

GROUNDFISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

Action Item

Big Skate Trip Limits for the Shorebased Individual Fishing Quota Fishery in 2016

In April 2015, the GMT brought to the Council’s attention new information that suggested that big skate was being targeted in the shorebased individual fishing quota (IFQ) fishery ([Agenda Item E.8.a, GMT Report 2, April 2015](#)). Trip limits and a sorting requirement for big skate were put into place for the shorebased IFQ fishery starting on June 1, 2015, with a subsequent increase in limits at the September Council meeting. Trip limits that would be in place for 2016 are as follows: unlimited from January 1- May 31, 15,000 lbs per month for June, and 35,000 lbs per month bimonthly for the remainder of the year (periods 4 through 6).

As in 2015, there is no harvest specification in regulations for big skate for 2016, as it was designated an Ecosystem Component (EC) species for the 2015-2016 biennial harvest specifications process. However, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) had initially endorsed an overfishing limit (OFL) of 540.8 mt for 2015 and 2016 before this decision. Based on the current 2017-2018 Harvest Specifications documents ([Agenda Item I.4.a, Supplemental REVISED Attachment 2](#)), the default harvest control rule would be a P* of 0.45, which results in an acceptable biological catch (ABC) of 493.9. The Council chose to monitor landings in 2015 compared to the unadopted OFL, and the GMT presents projected landings compared to the 2016 unadopted OFL (and accompanying ABC), that was recommended by the SSC (see Methodologies for more details).

The GMT first examined current 2015 landings compared to historical landings. Table 1 shows the trawl and non-trawl landings and discard from 2010-2015 (to date; excludes Tribal catch).

Table 1: Trawl and non-trawl landings and discard from 2010-2015 (excludes Tribal catch).

Year	Trawl				Non Trawl			
	Landings	Discard Mortality	Total	Percent	Landings	Discard Mortality	Total	Percent
2010	170.06	28.80	198.86	94.56	10.04	1.40	11.44	5.44
2011	236.12	53.20	289.32	96.79	6.90	2.70	9.60	3.21
2012	227.66	51.20	278.86	96.49	3.43	6.70	10.13	3.51
2013	123.59	51.60	175.19	93.61	6.86	5.10	11.96	6.39
2014	352.17	79.60	431.77	97.83	6.30	3.30	9.60	2.17
2015	102.51	79.60	182.11	96.96	2.41	3.30	5.71	3.04

These results suggest that this fishery can be very opportunistic, and trip limits in 2015 did decrease effort, as industry shifted to other fisheries. Therefore, the GMT considered trip limits that would keep the fishery under the unadopted OFL and ABC, both under average fishing behavior (November 2013- October 2015) and the higher effort levels seen in 2014. Furthermore, the GMT notes that with big skate now being sorted and with landings being recorded on e-tickets in the

shoreside IFQ fishery, inseason monitoring will occur through 2016 and can recommend action next year as needed.

In order to project the impacts under various trip limits, the GMT looked at the distribution of vessel landings per period from October 2013- November 2015. Table 2 shows the number of unique vessels and the average, median (50th), 90th, and 95th percentiles of landings that occurred in each period.

Table 2: Number of average unique vessels, and average, median, 90th, and 95th percentiles of landings by period from November 2013-October 2015.

Period	Number of vessels	Vessel Landings Per Period (lbs)			
		Average	Median	90th	95th
1	19	18.50	63.21	1,167.90	4,942.43
2	26	26.00	83.30	2,015.58	6,431.25
3	26	25.50	721.78	13,324.67	16,808.27
4	31	30.50	78.78	12,900.46	25,716.28
5	28	28.00	120.26	3,707.04	7,790.45
6	11	10.67	63.70	437.08	2,818.87

The GMT used the 95th quantile per period as the breakpoint to determine which vessels would be primarily affected by the trip limit. In other words, if a vessel on average exceeded the breakpoint, it was considered a “targeting” vessel and assumed to take the entire trip limit. If below, the vessel was assumed to take their average amount in that period. To account for potential discard, if a vessel on average exceeded the trip limit, then a discard rate of 50 percent was applied to the difference between the vessel’s landings and the trip limit that they were assumed to take.

Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5 show the trip limit alternatives and projected landings assuming average landings and 2014 landings, respectively.

Table 3: Trip Limit Alternatives.

