

GROUNDFISH MANAGEMENT TEAM (GMT) REPORT ON INSEASON ADJUSTMENTS

Action Items

- Trip limit decrease in open access daily trip limit (DTL) fishery North of 36° lat.

Information Items

- 2016 projected attainments for DTL fisheries North and South of 36° lat.
- Overfished species scorecard update

Action Items

Trip Limit Decrease in OA DTL North of 36° Latitude.

At the March 2016 Council meeting, the Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) and GMT discussed the sablefish Open Access (OA) daily trip limit (DTL) North of 36° lat. (OAN) exceeding its landing target in 2015. Due to concerns about increased effort in the OAN from the predicted poor salmon season and the lack of a Dungeness crab fishery off of California, the GAP asked the GMT to consider reducing the trip limits from 300 lbs. daily, 1,000 lbs. weekly, and 2,000 lbs. bimonthly (No Action) to 300 lbs. daily, 850 lbs. weekly and 1,700 lbs. bimonthly (Alternative 1).

In the projection model, the GMT weighted 2015 data higher than other years (2012-2014) included in the model based on input from the GAP in order to assume that the 2016 fishery may experience an effort level closer to 2015 than 2012-2014. Table 1 below shows the projected attainment of the landing target in 2016 under both No Action and Alternative 1. Projections include the Quota Species Monitoring (QSM) Best Estimate Report (BER) through February 28th, 2016.

Table 1: Projected attainment for sablefish DTL OAN landing target under No Action and Alternative 1 trip limits.

Alternative	Projected Landings	Landing Target	Projected Attainment
No Action	295	425	69.5%
Alternative 1	234		55.1%

While the OAN landing target was exceeded in 2015, the GMT notes that much higher trip limits were put into place starting on August 14, 2015 (to 350 lbs. daily, 1,600 lbs. weekly and 3,200 lbs. bimonthly, from 300 lbs. daily, 900 lbs. weekly, 1,800 lbs. bimonthly). The GMT also notes that the 2016 landing target (425 mt) is higher than 2015 landing target (388 mt) due to the higher 2016 ACL. Furthermore, last year's model saw large differences between the QSM BER reported landings and projected landings, ranging from ~11-109 percent, with an average of 67 percent. As noted above, the 2016 model adds 2015 data and weights that data more heavily. The updated model has only a 14 percent difference between QSM and BER estimates, and

therefore, the GMT is more confident in the fit of this updated model. Projected attainment of the landing target under No Action trip limits is less than 70 percent. **Therefore, the GMT recommends No Action trip limits for sablefish in the OAN fishery and will continue to monitor landings inseason.**

Information Items

2016 Projected Attainments for Sablefish DTL fisheries North and South of 36° North Latitude

Due to a time lag in 2015 ticket data entry in California, the GMT was unable to provide updated projected attainments for all DTL sectors in 2016 at the March Council meeting. Table 2 below shows the trip limits in all four DTL sectors as established in the 2015-2016 Biennial Harvest Specifications process, except for Limited Entry North of 36° N lat. (LEN). The Council took action to lower the weekly trip limit in March and that change is reflected here. Note that due to workload, NMFS does not expect the trip limit change to be implemented into regulation until July 1 (start of Period 4).

Table 2: 2016 sablefish DTL trip limits (lbs.) by sector (Limited Entry North of 36° lat.= LEN; Open Access North of 36° lat. = OAN; Limited Entry South of 36° lat.= LES; Open Access South of 36° lat.= OAS).

Sector	Daily	Weekly	Bimonthly
LEN a/	-	1,125	3,375
OAN	300	1,000	2,000
LES	-	2,000	-
OAS	300	1,600	3,200

a/ Weekly trip limit of 1,275 lbs was established under the 2015-2016 Biennial Harvest Specifications process and expected to be in place until June 30.

Table 3 below shows the projected attainment for all DTL sectors for 2016 with hard data from PacFIN complete for 2015 for Washington and Oregon and through November for California. Note that the OAN attainment is 70 percent under No Action; alternative projected attainments can be seen under Action Items above. Ranges under price assumptions are shown for LEN¹ and LES². As stated above, 2015 data were weighted positively to other years in OAN to best project under the conditions that are expected in 2016 (i.e. lack of salmon, sardine, and Dungeness crab opportunities). Projections include QSM BER estimates through Period 1 (February 27, 2016).

Table 3: Projected landings (mt), landing targets (mt), and projected percent attainment in 2016 DTL fisheries.

¹ 2015 average price per period (with 2014 Period 6 average price used as a proxy since fishery closed in Period 6 for 2015), with ± 10 percent range.

² 2013-2015 average price per period with ± 10 percent range.

