

## CONSIDERATION OF INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

The Council set optimum yield (OY) levels and various management measures for the 2006 groundfish management season with the understanding these management measures will likely need to be adjusted periodically through the biennial management period with the goal of attaining, but not exceeding, the OYs. The Groundfish Management Team (GMT) will begin meeting on Sunday, June 11, 2006 and the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) will begin meeting on Monday June 12, 2006 (see Ancillary A and C agendas) to discuss and recommend inseason adjustments to ongoing 2006 groundfish fisheries.

Under this agenda item, the Council is to consider advisory body advice and public comment on the status of ongoing fisheries and recommended inseason adjustments prior to adopting final changes as necessary.

### **Council Action:**

- 1. Consider information on the status of ongoing fisheries.**
- 2. Consider and adopt inseason adjustments as necessary.**

### **Reference Materials:**

1. Agenda Item F.4.c, CDFG Report: Draft California Department of Fish and Game Report on Inseason Management Proposals for the 2006 California Recreational Fishing Season.
2. Agenda Item F.4.e, Public Comment.

### **Agenda Order:**

- a. Agenda Item Overview
  - b. Report of the Groundfish Management Team (GMT)
  - c. Agency and Tribal Comments
  - d. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies
  - e. Public Comment
  - f. **Council Action:** Adopt Final Recommendations for Adjustments to 2006 Fisheries
- John DeVore  
Susan Ashcraft

PFMC  
05/23/06

**DRAFT CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME REPORT ON  
INSEASON MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE 2006 CALIFORNIA  
RECREATIONAL FISHING SEASON**

BACKGROUND AND PROPOSED ACTION

The Pacific Fisheries Management Council (Council) approved inseason changes to California's recreational 2005 season and depth structure at its March 2005 meeting. The Council, in adopting these changes, took into account a number of factors including: 1) the 2004 annual California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS) estimates of recreational take which showed that harvest of overfished species was below their respective California recreational harvest targets in 2004; and 2) the improved ability for real-time inseason catch monitoring through the new CRFS program. The March 2005 inseason changes provided more recreational fishing opportunity while keeping projected impacts (derived from California's recreational catch model) within recreational harvest guidelines or allocations for overfished and constraining species.

In March 2006, complete CRFS estimates of recreational take for 2005 (through December) became available. These estimates indicated that even under this modified management structure adopted at the March 2005 meeting, the California recreational harvest guidelines or allocations for overfished species were not exceeded and, in some cases, catch was well below the projected impacts. However, due to the shallow water restriction of 20 fm in some areas, fishing pressure was increased on nearshore groundfish species resulting in take that met or exceeded these species OYs or harvest targets. These results suggest that the current 2006 management structure could be further modified to allow for additional fishing opportunities for shelf species such as vermilion rockfish (thereby reducing fishing pressure on nearshore groundfish species such as the nearshore rockfish and cabezon ), while still remaining within recreational harvest targets for overfished and constraining species.

A proposed season and depth structure for the California recreational fishery is provided in Attachment 1. We request that the Council consider adopting at the June 2006 PFMC meeting these inseason management measures in federal waters for 2006.

A table with the impacts of this proposed inseason change is provided below. These impacts were projected using a modeling approach that has been reviewed and approved by the Groundfish Management Team for use in crafting 2007-2008 recreational fishery management options.

ESTIMATED IMPACTS RESULTING FROM ACTION:

Species		2005 CRFS Catch Estimates	Projected 2006 Catch Estimates Under Current Regulations	Projected 2006 Catch Estimates Under Proposed Changes	HG <sup>1</sup> , updated impact estimate <sup>2</sup> , or HT <sup>3</sup>
Rebuilding Species	Bocaccio	38	52	66	66 <sup>2</sup>
	Canary	2.3	6.2	7.9	9.3 <sup>1</sup>
	Cowcod	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4 <sup>3</sup>
	Darkblotched	0	0	0	0 <sup>2</sup>
	Lingcod	300	256	228	422 <sup>1</sup>
	POP	0	0	0	0 <sup>2</sup>
	Widow	1.7	5.7	17.6	17.6 <sup>2</sup>
Yelloweye	1.7	1.5	1.3	3.7 <sup>1</sup>	
Other Target Species	Black RF	180	176	142	171 <sup>3</sup>
	Minor NS RF North (40°10' – CA/OR)	19.9	17.3	15.3	15.3 <sup>2</sup>
	Minor NS RF South (40°10' – US/Mexico)	430	447 <sup>5</sup>	436 <sup>5,6</sup>	383 <sup>3</sup>
	Cabezon	41.8	43.0	33.5 <sup>6</sup>	42.1 <sup>4</sup>
	Greenlings	4.8	6.7	5.5	15.5 <sup>4</sup>

1 – Harvest Guideline (HG) established in Federal Regulations

2 – Best estimate of recreational impact in 2006

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.

