



NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-206

<https://doi.org/10.25923/c8cz-tk83>

Estimated Discard and Catch of Groundfish Species in the 2024 U.S. West Coast Fisheries

March 2026

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northwest Fisheries Science Center

NOAA Technical Memorandum Series NMFS-NWFSC

The Northwest Fisheries Science Center of NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service uses the NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC series to issue scientific and technical publications that have received thorough internal scientific review and editing. Reviews are transparent collegial reviews, not anonymous peer reviews. Documents within this series represent sound professional work and may be referenced in the formal scientific and technical literature.

The Northwest Fisheries Science Center's NOAA Technical Memorandum series continues the NMFS-F/NWC series established in 1970 by the Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Science Center, which subsequently was divided into the Northwest Fisheries Science Center and the Alaska Fisheries Science Center. The latter uses the NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC series.

NOAA Technical Memorandums NMFS-NWFSC are available from the NOAA Institutional Repository, <https://repository.library.noaa.gov>.

We used generative artificial intelligence (Google Gemini) to assist with the initial drafting of the alternative texts. All outputs from generative AI that were incorporated into the current document were reviewed for accuracy by qualified staff members, and edited as necessary to ensure use of the best available scientific and commercial data. The authors retain all responsibility for the content of this document.

Any mention throughout this document of trade names or commercial companies is for identification purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA.

Reference this document as follows:

Somers, K. A., K. E. Richerson, and V. J. Tuttle. 2026. Estimated Discard and Catch of Groundfish Species in the 2024 U.S. West Coast Fisheries. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-206.

<https://doi.org/10.25923/c8cz-tk83>



NOAA
FISHERIES

Estimated Discard and Catch of Groundfish Species in the 2024 U.S. West Coast Fisheries

Kayleigh A. Somers, Kate E. Richerson, and Vanessa J. Tuttle

<https://doi.org/10.25923/c8cz-tk83>

[Click author name for ORCID.](#)

March 2026

Fishery Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
2725 Montlake Boulevard East
Seattle, Washington 98112
<https://ror.org/05r7z1k40>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Contents

List of Figures	ii
List of Tables	iii
Plain Language Summary	iv
Executive Summary	vi
Acknowledgments	viii
Data Sources.....	1
Methods	4
Discard Estimation Methods Overview.....	4
IFQ Fishery Discard Estimation.....	5
Shorebased IFQ sectors.....	5
At-sea hake sectors	9
California Halibut Bottom Trawl Fishery	9
Pink Shrimp Trawl Fishery	10
Non-Nearshore Fixed Gear Fishery.....	10
Directed Pacific Halibut Fishery	11
Nearshore Fixed Gear Fishery.....	12
Other Commercial Data Summaries	12
Aggregate Mortality Estimation Methods	13
Results	22
List of References.....	25
Appendix A: Discard Mortality Analysis Details.....	27
Appendix B: PacFIN Data Processing Protocol.....	28
Fish Ticket Data Retrieval and Processing.....	28
FOS sector definitions for PacFIN fish-ticket data.....	29
Trawl Logbook Data Retrieval and Processing.....	31
Explicit WCGOP postprocessing of PacFIN logbook data	31

Figures

Figure 1. PacFIN fish ticket data processing for division into groundfish fishery sectors	2
Figure 2. Sector-level targeted landings in 2024 compared to 2019–23	22
Figure 3. Proportion of ACL attained in 2024 compared to 2019–23 for select species that are highly targeted, highly attained, or rebuilding	23
Figure 4. Sector-level contributions to 2024 mortality	24

Tables


Table 1. Estimated 2024 fishing mortality of major U.S. West Coast groundfish species and corresponding management reference points (harvest specifications)	14
Table 2. Estimated 2024 fishing mortality of groundfish and a subset of nongroundfish species, by sector	15

Plain Language Summary

Background

Groundfish is a term that includes dozens of ocean-dwelling fish, including species of sharks, skates, flatfish, and rockfish. Groundfish live off the entire U.S. West Coast, from Canada to Mexico, in environments from the nearshore to over 1,000 fathoms deep. Unfortunately, many groundfish species were overfished in the 1980s and '90s, leading to a plan for fishery management that first went into effect in 1982. NOAA Fisheries has since declared the majority of groundfish species rebuilt.

The Northwest Fisheries Science Center helps the Pacific Fishery Management Council make management decisions for groundfish on the U.S. West Coast. One way we do that is by providing data on how many are caught each year. Our data come from direct observation, electronic monitoring, and fish sales information.



In this report, we focus on the most recent year of data by comparing it to the previous five-year time period and to fishery management catch guidelines. This report is updated annually, and here we add and analyze 2024 data.

Key Takeaways

We present data by fishery sector, as well as by fishery management groupings and species.

- In 2024, one fishery sector landed catch above the range of the previous five years (2019–23), while six sectors landed within and five sectors landed below the range.
- Groundfish fisheries landed two consistently targeted species (Dover sole and Pacific hake) below the range seen in the last five years. Another consistently targeted species, northern sablefish, was landed within the five-year range.
- Groundfish fisheries did not exceed 2024 fishery management guidelines for any management group, although the stock-level contribution of quillback rockfish south of lat 40°10'N to the complex annual catch limit was estimated at 96%.
- Groundfish fisheries attained the highest percentage, without exceeding, of harvest guidelines for petrale sole, widow rockfish, minor nearshore rockfish in the north, northern sablefish, and Oregon black/blue/deacon rockfish.
- Groundfish fisheries attained less than 70% of harvest guidelines for all other groundfish groupings and species.

Links used in this section:

- Groundfish: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/west-coast-groundfish>
- Plan for fishery management: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/management-plan/pacific-coast-groundfish-fishery-management-plan>
- Pacific Fishery Management Council: <https://www.pcouncil.org/>
- Direct observation: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/west-coast/fisheries-observers/west-coast-groundfish-and-sea-hake-observer-data-collection-quality>
- Electronic monitoring: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/west-coast/resources-fishing/electronic-monitoring-west-coast>
- Fishery management catch guidelines: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/west-coast-groundfish#commercial>

Executive Summary

The primary objectives of this report are to: 1) update estimated fishing mortality of groundfish species in U.S. West Coast fisheries in 2002 to 2023, 2) provide mortality estimates for 2024, and 3) compare the 2024 estimates to annual catch limits (ACLs). These management specifications are published in the federal groundfish regulations for selected groundfish species (USOFR 2001, 2015). Based on a recommendation from the Pacific Fishery Management Council's (PFMC) Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), we present groundfish mortality estimates by species, whenever possible (PFMC 2014). PFMC's Groundfish Management Team (GMT) provides discard mortality rates for a subset of species based on scientific literature and after review by the SSC. Absent of specific guidance for other species, we report the full weight of discards without any mortality rates applied. This is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather to emphasize the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species where sufficient data on survival are available. Across all sectors, our primary findings include that:

- Only in the pink shrimp sector were targeted landings reported in 2024 above the range of the previous five years (2019–23). Five sectors reported landings below the previous five year range: both the at-sea hake mothership catcher vessel and catcher-processor fleets, shoreside-processed hake, catch shares bottom trawl, and nearshore fixed gear (Figure 2). The remaining six observed sectors were within the range.
- No management grouping exceeded its 2024 ACL.
- Species consistently targeted by groundfish fisheries include: Pacific hake (a.k.a. Pacific whiting, hereafter: “hake”), Dover sole, and sablefish north of lat 36°N. 2024 attainment of Dover sole (6% of ACL) and Pacific hake (41% of total allowable catch [TAC]) were below their five-year ranges (Table 1, Figure 3). Sablefish north of lat 36°N (74% of ACL) was within the five-year range.
- ACL attainment of yelloweye rockfish, a rebuilding groundfish species, was 47% and within the five-year range (Table 1, Figure 3). Discards by recreational and non-catch shares fixed gear fisheries accounted for most of this mortality (Table 2, Figure 4).
- Black/blue/deacon rockfish in Oregon was attained at 71% of its ACL and was below its five-year range. Four other groupings also attained greater than 70% of their ACLs but were within their five-year ranges: minor nearshore rockfish north of lat 40°10'N (75%), widow rockfish (85%), and petrale sole (86%) (Table 1, Figure 3).
- Quillback rockfish off of California was declared overfished in 2023; this report reflects the final 2024 management specifications as published in the federal register. Future reports will reflect any changes in specifications and stock status. Based on stock-level contributions to the ACL, we estimate that the stock north of lat 40°10'N attained 44% of the ACL contribution and the stock south of lat 40°10'N attained 96%. Stock-level mortality estimates are provided in the Groundfish Expanded Mortality Multiyear (GEMM) product (Table 3).
- ACL attainment for all other groundfish management groupings was < 70% (Table 1).

Summaries of 2024 catch from the following groundfish fishery sectors are included:

1. Commercial:
 - a. Limited entry (LE) shorebased individual fishing quota (IFQ) program:
 - Bottom trawl gear.
 - Fixed gear.
 - Midwater trawl gear landing 50% or more Pacific ocean perch, widow rockfish, and yellowtail rockfish.
 - Midwater trawl gear landing 50% or more hake.
 - Bottom trawl gear using electronic monitoring (EM).
 - Fixed gear using EM.
 - Midwater trawl gear landing 50% or more rockfish and using EM.
 - Midwater trawl gear landing 50% or more hake and using EM.
 - b. At-sea hake co-ops:
 - Hake catcher-processors (CPs).
 - Hake mothership catcher vessels (MSes).
 - c. Open access (OA) fixed gear nearshore (Oregon/California).*
 - d. Fixed gear LE sablefish primary season (tier endorsed).*
 - e. Fixed gear LE nonprimary sablefish (non-endorsed and daily trip limit [DTL] sectors).*
 - f. Directed 2A Pacific halibut fishery.
 - g. Fixed gear OA DTL.*
 - h. Exempted fishing permit (EFP), not including EM sectors listed above.*
2. Tribal:
 - a. Shoreside hake.
 - b. At-sea hake.*
3. Recreational (Washington/Oregon/California).
4. Research.

Summaries of 2024 catch from the following commercial nongroundfish fisheries are also included:

1. Tribal targeting any species (including nongroundfish) other than Pacific hake.
2. OA pink shrimp trawl (Washington/Oregon/California).*
3. OA bottom trawl targeting California halibut.*
4. OA bottom trawl not included above.
5. Other gear groups not included above.
6. Fixed gear targeting nongroundfish.

*Indicates sectors that use federal observer data for catch estimation.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the observers and staff from the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) and the At-Sea Hake Observer Program (A-SHOP), as well as the assistance of Jim Fellows (NWFSC) in data acquisition. Erica Crust (WDFW), Christian Heath (ODFW), and Ryan Denton (CDFW) provided recreational data. Dana Preedeedilok and Monica Falcon (NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region [WCR]) ensured that catch associated with research permits was uploaded in a timely manner to an application maintained by Melina Shak (NWFSC).

