

Subject: Recreational Rockfish Regulations for 2011 and 2012

From: Tim <reelsteel@humboldt1.com>

Date: Tue, 14 Dec 2010 16:26:01 -0800

To: pfmc.comments@noaa.gov

CC: JRSmith@co.humboldt.ca.us, Phil Glenn <celtic4@suddenlink.net>, Flatland@mcn.org, Tom & Mary Marking <tmmarking@sbcglobal.net>

Dear Sirs, I am a charter boat operator in Eureka Ca. I am concerned that the 2011 and 2012 regulations for California will not go into effect on January 1 because the PFMC has not completed their review. The new California rockfish regulations allow for a slightly longer season in parts of Northern California. This added season length will increase the number of trips that we can make next year. I am already seeing interest from customers. Depending on weather, the longer season should help the local charter boats see a revenue increase of 15 to 20%. It is very important to us to know what our season length is so that we can book trips during the Sportsman Shows in January and February. Since we don't know what the salmon season will be like, we need to know what will be open during the season. I have hope that the longer season and relaxed restrictions on ling cod will provide increased business opportunities for recreational fishing based businesses like mine. Thank you, Tim Klassen
REEL STEEL SPORTFISHING Eureka Ca 707-499-5509

January 3, 2011

Mr. William Stelle
Northwest Regional Administrator
National Marine Fisheries Service
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-0070
ATTN: Becky Renko
RIN 0648-BA01

Dear Mr. Stelle:

The following comments are submitted in response to the proposed rule to establish 2011 – 2012 Pacific groundfish harvest specifications and implement revised overfished species rebuilding plans under Amendment 16-5 to the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan. These joint comments reflect the views of several organizations representing commercial and recreational fishermen, seafood processors, and fishery-related businesses located in the states of Washington, Oregon, and California.

In the *Federal Register* notice announcing the proposed rule (75 FR 67810 – 67896) NMFS asked for specific comments on whether the proposed annual catch limits (ACLs) for several overfished species are consistent with the 2010 court order in *NRDC v. Locke*. In that ruling, the court found that 2010 catch limits were set too high because there was insufficient data available to demonstrate that those limits would allow rebuilding in as short a time as possible while taking into account other factors required by statute. Most contentious was the perceived lack of a record demonstrating the needs of fishing communities. While those needs were more than adequately demonstrated for the 2007 – 2008 fisheries, the court found them inadequately demonstrated for the 2009 – 2010 fisheries. Thus, NMFS has now requested additional comment relating to this issue before making a decision on approving catch limits for the 2011 – 2012 fisheries.

The attached documents clearly show that, at a minimum, the harvest levels identified as the preferred alternatives by the Pacific Fishery Management Council are required in order to meet community needs and thus pass the test laid out by the statute and the court. We believe the information presented here more than justifies those Council recommendations.

Sincerely,

Rod Moore
West Coast Seafood Processors Association

Robert Alverson
Fishing Vessel Owners Association

Dan Waldeck
Pacific Whiting Conservation Cooperative

John Holloway
Recreational Fishing Alliance / Oregon

Steve Westrick
Westport Charterboat Association

Roger Thomas, President
Bob Ingles, Member, Board of Directors
Golden Gate Fishermen's Association

David Jincks
Midwater Trawlers Cooperative

Brad Pettinger
Oregon Trawl Commission

Introduction

This report provides information to bolster the Pacific Fishery Management Council's (PFMC) recommended 2011 - 2012 harvest levels for certain overfished species to demonstrate that some minimal harvest of those species is necessary to provide opportunity to catch healthy fish stocks. We firmly believe the PFMC recommendations balance the needs of fishing communities with the mandate to rebuild stocks in the shortest time frame possible.

While the comments briefly highlight scientific justifications for proposed harvest levels, the primary purpose of these comments is to describe how the PFMC preferred alternatives for overfished species in 2011-2012 take into account the needs of fishing communities. The comments further describe how lower Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) proposed in Alternatives 1 and 2 would negatively affect different sectors of the Pacific Coast Groundfish fishery as whole and/or individual west coast port communities who are dependent to some degree on groundfish fisheries.

These comments are patterned after the June 2006 Supplemental Groundfish Advisory Subpanel (GAP) report provided to the PFMC at the June 2006 meeting (Agenda Item F2.2.c Supplemental GAP Report) and include expanded community-specific information.

The report is divided into three parts. The first section includes general comments on current and future economic conditions in the Pacific Coast Groundfish fishery. The second section examines the effects of lower ACLs on a cumulative basis for all sectors. The last section summarizes the rationale for the preferred alternatives and contrasts the alternatives with lower ACL values to demonstrate the potentially negative impacts on fishery sectors as well as the west coast port communities that are affected.

A variety of sources were used to compile this report and include the Proposed Harvest Specifications and Management Measures for the 2011-2012 Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Draft Environmental Assessment; PFMC Briefing Book documents including Groundfish Management Team reports, GAP reports and public comments between 2006-2010; and the PacFIN data base. The generally accepted multiplier of 2.5 is used to generate community impacts from ex-vessel revenue amounts.

1. General Comments

Many of the comments presented in Agenda Item F.2.c Supplemental GAP Report from June 2006 are still appropriate and applicable today. The following comment rings true now more than ever:

"Taking into consideration the needs of fishing communities to avoid short and mid-term disastrous consequences has different meanings to different stakeholders. However, one fact is undisputable: short and long-term consequences to fishing communities are intrinsically linked. In order for there to be commercial and recreational fishing industries over the long term, short and mid-term management measures must help preserve fishing businesses. More plainly said, if no fishing industry exists into the future because of overly extreme cuts in harvest then the Council has not taken into account the economic needs of fishing communities. If individual businesses continue to become depleted, necessary infrastructure within fishing communities that support commercial and recreational industries also become depleted. Once boats are tied to the dock, doors are closed, [and] markets are lost, it isn't just one season's fishing foregone."

Consider yelloweye rockfish in the context described above. Yelloweye rockfish are incidentally taken by all sectors of the groundfish fishery except the commercial trawl whiting sector. If a zero harvest (zero impact) of yelloweye were imposed to meet the quickest time to rebuild we would eliminate virtually all commercial and recreational groundfish fisheries on the west coast. At the same time, the best available science tells us that even under a zero harvest of yelloweye the stock would not be rebuilt until 2047. Eliminating the "glue" (i.e. groundfish fisheries/sectors) that holds a majority of west coast commercial and recreational fishing business portfolios together and solvent will cripple the system and decimate businesses and coastal communities.

Allowing a trade-off in rebuilding time with a small impact on yelloweye stocks allows the fabric of west coast groundfish fisheries to remain whole. At 17 mt, the proposed Annual Catch Target equates to approximately 38,080 pounds of fish. At an average of 5-7 pounds per yelloweye this equates to just over 6,000 individual yelloweye that are necessary to keep our groundfish fisheries somewhat intact, albeit under severely reduced conditions and with numerous restrictions on the harvest of healthy species.