Alternative	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6
A	5,000	25,000	30,000	30,000	10,000	5,000
B	5,000	25,000	30,000	35,000	10,000	5,000

Table 4: Projected Landings Assuming Average Fishing Effort.

Alternative	IFQ Landings	Total Mortality	Over ABC?	Over OFL?
Status Quo (Average)	284.52	425.31	No	No
Alt A	306.50	447.29	No	No
Alt B	308.77	449.56	No	No

Table 5: Projected Landings Assuming 2014 Fishing Behavior.

Alternative	IFQ Landings	Total Mortality	Over ABC?	Over OFL?
2014 landings	352.32	493.11	No	No
Alt A	339.76	480.55	No	No
Alt B	345.16	485.96	No	No

Alternative B allows for the most fishing opportunity while keeping catch projections under the ABC; **the GMT recommends Alternative B and will continue to monitor landings inseason.**

Informational Items

Sablefish Trip Limits 2015

At the September Council meeting, the Council chose to close the Limited Entry Fixed Gear (LEFG) Daily Trip Limit (DTL) and Open Access (OA) fisheries north of 36° N. latitude (LE N and OA N, respectively) starting November 1, 2015 and through the remainder of the year. Table 6 below shows the projected attainment of all four DTL fisheries under current 2015 regulations. The Quota Species Monitoring (QSM) Best Estimate Report (BER) was queried on November 13, 2015. Hard data is 90 percent complete through September in Washington, October in Oregon, and June in California.

Table 6: No Action Projected Impacts for 2015 DTL Fisheries.

	LE N	OA N	LE S	OA S	South Total
Projected landings	225.4	479.7	458.7	52.4	511.1
Landing target	236.0	388	531.0	432	963.0
Difference	10.6	-91.7	72.3	379.6	451.9
Percent attainment	95.5%	123.6%	86.4%	12.1%	53.1%

Note that with the LE S, price may influence landings in Period 6. Landings could range from 381.5 mt to 686.7 mt. However, the projection made above uses 2015 average prices for Periods 1-5, and the average price assumption (2012-2014) for Period 6 (2015 data is incomplete for this period). 2015 prices have tracked very closely to this 2012-2014 average and therefore the LE S projection in Table 6 is considered most probable.

Since both LE N and OA N are closed for the remainder of the 2015, and neither sectors south of 36° N. latitude are predicted to attain their respective shares, or their cumulative south of 36° N. latitude allocation, **the GMT is not recommending any changes to trip limits for the remainder of 2015.** Furthermore, the ACL for sablefish north of 36° N. latitude is not expected to be exceeded, as projections from September ([Agenda Item H.9.a, Supplemental GMT Report](#)) with updates for the LE N, OA N, and LE primary fishery are 95.9 percent of the ACL.

Sablefish Trip Limits 2016

In the 2015-2016 Biennial Harvest Specifications and Management Measures process, sablefish trip limits were set for all four DTL sectors. Because of the nearly 500 mt increase in the ACL for sablefish north of 36° N. latitude from 2015 to 2016, year-specific trip limits were established in Federal regulation, and are set slightly higher for both LE N and OA N in 2016. Table 7 below shows the trip limits that are currently scheduled to be in place starting January 1, 2016 (No Action):

Table 7: Trip limits currently scheduled to be in place on January 1, 2016 (No Action).

	Daily	Weekly	Bimonthly
LE N	-	1,275	3,375
OA N	300	1,000	2,000
LE S	-	2,000	-
OA S	300	1,600	3,200

In 2015, LE N and OA N saw above-average landings due to a combination of factors: higher prices in Oregon and Washington, reduced opportunities for fishing in other fisheries (i.e., salmon), good weather conditions, etc. Because similar conditions could persist in 2016, the GMT made adjustments to the model to account for similar behavior and provides updated projected impacts under the 2016 trip limits that are currently in regulation.

Table 8: Projected landings under No Action, by price assumption for Limited Entry Fixed Gear North and South of 36° N. latitude.

