints placed on salmon fishing in 2005 will likely persist over the next several years; and the acknowledgement that the expanded distribution and greater abundance of blue rockfish (as well as other groundfish species) due to cooler oceanographic conditions will also likely persist into 2007 and 2008. Model output predicts expected catch under any combination of season and depth fishing restrictions by region. Reasons for using 2004 data include: the recognition that oceanographic conditions in 2005 were unusual while conditions in 2004 are more in line with what might be expected in 2007-2008 under a colder water regime; and the expectation that the bulk of blue rockfish take (and potentially brown and olive rockfish take) will occur within deeper nearshore waters as was observed in 2004 rather than in the shallow nearshore waters as in 2005.

#### Management Region Definitions:

North Region:	North of 40°10' N lat to CA/OR border
North-Central Region:	South of 40°10' N lat to 37°11' N lat (Pigeon Pt.)
South-Central Monterey Region:	South of 37°11' N lat (Pigeon Pt.) to 36° N lat (Lopez Pt.)
South-Central Morro Bay Region:	South of 36° N lat (Lopez Pt.) to 34°27' N lat (Pt. Conception)
South Region:	South of 34°27' N lat (Pt. Conception) to CA/Mexico Border

## **II. CDFG/California Recreational Groundfish Model Assumptions**

- Effort Shift Inshore: The model includes a 27.6% increase in expected landings when fishing is restricted to less than 30 fm and a 39.3% increase in expected landings when fishing is restricted to less than 20 fm. The increase, or effort shift, is to account for increased effort in a smaller fishing area.
- Discard Mortality:
  - 1) Canary, cowcod, and yelloweye rockfish are non-retention species. Therefore, expected mortality estimates for these species also include B2 fish (fish reported to be released live) with hooking mortality rates as follows:
  - 2) CA scorpionfish hooking mortality rate is assumed to be 5%. This rate is applied to expected landings of CA scorpionfish when fishing is allowed for species which associate with CA scorpionfish, but fishing for CA scorpionfish is not allowed.

## **III. Inputs and Key Parameters for the Model**

- Base Year Catch: Initially, CRFS catch estimates in WEIGHT of fish were summed for caught and retained (CRFS “A” catch), filleted/caught and released dead (CRFS “B1” catch), and for species of concern, a proportion of CRFS “B2” catch (released alive) derived using depth-based mortality estimates. Base year catch estimates are assumed to be for an unrestricted fishing year with no months closed and no depths closed. Therefore, for 2004 and 2005, a back calculation method was used to add a catch estimate for what the catch would have been if all months and all depths had been open.

This back calculation uses percent catch by month and depth derived from historical catch estimates.

- Historical Catch By Month: Estimates of historical percent catch by two-month period were calculated for each region based on RecFIN Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) data (weight of A+B1) from 1993-1999, which was a time period when seasons and depths were unconstrained. Proxies were considered on a species by species basis for regions where there was a lack of catch data for that area. Monthly estimates of percent catch then were divided equally (50:50) for each pair of months.
- Historical Catch By Depth: Estimates of percent catch by depth were calculated for each region based on RecFIN MRFSS depth sample data (numbers caught A+B1 for CPFV and A+B1+B2 for PR) from 1999-2000, which was a time period when depths were unconstrained. Proxies were considered on a species by species basis for regions where there was a lack of catch data for that area.

**Subject:** Catch for blackcod

**From:** "michael salerno" <blackcod@cuisp.com>

**Date:** Fri, 13 Jan 2006 19:32:36 -0800 (Pacific Standard Time)

**To:** <pfmc.comments@noaa.gov>

**CC:** "bob kraig" <bkraig@myhome.net>, "chuck smith" <csmith1@surfbest.net>, "don warner" <dwarner@localaccess.com>, "tiny" <tycos@centurytel.net>, <Salmon\_Cod\_Man@hotmail.com>

Dear Sir:

I am writing you to look into the catch Limit of the Black cod, To increase the daily limit from 300Lbs. up to 400Lbs. and instead of 12 trips ,it would be 9 ,during May- June , July- August because it would help out the small fisherman . I fish with fishing poles & Jigger , out of a 21 ft. boat for blackcod. There is 4 other boats that do the same out of La-push as I do and we feel that if you could help us out that would save us lots of money on fuel as you know the fuel prices are so High and the weather has not been good for us small boats ether.

You could increase the limit like you did the end of 2005 but it did no good because the water was so bad to even the big boat could not get out ether. You try to help but the weather does no want to cooperate ether. It seams that if you could have a readjustment too the quota during the season that you, Know that the weather is bad and help out the same fisherman this would be greatly helpful to.

Could you please check into this and help us out ?In the state of Washing they have taken all the fishing away from us that was near shore and for the reason that sound that they just don't know what they are doing. It has not heart Oregon or California for near shore fishing!!

Thank you

Michael Salerno