

Status of China Rockfish (*Sebastes nebulosus*) Along the U.S. Pacific Coast in x2015x



E.J. Dick¹
Author No. 2²
Author No. 3³

¹Southwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 110 Shaffer Road, Santa Cruz, California 95060

²Northwest Fisheries Science Center, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112

³Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, Washington 98501

⁴Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2040 SE Marine Science Drive, Newport, OR 97365

DRAFT SAFE

Disclaimer: This information is distributed solely for the purpose of pre-dissemination peer review under applicable information quality guidelines. It has not been formally disseminated by NOAA Fisheries. It does not represent and should not be construed to represent any agency determination or policy.

Status of China Rockfish (*Sebastes nebulosus*) Along the U.S. Pacific Coast in x2015x

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Stock	1
Catches	1
Data and Assessment	6
Stock Biomass	8
Recruitment	11
Exploitation status	13
Ecosystem Considerations	16
Reference Points	16
Management Performance	17
Unresolved Problems And Major Uncertainties	17
Decision Table(s) (groundfish only)	18
Research And Data Needs	23
Rebuilding Projections	23
1 Introduction	24
1.1 Basic Information	24
1.2 Map	24
1.3 Life History	24
1.4 Ecosystem Considerations	24
1.5 Fishery Information	24
1.6 Summary of Management History	25
1.7 Management Performance	25
1.8 Fisheries off Canada, Alaska, and/or Mexico	25

46	2	Assessment	25
47	2.1	Data	25
48	2.1.1	Commercial Fishery Landings	25
49	2.1.2	Sport Fishery Removals	26
50	2.1.3	Estimated Discards	26
51	2.1.4	Abundance Indices	26
52	2.1.5	Fishery-Independent Data: possible sources	26
53	2.1.6	Biological Parameters and Data	27
54	2.1.7	Environmental Or Ecosystem Data Included In The Assessment . . .	30
55	2.2	History Of Modeling Approaches Used For This Stock	30
56	2.2.1	Previous Assessments	30
57	2.2.2	Previous Assessment Recommendations	30
58	2.3	Model Description	30
59	2.3.1	Transition To The Current Stock Assessment	30
60	2.3.2	Definition of Fleets and Areas	31
61	2.3.3	Summary of Data for Fleets and Areas	31
62	2.3.4	Modeling Software	31
63	2.3.5	Data Weighting	31
64	2.3.6	Priors	31
65	2.3.7	General Model Specifications	31
66	2.3.8	Estimated And Fixed Parameters	31
67	2.4	Model Selection and Evaluation	32
68	2.4.1	Key Assumptions and Structural Choices	32
69	2.4.2	Alternate Models Considered	32
70	2.4.3	Convergence	32
71	2.5	Response To The Current STAR Panel Requests	32
72	2.6	Model 1	33
73	2.6.1	Model 1 Base Case Results	33
74	2.6.2	Model 1 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	33
75	2.6.3	Model 1 Retrospective Analysis	33
76	2.6.4	Model 1 Likelihood Profiles	33
77	2.6.5	Model 1 Harvest Control Rules (CPS only)	33

78	2.6.6	Model 1 Reference Points (groundfish only)	33
79	2.7	Model 2	34
80	2.7.1	Model 2 Base Case Results	34
81	2.7.2	Model 2 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	34
82	2.7.3	Model 2 Retrospective Analysis	34
83	2.7.4	Model 2 Likelihood Profiles	34
84	2.7.5	Model 2 Harvest Control Rules (CPS only)	34
85	2.7.6	Model 2 Reference Points (groundfish only)	34
86	2.8	Model 3	34
87	2.8.1	Model 3 Base Case Results	34
88	2.8.2	Model 3 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	34
89	2.8.3	Model 3 Retrospective Analysis	34
90	2.8.4	Model 3 Likelihood profiles	34
91	2.8.5	Model 3 Harvest Control Rules (CPS only)	34
92	2.8.6	Model 3 Reference Points (groundfish only)	34
93	3	Harvest Projections and Decision Tables	34
94	4	Regional Management Considerations	35
95	5	Research Needs	35
96	6	Acknowledgments	35
97	7	Tables	36
98	8	Figures	46
99		References	

100 **Executive Summary**

executive-summary

101 **Stock**

stock

102 Include: species/area, including an evaluation of any potential biological basis for regional
103 management.

104 This assessment reports the status of the China rockfish (*Sebastes nebulosus*) resource in
105 U.S. waters off the coast of the California, Oregon, and Washington using data through 2013.
106 Etc...

107 **Catches**

catches

108 Include: trends and current levels-include table for last ten years and graph with long term
109 data

110 Catch figure(s) with fleets: (Figures a-c)
111 Catch table: (Table a)

Table a: Recent China rockfish landings (mt) by fleet.

Year	tab:Exec_catch					Total
	Landings 1	Landings 2	Landings 3	Landings 4	Landings 5	
2005	-	-	-	-	-	-
2006	-	-	-	-	-	-
2007	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010	-	-	-	-	-	-
2011	-	-	-	-	-	-
2012	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-	-	-	-	-
2014	-	-	-	-	-	-




Figure a: China rockfish landings in `fig:Exec_catch1`




Figure b: Stacked line plot of China rockfish landings history for Oregon by fleet (recreational and commercial). `fig.Exec_catch2`




Figure c: Stacked line plot of China rockfish landings history for California by fleet (recreational and commercial).
 fig:Exec_catch3




Figure d: Landings history of China rockfish. `fig:r4ss_catches`

Data and Assessment

data-and-assessment

Include: date of last assessment, type of assessment model, data available, new information, and information lacking.

China rockfish was assessed. . . . This assessment uses the newest version of Stock Synthesis (3.24u). The model begins in 1900, and assumes the stock was at an unfished equilibrium that year.

Map of assessment region: (Figure [e](#)).




Figure e: Map depicting the boundaries for the base-case model. fig:assess_region_map

Stock Biomass

stock-biomass

Include: trends and current levels relative to virgin or historic levels, description of uncertainty-include table for last 10 years and graph with long term estimates.

Spawning output Figure: Figure f

Spawning output Table(s): Table b

Relative depletion Figure: Figure g

Example text (remove Models 2 and 3 if not needed - if using, remove the # in-line comments!!!)
The estimated relative depletion level (spawning output relative to unfished spawning output) of the the base-case model in 2014 is 73.4% (~95% asymptotic interval: $\pm 63.7\%$ -83.2%) (Figure g).