No Action	LE N, by price assumption			OA N	LE S, by price assumption			OA S	South Sum, by price		
	Low	Mid	High		Low	Mid	High		Low	Mid	High
Projected landings	209.7	220.2	284.5	308.7	427.8	482.7	570.2	59.1	486.9	541.8	629.3
Landing target	258.0	258.0	258.0	425	581.0	581.0	581.0	472	1053.0	1053.0	1053.0
Difference	48.3	37.8	-26.5	116.3	153.2	98.3	10.8	412.9	566.1	511.2	423.7
Percent attainment	81.3%	85.3%	110.3%	72.6%	73.6%	83.1%	98.1%	12.5%	46.2%	51.5%	59.8%

At this time, the **GMT does not recommend any trip limit adjustments to the 2016 DTL fisheries.** Furthermore, with the combination of factors that occurred during this year which resulted in closures for both DTL fisheries N of 36° N. latitude on November 1, 2015, the **GMT recommends that the Council consider being conservative in any considerations of trip limit adjustments until at least the June Council meeting due to the limited hard data completeness and that a majority of fishing does not occur until Period 3.**

Canary Rockfish Projected Impacts

On November 11, 2015, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) received updated estimates of canary rockfish impacts (landings plus discard mortality) through September for the Oregon recreational fishery. Estimates indicated that canary rockfish impacts were higher than expected (12.8 mt through September) and had exceeded the Oregon recreational harvest guideline (HG; 11.7 mt). ODFW staff indicated to the GMT that this was driven primarily by an almost 25 percent increase in effort compared to recent years.

In [Agenda Item B.1.a. Supplemental CDFW Report](#), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) outlined an issue regarding data availability for the California recreational fishery. July through September data became available on November 10 but did not include depth-dependent mortality rates. Once these data were applied, canary rockfish impacts were higher than expected (24.8 mt) and had exceeded the California recreational HG (24.3 mt).

Based on these updates, removals of canary rockfish are now expected to be close to, or exceed, the 2015 non-trawl allocation but not the overall fishery HG of 106.8 mt or the ACL of 122 mt. Table 9 presents the GMT scorecard for canary rockfish as updated through November with projections as well as landings-to-date where possible. As can be seen in *Table 9*, non-trawl removals (i.e., recreational and non-IFQ fixed gear fisheries) are within 1.2 mt of the 49.9 mt non-trawl allocation through September for the recreational fisheries. In addition, the research sector exceeded their set-aside by 0.2 mt, based on data through November 2015.

While the Council and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) may consider taking inseason action to limit overages in the non-trawl fisheries, the GMT notes that the fishery HG is not expected to be exceeded because the trawl fisheries are anticipated to have a residual of 39.7 mt. Accounting for the 2.7 mt overage in the research sector, there would be 37 mt remaining on the ACL (assuming Tribal fisheries obtain their entire set-aside) as seen in the “projected landings” column. Additionally, total mortality is expected to be well below the ABC and OFL. Given that there are approximately six weeks left in calendar year 2015, if the Council and NMFS were to take immediate inseason action, projected savings of canary rockfish would likely be less than 2 mt from all sectors combined. Further, canary rockfish was declared rebuilt in June 2015, and while there currently is no “green light” policy which would allow a higher ACL until 2017, the GMT does not believe there is a conservation concern if the fishery HG or even the ACL were to be exceeded by the amounts currently projected, especially considering the buffers between the ACL and the ABC/OFL.

Table 9: Canary rockfish allocations, projected impacts, and landings-to-date.

	Allocation	November 2015 Scorecard	Landings-to-date
Off the Top Deductions	15.2	15.4	17.9
• EFPa/	1	1	1
• Research b/	4.5	4.7	7.2
• Incidental OA c/	2	2	2
• Tribal d/	7.7	7.7	7.7
Trawl	56.9	56.9	17.13
• SB Trawl e/	43.26	43.3	16.94
• At-Sea Trawl	13.7	13.7	0.19
o MS	5.7	5.7	0.14
o CP	8	8	0.05
Non-Trawl	49.9	55.2	48.1
• Non-Nearshore f/	3.8	1.1	1.1
• Directed OA: Nearshore f/	6.7	7.8	7.8
• Recreational Groundfish			
o WA	3.4	2	1.6
o OR	11.7	14.8	12.8
o CA	24.3	29.5	24.8
TOTAL	122	127.5	83.1
2015 Harvest Specification	122	122	122
Difference	0.0	-5.5	38.9
Percent of ACL	100%	104%	68%

a/ EFPs are amounts deducted from the ACL to accommodate anticipated applications. Values in this table represent the estimates from the 15-16 biennial cycle, which are currently specified in regulation.

b/ Includes NMFS trawl shelf-slope surveys, the IPHC halibut survey, and expected impacts from SRPs and LOAs.

c/ The GMT's best estimate of impacts as analyzed in the 2015-2016 Environmental Impact Statement (Appendix B), which is currently specified in regulation.

d/ Tribal values in the allocation column represent the the values in regulation. Projected impacts are the tribes best estimate of catch.

e/ Includes average shorebased observed discard

f/ Since canary is prohibited from being retained, these values are same as projected from the nearshore and non-nearshore models.

