

GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM (GMT) REPORT ON  
2010 INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS RELATED TO THE COURT RULING

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) considered the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California ruling in Natural Resources Defense Council v. Locke and the subsequent preliminary National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) guidance and provides the following evaluation relative to 2010 inseason management.

The GMT also received guidance from NMFS Northwest Region (NWR) regarding timing of implementation of inseason recommendations from this meeting. Given the high priority of implementing measures that affect projected impacts to yelloweye rockfish, NMFS anticipates implementing routine inseason adjustments to fishery management measure by July 1, 2010.

**2010 Harvest Specifications for Cowcod**

The Court ordered that the 2010 optimum yield (OY) for cowcod be set at the 2008 OY, which is 4 mt; equivalent to the status quo OY. The GMT notes that current projections of cowcod are 1 mt (Attachment 1) thus no inseason action is recommended to further constrain catches.

**2010 Harvest Specifications for Darkblotched**

The Court specified a darkblotched OY of 330 mt (2008 level) and NMFS recommended that the Council's management measures be designed to keep the fishery within 290 mt, which is equivalent to the 2007 OY. Since the April Council meeting, the non-whiting limited entry trawl model has been updated with the most recent West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) bycatch rates (2008). Projected impacts to darkblotched rockfish are 248.4 mt (Attachment 1). The GMT will be considering inseason adjustments to the non-whiting trawl fishery at the June Council meeting and should any of those adjustments impact darkblotched rockfish, recommendations will be made that constrain catch at or below 290 mt, per NMFS guidance.

**2010 Harvest Specifications for Yelloweye Rockfish**

The Court ordered that the 2010 OY for yelloweye rockfish be reduced from 17 mt to 14 mt. The GMT has attached two scorecards to this statement; the first contains projected impacts through the end of 2010 prior to inseason action by the Council in June, and with the new darkblotched and yelloweye rockfish OYs of 14 mt and 330 mt, respectively (Attachment 1). The second scorecard contains projected impacts for yelloweye rockfish only, under various scenarios (Attachment 2).

## Pre-Inseason Scorecard Updates

### RESEARCH

In March 2010, the GMT received updates on proposed research activities for 2010 from NMFS NWR, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), and the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) relative to projected research catches. The Council adopted a 3.3 mt set-aside for yelloweye rockfish for 2010 based on the projected impacts in Table 1.

Table 1. Yelloweye rockfish research projections for 2010, including updated impacts after the cancellation of the WDFW and ODFW Enhanced Rockfish Surveys.

Agency	Projected Impacts from March 2010 final Scorecard	Updated Projected Impacts for June 2010
IPHC Halibut Stock Assessment Survey	1.1	1.1
WDFW Enhanced Rockfish Survey	1.0	Cancelled
ODFW Enhanced Rockfish Survey	1.0	Cancelled
Other (including NMFS trawl survey)	0.2	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>

In response to the new, lower 2010 yelloweye rockfish OY, ODFW and WDFW cancelled their enhanced rockfish surveys, reducing the projected research catch by 2.0 mt, to 1.3 mt. While this cancellation of research may mitigate some of the fishery restrictions necessary to keep projected impacts to yelloweye rockfish below 14 mt, the GMT notes that this is a loss of the opportunity to collect valuable biological information that could be used to inform the yelloweye stock assessment. Due to retention of yelloweye rockfish in most fisheries being prohibited, and the NMFS trawl survey not operating in areas of yelloweye rockfish habitat, there is little new information being collected to inform stock assessments. The enhanced rockfish surveys are the most cost effective way to gather data and information on yelloweye (and other) rockfish, given the current budget climate. A yelloweye rockfish workgroup met during the winter of 2009-10 to discuss non-extractive survey techniques. Unfortunately the non-extractive survey techniques, such as ROV work, are currently cost prohibitive to be used on a large scale, temporally or geographically, or the technology is still being developed. Therefore, the enhanced rockfish surveys were determined by the workgroup to be the best option currently available to gather data on yelloweye rockfish. The June scorecard (Attachment 1) has been updated to reflect the survey cancellation (impacts reduced from 3.3 mt to 1.3 mt).