The estimated relative depletion level of model 2 in 2014 is (~95% asymptotic interval: \pm) (Figure g).

The estimated relative depletion level of model 3 in 2014 is (~95% asymptotic interval: \pm) (Figure g).

Table b: Recent trend in beginning of the year spawning output and depletion for the base model for China rockfish.

tab:SpawningDeplete_mod1				
Year	Spawning Output (billion eggs)	~ 95% confidence interval	Estimated depletion	~ 95% confidence interval
2005	17.891	(8.81-26.97)	0.732	(0.635-0.829)
2006	17.942	(8.86-27.03)	0.734	(0.638-0.83)
2007	18.030	(8.94-27.12)	0.738	(0.642-0.833)
2008	18.044	(8.95-27.14)	0.738	(0.643-0.833)
2009	18.034	(8.93-27.13)	0.738	(0.642-0.833)
2010	18.062	(8.96-27.17)	0.739	(0.644-0.834)
2011	17.993	(8.89-27.1)	0.736	(0.64-0.833)
2012	17.971	(8.86-27.08)	0.735	(0.638-0.832)
2013	17.981	(8.87-27.09)	0.736	(0.639-0.833)
2014	17.944	(8.83-27.06)	0.734	(0.637-0.832)




Figure f: Time series of spawning output trajectory (circles and line; median; light broken lines: 95% credibility intervals) for the base case assessment model. fig:Spawnbio_all




Figure g: Estimated relative depletion with approximate 95% asymptotic confidence intervals (dashed lines) for the base case assessment model. fig:RelDeplete_all

133 **Recruitment**

recruitment

134 Include: trends and current levels relative to virgin or historic levels-include table for last 10
135 years and graph with long term estimates.

136 Recruitment Figure: (Figure [h](#))
137 Recruitment Tables: (Tables [c](#), [??](#) and [??](#))

Table c: Recent recruitment for the base model.

		tab:Recruit_mod1	
Year	Estimated Recruitment (1,000s)	~ 95% confidence interval	
2005	33.28	(23.3 - 47.52)	
2006	33.29	(23.31 - 47.53)	
2007	33.30	(23.33 - 47.54)	
2008	33.30	(23.33 - 47.54)	
2009	33.30	(23.33 - 47.54)	
2010	33.31	(23.33 - 47.55)	
2011	33.30	(23.32 - 47.54)	
2012	33.29	(23.31 - 47.54)	
2013	33.29	(23.32 - 47.54)	
2014	33.29	(23.31 - 47.54)	




Figure h: Time series of estimated China rockfish recruitments for the base-case model with 95% confidence or credibility intervals. `fig:Recruits_all`

Exploitation status

exploitation-status

Include: exploitation rates (i.e., total catch divided by exploitable biomass, or the annual SPR harvest rate) include a table with the last 10 years of data and a graph showing the trend in fishing mortality relative to the target (y-axis) plotted against the trend in biomass relative to the target (x-axis).

Exploitation Tables: Table d, Table ??, Table ?? Exploitation Figure: Figure i).

A summary of China rockfish exploitation histories for base model is provided as Figure j.

Table d: Recent trend in spawning potential ratio and exploitation for China rockfish in the base model. Fishing intensity is $(1-SPR)$ divided by 50% (the SPR target) and exploitation is F divided by F_{SPR} .

tab:SPR_Exploit_mod1				
Year	Fishing intensity	~ 95% confidence interval	Exploitation rate	~ 95% confidence interval
2004	0.39	(0.23-0.54)	0.27	(0.14-0.39)
2005	0.44	(0.27-0.61)	0.32	(0.17-0.47)
2006	0.39	(0.24-0.55)	0.28	(0.15-0.4)
2007	0.47	(0.3-0.65)	0.35	(0.19-0.51)
2008	0.50	(0.32-0.68)	0.38	(0.2-0.55)
2009	0.45	(0.28-0.63)	0.33	(0.18-0.49)
2010	0.56	(0.36-0.76)	0.44	(0.24-0.64)
2011	0.51	(0.32-0.7)	0.39	(0.21-0.57)
2012	0.48	(0.3-0.66)	0.35	(0.19-0.52)
2013	0.53	(0.34-0.72)	0.41	(0.22-0.59)




Figure i: Estimated spawning potential ratio (SPR) for the base-case model. One minus SPR is plotted so that higher exploitation rates occur on the upper portion of the y-axis. The management target is plotted as a red horizontal line and values above this reflect harvests in excess of the overfishing proxy based on the $SPR_{50\%}$ harvest rate. The last year in the time series is 2014. fig:SPR_all




Figure j: Phase plot of estimated relative (1-SPR) vs. relative spawning biomass for the base case model. The relative (1-SPR) is (1-SPR) divided by 50% (the SPR target). Relative depletion is the annual spawning biomass divided by the unfished spawning biomass. fig:Phase_all

Ecosystem Considerations

ecosystem-considerations

In this assessment, ecosystem considerations were....

Reference Points

reference-points

Include: management targets and definition of overfishing, including the harvest rate that brings the stock to equilibrium at $B_{40\%}$ (the B_{MSY} proxy) and the equilibrium stock size that results from fishing at the default harvest rate (the F_{MSY} proxy). Include a summary table that compares estimated reference points for SSB, SPR, Exploitation Rate and Yield based on SSBproxy for MSY, SPRproxy for MSY, and estimated MSY values

Write intro paragraph....and remove text for Models 2 and 3 if not needed

This stock assessment estimates that China rockfish in the base model are above the biomass target, but above the minimum stock size threshold. **Add sentence about spawning output trend.** The estimated relative depletion level for **Model 1** in 2014 is 73.4% (~95% asymptotic interval: $\pm 63.7\%$ -83.2%, corresponding to an unfished spawning output of 17.9443 billion eggs (~95% asymptotic interval: 8.83-27.06 billion eggs) of spawning output in the base model (Table e). Unfished age 1+ biomass was estimated to be 240.8 mt in the base case model. The target spawning output based on the biomass target ($SB_{40\%}$) is 9.8 billion eggs, which gives a catch of 6.3 mt. Equilibrium yield at the proxy F_{MSY} harvest rate corresponding to $SPR_{50\%}$ is 5.8 mt.

