

**GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM REPORT ON
 STATUS OF 2005 GROUND FISH FISHERIES AND INITIAL CONSIDERATION OF
 INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS**

The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) reviewed updated landings information, updated West Coast Groundfish Observer Program discard information, and new California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS) based projections for 2005 and considered options for inseason adjustments. In addition, the GMT also discussed clarifying limited entry trawl gear requirements.

LIMITED ENTRY TRAWL

During the first period of 2005, landings of petrale sole, trawl sablefish, longspine, arrowtooth, and Dover sole were higher than what was projected for that period in the trawl model, while landings of slope rockfish were substantially below initial model projections. The higher landings of petrale and Dover sole are a concern, as access to flatfish stocks are substantially more liberal than in recent years, and these species were initially modeled to achieve their respective optimum yields (OYs).

Period 1 QSM v Model Projection

	Period 1 QSM*	Period 1 TWL Model Proj
Longspine THDS	106	79
Shortspine THDS (N. CP)	65	67
TWL Sable (N.of CP)	231	197
Dover sole	1,281	1,038
Petrale	1,120	830
English Sole	212	241
Arrowtooth Flounder	367	128
Slope Rockfish	45	96

*except for TWL Sablefish, this column includes both trawl and non-trawl.

Projected Impact if No Action is Taken

		North	South	Total	HG
Rebuilding Species	Lingcod	121.1	32.6	153.7	
	Canary	5.1	0.6	5.7	
	POP	77.5	0.0	77.5	
	Darkblotch	134.9	35.5	170.4	
	Widow	1.3	0.1	1.4	
	Bocaccio	0.0	19.2	19.2	
	Yelloweye	0.2	0.2	0.3	
	Cowcod	0.0	1.1	1.1	
Target Species	Sablefish	1,759.0	521.6	2,280.6	3,505
	Longspine	644.4	561.1	1,205.5	2,450
	Shortspine	476.5	208.1	684.6	995
	Dover	6,072.3	2,494.1	8,566.4	7,445
	Arrowtooth	3,182.3	43.2	3,225.5	5,800
	Petrals	2,122.7	533.9	2,656.6	2,762
	Other Flat	1,649.2	770.7	2,419.9	4,909
	Slope Rock	133.4	135.2	268.6	1,799

In response, the GMT considered four options for inseason adjustments. In order to accommodate the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel's (GAP's) wishes, the GMT is recommending option 2B for the Council's consideration. This option uses a precautionary approach to flatfish management, due to the more liberal cumulative limits and Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA) boundaries in place for 2005, but it is expected that limits and RCA configurations will be revisited at the June Council meeting.

Status Quo Regulations

SUBAREA	Period	INLINE	OUTLINE	Sablefish	Longspine	Shortspine	Dover	Other Flat	Petrals	Arrowtooth	Slope Rock
N 40 10	1	75	150	9,500	15,000	3,500	69,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	4,000
	2	100	200	9,500	15,000	3,500	69,000	110,000	42,000	150,000	4,000
	3	100	200	17,000	23,000	4,900	30,000	110,000	42,000	150,000	4,000
	4	100	200	17,000	23,000	4,900	30,000	110,000	42,000	150,000	4,000
	5	100	200	17,000	23,000	4,900	30,000	110,000	42,000	150,000	4,000
	6	75	150	8,000	15,000	3,500	69,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	4,000
North SFFT Limit	1	75	150	1,500	1,000	1,000	20,000	100,000	25,000	70,000	4,000
	2	100	200	10,000	1,000	1,000	35,000	100,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	3	100	200	10,000	1,000	3,000	50,000	100,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	4	100	200	10,000	1,000	3,000	50,000	100,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	5	100	200	10,000	1,000	3,000	50,000	100,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	6	75	150	1,500	1,000	1,000	20,000	100,000	25,000	70,000	4,000
40 10 - 38	1	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	4,000
	2	100	200	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	4,000
	3	100	200	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	4,000
	4	100	200	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	4,000
	5	100	200	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	4,000
	6	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	4,000
S 38	1	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	40,000
	2	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	3	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	4	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	5	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	6	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	40,000

Compared to status quo, option 2b make the following adjustments:

N. of 40°10' N. lat:

- Reduce Dover sole and other flatfish limits shoreward in periods 3 – 6; Reduce petrale limits in periods 3-6, and reduce the arrowtooth limit seaward in period 6.