All sectors of the Pacific Coast Groundfish fishery have undergone severe restrictions in one form or another as a result of rebuilding plans. Rockfish Conservation Areas, depth restrictions, bycatch harvest caps, reduced trip limits, reduced bag limits, reduced seasons – all of these management measures are utilized to keep the groundfish fishery within a specified range of harvest. Many of these measures have eliminated or severely curtailed certain segments of the groundfish fishery resulting as well in closed and/or consolidated businesses. We hear again and again during public comments at the PFMC meetings that many participants are just barely hanging on and they fear the last “nail in the coffin” that finally destroys the fishing business that has long been their families’ only livelihood.

For years we have been trying to get socioeconomic information included in PFMC decision making. While some progress has been made, available data does not adequately demonstrate the dire consequences of failed businesses and communities. Moreover, it is not just fishermen and their crew (and families) that suffer, or seafood processors and their workforce (and families) that suffer, but all the secondary and tertiary businesses which are affected by reductions in fishing opportunities. And it’s not even just gear suppliers, ports, grocery stores, shoe stores and automotive dealers. It’s the states who lose revenue from landings taxes, business taxes, and reduced revenues based on personal income reductions. It’s a vicious cycle that is now exacerbated by the threat of litigation over approximately 6,000 individual yelloweye, a relatively small number of fish whose harvest can help stem the tide of despair while continuing to allow the yelloweye rockfish stock to rebuild.

The majority of hard-working people left in west coast fisheries want to continue fishing over the long term. They are working for sustainable fisheries within the system the law allows. Great strides have been made in the groundfish fishery in terms of improved gear, improved knowledge about stocks, improved cooperation and sharing of information between fishermen and fisheries, improved knowledge about the importance of all fisheries to the fabric of west coast communities, and innovative new ways to manage fisheries such as the Trawl IQ program. These are all the positive results of the hard work and collaboration of fishery participants. All overfished stocks are rebuilding. We are moving in a positive direction for the Pacific Coast Groundfish fishery. All participants ask is for the chance to allow all these positive initiatives to see continued and improved success, which requires a minimum amount of impact on species under rebuilding plans. Otherwise all the efforts at sustainability apply only to the biology of fish and not to sustaining our coastal communities and our fishing businesses.

It should go without saying that any loss of revenue to coastal communities during the current national and regional economic crisis should be avoided to the extent practicable. Many of the affected coastal communities have unemployment rates well above the national average of 9.8% Realty Trac reports that as of November, 2010, California had the 3rd highest foreclosure rate in the nation with one in every 233 households at some step in the foreclosure process. Many of the west coast counties described below as “vulnerable” or “most vulnerable” under the draft DEIS also are ranked as counties with “high” foreclosure rates. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) identifies the main tipping point that forces people into foreclosure as job loss. Eliminating jobs and revenue without meaningful gains in rebuilding times for overfished species should clearly be avoided. This is the delicate balance that managers must consider and the PFMC proposed ACLs will accomplish this goal.

2. Low ACL Options Cumulative Effects on Sectors

The nature of the west coast groundfish fishery requires a comprehensive approach to management necessitated by the multiple stocks and stock statuses and the multiple interactions between stocks and fishing strategies

across all sectors. It is important to note that under Alternative 1 ACLs, all sectors would be hampered to some degree and there is always the chance that entire fisheries and seasons can be eliminated if an ACL is projected to be exceeded. All sectors of the groundfish fishery contributed more than \$73 million in ex-vessel revenue in 2009 equating to over \$182 million in revenue to affected communities. While this seems to be an impressive number, it is below the 5-year average of just over \$85 million in ex-vessel revenue and significantly less than the \$93 million dollars in ex-vessel revenue generated in the year 2000.

Any new restrictions occur on top of the cumulative effects of closed areas, gear changes and restrictions, restricted bag limits, seasonal closures, reduced trip limits and other restrictive management measures already in place.

All of the Alternative 1 ACLs (or ACTs) for 2011 are lower than initial 2009-2010 Optimum Yields sans widow rockfish. Closed areas in all three states (through state processes) and the rebuilding paradox alone exacerbate an already distressed fishery; implementing ACLs that are even lower than the current limited opportunities will negatively affect participants and fishing communities in a significant way and reduce ex-vessel revenue causing job loss and associated economic loss to affected communities.

Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting and Whiting

In 2009 west coast trawl fisheries contributed over \$46,000,000 in ex-vessel revenue - this equates to over \$115,000,000 in positive economic impact to affected communities.

Alternative 1 ACLs result in the lowest trawl allocations for overfished species of all the available ACL alternatives and all ACLs equate to the possibility of lost revenue or a reduction in the \$46,000,000 in ex-vessel revenue and \$115,000,000 in economic impact to affected communities.

Species	Trawl Allocation under status quo fishery (2010)	Trawl Allocation under Alternative 1 ACL	Percent change from 2010
Canary rockfish	21 mt	8.0 mt	62% LESS
Yelloweye rockfish	0.6 mt	0.4 mt	33% LESS
Cowcod	1.5 mt	0.9 mt	40% LESS
Darkblotched rockfish	230 mt	175.8 mt	24% LESS
Bocaccio rockfish	16.1 mt	4.7 mt	71% LESS
Pacific Ocean Perch	100.8 mt	33.8 mt	66% LESS
Petrale Sole	1,111 mt	342 mt	79% LESS

In recent years the bulk of non-whiting landings (by weight) in the limited entry non-whiting trawl sector was made up of Dover sole, Arrowtooth Flounder, Petrale sole, sablefish, short spine thornyheads and longspine thornyheads. Under alternative 1 & 2 ACLs sablefish, petrale sole and Dover sole opportunities will be reduced for the limited entry non-whiting trawl fishery. Even under the PFMC's preferred alternative, there will be

reduced catches for sablefish and petrale sole. There will be less opportunity to target healthy stocks because of low overfished species ACLs - all resulting in reduced annual catches and a reduction in the \$46,000,000 ex-vessel revenue generated from the catch.

Species	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	2010	Difference
Dover sole					
<i>Projected catch a/</i>	10,575 mt	12,492 mt	17,710 mt	13,829 mt	3,254 mt LESS to 3,881 mt more
<i>Projected ex-vessel revenue b/</i>	\$7,784,638	\$9,195,810	\$13,036,968	\$10,180,024	\$2,395,386 LESS to \$2,856,944 more
Sablefish					
<i>Projected catch a/</i>	2,187 mt	2,325 mt	2,538 mt	2,915 mt	728 mt – 377 mt LESS
<i>Projected ex-vessel revenue b/</i>	\$9,269,144	\$9,854,028	\$10,756,785	\$12,354,621	\$3,085,477 - \$1,597,836 LESS
Petrale Sole					
<i>Projected catch a/</i>	341 mt	632 mt	851 mt	1111 mt	770 mt – 260 mt LESS
<i>Projected ex-vessel revenue b/</i>	\$962,753	\$1,784,340	\$2,402,648	\$3,136,712	\$2,173,959 - \$734,064 LESS

a/ Projected catch values taken from DEIS Appendix C Trawl Projected Impact Tables

b/ Projected ex-vessel revenue utilizes average price per pound in 2010 from PacFIN

What’s more, in order to stay within the ACLs for overfished species, the required management measures for all species result in projected catches that are significantly below the targets for many of the remaining trawl-caught species. In the table below projected catches and trawl allocations are from the DEIS, Appendix C. Revenue is based on average price per pound for each trawl species in 2010.