This stock assessment estimates that China rockfish in the are

the biomass target, but the minimum stock size threshold. **Add sentence about spawning output trend.** The estimated relative depletion level for **Model 2** in 2014 is (~95% asymptotic interval: \pm), corresponding to an unfished spawning output of (~95% asymptotic interval:) of spawning output in the base model (Table ??). Unfished age 1+ biomass was estimated to be mt in the base case model. The target spawning output based on the biomass target ($SB_{40\%}$) is , which gives a catch of mt. Equilibrium yield at the proxy F_{MSY} harvest rate corresponding to $SPR_{50\%}$ is mt.

This stock assessment estimates that China rockfish in the are

the biomass target, but the minimum stock size threshold. **Add sentence about spawning output trend.** The estimated relative depletion level or **Model 3** in 2014 is (~95% asymptotic interval: \pm), corresponding to an unfished spawning output of (~95% asymptotic interval:) of spawning output in the base model (Table ??). Unfished age 1+ biomass was estimated to be mt in the base case

178 model. The target spawning output based on the biomass target ($SB_{40\%}$) is , which gives a
 179 catch of mt. Equilibrium yield at the proxy F_{MSY} harvest rate corresponding to $SPR_{50\%}$ is
 180 mt.

Table e: Summary of reference points and management quantities for the base case base model.

Quantity	Estimate	tab:Ref_pts_mod1 95% Confidence
		Interval
Unfished spawning output (billion eggs)	24.4	(15.2-33.7)
Unfished age 1+ biomass (mt)	240.8	(153-328.7)
Unfished recruitment (R0, thousands)	34.2	(22.3-46)
Spawning output(2014 billion eggs)	17.9	(8.8-27.1)
Depletion (2014)	0.7342	(0.6367-0.8317)
Reference points based on $SB_{40\%}$		
Proxy spawning output ($B_{40\%}$)	9.8	(6.1-13.5)
SPR resulting in $B_{40\%}$ ($SPR_{B40\%}$)	0.444	(0.444-0.444)
Exploitation rate resulting in $B_{40\%}$	0.0551	(0.0522-0.058)
Yield with $SPR_{B40\%}$ at $B_{40\%}$ (mt)	6.3	(4-8.5)
Reference points based on SPR proxy for MSY		
Spawning output	11.3	(7-15.5)
SPR_{proxy}	0.5	
Exploitation rate corresponding to SPR_{proxy}	0.0458	(0.0435-0.0482)
Yield with SPR_{proxy} at SB_{SPR} (mt)	5.8	(3.7-7.9)
Reference points based on estimated MSY values		
Spawning output at MSY (SB_{MSY})	5.6	(3.5-7.8)
SPR_{MSY}	0.2875	(0.2823-0.2927)
Exploitation rate at MSY	0.0924	(0.0863-0.0985)
MSY (mt)	7	(4.5-9.4)

181 Management Performance

management-performance

182 Include: catches in comparison to OFL, ABC and OY/ACL values for the most recent 10
 183 years (when available), overfishing levels, actual catch and discard. Include OFL(encountered),
 184 OFL(retained) and OFL(dead) if different due to discard and discard mortality.

185 Management performance table: Table [f](#)

186 Unresolved Problems And Major Uncertainties

unresolved-problems-and-major-uncertainties

187 TBD after STAR panel

Table f: Recent trend in total catch and commercial landings (mt) relative to the management guidelines. Estimated total catch reflect the commercial landings plus the model estimated discarded biomass.

tab:mnmgmt_perform				
Year	OFL (mt; ABC prior to 2011)	ABC (mt)	ACL (mt; OY prior to 2011)	Estimated total catch (mt)
2007	-	-	-	-
2008	-	-	-	-
2009	-	-	-	-
2010	-	-	-	-
2011	-	-	-	-
2012	-	-	-	-
2013	-	-	-	-
2014	-	-	-	-
2015	-	-	-	-
2016	-	-	-	-

Decision Table(s) (groundfish only)

decision-tables-groundfish-only

Include: projected yields (OFL, ABC and ACL), spawning biomass, and stock depletion levels for each year. Not required in draft assessments undergoing review.

OFL projection table: Table [g](#)

Decision table(s) Table [h](#), Table ??, Table ??

Yield curve: Figure [\ref{fig:Yield_all}](#)




Figure k: Equilibrium yield curve for the base case model. Values are based on the 2014 fishery selectivity and with steepness fixed at... fig:Yield_all

Table g: Projections of potential OFL (mt) for each model, using the base model forecast.

		tab:OFL_projection
Year	OFL	
2015	9.51	
2016	9.57	
2017	9.63	
2018	9.29	
2019	8.98	
2020	8.69	
2021	8.43	
2022	8.20	
2023	7.99	
2024	7.80	
2025	7.64	
2026	7.49	

Table h: Summary of 10-year projections beginning in 2016 for alternate states of nature based on an axis of uncertainty for the base model. Columns range over low, mid, and high states of nature, and rows range over different assumptions of catch levels. An entry of "–" indicates that the stock is driven to very low abundance under the particular scenario.

tab:Decision_table_mod1

		States of nature					
		Low M 0.05		Base M 0.07		High M 0.09	
	Year	Catch	Spawning Output	Depletion	Spawning Output	Depletion	Spawning Output
40-10 Rule, Low M	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
40-10 Rule	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
40-10 Rule, High M	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-
Average Catch	2019	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2020	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2021	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2022	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2023	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2024	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2025	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2026	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2027	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2028	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table i: Base case results summary.

	Quantity	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Landings (mt)											
Total Est. Catch (mt)											
OFL (mt)											
ACL (mt)											
(1-SPR)(1-SPR _{50%})			0.39	0.44	0.39	0.47	0.50	0.45	0.56	0.51	0.48
Exploitation rate			0.27	0.32	0.28	0.35	0.38	0.33	0.44	0.39	0.35
Age 1+ biomass (mt)		182.52	182.15	182.55	183.26	183.36	183.25	183.49	182.90	182.72	182.82
Spawning Output		17.9	17.9	17.9	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.1	18.0	18.0	18.0
95% CI		(8.83-27.06)	(8.81-26.97)	(8.86-27.03)	(8.94-27.12)	(8.95-27.14)	(8.93-27.13)	(8.96-27.17)	(8.89-27.1)	(8.86-27.08)	(8.87-27.09)
Depletion		0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
95% CI		(0.637-0.832)	(0.635-0.829)	(0.638-0.83)	(0.642-0.833)	(0.643-0.833)	(0.642-0.833)	(0.644-0.834)	(0.64-0.833)	(0.638-0.832)	(0.639-0.833)
Recruits		33.29	33.28	33.29	33.30	33.30	33.30	33.31	33.30	33.29	33.29
95% CI		(23.31 - 47.54)	(23.3 - 47.52)	(23.31 - 47.53)	(23.33 - 47.54)	(23.33 - 47.54)	(23.33 - 47.54)	(23.33 - 47.55)	(23.32 - 47.54)	(23.31 - 47.54)	(23.32 - 47.54)

Research And Data Needs

research-and-data-needs

Include: identify information gaps that seriously impede the stock assessment.