A note about tables:

Tables 1 and 2 have been typeset in this report. They are also available in the accompanying Excel file, together with Table 3, the Groundfish Expanded Mortality Multiyear data product, and Appendix Tables A-1–A-8.

Data Sources

Data sources used to estimate groundfish fishing mortality include landing receipts, onboard observer records, EM logbooks, and recreational and research catch information.

Fleetwide landing receipts (a.k.a. fish tickets) are the cornerstone of retained catch information for all shoreside sectors of the commercial groundfish fishery on the U.S. West Coast. Fish tickets are trip-aggregated sales receipts issued to vessels by fish buyers in each port for each delivery of catch and, in most fisheries, are now reported electronically to state agencies. Each state conducts species-composition sampling for numerous market categories reported on fish tickets. Market categories represent either a single species or a mixture of species. Fish ticket and species-composition data are submitted by state agencies to the Pacific Fisheries Information Network (PacFIN) regional database, which is maintained by the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC). PacFIN distributes market category weights using species-composition data to estimate landed weights by individual species whenever possible. Landings are presented in round weight (complete weight as caught, prior to any dressing), as any conversion factors (e.g., for at-sea processing) have already been applied by state agencies or in the PacFIN database. Fish ticket landings data for the calendar year 2024 were retrieved from the PacFIN database on 8 May 2025. We allocated these landings to reflect sectors as defined for observer coverage (Figure 1; [Appendix B](#)). All additional data processing steps are described in [Methods](#).

“Discard” is defined in this report primarily as catch which is discarded at sea, and is estimated using scientific at-sea observations conducted by the Fisheries Observation Science Program (FOS),¹ which consists of the West Coast Groundfish Observer Program (WCGOP) and the At-Sea Hake Observer Program (A-SHOP). Additional catch may be discarded shoreside during processing, and groundfish and protected species are recorded in landings data. These data are reported here as landings.

WCGOP was established in 2001 by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS, or NOAA Fisheries; USOFR 2001) to improve total catch estimates by collecting information on groundfish species discarded at sea on the U.S. West Coast. All commercial vessels fishing in the U.S. exclusive economic zone (from 3–200 miles offshore) and/or participating in a federal fishery are required to carry an observer when notified to do so by NOAA Fisheries or its designated agent. Thus, WCGOP observes several different sectors of the federal groundfish fishery, including individual fishing quota (IFQ) shorebased, limited entry (LE), and open access (OA) fixed gear.

The sampling protocol employed by WCGOP includes quantifying all catch in fixed gear sectors and discarded catch in trawl sectors, as well as biological sampling and recording interactions with protected species. Detailed information on data collection methods employed in each observed fishery can be found in the WCGOP manual (NWFSC 2025b). Observers record haul-level retained amounts, either by estimating based on catch and

¹Fishery Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division (FRAM), Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC).




Figure 1. PacFIN fish ticket data processing for division into groundfish fishery sectors. Bolded text indicates the level of aggregation published in the GEMM (Table 3).

effort, or by transcribing the captain’s estimates as recorded in the logbook. These haul-level data are reconciled with the physical measurements reported in trip-level fish ticket landings data, so that the WCGOP estimate of total retained catch is equal to that on landings receipts. Some vessels in the IFQ fishery carry EM systems in addition to or in lieu of at-sea observers.

A-SHOP has conducted observations of the U.S. West Coast at-sea Pacific hake (a.k.a. Pacific whiting, henceforth: “hake”) fishery since 2001. Prior to 2001, observer coverage of this fishery was conducted by the North Pacific Observer Program. A-SHOP observes the catcher–processor (CP) and mothership (MS) sectors of the at-sea Pacific hake fishery. No tribal fishing in the at-sea hake fishery has occurred since 2012. Current A-SHOP program information and documentation on data collection methods can be found in the observer manual (NWFSC 2025a). The at-sea hake fishery has mandatory observer coverage, with each vessel over 38 m carrying two observers. Beginning in 2011, and in accordance with IFQ/co-op program management, all catcher vessels that deliver to motherships are required to carry either WCGOP observers or EM systems in addition to the A-SHOP observers aboard the motherships.

For all PacFIN, WCGOP, A-SHOP, and PSMFC data, we maintain confidentiality of persons and businesses as required by the Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), which was most recently reauthorized in 2007. NOAA Fisheries guidance recommends, and FOS follows, the “rule of three,” which states that “information from at least three participants in the fishery must be aggregated/summarized at a temporal and spatial level to protect not only the identity of a person or a business, but also any business information” (N. Cyr; 2009 memorandum to NOAA Fisheries on data aggregation and summarization guidelines).

Groundfish species catch data from the recreational fisheries were provided by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) via the Recreational Fisheries Information Network (RecFIN). ODFW provided additional estimates of estuary impacts that are not currently included in RecFIN and were recently updated to be consistent with stock assessment estimations. Estimates from all three state agencies include catch weight (discarded and retained) estimates with PFMC-approved mortality rates applied to account for discard mortality (PFMC 2014). WDFW applied descending device mortality credits for canary rockfish from 2016 to 2024, but only surface-release mortality rates were applied to all other released rockfish. CDFW also applied newly approved depth-dependent mortality rates.² Again, this is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species.

Each year, a certain portion of the ACL for groundfish species is harvested through research activities. Total federally permitted research groundfish catch (discarded and retained) information collection was coordinated by NOAA's West Coast Region (WCR) and compiled by FOS analysts, with help from the FRAM Data Team. In addition, nonfederal research catch was also compiled through the same method and combined with the federal research catch, though this may not be an exhaustive accounting of nonfederal research activities. Catch varies by research permit, including but not limited to: a) catch from permits with only retained catch, b) tagging study catch where all fish were released alive, and c) combined discarded and retained catch. In this report, depth-dependent mortality rates (PFMC 2019b) were applied to canary, cowcod, and yelloweye rockfish discards caught using fixed gear and released at depth, where data were available (Table A-3). Again, this is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species.

In addition to these data sources, discard mortality rates were provided by PFMC's Groundfish Management Team (GMT; PFMC 2014, 2017, 2019b). The GMT is an advisory body to PFMC that comprises representatives from federal, state, and tribal agencies and supports the evaluation of management performance and alternatives for U.S. west coast groundfish fisheries, between the U.S.–Canada and U.S.–Mexico borders. For the purposes of this analysis, the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed and approved discard mortality rates, provided by GMT, which estimate the survival of discarded catch for a limited number of species and species groups in sectors using bottom trawl and fixed gears (see Tables A-1, A-2, and A-3 or PFMC 2019b). In the absence of specified discard mortality rates, we estimate that discard and mortality are equivalent for all other species. This is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species. Changes to estimation, discard mortality rates, and management are documented in Tables A-4 and A-5.

²<https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2022/11/h-4-a-supplemental-gmt-report-3.pdf/>

Methods

Discard Estimation Methods Overview

We used a deterministic approach to estimate discard mortality for all observed sectors of the groundfish fishery. Observed discard rates for each species were expanded to the fleetwide level to estimate total discard amount. Expansion methods varied slightly between fishery sectors to reflect varying data availability and management structures. The overall WCGOP sampling design is based on a stratified multistage random sampling. This design-based framework distributes observational effort more evenly coastwide than simple random sampling, and uses prior landings information to improve the efficiency of sampling allocation. However, strata employed in this report provide mortality estimates that are relevant to the spatial and temporal structure of groundfish management while ensuring adequate sample size and meeting confidentiality mandates.

In all cases where a fishery management plan (FMP) groundfish species grouping, nearshore species grouping, or unsampled catch category was used to compute discard ratios, any retained weights that were recorded by the observer but did not appear on fish tickets were excluded from the denominator. This prevents potential double-counting due to differences in the species codes used by observers and those used by processors. For instance, while observers may record rockfish catch at the species level, various species of rockfish are often aggregated, weighed, and recorded together on the fish ticket under a grouped species code (e.g., *NUSP* = Northern Unspecified Slope Rockfish). When using a single species in the denominator (e.g., sablefish), any retained weights in observer and fish ticket data that share the same species code will be matched and adjusted. Species were defined and grouped for this report according to WCGOP data processing codes (Table A-6). Occasionally, WCGOP observers identify catch beyond the required taxonomic level, potentially resulting in mortality estimates that do not include catch sampled at the higher taxonomic level; we list the estimates that should be analyzed with caution in Table A-7. The Groundfish FMP provides a complete listing of groundfish species (PFMC 2019a).

As with all point estimates, mortality values presented in Table 1 and Table 2 should be considered with caution. We have provided the coefficient of variation (CV) of the discard ratio for each species (or species group) as a measurement of statistical uncertainty and indicator of relative variability. We calculated the standard error (SE) of the observed discard ratio for each fish species, as described in Pikitch et al. (1998). The SE of the discard ratio was then divided by the discard ratio itself to calculate the CV. Within a given stratum, the CV of the discard ratio of a fish species is identical to the CV of the expanded discard estimate of the given species. This informative statistic is unitless, allowing for comparisons across estimates of species regardless of differences in the magnitude of discarded amounts. Additional sources of uncertainty that were not accounted for in this analysis might influence mortality estimates, including species composition sampling of landed catch, observed retained weights, and discard mortality rates.

IFQ Fishery Discard Estimation

The IFQ/co-op managed groundfish catch shares fishery operates with a variety of gear types and target strategies, which depend on where catch is delivered and processed. Fleets that deliver catch to shorebased processors use both trawl and fixed gears. Bottom trawl nets are used to target a variety of groundfish species. Midwater trawl nets are used to target hake or midwater nonhake species such as widow and yellowtail rockfish. Fixed gears are used primarily to target sablefish, and include pot or trap gear as well as longlines. Fleets that process catch at sea used midwater trawl nets to target hake. Catcher vessels deliver unsorted catch to a mothership for sorting and processing, while CPs process their own catch at sea.

In 2011, the implementation of the IFQ management program resulted in changes to fishing regulations which, in turn, resulted in the development of new methods for estimating fishing mortality in the impacted sectors. In 2015, EM systems provided another option for monitoring quota species catch; in 2024, the level of review of EM video on trips operating under optimized retention was reduced to a minimum of 10% of hauls on every trip. Vessels operating under maximized retention continue to have EM video on 100% of hauls reviewed on every trip.

Shorebased IFQ sectors

Fleetwide discard estimates for the shorebased IFQ sectors were derived from WCGOP observer data, EM data, and PacFIN fish ticket landings data. Fish tickets associated with the IFQ fishery were defined by FOS analysts through an extensive quality control and review process of all available data sources.

100% observed shorebased IFQ sectors

Observer data from the IFQ fishery not participating in the EM program were stratified by sector, gear type, and management area to the finest possible level while maintaining confidentiality. When sample size was adequate (10 hauls or more per stratum) and data confidentiality rules were met, we further stratified by season and depth. Records were separated into two groundfish management areas: north and south of lat 40°10'N. Each management area was divided into three depth strata (0–125, 126–250, and > 250 fth).³ The fishery was further stratified into two seasonal strata: winter (November–April) and summer (May–October), reflecting seasonal changes in rockfish conservation area (RCA) boundaries, fishing effort, and target species (e.g., winter petrale sole).

