# Estimated Discard and Discard Rates in the Coastal Washington Arrowtooth Flounder Fishery In 2001 

Farron Wallace<br>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife<br>Marine Resources Division<br>48 Devonshire Road<br>Montesano, Washington 98563

## December 2002

FPT 02-13

## Acknowledgements

Special recognition goes to the participants in this program including fishing vessels Carla R, Friendship, Larkin, Miss Leona, Pacific Oryan, Starlight and Windjammer and to Bellingham, Washington processors Bornstein and Sea-K. I would also like to thank WDFW port samplers, at-sea monitors and support staff whose dedication and hard work made this study possible.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary ..... 1
Introduction ..... 3
Review of Terms and Conditions ..... 4
Program Objective ..... 5
Methods ..... 6
At-Sea Sampling ..... 6
Shoreside Sampling ..... 6
Analytical Procedures ..... 6
Rockfish Discard Estimation ..... 7
Non-Rockfish Discard Estimation .....  .7
Results ..... 9
Tow Data ..... 9
Catch Data ..... 10
At-Sea Sampling ..... 11
Shoreside Sampling ..... 11
Discard ..... 12
Non-Directed Tows Versus Directed Tows ..... 12
Vessel Comparison ..... 13
Discussion ..... 15
Tables ..... 16
Figures ..... 39

## Executive Summary

## Overview

In 2001, WDFW began a 2-year cooperative industry at-sea data collection program in an effort to facilitate directed Arrowtooth flounder fishing and to establish an objective basis for estimation of canary rockfish discard in that fishery. The program was approved by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and administered under an Exempted Fishing Permit. This report provides a review of the 2001 (year 1) observer data and an estimate of discarded catch for the participating vessels. A final report will be produced in 2003 summarizing results of the entire program.

All participating vessels were required to carried observers throughout the study period and retain all rockfish species (Sebastes and Sebastelobus) caught. Shoreside, rockfish catch was sorted into marketable, unmarketable, and forfeited. Unmarketable catch was typically made up of small fish of no value and rockfish landings exceeding monthly cumulative trip limits were forfeited. Rockfish discard estimates in this study are assumed equal to the sum of forfeited and unmarketable, because this catch would have ordinarily been discarded at-sea under normal fishing operations. Observers also monitored fishing strategies and collected data to estimate total catch, discard and bycatch rates of incidental catch of non-rockfish species.

## Results

Participating vessels landed approximately 810 mt of arrowtooth flounder that would not have been possible without the EFP fishery. The estimated bycatch rate for canary rockfish in the north coastal Washington arrowtooth fishery is significantly lower than that used to set current regulations for the arrowtooth fishery in 2002. In arrowtooth directed tows, the ratio of canary to arrowtooth was $0.07 \%$ compared to an assumed rate of $2.0 \%$ to $3.0 \%$. Among the 7 vessels participating in the study, the highest canary discard rate for a single vessel was $1.9 \%$. Two vessels caught no canary. This questions the ability for at least some vessels to avoid canary rockfish in directed arrowtooth tows. This also suggests that predicting bycatch may be highly prone to error.

Although the relative volume of catch was low, the percent discard within rockfish market category was much higher.

Total estimated rockfish catch and discard

|  | Total Estimated |  | Discard |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species/Market Category | Catch(lbs) | Discard(lbs) | Rate |
| Canary | 5,226 | 2,574 | $49.3 \%$ |
| Darkblotched | 4,359 | 22 | $0.5 \%$ |
| POP | 28,099 | 4,528 | $16.1 \%$ |
| Shortspine Thornyhead | 14,893 | 3,838 | $25.8 \%$ |
| Shelf | 21,656 | 12,193 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Slope | 15,851 | 5,922 | $37.4 \%$ |
| Widow | 632 | - | $0.0 \%$ |
| Yellowtail | 41,975 | 10,014 | $23.9 \%$ |
| Sub-Total | 132,691 | 39,091 | $29.5 \%$ |

## Data Limitation

Analysis in this study is based on data collected from seven volunteer vessels and does not represent a random sampling of the fleet. Because this study is limited in scope, results should not be widely applied to other fisheries. Furthermore, vessels participating in this study actively attempted to minimize canary bycatch and discard rates may not be representative of other vessels targeting arrowtooth.

## Introduction

Arrowtooth flounder (Atheresthes stomias) are an extremely important species in the coastal Washington groundfish fisheries. Washington fishers and processors have succeeded in developing important overseas markets for this species. A large component of the Washington trawl fleet, and at least two major processors, are heavily dependent upon arrowtooth flounder for their livelihoods. In 2000, arrowtooth flounder comprised approximately one-third of all Washington non-whiting groundfish landings.

In recent years, the PFMC has been presented with information that suggests canary and several other rockfish stocks are severely depressed and below $\mathrm{B}_{25 \%}$. As a result, rebuilding plans have been initiated and more restrictive management measures have been adopted. In 2001, the PFMC placed restrictive limits on the flatfish fishery (which includes arrowtooth) based on an assumed canary bycatch rate of $1 \%$. Trip limits beginning in July limited fishers to $30,000 \mathrm{lbs} /$ month for all flatfish (except Dover sole). A more restrictive $10,000 \mathrm{lbs} /$ month trip limit for arrowtooth was enacted for directed arrowtooth fishing because the canary bycatch rate was assumed to be two to three percent. Fishers who historically targeted arrowtooth flounder stated that their current bycatch rate of canary rockfish is less than one percent and perhaps as low as $0.2 \%$.

Using federal groundfish disaster relief funding, WDFW proposed a 2 -year cooperative industry at-sea data collection program in an effort to facilitate directed Arrowtooth flounder fishing while simultaneously establishing an objective basis for estimation of canary rockfish discard in that fishery. This report provides a review of the 2001 (year 1) observer data and an estimate of discarded catch for the participating vessels. A final report will be produced in 2003 summarizing results of the entire program.

## Review of Terms and Conditions of Permit

The cooperative industry at-sea data collection program was contingent upon and received approval from PFMC and NMFS. This program was prescribed through an Exempted Fishing Permit (EFP) process in which NMFS approved and provided a permit to Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Under the terms of the permit, WDFW authorized qualifying processors and fishers to participate in the arrowtooth EFP fishery.

Since the observer program is voluntary, WDFW recognized the need to provide fishers with incentives to carry observers to verify the total catch and bycatch occurring in the fishery. Working through the PFMC process, WDFW provided fishers with the opportunity to land arrowtooth flounder and petrale sole in excess of the current monthly limits while collecting canary rockfish bycatch data through an observer program. Because funding was limited, WDFW developed strict qualifying criteria for EFP participation based on arrowtooth landing history. Only seven vessels (Carla R, Friendship, Larkin, Miss Leona, Pacific Oryan, Starlight and Windjammer) qualified and two Bellingham, Washington processors (Bornstein and Sea-K) processed landings. As a consequence, the observations from this program do not represent a random sampling of the LLP fleet fishing Washington's coastal waters. It does reflect catch and bycatch rates among the Bellingham based trawl fleet participating in this EFP. Participants landed $25 \%$ of the total Arrowtooth flounder catch taken off Washington, Oregon, and California in 2001.

All participating vessels carried observers throughout the study period and were required to follow trip limit regulations established for the arrowtooth EFP fishery. Trip limits affecting participating vessels included a monthly cumulative canary catch trigger of 200 pounds. If a vessel reached the trigger, no further directed arrowtooth fishing was allowed for the remainder of the month. This reduced the possibility that EFP participants would not significantly exceed the limited entry 300 -pound monthly cumulative trip limit for canary. All catch counted toward the vessel's monthly cumulative trip limit for all species or species groups. Participating vessels were also required to retain all rockfish species (Sebastes and Sebastelobus) caught; much of this catch would normally be discarded at-sea. This ensured a complete census of all incidental rockfish catch.

Although not required by the EFP, vessels in the program attempted to minimize incidental rockfish bycatch in directed and non-directed tows. Several vessels used gear modifications and/or actively avoided areas known for high bycatch rates of canary.

## Program Objective

The primary motive of the arrowtooth observer program was to estimate incidental catch rates for canary and other rockfish species associated with the coastal Washington arrowtooth flounder fishery. Information may also be used to augment the NMFS' Pacific Coast Groundfish Observer Program, but was not intended to replace it. A secondary objective was evaluation of the rockfish full retention provisions of the program. The scope of the study included data collection to monitor fishing strategies and estimate total catch, discard and bycatch rates of incidental catch of non-target species.

## Methods

## At Sea Sampling

Under terms of the permit, the arrowtooth EFP fishery began August 1, 2001, and ended September 30, 2001. During this time period, each vessel carried a single observer hired and trained by WDFW personnel. Vessel operators had to accept an assigned observer and had no influence on their placement. The observer's primary mission was to collect canary rockfish catch information for each sampled tow (the sampling unit). Secondary objectives included sampling bycatch for species composition and enumerating incidence of prohibited species (halibut and salmon) in each tow. Observers were also directed to collect biological data on various fish species. A list of observer's main duties included: 1) record whether the tow was a directed or non-direct arrowtooth flounder tow; 2) enumerate, by species, all live fish discarded; 3 ) provide information on average size of discard (live and dead); 4) estimate total discard weight using the skipper's estimate, visual observation, or sorted and weighed basket samples; 5) ensure that all canary rockfish from each tow were set aside, enumerated and measured; 6) record species composition data for the discarded and retained portion of the catch; and 7) record notes on anything that might have affected the performance of the above protocol.

## Shoreside Sampling

WDFW port sampling and shoreside observer personnel collected species composition and biological samples from the marketable and unmarketable portion of the landed catch. The shoreside observer was solely responsible for debriefing observers and sampling the unmarketable portion of the catch. Mixed rockfish landings that could not be whole-sampled were basket-sampled so that species composition could be estimated. Additional length frequency samples were collected on retained unmarketable rockfish. Individual fish weights were collected to enable construction of a length/weight regression formula to convert at-sea length frequency observation to weight. If time did not permit individual length-weight sampling, species were separated, counted and each basket weighed to provide information on average weight.

## Analytical Procedures

Logbook and observer data were reviewed to determine if a tow was successfully completed. Tows were considered unsuccessful and not included in the analysis if: 1) tows were primarily dogfish shark and dumped before being brought onboard; 2) damaged net tows with little or no catch; or 3) recorded as unsuccessful no-catch tows due to gear problems.

Market categories are used to identify any single or multi-species group, which has a size or limit (OY) restriction. Vessel operators and buyers/processors are required to
document fish caught (hailed) or landed (fish ticket) for each market category. Market categories may include marketable, unmarketable and forfeited catch.

For each vessel's trip, hailed catch is stratified by tow number, tow type (directed/nondirected) and market category. Fish ticket data are stratified by market category and vessel trip. To allow comparison of the amount of market category catch by tow and between directed and non-directed tows, hailed catch is adjusted to correspond to the total weighed catch (from fish tickets) for each market category.

