

GROUNDFISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON CONSIDERATION OF INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS FOR 2011 AND 2012 FISHERIES

PART I. 2011 FISHERIES

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) considered the most recent information on the status of ongoing fisheries, research, and requests from industry and provides the following recommendations for 2011 inseason adjustments.

The GMT also received guidance from National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Northwest Region (NWR) regarding timing of implementation of inseason recommendations from this meeting. NMFS anticipates implementing routine inseason adjustments to fishery management measures by December 1, 2011.

SCORECARD UPDATE

The November 2011 scorecard (Attachment 1) projected impacts have been updated to reflect: increased canary rockfish in the Washington recreational fishery; and increased canary and yelloweye rockfish in the Oregon recreational fishery; and decreased yelloweye rockfish in research, based on updates from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC).

RESEARCH CATCH UPDATES

The GMT received updates from WDFW and IPHC that their research activities have been completed for the year. Both agencies provided updates to their yelloweye rockfish impacts, which are reflected in the November scorecard (Attachment 1).

RECREATIONAL FISHERIES

For Oregon recreational fisheries, projected impacts to both canary and yelloweye rockfish have increased, due to increased encounter rates from what was projected pre-season. However, projected impacts remain under the Oregon recreational harvest guidelines (HG).

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Fixed Gear Sablefish Daily Trip Limit Fisheries - 2011

The following section discusses 2011 inseason considerations for the four fixed gear, daily trip limit (DTL) fisheries, including both limited entry (LE) and open access (OA), north and south of 36° N. lat. for 2011. Hereafter, they will be referred to as follows: LE North, LE South, OA North, and OA South.

Landings projection models were updated with the most recent available data from PacFIN, acquired on October 28, 2011. The following sections describe these modeling results. It should

be noted that the Quota Species Monitoring (QSM) Best Estimate Report (BER), which is accessible by the public, is not currently correct for fixed gear sablefish DTL fisheries, due to data contamination with fixed gear IFQ sablefish landings. A corrected data feed of “hard” fish ticket data from PacFIN was used to inform inseason modeling for these fisheries.

Reflecting current sablefish landings data, model projections under a no action alternative (i.e., status quo) through the end of 2011 show potential overages in the LE North and OA South fisheries (Table 1), of 6% and 8% respectively. The projection for the LE North is the same as in September, yet actual catch has been higher than projections for the OA North, which was formerly projected to attain 98% of its harvest guideline (HG). Both southern sablefish DTL fisheries, including LE South and OA South, are tracking within their harvest guidelines (Table 2).

Table 1. Model-projected impacts of alternative trip limits in the fixed-gear, sablefish, DTL fisheries, north of 36° N. lat., for 2011. Harvest guidelines and projected impacts are in metric tons (mt). Currently a collective overage of 51 mt is projected in the North.

Fishery	Alternative	HG	Projection	Difference	Attainment
LE N	No Action	273	290	-17	106%
	A1, Close 12/1/11		276	-3	101%
OA N	No Action	433	467	-34	108%
	A1, Close 12/1/11		434	9	100%

Table 2. Model-projected impacts of alternative trip limits in the fixed-gear, sablefish, DTL fisheries, south of 36° N. lat., for 2011. Harvest guidelines and projected impacts are in metric tons (mt).

Fishery	Alternative	HG	Projection	Difference	Attainment
LE S	No Action	393	374	19	95%
OA S	No Action	319	230	91	72%

The Council decided at the September, 2011 meeting not to take action regarding the projected overage of 6% (17 mt) in the LE North fishery, due to a probable remainder from the sablefish primary tier fishery (considering past attainment of this fishery from 2004-2010). A similar situation exists at this meeting.

The information that we have regarding primary tier fishery attainment is historical, from 2004 to 2010. Over that period, the average attainment was 95% of the sum of tier limits, with a maximum of 97% and a minimum of 93%. Table 3 translates a range of possible percentage attainments of the primary tier fishery into corresponding possible remainders, in metric tons, considering the current sum of tier limits for 2011. We do not have a projection model to make predictions of sablefish catch in the primary tier fishery, and landings data are incomplete at this time.

Table 3. Possible remainders from the primary tier sablefish fishery, for consideration, along with projected attainment of LE FG sablefish DTL fishery, and the OA sablefish fishery, north of 36° N. lat., for 2011 (past primary attainment averaged 95%, max 97%, min 93%).