Species	Projected Catch compared to trawl allocation and projected ex-vessel revenue under Alternative 1	Projected Catch compared to trawl allocation and associated ex-vessel revenue under Alternative 2	Projected Catch compared to trawl allocation and associated ex-vessel revenue under Alternative 3	Projected Ex-vessel revenue for 2010 catch
Longspine	1,326 mt / 2000 mt \$987,806	1,337 mt / 2,000 mt \$996,000	1,341 mt / 1,971 mt \$998,980	1,512 mt = \$1,126,367
Shortspine	1,283 mt / 1,450 mt \$1,693,811	1,418 mt / 1,450 mt \$1,747,027	1,387 mt / 1,450 mt \$1,708,833	1,335 mt = \$1,762,461
Arrowtooth	3,447 mt / 14,166 mt \$736,927	4,607 mt / 14,166 mt \$883,383	5,524 mt / 12,441 mt \$1,059,215	5,181 mt = \$993,446
English sole	424 mt / 18,659 mt \$290,628	439 mt / 18,659 mt \$300,909	458 mt / 18,659 mt \$313,933	598 mt = \$409,895

The whiting fishery will also be hampered by the low ACLs for species of concern. The lower trawl allocations will likely result in more restrictive bycatch caps that could prevent one or all of the three sectors from achieving their whiting allocation – thus foregoing millions of dollars in revenue. In 2008 the whiting sectors combined to produce over \$57 million dollars in ex-vessel revenue and over \$144 million in economic contributions to affected communities.

Low ACLs also affect the flexibility managers will have when implementing the trawl IQ program and this affects both the non-whiting and whiting fisheries. An example of an unexpected consequence of the program came to light recently when Fort Bragg non-whiting trawl fishermen notified the Council they were not allocated enough yelloweye (in some cases zero) to prosecute healthy target fisheries. The lower the ACL, the less flexibility in dealing with unintended consequences of the IQ fishery during the first year of implementation.

Fixed Gear

Fixed gear fisheries contributed over \$27,000,000 in ex-vessel revenue in 2009 which equates to over \$81,000,000 in economic impact to affected communities. Any reduction in opportunities will lower the ex-vessel revenue and negatively affect communities.

The non-nearshore fixed gear fishery mainly targets sablefish. According to the DEIS, Alternative 1 ACLs, particularly for canary, “are so low that RCAs would have to be restricted to depths that are deeper than implemented since the inception of RCAs and sablefish allocations would have to be reduced by as much as 42 percent.” Obviously the results of the management measures could be catastrophic and include reduced annual catches, fewer areas to fish, longer-distance runs to fishing grounds, decreased revenue and catch rates, increased effort and costs, increased gear conflicts and increased safety concerns.

The 2010 OY/ACL for sablefish was 6,471 mt resulting in a fixed gear allocation of 2,140 mt. At an average price of \$2.80 per pound this equates to projected ex-vessel revenue of \$13,206,368 and an associated community impact of \$33,015,920. A 42% reduction in the fixed gear allocation from 2010 would equate to 1,241.2 mt which results

in a projected loss of over \$5.5 million dollars to the fixed gear fishery and associated \$11 million dollar loss to affected communities. These dollar projections are probably conservative as sablefish prices in the directed fishery versus the daily trip limit fishery are not separated out and an average price (from PacFIN) was used for the calculation.

The nearshore fixed gear fisheries in Oregon and California are severely affected under Alternative 1 & 2 ACLs. Neither state can maintain opportunities that are similar to the limited opportunities available in 2010 thus resulting in reduced annual catches and reduced revenue. Total catches include black rockfish, blue rockfish, cabezon, kelp greenling, lingcod, deeper nearshore rockfish, other minor rockfish, and shallow nearshore rockfish.

2010 projected catch	Alternative 1		Alternative 2				Alternative 3 (PPA)
456 mt	Option 1	Option 2	Option 1		Option 2		525 mt
	226 mt	232 mt	1a	1b	2a	2b	
			413 mt	328 mt	420 mt	336 mt	
	50% LESS than 2010	49% LESS than 2010	9% Less than 2010	28% Less than 2010	8% Less than 2010	26% Less than 2010	115% of 2010

Washington, Oregon & California Recreational

All sectors of the recreational fishery in all three states are negatively affected under Alternatives 1 & 2 – all would require changes to fathom line fishing areas (all would be more restricted) as well as reductions to seasons in the order of magnitude of months. Any opportunities afforded the recreational sectors in all three states under ACLs in Alternative 1 will result in significant reductions in opportunity and revenue.

It is more challenging to estimate the social and economic value of recreational fishing than it is for commercial fishing purposes and different methods are used to equate potential affects from changes to regulations. For example, the DEIS from June 2006 noted that in 2005 California Recreational survey data for northern California recorded almost 57,000 angler trips for the months of September and October alone. To develop the economic value of these trips, local businesses, harbor masters, restaurants, motels, sports shops, marine mechanics and suppliers, fuel docks, harbors, and associated businesses that support the sport fishing community all must be considered and evaluated.

The Groundfish Advisory Panel (GAP) noted in 2010: “To-date loss of time on the water due to restrictions, closures, bag limit reductions and effort shift to other areas by tourists have already resulted in the loss of tens of millions of dollars to coastal communities.”

An illustration of these effects is the early closure of the groundfish season in 2008 in the northern coastal California region due to yelloweye impacts. In September and October of 2008, the season was closed in an emergency action resulting in the direct loss of more than \$3.7 million dollars PER MONTH to the Humboldt County area alone. Attachment #1 to these comments describes the expenditures on a trip and annual basis that support these projected losses. Chapter 3 of the DEIS states that over 567,000 trips (charter plus private) were taken for groundfish in 2009. Using the \$130 expenditure amount per angler per day, this equates to over \$74 million dollars spent on sport fishing activities in 2009 and over \$180 million in economic contributions to affected

communities. Any reductions to current opportunities in California (as projected under Alternatives 1 & 2 ACLs) will result in reductions from this expenditure amount in 2011 and 2012.

Oregon has already suffered losses in the recreational charter fleet – down from 232 boats in 2001 to 76 businesses in 2008. Only seventy-five percent of these boats can operate on a full-time basis and many businesses have already gone under. Chapter 3 of the DEIS states that 71,822 trips (charter and private) for groundfish were taken in 2009. Using the \$130 expenditure amount per angler per day, this equates to over \$9 million dollars spent in Oregon on sport fishing activities and over \$22.5 million in economic contributions to affected communities. Any reductions to current opportunities in Oregon (as projected under Alternatives 1 & 2 ACLs) will result in reductions from this expenditure amount in 2011 and 2012.