South of 40°10' N. lat:

- Reduce Dover sole limits in periods 3 – 6, and reduce arrowtooth limits in period 6.

Between 40°10' N. lat and 38° N. lat:

- Increase slope rockfish limits and liberalize the seaward RCA line from 200 fm to 150 fm.

The specific limits and resulting impacts are shown in the table below.

Option 2B - RCA Boundaries and Cumulative Limits – with Slope Rockfish Liberalization

SUBAREA	Period	INLINE	OUTLINE	Sablefish	Longspine	Shortspine	Dover	Other Flat	Petrale	Arrowtooth	Slope Rock
N 40 10	1	75	150	9,500	15,000	3,500	69,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	4,000
	2	100	200	9,500	15,000	3,500	69,000	110,000	42,000	150,000	4,000
	3	100	200	17,000	23,000	4,900	30,000	110,000	40,000	150,000	4,000
	4	100	200	17,000	23,000	4,900	30,000	110,000	40,000	150,000	4,000
	5	100	200	17,000	23,000	4,900	30,000	110,000	40,000	150,000	4,000
	6	75	150	8,000	15,000	3,500	22,000	80,000	60,000	80,000	4,000
North SFFT Limit	1	75	150	1,500	1,000	1,000	20,000	100,000	25,000	70,000	4,000
	2	100	200	10,000	1,000	1,000	35,000	100,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	3	100	200	10,000	1,000	3,000	35,000	90,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	4	100	200	10,000	1,000	3,000	35,000	90,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	5	100	200	10,000	1,000	3,000	35,000	90,000	35,000	70,000	4,000
	6	75	150	1,500	1,000	1,000	8,000	75,000	15,000	70,000	4,000
38 - 40 10	1	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	8,000
	2	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	8,000
	3	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	40,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	8,000
	4	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	40,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	8,000
	5	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	40,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	8,000
	6	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	35,000	110,000	100,000	20,000	8,000
S 38	1	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	No Limit	No Limit	40,000
	2	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	50,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	3	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	40,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	4	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	40,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	5	100	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	40,000	110,000	42,000	10,000	40,000
	6	75	150	14,000	19,000	4,200	35,000	110,000	100,000	20,000	40,000

Option 2B - Projected 2005 Mortality of Rebuilding and Target Species – with Slope Rockfish Liberalization

		North	South	Total
Rebuilding Species	Lingcod	95.2	33.6	128.8
	Canary	4.0	0.6	4.6
	POP	74.7	0.0	74.7
	Darkblotch	143.7	37.0	180.7
	Widow	1.3	0.1	1.4
	Bocaccio	0.0	19.0	19.0
	Yelloweye	0.2	0.1	0.3
	Cowcod	0.0	1.1	1.1
Target Species	Sablefish	1,802.2	527.0	2,329.2
	Longspine	753.5	561.4	1,314.9
	Shortspine	511.0	208.3	719.3
	Dover	5,357.2	2,144.2	7,501.4
	Arrowtooth	2,941.3	49.0	2,990.2
	Petrale	2,047.0	551.1	2,598.1
	Other Flat	1,619.1	782.6	2,401.7
	Slope Rock	133.4	163.9	297.3

Minor Slope Rockfish Trip Limits

In May 2004, the Council implemented trawl management measures that affected the catch rate of darkblotched rockfish. Specifically, the trawl slope rockfish cumulative limit was increased (from 4,000 pounds to 8,000 pounds per 2 months north of 40E10' N latitude), and the trawl RCA boundary was moved shoreward from 200 fathoms to 150 fathoms (north of 40E10' N latitude). Subsequently, the GMT received comments from industry that targeting on slope rockfish had increased since the May inseason action, and there was a size-related market discard factor for small darkblotched rockfish that was independent of trip limit size. The combination of these factors contributed to an increased darkblotched encounter rate and potentially the discard rate.