Primary % attainment	Estimated remainder (mt)
100%	0
99%	15
98%	31
97%	46
96%	62
95%	77

If the projections for DTL attainment of 51 mt above the HGs in the area north of 36° N. lat. are correct, then attainment of 96% or less by the primary tier fishery would be required in order to provide a sufficient buffer to accommodate such an overage, and prevent exceeding the sablefish ACL for north of 36° N. lat.

Some additional, qualitative considerations are worth mentioning. The point has been made that closing the fishery mid-period (i.e., December 1) may stimulate increased fishing effort before the closure, so that bimonthly limits are attained early, as noted in the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) statement. It is notable that the sablefish DTL projection models possess significant uncertainty, like any other projection model, which extrapolates average relationships among variables from previous years to the future, and actual landings for the remainder of the year have a relatively equal probability of being higher or lower than projections. It is also notable that sablefish prices have been steadily rising this year, especially in the north, and within the open access sablefish fisheries.

At this point in the season, few options are available to restrict landings for the rest of this year; according to model projections and regulations (i.e., trip limits cannot be reduced in the second month of a two month period), only fishery closure on December 1 was an option for potentially bringing landings to within the HG for the LE North and the OA North fisheries.

Although sablefish is subject to a coastwide acceptable biological catch (ABC) and overfishing limit (OFL). The southern DTL fisheries are projected to finish under their HGs and the sablefish ACL south of 36 N. lat. The sum total of all sablefish impacts is therefore unlikely to exceed the ABC and OFL, thus it is unlikely that there is a conservation concern.

Considerations for 2011:

- 1) The GMT recommends the Council consider the potential risks associated with exceeding the sablefish ACL in the area north of 36° N. lat., for Alternative 1 versus the No Action alternative (Table 1), in the LE North and OA North sablefish DTL fisheries.**

PART II. 2012 FISHERIES

The GMT considered the most recent information on the status of 2011 fisheries, upcoming research, and requests from industry and provides the following recommendations for 2012 inseason adjustments.

SCORECARD

The scorecard for the beginning of 2012 (Attachment 2) has been updated to reflect: no exempted fishing permits (EFP) were applied for in 2012, therefore projected impacts have been set to zero; the tribal projected impacts has been increased for Petrale sole and widow rockfish; increased projected impact to canary rockfish in the Washington recreational fishery; and increased projected impacts to canary and yelloweye rockfish in the Oregon recreational fishery. Values remain in the allocation columns for EFPs since the federal regulations still contain those off the top deductions for 2012. The GMT updated the projected impacts in the scorecard (Attachment 1) for petrale sole and widow rockfish based on the letter provided by the Makah tribe ([Agenda Item E.4.b, Supplemental Tribal Report](#)).

RECREATIONAL

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is asking the Council to adopt conforming regulations that close portions of Washington Marine Areas 1 and 2 to recreational lingcod fishing (Agenda Item E.8.b, WDFW report). The changes are needed to ensure that recreational yelloweye and canary impacts stay below the recreational harvest guideline in 2012 and beyond. Council action is needed at this meeting so that regulations are in place in time for recreational lingcod seasons that begin in early spring 2012.

The Oregon recreational projected impacts to canary and yelloweye rockfish are increased over what was projected in the biennial harvest specifications modeling. The increased projected impacts are based on increased encounter rates observed in 2011. The projected impacts are still within the 2012 HG for both species.

The GMT recommends the Council adopt conforming regulations to restrict recreational lingcod fisheries in Washington as proposed in Agenda Item E.8.b, WDFW Report.

COMMERCIAL

Fixed Gear Sablefish DTL fisheries - 2012

The following section discusses 2012 inseason considerations for the four fixed gear, daily trip limit (DTL) fisheries, including both limited entry (LE) and open access (OA), north and south of 36° N. lat. for 2012. Projections of landings were made in order to inform choice of trip limit structures for the year 2012 in these fisheries.

Table 4 shows the No Action Alternative trip limits for 2012, those that are currently in place as of November 1, 2011. If no action is taken at this meeting, these regulations would be in place for 2012.

Table 4. Sablefish DTL trip limits that were in place in 2011; the No-Action Alternative for 2012, not including any potential 2011 inseason action.