Washington businesses are struggling already due to recent restrictions, shorter halibut seasons, fathom restrictions, high fuel prices and in general a poor economy – all of this affects businesses in all sectors that support sport fishing. Walking down the streets of any Washington port and seeing vacant storefronts where thriving businesses used to operate is an ominous reminder of what has occurred in recent years. According to Chapter 3 of the DEIS, 17,682 trips (charter plus private) in Washington were associated with groundfish. Using the \$130 expenditure per day per angler this equates to a conservative estimate of over \$2 million dollars spent on sport fishing activities and over \$5 million in economic contributions to affected communities. Any reductions to current opportunities in Washington (as projected under Alternatives 1 & 2 ACLs) will result in reductions from this expenditure amount in 2011 and 2012.

Research

Research opportunities could be curtailed or eliminated under Alternative 1 ACLs – both the annual surveys that inform management and stock assessments and the exempted fishing permits that research gear and fishing techniques to reduce bycatch while targeting healthy stocks.

3. Individual Species Impact Discussion

The following section details information specific to each species including the PFMC recommendation, the fisheries affected by the recommendation, the communities that are affected by changes to regulations and available limits for that species, scientific rationale for the recommendation, regained opportunities when applicable, and individual affects on sectors due to management measures to attain low value ACLs.

YELLOWEYE ROCKFISH

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 20 mt in 2011 and 2012 with Annual Catch Targets of 17 mt for both years

Fisheries Affected

Yelloweye rockfish are currently caught in virtually all West Coast fisheries including:

- Research Fisheries
- Tribal Fisheries
- Washington Recreational Fisheries
- Oregon Recreational Fisheries
- California Recreational Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Fixed Gear Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Groundfish Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Fisheries With Incidental Groundfish Catch
 - Pink Shrimp

- Salmon Troll

Communities Affected

- There are at least 31 port communities affected by the amount of yelloweye rockfish available.
- These port communities are in counties with unemployment rates ranging from a low of 7.3% (Whatcom County, Washington) to a high of 13.3% (Winchester Bay, Oregon).
- Fifty-five percent of these communities have unemployment rates higher than the November 2010 national average of 9.8%
- Over 1/3 of the communities ranked as “highly” dependent on groundfish fisheries
- Just under 1/3 of the communities were ranked with a “medium” dependency on groundfish fisheries
- Sixty-five percent of the communities received a “vulnerable” rank with respect to changes in groundfish fisheries with 12 communities receiving the “most vulnerable” rating
 - 23% of Washington communities were rated “most vulnerable”
 - 33% of Oregon communities were rated “most vulnerable”
 - 75% of California communities were rated “most vulnerable”

State of Washington				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Aberdeen	Grays Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable
Bellingham	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Blaine	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Cathlamet	Wakiakum	11.9%	Not Ranked	
Chinook	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Everett	Snohomish	9.8%	Not Dependent	
Ilwaco	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
La Push	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Mill Creek	Snohomish	9.8%	Not Dependent	
Neah Bay	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Port Angeles	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Port Townsend	Jefferson	8.3%	Not Dependent	
Seattle	King	8.5%	Not Dependent	
Tokeland	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Westport	Gray’s Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable

State of Oregon				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Astoria	Clatsop	9.1%	Medium	Vulnerable
Bandon	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Brookings	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Charleston	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Depoe Bay	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable

Florence	Lane	10.1%	Low	
Garibaldi	Tillamook	9%	Medium	
Gold Beach	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Newport	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Pacific City	Tillamook	9%	Medium	
Port Orford	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Winchester Bay	Douglas	13.3%	Low	

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Crescent City	Del Norte	12.6%	High	Vulnerable
Eureka	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Fields Landing	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Trinidad	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- Yelloweye rockfish are rebuilding, albeit slowly
- The SPR harvest rate under this alternative is more conservative than the SPR harvest rate in the ramp-down strategy for 2010
- This alternative represents a more conservative harvest rate than adopted in the FMP
- Rebuilds 3 years earlier than the median time to rebuild under the FMP SPR harvest rate
- Adds 37 years to T-target which is 2047 under a zero harvest level
- Includes an ACT level to ensure the ACL level is not exceeded and which reduces rebuilding time by 10 years from the ACL level
- Level allows for limited but increased research opportunity

Impacts of lower ACL values

- Alternative 1 ACL of 13 mt in 2011 and 2012; Alternative 2 ACL of 17 mt in 2011 and 2012

Limited Entry Trawl

The non-whiting trawl fishery would be negatively affected under ACL alternative 1 which results in a trawl allocation that is 33% less than what is available to the fishery in 2010. Alternative 2 would result in a trawl allocation approximately equal to the 2010 fishery. As described in the previous section, the lower ACL amount for yelloweye will affect the flexibility that managers have when dealing with unintended consequences during the first year of the trawl IQ program.

Nearshore Fixed Gear

Oregon and California would be severely constrained by yelloweye rockfish. Neither state would be able to maintain opportunities that are similar to 2009-2010 resulting in nearshore fishermen and communities being negatively affected by low ACL values for yelloweye rockfish. Oregon would require lower catches of the most

important near shore species (black rockfish and greenling) to stay within projected yelloweye impacts. Likewise in California, lower landings limits on black rockfish and cabezon would be imposed to stay within overfished species limits. In addition the shoreward boundaries of the RCA would be set at 20 fathoms (moved shoreward from 30 fathoms) for all areas except between 43° and 46°16':

Shoreward RCA Boundary	South 34° 27'	34°27'-40°10'	40°10'-42°	42°-Col/Eur 43°	Col/Eur 43°-46°16'	North of 46°16'
Shore						
20 fm						
30 fm						
60 fm						

(Grey areas are closed to fishing)

In addition to less access to target species resulting in lower annual catches, expanding RCA boundaries towards shore increases the opportunities for gear conflicts and reduces the area available for fishing. All of these reduce revenue to fishermen, processors and coastal communities.

Washington Recreational

The DEIS states “the most restrictive option for the Washington recreational groundfish fishery would be in place under Alternative 1.” The bottom fish limit would be reduced from 15 to 12 fish per day and would include a new cabezon sub limit of two fish per angler per day. This sublimit would be in addition to sublimits for rockfish and lingcod at 10 and 2 fish, respectively. The 20 fathom depth restriction would be in place for a longer time period than in 2009-2010 in Management areas 3 and 4.

Oregon Recreational

An ACL of 13 mt could result in an Oregon recreational season which is open year-round but only in waters between shore and 20 fathoms. Any options considered to meet this alternative are more restrictive than fishing regulations in place during the 2009-2010 seasons. There is also an option to expand the Yelloweye RCA at Stonewall Bank.

California Recreational

To meet the 13 mt ACL a “reduction to the already highly constrained three month fishing season in the North-Central North of Point Arena Management Area would be needed”. The reduction would equate to a 1.5 month season – a reduction of 50% of fishing time versus the already very limited status quo.

