

## GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON THE BIENNIAL HARVEST SPECIFICATIONS AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES PART II

### **Introduction**

Based on the materials in the briefing book, the outcomes of Agenda Items H.4, H.5, and H.6 at this meeting, the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) had some additional discussions, and provide the following considerations. We anticipate working over the winter and having a January work session in order to expand on these items and help complete the draft environmental impact statement (EIS). We will provide additional thoughts for Council consideration at the March or April meetings, prior to the June final action.

### **Cowcod or Other Annual Catch Targets (ACT)**

Groundfish mortality from Pacific Coast treaty Indian Tribes, projected research catch, non-groundfish fisheries (also termed incidental open access), and exempted fishing permits (EFPs) can be removed from either the annual catch limit (ACL) or annual catch target (ACT).<sup>1</sup> The resulting value is termed the fishery harvest guideline. It is our understanding, based on Council discussion under Agenda Item H.6, that the Council is interested in establishing a cowcod ACT, and that the research and other set-asides would come off the top of the cowcod ACL. That is, only Council-managed catch would accrue from the ACT. **The Council should confirm that set-asides should be removed from the cowcod ACL and not from the ACT, if established.**

### **Cowcod, Annual Catch Targets, and Rebuilding Generally**

We discussed an intermediate ACL scenario for cowcod, and relatedly, the question of the potential research set-aside for the stock. In brief, we think some analysis is necessary before we can advise on either question. The research design and catch would depend on how much the fishery will take. Time is needed to explore how management measures and the fishery might change under higher cowcod ACLs. At some level of the cowcod ACL, the California recreational fishery becomes more constrained by bocaccio rockfish, and so any ACL higher would likely not be used. Additional modeling will inform an appropriate intermediate ACL value that would address the need for both research and the needs of fishing communities given constraints from other stocks, while applying the residual to faster rebuilding. We can explore these questions over winter. **The GMT recommends the Council provide the GMT flexibility in structuring the analysis to provide for a potential increase in cowcod research impacts.**

Of note, the topic of ACTs came up in the context of the cowcod research set-aside. The idea was that an ACT might be used to separate fishery catch from research catch. We have planned on more analysis of ACTs in general to give further attention to management uncertainty of catch and our catch projections. In short, we have noted in the past that the time to rebuild ( $T_{TARGET}$ ) is calculated based on the ACL instead of the ACT. We questioned this practice because, if implemented, the ACT would be based on the best estimate of what catch would be. Rebuilding times based on the ACL are therefore potentially being calculated based on a less

---

<sup>1</sup> See General Definitions at 50 CFR 660.11

likely catch scenario and so biased. This is a matter that has been part of our rebuilding discussions with the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and we have a couple ways of exploring this issue. One is through rebuilding analysis scenarios and the other through the rebuilding management strategy evaluation (MSE). If possible with the new cowcod rebuilding analyses, we will explore scenarios for cowcod and do more general analysis in the Tier 1 environmental impact statement (EIS) or elsewhere.

Lastly, we have general plans to explore rebuilding related analyses within the Tier 1 EIS and elsewhere. However, cowcod is the only rebuilding analysis being updated this cycle. We do hope to conduct some analyses for other species to explore some of the questions we have raised over the past couple of cycles.

### **Sector-Specific Allocation Alternatives**

The fishery harvest guideline is allocated between sectors with either formal allocations or two-year allocations.

The Council chose overfished species set-asides for EFPs earlier at this meeting. Those set-asides are combined with research, incidental open access fisheries, and tribal set-asides and are taken “off the top” of the Council’s preliminary preferred ACL, which the Council identified under Agenda Item H.6. The resulting value is the fishery harvest guideline.

There are four overfished species for which the Council determines two-year trawl and non-trawl allocations and within non-trawl sharing: cowcod, bocaccio, canary rockfish and yelloweye rockfish. The GMT has provided tables (Appendix 1) based on the preliminary preferred ACL and recent years sharing from the EISs and West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) groundfish mortality reports. **The Council should adopt preliminary two-year allocations for bocaccio, canary, cowcod, and yelloweye rockfish for analysis in the preliminary DEIS.**

Last cycle, the Council temporarily suspended the trawl and non-trawl Amendment 21 allocation for petrale sole, since the stock was declared overfished. In 2013-2014, the Council allocated 35 mt of petrale sole to the non-trawl sector and the remainder to the trawl sector. **The Council should adopt either a 2-year petrale sole allocation or revert back to the Amendment 21 allocation.**

### **Management Measures**

Under Agenda Items H.4 and H.6, the Council chose to manage spiny dogfish with species-specific harvest specifications. The proposed ACLs are 1,912 mt for 2015 and 1,897 mt for 2016. This compares to the historical catch by sector presented in Table 1.

