

# **Status of SPECIES off the U.S. West Coast in 2025**

Michael Kinneen<sup>1</sup>

1. NOAA Fisheries Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East

U.S. Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Northwest Fisheries Science Center

## Table of contents

Disclaimer	i
Executive Summary	ii
Stock	ii
Catches	ii
Data and Assessment	ii
Stock biomass and dynamics	ii
Recruitment	ii
Exploitation status	ii
Ecosystem considerations	ii
Reference points	ii
Management performance	ii
Harvest projections	ii
Decision table	ii
Scientific uncertainty	ii
Research and data needs	ii
Rebuilding projections	ii
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Distribution and Stock Structure	1
1.2 Life History and Ecosystem Interactions	1
1.3 Fishery description	2
1.4 Management History and Performance	3
1.5 Fisheries off Canada and Alaska	4
<b>2 Data</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Fishery-independent data	5
2.1.1 SWFSC and NWFSC/PWCC Midwater Trawl Survey	5
2.1.2 Alaska Fisheries Science Center/Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Triennial Shelf Survey	6
2.1.3 Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey	6
2.2 Fishery-dependent data	8
2.2.1 Landings	8
2.2.2 Fishery length and age data	9
2.2.3 Discards	10
2.2.4 Biological data	10
2.2.5 Abundance indices	14
2.3 Environmental and ecosystem data	14
2.4 History of modeling approaches	15
2.5 Responses to SSC Groundfish Subcommittee requests	15
2.6 Model Structure and Assumptions	15
2.6.1 Model Changes from the Last Assessment	15
2.6.2 Modeling Platform and Structure	15

2.6.3	Model Parameters . . . . .	15
2.6.4	Key Assumptions and Structural Choices . . . . .	15
2.7	Base Model Results . . . . .	16
2.7.1	Parameter Estimates . . . . .	16
2.7.2	Fits to the Data . . . . .	17
2.7.3	Population Trajectory . . . . .	17
2.8	Model Diagnostics . . . . .	17
2.8.1	Convergence . . . . .	18
2.8.2	Parameter Uncertainty . . . . .	18
2.8.3	Sensitivity Analyses . . . . .	18
2.8.4	Retrospective Analysis . . . . .	20
2.8.5	Likelihood Profiles and key parameters . . . . .	20
2.9	Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties . . . . .	20
3	Management . . . . .	21
3.1	Reference Points . . . . .	21
3.2	Unresolved problems and major uncertainties . . . . .	21
3.3	Harvest Projections and Decision Tables . . . . .	21
3.4	Evaluation of Scientific Uncertainty . . . . .	22
3.5	Regional management considerations . . . . .	22
3.6	Research and Data Needs . . . . .	22
3.7	Acknowledgements . . . . .	23
4	Tables . . . . .	24
4.1	Data . . . . .	24
4.1.1	Fishery-dependent data . . . . .	24
5	Figures . . . . .	61
5.1	Data . . . . .	63
5.2	References . . . . .	103
6	Appendix A: Year-specific fits to the length and age compositions . . . . .	109

Please cite this publication as:

Michael Kinneen, Maurice Goodman, . (2025) Status of Widow Rockfish off the U.S. West Coast in 2025. Pacific Fishery Management Council. [XX] p.

**Disclaimer**

These materials do not constitute a formal publication and are for information only. They are in a pre-review, pre-decisional state and should not be formally cited or reproduced. They are to be considered provisional and do not represent any determination or policy of NOAA or the Department of Commerce.

## Executive Summary

Checking to see if this works Alaska Fisheries Science Center/Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Triennial Shelf Survey (Triennial Survey)

Stock

Catches

Data and Assessment

Stock biomass and dynamics

Recruitment

Exploitation status

Ecosystem considerations

Reference points

Management performance

Harvest projections

Decision table

Scientific uncertainty

Research and data needs

Rebuilding projections

## 1 Introduction

*Sebastes entomelas* (Widow Rockfish) is named after its black-lined gut cavity (*ento* meaning within and *melas* meaning black). It has been referred to as buda, beccafico (Italian bird), and viuva (widow) prior to the 1930s. More recently, the Widow Rockfish is also called brownie, belinda bass, brown bomber, and soft brown.

This is an assessment of Widow Rockfish that inhabit the waters off California, Oregon, and Washington from the U.S.-Canadian border in the north to the U.S.-Mexico border in the south, and does not include Puget Sound waters (Figure 1). This assessment represents a thorough reconsideration of the data, data preparation, and model structure for assessing Widow Rockfish, including reinvestigations of recent and historical catches (including discards), length and age data, and fleet structure.

### 1.1 Distribution and Stock Structure

Widow Rockfish inhabit water depths of 25–370 m from northern Baja California, Mexico to Southeastern Alaska, and are most abundant from British Columbia to Northern California. Although catches north of the U.S.-Canada border or south of the U.S.-Mexico border were not included in this assessment, it is possible that these populations contribute to the biomass of Widow Rockfish off of the U.S. West Coast through adult migration and/or larval dispersion.

There is little evidence of genetically separate stocks along the U.S. coast and past assessments have used a single area, coastwide model with multiple fisheries (He et al. 2011). In 2011, a two-area assessment model was brought forward for review, and was found to be similar to a coastwide model (He et al. 2011). There is some evidence of biological differences between areas. For example, Widow Rockfish collected off California tend to mature at a smaller length than Widow Rockfish collected off of Oregon (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**). This may be due to environmental or anthropogenic effects rather than genetic differences. The connectivity of Widow Rockfish populations throughout its range is unknown and it was decided to continue with a single area model for this assessment instead of potentially lose prediction power by splitting the data into two separate areas.

### 1.2 Life History and Ecosystem Interactions

Widow Rockfish are atypical for West Coast rockfish species because they form dense midwater aggregations at night, which were largely undetected until the late 1970s.

They are typically found over high relief strata and near cobblestone. The diet of Widow Rockfish is dominated by species that comprise the deep scattering layers, including salps, myctophids, *Sergestes similis* (a caridean shrimp), and euphausiids (Adams 1987).

Widow Rockfish are ovoviparous with gestation lasting from 1 to 3 months. Parturition occurs earlier in southern latitudes (December-March off California) than in northern latitudes (April in British Columbia) and occur once a year (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**). Estimates of fecundity of Widow Rockfish range from 95,375 oocytes at 33 cm to 1,113,000 oocytes at 52 cm (**Boehlert\_fecundity\_1982?**).

There is little information regarding the movement of Widow Rockfish. Past assessments have assumed a two-area model because of differences in growth and maturity (see (He et al. 2011)). However, using recent observations from the NWFSC shelf/slope survey to follow two separate cohorts through time and space suggests that Widow Rockfish may recruit in the south and disperse northward as they age (Figure 2). Spatial recruitment and movement patterns of Widow Rockfish are uncertain and much more investigation and sampling is needed to fully understand them.

### 1.3 Fishery description

Widow Rockfish were lightly exploited by bottom trawl and hook-and-line gears prior to the 1980s. After many attempts to start trawl fisheries off the west coast of the United States in the late 1800s, the availability of otter trawl nets and the diesel engine in the mid-1920s helped trawl fisheries expand (Douglas 1998). The trawl fisheries really became established during World War II when demand increased for shark livers and bottomfish. A mink food fishery also developed during World War II (Jones and Harry Jr 1960). Foreign fleets began fishing for rockfish in the mid-1960s until the EEZ was implemented in 1977 (Rogers 2003). Longline catches of Widow Rockfish are present from the turn of the century and continue in recent years, mainly from fisheries targeting sablefish and halibut.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, it is reported that foreign fishing vessels caught large numbers of Widow Rockfish (Rogers 2003). In the late 1970s a domestic midwater trawl fishery began developing off of Oregon when it was realized that Widow Rockfish form dense aggregations at night (**Gunderson\_great\_1984?**). The fishery expanded very quickly, with landings from trawl, net, and hook-and-line gears increasing more than 20 times by the early 1980s (Table 1). As early as 1982, trip limits were imposed to keep catches below recommended annual levels (Table 3). Trip limits became more restrictive over the years until Widow Rockfish was declared overfished in 2001. In 2002, harvest guidelines were greatly reduced and over the last decade have been small, although increasing since 2004 (Table 4).

Historical discarding practices are not well known, but it is believed that little discarding occurred prior to management restrictions. With the introduction of trip limits, limited data from the mid-1980s show occasional very high discard rates of Widow Rockfish from tows that occurred near the end of a trip.

More detailed information of the fisheries in each state is given in Section 2.2.1 where the reconstructed landings are discussed.

#### 1.4 Management History and Performance

Widow Rockfish has been a small large component of groundfish fisheries since the late 1970s. The landings of Widow Rockfish have been historically governed by harvest guidelines and trip limits, while recently management is imposed with total catch harvest limits in the form of overfishing limits (OFLs), acceptable biological catches (ABCs), and annual catch limits (ACLs). A trawl rationalization program, consisting of an individual fishing quota (IFQ) or catch shares system was implemented in 2011 for the limited entry trawl fleet targeting non-whiting groundfish, including Widow Rockfish, and the trawl fleet targeting and delivering whiting to shore-based processors. The limited entry at-sea trawl sectors (motherships and catch-processors) that target whiting and process at sea are managed in a system of harvest cooperatives.

Limits on Widow Rockfish were first established in 1982 (Table 3). These were implemented as trip limits and cumulative landing limits that were first imposed by trip, then week, then every 2 weeks, month, 2 months, and eventually into periods. In many years, the trip limits on Widow Rockfish were significantly reduced at the end of the year to avoid exceeding the harvest recommendations. Some important years were 1985 when trip limits were reduced to 30,000 pounds once per week or 60,000 pounds once every 2 weeks, 1990 when trip limits were reduced to 15,000 or 25,000 pounds every one or two weeks, respectively, 1998 when a 25,000 pound cumulative limit per two-month period was implemented, and 2011 when catch shares was implemented.

A sorting requirement was implemented for Widow Rockfish in the early 1980s with California beginning in 1982, Oregon in 1984, and Washington in 1988. Some important events that could affect fishery selectivity are the gear restrictions implemented in 2000, implementation of Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCA's) in 2002, seasonal changes to the RCA's in 2007, and the beginning of catch shares in 2011.

Table 4 shows that recent landings have been below recommended catch levels. Landings are a considerable amount below the ACL, and it is unlikely that total mortality has exceeded the ACL in the last 10 years.

### 1.5 Fisheries off Canada and Alaska

Widow Rockfish are distributed throughout Canada and Southeast Alaska and are commonly caught in trawl and hook-and-line fisheries. However, the landings from the fisheries in these areas are estimated to harvest Widow Rockfish at much smaller rate than has been observed off California, Oregon, and Washington mostly due to lower abundance of Widow Rockfish, but also partly due to precautionary behavior of Canadian managers after the large catches followed by management restrictions and concerns of the U.S. fishery in the early 1980s.

Alaska formed the “Other Rockfish” complex in 2012 from the combination of Other Slope Rockfish and the Widow and Yellowtail Rockfishes from the Pelagic Shelf Rockfish category. This new complex includes 18 species and Widow Rockfish are a small proportion of the catch (less than 5%). Total biomass estimates are provided by the Gulf of Alaska (GOA) triennial/biennial trawl survey. ABC’s and OFL’s were set for the Other Rockfish Complex and component species in 2013 with a recommended OFL in 2014 of 5,347 mt for the complex. Widow Rockfish comprise a small part of this complex in Alaska.

The fishery for Widow Rockfish in British Columbia, Canada started in 1986 although some very small landings occurred in the mid-1970s. Landings peaked at about 4,500 mt in 1990 and were around 2,000 mt throughout the 1990s [dfo\_widow\_1999]. Most landings occurred in a midwater trawl fishery, but there have also been reports of “nuisance catches in the salmon troll fishery”. An assessment of Widow Rockfish in Canada was completed in 1998 ([stanley\\_shelf\\_1999?](#)) as part of a shelf rockfish complex. Additional research has since been done on the estimation of biomass of particular aggregations of Widow Rockfish (Stanley et al. 2000), but no formal assessment has been done since.

## 2 Data

Many sources of data were available for this assessment, including indices of abundance (Table 5), length observations, and age observations from fishery-dependent and fishery-independent sources.

### 2.1 Fishery-independent data

Data from three fishery-independent surveys were used in this assessment: 1) the SWFSC and NWFSC/PWCC Midwater Trawl Survey (hereafter, “juvenile survey”); 2) the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC)/NWFSC Triennial Shelf Trawl Survey (hereafter, “triennial survey”); and 3) the NWFSC West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey (hereafter, “WCGBT”). These surveys employed different designs and sampling methodologies, were conducted during different years and time periods within years, and included coverage over different areas of the coast. In some instances, the survey frequency, depths, and geographic areas covered were not internally consistent within surveys. A brief description of each survey is provided below.

Strata were defined by latitude and depth to analyze the catch-rates, length compositions, and age compositions using stratified random sampling theory (Table 6 & Table 7). The latitude and depth breaks were chosen based on the design of the survey as well as by looking at biological patterns in relation to latitude and depth. Indices of abundance for all of the surveys were derived using model based approaches described below.