In September, the GMT did not have any quantitative information to evaluate the net effects of these factors. The only quantitative information available to the team at that time, relative to darkblotched rockfish, was the PacFIN quota species monitoring (QSM) data on landed catch and, for non-whiting trawl, a preliminary estimated discard proportion measured by information collected by the West Coast Observer Program from the 2003 fishery when the slope rockfish limit was 1,800 pounds per two months. Based on these data, the Council adjusted trip limits for slope rockfish in September 2004 as follows for the remainder of the year:

N of 40E10'

X Period 6 - Change from 8,000 lbs/2 mo. to 1,800 lbs/2 mo. (with no retention of darkblotched)

Between 40E10' and 38E

X Period 6 - Reduce from 50,000 lbs/2 mo. to 10,000 lbs/2 mo. (with no retention of darkblotched)

South of 38E

X Period 6 - Keep limit at 50,000 lbs/2 mo. (with no retention of darkblotched)

Also in response to the higher darkblotched rockfish mortalities, the GMT recommended changes to the limited entry trawl management measures for the beginning of 2005 as a precautionary measure until new Observer Program data were available. Specifically, in the area north of 40E10' N latitude, the RCA boundary scheduled for Period 1 was moved from 150 fm to 200 fm, as modified to allow fishing in petrale areas, and the slope rockfish trip limit was reduced to 4,000 lbs/2 mo (i.e., the same trip limit that was in place in period 1 of 2004). These depths and trip limits were also adopted for the area between 40E10' N latitude and 38E N latitude. due to uncertainty in darkblotched encounter rates for that area. At that time, the GMT anticipated these RCA boundaries and/or trip limits would then be adjusted inseason (in April) as more discard information became available from the 2004 Observer Program.

In summary, the GMT is recommending a liberalization of the trawl RCA and an increase in slope rockfish limits between 40E10' N latitude and 38E N latitude. Due to higher than anticipated catches of darkblotched rockfish in general, the GMT is proposing a modest increase for slope rockfish limits in the area between 40E10' N latitude and 38E N latitude at this time, but anticipates this issue will be revisited at the June meeting.

Gear Regulations

The GMT recommends two clarifications to limited entry trawl gear requirements found in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 660.381.

The first clarification is to the chafing gear requirements found in paragraph (b)(3). The purpose of this clarification is to include the chafing gear requirements for small footrope gear (currently found in 660.831 (b)(5) and referenced in current chafing gear requirements section) with all other chafing gear requirements.

Current chafing gear requirements are as follows: Chafing gear may encircle no more than 50% of the net's circumference, except as provided in paragraph (b)(5) of this section. No section of chafing gear may be longer than 50 meshes of the net to which it is attached. Except at the corners, the terminal end of section of chafing gear must not be connected to the net. (The terminal end is the end farthest from the mouth of the net.) Chafing gear must be attached outside any riblines and restraining straps. There is no limit on the number of sections of chafing gear on a net.

Proposed chafing gear requirements are as follows: Chafing gear may encircle no more than 50% of the net's circumference. No section of chafing gear may be longer than 50 meshes of the net to which it is attached. Chafing gear may be used only on the last 50 meshes of a small footrope trawl, measured from the terminal (closed) end of the codend. Except at the corners, the terminal end of each section of chafing gear must not be connected to the net. (The terminal end is the end farthest from the mouth of the net.) Chafing gear must be attached outside any riblines and restraining straps. There is no limit on the number of sections of chafing gear on a net.

The GMT also recommends removing the sentence describing the small footrope chafing gear requirements (the sentence that was added to the chafing gear section) from the section describing small footrope requirements.

The second clarification is to the selective flatfish gear requirements found in paragraph (b)(5)(i). It was brought to the GMT's attention that buoy placement on selective flatfish gear can alter the size and shape of the trawl mouth. Changing the shape of the selective trawl mouth can result in an increased take of rockfish. This increased take of rockfish is not accounted for by the trawl bycatch model and may result in achieving rockfish OYs more quickly than anticipated. The purpose of this clarification to selective flatfish trawl gear requirements is to specify buoy placement and the number of riblines to preserve the original intent of the gear requirement.