On rare occasions (e.g., observer illness), tows or sets are unsampled, although an observer is present on 100% of trips. In some cases, tows or sets may have some portion of unsampled discarded catch recorded in very broad or mixed categories (Table A-7). At the stratum level, we used ratio estimators to apportion any unsampled discard weight to specific species based on the composition of observed catch.

³10 fth \cong 18 m, so the depth distributions are approximately 0–228 m, 229–457 m, and > 457 m.

To obtain the estimated discard weight of a species (W) when the entire haul or set was unsampled, the unsampled discard weight, summed within the stratum, was multiplied by the ratio of the discard weight of the species (summed across sampled hauls within a stratum) divided by the total discard weight of all species in all sampled hauls within a stratum:

$$W = \sum_y \left(\sum_x x_y \times \frac{\sum_f w_{f,y}}{\sum_f x_{f,y}} \right)$$

where, for each stratum,

W = estimated unsampled discard weight of a given species in a stratum,

y = unsampled haul,

x = total weight of discarded catch of all species,

f = sampled haul, and

w = sampled discard weight of a given species.

In hauls with unsampled catch categories, unsampled discard weight was recorded as non-IFQ species (*NIFQ*) or IFQ species. Unsampled IFQ species weight could be further categorized into IFQ flatfish (*IFQFF*), IFQ rockfish (*IFQRF*), IFQ roundfish (*IFQRD*), and IFQ mixed species (*IFQM*; Table A-8). *IFQM* included all IFQ managed species (see Tables A-6 and A-8, or USOFR 2013), while *NIFQ* included all other fish species. Observers are instructed to avoid double-counting in IFQ hauls or sets by ensuring that unsampled categories do not also contain sampled species. Rarely, observers are unable to sort discard by IFQ category, resulting in unsampled discard that contains both IFQ and non-IFQ species (referred to as *ZMIS*). Even less often, entire hauls, including species that would have normally been retained, are discarded at sea, due either to errors (e.g., net rips before landed) or operational considerations (e.g., deliberate release of catch from net before landing because of safety or other concerns). In these instances, the observer records a visual estimate as unsorted catch (*UNST*), including both discarded and retained species. Very infrequently, haul and trip data fail quality control measures or a haul is entirely unsampled (*FAIL*). In these cases, discards are estimated based on stratum-level observed discard rates and haul-level estimates of retained values from fish tickets.

To obtain the estimated discard weight of a species (W) in strata that include unsampled categories, the unsampled discard weight, summed within the stratum, is multiplied by the ratio of the sampled discard weight of the species to the sampled weight of all species included in an unsampled category (*NIFQ*, *IFQFF*, *IFQRF*, *IFQRD*, *IFQM*, or *ZMIS*) within a stratum. When entire hauls, including species that are typically retained, were discarded and unsampled (*UNST*), the same formula was applied, but included both discarded and retained weight for all species. Data were failed (*FAIL*) when errors occurred consistently throughout an observer's sampling of a haul or trip and when discard was not sampled. In these cases, discard is estimated using the ratio of sampled discarded to retained weight for

each species in the stratum, multiplied by the known retained weight from the fish tickets associated with the failed trip. Estimated discard weight of the species was calculated and summed across unsampled categories as:

$$W = \sum_y \left(\sum_{x_y} x_y \times \frac{\sum_f w_{f,y}}{\sum_f x_{f,y}} \right)$$

where, for each stratum,

- W = estimated unsampled discard weight of a given species within a stratum,
- y = unsampled catch category (NIFQ, IFQFF, IFQRF, IFQRD, IFQM, ZMIS, UNST, or FAIL),
- x = weight of unsampled catch within a stratum,
- f = sampled catch within a stratum, and
- w = sampled discard weight of a given species.

Expanded discard weights of a particular species obtained using the equations above for unsampled hauls or partially unsampled hauls (those containing both sampled and unsampled catch categories) were then added to the sampled discard weight of that species within each stratum to obtain the total species-specific discard weight per stratum.

Electronically monitored shorebased IFQ sectors

Vessels utilizing EM in the trawl IFQ fishery under optimized retention rules (generally bottom trawl and fixed gear vessels) are only allowed to discard certain species; on those vessels, observer coverage was targeted at a random sample of 30% of trips, to result in 25–30% of landings being observed. In addition, starting in 2024, the review rate of EM video for these trips was reduced to less than 100%. For non-IFQ species, total at-sea discard estimates were calculated in the manner described below for non-catch shares fisheries. A ratio estimator of observed discard rates from the EM fleet was applied to the total amount of groundfish retained by this fleet, with rates and total landings stratified by gear and by area, while maintaining confidentiality where possible. In addition, observers sampled non-IFQ species that were not discarded at sea, but were required to be landed under EM rules and were expected to be discarded shoreside. The only species consistently recorded by both observers (as likely shoreside discard) and shoreside processors (on fish tickets) were longnose skate, Pacific grenadier, and spiny dogfish. For all other species, we calculated a “shoreside discard” rate, following the procedures described above for at-sea discard, and multiplied this rate by total groundfish landings. Double-counting was avoided by explicitly excluding those species most likely to be recorded both as estimated shoreside discard and as landings. For at-sea discard of IFQ species in 2015–20, we chose to use EM video reviewer data as the most accurate record, as they provided 100% coverage of at-sea discard for this subset of species. However, a small amount of at-sea discard occurs due to spillage or lost gear and so is not sorted. Video reviewers estimate the amount of catch lost, and we assume the catch composition matches that of the rest of the haul or trip, as appropriate.

The midwater hake and rockfish sectors operate under maximized retention when monitored using EM, so no observer coverage was required on any trips where EM systems were in place. The small amount of at-sea discard of IFQ species was estimated by PSMFC based on a review of 100% of EM video from 2015 to 2020. Similar to the EM pot and bottom trawl sectors, a small amount of unmonitored at-sea discard was expanded at the haul level, based on the composition of shoreside landings. These same methods were applied in 2024.

From 2021 to 2023, video reviewer estimates of at-sea discards were not available at the time of analysis for this annual report, so final mortality estimation methods differ in 2021–23 compared to other years. For EM vessels operating under optimized retention, we used the same methods as described above for 2016–20 for non-IFQ species and applied them to all species, including IFQ species. Midwater rockfish and hake EM vessels operate under maximized retention and thus currently do not require additional scientific observer coverage. For the midwater rockfish EM fleet, the methods were the same as those for bottom trawl and pot trawl, but used observed discard rates from the 100% observed midwater rockfish fleet. For the midwater hake EM fleet, we observed fewer than three vessels in the 100%-observed portion of the fleet, so could not use those confidential discard rates for estimation. Instead, we estimated the fleetwide discard amount using the median five-year discard percentage from all midwater hake trips (0.3% in 2021–23) and assumed that the species composition of discards was equivalent to that of the landed catch as recorded on fish tickets.

In 2024, EM video reviewer estimates were available for use in this annual report. In fleets using maximized retention, 100% of video is reviewed, so this analysis continued to use EM video reviewer data as the best available estimate for at-sea discards in 2024. However, EM video review was required on 10% of hauls on all trips operating under optimized retention. Therefore, this report only utilizes the observed discard rates to estimate total discards in fleets using optimized retention, following methods used for non-catch shares fisheries as described below.

Mortality summary for shorebased IFQ sectors

We estimated coastwide landings, discards, and fishing mortality (including discard mortality rates) in the shorebased non-hake IFQ sectors. We applied a 50% mortality rate to discarded sablefish and lingcod weight caught by IFQ bottom trawl and LE California halibut trawl sectors, reflecting guidance from the GMT to use rates used in the pre-IFQ LE groundfish bottom trawl sector. We also applied a 20% mortality rate to discarded sablefish caught by IFQ longline and pot gear, the rate suggested by GMT based on studies used to inform mortality rates in non-nearshore groundfish fixed gear sectors. We applied a 7% mortality rate to discarded lingcod caught by IFQ hook-and-line gear, based on mortality rates applied in other groundfish fixed gear sectors. We also applied discard mortality rate assumptions (previously made for stock assessment purposes) recommended by PFMC's SSC for longnose skate (50% for both bottom trawl and fixed gear) and spiny dogfish (50% for hook-and-line; PFMC 2012), as well as for big skate (50% for bottom trawl; PFMC 2015a,b). A discard mortality rate of 100% is applied for all other species in bottom trawl and fixed gear sectors and for all species in midwater trawl sectors. This is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species.

At-sea hake sectors

The midwater trawl fishery for hake comprises three at-sea processing fleets: CPs, MSes, and a tribal catcher vessel fleet delivering to motherships. A-SHOP produces estimates of total catch (discarded and retained) in the at-sea hake fishery. Observers sample unsorted catch and provide a visual estimate of the proportion retained, at the species level. Discarded catch weight is calculated on a haul basis for the total weight of all species.

California Halibut Bottom Trawl Fishery

Fleetwide discard estimates in the California halibut bottom trawl fishery were derived from WCGOP and fish-ticket data. All California halibut vessels are permitted by the state of California, but are considered OA in this report unless they also have a federal LE groundfish permit. Since 2013, no fishing effort has occurred in the LE California halibut fishery. WCGOP randomly samples the OA California halibut fishery following non-catch shares sampling priorities, protocols, and selection design.

Discard ratios for the OA California halibut fishery were calculated by dividing the observed discard weight of each species or complex by the observed retained weight of California halibut. Fleetwide landings of California halibut were compiled from OA trawl fish tickets for those vessels that had a state-issued California halibut bottom trawl permit but no federal bottom trawl permit. They were used as a multiplier to expand observed discard ratios to the total discard estimate.

The discard estimate for each species was computed based on the following equation:

$$D = \frac{\sum_t d_t}{\sum_t r_t} \times F$$

where

D = discard estimate for a given species,

t = observed tows,

d = observed discard weight for a given species,

r = observed retained weight of California halibut, and

F = weight of retained California halibut recorded on fish tickets for the fleet (expansion factor).

A 50% mortality rate was applied for discarded lingcod and sablefish, based on assumptions made by GMT and carried over from management under the pre-IFQ groundfish bottom trawl sector. We also applied an SSC-recommended discard mortality rate assumption (previously made for stock assessment purposes) of 50% for longnose skate (PFMC 2012) and big skate (PFMC 2015a,b). Again, this is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species.

Pink Shrimp Trawl Fishery

Fleetwide discard estimates for the pink shrimp trawl fishery were derived from WCGOP and fish-ticket data. The discard estimate for each species in each state was computed based on the same equation as described above for the OA California halibut fishery, but utilizing pink shrimp as the retained weight for both discard rates and expansion factors. We estimated landings, discard, and total mortality in individual state pink shrimp trawl fisheries.

Prior to 2011, pink shrimp fish tickets in the area north of lat 40°10'N were compiled for a single discard expansion factor, but pink shrimp fish tickets south of lat 40°10'N were summarized as part of the remaining incidental fisheries. Observer data from all state pink shrimp fleets in the north were combined to calculate discard rates. In 2010, WCGOP coverage of the Washington pink shrimp fleet began, and coverage of all state fisheries from 2011 to the present was sufficient to improve analysis stratifications.