We recommend the following research be conducted before the next assessment:

1. List item No. 1 in the list
2. List item No. 2 in the list, etc.

Rebuilding Projections

rebuilding-projections

Include: reference to the principal results from rebuilding analysis if the stock is overfished. This section should be included in the Final/SAFE version assessment document but is not required for draft assessments undergoing review. See Rebuilding Analysis terms of reference for detailed information on rebuilding analysis requirements.

1 Introduction

introduction

1.1 Basic Information

basic-information

Include: Scientific name, distribution, the basis of the choice of stock structure, including regional differences in life history or other biological characteristics that should form the basis of management units.

1.2 Map

map

A map showing the scope of the assessment and depicting boundaries for fisheries or data collection strata is provided in Figure 1.

1.3 Life History

life-history

Include: Important features of life history that affect management (e.g., migration, sexual dimorphism, bathymetric demography).

1.4 Ecosystem Considerations

ecosystem-considerations-1

Include: Ecosystem considerations (e.g., ecosystem role and trophic relationships of the species, habitat requirements/preferences, relevant data on ecosystem processes that may affect stock or parameters used in the stock assessment, and/or cross-FMP interactions with other fisheries). This section should note if environmental correlations or food web interactions were incorporated into the assessment model. The length and depth of this section would depend on availability of data and reports from the IEA, expertise of the STAT, and whether ecosystem factors are informational to contribute quantitative information to the assessment.

1.5 Fishery Information

fishery-information

Include: Important features of current fishery and relevant history of fishery.

Rockfish example: The rockfish fishery off the U.S. Pacific coast first developed off California in the late 19th century as a hook-and-line fishery (Love et al. 2002).

The rockfish trawl fishery was established in the early 1940s, when the United States became involved in World War II and wartime shortage of red meat created an increased demand for other sources of protein (Harry and Morgan 1961, Alverson et al. 1964). Etc....

230 1.6 Summary of Management History summary-of-management-history

231 Include: Summary of management history (e.g., changes in mesh sizes, trip limits, or other
232 management actions that may have significantly altered selection, catch rates, or discards).

233 1.7 Management Performance management-performance-1

234 Include: Management performance, including a table or tables comparing Overfishing Limit
235 (OFL), Annual Catch Limit (ACL), Harvest Guideline (HG) [CPS only], landings, and catch
236 (i.e., landings plus discard) for each area and year.

237 Management performance table: (Table [f](#))
238 A summary of these values as well as other base case summary results can be found in Table
239 [i](#).

240 1.8 Fisheries off Canada, Alaska, and/or Mexico fisheries-off-canada-alaska-andor-mexico

241 Include if necessary.

242 2 Assessment assessment

243 2.1 Data data

244 Data used in the China rockfish assessment are summarized in Figure [2](#).
245 A description of each data source is below.

246 2.1.1 Commercial Fishery Landings commercial-fishery-landings

247 Sub-heading 1

248 Sub-heading 2

249 Sub-heading 3

250 **2.1.2 Sport Fishery Removals**

sport-fishery-removals

251 **Sub-heading 1**

252 **Sub-heading 2**

253 **Sub-heading 3**

254 **2.1.3 Estimated Discards**

estimated-discards

255 **Sub-heading 1**

256 **Sub-heading 2**

257 **Sub-heading 3**

258 **2.1.4 Abundance Indices**

abundance-indices

259 **Sub-heading 1**

260 **Sub-heading 2**

261 **2.1.5 Fishery-Independent Data: possible sources**

fishery-independent-data-possible-sources

262 *Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) slope survey*

263 The NWFSC slope survey was conducted annually from 1999 to 2002.

264 The depth range of this survey is 100-700 fm.

265 *Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) shelf-slope survey*

266 This survey is referred to as the “combo,” conducted annually since 2003.

267 The survey consistently covered depths between 30 and 700 fm.

268 *Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) shelf survey*

269 The survey, often referred to as the “triennial” survey was conducted every third year between
270 1977 and (and conducted in 2004 by the NWFSC using the same protocols). The triennial
271 survey trawls in depths of 30 to 275 fm.

272 *Pikitch Study*

273 The Pikitch study was conducted between 1985 and 1987 (Pikitch et al. [1988](#)). The northern

and southern boundaries of the study were 48°42' N latitude and 42°60' N. latitude respectively, which is primarily within the Columbia INPFC area (Pikitch et al. 1988 , Rogers and Pikitch 1992). Participation in the study was voluntary and included vessels using bottom, midwater, and shrimp trawl gears.

Observers of normal fishing operations on commercial vessels collected the data, estimated the total weight of the catch by tow and recorded the weight of species retained and discarded in the sample.

Enhanced Data Collection Project (EDCP)

The EDCP was conducted by ODFW to collect information on bycatch and discard groundfish species off the coast of Oregon from late 1995 to early 1999.

EDCP had limited spatial coverage in Oregon waters only.

Partnership For Interdisciplinary Studies of Coastal Oceans (PISCO)

Blurb on species presence in PISCO surveys

2.1.6 Biological Parameters and Data

biological-parameters-and-data

Length And Age Compositions

Include: Sample size information for length and age composition data by area, year, gear, market category, etc., including both the number of trips and fish sampled.

Length compositions were provided from the following sources, by region, with brief descriptions below:

Model 1

- Source No. 1 (*ex. research, commercial dead fish, live fish, etc,*
date range (ex. 2010-2011))
- Source No. 2 (*ex. research, commercial dead fish, live fish, etc,*
date range (ex. 2010-2011))
- etc...
- Begin sublist if desired
 - Sublist source No. 1
 - Sublist source No. 2
 - etc...
- Back to main list, next Source
- Last Source

Can duplicate this list if you have more than one assessment model

Possible sources of age and length data:

Recreational: Washington (WDFW)

Recreational: California MRFSS And CRFS Length Composition Data Individual fish lengths recorded by MRFSS (1980-2003) and CRFS (2004-2011) samplers were downloaded from the RecFIN website (www.recfin.org). CRFS data from 2012-2014 were obtained directly from CDFW.