Current selective flatfish trawl gear requirements are as follows: The selective flatfish trawl net must be a two-seamed net, and its breastline may not be longer than 3 ft (0.92 m) in length. There may be no floats along the center third of the selective flatfish trawl net's headrope and the headrope must be at least 30% longer in length than the footrope. Selective flatfish trawl gear may not have a footrope that is longer than 105 ft (32.26 m) in length. An explanatory diagram of a selective flatfish trawl net is provided as Figure 1 of Part 660, Subpart G.

Proposed selective flatfish trawl gear requirements are as follows: The selective flatfish trawl net must be a two-seamed net with no more than two riblines, excluding the codend. The

breastline may not be longer than 3 ft (0.92 m) in length. There may be no floats along the center third of the headrope or attached to the top panel except on the riblines. The headrope must be at least 30% longer in length than the footrope and the footrope must be shorter than 105 ft (32.26 m) in length. An explanatory diagram of a selective flatfish trawl net is provided as Figure 1 of Part 660, Subpart G.

CALIFORNIA RECREATIONAL

At the March 2005 Council meeting, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) provided an Informational Report which summarized the CRFS program implementation and validation process, and provided recreational groundfish catch and effort estimates by mode for 2004 (Informational Report 2: CDFG 2004 Recreational Fisheries Data, March 2005). California recreational harvest guidelines or allocations for overfished species were not exceeded in 2004. Based on these results, in conjunction with the improved ability for real-time inseason catch monitoring, the Council conveyed its willingness to consider CRFS estimates to support inseason fishery actions in 2005.

Using the 2004 recreational groundfish fishing regulations as a starting point, the CDFG analyzed options for modifying the fishing season in 2005. Primary considerations in adjusting the season were constraining the canary and minor nearshore rockfish catch, and distributing the fishing effort over a greater depth range to avoid concentrating the fishing effort on the nearshore groundfish species. The preferred option, provided to the GMT by the CDFG, adjusts the 2005 recreational groundfish fishery regulations in each management area, using a combination of open months and allowable depths of fishing. This option is outlined in Attachment 1 (same as Attachment 1 provided in the Supplemental CDFG Report 2, Agenda Item B.6.c).

For the Northern Management Area (California/Oregon border to 40°10' N. lat), the proposal provides for similar angling opportunities as in 2004 with fishing from May 1 through December within 30 fathoms for rockfish and associated nearshore species. For the North-Central Management Area (40°10' N. lat to 37°11' N. lat) and the Monterey South-Central Management Area (37°11' N. lat to 36° N. lat), the proposal expands the current 2005 season to allow retention of groundfish and associated nearshore species in December within the same depth range as July-November (20 fathoms). In the Morro Bay South-Central Management Area (36° N. lat to 34°27' N. lat), it maintains the current 2005 season structure, but expands the allowable depth of fishing to include access to shallow water. In the Southern Management Area (34°27' N. lat to US/Mexico border), the proposal mirrors the 2004 recreational groundfish fishing regulations with the exception of California scorpionfish, which retains the same season structure as previously set in 2005 regulations, but follows the depth ranges as proposed for the nearshore rockfish. In all areas, divers and shore anglers may take groundfish during the proposed season closures. In addition, lingcod can be taken during the same months and depths as nearshore rockfish except that it can not be taken by any anglers during December. All other regulations remain status quo. The impacts of this option on overfished species and on other groundfish species with harvest targets are provided in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Total Bycatch Estimate (mt) for Overfished Species relative to target (OY/HG)

	Bocaccio	Canary	Cowcod	Dkbl	Lingcod	POP	Widow	Yeye
Total 2005 Catch Estimate	60	9.1	0.4	0	<422	0	9.4	<3.7
HG ¹ or updated impact estimate ²	77 ²	9.3 ¹	1.8 ¹	0 ²	422 ¹	0 ²	9.4 ^{2,3}	3.7 ¹

1 – Harvest Guideline (HG) established in Federal Regulations

2 – Best estimate of recreational impact in 2005

3 – Widow estimate was updated relative to bycatch scorecard value (as updated in March 2005) by adjusting projections for temporary targeting that occurred in 2004.