Area	Fishery	Jan-Feb	Mar-Apr	May-June	July-Aug	Sept-Oct	Nov-Dec
North of 36° N. lat. (U.S./Canada Border to 36° N. lat.)	LE N	1,750 lb. per week, not to exceed 7,000 lb. per 2 mo.	2,000 lb. per week, not to exceed 7,000 lb. per 2 mo.		2,000 lb. per week, not to exceed 3,500 lb. per 2 mo.		
	OA S	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 800 lb., not to exceed 2,400 lb. per 2 mo.	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 950 lb., not to exceed 1,900 lb. per 2 mo.		300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 1,050 lb., not to exceed 2,100 lb. per 2 mo.		
South of 36° N. lat.	LE S	400 lb. per week, not to exceed 1,500 lb. per 2 mo.	2,100 lb. per week				
	OA S	400 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 1,500 lb., not to exceed 8,000 lb. per 2 mo.	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 1,200 lb., not to exceed 2,400 lb. per 2 mo.				300 lb. per day/one land per week of 1500 lb./3000 lb. bimonthly

We present the projected results of status quo (No Action, NA) and two alternative trip limit structures for each of the four sablefish DTL fisheries in Table 5; the corresponding trip limits for these projections are located in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 5. Model-projected impacts of alternative trip limits (i.e. Alt. 1 and Alt. 2) in the fixed-gear, sablefish, DTL fisheries for 2012, compared to No Action. Harvest guidelines and projected impacts are in metric tons (mt).

Area	Fishery	HG	No Action (mt)	No Action (%)	Alt. 1 (mt)	Alt. 1 (%)	Alt. 2 (mt)	Alt. 2 (%)
North of 36° N. lat. (U.S./Canada Border to 36° N. lat.)	LE N	265	247	93%	242	91%	234	88%
	OA N	419	426	102%	381	91%	359	86%
South of 36° N. lat.	LE S	380	413	109%	353	93%	323	85%
	OA S	309	263	85%	284	92%	264	85%

Table 6. Proposed 2012 trip limits for sablefish DTL fisheries under Alternative 1.

Area	Fishery	Jan-Feb	Mar-Apr	May-June	July-Aug	Sept-Oct	Nov-Dec
North of 36° N. lat. (U.S./Canada Border to 36° N. lat.)	LE N	1,300 lb. per week, not to exceed 5,000 lb. per 2 mo.					
	OA N	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 900 lb., not to exceed 1,800 lb. per 2 mo.					
South of 36° N. lat.	LE S	1,800 lb. per week					
	OA S	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 1,350 lb., not to exceed 2,700 lb. per 2 mo.					

Table 7. Proposed 2012 trip limits for sablefish DTL fisheries under Alternative 2.

Area	Fishery	Jan-Feb	Mar-Apr	May-June	July-Aug	Sept-Oct	Nov-Dec
North of 36° N. lat. (U.S./Canada Border to 36° N. lat.)	LE N	1,300 lb. per week, not to exceed 4,900 lb. per 2 mo.					
	OA N	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 850 lb., not to exceed 1,700 lb. per 2 mo.					
South of 36° N. lat.	LE S	1,750 lb. per week					
	OA S	300 lb. per day, or 1 landing per week of up to 1,300 lb., not to exceed 2,600 lb. per 2 mo.					

The GMT considered the uncertainty in the landings data seen during 2011(in terms of correctly separating primary tier landings from DTL landings, and separating new IFQ fixed gear landings from DTL landings) along with the normal uncertainty associated with projection models, when constructing the three alternative trip limit structures for 2012 for each fishery presented here. Alternative 1 (Table 6) results in of projected attainments in the range of 91% to 93%, Alternative 2, consists of projected attainments in the range of 85% to 88%, and the No Action Alternative has projected attainments between 85% and 109%. We strove in A1 and A2 to present options with a predictable and temporally even structure, which was appreciated by the GAP, and avoid starting the year with highly variable trip limits, such as resulted from the “rolling over” of 2010 trip limits into 2011, due to unforeseeable delays in implementation.

Trip limits for the four DTL sablefish fisheries under Alternative 1 yield projected attainments of better than 90%, yet allow for some uncertainty in landings data and model projections. These trip limits can be adjusted inseason as needed to influence higher or lower landings as 2012 progresses.

The GMT recommends 2012 trip limits for the four DTL sablefish fisheries under Alternative 1, in Table 6.