Recreational: Oregon Recreational Boat Survey (ORBS) Biological data from the ORBS program were provided by ODFW. The ORBS is a dockside sampling program for the both the recreational CPFV and private modes. Length composition samples from north of Florence for the CPFV and private fleets were provided from 1980-2014. Samples from south of Florence spanned 1984-2014

Recreational: Miller and Gotshall (1965)

The Northern California Marine Sport Fish Survey conducted an assessment survey with goals that included estimation of annual fishing effort by all recreational fishing modes, catch by weight, CPUE, and collection of data to analyze length compositions

Commercial: PacFIN (Oregon and California)

Research: NMFS Groundfish Ecology Survey

From 2001-2005, the SWFSC Fisheries Ecology Division conducted longline surveys aboard a chartered commercial longline vessel at various stations between Monterey and Davenport, CA (36° N. latitude to 37.5° N. latitude) (pers. comm. Don Pearson, SWFSC). Longline gear was set in various depths from 10 meters to 700 meters, parallel to the depth contour. Each longline set consisted of 3-5 skates, each with about 250 2/0 circle hooks baited with squid. In nearshore habitats, the gear soaked for roughly 30 minutes.

Research: California Collaborative Fisheries Research Program (CCFRP)

Research: NWFSC shelf-slope survey

Research: NWFSC slope survey

Research: Abrams Thesis

Age Structures

Age structure data were available from the following sources:

Model Region 1

- Source No. 1 (*ex. research, commercia dead fish, live fish, etc,*
date range (ex. 2010-2011))

- 338 • Source No. 2 (*ex. research, commercia dead fish, live fish, etc,*
- 339 date range (ex. 2010-2011)
- 340 • etc...
- 341 • Begin sublist if desired
 - 342 – Sublist source No. 1
 - 343 – Sublist source No. 2
 - 344 – etc...
- 345 • Back to main list, next Source
- 346 • Last Source

347 Can duplicate this list if you have more than one assessment model

348 Length-at-age was initially estimated external to the population dynamics models using the
 349 von Bertalanffy growth curve (Bertalanffy 1938), $L_i = L_\infty e^{(-k[t-t_0])}$, where L_i is the length
 350 (cm) at age i , t is age in years, k is rate of increase in growth, t_0 is the intercept, and L_∞ is
 351 the asymptotic length.

352 **Aging Precision And Bias**

353 **Weight-Length**

354 The weight-length relationship is based on the standard power function: $W = \alpha(L^\beta)$ where
 355 W is individual weight (kg), L is length (cm), and α and β are coefficients used as constants.

356 **Maturity And Fecundity**

357 **Natural Mortality**

358 Natural mortality for wild fish populations is extremely difficult to estimate.

359 **Sex ratios**

360 **2.1.7 Environmental Or Ecosystem Data Included In The Assessment**
environmental-or-ecosystem-data-included-in-the-assessment

361 **2.2 History Of Modeling Approaches Used For This Stock**
history-of-modeling-approaches-used-for-this-stock

362 **2.2.1 Previous Assessments**
previous-assessments

363 **2.2.2 Previous Assessment Recommendations**
previous-assessment-recommendations

364 Include: Response to STAR panel recommendations from the most recent previous assessment.

365 **Recommendation 1: blah blah blah.**

366

367 STAT response: blah blah blah....

368 **Recommendation 2: blah blah blah.**

369

370 STAT response: blah blah blah....

371 **Recommendation 3: blah blah blah., etc.**

372

373 STAT response: Continue recommendations as needed

374 **2.3 Model Description**
model-description

375 **2.3.1 Transition To The Current Stock Assessment**
transition-to-the-current-stock-assessment

376 Include: Complete description of any new modeling approaches

377 Below, we describe the most important changes made since the last full assessment and
378 explain rationale for each change.:

379 1. Change No. 1. *Rationale*: blah blah blah.

380 2. Change No. 2. *Rationale*: blah blah blah.

381 3. Change No. 3. *Rationale*: Continue list as needed.

382 **2.3.2 Definition of Fleets and Areas** definition-of-fleets-and-areas

383 We generated data sources for each of the models. Fleets by model include:

384 **Model Region 1 or remove this line if only one model**

385 *Commercial*: The commercial fleets include...

386 *Recreational*: The recreational fleets include...

387 *Research*: Research derived-data include...

388 **2.3.3 Summary of Data for Fleets and Areas** summary-of-data-for-fleets-and-areas

389 **2.3.4 Modeling Software** modeling-software

390 The STAT team used Stock Synthesis 3 version 3.24u by Dr. Richard Methot at the NWFSC.

391 This most recent version (SS-V3.24u) was used, since it included improvements and corrections

392 to older versions.

393 **2.3.5 Data Weighting** data-weighting

394 Citation for Francis method (Francis [2011](#))

395 Citation for Ianelli-McAllister harmonic mean method (McAllister and Ianelli [1997](#))

396 **2.3.6 Priors** priors

397 Citation for Hamel prior on natural mortality (Hamel [2015](#))

398 **2.3.7 General Model Specifications** general-model-specifications

399 Citation for posterior predictive fecundity relationship from Dick ([2009](#))

400 Model data, control, starter, and forecast files can be found in Appendices A-D.

401 **2.3.8 Estimated And Fixed Parameters** estimated-and-fixed-parameters

402 A full list of all estimated and fixed parameters is provided in Tables... Estimated and fixed

403 parameters tables currently read in from .csv file, EXAMPLE: Table ??

404 2.4 Model Selection and Evaluation model-selection-and-evaluation

405 2.4.1 Key Assumptions and Structural Choices key-assumptions-and-structural-choices

406 Include: Evidence of search for balance between model realism and parsimony.
407 Comparison of key model assumptions, include comparisons based on nested models (e.g.,
408 asymptotic vs. domed selectivities, constant vs. time-varying selectivities).

409 2.4.2 Alternate Models Considered alternate-models-considered

410 Include: Summary of alternate model configurations that were tried but rejected.

411 2.4.3 Convergence convergence

412 Include: Randomization run results or other evidence of search for global best estimates.

413 Convergence testing through use of dispersed starting values often requires extreme values to
414 actually explore new areas of the multivariate likelihood surface. Jitter is a SS option that
415 generates random starting values from a normal distribution logistically transformed into
416 each parameter's range (Methot 2015). Table 3 shows the results of running 100 jitters for
417 each pre-STAR base model. . . .

418 2.5 Response To The Current STAR Panel Requests response-to-the-current-star-panel-requests

419 **Request No. 1: Add after STAR panel.**

420

421 **Rationale:** Add after STAR panel.

