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## Executive Summary

## Stock

This assessment reports the status of the yelloweye rockfish (Sebastes ruberrimus) resource off the west coast of the United States, from the Mexican border to the Canadian border. This stock is treated as a single coastwide population as in the previous two assessments (Wallace et al. 2005, Methot et al. 2002) and additionally as separate sub-populations in area models for Washington, Oregon and California. Although there is no apparent genetic distinction between areas, yelloweye are considered to be sedentary, habitat specific, and non-migratory signifying a slow rate of mixing where area-specific patterns are likely to persist for some time. This life history feature would support area-specific model configurations. Additionally, differences in CPUE trends and exploitation between areas further indicate the need for area-specific model configurations. For these reasons, we believe that separate area models for California and Oregon better represent sub-stock dynamics than the coastwise model and should be used for management considerations.

## Catches

NMFS and State personnel expended a significant amount of effort to provide the best possible historical accounting of landings prior to 1983. These estimates are considered to be a significant improvement over previous catch time series for California, Oregon and Washington. This resulted in decreasing total catch between 1955-2005 for the coastwide recreational fishery by 667 mt and increasing the commercial landings by $1,674 \mathrm{mt}$ (compared to the 2005 assessment).


Figure ES1. Reconstructed historical landings (mt) by area and year.

Table ES1. Twenty-five year catch history by State, fishery and year (shaded values indicated where there are no data and catches are based on interpolation) including discard estimates.

Coastal Washington, Oregon and California Yelloweye Rockfish Landings

| Source | PacFIN | 相 |  |  | ga | Or | , |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Califo | $i^{1 /}$ |  |  | Oreg |  |  |  | Vash | gton ${ }^{3 /}$ |  |  |  | Totals |  |  |
| Year | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Total |
| 1980 | 147.9 | 20.2 |  | 75.9 | 60.2 | 8.0 |  | 27.5 | 29.2 | 5.8 | 0 | 2.4 | 237.3 | 34.0 | 0.0 | 105.8 | 377.1 |
| 1981 | 138.7 | 20.4 | 50.7 | 46.9 | 93.7 | 8.5 |  | 34.2 | 5.3 | 4.4 | 0 | 3.4 | 237.7 | 33.4 | 50.7 | 84.5 | 406.3 |
| 1982 | 146.9 | 28.3 | 1.8 | 103.8 | 99.9 | 9.0 | 5.6 | 48.7 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 0 | 3.4 | 253.3 | 43.5 | 7.4 | 155.8 | 460.0 |
| 1983 | 56.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 51.0 | 177.3 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 6.5 | 10.1 | 0 | 6.7 | 240.3 | 26.3 | 0.8 | 120.6 | 388.0 |
| 1984 | 43.5 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 80.8 | 57.1 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 43.6 | 3.0 | 10.4 | 0 | 12.2 | 103.6 | 20.9 | 0.9 | 136.6 | 262.0 |
| 1985 | 7.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 125.8 | 91.9 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 10.5 | 15.9 | 0 | 8.8 | 109.7 | 26.8 | 0.6 | 161.4 | 298.4 |
| 1986 | 9.8 | 20.0 | 1.2 | 65.5 | 59.8 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 2.7 | 12.0 | 0 | 9.0 | 72.3 | 42.8 | 1.2 | 101.7 | 218.0 |
| 1987 | 16.9 | 33.1 | 3.7 | 75.2 | 65.7 | 15 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 6.0 | 19.1 | 0 | 10.5 | 88.6 | 67.2 | 3.7 | 115.1 | 274.6 |
| 1988 | 30.6 | 22.5 | 11.8 | 57.5 | 110.7 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 15.8 | 9.8 | 0 | 8.3 | 157.1 | 41.7 | 11.8 | 75.4 | 286.0 |
| 1989 | 9.4 | 34.0 | 6.7 | 58.7 | 169.4 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 27.9 | 11.3 | 0 | 14.6 | 206.7 | 55.9 | 6.7 | 89.3 | 358.6 |
| 1990 | 10.1 | 58.8 | 10.9 | 46.12 | 61.1 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 18.8 | 7.5 | 0 | 9.9 | 90.0 | 79.5 | 10.9 | 72.6 | 253.1 |
| 1991 | 13.9 | 124.0 | 3.2 | 33.57 | 104.6 | 31.3 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 15.8 | 4.6 | 0 | 18.0 | 134.3 | 159.9 | 3.2 | 66.5 | 363.8 |
| 1992 | 15.8 | 95.1 | 1.3 | 21.02 | 107.8 | 58 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 25.1 | 8.7 | 0 | 16.2 | 148.7 | 161.8 | 1.3 | 63.2 | 374.9 |
| 1993 | 6.2 | 46.1 | 0.6 | 8.5 | 119.3 | 63.9 | 0.0 | 19.7 | 17.6 | 12.2 | 0 | 18.0 | 143.1 | 122.2 | 0.6 | 46.2 | 312.1 |
| 1994 | 4.7 | 48.7 | 1.0 | 14 | 77.6 | 24.6 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 7.2 | 12.4 | 0 | 10.3 | 89.5 | 85.7 | 1.0 | 43.0 | 219.2 |
| 1995 | 3.6 | 44.2 | 0.7 | 12.6 | 126.3 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 8.1 | 9.9 | 0 | 9.9 | 138.0 | 76.9 | 0.7 | 36.3 | 251.9 |
| 1996 | 16.2 | 48.0 | 1.6 | 12.5 | 75.5 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 0 | 10.8 | 100.3 | 78.5 | 1.6 | 31.7 | 212.1 |
| 1997 | 6.0 | 55.3 | 0.9 | 15.1 | 71.4 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 6.5 | 12.2 | 0 | 11.4 | 83.9 | 111.6 | 0.9 | 40.9 | 237.3 |
| 1998 | 4.0 | 16.7 | 0.9 | 5.8 | 20.8 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 0 | 14.4 | 29.6 | 38.0 | 0.9 | 39.1 | 107.6 |
| 1999 | 8.7 | 13.4 | 0.1 | 12.6 | 7.1 | 54.2 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 9.9 | 23.0 | 0 | 10.6 | 25.7 | 90.6 | 0.1 | 41.0 | 157.4 |
| 2000 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 0 | 10.1 | 1.2 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 42.4 |
| 2001 | 0.6 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 21.2 | 0 | 12.5 | 2.1 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 20.3 | 53.0 |
| 2002 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 12.9 |
| 2003 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 11.6 |
| 2004 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 12.0 |
| 2005 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 0.3 | 13.1 | 23.6 |
|  |  | an Ann | ual Catc |  |  | n Ann | al Catc |  |  | n Ann | al Catc |  |  | an Ann | al Catc |  |  |
| 1980's | 60.7 | 18.0 | 8.7 | 74.1 | 98.6 | 10.7 | 0.7 | 32.6 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 170.7 | 39.2 | 8.4 | 114.6 | 263.7 |
| 1990's | 8.9 | 55.0 | 2.1 | 18.2 | 77.2 | 35.5 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 12.2 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 98.3 | 100.4 | 2.1 | 48.1 | 109.8 |
| 2000-2004 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 9.6 | 0.1 | 15.0 | 26.4 |

Discard was assumed to have not occurred prior to enactment of strict harvest policies beginning in 2002 and estimates in recent years are included in the catch table above. By 2004, all three States instituted regulations that prohibited yelloweye retention in the recreational fishery and most commercial fisheries.

## Data and assessment

The first and second full assessments for yelloweye rockfish were conducted in 2001 (Wallace 2001) and 2002 (Methot et al. 2002), respectively. Both assessments were length-based models that used an earlier version of the Stock Synthesis program (Methot 1989). Wallace (2001) conducted two separate area assessments for the Northern California and Oregon areas. Methot et al. (2002) incorporated Washington catch, recreational abundance indices, and age data, and treated the stock as one single assemblage of the W-O-C coast. The 2005 assessment (Wallace et al. 2005) provided an update of the 2002 assessment incorporating a revised catch time series (1982-2004) and employed the Stock Synthesis 2 (SS2) modeling framework to estimate model parameters and management quantities. Abundance indices were not revisited and little new composition data were available. Each of the assessments concluded that ending spawning biomass was less than $25 \%$ of unfished.

This current (2006) assessment reevaluated all of the available coast-wide catch and effort information and reformulated all indices of abundance. New information included the IPHC survey index of abundance for 1999 and from 2001-2005, a revised historical catch time series from 1955-1982 and new age, length and size composition data. The SS2 modeling framework is again used to estimate model parameters for a coastwide model and for separate area models for W-O-C. Additionally, natural mortality was estimated within the coastwide model to be 0.036 and was then assumed to be 0.036 in all area specific models. This compares to natural mortality estimates of 0.02 and 0.033 (Chi Hong, DFO, Canada pers. communication) used in the SE

Alaska, U.S. and British Columbia, Canada, respectively. Natural mortality was assumed to be 0.045 in the previous two assessments (Wallace et al., 2005 and Methot, et al., 2002) and age specific in the 2001 assessment (Wallace, 2001).

Since natural mortality is confounded with selectivity in age-structured models we explored the trade-off between natural mortality and selectivity relative to our ability to estimate selectivity parameters. Because of the lack of age and length composition information especially for older, larger individuals we concluded that data were insufficient to allow us to satisfactorily estimate the descending limb of a double logistic selectivity curve and chose to assume a logistic form for all area specific and coastwide models. This model form assumes that all ages and sizes of fish are available to the fishery with no refugia for the largest individuals in the population.

## Stock biomass and recruitment for the coastwide model and each area model

In agreement with previous assessment(s) yelloweye rockfish biomass is considered to be at near historic low levels with spawning biomass less than $25 \%$ of unfished in all models.

Table ES2. Recent trend in spawning biomass and depletion level for the Coastwide and each area model.



Figure ES2. Estimated spawning biomass time series from area-specific models, coastwide model and the sum of area-specific models.


Figure ES3. Estimated recruitment time series from area-specific models, coastwide model and the sum of area-specific models.

## Estimated fishing mortality rates for coastwide and each area model

Harvest and consequent fishing mortality rates have declined significantly coastwide in the last 10 years. Plot of $F / F_{\text {MSY }}$ and $B / B_{\text {MSY }}$ indicate that harvest have far exceeded $F_{\text {MSY }}$ and $B_{\text {MSY }}$ since the mid 1970's.

Table ES3. Recent trend in average fishing mortality rates for each area model and the coastwide model.

Average Fishing Mortaily Rates

| Year | Coastwide | California | Oregon | Washington |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | 0.1430 | 0.1793 | 0.1777 | 0.0763 |
| 1996 | 0.0720 | 0.0739 | 0.0938 | 0.0878 |
| 1997 | 0.1086 | 0.0969 | 0.1281 | 0.0621 |
| 1998 | 0.0312 | 0.0339 | 0.0225 | 0.1415 |
| 1999 | 0.0387 | 0.0266 | 0.0159 | 0.0656 |
| 2000 | 0.0094 | 0.0066 | 0.0071 | 0.1297 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 0.0082 | 0.0103 | 0.0077 | 0.0260 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 0.0083 | 0.0095 | 0.0048 | 0.0126 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 0.0158 | 0.0139 | 0.0132 | 0.0214 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 0.0074 | 0.0073 | 0.0051 | 0.0365 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 0.0144 | 0.0107 | 0.0141 | 0.0290 |



Figure ES4. Estimated exploitation rate time series from area-specific models and the coastwide model.


Figure ES5. Estimated (SS2 V2.21 forecast) F/F $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ and B/B $\mathrm{B}_{\text {MSY }}$ time series from the coastwide model.

## Reference points

The current assessment uses the F50\% Council default harvest policy to make harvest projections for yelloweye rockfish. Given that yelloweye rockfish spawning stock biomass (SB) was less than the Council's default harvest control rule of $25 \%$ of the unexploited level (based on coastwide or independent area models) the stock is considered to be "overfished".

Table ES4. Benchmark fishing mortality rates for each area model and the coastwide model based on the SSC default rebuilding analysis simulation software.

| Reference Point | Area (models) for consideration |  |  |  | W-O-C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Coastwide | California | Oregon | Washington |  |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ Unfished Spawning Stock Biomass ( SSB $_{0}$ ) | 3,322 | 1,715 | 1,258 | 453 | 3,425 |
| Unfished Exploitable Biomass ( $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ ) | 7,448 | 3,877 | 2,789 | 1,017 | 7,683 |
| Unfished Recruitment ( $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ ) | 4.85 | 4.19 | 3.85 | 3.00 |  |
| SSB 2006 | 588 | 145 | 274 | 95 | 514 |
| Depletion Level (2006) | 17.7\% | 8.5\% | 21.8\% | 21.0\% | 15.0\% |
| Depletion -95CI | 14.2\% | 5.7\% | 16.5\% | 17.3\% |  |
| Depletion +95CI | 21.1\% | 11.2\% | 27.0\% | 24.6\% |  |
| Target Spawning Biomass ( $\mathrm{B}_{0.40}$ ) | 1,329 | 684 | 502 | 181 |  |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY Proxy ( }}$ (SPR=0.50) | 0.024 | 0.021 | 0.021 | 0.027 |  |
| Exploitable Biomass | 1491 | 383 | 671 | 255 |  |
| ${ }^{21}$ ABC 2006 | 36.2 | 8.1 | 14.2 | 7.0 |  |
| OY 2006 | 36.2 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ This value is expressed in female biomass <br> ${ }^{2 /}$ Assumes $\mathrm{F}_{\text {Msy }}$ Proxy (SPR=0.50) | alf of the $m$ | SSB $_{0}$ estim | 6,644 m | or both sexes |  |

## Management Performance

As in previous assessments, the current assessment indicated over-exploitation during the last two decades. This is likely the result of managing yelloweye rockfish as part of a larger rockfish complex where regulations were ineffective in constraining yelloweye catches below current
harvest policy until 2002. Specifically, there have been few regulations developed to effectively control catch or bycatch of yelloweye rockfish until 2002 (Washington prohibited retention in 2002, California and Oregon in 2004). Recent management decisions have significantly restricted yelloweye rockfish catch and is reflected in the recent low level of yelloweye landings that have not exceeded the yelloweye rockfish coastwide rebuilding ABC/OY target first established in 2003. Total catch between 2002 and 2004 is highly uncertain because sampling programs were insufficient to estimate discard related to management measures. There has been significant improvement in sampling coverage in 2005. Discard prior to 2002 was likely minimal because yelloweye are a highly prized sport fish and commercial value for this species typically exceeded other rockfish species.

Table ES5. Comparison of yelloweye ABC, OY and catch since single species management began in 2002.

Coastal Washington, Oregon and California Yelloweye Rockfish Landings

| Year | PacFIN and MRFSS |  |  |  | Tagart, PacFIN, and ODFW |  |  |  | Tagart, PacFIN and WDFW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | California ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  |  | Oregon ${ }^{2 /}$ |  |  |  | Washington ${ }^{3 /}$ |  |  |  | Totals |  |  |  | Coastwide |  |  |
|  | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Total | ABC | OY ${ }_{\text {(Tmid) }}$ |
| 2002 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 12.9 | 52.0 | 22.0 |
| 2003 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 52.0 | 22.0 |
| 2004 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 12.0 | 54.0 | 22.0 |
| 2005 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 0.3 | 13.1 | 23.6 | 54.0 | 26.0 |
| Note: GMT | ard' |  | 200 |  | 2005 |  | , |  |  |  | rit |  | clud |  | R | , | , O | $N$ and | FW. |

## Unresolved problems and major uncertainties

As in the previous assessments, the sparseness of the size and age composition data and the lack of a relevant fishery-independent survey has limited the model's ability to properly assess the status of the resource. This is especially apparent in the Washington model where the wholesale lack of data resulted in our inability to obtain a converged model without placing significant restraints and assumptions within the model relative to the area-specific models for California and Oregon. Further, due to catch restrictions since 2002, catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) data no longer reflect the real changes in population abundance, and discard estimates are highly uncertain.

The landings data are basically derived from total landings of unclassified rockfish times an estimated fraction that are yelloweye. In recent years, actual samples are available in many areas, but because yelloweye are rare in the overall catch and that species composition estimates derived from mixed rockfish categories is limited, substantial substitution for missing cells is required. In earlier years (prior to 1983), estimates of fraction yelloweye had to be borrowed from remote years and areas. The consequence of these estimation steps is that the catch is known only with considerable uncertainty and the current version of SS2 does not allow for uncertainty measurements of landings. This makes it nearly impossible to evaluate the true uncertainty of model results. Internal estimates of standard error on depletion estimates were on the order of 2$2.5 \%$ and are likely to be serious underestimates of uncertainty.

## Research and Data Needs

Additional effort to collect age and maturity data is essential for improved population assessment. Collection of these data can only be accomplished through research studies and/or by onboard observers because this species is now prohibited. In 2006, IPHC and WDFW scientists are conducting a study to increase our knowledge of current stock biomass off Washington coast. Loss of the study due to declining OY will have significant detrimental effects on our ability to adequately assess this stock in the future. We strongly urge Management to make this study the highest priority. Increased effort toward habitat mapping and in-situ observation of behavior will provide information on the essential habitat and distribution for this species.

Alternative survey such as the in-situ 2002 US Vancouver submersible survey in untrawlable habitat is required for future assessment of yelloweye rebuilding status. This study has demonstrated that submersible visual transect surveys can provide a unique alternative method for estimating demersal fish biomass in habitats not accessible to conventional survey tools. For example, because of the low frequency of yelloweye rockfish encountered in the NMFS shelf trawl survey tows, those data were not considered a reliable indicator of abundance and were not used in the 2002 yelloweye stock assessment for PFMC (Methot et al. 2002). Results from this study support this conclusion and illustrate the need for large-scale surveys to assess bottomfish densities in habitats that are not accessible to trawl survey gear. Further, stratified random sampling designs should be employed with sample sizes sufficient to ensure acceptable levels of statistical power (Jagielo et al. 2003). At present, the in-situ visual transect submersible survey method appears to be a useful tool for this purpose, and the utility of this method will likely improve further with technological advances such as the 3-Beam Quantitative Mensuration System (QMS).

## Rebuilding Projections

Rebuilding projections and 10 year forecast yield are based on results from the SSC default rebuilding analysis simulation software. Specific detail can be obtained from PFMC "Updated Rebuilding Analysis for Yelloweye Rockfish Based on the 2006 Stock Assessment" document.

Table ES6. Rebuilding projections and 10 year forecast yield based on results from the SSC default rebuilding analysis simulation software.

|  | Coastwide |  | California |  | Oregon |  | Washington |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FMSY proxy |  | 0.024 |  | 0.021 |  | 0.021 |  | 0.027 |
| FMSY SPR / SPR(F=0) |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |
| Virgin SPR |  | 52.195 |  | 52.189 |  | 53.349 |  | 44.960 |
| Generation time |  | 50 |  | 47 |  | 49 |  | 46 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}$ |  | 2046 |  | 2073 |  | 2035 |  | 2026 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\text {MAX }}$ |  | 2096 |  | 2120 |  | 2084 |  | 2072 |
| Virgin Spawning Output |  | 6643 |  | 3421 |  | 2510 |  | 906 |
| Target Spawning Output |  | 2657 |  | 1368 |  | 1004 |  | 362 |
| Current Spawning Output |  | 1146 |  | 281 |  | 530 |  | 188 |
| Spawning Output (ydecl = 2002) |  | 1019 |  | 249 |  | 456 |  | 180 |
| Natural mortality |  | 0.036 |  | 0.036 |  | 0.036 |  | 0.040 |
| Steepness |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |  | 0.45 |
| SigmaR |  | 0.50 |  | 0.50 |  | 0.50 |  | 0.50 |
| Depletion level in 2005 |  | 17.3\% |  | 8.2\% |  | 21.1\% |  | 20.8\% |
|  | OY | Depletion | OY | Depletion | OY | Depletion | OY | Depletion |
| 2007 | 12.6 | 18.0\% | 2.7 | 8.6\% | 6.4 | 22.5\% | 2.6 | 20.9\% |
| 2008 | 12.9 | 18.5\% | 2.8 | 8.9\% | 6.6 | 23.1\% | 2.7 | 21.8\% |
| 2009 | 13.2 | 18.9\% | 2.9 | 9.2\% | 6.7 | 23.7\% | 2.8 | 22.8\% |
| 2010 | 13.5 | 19.4\% | 2.9 | 9.5\% | 6.8 | 24.2\% | 2.9 | 23.7\% |
| 2011 | 13.8 | 19.8\% | 3.0 | 9.8\% | 6.9 | 24.7\% | 3.0 | 24.5\% |
| 2012 | 14.1 | 20.2\% | 3.1 | 10.1\% | 7.0 | 25.2\% | 3.0 | 25.4\% |
| 2013 | 14.3 | 20.5\% | 3.1 | 10.3\% | 7.1 | 25.6\% | 3.1 | 26.1\% |
| 2014 | 14.5 | 20.8\% | 3.2 | 10.6\% | 7.1 | 25.9\% | 3.2 | 26.8\% |
| 2015 | 14.7 | 21.1\% | 3.3 | 10.8\% | 7.2 | 26.2\% | 3.2 | 27.3\% |
| 2016 | 15.0 | 21.4\% | 3.3 | 11.0\% | 7.3 | 26.5\% | 3.3 | 27.9\% |

### 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Life History

Yelloweye rockfish (Sebastes ruberrimus) can be characterized as relatively low in abundance, extremely long-lived (aged up to 120 years), late maturing, and slow growing. They primarily inhabit high-relief rocky areas from northern Baja to the Aleutian Islands in depths 15 to 550 meters (Rosenthal et al. 1982, Eschemeyer et al. 1983, Love et al. 2000). Adult yelloweye are carnivorous feeding primarily on other rockfishes, herring, sand lance, crab and shrimp (Washington et al. 1978, Rosenthal et al. 1988, Reilly et al. 1994, Love 1996).

### 1.2 Stock Structure

This assessment treats the yelloweye stock as a single coastwide assemblage and evaluates separate WOC (Washington, Oregon, California) models. Evaluation of stock boundaries is reliant upon life history traits associated with a population or sub-population. Data for delineation of stock boundaries for WOC yelloweye are limited. However, the species affinity for hard bottom suggests that they may form stable local populations that, when recognized, could be treated as independent stocks. Thus, the comparison of biological parameters between subareas is may be unreliable. Currently, there are three independent studies that give some insight into whether or not local aggregations of fishes can be identified as separate stock units.

Gao and Wallace (2003, unpublished) examined yelloweye rockfish stock structure by evaluating ratios of $\mathrm{C}^{13} / \mathrm{C}^{12}$ and $\mathrm{O}^{18} / \mathrm{O}^{16}$ in aragonite powder samples of 200 yelloweye rockfish otoliths from the Washington and Oregon coast. For each otolith, three samples were taken; one from the nucleus (the starting time of otolith growth) and the other two from the first and fifth annual zone (assumed to be year 1 and 5 in life history). The isotopic signature of the nuclei is used to provide information on the natal development and spawning stock separation of the fish, whereas signatures of age- 1 and age- 5 indicate the behavior of the fish over the sampling period. Isotopic differences were not identified in otolith nuclei samples, suggesting there might be a single spawning stock for yelloweye rockfish along the Washington and Oregon coast. Distinct isotopic differences between samples from otolith nuclei and the fifth annual zones from both sample areas indicate yelloweye rockfish may move to other habitat as they grow from age-1 to age- 5 . Further, comparison within the fifth annual otolith zones between Washington and Oregon samples show clear differences in $\quad \delta^{13} \mathrm{C}$, but not in $\quad \delta^{18} \mathrm{O}$ variations, suggesting that the food sources or composition of the two areas are slightly different. In conclusion, the isotopic signatures from otolith nuclei showed there may possibly be a single spawning stock for yelloweye rockfish along the Washington and Oregon coast and age- 1 to age- 5 fish may change their habitat or associated bottom substrates for food.

Yamanaka et al. (2001) conducted a genetic analysis of yelloweye rockfish collected from northern Vancouver, B.C. and SE Alaskan waters. Though the authors found little variability among samples and suggested a well-mixed panmictic stock in their study area, specific habitat requirements for yelloweye rockfish support the hypothesis for site fidelity, and little mixing may occur after settlement. It is likely that discrete sub-populations corresponding to high-relief rocky areas form a much larger genetically diverse meta-population. Preliminary results from a DNA analysis of yelloweye collected off Oregon, Washington, Vancouver Island B.C., and the Strait of Georgia B.C. (Personal communications, Lynne Yamanaka DFO) suggest a distinct genetic separation of Strait of Georgia samples from West Coast samples, indicating the possibility of separate area stocks.

### 1.3 Fishery

Yelloweye rockfish are highly prized by sport fishers due to their size, beauty, and quality. Commercial fishers value their high market demand and ex-vessel price. Yelloweye rockfish inhabit areas typically inaccessible to trawl gear and catch in the coastal trawl fishery primarily results from incidental harvest associated with other target fisheries operating at the fringes of this habitat. However, due to lack of information it is impossible to determine if yelloweye distribution is now limited due to past intense fishing pressure in more easily accessible habitats. Yelloweye are also caught incidentally in both commercial hook-and-line and sport fisheries targeting other species found in association with the yelloweye habitat preferences. This species has been subjected to a periodic target fishery for both commercial hook-and-line and sport fisheries at least since the 1970's.

Specific catches of yelloweye are not well documented, but rockfish landings are reported back to 1916 (Table 3) in California (Heimann and Carlisle 1970). The earliest account of detailed yelloweye catch is in the April 1937- March 1938 from the wholesale rockfish markets in Monterey (Phillips, 1939). Yelloweye accounted for $0.6 \%$ ( 4.1 mt ) of the total rockfish landed accounting for 4.1 mt of a 669 mt fishery (Table 4). Nitsos and Reed (1965) also reported yelloweye catch in the 1961-1962 animal- food fisheries in California. Rockfish have been a mainstay of the fresh fish markets in California since the early 1900's and the catch increased significantly to 8 million pounds in 1918. The catch was as high as 13.5 million pounds during the 1943-1947 time period as demand rose during WW I and WW II. There was a significant shift in the California rockfish fishery in 1943. The fishery was first conducted primarily in Southern California and Central California, with Hook-and-line, trawl lines or long lines with baited hooks. In 1943, the balloon drag net proved successful and the frozen filet industry began in Northern California (Bureau of Marine Fisheries 1949). Immediately following WW II there was a significant increase in the party boat business along with increases recreational catches of rockfish in Central and Northern California (Young 1969). In the 1960 Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessel (CPFV) fishery from Crescent City to Aliva, yelloweye rockfish are reported to comprise $0.5 \%$ of total rockfish catch with body weight averaging 2.41 kg in weight (Miller and Gotshall 1965).

Significant increases in rockfish landings in Oregon during WW II are also reported in the literature. Landings of rockfish increased from 1.3 million pounds in 1941 to a peak of over 17 million pounds by 1947 in 1945 (Cleaver 1949). The report further states "The principle fish caught by the long-line fishery is the "Red Snapper" S. ruberrimus. The report does not state what portion of the rockfish catch was by the long-line fishery. Statistical reports of rockfish landings in Washington indicate that the annual rockfish catch was around 1 million pounds between 1949 and 1951 (Table 5). For Washington, no summary documents were found prior to 1953 (Table 6). Thus, further investigation is needed to verify rockfish catches from the earlier time period.

### 1.4 Management history

Management of rockfish has had a long history beginning in 1983 when the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) first imposed trip limits on landings (Figure 1) from the Sebastes complex-- a group of about 50 species. Yelloweye were managed as part of the Sebastes complex until 2000, when the Council abandoned the Sebastes complex in favor of a finer scale portioning of mixed rockfish categories dividing it into three minor rockfish groupings: Nearshore, Shelf and Slope. Based on results from the 2001 assessment (Wallace, 2001) the Council enacted an interim level OY of 13.5 m that allowed for fisheries to take place and potentially catch yelloweye along with other fish, but did not allow fisheries that target yelloweye. Yelloweye were also separated into their own management category. Because the 2002 assessment did not assess yelloweye coastwide a coastwide ABC was not available until the 2002 assessment, which
used all available coastwide information to develop a coastwide stock assessment for Washington, Oregon and California. Based on the 2002 assessment and rebuilding plan results (Methot et.al., 2002 and Methot and Piner, 2002), the Council adopted an OY of 22 metric tons and rebuilding measures with consistent harvest levels for the 2003 fisheries (Table 42).