Reductions to the seasons in both the North-Central South of Point Arena Management Area and the South Central Management area would also be imposed at .5 months and 1 month, respectively.

It is important to note that maintaining yelloweye catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with yelloweye. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

DARKBLOTCHED ROCKFISH

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 332 mt in 2011 and 329 mt in 2012.

Fisheries Affected

Darkblotched rockfish is currently taken in several West Coast fisheries including:

- Research Fisheries
- Tribal Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry fixed-gear Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Groundfish Fisheries

Communities Affected

- There are at least 13 port communities in Washington, Oregon and California that are affected by the amount of darkblotched rockfish available for harvest.
- These communities are in counties where the unemployment rate ranges from a low of 7.3% (Whatcom County, Washington) to a high of 12.6% (Del Norte County, California).
- Over half of these communities (7 or 54%) have unemployment rates higher than the November 2010 national average of 9.8%.
- Just under half of these communities (6 or 46%) are ranked as “highly” dependent on groundfish fisheries
- Five of these communities are ranked with a “medium” dependency on groundfish fisheries
- A majority of the communities received a “vulnerable” rank with regards to changes in groundfish fisheries with six of the communities receiving the “most vulnerable” rating
 - 40% of Washington communities were ranked “most vulnerable”
 - 50% of Oregon communities were ranked “most vulnerable”
 - 67% of California communities were ranked “most vulnerable”

State of Washington				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Bellingham	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Blaine	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Ilwaco	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Neah Bay	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Westport	Gray’s Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable

State of Oregon				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Astoria	Clatsop	9.1%	Medium	Vulnerable
Brookings	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Charleston	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Newport	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Crescent City	Del Norte	12.6%	High	Vulnerable
Eureka	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Fort Bragg	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most vulnerable
Trinidad	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- Darkblotched rockfish continues to rebuild at a steady rate and is at 25% of the unfished biomass with an upward trajectory, according to the latest stock assessment
- Rebuilds one year faster than T-target
- Several currently restricted opportunities could be made available:
 - Trawl: darkblotched constrains slope rockfish, sablefish, whiting, shortspine and longspine thornyheads, Dover sole and all other fisheries seaward of the RCA – opportunities for increased harvest seaward of the RCA could be explored
 - Open access fisheries have been constrained due to the rebuilding paradox – an example is the shrimp fishery. During good years shrimpers tend to encounter more darkblotched rockfish – a higher ACL could accommodate that fishery more appropriately without constraining other fisheries.

Impacts of Lower ACL values

- The Alternative 1 ACLs of 222 mt in 2011 and 2012 result in a reduction of 33% from 2010 levels.
- The Alternative 2 ACLs of 298 mt in 2011 and 296 mt in 2012 result in a reduction of 10% from 2010 levels.
- The Alternative 3 (preferred) ACLs of 332 mt in 2011 and 329 mt in 2012 result in similar fishing opportunities for 2011.

Limited Entry Trawl

Darkblotched rockfish continue to constrain slope rockfish, sablefish, whiting, shortspine and longspine thornyheads, Dover sole and all other fisheries seaward of the RCA by allowing reduced opportunities to harvest these healthy stocks. Lower darkblotched ACLs will likely result in more restrictive bycatch caps for the whiting fishery with the potential for one or more whiting sectors forgoing a portion of their whiting allocation. In addition, the lower ACLs will affect the flexibility managers have when attending to unintended consequences during the first year of the trawl IQ program.

It is important to note that maintaining darkblotched catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with darkblotched rockfish. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to

lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

COWCOD

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 4 mt in 2011 and 2012.

Fisheries Affected

Cowcod are caught in the following California fisheries south of 38°10’ N. Lat:

- Research Fisheries
- California Recreational Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Fixed-Gear Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Groundfish Fisheries

Communities Affected

- There are at least 31 port communities that are affected by the amount of cowcod available for harvest.
- These communities are all located in the state of California south of 38° 10’ N. Lat.
- All communities are in counties with an unemployment rate ranging from a low of 8% (Marin County) to a high of 15.7% (Fresno County).
- Twenty-one of the communities have unemployment rates higher than the November 2010 national average of 9.8%.
- One-third of California port communities (10 or 32%) are ranked as “highly” dependant on groundfish fisheries
- Over half of California communities (18 or 58%) are ranked with a “medium” dependence on groundfish fisheries
- Over one-third of these port communities (35%) received a “vulnerable” score related to changes in groundfish fisheries and 5 of these communities received the “most vulnerable” rank.

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Albion	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Avila	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Berkeley	Alameda	11%	Low	
Big Creek	Fresno	15.7%	Not Rated	
Bodega Bay	Sonoma	9.7%	Medium	
Dana Point	Orange	9.1%	Medium	
Elk	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Fort Bragg	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	8.5%	Medium	
Long Beach	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
Mission Bay	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
Monterey	Monterey	10.4%	High	Vulnerable
Morro Bay	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Moss Landing	Monterey	10.4%	High	Vulnerable

Newport Beach	Orange	9.1%	Medium	
Oceanside	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
Oxnard	Ventura	12.5%	Medium	
Playa Del Rey	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
Point Arena	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Point Loma	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
Point Reyes	Marin	8%	Low	
San Diego	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
San Francisco	San Francisco	9.3%	Medium	
San Pedro	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
San Simeon	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	8.7%	Medium	
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	10.6%	Medium	
Shelter Cove	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most Vulnerable
Terminal Island	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
Ventura	Ventura	12.5%	Medium	
Wilmington	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- Cowcod is rebuilding, albeit slowly
- Most of the cowcod habitat is protected inside the Cowcod Conservation Area (CCA)
- Cowcod is extremely important to the recreational and trawl fisheries south of 40°10'
- This level of catch is consistent with recent years
- Cowcod impacts have varied over the last five years and this ACL encompasses that variability

Impacts of lower ACL values

- The Alternative 1 ACL of 2 mt in 2011 and 2012 equate to a 50% reduction from 2010 levels. These levels could eliminate research activities in the area as well as require changes to the recreational fisheries in the Southern Management Area.
- The Alternative 2 ACL of 3 mt in 2011 and 2012 equate to a 25% reduction from 2010 levels. These levels could adversely affect or eliminate research activities in the area.
- The Alternative 3 (preferred) ACL of 4 mt in 2011 and 2012 is equal to 2010 levels.

See the cumulative effects of lower ACL values for individual sector affects described above.

It is important to note that maintaining cowcod catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with cowcod. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels.

This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

CANARY ROCKFISH

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 102 mt for 2011 and 107 mt for 2012.