Non-Nearshore Fixed Gear Fishery

Fleetwide discard estimates for the LE and OA non-nearshore fixed gear sectors of the groundfish fishery were derived from WCGOP and fish-ticket data (see [Appendix B](#)). Fish tickets for fixed gear that did not record sablefish or nearshore species were included in the non-nearshore fixed gear sector only if groundfish landings were greater than nongroundfish landings based on a unique vessel and landing date. Fixed gear fish tickets, where a) nongroundfish landings were greater than groundfish landings, and b) sablefish or nearshore species were not recorded, were summarized as incidental landings. Fixed gear fish tickets with nongroundfish landings greater than groundfish landings, but also containing sablefish, were classified as non-nearshore fixed gear; those with nearshore species landings on a nearshore permit were classified as nearshore fixed gear. Fish tickets associated with the Pacific halibut directed commercial fishery were identified by the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC) for 2002–23 in Washington and Oregon. Pacific halibut directed fishery tickets for 2024, and in California across all years, were identified as those using line gear and landing Pacific halibut on the day of the opening or within two subsequent days. The PFMC further distributes all sablefish mortality associated with the directed Pacific halibut fishery into the LE, zero-tier, and OA sectors to reflect management of the stock and inform management decisions. This report, however, consistently summarizes mortality of all stocks associated with each fishery sector and does not make an exception for sablefish.

Fish tickets were partitioned into three commercial fixed gear subsectors: LE sablefish-endorsed primary season, LE non-sablefish-endorsed, and OA fixed gear groundfish. Vessels landing groundfish catch without a federal groundfish permit were classified as the OA fixed gear groundfish subsector. Those vessels landing groundfish catch with a federal groundfish permit were further separated based on whether the vessel's federal groundfish permit(s) had a sablefish endorsement with tier quota for the primary season or whether they were not endorsed (also referred to as zero-tier permits). Fish tickets for all LE vessels with tier sablefish endorsements operating during the sablefish primary season (April–December in 2020, 2021, and 2023 and beyond, or April–October in all other years) and within their allotted tier quota

were placed in the LE sablefish-endorsed primary subsector. If LE sablefish-endorsed vessels fished outside of the primary season or made trips within the season after they had reached their cumulative tier quota, the fish tickets were placed in the LE non-sablefish-endorsed subsector. Fish tickets from non-sablefish-endorsed LE vessels were also placed in this subsector.

Data used in these analyses were collected by WCGOP from the following fixed gear subsectors: LE sablefish-endorsed primary season fixed gear, LE zero-tier (non-sablefish-endorsed), and OA non-nearshore fixed gear. LE sablefish-endorsed vessels that were fishing outside of the primary season or that had reached their cumulative tier quotas in the primary season were not observed. However, observed LE zero-tier discard rates were assumed to be the most comparable discard rates and were used to estimate discard based on these landings.

Observer data were stratified by subsector, gear type, and area, as possible while maintaining confidentiality and appropriate sample size. Area strata (north and south of lat 36°N) are based on PFMC area management for sablefish trip limits. Gear type was defined as longline or pot/trap gear. Explicit depth stratification of fixed gear fishing effort is not possible due to a lack of fleetwide records. If landings were made by a fixed gear subsector for which there were no or very few WCGOP observations, the most appropriate observed discard ratios were selected and applied to these landings based on similarities in the fishery management structure, fishing and discard behavior, and the gear fished. For example, observed discard rates from the OA fixed gear pot sector were used to estimate the total discard associated with the small amount of groundfish landed by the pot gear portion of the LE non-sablefish-endorsed subsector, which is unobserved. Retained groundfish was used as the denominator, rather than sablefish weight alone, to reflect the wider range of target species in some subsectors, primarily fixed gear fisheries south of lat 36°N. A 20% mortality rate is applied for discarded sablefish and a 7% rate for line-caught discarded lingcod, based on guidance from GMT. We also applied SSC-recommended discard mortality rates (previously made for stock assessment purposes) for longnose skate (50%) and spiny dogfish (50%; PFMC 2012). Again, this is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species.

Directed Pacific Halibut Fishery

WCGOP observed this fishery from 2017 to 2023; annual landings estimates for all years and annual discard estimates for those years with WCGOP coverage are included in this report. This means that 2002–16 and 2024 landings are described in the various tables of this report, but no estimation of associated discards is provided. As described above in the non-nearshore fixed gear sector, this fishery was defined based on IPHC-identified tickets using line gear and landing Pacific halibut within two days of the halibut fishery openings. Effort in this fishery occurs primarily in Washington and Oregon. Discard estimates for each species were computed based on the equation for the OA California halibut fishery, but utilizing Pacific halibut as the retained weight for both discard rates and expansion factors. Because the gear and effort in this fishery are similar to the non-nearshore and catch shares hook-and-line fisheries, the same mortality rates were applied to discarded lingcod (7%), longnose skate (50%), sablefish (20%), and spiny dogfish (50%). Again, this is not meant to imply that all discarded catch results in mortality for these species, but rather emphasizes the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species.

Nearshore Fixed Gear Fishery

Fleetwide discard estimates for the commercial nearshore fixed gear sector of the groundfish fishery were derived from WCGOP observer data, fish-ticket landings, and mortality rates provided by GMT (Table A-2).

Fish tickets are defined as nearshore if a vessel landed nearshore species (Table A-2) and had a state nearshore permit. WCGOP selects commercial nearshore vessels in California and Oregon for observer coverage based on state-issued nearshore permits or licenses; no commercial nearshore fishery exists in Washington. Although California and Oregon nearshore fisheries are sampled separately for observer coverage, fleetwide discard estimates are provided for the areas north and south of the groundfish management line at lat 40°10'N, in accordance with federal groundfish management specifications.

As directed by PFMC, we applied a discard mortality rate of 7% for all FMP species without swim bladders (Albin and Karpov 1996). In June 2017, GMT provided revised depth-specific discard survival assumptions for some nearshore species (Table A-2). This update separated the > 20 fth depth bin into 20–30 fth and > 30 fth, allowing for more accurate accounting of discard mortality by depth, and provided distinct rates north and south of lat 40°10'N that a) reflect the differing depth distributions of observed fishing effort, and b) align with recreational mortality rates using similar gear (PFMC 2017). We first generated estimates of the depth distribution of landings (0–10 fth, 11–20 fth, 21–30 fth, and > 30 fth) based on the observed percentage of catch for each species or complex from 2003 to the most current year of data.⁴ Using data from all previously observed years ensures that data are comparable across years and that proportions are available for all species landed in a given year. Annual fleet landings of each nearshore species and complex were then distributed among depth intervals using the observed percentages. Finally, the total distributed landed weights of all nearshore groundfish species within each depth stratum were used to expand observed discard to the fleetwide level.

Observed discard ratios were calculated within each area and depth stratum by dividing the discard weight of each species or complex by the retained weight of nearshore species. These ratios were then multiplied by the allocated landed weight of all nearshore groundfish species within each area and depth stratum, and then by the depth-specific discard mortality rates.

Other Commercial Data Summaries

Landings of groundfish species from other nongroundfish fisheries operating under federal OA landing limits, which are mostly state-managed, and a small number of EFPs outside of the EM program, are summarized as incidental. Sea cucumber and ridgeback prawn trawl landings are included in the incidental sector in this report as they are no longer observed by WCGOP; estimates of discards in years when the fisheries were observed are available in earlier reports. Other than observed non-EM EFP trips, catch summaries of incidental fisheries are based exclusively on fish ticket data and therefore do not include any estimates of discards at sea.

⁴10 fth \cong 18 m, so the depth distributions are approximately 0–18 m, 19–36 m, 37–54 m, and \geq 55 m.

Landings of groundfish species from all Washington tribal shorebased fisheries, not just those targeting groundfish, are included in Table 1. Washington tribal data are based exclusively on PacFIN landings data, because tribal directed groundfish fisheries employ full retention requirements. Catch amounts from fishing effort by the Quinault tribe are not provided to PacFIN and are not currently included in this report. In addition, both the Makah bottom trawl and midwater (targeting yellowtail rockfish) trawl sectors are monitored. PFMC accounts for discard mortality of fixed gear sablefish by reducing the tribal allocation appropriately. For more information on discard and retention in tribal sablefish fisheries and Makah trawl observations, see PFMC and NMFS (2012), their Appendix B.

Groundfish species catch from research activities (including discard mortality rates as documented in Table A-3) and from each state's recreational fisheries, combined across all gear types, is also summarized in Table 1.

Bycatch estimation and summaries for protected fish species observed by WCGOP and A-SHOP are available in separate reports. The most current estimations are available for salmon species (Richerson et al. 2026⁵) and green sturgeon and eulachon (NWFSC 2025c). Mortality estimations from 2002–24 for all nonprotected fish species are available in Table 3 and in the Groundfish Expanded Mortality Multiyear (GEMM) product via NOAA Fisheries' [Posit Connect Website](#).⁶ Updated estimates of Pacific halibut mortality through 2024 were published in draft form in PFMC's November 2025 Briefing Book and later included in the GEMM.⁷

Aggregate Mortality Estimation Methods

We calculated the aggregate for each species in a sector as the sum of the total discard mortality and retained weight. To calculate the aggregate mortality across all sectors, we summed the estimated discard mortality and retained weight from all observed sectors, the retained weight from unobserved incidental fisheries, and the mortality estimates from research and recreational sectors. These final mortality estimates reflect that a subset of studied species have estimated survivorship rates, but do not imply that all discards of other species result in mortality.

⁵Richerson, K. E., K. A. Somers, V. J. Tuttle, N. B. Riley, J. T. McVeigh, and K. M. Nichols. 2026. Observed and Estimated Bycatch of Salmon in U.S. West Coast Fisheries, 2002–24. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Data Report NMFS-NWFSC-DR-2026-01. <https://doi.org/10.25923/qqg8-1573>

⁶https://connect.fisheries.noaa.gov/gemm_csv/

⁷<https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2025/10/f-1-b-nwfsc-report-1-pacific-halibut-bycatch-in-u-s-west-coast-groundfish-fisheries-2002-2024.pdf/>

Table 1. Estimated 2024 fishing mortality of major U.S. West Coast groundfish species and corresponding management reference points (harvest specifications). Rebuilding species are capitalized. *EFM* = estimated fishing mortality, *ACL* = annual catch limit, *ABC* = acceptable biological catch, *OFL* = overfishing limit, *TAC* = total allowable catch. Discard mortality rates are applied where possible to emphasize the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species where sufficient data are available.