### 1.4.1 Commercial Fishery

Prior to 2001 trip limit, regulations on the Sebastes complex probably had little or no impact in restricting harvest of yelloweye in the trawl fishery and yelloweye were likely never targeted. Open access and limited entry line gear trip limits for rockfish, which remained at or above $10,000 \mathrm{lbs}$ in all years prior to 1999, did not constrain yelloweye catch because yelloweye landings rarely exceeded $10,000 \mathrm{lbs}$. Trip and bag limits were significantly reduced following completion of the 2002 yelloweye stock assessment (Figure 1). Commercial retention of yelloweye rockfish was prohibited except for a 300 -pound trip limit in the trawl fishery so that yelloweye that are caught dead may be retained.

In addition to restrictive trip limits for yelloweye, managers instituted Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCAs) in 2002. These areas are large coastal closure areas intended to protect overfished rockfish species. The boundaries of the RCA's and landings limits outside them have varied by year, gear type, and season. The seaward boundary of the trawl RCA has ranged from 150-250 fm , while the shoreward boundary has ranged from 100 fm to the shore. Trawl gear that is used shoreward of the RCA is required to have small footropes ( $<8$ " diameter), which increases the risk of gear loss in rocky areas and diminishes incentive to fish close to these areas. Reductions in landings limits for shelf rockfish species have also reduced incentives to fish in rocky areas shoreward of the RCA.

### 1.4.2 Sport Fishery

Sport CPUE indices used in this assessment indicate that catch rates for yelloweye rockfish are low. Sport rockfish limits for WOC have remained at or above ten-fish until 1999 and it is likely that a ten-fish bag limit had little effect on restricting yelloweye harvest. In response to concerns for declining rockfish stocks, management of sport fisheries started becoming much more restrictive beginning in 2000. WDFW first adopted a two-fish bag limit for yelloweye in 2000, and an either/or two fish limit for yelloweye or canary rockfish in 2001 (Figure 1). In 2002, ODFW began a daily bag limit of one yelloweye rockfish, while California imposed a limit of no more than two yelloweye allowed per day per vessel. In addition to reductions in yelloweye retention, California also closed areas and limited recreational fishing seasons. WDFW first prohibited retention of yelloweye rockfish in coastal recreational fisheries in 2002. Both Oregon and California followed suit prohibiting retention beginning in 2004.

### 1.5 Management performance

The current and previous assessment(s) indicated over-exploitation during the last two decades, and regulations have most likely been ineffective in constraining yelloweye catch until most recent years. Specifically, there have been no regulations developed to significantly control catch or bycatch of yelloweye rockfish until 2002 (Washington prohibited retention in 2002, California and Oregon in 2004). Recent management decisions have significantly restricted yelloweye rockfish catch and is reflected in the recent low level of yelloweye landings that have not exceeded the yelloweye rockfish coastwide rebuilding ABC/OY target first established in 2002 (Table 42). There are a variety of sources (Westcoast Observer Program, WDFW and Oregon recreational observers and WDFW salmon troll observers) to estimate discard related to recent management measures. These estimates are highly uncertain and most sampling programs were not in place until 2004. Historical discard was likely minimal until enactment of recent regulations because yelloweye are a highly prized sport fish and commercial value for this species typically exceeded other rockfish species.

### 2.0 Assessment

### 2.1 Fishery Dependent Data

### 2.1.1 Catch and discard

Catch data are treated as known without error and, due to the high market value for yelloweye rockfish, discarding was assumed to have not occurred prior to enactment of strict harvest policies beginning in 2002. Discard estimates in the sport fishery are provided by Marine Recreational Fishery Statistical Survey (MRFSS), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and are included in the catch estimates since 2002. Commercial trawl catch and discard of yelloweye rockfish are likely minimal due to trawl closure areas (Rockfish Conservation Areas) on the shelf since 2001 and in earlier years catch was not restrictive because they were infrequently caught. Observations of yelloweye catch from the West Coast Observer Program (NMFS) from commercial fisheries are very rare and the overall magnitude of discard cannot be estimated.

Catch data were compiled and analyzed for three independent coastal areas: California, Oregon and Washington (Table 1). California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and/or the MRFSS intermittently collected length, weight, effort and catch data on recreational fisheries in northern California ports of landing beginning in 1978. Rockfish catches have been reported in the California CPFV fishery logbooks since the mid 1930's, but specific yelloweye catch and effort data was rarely reported prior to 1987. These data provide the most complete and longest time series of information on yelloweye rockfish. Data collection by MRFSS and ODFW in Oregon spans back to the early 1980s, but sampling levels were low and sporadic until most recent years. Washington sport catch data are available in annual Department reports back to 1975. Yelloweye commercial catch data prior to 1980 do not exist with the exception of Oregon and Washington trawl catch during the 1970’s as estimated by Tagart and Kimura (1982). In 2005, nearly all data sources including MRFSS, PacFIN, ODFW and WDFW provided updated catch estimates based on revised expansion algorithms intended to more accurately define rockfish catch since 1980. The Catches reported on the Council’s Groundfish Management Team "Scorecard" from Nov. 2005 was used for the 2005 total catch estimates,

This year, considerable effort by both Federal and State personnel was expended on searching records for catch and species composition information to provide more accurate estimates of catch prior to 1980. This resulted in complete revision of the catch time series for each State for the early time period. For some years and fisheries, there were significant differences in catch estimates compared to those provided during the last stock assessment. Overall catch estimates for recreational fisheries were revised downward and catch estimates for commercial fisheries increased. The total catch for the entire time series increased approximately 1,000 mt (Table 2).

## California

A revised California historical commercial catch time series is based on the average California Commercial database (CALCOM) proportion of yelloweye rockfish observed in commercial landings of rockfish between 1978 and 1982 after removing widow rockfish (Don Pearson, SWFSC, NMFS, personnel communication). These observations suggest that yelloweye constitute $1.0 \%$ of both the hook-and-line and trawl landings of rockfish. This fraction is applied to commercial rockfish landings to estimate yelloweye rockfish catch back to 1969. This fraction was then declined to $0.05 \%$ to model decline in technology and rock-tending gear in the earlier years of the trawl fishery.

Trawl landings of yelloweye rockfish declined from well over 100 mt in the late 1970's and early 1980s to $50-75 \mathrm{mt}$ in the 1990s and in recent years to less than 1 mt . The commercial line fishery catch reached a historic high of almost 121 mt in 1991 and declined to less than 20 mt 's by the late 1990's. Trawl and hook-and-line catches are grouped with the trawl fishery catch time series prior to 1969. Sport catches of yelloweye rockfish averaged 75 mt during the 1980's and sharply declined to less than 20 mt in the 1990s averaging only 5 mt in 2000 - 2004 (Table 1 and Figure 2).

Rockfish catches have been reported in the California CPFV fishery (Kevin Hill, NMFS personal communication) since the mid 1930's. Miller and Gottshall (1965) reported in 1960 that yelloweye represented $0.5 \%$ of the Northern California rockfish catch with an averaged body weight of 2.41 kg in weight. Based on this information, yelloweye catch prior to 1980 is assumed to be equal to $0.5 \%$ of all CPFV rockfish catches reported in Northern California waters and $0.025 \%$ of Southern California CPFV rockfish catches. The 1980-2004 recreational catches of yelloweye are based on RecFIN catch estimates.

## Oregon

Trawl landings of yelloweye rockfish increased in the late 1970's and averaged 80-100 mt in the 1980's. Landings decreased significantly in the mid to late 1990's and fell to less than 1 mt since 2000. A commercial line fishery was developed in the early 1990's and has averaged 37 mt annually until management restrictions in 2000 reduced catches to less than 5 mt . Sport catches of yelloweye rockfish averaged 30 mt during the 1980s, declined to 20 mt in the 1990's and have averaged less than 5 mt between 2000 - 2004 (Table 1 and Figure 2).

Trawl catches are projected using species composition estimates of mixed rockfish categories collected by State port sampling personnel as early as 1963 (in at least some ports). Catch estimates for the most current time period (1984-2004) were obtained from the PacFIN database and for the 1978-1983 time period from Tagart and Kimura (1982). For years between 1969 and 1976, yelloweye are assumed to represent $1.0 \%$ of the total rockfish catch reported in various Fisheries and Statistics of Oregon publications. This fraction was then declined to $0.05 \%$ by 1955 to model a presumed decreased in yelloweye catches resulting from absence of technological and rock-tending gear in the earlier years of the trawl fishery.

Commercial gear type was not reported prior to 1980 and few species composition estimates were taken before 1990. The most current hook-and-line rockfish catches were obtained from the PacFIN database and 1982-1990 yelloweye catches are a product of species composition estimates (Table 7) taken from various Washington line fisheries.

## Washington

Washington trawl landings of yelloweye rockfish have been variable and less than 20 mt annually and have declined to less than 1 mt by 2000. A small target commercial line fishery developed in the late 1990's and catch peaked at 23 mt in 1999. Insignificant catches are reported since strict regulations went into effect in 2001. Sport yelloweye rockfish landings averaged 8 mt in the 1980's, 13 mt during the 1990's and have declined to less than 7 mt in 2000.

Caches from the trawl fishery between 1983 and 2004 are obtained from PacFIN; 1976-1982 from Tagart and Kimura (1982) and are then assumed to decline to 1 mt by 1955. Commercial line catch estimates from 1970-1999 are estimated from species composition data taken between 1986-1999 applied to "other rockfish" catch across all years, catch is then assumed to decline to 1 mt by 1955. Recreational catches from various WDF reports back to 1975, catch then assumed to decline to 1 mt .

### 2.1.2 Life History

Weight-at-length
An allometric length-weight function (weight $=0.000021$ *length ${ }^{2.9659}$ ) was computed from over 3,000 observations to estimate weight for a fish of known length for combined sexes. This relationship is used in the current assessment for all area models and in the previous assessment (Figure 3).

Growth
The von Bertalanffy growth function (Linf(1-e-k(age-to)) was used to estimate the length of a fish of a known age. Estimated parameter values are compared among estimates derived from age data collected from Washington, Oregon, California and other locales (Table 8). Differences in growth between Washington, Oregon and California fish were not apparent (Figure 4) and a single growth function for combined sexes was used for W -O-C areas (Table 8).

Growth parameters Lmin, Lmax, vBK, CV young and CV old are re-estimated within the model to adjust for the effects of size-selectivity and ageing error on the expected value of size-at observed age. Comparison of model results indicates that model estimates are very similar to the previous SS2 model estimates (Table 26).

In an effort to examine yelloweye growth independent of model estimates, we compared results from several model fits including the von Bertalanffy growth curve. These models were only used to explore model fit to the data and results were not incorporated into the current assessment.
(von Bertalanffy, 1938), which has the form:

Model I:

$$
L_{t}=L_{\infty}\left(1-e^{-K\left(t-t_{0}\right)}\right)+\varepsilon
$$

where $L_{t}(\mathrm{~cm})$ is the length of captured yelloweye rock at age $t$ (years), $L_{\infty}$ is the limited growth size (cm), $K$ (per year) is the growth parameter and $t_{0}$ is the age with zero length. In Model I, there are three unknown parameters,

We have assumed $\varepsilon \sim N\left(0, \sigma^{2}\right)$. Most of the captured yelloweye rockfish are with age greater than or equal to 5 years, it would possibly induce bias in the estimation of $t_{0}$, and subsequently affects the estimation of $L_{\infty}$ and $K$ because they are highly correlated. We proposed to fit the growth curve with length zero at age zero. The proposed model is

Model II:

$$
L_{t}=L_{\infty}\left(1-e^{-K t}\right)+\varepsilon,
$$

where there are two unknown parameters, $L_{\infty}$ and $K$ to be determined.

We compared both Models I and II with fitting data with age greater than or equal to $5,10, \ldots, 30$ years, and investigate the bias of estimating $t_{0}, K$ and $L_{\infty}$ in fitting Models I and II.

From Table 34, $\hat{t}_{0}$ decrease from -11.16 to 45.10 years with the age of data in fitting Model I. It is unlikely that the initial length of yelloweye rockfish at age zero is 25.5 cm . even with the full data set available. We believe that the yelloweye rockfish at age zero is around 1 to 2 cm . So the estimated $\hat{L}_{\infty}$ and $\hat{K}$ by fitting the data with Model II are reasonable and should be close to the
actual mean values. The estimated $\hat{K}$ of Model II, 0.083 is nearly two times the estimated $\hat{K}$ of Model II, 0.046 indicating growth may be twice as fast than expected. This will affect the time to recover the depleted stock at the moment. In Figure 26, plots of fits by Models I and II with different set of data shows that the more captured yelloweye with age near zero, the less the bias we have in the estimation of the expected von Bertalanffy growth curve.

The estimation of $L_{\infty}$ and $K$ may vary with other factors, location annual and gender effect. Model III was examined

Model III:

$$
L_{t}=\left(L_{\infty}+r_{L} Z_{s}+s_{L} Z_{a}+\sum_{j} y_{L, j} z_{j}\right)\left(1-e^{-\left(K+r_{K} z_{s}+s_{K} z_{a}+\sum_{j} y_{K, j} z_{j}\right) t}\right)+\varepsilon,
$$

Where $j=1999$, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 (2005 = control), $z_{s}$ is a dummy variable ( $1=$ female, $0=$ control), $z_{a}$ is a dummy variable ( $1=$ Columbia, $0=$ control), $z_{i}$ are dummy variables( $1=$ year $j$, $0=$ elsewhere). $r_{L}, s_{L}, y_{L, j} \mathrm{~s}, r_{k}, s_{K}, y_{K, j} \mathrm{~s}$ are additional unknown parameters to be determined. We used both Akaike information criteria (AIC) (Akaike, 1974) and Bayesian information criteria (BIC) (Schwarz, 1978) to select the optimal sub-model within Model III, the final submodel is compared with Model II fit by likelihood ratio test.

In Table 35, there is a summary of the number of yelloweye used in modeling the growth of yelloweye rock fish. The smallest group of yelloweye rock fish was captured near Vancouver Island, US in year 2003. The smaller the no. of fish in the group, the higher the chance to induce bias in the estimation. In Table 36, there is a summary of all estimated parameters in the final optimal sub-model from Model III. The estimated residual standard error is 4.013 with 724 degrees of freedom. We used likelihood ratio test ( $\mathrm{P}=0.043$ ) to select the optimal sub-model. The optimal sub-model was Model III. Compared Model II and III, the optimal sub-model was Model III ( $\mathrm{P}=0.00$ ). Female yelloweye rockfish has a small $\hat{L}_{\infty}=(64.44-7.444) \mathrm{cm}$ but grows faster ( $\hat{r}_{K}=0.022, \mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) compared with male yelloweye rockfish. Columbia yelloweye grows slower ( $\hat{s}_{K}=-0.0009, \mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) compared with Vancouver Island, US yelloweye. The annual effect of year 2003 did significantly ( $\hat{y}_{K, 2003}=-0.086, \mathrm{P}<0.05$ ) affect the growth rate of yelloweye compared with the growth rate of year 2005 yelloweye.

Maturity-at-age
Length and age at $50 \%$ maturity for female yelloweye collected from coastal waters off Vancouver Island, B.C., was estimated to be 42.1-42.4 cm and 16.5-17.2 years of age (Yamanaka and Kronlund 1997). Length at $50 \%$ maturity for yelloweye collected off Oregon was estimated to be 41 cm by Barss (1989) and 45 cm by McClure (1982); and for fish collected off California, 40 cm by Reilly et al. (1994). Misspecification of length at $50 \%$ maturity at a larger size than actual will tend to lower allowable rates of fishing. As in the previous assessment, model runs were made with $50 \%$ maturity occurring at 42 cm (Table 10).

Natural mortality
Several procedures to derive estimates of natural mortality have been explored in the past (Wallace 2001). Robson and Chapman (1961) method was investigated, but Chi-square testing indicated that at least one of the critical assumptions of the data was not met. Catch curve estimates (Ricker 1975) of total mortality were derived from age data collected from various locales (Table 6). Estimates of mortality from an exploited stock off Neah Bay Washington (0.076) is higher compared to mortality estimates of an unexploited stock (0.025) located at the Bowie Seamount, Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C. (data provided by Yamanaka, DFO). Mortality
estimates from Bowie Seamount using five-year age bins were 0.086 males and 0.043 females (Yamanaka, 2000) and no age bins were quite different ( 0.021 males and 0.033 females). Catch curve estimates of natural mortality assume constant recruitment and large variation in recruitment makes it difficult to interpret results derived from catch curve procedures. Yelloweye natural mortality estimates are further complicated due to ambiguity in making bin specifications for large year class(s) recruited in the late 1960s.

An estimated natural mortality rate near 0.045 was used in the 2002 assessment (Methot et al. 2002) and the 2005 assessment (Wallace et al. 2005) and represents a compromise between a low value of 0.02 (O’Connell et al. 2000) and high estimates of 0.043 for females and 0.086 for males (Yamanaka et al. 2001) and is equivalent to that estimated using Hoenig’s (1983) method (Tables 11 and 12).

Natural mortality in the this assessment was estimated within the coastwide model to be 0.036 across all ages and then assumed (fixed) to be 0.036 in all area specific models. This compares to natural mortality estimates of 0.02 (O'Connell, 2004) and 0.033 (Chi Hong, DFO, Canada pers. communication) used in the SE Alaska, U.S. and British Columbia, Canada, respectively. We believe that the lower rate (compared to previous assessments) better represents the life history of this species whose life span can well exceed 100 years and corresponds better to other rockfish species with similar life history.

### 2.1.3 Age Validation and Ageing Error

Break-and-burn aging techniques for yelloweye rockfish were corroborated using radiometric aging techniques. Andrews et al. (2001) verified growth zone age estimates between 30 and 100 years, substantiating that longevity likely exceeds 100 years.

Aging error was assessed using data collected from an exchange of 100 otoliths between the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada (DFO) and WDFW. Aging error increased with age and was assumed unbiased, but imprecise and equivalent differences between DFO and WDFW age readings. Comparison of DFO and WDFW age readings indicate that $75 \%$ of fish 913 years old and $89 \%$ of fish older than 70 years of age are mis-aged by at least one year (Wallace 2001). These data were incorporated in both of the last two assessments.

A revised aging error vector was incorporated in this assessment. The previous analysis included a single large outlier at the end of the data series that influenced the results. The revised ageing error is based on the same dataset, but excludes the outlier and results in an opposite slightly decreasing trend in age error for older aged fish (Figure 5). Age readers (Sandy Rosenfield, WDFW personnel communication) found older fish easer to age than younger fishes where demarcations between annuli are often difficult to interpret corroborated this result.

### 2.1.4 Fishery Size and age composition

Northern California data provide the most complete and longest time series of length information for yelloweye rockfish. Data collection in Oregon began in the early 1980's, though sampling levels were low and sporadic until most recent years. Washington data is essentially limited to the last five years (Tables 13-15).

Size frequency distribution data are used to estimate proportion at each size/age for combined sexes and gear for each assessment area. Due to scarcity of data, no weighting is applied in combining samples within State/gear/year strata. As in the last assessment, because of the small sample sizes, some samples are combined across years (super years) in order to provide the model with observations that reflect average conditions, although blurring any potential annual signal. The fish within one or a few fishery samples within a year/state/gear cannot represent a good
random sample of the entire fishery catch. For example, inspection of the raw data often indicated a cluster of small fish in one year and a cluster of much larger fish in the following year. This occurs because fish within a sample tend to be more similar in size and age than the diversity of size and age that appears when many independent samples are taken. Because the model believes that the fish within a size or age composition observation are from a multinomially distributed random sample, it may attempt to infer recruitment events from what is sampling variability. Since inspection of the data do not reveal any obviously strong recruitment events moving through the population, we felt it was better continue (as in the last two assessments) to blend the small sample size years into multi-year observations. The procedure involved: (1) combining sample data across the range of selected years (see boxed data in Tables 13-15) to create a multiyear observation; (2) assign these proportions at age/size back to each of the source years; (3) assign a multinomial sample size for each of these years so that the sum of these sample sizes equals the sum of the original sample sizes for those years. All blended data time series and proportions are unchanged from the last assessment for years prior to 2000 and have only been revised in most current years. Age, length and size composition data are tabulated in Appendix A data input section.

### 2.1.5 Fishery CPUE

Abundance indices are assumed to be proportional to population abundance. The catchability coefficient $(\mathbf{Q})$ is the factor that relates the units of the index to the abundance of the population. Random variability in the coefficient may occur, but if there is a trend over time or if the coefficient varies with population abundance, then the assessment may be biased. Sport fishery catch rates will be influenced by undocumented search time at sea; and the observed decline in CPUE indices would be underestimated. There is no information to evaluate annual differences in effort for specific individual target species such as yelloweye. It is unlikely that discard or bag limits influenced CPUE historically because yelloweye are a highly valued species and fishers rarely caught their bag limit of yelloweye. To minimize influence of non-bottomfish effort, data were restricted to rockfish or bottomfish-targeted trips. Described below are the statistical models used to explain some of the overall variability in sport CPUE in order to come closer to having indexes that are proportional to the abundance of fish available to the sport fishery.

We explored recreational fishery creel survey data provided by CDFG, ODFW, WDFW, NWFSC, and RecFIN. Data for 2002-2005 were not included in the assessment due to the significant management changes restricting the harvest of yelloweye rockfish since 2001 (Tables 16 and 17, Figure 6). All annual mean CPUE, except for Oregon recreational fishery, was calculated by two methods: 1) total annual catch divided by annual total efforts, and 2) delta lognormal modeling.

## Delta lognormal model

Delta lognormal model (Lo et al. 1992) has been commonly used in the in modeling of the abundance of marine species from trawling data. It uses generalized linear models GLMs in both stages. The relative abundance of yelloweye in Pacific Northwest among years could be expressed as the product of density and a measure of area:

$$
I=D A,
$$

where $I$ is the index of relative abundance (tons) for a given year, $D$ is the density (tons per sq. km ), $A$ is the total fishing area. If the area of fishing did not change with time, $D$ can be used as the index of relative abundance because $A$ is a constant. Assuming there is $i$ blocks in the fishing with density $D_{i}$ and area $A_{i}$. If $A_{i}$ s are not known, the annual catch in $A_{i}$ can be used as substitutes. The density of fish for each year was

$$
D_{i}=P_{i} C_{i}
$$

where $P_{i}$ is the probability of abundance and $C_{i}$ (tons per sq. km) is standard measure of density within the fishing block i. In recreational data, we can use the catch per unit effort (CPUE) to replace $C$ on the condition that the speeds of hauling are similar among all the trawling boat and it does not vary among years. CPUE can be catch per angler hr, catch per trip, or catch per angler. The distribution of $C_{i}>0$ usually follows a lognormal distribution. The distribution of $P_{i}$
follows a binomial distribution. The modeling of $P_{i}$ and $C_{i}$ through a two stages process with other predictor variables is commonly called delta lognormal model (Lo et al. 1992). The advantage of delta lognormal model can help to investigate the probability of abundance in a spatial scale with other predictor variables, which include both geographical information, and environmental variables. In most of catch data, a large proportion of zero catch would be affected the predictability of the model and it can be avoided by delta lognormal model, which only fit the positive catch data. There is possible bias induced by a two stages model process. Lo et al. (1992) and Syrjala (2000) attempted to estimate the bias of estimated variance by both simulation and approximation. No much literature has attempted to discuss the bias of the estimates. In fact, neither $P_{i}$ nor $C_{i}$ assumes normal distribution (binomial, lognormal) in the 2-stage model process and there is possible correlation between them. The use of delta lognormal method to estimate the variance of final estimate is questionable. This can be overcome by non-parametric bootstrapping.

## First stage model

The response variable $P_{i j}$ is a Bernoulli component (presence-absence) of CPUE $j$ in year $i$. The choice of logit link function is standard (McCullagh and Nelder 1989, Cheng and Gallinat 2004). The link function is

$$
g\left(P_{i j}\right)=\log \left(\frac{P_{i j}}{1-P_{i j}}\right)=x_{i}
$$

where $x_{i}$ is a factor variable (annual effect).

## Second stage model

We model $C_{i j}>0$ in terms of the covariates $x_{i j \text {. }}$ It is a truncated Poisson distribution.

## Bootstrapping method and non-parametric coefficient of variation

The nonparametric bootstrap method (Efron 1982, Hall 1992, Jackson and Cheng 2001) was used to estimate the $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the mean CPUE in both mean estimates and estimates resulted from delta lognormal model. Due to the intensity computing of GLMs and large data set, $K=200$ to 1000 samples have been used. We have rerun the bootstrapping thee times and compared the precision of estimates of $2.5 \%, 15.87 \%, 84.13 \%, 97.5 \%$ quantiles. The estimates of the quantiles are correct to the first 3 significant places due to huge dataset.
Coefficient of variation of a data $X$,
$C V_{X}=\frac{\sigma_{X}}{\mu_{X}} \approx \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{X}}{\bar{X}}$,
is commonly used to describe variation (one standard deviation) of the data compared with the mean of the data. $\sigma_{X}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{X}$ are population $X$ standard deviation and estimate population $X$ standard deviation. It is commonly used in marine research and has been widely applied or accepted by fisheries managers and scientists as a measure the quality of data or estimates. Let define $q_{X, 0.025}$ be the $2.5 \%$ quantile of data $X$. We define the ad hoc CV for non-normal distribution as

$$
C V_{X}=\frac{q_{X, 0.8413} q_{X, 0.1587}}{2 \mu_{X}} \approx \frac{\hat{q}_{X, 0.8413} \hat{q}_{X, 0.1587}}{2 \bar{X}}
$$

For the sample mean, we use

$$
C V_{\bar{X}}=\frac{q_{X, 0.8413} q_{X, 0.1587}}{2 \sqrt{n} \mu_{X}} \approx \frac{\hat{q}_{X, 0.8413}-\hat{q}_{X, 0.1587}}{2 \sqrt{n} \bar{X}},
$$

where $n$ is the sample mean.
The sample mean of the CPUE in each year was compared with the estimates resulted from delta lognormal model. Delta method (Seber 1982) was used to estimate the overall variance in the sample mean.

## Northern California CPFV CPUE

The CDFG Central California Marine Sport Fish Project has been collecting catch and effort data onboard recreational Commercial Passenger Fishing Vessels (CPFV) from 1987 to 1998. Data were collected from trips originating out of northern California ports from Port San Luis to Fort Bragg. Observers collected data on catch, number of fishers and time spent fishing at each location fished for the entire day (personal communication, Deb Wilson-VanDanberg CDFG, 2005). We also explored another version of CPFV data provided by Don Pearson at the SWFSC NOAA. CPUE was calculated as yelloweye catch per angler-hour (Table 16, Figure 6).

## Oregon CPUE

Since the late 1970s, samplers with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) have conducted dockside interviews and collected recreational catch and effort data from marine sport anglers fishing from boats as they returned to ports along the Oregon coast. Until the mid-1990s the program focused on the ocean sport fishery for Pacific salmon, with sampling effort concentrated during the summer salmon fishing seasons. There was limited sampling to measure the species compositions of the non-salmonid, general categories (rockfish, flatfish, and miscellaneous), but the data collection procedures for bottom-fish were ad hoc, involving weekly data sheets with running tallies of the species seen during some unknown fraction of the interviewed angling trips. More detailed and rigorous sampling for species composition began in 1999. Through 1987 the species composition data were collected on the basis of the Trip-Type (bottom-fish versus salmon), but from 1988 through 1998 they were collected by Boat-Type (charter versus private), without regard to the Trip-Type. During all years of the sampling program the interviewers collected data on rockfish catch (numbers of fish) and effort (number of boat trips and number of angler trips) on the basis of both Trip- and Boat-Type.

The Oregon sport boat catch and effort data series for yelloweye rockfish was used in the 2001 stock assessment (as well as the 2002 and August 2005 updates) to develop a catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) abundance index. The data series provided previously by ODFW suffered from two major flaws. First, in the previous data series the species composition estimates (yelloweye rockfish as a percent of the total catch of rockfish) that were used for estimating the catch of yelloweye rockfish were not derived consistently over the entire time series. For the period 197987 the species composition estimates were derived only from bottom-fish trips. In later years, when the species composition data were collected by Boat- but not Trip-Type, the species composition estimates included data from "combination trips", which were directed at catching salmon and possibly bottom-fish as well. The data available for 1979-87 indicate that there can be large differences in rockfish species composition between bottom-fish versus combination trips. Second, the previous catch and effort data series was inconsistent in its measure of fishing effort. The rockfish catch and effort data for 1979-87, and 1999 was based only on bottom-fish trips, but for 1994-98 the series included trips directed at salmon and combination trips.