The IPHC survey is scheduled to start around June 30 and continue through August 20. Traditionally, IPHC has provided catch estimates after each trip which facilitates inseason tracking of constraining species, such as yelloweye. It is anticipated that the final survey estimate of yelloweye impacts will be provided in time for the September Council meeting.

### NON-WHITING EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS (EFPs)

The Council recommended five non-whiting exempted fishing permits (EFPs) for 2010 at their November 2009 meeting (Table 2). On May 25, 2010, NMFS NWR informed Kathy Fosmark (Trolled Longline for Chilipepper Rockfish EFP) and Jim Martin (California Recreational Chilipepper EFP) that

their 2010 EFPs would not be issued in 2010. This decision was based on the need to reduce non-whiting EFP impacts to yelloweye rockfish, and the reason these two projects were chosen was based on their past performance (lack of participation, low target catch, lack of funding, etc.). NMFS continues to work with the remaining projects towards issuance of their 2010 EFPs and tracking of catch against the catch limits approved in November 2009, pending further decisions by the Council. NMFS provided guidance to the GMT that the remaining EFPs approved in November 2009 should be brought to the Council for consideration at this meeting in light of the recent Court decision, and the status of ongoing non-EFP fisheries. The GMT offers the following comments relative to the three remaining EFPs that may be permitted, or are already permitted with an EFP, in 2010.

Table 2. Council approved EFPs and Bycatch Caps for 2010 as updated based on NMFS action. Adjusted Total reflects the NWR cancellation of the following EFPs: Trolled longline for chilipeper in CA and the CA recreational chilipeper.

<b>EFP</b>	<b>bocaccio</b>	<b>canary</b>	<b>cowcod</b>	<b>darkblotched</b>	<b>POP</b>	<b>widow</b>	<b>yelloweye</b>
Trolled longline for chilipeper in CA	3.300	0.027	0.015	0.400	*	3.000	0.005
Morro Bay/Port San Luis regional fishing assoc.	5.000	0.023	0.200	1.000	0.136	2.000	0.068
OR recreational yellowtail	*	1.000	*	*	*	3.000	0.200
CA recreational chilipeper	2.700	0.200	0.023	0.100	*	3.000	0.023
ODFW yelloweye	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.060
<b>Total all EFP's</b>	<b>11.000</b>	<b>1.250</b>	<b>0.237</b>	<b>1.500</b>	<b>0.136</b>	<b>11.000</b>	<b>0.356</b>
<b>Adjusted Total</b>	<b>5.000</b>	<b>1.023</b>	<b>0.199</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.136</b>	<b>5.000</b>	<b>0.328</b>

Note: "\*" = no proposed EFP cap.

Of these permits, the Morro Bay and Port San Luis regional fishing association EFP has been issued and is currently underway. To date, there have been no yelloweye rockfish impacts reported since the start of this EFP project in 2008. If the Council chooses to recommend that no other EFPs are issued this year, the total this EFP yelloweye cap in the scorecard would be 0.1 mt.

The GMT notes that the ODFW yelloweye EFP was designed to allow retention of incidentally caught yelloweye rockfish in the recreational charter boat fishery for biological sampling purposes. Currently incidentally caught yelloweye rockfish in the Oregon recreational fishery have a 66% mortality rate applied, which is already included in the Oregon Recreational line in the GMT scorecard. The GMT notes that denying this particular EFP may mitigate some of the fishery restrictions necessary to keep

projected impacts to yelloweye rockfish below 14 mt, however this is another loss of opportunity to collect valuable biological information that could be used to inform stock assessments.

Additionally, the GMT notes that the Oregon recreational yellowtail EFP is designed to create an offshore recreational fishery that avoids yelloweye rockfish, while allowing opportunity to target underutilized yellowtail rockfish. It is anticipated that offshore fishing opportunities such as this may take some pressure off of the nearshore fishery, and species such as the minor nearshore rockfish, cabezon, greenlings and juvenile yelloweye and canary rockfish. In 2009, over 1,600 yellowtail rockfish were caught with zero catch of yelloweye rockfish. Therefore it may be possible to prosecute this EFP with a much lower yelloweye cap.