The available management measures for reducing spiny dogfish mortality include trawl and non-trawl rockfish conservation area (RCA) adjustments and trip limit adjustments. However, as demonstrated in the 2013-2014 harvest specifications and management measures EIS, these measures have limited efficacy.

In September, the Council expressed interest in exploring individual fishing quota (IFQ) for managing spiny dogfish in the shoreside IFQ fishery. **If the Council is interested in spiny dogfish IFQ for 2015-2016, a two-year trawl and non-trawl allocation may need to be**

**consider the historical catches in Table 1. Further a methodology and process for establishing initial allocations would need to be derived.**

### **Slope rockfish**

The Council's recommendation to follow the NMFS proposal for the slope rockfish alters the analysis we described under [Agenda Item H.10.b, GMT Report](#) by adding individual management of certain stocks into the analysis of the flexible sorting grid and closed areas (Items A.2 and C.3). NMFS has expressed interest in leading the analysis, and so, we look for guidance on the team's role. Based on our experience with the issues over the past couple of cycles and the general outline of what would be involved with the analysis, the number of issues needing consideration increases with individual management in play. As the Council considered in September, much of the potential workload and Council time comes from the need to consider intersector and finer scale allocations. The general outline of potential management measures is well known (i.e., trip limits, closed areas, IFQ and co-op management, etc.). In addition, we have heard interest from the NMFS and industry in providing substantial time for industry input into management. Additional workshops or time at Council meetings might be needed. **The GMT recommends the Council provide guidance on the team's role in the slope rockfish analysis and on the extra process, if any, for engaging input from industry on developing management measures.**

### **Ecosystem Component (EC) Species Analysis**

The Council chose to designate the following ecosystem component (EC) species within the groundfish fishery management plan (FMP) under Agenda Item H.4. Those species are: big skate, California skate, Aleutian skate, roughtail/black skate, Bering/sandpaper skate, all other skates, Pacific grenadier, giant grenadier, all other grenadiers, spotted ratfish, soupfin shark, and finescale codling. This raises specific questions that the GMT will analyze during this next year, because EC species have no associated overfishing levels (OFLs) or allowable biological catch (ABCs), and management measures are not applied to EC species. The GMT summarized the purpose of EC species designation under [Agenda Item H.4.b, GMT Report 2](#), where it was pointed out that one purpose was data collection to evaluate whether conditions have changed (e.g., increased targeting). The question is whether the GMT should explore ways to improve monitoring of these species. Monitoring catch trends can be accomplished a number of ways, including data from the observer program (at sea and at ports), and state port sampling programs. We also discussed whether it would be fruitful for WCGOP to include discard of EC species in their annual groundfish mortality reports. **We seek guidance from the Council to help develop our analysis regarding EC species, and ask if there is anything specific the Council may wish included in the analysis.** Our detailed analysis will be completed over the winter.

**GMT Recommendations:**

- 1. The Council should confirm that set-asides should be removed from the cowcod ACL and not from the ACT, if established.**
- 2. Provide the GMT flexibility in structuring the analysis to provide for potential increased cowcod research impacts.**
- 3. The Council should adopt preliminary two-year allocations for bocaccio, canary, cowcod, and yelloweye rockfish for analysis in the preliminary DEIS based on information in Appendix 1.**
- 4. The Council should adopt either a 2-year petrale sole allocation or revert back to the Amendment 21 allocation.**
- 5. If the Council is interested in spiny dogfish IFQ for 2015-2016, a two-year trawl and non-trawl allocation would need to be established and may be based on the historical catches in Table 1. Further a methodology and process for establishing initial allocations would need to be derived.**
- 6. Provide guidance on the team's role in the slope rockfish analysis and on the extra process, if any, for engaging input from industry on developing management measures.**
- 7. Provide guidance to help develop the team's analysis regarding EC species, and ask if there is anything specific the Council may wish included in the analysis.**

### **Informational - Holdovers from Agenda Item H.6.**

In our report under Agenda Item H.6 ([Agenda Item H.6.b, Supplemental GMT Report 2, November 2013](#)) we noted that we may have additional thoughts on the P\* white paper ([Agenda Item H.6.a, Supplemental Attachment 4, November 2013](#)). In response to a question from the Council, one of our representatives expressed the view that we believe more discussion is needed over the course of the upcoming cycles before the Council arrives at regular guidelines for using P\*. And that was the view we wished to elaborate on here.