For each tow in a given trip, hailed catch (recorded in logbooks) was adjusted to reflect landed catch for each market category as follows:
$C_{i}^{m}=$ landed weight of market category i
$C_{i j}^{h}=$ hailed weight of market category i in the $\mathrm{j}^{\text {th }}$ tow ( $\mathrm{j}=1$ to n )
$\hat{C}_{i j}=$ the estimated actual weight of the catch of market category i , during tow j
$\hat{C}_{i j}=C_{i}^{m}\left(C_{i j}^{h} / \sum_{j=1}^{n} C_{i j}^{h}\right)$
If a species or a mixed species market category was landed but not hailed (unrecorded in the skipper's logbook), catch was evenly distributed across all tows for the vessel trip, i.e.,
$\hat{C}_{i j}=C_{i}^{m} / n$

## Rockfish Discard Estimation

EFP requirement for full retention of rockfish ensured that incidental catch of rockfish would be known. Shoreside, rockfish catch was sorted into marketable, unmarketable, and forfeited. Unmarketable catch was typically made up of small fish of no value. Forfeitures were rockfish landings exceeding monthly cumulative trip limits and included unmarketable and marketable rockfish. The unmarketable and forfeited catch would have ordinarily been discarded at-sea under normal fishing operations. Rockfish discard estimates in this study are assumed equal to the sum of forfeited and unmarketable catch.

For a given trip, the species specific catch for each market category (marketable or unmarketable) was estimated as follows:

Cj is the total landing weight in market category j ,
$W_{j k}$ is the species composition sampled weight of species $k(k=1$ to $m$ ) from market category j , and
$\hat{C}_{j k}$ is the estimated total landing weight of the species k from market category j

$$
\hat{C}_{j k}=C_{j}\left(W_{j k} / \sum_{k=1}^{m} W_{j k}\right)
$$

## Non-Rockfish Discard Estimation

Unmarketable non-rockfish catch was discarded at sea. Non-rockfish discard was estimated for all tows where observers recorded both discarded catch weight and species composition of the discarded catch. Catches were either sub-sampled (basket samples) or whole haul sampled for species composition. Weight of unmarketable species was either measured directly on a platform scale or estimated from the number of fish recorded in the sample. When fish were counted but not weighed, numbers of fish were converted to weight by multiplying number in the sample by their estimated mean weight. [See at-sea sampling for estimation of mean weight.]

For each vessel trip and each tow type, total estimated discard per tow was distributed to the species level based on at-sea species composition of the sampled discard catch, where
$D_{j}$ is the total non-rockfish discarded catch weight in tow $j$,
$\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{jk}}$ is the species composition sampled weight of species $\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{k}=1$ to n ) from tow j , and $\hat{D}_{j k}$ is the estimated total discard weight of the species k from tow j
$\hat{D}_{j k}=D_{j}\left(W_{j k} / \sum_{k=1}^{n} W_{j k}\right)$
There was a record of tow type for every tow from every trip; however, despite the presence of observers, there may be no record of sampled catch for some tows. In these circumstances, discarded catch was estimated based on the average species discard within the sampled trip for sampled tows. For each vessel trip and tow type where sampling data was missing, discarded catch was assumed equal to the simple average of estimated discard for each species $\left(\bar{D}_{k}\right)$ in sampled tows during that trip. For those trips where there is no record of sampled catch for any tow, discarded catch was estimated based on the number of unsampled tows and the average species specific discard for the vessel and tow type over all trips.

## Results

## Tow Data

There were 2,165,260 pounds ( 982 mt ) hailed in logbooks by the seven participating vessels, which collectively made 41 trips and 577 tows during the arrowtooth EFP fishery (Table 1). Arrowtooth flounder catch weight exceeded 1,000 pounds in $65 \%$ of the directed tows and $12.6 \%$ of non-directed tows.. Skipper's logged catches of canary rockfish in $12.9 \%$ of directed and $26.4 \%$ of the non-directed tows (Table 2). Catch was brought onboard and retained in approximately $95 \%$ of the tows (Table 3).

Each fisher considers multiple factors before making a decision on target species. These included permit regulations, trip limit attainment, fishing expertise (in directing arrowtooth tows) and individual differences in general fishing strategy. Participating vessels displayed a broad range of proficiency in directing their arrowtooth flounder tows.

Vessel A targeted arrowtooth in 23.5\% of his tows, the lowest rate among EFP participating vessels. This was due to Vessel A exceeding the canary trip limit of 200 pounds during the first trip in August. The EFP prohibited arrowtooth targeting for the remainder of the month for this vessel. Arrowtooth target rates for remaining vessels ranged from $47.2 \%$ (vessel B) to $73.4 \%$ (vessel C) of tows. Among the seven vessels in the study, tow rate success ranged from a high of $98 \%$ for the vessel A and a low of $88 \%$ for vessel C (Table 4). Although there was no obvious trend in vessel success rate, vessel C had higher catches of slope rockfish species than other vessels indicating a deeper and possibly "rocky" target fishing location.

Tow frequency analysis of hailed canary catch indicates that canary catches exceeding 100 pounds were rare in both directed and non-directed tows. The monthly cumulative canary catch limit of 200 pounds for directed tows was exceeded only once, during the first trip for vessel A. A large majority ( $87 \%$ ) of directed tows caught no canary and tows with canary were generally below 50 pounds (Figure 2). Approximately $74 \%$ of the non-directed tows caught no canary and catches exceeding 100 pounds were rare (Figure 3 ). Only two non-directed tows caught canary catch in excess of 200 pounds.

Comparisons of fish ticket adjusted catch among tows indicate to some extent the random nature of incidental rockfish catch in tows. However, distinct differences in the catch frequency and amount of rockfish catch between vessels are apparent (Figure 4-10). Although comparison of tow specific catch is somewhat inexact, due to an equal distribution across all tows for non-hailed landed catch, frequency of occurrence for tows exceeding 100 lbs of canary was most prevalent for Vessel A which accounted for most of the canary caught. Generally, vessels can be grouped based on frequency of occurrence of relatively "large" tows of either slope or shelf rockfish. Vessels which had greater occurrence of slope species include vessels $B, C$, and $G$ and vessels with a greater occurrence of shelf species included A, D, E and F).

## Catch Data

There was a total of $2,404,611$ pounds reported in 41 landings from vessels participating in the arrowtooth EFP fishery. The majority of the catch was arrowtooth, which by weight was 74.3 \% of the total landed catch. Flatfish (including arrowtooth), rockfish, roundfish (lingcod, Pacific cod, Pacific whiting and sablefish) and miscellaneous species accounted for $84.9 \%, 5.3 \%, 6.8 \%$ and $3.0 \%$ of the total landed catch respectively (Table 5).

Although vessels were compensated for nearly all (95\%) of the landed catch, $26.8 \%$ of rockfish were either of no value or forfeited. Fish of no value (weigh-back) were generally too small to market and rockfish forfeited to the state were in excess of trip limits. Surprisingly few rockfish (2.7\%) were weigh-backs and may reflect processors' ability to find new markets for small fish that typically are not landed. A much larger portion (24.1\%) of rockfish was in excess of trip limits and forfeited to the state (Table 6).

Arrowtooth directed tows accounted for almost all (92.1\%) of the arrowtooth landings and the majority of rockfish landings (67.3\%). Differences in rockfish composition were apparent between directed and non-directed tows (Table 7). The majority of canary ( $68.6 \%$ ), darkblotched ( $84 \%$ ), shelf rockfish ( $67.3 \%$ ) and yellowtail rockfish ( $60.2 \%$ ) were caught in non-directed tows. Directed tows caught most of the Pacific ocean perch ( $90.2 \%$ ), shortspine thornyhead ( $60.5 \%$ ) and slope rockfish ( $88.2 \%$ ).

Comparison of catch data between vessels indicates similar target strategies for nondirected tows (Table 8). Vessels generally targeted a DTS mix (dover sole, thornyhead rockfish and sablefish) or a flatfish mix of petrale, English sole and dover. While not directly targeted, arrowtooth was the largest portion of the catch for all vessels and petrale sole ranked second for five of the seven vessels (Table 9). Rockfish composition in non-directed tows was fairly similar among vessels, but total volume was not. Rockfish represented 2-23\% of total individual vessel catch and three vessels caught $80 \%$ of all rockfish.

As anticipated, catch in directed tows was dominated (83-97\%) by arrowtooth (Table 10). Although rockfish composition was somewhat similar among vessels for non-directed tows, rockfish composition in directed tows differed (Table 11). There were generally two groups of vessels based on rockfish composition of the catch in directed tows. Vessels that primarily caught slope rockfish species (slope strategy) and POP (vessels B, C, and G) and vessels that primarily caught shelf rockfish species (shelf strategy) and shortspine (vessels A, D, E and F). Slope and shelf strategy vessels catch are also reflected in catch composition unmarketable and forfeited catch. Dissimilarity in rockfish catch composition in directed tows probably points to variation in a vessel's trawl gear, preference in target area and/or fishing strategy for directed tows.

## At-Sea Sampling

An estimate of total discard was collected for approximately $63 \%$ of the successful tows. Estimates of total discard with accompanying species composition data, necessary to identify which species comprised the discarded portion of the catch, was collected for $55 \%$ of the tows. Discard sampling rate varied significantly among vessels. Discard could be estimated for almost $87 \%$ of the tows for vessel F while only $17 \%$ of the tows had sufficient data to estimate discard aboard vessel E (Table 12). All tows are assumed to have been observed, but there was no observer record for $21.7 \%$ of tows.

Hailed catch information in the trawl logbook was sufficient to estimate tow specific rockfish catch to the market category level in $78 \%$ of all tows. If a rockfish species or mixed species market category was landed, but not hailed, than the catch was evenly distributed to all tows. Approximately $13 \%$ of the tows that hailed rockfish were not sampled and $22 \%$ of tows that were sampled for rockfish did not have accompanying hail information (Table 13). Tow specific catch for individual species landed in mixed rockfish market categories was not estimated.

Mean weight was estimated from weighed basket-samples of discard where weight and numbers were collected for individual species. Weight data were not collected for several minor discard species including flathead sole, sand sole, walleye pollock and wolf-eel. A one pound average was assumed for all these species except wolf-eel where mean weight was assumed to be three pounds (Table 14). Mean weight was similarly estimated from weighed basket-samples of 18 species of retained rockfish (Table 15).

Observers were also requested to collect information on discard of species that were immediately released after the capture such as salmon, halibut, lingcod, sablefish and crab. Observer information for these species was sufficient to estimated discard in approximately $88 \%$ of tows.

## Shoreside Sampling

A WDFW port sampler collected species composition and biological samples for the marketable portion of the catch. A total of 6 of the 41 EFP landings (15\%) were intercepted and sampled for species composition and biological specimens.

The observer coordinator was responsible for sampling the forfeited and unmarketable portion of the catch for species composition and collecting biological samples on sex, length and weight. The coordinator intercepted and sampled 19 of 41 EFP landings ( $46 \%$ ). Individual length-weight (Table 16) and basket-weight data for 20 species of fish were collected (Table 17). Data collected from unsorted catch and sorted unmarketable catch were pooled for each species to obtain an estimate of mean weight. Average weight was considerably lighter for unmarketable fish compared to that retained illustrating the comparatively small size of unmarketable fish (Table 18).