IFQ fishery

The GMT worked with the GAP to further refine the request in the GAP inseason report and understands the request for 2012 to be:

1) 45°46' - 48°10': Move seaward line from 200 fm to 150 fm for Period 2.

Tables 8 and 9 highlight the changes proposed in this request.

Table 8. Current limited entry trawl rockfish conservation areas north of 40°10' N. lat.

	Jan-Feb	Mar-Apr	May-Jun	Jul-Aug	Sept-Oct	Nov-Dec
North of 48°10' N. lat.	shore - modified 200 fm line	shore - 200 fm line	shore - 150 fm line		shore - 200 fm line	shore - modified 200 fm line
48°10' N. lat. - 45°46' N. lat.	75 fm line - modified 200 fm line	75 fm line - 200 fm line	75 fm line - 150 fm line	100 fm line - 150 fm line	75 fm line - 150 fm line	75 fm line - 150 fm line
45°46' N. lat. - 40°10' N. lat.			75 fm line - 200 fm line	100 fm line - 200 fm line	75 fm line - 200 fm line	75 fm line - modified 200 fm line

Table 9. Proposed limited entry trawl rockfish conservation areas north of 40°10' N. lat. with the requested modification (strikeout vs bold).

	Jan-Feb	Mar-Apr	May-Jun	Jul-Aug	Sept-Oct	Nov-Dec
North of 48°10' N. lat.	shore - modified 200 fm line	shore - 200 fm line	shore - 150 fm line		shore - 200 fm line	shore - modified 200 fm line
48°10' N. lat. - 45°46' N. lat.	75 fm line - modified 200 fm line	75 fm line - 200 fm line 150 fm line	75 fm line - 150 fm line	100 fm line - 150 fm line	75 fm line - 150 fm line	75 fm line - 150 fm line
45°46' N. lat. - 40°10' N. lat.		75 fm line - 200 fm line	75 fm line - 200 fm line	100 fm line - 200 fm line	75 fm line - 200 fm line	75 fm line - modified 200 fm line

We examined time-weighted average bycatch rates from WCGOP, from 2005 to 2010, data which are available for this area, during this period (Table 10). It generally shows increased bycatch rates of rebuilding species in Periods 1 and 2, in the area shoreward of 150 fm, versus the area shoreward of 200 fm, indicating that if the seaward RCA were moved from 200 fm to 150 fm during periods 1 and 2 of 2012, that the probability of encountering darkblotched rockfish, Pacific ocean perch, widow rockfish and yelloweye rockfish will likely be higher than if status quo seaward boundaries remained in place. However, this fishery is now managed under IFQ, attainment of these rebuilding species is currently very low (NMFS report under Agenda Item E.6.b., Status Report on the 2011 Rationalized Trawl Fishery), at 17%, 19%, 35%

and 6% respectively, as of October 11, 2011. Fishing behavior, and bycatch rates, could potentially be different than those observed during pre-IFQ. We also note that the request was made for a relatively small area of the coast (48°10' - 45°46' N. lat.). The Council should consider the potential impact of individual accountability when making this decision.

Table 10. Time-weighted average, pre-IFQ bycatch rates of rebuilding species, seaward of 150 fm and 200 fm, for Period 2, over the years 2005-2010, in the area north of 40°10'N. lat.

Species	> 150 fm	> 200 fm
bocaccio	0.0001%	0.0001%
canary	0.0030%	0.0044%
cowcod	0.0000%	0.0000%
darkblotched	0.7734%	0.5875%
pop	0.5384%	0.3041%
widow	0.0084%	0.0061%
yelloweye	0.0002%	0.0001%

Therefore, the GMT recommends the Council consider changes to the trawl Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) from the 200 fm line to the 150 fm line (Table) for the area 45°46' N. lat. (Cape Falcon) to 48°10' N. lat. (Cape Alava) during March and April of 2012.

Minor Nearshore Rockfish and Black Rockfish Limits between 42° N. lat. and 40°10' N. lat.