#### 2.1.1 SWFSC and NWFSC/PWCC Midwater Trawl Survey

We updated the coastwide pre-recruit index of abundance for widow rockfish using data from three midwater trawl surveys targeting young-of-the-year (YOY) rockfish (SWFSC and NWFSC/PWCC Midwater Trawl Survey (Juvenile Survey)), provided by Tanya Rogers (SWFSC, pers. comm.). All surveys used identical gear, enabling the construction of a consistent coastwide index spanning from 36°N to the U.S./Canada border since 2004. For building the widow rockfish pre-recruit index, we used data from 2001 to 2024 without spatial subsetting (including CA, OR, and WA). Sampling in 2020 was limited due to the COVID-19 pandemic and excluded from all models. In 2010 and 2012, coverage was incomplete, so these years were used to construct the index but excluded from the final model to align with the 2019 assessment. Data from 2001–2003 were also excluded following the 2015 assessment due to limited spatial coverage (36°30' to 38°20' N latitude). However, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to examine the impact of including those early years (see Figure: Sensitivity Analysis).

The index was built using a spatial GLM with the sdmTMB package [anderson\_-sdmtmb\_2022], modeling 100-day standardized catch-per-tow as a function of year (fixed effect), Julian date (GAM smoother,  $k = 4$ ), spatial random field, and spatiotemporal random effects. Models with Tweedie, delta-lognormal, and delta-gamma error structures were compared; DHARMA residuals and simulation-based diagnostics indicated the Tweedie model performed best. The index shows a strong increasing trend in juvenile abundance from 2017 to 2023, with a slight decline in 2024. Despite the dip, recent values remain high relative to the previous decade, and uncertainty estimates support the robustness of this trend.

#### 2.1.2 Alaska Fisheries Science Center/Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Triennial Shelf Survey

The Triennial Survey was first conducted by the Alaska Fisheries Science Center (AFSC) in 1977, and the survey continued until 2004 ([weinberg\\_2001\\_2002?](#)). Its basic design was a series of equally-spaced east-to-west transects across the continental shelf from which searches for tows in a specific depth range were initiated. The survey design changed slightly over time. In general, all of the surveys were conducted in the mid summer through early fall. The 1977 survey was conducted from early July through late September. The surveys from 1980 through 1989 were conducted from the middle of July to late September. The 1992 survey was conducted from the middle of July through early October. The 1995 survey was conducted from early June through late August. The 1998 survey was conducted from early June through early August. Finally, the 2001 and 2004 surveys were conducted from May to July.

Haul depths ranged from 91–457 m during the 1977 survey. Due to haul performance issues and truncated sampling with respect to depth, the data from 1977 were omitted from this analysis. The surveys in 1980, 1983, and 1986 covered the U.S. West Coast south to 36.8°N latitude and a depth range of 55–366 m. The surveys in 1989 and 1992 covered the same depth range but extended the southern range to 34.5°N (near Point Conception). From 1995 through 2004, the surveys covered the depth range 55–500 m and surveyed south to 34.5°N. In 2004, the final year of the Triennial Survey series, Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) Fishery Resource and Monitoring Division (FRAM) conducted the survey following similar protocols to earlier years.

#### 2.1.3 Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey

The Northwest Fisheries Science Center West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey (WCGBTS) is based on a random-grid design; covering the coastal waters from a depth of 55–1,280 m (Bradburn, Keller, and Horness 2011). This design generally uses four industry-chartered vessels per year assigned to a roughly equal number of randomly

selected grid cells and divided into two ‘passes’ of the coast. Two vessels fish from north to south during each pass between late May to early October. There were only two vessels used in 2019 and three in 2013, with one of the three that year unable to complete its survey pass due to a government shutdown. No survey occurred in 2020 due to Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). This design therefore incorporates both vessel-to-vessel differences in catchability, as well as variance associated with selecting a relatively small number (approximately 700) of possible cells from a very large set of possible cells spread from the Mexican to the Canadian borders. Note that the Survey is not permitted to access the Cowcod Conservation Areas (CCAs) in Southern California.

Widow rockfish are not commonly caught in the WCGBTs. Higher catch rates occur north of 40° N latitude and catches are rare south of 36° N latitude (Figure 11). Few large fish are found shallower than 100 m and few small fish are found in the deeper water of the slope. There is no clear trend in length with latitude other than smaller fish tend to occur south of approximately 36° N latitude, and there appears to be some very small fish found near 39° N latitude.

Geostatistical models of biomass density were fit to survey data using the R package [Species Distribution Models with Template Model Builder \(sdmTMB\)](#) ([Anderson:2022:SRP?](#)). This approach reflects an updated approach compared to the 2015 assessment (non-spatial delta-GLMM) and the 2019 update assessment (VAST delta-lognormal model). These models can account for latent spatial factors with a constant spatial Gaussian random field and spatiotemporal deviations to evolve as a random walk Gaussian random field using a 200 knot grid of the survey area ([thorson\\_geostatistical\\_2015?](#)). The prediction grid was also truncated to only include available survey locations in depths between 55–500 m to limit extrapolating beyond the data and edge effects. Tweedie, delta-binomial, delta-gamma, and mixture distributions, which allow for extreme catch events, were investigated. The positive catch weight model includes survey pass ('first' for early season or 'second' for late season) and year. Vessel-year effects, which have traditionally been included in index standardization for this survey, were not included as the estimated variance for the random effect was close to zero. Vessel-year effects were more prominent when models did not include spatial effects and were included for each unique combination of vessel and year in the data to account for the random selection of commercial vessels used during sampling ([helser\\_generalized\\_2004?](#); [thorson\\_accounting\\_2014?](#)).

Results are only shown for both the delta-gamma and delta-lognormal distributions. Both models converged (positive, definite Hessian matrix) but predicted data from both models showed slightly right-heavy tails compared to null expectations, with the gamma model having stronger divergence. The delta-lognormal distribution ultimately had the best model diagnostics, e.g., similar distributions of theoretical normal quantiles and model quantiles, high precision, lack of extreme predictions that are incompatible with the life history, and low Akaike information criterion (AIC). Spatiotemporal estimates of positive catch for the delta-lognormal distribution were then converted into annual

indices using `sdmtmb::get_index()` function informed by the spatial bounds of the survey (**Anderson:2022:SRP?**).

The index estimate is relatively stable, with a slightly increasing trend in recent years and a moderate peak in 2016. Overall, the lognormal index estimates were more comparable to the 2019 spatiotemporal VAST-based index and seemed less influenced by potential extreme catch events, particularly in 2013 and 2016; for these reasons, in addition to better model performance described above, the delta-lognormal sdmTMB-based index was used for the base model in this assessment. The delta-lognormal mean value (2262.824) was slightly lower than the means of the index values used in the 2015 assessment (2701.12) and the 2019 update assessment (3301.765). Comparisons of the different error structures, design-based estimate and the VAST index used in 2019 are in Figure XX.

## 2.2 Fishery-dependent data

### 2.2.1 Landings

Widow rockfish have been caught in trawl and hook-and-line fisheries since the early part of the 20th century. Widow rockfish are a desirable rockfish and are not likely to be discarded for market reasons. However, smaller widow rockfish are found at shallower depths and discarding practices in the early 1900s are uncertain. In data from the early 1980s, widow rockfish have had their own landing category, beginning in California in 1982, Oregon in 1984, and Washington in 1988. Estimates of historical landings of widow rockfish rely upon species-composition sampling data from each period. The uncertainty in species composition is greater in past years, with less systematic and extensive sampling occurring prior to 1980. Consequently, the precision with which landings of widow rockfish can be estimated likely decreases for earlier years.

The definitions of fishing fleets have not been changed from those in the 2015 and 2019 assessments. Five fishing fleets were specified within the model: 1) a shorebased bottom trawl fleet with coastwide catches from 1916–2024, 2) a shorebased midwater trawl fleet with coastwide catches from 1979–2024, 3) a mostly midwater trawl fleet that targets Pacific Hake/Whiting (*Merluccius productus*) and includes a foreign and at-sea fleet with catches from 1975–2024, a domestic shorebased fleet that targeted Pacific Hake with catches from 1991–2024, and foreign vessels that targeted Pacific Hake and rockfish between 1966–1976, 4) a net fishery consisting of catches mostly from California from 1981–2024, and 5) a hook-and-line fishery (predominantly longline) with coastwide catches from 1916–2024. As in previous assessments, catches from Puget Sound and those from commercial shrimp trawls, commercial pots, and recreational fisheries were excluded (as these are generally minimal).

Catches from all years (1916-2018) were carried forward into this assessment, with two exceptions. First, discards from the hook-and-line fleet were added to the removals for this fleet . The hook-and-line removals of widow rockfish are extremely minimal (Figure 1) and comprised only approximately 0.2% of the total removals over the last twenty years, with discard being a small fraction of that. The biological samples of the discard amount are also scarce, with input sample sizes not exceeding 6 and averaging around 3 per year (Table X). With this limited data, the model was unable to reliably estimate retention parameters and exhibited substantial sensitivity to even slight changes in discard amounts within the hook-and-line fleet. Therefore, in this assessment, we added hook-and-line discards to hook-and-line landings. Second, because PacFIN appear to underestimate midwater trawl catches in California in 1979-1980 (Edward Dick, Pers. Comms.) we adjusted midwater and bottom trawl catches from California in these years to reflect the ratio of California midwater to bottom trawl catches in 1981-1982. New catches (2019-onward) from PacFIN and ASHOP were otherwise appended onto the 1916-2018 landings and apportioned among fleets using the same criteria as those documented in the 2015 assessment.

#### 2.2.2 Fishery length and age data

Biological data from commercial fisheries that caught widow rockfish were extracted from PacFIN (PSMFC) on July 3, 2019, from CALCOM on July 3, 2019 and from the NORPAC database on July 3, 2019. Lengths taken during port sampling in California, Oregon, and Washington were used to calculate length and age compositions. The data were classified into bottom trawl, midwater trawl, hake trawl, net, and hook-and-line fleets

Table 10 shows the number of landings sampled and Table 11 shows the number of lengths taken for each year, gear, and fleet from the three states. Table 12 shows these numbers for the at-sea fleet.

Consistent with the 2015 assessment, length and age samples from PacFIN and CALCOM were expanded up to the total landing then combined into state-specific frequencies (Table 13). Expansion factors were calculated in a way such that large expansions would not occur and based on ideas first presented by Owen Hamel (pers. comm., NWFSC). First the expansion factor ( $E_k$ ) was the total catch weight ( $W_k$ ) divided by the sample weight ( $w_k$ ), and raised to 0.9 to account for non-homogeneity within a trip. Then, expansion factors greater than 300 were capped (100 for net fisheries) to reduce the influence of small samples (i.e., a few fish representing a large catch). The predicted total numbers at length or age weighted by landings for each state were added to create a coast-wide length frequency. The effective sample sizes of the state combined length frequencies were determined from the following formula,

which has been used in previous widow rockfish assessments as well as other west coast groundfish assessments.

Fishery Samples	Survey Samples
$N_{eff} = N_{sample} + 0.138N_{fish}, \frac{N_{fish}}{N_{sample}} < 44$	$N_{eff} = N_{sample} + 0.0707N_{fish}, \frac{N_{fish}}{N_{sample}} < 55$
$N_{eff} = 7.06N_{sample}, \frac{N_{fish}}{N_{sample}} \geq 44$	$N_{eff} = 4.89N_{sample}, \frac{N_{fish}}{N_{sample}} \geq 55$

This is slightly different than the sample size of 2.43 per haul for rockfish that ([stewart\\_bootstrapping\\_2014?](#)) report. Observed lengths were expanded to the tow from At-Sea Hake Observer Program samples (NORPAC). Tows are typically well sampled, thus expansion factors were not modified from what was calculated. Hake fishery length compositions were created by combining shoreside and at-sea length compositions, weighting by the catch from each sector. The effective sample sizes for hake fishery length and age comps were calculated using the above equations for the shoreside fleet and added to the number of tows sampled from the at-sea fleet.

Expanded length compositions for bottom trawl, midwater trawl, hake fisheries, net, and hook-and-line are shown in Figure 17 to Figure 21. It is quickly apparent that all of these fisheries rarely land fish less than 26 cm. All of the non-hake fleets show a strong cohort coming through in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and then another cohort coming through in the late 1980s. Sample sizes typically dropped off after 2000, except in the hake fishery where nearly every tow is sampled. Age compositions for the five fleets are shown in Figure 22 and Figure 26. Occasional cohorts appear to move through the population, indicating that widow rockfish population dynamics may be characterized by episodic recruitment events.

### 2.2.3 Discards

— TO DO!!! —

$$D_{y,f} = \frac{d_{y,f}}{r_{y,f}} R_{y,f}$$

### 2.2.4 Biological data

#### 2.2.4.1 Weight-length relationship

Weight-at-length data, which are the same used in the 2015 assessment, were collected from fisheries sampling and by the Triennial and NWFSC WCGBT Surveys, and were used to estimate a weight-length relationship for widow rockfish (Figure 30). Weight-at-length was similar between sources with the fishery samples showing a slightly smaller weight at large sizes when compared to the survey data (Figure 31). WCGOP data were not used because only small fish were sampled, the weight of these small fish were typically less than from other sources (Figure 30), and the curves fitted to only WCGOP data were unable to estimate the slope. There were only 81 observations from the WCGOP data, which is a small amount of data compared to everything available. However, these observations may be useful to understand discards.