The GMT notes that if the three non-whiting EFPs continue, their total bycatch limit would be 0.328 mt of yelloweye rockfish. The GMT offers the following options for Council consideration relative to the three remaining EFPs:

1. Take no action – NMFS will issue EFPs for the three projects with the originally adopted bycatch caps for overfished species, including yelloweye rockfish, and the projected impacts from non-whiting EFPs in the scorecard will be 0.3 mt.
2. Reduce bycatch caps for some or all – NMFS will issue EFPs for the three projects with amended bycatch caps for yelloweye rockfish. The GMT can provide additional considerations for what bycatch caps may be appropriate under Agenda Item B.5 – Consideration of Inseason Adjustments. The projected impacts from EFPs to yelloweye rockfish will be updated in the scorecard at that time.
3. Disapprove some or all – Based on the Council’s consideration and recommendations, NMFS will not issue EFPs or will discontinue current EFPs for some or all of the three projects. The projected impacts from EFPs to yelloweye rockfish will be updated as appropriate.

The Council could consider recommending to NMFS that the yelloweye bycatch caps are reduced or that some or all of the EFPs should be cancelled in order to stay within the 14 mt yelloweye OY.

### **2010 Management Measures for Yelloweye Rockfish**

The GMT offers the following considerations for potential changes to fishery management measures that could reduce the projected impacts to yelloweye rockfish at or below 14 mt. These fishery management measures would restrict fisheries that catch yelloweye rockfish incidentally, beginning on July 1, 2010.

#### **COMMERCIAL**

##### *Limited Entry Non-Tribal Trawl Fishery*

The limited entry non-treaty whiting fisheries do not have impacts to yelloweye rockfish (Attachment 1). Based on the latest WCGOP bycatch rates, the limited entry non-whiting trawl fisheries have estimated impacts of 0.3 mt. The only available management measure to reduce yelloweye rockfish catch in the non-whiting trawl fishery is to implement a coastwide shoreward closure of the rockfish conservation area.

*Limited Entry Fixed Gear and Open Access Sablefish Daily Trip Limit Fishery (Non-nearshore Fixed Gear) North of 36° N. Latitude*

We attempt to manage yelloweye rockfish bycatch in the non-nearshore fixed gear fisheries using the non-trawl RCA boundaries. For 2009-2010, the Council considered bycatch encounter rates for four management areas north of 40°10' N. latitude with three seaward RCA boundary options for each: 100 fm, 125 fm, and 150 fm. In consideration of those possible RCA configurations and the associated bycatch estimates and fishery impacts, the Council chose the configuration depicted in Table 3. Under these status quo RCA configurations, held constant for the entire year, we estimate that 0.9 mt of yelloweye rockfish will be taken through the end of the year.

In light of the court order on yelloweye, the GMT anticipates that the Council may wish to revisit the seaward RCA boundaries and potentially increase their extent as one means of lowering expected yelloweye bycatch. Although we make our best effort here to estimate the effect of various RCA changes, we note that this non-nearshore fixed gear bycatch projection model has not been designed to model inseason changes.

Table 3. Current configuration of the seaward non-trawl RCA boundaries north of 36 N. lat. Blue fill indicates location of the RCA boundary.

	36° - 40° 10'	40°10' - 43°	43°- 45.064°	45.064° - 46.888°	46.888°
150 fm					
125 fm					
100 fm					

The model projects yelloweye bycatch with a simple application of yelloweye encounter rates (lbs of yelloweye) to the full fixed gear allocations for the northern sablefish OY (lbs of sablefish landed). We project the amount of effort that will occur in each area based on the 2002-2008 average from observed landings and then apply the applicable area and depth yelloweye encounter rates.