In 2009-2010, the Council has recommended re-structuring and increases to the trip limits for minor nearshore rockfish and black rockfish trip limits in both the limited entry fixed gear fishery and the open access fishery. The Council has recommended that these changes be implemented consistently, over the entire calendar year. However, due to workload and delays in implementation, those changes were not able to be implemented until Period 2, leaving outdated trip limit structures and amounts in place during Period 1. The GMT finds it pertinent to strive for greater stability in structuring these limits using a stable trip limit for periods 1-6. Therefore, the GMT has determined that it would be appropriate to increase black rockfish limits for both LEFG and OA during Period 1 nearshore fisheries in California, between 42° N. lat. and 40°10' N. lat. Restructuring the trip limits in this manner would allow consistent access to the higher black rockfish ACL while restricting blue rockfish harvest to stay within its' harvest guidelines. The proposed modified trip limit for Period 1 is "8,500 lb /2months of which no more than 1,200 lb may be species other than black rockfish". Under this restructured trip limit, blue rockfish would continue to be managed under the 1,200 lb/2 month sub limit. With this change in Period 1, it will bring consistency to the trip limit structure and poundage for the entire year, as the Council as previously recommended.

The GMT recommends a minor nearshore rockfish and black rockfish trip limit between 42° N. lat. and 40°10' N. lat. in both the LEFG and OA fisheries be revised in Period 1 to "8,500 lb /2months of which no more than 1,200 lb may be species other than black rockfish."

Recommendations for 2012:

- 1) **The GMT recommends trip limits for the four DTL sablefish fisheries under Alternative 1, in Table 6.**

- 2) The GMT recommends the Council consider changes to the trawl Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) from the 200 fm line to the 150 fm line (see Table 9) for the area between 45°46' N. lat. (Cape Falcon) to 48°10' N. lat. (Cape Alava) during March and April (Period 2).**
- 3) The GMT recommends a minor nearshore rockfish and black rockfish trip limit between 42° N. lat. and 40°10' N. lat. in both the LEFG and OA fisheries be revised in Period 1 to “8,500 lb /2months of which no more than 1,200 lb may be species other than black rockfish.”**
- 4) The GMT recommends the adoption of conforming regulations to restrict recreational lingcod fisheries in Washington as proposed in Agenda Item E.8.b, WDFW Report.**

Attachment 1. November 2011 Scorecard. Allocations^a and projected mortality impacts (mt) of overfished groundfish species for 2011. Bolded numbers represent updates since the June Council meeting.

Fishery	Bocaccio b/		Canary		Cowcod b/		Dkbl		Petrale		POP		Widow		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	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts
Date: 1 November, 2011																
Off the Top Deductions	13.4	13.4	20.0	19.7	0.3	0.3	18.7	18.7	65.4	64.5	12.8	12.9	61.0	58.6	5.9	4.5
EFPc/	11.0	11.0	1.3	1.0	0.2	0.2	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	0.1	0.1	11.0	8.7	0.1	0.0
Research d/	1.7	1.7	7.2	7.2	0.1	0.1	2.1	2.1	17.0	17.0	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.6	3.3	2.0
Incidental OA e/	0.7	0.7	2.0	2.0	--	--	15.0	15.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	3.3	3.3	0.2	0.2
Tribal f/			9.5	9.5			0.1	0.1	45.4	45.4	10.9	10.9	45.0	45.0	2.3	2.3
Trawl Allocations	60.0	60.0	34.1	34.1	1.8	1.8	265.0	265.0	876.0	876.0	137.0	137.0	491.0	491.0	0.6	0.6
---SB Trawl	60.0	60.0	25.9	25.9	1.8	1.8	250.5	250.5	871.0	871.0	119.6	119.6	342.1	342.1	0.6	0.6
---At-Sea Trawl			8.2	8.2			14.5	14.5	5.0	5.0	17.4	17.4	147.9	147.9		
a) At-sea whiting MS			3.4	3.4			6.0	6.0			7.2	7.2	61.2	61.2		
b) At-sea whiting CP			4.8	4.8			8.5	8.5			10.2	10.2	86.7	86.7		
Non-Trawl Allocation	189.6	55.9	29.8	18.9	0.9	0.2	14.0	5.8	35.0	0.0	7.0	0.4	49.0	10.0	10.5	9.8
Non-Nearshore	57.9		2.3												1.3	
LEFG				1.4				4.8				0.3		0.1		0.8
OA FG				0.2				0.8				0.1		0.0		0.1
Directed OA: Nearshore	0.7	0.5	4.0	3.2		0.0		0.2						0.2	1.1	1.0
Recreational Groundfish																
WA			2.0	1.0				--		--		--		--	2.6	2.5
OR			7.0	3.8				--		--		--		1.0	2.4	2.3
CA	131.0	55.4	14.5	9.3		0.2		--		--		--		8.7	3.1	3.1
TOTAL	263.0	129.3	83.9	72.7	3.0	2.3	297.7	289.5	976.4	940.5	156.8	150.3	601.0	559.6	17.0	14.9
2011 Harvest Specification	263	263	102	102	3.0	3.0	298	298	976	976	157	157	600	600	17	17
Difference g/	0.0	133.7	18.1	29.3	0.0	0.7	0.3	8.5	-0.4	35.5	0.2	6.7	-1.0	40.4	0.0	2.1
Percent of OY	100.0%	49.2%	82.3%	71.3%	100.0%	76.7%	99.9%	97.1%	100.0%	96.4%	99.9%	95.7%	100.2%	93.3%	100.0%	87.6%
Key																