Sector	Projected Landings (mt)	Landing Target (mt)	Percent Attainment
LEN	200-229	258	78% - 89%
OAN	295	425	70%
LES	348-520	578	60%-90%
OAS	65	473	14%

2016 Overfished Species Scorecard

Attachment 1 has the updated overfished species scorecard for 2016. The estimated projected impact to canary rockfish for the nearshore fishery has been updated reflecting a recalculation of the projected 2016 mortality of lingcod for Oregon and California. Both states are seeing a definite increasing trend in lingcod mortality in the nearshore fishery. This recalculation did not change the estimated projected impact to yelloweye rockfish for the nearshore fishery, which is linked to overall landings of all stocks; while lingcod landings have continued to rise, the total landings are similar, but slightly higher, due to comparable decreases in non-lingcod landings. These slightly higher landings were enough to increase canary rockfish projections, but not enough to increase yelloweye rockfish projections.

Additionally, the estimated projected impacts to canary rockfish from scientific research activities increased from 4.5 mt to 5.8 mt as new research activities are reported to NMFS. Additional updates will be provided, as needed, in June.

PFMC
04/13/16

Attachment 1. Allocations^a and projected mortality impacts (mt) of overfished groundfish species for 2016.

Fishery	Bocaccio b/		Canary		Cowcod b/		Dkbl		Petrale		POP		Yelloweye	
	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts	Allocation a/	Projected Impacts
<i>Date: 13 April 2016</i>														
Off the Top Deductions	8.3	8.3	15.2	16.5	2.0	2.0	20.8	20.8	236.6	236.6	15.0	15.0	5.8	5.8
EFPC/	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Research d/	4.6	4.6	4.5	5.8	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	14.2	14.2	5.2	5.2	3.3	3.3
Incidental OA e/	0.7	0.7	2.0	2.0	--	--	18.4	18.4	2.4	2.4	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.2
Tribal f/			7.7	7.7			0.2	0.2	220.0	220.0	9.2	9.2	2.3	2.3
Bottom Trawl			0.8	0.8			0.2	0.2	45.4	70.0	3.7	3.7		0.0
Troll			0.5	0.5			0.0							0.0
Fixed gear			0.3	0.3			0.0						2.3	2.3
mid-water			3.6	3.6			0.0							0.0
whiting			4.3	4.9				0.3			7.2	11.1		
Trawl Allocations	85.0	81.9	58.5	58.5	1.4	1.4	308.9	308.9	2,638.4	2,638.4	141.6	141.6	1.1	1.1
-SB Trawl	85.0	81.9	44.5	44.5	1.4	1.4	292.8	292.8	2,633.4	2,633.4	124.2	124.2	1.1	1.1
-At-Sea Trawl			14.0	14.0			16.1	16.1	5.0	5.0	17.4	17.4	0.0	0.0
a) At-sea whiting MS			5.8	5.8			6.7	6.7			7.2	7.2		
b) At-sea whiting CP			8.2	8.2			9.4	9.4			10.2	10.2		
Non-Trawl Allocation	268.7	186.1	51.3	47.7	2.6	1.2	16.3	6.3	35.0		7.5	0.4	12.1	11.8
Non-Nearshore	82.1		3.9					6.1			0.4		0.6	0.7
LE FG				1.0						0.4				
OA FG				0.2										
Directed OA: Nearshore	1.0	0.5	6.9	7.5				0.2		0.0			1.9	1.8
Recreational Groundfish														
WA			3.5	2.0				--		--		--	3.1	2.8
OR			12.0	12.0				--		--		--	2.8	2.8
CA	185.6	185.6	25.0	25.0		1.2		--		--		--	3.7	3.7
TOTAL	362.0	276.3	125.0	122.7	6.0	4.6	346.0	336.0	2,910.0	2,875.0	164.1	157.0	19.0	18.7
2016 Harvest Specification	362	362	125	125	6.0	6.0	346	346	2,910	2,910	164	158	19	19
Difference	0.0	85.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.4	0.0	10.0	0.0	35.0	-0.1	1.0	0.0	0.3
Percent of ACL	100.0%	76.3%	100.0%	98.2%	100.0%	76.7%	100.0%	97.1%	100.0%	98.8%	100.1%	99.4%	100.0%	98.5%
Key			= not applicable											
		--	= trace, less than 0.1 mt											
			= Fixed Values											
			= off the top deductions											

a/ Formal allocations are represented in the black shaded cells and are specified in regulation in Tables 1b and 1e. The other values in the allocation columns are 1) off the top deductions, 2) set asides from the trawl allocation (at-sea petrale only) 3) ad-hoc allocations recommended in the 2013-14 EIS process, 4) HG for the recreational fisheries for canary and YE.

b/ South of 40°10' N. lat.

c/ EFPs are amounts set aside to accommodate anticipated applications. Values in this table represent the estimates from the 13-14 biennial cycle, which are currently specified in regulation.

d/ Includes NMFS trawl shelf-slope surveys, the IPHC halibut survey, and expected impacts from SRPs and LOAs.

e/ The GMT's best estimate of impacts as analyzed in the 2015-2016 Environmental Impact Statement (Appendix B), which are currently specified in regulation.

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