The model has no temporal feature (i.e., when the catch occurs does not change estimate of bycatch impacts). The best we can do for this situation is estimate the proportion of the sablefish catch that will have occurred by the time RCA adjustments could be in place (July 1) and adjust the annual estimates by our best estimate of the percentage of catch that has not yet occurred. To produce estimates of the impact that RCA changes may have between July 1 and the remainder of the fishing year, we must assume that yelloweye encounter rates and the proportion of catch between areas are constant.

Based on a review of landings of non-trawl caught sablefish by month for the years 2004-09, we assume that 50 percent of sablefish catch will have occurred by July 1, which is a slightly conservative assumption given the data (Table 4). Because the model applies a yelloweye bycatch rate to the landed sablefish, we also assume that 50% of the yelloweye mortality will also have occurred by July 1, or 0.4 mt.

Table 4. Percentage of the annual non-trawl sablefish total landings made through June in the years 2004-2009 for the area north of 36° N. latitude (i.e. the modeled area).

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
44.4%	32.4%	38.2%	41.0%	41.9%	46.9%

Table depicts three different RCA configuration scenarios for implementation on July 1, 2010 and the estimated savings of yelloweye bycatch for each, assuming that 50% of the yelloweye rockfish bycatch has already occurred through June. The estimated savings is based on the reduction in sablefish landings and thus yelloweye rockfish mortality, from keeping the status quo RCA boundaries, depicted in Table 3, for all of 2010.

Table 5. Three possible RCA boundary configurations and the estimated change in yelloweye projected impacts from the current boundaries.

	40°10' - 43°	43° - 45.064°	45.064° - 46.888°	N. of 46.888°	Est. Change
150 fm					(0.1)
125 fm					
100 fm					
	40°10' - 43°	43° - 45.064°	45.064° - 46.888°	N. of 46.888°	Est. Change
150 fm					(0.2)
125 fm					
100 fm					
	40°10' - 43°	43° - 45.064°	45.064° - 46.888°	N. of 46.888°	Est. Change
150 fm					(0.3)
125 fm					
100 fm					

The more restrictive RCA boundaries do not come without costs to fishing communities. We will discuss those impacts at the June Council meeting.

*Directed Nearshore Fishery*

Under status quo management, a 20 fm depth restriction is currently in effect between 43° N latitude and 40°10' N latitude to reduce yelloweye impacts. The GMT examined a variety of management measures (Table 6) that the Council could consider to further reduce yelloweye rockfish, including updating projected landings, additional depth restrictions, total fishery closures, and reductions in landed catch. The GMT notes that modifying the depth restriction south of 40°10' N lat will provide little (if any) additional yelloweye savings since this is an area of low yelloweye bycatch. Reductions to landed catch do not directly relate to the same reduction in trip limits (i.e., 50% reduction to landed catch ≠ 50% reduction to trip limit), therefore construction of new trip limit models (or updating current ones) would be required and could likely not be accomplished for a June Council action.

Table 6. Options to reduce impacts to yelloweye rockfish for 2010 in the nearshore commercial fisheries (LEFG and OA).