The revised Oregon sport boat catch and effort data series for yelloweye rockfish, compiled for CPUE analysis in the current assessment, rectified the flaws in the previous data series. First, the species composition data (used to estimate percent yelloweye rockfish by Year, Month, Port) were pooled across bottom-fish and salmons trips (by Year, Month, Port) to maintain consistency across the entire time series. Second, the rockfish catch and effort data (by Year, Month, Port) were taken only from trips designated in the database as bottom-fish trips.

Another change in the process for estimating the revised catch, effort, and CPUE series for yelloweye rockfish was in the treatment of Year, Month, Port cells for which there were no or few species composition data. A GLM with terms for Year + Month + Port was applied to the logits of the available data on the percent yelloweye. Coefficients from the GLM were then used to estimate the percent yelloweye and applied to any Year, Month, Port cells that had less than 100 rockfish sampled for species composition. These GLM coefficients were not used in developing the estimates of total Oregon recreational catch of yelloweye rockfish.

Annual mean CPUE was then estimated by applying a general linear model to the revised catch and effort information. Data were log transformed and normality was assumed. Factors included in the final model were Year, Month, and Port. Back-transformed least square means of the Year factor were calculated as annual mean CPUE used in the current assessment (Table 16, Figure 6).

## Washington CPUE

April-September estimates of catch and effort (by trip type) for coastal Washington ports are available from the WDFW Ocean Sampling Program since 1984. Directed halibut trips were pooled with bottomfish trips until 1989. However, pre-1990 sample data are not currently available and are therefore not included in this analysis. Yelloweye abundance trends for bottomfish-only and directed halibut trips were explored (Figure 7).

## MRFSS CPUE

RecFIN Trip-level summaries of party-boat catch and angler-effort for northern California and Oregon were provided by Wade VanBuskirk, (personal communication). These RecFIN intercept data reflect sampling and interviews conducted at the end of a fishing trip, and do not include information on specific fishing locations. These data include both relevant trips, in which yelloweye rockfish were reasonably likely to be taken, and non-relevant trip such as trips targeting salmon or tuna, two methods were used to obtain a sub-set of the trip data that would be appropriate for calculating yelloweye rockfish CPUE. The first method was by selecting trips targeting bottomfish, lingcod, and rockfish. Delta-lognormal model was applied to this sub-set to calculate CPUE. The second method was by using the logistic regression method (Stephens and MacCall 2004). This method uses the species composition from each trip catches to determine whether yelloweye rockfish were likely to have been encountered on that trip. Alec McCall at Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) graciously provided this analysis for the northern California.

For the logistic filtering method, the top 50 species in frequency of occurrence for each region were extracted, and yelloweye rockfish were separated as being the target species. The remaining 49 species served as potential explanatory variables. Three species of salmon were combined into a single category. This resulted in 47 "species" other than yelloweye rockfish being considered in the northern California analysis. Logistic regression of yelloweye rockfish presence/absence on categorical presence/absence of these explanatory species provided predicted probabilities that yelloweye rockfish would be taken on a trip, given the other species that were taken on that trip. Prior to the analysis, some trips were excluded from the data set if they were too short ( $<0.25 \mathrm{hr}$ ) or too long ( $>14 \mathrm{hr}$ ).
Defining the appropriate subset of the data for use in calculating CPUE requires establishing a
threshold probability for inclusion. The threshold probability recommended by Stephens and MacCall (2004) is based on an equal number of false negatives (trips that are excluded from the selected set, but the target is present) and false positives (trips that are included in the selected set, but for which the target is absent). This threshold probability values was 0.4 for the northern California RecFIN data. However it may be possible to gain precision by increasing the number of positive occurrences of the target species in the subset, i.e., by reducing the number of false negatives despite an increase in false positives. Because yelloweye rockfish are relatively rare in the RecFIN data, the threshold was reduced to 0.08 , and 59 additional trips below this threshold that caught yelloweye were also included. One year did not appear to be sampled well: Waves 1 to 4 in year 1993 were sampled too thinly to be of use, so trips from year 1993 were deleted from consideration.

The abundance index is calculated from the retained trips by a GLM using a delta-lognormal distribution (R language code provided by Edward Dick, NMFS). A gamma distribution was considered for the positive record, but was rejected based on a large difference in AIC (AIC for gamma model was -2118.55; AIC for lognormal model was -2230.46).

The final northern California GLM included 21 year-effects, 6 wave effects. The year effects serve as the abundance index (Figure 9). Precision of the estimated year effects was estimated by use of a jackknife procedure.

Northern California CPUE indices calculated from the two methods both showed a declining trend (Figure 9). Oregon yelloweye CPUE trend based on RecFIN data is similar to the trend based on ODFW survey data (Figure 8). RecFIN data collected during 1987 and 1988 were excluded from the assessment models due to species identification problem in these two years (Russ Porter, pers. comm.).

### 2.2 Fishery Independent data

## NMFS Trawl Survey

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) triennial trawl survey has covered a wide range of depths off California, Oregon and Washington since 1977. Yelloweye rockfish inhabit areas typically inaccessible to trawl gear and, as a result, were infrequently caught. Most yelloweye rockfish are caught on and near Hecate Bank off central Oregon and off northern Washington (Figure 16). Estimated biomass by statistical area is summarized in Table 21. Given the low frequency of positive tows, NMFS trawl survey probably does not sample yelloweye habitat consistently and may not be a reliable indicator of abundance. NMFS trawl survey data were not incorporated into this or any of the last assessments.

## IPHC longline survey

The International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) has conducted longline surveys off Oregon and Washington coast since 1997 (Figures 10-14). These are standardized fixed station surveys with $78,71,84$, and 85 stations in 1999, 2001, and 2002-2005, respectively. Data collected during 1997 survey were excluded due to the differences in station locations (Figures 10-14). In 1997 and 2001, yelloweye catches were observed for the first 20 hooks of each skate. There were 100 hooks on each skate. Yelloweye catches were expanded from the observed catches. For 2002 - 2005, all hooks were observed for rockfish catches. Fishing gear between the Washington line fishery and the IPHC survey is comparable and both fish the Northern Washington waters off shore of Cape Flattery; and length composition between the fishery and survey is similarly comparable (Figure 18).

## 2002 US Vancouver Submersible Survey

Only one survey has been conducted (Jagielo, WDFW personal communication) and we therefore do not have inter-annual comparison of biomass estimates. This point estimate was incorporated into an alternate Washington model to allow for useful comparison to other model runs. If additional surveys were conducted on a more routine basis, a time series of yelloweye rockfish density data could be used to develop a more reliable estimate of abundance. Further, because this species cannot be sampled using traditional survey techniques, these data will likely provide the only alternative for development of future demographic models of the yelloweye rockfish population abundance.

To our knowledge, submersible survey data have been used in only two other assessments. In Southeast Alaska, O’Connell et al. (2004) have used the submersible visual transect approach to estimate the biomass of yelloweye rockfish for the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC); and in California, submersible survey information collected by Yoklavich et al. (to quantify the biomass of cowcod (Sebastes levis) for PFMC management was used in the most recent assessment.

Fifty submersible dive sites ranging in depth from 102 to 225 m were randomly sampled throughout the untrawlable habitat sampling stratum between August 18th-28th, 2002 (Figure 19a). In total, an estimated $276,258 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ was covered across all sites (Table 22). Overall, transect duration averaged 61 min., width averaged 2.52 m , length averaged 2183m, and submersible speed averaged $0.60 \mathrm{~m} /$ second.

While yelloweye rockfish occurred in 24 of the 50 nominally untrawlable submersible dive sites in 2002, they occurred in only 2 of the 25 of the 2001 NMFS trawl survey tows within the 55183m U.S (Figure 19b). Vancouver INPFC Area strata. With the exception of Dover sole, densities of the seven target species were higher in the untrawlable area compared to the trawlable area. Approximately $16 \%$ of the US Vancouver INPFC statistical area is considered untrawlable, vs. $84 \%$ deemed to be trawlable (Zimmermann 2003). When the relative size of these survey sampling strata are accounted for, point estimates of population numbers were higher in the untrawlable area by a factor of 9 (canary rockfish), 5 (yelloweye rockfish), 4 (Pacific halibut), and 3 (lingcod), respectively; and higher in the trawlable area by a factor of 11 (Dover sole), 3 (petrale sole), and 2 (yellowtail rockfish), respectively.

Size distributions of fish sampled in the submersible survey were similar to those of fish sampled in the trawl survey, with the exception of Pacific halibut, which tended to be larger than those in the trawl survey. Mean sizes of fish collected in the submersible survey were 47.9 cm (yelloweye rockfish), 44.1 cm (canary rockfish), 44.2 cm (yellowtail rockfish), 58.6 cm (lingcod), 34.8 cm (petrale sole), 33.0 cm (Dover sole), and 65.8 cm (Pacific halibut). Mean sizes from the trawl survey were 45.3 cm (canary rockfish), 46.4 cm (yellowtail rockfish), 58.2 cm (lingcod), 35.2 cm (petrale sole), 36.0 cm (Dover sole), and 86.2 cm (Pacific halibut), respectively.

Estimates of yellow biomass compared favorably with estimates reported by Methot et al. (2002) that estimated a total coastal Washington biomass of 542 mt . This compares to a submersible survey estimate of 292 mt in the untrawlable zone; and a NMFS Trawl survey estimate of 101 mt in the trawlable portion of the U.S. Vancouver INPFC statistical area, which represents only the northern portion of the Washington coast (Tables 23 and 24).

### 2.3 History of modeling approaches

Yelloweye were first addressed as part of the "remaining rockfish" assessment completed in 1996. This assessment included a number of previously un-assessed rockfish species managed as the "Sebastes complex". Rogers et al. (1996) estimated a yelloweye rockfish Allowable

Biological Catch (ABC) of 39 mt for the Northern area (Columbia and Vancouver) based on biomass estimates from the triennial trawl survey and assumptions about natural mortality (M) and catchability (Q). No separate yelloweye ABC was estimated for the Southern area (Monterey and Conception), where yelloweye rockfish were incorporated with the "other rockfish" assemblage ABC .

Model description for the 2001 stock assessment
Wallace (2001) used the length-based version of Stock Synthesis (Methot 1990) to model the northern California and Oregon regions separately. Growth was estimated externally to the model. Sport CPUE and sport and commercial size composition data were included in the model. The modeled time period extended from 1970 through 2000 and year-specific recruitments were estimated without constraint by a spawner-recruitment curve. The assessment examined both increasing natural mortality with age and dome-shaped selectivity with size as alternative factors to improve the fit to the data. Alternative model configurations found that increasing natural mortality with age provided a somewhat better fit to the data, but there were no age data included in the 2001 model, and much of an increase in M would be inconsistent with direct examination of age data through the catch curve analysis documented above.

Model description for the 2002 stock assessment
The length-based version of Stock Synthesis was also employed in the 2002 evaluation (Methot et al. 2002). There were a number of important differences in model configuration from Wallace (2001) that include: 1) inclusion of Washington catch, CPUE, size and age data, 2) inclusion of age composition data from all three states as available and update of size composition data, 3) inclusion of mean length-at-age data from each data source to aid in the simultaneous estimation of growth parameters and size-selectivity, 4) allowing all fishery sectors to have dome-shaped selectivity 5 ) including emphasis (0.5) on the spawner-recruitment curve and estimating the curvature (steepness) of this curve, 6) starting in 1955 rather than 1970 to better allow for potential long-term patterns in recruitment, and 7) use of constant natural mortality of 0.045.

Model description for the 2005 stock assessment
The 2005 assessment was a simple update of the 2002 model that included a revised catch time series and additional age and length composition information. The assessment used the Stock Synthesis 2 V1.19 modeling framework written by Dr. Richard Methot at the NOAA Fisheries Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC).

### 2.4 Model description for the current stock assessment

This assessment employed the Stock Synthesis 2 V1.21 modeling framework written by Dr. Richard Methot at the NWFSC and modeling framework is described in documentation available from NWFSC (Methot, 2005). The 2006 yelloweye stock assessment includes a number of model specifications carried over from the previous assessments, which are described in each of the sub-sections below.

A coastwide model treats yelloweye as one coastwide stock such that the information from each of the States (WOC) is applied across all three areas to represent the sum of 1 the processes operating in each area. This presumes that differences in recruitment and mortality off each state are negligible and that a coastwide model captures the common recruitment and mortality trends.

Although there is no apparent genetic distinction between areas, yelloweye are considered to be sedentary, habitat specific, and non-migratory signifying a slow rate of mixing where areaspecific patterns are likely to persist for some time. This life history feature would support areaspecific model configurations. Additionally, differences in CPUE trends and exploitation between areas further indicate the need for area-specific model configurations. For these reasons,
we believe that separate area models for California and Oregon better represent sub-stock dynamics than the coastwise model and should be used for management considerations.

## Area Modeling

The 2002 assessment (Methot et al. 2002) explored area-specific model configurations by constructing models that included data from subsets of the coast, and compared these results to the baseline coastwide model. The authors (Methot et al. 2002) concluded that the estimated differences between the areas (states) were neither sufficiently different nor sufficiently precisely estimated to recommend that management be based on area-specific population models. They suggested that area-specific modeling should remain in consideration as new data become available.

In the current assessment, we explored separate area models for each Washington, Oregon and California. For a single coastwide model the implicit assumption is that either: (1) similar recruitment and mortality occur off each state, or (2) there is sufficient mixing between areas within the coast so that any differences in recruitment or mortality among areas are obscured in the coastwide mixing. Thus, a coastwide model will either capture the common recruitment and mortality trends or it will represent the sum of all the processes operating in each area.

The independent area model for California waters included all data elements (Indices, compositions etc.) originating from California waters. A similar construct was used for both Oregon and Washington models, with the exception of including all (Oregon and Washington) IPHC length compositions in both area model specifications. A separate IPHC survey index was constructed for data originating from coastal waters off each state. The IPHC survey does not extend into California waters. Each area included a sport CPUE index and combined catch, age and length composition information for separate commercial and sport fisheries. In addition, Washington included a commercial line fishery that began targeting yelloweye rockfish in 2000. CPUE time series are assumed to occur instantaneously at the middle of the year.

As in the last assessment, the model combines male and female data into a single morph. Growth is modeled by using the von Bertalanffy growth equation and is assumed to be equal between female and male. A constant (but estimated) CV is used over time. Maturity is assumed to be a logistic function of length and is estimated externally to SS2. Size data were condensed into $2-\mathrm{cm}$ length bins ranging from 18 cm to 76 cm . Only $0.1 \%$ of the observed fish are greater than 76 cm , thus 76 cm was considered to be a reasonable accumulator bin. Age data were condensed into 1 -age bins for ages 3 to 29, and into 5 -age bins for ages $30-70$. All fish above age 70 were accumulated in the 70+ age bin. In addition to providing the model with size and age composition vectors, we calculated the mean length at each age-bin for each gear/state strata (and the number of fish in each age-bin used for the calculation) and assigned this vector to a year that supplied much of the age data. In SS2, the mean size at-age-bin is compared to the expected value for this quantity that takes into account the effects of ageing error and size-selectivity of the fishery. Sample sizes used in this assessment are the number of individual fish sampled for all length and age frequencies with a maximum sample size set at 200.

Natural Mortality and Recruitment
In the current assessment natural mortality was estimated within the coastwide model to be 0.036 across all ages and then assumed to be 0.036 in all area specific models. This compares to natural mortality estimates of 0.02 (O’Connell, 2005) and 0.033 (Chi Hong, DFO, Canada pers.
communication) used in the SE Alaska, U.S. and British Columbia, Canada, respectively. The stock-recruitment function was a Beverton-Holt parameterization, with the log of mean unexploited recruitment estimated and steepness (h) of the stock recruit function fixed at 0.45 , which compares to 0.437 in the last two assessments. The range of years where year-specific
recruitment deviations were estimated was determined by examination of the CV of the recruitment and recruitment deviation estimates. The standard deviation of the recruitment ( $\sigma_{\mathrm{R}}$ ) is treated as a fixed input quantity where the initial value examined was set at the 2002 model (Methot 2002) derived value of 0.4 and following a series of model sensitivity analyses was set at STAR Panel recommended 0.5 for all models with the exception of the Washington model that would not converge at values higher than 0.4 and therefore $\sigma_{\mathrm{R}}$ fixed at the initial value of 0.4 .

## Selectivity

Natural mortality is confounded with selectivity in age-structured models. In this assessment we assumed logistic form of selectivity and then estimated natural mortality in the current model.

Selectivity is assumed to be length based for all fleets, and to be logistic in all base model runs (SS2 Type1). During model development we did explored a double logistic shape (SS2 Type 2) for all fisheries and various combinations of logistic and double logistic. Selectivity for the CPUE indices was mirrored from the respective State sport fisheries. Fishery selectivity was assumed to be time-invariant for all model runs.

Lambdas
Model runs for the 2005 assessment indicated that the model's ability to fit the age and size composition data implied an effective sample size that was approximately $60 \%$ of the observed sample size values. Because sample size and emphasis factors are algebraically equivalent, this reduction in each observation's sample size was subsequently implemented by reducing all the size and age composition emphasis factors from 1.0 to 0.6 . Emphasis factors (lambdas) for size, age and mean size likelihood components were set similarly for all base model runs. We also set CPUE likelihood components to 1.0 and the baseline model was set to have an emphasis level of 0.5 on deviations from the $S / R$ curve and 0.0001 for the $S / R$ time series as was done in the previous assessment. Lastly, lambda for the initial equilibrium catch was set to 1.0 and parameter prior lambda to 1.0.

Model estimated parameters
Table 26 lists all estimated and assumed model parameters.
Model time period
The modeling time period begins in 1925 and the population is assumed to be in equilibrium.

### 2.5 Priors

No informative priors were set for most model parameters and parameter bounds were set to be sufficiently wide to avoid truncating the searching procedure during maximum likelihood estimation. Informative priors were set for both steepness and natural mortality and were based on values derived during the STAR Panel meeting stock assessment. The Washington model differed significantly to other area models in that we had to set informative priors on the indices (10) and severely limit our estimated recruitment deviations to years 1987-1992 to obtain convergence.

### 2.6 Model selection and evaluation

The final base model represents a close approximation to the SS2 model with logistic selectivity while re-estimating all parameters estimated in the last assessment with data time series appended since 2005. Steepness was fixed at the slightly revised value of 0.45 (instead of 0.437 ) and SigR $=0.5$ in all model runs with the exception of the sensitivity analysis. The Coastwide model fit all of the indices fairly well with the exception of the IPHC Halibut survey (Figure 30).

We evaluated the convergence status of the base model(s) with multiple model runs that explored the ability of the model to recover similar maximum likelihood estimates when initialized from disperse starting values. All model parameters were jittered by $0.5 \%$ of the range of the bounds from the maximum likelihood values for a set of 24 convergence runs. Starting values in some runs were outside the range of the model's ability to successfully complete and the run was either terminated early or Hessian matrix was not positive definite. Results for all successful runs show little variability in the objective function and current depletion for all completed runs (Table 27), indicating that the base case model estimates are unlikely to represent local minima.

### 2.6 Base-run(s) results selection and evaluation

The base case model population trajectory is similar to that predicted during the last stock, although estimated logistic selectivity is quite dissimilar compare to double logistic used in the last two assessments (Figures 20 and 21). Decline in biomass is significant and uninterrupted beginning in the 1970’s reaching lowest levels in 2000 (Table 28 and Figure 22). Population numbers at age indicate a substantial loss of the oldest age classes related to poor recruitment and/or overexploitation across the time series (Table 29 and Figure 23). Model fit the declining trend observed in the indices of abundance from all States fairly well, but fit the shorter more recent time series from the IPHC survey poorly (Figures 30-32). The lack of fit to the IHPC CPUE series is likely partially due to assuming average recruitment in the most recent years based on minimal data on younger age classes. There were no major conflicts between Model estimates and observed size/age composition data (Figures 33-39).

### 2.7 Uncertainty and sensitivity analyses.

We used a number of alternate models (SS2 version 1.21) to assess the sensitivity of the assessment results to the specific model configuration used in the base case. A profile of likelihood and other model outcomes over a range of fixed values for the initial recruitment level (virgin recruitment) are presented in Table 30 and Figure 25. In Table 31 and Figure 25 we show likelihood values and other model results over a range of fixed values for steepness. To assess the effect on model fit to emphasis on the SR curve we profiled across increasing lambda values on the SR curve and display the results in Table 32 and Figure 24. In Table 33 we assess the effect on model fit to increasing emphasis on length, age and size compositions.

### 2.8 Alternate model(s)

Double logistic selectivity was evaluated and presented during the STAR Panel (Table 26 b). Both the STAR Panel and STAT Team were in agreement that the descending limb parameters were poorly estimated and confounded with other parameters.

### 3.0 Rebuilding projections

Rebuilding projections are based on results from the SSC default rebuilding analysis simulation software and specific detail can be obtained from PFMC "Updated Rebuilding Analysis for Yelloweye Rockfish Based on the 2006 Stock Assessment" document (Tsou and Wallace, 2006).

The results from this analysis indicate that the yelloweye rockfish stock is behind in rebuilding schedule and will take longer time to rebuild then as indicated in the 2002 rebuilding analysis (Methot and Piner 2002). New TMIN of 2046 and TMAX of 2096 are 19 and 25 years longer than the TMIN of 2027 and TMAX of 2071 reported in the previous analysis. Probabilities of recovery by current TTARGET (2058) and TMAX (2071) based on current SPR are low. Probability of recovery by re-estimated TMAX (2080) with current SPR is also low. The current harvest control rule ( $\mathrm{F}=0.0153$ ) is too high to rebuild the stock by current TTARGET and current TMAX. Based on SSC run 6 settings, where TMAX and SPR are re-estimated and Po = $80 \%$, OY is projected to be 12.6 mt in 2007 and the coastwide stock is estimated to rebuild in year 2096 (Table 41).

### 4.0 Reference Points (biomass and exploitation rate)

The current assessment uses the F50\% Council default harvest policy to make harvest projections for yelloweye rockfish. Given that yelloweye rockfish spawning stock biomass (SB) was less than the Council's default harvest control rule of $25 \%$ of the unexploited level (based on coastwide or independent area models) the stock is considered to be "overfished". Benchmark fishing mortality rates for each area model and the coastwide model are presented in Table 39. Plot of $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ and $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{B}_{\text {MSY }}$ indicate that harvest have far exceeded $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY }}$ since the mid 1970's (Figure 29).

### 5.0 Harvest projections

Fishing mortality benchmarks and 10-year yield projections based on SS2 V1.21 model output can be found in Table 40 and Table 41 respectively.

### 6.0 Research Needs

Additional effort to collect age and maturity data is essential for improved population assessment. Collection of these data can only be accomplished through research studies and/or by onboard observers because this species is now prohibited. Increased effort toward habitat mapping and insitu observation of behavior will provide information on the essential habitat and distribution for this species. A study of the role of Marine Protected Areas in harvest management will be beneficial for sedentary species like yelloweye rockfish. Genetic study is required as a first step in delimiting stock boundaries for this species.

Alternative survey such as the in-situ 2002 US Vancouver submersible survey in untrawlable habitat is required for future assessment of yelloweye rebuilding status. This study has demonstrated that submersible visual transect surveys can provide a unique alternative method for estimating demersal fish biomass in habitats not accessible to conventional survey tools. For example, because of the low frequency of yelloweye rockfish encountered in the NMFS shelf trawl survey tows, those data were not considered a reliable indicator of abundance and were not used in the 2002 yelloweye stock assessment for PFMC (Methot et al. 2002). Results from this study support this conclusion and illustrate the need for large-scale surveys to assess bottomfish densities in habitats that are not accessible to trawl survey gear. Further, stratified random sampling designs should be employed with sample sizes sufficient to ensure acceptable levels of statistical power (Jagielo et al. 2003). At present, the in-situ visual transect submersible survey method appears to be a useful tool for this purpose, and the utility of this method will likely improve further with technological advances such as the 3-Beam Quantitative Mensuration System (QMS).
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9.0 Tables and Figures

Table 1. Summary of estimated yelloweye rockfish catch by State and fishery since 1955. Italicized catch data indicate years where there are no data to estimate catch, but presumed by authors. Grey areas indicate an interpolated catch time series from the earliest to latest years catch estimates. Blank cells indicate catch grouped into the trawl gear column.