The weight-length relationship used in the 2011 assessment was similar for males but predicted slightly heavier females at larger sizes than the 2015 assessment (Figure 31). The following relationships between weight and length for females and males were estimated for the 2015 assessment from all of the data combined and were used in the current assessment:

$$\text{Females: } \text{weight} = 1.7355 \times 10^{-5} \cdot \text{Length}^{2.9617}$$

$$\text{Males: } \text{weight} = 1.4824 \times 10^{-5} \cdot \text{Length}^{3.0047}$$

where weight is measured in kilograms and length in cm. These relationships were used in the assessment as fixed relationships.

#### 2.2.4.2 Maturity schedule

Estimates of maturity used in this update were the same as the 2015 assessment. Estimates of maturity at length have been presented by (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**), (**echeverria\_thirty-four\_1987?**), and (**love\_life\_1990?**). (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**) supplied data collected from Oregon and California commercial and recreational samples, which allowed us to estimate the proportion mature-at-length and proportion mature-at-age for samples from each state (Figure 32). As noted by (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**), the samples from Oregon matured at older age and larger length. Estimates of maturity-at-length from California reported by (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**) are similar to estimates of length-at-50%-mature from samples collected in California reported by (**echeverria\_thirty-four\_1987?**) and (**love\_life\_1990?**), although (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**) show the smallest length-at-50%-mature. To maintain some consistency with the 2011 assessment and to avoid any potential growth issues by area, the 2015 assessment used maturity-at-age data from the 2011 assessment,

but used the data provided by (**barss\_maturity\_1987?**) to estimate a new maturity curve following a logistic function with the data from California and Oregon equally weighted to avoid California dominating the estimated relationship. This maturity-at-age curve falls between the estimated California and Oregon maturity-at-age curves (Figure 32, right), with the age-at-50%-mature estimated at 5.47 and with a slope of -0.7747 (as specified in SS). This logistic maturity-at-age curve was used in the 2015 and 2019 update assessment except that maturity-at-age for ages 2 and lower were set equal to zero (Table 19).

#### 2.2.4.3 Fecundity

Fecundity in rockfish is often not a linear function of weight, but increases faster at larger weights (Dick 2009). Therefore, this relationship is often accounted for in rockfish assessments by using spawning output (numbers of eggs) to determine current status. (Dick 2009) did not find a significant relationship between the number of eggs per gram of body weight and body weight for widow rockfish. Therefore, spawning output was assumed to be proportional to weight, which is the same as spawning biomass, and is reported here.

#### 2.2.4.4 Natural Mortality

Natural mortality used in this update differed from the 2015 assessment. Natural mortality (M) is a parameter that is often highly uncertain in fish stocks. Past assessments of widow rockfish assumed constant natural mortality of 0.125 yr-1 or 0.15 yr-1. The 2011 assessment estimated M with a prior developed by Owen Hamel (NWFSC, pers. comm.) using methods described in (Hamel 2014). This prior was based on a maximum age of 44 and 40 for females and males, respectively, a mean temperature of 8 degrees Celsius (about 150m deep off of Oregon), and a gonadosomatic index of 9.99% and 1.86% for females and males, respectively (**love\_life\_1990?**). The sex-specific lognormal priors for M have medians of 0.124 yr-1 and 0.129 yr-1 for females and males, respectively, and a coefficient of variation (CV) of 30.7% for each sex. In 2015, discussions with Owen Hamel (NWFSC) led to the development of a new prior based solely on maximum age to use when estimating M. Using all of the available age data, a maximum age of 54 was determined for both females and males, although it has been rare to observe widow rockfish older than about 45 years old (Figure 33). This resulted in a prior with a much smaller median (0.0810 or -2.513284 in log space) and a larger standard deviation in log space (0.523694). For the update assessment, an updated meta-analysis resulted in a prior with a slightly smaller median than the 2015 assessment (0.10 or -2.30 in log space) and a smaller standard deviation in log space (0.438). Figure 34 shows that these prior distributions are wide and not highly informative.

#### 2.2.4.5 Length-at-age

Estimates of length-at-age used in this update were the same as the 2015 assessment. Two different labs have aged the majority of processed otoliths for widow rockfish. The SWFSC has been aging widow rockfish otoliths for many years, including all of the fishery data prior to 2011 and otoliths collected from the NWFSC WCGBT survey in 2009 and 2010. The Cooperative Ageing Project (CAP) in Newport, Oregon aged 1,100 otoliths from the NWFSC WCGBT survey, 2,026 otoliths provided by ASHOP, and 3,467 otoliths collected by port samplers. All of the commercial fishery samples were collected in the years 2011–2014. In total, there are 105,814 paired age and length observations ranging from 1978 to 2014. Figure 35 shows the lengths and ages for all years and all data as well as predicted von Bertalanffy fits to the data. Females grow larger than males and sex specific growth parameters were estimated at the following values:

$$\text{Females: } L_{\infty} = 50.34, \quad k = 0.15, \quad t_0 = -2.22$$

$$\text{Males: } L_{\infty} = 44.19, \quad k = 0.21, \quad t_0 = -1.78$$

The data from each source (ASHOP, port sampling/BDS, Triennial survey, and NWFSC survey) are shown in Figure 36 with fitted von Bertalanffy lines. All of these sources are quite similar, especially observations from ASHOP and the NWFSC survey. The standard deviation (SD) and coefficient of variation (CV) of length-at-age are shown in Figure 37. Modelling the CV as a function of predicted length-at-age appears to be somewhat linear from a value just over 0.1 at small lengths and slightly less than 0.045 at larger lengths. However, variance in length- at-age was estimated separately in stock-synthesis.

#### 2.2.4.6 Sex ratios

Females tend to grow larger than males and it is expected that the proportion of females approaches one at large lengths and is less than 0.5 at intermediate lengths. Figure 38 shows that the proportion of females at length from survey data is approximately 50% until approximately 34 cm, when the proportion of females drops below 50%. At lengths larger than 46 cm, the proportion of females increases rapidly to one, suggesting that few males grow larger than 50 cm.

#### 2.2.4.7 Ageing bias and imprecision

Uncertainty surrounding the ageing-error process for widow rockfish used in the 2015 assessment was incorporated by estimating ageing error by age. No changes were made from the 2015 assessment for the update. Age-composition data used in the model were from break-and-burn and surface reads and were aged by the Cooperative Ageing Project (CAP) in Newport, Oregon and the SWFSC in Santa Cruz, California. 12 Break-and-burn double reads of 1788 otoliths were performed by both the CAP and the SWFSC lab combined. Additionally, 100 otoliths were read both by surface and break-and-burn methods. An ageing error estimate was made based on these double reads using a computational tool specifically developed for estimating ageing error (Punt et al. 2008), and using release 1.0.0 of the R package nwfscAgeingError (**thorson\_nwfscageingerror\_2012?**) for input and output diagnostics, publicly available at: <https://github.com/nwfsc-assess/nwfscAgeingError>. The maximum aged fish read by the surface reading method was 10 years and the cross otolith reads between the surface and break-and-burn ageing methods showed limited variation. Therefore, a unique ageing error was not created for surface read otoliths. A non-linear standard error was estimated by age where there is more variability in the estimated age of older fish was estimated for each reading lab (Table 20 and Figure 39).

#### 2.2.5 Abundance indices

### 2.3 Environmental and ecosystem data

### Assessment model

An age-structured stock assessment model was used to predict the biomass trajectory of Widow Rockfish with an approach of balancing parsimony with complexity. This allowed for the determination of general trends in the biomass over time without introducing extraneous data partitions that explain little additional variation. The assessment followed the same model structure as the 2015 base assessment.

#### 2.4 History of modeling approaches

Refer to the most recent full assessment for additional information.

#### 2.5 Responses to SSC Groundfish Subcommittee requests

To be completed after review.

### 2.6 Model Structure and Assumptions

For this update assessment, new versions of the previously used software were used. Stock Synthesis v3.30.13 was used to estimate the parameters in the 2019 model. R4SS, version 1.35.3, along with R version 3.5.3 were used to investigate and plot the 2019 model fits. For the update, Stock Synthesis v3.30.2 and R4SS, version 1.51.0 , along with R version 4.4.2 were used. Bridging from Stock Synthesis v3.24U to v3.30.13 is illustrated in Figure 41. A summary of the data sources used in the model (details discussed above) is shown in Figure 40. Stock Synthesis has many options when setting up a model and the assessment model for Widow Rockfish was set up in the following manner.

#### 2.6.1 Model Changes from the Last Assessment

#### 2.6.2 Modeling Platform and Structure

#### 2.6.3 Model Parameters

#### 2.6.4 Key Assumptions and Structural Choices

Refer to the most recent full assessment for additional information.

## 2.7 Base Model Results

### 2.7.1 Parameter Estimates

#### 3.3.1 Parameter estimates

The estimates of natural mortality 0.124273 yr-1 and NA yr-1 for females and males, respectively) were higher than suggested by the medians of the prior distributions used in this assessment and the 2015 assessment. Fixing M at lower values than those estimates resulted in a pattern of reduced recruitment immediately before the fishery started. This suggests that the model is doing what it can to reduce the number of observations of older fish in the data. The estimates of M fall within the 95% confidence interval of the prior distribution (0.0425–0.237), and are shown in Figure 44.

Estimating M is difficult in stock assessments, and the estimated values may represent model misspecification instead of the actual life-history trait. However, in alternative models to the base case model, the estimates of M were rarely less than 0.14 yr-1 (Table 29). Uncertainty in the estimated M was also much less than the range of the prior (Figure 44). The assumption that appeared to have the largest effect on M was introducing dome-shaped selectivity in the midwater trawl fleet, which made M smaller (Table 29).

Selectivity curves were estimated for commercial and survey fleets and parameter estimates are provided in Table 24. The final base model assumed asymptotic selectivity (double-normal selectivity curve ) for each fishery, except for the midwater trawl fishery. The NWFSC and Triennial surveys both used spline curves. All selectivity curves were length-based and are the same shape as in the 2015 benchmark. Time blocks were used for the bottom trawl, midwater trawl and hook-and-line fisheries as indicated in Table 21. The estimated selectivity, retention, and keep (the product of selectivity and retention) curves for the trawl and hook-and-line fleets are shown in Figure 45. The selectivity curves showed a shift to larger fish in 2002 for the bottom trawl fishery and a shift to smaller fish in 2003 for the hook-and-line fishery. The bottom trawl shift is consistent with the introduction of the RCA and gear restrictions (shoreward of the 18' RCA) that virtually eliminated fishing in shelf habitats where smaller Widow Rockfish would more likely be encountered. Around this same time, the fixed-gear RCA specifications began preventing fishing between 30 and 100 fm.

The retention curves showed a shift to retaining a lower percentage of fish since trip limits were introduced, but increases in recent years. The asymptote of the retention curve for the bottom trawl fishery sequentially decreased as more management restrictions were introduced to about 50% retention of larger fish in the 1998–2010 period.

Midwater trawl and hook-and-line fisheries estimated an asymptote to retention just above 80% for the period 1983-2010. Both the selectivity for the hake fleet and the selectivity of the net fleet did not support dome-shaped selectivity (Figure 46). The estimated selectivity curves for the Triennial and NWFSC WCGBT surveys were similar to each other except that the triennial survey selected larger fish (Figure 46). The NWFSC WCGBT survey was no longer minimally dome-shaped as in the 2015 assessment.

In 2015, additional survey variability (process error added directly to each year's input variability) for the triennial and NWFSC WCGBT surveys was not estimated in the model because the estimate was zero. To avoid bound issues in estimation of the Hessian, the authors fixed these at zero because the model-based results provided reasonable estimates of variance. We retained the same modelling approach for the update assessment. The additional standard deviation added to the fishery-dependent indices was quite large, ranging from 0.16 for the bottom trawl index and 0.58 for the foreign at-sea hake fleet. The additional variability on the juvenile survey was the highest, at 0.83, giving the index very little weight in the model.

The estimates of maximum size for both females and males (Table 23) were not unexpected given the data in Figure 35. Estimates of  $k$  were slightly different in the model, but that is expected when accounting for selectivity. Estimated growth curves are shown in (Figure 47).

Estimates of recruitment suggest that the Widow Rockfish population is characterized by variable recruitment with occasional strong recruitments and periods of low recruitment (Figure 48). There is little information regarding recruitment prior to 1965, and the uncertainty in these estimates is expressed in the model. There are very large, but uncertain, estimates of recruitment in 2013, 1970, 2008, and 1971. Other large recruitment events (in descending order of magnitude) occurred in 1978, 2014, 1981, 2010, and 1991. The five lowest recruitments (in ascending order) occurred in 2012, 2011, 1976, 2007, and 1973. Estimates of recruitment appear to be episodic and characterized by periods of low recruitment. Two of the four largest estimated recruitments occurred in the last 11 years.

### 2.7.2 Fits to the Data

### 2.7.3 Population Trajectory

## 2.8 Model Diagnostics

Three types of uncertainty are presented for the assessment of Widow Rockfish. First, uncertainty in the parameter estimates was determined using approximate asymptotic

estimates of the standard error. These estimates were based on the maximum likelihood theory that the inverse of the Hessian matrix (the second derivative of the log-likelihood function with respect to the parameter vector) approaches the true uncertainty of the parameter estimates as the sample size approaches infinity. This approach takes into account the uncertainty in the data and supplies correlation estimates between parameters, but does not capture possible skewness in the error distribution of the parameters and may not accurately estimate the standard error in some cases (see (Stewart et al. 2013)).

The second type of uncertainty that is presented is related to modeling and structural error. This uncertainty cannot be captured in the base model as it is related to errors in the assumptions used in specifying the base model. Therefore, sensitivity analyses were conducted where assumptions were modified to reveal the effect they have on the model results.