<b>Option</b>	<b>Management Action</b>	<b>YE (mt)</b>
<b>1. Status quo</b>	N of 40°10' N lat – 20 fm depth restriction between 43°N lat and 40°10' N lat	<b>1.3</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – status quo depth restriction	
<b>2. Updated model landings</b>	N of 40°10' N lat – 20 fm depth restriction between 43°N lat and 40°10' N lat	<b>1.1</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – status quo depth restriction	
<b>3. 20 fm depth statewide</b>	N of 40°10' N lat – 20 fm depth restriction between 43°N lat and 40°10' N lat	<b>1.1</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – 20 fm depth restriction	
<b>4. Total closures, effective July 1, 2010</b>	<b>A</b> N of 40°10' N lat – total fishery closures effective July 1, 2010	<b>0.5</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – total fishery closures effective July 1, 2010	
	<b>B</b> N of 40°10' N lat – total fishery closures effective July 1, 2010	<b>0.6</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – status quo depth and trip limits	
<b>5. Total closures, effective August 1, 2010</b>	<b>A</b> N of 40°10' N lat– total fishery closures effective August 1, 2010	<b>0.7</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat– total fishery closures effective August 1, 2010	
	<b>B</b> N of 40°10' N lat– total fishery closures effective August 1, 2010	<b>0.7</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat– status quo depth and trip limits	
<b>6. Total closures, effective Sept 1, 2010</b>	<b>A</b> N of 40°10' N lat– total fishery closures effective September 1, 2010	<b>0.8</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat– total fishery closures effective September 1, 2010	
	<b>B</b> N of 40°10' N lat– total fishery closures effective September 1, 2010	<b>0.9</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat– status quo depth and trip limits	
<b>7. 25% reduction landed catch</b>	N of 40°10' N lat – 25% reduction in ALL landed catch	<b>1.0</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – status quo depth and trip limits	
<b>8. 50% reduction landed catch</b>	N of 40°10' N lat – 50% reduction in ALL landed catch	<b>0.9</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – status quo depth and trip limits	
<b>9. 75% reduction landed catch</b>	N of 40°10' N lat – 75% reduction in ALL landed catch	<b>0.7</b>
	S of 40°10' N lat – status quo depth and trip limits	

RECREATIONAL

Table 7 contains the recreational harvest guidelines (HGs) for yelloweye rockfish specified in regulation under a 17 mt OY. Because the 2010 OY is reduced by 17.65%, the GMT applied that percentage

reduction to the original HGs to provide an informational alternative for recreational catch sharing under a 14 mt yelloweye rockfish OY.

Table 7. Proportional reduction of harvest guidelines applied to each state for a decreased yelloweye OY from 17 mt to 14 mt.

	HG under a 17 mt OY		<i>Proportional decrease to a 14 mt OY</i>	
Washington	2.7	5.1	2.2	4.2
Oregon	2.4		2.0	
California	2.8		2.3	

### *Washington*

During the 2009-2010 harvest specifications and management measures process, WDFW estimated that recreational fishery projected impacts for yelloweye rockfish would be 2.5 mt for 2010. However, based on the final estimated impacts from 2009 the projected impacts for 2010 were revised to 1.9 mt. The reduction in yelloweye impacts is believed to be primarily a result of the implementation of coastwide discard mortality rates for yelloweye rockfish that are less conservative than discard rates used in Washington’s recreational fishery harvest impact model for 2009-2010. The revised projected impacts for yelloweye rockfish would keep the Washington recreational fishery under a revised yelloweye rockfish HG, assuming a proportional reduction under a 14 mt OY, therefore no additional management measures are proposed at this time.

### *Oregon*

Depth management is the main tool used for controlling yelloweye rockfish catch in the Oregon recreational fishery. There is a component to the Oregon recreational model for yelloweye impacts incurred during the recreational Pacific halibut fishery. The 2010 Pacific halibut quota for Area 2A is approximately 18 % less than it was in 2009, 2009 was 17 % less than the 2008 level used in the model. Based on this we anticipate reduced yelloweye interactions during the Pacific halibut fishery; however that level is not currently quantifiable, therefore projections in Table 8 are based on the 2008 quota level used in the original model. The majority of the Central Oregon all-depth halibut fishery will occur in May and June, after which time ODFW should have a better estimate on yelloweye savings due to the reduction in the Pacific halibut quota.

Table 8 shows projected yelloweye impacts for the Oregon recreational fishery under various depth restrictions scenarios, along with consequences of those depth restrictions. The current projection, if no actions are taken, is 2.2 mt, which is less than the 2.4 mt allocated to Oregon recreational fisheries under a 17 mt OY. That does not include any savings from the reduced halibut quota. Keeping the 40 fathom depth restriction throughout the remainder of the year, instead of removing the restriction for October-December, restricts the fall and winter access to more offshore species, such as lingcod. Any depth restriction scenario that limits the recreational fishery to inside of 20 fathoms will essentially shut down fishing (private and charter) out of several Oregon ports, including Garibaldi, Gold Beach and Port Orford. Allowing fishing to occur out to 30 fathoms opens up some grounds out of those ports; however, it will concentrate effort into smaller areas than already occur under the 40 fathom restrictions out of all Oregon ports.