Fisheries Affected

Canary rockfish are caught in all the major fishery sectors, including:

- Research Fisheries
- Washington Recreational Fisheries
- Oregon Recreational Fisheries
- California Recreational Fisheries
- Tribal Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-Whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Fixed Gear Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Groundfish Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Fisheries with Incidental Groundfish Catch
 - California Halibut
 - Pink Shrimp
 - Salmon Troll

Communities Affected

- There are at least 46 port communities in Washington (15 or 33%), Oregon (12 or 25%) and California (19 or 41%) that are affected by the amount of canary rockfish available for harvest.
- These port communities are all in counties with unemployment rates ranging from a low of 7.3% (Whatcom County, Washington) to a high of 15.7% (Fresno County, California).
- Over half (61%) of these communities are located in counties that have unemployment rates higher than the November 2010 national average of 9.8%.
- Almost half of these communities (21 or 46%) are ranked as “highly” dependent on groundfish fisheries
- 13 communities (28%) are ranked with a “medium” dependence on groundfish fisheries
- Twenty-seven of these communities (59%) received a “vulnerable” score related to changes in groundfish fisheries with a majority of those communities (17) receiving the “most vulnerable” status
 - 5 most vulnerable communities in Washington (1/3 of Washington port communities)
 - 4 most vulnerable communities in Oregon (1/4 of Oregon port communities)
 - 8 most vulnerable communities in California (1/2 of California port communities)

State of Washington				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Aberdeen	Grays Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable
Bellingham	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Blaine	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Cathlamet	Wakiakum	11.9%	Not Ranked	
Chinook	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Everett	Snohomish	9.8%	Not Dependent	

Ilwaco	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
La Push	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Mill Creek	Snohomish	9.8%	Not Dependent	
Neah Bay	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Port Angeles	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Port Townsend	Jefferson	8.3%	Not Dependent	
Seattle	King	8.5%	Not Dependent	
Tokeland	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Westport	Gray's Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable

State of Oregon				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Astoria	Clatsop	9.1%	Medium	Vulnerable
Bandon	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Brookings	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Charleston	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Depoe Bay	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Florence	Lane	10.1%	Low	
Garibaldi	Tillamook	9%	Medium	
Gold Beach	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Newport	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Pacific City	Tillamook	9%	Medium	
Port Orford	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Winchester Bay	Douglas	13.3%	Low	

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Albion	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Avila	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Big Creek	Fresno	15.7%	Not Rated	
Bodega Bay	Sonoma	9.7%	Medium	
Crescent City	Del Norte			
Elk	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Eureka	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most Vulnerable
Fields Landing	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most Vulnerable
Fort Bragg	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	8.5%	Medium	
Monterey	Monterey	10.4%	High	Vulnerable
Morro Bay	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Moss Landing	Monterey	10.4%	High	Vulnerable
Point Arena	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Point Reyes	Marin	8%	Low	
San Francisco	San Francisco	9.3%	Medium	

Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	10.6%	Medium	
Shelter Cove	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most Vulnerable
Trinidad	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most Vulnerable

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- The latest assessment for canary rockfish demonstrates that the stock has been rebuilding since 2000
- This level of harvest equates to an additional 3 years to rebuild as compared to a zero-harvest alternative
- New information used to inform the 2009 assessment resulted in a new T-target for rebuilding – rebuilding has still been occurring since 2000
- Availability of some level of canary rockfish in the majority of fisheries is critical to prosecuting those fisheries – this option allows greater management flexibility for bycatch in all sectors and more equitably distributes bycatch to slow the loss of valuable fishing heritage
- Several cumulative management measures are already in place to support rebuilding of canary rockfish
- The majority of the 2010 OY of 105 mt is projected to be nearly fully utilized
- Several regained opportunities could include:
 - Recreational: liberalizing of RCA boundaries from 20 fathoms to 30 fathoms north of 40°10', a one-fish bag limit reducing regulatory discards, and reduction in impacts to other recreationally-caught species of concern (i.e. yellow-eye)
 - Trawl whiting: flexibility for the whiting fishery which has been constrained by canary in recent years
 - Trawl non-whiting: mid-water yellowtail rockfish opportunities, arrowtooth flounder opportunities, chilipepper rockfish opportunities and to a lesser degree an opportunity to regain lingcod, sanddabs, and a shallow-water English sole fishery.

Impacts of lower ACL values

- The Alternative 1 ACLs of 49 mt in 2011 and 51 mt in 2012 equate to a reduction of 53% and 51% from 2010 levels.
- The Alternative 2 ACLs of 94 mt in 2011 and 99 mt in 2012 equate to a reduction of 10% and 5% respectively from 2010.
- The Alternative 3 (preferred) ACLs of 102 mt in 2011 and 107 mt in 2012 are more in line with 2010 catches although there is a slight reduction between 2010 and 2011 (3%)

Limited Entry Trawl

The Alternative 1 ACL of 49 mt equates to a trawl allocation of 8 mt – 62% less than what is available in 2010. This will affect both the non-whiting and whiting sectors negatively. The whiting sectors would likely have lower bycatch caps which could preclude them from attaining their whiting allocations.

See the cumulative effects of lower ACL values for individual sector effects described above.

It is important to note that maintaining canary catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with canary rockfish. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for

measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

BOCACCIO

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 263 mt for 2011 and 274 mt for 2012.

Fisheries Affected

Bocaccio is caught in the following fisheries occurring south of 40°10’:

- Research fisheries
- California Recreational Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Fixed-Gear Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Groundfish Fisheries
- Open Access Incidental Fisheries
 - California halibut
 - California gillnet
 - Coastal pelagic species wetfish
 - Pink shrimp
 - Ridgeback prawn
 - Salmon troll

Communities Affected

- There are at least 31 port communities that are affected by the amount of bocaccio available for harvest.
- These communities are all located in the State of California, south of 40°10’ North latitude.
- These communities are all located in counties with unemployment rates ranging from a low of 8% (Marin County) to a high of 15.7% (Fresno County).
- A majority of the communities (68%) have unemployment rates higher than the November 2010 national average of 9.8%
- Just under 1/3 of the communities are rated as “highly” dependent on groundfish fisheries
- Over half the communities were rated with a “medium” dependency on groundfish fisheries
- Just under 40% of the communities received a “vulnerable” ranking with regards to changes in groundfish fisheries with five communities receiving the “most vulnerable” ranking

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Albion	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Avila	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Berkeley	Alameda	11%	Low	
Big Creek	Fresno	15.7%	Not Rated	
Bodega Bay	Sonoma	9.7%	Medium	
Dana Point	Orange	9.1%	Medium	

Elk	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Fort Bragg	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Half Moon Bay	San Mateo	8.5%	Medium	
Long Beach	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
Mission Bay	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
Monterey	Monterey	10.4%	High	Vulnerable
Morro Bay	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Moss Landing	Monterey	10.4%	High	Vulnerable
Newport Beach	Orange	9.1%	Medium	
Oceanside	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
Oxnard	Ventura	12.5%	Medium	
Playa Del Rey	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
Point Arena	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most Vulnerable
Point Loma	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
Point Reyes	Marin	8%	Low	
San Diego	San Diego	10.2%	Medium	
San Francisco	San Francisco	9.3%	Medium	
San Pedro	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
San Simeon	San Luis Obispo	9.4%	High	
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	8.7%	Medium	
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	10.6%	Medium	
Shelter Cove	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most Vulnerable
Terminal Island	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable
Ventura	Ventura	12.5%	Medium	
Wilmington	Los Angeles	12.5%	Medium	Vulnerable

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- Bocaccio have displayed significant rebuilding since being declared overfished in 1999
- This level of harvest equates to an 86.8% chance of rebuilding four years ahead of schedule
- ACLs for both years are significantly less than the preferred Allowable Biological Catch (ABC) (2011 ACL is 36% of ABC and 2012 ACL is 37% of ABC)
- ACLs for both years are less than the 2010 OY (7% less in 2011 and 5% less in 2012)
- Restrictions on bocaccio availability have created significant restraints on several California fisheries over the last ten years including the spot and ridgeback prawn trawl fisheries, the California halibut fishery, sea cucumber fishery, overall California open access fisheries, the California limited entry trawl fishery and most notably, all of the California recreational fisheries.