## Discard

Total fishing mortality estimates of groundfish are essential for managing fisheries and estimating stock abundance. Optimal yields are determined by deducting estimated or presumed discard from total specified catch. Discard is the fraction of the utilized and unutilized volume of catch that can be computed as a fraction of: 1) total catch of all Groundfish; 2) total catch of target species or species group; 3) the total retained groundfish catch; or 4) total retained catch on a species-specific or mixed-species group basis. Council management recommendations are typically based on species-specific discard percentages computed from retained catch. As reported in this study, speciesspecific discard rates can be very high even though the absolute volume of discard is low.

Total estimated discard rate for the EFP arrowtooth fishery was $28 \%$ by weight for all species combined (Table 19). There were large disparities in discard rates between species and species groups. Discard rate for flatfish, rockfish, roundfish and miscellaneous species were $17.5 \%, 26.8 \%, 23.7 \%, 84.1 \%$ respectively. All catch of prohibited species such as halibut ( $75,191 \mathrm{lbs}$.) was discarded and for unmarketable species eelpout ( 583 lbs .), ratfish ( $53,481 \mathrm{lbs}$.), sculpin ( 221 lbs .), shad ( $4,481 \mathrm{lbs}$ ), snailfish ( 31 lbs .) and wolfeel ( 38 lbs .). Pacific whiting ( $4,660 \mathrm{lbs}$.), dogfish shark $(259,512 \mathrm{lbs}$.$) and skate (68,201)$ discard was mainly due to market restraints and small size. Discard rate for Pacific whiting, dogfish shark and skate was $87.2 \%, 79.4 \%$ and $92.5 \%$ respectively. Discard of dogfish shark are probably grossly underestimated because a number of large volume tows of dogfish were dumped prior to being brought onboard and discard was not estimated nor included in this study. Arrowtooth discard ( $184,348 \mathrm{lbs} ., 9.8 \%$ of total catch) was due to small size and/or if caught early in the trip and were discarded because they could not be preserved in marketable condition for more than several days.

Discard length and weight information suggests that discard for a number of species was largely due to catch of small unmarketable fish. Although market limits may have contributed to discard, length frequency and weight information collected on discard for petrale sole ( $30.8 \%$ of total catch, $46,943 \mathrm{lbs}$ ), dover sole ( $42.8 \%$ of total catch, 54,832 lbs ) English sole ( $14.2 \%$ of total catch, $8,560 \mathrm{lbs}$ ), "other" flatfish ( $58.5 \%$ of total catch, $26,561 \mathrm{lbs}$ ), rex sole ( $83.1 \%$ of total catch, $19,921 \mathrm{lbs}$ ) and sand sole ( $73.6 \%$ of total catch, 220 lbs ) were nearly all small fish. Mean weight for fish discarded at sea was generally one pound or less (Table 14) and mean size frequency was small (Table 20 and Figure 11).

## Non-Directed Tows Versus Directed Tows

Although non-directed tows accounted for only one-third of the total estimated landings they contributed $50 \%$ of the total estimated discard. Total estimated discard for all species combined was $47.0 \%$ and $19.8 \%$ for non-directed and directed tows respectively (Table 21). Discard of dogfish shark and flatfish accounted for much of the difference. Nearly $70 \%$ of the total estimated discard of dogfish ( $259,512 \mathrm{lbs}$.) came from nondirected tows. However, this estimate is grossly underestimated because large catches of
dogfish are dumped before coming onboard and cannot be included in estimates. Discard rate for flatfish was also much higher in non-directed tows ( $34.8 \%$ ) than directed tows ( $13.3 \%$ ) due to an increased retention of arrowtooth in directed tows. All discard of lingcod ( $6,116 \mathrm{lbs}$.), Pacific whiting ( $4,660 \mathrm{lbs}$.) and sablefish ( $40,187 \mathrm{lbs}$.) came from non-directed tows. Lingcod and sablefish discard was due to both catch of unmarketable fish and attainment of trip limits. Whiting was generally unmarketable.

Discard rates of rockfish were similar in non-directed ( $28.7 \%$ ) and directed tows (25.2 $\%$ ), but there were differences in rockfish composition and discard rates among species and species groups. Canary discard in non-directed tows ( $1,239 \mathrm{lbs}$.) was $35.7 \%$ of the total estimated canary catch ( $3,471 \mathrm{lbs}$.); whereas, $73.5 \%(1,585 \mathrm{lbs})$ was discarded in directed tows. Nearly $72 \%$ of the shelf rockfish discard ( $9,983 \mathrm{lbs}$.) was from nondirected tows, while $95 \%$ of slope rockfish discard ( $3,404 \mathrm{lbs}$.) is attributed to directed tows.

Dissimilarity in rockfish discard between non-directed and directed tows is reflected in the ratio of discard to landed catch (Table 22). With the exception of POP and slope rockfish, the ratio of rockfish discard to landed catch for all rockfish species and species groups, was higher in non-directed tows. Canary discard ratio to total landed catch was very low: $0.24 \%$ in directed tows and $0.06 \%$ in arrowtooth directed tows. Shelf rockfish discard ratio to total landed catch was $1.39 \%$ in non-directed tows and $0.15 \%$ in arrowtooth directed tows. Discard ratio in non-directed tows for slope ( $0.04 \%$ ) and POP $(0.10 \%)$ was lower than the slope $(0.17 \%)$ and POP $(0.21 \%)$ discard ratio to in directed tows.

## Vessel Comparison

Discard and discard rates of species and species groups between vessels in both nondirected and directed tows were somewhat dissimilar (Table 23 and 24). This was especially evident for discard and discard rate of rockfish. Vessel A was largely responsible for the total canary, shortspine thornyhead, and shelf rockfish discard. Vessel B was largely responsible for the total, POP, shortspine thornyhead, shelf, slope and yellowtail rockfish discard (Table 25). Species composition largely reflects differences in target strategy where Vessel A targeted on-shelf areas and Vessel B targeted deeper areas near the shelf break. However, the high degree of variability in bycatch rates between vessels fishing in the same general location indicates that predicting bycatch may be highly prone to error.

Nearly all rockfish discard was trip limit induced. Forfeited rockfish catch in excess of trip limits (which would have been discarded at-sea) accounted for $91 \%$ of the total rockfish discard. Shortspine thornyhead rockfish was the only rockfish species where most of the discard was unmarketable because of size (Table 26 and Table 27). All of the canary landed was marketable and all estimated discard was in excess rockfish trip limits and forfeited. Monthly and bi-monthly cumulative catch limits for rockfish species are summarized in Table 28.

Discard of sablefish and lingcod was due to catch in excess of trip limits and/or catch of unmarketable small fish. Vessel A accounted for approximately $50 \%$ of the total estimated lingcod discard and Vessel F accounted for $64 \%$ of the total estimated discard of sablefish (Table 23 and 24). Length information for lingcod was inadequate to assess the amount discard due to catches of unmarketable small fish. Review of retained and discard catch by tow indicate that there was lingcod discard due to trip limits. However, at least a portion of the discarded catch was catch that was discarded prior to exceeding the monthly trip limit of 400 lbs (Figures 12 to 18) for nearly all vessels.

Length information on discarded sablefish indicates that much, but not all sablefish were discarded due to catch of small, unmarketable fish (Table 20 and Figure 11). Retained catch data show that the bi-monthly cumulative limit on sablefish was achieved twice. Vessel B and Vessel F reached the bi-monthly trip limit (for September and October) during September. Tows with an estimated $3,750 \mathrm{lbs}$ and $3,000 \mathrm{lbs}$ of sablefish were observed discarded following trip limit attainment (Figures 13 and 17). This discard would represent approximately $17 \%$ of the total $40,194 \mathrm{lbs}$ of estimated sablefish discard. The remainder of sablefish discard was prior to trip limit attainment and can likely be attributed to catch of small, unmarketable fish.

## Discussion

The estimated bycatch rate for canary rockfish in the north coastal Washington arrowtooth fishery is significantly lower than that used to set current regulations for the arrowtooth fishery in 2002. In arrowtooth directed tows, the ratio of canary to arrowtooth was $0.07 \%$ compared to an assumed rate of $2.0 \%$ to $3.0 \%$. Among the seven vessels participating in the study, the highest canary discard rate for a single vessel was $1.9 \%$. Two vessels caught no canary. This questions the ability for at least some vessels to avoid canary rockfish in directed arrowtooth tows. This also suggests that predicting bycatch may be highly prone to error.

Analysis in this study is based on data collected from seven volunteer vessels and does not represent a random sampling of the fleet. Because this study is limited in scope, results should not be widely applied to other fisheries. Furthermore, vessels participating in this study actively attempted to minimize canary bycatch and discard rates may not be representative of other vessels targeting arrowtooth.

Changes within the program are needed to meet sampling challenges and redefined study objectives. Data collection during the second year of the study will be entirely focused on tow specific rockfish catch. These data will provide necessary information to estimate species-specific rockfish catch and discard for each tow. This information will provide us with a better understanding of rockfish distribution and co-occurrence of groundfish species in coastal Washington waters.

Full retention of rockfish, during this study, ensured a complete census of rockfish catch during a vessel trip. Regulations requiring full-retention across the fleet, would greatly add to our current knowledge of coincident catch rates and provide a means to fully account for fishing mortality. Catch rates observed during the NMFS' observer program could be used to verify catch rates from non-observed vessels.

## Tables

Table 1. Summary of all tows recorded in logbooks during the arrowtooth EFP fishery.

| Summary of arrowtooth EFP logbook data. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{1}$ Directed | Successful | Total <br> Number of Tows | Number of tows with >1000 Ibs ARTH | Gross | Hailed Pounds Arrowtooth | Canary |
| No | No | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | No | 13 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 |
| No | Yes | 246 | 31 | 452,870 | 122,310 | 2,556 |
| Yes | Yes | 303 | 197 | 1,712,237 | 1,496,370 | 1,148 |
| Total |  | 577 |  | 2,165,260 | 1,618,680 | 3,704 |
| 1/ Directed arrowtooth tows. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Summary of total, arrowtooth and canary catch for non-directed and directed tows.

| Summary of arrowtooth EFP logbook data for successful tows. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'Directed | Percent of tows with >0 lbs Canary | Percent of tows with >1000 lbs ARTH | ercent of ton with Canary | Hailed <br> Canary/Gross Catch |
| No | 26.4\% | 12.6\% | 26.4\% | 0.56\% |
| Yes | 12.9\% | 65.0\% | 12.9\% | 0.07\% |
| 1/ Directed arrowtooth tows. |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Summary of unsuccessful tow data
Summary of arrowtooth EFP logbook data for non-successful tows.

| 1 Directed | Percent of tows <br> that failed | Damaged Net | Reason for tow failure <br> Mostly Dogfish | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | $5.7 \%$ | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| Yes | $4.1 \%$ | 8 | 2 | 3 |

Table 4. Vessel comparison of unsuccessful and successful tows.