The team has been highlighting the need for such discussion since the P\* -based control rule was adopted in Amendment 23. In brief, P\* is meant to reflect a risk decision. And in the classic definition, risk is the probability of an event times its consequence. Based on this model it would be fully reasonable for the Council to choose different P\* values for two stocks with equally uncertain stock assessments if the concern over the consequences of overfishing were different. Conversely, choosing the same P\* for the stocks implies the Council's view that the consequences are equal.

What we have highlighted in the past is that P\* is based on a very narrow, uncertain view of the consequences. Our hope is that the science might bring a more specific, longer-view focus to the consequences side of the equation by grounding the decision in specific outcomes for the stock (e.g., probability that the stock will be overfished over some time period). Stock assessments may be limited in their ability to do this. Yet decision tables used for setting harvest specifications for Pacific halibut and Pacific whiting in their international forums have been moving this direction. Again, our point is that a framework could be developed over time and that we expect the planned Tier 1 EIS analyses to help inform the effort. To be clear, we thought the Council's look to stock specific considerations in choosing P\* values under H.6 was the right approach to take for now.

In addition, we wished to further clarify our statement made about P\* and cartilaginous species under H.6 (Pp. 1-2, [Supplemental GMT Report](#)). In clarifying the statement to the Council, the GMT Chair did not wish to speak for the team about how we would have worded the sentence until he had opportunity to discuss it with the team. Having now had that discussion, the team consensus is that the sentence was erroneous and should have been struck from the report. The point that we had intended to make was that the Council had chosen a P\* of 0.3 for spiny dogfish last cycle because of the uncertainty in the  $F_{MSY}$  proxy. That rationale potentially changed when the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) recommended the new proxy in September. Our statement was erroneous because the proxy would apply to all elasmobranchs. Furthermore, after the Council's action in H.4, the only elasmobranchs other than spiny dogfish requiring a P\* will be leopard Shark and longnose Skate.

On that note, the GMT discussed how the Council's rationale for the P\* recommendation of 0.35 for spiny dogfish could logically apply to longnose skate as well. However, we understand the Council did not apply the P\* of 0.3 to longnose skate in 2013-14 or recommend the same P\* as for spiny dogfish for 2015-16 because the stock's annual catch limit (ACL) is low enough that it subsumes what a P\* of 0.35 would produce in terms of an allowable biological catch (ABC). Like us, some may wonder and need to be reminded about the difference.

**Table 1. West coast groundfish mortality estimates, by sector in metric tons, for dogfish shark from 2006-2012. Estimates assume 100% mortality for discarded dogfish shark for all gear types during 2006-2011. For 2012, 50% mortality was shown in Bellman et al. (2013) for discarded dogfish in the fixed gear fishery and 100% discard mortality in the trawl fishery. Data were acquired from Hastie and Bellman (2007), Bellman et al. (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013).**

Year	Shoreside commercial fisheries						WA tribal landings <sup>a</sup>	All at-sea hake fisheries	Total recreational fishing mortality			Research	Remaining incidental OA fisheries landings	Estimated total fishing mortality
	LE bottom Trawl	CA halibut	Pink Shrimp	Non-nearshore fixed-gear	Nearshore fixed-gear	Shoreside hake mid-water trawl			WA	OR	CA			
	2006	666.0	--	--	563.0 <sup>a</sup>	--			33.2	77.0	59.0			
2007	652.0	3.0	1.0	509.0	0.0	51.0	113.0	155.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	13.0	1.0	1,504.0
2008	1,023.0	3.0	4.0	332.0	1.0	59.0	303.0	673.0	--	0.0	3.0	14.0	82.0	2,497.0
2009	665.5	3.2	0.4	216.2	0.0	16.0	125.4	163.4	--	0.1	4.9	10.9	1.0	1,206.9
2010	520.1	2.9	16.4	254.1	0.1	124.6	6.9	277.7	--	0.1	1.6	10.2	0.4	1,215.1
2011	395.0 <sup>b</sup>	0.5	2.9	129.5	0.3	181.0	186.2	725.1	0.2	0.1	9.3	31.5	0.1	1661.7
2012	368.4 <sup>b</sup>	1.8	0.9	82.3	0.0	160.1	2.5	177.8	0.1	0.1	2.8	33.2	0.1	830.8

<sup>a</sup>Washington tribal landings include shoreside and at-sea fisheries combined.

<sup>b</sup>Reported as “estimated non-trawl”, which included non-nearshore fixed gear, nearshore fixed gear, and minor landings made with troll.

<sup>c</sup>Includes IFQ trawl and IFQ fixed gear combined.