Lastly, a major axis of uncertainty was determined from a parameter or structural assumption that results in the greatest change in stock status and advice, and projections were made for different states of nature based upon that parameter or structural assumption.

#### 2.8.1 Convergence

#### 2.8.2 Parameter Uncertainty

Parameter estimates are shown in Table 22, Table 23, and Table 28 along with approximate asymptotic standard errors. The only parameters with an absolute value of correlation greater than 0.95 were the female and male natural mortality parameters, which is expected. Estimates of key derived quantities are given in Table 26 along with approximate 95% asymptotic confidence intervals. There is a reasonable amount of uncertainty in the estimates of biomass. The confidence interval of the 2019 estimate of depletion is XX%–XX% and above the management target of 40% of the unfished spawning biomass.

#### 2.8.3 Sensitivity Analyses

Sensitivity analysis was performed to determine the model behavior under different assumptions than those of the base case model. 11 sensitivity analyses were conducted to explore the potential differences in model structure and assumptions, including:

1. Fixed natural mortality at 0.1 for both sexes (2015 assessment prior)

2. Fixed natural mortality at 0.124 yr-1 for females and 0.129 yr-1 for males (2011 assessment prior)
3. Fixed steepness at 0.4
4. Fixed steepness at 0.6
5. Fixed steepness at 0.798 (2015 assessment value)
6. Forcing asymptotic selectivity on the midwater trawl fleet
7. Fitting logistic curves for NWFSC WCGBT survey selectivities
8. Weighting the composition data using the Francis method
9. Updated Washington catch reconstruction
10. Inclusion of previously excluded shrimp trawl data
11. Exclusion of triennial survey data

Likelihood values and estimates of key parameters are shown in Table 29. Predicted spawning biomass trajectories, estimated recruitment deviations and comparisions of model estimates for 2025 are shown in in Figure 65 (sens\_compare2\_spawningbio\_-uncertainty.png), Figure XX (sens\_compare11\_recdevs.png) and Figure XX (sens\_summary.png). The estimates of current stock depletion ranged from 49.14%-153.59% across the sensitivity runs, with fixing natural mortality to 0.1 (2015 assessment prior) resulting in the lowest estimate and forcing asymptotic selectivity on the midwater trawl fleet resulting in the highest estimate. Generally, the trajectory of the spawning biomass was qualitatively similar across all tested models, e.g., peak around late 1970s and late 2010s, projected decrease in biomass in 2025 followed by some recovery into the 2030s; the quantitative magnitude of these trends did vary across cases.

Fixing M at values lower than the base case estimate resulted in decreases in estimated spawning biomass, while fixing steepness across the values tested resulted in similar or increased estimated spawning biomass. The relative spawning biomass in 2025 changed to 86.73% with an M of 0.124 yr-1 and 0.129 yr-1 for females and males, respectively (2011 assessment prior), and to 49.14% with an M of 0.1 yr-1 (2015 assessment prior).

Fixing steepness at a value of 0.6 resulted in an increase of the spawning biomass to 138.4% and a decrease in equilibrium yield at a SPR50% reference harvest rate, while other tested values for fixed steepness increased spawning biomass slightly (108.58% and 108.58% for steepness at 0.4 and 0.798, respectively) and increasing equilibrium yield at a SPR50% reference harvest rate slightly. Fixing steepness at a value of 0.4 resulted in low recruitment deviations in the 2019-2024 period relative to other tested models and the base model.

Forcing asymptotic selectivity on the midwater fleet increased estimated biomass in 2025 by 153.59% compared to base model, while forcing logistic selectivity on the NWFSC WCGBT resulted in similar estimated spawning biomass to the base model. Including shrimp trawl data and updating WA catch reconstruction had no almost impact on the estimated spawning biomass. Excluding the triennial survey data lead to slight increases in estimated spawning biomass.

The alternative weighting using the Francis method generally increased the estimate of spawning biomass across the timeseries, but the estimated biomass for 2025 was similar between the Francis weighted model and the base model (117.66% compared to base model).

#### 2.8.4 Retrospective Analysis

A 5-year retrospective analysis was conducted by running the model using data only through 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 progressively (Table 30 and Figure 66). The initial scale of the spawning population was basically unchanged for all of these retrospectives. Removing 4–5 years of data led to slightly lower estimates of fishing mortality ( $F$ ) and slightly higher spawning biomass over the last 15 years. In contrast, removing only 1–2 years resulted in higher  $F$  and lower biomass estimates. Despite these minor differences, all retrospectives showed a consistent declining trend in spawning biomass over the past decade. No concerning patterns were observed in the retrospective analysis.

#### 2.8.5 Likelihood Profiles and key parameters

Likelihood profiles were conducted for  $R_0$ , steepness (even though it was not estimated in the base case) and over male and female natural mortality values simultaneously. These likelihood profiles were conducted by fixing the parameter at specific values and removing the prior on the parameter being profiled. Without the original prior distribution the MLE estimates from the base case will likely be different than the MLE in the likelihood profile, but this displays what information the data have. There was some difficulty in achieving model convergence for many parameterizations in the likelihood profile. In some cases jittering was required.

As  $R_0$  increased, natural mortality also increased and the relative spawning biomass in 2015 was less depleted (Table 31). There was variable support for each likelihood component across the range of  $R_0$  evaluated. The total likelihood supported the estimated value (Table 31). Profiles are illustrated in Figure 68.

### 2.9 Unresolved Problems and Major Uncertainties

---

### 3 Management

#### 3.1 Reference Points

catches (landings plus discards) have been below the point estimate of potential long-term yields calculated using an SPR50% reference point and the population has been increasing over the last decade. However, catches in 2018 were above the point estimate of potential long-term yields calculated using an SPR50 reference point.

The predicted spawning biomass from the base model generally showed a slight decline until the late 1970s, steep increase above unfished equilibrium levels, then a steep decline until the mid-1980s followed by less of a decline until 2001 (Figure 61). Since 2001, the spawning biomass has been increasing due to small catches, and recently, above average recruitment. The 2018 spawning biomass relative to unfished equilibrium spawning biomass is above the target of 40% of unfished spawning biomass (Figure 63). The fishing intensity (relative 1-SPR) exceeded the current estimates of the harvest rate limit (SPR50%) throughout the 1980s and early 1990s, as seen in Figure 73. Recent exploitation rates on Widow Rockfish were predicted to be much less than target levels. In recent years, the stock has experienced exploitation rates that have been below the target level while the biomass level has remained above the target level (Figure 74).

The equilibrium yield plot is shown in Figure 75, based on a steepness value fixed at 0.720. The predicted maximum sustainable yield under the assumptions of this assessment occurs near 25% of equilibrium unfished spawning biomass.

#### 3.2 Unresolved problems and major uncertainties

#### 3.3 Harvest Projections and Decision Tables

```
load(file=here::here("report","tables","projections.rda"))
projections <- as.data.frame(projections$table)

projections <- projections|>dplyr::mutate(across(2:ncol(projections), ~ round(.x)))
```

Projections with catches based on the predicted annual catch limit (ACL) using the SPR rate of 50%, the 40:10 control rule, and a 0.25 P\* adjustment using a sigma of 0.50 from 2021 onward suggest that the spawning biomass will decrease over the projection period

for all states of nature. Predicted ACL catches range from 10,961 mt in 2021 to 5,944 mt in 2030.

### ***nOT SURE WHERE acl CATCHES ARE***

#### **3.4 Evaluation of Scientific Uncertainty**

#### **3.5 Regional management considerations**

Widow Rockfish have shown latitudinal differences in life-history parameters, which has led past assessment authors to pursue a two-area model. Modelling a stock with two areas is difficult because it requires many assumptions about recruitment distribution, movement, and connectivity, while also splitting data into two areas that reduces sample sizes when compared to a coastwide model. The upside is that it can result in a better model that more accurately predicts regional status. This assessment is a coastwide model because not enough is known about the assumptions that would have to be made for a two-area model.

It is still important to consider regional differences when making management decisions. Following recent cohorts through time with survey data showed that older fish showed up in the north after younger fish were observed in the south (Figure 2). This may indicate connectivity between the north and the south and that this is truly one stock. However, more investigation is needed.

Widow Rockfish are managed on a coastwide basis and observed more often in the NWFSC WCGBT bottom trawl survey north of latitude 40° 10' N. Bottom trawl catches in California have historically been as large as in Oregon and larger than in Washington, but recently catches in California have been small. Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCAs) cover a significant proportion of Widow Rockfish habitat, but a midwater trawl fishery is beginning to re-develop that can fish in these areas. Future assessments and management of Widow Rockfish may want to monitor where catches are being taken to make sure that specific areas are not being overexploited. In addition, research on the connectivity along the coast as well as regional differences would help to inform the potential for overfishing specific areas. »»»> 1ed44512b0ba062144bae79bac8c50155d6b6fec

#### **3.6 Research and Data Needs**

### 3.7 Acknowledgements

## 4 Tables

### 4.1 Data

#### 4.1.1 Fishery-dependent data

Table 2: Landings (mt) from the foreign & domestic at-sea fleet and the domestic shoreside hake fleet. Catches (mt) from the Pacific whiting at-sea fishery as determined by onboard observers.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Foreign &amp; Domestic</b>	<b>Shoreside hake</b>		
	<b>At-sea</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>OR</b>	<b>WA</b>
1966	3,670.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1967	3,902.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1968	1,956.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1969	358.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1970	554.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1971	701.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1972	421.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1973	656.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1974	418.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1975	391.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
1976	718.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
1977	119.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
1978	191.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
1979	197.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
1980	272.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1981	227.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
1982	157.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
1983	131.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
1984	294.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
1985	182.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
1986	256.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
1987	181.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
1988	231.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
1989	212.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

<b>Year</b>	<b>Foreign &amp; Domestic</b>	<b>Shoreside hake</b>		
	<b>At-sea</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>OR</b>	<b>WA</b>
1990	230.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
1991	471.3	42.7	39.0	9.3
1992	389.6	13.5	42.1	6.2
1993	173.2	0.4	91.2	11.0
1994	370.7	2.1	210.8	28.6
1995	228.6	7.2	192.1	36.8
1996	252.2	5.7	475.1	104.7
1997	215.5	7.2	133.9	22.1
1998	268.5	40.4	278.0	28.1
1999	191.8	12.7	166.4	15.2
2000	205.4	7.7	70.9	4.7
2001	174.0	9.2	26.4	9.0
2002	154.9	1.2	2.6	1.4
2003	14.5	0.4	7.6	4.6
2004	21.2	7.4	12.4	8.5
2005	80.1	5.2	59.1	13.6
2006	143.0	3.6	11.3	35.3
2007	146.0	1.0	46.1	35.3
2008	115.2	29.2	36.1	37.5
2009	26.6	2.3	46.6	59.8
2010	44.6	9.0	35.3	17.5
2011	38.4	0.0	79.9	19.5
2012	79.2	0.0	85.1	17.1
2013	31.2	0.0	115.1	29.2
2014	56.2	0.0	250.1	35.9

Table 3: A subset of management actions of importance to fisheries that caught Widow Rockfish.

Year	Management action
1982	Establishment of a 75,000 pound trip limit on Widow Rockfish in October
1983	Per-trip and per-week limits implemented for <i>Sebastodes</i> complex coastwide (north and south of 40° N)
1984	30,000 pound Widow Rockfish trip limit at the start of the year adjusted to 1,000 pound trip limit in September
	50,000 pound Widow Rockfish trip limit limited to once per week
	Trip limit lowered to 40,000 pounds once per week in May
	Directed fishery for Widow Rockfish closed in August and a full fishery closure in November
1985	30,000 pound trip limit once per week, or 60,000 pounds once every 2 weeks. Every 2 week option was rescinded in April
	Landings of <i>Sebastodes</i> complex and Widow Rockfish smaller than 3,000 pounds unrestricted
	Widow Rockfish trip limit reduced to 3,000 pounds per trip without a trip frequency in July
1986	30,000 pound coastwide Widow Rockfish trip limit with no biweekly option
	Landings of <i>Sebastodes</i> complex and Widow Rockfish smaller than 3,000 pounds unrestricted
	3,000 pound coastwide trip limit implemented in September when Widow Rockfish ABC reached
1987	30,000 pound coastwide Widow Rockfish trip limit with no biweekly option. Only one landing per week above 3,000 pounds.
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 5,000 pounds in October
	Closed the Widow Rockfish fishery in November
1988	30,000 pound coastwide Widow Rockfish trip limit with no biweekly option. Only one landing per week above 3,000 pounds.
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 3,000 pounds in October
	30,000 pound coastwide Widow Rockfish trip limit with no biweekly option. Only one landing per week above 3,000 pounds.