Coastal Washington, Oregon and California Yelloweye Rockfish Landings

| PacFIN and MRFSS |  |  |  |  | Tagart, PacFIN, and ODFW |  |  |  | Tagart, PacFIN and WDFW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | California ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  |  | Oregon ${ }^{2 /}$ |  |  |  | Washington ${ }^{3 /}$ |  |  |  | Totals |  |  |  |  |
|  | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Total |
| 1955 | 24.1 |  |  | 14.2 | 9.9 |  |  | 6.2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 34.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 57.3 |
| 1956 | 28.8 |  |  | 16.6 | 10.1 |  |  | 6.5 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 39.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 64.9 |
| 1957 | 31.5 |  |  | 12.4 | 10.4 |  |  | 6.7 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 42.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 64.0 |
| 1958 | 35.5 |  |  | 15.8 | 10.6 |  |  | 7.0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 47.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 24.7 | 72.8 |
| 1959 | 30.9 |  |  | 12.4 | 10.9 |  |  | 7.2 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 42.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 65.3 |
| 1960 | 28.1 |  |  | 10.0 | 11.1 |  |  | 7.5 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 40.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 60.7 |
| 1961 | 22.6 |  |  | 8.3 | 11.4 |  |  | 7.7 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 34.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 53.9 |
| 1962 | 20.8 |  |  | 9.1 | 11.6 |  |  | 8.0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 33.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 53.4 |
| 1963 | 25.2 |  |  | 9.4 | 11.9 |  |  | 8.2 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 39.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 61.6 |
| 1964 | 17.7 |  |  | 8.5 | 12.1 |  |  | 8.5 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 31.8 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 53.7 |
| 1965 | 20.7 |  |  | 12.5 | 12.4 |  |  | 8.7 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 35.1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 24.2 | 61.2 |
| 1966 | 22.5 |  |  | 15.0 | 12.6 |  |  | 9.0 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 37.1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 66.0 |
| 1967 | 22.2 |  |  | 16.1 | 12.9 |  |  | 9.2 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 37.1 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 67.4 |
| 1968 | 21.7 |  |  | 17.3 | 13.1 |  |  | 9.5 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 36.8 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 68.5 |
| 1969 | 35.2 | 5.3 |  | 16.8 | 27.2 |  |  | 9.7 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 64.4 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 101.2 |
| 1970 | 42.0 | 5.1 |  | 21.8 | 19.2 |  |  | 10.0 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 0 | 4 | 64.6 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 35.8 | 107.2 |
| 1971 | 40.9 | 5.9 |  | 18.1 | 19.0 |  |  | 13.1 | 3.2 | 1.4 | 0 | 4 | 63.1 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 35.2 | 105.7 |
| 1972 | 61.1 | 9.4 |  | 24.2 | 24.0 |  |  | 16.3 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 0 | 4 | 88.2 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 44.5 | 144.6 |
| 1973 | 81.8 | 9.9 |  | 29.6 | 22.2 |  |  | 19.5 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 0 | 4 | 109.3 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 53.1 | 174.4 |
| 1974 | 73.3 | 11.0 |  | 33.0 | 18.2 |  |  | 22.6 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 0 | 4 | 95.8 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 59.7 | 170.7 |
| 1975 | 82.6 | 9.8 |  | 32.0 | 14.8 |  |  | 25.8 | 4.3 | 2.8 | 0 | 4.0 | 101.7 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 61.7 | 176.0 |
| 1976 | 91.0 | 12.6 |  | 31.0 | 25.9 |  |  | 29.0 | 7.7 | 2.6 | 0 | 4.3 | 124.7 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 64.2 | 204.2 |
| 1977 | 89.5 | 11.2 |  | 27.5 | 29.3 |  |  | 32.1 | 12.9 | 4.9 | 0 | 8.8 | 131.7 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 68.4 | 216.2 |
| 1978 | 82.0 | 17.4 |  | 24.5 | 21.5 | 7.0 |  | 35.3 | 17 | 6.9 | 0 | 4.5 | 120.5 | 31.2 | 0.0 | 64.4 | 216.1 |
| 1979 | 112.3 | 22.0 |  | 29.9 | 54.7 | 7.5 |  | 38.5 | 18.4 | 10.1 | 0 | 3.5 | 185.4 | 39.6 | 0.0 | 71.8 | 296.8 |
| 1980 | 147.9 | 20.2 |  | 75.9 | 60.2 | 8.0 |  | 27.5 | 29.2 | 5.8 | 0 | 2.4 | 237.3 | 34.0 | 0.0 | 105.8 | 377.1 |
| 1981 | 138.7 | 20.4 | 50.7 | 46.9 | 93.7 | 8.5 |  | 34.2 | 5.3 | 4.4 | 0 | 3.4 | 237.7 | 33.4 | 50.7 | 84.5 | 406.3 |
| 1982 | 146.9 | 28.3 | 1.8 | 103.8 | 99.9 | 9.0 | 5.6 | 48.7 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 0 | 3.4 | 253.3 | 43.5 | 7.4 | 155.8 | 460.0 |
| 1983 | 56.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 51.0 | 177.3 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 62.9 | 6.5 | 10.1 | 0 | 6.7 | 240.3 | 26.3 | 0.8 | 120.6 | 388.0 |
| 1984 | 43.5 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 80.8 | 57.1 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 43.6 | 3.0 | 10.4 | 0 | 12.2 | 103.6 | 20.9 | 0.9 | 136.6 | 262.0 |
| 1985 | 7.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 125.8 | 91.9 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 10.5 | 15.9 | 0 | 8.8 | 109.7 | 26.8 | 0.6 | 161.4 | 298.4 |
| 1986 | 9.8 | 20.0 | 1.2 | 65.5 | 59.8 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 27.2 | 2.7 | 12.0 | 0 | 9.0 | 72.3 | 42.8 | 1.2 | 101.7 | 218.0 |
| 1987 | 16.9 | 33.1 | 3.7 | 75.2 | 65.7 | 15 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 6.0 | 19.1 | 0 | 10.5 | 88.6 | 67.2 | 3.7 | 115.1 | 274.6 |
| 1988 | 30.6 | 22.5 | 11.8 | 57.5 | 110.7 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 15.8 | 9.8 | 0 | 8.3 | 157.1 | 41.7 | 11.8 | 75.4 | 286.0 |
| 1989 | 9.4 | 34.0 | 6.7 | 58.7 | 169.4 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 27.9 | 11.3 | 0 | 14.6 | 206.7 | 55.9 | 6.7 | 89.3 | 358.6 |
| 1990 | 10.1 | 58.8 | 10.9 | 46.12 | 61.1 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 18.8 | 7.5 | 0 | 9.9 | 90.0 | 79.5 | 10.9 | 72.6 | 253.1 |
| 1991 | 13.9 | 124.0 | 3.2 | 33.57 | 104.6 | 31.3 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 15.8 | 4.6 | 0 | 18.0 | 134.3 | 159.9 | 3.2 | 66.5 | 363.8 |
| 1992 | 15.8 | 95.1 | 1.3 | 21.02 | 107.8 | 58 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 25.1 | 8.7 | 0 | 16.2 | 148.7 | 161.8 | 1.3 | 63.2 | 374.9 |
| 1993 | 6.2 | 46.1 | 0.6 | 8.5 | 119.3 | 63.9 | 0.0 | 19.7 | 17.6 | 12.2 | 0 | 18.0 | 143.1 | 122.2 | 0.6 | 46.2 | 312.1 |
| 1994 | 4.7 | 48.7 | 1.0 | 14 | 77.6 | 24.6 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 7.2 | 12.4 | 0 | 10.3 | 89.5 | 85.7 | 1.0 | 43.0 | 219.2 |
| 1995 | 3.6 | 44.2 | 0.7 | 12.6 | 126.3 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 8.1 | 9.9 | 0 | 9.9 | 138.0 | 76.9 | 0.7 | 36.3 | 251.9 |
| 1996 | 16.2 | 48.0 | 1.6 | 12.5 | 75.5 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 0 | 10.8 | 100.3 | 78.5 | 1.6 | 31.7 | 212.1 |
| 1997 | 6.0 | 55.3 | 0.9 | 15.1 | 71.4 | 44.1 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 6.5 | 12.2 | 0 | 11.4 | 83.9 | 111.6 | 0.9 | 40.9 | 237.3 |
| 1998 | 4.0 | 16.7 | 0.9 | 5.8 | 20.8 | 20.6 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 4.8 | 0.7 | 0 | 14.4 | 29.6 | 38.0 | 0.9 | 39.1 | 107.6 |
| 1999 | 8.7 | 13.4 | 0.1 | 12.6 | 7.1 | 54.2 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 9.9 | 23.0 | 0 | 10.6 | 25.7 | 90.6 | 0.1 | 41.0 | 157.4 |
| 2000 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 0 | 10.1 | 1.2 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 42.4 |
| 2001 | 0.6 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 21.2 | 0 | 12.5 | 2.1 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 20.3 | 53.0 |
| 2002 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 12.9 |
| 2003 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 11.6 |
| 2004 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 12.0 |
| 2005 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 0.3 | 13.1 | 23.6 |
| Mean Annual Catch |  |  |  |  | Mean Annual Catch |  |  |  | Mean Annual Catch |  |  |  | Mean Annual Catch |  |  |  |  |
| 1980's | 60.7 | 18.0 | 8.7 | 74.1 | 98.6 | 10.7 | 0.7 | 32.6 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 170.7 | 39.2 | 8.4 | 114.6 | 263.7 |
| 1990's | 8.9 | 55.0 | 2.1 | 18.2 | 77.2 | 35.5 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 12.2 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 98.3 | 100.4 | 2.1 | 48.1 | 109.8 |
| 2000-2004 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 1.3 | 9.6 | 0.1 | 15.0 | 26.4 |

Note: GMT "Scorecard" from Nov. 2005 used for all 2005 catch estimates, ${ }^{1 / 1} 1983-2004$ commercial catches from PacFIN, 1969-1982 catch assumed to be 1\% of total Rockfish based on CalCom species composition estimates taken 1978-1982 after removing widow rock. Yelloweye are assumed to decline from 1\% in 1969 to $0.08 \%$ of total rockfish by 1955. Trawl and hook-and-line catches grouped prior to 1969. Recreational catches 1980-2004 from RecFIN and all prior years catch (\#'s of fish) assumed to be $0.5 \%$ yelloweye weighing 2.41 k (Miller and Gottshall, 1965) for all CPFV rockfish catches (Kevin Hill, NMFS personal communication) in Northern California waters and 0.025\% of Southern California rockfish catches.
${ }^{2 /}$ 1983-2004 Trawl catches from PacFIN, 1978-1983 from Tagart and Kimura (1982). 1991-2004 hook-and-line from PacFIN and 1982-1990 catches based species composition estimates taken for Washington line gears applied. Trawl and Line gear catch grouped prior to 1977 and yelloweye assumed to
$1.0 \%$ of total rockfish catch as reported in variuos Fisheries and Statistics of Oregon publications.
${ }^{3 /}$ 1983-2004 Trawl catch from PacFIN, 1976-1982 from Tagart and Kimura (1982) then assumed to decline to 1 mt by 1955. 1970-1999 commercial line catc applies species composition estimates taken 1986-1999 to "other rockfish" catch across all years, catch then assumed to decline to 1 mt by 1955 .
Recreational catches from various WDF reports back to 1975, catch then assumed to decline to 1 mt .

Table 2. Differences between catch estimates used in the 2006 and 2005 assessments. Bracketed () catch indicate a reduction in catch otherwise an increase in catch. Differences in Initial equilibrium catch on first line.

| Year | (4.0) | 7.8 | (4.0) | 0.8 | (1.0) | 0.0 | 0.0 | (9.0) | 8.6 | (0.4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | California |  | Oregon |  | Washington |  |  | Total |  | Grand |
|  | Rec ${ }^{1 /}$ | Com ${ }^{2 /}$ | Rec ${ }^{3 /}$ | Com ${ }^{21}$ | Rec ${ }^{4 /}$ | Com ${ }^{21}$ | Line | Rec | Com | Total |
| 1955 | (5.8) | 23.1 | (13.8) | 8.9 | (4.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (23.6) | 33.0 | 9.4 |
| 1956 | (3.4) | 27.8 | (13.5) | 9.1 | (4.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (20.9) | 37.9 | 17.0 |
| 1957 | (7.6) | 30.5 | (13.3) | 9.4 | (4.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (24.9) | 40.9 | 16.0 |
| 1958 | (4.2) | 34.5 | (13.0) | 9.6 | (3.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (20.2) | 45.1 | 24.9 |
| 1959 | (7.6) | 29.9 | (12.8) | 9.9 | (3.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (23.4) | 40.8 | 17.4 |
| 1960 | (10.0) | 27.1 | (12.5) | 10.1 | (3.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (25.5) | 38.2 | 12.7 |
| 1961 | (11.7) | 21.6 | (12.3) | 10.4 | (3.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (27.0) | 33.0 | 6.0 |
| 1962 | (10.9) | 19.8 | (12.0) | 10.6 | (3.0) | 1.0 | 0.0 | (25.9) | 31.4 | 5.5 |
| 1963 | (10.6) | 24.2 | (11.8) | 10.9 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (24.4) | 38.1 | 13.7 |
| 1964 | (11.5) | 16.7 | (11.5) | 11.1 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (25.0) | 30.8 | 5.8 |
| 1965 | (7.5) | 19.7 | (11.3) | 11.4 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (20.8) | 34.1 | 13.3 |
| 1966 | (5.0) | 21.5 | (11.0) | 11.6 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (18.0) | 36.1 | 18.1 |
| 1967 | (3.9) | 21.2 | (10.8) | 11.9 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (16.7) | 36.1 | 19.4 |
| 1968 | (2.7) | 20.7 | (10.5) | 12.1 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (15.2) | 35.8 | 20.6 |
| 1969 | (3.2) | 39.5 | (10.3) | 26.2 | (2.0) | 3.0 | 0.0 | (15.5) | 68.7 | 53.2 |
| 1970 | (3.3) | 45.9 | (13.5) | 18.7 | (1.0) | 4.1 | 0.0 | (17.8) | 68.7 | 50.9 |
| 1971 | (12.1) | 41.6 | (13.9) | 18.5 | (1.0) | 3.6 | 0.0 | (27.0) | 63.7 | 36.7 |
| 1972 | (11.1) | 61.4 | (14.2) | 20.5 | (1.0) | 3.8 | 0.0 | (26.3) | 85.7 | 59.4 |
| 1973 | (10.7) | 78.5 | (14.5) | 15.7 | (1.0) | 6.4 | 0.0 | (26.2) | 100.6 | 74.4 |
| 1974 | (12.4) | 67.1 | (14.9) | 8.7 | (1.0) | 7.5 | 0.0 | (28.3) | 83.3 | 55.0 |
| 1975 | (18.5) | 71.2 | (15.2) | 2.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | (33.7) | 77.8 | 44.1 |
| 1976 | (24.6) | 78.5 | (15.5) | 10.4 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | (40.1) | 95.9 | 55.8 |
| 1977 | (33.2) | 71.5 | (15.9) | 10.8 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 0.0 | (49.1) | 99.2 | 50.1 |
| 1978 | (41.2) | 66.1 | (16.3) | 7.0 | 0.0 | 22.7 | 0.0 | (57.5) | 95.8 | 38.3 |
| 1979 | (40.9) | 97.0 | (16.6) | 7.5 | 1.2 | 22.5 | 0.0 | (56.3) | 127.0 | 70.7 |
| 1980 | 0.0 | 126.9 | (8.0) | 8.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | (8.0) | 139.2 | 131.2 |
| 1981 | 0.0 | (158.0) | 10.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 10.0 | (143.4) | (133.4) |
| 1982 | 0.0 | (24.8) | 9.6 | 94.5 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 77.0 | 86.6 |
| 1983 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (3.4) | 15.9 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | (3.4) | 24.8 | 21.4 |
| 1984 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 18.4 | 28.2 |
| 1985 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (3.6) | 10.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | (3.6) | 19.6 | 16.0 |
| 1986 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 10.7 | 19.8 |
| 1987 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (6.3) | 6.3 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | (6.3) | 17.3 | 11.0 |
| 1988 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | (5.0) | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.2 |
| 1989 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | (9.4) | 0.0 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 1.5 | (0.6) | 0.9 |
| 1990 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (2.0) | (12.5) | 0.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | (2.0) | (6.7) | (8.7) |
| 1991 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (3.9) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | (3.9) | 2.8 | (1.1) |
| 1992 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | (0.1) | 5.4 | 5.3 |
| 1993 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (1.9) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | (1.9) | 3.2 | 1.3 |
| 1994 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 9.6 | 11.1 |
| 1995 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 9.8 | 15.4 |
| 1996 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (7.0) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | (7.0) | 8.3 | 1.3 |
| 1997 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (4.4) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (4.4) | 0.0 | (4.4) |
| 1998 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| 1999 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
| 2000 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.0) | 4.4 | (0.0) | 4.4 |
| 2001 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.1) | 0.0 | (0.1) | (0.1) |
| 2002 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2003 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 2004 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | (313.6) | 1000.7 | (308.4) | 424.7 | (44.8)\| | 248.2 | (0.1) | (666.8) | 1673.6 | 1006.8 |

Table 3. Historical rockfish landings in California waters from 1916 to 1955 (Heimann and Carlisle, 1970) and estimated catch of yelloweye. Catch estimates are not available for blank cells.

| Historical <br> Year | Rockfish Landing Commercial Catch (mt) ${ }^{1 /}$ | ss in California CPFV Catch Catch (mt) ${ }^{2 l}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1916 | 2,231 |  |
| 1917 | 3,526 |  |
| 1918 | 3,739 |  |
| 1919 | 2,449 |  |
| 1920 | 2,555 |  |
| 1921 | 2,160 |  |
| 1922 | 1,956 |  |
| 1923 | 2,312 |  |
| 1924 | 2,151 |  |
| 1925 | 2,490 |  |
| 1926 | 3,421 |  |
| 1927 | 2,899 |  |
| 1928 | 2,912 |  |
| 1929 | 2,738 |  |
| 1930 | 3,277 |  |
| 1931 | 3,301 |  |
| 1932 | 2,557 |  |
| 1933 | 2,172 |  |
| 1934 | 2,088 |  |
| 1935 | 2,191 |  |
| 1936 | 2,088 | 139 |
| 1937 | 1,946 | 165 |
| 1938 | 1,650 | 163 |
| 1939 | 1,512 | 143 |
| 1940 | 1,620 | 205 |
| 1941 | 1,545 |  |
| 1942 | 646 |  |
| 1943 | 1,253 |  |
| 1944 | 2,913 |  |
| 1945 | 6,027 |  |
| 1946 | 5,063 |  |
| 1947 | 3,855 | 132 |
| 1948 | 2,952 | 279 |
| 1949 | 2,704 | 388 |
| 1950 | 3,681 | 462 |
| 1951 | 4,987 | 491 |
| 1952 | 4,866 | 480 |
| 1953 | 5,547 | 474 |
| 1954 | 5,734 | 782 |
| 1955 | 5,752 | 1182 |

1/ Commercial rockfish catch reported by Heimann and Carlisle (1970). 2/ Receational landings (\#numbers offish) assumed to have an average weight of 1.5 kg .

Table 4. Historical observations of the yelloweye proportion in rockfish landings.

| Source | Year of <br> Estimate | Fishery | Proportion of Rockfish <br> that are Yelloweye |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Phillips, 1939. | $1937-1938$ | Wholesale Monterey rockfish markets | $0.6 \%$ |
| Nitsos and Reed, 1965. | $1961-1962$ | Trawl caught animal food fishery in Calif. | $0.1 \%$ |
| Heimann, 1963. | 1960 | Trawl caught rockfish in Monterey Bay | none reported |
| Miller and Gotshall, 1965 ${ }^{1 /}$ | 1960 | CPFV Cresent city to Avila | $0.5 \%$ |
| Nitsos, R.J., 1965. | 1962 | Ca. Ottertrawl (Monterey Excluded) | $0.2 \%$ |
| Don Pearson (NMFS personnel com.) | $1978-1982$ | Ca. Trawl and Line fisheries (spp. Comps.) | $1.00 \%$ |

${ }^{1 /}$ Miller and Gotshall reported 1,059 "Turkey Red" fish landed totaling 5,625 lbs (Ave. weight $=5.3 \mathrm{lbs}$ or 2.41 k )

Table 5. Historical rockfish landings in Oregon waters between 1928 and 1953.
Historical rockfish landings in Oregon

| Year | Total Rockfish ${ }^{\text {1/ }}$ <br> Catch (lbs) | Catch (mt) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1928 | 73,702 | 33 |
| 1929 | 128,265 | 58 |
| 1930 | 118,688 | 54 |
| 1931 | 90,833 | 41 |
| 1932 | 33,303 | 15 |
| 1933 | 48,709 | 22 |
| 1934 | 52,900 | 24 |
| 1935 | 48,800 | 22 |
| 1936 | 121,100 | 55 |
| 1937 | 153,800 | 70 |
| 1938 | 139,700 | 63 |
| 1939 | 163,800 | 74 |
| 1940 | 619,300 | 281 |
| 1941 | $1,301,400$ | 590 |
| 1942 | $1,898,488$ | 861 |
| 1943 | $6,923,325$ | 3140 |
| 1944 | $11,367,169$ | 5156 |
| 1945 | $17,458,309$ | 7919 |
| 1946 | $10,867,187$ | 4929 |
| 1947 | $6,799,941$ | 3084 |
| 1948 | $4,658,388$ | 2113 |
| 1949 | $4,737,478$ | 2149 |
| 1950 | $4,163,795$ | 1889 |
| 1951 | $3,670,157$ | 1665 |
| 1952 | $3,760,818$ | 1706 |
| 1953 | $1,986,794$ | 901 |

${ }^{1 /}$ 1928-1949 rockfish catch from: Fisheries Statistics ofOregon, F.C. Cleaver - Editor, Oregon Fish Commission, Portland, Oregon, Contribution No. 16, September, 1951. And 1950-1953 data from: Fisheries Statistics of Oregon, Harrison S., Fish Commission of Oregon, Portland, Oregon, Contribution No. 22,February 1956.

Table 6. Historical rockfish landings in Grays' Harbor and Willapa Harbor in1953.

| Species | Month | Catch (Ibs) | Gear | Area |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Gen. Rockfish | Jan-July | 250,304 | Otter Trawl (GH) | Cape John-Cape Shoal |
| Black Rockfish | Apr-May | 10,720 | Otter Trawl (GH) | Cape Shoal |
| Red Rockfish | May-June | 6,310 | Otter Trawl (GH) | Cape Shoal |
| POP | Feb-Aug | 160,473 | Otter Trawl (GH) | Cape Flattery-Cape TImk |
| Red Snapper | April | 17,595 | Otter Trawl (GH) | Cape John-Cape Shoal |
| Gen. Rockfish | Feb-Nov | 93,781 | Troll (Grays Harbor) | Cape Flattery-Cape TImk |
| Red Snapper | May-Sept | 364 | Troll (Grays Harbor) | Cape Flattery-Cape Shoal |
| Gen. Rockfish | June\&Oct | 101 | Troll (Willapa Harbor) | Cape shoal-Cape TImk |
| Red Rockfish | Sept | 16 | Troll (Willapa Harbor) | Cape shoal-Cape TImk |
| Gen \& Red | Total | 368,471 |  |  |
| Yelloweye \% | $1.0 \%$ | 1.7 |  |  |
| From table belwo |  | 0.4 |  |  |
| Total Yelloweye Catch (mt) | 2.1 |  |  |  |


$\left.\begin{array}{llrl}\text { Species } & \text { Month } & \text { Catch (lbs) } & \text { Gear }\end{array}\right]$ Area | Rockfish liver | March | 342 Otter Trawl | Cape Shoal |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Black Rockfish liver | May | 126 Otter Trawl | Cape Shoal |
| Red Rockfihs liver | Jan-Oct | 9841 Otter Trawl | Cape Flattery-Pt Lookout |
| POP liver | May-Sept | 406 Otter Trawl | Cape Shoal |
| No data for Troll rockfish livers in GH \& Willapa |  |  |  |

Misc. data- All gears combined

| Species | Month | Catch (Ibs) | Gear | Area |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Gen. Rockfish | Apr-May | 344,056 all gears combined | Grays Harbor |  |
| Black Rockfish | Jan-Dec | 10,720 all gears combined | Grays Harbor |  |
| Red Rockfish | May-June | 6,310 all gears combined | Grays Harbor |  |
| POP | Feb-Aug | 160,473 all gears combined | Grays Harbor |  |
| Red Snapper | Apr-Sept | 17,959 all gears combined | Grays Harbor |  |
| Gen. Rockfish | Jun\&Oct | 101 all gears combined | Willapa Harbor |  |
| Red Rockfish | Sept | 16 all gears combined | Willapa Harbor |  |


| Species | Month | Catch (Ibs) | Gear | Area |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Gen. Rockfish livers March | 342 | all gears combined | Grays Harbor |  |
| Black Rockfish liver | May | 126 | all gears combined | Grays Harbor |
| Red Rockfish liver | Jan-Oct | 12,898 | all gears combined | Grays Harbor |
| POP liver | May\&Sept | 406 | all gears combined | Grays Harbor |

Table 7. Number of species composition estimates taken in Washington ports by Fishery since 1986.

Number of species compositions taken in Washington ports by Gear

| YR | Bottomfish Troll | Hand-line-jig | Set Line | SN | Salmon Troll |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86 |  | 33 |  |  | 6 |
| 87 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 34 |
| 88 | 15 | 285 | 252 | 2 | 22 |
| 89 | 5 | 311 | 4 | 1 | 81 |
| 90 |  | 230 | 2 |  | 11 |
| 91 |  | 308 | 1 | 18 |  |
| 92 | 308 |  | 5 |  |  |
| 93 |  | 631 | 197 |  |  |
| 94 |  | 124 | 250 |  |  |
| 95 |  |  | 164 |  |  |
| 96 |  |  | 1146 |  |  |
| 97 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 98 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 99 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8. Summary of the estimated yelloweye rockfish von Bertalanffy growth function parameters by area and sex. Sizes are in cm fork length.

| Area | Males |  |  |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |  |  | Combined Sexes |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Linf | K | $t 0$ | t 20 | t 40 | N | Linf | K | t 0 | t 20 | t 40 | N | Linf | K | t 0 | $t 20$ | t 40 | N |
| California | 67.3 | 0.054 | -5.0 | 49.9 | 61.4 | 50 | 66.3 | 0.048 | -7.8 | 49.0 | 59.7 | 79 | 65.4 | 0.052 | -7.1 | 49.2 | 59.6 | 160 |
| Oregon | 67.3 | 0.054 | -5.5 | 50.5 | 61.6 | 424 | 64.1 | 0.055 | -6.0 | 48.6 | 58.9 | 531 | 65.4 | 0.055 | -5.5 | 49.2 | 60.0 | 1060 |
| Washington | 68.5 | 0.050 | -5.6 | 49.6 | 61.6 | 355 | 67.3 | 0.043 | -9.3 | 48.1 | 59.1 | 286 | 67.5 | 0.047 | -7.4 | 49.1 | 60.3 | 759 |
| W-O-C | 68.0 | 0.051 | -6.0 | 50.0 | 61.5 | 779 | 64.9 | 0.051 | -6.6 | 48.4 | 59.0 | 817 | 65.9 | 0.053 | -5.9 | 49.2 | 60.1 | 1979 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Vancouver Is. | 69.1 | 0.052 | -3.7 | 49.2 | 62.1 | 684 | 66.4 | 0.052 | -4.3 | 47.8 | 59.9 | 642 | 67.2 | 0.055 | -3.5 | 48.6 | 60.9 | 1326 |
| ${ }^{2}$ Queen Charlotte Islands | 68.3 | 0.053 | -6.2 | 51.2 | 62.4 | 749 | 65.4 | 0.051 | -6.6 | 48.7 | 59.4 | 997 | 65.8 | 0.056 | -5.6 | 49.9 | 60.5 | 1746 |
| ${ }^{3}$ Bowie Seamount | 79.3 | 0.043 | -6.0 | 53.8 | 68.6 | 240 | 82.4 | 0.035 | -7.8 | 50.9 | 66.6 | 228 | 81.0 | 0.038 | -7.1 | 52.3 | 67.7 | 468 |
| ${ }^{4}$ SE Alaska | 64.4 | 0.051 | -5.4 | 46.9 | 58.1 | 1112 | 65.9 | 0.037 | -11.6 | 45.6 | 56.3 | 1091 | 64.4 | 0.046 | -7.6 | 46.2 | 57.1 | 2203 |

Table 9. Comparison of mean length estimates and standard deviations.

| Source | L at Age 6 | L at Age 60 | K | CV @ Age 6 | CV @ Age 60 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| External | 30.8 | 63.9 | 0.053 | 0.180 | 0.098 |
| SS1 Model estimates | 26.9 | 65.7 | 0.049 | 0.128 | 0.095 |
| SS2 (SS1 age error and catch) | 23.1 | 64.1 | 0.059 | 0.141 | 0.134 |
| SS2 Base Model (revised age error and catch) | 22.6 | 64.6 | 0.063 | 0.082 | 0.051 |

Table 10. Length and age at $50 \%$ maturity for yelloweye rockfish by area and source.

|  |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source | Area | $\mathbf{A}_{50}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{50}$ | $\mathbf{A}_{50}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{50}$ |
| O' Connell et.al. 2000 | SE Alaska | 23 | 50 | 21 | 45 |
| Rosenthal et.al., 1982 | SE Alaska | - | $52-60$ | - | $50-52$ |
| Kronlund and Yamanaka, 2000 | Queen Charolotte Is. | - | - | $18.9-20.3$ | $48.5-49.1$ |
| Kronlund and Yamanaka, 2000 | Vancouver Is. | - | - | $16.5-17.2$ | $42.1-42.4$ |
| Barss, 1989 | Oregon | - | 45 | - | 41 |
| McClure, 1982 ${ }^{1}$ | Oregon | 12 | 56 | 11 | 45 |
| Reilly et al. $1994^{2}$ | California |  | 40 |  | 40 |
| ${\text { Watters, } 1992^{1}}^{1}$ Curface age reading of otoliths | California |  | 7 | 40 | 7 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Sex unspecified |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  |  | 39 |  |  |  |

Table 11. Catch curve estimates of natural mortality.

Ricker Catch Curve Analyses

| Area | Year | Age Range | Combined <br> Sexes | Males | Females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neah Bay, Washington | 2000 | $16-34$ | 0.076 | 0.060 | 0.083 |
|  |  | $17-34$ | 0.065 | 0.049 | 0.074 |
|  |  | $18-34$ | 0.048 | 0.036 | 0.056 |
|  | $19-34$ | 0.048 | 0.049 | 0.049 |  |
| Bowie Seamount $^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $19-46$ | 0.025 | 0.021 | 0.033 |
|  |  | $20-46$ | 0.011 | 0.008 | 0.020 |
| Bowie Seamount-bright $^{2}{ }^{2}$ | 1999 | >=20, 5yr Bins | -0.003 | -0.007 | 0.009 |
| SE Alaska $^{3}$ | 1988 | 36-96,2yr Bins | 0.02 | 0.086 | 0.043 |
| ${ }^{1}$ Data provide by Yamanaka, DFO Canada |  | - | - |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Yamanaka ,2000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3}$ O'Connel et.al., 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12. Natural mortality estimates derived from maximum age (Hoenig, 1983).

| Area | Year | Gear | Sexes Combined |  |  |  | Males |  |  |  | Females |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean | Max | Mortality | N | Mean | Max | Mortality | N | Mean | Max | Mortality | N |
| California | 77-85 | Sport | 25.8 | 122 | 0.038 | 163 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neah Bay, Washington | 98-00 | Sport | 25.8 | 87 | 0.053 | 296 | 25.2 | 79 | 0.058 | 152 | 26.6 | 87 | 0.053 | 144 |
| N. Vancouver Island | 97-98 | Set Line | 23.8 | 95 | 0.048 | 1129 | 23.8 | 109 | 0.042 | 577 | 24.9 | 94 | 0.049 | 552 |
| Queen Charelotte | 97-98 | Set Line | 24.3 | 115 | 0.040 | 1407 | 22.6 | 95 | 0.048 | 716 | 25.2 | 89 | 0.051 | 684 |
| Bowie Seamount | 99 | Set Line | 28.6 | 99 | 0.046 | 851 | 26.9 | 92 | 0.050 | 427 | 30.4 | 99 | 0.046 | 424 |

SE Alaska
Note: Natural mortality was estimated using Hoenig's "all groups" a and b parameters.