422 **STAT Response:** Add after STAR panel.

423 **Request No. 2: Add after STAR panel.**

424

425 **Rationale:** Add after STAR panel.

426 **STAT Response:** Add after STAR panel.

427 **Request No. 3: Add after STAR panel.**

428

429 **Rationale:** Add after STAR panel.

430 **STAT Response:** Add after STAR panel.

431 Request No. 4: Example of a request that may have a list:

432

- 433 • Item No. 1
- 434 • Item No. 2
- 435 • Item No. 3, etc.

436 **Rationale:** Add after STAR panel.

437 **STAT Response:** Continue requests as needed.

438 2.6 Model 1

model-1

439 2.6.1 Model 1 Base Case Results

model-1-base-case-results

440 Table ??

441 2.6.2 Model 1 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses

model-1-uncertainty-and-sensitivity-analyses

442 Table [4](#)

443 2.6.3 Model 1 Retrospective Analysis

model-1-retrospective-analysis

444 2.6.4 Model 1 Likelihood Profiles

model-1-likelihood-profiles

445 2.6.5 Model 1 Harvest Control Rules (CPS only)

model-1-harvest-control-rules-cps-only

446 2.6.6 Model 1 Reference Points (groundfish only)

model-1-reference-points-groundfish-only

447 Intro sentence or two. . . (Table [5](#)).

448 Equilibrium yield at the proxy F_{MSY} harvest rate corresponding to $SPR_{50\%}$ is 5.8 mt. Table
449 [e](#) shows the full suite of estimated reference points for the northern area model and Figure [k](#)
450 shows the equilibrium yield curve.

451	2.7 Model 2	model-2
452	2.7.1 Model 2 Base Case Results	model-2-base-case-results
453	2.7.2 Model 2 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	model-2-uncertainty-and-sensitivity-analyses
454	2.7.3 Model 2 Retrospective Analysis	model-2-retrospective-analysis
455	2.7.4 Model 2 Likelihood Profiles	model-2-likelihood-profiles
456	2.7.5 Model 2 Harvest Control Rules (CPS only)	model-2-harvest-control-rules-cps-only
457	2.7.6 Model 2 Reference Points (groundfish only)	model-2-reference-points-groundfish-only
458	2.8 Model 3	model-3
459	2.8.1 Model 3 Base Case Results	model-3-base-case-results
460	2.8.2 Model 3 Uncertainty and Sensitivity Analyses	model-3-uncertainty-and-sensitivity-analyses
461	2.8.3 Model 3 Retrospective Analysis	model-3-retrospective-analysis
462	2.8.4 Model 3 Likelihood profiles	model-3-likelihood-profiles
463	2.8.5 Model 3 Harvest Control Rules (CPS only)	model-3-harvest-control-rules-cps-only
464	2.8.6 Model 3 Reference Points (groundfish only)	model-3-reference-points-groundfish-only
465	3 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables	harvest-projections-and-decision-tables
466	Table f	
467	Model 1 Projections and Decision Table (groundfish only) (Table 6	
468	Table h	

469 **Model 2 Projections and Decision Table (groundfish only)**

470 **Model 3 Projections and Decision Table (groundfish only)**

471 **4 Regional Management Considerations**

regional-management-considerations

- 472 1. For stocks where current practice is to allocate harvests by management area, a
473 recommended method of allocating harvests based on the distribution of biomass should
474 be provided. The MT advisor should be consulted on the appropriate management
475 areas for each stock.
- 476 2. Discuss whether a regional management approach makes sense for the species from a
477 biological perspective.
- 478 3. If there are insufficient data to analyze a regional management approach, what are the
479 research and data needs to answer this question?

480 **5 Research Needs**

research-needs

- 481 1. Research need No. 1
- 482 2. Research need No. 2
- 483 3. Research need No. 3
- 484 4. etc.

485 **6 Acknowledgments**

acknowledgments

486 Include: STAR panel members and affiliations as well as names and affiliations of persons
487 who contributed data, advice or information but were not part of the assessment team. Not
488 required in draft assessment undergoing review.

Table 1: List of parameters used in the base model, including estimated values and standard deviations (SD), bounds (minimum and maximum), estimation phase (negative values indicate not estimated), status (indicates if parameters are near bounds, and prior type information (mean, SD).

No.	Parameter	Value	SD	Bounds	Phase	Status	Prior
1	NatM_p_1_Fem_GP_1	0.07		(0.01, 0.15)	-3		Log_Norm (-2.94, 0.53)
2	L_at_Amin_Fem_GP_1	2.00		(-10, 45)	-2		Normal (2, 10)
3	L_at_Amax_Fem_GP_1	35.41	0.36	(20, 50)	6	OK	Normal (34, 10)
4	VonBert_K_Fem_GP_1	0.15	0.01	(0.01, 0.3)	6	OK	Normal (0.1, 0.8)
5	CV_young_Fem_GP_1	0.10		(0.01, 0.25)	-6		None
6	CV_old_Fem_GP_1	0.08	0.01	(0.01, 0.25)	6	OK	None
7	NatM_p_1_Mal_GP_1	0.00		(-1, 0.15)	-3		None
8	L_at_Amin_Mal_GP_1	0.00		(-1, 45)	-2		Normal (2, 10)
9	L_at_Amax_Mal_GP_1	0.00		(-1, 50)	-4		Normal (33.13, 10)
10	VonBert_K_Mal_GP_1	0.00		(-1, 0.3)	-4		Normal (0.246, 0.8)
11	CV_young_Mal_GP_1	0.00		(-1, 0.25)	-3		None
12	CV_old_Mal_GP_1	0.00		(-1, 0.25)	-3		None
13	Wtlen_1_Fem	0.00		(0, 1)	-3		None
14	Wtlen_2_Fem	3.18		(2, 4)	-3		None
15	Mat50%_Fem	28.50		(1, 100)	-3		None
16	Mat_slope_Fem	-1.00		(-9, 9)	-3		None
17	Eggs/kg_inter_Fem	0.20		(-3, 3)	-3		None
18	Eggs/kg_slope_wt_Fem	0.06		(-3, 3)	-3		None
19	Wtlen_1_Mal	0.00		(0, 1)	-3		None
20	Wtlen_2_Mal	3.18		(2, 4)	-3		None
24	CohortGrowDev	0.00		(0, 0)	-4		None
25	SR_LN(R0)	3.53	0.18	(2, 12)	1	OK	None
26	SR_BH_steep	0.77		(0.2, 1)	-3		Full_Beta (0.773, 0.147)
27	SR_sigmaR	0.50		(0, 2)	-3		None
28	SR_envlink	0.10		(-5, 5)	-3		None
29	SR_R1_offset	0.00		(-5, 5)	-4		None

Continued on next page

Table 1: List of parameters used in the base model, including estimated values and standard deviations (SD), bounds (minimum and maximum), estimation phase (negative values indicate not estimated), status (indicates if parameters are near bounds, and prior type information (mean, SD).