	Management reference points (harvest specifications)						
	EFM (mt)	ACL (mt)	% of ACL	ABC (mt)	% of ABC	OFL (mt)	% of OFL
Arrowtooth flounder	1,092	14,178	8	14,178	8	20,459	5
Big skate	112	1,267	9	1,267	9	1,492	8
Black rockfish (CA)	173	329	53	329	53	364	47
Black rockfish (WA)	147	289	51	289	51	319	46
Black/blue/deacon rockfish (OR)	424	594	71	594	71	671	63
Bocaccio rockfish (S of 40°10'N)	823	1,828	45	1,828	45	2,002	41
Cabazon (CA)	46	171	27	171	27	185	25
Cabazon/kelp greenling (OR)	66	180	37	180	37	198	33
Cabazon/kelp greenling (WA)	9	17	52	17	52	22	40
California scorpionfish (S of 34°27'N)	164	252	65	252	65	280	59
Canary rockfish	580	1,296	45	1,296	45	1,434	40
Chilipepper rockfish (S of 40°10'N)	1,144	2,121	54	2,121	54	2,346	49
Cowcod rockfish (S of 40°10'N)	16	79	20	79	20	112	14
Darkblotched rockfish	345	782	44	782	44	857	40
Dover sole	3,030	50,000	6	51,949	6	55,859	5
English sole	214	8,960	2	8,960	2	11,158	2
Lingcod (N of 40°10'N)	1,066	3,854	28	3,854	28	4,455	24
Lingcod (South of 40°10'N)	273	722	38	740	37	855	32
Longnose skate	557	1,660	34	1,660	34	1,955	28
Minor rockfish (N of 40°10'N)							
Nearshore	68	91	75	91	75	109	62
Shelf	347	1,278	27	1,278	27	1,610	22
Slope	366	1,516	24	1,516	24	1,797	20
Minor rockfish (S of 40°10'N)							
Nearshore	343	891	39	902	38	1,097	31
Shelf	545	1,464	37	1,464	37	1,833	30
Slope	126	697	18	697	18	868	15
Other flatfish	443	4,874	9	4,874	9	7,946	6
Other groundfish	19	223	9	223	9	286	7
Pacific cod	75	1,600	5	1,926	4	3,200	2
Pacific hake	166,460	2024 U.S. TAC = 410,034 mt, 41% of U.S. TAC					
Pacific ocean perch (N of 40°10'N)	303	3,443	9	3,443	9	4,133	7
Petrale sole	2,839	3,285	86	3,285	86	3,563	80
QUILLBACK ROCKFISH (CA) (N of 40°10'N)	0.42	0.96	44	1.00	43	1.15	37
QUILLBACK ROCKFISH (CA) (S of 40°10'N)	0.93	0.97	96	1.01	92	1.17	80
Quillback rockfish (WA/OR)	9	5	178	5	178	6	146
Sablefish (N of 36°N)	5,710	7,730	74	9,923	60	10,670	56
Sablefish (S of 36°N)	278	2,193	13				
Spiny dogfish	391	1,407	28	1,407	28	1,883	21
Splitnose rockfish (S of 40°10'N)	56	1,553	4	1,553	4	1,766	3
Starry flounder	25	392	6	392	6	652	4
Thornyheads							
Longspine thornyhead (N of 34°27'N)	37	2,162	2	2,846	1.49	4,433	0.96
Longspine thornyhead (S of 34°27'N)	5	683	0.77				
Shortspine thornyhead (N of 34°27'N)	549	1,328	41	2,030	29	3,162	19
Shortspine thornyhead (S of 34°27'N)	38	702	5				
Widow rockfish	9,734	11,482	85	11,482	85	12,453	78
YELLOWEYE ROCKFISH	25	53	47	76	33	91	27
Yellowtail rockfish (N of 40°10'N)	2,802	5,291	53	5,291	53	5,795	48

Table 2. Estimated 2024 fishing mortality (mt) of groundfish and a subset of nongroundfish species, by sector. Discard mortality rates are applied where possible to emphasize the survivorship rates for a subset of studied species where sufficient data are available. Mortality in unobserved fisheries, such as incidental, does not include any estimate of discards. *IFQ* = individual fishing quota, *BT* = bottom trawl, *FG* = fixed gear, *MW* = midwater, *Shs* = shoreside, *A-S* = at-sea, *CP* = catcher-processor, *MSCV* = mothership catcher vessel, *OA* = open access, *PS* = pink shrimp, *ns.* = nearshore, *Dir. PHLB* = directed Pacific halibut fishery, *IF* = incidental fisheries, *Res.* = research, *EFM* = estimated fishing mortality, *rf.* = rockfish, *ECS* = ecosystem component species, *LST* = longspine thornyhead, *SST* = shortspine thornyhead, *unid.* = unidentified.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Groundfish species																		
Arrowtooth flounder	989.7	0.2	0.4	23.5	36.0	1.4	—	6.6	17.2	1.0	—	—	1.9	1.0	0.0	0.0	12.8	1,091.9
Big skate	61.8	—	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	36.8	0.2	5.4	2.5	0.1	—	2.6	—	0.1	0.0	1.5	112.2
Black rf. (CA)	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	2.0	—	27.2	0.0	—	—	—	143.5	0.1	172.8
Black rf. (WA)	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	146.0	—	—	1.0	147.1
Black/blue/deacon rf. (OR)																		
Black rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6	0.2	93.9	0.1	—	—	279.7	—	—	374.5
Blue/deacon rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	15.5	0.0	—	—	33.9	—	—	49.5
Bocaccio rf. (S of 40°10'N)	539.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	120.2	0.0	4.2	0.5	—	—	—	156.0	2.9	823.1
Cabazon (CA)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	25.8	0.0	—	—	—	19.8	0.0	45.7
Cabazon/kelp greenling (OR)																		
Cabazon	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.1	0.0	17.1	—	—	—	12.7	—	—	29.9
Kelp greenling	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	14.4	—	—	—	21.6	—	0.0	36.0
Cabazon/kelp greenling (WA)																		
Cabazon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.5	—	—	0.0	7.5
Kelp greenling	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.2	—	—	0.0	1.3
CA scorpionfish (S of 34°27'N)	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	1.9	0.0	—	—	—	162.0	0.1	164.1
Canary rf.	187.2	0.0	183.7	42.3	0.2	0.8	—	0.1	25.7	3.4	3.8	0.2	3.9	26.8	50.3	40.0	11.7	580.3
Chilipepper rf. (S of 40°10'N)	972.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	70.4	0.1	0.8	0.1	—	—	—	91.1	9.1	1,143.7
Cowcod rf. (S of 40°10'N)	3.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.7	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	3.6	0.5	15.9
Darkblotched rf.	157.6	0.2	5.0	132.7	36.2	3.3	—	4.8	2.2	0.5	0.0	—	0.0	—	—	—	2.5	344.9
Dover sole	2,973.9	1.0	0.1	1.0	2.2	0.2	0.0	2.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.3	7.0	—	0.0	0.0	40.6	3,030.3
ECS																		
Aleutian Skate	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Black skate	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.5	2.1
CA grenadier	0.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	1.0
CA skate	1.8	—	—	—	—	—	9.3	0.0	0.2	—	—	0.3	—	—	—	0.0	0.3	12.0
Deepsea skate	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.1
Giant grenadier	10.2	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.7	13.2
Grenadier, unid.	0.0	0.2	—	—	4.2	0.0	—	—	26.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.9

Table 2 (continued). Sector-level estimated fishing mortality in 2024.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Pacific flatnose	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	0.3
Pacific grenadier	1.8	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.4	12.2
Popeye grenadier	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Sandpaper skate	24.9	—	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	—	0.1	0.2	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	25.4
Shortbelly rf.	15.3	—	22.4	119.7	0.1	2.4	—	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	8.2	168.4
Smooth grenadier	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Softhead grenadier	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Soupin shark	3.1	—	0.1	0.6	0.2	—	—	—	0.3	—	0.2	5.1	—	—	—	1.0	—	10.5
Spotted ratfish	99.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.1	2.4	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	3.1	104.7
English sole	200.3	—	2.5	0.2	0.1	0.0	5.6	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	5.0	213.6
Groundfish, unid.	—	—	0.0	2.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	2.1
Lingcod (N of 40°10'N)	392.3	2.3	1.8	14.7	0.0	0.2	—	0.3	71.9	11.4	56.4	3.9	57.3	226.3	180.0	35.6	11.5	1,065.8
Lingcod (S of 40°10'N)	64.4	0.1	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	8.7	0.0	11.4	0.5	—	—	—	187.7	0.8	273.5
Longnose skate	494.4	—	0.5	1.6	1.8	0.5	0.1	0.8	31.7	4.9	0.2	0.0	9.8	—	0.1	0.6	10.0	556.8
LST (N of 34°27'N)	17.5	0.1	0.0	0.2	1.9	0.0	—	0.0	2.6	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	14.6	37.1
LST (S of 34°27'N)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.3	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	1.0	5.3
Minor ns. rf. (N of 40°10'N)																		
Black and yellow rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	0.1
Blue/deacon rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10.9	—	4.0	—	—	3.8	—	7.5	0.1	26.3
Brown rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	0.4	0.3	1.4	0.0	2.2
China rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	7.2	—	—	1.6	4.0	0.4	0.0	13.3
Copper rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	0.1	2.4	—	—	1.6	8.3	3.2	0.0	15.9
Gopher rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	—	—	—	0.1	0.0	—	0.3
Grass rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	0.0	0.1	—	0.2
Kelp rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	0.0
Nearshore rf., unid.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.0
Olive rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4
Quillback rf. (CA)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4
Quillback rf. (WA/OR)	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	2.0	—	0.1	1.4	5.0	—	0.1	8.8

Table 2 (continued). Sector-level estimated fishing mortality in 2024.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Minor ns. rf. (S of 40°10'N)																		
Black and yellow rf.	0.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	13.1	0.0	—	—	—	4.1	—	17.8
Blue/deacon rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.6	—	9.2	0.0	—	—	—	65.1	0.1	76.0
Brown rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	—	1.5	—	19.6	0.1	—	—	—	87.2	0.1	108.7
Calico rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.1	0.0	0.1
China rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	2.9	—	—	—	—	9.6	0.0	12.6
Copper rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.7	—	1.5	0.0	—	—	—	33.2	0.5	36.0
Gopher rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6	—	27.5	0.0	—	—	—	36.3	0.0	64.4
Grass rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	6.7	—	—	—	—	1.4	—	8.2
Kelp rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.7	0.0	—	—	—	2.7	0.0	3.4
Nearshore rf., unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Olive rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	1.4	0.0	—	—	—	8.5	0.1	10.1
Quillback rf. (CA)	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.8	0.0	0.9
Treefish rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	1.5	0.0	—	—	—	3.4	0.0	5.0
Minor shelf rf. (N of 40°10'N)																		
Bocaccio rf.	60.7	—	26.3	4.7	0.1	0.1	—	0.0	1.6	0.7	0.0	—	0.4	17.7	2.8	0.2	40.4	155.8
Chameleon rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Chilipepper rf.	34.2	—	3.3	1.8	0.2	0.1	—	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	0.2	—	0.9	41.3
Cowcod rf.	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Flag rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	0.2
Greenblotched rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	0.0
Greenspotted rf.	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	—	0.0	—	0.4	0.0	0.2	1.2
Greenstriped rf.	42.6	—	0.3	0.1	—	—	—	0.3	2.9	0.2	0.0	—	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.9	49.0
Halfbanded rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Harlequin rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Pygmy rf.	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.1
Redstripe rf.	1.4	—	30.6	4.9	0.1	1.2	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.1	—	0.1	38.3
Rockfish, unid.	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	0.2
Rosethorn rf.	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	0.1	—	0.4	2.5
Rosy rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Shelf rf., unid.	6.7	0.0	0.8	0.0	—	—	—	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	0.3	9.4
Silvergray rf.	2.2	—	6.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	—	—	1.2	0.2	—	—	0.0	0.5	1.4	—	0.4	14.0
Speckled rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	0.0