| Summary of arrowtooth EFP logbook data. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of tows |  |  | \% of Tows |  |
| Vessel | Directed | Non-Directed | Total | Directed | Jon-Directe |
| Unsuccessful Tows |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| B | 2 | 2 | 4 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| C | 9 | 2 | 11 | 81.8\% | 18.2\% |
| D | 1 | 2 | 3 | 33.3\% | 66.7\% |
| E | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| F | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| G | 1 | 1 | 2 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Total | 13 | 15 | 28 |  |  |
| Successful Tows |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | 22 | 72 | 94 | 23.4\% | 76.6\% |
| B | 25 | 28 | 53 | 47.2\% | 52.8\% |
| C | 69 | 25 | 94 | 73.4\% | 26.6\% |
| D | 61 | 24 | 85 | 71.8\% | 28.2\% |
| E | 50 | 46 | 96 | 52.1\% | 47.9\% |
| F | 34 | 33 | 67 | 50.7\% | 49.3\% |
| G | 42 | 18 | 60 | 70.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Total | 303 | 246 | 549 |  |  |

Table 5. Total retained catch for all vessels participating in the study.

| Fish Ticket Species | Landing <br> Total (lbs) | Data \% of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flatfis h |  |  |
| ARTH | 1,786,925 | 74.3 \% |
| D O V R | 73,839 | 3.1 \% |
| EGLS | 51,894 | $2.2 \%$ |
| OFLT | 17,493 | 0.7 \% |
| PTRL | 105,440 | 4.4 \% |
| REX | 4,037 | 0.2 \% |
| RSOL | 1,332 | 0.1 \% |
| SSOL | 79 |  |
| Sub-Total | 2,041,039 | 84.9 \% |
| Rockfish |  |  |
| CNRY | 5,056 | 0.2 \% |
| DBRK | 4,359 | 0.2 \% |
| POP | 28,099 | $1.2 \%$ |
| SSPN | 14,893 | $0.6 \%$ |
| USLF | 19,446 | $0.8 \%$ |
| USLP | 13,333 | $0.6 \%$ |
| W D O W | 632 | $0.0 \%$ |
| YTRK | 41,975 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Sub-Total | 127,793 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Roundfish |  |  |
| LCOD | 3,460 | 0.1 \% |
| PCOD | 77,350 | $3.2 \%$ |
| PW H T | 693 | $0.0 \%$ |
| SABL | 82,958 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Sub-Total | 164,461 | $6.8 \%$ |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |
| DSRK | 68,152 | $2.8 \%$ |
| O C TP | 164 | $0.0 \%$ |
| SKAT | 2,838 | 0.1 \% |
| SSRK | 47 | $0.0 \%$ |
| M IS C | 117 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Sub-Total | 71,318 | 3.0\% |
| Grand Total | 2,404,611 | $100 \%$ |

Table 6. Comparison of total catch and percent of catch which was sold, forfeited or unmarketable.

| Fish Ticket Adjusted Logbook Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Total (lbs) | \% of Total | Non-Dir. (lbs) | Directed (lbs) | Non-Dir. (\%) | Directed (\%) |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 1,786,925 | 74.3\% | 141,003 | 1,645,922 | 7.9\% | 92.1\% |
| DOVR | 73,839 | 3.1\% | 43,384 | 30,455 | 58.8\% | 41.2\% |
| EGLS | 51,894 | 2.2\% | 45,395 | 6,499 | 87.5\% | 12.5\% |
| OFLT | 17,493 | 0.7\% | 7,930 | 9,563 | 45.3\% | 54.7\% |
| PTRL | 105,440 | 4.4\% | 75,912 | 29,528 | 72.0\% | 28.0\% |
| REX | 4,037 | 0.2\% | 1,326 | 2,711 | 32.8\% | 67.2\% |
| RSOL | 1,332 | 0.1\% | 1,311 | 21 | 98.4\% | 1.6\% |
| SSOL | 79 |  | - | 79 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 2,041,039 | 84.9\% | 316,260 | 1,724,779 | 15.5\% | 84.5\% |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 5,056 | 0.2\% | 3,471 | 1,585 | 68.6\% | 31.4\% |
| DBRK | 4,359 | 0.2\% | 3,661 | 698 | 84.0\% | 16.0\% |
| POP | 28,099 | 1.2\% | 2,759 | 25,340 | 9.8\% | 90.2\% |
| SSPN | 14,893 | 0.6\% | 5,875 | 9,018 | 39.5\% | 60.5\% |
| USLF | 19,446 | 0.8\% | 13,094 | 6,352 | 67.3\% | 32.7\% |
| USLP | 13,333 | 0.6\% | 1,571 | 11,762 | 11.8\% | 88.2\% |
| WDOW | 632 | 0.0\% | 632 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| YTRK | 41,975 | 1.7\% | 25,266 | 16,709 | 60.2\% | 39.8\% |
| Sub-Total | 127,793 | 5.3\% | 41,767 | 86,026 | 32.7\% | 67.3\% |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | 3,460 | 0.1\% | 2,222 | 1,238 | 64.2\% | 35.8\% |
| PCOD | 77,350 | 3.2\% | 50,189 | 27,161 | 64.9\% | 35.1\% |
| PWHT | 693 | 0.0\% | 628 | 65 | 90.6\% | 9.4\% |
| SABL | 82,958 | 3.4\% | 33,705 | 49,253 | 40.6\% | 59.4\% |
| Sub-Total | 164,461 | 6.8\% | 86,552 | 77,909 | 52.6\% | 47.4\% |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 68,152 | 2.8\% | 68,152 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| OCTP | 164 | 0.0\% | 164 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SKAT | 2,838 | 0.1\% | 2,731 | 107 | 96.2\% | 3.8\% |
| SSRK | 47 | 0.0\% | 47 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| MISC | 117 | 0.0\% | - | - | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 71,318 | 3.0\% | 71,094 | 107 | 99.7\% | 0.2\% |
| Grand Total | 2,404,611 | 100\% | 515,673 | 1,888,821 | 21.4\% | 78.5\% |

Table 7. Comparison of catch data between non-directed and directed tows.
Fish Ticket Adjusted Logbook Data

| Species | Total (lbs) | \% of Total | Non- <br> Directed (lbs) | Directed (lbs) | NonDirected (\%) | Directed (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 1,786,925 | 74.3\% | 141,003 | 1,645,922 | 7.9\% | 92.1\% |
| DOVR | 73,839 | 3.1\% | 43,384 | 30,455 | 58.8\% | 41.2\% |
| EGLS | 51,894 | 2.2\% | 45,395 | 6,499 | 87.5\% | 12.5\% |
| OFLT | 17,493 | 0.7\% | 7,930 | 9,563 | 45.3\% | 54.7\% |
| PTRL | 105,440 | 4.4\% | 75,912 | 29,528 | 72.0\% | 28.0\% |
| REX | 4,037 | 0.2\% | 1,326 | 2,711 | 32.8\% | 67.2\% |
| RSOL | 1,332 | 0.1\% | 1,311 | 21 | 98.4\% | 1.6\% |
| SSOL | 79 |  | - | 79 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 2,041,039 | 84.9\% | 316,260 | 1,724,779 | 15.5\% | 84.5\% |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 5,056 | 0.2\% | 3,471 | 1,585 | 68.6\% | 31.4\% |
| DBRK | 4,359 | 0.2\% | 3,661 | 698 | 84.0\% | 16.0\% |
| POP | 28,099 | 1.2\% | 2,759 | 25,340 | 9.8\% | 90.2\% |
| SSPN | 14,893 | 0.6\% | 5,875 | 9,018 | 39.5\% | 60.5\% |
| USLF | 19,446 | 0.8\% | 13,094 | 6,352 | 67.3\% | 32.7\% |
| USLP | 13,333 | 0.6\% | 1,571 | 11,762 | 11.8\% | 88.2\% |
| WDOW | 632 | 0.0\% | 632 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| YTRK | 41,975 | 1.7\% | 25,266 | 16,709 | 60.2\% | 39.8\% |
| Sub-Total | 127,793 | 5.3\% | 41,767 | 86,026 | 32.7\% | 67.3\% |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | 3,460 | 0.1\% | 2,222 | 1,238 | 64.2\% | 35.8\% |
| PCOD | 77,350 | 3.2\% | 50,189 | 27,161 | 64.9\% | 35.1\% |
| PWHT | 693 | 0.0\% | 628 | 65 | 90.6\% | 9.4\% |
| SABL | 82,958 | 3.4\% | 33,705 | 49,253 | 40.6\% | 59.4\% |
| Sub-Total | 164,461 | 6.8\% | 86,552 | 77,909 | 52.6\% | 47.4\% |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 68,152 | 2.8\% | 68,152 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| OCTP | 164 | 0.0\% | 164 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SKAT | 2,838 | 0.1\% | 2,731 | 107 | 96.2\% | 3.8\% |
| SSRK | 47 | 0.0\% | 47 | - | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| MISC | 117 | 0.0\% | - | - | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 71,318 | 3.0\% | 71,094 | 107 | 99.7\% | 0.2\% |
| Grand Total | 2,404,611 | 100\% | 515,673 | 1,888,821 | 21.4\% | 78.5\% |

Table 8. Vessel comparison of total catch in non-directed tows.

| Fish Ticket Adjusted Logbook Data for Non-Directed Tows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 21,276 | 15,243 | 25,837 | 15,705 | 29,299 | 24,970 | 8,673 |
| DOVR | 14,061 | 9,342 | 1,882 | 3,517 | 4,270 | 6,359 | 2,594 |
| EGLS | 19,692 | 6,894 | 1,557 | 6,184 | 1,714 | 2,162 | 7,080 |
| OFLT | 3,217 | 2,390 | 1,855 | - | - | 294 | - |
| PTRL | 18,095 | 3,855 | 2,102 | 9,837 | 20,914 | 14,190 | 6,850 |
| REX | 894 | - | - | - | 96 | - | 206 |
| RSOL | 99 | - | - | 106 | 265 | 454 | - |
| SSOL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 77,334 | 37,725 | 33,233 | 35,348 | 56,557 | 48,429 | 25,403 |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 460 | - | 489 | 356 | 891 | 175 | 149 |
| DBRK | - | 356 | - | - | 507 | - | - |
| POP | 996 | - | 1,095 | 167 | 134 | - | 119 |
| SSPN | 1,774 | 1,224 | 973 | - | 619 | 506 | 114 |
| USLF | 3,970 | 108 | 1,793 | 1,981 | 813 | 214 | 1,141 |
| USLP | 478 | 257 | - | 117 | - | 114 | 252 |
| WDOW | - | - | - | 139 | 25 | - | - |
| YTRK | 7,356 | 294 | 7,126 | 1,266 | 8,147 | 478 | 319 |
| Sub-Total | 15,035 | 2,240 | 11,476 | 4,027 | 11,135 | 1,487 | 2,095 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | 700 | - | 178 | 389 | - | 241 | 292 |
| PCOD | 7,232 | 616 | 1,473 | 2,484 | 26,411 | 6,364 | 4,988 |
| PWHT | - | - | - | - | 558 | - | - |
| SABL | 8,998 | 7,003 | 4,339 | 1,971 | 4,939 | 5,116 | 1,234 |
| Sub-Total | 16,930 | 7,619 | 5,990 | 4,845 | 31,908 | 11,721 | 6,514 |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 18,346 | - | - | 195 | 13,571 | - | - |
| OCTP | - | - | - | - | - | 164 | - |
| SKAT | 1,037 | 943 | - | - | 315 | - | - |
| SSRK | , | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MISC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 19,383 | 943 | - | 195 | 13,886 | 164 | - |
| Grand Total | 128,681 | 48,527 | 50,698 | 44,415 | 113,487 | 61,800 | 34,012 |