Table 8. Seasonal depth restrictions, from status quo, anticipated yelloweye impacts and consequences to participants in the Oregon recreational bottomfish fishery.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Total YE (mt)</b>	<b>Consequences</b>
No Action	2.2	
inside 40 fm Oct-Dec	2.1	no access to offshore fisheries in the fall/winter (i.e. lingcod)
inside 30 fm July	2.2	allow some fishing grounds to remain open
inside 30 fm Aug	2.1	allow some fishing grounds to remain open
inside 20 fm July	2.1	close almost all fishing grounds out of many ports (Garibaldi, Gold Beach, Port Orford)
inside 20 fm Aug	2.0	close almost all fishing grounds out of many ports (Garibaldi, Gold Beach, Port Orford)
inside 30 fm Jul-Aug	2.0	allow some fishing grounds to remain open
inside 30 fm Jul-Sep	2.0	allow some fishing grounds to remain open
inside 30 fm Jul-Sep	2.0	allow some fishing grounds to remain open
inside 20 fm Jul-Aug	1.8	close almost all fishing grounds out of many ports (Garibaldi, Gold Beach, Port Orford)
inside 20 fm Jul-Sep	1.7	close almost all fishing grounds out of many ports (Garibaldi, Gold Beach, Port Orford)

### *California*

Management actions needed to reduce yelloweye impacts for California recreational fishery were not available for GMT review prior to the Briefing Book deadline. It is expected that they may be provided under a state report at the June Council meeting.

### **Summary**

The GMT has provided a summary table of actions and impacts to achieve a proportional reduction to all managed fisheries in order to stay under a 14 mt OY for yelloweye (Table 9). This table is for reference as the Council decides what inseason actions are best able to meet the OY while taking into account the needs of the fishing community. The same values are shown in Attachment 2 with comparisons against various pre-inseason amounts.

Table 9. Proportional reduction to all managed fisheries from reducing the OY from 17 mt to 14 mt.

<b>Set-aside/ Sector/Fishery</b>	<b>Description of Option</b>	<b>Estimated Impact to YE (mt)</b>
RESEARCH	Scorecard Update	1.3
TRIBAL FIXED GEAR	Status Quo	2.3
INCIDENTAL OPEN ACCESS (OA)	Status Quo	0.3
Non-Whiting EFPs	Status Quo caps for existing or potential permits	0.3
Non-whiting trawl	Proportional decrease to impacts	0.2
Non-nearshore fixed gear (sablefish) North of 36° N. lat.	Proportional decrease to impacts	0.7
Nearshore fixed gear	Proportional decrease to impacts	1.1
Recreational - Washington	Proportional decrease to the HG – no change to management measures	2.2
Recreational - Oregon	Proportional decrease to the HG – adjust depth restrictions as needed	2.0
Recreational - California	Proportional decrease to the HG – unknown	2.3
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>12.7 mt (90.7 % of 14 mt OY)</b>

Note: ALL CAPS indicates a set-aside or sector where no inseason adjustments can be taken by the Council to reduce yelloweye rockfish impacts.

**Attachment 1.** Projected impacts (mt) of overfished groundfish species for 2010 updated based on the latest WCGOP bycatch data in the non-whiting trawl fishery and updated EFP impacts. Adjustments to the EFP impacts represent the cancellation of the following EFPs: Trolled longline for chilipeper in CA and the CA recreational chilipepper.