Table 2. Total Catch Estimate (mt) for Other Species [e.g., Target Species/Species Group, Species with Harvest Guideline (HG), Constraining Species]:

	Black Rockfish (RF)	Minor Nearshore RF North (40°10'-CA/OR border)	Minor Nearshore RF South (40°10'-US/Mexico border)
Total 2005 Catch Estimate	137	11	383
HG ¹ , updated impact estimate ² , or HT ³	175 ³	11 ²	383 ²

1 – Harvest Guideline (HG) established in Federal Regulations

2 – Best estimate of recreational impact in 2005

3 – Harvest Target (HT): For black rockfish, this is the state-derived recreational harvest target within the Federal HG for CA recreational and commercial catch, combined. The black rockfish recreational target is derived from CA Fish and Game Commission allocation guidance between recreational and commercial sectors.

In their report to the GMT, CDFG reviewed the uncertainties and risks associated with using the CRFS data including: (1) identification of technical errors in CRFS during its first year of operation; (2) the tracking of uncalibrated 2004 CRFS data against harvest targets set for unassessed and assessed stocks; and (3) impacts on fishing opportunities of other fisheries and sectors. The GMT discussed these uncertainties and associated risks with much of the discussion centering on potential technical errors in the CRFS data. As with any new program involving sampling and expansions, risks exist that technical errors may be identified during implementation. The RecFIN Statistical Sub-committee (RecFIN SSC) met recently and evaluated the data inputs from the first year of the CRFS sampling program including errors that could potentially impact the catch estimates generated for 2004. A summary of their results was provided to the GMT by Ms. Jennifer Cahalan (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife) with additional information on the 2005 CRFS program changes provided by Mr. Russell Porter (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission). The RecFIN SSC's findings primarily focused on sampling errors in the Angler License Database (ALD) survey. Specifically, the RecFIN SSC noted that licensed anglers were kept in the sample population for only one sample period (month) following entry into the angler license database instead of being retained for the remainder of the calendar year. Sampling errors, such as this one, can cause statistical problems and biases in the estimate. However, further discussion highlighted the fact that ALD effort estimates are only used to estimate catch for beach/bank anglers, private access boats, and nighttime fishing components of the private/rental, man-made, and beach/bank modes. Considering that only about 10% of the overall catch and effort for all sportfishing in California comes from these anglers, of which the majority are beach and bank anglers, and anglers fishing

from beach and banks do not catch significant numbers of groundfish, the GMT concluded that the impact of this error on the estimates for groundfish species of concern should be minimal.

CDFG also summarized their plans for tracking inseason take, instituting closures, and providing regulation and educational information to the public. CDFG staff will review recreational catch estimates on a monthly basis for inseason tracking and provide these estimates to the GMT. In addition, as 2005 monthly catch estimates become available, CDFG will replace the projected catches with the estimates for that month and will use these along with the remaining projected impacts to evaluate whether harvest targets will be met as scheduled. If catches are projected to exceed specific harvest targets specified in federal regulations, then the director of CDFG can take action to restrict the fishery to slow the harvest or close the fishery when warranted. This action becomes effective 10 days following public notice. To keep anglers informed and assist with rapid distribution of concerns or requests to slow fishing, CDFG has established a communication network with commercial passenger fishing vessel operators and approximately 20 recreational angling associations and clubs (this successfully stopped the targeting of widow rockfish in Southern California waters during 2004).

The GMT recommends approving the adjustments proposed by the CDFG. It recognizes that a more conservative approach might be warranted, given that this is a new program with only a single year of data, and there are uncertainties and risks associated with the CRFS estimates. However, the GMT is confident in the ability of the CDFG to effectively track their inseason recreational catches and to quickly take action to close fisheries when necessary. Because the CDFG will be providing monthly updates to the GMT on the status of its 2005 fishery, the GMT should have the information necessary for taking additional inseason action at the June or September Council meetings, if warranted. The GMT also recommends the Council provide NMFS with the authorization to take action similar to that taken by CDFG between Council meetings.