Table 13a. Comparison of Fishery size and age composition sample size from California, Oregon and Washington Fisheries.

| All Values are \#'s of Fish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | California |  |  |  | Oregon |  |  |  | Washington |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IPHC } \\ & \text { Size } \end{aligned}$ |
| Year | Size | Age | Size | Age | Size | Age | Size | Age | Size | Age | Size | Age |  |
| Year |  | ORT | COM | RCIAL |  | ORT | COM | ERCIAL |  | ORT | COM | ERCIAL |  |
| 1978 | 81 |  | 50 |  | 120 | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1979 | 119 |  | 5 |  | 106 | 169 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 124 | 17 | 11 | 12 | 25 |  |  |  | 111 |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 83 | 33 | 3 |  | 13 |  |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 106 | 18 | 8 | 8 | 61 |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 | 105 |  | 22 | 5 | 17 |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 169 |  | 18 | 17 | 373 |  |  |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 300 |  | 11 | 39 | 222 | 244 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 206 |  | 14 | 5 | 177 | 124 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 98 |  | 22 |  | 163 | 140 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| 1988 | 317 |  | 14 |  | 38 | 123 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 385 |  | 8 |  | 112 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 89 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 112 |  | 224 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 164 |  | 493 |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 236 |  | 709 |  | 163 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 250 |  | 748 |  | 151 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 199 |  | 383 |  | 110 |  | 98 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 239 |  | 534 |  | 73 |  | 161 |  | 14 |  | 266 | 0 |  |
| 1997 | 250 |  | 299 |  | 99 |  | 256 |  |  |  | 118 | 0 |  |
| 1998 | 125 |  | 54 |  | 147 |  | 118 |  | 48 | 25 | 40 | 0 |  |
| 1999 | 88 |  | 507 |  | 246 |  | 166 | 24 | 96 | 95 | 45 | 0 |  |
| 2000 | 47 |  | 28 |  | 62 |  | 141 |  | 189 | 189 | 361 | 0 |  |
| 2001 | 15 |  | 132 |  | 368 | 86 | 248 | 38 | 101 | 96 | 582 | 186 |  |
| 2002 | 13 |  |  |  | 448 | 73 |  |  |  |  | 187 | 187 | 141 |
| 2003 | 15 |  |  |  | 490 |  |  |  |  |  | 19 | 10 | 314 |
| 2004 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 28 | 174 |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 155 |

Table 13b. Fishery size and age composition sample size from California Fisheries. X in the size@age column indicates the year to which mean size-at-age observation was assigned for data source and negative values indicate sample data not used due to small sample size.


Table 14. Fishery size and age composition sample size from Oregon Fisheries. X in the size@age column indicates the year to which mean size-at-age observation was assigned for data source and negative values indicate sample data not used due to small sample size.


Table 15. Fishery size and age composition sample size from Washington Fisheries. X in the size@age column indicates the year to which mean size-at-age observation was assigned for data source and negative values indicate sample data not used due to small sample size.

| Year | Size <br> N | $\mathrm{N}^{1 /}$ | Age <br> N | $\mathrm{N}^{1 /}$ | Size@Age | Catch (mt) | N/Catch |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPORT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 111 | 29 |  |  |  | 2.4 | 45.7 |
| 1981 | 45 | 29 |  |  |  | 3.4 | 13.3 |
| 1982 | 15 | 29 |  |  |  | 3.4 | 4.5 |
| 1983 | 7 | 29 |  |  |  | 6.7 | 1.0 |
| 1984 | 19 | 29 |  |  |  | 12.2 | 1.6 |
| 1985 | 15 | 29 |  |  |  | 8.8 | 1.7 |
| 1986 | 9 | 29 |  |  |  | 9.0 | 1.0 |
| 1987 | 34 | 28 |  |  |  | 10.5 | 3.2 |
| 1988 | 4 | 28 |  |  |  | 8.3 | 0.5 |
| 1995 | 9 | 11 |  |  |  | 9.9 | 0.9 |
| 1996 | 14 | 12 |  |  |  | 10.8 | 1.3 |
| 1998 | 48 |  | 25 | 60 |  | 14.4 | 3.3 |
| 1999 | 96 |  | 95 | 60 |  | 10.6 | 9.0 |
| 2000 | 189 |  | 189 |  | X | 10.1 | 18.6 |
| 2001 | 101 |  | 96 |  |  | 12.5 | 8.1 |
| COMMERCIAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 266 |  |  |  |  | 8.6 | 30.9 |
| 1997 | 118 |  |  |  |  | 18.7 | 6.3 |
| 1998 | 40 | 34 |  |  |  | 5.5 | 7.3 |
| 1999 | 45 | 34 |  |  |  | 32.9 | 1.4 |
| 2000 | 17 | 34 |  |  |  | 0.2 | 85.0 |
| 2001 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| 2002 | 48 | 23 | 48 | 23 |  | 0.4 | 120.0 |
| 2003 | 5 | 23 | 2 | 23 |  | 0.2 | 25.0 |
| 2004 | 16 | 23 | 14 | 23 |  | 0.1 | 160.0 |
| LINE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 344 |  |  |  | X | 7.7 | 44.4 |
| 2001 | 582 |  | 186 |  |  | 21.2 | 27.4 |
| 2002 | 139 |  | 139 |  |  | 2.2 | 63.2 |
| 2003 | 14 |  | 8 |  |  | 0.3 | 46.7 |
| 2004 | 24 |  | 14 |  |  | 0.8 | 30.0 |
| IPHC (Washington and Oregon) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 141 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 314 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 174 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 155 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 16. CPUE indices of abundance used in base run.

|  | CPFV per angler hour | CA_MRFSS per angler hour | OR_Sport per angler hour | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { OSP_BFO } \\ \text { per angler trip } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { IHPC } \\ \text { per set } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1979 |  |  | 11.67 |  |  |
| 1980 |  | 4.48 | 15.69 |  |  |
| 1981 |  | 2.78 | 13.92 |  |  |
| 1982 |  | 11.27 | 18.09 |  |  |
| 1983 |  | 4.64 | 23.27 |  |  |
| 1984 |  | 8.46 | 16.52 |  |  |
| 1985 |  | 13.57 |  |  |  |
| 1986 |  | 6.25 | 13.03 |  |  |
| 1987 |  | 11.70 | 15.14 |  |  |
| 1988 | 26.19 | 2.96 | 10.17 |  |  |
| 1989 | 25.52 | 3.94 | 6.58 |  |  |
| 1990 | 32.16 |  | 12.21 | 6.90 |  |
| 1991 | 31.59 |  | 14.69 | 16.03 |  |
| 1992 | 20.88 |  | 11.91 | 15.29 |  |
| 1993 | 23.63 | 7.72 | 10.81 | 13.19 |  |
| 1994 | 21.67 | 1.87 | 8.98 | 7.15 |  |
| 1995 | 16.33 | 3.06 | 7.24 | 5.70 |  |
| 1996 | 17.90 | 2.08 | 5.63 | 5.72 |  |
| 1997 | 13.31 | 4.23 |  | 8.75 |  |
| 1998 | 10.13 | 3.12 | 9.53 | 11.06 |  |
| 1999 |  | 2.14 | 10.79 | 6.88 | 5.71 |
| 2000 |  | 3.39 |  | 6.45 |  |
| 2001 |  | 1.18 |  | 4.42 | 4.82 |
| 2002 |  |  |  |  | 3.36 |
| 2003 |  |  |  |  | 4.8 |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  | 3.37 |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  | 2.65 |

Table 17. Number of interviewed trips in MRFSS, CPFV, and OSP data sets.

|  | Oregon MRFSS |  | N. California MRFSS |  | CPFV |  | OSP |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Angler_hour | Trip | Angler_hour | Trip | Angler_hour | Trip | Halibut trip | Bottomfish trip |
| 1980 | 15,765 | 294 | 80,417 | 694 |  |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 7,347 | 174 | 25,221 | 217 |  |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 12,581 | 182 | 24,836 | 262 |  |  |  |  |
| 1983 | 7,718 | 151 | 10,780 | 135 |  |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 22,610 | 393 | 46,099 | 378 |  |  |  |  |
| 1985 | 11,872 | 239 | 146,683 | 997 |  |  |  |  |
| 1986 | 15,480 | 224 | 132,868 | 836 |  |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 16,950 | 189 | 39,321 | 363 | 3,658 | 148 |  |  |
| 1988 | 25,463 | 286 | 84,401 | 550 | 10,423 | 351 |  |  |
| 1989 | 30,389 | 254 | 68,479 | 371 | 9,796 | 384 |  |  |
| 1990 |  |  |  |  | 2,706 | 120 | 4,470 | 20,678 |
| 1991 |  |  |  |  | 3,165 | 131 | 4,372 | 20,437 |
| 1992 |  |  |  |  | 7,041 | 376 | 3,386 | 19,797 |
| 1993 | 32,720 | 1,520 | 6,479 | 178 | 7,407 | 459 | 5,046 | 18,843 |
| 1994 | 42,252 | 1,446 | 16,043 | 500 | 6,323 | 458 | 5,576 | 25,821 |
| 1995 | 29,653 | 873 | 62,141 | 627 | 5,755 | 513 | 6,760 | 23,890 |
| 1996 | 36,014 | 1,463 | 245,694 | 2,061 | 5,978 | 557 | 7,760 | 26,046 |
| 1997 | 80,943 | 1,475 | 115,810 | 2,475 | 6,684 | 628 | 8,368 | 21,355 |
| 1998 | 47,331 | 1,343 | 89,658 | 1,160 | 4,243 | 431 | 9,500 | 21,889 |
| 1999 | 58,203 | 1,586 | 298,606 | 1,741 |  |  | 6,728 | 15,919 |
| 2000 | 31,795 | 916 | 106,164 | 680 |  |  | 6,641 | 16,719 |
| 2001 | 21,690 | 567 | 101,973 | 732 |  |  | 5,773 | 14,733 |

Table 18. Numbers of stations and yelloweye caught during the IPHC surveys. Note that values for the 1999 and 2001 yelloweye catch were expanded from the first 20 hooks of each skate. There are 100 hooks per skate.

| Year | Yelloweye catch | no. of stations |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1999 | 336 | 71 |
| 2000 | 203 |  |
| 2001 | 141 | 84 |
| 2002 | 317 | 85 |
| 2003 | 172 | 85 |
| 2004 | 156 | 85 |
| 2005 |  | 85 |

Table 19. Summary of Northern California partyboat (CPFV) trips sampled, number retained for CPUE analysis and number positive for yelloweye rockfish.

|  |  | WAVE |  |  |  |  |  | Year Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | Trips | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| 1980 | Positive | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 26 |
|  | Retained | 7 | 5 | 14 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 56 |
|  | Total Trips | 13 | 21 | 37 | 37 | 31 | 46 | 185 |
| 1981 | Positive | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
|  | Retained | 2 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 34 |
|  | Total Trips | 10 | 13 | 18 | 30 | 18 | 11 | 100 |
| 1982 | Positive | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 13 |
|  | Retained | 5 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 42 |
|  | Total Trips | 10 | 15 | 26 | 24 | 18 | 5 | 98 |
| 1983 | Positive | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 14 |
|  | Retained | 1 | 5 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 47 |
|  | Total Trips | 5 | 14 | 32 | 31 | 14 | 9 | 105 |
| 1984 | Positive | 5 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 30 |
|  | Retained | 9 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 7 | 59 |
|  | Total Trips | 22 | 19 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 24 | 157 |
| 1985 | Positive | 6 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 20 | 6 | 53 |
|  | Retained | 14 | 14 | 16 | 24 | 31 | 11 | 110 |
|  | Total Trips | 21 | 31 | 47 | 52 | 48 | 21 | 220 |
| 1986 | Positive |  | 7 | 12 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 40 |
|  | Retained |  | 18 | 20 | 19 | 24 | 10 | 91 |
|  | Total Trips | 21 | 25 | 35 | 43 | 35 | 23 | 182 |
| 1987 | Positive | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 13 |
|  | Retained | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 32 |
|  | Total Trips | 15 | 18 | 16 | 25 | 31 | 19 | 124 |
| 1988 | Positive | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
|  | Retained | 7 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 34 |
|  | Total Trips | 12 | 24 | 8 | 30 | 16 | 16 | 106 |
| 1989 | Positive |  |  | 5 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 18 |
|  | Retained |  |  | 6 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 35 |
|  | Total Trips | 1 |  | 12 | 20 | 10 | 8 | 51 |
| $\begin{gathered} 1993 \\ \text { (not used) } \end{gathered}$ | Positive |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Retained |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Trips | 1 |  |  | 5 | 60 | 56 | 122 |
| 1994 | Positive | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |
|  | Retained | 9 | 7 |  |  | 9 |  | 25 |
|  | Total Trips | 33 | 108 | 110 | 227 | 111 | 5 | 594 |
| 1995 | Positive |  | 0 | 7 | 8 |  | 0 | 15 |
|  | Retained |  | 2 | 15 | 25 |  | 2 | 44 |
|  | Total Trips |  | 13 | 35 | 89 | 1 | 4 | 142 |
| 1996 | Positive | 7 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 32 |
|  | Retained | 17 | 18 | 21 | 32 | 25 | 11 | 124 |
|  | Total Trips | 40 | 87 | 191 | 226 | 105 | 26 | 675 |
| 1997 | Positive | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 26 |
|  | Retained | 1 | 11 | 13 | 47 | 26 | 34 | 132 |
|  | Total Trips | 2 | 70 | 105 | 245 | 139 | 94 | 655 |
| 1998 | Positive | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 28 |
|  | Retained | 2 | 6 | 6 | 30 | 34 | 22 | 100 |
|  | Total Trips | 10 | 43 | 71 | 164 | 141 | 68 | 497 |
| 1999 | Positive | 8 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 31 |
|  | Retained | 30 | 29 | 8 | 15 | 21 | 7 | 110 |
|  | Total Trips | 63 | 79 | 82 | 76 | 52 | 21 | 373 |
| 2000 | Positive | 4 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 |
|  | Retained | 8 |  | 6 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 47 |
|  | Total Trips | 16 | 16 | 30 | 46 | 32 | 28 | 168 |
| 2001 | Positive | 3 |  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
|  | Retained | 10 |  | 1 | 15 | 13 | 1 | 40 |
|  | Total Trips | 16 | 12 | 50 | 82 | 50 | 12 | 222 |
| 2002 | Positive | 3 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 4 |
|  | Retained | 16 |  |  | 6 | 6 |  | 28 |
|  | Total Trips | 28 | 38 | 57 | 103 | 47 | 8 | 281 |
| 2003 | Positive | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
|  | Retained | 1 |  |  | 13 | 11 | 6 | 31 |
|  | Total Trips | 18 | 37 | 65 | 129 | 78 | 27 | 354 |
| Total Positive |  | 53 | 38 | 80 | 84 | 92 | 51 | 398 |
| Total Retained |  | 144 | 139 | 182 | 306 | 288 | 162 | 1221 |
| Total Trips |  | 357 | 683 | 1057 | 1714 | 1069 | 531 | 5411 |

Table 20. Estimated year effects from delta-GLM of yelloweye rockfish CPUE (catch per hour) on northern California RecFIN trips.

| Year | CPUE Index | CV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 0.0081 | 0.19 |
| 1981 | 0.0064 | 0.30 |
| 1982 | 0.0094 | 0.36 |
| 1983 | 0.0057 | 0.34 |
| 1984 | 0.0144 | 0.25 |
| 1985 | 0.0120 | 0.20 |
| 1986 | 0.0106 | 0.20 |
| 1987 | 0.0100 | 0.30 |
| 1988 | 0.0125 | 0.30 |
| 1989 | 0.0109 | 0.28 |
|  |  |  |
| 1994 | 0.0071 | 0.51 |
| 1995 | 0.0052 | 0.27 |
| 1996 | 0.0043 | 0.22 |
| 1997 | 0.0096 | 0.24 |
| 1998 | 0.0167 | 0.28 |
| 1999 | 0.0038 | 0.25 |
| 2000 | 0.0061 | 0.38 |
| 2001 | 0.0030 | 0.42 |
| 2002 | 0.0017 | 0.58 |
| 2003 | 0.0017 | 0.52 |

Table 21. Yelloweye rockfish biomass as estimated from area-swept densities observed in bottom trawl surveys.

| YEAR | California |  |  | Oregon |  |  | Washington |  |  | Canada |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Biomass | CV | Tows | Biomass | CV | Tows | Biomass | CV | Tows | Biomass | CV | Tows |
| Depth Zone 55-183m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977\| | 0 |  | 0 | 68 | 0.78 | 2 | 232 | 0.29 | 14 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1980 | 59 | 0.72 | 2 | 234 | 0.65 | 11 | 82 | 0.72 | 8 | 7 | 0.44 | 7 |
| 1983 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 180 | 0.43 | 11 | 510 | 0.58 | 14 | 4 | 0.50 | 4 |
| 1986 | 299 | 0.70 | 2 | 136 | 0.47 | 6 | 181 | 0.31 | 29 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1989 | 83 | 0.54 | 8 | 187 | 0.52 | 11 | 463 | 0.36 | 8 | 17 | 0.62 | 17 |
| 1992 | 11 | 0.65 | 4 | 213 | 0.58 | 11 | 108 | 0.30 | 11 | 12 | 0.41 | 12 |
| 1995 | 18 | 1.00 | 1 | 44 | 0.96 | 3 | 22 | 0.60 | 3 | 6 | 0.58 | 6 |
| 1998 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 24 | 0.75 | 3 | 61 | 0.36 | 5 | 10 | 0.49 | 10 |
| 2001 | 0 |  | 1 | 172 | 0.52 | 8 | 111 | 0.49 | 9 | 3 | 0.75 | 3 |
| Depth Zone 184-366m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1977{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 23 | 0.61 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1980 | 34 | 1.00 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 1.00 | 1 | 2 | 0.67 | 2 |
| 1983 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 126 | 0.58 | 4 | 49 | 0.75 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1986 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 27 | 1.00 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1989 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 | 12 | 1.00 | 1 | 2 | 0.79 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 |
| 1992 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 0.72 | 1 | 1 | 0.96 | 1 |
| 1995 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1998 | 4 | 1.00 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1.00 | 0 | 1 | 1.00 | 1 |
| 2001 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 0.53 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Depth zone 367-475 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1977^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52 | 0.60 | 31 |  |  |  |

Table 22. Yelloweye submersible study area statistics.

| Area Description | Area (ha) |
| :--- | ---: |
| Vancouver (U.S. only) shallow strata $55-183$ meters | 351,800 |
| Study Area | 55,680 |
| Total Sampled Area | 28 |
| Study Area/U.S. Vancouver Area Ratio | $15.8 \%$ |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ Vancouver US includes U.S. territorial coastal waters from |  |
| 47 30' - U.S. Canadian Border. |  |

Table 23. Results from the 2002 yelloweye submersible survey in untrawlable habitat found in the US Vancouver INPFC area.

## Study results for yelloweye rockfish

|  | All Fish | Age 3+ Fish ${ }^{\text {1/ }}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mean Length (cm) | 50.0 | 51.7 |
| Length Estimates (\#'s of Fish) | 38 | 36 |
| ${\text { Weight }(\mathrm{kg})^{21}}^{\text {Number of Fish Observed }} 12.73$ | 2.69 |  |
| Mean Density (\#'s per ha) | 59 | 57 |
| Estimated Numbers of Fish in Stu | 112,586 | 1.95 |
| Biomass in Study Area (mt) | 307 | 108,746 |
| 1/ Fish greater than 30 cm |  | 292 |
| ${ }^{\text {2/ }}$ Weighted biomass |  |  |

Table 24. Adjusted NMFS trawl survey area swept estimates in the US Vancouver INPFC area.

| Year | Washington State |  |  | U.S. Vancouver 55-183 meter |  |  | ${ }^{21}$ Adjusted Biomass (mt) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | CV | ${ }^{1 /}$ Tows | Total | CV | ${ }^{1 /}$ Tows | U.S. Vancouver | Total Washington |
| 1977 | 232 | 0.29 | 14 | 56 | 0.50 | 4 | 47 | 223.6 |
| 1980 | 82 | 0.72 | 8 | 57 | 1.00 | 2 | 48 | 73.0 |
| 1983 | 510 | 0.58 | 14 | 140 | 0.48 | 7 | 118 | 487.9 |
| 1986 | 181 | 0.31 | 29 | 120 | 0.44 | 18 | 101 | 162.1 |
| 1989 | 463 | 0.36 | 8 | 422 | 0.38 | 4 | 355 | 396.0 |
| 1992 | 108 | 0.30 | 11 | 82 | 0.33 | 8 | 69 | 95.2 |
| 1995 | 22 | 0.60 | 3 | 8 | 0.55 | 1 | 7 | 21.1 |
| 1998 | 61 | 0.36 | 5 | 52 | 0.39 | 4 | 44 | 53.0 |
| 2001 | 111 | 0.49 | 9 | 64 | 0.61 | 7 | 54 | 101.2 |
| Mean | 197 | 0.45 | 11 | 111 | 1 | 6 | 94 | 179 |
| Median | 111 | 0.36 | 9 | 64 | 0 | 4 | 54 | 101 |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ Tows with yelloweye rockfish. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2 /}$ WDFF | adjust | t to | FS trawl | vey bio | ss ref | ing traw | le habitat in US | Vancouver Area onl. |

Table 25. Comparison of biomass estimates from the current assessment and the 2002 submersible survey in the US Vancouver INPFC area.

## Comparison of biomass estimates

| Area Model | Biomass (mt) ${ }^{1 /}$ | Ratio <br> W-O-C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Yelloweye Stock Assessment |  |  |
| W-O-C ${ }^{2 /}$ | 1,593 |  |
| California ${ }^{3 /}$ | 484 | 30.4\% |
| Oregon ${ }^{3 /}$ | 581 | 36.5\% |
| Washington ${ }^{3 /}$ | 312 | 19.6\% |
| Survey Biomass Estimates |  |  |
| Adjusted 2001 NMFS Trawl Survey for | 101 |  |
| Study Survey | 292 |  |
| Total Survey Based Biomass | 393 |  |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ Age 3+ Biomass in 2005 |  |  |
| ${ }^{2 /} 2006$ Base Model Results |  |  |
| ${ }^{3 /} 2006$ Base Model Results |  |  |
| ${ }^{4 /}$ WDFW adjusted NMFS trawl survey | omass |  |

Table 26a. Comparison between 2005 and 2006 model configurations, parameter estimates and results.
Parameters Estimated (Bold) in Final Base Model

| Area | Coastwide | Coastwide | California | Oregon | Washington |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessment Year | 2005 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Start Year | 1955 | 1925 | 1925 | 1925 | 1925 |
| End Year | 2004 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Composition | Through 2004 | Appended New | Appended New | Appended New | Appended New |
| Catch (Years Revised) | 1980-2004 | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 |
| Number of Parameters | 112 | 58 | 38 | 42 | 18 |
| Estimated Recruitement Years | 1955-2004 | 1968-1999 | 1968-1999 | 1968-1999 | 1984-1999 |
| Objective function value | 1171 | 1494 | 452 | 533 | 585 |
| Selectivity | Double Logistic |  |  |  |  |
|  | Time varying | Logistic | Logistic | Logistic | Logistic |
| Peak | 7 Fisheries | 7 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 3 Fisheries |
| Initial | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Ascending inflection | 7 Fisheries | 7 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 3 Fisheries |
| Ascending slope | 7 Fisheries | 7 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 3 Fisheries |
| Final | 7 Fisheries | 7 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 2 Fisheries | 3 Fisheries |
| Descending inflection | 7 Fisheries | na | na | na | na |
| Descending slope | 7 Fisheries | na | na | na | na |
| Width of top | 7 Fisheries | na | na | na | na |
| Mirror related sport fisheries | 4 Surveys | 4 Surveys | 2 Surveys | 2 Surveys | 2 Surveys |
| Estimated |  | 1 Survey | 1 Survey | 1 Survey | 1 Survey |
| Age Error | Revised Age Error | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 |
| Discard | Included in catch | Included in catch | Included in catch | Included in catch | Included in catch |
| M-G Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Mortality (Young) | 0.045 | 0.036 | Fixed to CSTWide | Fixed to CSTWide | Fixed to CSTWide |
| Old Offset | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| age_for_growth_Lmin | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| age_for_growth_Lmax | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Body length @Agemin | 22.6 | 23.9 | 29.3 | 21.0 | Fixed to Oregon |
| Body length @Agemax | 64.6 | 61.4 | 59.0 | 61.1 | Fixed to Oregon |
| VonBert | 0.063 | 0.066 | 0.077 | 0.079 | Fixed to Oregon |
| CV@Age 6 | 0.082 | 0.107 | 0.079 | 0.099 | Fixed to Oregon |
| CV@Age 60 | 0.577 | 0.057 | 0.408 | 0.171 | Fixed to Oregon |
| Biology |  |  |  |  |  |
| W-length-1 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 |
| W-length-2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Mat-length-1 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 |
| Mat-length-2 | -0.415 | -0.415 | -0.415 | -0.415 | -0.415 |
| S-R Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ln(R0) (Lambda 0.5) | 5.269 | 4.846 | 4.185 | 3.853 | 3.003 |
| S-R Steepness (assumed, est it | 0.437 | 0.450 | 0.450 | 0.450 | 0.450 |
| SD Recruitments (assumed, es ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Enviro Link | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Initial Equil | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Final Results |  |  |  |  |  |
| $B_{2005}$ | 2,008 | 1,593 | 375 | 657 | 254 |
| SPB 0 | 3,808 | 3,322 | 1,715 | 1,258 | 453 |
| SPB2005 | 798 | 573 | 141 | 265 | 94 |
| Depletion | 21.0\% | 17.3\% | 8.2\% | 21.1\% | 20.8\% |

Table 26b. Comparison between alternative model configurations employing double logistic selectivity, parameter estimates and results.