At-Sea Darkblotched Rockfish Landings

Due to darkblotched rockfish concerns in the at-sea whiting sectors, the NMFS transferred 7 mt of residual darkblotched from the pink shrimp fishery (within the incidental open access set-aside) to the at-sea whiting sectors, with 3.5 mt each to mothership and catcher processor sectors ([Agenda Item I.8.a, Supplemental NMFS Letter](#)). This inseason reallocation, paired with current low activity in the both sectors, may have alleviated bycatch concerns with darkblotched rockfish (Table 10).

Table 10: Remaining allocations of whiting and darkblotched rockfish for the at-sea whiting sectors.

Sector	Whiting			Darkblotched rockfish		
	mt taken	mt allocation	% taken	mt taken	<i>mt adjusted allocation</i>	% taken
Mothership	27,685	71,204	39%	2.4	10.0	24%
Catcher-Proc.	66,423	100,873	66%	5.6	12.7	44%
<i>Adjusted allocation includes inseason transfer of 3.5 mt to each sector (originally 6.5 mt for MS, 9.2 mt for C-P)</i>						

Minor Nearshore Rockfish N 40° 10'

During the 2015-2016 Biennial Harvest Specification cycle, the states adopted more restrictive regulations to stay within newly adopted non-regulatory target thresholds (i.e., HG for California and a sharing agreement between Oregon and Washington). These actions have been successful for limiting total mortality of northern minor nearshore rockfish, as only 66 percent of the ACL has been taken and all states are within their non-regulatory target thresholds (Table 11).

Table 11: Removals of minor nearshore rockfish complex N of 40° 10' N. lat. by fishery relative to non-regulatory target thresholds.

Fishery	MT	Limit	% taken	Limit type	Through	Comment
WA sport	4.6	8.9	51.7%	WA/OR federal share	Sep-31	Excludes Puget Sound
OR sport	24.8	36.4	82.7%	WA/OR federal share	Sep-31	
OR Com. Nearshore	5.3			WA/OR federal share	17-Oct	Includes nominal
CA sport	8.7	23.7	46.4%	HG	Sep-31	RecFIN "Redwood" district
CA Com. Nearshore	2.3				30-Jun	PFMC 1C, includes nominal
Total	45.7	69	66.2%	ACL		
<i>Washington/Oregon have not reached consultation trigger of 75% SQ harvests</i>						

Nearshore Overfished Species (OFS) Bycatch Model

Starting in 2015, the nearshore OFS bycatch model differs from previous versions in that selected species have been separated out from the larger groupings they previously were included in and have been assigned their own parameter values. These values (e.g., discard mortality rates) are intended to provide a more robust estimate of the OFS estimates. Modelers now input commercial nearshore landings data separately for these species as their own line-items within the model structure. Identified species include: China, copper, quillback, and blue rockfish, California scorpionfish, and unidentified greenlings. Blue rockfish in California is now separated north of 40° 10' N. lat., between 40° 10' and 34° 27', and south of 34° 27' N. lat.

The GMT notes, however, that this new model methodology appears to demonstrate a high level of sensitivity, particularly for California scorpionfish. Small changes in the estimated landing amounts of California scorpionfish inserted into the model result in marked differences in the canary rockfish estimated mortality - much more than what would be expected. As such, the canary values in the 2015 and 2016 scorecard, which are projected using the nearshore model, may be higher than actual. The GMT notes, however that the California scorpionfish landings are a very small part of the landing inputs. The GMT will work with the WCGOP staff to investigate this apparent anomaly.

California Scorpionfish

At the November 2014 meeting, the Council was notified that the CDFW took action to close both the commercial and recreational fisheries for California scorpionfish ([Agenda Item J.8.b, Supplemental CDFW Report, November 2015](#)). The 2014 OFL was exceeded and as a result, the 2015 recreational season was closed from September through December (the fishery had been year-round). Preliminary recreational data indicates that the closure was effective in keeping mortality within allowable limits. In 2016, the recreational season for California scorpionfish will remain closed from September through December, which is expected to keep mortality within allowable limits.