Impacts of ACL Values

From 2005-2010 the annual OY for bocaccio has averaged 270 mt:

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Annual OY	307 mt	306 mt	218 mt	218 mt	288 mt	288 mt

- The Alternative 1 ACLs (53 mt in 2011; 56 mt in 2012) equate to an 80% and 79% reduction respectively from the average OY 2005-2010 and a dramatic 82% reduction between 2010 and 2011.
- The Alternative 2 ACLs (109 mt in 2011; 115 mt in 2012) equate to a 60% and 57% reduction respectively from the average 2005-2010 OY and a significant 62% reduction between 2010 and 2011.
- The Alternative 3 (preferred) ACLs (263 mt in 2011; 274 mt in 2012) equate to a 5% reduction between 2010 and 2011.

Alternatives 2 and 3 do not further constrain any sectors of the current fisheries but it is important to note that current fisheries have already been severely constrained. Alternative 1 adds additional levels of restrictions for the California recreational fishery with an economically damaging 5-month season reduction in the Southern Management Area and a 1-month season reduction in the Northern Management Area.

See the cumulative effects of lower ACL values for individual sector affects described in the previous section.

Maintaining bocaccio catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with bocaccio. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

PACIFIC OCEAN PERCH

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 180 mt in 2011 and 183 mt in 2012

Fisheries Affected

POP is currently taken in several West Coast fisheries including:

- Research Fisheries
- Tribal Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting fisheries
- Limited Entry Fixed-Gear Fisheries
- Open Access directed Groundfish Fisheries

Communities Affected

- There are 12 port communities in Washington, Oregon and California that are affected by the amount of Pacific Ocean Perch available for harvest.
- These communities are in counties where unemployment rates range from a low of 7.3% (Whatcom County, Washington) to a high of 12.6% (Del Norte County, California).
- A majority of these communities (59%) are located in counties where the unemployment rate is above the November 2010 national average of 9.8%.
- 50% (6) of these communities were ranked “highly” dependent on groundfish fisheries
- Just under half of the communities were ranked with a “medium” dependency on groundfish Fisheries
- 83% of these communities (10) received a “vulnerable” rank with regards to changes in the groundfish fishery with a majority receiving the “most vulnerable” rating

- 40% of Washington communities ranked “most vulnerable”
- 50% of Oregon communities ranked “most vulnerable”
- 67% of California communities ranked “most vulnerable”

State of Washington				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Bellingham	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Blaine	Whatcom	7.3%	Medium	
Ilwaco	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Neah Bay	Clallam	8.9%	Medium	Vulnerable
Westport	Gray’s Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable

State of Oregon				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Astoria	Clatsop	9.1%	Medium	Vulnerable
Brookings	Curry	11.7%	High	Vulnerable
Charleston	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Newport	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Crescent City	Del Norte	12.6%	High	Vulnerable
Eureka	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Fort Bragg	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most vulnerable

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- POP are rebuilding
- Current rate of exploitation is less than 1%
- This level adds 2 years to rebuilding time compared with a zero harvest option
- This alternative includes an ACT lower than the ACL to ensure catches do not exceed the ACL
- Regained opportunities:
 - Trawl – could provide greater access to the slope complex, especially during summer months on the north coast

Impacts of Lower ACL Values

- The Alternative 1 ACLs of 80 mt in 2011 and 2012 result in a 40% reduction from 2010

- The Alternative 2 ACLs of 111 mt in 2011 and 113 mt in 2012 result in a reduction of 44% and 43% respectively from 2010 levels.
- The Alternative 3 (preferred) ACLs of 180 mt in 2011 and 183 mt in 2012 result in slight reductions from 2010 levels but retain similar opportunities for current fisheries.

See the cumulative effects of lower ACL values for individual sector affects described in the previous section.

It is important to note that maintaining POP catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with Pacific Ocean perch. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

WIDOW ROCKFISH

PFMC Recommendation

Annual Catch Limit of 600 mt in 2011 and 2012.

Fisheries Affected

Widow rockfish are taken in several West Coast Fisheries including:

- Research Fisheries
- Tribal Fisheries
- Oregon Recreational Fisheries
- California Recreational Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Non-whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Trawl Whiting Fisheries
- Limited Entry Fixed Gear Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Groundfish Fisheries
- Open Access Directed Fisheries with Incidental Groundfish Catch
 - Salmon Troll
 - Pink Shrimp

Communities Affected

- There are at least 11 port communities in Washington, Oregon and California which are affected by the amount of widow rockfish available for harvest.
- These communities are all in counties with unemployment rates ranging from a low of 8.5% (King County and Gray’s Harbor County in Washington) to a high of 12.6% (Del Norte County in California).
 - Over 50% of the communities reside in counties where the unemployment rate is above the November 2010 national average of 9.8%.
- Five of these communities were ranked as “highly” dependent on groundfish fisheries.
- Two communities were ranked with a “medium” dependency on groundfish fisheries.
- Sixty-two percent (8) of the communities received a “vulnerable” ranking with respect to changes in groundfish fisheries with six of the communities receiving the “most vulnerable” rating.

- 67% of Washington communities were ranked “most vulnerable”
- 67% of Oregon communities were ranked “most vulnerable”
- 50% of California communities were ranked “most vulnerable”

State of Washington				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Ilwaco	Pacific	10.3%	Low	Most vulnerable
Seattle	King	8.5%	Not Dependent	
Westport	Gray’s Harbor	8.5%	Medium	Most vulnerable

State of Oregon				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Astoria	Clatsop	9.1%	Medium	Vulnerable
Charleston	Coos	11.8%	High	Most vulnerable
Newport	Lincoln	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable

State of California				
Community	County	County Unemployment rate a/	Groundfish Fishery Dependence b/	Vulnerability rating updated for 2006 c/
Crescent City	Del Norte	12.6%	High	Vulnerable
Eureka	Humboldt	10.3%	High	Most vulnerable
Fort Bragg	Mendocino	10.2%	High	Most vulnerable
Bodega Bay	Sonoma	9.7%	Medium	
San Francisco	San Francisco	9.3%	Medium	

a/ County unemployment rates as of October 2010 source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

b/ Groundfish fishery community dependence as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

c/ Vulnerability rating as ranked in Appendix E of the 2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications DEIS

Justification for Recommendation

- The stock is rebuilding and the last assessment measured the stock at 38.5% of unfished biomass – just short of being rebuilt
- The stock is expected to be fully rebuilt in 2010 which is 5 years earlier than T-target
- Widow are difficult to avoid because they are rebuilt and they co-occur with many other important stocks – this ACL level provides additional opportunities for some sectors of the fishery
- Regained opportunities:
 - Trawl- higher ACLs for widow would eventually allow a targeted mid-water yellowtail fishery which has been eliminated due to canary and widow interactions

Impacts of lower ACL values

- The Alternative 1 ACLs of 200 mt in 2011 and 2012 is a 60% reduction from 2010 levels.
- The Alternative 2 ACLs of 400 mt in 2011 and 2012 is a 28% reduction from 2010 levels.
- The Alternative 3 (preferred) ACLs of 600 mt in 2011 and 2012 is an increase of 15% from 2010 levels which appropriately reflects the projection that widow rockfish is projected to be rebuilt in 2010.

