

NOTE: This motion may or may not have been modified on the Council floor. See the Final June 2010 Council Minutes and Voting Log for the final motion.

Agenda Item B.3.d
Supplemental WDFW Motion
June 2010

WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE MOTION B.3

I move the Council tentatively confirm its preliminary preferred alternative for annual catch limits (ACLs) for 2011 and 2012 for the following overfished species: petrale sole; canary rockfish; Pacific ocean perch; widow rockfish; and yelloweye rockfish, as described in Chapter 2 (Agenda Item B.3.a, Attachment 2), Table 2-1 on page 1, and tentatively adopt ACLs for bocaccio, cowcod, and darkblotched rockfish that are different than those in the preliminary preferred alternative.

Specifically, tentatively adopt the following:

Species	TTarget	Med Time to Rebuild	2011 ACL	2012 ACL	SPR
Bocaccio	2026	2022	263	274	77.7%
Canary	2027	2027	102	107	88.7%
Cowcod	2072	2068	3	3	82.7%
Darkblotched	2028	2025	298	296	64.9%
Pacific ocean perch*	2020	2020	180	183	86.4%
Widow	2015	2010	600	600	constant catch
Yelloweye**	2084	2084	20	20	72.8%
Petrale Sole	Tmax 2021	2016	976 mt	1,160 mt	ABC in 2011; 25:5 rule thereafter

*For POP, the ACL would be set at 180 mt in 2011 and 183 mt in 2012 with an annual catch target (ACT) of 150 mt. The ACT would apply to total mortality from all harvest sources and the intent would be to limit harvest to stay within the ACT by adopting the appropriate management measures. The purpose of the 30-33 mt difference between the ACT and the ACL would be to provide a buffer for management uncertainty associated with all harvest sources, including commercial, recreational, tribal, and research catches.

**For yelloweye, the ACL would be set at 20 mt with an ACT of 17 mt. The ACT would apply to total mortality from all harvest sources and the intent would be to limit harvest to stay within the ACT by adopting the appropriate management measures. The purpose of the 3 mt difference between the ACT and the ACL would be to provide a buffer for management uncertainty associated with all harvest sources, including commercial, recreational, tribal, and research catches.

Through this action, the median time to rebuild would replace the current TTarget values in the rebuilding plans.

With regard to petrale, because the intersector allocations adopted through Amendment 21 are suspended when a species either becomes overfished or is rebuilt, I would like to request the GMT review the non-trawl allocation of petrale of 5% as compared to recent harvest levels so the Council could consider whether to revise its trawl/non-trawl petrale allocations.

The intent of the motion is to provide guidance to the GMT, so they can review and discuss the management measures associated with these preliminary preferred ACLs with the GAP, and provide time for the Council to review the economic and protected resources data that we have recently received. The Council would then consider final approval of the actions taken under Agenda Item B.3 on Thursday under Agenda Item B.7.

PFMC
06/15/10