Parameters Estimated (Bold) in Final Base Model

| Area | Coastuide | Califomia | Oregon | Washington | Washington |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mbdel Name | CST-1b | CA1b | OR-1b | WA-1b | WA1c |
|  |  |  |  |  | Fit to Wa Sub Survey |
| Assessment Year | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 | 2006 |
| Start Year | 1955 | 1955 | 1955 | 1955 | 1955 |
| End Year | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 | 2005 |
| Composition | Appended New | Appended New | Appended New | Appended New | Appended New |
| Catch (Years Revised) | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 | 1955-1980 |
| Number of Parameters | 64 | 41 | 45 | 21 | 67 |
| Estimated Recruitement Year | 1968-1999 | 1968-1999 | 1968-1999 | 1984-1999 | 1984-1999 |
| Objective function value | 1469 | 433 | 527 | 590 | 589 |
| Selectivity Type | Dbl Logistic Rec | Dbl Logistic Rec | Dbl Logistic Rec | Dbl Logistic Rec | Logistic |
| Age Error | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 | Same as 2005 |
| Discard | Included in catch | Included in catch | Included in catch | Induded in catch | Indudedin catch |
| M-GParameters |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Mortality (Young) | 0.045 | 0.045 | 0.045 | 0.045 | 0.045 |
| Od Offset | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| age for_grouth L L min | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| age for_grouth Lmax | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| Body length @Agemin | 23.6 | 27.4 | 212 | Fixed to Oregon | Fxed to Oregon |
| Body length @Agemax | 614 | 57.9 | 610 | Fixed to Oregon | Fixed to Oregon |
| VonBert | 0.068 | 0.110 | 0.082 | Fixed to Oregon | Fixed to Oregon |
| CV@Age 6 | 0.105 | 0.055 | 0.071 | Fixed to Oregon | Fixed to Oregon |
| CV@Age 60 | 0.158 | 0.904 | 0.600 | Fixed to Oregon | Fixed to Oregon |
| Biology |  |  |  |  |  |
| W-length-1 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 | 2.9696 |
| W-length-2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Mat-length-1 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 | 42.1 |
| Mat-length-2 | $-0.415$ | $-0.415$ | -0.415 | -0.415 | -0.415 |
| S-R Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ln(R0) (Lambda 0.5) | 5.242 | 4.482 | 4.256 | 3.230 | 3.231 |
| S-RSteepness (assumed, est | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 |
| SD Recruitments (assumed, e | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| EnviroLink | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Initial Equil | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Fnal Results |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}_{2006}$ | 1619 | 475 | 580 | 313 | 314 |
| SPB0 | 6566 | 1677\| | 1273 | 456 | 456 |
| SPB2006 | 1271 | 176 | 235 | 113 | 113 |
| Depletion | 19.4\% | 10.5\% | 18.5\% | 24.8\% | 24.8\% |

Table 27. Convergence test for the base models. Convergence test of base models using SS2 V1.21

## Run Obj. Func. Value Max. Gradient Hession Depletion

Run Obj. Func. Value Max. Gradient Hession Depletion
Oregon Model

|  | Oregon Model |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 528.527 | 0.00027718 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 2 | 528.527 | 0.000195903 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 3 | 528.527 | 0.000406173 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 4 | 528.527 | 0.000189687 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 5 | 528.527 | 0.00026801 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 6 | 528.527 | 0.000287327 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 7 | 528.527 | 0.00006825 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 8 | 528.527 | 0.000290843 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 9 | 528.527 | 0.000023134 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 10 | 528.527 | $3.73447 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 11 | 528.527 | $7.31964 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 12 | 528.527 | $4.68811 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 13 | 528.527 | $6.58172 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 14 | 528.527 | $9.56227 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 15 | 528.527 | $7.02865 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 16 | 528.527 | 0.000741329 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 17 | 528.527 | $1.43859 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 18 | 528.527 | 0.00008854 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 19 | 528.527 | 0.000062811 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 20 | 528.527 | $9.45772 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 21 | 528.527 | $3.37473 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 22 | 528.527 | 0.000092456 | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 23 | 528.527 | $2.59858 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 24 | 528.527 | $2.59858 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |
| 25 | 528.527 | $2.63323 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 115.135 | $18.2 \%$ |


| Washington Model |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 589.384 | $3.54 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $8.53 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $6.12 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $5.79 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $8.75 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $8.75 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $7.84 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $2.30 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $5.17 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $4.95 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $5.61 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $1.07 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $3.02 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $2.44 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $8.65 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $3.75 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $3.87 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $2.17 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $1.18 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $6.23 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $5.16 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $8.71 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $1.36 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $2.90 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |
| 589.384 | $1.01 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 68.99 | $24.5 \%$ |

## Note: Blank cells indicate non-convergence and

depletion=100\% results have unreasonable estimates for Fpenalty.

Table 28. Biomass results from base models.

|  |  | Coastwide Model |  |  |  | California Model |  |  |  | Oregon Model |  |  |  | Washington Model |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | bio-all | bio-smry | Recruit | SpawnBio | bio-all | bio-smry | Recruit | SpawnBio | bio-all | bio-smry |  | SpawnBio | bio-all | bio-smry | Recruit |
| 1923 | 1923 | 7496 | 7448.08 | 127 | 3322 | 3902.43 | 3877.05 | 65.704 | 1715 | 2807 | 2789 | 47 | 1258 | 1025 | 1017 | 20 |
| 1924 | 1924 | 7496 | 7448.08 | 127 | 3322 | 3884.67 | 3859.4 | 65.4049 | 1707 | 2796 | 2779 | 47 | 1253 |  |  |  |
| 1925 | 1925 | 7496 | 7448.08 | 127 | 3322 | 3884.7 | 3859.4 | 65.6123 | 1707 | 2796 | 2779 | 47 | 1253 |  |  |  |
| 1926 | 1926 | 7486 | 7437.3 | 127 | 3317 | 3876.79 | 3851.47 | 65.5696 | 1703 | 2795 | 2778 | 47 | 1252 |  |  |  |
| 1927 | 1927 | 7475 | 7426.63 | 127 | 3312 | 3868.96 | 3843.62 | 65.5269 | 1699 | 2795 | 2777 | 47 | 1252 |  |  |  |
| 1928 | 1928 | 7464 | 7416.08 | 127 | 3307 | 3861.22 | 3835.9 | 65.4843 | 1696 | 2794 | 2776 | 47 | 1251 |  |  |  |
| 1929 | 1929 | 7454 | 7405.66 | 127 | 3302 | 3853.59 | 3828.28 | 65.4417 | 1692 | 2793 | 2775 | 47 | 1251 |  |  |  |
| 1930 | 1930 | 7444 | 7395.38 | 127 | 3297 | 3846.06 | 3820.78 | 65.3993 | 1689 | 2792 | 2774 | 47 | 1251 |  |  |  |
| 1931 | 1931 | 7433 | 7385.25 | 127 | 3292 | 3838.66 | 3813.39 | 65.3571 | 1685 | 2791 | 2773 | 47 | 1250 |  |  |  |
| 1932 | 1932 | 7423 | 7375.26 | 127 | 3287 | 3831.37 | 3806.12 | 65.3152 | 1682 | 2790 | 2772 | 47 | 1250 |  |  |  |
| 1933 | 1933 | 7414 | 7365.43 | 127 | 3283 | 3824.21 | 3798.98 | 65.2737 | 1678 | 2789 | 2771 | 47 | 1249 |  |  |  |
| 1934 | 1934 | 7404 | 7355.76 | 127 | 3278 | 3817.18 | 3791.96 | 65.2328 | 1675 | 2788 | 2770 | 47 | 1249 |  |  |  |
| 1935 | 1935 | 7394 | 7346.25 | 127 | 3273 | 3810.27 | 3785.07 | 65.1924 | 1672 | 2787 | 2770 | 47 | 1248 |  |  |  |
| 1936 | 1936 | 7385 | 7336.9 | 127 | 3269 | 3803.5 | 3778.31 | 65.1528 | 1668 | 2787 | 2769 | 47 | 1248 |  |  |  |
| 1937 | 1937 | 7376 | 7327.71 | 127 | 3264 | 3796.85 | 3771.68 | 65.1139 | 1665 | 2786 | 2768 | 47 | 1248 |  |  |  |
| 1938 | 1938 | 7367 | 7318.68 | 127 | 3260 | 3790.33 | 3765.17 | 65.0757 | 1662 | 2785 | 2767 | 47 | 1247 |  |  |  |
| 1939 | 1939 | 7358 | 7309.81 | 126 | 3256 | 3783.93 | 3758.79 | 65.0383 | 1659 | 2784 | 2767 | 47 | 1247 |  |  |  |
| 1940 | 1940 | 7349 | 7301.09 | 126 | 3252 | 3777.66 | 3752.53 | 65.0015 | 1656 | 2784 | 2766 | 47 | 1247 |  |  |  |
| 1941 | 1941 | 7340 | 7292.54 | 126 | 3247 | 3771.51 | 3746.4 | 64.9656 | 1653 | 2783 | 2765 | 47 | 1246 |  |  |  |
| 1942 | 1942 | 7332 | 7284.15 | 126 | 3243 | 3765.49 | 3740.38 | 64.9302 | 1650 | 2782 | 2765 | 47 | 1246 |  |  |  |
| 1943 | 1943 | 7324 | 7275.9 | 126 | 3239 | 3759.58 | 3734.49 | 64.8956 | 1647 | 2782 | 2764 | 47 | 1246 |  |  |  |
| 1944 | 1944 | 7316 | 7267.81 | 126 | 3236 | 3753.78 | 3728.71 | 64.8616 | 1645 | 2781 | 2763 | 47 | 1245 |  |  |  |
| 1945 | 1945 | 7308 | 7259.87 | 126 | 3232 | 3748.1 | 3723.04 | 64.8283 | 1642 | 2781 | 2763 | 47 | 1245 |  |  |  |
| 1946 | 1946 | 7300 | 7252.08 | 126 | 3228 | 3742.53 | 3717.48 | 64.7955 | 1639 | 2780 | 2762 | 47 | 1245 |  |  |  |
| 1947 | 1947 | 7292 | 7244.43 | 126 | 3224 | 3737.07 | 3712.03 | 64.7633 | 1637 | 2780 | 2762 | 47 | 1244 |  |  |  |
| 1948 | 1948 | 7285 | 7236.92 | 126 | 3221 | 3731.72 | 3706.69 | 64.7317 | 1634 | 2779 | 2761 | 47 | 1244 |  |  |  |
| 1949 | 1949 | 7277 | 7229.56 | 126 | 3217 | 3726.46 | 3701.45 | 64.7007 | 1632 | 2779 | 2761 | 47 | 1244 |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 1950 | 7270 | 7222.33 | 126 | 3214 | 3721.31 | 3696.32 | 64.6703 | 1629 | 2778 | 2760 | 47 | 1244 |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 1951 | 7263 | 7215.23 | 126 | 3211 | 3716.26 | 3691.28 | 64.6403 | 1627 | 2778 | 2760 | 47 | 1244 |  |  |  |
| 1952 | 1952 | 7256 | 7208.27 | 126 | 3207 | 3711.31 | 3686.33 | 64.6109 | 1625 | 2777 | 2759 | 47 | 1243 |  |  |  |
| 1953 | 1953 | 7249 | 7201.43 | 126 | 3204 | 3706.45 | 3681.49 | 64.582 | 1622 | 2777 | 2759 | 47 | 1243 |  |  |  |
| 1954 | 1954 | 7242 | 7194.72 | 126 | 3201 | 3701.69 | 3676.73 | 64.5536 | 1620 | 2776 | 2758 | 47 | 1243 | 960 | 952 | 20 |
| 1955 | 1955 | 7236 | 7188.14 | 126 | 3198 | 3697.01 | 3672.07 | 64.5257 | 1618 | 2776 | 2758 | 47 | 1243 | 960 | 952 | 20 |
| 1956 | 1956 | 7184 | 7136.02 | 125 | 3173 | 3662.43 | 3637.52 | 64.3242 | 1602 | 2760 | 2743 | 47 | 1236 | 959 | 951 | 20 |
| 1957 | 1957 | 7124 | 7076.83 | 125 | 3146 | 3621.1 | 3596.25 | 64.0789 | 1583 | 2745 | 2727 | 47 | 1228 | 958 | 950 | 20 |
| 1958 | 1958 | 7067 | 7019.35 | 125 | 3119 | 3581.68 | 3556.92 | 63.8396 | 1565 | 2729 | 2711 | 47 | 1221 | 957 | 949 | 20 |
| 1959 | 1959 | 7001 | 6953.78 | 124 | 3088 | 3535.42 | 3510.76 | 63.5532 | 1544 | 2712 | 2695 | 47 | 1213 | 955 | 947 | 20 |
| 1960 | 1960 | 6944 | 6896.46 | 124 | 3061 | 3497.63 | 3473.07 | 63.3128 | 1526 | 2696 | 2678 | 47 | 1205 | 953 | 945 | 20 |
| 1961 | 1961 | 6891 | 6844.48 | 124 | 3036 | 3465.45 | 3440.99 | 63.103 | 1511 | 2679 | 2661 | 46 | 1197 | 951 | 943 | 20 |
| 1962 | 1962 | 6847 | 6799.97 | 123 | 3015 | 3440.93 | 3416.54 | 62.9388 | 1499 | 2662 | 2644 | 46 | 1189 | 949 | 941 | 20 |
| 1963 | 1963 | 6803 | 6756.63 | 123 | 2994 | 3417.81 | 3393.49 | 62.7821 | 1488 | 2644 | 2627 | 46 | 1180 | 947 | 940 | 20 |
| 1964 | 1964 | 6753 | 6706.14 | 123 | 2970 | 3390.43 | 3366.18 | 62.5966 | 1475 | 2627 | 2609 | 46 | 1172 | 942 | 935 | 20 |
| 1965 | 1965 | 6711 | 6664.22 | 123 | 2949 | 3371.81 | 3347.62 | 62.467 | 1466 | 2609 | 2592 | 46 | 1163 | 937 | 930 | 20 |

Table 28 (Continued). Biomass results from base models.

|  | Year | Coastwide Model |  |  |  | California Model |  |  |  | Oregon Model |  |  |  | Washington Model |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | bio-all | bio-smry | Recruit | SpawnBio | bio-all | bio-smry | Recruit | SpawnBio | bio-all | bio-smry | Recruit | SpawnBio | bio-all |  | bio-smry | Recruit |
| 1966 | 1966 | 6662 | 6615.62 | 122 | 2926 | 3346.56 | 3322.44 | 62.2935 | 1454 | 2591 | 2574 | 46 | 1155 |  | 932 | 925 | 20 |
| 1967 | 1967 | 6609 | 6563.06 | 122 | 2901 | 3317.5 | 3293.44 | 62.0932 | 1440 | 2573 | 2555 | 46 | 1146 |  | 927 | 920 | 19 |
| 1968 | 1968 | 6546 | 6510.04 | 45 | 2876 | 3283.89 | 3264.03 | 30.3249 | 1427 | 2555 | 2537 | 46 | 1137 |  | 923 | 915 | 19 |
| 1969 | 1969 | 6484 | 6456.66 | 55 | 2850 | 3251.03 | 3234.41 | 36.4519 | 1413 | 2533 | 2519 | 19 | 1128 |  | 918 | 910 | 19 |
| 1970 | 1970 | 6488 | 6371.86 | 794 | 2810 | 3200.97 | 3187.04 | 41.3152 | 1391 | 2537 | 2486 | 327 | 1113 |  | 913 | 906 | 19 |
| 1971 | 1971 | 6388 | 6273.29 | 57 | 2768 | 3161.76 | 3123.25 | 218.362 | 1364 | 2509 | 2462 | 26 | 1101 |  | 906 | 899 | 19 |
| 1972 | 1972 | 6289 | 6178.16 | 53 | 2727 | 3100.88 | 3063.11 | 37.0963 | 1339 | 2479 | 2432 | 26 | 1088 |  | 900 | 893 | 19 |
| 1973 | 1973 | 6151 | 6129.99 | 53 | 2669 | 3010.67 | 2973.03 | 36.3038 | 1301 | 2441 | 2431 | 25 | 1072 |  | 893 | 886 | 19 |
| 1974 | 1974 | 6065 | 5968.45 | 637 | 2598 | 2901.63 | 2886.87 | 41.1095 | 1251 | 2439 | 2392 | 308 | 1055 |  | 885 | 877 | 19 |
| 1975 | 1975 | 5928 | 5830.39 | 84 | 2529 | 2800.62 | 2784.53 | 47.435 | 1204 | 2400 | 2355 | 21 | 1039 |  | 875 | 868 | 19 |
| 1976 | 1976 | 5797 | 5697.83 | 87 | 2459 | 2693.8 | 2675.69 | 52.0892 | 1153 | 2371 | 2328 | 19 | 1023 |  | 867 | 860 | 19 |
| 1977 | 1977 | 5639 | 5609.44 | 64 | 2376 | 2577.7 | 2557.69 | 55.7812 | 1097 | 2335 | 2327 | 19 | 1001 |  | 855 | 848 | 19 |
| 1978 | 1978 | 5475 | 5449.27 | 57 | 2290 | 2481.39 | 2447.67 | 152.371 | 1045 | 2294 | 2287 | 19 | 976 |  | 832 | 825 | 19 |
| 1979 | 1979 | 5382 | 5307.27 | 459 | 2206 | 2374.19 | 2343.33 | 33.7009 | 995 | 2280 | 2246 | 222 | 951 |  | 808 | 801 | 18 |
| 1980 | 1980 | 5166 | 5093.06 | 61 | 2090 | 2228.66 | 2200.36 | 33.3917 | 930 | 2212 | 2178 | 27 | 911 |  | 780 | 773 | 18 |
| 1981 | 1981 | 4911 | 4802.93 | 339 | 1946 | 2027.2 | 1996.01 | 172.841 | 831 | 2156 | 2123 | 22 | 877 |  | 747 | 740 | 18 |
| 1982 | 1982 | 4590 | 4529.64 | 79 | 1797 | 1795.82 | 1766.25 | 26.2746 | 728 | 2060 | 2052 | 20 | 829 |  | 739 | 732 | 18 |
| 1983 | 1983 | 4225 | 4157.22 | 128 | 1633 | 1543.11 | 1513.38 | 31.6742 | 615 | 2004 | 1930 | 523 | 772 |  | 728 | 721 | 18 |
| 1984 | 1984 | 3932 | 3897.83 | 60 | 1503 | 1470.01 | 1455.92 | 51.1318 | 577 | 1786 | 1715 | 20 | 679 |  | 710 | 703 | 18 |
| 1985 | 1985 | 3827 | 3736.39 | 514 | 1432 | 1379.77 | 1365.25 | 30.4267 | 533 | 1716 | 1647 | 25 | 651 |  | 690 | 684 | 17 |
| 1986 | 1986 | 3630 | 3552.76 | 42 | 1350 | 1280.88 | 1266.6 | 29.4327 | 486 | 1632 | 1623 | 25 | 618 |  | 661 | 655 | 17 |
| 1987 | 1987 | 3515 | 3442.17 | 40 | 1302 | 1221.59 | 1208.58 | 40.9978 | 457 | 1577 | 1568 | 23 | 598 |  | 644 | 637 | 18 |
| 1988 | 1988 | 3346 | 3330.27 | 41 | 1233 | 1131.64 | 1115.31 | 56.2407 | 417 | 1520 | 1501 | 99 | 573 |  | 615 | 609 | 11 |
| 1989 | 1989 | 3169 | 3152.3 | 54 | 1158 | 1041.86 | 1026.87 | 19.9289 | 380 | 1448 | 1431 | 19 | 539 |  | 587 | 582 | 9 |
| 1990 | 1990 | 2937 | 2913.24 | 90 | 1055 | 963.774 | 952.168 | 14.0639 | 351 | 1321 | 1305 | 16 | 475 |  | 540 | 536 | 8 |
| 1991 | 1991 | 2802 | 2778.37 | 42 | 997 | 868.313 | 862.076 | 14.4547 | 316 | 1299 | 1292 | 15 | 457 |  | 511 | 508 | 9 |
| 1992 | 1992 | 2552 | 2532.06 | 25 | 896 | 723.387 | 716.899 | 21.7774 | 260 | 1217 | 1211 | 11 | 415 |  | 480 | 477 | 11 |
| 1993 | 1993 | 2290 | 2272.98 | 64 | 791 | 616.488 | 609.079 | 21.3551 | 220 | 1094 | 1087 | 27 | 359 |  | 440 | 435 | 18 |
| 1994 | 1994 | 2082 | 2062.75 | 60 | 711 | 578.308 | 570.141 | 20.3219 | 206 | 958 | 950 | 24 | 304 |  | 404 | 396 | 36 |
| 1995 | 1995 | 1957 | 1934.18 | 58 | 669 | 531.281 | 523.476 | 18.9849 | 189 | 897 | 888 | 23 | 286 |  | 383 | 374 | 13 |
| 1996 | 1996 | 1793 | 1771.68 | 54 | 614 | 490.435 | 483.087 | 17.801 | 175 | 790 | 781 | 21 | 254 |  | 363 | 355 | 12 |
| 1997 | 1997 | 1660 | 1639.37 | 52 | 574 | 431.002 | 424.218 | 15.9558 | 153 | 731 | 723 | 21 | 241 |  | 343 | 338 | 12 |
| 1998 | 1998 | 1495 | 1475.4 | 48 | 522 | 370.855 | 364.717 | 13.9752 | 131 | 643 | 635 | 19 | 217 |  | 320 | 316 | 11 |
| 1999 | 1999 | 1450 | 1431.65 | 48 | 517 | 359.137 | 353.527 | 13.6365 | 127 | 617 | 610 | 19 | 215 |  | 308 | 304 | 11 |
| 2000 | 2000 | 1355 | 1337.05 | 46 | 488 | 339.542 | 334.317 | 12.9935 | 120 | 570 | 563 | 18 | 203 |  | 274 | 270 | 10 |
| 2001 | 2001 | 1368 | 1350.35 | 47 | 502 | 342.587 | 337.464 | 13.1585 | 122 | 585 | 578 | 19 | 215 |  | 266 | 262 | 10 |
| 2002 | 2002 | 1371 | 1352.88 | 47 | 509 | 347.822 | 342.728 | 13.4058 | 125 | 603 | 596 | 20 | 228 |  | 242 | 239 | 9 |
| 2003 | 2003 | 1409 | 1391.31 | 49 | 531 | 359.647 | 354.434 | 13.9023 | 130 | 624 | 617 | 21 | 241 |  | 246 | 242 | 9 |
| 2004 | 2004 | 1448 | 1429.66 | 50 | 553 | 369.951 | 364.584 | 14.3602 | 135 | 645 | 637 | 21 | 253 |  | 253 | 249 | 9 |
| 2005 | 2005 | 1485 | 1466.4 | 52 | 573 | 380.272 | 374.722 | 14.8329 | 140 | 665 | 657 | 22 | 265 |  | 258 | 254 | 9 |
| 2006 | 2006 | 1510 | 1490.82 | 53 | 588 | 388.606 | 382.883 | 15.2434 | 145 | 679 | 671 | 22 | 274 |  | 259 | 255 | 9 |
|  | depletion |  |  |  | 17.7\% |  |  |  | 8.5\% |  |  |  | 21.1\% |  |  |  |  |
|  | Area \% in | 2006 |  |  | 114.5\% |  |  |  | 28.2\% |  |  |  | 53.3\% |  |  |  |  |

Table 29. Estimates of average fishing mortality from each base model.
Average Fishing Mortaily Rates

| Year | Coastwide | California | Oregon | Washington |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 5 5}$ | 0.009 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.003 |
| 1956 | 0.010 | 0.014 | 0.006 | 0.003 |
| 1957 | 0.009 | 0.012 | 0.007 | 0.004 |
| 1958 | 0.009 | 0.011 | 0.007 | 0.004 |
| 1959 | 0.008 | 0.009 | 0.007 | 0.004 |
| 1960 | 0.008 | 0.009 | 0.007 | 0.004 |
| 1961 | 0.009 | 0.010 | 0.008 | 0.004 |
| 1962 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.007 |
| 1963 | 0.009 | 0.010 | 0.008 | 0.007 |
| 1964 | 0.010 | 0.011 | 0.008 | 0.007 |
| 1965 | 0.010 | 0.012 | 0.009 | 0.008 |
| 1966 | 0.010 | 0.012 | 0.009 | 0.008 |
| 1967 | 0.016 | 0.018 | 0.015 | 0.008 |
| 1968 | 0.017 | 0.022 | 0.012 | 0.008 |
| 1969 | 0.017 | 0.021 | 0.013 | 0.010 |
| 1970 | 0.023 | 0.031 | 0.016 | 0.009 |
| 1971 | 0.028 | 0.040 | 0.017 | 0.011 |
| 1972 | 0.028 | 0.040 | 0.017 | 0.013 |
| 1973 | 0.030 | 0.044 | 0.017 | 0.014 |
| 1974 | 0.035 | 0.050 | 0.023 | 0.013 |
| 1975 | 0.038 | 0.050 | 0.026 | 0.017 |
| 1976 | 0.039 | 0.050 | 0.028 | 0.031 |
| 1977 | 0.055 | 0.069 | 0.044 | 0.034 |
| 1978 | 0.073 | 0.109 | 0.043 | 0.040 |
| 1979 | 0.083 | 0.127 | 0.063 | 0.048 |
| 1980 | 0.100 | 0.156 | 0.079 | 0.018 |
| 1981 | 0.092 | 0.070 | 0.128 | 0.022 |
| 1982 | 0.067 | 0.086 | 0.062 | 0.032 |
| 1983 | 0.078 | 0.098 | 0.075 | 0.036 |
| 1984 | 0.060 | 0.075 | 0.060 | 0.051 |
| 1985 | 0.078 | 0.106 | 0.070 | 0.036 |
| 1986 | 0.085 | 0.108 | 0.085 | 0.055 |
| 1987 | 0.113 | 0.104 | 0.135 | 0.055 |
| 1988 | 0.086 | 0.131 | 0.069 | 0.092 |
| 1989 | 0.130 | 0.201 | 0.116 | 0.067 |
| 1990 | 0.147 | 0.184 | 0.158 | 0.075 |
| 1991 | 0.136 | 0.100 | 0.185 | 0.104 |
| 1992 | 0.105 | 0.119 | 0.126 | 0.109 |
| 1993 | 0.129 | 0.115 | 0.182 | 0.074 |
| 1994 | 0.118 | 0.160 | 0.134 | 0.073 |
| 1995 | 0.143 | 0.179 | 0.178 | 0.076 |
| 1996 | 0.072 | 0.074 | 0.094 | 0.088 |
| 1997 | 0.109 | 0.097 | 0.128 | 0.062 |
| 1998 | 0.031 | 0.034 | 0.022 | 0.142 |
| 1999 | 0.039 | 0.027 | 0.016 | 0.066 |
| 2000 | 0.009 | 0.007 | 0.007 | 0.130 |
| 2001 | 0.008 | 0.010 | 0.008 | 0.026 |
| 2002 | 0.008 | 0.009 | 0.005 | 0.013 |
| 2003 | 0.016 | 0.014 | 0.013 | 0.021 |
| 2004 | 0.007 | 0.007 | 0.005 | 0.036 |
| 2005 | 0.014 | 0.011 | 0.014 | 0.029 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 30. Profile of likelihood and other model outcomes over a range of fixed values for the initial recruitment level (virgin recruitment) for the Coast-Wide model.

| Bold = Estimated |  |  |  | Prof |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model Initial $\mathbf{R}_{0}$ | 145 | 152 | 159 | 166 | 173 | 180 | 187 | 194 | 201 | 208 | 215 | 222 | 229 | 236 | 243 |
| RUN FILE | SS2-15 SS2-16 SS2-17 SS2-18 SS2-19 SS2-20 SS2-21 SS2-22 SS2-23 SS2-24 SS2-25 SS2-26 SS2-27 SS2-28 SS2-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S-R Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ln(R0) | 4.977 | 5.024 | 5.069 | 5.112 | 5.153 | 5.193 | 5.233 | 5.268 | 5.303 | 5.338 | 5.371 | 5.403 | 5.434 | 5.464 | 5.493 |
| S-R Steepness (model est) | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 |
| SD Recruitments | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Enviro Link | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Initial Equil | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 |
| SPB 0 |  |  |  |  | 6007 | 6252 | 6508 | 6739 | 6979 | 7228 | 7471 | 7713 | 7956 | 8199 | 8440 |
| SPB2005 |  |  |  |  | 907 | 1052 | 1251 | 1467 | 1736 | 2087 | 2484 | 2915 | 3366 | 3824 | 4300 |
| Depletion |  |  |  |  | 15.1\% | 16.8\% | 19.2\% | 21.8\% | 24.9\% | 28.9\% | 33.2\% | 37.8\% | 42.3\% | 46.6\% | 51.0\% |
| LIKELIHOOD | No Convergence or crash |  |  |  | 1494.8 | 1483.1 | 1479.7 | 1481.6 | 1486.5 | 1493.2 | 1500.5 | 1507.7 | 1514.5 | 1521.6 | 1526.8 |
| indices |  |  |  |  | 27 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 30 | 32 | 35 | 38 | 41 | 44 | 47 |
| discard |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| length_comps |  |  |  |  | 967 | 965 | 966 | 969 | 972 | 976 | 979 | 983 | 986 | 990 | 990 |
| age_comps |  |  |  |  | 406 | 399 | 395 | 394 | 394 | 393 | 392 | 391 | 390 | 390 | 389 |
| size-at-age |  |  |  |  | 76 | 76 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 77 | 78 |
| mean_body_wt |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Equil_catch |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Recruitment |  |  |  |  | 19 | 16 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 24 |
| Parm_priors |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parm_devs |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| penalties |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Forecast_Recruitment |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CaCPFV Index |  |  |  |  | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 8.6 | 10.0 | 11.2 | 12.3 | 13.5 |
| Ca MRFSS Index |  |  |  |  | 19.3 | 19.1 | 19.3 | 19.7 | 20.4 | 21.5 | 22.9 | 24.4 | 25.9 | 27.3 | 28.8 |
| OrRec Index |  |  |  |  | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Wa Rec Index |  |  |  |  | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| IPHC |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Table 31. Profile of likelihood and other model outcomes over a range of fixed values for steepness for the Coast-wide Model.