See the cumulative effects of lower ACL values for individual sector affects described in the previous section.

It is important to note that maintaining widow catches at levels similar to 2010 in order to prosecute fisheries on healthier stocks DOES NOT represent a profitable position for any of the fisheries which interact with widow rockfish. Using individual annual catch levels or an average catch level from recent years as a benchmark for measuring impacts is misleading and inappropriate as these levels are not reflective of healthy coastal communities. Some would argue incorrectly that those businesses which have been able to adapt to lower OY levels and “stay alive” during recent years have “figured out how to make it work” and thus can continue to adapt to these low levels. This is a gross misrepresentation of the truth and provides a false security that the needs of fishing communities are being met.

Conclusion

These comments clearly provide information to bolster the PFMC recommended 2011 - 2012 harvest levels for certain overfished species and effectively demonstrate that some minimal harvest of those species is necessary to provide opportunity to catch healthy fish stocks. We firmly believe the PFMC recommendations balance the needs of fishing communities with the mandate to rebuild stocks in the shortest time frame possible.

References:

2011-2012 Groundfish Harvest Specifications Draft Environmental Impact Statement & Appendices

Groundfish Advisory Panel and Groundfish Management Team Reports found on www.pcouncil.org

Public comments found on www.pcouncil.org

2005-2006 Groundfish Harvest Specifications FEIS www.pcouncil.org

2007-2008 Groundfish Harvest Specifications FEIS www.pcouncil.org

PacFIN database www.psmfc.org

www.foreclosurehelpandhope.org

www.fdic.org

www.realtytrac.com

Recreational Fishing Expenses for Humboldt County (from California Survey Data) ¹

Trip Expenditures

	Residents	Non Residents	Totals
Transportation	\$225,000.00	\$810,000.00	\$1,035,000.00
Rental / Mooring	\$116,000.00	\$0.00	\$116,000.00
Launch Fees	\$51,000.00	\$110,000.00	\$161,000.00
Charter Fees	\$247,000	\$576,000.00	\$823,000.00
Food	\$450,000.00	\$1,350,000.00	\$1,800,000.00
Lodging	\$0.00	\$1,150,000.00	\$1,150,000.00
Boat Fuel	\$685,000.00	\$457,000.00	\$1,142,000.00
Bait and Ice	\$180,000.00	\$108,000.00	\$288,000.00
Subtotal	\$1,954,000.00	\$4,561,000.00	\$6,515,000.00

Annual Expenditures

	Residents	Non Residents	Totals
Tackle	\$300,000.00		\$300,000.00
Club Dues	\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00
Vehicle License Fees	\$20,000.00		\$20,000.00
Boat Maintenance	\$400,000.00		\$400,000.00
Fishing Vehicle	\$800,000.00		\$800,000.00
Fishing License	\$52,000.00		\$52,000.00
Subtotal	\$1,578,000.00		\$1,578,000.00

Totals

	Residents	Non Residents	Totals
Total	\$3,532,000	\$6,139,000	\$9,671,000

- Estimate 1,000 anglers x 62 days = 62,000 angler days
- Trip expenditure: \$6,515,000 / 62,000 angler days = \$105/angler/day
- Annual expenditure: \$1,578,000 / 62,000 anglers - \$25/angler/day
- Total angler day cost is \$105 + \$25 = \$130 per angler/ per day
- 57,000 anglers per month from the California Rec. Survey = 28,500 anglers/month in Humboldt county
- 28,500 per month x \$130 per day - \$3,705,000 per month spent in Humboldt County
- \$3,705,000 x 4 months = \$14,820,000 in lost revenue to Humboldt County

¹ June, 2010 GAP statement http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/B3b_SUP_GAP_JUNE2010BB.pdf

BRETT HEARNE

407 se 4th street
Newport, Oregon 97365
Phone (541-265-7821
Fax (541-265-7821
last straw@newportnet.com

2/15/2011
Pacific Fisheries Management Council
AGENDA ITEM H2

Dear Council Members,

Please include my public comment under agenda item H.2. I own the trawler "Last Straw" and have been cutting, freezing and glazing ground fish during 2010.

In 2011 any processing at sea is prohibited. In November 1,2010 I requested a permit or exemptions to continue what was legal in 2010, stating that I had invested around 1,000,000.dollars towards preserving and developing our fishery.

Here it is the middle of February and we need to know what to do with our crew, our markets, and our investment which was permitted and legal in 2010.

In our West Coast Groundfish Catch Share Program: Program Components Guidance -2010 Page 7 of 67 states word for word: The goal and objectives of Amendment 20- "What are the economic performance goals?" states "Economic performance measures will be tracked to assess the effectiveness of the program. These include:

- Profitable and efficient fleets
- Operational Flexibility
- Minimizing the adverse impacts on fishing communities
- Promotion of economic and employment benefits
- Providing consumers with quality product

My business fulfills all these criteria ! Shutting down my business would defeat all of the above.

In the QS Permit Application cover letter issued October 2010 the first paragraph states that trawl rationalization program is "intended to increase net economic benefits, create individual economic stability. Provide full utilization of the trawl sector allocation. Consider environmental impacts and achieve individual accountability of catch and by catch. We fit these categories and criteria.

With legal and earnest history, how could we be outlawed from continuing what was legal and consistent with Amendments 20 and 21

It is important to note that this law was proposed on August 31,2010 (Federal Register/vol.75 No.168/ Tuesday Aug ,31 ,2010/ Proposed Rules, see page 53414) and became final on Oct 1,2010. This vessel has been developing the operation since 2007/2008.

Also note that there is an exeption for a whiting processor 75 feet or less. It is also important to note that there is an exception for a Limited Entry Fixed Gear Vessel who was identified as active in glazing sablefish before Amendment 14 went into effect.

Life has gone on for Fixed gear Sablefish and the whiting industry , with these exceptions therefore I request an exemption Permit now in 2010 not 2013 or whatever is convenient for the rule makers to continue what is consistent with amendments 20 and 21

Sincerely,

Brett Hearne