Year	Management action
1989	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 10,000 pounds in April
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 3,000 pounds in October
1990	15,000 pound trip limit once per week, or 25,000 pounds once every 2 weeks. Only one landing per week above 3,000 pounds.
	Closed the Widow Rockfish fishery in December
1991	10,000 pound trip limit once per week, or 20,000 pounds once every 2 weeks. Only one landing per period above 3,000 pounds.
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 3,000 pounds on my birthday in September
1992	30,000 pound coastwide Widow Rockfish trip limit per 4-week period. All landings apply to the 30,000 pounds.
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 3,000 pounds in August
	Re-established the 30,000 pound cumulative landing limit for December
1993	30,000 pound coastwide Widow Rockfish trip limit per 4-week period. All landings apply to the 30,000 pounds.
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 3,000 pounds in December
1994	Divided the commercial groundfish fishery in limited entry and open access fisheries.
	30,000 pound cumulative Widow Rockfish limit per calendar month.
	Reduced Widow Rockfish trip limit to 3,000 pounds in December
	Rockfish limit of 10,000 per vessel per trip in open access fisheries, not to exceed 30,000 pounds of Widow Rockfish (as in limited entry fisheries) cumulative per month.
1995	30,000 pound cumulative Widow Rockfish limit per calendar month.
	Monthly cumulative trip limit increased to 45,000 pounds for Widow Rockfish
1996	70,000 pound cumulative Widow Rockfish limit per two-month period.
	Reduced cumulative two-month period Widow Rockfish limit to 40,000 pounds in September.
	25,000 pound monthly cumulative limit implemented in November.
1997	70,000 pound cumulative Widow Rockfish limit per two-month period.
	Reduced cumulative two-month period Widow Rockfish limit to 60,000 pounds in May.

Year	Management action
1998	25,000 pound cumulative Widow Rockfish limit per two-month period.
	Increased cumulative two-month period Widow Rockfish limit to 30,000 pounds in May.
	Open access monthly cumulative trip limits reduced to 3,000 pounds in July.
1999	Dividing line between north and south management areas moved to 40° 10' N.
	Three-phase cumulative limit period system introduced.
	Phase 1: 70,000 pounds cumulative limit from January through March for Widow Rockfish.
	Phase 2: 16,000 pounds per 2-month period April through September for Widow Rockfish.
	Phase 3: 30,000 pounds per month October through December for Widow Rockfish.
	Open access limit to 2,000 pounds per month of Widow Rockfish
	Phase 2 two-month limits reduced to 11,000 pounds for Widow Rockfish starting in June.
	Open access month cumulative trip limit increased to 8,000 pounds of Widow Rockfish.
2000	WA and OR restrict landings applied to 30,000 monthly limit to have midwater gear. State imposed cumulative trip limit per month applied otherwise.
	Sorting of Widow Rockfish required before weighing in limited entry and open access fisheries.
	New limited entry trawl gear restrictions implemented for large footrope trawl gear, small footrope trawl gear, and midwater trawl gear.
	Cumulative trip limits allowed for Widow Rockfish only if small footrope or midwater trawl gear were used. Higher cumulative trip limits available to midwater gear.
	30,000 pound two-month cumulative trip limit for Widow Rockfish caught with mid-water gear.
	1,000 pound monthly trip limit allowed for small footrope trawl.
	3,000 pound monthly trip limits for Widow Rockfish caught with limited entry fixed gear, open access gear, and exempted trawl gear. Some closures south of 40° 10' N latitude in January through April

Year	Management action
2001	Similar actions as in 2000 with the following changes  20,000 pound two-month cumulative trip limit for Widow Rockfish caught with mid-water gear in January through April and September through October. 10,000 pound two-month cumulative trip limit in other periods.
	Widow Rockfish limits reduced to 1,000 pounds per month in July-September unless landed with Pacific Whiting, which is 2,000 pounds per month with a 500 pound trip limit.
	Retention of Widow Rockfish prohibited beginning in October. For gears other than midwater trawl.
2002	Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCA) established. Large footrope gear prohibited inside 275 m. Widow fishery closed most of the year except for a small amount of bycatch and small monthly limits in some months.
2003	Widow fishery closed most of the year except for a small amount of bycatch and small monthly limits in some months.
2004	Widow fishery closed most of the year except for a small amount of bycatch and small monthly limits in some months
2005	Widow fishery closed most of the year except for a small amount of bycatch and small monthly limits in some months.
2006	Amendment 19 established essential fish habitat (EFH) boundaries and conservation areas. Widow bycatch cap in the non-tribal limited entry whiting trawl fishery increased from 200 mt to 220 mt in October
2007	Seasonal changes of trawl RCA boundaries and periodic closures within certain latitude boundaries (e.g., north of Cape Alava at 48°10' N latitude to the U.S.-Canada border) started in 2007. Small monthly limits for Widow Rockfish (less than 1,500 pounds per month)
	Widow bycatch cap in the non-tribal limited entry whiting trawl fishery increased from 200 mt to 220 mt in May.
	Limited entry whiting trawl fishery closed due to attainment of 220 mt widow bycatch in July
	Limited entry whiting trawl fishery re-opened with 275 mt widow bycatch cap in October
	Widow bycatch cap of 275 mt adopted for limited entry whiting trawl fishery.
	Limited entry whiting trawl fishery closed due to attainment of canary bycatch in August

Year	Management action
2008	Limited entry whiting trawl fishery re-opened with 284 mt widow bycatch cap in October
	Small monthly limits for Widow Rockfish (less than 1,500 pounds per month)
2009	Sector specific bycatch caps for Widow Rockfish in the limited entry whiting trawl fishery: 105 mt for shoreside fleet, 85 mt to catcher-processors, 60 mt to motherships
	Small monthly limits for Widow Rockfish (less than 1,500 pounds per month)
2010	Trawl rationalization began, establishing the IFQ fishery.
2011	Small monthly limits for Widow Rockfish (less than 1,500 pounds per month)

Table 4: Management guidelines for Widow Rockfish from 2004 to 2024. Total landings (mt) are also shown.

Year	OFL mt termed ABC prior to 2011	ABC mt	ACL mt termed OY prior to 2011	Commercial Landings mt	Estimated Total Catch mt
2004	3,460		284	87	99
2005	3,218		285	195	204
2006	3,059		289	213	221
2007	5,334		368	240	245
2008	5,144		368	264	272
2009	7,728		522	177	186
2010	6,937		509	166	179
2011	5,097	600	4,872	212	213
2012	4,923	600	4,705	270	271
2013	4,841	1,500	4,598	470	473
2014	4,435	1,500	4,212	722	726
2015	4,137	2,000	3,929	880	885
2016	3,990	2,000	3,790	1,039	1,045
2017	14,130	13,508	13,508	6,346	6,395

Year	OFL mt termed ABC prior to 2011	ABC mt	ACL mt termed OY prior to 2011	Commercial Landings mt	Estimated Total Catch mt
2018	13,237	12,655	12,655	10,493	10,588
2019	12,375	11,831	11,831		

⋮⋮

Table 5: Depth ranges and limits of the southern latitude in the Triennial survey for the different years.

Years	Depth range (m)	Southern latitude
1977	91-457	34.05
1980-1986	55-366	36.80
1989-1992	55-366	34.50
1995-2004	55-500	34.50

Table 6: Stratifications used for the two surveys.

Triennial					
Strata	Area (km2)	Depth1	Depth2	Latitude1	Latitude2
A	33,730.25	55	183	34.5	49
B	11,062.63	183	400	34.5	49

Table 7: Stratifications used for the two surveys.

NWFSC WCGBT					
Strata	Area (km2)	Depth1	Depth2	Latitude1	Latitude2
A	10,687.86	55	183	34.5	40.5
B	3,394.82	183	400	34.5	40.5
C	23,042.39	55	183	40.5	49.0
D	7,667.81	183	400	40.5	49.0

Table 8: Number of positive tows, lengths, and ages in each year from the Triennial survey (Tri) and the NWFSC WCGBT survey (NW).

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of positive tows</b>		<b>Number of tows with lengths</b>		<b>Number of lengths</b>		<b>Number of tows with ages</b>		<b>Number of ages</b>	
	<b>Tri</b>	<b>NW</b>	<b>Tri</b>	<b>NW</b>	<b>Tri</b>	<b>NW</b>	<b>Tri</b>	<b>NW</b>	<b>Tri</b>	<b>NW</b>
1977	80		1		9					
1978										
1979										
1980	38		3		166		1		22	
1981										
1982										
1983	70		5		385					
1984										
1985										
1986	46		8		317					
1987										
1988										
1989	38		20		713					
1990										
1991										
1992	50		10		708					
1993										
1994										
1995	43		43		500					
1996										
1997										
1998	59		58		738					
1999										
2000										

Year	Number of positive tows		Number of tows with lengths		Number of lengths		Number of tows with ages		Number of ages	
	Tri	NW	Tri	NW	Tri	NW	Tri	NW	Tri	NW
2001	28		28		130					
2002										
2003		20		18		216				
2004	36	12	33	12	219	84		12		43
2005		20		20		78		18		65
2006		26		26		172		26		89
2007		27		27		92		27		83
2008		17		17		26		15		20
2009		31		31		141		31		123
2010		28		28		240		28		116
2011		31		31		313		31		152
2012		32		32		181		32		91
2013		18		18		364		18		246
2014		29		28		349		28		264
2015		21		21		149		21		93
2016		40		40		888		40		556
2017		30		30		310		30		213
2018		34		34		410		34		353
2019		23		23		219		23		161
2020										
2021		18		17		66		17		66
2022		18		18		125		18		109
2023		30		29		159		29		110
2024		35		35		485		35		347

Table 9: Number of landings sampled for length data by gear and state for non-whiting fisheries.

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Line		
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR	WA
1	1971	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
2	1977	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1978	50	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0
4	1979	32	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0
5	1980	101	0	0	6	0	19	0	0	1	0	1
6	1981	72	3	0	59	20	31	0	0	6	0	0
7	1982	88	7	0	89	34	41	1	0	11	0	0
8	1983	158	16	0	46	10	25	18	0	9	0	0
9	1984	146	20	0	29	12	22	25	0	4	0	0
10	1985	149	20	0	25	35	16	81	0	5	0	0
11	1986	108	17	0	25	28	27	59	0	16	0	0
12	1987	88	29	0	49	74	36	37	0	3	0	0
13	1988	79	30	7	37	42	14	43	0	2	0	0
14	1989	81	49	14	30	67	16	81	0	7	0	0
15	1990	80	58	11	39	62	30	74	0	8	0	0
16	1991	74	76	20	17	63	15	23	0	12	0	0
17	1992	55	98	22	5	41	9	31	0	53	1	0

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Line		
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR	WA
37	18	60	69	28	5	49	8	19	0	39	0	0
	19	54	67	13	2	21	16	34	0	38	0	0
	20	53	47	17	11	14	16	14	0	7	0	0
	21	49	33	17	11	12	13	4	0	10	0	0
	22	54	49	16	10	21	19	2	0	20	0	0
	23	41	43	26	3	11	8	5	0	15	0	0
	24	38	28	21	5	19	11	1	0	3	1	0
	25	14	0	3	16	44	19	0	0	8	1	0
	26	12	6	2	10	38	11	0	0	2	3	0
	27	22	8	7	1	15	10	1	0	2	0	0
	28	7	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
	29	5	1	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0
	30	4	2	0	0	0	10	0	0	1	0	0
	31	7	3	2	0	0	8	0	0	4	1	0
	32	7	16	4	0	0	3	0	0	4	1	0
	33	5	18	5	0	0	12	0	0	2	0	0
	34	19	30	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
	35	18	22	1	0	0	11	0	0	0	2	0

38

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Line		
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR	WA
36	2011	6	14	9	0	1	6	0	0	1	0	0
37	2012	14	19	5	0	4	7	0	0	3	1	0
38	2013	20	21	1	0	6	6	0	0	9	1	0
39	2014	18	20	3	0	5	7	0	0	12	2	0
40	2015	37	23	0	0	18	4	0	0	9	7	2
41	2016	27	14	0	0	7	1	0	0	2	4	2
42	2017	22	41	0	3	33	3	0	0	5	2	3
43	2018	31	25	7	10	60	4	0	0	3	4	7
44	2019	34	33	1	2	48	12	0	0	7	3	2
45	2020	29	18	0	2	31	5	0	0	13	8	1
46	2021	42	18	2	4	39	7	0	0	10	2	0
47	2022	13	10	0	12	46	4	0	0	2	5	2
48	2023	20	7	0	7	51	7	0	0	3	7	5
49	2024	27	13	0	0	52	9	0	0	16	9	4

Table 10: Number of lengths of Widow Rockfish by gear and state for non-whiting fisheries.

Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Line		
	CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR	WA
1	1971	0	0	0	0	408	0	0	0	0	0
2	1977	0	0	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1978	303	0	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	0
4	1979	436	0	0	0	0	34	0	7	0	0
5	1980	727	0	0	13	0	1,900	0	1	0	2
6	1981	444	250	0	1,340	1,746	3,100	0	0	19	0
7	1982	932	792	0	3,144	3,960	4,100	1	0	84	0
8	1983	1,352	478	0	1,411	321	2,500	103	0	31	0
9	1984	1,722	2,394	0	1,278	1,525	2,199	126	0	11	0
10	1985	1,853	2,233	0	1,176	3,971	1,600	557	0	8	0
11	1986	1,740	1,425	0	1,032	2,788	2,650	321	0	120	0
12	1987	998	865	0	1,744	2,198	1,942	262	0	11	0
13	1988	763	916	350	1,230	1,239	700	334	0	3	0
14	1989	1,007	1,099	700	1,325	1,843	800	450	0	23	0
15	1990	1,202	1,320	550	1,510	1,454	1,500	612	0	37	0
16	1991	1,596	1,569	997	761	1,442	750	268	0	75	0
17	1992	1,470	1,982	1,100	222	1,760	450	231	0	689	2

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Line			SPECIES assessment 2025
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR	WA	
40	18	1993	1,682	1,410	1,400	231	1,156	400	275	0	238	0	0
	19	1994	1,359	1,464	650	112	557	842	410	0	554	0	0
	20	1995	1,539	1,066	850	519	296	800	175	0	22	0	0
	21	1996	1,364	845	704	437	316	650	132	0	80	0	0
	22	1997	2,063	1,231	557	382	620	950	80	0	212	0	0
	23	1998	1,368	1,013	865	125	291	400	179	0	318	0	0
	24	1999	1,420	727	952	240	514	550	1	0	104	20	0
	25	2000	263	0	101	641	1,147	950	0	0	65	1	0
	26	2001	139	98	2	349	960	550	0	0	4	20	0
	27	2002	318	185	136	39	319	500	2	0	74	0	0
	28	2003	234	0	46	0	0	208	0	0	0	0	0
	29	2004	26	18	3	0	0	508	0	0	0	0	0
	30	2005	27	48	0	0	0	399	0	0	4	0	0
	31	2006	79	58	7	0	0	461	0	0	36	1	0
	32	2007	12	302	104	0	0	250	0	0	64	1	0
	33	2008	8	274	76	0	0	1,086	0	0	27	0	0
	34	2009	170	316	0	0	0	1,079	0	0	0	0	0
	35	2010	205	233	100	0	0	903	0	0	5	0	0

41

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Line			SPECIES assessment 2025
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR	WA	
36	2011	32	246	93	0	30	550	0	0	17	0	0	
37	2012	136	353	241	0	95	688	0	0	9	7	0	
38	2013	153	365	39	0	215	486	0	0	102	1	0	
39	2014	134	324	106	0	150	700	0	0	242	4	0	
40	2015	263	295	0	0	530	400	0	0	45	11	2	
41	2016	143	254	0	0	210	100	0	0	38	4	24	
42	2017	316	864	0	158	949	125	0	0	73	3	23	
43	2018	645	161	12	507	1,492	350	0	0	32	7	10	
44	2019	566	346	50	90	1,149	600	0	0	47	6	7	
45	2020	593	228	0	83	759	233	0	0	134	15	1	
46	2021	850	226	8	183	890	307	0	0	67	3	0	
47	2022	272	185	0	502	1,025	180	0	0	11	7	3	
48	2023	376	135	0	316	1,125	571	0	0	18	97	13	
49	2024	540	164	0	0	1,255	830	0	0	268	86	10	

Table 11: Number of landings and number of lengths sampled from the at-sea hake and shoreside hake fisheries.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of hauls (at-sea) or landings (shoreside)</b>		<b>Number of lengths</b>	
	<b>Domestic at-sea</b>	<b>Shoreside</b>	<b>Domestic at-sea</b>	<b>Shoreside</b>
1 1992	214	0	1,474	0
2 1993	239	0	1,468	0
3 1994	361	3	3,458	78
4 1995	304	19	1,789	570
5 1996	332	18	2,620	540
6 1997	397	30	2,841	869
7 1998	481	32	2,431	975
8 1999	598	52	3,070	1,551
9 2000	571	33	2,845	1,004
10 2001	522	19	1,758	576
11 2002	369	3	1,204	70
12 2003	291	2	665	26
13 2004	512	19	1,670	380
14 2005	1,228	1	5,538	50
15 2006	1,295	14	6,104	594
16 2007	1,491	21	10,658	860
17 2008	1,138	36	7,324	966
18 2009	400	24	1,976	845
19 2010	980	43	4,734	1,214
20 2011	982	43	3,605	1,286
21 2012	914	46	4,779	1,291
22 2013	901	40	3,808	1,160
23 2014	773	50	3,970	1,452
24 2015	522	36	2,312	1,313

Year	Number of hauls (at-sea) or landings (shoreside)		Number of lengths	
	Domestic at-sea	Shoreside	Domestic at-sea	Shoreside
25	2016	801	49	3,934
26	2017	997	57	5,406
27	2018	461	65	2,245
28	2019	469	73	2,642
29	2020	214	37	902
30	2021	310	61	1,776
31	2022	333	88	1,489
32	2023	469	68	1,738
33	2024	83	60	251

Table 12: Number of landings sampled for ages by gear and state for non-whiting fisheries.

Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Li	
	CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR
1	1978	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1979	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1980	27	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0
4	1981	14	3	0	30	20	31	0	0	0
5	1982	87	6	0	71	34	40	1	0	4
6	1983	151	16	0	45	10	25	5	0	2
7	1984	144	20	0	29	12	22	10	0	2
8	1985	137	20	0	25	33	16	65	0	3
9	1986	106	17	0	22	28	27	53	0	3
10	1987	84	27	0	49	62	36	27	0	0
11	1988	67	29	6	34	41	14	39	0	2
12	1989	75	49	14	30	66	16	75	0	3

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Li	
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR
13	1990	70	58	11	32	62	30	65	0	2	0
14	1991	65	76	20	17	63	15	19	0	9	0
15	1992	45	93	22	4	26	9	21	0	15	0
16	1993	28	67	28	0	49	8	6	0	3	0
17	1994	28	67	13	2	21	15	7	0	1	0
18	1995	8	45	17	3	13	16	0	0	0	0
19	1996	36	32	14	6	11	13	2	0	1	0
20	1997	42	46	11	10	20	19	0	0	9	0
21	1998	27	42	14	2	11	8	2	0	3	0
22	1999	29	27	19	3	18	10	0	0	0	0
23	2000	8	0	2	9	42	19	0	0	3	0
24	2001	2	6	0	4	35	10	0	0	0	0
25	2002	17	8	2	1	15	10	1	0	0	0
26	2003	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
27	2004	3	0	1	0	0	12	0	0	0	0
28	2005	0	2	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0
29	2006	6	3	1	0	0	8	0	0	2	1
30	2007	6	16	4	0	0	3	0	0	3	1
31	2008	5	18	5	0	0	12	0	0	0	0
32	2009	8	29	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
33	2010	7	21	1	0	0	11	0	0	0	2
34	2011	0	5	7	0	1	5	0	0	0	0
35	2012	0	8	5	0	0	7	0	0	0	1
36	2013	0	7	1	0	3	5	0	0	0	0
37	2014	0	4	2	0	1	7	0	0	0	0
38	2015	0	22	0	0	14	4	0	0	0	0
39	2016	0	13	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Hook-and-Li	
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	OR
40	2017	0	36	0	0	31	3	0	0	0	0
41	2018	0	25	7	0	46	4	0	0	0	0
42	2019	0	16	1	0	34	12	0	0	0	0
43	2020	0	15	0	0	25	5	0	0	0	2
44	2021	0	12	2	0	31	6	0	0	0	0
45	2022	0	8	0	0	45	4	0	0	0	0
46	2023	0	5	0	0	48	7	0	0	0	1
47	2024	0	7	0	0	42	7	0	0	0	0

Table 13: Number of landings sampled for ages by gear and state for non-whiting fisheries.

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Ho	
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	CA	CA
1	1978	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1979	269	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1980	404	0	0	0	0	1,775	0	0	0	0
4	1981	205	109	0	598	600	3,050	0	0	0	0
5	1982	834	174	0	2,382	1,019	3,944	1	0	18	
6	1983	1,283	475	0	1,365	321	2,480	55	0	3	
7	1984	1,678	600	0	1,278	360	2,194	89	0	5	
8	1985	1,762	589	0	1,176	963	1,591	477	0	4	
9	1986	1,704	680	0	913	939	2,594	188	0	5	
10	1987	968	805	0	1,742	1,837	1,940	186	0	0	
11	1988	692	886	298	1,132	1,209	695	290	0	3	
12	1989	919	1,099	695	1,323	1,794	799	403	0	6	
13	1990	1,051	1,310	550	1,309	1,447	1,497	533	0	8	
14	1991	1,308	1,566	991	761	1,413	748	164	0	23	

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Ho
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	
15	1992	676	1,889	1,097	82	574	450	87	0	91
16	1993	472	1,361	1,398	0	1,155	400	57	0	3
17	1994	516	1,463	650	54	556	749	58	0	1
18	1995	167	1,027	850	68	276	800	0	0	0
19	1996	873	827	699	158	292	649	88	0	7
20	1997	892	1,164	549	187	593	949	0	0	55
21	1998	1,019	987	699	82	291	400	84	0	46
22	1999	1,026	706	950	133	479	500	0	0	0
23	2000	157	0	100	353	1,067	948	0	0	12
24	2001	43	98	0	132	858	485	0	0	0
25	2002	294	179	99	21	319	488	2	0	0
26	2003	87	0	0	0	0	208	0	0	0
27	2004	7	0	3	0	0	506	0	0	0
28	2005	0	48	0	0	0	399	0	0	0
29	2006	74	58	6	0	0	361	0	0	5
30	2007	11	302	54	0	0	150	0	0	23
31	2008	8	274	75	0	0	600	0	0	0
32	2009	81	315	0	0	0	759	0	0	0
33	2010	54	231	50	0	0	539	0	0	0
34	2011	0	63	84	0	30	250	0	0	0
35	2012	0	80	73	0	0	163	0	0	0
36	2013	0	190	26	0	90	153	0	0	0
37	2014	0	91	52	0	30	229	0	0	0
38	2015	0	152	0	0	69	195	0	0	0
39	2016	0	156	0	0	36	28	0	0	0
40	2017	0	209	0	0	223	100	0	0	0
41	2018	0	161	12	0	495	200	0	0	0

	Year	Bottom Trawl			Midwater Trawl			Net		Ho
		CA	OR	WA	CA	OR	WA	CA	WA	
42	2019	0	55	49	0	176	597	0	0	0
43	2020	0	61	0	0	134	233	0	0	0
44	2021	0	53	8	0	135	300	0	0	0
45	2022	0	44	0	0	281	129	0	0	0
46	2023	0	28	0	0	312	320	0	0	0
47	2024	0	33	0	0	248	340	0	0	0

::: {#tbl-disc totals .cell tbl-cap='Discard totals (mt) for four fleets derived from Pikitch data, EDCP data, and WCGOP data. Italics indicate years that were not fitted to because they were simply added to the landings (Shoreside hake) or omitted because they were outside of the main study period.'} ::: {.cell-output-display}

Fleet	Year	Source	Discards	Error	Error Stat	Source 1	U
Bottom Trawl	1981	Pikitch	900.1900	54.26%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1982	Pikitch	1,450.7400	44.12%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1983	Pikitch	1,847.1500	43.91%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1984	Pikitch	586.3600	55.78%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1985	Pikitch	462.9000	49.53%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	1986	Pikitch	534.8000	53.11%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	1987	Pikitch	1,035.5000	42.57%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	1988	Pikitch	1,177.0900	43.38%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1989	Pikitch	1,217.7400	44.70%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1990	Pikitch	1,010.9500	51.53%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1991	Pikitch	1,219.2500	42.20%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1992	Pikitch	1,217.5100	44.62%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1993	Pikitch	1,430.1800	46.57%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1994	Pikitch	1,177.7100	43.11%	CV	2019 report	
Bottom Trawl	1995	EDCP	924.8000	83.18%	CV	2019 data	

Fleet	Year	Source	Discards	Error	Error Stat	Source 1	U
Bottom Trawl	1996	EDCP	3,084.5000	67.07%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	1997	EDCP	3,353.3000	75.06%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	1998	EDCP	42.6000	48.80%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	1999	EDCP	4.8000	68.78%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2002	WCGOP	13.2200	43.07%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2003	WCGOP	1.2100	81.96%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2004	WCGOP	5.1300	75.89%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2005	WCGOP	10.1700	44.61%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2006	WCGOP	0.0300	135.56%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2007	WCGOP	13.8600	61.57%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2008	WCGOP	3.9000	44.54%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2009	WCGOP	26.5700	33.77%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2010	WCGOP	22.7400	54.32%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2011	WCGOP	0.0800	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2012	WCGOP	0.0100	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2013	WCGOP	2.4300	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2014	WCGOP	0.0900	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2015	WCGOP	0.0300	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2016	WCGOP	0.0200	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2017	WCGOP	0.2600	5.00%	CV	2019 data	
Bottom Trawl	2018	WCGOP	0.0143	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Bottom Trawl	2019	WCGOP	0.7832	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Bottom Trawl	2020	WCGOP	0.2763	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Bottom Trawl	2021	WCGOP	0.1440	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Bottom Trawl	2022	WCGOP	0.0750	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Bottom Trawl	2023	WCGOP	0.1184	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	1981	Pikitch	6,479.8800	23.24%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1982	Pikitch	5,722.2500	22.84%	CV	2019 report	

Fleet	Year	Source	Discards	Error	Error Stat	Source 1	U
Midwater	1984	Pikitch	1,737.5700	23.33%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1985	Pikitch	1,502.0000	24.09%	CV	2019 data	
Midwater	1986	Pikitch	1,321.2000	23.64%	CV	2019 data	
Midwater	1987	Pikitch	1,798.4000	26.20%	CV	2019 data	
Midwater	1988	Pikitch	1,615.8300	24.82%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1989	Pikitch	1,981.8600	25.26%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1990	Pikitch	1,205.4400	24.51%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1991	Pikitch	565.9400	24.33%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1992	Pikitch	356.0000	25.00%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1993	Pikitch	569.8600	25.34%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1994	Pikitch	536.8000	25.43%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1995	Pikitch	663.2400	23.81%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1996	Pikitch	465.6600	24.84%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1997	Pikitch	663.1400	24.10%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1998	Pikitch	217.1500	25.53%	CV	2019 report	
Midwater	1997	EDCP	1.0000	83.26%	CV	2019 data	
Midwater	1998	EDCP	18.7000	80.00%	CV	2019 data	
Midwater	2002	WCGOP	39.4000	40.71%	CV	2019 data	
Midwater	2012	WCGOP	0.0000	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2013	WCGOP	0.0020	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2014	WCGOP	0.0136	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2015	WCGOP	0.8800	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2016	WCGOP	1.5600	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2017	WCGOP	9.7500	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2018	WCGOP	37.2300	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2019	WCGOP	18.7800	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2020	WCGOP	45.4400	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2021	WCGOP	36.3800	5.00%	CV	2025 data	

Fleet	Year	Source	Discards	Error	Error Stat	Source 1	U
Midwater	2022	WCGOP	47.6000	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Midwater	2023	WCGOP	17.3700	5.00%	CV	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2007	WCGOP	0.0160	0.51%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2008	WCGOP	0.0120	0.33%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2010	WCGOP	0.0080	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2011	WCGOP	0.0110	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2012	WCGOP	0.0010	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2013	WCGOP	0.0010	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2014	WCGOP	0.0090	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2015	WCGOP	0.0550	3.06%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2016	WCGOP	0.1880	2.96%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2017	WCGOP	0.0370	1.76%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2018	WCGOP	0.1380	8.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2019	WCGOP	0.0120	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2021	WCGOP	0.0000	2.32%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2022	WCGOP	0.0270	1.47%	SD	2025 data	
Hook & Line	2023	WCGOP	0.0020	0.14%	SD	2025 data	

... ...