**Appendix 1.** 2015 and 2016 cowcod, bocaccio, canary rockfish, and yelloweye rockfish sector-specific allocation scenarios based on the Council’s preliminary preferred (PPA) ACLs and recent environmental impact statements and groundfish mortality reports.

**Table A1. 2015-2016 Cowcod sector-specific allocation scenarios (in mt) based on recent past biennial harvest specifications and management measures environmental impact statements (EIS) and the groundfish mortality reports (GMR).**

**2015** ACL = 16 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS	09-10 EIS	07-08 EIS	05-06 EIS	2012 GMR	2011 GMR	2010 GMR	2009 GMR	2008 GMR	2007 GMR
LE Trawl- Non-Whiting	5.4	14.2	13.7	13.4	6.1	1.5	0.4	9.5	9.9	7.9	14.3
LE Trawl- Whiting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OA: Directed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LE Fixed Gear	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: WA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: OR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: CA	10.3	1.6	1.1	1.4	7.3	14.2	15.4	6.3	3.9	7.9	1.5

**2016** ACL = 16 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS	09-10 EIS	07-08 EIS	05-06 EIS	2012 GMR	2011 GMR	2010 GMR	2009 GMR	2008 GMR	2007 GMR
LE Trawl- Non-Whiting	5.4	14.2	13.7	13.4	6.1	1.5	0.4	9.5	9.9	7.9	14.3
LE Trawl- Whiting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OA: Directed	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LE Fixed Gear	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: WA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: OR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: CA	10.3	1.6	1.1	1.4	7.3	14.2	15.4	6.3	3.9	7.9	1.5

**Table A2. 2015-2016 bocaccio sector-specific allocation scenarios (in mt) based on recent past biennial harvest specifications and management measures environmental impact statements (EIS) and the groundfish mortality reports (GMR).**

**2015**                      ACL = 349 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS	09-10 EIS	07-08 EIS	05-06 EIS	2012 GMR	2011 GMR	2010 GMR	2009 GMR	2008 GMR	2007 GMR
LE Trawl- Non-Whiting	82.4	82.4	40.6	119.0	145.0	22.1	16.4	61.8	100.8	50.1	24.6
LE Trawl- Whiting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OA: Directed	1.0	1.0	35.7	26.3	31.3	1.8	2.3	2.4	4.9	7.3	5.9
LE Fixed Gear	79.5	79.5	44.2	33.2	39.6	6.6	4.9	4.3	7.9	2.4	25.2
Rec: WA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: OR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: CA	179.8	179.9	222.2	164.3	126.9	312.2	319.2	274.2	229.2	282.9	287.1

**2016**                      ACL = 362 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS	09-10 EIS	07-08 EIS	05-06 EIS	2012 GMR	2011 GMR	2010 GMR	2009 GMR	2008 GMR	2007 GMR
LE Trawl- Non-Whiting	85.5	85.5	42.2	123.5	150.5	23.0	17.1	64.2	104.6	52.0	23.8
LE Trawl- Whiting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OA: Directed	1.0	1.0	37.0	27.3	32.5	1.9	2.3	2.5	5.1	7.6	5.7
LE Fixed Gear	82.5	82.5	45.9	34.5	41.1	6.8	5.0	4.5	8.2	2.5	24.3
Rec: WA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: OR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rec: CA	186.7	186.7	230.7	170.5	131.8	324.1	331.3	284.6	237.9	293.7	277.0



**Table A3. 2015-2016 canary rockfish sector-specific allocation scenarios (in mt) based on recent past biennial harvest specifications and management measures environmental impact statements (EIS) and the groundfish mortality reports (GMR).**

**2015** ACL = 122 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS	09-10 EIS	07-08 EIS	05-06 EIS	2012 GMR	2011 GMR	2010 GMR	2009 GMR	2008 GMR	2007 GMR
LE Trawl- Non-Whiting	see Table A4		19.6	24.7	23.4	15.7	7.4	7.4	28.7	45.0	46.6
LE Trawl- Whiting			22.7	14.7	21.4	8.0	3.6	15.9	14.0	16.4	9.9
OA: Directed			3.5	6.6	2.9	22.7	40.0	18.2	11.3	6.7	9.9
LE Fixed Gear			1.3	2.8	2.6	0.4	0.2	0.0	1.0	5.8	0.2
Rec: WA			6.2	5.3	5.9	2.0	2.2	3.1	1.6	2.1	2.7
Rec: OR			20.2	20.3	19.0	11.5	8.2	13.0	9.7	9.1	6.2
Rec: CA			28.9	28.1	27.2	42.1	40.9	44.8	36.1	17.3	26.9