Table 9. Vessel comparison of percent composition of total catch in non-directed tows.

| Percent Composition of total catch in Non-Directed Tows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 16.5\% | 31.4\% | 51.0\% | 35.4\% | 25.8\% | 40.4\% | 25.5\% |
| DOVR | 10.9\% | 19.3\% | 3.7\% | 7.9\% | 3.8\% | 10.3\% | 7.6\% |
| EGLS | 15.3\% | 14.2\% | 3.1\% | 13.9\% | 1.5\% | 3.5\% | 20.8\% |
| OFLT | 2.5\% | 4.9\% | 3.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% |
| PTRL | 14.1\% | 7.9\% | 4.1\% | 22.1\% | 18.4\% | 23.0\% | 20.1\% |
| REX | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% |
| RSOL | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% |
| SSOL | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 60\% | 78\% | 66\% | 80\% | 50\% | 78\% | 75\% |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% |
| DBRK | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| POP | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% |
| SSPN | 1.4\% | 2.5\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.8\% | 0.3\% |
| USLF | 3.1\% | 0.2\% | 3.5\% | 4.5\% | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 3.4\% |
| USLP | 0.4\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.7\% |
| WDOW | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| YTRK | 5.7\% | 0.6\% | 14.1\% | 2.9\% | 7.2\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% |
| Sub-Total | 12\% | 5\% | 23\% | 9\% | 10\% | 2\% | 6\% |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% |
| PCOD | 5.6\% | 1.3\% | 2.9\% | 5.6\% | 23.3\% | 10.3\% | 14.7\% |
| PWHT | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SABL | 7.0\% | 14.4\% | 8.6\% | 4.4\% | 4.4\% | 8.3\% | 3.6\% |
| Sub-Total | 13\% | 16\% | 12\% | 11\% | 28\% | 19\% | 19\% |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 12.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| OCTP | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% |
| SKAT | 0.8\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SSRK | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| MISC | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 15\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 12\% | 0\% | 0\% |

Table 10. Vessel comparison of total catch in directed tows.

| Fish Ticket Adjusted Logbook Data for Directed Tows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 41,336 | 76,518 | 264,168 | 655,107 | 178,587 | 113,783 | 316,423 |
| DOVR | 2,167 | 8,446 | 5,718 | 718 | 7,897 | 4,143 | 413 |
| EGLS | 792 | 5 | 1,434 | 293 | 1,413 | 2 | 2,543 |
| OFLT | 3,806 | 4,044 | - | 3 | - | 1,500 | - |
| PTRL | 3,087 | 133 | 1,216 | 1,114 | 12,099 | 8,973 | 2,879 |
| REX | 1,703 | - | - | 25 | 419 | - | 299 |
| RSOL | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | - |
| SSOL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 52,891 | 89,145 | 272,536 | 657,261 | 200,431 | 128,401 | 322,557 |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 650 | - | 145 | - | 100 | 124 | 132 |
| DBRK | - | 165 | - | - | - | - | - |
| POP | - | 958 | 8,561 | 8,131 | 122 | - | 5,293 |
| SSPN | 2,872 | 1,314 | 755 | 52 | 867 | 1,669 | 469 |
| USLF | 429 | 164 | 1,460 | 102 | 844 | 945 | 917 |
| USLP | 494 | 1,582 | 2,795 | 1,776 | 21 | 300 | 2,154 |
| WDOW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| YTRK | 363 | - | 6,160 | - | 6,769 | 176 | 3,056 |
| Sub-Total | 4,807 | 4,182 | 19,876 | 10,060 | 8,724 | 3,214 | 12,020 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | 47 | - | 281 | - | 292 | 234 | 149 |
| PCOD | 832 | - | 2,134 | 301 | 13,817 | 8,956 | 783 |
| PWHT | - | - | - | 58 | - | - | - |
| SABL | 4,471 | 5,023 | 9,570 | 9,628 | 2,053 | 13,638 | 4,719 |
| Sub-Total | 5,350 | 5,023 | 11,985 | 9,986 | 16,162 | 22,828 | 5,650 |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 1,052 | - | - | 383 | 5,650 | - | - |
| OCTP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SKAT | - | - | - | 90 | - | - | - |
| SSRK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MISC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total | 1,052 | - | - | 473 | 5,650 | - | - |
| Grand Total | 64,101 | 98,350 | 304,398 | 677,780 | 230,966 | 154,444 | 340,227 |

Table 11. Vessel comparison of percent composition of total catch in non-directed tows.

| Percent Composition of total catch in Non-Directed Tows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 64.5\% | 77.8\% | 86.8\% | 96.7\% | 77.3\% | 73.7\% | 93.0\% |
| DOVR | 3.4\% | 8.6\% | 1.9\% | 0.1\% | 3.4\% | 2.7\% | 0.1\% |
| EGLS | 1.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% |
| OFLT | 5.9\% | 4.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% |
| PTRL | 4.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 5.2\% | 5.8\% | 0.8\% |
| REX | 2.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
| RSOL | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SSOL | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 83\% | 91\% | 90\% | 97\% | 87\% | 83\% | 95\% |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% |
| DBRK | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| POP | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 2.8\% | 1.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% |
| SSPN | 4.5\% | 1.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 1.1\% | 0.1\% |
| USLF | 0.7\% | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.3\% |
| USLP | 0.8\% | 1.6\% | 0.9\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% |
| WDOW | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| YTRK | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 0.1\% | 0.9\% |
| Sub-Total | 7\% | 4\% | 7\% | 1\% | 4\% | 2\% | 4\% |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% |
| PCOD | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 6.0\% | 5.8\% | 0.2\% |
| PWHT | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SABL | 7.0\% | 5.1\% | 3.1\% | 1.4\% | 0.9\% | 8.8\% | 1.4\% |
| Sub-Total | 8\% | 5\% | 4\% | 1\% | 7\% | 15\% | 2\% |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 1.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| OCTP | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SKAT | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| SSRK | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| MISC | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% |

Table 12. Vessel summary of non-rockfish discard information collected at-sea.

## Non-Rockfish Discard data collected for successful tows

## All Vessels

| Total Discard Estimate Collected? | Sub-Sample | Number of Tows |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 93 | 55 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 48 | 40 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 29 | 37 |
| Yes | None | 17 | 26 |
| No | None | 76 | 43 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 27 | 32 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 10 | 13 |
| No | Species Lengths | 3 | 0 |
| Total |  | 303 | 246 |
| Percent of tows with sufficient data to estimate discard. Percent of all tows with sufficient data to estimate discard. Percent of tows without data: |  | 56.1\% 53.7\% |  |
|  |  | $55.0 \%$ |  |
|  |  | 21.7\% |  |
| Vessel A |  |  |  |
| Total Discard Estimate Collected? | Sub-Sample | Number of Tows |  |
|  | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 14 | 24 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 3 | 9 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | None | 2 | 11 |
| No | None | 0 | 7 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 3 | 20 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 0 | 1 |
| No | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 22 | 72 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 77.3\% | 45.8\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 53.2\% |  |
| Percent of tows without | data: | 7.4\% |  |
| Vessel B |  |  |  |
| Total Discard | Sub-Sample | Num | of Tows |
| Estimate Collected? | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 15 | 9 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 3 | 12 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | None | 3 | 5 |
| No | None | 2 | 0 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 2 | 0 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 0 | 2 |
| No | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 25 | 28 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 72.0\% | 75.0\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 73.6\% |  |
| Percent of tows without | data: | 3.8\% |  |
| Vessel C |  |  |  |
| Total Discard | Sub-Sample | Num | of Tows |
| Estimate Collected? | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 15 | 7 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 24 | 14 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | None | 4 | 0 |
| No | None | 9 | 1 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 13 | 3 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 4 | 0 |
| No | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 69 | 25 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 56.5\% | 84.0\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 63.8\% |  |
| Percent of tows without | data: | 10.6\% |  |

Table 12 (continued). Vessel summary of non-rockfish discard information collected at-sea.

| Non-Rockfish Discard data collected for successful tows |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vessel D |  |  |  |
| Total Discard Estimate Collected? | Sub-Sample <br> Data Type | Number of Tows |  |
|  |  | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 25 | 1 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 14 | 4 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | None | 0 | 0 |
| No | None | 14 | 3 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 7 | 8 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 1 | 8 |
| No | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 61 | 24 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 63.9\% | 20.8\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 51.8\% |  |
| Percent of tows withou | data: | 20.0\% |  |
| Vessel E |  |  |  |
| Total Discard | Sub-Sample | Numb | of Tows |
| Estimate Collected? | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 0 | 1 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 4 | 1 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 2 | 8 |
| Yes | None | 1 | 5 |
| No | None | 38 | 29 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 0 | 0 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 4 | 2 |
| No | Species Lengths | 1 | 0 |
| Total |  | 50 | 46 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 12.0\% | 21.7\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 16.7\% |  |
| Percent of tows withou | data: | 69.8\% |  |
| Vessel F |  |  |  |
| Total Discard | Sub-Sample | Numb | of Tows |
| Estimate Collected? | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 2 | 1 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 26 | 29 |
| Yes | None | 4 | 2 |
| No | None | 2 | 1 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 0 | 0 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 0 | 0 |
| No | Species Lengths | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 34 | 33 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 82.4\% | 90.9\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 86.6\% |  |
| Percent of tows withou | data: | 4.5\% |  |
| Vessel G |  |  |  |
| Total Discard | Sub-Sample | Numb | of Tows |
| Estimate Collected? | Data Type | Directed | Non-Directed |
| Yes | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 22 | 12 |
| Yes | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 0 | 0 |
| Yes | Species Lengths | 1 | 0 |
| Yes | None | 3 | 3 |
| No | None | 11 | 2 |
| No | Species Comp. (Lbs) | 2 | 1 |
| No | Species Comp. (\#'s) | 1 | 0 |
| No | Species Lengths | 2 |  |
| Total |  | 42 | 18 |
| Percent of tows with su | fficient data to estimate discard. | 54.8\% | 66.7\% |
| Percent of all tows with | sufficient data to estimate discard. | 58.3\% |  |
| Percent of tows withou | data: | 21.7\% |  |

Table 13. Summary of rockfish discard information collected at-sea by vessel

| Rockfish Data Collected in Successful Tows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rockfish Hailed? | Sub-Sample <br> Data Type | A | B | C | Vessel D | E | F | G | Total | Percent |
| Yes | Rockfish Comp. (Lbs) | 28 | 9 | 43 | 54 | 15 | 7 | 33 | 189 | 34.4\% |
| Yes | Rockfish Comp. (\#'s) | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 3.6\% |
| Yes | Rockfish Lengths | 18 | 7 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 80 | 14.6\% |
| Yes | None | 0 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 15 | 22 | 7 | 70 | 12.8\% |
| No | None | 3 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 31 | 15 | 5 | 69 | 12.6\% |
| No | Rockfish Comp. (Lbs) | 18 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 57 | 10.4\% |
| No | Rockfish Comp. (\#'s) | 10 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 3.5\% |
| No | Rockfish Lengths | 8 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 45 | 8.2\% |
| Total | Total Tows | 94 | 53 | 94 | 85 | 96 | 67 | 60 | 549 | 100.0\% |