| Bold = Estimated <br> Model | Profile on Steepness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.35 | 0.4 | 0.45 | 0.5 | 0.55 | 0.6 | 0.65 | 0.7 | 0.75 |
| RUN FILE | SS2-30 | SS2-31 | SS2-32 | SS2-33 | SS2-34 | SS2-35 | SS2-36 | SS2-37 | SS2-38 | SS2-39 | SS2-40 | SS2-41 | SS2-42 | SS2-43 | SS2-44 |
| S-R Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ln(R0) | 5.273 | 5.242 | 5.234 | 5.230 | 5.230 | 5.228 | 5.229 | 5.231 | 5.234 | 5.229 | 5.242 | 5.24585 | 5.25039 | 5.25505 | 5.25967 |
| S-R Steepness (model est) | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.35 | 0.4 | 0.45 | 0.35 | 0.55 | 0.6 | 0.65 | 0.7 | 0.75 |
| SD Recruitments | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Enviro Link | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Initial Equil | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 3.49E-02 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 |
| SPB 0 | 6776 | 6567 | 6512 | 6485 | 6485 | 6476 | 6483 | 6496 | 6515 | 6483 | 6563 | 6592 | 6622 | 6653 | 6683 |
| SPB2005 | 532 | 610 | 695 | 787 | 787 | 971 | 1072 | 1177 | 1280 | 1072 | 1477 | 1570.14 | 1658 | 1741 | 1819 |
| Depletion | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.27 |
| LIKELIHOOD | 1543 | 1502 | 1488 | 1481 | 1481 | 1477 | 1478 | 1479 | 1480 | 1478 | 1483 | 1484 | 1486 | 1487 | 1488 |
| indices | 35 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 29.5308 | 30 | 31 | 31 |
| discard | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| length_comps | 984.0 | 975.6 | 971.8 | 969.7 | 969.7 | 967.0 | 966.5 | 966.3 | 966.2 | 966.5 | 966.1 | 966.1 | 966.0 | 965.9 | 965.8 |
| age_comps | 374.6 | 381.9 | 385.3 | 388.4 | 388.4 | 392.1 | 393.5 | 394.7 | 395.6 | 393.5 | 397.1 | 397.6 | 398.1 | 398.5 | 398.9 |
| size-at-age | 75.0 | 71.6 | 72.3 | 72.5 | 72.5 | 74.5 | 75.3 | 75.9 | 76.5 | 75.3 | 77.4 | 77.8 | 78.1 | 78.4 | 78.7 |
| mean_body_wt | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Equil_catch | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Recruitment | 73.7 | 40.3 | 27.7 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 16.4 | 15.1 | 14.4 | 13.9 | 15.1 | 13.4 | 13.3 | 13.2 | 13.1 | 13.1 |
| Parm_priors | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Parm_devs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| penalties | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Forecast_Recruitment | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CaCPFV Index | 4.4 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.9 |
| Ca MRFSS Index | 23.4 | 22.1 | 21.0 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 19.3 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 19.4 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 20.8 | 21.1 |
| OrRec Index | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Wa Rec Index | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| IPHC | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Table 32. Profile of likelihood and other model outcomes over a range of Lambda values on the SR curve.

| Bold = Estimated | Rec from SR | Rec from SR | SR Lam | da Profile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | Emp 0 for comps Force SR | for comps Force SR | 10 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.01 | 0.001 |
| RUN FILE | SS2-1 | SS2-2 SS2-3 | SS2-4 | SS2-5 | SS2-6 |  |  |
| S-R Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ln(R0) | 5.190 | 5.242 | 5.296 | 5.242 | 5.229 | 5.229 | 5.229 |
| S-R Steepness (model est) | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 | 0.437 |
| SD Recruitments | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Enviro Link | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Initial Equil | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 | 0.0349 |
| SPB 0 | 6234 | 6564 | 6933 | 6564 | 6480 | 6480 | 6481 |
| SPB2005 | 710 | 1181 | 1150 | 1181 | 1462 | 1462 | 1470 |
| Depletion | 0.11 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| LIKELIHOOD | 29 | 1492.19 | 1582 | 1492.19 | 1464 | 1464 | 1463 |
| indices | 26.9 | 27.4 | 27.8 | 27.4 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 28.9 |
| discard | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| length_comps | 0.0 | 967.9 | 1000.6 | 967.9 | 964.8 | 964.8 | 964.8 |
| age_comps | 0.0 | 397.1 | 418.0 | 397.1 | 393.9 | 393.9 | 393.8 |
| size-at-age | 0.0 | 77.3 | 81.6 | 77.3 | 75.5 | 75.5 | 75.5 |
| mean_body_wt | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Equil_catch | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Recruitment | 1.9 | 22.4 | 54.1 | 22.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Parm_priors | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Parm_devs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| penalties | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Forecast_Recruitment | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CaCPFV Index | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Ca MRFSS Index | 18.6 | 19.2 | 19.4 | 19.2 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 19.9 |
| OrRec Index | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
| Wa Rec Index | 0.967 | 0.983 | 0.992 | 0.983 | 0.951 | 0.951 | 0.951 |
| IPHC | 0.098 | 0.154 | 0.164 | 0.154 | 0.161 | 0.161 | 0.161 |

Table 33. Profile of likelihood and other model outcomes over a range of Lambda values on the size, age and mean-size-at-age compostion.

| Bold = Estimated | Length, Age and Size Profile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model Lamda | 100 |  |  | 10 |  | 1 |  | 0.5 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.01 | 0.001 |
| RUN FILE | SS2-8 |  | SS2-9 |  | SS2-10 |  | SS2-11 |  | SS2-12 |  | SS2-13 |  |  |
| S-R Parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ln(R0) |  | 5.324 |  | 5.271 |  | 5.234 |  | 5.234 |  | 5.265 |  | 5.304 | 5.30518 |
| S-R Steepness (model est) |  | 0.437 |  | 0.437 |  | 0.437 |  | 0.437 |  | 0.437 |  | 0.437 | 0.437 |
| SD Recruitments |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Enviro Link |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Initial Equil |  | 0.0349 |  | 0.0349 |  | 0.0349 |  | 0.0349 |  | 0.0349 |  | 0.0349 | 0.0349 |
| SPB 0 |  | 7128 |  | 6761 |  | 6513 |  | 6515 |  | 6718 |  | 6987 | 6995 |
| SPB2005 |  | 3,342 |  | 2,236 |  | 1,361 |  | 1,222 |  | 1,117 |  | 1,114 | 1,038 |
| Depletion |  | 0.469 |  | 0.331 |  | 0.209 |  | 0.188 |  | 0.166 |  | 0.159 | 0.148 |
| LIKELIHOOD |  | 238526 |  | 23922.7 |  | 2437.55 |  | 1239.95 |  | 277.119 |  | 55.1195 | 31.8194 |
| indices |  | 47.5 |  | 36.2 |  | 28.2 |  | 27.5 |  | 27.3 |  | 27.8 | 27.7 |
| discard |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| length_comps |  | 161329.0 |  | 16109.1 |  | 1609.8 |  | 805.4 |  | 162.4 |  | 17.0 | 1.9 |
| age_comps |  | 64659.2 |  | 6503.5 |  | 657.1 |  | 329.9 |  | 67.3 |  | 7.1 | 0.7 |
| size-at-age |  | 12438.5 |  | 1242.8 |  | 126.2 |  | 63.9 |  | 13.4 |  | 1.4 | 0.1 |
| mean_body_wt |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Equil_catch |  | 1.5 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Recruitment |  | 50.3 |  | 31.1 |  | 16.1 |  | 13.3 |  | 6.6 |  | 1.7 | 1.3 |
| Parm_priors |  | 0.1 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.1 |  | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Parm_devs |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| penalties |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Forecast_Recruitment |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CaCPFV Index |  | 14.2 |  | 9.3 |  | 5.0 |  | 4.4 |  | 4.1 |  | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| Ca MRFSS Index |  | 28.9 |  | 23.3 |  | 19.5 |  | 19.3 |  | 19.2 |  | 19.3 | 19.2 |
| OrRec Index |  | 3.0 |  | 2.4 |  | 2.5 |  | 2.6 |  | 2.8 |  | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| Wa Rec Index |  | 1.2 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| IPHC |  | 0.178 |  | 0.171 |  | 0.158 |  | 0.155 |  | 0.153 |  | 0.166 | 0.173 |

Table 34: Summary of the estimated parameters in fitting both Models I and II.

| Age <br> (year) <br> [ $>=$ age] | No. of yelloweye rockfish used | Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Model I |  |  |  | Model II |  |
|  |  | $\hat{L}_{\infty}$ (cm) | $\hat{K}$ (per year) | $\hat{t}_{0}$ (year) | $\hat{L}_{0}$ (cm) | $\hat{L}_{\infty}$ (cm) | $\hat{K}$ (per year) |
| 5 | 730 | 63.38 | 0.04614 | -11.16 | 25.50 | 59.94 | 0.08314 |
| 10 | 723 | 64.64 | 0.03764 | -16.86 | 30.37 | 60.05 | 0.08268 |
| 15 | 697 | 65.46 | 0.03318 | -21.01 | 32.86 | 60.37 | 0.08042 |
| 20 | 559 | 65.42 | 0.03341 | -20.70 | 32.66 | 61.37 | 0.07290 |
| 25 | 364 | 67.43 | 0.02403 | -36.08 | 29.09 | 62.31 | 0.06583 |
| 30 | 268 | 68.62 | 0.02041 | -45.10 | 41.29 | 62.92 | 0.06095 |

Table 35: Summary of the number of yelloweye used in modeling the growth of yelloweye rock fish.

|  | No. of yelloweye collected |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | Columbia | Vancouver Island, US |
| 1999 | 24 | 0 |
| 2001 | 19 | 125 |
| 2002 | 0 | 135 |
| 2003 | 208 | 10 |
| 2004 | 154 | 55 |

Table 36: Summary of estimated unknown parameters and their standard errors in the final suboptimal model in Model III.

| Parameters | Estimates (Model III) | Estimated standard error |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\hat{L}_{\infty}(\mathrm{cm})$ | 64.44 | 0.5160 |
| $\hat{K}$ (per year) | 0.07779 | 0.001944 |
| $\hat{r}_{L}$ (female) $(\mathrm{cm})$ | -7.444 | 0.6678 |
| $\hat{s}_{K}$ (Columbia) (per year) | -0.0009158 | 0.001531 |
| $\hat{r}_{K}$ | 0.02224 | 0.0035 |
| $\hat{y}_{K, 2003}$ | -0.008632 | 0.002408 |

Table 37. Summary of estimated yelloweye rockfish total mortality coefficients from years 1984 to 2002 in Washington, Oregon and California states. Bold value means the estimated coefficient was not significant ( $\mathrm{P}>0.05$ ).

| Years | Estimated total mortality coefficient [M+F] (standard error) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Washington | Oregon | California |
| 1984 |  | $0.17(0.006)$ |  |
| 1985 |  | $0.09(0.022)$ |  |
| 1986 |  | $0.13(0.030)$ |  |
| 1987 |  | $0.14(0.006)$ | $0.08(0.031)$ |
| 1989 |  | $0.18(0.023)$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9 ( 0 . 1 2 )}$ |
| 1990 |  |  | $0.10(0.023)$ |
| 1991 |  |  | $0.13(0.014)$ |
| 1992 |  | $0.09(0.026)$ | $0.14(0.08)$ |
| 1993 |  |  | $0.15(0.013)$ |
| 1994 |  |  | $0.18(0.006)$ |
| 1995 | $0.15(0.031)$ | $0.14(0.012)$ |  |
| 1996 | $0.20(0.026)$ | $0.15(0.016)$ |  |
| 1997 | $0.12(0.017)$ | $0.15(0.069)$ |  |
| 1998 | $0.08(0.019)$ | $0.07(0.049)$ |  |
| 1999 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 ( 0 . 0 3 7 )}$ | $0.24(0.063)$ |  |
| 2000 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2 ( \mathbf { 0 . 0 5 9 } )}$ | $0.21(0.040)$ |  |
| 2001 | $0.08(0.031)$ |  |  |
| 2002 |  |  |  |

Table 38. Table 2. Ten-year OY projections and depletion levels under different PMAX for the coastwide model.

| $P_{\text {MAX }}$ <br> $\mathrm{T}_{\text {MAX }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.5 \\ 2096 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.6 \\ 2092 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.7 \\ 2087 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.8 \\ 2083 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.9 \\ 2078 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{Yr}=\text { Tmid } \\ 2073 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F}=0 \\ & 2048 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 14.8 | 18\% | 14.1 | 18\% | 13.4 | 18\% | 12.6 | 18\% | 11.4 | 18\% | 10.2 | 18\% | 0.0 | 18\% |
| 2008 | 15.1 | 18\% | 14.5 | 18\% | 13.7 | 19\% | 12.9 | 19\% | 11.7 | 19\% | 10.5 | 19\% | 0.0 | 19\% |
| 2009 | 15.4 | 19\% | 14.8 | 19\% | 14.0 | 19\% | 13.2 | 19\% | 12.0 | 19\% | 10.7 | 19\% | 0.0 | 19\% |
| 2010 | 15.7 | 19\% | 15.1 | 19\% | 14.3 | 19\% | 13.5 | 19\% | 12.3 | 20\% | 11.0 | 20\% | 0.0 | 20\% |
| 2011 | 16.0 | 20\% | 15.4 | 20\% | 14.6 | 20\% | 13.8 | 20\% | 12.6 | 20\% | 11.2 | 20\% | 0.0 | 21\% |
| 2012 | 16.3 | 20\% | 15.6 | 20\% | 14.9 | 20\% | 14.1 | 20\% | 12.8 | 20\% | 11.4 | 20\% | 0.0 | 21\% |
| 2013 | 16.6 | 21\% | 15.9 | 21\% | 15.1 | 21\% | 14.3 | 21\% | 13.0 | 21\% | 11.7 | 21\% | 0.0 | 22\% |
| 2014 | 16.8 | 21\% | 16.1 | 21\% | 15.4 | 21\% | 14.5 | 21\% | 13.2 | 21\% | 11.9 | 21\% | 0.0 | 22\% |
| 2015 | 17.0 | 21\% | 16.4 | 21\% | 15.6 | 21\% | 14.7 | 21\% | 13.5 | 22\% | 12.1 | 22\% | 0.0 | 23\% |
| 2016 | 17.3 | 21\% | 16.6 | 22\% | 15.8 | 22\% | 15.0 | 22\% | 13.7 | 22\% | 12.2 | 22\% | 0.0 | 23\% |

Table 39. Benchmark fishing mortality rates for each area model and the coastwide model based on the SSC default rebuilding analysis simulation software..

| Reference Point | Area (models) for consideration |  |  |  | W-O-C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Coastwide | California | Oregon | Washington |  |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ Unfished Spawning Stock Biomass ( SSB $_{0}$ ) | 3,322 | 1,715 | 1,258 | 453 | 3,425 |
| Unfished Exploitable Biomass ( $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ ) | 7,448 | 3,877 | 2,789 | 1,017 | 7,683 |
| Unfished Recruitment ( $\mathrm{R}_{0}$ ) | 4.85 | 4.19 | 3.85 | 3.00 |  |
| SSB 2006 | 588 | 145 | 274 | 95 | 514 |
| Depletion Level (2006) | 17.7\% | 8.5\% | 21.8\% | 21.0\% | 15.0\% |
| Depletion -95CI | 14.2\% | 5.7\% | 16.5\% | 17.3\% |  |
| Depletion +95CI | 21.1\% | 11.2\% | 27.0\% | 24.6\% |  |
| Target Spawning Biomass ( $\mathrm{B}_{0.40}$ ) | 1,329 | 684 | 502 | 181 |  |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\text {MSY Proxy ( }}$ (SPR=0.50) | 0.024 | 0.021 | 0.021 | 0.027 |  |
| Exploitable Biomass | 1491 | 383 | 671 | 255 |  |
| ${ }^{21}$ ABC ${ }_{2006}$ | 36.2 | 8.1 | 14.2 | 7.0 |  |
| OY 2006 | 36.2 |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1 /}$ This value is expressed in female biomass ${ }^{21}$ Assumes $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ Proxy (SPR=0.50) | alf of the $m$ | SSB $_{0}$ estim | f 6,644 m | both sexes |  |

Table 40. Fishing benchmarks based on SS2 V1.21 forcast.ss2 output.

Forecast based SS2 v1.21 output for Coastwide Model

| Element | perRecr | *Recr |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Recr_unfished | 1.0 | 127.4 |
| SPB_unfished | 51.8 | 6603.1 |
| BIO_Smry_unfished | 58.2 | 7414.5 |
|  |  |  |
| Steepness_for_MSYcalc | 0.450 |  |
| SPR_at_msy | 0.573 |  |
| Exploit_at_MSY_(=Y/Bsmry) | 0.016 |  |
| Recruits_at_msy | 0.671 | 85.5 |
| SPB_at_msy | 29.7 | 2539.4 |
| SPBmsyISPBzero(using_S0) | 0.384 |  |
| SPBmsyISPBzero(using_endyear_LifeHistory) | 0.385 |  |
| MSY_Yield | 0.558 | 47.7 |
| BIO-Smry_at_MSY | 35.5 | 3038.5 |
|  |  |  |
| SPR_for_target_F | 0.500 |  |
| Exploit_at_target_F_(=Y/Bsmry) | 0.020 |  |
| SPB_at_target | 25.9 |  |
| YIELD_at_Target_F | 0.636 |  |
| Biomass_Smry_at_Target_F | 31.6 |  |
| Depletion(endyr\&endyr+1) | 0.160 | 0.163 |
| Summary_age: | 3 |  |

Table 41. Yield (with 40:10 adjustment) based on SS2 V1.21 forcast.ss2 output.

| year | bio-all | bio-Smry | SpawnBio | Depletion | recruit-0 | Catch |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 1,345 | 1,329 | 1,078 | 0.163 | 43.8 | 26.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 1,355 | 1,338 | 1,095 | 0.166 | 50.2 | 26.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 1,362 | 1,344 | 1,109 | 0.168 | 50.6 | 27.0 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | 1,369 | 1,350 | 1,119 | 0.169 | 50.9 | 27.1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 1,374 | 1,354 | 1,125 | 0.170 | 51.2 | 27.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | 1,378 | 1,358 | 1,130 | 0.171 | 51.3 | 27.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | 1,381 | 1,362 | 1,132 | 0.171 | 51.4 | 27.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | 1,385 | 1,365 | 1,132 | 0.171 | 51.4 | 27.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | 1,388 | 1,369 | 1,132 | 0.171 | 51.4 | 27.4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | 1,392 | 1,372 | 1,131 | 0.171 | 51.3 | 27.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | 1,396 | 1,376 | 1,129 | 0.171 | 51.3 | 27.5 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | 1,399 | 1,380 | 1,128 | 0.171 | 51.2 | 27.6 |

Table 42. Comparison of yelloweye ABC, OY and catch since single species management began in 2002.
Coastal Washington, Oregon and California Yelloweye Rockfish Landings

| Source ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | PacFIN and MRFSS |  |  |  | Tagart, PacFIN, and ODFW |  |  |  | Tagart, PacFIN and WDFW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | California ${ }^{1 /}$ |  |  |  | Oregon ${ }^{2 /}$ |  |  |  | Washington ${ }^{3 /}$ |  |  |  | Totals |  |  |  | Coastwide |  |  |
|  | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Trawl | Line | Other | Sport | Total | ABC | OY (Tmid) |
| 2002 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 2.2 | 0 | 3.7 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 12.9 | 52.0 | 22.0 |
| 2003 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 52.0 | 22.0 |
| 2004 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 12.0 | 54.0 | 22.0 |
| 2005 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 0.3 | 13.1 | 23.6 | 54.0 | 26.0 |
| Note: GMT | ard | N | 200 |  | 200 |  | at |  | atch |  | rity |  | clud |  | , Rec |  | O | and |  |

Figure 1. Yelloweye management history by fishery and area 1985-2004.



Note: The PFMC N/S Management border shifted North from Cape Mendencio to $40^{\circ} 10^{\prime}$ in 2000. Between Cape Mendocino and $N$ of $36^{\prime} N$, recreational rockfish fishing is closed $3 / 1-4 / 30$; S of $36^{\prime} N$, recreational rockfish fishing is closed 1/1-2/29

Figure 2. Estimated yelloweye rockfish catch by State and year since 1955.










Figure 3. Yelloweye allometric growth for combined sexes (weight $=0.000021 *$ length ${ }^{2.9659}$ )


Figure 4. Predicted yelloweye rockfish size-at-age by locale. Need to update for the final model.


Figure 5. Observed and predicted age error for yelloweye rockfish when omitting the outlier from the dataset.


Figure 6. Comparison of standardized CPUE indices used in the base run.


Figure 7. Abundance indices calculated from Washington recreational sampling - bottomfish only trips (OSP_BFO), halibut directed trips (OSP_halibut), and combined (OSP_B\&H).


Figure 8. Comparison of Oregon sport CPUE and MRFSS CPUE.


Figure 9. Comparison of Northern California MRFSS CPUE trends generated by using targeted speicies information (Wallace) and by using a binomial filtering mechanism (McCall).


Figure 10. IPHC 1997 stations off Washington coast.


Figure 11. 1997 IPHC survey stations off Oregon coast.


Figure 12. IPHC survey stations off Washington coast during 1999 and 2001.


Figure 13. IPHC survey stations off Oregon coast during 1999 and 2001.


Figure 14. IPHC survey stations off Oregon coast during 2002-2005.


Figure 15. IPHC survey stations off Washington coast during 2002-2005.


Figure 16. Spatial pattern of yelloweye rockfish occurrence in the NMFS bottom trawl survey; 1977-2001. Size of circle is proportional to yelloweye rockfish density at that location.


Figure 17. IPHC US water 2A yelloweye catch since 1997. Expanded estimates through 2001.


Figure 18. Comparison of length composition between the Washington yelloweye line fishery and the IPHC line survey by year.


Figure 19a. Yelloweye density in the untrawlable habitat surveyed in 2002.


Figure 19b. NMFS trawl survey haul location for all successful tows in the U.S. Vancouver Area in 2001. Symbols mark tows with yelloweye rockfish and grey grid represents the untrawlable habitat surveyed in 2002.


Figure 20. Comparison of estimated selectivity's between 2005 and 2006 models.



Figure 21. Comparison of the estimated recruitment time series between 2005 and 2006 base models (top panel) and between 2006 area specific models.



Figure 22. Comparison of the spawning biomass time series between 2005 and 2006 base models (top panel) and between 2006 area specific models.


Figure 23. Comparison of average fishing mortality between all 2006 area specific base models.



Figure 24. Profile of likelihood over a range of emphasis values (lambda) on length, age and size composition data (top panel) and over a range of emphasis values on the stock recruitment curve.



Figure 25. Profile of likelihood over a range of initial recruitment (Ro) values (top Panel) and over a range of steepness values presumed in the stock recruitment curve.


Figure 26. Plots of expected yelloweye rockfish growth curves fitted by Models I and II with different age groups.


Figure 27. Plot of the yelloweye rockfish length frequency data collected from years 1984 to 2002 in Oregon State coastal sampling.


Figure 28. Plot of the estimated total mortality coefficients from yelloweye rockfish length frequency data collected between years 1984 to 2002 in Washington, Oregon and California states coastal sampling.



Figure 29. Estimated (SS2 V2.21 forecast) $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ and $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ (SPB at $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ ) time series from the coastwide model.



Figure 30. Coastwide Model fit to California CPFV (top panel) and California MRFSS (bottom panel) indices.



Figure 31. Coastwide Model fit toOregon sport (top panel) and Washington OSP (bottom panel) indices.


Figure 32. Coastwide Model fit to the Washington and Oregon IPHC halibut set line survey index.



Figure 33. Coastwide model fit to California sport length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed $<$ Expected).



Figure 34. Coastwide model fit to California commercial length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed <Expected).



Figure 35. Coastwide model fit to Oregon sport length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed <Expected).


## NO AGE DATA

Figure 36. Coastwide model fit to Oregon commercial length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed <Expected).



Figure 37. Coastwide model fit to Washington sport length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed <Expected).


Figure 38. Coastwide model fit to Washington commercial length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed $<$ Expected).



Figure 39. Coastwide model fit to Washington target line length and age compositions by year (solids = Observed $<$ Expected).