Selected Species Scorecard

At the June 2012 meeting, the Council requested that the GMT provide landings information by sector for aurora, rougheye, shortraker, China, copper, and quillback rockfishes under the inseason agenda item (see [Council meeting minutes](#)). Rougheye and blackspotted rockfish were reported together starting in 2015. Per the Council request, the GMT prepared a landings report (Attachment 1) of these selected species. The query date for these tables was November 13, 2015. Commercial data is 90 percent complete through September in Washington, October in Oregon, and June in California. Recreational data is complete through September and NORPAC through November 12.

Overfished Species Scorecard

The 2015 overfished species scorecard (Attachment 2) has been updated to reflect changes in projected impacts for all three state recreational fisheries. The projected impacts to canary rockfish for the Oregon and California recreational sectors have been updated to reflect total end of the year projections. Additionally, the GMT received an update on canary rockfish from the NMFS trawl survey. In June, the survey had encountered more than anticipated canary rockfish on their first pass; therefore, the GMT recommended and the Council approved putting the recent high of 7.2 mt in the scorecard as a placeholder. The NMFS trawl survey has completed its second pass and preliminary estimates of total canary rockfish catch are 4.7 mt, which has been updated in the scorecard. Additionally, based on the NMFS action in September, 7.0 mt of darkblotched was removed from the incidental open access allocations and redistributed 3.5 mt to each of the at-sea sectors.

An overfished species scorecard for the beginning of 2016 is also attached (Attachment 3). The allocations are what were specified in the 2015-2016 biennial Harvest Specifications and Management Measures Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Projected impacts are based on the most up-to-date information and are the GMT's best estimates at this time; they therefore may differ from what was in the FEIS.

Recommendations

- 1. The GMT recommends Alternative B for big skate trip limits for 2016.**
- 2. The GMT recommends No Action for sablefish DTL trip limits for 2015 and 2016.**
- 3. The GMT recommends that the Council consider being conservative in any considerations of trip limit adjustments until at least the June Council meeting.**

Attachment 1. Selected species scorecard.

Species	North/South of 40° 10' N lat.	Inseason Retained (mt)	Discard (mt)	Sum Catch (mt)	Component OFL (mt)	% OFL North/ South Areas	% OFL Areas Combined
Aurora Rockfish	North	11.32	4.24	15.56	17.40	89.41	22.16
	South	1.51	3.26	4.77	74.30	6.42	22.16
China Rockfish	North	5.17	0.57	5.74	7.20	79.79	28.80
	South	10.20	2.02	12.22	55.20	22.15	28.80
Copper Rockfish	North	2.85	0.65	3.50	10.60	32.98	35.95
	South	103.51	5.06	108.57	301.10	36.06	35.95
Quillback Rockfish	North	3.94	0.58	4.52	7.40	61.05	67.82
	South	4.14	0.02	4.16	5.40	77.11	67.82
Shortraker Rockfish	North	11.63	2.67	14.29	18.70	76.43	76.43
Nominal Roughey + Blackspotted Rockfish	North	89.63	26.14	115.76	201.90	57.34	56.42
	South	0.35	0.10	0.46	4.10	11.17	56.42

Attachment 2. Scorecard for 2015. Allocations^a and projected mortality impacts (mt) of overfished groundfish species for 2015.