Table 2 (continued). Sector-level estimated fishing mortality in 2024.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Squarespot rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Stripetail rf.	13.7	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	3.5	22.3
Tiger rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.2	—	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.1	0.0	1.4
Vermilion rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	0.3	2.4	—	—	0.9	3.7	3.6	0.0	11.3
Minor shelf rf. (S of 40°10'N)																		
Bronzespotted rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6	0.1	3.0
Chameleon rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0
Flag rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	5.1	0.0	5.2
Freckled rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0
Greenblotched rf.	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	15.1	0.1	15.6
Greenspotted rf.	2.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.4	0.0	0.4	0.1	—	—	—	47.3	0.6	59.9
Greenstriped rf.	3.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	7.9	0.6	12.4
Halfbanded rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.5	0.9	1.4
Harlequin rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Honeycomb rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	3.7	0.0	3.8
Mexican rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8.3	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	34.9	0.1	43.3
Pink rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Pinkrose rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0
Redstripe rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.7	0.7
Rockfish, unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Rosethorn rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.7	0.0	0.8
Rosy rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	—	0.3	0.0	—	—	—	5.3	0.0	6.1
Shelf rf., unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.5	—	0.6	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.0	5.1
Silvergray rf.	4.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.1
Speckled rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.0	—	0.1	0.0	—	—	—	6.5	0.2	7.8
Squarespot rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	0.0	0.1	—	—	—	2.9	0.1	3.3
Starry rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	3.6	—	0.2	0.1	—	—	—	21.0	0.3	25.2
Stripetail rf.	27.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	2.5	30.0
Swordspine rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	0.2	0.5
Tiger rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	0.0	0.2
Vermilion rf.	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	79.3	—	14.2	1.4	—	—	—	156.4	3.9	255.5
Yellowtail rf.	0.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.5	—	1.7	0.1	—	—	—	42.0	0.1	61.3

Table 2 (continued). Sector-level estimated fishing mortality in 2024.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Minor slope rf. (N of 40°10'N)																		
Aurora rf.	5.9	—	0.0	0.6	0.2	0.0	—	0.1	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.2	7.1
Bank rf.	1.1	—	0.5	2.2	0.2	0.1	—	—	0.4	0.2	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0	4.6
Blackgill rf.	0.1	0.1	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	0.9	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	1.2
Redbanded rf.	5.5	0.0	0.1	4.1	0.1	0.0	—	0.1	17.8	4.8	0.1	—	5.0	0.4	—	—	0.1	38.0
Rockfish, unid.	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Rougheye/blackspotted rf.	8.5	0.4	0.1	69.2	25.7	3.9	—	0.0	4.6	1.7	—	—	2.2	0.0	0.2	—	0.2	116.8
Sharpchin rf.	15.9	—	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.9	19.4
Shortraker rf.	2.3	0.0	—	0.7	0.2	—	—	—	1.8	0.3	—	—	0.5	—	—	—	0.1	6.0
Shortraker/rougheye rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	0.1
Shortraker/rougheye/blackspotted rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Slope rf., unid.	2.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	—	—	—	—	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	—	—	—	—	4.3
Splitnose rf.	28.0	0.0	2.7	41.1	71.1	11.5	—	1.3	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.8	158.5
Yellowmouth rf.	2.8	—	1.3	3.5	0.3	—	—	—	0.9	0.3	0.0	—	—	—	0.5	—	0.3	9.8
Minor slope rf. (S of 40°10'N)																		
Aurora rf.	2.9	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	4.3
Bank rf.	29.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9.0	—	0.3	0.1	—	—	—	18.9	0.4	57.7
Blackgill rf.	12.0	0.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	38.7	—	1.8	0.1	—	—	—	1.4	0.6	55.3
Pacific ocean perch rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Redbanded rf.	0.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.7	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	5.5
Rougheye/blackspotted rf.	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.0	0.1	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.3
Sharpchin rf.	0.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.3
Shortraker rf.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Slope rf., unid.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Yellowmouth rf.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Mixed thornyheads																		
SST/LST	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	0.0	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Other flatfish																		
Butter sole	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Curlfin sole	0.9	—	—	—	—	—	4.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	0.1	5.0
Flatfish, unid.	6.3	—	0.2	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.0	0.1	—	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.0	9.1
Flathead sole	13.6	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	14.5
Pacific sanddab	80.3	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.6	2.0	0.9	—	0.4	0.0	—	3.4	0.2	23.0	7.7	118.4
Rex sole	207.9	—	0.1	6.2	20.3	0.5	0.0	22.2	0.0	—	—	0.0	1.2	—	—	—	8.6	266.9

Table 2 (continued). Sector-level estimated fishing mortality in 2024.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Rock sole	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.3	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	0.1	0.0	0.8	0.1	2.4
Sand sole	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	22.4	—	0.1	—	0.0	0.0	—	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	22.9
Sanddab, unid.	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	3.3	—	0.1	0.4	0.0	—	—	—	—	3.7
Other groundfish																		
Kelp greenling (CA)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	1.7	—	—	—	—	1.8	0.0	3.5
Leopard shark	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.9	—	0.0	—	0.1	1.7	—	—	—	13.2	—	16.0
Other rf.																		
Rockfish, unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	0.0	0.1
Pacific cod	33.4	—	0.0	0.1	—	—	0.0	—	1.7	0.0	0.0	—	37.6	1.8	0.4	—	0.1	75.2
Pacific hake	236.6	0.0	244.7	814.2*	618.7*	210.8*	0.1	23.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	—	1,553.6	0.0	0.0	0.3	31.3	1,664.6*
Pacific ocean perch (N of 40°10'N)	143.9	—	67.7	70.9	15.4	0.6	—	0.5	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	4.4	303.4
Petrale sole	2,457.1	0.2	1.2	0.5	—	—	1.5	0.3	4.4	2.1	0.0	0.0	337.1	1.8	6.9	10.6	15.7	2,839.4
Roundfish, unid.	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.5	0.8
Sablefish (N of 36°N)	1,531.8	653.0	5.7	285.0	196.1	25.2	—	0.7	2,211.6	171.3	2.1	0.3	555.5	19.8	5.8	1.9	43.6	5,709.6
Sablefish (S of 36°N)	—	87.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	187.1	—	0.5	—	—	—	—	1.2	1.5	277.9
SST (N of 34°27'N)	255.7	0.9	0.0	85.7	146.1	9.0	—	0.1	38.1	0.6	0.0	—	4.1	0.0	—	0.0	8.9	549.3
SST (S of 34°27'N)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	37.3	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	37.8
Spiny dogfish	134.7	0.1	3.8	101.9	41.6	8.4	3.2	0.1	52.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	14.9	—	0.0	2.9	27.5	391.5
Splitnose rf. (S of 40°10'N)	51.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.1	55.7
Starry flounder	0.1	—	—	0.0	—	—	23.8	—	0.1	—	0.0	0.1	—	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	24.5
Widow rf.	26.9	0.0	9,169.3	441.4	54.2	12.4	—	—	12.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	1.4	6.9	4.1	3.0	0.7	9,733.7
Yelloweye rf.	0.6	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	5.8	0.0	3.4	0.1	3.0	3.1	3.6	4.6	0.5	24.7
Yellowtail rf. (N of 40°10'N)	164.9	—	1,569.6	837.9	0.1	14.4	—	0.6	5.5	0.1	1.5	2.3	78.4	59.7	61.4	1.0	4.9	2,802.4
Nongroundfish species																		
CA halibut	—	—	—	—	—	—	219.4	—	1.7	—	1.2	265.4	—	—	0.2	299.5	0.0	787.6
Dungeness crab	46.9	0.4	0.0	0.1	—	—	164.5	0.0	1.0	—	—	252.0*	842.4	—	—	—	7.0	262.6*
Non-FMP flatfish																		
Deepsea sole	0.4	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.7	1.1
Diamond turbot	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Hornyhead turbot	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.3
Longfin sanddab	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	0.2	0.3
Slender sole	44.9	—	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	—	122.8	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.6	169.4
Speckled sanddab	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Numbers in shaded cells should be multiplied by 100.

Table 2 (continued). Sector-level estimated fishing mortality in 2024.

	Commercial fisheries												Recreational fishing mortality					
	IFQ/co-op management						Non-IFQ						WA tribal Shs	WA	OR	CA	Res.	EFM
	BT	FG	MW rf.	Shs MW hake	A-S MW CP	A-S MW MSCV	OA CA halibut	FS	Non-ns. FG	Dir. PHLB	Ns. FG	IF						
Other nongroundfish																		
Brown Irish lord sculpin	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Buffalo sculpin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
CA sheephead	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	57.9	2.0	—	—	—	38.9	0.0	98.8
Red Irish lord sculpin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Sculpin, unid.	1.1	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.1	0.0	—	0.3	0.2	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	1.8
Skate, unid.	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	—	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5	0.1	2.5	16.9	—	—	—	—	24.0
Squid, unid.	0.7	0.0	0.4	45.5	148.1	15.6	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	210.2
Starry skate	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2
Shared ECS																		
Barracudina, unid.	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Blacksmelt, unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Bristlemouth, unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Deepsea smelt, unid.	—	—	—	—	0.3	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.4
Duckbill barracudina	—	—	—	—	7.2	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	7.4
Jacksmelt	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	36.5	0.0	36.5
Lanternfish, unid.	0.0	—	—	—	2.3	0.0	—	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.2	3.0
Lightfish, unid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Longfin smelt	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Night smelt	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Non-eulachon smelt, unid.	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	55.7	0.0	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	55.7
Non-Humboldt squid, unid.	1.6	0.0	—	0.0	—	—	0.1	7.4	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	9.1
Pacific sandlance	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Pacific saury	0.0	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Rainbow smelt	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0
Robust clubhook squid	—	—	0.0	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Round herring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	0.1
Slender barracudina	—	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Smelt, unid.	—	—	—	0.0	—	—	—	7.6	0.0	—	0.0	36.8	—	—	—	—	0.0	44.4
Surf smelt	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.1
White barracudina	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0
Whitebait smelt	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.0	1.5

Results

Targeted landings consist of the same species or set of species defined in [Methods](#) as the retained weight used to calculate both discard rates and expansion factors. Targeted landings in 2024 by all three hake sectors, the catch shares bottom trawl sector, and the nearshore fixed gear sector were less than the lowest annual landings of the previous five years (2019–23; Figure 2). However, 2024 targeted landings in the pink shrimp sector were greater than the last five years (Figure 2). Targeted landings by all other sectors were within the five-year range.