Fishery	Bocaccio b/	Canary	Cowcod	Dkbl	POP	Widow	Yelloweye
<b>Limited Entry Trawl - Non-whiting</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>191.4</b>	<b>93.8</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Limited Entry Trawl - Whiting</b>							
At-sea whiting motherships a/		3.3		6.0	0.5	67.0	0.0
At-sea whiting cat-proc a/		4.8		8.5	0.5	95.0	0.0
Shoreside whiting a/		5.9		10.5	4.7	117.0	0.0
Tribal whiting		4.3		0.0	7.2	5.0	0.0
<b>Tribal</b>							
Midwater Trawl		3.6		0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0
Bottom Trawl		0.8		0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0
Troll		0.5		0.0	0.0		0.0
Fixed gear		0.3		0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
<b>Fixed Gear Sablefish</b>	0.0	2.5	0.0	4.5	0.4	0.0	0.9
<b>Fixed Gear Nearshore</b>	0.3	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.3
<b>Fixed Gear Other</b>	5.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
<b>Open Access: Incidental Groundfish</b>	0.8	1.7	0.0	15.0	0.0	<b>3.3</b>	0.3
<b>Recreational Groundfish e/</b>							
WA		20.9					5.1
OR						1.0	
CA	67.3	22.9	0.3			6.2	2.8
<b>EFPs</b>	11.0	1.3	0.2	1.5	0.1	11.0	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Research: Includes NMFS trawl shelf-slope surveys, the IPHC halibut survey, and expected impacts from SRPs and LOAs.</b>							
	2.0	4.5	0.2	2.0	2.0	5.7	<b>1.3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	94.4	93.6	1.0	248.4	112.9	367.7	14.6
<b>2010 OY f/</b>	288	105	4.0	<b>330</b>	200	509	<b>14</b>
<b>Difference</b>	193.6	11.4	3.0	81.6	87.1	141.3	-0.6
<b>Percent of OY</b>	32.8%	89.1%	25.5%	75.3%	56.4%	72.2%	104.3%
Key		= either not applicable; trace amount (<0.01 mt); or not reported in available data sources.					
a/ Non-tribal whiting values for canary, darkblotched, and widow reflect bycatch limits for the non-tribal whiting sectors. All other species' impacts are projected from the GMT's whiting impact projection model. The Council may elect to change these bycatch limits when setting final whiting management measures in March 2010 or under any inseason action at any of their future meetings.							
b/ South of 40°10' N. lat.							
e/ Values in scorecard represent projected impacts for all species except canary and yelloweye rockfish, which are the prescribed harvest guidelines.							
f/ 2009 and 2010 OYs are the same except for darkblotched (330 mt in 2010), POP (200 mt in 2010), widow (509 mt in 2010), and yelloweye (14 mt in 2010).							

**Attachment 2.** Yelloweye rockfish impacts timeline and impacts relative to a proportional reduction.

<b>Projected mortality impacts (mt) of Yelloweye rockfish for 2010</b>	<b>April Post-Inseason</b>	<b>April Post-Inseason with Court Order Change</b>	<b>June Pre-Inseason</b>	<b>June Inseason Proportional Reduction</b>
<b>Limited Entry Trawl - Non-whiting</b>	0.6	0.6	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Limited Entry Trawl - Whiting</b>				
At-sea whiting motherships a/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
At-sea whiting cat-proc a/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shoreside whiting a/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tribal whiting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Tribal</b>				
Midwater Trawl	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bottom Trawl	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Troll	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fixed gear	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
<b>Fixed Gear Sablefish</b>	0.9	0.9	0.9	<b>0.6</b>
<b>Fixed Gear Nearshore</b>	1.3	1.3	1.3	<b>1.1</b>
<b>Fixed Gear Other</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Open Access: Incidental Groundfish</b>	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
<b>Recreational Groundfish e/</b>				
WA	5.1	5.1	5.1	<b>4.2</b>
OR				
CA	2.8	2.8	2.8	<b>2.3</b>
<b>EFPs</b>	0.4	0.4	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Research: Includes NMFS trawl shelf-slope surveys, the IPHC halibut survey, and expected impacts from SRPs and LOAs.</b>				
	3.3	3.3	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	17.0	17.0	14.6	12.7
<b>2010 OY f/</b>	17	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Difference</b>	0.0	-3.0	-0.6	1.3
<b>Percent of OY</b>	100.0%	121.4%	104.3%	90.7%