Fishery	Bocaccio b/		Canary		Cowcod b/		Dkbl		Petrale		POP		Yelloweye	
	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/ g/	Projected Impacts g/	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts
Date : 17 Nov 2015														
Off the Top Deductions	8.3	8.3	15.2	15.4	2.0	2.0	13.8	19.1	236.6	236.6	15.0	15.0	5.8	4.2
EFPC/	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.02	0.02	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Research d/	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.7	2.0	2.0	2.1	7.4	14.2	14.2	5.2	5.2	3.3	1.7
Incidental OA e/	0.7	0.7	2.0	2.0	--	--	11.4	11.4	2.4	2.4	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.2
Tribal f/			7.7	7.7			0.2	0.2	220.0	220.0	9.2	9.2	2.3	2.3
Bottom Trawl			0.8	0.8			0.2	0.2	45.4	70.0	3.7	3.7		0.0
Troll			0.5	0.5			0.0							0.0
Fixed gear			0.3	0.3			0.0						2.3	2.3
mid-water			3.6	3.6			0.0							0.0
whiting			4.3	4.9				0.3			7.2	11.1		
Trawl Allocations	81.9	81.9	56.9	56.9	1.4	1.4	301.3	301.3	2,544.4	2,544.4	135.9	135.9	1.0	1.0
-SB Trawl	81.9	81.9	43.3	43.3	1.4	1.4	285.6	285.6	2,539.4	2,539.4	118.5	118.5	1.0	1.0
-At-Sea Trawl			13.7	13.7			22.7	22.7	5.0	5.0	17.4	17.4	0.0	--
a) At-sea whiting MS			5.7	5.7			10.0	10.0			7.2	7.2		
b) At-sea whiting CP			8.0	8.0			12.7	12.7			10.2	10.2		
Non-Trawl Allocation	258.8	117.7	49.9	55.2	2.6	1.2	15.9	5.7	35.0		7.2	0.3	11.2	11.1
Non-Nearshore	79.1		3.8					5.5				0.3	0.6	0.6
LE FG				0.9						0.3				
OA FG				0.2						0.1		0.0		
Directed OA: Nearshore	1.0	0.5	6.7	7.8				0.2		0.0			1.7	1.8
Recreational Groundfish														
WA			3.4	2.0				--		--		--	2.9	2.8
OR			11.7	14.8				--		--		--	2.6	3.0
CA	178.8	117.2	24.3	29.5		1.2		--		--		--	3.4	2.9
TOTAL	349.0	207.9	122.0	127.4	4.0	2.6	331.0	326.1	2,816.0	2,781.0	158.1	151.2	18.0	16.3
2015 Harvest Specification	349	349	122	122	4.0	4.0	338	338	2,816	2,816	158	158	18	18
Difference	0.0	141.09	0.0	-5.4	0.0	1.4	7.0	11.9	0.0	35.0	-0.1	6.8	0.0	1.7
Percent of ACL	100.0%	59.6%	100.0%	104.5%	100.0%	65.0%	97.9%	96.5%	100.0%	98.8%	100.1%	95.7%	100.0%	90.7%
Key			= not applicable											
		--	= trace, less than 0.1mt											
			= Fixed Values											
			= off the top deductions											

a/ Formal allocations are represented in the black shaded cells and are specified in regulation in Tables 1b and 1e. The other values in the allocation columns are 1) off the top deductions, 2) set asides from the trawl allocation (at-sea petrale only) 3) ad-hoc allocations recommended in the 2013-14 EIS process, 4) HG for the recreational fisheries for canary and YE.

b/ South of 40°10' N. lat.

c/ EFPs are amounts deducted from the ACL to accommodate anticipated applications. Values in this table represent the estimates from the 15-16 biennial cycle, which are currently specified in regulation.

d/ Includes NMFS trawl shelf-slope surveys, the IPHC halibut survey, and expected impacts from SRPs and LOAs.

e/ The GMT's best estimate of impacts as analyzed in the 2015-2016 Environmental Impact Statement (Appendix B), which are currently specified in regulation.

f/ Tribal values in the allocation column represent the values in regulation. Projected impacts are the tribes best estimate of catch.

g/ the cowcod harvest specification is a 4.0 mt Annual Catch Target (ACT). The off the top deductions are subtracted from the 10 mt ACL

Attachment 3. Allocations^a and projected mortality impacts (mt) of overfished groundfish species for 2016.