Table 14. Summary of weight-length data and estimated mean size of discarded fish.

| Basket weight data collected at-sea from discarded catch. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | \# of <br> Baskets | \# of Fish | Total Weight | Mean Weight |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |
| Arrowtooth | 25 | 421 | 437 | 1.0 |
| Dover | 29 | 534 | 474 | 0.9 |
| English | 10 | 54 | 61 | 1.1 |
| 'Flathead Sole |  |  |  | 1.0 |
| Halibut | 9 | 27 | 710 | 26.3 |
| Petrale | 1 | 13 | 30 | 2.3 |
| Rex | 24 | 333 | 154 | 0.5 |
| Sandab | 10 | 84 | 19 | 0.2 |
| 'Sand Sole |  |  |  | 1.0 |
| Slender Sole | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0.2 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |
| Hake | 44 | 540 | 1109 | 2.1 |
| Lingcod | 4 | 25 | 81 | 3.3 |
| 'Pollock |  |  |  | 1.0 |
| Sablefish | 7 | 44 | 72 | 1.6 |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |
| Dogfish | 56 | 1310 | 2995 | 2.3 |
| Ellpout | 3 | 9 | 8 | 0.9 |
| Ratfish | 23 | 238 | 249 | 1.0 |
| Sculpin | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Shad | 9 | 22 | 37 | 1.7 |
| Skate | 48 | 303 | 1348 | 4.4 |
| Slender Sole | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0.2 |
| Wolf-eel |  |  |  | 3.0 |
| Crab |  |  |  |  |
| 'Dungeness |  |  |  | 1.5 |
| ' Average weight is assumed for these species. |  |  |  |  |

Table 15. Summary of weight-length data and estimated mean size for retained rockfish (collected at-sea).

| Basket weight data collected at-sea from retainedrockfish catch. <br> \# of <br> \# of | Total |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | Baskets | Fish | Weight | Mean |
| Blackgill | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.1 |
| Bocaccio | 7 | 17 | 138 | 8.1 |
| Canary | 4 | 6 | 21 | 3.5 |
| Darkblotched | 30 | 210 | 275 | 1.3 |
| Greenstriped | 51 | 2635 | 2868 | 1.1 |
| POP | 57 | 1234 | 2815 | 2.3 |
| Redbanded | 44 | 182 | 437 | 2.4 |
| Redstriped | 18 | 697 | 778 | 1.1 |
| Rosethorn | 28 | 171 | 82 | 0.5 |
| Rougheye | 32 | 215 | 582 | 2.7 |
| Sharpchin | 20 | 212 | 160 | 0.8 |
| Shortraker | 7 | 106 | 199 | 1.9 |
| Shortspine Thornyhead | 12 | 59 | 132 | 2.2 |
| Silvergrey | 5 | 8 | 42 | 5.2 |
| Splitnose | 39 | 1252 | 666 | 0.5 |
| Widow | 4 | 7 | 26 | 3.8 |
| Yelloweye | 1 | 3 | 43 | 14.3 |
| Yellowtail | 22 | 335 | 1188 | 3.5 |

Table 16. Individual weight-length and numbers of fish collected in port from unmarketable and forfeited catch.

| Species | Total W eight | Number of Lengths | Mean Weight |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |
| Arrotooth | 0.94 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Dover | 0.57 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Rex | 7.93 | 15 | 0.5 |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |
| Greenstripe | 6.52 | 11 | 0.6 |
| POP | 2.41 | 2 | 1.2 |
| Rosethorn | 1.06 | 2 | 0.5 |
| Rougheye | 1.54 | 2 | 0.8 |
| Sharpchin | 1.37 | 2 | 0.7 |
| Shortspine | 6.1 | 19 | 0.3 |
| Splitnose | 16.26 | 24 | 0.7 |
| Widow | 7.97 | 2 | 4.0 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |
| Sable | 14.07 | 2 | 7.0 |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |
| Dogfish | 37.74 | 18 | 2.1 |
| Skate | 11.05 | 7 | 1.6 |
| Individual weight-length data collected shoreside from forfieted catch. |  |  |  |
| Species | Total Weight | Number of Lengths | Mean Weight |
| Canary | 651.77 | 151 | 4.3 |

Table 17. Summary of weight-length data and estimated mean size from unmarketable rockfish.

| Basket weight data collected from unmarketable rockfish. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | Weight of all Baskets | Total number of Fish Weighed | Mean Weight |
| Darkblotched | 36.23 | 130 | 0.28 |
| Greenspotted | 1.06 | 2 | 0.53 |
| Greenstripe | 71.41 | 132 | 0.54 |
| POP | 73.03 | 223 | 0.33 |
| Redbanded | 24.62 | 53 | 0.46 |
| Redstripe | 1.36 | 2 | 0.68 |
| Rosethorn | 83.92 | 180 | 0.47 |
| Rougheye | 5.65 | 10 | 0.57 |
| Sharpchin | 50.65 | 104 | 0.49 |
| Shortspine | 29.75 | 117 | 0.25 |
| Splitnose | 664.49 | 1671 | 0.40 |
| Yelloweye | 0.51 | 1 | 0.51 |
| Total | 1042.68 | 2625 |  |

Table 18. Comparisons of rockfish mean weight for unmarketable and retained rockfish.

| Mean weight of unmarketable and retained rockfish catch. <br> Mean Weight of <br> Unmarketable | Mean Weight of <br> Catch |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Species | 0.28 | 1.31 |
| Darkblotched | 0.53 |  |
| Greenspotted | 0.54 | 1.09 |
| Greenstripe | 0.34 | 2.28 |
| POP | 0.46 | 2.40 |
| Redbanded | 0.68 | 1.12 |
| Redstripe | 0.47 | 0.48 |
| Rosethorn | 0.60 | 2.71 |
| Rougheye | 0.49 | 0.75 |
| Sharpchin | 0.26 | 2.24 |
| Shortspine | 0.40 | 0.53 |
| Splitnose | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| Widow | 0.51 | 14.33 |
| Yelloweye |  |  |

Table 19. Total estimated catch and discard for the arrowtooth EFP fishery.
Total estimated catch and discard

| Species | Total Estimated |  | Discard Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Catch(lbs) | Discard(lbs) |  |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |
| Arrowtooth Flounder | 1,888,692 | 184,348 | 9.8\% |
| Dover Sole | 128,158 | 54,832 | 42.8\% |
| English Sole | 60,444 | 8,560 | 14.2\% |
| Halibut | 92,998 | 92,998 | 100.0\% |
| Other Flatfish | 45,376 | 26,561 | 58.5\% |
| Petrale | 152,366 | 46,953 | 30.8\% |
| Rex Sole | 23,958 | 19,921 | 83.1\% |
| Sand Sole | 299 | 220 | 73.6\% |
| Sub-Total | 2,392,291 | 434,393 | 18.2\% |
|  | Rockfish |  |  |
| Canary | 5,226 | 2,574 | 49.3\% |
| Darkblotched | 4,359 | 22 | 0.5\% |
| POP | 28,099 | 4,528 | 16.1\% |
| Shortspine Thornyhead | 14,893 | 3,838 | 25.8\% |
| Shelf | 21,656 | 12,193 | 56.3\% |
| Slope | 15,851 | 5,922 | 37.4\% |
| Widow | 632 | - | 0.0\% |
| Yellowtail | 41,975 | 10,014 | 23.9\% |
| Sub-Total | 132,691 | 39,091 | 29.5\% |
|  | Roundfish |  |  |
| Lingcod | 10,627 | 7,174 | 67.5\% |
| Pacific Whiting | 5,347 | 4,660 | 87.2\% |
| Pacific Cod | 77,350 | - | 0.0\% |
| Sablefish | 123,178 | 40,285 | 32.7\% |
| Sub-Total | 216,503 | 52,120 | 24.1\% |
|  | Miscellaneous |  |  |
| Dogfish | 326,909 | 259,512 | 79.4\% |
| Eelpout | 583 | 583 | 100.0\% |
| Ratfish | 53,481 | 53,481 | 100.0\% |
| Sculpin | 220 | 220 | 100.0\% |
| Shad | 4,841 | 4,841 | 100.0\% |
| Skate | 73,978 | 68,409 | 92.5\% |
| Snailfish | 31 | 31 | 100.0\% |
| Wolf-eel | 38 | 38 | 100.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 460,081 | 387,115 | 84.1\% |
|  | Crab |  |  |
| Dungeness | 96 | 96 | 100.0\% |
| Grand Total | 3,201,661 | 912,719 | 28.5\% |

Table 20. Length frequency distribution of discarded catch..