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 2011-12 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 11-12 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 2011-2012 Environmental Impact Statement (Appendix B), which are currently specified in regulation.

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

g/ Petrale and widow allocations round higher than the ACL as a result of rounding issues. Projected impacts are under the ACL; there is no conservation concern.

Attachment 2. Scorecard for the beginning of 2012. Allocations^a and projected mortality impacts (mt) of overfished groundfish species for 2012.

Fishery	Bocaccio b/		Canary		Cowcod b/		Dkbl		Petrale		POP		Widow		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	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts
Date: 1 November 2011																
Off the Top Deductions	13.4	2.4	20.0	18.7	0.3	0.1	18.7	17.2	65.4	87.1	25.5	12.8	61.0	64.9	5.9	5.8
EFPc/	11.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	12.8	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Research d/	1.7	1.7	7.2	7.2	0.1	0.1	2.1	2.1	17.0	17.0	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.6	3.3	3.3
Incidental OA e/	0.7	0.7	2.0	2.0	--	--	15.0	15.0	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	3.3	3.3	0.2	0.2
Tribal f/			9.5	9.5			0.1	0.1	45.4	70.0	10.9	10.9	45.0	60.0	2.3	2.3
Trawl Allocations	60.0	60.0	34.1	34.1	1.8	1.8	265.0	265.0	876.0	876.0	137.0	137.0	491.0	491.0	0.6	0.6
--SB Trawl	60.0	60.0	25.9	25.9	1.8	1.8	250.5	250.5	871.0	871.0	119.6	119.6	342.1	342.1	0.6	0.6
--At-Sea Trawl			8.2	8.2			14.5	14.5	5.0	5.0	17.4	17.4	147.9	147.9		
a) At-sea whiting MS			3.4	3.4			6.0	6.0			7.2	7.2	61.2	61.2		
b) At-sea whiting CP			4.8	4.8			8.5	8.5			10.2	10.2	86.7	86.7		
Non-Trawl Allocation	189.6	55.9	29.8	19.2	0.9	0.2	14.0	5.8	35.0	0.0	7.0	0.4	49.0	10.0	10.5	9.9
Non-Nearshore	57.9		2.3												1.3	
LEFG				1.4				4.8				0.3		0.1		0.8
OA FG				0.2				0.8				0.1		0.0		0.1
Directed OA: Nearshore	0.7	0.5	4.0	3.3		0.0		0.2						0.2	1.1	1.1
Recreational Groundfish																
WA			2.0	1.0				--		--		--		--	2.6	2.5
OR			7.0	4.0				--		--		--		1.0	2.4	2.3
CA	131.0	55.4	14.5	9.3		0.2		--		--		--		8.7	3.1	3.1
TOTAL	263.0	118.3	83.9	72.0	3.0	2.1	297.7	288.0	976.4	963.1	169.5	150.2	601.0	565.9	17.0	16.3
2011 Harvest Specification g/	263	263	102	102	3.0	3.0	298	298	976	976	157	157	600	600	17	17
Difference	0.0	144.7	18.1	30.0	0.0	0.9	0.3	10.0	-0.4	12.9	-12.5	6.8	-1.0	34.1	0.0	0.7
Percent of OY	100.0%	45.0%	82.3%	70.6%	100.0%	70.0%	99.9%	96.6%	100.0%	98.7%	108.0%	95.7%	100.2%	94.3%	100.0%	95.9%
Key																

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 2011-12 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 11-12 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 2011-2012 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.