No.	Parameter	Value	SD	Bounds	Phase	Status	Prior
30	SR_autocorr	0.00		(0, 0)	-99		None
68	InitF_11_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	0.00		(0, 1)	-1		None
69	InitF_22_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	0.00		(0, 1)	-1		None
70	InitF_33_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR	0.00		(0, 1)	-1		None
71	Q_extraSD_3_3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR	0.13	0.02	(0, 2)	2	OK	None
72	SizeSel_1P_1_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	34.89		(19, 36)	-4		None
73	SizeSel_1P_2_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	-4.00		(-9, 5)	-9		None
74	SizeSel_1P_3_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	3.97	0.36	(0, 9)	5	OK	None
75	SizeSel_1P_4_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	8.00		(0, 9)	-9		None
76	SizeSel_1P_5_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	-8.00		(-9, 9)	-9		None
77	SizeSel_1P_6_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR	8.00		(-9, 9)	-9		None
78	SizeSel_2P_1_2_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	34.86	1.00	(19, 36)	4	OK	None
79	SizeSel_2P_2_2_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	-4.00		(-9, 5)	-9		None
80	SizeSel_2P_3_2_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	2.92	0.35	(0, 9)	5	OK	None
81	SizeSel_2P_4_2_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	8.00		(0, 9)	-9		None
82	SizeSel_2P_5_2_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	-8.00		(-9, 9)	-9		None
83	SizeSel_2P_6_2_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PC	8.00		(-9, 9)	-9		None
tab:model_params							

Table 2: Summary of the biomass/abundance time series used in the stock assessment.

tab:Index_summary									
Region	ID	Fleet	Years	Name	Fishery ind.	Filtering	Method	Rank	Endorsed
WA	1	4	1981- 2014	Dockside CPUE	No	trip, area, month, Stephens- MacCall	delta-GLM (bin- gamma)	1	SSC
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 3: Results from 100 jitters from each of the three models.

Status	Model.1	Model.2	Model.3
Returned to base case	-	-	-
Found local minimum	-	-	-
Found better solution	-	-	-
Error in likelihood	-	-	-
Total	100	100	100

tab:jitter

Table 5: Time-series of population estimates from the base-case model.

Year	Total biomass (mt)	Spawning biomass (mt)	Depletion	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative ex- ploitation rate	SPR
1900	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1901	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1902	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1903	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1904	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1905	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1906	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1907	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1908	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1909	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1910	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1911	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1912	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1913	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1914	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1915	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1916	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1917	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1918	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1919	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1920	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1921	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1922	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1923	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1924	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1925	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1926	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1927	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1928	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1929	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1930	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1931	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1932	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1933	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1934	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1935	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1936	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1937	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1938	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1939	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00

Table 5: Time-series of population estimates from the base-case model.

Year	Total biomass (mt)	Spawning biomass (mt)	Depletion	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative ex- ploitation rate	SPR
1940	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1941	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1942	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1943	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1944	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1945	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1946	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1947	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1948	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1949	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1950	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1951	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1952	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1953	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1954	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1955	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1956	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1957	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1958	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1959	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1960	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1961	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1962	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1963	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1964	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1965	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1966	241	24	0.00	34	0	0.00	1.00
1967	223	24	0.00	34	1	0.00	0.91
1968	220	24	0.99	34	2	0.00	0.89
1969	216	24	0.99	34	2	0.17	0.87
1970	213	24	0.98	34	2	0.20	0.86
1971	209	24	0.97	34	2	0.23	0.84
1972	206	23	0.96	34	3	0.26	0.82
1973	203	23	0.95	34	3	0.29	0.80
1974	200	23	0.94	34	3	0.32	0.79
1975	197	23	0.93	34	4	0.35	0.77
1976	214	22	0.92	34	2	0.19	0.86
1977	220	22	0.91	34	1	0.14	0.89
1978	193	22	0.91	34	4	0.39	0.75
1979	201	22	0.90	34	3	0.31	0.79

Table 5: Time-series of population estimates from the base-case model.

Year	Total biomass (mt)	Spawning biomass (mt)	Depletion	Age-0 recruits	Total catch (mt)	Relative ex- ploitation rate	SPR
1980	205	22	0.89	34	3	0.27	0.82
1981	208	22	0.88	34	2	0.24	0.83
1982	203	21	0.88	34	3	0.29	0.80
1983	200	21	0.87	34	3	0.32	0.79
1984	195	21	0.86	34	3	0.36	0.77
1985	195	21	0.86	34	3	0.36	0.77
1986	189	21	0.85	34	4	0.42	0.73
1987	180	20	0.84	34	5	0.53	0.69
1988	171	20	0.82	34	6	0.65	0.64
1989	162	20	0.81	34	7	0.77	0.60
1990	155	19	0.79	33	8	0.90	0.56
1991	181	19	0.76	33	4	0.50	0.69
1992	155	18	0.75	33	8	0.89	0.56
1993	161	18	0.73	33	7	0.78	0.59
1994	174	18	0.72	33	5	0.58	0.66
1995	180	17	0.71	33	4	0.51	0.69
1996	194	17	0.71	33	3	0.35	0.76
1997	196	17	0.71	33	3	0.33	0.77
1998	206	17	0.71	33	2	0.24	0.82
1999	199	18	0.72	33	2	0.30	0.79
2000	193	18	0.72	33	3	0.37	0.75
2001	186	18	0.72	33	4	0.44	0.72
2002	199	18	0.72	33	2	0.30	0.79
2003	201	18	0.72	33	2	0.29	0.80
2004	203	18	0.73	33	2	0.27	0.81
2005	198	18	0.73	33	3	0.32	0.78
2006	203	18	0.73	33	2	0.28	0.80
2007	195	18	0.74	33	3	0.35	0.76
2008	192	18	0.74	33	3	0.38	0.75
2009	197	18	0.74	33	3	0.33	0.77
2010	186	18	0.74	33	4	0.44	0.72
2011	191	18	0.74	33	3	0.39	0.74
2012	194	18	0.74	33	3	0.35	0.76
2013	189	18	0.74	33	3	0.41	0.74
2014	194	18	0.73	33			

tab:Timeseries_mod1

Table 4: Sensitivity of the base model to dropping or down-weighting data sources and alternative assumptions about growth.