| Length |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 흠 } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \text { 山̈ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { O} \\ & . \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{O} \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Y } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { Q } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{O} \\ & \mathscr{\infty} \\ & \times \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathscr{O}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{5}{6}$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ 0 0 0 0 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ত্ত } \\ & \frac{\pi}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{0} \\ & \omega \\ & \omega \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 16 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 17 | 5 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 18 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
|  | 19 | 17 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |
|  | 20 | 29 |  |  | 5 | 5 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
|  | 21 | 20 |  | 1 | 4 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 |
|  | 22 | 15 |  | 2 |  | 11 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 |
|  | 23 | 14 |  | 3 |  | 23 |  |  | 11 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |
|  | 24 | 23 |  | 7 | 4 | 17 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 1 |  | 8 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 5 | 2 |
|  | 25 | 19 |  | 2 | 9 | 12 |  |  | 33 | 1 |  | 7 |  | 11 |  | 1 |  |  | 9 |  |
|  | 26 | 47 |  | 12 | 3 | 10 |  |  | 40 | 2 |  | 8 |  | 17 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 7 |  |
|  | 27 | 89 |  | 12 | 16 | 12 |  |  | 73 | 1 |  | 12 |  | 24 |  | 4 | 2 |  | 24 |  |
|  | 28 | 115 |  | 17 | 24 | 13 |  | 1 | 118 | 3 |  | 12 |  | 32 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 16 |  |
|  | 29 | 146 |  | 27 | 35 | 9 |  |  | 164 | 3 |  | 35 | 1 | 32 |  |  | 3 |  | 5 |  |
|  | 30 | 154 |  | 29 | 38 | 11 |  |  | 173 | 15 | 1 | 50 |  | 31 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 2 |  |
|  | 31 | 150 |  | 38 | 32 | 23 |  |  | 169 | 18 | 1 | 27 | 1 | 11 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
|  | 32 | 130 |  | 41 | 37 | 47 |  |  | 166 | 35 | 2 | 45 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |
|  | 33 | 78 | 1 | 60 | 31 | 57 |  |  | 89 | 29 | 1 | 46 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |
|  | 34 | 54 |  | 48 | 28 | 47 |  | 1 | 32 | 35 | 8 | 39 | 1 |  |  |  | 5 | 1 |  |  |
|  | 35 | 41 |  | 41 | 17 | 33 |  |  | 20 | 24 | 8 | 34 | 1 |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |
|  | 36 | 40 | 1 | 35 | 19 | 29 | 1 |  | 7 | 21 | 10 | 30 | 11 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |
|  | 37 | 36 |  | 30 | 10 | 13 |  |  | 4 | 13 | 7 | 29 | 30 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
|  | 38 | 46 | 1 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 1 |  |  | 6 | 3 | 14 | 50 |  |  |  | 11 | 5 |  |  |
|  | 39 | 49 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 5 |  |  |  | 4 | 7 | 11 | 73 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |
|  | 40 | 58 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 11 | 7 | 109 |  |  |  | 6 | 1 |  |  |
|  | 41 | 65 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 15 | 1 | 94 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |  |  |
|  | 42 | 64 | 11 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 12 |  | 82 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |
|  | 43 | 50 | 16 | 4 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 12 | 1 | 46 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |
|  | 44 | 42 | 34 |  |  | 4 | 10 |  |  | 1 | 20 | 1 | 35 |  |  |  | 3 | 2 |  |  |
|  | 45 | 34 | 34 | 1 |  |  | 9 | 1 |  | 2 | 23 | 1 | 12 |  |  |  | 4 | 3 |  |  |
|  | 46 | 17 | 42 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 26 |  | 12 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |
|  | 47 | 16 | 37 | 2 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 30 | 1 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 |
|  | 48 | 5 | 37 |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 23 | 1 | 13 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
|  | 49 | 14 | 38 | 2 |  |  | 19 |  |  | 1 | 17 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
|  | 50 | 7 | 33 |  |  |  | 22 | 2 |  | 1 | 18 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 51 | 1 | 50 |  |  |  | 12 | 1 |  |  | 15 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
|  | 52 | 5 | 48 |  |  |  | 14 |  |  | 1 | 16 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |
|  | 53 | 5 | 37 |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  | 11 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |
|  | 54 | 7 | 44 |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |
|  | 55 | 3 | 33 | 1 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  | 11 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |
|  | 56 | 6 | 34 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 17 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | 57 | 9 | 28 |  |  |  | 6 | 1 |  |  | 14 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | 58 | 11 | 24 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 13 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |
|  | 59 | 10 | 18 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | 60 | 8 | 18 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | 61 | 9 | 11 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | 62 | 4 | 8 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |
|  | 63 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
|  | 64 | 7 | 15 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 65 | 2 | 9 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 66 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 67 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |
|  | 68 | 4 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 69 | 2 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 70 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 71 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 72 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 73 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 75 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 76 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 77 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 78 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 79 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | 80+ |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |
| Total |  | 1798 | 746 | 452 | 334 | 410 | 178 | 10 | 1123 | 226 | 385 | 418 | 615 | 174 | 3 | 12 | 70 | 139 | 80 | 14 |
| Average |  | 34.5 | 52.9 | 33.1 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 51.3 | 46.4 | 29.9 | 34.1 | 47.7 | 32.7 | 41.5 | 27.8 | 30.0 | 24.6 | 37.0 | 55.0 | 26.4 | 25.9 |

Table 21. Total estimated catch and discard for non-directed and directed tows in the arrowtooth EFP fishery.

Total estimated catch and discard

| Species | Non-Directed Tows |  |  | Directed Tows |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Catch(lbs) | Estimated Discard(Ibs) | Discard Rate | Total Es <br> Catch(Ibs) | timated Discard(lbs) | Discard Rate |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arrowtooth Flounder | 204,991 | 71,118 | 34.7\% | 1,683,701 | 113,230 | 6.7\% |
| Dover Sole | 53,927 | 10,830 | 20.1\% | 74,230 | 44,002 | 59.3\% |
| English Sole | 50,154 | 4,765 | 9.5\% | 10,290 | 3,795 | 36.9\% |
| Halibut | 45,891 | 45,891 | 100.0\% | 47,107 | 47,107 | 100.0\% |
| Other Flatfish | 18,415 | 9,176 | 49.8\% | 26,961 | 17,384 | 64.5\% |
| Petrale | 105,080 | 29,186 | 27.8\% | 47,285 | 17,767 | 37.6\% |
| Rex Sole | 4,742 | 3,417 | 72.0\% | 19,216 | 16,505 | 85.9\% |
| Sand Sole | 280 | 201 | 71.8\% | 19 | 19 | 100.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 483,482 | 174,584 | 36.1\% | 1,908,808 | 259,808 | 13.6\% |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canary | 3,641 | 1,409 | 38.7\% | 1,585 | 1,165 | 73.5\% |
| Darkblotched | 3,661 | 15 | 0.4\% | 698 | 7 | 1.0\% |
| POP | 2,759 | 495 | 17.9\% | 25,340 | 4,033 | 15.9\% |
| Shortspine Thornyhead | 5,875 | 1,664 | 28.3\% | 9,018 | 2,174 | 24.1\% |
| Shelf | 15,304 | 9,372 | 61.2\% | 6,352 | 2,820 | 44.4\% |
| Slope | 1,571 | 189 | 12.1\% | 14,280 | 5,733 | 40.1\% |
| Widow | 632 | - | 0.0\% | - | - | 0.0\% |
| Yellowtail | 25,266 | 5,409 | 21.4\% | 16,709 | 4,605 | 27.6\% |
| Sub-Total | 58,710 | 18,554 | 31.6\% | 73,981 | 20,537 | 27.8\% |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lingcod | 9,382 | 7,167 | 76.4\% | 1,245 | 7 | 0.6\% |
| Pacific Whiting | 5,282 | 4,660 | 88.2\% | 65 | - | 0.0\% |
| Pacific Cod | 50,189 | - | 0.0\% | 27,161 | - | 0.0\% |
| Sablefish | 73,920 | 40,280 | 54.5\% | 49,259 | 6 | 0.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 138,773 | 52,107 | 37.5\% | 77,729 | 13 | 0.0\% |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dogfish | 241,185 | 173,789 | 72.1\% | 85,724 | 85,724 | 100.0\% |
| Eelpout | 209 | 209 | 100.0\% | 374 | 374 | 100.0\% |
| Ratfish | 28,329 | 28,329 | 100.0\% | 25,152 | 25,152 | 100.0\% |
| Sculpin | 156 | 156 | 100.0\% | 64 | 64 | 100.0\% |
| Shad | 2,475 | 2,475 | 100.0\% | 2,367 | 2,367 | 100.0\% |
| Skate | 14,509 | 11,671 | 80.4\% | 59,469 | 56,738 | 95.4\% |
| Snailfish | - | - | 0.0\% | 31 | 31 | 100.0\% |
| Wolf-eel | - | - | 0.0\% | 38 | 38 | 100.0\% |
| Sub-Total | 286,863 | 216,629 | 75.5\% | 173,217 | 170,486 | 98.4\% |
| Crab |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dungeness | 96 | 96 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0 | 100.0\% |
| Grand Total | 967,925 | 461,970 | 47.7\% | 2,233,736 | 450,845 | 20.2\% |

Table 22. Ratio of rockfish species or species group catch to landed catch in non-directed and directed tows.

| Ratio of Discard to Landed Catch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Non-Directed tows |  |  |  |  | Directed tows |  |  |  |
| Species | Total |  | Petrale |  | All Flatfish | Total |  | Arrowtooth | All Flatfish |
| Canary |  | 0.24\% |  | 1.63\% | 0.39\% |  | 0.06\% | 0.07\% | 0.07\% |
| Darkblotched |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.02\% | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| POP |  | 0.10\% |  | 0.65\% | 0.16\% |  | 0.21\% | 0.25\% | 0.23\% |
| Shortspine Thornyhead |  | 0.32\% |  | 2.19\% | 0.53\% |  | 0.12\% | 0.13\% | 0.13\% |
| Shelf |  | 1.39\% |  | 9.44\% | 2.26\% |  | 0.15\% | 0.17\% | 0.16\% |
| Slope |  | 0.04\% |  | 0.25\% | 0.06\% |  | 0.17\% | 0.20\% | 0.19\% |
| Widow |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Yellowtail |  | 1.05\% |  | 7.13\% | 1.71\% |  | 0.24\% | 0.28\% | 0.27\% |

Table 23. Total estimated catch and discard by vessel for non-directed tows in the arrowtooth EFP fishery.

## Total estimated discard for non-directed tows

| Species | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arrowtooth Flounder | 37,235 | 6,702 | 6,944 | 1,413 | 7,157 | 8,742 | 2,926 |
| Dover Sole | 1,096 | 1,162 | 1,266 | 4,225 | 1,070 | 1,776 | 236 |
| English Sole | 918 | 959 | 51 | 859 | 133 | 1,771 | 74 |
| Flathead Sole | - | 360 | 1,128 | 2,926 | - | 849 | - |
| Halibut | 16,455 | 2,341 | 4,019 | 6,563 | 12,738 | 1,026 | 2,749 |
| Other Flatfish | 376 | - | 8 | - | - | 38 | - |
| Petrale | 1,786 | 5,359 | 380 | 2 | 5,079 | 16,576 | 4 |
| Rex Sole | 58 | 504 | 688 | 1,020 | 163 | 896 | 87 |
| Sanddab | 1,887 | - | 471 | - | - | 1,134 | - |
| Sand Sole | 192 | - | - | - | - | 10 | - |
| Sub-Total | 60,003 | 17,386 | 14,954 | 17,009 | 26,340 | 32,816 | 6,076 |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canary | 791 | - | 213 | 52 | 353 | - | - |
| Darkblotched | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - |
| POP | 7 | - | 481 | 3 | 1 | - | 3 |
| Shortspine Thornyhead | 862 | 197 | 582 | - | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| Shelf | 4,451 | - | 2,788 | 1,040 | 513 | 129 | 451 |
| Slope | 77 | 39 | - | 23 | - | 6 | 45 |
| Widow | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yellowtail | 1 | - | 3,326 | - | 2,082 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 6,189 | 252 | 7,390 | 1,118 | 2,949 | 136 | 521 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lingcod | 3,265 | 383 | 298 | 1,344 | 1,384 | 334 | 158 |
| Pacific Whiting | 146 | 723 | 2,003 | - | 968 | 748 | 73 |
| Sablefish | 123 | 4,339 | 794 | 7,808 | 1,136 | 25,776 | 303 |
| Sub-Total | 3,534 | 5,445 | 3,095 | 9,152 | 3,488 | 26,859 | 534 |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dogfish | 30907 | 79399 | 8125 | 11182 | 4263 | 13059 | 26854 |
| Eelpout | 0 | 3 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ratfish | 148 | 185 | 1086 | 12 | 12226 | 14309 | 364 |
| Sculpin | 0 | 0 | 11 | 134 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| Shad | 54 | 60 | 386 | 633 | 924 | 335 | 82 |
| Skate | 1705 | 967 | 2905 | 116 | 1849 | 2163 | 1966 |
| Snailfish | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wolf-eel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub-Total | 32814 | 80614 | 12719 | 12078 | 19261 | 29868 | 29275 |
| Crab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dungeness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Grand Total | 102,540 | 103,697 | 38,158 | 39,356 | 52,038 | 89,678 | 36,502 |