Table 15: Ageing error for two labs that was used in the assessment model.

True Age	Standard Deviation CAP	Standard Deviation SWFSC
0.5	0.145	0.111
1.5	0.145	0.111
2.5	0.187	0.147
3.5	0.233	0.187
4.5	0.283	0.233

True Age	Standard Deviation CAP	Standard Deviation SWFSC
5.5	0.338	0.284
6.5	0.398	0.341
7.5	0.463	0.406
8.5	0.533	0.478
9.5	0.612	0.560
10.5	0.697	0.651
11.5	0.790	0.755
12.5	0.892	0.871
13.5	1.003	1.001
14.5	1.124	1.148
15.5	1.256	1.313
16.5	1.401	1.499
17.5	1.558	1.708
18.5	1.731	1.943
19.5	1.919	2.207
20.5	2.124	2.504
21.5	2.349	2.839
22.5	2.594	3.215
23.5	2.861	3.638
24.5	3.154	4.113
25.5	3.473	4.649
26.5	3.821	5.250
27.5	4.202	5.927
28.5	4.618	6.689
29.5	5.072	7.545
30.5	5.568	8.508

True Age	Standard Deviation CAP	Standard Deviation SWFSC
31.5	6.109	9.592
32.5	6.700	10.810
33.5	7.346	12.181
34.5	8.052	13.723
35.5	8.822	15.456
36.5	9.663	17.407
37.5	10.582	19.600
38.5	11.585	22.067
39.5	12.680	24.842
40.5	13.877	27.964

Label	Base	Fixed natural mortality to 2015 prior	Fixed natural mort
M (females)	0.125	0.100	0.1
Lmin (females)	20.652	20.666	20.7
Lmax (females)	49.524	49.403	49.5
k (females)	0.181	0.184	0.1
CV old (females)	0.116	0.116	0.1
CV young (females)	0.048	0.049	0.0
M (males)	0.137	0.100	0.1
Lmin (males)	21.041	21.118	21.0
Lmax (males)	43.637	43.462	43.5
k (males)	0.245	0.245	0.2
CV old (males)	0.094	0.092	0.0
CV young (males)	0.057	0.058	0.0

Label	Base	Fixed natural mortality to 2015 prior	Fixed natural mort
lnR0	10.437	9.898	10.3
Virgin recruitment (thousands)	34.103	19.899	31.2
SSB unfished (mt)	151584	139,734.000	145,72
SB0 (thousand mt)	81.734	72.835	75.7
SSB 2025 (thousand mt)	40.603	19.951	35.2
B ratio 2025	0.497	0.274	0.4
SPR ratio 2025	1.257	1.657	1.3
Total	7664.49	21.710	5.4
Survey	13.022	2.609	0.3
Length	854.968	1.593	-1.3
Age	1366.28	9.670	5.7
Discards	5410.79	0.710	0.1
Recruitment	17.84	7.922	0.6
Forecast recruitment	0.601	0.138	0.0
Parameter Priors	0.983	-0.924	-0.2

Table 17: Results from retrospective runs, sequentially removing data over the last five years using the base case assumptions.

Retrospective	Base Model	Retro 1	Retro 2	Retro 3	Retro 4
M (females)	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.14
Lmin (females)	20.65	20.56	20.54	20.40	20.41
Lmax (females)	49.52	49.70	50.04	50.07	50.18
k (females)	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
CV old (females)	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
CV young (females)	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04
M (males)	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.15
Lmin (males)	21.04	21.05	21.02	21.10	21.16
Lmax (males)	43.64	43.76	43.86	44.05	44.14
k (males)	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
CV old (males)	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10
CV young (males)	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05
lnR0	10.44	10.50	10.64	10.66	10.69
SB0	81734	79,220.00	82,577.00	85,581.00	88,283.00
SB final year	40603	36,546.00	41,101.00	42,587.00	48,218.00
Depletion Final Year (%)	49.68	46.13	49.77	49.76	54.62
Yield SPR 50	5628	5,736.00	6,329.00	6,514.00	6,727.00
h (steepness)	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72
<b>Difference from Base Model Likelihood</b>					
Total	7664.49	7,553.87	7,444.31	7,342.89	7,274.85
Survey	13.02	12.01	12.19	8.73	2.95
Discard	5410.79	5,410.78	5,402.22	5,384.36	5,376.48
Length	854.97	829.68	788.03	764.60	744.61
Age	1366.28	1,284.89	1,229.12	1,174.31	1,140.14
Recruitment	17.84	15.03	10.98	9.16	9.05
Forecast Rec	0.60	0.21	0.15	0.11	0.00

Retrospective	Base Model	Retro 1	Retro 2	Retro 3	Retro 4	
Priors	0.98	1.26	1.60	1.60	1.60	
Parameter	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Table 18: Results from retrospective runs, sequentially removing data over years using the base case assumptions.

log(R0)	R0 10.4	R0 10.2	R0 10	R0 9.8	R0 10.6	R0
M (females)	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.13	0
Lmin (females)	20.62	20.63	20.64	20.65	20.66	20
Lmax (females)	49.38	49.44	49.48	49.52	49.55	49
k (females)	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0
CV old (females)	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0
CV young (females)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0
M (males)	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.14	0
Lmin (males)	21.04	21.04	21.04	21.04	21.04	21
Lmax (males)	43.70	43.68	43.66	43.64	43.62	43
k (males)	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0
CV old (males)	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0
CV young (males)	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0
lnR0	9.80	10.00	10.20	10.40	10.60	10
SB0	73122	73888	76459	80765	86546	93
SB final year	15300	21502	29330	38706	49437	61
Depletion Final Year (%)	0.21	0.29	0.38	0.48	0.57	0
Yield SPR 50	3820.98	4270.68	4820.63	5489.86	6290.92	723
h (steepness)	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0
<b>Difference from Base Model Likelihood</b>						
Total	7674.73	7668.61	7665.58	7664.52	7664.94	766
Survey	15.4531	14.2187	13.4387	13.0554	13.0009	13.
Discard	5411.74	5411.35	5411.05	5410.83	5410.69	54

log(R0)	R0 10.4	R0 10.2	R0 10	R0 9.8	R0 10.6	R0
Length	852.42	853.706	854.48	854.914	855.129	855
Age	1361.89	1362.68	1364.13	1365.92	1367.91	137
Recruitment	32.2007	25.6514	21.2814	18.2805	16.2748	15.
Forecast Rec	0.931242	0.794112	0.688606	0.611943	0.559064	0.5
Priors	0.0871177	0.204037	0.498466	0.900147	1.37351	1.8
Parameter	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 19: Quantities of interest

steepness (h)	0.715	0.66	0.605	0.55	0.495	
M (females)	0.144673	0.136564	0.131521	0.128413	0.12656	
Lmin (females)	20.6294	20.6292	20.6326	20.637	20.6413	
Lmax (females)	49.5276	49.5212	49.5184	49.5178	49.5185	
k (females)	0.180661	0.180935	0.181077	0.181141	0.181162	
CV old (females)	0.115722	0.115949	0.116026	0.116031	0.116003	
CV young (females)	0.0478482	0.0479314	0.0479921	0.0480373	0.0480714	
M (males)	0.156665	0.148474	0.143422	0.140343	0.138538	
Lmin (males)	21.0677	21.0597	21.0539	21.0498	21.0468	
Lmax (males)	43.6659	43.6641	43.6604	43.6559	43.6512	
k (males)	0.243016	0.243271	0.243528	0.243773	0.243997	
CV old (males)	0.0936934	0.0938668	0.0939785	0.094049	0.0940914	
CV young (males)	0.0563484	0.0564508	0.0565401	0.0566173	0.0566828	
lnR0	11.1143	10.8718	10.7108	10.6053	10.5372	
SB0	117988	104576	96247.2	90958.6	87512.1	
SB final year	21839.3	23798.5	26113.7	28657.5	31291	
Depletion Final Year (%)	0.185098	0.227571	0.271319	0.315061	0.357562	
Yield SPR 50	2.50E-14	1.04E-12	2640.91	3871.49	4521.34	
h (steepness)	0.275	0.33	0.385	0.44	0.495	

steepness (h)	0.715	0.66	0.605	0.55	0.495	
<b>Difference from reference</b>						
Total	7674.7	7670.81	7668.56	7667.15	7666.21	
Survey	12.325	12.2616	12.3785	12.5314	12.6736	
Discard	5410.61	5410.67	5410.73	5410.77	5410.79	
Length	851.248	851.945	852.57	853.125	853.611	
Age	1370.81	1369.61	1368.73	1368.05	1367.52	
Recruitment	23.5201	21.7009	20.4979	19.6773	19.0905	
Forecast Rec	0.888692	0.854896	0.812813	0.768038	0.724985	
Priors	5.29564	3.76019	2.83695	2.22346	1.79449	
Parameter	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 20: Quantities of interest when profiling over natural mortality

Natural Mortality (females)	0.121	0.11	0.099	0.088	0.132	0.12
M (females)	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.12
Lmin (females)	20.67	20.66	20.66	20.65	20.65	20.65
Lmax (females)	49.33	49.40	49.45	49.51	49.56	49.56
k (females)	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.18
CV old (females)	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
CV young (females)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
M (males)	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.14
Lmin (males)	21.03	21.03	21.04	21.04	21.04	21.04
Lmax (males)	43.68	43.67	43.66	43.64	43.62	43.62
k (males)	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
CV old (males)	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
CV young (males)	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
lnR0	9.84	10.00	10.18	10.37	10.57	10.77
SB0	85925.30	82223.70	80985.70	81367.50	82812.40	85120.00

Natural Mortality (females)	0.121	0.11	0.099	0.088	0.132	0
SB final year	21441.60	26610.80	32539.80	38661.50	44476.00	49
Depletion Final Year (%)	0.25	0.32	0.40	0.48	0.54	
Yield SPR 50	4153.67	4469.16	4898.71	5432.97	6063.15	67
h (steepness)	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	
<b>Difference from Base Model Likelihood</b>						
Total	7676.37	7669.86	7666.15	7664.59	7664.92	7
Survey	15.7341	14.6707	13.7931	13.1656	12.8216	12
Discard	5411.3	5411.14	5410.97	5410.83	5410.73	54
Length	855.428	855.473	855.37	855.093	854.661	85
Age	1364.77	1364.08	1364.51	1365.73	1367.61	13
Recruitment	28.2584	23.6781	20.4737	18.3397	17.0951	16
Forecast Rec	0.729468	0.671908	0.629148	0.604573	0.611465	0.6
Priors	0.147022	0.142084	0.384432	0.811827	1.37627	2.
Parameter	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 21: Quantities of interest when profiling

Natural Mortality (males)	0.132	0.121	0.11	0.099	0.088
M (females)	0.0801684	0.0897233	0.0996306	0.109792	0.120092
Lmin (females)	20.6627	20.6683	20.6674	20.6612	20.6553
Lmax (females)	49.2653	49.3354	49.3943	49.4508	49.5018
k (females)	0.185729	0.184598	0.183604	0.182561	0.18156
CV old (females)	0.1158	0.115739	0.115711	0.115793	0.115818
CV young (females)	0.0488764	0.0486538	0.0484847	0.0483239	0.0481996
M (males)	0.088	0.099	0.11	0.121	0.132
Lmin (males)	21.0587	21.0589	21.0571	21.0471	21.0429
Lmax (males)	43.6129	43.6356	43.6436	43.6442	43.6393
k (males)	0.244864	0.244453	0.244377	0.24444	0.24458

Natural Mortality (males)	0.132	0.121	0.11	0.099	0.088
CV old (males)	0.0939186	0.0940718	0.0941317	0.0941613	0.094145
CV young (males)	0.0571452	0.0569929	0.0569156	0.0568734	0.056856
lnR0	9.69739	9.83786	9.99693	10.1699	10.3551
SB0	87488.3	83027.1	80722.3	80090.6	81018.7
SB final year	16639.1	20822.9	25974.5	31651.3	37926.1
Depletion Final Year (%)	0.190187	0.250797	0.321776	0.395194	0.468115
Yield SPR 50	3960.85	4158.51	4459.32	4860.44	5375
h (steepness)	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.72
<b>Difference from Base</b>					
Total	7686.25	7676.56	7670.39	7666.33	7664.66
Survey	16.8948	15.7211	14.6694	13.8694	13.2195
Discard	5411.53	5411.35	5411.17	5411	5410.85
Length	853.665	854.144	854.585	854.801	854.945
Age	1368.93	1366.25	1365.18	1365	1365.76
Recruitment	33.8673	28.0796	23.8302	20.6567	18.5067
Forecast Rec	0.949187	0.877061	0.813761	0.634383	0.606857
Priors	0.401122	0.122614	0.126855	0.354612	0.761645
Parameter	0	0	0	0	0

Table 22: Estimated Dirichlet-multinomial parameters and weights derived using the McAllister-Ianelli and Dirichlet-multinomial ln(EffN\_mult) parameter was 7.