Fishery	Bocaccio b/		Canary		Cow cod b/		Dkbl		Petrale		POP		Yelloweye	
	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts
Date: 17 Nov 2015														
Off the Top Deductions	8.3	8.3	15.2	15.2	2.0	2.0	20.8	20.8	236.6	236.6	15.0	15.0	5.8	5.8
EFPC/	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Research d/	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	14.2	14.2	5.2	5.2	3.3	3.3
Incidental OA e/	0.7	0.7	2.0	2.0	--	--	18.4	18.4	2.4	2.4	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.2
Tribal f/			7.7	7.7			0.2	0.2	220.0	220.0	9.2	9.2	2.3	2.3
Bottom Trawl			0.8	0.8			0.2	0.2	45.4	70.0	3.7	3.7		0.0
Troll			0.5	0.5			0.0							0.0
Fixed gear			0.3	0.3			0.0						2.3	2.3
mid-water			3.6	3.6			0.0							0.0
whiting			4.3	4.9				0.3			7.2	11.1		
Trawl Allocations	85.0	81.9	58.5	58.5	1.4	1.4	308.9	308.9	2,638.4	2,638.4	141.6	141.6	1.1	1.1
-SB Trawl	85.0	81.9	44.5	44.5	1.4	1.4	292.8	292.8	2,633.4	2,633.4	124.2	124.2	1.1	1.1
-At-Sea Trawl			14.0	14.0			16.1	16.1	5.0	5.0	17.4	17.4	0.0	0.0
a) At-sea whiting MS			5.8	5.8			6.7	6.7			7.2	7.2		
b) At-sea whiting CP			8.2	8.2			9.4	9.4			10.2	10.2		
Non-Trawl Allocation	268.7	186.0	51.3	48.0	2.6	1.2	16.3	6.3	35.0		7.5	0.5	12.1	11.8
Non-Nearshore	82.1		3.9					6.1				0.4	0.6	0.7
LEFG				1.0						0.4				
OA FG				0.2								0.1		
Directed OA: Nearshore	1.0	0.4	6.9	7.8				0.2		0.0			1.9	1.8
Recreational Groundfish														
WA			3.5	2.0				--		--		--	3.1	2.8
OR			12.0	12.0				--		--		--	2.8	2.8
CA	185.6	185.6	25.0	25.0		1.2		--		--		--	3.7	3.7
TOTAL	362.0	276.2	125.0	121.7	6.0	4.6	346.0	336.0	2,910.0	2,875.0	164.1	157.1	19.0	18.7
2016 Harvest Specification	362	362	125	125	6.0	6.0	346	346	2,910	2,910	164	158	19	19
Difference	0.0	85.8	0.0	3.3	0.0	1.4	0.0	10.0	0.0	35.0	-0.1	0.9	0.0	0.3
Percent of ACL	100.0%	76.3%	100.0%	97.4%	100.0%	76.7%	100.0%	97.1%	100.0%	98.8%	100.1%	99.4%	100.0%	98.5%
Key			= not applicable											
		--	= trace, less than 0.1mt											
			= Fixed Values											
			= off the top deductions											

a/ Formal allocations are represented in the black shaded cells and are specified in regulation in Tables 1b and 1c. The other values in the allocation columns are 1) off the top deductions, 2) set asides from the trawl allocation (at-sea petrale only) 3) ad-hoc allocations recommended in the 2013-14 EIS process, 4) HG for the recreational fisheries for canary and YE.

b/ South of 40°10' N. lat.

c/ EFPs are amounts set aside to accommodate anticipated applications. Values in this table represent the estimates from the 13-14 biennial cycle, which are currently specified in regulation.

d/ Includes NMFS trawl shelf-slope surveys, the IPHC halibut survey, and expected impacts from SRPs and LOAs.

e/ The GMT's best estimate of impacts as analyzed in the 2015-2016 Environmental Impact Statement (Appendix B), which are currently specified in regulation.

f/ Tribal values in the allocation column represent the values in regulation. Projected impacts are the tribes best estimate of catch.

Methodologies

Big Skate

Projected landings were calculated as follows:

1. Each state's landing of big skate is calculated differently due to different market category procedures
 - a. California- Any landings under the BSKT market category are assumed to capture all big skate landings.
 - b. Oregon- Species compositions are still in the process of being uploaded to PacFIN. Therefore, the GMT chose to continue the procedure outlined in previous statements ([Agenda Item E.8.a., Supplemental GMT Report 8, April 2015](#)) and apply a 98 percent species composition to all unidentified skate (USKT) landings.
 - c. Washington- As of June 1, 2015, all big skate landings are assumed to be captured by the BSKT market category. Prior to that date, the 95.2 percent species composition used in previous analysis is applied ([Agenda Item E.8.a., Supplemental GMT Report 8, April 2015](#)).
2. Since trip limits only went into place in June 2015, the GMT chose to use a vessel's two-year (November 2013-October 2015) average landings per period as a prediction of what that vessel would take with no trip limit restrictions (2014 only landings are also used for comparison).
3. Trip limits only apply to the shoreside IFQ fishery (Dahl sectors 3, 4, and 20).
4. The 2014 discard mortality from the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) Groundfish Mortality Report (with mortality rates applied) of 82.96 mt is used as a proxy for 2015 as it is the best available data.
5. Non-IFQ landings (including tribal) from 2014 were queried from PacFIN as a proxy for 2015, resulting in 57.83 mt. The same species compositions stated in assumption #1 are applied here.

PFMC
11/18/15