In December 2023, NOAA Fisheries notified PFMC that the quillback rockfish stock off of California was overfished. To support management of this stock, Table 3, also known as the GEMM data product, includes state-level mortality estimations for quillback rockfish within the minor nearshore rockfish complex. In 2024, the mortality of quillback rockfish off of




Figure 2. Sector-level targeted landings in 2024 compared to 2019–23. Gray points display annual estimates from 2019 to 2023; 2024 points are colored as indicated in the legend. Species and groupings included in targeted landings are defined in [Methods](#). *CS* = catch shares, *DTL* = daily trip limit, *OA* = open access, *Prim* = sablefish primary, *CP* = catcher–processor, *MS* = mothership catcher vessel, *SS* = shoreside, *CS Bot* = catch shares bottom trawl, *Mid RF* = midwater rockfish, *PS* = pink shrimp, *CHLB* = open access California halibut, *NS* = nearshore.

California north of lat 40°10'N was 0.42 mt and south of lat 40°10'N was 0.93 mt. Based on the stock-level contribution of quillback rockfish to the complex north (0.96 mt) and south (0.97 mt) of lat 40°10'N, this accounts for 44% and 96%, respectively, of the ACL contributions.

The remainder of this summary focuses on highly targeted and highly attained 2024 harvest goals. The attainment for each species or grouping is compared to the ACLs, acceptable biological catch (ABC), and overfishing limit (OFL) harvest specifications in Table 1. For brevity, we only compare mortality to ACLs here. Additionally, we contextualize the most recent year's estimate by comparing it to those of the previous five years. The ACLs were not exceeded for any management grouping in 2024. Pacific hake, Dover sole, and sablefish north of lat 36°N are consistently targeted by groundfish fisheries. In 2024, ACL attainment of Dover sole was 6% and below the five-year range (Table 1, Figure 3). Landings by the catch shares bottom trawl fleet continue to be the primary contributor to Dover sole mortality (Table 2, Figure 4). Pacific hake is managed using a TAC and, at 41% attainment, was below the five-year range; this mortality was attributable to landings by the hake fleets (Table 1 and Table 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4). 74% of the ACL for sablefish north of lat 36°N was attained, which is within the five-year range (Table 1, Figure 3). Nearly half of the sablefish mortality was attributed to landings by the non-catch shares fixed gear, and more than a quarter attributed to landings by the catch shares bottom trawl, fleets (Table 2, Figure 4).

The ACL attainment of yelloweye rockfish, a rebuilding groundfish species on the U.S. West Coast, was 47% (Table 1 and Figure 3). Recreational and non-catch shares fixed gear discards were the primary contributors to this mortality (Table 2 and Figure 4).

A number of other groupings and species attained 70% or greater of their ACL attainments in 2024, nearly all of which were within their respective five-year ranges. Black/blue/deacon rockfish (in Oregon) was attained at 71%, the only grouping to attain greater than 70% of its ACL while being below the five-year range (Table 1, Figure 3). Approximately 75% of this mortality was landed by the Oregon recreational fishery and about 25% by the non-catch shares fixed




Figure 3. Proportion of ACL attained in 2024 compared to 2019–23 for select species that are highly targeted, highly attained, or rebuilding. Gray points display annual estimates from 2019 to 2023; 2024 points are colored as indicated in the legend. Hake attainment is shown as proportion of TAC. Sablefish is managed north and south of lat 36°N; the minor nearshore rockfish complex is managed north and south of lat 40°10'N. Rebuilding species are capitalized.




Figure 4. Sector-level contributions to 2024 mortality. The x-axis shows the contribution of the given sector to total mortality, while color indicates the percent of the catch that is discarded by that sector. Sablefish is managed north and south of lat 36°N; the minor nearshore rockfish complex is managed north and south of lat 40°10'N. Rebuilding species are capitalized.

gear fleet (Table 2, Figure 4). The ACL for the minor nearshore rockfish complex north of lat 40°10'N was attained at 75% (Table 1, Figure 3). Nearly all mortality was due to landings by the recreational fleet and discards by the non-catch shares fixed gear fleet, with a slightly higher contribution from the recreational fleet (Table 2, Figure 4). 85% of widow rockfish ACL was attained in 2024, and nearly all the mortality was attributed to landings by the midwater rockfish fleet (Table 2, Figure 4). Petrale sole ACL attainment was 86% in 2024, and nearly all of this mortality was attributed to catch shares bottom trawl landings (Table 1 and Table 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4).



References

- Albin, D., and K. A. Karpov. 1996. Mortality of lingcod, *Ophiodon elongatus*, related to capture by hook and line. *Marine Fisheries Review* 60(3):29–34.
- MSA (Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976). 2006. Magnuson–Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorizat on Act of 2006. U.S. Code, volume 16, section 1851.
- NWFSC (Northwest Fisheries Science Center). 2025a. At-Sea Hake Observer Program 2025 Sampling Manual. Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle. Available: repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/67356 (August 2025).
- NWFSC (Northwest Fisheries Science Center). 2025b. West Coast Groundfish Observer Program 2025 Training Manual. Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle. Available: repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/67559 (August 2025).
- NWFSC (Northwest Fisheries Science Center). 2025c. Endangered Species Interactions with U.S. West Coast Federal Groundfish Fisheries, 2002–2023. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2025/05/informational-report-3a-endangered-species-interactions-with-u-s-west-coast-federal-groundfish-fisheries-2002-2023.pdf/ (August 2025).
- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2012. Scientific and Statistical Committee Report on Briefing on and Limited Actions for Emerging Issues in the 2013–2014 Biennial Specifications Process. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2012/03/f-groundfish-management-march-2012.pdf (March 2020).
- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2014. Groundfish Management Team Report on Proposed Discard Mortality for Cowcod, Canary Rockfish, and Yelloweye Rockfish Released Using Descending Devices in the Recreational Fishery. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2014/03/d-groundfish-management-march-2014.pdf (March 2020).
- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2015a. Groundfish Management Team Report to the Scientific and Statistical Committee on a Literature Review of Skate Discard Mortality. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2015/06/agenda-item-d-7-a-gmt-report.pdf (March 2020).
- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2015b. Scientific and Statistical Committee Report on Inseason Adjustments. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2015/06/agenda-item-d-7-a-supplemental-ssc-report.pdf (March 2020).
- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2017. Groundfish Management Team Informational Report on Updated Nearshore Discard Mortality Rates for Rockfish. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2017/06/f10a_sup_gmt_rpt_inseasonrpt1-final_dmrs_for_bb_and_wcgop_jun2017bb.pdf (March 2020).
- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2019a. Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan for the California, Oregon, and Washington Groundfish Fishery. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2016/08/pacific-coast-groundfish-fishery-management-plan.pdf (March 2020).

- PFMC (Pacific Fishery Management Council). 2019b. Status of the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery: Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2019/01/status-of-the-pacific-coast-groundfish-fishery-stock-assessment-and-fishery-evaluation-description-of-the-fishery-revised-january-2019.pdf (July 2020).
- PFMC and NMFS (Pacific Fishery Management Council and National Marine Fisheries Service). 2012. Proposed Harvest Specifications and Management Measures for the 2013–2014 Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery and Amendment 21-2 to the Pacific Coast Fishery Management Plan; Final Environmental Impact Statement. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Portland, Oregon. Available: www.pcouncil.org/documents/2012/09/groundfish-harvest-specifications-and-management-measures-for-2013-2014-and-amendment-21-2.pdf/ (July 2020).
- Pikitch, E. K., J. R. Wallace, E. A. Babcock, D. L. Erickson, M. Saelens, and G. Oddsson. 1998. Pacific halibut bycatch in the Washington, Oregon, and California groundfish and shrimp trawl fisheries. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 18:569–586.
- USOFR (U.S. Office of the Federal Register). 2001. 50 CFR Part 660: Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Groundfish Observer Program, final rule. *Federal Register* 66:79(24 April 2001):20609–20614.
- USOFR (U.S. Office of the Federal Register). 2013. 50 CFR Part 660: Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2013–2014 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures, final rule. *Federal Register* 78:2(3 January 2013):580–644.
- USOFR (U.S. Office of the Federal Register). 2015. 50 CFR Part 660: Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Trawl Rationalization Program; Midwater Trawl Requirements, final rule. *Federal Register* 80:239(14 December 2015):77267–77275.

Appendix A: Discard Mortality Analysis Details

See supporting spreadsheet.

Table A-1. GMT-provided and SSC-approved mortality rates applied in bottom trawl and fixed gear fisheries.

Table A-2. GMT-provided and SSC-approved depth-dependent mortality rates applied in the nearshore fixed gear fishery.

Table A-3. Depth-dependent mortality rates applied to research catch, when caught using hook-and-line gear and descended at depth using a descending device. Rates were developed and approved by PFMC, transmitted to FOS, and are documented in Table 1-16 of Section 1.2 of the 2016 SAFE.¹

Table A-4. Updates to analysis used in this report.

Table A-5. In-season adjustments to 2024 U.S. West Coast groundfish fisheries. A complete list of NMFS Public Notices and a complete list of Federal Register Notices can be found on the [NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region website](#).²

Table A-6. Species identification codes used in the Pacific Coast Fisheries Information Network (PacFIN) database and assigned to WCGOP data. Columns on the far right specify which species were defined as groundfish (as identified in the Pacific Coast Groundfish FMP), as nearshore species, as IFQ-managed species or categories, or as rebuilding species in 2024.

Table A-7. Identifications beyond taxonomic level required by WCGOP.

Table A-8. Species belonging to each WCGOP unsampled IFQ catch category. The *IFQM* catch category includes all IFQ species, and the *NIFQ* category includes all non-IFQ fish species.

¹<https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2016/12/status-of-the-pacific-coast-groundfish-fishery-stock-assessment-and-fishery-evaluation-description-of-the-fishery-december-2016.pdf/>

²<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/rules-and-announcements/notices-and-rules>

Appendix B: PacFIN Data Processing Protocol

Fish Ticket Data Retrieval and Processing

The basic protocol we employ using Oracle SQL developer and R software is as follows:

1. Run an SQL query to retrieve PacFIN data from 2002 through previous year and output an initial data file (.csv file).
2. Postprocess the PacFIN data internally.
3. Utilize postprocessed PacFIN data files in analyses and groundfish mortality (GM) reporting.

Prior to PacFIN fish ticket data retrieval (summarized from PacFIN website):

Landings can be recorded within the PacFIN system in very general categories consisting of many species, and others not as general but consisting of two or more species. Within the fish-ticket tables, these are known as a fish-ticket market category, or “category” for short. Examples in the PacFIN system are names such as “unspecified slope rockfish,” “nominal yellowtail rockfish,” and “unspecified small reds rockfish.”

