

Northwest Fisheries Science Center Report

September 2006

■ Pre-recruit Survey Workshop

- Co-organized by SW & NW Centers
- This Wednesday-Friday in Santa Cruz
- Examining comparability of 2 existing surveys and methods for including data from them in stock assessments

■ Economic Data Collection

- Remarkable 77% response rate to cost-earnings survey from the Oregon trawl fleet
- Survey begins in Washington this week

- **Canary Catch in 2006 Trawl Survey**
 - Roughly 6.5 mt through 1st leg of 2nd survey pass
 - Reports of another .7 mt this weekend that have not been QA/QC'd yet
- **August Workshop on Data & Modeling Issues held in Seattle**
 - Brought together over 40 scientists and data managers from throughout the west coast

**Discard in the 2002 and 2003
Groundfish Trawl Fisheries:
A Comparison of MRAG and NW
Fishery Science Center Analyses**

(Agenda Item C.1.a, Attachment 2)

Prepared by:

James Hastie, Jonathan Cusick,

Nancy Gove, Janell Majewski

of the NWFSC

Background

- Results of MRAG analysis presented at June Council meeting under public comment
- NWFSC undertook a comparison of methods and results this summer
- MRAG Lead author Jennie Harrington provided a description of methods and an example of calculations.

Coastwide Discard Estimates

	2002		2003	
	MRAG	NWFSC	MRAG	NWFSC
Whiting	4,695	1,841	5,118	1,255
Arrowtooth flounder	2,347	4,128	2,611	587
Petrale sole	592	185	692	105
Dover sole	1,469	1,210	1,620	1,102
Longspine thornyhead	365	380	407	321
Shortspine thornyhead	229	355	259	432
Unspecified thornyheads	271		312	
Sablefish	4,831	1,814	5,471	1,615
mortality		907		808

	2002		2003	
	MRAG Coast- wide	NWFSC Coast- wide	MRAG Coast- wide	NWFSC Coast- wide
Bocaccio ¹	104	27	92	2
Chilipepper ¹	189	141	97	2
Canary	221	36	254	14
Cowcod ¹	3	3	2	0
Widow	3	39	3	5
Yellowtail	508	396	490	4
Yelloweye	1	1	1	0
Darkblotched	120	94	132	39
POP	37	36	39	14
Splitnose ¹	188	21	210	7
Lingcod	619	269	706	139
mortality		135		70

Overall Discard Conclusions

	2002		2003	
	MRAG	NWFSC	MRAG	NWFSC
Sum of gross discard for the included spp.	16,791	10,975	18,515	5,644
Sum of discard mortality		9,933		4,767

Major Methodological Differences

- MRAG used discard data from 2002 to estimate 2003 discard
 - No ability to capture effects of RCAs
- Different data stratifications were used
 - MRAG approach had limited ability to pick up depth-based differences in discard rates

Major Methodological Differences

- Different approaches used to expand observed discard to the fleet
- MRAG uses 'target fishery' categories from Observer Program Initial Report in a manner inconsistent with how the categories were used in the report.
 - 44% of MRAG's sablefish discard estimate was attributed to the Non-Groundfish target fishery (where only 1.6 mt of discard observed)

Major Methodological Differences

- MRAG applied non-EFP discard data rates to EFP trips
 - EFPs required full *Sebastes* retention
- MRAG did not differentiate between discard and discard mortality
 - Based on peer-reviewed studies, the Council family assumes survival of sablefish and lingcod averages 50%