**2016** ACL = 125 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS	09-10 EIS	07-08 EIS	05-06 EIS	2012 GMR	2011 GMR	2010 GMR	2009 GMR	2008 GMR	2007 GMR
LE Trawl- Non-Whiting	see table A4		20.1	25.4	24.1	16.2	7.6	7.6	29.6	46.3	48.0
LE Trawl- Whiting			23.4	15.1	22.0	8.2	3.7	16.3	14.4	16.9	10.2
OA: Directed			3.6	6.7	3.0	23.4	41.2	18.8	11.6	6.9	10.2
LE Fixed Gear			1.3	2.9	2.7	0.4	0.2	0.0	1.0	5.9	0.3
Rec: WA			6.4	5.5	6.0	2.1	2.3	3.2	1.7	2.2	2.8
Rec: OR			20.8	20.9	19.6	11.9	8.4	13.4	10.0	9.4	6.3
Rec: CA			29.8	28.9	28.0	43.3	42.1	46.1	37.2	17.8	27.7

**Table A4. 2015-2016 canary rockfish sector-specific allocation scenarios (in mt) based on the 2011-2012 and 2013-2014 EIS analysis, with the at-sea whiting sectors broken out from the shoreside IFQ trawl sectors.**

**2015**                      ACL = 122 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS
Shorebased IFQ	40.5	48.7
At-sea Whiting	16.6	12.0
-Mothership	6.9	5.0
-Catcher-Processor	9.7	7.0
OA: Directed	6.1	5.6
LE Fixed Gear	3.4	3.2
Rec: WA	3.1	2.8
Rec: OR	10.6	9.8
Rec: CA	22.1	20.3

**2016**                      ACL = 125 mt

Sector Specific Allocation	13-14 EIS	11-12 EIS
Shorebased IFQ	41.7	50.1
At-sea Whiting	17.0	12.4
-Mothership	7.1	5.2
-Catcher-Processor	10.0	7.2
OA: Directed	6.3	5.8
LE Fixed Gear	3.6	3.3
Rec: WA	3.1	2.9
Rec: OR	11.0	10.1
Rec: CA	22.7	20.9

**Table A5. 2015-2016 yelloweye rockfish sector-specific allocation scenarios (in mt) based on recent past biennial harvest specifications and management measures environmental impact statements (EIS) and the groundfish mortality reports (GMR).**

**2015 ACL = 18 mt**

<b>Sector Specific Allocation</b>	<b>13-14 EIS</b>	<b>11-12 EIS</b>	<b>09-10 EIS</b>	<b>07-08 EIS</b>	<b>05-06 EIS</b>	<b>2012 GMR</b>	<b>2011 GMR</b>	<b>2010 GMR</b>	<b>2009 GMR</b>	<b>2008 GMR</b>	<b>2007 GMR</b>
<b>LE Trawl- Non-Whiting</b>	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
<b>LE Trawl- Whiting</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
<b>OA: Directed</b>	1.2	1.2	1.0	2.1	0.5	2.2	1.2	0.2	0.7	2.3	1.9
<b>LE Fixed Gear</b>	1.1	1.4	1.5	2.0	2.1	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.7	0.8	0.4
<b>Rec: WA</b>	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.9	3.7	3.7	2.1	2.9	1.8
<b>Rec: OR</b>	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.7	3.7	3.3	5.2	2.6	3.9	2.1
<b>Rec: CA</b>	3.4	3.4	3.2	1.9	3.1	1.9	3.3	2.4	5.0	2.0	5.9

**2016 ACL = 19 mt**

<b>Sector Specific Allocation</b>	<b>13-14 EIS</b>	<b>11-12 EIS</b>	<b>09-10 EIS</b>	<b>07-08 EIS</b>	<b>05-06 EIS</b>	<b>2012 GMR</b>	<b>2011 GMR</b>	<b>2010 GMR</b>	<b>2009 GMR</b>	<b>2008 GMR</b>	<b>2007 GMR</b>
<b>LE Trawl- Non-Whiting</b>	1.1	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
<b>LE Trawl- Whiting</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
<b>OA: Directed</b>	1.3	1.3	1.1	2.3	0.6	2.3	1.3	0.2	0.7	2.5	2.1
<b>LE Fixed Gear</b>	1.2	1.5	1.6	2.2	2.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.8	0.9	0.4
<b>Rec: WA</b>	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	2.3	3.1	2.0
<b>Rec: OR</b>	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.2	2.9	4.0	3.6	5.6	2.8	4.2	2.3
<b>Rec: CA</b>	3.7	3.7	3.4	2.0	3.4	2.1	3.6	2.6	5.4	2.2	6.4