## Appendix A: Data Input and Control Files for Coastwide Yelloweye Model

## Control File for Coastwide Model

```
        V1.21 version
        Yeye06-C.ctl selex pattern 1; Logistic
        datafile:Yeye05.dat
        #_N_growthmorphs
#_assign_sex_to each_morph_(1=female;_2=male)
1
#_N_Areas_(populations)
#_each_fleet/survey_operates_in_just_one_area
#_but_different_fleets/surveys_can be assigned_to_share_same_selex(FUTURE_coding)
\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllll}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \#area_for_each_fleet/survey
\end{tabular}
0 #do_migration_(0/1)
0 #r #_N_Time_Block_Definitions 
#1983 2004
#1987 2004
#2000 2004
#1998 2004
#1998 2004
#1998 2004
#Natural_mortality_and_growth_parameters_for_each_morph
#_Last_age_for_natmort_young
10 #_First_age_for_natmort_old
# #_age_for_growth_Lmin
60 #_age_for_growth_Lmax
```






| $10 \quad 70$ | 31.293 |  | 0 | 99 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#infl_for_logistic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00160 | 9.54 | 15 | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | \#95\%width_for_logistic |
| \#Cal_Com2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#40 70 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 10 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | \#peakCaCom_2 |
| \#0.0001 | 0.1 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 99 | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#init |
| \#-10 9 | 0.11186 |  | 0.5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#infl1 |
| \#-5.00 | 9 | 0.2627 |  | 0.3 | 0 | 99 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 00 \#slope1 |
| \#-10 10 | -3.3152 |  | 5 | 0 | 99 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#final |
| \#-10 9 | -0.5608 |  | 0.3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#infl2 |
| \#-5.00 | 9 | 0.2918 |  | 0.3 | 0 | 99 | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | $0 \quad 0 \quad$ \#slope2 |
| \#0. 110 | 3 | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | 99 | -4 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | \#width of top |
| \#CaCom_2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1070 | 33.24 | 30 | 0 | 99 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | \#infl_for_logistic |
| 0.00160 | 8.93 | 15 | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#95\%width_for_logistic |
| \#OrREc_3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#40 70 | 48 | 50 | 0 | 10 | -3 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#peakOrRec_3 |
| \#0. 0001 | 0.1 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 99 | -2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#init |
| \#-10 9 | -0.4227 |  | 0.5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#infl1 |
| \#-5.00 | 9 | 0.3646 |  | 0.3 | 0 | 99 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 00 \#slope1 |
| \#-9 10 | -1.2055 |  | 5 | 0 | 99 | 3 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 \#final |
| \#-10 9 | -0.8301 |  | 0.3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 \#infl2 |
| \#-5.00 | 9 | 0.4545 |  | 0.3 | 0 | 99 | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | $0 \quad 0 \quad$ \#slope2 |
| \#0. 110 | 3 | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | 99 | -4 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0.5 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | \#width of top |
| \#OR_Rec_3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1070 | 28.61 |  | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#infl_for_logistic |


| 0.00160 | 6.69 | 15 | 0 | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#95\%width_for_logistic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#OR_Com_4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1070 | 34.71 |  | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#infl_for_logistic |
| 0.00160 | 8.23 | 15 | 0 | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#95\%width_for_logistic |
| \#WA_Rec_5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10 \quad \begin{array}{ll} 70 \\ & \text { \#ir } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.7191 \\ & \text { for } 100 \end{aligned}$ |  | 30 | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 0.001 \quad 60 \\ \\ \# 95 \end{array}$ | $7.6622$ idth_for |  |  | 0 | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
| \#WA_Com_6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10 \quad \begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \text { \#ir } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.167 \\ & \text { for_los } \end{aligned}$ |  | 30 | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| $\begin{array}{rl} 0.001 & 60 \\ \# 95 \end{array}$ | $7.3690$ idth_for |  | $15$ | 0 | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| \#WA_Com_7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1070 | 41.96 | 30 | 0 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#infl_for_logistic |
| 0.00160 | 13.63 | 15 | 0 | 99 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#95\%width_for_logistic |
| \#CaCPFV_8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 137 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 99 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#minsizeBinCaCPFV_8 |
| 137 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 99 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#maxsizeBinCaCPFV_8 |
| \#CaMRFSS_9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 137 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 99 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#minsizeBinCaMRFSS_9 |
| 137 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 99 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#maxsizeBinCaMRFSS_9 |
| \#OrRecSur_10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 137 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 99 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#minsizeBinOrRecSur_10 |
| 137 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 99 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | \#maxsizeBinOrRecSur_10 |



```
#The last lambda value is used for all higher numbered phases
1 #_max_lambda_phases:_read_this_Number_of_values_for_each_componentxtype_below
# #SDoffset
#_survey_lambda
\begin{tabular}{llllllllllll}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}
#_discard_lambdas
\begin{tabular}{llllllllllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
#_meanbodywt
0
#_lenfreq_lambdas
\begin{tabular}{lllllllllll}
0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\#_age_freq_lambdas & & & & & & 0.6 \\
0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\#_size@age_lambdas & & & & & & & & 0.6 \\
\(\# 1\) & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0.6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
#_initial_equil_catch(f)
1
#_recruitment_lambda
0.5
#_parm_prior_lambda
1
#_parm_dev_timeseries_lambda
0.00001
#SS1 Lambdas
#33 STOCK-RECR "2=RICKER," 3=new B-H
#3 1=B-H, 2=RICKER," 3=new B-H
```




## Forecast File for Coastwide Model

```
# # summary age for biomass reporting
0 # 0=skip forecast; 1=normal; 2=force without sdreport required
0 # Do_MSY: 0=skip; 1=calculate; 2=set to Fspr; 3=set to endyear(only useful if set relative F from
endyr)
0.5 # target SPR
12 # number of forecast years
12 # number of forecast years with stddev
# emphasis for the forecast recruitment devs that occur prior to endyyr+1
1 # fraction of bias adjustment to use with forecast_recruitment_devs before endyr+1
0 # fraction of bias adjustment to use with forecast_recruitment_devs after endyr
0.40 # topend of 40:10 option; set to 0.0 for no 40:10
0.10 # bottomend of 40:10 option
1.00 # OY scalar relative to ABC
2 # for forecast: 1=set relative F from endyr; 2=use relative F read below
# relative Fs used for forecast; rows are seasons; columns are fleets
    # Fleet 1 Fleet 2
0.30 0.02 0.30
# starwars battlefront
    # verify end of input harvest rates
    999
    # specified actual catches into the future
    # (negative values are not used, but there must be a sufficient number of values)
    # fleet1 fleet2
\begin{tabular}{llllllllll} 
\\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 1 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 2 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 3 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 4 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 5 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 6 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 7 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 8 & season & 1 \\
7.8 & 0.52 & 7.8 & 1.3 & 7.8 & 0.52 & 0.26 \#year & 9 & season & 1
\end{tabular}
```

| 7.8 | 0.52 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 0.52 | 0.26 | \#year | 10 | season |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7.8 | 0.52 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 0.52 | 0.26 | \#year | 11 | season |
| 7.8 | 0.52 | 7.8 | 1.3 | 7.8 | 0.52 | 0.26 | \#year | 12 | season |

## Data File for Coastwide Model



| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1925$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1926$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1927$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1928$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1929$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1930$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1931$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1932$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1933$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1934$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1935$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1936$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1937$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1938$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1939$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1940$ |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | $\# 1941$ |


| $\bigcirc$ | 8 | 0 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | \#1942 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1943 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1944 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1945 |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | 8 | 0 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | \#1946 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1947 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1948 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1949 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | \#1950 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1951 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | \#1952 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1953 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | \#1954 | CaCOM. 005 | CaCOM. 01 | OrCOM. $005 \%$ | OrCOM. 01 |
| 14.2 | 24.05 | 6.2 | 9.85 | 1 | 2 | 0 | \#1955 | 24.0548 .1 | 9.8519 .7 |  |  |
| 16.6 | 28.8 | 6.5 | 10.1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | \# | 28.857 .6 | 10.120 .2 |  |  |
| 12.4 | 31.5 | 6.7 | 10.35 | 1 | 2 | 0 | \# | 31.563 | 10.3520 .7 |  |  |
| 15.8 | 35.45 | 7 | 10.6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \# | 35.4570 .9 | 10.621 .2 |  |  |
| 12.4 | 30.85 | 7.2 | 10.85 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \# | 30.8561 .7 | 10.8521 .7 |  |  |
| 10 | 28.1 | 7.5 | 11.1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \# | 28.156 .2 | 11.122 .2 |  |  |
| 8.3 | 22.55 | 7.7 | 11.35 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \# | 22.5545 .1 | 11.3522 .7 |  |  |
| 9.1 | 20.75 | 8 | 11.6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \# | 20.7541 .5 | 11.623 .2 |  |  |
| 9.4 | 25.15 | 8.2 | 11.85 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \# | 25.1550 .3 | 11.8523 .7 |  |  |
| 8.5 | 17.65 | 8.5 | 12.1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \# | 17.6535 .3 | 12.124 .2 |  |  |
| 12.5 | 20.7 | 8.7 | 12.35 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \# | 20.741 .4 | 12.3524 .7 |  |  |
| 15 | 22.45 | 9 | 12.6 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \# | 22.4544 .9 | $12.6 \quad 25.2$ |  |  |
| 16.1 | 22.2 | 9.2 | 12.85 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \# | 22.244 .4 | 12.8525 .7 |  |  |
| 17.3 | 21.65 | 9.5 | 13.1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \# | 21.6543 .3 | 13.126 .2 |  |  |
| 16.8 | 40.5 | 9.7 | 27.2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | \#1969 |  |  |  |  |
| 21.8 | 47.1 | 10 | 19.2 | 4 | 5.1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18.1 | 46.8 | 13.1 | 19 | 4 | 4.6 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24.2 | 70.6 | 16.3 | 24 | 4 | 5.5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29.6 | 91.7 | 19.5 | 22.2 | 4 | 7.4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | 84.3 | 22.6 | 18.2 | 4 | 8.5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | 92.4 | 25.8 | 14.8 | 4 | 7.1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | 103.7 | 29 | 25.9 | 4.3 | 10.3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27.5 | 100.7 | 32.1 | 29.3 | 8.8 | 17.8 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24.5 | 99.3 | 35.3 | 28.5 | 4.5 | 23.9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29.9 | 134.2 | 38.5 | 62.2 | 3.5 | 28.5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |


| 75.9 | 168.1 | 27.5 | 68.2 | 2.4 | 35 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46.9 | 209.8 | 34.2 | 102.2 | 3.4 | 9.7 | 0 |
| 103.8 | 177 | 48.7 | 114.5 | 3.4 | 12.6 | 0 |
| 51 | 57.6 | 62.9 | 193.2 | 6.7 | 16.6 | 0 |
| 80.8 | 44.9 | 43.6 | 67.1 | 12.2 | 13.4 | 0 |
| 125.8 | 8.8 | 26.8 | 101.9 | 8.8 | 26.4 | 0 |
| 65.5 | 31 | 27.2 | 70.6 | 9 | 14.7 | 0 |
| 75.2 | 53.7 | 29.4 | 80.7 | 10.5 | 25.1 | 0 |
| 57.5 | 64.9 | 9.6 | 120.1 | 8.3 | 25.6 | 0 |
| 58.7 | 50.1 | 16 | 180 | 14.6 | 39.2 | 0 |
| 46.1 | 79.8 | 16.6 | 74.3 | 9.9 | 26.3 | 0 |
| 33.6 | 141.1 | 14.9 | 135.9 | 18 | 20.4 | 0 |
| 21 | 112.2 | 25.9 | 165.8 | 16.2 | 33.8 | 0 |
| 8.5 | 52.9 | 19.7 | 183.2 | 18 | 29.8 | 0 |
| 14.4 | 54.4 | 18.3 | 102.2 | 10.3 | 19.6 | 0 |
| 12.6 | 48.5 | 13.8 | 149.1 | 9.9 | 18 | 0 |
| 12.5 | 65.8 | 8.4 | 97.7 | 10.8 | 16.9 | 0 |
| 15.1 | 62.2 | 14.4 | 115.5 | 11.4 | 18.7 | 0 |
| 5.8 | 21.6 | 18.9 | 41.4 | 14.4 | 5.5 | 0 |
| 12.6 | 22.2 | 17.8 | 61.3 | 10.6 | 10 | 23 |
| 7.5 | 4 | 9.2 | 3.6 | 10.1 | 0.2 | 7.7 |
| 4.6 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 6.2 | 12.5 | 1 | 21 |
| 2.1 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 0.4 | 2.2 |
| 3.7 | 0 | 3.8 | 1 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| 3.5 | 0 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| 3.7 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 0 |


| 64 | \#_N_cpue_and_surveyabundance_observations |  |  |  |  | the same | as | SS1 | ye-dat09.dat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#Note | all | value |  | for indexes | are |  |  |  |  |
| \#Year | seas | index | obs | selog |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# | CA | CPFV | CPUE; | using Henrys | delt | lognormal | and | est | V's |
| 1988 | 1 | 8 | 26.19 | 0.2112 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 1 | 8 | 25.52 | 0.1298 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 1 | 8 | 32.16 | 0.2652 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 1 | 8 | 31.59 | 0.1565 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 1 | 8 | 20.88 | 0.1297 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 1 | 8 | 23.63 | 0.1555 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 1 | 8 | 21.67 | 0.1321 |  |  |  |  |  |



| 1993 | 1 | 10 | 12.6602333 | 0.1369043 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 1 | 10 | 10.1659667 | 0.13175002 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 1 | 10 | 9.6534667 | 0.2570788 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 1 | 10 | 6.0977241 | 0.1344485 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 1 | 10 | 10.7553 | 0.1266993 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 1 | 10 | 13.8429655 | 0.1856925 |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# | WA | sport | CPUE Henr | _Delta_Lo | rmal |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 1 | 11 | 6.90 .7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 1 | 11 | 16.031 .7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 1 | 11 | 15.291 .24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 1 | 11 | 13.191 .01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 1 | 11 | $7.15 \quad 0.42$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 1 | 11 | 5.70 .46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 1 | 11 | $5.72 \quad 0.5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 1 | 11 | 8.751 .05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 1 | 11 | 11.061 .24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 1 | 11 | $6.88 \quad 0.85$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 1 | 11 | 6.450 .54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 1 | 11 | $4.42 \quad 0.41$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# | IPHC | Oregon | n and | Wash TSO | CPUE |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 1 | 12 | 5.71 1.690 | 21569 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 1 | 12 | 4.821 .690 | 21569 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 1 | 12 | 3.361 .455 | 24749 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 1 | 12 | 4.81 .691 | 64656 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 1 | 12 | 3.371 .226 | 9225 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 1 | 12 | 2.65 0.985 | 77383 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | \# | Discar | d in | fraction | of total catch | value causes |  | to | ignore) |
| $\bigcirc$ | \# | Number | $r$ of | Discard | observaions (- |  | program |  |  |
| 0 \#_N_meanbodywt_obs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0.0001 \text { this }$ |  | value | compress | tails of | composition until observed\# |  | proportion is | greater |  |




|  | 0.00779 | 0.01039 | 0.0026 | 0.0026 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 \# | 250.25 | 385 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 11 | 0 | 890 | 0.01124 | 0.02247 |  | 0.03371 |  | 0.02247 |  | 0.02247 |  |  |
|  | 0.02247 | 0.02247 | 0.08989 | 0.06742 | 0.07865 |  | 0.16854 |  | 0.11236 |  | 0.07865 |  |  |
|  | 0.04494 | 0.02247 | 0.03371 | 0.01124 | 0.03371 |  | 0.03371 |  | 0.03371 |  | 0 | 0.01124 |  |
|  | 0.01124 | 0.01124 | 00 | 00 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | 57.8589 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 11 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1120 | 0.00893 |  | 0 | 0.00893 |  | 0.01786 |  | 0.01786 |  |  |
|  | 0.07143 | 0.05357 | 0.10714 | 0.05357 | 0.11607 |  | 0.08929 |  | 0.07143 |  | 0.08036 |  |  |
|  | 0.05357 | 0.01786 | 0.0625 | 0.05357 | 0.03571 |  | 0.04464 |  | 0 | 0.01786 |  | 0 |  |
|  | 0.01786 | 00 | 0 | 00 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | \# | 72.8 | 112 |
| 1992 | 11 | 00 | 1640 | 0.0061 | 0.0061 |  | 0.03049 |  | 0.04878 |  | 0.0122 |  |  |
|  | 0.02439 | 0.06098 | 0.02439 | 0.06707 | 0.07317 |  | 0.09756 |  | 0.08537 |  | 0.07317 |  |  |
|  | 0.04268 | 0.06098 | 0.07927 | 0.04878 | 0.05488 |  | 0.03659 |  | 0.0061 |  | 0.03049 |  |  |
|  | 0.02439 | 0.0061 | 00 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | \# 106.6 | 164 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 11 | 0 | 200 0 | $0 \quad 0.0042$ | 0.00424 | 0.01695 |  | 0.0339 |  | 0.05932 |  | 0.04237 |  |
|  | 0.07203 | 0.05085 | 0.0678 | 0.07627 | 0.07203 |  | 0.08898 |  | 0.08051 |  | 0.0339 |  |  |
|  | 0.04237 | 0.03814 | 0.0339 | 0.04237 | 0.0339 |  | 0.02119 |  | 0.01695 |  | 0.02542 |  |  |
|  | 0.02119 | 0.01695 | 0.00424 | 0.00424 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 \# | 153.4236 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 11 | $0 \quad 0$ | 200 | $0 \quad 0.004$ | 0.0040 | 0.02 | 0.0360 | 0.064 | 0.0760 | 0.088 | 0.092 | 0.06 | 0.08 |
|  | 0.080 .104 | 0.0560 .056 | 0.0560 .032 | 0.020 .016 | 0.0120 | 0.016 | 0.0120 | 0.008 | 0 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \# | 162.5 | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 11 | $0 \quad 0$ | 1990 | 0.00503 | 0.01508 |  | 0.01005 |  | 0.00503 |  | 0.0402 |  |  |
|  | 0.04523 | 0.0804 | 0.07538 | 0.06533 | 0.07035 |  | 0.07035 |  | 0.08543 |  | 0.0954 |  |  |
|  | 0.07538 | 0.06533 | 0.0402 | 0.03518 | 0.0201 |  | 0.03015 |  | 0.0201 |  | 0.0201 |  |  |
|  | 0.0201 | $0 \quad 0.01005$ | 05 | 00 | 0 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | \# 129.35 | 199 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 11 | 0 | 200 0 | 0.01255 | 0.01674 |  | 0.02092 |  | 0.03766 |  | 0.0502 |  |  |
|  | 0.02092 | 0.04603 | 0.05858 | 0.04603 | 0.1046 |  | 0.10042 |  | 0.08368 |  | 0.0585 |  |  |
|  | 0.06695 | 0.06695 | 0.05021 | 0.02092 | 0.03766 |  | 0.02929 |  | 0.01255 |  | 0.0292 |  |  |
|  | 0.00837 | 0.00418 | 0.01255 | 0.00418 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 0 | \# 155.35 | 239 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 11 | 0 | 200 | 0.0040 .008 | 0.0320 | 0.04 | 0.0160 | 0.012 | 0.0440 | 0.048 | 0.052 | 0.076 | 0.068 |
|  | 0.040 .06 | 0.0560 .084 | 0.0920 .076 | 0.0640 .02 | 0.040 | 0.04 | 0.0120 | 0.012 | 0.0040 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 00 | 00 | 0 | 0 | \# 1 | 162.5 | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |













\#IPHC


36 \# N age' bins

| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 |  |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | $\#$ | number | of | unique | ageing | error matrices | to | generate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 0.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 9.5 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 13.5 | 14.5 | 15.5 | 16.5 | 17.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18.5 | 19.5 | 20.5 | 21.5 | 22.5 | 23.5 | 24.5 | 25.5 | 26.5 | 27.5 | 28.5 | 29.5 | 30.5 | 31.5 | 32.5 | 33.5 | 34.5 |
|  | 35.5 | 36.5 | 37.5 | 38.5 | 39.5 | 40.5 | 41.5 | 42.5 | 43.5 | 44.5 | 45.5 | 46.5 | 47.5 | 48.5 | 49.5 | 50.5 | 51.5 |
|  | 52.5 | 53.5 | 54.5 | 55.5 | 56.5 | 57.5 | 58.5 | 59.5 | 60.5 | 61.5 | 62.5 | 63.5 | 64.5 | 65.5 | 66.5 | 67.5 | 68.5 |
|  | 69.5 | 70.5 | \#71. 5 | 72.5 | 73.5 | 74.5 | 75.5 | 76.5 | 77.5 | 78.5 | 79.5 | 80.5 | 81.5 | 82.5 | 83.5 | 84.5 | 85.5 |
|  | 86.5 | 87.5 | 88.5 | 89.5 | 90.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#SS1 | Age | Error | Vector | 1.5 | 1.53 | 1.57 | 1.6 | 1.64 | 1.67 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 1.78 | 1.81 | 1.85 | 1.88 | 1.92 | 1.95 |
|  | 1.99 | 2.02 | 2.06 | 2.09 | 2.13 | 2.16 | 2.2 | 2.23 | 2.27 | 2.3 | 2.33 | 2.37 | 2.4 | 2.44 | 2.47 | 2.51 | 2.54 |
|  | 2.58 | 2.61 | 2.65 | 2.68 | 2.72 | 2.75 | 2.79 | 2.82 | 2.86 | 2.89 | 2.93 | 2.96 | 3 | 3.03 | 3.07 | 3.1 | 3.13 |
|  | 3.17 | 3.2 | 3.24 | 3.27 | 3.31 | 3.34 | 3.38 | 3.41 | 3.45 | 3.48 | 3.52 | 3.55 | 3.59 | 3.62 | 3.66 | 3.69 | 3.73 |
|  | 3.76 | 3.8 | 3.83 | 3.87 | 3.9 | 3.93 | \#3.97 | 4 | 4.04 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.32 |
|  | 4.35 | 4.39 | 4.42 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.53 | 4.56 | 4.6 | 4.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#1. 01 | 1.06 | 1.1 | 1.14 | 1.19 | 1.23 | 1.27 | 1.31 | 1.36 | 1.4 | 1.44 | 1.49 | 1.53 | 1.57 | 1.62 | 1.66 | 1.7 | 1.75 |
|  | 1.79 | 1.83 | 1.87 | 1.92 | 1.96 | 2 | 2.05 | 2.09 | 2.13 | 2.18 | 2.22 | 2.26 | 2.31 | 2.35 | 2.39 | 2.44 | 2.48 |
|  | 2.52 | 2.56 | 2.61 | 2.65 | 2.69 | 2.74 | 2.78 | 2.82 | 2.87 | 2.91 | 2.95 | 3 | 3.04 | 3.08 | 3.12 | 3.17 | 3.21 |
|  | 3.25 | 3.3 | 3.34 | 3.38 | 3.43 | 3.47 | 3.51 | 3.56 | 3.6 | 3.64 | 3.69 | 3.73 | 3.77 | 3.81 | 3.86 | 3.9 | 3.94 |
|  | 4 | 3.93 | \#3.97 | 4 | 4.04 | 4.07 | 4.11 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 4.25 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 4.35 | 4.39 | 4.42 | 4.46 |
|  | 4.49 | 4.53 | 4.56 | 4.6 | 4.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4177 |  | 2.398 | 5 | 2.379 | 15 | 2.359 | 5 | 2.340 | 5 | 2.321 | 5 | 2.301 | 5 | 2.282 | 5 | 2.263 |  |
|  | 2.244 |  | 2.2247 |  | 2.205 |  | 2.1861 |  | 2.1668 | 5 | 2.1475 | 5 | 2.128 | 5 | 2.108 |  |  |
|  | 2.089 |  | 2.0703 |  | 2.051 |  | 2.0317 |  | 2.012 |  | 1.9931 | 5 | 1.973 | 5 | 1.95 |  |  |
|  | 1.935 |  | 1.9159 |  | 1.896 |  | 1.8773 |  | 1.8580 |  | 1.8387 |  | 1.819 |  | 1.800 |  |  |
|  | 1.780 |  | 1.7615 |  | 1.742 |  | 1.7229 |  | 1.7036 |  | 1.6843 |  | 1.665 |  | 1.645 |  |  |
|  | 1.626 |  | 1.6071 |  | 1.587 |  | 1.5685 |  | 1.5492 |  | 1.5299 |  | 1.510 |  | 1.491 |  |  |
|  | 1.472 |  | 1.4527 |  | 1.433 |  | 1.4141 |  | 1.3948 |  | 1.3755 |  | 1.356 |  | 1.336 |  |  |
|  | 1.317 |  | 1.2983 |  | 1.279 |  | 1.2597 |  | 1.240 |  | 1.2211 |  | 1.201 |  | 1.182 |  |  |









|  | 29 | 21 | 30 | 21 | 29 | 29 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 | 30 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#2000 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 35.2 | 32.4 | 34.8 | 37.1 | 37.3 | 37.4 | 41.2 | 41 |
|  | 43.4 | 43.6 | 44.8 | 43.5 | 43.9 | 46.7 | 48.6 | 48 | 51.8 | 53 | 53.8 | 52.9 | 53.2 | 54.8 | 56.7 | 56.5 | 57 |
|  | 56.6 | 62.2 | 61.7 | 64.2 | 64.1 | 64.4 | 63.8 | 65.7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 15 | 29 |
|  | 29 | 21 | 30 | 21 | 29 | 29 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 10 |
|  | 7 | 30 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#2000 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 35.2 | 32.4 | 34.8 | 37.1 | 37.3 | 37.4 | 41.2 | 41 |
|  | 43.4 | 43.6 | 44.8 | 43.5 | 43.9 | 46.7 | 48.6 | 48 | 51.8 | 53 | 53.8 | 52.9 | 53.2 | 54.8 | 56.7 | 56.5 | 57 |
|  | 56.6 | 62.2 | 61.7 | 64.2 | 64.1 | 64.4 | 63.8 | 65.7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 15 | 29 |
|  | 29 | 21 | 30 | 21 | 29 | 29 | 14 | 15 | 6 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 10 |
|  | 7 | 30 | 15 | 23 | 22 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \#Year | Seaso |  | Fleet | Gende |  | Part | ion | agee |  | Nsamp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 1981 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 74 | 24 | 24.8 | 26 | 35.3 | 36.3 | 33.5 | 40.2 | 40 | 38.6 | 38.7 | 43.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 41.5 | 45 | 44 | 42 | 44 | 45 | 48 | 50 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 64 | 59 | 60 | 61.3 |
|  | 53.6 | 61.5 | 62 | 62.6 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 65.3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
|  | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|  | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | \#80-82 |  | California |  | Sport |  |  |
| 1986 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 86 | 24 | 24.8 | 26 | 30 | 29.8 | 35.4 | 32.7 | 38 | 38 | 46.7 | 40 |
|  | 43 | 45.5 | 52 | 48 | 45 | 45 | 48 | 47.5 | 54.7 | 53.3 | 56.7 | 50.5 | 53 | 53.8 | 60 | 58 | 56.2 |
|  | 57.5 | 62.3 | 61.2 | 66 | 61 | 65 | 64.5 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
|  | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | \#80-86 |  | California |  | Com |  |  |
| 1986 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 200 | 24 | 24.8 | 30.2 | 23.6 | 27.9 | 27.7 | 30.9 | 37.2 | 36.7 | 36.4 | 39.1 |
|  | 40.1 | 40.9 | 44.4 | 45.9 | 45.6 | 46 | 38.8 | 44.5 | 49.6 | 52.5 | 54.1 | 51.6 | 53.9 | 54 | 51.5 | 39.8 | 57.4 |
|  | 57.9 | 56.5 | 59.8 | 62.4 | 58.7 | 60.4 | 63.2 | 62.8 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 22 | 36 | 55 | 35 | 41 |
|  | 52 | 46 | 29 | 23 | 23 | 17 | 20 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
|  | 4 | 20 | 47 | 22 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 40 | \#84-87 |  | Oregon |  | Sport |  |  |
| 2000 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 200 | 24 | 24.8 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 35 | 36 | 38.8 | 37.9 | 40.5 | 40.8 |
|  | 43.7 | 43.7 | 44.6 | 44.6 | 46.3 | 47.8 | 51 | 47.7 | 49.5 | 52.3 | 54.2 | 53.9 | 54 | 55.1 | 55.2 | 56.7 | 56.3 |
|  | 59.8 | 62 | 62.2 | 64.9 | 65.3 | 64.4 | 63 | 65.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 13 |
|  | 19 | 13 | 26 | 23 | 34 | 30 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 9 |
|  | 9 | 32 | 11 | 20 | 18 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 10 | \#98 | - | 4 | Washi | ngton | Sport |  |


| 2000 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 200 | 24 | 24.8 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 33 | 36 | 38 | 39.5 | 42 | 46.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 43.4 | 46.3 | 47 | 47.5 | 48.4 | 48.6 | 48.7 | 50.9 | 51.1 | 50.4 | 52.3 | 51 | 54.3 | 53.4 | 56 | 54.1 | 56.2 |
|  | 56 | 64 | 62.5 | 62.7 | 65 | 65 | 67 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 4 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 22 | 25 | 30 | 20 | 22 | 18 | 9 | 13 | 3 | 8 | 6 |
|  | 8 | 36 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | \#00 | - | 4 | Washington |  | Line |  |
| \#2002 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 141 | 24 | 24.8 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 33 | 36 | 38 | 39.5 | 42 | 46.3 |
|  | 40.1 | 46 | 46.5 | 41.4 | 45.3 | 46.8 | 45 | 46.1 | 48.5 | 45.8 | 47 | 48.7 | 50.7 | 49.9 | 50 | 51 | 53.1 |
|  | 53.4 | 60.5 | 56.5 | 58.5 | 58 | 58 | 65.7 | 62.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 3 |
|  | 8 | 20 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 7 | \# | 2002 | IPHC |  |  |  |  |
| \#2003 | 1 | 12 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 200 | 24 | 24.8 | 30.2 | 23.6 | 27.9 | 27.7 | 35 | 37.2 | 36.7 | 39 | 39.1 |
|  | 42 | 45 | 41.3 | 46.6 | 44.8 | 46.3 | 47.1 | 47.1 | 48.4 | 48.2 | 50.5 | 50.1 | 52.5 | 53.2 | 53.2 | 51.7 | 53.9 |
|  | 55.8 | 57.4 | 60.2 | 59.8 | 61.9 | 62.7 | 59.6 | 62.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 17 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 15 | 12 |
|  | 13 | 48 | 16 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 30 | \# | 2003 | IPHC |  |  |  |  |
| \#2004 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 174 | 24 | 24.8 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 33 | 36 | 38 | 39.5 | 42 | 46.3 |
|  | 55.5 | 56 | 44.4 | 50.5 | 52.3 | 50.1 | 48.2 | 49.1 | 50.2 | 51.2 | 49.1 | 49.2 | 53 | 55.7 | 53.5 | 51.8 | 52.7 |
|  | 55.8 | 47 | 55.3 | 57.2 | 55.6 | 61 | 54.7 | 59.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 11 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 4 | 23 | 9 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 10 | \# | 2004 | IPHC |  |  |  |  |
| \#2005 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 134 | 24 | 24.8 | 30.2 | 23.6 | 27.9 | 27.7 | 30.9 | 37.2 | 36.7 | 36.4 | 42 |
|  | 40.1 | 40.9 | 44.4 | 47 | 49 | 44.5 | 49.5 | 46.6 | 47.8 | 50.7 | 50.3 | 50.8 | 54.2 | 53 | 54.3 | 53 | 54.9 |
|  | 57.1 | 55.7 | 60.8 | 61.5 | 61.4 | 58.8 | 65 | 63.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 3 | 15 | 15 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 11 | \# | 2005 | IPHC |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | \#N | envir | onmen | 1 | varia | les |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

0 \#_N_environ_obs
999
\#ENDDATA