Table 24. Total estimated catch and discard by vessel for directed tows in the arrowtooth EFP fishery.
Total estimated discard for directed tows

| Vessel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arrowtooth Flounder | 10,505 | 7,021 | 20,790 | 21,436 | 20,288 | 14,692 | 18,497 |
| Dover Sole | 4,467 | 1,281 | 10,253 | 593 | 25,482 | 1,192 | 735 |
| English Sole | 31 | - | 248 | - | 1,818 | 926 | 773 |
| Flathead Sole | 600 | 1,574 | - | 181 | - | 5,242 | - |
| Halibut | 1,631 | 2,920 | 8,149 | 14,918 | 14,879 | 789 | 3,821 |
| Other Flatfish | 7,517 | - | - | 3 | - | 238 | 4 |
| Petrale | 337 | - | 460 | 0 | 5,967 | 10,985 | 17 |
| Rex Sole | 8,048 | 1,661 | 2,588 | 63 | 2,848 | 1,055 | 241 |
| Sanddab | 3 | - | 921 | 1 | 1,084 | 18 | - |
| Sand Sole | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | - |
| Sub-Total | 33,139 | 14,457 | 43,409 | 37,194 | 72,366 | 35,156 | 24,088 |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Canary | 1,111 | - | 14 | - | 40 | - | - |
| Darkblotched | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - |
| POP | - | - | 3,761 | 140 | 1 | - | 131 |
| Shortspine Thornyhead | 1,394 | 212 | 451 | 23 | 1 | 4 | 89 |
| Shelf | 471 | - | 1,428 | 8 | 414 | 137 | 362 |
| Slope | 79 | 1,576 | 2,418 | 647 | 5 | 15 | 992 |
| Widow | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yellowtail | 0 | - | 2,876 | - | 1,729 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 3,057 | 1,794 | 10,947 | 819 | 2,189 | 156 | 1,575 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lingcod | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - |
| Pacific Whiting | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sablefish | - | - | - | 1 | 5 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | - | - | - | 1 | 5 | 7 | - |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dogfish | 985 | 2327 | 10969 | 2992 | 32107 | 17118 | 19226 |
| Eelpout | 0 | 0 | 187 | 20 | 0 | 162 | 4 |
| Ratfish | 7623 | 117 | 2469 | 59 | 12594 | 1402 | 887 |
| Sculpin | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2 |
| Shad | 29 | 0 | 45 | 499 | 225 | 61 | 1508 |
| Skate | 401 | 352 | 6906 | 1153 | 43264 | 3146 | 1514 |
| Snailfish | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Wolf-eel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sub-Total | 9038 | 2797 | 20612 | 4784 | 88192 | 21918 | 23147 |
|  |  |  | Crab |  |  |  |  |
| Dungeness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 45,234 | 19,048 | 74,968 | 42,798 | 162,752 | 57,237 | 48,809 |

Table 25. Percent discard contribution by vessel for the arrowtooth EFP fishery.

| Vessel Portion of total Forfeited and "0" Value Catch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | C | D | E |  | G |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 73.9\% | 0.0\% | 8.8\% | 2.0\% | 15.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| DBRK | 3.3\% | 18.3\% | 57.5\% | 15.8\% | 0.0\% | 5.0\% | 0.0\% |
| POP | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 93.7\% | 3.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.0\% |
| SSPN | 58.8\% | 10.7\% | 26.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 2.9\% |
| USLF | 40.7\% | 0.0\% | 34.9\% | 8.7\% | 7.7\% | 1.4\% | 6.7\% |
| USLP | 2.6\% | 27.3\% | 40.8\% | 11.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.4\% | 17.5\% |
| WDOW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| YTRK | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 61.9\% | 0.0\% | 38.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | 23.7\% | 5.2\% | 47.1\% | 5.0\% | 13.1\% | 0.5\% | 5.4\% |

Table 26. Comparison of unmarketable catch between vessels.

| Fish Ticket Landing Data for "0" Value Catch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | c |  | E | F | G |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | 3,190 | 6,432 | 19,010 | 21,818 | 8,864 | 5,890 | 17,377 |
| DOVR | 5 | 419 | 14 | - | 12 | - | 63 |
| EGLS | - | - | - | - | 10 | - | - |
| OFLT | - | - | 8 | 3 | 8 | - | - |
| PTRL | - | - | - | 2 | 25 | - | - |
| REX | - | - | - | 1 | 9 | - | - |
| RSOL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SSOL | 8 | - | 4 | 1 | 66 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 3,203 | 6,851 | 19,036 | 21,825 | 8,994 | 5,890 | 17,440 |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| DBRK | 4 | 22 | - | 19 | - | 6 | - |
| POP | 7 | - | 20 | 16 | 2 | - | - |
| SSPN | 1,256 | 396 | 387 | 23 | 1 | 5 | 111 |
| USLF | 92 | - | 209 | 23 | 52 | 27 | - |
| USLP | 156 | 54 | 219 | 366 | 5 | 21 | - |
| WDOW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| YTRK | 1 | - | - | - | 5 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 1,516 | 472 | 835 | 447 | 65 | 59 | 111 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | - | - | - | - | - | 14 | - |
| PCOD | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - |
| PWHT | - | - | 12 | - | 65 | - | - |
| SABL | - | - | - | 1 | 17 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | - | - | 12 | 1 | 91 | 14 | - |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | 415 | 177 | 1,625 | 393 | 326 | - | 949 |
| OCTP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SKAT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SSRK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MISC | - | - | - | - | 67 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 415 | 177 | 1,625 | 393 | 393 | - | 949 |
| Grand Total | 5,134 | 7,500 | 21,508 | 22,666 | 9,543 | 5,963 | 18,500 |

Table 27. Comparison of forfeited catch among vessels.

| Fish Ticket Data for Forfeited Catch |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Species | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
| Flatfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ARTH | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| DOVR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| EGLS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| OFLT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PTRL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| REX | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RSOL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SSOL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rockfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CNRY | 1,903 | - | 226 | 52 | 393 | - | - |
| DBRK |  | - | 69 | - | - | - | - |
| POP | - | - | 4,222 | 127 | - | - | 134 |
| SSPN | 1,000 | 13 | 646 | - | - | - | - |
| USLF | 4,831 | - | 4,007 | 1,025 | 875 | 141 | 813 |
| USLP |  | 1,561 | 2,199 | 304 | - | - | 1,037 |
| WDOW | - |  | - |  | - | - | - |
| YTRK | - | - | 6,202 | - | 3,806 | - | - |
| Sub-Total | 7,733 | 1,574 | 17,571 | 1,509 | 5,074 | 141 | 1,984 |
| Roundfish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LCOD | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PCOD | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| PWHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SABL | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DSRK | - | - |  |  | - | - | - |
| OCTP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SKAT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SSRK | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| MISC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Total | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Grand Total | 7,733 | 1,574 | 17,571 | 1,509 | 5,074 | 141 | 1,984 |

Table 28. Monthly or bi-monthly trip limits on selected species for trawl gear in 2001.
Trip limits for limited entry trawl gear on selected species

| Species/Species Group | Jul-Aug | Sep-Oct |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lingcod | $400 \mathrm{lbs} /$ month | $400 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{month}$ |
| Sablefish | $11,000 \mathrm{lbs} / 2$ months | $11,000 \mathrm{lbs} / 2$ months |
| Slope Rockfish | $1,500 \mathrm{lb} / 2$ months | $1,500 \mathrm{lb} / 2$ months |
| Shelf Rockfish | $1,000 \mathrm{lbs} /$ month | $1,000 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{month}$ |
| Canary Rockfish | $300 \mathrm{lbs} /$ month | $300 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{month}$ |
| POP | $2,500 \mathrm{lbs} /$ month | $2,500 \mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{month}$ |
| Yellowtail Rockfish | $15,000 \mathrm{lbs} / 2$ months | $15,000 \mathrm{lbs} / 2$ months |

Figures


Figure 1. Tow locations for arrowtooth EFP fishery.


Figure 2. Tow frequency and hailed canary catch in directed tows.
Tow Frequency Report for Hailed Catch in Successful Non-Directed Arrowtooth Tows

| Canary Rock Interval lbs | Tows | Percent | Cumulative Tows | Cumulative Percent | Weight (lbs) | Percent | Cumulative Weight | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 181 | 73.58\% | 181 | 73.58\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| <=25 | 41 | 16.67\% | 222 | 90.24\% | 377 | 14.75\% | 377 | 14.75\% |
| <=50 | 11 | 4.47\% | 233 | 94.72\% | 443 | 17.33\% | 820 | 32.08\% |
| <=75 | 5 | 2.03\% | 238 | 96.75\% | 336 | 13.15\% | 1156 | 45.23\% |
| <=100 | 3 | 1.22\% | 241 | 97.97\% | 300 | 11.74\% | 1456 | 56.96\% |
| <=125 | 1 | 0.41\% | 242 | 98.37\% | 110 | 4.30\% | 1566 | 61.27\% |
| <=150 | 0 | 0.00\% | 242 | 98.37\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1566 | 61.27\% |
| <=175 | 1 | 0.41\% | 243 | 98.78\% | 160 | 6.26\% | 1726 | 67.53\% |
| <=200 | 1 | 0.41\% | 244 | 99.19\% | 200 | 7.82\% | 1926 | 75.35\% |
| <=225 | 0 | 0.00\% | 244 | 99.19\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1926 | 75.35\% |
| <=250 | 0 | 0.00\% | 244 | 99.19\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1926 | 75.35\% |
| <=275 | 0 | 0.00\% | 244 | 99.19\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 1926 | 75.35\% |
| <=300 | 1 | 0.41\% | 245 | 99.59\% | 300 | 11.74\% | 2226 | 87.09\% |
| <=325 | 0 | 0.00\% | 245 | 99.59\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2226 | 87.09\% |
| <=350 | 1 | 0.41\% | 246 | 100.00\% | 330 | 12.91\% | 2556 | 100.00\% |
| <=375 | 0 | 0.00\% | 246 | 100.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2556 | 100.00\% |
| <=400 | 0 | 0.00\% | 246 | 100.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2556 | 100.00\% |
| < $=425$ | 0 | 0.00\% | 246 | 100.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2556 | 100.00\% |
| <=450 | 0 | 0.00\% | 246 | 100.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2556 | 100.00\% |
| <=500 | 0 | 0.00\% | 246 | 100.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 2556 | 100.00\% |
| Total | 246 |  |  |  | 2,556 |  |  |  |




Figure 3. Tow frequency and hailed canary catch in non-directed tows.


Figure 4. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species group for all tows by Vessel A during August and September.


Figure 5. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species group for all tows by Vessel B during August and September.


Figure 6. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species for tows by Vessel C during August and September.


Figure 7. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species group for all tows by Vessel D during August and September.


Figure 8. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species group for all tows by Vessel E during August and September.


Figure 9. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species group for all tows by Vessel F during August and September.


Figure 10. Tow specific catch for key rockfish species or species group for all tows by Vessel G during August and September.


Figure 11. Length frequency plots of discarded catch.


Figure 12. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel A in August and September.


Figure 13. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel B in August and September.


Figure 14. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel C in August and September.


Figure 15. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel D in August and September.


Figure 16. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel E in August and September.


Figure 17. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel F in August and September.


Figure 18. Fish ticket adjusted lingcod and sablefish catch (retained) by tow and expanded discard for observed tows for Vessel G in August and September.