Fleet	Composition data type	Log Mean effN 2025 base model	Log Mean effN Fram
BottomTrawl	Length	4.366490	4.354044
Hake	Length	5.036966	4.897631
HnL	Length	3.104232	3.069252
MidwaterTrawl	Length	5.101000	4.878999
Net	Length	3.841918	3.860595
NWFSC	Length	3.821812	3.757661
Triennial	Length	3.228367	3.189216
BottomTrawl	Age	4.508326	4.653894
Hake	Age	4.411991	4.509703
HnL	Age	1.973299	2.008445
MidwaterTrawl	Age	4.434078	4.473006
Net	Age	3.532123	3.563373
NWFSC	Age	2.373780	1.997263

5 Figures




Figure 1: A map of the west coast of the U.S. with the EEZ and the  $40^{\circ}$  10 line that divides management into northern and southern regions for some species (although not Widow Rockfish). The line at latitude  $43^{\circ}$  N latitude is where past assessment models have been stratified into two areas.

## 5.1 Data




Figure 2: Observations of two cohorts (2008, top and 2010, bottom) from the NWFSC WCGBT survey data. Darker circles indicate more observations (possibly within the same tow).




Figure 3: Fishery-dependent indices of abundance from the 2011 assessment scaled to the mean of their own series.




Figure 4: Survey tow locations in 2004, showing the difference in station design for the NWFSC WCBTS survey relative to the Triennial trawl survey (Figure from Stewart (2007)).





Figure 5: Distribution of dates of operation for the triennial survey (1980-2004). Solid bars show the mean date for each survey year, points represent individual hauls dates, but are jittered to allow better delineation of the distribution of individual points (Figure from (Stewart 2007)).



```
pred-(1-SPR) fig-align='center' width=90%}
```

{#fig-




Figure 6: QQ for delta-gamma sdmTMB index (first panel) and lognormal sdmTMB index (second panel)




Figure 7: Model-based survey estimates for the Triennial with estimated 95% confidence intervals. Based estimates and 95% confidence intervals are shown in blue for comparison.




Figure 8: Expanded length compositions weighted by estimated numbers from the GLMM in each strata for the Triennial survey.




Figure 9: Estimated index of relative abundance for the West Coast Groundfish Bottom Trawl Survey using VAST, swept area biomass estimates (design-based), and the swept area biomass estimate from the 2015 assessment with 5 and 95% intervals.




Figure 10: Expanded length compositions for the WCGBTS




Figure 11: Expanded marginal age compositions from the WCGBTS.




Figure 12: Conditional age-at-length from WCGBTS observations for females (red) and males (blue).




Figure 13: Expanded length compositions for the bottom trawl fishery. The area of the circle is proportional to the proportion-at-length.




Figure 14: Expanded length compositions for the midwater trawl fishery. The area of the circle is proportional to the proportion-at-length.




Figure 15: Expanded length compositions for the hake fishery. The area of the circle is proportional to the proportion-at-length.




Figure 16: Expanded length compositions for the net fishery. The area of the circle is proportional to the proportion-at-length




Figure 17: Expanded length compositions for the hook-and-line fishery. The area of the circle is proportional to the proportion-at-length.




Figure 18: Expanded age compositions for the bottom trawl fishery. The area of the circle is proportional to the proportion-at-age.




Figure 19: Expanded age compositions for the midwater trawl fishery. The area of the circles is proportional to the proportion-at-age.




Figure 20: Expanded age compositions for the hake fishery. The area of the circles is proportional to the proportion-at-age.




Figure 21: Expanded age compositions for the net fishery. The area of the circles is proportional to the proportion-at-age.




Figure 22: Expanded age compositions for the hook-and-line fishery. The area of the circles is proportional to the proportion-at-age.




Figure 23: Length compositions for discards from the Pikitch study. The discard length comps were fit to in the model.




Figure 24: Length compositions of the discards for the bottom trawl.




Figure 25: Maturity-at-length (left) and maturity-at-age (right) from data reported by Barss & Echeverria (1987). Circles are proportional to the number of observations at that length or age. Lines are estimated logistic curves fitted to the data. The bars at the bottom are the number of samples by each state. The purpleline is the estimated maturity-at-age using all data with each state equally weighted, and is used in the assessment model with maturity-at-age for ages 2 and lower set equal to zero.




Figure 26: Length-at-age observations (points, slightly jittered) and predicted length-at-age von Bertalanffy curves for female (top) and male (bottom) Widow Rockfish collected from all fishery (BDS and At-Sea) and survey (Triennial and NWFSC) data.




Figure 27: Estimated ageing error for the Cooperative Ageing Project lab and the SWFSC.




Figure 28: Bridging from the 2019 assessment model with updated data and bridging steps.




Figure 29: The prior for natural mortality ( $M$ , yr<sup>-1</sup>) and the estimated  $M$  for females (top) and males (bottom) with asymptotic uncertainty based on maximum likelihood theory. The median of the prior is shown by the red triangle and the maximum likelihood estimate is shown by the vertical blue line.




Figure 30: Estimated selectivity for different fleets and surveys.




Figure 31: Estimated selectivity curves for 2018 of the hake fleet (topleft), net fishing fleets (topright), the triennial survey (bottomleft), and the NWFSC survey (bottomright).





Figure 32: Length at age (top-left panel) with estimated coefficient of variation (CV, thick line) and calculated standard deviation (SD, thin line) versus length at age in the top-right panel and versus age in the lower-left panel.



{#fig-




Figure 33: Estimates of recruitment (upper) and recruitment deviates (lower) with approximate asymptotic 95% confidence intervals (vertical lines) from the MLE estimates.




Figure 34: Estimated and input recruitment bias adjustment ramp. Red line shows current settings for bias adjustment specified the model. Blue line shows least squares estimate of alternative bias adjustment relationship for recruitment deviations.




Figure 35: Estimates of recruitment deviations for a sensitivity model with natural mortality fixed at 0.124 and 0.129 for females and males, respectively




Figure 36: Fits (lines) to the abundance estimates (points) for the base model. Bottom trawl is in the top left, hake indices are in the top right (a separate  $q$  is estimated for the Hake series starting in 1991), the triennial trawl survey index is on the middle left, the NWFSC survey index is on the middle right, and the juvenile survey index (in numbers) is on the bottom. 95% confidence intervals are shown input the input standard errors. Thicker lines (if present) indicate input uncertainty before addition of estimated additional uncertainty parameter.




Figure 37: Predicted (blue line) and observed (open circles) discards for the bottom trawl (top) and midwater trawl (bottom) fleets from the base model. 95% confidence intervals are shown for the observations




Figure 38: Pearson residuals for fits to length frequency data (left) and age frequency data (right) for landings from the trawl commercial fleets (rows). Filled circles indicate that the fitted proportion was less than the observed proportion. Red indicates females, blue males, and gray unsexed.




Figure 39: Pearson residuals for fits to length frequency data (left) and age frequency data (right) for landings from the net and hook-and-line commercial fleets (rows). Filled circles indicate that the fitted proportion was less than the observed proportion. Red indicates females, blue males, and gray unsexed.




Figure 40: Combined length frequencies for all years from fishery (retained catch) and survey length frequency data (points). Fits are shown by the red line (females) and blue line (males).




Figure 41: Pearson residuals for fits to the discard length frequencies from the bottom trawl (left) and hook-and-line (right) fleets. Filled circles indicate that the fitted proportion was less than the observed proportion. Red indicates females, blue males, and gray unsexed.




Figure 42: Pearson residuals for fits to the triennial survey length frequency data (left) and NWFSC WCGBT (shelf/slope) survey length frequency data (right). Filled circles indicate that the fitted proportion was less than the observed proportion. Red indicates females, blue males, and gray unsexed.

relative-(1-SPR) fig-align='center' width=90%}




Figure 43: Combined age frequencies for all years from fishery (retained catch) and survey length frequency data (points). Fits are shown by the red line (females) and blue line (males).




Figure 44: Observed and expected age-at-length with 95% confidence intervals (left) and observed and expected standard deviation of age-at-length with 95% confidence intervals (right) for the NWFSC WCGBT survey data.




Figure 45: Combined age frequencies for all years from fishery (retained catch) and survey length frequency data (points). Fits are shown by the red line (females) and blue line (males).




Figure 46: Combined age frequencies for all years from fishery (retained catch) and survey length frequency data (points). Fits are shown by the red line (females) and blue line (males).




Figure 47: Predicted spawning biomass (thousand mt) for Widow Rockfish using the base assessment. The solid line is the MLE estimate and the dashed lines depicts the approximate asymptotic 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 48: Predicted summary biomass (age 4+) from the base model.




Figure 49: Predicted relative spawning biomass from the Widow Rockfish base case assessment. The solid line is the MLE estimate and the dashed lines depicts the approximate asymptotic 95% confidence intervals. The dashed lines show the equilibrium level (100%), the management target of 40% of unfished biomass, and the minimum stock size threshold of 25% of unfished biomass.




Figure 50: Estimated recruitment (red circles) and the assumed stock-recruit relationship (black line). The dashed line shows the effect of the bias correction for the lognormal distribution.




Figure 51: Spawning biomass (with 95% confidence interval around the base model) for the base model and sensitivity runs. (no rec dev)

## 5.2 References




Figure 52: Five-year retrospective estimates of spawning biomass (top) and recruitment deviations (bottom).




Figure 53: Likelihood components in the likelihood profile for unfished equilibrium recruitment ( $R_0$ )




Figure 54: Likelihood components in the likelihood profile for steepness ( $h$ ).




Figure 55: Likelihood components in the likelihood profile for natural mortality (M).  
Note: male and female natural mortality are set to the same value.




Figure 56: Time series of recruitment estimates for models with different fixed values of natural mortality ( $M$ )




Figure 57: Estimated plot of equilibrium yield vs relative spawning biomass ( $B/B_0$ ).

## 6 Appendix A: Year-specific fits to the length and age compositions

This is for the appendix.

- Adams, PB. 1987. "The Diet of Widow Rockfish *Sebastodes Entomelas* in Northern California." *NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS* 48: 37–41.
- Bradburn, Mark James, Aimee A Keller, and Beth Helene Horness. 2011. "The 2003 to 2008 US West Coast Bottom Trawl Surveys of Groundfish Resources Off Washington, Oregon, and California: Estimates of Distribution, Abundance, Length, and Age Composition."
- Dick, Edward Joseph. 2009. *Modeling the Reproductive Potential of Rockfishes (Sebastes Spp.)*. University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Douglas, David A. 1998. "Species Composition of Rockfish in Catches by Oregon Trawlers, 1963–93."
- Hamel, Owen S. 2014. "A Method for Calculating a Meta-Analytical Prior for the Natural Mortality Rate Using Multiple Life History Correlates." *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 72 (1): 62–69.
- He, Xi, Donald Pearson, E. J. Dick, John Field, Stephen Ralston, and Alec MacCall. 2011. "Status of the Widow Rockfish Resource in 2011." Portland, OR: Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Jones, Walter G, and George Y Harry Jr. 1960. "The Oregon Trawl Fishery for Mink Food 1948–1957." *Fish Commission of Oregon Research Briefs* 8: 14–30.
- Punt, André E, David C Smith, Kyne KrusicGolub, and Simon Robertson. 2008. "Quantifying Age-Reading Error for Use in Fisheries Stock Assessments, with Application to Species in Australia's Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery." *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 65 (9): 1991–2005.
- Rogers, Jean Beyer. 2003. "Species Allocation of *Sebastodes* and *Sebastolobus* Sp. Caught by Foreign Countries from 1965 Through 1976 Off Washington, Oregon, and California, USA."
- Stanley, RD, R Kieser, K Cooke, AM Surry, and B Mose. 2000. "Estimation of a Widow Rockfish (*Sebastodes Entomelas*) Shoal Off British Columbia, Canada as a Joint Exercise Between Stock Assessment Staff and the Fishing Industry." *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 57 (4): 1035–49.
- Stewart, Ian J, Allan C Hicks, Ian G Taylor, James T Thorson, Chantell Wetzel, and Sven Kupschus. 2013. "A Comparison of Stock Assessment Uncertainty Estimates Using Maximum Likelihood and Bayesian Methods Implemented with the Same Model Framework." *Fisheries Research* 142: 37–46.