4 – Total Allowable Catch (TAC) established in State Regulations.

5 – Includes increased take of California scorpionfish projected under California regulations which now couples fishing for California scorpionfish with fishing for nearshore rockfish, resulting in the same seasons and depths for both.

6 – These species show a reduction in projected take under the proposed inseason change primarily because the projection model does not include an increase in catch due to an inshore shift in effort when fishing is at or greater than 40 fm.

Attachment 1. Proposed California Recreational Inseason Action for June 2006 PFMC Meeting.

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

**North Coast 2005 and 2006 (Current)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Black rockfish <sup>2</sup>					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Lingcod					30	30	30	30	30	30	30	

**North Coast 2006 (In-Season Proposal)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish					30	30	40	40	40	40	40	40
Black rockfish <sup>2</sup>					30	30	40	40	40	40	40	40
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish					30	30	40	40	40	40	40	40
Lingcod					30	30	40	40	40	40	40	

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

**North-Central Coast 2005 and 2006 (Current)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish							20	20	20	20	20	20
California scorpionfish							20	20	20	20	20	20
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish							20	20	20	20	20	20
Lingcod							20	20	20	20	20	
Sanddabs												

**North-Central Coast 2006 (In-Season Proposal)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish							40	40	40	40	40	40
California scorpionfish							40	40	40	40	40	40
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish							40	40	40	40	40	40
Lingcod							40	40	40	40	40	
Sanddabs												

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

**South-Central Coast 2005 and 2006 (Current)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish					40	40	40	40	40			
California scorpionfish					40	40	40	40	40			
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish					40	40	40	40	40			

Lingcod					40	40	40	40	40			
Sanddabs												

**South-Central Coast 2006 (In-Season Proposal)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish					40	40	40	40	40	40		
California scorpionfish					40	40	40	40	40	40		
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish					40	40	40	40	40	40		
Lingcod					40	40	40	40	40	40		
Sanddabs												

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

**South Coast 2005**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
California scorpionfish										30	60	60
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish			30-60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Lingcod				60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	
Sanddabs												

**South Coast 2006 (Current)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish			60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
California scorpionfish										30	60	60
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish			60	60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	60
Lingcod				60	60	60	60	60	30	30	60	
Sanddabs												

**South Coast 2006 (In-Season Proposal)**

Species	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Nearshore & shelf rockfish			60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
California scorpionfish			60	60	60	60	60	60		60	60	60
Cabazon, greenlings, CA sheephead, ocean whitefish			60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
Lingcod				60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	
Sanddabs												

RECEIVED

MAY 18 2006

PFMC

Dear Don,

I have fished for over 35 years and own a part in a crab processing cannery. This is the oldest continuously operating cannery on the Col. River. In the last year we began purchasing block ice, I have been out on the open access part with one of my sons. We have a \$2500 electronic scale on the boat - we weigh our garbage can at a time - as the boat rolls - 99 - 102 - 101 - 99 - 100 - and so on - looks like a 100 lbs - dump them into the slush ice - do it again - 10 times = 1000 lbs - everyone usually has some extra to throw over - hopefully they're alive. Any way we get to the cannery - up the hoist - and the weight is 1011 lbs - now what - was it slush ice they're suspended in - taking on a little water - or the almost impossible chance to hit 100 each time?

Some guys draw a line around the garbage can, also one around the tote - but again a guess - if they are smaller they pack more and you're over a little.

Believe me we're trying to be honest - we're facing this decline at our cannery right now.

How can we improve this program?

I know you guys are on the enforcement review - at your next meeting - so let me try some thoughts from the fishermen and cannery

(2)

point of view — what if you created a relatively small range of overages — lets say 5% - 6% — or 50 Lbs. — something not very large — just enough to help make it possible to be close. There shouldn't be any incentive for the fisher to go over — so buyer would make out a state ticket and send the overage check to the state or Nat. mar. fish —

Then the next part for no incentive is the obvious fact that what ever the overage add up to would come off the final biomass that is allocated to the open access. You would get a pretty good picture of how the small overages add up — by mid season you would have a pretty good scientific picture of what the final adjustment would be — As you put a couple of years into this method I believe you would have a good picture how it works —

It is very hard to "hit" the number — and most fishermen don't want to throw them back — esp. at the cost of fuel — I would hope you wouldn't just drop the weekly level by 50 Lbs. for every delivery, because I believe in most cases guys will get pretty close either just below or a little above. With negative incentives — Pay the state (no wants to do that) and the adjusted loss from the total! Please think about this — only trying to keep us legal —

Sincerely — Steve Gray — 360 642-2408 —