These market categories are sampled regularly, resulting in proportions that describe the composition of these various categories in terms of the actual species observed. This market category sampling occurs in various ports and for distinct gear types, producing proportions for individual species by port (or port group), gear (or gear group), and month (or quarter). For some PacFIN data sources, area is also a sampling dimension.

The PacFIN system combines monthly summations of market categories with corresponding species composition proportions to produce the best estimate of catch for individual species, where possible. If all possible combinations of market category, gear type, port, month, and area (where applicable) were actually sampled, then the resulting PacFIN reports/data would contain catch for only individual scientifically defined species. As it is, there are situations that result in unsampled strata and thus, PacFIN reports/data potentially include both individual species as well as market categories.

We selected from all data from 2002–24 from one view created by PacFIN, `WCGOP_COMPFT_FEDPERMITS_V2`, which joins permits tables to the comprehensive fish-ticket table.

Prior to running the code below, edits are made to the downloaded PacFIN data, including:

- Correcting attribute fields, including gear, vessel ID, and ticket date, based on multiple data sources.
- Removing duplicated tickets.
- Incorporating state permit and management regulations data.

FOS sector definitions for PacFIN fish-ticket data

This procedure identifies sectors, as shown in Figure 1.

“Tribal” landings are defined as tickets with $PARGRP = I$.

“Research” landings are defined as $REMOVAL_TYPE = R$ and $IFQ_LANDING = FALSE$. These data are omitted, as commercial federal research data are provided by permit holders to the NWFSC. Further, IFQ trips in early years of the program were often incorrectly identified as research, so we ignore overlap between those two fields.

“EFP” landings are defined as non-IFQ EFP landings from Non-Research, Vessel ID known as $REMOVAL_TYPE = E$ and $IFQ_LANDING = FALSE$. We ignore the EFP flag where $IFQ_LANDING = TRUE$, because this field is not always correct. Instead, we use a separate list from PSMFC to identify EM and other EFP tickets under the IFQ program. In 2017 and beyond, the gear modification EFP trip was included in the IFQ catch shares program as EM or observed, as appropriate.

IFQ landings are defined as tickets where $IFQ_LANDING = TRUE$. They are further subdivided as:

All IFQ landings where $ADJ_GRID \neq MDT$ are defined as “Catch Shares.”

For IFQ landings where $ADJ_GRID = MDT$:

“Midwater Hake” when landing $\geq 50\%$ hake on unique vessel landing date (VIDYMD).

“Midwater Rockfish” when landing $\geq 50\%$ midwater rockfish on VIDYMD.

Any remaining tickets are defined based on the captain’s logbook.

For IFQ landings where $IS_EM_LANDING = TRUE$, the same definitions as above are used, but EM is added to the sector definition.

Shrimp trawl landings ($GRGROUP = TWS$) are categorized as:

“Pink Shrimp” landings where landed more pink shrimp (PS) than other species, had state permit, and occurred between April and November.

“Ridgeback Prawn Trawl” landings where landed more ridgeback prawn than sea cucumber and had state permit; these are added to the “Incidental” sector (see below).

“Sea Cucumber Trawl” landings where landed more sea cucumber than ridgeback prawn and had state permit; these are added to the “Incidental” sector (see below).

Non-IFQ landings where $GRGROUP = TWL$ are categorized as follows:

“Limited Entry” landings if $PERM1 \neq$ [blank], further defined as:

“Non-Tribal Shoreside Hake” landings where $ADJ_GRID = MDT$ for 2002–10.

“LE CA Halibut” if $ADJ_GRID \neq MDT$ and landed > 150 lb of CA Halibut and, if after 2007, had state permit.

All remaining tickets defined as “LE Trawl.”

“Open Access” landings if PERM1 = [blank], further defined as:

“OA CA Halibut” if ADJ_GRID ≠ *MDT* and landed > 150 lb of CA Halibut and, if after 2007, had state permit.

“Ridgeback Prawn” if landed more ridgeback prawn than sea cucumber and had state permit; these are added to the “Other Fisheries” sector (see below).

“Sea Cucumber Trawl” if landed more sea cucumber than ridgeback prawn and had state permit; these are added to the “Other Fisheries” sector (see below).

“Nearshore” landings consist of those where GRGROUP = *HKL* or *POT* or GEAR = *BTR*, *TRL* or *USP* in OR or CA and landed nearshore species (see Table A-6) on VIDYMD and nearshore or groundfish species, California sheephead, California halibut, or Pacific halibut on the FTID. When *BTR*, *TRL*, or *USP* gears were used, vessels must have landed more groundfish than nongroundfish on that day using that gear. Additionally, from 2004–present, the ticket must be associated with a state permit.

“Non-Nearshore Fixed Gear” landings consist of those where GRGROUP = *HKL* or *POT* or GEAR = *BTR*, *TRL* or *USP*, did not land nearshore species, and landed sablefish or more groundfish than non-groundfish on VIDYMD and groundfish species, California sheephead, California halibut, or Pacific halibut on the FTID. When *BTR*, *TRL*, or *USP* gears were used, vessels must have landed more groundfish than nongroundfish on that day using that gear. These are further categorized as:

“LE Sablefish Primary” landings where has federal permit, is tier endorsed, fished during primary season, and did not reach tier limit.

“LE Non-Primary”/“LE 0 Tier” landings where has federal permit, is not tier endorsed, and GRGROUP = *HKL* and landings where has federal permit, is tier endorsed, and has reached tier limit.

“OA Fixed Gear” landings where has no federal permit and landings where has federal permit, is not tier endorsed, and GRGROUP = *POT*.

“Directed PHLB” landings where identified by the IPHC and, for recent years of data where IPHC has not finalized identification and landings in CA, tickets recorded PHLB catch landed on one of the specific calendar-year 10-hour openings, plus two days post (to allow for any subsequent deliveries).

“Other fisheries” landings include tickets or parts of tickets where:

DRVID = *MISSING*, *UNKNOWN*, or blank.

GRGROUP ≠ *HKL*, *POT*, *TWL*, or *TWS*.

GRGROUP = *TWL* but not included in federal or state trawl fisheries.

GRGROUP = *TWS* but not included in pink shrimp fisheries.

GRGROUP = *HKL* or *POT* but not included in nearshore or non-nearshore fixed gear fisheries.

GRGROUP = *HKL* or *POT* or GEAR = *BTR*, *TRL* or *USP* but didn’t land any groundfish, nearshore, Pacific halibut, California halibut, or California sheephead.

GEAR = *BTR*, *TRL*, or *USP* but landed Albacore tuna or any salmon species.

All additional data processing steps that were applied during the discard estimation process are described in [Methods](#).

Trawl Logbook Data Retrieval and Processing

Logbook data are downloaded from `COMPREHENSIVE_TRAWL_LOGBOOK`, a table in PacFIN that incorporates logbook data and permit information for 2005 to 2024. The procedures used in previous reports are necessary for data from 2002 to 2004 as they are not included in this table.

Data from 2002–10 are used in estimations of discard for the LE trawl fleet. Data from 2011–24 are sometimes used for effort estimations when observer data are unavailable because a trip was monitored using an electronic system.

Explicit WCGOP postprocessing of PacFIN logbook data

Select Puget Sound landings:

`PSGRNDCODE ≠ 0`

Select Non-Puget Sound (Ocean) landings:

`PSGRNDCODE = 0`

Select Midwater:

`GRID = MDT`

Select Non-Midwater:

`GRID ≠ MDT`

Select Limited Entry permitted:

`PERMID_1 ≠ [blank]`

Select Non-LE permitted (Open Access):

`PERMID_1 = [blank]`

Note: LE non-midwater logbook data are further delineated into the state CA halibut trawl fishery for each individual tow/haul as follows:

- a) If tow target is CA halibut (`PACFIN_TARGET = CHLB or CHL1`), or*
- b) Tow target `PACFIN_TARGET = (NSM or OFLT or SSOL or SS01)` and `DEPTH1 < 30 (fth)` and `SET_LAT < 40.16667`.*

The remaining LE non-midwater logbook data tows are considered part of the LE groundfish trawl fishery.

Additional data processing steps are described in each report and product.

Recently published by the Northwest Fisheries Science Center

NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-

- 205 Keller, A. A., V. H. Simon, D. L. Draper, A. C. Chappell, K. L. Bosley, J. C. Buchanan, P. H. Frey, J. H. Harms, and M. A. Head. 2026.** The 2019 U.S. West Coast Bottom Trawl Survey of Groundfish Resources off Washington, Oregon, and California: Estimates of Distribution, Abundance, and Length Composition. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-205. <https://doi.org/10.25923/w111-ja31>
- 204 Gaydos, J. K., H. H. Nollens, C. F. Lo, M. B. Hanson, K. Haman, M. Weiss, D. Giles, S. J. Thornton, T. R. Robeck, and C. Dold. 2026.** Remotely Sensed Metrics for Evaluating Wild Killer Whale Health. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-204. <https://doi.org/10.25923/jftd-d217>
- 203 Somers, K. A., K. E. Richerson, and V. J. Tuttle. 2025.** Fishing Effort in the 2002–23 U.S. Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-203. <https://doi.org/10.25923/1rck-7159>
- 202 Sol, S. Y., P. M. Nicklason, B. F. Anulacion, and R. B. Johnson. 2025.** Use of Non-Native Columbia River American Shad (*Alosa sapidissima*) as an Alternative Fishmeal Source for Juvenile Sablefish (*Anoplopoma fimbria*). U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-202. <https://doi.org/10.25923/8dcv-5t90>
- 201 WC Chinook Salmon Status Review Team. 2025.** Biological Status of the Washington Coast Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit: Report of the Status Review Team. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-201. <https://doi.org/10.25923/1713-1129>
- 200 Steiner, E., A. Phillips, and A. Chen. 2025.** Economic Status of the Pacific Hake Fishery, 2009–23. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-200. <https://doi.org/10.25923/gcr3-ph80>
- 199 Somers, K. A., K. E. Richerson, V. J. Tuttle, and J. T. McVeigh. 2024.** Estimated Discard and Catch of Groundfish Species in the 2023 U.S. West Coast Fisheries. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-199. <https://doi.org/10.25923/mxc3-9934>
- 198 OP Steelhead Status Review Team. 2024.** Biological Status of the Olympic Peninsula Steelhead Distinct Population Segment. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-198. <https://doi.org/10.25923/tnxh-7j96>
- 197 Steiner, E., A. Phillips, and A. Chen. 2024.** Economic Status of the Pacific Hake Fishery, 2009–22. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-197. <https://doi.org/10.25923/6jh0-xq09>

NOAA Technical Memorandums NMFS-NWFSC are available from the NOAA Institutional Repository, <https://repository.library.noaa.gov>.



U.S. Secretary of Commerce
Howard Lutnick

Under Secretary of Commerce
for Oceans and Atmosphere
Dr. Neil Jacobs

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries
Eugenio Piñeiro Soler

March 2026

fisheries.noaa.gov

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

National Marine
Fisheries Service
Northwest Fisheries Science Center
2725 Montlake Boulevard East
Seattle, Washington 98112