Label	tab:Sensitivity_model1							
	Base (Francis weights)	Harmonic mean weights	Drop index	Drop ages	Down- weight lengths	Free size Age0	Free CV Amin	External growth
TOTAL_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Catch_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Equil_catch_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Survey_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length_comp_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Age_comp_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parm_priors_like	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SSB_Unfished_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TotBio_Unfished	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SmryBio_Unfished	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recr_Unfished_billions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SSB_Btgt_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPR_Btgt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fstd_Btgt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TotYield_Btgt_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SSB_SPRtgt_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fstd_SPRtgt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TotYield_SPRtgt_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SSB_MSX_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPR_MSX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fstd_MSX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TotYield_MSX_thousand_mt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RetYield_MSX	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bratio_2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F_2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPRratio_2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recr_2015	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recr_Virgin_billions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L_at_Amin_Fem_GP_1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L_at_Amax_Fem_GP_1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VonBert_K_Fem_GP_1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CV_young_Fem_GP_1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CV_old_Fem_GP_1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 6: Projection of potential OFL, spawning biomass, and depletion for the base case model.

Year	OFL contriubtion (mt)	ACL landings (mt)	Age 5+ biomass (mt)	Spawning Biomass (mt)	tab:Forecast_mod1 Depletion
2015	9.51	1.97	182.58	17.95	0.73
2016	9.57	2.03	183.59	18.07	0.74
2017	9.63	8.81	184.50	18.18	0.74
2018	9.29	8.50	179.23	17.55	0.72
2019	8.98	8.22	174.48	16.98	0.69
2020	8.69	7.96	170.21	16.47	0.67
2021	8.43	7.72	166.38	16.00	0.65
2022	8.20	7.51	162.98	15.58	0.64
2023	7.99	7.31	159.93	15.20	0.62
2024	7.80	7.14	157.22	14.86	0.61
2025	7.64	6.99	154.80	14.57	0.60
2026	7.49	6.85	152.64	14.30	0.59




Figure 1: Map showing the state boundary lines for management of the recreational fishing fleets. CRFS Districts 1-6 in California are presented as well as the WDFW Recreational Management Areas in Washington. Florence, OR is shown as a potential location of model stratification. fig:boundary_map




Figure 2: Summary of data sources used in the northern assessment. fig:data_plot




Figure 3: length comps, retained, 1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR ^{fig:mod1_1_comp_lenfit_f}




Figure 4: Pearson residuals, retained, 1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR (max=4.76)
 Closed bubbles are positive residuals (observed > expected) and open bubbles are negative residuals (observed < expected).
 fig:mod1_2_comp_lenfit_residsfit1mkt2




Figure 5: N_EffN comparison, length comps, retained, 1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR fig:mod1_3_comp




Figure 6: Francis data weighting method TA1.8 1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR Suggested sample size adjustment (with 95% interval) for len data from 1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR: 0.9991 (0.6694_2.1596)
 fig:mod1_4_comp_lenfit_data_weighting_TA1.8_1_WA_SouthernWA_Rec_PCPR




Figure 7: length comps, retained, 3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR ^{fig:mod1_5_comp_lenfit_fl}




Figure 8: Pearson residuals, retained, 3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR (max=6.82)
 Closed bubbles are positive residuals (observed > expected) and open bubbles are negative residuals (observed < expected).
 fig:mod1_6_comp_lenfit_residsflt3mkt2




Figure 9: N-EffN comparison, length comps, retained, 3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR fig:mod1_7_comp_




Figure 10: Francis data weighting method TA1.8 3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR Suggested sample size adjustment (with 95% interval) for len data from 3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR: 0.9797 (0.6276_2.2231)
 fig:mod1_8_comp_lenfit_data_weighting_TA1.8_3_WA_NorthernWA_Rec_PR

length comps, retained, aggregated across time by fleet




Figure 11: length comps, retained, aggregated across time by fleet fig:mod1_9_comp_lenfit_m




Figure 12: Note: this plot doesn't seem to be working right for some models. Pearson residuals, sexes combined, retained, comparing across fleets
 Closed bubbles are positive residuals (observed > expected) and open bubbles are negative residuals (observed < expected).
 fig:mod1_10_comp_lenfit_sex1mkt2_multi-fleet_comparison

References

references

- Alverson, D.L., Pruter, a T., and Ronholt, L.L. 1964. A Study of Demersal Fishes and Fisheries of the Northeastern Pacific Ocean. Institute of Fisheries, University of British Columbia.
- Bertalanffy, L. von. 1938. A quantitative theory of organic growth. Human Biology **10**: 181–213.
- Dick, E. 2009. Modeling the reproductive potential of rockfishes (*Sebastes* spp.). PhD Dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz.
- Francis, R. 2011. Data weighting in statistical fisheries stock assessment models. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **68**: 1124–1138.
- Hamel, O. 2015. A method for calculating a meta-analytical prior for the natural mortality rate using multiple life history correlates. ICES Journal of Marine Science **72**: 62–69.
- Harry, G., and Morgan, A. 1961. History of the trawl fishery, 1884-1961. Oregon Fish Commission Research Briefs **19**: 5–26.
- Love, M., Yoklavich, M., and Thorsteinson, L. 2002. The rockfishes of the northeast Pacific. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, USA.
- McAllister, M.K., and Ianelli, J.N. 1997. Bayesian stock assessment using catch-age data and the sampling - importance resampling algorithm. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **54**(2): 284–300.
- Methot, R.D. 2015. User manual for Stock Synthesis model version 3.24s. NOAA Fisheries, US Department of Commerce.
- Miller, D., and Gotshall, D. 1965. Ocean sportfish catch and effort from Oregon to Point Arguello, California July 1, 1957-June 30, 1961. State of California, The Resources Agency Department of Fish and Game, Fish Bulletin **130**.
- Pikitch, E., Erickson, D., and Wallace, J. 1988. An evaluation of the effectiveness of trip limits as a management tool. Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, US Department of Commerce.
- Rogers, J., and Pikitch, E. 1992. Numerical definition of groundfish assemblages caught off the coasts of Oregon and Washington using commercial fishing strategies. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and and Aquatic Sciences **49**: 2648–2656.