FINAL CONSIDERATION OF INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

On Friday, the GMT will provide the Council with an updated bycatch score card and updated trip limit tables. The GMT would like to bring it to the Council's attention that the canary rockfish buffer in the updated bycatch scorecard is projected to be larger than the 2.5 mt buffer recorded in the bycatch scorecard distributed at the March Council meeting.

GMT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Adopt proposed limited entry trawl trip limit inseason adjustments.
2. Adopt proposed limited entry trawl clarifications to gear requirements.
3. Adopt proposed California recreational inseason adjustments.

PFMC
04/06/05

**GROUND FISH MANAGEMENT TEAM STATEMENT ATTACHMENT 1.
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME INSEASON PROPOSAL FOR 2005 BY REGION**

Key:

	Allowed in all waters
20	Depth closed > 20fm
30	Depth closed > 30fm
40	Depth closed > 40fm
60	Depth closed > 60fm
20-40	Depth open between 20-40fm
30-60	Depth open between 30-60fm
	Closed

**NORTH COAST
(CA/OR Border to 40E 10' N Lat)**

North Coast 2005

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish							40	40	40	40		
Black rockfish ²							40	40	40	40		
California sheephead							40	40	40	40		
Cabezon							40	40	40	40		
Greenlings (rock, kelp)							40	40	40	40		
Ocean Whitefish							40	40	40	40		
Shelf rockfish							40	40	40	40		
Lingcod							40	40	40	40		

North Coast 2005 (In-Season Proposal)

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Black rockfish ²					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
California sheephead					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Cabezon					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Greenlings (rock, kelp)					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Ocean Whitefish					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Shelf rockfish					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Lingcod					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	

**NORTH-CENTRAL COAST
40E 10' N lat to Lopez Point (36E 00' N lat)**

North-Central Coast 2005

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish							20	20	20	20	20	
California scorpionfish							20	20	20	20	20	
California sheephead							20	20	20	20	20	
Cabezon							20	20	20	20	20	
Greenlings (rock, kelp)							20	20	20	20	20	
Ocean whitefish							20	20	20	20	20	
Shelf rockfish							20	20	20	20	20	
Lingcod							20	20	20	20	20	
Sanddabs												

North-Central Coast 2005 (In-Season Proposal)

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish							20	20	20	20	20	20
California scorpionfish							20	20	20	20	20	20
California sheephead							20	20	20	20	20	20
Cabezon							20	20	20	20	20	20
Greenlings (rock, kelp)							20	20	20	20	20	20
Ocean whitefish							20	20	20	20	20	20
Shelf rockfish							20	20	20	20	20	20
Lingcod							20	20	20	20	20	
Sanddabs												

SOUTH-CENTRAL COAST
Lopez Point (36E 00' N lat) to Pt. Conception (34E 27' N lat)

South-Central Coast 2005

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
California scorpionfish					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
California sheephead					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
Cabazon					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
Greenlings					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
Ocean Whitefish					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
Shelf rockfish					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
Lingcod					20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40	20-40			
Sanddabs												

South-Central Coast 2005 (In-Season Proposal)

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish					40	40	40	40	40			
California scorpionfish					40	40	40	40	40			
California sheephead					40	40	40	40	40			
Cabazon					40	40	40	40	40			
Greenlings					40	40	40	40	40			
Ocean Whitefish					40	40	40	40	40			
Shelf rockfish					40	40	40	40	40			
Lingcod					40	40	40	40	40			
Sanddabs												

SOUTH COAST
Pt. Conception (34E 27' N lat) to US/Mexico Border

South Coast 2005

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish			30-60	30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
California scorpionfish										40	40	20
California sheephead			30-60	30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
Cabazon			30-60	30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
Greenlings			30-60	30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
Ocean Whitefish			30-60	30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
Shelf rockfish			30-60	30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
Lingcod				30-60	30-60	30-60	40	40	40			
Sanddabs												

South Coast 2005 (In-Season Proposal)

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore rockfish			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
California scorpionfish										30	60	60
California sheephead			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Cabazon			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Greenlings			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Ocean Whitefish			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Shelf rockfish			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Lingcod				60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	
Sanddabs												